JUN 6- 1957

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 102—PART 11

JULY 25, 1956, TO JULY 27, 1956
(PAGES 14323 TO 15782)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, July 16, 1956)

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we turn unfilled to Thee, grant the assurance to our anxious groping hearts that behind the shadows and in them standeth One who slumbers not, nor sleeps. We are beset by perplexity, our needs are many as we turn from problem to problem, but our greatest need is of Thee; unless we find Thee and are found of Thee, the laws of Thy physical universe break our mortal life, and the laws of Thy moral realm make mockery of our futile rebellion. For Thou hast said regarding Thy laws for human behaviour, "Whosoever falls upon them shall be bruised, but upon whomsoever they shall fall, he shall be ground to powder."

Only in Thy will is our peace. And so Eternal Father, whose mercy is like the wideness of the sea, breathe now on hearts that pray the peace that comes only when our jarring discords are tuned to the music of Thy will. Then, as heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts as a holy sacrament the bread of human kindness and the red wine of sacrificial service. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 24, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2568) to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. GARY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DENTON, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. FENTON, Mr. FORD, and Mr. HAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of the various standing committees, with the exception of the Committee on the Judiciary, be permitted to file reports during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from New York understand that we are now in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is not in the morning hour. The Senate is meeting following a recess.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I read rule VII, it provides:

1. After the Journal is read, the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order:

The presentation of petitions and memorials.

Reports of standing and select committees.

The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Concurrent and other resolutions.

All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order, unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The section of the rule which the Senator from New York has read applies only when there has been a reading of the Journal when the Senate meets after an adjournment. This morning the Senate is meeting after a recess. Therefore the section of the rule to which the Senator has referred does not apply.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the Senator from New York understand, therefore, that until a new legislative day comes into being—and there has been no legislative day, as I understand, since July 16, in spite of the fact that today is July 25——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. There will be no morning hour and that no bills, therefore, can be introduced, except by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I address another parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make it very clear—as clear as I possibly can—that my inquiry in no way reflects, by implication or otherwise, on our present leadership, whom I consider to be men of honor and of good will.

However, if the ruling of the Chair is correct, it seems to me that inevitably the logical conclusion must be that no work can be done by the Senate except by unanimous consent, unless there is a new legislative day. Therefore it follows that at some future time, if we should have a leadership of lesser stature and of lesser integrity than the leadership of today, a leader could recess the Senate at the close of business on the very first day of the session; and if he had sufficient votes behind him, he could continue to recess the Senate every day until the

end of the session. That would result in legislation exclusively by unanimous consent, and not in an orderly way of a democratic legislative body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield, although I have addressed an inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not wish to get into an argument on this subject with my good friend from New York. I believe that before the session is over he will find that there has never been a session of the Senate in which more business has been transacted and in which the calendar has been kept so clear as it has been during the present session.

The Senator from New York is quite correct, that if a majority of the Senate decided on the first day of the session that it did not want the Senate to do anything, such a majority could decide to do just that. All the majority would have to do would be to have a Senator move to recess, which is a motion that takes precedence. If 48 other Senators joined in the motion, the majority could do anything it wished to do.

In the same way, a majority of 49 Senators could move the consideration of bills and vote against them. In that way no business would be transacted.

The Senator is correct that that could be done, if a majority of the Senate wanted to do it.

However, a majority of the Senate has demonstrated that it wants to act on legislation. Although I do not have the list with me, I believe that during this session the Senate has passed approximately 2,800 bills. I will say to the Senator from New York that between now and final adjournment it will be in order, and it is in order today, without any consent to move to consider any bill. That was done last night, when the Senate took up a very important bill which had been reported by a committee of which the Senator is a member, the Committee on Banking and Currency. Any other bill on the calendar could be taken up in that way prior to the last legislative day.

I will say to my friend from New York that I have no doubt the Senate will adjourn sometime between now and the sine die adjournment. Yesterday there was an extremely important bill before the Senate under a consent agreement, and the leadership felt that we should go ahead with it and dispose of it.

We have other bills scheduled for consideration, and we have several reports we wish to have received. There are also several conference reports which must be disposed of.

Ever since the first day the Senate met in January a motion could have been made to discharge a committee from the consideration of a bill. Furthermore, it has been in order since last January to move to suspend the rules. That could have been done. Now we are in the last 2 or 3 or 4 days of the session, we hope, and there are measures on the calendar which affect my State and the Senator's State. They are measures of great importance, affecting all the people of those and other States.

The Senator has had some bills passed by the Senate, and there are other bills pending in the House which we wish to pass before Congress adjourns. It is hoped that we can act on the supplemental appropriation bills, the rivers and harbors bill, and various conference reports within the days between now and the time of the Democratic National Convention.

There is a bill pending before the Senate at this time. We can act on that bill today, and when it is acted upon we can go through the calendar and pick out any bill for consideration. I have a list of those which we expect to take up and act upon; and we shall act upon them expeditiously. I have never undertaken to have the Senate consider a bill which had not been cleared with the majority policy group and the minority policy group. Sometimes the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has objected to measures being considered, and we have had to send them back to committees.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I believe we have had a productive session, and I desire particularly to remind the majority and the minority leaders that what I am saying now has no application whatsoever, actually or by implication, to the present leadership. I am, however, addressing myself to a situation which I think could, under less honorable and well-disposed leadership, become serious and one which is by no means understood by the American people, and, I may say, by the membership of the Senate itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If my friend from New York will permit me to interject at that point, that is true, but the majority of the Members of the Senate would have to be corrupt as well as the leadership to bring about such a situation.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true. But I can conceive of a situation where 1 party or 1 group might be in the great majority and might be able to impose, through the weight of their representation, conditions which would be onerous to other Members and be very, very harmful to the Nation.

The majority leader mentioned a number of important bills which are now ready for consideration. I know they are. But what I am getting at is this: If there is to continue in effect the rule—and I think it is an extremely bad and dangerous rule—that there cannot be a morning hour save on a new legislative day, it is perfectly conceivable that at some time in the future a leadership could, as I have already pointed out, move to recess on the very first day of a session and continue to recess day after day until the end of the session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me finish my sentence. The Senate could continue to recess day after day until the end of the session, and under those circumstances bills could not be introduced. It would not be a matter of considering bills which were on the calendar, but bills could not be introduced.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senate could recess for 3 days at a time if the majority did not want to do anything.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am addressing myself to the question of holding a morning hour only if there is a new legislative day, and if there is not, requiring unanimous consent to transact business.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hoped the Senator would yield to me while he was on my side of the aisle. I am glad to welcome him temporarily over here.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been on the same side as the minority leader on many issues.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With reference to the hypothetical case which the Senator presents, in the first place, no leadership in the Senate, in my judgment, either sitting on this side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle, would take any such arbitrary attitude as that suggested by the Senator from New York, because the Senate itself would not stand for it. There are 96 Members of this body. They have it in their control at any time to adjourn the Senate or to take the leadership away from any leader resorting to any such arbitrary and unfair action as has been suggested by the Senator.

As the Senator has said, at some future time there may be a question of the integrity of the leadership; but the majority has control at all times. There may be a time when one party will have a predominant voice in this Chamber. Instead of being divided, as we are now, with 49 Members on the other side of the aisle and 47 Members on this side, there may be 17 on the other side or on this side. In recent history the Republican representation in the Senate has been down to that narrow margin. It is for that reason that the rules of the Senate are rather strict, so that an arbitrary majority can not temporarily ride roughshod over the minority. It is for that reason that the rules prevail. There are honest differences of opinion as to how strict the rules should be, but the Senator can at any time submit a resolution providing for a change in the rules and have it go before the Committee on Rules and Administration, have it reported to the Senate, and ask that it be taken up and considered, and if a majority of the Members agree, the rules can be changed.

But with reference to the matter under discussion at this time, this is the second year of the 84th Congress. At any time since the introduction of the measure, the Senator from New York had it within his power, and the Senator from Missouri had it within his power, to move to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the consideration of such a bill. It was not necessary, in the last few days of the session, to submit a resolution of that kind.

There are matters of great importance before the Senate this late in the session, and the Senator from New York knows as well as I do that those who are in favor of a particular measure are

within their rights to move to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a particular bill when the bill has been in the hands of the committee even for only 1 day. Assuming for a moment that the parliamentary situation should become such that a motion of that kind could be made, it would require a majority vote to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a bill. But the motion to discharge would be subject to unlimited debate. Then, if a cloture petition were filed, it would have to be approved by 64 Members. Then, each Senator would have 1 hour for debate. If the bill were taken from the committee and placed on the Senate calendar, the next motion would be to proceed to its consideration, whether a House bill or a Senate bill, and that motion would be subject to unlimited debate.

Cloture would have to be invoked before it could be brought before the Senate for consideration. If the Senate agreed to consider the bill, the bill itself and each amendment to it would be subject to unlimited debate. A hundred amendments might be proposed, and each one would be subject to unlimited debate. It might be necessary to circulate a cloture petition on each amendment. If Members finally became tired of offering amendments, a cloture petition on the bill itself would have to be circulated, and each Senator would have 1 hour's debate.

The Senator from New York is a practical man. This is no time, in the last few days of the session, to proceed with something which, from a practical point of view, the Senator knows as well as anyone knows cannot be accomplished.

It is only "kidding" minority groups and the American people to go through a lot of idle gestures.

As the minority leader of the Senate, I have had some experience with filibusters. I have helped to break them. I have on occasion signed cloture petitions. On occasions I voted for cloture.

But if the Senate is to be faced with prolonged debate, the only time to bring up such measures is early in a session, before there is a backlog of important bills.

Then, after a fair debate—because regardless of what the issue is, every Senator is entitled to have fair debate, and I would insist on that even before I signed a cloture petition—after the Senate had run along for perhaps a week or two with what might be termed legitimate debate, it might be necessary to have the Senate remain in session around the clock.

The Senator from New York knows, as well as I do, that at the end of a session, when Senators have worked hard, it is not desirable to start to have sessions around the clock, considering the parliamentary situation as it is.

I am merely stating what the facts are.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very much interested in what the Senator has said. He has stated the various courses of action which are open. He has described the length of debate which might take place and various motions which could be made. All that is interesting. I do not question the accuracy of the statements made by the Senator from California.

But the fact remains that we were estopped from entering the motion to discharge the committee, and we were estopped on one ground only, namely, that there was no morning hour. Under the rules, there must be a morning hour, to enable Senators to have an opportunity of at least of presenting such a motion and of having it considered by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from New York does not claim that that failure to have a morning hour is in violation of the rules, does he?

Mr. LEHMAN. No. Of course I accept the decision of the distinguished Vice President. But what I am saying is that in effect it is really a prohibition on the introduction of bills each day. It is really a case of going way beyond any specific legislation. I believe such a practice affects the orderly processes of the Senate.

I may say to the Senator from California—and I believe I speak for many other Senators—that until 3 days ago I did not know, indeed, I never suspected, that there was not a morning hour each day, regardless of whether it was a legislative or a calendar day. I do not recollect a single instance in the 7 years I have been in the Senate when we did not have a morning hour.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I find it most difficult to understand that the distinguished Senator from New York, with all his background of public service, would have such a belief, because year after year, in the 11 years I have been in the Senate, both in the period of time I served as majority leader, succeeding the late Senator Taft, and in the time I have occupied the position of minority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Texas has occupied the position of majority leader, as have many of his illustrious predecessors, there has never been a day which has passed when either from this side of the aisle, or the other side of the aisle, when we did not have an adjournment, but recessed instead, the custom or practice of the majority leader was not to rise and ask unanimous consent that there might be a period for the insertion of material in the RECORD under a 2-minute rule. But that has been accomplished by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Or when Senators did not yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or when Senators did not yield for that purpose. As the Senator from New York knows, almost anything can be done by unanimous consent; and the customary practice is that unanimous consent is given.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the Senator from New York at this point—and I should like to have the attention of all Senators——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Senators who are familiar with the operations of the Senate know that it has not been the practice of the leadership of any party, at any time, to adjourn the Senate every night. The leadership has followed what was usually considered to be the wishes of the majority of the Members of the Senate. Sometimes there was an adjournment, if it was necessary to have a morning hour of 2 hours' duration, when there had not been an adjournment in several days. The leadership has sometimes followed that course. Until the day before yesterday, the Senate had been recessing from July 16. No objection was raised to it.

I do not object to Senators making insertions or to moving to adjourn, even now. In the opinion of the majority leader—and I hope the minority leader concurs in my view—there will be an adjournment of the Senate before there is a sine die adjournment. But the point I wish to make is that there will not be an adjournment based on what one Senator says or on what two Senators say, when important legislation must be acted on by the Senate, and the leadership thinks an adjournment does not serve the interest of the Senate.

The question of adjournment was submitted to the Senate last night. The Senate determined whether it wanted to adjourn.

I shall ask that the Senate adjourn before the sine die adjournment of the Senate. I shall ask the Senate to permit Senators to make statements. I shall freely yield my time to any Senator who wishes to make a statement or make an insertion in the RECORD or submit a report.

I assure the Senator from New York that, so far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, he anticipates that the Senate will adjourn before a sine die adjournment resolution is submitted. But the Senator from Texas will not be threatened, bludgeoned, intimidated, or forced to move an adjournment at a specific time or on a specific day by any Senator, regardless of the side of the aisle on which he sits. I think the Senate will support that position; I hope the minority leader will support it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say in reply to the Senator from Texas that I think we must follow the orderly procedures of the Senate; otherwise, the Senate could easily become snarled, just as some of the parliamentary bodies of Europe have become snarled, and no one now knows where the responsibility lies, because the control of those parliaments changes from day to day. Such an occurrence in the United States Senate could result in an utterly chaotic situation.

There have been many times in the course of the years when, because of the absence by reason of illness, or for other reasons of Senators of the majority party, the control of the Senate could have shifted to the other side of the aisle. There have been times when I have had a majority of the Members of the Senate actually present on this side of the aisle. At such times I could have moved to usurp the leadership of the Senate—and, I may say, when I would have preferred to have it.

However, I do not believe there has ever been a majority leader who has been

and is more courteous and more considerate to the minority leader than the able Senator from Texas. But if it had merely been desired to cause the Senate to become snarled, I could probably have moved on two dozen occasions, perhaps more, to usurp the leadership for a day or two. The majority leader then would have had to rush forth and get Senators from his side of the aisle out of a sick bed to come to the Senate, because he controlled 49 votes, while I had only 47.

In the next Congress I hope that my party will have a substantial working majority. But suppose my side had a majority of one. I would be faced with the same problem. If there were a temporary vacancy in the Senate, the leadership could be usurped. I think such usurpation would be disruptive of the orderly processes of the Senate.

If we do not like the procedures, there are methods provided for changing the rules. I, myself, have, on occasion, suggested changes in the rules. So far as I am concerned, so long as I remain in this chair, and so long as I am dealt with fairly, and my party is dealt with fairly—and I believe my party is being dealt with fairly—I shall not be a party to usurping the prerogatives of the majority leader of the Senate when bills are being considered which affect the welfare of the country.

If I had the responsibility to schedule a program, or if I were interested in a type of legislation in which the President of the United States is interested, I would try to schedule it early in the session, when the Senate would not be involved in such a situation as this.

I shall not destroy the orderly processes of the Senate. I intend to back up the majority leader so long as I feel he is treating the party on this side of the aisle equitably and is following the rules of the Senate, and I feel that every Member of the Senate is being accorded all his rights under the rules.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas say is no doubt, in the main, technically true.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not only technically true, but it is factually true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we pierce behind the complex rules and procedures, we know, as men, that the rules of the Senate have been very skillfully devised to prevent any action on civil rights which is obnoxious to the Members from the South who sit in the United States Senate.

A complex of rules for this purpose has been built up over the years, carefully guarded, carefully defended—the provisions that the Senate can be recessed rather than adjourned, so that the introduction of bills and resolutions and motions to discharge and reports, as of right, can be shut off in what would otherwise have been the morning hour; the provisions for motions to proceed to consideration of a bill being subject to unlimited debate, and requiring cloture motions to secure a vote for that; and the provisions for unlimited debate when the bill comes up. The severe restrictions upon cloture is another set of fortresses. A combined Republican and southern majority fastened those rules on the Senate still more firmly in 1949, when I am sorry to say, the then minority leader joined with the Members of the South to make the application of cloture still more difficult.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has mentioned my name. The fact of the matter is that the new rules do not make cloture more difficult.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, they do.

Mr. KNOWLAND. To the contrary, up to the time of the rule changes, cloture was not applicable to a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. There was no way one could possibly bring debate to a close until we changed the rules so that, on a motion to bring up a bill, a cloture petition could be filed. Up to that time the Senate could not apply cloture even if 64 or 70 Members wanted to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the RECORD will show I made this statement of the then minority leader. It was the late Senator Wherry who made the motion which made bringing the measure to a conclusion and to a vote more difficult. The RECORD will show, I believe, that the Senator from California also voted for the Wherry motion.

But all this is beside the point. I think it is now clear, from our experience of yesterday, when a motion which would have permitted us to propose action was defeated by the crushing vote of 76 to 6, that it will be impossible, under the rules of the Senate, with the present temper of the southern Senators, and with the temper of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and with the present attitudes of the real leaders of both political parties, ever to bring a civil-rights measure of any real substance to a vote in this body. Pale imitations may be offered by the political leaders to clear their skirts but it has now been demonstrated that no real improvement can be made.

I think the course which the Senate has followed will probably prevent the American people, in a legislative fashion, from ever proceeding to defend the rights of the Negro minority in this country.

I say that with great sadness, but I think it is a fact. Many persons may exult over this tendency. I do not.

I say that great wrongs are perpetrated upon the Negroes of this country, in all sections of the country. Sometimes those wrongs are perpetrated legally. Sometimes they are perpetrated outside the law, by the coercion exercised upon Negroes to prevent them from voting, and in various other ways. They are discriminated against in employment and in housing. They are discriminated against so far as schooling is concerned. They are discriminated against in voting which frequently they can only do at the peril of their lives. They are not assured of a fair trial and frequently do not receive it. I regard all this as a great blot upon the American people, and as unworthy of the ideals upon which this Republic was founded. It is in the deepest sense of the term un-Christian.

I want to say that the Senate of the United States, along with all the other matters with which it has to deal, has in this matter a heavy burden upon its conscience.

I think as a result of the disillusioning experience we have gone through that practically there is very little we can do. The Negroes of this Nation are subjected, in many quarters, to great economic and physical pressure and are deprived of their basic rights under the Constitution. The rules of the Senate are so devised that we cannot act to defend them, and thus our legislative action in their protection will be almost impossible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator, if he will yield——

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I complete my statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe the American people can permanently postpone dealing with this issue. But the Members of the Senate who are in this quiet, and at times pleasant, club cannot hope to escape the scrutiny of the public opinion, not only of this country, but of the world.

I have probably not been very skillful in the efforts which I have made to bring this matter to a vote. I have tried my best but I know that at on at least two occasions I have been outwitted by the very able field generals on the opposing side. I make no protestations of personal virtue. I believe we must seek to right the great wrongs we have inflicted upon the Negro people if we are to escape the judgment of a just God. I do not question the motives of those, however, who have taken a contrary position. I merely say this is an issue which will weigh not only upon the conscience of the country, but upon the conscience of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois that the rules of the Senate make impossible the passage of proposed legislation on civil rights. To the contrary, I think it is quite possible to get civil rights proposed legislation before the Senate. But I make the point that there should not be an effort to get it through in the last 4 days of the session, when much major proposed legislation is backing up in the Senate. As I said to the Senator before, and as I say again, if I had the responsibility as majority leader, and my party was in control of the votes, as the Senator's party has been, I would endeavor to get a bill to the Senate early in the session, when the situation of a prolonged debate could be met, and not in the last four days.

Mr. NEUBERGER and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wanted to make a very brief statement on the subject the Senator from California and the Senator from Illinois were discussing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I want to make one statement in reply to the statement of the Senator from California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Illinois, of course, expressed my views, with regard to civil rights legislation, very graphically and sincerely. As my colleagues know, I have been fighting for civil rights legislation for a great many years, for many years before I came to Washington, during the time I was Governor of the State of New York, and even before that. I consider the issue of civil rights the most important confronting the Nation today. We can no longer close our eyes to the injustice and cruelty shown to some of our fellow citizens because of the color of their skin. I feel deeply about the fact that we have been estopped from invoking what I believe are orderly means to bring this utterly compelling measure before the Senate. The Senator from California, the minority leader, and the Senator from Texas, the majority leader, have said they would not be intimidated—I think that was the word—or forced into any situation by an individual or a small group of individuals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas made it very specific. He said so long as he was the majority leader—and he hoped he would be supported by the minority leader—on no particular day could a Senator tell him he had to move to adjourn or recess the Senate on that particular day. The Senator from Texas believes there should be an adjournment, as there have been adjournments; but he desires to say, that he does not believe 1, 2, or 3 Senators, or less than a majority, have a right to say, "Throw away your plans, junk your procedures, lift everything out in the aisle, throw it in the wastebasket; we are going to proceed to adjourn forthwith." If a majority of the Senate wants to do that, it always has that power. The Senate did not adjourn yesterday, just as it had not adjourned since July 16, just as it did not adjourn many days in February, March, and April. I think the Senate will adjourn before Congress adjourns sine die, and the Senator may present anything he wishes to under the rule, but the majority leader was not going to do it on Tuesday.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I say to the Senator from Texas, of course, the motion to adjourn, rather than recess, which was made last night was merely a part of the battle we have been fighting for 2 days to obtain the right to make our motion to bring the civil rights bill to the floor of the Senate. That right was denied to us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That right was denied on Tuesday. The Senator has had that right since January. We have had morning hours time and time and time again.

Mr. LEHMAN. But we did not do it. We have a right to make a motion to discharge, in an orderly way, under rule XXVI. Rule XXVI definitely prescribes the manner in which a motion to discharge may be submitted to the Senate. When it is submitted to the Senate, it is supposed to be considered by the Senate and decided by majority vote. On several occasions, we were estopped, by a single objection, even from making our motion. It was ruled out of order because of the objection of only one Member. You Senators speak of orderly procedure and democratic processes. I maintain that what you have done is neither orderly procedure nor democratic process, inasmuch as rule XXVI definitely prescribes the manner in which a motion to discharge a committee from the further consideration of a measure may be made and may be brought to the attention of the Senate for action by majority vote, not by the vote or decision of only one Member.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, some of us who are sincere and persistent advocates of civil rights have been placed in a most unfair situation by this episode.

I merely wish to announce that I plan to speak at slightly greater length this afternoon, if I can obtain the time from the majority leader, regarding exactly why I voted last night against the motion to adjourn.

At this time I merely wish to say that I am a very new and inexperienced Member of this body. However, I believe there is a proper and strategic and appropriate time for everything. For example, there are a great many of us on the floor of the Senate who would like to see the Kremlin destroyed and overthrown. However, that does not mean that we are going to rise this morning and suggest that American boys be put on ships and American pilots be put in bombers, to go forth and destroy the Kremlin. It is my opinion that there is a right time for everything.

I wish to state for the RECORD at this time my memory of an incident in January 1955, and I shall ask the distinguished Senator from New York whether my recollection of it is correct: In January 1955, on the day when the 1st session of the 84th Congress convened, there was held in the office of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] a meeting to discuss the civil-rights situation and the possibility of amending the Senate rules so that a civil-rights bill could successfully be considered. I remember that day particularly well, because it was the day when I became a Member of the Senate. I remember the occasion especially because the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and I stood in one corner of the room, inasmuch as there were so many Senators present at the meeting that there were not sufficient chairs for all. Therefore, we, being new Members with only a few hours seniority, stood in one corner. I remember that the junior Senator from New York went around the room—and I ask him to state if I am incorrect in my recollection; however, I think my memory is fairly good—and asked Senator after Senator what should be done. When he came to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and me, we passed, saying that we had no opinion, because as Members of the Senate with only 2 or 3 hours of service, we certainly did not have sufficient knowledge to pass on the question.

If I am not mistaken, the only Member of the Senate in that office on that day who favored making, at the very beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, an all-out fight to change the rules of the Senate was the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]; no one else among those present took that view. I ask the Senator from New York whether I am correct or incorrect in that recollection.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct.

I was very much saddened that at that time I did not have the support I had hoped to have. I shall add that I have never ceased to regret that I did not on my own, as an individual Senator alone, move that the rules be changed. I have stood alone on other occasions. I regret that very much even though I would have been overwhelmed by an adverse vote. The Senator from Oregon is quite correct in recalling that I was the only one who favored the submission of a motion to change the rules of the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from New York will also bear me out in my recollection, I believe, that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and I, having just been sworn in, passed, when our opinion was requested. We did not express any opinion, because of our total lack of experience in such a situation. Is that correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I recall that; and that is absolutely correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And all the other Senators then present, with the sole exception of the Senator from New York, did not then favor, at the beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, making an all-out effort to change the rules of the Senate, so that a civil-rights measure could be considered; only the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] favored undertaking that procedure. Is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. But we should have undertaken it; we should have pushed for it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I simply wished to have that account of the episode appear in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York still desire the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; Mr. President, unless some Senator requests that I yield.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has yielded the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I seek the floor in my own right, and not by sufferance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized in his own right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but I cannot remain completely silent, in view of so many of the statements which have been made.

There are times when we hear a great deal said about democratic processes.

Those times usually occur when individual Senators have not been able completely to accomplish their will in the manner they desire on the floor of the Senate.

The rules of the Senate apply to all Members of the Senate. When they are invoked, every Member of this body is bound thereby.

Mr. President, I am not one who believes that there is no democratic process other than that which I prescribe.

Mr. President, all men may differ in their opinions on the proposed legislation which has been discussed here this morning. Some Senators may believe it is good and salutary legislation. There are others of us who believe that it is largely political in its inspiration and that it is totally and completely in violation of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. We believe that it is destructive of the rights of the States. We believe that if carried to its final analysis though it may be aimed at one section of the country, it could finally take away from our people in every section the priceless heritage of individual rights and liberties which have enabled us to become the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, I merely say that when such nefarious schemes as these are presented in the future—and we hear that they will be—there will be Members of the Senate of the United States who will undertake to point out the vice of those proposals, and will resort to every weapon at their command to prevent such proposals being imposed upon the people of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the beginning of the discussion, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] propounded a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair made a ruling.

The Chair has asked the Parliamentarian to check the records of the Senate, to see how long the interpretation made by the Chair of the rule has been held to be correct. The rule interpreted by the ruling of the Chair has been in effect for 88 years.

The Chair would like to point out also, as Senators are aware, that the ruling made today by the Chair was not new or arbitrary. As is the custom, the Chair made the ruling after consultation with the Parliamentarian.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Edward (Shou Shrue) Keh, and his wife, Martha Mei Sing Keh nee Chen, from a report transmitted to the Senate on August 3, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that at the end of the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1956, there were 2,720 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site

"Whereas the Adams Mansion in Quincy, Mass., the home of John Adams and John Quincy Adams, an illustrious father and an illustrious son, both presidents of the United States of America, has been established as a national historic site in honor of the Adams family and the great contributions of that family to the United States and to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

"Whereas visitors from all parts of the country pay homage to the Adamses by visiting the old Adams home, now a historic shrine, thereby keeping alive the memory of the two distinguished leaders of our country who fought courageously to acquire and to retain the freedom and rights enjoyed by Americans: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a special commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

The petition of Ken Mantel, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the admission into the United Nations of Communist China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, New York, N. Y., signed by Shing-Tai Liang, president, relating to the admission into the United Nations of Communist China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN AIRCRAFT—PETITION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by some of the good people of North Dakota, concerning pending legislation.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEACH, N. DAK., *July 17, 1956.*

MILTON R. YOUNG,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We were pleased to hear bill H. R. 8000, introduced by Congressman JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, was favorably reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

We urge you to act promptly in reporting the Siler bill H. R. 4627 out favorably and also H. R. 388.

We are tired of the false claims made by the brewing industry in their advertising.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Guy Brown, Secretary; Mrs. H. Halstead, Mrs. F. D. Spiegelberg, Mrs. C. Lee Birdsall, Mrs. Marie Chuska, Mrs. Mary Avis Douglas, Mrs. Gurine Risli, Mrs. Chas. Slocomb, Mrs. W. E. Logan, Mrs. C. C. Hollstein, Mrs. O. L. Alsrud.

FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and the National Agricultural Workers Union have each recently released resolutions concerning the Fund for the Republic. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS' EXECUTIVE BOARD, JULY 16, 1956

RESOLUTION ON THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

A democratic nation has the obligation to carry on an unceasing survey of its ability to implement the promise of freedom and liberty. Such study is a difficult burden to bear, not only because of the magnitude of the task but because of the antagonisms bred of ignorance and demagoguery that will always assail democracy's efforts. The Fund for the Republic has embarked on what may be the noblest and most auspicious experiment ever attempted by a private organization in the United States to encourage and facilitate the study of civil liberties. In addition, the Fund for the Republic has dramatized those situations in which liberty has prevailed over momentary expediency by rewarding institutions which have advanced the cause of democracy.

The Fund for the Republic has carried on its activities in the face of unscrupulous attacks from those who either do not understand or do not agree with, the precepts of a democratic society. A committee of the United States Congress will, in the very near future, conduct hearings designed to evaluate the validity of such attacks. Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting of the IUE-AFL-CIO Executive Board warmly commends the activities of the Fund for the Republic; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting has confidence that when all the facts are laid before the American public, the Fund for the Republic will be vindicated and the criticisms leveled against it will be shown to be without foundation.

BROTHERHOOD OF SLEEPING CAR PORTERS,

New York, N. Y., July 13, 1956.

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: Because we are unequivocally opposed to the Soviet Union Communist conspiracy, we are strongly committed to the support of those organizations in our national community whose control is in the hands of persons who believe in the democratic process and human

dignity for all men regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, and the purpose and program of which are designed to give strength to our national unity and reality and integrity to our American dream.

By these standards, without passing judgment on the merits or demerits of the Report on Blacklisting by John Cogley, a noted and able journalist, and former editor of the well-known Catholic weekly, Commonweal, we wish to express our unqualified belief in and support of the Fund for the Republic, headed by a distinguished and responsible educator, Dr. Robert N. Hutchins, backed by a board of directors comprised of such outstanding American patriots as Paul G. Hoffman, George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College and Dean Erwin N. Griswold of the Harvard Law School, to name a few.

A review of the grants by the Fund for the Republic will indicate that they have been made to causes the advancement of which is fundamental to the leadership of the democratic forces of the world by the United States against Russian Soviet communism in its drive for worldwide conquest of the minds and allegiance of the peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

It is our earnest hope that nothing will be done that may impair the usefulness, in these times of crisis to the free world, of this valuable and important movement, the Fund for the Republic.

Very truly yours,

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
International President.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKERS UNION, AFL-CIO

The National Agricultural Workers Union, AFL-CIO yesterday forwarded to Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a resolution adopted by its executive board. The resolution warmly commended the Fund for the Republic for its activities in providing an explanation essential for an adequate understanding of American democracy and its underlying principles. The union executive board resolution which was adopted June 17, 1956, also expressed its appreciation to the Fund for a grant-in-aid made to Ernesto Galarza for a study of civil rights of contract workers imported into the United States for employment on large-scale corporate farms. Galarza is research director for the union and a member of its board. A copy of the letter to Congressman WALTER and the attached resolution follows:

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALTER: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the executive board of the National Agricultural Workers Union, AFL-CIO, on June 17, 1956, respecting the activities of the Fund for the Republic.

We request that this letter and the accompanying resolution be included in the record of the hearings being held by your committee on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. MITCHELL,
President.

RESOLUTION ON THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

The executive board of the National Agricultural Workers Union, AFL-CIO, having before it a report on the civil rights and legal status of contract workers imported from Mexico for employment on the large-scale corporate farms of the United States, expresses its appreciation to the Fund for the Republic for having made this study possible by a grant-in-aid given to Dr. Ernesto Galarza, one of the members of this executive board.

The Fund for the Republic was established by the Ford Foundation for the purpose of exposing and combating the deterioration of traditional principles of American democracy set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It has carried on its activities in the face of unscrupulous attacks from those who do not understand or do not agree with the precepts of a democratic society. A committee of the Congress of the United States is reported to be exploring the charges leveled against the Fund for the Republic in order to determine whether they have any valid foundation. The congressional committee either projects or has scheduled hearings which will investigate various phases of the Fund's operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Agricultural Workers Union warmly commends the Fund for the Republic for its activities in providing information and explanation essential for an adequate understanding of American democracy and its underlying principles; further be it

Resolved, That this organization believes that a fair investigation can disclose only that the charges leveled against the Fund for the Republic are without foundation and that the Fund is in the forefront for the preservation of the democratic American way of life.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Under authority of the unanimous-consent agreement of today, July 25, 1956,

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H. R. 7728. A bill to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio (Rept. No. 2771);

H. R. 9631. A bill to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States (Rept. No. 2772); and

H. R. 10383. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla. (Rept. No. 2773).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks (Rept. No. 2777);

H. R. 4392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts (Rept. No. 2797);

H. R. 7634. A bill to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons (Rept. No. 2778);

H. R. 7643. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts (Rept. No. 2799);

H. R. 9396. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list (Rept. No. 2779);

H. R. 11834. A bill to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests (Rept. No. 2798);

H. R. 12152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations (Rept. No. 2800);

H. R. 12254. A bill to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules (Rept. No. 2780); and

S. Res. 314. Resolution favoring an investigation and report to the Senate on alleged inequities in the policy of the United States with reference to imports of distilled spirits (Rept. No. 2776).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 9875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds $1 (Rept. No. 2781); and

H. R. 10177. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty (Rept. No. 2782).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. R. 11702. A bill to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use (Rept. No. 2789).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 4164. A bill to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2783).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H. R. 11833. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program (Rept. No. 2785).

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. DUFF), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 10624. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co. (Rept. No. 2787).

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for Mr. MONRONEY), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3946. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition and certain unfair practices in the distribution of new motor vehicles in interstate commerce (Rept. No. 2791).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 10332. A bill to preserve the Key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys by the establishment of a National Key Deer Refuge in the State of Florida (Rept. No. 2804);

H. R. 11197. A bill to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission (Rept. No. 2805); and

H. R. 11548. A bill for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va. (Rept. No. 2806).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

H. R. 7536. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations (Rept. No. 2792).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 8157. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict (Rept. No. 2794); and

H. R. 9506. A bill to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, Puerto Rico, to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 2795).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 2567. A bill to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy (Rept. No. 2796).

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, and on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the chairman of the subcommittee which processed the bill, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 3517) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2788) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS FOR NAVIGATION AND FLOOD CONTROL (S. REPT. NO. 2784)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the individual views of the members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. What was the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request was that the individual views of the members of the committee be printed, along with the report.

Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 2775)

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 12270) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi was the chairman of the subcommittee which did the work and held the hearings on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that he may report the bill under the order heretofore entered, in his name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ENTITLED "PACIFIC COAST AND ALASKA FISHERIES" (S. REPT. NO. 2801)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, pursuant to Senate Resolution 13 and Senate Resolution 163, 84th Congress, I submit a report entitled "Pacific Coast and Alaska Fisheries." I ask that the report be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

REPORT ENTITLED "TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS OF ALASKA AND THE PACIFIC COAST STATES" (S. REPT. NO. 2802)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, pursuant to Senate Resolution 13 and Senate Resolution 163, of the 84th Congress, I submit a report entitled "Transportation Problems of Alaska and the Pacific Coast States." I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ENTITLED "UNEXPENDED BALANCES, DOMESTIC-CIVILIAN AGENCIES" (S. REPT. NO. 2803)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, pursuant to section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report entitled "Unexpended Balances, Domestic-Civilian Agencies," which I ask to have printed as a Senate report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND AT FORT BELVOIR ACCOTINK DAM SITE MILITARY RESERVATION (S. REPT. NO. 2793)

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 4284) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation, which was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

REPORT ENTITLED "DEFENSE ESSENTIALITY AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY" BY JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 2629)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I submit the additional views of myself and Representatives WOLCOTT and CURTIS of Missouri, as members of the Joint Economic Committee, on the report of that committee entitled "Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy—Case Study: Watch Industry and Precision Skills." I ask unanimous consent that the additional views may be printed as part 2 of Senate Report No. 2629.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the additional views will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

DISTINCTION BY FOREIGN NATIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES CITIZENS BECAUSE OF INDIVIDUAL RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 2790)

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 323) opposing distinction by foreign nations against United States citizens because of individual religious affiliations, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and

Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice George V. Allen;

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, vice Edward T. Wailes;

Edward T. Wailes, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Hungary, vice Christian M. Ravndal;

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, vice Cavendish W. Cannon;

Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, Athelstan F. Spilhaus, of Minnesota, Mrs. Helen C. Russell, of California, Mrs. Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger,

of Minnesota, and Asa T. Spaulding, of North Carolina, to be representatives to the ninth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; and

Herold Christian Hunt, of Massachusetts, and Robert McClintock, of California, to be alternate representatives to the ninth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Lyle E. Seeman (Colonel, Corps of Engineers), to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Brig. Gen. William E. Potter; and

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be also a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Rear Adm. Leo Otis Colbert.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 4277. A bill to amend section 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the granting of immunity from Federal prosecution to witnesses summoned to give evidence in certain State cases and proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 4278. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to define comprehensive plan and to provide for multiple-purpose development of water resources for optimum public benefit; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 4279. A bill for the relief of Abraham Harry Wyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4280. A bill to amend section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act with respect to the time of filing of certain claims for the return of property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota:

S. 4281. A bill to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota, and to establish the Minnesota Indian Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 4282. A bill for the relief of Johann Merle; and

S. 4283. A bill for the relief of Jakob Harjung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 4284. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation; placed on the Calendar.

(See reference to above bill when reported by Mr. RUSSELL from the Committee on Armed Services, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to authorize the sale of five victory-type vessels for conversion to ore carriers for use on Great Lakes operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FAITH IN THE WORD OF GOD AND RENEWED OBSERVANCE OF THE 10 COMMANDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. CLEMENTS) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the world today is divided by conflicting ideologies which cause people to live in constant fear of annihilation or enslavement, and

Whereas the basic principles of man's ethical conduct towards his fellow man have cast aside throughout so much of the world today, and

Whereas a return to the precepts as expressed in the 10 Commandments never was more vital to our survival and continued civilization than today; and

We believe, the 10 Commandments, as the primary moral force behind the 3 great religions of today—Christianity, Judaism and Islam—should be reaffirmed as the ethical code governing the lives of men, and are the means of bringing about lasting world peace and a solution to the many problems of mankind: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we hereby proclaim our faith in the word of God and thereby perpetuate renewed observance throughout the world, by nations and by individuals, of the 10 Commandments.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. Res. 322. Resolution providing for the study of rehabilitation of narcotic addicts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. LEHMAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. Res. 323. Resolution opposing distinction by foreign nations against United States citizens because of individual religious affiliations.

(See reference to above resolution when reported by Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT, RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to define "comprehensive plan" and to provide for multiple-purpose development of water resources for optimum public benefit.

Mr. President, the necessity for this amendment has been made all too clear by the action of the Federal Power Commission in licensing the low-dam plan for development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River, and by the failure of this body last week to pass legislation authorizing a high Hells Canyon Dam. The Senate action, I might add, appears to have been based to a large extent on the acceptance by many Senators of the FPC conclusion that the low-dam plan is best adapted to a comprehensive plan.

Mr. President, the FPC decision was a political decision not justified by the facts. The FPC obviously ignored the meaning of comprehensive plan, as it has evolved over the past 50 years, and misapplied the statute in the Hells Canyon case. The FPC has disregarded the law. This amendment should prevent recurrence of any such disregard for the law.

The proposed amendment, Mr. President. will define "comprehensive plan" under section 10 (a) of the Federal Power Act. The definition identifies and relates six attributes of "comprehensive plan" applicable to water resources development. These are:

One. Geographic scope—"a river basin and its watershed."

Two. Scope of development—"optimum public benefit."

Three. Multiple purpose test—"for all beneficial public uses."

Four. Long range test—"during the economic service life."

Five. Flexibility test—"no projects shall result in a unnecessary limitation upon the multiple purpose use."

Six. Concern with not only "existing and proposed projects" but also "other possible projects."

Mr. President, I do not suggest that the language of this bill necessarily is perfect. But I do believe it is a good starting point for some serious thought about defining "comprehensive plan" in such a way that the FPC may never again twist the meaning of the statute.

I am introducing this amendment now for the purpose of full study and discussion between sessions. As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I intend to schedule hearings early in the next session on this subject.

Mr. President, the number of sites available in the Pacific Northwest and other regions for multiple-purpose development is limited. We cannot waste a single one.

I am not ready to concede that the Hells Canyon site is yet lost for really comprehensive development. For one reason, the case is still in the courts.

But the fight for comprehensive development, first enunciated by President Theodore Roosevelt more than 50 years ago, will not end with the fight for a high Hells Canyon Dam. Mr. President, this amendment is an integral part of the fight for comprehensive river development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4278) to amend the Federal Power Act to define "comprehensive plan" and to provide for multiple-purpose development of water resources for optimum public benefit, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

WELFARE OF INDIAN CITIZENS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the House Subcommittee on

Indian Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on June 18, 1956, on H. R. 10909, the companion bill to S. 3786. I introduced this bill on May 7, 1956, to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota, and to establish the Minnesota Indian Administration, and for other purposes.

A great deal of expert testimony was presented at the House hearings. Indians themselves came from Minnesota to testify. As a result of these hearings certain changes in this bill seemed appropriate, and I introduce, for appropriate reference, a revised version of the measure. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4281) to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota, and to establish the Minnesota Indian Administration, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of promoting and advancing the welfare and economic situation of the Indians in the State of Minnesota, there is hereby established the Minnesota Indian Administration, hereinafter referred to as the "Administration." The Administration shall be subject to the general direction of the President of the United States, or the head of such agency as he may designate as his representative.

SEC. 2. The Administration shall have its principal office in the State of Minnesota, and it may establish branch or other offices in the District of Columbia or in the State of Minnesota in such places as it may deem necessary in the conduct of its business.

SEC. 3. The Administration is authorized to engage in the following activities when it finds that such activities will further the purposes of this act:

(a) To promote and engage in land-use planning, to the end that the lands owned by the Indians shall be put to the most beneficial use.

(b) To investigate and conduct research and experimentation in the production, distribution, and marketing of any products of Indian lands and waters, and of any articles and materials, including handicrafts, which are or may be produced by Indian labor.

(c) To promote, sponsor, or engage in a plan or program of tree planting and reforestation on Indian lands, whether tribal or allotted, in order that a future supply of timber may be harvested on the principle of sustained-yield management.

(d) To make loans to any Indian, band, tribe, or community for the establishment, construction, reconstruction, repair, enlargement, improvement, or operation of any industrial, commercial, agricultural, or related enterprise in the State of Minnesota. All such loans shall be secured as reasonably to assure repayment, full consideration being given to the intent of the Congress that the lending powers of the Administration shall be used for the purpose of improving the general welfare of the Indians of Minnesota, with special reference to their economic and social condition. It shall be the policy of the Administration to charge interest on loans at a rate reasonably expected to cover the current interest cost of funds to the United States, but in no event to exceed 3 percent per annum.

(e) To establish, maintain, operate, and engage in, upon, and for its own account, any enterprise, business, or activity for the development of the industrial, commercial, mineral, agricultural, fishery, forest, or other resources of the Indians in Minnesota.

(f) To encourage and enlist the investment of private capital in commercial, industrial, agricultural, and other enterprises or undertakings for the purpose of insuring the maximum development of Indian resources.

(g) To make grants-in-aid or loans, or both, in its discretion, for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails across or on Indian lands, when such roads or trails cannot be built from other funds.

(h) To make grants-in-aid or loans, or both, in its discretion, for either individual Indians or to tribes, bands, or communities for the maintenance, repair, and construction of homes and appurtenant buildings, including the acquisition of lands by purchase, exchange, gift, or otherwise.

(i) To establish a program of financial aid to students in vocational schools, business schools, colleges, art, and other professional schools, by granting scholarships either directly to specially selected students or by grants to institutions: *Provided*, That not more than $100,000 shall be spent in any one year for this purpose.

(j) To promote, establish, and operate social, recreational, or community centers, within or without Indian reservations, including facilities which would permit and encourage programs of education for adult Indians in language training and improvement in community customs and living standards.

SEC. 4. The Aministration shall have and may exercise the following general powers:

(a) To have succession for 20 years from the date of the approval of this act or until a later date if authorized by act of Congress.

(b) To sue and be sued.

(c) To acquire any property, real, personal, or mixed, to hold, use and operate the same, and to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property whenever any of such transactions are deemed appropriate or necessary to the conduct of the activities authorized by this act.

(d) To enter into and perform such cooperative agreements, leases, contracts, or other transactions with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with the State of Minnesota or any political subdivision thereof, or with any institution, corporation, association, or person; as may be deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized by this act.

(e) To appoint or employ, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, such persons, including attorneys, as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Administration: *Provided*, That preference shall be given first to qualified Indian residents, and second, to other qualified residents of Minnesota. If the Administration requires bonds from any of its officers or employees, the premiums therefor shall be paid by the Administration. In the appointment and promotion of employees no political test shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

(f) To use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as the executive departments of the Federal Government.

(g) To settle and adjust claims held by it against other persons or parties, and by other persons or parties against the Administration.

(h) To request and accept gifts, or donations of services, money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, including any property which may be declared surplus by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or by any other Federal agency, in aid of any of the activities authorized by this act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Administration is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States, for use in the performance of its duties and functions, not to exceed a total of $10 million outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed the sum of $10 million are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the revolving fund when requested by the Administration.

(b) As the Administration repays the advances received from the Treasury, the repayments shall be made to the revolving fund: *Provided, however*, That interest received by the Administration shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. (a) The management of the Administration shall be vested in a board of directors of 5 members, 1 of whom shall be chosen by the tribal executive committee of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; one by the Red Lake Band; one by the Governor of Minnesota; one by the Secretary of the Interior; and these four by majority vote shall select a fifth director who shall be a resident of the State of Minnesota. The directors to represent the tribe and the band may be, but need not be, Indians of each group, respectively.

(b) The directors appointed by the Governor and the Secretary of the Interior shall hold office at the pleasure of the appointing officer. The Indian directors shall serve for such term, not less than 2 years or more than 5, as may be fixed in each case by the tribal executive committee of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe or by the Red Lake Band. The fifth member of the board shall serve for 5 years. Any member of the board shall be eligible for reappointment and shall serve until a successor is selected and sworn in.

(c) If, within 6 months after approval of this act, the Indians shall not have designated directors to represent them, as provided in paragraph (a) above, the Secretary of the Interior shall designate the President of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe and the Chairman of the Red Lake Tribal Council to serve as directors interim, until regular directors shall have been selected. During their tenure the interim directors shall have all the powers and duties of regularly selected directors.

(d) The board shall elect its own chairman. Appointees to the board may be persons regularly employed by the United States, the State of Minnesota, or any political subdivision or agency thereof.

(e) Directors shall receive no salary for their services on the board, but they shall be allowed and paid reasonable per diem fees, not to exceed $50 per diem, and allowance in lieu of subsistence expense, and their necessary travel expenses, for attendance at meetings of the board and when engaged in official service of the Administration. Such schedule of fees and allowances shall be fixed by the board, with the approval of the President or his designated representative. The board shall hold regular meetings at least quarterly, and may meet at other times at the call of the chairman or at the written request of any two directors.

SEC. 7. (a) Title to the lands and interests in lands, together with the improvements thereon, which were acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), and subsequent acts, lying within the White Earth Indian Reservation, Minn., administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior is hereby declared to be

held in trust by the United States for the use and benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota, and such lands shall constitute an addition to the White Earth Indian Reservation.

(b) Any rents previously collected for the use of the lands referred to in the first paragraph of this section are hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States for the use and benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota.

SEC. 8. (a) No program, plan, or project shall be carried out by the Administration on Indian lands except at the request of, or with the consent of, the Indian band, group, or individual owner.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to change or amend the existing rights and powers of the Minnesota Indian Tribe, the Red Lake Band of Chippewas, or any other recognized Indian group in Minnesota, or any individual members thereof.

SEC. 9. This act may be cited as the "Minnesota Indian Act of 1956."

STUDY OF REHABILITATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Congress, in recent weeks, enacted legislation increasing the police powers of Government agencies in connection with the apprehension and punishment of those engaged in, or victims of, the traffic of narcotics. The main emphasis in this legislation is to invoke more severe punishment.

No effective consideration has been given to the question of the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the United States. I pointed out and described this tragic failure in several speeches on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. Unfortunately, little heed was given to my warning.

I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to conduct a full and complete study on rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and to report its findings to the Senate.

I realize, of course, that no action will be taken on this resolution at this session of Congress. I am submitting the resolution, however, so that careful consideration may be given to it before the 85th Congress convenes next January. I hope at that time appropriate legislation dealing with this important subject may be introduced and enacted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 322) to make a study of the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the United States, submitted by Mr. LEHMAN, was received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation, special attention shall be given to (1) determining the nature and extent of the facilities and services available and needed for the successful rehabilitation of narcotic addicts; (2) the adequacy of existing laws providing for the treatment of youthful and juvenile addicts; (3) the extent and effectiveness of the cooperation and coordination of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government both among themselves and with the various State and local agencies concerned with the rehabilitation of drug addicts; and (4) the efficacy of the Nation's present approach to the rehabilitation of drug addicts with special emphasis upon youthful and juvenile addicts.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS OF UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, as chairman of the 13th Congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y., I submit the report of that Board, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, KINGS POINT, N. Y., MAY 11, 1956

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: As a result of meetings held at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y., the members of the 1956 Board of Visitors, hereinafter noted, specifically recommend:

1. That a supplemental appropriation in the amount of approximately $860,000 be approved to permit the Academy to achieve a satisfactory level of operations on a permanent basis and embark upon a major repair and replacement program.

2. That steps be taken to restore the previous Naval Reserve status of midshipman to the students at Kings Point.

3. That the annual budget for Kings Point be established at a level to permit an entering class of 400.

4. That in view of the new permanent status of the United States Merchant Marine Academy the rehabilitation of the engineering and nautical science laboratories commence at the earliest possible moment.

5. That funds be approved to permit courses of instruction in nuclear engineering to be offered at the earliest practical moment.

6. That funds be provided for the construction of a separate and adequate library building.

7. That the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to complete the chapel fund drive in accord with the language of Public Law 485, 80th Congress, approved April 17, 1948, and as recommended by previous Boards of Visitors.

Pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, approved May 11, 1944, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1956 Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

By the President of the Senate:

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey.

By the chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina.

Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE, Republican, of Maine.

By the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Congressman FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, of New York.

Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York.

By the chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Congressman JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., Republican, of California.

Congressman IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, Democrat, of New York.

Congressman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois.

Ex-officio members:

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington (chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina (chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.)

The meetings of the 13th congressional Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy were held on Friday, May 11, 1956.

The following members of the Board were present: Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE, of Maine; Congressman JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., of California; Congressman IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, of New York; Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York; and Congressman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, of Illinois. Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON of Connecticut attended the meetings at the invitation of the Board, and was of great assistance in its deliberations, being a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

The Board convened at Wiley Hall, Kings Point, at 10 a. m., May 11, 1956. The Board elected Senator PAYNE to serve as permanent chairman and confirmed the appointments of Comdr. Clifford William Sandberg and Lt. (jg) John A. Walsh, and Ens. John Kiszenik as Secretary and Assistant Secretaries respectively.

During the first meeting the Superintendent, Adm. Gordon McLintock, and his staff discussed the present status of the Academy and provided such information as the Board requested. At the conclusion of the first meeting the Board was invited to lunch with the regiment by Regimental Comdr. Lee A. Farber, of Utah. Senator PAYNE addressed the regiment on behalf of the Board.

After lunch the Board members met with cadet-midshipmen from their districts and States. These discussions were followed by the second meeting of the Board and the executive session. At the conclusion of the executive session the Board toured the grounds and facilities. Following the tour of the grounds Senator PAYNE served as reviewing officer for the regimental parade on Tomb Memorial Field.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Part I

Needs to Achieve a Satisfactory Permanent Condition for Kings Point

The Board recognizes the fact that the academy has certain basic needs which must be fulfilled if it is to achieve a satisfactory

permanent status. The signing of Public Law 415 by the President on February 20, 1956, established the United States Merchant Marine Academy as a permanent Federal service academy. The Board wishes to emphasize that with the signing of this bill the status of the academy underwent an appreciable change in status and responsibilities. The Board noted that Public Law 415 requires that the Government assume uniform and textbook expenses to a degree greater than existed prior to the passage of Public Law 415. The additional funds needed amount to approximately $244,400. The Government also must assume certain new travel expenses for cadet-midshipmen traveling under orders. These expenses are of a recurrent nature and the Board presumes that the necessary funds will be appropriated for these purposes.

In its new status as a permanent Federal service academy the Board recognizes that certain nonrecurrent needs are proper and necessary. As pointed out by the superintendent the question of major repairs at the academy has long been a critical one. This nonrecurrent expense is approximately $291,080 over the $33,900 earmarked in the budget for this purpose. The Board is in sympathy with this request and urges that this amount be appropriated to permit a start to clear up the backlog of major repairs and institute a program of equipment replacement.

In order to achieve a satisfactory permanent status for the academy the Board urges that all present vacancies, which will require $46,000, should be filled and the academy complement be brought up to full strength as soon as possible.

The Board noted with interest the dean's advice that in order for the academic departments to operate adequately during fiscal 1957 an additional $125,000 is required for additional personnel services, library improvements, preparation for instituting a nuclear engineering program, and to defray the costs of a long-range planning survey. The request for these funds in the Board's opinion seems a proper one and accordingly the Board sanctions this request for additional funds.

The Board noted that steps have been taken to request funds for operational improvements such as the reorganization of the property accounting and administrative services, the installation of an automatic system to facilitate recordkeeping, aptitude estimates, conduct grades, and equipment and supply inventories. The funds requested amount to approximately $150,000.

These requests for supplemental funds total approximately $360,000 of which some $247,000 represents new expenses stemming from Public Law 415; $211,000 represents recurring expenditures stemming from additional personnel required to carry on the mission of the Academy; and approximately $401,080 which is nonrecurring expenditure for necessary major repairs, replacements, operational improvements, and so forth.

In order to further the achievement of a satisfactory permanent condition the Board recommends that immediate steps be taken to bring the engineering and nautical science laboratories to a more up-to-date condition by providing the necessary funds for the installation of the requisite engineering and electronic equipment. The Board notes with satisfaction that many requested items for these laboratories are available from other Government sources and that the primary needs of the Academy are for funds to pay the cost of installation. The Board urges that the development of the nuclear engineering program be given a higher priority and that funds be provided to permit the offering of this course at the earliest moment.

The Board was pleased to learn that the effect of permanent status has been salutary with respect to the number of applications for admission received for the class of 1960 which enters the Academy in August 1956. The greater number of applications received is undoubtedly the result of the removal of the uncertainty which has existed so long concerning existence of the Academy. It would seem that an entering class of 400 students would represent a more logical size for an entering class based upon the needs of the industry, as supported by the recent investigation of Maritime Training conducted by the Special Subcommittee on Maritime Training of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the important reserve of competent officers represented by the graduates of this Academy.

The Board was impressed with the magnitude of the funds already raised for the construction of the chapel. This private subscription is in the order of $325,000 and plans are well underway to renew the fund raising drive in view of the newly achieved permanency of the Academy. It is now estimated that a minimum total of $600,000 will be necessary to build the Merchant Marine Memorial Chapel. The Board learned with interest that funds in the amount of approximately $175,000 are held in escrow by the Maritime Administration as a result of certain profits from ship's service activities during World War II. The Board strongly urges that means be found to release these funds and transfer them to the Chapel Fund.

The Board believes that the library is unsatisfactory from the point of view of the space available for this activity. It is clear that a library building is necessary for the library to develop in accordance with the needs of the Academy and recognized college library standards and to this end the Board recommends that early steps be taken to provide the necessary library facilities. The Board renews its previous request that the library be constituted a designated depository of Government publications.

Part II

Needs To Improve Condition and Status of Students and Graduates

The Board learned with concern that the Naval Reserve status of the students at Kings Point was changed from that of midshipman, United States Naval Reserve, to that of officer candidate, United States Naval Reserve. The significant difference appears to rest with the fact that under the new classification the graduate of Kings Point is liable to be drafted as a private in the Army or an apprentice seaman in the Navy. In view of the commission received by each graduate at Kings Point as ensign, United States Naval Reserve, this strikes the Board as a situation where a deplorable and expensive waste of highly skilled manpower is involved. The Board wishes to stress the fact that the graduate of Kings Point is a competent Naval Reserve officer whose major study at the Academy is to qualify him as a superior merchant marine deck or engineer officer. This is quite different from the standard NROTC graduate whose major field of activity is seldom associated with maritime affairs and probably never is directed toward making him a deck or engineer officer aboard ship.

In addition, the interdependence of the Navy and the merchant marine is well understood; the merchant marine is regarded by all as the fourth arm of national defense. In view of the unique situation facing the graduate of Kings Point and the State maritime colleges the Board strongly urges that the midshipmen status of the students of these institutions be restored at the earliest moment in such a way that the interests of individual and the Government are protected. The Board recognizes that the graduates of these institutions have certain service obligations; the Board requests that the final resolution of these problems associated with the change in the Naval Reserve status be accomplished in such a manner as to encourage and foster the desire of the graduates for assignment aboard American vessels, both merchant and naval.

The Board commends the Maritime Administration for its program of education and training at its Academy, The United States Merchant Marine Academy; and specifically commends the superintendent, Rear Adm., Gordon McLintock, and his staff for the efficient manner in which the program is being carried forward.

The Board offers its sincere thanks to its secretaries, Comdr. Clifford W. Sandberg, Lt. (jg.) John A. Walsh, and Ens. John Kiszenik for their assistance.

Approved:

FREDERICK G. PAYNE, *Chairman.*
JOHN J. ALLEN.
IRWIN D. DAVIDSON.
EUGENE J. KEOGH.
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement by him in tribute to the motion-picture industry and the motion picture Away All Boats.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement prepared by him in connection with the vote on the bill, S. 1333, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Statement proposed by him on live musical programs of the National Broadcasting Co.

By Mr. BYRD:

Addresses delivered by him, by Counsellor Ronald W. Bailey, of the British Embassy, and by John Marshall Dinwiddie, at Portsmouth, Va., on July 6, 1956, at ceremonies honoring Robert Dinwiddie.

TRANSPORTATION OF CHILDREN FOR ADOPTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file a report from the Committee on the Judiciary on Senate bill 3021.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has this question been taken up with the majority leader and the minority leadership? What is the bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is a bill to make illegal the transportation of children for adoption from one State to another.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee—and the same is true of the chairman of all standing committees—has authority to file reports from the committee during the remainder of the session. However, I believe an exception was made with respect to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the request has been made. While it is being checked by the majority leader and the minority leader, I withhold the request. I shall renew it later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. As soon as the minority leader can check with his members, in accordance with the procedure we have established throughout the ses-

sion, I will notify the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have a brief address, which will occupy 8 or 10 minutes, on a disturbing situation in the Northwest with respect to Indian tribes. Is it in order at this time to make that speech?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will lay the unfinished business before the Senate, and the Senator from Oregon will be recognized. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3911.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATION OF BANKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3911) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidation of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SWISS WATCH CARTEL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relative to the activities of the Swiss watch cartel.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR BRIDGES, RELATIVE TO ACTIVITIES OF THE SWISS WATCH CARTEL

Until recently the Nation seemed to be of one mind in supporting the defense mobilization policy expressed in the Defense Production Act, extended by Congress each year since 1950. To have the capacity to resist aggression and further the cause of peace, our Nation required a mobilization effort which included the expansion of defense production and the creation of new capacity beyond the levels needed for peacetime civilian demand. Only in this way could we hope to reduce the time required for full mobilization in the event of an attack on the United States.

Last year, alarmed by the threats of injury to our mobilization base, the Congress provided a new procedure designed to insure that our national security would not be impaired by excessive imports of critical items. Such a procedure was made necessary by the deep inroads which repeated tariff reductions made under the Trade Agreements program have had on the capacity of some essential industries to compete with low-cost foreign products in the United States market.

The Congress decided that if the security of the American people called for the annual expenditure of billions of dollars to create and sustain our defense essential productive capacity and skills for use in an emergency, it was also important to protect that critical capacity from erosion and injury from the increased quantities of imports ushered into the United States under the forced draft of the tariff reductions which have been made under the Trade Agreements program.

Now, one of the chief beneficiaries of American generosity under the Trade Agreements program is using a portion of the profits which that lucrative trade generates to attack this Nation's defense mobilization policy—and the maintenance of a broad mobilization base to safeguard the security of our people from aggression.

I refer to testimony recently given by a sincere and patriotic American industrialist, Mr. Arthur B. Sinkler, president of the American Watch Manufacturers Association, to a committee of Congress. Mr. Sinkler told the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee that the Swiss watch cartel was using the very wealth created by the Swiss Trade Agreement to propagandize the United States. He explained that the Swiss cartel makes a 12½-cent levy on each of the 25 million jeweled watches exported annually by the Swiss. This is added to the price paid by the consumer. It is a brazenly called a propaganda tax by the Swiss cartel. The cartel has directed that this fund of $2 million or more per year be used in a very special effort to influence American opinion.

The obvious inequality involved in the marshaling of this multi-million-dollar propaganda fund by the cartel for use in the United States against our 4 remaining domestic watch companies, offends one's sense of fair play. But there is something much more disturbing about the Swiss propaganda campaign.

I am appalled to learn that these propaganda funds have been turned to a systematic attack on our basic national policy for the creation and protection of an industrial mobilization base.

The Swiss watch trust in its unceasing efforts to destroy the domestic jeweled watch industry is now using a large part of its propaganda war chest in an outright attempt to undermine our basic national policy of safeguarding industries essential to national defense from destruction or impairment from import competition. This national policy was made unmistakably clear in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

Bear in mind that for the past 6 years Congress has repeatedly extended the Defense Production Act, and its watchdog committee, the Joint Committee on Defense Production, has continually reviewed the manner in which the Office of Defense Mobilization has gone about planning our defense mobilization resources. Against this background, agents of the Swiss cartel have lately been launched in a full-scale effort to destroy our mobilization base concept.

The efforts of this well-financed foreign cartel, operating from the sanctuary of a neutral country, to subvert an entire United States national policy of this importance, surely merits the attention of every American. The attention of the American people is equally appropriate not only because of the importance of this policy to their personal security but also because a major portion of the funds in the Swiss propaganda campaign is financed by every American consumer who buys a Swiss watch.

As soon as it became known last winter that the Government intended to examine the possible need of the domestic jeweled-watch industry for additional assistance to correct the unhealthy conditions stemming from the overwhelming Swiss dominance of the United States market, the propaganda efforts to destroy the basis for any future relief to this essential industry commenced.

The Swiss watch cartel is, of course, indifferent to what is or is not essential to the American national defense. The Swiss watch cartel is expending its millions of dollars in propaganda money in the United States and other parts of the world to fight anything which might affect its own interests.

This commercial conflict between a highly regimented Swiss watch industry which controls over 95 percent of the world trade in watches, and our relatively small domestic industry which enjoys less than a quarter of the American market has now swirled over into an area which is vital to the security of every American.

The agents in this country, who report directly to Swiss watch cartel headquarters in Bienne, Switzerland, for orders are reported to be carrying on a campaign to discredit the defense essentiality of the American watch-manufacturing industry—despite the fact that this industry has been declared essential to America's national defense by the old National Security Resources Board under President Truman, the Office of Defense Mobilization under President Eisenhower, with the concurrence of the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Treasury, Labor, and State, under both administrations, by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, by Secretary of Defense Wilson, Secretary of State Dulles, and by President Eisenhower himself.

The Swiss through their many propaganda agents began in December 1955 to urge the Office of Defense Mobilization to abandon its patiently forged mobilization policies in favor of looser views which would not call for the protection of industrial capacity and production workers in existing industries whose products are essential to the support of military and critical civilian activities in time of emergency. This dangerous doctrine they blandly stated as follows: "Government policies concerning strengthening the mobilization base should be refocused away from protecting production workers and toward methods of preventing bottlenecks from developing in engineering and tool design talents."

The propaganda organs of the cartel have taken up this line. A subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress hurriedly called a 4-day hearing in June to hear hand-picked witnesses develop the theme that (1) our mobilization planning—despite the continuing study of both ODM and our own congressional watchdog committee—is obsolete because it emphasizes concepts which lead logically to the necessity for preserving industrial capacity and production skills essential to national security from destruction by imports (or any other cause), and (2) the classical free-trader's theoretical concept of international alliances of imperishable friends is the only approach to the security of Americans.

The objective of these maneuvers by the Swiss propagandists is clear enough for those who will look. The possible need of the domestic watch industry for further relief to enable it to hold its domestic watchmaking personnel and operations together through access to much less than half of the United States market in order that essential mobilization needs for precision military timepieces and other microprecision subminiaturized components can be met by this industry is under investigation by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Obviously, the Swiss cartel seeks to create a climate of opinion in and out of Government which will embarrass the judgment and hamstring the freedom of action needed by ODM and the President in conforming to the congressional policy of preserving essential industries reflected in section 7 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1955.

This is the same cartel which has been the subject of months of investigation by the Department of Justice—the same cartel which is now a defendant in an antitrust suit pending in the Federal courts of New York.

Thus far it would not appear that the dangerous propaganda of the Swiss cartel

has had much effect on Government agencies or committees of Congress who have national security responsibilities. The threat of these continued efforts, however, lies in the fact that sooner or later this propaganda line could cause confusion or even injure the capacity of our Government to respond adequately to the needs of defense industries.

I do not believe that the American people are indifferent to these things. What the Swiss watch cartel wants is not necessarily what America wants. I am confident all Members of Congress believe that the strength of America's defenses must come before the desires and international objectives of any foreign trust.

THE ESSENTIALITY OF THE DOMESTIC JEWELED WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee has prepared a report which touches on the essentiality of the domestic jeweled watch industry. I understand that the subcommittee failed to reach a unanimous conclusion on the matter.

Senators who are interested in the subject will undoubtedly recall that the Preparedness Subcommitteee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, which I appointed examined this question just 2 years ago. The subcommittee reached the unanimous—and I may say, bipartisan—conclusion that the highly skilled workers in the American watch and clock industry, who require long years of training and experience, and their unique ability to develop and produce, within the shortest time possible, precision instruments to minute tolerances, are essential to the national defense. We found that it is in the interest of national defense to keep this essential industry alive and vital.

It is reassuring to me that the Congress in its wisdom provided last year in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 a specific procedure which will insure that essential industries such as the watch industry are not weakened beyond their capacity to perform their vital defense role.

NEED FOR RESOLVING THE AIR NAVIGATION CONFLICT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me again?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the need for resolving the air navigation conflict by the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES ON THE NEED FOR RESOLVING THE AIR NAVIGATION CONFLICT BY ADOPTING SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16

The recent crash of two commercial planes in Arizona with such appalling loss of life tragically illustrates a dangerous situation in civil and military air operations which has deeply concerned me for some time.

Although the investigation of this crash is not yet complete, enough is already on record from highly competent authorities to show that the crash was due to a collision when both of these planes were off the existing civil airways, without information of their exact positions in the air.

The problem this crash illustrates so tragically is the confusion and controversy which still exists over the need for a common system of air navigation in the United States.

Let me give a brief description of the predicament in which we find ourselves at this time.

Back in 1947–47 a Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board undertook an exhaustive study of what should be the aviation policies of the United States. One of its chief and most important findings was that the United States could not afford to have two air navigation systems, one for civilian aviation and one for the military. They reached this finding on grounds of expense, air safety, and relief of air congestion. The Board thereupon recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should create and develop a common system of air navigation which would meet both the needs of civil and military aviation.

The end result was the development of what is known as the VOR/DME system which was fully agreed upon by all interests concerned, military and civilian. Although the installation of equipment needed to operate this system was costly, the Federal Government and non-Government interests invested heavily and made great progress toward bringing the system into being. It is recognized that the system works satisfactorily for civilian aviation, but apparently has not met the full needs of all military operations.

As a consequence, the military, secretly at first and lately more openly, began experimenting with a new system known as TACAN. It is not necessary for my present purposes to describe in detail the technical differences between the VOR/DME and the TACAN systems, except to say that they are in large part incompatible systems. That is to say, the use of TACAN would render the full use of VOR/DME impossible.

I may say that both VOR/DME and TACAN are based on the principle of providing information to the pilot to determine the exact location of an aircraft in terms of distance and direction with relation to a known ground point. As a result of the 1948 policy the VOR/DME equipments are part of the common system of air navigation. The common system at present employs electronic devices designed to control air traffic both on the airways and while taking off and landing at airports. It is called the common system because it is used in common by all users of the air space, just as in automobile movement over the Nation's highways we all agree to have one traffic control system governing all vehicles on the road.

The military development of TACAN obviously alarmed the civilian lines because it threatened the agreed operation of a common system of air navigation and also jeopardized the millions of dollars spent by both the Government and the civilian airlines for the installation of the VOR/DME system. Two incompatible systems of air navigation in the United States would not only compel costly duplications in equipment, but they would amount to a standing appointment with disaster for all air traffic.

The conflict came out into the open when civilian aviation became fully aware of what the military was developing in secret. In an effort to resolve the conflict the Air Navigation Development Board set up a special committee, VORTAC, to conduct a special investigation. The special committee came up with a divided report. Some of its members, chiefly the Army, Navy, and Air Force, favored the TACAN system, while most of civilian aviation favored the VOR/DME in which they had heavily invested in the good faith belief that that was to be the common short distance air navigation system.

The situation, therefore, in the early months of 1955 was that a basic conflict existed between rival air navigation systems which apparently could not be resolved by any Government or private body. The conflict indicated great waste of taxpayers' money as the military branched out on its own with TACAN after agreeing to a common system with civilian aviation. It threatened great delays to civilian airlines, which needed the complete VOR/DME system, particularly for the jet transports which are just over the horizon.

The civilian airlines have been reluctant, in view of this confusion, to make the heavy investments necessary to equip their fleets with DME. Finally, the conflict threatened to throw air navigation into confusion in such important matters as air safety and relief of growing air congestion.

At this point, the situation was brought to my attention. After careful study, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 to the Senate on March 10, 1955, calling for a joint congressional committee to investigate the conflict and to recommend a policy to resolve the conflict. It was clear to me then that here was a very important technological conflict affecting heavy investments in money and threatening air safety and air congestion, which could not be resolved by Government or private aviation bodies without a clear mandate of policy by the whole Congress—just as Congress in 1948 had laid down the original policy of a common air navigation system.

My resolution was passed by the Senate on May 5 with some perfecting amendments and went to the House where on May 6 it was referred to the House Committee on Rules. There it was considered along with House Resolution 162, sponsored by Congressman HALE BOGGS, whose resolution was similar to mine with the exception that Mr. BOGGS called for a select committee rather than a joint committee.

As the two resolutions were being considered by the House Rules Committee on May 17, there was placed before the Committee House Report No. 592 made by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the day before, May 16. Briefly this report was grounded upon hearings which attempted to investigate the conflict in air navigation systems. The committee offered recommendations based upon an attempt of the Air Coordinating Committee to resolve the conflict. Although all these recommendations were made in sincerity and good faith, they do not resolve the conflict in air navigation systems. Caught up in the complexities of a complex and evolving technical development, they merely postpone the settlement of the issue—leaving all the confusion, expense, and the threat to air safety and air congestion to carry on for years to come.

Either misled by the belief that the Air Coordinating Committee had resolved the conflict, or discouraged perhaps by the hopelessness of ever doing anything about it, Congressman BOGGS withdrew his resolution. The House Rules Committee apparently reached similar conclusions because it took no further action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, which I sponsored and which the Senate passed.

Since that time, still another inquiry was made into the situation by the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Committee on Government Operations. The findings of this committee are contained in House Report No. 737 filed on June 8, 1955.

The subcommittee's first and most important recommendation is as follows:

"1. The subcommittee recommends that the Congress undertake at once an exhaustive investigation of the relative merits of TACAN and VOR/DME for use in a common system of air navigation which meets both civil and military requirements. This subcommittee endorses the proposal for such an investigation as contained in Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 [my resolution], and urgently recommends that the House of Representatives expedite concurring action on this resolution as amended by House Resolution 128, or action on House Concurrent Resolution 128."

The House subcommittee made several other very worthwhile recommendations, but the one quoted above is the heart of its action. This subcommittee has seen as clearly as I saw more than a year ago that great confusion and a serious conflict in air navigation systems exist and that nobody but the Congress itself is capable of resolving the situation.

The best proof of the way this situation has tied itself into knots lies in all these past investigations, which, for want of proper authority to enforce their recommendations, have ended in blind alleys.

We start with a common air navigation system laid down in 1947–48 by congressional authority. Then the military secretly commences to develop a system at a cost of over $325 million, which threatens to destroy the common system originally agreed upon. When confusion and conflict follow in natural course, everybody gets into the act, but no one has the authority to enforce its decisions or resolve the conflict.

The Air Navigation Development Board considered the matter. Its technical subcommittee VORTAC investigated. The Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics investigated. Finally, the Air Coordinating Committee investigated the problem. The military did its own investigating and strictly on its own began developing a new system.

All of these bodies came up with recommendations which either revealed division within their own ranks, conflicted with recommendations made by others, or lacked sufficient authority to lay down a policy to resolve the conflict.

This was followed by consideration of the problem by at least 1 Senate committee and some 3 or 4 House committees which, at best, could offer recommendations on which no definite congressional action has been taken.

It is not clear that the one thing lacking in this web of confusion and indecision is an authoritative mandate that only a joint committee of Congress can issue and enforce? That is precisely what my resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, aims to bring about. That is why the House Government Operations Committee has strongly endorsed my resolution and urged its immediate passage by the House.

Every day we delay joint congressional action we permit deeper confusion, more waste of taxpayers' money for duplicate air navigation systems, and invite new disasters in air operations.

Since Congress last authoritatively set air policies in 1948, enormous technical advances have been made in aviation and in the electronics equipment for air navigation. Planes are larger, swifter, and far more numerous than in 1948. Air congestion is rushing upon us. Air safety has become more vital than ever. Disasters, such as we have recently witnessed in Arizona, may become the heavy price we may have to pay for failure to keep air navigation well defined and abreast of the times. We urgently need a new look at air navigation policies with an authority that only the whole Congress can impart.

The final days of the 84th Congress are here. It would be a misfortune we would deeply regret if the session closed without action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 16. The leadership of this Congress, of course, rests with our Democratic friends in both Houses. Republicans cannot put through legislation without their consent and cooperation. We can only urge action and plead for cooperation. In these circumstances, and when the important House Committee on Government Operations also urges the same action, I hope that the House Rules Committee will report out Senate Concurrent Resolution 16 and that the House will pass the resolution.

ILLEGAL PRACTICES IN CONNECTION WITH PLACING OF MINOR CHILDREN FOR PERMANENT FREE CARE OR FOR ADOPTION (S. REPT. NO. 2786)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report on the bill (S. 3021) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. The proposal would prohibit so-called black marketing of babies for adoption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

INTERIM REPORT, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA (S. REPT. NO. 2774)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file an interim report of the subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary, dealing with juvenile delinquency in the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Tennessee whether this is a report of the subcommittee or a report of the full committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is a report of the full committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed.

MILITARY AID

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I voted against the appropriations bill for military aid because I am convinced that the amount provided in the bill, plus the amount already appropriated and unused, is entirely too much money to make available before there is a complete and thorough legislative survey of the entire program, a reappraisal of the world situation, and a new start taken.

We now have $6.4 billion available and on hand for expenditures in future years. Should we appropriate as much as $2 billion for fiscal year 1957, I am satisfied that the program would be continued without interruption and without injury. Because, in my opinion, we are voting far more than is necessary, I am opposing the bill in its present form.

If my vote against this bill meant a stopping of the program, I would have voted otherwise because I think that some military aid is necessary. Further, I feel that this military aid program, on a more limited scale, of course, must be continued for several years, especially in certain critical areas. We should prepare now to continue the program on some scale for perhaps a decade in the future.

It is the very necessity of this continuation of the program that furnishes the compelling reason why we should hold this appropriation to a reduced amount and then resurvey and reappraise the entire program and the world situation before continuing further these expenditures on such a lavish scale. Further, a special study could well be taken of the attitude of the people in the various countries involved, as well as their capacity to carry their part of the burden.

In years past we have been so generous with military aid that some of our allies have been encouraged to postpone rather than hasten their own preparedness program.

Even though the amounts appropriated during the last few fiscal years has been decreasing, the actual sums expended have not decreased in proportion to the decreases in appropriations. This year, we are requested to almost double last year's appropriation.

For illustration, in fiscal year 1953, we appropriated $6 billion for our entire aid program, including military aid and other, and we spent $5.7 billion.

For fiscal year 1954, we reduced the appropriated sum $1.3 billion down to $4.7 billion, but we reduced the expenditures only $0.9 billion, making the expenditures $4.8 billion.

In fiscal year 1955, we further reduced the appropriated sum by $1.9 billion down to $2.8 billion, but actual expenditures were reduced by less than one-third this much—that is, by only $0.6 billion, bringing actual expenditures down to $4.2 billion.

In fiscal year 1956, we reduced the appropriation to $2.7 billion, but actually spent $4.18 billion, virtually the same as in the preceding year.

For fiscal year 1957, we were asked to appropriate almost $4.9 billion, and the bill now before the Senate will appropriate $4.1 billion.

It is gratifying to see that the Congress is recognizing its responsibilities and asserting its own powers in the recent passage by the Senate of a resolution providing for a reconsideration and resurvey of this entire program. This will and should be done from the congressional viewpoint.

There is a natural tendency by those administering the program to continue it on a large scale. Sizable, voluntary reductions in expenditures are seldom made. This is a congressional responsibility which we should not shun. Those of us who feel that some military aid is of necessity a part of our foreign policy are greatly concerned that these expenditures remain within more reasonable limits. Otherwise, the entire program is

likely to lose the necessary public support for its continuation.

It is my considered conclusion that the sum appropriated in this bill is far in excess of the amounts required for the essential part of the program for fiscal year 1957, and in protest against this large amount I voted against the bill.

Next yar our military-aid program should be fully considered by the Armed Services Committees of both the House and the Senate. Our military aid is definitely a part of our military defense and should have active legislative consideration as a part of our worldwide military program. I shall exert my effort and my influence as a Member of the Senate to see that such a legislative course is adopted regarding all military aid in the future.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

CONSTRUCTION OF A NUCLEAR-POWERED MERCHANT SHIP

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am glad to see that both the Senate and House adopted on Monday the conference report on H. R. 6243, the bill authorizing construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. I am sorry that I was tied up in a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Monday, but I would now like to say a few words concerning the reactor to be installed in this ship.

The reactor should not be an exact duplicate of the *Nautilus* reactor. It would be folly to place a 1925 model T engine in a 1956 automobile. Similarly, it would not make sense to take the first power reactor ever developed, designed for use on a submarine, and ignoring subsequent developments, stick that reactor in a newly designed surface ship. It would be far better to take an additional year's time for redesign and development work in order to move clearly forward, and to hasten the day of widespread application of nuclear power by the American merchant marine. The estimated construction time of such a reactor is 39 to 42 months.

I agree with the following statement of the House managers concerning the conference report on this bill:

> It was the contemplation of the conferees that the vessel would contain the most advanced type of reactor possible for a practical merchant ship which would be a definite step forward in the art of nuclear propulsion utilizing all experience and improvements learned to date.

Also, the Commission should not merely construct a *Nautilus* duplicate because of the security restrictions that this might necessitate. It would be tragic indeed to display this ship throughout the world but to keep the design characteristics of the reactor secret.

For these reasons, as well as others, the Atomic Energy Commission should arrange for the construction of an up-to-date, newly designed reactor for installation in this ship.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I shall now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for the presentation of a conference report.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING METHODS AND PROCEDURES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3897) to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 23, 1956, p. 14007.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand this is the conference report about which the Senator spoke to me earlier today. I understand it has been signed by all conferees. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The conference report has been signed by a majority of the conferees. Three members did not sign it, two of whom are present on the floor, and no doubt they will have a statement to make relating to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I merely wish to make sure, because the Senator from Massachusetts is presenting the report on time yielded to him by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], that other members of the committee on conference may be certain of having sufficient time in which to make statements explaining why they did not sign the report.

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe, unless lengthy debate ensues, it will be agreeable to the Senator from Oregon that the two Senators, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], may make their statements. I am sure they will make their statements within a reasonable time, and in that way we will be able to dispose of the conference report promptly.

Mr. President, the conferees agreed to the House amendment which deleted section 1 (b), (c), and (d) providing that proposed appropriations be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis and the lapsing of unused balances of appropriations at the end of each fiscal year.

On the other hand the conferees accepted all of the other provisions of the Senate bill which will permit the agencies to prepare and execute their budgets on a cost basis; bring about closer correlation between budgeting, accounting, and organizational structure; improvement in the budget justifications by inclusions of information on performance and program costs; permit the agencies to maintain their accounts on an accrual basis; integrate the property accounting records with the financial accounting system, and to simplify the allotment accounting system.

One of the most important provisions of the bill was deleted by the House of Representatives, namely, the accrued expenditure basis for determination of appropriations. The acceptance of this amendment became necessary, in the view of a majority of the conferees, because the Appropriations Committee of the House insisted that this provision be deleted. The Senate conferees did everything possible to restore the language of the Senate bill, but it was finally concluded by a majority of the Senate conferees that we would have to forego this objective or enact no legislation on this important bill at this session of Congress. We are not altogether satisfied with this turn of events, but believe that substantial progress will be possible under the language agreed to by the conferees, and for this reason I strongly urge acceptance of the conference report.

It was agreed by conferees of both the House and the Senate that the action of the conferees in adopting the substitute language should not be construed to indicate disapproval of authorization to determine the amounts of proposed appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis, but that lack of information at the present time on this important phase of the program made it advisable to defer action until the next Congress.

The House conferees agreed with the Senate conferees that this important provision of the bill should be reconsidered at the next session of the Congress, and it was our understanding that something would be included in the statement of the managers on the part of the House to this effect.

These objectives were submitted to the chairman of the committee of the other body for inclusion in the statement of the managers, but I was surprised to find that the language agreed to was not included in the report.

I have in my hand messages from Mr. J. Harold Stewart, chairman, Hoover Commission Task Force on Budgeting and Accounting; Clarence Francis, chairman, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; John Coleman, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Meyer Kestnbaum, special assistant to the President; Percival Brundage, the Director of the Budget; and former President Herbert Hoover.

I ask unanimous consent that the messages be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOHEMIAN GROVE, CALIF., *July 22, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

S. 3897, as presently before the Congress, will, if enacted, carry out certain recommendations of the task force and commission which will provide basic tools in form of cost-based budgets and accrual accounting. These are incidental to the most significant recommendation No. 7 for budget in terms of annual accrued expenditures which fundamental improvement must be sought in the next session of the Congress if it cannot

presently be accomplished. I greatly appreciate your statesmanlike effort in this matter for which the country is in your debt.

J. HAROLD STEWART,
Chairman, Hoover Commission Task Force on Budgeting and Accounting.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 20, 1956.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your splendid work on behalf of the Hoover Commission's budget and accounting report. While we would have much preferred your Senate version in full, the conference-approved bill will be a major stride in the history of Federal fiscal practice, and lead to important savings. The citizens committee hopes the conference version will be speedily enacted. Please accept our congratulations.

CLARENCE FRANCIS,
Chairman, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1956.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building:

Strongly recommend approval of conference report on H. R. 11526 to implement Hoover Commission budget and accounting recommendations. Warmest congratulations to members and staff of Reorganizations Subcommittee, Government Operations Committee, for your efforts in behalf of better government at less cost. Sincerely hope next session will approve other fiscal reforms recommended by Commission.

JOHN F. COLEMAN,
President, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 23, 1956.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Inasmuch as the administration has accepted wholeheartedly the basic recommendations contained in the Hoover Commission Report on Budget and Accounting, those of us who are working to advance these recommendations were very much encouraged by the passage in the Senate of S. 3897. We were hopeful that the House would take similar action. We appreciate the fact that the elimination by the House of the provision for accrual expenditure accounting, which is one of the basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission, raises some question as to the wisdom of enacting any legislation at the present time. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that the bill as now accepted by the conference committee would be helpful, and would provide a basis for further legislation in the next session of the Congress. Now that Mr. Hoover's reservations have been resolved, I am hopeful that this legislation will be enacted.

Every good citizen should be indebted to you for the great interest that you have taken in the work of the Hoover Commission, and for the leadership that you have assumed in securing congressional action on these recommendations.

Sincerely,

MEYER KESTNBAUM,
Special Assistant to the President.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I testified before your subcommittee on June 4, 1956, regarding S. 3897, "To improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes." I strongly favored the enactment of the bill including the provision that appropriations be determined on an annual accrued expenditures basis to the maximum extent deemed desirable and practicable by the President. In the course of my testimony, I stated, "We believe that this change would have many advantages both for the legislative and the executive branches."

Since the date of my testimony, I understand that consideration has been given by your subcommittee to the elimination of section 1 (a) of the bill in order to meet the desires of the House. Under the circumstances, I think it important that I clarify my position with respect to this matter.

While I favor putting appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, and believe that legislation to accomplish this should ultimately be enacted, I regard the other sections of your bill to be of such great importance that I would strongly favor the enactment of your bill even without the section to place appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis. In view of the fact that appropriations could not be placed on an accrued expenditure basis until accrual cost accounting is adopted throughout the Government, which will take several years to accomplish, I can see no danger in postponing until next year the enactment of section 1 (a).

Immediate benefits would result from prompt enactment of the remaining portions of the bill. I refer specifically to the following:

Section 1 (b) providing for the development of appropriations from cost based budgets.

Section 2 (a) which would require consistency between accounting and budget classification, and the synchronization of accounting and budget classification and organizational structure.

Section 2 (b) requiring agency accounts to be maintained on an accrual basis.

Section 3 establishing the objective of financing each operating unit at the highest practical level.

I believe that efforts should be made next year to enact another bill containing the substance of section 1 (a) of the present bill, but I would deplore the failure to adopt the other provisions of the bill at this time.

After the situation had been thoroughly explained to Mr. Herbert Hoover, he was in favor of enacting the amended bill as approved by the conference report as was Mr. Clarence Francis and Mr. Meyer Kestnbaum, all of whom are particularly anxious to see the recommendations of the Hoover Commission adopted.

Sincerely yours,

PERCIVAL BRUNDAGE,
Director.

BOHEMIAN GROVE, CALIF., *July 24, 1956.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I agree completely with position of Stewart task force chairman stated to you in his telegram of the 21st. Sincerely appreciate all your effort which is real leadership.

HEBERT HOOVER.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before concluding my statement I should like to express my keen regret that the conferees, from both parties, on behalf of the House of Representatives felt unable to accept the heart of the bill, which would have placed our appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis. It would have brought about a most desirable reform in our budgeting and accounting procedures. That was the heart of the Hoover Commission recommendation on budgeting and accounting.

It is most regrettable that the House conferees felt they could not accept the provision because of the opposition of some Members of the House to that reform.

I assure the membership of the Senate that this question will be the primary one before the Subcommittee on Reorganization next year, and it is my hope that the full committee will again be able to report it unanimously to the Senate, and that the Senate will again take prompt action on it. It is my further hope that after some experience has been developed along these lines in Government during the intervening period, we will be able to enact the heart of the program without further delay.

So, while I understand perfectly why my colleagues on the other side did not feel that they could sign the conference report—and I must say that I have great sympathy with their position and at first was inclined to take the same position myself—after talking with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, I felt that this step forward would be in the public interest, and I reluctantly signed the report, while some conferees who were as keenly disappointed as I was felt constrained to withhold their signatures.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the subcommittee, if he included in the RECORD both the telegrams from former President Hoover in his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have not included Mr. Hoover's original telegram, a copy of which I think the Senator from Maine has, which expressed the hope that there would be no compromise of position. I received a second telegram which I assume represents his latest thinking. That is the one I am placing in the RECORD.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in order that the record may be clear, I should like to include in it at this point the first telegram which was sent by former President Hoover, dated July 18, 1956, which was a day and a half before he sent the second telegram which has been referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts. I wish to read the telegram:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 18, 1956.*

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to express my appreciation for the statesmanship you and your colleagues have shown in the legislation which would reform the Federal budget and accounting system. The heart of the Commission's recommendation in this legislation is to restore to the Congress the control of the purse through the provision for a budget based on annual expenditures. The Senate passed this provision without dissent. It is supported by the President, the Comptroller General, and the Director of the Budget and has been widely supported by the press and the public.

The passage of the House version deleting this critical provision would be misleading

to the country. My view is that unless the House conferees are willing to yield on this critical provision, the country will be better served by allowing the legislation to die in this session in order that we may have an opportunity to present to the country and the next session the fundamental importance of this issue.

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. President, as a member of the Senate conferees I have refused to sign this report. My two colleagues, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] also have refused to sign it.

This bill, which had so much promise of restoring to the Congress control of the public purse, in my opinion, is now but an empty gesture in that direction.

Stricken from it, at the insistence of the House of Representatives, is its very heart—the Hoover Commission's recommendation that appropriations be made on an accrued-expenditures basis.

There has been a great amount of publicity about implementation of cost-based budgets, accrual accounts, and other improvements in the Government's financial structure by enactment of this legislation.

But, let me point out to Senators there is nothing in this bill which cannot be effectuated by administrative action within the executive branch at the present time or which already is not now being effectuated by administrative action in the various executive agencies.

Any claim that this action by the Congress carries out the Hoover Commission's major recommendations on budgeting and accounting—recommendations which are regarded as among the most important that the Commission presented to the Congress—would be a deception. And to claim that the enactment of this legislation would result in any substantial savings any way near approaching the ridiculous estimates that have been given official credence would be to deliberately mislead the American public.

S. 3897, as introduced, implemented directly the Hoover Commission's recommendations. Thirty-two Senators from both sides of the aisle sponsored it. Extensive hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations. The bill was reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on Reorganization on June 6, 1956. It was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Government Operations on June 7, 1956. It was passed unanimously by the United States Senate, by voice vote, on June 20, 1956.

I find from a review of the hearings this bill had the unreserved endorsement of the Government's foremost financial authorities—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, each of whom presented testimony upon it. And, in addition, this legislation carried the endorsement of the President of the United States, who, in a special message to the Congress on May 10, 1956, urged early enactment of appropriate legislation on the Hoover Commission's recommendations in this area.

Yet, to my regret, and, I am confident, to the regret of every Member of the Senate who believes in restoring control of the public purse to the Congress, all of this has been lost.

Mr. President, I wish the record to be clear. The above facts show clearly why I, in good conscience, could not agree to the conferees' action.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate in unnecessary repetition of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], indicating why the members of the conference committee on this side of the aisle found themselves unable to sign the conference report on this bill which sought to improve the budgeting and accounting procedures of the Government. I wish, however, in a very brief way, to let the record show exactly the point of disagreement.

It is a question, Mr. President, of tactics. I think the earnest desire of the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and of his colleagues on the other side of the aisle was exactly the same as our own. We were seeking to find the course we could pursue which would be the most effective in making the Hoover Commission recommendations really an essential part of this all-important measure and enacting their full weight into law.

Mr. President, this budget and accounting bill, which was originally introduced by the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the able Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], in my humble opinion, is the keystone of the arch of all the various recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission. It had the greatest possibilities, it could accomplish the most, and it would give Congress, had it been enacted in the form in which it passed this body, the most important power it could possibly have and the one most vital to the welfare of the American taxpayers, namely, full control of the purse and of all Government spending.

I think it would be of interest to the Senate to realize—and I am sure I speak the fact—that had this bill been the law yesterday, the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader to the mutual-security bill affecting money in the pipeline for aid to Yugoslavia would have been in order, because this bill, if enacted, would have given to Congress every year complete control not only of appropriations made for that year, but complete control over money previously appropriated and remaining unspent, in other words, control over money and goods in the pipeline.

Mr. President, when the bill reached the House, the heart of it, as has been so well expressed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], was taken out. That portion of the bill which would have meant the ultimate control of some $70 billion in carryover balances from previous appropriations passing through the pipeline was completely stricken and eliminated.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has referred to the part that remains. Someone has said it is a declaration of policy or of intent on the part of the Congress. I would not even dignify it by saying it is a declaration of intent; I would say it is only a declaration of a hope. It confers upon the executive departments, in my opinion, not a single power which they do not have at present.

The question before the conferees was whether we should accept the bill as it has been emasculated, or whether we should let it die. On the theory or the philosophy that half a loaf is better than none, the conferees, headed by the Senator from Massachusetts, sincerely felt it should be accepted. But, Mr. President, it is not half a loaf. There is no wheat in the bill. The conferees—I think I am expressing the opinion of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]—felt that to pass the bill in its present form, which is an utterly empty and meaningless gesture, would be a disservice to the American people, because it would lull them into slumber.

This statement is in no way a reflection on the views or the sincerity of the Senator from Massachusetts, as I feel certain he knows. But we felt it would be a disservice to the American people because it would enable the people, including Members of Congress, who are all human, to say, "Here is another bill, here is another important measure. Which is part and parcel of the Hoover recommendations which have been enacted. This is one more achievement. This means that a larger percentage of the recommendations has been accomplished."

As a matter of fact, not a single dollar will be saved by this bill in its present form. It is highly possible, on the other hand, that more money will be spent, because the bill encourages the setting up of a dual system of bookkeeping in the executive departments without any assurance that the new accrual system will be put into practice or utilized in any way to save a dollar for the taxpayers.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I do not have the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the senior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the original intentions of the bill as set forth, but I agree with the junior Senator from New Hampshire that if it shall be finally passed, it will be far from what it should be and far from what I thought it would be.

There was one item in the original bill which I considered highly important, and that was the provision giving the Committee on Appropriations and Congress control over appropriations previously made and in the pipeline. That is vital to the control of those appropriations. Is that provision still in the bill, or was it eliminated?

Mr. COTTON. I answer my distinguished senior colleague from New Hampshire, who incidentally was a sponsor of the bill, by saying that it definitely is not any longer in the bill. I want to repeat the statement I made which I think points up the importance of what

he has emphasized; namely, that if this feature had been in the law yesterday, the amendment offered by the minority leader to the mutual security appropriation bill yesterday would have been in order, because Congress would have been in control of the money in the pipeline.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. The issue then, was a question of whether the conferees would accept a synthetic bill or would refuse to agree to the report and would let the American people know that this great step had not been taken, but still remained to be accomplished.

We felt—at least I felt, and I think my colleagues felt the same way—that the danger in accepting the conference report is that the people of the country, especially those who are interested in the Hoover Commission reports, will come to believe that this bill will lead to accomplishments which, in fact, have not been accomplished, and which we cannot now do because there will not be steam or drive behind this vital budget proposal when Congress reassembles next January.

We felt—and I feel—that it would be far better to have the bill die and to have the people know it died, than to have them falsely believe that something has been accomplished. I believe we should make it perfectly clear that Congress has not taken this vital step in the improvement of our budgets and accountings as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

That is the reason why I was unable to sign the conference report.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I must say that with most of what the junior Senator from New Hampshire has said I am in complete agreement. At least, I took the same position at the beginning as he did, namely, that because what we got in relation to what we wanted was comparatively minor, it would be better to reject the report and to start again next year.

But after talking with the responsible officials of the Government, including the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who has communicated with me about this matter, I reconsidered my position. I should like to quote a paragraph from the Director's letter:

> While I favor putting appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, and believe that legislation to accomplish this should ultimately be enacted—

This is important—

> I regard the other sections of your bill to be of such great importance that I would strongly favor the enactment of your bill even without the section to place appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

It is because of that view, strongly held, which has been expressed in that letter and expressed to me in person, and expressed in a letter by Mr. Kestnbaum; in a telegram by J. Harold Stewart, who directed the task force of the Hoover Commission; and expressed by Herbert Hoover, that I was willing to sign the conference report.

I share the view completely, however, that it is a misfortune of great proportions that our bill was not accepted by the House. It might have been easier to dramatize the issue if we had rejected the report; but because the executive departments felt that it would be a valuable step and would lay the groundwork for later passage of the other provision, I somewhat reluctantly agreed to sign the conference report.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, first of all, I share very much the feeling which has been expressed by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and also by the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], as well as the statement which has been made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KENNEDY].

It is true, undoubtedly, that under the present structure of our Government the executive department has had, for a long period of time, the perfect right to put into effect much of this cost basis proposal. It is also true that under the present governmental structure the executive branch undoubtedly could have directed the various departments to establish their accounts on an accrual basis.

The fact, however, remains that neither one of those steps—both of them steps which could develop orderly, proper control over Government fiscal operations—has been put into effect, regardless of whether the authority exists or not.

This particular provision of the bill, which does not include, I also admit, the most important provision which was embraced in the bill as originally introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself, along with a number of other sponsors, nevertheless goes to the root of some of the evils which have existed in the Government financial structure.

By this enactment, if this much can go through, there will be conveyed to the executive branch of the Government the mandate of Congress that the departments and agencies of the Government shall start to put their house in order and should adopt a cost-based budget.

So that no one can misunderstand what I mean, let me say that in the past, in submitting budgets for the various departments and in the compiling of the budget for the next fiscal year, the inventories of goods which are on hand devoted to the development of a particular program have never been taken into consideration. Under this proposal it will be necessary to take that into account in determining the additional amount of money which is needed in order to carry out any specific program which is being presented to Congress.

In the establishment of an accrual system of accounting at the staff level in the agencies and departments of Government, the groundwork will be laid that will lead to an orderly development of the accrued expenditure appropriation basis, which must come if Congress is to obtain full and complete control over the expenditures of Government.

Let me say that it was a disappointment to me to find that any Member of the House of Representatives could in any way have held his tongue in check and believed that this type of proposal was going too far in any way, shape, or manner. Anyone who will reflect about it, will realize that the Corps of Engineers, operating as it has done for many years, actually has been operating under the very system this bill proposed originally, namely, on an accrued expenditure basis, from appropriations for 1 year, and 1 year only, in the case of projects which the corps has been able to estimate as being possible of accomplishment in that 1 year. The corps has for a long time worked on contract authorizations with annual appropriations, and it has to come before the appropriate committees to justify, in the next year, the money it needs in furtherance of a project for which the corps has been given a contract authorization. So there is nothing extraordinary and there is nothing new in the proposal. Such a plan has been in operation in that agency. It has also been in operation in the Atomic Energy Commission, and I believe in the reclamation division. So it is unfortunate that the provision has been omitted from the bill; but much as I am disappointed, I am convinced that there is some merit at least in having the Congress of the United States for once lay down a firm and definite mandate to the agencies in charge of our fiscal operations that they shall get their house in order, that they shall start to develop a cost-based system, and that they shall set up their accounts on an accrual basis, which will lead to the development of the other system.

I can assure the Members of the Senate and the American people that, so long as I have a little breath left in me, I shall fight for recognition and understanding by the American people that the provision, which my distinguished colleague [Mrs. SMITH of Maine] has mentioned as having been stripped from the bill must ultimately be adopted to put the house in order; that it is a provision which will help save for the American people a very substantial amount of money; and that it is the only means by which Congress can gain control, which it does not now have, over the moneys it appropriates.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. I will say that will be the first proposed legislation which the Subcommittee on Reorganization will consider next year.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN TIMBER SALES AND UNFAIR INTEREST CHARGES ON CONTRACTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield. I have yielded for 55 minutes and to 13 Senators, and I think that represents a reasonable amount of yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

I

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on June 24 last year, I addressed the Senate indicating my concern about the low prices the American Indians were receiving for their timber. I was particularly concerned about the situation on the Quinaielt Reservation in Washington. I have visited this reservation, and I am familiar with the way many of the Indians live on the Olympic Peninsula. Many of them exist under very straitened circumstances. Their allotted share in the tribal timber stands is their only asset. Upon the way this timber is managed depends the economic future of hundreds of Indian families.

I had written to Commissioner Emmons of the Bureau of Indian Affairs about this situation. My inquiry into the Quinaielt timber contracts was in part responsible for the congressional timber hearings which were held in the Northwest last fall.

With a business administration in the saddle, as the then Secretary of the Interior had said, one might expect the Indians would be getting business management. Now I find they have been "given the business."

Not only are the Indians consistently getting too low prices for their timber, the ex-bankers and businessmen who have been acting as trustees for the Indians' affairs even seem a little hazy on simple and compound interest.

Here is what has occurred. On October 1, 1955, the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, allowed some 1,000 Indian allottees on the Quinaielt Reservation to be saddled with what may total $3½ million in interest charges for advance payments made to them under their long-term timber contracts—contracts which, under the previous national administration, had provided for these advance payments on an interest-free basis.

At the present time, not only are the prices which the Indians receive for their timber about half of its market value, but also the Indians are paying an uncalled-for interest charge.

Last October, when the self-proclaimed business management over in the Department of the Interior took this unprecedented action, they were supposedly raising the price the Indians were getting for their timber. They did raise them. On one contract the increase averaged 47 cents per thousand board-feet—47 cents. At the same time the Indian was socked with a charge of $1.72 per thousand board-feet for interest; and, as if this were not enough, the Indians are being charged an additional 23 cents per thousand board-feet as profit-and-risk allowance on this interest. This raises the total charge to $1.95 per thousand board-feet.

In other words, the Secretary of the Interior determined that the contract price for the Indians' timber was too low by at least $2.42 per thousand board-feet and adjusted the terms of the long-term contract accordingly. Two dollars and forty-two cents is a modest enough adjustment in the light of the price for similar timber in the surrounding area. But, instead of the Indians' receiving this additional $2.42 per thousand board-feet for their timber, their share was increased by 47 cents, while $1.95 was taken right off the contract price of the timber again, in the form of prorated interest and profit-and-risk allowance on the advance payment by the purchaser to the Indians required under the contract. On another contract, I am told, the situation in terms of these charges is even worse.

If the Secretary had done the job to which the Indians are entitled, he would have exerted to the utmost his rights under the contract, so as to raise the price of the Indians' timber to a par with the prices obtained by the Forest Service for adjacent timber. Under the Indian Bureau's long-term contract, the Indians now get an average for all the species on the Quinaielt Reservation of about $10 per 1,000 board-feet, while the Forest Service's competitive sales bring about $19 per thousand average for a comparable combination of species.

II

Perhaps there is little or nothing to be done about the Indian Bureau's long-term timber sale contracts until they have run their course, unfavorable as they have proved to be for the Indians. But this new interest charge on the downpayments to the Indians adds a new and unnecessary burden to these already disadvantageous contracts, and in a manner certain to fall unevenly and unfairly on different Indians.

Under these long-term Indian timber contracts, which may run for one-third of a century, the purchaser wins the right to cut hundreds of millions—perhaps three-fourths of a billion—board-feet of timber. He does not have to keep bidding every year on this timber against competitors hungry for trees. Such an assured timber supply for 20 or 30 years is an exceedingly important and valuable right, as pressure on the limited log supply of the area steadily increases.

In return for this long-term assurance, the purchaser is bound to make certain substantial advance payments. He has to pay 25 percent of the total appraised value during the first year of the contract, 15 percent in the third year, and 10 percent in the sixth year.

However, the contracts contain no express provision that the Indians are to pay interest to the purchaser for these advance payments on timber not yet cut. These interest charges were adopted by the Indian Bureau in October 1955, without prior notice to the Indians.

Moreover, interest was not computed, in the normal manner, on the remaining balance of advance payments over the sums recovered from timber cut under the contract. Instead, it was computed on the basis of applying the interest charge to an assumed average of the advance payments outstanding. Then this charge was prorated, by volume, over the timber to be cut over the life of the contract, to be recovered as a cost by the purchaser. And a profit-and-risk allowance is further added to this cost. This, I repeat, represents $1.95 of the recalculated, increased price of the Indians' timber, while the Indians themselves were left the other 47 cents.

Mr. President, quite apart from the propriety or impropriety of adding an interest charge to these long-term contracts at all, these methods of letting the purchasers recover it as a cost, apportioned by volume to the timber cut, results in serious inequities among the different Indian owners of the timber themselves.

The individual Indian's advance payment is based on the estimated value of his timber, but his share of the interest charge on the total advance payment is recovered by the purchaser on the basis of the volume—not the value, but the volume—of that timber, which may be more or less.

On 1 million board-feet of timber worth, let us say, $10,000, an Indian receives, under the contract, an initial advance of $2,500. Another Indian with 1 million board-feet of a different kind or grade, worth only $5,000, receives an initial advance of $1,250. Under the astute business management of the Interior Department, the purchaser recovers from each of these Indians $1,950 in interest on the advance, in the form of timber prices reduced $1.95 per 1,000 board-feet.

It must be noted further, Mr. President, that the individual Indian is charged with this interest, not only without regard to the value of his particular timber, but also irrespective of when his timber is cut. It may be cut in the very first year, in which case it is obviously absurd to charge him with interest on his so-called advance payment. Yet he will, in effect, pay as much interest as another Indian with the same volume of timber which may not be cut until the very end of the contract period—25 years after he has received his final advance payment.

Again, because this interest charge is prorated by volume over the timber cut, another inequity occurs. It is not at all unusual for the actual cut to overrun the estimate by as much as 50 percent. But the interest component is to be recovered as a part of the purchaser's cost at the rate of $1.95 per thousand board-feet. Thus the 2 Indians of my hypothetical examples may end up paying $2,925 in interest on their advances of, respectively, $2,500 and $1,250.

III

It seems to me, Mr. President, that $2,925 is rather steep interest to pay for an advance of $1,250 for 1 year—or for 10 years—even under the business management of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that it is beyond the ability of the Department and the Indian Bureau to devise a method for pooling the Indians' timber allotment in a way to assure equitable sharing of the income, along with proper forest management. Under the present method, after the advance payments, the Indian gets the balance of the money for his timber when it is cut—at the convenience of the purchaser under the long-term contract. The Indians cannot decide when their timber will be cut. An Indian with high-value timber

may find it cut in a period of low prices. On the other hand, if his allotment were pooled for purposes of payment, he could receive a prorata share of the value of his timber over the life of the contract, and thus avoid this risk.

The forest is under sustained-yield management, but not the Indians' income. All of the Indians get the advance payments under the long-term contracts. Those whose timber is cut early in the contract get all of their money quickly. The others may have to wait 14, 24, or 34 years for the final receipt of their money.

Now the sterility of ideas is compounded by an improper $3½ million interest surcharge on the Indians, which moreover falls upon each individual in a most inequitable manner, without relation to the value of his timber or the time when it is cut.

What the Indians have long deserved is to have their timber sold under procedures which will return to them the greatest income, consistent with the long-term protection of their forest resource. Once the long-term contracts were chosen as the Indian Bureau's device for dealing with the particular difficulties of the situation on the Quinaielt Reservation, the Indians at least were entitled to the exertion of every effort by the Bureau to obtain for them the highest returns possible under the terms of the contracts. A trustee can hardly justify anything less than such efforts on behalf of those whose property is entrusted to his management.

Instead, after apparently determining that timber prices, under the contract formulas, could be raised between $2 and $3, the Indian Bureau raised the return to the Indians 47 cents. The companies who hold these contracts asked to have the price of timber calculated so as to allow them to recover interest on their contractual advances to the Indians, and the Secretary of the Interior blithely agreed.

Mr. President, I intend to ask the Comptroller General to look into the propriety of these interest charges and their apportionment to the timber of the individual Indians. I hope that the Secretary of the Interior, too, will review this question of the management of the timber on the Quinaielt Reservation under these long-term contracts, and that the injustice to the Indians will be speedily corrected.

EXPIRATION OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS FOR SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, today, July 25, 1956, there expires one of the greatest veterans' programs of all time—the GI bill of rights for the veterans of World War II.

For millions of young American servicemen of that great war, this great program, created in June of 1944, has meant help with readjustment to civilian employment, with purchasing a home or starting a business, but above all, it has meant the opportunity to complete their educations.

By making it possible for more than 2 million veterans to obtain educations which were either interrupted by the war, or which might have been beyond their economic capacities, the GI bill has brought untold benefits to the Nation. It should not have been permitted to die, without having a substitute take its place for the hundreds of thousands of servicemen still entering the armed services every year.

The Nation needs educated men and women more than ever. We still draft men into the Armed Forces, which must be kept at a level lower than for war, but certainly higher than for real peace. We impose upon them a compulsory Reserve obligation unprecedented in our history. For these reasons, I introduced on January 18, 1956, S. 2967, cosponsored by eight other Senators, to revive the GI bill. During the coming session of Congress, I shall again urge enactment of a new GI bill or a bill providing an equivalent, revised program to offer our servicemen the educational opportunities which their services and the needs of our Nation demand.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the July 22, 1956, issue of the New York Times by Dr. Benjamin Fine, entitled "Education in Review," which stresses the outstanding success of the GI bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—GI BILL, EXPIRING AFTER 12 YEARS, HAS BEEN, IT IS AGREED, AN OUTSTANDING SUCCESS

(By Benjamin Fine)

On Wednesday the GI bill of rights set up for veterans of World War II on June 22, 1944, expires. In 12 years, nearly 8 million ex-servicemen attended school and college, took on-the-job training, or worked on farms. The whole program cost the Government $14,500,000,000.

Educators began last week to take stock of this great educational venture. At one time college campuses were swamped with veterans. A total of 2,200,000 veterans took advantage of the GI bill to go to college or graduate school, with up to $500 in tuition fees, and subsistence grants ranging from $75 to $110 a month from the Government.

There were misgivings at first. But the educators soon found that the veterans were characterized by maturity and strong motivation. The veterans were substantially older than their civilian classmates. And they wanted to make up for lost time.

Perhaps the situation at Yale University is typical of the institutions that found their campuses overcrowded with ex-servicemen. Some 15,000 veterans attended Yale in the 12 years. A maximum of 5,900 were enrolled during the spring term of 1947. Yale found that scholastically the vets did better work than the other students. But as Richard R. Shank, head of the veterans' affairs program at Yale puts it, the university benefited also from the rise in standards achieved by the veterans.

BENEFITS CONFERRED

The GI bill, educators generally agree, opened avenues of educational opportunities to wide numbers of veterans qualified in every way except financially. It did so without directly subsidizing schools. Nor were the administrative controls too objectionable. Many veterans continued their education at the graduate level. This, of course, increased the country's supply of research scientists and doctor of philosophy scholars to teach as well as to man posts in private industry.

The GI bill discounted the theory, held in some quarters, that only those able to afford it should take graduate studies. It has given impetus to a fellowship program sponsored by industry and the Federal Government.

The Columbia University campus probably had the largest number of GI's of any institution. Some 85,000 veterans have attended Columbia since the program began. The peak year was reached in 1947 when 17,733 ex-servicemen were enrolled, comprising 74 percent of the male student body.

Contrary to expectations, few veterans gave up before completing their educational objectives. The ease and completeness with which the ex-GI's fitted into the academic environment proved heartening.

"Veterans seem to be more interested in public affairs and world problems, and in equipping themselves for sound citizenship," one official summed up. "They have brought to our campuses an atmosphere of serious purpose and a sense of responsibility."

The GI program is bound to have lasting results. It has trained 238,000 teachers, 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 scientists, and 36,000 clergymen.

There is little doubt that the veterans brought a sense of maturity previously unknown to college campuses. This view was best expressed by Dr. Herold C. Hunt, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and former Chicago school superintendent and Harvard University professor.

HIGH LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT

"Having shared the experience and responsibility of winning World War II," he said, "many veterans came to college with a deeper sense of values than those who came directly from high schools. Their seriousness brought good scholarship and a high level of achievement. The progress they are now making in their peacetime pursuits confirms this observation.

"As a former superintendent of schools, I have observed the benefits of the GI bill of rights at first hand. I feel that inestimable good has come from educational and training opportunities the bill made possible."

According to Dr. Henry T. Heald, president of New York University who recently has been named as president of the Ford Foundation, the GI bill was one of the most enlightened pieces of legislation enacted by Congress in the wake of any military effort in which the Nation has been engaged.

Educators in all parts of the country, in almost every type of institution, speak highly of the GI program. Dean Fred W. Ajax, coordinator of veterans' affairs at Georgia Institute of Technology, says, "The veterans' program was worth every cent spent by the Government, both to the individual veteran and to the country. Federal aid to higher education in peacetime is more than justified by the results of the federally sponsored GI bill."

UNDER HANDICAPS

Not only were the GI's ambitious and eager to complete their courses, but many worked under tremendous handicaps. Some 600,000 disabled veterans received vocational rehabilitation, some of them in colleges. A striking example is the Tulane University veteran who had lost both hands and one eye but completed an architecture course with an outstanding record.

Many institutions created veterans' divisions. Brown University set up a separate college for ex-servicemen in the fall of 1946 for men whose academic background was not up to those of the regular students. All, however, who had the equivalent of a high-school education had been told by Uncle Sam that they could go to college. College gave them this chance to show that acquired maturity and greater incentive to learn could offset any deficiencies of previous training.

They took the same course under the same faculty and with the same grading system as the students of the regular college. The

only differences were that their classes and laboratories were held in the late afternoon and evening (thus utilizing the Brown plan during off-hour periods) and they did not participate in any extracurricular activities. They made good. Most of them were able to transfer successfully to the college proper.

Although in the main the GI program did an excellent job, in its early years some unscrupulous promoters made financial killings. They organized phony trade schools or other institutes to get a share of the free tuition funds. Some GI's in these schools spent Government money on ballroom dancing, toying with photography, or taking up horseback riding. The Government cracked down in 1948, when the Veterans' Administration tightened up its requirements.

Now the Korean veterans, 350,000 strong, are on the Nation's campuses and in the classrooms—not a large number, in comparison with their predecessors. But they are being made welcome by educators impressed with the success of the World War II veterans.

RACIAL SEGREGATION IN FEDERAL HOUSING

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing. The letter is in reply to a letter addressed to me by Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Inasmuch as some time ago I had Mr. Cole's letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, therefore in fairness I believe that this committee's comments on Mr. Cole's letter should also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST
DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING,
New York, N. Y., July 23, 1956.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: An Associated Press story of June 27 reported that you have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 21 a letter from Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole, commenting upon a letter of mine to you. My letter had been written over a year ago, on June 16, 1955. I trust you are interested in my appraisal of Mr. Cole's reply.

Mr. Cole makes abundantly clear that he is not only familiar with our assertion "that racial segregation continues in housing built under the Federal housing programs, and that the Federal Government is actually supporting the spread of segregation," but that our charge is correct. He reports attempts by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to foster the production of "Negro housing" or "minority housing." Nowhere does he mention efforts to assist in opening up the housing market—wherever Government aid is involved—to free bargaining of all families, regardless of race.

Mr. Cole's report of Agency accomplishments is inaccurate and ambiguous. He cites a conference he held in December 1954 with the real estate, lending, building, and public interest groups. The purpose of the conference was to develop Federal housing policy with regard to racial factors. The home builders, seconded by the lenders and real estate interests, and with the tacit approval of the Government representatives, offered to devote 10 percent of their next year's anticipated production to "minority group housing if they could obtain suitable sites." All the public interest groups rejected this racially segregated housing plan. They supported instead a policy statement that all housing built with Federal aids be open to all who qualify, regardless of race.

No report on the conference has been made nor any policy statement issued by the Housing Agency. In answer to a question asked by Senator HERBERT LEHMAN at hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Cole stated, "Nothing tangible came out of the conference * * *. I * * * set up a committee to help me * * * determine what could be done. The committee never met. * * * That was the end of that conference." Nothing like 10 percent of new building has been available to minority groups, even on a segregated basis. Practically none has been available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Mr. Cole further reports in his letter that he and other housing officials have exhorted builders, lenders and FHA district offices during 1954–55 to step up the production of housing for minorities including "emphasis on the development of demonstration open-occupancy projects in suitable key areas." Neither in Cole's letter to you nor at any other time, are any specific results of these exhortations, speeches, and directives presented or stated in statistical or any other form.

Mr. Cole tells you that "I am convinced that the efforts of these leaders on a national scale are being reflected locally in an increasingly substantial volume of production of housing for these families." Where are the facts and figures? How many homes were actually produced? In what cities? At what prices? And how does the number compare to those made available to "whites" but closed to Negroes?

The Administrator makes much of the voluntary home mortgage credit program. But let us look at the facts: The program is available to assist only FHA- or VA-aided housing. Since Negroes already are largely excluded from both of these programs, the availability of VHMCP to them must be severely limited. For the whole country, for the 1½-year period, through May 1956, only 1,085 individual loans (to minority families) and 1,938 to builders for housing available to minority groups were placed. Mr. Cole admitted to Senator LEHMAN at the subcommittee hearings, "The applications are extremely small." Furthermore, I am sure that an analysis of the loans would reveal that most, if not all of them, are in areas already occupied by minorities, or in neighborhoods already in racial transition. The builders' loans are mainly for "Negro housing." We have received many reports that local correspondents of VHMCP lenders are refusing loans except for homes in "Negro neighborhoods."

Mr. Cole's statements regarding the Public Housing Administration policy and program serve only to reemphasize that agency's application of the discredited "separate-but-equal" doctrine to publicly subsidized housing. The statement that "local housing authorities are encouraged to admit tenants without regard to racial considerations" is revealing. Mr. Cole went further in statements at the Senate subcommittee. He said: "This is the problem of the people in the locality. If they want integrated housing, they have it. If they don't want it, they don't have it." This is a clear abdication of Federal responsibility. The projects he is speaking of are directly subsidized by Federal funds. The notion that the locality may determine for itself whether to obey the law and Constitution is quite fantastic. The President has stated firmly that public funds and powers are not to be utilized to foster racial discrimination or segregation. Yet, 85 percent of federally subsidized public housing remains segregated. New segregated projects continue to be approved. In addition, projects actually owned by the Federal Government continue to be operated on a segregated basis.

It is a shocking fact that Federal policy permits entire Negro neighborhoods to be cleared under the urban renewal program to make way for housing—usually FHA-aided—from which the developer, with local and Federal sanction, may exclude all Negro families. An official report as of December 1954 shows 13 federally approved projects under this program were replacing racially integrated sites with new segregated housing. At the same time the racial relations staff attached to the urban renewal program has been reduced from 5 persons to 1 person.

A basic reason that many of the promising urban redevelopment plans have either been stopped cold or inordinately delayed is the failure of the Federal agency to insist that the total supply of housing available to minorities be increased. Almost two-thirds of all families displaced are nonwhite, but additional living space, either on a segregated or integrated basis, is not being opened to them.

Mr. Cole's statement of our case is in itself an effort to prejudice against it. Mr. Cole says that we are asking as a condition to all types of Federal assistance in housing, a [rigid] agreement, that the recipients of this aid agree to [limit racial segregation] and to [require integration]. [Words in brackets supplied.] What we ask is stated very simply: As a condition of Federal assistance, recipients agree to make the housing available to all eligible families on exactly the same basis, and without regard to race.

The FHA commitments already require two agreements from the recipients during the life of the mortgage: (1) that no racial restrictive covenants will be recorded against the property, and (2) that no lease or other instrument will be executed which would restrict occupancy on the basis of race. These agreements with FHA are formal but meaningless. Builders of FHA developments simply do not admit Negro families. We are asking that the Federal Government render these two agreements meaningful and require a commitment that housing produced through FHA insurance is to be available to all eligible families on the same basis without regard to race.

Mr. Cole argues that under such a condition, private builders and local communities in various sections of the country would reject FHA assistance. This would be their privilege. Federal aid is not obligatory and is supposedly available only where a need exists which is beyond local and State ability to meet. Further, Mr. Cole is not called upon to be either prophet or spokesman for what builders or communities will do. This will be a question for each builder for himself and each community for itself to decide. Experience in New York State, however, where discrimination in Government-insured housing is barred by State law, has not shown any dropoff in FHA applications.

We believe that the decisions of the United States Supreme Court during the past several years require that the Federal Government refuse to support segregated housing. The briefs amicus curiae filed by the United States Government in such cases as those on racial covenants, segregation in transportation, and segregation in public schools, clearly affirmed the doctrine that racial segregation imposed or supported by law or public powers is per se unconstitutional. Mr. Cole's homily upon local rights and privileges to exercise racial discrimination in varying degrees smacks of the same argument completely rejected by the United States Supreme Court in the public school cases. It is evident that these are the principles which have guided Mr. Cole during the past 3 years. It is simply not true that he has taken "vigorous steps against racial discrimination in housing." Vigorous words have been spoken, but action has been meager and even then directed toward the expansion or reinforcement of

racial segregation in housing. Mr. Cole quotes the President in behalf of moderation in the enforcement of the Supreme Court's decision regarding public schools. He seems to forget that the President has unequivocally stated on many occasions that it is his determination that public funds will not be used under his administration to foster racial discrimination or segregation.

Either Mr. Cole does not understand what the President has declared or the President has not been adequately advised as to the implications of his stated policy in the field of federally assisted housing.

The HHFA has reproduced and given wide circulation to Mr. Cole's letter containing my name. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should like to ask your consideration in inserting this letter also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that all sides of the issue may be presented to the American people.

Your interest in the matter is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES LEVENSON,
Executive Director.

THE ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR ANNUAL REUNION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Army and Navy Legion of Valor will hold its 66th annual reunion in the great State of Texas, at San Antonio, July 29 to August 1, inclusive.

This organization is composed of men and women who have received the highest decorations of the United States for valor in action. It is noteworthy that five Members of the United States Senate have received this highest award, the Congressional Medal of Honor. They are as follows: Adelbert Ames, of Mississippi; Henry A. du Pont, of Delaware, of the famous Du Pont family; Matthew Stanley Quay, of Pennsylvania, an outstanding political leader; William Joyce Sewell, of New Jersey; and Francis E. Warren, of Wyoming.

Senator Warren was father-in-law of General Pershing.

The commander of this great organization is Lt. Peter Paul Martinek, of California; and the adjutant and quartermaster is "Old Reliable" Lt. Ben Prager, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, in order that all of us may be better acquainted with this organization, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement relative to the Legion of Valor and its annual reunion program, and also a list of those who have received two Congressional Medals of Honor.

There being no objection, the statement and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGION OF VALOR

The Legion of Valor is, perhaps, the most unique organization in the United States. Membership is not achieved by birth, social position, wealth, academic achievement, or other requirements that most societies and organizations have established for membership qualification.

Eligibility is confined to recipients of our Nation's two highest decorations for valor. The official presentation of these decorations to members of the Armed Forces in appropriate ceremonies determine whom its members shall be.

The Legion of Valor was organized on April 23, 1890, in Washington, D. C., by a group of Civil War and Indian campaign veterans who had been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Membership was, of course, restricted to recipients of this medal.

The membership was somewhat augmented during the Spanish campaign of 1898 and again during the Philippine Insurrection.

The membership was never large and with the passage of years and subsequent death of members, it was decided on November 25, 1918, to change the name of the organization to the Army and Navy Legion of Valor and admit into membership persons who had been awarded the Army's Distinguished Service Cross, the second ranking Army decoration.

Then again in 1933, persons who had been awarded the Navy Cross, the second ranking Navy decoration, were admitted to membership.

Today, the membership consists of our two highest Army and Navy decorations; however, there actually are four medals; namely, the Army Congressional Medal of Honor and the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Congressional Medal of Honor and the Navy Cross. Personnel of the Air Force are awarded Army decorations; the Marine Corps and Coast Guard are awarded Navy decorations.

At the present time the official name of the organization is the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., the organization having been incorporated under the laws of the State of New York.

It is interesting to note that this quite small but select group of service veterans are members of the oldest veteran organization in the United States today; the Grand Army of the Republic was until quite recently the oldest. With the death of all except a few of these wonderful gentlemen (at this writing) the organization was dissolved for lack of perpetuation of the body as an active organization.

The Legion of Valor, dating its inception in 1890, therefore is at present our oldest veteran organization.

The Navy Congressional Medal of Honor was the first to be authorized. On December 21, 1861, "An act to further promote the efficiency of the Navy" was introduced in and approved by Congress (12 Stat. 329–330, sec. 7): *"And be it further enacted*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to cause 200 Medals of Honor to be prepared with suitable emblematic device, which shall be bestowed upon such petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and marines as shall most distinguish themselves by their gallantry in action and other seamanlike qualities during the present war."

On July 12, 1862, some 6 months later, similar legislation was approved by Congress for issuance of an Army Congressional Medal of Honor.

The original Medals of Honor were awarded to enlisted men only; however, both services in later legislation made provision whereby the Congressional Medal was authorized to be awarded to officers.

When first authorized, both the Navy and Army Congressional Medals of Honor were awarded to persons who "shall most distinguish themselves by their gallantry in action." Since that time, however, many modifications have been introduced in legislation pertaining to requirements for the award of the medals.

On July 9, 1918, legislation clarified the Army Medal of Honor award in the following wording: "That the provisions of existing law relating to the award of Medals of Honor to officers, noncommissioned officers, privates of the Army be, and they hereby are, amended so that the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor only to each person who, while an officer or enlisted man of the Army, shall hereafter, in action involving actual conflict with an enemy, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty."

On August 7, 1942, legislation affecting the Navy Medal of Honor amended the act of February 4, 1919, and provides in section 1: "That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby authorized, to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, shall, in action involving actual conflict with the enemy, or in the line of his profession, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command to which attached."

At the present time the requirements for the award of the Medal of Honor are set at such a high standard that a great portion of awards are posthumous. The actual act of outstanding heroism must entail the risk of almost certain death.

Citations record acts of heroism which seem utterly incredible of performance by an individual. Yet witnesses observe and in many instances owe their very lives to these men who brave death so that their comrades in arms may live.

Even with the advent of World War I the membership could foresee eventual termination of the organization unless the membership was somehow augmented. After much discussion, it was decided to change the requirements of the constitution and bylaws so that persons awarded the Army Distinguished Service Cross would become eligible for membership. This, of course, necessitated the change in name of the organization to its present name.

The requirements for award of the Distinguished Service Cross are, to quote Army Regulations No. 600–45 of June 27, 1950, "The Distinguished Service Cross is awarded to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Army of the United States, shall have distinguished himself or herself by extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy."

Several years later recipients of the Navy Cross were also admitted to membership. The requirements for award of the Navy Cross as set forth in section 8 of Navy Regulations relating to decorations reads:

"The act of August 7, 1942, 'That the President be, and he hereby is, further authorized to present but not in the name of Congress, a Navy Cross of appropriate design and ribbon, together with a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, to any person, who, while serving in any capacity with the Naval service of the United States, distinguishes himself by extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an armed enemy'."

Although the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor entails an act of almost incredible heroism, yet in the military history of our country since the authorization by Congress of this medal and prior to the close of World War I, 17 persons had performed heroic acts which merited two awards of the Medal of Honor. Five of those persons rereceived 2 Army Medals of Honor, 7 received 2 Navy Medals of Honor, and 5 received 1 Army Medal of Honor, and 1 Navy Medal of Honor. The names of the 17 persons are listed on the following pages and copies of their citations are included in the Medal of Honor volumes of the Army and the Navy Departments:

Frank Baldwin, United States Army, July 20, 1864, Army; second medal, November 8, 1874, Army.

Smedley Butler, United States Marine Corps, April 22, 1914, Navy; second medal, November 17, 1915, Navy.

John Cooper, United States Navy, August 5, 1864, Navy; second medal, April 26, 1865, Navy.

Louis Cukela, United States Marine Corps, July 18, 1918, Navy; second medal, July 18, 1918, Army.

Thomas Custer, United States Army, April 2, 1865, Army; second medal, April 6, 1865, Army.

Dan Daly, United States Marine Corps, August 14, 1900, Navy; second medal, October 22, 1915, Navy.

Charles Hoffman, United States Marine Corps (awarded under the name of E. A. Janson), June 6, 1918, Navy; second medal.

Henry Hogan, United States Army, 1876 to 1877, Army; second medal, September 30, 1877, Army.

John J. Kelly, United States Marine Corps, October 3, 1918, Navy; second medal, October 3, 1918, Army.

John King, United States Navy, May 29, 1901, Navy; second medal, September 13, 1909, Navy.

Matej Kocak, United States Marine Corps, July 18, 1918, Navy; second medal, July 18, 1918, Army.

Patrick Leonard, United States Army, May 15, 1870, Army; second medal, April 28, 1876, Army.

John McCloy, United States Navy, June 22, 1900, Navy; second medal, April 22, 1914, Navy.

Patrick Mullen, United States Navy, March 17, 1865, Navy; second medal, May 1, 1865, Navy.

John H. Pruitt, United States Marine Corps, October 3, 1918, Navy; second medal, October 3, 1918, Army.

Albert Weisbogel, United States Navy, January 11, 1874, Navy; second medal, April 27, 1876, Navy.

William Wilson, United States Army, March 28, 1872, Army; second medal, September 29, 1872, Army.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO CONSIDER SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I invite the attention of all Senators to this unanimous-consent request, which I have cleared with the minority leader and other interested Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 2825, H. R. 12350, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, be in order immediately following the disposition of the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATION OF BANKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3911) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidation of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, S. 3911 was introduced by myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to provide effective Federal regulation of mergers and consolidations involving banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I am sure that every Member of this body is aware of the great rash of bank mergers that has taken place in the last few years. The magnitude of the problem is emphasized by the fact that there have been 830 mergers, consolidations, and purchases involving national and State banks during the 6-year period from January 1, 1950 to December 31, 1955. With 225 banks being absorbed during the year 1955, it is evident that the pace of bank mergers is steadily increasing.

It is also clear that the present laws governing bank mergers are inadequate and ineffective. Theoretically, all bank mergers are subject to scrutiny under sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. However, the Sherman Act has never been applied to bank mergers and consolidations.

Most, if not all, bank mergers are accomplished through asset acquisitions because national banks and State member banks of the Federal Reserve System are prohibited from acquiring stock in other banks, and virtually all State banking laws prohibit State chartered banks from acquiring the controlling stock in another bank. Since section 7 of the Clayton Act applies, in the case of banks, only to mergers or consolidations by stock acquisitions, the prohibitions of that act are for all practical purposes a nullity insofar as banks are concerned. This conclusion is borne out by the fact that there has never been an action instituted against a bank pursuant to section 7.

In this connection, it should be noted that there was an unsuccessful attempt to enforce the stock acquisition provisions of section 7 against a bank holding company. The enactment of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 earlier this year provides effective regulation of all acquisitions by bank holding companies, and thus eliminates the necessity of resorting to the Clayton Act in such cases.

The National Bank Act and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act require advance approval by the banking agencies of certain mergers involving insured banks. However, the law specifies no standards to be applied to such transactions and, in particular, no mention is made of competitive and monopolistic aspects.

Thus, we are faced with an important problem, and the present statutes are inadequate to meet the problem. We believe S. 3911 will provide effective and uniform regulation of all bank mergers, consolidations, and other asset acquisition transactions involving banks insured by the FDIC.

The bill contains two fundamental provisions:

First. Administration of the law follows the traditional structure of the banking statutes by placing authority in the three Federal banking supervisory agencies.

Second. The banking agencies would be required to consider whether the proposed bank merger would lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly.

I should like to discuss these two points in some detail.

The bill amends the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require every insured bank to receive advance approval before it can acquire the assets of another bank by merger, consolidation, or assumption of deposit liabilities. The authority to grant consent to bank acquisitions is divided along traditional lines between the three banking agencies. Thus, prior written consent would be required from the Comptroller of the Currency if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a national bank; the Federal Reserve Board if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a State member bank; or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a State nonmember insured bank.

The bill requires the 3 banking agencies to consider the banking factors enumerated in section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. These factors cover the financial history and condition of the bank, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, and the convenience and needs of the community to be served by the bank.

In addition, the three banking agencies would be required to consider carefully whether the effect of each asset acquisition may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. The committee adopted this new competitive test of unduly lessening competition in preference to the substantial lessening of competition standard as used in section 7 of the Clayton Act. The new test is intended to provide a more flexible test of the degree to which competition may not be impaired than the Clayton Act test.

The new test was necessary in order to permit acquisitions when this is the best means of dealing with situations such as—

First. Where the acquired bank's future prospects are unfavorable because of inadequate management or lack of provision for management succession;

Second. Where the acquired bank has inadequate capital or unsound assets;

Third. Where the acquired bank is an uneconomic unit or is too small to meet the needs of the community by providing loans of sufficient size or necessary banking facilities;

Fourth. Where there is a reasonable probability of the ultimate failure of the bank to be acquired; or

Fifth. Where several banks in a small community are compelled by an "overbanked" situation to resort to unsound

competitive practices which may eventually have an adverse effect upon the condition of such banks.

The new criteria would permit the Federal banking agencies to deal with situations such as these and others peculiar to banks. In the absence of such exceptional circumstances, the new standard is intended to be applied vigorously to preserve competition in the banking field.

In the interest of achieving uniform standards, the agency having jurisdiction in a particular merger must seek the views of each of the other two agencies on the competitive and monopolistic aspects of the transaction. This mandatory consultation requirement will insure that the law has uniform applications to all acquisition transactions by insured banks.

S. 3911 also permits the banking agencies to request the opinion of the Attorney General on any competitive or monopolistic question. As a result, the banking agencies, when confronted with an unusually difficult competitive situation, will be free to obtain the views of the Attorney General. This provision, coupled with the fact that the Attorney General would retain his authority under sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, adequately protects the legitimate interests of the Attorney General in the banking field.

I should also like to point out that the bill is not intended to deprive the State bank supervisors of any of their present authority over bank mergers and consolidations within their respective States. As has been the case in the past in regard to other bank regulatory problems, the views of the State supervisory authorities will be given careful consideration by the Federal agencies in any transaction involving a State-chartered bank.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that this bill is unequivocally endorsed by the Treasury Department, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Bureau of the Budget has stated that "the enactment of legislation for this purpose would be in accord with the program of the President." The bill also has the full support of the Federal Advisory Council, the American Bankers Association, and many individual bankers throughout the country.

The need for a uniform system of Federal regulation of bank mergers and consolidations is evident. S. 3911 will meet the need and provide adequate safeguards to preserve competition. I hope Members of the Senate will join with me and the members of the Banking and Currency Committee in voting for this important legislation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee on the very able presentation of the bill. I sat in the committee with him in the preparation of this measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. I very strongly endorse the bill, which has the sponsorship of the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BUSH. As I see it, the bill places the regulation of mergers in the hands of the expert and informed agencies of the Government which are experienced in every way to deal with the problem. I very strongly urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas and the other members of his subcommittee, and the members of the full committee, as well, for the very thorough work they have done on this important measure. It is important and, to me, rather complicated. It is absolutely necessary that there be proper regulation of bank mergers, because they can be vital to the future economy of our country, and there must be an agency to exercise continuous supervisory authority over them. It is my understanding that S. 3911 comes nearer to meeting the problem than some of the other bills which have been introduced dealing with the same subject. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not correct that his subcommittee went thoroughly into all the bills which were introduced on this subject?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator——

Mr. STENNIS. At least the subcommittee gave consideration to those bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. This matter has, of course, received attention by other committees, such as the Committee on the Judiciary. It is a very broad field. Our committee takes the view that banks are in a class by themselves, and should not be treated as ordinary industrial corporations, and should be regulated as quasi-utilities and monopolies are regulated, and that that is the proper approach to the problem of regulating banks.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, after the rather crushing defeat which was administered to the Senator from Illinois last night, I was not quite certain whether it would be appropriate to move an amendment to the bill under consideration at the present time. However, there is an old Scottish song which my ancestors used to sing: "I lie me down to rest, and rise to bleed again."

I wish there might be a longer interval before I was compelled to rise and bleed again, but the exigencies of the fight require me now to rise and move an amendment. I therefore call up my amendment, which is offered by me on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and is identified as "7–20–56—C."

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be not read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS on behalf of himself and Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

On page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly" and insert in lieu thereof "substantially to lessen competition or to tend."

On page 2, line 20, strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall."

On page 2, line 21, add the following sentence after the period at the end thereof: "If the Attorney General finds that the effect of the proposed transaction may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly, consent shall not be given under this subsection unless the Attorney General finds further that such a transaction is necessary to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks concerned.".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in the field of banking."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the question of bank mergers is an extremely important one. There has been a consolidation of bank control into fewer and fewer hands through three processes: Branch banking, which we have attempted to regulate with greater or lesser success; bank holding companies upon which we passed a fairly good bill earlier in the session, and made better, I believe, by an amendment which I offered, and which, by some strange action, was accepted by the Senate; and bank mergers, of which in the last 2 or 3 years we have had a very large number in the big metropolitan centers of this country. These have been mergers of banks which were not in any sense in financial difficulty. The banks were all in excellent financial condition, and the security of the depositors was not threatened in any respect. By an interchange of assets or acquisition of assets the provisions of the Sherman Act were avoided.

That process of acquiring assets of a bank, rather than the stock, avoids the Sherman Act. Through a slip in the revision of the Sherman Act, which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and Representative CELLER, of New York, put through some years ago, banks were exempted from that law. Therefore, at present, the gates are open for further bank mergers. Representative CELLER introduced a bill to meet this situation which has been passed by the House. That bill gives to the Attorney General the final decision as to whether mergers are in the public interest and to say whether a merger substantially lessens competition. In other words, the test of the Sherman Act is to be applied to bank mergers.

We did not hear anything from the Federal Reserve Board about the pending bill, or from the FDIC or from the Comptroller of the Currency, until after the Celler bill had been passed and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary in the Senate. Suddenly these agencies developed an interest in the question of bank mergers. I believe the very able Senator from Arkansas will agree that this bill had its genesis in the sacred precincts of those three regulatory agencies.

(At this point Mr. DOUGLAS yielded to Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina for a statement on the Dominican Republic,

which, on request and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Official Reporter to read back to me a few words where I was interrupted by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, does that require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois restate his request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I simply inquired if the Official Reporter would read back to me the last 2 or 3 sentences so that I might be able to make a more connected statement, because of the fact that I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not believe I shall object, I should like to point out to the Senator from Illinois that he will accomplish very little by objecting to minor unanimous-consent requests on the floor. What some Senators are doing with regard to the bill he wishes to press through this session is exactly what he did last year with reference to the sugar bill. The bill was killed because certain Senators would not give unanimous consent to report it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently the Senator agrees that the tactics which were used yesterday were wrong.

Mr. LONG. The Senator certainly understands that the attitude he takes toward the bill from the further consideration of which he wishes to discharge the committee is similar to the action he took last year.

However, Mr. President, I shall not object to the Senator's request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my request, lest I offend the sensibilities of my good friend from Louisiana. But I may say to him, in reply, that I think there is a difference in the magnitude of the issues involved in acting on a sugar bill which would benefit a small group of people at the expense of the 165 million consumers of the country, and the question of civil rights for 16 million Americans. But I shall let that go. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to score a point on that matter, I shall certainly let him do so.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request, and although I am laboring under some disability because of my attempt to be polite to the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me I could refresh his memory.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has had a very fine classical education, including education at Oxford, and several honorary degrees, and I am sure he is familiar with the expression "Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentes"—Beware of the Greeks when they bring gifts.

So, I feel that the Senator from Arkansas will pardon me if I do not yield to him to give his version of what I have been saying. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, as I was saying when I was interrupted—and I believe that is the way Oliver Wendell Holmes begins The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table—it was not until the Celler bill had passed the House and was before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate that these regulatory agencies discovered an interest in regulating bank mergers.

Then they drafted this bill, and the Senator from Arkansas lent the prestige of his deservedly great name to the bill and it was presented to the Banking and Currency Committee at the same time the Celler bill was in the Judiciary Committee.

The Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency have never evinced any real desire to check bank mergers. Their testimony before House committees and Senate committees has been that they were at best indifferent toward mergers and at times were very favorable to them.

So the only conclusion I can draw is that they wanted a softer bill, a bill which would make mergers easier. That is what this bill does. It is a step forward from the present situation, but it is a comparatively soft bill.

For one thing, it replaces the standard of the Sherman Act, which provides that combinations in restraint of trade which substantially lessen competition shall be illegal, and now provides merely that combinations shall not "unduly" limit competition.

That change of words may seem to be innocent; but the testimony which was given before our committee clearly indicated their belief that there could be a very substantial lessening of competition even though it would not be an undue limitation of competition.

So the standard which the agencies desire is one which gives them great leeway. The agencies want to be made the final arbiters as to whether or not a merger is to take place. I think the confiding of such decisions to these bodies will not provide a great deal of protection for the public.

There is a tendency, as we all know, as practical men, for bodies which supposedly regulate industries to become in effect regulated by those industries and for those who are the ostensible controllers to become the controlled. This can take place without any dishonesty on the part of the regulators. They associate with the persons whom they are regulating. They have business dealings with them. They frequently have social dealings with them. They live in a limited world, and they subconsciously absorb the point of view of those whose activities they are supposedly regulating. This is evidenced by the way these gentlemen have refused to take, in the past, any determined stand against bank mergers.

Moreover, they have a certain occupational bias. They think that financial solidity is the sole and only test. They do not place much importance to the decline of competition.

Therefore, without reflecting on the characters of the men who form the Federal Reserve Board, who man the FDIC, or who run the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, I think there would be soft enforcement of this provision if the Fulbright bill in its present form were passed. That is why the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and I have proposed an amendment, which is, as I have said, on the desks of all Senators, and which is rather simple in nature.

In the first place, we give the ultimate decision as to whether combinations will substantially reduce competition to the Office of the Attorney General, who then has the power in advance of approval. I hold no brief for the Office of the Attorney General; I certainly hold no brief for the present Attorney General. I recognize that in recent years the Office of the Attorney General has been a political office, to which the leading politicians of both parties have been appointed. I know that.

Nevertheless, there is an Antitrust Division in the Office of the Attorney General. The Antitrust Division concentrates its attention upon whether competition is being substantially impaired. On the whole, the record of the Antitrust Division has been a good one.

I should say at this point that I think the Assistant Attorney General who has been in charge of antitrust matters in the present administration, the Honorable Stanley N. Barnes, is a great public servant, an honest man, an able lawyer, one who works in the public interest. Although he is of an opposite political party from mine, I have only words of commendation for what he did. I prophesied to him a year ago that he was such a good Assistant Attorney General that shortly he would be kicked upstairs and appointed to the Federal bench in order to get him out of the way. This has happened. Barnes has now been promoted to the bench. We rejoice in his appointment. I think he will be a good judge.

What kind of administrator his successor will be, I do not know; but I think Judge Barnes had some voice in his selection.

In any event, unsatisfactory as the Office of the Attorney General may be, there is a concentration upon the question of preserving competition and restricting undue combination.

We have made 1 modification—I should, perhaps, say 2 modifications—in the Celler bill in this respect. The Attorney General is to be advised by the agencies which do the examining, which, in the case of the national banks, is the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; in the case of State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Reserve Board; and in the case of State banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. So I think an improvement has been made upon the Celler bill in this respect.

We have also provided that the test of substantially lessening competition can be modified if a merger is necessary to prevent the imminent failure of one of the banks in question. I do not think it was really necessary to include this in the bill, because it is the common law under the International Shoe Co. decision, but it has been made explicit now, so far as the statutes are concerned.

In short, Mr. President, if Senators want a soft bill, they can vote for the present draft. If they want a more vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, so as to maintain this country more effectively as a country of free competition, then I suggest that Senators should vote for the amendments of the Senator from New York and myself.

This is not an unimportant matter; rather, it is a matter of grave concern. Wherever banks have become consolidated, control has been concentrated in a few hands; control over industry has then become concentrated; and the control over banks has helped the concentration of industry.

In England there are now only five great banks. Those great banks work very closely with the cartels and monopolies which have been created. The same thing is true in Germany; it is true also in Canada.

So the more the concentration of credit is facilitated, the greater will be the concentration of industry. This is bad in itself. It leads to a restriction of output. It leads to a concentration of power in economic life, which is bad. It also means that it is very hard to maintain a true political democracy in a country where economic power is concentrated in ever fewer and fewer hands, because, make no mistake about it, if a few control the credit of a country, they will control not only the industry of the country, but also the politics of the country.

So while the move of the Senator from Arkansas is a step forward from what we have, it is not as good a measure as it would be if the amendments of the Senator from New York and myself were put into effect. I hope very much that the amendments may be adopted.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, with the understanding that his remarks will be printed in the RECORD at the end of my speech.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. will the Senator from Illinois permit me to read a 2-minute statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is in a very obliging mood, despite the fact that our friends from the South call foot faults on him at every opportunity.

The Senator from Illinois believes in the admonition contained in the Book of Matthew, to turn the other cheek and to go the second mile. However, it is extraordinary how these demonstrations on the part of the Senator from Illinois and his fellow Senators from the North never seem to awaken reciprocal tendencies on the part of Senators from south of the Mason-Dixon line.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to report to the Senate on the subject of my recent visit to one of our Latin American neighbors. Latin America is a subject which has long occupied my interest since I have always felt that the efforts of our great country should be directed toward assisting and improving conditions in the deserving countries of Latin America.

I have often expressed to the Senate my view that much of the money which we have appropriated for foreign aid in Europe has been wasted and I now express the view that our country could best serve its own requirements by lessening our concentration on aid and assistance to Europe and concentrating more directly on the subject of aid, assistance, and interest in the affairs of some of the countries of Latin America.

We have all witnessed the communistic developments which have taken place in some Latin American countries and have been horror stricken by recent activities in Guatemala, with the ensuing confiscation of American properties in that country. This has been a matter of grave concern to the State Department and the administration as well as to the Congress.

In the last several months particularly I have heard much about the activities of the Government of the Dominican Republic and I deemed it advisable to acquaint myself fully with conditions in that Republic. Accordingly I recently visited that country at my own expense in order to obtain firsthand information. I was amazed by what I saw and heard in that country. Generalissimo Trujillo, in a period of 25 years, has achieved a tremendous success in the improvement of the spiritual and economic well-being of the people of that country. The country has experienced a remarkable development. It has remained free of external debt; has continued to maintain its currency at a par with the United States, with complete freedom of exchange between its pesos and our dollars. This accomplishment alone is remarkable when one realizes that almost every other country in the world has its entire economic system out of balance because of its inability to earn sufficient United States dollars to run its day-to-day affairs.

The Dominican Republic has continued to improve the working and living conditions of its people to a point where it is almost unthinkable that the terror of communism can acquire even the slightest influence.

New and modernly equipped hospitals are available in sufficient number to care for the country's sick; sickness and disease have been substantially reduced within the past 25 years; extreme health measures have been undertaken by the government and the cleanliness which exists throughout the Republic would be an inspiration to most of our American cities.

The increase of electric power has been undertaken with great success and the country is now about to embark on the installation of an atomic-powered reactor for the production of electricity. This step into the future is in keeping with the progressive views of the country and will make the Dominican Republic one of the first nations of the world and perhaps the very first in Latin America to encourage and use the wonders of atomic energy for the production of power and for the betterment of the welfare of its people.

The Government of the Dominican Republic has produced wonderful results in increasing the educational opportunities available to all children of the Republic in place of the education of only the select few which has so long been a problem of many Latin American nations and which has contributed so much to the general low level of the educational accomplishments of these countries.

Although tolerant of all religions the Dominican Republic is predominately a Catholic country and the spiritual well-being and religious activities of the country have won the highest praise of the Catholic Church. Recently during the International Catholic Congress at Ciudad Trujillo, Cardinal Francis J. Spellman best stated the spiritual development of the country when he said:

"The Catholic Church needs freedom to carry out the mission of Christ. Praise God that this freedom exists in the Dominican Republic.

"New and magnificent edifices have risen to stand alongside the ancient Cathedral of Santa Maria La Menor, San Nicolas De Bari, San Miquel and others. The people of the present generation are adding to the richness bequeathed them by their ancestors. The proof is all around us. New hospitals and clinics, new roads, new industries, greatly improved social and sanitation facilities, new housing, new ports, and new public works, a higher standard of living and education. At the same time there are rising in the Republic new churches and new convents and magnificent new schools to educate the future generation of your citizenry. But even more significant than buildings and monuments, highways and ports, the Dominican Republic will be remembered in history for a great act of social justice.

"My friends of the Dominican Republic, you have been among the first in the world to recognize the need for the solidarity of the Americas. You have been among the first to recognize the threat to the Americas of world communism. Perhaps long after your physical achievements have disappeared, you will be remembered for your courage and wisdom in this regard. Only last month I returned from a trip around the world. For the fifth consecutive year I spent Christmas with the American troops in Korea, still devastated by the years of war. With my own eyes I saw once again the results of Comunist aggression. Once again I saw at first hand how communism would enslave the people of the earth.

And above all, I was thankful to Almighty God for the strong Christian tradition of the Americas. That tradition is well symbolized in the strength and faith of the Dominican people as expressed in your magnificent International Fair."

When I speak of this country I speak of one of America's stanchest allies in the field of hemispheric defense and solidarity. At their own expense and in close cooperation with the United States Navy, the Dominicans have maintained

the largest fleet in operation in the Caribbean. They are in process of completing a new and modern shipyard which we anticipate will soon be in full-scale operation on an efficient, economic basis. I look forward to the operation of this great shipyard as an adjunct of the United States Navy for its use in conjunction with the Government of the Dominican Republic for the use of our ships patrolling the waters of the Caribbean.

During my recent visit I was informed by Generalissimo Trujillo and his staff of advisers that the country is now preparing to embark upon the further development of its natural resources by working in conjunction with technicians from American oil companies, in order that this great potential wealth might be further developed for the benefit of its people.

As I viewed the development of this country and became aware that so much of this great accomplishment had taken place within the period of only 25 years, I became shocked to think that the Congress of the United States in the present foreign-aid bill had been so paltry in its treatment of the nations of Latin America, our close friends and allies, while being so extremely generous to the nations of Europe. I could not help but think that out of the $4 billion appropriation for foreign aid this year we granted only $50 million for financial assistance to all of the Latin American countries or one-eightieth of the total aid voted by the Congress.

The conclusion is inescapable. These vast accomplishments which I have only briefly called to your attention, Mr. President, have been done almost without assistance from the United States. The task undertaken so far has been most difficult, as will be the fulfillment of the present programs of this Government. I consider it shocking when I think of how little this great country has done to assist this friend and military ally.

It is bad enough for us to fail to give material assistance to friends and allies, but it is far worse for us to tolerate the working of sinister forces in our own country, communistically inspired, whose known purpose is to injure the Dominican Republic and its people and eventually subject that nation to control by a communistic government. Communist Russia will welcome that day when the United States is confronted with problems in the Dominican Republic such as those which have recently confronted us in Guatemala.

Today I am confident that the same communistic sources, the same people, and the same financial agents who destroyed the Government of Guatemala are actively working in this country for the destruction of the Government of the Dominican Republic.

The Government of this Republic has only recently been subjected to unfair and unfounded attacks. The sinister elements within the United States can not escape responsibility for having participated in these unfounded attacks and thus willfully and knowingly advanced the cause of communism within our own hemisphere to the detriment of our allies and good neighbors.

I am pleased to learn from press reports that even the Republican administration has suddenly realized that the rise of Soviet influence in Latin America is taking place at an alarming rate. Finally it appears from the President's pronouncements at the current Panama Conference that the Republican administration is at last agreeable to meeting this problem head on and taking some steps to correct it. The administration would do well to take action within our own borders designed to prevent insidious communism from using our country as a launching board for such deliberate and unfounded attacks and unfair statements as have recently been directed against the Government of the Dominican Republic.

Whether or not the administration takes the action which fairness and decency demand, it is the duty of this great body to use the vast powers which it possesses to determine and publicly expose the forces which prompted such action within our own country.

I advise you, Mr. President, that as a Member of this body I intend to devote my energies to informing the American people of the true situation with respect to the Dominican Republic precisely as it exists. It is my further intention to conduct such investigations as may be necessary to fully expose these sinister forces within our borders.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1637) to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4096) to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5712) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7992. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 689. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a history of momentous scenes in the Congress since the Revolutionary War.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 7992. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 689. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a history of momentous scenes in the Congress since the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATION OF BANKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3911) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidation of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, while I shall, of course, vote for S. 3911, I sincerely hope that the amendments which have been proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois and myself will be agreed to.

I have the feeling that bank mergers should take place only where a real economic reason can be definitely shown. Certainly, in the past the reasons which had been advanced by many banks as justification for the mergers in which they were proposing to engage were completely inadequate. I have looked with great concern on the evergrowing number of mergers which are taking place in this country, and notably in the State of New York. Since 1950, in 5 years, mergers have occurred involving banks with total resources of $19 billion.

In the State of New York mergers took place as follows: Banks having resources of under $5 million, 44. Banks having resources of over $5 million and under $10 million, 40. Banks having resources of over $10 million and under $25 million, 29. Banks having resources of over $25 million and under $50 million, 11. Banks having resources of over $50 million, 13. And, Mr. President, believe it or not, those 13 banks had total resources of nearly $9 billion.

I can say, Mr. President, from a very long experience in the banking field, that there are today in the State of New York less than half the number of banks there were 20 years ago. They have been absorbed, they have been merged, their assets have been bought, or in other ways, banks have been taken into other banks.

I can see that in certain instances it is an economic advantage and perhaps in the interest of depositors that banks should be sold through mergers. In our amendment we have provided that wherever the Attorney General feels that necessity requires, he should give consent; but, in the main, there is no real advantage——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think there is some confusion. Maybe it is on my part. The Senator said only where there are sound economic reasons should mergers be permitted.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said only where there are sound economic reasons should mergers be permitted.

Mr. LEHMAN. No. I qualified that by saying when there are reasons which demonstrate that mergers are in the public interest, either because of the economic considerations involved or in order to protect the depositors. I know that in many instances there is an advantage in merging, for the protection of the depositors. We found during the days of the depression that many banks had to be merged.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Arkansas knows perfectly well what our amendment provides. It provides that a merger can be permitted when, in the opinion of the Attorney General, it is necessary to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks concerned. The Senator from Arkansas is merely muddying the waters.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thought I had made it very clear to the Senator from Arkansas that that was the case. I mentioned that whenever the Attorney General felt it was in the public interest, or for the protection of depositors or the community, he could give permission. However, what I am talking about is that we know that there have been mergers between the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan in New York, creating the Chase-Manhattan Bank. There has been a merger between the Chemical Bank & Trust Co. and the Corn Exchange Bank, leading to the creation of what is now known as the Chemical-Corn Exchange Bank. There have been mergers of other huge commercial banks. I do not believe there is any need of that. After a bank has reached a certain size, sufficient to care for the community's needs, I do not believe there is any advantage whatsoever to the community in permitting such mergers.

I again wish to repeat that today there are in the city of New York less than half the number of banks there were 20 years ago. The banks that have been taken over, absorbed, and merged were the very banks which gave service to small groups, small merchants, and the small private investor. They have been simply absorbed and merged into great entities having assets of $5 billion, $6 billion, or $7 billion. The size of banks beyond a certain level does not inure to the benefit of the community or the people who live in the community.

So I believe the amendment which the Senator from Illinois and I have offered is definitely in the interest of sound banking, and particularly in the interest of communities served by banks. This is true particularly when we realize that in one State alone, within a period of 5 years, banks having resources of about $10 billion have merged and throughout the country there were mergers of banks which had total resources of nearly $19 billion. When we realize that in very few cases was there any need of or necessity for or any advantage to the community in the mergers, I think we should take every possible step to insure that mergers will have to be proved to be in the interest of the community and on a basis that is sound and safe for the depositors.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think there is some real confusion about the significance—the meaning, if you like—of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New York. If I understand what the Senator from New York has said, there are circumstances which he thinks should be considered in cases of mergers, such as that the mergers should be to the benefit of the community, perhaps result in a saving to stockholders, and so on. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the language of the amendment which appears on page 2:

> That the effect of the proposed transaction may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly—

That is very specific—

> consent shall not be given under this subsection unless the Attorney General finds further that such a transaction is necessary to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks concerned.

In other words, the only exception is failure of a bank. The amendment states nothing about benefit to the community or other reasons. The very point of the bill of the committee is to permit consideration of other elements than lessening of competition. There are six broad categories under section 6, which were referred to and mentioned specifically in my initial statement. In other words, the amendment encompasses the very narrow conception of lessening of competition. What we are trying to do is to permit broader consideration of all the factors involved before the merger is prohibited. The pending amendment provides that if the effect of the proposed transaction may be substantially to lessen competition, the Attorney General shall oppose it, unless he finds the transaction necessary to prevent the failure of the bank.

If I correctly understood the Senator from New York, he was saying that he, himself, had a broader concept of what would be to the welfare and benefit of the community. But what does he mean by such language? That language is not in his own amendment. That language is involved in the concept of the law we are proposing to create, a concept not now in the law. We wanted the bill to be so flexible that the benefits to the community can be considered. I understand that is the sort of language the Senator from New York wishes to use. I do not think there is any difference between the objective of the amendment of the Senator from New York and the objective of the bill I introduced.

It is true that in his own State, some large mergers have occurred. For example, nothing could be done about the merger between the Chase National Bank and the Manhattan National Bank, because no existing law could have prevented it. But if this bill had been enacted and in effect, I hope it could have and would have prevented such a merger.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have already told the Senator from Arkansas that I would support his bill. I am a member of the committee which reported the bill. But my thesis is that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself would greatly strengthen the bill.

I realize perfectly well that all that the bill does, as a matter of fact, is to call the Attorney General into the picture and require that when he sees a transaction which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, he shall take action. Of course, we assume that in such an event he would not give his consent. But he would be allowed to give his consent in cases where, even though the mergers might lessen competition or might tend to create a monopoly, the failure to carry out the transaction or merger would lead to probable failure by one of the banks concerned, and thus to cause loss to the depositors in the bank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, apparently the Senator from New York himself recognizes that the standard of substantially lessening competition was too narrow. So he has provided for one additional exception, namely, unless the Attorney General finds it will result in the probable failure of one of the banks.

All that the bill seeks to do by its adoption of the word "unduly" is to give the regulatory bodies authority to consider these five different elements, in making their decision—for example, where the acquired bank has inadequate capital or unsound assets. That is similar to the exception favored by the Senator from New York, namely, with respect to probable failure of one of the banks; but it is not quite similar. It is a little different; the Attorney General would not have to wait until the bank was about to fail.

Second, where the acquired bank is an uneconomic unit and is too small to meet the needs of the community by being of sufficient size to provide the necessary banking facilities—and so on. I shall not read the remainder.

The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New York seek to provide the power to consider additional factors, besides that of competition—which is what I would interpret the Senator meant when he said "consider the public welfare in the community."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Arkansas interpret the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to mean that the Attorney General must, of necessity, find that the transaction is necessary in order to prevent a probable failure, before he could permit a merger to occur?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Provided that he must find also that it does not substantially lessen competition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would say that practically every merger would lessen competition.

Mr. PASTORE. I invite the attention of the two Senators—the Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois—to their amendment. If they mean something other than what is stated in the amendment, I think they should modify the amendment accordingly.

After setting forth the things to be considered by the Attorney General, then on page 2, in line 3 of the amendment, there is the statement:

> Unless the Attorney General finds further——

In other words, he must, of necessity, find it further, as a further fact, in addition to all the other things—

> that such a transaction is necessary to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks concerned.

That is a further finding that he must make in any event, regardless of all else.

If the sponsors of the amendment do not mean that, I think they should correct or modify the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have a ruling as to who has the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, do I not have the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe that I yielded to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas was recognized, and has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct, Mr. President.

I may say that the Senator is quite correct, because the merger of banks in an existing community is bound to lessen competition. The point is not whether the merger will lessen competition; the point is whether the effect of the merger will be beneficial or not beneficial.

The Senator is quite correct in saying that the only consideration under this bill, the only thing the Attorney General can consider, is whether the merger is likely to result in the failure of one of the banks. That criterion is much too narrow. So I think the Senator is entirely correct.

The Senator from Illinois said this is a soft bill. Mr. President, it is not soft at all, in any respect, other than when it permits and directs the authorities to consider elements other than that of the substantial lessening of competition.

I would say that a mandatory requirement that the Attorney General must object to a proposed merger if there would be a substantial lessening of competition, is much too narrow, and would not work; and when it is so unrealistic and unacceptable, I believe it probably would result in evasion of the law. So I do not believe that in the long run it would be nearly so effective for all purposes as the standards set forth in the bill itself—beginning with that of unduly restricting competition, in which case the authorities are authorized and directed to consider additional elements which would exist in the community.

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] would destroy the fundamental nature of Senate bill 3911, by attempting to transplant portions of the Clayton Act into the banking statutes.

The amendment proposes two drastic changes: First, the Clayton Act test of substantially lessening competition would be imposed on all mergers by insured banks; and, second, the Attorney General would be given a veto power over all insured bank mergers.

The bill presently provides that no merger may lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly. The Douglas amendment would substitute for this test the criteria of substantially lessening competition as used in the Clayton Act. The Clayton Act test, as interpreted by the courts, is not broad enough to permit bank mergers which would be in the public interest. Earlier today I mentioned a number of situations where, although there might be a substantial lessening of competition, a merger might properly be permitted.

The Senator from Illinois, by modifying his amendment, has recognized the fact that there are cases where a bank merger should be permitted, although there is a substantial lessening of competition. However, the Douglas amendment permits such a merger only where it is necessary to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks concerned. The difficulty with this approach is that it recognizes only one of the many factors which should be considered in a bank merger. The Douglas amendment does not cover situations such as where the acquired bank's future prospects are unfavorable because of inadequate management or inadequate capital or unsound assets or because it is too small to meet the needs of the community. It is impossible to list all the situations which may arise where a bank merger could be permitted, although there is a substantial lessening of competition.

The unduly lessening of competition test is used in the bill, instead of the Clayton Act test, in order to permit the Federal banking agencies to deal with these situations peculiar to banks.

The competitive test in Senate bill 3911 is broad enough to meet these situations and yet will provide ample safeguards to insure competition in the banking field.

The other change proposed by the Douglas amendment is to give the Attorney General a veto power over all bank mergers covered by the bill. Even though the banking agencies after considering all the relevant factors consent to the merger, under the proposed amendment, the Attorney General could step in and override the findings of the banking agencies. The banking agencies are fully competent to pass on the merits of these transactions, and there is no need to superimpose another level of administrative authority. It is well known by every Member of this body that the Attorney General's Office is often used for political purposes. There is certainly no need to inject political considerations into the bank-merger question. Nothing could be more disastrous to the reputation of a bank and to the depositor's confidence in a bank than to have scare headlines relating to the Attorney General's rejection of a bank-merger proposal.

The Attorney General's legitimate interests are fully protected by the present provisions of the bill. If the banking agencies have a difficult merger question to consider, they are free to obtain the opinion of the Attorney General. I am sure that if the banking agencies are faced with a merger of the magnitude of the Chase-Manhattan situation, they will not hesitate to obtain the Attorney General's views. In addition, the Attorney General would retain his authority to proceed against any bank merger under the provisions of the Sherman Act.

I do not think it is logical to attempt to place provisions of the Clayton Act in the banking statutes. I am sure it is clear that the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the American Bankers Association strenuously oppose the Douglas amendment. The Douglas amendment would destroy the fundamental principles of this legislation, and I urge the Members of the Senate to vote against it.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made reference to the fact that there had been no great interest in bank mergers by these authorities. Nearly a year ago the Banking and Currency Committee requested the agencies to make suggestions covering this subject, and they were slow in doing so. However, it is very natural that no agency or industry goes out of its way to seek additional regulation, however meritorious it may be. I cannot see any particular reason why the bill should be

objected to because there was not prompted action on the part of the agencies in suggesting regulations.

In connection with the last point I should like to make, I invite the attention of Senators to a paragraph on page 17 of the hearings on Senate bill 3911, from the statement of L. A. Jennings, first Deputy Comptroller of the Currency. I ask unanimous consent that that paragraph be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, in order to make the point I wish to make. It is the next to the last paragraph at the bottom of the page. I think it would make the RECORD much clearer.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Banking is a supervised and regulated industry, and our dual banking system is one composed of well designed checks and balances that have been the outgrowth of long experience. It assures an aggressive and progressive climate for banking which redounds to the benefit of the public. The Congress has long recognized the regulated and supervised nature of banking, as it has in other regulated industries, and we are aware of no justifiable reason for placing asset acquisitions by banks in the form of consolidations, mergers, and purchases within the scope of section 7 of the Clayton Act and within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. Section 7 of the Clayton Act prohibits corporate mergers where there may be a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create a monopoly. That section and other sections of the Clayton Act are administered by certain named boards and commissions with concurrent enforcement authority in the Department of Justice; but the last paragraph of section 7 of the Clayton Act expressly provides that that section shall not apply to transactions in certain regulated industries which are duly consummated pursuant to authority given by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, United States Maritime Commission, and the Secretary of Agriculture. We see nothing in the bank supervisory field or in the field of banking that should require the Congress to treat the regulated banking industry and its duly constituted supervisors in a very special and less favorable way than is the case in the regulated industries, commissions, and boards just named.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This paragraph points out that in all other cases in which the Government supervises an activity of a quasi-monopolistic nature, such as a railroad, a communications utility, or a power company, the agency which has supervision over it is authorized to approve mergers within its jurisdiction. Such mergers are exempt from the Clayton Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to strike out the words "to lessen competition substantially or to tend unduly" and insert in lieu thereof "substantially to lessen competition or to tend."

On page 8, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall."

On page 2, line 21, it is proposed to add the following sentence after the period at the end thereof:

If the Attorney General finds that the effect of the proposed transaction may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly, consent shall not be given under this subsection unless the Attorney General finds further that such a transaction is necessary to prevent the probable failure of one of the banks concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that during the past 48 hours every Member of the Senate has had a complete education in parliamentary law. We have seen problem after problem presented, within and without the rules of the Senate. We know how important it is, if any constructive legislation is to be enacted, that it have the support of the departments involved, as well as the support of the two Houses of Congress. Therefore, in seeking to obtain any legislation it is incumbent upon those who desire to get constructive results to keep their eyes upon what each House is doing with respect to the legislation, and to keep their eyes upon what the Executive attitude toward a particular measure may be.

I am speaking directly, now, to my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. I should like to have the RECORD show that the bill which he has brought before the Senate today is a Senate bill. This is Wednesday. By the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act the Congress is under obligation to bring its session to a close by the 31st of July. We must bring it to a close unless a resolution can be passed through both Houses extending the session. So when we seek legislation to place upon the statute books, we must think of the executive power as well as the legislative power.

Before us is a bill which was introduced in the Senate, not in the House. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and at the very moment when it was introduced and sent to the Banking and Currency Committee, there had passed a House bill designed to stop mergers—mergers which are eating up the substance of the free-enterprise system in America. We find them in connection with the food industry. We find them in every branch of agriculture. We find them in the automobile industry, and we find them in almost every line to which we turn our attention. Monopoly through merger is closing the door of opportunity to the plain people of America. Is it not important to bear that in mind?

The House bill contained provisions for prenotification to the Department of Justice and to the Federal Trade Commission by corporations which were seeking to merge, not only in the industrial field, but in the banking field. The bill which passed the House was before the Judiciary Committee. Therefore, in the Judiciary Committee we have a bill dealing with bank mergers which would require notification to the Attorney General.

In that way the Attorney General would know in advance whether or not the mergers of banks, as well as mergers in other industries, would have an adverse effect upon free opportunity and free enterprise. Not until that bill had passed the House did the financial agencies of the Government—the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Comptroller of the Currency—make any move with respect to mergers. They did not want the Department of Justice to have its hand in bank mergers.

If a monopoly is brought about by a bank, it is just as much a monopoly as if it had been consummated by some great national corporation engaged in some other branch of industry. We know that with so many mergers taking place the position of small business is constantly becoming worse and worse and worse, because we fail to deal with fundamentals.

I remember very well when the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed—it was designed to make Congress a more efficient legislative unit by reducing the number of committees—so that Members would not have to serve on so many committees, thus would know more of the business that was going on.

Legislative reorganization was based upon the theory that the respective activities of the Government should be under the supervision of committees which were in close touch with the various governing agencies. The antitrust law, passed for the protection of small business, has been on the statute books since 1890, and everyone has been paying mere lip service to it. Combinations in restraint of trade have been universally denounced, even by the leaders of monopolistic combinations.

What is the situation with respect to the banks at the present moment? I have talked with Members of the Senate, who will tell anyone, I am sure, of the inability of a small-business man to secure credit in his own community.

Last Sunday afternoon, I was riding from Boston to Washington in an airplane. By chance I sat with a gentleman who is the head of a large corporation. His headquarters are in Detroit. It is a large corporation by the standards of small business, but a small business by the standards of big business. In the course of our conversation, he told me that in the city of Detroit there are only 2 big banks, because those 2 big banks have absorbed the other banks. He said it has come to the point where it is getting more and more difficult all the time for the little fellow to get credit which will keep him in business.

In the city of Boston, while I was there, only for a few hours, I talked with another man, who had obtained a loan from the Small Business Administration, which was established by Congress. It was a loan to permit him to continue in business. It was for only $35,000. In the 6 months since that loan was extended, he had made a profit of about $12,000. The loan by the SBA was based upon the condition that a local bank

should participate in the loan to the extent of 10 percent. The bank did that. However, only the other day the bank, which is a small branch of a big bank that operates throughout the State of Massachusetts, told the borrower that even though he had paid every single obligation up to date, the bank did not want to go along with him any longer. The manager of the small branch of the big bank was perfectly within his right in telling him that. However, the sad thing is that when that bank suspends operations with that small-business man, he goes out of business, because the SBA will have to liquidate the loan. That will happen because of the concentration of bank mergers.

So much for the merits. That situation is found in every State, and in every large city.

There is now pending in the Committee on the Judiciary a bill, to be considered by the committee tomorrow morning, which contains a provision with respect to banks. It came to us from the House, and that bill, with its bank provision—we did not put the provision in the bill—preserves the right of the Department of Justice to enforce antitrust laws against bank mergers when the occasion arises. What is wrong about that? The Department of Justice testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the former head of the Antitrust Division, Judge Barnes, whose nomination by the President to be a circuit judge in California was recently confirmed by the Senate, told the committee what he thought of the bill. He said:

> All told, then, that proposal does little, if anything, to insure competitive enterprise in banking. Any pretense that it does seems to me unrealistic and largely a sham.

When the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has that to say about a bill sponsored by the financial agencies which never were at all in favor of control of bank mergers until after the House had acted and the Department of Justice had recommended it, what is the result?

We have before us a Senate bill. We have only Thursday, Friday, and Saturday remaining of this session. There is no possibility of the bill being enacted in the House against the recommendation of the former head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The Senate in passing the bill is merely taking action in futility. The Senate is asked to pass a bill which the House cannot consider because of the lack of time, and against which the Department of Justice has already testified, saying that the proposed legislation is largely a sham.

How are we going to have constructive legislation enacted by that method? How will we get the Executive's signature to the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that if the amendment under consideration were adopted the bill would not be a sham? It may be that, because of the shortness of the time of the session, no legislation can be passed, but I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming, if he supported the amendment, could not be satisfied with the whole bill itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the amendment is an improvement, of course, because it is an attempt to correct the situation which now exists. But what I am asking the Senator from Arkansas, and I do so in the utmost sincerity, is why would it not be better, if constructive legislation is desired, to postpone further consideration of this bill until the Judiciary Committee tomorrow has an opportunity to work out an amendment to the House bill, which might bring about some results? I realize, from long experience, that all legislation comes as a result of compromise. I know perfectly well that no legislation will come out of this procedure, because the bill from the Banking and Currency Committee does not have a Chinaman's chance to pass the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At least, it is on the floor of the Senate, and the Senator's bill is not on the floor. I do not know that it will ever get there.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Neither do I; but all I am asking is that the Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee wait until the Judiciary Committee acts tomorrow. If it does not act, my mouth is shut.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As long ago as February or March I wrote to the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee calling attention to the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee over this matter. That committee clearly does have jurisdiction over banking legislation. I cannot understand the Senator's enthusiasm for putting bank mergers under the regulatory authority of the Department of Justice when he himself has, better than anyone else in this country, convinced us that that Department has been ineffective in enforcing antimonopoly legislation already on the books. There is a complete inconsistency out of his own mouth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator exaggerates his compliment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Wyoming is trying to give to the Department of Justice power to restrict bank mergers. I am informed by excellent authority that if we had had on the books legislation such as that to which the Senator refers it would have prevented certain mergers. I do not say this is a perfect bill, but it is consistent with the previous actions of the Government in other fields. The Clayton Act exempts mergers approved by the CAB, by the Department of Agriculture, and by the Maritime Commission——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the Senator asks me 10 questions, let me answer the 3 which he has propounded. In the first place, I am not trying to take any authority away from fiscal agencies. I have good words for them.

In the second place, I never said that the Department of Justice for 50 years was not enforcing the antitrust laws. What I have said is that for 50 years the Congress of the United States has not amended the antitrust laws so as to make them effective. That is what I am trying to do now, to ask the cooperation of the Committee on Banking and Currency for 24 hours with the Committee on the Judiciary in the hope that tomorrow morning we may be able to report a bill dealing with bank mergers, as well as with other mergers, a bill which will be satisfactory to the Senator from Arkansas and the members of his committee and which will have a chance of being signed. The measure the Senator proposes, if it shall pass, when it goes out of this door, will go right down the road to oblivion.

If the Senator will cooperate with me and with the members of the Judiciary Committee to see if we cannot agree upon a bank amendment which will be satisfactory to the three Government agencies for whom the Senator speaks, and the Department of Justice for which I am now speaking, then we may have a law upon the statute books which will prevent these mergers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has not persuaded me that he knows the House will agree to such a provision as he suggests. He knows that, so far as the executive branch being in favor of it, there is no question that they prefer this Senate bill. There is no question that the President will sign the Senate bill if it is passed. The House has had a housing bill before it for a long time, which was passed by the Senate by an overwhelming majority, and the House has refused to do anything with it. On the other hand, if they could get a rule, they could pass it tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If they could get a rule. The Senator from Arkansas himself was once a very amiable and very able Member of the House. He knows all about the Rules Committee. He knows how bills can be bottled up in the Rules Committee, and he knows that debate can be limited in the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And that a bill can be passed in a minute if the House wants to pass it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, on the other hand, with time pressing as it is now, and with every Member of Congress, whether in the Senate or in the House, buttonholing every other Member of Congress in order to get through bills which they regard as very important, the result is that important proposed legislation does.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why does the Senator think the House will pass the bill to which he refers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It has already passed the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it has not passed the Senate. I told the Senator long ago that I would object to the jurisdiction of his committee, the Committee on the Judiciary, in this field.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator introduce a bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I introduced this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not until after the House had passed its bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had given notice in February that we were developing a bill [illegible] set forth in a letter many of the features of the bill. The coincidence of

the timing is not particularly significant. Even the sponsors of this amendment admit that the bill is a step forward.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is only a gesture, a futility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Illinois simply wish to adopt the standard of the Clayton Act. I cannot see why the Senator from Wyoming is so enthusiastic about putting further power in the hands of an agency which has been so unsuccessful in preventing monopolies in the past. Why not give us a chance with a new agency?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Congress has been endeavoring by means of the bill which is before the Judiciary Committee to increase the efficiency of the Department of Justice. But when we transfer the jurisdiction over bank mergers to the financial agencies they will have to hire a new bunch of lawyers if they undertake to enforce it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Banking is a regulated business. It is not comparable to the automobile business or to the food industry. It is comparable to the communications business, which is regulated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rose not to hold the floor and prevent disposition of the bill. I rose to point out to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee the realistic facts of legislative life, including the fact that there are only a few days left of the session. The Senator stands for a bill which has not yet passed the Senate or the House. I favor the bill which has already passed the House. I am saying to the Senator that in the session of the committee tomorrow it is quite possible we may be able to work out an amendment which will be satisfactory to the Senator. Therefore, I am only requesting that he let the matter go over for a day or so—until tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has asked something which it is very difficult to agree to, for the same reason he has mentioned, namely, that we are nearing the end of the session. If we are to get action on the bill at all, it will have to be done in the proper order. There are many conference reports which are pressing upon the Senate. I do not know what will happen.

I do not think it is a legitimate request that action on the bill be postponed based on what the House may or may not do. This is a good bill. It should be considered on its merits. Whatever the House may do is its responsibility, not ours. If the House acts arbitrarily or unwisely, that is the responsibility of the House. But the Senate should not consider the bill with that in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. What does the Senator have to say on the question of jurisdiction? I am very much interested in what the Senator from Arkansas said about that, because many of us know that occasionally the question of jurisdiction crops up. Should not a bank matter stay in the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Should not an antitrust matter stay in the Department of Justice?

Mr. ANDERSON. Is this primarily an antitrust matter?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It deals primarily with the merger of banks. It relates to monopolistic mergers. If there are no monopolistic mergers, then the Department of Justice will have nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a very important question. I pointed out that in other fields where the Government is given regulatory powers, these very questions of mergers are specifically exempted from the operation of the Clayton Act, indicating that for years we have recognized that there are regulated industries, and that, therefore, they are exempt from the ordinary jurisdiction with regard to mergers. That is true. I think that point is very well taken.

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as I am concerned, if a bill is a good bill and there is still a chance of having it acted on by the House, I do not care whether the House can take action on it or not.

A couple of years ago some Senators were trying to get action on the upper Colorado bill in almost the last days of the session. We knew it was a futile attempt, but we thought we might express the action of one House on the subject.

I am somewhat interested in the question of bank mergers. In the neighboring State of Arizona, the banking situation is such that about two banks control all the banking in the State. If a person cannot get money in one place, he cannot get it anywhere else.

Now one of those chains has come into my home State of New Mexico and has established a great many banks. I am concerned to know what is going to follow that. That is why I am curious about the queston of jurisdiction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason why the merger provision is before the Committee on the Judiciary now is that it is a part of a House-passed bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that; it is the Celler bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Celler bill. If we desire to procure legislation which will be effective to prevent monopolistic banking, such as the Senator from New Mexico is worried about, then I say the Senate should agree to my simple request of the Senator from Arkansas to withhold further action upon the pending bill until we have had a chance, in the bill already passed by the House, to see if we cannot write an amendment which will be satisfactory both to the Senate and to the House.

In other words, I am saying that, if we delay action for 24 hours, we may have a chance to secure legislation. If we do not, then perhaps we will have killed the chance to have legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator indicate how long the House bill has been before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have forgotten. We held our hearings very quickly. The hearings were held not less than 2 months ago.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate the bills which have been reported to the Senate today and which I hope will be ready for consideration by the Senate tomorrow, or as soon as possible thereafter. I shall announce all the bills in the hope that some or all of them can be favorably acted upon by the Senate at the earliest possible time.

H. R. 11270, the military construction bill;

H. R. 7728, to ratify the transfer of property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Navy;

H. R. 9631, to confirm a 1947 sale of surplus land;

H. R. 10383, for the conveyance of land to Vero Beach, Fla.;

S. 3021, relating to the black market in child adoption in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill;

Senate Resolution 314, to investigate the importation of distilled spirits;

H. R. 10624, relating to the Manila Electric Co., in the Philippines;

H. R. 2845, relating to a statutory award for certain injuries to military personnel;

H. R. 7634, providing an increased tax exemption on transportation charges;

H. R. 9396, relating to the transfer of guar seed to the free list;

H. R. 9875, providing an increased exemption on theater tickets;

H. R. 12254, relating to the extension of the Tariff Commission report filing date;

H. R. 10177, to provide a 2-year free entry of certain shoe lathes;

S. 4164, providing for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 11833, relating to the Great Plains Conservation program; and

S. 3517, to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government.

I do not know that any or all of these bills willl be called up; but when the reports are available, and when I have cleared the bills with the respective policy groups on both sides, and after I have given notice, and Senators have had a chance to register their views with me, the bills may be taken up.

I shall attempt to give as much advanced notice as possible of the calling up of bills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire if it is the intention of the leadership to schedule Calendar No. 2618, H. R. 3210, a bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway, and for other purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That bill has not been cleared, although I have not made any special effort to clear it. I shall be glad to do so this afternoon.

I shall inform the Senator from Illinois before we conclude our session today of the results of my efforts, and perhaps ask his cooperation.

So far as I am concerned, I shall be very happy to schedule the bill and to see that the Senate acts on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the assurance of the Senator from Texas. This is a very important measure. It was passed by the House last year by a very large vote. It is vitally connected with the sanitation problem in the city of Chicago. It will not effect any real hardship on any other locality.

The bill has been opposed by the administration in the past on the ground that Canada did not like it. But I think the Canadian objections have been pretty well refuted in the hearings before the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall discuss the bill with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]; with the distinguished minority leader; with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ], and with the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], to see if I can make any progress, and I will keep the Senator from Illinois fully informed.

If I am unable to have the bill cleared, I will tell the Senator the reasons, and perhaps he can help me to do something about it.

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS' DAY IN COURT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, I have just consulted the Senator from California, and it is agreeable to him that I may bring before the Senate the House-passed dealers-day-in-court bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the Senator, so far as the subject which he is discussing and on which he has done so much work is concerned, whenever the Senator from Wyoming says he wants to move to concur in the House amendments, the Senator from Texas will be standing by his side, as he has during the long, tortuous road the Senator from Wyoming has traveled.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the House to Senate bill 3879 be considered, after the bill from the Banking and Currency Committee shall have been disposed of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not want to object to the request of my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, but we have a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from Wyoming agree to a time limitation of 10 minutes to each side?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not in a position to agree, because there are several Members on this side of the aisle who want to be notified and to have a chance to present their views. I think there is some opposition to the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from Wyoming be agreeable, when we take up the supplemental appropriation bill, to laying it aside and taking up the House amendments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator made his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Wyoming asked unanimous consent that the amendments of the House to the dealers-day-in-court bill be laid before the Senate immediately following action on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MILLIKIN, OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? The Senator from Colorado has an important announcement to make, and I should like to have complete order in the Chamber.

Mr. ALLOTT. This morning my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, announced at a press conference that he would retire from the United States Senate at the conclusion of this term. This is an announcement which causes a great deal of grief to many of us who have known him for these many years. He is one of Colorado's greatest citizens, if not indeed its greatest citizen. He was graduated from the University of Colorado law school in 1913, and thereafter entered the Army as a private, and came out as a lieutenant colonel in the First World War.

He then began the practice of law in Denver, and participated very actively in the Republican Party and in politics in the State of Colorado, and did so for many years. He later formed a partnership with the late United States Senator Karl C. Schuyler, who died in 1933.

In 1941, GENE MILLIKIN was appointed to the United States Senate by our mutual, and great friend, Ralph Carr, then the Governor of Colorado, and he has served in the Senate since that time.

Mr. President, no words can do adequate justice to this occasion. Senator MILLIKIN has been, I believe, one of the great leaders and one of the great minds of the Senate. He has been a United States Senator in every sense of the term, and his mind has helped formulate and solve some of the most difficult problems which have faced this body and the Nation during the past 15 years. He has been our Senator from Colorado, but, more than that, he has been the representative of every man, woman, and child in this country. His mind—his brain—has always had the forward look, and he has at the same time been the conservator as well as the planner for the future.

One distinguished journalist, writing in one of our periodicals, described him as "a man of inner gaiety and lively humor which not even taxes and tariffs can blunt. He is a heavy-duty Senator with the light touch."

I say, as I am sure many of my colleagues will say, that he has been a great harmonizer in the Senate, and many difficult situations have been passed over lightly and without hard feelings because of his ability to pull from the recesses of his mind some light shaft of wit which lessened the flush of victory or the pain of defeat, as the case may be, on either side.

He has had the ability, and he has now, of keeping the respect of his friends. As the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as I recently stated on this floor, no small amount of the credit should go to him for the passage of the upper Colorado River bill, for the passage of the Fryingpan-Arkansas bill, and for many other measures of a similar kind, and, as former chairman and now ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, he deserves great praise for the rewriting of the finance provisions of the Federal statutes in 1954, and for the enactment of an almost endless list of laws. In his legislative efforts he has been devoted and tireless.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to GENE MILLIKIN. I call him Gene because that is what I have called him all my life. We in Colorado, and I am sure all the people of the Nation, will miss his services in the Senate, his guidance, his commonsense, and, of course, always his wit. My wife and I are both greatly indebted to him and his wonderful wife for their friendship and counsel.

I do not suppose that any of us can realize the courage it has required for him to be in daily attendance in the Senate and in committee meetings during the past few months; but I may say it is only the courage which he has shown in every single act of his life in his long period of public service. And so I think the tribute written by Beverly Smith in an article some 2 years ago would be proper to repeat at this time:

> He was the ponderous, witty, modest, brainy EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado, a man not afraid to burn the lonely midnight oil, an erudite fellow, but possessing the wit to bring the subject down to earth with a jolt.

That is EUGENE MILLIKIN, and we are proud to pay our respects to him today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know of any Member of the Senate who is going to be more greatly missed than the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. He is one of the great stabilizing influences in this body.

I have a very deep affection for EUGENE MILLIKIN. The fact that we sit on opposite sides of the aisle does not affect my regard for him in any manner whatsoever.

In a very real sense he is a statesman—a man who never talks too much and never thinks too little. He is a man of massive intellect, of deep conviction, of prudence, and of great wisdom.

I have always found EUGENE MILLIKIN to tower above the petty conflicts of partisanship and personality. He has always been able to go to the heart of a

question and to put the Nation's good ahead of any personal consideration.

Mr. President, this announcement means to me that the Senate is losing two of its great men at the close of this, the 84th, Congress. In my own mind, I like to link the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], both of whom are retiring. They are leaving this Chamber when final adjournment comes, but both of them are going to remain with all of us forever. They are the kind of men who work for permanent and constructive achievements, and those achievements will always be with us.

I want the Senator from Colorado to know that my respect and my regard and my affection for him are deep and abiding.

Mr. President, GENE MILLIKIN is one of the greatest Americans I have ever known, and he has devoted his life to his country. I feel positive that every Member of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, will echo that sentiment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to pay my tribute to a great Senator of the United States. GENE MILLIKIN'S imprint on legislation of vast importance to the country is very clear. Perhaps no person who has served in the Senate of the United States has had a finer grasp of the great subject of reclamation in the West than has the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

He serves now on the important Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is also the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, and was formerly its chairman. He has left his imprint on much legislation of tremendous value to the people of the United States and to the solvency of the Federal Government. He has served since its inception on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and prior to that time he served on the then special committee dealing with that subject, which played so important a part in the formulation and passage of the original Atomic Energy Act.

He has been active in the affairs of his party. He serves as chairman of the Republican conference.

In dealing with the complex problems of our country, not only has he been a great Senator of his beloved State of Colorado but he has also been, in the full sense of the word, a Senator of the United States.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned a personal observation, let me say that when I first came here as a new Senator—as all of us have done at one time or another—new to the rules of the Senate and its procedures, I found in GENE MILLIKIN a friend who treated me as an elder brother would have done, in helping me to learn the ropes of the Senate of the United States. On numerous occasions he has been his considerate, thoughtful self in helping to work out problems with which I, as a new Senator, have been confronted from time to time. We shall miss him in the Senate. To me this body will never be the same without GENE MILLIKIN in the Chamber participating, as he has so actively, in the great debates of the Senate.

He has been loyal to the Senate and to his country. He has been here day after day, attending the meetings of this body, attending the meetings of his committees, and returning, if necessary, for yea-and-nay votes late at night, in order that he might cast his vote as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. President, we shall miss him greatly. We hope that from time to time he will have opportunity to visit again with us. I believe that all the other Members of this body—all 95—hope that we shall have an opportunity from time to time to see GENE MILLIKIN and to wish him every happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have just learned of the announcement of the decision of one of America's great Senators to retire at the end of this session.

It is with a deep sense of regret that I and others have learned that Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, who has served the Nation and the State of Colorado for the past 15 years in the Senate, has decided to leave us.

Mr. President, Senator MILLIKIN is one of the truly great legislators.

Because I am 1 of the 3 Republican Senators who currently sit in the Senate, and who also were here when GENE MILLIKIN took his seat December 20, 1941, it becomes my privilege—one of the very great privileges in all my 20 years in the Senate—to speak of this man of outstanding intellect, good will, and deeds, who gave a helping hand to all who needed it.

Mr. President, this is a day of regret, to be sure, because GENE MILLIKIN has announced he will leave us as a Senator. But, Mr. President, his counsel forever will be sought by Senators on both sides of the aisle. Mr. President, how his gracious wife, his associates, and his frends must be proud of this man and the record he has made.

Only a few days ago, the Senate demonstrated its respect for and faith in GENE MILLIKIN when one of his favorite pieces of proposed legislation—the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project—was passed by the Senate. As the United Press reported in its news story at the time, debate on that important measure consisted of one tribute after another to the senior Senator from Colorado.

Only a short time before in the Senate, it was GENE MILLIKIN who helped place on the Nation's law books the measure authorizing one of the West's biggest multiple-purpose projects affecting five States. This was the upper Colorado River water-storage project.

But GENE MILLIKIN'S name is not alone associated with these laws.

Throughout his years in the Senate, Senator MILLIKIN has been a statesman in the finest sense of that term. He has had a brilliant record of accomplishment in many fields—notably, in taxation and in resource development. For the last 10 years he has served as chairman of the Republican Conference of the Senate—the leader of the organization of all Republican Senators. Since he was first elected to this post, there never has been any question about his continuing to occupy it for as long as he was willing to do so. His reelection as conference chairman has been unanimous at the start of every new Congress.

Mr. President, Senator MILLIKIN was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee in the 80th and 83d Congresses. In each of these Congresses there was a tax reduction, and the legislation had the benefit of the guiding hand of GENE MILLIKIN.

The citizens of this Nation should never forget that it was Senator MILLIKIN who, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee in 1954, was one of the few persons responsible for the change and codification of the tax laws, which resulted in the biggest tax reduction in a single Congress in our history.

Oh, Mr. President, we could cite instance after instance of this man's legislative genius, his humor, his guiding hand in the Republican Party, his ability to bring those of opposing views to a settlement.

Year after year, important legislation was guided through the Senate by GENE MILLIKIN. Just in the last few days the new social security bill passed the Senate with the help of his wise counsel.

Some Senators may recall that day in July—July 25, 1945—when the late Senator Vandenberg arose on the Senate floor to comment on Senator MILLIKIN'S work in connection with the hearings on the United Nations Charter. Senator Vandenberg said:

> Mr. President, before the Senator from Colorado takes his seat I desire to make one observation. During the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee he was by far the most presistent and consistent cross-examiner of the witnesses among all Senators, and I simply want to say to him that I think he rendered a very great service by the constant attention he gave to those examinations and the very illuminating information which he produced as the result of his questions. I want to thank him on my own behalf for the service he rendered in that fashion.

Mr. President, that was more than 10 years ago, but today let me add my humble thanks and appreciation for all that Senator MILLIKIN has done for his country, both in the Senate and on the field of battle during World War I, in which he served with great honor, bravery, and distinction.

May I also recall to mind that it was Senator MILLIKIN who handled the important Mexican Water Treaty in the early 1940's—being asked by the then Democratic administration to guide this matter through the Senate.

Senator MILLIKIN represents a type which has lent a peculiar distinction and charm to American history. He is the boy who pulled up stakes and went west. Denver had not ceased to be wild and woolly when GENE MILLIKIN went there. He proved to be an adept in the catch-as-catch-can life of the time when it took an alert and forceful person to survive. To be an intellectual and simultaneously capable of dealing with ordinary human affairs is an unusual accomplishment. The Senator is such a person. His interests are wide and discriminating. His sense of humor is

sharp and instant. He can size up a situation accurately better than most men I know. In politics, an able strategist, he can—like President Martin Van Buren—row toward his objective with muffled oars. He has proved himself to be an opponent to be feared and an ally to be depended on.

There is another thing about him that is more than pleasant to remember. He has known the ups and downs of life. He remembers when a dollar looked like a large sum. I believe that in the days before he studied law he and Gene Fowler worked together on the Denver Post. Something of those days has stuck with him. No man has ever been able to see the hole in the doughnut more quickly than the senior Senator from Colorado, and, at the same time, no one has ever been a softer "touch" for a real hard luck story.

Senator MILLIKIN has a long and distinguished record of public service, beginning with his enlistment as a private in the Colorado National Guard in 1917. He served during World War I in France with the 42d, 6th, and 7th Divisions and the 4th Corps, and later with the Army of Occupation. He was commissioned a captain, then a major of infantry, and finally a lieutenant colonel of engineers. He received the Pershing citation for distinguished and meritorious service.

He was again called on to serve his country when he was appointed United States Senator from Colorado on December 20, 1941, and has served with distinction in this body ever since, having been elected three times by his constituents as their representative here.

I have no doubt that he would have again been called upon by the people of Colorado to continue as senior Senator from that great State had he felt able to stand for renomination.

Mr. President, the Senate will miss the wise counsel and forthright leadership of Senator MILLIKIN. He will be missed in this Chamber, where even during recuperation from his illness he came to lend his strong support to the issues of the day. His keen mind and astuteness will be missed on the committees on which he has been such a powerful influence. He has been a valued member of the Finance and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees and the Joint Committees on Atomic Energy and Internal Revenue Taxation. His Republican colleagues have profited from his leadership as chairman of the minority conference.

I agree with what his distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has said, and what the distinguished majority and minority leaders have said. We shall miss him and his very able associate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is also retiring at the conclusion of this session.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in an effectionate salute and an expression of fond regard for the future to Senator MILLIKIN as he concludes his brilliant career in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I well remember the day when Senator MILLIKIN entered the Senate. I well remember the first days of his service here. From the very first he impressed the Senate as a man of great stability, great wisdom, and great understanding of the problems we have to face here day after day.

He was very early assigned to the Senate Committee on Finance, of which I was a member on the opposite side of the table, so to speak, and had been for some years. From the very beginning Senator MILLIKIN demonstrated his fine capacity as a lawyer who understood the tax problems, but with business judgment also. He understood what lay behind the making of our entire tax structure.

I do not recall that in all our service on the Finance Committee, on any purely tax matter, there was ever any serious disagreement between the views of Senator MILLIKIN and the views of those of us on the other side of the table who were called upon to help write our tax laws. I know that, on the whole, his views and my views were very much the same.

He understood the mining laws of the West. He understood the problems of those who produce our minerals. He had a very clear understanding of the problems which confront American business. From week to week and from year to year I learned not only greatly to admire him, but greatly to depend upon the soundness of his judgment.

When we were dealing with trade matters and treaties which have been entered into, and which have shaped in such large measure our commercial and economic affairs, especially in the foreign trade field, Senator MILLIKIN had the patience which men often denominate and describe as genius, in the careful study of those intricate and sometimes very dull and tiresome problems, which someone in the Senate as well as in the House of Representatives must from time to time carefully study and evaluate, if our affairs are to be kept in balance.

Senator MILLIKIN was closely associated with me as a member of the Senate Finance Committee. During two Congresses he was chairman of that committee, and I was but the ranking minority member. On other occasions I was chairman, and during other Congresses I served as chairman and he as the ranking minority member, or next to the ranking member, until Senator Vandenberg left the Finance Committee.

That is a great committee yet. But at one time, as I recall, when Senator Vandenberg and Senator MILLIKIN and other great men who have served in the Senate were members of that committee, it was a peculiarly and particularly strong committee. I never knew Senator MILLIKIN to advocate any piece of tax legislation which was unsound and which on the whole worked against the economy of his country. He gave his very best thought to the tax problems which came before us and to all the trade and tariff issues which arose. He gave his very close and almost undivided attention to all the important problems which had to be considered by that committee during the time he served on it.

I am quite sure that he is one of the great intellects of the Senate. He has been so recognized from almost the first day he entered the Senate, and very early left his impress and imprint upon the minds and hearts of thoughtful men in this body. I am quite sure that he yet remains one of the great intellects, one of the great men who have served in the Senate.

He is also a man of great heart. He has always loved his State and the Far West. He has kept in mind, and referred repeatedly to the many States in the Far West, enumerating them, that depended upon wise and just legislation in the field of taxation and in the field of tariffs.

Therefore, it is with peculiar sadness that I learn Senator MILLIKIN is retiring, that he is leaving the Senate, the field of his labors for so many years. But certainly there is no stain upon his character. Whatever record leaps to life in future days, there will be nothing to make him ashamed, or his people ashamed.

I hope I may be pardoned for a simple statement, which some of my Democratic friends may not fully appreciate, but which I trust they will. I remember that there was a year in which Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN had what was supposed to be very strong opposition. I think in the same year, or at about that same time, Senator Bob Taft, who also served on the Committee on Finance, and also was a very active and diligent member of the committee, had very stubborn opposition. When the elections were over I, as a Democrat, very well remember telegraphing Bob Taft a congratulatory message, and I also telegraphed EUGENE MILLIKIN. While naturally as a party man I would like to see my party prevail, I recognized the worth of these two men. I recognized the value and the enormous contribution which they had made to the public life of the Nation, a contribution which will last long after our present day and generation.

Therefore I feel in a peculiar sense a personal grief to think that Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN has decided to leave the Senate at the end of his present term.

I could go away with a little higher degree of confidence if he remained, in his accustomed health and strength and vigor of mind and patience of heart, to help enact sound and wholesome legislation for this, our America.

I know that the present chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will sorely miss Senator MILLIKIN, as I missed him when even on occasion he was unable to be present or when for any reason I did not have the advantage and support of his very great ability and his very earnest devotion to public duty and his very constant work upon the tasks before us.

So Senator MILLIKIN leaves this body with the respect, with the confidence, with the affection, and with the love, not only of the men who now serve with him or have served with him, but of the whole American community, who know the value of his service.

After all, the work that men do does live after them; and the things to which men devote themselves to in public life, as well as in private life, live after them.

Senator MILLIKIN, though he goes back to his home, perhaps in Colorado, carries

with him to a high degree, the confidence and the esteem of his fellow citizens.

Many perplexing problems have arisen in our day since the Senator from Colorado became a Member of the Senate, but in nearly all of them he took a position which would be expected of a statesman. He conscientiously followed the course that all men of great conviction, of great sincerity of purpose, and of great devotion to public duty, strive earnestly to follow.

To Senator MILLIKIN and to his charming wife, I am pleased to speak these words, and I am pleased to say to him in his presence that for no man with whom I have served have I ever had a more profound and sincere feeling of friendship, affection, admiration, and appreciation as a great public servant.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we have listened to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of our policy committee, tell us of the record of Senator MILLIKIN as a Member of this great deliberative body. I should like to speak for a moment regarding my personal friendship with him.

Friendships come slower as we grow older, but they also become much warmer.

When I came to this body 12 years ago Senator MILLIKIN was a Member of it, and we shortly became friends. Our families exchanged social visits on many occasions. A humorist, a man of sharp wit, Senator MILLIKIN excels as a conversationalist, and inspires a feeling of enthusiasm and interest in one who engages in conversation with him. I, for one, shall miss the opportunities for conversation and exchange of wit with my friend, Senator MILLIKIN.

As a Member of the Congress he sets a great example. He is a hard worker; he is an individualist; he does not make up his mind because of what anyone may tell him. He takes to heart what we say, but reaches his own conclusions and renders his own judgment. He is a great example of one who knows thoroughly what he proposes to say before he rises on the Senate floor. I know that any one of us may well hesitate to tangle with him in debate when he speaks in support of or in opposition to some measure. We do so with hesitation because we realize that he has studied the subject thoroughly and has made up his mind only after a most careful and painstaking examination of the facts. When he takes the floor he is a keen debater. His remarks are enlivened with much humor and sharp language, and are couched in words we can clearly understand.

When he is engaged in debate many Senators come to the floor, not because they have not made up their minds, perhaps, on the subject under discussion, but because they wish to hear GENE MILLIKIN'S analysis.

He has served his country well. He has always stood for measures which were of interest to his State. He has been a friend to many of us. As chairman of the Republican conference he has presided over its deliberations with great skill and tact, and an ability to make every one feel he has had his opportunity to speak, and yet, when the discussion has closed, the decision is made quickly, whether it be for or against a proposition.

Mr. President, I shall miss Senator MILLIKIN as a friend and as the personification of a great Senator; I shall miss him as one who has taught me much and demonstrated what a legislator can do after studying and acquiring knowledge of the subject at hand.

It is my hope that Senator MILLIKIN and Mrs. Millikin, who is a great friend of my wife's and of mine will have many more happy years together in Colorado.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in every body of men some one man stands out above all others. In my nearly 12 years of service in the Senate of the United States there have been five Members who stood out, in my mind, above all others, they are the late Senator Arthur Vanenberg of Michigan, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. George], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russel] and my good and close friend, Gene Millikin.

It has been a great honor and privilege for me to serve with him as secretary to the Republican conference of which he has been chairman. I have been secretary of the conference for nearly 8 years. I have learned much from him. He is a kindly person, and, certainly, no more able man ever served in the Senate of the United States. He has helped me as he has others time and time again.

In talking with many lawyers in the Senate, and particularly those who are historians, all will tell us that GENE MILLIKIN will go down in history as one of the ablest lawyers ever to serve in the Senate of the United States.

Sentor MILLIKIN has many great qualities which have made him the great man that he is. He is a very intelligent person; he has a great sense of humor, super judgment, and he has been a most faithful servant of the Senate. On Saturday afternoons or most holidays one could always find him in his office, when most Senators had gone home. He has made a great contribution to the Senate of the United States and to this great Nation. I, like all the Members of the Senate, deeply regret that he is leaving us, and we will miss him greatly. I wish he and his good wife many, many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there is a poem containing a line something like this: "Give us men to match our mountains."

I think of that line when I think of GENE MILLIKIN, for if ever a State has had a man to match its mountains, Colorado has such a man in the person of GENE MILLIKIN.

I first came to know him in the summer of 1944, when he was a member of a committee of the Senate which was dealing with a proposal to authorize a comprehensive water-development plan on the Missouri River. Senator MILLIKIN was one of those whose names became associated with an amendment which preserved for the States of the West the waters west of the 98th meridian for beneficial consumptive use. At that time I learned something of his tenacity, his ability, and his loyalty to a friend and to a cause.

During the years I have had the privilege of knowing GENE MILLIKIN, and particularly years I have served in the Senate I have become even more impressed with the intelligence he applies to every question to which he directs his attention. His loyalty to the great West was never questioned. When we were considering the highway bill in the Senate Committee on Public Works, a little more than a year ago, and he appeared before the committee, and again this year, when he came to talk about the importance of extending the mileage of the so-called Interstate System, he said that originally when the pioneers went to Colorado, they saw the mountains, and the mountains stopped their progress for a while, but, he said, "today the mountains do not stop us. We do not let the mountains bluff us any more; we are masters of the mountains."

The people of Colorado are masters of the mountains because of the spirit and the leadership of men like GENE MILLIKIN.

We have a phrase in South Dakota which we cherish because of a book written about some of the early pioneers, called Giants in The Earth.

Those who have had the privilege of serving with Senator MILLIKIN will forever remember him as a giant in the United States Senate, and our good wishes will go with him wherever he may go.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it has been my hope that as long as I should serve in this body the guiding spirit of Senator MILLIKIN would be with us. I knew GENE MILLIKIN many years before he came to the Senate and before I came here. I knew of his great distinction as a leading member of the bar not only of his State, but of the bar of the United States. His contribution to this body has been of great and lasting value.

No one in our midst has cherished the fine and noble traditions of the Senate more than has Senator MILLIKIN. We have all been inspired by his devotion to the highest traditions and principles of this body. His going will leave a great void in our midst. His leadership will be hard to replace.

Since I came to the Senate, I have had no finer friend, no more loyal guide and helper, than GENE MILLIKIN. I have become very fond of him personally. That friendship has meant much to me. When I speak of my personal friendship and dependence upon his guidance, I know I voice the feeling of many other Senators.

Today, as Senator MILLIKIN announces that he will leave the Senate at the end of this term, I can only express my abiding friendship for him and give voice to the hope and prayer that health may return to him, and that many years of fine companionship with his gracious and lovely wife may attend him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, while I rise with great sorrow, it has been a great privilege to me to be present this afternoon to hear the wonderful tributes being paid to our beloved

friend and colleague, GENE MILLIKIN. I am happy to identify myself with all that has been said, which is so deserved and so splendid.

My own remarks are very personal, because for a time in my life I lived in Colorado. I went there during my younger days for reasons of health which was fully restored. I have received inspiration from the gorgeous mountains there. I know the spirit of the people of Colorado. Later, after I came East during World War I, and then stayed here because of situations which had developed, I always held great love for that area.

When I came to the Senate 12 years ago, GENE MILLIKIN, because of his representing my former home State of Colorado, was one with whom I immediately became acquainted; and then he and his good wife and my wife and I came to know each other because of the intimacy of the Colorado association. It has been that association which has meant so much to us.

I take pride in the jovial attitude which GENE MILLIKIN and his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], take toward me in calling me the third, and junior, Senator from Colorado. I take real pride in that, because it shows a warm friendship and shows that they understand what my early life in Colorado meant to me and what our intimate contacts here have been.

I rejoice in the honors which have come to Gene in the expressions which are being made in the Senate today concerning his great accomplishments. I need not recount them further. I simply identify myself with all those expressions.

I say to Gene: As you leave us, you leave with me, as one Senator, an impression which will remain with me all my life. You are deep in my affections, and I will always feel that the inspiration of your presence here, your great knowledge, and, above all, your inimitable wit and lightness of touch, no matter what the circumstances were, have left with me something that will stay with me always.

So on behalf of my wife and myself, I extend to you and your lovely wife our deepest affection and best wishes. As I plan to visit Colorado frequently—every year, I hope—I shall be able, I hope and pray, to maintain the wonderful friendship which we have had throughout the last 12 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, knowing the sense of modesty, and even of humility, which is always present in the person of our very dear friend, Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN, I am very certain that he is passing through quite an ordeal, as those of us who feel so tender an affection for him speak briefly about him. I hope, however, that he will bear with me and with other Senators, because we will all feel so much better if we have this little say on the day when Senator MILLIKIN has made up his mind not to come back to the Senate after this term.

On a somewhat similar occasion, when his great former colleague, Senator Edwin Johnson, was announcing his retirement, I spoke briefly in the Senate. Because those remarks at that time are quite appropriate now, I should like to refresh the Senate as to those remarks, although I wish to make it very clear that what I am saying is in no way in derogation of the distinguished present colleague of the senior Senator from Colorado, who has already made for himself a place of respect and esteem in the Senate.

On that day, April 5, 1954, I said this:

> Mr. President, I think that all Members of the Senate who are not from the State of Colorado will agree with me when I say that we have seen no more effective teamwork, for the interests of their State and region, and also for the interests of the Nation, than that of the team composed of the two great Senators from Colorado, who sit on different sides of the aisle and come from somewhat different backgrounds, yet who always have worked together here so cordially. I believe they maintain between them the only joint staff of any team of Senators who represent any of the great States of the Union.
>
> My own high tribute goes to the team, but more particularly at this time to that splendid member of the team who quietly is bowing out of the Senate at a time when he does not need to do so.

We now see the other member of that great team, Senator MILLIKIN, bowing out of the Senate under similar conditions at a time when he does not need to do so.

I think the very fine service rendered by the joint efforts of those two great Senators, sitting on opposite sides of the aisle, holds out something in the nature of an inspiration and a lesson to all the rest of us who have been privileged to serve with both of them.

To comment briefly about Senator MILLIKIN, I think there has not been, in my stay in the Senate, a Member of the Senate who has been quite so scholarly as has the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado. Whenever he has had anything to say, it has been just as if it were documented, just as if it had come from the source of final authority on the subject upon which he spoke. We learned, therefore, to value very greatly and to heed with very deep respect anything serious that was contained in the speeches of the Senator from Colorado.

Wise he was, and is; matchless in oratory and debate; with humor that is rollicking and with sarcasm that is devastating.

Mr. President, because I think we like to treasure happy memories in the Senate, I shall never forget the afternoon in which I laughed more heartily, I think, and for a longer period of time than I have in years, when the distinguished Senator from Colorado, while engaging in debate with my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who, I regret, has just been called from his seat next to mine, put on as fine a show of friendly, humorous exchange as it has ever been my privilege to hear or witness. I doubt whether there has been any superior display of friendly wit in the Halls of the Senate. I shall ever remember that fine afternoon.

Mr. President, I know that we are going to miss Senator MILLIKIN, and it will be a personal loss, and also a collective one—for his party, for both parties, and for all of us. I am sure he would much rather have us recall the pleasure which we all received from the numerous instances when he first regaled us and rendered us helpless by his humor, and then proceeded to overwhelm us with such salutary persuasion that, caught unaware, we could not help but admit he was right and go along with him.

Mr. President, as Senator MILLIKIN goes back with his lovely wife to Denver, to a spot which is a mile higher than the places where we who live near sea level reside, I want him to know that we shall think of him as having the intellect, character, and kindly consideration for others which will place him always, in our recollections, as away up yonder above the ordinary plane of most of us humans. We shall, indeed, miss him very, very greatly.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, like most of my colleagues, I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] would be a candidate again, and continue to be a Member of the Senate. When I became a Member of the Senate, the first Senator with whom I had a conference, was the senior Senator from Colorado. I conferred with him in order that I might a little better perform my duties as a Senator. He gave me some advice which I have tried to follow. It has been sound advice.

As a new Member of the Senate I gave some consideration to the biographies of the other Members of this body. One of the Senators whose biographies I went into was that of the senior Senator's from Colorado. I found he had been a soldier. In going into his military record, I found that he was 1 of the 500 officers of the 200,000 in World War I who was selected for the initial general staff eligibility list. I found he was probably the youngest man of any officer in the United States Army to receive that honor. The record of GENE MILLIKIN, as a soldier, disclosed that he always tried to carry out what our flag symbolized. That meant 100 percent loyalty to the ideals for which we have fought.

Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate I was assigned to the Senate Finance Committee. GENE MILLIKIN at that time was not only the senior Republican member, but he was the chairman of the committee. I soon found that he made a very thorough study of every question which came before that committee.

In the consideration of the tax bill of 1954, which was the first rewriting of the tax laws of the United States in three-quarters of a century, much of the burden fell on the shoulders of GENE MILLIKIN, and the United States was very fortunate in having a man of his ability and his ideals in charge of the writing of that bill. It may be of interest to my colleagues to know that the Senate Finance Committee proposed more than 900 amendments to that bill as it came from the House. So long conferences with the other body were required. Senator MILLIKIN's ability was very helpful in formulating a tax bill which I think is of such great importance to our country.

As my colleagues realize, in a form of government such as ours, a bad tax law may destroy a whole segment of industry. Senator MILLIKIN not only appreciated what the tax laws meant to our own country, but what they meant to our trade with foreign countries.

I regret very much that GENE MILLIKIN is leaving the Senate. I regret very much that WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, is leaving the Senate. They are two great, stalwart Americans, who always keep the ideals of our country uppermost in their minds.

Mr. President, as Senator MILLIKIN leaves this body, my family wishes for him and his most gracious wife long years of health and happiness.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, someone once remarked about a very able man who became President of the United States that he loved him because of the enemies he had made. I am afraid if we had to judge the record of GENE MILLIKIN by that standard, he has been a great failure in the Congress of the United States, because, wherever he has been, he is known and admired today for the friends he has made. I do not know where we would go to find any enemies he has made.

It was my pleasure, when I came to the Senate of the United States, to be assigned to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I found the able Senator from Colorado, who was then the junior Senator from Colorado to be its ranking minority Member. We had much interesting legislation to consider during that time. One of the most interesting pieces of legislation, of course, was the so-called Tidelands bill, on which the Senator from Colorado and I were usually on different sides. However, I came out of those experiences with the finest appreciation of what a great legal mind can mean to a committee. He was my lawyer, even though he was on the other side. When we finally went into a conference on the bill, and I was privileged to have the opportunity to contribute something to the final writing of the conference report, I depended to a great degree upon the legal advice of the Senator from Colorado, which he was willing to give me, even though my point of view was different from his. He steadily tried to make sure that we would write good legislation that would stand the test of time.

Subsequently, the Submerged Lands Act came before the Congress. It had been a part of our desire in the other effort. The Senator from Colorado was of tremendous help to us in the writing of a good bill. From that day on, I have had the greatest respect not only for his fine humor and for his good commonsense, but also for his remarkable legal background, which stretches over a vast experience in the State from which he comes.

Then, Mr. President, I was assigned to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Although the able Senator from Colorado was senior to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and was the ranking Member on the Republican side, he was not named the chairman, because of the desire to fill the chairmanship on a somewhat different basis than the ordinary seniority basis, since the Senator from Colorado was Chairman of the Finance Committee. But I have had the privilege of sitting next to him on the Senate side of the Joint Committee many, many times, and for a number of years. There, again, his wise counsel and excellent business judgment were of great benefit and help to our committee.

Finally, Mr. President, I was assigned to a third committee—the Finance Committee—on which the Senator from Colorado served. I think that was probably a unique experience on my part. So the able senior Senator from Colorado and I have had the pleasure of serving together on all three of our principal committees.

On the Finance Committee, I had known that when the great Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was its chairman, he had relied greatly upon the remarkable talents of the Senator from Colorado. I know that the more recent chairman of that committee, the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], relies no less on and depends on the great ability and fine character of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, it was one of the great joys of my life a few days ago to have the privilege of presenting to the Senate the Fryingpan-Arkansas bill, which was close to the heart of the great senior Senator from Colorado. I am sure that he and I can be happy in our realization that the bill was passed by the Senate under his guidance and leadership, and with his name attached to it.

Mr. President, I am sorry that GENE MILLIKIN is leaving the Senate. We can ill afford to lose men of his fine and outstanding stature and character.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, all of us are saddened by the announcement of the decision by the brilliant senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who has advised the Nation and his constituents in Colorado that at the close of this session, he will end his career in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have great affection for the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado. He has long been the leading statesman in our sister State to the west and in the entire Midwestern section of the United States. He has established himself as an elder statesman in this great body. It was my good fortune to enter the Senate at a time when I had the helpful assistance and guidance of GENE MILLIKIN. I found him to be considerate, patient, and a man devoted to duty. He is a man of great industry, and he always displays a fine sense of fairness. I know he is without peer in ability in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall leave it to my peers to recite fully his brilliant legislative record. But from the record, I know that GENE MILLIKIN'S name has been attached only to constructive legislation which has been good for the Nation. I know that he has always been regardful of his constituents' needs and requirements, and that he has the sort of understanding which has won confidence in his judgment and respect for him when he took positions on proposed legislation.

He is a man trusted and respected in the councils of my party and has rendered long and lasting service in it.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressions of deep regret that he is leaving this Chamber.

I cannot help but recall—to strike a personal note in closing—that I entered this body during the service of the great Senator from the North, Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan; and it was also my good fortune to serve in this body during the period of service of the late distinguished Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio, and other Senators. This year, on another occasion, we were made aware of the decision of a great southern statesman, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to close his career in the Senate. And now we have the announcement that GENE MILLIKIN, of Colorado, will leave the Senate at the end of this session. We all feel a great sense of loss to this Nation and the Senate.

Mr. President, one of the greatest things I can look back upon is my association in the Senate with men like GENE MILLIKIN. I admire and respect him for what he is, what he has always stood for, and the inspiration he has given us in serving our States and the Nation.

Mrs. Schoeppel and I wish for both Senator MILLIKIN and Mrs. Millikin many years of happiness to come.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, knowing full well my inadequacy to cover this farewell subject as it should be covered, nevertheless I cannot refrain from associating myself with the expressions of those who have spoken, nor from imposing upon my colleagues long enough to voice my sentiments, because I venture to say that I have known GENE MILLIKIN longer than has any other Member of the Senate.

I remember GENE MILLIKIN when he was a student at the University of Colorado in Boulder, Colo., and I was an editor—shall I admit it?—of a Republican newspaper in the town of Boulder. Of course I was paid a salary for writing Republican editorials.

Upon occasion I was invited to go to the campus of the university. The first of those invitations came to me through GENE MILLIKIN, because he was the head of a student group that was interested in public affairs, and for some reason they felt that the editor of the Republican newspaper should be invited to come. They did not know that I was a Democrat at heart—as most Republicans are, and as I think GENE MILLIKIN always has been.

I went there. I shall never forget the occasion; because after I had made my preliminary remarks, GENE MILLIKIN, a young man, wearing the clothes worn in those days by young men, rose and timorously asked, "Mr. O'MAHONEY, are you willing to answer questions?"

I replied, "Mr. MILLIKIN, if I was willing to come here to talk with this group, surely I should be willing to answer questions."

Then I was initiated to the qualities of this man as a cross-examiner and an interrogator, because he knew that although I was employed by a Republican

newspaper, I really was a Democrat and held Democratic views—which I did not hesitate to express, although I did not have the opportunity to have them printed in the newspaper for which I was working.

But in those days, Mr. President, as in the present days, I knew Gene just as his colleagues here have known him. He was frank; he was intelligent; he was a good fellow. By that, I mean that he was a young man—just as he is now, a man of the same period as the rest of us here—who was one who knew how to get along with people. He understood human relations better than almost any person I have known.

I remember distinctly when, having just received his law degree, he became secretary to the district attorney for the district of Colorado in which Boulder was situated. That was George Carlson. Gene became his secretary and then successfully managed his campaign to become Governor of the State of Colorado.

Gene early learned ways of getting along with people; and by the humor and by the intelligent grasp of affairs which he has demonstrated here, by his legal ability, and by the speed with which he could penetrate the center of every problem that arose, he soon became a leader in the Republican Party of Colorado, as he has since become a leader in the United States Senate. He is a man of perspicacity, a man of vision, a man of intelligence and integrity. He is a man of industry, who will be sadly missed in this body.

I regret as much as I regret anything that it has fallen to my lot to participate in this session this afternoon, in which we must acknowledge that he has reached the decision no longer to stand for election to this body.

Gene, along with the rest of our colleagues, I wish you Godspeed. I will always hold you in fond memory and deep affection. It has been a long and very pleasant association.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, ever since Senator MILLIKIN came to the Senate in 1941 I have been one of his followers and admirers. I wish to say today publicly what I have said many times privately; GENE MILLIKIN possesses one of the greatest minds ever to serve in the Congress.

I further pay tribute to him because of the fact that he has kept the faith. GENE MILLIKIN has been true to the people back home, to their ideas and their ideals, and their economic philosophy. He has been true to our basic American system, and the Americanism he holds dear.

I hope that GENE MILLIKIN and Mrs. Millikin will have a future in which every day will be bright.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Delaware is one of the more fortunate Members of this body. He has been privileged to serve on the Finance Committee during the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Georgia, the senior Senator from Colorado, and now the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I think there is no committee of the Senate whose leadership surpasses the quality of those three men who have served as its chairmen.

Six years ago, about this time of the year, I was in the city of Denver, Colo. The headquarters of the senior Senator from Colorado for nomination on the Republican ticket were in the hotel at which I was staying. As a Democrat, I went to visit the office of the Republican candidate. My experience was similar to that which has been described by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I was very courteously received. I informed him that I could not vote in Colorado, but that I thought the State of Colorado was quite well represented by its senior Senator.

I also recall the afternoon, of which we were reminded by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], when the famous expression "BD" was coined—meaning "before Douglas." That also gave me a great deal of pleasure.

Esther and I wish to extend to Senator MILLIKIN and Mrs. Millikin our very best wishes for many, many days of happy life to come. For many years Mrs. Millikin has shared Senator MILLIKIN with the Senate of the United States, and with the people of the Nation, as well as of the world. She deserves to have his companionship, and I know they will enjoy being together.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly, and somewhat personally, about the years during which I have known Senator MILLIKIN and have become familiar with his work.

When I succeeded Warren Austin as a Senator from Vermont, he took occasion to meet with me and to go over, in a few words, some of the characteristics and abilities of the men whom I would meet in the United States Senate. Of all those men, the one he most wanted me to become acquainted with was Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado. I had not been here many years before I realized that the judgment of my predecessor in the Senate could not be gainsaid.

Senator MILLIKIN is a phenomenon. He is a most delightful combination of ability, intellect, and humor. Who would imagine that guiding tax bills through the United States Senate could be a delightful and stimulating experience? We have all seen Senator MILLIKIN walking up and down the center aisle, exhibiting, alternately, drama, humor, and keen intellectual analysis; and we have seen objections fade away like the snow in the springtime.

We shall not see that again. We shall see many fine things in the Senate, but that we shall not see again; and we are the poorer for the loss of that experience.

I wish to mention one further thing. It so happens that for many years, in the private dining room frequented by Republican Senators, Senator MILLIKIN and I have sat across the table from each other at luncheon. Those luncheons are rare memories. They were experiences the memory of which I shall carry with me to my dying day.

Someone has mentioned the wit of the Senator from Colorado. He does have wit; but he has, to a beautiful and wonderful degree, a sense of humor. It is a real sense of humor, because he enjoys it even if it happens to be directed at himself. That is the test of a real sense of humor.

Senator MILLIKIN, the Senate will be poorer with you gone. It will take all the rest of us to make up for the gap which you leave behind you.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing my appreciation for the wonderful public service of Senator MILLIKIN, and for his kindness to me. He is always thoughtful and considerate of all Members of the Senate, Democrat as well as Republican. I certainly agree that he is one of the great lawyers of the United States Senate. I have had the privilege of visiting in Colorado on a number of occasions, on committee hearings and on other business. Senator MILLIKIN always looks up his colleagues and extends to them great courtesy and thoughtfulness whenever they visit his beautiful State. I consider him a man whose service and work and integrity have been in the best traditions of this high legislative body. I wish for him and Mrs. Millikin many happy years, and for him many years of service and useful life in his own State.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I studied the record of the Senate, even before I became a Member of it, I came to admire Senator MILLIKIN. When I was privileged to come to the Senate as a junior Member, I found that Senator MILLIKIN had the faculty of making one feel important even though one knew he was not important as a junior Member of the Senate. Over the years of service in the Senate, I have come not only to admire but to respect the ability of Senator MILLIKIN. He is a great statesman, a great legislator, and a great leader. The Senate will long remember Senator MILLIKIN, and the time will be remote when it will have among its Members one who can render more devoted and able service than Senator MILLIKIN has rendered the Senate and the country.

At the close of the session the Senate will lose two extremely able men. They are Senator MILLIKIN and Senator GEORGE. Many of us will have to work much harder than we have in the past if we are to render the Nation the type of service Senator MILLIKIN and Senator GEORGE have rendered this Nation.

Senator MILLIKIN, I can only wish for you and Mrs. Millikin the rest and the enjoyment which will come when you are freed from the heavy schedule that you have had to face here. I know that we shall always remember our association with you, and we shall always strive to render the kind of service that you rendered, and to set the type of example you set for all men in public service in your career as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I would be remiss, indeed, if I did not rise this afternoon and express my admiration and affection for Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN. It was with deep regret that I learned this morning of his decision to retire from public life come next New Year's Day. His retirement will be a great loss to Colorado. It will be an even greater loss to the Western States. He has been a tower of strength in the promotion of policies beneficial to the West.

He occupied a powerful position both before committees and on the floor of the Senate. He possesses a keen intellect and in the profession he is known as a lawyer's lawyer. He has led the fight in every battle for western development. GENE MILLIKIN was ready and willing on every occasion to advocate those policies that were necessary for the welfare of western industries. He was in the forefront in the consideration of legislation affecting mining, oil and gas, sheep and cattle, reclamation, and related western problems.

On behalf of the people of my State I desire to express my deep gratitude to a great American, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, for his long and faithful service to the people of his State and his country. I trust that in the years that lie ahead he and his good wife will enjoy many happy years of well deserved retirement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like very much to associate myself with the felicitations paid by my colleagues to GENE MILLIKIN, and to reaffirm my support of all the tributes which have been paid to his great ability, his high qualities of citizenship, his capacity as a great Senator of the United States, and as a great leader from the West.

Mr. President, I believe all of us can utilize occasions such as this to sort of check the experiences and records of great men like WALTER GEORGE and GENE MILLIKIN against the records which each of us endeavors to write in the book of the Senate. From it I believe we can learn one significant lesson which needs to be badly learned, and that is that the effectiveness of senatorial speech is not measured by its quantity, but by its quality. We have not heard so frequently from WALTER GEORGE and GENE MILLIKIN, and we have not heard from them with as much fervency, as from others. But, when they speak, they speak with attachment for fact and with accuracy which I believe is a happy model for all of us occasionally to review.

So, in addition to all the other great qualifications, I commend those two great men for having placed before us an example, which, if we can follow it, will make for better action on the part of the Senate, for better legislative records, and for more expeditious effort.

I have never seen GENE MILLIKIN, in the years I have served with him in Congress, engage in a single irresponsible act; nor have I heard him make a reckless statement in senatorial debate. Integrity like that, succinctness like that, and adherence to the facts such as he has persistently and constantly exemplified, have served, among his other great mental qualifications and personal characteristics, to mark him as a man apart in senatorial service.

I wish for Gene and his lovely lady all the happiness in the world, and again assure him that those of us who have known him for so long will continue to consult with him whenever opportunity presents itself as we confront the prodigious problems of the future.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, once before in this year we were confronted with the almost impossible task of trying to imagine a United States Senate in the future without one of its valued Members. Today we are confronted again with that hurdle. With GENE MILLIKIN announcing today that he will retire to the beautiful State which, in part, he so ably represents, we are faced with the unhappy prospect of being without both Senator GEORGE and Senator MILLIKIN in the coming year.

I have known GENE MILLIKIN for many years. I knew him before I ever thought of becoming a Member of the United States Senate. I have known him to be a man of high honor, a man of clear mind, and a man of great courage. I have always known him to be a man with extreme ability to express himself clearly and honestly and quickly.

However, I believe one attribute of this distinguished man has been overlooked in the eulogies which have been paid to him today. It is his willingness to help the younger Members of the Senate.

I recall that when I came to the Senate GENE MILLIKIN was the first man I called upon to ask for assistance, and all during my membership in the Senate I have gone to him religiously to ask his help on problems which confronted me. I know I speak for all the younger Members of this body when I speak in that vein. His helpfulness has meant much to the States of the West, but particularly to the State which I am happy to represent along with my senior colleague [Mr. HAYDEN].

I know Members will recall the fight which went on on this floor and in the committee to obtain water from the Colorado River for the southern part of Arizona, the realization of which we have not yet come to but which we look for in the future. Senator MILLIKIN was a bulwark of strength to my State all through that fight, and we in Arizona shall be eternally grateful to him for all he did for us.

Senator MILLIKIN's name will be engraved on many important legislative monuments which will help to build the future of the West. His constant interest in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate has resulted in important laws being placed on the books having a beneficial effect not only on the West, but on the entire Nation.

Lastly, Mr. President, but certainly most important of all, Senator MILLIKIN has been a great help to his country at a time in our history when honesty has been needed, when clearness of vision and expression has been needed, and when adherence to American principles has been needed. This man from the great State of Colorado has been like a great rock to which we could tie our ropes and pull ourselves up in ever-increasing efforts to better ourselves and our country.

It will be difficult to envision the Senate without the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

In closing, Mr. President, I merely wish to express to Gene the wishes of Peggy and myself for him and his wife that they may have long happiness in the delightful State of Colorado.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am sure that I cannot embellish the eloquent testimony which has been given by my colleagues regarding the service of Senator MILLIKIN to the people of the United States, but I should like to express to him, in the presence of his colleagues, a personal tribute of gratitude for his faith in me. As a new Senator newly come to the great Finance Committee, and during the 4 years I have served with him on that committee, he has given me a number of important personal assignments, important to me, certainly, and apparently important to him and to the people of his State. He has had the faith to trust me to carry out those assignments. I wish for nothing higher than the commendation I have received from him for whatever success I have had. I wish him to know as he departs from the Senate, that if I should return I shall be buoyed up by the knowledge of the faith, the trust, and the strength he gave me.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think no one realizes more than does the senior Senator from Colorado that all the 96 Senators cannot make speeches today, but I wish to say to him that I want him to multiply many, many times all the nice, wonderful, and truthful things that have been said about him this afternoon and to believe me when I tell him that is the way I feel about him. We are going to miss him very much, and we hope he will come back and visit us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the other Members of the Senate who have said so many kindly things about the Senator from Colorado which I know were deserved and merited. He is my next-door neighbor, and he knows how I feel personally about him. I would say amen to everything that has been said about him. But the greatest tribute which has been paid today to the Senator from Colorado is that the House Rules Committee has this day approved a rule so that one piece of legislation which he sponsored, the Arkansas-Fryingpan project, which means so much to the West, can be approved. I think that is the greatest tribute which could have been paid to the Senator from Colorado.

Again, I wish to say amen to everything that has been said about my good friend Senator MILLIKIN.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the opportunity of having served with this great American, this great citizen, this great United States Senator. He is our neighbor and our friend. He is not only going to be missed by the State of Colorado, but his service in the United States Senate will be missed by the people of Kansas and all America. It has been my privilege to serve on the Finance Committee with him, and I have on several occasions stated that whenever the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] were agreed on a piece of proposed legislation, there was no doubt of its outcome in the Senate.

There was never any doubt in my mind or in the mind of the people of the country as to the thorough analysis which had

been given that piece of proposed legislation.

It is a genuine privilege to me to have had an opportunity to serve with Senator MILLIKIN. He is a great student of our tax structure, and a man who analyzes problems thoroughly and correctly. His brilliant leadership and knowledge carried the Finance Committee through many knotty problems. I have observed him as chairman of the Republican conference on occasions when things were extremely tense, and it was his fine mind and kindly hand that drew us all together and carried us through.

The people of Kansas are going to miss his presence in the Senate, and I shall miss the privilege of serving with him. I wish him many years of well-deserved and well-earned rest.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall speak but a few minutes in paying my tribute to Senator MILLIKIN. I, like other Senators associate myself wholeheartedly with all the fine things which have been said about him on this floor.

It has been remarked repeatedly that this year the Senate is losing the services of two great statesmen, of two great Americans, by their own decisions. It is the loss of the Senate and of the United States that their services will not hereafter be available on the floor. But that, Mr. President, is their own choice and their own determination; it is the choice of Senator WALTER GEORGE and the choice of Senator GENE MILLIKIN.

I have been associated with Senator MILLIKIN on one committee for approximately 10 years. That is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He and I were members of the original Senate committee which was created to write the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. We have served on that committee ever since. I have seen many instances where the clear perception and the sound and irrefutable logic of the senior Senator from Colorado has saved situation after situation, when a wrong decision by that committee might have been highly prejudicial to the atomic energy leadership of this country, and therefore to the security of the country and its progress in atomic science. I mention this because of the intimate association Senator MILLIKIN and I have had during the last 10 years in that particular field.

I repeat once more, although perhaps not in such an impressive way as others have said it, that the clear logic of Senator MILLIKIN and his incisive grasp of the public measures which have come before the Senate during his service here mark him as one of the great Senators of the United States and one of the great Americans in this country's history.

We shall miss him. I shall miss his counsel and advice. But I hope our association and friendship may continue in the years which will follow. I, together with my colleagues, wish for Senator MILLIKIN and his lovely wife, Elsie, all the best things in life, and I express the hope that happiness may continue to be theirs in the future as it has been in the past.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has already spoken for our State of Ohio, of the esteem in which the distinguished statesman from Colorado is held. It is rather unusual that a man in his lifetime hears the tributes paid to him as, first, Senator GEORGE, and now Senator MILLIKIN, are hearing.

A poet once wrote:

If with pleasure you are viewing
Any work a man is doing,
If you like him or you love him,
Tell him now.
Don't withhold your approbation
Till the priest makes his oration
And he lies with snowy lilies on his brow.
For no matter how you shout it
He'll not know about it
For he cannot read his tombstone when he's dead.

It is indeed fortunate for a man who has rendered such distinguished service to hear the fine tributes paid to him today, even from some of the newest members of this body.

It has been my privilege to know Senator MILLIKIN ever since I first came to Congress in 1938, and even before that. He has been a source of encouragement to young men. He has a keen sense of humor. He has learned what "rule VI" means. "Rule VI" is:

Never take yourself too seriously.

Mr. President, I have always carried in my pocket a little card which reads:

MY PRAYER FOR TODAY

Dear God, please help me to keep my big mouth shut until I know what I am talking about.

I know what I am talking about today. I am talking about a good man. I am talking about a man of character, a man of conviction, a man who deserves all the nice things which have been said about him.

Since I am on the floor today, I would not feel right if I did not add this word to the word of the senior Senator from the State of Ohio in tribute to Senator MILLIKIN.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have already expressed my appreciation for the wonderful work of Senator MILLIKIN in connection with our problems in the West on the occasion of the passage by the Senate of the Fryingpan-Arkansas bill. However, I wish to join with my colleagues today in their eloquent and splendid expressions of appreciation of the Senator's example of life and the great service he has rendered to the Nation. I feel there is very little I can add to the statements which have been made.

I met Senator MILLIKIN for the first time at the Republican convention in Chicago in 1944. I had the high privilege of serving with him on the committee on platform and resolutions of that convention. I learned by his example how things ought to be done in the writing of a platform. Senator MILLIKIN, I think, was the chief draftsman of many of the planks in that platform, particularly the one which related to the problems of the West. His work was done in such a way that when he had finished, the platform contained a comprehensive statement, in a few very simple words which anyone could understand, of the numerous programs and problems of the West.

It has been my privilege to serve with Senator MILLIKIN on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for 10 years, and for about the same length of time as a member of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. But I have already spoken of his services there.

In behalf of the people of the State of Utah, a State which has many problems in common with her sister State of Colorado, I desire to express deep appreciation for the great service which Senator MILLIKIN has rendered the people of this country, but particularly the people of the West and of my own State.

We in Utah have great respect and admiration for Senator MILLIKIN. We hope he will have many years of happy life on earth. We extend to him our sincere thanks for the things he has done for us and for the people of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the many fine things which have been said about the senior Senator from Colorado. I do not know that I can add much to the statements which have been made about his career in the Senate; they are very well known.

But I have had a rather unusual opportunity to visit with him personally, having lived in the same apartment house with Senator MILLIKIN and his lovely wife, Elsie, for a number of years. I know him to be, in addition to being a great leader of his party and of this body, a delightful individual having a keen sense of humor. He is a most interesting conversationalist and one of the best informed men I have ever known in Washington.

Mrs. Fulbright and I wish for Senator and Mrs. Millikin great happiness in the years to come.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American. I recall as a freshman Senator, when I was assigned to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 80th Congress, it was a real inspiration to have the counsel and guidance of Senator MILLIKIN. I was profoundly impressed by his extensive knowledge of the problems which vitally concern the States of the West, and also by his sympathetic understanding and his constant willingness to help his associates on that committee in solving many of the problems before it. Probably the fact which most impressed me was that he never indulged in partisanship. He seemed to sense the need of having a common front and the need for joining together in the committee in order to report constructive proposed legislation.

Senator MILLIKIN's ideas were always sound, and because of his extensive legal experience prior to his becoming a Member of the Senate, I know he had a firm grasp of problems which affected the West—irrigation, reclamation, mining, and all the various activities and industries which are so vital to the economy of our country.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of the people of the State of Idaho, I desire to express our gratitude and appreciation for the fine service which Senator MILLIKIN has rendered not only to his own

State but to the Nation. I sincerely hope he and Mrs. Millikin may enjoy many years of happiness.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleagues in the statements they have made about our distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Colorado. Senator MILLIKIN is one of the ablest men who ever sat in the United States Senate. He is one of the most influential Members of this body. I do not think the statement would be contradicted if I said he is one of the most influential men who ever sat in the United States Senate. He has made a very effective Senator. He is a man of unimpeachable integrity. He is one of the most popular Senators among his colleagues.

I think all Americans, from every section of the country, owe a deep debt of gratitude to him for the very distinguished service he has rendered his country. I shall certainly miss him in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with my colleagues in expressing regret at the departure of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. He has two qualities in great degree. One is his complete knowledge of all the subjects he discusses. The second is the courtesy with which he treats his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly those of us who are a great many years junior to him in service.

The Senator from Colorado was made a member of the committee to select the five greatest Senators who have sat in the Senate. I know his advice on that subject would be invaluable. As chairman of that committee, I am particularly sorry that we shall not have the benefit of his advice. I think it can be said of him, as was said of a great Governor of Massachusetts, "He dwelt an arrow's flight beyond them all."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 3 years ago I was confined to a hospital in Denver, Colo., for about 5 weeks. One morning I picked up a newspaper and read that the distinguished Senator from Colorado had come back to Denver, and that early in the morning 600 citizens had gone to the train to meet him. It was a magnificent tribute. I thought that sometime during the day I would hear from GENE MILLIKIN. Sure enough, in the afternoon, busy as he was with his friends, he called up to find out how I was getting along in the hospital.

Mr. President, one of the finest debates I heard on the floor of the Senate was the one between Tom Connally, of Texas, and the distinguished Senator from Colorado. All of us oldtimers are familiar with the way that Tom Connally, just by shrugging his shoulders, could disable an enemy in debate.

On that day we learned GENE MILLIKIN could shrug his shoulders even more expressively and suggestively than could Tom Connally, of Texas.

One time I won a bet from a constituent of mine from North Dakota. I told my constituent that if we went over and shook hands with Senator MILLIKIN, he would say, "How's the old kid?" Sure enough, I won the bet.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to say that when I meet this great man in heaven, I am sure he will say, with a beautiful smile, "How's the old kid?"

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to be permitted to join my colleagues in paying my deep respects and expressing my affection for the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. He is not only a neighbor to us in Oklahoma, but I have had the distinguished pleasure of having my name called immediately after his on calls of the roll during my service in the Senate. While I cannot say he has ever influenced my vote, I will say that in not winning my vote, he won my heart, my affection, and my respect, for, to the fullest degree, he is indeed a Senator after whose conduct all of us can pattern our own conduct. Through many years, he has contributed his ability and service to this Nation.

We are going to miss him deeply. Above all, we shall miss the glorious sense of human he displayed so often in the United States Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I, of course, wish to add an expression of my feelings to what has already been said about GENE MILLIKIN. I have served with him in the Senate for a long time. So much has been said in tribute to him that if there were any other adjectives in Webster's dictionary, I would use them. I know that he will leave the Senate with the affection of all of us. I wish for him great happiness and I pray for his good health for many years to come.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the most facile intellects, one of the greatest debaters, one of the most lovable personalities to grace this body has been the senior Senator from Colorado, the Honorable EUGENE MILLIKIN. To hear him in debate has been a treat, even to those who disagree with him, unless, of course, one was the victim of his devastating sarcasm, even though it would leave no sting. He is a man who is beloved and respected by every Member in a body in which the personal equation is more important than it is in any other legislative body in the world.

Mr. President, I join with other Senators in wishing for Senator MILLIKIN, in his retirement, the fullest measure of happiness and joy. I know that his recollection of his triumphs and his service in the Senate will add to his joy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues today in expressing the high esteem all of us have for the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

As a Senator from the State of Montana, on the northern edge of the Rocky Mountains, I am happy to join with my other colleagues from that region, as well as with those from the rest of the United States, in expressing how we feel about a man who has distinguished himself through his ability, through his integrity, through his sense of humor, and through his sense of tolerance and understanding.

All of us will miss Gene. But because of having had the chance to know him—limited though it may have been, in the case of some of us—I believe that all of us will be better because of the friendship he has so freely extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words of personal friendship and admiration for the very distinguished and able senior Senator from Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN.

When I became a United States Senator and was privileged to engage in debate in the Senate, one of my first experiences was in connection with consideration of the tax bill by the Senate. Let me say that during that debate I received quite an education from the professor of the Finance Committee, the able, brilliant, genial, and unbelievably effective Senator from Colorado, now its senior Senator, Mr. MILLIKIN. However, I wish to note for the RECORD that although his arguments are devastating and, in terms of the votes taken, persuasive, he is always kindly and always, let me say, most amusing, even though he is giving a very serious message or note of admonition to his much younger colleague.

Senator MILLIKIN and Mrs. Millikin have been good friends of the HUMPHREYS. We are honored by their friendship.

As has been stated by his other colleagues, the senior Senator from Colorado is one of the truly brilliant debaters of this Congress or any other Congress. I only wish that those great talents, that genial personality, that kindly spirit, and that agile and productive mind could always have been on this side of the aisle, because if that had been the case, the record of this side of the aisle—good as it has been—would have been ever better.

But, Mr. President, it is always good, under the two-party system, to have capable talents on both sides.

The Senator from Colorado is surely a giant on the side of the forces and the views and the causes which he and his party represent.

Let me conclude by saying that not only is the senior Senator from Colorado an effective and an honorable partisan, but he is better than that: He is a great American, a truly fine and noble citizen. He does honor to his State. He has brought great honor to his party. He has given even greater service to his country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the views of my colleagues who already have spoken in expressing their admiration and affection for the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

It was with regret that, this morning, I learned that he is retiring from the Senate at the end of his present term.

Senator MILLIKIN is not only one of the most brilliant Members of the United States Senate, but he is thorough, devoted, industrious, and, above all things, wise. I know of no man whose judgment is sounder in regard to the matters coming under his cognizance and jurisdiction.

I also know that the senior Senator from Colorado is one of the finest debaters in the Senate. He is most incisive in his approach to all matters and in his expressions. He is always kindly,

and he never has deliberately hurt anyone in opposition to him.

Surely, even though Senator MILLIKIN is retiring from the Senate, he will serve in many useful activities in the years which lie ahead.

I hope very much indeed that we shall soon hear of his great improvement in health and, ultimately, of his complete recovery.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, certainly there is little that I could add to the very eloquent and highly deserved words of tribute which have been spoken here this afternoon regarding a very outstanding and most capable American, Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN.

I simply wish to say that it has been one of the greatest joys of my life to have had the opportunity to serve in the United States Senate with Senator MILLIKIN and to be able to seek his counsel and advice on many, many occasions.

As I stand here this afternoon and see on my left the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] I should like to state—if it is permissible for me to do so—that even though I happen to be a Republican, there are in the Senate two Members to whom I have looked to provide the type of leadership which in my younger days I always hoped would be in the minds and hearts of those serving in this body. Those two men are Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN and Senator WALTER GEORGE. Frankly, Mr. President, there have been many times when not only have I followed the leadership of Senator MILLIKIN, but I have likewise turned to the guidance and leadership of Senator GEORGE on matters which he was debating on this floor, and in connection with which he was taking the lead, and I have supported the position he has taken, because in my opinion both of these men stand for everything that is great and good in the interests of this country and all of its people.

To both of them I wish every success and happiness in the world.

I hope that GENE MILLIKIN will have an opportunity to return to his great State of Colorado, and there to breathe the invigorating air of that great State. I wish him to know that the many people of Maine, among whom he has many very great and fond admirers, wish for him and Mrs. Millikin everything good in the years they will have together in the times ahead.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a hearty and sincere amen to everything the Senator from Maine has just said in respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and in respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the great privileges which has been mine during the last 4 years has been the friendship of the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. Similarly, Mr. President, while my wife has been in the city of Washington, she has counted as one of her great privileges the friendship of Mrs. Millikin.

In times of doubt—as one has during service in the Senate—I have turned more often to Senator MILLIKIN for advice than I have to any other Member of the Senate. Never once has he given me advice which was not sound. I think I can say that in almost every case in which I have asked him for advice, I have followed the advice he gave.

I have enjoyed his friendship. I have enjoyed his wit and his companionship, but most of all I have respected his intellect and his great integrity as a statesman.

So, Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to this great American. I hope that when he returns to his home, he will live happily with his lovely wife for many years to come.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very happy to have the privilege of joining my colleagues today in paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I have had the good fortune to be very closely associated with him for a number of years on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He was the ranking member on the Republican side in that committee, and I found him to be a very valuable member. He is one of the best informed Members of the United States Senate on the subjects of water conservation, flood control, power development and problems of that character which come before our committee.

I always looked to him for advice and direction in our studies and I must say that he cooperated fully with me as chairman of that committee. Made it possible for our committee in this session of Congress to make one of the finest records ever made by that committee in the matter of power and reclamation projects of great value to our country.

I am very pleased indeed to be here today to hear many fine tributes paid to him on the record of his service here. I am in accord with everything that has been said about him, concerning his fine personal traits of character which have endeared him to his colleagues. I also wish to associate myself with all that has been said concerning my distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia.

I feel very proud that I have served in this body during the time these great Senators were here, and that I have had the opportunity of hearing them in debate and committee work and observing their great fairness, and their desire to do what is right and for the best interests of the welfare of our country.

I am very happy today to pay this sincere tribute of respect and regard to both the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Georgia. May they enjoy many more years of health and happiness is my sincere wish.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I would not want the comments by my brethren to conclude without having an opportunity to tell a very distinguished American that he has the respect, the admiration, and the friendship of every Member of this body as he announces his decision to retire from the Senate. We wish him Godspeed.

For the past 3½ years I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which Senator GENE MILLIKIN has been the ranking Republican. During that time, like so many others among my colleagues, I have sought his counsel and assistance, which he freely gave, and for which he has not only the gratitude of the junior Senator from California, but the gratitude of the people whom I represent in the Senate.

Time and time again projects of interest to California were before that committee, and time and time again it was only through the patient, friendly, and understanding assistance of the senior Senator from Colorado that legislation came from the committee, passed the Senate, and went on its way to becoming law.

I value and treasure a great friendship for GENE MILLIKIN, and I flatter myself that he returns that friendship.

Those who, like myself, are new in the Senate, but who have always respected, and in many ways have attempted to follow, his own high type of courage and leadership in his public service, are honored to pay tribute to him.

My wife would want me to say also that both of us bid Godspeed to the Millikin family. We very much hope that in the years ahead it will be our privilege upon many occasions to see each of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of observing the statesmanship of GENE MILLIKIN from two vantage points. While serving in the House of Representatives, I was a member of the House Ways and Means Committee. From there I looked across the Capitol to witness the stature and the brilliance of Senator MILLIKIN. Two years ago I came to the Senate, and I have been able to view from a closer point of observation the character of GENE MILLIKIN. I learned, as other Senators have learned, that the closer one is to Senator MILLIKIN, the more one respects and admires him.

I have another association with GENE MILLIKIN of which I am very proud. During my service on the Committee on Military Affairs in the House, I became particularly interested in the field of stockpiling of strategic materials. In that capacity I grew to appreciate the understanding and comprehension of the problems of national defense and metals and minerals that was GENE MILLIKIN'S.

Mr. President, a man's deeds live after him. By this token will GENE MILLIKIN be long remembered and admired. Mrs. Martin and I wish to Senator and Mrs. Millikin the long years of happiness and contentment they so richly deserve.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is very little to be added to the eulogies to Senator MILLIKIN which he has heard today from his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The Chair would like to add a personal note. In the past 10 years the present occupant of the chair has attended many meetings in which Senator MILLIKIN has participated. There has never been one which was not better by reason of his presence.

There is understandably some sadness as this session draws to a close, because we realize that in the services of Senator MILLIKIN and Senator GEORGE, we have enjoyed a rare privilege—the privilege

of having two giants in our midst on the floor of the Senate. They are giants in intellect, giants in devotion to duty, and giants in courage.

But there is also a happy note on this occasion. So great has been the stature of these two men that few have dared to tangle with them, and those who did invariably came out second best. They were, and they are, champions; and we are happy to note that, like the greatest of champions, they retire undefeated, untied, and unscarred.

ORDER FOR RECESS AT 5 O'CLOCK TOMORROW AFTERNOON—RECEPTION FOR SENATOR AND MRS. MILLIKIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to take a recess tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock subject to the call of the Chair. It is planned at that time to have a reception in honor of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THEATER ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader and I have prepared a proposed unanimous-consent agreement on the theater admissions tax bill, which may be called up. The unanimous-consent agreement is at the desk, and I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9875) on theater admissions tax, debate on the passage of the said bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Ordered further, That the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, without debate: *Provided further*, That no other amendments to the bill shall be in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I regret that I did not hear the agreement read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It provides for a limitation of debate on the theater admissions tax bill. The proposed agreement has been cleared with the minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement is entered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10:30 a. m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS TO LIE OVER A DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement, which I have cleared with the minority leader.

Because of the fact that we are in the last days of the session, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the minority leader and myself, that the requirement that committee reports lie over a day be waived on all bills which we have heretofore announced we would take up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LATE SESSION TONIGHT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like all Senators to know that it is planned to have a late session this evening. We hope to be able to take up the auto dealers bill after we dispose of the pending business. We hope to proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, and complete action before we conclude the session tonight. We may act on the theater admission bill before the evening is over, because it is desired to clear as much legislation as possible before the week is over.

THE DEPRESSED AREA BILL—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous consent request will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That after the adoption of this agreement, it shall be in order to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2663, the so-called depressed area bill; that no amendment to the committee substitute shall be in order, except certain amendments to be proposed by Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. DIRKSEN, respectively; that on the amendments to be proposed by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which shall be considered and voted upon en bloc, debate shall be limited to 30 minutes, and upon the other amendments to be proposed a 30-minute limitation also shall be allowed respectively; that the time on the above amendments shall be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of such amendments and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That after the disposition of the above amendments, the committee amendment, whether amended or not, shall be voted upon without further debate; and that on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make sure that in case any difficulty arises I may reserve the right——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator's amendment is covered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know; and I think that is all correct. I merely wanted to be certain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The chairman has told me that he would accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With that understanding, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AWARD FOR INJURIES TO CERTAIN MILITARY PERSONNEL—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may state a proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of H. R. 2845, providing a statutory award for injuries to certain military personnel, no amendments shall be in order, and debate on the said bill shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, the agreement is entered.

THE SOUND FREE-ENTERPRISE POSITION OF VENEZUELA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the newspapers of the past few days have reported two contrasting actions which I think well deserve the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

Both of these actions relate to a great resource of the free world—the petroleum resource—a resource on which I have previously commented on March 21, 1956. Both of these actions involve countries which are our good friends, and for whom we rightly have a high regard.

The one action—in the Old World—involves Italy; the other action is in the New World, and involves Venezuela.

In the one newspaper report, we learned that the Italian Parliament is, unfortunately, approving highly restrictive legislation with regard to the development of Italy's oil resource. Indeed, the law is reported to be so rigid as to make it perhaps virtually impossible for foreign capital to come in, to make a fair return on its investment, and to help develop the oil resource as it should be developed.

The other news reports convey more welcome news. The news is that the Government of Venezuela through its regular bid and award procedure, is in the process of developing the vast additional petroleum resources with which that great country is blessed.

Thus, on the one hand, additional foreign capital will pour into Venezuela; on the other hand, unfortunately, foreign capital may be completely frozen out of Italy's oil industry.

I do not like to draw this contrast, and I certainly do not do so to reflect upon our good Italian friends.

Of course, what a government does inside its own boundaries is its own prerogative. We shall continue to have the warmest sentiments of friendship for the Italian Government and people. But we are forced to the reluctant conclusion that, in this instance, in our frank appraisal, our Italian friends are not following a policy which will best serve the interest of Italy itself. That, I repeat, however, is their prerogative, if they are so inclined.

On the other hand, I want to say the warmest word of commendation for the Government of President Marcos Perez Jimenez of Venezuela. That Government has welcomed foreign capital. It has treated foreign capital in a fair, friendly, sound, and equitable manner.

Let me state quite clearly that the Venezuelan Government has amply protected the sovereign rights of the people of Venezuela. There is no so-called "exploitation" by foreign interests; on the contrary, there is genuine partnership, genuine teamwork, between foreign and Venezuelan interests. As a result, there is prosperity for Venezuela and prosperity for the United States and for the rest of the free world.

The free nations will get equitable benefit from the present tapped and untapped reserves of Venezuela. The Venezuelan people in turn benefit, because payments received for the oil are plowed back—sown back—into the land, so to speak. The result is a huge program of internal development and modernization in Venezuela. That program has set a breathtaking example for the rest of the hemisphere and the world—an example of how a people's mineral resource can be constructively applied for their own benefit. Within the space of but a few years, Venezuela has literally been transformed. Standards of living have been elevated, and foreign capital has proven what private enterprise can accomplish.

I should like now to quote from a message which I think expresses sentiments felt here in the Congress. The message is from Mr. Joseph Davidson, of Washington, D. C., who for 35 years has been active in petroleum affairs in Latin American countries, particularly in Venezuela. It reads in part:

JULY 25, 1956.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Ranking Republican, United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I recall with pleasure your many fine statements to others and myself, as well as on the Senate floor, on the issue of free-enterprise development in the Western Hemisphere.

I thought, therefore, I would drop this little note to you on the occasion of the news from Venezuela, so welcomed by the free world, indicating the further splendid and equitable cooperation with foreign capital, on the part of the administration of Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez, one of the most brilliant men to appear on the Western Hemisphere scene in the past century.

You, Senator WILEY, have frequently pointed out how a friendly climate for foreign capital can result in mutual prosperity for the country which welcomes the foreign capital and for the country from which the capital comes.

Venezuela is the most dramatic single instance, confirming the unparalleled benefits for a nation and a people—benefits which a favorable climate for free-enterprise capital can achieve. In that friendly climate, maximum national initiative has been stimulated inside Venezuela, and the genius, know-how, and resources of America's own great petroleum industry have been fully utilized.

It is the hope, I know, of the petroleum industry, and, yes, of other United States industries, that other countries may be encouraged similarly to welcome foreign capital, as Venezuelan President Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez has done so wisely and effectively. Your own additional fine efforts toward that goal will, I know, be appreciated. Your endeavors will be applauded by all those who believe in the free-enterprise system—in our land, among our good neighbors to the south, particularly in Venezuela, in Canada to the north, and throughout other friendly nations.

With assurance of personal esteem, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH DAVIDSON.

Mr. President, I do indeed pledge my own continued effort for this purpose; and I know that, as Mr. Davidson indicated, I am joined by Members of the Congress who so firmly believe in the value of free-enterprise development.

THE A. S. KAY CONVALESCENT CENTER FOR THE DISABLED VETERANS OF ISRAEL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am always pleased to note humanitarian activities performed by generous American philanthropists on behalf of the fulfillment of needs at home and abroad.

Certainly, there are few groups more deserving of assistance than those who, on the field of battle have risked their lives in the interest of preserving their country's freedom and independence. That is why I have noted with pleasure the fine work of the World Veterans' Federation.

It is why, too, right here at home, I am a vigorous supporter of legislation to improve the veterans' pension program in our own Nation. It is why I have urged the Senate Finance Committee to take action on the numerous veterans' bills which the House of Representatives has passed, and which now lie before the committee on our side of the Hill.

But certainly the heart of America is big enough and warm enough to do our part, if only in a small way abroad, to help others fulfill foreign needs, as well. Our basic interest is, of course, in looking after the needs of our own people, first and foremost; but America's sympathies do not stop at our borders.

So many Americans have noted with gratification the generous action of Mr. A. S. Kay, long prominent in the construction industry in our Nation's Capital, in donating funds for the construction of a 150-bed center for the disabled veterans of Israel, at Nahiryah, between Haifa and Acre, on the Mediterranean. This great pioneering project will fulfill the needs of the presently handicapped men and women who fought so heroically against overwhelming odds in Israel's war of independence, when invading armies poured in from every side, and when only the courage of an ancient people stood between survival and utter destruction.

The cornerstone for the buildings was laid by Mr. Kay on May 7, 1955. Actual construction, I understand, will be completed in the spring of next year. It will be an inspiring day—for Israel, which donated the land for the buildings; for the veterans and their loved ones; and for Mr. Kay, himself, a veteran of our own forces in the First World War.

The center will prove an additional measure of gratitude to those who performed deeds of gallantry. The gratitude of whom? The gratitude of the Israeli Government and people. The gratitude of Jewish coreligionists abroad, and of men and women of good will—of all religions—who admire the democratic bastion of Israel.

As we all know, our own country is, of course, the richest in the world, and can well afford a comprehensive program for our exservicemen.

However, other lands with meager resources, cannot. This is particularly so in the case of a relatively poor land like Israel, whose population has been swollen by the ingathering of exiles, and whose borders are still menaced, thus requiring considerable outlays for defense purposes. So, regrettably, Israel, with her heavy defense and other commitments, can hardly afford all that she might otherwise gratefully do for her exservicemen—particularly for their convalescence and rehabilitation.

So I commend this philanthropic step by Mr. Kay. I hope that other generous-hearted individuals will follow in the splendid path which he and others have now set, and I congratulate him on this most excellent service in the name of humanity.

ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 985) to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, which were on page 1, line 5, strike out "eleven" and insert "twelve"; on page 1, line 11, strike out "three" and insert "four"; on page 2, line 2, strike out all after "from", down through and including "Army" in line 3, and insert "the Department of the Army, to be designated by the Secretary of the Army"; on page 2, line 4, strike out "and one from the Department of State" and insert "one from the Department of State, and one from the Department of Commerce"; on page 2, line 11,

strike out "six" and insert "seven"; on page 2, after line 14, insert:

(d) The appointment of an officer of the Army on the active list as a member of the Commission is authorized as an exception to section 1222, Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 576), and does not vacate his appointment as a commissioned officer of the Army.

And on page 3, line 7, strike out all after "Alaska" down through and including "trench" in line 8.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL AS CIVILIAN AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1135) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes", which were on page 2, strike out lines 11 through 22 and insert:

"(b) In administering that act for Members covered by this section—

"(1) the monthly pay of such a member shall, for the purpose of computing compensation for disability or death, be considered to be $300;

"(2) the percentages applicable to payments under section 10 of that act are—

"(A) 45 percent for clause (C) of that section, in any case where the member died fully or currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act, with no additional payments for a child or children so long as the widow or wiower remains eligible for payments under that clause;

"(B) 20 percent for clause (D) of that section, for one child and 10 percent additional for each additional child, but not more than a total of 75 percent, in any case where the member died fully or currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act; and

"(C) 25 percent for clause (E) of that section, if one parent was wholly dependent for support upon the deceased member at the time of his death and the other was not dependent to any extent; 16 percent to each, if both were wholly dependent; and if one was, or both were, partly dependent, a proportionate amount in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor;

"(3) no payments may be made under clause (F) of that section;

"(4) the term 'performance of duty', as used in that act, means only active service, and travel to and from such service, rendered in performance or support of operational missions of the Civil Air Patrol, under direction of the Department of the Air Force, and under written authorization by competent authority covering a specific assignment and prescribing a time limit for such assignment; and

"(5) the Secretary of Labor, or his designee, shall inform the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare whenever a claim is filed and eligibility for compensation is established under clause (C) or clause (D) of section 10 of that act, and that Secretary shall then certify to the Secretary of Labor as to whether or not the member concerned was fully or currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act at the time of his death."

And on page 4, after line 11, insert:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 760 of title 14, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$150" in subsection (a) and inserting "$300" in lieu thereof; and

(2) by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) In administering the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for persons covered by this section—

"(1) the percentages applicable to payments under section 10 of that act are—

"(A) 45 percent for clause (C) of that section, in any case where the member died fully or currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act, with no additional payments for a child or children so long as the widow or widower remains eligible for payments under that clause;

"(B) 20 percent for clause (D) of that section, for one child, and 10 percent additional for each additional child, but not more than a total of 75 percent, in any case where the member died fully or currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act; and

"(C) 25 percent for clause (E) of that section, if one parent was wholly dependent for support upon the deceased member at the time of his death and the other was not dependent to any extent; 16 percent to each if both were wholly dependent; and if one was, or both were, partly dependent, a proportionate amount in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor;

"(2) no payments may be made under clause (F) of that section; and

"(3) the Secretary of Labor or his designee shall inform the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare whenever a claim is filed and eligibility for compensation is established under clause (C) or clause (D) of section 10 of that act, and that Secretary shall then certify to the Secretary of Labor as to whether or not the member concerned was fully or currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act at the time of his death."

(b) The amendments made by this section apply only to benefits for months beginning after the month in which it is enacted.

(c) The entitlement of any person to benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as it was in effect before the enactment of this section is not affected by this section.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the effect of the House amendments to S. 1135 is—

First. To modify the Federal Employees Compensation Act benefits payable to survivors of Civil Air Patrol members so that they are consistent with benefits that may be paid survivors of persons in the lowest military commissioned grade under the Survivor Benefits Act; and

Second. To raise from $150 to $300 the assumed monthly wage on which benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act would be paid to survivors of members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary.

The House amendments were considered by the Committee on Armed Services on July 19 and the committee recommends acceptance of the amendments.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1456) to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which were on page 2, line 17, after "219" insert "(a)"; on page 2, line 20, strike out "the section" and insert "such section 219 (a)"; on page 4, line 2, after "agreements" insert ", arrangements, or contracts affecting the same, as the Commission may require", and on page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike out "the section" and insert "such section 410 (a)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendments added by the House are of a perfecting nature.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

REGULATION OF INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MIGRANT FARMWORKERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3391) to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farmworkers, which were on page 2, after line 18 insert "Such requirements shall apply to any such carrier only in the case of transportation of any migrant worker for a total distance of more than 75 miles, and then only if such transportation is across the boundary line of any State, the District of Columbia, or Territory of the United States, or a foreign country.", and on page 3, line 4, strike out "section 2 of this act" and insert "section 204 (a) (3a) of the Interstate Commerce Act."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one of the House amendments is of a technical perfecting nature. The other House amendment provides that the reasonable requirements to be established by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the transportation of migrant farm workers shall apply only in the case of transportation for a total distance of more than 75 miles, and then only if such transportation is across the boundary line of any State, the District of Columbia, or Territory of the United States, or a foreign country.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MARCH 3, 1901, RELATING TO THE USE OF THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND BY NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2060) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices, which were on page 2, line 6, strike out "subect" and insert "subject"; on page 2, line 6, strike out "adustment" and insert "adjustment"; and on page 3, line 7, strike out "the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449)" and insert "this act."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendments added by the House correct typographical errors in the bill and make minor perfecting changes.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1833) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, which were on page 2, line 5, after "valuation" insert "(exclusive of National Defense features paid for by the Government)"; on page 2, line 10, after "vessel," insert "for the period of insurance prior to requisition for title or use,"; on page 2, line 14, after "features)" insert ", and for the period of insurance after requisition for use the valuation so determined shall not exceed the amount which would be payable under section 802 in the case of requisition for title or use; on page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike out all after "valuation," down through and including "policy" in line 20 and insert "and shall pay, at the rate provided for in said policy, premiums upon such asserted valuation as the insured shall specify at the time of rejection, but such asserted valuation shall not operate to the prejudice of the Government in any subsequent action on the policy"; on page 3, line 10, after "compensation" insert "for any period of insurance prior to actual requisition for title or use of the vessel", and on page 3, line 14, after "features)" insert ", and for any period of insurance after actual requisition for use, the valuation determined by the court shall be the amount which would have been payable under section 802 in the case of requisition for title."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendments added by the House are of a perfecting nature. They were suggested by the Comptroller General of the United States who informed the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that he offered no objection to the legislation if the amendments were incorporated therein.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

TOWN OF CLAYTON, N. MEX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 218) for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex., which were, on page 1, line 11, after "shall", insert "for the sole purpose of releasing the town of liability based upon those costs," and on page 2, strike out lines 4 through 13.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the House made two changes in the Senate bill. First, it added a provision to make it clear that the town was to be relieved of liability only for the costs of the construction described in the bill. The second amendment was to strike from the bill section 2, which would have authorized payment to the town of the sum of approximately $4,000 covering specific project costs. The House apparently felt this might result in a duplicate payment of this amount and deleted the section. In view of the fact that we are in the closing days of the session and there is probably not time for a conference, the sponsor of the legislation has suggested that we accept the House amendments. Accordingly, I move that the Senate concur therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT FROM ERICSSON MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States, which were on page 2, line 8, strike out "public or private,"; on page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out "reimburse the United States for amounts expended under" and insert "carry out", and on page 2 strike out lines 11 through 16.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the joint resolution deals with Leif Ericsson Memorial. We have finally been able to get an agreement on it.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relating to the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve under the auspices of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

When the Senate passed the Mutual Security Act of 1956 it added a new section 11 (d), expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should explore with other nations the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve under the auspices of the United Nations. This reserve was to be organized with a view to (1) preventing extreme price fluctuations in the international market in these commodities; (2) preventing famine and starvation; (3) helping absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials (exclusive of minerals); and (4) economic and social development programs formulated in cooperation with other appropriate international agencies.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in a study entitled "Functions of a World Food Reserve—Scope and Limitations" shows that these four objectives are contradictory and cannot be incorporated in one package. At the very time this bill was before the Senate our delegation to the United Nations Economic and Social Council was on its way to Geneva to oppose this concept. Fortunately, the final version of the Mutual Security Act of 1956 does not contain this provision. The entire section dealing with the international food and raw materials reserve was dropped in the House-Senate conference.

The international food and raw materials reserve provisions described above were also presented to the Senate in Senate Resolutions 85 and 86. A complete list of the witnesses who had appeared before the Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee having jurisdiction of Senate Resolutions 85 and 86 is given on page 54 of Senate Report 2273 on the Mutual Security Act of 1956. The only farm organization listed was the National Farmers Union. The American Farm Bureau Federation was conspicuous by its absence. The leaders of that great organization, however, were not unaware of the stake that American agriculture had in this proposal. I include a short article which appeared in the American Farm Bureau Federation's Official News Letter of July 16, 1956, entitled "Farm Bureau Wins Victory on MSA Bill."

"FARM BUREAU WINS VICTORY ON MSA BILL

"The American Farm Bureau Federation scored an important victory—virtually single handedly—before congressional passage of the mutual security authorization bill.

"The measure is now awaiting a Presidential signature at the White House.

"When the bill was up for Senate consideration, an amendment was inserted following a brief hearing to which many organizations, including the AFBF were not invited. The amendment would have required President Eisenhower to consult with other nations on the possible development of a world food bank plan.

"Farm Bureau has warned that such a plan, not carefully considered, might have grave implications for the Nation and for United States agriculture. It would give a world organization the right to tap United States surplus resources of farm commodities. At the same time it might deprive this Nation of proper control of distribution.

"When conflicting House and Senate versions of the legislation went to a conference committee, Farm Bureau persuaded the conferees that world food bank plans would be given congressional study. And the amendment was stricken from the authorization bill finally enacted."

On July 6, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the magazine U. S. A. by its editor, Alice Widener. In inserting this article I was not endorsing her characterizations of any of the individuals mentioned. I inserted the article because it clearly showed that the witnesses who appeared on behalf of Senate Resolutions 85 and 86 were not averse to Government interference in free markets. Such a point of view obviously does not make one a Communist, and I did not suggest that any of the persons mentioned were Communists. I believe that their own writings which Mrs. Widener assembled to furnish valuable information to assist the Senate in weighing the evidence they submitted to the Senate committee.

In the July 13 issue of U. S. A. Mrs. Widener has written another article entitled "As Time Goes By." This article contains information which explains why the Farmers Union would not necessarily be opposed to a measure which the American Farm Bureau Federation warns "might have grave implications for the Nation and for United States

agriculture." I believe the information she has assembled should be a part of the record which will be before us when this proposal once again comes before the Congress in future years as I am sure it will. This article is useful as it reminds us of the social and political climate in which we lived only a few years ago. She reconstructs the activities of George Marshall (not to be confused with Gen. George Marshall) who was the head of the Civil Rights Congress and of the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the main sources of funds for the Communist Party.

It is sometimes necessary, though unpleasant, to be reminded of the past. Almost coincidentally, the New York Times in its book review section of July 1, 1956, announced a new book by the late Robert Marshall entitled "Arctic Wilderness." It is edited and contains an introduction by George Marshall who is a brother of the late Robert Marshall and whose actiivties Mrs. Widener describes fully in As Time Goes By." From the New York Times review, one would get the impression that the Marshalls are great patriots and only interested in the preservation of wildlife. The last sentence of the review in the New York Times makes me apprehensive. It said:

"The present-day invasion of Alaska's remote wilderness areas for defense purposes makes this appeal of Bob Marshall for their preservation timely and even urgent."

I wonder whether this is another disguised attempt to weaken our Arctic defenses.

I include excerpts from the article entitled "As Time Goes By," by Alice Widener, with my remarks at this point:

"As time goes by, we are able to take a longer view of the years of our century and to gain a clearer perspective of human events.

"U. S. A. believes that the main threat to our country now lies in the Socialist effort to destroy the free economy of capitalism. During the 5 fateful months of July–November 1956, when the United States will hold its 46th presidential election and the United Nations will initiate its 11th General Assembly, we can try to assess the * * * damage done to America in the last 50 years. * * *

"The article, A Key Resolution, in our issue of June 29, 1956, set forth facts concerning the dangerous Senate Resolution 86, which is sponsored by 23 Senators and would express the 'sense of the Senate' that the President of the United States should enter into negotiations through the United Nations to establish an international food and raw materials reserve. Such a scheme would replace a free, competitive market in the world's basic materials with a system of bureaucratic controls. Of necessity domestic controls would have to be established to implement the scheme of the world planners. Such controls are completely at variance with our system of private enterprise.

"SENATOR BRIDGES STOOD WATCH

"Among the witnesses in favor of Resolution 86 at hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, May 28–29, 1956, was James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union. This is an organization through which the Communists hoped to gain control over agriculture in our country, a fact pointed out by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, on September 7, 1950.

"In a well-documented speech largely based on correspondence between James Patton and Gardner Jackson (a former official of the National Farmers Union and an original trustee of the Robert Marshall Foundation) Senator BRIDGES quoted as follows from a House report:

" 'The Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union has been handsomely subsidized by the Robert Marshall Foundation. The monthly contribution to the Farmers Union from the Robert Marshall Foundation has been $7,500.'

"Apparently the go-between for James Patton of the Farmers Union and the Marshall fund was Mr. Lement Harris. When he testified at hearings on Communist activities among farm groups held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, February 28, 1951, Mr. Harris several times invoked the fifth amendment. Concerning George Marshall, president of the Robert Marshall Foundation, and James Patton of the National Farmers Union, there was the following testimony:

" 'Mr. TAVENNER (counsel for the committee). My question now is, Was a contribution made from the Marshall fund to the operation of the Farmers Union?

" 'Mr. HARRIS. It was general knowledge in Farmers Union circles that the Marshall fund made a contribution. To the best of my memory it appeared on the statement which would be passed out by the proper authorities at the Farmers Union conventions.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. Was your knowledge of it purely from that source, general information on the subject, or did you have some connection with obtaining funds from the Marshall fund?

" 'Mr. HARRIS. On the latter part of your question, the obtaining of the funds, I think that brings us again into an area that could involve jeopardy to me and self-incrimination, so I won't answer that question. I would like to give it some thought.

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't mean to infer that you put any pressure on anybody, and I don't think the text of the letter implies it. But did you have a conversation with James G. Patton regarding the remaining funds of the Marshall Foundation?

" 'Mr. HARRIS. I have met Mr. Patton a few times. Never had any long conversations with him. The nearest to this that I can recall in rather a vague way is that at some time Mr. Patton expressed his warm feeling toward Mr. (George) Marshall. He probably said: "He is a fine person," with which I believe I agreed.'

"SOCIALISM SUBSIDIZED

"The Robert Marshall Foundation (established by the will of the late Robert Marshall) provided funds for furthering doctrinaire Marxism in our country through 'the education of the people of the United States of America to the necessity and desirability of the development and organization of unions of persons engaged in work or of unemployed persons, and the promotion and advancement of an economic system in the United States based upon the theory of production for use and not for profit.'

"Robert Marshall's brother, George, became administrator of the foundation. Mr. George Marshall has a most interesting background. He supplied $20,000 bail for Communist Gerhart Eisler. As chairman of the subversive Civil Rights Congress, George Marshall directed the raising of a $250,000 defense fund for the Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act in Judge Medina's court. On June 5, 1950, George Marshall received a 90-day jail sentence for contempt of Congress.

"George Marshall married Miss Elizabeth Dublin whose sister, Mary, is married to Leon Keyserling, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under former President Truman.

"During the Truman administration, Mary Dublin Keyserling served as Chief of the Special Programs Branch, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce. Prior to her marriage to Leon Keyserling, Mary Dublin and her brother-in-law, George Marshall, participated in activities of the following organizations cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities: American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, American Committee To Save Refugees, American Council on Soviet Relations, Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, Signers of the Open Letter to American Liberals.

"The open letter to American liberals—signed by Mary Dublin, George Marshall, and many other leftwingers—was an attack on so-called Trotskyites who questioned the validity of the Moscow trials in the 1930's. * * * Recent public statements made by Khrushchev lend added significance to the following excerpts from the open letter:

" 'A number of persons joined the Trotsky defense committee (headed by John Dewey) for the purpose of defending the right of asylum for Trotsky and to provide him with "the fullest opportunity to state his case." Since Trotsky is now safely domiciled in Mexico, the right of asylum is no longer an issue. The Mexican Government and the American press have certainly allowed him full freedom of expression in his own defense.

" 'Under these circumstances it is proper to inquire into the nature of the further activities of the committee, since we believe it likely that these were not endorsed by its liberal members.

" 'Its publications have included not only violent attacks on the Moscow trials, but bitter denunciations of the Soviet Government. Speakers at meetings sponsored by the committee have not merely defended Trotsky and his theories, but have gone so far in their attacks on the Soviet regime as to advocate armed uprising.

" 'One of the announced purposes of the committee is the organization of "a complete and impartial investigation of the Moscow trials." The 33 defendants in the trials under attack all confessed fully the crimes of high treason of which they were convicted. Impartial observers and newspaper correspondents present at the trials have reported that the trials were properly conducted and the accused fairly and judicially treated.

" 'The committee has offered no shred of evidence to the contrary. The demand for an investigation of trials carried on under the legally constituted judicial system of the Soviet Government can only be interpreted as political intervention in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union with hostile intent.

" 'We believe that it is imperative, in the interest of separating liberal ideas from active hostility against the Soviet Union, that liberal members of the committee, who presumably have no hostile intent against that nation but whose names are being used to further these hostile purposes, should clarify their position on the following questions:

" 'Are you willing to ally yourselves, even incidentally, with the internal political movement which has opposed the progressive movement undertaken by the Soviet Union under the 5-year plan, and the Soviet foreign policy of peace and international understanding and other achievements which have commanded the respect of liberals throughout the world?

" 'Should not a country recognized as engaged in improving conditions for all its people, whether or not one agrees with all the means whereby this is brought about, be permitted to decide for itself what measures of protection are necessary against treasonable plots to assassinate and overthrow its leadership and involve it in war with foreign powers?'

"Mary Dublin, who endorsed the foregoing statements, was also on the board of editors of the League for Industrial Democracy, an organization completely dedicated to the promotion of socialism.

* * * * *

"In her job as a United States Government employee, Mary Dublin reported to Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce under the Truman administration until his resignation at the end of 1950. Secretary Blaisdell's wife, Catherine, and his

father were witnesses to the last testament of Robert Marshall establishing the Robert Marshall Foundation to promote * * * production for use and not for profit in America.

"The record of times gone by reveals that from 1935 to 1939 Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., was a member and then chairman of the Industrial Committee of the National Resources Committee established in 1935 by President Roosevelt. Among the members of his Industrial Committee during those 4 years were Isadore Lubin, Lauchlin Currie, and Harry Dexter White.

"In 1939, the name National Resources Committee was changed to National Resources Planning Board. Mr. Blaisdell retained his post as chairman of the Industrial Committee, and Messrs. Lubin, Currie, and White remained members, as is shown in the official report to the President dated June 1941.

* * * * *

"The close association * * * is also revealed in the book Redirecting Education, by Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Leon Keyserling, and Rexford G. Tugwell. The following typical passages were written by Mr. Keyserling, who played such an important part in shaping the economic policies of the Truman administration:

" 'Meditation convinces one that the present college mirrors as accurately as its predecessors the social philosophy and the aspirations of American life. The elective system does so in two respects. In the first place, it is subservient to the doctrines of individualism and laissez faire * * *. In addition, the needs of business, individualistically conceived, are so varied that no prescription could hope to succeed. The theory of the elective system is thus a concomitant of the theory of business enterprise. Secondly, belief in the elective system parallels the unbounded confidence in quantitative production without organized control or reference to defined goals. * * *

" 'The athletic and social impediments of the college also recruit their chief apologists from the ranks of those who accept uncritically the entire scale of values descending from the late nineties. The typical American businessman supports competitive intercollegiate athletics not purely because he enjoys a football game, but because he believes that carrying a pigskin builds the qualities he values most in the world. And he is correct. The victory which can be won only by pulverizing an opponent, the drive toward the goal merely because it is designated as such, the rigid subordination to a kind of crude discipline, all earn big rewards in an acquisitive society.

" 'The same thing is true in a large way of collegiate social life. Social intercourse should be the external trapping of friendship, and friendship cannot be competed for. But under present conditions a great deal of college society is on the fraternity basis. This means it is on the "rushing" basis, or the competitive basis—an impeccable preparation for the businessman's civilization, where clients may be met or customers won over by ingenuity in entertainment. Success in one area implies aptitude for the other, and thus the apotheosis of the "go-getter" continues.

" 'It is interesting to note that the system is deemed true to its function even when it encourages a full measure of idlers. It is claimed that the machine age will put us all at ease, and that we must learn to use our leisure. But at this particular moment it should not be necessary to labor the point that man cannot master the machine by learning how to use leisure, and that until he gains this mastery, leisure will remain the gift of society to the unemployed.

" 'This summary analysis indicates that American educational ideals, today as completely as at any other time, stem from the thoughts and aspirations of the people, which are framed in a current ideology. The favored dogma at present involves belief in societal perfection by means of individualism, laissez faire, and an unguided prolific productivity, all set directly in the context of business success.

" 'The direction of educational enterprise might be altered if that favored dogma were abandoned or modified. On the social and economic side, laissez faire is demonstrably a failure. It does not guard against the two great menaces of the age—poverty and war. Conjunctive activity of some sort is necessary for a frontal attack upon these evils. An educational process which does not relate to new social goals, which remains the outcome of the 19th-century view of things, must be an impediment rather than an implement. It cannot justify itself by reciting ideals which have lost their setting.'

"HINDSIGHT LEADS TO FORESIGHT

"The study of 20-year-old documents may seem to some persons a mere matter of trying to exercise destructive political and economic hindsight. But commonsense tells us that it is difficult to know where we actually are if we don't know where we have been. 'No man who is correctly informed about the past,' wrote Thomas McCaulay, 'will be disposed to take a morose or desponding view of the present.'

* * * * *

"Aware of the record, Americans will know that resolution 86 is favored by long-time * * * associates in the National Farmers Union, United Automobile Workers, Americans for Democratic Action, and other * * * organizations.

"Only 2 years ago, there appeared in the press the following news item:

" 'KEYSERLING HIRED

" 'DENVER.—Leon H. Keyserling, who was Chairman of former President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, was hired Saturday by the National Farmers Union as economic consultant.'

"Thus Messrs. Leon Keyserling and James G. Patton are working closely together in the Farmers Union and also in the executive committee of a new organization—known as the Conference on Economic Progress—which includes Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW, and M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives. Mr. Thatcher used to be chairman of the national legislative committee of the Farmers Union.

"The new Conference on Economic Progress has published a number of studies. * * * The conference has announced its intention to consider the subjects of technology, productivity, automation, social security, education, and housing.

"Who are the persons chosen to make these studies?

* * * * *

"Of course the Conference on Economic Progress studies will be made by Leon H. Keyserling and his wife, Mary Dublin Keyserling."

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT TO FACILITATE PRIVATE FINANCING OF MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has suggested, the matter to which I am about to refer can be taken care of in about a minute. There is on the calendar, Order No. 2677, H. R. 11554, which is a bill to amend certain provisions of the Merchant Marine Act regarding facilities for private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The bill has been discussed with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He has stated that any objections he had to the bill have been removed. He has discussed the matter with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. It is a very important bill. It provides for 100-percent insurance features for vessels for special purposes, and was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Washington to say that he had talked with the Senator from Maryland, who had talked with the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. And the senior Senator from Delaware has concurred in this proposal?

Mr. BUTLER. I was about to address myself to that point. I had a conversation with the senior Senator from Delaware, and he has stated to me that he would not insist upon his amendment; nor would he object to the disposal of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. BUTLER. I have also talked with the minority leader, and I believe the minority leader talked with the majority leader about the bill. There is no objection to the bill.

Mr. FREAR. That being the case, I certainly offer no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall ask unanimous consent to have the report on the bill printed in full in the RECORD.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the senior Senator from Delaware been advised of the fact that the bill would be called up at this time? He is not on the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. The senior Senator from Delaware has just entered the Chamber. I have heretofore talked to him about the bill. He said any objection he had to it had been removed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I object. No one has cleared the bill with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask the majority leader whether he will agree to have the bill considered at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader will be glad to consider it in the regular order. We have two bills pending now. The bill the Senator referred to has not been cleared by the minority committee. The Senator from Delaware is entitled to be notified before the bill is taken up.

Mr. BUTLER. The senior Senator from Delaware is here now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It will not be taken up now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May we have the assurance of the majority leader that it will be taken up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader will be glad to discuss it with the minority leader.

Mr. BUTLER. I have talked to the Senator from Delaware about the bill, and it was my understanding that the minority leader would talk with the majority leader about it. I do not want any

implication left on the RECORD of the Senate that there is anything improper about bringing the bill up at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is something improper about not clearing it with the majority leader. I am objecting because it has not been cleared. I will object to any other bills which have not been cleared. The minority leader has not asked me to bring it up.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry that the minority leader did not talk to the Senator about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will discuss the bill with the majority leader.

Mr. BUTLER. The RECORD should be clear that I talked about it with the Senator from Delaware and with the minority leader.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will discuss it with the majority leader.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TOWN OF NORTH KINGSTOWN, R. I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3195) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I., which were on page 1, line 7, after "town" insert ", upon payment by said town of the fair market value of said property as determined by said Administrator after competent appraisal and upon such terms and conditions as may in the determination of said Administrator be necessary to protect the interest of the United States", and on page 2, strike out line 20 over through and including line 3 on page 3.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3316) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey, without consideration therefor, to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described properties, real and personal: The dwelling house located on lot 5, block 29, in the said city of Roseburg, Oreg., together with furniture, personal effects, and jewelry stored in said dwelling house or elsewhere which has been designated by said Administrator as "lot A personalty," all of said property being a part of the estate of Lillie Lela Moore devised to the United States by said Lillie Lela Moore under provisions of her will probated in 1940 which has since been declared surplus to the needs of the United States.

Such conveyance, in addition to being subject to such terms and conditions as may be considered by said Administrator to be necessary to protect the interest of the United States, shall be expressly conditioned upon an undertaking by the city of Roseburg, Oreg., that such dwelling house, together with said items of personal property, shall, within a reasonable period of time as determined by said Administrator, be transferred by the city of Roseburg to the Douglas County Historical Society and removed from said land without cost to the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST MERGERS AND CONSOLIDATION OF BANKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3911) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidation of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wonder whether we cannot proceed to dispose of the pending business. I understand that the Douglas amendment is pending. I wonder whether we cannot dispose of that amendment and then proceed to dispose of the bill. We have been waiting for a long time. If there are no more speeches to be made on it, perhaps we could vote on the amendment and then on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3911) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "No insured bank shall merge or consolidate with any other insured bank or, either directly or indirectly, acquire the assets of, or assume liability to pay any deposits made in, any other insured bank without the prior written consent (i) of the Comptroller of the Currency if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a national bank or a district bank or (ii) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a district bank), or (iii) of the Corporation if the acquiring, assuming, or resulting bank is to be a nonmember insured bank (except a district bank). In granting or withholding consent under this subsection, the Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall consider the factors enumerated in section 6 of this act. In the case of a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration whether the effect thereof may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly, and, in the interests of uniform standards, it shall not take action as to any such transaction without first seeking the views of each of the other two banking agencies referred to herein with respect to such question; and in such a case the appropriate agency may also request the opinion of the Attorney General with respect to such question."

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO REGULATION OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property, which were on page 3, line 11, strike out "(17)," and insert "(17)", and on page 3, line 12, strike out all after "of" down to and including "(6)" in line 14, and insert "property of a character embraced within section 203 (b) (6) or perishable products manufactured from perishable property of a character embraced within section 203 (b) (6)."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the House amendments were discussed at a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and it was the unanimous view of the committee that the Senate should agree to them. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement concerning S. 898.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

S. 898, as originally passed by the Senate, provided for trip leasing of motor vehicles owned by farmers, cooperative associations and vehicles of private carriers. The bill included a restriction that private vehicles to be eligible for trip leasing must be "used regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6)" of the Interstate Commerce Act. (This section of the act sets forth the agricultural exemption and removes from economic regulation of the Commission motor vehicles used in carrying ordinary livestock, fish, including shellfish, or agricultural commodities but not including the manufactured products thereof.)

Thus, in addition to exempting vehicles used for moving farm products the intent of the bill as passed by the Senate was to limit trip leasing by private carriers to those carriers carrying perishable agricultural products or perishable products manufactured therefrom.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported the bill to the

House with the purpose of providing exactly the same regulation for which the Senate bill provided. Aside from a single change in punctuation, the only change made by the House Committee was a slight modification in wording concerning private carriers subject to trip leasing. The wording was changed to provide that private vehicles to be eligible for trip leasing must transport "property of a character embraced within section 203 (b) (6) or perishable products manufactured from perishable property of a character embraced within section 203 (b) (6)." The House passed the bill with that amendment.

In my opinion, the House version contains clearer wording than does that of the Senate. The aim of the legislation is exactly the same. Therefore, I recommend that the House language be adopted.

ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE COMMITTEES ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOLS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Monday the Senate passed S. 4211, to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes.

On the same day, the House passed H. R. 12237, on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 4211 was passed, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 12237) to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 12237) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill S. 4211 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill is indefinitely postponed.

SUPPLEMENTATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3879) to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That as used in this act—

(a) The term "automobile manufacturer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of passenger cars, trucks, or station wagons, including any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for and is under the control of such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles.

(b) The term "franchise" shall mean the written agreement or contract between any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce and any automobile dealer which purports to fix the legal rights and liabilities of the parties to such agreement or contract.

(c) The term "automobile dealer" shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise resident in the United States or in any Territory thereof or in the District of Columbia operating under the terms of a franchise and engaged in the sale or distribution of passenger cars, trucks, or station wagons.

(d) The term "commerce" shall mean commerce among the several States of the United States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or among the Territories or between any Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation.

(e) The term "good faith" shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise, and all officers, employees, or agents thereof to act in a fair and equitable manner toward each other so as to guarantee the one party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation from the other party: *Provided*, That recommendation, endorsement, exposition, persuasion, urging or argument shall not be deemed to constitute a lack of good faith.

SEC. 2. An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce, in any district court of the United States in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of suit by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer from and after the passage of this act to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer: *Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith.

SEC. 3. Any action brought pursuant to this act shall be forever barred unless commenced within 3 years after the cause of action shall have accrued.

SEC. 4. No provision of this act shall repeal, modify, or supersede, directly or indirectly, any provision of the antitrust laws of the United States.

SEC. 5. This act shall not invalidate any provision of the laws of any State except insofar as there is a direct conflict between an express provision of this act and an express provision of State law which cannot be reconciled.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in understanding that the order of business is the consideration of the House amendment to the Senate bill dealing with the automobile dealers' day in court?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I promised the minority leader that a quorum call would be had so that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] might be notified. So, Mr. President, pending notification of the Senator from Ohio, I should be glad to have the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] make a statement.

I may say, however, before he takes the floor, that on behalf of the Judiciary Committee and the members of the subcommittee which handled the hearings on this day-in-court bill, I intend to move that the Senate agree to the House amendment. I am ready to discuss the amendment, but I yield to the Senator from Utah to make a preliminary statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am sure that many automobile dealers in the United States are in accord with the position I take. I agree that the dealers want some help, but I am greatly concerned about the form in which this bill has come before us. The automobile dealers of the United States face many other problems, two of which bother them particularly, one, being the fear that their franchise can be canceled arbitrarily. It is the purpose of this bill to prevent such arbitrary cancellation. The other problem is the realization that there has developed in the past few years in the business a system of distribution which we call in the industry bootlegging.

My fear of the bill in the form in which it has come from the House is that while it will make it harder for the manufacturers to cancel dealers' contracts, it will permanently freeze into our automobile distribution pattern a bootlegging process and make it practically impossible for the manufacturer to move against the dealer who wants to be a bootlegger.

Most of the dealers tell us they want this bill, but they know it only by name. They do not realize the changes which have been made in it, both on the floor of the Senate and in the House. Among those changes, Mr. President, is the fact that the amendment which was written into the bill by the Senate, which would require good faith both on the part of the dealer and the manufacturer, has been deleted by the House, and now the dealer is not required to deal with the manufacturer in good faith. The manufacturer could allege his good faith as a defense, but he could not demand specific good faith on the part of the dealer.

Mr. President, I notice the Senator from Wyoming is on his feet. Do I read the bill incorrectly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator does, and I shall be very glad to explain it at greater length when the Senator concludes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, that is not the chief objection, and I shall listen with a great deal of interest to the Senator from Wyoming when he makes his explanation.

The thing which bothers me most is contained in two paragraphs of the House report. I should like to read to my colleagues these two paragraphs. As I read them, some may say, "Those are only paragraphs in the report. They are not the law. No court will pay any attention to them."

But this is a statement of legislative intent. I read from page 10 of the House report:

> The manufacturer's obligation to act in good faith extends to all of his franchised dealers, including dealers who sell automobiles to other dealers, franchised or not, for resale to the public; dealers who sell outside of a "zone of influence" or "territory"; and dealers who sell automobiles at less than the manufacturers' suggested resale prices.

In this bill, Mr. President, the manufacturer is required to have the same attitude of good faith toward the dealer who supplies cars to the bootleg market as to the dealer who is injured by the bootleg market, as I read this statement. I read further:

> Contract provisions restricting an automobile dealer from transacting business with customers of his choice or from selling outside a specified territory could violate the antitrust laws. Any restriction on a dealer's right to sue based on the fact that he is willing to sell to another dealer, franchised or not, for resale to the public or based on the fact that he sells outside of a territory or sells at cut rates would contravene the congressional purposes underlying section 4 of this bill which provides that this measure shall not repeal, modify, or supersede, directly or indirectly, any provision of the antitrust laws.

The second paragraph is more explicit, I think, in stepping up the permanent pattern of bootlegging in the automobile industry:

> Similarly, a manufacturer, in a dealer's suit for damages stemming from a manufacturer's refusal to supply adequate cars, could not set up by way of defense, as lack of good faith, the fact that the dealer sold new cars to other new- or used-car dealers for resale to the public. Also, a dealer located near another franchised dealer who has sold new cars to used-car dealers for resale would not be authorized under this measure to sue a manufacturer for supplying dealers who sell cars to other dealers for resale.

In other words, Mr. President, the manufacturer dare not attempt to make it difficult for a particular dealer who is selling into the bootleg market to get the automobiles he wants to sell in such market, because he immediately lays himself open to the kind of suit which this bill makes possible.

There are many small men in the automobile business, and there is a great deal of money available at the retail level. I think, as the only automobile dealer in the Senate, I may be pardoned for the feeling that I am a little more sensitive to this program than are some of my colleagues. Over the years the industry has eliminated very largely the wholesaling process in the distribution pattern, but this bill would make it possible to set it up again on an interesting new basis. A dealer with an investment in parts and service facilities, so he would have the greatest flexibility, and located at a strategic point from which he could ship to many parts of the United States, could, in fact, immediately become a great wholesaler. He could establish a string of used-car properties, if you please, or used-car agents, all over the United States and undertake to supply them with any automobile they wanted. Under this bill, the manufacturer would not dare refuse, or he would not carry on his business. Pretty soon we would find a parallel automobile distribution protected by the bill through which the used-car dealers would, in fact, fast become new-car dealers, and the very dealers whom this bill is supposed to protect through their investment in service facilities and their legitimate franchise from the manufacturer would not be protected because the manufacturer would be powerless to protect them.

It may be said that this is a wild figment of the imagination, but I am willing to make the prediction that if this bill passes and is not vetoed, in the new-model period which will arrive in the next few months we shall see several such distribution systems set up in the United States with the impetus which will come from the introduction of new models.

As a retail automobile dealer, I know that over the past 2 or 3 years the used-car dealers in my town have had new models for sale on used-car lots as soon as the new-car dealers have had them in any quantities to take care of their customers.

I realize that the bill probably will pass. The Senate is in a hurry. We have not, obviously, time to send the bill back to conference, if the report is to be adopted today. I realize that there is a great push on to get a bill—any bill—so that the automobile dealers can say, "We have had legislative success."

But I have made this prediction. I am certain that my fellow automobile dealers—40,000 of them—within a year after the bill becomes law, will be back asking Congress to modify it to protect them from the bootleg system which the bill will create, and to protect them against any action on the part of the manufacturers to destroy it or eliminate it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator has misunderstood the language in the report. But as I read it myself, I can see why the Senator has drawn from it the conclusion he has drawn.

I recall to his mind that he was on the floor of the Senate when, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I explained the bill, which had been reported from that committee, and which the committee had recommended that the Senate pass. The Senator from Utah will recall, I feel certain, that he was under obligation that day and had his reservations to fly home to Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I envied him in the flight out West. The Senator explained to me that he wanted to vote for the bill, but he was in such a hurry that he wondered if the vote would be taken before he had to meet his reservation.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unfortunately, the vote could not be taken before the Senator left, because I was asked many questions about the bill from all quarters of the Senate. One of the questions related to bootlegging.

During that debate, before we had the vote of 75 to 1 in favor of the bill, I made it clear that there was nothing in the bill which would stimulate bootlegging; and I assure the Senator now, as the bill has come back, amended by the House, there is nothing in it which will stimulate bootlegging.

The language that alarms the Senator is the language that is found in the committee report.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not a word is contained in the amendments added by the House which changes the objective of the bill as it passed the Senate. That is why I am so ready to move the adoption of the House amendments.

The Senator from Utah himself introduced a bill with reference to this problem, of which I thought a great deal. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and other Senators whose names I shall place in the RECORD, joined in sponsoring a bill which has just been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That bill deals with bootlegging.

The bill now before the Senate, however, is the bill which was designed to accomplish one purpose, and one purpose alone, namely, to give the dealer his day in court whenever a big company, by reason of its preponderant wealth, its great power, its national aspect, could force a dealer, by coercion and intimidation, into the performance of economic acts which he did not believe he should do.

If an automobile manufacturer, in order to coerce a dealer, should sell cars to a used-car lot merely to force the dealer to follow a policy, the manufacturer would be liable under the language of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. The condition last described by my colleague from Wyoming is so rare as to be almost impossible.

The bill which was introduced by the Senator from Wyoming was to handle the day-in-court problem. But there is an old saying: "If you save at the spigot, you lose at the bunghole."

While the bill gives a dealer his day in court, it also fixes the pattern of bootlegging and makes it impossible for the manufacturer to proceed against the bootlegger.

The source of bootlegged automobiles is not the direct sale by a manufacturer to a used-car dealer. It is a franchised

dealer who sees an opportunity greatly to expand the number of cars he can distribute, and who insists on having the manufacturer supply those cars to him for resale to used-car dealers.

The bill would say that no dealer can complain that that is going on, and that the manufacturer cannot refuse to sell those cars to the man who is supplying the bootleg market.

The Senator from Wyoming is a lawyer; the Senator from Utah is only an automobile dealer. But the language in the second paragraph, I think, is very clear.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is not in the law.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Wyoming can be certain that this is a statement of legislative intent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. It is for that reason that I have written, in plain language, the legislative intent of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, to let it be compared with that language in any court; and I do not believe that any court will deprive an automobile dealer who is being coerced by a manufacturer——

Mr. BENNETT. No, no; that is not the problem. The problem is that of a franchised automobile dealer, the X Motor Co., in a little town in Ohio, who suddenly finds that a used-car dealer on a corner is selling cars which the franchised dealer has a franchise to sell, but who is selling them at a price lower than that at which the franchised dealer can sell.

When he goes to the manufacturer, the manufacturer will have to say, "I cannot refuse to sell to the dealer who is supplying these cars on the bootleg market, under the language in the House report, because the report reads:

> Similarly, a manufacturer, in a dealer's suit for damages stemming from a manufacturer's refusal to supply adequate cars could not set up by way of defense, as lack of good faith, the fact that the dealer sold new cars to other new- or used-car dealers for resale to the public.

To me, that is just as clear as crystal.

The report is referring to a dealer who intends to sell his cars in a bootleg market, and who says to the manufacturer, "I want 500 cars." The manufacturer says, "Last year you sold only 100."

The dealer replies, "Well, I have a market for them."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I say again to the Senator from Utah that that is simply language in a report. The language in the law does not support that argument. By the time the record is complete here, I think it will be clear.

What I most emphatically wish to impress upon the Senator is that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] conducted a long investigation into the bootlegging problem, and has reported a bill on that phase of the matter to the Senate.

Mr. BENNETT. But I point out to the Senator from Wyoming that the bill in its final form was based primarily upon the assumption that cars got into bootleg channels because dealers had overbought and had no other way to get rid of them.

I know from sad experience that most cars get into bootleg channels because a particular dealer sees a chance greatly to increase his distribution of cars. He does not find himself with distress merchandise. He deliberately goes out and buys the automobiles, so that he can spread them all over the United States, or in a particular area.

The Senator from Utah has made himself abundantly clear. I do not wish to delay the Senate further. The Senator from Wyoming and I have different points of view on this particular subject. I do not think either of us can change the mind of the other but I appreciate his friendly attitude.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All I wish to do is make the legislative record clear on the part of those of us who have been working day after day and week after week on the bill. Let me read into the legislative record a carefully written statement to describe what we are trying to do:

> I made it clear at the time this measure was debated on the floor of the Senate that the bill was not concerned with the problem of bootlegging. The problem of bootlegging was dealt with specially in S. 3946, a bill introduced by Senator MONRONEY and others. Extensive hearings were conducted by the Select Committee on Automobile Marketing Practices of which Senator MONRONEY was chairman and the problem of bootlegging was thoroughly analyzed at that time.
>
> Dealers do not have a right of action in this bill against the manufacturer because the manufacturer was selling to a bootlegging dealer unless this can be construed as a device to coerce or intimidate a dealer. However, in a suit by the dealer, a manufacturer should be free by way of defense to introduce all relevant evidence bearing upon the lack of good faith on the part of the dealer, including evidence of bootlegging by the dealer if this can be shown to constitute coercion or intimidation or threats of same. The basic issue for the court in a suit under this bill is the good faith of the manufacturer or the dealer. The court should consider any evidence introduced by either party in support of its contention that there was that lack of good faith which constituted coercion or intimidation.

Let me add that I have yet to meet a person who has appeared before either committee, a person familiar with the automobile business, who has not said that the automobile manufacturers themselves could do much by independent action to eliminate bootlegging. What we are trying to do in the bill is take a first step toward allowing the dealer an opportunity which he has not heretofore had, because of the difference in size between the dealer and the manufacturer, to take his case into court and to secure a better franchise.

That this was a good bill in itself was demonstrated by the fact that during the very time the hearings were being conducted, the General Motors high command immediately announced a change in granting franchises from yearly franchises to 5-year franchises. Then by the time representatives of General Motors appeared before the committee of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], Mr. Curtice testified that about 15 or 16 new changes were being made in dealerships. What I am saying to the Senate and to the Senator from Utah is that the passage of the bill is going to nail down the concessions which were won because the bill was introduced and because it was certain to be passed.

I shall try to make a prediction, as the Senator from Utah has. I venture to say that after the bill has gone to the White House and has been signed, because the Department of Justice has said it is constitutional, the big manufacturers will again make some concessions to the dealers.

Mr. BENNETT. I stand on my prediction.

Mr. President, I should like to yield the floor, but I am willing to yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to confirm what the Senator from Wyoming has said. There was a most complete investigation. A copy of the bill was sent to every automobile dealer in the State of North Dakota, particularly to George M. Dixon, who is the executive head of the automobile dealers of North Dakota. I asked him to go over it with his lawyer. Mr. Dixon wired a message that he is entirely satisfied with the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the Senator from North Dakota send him the original bill?

Mr. LANGER. The original bill.

Mr. BENNETT. The House has changed it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I hesitate to state my objection at this late hour, but I think this is bad legislation. I believe the Senate is being asked to pass a bad bill. It has not been thoroughly considered by the committee. The bill which has been reported by the House committee and passed by the House should properly have been considered by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There is no amendment of the antitrust laws involved. There is no attempt to affect them in any way. As a matter of fact, the contrary is true. The question involved is one of distribution of automobiles in interstate commerce. There is no distinction between distribution of automobiles and distribution of radios, washing machines, or other products, which might change the contractual relationship between manufacturer and distributor.

Some 4 years ago the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce started to consider proposed legislation dealing with the bootleg problem, which was an acute problem at that time.

In spite of what the proponents of the bill have stated to the Senate, in my judgment, this bill freezes the bootlegging principle in the automobile business and prohibits the manufacturer or the dealer himself from doing anything about it.

That is definitely set out, as the Senator from Utah stated a moment ago, in the last two paragraphs of the report, on page 10, which states, in effect, that nothing can be done about bootlegging on the part of the manufacturer. The manufacturer must furnish automobiles for that market, if they are sought by a distributor.

So not only do we not achieve the aim we started out to achieve, but we negate the principle sought by the dealers in the

very beginning of the campaign for legislation.

This bill assumes to be in the field of antitrust legislation. I do not think it is properly so. I do not think it affects the antitrust laws, unless as it might nullify some of the vital provisions of the antitrust laws.

I remind Senators that it is a very sacred right of citizens to enter into a contract and fix terms thereof and abide by them. The matter of good faith is written into every contract. Here there is an attempt to change the rule of good faith which is written into every contract.

I think section 2 as it comes from the House is a poorer provision than that which was proposed by the Senate. I now read that section:

An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manuacturer engaged in commerce, in any district court of the United States in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy—

That eliminates the amount in controversy which gives eligibility for suit in Federal courts—

and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee, by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in conforming or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise—

Not only does good faith run to the distributor, but it runs to the manufacturer at the present time. Good faith in a contract is implied in both parties participating therein. But the further wording in this section reads:

Or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer.

That is an invitation to every dealer in the automobile business in this country to go into court if there is an attempt made to change the franchise, or to give somebody else the franchise, or in any way give a franchise to a new distributor in the territory. It means that every dealer's franchise is in fact given in perpetuity if the dealer desires.

The same right is not given to a manufacturer who acts in good faith; the manufacturer is not given a right to sue for violation of a contract entered into in good faith. No obligation to proceed in good faith is placed on the dealer at all, insofar as filing a suit is concerned. Instead, the provision is that in the case of such a suit by the distributor, the manufacturer can use a lack of good faith on the part of the distributor by way of defense.

Mr. President, without delaying the debate further let me say that I doubt very much whether such a provision is constitutional. We have been given no time to brief the question.

In the first place this legislation is a violation of a right of contract on the part of the citizens of the United States; and, in the second place, it negates the very thing we attempted to do at the very beginning of our consideration of this problem; namely, to eliminate the bootlegging of automobiles, which was doing so much to disturb the proper distribution of automobiles in the United States.

Mr. President, this measure is bad legislation. I suppose what I have said has been spoken in vain, because much bad legislation is passed under pressure during the last few weeks of the session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to debate this matter at length. I think the Senate well knows the issues involved.

I wish to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my presentation, a statement which analyzes each one of the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives, and shows clearly that the amendments adopted by the House, and now before us, do not lead down the road to disaster, as predicted by the Senators who have just spoken.

This is the first step toward the balancing of little business with big business. In my judgment, this measure will be a great contribution to the maintenance of the basic principle of free enterprise.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the statement to which I have referred, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

S. 3879, passed by the Senate on June 19, 1956, was passed by the House on July 24, 1956, with some change in wording. The two bills are identical in concept, but the House of Representatives did change wording which, in my opinion, aids in the clarification of the Senate bill. The changes are as follows:

Section 1 (a) in the bill as passed by the Senate is as follows:

"The term 'automobile manufacturer' shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise engaged in the manufacturing or assembling of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles, including any person, partnership, or corporation which acts for such manufacturer or assembler in connection with the distribution of said automotive vehicles."

The House amendment to the above excludes transactions involving buses, tractors, motorcycles, and other transportation vehicles propelled by power. This accomplishes two purposes: first, it avoids any ambiguity resulting from use of the phrase "or other automotive vehicles,"; second, it restricts the bill to those areas of automotive distribution in which congressional committees ascertained a present need for remedial legislation.

Section 1 (b) of the Senate version is as follows:

"The term 'franchise' shall mean the agreement, contract, understanding, or arrangement between any automobile manufacturer and any automobile dealer which purports to fix the legal rights and liabilities of the parties to such agreement, contract, understanding, or agreement."

The changes made by the House in this section of the Senate bill are extremely minor, consisting of the word "written" preceding the word "agreement" on line 5 of the Senate bill.

Section 1 (c) of the Senate version is as follows:

"The term 'automobile dealer' shall mean any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise operating under the terms of a franchise and engaged in the sale or distribution of passenger cars, trucks, station wagons, or other automotive vehicles."

The House has changed the above provision by striking out the words "other automotive vehicles" in the last line of the section to make it conform to section 1 (b). This section was further amended by the House so as to limit the right to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to dealers resident in the United States, or its Territories, or the District of Columbia only. The committees heard no testimony concerning manufacturers and their dealers in foreign countries.

Section 1 (d) of S. 3879 dealing with the definition of commerce remains unchanged in the House version.

Section 1 (e), the "good faith" provision of the Senate bill, was as follows:

"The term 'good faith' shall mean the duty of each party to any franchise, and all officers, employees, or agents to act in a fair, equitable, and nonarbitarary manner so as to guarantee such other party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion or intimidation, so as to preserve all equities of such other party which are inherent in the nature of the relationship between such parties by such franchise."

The House has changed the wording of this "good faith" provision in several respects. However, the intent of the term "good faith" remains the same in both versions of the bill.

The House committee's amendment to this paragraph has four purposes. First, it makes clear that the manufacturer is obligated to protect his dealer only from coercion by the manufacturer or persons subject to his control. The House version, in my opinion, spells out the problem in more concrete terminology. Second, the word "nonarbitrary" is stricken from the Senate bill for being vague and indefinite. Third, the House deleted the provision which would require a party to a franchise to preserve all the equities of the other parties which are inherent in the nature of the franchise relation. This was done to preclude any interpretation inconsistent with antitrust principles. The House concern for other antitrust legislation is well taken and this change obviates the possibility of conflict between this act and prior antitrust legislation on the statute books. Fourth, a proviso has been added to affirm that normal sales persuasion and recommendation by themselves are consonant with good faith. The committee added this proviso to assure that recommendation, endorsement, persuasion, urging, or argument of the kind that is normal in competitive relationships is not to be deemed in and of itself to constitute a lack of good faith.

Section 2 of the Senate version is as follows:

"An automobile dealer may bring suit against any automobile manufacturer engaged in commerce, in any district court of the United States in the district in which said manufacturer resides, or is found, or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover the damages by him sustained and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee, by reason of the failure of said automobile manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling, or not renewing the franchise with said dealer: *Provided*, That in any such suit the manufacturer shall not be barred from asserting in defense of any such action the failure of the dealer to act in good faith."

Section 2 of the House bill differs in several respects from the corresponding section of the Senate bill. In the House bill, only activities by the manufacturer which occur from and after the passage of this legislation are actionable. The purpose of this change is to avoid liabilities based on past actions which were not illegal when committed. The committee has no objection whatsoever to this amendment.

The House deleted under section 2 the right to recover reasonable attorney's fees. The House has added sections 3, 4, and 5. These are all mechanical provisions strengthening the legislation. Section 3 embraces the 3-year statute of limitations on such actions. Section 4 assures that this act will not modify, repeal, or supersede any provision of existing antitrust law. Section 5 provides that this act does not invalidate any State laws unless there is a direct conflict between an express provision of State law and an express provision of this act which cannot be reconciled.

This bill as amended by the House makes clear that the automobile manufacturer has an obligation of the highest magnitude to act toward his dealer so as to guarantee him freedom from coercion, intimidation or threats of coercion and intimidation. This is not simply a prohibition against coercion or intimidation. It is a statutory obligation to observe the highest degree of good faith necessary to insure the dealer complete freedom from coercion or intimidation.

While it is true that the principal thrust of the bill in its present form is directed against coercion or intimidation, the House report emphasizes that dealers obtain extensive rights under this bill. An amendment was added in the House to the Senate bill to provide that normal sales efforts by the manufacturer do not constitute a lack of good faith. However, the House report emphasizes that the issue of fact in each case is whether the evidence discloses such pressure as would constitute coercion or intimidation. Whether or not the manufacturer's sales activities were normal competitive measures or constituted that kind of pressure which amounts to coercion is the principal issue. For that reason, any evidence bearing upon the sales techniques of the manufacturer will be admissible in determination of this issue. Normal sales methods are in themselves unobjectionable, but when combined with other factors as part of a course of conduct, they might in some circumstances constitute coercion or intimidation.

The principal purpose of the House bill is to prevent coercion or intimidation by the manufacturer in whatever form this might appear. Therefore, the dealer obtains a right of action under this bill whenever there has been coercion or intimidation by the manufacturer in connection with any of the transactions relating to the distribution of automobiles under the franchise. Thus, in explaining the type of coercion which is actionable by the dealer, the House report states, "For example, manufacturer pressure, direct or indirect, upon a dealer to accept automobiles, parts, accessories, or supplies which the dealer does not need, want, or feel the market is able to absorb, may in appropriate instances constitute coercion or intimidation." Again the report states on page 9: "Similarly, coercion or intimidation may be found where the manufacturer attempts to require the dealer to handle exclusively, or sell a specified quota of, parts, accessories, and tools made or approved by the manufacturer." Thus, any activity by the manufacturer which in fact constitutes coercion or intimidation in the course of the business relationship between the parties becomes an actionable wrong.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the pending question is merely on agreeing to the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives, and thus averting a conference.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendments of the House.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in respect to this measure, I have heard—as is true in the case of all other Senators—from a great many of the automobile dealers in my State. Most of those communications have been in favor of legislation of this type, although some have been opposed. The communications in opposition were received from persons who had had an opportunity to examine the bill and consider it.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that if we agree to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to concur in the amendments adopted by the House of Representatives, we should be sure of what we are doing.

At this time I should like to refer to page 4, line 11:

> An automobile dealer is any person, partnership, corporation, association, or other form of business enterprise resident in the United States or in any territory thereof or in the District of Columbia, operating under the terms of a franchise and engaged in the sale or distribution of passenger cars, trucks, or station wagons.

When I compare that paragraph with the last 2 paragraphs on page 10 of the report of the House committee—Report No. 2850—the only conclusion I can reach is that we shall be freezing the rights of those who now are making bootlegging of automobiles possible.

All of us are opposed to bootlegging, and I suppose that almost every Member of this body has met at one time or another with the automobile dealers in his State, in an attempt to cure this problem, which causes them so much trouble.

Yet, Mr. President, although this question was discussed on the floor of the Senate at very great length 2 or 3 weeks ago, when the bill was previously before us, and although at that time it was pointed out in great detail by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] that this bill would, in fact, make bootleggers the recipients of the greatest rights to be received under the bill, nevertheless at this stage we have before us a measure which does not cure that difficulty. Therefore, under the provisions of section 2 and the provisions of subsection (c) of section 1, a bootlegger himself would have his right to continue bootlegging frozen, and he could sue a manufacturer for a breach of good faith.

I am aware, as I am sure all other Senators are, of the problems which beset the automobile dealers. But certainly, Mr. President, in the case of persons who already are causing a great deal of trouble, it will be no cure to freeze the rights they now are enjoying, and also to give them a legal right to sue under a good-faith contract—and to do that in a bill passed by the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. President, much as I have favored legislation of this general type to cure this trouble, I am afraid that I shall have to oppose this measure, because we have had an opportunity to correct the bill; but after 3 weeks we have not corrected the fundamental thing that is wrong with it, and that is causing most of the trouble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

OPERATIONS OF THE MISSOURI STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the farmers of Missouri would not want the 84th Congress to draw to a close without expressing their deep appreciation of the fine work done by the members of the Subcommittee on Administration of Farm Programs, especially its chairman, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

During the past 3 years, my senior colleague [Mr. HENNINGS] and I, along with Members of the House representing Missouri farm areas, have received a great many complaints about the operations of the Missouri State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee.

On a number of occasions this unfortunate situation has been discussed on the floor of the Senate. It has received a great deal of attention before the Humphrey subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee. It has also received much attention in the House of Representatives.

Over the past 3 years, 55 farmer-elected committeemen have been either suspended or dismissed in Missouri, out of a total of only 220 dismissals in the entire United States. In no other State have more than 16 county committeemen been suspended or removed by the State committee.

Because of the extraordinary number of suspensions and dismissals in Missouri, many of them without any statement as to cause, and many without hearings, we repeatedly asked for a full investigation of this matter by the Department of Agriculture. When the Department did not act, we asked, and received, the attention of the Humphrey subcommittee.

On November 14 and 15, 1955, Chairman HUMPHREY and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] came to Jefferson City, and held hearings for 2 days. The hearings started at 9 o'clock in the morning, and lasted until well after midnight. More than 220,000 words of sworn testimony, covering 26 counties, were taken. Nevertheless, it was not possible to hear all of the Missouri farm people who came to protest these dismissals.

In December of last year, the record of those hearings was forwarded to the Department of Agriculture. Nevertheless, in 1956, the Missouri State ASC chairman, Mr. Murray Colbert, the man primarily responsible for these conditions in my State, was reappointed by Secretary of Agriculture Benson for the fourth straight year. This was done without consultation with the farm leaders of our State, and without the recommendation of the 2 men in the Department of Agriculture, Earl Hughes and H. L. Manwaring, who are directly responsible for this program.

The Humphrey subcommittee held additional hearings on this subject in Washington in June of this year.

Following these hearings, I wrote Secretary Benson, presenting the fact that the 3 regular members of the Boone County ASC committee had been charged with "obvious manipulation of normal wheat yields," and that as a result the character of these fine Missouri citizens had been blackened in a telegram of accusation which was signed by Secretary Benson himself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD my letter of June 14 to the Secretary be inserted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 14, 1956.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I regret very much you did not consider it important enough to appear before the Senate Subcommittee on the Farmer-Committee System.

Chairman HUBERT HUMPHREY postponed the date to meet your convenience; and I, in turn, postponed 2 days of the airpower inquiry to do the same.

On November 1, 1955, you sent me a telegram which read as follows:

"Three regular members of Boone County Agricultural Stabilization Committee were removed from office by unanimous action of Missouri State ASC Committee October 14, 1955. Basis for their removal was the obvious manipulation of normal wheat yields on farms having excess wheat so those producers would be excused from paying proper penalties on their farm marketing excess. Decision to remove the Boone County committee was made by the Missouri State ASC Committee on the basis of evidence in their possession. Washington representatives of Commodity Stabilization Service concurred with State committee's action.

"EZRA TAFT BENSON."

On the basis of that telegram, the character of these men has been blackened.

But the facts most certainly do not bear out this blanket accusation on your part.

I was anxious to have you appear to see, to listen, and if you so desired, to question these convicted men.

This Boone County case is only one of many in Missouri which appear totally unjustified. I refer to other arbitrarily discharged committeemen. As you know in my State there have been 55, 29 percent of all those discharged in the Nation during the past 3 years.

There was considerable talk at the hearing about the heavy workload of those in the Department of Agriculture; and I can understand that, based on some previous experience in the executive branch.

No workload I have ever had anywhere, however, compares with that incident to the work of a Senator; and in the case of this hearing, we had adjusted our plans to suit yours.

In my opinion, no democratic form of government should become so big that in turn it becomes casual about the unwarranted destruction of the reputation of people.

If these Missourians are guilty, this attack on their character is one thing. But if they are not, no matter what the relative size of their position in life as against that of others, it is only decent and right that you should exonerate them.

Otherwise, what is our way of life all about?

I talked with Under Secretary of Agriculture Morse concerning this matter, believe he now has a better understanding of it, and would appreciate your discussing it with him.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. SYMINGTON. On June 28, Secretary Benson replied. I quote the last paragraph of his letter:

I strongly commend the efforts of Senator HUMPHREY'S subcommittee in focusing attention on situations in the farmer-committee system which warrant scrutiny. I wish to see the operations of farmer committees continue in sound condition as a vital part of the administration of national agricultural programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point Secretary Benson's full reply be made part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1956.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: I have your letter of June 14, 1956, with reference to the recent hearing by the Subcommittee on the Farmer-Committee System of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Department gave most careful attention to the hearing and Under Secretary Morse devoted 2 full days to the hearing and General Counsel Farrington and several other Department officials spent all or virtually all of such time in addition to careful preparation to comment upon or answer questions.

I regret that I was unable to be present at the hearing. However, I have been fully informed as to the problems considered and as you were informed Under Secretary Morse was authorized to speak for me at the hearing. I do not feel that the Department has in any way failed to give adequate attention to the hearing or the issues there involved.

Concerning the matter of the removal of the Boone County Agricultural Stabilization Committee, the telegram quoted by you of November 1, 1955, in response to your request stated the reason which the State committee had used for the removal action. This reason was correctly repeated in the telegram and was not intended to state my personal judgment on this case nor to foreclose the review of the case on appeal. I am informed that the former committee members of Boone County have recently presented their appeal under the regulations, that this appeal was heard and that a decision therein is to be made shortly.

I strongly commend the efforts of Senator HUMPHREY'S subcommittee in focusing attention on situations in the farmer-committee system which warrant scrutiny. I wish to see the operations of farmer committees continue in sound condition as a vital part of the administration of national agricultural programs.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on July 11, Mr. Clay H. Stackhouse, Acting Deputy Administrator, Production Adjustment, ruled on the appeal of the Boone County ASC committee, and I call attention to his final paragraph:

It is my conclusion after reviewing all of the facts and evidence available that the State committee did not have a supportable basis for their removal action at the time it was taken and therefore the charge of "obvious manipulation" is not sustained. Messrs. Lynn Drane, Arcie Nichols, and E. S. Wilcoxon are returned to their offices as chairman, vice chairman, and regular member of the Boone County (Missouri) ASC Committee effective upon their receipt of this decision. Messrs. Spiva and Brushwood will resume their status as alternates and Mr. E. R. Smith, who was specially elected because of the removal action, is hereby relieved as a committeeman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the decision on the appeal of Lynn Drane, Arcie Nichols and E. S. Wilcoxon, duly elected county committeemen of Boone County, Mo., be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISION ON THE APPEAL OF LYNN DRANE, ARCIE NICHOLS, AND E. S. WILCOXON FROM THEIR REMOVAL FROM THE BOONE COUNTY (MO.) ASC COMMITTEE BY THE MISSOURI ASC STATE COMMITTEE

This decision is made under the provisions of section 7.33 of the Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture governing ASC County and Community Committees (7 CFR 7.33), upon the appeal of Lynn Drane, Arcie Nichols, and E. S. Wilcoxon from their removal from the Boone County (Mo.) ASC Committee by the Missouri ASC State Committee in October 1955.

Mr. Lynn Drane was elected chairman, Arcie Nichols, vice chairman, E. S. Wilcoxon, regular member, Robert Spiva, first alternate, and Ervin Brushwood, second alternate, of the Boone ASC County Committee in the 1955–56 elections and the committee entered on duty on September 1, 1955. The ASC State Committee in individual letters dated October 14, 1955, to Messrs. Drane, Nichols, and Wilcoxon removed them from office effective upon receipt of the letters. In accordance with the rules of succession Robert Spiva then became chairman, Ervin Brushwood, vice chairman, and in a specially called county convention, Mr. E. R. Smith was elected regular member.

These actions were taken by the State committee in accordance with the provisions of section 7.33 (a) of the Secretary's regulations which provided as follows:

"Any member of a county or community committee or alternate to such office or any member of a community election board who becomes ineligible for office under the provisions of section 7.29 or who fails to perform the duties of his office or who is incompetent or commits, or attempts or conspires to commit, fraud, shall be removed by the State committee, or if it appears that he may be subject to such removal, he may be suspended by the State committee pending an investigation. The State committee may also suspend pending investigation or remove any county or community committeeman or alternate, if such action is determined by majority vote of the State committee to be necessary for the success of any program administered by the county committee."

The reason given by the State committee for their unanimous action was that the county committee manipulated normal wheat yields which they established for farms having excess wheat acreage under the wheat acreage allotment and marketing quota program so that producers would be excused from paying proper penalties on their farm marketing excess. There were 21 cases in which the county committee established wheat normal yields and in no instance was a yield established which was equal to or greater than the normal yield established for Boone County.

Section 728.553 (b) and (c) of the 1955 Wheat Marketing Quota Regulations provides:

"Yields based on reliable records: Where reliable records of the actual average yield

per acre for all of the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the yield is determined are presented by the farmer or are available to the county committee, the normal yield per acre of wheat for the farm shall be determined to be the average of such yields, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and trends in yields.

"Appraised yields: If for any year of such 10-year period records of the actual average yield are not available, or there was no actual yield, the normal yield per acre of wheat for the farm shall be appraised by the county committee, taking into consideration abnormal weather conditions, the normal yield for the county, and the yields in years for which data were available. Where the normal yields for the county is not considered representative of the normal yield for the farm, the county committee in appraising the normal yield for the farm shall take into consideration in lieu thereof the yields obtained on farms in the same locality which are similar with respect to types of soil, topography, and farming practices associated with the production of wheat."

We have examined the farm folders containing the records on which the county committee established the normal yields for the farms in question and it appears that the regulations were not followed because the proper adjustments for trends in yields were not made as required, the procedure for appraising yields for farms on which there were no reliable yield records for the 10 preceding years was not properly applied, and the cases were not properly documented. However, the record also shows that the farms in question were not located in the major wheat-producing areas of Boone County, the wheat in question in most cases was planted primarily for pasture or cover-crop, the farms in question did not fertilize as heavily as a farmer producing wheat for market would have fertilized, or did not fertilize at all, and that the farms in question undoubtedly had a lower average 10-year yield than that for the entire county. The county committee claims, and it has not been disputed, that they used the same method of establishing normal yields under the 1955 program as they did for 1954. While this does not make the county committee action correct with respect to the 1955 program, it does indicate that the State committee did not discover the improper actions at an earlier time and did not take remedial action at least before the 1955 yields were set. The county committee on several occasions stated that they were doing the best job they could, that they were never apprised by a State committee representative of any deficiency on their part in setting normal yields, and that they would have been willing and anxious to follow the proper method and to take any corrective action necessary to obtain proper administration of the wheat program.

It is true that two representatives of the Commodity Stabilization Service from Washington, D. C., informed the chairman of the Missouri State committee that it would be proper for the State committee to remove the Boone County Committee if they had in their possession clear, documented evidence of willful manipulation of normal yields by the county committee to support the removal action. All of the documented evidence supporting the removal is dated June 7, 1956—approximately 8 months after the removal took place.

It is my conclusion after reviewing all of the facts and evidence available that the State committee did not have a supportable basis for their removal action at the time it was taken and therefore the charge of "obvious manipulation" is not sustained. Messrs. Lynn Drane, Arcie Nichols, and E. S. Wilcoxon are returned to their offices as chairman, vice chairman, and regular member of the Boone County (Mo.) ASC Committee effective upon their receipt of this decision. Messrs. Spiva and Brushwood will resume their status as alternates and Mr. E. R. Smith, who was specially elected because of the removal action, is hereby relieved as a committeeman.

CLAY H. STACKHOUSE,
Acting Deputy Administrator,
Production Adjustment.

JULY 11, 1956.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I now present the reaction to this decision of the Missouri State ASC Chairman, Mr. Murray Colbert, as reported by the Missouri press. Kindly remember again that this Federal appointee in our State was reappointed this year by Secretary Benson for his fourth term.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 18, headed "Colbert Hits at United States Ruling on Boone ASC," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLBERT HITS AT UNITED STATES RULING ON BOONE ASC—CALLS DECISION DISTURBING—ATTORNEY REPLIES TO COMPTON WIRE TO BENSON

COLUMBIA, Mo., July 17.—Murray C. Colbert, chairman of the State Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee, today criticized the Federal ruling restoring the Boone County ASC Committee, which he had dismissed earlier.

Colbert indicated he was "not pleased" and commented:

"The decision is disturbing and makes us wonder what's going on in Washington."

Colbert was not in Columbia yesterday when the old committee took over the local ASC office, but he said he had an intimation of the Federal action Friday.

Colbert said a letter to E. R. Smith, one of the committee members displaced by the Federal action, was opened in the State ASC office by mistake, and gave State officials a hint of what was coming.

ATTORNEY REPLIES

Warren D. Welliver, a Democrat and attorney for the restored county committee, took exception today to a protest made yesterday by Perry Compton, State Republican chairman, on the Federal ruling. Welliver, in telegrams to Senator SYMINGTON of Missouri and Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, both Democrats, said:

"We submit that the (Compton's) telegram on its face specifically identifies the sender, Compton, neighbor of State ASC Chairman Colbert, as the moving force behind the political manipulation of the ASC program and ASC personnel in Missouri.

"The telegram shows Compton's complete disregard and disrespect for the administrative tribunal which has acquitted these loyal Boone County farmers and the libelous nature of the text of the telegram shows the sender's malicious political intent to smear the names of the acquitted committee members and to further make the farm program a political football.

"We urge your continuous effort toward putting the farm program back in the hands of the farmers and removing it from the control of such men as Chairman Compton and his handpicked political appointees."

DEMANDS THREE BE FIRED

Compton's telegram, addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, demanded that Benson fire three of his employees for "condoning fraudulent practices" in the national farm program. It protested against reinstatement of the Boone County ASC Committee.

Compton said he specifically was demanding the discharge of H. L. Manwaring, of Washington, D. C., deputy administrator of production adjustment; Clay Stackhouse, Manwaring's assistant, and Lester E. Leigh, also of Washington, Midwest area director of the ASC program.

"I think these fellows are leaning over backward to let SYMINGTON tell them what to do," Compton said later at Jefferson City.

DIFFICULT TIME TO SHIFT

Colbert said the changeover in Boone County administration comes at a bad time when the work load is heavy, since farmers must be signed up for the soil bank by Friday.

"My only fear," Colbert said, "is that the farmers won't be taken care of. The State office will do everything it can to give assistance so Boone County farmers won't suffer."

The restored Boone County committee hired Smith and Robert Spiva, another member of the displaced committee, to help them with the work.

Colbert was outspoken about the situation of E. L. Cunningham, who was once fired by the restored committee and who resigned as soon as he heard about the Federal ruling.

Colbert said he would recommend Cunningham highly, would give the man a job in the State ASC office if Cunningham could qualify under civil service.

Colbert said the former office manager was "capable, sincere, and has done a good job."

OTHER MISSOURI APPEALS

Department of Agriculture officials at Washington said two other appeals besides the Boone County case have been made by county committees in Missouri against ouster orders of the State committee.

"One was by the Henry County committee, which lost its appeal. The Department upheld action of the State committee in removing members of the county committee for alleged violation of regulations in carrying out a wheat control program."

The other appeal was by the Callaway County committee, also ousted on similar charges. No action has been taken on this appeal. Members of the ousted committee were said to have indicated they intend to ask for a formal hearing before a Department official.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask that an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 17, headed "Perry Compton Blasts Three ASC Reinstatements in Protest to Benson," and also an editorial, A Touch of Politics, from the Springfield Leader and Press of July 18, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 17, 1956]

PERRY COMPTON BLASTS THREE ASC REINSTATEMENTS IN PROTEST TO BENSON

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo., July 16.—Perry Compton, Republican State chairman, protested to Agriculture Secretary Benson today at the reinstatement of three Boone County ASC committeemen.

Compton, in a telegram to Benson, demanded that the reinstatement be rescinded and "employees in your department who condone such fraudulent practices by ordering the reinstatement" be fired.

"The millions of voters disgusted with the Hisses, the Youngs, the Finnigans, the Caudles, the Connollys, who supported Eisenhower in 1952 are being slapped in the face with this reinstatement," Compton wired.

The three members of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee who were suspended last winter for alleged manipulation of wheat-yield figures are Chairman Lynn Drane, of Harrisburg, Arcie

Nichols, of Ashland, and E. S. Wilcoxon, of McBaine. The United States Department of Agriculture and a Senate subcommittee held hearings on the case. The men were ordered reinstated Saturday.

Compton told the Secretary of Agriculture the three had been discharged by unanimous vote of the State ASC committee on the recommendation of H. L. Manwaring, Deputy Administrator for Production Adjustments; Lester E. Leigh, Midwest area Director of the ASC program, and Sylvester J. Coe, Adminstrative Officer for the Midwest area.

The three were cleared of wrongdoing by Clay Stockhouse, the Agriculture Department's Assistant Deputy Administrator for Production Adjustment. He had heard their appeal from their dismissal by the State SCC. The Boone County case was a bone of contention at recent hearings by a Senate Agriculture Subcommittee in Jefferson City and in Washington.

Senator SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, charged that the three had been disgraced by the treatment accorded them by the Department of Agriculture and urged that their names be cleared so they "can go back to their neighbors and friends."

[From the Springfield Leader and Press of July 18, 1956]

A TOUCH OF POLITICS

In taking angry issue with Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Perry Compton, Missouri Republican chairman, is doing nothing to heal the schisms already painfully apparent in party ranks in Missouri.

Compton fired a hot telegram to Benson this week, "demanding" that three of the USDA chief's aids be fired for "condoning fraudulent practices"

What really irks Compton is not alleged "fraudulent practices," but the reinstatement of the Boone County Agricultural Stablization and Conservation Committee, which went back in office at the order of Secretary Benson, after a hearing in Washington on the summary firing of the three members by Missouri ASC boss Murray Colbert.

And behind that is anger at the resistance of Missouri ASC members. Both Republican and Democratic, who fought to a standstill the attempt of certain politicians, such as Compton and Colbert, to take over the ASC as a political plum in the State.

Because resistance has been something beyond party lines is the reason that Compton's brassy challenge is dangerous. That rebellion of the past 3 years was not politically inspired, and many Republicans were just as angry as some Democrats. It stands to reason that something must have been gravely wrong in Missouri when this State was almost alone in the furor created over ASC changes. Missouri probably had more protests filed in Washington and more columns of newspaper criticism than all other States combined.

Now the gates are opened by the Boone County committee's victory. Two other cases already had been appealed. One was the Henry County committee, which lost its appeal; the other the Callaway County committee, whose appeal is still pending.

With the reinstatement of the Boone County ASC, it is expected that Callaway and other counties will press their cases in Washington. If all do, there will be more than a score filed.

None of this will make Compton's protest look good in national Republican administration eyes.

Maybe the little man should pull in his neck.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, again I point out that Murray Colbert is the hired employee of the United States Department of Agriculture appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and responsible to the Secretary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a telegram from Mr. Warren D. Welliver, attorney for the once discharged, and now reinstated, Boone County ASC Committee.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA, MO., *July 17, 1956.*

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
United States Senate Agriculture Subcommittee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Yesterday, July 16, Perry Compton, Missouri State Republican chairman, released to the local press the text of a telegram to Secretary of Agriculture Benson virtually libeling the reinstated Boone County ASC Committee and demanding that the order reinstating them should be rescinded and that the employees who reinstated them should be discharged from the Department of Agriculture.

We respectfully request and strongly urge that your committee secure the full text of the telegram from Secretary Benson for consideration by your committee. We submit that the telegram on its face specifically identifies the sender, Compton, neighbor of the State ASC Chairman Colbert, as the moving force behind the political manipulation of the ASC program and ASC personnel in Missouri. The telegram shows Compton's complete disregard and disrespect for the administrative tribunal which has acquitted these loyal Boone County farmers, and the libelous nature of the text of the telegram shows the sender's malicious political intent to smear the names of the acquitted committee members, and to further make the farm program a political football. We urge your continued efforts toward putting the farm program back in the hands of the farmers and removing it from the control of such men as Chairman Compton and his handpicked political appointees.

WARREN D. WELLIVER,
Attorney for Boone County ASC Committee Members.

Mr. SYMINGTON. This record is crystal clear.

Every farmer in Missouri, and every fair-minded person in America, now hopes the Secretary of Agriculture will institute investigations to right the wrong done so many committeemen in other Missouri counties, just as he has now done, most commendably, in taking the necessary steps to clear the good name of these three citizens of Boone County.

Again I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for helping to bring some light into this unfortunate situation, in the interest of Missouri farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. First, let me say to the Senator from Missouri that, once we made a preliminary examination, the situation brought to the attention of the Senate about 2 years ago by the two Senators from Missouri was one which clearly necessitated the most careful scrutiny by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or a subcommittee thereof.

I think the RECORD should be made clear, that the communications of the Senator from Missouri, along with those of his colleague [Mr. HENNINGS] were unanswered for weeks. Only one of them, as I recall, was ever answered by the Secretary himself.

I say this to the Senator in relation to his present remarks: The telegram of the State Republican chairman to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, as reported in the Missouri press, underscores the complaint of a number of witnesses at the time of the hearings at Jefferson City, namely, that the Missouri ASC committee was a political tool, or, let me say, was being changed or altered into a political tool, for the State chairman of the Republican Party. The transcript of the Missouri hearings includes many sworn statements substantiating this fact.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is entirely correct. He has had a great deal of experience as an administrator. He was a great mayor, and he has become a great Senator.

The Department of Agriculture officially decided that the farmer elected Boone County ASC Committee should be reinstated and their good name restored. Now, is it not almost inconceivable that one of the appointees of the Secretary of Agriculture, a man appointed for a fourth term despite the protests of many of us about his mistreatment of farmer elected county committeemen should state, "This makes us wonder what is going on in Washington"?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I should like to say to the Senator and to our colleagues that I have sat through a number of hearings as a United States Senator. I have listened to a great deal of testimony, but I have never heard anything in my life that was so unbelieveable, that was so beyond the norm of decent political and administrative conduct, as the operation of the Missouri State ASC committee. I want Members of the Senate to read those hearings. The testimony was taken under oath. I want Members of the Senate not only to read the hearings, but to read the affidavits. I hope Members of the Senate will read the testimony of the Department of Agriculture officials. Then I hope they will read the comments of Mr. Colbert, State ASC chairman, when the Department of Agriculture reinstated the Boone County Committee, and when the State ASC chairman himself rebuked the Department of Agriculture for that reinstatement.

I wish to compliment the junior Senator from Missouri for his great public service on behalf of the citizens of his State and his constituents. Many of those constituents were maligned and falsely accused and humiliated by the Government of the United States. When a government cannot be just, it is undeserving of respect. The Department of Agriculture was unjust, unkind, and unsavory, and therefore is unworthy of respect in this instance.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 4221) to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, California;

H. R. 10432. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5738. An act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9699. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oregon, to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 35 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11613. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11677. An act to provide for the advancement of Major General Hanford MacNider, United States Army Reserve (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; and

H. R. 11695. An act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3882. An act to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaskaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6794. An act to authorize certain members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept and wear decorations, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines;

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate;

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8474. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9547. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 (e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision (e) of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 11636. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish;

H. R. 11696. An act to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska;

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States;

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce;

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Pursuant to a previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate, House bill 12350, the second supplemental appropriation bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as this bill passed the House of Representatives it carried appropriations totaling $1,941,895,000. As reported by the committee it includes appropriations that total $2,311,391,438, which is an increase of $369,496,438 over the amount approved by the House. However, I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the committee considered estimates that total $453,458,038 that were not considered by the House.

The estimates considered by the committee total $2,365,553,038. The recommendations of the committee, totaling $2,311,391,438, is a decrease of $54,161,600 below the budget estimates.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order against an amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

At the top of page 2, to insert "Chapter I".

On page 2, after line 1, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Farmers' Home Administration

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $1,400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11544, 84th Congress, or similar legislation amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

On page 2, after line 9, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the General Counsel', $85,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11544, 84th Congress, or similar legislation amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

On page 2, after line 16, to insert:

"RELATED AGENCIES

"Commission on increased industrial use of agricultural products

"For expenses necessary for the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricul-

tural Products, established by section 209 of the Act of May 28, 1956 (70 Stat. 201), including services as authorized by the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, $150,000."

On page 3, after line 2, to insert "Chapter II."

On page 3, after line 3, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"Civil Aeronautics Administration

"Operation and regulation: For an additional amount for 'Operation and regulation,' $13,968,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for hire of aircraft is increased from '$370,000' to '$570,000'."

On page 3, after line 11, to insert:

"Establishment of air navigation facilities: For an additional amount for 'Establishment of air navigation facilities' $54,075,000, to remain available until expended."

"MARITIME ACTIVITIES

"Ship construction: For an additional amount for 'Ship construction' for design, construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation of a nuclear-powered merchant ship, $22 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount which may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses,' for administrative and warehouse expenses for the current fiscal year, is increased from '$1,115,000' to '$1,315,000': *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6243, 84th Congress."

On page 4, after line 5, to insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"Federal-aid highways (trust fund): For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $1,150,000,000, to be derived from the highway trust fund; which sum is composed of $186,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, $875 million, the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, $85,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957, and $30,401, $14,097, $1,034,766, and $985,204, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 8, 1938, section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943, and section 9 of the act approved September 7, 1950, as amended (23 U. S. C. 13a, and 13b), and section 7 of the act approved June 25, 1952, and $935,532 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across dams in accordance with the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709): *Provided*, That at such time, but no later than June 30, 1957, as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the amounts available and estimated to become available in the highway trust fund during the fiscal year 1957 are sufficient for carrying out, on a current basis, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, this appropriation shall reimburse the appropriations for 'Federal-aid highways' for all expenditures subsequent to June 30, 1956."

On page 5, after line 14, to insert:

"Reduction in appropriations: The appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, and the unexpended balances as of June 30, 1956, of appropriations granted under this head for prior fiscal years are rescinded effective June 30, 1957, or such earlier date as all expenditures from such appropriations made after June 30, 1956, have been reimbursed by appropriations from the highway trust fund: *Provided*, That the sums rescinded shall revert to the general fund."

At the top of page 6, to insert "Chapter III."

On page 6, after line 1, to insert:

"FOREIGN OPERATIONS

"Export-Import Bank of Washington

"Not to exceed $4,000 of the funds previously made available for administrative expenses of the Bank shall be available for the purchase of one motor vehicle for replacement only."

On page 6, line 8, to insert "Chapter IV."

On page 6, after line 8, to insert:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"General Services Administration

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service: For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service,' $3,500,000."

On page 6, after line 13, to insert:

"HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

"Federal Flood Insurance Administration

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Federal Flood Insurance Administration, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; $500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (S. 3732, 84th Cong.) or similar legislation."

At the top of page 7, to insert:

"PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"Administration expenses: For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses', $750,000 and the limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration is increased from '$12,475,000' to '$13,225,000' and the limitation thereunder on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from '$950,000' to '$1,010,000': *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of legislation authorizing the Administration to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956."

On page 7, after line 12, to insert:

"FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"The limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on administrative expenses of the Association is increased from '$3,775,000' to '$4,275,000,' and the limitation thereunder on expenses of travel is increased from '$150,000' to '$200,000': *Provided*, That $200,000 of the foregoing increase in administrative expenses shall be available only upon the enactment into law of the amendments to subsection 303 (b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, contained in S. 3855, 84th Congress, with respect to nonrefundable capital contributions by mortgage sellers, or legislation of similar effect."

At the top of page 8, to insert "Chapter V."

On page 8, after line 1, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

"Department of the Interior

"Office of the Secretary

"Acquisition of strategic minerals

"For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the 'Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956' (Public Law 733, approved July 19, 1956), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $35 million, to remain available until December 31, 1958: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for expenses incurred in connection with materials procured under said act after their transfer to the strategic or supplemental stockpile."

On page 8, after line 16, to insert:

"BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Resources management

"For an additional amount for 'Resources management,' $250,000."

On page 8, after line 20, to insert:

"PAYMENT TO PINE RIDGE SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

"For payments, as authorized by law, to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians, in settlement of their claims for damages resulting from the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, $437,500, to remain available until expended."

On page 9, after line 3, to insert:

"FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction,' $1,250,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 9, after line 7, to insert:

"FISHERIES LOAN FUND

"For initial capital for the fisheries loan fund, for financing and refinancing of operations, maintenance, replacement, repair, and equipment of fishing gear and vessels; and for research into the basic problems of fisheries, as authorized by law, $10 million, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3275, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 9, after line 16, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Forest Service

"Acquisition of Lands for Cache National Forest

"For the acquisition of lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest, Utah, $50,000, to remain available until expended."

At the top of page 10, to insert:

"RELATED AGENCIES

"Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission

"For an additional amount for 'Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission', $55,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $25,000 of this amount shall be available only upon the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 576, 84th Congress."

On page 10, after line 7, to insert:

"NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

"For salaries and expenses of the National Memorial Stadium Commission as authorized by the act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 844), $10,000, to remain available until expended and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission."

On page 10, after line 13, to insert:

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for 'Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission', $163,400, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3386, 84th Congress."

On page 10, line 20, to insert "Chapter VI."

On page 10, after line 20, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Office of the Solicitor

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $300,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund created by section 209 of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956."

On page 11, after line 2, to insert:

"BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

"Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed $47,000 may be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906), for the purposes of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1947."

On page 11, after line 9, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Office of Education

"Promotion and further development of vocational education: For an additional amount for 'Promotion and further development of vocational education' for grants to States for extension and improvement of practical nurse training, $2 million: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

On page 11, after line 18, to insert:

"Grants for education of the mentally retarded: For grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct research in, or conduct training of teachers in, fields related to education of mentally retarded children, $350,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11253 or S. 3620, 84th Congress."

On page 12, after line 2, to insert:

"Grants for library services: For grants to the States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1956 (Public Law 597), $7,500,000."

On page 12, after line 5, to insert:

"Assistance for school construction: For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title III and title IV of the act of September 23, 1950, as amended, including payments upon applications filed on or before June 30, 1956, and not to exceed $500,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies and not to exceed $15 million for title IV, $108,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 12, after line 19, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $290,000: *Provided*, That of this amount (a) $85,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, (b) $45,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 11549 or S. 3958, 84th Congress, and (c) $20,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11253 or S. 3620, 84th Congress."

On page 13, after line 3, to insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Assistance to States, general: For an additional amount for 'Assistance to States, general', including $1 million for grants for graduate training of professional public-health personnel, pursuant to the provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, $1,040,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

On page 13, after line 11, to insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50 million, to remain available until expended."

On page 13, after line 15, to insert:

"Sanitary engineering activities: For an additional amount for 'Sanitary engineering activities', for carrying out the purposes of the act of July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), not otherwise provided for, $4,100,000, including $2,700,000 for grants to States and $300,000 for grants to interstate agencies."

On page 13, after line 21, to insert:

"Hospitals and medical care: For an additional amount for 'Hospitals and medical care', including $2 million for grants for advanced training of professional nurses, pursuant to the provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, $2,050,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

On page 14, after line 4, to insert:

"FOREIGN QUARANTINE SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Foreign quarantine service', $150,000."

On page 14, after line 7, to insert:

"Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health: The Surgeon General is authorized to transfer to the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year 1957, from other appropriations available to the Public Health Service for salaries and expenses for the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed $200,000 for administration of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 849, 84th Congress."

On page 14, after line 16, to insert:

"Construction of dental research building: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of buildings and facilities for the National Institute of Dental Research, in accordance with the National Dental Research Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 288), $200,000."

At the top of page 15, to insert:

"Grants for construction of health research facilities: For grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, $30 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 849, 84th Congress."

On page 15, after line 5, to insert:

"Construction of animal quarters: For construction of facilities for housing animals for the National Institutes of Health, including preparation of plans, equipment, and the temporary diversion of such facilities for office space, $1,371,000, to be derived by transfer from funds available to the National Institutes of Health as determined by the Surgeon General."

On page 15, after line 12, to insert:

"General office building: For plans and specifications preparatory to construction of a general office building, National Institutes of Health, $300,000, to be derived by transfer from funds available to the National Institutes of Health as determined by the Surgeon General."

On page 15, after line 17, to insert:

"Construction of library facilities: For the preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings for the National Library of Medicine, $350,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3430, 84th Congress."

At the top of page 16, to strike out "Title I" and insert "Chapter VII."

On page 16, after line 1, to insert "Public Works."

On page 17, line 5, to strike out "Title II."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and Rehabilitation," on page 17, line 19, after the word "rehabilitation", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$12,750,000, of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Alamogordo Dam, Carlsbad project, New Mexico; and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Dickinson Unit, North Dakota, Missouri River Basin project."

At the top of page 18, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to participate in the construction of the bridge required in the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, Arizona, Colorado River storage project; and may transfer for this purpose to the Secretary of the Interior funds available for the construction of public lands highways: *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall not exceed the cost of placing such bridge upon and across the dam under the provisions of the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709; 21 U. S. C. 6470)."

On page 18, after line 10, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Department of the Army

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

"Construction, general

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $2,520,000."

On page 18, after line 17, to insert: "Chapter VIII."

On page 18, after line 18, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"Contributions to international organizations

"Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1957 shall be available for contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, as authorized by the act of July 11, 1956 (Public Law 689), in an amount not to exceed $6,000."

On page 19, after line 3, to insert:

"MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

"For an additional amount for 'Missions to international organizations', $30,000."

On page 19, after line 6, to insert:

"CLEVELAND PAN AMERICAN GAMES

"For necessary expenses of the III Pan American Games, 1959, $100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the III Pan American Games Act of 1956 (S. J. Res. 186, 84th Cong.) or similar legislation."

On page 19, after line 13, to insert:

"RELATED AGENCIES

"Funds appropriated to the President

"President's special international program

"For an additional amount for the 'President's Special International Program', for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3116, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

At the top of page 20, to insert "Chapter IX."

On page 20, after line 1, to insert:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"Bureau of Narcotics

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $200,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 20, after line 6, to insert "Chapter X."

On page 20, after line 7, to insert:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Settlement of claims and suits

"For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of

February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), $10,000."

On page 20, after line 13, to insert:

"DIVISION OF EXPENSES

"The sum appropriated in this act for the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1957."

On page 20, after line 18, to insert "Chapter XI."

On page 20, after line 19, to insert:

"CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 143, 84th Congress, $1,312,538, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been agreed to en bloc, as requested by the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been agreed to.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

COAST GUARD

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, construction, and improvements," Coast Guard, for the construction of three patrol vessels, $6 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this amendment would appropriate an additional $6 million for the Coast Guard for the purpose of constructing three patrol boats. These ships are urgently required to enable the Coast Guard to continue its patrol activities in the Gulf of Mexico in relation to the protection of American fishing boats.

The State Department has indicated the urgent necessity for this appropriation by underscoring the fact that unless the patrol activities are maintained, a serious international incident could occur.

The Government of Mexico has for some time been seizing American fishing boats which they claim have been operating inside their jurisdiction limits. The operators of the vessels have claimed with equal force that the ships were outside the 9-mile limit claimed by Mexico. In order to furnish official protection and observers, the Coast Guard has been operating a patrol in these waters.

The construction of these three patrol vessels at the earliest time is of the greatest importance to the continued patrol activity which the State Department considers essential in this area.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is a very worthwhile amendment, and it should be adopted. I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment and ask that it be stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, $50,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 4228, 84th Congress, or similar legislation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the amendment. I have given a copy of it to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and to the ranking minority member, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

S. 4228 and H. R. 12025 would authorize the creation of a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space. S. 4228 passed the Senate, July 21. H. R. 12025 was reported favorably to the House, July 20, and is on the calendar.

The only difference between the bill passed by the Senate and the one reported by the House is in the funding provision. S. 4228 reads "Appropriations to the President for 'Expenses of Management Improvement' shall be available for necessary expenses of the Commission, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary for such expenses." H. R. 12025 as reported reads "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

By floor amendment the House included $50,000 in the first supplemental bill for 1957 for expenses of the Commission. The Senate Appropriations Committee deleted the $50,000 pending appropriate legislative authorization. Conference confirmed the Senate committee's action.

The second supplemental bill for 1957 has now passed the House and been reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee. It contains no appropriation for the Commission.

However, to insure that the funds will be available, it is recommended that the amendment be agreed to. I ask the chairman of the committee if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will be glad to accept the amendment. It is a reasonable request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Payments to school districts: For an additional amount for "Payments to school districts," $34,050,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is an amendment for the benefit of the so-called impacted area.

Mr. HILL. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that on Monday a bill was passed which authorizes the appropriation. The amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to join in what has been said by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am happy to have the Senator join us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Salaries and expenses: "For 'Salaries and expenses' for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) and expenses of attendance at meetings, $300,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. I realize that there was a difference of opinion on this amendment in committee. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Alabama was in favor of it in committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was not present when that item was discussed, but from the information which is at hand, I believe it is essential to have the money appropriated to proceed in the direction indicated.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the original request was for $650,000. My amendment would appropriate $300,000.

Mr. HILL. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will accept the amendment. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said I offered a similar amendment in committee. He is correct. I hope the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was in favor of the amendment when it was considered in committee. I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there are several amendments relating to the Atomic Energy Commission, and I hope we may be able to consider them at one time, not necessarily en bloc, but in sequence.

First of all I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and statement sent to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lewis Strauss, discussing the amendment and submitting a justification for it.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1956.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: The House of Representatives on yesterday passed H. R. 12350, "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957, and for other purposes," which included appropriations necessary to finance the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1957.

The appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission included in the bill as passed by the House total $1,938,700,000, which is $40,000,000 more than was requested by the President. As indicated by the House report, this additional amount was provided for acceleration of the power reactor development program.

In the action on the bill in the House, some of the provisions contained in the Commission's proposed appropriation language were eliminated on the basis of a point of order. The enactment of certain of these provisions is essential to enable the Commission to carry out its proposed program for the fiscal year 1957, and I am submitting herewith 17 copies of a statement which sets forth the proposed amendments and the necessity therefor.

In addition to the provisions included in the proposed amendments, the House eliminated two limitations which have been included in appropriation acts for the past several years. The first provision limits amounts to be paid as fees to contractors for the operation of certain community facilities, and the second provision requires security clearances for persons receiving payments under fellowships granted by the Commission. The Commission feels that the inclusion of these limitations in the 1957 Appropriation Act is a matter for determination by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS STRAUSS,
Chairman.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1957 (H. R. 12350)

PUBLIC WORKS' ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amended estimate submitted to the House:	
Operating expenses	$1,740,400,000
Plant acquisition and construction	158,300,000
Total	1,898,700,000
Act:	
Operating expenses	1,780,400,000
Plant acquisition and construction	158,300,000
Total	1,938,700,000
Change by House:	
Operating expenses	+40,000,000
Plant acquisition and construction	0
Total	+40,000,000

AMENDMENTS TO BILL

(1) Page 16, line 7, before the first semicolon insert the following: ", including the employment of aliens."

(2) Page 16, line 21, before the period insert the following: ", together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1956, of prior year appropriations made available under this head to the Atomic Energy Commission, and, in addition, any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U. S. C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 484): *Provided*, That of such amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred."

(3) Page 17, line 4, strike out the period and add the following: ", to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1956, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for 'Plant and equipment' for the activity 'Equipment not included in construction projects', shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for 'Operating Expenses', and the remaining balance of such appropriations shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That, in the event additional feed materials capacity is constructed by private industry with its own funds, the amounts included in this appropriation for such construction may be transferred to the appropriation for 'Operating Expenses.'

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Any appropriation available under this or any other act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this act during the fiscal year 1957 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

"Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation under this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate."

HOUSE REPORT

PUBLIC WORKS—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating expenses

Appropriations, 1956	[1] $575,000,000
Estimates, 1957	1,740,400,000
Recommended, 1957	1,780,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriations, 1956	+1,205,400,000
Estimates, 1957	+40,000,000

[1] An additional $481,400,000 transferred from prior year appropriations under the head "Plant and equipment."

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,780,400,000, an increase of $40 million over the budget estimate of $1,740,400,000 and an increase of $1,205,400,000 over the 1956 appropriation.

Funds for the reactor-development program have been increased by $40 million. This $40 million and the $10 million in the budget estimate for "Increase for power reactors demonstration program" together with the $15 million in the budget estimate for power reactor acceleration will make a total of $65 million available for acceleration of the power-reactor program. It is the understanding of the committee that these funds will be available for any research and development work which may be necessary in connection with the civilian atomic power acceleration program provided for in the plant acquisition and construction appropriation.

Plant acquisition and construction

Appropriations, 1956	$259,227,000
Estimates, 1957	158,300,000
Recommended, 1957	558,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriations, 1956	+299,073,000
Estimates, 1957	+400,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $558,300,000, an increase of $400 million over the budget estimate of $158,300,000 and an increase of $299,073,000 over the 1956 appropriation. This increase is for the purpose of implementing the provisions of H. R. 12061 for a civilian atomic power acceleration program. Language authorizing this program has been included in the bill.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The Commission proposes no amendments with respect to the amounts of the appropriations provided in the bill. The following amendments as proposed herein are to reinstate certain provisions in appropriation language which were recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in its report on the bill but which were stricken by the House during its consideration on the basis of points of order. In addition to the provisions covered by the proposed amendments, the House action has resulted in the elimination of two limitations which have been included in appropriation acts in 1956 and prior years. The first of these is the limitation on the amount to be paid as fees to contractors for the operation of certain community facilities. The second provision requires a loyalty determination regarding persons receiving fellowship payments from the Commission. The Commission feels that the inclusion of these limitations in the 1957 Appropriation Act is properly a matter to be determined by the Congress.

Amendment (1) would restore authority to the Commission to employ aliens. From time to time it is highly desirable to employ outstanding and talented scientists for research work in the Commission's laboratories. Such persons have made very significant and valuable contributions to our program. If this amendment were not adopted it would be necessary to immediately terminate the employment of such persons now working on the program. This authority has been available to the Commission since 1948.

Amendment (2) would reinstate the following provisions:

(a) Provide for the reappropriation of unexpended balances of prior year appropriations and the merger of such balances with the current appropriation.

The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1957 reflect the application of an estimated unobligated balance of $40 million as a reduction in the amount of new appropriations for the fiscal year 1957. The elimination of this provision therefore would have the effect of reducing amounts available for obligation in the fiscal year 1957 by $40 million. Furthermore, the provision which authorizes the merger of unexpended balances has been included in appropriation acts since the adoption of the cost performance budget system in 1951. This has enabled the Commission to simplify its accounting and budget procedures and to relieve contractors of a complicated identification of each payment with the year or years of obligation. This provision has the approval of the Comptroller General.

(b) Allow the AEC to retain, for application to its cost of operations, cash receipts which otherwise would be deposited to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

This proviso would authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to retain and apply, against its costs of operations, receipts which otherwise would be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. At the present time, collections made by AEC (representing 15 percent of all collections) must be deposited to the Treasury, but collections made by contractors (representing 85 percent of all collections) may be applied against their cost of operation. This proviso would enable the AEC to treat all collections (except those received under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955) on a uniform basis, irrespective of whether the AEC or the contractors made the collection. The Comptroller General, in a letter to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy dated June 2, 1955, reported that AEC's budget and accounting procedures provide adequate control over the receipt and disposition of collections made by contractors. Since the credit for these revenues has been applied in determining the appropriation required for fiscal year 1957 the elimination of this proviso would have the effect of reducing amounts available to the Commission.

(c) Authorize the use of not to exceed $100,000 for confidential expenditures.

Section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides that acts appropriating funds for the Atomic Energy Commission "may appropriate specified portions thereof to be accounted for upon the certification of the Commission only." The proposed amendment is necessary to make funds available to the Commission to make confidential payments for security and intelligence purposes.

(d) Authorize the transfer of funds to appropriations of other Government agencies for performance of work for the Atomic Energy Commission.

This authority has been available to the Commission since 1948 in order to provide a means of having work done by other agencies which for security reasons, should not be identified as being related to the atomic energy program.

Amendment (3) would reinstate the following provisions:

(a) Make funds appropriated for plant acquisition and construction available until expended.

Appropriations for plant construction have been on a no-year basis since the establishment of a separate appropriation for this purpose in the fiscal year 1953. This follows the general appropriation practice (of making appropriations on this basis) for all major construction programs of the Government. Since construction on many of these projects continues for several years it is difficult to determine precisely when each phase of the work will require obligation of funds. If this provision is not inserted the funds appropriated for construction would not be available for obligation after June 30, 1957. If portions of the program were not covered by obligations as of that date it would be necessary to request new appropriations to complete the work despite the fact that the Congress had previously made appropriations for such purposes.

(b) Permit the transfer of obligated balances as of June 30, 1956, for equipment not included in construction projects to the appropriation for operating expenses.

The appropriation language enacted by the House provides that, effective July 1, 1956, funds for equipment not included in construction projects are included in the operating expenses appropriation, whereas heretofore they were included in the plant and equipment appropriation. The proposed language deleted by the House provided that obligated balances of such equipment remaining in the plant and equipment appropriation as of June 30, 1956, were to be transferred to the operating expenses appropriation. This amendment is necessary so that all costs and expenditures for equipment made during the fiscal year 1957 can be accounted for under one account providing for an orderly transition in accounting for such equipment under the new appropriation structure.

(c) Authorize the merger of balances of prior year appropriations for construction made under the title "Plant and Equipment" with those to be appropriated in 1957 for the same purpose under the title "Plant Acquisition and Construction."

The inclusion of this provision is necessary because of the change in the title of the appropriation made to reflect the transfer of equipment to the operating expense appropriation.

(d) Authorize the transfer of funds to the operating expenses appropriation if additional feed materials capacity is constructed by private industry with its own funds.

The appropriation passed by the House for plant acquisition and construction includes funds for the construction of additional feed materials facilities. Proposals from private industry are being considered by AEC whereby private industry would construct the facilities with its own funds and AEC would enter into unit price contracts for the procurement of feed materials. If these proposals are accepted, funds would not be required for construction, but would be required under operating expenses to cover long term liabilities under the contracts for procurement of the concentrates under unit price contracts.

(e) Authorize adjustments between appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission on the basis of cost.

This authority has been available to the Commission since 1951 when the Commission first presented its budget on a cost basis. It enables the Commission to reflect charges to appropriations on the basis of ultimate use rather than on the manner of obligation. This language is especially valuable in the purchase of stores inventories, where, at the time of purchase, the use of the stores as between the two appropriation accounts is not precisely known.

(f) Authorize the transfer of not to exceed 5 percent between appropriations.

This authority is required to enable the Commission to proceed with certain new activities in a manner which is most advantageous to the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up the first amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$1,780,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,740,400,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this would bring the appropriation up to the amount of the budget estimate. There was added $40 million in the committee. It was agreed to in the Senate, but killed in the House yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my next amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 17, line 7, before the first semicolon, to insert the following: "including the employment of aliens."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission finds it necessary to employ aliens, and I, therefore, deem the amendment important. It is in language which has heretofore been carried in the atomic energy bill, which was stricken by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I see no reason why I should not accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my next amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 16, line 21, after the sum insert: ", together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1956, of prior year appropriations made available under this head to the Atomic Energy Commission, and, in addition, any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U. S. C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 484): *Provided*, That of such amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance

of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided, further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, that is a provision which has been contained in appropriation bills for several years.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the language should be in the bill, and I see no reason why I should not take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have a further amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 17, line 4, after the sum to insert:

Provided, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1956, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for "Plant and equipment", for the activity "Equipment not included in construction projects", shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Operating expenses", and the remaining balance of such appropriations shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further,* That, in the event additional feed materials capacity is constructed by private industry with its own funds, the amounts included in this appropriation for such construction may be transferred to the appropriation for "Operating expenses."

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this act during the fiscal year 1957 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided,* That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation under this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

No part of any appropriation herein made to the Atomic Energy Commission shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided,* That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. ANDERSON. That, again, Mr. President, is a standard provision which has been in the law for several years. I think it should go to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think the language should be restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I call up the amendment, which I laid on the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 12, line 19, to insert the following new section:

CHAPTER II

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Contingent Expenses of the House

Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: For an additional amount for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, $50,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Revenue Taxation which was created under the Revenue Act of 1926 was authorized by law to investigate the operation and effect of internal revenue taxes.

Since the staff has undertaken new studies at the direction of the chairman relating to the internal revenue laws pursuant to the authority vested in the committee by the statute, it is necessary that sufficient funds be available to permit the carrying on of the studies. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Virginia has rendered very fine service. I think it is entirely proper that I accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 11, line 9, to strike out "1947" and to insert in lieu thereof "1957."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I say to the chairman of the committee and to the Members of the Senate that this amendment simply corrects a clerical error.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is my amendment No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

For an additional amount for "Grants States, and other agencies," $1 million, for grants for special projects under section 4 (a) (2): *Provided,* that not more than $2 of these funds shall be expended for any project for each $1 that the grantee or the grantee and the State, expends for the same purpose: *Provided, further,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3875, 84th Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the time the Senate Appropriations Committee considered the bill there was a proposal for extending vocational rehabilitation. This amendment is merely to make an appropriation of $1 million to carry out that extension.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is No. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, it is proposed to strike out lines 8 through 16, and insert in lieu thereof:

Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health: An additional amount for "Operating expenses, National Institutes of health", $200,000, for administration of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 849, 84th Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the Senate Committee on Appropriations considered this item it was agreed that $200,000 should be appropriated, but instead of appropriating it some language was put into the bill providing for the transfer of certain funds. Since agreeing on the transfer of funds the Senator from Alabama has been advised by representatives of the House Committee on Appropriations that they will not agree to the transfer of funds but will agree to an appropriation, because they feel it should be made. What this amendment does is to make the appropriation of $200,000 just as the committee thought it should be made, a direct appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, under those circumstances I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I call up my last amendment, No. 5, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, it is proposed to strike out the words, beginning in lines 10 and 15, "to be derived by transfer from funds available to the National Institutes of Health as determined by the Surgeon General."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, What I stated about the transfer of funds with reference to the previous amendment applies to this amendment, and I hope the Senator from Arizona will accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment with the same understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Under the subtitle of "Sanitary engineering activities" I see the sum of $4,100,000 is appropriated, including $2,700,000 for grants to the States and $300,000 to interstate agencies. As I understand the language, it is over and above the $4,100,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, it is not.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Is that a part of the $4,100,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a part of the total.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. According to the author of the act in the other body the amount of funds under section 4, and according to the report, is limited to $450,000 for research.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Alabama had charge of that matter.

Mr. HILL. We arranged the language so that the States might get their part of the Federal funds to go forward with the State plans.

As the Senator knows, under the act which has now passed both Houses of Congress, before any Federal funds available for any projects in a particular State can be used, the State must make its study and its plans, and then submit the plans for approval.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. After the plan has been approved, the project under the plan in the particular State will become eligible for Federal funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is my understanding.

I should like to ask the Senator a further question. The funds under section 4 are strictly for research purposes, as I understand the act. There is a feeling on the part of those who worked so diligently to make the act a reality that that amount of money—$450,000—will seriously restrict the possibilities of water pollution control under the terms of the act. In fact, it has been suggested to me that that sum should be raised to the amount of $1,450,000 for research activities. I would appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. HILL. If the figure were to be raised to the full amount, the increase would be $1 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. One million four hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. HILL. It would be the full figure as authorized by the act.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. The point seems to be that the research funds are of importance to this particular proposal, and that the modest amount provided in the bill might very seriously limit the effectiveness of this particular act.

I desire to have the advice and counsel of the able Senator from Alabama, for whom I have such a high regard. I know he examined into the matter. I wondered if the Senator would be receptive to increasing the figure from $450,000 to $900,000.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has charge of the bill; but I may say to him that I think it would be well to make the figure $900,000 and to take it to conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. The urgency of this matter in terms of research is, I think, of the utmost importance. Therefore, in order to formalize the procedure, I move that the amount be raised from $4,100,000, as provided in the bill, to $4,550,000, with the understanding that the additional $450,000 will go to section 4 research funds.

Mr. HILL. That is satisfactory.

Mr. HAYDEN. On the recommendation of the Senator from Alabama, who is more familiar with the subject than I am, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$4,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,550,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I have a comment to make on that amendment. In Cincinnati, the Taft Engineering Co. is engaged in the kind of work to which the Senator from Minnesota is referring. Rather than to increase the amount, I think the figure should be changed, so as to keep the present figure at $4,100,000, and substituting an amendment which will provide a sufficient amount of money for research.

Actually, it was not intended by the House or by the Budget Bureau, or by any other agency of the Government, to curtail research to that extent at all. I think that by changing the language somewhat, the $4,100,000 could be retained, and the amount for research could be increased.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, has not the amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the amendment has not been adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. It is my understanding that it was accepted by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. So it has been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been accepted by the chairman of the committee, but it has not been voted upon by the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not think the Senator wants to take any funds out of the $3 million. The $3 million is to provide Federal funds for matching to bring into being the State plans.

Before any project under this act can be eligible within any State for any Federal funds within a particular State, whether it be Ohio, Alabama, or any other State, the State first must make its survey, its study, and its plans, and then submit the plans and have them approved.

There might be some other immediate project, but that project would not be eligible unless the State plan had been approved. The purpose of the $3 million was to enable the States to have their plans approved.

Mr. BENDER. As I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota provides $400,000 more for research.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is correct; $450,000.

Mr. BENDER. That is acceptable to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is agreed to.

AGREEMENT FOR CONSIDERATION OF RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, I submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement concerning the consideration of the rivers and harbors bill tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective at 9:30 a. m. on July 26, 1956, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12080), the public works authorization bill, and the debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any

Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreement is entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Barlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of 1 prototype ship and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12354) relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5712) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto, and it was signed by the Vice President.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have previously sent to the desk an amendment relating to educational, scientific, and cultural activities in Israel, which was requested by the State Department. I now call up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Not to exceed $3,500,000 of foreign currencies, available after June 30, 1955, from the special account for the informational media guaranty program, shall be available during the current fiscal year for educational, scientific, and cultural purposes, as authorized by section 1011 (d) of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the appropriation authorized by law?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is there a budget estimate for it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. It was also submitted to the committee and is authorized by the 1956 Mutual Security Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under those circumstances, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am offering the amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Illinois has permitted me to join as a cosponsor in the offering of the amendment, and I am delighted that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has accepted it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is a most desirable one. Its purpose is the utilization of accumulated funds in the currency of the State of Israel, to be used there for the purpose of educational, scientific, and cultural projects, as the projects may be jointly agreed to, as I understand, by our Government and the Government of Israel. The money will not be used constructively unless we so designate. It might very well become depreciated in value unless the designation is made now.

I am happy to join as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the chairman of the committee accepts the amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit another amendment, which is at the desk.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? May I be made a cosponsor of the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withhold my request and I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] be made a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask that I may be made a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall gladly accept the cosponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 10, after line 19, to insert:

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission to carry out the year-long celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington and to promote the spirit of interracial good will, and revive interest in the practical policies, programs, principles, and philosophies of Booker T. Washington, $225,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as everyone knows, Booker T. Washington made such a great contribution to interracial good will that I think we are under some obligation to observe the 100th anniversary of his birth. That is all this fund is designed to do.

I submit the amendment in behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. I sincerely hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will take the amendment to conference and deal generously with it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment and will take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] may be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment providing for payment to the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 6, under title "Reimbursement to District of Columbia," it is proposed to insert:

For reimbursement to the Highway Fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, $665,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HAYDEN. My recollection is that an appropriation of this kind was provided last year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. It was provided in a public law of the 84th Congress. It is specified by law. The amendment provides for a readjustment to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 19, line 9, to strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the amendment has to do with the pan-American games. A bill was passed authorizing an expenditure of $5 million for the games in 1959. The committee authorized $10,000 in its report. I have taken the amendment up with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES], and the majority leader. I understand they are willing to accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there would be no harm in providing a little more money to commence the study of this very important project. I think it would be entirely proper to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarthy
Allott	Gore	McClellan
Anderson	Green	McNamara
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bender	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Hruska	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey, Minn.	Neuberger
Bush		O'Mahoney
Butler	Humphreys, Ky.	Pastore
Byrd		Payne
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kefauver	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Smathers
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Duff	Laird	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Symington
Eastland	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ervin	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Frear	Mansfield	Wofford
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Young
George	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the Chair). A quorum is present.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert:

To carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation and maintenance of a public airport in the vicinity of the District of Columbia", approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 770), $12,943,750.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my amendment seeks to add to the bill $15 million plus for the construction of a second airport for Washington, D. C. This is in line with an authorization approved by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both the House and Senate and voted by the Congress in 1950. It is in line with action taken by the Appropriations Committee in the year 1950, during which time more than $1 million was spent to acquire land in the vicinity of Burke, Va., to give Washington a second airport, which the Civil Aeronautics Board and those familiar with aviation needs said was necessary to meet the demands of the increasing air traffic into and out of Washington, D. C.

Bear in mind that this was in the year 1950, when most of our traffic was limited to DC–3's, slower aircraft, and flight movements well under half of the flight movements in and out of Washington National Airport today.

This project was not promoted by any land speculators or any civic pride group. It was originated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, viewing the increasing air traffic in the year 1950. It came to the conclusion that a second airport in the vicinity of Washington was an absolute must.

The location of Burke, Va., was not chosen by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It was not chosen by the Appropriations Committee. The selection was not made by anyone in political life, by any county officials, governors, or chambers of commerce.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration, with all its technicians, was directed by the Congress to find the best available site, near enough to Washington to serve our needs, yet far enough away from the Washington National Airport and other airports so that air traffic safety would be promoted, and so that dangerous conditions over the airport would not result.

This proposal is the most closely and carefully studied local bill I have known in my 18 years in Congress. It was studied constantly for many years by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both Houses, prior to the authorization. It was restudied by the Appropriations Committee before it recommended an appropriation of $1 million to acquire land at the site where the technicians said the second airport should be built, in the interest of safety.

It was studied again by the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as recently as a year ago, after which time, after receiving the evidence which was presented to us by the men who fly the planes, the Airline Pilots Association, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and all the others concerned, our committee unanimously directed that the Civil Aeronautics Administration, through the budget office of the President, bring in, not later than January 3 of this year, a recommendation for an appropriation to begin construction of a second airport, which was necessary for this vicinity.

We did not specify where to place the airport. The location had already been chosen by the technicians. It was testified by them that it was the only available site yet undeveloped which would be capable of serving Washington conveniently for the air needs of the future.

The Commerce Department supervisors and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, instead of bringing in, on January 3, a budget recommendation, as our committee had unanimously directed, came in with a recommendation, not from the Civil Aeronautics Administration, but from the Department of Commerce and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. The recommendation was for an intermixture of civilian and military aircraft at Andrews Field. This seemed to present very grave danger. It involved intermixing civilian aircraft with jet-fighter planes, some flying as fast as the speed of sound. The airport at Andrews Field, used by the military, is becoming overcrowded. Although it is close to Washington, the testimony showed that, with military use, it could not serve as a safe airport for Washington, D. C.

After several days' hearings and study, the testimony being taken by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, we rejected the joint use of Andrews Airbase, and directed that a recommendation be brought in for the solution of this problem.

Burke, Va., had been recommended as the second best location, if it were not possible to manage an intermixture of civilian and jet aircraft at Andrews Field.

After many months of delay, in the closing days of Congress, only a few weeks ago, a budget request was submitted to Congress for an appropriation of $34,700,000. This amount was asked for by the proponents of a second airport at Burke, Va., in a 1-day hearing before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Because of other pressing business, the maximum number of members of the Appropriations Committee present that day at no time was more than four.

After this brief hearing, it was decided to hold up the budget request for $34,700,000, and, instead, to propose the establishment of a committee to study the question as to whether Congress should appropriate next year funds for construction of the Burke Airport.

Because of my doubt of the legality of the authorization bill containing an authorization of $34,700,000, and in order to remove any doubt that the expenditure for starting money is within the limits previously authorized by the Congress, I have amended the amount requested by the Budget to $12,700,000 plus, in order not to lose a valuable period of some 8 months' time in order to begin to relieve what today is an extremely dangerous and critically congested air space over the Washington National Airport.

It is one of the most congested air spaces in the country. It is a strange thing to me, Mr. President, that the collision between the TWA plane and the United Airlines plane occurred over Arizona, and not over the Washington National Airport.

The testimony before our committee from the Airline Pilots Association revealed stories which would curl one's hair—stories about coming in through murky and soupy weather, with planes landing 30 seconds behind the tail of the plane ahead. It would require only a small slip in the cockpit of any of these planes to produce a crash which would

result in many more casualties than occurred in the broad air space over the Grand Canyon a few weeks ago.

I know of no one in the aviation industry who does not support wholeheartedly the request for getting under way with the Burke Airport. The argument has always been, "Mañana—tomorrow. Let us investigate some more. Let us not do anything about it now." That attitude has continued until the air space over the Washington National Airport today is considered by pilots who fly in and out of that airport to be one of the most dangerous air areas in the United States. This is the Nation's Capital, which draws people from the 48 States of the Union. We certainly should be entitled to have an airport in the Capital of the United States which would be at least equal to the facilities we have built around the world through mutual security aid. We have given a new airport to the city of London. We have given two to the city of Paris. Whether we go to Cairo or Lebanon, we find great airbases which we have built in profusion.

In Washington there is only one airport, which is handling a record-breaking volume of traffic, and its capacity is crowded to a dangerous degree. Do Senators know, for example, that planes overfly Washington on dozens of schedules today? Those planes would like to land in Washington, but there is no available time to get them through the crowded stack and to land in Washington, except between the hours of midnight and dawn, when fewer people are using the airport.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am not informed on the subject, although I have read a little about it in the newspapers. What is wrong with using Friendship Airport?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that Friendship Airport, according to the testimony, and according to my own driving experience, is so far from Washington that it is necessary to allow an hour and 15 minutes in which to reach the airport from a downtown hotel in Washington, if sufficient time is to be allowed for the formalities for arriving at the airport and checking in and boarding the plane. Washington serves short-haul traffic to a higher degree than any other airport in the Nation. Our traffic comes in from——

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to complete my statement in answer to the question from the Senator from Tennessee. A heavy short-haul traffic comes into Washington from New York, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh. People would not use Friendship Airport if it were necessary for them to travel the considerably extra long distance to reach Washington after landing at Friendship Airport in Baltimore. Under those conditions, instead of going by air, people would prefer to go by train, because they could make better time than by going by bus, for example, from the Statler Hotel, to Friendship Airport, and then flying from Baltimore to New York.

I might say also that Baltimore built the Friendship Airport so that its people would not have to use National Airport in Washington. That was done at a time when the traffic at Washington National Airport was not so heavy as it is today. At that time, by using the Washington Airport, people from Baltimore had much better airline service. However, National Airport was too far from Baltimore. Therefore, Baltimore spent about $13 million or $14 million to build its airport. I do not believe that the air passenger traffic to the Nation's Capital should be rerouted to Baltimore.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator believe that Washington air traffic ought to be forced to use the Baltimore airport, or that the Baltimore air traffic should be forced to use the Washington Airport?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly the point. When the second airport at Washington is completed, there will be no necessity for urging the use of the Baltimore airport. We might as well ask people to use the Baltimore railroad station at Baltimore, instead of the Union Station in Washington. To follow that line of argument, we would not need the Union Station in Washington.

Mr. President, this is the Nation's Capital. One of the purposes of aviation is to provide speed in transportation. If people were forced to drive for 50 minutes—and that is the bus time, according to the testimony before our committee; and if anyone should drive that distance in less than 50 minutes he would be likely to be arrested for speeding—they would not use the Baltimore airport.

However, the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce insists that Washington should become the captive community of the Baltimore airport. The chamber of commerce insists that we must not have at Washington the air facilities necessary to serve the air traffic generated by the Nation's Capital.

People come to Washington because this is the Nation's Capital. That is why people come here from New York City and Pittsburgh and Philadelphia and Chicago. If they must be rerouted to Baltimore, the result will be that we will probably help a little bit along the line of safety by eliminating some of the overcrowding; but I do not believe that any of the Senators who have been at Friendship Airport will ever have any doubt that Friendship Airport is still the Baltimore airport and not the airport serving the Nation's Capital.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Suppose a Member of the Senate is in Chicago and he wishes to come to Washington. If Friendship Airport were used, would he have to buy a ticket from Chicago to Baltimore, or from Chicago to Washington?

Mr. MONRONEY. The proposal would be that he would have to buy a ticket to Washington-Baltimore. He might get on a plane that would take him to Washington, and he might get on a plane that would take him to Baltimore. He would have to read the fine print on the ticket and on the timetable.

Mr. GORE. Under an arrangement like that, Senators and Representatives and Government officials would perhaps be inconvenienced. I know, for example, that many of us operate on a tight schedule. I know that there is a plane which arrives from my State at 11:30 in the morning. That is very convenient, because I can take a cab from the airport and get to the Capitol in time for the session at noon. If I must travel about 50 miles farther, and take 1 hour and 15 minutes to come to the Capitol, I might miss a 1:30 rollcall.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that most of the passengers who come to Washington from New York or Boston or Chicago or Cleveland or Philadelphia, are men who come to Washington to attend hearings or to conduct other business, and that they are on a very tight schedule before the various Government departments in their appointments downtown, for example. Washington generates the traffic because it is the seat of government. As a nation we have been very liberal in building airports all over the world, and I certainly believe that we could afford to have a second airport in the Nation's Capital, because the air traffic has grown to such tremendous volume and because the only safe thing we can do under the circumstances is to divide the traffic between two airports.

Another point is that if we must go to the Baltimore airport in order to obtain some safety in air operations, we might as well go to Richmond. We would be adding to our safety by going to Richmond, and we would be going just about as far as we would be going to Baltimore.

The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, through its very able representatives, seeks to prevent us from building the second airport. The effort of the representatives of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce are laudable from their standpoint. However, we are the National Congress. We do not represent the chamber of commerce of Baltimore.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I must confess that I have very meager information on this subject. However, I should like to know who it is who is trying to have the Washington traffic go to Baltimore.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. GORE. I thought Congress represented the American people.

Mr. MONRONEY. Congress is supposed to represent the American people, but this subject has been considerably confused by the idea that the airport at Baltimore, which was built to serve the people of Baltimore, because the people of Baltimore thought it was too far to go to Washington to take a plane, should now be used to serve Washington.

Apparently it is not too far for Washington people to go to Baltimore to take a plane.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Baltimore spent about $15 million because it was too far for the people of Baltimore to come to Washington.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to reply to the Senator from Tennessee. Then I shall be happy to yield. The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, of course, says, "No; you cannot have another airport in Washington." The chamber of commerce wants us to use its airport in Baltimore. If they had located the airport halfway between the two cities, that would have been a different matter.

Mr. BEALL and Mr. BUTLER addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I am explaining to my friend from Tennessee what the situation is. He does not represent the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. BUTLER. He does not know much about the facts either.

Mr. GORE. Baltimore is a delightful city, and I hope to visit it, but I do not believe I should be forced to go to Baltimore every time I want to fly to Washington.

Mr. MONRONEY. Exactly. Anyone who will buy a ticket, if the Friendship Airport is forced on Washington, will not know whether he will land in Baltimore or in Washington, because the schedule will have to be so arranged that certain planes will land in Washington and certain planes will land in Baltimore. It will be necessary to read the fine print to find out. Estimates have been made which indicate that by 1960 the metropolitan district of Washington will have a population of 5 million. In order to please the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, we will be offering a substantial number of those 5 million people the privilege of spending an extra hour going to Friendship Airport and another hour coming from the airport, and we will be allowing them to spend an extra dollar or a dollar and a half for bus fare.

Much as I love my two distinguished colleagues from Maryland, who have done such a fine job for the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, Washington is the Nation's Capital and is entitled to good air service. There is poor air service in Baltimore, and a poor schedule, which indicates to me that the people of Baltimore do not fly very much. Yet, they want to get in on these good airline schedules, because they tell us that if we build up a larger traffic load, there will be more business for Baltimore. The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce should be proud of the two Senators who have so ably managed to prevent construction of a project which everyone who has ever studied it says must be built at Burke. This is a technical decision; it is not a political decision.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If a man boards a plane in Pittsburgh or Nashville or some other point and wishes to call his wife and ask if she will meet him at the plane, where would he tell her to meet him?

Mr. MONRONEY. He would get out his eyeglasses and try to read the schedule to find out whether flight 69 was coming into Washington Airport or into Friendship Airport. If it is a late schedule, he could probably tell his wife to meet him at the National Airport. If the schedule were over 2 weeks old, the plane might be landing in the next month or two in Baltimore. If the man should board a plane to go to Washington and was put off at Baltimore, he would have to take an hour and 15 minutes and pay an extra dollar to reach Washington by bus or hire a taxi to take him there.

The proponents of the Friendship Airport idea think a depot should be located at New York Avenue and Bladensburg Road. I do not know why they did not choose Laurel, Md.; it would be nearer to Friendship. But they want a depot at New York Avenue and Bladensburg Road. Then one could take a cab and run up another $2 going to northwest Washington, instead of having a national airport 14.8 miles from the control tower, far enough away to be safe, but not so far as going into another State and to another city on a long tour in nice, comfortable buses. The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce would like to see those planes coming in——

Mr. GORE. The Senator has already convinced me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the turn of the century I believe there was a popular song entitled "Put Me Off at Buffalo." Is the Senator saying that there is now an attempt to write a new popular song entitled "Put Me Off at Baltimore"?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am afraid there will be a lot of kicks, particularly by United States Senators, when the plane door is opened and they think they are getting off at Washington instead of at the delightful city on Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. BUTLER. They will have a thrill when they come to Washington, and do not have to get off in Virginia.

Mr. MONRONEY. Burke is 14.8 miles on the Shirley Highway, without a red light until we get to Independence Avenue and 13th Street, I think.

Let us talk about this a little bit. We always meet these difficulties. It is something like locating a fish hatchery. Someone has always got other ideas about where a fish hatchery should be located.

I am willing to yield to my colleagues when they want a fish hatchery or a dam or a dock. But the traffic coming from Washington and taking off from here is interstate commerce. The Senators from Maryland and the Senators from Virginia, I may say, do not use the airlines very much to come to Washington, but there are 92 other Senators who have to use the airlines. The number of near misses we have had in the past 3 or 4 weeks have been tabulated, as have been the number of congestions on the radio, in the cockpit, where for several minutes the man in the cockpit cannot reach the control tower. He cannot contact the control tower to get landing instructions to come into Washington. I can remember the old situation when we came in over high-tension wires and cut off in a hurry, on a "dogleg" on a runway. For years Congress battled with it. For years there were new investigations and technicians did their work. Then, one day, President Roosevelt said he was going to issue an Executive order to start construction of a Washington airport. He was asked why, and he said, "I had a dream that one of the huge airliners came in for a landing and cracked up and people were killed." He said he was starting it at Gravelly Point on the Potomac River. That is the airport which now serves this Nation well. It cost around $12 million. A great deal of it was WPA money, putting idle people to work. This WPA project was a boondoggle in those days. Unfortunately, Friendship Airport had not been built, or they would have wanted to use Friendship.

The Washington Airport was built at a cost of $12 million, and has paid into the United States Treasury, since 1942, $17 million. Every 48 hours the United States Treasury gets at least $15,000 from the Washington National Airport.

The income from landing fees is great. Under the new estimates, they will run about $178,000 a year. Even the ground transportation will pay into the Federal Treasury about $175,000.

The parking lot pays $118,000, and the shoeshine concession paid $1,650 last year.

Can we wonder why the Friendship Airport wants to be bailed out, to collect landing fees? The Baltimore Chamber of Commerce wants the planes to land near Baltimore.

I wish the Members of the Senate who will have to vote on this question would start out and drive from the Statler Hotel to Friendship, and see how fast they can make it. I have not been able to make it in less than 55 minutes, and I had to violate the speed laws a little bit at that.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator proposing an investigation, or has it already been investigated?

Mr. MONRONEY. It has been investigated. It has been restudied by the technicians. It was restudied in 1950. It was studied last year, and there was a unanimous report that we had to have a second Washington airport. That was reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It was restudied a few weeks ago. The reports have been virtually unanimous, except the last one which was not concurred in by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who is fighting so ably for the use of the Friendship Airport.

We have made sufficient studies so that if the paperwork were laid end to end, it would hard-surface the runways.

I feel that we have an obligation to the Nation, to the air travelers, and we have an obligation to the national defense of

this country. Where would we have been in World War II had we not had the Washington National Airport to handle the overseas communications which had to go out from Washington?

What shall we do? Shall we postpone the construction of another airport, as is proposed in the pending appropriation bill, for another study, another investigation, and another delay? Eight or 9 months is what it will cost in time before we get to where we can get today; that is, if the $12 million which is in the bill can be appropriated. The land can be acquired. The engineering studies can be made. Bids can be obtained. The pouring of concrete for the runways can be started by the time the Committee on Appropriations provides the second amount with which to go to work sometime in February or March 1957. It will be necessary to get another authorization, because construction costs have gone up so much since 1950, when it was first proposed to build the airport.

The runways must be larger. The jet age is only 3 years away. Everyone knows that. Jet transports from coast to coast and from country to country will be the major long-range carriers. It will not be possible to land them in Washington. The Nation's Capital is not important enough to have a jet runway. Such runways cannot be built along the Potomac, because there is no airspace. There is not the length which is necessary, without having dangerous situations of water backing up into the basement of the Pentagon, and many other hydraulic problems connected with filled land.

So a jet airport cannot be made out of Washington National Airport. The Baltimore airport could be used, although it is a little obsolete for jet transports. But jets could get in and out.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator from Oklahoma saying that within a short time it will be impossible to board a plane at any principal city in the United States and come to Washington?

Mr. MONRONEY. It will be impossible to board a true jet airliner, such as will be flying the skies soon on the long transcontinental runs, and land at Washington.

Mr. GORE. That is what I mean.

Mr. MONRONEY. That will occur within 3 years.

Mr. GORE. The planes of the future will be jet planes; and, unless something is done to correct the situation, there will be no jet planes landing in Washington; it will be necessary to go to Baltimore.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true; or it will be necessary to take an old-fashioned DC–3 in order to come into Washington. It is the "horse and buggy" idea all over again. It will not be possible to come from Florida. Florida will be able to have jet airliners use the fine fields the Government helped to build. But Washington will not be able to accommodate jet airliners. So, passengers will have to pass up the jet airliners; and if they want to come into National Airport they must come in on an old-fashioned plane, because the Nation's Capital cannot afford to build an airport to accommodate jet airliners. Yet, jet planes are on order and are scheduled for delivery before the Burke Airport, if it is to be voted tonight, could be completed to accommodate them.

Yet it is proposed to delay its construction for another 7 or 8 months, while more and more studies are made.

I think it is a mistake to allow local prejudices and local differences of opinion as to location and the protests of local property owners to interfere with this project. I can appreciate the responses which Senators receive from the immediate localities concerned, but I may say that the airport will be located in Fairfax County.

Representative BROYHILL, who represents that county, took a poll of all the registered voters of which he had a list in Fairfax County. He sent all of them questionnaires, asking if they wanted Burke Airport to be built.

I feel certain the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], who has opposed the project, did not load the questionnaires in any way so as to favor Burke Airport. But when the returns came in, they showed that a majority of the people who lived in that county wanted the airport to be located at Burke.

Then we are told that the county is too wide an area for a poll and a poll should be taken of the township. Where will we find a township in which everyone is going to get together?

There are property owners who do not want 4-lane highways to go past their country homes. But progress demands that such highways be built. Similarly, progress demands that safe airports be built close enough to the cities they are intended to serve to be usable for air traffic uses.

Mr. GORE. If the Government waited until there was no objection on the part of property owners before a reservoir could be built, would any hydroelectric dam or reclamation project or flood control project ever be constructed in the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. I know of no project on which the people of my State would have complete unanimity. Are we not foolish to expect unanimity from a combination of local property owners who have been heard again and again and again?

The result of the poll taken by Representative BROYHILL showed that the majority of the people of Fairfax County favored the airport. If they did not favor it, I would still think it was worth building, because it is the only undeveloped site which could be chosen from a communications, engineering, and flight-pattern standpoint.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator consider that this is a local problem, or is not a problem which concerns the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. I consider, as do most of my friends, that it is a national matter; it is a question which must be resolved in the interests of the Nation. Even though those interests might conflict with the interests of a few of the local constituencies, nevertheless, if we represent Maryland or Virginia, then we must resolve those conflicts in the interest of the Nation, and in the interest of national defense.

The Nation's Capital is one of the most important key centers of transportation. We are just on the eve—the beginning—of a great upsurge in the movement of airfreight. That movement will become tremendous. The new turbojet planes will have great hauling power. Yet, all the freight which will originate in Washington or will be destined for Washington will have to come through Baltimore. It will have to be transshipped and reloaded.

I want to reserve a little of my time, and permit Senators who are opposed to the Burke Airport to explain their position. But, before doing so, I may say that whenever a second airport is built, whether it be Midway or O'Keefe, of Chicago, or LaGuardia and Idlewild in New York, or any other two airports, the second airport must be built with consideration of the transfer of interline traffic. The transfer of passengers who arrive on a plane and depart on another plane must be considered, because such passengers amount to 20 or 25 percent of all air passenger traffic. Therefore, the most important thing to keep in mind is that the second airport should be built on the same side of the city; passengers should not be required to traverse a large city in order to make transfer.

In this instance, they should not have to go through the stream of traffic from Washington National Airport in order to go to the Baltimore airport.

Twenty percent of the air passenger traffic is interline traffic. All of it cannot be accommodated at Washington National Airport. Yet if the airport is built at Burke, for the valuable and important transfer of passengers between planes, the time will be about 17 minutes from Washington Airport to Burke Airport, on a through 4-lane highway, with cloverleaf intersections, and no city traffic and no traffic lights.

I wish to reserve the remainder of my time, because I know the able Senators who oppose our position desire to state their case on the need for a second Washington airport.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I wish to compliment the Senator from Oklahoma upon making such a good case out of a situation which I think is not a strong case for the immediate beginning of the construction of Burke Airport.

There must be two sides to the case, because in a committee consisting of 23 Senators—I do not believe all of them were present, but most of them were—when the vote was taken, there were only 3 votes in favor of an immediate beginning of construction at Burke, and the rest of the members of the Committee on Appropriations all felt that it was unwise for that step to be taken, and those Senators voted against it.

The pleadings of my eloquent friend would make it appear that when we make possible the beginning of construction by setting up an appropriation, our troubles will all be over. The contrary, of course, is true, because the construction time of the new airport, if and when one is constructed, will be between 3 and 4 years. In that period of time, with flight conditions as they are at National Airport, there will certainly

have to be made a bona fide tryout of the alternatives which exist.

The principal objection to the making of an appropriation now is that there has been a completely recalcitrant attitude manifested on the part of the CAB and on the part of the commercial air carriers toward trying out or making any serious attempt to test the alternatives which are offered.

Mr. President, there are several alternatives. Let me mention what they are. One of them is to move the MATS terminal from the National Airport where it is now. In the last 2 years the Senate Committee on Appropriations has strongly recommended that course. Up to this good hour the recommendations have been disregarded. There has been no effort made on the part of anyone to obtain the degree of relief, whatever it would be, that would be occasioned by the moving of MATS. It is said that MATS will move, but it just never moves.

I realize perfectly well that it is not a complete answer to the problem, because MATS handles only 3 to 4 percent of the flights at National Airport; but I also know MATS has a very large part of the space at the airport. I know, according to reports made to us, there is only one less plane being kept in the MATS terminal now than was the case a year ago. There is one alternative in which there has been no effort at all to comply with the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee in order to see what was the best use to be made of the National Airport.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee after I have completed my statement on the alternatives.

The second alternative is to try out Andrews Field. At the hearings we were told that as between Andrews and Burke, Andrews is now well equipped, flying would be more secure, and flight arrangements would be better. Even after Burke is built, if it is built, flying conditions are such that that statement would be true. Andrews is closer to Washington.

Mr. President, there seems to be a completely recalcitrant attitude with reference to this alternative. There has been no effort to work out a joint operation, nor has there been an exploration made of the matter of taking over Andrews Field. It is said that there is a great deal of construction which is not readily adapted to commercial air use, such as some of the buildings. That might well be the case, but certainly this alternative deserves a reasonable tryout.

Mr. President, which is it most necessitous to have nearby—and I listened with great sympathy to the pleadings of my friend from Oklahoma—the facilities which are serving the National Capital, or the facilities which are serving the men and officers of the Air Force, who have to be stationed in this general area, but not necessarily in that particular place or anywhere near that place?

Another alternative is to move Bolling Field and Anacostia Field. That has been suggested, and nothing has been done in that direction. The flying at Bolling Field could easily be absorbed at Andrews Field, as everybody admits. Yet there has been no effort to comply with the suggestions of the Appropriations Committee in this regard.

The last of the alternatives, which has already been mentioned by my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, is the use of Friendship Airfield, which is not at Baltimore, but which is between Washington and Baltimore, closer, of course, to Baltimore than to Washington. It is a well constructed airport, which can be used.

One or several of the alternatives would have to be used if construction at Burke started tomorrow. The Senator from Oklahoma knows that. The Committee on Appropriations feels it is within its rights, and the Senate is within its rights, to know how these alternatives, or any grouping of them, would work out before we are called upon to embark on the expenditure of $50 million of Federal funds for the construction of a second airport to serve the Nation's Capital, which is already served by an airport, the National Airport, which has cost, up to date $25½ million.

Mr. President, more people are being served than just people who come to Washington on Federal business. I checked the census figures and found that over 400,000 people live in the suburbs on the Virginia side of the river, and 600,000, or maybe a few more, people live in the suburbs on the Maryland side of the river. Is it proposed actually to serve those more than 1 million people who do not reside in the District of Columbia, and many of whom are not here on Capital business, without having the cities or local units of government put up a single dime in the construction of that airport?

I call attention to the fact that in my State, when the city of Tampa, with a population of about 300,000, or when the city of Jacksonville, with a little larger population, gets ready to have air transport facilities, they put up very heavily out of local funds in order to get some service. The city of Miami, whose population is roughly comparable to the residents in the suburbs on the Maryland side of the Capital, has spent many millions of dollars in recent years in equipping itself to handle air traffic at the Miami Airport.

Mr. President, I make this point in passing. Shall we take the position that all of the air transportation facilities at the National Airport, which serve more people who live outside the capital than it does those who live inside, shall be paid for, 100 cents on the dollar, by the Federal Government? Is that what Senators seriously request? It seems to me that that is something which will make the Senate realize that the Appropriations Committee had serious matters before it when it decided it should not vote to make an appropriation for $34 million and put it in this bill, and commit ourselves to a $50 million expenditure on the slight acquaintance we had with the subject matter.

To come to the next point, with reference to Friendship, I was amused by my distinguished friend's able presentation of the difficulties of reaching Washington from Friendship. Fortunately, that matter has been very thoroughly explored by all those who are interested in not going to Friendship. We find from the testimony of General Arnold, who is head of the Air Transport Association, composed of all the commercial airlines, that it was 48 minutes from the Friendship Airport to the Statler Hotel, whereas it was 31 minutes from the Burke Airport to the Statler Hotel.

In other words, there was a difference of 17 minutes in travel time. Yet the Senator seems to believe that the 17 minutes difference for those coming into the heart of Washington—which would not be that difference at all for the people living in the great area of Maryland who use the airport, where over 600,000 people live—is enough to justify giving our approval to the beginning of a $50 million airport construction program, without giving it any real serious study.

The CAA also made a study of the distances involved both by mileage and by time. I have the report of the CAA in my hands, and it shows that the run from the Statler Hotel to the Burke terminal was 32 minutes and 30 seconds, and it was 32 minutes and 30 seconds from Burke to the Statler Hotel. Apparently everybody starts and ends at the Statler Hotel, which I suppose is a good central spot in the city of Wshington. But 32 minutes and 30 seconds is the running time, the CAA found, in both directions; whereas in the case of Friendship Airport, the time was 47 minutes and 30 seconds, or 15 minutes difference by their calculations as compared to the 17 minutes difference reported by General Arnold.

Mr. President, the average of those two is approximately 16 minutes. Even if the difference were 17 minutes, and if everyone were traveling to the part of the city of Washington which is represented by the location of the Statler Hotel, can we say we are justified in embarking on a $50 million expenditure without further studying the matter? The answer of all but 3 members of the Appropriations Committee was "no"; and they believe that a special subcommittee should be appointed to study this matter and to report between now and January 15.

Incidentally, Mr. President, Burke Airport, if begun at once, would require between 3 and 4 years for completion, as I know the Senator from Oklahoma will agree, because everyone gives us the same information on that point.

Why is there such unwillingness to try out these alternatives? I have not been able to find an answer to that question, so I shall supply one myself. I think the answer is that those who oppose the alternatives are afraid they will work; they are afraid people will not find it too much of a burden to travel 15, 16, or 17 minutes longer in order to reach the Statler Hotel, and a lesser period of time in order to reach the area where 600,000 people now live, and to which a great many of the travelers will be going.

Friendship Airport is constructed, completed, and functioning. I think it

must be used in connection with this situation, before there is any real trial of the alternatives. After all, 47 minutes is considerably less time than is required to go into some of the key cities of the Nation from the airports which serve them. Every Senator knows that, and that testimony was heard by our Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, there is one other matter which I think should be called to the attention of the Senate. Not only are all 4 Senators from the 2 States affected by this matter strongly opposed to so precipitous a way of going into the matter, but, in addition, the Members of the House of Representatives who represent the various districts affected are likewise opposed to it. What is much more important than even that, Mr. President, is the fact that the public unit of government in the area where this large airport would be located, if constructed at Burke, is very strongly opposed to it. I was shocked when I found that out at our Appropriation Committee meeting. I questioned the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] about this matter. His reply gave us the information that in the supposedly extensive hearings given to this matter last year by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the subcommittee did not hear the representatives of the local government at Burke or the representatives of the local government in Fairfax County.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from Florida yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield half of a minute to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Tennessee. However, inasmuch as he has left the Chamber, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to say that everyone was invited to testify.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we had before us the chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County. He said he was not notified of, nor invited to attend, the hearing. I am very sure that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, means that the general public was invited; but that does not mean that any particular governmental agency felt it was summoned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do not send out engraved invitations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say that the Appropriations Committee did not send out engraved invitations. We only asked our staff to call on the telephone the representatives of the various units of government, and let them understand that we were interested in knowing what their point of view was.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We did the same thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. But apparently that was not done in the case of the subcommittee headed by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, because the chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County specifically stated that they were not notified of the meeting and were not asked to attend it; and the Senator from Oklahoma advised the Appropriations Committee that he did not feel it was necessary to hear or to invite them, because he thought that question had been determined in 1950, 6 years ago.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. That was precisely one of the points made before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, especially in view of the fact that the legislation provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall consult the local people. But he did not do so, and the committee also ignored them.

Mr. HOLLAND. At any rate, the Appropriations Committee has no great feeling in this matter. I think 1 of the 4 Senators who represent the 2 States affected is a member of that committee, and I do not remember that he was highly vocal in his protests on the matter. The other 22 members of the committee are trying to be completely objective in my opinion.

I think I do about as much flying as do most other Senators. I certainly value safety. I call attention to the fact that the Senate subcommittee which I head reported to the full committee, and it reported to the Senate, and the Senate adopted the full appropriation request in the regular budget—namely, $40 million—to improve air navigation facilities, although the House of Representatives had voted a lesser amount; and in the conference we insisted on the larger amount, and obtained the appropriation of the $40 million item.

I also call attention to the fact that the bill now before the Senate provides $68 million more for the Civil Aeronautics Authority, occasioned by the fact that the President thought we could hasten the 5-year program we had adopted. We are working with all speed, and in every way we know how, to improve quickly the flight-control facilities of the Nation, in the interest of the security, speed, safety, and convenience of those who travel, as well as of those who operate the airplanes.

But, Mr. President, when we find that the committee which has last gone into the matter, and which has insisted on the taking of immediate action, did not even hear local officials; and when the chairman of the subcommittee, able and distinguished as he is, states to our Appropriations Committee that he did not feel it was necessary to call on the local officials again, because he thought the matter had been decided in 1950, that illustrates the fact that there is something left to be done by an Appropriations Committee which acts at the time when the money is requested and is about to be appropriated.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at this point, inasmuch as he has mentioned my name?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's train of thought.

However, I should like to say that as a result of the congressional authorization, $1 million has already been spent in acquiring land in that particular area. Under those circumstances, is it necessary that every new county commissioner be called before the congressional committee, to veto the technical decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration officials who have studied the location of the necessary airport? Are we a National Congress, or are we a coequal body with the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County a majority of whose residents—according to the poll of all registered voters there, as taken by the Member of Congress from that district—already have shown that they favor the Burke site for the airport?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, evidently the answer is that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma thought it was not necessary to advise the local supervisors, because he did not advise them, and they were not heard. But they were very glad to have an opportunity to appear before the Appropriations Committee. They told us that since the decision was made in 1950, the then slightly developed area in that part of their county, which had been chosen for the location of the airport—I believe the name of it is Springfield—has greatly increased in population and that the impact of this airfield, if constructed at Burke, upon that area, as it now exists, would be a completely different thing from that which would have prevailed in 1950.

I do not think those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee need apologize for our willingness to hear citizens who are adversely affected, and who are affected at this time in a way very different from the way in which they would have been affected 6 years ago, at the time when the authorization measure was passed. On the contrary, I think the Appropriations Committee is entitled to be complimented, and I think it is entitled to have an expression of confidence from the Senate, because it insists that the few months from now until January shall be devoted to two things: First, to exploring the situation at Burke more fully than it has been explored since 1950; second, to insist—and I want to use that word again—that those who are in authority throw aside their recalcitrance and try out the alternatives, so that we may know from actual operation what relief can be obtained from them.

I repeat that to me the blind spot in the whole situation has been why the CAB and the airlines are unwilling to try out alternatives which exist, and which they have been directed by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House to try out in the past 2 years. Is it not a very reasonable answer to suggest that they are afraid those alternatives will work well, and will therefore obviate the necessity of this construction?

I shall not argue the question in greater detail. The Senator from Okla-

homa knows that I am as much interested in aviation as is he or any other Member of this body. I suspect that my very intimate connection with aviation goes back further than that of any other Member of this body, unless it be the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who was also a flyer in World War I.

Always I have had an interest in aviation. Always I have been willing to fight for security in the air, and for greater expansion of aviation. But I think we are entitled to consider also the welfare of the Nation and the funds of the Nation. To put $50 million into a second airport without asking for a dime's contribution by the areas affected, and without trying to utilize facilities already in existence, one of which, an excellent facility, was supplied by a part of the area to be served, I think is unreasonable. I do not think it is right. I do not think it is an observance of the obligation under which we rest with reference to our people and our Nation.

I see the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has returned to the Chamber. I am very glad to yield to him at this time. I looked for him a moment ago, and he had stepped out of the Chamber.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at the time I requested the Senator to yield I thought he had suggested that if MATS would move its terminal, the National Airport facility might be adequate.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I did not make that suggestion. I said that that was one of the things which could be done, which would alleviate the situation to some degree. After the Senator stepped from the Chamber, I think I stated that the total volume of flights out of MATS was 3 or 4 percent of the total volume of flights from the airport. So that would not afford any permanent relief, but it would afford that degree of relief, and it would afford the availability of a great deal of space now being used by MATS.

To justify my position, and the position of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I used that fact, along with the fact that Bolling could easily be moved to Andrews; the fact that Anacostia is not functioning with any great degree of activity; the fact that Andrews was reported by the CAA to be the safest place available, even safer than Burke; the fact that Friendship is available, paid for largely by local funds; the fact that the driving time from Burke to the Statler, as compared with the driving time from Friendship to the Statler, represents a difference of only 16 or 17 minutes; the fact that a great many of the people coming into Friendship or National, or Burke, would not be coming to Washington, but would be coming to the areas in Prince Georges and Montgomery Counties in Maryland, where between 600,000 and 700,000 people live, or to areas in Arlington, Alexandria, Fairfax, Loudoun County, and the city of Falls Church, where more than 400,000 people live. I think we are entitled to a fair trial of the alternative facilities before we embark upon the expenditure of not less than $50 million, the estimated cost of the Burke Airport. If we embark upon it, we shall be committed to it.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee is known for his fine sense of economy and practicability. He will realize that the problem cannot be solved in a shorter time than 3 or 4 years, even if Burke Airport is begun tomorrow. We must make a trial of some of the alternatives. The Senator from Florida has asked over and over again why the unwillingness on the part of the CAB and flying groups to try the alternatives. Is it possible that they are afraid they would work out well? Is that the reason why they are pleading with the voices of angels for an expenditure of $50 million out of the Federal coffers for the supplying of a second great airport facility?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was called to the telephone and did not hear a part of the Senator's remarks. I had wondered if he intended to infer that moving the MATS terminal facilities of the National Airport would in any way better the situation to the extent that jet traffic could come in. The Senator has answered that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Jet traffic can use either Friendship or Andrews.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the Senator's compliment as to the concern of the junior Senator from Tennessee with economy. I hope to merit his generous remarks.

I must say that I am more concerned with the danger of air traffic and the possibility of a tragic crash at the National Airport than I am with the comparatively small amount necessary to provide an adequate airport. I will not call it a small amount. I think it is necessary that the National Capital have an adequate airport, but it seems to me the sooner we get started, the better.

I should like to go one step further. More than once the Senator has referred to the fact that the people who live in the Montgomery area of the metropolitan center are large users of the airport. I dare say that is true; but does not the Senator concede that the great and overwhelming bulk of the air traffic into Washington consists of people from all over the United States who are coming to Washington, not to go to their homes in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, but for the transaction of business with the Government?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that the majority of the people come for that purpose; yet I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that today the Washington newspapers were rejoicing over the fact that more than 5 million tourists are coming to the Capital this year. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Washington has become a great convention center. People are coming here by the tens of thousands to attend conventions, for sightseeing, and for all kinds of visitation.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that there is enough business in serving the more than 1 million people who live outside the city of Washington, but who are a part of the metropolitan area, to require what would be considered very elaborate facilities in the Senator's State in an area of that size, or in my State in an area of that size.

I wonder why we have completely forgotten the fact that service is rendered to those people.

It is proposed to make an enormous expenditure without taking a survey of the situation. None was possible, except a cursory one, during 1 day of hearings before the Appropriations Committee. What are the facts today? The authorization took place in 1950. The very maps shown to us by the supervisors of Fairfax County showed a phenomenal growth. The impact upon that area is much more severe than could possibly have been the case with respect to the airport which was planned in 1950.

There is more to this than meets the eye. One thing I wish to say to the Senator may comfort him greatly, and it is this: There is no way, by wishful thinking or by appropriation, whereby we can create overnight a second airport. However, there are ways for us, by our direction and insistence, to have a trial run of the alternative facilities which are available. For some reason or other, there has been complete unwillingness to try them out. They would have to be tried out during the term of construction, if we should decide to build and do proceed to build a second air terminal. To save my soul, Mr. President, I cannot understand how the distinguished Senator from Tennessee or any other Senator cannot feel that we are entitled to have a trial run of the alternative facilities before we are called upon to take this plunge, particularly when we are asked to take it in almost a twinkling of an eye, because the supplemental budget estimate comes to us within only a few days of the end of the session, and because it is a request to appropriate $34 million as a beginning on what is estimated to cost $50 million. My experience with estimates of that kind indicates to me that the final figure is apt to be a great deal more.

I was nonplused to find—and I am sure other members of the Committee on Appropriations were also—that no effort was made to replace 9 miles of roads in Fairfax County, in the Springfield area, which would be displaced by the building of the airport at Burke.

We asked CAA, "Have you figured that in?" They said, "No; we haven't got around to that."

Does the distinguished Senator feel it is fair, without even making any effort to find out how much it will cost the community to replace its highways, and without finding out whether it is fair for us to pay any part of it and, if so, what part, for us to embark on a transaction which is likely to cost at least $50 million, according to the cost estimates alone?

The Senator from Florida does not think it is fair or prudent.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it fair to conclude from the able Senator's remarks that he does favor the Capital of the United States, the city of Washington, having an airport adequate to serve the needs of the Nation and the Nation's Capital?

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly favor having not only an adequate but a

splendid airport, and adequate and splendid airport facilities to serve air traffic into the city of Washington.

I have just as much concern in that regard as my distinguished friends who are on the legislative committee which handled the proposed legislation. It seems to me, though, that we have a right, and should, consider the other implications which I have mentioned so briefly. When there are alternatives available, at least 2 of which are safer and 1 of which is closer, it seems to me that we are entitled to have a trial run of those alternatives before we embark upon this costly venture.

Mr. BUTLER addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to address the Senate for about 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Florida referred to trial runs. Is he proposing to intermix civilian aircraft with military jet fighter planes at Andrews Airport?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is one of the alternatives. Either the Department of Commerce or the CAB—I forget which, and perhaps it was both—reported to us that the size of the field at Andrews is so great and the partial use now is so small that for many years in the future a joint use of the facilities by the overflow from the National Airport on that field and by the Air Force is not only possible but quite safe.

Mr. MONRONEY. Apparently the Senator did not avail himself of our hearings or pay any attention to what the Air Force has told our committee. We have been informed that it was near capacity in military use alone, and that to intermix civilian planes with military jets would endanger the lives of the military pilots, let alone the civilian pilots and passengers; and that they intended to come to us very shortly to ask for money with which to build a second runway, to take care of their military traffic. I may say to my distinguished friend from Florida that we must also consider the cost involved. Does the Senator know the cost of readying this so-called easy alternative at Andrews? Does he know the estimate that has been made in that connection?

Mr. HOLLAND. A figure was given to us.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is $30 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall the exact figure, but the fact remains that the responsible agencies of our Government told our committee that there was a large amount of room still available at Andrews Field, and enough to give joint occupancy safely for some years in the future.

In addition to that, they told us that Friendship would serve safely this overflow of traffic at National Airport for a long period of time ahead.

I have already stated to the Senator, in spite of his humorous treatment of the time factor, what was reported to us, and what is shown in the RECORD, not only by the Air Transport Association, whose witness was General Arnold, but also by CAA, as to the probable time factor so far as Friendship Airport is concerned.

I am unable to accede at all to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that here is something that is so ridiculous that the people will not use that airport. The fact of the matter is that they are using the airports at Detroit, at New York, at Los Angeles, and at other places, well known to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, which require greater time to reach than is the case with Friendship.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator clarify the alternative he is asking us to use? Does he propose to intermix military jet aircraft with civilian aircraft through joint use of Andrews? Either we must accept joint use under the Senator's proposal, or we must rule it out. It would be helpful, therefore, to the people of this country, particularly those who anticipate flying to Washington, to know whether they are to land at Andrews in a jet blast behind some hot fighter pilot coming into the air pattern at perhaps 400 miles an hour, alongside of a lumbering DC–3 or DC–4.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is one of several alternatives that ought to be explored. Some of them ought to be in action right now. There has been no showing of any disposition whatever on the part of either the commercial airlines or the official agencies of the Government to try any of those alternatives. They do not want to try them out until we are committed to Burke and the actual work is under way. That is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. MONRONEY. How much does the Senator want to spend for intermixing civilian and military air traffic? Is it $30 million? We could get a new airport, properly engineered, for $50 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma overlooks one thing which the Senator from Florida has stated. We have had only a very few days to look into the subject. We were surprised to find that the Senator's committee had not given the local agencies of Government an opportunity to be heard. We were surprised to learn that CAA had not figured in the cost the replacement of 9 miles of highways in Fairfax County which would be knocked out by the construction of the airport. We found that the Department of Commerce had only recently suggested use of Friendship, and that no such use has been made. We were told, on the day that we were sitting in committee, that CAB was hearing them on the matter. We are hopeful that CAB may at long last get a move on, so to speak, and do something about it.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have been hoping for some action for 18 months, while the condition has been getting worse and worse.

Mr. HOLLAND. The action which the Senator from Oklahoma proposes will not do anything for us until 3 or 4 years from now. The action which we propose will do something beginning the very day that the alternatives are tried. The members of the Committee on Appropriations, with three exceptions, took the position that we were entitled to know where we were stepping before we stepped, and that we were entitled to some cooperation from those whom the Federal Government serves in this matter, and that we were entitled to know whether any one of those alternatives, or any admixture of them, could be used satisfactorily. We were utterly at a loss to understand why those who were such great beneficiaries of Government largess were unwilling to cooperate to the small degree that we had asked.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator yield on that point? I would like to say something on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment, but not right now. The Senator from Oklahoma does not serve, as I do, as chairman of the subcommittee which provides for paying out subsidies to airlines. Last year we were asked for approximately $60 million for subsidies to the airlines. We cut it down. My recollection is that we cut it down to an appropriation of about $54½ million.

This year the amount was greatly reduced from that, but we were told when we reduced it that next year it would go up again in the neighborhood of between $30 million and $40 million.

In addition to that, Mr. President, there is a great demand for air navigation facilities and airport grants, with joint contributions, to a total which I am not able to state, because I have not refreshed my mind on it today, but it is well over $200 million a year. It seemed to me and to other members of the Appropriations Committee, with three exceptions, that we were entitled to have a modicum of cooperation from these people who are getting such handsome treatment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the Senator know that the State of Florida, which he so ably represents, received $151 million of Federal money to build airports, without 1 dime from the State of Florida?

When those airports are put into operation, all of the revenues derived therefrom remain in the State of Florida. The Miami Airport received $6,700,000 of Federal funds, and all the revenues coming from automobile rentals, orange-juice stands, and so forth stay in the city of Miami.

Every 48 hours $15,000 from the Washington National Airport goes into the Federal Treasury. Over $17 million has been paid into the Federal Treasury. If it belonged to the city of Miami, none of the money would go into the Treasury. If it was in the State of Virginia, none of the money would go into the Treasury. The Federal Government gave away $1,349 million without a penny coming back, and now, when Washington needs an airport, the Senator from Florida feels that we are handing out largesse. I did not hear any speeches from the Senator from Florida when Florida received money for airports.

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, the Senator from Oklahoma does not know

the location of those airports as I do. I have been to every one of them. We had 126 of them during the war. Perhaps 8 or 10, or, let us say, a dozen are in a position where they can serve important commercial uses. The majority of them are now in tiny villages, or away out in the country, where they cannot serve anyone. I remember not long ago asking officials whether there was any possible use that could be made of an airport at a certain point, and I was told, "No. Dig up the concrete and put the land back into pasture."

I am glad the Senator from Oklahoma went further and quoted into the RECORD that the donation to the Miami Airport was between 6 and 7 million dollars. My recollection is that the total investment there was somewhere between 30 and 50 million dollars, which indicates rather clearly that the Miami people have been doing something for themselves. The Senator will find that to be true every place in our progressive State, as I am sure it is in his State. But the point is whether we should spend our money prudently, whether we should get cooperation from those who have been so greatly benefited out of the public till. I am for them. I have voted for appropriations for them. I have voted for more than a great many other Members of the Senate thought I should vote, so I am not willing to assume the reputation of being parsimonious. But I think we are entitled to be prudent and entitled to know what we are doing. I think we have not been treated fairly by those in authority and those in the commercial business in their unwillingness to try out any of the alternatives available. Until they do, I shall maintain my position.

CLERK HIRE OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 12354.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12354) relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. WARREN D. COOPER AND HER SON, TEDDY DEVERE COOPER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 269.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 269) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8008) for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

On page 2, line 1, of the House engrossed bill, strike out the date "September 2, 1934" and insert "September 23, 1934."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 9591) to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.; and

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr.; and

H. R. 7855. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 269) authorizing the Clerk of the House to correct an enrolled bill, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought I had been recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we have all kinds of time on this issue. I should like to take about 5 minutes. I know the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has a great deal to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I left here about an hour and a half ago——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not said a word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know the Senator has not.

Mr. President, I wonder if we could have an agreement on this Burke Airport issue. We do not wish the whole Congress to be brought to a standstill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for 5 minutes without losing the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOLLAND. Gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if we can have a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the debate on the Burke Airport question to 30 minutes to each side.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, Mr. President. I am sorry, but my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], his colleague [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] wish to speak.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished friend from Illinois, who I know is so warmly devoted to the cause of economy and prudence in appropriations, that we are trying to insist that the Senate be cautious and that it be prudent. We are trying to let the Senate understand why all members of the 23-man committee, except 3, voted against the appropriation for Burke Airport, and we think the Senators most directly affected may know the subject better than the Senator from Florida does. They may know it better than the Senator from Illinois does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I went to a meeting with the Speaker and the minority leader of the House I talked to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from

Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and told them of the many conference reports pending and the other important business before the Senate. I realize that this is a controversial question. I asked them if they felt that 30 minutes to a side would be agreeable, and they told me they did. There are some 6 or 8 conference reports pending. There are 2 or 3 bills pending. We hope Congress can adjourn this weekend. I am hopeful that the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Florida will permit us to have a vote on the question within a reasonable length of time after each Senator has had an opportunity to express himself. I hope we shall not have to stay here all evening to get a situation like the Burke Airport settled, and that we can vote and send the bill to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. I could not agree more thoroughly with my friend, the distinguised majority leader, but one of the duties I perform in the Senate is as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which has been assigned the duty of studying this subject matter, of bringing it to the attention of the Senate, and of making a report on January 15. It seems to me that a beginning of that duty might well be the acceding to the request of the four Senators most affected, none of whom has opened his mouth as yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] tells me he would like to have about 3 minutes.

How long would the Senator from Virginia like to have in order to express his views?

Mr. BYRD. About 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How long would the senior Senator from Maryland like to have?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know; I may speak at length.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Earlier in the evening I understood the Senator would be agreeable to 30 minutes. That was about an hour and a half ago.

Mr. BUTLER. I feel that my remarks will be brief.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been in sympathy with the Senator's position, but I think we ought not to allow the Burke Airport to stand in the way of the consideration of the customs simplification and the social security conference reports.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think we ought to let the customs simplification bill interfere with the proposed expenditure of $60 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the time for this discussion is not being taken from my time.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not take more than 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proponents may have 30 minutes and the opponents may have 30 minutes in order to discuss the situation. At the end of that time the absence of a quorum will be suggested, the yeas and nays will be requested, and we can come to a vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. I object. I may say to my distinguished friend that as soon as the Senators whom he has mentioned have been heard, I shall be perfectly willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. I had hoped a vote could have been reached by this time. I certainly have no disposition to hold up action on the amendment any longer, but I shall not give my consent to a unanimous-consent agreement until Senators who have a major interest in the matter have had at least some opportunity to be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Each of the Senators concerned is present. Each has told me how long he would like to have. I have included twice as much time as they need.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that; but I also understand that the Senator from Florida has been given the duty of trying to bring before the Senate the meaning of this matter. He thinks that one important step in that direction would be to allow his four friends at least an opportunity to make their speeches.

I have heard Senators start on a 5-minute speech and suddenly look at the clock an hour later and wonder what had happened to the 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I remind the Senator that there are pending several conference reports and if we follow the pattern he has just mentioned, we shall be here double the length of time we had anticipated.

In view of the statements by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Virginia that each will not take more than 5 or 10 minutes, could we not reach some agreement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to agree to a time limitation when each of those Senators has had a chance to be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In view of the attitude of the Senator from Florida; in view of the fact that there are at the desk conference reports on farm measures, customs simplification, and other matters; and in view of the fact that the Senator from Virginia has told me he must leave tomorrow afternoon, and I am trying to accommodate him also, I hope Senators will make their statements brief in order that an agreement can be reached as early as possible.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, in order that we may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall adhere to the admonition of the majority leader to be very brief on this matter. I think there is probably too much controversy about it.

I desire to correct the RECORD a little. I am certain that no Senator would wish to make a deliberate misstatement of the facts, but this has been a long-continuing matter, particularly in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. So many things have occurred in this controversy that no one could be accurately informed about the facts, chronologically or otherwise.

In 1950, even then being cognizant of the fact that a second airport, or second airport facility, was needed in Washington, because of the increase of air traffic, a bill was passed authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to select a site. The Senator from Maryland will recall that.

The Secretary of Commerce was directed to use all the technical assistance and know-how and to scour the area to determine what could be done, even if it were necessary to remove the MATS terminal.

He was directed to ascertain whether there could be a military pool. In short, he was asked to come up with something. In any event, a second air facility was needed.

Six years went by. Hearing after hearing was held on the matter.

I am certain the Senator from Florida will agree with me that anyone from Fairfax County who wanted to testify could have come forward and done so. Is there a newspaper in Fairfax County? I suppose there is. At any rate, I am certain there were notices that public hearings would be held, and that the committee would hear anyone who wanted to testify.

I have discussed the matter with the Senators from Maryland and Virginia on many occasions. It is a very difficult situation for them; I know that. There are some persons who favor the proposed airport, and some who do not. It is pretty hard to satisfy both sides.

But what we should remember is that a second facility is needed for the Washington area. The Washington National Airport cannot be enlarged to take care of planes which will be flying in the jet age, which is even now closer than my friend from Oklahoma says it is. So we must do something.

We cannot take over Bolling, because the amount of airspace is the same over that area. If someone could figure out a way to get the military out of Andrews Field he would be a magician.

In the same bill we have appropriated money for new facilities and a new administration building in the military airports, to enlarge them and keep them where they are. So we are down to that point.

I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma and I are not concerned whether the proposed new airport shall be built at Burke or somewhere else. If Friendship had been designated, I would have been just as favorable to that. But after all this time, the Department finally made its report to the committee. I agree with the Senator from Florida when he says the Department has been dragging its heels.

I do not know how many communications, telephone calls, and hearings we have had with the Department of Commerce, urging them to get on with this matter. Nothing happened.

There was a proposal made that there be a compact between the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia with respect to a second airport. But we know that the States would not have gotten together to make such a compact, because, fundamentally, not only do we believe there should be a second airport, but we believe that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to construct it.

I should think that more than 85 percent of the traffic coming into and going out of Washington is either on Government business or is comprised of the citizens coming to the Nation's Capital, whether they be tourists or not. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide a good airport.

That is the story. Everyone had a chance to be heard. I think I have talked to 200 persons from the area in question who have come to see me personally about the matter because I happen to be chairman of the committee. I think they had a right to be heard. As a matter of fact, the authorization bill provided that the committee should hear from the local interests. Whether the one supervisor who appeared before the Committee on Appropriations is new or not, I do not know. But surely in the 6 years which have elapsed everyone concerned has had an opportunity to be heard.

Finally, after considering all these matters, engineeringwise, landwise, land-taking-wise, and taking into consideration the air space, which is becoming a real problem, although not so much as the problem landwise, the Department of Commerce has said that Burke is the logical place to build the airport.

So I said, "Well, thank the Lord you have made the decision. So I am going to stick with it." I want to be frank with my friend from Florida. I do not know that a period of 3 or 4 months is going to be too serious in this matter. I must admit a good point has been made. I voted against the appropriation because I had been impatient with the inability of the persons concerned to make a decision. When they finally did make a decision, I said, "I will stick by you." That is the position of the Senator from Oklahoma. He has no other interest in the matter. But the fact is that we know week by week the situation is becoming worse and worse. More planes are stacked up at the Washington Airport than at any other airport in the United States, with the exception of La Guardia Airport. I am afraid something is going to happen. I am afraid that if even an attempt is made to use the alternative of mixing military with commercial operations, more serious things will happen. I know we are going to have jet planes, and I know the National Airport is not going to be sufficient. We have to do something. Everybody who operates planes—I guess that is their business—testified against Friendship. Friendship must be used as an alternative in the meantime, while we build another airport.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator think the Senate can act more soundly if that use takes place before the funds are appropriated than afterward?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think it makes much difference, because everybody knows the capabilities of Friendship and the inherent possibilities of Friendship. Maybe the fact that Friendship is not so close technically fits into the problem. I do not know that it would serve any purpose to have any more investigations, to be honest with the Senator. The chairman of the Appriations Committee put me on the subcommittee. I have gone through the problem for 6 long years. I do not know that anybody can tell me anything that I do not already know. My friend from the State of Maryland said, "Why don't you visit Friendship? I will take you to lunch there sometime." I have been to Friendship many times. I think it is a marvelous airport. Maybe something can be done with regard to it. I do not know. But I say the Senate committee had no choice. We tried to hear all possible witnesses. We tried to do the best objective job we could do. We do know another airport facility is needed, and as soon as possible. That is all we can say. I hope the issue can be resolved. I do not know what will happen if the vote of the Senate is in the same proportion as the vote was in the Appropriations Committee.

I think the Senators from Virginia are disturbed about the matter, and logically so. Some persons living in that area want the airport there, and some do not. Yet the Senators from Virginia know we have to have this additional facility. They also do not want the financial burden to be placed on either side, because the airport is for a Federal use, and always will be.

I know the Senators from Virginia heard the evidence. To me it was repetitious. There are two sides to the question. I do not know what the Senate is going to do tonight, but we had better start on an airport facility, or something is going to happen.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to say, as one who is on the subcommittee of five to make the quick checkup and report back January 15, I was very much pleased with all the other appointments, particularly with the fact that the chairman of the committee appointed the distinguished Senator from Washington, who has, I think, greater familiarity with the question than has anybody else, and, if I may say so, because the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who may not be considered by some to be completely impartial, was not appointed to the subcommittee. I am sure he preferred not to be appointed. In other words, the subcommittee is a completely impartial one. All we want to do is see what the facts are and see what the use of the alternatives will produce in the way of relief.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps I may commit myself a little bit tonight. After going into the whole question, I want to be honest and say that I myself do not think there are any alternatives, with one exception. Let me say this, and then I shall sit down. Senators can talk about $50 million or $30 million or $40 million for Andrews. The Senator from Maryland said it would be $60 million. I do not know, but I do know that the Federal Government is going to have to spend, and it had better do it pretty soon, at least $50 million, somewhere, to get a second airport in this area. It is going to cost that much, no matter what is done. We are not going to save any money that easily. It is going to cost us that much even to approach what is going to be needed in the air age in the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his very excellent and able presentation of the case in connection with Burke Airport. He has approached this problem with complete impartiality. He sat patiently through all the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, which overwhelmingly voted to have a subcommittee appointed, naming him as chairman, to make a study of this problem. Why did the Appropriations Committee ask for that study? It asked for it because, as the Senator from Florida has so ably said, there is something in this situation that does not meet the eye. I am not going to argue for the Friendship International Airport. I think the Senator from Florida and other Senators have very well made that case. But I do want to say to my colleagues that the most important issue, and the only real issue or principle, before the Senate, is this: Air safety.

We who have any familiarity with this question all know that the CAA, back in 1948, said that even planes of the type then in existence should not be flown in and out of airports that were closer than 16 miles apart.

Strictly from the point of air safety, if the field is located at Burke—if the Senate tonight overrides the judgment of its Appropriations Committee and accepts the amendment and makes provision for the construction of an airfield at Burke—when the airfield is completed there will be 6 major airports and 5 minor airports within a radius of approximately 12 miles.

The CAA was speaking of 1948 standards. The testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by General Arnold, who heads the airline lobby, was that a plane could not land on the Burke Airport until at least 1961. By that time we shall have jet plane operations. If we are going hunting for a field, we better not locate the airport at Burke, Va., because we shall never get safety at Burke, Va.

We shall never obtain safety there, because the Civil Aeronautics Authority and other persons who know the facts have told us that jet aircraft or even the aircraft of the standard of 1948 cannot be operated so close together.

Further, Mr. President, it is not the duty of the Senate of the United States or any of its committees—the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Appropriations Committee—to determine where this airfield shall be located, if indeed one is to be constructed. The basic law expressly states that the selection shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with the authorities in the locality where it is proposed to construct the airport. It is not our duty or our right to say where the airport shall be constructed Indeed, the testimony before the congressional committees has been

to the effect that the Secretary of Commerce up to this very moment has not finished the engineering in connection with the Burke site. As was pointed out by the Senator from Florida, 9 miles of street have been torn up, but no provision whatever has been made for replacing it. The runways have not even been located. Nothing required for construction of the airport at Burke has been done there. I say that responsibility cannot be shifted to the Congress. It is the duty of the Secretary of Commerce, after a complete and thorough study, to make the selection.

Let me say that I enjoyed very much the speech of the Senator from Oklahoma. It was very humorous. He very adroitly referred to me as being, not a Senator from Maryland, but a Senator from Baltimore. I do not mind such a reference. He said I represent the Chamber of Commerce. Well, Mr. President, if the members of the Chamber of Commerce are individuals who pay taxes into the Treasury of the United States, I naturally represent them; and I am standing here right now defending their interest and also that of all the other taxpayers of our great Nation.

When one of the finest airports in the world is located in Maryland 30 miles away from this very spot, how can the Members of the Senate vote to have $50 million or $60 million spent for the construction of a new airport, aside from its approaches, at a location 20 miles away, in Virginia, and then go home and face their constituents, and say to them, "We have been careful of the public's money"? We simply cannot afford to spend $50 million or $60 million to save someone 15 minutes of time when he gets out of an airplane. We are not that rich, and I hope we have not gotten that arrogant.

As I have said, we have readily available, within 47 minutes of the Statler Hotel—as compared with 32 minutes from the Statler Hotel to the proposed Burke Airport—one of the finest airports in the world. It is ready and available. It will not cost the taxpayers a penny. They have already invested approximately $4 million in the Friendship Airport, and they invested it there after representations made to the congressional committees and to the Senate itself that that airport would be used in part for Washington traffic.

What is the difference between getting a ticket marked "Washington-Baltimore" and a ticket marked "Washington-Burke"?

As the Senator from Florida so ably and succinctly said, there is something in this matter that does not meet the eye. I will tell the Senate what it is. It is the airline lobby. They would not dare try the Friendship Airport. The other day I stated before the Appropriations Committee, and I state it tonight to the Senate, that the minute they try the Friendship Airport, they will find it such an excellent facility that they will not be able to have this money appropriated. That is what is wrong with this entire situation. They stubbornly refuse to try any alternative; it is easier for them to attempt to milk the public to the extent of $50 million or $60 million.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said, and as I said the other day before the committee—and I repeat it now—if they once use Friendship Airport, they will not have anything to do with any other airport, because Friendship Airport is a splendid one. The pilots and all others who have to do with the operation of the planes say so, and say they are delighted to use Friendship Airport; and the Civil Aeronautics Authority is ready to name Friendship Airport as a coterminal.

So, Mr. President, why not provide for a period of 5 or 6 months in which to try Friendship Airport as an alternative, and thus save the taxpayers $50 million or $60 million?

In addition, how are we going to relieve the known congested condition at the Washington National Airport, by commencing the construction of an airfield which, according to the testimony of General Arnold, cannot be constructed before 1961 or 1962? How will the construction of an airport at that time relieve the present congestion? The plain truth is that it will not relieve it. The only way to relieve the congestion at the National Airport is to have the Civil Aeronautics Authority do its duty and tell the long-range flights to begin to use Friendship Airport, which is ready and available, and can be used without costing the taxpayers of the United States one penny.

Mr. President, on the basis of those facts, I say the Senate cannot in good conscience override the judgment of 20 members of its Appropriations Committee who have just completed 2 days of hearings, during which they heard numerous witnesses. The Senate simply cannot do that. Twenty members of that great committee thought there was enough to this matter to justify taking a second look at it. Only three members of the committee said, "No; we have already looked at it, and we do not wish to see any more of it." However, that takes us back again to the point made by the Senator from Florida, who pointed out that the interested people from Burke and the town councilmen were not called before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to testify.

Those three Senators said, "No; they testified in 1950." Regardless of that, Mr. President, it was that committee's responsibility, if it was going to file a true and accurate report to hear these people before making a decision to usurp the powers of the Secretary of Commerce, by trying to tell him where to locate the airport. It is his duty, under the Act of Congress, to decide where the airport should be located.

So, Mr. President, I say we should let this matter go over until January; and we should let the appropriations subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], make its report, because I know there is no more thorough Member of the Senate than the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to uphold the appropriations subcommittee, and to be patient, and to read the report of the Senator from Florida, before taking action on this matter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly.

I should like to have my position in respect to this matter very clearly understood.

This question has been under consideration for more than 6 years. It has been debated back and forth, and back and forth again.

In my judgment, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] made one of the most comprehensive and effective speeches I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate. He spoke as a disinterested Senator but as one who is very deeply interested in aviation; and he spoke as chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He very clearly showed the reasons why Friendship Airport should be used, instead of Burke airport.

Mr. President, some reference has been made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to the point that the Maryland Senators were speaking for the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce. I am not speaking for the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce. I am speaking against a project which it is proposed to locate in my own State at a cost of $50 million. I do so only because of my sincere conviction that that is not the right course to pursue. I do not know whether the people of Fairfax County, whom I in part represent, favor this project, as the Senator from Oklahoma indicated was shown by some referendum conducted by Representative BROYHILL. They may favor it and they may not favor it.

However, this fact is very significant, and I think the Senate should give due consideration to it: There are four Senators involved in this question, two from Virginia and two from Maryland. They are all opposed to the proposal. Representative BROYHILL is opposed to it, although it is said that his referendum indicated that the people of Fairfax County are for it. That may not be correct, for the reason that the referendum which he conducted reached only a small proportion of the people of Fairfax County. But that is not the question at issue.

The Representatives from Maryland, as well as the Representatives from Virginia, the two Senators from Virginia, the two Senators from Maryland, and all the local authorities involved, are opposed to the Burke airport. I think that fact deserves some consideration on the part of the Senate.

Why should all these agencies, which represent the people in the respective communities, be opposed to this particular location? I am opposed to it because it would cost $50 million. There is an airport at Friendship, which I think cost much more than $50 million, and which is available for the purpose of relieving the traffic congestion which exists at present at the Washington Airport.

I am frank to say that something should be done. I believe that if there is congestion at the airport in Washington it should be relieved. But I do not believe that relief will come from constructing another airport within 15 miles of the present airport. That would simply add

to the congestion which now exists. When we come to the use of jet airplanes, which point we are rapidly approaching, there will be faster airplanes. With the Burke Airport only 15 miles from the present airport, it does not seem to me that there would be any great relief in air traffic conditions.

The solution to this problem should be a permanent solution. It should not be a temporary solution, which I think the Burke Airport would be.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] brought out the fact that, so far as the time element is concerned, it requires 46 minutes to travel from the Friendship Airport to the Statler Hotel, and 32 minutes from the Burke Airport. I submit that a difference of only 14 minutes is not sufficient to justify the expenditure of $50 million, which would be the cost of constructing the Burke Airport.

Therefore, as a Senator from Virginia, I stand before the Senate asking it to vote down an appropriation for an expenditure of approximately $50 million in my State. I do so with the very sincere conviction that that is not the true solution.

The Senator from Florida brought out very clearly the fact that the defeat of the pending proposal would simply mean that the question would be deferred until January. In the meantime Friendship Airport would be used as an auxiliary field, so as to determine its practicability. I think that is the sensible and proper thing to do, and I hope the Senate will vote down the pending amendment.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, this evening we have heard a very fine explanation by a disinterested Senator. No one can accuse the Senator from Florida of having a selfish interest. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said that, as a Maryland Senator, I might possibly have some selfish interest. Perhaps he is correct. The able Senator from Florida was thinking of the welfare of the country, and of the need for an additional airport.

We all know that there is need for an additional airport to serve the Nation's capital. Such facilities are now available. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said that the additional airport was needed now. We could start tomorrow morning using the facilities at Friendship.

There is one runway at Friendship 9,450 feet long. There is another 6,437 feet long; and a third 6,000 feet long. We are ready to go at Friendship.

In all fairness, why not begin to use the facilities at Friendship, which is only 46 or 47 minutes away from the city of Washington? Why wait for 5 years? Why not use those facilities now? Why vote for this additional appropriation tonight, when the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, has said, "We will look into the question next January. Then if an appropriation of $50 million, or whatever the cost may be, is necessary, it can be obtained at that time."

Let us use the facilities now in existence at Friendship. Friendship is between Baltimore and Washington. It is not necessarily exclusively a Baltimore airport. It would still be used by the millions of people coming to Washington.

Friendship is equipped to handle 100,000 passengers a day. I hope the Senate will vote tonight to sustain the Appropriations Committee in its judgment, and let us determine in January what is the desirable thing to do.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator opposed to the $50 million airport?

Mr. BEALL. I recognize the need for an additional airport, but we have it now. Why not use it now? Why spend $50 million and wait until 1960 or 1962 to get it?

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator mind a suggestion?

Mr. BEALL. No, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. Why not offer an amendment to locate an airport at Menoken, N. Dak.? We need a $50 million airport there.

Mr. BEALL. I will answer the Senator in this way: I cannot see why the airline companies cannot build their own airports. Railroad companies build their own stations. Bus companies build their own terminals. Why cannot the airlines build their own airports?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will have to ask a much wiser man than I.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the hour is late, and it is desired to complete action on the pending bill in order that the Senate may dispose of several conference reports and other matters. I shall be very brief.

I endorse what the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said about the opposition to this proposal in Fairfax County. One phase of the question which has not been mentioned is the fact that if the airport were located at Burke, 9½ miles of primary and secondary roads would be closed. Beautiful farms and homes which would not be acquired by the Government for the airport would be rendered absolutly useless to the owners. Certainly we should not let a proposal such as this be adopted if we could prevent it, without inserting a provision that all property owners whose property was actually destroyed by the closing of their roads should be adequately compensated.

It has been pointed out that there is no objection to Friendship, from the practical standpoint, except for the distance.

Friendship is 14 or 15 minutes further from Washington in travel time than the Burke site.

The Burke site, as the senior Senator from Virginia has stated, will cost at least $50 million, and perhaps more. for one-tenth of that sum, we could provide access roads to Friendship Airport which would eliminate the 14- or 15-minute difference in driving time. By use of those roads it would be possible to travel 60 miles an hour, and in that way cut down the travel differential as between Baltimore and Burke.

The airports at Chicago are 45 minutes to an hour from the business section of Chicago. The same thing is true of New York. I do not know of any metropolitan areas the size of the District of Columbia where the airports are within 15 minutes driving time of the downtown hotels.

Therefore, I hope that the Senate will support the position of the Committee on Appropriations. We should not rush into the expenditure of this large sum of money, at such a great disservice to a community in Virginia, and at such great cost to the taxpayers of the Nation, until we know that there is no suitable alternative available.

The Committee on Appropriations has appointed a subcommittee of five members to make a thorough study of the subject between now and next January, and to report to the committee. Then we will expect action. In the meantime, if we voted the $12 million tonight, it would be more than 3 years before the airport at Burke could be in operation. In the meantime, also, we certainly should try something else.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I speak as one who does not come from either Virginia or Maryland, and as one who believes a second airport is necessary. May I inquire whether I am right in stating that there was such divergence of opinion in the committee, that the committee took no action pro or con except to appoint a committee of five of its members to go into the matter and to study the whole subject between now and next January or February, when the first supplemental appropriation bill will be ready for action. In other words, I should like to point out that there was no decision pro or con reached in our committee. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is absolutely correct. The committee did not go on record either for or against Burke, or for or against any other site. We merely took the position that another airport is needed, but we did not know exactly where it should be located. We wanted from now until next January to get more information on the question than we have now. I hope the Senate will support the position taken by the Committee on Appropriations on that issue.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I should like to read from a statement on the time factor, which has been put into the RECORD by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Of the 695 cities served by airlines, very few of them have a travel time distance which would be the case if Friendship were selected as a second airport for Washington. It is apparent from a review of 23 cities selected as examples of excessive travel time of 40 minutes or more, if allowance is made for passenger travel from downtown area and for formalities at the airport, and so forth, that Friendship would top the list of airports, if time were allowed for driving from Washington to the airport and for the necessary formalities.

There is no question of a lobby involved. Airlines look to their customers' convenience. If it were possible to dragoon the passengers into using only one

airport, the airlines would certainly be agreeable to using a combination of Baltimore and Washington.

I am aware of the difficulties which confront the two Virginia Senators and the two Maryland Senators. Unfortunately Washington is in the middle. Not one of those Senators flies to Washington. However, 92 Senators do fly to Washington, and they face death every time they come into the airport under the congested conditions that exist. Yet Congress is offering no alternative except a trial run.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. This subject has been before Congress since 1950. It has been investigated by no less than ten separate committees. Perhaps the Appropriations Committee does not believe anyone has sense enough to understand aviation or to understand the subject except Senators appointed by the Appropriations Committee. However, there there are men who are sincerely interested in the work. Otherwise approximately 10 committees would not have come to the same conclusion by almost unanimous vote. It will be a very poor statement by the Senate of the United States in the event that between now and the first of April two DC–6's crash with a loss of 150 lives, if all the Senate will be able to say will be, "We felt we needed another study to be made." I feel the time to act is now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there anything in the suggestion of the Senator which would make an airport available between now and April of next year?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator. However, an investigation of 8 months would mean another delay beyond the estimated 3 years now, in starting the work. I do not believe in procrastinating. First it was 1950. Now it is 1956. Soon it will be 1960. Then the request will be made that we wait another 10 years. Maybe in that time we will be thinking about building an airport for flying saucers.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator know that the Secretary of Commerce, during the past 2 weeks, wrote CAB asking that it immediately name Friendship as a co-terminal, with Washington Airport, and that we momentarily expect CAB to decide that that be done, and that that is the only thing which will serve to alleviate the congestion at the present time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree that the planes ought to be allowed to go to Friendship, but we should not make that a permanent proposition.

Mr. BUTLER. No one is asking that it be made permanent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether it would be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that then each side have 10 additional minutes to speak on the subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would suggest a unanimous-consent agreement that we vote in 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to vote on the pending amendment in 1 minute.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent; and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official business.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is reported as voting in the negative.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire how I am recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—32

Bible	Jackson	Murray
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Ervin	Kennedy	Pastore
Gore	Kerr	Payne
Green	Laird	Purtell
Hayden	Lehman	Smathers
Hill	Long	Sparkman
Humphrey, Minn.	Magnuson	Symington
Humphreys, Ky.	Mansfield	Wofford
	McNamara	
	Monroney	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Dworshak	McCarthy
Allott	Eastland	McClellan
Barrett	Ellender	Millikin
Beall	Flanders	Morse
Bender	Frear	Mundt
Bennett	Fulbright	Neely
Bricker	Goldwater	Robertson
Bridges	Hennings	Russell
Bush	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler	Holland	Scott
Byrd	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jenner	Stennis
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Watkins
Clements	Kuchel	Wiley
Cotton	Malone	Williams
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Young
Dirksen	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	George	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Welker
Daniel	Potter	

So Mr. MONRONEY's amendment was rejected.

MODIFICATION OF ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the previous order, so that the Senate may meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning. I understand the first order had been modified by a subsequent order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPERATION WORLD LEADER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Ellsworth W. Taylor, who lives in Hawaii, with which letter he sent to me a manuscript entitled "Operation World Leader." Then I received a letter from a Hawaiian newspaperman, suggesting that he though the manuscript was so worthy of attention that he should like to have me read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do not want to take the time to read it in its entirety, but I should like

to read the first paragraph of it. It reads:

"There is no force more powerful than that of an idea whose time has come," said Victor Hugo. I am an American citizen with an idea for stopping war and I believe its time has come. I believe the world is still looking to the United States for leadership, and that if we move into that leadership role with boldness and imagination we can banish the threat of general war within 10 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPERATION WORLD LEADER—AN AMERICAN 10-YEAR PLAN FOR DISARMAMENT

(By Ellsworth W. Taylor)

"There is no force more powerful than that of an idea whose time has come," said Victor Hugo. I am an American citizen with an idea for stopping war and I believe its time has come. I believe the world is still looking to the United States for leadership, and that if we move into that leadership role with boldness and imagination we can banish the threat of general war within 10 years.

The heart of this plan is to tell the world:

"We believe there is this choice before the world: Disarm or die. We have seen the nations put their capital into war machines many times before, and we have seen war follow each time. We have seen one nation arm and others follow that example to defend themselves; we believe that if one nation disarms, others will follow that example, also.

"The United States is at the last crossroads. One road leads to atomic-hydrogen war against human beings; the other leads to a great fight against hunger, against disease, against ignorance and tyranny and corruption—all the real enemies of free men on which communism feeds and without which it will wither away. We are going to take the second road.

"Between now and 1965 we are going to take ten steps along that road to world welfare. We are going to spend 10 percent less each year on our armed forces, begining in 1957, and apply the money we save to making this green earth a fit place for the children of men to live in.

"At present our direct military budget is $40 billion a year. The chart of America's 10-year plan would look something like this:

"Year	For war	Saving	To feed and build in the poor lands	For United States schools	To pay public debt	Taxes saved each year
1956	40,000,000,000					
1957	36,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000
1958	32,000,000,000	8,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000
1959	28,000,000,000	12,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	3,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
1960	24,000,000,000	16,000,000,000	8,000,000,000	3,000,000,000	3,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
1961	20,000,000,000	20,000,000,000	10,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
1962	16,000,000,000	24,000,000,000	10,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	4,000,000,000
1963	12,000,000,000	28,000,000,000	10,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	6,000,000,000	9,000,000,000
1964	10,000,000,000	30,000,000,000	9,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	8,000,000,000	8,000,000,000
1965	10,000,000,000	30,000,000,000	8,000,000,000	5,000,000,000	8,000,000,000	9,000,000,000
Total	228,000,000,000	172,000,000,000	66,000,000,000	33,000,000,000	37,500,000,000	37,500,000,000"

"The most important element in the working of the plan is its gradualness. As we take the first steps along the road to a richer world we shall be watching the reactions of other nations. We shall at first maintain our Air Force at full striking power, but reduce our surface Navy and our Army, our Marines and auxiliary forces. But we are certain that there will be a mighty swing of world public opinion in our favor, and that world communism will fall apart, deserted by all its allies.

"As we move down this road to disarmament, we invite all nations to follow, and to transfer funds from their war budgets to the various agencies of the United Nations for the feeding, healing, and teaching of the men, women, and children of the great poor lands of the earth. But whatever others do, we are going ahead with Operation World Leader."

It does not take much imagination to see the joy of other nations and to hear their great sigh of relief when the United States chooses this course. The peoples of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and South America are waiting for leadership like this. For these are the people whose loyalty we must have. The world is presently divided roughly into thirds: one-third in the party of the United States; one-third in the party of Russia; and one-third uncommitted. It is the uncommitted third that both the United States and the U. S. S. R. are trying to win.

In this campaign for election to world leadership the Russians seem to be leading, largely because the United States has waited for them to make the first move and then tried to counter it: the Bear has been calling the tune for the Man to dance to. If we are to make good our claim to world leadership, we must get out in front and lead. The place for a leader is out in front, making the bold first move, catching the opposition off balance. This American 10-year plan is the kind of surprise that will knock the Bear clear off his paws, and when we follow through on it, he'll never get up again.

The uncommitted third will not be won by stockpiling H-bombs nor by the false security of alliances nor by slogans about liberty and democracy. A man in Asia whose stomach is empty and whose landlord has just collected two-thirds of his crop and whose wife has just died of cholera leaving him with seven scrawny children he cannot feed and no social security—such a man is not going to listen to sermons about liberty and democracy; he needs practical help. The uncommitted third will be won by the party which takes on the real enemies which rule in the great poor lands of the earth: Hunger, disease, illiteracy, and the kind of government that cares nothing for the citizen. Let's take our capital wealth out of the machines of slaughter and put it into machines that plow land and build roads and irrigation ditches and dams and hospitals and schools all over the world. Poverty, hunger, disease: these are the fertilizer for communism. These are the fertilizer, the soil, and the root of Russian and Chinese expansion; these are the enemies we must attack and the weapons are dollars. We have been trying to preach Americanism to starving foreigners, and it's like trying to cure cancer with Vaporub.

In our campaign for the loyalty of the uncommitted third, one tractor is worth a thousand tanks. Less for guns, more for the hungry ones should be our goal and our motto.

Let's get back to the chart for a moment. Let's understand that the more than $37 billion saved in taxes is not the only dividend. Every cent we send overseas will come back with interest in orders for American tools, machines, cars, and everything else we make. When Europe and Asia are prosperous, we are prosperous. But if the tools and machines come from Russia because we hide our heads in the sand, we'll not be prosperous; we'll be out in the cold and getting colder.

The way I feel about my country and the world of men cannot be expressed by armies and navies and hell-bombs. The American spirit is manifested by CARE and friendship trains and the Marshall plan and the point 4 program and the young American Quakers who have gone to Germany and Austria and Japan and Mexico and given their time and their labor and even paid their own expenses to help build homes, sewer systems and irrigation ditches—to teach, and to battle disease and filth and ignorance. These are the wonderful hands America has shown to other nations; but with the coming of the great fear we have forgotten the powerful and tender spirit of love for all mankind that has made the name of America blessed in every land of earth. Remember the words on the Statue of Liberty:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your heavy-laden yearning to be free."

This is the spirit that has made our country what it is, and the same spirit will preserve us and keep us from becoming a desperately frightened nation of men carrying guns and shivering behind coasts studded with steel and radar and under skies slashed with screaming jets. Certainly this would be a United States far from our ideals—unrecognizable by ourselves or any other peoples.

The worst danger to America's 10-year plan is the fear some of us have that Russia will attack in force if we weaken ourselves. I do not mean to ridicule this fear, for it has been skillfully planted by men in high position over a period of many years. But may I call your attention to the statements and actions of Communist and Russian leaders from Marx to the present? The Russians have always been afraid of large scale war; they have always lost heavily in war; and the whole Communist design is that of subversion and economic attack—not war.

Why then do the Communists keep large armies and make H-bombs? For the same reason we do: To defend themselves. The Russians have good reason to fear attack. Their country has been invaded and half-destroyed many times in their history. To mention only a few: Napoleon's invasion; the Kaiser's invasion in World War I; Hitler's invasion, the most destructive of all but not the worst; worst for the Russians' state of mind was the interference of 1919, when the Communist Government was less than 2 years old. In that year America, England, Turkey, France, and other nations which had come out on top in the Great War invaded Russia to destroy the new government and restore the Czar's family to the throne of Russia. American troops occupied at least one city and an area of Russian territory north of China; but the unforgivable insult was the sending of German soldiers—the defeated enemies of Russia and the other Allies—German soldiers who had killed and burned and strutted in Russia during the Great War—these German soldiers were sent by Russia's allies to destroy the new government which had taken the place of the Czar.

I do not agree with the Communist philosophy of religion or science or politics or anything else; but I can certainly understand why they are afraid of other nations. They see around them a ring of hostility: Air bases in North Africa, Arabia, Japan, Canada, Alaska, England, and France. They watch the invention and use of the A-bomb and the experiments with the H-bomb. They are frightened and they have only

to look into recent history to find reason to be frightened.

The capture of the satellite nations was a symptom of that fear. Stalin determined that Russia would never again be surprised—that any future attack would be met on foreign soil. This was the reason for enslaving a ring of countries just outside the borders of the U. S. S. R. If you look at the map, you will see the plan in perfect clarity. Out of fear comes crime, and the Communist leaders, afraid of new invasion, committed a series of national crimes to build a wall of lands and peoples around Russia's borders. Like all crimes, these should be condemned; but more important, they should be understood.

Perhaps it will help us Americans to understand these crimes better if we do some confessing of our own. We have satellites of our own in South and Central America and in the Caribbean—satellites whom we have kept in line with alliances, trade agreements, money—and an occasional regiment of Marines or a visiting fleet of warships. Our hands are not as red as the Communists', but there are stains on them which will not easily wash out. If the United States were ringed with Soviet bases as Russia is with ours, we might take even more violent means to establish friendly governments in countries near our borders. Nations have always done so.

Russians are people. They fear and hate war, and they will respond to an American 10-year plan for peace the same as people in other countries. If the diplomats wish to start a revolt of the Russian people against their leaders, let them try this plan.

Let's check back a little. In 1946, when American armies and fleets went home, and nobody except a few professionals ever wanted to see a uniform or a gun again, the Russians could have attacked in force and wiped us out. Why didn't they? Because their method is to subvert, to undermine, and then to wait for their enemies to fall by themselves. They have been warned by their own leaders and prophets again and again not to be drawn into war—except to defend their own country. Every act of Communist leaders shows they follow those advices right down the line.

The load of armaments is as heavy for them as for any other nation, and they will put it down for good as soon as they feel safe again.

Continuing the arms race will bring military rule in America as strict and harsh as in many Communist areas. At present rates we would spend $400 billion on arms and armament by 1965. The way of violence is expensive:

"The debt we owe for bombs and jets
Gets bigger all the time—
The tax is high on private sky,
It don't come for a dime—
The men and guns don't practice free,
The price of hate ain't hay:
So if you choose to go to hell
You've got to pay your way."

Of course there will be opposition to an American 10-year plan for peace. But watch who objects. The makers of armor plate, of planes and tanks and H-bombs will scream, of course, and the military men who have studied almost nothing but tactics and strategy since they were adolescents—these generals and admirals will howl in anguish, and will bring out their scheduled war scares ahead of schedule. (Remember the admiral who said there would be war in the Formosa Strait by the middle of April 1955? And how often these war headlines come at the same time military appropriations are being voted on by Congress. Let us not be stampeded—let us not be discouraged by such as these.

But while we are talking about military men and munitions makers, let us confess again that in past centuries white European and American soldiers and traders raided South America of gold; robbed Africa of gold, diamonds, and slaves; and raided Asia of everything that wasn't nailed down. We are less guilty than the Europeans, but we helped strip the great poor lands of their capital goods; in returning some of that borrowed wealth we will be smashing world communism and seizing the greatest opportunity for world leadership ever offered.

In raising living standards in other lands, "A dollar for the world" would be a wonderful goal for organized labor. Let American labor be satisfied with a $1 minimum wage and concentrate on raising the rest of the world's workingmen to that same dollar. One profitable attack is to bring prices down while wages stay at present levels. I for one will not be happy with the most fabulous prosperity if I must be defended against the starving men of other nations by H-bomb-waving diplomats and politicians.

The strange thing we have overlooked is that America's 10-year plan will be immensely profitable. Even the munitions makers will enjoy a thriving business, once they convert to making machines for peace, since capital in the great poor lands will mean floods of orders for everything America sells, from wrist watches to steel mills. We save every way you look at it.

Some might say reducing the Armed Forces will bring unemployment. I say there is plenty of work in the world to keep everyone busy, and certainly enough here in the United States. There are schools, hospitals, bridges, dams, and Federal buildings to be built all over the country. How many men can New England use to build the multipurpose dams it needs to control floods and make power? How many can California use? And the old Mississippi River needs a few battalions of workers to bring her under bondage.

How many men will it take to reforest the dust bowl? How many to clear the slums out of Washington, D. C.? How many to irrigate desert areas of the United States which are only waiting for water? And if we still have idle men, let's send them overseas as workers and teachers and hungerfighters and crusaders against disease. Let them build schools, hospitals, and productive farms; let them teach the men of the great poor lands how to use American machines and tools; let them go not as soldiers but as working missionaries: such missionaries have always been welcome abroad.

This plan does not offer peace. The American 10-year plan is a way of getting past the roadblock of war to the great fights we have hardly begun yet: the fights to conquer poverty, and hunger, and disease, and ignorance all over the earth; yes, and the great campaign to conquer space, and to harness the power of the sun, and the tides and the atom for peaceful, everyday use. I see great battles ahead far beyond the lives of my great-grandchildren; but we will never fight those battles and we probably won't even have grandchildren unless we stop making war.

The place for a leader is out in front. America has won its place in the world by moving ahead; by breaking new trails; by leading the way with new ideas, new plans, and new ways of living. No nation deserves that place of leadership but the United States of America. Operation world leader is ready for D-day. The last handwriting is on the wall: disarm or die. And the men of the world are waiting for America to lead the way again. "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

SIZE OF FARM UNITS IN COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from Clancy Jean, manager, agricultural department, Portland Chamber of Commerce, on June 6, 1956, together with a resolution which was enclosed with the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Portland, Oreg., July 6, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a resolution recently passed by our board of directors stating our position on the size of farm units in the Columbia Basin project. The resolution also contains our recommendations regarding development of future area within the project.

Recently the Quincy (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce met with some of our members and requested our support of a similar resolution. This matter was referred to our 50-member agricultural committee who, in turn, drafted the attached resolution. All members of our agricultural committee are well acquainted with the Columbia Basin project and several of them have had long and continuing association with the project since its beginning.

We felt that you would be interested in the position we have taken on this matter. If you desire additional comment, please let me know.

Sincerely,

CLANCY JEAN,
Manager, Agricultural Department.

The board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce on June 15 approved the following resolution which was submitted to them by the chamber's agricultural committee. It is felt the content of this resolution will be of interest to you:

"Whereas farm technology and mechanization, as well as economic conditions, have changed substantially since the passage of the Columbia Basin Act which established farm unit size at approximately 80 acres; and

"Whereas it has become apparent that too little attention was given to an accurate soil classification in accordance with its productivity and adapted types of farming: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce favors amending the Columbia Basin Act to permit one family to own two farm units as now platted and engineered (a family to be defined as one single person, or husband and wife and all children under 21 years of age residing at home); and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in advance of delivery of water to all future irrigation blocs, particular attention be given to—

"A. Accurate soil studies under the direction of the State College of Washington or the Soil Conservation Service.

"B. Provisions be made to prevent the delivery of water to land of questionable productivity as determined by such studies.

"C. The size of farm units within the future area be platted in accordance with the type of agriculture necessary to provide sounder economic farm units."

Approved by the board of directors on June 15.

OREGON SCHOOL-BUILDING NEEDS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the first constitutional convention of the

Oregon State Labor Council, held in Portland, Oreg., on June 18 through 22, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 69

Whereas recent studies of Oregon school-building needs made by the schoolhouse planning section of the Oregon State Department of Education show that between 1956 and 1961 a total of $84,555,200 must be expended to provide for unhoused pupils and the increase which will occur in the State's elementary- and high-school population; and

Whereas the estimated total expenditures needed for school facilities between now and 1961 has been shown to be $98,261,597; and

Whereas 70 distressed school districts will need to provide school-building facilities in excess of their present remaining bonding capacity and accumulated bonding capacity to 1961 in an amount found to be $13,577,166; and

Whereas the amount 88 distressed school districts will need in excess of their present remaining bonding capacity to 1961 has been shown to be $23,368,216; and

Whereas school-building needs of 44 distressed districts for the next 2 years to house pupils who are double shifted, pupils in overloaded classrooms, and two-fifths of the 5-year projected increase is estimated to be $13,823,800; and

Whereas needs in excess of remaining bonding capacity for 44 districts for the next 2 years has been shown to be $5,225,114; and

Whereas school-building needs for 62 distressed districts for the next 4 years necessary to house pupils, pupils housed in substandard classrooms and two-fifths more of the projected increase is estimated to be $16,579,400; and

Whereas needs in excess of remaining bonding capacity and accumulated bonding capacity for the next 4 years for these 62 schools has been found to be $11,071,129; and

Whereas the estimated annual additional aid necessary to provide for minimum needs of Oregon schools is $5,225,114 for 1956–58 and $6,846,015 for 1958–60 and $2,506,037 for 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this first constitutional convention of the Oregon State Labor Council urges Congress to act with all speed to adopt the Kelley bill which would make Federal aid available to all States for school-building needs and to the State of Oregon in the amount of $3,852,000 annually, or $15,408,000 over a 4-year period, and would require Oregon matching funds of only an equal amount.

Adopted: June 21, 1956.

RESOLUTION No. 46

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act states that it is the policy of the United States (carried over from the Wagner Act) to encourage organization of workers into unions of their own choosing and to promote industrial peace and progress through collective bargaining; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act has operated to curtail and block union organization, to weaken unions and to interfere with free collective bargaining because many of the act's provisions subvert its professed aims; and

Whereas since the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act the rate of organization has been greatly reduced—contrary to the experience under the Wagner Act, so that, today, two-thirds of the workers who are eligible for union membership remain unorganized; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act places serious restrictions on the right to strike and to picket, and strikes or picketing for various purposes which were legal long before the advent of the Wagner Act are entirely prohibited by the Taft-Hartley Act; and

Whereas the use of the labor injunction had been virtually halted in the Federal courts for 15 years prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, because of the Norris-LaGardia Act; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act permits the Government to seek an injunction in any unfair labor practice case prior to any hearing on the merits of the case and, in addition, is actually compelled by the act to seek such injunction in certain types of cases; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act injects the Government into the writing of collective-bargaining agreements (unlike the Wagner Act where unions and employers were generally free to make whatever collective-bargaining contracts they thought appropriate); and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act restricts the benefits unions may achieve through collective bargaining, such as union security, welfare funds, check-off arrangements and strike notices, and in industries with shifting employment patterns such as construction, maritime trades and canning places restrictions on security arrangements which are wholly unworkable; and

Whereas section 14 (b) of the act legalizes State antiunion security (so-called right-to-work) laws in defiance of the principle that Federal legislation normally overrides conflicting State laws; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley law contains a host of other restrictive provisions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this first constitutional convention of the Oregon State Labor Council meeting at Portland, June 19 to 22, 1956, calls upon the Congress of the United States—aided by the leadership of the executive department of the Federal Government—to remove the restrictive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to the end that the entire area of collective bargaining will be returned to the labor-management field, with the Government entering the picture only in the public interest—and impartially—after the two unhindered free enterprise agents, labor and management, find they are unable to reach agreement, themselves.

Adopted June 22, 1956.

RESOLUTION No. 71

Whereas many working people who are insured under the Social Security Act became unable to earn a living through sickness or accident long before they become 65 years of age and therefore are left without any means of providing a livelihood: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we—all local unions—in Oregon write letters to all Oregon Congressmen to work for an amendment to this act so that these people may be taken care of within the Social Security Act.

Adopted June 22, 1956.

PROPOSED ALTERATION OF CAPITOL—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Southwestern Oregon Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Capitol is by general consent the most historic and as it stands one of the most beautiful buildings in the country; and

Whereas the central portion preserves intact the work of three of the greatest American architects, Thornton, Latrobe, and Bulfinch, as when completed in 1829: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Southwest Oregon Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, both for aesthetic and historical reasons, opposes any changes which would alter in material or design this central portion of the building, and recommends that if additional space be necessary, it should be taken care of by other means, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded at once to our Congressmen and to Don J. Stewart, regional director, for his action.

A CVA IS THE ANSWER—EDITORIAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a request to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A CVA Is the Answer," which was published in the Oregon Farmer Union for May, 1956. I desire to make it clear that I do not share the conclusions of the editor, but I believe points of view which do not agree with mine are entitled to insertion in the RECORD when responsible constituents want them inserted. I consider the editorial meritorious, even though I do not agree with its conclusions.

I have always opposed, for my section of the country, a CVA; but in this particular editorial an argument is made for a CVA.

It is interesting that with the growing threat that Congress is making against comprehensive development of our water resources, there is renewed agitation in my section of the country for a CVA, so I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CVA IS THE ANSWER

Private utilities of the Pacific Northwest are trying to block further development of the Columbia River by a new propaganda twist. Numerous nationally circulated magazines are running advertisements and articles purporting to show how much the taxpayers of each of the 48 States would have to pay for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. A story along this line was carried in the Saturday Review for May 10. Earlier, Time magazine had published a similar article.

"Why should taxpayers far from the Columbia River have to pay taxes so the people of the Pacific Northwest can have cheap power?" is the gist of this latest propaganda drive.

This propaganda is as false as most of the private utility stuff peddled across the Nation in magazines and on the radio.

All of the money spent for power development at Hells Canyon and at all the other Columbia River power projects is reimbursable, is paid back to the Federal Treasury with interest. The Bonneville Administration is several years ahead of schedule in reimbursing the Federal Treasury for the cost of dams completed and in operation.

With regard to the nonreimbursable cost of Columbia River projects—that part of the cost allocated to flood control, navigation, and so forth—what difference is their in money spent on the Columbia for these purposes and money spent on the Mississippi, New York Harbor, the Delaware River, and so forth? No one has ever questioned the right of the Federal Government to spend money to improve the usefulness of these rivers and harbors. They are a national asset, even though directly benefiting only that part of the Nation immediately adjacent. But when the Federal Government spends money on the Columbia River for identical

purposes, this is damned as a crime against the Nation's taxpayers.

This propaganda campaign is so vicious, so untruthful that a question is being raised in the minds of many people of the Pacific Northwest as to whether the private utilities have not forfeited their right to continue in business. Had they been fair, there is no reason why public power and private power could not have continued to co-exist. But their tactics have been so unfair, their propaganda so false, that it now appears the people of the Columbia Basin have only one recourse to protect their vital interest in the cheap power and the full development of the Columbia River and its tributaries. That recourse is condemnation of all the private utilities in the area, with a Columbia Valley Authority taking over not only the production of power but also its distribution. We cannot continue indefinitely to waste so much social energy fighting the vicious tactics of the private utilities, not only to keep the dams we have, but also to develop for future generations the still undeveloped resources of the Columbia Basin.

PATTON ON FOREIGN AID—EDITORIAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patton on Foreign Aid," which was published in the Oregon Farmer Union for May 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATTON ON FOREIGN AID

President Patton rendered a notable public service in his statement early this month before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. Mr. Patton brought out into the open a fact carefully concealed by most of the Nation's newspapers. Only about 11 percent of the $4.7 billion asked by the administration for foreign aid will be for purposes not connected with military expenditures. A total of $533 million is in this category. The balance of the $4.7 billion is either for military aid programs or for some kind of economic development directly connected with the military program where the primary reason for giving the aid is to boost the economies of those countries with men under arms.

As late as last November, Mr. Patton pointed out, a delegate of the United States to the United Nations refused United States support for a United Nations economic development fund, despite the fact that the President has stated that one dollar of aid spent for economic aid is worth five spent on the military.

"It is equally a mystery," said Patton, "that the President and top State Department officials continue to give lipservice about expanding our contribution for economic development to the lesser developed countries and at the same time request of Congress such insignificant appropriations to be used for this purpose."

President Patton continued: "National Farmers Union sees the need for a strong defense among the free and democratic nations. But we are convinced that we are in grave error in assuming that effective military pledges can be bought in underdeveloped nations whose people as yet have not attained something they really want to defend.

"Aren't we putting the cart before the horse in our attempt to make military allies out of people who haven't yet won the battle against poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy?"

President Patton hailed the United Nations as the ideal medium for administering an economic aid program, and called for much larger U. N. expenditures for economic aid and technical assistance. The underdeveloped nations are highly critical of the United States for tying strings on aid and on our insistance that they line up with some regional military pact. What is needed is more economic aid, more cultural exchanges, more trade, more international commodity agreements, and establishment of a world food bank. American farmers, and workers, can earn a better living if people in other nations can earn the purchasing power required to buy the commodities we produce.

This is the kind of a foreign-aid program we need rather than an additional expenditure of $4 billion, practically all of it for military purposes.

USE OF MOTOR FUELS OF ALCOHOL MANUFACTURED FROM AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, and myself in connection with the so-called Jensen-Mundt bill, which proposes to provide for the utilization of grain alcohol in the manufacture of fuel used for motor vehicles.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JENSEN-MUNDT BILL: BEFORE THE ADVENT OF THE AUTO, TRUCK, AND TRACTOR OUR HORSES AND MULES CONSUMED THE CROPS FROM 43 MILLION ACRES—OUR GRAIN SURPLUSES SHOULD NOW BE CONSUMED IN MOTOR FUEL

The Jensen-Mundt agriculture alcohol motor fuel bill, H. R. 9522, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman BEN F. JENSEN, of Iowa, and an almost identical bill, S. 3758, introduced in the Senate by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota:

"A bill to raise revenue, assist the American farmer by providing for the use of motor fuels of alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown upon the farm in the United States; to utilize grains in surplus; to balance consumption with production of certain agricultural products

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the 'Agricultural Alcohol Motor Fuel Act.'

"SEC. 2. As used in this act—

"(1) The term 'United States' includes the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

"(2) The term 'motor fuel' means any of the following having a specific gravity of 36° or above, Baume scale, and suitable for use in internal-combustion engines: Gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, benzine, crude oil, and other petroleum products.

"(3) The term 'agricultural products' means all agricultural products grown upon the farm within the United States.

"(4) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, or corporation.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby imposed on motor fuel sold by the importer thereof or by a producer of motor fuel, unless at least 5 percent thereof, by volume, is alcohol manufactured from agricultural products grown upon the farm within the United States, a tax of 5 cents per gallon, such tax to be in addition to any other tax imposed by law.

"SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person to sell motor fuel in the United States unless at least 5 percent thereof by volume is alcohol manufactured from agricultural products.

"SEC. 5. The act entitled 'An act for the withdrawal from bond, tax free, of domestic alcohol when rendered unfit for beverage or liquid medicinal uses by mixture with suitable denaturing materials,' approved June 7, 1906, is amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph of section 1 thereof a new sentence, as follows: 'Domestic alcohol manufactured from agricultural products may be withdrawn from bond, without the payment of the internal-revenue tax, for use in motor fuels, as provided in the Agricultural Alcohol Motor Fuel Act, without mixing such alcohol with methol alcohol or other denaturing material or materials.'

"SEC. 6. This act shall take effect 6 months after the date of its enactment, except that section 5 shall take effect upon the date of its enactment.

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3 and 4, the requirement under this act as to the percentage of alcoholic content shall be 2 percent during the 6 months after this act takes effect, with an increase of 3 percent 1 year after this act takes effect.

"SEC. 8. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 9. The Secretary of Agriculture shall have the authority to declare this act inoperative for an indefinite period of time on any or all agricultural products declared in surplus, when such surplus has been reduced to proper proportions as determined by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and after the Secretary of Agriculture has given all interested manufacturers, importers, exporters, and blenders 6 months' advance notice in writing of such a declaration."

Now let us see how the law would operate in actual practice.

Let us say the processor of corn pays the farmer $1.50 per bushel delivered at his plant. Each bushel of corn will produce 2½ gallons of alcohol. The residue, or mash, from that bushel of corn is worth 60 percent of the natural grain in feed value, or 90 cents, which will be sold to farmers for stock and poultry feed at that price, making the first net cost for 2½ gallons of agrol 60 cents, or 24 cents per gallon, plus processing costs, which we are told is about 20 cents per gallon, making the next cost per gallon 44 cents. Add to that a 25 percent gross profit, making 55 cents per gallon, then allowing 5 cents per gallon for transportation costs and interest on the investment, making the total cost per gallon 60 cents. This bill provides for a 5 percent or one-twentieth agrol to nineteen-twentieths gasoline, one-twentieth of 60 cents equals 3 cents extra cost per gallon to the dealer over the price of low-grade gasoline.

The alcohol blend makes a premium-grade motor fuel from low-grade gasoline. It is a well-known fact that by adding 5 percent agrol to low-grade gasoline, which retails at an average throughout the country of 27 cents per gallon, that such a mixture makes a smooth-acting, powerful, high-grade extra mileage motor fuel, costing the consumer 30 cents per gallon, or just about to the penny the same as high-octane gasoline. These facts and figures apply equally to wheat, and some other grains, as well as to potatoes. Since that only comes out even, wherein do we benefit under provisions of this bill? Here it is:

The Department of Agriculture had on April 30 this year 976,406,792 bushels of corn and 728,356,697 bushels of wheat in Government storage. Total gallons of gasoline consumed in the United States in 1955 was a little over 72 billion gallons. Our bill provides for a 5-percent mix of agrol; 5 percent or one-twentieth of 72 billion gallons, is 3,600,000,000 gallons divided by 2½, which 1 bushel of corn will produce, making 1,440,000,000 bushels of corn thus consumed in 1 year. Hence, you will note, our surplus of corn and wheat would be exhausted in about

14 months if full production could immediately be put into effect; but that cannot be done due to the fact that it will require about 1 year to build the necessary processing plants for full production. But it is plain to see that in about 2 years after our bill went into effect, the surplus of corn and wheat would be reduced even below the ever-normal granary requirement, but that is safeguarded in section 9 of the bill.

We are informed that our present distillers of alcohol for medicine and beverage need only to operate their plants less than 25 percent of the time to meet their present requirements, so partial production could be accomplished quickly to furnish the 2 percent mix 6 months after the law went into effect, then additional needed plants could be erected and put into operation to produce the other 3 percent within a year after the law went into effect as the bill provides.

True, the amount of mash would go into the feed market and would replace some natural grain consumption, but remember the price of all feed grain is geared and determined by the price of corn, the greatest of all feed grains, hence the prices of all feed grains and livestock would be enhanced by stabilizing the price of corn. Remember too that the price of livestock, like other finished products, is determined by the cost of the parts required to produce it, whether it be meat, marbles or mowers. Therein lies the benefit to our farmers and to our entire economy, because the prosperity of every American over the long pull depends on the value of our raw products, which spring from mother earth in the form of feed and fiber each succeeding year, and which in the final analysis is our only real source of new wealth.

We import millions upon millions of barrels of blackstrap molasses annually, which is produced from sugarcane from which most of our present supply of alcohol and synthetic rubber is produced. All of this could and should also be produced from our own farm crops to further insure a stable ecenomy for America.

Before the advent of the automobile and tractor, our horses and mules consumed the grain produced on 43 million acres of our land. Is it any wonder we have long had a surplus of grain? Now I am sure you will agree that had we, years ago, adopted such a law as our bill provides, the periodical farm recessions and depressions would never have come upon us. So why wait longer? A start in correcting our past folly cannot be started earlier than now. Congress recently passed the soil-bank bill, which the President signed, the main purpose of which is to take 40 million acres out of production. Compare that figure, if you please, with the 43 million acres of grain production previously consumed by our horses and mules. Does not that fact prove to you the urgent need for the passage of this bill, which is not a new experiment? Many nations of the world have many years used an agrol mix in their motor fuels. One of those nations requires by law the use of 25 percent agrol in all their motor fuel in order to keep their farm crops in normal supply.

We have been told that when several bills, such as H. R. 9522 and S. 3758 were introduced in Congress during the early thirties, that the large gasoline producers vigorously opposed the legislation. If that is true, then they were plainly stupid and shortsighted, for certainly they should have known then, as they now know, that they are in the same boat with the farmers and the rest of us in any economic storm.

After H. R. 9522 was introduced, a provision was written into the soil-bank bill recently passed by Congress, directing the President to appoint a commission to make a study into new uses for farm products; which is all well and good. But why wait longer when we already know the facts as above stated? Certainly our bill should be passed without further delay. Then there would be little or no need in the future for such controversial and costly farm legislation such as Congress and the farmers have been struggling with these many, many years.

Congressman BEN F. JENSEN.
Senator KARL E. MUNDT.

ALLEVIATION OF CONDITIONS OF EXCESSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Arizona to Senate bill 2663. I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered today, this amendment may be in order, and that it be allotted equal time with the others on Senate bill 2663.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that as soon as action is completed on the pending bill, we shall take up the conference report on the first supplemental appropriation bill. We shall take up the housing bill and send it to conference. We shall take up the conference report on the Farm Tenant Act; the conference report on the judges, widows, and dependent children bill; the conference report on the customs simplification bill; the conference report on the agricultural trade development and assistance bill; the conference report on the watershed protection bill; and the conference report on the military decorations bill.

I should like all Senators to be on notice.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 10, line 5, to strike out the provision reading "That $25,000 of this amount shall be available only upon the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 576, 84th Congress." The amount appropriated is for the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The House did not pass House Joint Resolution 576 until July 23. For that reason, as Chairman of the Commission of which the senatorial Members are the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I offer the amendment. I have discussed it with the minority and majority leaders and with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and other Senators.

I ask that the authorizing language of House Joint Resolution 576 be inserted in lieu of the language on lines 5 through 7 on page 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 5, after the word "*Provided*", it is proposed to strike out "That $25,000 of this amount shall be available only upon the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 576, 84th Congress" and insert in lieu thereof:

That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $25,000, in addition to the sum of $175,000 heretofore authorized to be appropriated, as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I do not wish to offer an amendment. I merely ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee relating to the Upper Harbor project. I am pleased that that appropriation has been made available. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the Davis-Bacon provisions.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 28, 1956.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I should like to call to your attention the fact that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on June 19, 1956, recommended that the authorized project on the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., be completed substantially as authorized. Original authorization was on August 26, 1937.

You may recall that the engineers had been requested to review the project by action of the House Committee on Public Works in August 1954.

The action of the Board of Engineers was taken on the report of the district engineer dated April 15, 1955, recommending completion of the extension at St. Anthony Falls.

In discussions with the Army engineers, I am told that if the engineers were asked to indicate the amount of funds which would permit full resumption of work on this authorized project during the coming fiscal year, they would specify that the sum of $400,000 could be utilized. This would permit completion of the lower lock and dam, which is 82 percent complete, and commencement of work on the upper lock and dam.

Because of the pending decision of the Board of Engineers, the engineers had not initiated a budget request for the St. Anthony Falls extension for the fiscal 1957 budget.

Now that the decision of the engineers has been made, and the Congress will be given a favorable recommendation to complete the project, I wish to request the Committee on Appropriations to consider the appropriation of the sum of $400,000 to be added to the supplemental appropriation on which the committee is now conducting hearings.

This harbor and channel improvement at St. Anthony Falls will be of immense value to the entire upper Midwest, and not only to the city of Minneapolis. The project has been exhaustively reviewed and its completion favorably recommended. Since 1948, work has gone steadily forward on this magnificent engineering task. It would be a tragic loss to be forced to suspend construction for an entire year.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I urge that funds be appropriated to permit uninterrupted progress toward the development of the upper harbor at St. Anthony Falls.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am pleased to note that the Appropriations Committee has provided $300,000 for carrying out the labor-standards provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act enacted a few weeks ago. You will recall that the act was intended to assure that employees building the Interstate System will be paid not less than prevailing-wage rates in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. The Highway Act imposes the duty on the Secretary of Labor to determine the prevailing-wage rates in the immediate locality of each project, after consulting with the highway department of the State involved and giving due regard to the information obtained from it.

These responsibilities of the Secretary of Labor will add a tremendous burden on the Office of the Solicitor of Labor. The Solicitor recently testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that the Highway Act may increase the wage determination workload of his Department by approximately 12,000 determinations per year. This is based on estimates by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, on the number of contracts that will be made each year under the program.

The Solicitor of Labor explained that the workload and cost for each determination under the Highway Act will be substantially greater than for other Davis-Bacon determinations. This additional cost per determination is caused by several factors. For one thing, the greater bulk of the new highway construction will be in rural areas where complete or accurate wage-rate information cannot be obtained from the present sources. Many on-the-spot wage surveys will have to be conducted under the new program. In contrast, most of the present wage determinations are for building and heavy construction projects located in urban areas where information is readily available. Secondly, the requirement for the Secretary of Labor to consult with the appropriate State highway department before making each highway determination means that he must maintain constant liaison with the 48 State highway departments. This costs money. Thirdly, the Department of Labor will have to increase its subscriptions to the private reporting services which furnish information on contract awards.

Clearly the Secretary of Labor will need additional funds for making wage determinations under the Highway Act. He will also require extra funds for coordinating enforcement under the act, necessary to insure compliance with the labor-standards provisions of the act.

The sum of $300,000 is less than the amount requested by President Eisenhower in his communication of July 11 to the President of the Senate with respect to supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1957. It will, however, provide a minimum budget for the enforcement program. I am sure if more funds are needed, the Congress will respond favorably.

Lest there be any question regarding the authority of the Secretary of Labor to coordinate enforcement of the labor standards provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, I think that an examination of what Congress did in enacting the Highway Act clearly shows that both Houses intended to give the Secretary of Labor this responsibility.

Section 115 (a) of the act requires that employees working on the Interstate System shall be paid not less than prevailing wage rates in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. And the Secretary of Labor is given the overriding authority, under Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950, "to assure coordination of administration and consistency of the labor standards provisions" of the Davis-Bacon Act and related statutes.

It will be recalled that section 115 (a) was added on the floor of the Senate by the Chavez amendment, with the junior Senator from Oregon, among others, as cosponsor. The senior Senator from New Mexico pointed out that the language of his amendment was identical with the labor standard provision inserted in the highway bill by the House Public Works Committee and passed by the House. The provision was not in the bill when reported out by the Senate committee but was reinserted here by enactment of the Chavez amendment. During the debate on the amendment, the junior Senator from Oregon had printed in the RECORD the portion of the House committee report explaining the meaning and operation of the section. The House report stated, "In discharging his responsibilities, the Secretary of Labor will have, with respect to the labor standards specified in the bill, the authority and functions set forth in reorganization plan of 1950" and under the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended.

So when this Chamber voted to include the House labor standards provision in the bill, it was fully aware that the Secretary of Labor was being given the responsibility of coordinating enforcement of the provision, as provided in Reorganization Plan No. 14. The senior Senator from California, in opposing the Chavez amendment, correctly pointed out to the Senate that: "Inclusion of the Davis-Bacon Act in the highway bill would also result in placing enforcement functions in the Federal Government as provided under Reorganization Plan No. 14, 1950. This would mean that the Federal Department of Labor would have authority to conduct compliance inspections" on work conducted under the program. The senior Senator from Florida also referred to the responsibility of the Secretary of Labor if the amendment were adopted.

Nothing can be clearer than that the statement of the House committee is controlling with respect to the application of Reorganization Plan No. 14. The Senate accepted the provision exactly as reported out by the House committee. As the junior Senator from Tennessee explained with respect to the bill reported out of conference: "This particular section was not before the conference committee, because it was approved in identical language in both the Senate version of the bill and the House version of the bill."

The Secretary of Commerce is responsible, as stated by the managers on the part of the House in connection with the conference report, "to insure that the Davis-Bacon Act is applied to Interstate System projects." His enforcement responsibility under the Highway Act is comparable to that vested in each Federal contracting agency under the Davis-Bacon Act. But it is equally clear that the Secretary of Labor has the overall responsibility of coordinating enforcement under the Highway Act, as he has with respect to Davis-Bacon projects.

There is no inconsistency between the enforcement responsibilities of the Secretary of Commerce and the coordinating functions of the Secretary of Labor under the Highway Act. During the 6 years since adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 14, the functions performed by the agencies having the primary enforcement responsibility and those of the Secretary of Labor have been mutually complementary in producing effective enforcement of the labor standards provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the clerk be given authority to change the section numbers, if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the 2 Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, July 23, 1956, pp. 14002–14004 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the committee, whether the conference report includes agreement by the House of Representatives to the provision for the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, which provision was inserted in the bill by the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, that was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this item was not included in

the bill at the time when it was passed by the House of Representatives, because at that time the President had not signed the bill extending the life of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

I recognize the lateness of the hour, and I shall not detain the Senate; but I wish to say that when history is written, I think the work of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control and the value of the experiments on modication of clouds will be considered among the most important results from the tasks authorized by this Congress.

I may say that I have before me a paper by Capt. Howard T. Orville, chairman of the Committee, presented by him at a conference on weather control, held just a few days ago in the State of South Dakota, by invitation of Gov. Joe Foss. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the chairman of the Advisory Committee be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

(By Capt. Howard T. Orville, chairman, Friez instrument division, Bendix Aviation Corp.)

Gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure for the task force of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control to meet with the distinguished gentlemen from South Dakota headed by His Excellency, Gov. Joe Foss. We sincerely hope when this day is over you will all have a better understanding of what is meant by cloud seeding experiments and you will have a deeper appreciation of the capabilities and limitations of present cloud seeding techniques and even more important the great difficulties in determining exactly what effects have been obtained when cloud seeding experiments are carried out.

You will note that I have used the term "experiments" in connection with the cloud seeding. The use of this term is intentional to emphasize the fact that there is still much to be learned about cloud seeding and how to determine what results, if any, have been obtained when cloud seeding experiments are conducted over an area.

It may seem strange to some of you that even though the present techniques of creating precipitation artificially were first discovered almost 10 years ago there are still many questions remaining to be answered and because so many of the answers are unknown the whole question of weather modification using present scientific techniques is still controversial. There are many today who feel that cloud seeding can completely modify the weather and that the day of absolute weather control is on the horizon. There are many more, and probably most of us here today are in this classification, who take the more conservative view that cloud seeding experiments can and do produce increases in preciptation of varying amounts under favorable weather conditions. Then, of course, there is the third group who are positively skeptics and will never accept the view that cloud seeding has any effect on the weather until they have observed repeated positive demonstrations almost with mathematical certainty.

Because of the widely different opinions as to the effectiveness of cloud seeding and because of the tremendous economic importance of any methods of increasing precipitation in the western drought States, Congress became interested in weather modification as early as 1948. However, it was not until 1953 that through the efforts of your distinguished Senator FRANCIS CASE, assisted by Senators CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, that a bill was finally passed and signed into law creating the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. This bill was signed by President Eisenhower on August 13, 1953, and created an 11-man committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification. It is now known as Public Law 256 (67 Stat. 559). Its members consist of 5 members from private life of recognized standing in the fields of science, agriculture, and business, and 6 members from interested Government departments. The members from private life were appointed by President Eisenhower on December 9, 1953, and confirmed by the Senate on January 25, 1954. This 11-man Committee held its first meeting on December 18, 1953. At this first meeting the Committee adopted four guiding principles to ensure that its evaluation would be impartial in all respects. These principles are:

"First, the Committee will base its conclusions on facts obtained and interpreted, and not any preconceived notions. Experiments to date have suggested that weather control may eventually provide benefits to agriculture, industry, and Government. Without such a hint of substantial benefits, the Congress would most likely not have created this Committee. However, the Committee will not proceed under the assumption that weather control, including rainmaking, does 'work' or does not 'work.' It will aim to examine all the evidence with scholarly care and scientific impartiality.

"Second, the Committee recognizes the need for additional basic research dealing with processes related to rain, snow, and cloud phenomena. There is also a need to develop ways and means of providing methods for reliable evaluation of weather-control activities. The Committee will encourage such research in industry at our universities and throughout Government.

"Third, the Committee will welcome, and will solicit, the information possessed by and the opinions held by all individuals and groups having an interest in the field of weather control. It will carefully consider all facts and opinions pertinent to its study.

"Fourth, the Committee will not act in any way prejudicial to responsible individuals and concerns attempting to modify the weather."

Since that time the Committee has—

1. Held a total of 12 meetings.

2. Made numerous field trips to observe cloud-seeding operations.

3. Received and analyzed several hundred reports from private meteorologists, commercial cloud-seeding companies, and corporations.

4. Obtained complete information on Government-sponsored projects.

5. Consulted with or sought the advice of most of the leading scientists in the world who are familiar with one phase or another in the field of weather modification.

6. Developed an evaluation program consisting of two principal phases, a statistical one and a study of the physical process. You will hear much more of this program this afternoon from Capt. F. A. Berry, our chief scientific adviser.

The Committee was severely handicapped in its operations prior to July 1, 1954, due to lack of funds. A very modest budget was granted by Congress on July 1 and this permitted setting up a staff headquarters in Washington, D. C. As most of you know, the first executive secretary was Charles Gardner, Jr., a native son from Miller, S. Dak. Also you will be interested in knowing that our administrative assistant, Miss Rosalea Munkvold, is also a native of South Dakota. Since this was a temporary Committee, due to go out of existence on June 30, 1956, extreme difficulty was encountered in obtaining a competent technical staff. In fact, the only way in which this was possible was because Public Law 256 permitted the Committee to obtain personnel from other Government agencies on a reimbursable basis. The Committee obtained its chief scientific advisor, Capt. F. A. Berry, from the Navy, its chief climatologist, H. Thom, from the United States Weather Bureau, as well as several other members of the technical staff, and then the Department of Agriculture and Meteorological Survey assisted in furnishing several persons who were willing to come with the Committee for about 2 years.

The Committee is primarily concerned with three aspects of weather modification or cloud seeding as conducted by the commercial cloud-seeding companies.

1. The technical aspects. How effective is cloud seeding? Does it increase or decrease rainfall or is there no effect?

2. If the answers to (1) above are in the affirmative and there is a positive effect then what economic benefits may be expected from cloud seeding? Dean Eberle, our vice chairman, headed a group of economists and businessmen that has already made a study of the benefits to be obtained if a 10 percent increase in rainfall is produced.

3. If the answers to (1) and (2) are in the affirmative then the Committee has been directed to report to the President immediately on the advisability of the Federal Government regulating by means of licenses or otherwise, those who carry out weather modification activities.

Up to the present time the Committee has found partial answers to (1) and (2) above, but sees no reason to recommend Federal regulation at this time. It has found:

(a) That supercooled stratified clouds can be dissipated by aircraft seeding with dry ice or silver iodide.

(b) Water seeding of warm cumulus clouds will initiate precipitation under favorable temperature and moisture conditions.

(c) Dry ice and silver iodide seeding of cumulus clouds over 5,000 feet above the freezing line and temperature at top −10° C. will induce precipitation.

(d) Ground generator silver iodide seeding in the three Pacific Coast States has produced average increases in precipitation of 9 percent to 17 percent from late winter and early spring storms. These results cannot be referred to other areas or other seasons of the year. The Committee hopes to find answers to flatland seeding and interior mountain areas during the next 2 years that Congress has just granted.

(e) Intensify study of hail storm suppression and the possibility of inhibiting lightning fires seems well justified. Captain Berry may mention this in his discussion of project Skyfire this afternoon.

In its study the Committee is paying particular attention to any research leading to the discovery of new types of nucleating agents and new methods of dispersing these agents.

In closing I would like to quote from a report by Assistant Secretary Aandahl, of the Department of Interior, when he sums up the relation between cloud seeding and irrigation:

"While the studies to date offer hopes of some eventual increase of water supply, there is, within the present scope of scientific knowledge, little likelihood that artificially induced precipitation can ever substitute for irrigation in most of the areas now requiring irrigation. Precipitation cannot be caused when there is insufficient moisture vapor in the air. Furthermore, as far as is known now, other factors such as temperature must be favorable. Thus, it may not always be possible to cause rain when needed for the crops. There are also times when rainfall, while needed for some crops, may bring damage or even ruin to others. Air movements

are sufficiently erratic that it would be impractical, if not completely impossible, to deposit rainfall on certain localized plots. Even if the techniques develop to their maximum anticipated potential of effectiveness, the total annual rainfall in most arid areas will probably still be a fraction of that required for crops, and much of it will be at times when it cannot be fully used. Reservoirs will still be required to conserve water for use when needed, and canals and related works will still be needed to convey the water to the exact spot of use."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an account from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader for July 19, 1956, dealing with experiments in cloud seeding by the use of jet planes, as carried on by the South Dakota Air National Guard; and also an editorial from the same newspaper, commenting upon the results obtained.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOUD SEEDING IS HELD SUCCESSFUL

PIERRE, July 19.—South Dakota has successfully pioneered in cloud seeding experiments by jet plane, it was reported to a State weather modification conference here.

Clouds were seeded for the first time by a specially equipped jet plane and produced excellent results, Chief Howard Welle, United States Navy representative on the National Advisory Committee on Weather Control, told the conference.

The plane, carrying a converted jato tube (jet assist takeoff) with 60 pounds of dry ice on each flight, successfully seeded the coulds in the southeastern part of the State on 6 days.

Wells said arrangements for the experiments were made in Washington 2 weeks ago in conference with Senator Francis Case, Gov. Joe Foss, and Lt. Col. D. L. (Duke) Corning. One of the Air Guard planes of the 175th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Sioux Falls was specially equipped for the experiments on July 5.

TRACKED DOWN BY RADAR

"The experiments were carried out in cooperation with the United States Weather Bureau station at Sioux Falls which tracked the seeding operations by radar," Wells disclosed.

"We made one run in a C–47, but the icing level in this country is high (12,000–14,000 feet) and it took too long to reach that altitude."

Wells said M. Sgt. Bob Perkins, Air Guard mechanic, designed a trapdoor arrangement for a jato tube and placed screen mesh at one end. The tube, loaded with dry ice, was attached to the belly of a T–33 jet trainer. The pilot tripped the trapdoor from his pressurized cockpit, rushing air through the tube and supercooling it while the screen prevented chunks of ice from escaping.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILES AN HOUR

The super-cooled air was spread over the tops of storm clouds at altitudes ranging from 6,500 to 39,000 feet while the jet plane was traveling about 350 miles per hour. Except for one trip over the West River and near Pickstown, all flights were flown over the East River area.

Most of them were flown near Sioux Falls to permit ground as well as air observation.

Wells said every cloud seeded produced rains, many of them minutes after the plane had made its run over the tops. The ground observers kept in radio contact with the pilot and learned that the clouds rose quickly after seeding. One pilot reported that the top of a cloud he had seeded rose 2,500 feet within 3 minutes.

Flights were made July 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, and 17 and Wells gave instructions to the pilots on days when cloud formations were not right for seeding and when there were severe thunderstorms in the area.

THREE INCH FALL

"There was a complete changeover in the formation of the clouds after seeding and rain fell from them soon after each run," Wells said. "On one flight, three clouds 20 miles apart were seeded and one of them dropped three inches of rain in the Sioux City region."

Colonel Corning, Maj. John Schilt and Capt. Justin Berger took turns piloting the plane on the experimental flights. A chase plane went along on each flight to observe the effect of the seeding.

Colonel Corning described flying through one of the clouds after seeding and said, "Something was churning in there and I flew out of it fast."

"There were a lot of skeptics among my boys at first," Corning added. "But they joined me in believing there's something to it now."

Wells said the dry ice disappeared at the rate of about one pound for every 4 miles, while normal cloud seeding with dry ice requires from 3 to 20 pounds every 4 miles.

He added, "There is an abundance of moisture in the clouds out here."

FOSS OPENS EVENT

Governor Foss opened the weather modification conference by stating that rain increase programs should be encouraged in an effort to provide more stable rainfall for this agricultural State. He said arrangements have been made to conduct further experiments by the State.

"We're going to try out some new ideas," Foss said. "I realize that these programs are still pretty much of a gamble. However, rain increase research has been improving the odds."

Two other members of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, Chairman Howard T. Orville, New York, and Dean A. M. Eberle of South Dakota State College, also addressed the conference. Orville described rain increase projects on the West coast and Eberle traced the progress of rain programs in this State.

Other speakers were Charles Gardner, formely of Miller, S. Dak., and Jack Disanto, Rapid City, representing commercial rain increase companies.

JETS EXCEL AS RAIN PRODUCERS

The experiments with the "seeding" of rain clouds by jet airplanes in the Sioux Falls territory are an interesting development in this new field of scientific exploration.

According to the reports, the jets have made several tests under a program suggested by Gov. Joe Foss and Senator FRANCIS CASE. Dry ice was sprayed on the clouds and precipitation resulted.

One pilot said the reaction was noticeable when he dropped the ice on a cloud. He cited an instance where a cloud he had seeded rose 2,500 feet immediately afterward—an apparent result of the lightening of its weight due to the precipitation of some of the moisture it was carrying.

Each run produced results, the report said. The jets traveled through and above the clouds at about 350 miles an hour.

Col. Duke Corning said odd things took place after the seeding. "Something was churning in there," he explained in describing one incident, "and I flew out of it fast."

Then he added: "There were a lot of skeptics among my pilots at first but they join me in believing there's something to it now."

The experiments provided reason to believe that the jets achieved results better and faster than other types of airplanes.

All of this points up to another interesting chapter in the program of weather control. The experiments may have been the occasion for a rather peculiar and somewhat erratic rain pattern in the Sioux Falls area during July—many rains that struck limited areas and bypassed others.

Obviously it is wrong to classify today's rainmaking with the fakes of some 50 and 60 years ago. The earlier attempts were unscientific and often misrepresented. But these of today are something else. Rain can be produced, the tests have demonstrated, when conditions are right.

But there are countless problems that may develop. In fact, some already have developed. There may be a battle among areas in respect to the right to seed moisture-bearing clouds. There may be questions about hail resulting from the activity. There may be instances when the rain falls in areas where it isn't desired. There may be cases of excessive rainfall. In any event, all of it is extremely interesting and in a few more years we may know much more about it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I may say to the Senate that the use of jet planes for cloud seeding—the dropping of dry ice in cumulus clouds—is a new thing. The jet plane has made it possible to get on top of the higher clouds, and to do so with some remarkable results. On six trials between July 5 and July 17, as I recall, success was obtained in each instance. In view of the fact that the Congress is so repeatedly called upon to bring relief in one form or another to drought-stricken areas, the significance of this matter is not to be underestimated. Therefore, I have included in the RECORD the article and the editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus-Leader.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report by Mr. Howard J. Wells, an expert of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, who was sent to South Dakota as an observer during the conduct of these trials. In the report he details the incidents and the circumstances under which the seeding was carried on, and the results which were obtained. I am sure they will be of interest to every Member of the Senate. I think they have great significance for the country as a whole.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF HOWARD J. WELLS, ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Thursday July 5, 1956: Dean Aberle picked up at the Carpenter Hotel, and we proceeded to the Air National Guard Terminal at the Sioux Falls Airport. I was introduced to Lt. Col. Duane L. Corning and staff, and we inspected the available aircraft for the project. One C–47, one B–25 in overhaul and 3 T–33 Jets were found suitable for conducting the project. During the afternoon, a metal chute was made for the C–47. Dean Eberle and I established a source of dry ice at 4 cents a pound. We went to the United States Weather Bureau and met Mr. Clark, officer in charge. Everything is working fine, and all personnel are very interested and co-

operative. We gave a cold box demonstration in Colonel Corning's office during the afternoon.

Friday, July 6, 1956: We briefed Colonel Corning for first seeding run in the C-47. About 30 pounds of ice remaining from Thursday's demonstration was used. The top of the cumulus clouds was about 14,000 feet. Good results both by observation and radar were observed. This was a single drop method, and it was a wonderful experience for the crew. Also the colonel saw the results, which is an important part of the operation.

Saturday, July 7, 1956: After looking over the weather at the Weather Bureau, it was decided not to seed due to severe thunderstorms throughout the area. The remainder of the day was spent devising a suitable dispenser which could be used on jet aircraft. The result was using a Jato bottle and tripping mechanism control from the inside of the aircraft.

Sunday, July 8, 1956: This was a very good seeding day. The T-33 equipped with dispenser proceeded on discussed flight plane. It was decided to seed perpenicular to the wind and 40 miles away from the station on a bearing of 310 degrees. This would bring the seeding area over the station in about 1 hour. A chase plane accompanied the seeding plane to watch the dispenser in operation.

The seeding was conducted on top of clouds working back and forth along a 20-mile line. Complete change over was noted in about 30 minutes. The thunderstorms which formed at the end of the run were, or could have been, caused by seeding as the plane turned around at each end of the run. If this is true, then we are underseeding except at turning points.

The dispenser used 60 pounds of dry ice in 50 minutes, or about 1 pound per every 4 miles. Again the pilots could see very good results and were amazed at the growth. A second run was made in the afternoon, but the clouds were not forming due to subsidence in the atmosphere. There were no results to speak of.

Monday, July 9, 1956: This was a fair seeding day. The T-33 aloft proceeded at 27,000 feet. Clouds were visible at the station, and all available flying personnel were standing by to observe the results. We were in contact with the plane through radio, and the pilot gave word when the dispenser was opened. The target cloud was 60 miles distant from the station. Rain was observed to fall from the base of the cloud in about 30 minutes. The top of the cloud, in accordance with the pilot's report, rose at the rate of 2,500 feet in about 2 minutes. Everyone was very impressed.

Tuesday, July 10, 1956: The bottle was modified to give greater output. The T-33 was out and hit the top of three clouds about 20 miles apart. One of these clouds gave 3 inches of rain to Sioux City. The other two were observed to give rain, but how much was unknown.

Wednesday, July 11, 1956, and Thursday, July 12, 1956: There was high pressure over the area. The time was used to instruct pilots and men in methods of seeding.

Friday, July 13, 1956: The forecast proved a failure and spent the day in working with pilots in a simple method of when to work and when not to.

Saturday, July 14, 1956: Again, we decided not to seed because of severe thunderstorm and tornado warnings.

Sunday, July 15, 1956: A weak front was crossing the State southwest to northeast with thunderstorms reported north of station. We decided to conduct operation trying to slow down thunderstorms. Good results at station with 0.20 of light to moderate rain falling.

Monday, July 16, 1956: Air over the station was too dry to operate, but a moist zone was expected to move down from the north. At 1330 first top of cumulus clouds could be seen to the northwest and west. The flight departed from the area and reported moderate thunderstorms through the north half of the State. Captain Berger decided to seed only clouds that were not raining. One cloud was seeded, and as the plane descended to observe base, rain commenced to fall approximately 15 to 20 minutes after seeding.

Tuesday, July 17, 1956: Weak front south and southwest to north northeast through eastern half of the State with thundershowers in progress by 0900. The flight went to the extreme south end of the State and seeded again along the clear air side of the front. During the afternoon, a flight departed to conduct seeding operations over the airport. The cloud base was 6,500 feet and the tops 9,000 to 12,000 feet. Seeded clouds were observed to form and reach 19,000 to 20,000 feet. This bank moved southeast and light rain showers were falling from the base of the cloud by 1700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is the conference report on the first supplemental appropriation bill, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to thank the conferees for keeping in the bill the item of $35,000 for the building of an elevator at Anderson, S. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives announcing the action of the House on certain amendments of the Senate be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12138, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 23, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 26, 34, 38, 45, 58, 59, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 12138) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 23, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of Senate No. 4 to the bill (H. R. 12138) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes", and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $18,915,000 proposed, insert "$16,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 310. Not exceeding $5 million of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction may be used for capital expenditures other than for amortization of outstanding mortgages on any housing project constructed under title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the Housing amendments of 1955, in accordance with applicable provisions as may be authorized by law during the 2d session of the 84th Congress: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense or his designee, in acquiring such housing projects, may make purchases subject to any existing mortgage or assume such mortgage."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"REPAIR, IMPROVEMENT, AND EQUIPMENT OF FEDERALLY OWNED BUILDINGS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For an additional amount for 'repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia', not to exceed $35,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "expended", insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the amendment, delete the words "assisting the Territory in."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 4, 22, 27, 33, and 36.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, amendment No. 33 has been mentioned. The only reason I rise is to explain that today I have received a considerable number of telephone calls because certain language relative to amendment No. 33 denies the right to expend any of these funds until agreement is obtained from the local units of the Government. Many persons fear that that provision will restrict the use of the funds entirely, because concurrence will not be obtained from the local units of Government.

I wish to make this explanation because some persons have accused me of being the author of the amendment. It is a House provision. In the conference we were unable to get the House to agree to amendment No. 33 unless that language was made a part of the legislative enactment. I wish the RECORD to show that I am not the author of the amendment, and that the Senate conferees were unable to obtain concurrence.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has correctly stated the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a summary of the bill, showing for each appropriation title the amount of the budget estimate, the amount provided by the House of Representatives, the amount provided by the Senate, and the amount appropriated under the conference report.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)

Department or agency	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
CHAPTER I				
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE [1]				
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE				
Salaries and expenses—plant and pest control	----------	----------	Language	----------
Salaries and expenses—plant and pest control	$2,500,000	----------	$2,500,000	$2,500,000
Animal disease laboratory facilities	18,915,000	----------	18,915,000	16,250,000
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE				
Administrative expenses—Sugar Act program [2]	(189,000)	($189,000)	(189,000)	(189,000)
FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION				
Subscription to capital stock	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Total, chapter I	34,415,000	13,000,000	34,415,000	31,750,000
CHAPTER II				
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION				
Land acquisition, additional Washington airport	2,429	2,429	2,429	2,429
COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY				
Salaries and expenses	[3]	[3]	[3]	[3]
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
Salaries and expenses	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE				
Export control	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS				
Jones Point Bridge	14,325,000	14,325,000	14,325,000	14,325,000
Total, Department of Commerce	17,402,429	17,402,429	17,402,429	17,402,429
RELATED AGENCIES				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	350,000	----------	300,000	300,000
Total, Chapter II	17,752,429	17,402,429	17,702,429	17,702,429
CHAPTER III				
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY				
Construction	49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Operation and maintenance	----------	----------	88,369,170	88,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE				
Operation and maintenance	----------	----------	18,626,130	18,500,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				
INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES				
Loran stations	5,450,000	5,450,000	5,450,000	5,450,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Military construction, Army	[4](193,000,000)	[4](193,000,000)	(202,000,000)	(202,000,000)
Reduction in appropriation—Army stock fund	----------	(357,000,000)	Language	Language
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY				
Military construction, Navy	[5] 165,000,000	[5] 165,000,000	[5] 183,000,000	[5] 165,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE				
Military construction, Air Force	[6] 871,000,000	1,228,000,000	1,238,000,000	1,228,000,000
Total, Department of Defense	1,041,450,000	1,398,450,000	1,533,445,300	1,504,950,000
Total, chapter III	1,090,450,000	1,447,450,000	1,582,445,300	1,553,950,000
CHAPTER IV				
FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
Government and relief in occupied areas	2,380,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK				
Administrative expenses	(1,670,000)	(1,670,000)	(1,670,000)	(1,670,000)
Total, chapter IV	2,380,000	2,350,000	2,350,000	2,350,000

[1] Estimates of $2,500,000 consisting of $675,000 for eradication of Mediterranean fruitfly and $325,000 for control of burrowing nematode, contained in H. Doc. 403, and $1,500,000 for Mediterranean fruitfly contained in H. Doc. 407 (of which $1,250,000 made available during balance of 1956) included in Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1957 (Public Law 554).

[2] Provides increase in limitation for other than payments to producers as authorized in H. R. 7030, now Public Law 545.

[3] Language making funds available to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

[4] To be derived by transfer from the "Army stock fund."

[5] And $200 million to be derived by transfer from the "Navy stock fund" and $35 million to be derived by transfer from the "Marine Corps stock fund."

[6] And $357 million to be derived by transfer from the "Army stock fund." In lieu of this transfer the House committee recommends rescission of this amount.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)—Continued

Department or agency (1)	Budget estimate (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
CHAPTER V				
GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS				
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET				
Salaries and expenses	$405,000	$375,000	$400,000	$385,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY				
Salaries and expenses	665,000	600,000	665,000	632,500
PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE				
Salaries and expenses		50,000		
Total, chapter V	1,070,000	1,025,000	1,065,000	1,017,500
CHAPTER VI				
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	Language		Language	Language
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, 1956	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, 1957	3,550,000	3,550,000	3,550,000	3,550,000
Repair, improvement, and equipment of Federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia			50,000	35,000
Acquisition of land, District of Columbia	300,000	150,000	300,000	250,000
Additional court facilities	[7]	[7]	[7]	[7]
United States Post Office and Courthouse, Nome, Alaska	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Expenses, general supply fund	400,000	200,000	400,000	300,000
General supply fund	9,000,000	3,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Acquisition of tin	9,600,000		8,700,000	8,000,000
Total, General Services Administration	24,500,000	13,550,000	22,650,000	21,785,000
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY				
Public Housing Administration				
Annual contributions, 1956	1,300,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS				
Salaries and expenses	789,000	789,000	789,000	789,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION				
Synthetic rubber research and development	[7]	[8]	[8]	[8]
Total, chapter VI	26,589,000	14,789,000	23,889,000	23,024,000
CHAPTER VII				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
Office of oil and gas	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
Construction	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION				
Revolving fund	550,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Total, Department of the Interior	750,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
FOREST SERVICE				
Acquisition of land, Superior National Forest, Minnesota	500,000		500,000	500,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
National Monuments Commission, salaries and expenses			25,000	
Total, chapter VII	1,400,000	475,000	1,000,000	975,000
CHAPTER VIII				
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR				
Salaries and expenses	[9] (500,000)			
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School	300,000			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
Assistance to States, general:				
1956	[10] (11,000)	11,000	11,000	11,000
1957	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Venereal disease:				
1956	[10] (9,900)			
1957	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000

[7] Unobligated balances continued available until June 30, 1957.
[8] $500,000 of the unobligated balance continued available until June 30, 1957.
[9] To be derived by transfer from the highway trust fund established pursuant to sec. 209 of Public Law 627, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.
[10] Authority was requested to transfer this amount from other appropriations.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)—Continued

Department or agency (1)	Budget estimate (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
CHAPTER VIII—Continued				
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued				
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—continued				
Tuberculosis:				
1956	[10] ($6,600)			
1957	35,000	$35,000	$35,000	$35,000
Communicable diseases:				
1956	[10] (10,800)			
1957	540,000	540,000	540,000	540,000
Hospitals and medical care:				
1956	[10] (268,500)	268,500	268,500	268,500
1957	1,225,000	1,225,000	1,225,000	1,225,000
Foreign Quarantine Service:				
1956	[10] (8,000)			
1957	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Indian health activities:				
1956	[10] (25,700)			
1957	650,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
Microbiology activities, 1956	[10] (8,800)			
Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska	25,000		25,000	25,000
Construction, mental health facilities, Territory of Alaska	500,000			
Salaries and expenses	800,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS				
Grants to States for poliomyelitis vaccination		(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)
Grants for hospital construction		Language	Language	Language
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	3,990,000	3,664,500	3,689,500	3,689,500
Total, chapter VIII	4,290,000	3,664,500	3,689,500	3,689,500
CHAPTER IX				
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
Extension and remodeling, State Department Building	55,600,000	44,920,000	44,920,000	44,920,000
International Fisheries Commission	620,000	620,000	620,000	620,000
Vatican City claims	964,200	964,200	964,200	964,200
Total, Department of State	57,184,200	46,504,200	46,504,200	46,504,200
THE JUDICIARY				
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES				
Fees of jurors and commissioners, 1956	[11] (100,000)		[11] (100,000)	[11] (100,000)
Administrative Office of the United States Courts	113,500			
UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY				
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	2,000,000			
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
President's special international program	9,000,000	4,687,400	7,100,000	5,900,000
Total, chapter IX	68,297,700	51,191,600	53,604,200	52,404,200
CHAPTER X				
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS				
Salaries and expenses	82,000	82,000	82,000	82,000
DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT				
Salaries and expenses	275,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE				
Salaries and expenses	1,130,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
BUREAU OF THE MINT				
Salaries and expenses		3,500	3,500	3,500
Striking of gold medal for Gustaf E. Lambert		350	350	350
COAST GUARD				
Retired pay	425,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION				
Administrative expenses limitation increase	(225,000)		(175,000)	(175,000)
Total, chapter X	1,912,000	1,435,850	1,435,850	1,435,850
CHAPTER XI				
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
Federal payment	3,000,000			
OPERATING EXPENSES				
Department of general administration	(332,000)	(300,000)	(308,990)	(308,990)
Office of corporation counsel		(3,600)	(3,600)	(3,600)
Regulatory agencies	(21,800)	(21,800)	(21,800)	(21,800)
Department of occupations and professions	(3,200)		(3,200)	(3,200)
Public schools	(155,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)
Public schools (1956)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)	(155,000)
Metropolitan police	(831,200)	(695,000)	(831,200)	(758,100)
Courts	(424,000)	(379,250)	(398,850)	(398,850)
Department of Public Health	(336,000)	(121,290)	(261,790)	(191,520)
Department of Public Health (1955)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)
Department of Public Welfare	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)
Department of vehicles and traffic	(3,175)			
National Guard	(11,600)	(7,500)	(11,600)	(9,000)
Personal services, wage-scale employees	(943,000)	(943,000)	(943,000)	(943,000)
Total, operating expenses	(3,740,975)	(3,306,440)	(3,619,030)	(3,473,060)

[10] Authority was request to transfer this amount rom other appr8priations.

[11] To be derived by transfer.

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12138)—Continued

Department or agency (1)	Budget estimate (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
CHAPTER XI—Continued				
CAPITAL OUTLAY				
Public building construction, 1957	($8,818,500)	($7,427,929)	($7,922,829)	($7,922,829)
Public building construction, 1956	(343,000)	(335,000)	(335,000)	(335,000)
Department of Highways	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)	(140,000)
Department of Sanitary Engineering	(5,197,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Total capital outlay	(14,498,500)	(12,902,929)	(13,397,829)	(13,397,829)
Settlement of claims and suits	(22,281)	(22,281)	(22,281)	(22,281)
Judgments	(13,461)	(13,461)	(13,461)	(13,461)
Audited claims	(83,093)	(83,093)	(83,093)	(83,093)
Total, Federal funds (ch. XI)	3,000,000			
Total, District of Columbia funds	(18,358,310)	(16,328,204)	(17,135,694)	(16,989,724)
CHAPTER XII				
SENATE				
For payment to Jane R. Barkley, widow of Alben W. Barkley, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky			22,500	22,500
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE				
Miscellaneous items, 1956			Language	Language
Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, 1957			215,000	215,000
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
Gratuity payment to beneficiary of deceased Member		22,500	22,500	22,500
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE				
Miscellaneous items (1956)	125,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
Revolving fund			Language	Language
Total, chapter XII	125,000	122,500	360,000	360,000
CHAPTER XIII				
Claims, audited claims, and judgments, sec. 1301	2,683,396	2,683,396	2,683,396	2,683,396
Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments, sec. 1302	Language	Language	Language	Language
Grand total	1,254,364,525	1,555,589,275	1,724,639,675	1,691,341,875

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has a conference report on the customs simplification bill, House bill 6040. I ask that the report be submitted, so it may be considered by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6040) to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, July 21, 1956, pp. 13878–13879, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate receded on only 1 amendment, and the House receded on 12. So the conference report is practically the bill as it was passed by the Senate. It is a unanimous report by the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, pp. 14562–14563, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conferees agreed unanimously on the provisions of the conference report. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an explanation of the differences between S. 3903 as passed by the Senate and the conference substitute therefor.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN S. 3903 AS PASSED BY THE SENATE AND THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE THEREFOR

1. The provision of S. 3903 (sec. 2) providing for the use of foreign currencies generated under title I for American schools, libraries, and community centers abroad has been modified in technical respects (1) to conform to changes made in Public Law 480 by the Mutual Security Act of 1956 and (2) to meet parliamentary objections in the House. No change in substance was made in this provision.

2. The Senate bill would have modified section 304 of Public Law 480 so as to restrict it to title I transactions and permit barter with Iron Curtain satellites. The House amendment would have modified it to make it clear that barter with such countries is prohibited. The conference substitute omits both the House and Senate provisions and leaves the law unchanged.

3. The conference substitute extends the famine and urgent relief provisions of title II to provide assistance in meeting extraordinary relief requirements, such as those for refugee relief, which may be extraordinary although no longer urgent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CREDIT FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO FARMERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, pp. 14558–14560, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conferees were unanimous in their decision. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the differences between the conference substitute and the Senate amendment to House bill 11544.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE AND THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 11544

1. The House bill and the Senate amendment contained language restricting farm ownership and operating loans on less than family-size farms to bona fide farmers, but defined bona fide farmers somewhat differently. The conference substitute generally follows the House bill in this respect, but substitutes historical residence on a farm and historical dependence on farm income for dependence during 1 of the last 10 years on farm income.

2. The Senate amendment would have limited farm ownership refinancing loans on less than family-size farms to loans to refinance indebtedness constituting a lien on the farm. The conference substitute would permit such loans to refinance indebtedness incurred for any agricultural purpose.

3. The Senate amendment would have prohibited farm ownership or operating loans to borrowers able to obtain loans from other sources at "reasonable rates." The conference substitute leaves the existing law unchanged. Existing law prohibits such loans if obtainable elsewhere at prevailing rates but not in excess of 5 percent. The conferees felt the existing law to be adequate to assure that such loans will be restricted to other than the well-to-do farmers.

4. The Senate amendment would have permitted loans to be made on family-size farms having a value in excess of the average value of efficient family-size farms in the community. The conference substitute would permit improvement loans to be made for such farms, but not acquisition or enlargement loans.

5. The conference substitute would extend the economic emergency loan authority of Public Law 727, 83d Congress for 2 years and increase the overall limitation on such authority to $65 million. The Senate amendment contained no similar provision, the Senate having previously passed S. 3559, to provide for a similar extension and to increase the limitation to $50 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings, pp. 14560–14562, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, was the conference report signed by all the conferees?

Mr. KERR. It was. I will say to the Senator from California that the provisions agreed upon in conference were substantially in line with the spirit of the bill as passed by the Senate.

There were three principal changes. First, the Senate bill had provided that in certain instances plans should be submitted to the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate. In the bill as passed by the House, it was provided that the plans be referred to the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate.

It was agreed in conference—and certain specifications were agreed upon—that when the plan was predominantly a flood control plan, it be referred to the Public Works Committee, and when it was predominantly an agricultural plan, it be referred to the Agriculture Committees.

An effort was made to make especially clear the intent of the language as provided by the Senate, which permitted the local organization to have the optional right of employing engineering services in connection with plans for development. Where the structure for the impounding of water exceeded 5,000 acre-feet—in other words, when it became a structure which involved a considerable part of the program in the matter of conservation of water for municipal water supplies or irrigation—the privilege of employing local engineering services was made optional.

The other point, as I recall, was to clarify the language in the bill which specified that help was available to the local organization from the Secretary of Agriculture, in the preparation of specifications for the plan. The employment of necessary assistance in preparing advertisements for bids and entering into contracts for carrying out the structure as planned, was provided for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say for the RECORD that both the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget are opposed to this bill, although it was not generally known at the time it was passed by the Senate last Saturday morning.

Yesterday I had inserted in the RECORD, at page 14217, correspondence from these two agencies of the Government, setting forth their opposition to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH AWARDS OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL DECORATIONS MAY BE MADE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1637) to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report is signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate and the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a hand engrossed copy of House bill 11742, which has just come over from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a

substitute. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

The amendment offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT, in the nature of a substitute, was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1956."

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

PROPERTY IMPROVEMENT LOANS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "September 30, 1956," and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1959."

(b) Section 2 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000" and inserting "exceeds $3,500";

(2) striking out "except that" in clause (2) and inserting "except that the Commissioner may increase such maximum limitation to 5 years and 32 days if he determines such increase to be in the public interest after giving consideration to the general effect of such increase upon borrowers, the building industry, and the general economy, and"; and

(3) striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That no insurance shall be granted under this section (A) in the case of any obligation in a principal amount of $2,500 or less, representing any loan, advance of credit, or purchase made after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956, if such obligation has a financing charge in excess of an amount equivalent to $5 discount per $100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, or (B) in the case of any such obligation in a principal amount in excess of $2,500, if such obligation has a financing charge in excess of (i) an amount equivalent to $5 discount per $100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, with respect to that part of the principal amount not in excess of $2,500, and (ii) an amount equivalent to $4 discount per $100 original face amount of a 1-year note to be paid in equal monthly installments calculated from the date of the note, with respect to that part of the principal amount which is in excess of $2,500: *Provided further*, That such charges correctly based on tables of calculations issued by the Commissioner, or adjusted to eliminate minor errors in computations in accordance with requirements of the Commissioner, shall be deemed to comply with the preceding proviso: *And provided further*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $15,000 (nor an average amount of $2,500 per family unit), having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days, representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families."

HAZARD INSURANCE ON FHA ACQUIRED PROPERTIES

SEC. 102. Title I of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to establish a Fire and Hazard Loss Fund which shall be available to provide such fire and hazard risk coverage as the Commissioner, in his discretion, may determine to be appropriate with respect to real property acquired and held by him under the provisions of this act. For the purpose of operating such fund, the Commissioner is authorized in the name of the fund to transfer moneys and require payment of premiums or charges from any one or more of the several insurance funds established by this act and from the account established pursuant to section 2 (f) of this act, in such amounts and in such manner, including any repayments of such moneys, as the Commissioner, in his discretion, shall determine. In carrying out the authority created by this section, the Commissioner and the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund shall be exempt from all taxation, assessments, levies, or license fees now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. Moneys in the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund not needed for current operations of the fund shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States or in bonds or other obligations which are lawful investments for fiduciary, trust, and public funds of the United States.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to purchase such other insurance protection as he may, in his discretion, determine, and he may further provide for reinsurance of any risk assumed by the Fire and Hazard Loss Fund."

COOPERATIVE HOUSING INSURANCE

SEC. 103. Section 213 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "65 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percent"; and

(2) amending the last proviso to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That for the purposes of this section the word 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, or on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955."

GENERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 104. Section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "July 1, 1955" in the first sentence and inserting "July 1, 1956";

(2) striking out "$4,000,000,000" in the first sentence and inserting "$3,000,000,000"; and

(3) striking out "section 2" in the first and second sentences and inserting "section 2 and section 803."

HOUSING IN URBAN RENEWAL AREAS

SEC. 105. Paragraph (iii) of section 220 (d) (3) (B) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the first proviso thereof all that follows "construction and design" and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,000 per room or per family unit, as the case may be, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require."

LOW-COST HOUSING FOR DISPLACED FAMILIES

SEC. 106. Section 221 (d) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) striking out "$7,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$8,000";

(2) striking out "$8,600" in clauses (2) and (3) and inserting "$10,000";

(3) striking out "95 per centum of the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence: *Provided*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 5 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of acquisition in cash or its equivalent" in clause (2) and inserting "the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence, less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided further*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses)";

(4) striking out "95 percent of" in clause (3); and

(5) striking out "thirty" in clause (4) and inserting "forty."

COST CERTIFICATION OF RENTAL HOUSING

SEC. 107. Section 227 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by—

(1) inserting the following new sentence between the first and second sentences: "Upon the Commissioner's approval of the mortgagor's certification as required hereunder such certification shall be final and incontestable, execept for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor."; and

(2) adding at the end of subsection (c) the following: "In the case of a mortgage insured under section 220, there shall be included in the actual cost an allowance for sponsor's profit of up to, but not exceeding, 10 percent of all other items entering into the term 'actual cost'; except any allowance for builder's profit, land or amounts paid for a leasehold, amounts paid under a general construction contract where the mortgagor is not the builder as defined by the Commissioner, and amounts included under either (A) or (B) of clause (ii) of the preceding sentence."

NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 108. (a) Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 230. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, and in addition to mortgages insured under section 203 or 207, the Commissioner may insure and make commitments to insure any mortgage under this section which meets, except as hereinafter provided, the eligibility requirements set forth in such sections: *Provided*, That no mortgage shall be insured under this section unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing with respect to which the mortgage is issued is necessary in the interest of national defense. Any such certification shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the need for such housing without regard to any other requirement in this act that the project or property be economically sound or an acceptable risk. If the Commissioner determines, notwithstanding any such certification, that the insurance of any mortgage on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the Mutual

Mortgage Insurance Fund or the Housing Insurance Fund, as the case may be, from loss with respect to any such mortgage insured pursuant to this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided herein, the provisions of this title relating to mortgages insured under section 203 or 207, respectively, shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section which meet the eligibility requirements of such sections.

"(c) In the case of any mortgage insured under this section meeting the eligibility requirements of section 207, the principal obligation of such mortgage shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 207 (c) (2), not exceed 90 percent of the estimated value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed.

"(d) The Commissioner shall require that each dwelling designed for rental purposes and covered by a mortgage insured under this section shall be held for rental for a period of not less than 4 years after the dwelling is made available for initial occupancy.

"(e) The Commissioner and the Secretary of Defense shall comply with and carry out the purposes of clause (ii) of section 803 (b) (2) of this act, as amended by the Housing Amendments of 1956, in the administration of this section, and for such purposes any reference therein to the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund, or the Housing Insurance Fund, as the case may be."

(b) Section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts, which do not exceed $50 million outstanding at any one time, if such commitments relate to mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner shall have issued pursuant to section 230 a commitment to insure; but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any one State."

MILITARY HOUSING

SEC. 109. (a) Section 801 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and Midway Island."

(b) Section 803 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title (except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall not exceed $3 billion," and (2) by striking out in the last proviso "September 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1959."

(c) (1) Sections 803 (b) (2) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out all that follows clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and (ii) with the approval of the Commissioner, shall have determined that adequate housing is not available for such personnel at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of the installation and that the mortgaged property will not, so far as can reasonably be foreseen, substantially curtail occupancy in existing housing covered by mortgages insured under this act. The housing accommodations shall comply with such standards and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe to establish the acceptability of such property for mortgage insurance, except that the certification of the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall (for purposes of mortgage insurance under this title) be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the existence of the need for such housing. However, if the Commissioner does not concur in the housing needs as certified by the Secretary, the Commissioner may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss with respect to the mortgage covering such housing. The Commissioner shall report to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he has required the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund, with reasons therefor. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty."

(2) Title VIII of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 809. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, or of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955, no personnel shall be assigned to, or granted occupancy in, any project which was acquired or constructed under this title, and is situated at or near a military installation, if, at the time it is proposed to make such assignment or grant such occupancy, more than 10 percent of the living accommodations in any housing, acquired or constructed under this title prior to the construction of such project, and situated at or near the same military installation, are vacant.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'this title' refers to the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act in effect both prior to and on and after the date of enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955."

(d) Clause (B) of section 803 (b) (3) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) not to exceed with respect to any project an average of $15,000 per family unit, and with respect to all projects for any one of the armed services an average of $14,250 per family unit, for such part of the property (including ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and fixtures) as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That such amounts shall be reduced by the average amount per family unit of the replacement cost, as determined by the Commissioner, of all usable utilities which are owned by the United States, and which are not provided for out of the proceeds of the mortgage, and are within the boundaries of the property or project; and."

(e) (1) Section 803 (b) (3) (C) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "eligible builder of" and inserting in lieu thereof "eligible bidder with respect to."

(2) Sections 403 (a) and 403 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are amended by striking out "eligible builder", wherever the term appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eligible bidder."

(3) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "the builder", wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the term "the mortgagor."

(4) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out the term "with any builder."

(f) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is further amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence the following: "Any such contract shall provide for the furnishing by the contractor of a performance bond and a payment bond with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, and the furnishing of such bonds shall be deemed a sufficient compliance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), and no additional bonds shall be required under such section."

(g) Section 405 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "$9,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,000,000."

(h) The second sentence of section 406 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting after the colon immediately following the first proviso the following: "*Provided further*, That such plans, drawings, and specifications shall follow the principle of modular measure, in order that the housing may be built by conventional construction, on-site fabrication, or factory fabrication, whichever the successful bidder may elect, or, in the case of a negotiated contract, whichever the contracting officer may determine to be in the best interest of the Government."

(i) Section 407 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Any funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be expended by a military department for military construction or by the Coast Guard for acquisition, construction, and improvements may, within the purposes specified in subsection (a) above, be used for capital expenditures other than the amortization of outstanding mortgages."

(j) Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 410. (a) In the construction of housing under the authority of this title and title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the following are the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit:

"(1) For flag officers and general officers, 2,100 square feet.

"(2) For captains in the Navy and colonels, 1,670 square feet.

"(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders and for lieutenant colonels and majors, 1,400 square feet.

"(4) For officers below the grade of lieutenant commander or major, 1,250 square feet.

"(5) For enlisted members, 1,080 square feet.

"In this section 'net floor area' means the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement, service space instead of basement, attic, garage, and porches.

"(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) are increased—

"(1) 10 percent for quarters outside the United States;

"(2) 10 percent for quarters of the commanding officer of any station, base or other installation, based on the grade authorized for that position."

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting a comma and the following: "except that with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor who is 60 years of age or older, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, the mortgagor's payment required by this proviso may be paid by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor under such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe."

(b) Title II of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Elderly persons housing insurance

"SEC. 229. (a) The purpose of this section is to aid in the provision of housing for elderly persons and is designed to supplement systems of mortgage insurance under other provisions of this act. The Commissioner shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to

elderly persons a preference or priority of opportunity to rent or purchase dwelling units in housing the construction or rehabilitation of which is assisted under this section, and to prevent the benefits of this section from being made available to any such person with respect to the purchase of more than one dwelling unit. Any housing the construction or rehabilitation of which is assisted under this section shall be of such design as to be suitable for occupancy by elderly persons and shall be conveniently located so as to provide to the maximum extent practicable for their comfort and welfare. As used in this section, the term 'elderly person' means a person 60 years of age or over, or a family the head of which or his spouse is 60 years of age or over.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure under this section as hereinafter provided any mortgage which is eligible for insurance as provided herein and, upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe, to make commitments for the insurance of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon.

"(c) As used in this section, the terms 'mortgage', 'first mortgage', 'mortgagee', 'mortgagor', 'maturity date', and 'State', shall have the same meaning as in section 201 of this act.

"(d) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Commissioner as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Commissioner shall approve) in an amount not to exceed $8,000, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount not to exceed $10,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require, and not to exceed the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence; less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided*, That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and such mortgagor (or other person or corporation satisfactory to the Commissioner) shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses): *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall preclude the Commissioner from issuing a commitment to insure and insuring a mortgage pursuant thereto where the mortgagor is not the owner and occupant and the property is to be built or acquired and repaired or rehabilitated for sale and the insured mortgage financing is required to facilitate the construction or the repair or rehabilitation of the dwelling and provide financing pending subsequent sale thereof to a qualified owner-occupant, and in such instances the mortgage shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value; or

"(3) if executed by a mortgagor (other than a mortgagor referred to in paragraph (4) of this subsection (d)) which, until the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under this section, is regulated or restricted by the Commissioner as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will effectuate the purposes of this section, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $12,500,000; and not in excess of $7,200 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount to not to exceed $9,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require, and not in excess of 90 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of such property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, for use as rental accommodations for eight or more families eligible for occupancy as provided in this section; or

"(4) if executed by a mortgagor which is a public or private nonprofit corporation or association or other acceptable public body or political subdivision, regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States or agencies thereof, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will effectuate the purposes of this section, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $12,500,000; and not in excess of $8,000 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase this amount to not to exceed $10,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require, and not in excess of the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property or project when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, for use as rental accommodations for eight or more families eligible for occupancy as provided in this section; and

"(5) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such terms as the Commissioner may prescribe, but not to exceed 40 years from the date of insurance of the mortgage or three-quarters of the Commissioner's estimate of the remaining economic life of the building improvements, whichever is the lesser; bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charge, if any) at not to exceed 5 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, or not to exceed such percent per annum not in excess of 6 percent as the Commissioner finds necessary to meet the mortgage market; and contains such terms and provisions with respect to the application of the mortgagor's periodic payment to amortization of the principal of the mortgage, insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Commissioner may in his discretion prescribe.

"(e) The Commissioner may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgagor from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instrument secured thereby, or consent to the release of parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

"(f) The property or project shall comply with such standards and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe to establish the acceptability of such property for mortgage insurance. Without restricting the authority of the Commissioner under this act, the Commissioner is hereby authorized (with respect to a mortgagor under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (d)) to consider for purposes of mortgage insurance eligibility under this section, any financial arrangement, or guaranty or endorsement of the mortgage, with respect to such property or project by a person or corporation, other than the mortgagor, acceptable to the Commissioner. No mortgage shall be accepted for insurance under this section unless the Commissioner finds that the property or project, with respect to which the mortgage is executed, is economically sound.

"(g) The mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as hereinafter provided—

"(1) as to mortgages meeting the requirements of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of this section, as provided in section 204 (a) of this act with respect to mortgages insured under section 203, and the provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) of section 204 of this act shall be applicable to such mortgages insured under this section, except that all references therein to the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund or the fund shall be construed to refer to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund, and all references therein to section 203 shall be construed to refer to this section; or

"(2) as to mortgages meeting the requirements of paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of this section, as provided in section 207 (g) of this act with respect to mortgages insured under said section 207, and the provisions of subsections (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l) of section 207 of this act shall be applicable to such mortgages insured under this section, and all references therein to the Housing Insurance Fund or the Housing Fund shall be construed to refer to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund.

"(h) The provisions of section 221 (g) (3) of this act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section.

"(i) There is hereby created an Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this section, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to transfer to such fund the sum of $1 million from the War Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to the provisions of section 602 of this act. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration under this section may be charged to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund.

"Moneys in the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund not needed for the current operations of the Federal Housing Administration under this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of this section. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this section, the receipts derived from the property covered by such mortgage and claims assigned to the Commissioner in connection therewith shall be credited to the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures issued under this section, cash adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired under this section shall be charged to such fund."

(c) (1) Subsection (a) of section 212 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "or under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (d) of section 229 of this title," immediately following the phrase "or under section 213 of this title,".

(2) Section 219 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "the Elderly Persons Housing Insurance Fund," immediately following "the Defense Housing Insurance Fund."

(3) Section 226 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "229," immediately following "222."

(4) Subsection (a) of section 227 of such act, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting "(v) under section 229 if the mortgage meets the requirements of paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (d) thereof," immediately following "paragraph (3) of subsection (d) thereof,", and (2) by redesignating clauses (v) and (vi) as (vi) and (vii), respectively.

(5) Subsection (e) of section 513 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "under paragraph numbered (3) or (4) of subsection (d) of section 229," immediately preceding the phrase "under section 608."

(d) Section 305 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Association is authorized to enter into advance commitment contracts, which do not exceeed $50 million outstanding at any one time, if such commitments relate to mortgages with respect to which the Federal Housing Commissioner shall have issued pursuant to section 229 a commitment to insure; but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any one State."

AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

SEC. 202. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The term 'families' includes (A) a person 65 years of age or over, and (B) the remaining member of a tenant family. The term 'elderly families' means families the head of which (or his spouse) is 65 years of age or over."

(b) Section 10 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) For the purpose of increasing the supply of low-rent housing for elderly families, the Authority may assist the construction of new housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for such families, and may, with the approval of the President, after July 1, 1956, without regard to the provisions of any other law, enter into contracts for loans and annual contributions providing for not to exceed 15,000 new dwelling units designed specifically for such families (either as separate projects or as parts of projects), which number shall be increased by 15,000 dwelling units on July 1 of each of the years 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960, respectively. Such new dwelling units shall be in addition to the dwelling units for which annual contributions contracts are authorized by any other provision of law. The total authorization otherwise provided for annual contributions under this act shall be increased by $6 million per annum on July 1, 1956, and by the same amount on July 1 in each of the years 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960, respectively: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the provision of dwelling units designed for elderly families under such other authorizations. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 10 (g), any local public housing agency, in respect to dwelling units suitable to the needs of elderly families, may extend a prior preference to such families and may waive the provisions of clause (ii) of section 15 (8) (b) with respect to such units: *Provided further*, That as among such families, the 'First' preference in subsection 10 (g) shall apply."

(c) Section 15 (5) of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the colon in the first sentence the following: "or $2,250 in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families."

(d) Such act is further amended by striking the figure "$336,000,000" in subsection 21 (d) and substituting therefor the figure "$366,000,000."

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 203. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall establish, in accordance with the provisions of section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for elderly persons (as defined in section 229 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended).

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

SEC. 301. Subsection (b) of section 302 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that such $15,000 limit shall not be applicable with respect to mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii which are offered for purchase under section 305."

SEC. 302. Subsection (b) of section 303 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting: "The Association shall accumulate funds for its capital surplus account from private sources by requiring each mortgage seller to make payments of nonrefundable capital contributions equal to 2 percent of the unpaid principal amounts of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association from such seller or equal to such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 percent thereof, as the Association may determine from time to time, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy."

SEC. 303. Subsection (a) of section 304 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "at the market price" in the second sentence and inserting "within the range of market prices."

SEC. 304. (a) Subsection (b) of section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the price to be paid by the Association for mortgages purchased in its operations under this section shall be 100 per centum of the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items."

(b) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking out all that follows the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "but of such authorization not more than $5 million outstanding at any one time shall be available for such commitments in any one State."

SEC. 305. (a) Subsection (c) of section 305 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "purchasers" in the clause preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "purchases."

(b) Subsection (f) of section 305 of such Act is amended by striking out "by the Housing Amendments of 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "on or after August 11, 1955."

SEC. 306. (a) Subsection (c) of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "and subsection (e) of this section."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 306 of such Act is hereby repealed.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 401. Section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding section 110 (h) or any other provision of this title, the Administrator may make advances of funds under this subsection for surveys and plans for an urban renewal project (including general neighborhood renewal plans as hereinafter defined) to a single local public body which has the authority to undertake and carry out a substantial portion, as determined by the Administrator, of the surveys and plans or the project respecting which such surveys and plans are to be made: *Provided*, That the application for such advances shows, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, that the filing thereof has been approved by the public body or bodies authorized to undertake the other portions of the surveys and plans or of the project which the applicant is not authorized to undertake."

SEC. 402. (a) (1) Section 105 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "(including any redevelopment plan constituting a part thereof)."

(2) Section 110 (b) of such act is amended by striking out clause (3) and the semicolon and the word "and" which immediately precede said clause and by inserting the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (1).

(b) (1) Section 110 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Urban renewal project' or 'project' may include undertakings and activities of a local public agency in an urban renewal area for the elimination and for the prevention of the development or spread of slums and blight, and may involve slum clearance and redevelopment in an urban renewal area, or rehabilitation or conservation in an urban renewal area, or any combination or part thereof, in accordance with such urban renewal plan. Such undertakings and activities may include—

"(1) acquisition of (i) a slum area or a deteriorated or deteriorating area, or (ii) land which is predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, or (iii) open land necessary for sound community growth which is to be developed for predominantly residential uses: *Provided*, That the requirement in paragraph (a) of this section that the area be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating area shall not be applicable in the case of an open land project;

"(2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements;

"(3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds, and other improvements necessary for carrying out in the urban renewal area the urban renewal objectives of this title in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(4) disposition of any property acquired in the urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"(5) carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; and

"(6) acquisition of any other real property in the urban renewal area where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density (including measures designed to reduce the vulnerability of metropolitan target zones from enemy attack), eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or otherwise to remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration, or to provide land for needed public facilities.

"For the purposes of this title, the term 'project' shall not include the construction or improvement of any building, and the term 'redevelopment' and derivatives thereof shall mean development as well as redevelopment. For any of the purposes of section 109 hereof, the term 'project' shall not include any donations or provisions made as local grants-in-aid and eligible as such, pursuant to clauses (2) and (3) of section 110 (d) hereof.

"Financial assistance shall not be extended under this title with respect to any urban renewal area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character unless such area will be a predominantly residential area under the urban renewal plan therefor: *Provided*, That, where such an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character contains a substantial number of slum, blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating dwellings or other living accommodations, the elimination of which would tend to promote the public health, safety, and welfare in the locality involved and such area is not appropriate for predominantly residential uses, the Administrator may extend financial assistance for such a project, but the aggregate of the capital grants made pursuant to this title with respect to such projects shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount of capital grants authorized by this title.

"In addition to all other powers hereunder vested, where land within the purview of clause (1) (ii) or (1) (iii) of the first paragraph of this subsection (whether it be predominantly residential or nonresidential in character) is to be redeveloped for predominantly nonresidential uses, loans and advances under this title may be extended therefor if the governing body of the local public agency determines that such redevelopment for predominantly nonresidential uses is necessary and appropriate to facilitate the proper growth and development of the community in accordance with sound planning standards and local community objectives and to afford maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of the project area by private enterprise: *Provided*, That loans and outstanding advances to any local public agency pursuant to the authorization of this sentence shall not exceed 2½ percent of the estimated gross project costs of the projects undertaken under other contracts with such local public agency pursuant to this title."

(2) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of such act is amended by striking out the words "either the second or third sentence" in clause (2) and inserting "the second sentence."

(3) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of such act is amended by striking out the phrase ", public facilities financed by special assessments against land in the project area," in clause (3) and adding the following proviso before the period at the end of the sentence: ": *And provided further*, That in any case where a public facility furnished as a local grant-in-aid is financed in whole or in part by special assessments against real property in the project area acquired by the local public agency as part of the project, an amount equal to the total special assessments against such real property (or, in the case of a computation pursuant to the proviso immediately preceding, the estimated amount of such total special assessments) shall be deducted from the cost of such facility for the purpose of computing the amount of the local grants-in-aid for the project."

(d) Section 110 (e) of such act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Where real property in the project area is acquired and is owned as part of the project by the local public agency and such property is not subject to ad valorem taxes by reason of its ownership by the local public agency and payments in lieu of taxes are not made on account of such property, there may (with respect to any project for which a contract of Federal assistance under this title is in force or is hereafter executed) be included, at the discretion of the Administrator, in gross project cost an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes which would have been levied upon such property if it had been subject to ad valorem taxes, but in all cases prorated for the period during which such property is owned by the local public agency as part of the project, and such amount shall also be considered a cash local grant-in-aid within the purview of section 110 (d) hereof. Such amount, and the amount of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes included in gross project cost, shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator and such rules, regulations, limitations, and conditions as he may prescribe."

SEC. 403. (a) (1) Section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"In order to facilitate proper preliminary planning for the attainment of the urban renewal objectives of this title, the Administrator may also make advances of funds (in addition to those authorized above) to local public agencies for the preparation of general neighborhood renewal plans (as herein defined) for urban renewal areas of such scope that the urban renewal activities therein may have to be carried out in stages, consistent with the capacity and resources of the respective local public agency, over an estimated period of not more than 10 years. No contract for advances for the preparation of a general neighborhood renewal plan may be made unless the Administrator has determined that:

"(1) in the interest of sound community planning, it is desirable that the urban renewal area be planned for urban renewal purposes in its entirety;

"(2) the local public agency proposes to undertake promptly an urban renewal project embracing at least 10 percent of such area, upon completion of the general neighborhood renewal plan and the preparation of an urban renewal plan for such project; and

"(3) the governing body of the locality has represented that the general neighborhood renewal plan will be used to the fullest extent feasible as a guide for the provision of public improvements in such area and that the plan will be considered in formulating codes and other regulatory measures affecting property in the area and in undertaking other local governmental activities pertaining to the development, redevelopment, rehabilitation, and conservation of the area.

The contract for any such advance of funds for a general neighborhood renewal plan shall be made upon the condition that such advance shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to the local public agency for the undertaking of the first urban renewal project in such area: *Provided*, That in the event of the undertaking of any other project or projects in such area an appropriate allocation of the amount of the advance, with interest, may be effected to the end that each such project may bear its proper allocable part, as determined by the Administrator, of the cost of the general neighborhood renewal plan. As used herein, a general neighborhood renewal plan means a preliminary plan (conforming, in the determination of the governing body of the locality, to the general plan of the locality as a whole and to the workable program of the community meeting the requirements of section 101) which outlines the urban renewal activities proposed for the area involved, provides a framework for the preparation of urban renewal plans and indicates generally, to the extent feasible in preliminary planning, the land uses, population density, building coverage, prospective requirements for rehabilitation and improvement of property, and any portions of the area contemplated for clearance and redevelopment."

(2) Section 102 (d) of such act, as amended, is further amended by striking "The Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for" and inserting in lieu thereof "The Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for surveys of urban areas to determine whether the undertaking of urban renewal projects therein may be feasible and for."

(b) Section 104 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. Every contract for capital grants under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved. Such local grants-in-aid, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have theretofore been made, shall not be required in excess of one-third of the aggregate net project costs of all projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have been made."

(c) Section 103 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250,000,000".

SEC. 404. Section 106 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Administrator is hereby authorized to make payments to individuals, families, and business concerns to the extent necessary to compensate or reimburse them for the following expenses or losses, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement from an urban renewal area included in an urban renewal project with respect to which a contract for capital grant or temporary loan with a local public agency has been executed under this title:

"(1) necessary moving expenses not to exceed $100 for any individual or family; and

"(2) business losses, including loss of good-will and necessary moving expenses, not to exceed $2,000 for any business concern.

"The Administrator shall prescribe reasonable rules and regulations for the making of payments in conformity with the purposes of this subsection. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as may be necessary to make payments under this subsection."

TITLE V—PUBLIC HOUSING

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

SEC. 501. (a) Subsection (i) of section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Authority shall not enter into any new contracts for loans or annual contributions for more than 135,000 additional dwelling units during any fiscal year: *Provided*, That in respect to the fiscal year 1957 such number shall be increased by the difference between 45,000 and the number of units for which new annual contribution contracts for additional units were entered into during the fiscal year 1956: *Provided further*, That (subject to the authorization of not to exceed 810,000 dwelling units) the number of additional dwelling units for which contracts may be entered into under this subsection during any fiscal year may be increased at any time or times by additional amounts aggregating not more than 65,000 dwelling units, or may be decreased at any time or times by amounts aggregating not more than 85,000 dwelling units, upon a determination by the President, after receiving advice from the Council of Economic Advisers as to the general effect of such increase or decrease upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy, that such action is in the public interest."

(b) Section 13 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Authority shall establish general standards applicable to low-rent housing projects with respect to minimum space requirements and type of construction. The Authority shall allow, subject to the provisions of paragraph (5) of section 15 and consistent with such general standards as it may prescribe, the local public housing agencies a maximum amount of discretion with

respect to the size of any housing project, the types of dwellings, and project densities and design."

(c) Subsection (d) of section 21 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out the figure "10" in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15."

(d) There are hereby repealed—

(1) the third proviso and clause (2) of the eighth proviso appearing in that part of the First Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(2) clause (2) of the third proviso, and the fourth proviso, appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(3) the fourth proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(4) the sixth and seventh provisos appearing in that part of the first Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration", and the fifth and sixth provisos under the same caption in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953;

(5) as of its effective date section 10 (j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended; and

(6) section 10 (l) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

FARM-LABOR CAMPS

SEC. 502. Section 12 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by adding the following at the end of subsection (f): "Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, upon the filing of a request therefor within 12 months after the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1956, the Authority shall relinquish, transfer, and convey, without monetary consideration, all of its rights, title, and interest in and with respect to any such project or any part thereof (including such land as is determined by the Authority to be reasonably necessary to the operation of such project and contractual rights to revenues, reserves, and other proceeds therefrom) to any public housing agency whose area of operation includes the project, upon a finding and certification by the public housing agency (which shall be conclusive upon the Authority) that the project is needed to house persons and families of low income and that preference for occupancy in the project will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and their families and, second, to other low-income persons and their families. Upon the relinquishment and transfer of any such project it shall cease to be a low-rent project within the meaning of this act, and the Authority shall have no further jurisdiction over the same, except that in any conveyance hereunder the Authority shall reserve to the United States of America any mineral rights of whatsoever nature upon, in, or under the property, including the right of access to and the use of such parts of the surface of the property as may be necessary for mining and saving the minerals. Any project or part thereof not relinquished or conveyed or under a contract for disposal pursuant to this subsection shall be disposed of by the Authority pursuant to subsection (e) of section 13 of this act, notwithstanding the parenthetical clause in said subsection."

DISPOSITION OF DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 503. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, affective July 1, 1956, all right, title, and interest, including contractual rights and obligations and any reversionary interest, held by the Federal Government in and with respect to all real and personal property comprising the following housing projects:

Project No.:	Location
ALA-1D1	Ozark, Ala.
ALA-1D2	Ozark, Ala.
ALA-2D1	Foley, Ala.
ALA-2D2	Foley, Ala.
ARIZ-1D1	Yuma, Ariz.
ARIZ-1D2	Yuma, Ariz.
ARIZ-3D1	Flagstaff, Ariz.
CAL-3D1	Oceanside, Calif.
CAL-3D2	Oceanside, Calif.
CAL-4D1	Miramar, Calif.
CAL-6D1	San Ysidro, Calif.
CAL-7D2	Barstow, Calif.
CAL-9D1	Barstow, Calif.
CAL-9D2	Barstow, Calif.
CAL-10D1	Twentynine Palms, Calif.
COLO-1D1	Colorado Springs, Colo.
FLA-2D1	Green Cove Springs, Fla.
FLA-4D1	Milton, Fla.
FLA-8082	Pensacola, Fla.
FLA-8084	Pensacola, Fla.
GA-1D1	Hinesville, Ga.
KAN-3D1	Hutchinson, Kans.
ME-4D1	Brunswick, Maine
MD-1D1	Bainbridge, Md.
MO-1D1	Waynesville, Mo.
MO-2D1	Waynesville, Mo.
MO-4D1	Waynesville, Mo.
MO-5D1	Waynesville, Mo.
NEV-2D1	Fallon, Nev.
NC-1D1	Camp LeJeune, N. C.
NC-3D1	Camp LeJeune, N. C.
NC-4D1	Elizabeth City, N. C.
RI-1D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
RI-2D1	Portsmouth, R. I.
TEX-2D1	Kingsville, Tex.
TEX-3D1	Hondo, Tex.
TEX-5D1	Beeville, Tex.
TEX-5D2	Beeville, Tex.
TEX-6D1	Mission, Tex.
VA-6D1	Quantico, Va.
VA-10D1	Yorktown, Va.
VA-12D1	Yorktown, Va.
VA-13D1	Williamsburg, Va.

The provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, and of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, shall not apply to any property transferred hereunder and, except as otherwise provided herein, the laws relating to similar property of the Department of Defense shall be applicable to the property transferred.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, which is not transferred under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall, as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957, be disposed of on a competitive bid basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation: *Provided*, That project No. IDA-2D1 at Cobalt, Idaho, shall be sold only for use on the site.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby directed to convey (pursuant to the provisions of section 606 of the Act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended): (1) housing project No. RI-37013 to the Housing Authority of the city of Newport, R. I.: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of that section or of any other law, the agreement required by that section shall permit the use of the project in whole or in part for the housing of military personnel without regard to their income, and shall require the authority, in selecting tenants, to give a first preference in respect to 360 dwelling units to such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes for 3 years after the date of conveyance and to give 30 days advance notice of available vacancies to such designee, and (2) housing projects Nos. PA-36011 and PA-36012 to the Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pa.

(d) The act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 614. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, (1) any housing to be sold on site determined by the Administrator to be permanent, located on lands owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold or otherwise disposed of by the Administrator under other provisions of this act or under the provisions of other law by January 1, 1957, except housing which is determined by the Administrator by that date to be suitable for sale in accordance with section 607 (b) of this act; and (2) any permanent housing to be sold off site which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold or otherwise disposed of prior to the effective date of this section shall be disposed of, as expeditiously as possible, on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, all contracts entered into after the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1956 for the sale, transfer, or other disposal of housing (other than housing subject to the provisions of sec. 607 (b) of this act) determined by the Administrator to be permanent, except contracts entered into pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall require that if title does not pass to the purchaser by April 1, 1957 (or within 60 days thereafter if such time is necessary to cure defects in title in accordance with the provisions of the contract), the rights of the purchaser shall terminate and thereafter the housing shall be sold under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof. For the purposes of this subsection, title shall be considered to have passed upon the execution of a conditional sales contract.

"(c) The dates set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not be subject to change by virtue of the provisions of section 611 of this act."

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

COLLEGE HOUSING

SEC. 601. (a) Subsection (d) of section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "$500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$750,000,000."

(b) Section 404 (b) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2) any educational institution (no part of the net earning of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) the courses of which are designed to train persons to carry on the vocation of minister of a religious denomination, and (3)"

RESEARCH

SEC. 602. (a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to undertake such programs of investigation, analysis, and research as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. Without limiting such authority, such programs shall develop and supply data and information on—

(1) the housing inventory of the Nation and the production, use, and demolition and conversion of residential structures, and such other factors as affect the total supply of housing;

(2) mortgage market problems;

(3) the extent to which adequate housing is available to the low-income and middle-income families of the Nation through public and private means;

(4) housing for elderly persons;

(5) residential design, assembly methods, and materials use in relation to cost, utility, and comfort; and

(6) characteristics of current and prospective housing market demand.

(b) (1) In order to permit the Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by subsection (a) of this section, he is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with agencies of State or local governments and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations and into working agreements with departments and independent establishments and agencies of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis: *Provided*, That the total amount of such contracts and working agreements shall not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of $1 million on July 1, 1957, and July 1, 1958, respectively.

(2) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including administrative expenses which are hereby authorized, and amounts necessary to make payments pursuant to contracts or working agreements authorized under subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(3) The provisions of the third and fourth sentences of subsection (a) of section 301 of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, shall apply to contracts and appropriations pursuant to this section.

(c) The Administrator may disseminate (without regard to the provisions of section 306 of the Penalty Mail Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C. 321n)) any data or information acquired, or held under this section, including related data and information otherwise available to the Administrator through the operation of the programs and activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in such form as he shall determine to be most useful to departments, establishments and agencies of the Federal Government, or State, or local governments, to industry and to the general public.

(d) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator is hereby authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from private individuals, organizations, and other public agencies. Any such information or data shall be used only for the purposes for which it is supplied, and no publication shall be made by the Administrator whereby the information or data furnished by any particular person or establishment can be identified, except with the consent of such person or establishment.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, or any other provision of law.

HOME OWNER'S LOAN ACT OF 1933

SEC. 603. (a) Section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "$2,500" in the proviso at the end of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,500."

(b) Section 5 (c) of such act is further amended by striking out "15 percent" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent."

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

SEC. 604. (a) The Congress finds that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of the people require a dynamic housing industry and an increasing availability of residential housing and related community development. The Congress further finds that the periodic discounting of Government-supported mortgages demonstrates the lack of an orderly mortgage market and tends to negate public policy, and that it may be desirable to develop new sources of investment funds to meet the housing needs of the Nation. It is the purpose of this section to authorize an intensive study to be made of ways and means of encouraging a flow of investment capital to provide financing, through an orderly and adequate market, sufficient to support a level of residential construction compatible with the housing demands and needs of the population and the capacities of a balanced, high-level economy.

(b) (1) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on National Housing Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(2) The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(A) The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury, all ex officio; and

(B) Six persons to be appointed by the President from private life, such persons to be selected on the basis of their qualifications and experience in the field of housing or mortgage finance.

(3) The Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be selected by the Commission from among its members at its first meeting.

(4) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment as made.

(5) Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) (1) The members of the Commission who are serving ex officio shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their other services in the Government, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The members of the Commission from private life may be paid transportation expenses and not to exceed $50 per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73b–2.)

(2) The Commission may—

(A) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(B) make such expenditures (including expenditures for travel and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for witnesses appearing at the request of the Commission) for personal services, printing and binding, rent in the District of Columbia, and for such other matters as are necessary for the efficient execution of its functions under this section; and

(C) procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(3) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(4) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(d) The Commission is authorized and directed to conduct an inquiry with respect to the current and prospective residential housing needs of the country and the capacity of the economy in general and of the building industry and mortgage market in particular to meet these needs. The Commission shall formulate recommendations which shall include but not be limited to the following subjects:

(1) The short-term and long-term housing needs of the Nation;

(2) The discounting of Government-supported mortgages;

(3) Long-term prospects for developing new sources of investment funds to meet the housing needs of the Nation, including but not limited to private and semiprivate pension funds and trusts;

(4) The extent to which the resources of the Federal National Mortgage Association can be utilized to stabilize the mortgage market; and

(5) Ways and means of increasing the supply of adequate housing for families of moderate income.

(e) (1) The Commission may, in connection with its inquiries and studies under this section, hold such hearings and hear such witnesses as it may deem appropriate.

(2) All departments and agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission in its work and to furnish the Commission such information and assistance as it may require in the performance of its functions and responsibilities.

(f) The Commission may submit interim reports of its studies under subsection (d) to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report with respect to such studies to the Congress and the President not later than June 30, 1957. The final report of the Commission shall include its recommendations (including recommendations for governmental action, either legislative or administrative, as it shall deem necessary) with respect to the matters referred to in subsection (d), and such other related matters as it shall determine to be appropriate. The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submission of its final report.

FARM HOUSING

SEC. 605. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making loans under this title (other than loans under section 504 (b)). The total principal amount of such notes and obligations issued pursuant to this section during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, shall not exceed $450,000,000."

(b) Section 512 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 512. In conection with loans made pursuant to section 503, the Secretary is authorized to make commitments for contributions aggregating not to exceed $10 million during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961."

(c) Clause (b) of section 513 of such act is amended to read as follows: "(b) not to exceed $50,000,000 for grants pursuant to section 504 (a) and loans pursuant to section 504 (b) during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961; and."

(d) This section shall take effect on July 1, 1956.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 606. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, the authority under section 304 of such act to make loans or grants, or other payments to public and nonprofit agencies for the construction of hospitals is hereby revived and extended with respect to public and nonprofit agencies which have, prior to June 30, 1953, applied under such section 304 for such loans or grants, or other payments for the construction of hospitals, and have been denied such loans or grants, or other payments solely because of the unavailability of funds for such purpose.

(b) The authority granted by this section shall expire June 30, 1957.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 for the purposes of this section for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957.

SALE OF HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 607 (a) (1) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell and convey at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert to the city of Alexandria, Va., or to the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, or to any agency or corporation established or sponsored in the public interest by such city, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Chinquapin Village housing project, VA 44131, located in Alexandria, Va. Any sale pursuant to this authorization shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine, and the amount received for the project shall be reported by the Administrator to the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

(2) The provisions of this section shall be effective only during the period ending 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) The last proviso of subsection (c) of section 108 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "12" and inserting in lieu thereof "24."

CITY PLANNING SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 608. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000 annually for a 3-year period, commencing on or after July 1, 1956, to be used by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for the purpose of providing scholarships and fellowships in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education for the graduate training of professional city planning and housing technicians and specialists. Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships solely on the basis of ability.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

SEC. 609. (a) The fourth sentence of subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out "ten" the first time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eleven."

(b) Paragraph (C) of subsection (b) of section 512 of such act is amended by striking out "1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will I be permitted to offer an amendment to the substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the amendment which I have sent to the desk would strike out everything after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute the text of Senate bill 3855, which passed the Senate on May 24, 1956. Following the adoption of this amendment, I intend to move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am sure the Senate is generally familiar with the situation in which we find ourselves at this late date with respect to housing legislation.

However, for the record, I should like to review some of these circumstances. On March 20, 1956, the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency began hearings on a series of bills, the provisions of which dealt with all phases of housing. The subcommittee met morning and afternoon, and over a 10-day period took over 700 pages of testimony and heard close to a hundred witnesses. Following these extended hearings, the Banking and Currency Committee convened and after several days more discussion in executive session reported out a bill on May 15, 1956. The Senate passed this bill with three amendments on May 24, 1956. This bill was referred to the House, which body has been in a position to act on housing legislation since that time.

The House Banking and Currency Committee developed its own bill, H. R. 11742, which was reported to the House on June 15, 1956. Although the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency requested a rule to permit the House to consider this bill, no action was taken until July 21, 1956—a full 2 months after the Senate had passed its bill.

I make this statement not in any way reflecting on the House or any of its committees or Members, but merely to demonstrate that the delay has not been the responsibility of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On July 21, the House Rules Committee adopted a rule permittting one amendment to H. R. 11742. That amendment is the text of the bill which is now before us, which incidentally was introduced on July 20, 1956. At the time the rule was granted, it was stated before the Rules Committee of the House that those who offered the amendment had received assurances that there were sufficient votes in the House to substitute it for the bill reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The normal procedure, of course, following the enactment of a House bill, where a Senate passed bill is also in existence, would be to take up the Senate passed bill, insert the House language and eventually go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senator will suspend until there is quiet in the Chamber. Those having no business on the floor of the Senate, will please retire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. However, in this case the House has merely sent its bill to the Senate without action on the Senate-passed bill still pending in the House. Discussions during the hearings of the Rules Committee on July 21 were to the effect that the House would not consider the Senate-passed bill; that the House would send to the Senate its own bill and, moreover, would refuse to go to conference if the Senate amended the bill passed by the House.

The first I heard of the bill, which has passed the House and which is the pending measure, was on Monday, July 23. On that date the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and I met with the General Counsel of the HHFA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who is the general counsel of the HHFA?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. A. Oakley Hunter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is Mr. A. Oakley Hunter a former Representative from California?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is he the author of H. R. 12328?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot speak from personal knowledge. He was very much interested in it. He talked to us about it in conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did he not know all about H. R. 12328?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe he knew all about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did he not draft H. R. 12328?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my understanding he had a great deal to do with it, but I cannot testify that he actually drafted it. I am sure he was aware of its drafting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Section 603 of the bill, at page 61, contains an extraordinary provision, which says:

> The salary of the general counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency shall be the same as that of the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

As I understand, the heads of those agencies will receive a salary, under the executive pay bill, of $20,000. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency was not included in the executive pay bill, as I understand.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here we have a bill increasing the salary of the General Counsel of this Agency from the present figure, which I believe is $14,800,to $20,000, in a bill which apparently that same man drafted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say along that line——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor. Does he yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Carolina to clarify this particular point, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate one of the difficulties about increasing salaries in this manner. We get into a great deal of trouble in conference, particularly on bills like the executive pay bill, because one salary will be at one figure and another salary at another figure. Because of that we have a great deal of trouble trying to adjust the various salaries. Here we are undertaking to do the same thing in this field. I believe the Senator from Kansas will agree with every word I am saying.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, I should like to state that I am in thorough accord with what the chairman of the committee has stated. It is very unfortunate indeed that an attempt should be made to bring up piecemeal the salaries of various individuals.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was this provision for an increase in the salary of the general counsel of the Home Finance Agency contained either in the bill which the Senate passed or in the bill which the House committee reported?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not contained in the Senate bill, and I am informed it was not in the House bill either.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is something which was put in the bill drafted presumably by the man whose own salary was to be increased. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Senator is correct that this man had an interest, I suppose, in seeing that that be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Arkansas believe that that is highly improper conduct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do; and it is one of the provisions in the bill to which I object.

At this conference the general counsel advised us of this proposed method of procedure and indicated that he wanted our reaction to it. My reaction was that, quite aside from the merits of the bill, I did not propose to assume the responsibility of deciding whether or not the Senate would accept this measure. The Senate passed its own bill, as I have said, on May 24. That bill, so far as I am concerned, reflects the will of the Senate. The bill now before us presumably reflects the will of the House. The normal, and, indeed, necessary way to adjust differences between the two coequal legislative bodies is by a regularly appointed official conference committee. It is not proper for any sub rosa star chamber conference, between a few Members of either branch of the Congress, to decide in advance what either body will or will not do.

I believe in the procedure of an official conference committee. It has been worked out over a long period of time, and, while individual Members may often be disappointed in the results, they may have the satisfaction of knowing that there is a final and regular method of determining that result presumably reflecting the will of the Congress as a whole.

Therefore, I rejected this proposal for my own part, and it was my impression that the other two Senators present also rejected it. They can speak for themselves.

I intend no reflection on the House, any of its Members, or any of its committees. However, I implore those who did deliver this ultimatum to the Senate to consider the precedent they are establishing. I have moved that the Senate ask the House for a conference. Is not the Senate entitled to ask the House for a conference? It is, of course, for the House itself to decide whether it will grant a request of the Senate if such a request is made and to assume the responsibility for the consequences of either accepting or rejecting the request of the Senate.

Personally, I believe the House will accede to the solemn and formal request of the Senate until it acts to the contrary—and not before. I am not willing to proceed on the assumption which has been reported in the newspapers and through a messenger of the administration that the House will not honor such a request of the Senate, that it will deny the Senate an opportunity to confer with its own regularly appointed representatives in the normal way.

For, as I have indicated, consider what a precedent this would be. Would this mean that year after year, in the closing hours of the Congress, one House can force its will on the other and turn the Congress into a unicameral legislature? If Senators desire to uphold the right and dignity of the body in which they serve, they should vote to ask the House for a conference on this legislation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, to the so-called Fulbright amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and I ask unanimous consent that it be not stated at this time, but that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator's amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment to Mr. FULBRIGHT'S amendment is as follows:

On page 42, beginning with line 24, to strike out down through and including line 10, on page 45, and in lieu thereof, to insert the following:

"'(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Authority may enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 35,000 additional dwelling units on July 1, 1957, and may enter into only such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for annual contributions with respect to each such 35,000 additional dwelling units shall terminate 2 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That any balance of the authorization provided by this subsection, as amended by section 108 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, not utilized by July 31, 1956, shall be available in any succeeding year: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further*, That no new contracts for loans and annual contributions for additional dwelling units in excess of the number authorized in this sentence shall be entered into unless authorized by the Congress.'

"(b) Clause (2) of the third proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned 'Annual contributions:' under the heading 'Public Housing Administration' is repealed.

"SEC. 402. Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting the following after the first comma therein: 'or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956.'

"SEC. 403. Subsection (d) of section 21 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out the figure '10' in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '15.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the result of the substitute offered by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the amendment which I have just offered to it is simply this: On May 21 the Senate passed a bill. The House passed a bill 2 days ago on the same subject. The substitute offered by the Senator from Arkansas would restore the Senate bill in its entirety, and my amendment which is at the desk at the moment would strike out the language of the Senate bill as to public housing and substitute the House language for public housing.

The House language calls for 35,000 public housing units each year for 2 years. There are now approximately 55,000 houses authorized under previous laws, which have not been constructed, and they must be added. There would be a little more than 100,000 houses. The amendment which I have offered simply reduces the public housing units to 35,000 for 2 years.

I strongly urge that the Senate accept my amendment, and we shall be able to go to conference tomorrow. My best judgment is that in a couple of hours time we can straighten the matter out with the House and come back with a bill acceptable to everyone.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, it goes only to the public housing features and seeks to bring the public housing provision in line with what the House actually passed.

Mr. CAPEHART. In accordance with the House language concerning public housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And that includes public housing which the Senate committee in its bill and which the House committee in its bill have——

Mr. CAPEHART. It makes the total number of units for the next 2 years 35,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Plus the actual carryover, making a total of 115,000?

Mr. CAPEHART. We cannot know until the last half of this month. It all depends on whether we are talking about houses under contract or houses on which construction has actually been started.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am talking about those which are under construction.

There is a question which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator aside from that. It relates to a provision in the bill which the House passed. I do not wish to take up too much time. The Senator is familiar with the provision which the House passed requiring the Department of Defense to buy all the Wherry housing projects throughout the country, is he not?

Mr. CAPEHART. I should say that if the Senate passed the bill with the amendment the able Senator from Arkansas has proposed, plus the amendment I have just offered, the language of the bill will be the language of the original Senate bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the question of Wherry housing be in conference?

Mr. CAPEHART. Everything in the bill will be in conference except public housing. As a result of my amendment, we will be agreeing with the House on public housing, thereby taking public housing out of the conference. Everything else will be in conference. We have sought to place on the desk of each Senator a complete analysis of the bill which the Senate passed on May 24, the bill the House sent over today, and comments and analyses of each.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Inasmuch as it is most likely that the House will accede to the request of the Senate for a conference, and that the conference committee will meet tomorrow, and by that time the printed RECORD will be available to Senators, I think it might be quite relevant to place in the RECORD at this point a few facts. I should like to read them, if I may.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is from the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which brings out these facts with reference to Wherry projects:

> Since the inception of title VIII there have been 272 projects insured involving an aggregate of $690,945,270. This amount includes 83,217 housing units.

Under the provision as it passed the House, the Department of Defense would be required to purchase that number of houses under a price formula which I believe the able Senator from Indiana will agree with me the Senate has never had an opportunity to examine, but which seems to me to have in it some features which would almost guarantee windfall profits, or certainly unreasonable profits, which the Department of Defense could be required to pay.

Does the Senator from Indiana agree with me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I am inclined to agree with the able Senator tonight; however, that is one of the purposes of the conference which we hope to have tomorrow with the House. We might have the House conferees explain in detail exactly what is meant by that section in respect to Wherry housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the Senator from Indiana permit me at this point to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated July 25, 1956, addressed to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, by Robert Tripp Ross, Assistant Secretary of Defense, relating to this program, and stating very strong opposition on the part of the Department of Defense to this particular provision?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, let me say that, from my acquaintance with this subject as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services, which deals with military housing, I share the views which the Senator from Alabama has expressed, that a directive to require the Secretary of Defense to buy Wherry housing under a price formula which would be adjusted to current costs will open the way to huge windfalls. In my judgment, that would be utterly unjustified, since, in the first place, the builders of houses got a guaranteed or an insured loan. To make a price now which would be adjusted to current costs would add to the guaranty or insurance windfall that would come from whatever inflation may have taken place since the houses were originally built.

I certainly have no objection to having the letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense printed in the RECORD. But I should like the conferees to know that if the report should come back from the conference accepting the House language on the Wherry housing provision, and directing the purchase of Wherry housing units, I shall oppose the adoption of the conference report with all the vigor I can command.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1956.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I should like to offer certain comments on the provisions of H. R. 12328 (Housing Act of 1956), which appears scheduled for early consideration on the floor of the House, and may be brought to a joint conference shortly thereafter.

The Department of Defense objects to the language of section 512 of this bill, which directs the Secretary of Defense to acquire Wherry projects. It is believed that should this section be enacted, the Department would be at a disadvantage in negotiating the purchase of such projects at terms which are in the best interests of the Government.

The Department of Defense supports the language contained in section 419 of the military construction authorization bill (H. R. 12270), which provides the necessary authority and a satisfactory formula for the acquisition of Wherry projects, without the enactment of additional legislation.

In addition, since the military construction authorization bill has passed the House and is expected to receive favorable Senate action, enactment of section 512 would require the Department of Defense to comply with inconsistent laws. Section 512 not only sets forth different provisions from those contained in the MCA bill, but it also makes mandatory the assumption of mortgages in connection with Wherry acquisition, while section 311 of the supplemental appropriations bill (H. R. 12138), as agreed to by Senate and House conferees, makes this permissive.

Furthermore, the Department opposes the establishment of a revolving fund for Wherry acquisition, as is provided by the amended section 404 (h) of the National Housing Act. Since the fund will be used for the purchase of equities as well as the payment of obligations, while being replenished to a considerable extent from the rentals of substandard quarters, it will not be possible to operate on a revolving-fund basis without periodic augmentation from other sources.

The Department of Defense proposes to take positive steps to acquire a substantial number of Wherry projects during the present fiscal year, but believes that such a program should proceed gradually on a negotiated basis in its initial stages, until a degree of experience has been gained.

The Department also objects to the language of section 509 of H. R. 12328, which makes mandatory the use of modular measure in the design of title VIII housing. A similar provision appears in section 108 (h) of S. 3855. The Department does support greater use of the principle of modular dimensioning, and is currently undertaking extensive studies to determine the benefits which may be expected from a more extensive use of this principle. However, a number of technical difficulties arise in broadening the use of modular measurements, and it is believed that such use should be permissive until greater experience has been gained. Moreover, section 509 would necessitate costly revisions to designs already under way, and would delay completion of urgently needed housing.

Section 418 of H. R. 12270 contains language which registers the intent of Congress in this matter, and which is satisfactory to the Department of Defense. Accordingly, it is believed that the enactment of section 509 of H. R. 12328 is not necessary at this time.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT TRIPP ROSS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I invite the Senator's attention to title 512, on the acquisition of Wherry housing, which is the same point as was made by the Senator from South Dakota. The proposed law actually makes it mandatory that the Secretary of Defense shall buy Wherry housing, and also that he shall buy the personal property and the chattels which go with those houses. The formula then provides that he shall pay the cost adjusted to the current cost level. What does the Senator propose to do about that? Do I understand correctly that it is proposed to strike it out of the bill on the floor now?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] offered a substitute to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and to insert in lieu thereof the language of the Senate bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Would that provision be included?

Mr. CAPEHART. We hope to have the bill go to conference, if the Senate agrees with us tonight, and in conference we shall take up with the House all the questions which the able Senator from Mississippi is asking, as well as many other questions.

Mr. STENNIS. We want to register our views now, for whatever they may be worth, for the benefit of the conference, so that the Senate conferees can make very vigorous objection to this provision in the bill.

Incidentally, there is in the military construction bill permissive authority for the Secretary of Defense to buy Wherry housing when he determines there is actual need for it. Then there is a formula under which he can buy it. Does the Senator agree to that position?

Mr. CAPEHART. As one of the conferees, I am opposed to the present language of the House bill. Unless it provides something which I do not see or do not understand, I shall be opposed to giving in to the House in respect to this provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the provision requiring the Department of Defense to buy almost $700 million of Wherry housing, at grossly inflated prices, is in the bill which was drafted by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, under the direction of Mr. Cole and ex-Representative Hunter?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Illinois is wrong in that respect. They have been very crtical about that. This provision was written by the House itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Where did this provision come from?

Mr. CAPEHART. It came from the House itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask my good friend from Indiana if it is not true that, so far as public housing is concerned, the House bill fails to remove the very restrictive conditions concerning the direction of public housing, which in the past have virtually hogtied the program? Is it not true that those restrictive provisions are not removed by the House bill, whereas they were removed from the Senate bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think, in all fairness, my answer should be that there are certain restrictions in the House bill which are not in the Senate bill; but I cannot agree that public housing is restricted to the point where no houses can be built.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire from my friend from Indiana, who is in so amiable a mood, if the House Committee on Banking and Currency recommended not 35,000 units a year, but 60,000 units a year?

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Finally, may I ask my good friend from Indiana, why not have the entire Senate-approved bill for action in conference? Why remove the question of public housing from conference?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is a matter for the Senate to decide by its vote. If the Senate does not want to reduce the number to 70,000, it can say so by its vote—and I hope the vote will come in a few minutes. But if the Senate wants to agree with the House, then the Senate will adopt my amendment.

I think the best answer is that regardless of the number of houses which might be authorized in the bill, it will not be possible to have additional housing built between now and next year.

I am reliably informed—and I think the record of years gone by will prove it—that the House simply will not agree in conference to more than 70,000 public-housing units, as they have refused to do so in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana was on the committee of conference last year, along with the Senator from Illinois. He will remember that the House members of the committee of conference kept saying they would not take any public-housing units. Yet, finally, after several meetings, we forced them to take 45,000 units a year.

Why does the Senator from Indiana think the House will be so much more overbearing this year than it was last year? What is the Senator from Indiana afraid of?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am afraid of nothing. I think my record proves it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator. Later I shall ask to speak in my own time to reply the Senator from Indiana, but I should like to ask him a question. If the proposal of the Senator from Indiana should prevail—and I sincerely hope it will not prevail; I cannot conceive that the Senate will agree to it—the number of public-housing units would be reduced to 35,000 a year for 2 years. That is identical with what is contained in the House bill. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would that not completely preclude any discussion of public housing in conference?

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from New York is 100-percent correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understand, from what the Senator from Indiana has previously said, that he favors a conference on this bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I very much favor a conference, primarily because of the treatment the House gave the Wherry Housing provisions.

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree it is inconceivable that the Congress should proceed to enact legislation without the right of conference, and I am glad to hear the Senator say he agrees with that thought. I wonder, however, why the Senator should seek to exclude public housing from the purview of the conferees. That would not be a conference. Under those circumstances, the cards would be stacked against us.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are three reasons. The first is that, of course, the President has advocated 35,000 units a year for 2 years. So the administration asked for only 70,000 units. Secondly, regardless of how many units are authorized, whether they be 35,000 or 350,000, there will not be a single additional unit until next year, when Congress meets again. Thirdly, I think we have every reason to believe that if we want a housing bill passed, and passed within a reasonable time, the Senate must give in on this particular point. I have been as frank as I know how to be.

Mr. LEHMAN. I appreciate that. While I do not agree with the Senator, I am sure he is being very fair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is one thing I should like to say with reference to the restrictions referred to in the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Indiana. We have been assured—and I want to ask the Senator from Indiana if this is not true, and it occurred in the conference at which he and the Senator from Arkansas and I were present—that this so-called workable plan would be administered in a reasonable way, so as not to restrict it, as was the experience for a couple of years.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. I think the Senator will find a change in the language.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say I certainly would not be willing to support the bill at all unless what I have stated were the case.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared regarding this workable program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN ON WORKABLE PROGRAM

As the Senate knows, several times in the past I have voiced strong opposition to the so-called workable program requirement

contained in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949. My opposition to the workable program requirement has not been in connection with its application to the urban renewal program, but rather with reference to its application to public housing.

I have said previously and I say again, that it is important that communities be encouraged to adopt a program designed to improve housing conditions and city planning. This the workable program does when it is applied as a prerequisite to Federal aid under the slum clearance or urban renewal programs.

However, in the past, the workable program has been required before a community is entitled to an allocation of public-housing units. I am convinced that originally the workable program requirement and other restrictions prevented many communities from obtaining allocations of public-housing units to which they would otherwise have been entitled. I cannot condone the imposition of these requirements upon communities if they are deliberately intended as a device to prevent communities from obtaining public housing. Last year I supported the successful attempt to eliminate these requirements from the law.

At present, while a community must have a "workable program" to secure Federal aid under the urban renewal plan, it need not have an approved workable program to get public housing.

In the last year, the requirements which a community must meet before receiving approval of its workable program have been relaxed. It is now far easier, I am advised, to obtain the approval of a workable program than it has been in the past. I have talked with several persons who have had close association with the workable program and am advised in most instances, first, that it is desirable as applied to the urban renewal program; and, second, that it is now far easier to obtain approval of a workable program than formerly.

I have received assurances from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency that the workable program requirements will not be rigid as applied to large or small communities. The program, I am told, is now and will continue to be sufficiently flexible to permit smaller communities to obtain approval by means of reducing the number of requirements or the stringency of their applications to these smaller communities. Acting on these assurances, I am prepared to amend my previous position in opposition to the workable program.

If the program can be developed along flexible lines and will be administered in such a way that smaller communities can comply without unreasonable delays and expenditures and if the workable program requirement is not allowed to become an impediment to such public housing as may be desired by the community, I am willing to withhold my previous objections and to permit a trial period during which the workable program may be applied.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me repeat some of the pertinent facts and figures with respect to the acquisition of Wherry Act projects. I think this data is of such importance that it might well influence the decisions of Senators when they vote on this important bill.

This amendment would strike section 512 of the bill (H. R. 12328) beginning on line 1, page 51, through line 24, page 57. Since the inception of title VIII of the National Housing Act, there have been 272 Wherry Act projects insured, involving an aggregate of insurance of $690,945,270. These projects include 83,217 housing units. These projects are built on or near military installations principally for the use of military personnel stationed at those installations. They may also be used by civilian personnel. They are privately owned and privately financed. H. R. 12328 directs the Secretary of Defense to acquire all of these projects by one means or another. A formula is established for determining the purchase price. This price shall be not more than the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost, plus or minus certain allowances.

This may or may not be an equitable formula. The fact is that we, on the Banking and Currency Committee, who have primary responsibility for the Wherry Act projects simply are not in a position to know. The Banking and Currency Committee did discuss in its hearings the problem of Wherry Act housing units. We heard that the new title VIII program referred to as Capehart military housing could have an adverse effect upon Wherry Act projects. It is entirely possible that the construction of a Capehart project near a Wherry Act project would attract tenants from the Wherry units into the Capehart units, thereby creating a possibility of default by the Wherry Act owners. We are, of course, anxious to avoid any such defaults if we possibly can.

However, in 1955, we provided by law that Wherry Act projects could be acquired for fair market value by purchase, donation, or condemnation. When the committee discussed this problem again in 1956, it was decided that the 1955 act was adequate to take care of any problem which might arise, and certainly to provide a means of acquisition of Wherry Act projects.

Subsequent to that date the Supreme Court announced a decision relating to the payment of taxes by Wherry Act project sponsors. This decision will undoubtedly have some effect upon the expenses of a Wherry Act project and may require additional legislation to prevent unnecessary default. This Supreme Court decision came after the Senate had passed its bill. It may well be that an event such as the Supreme Court decision that occurred subsequent to Senate passage of S. 3855 might require additional legislation. Members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee stand ready to discuss this problem in a conference with the House. However, unless we go to conference, we shall not be given an opportunity to discuss this problem, and we can have no assurance that the language contained in H. R. 11742 would give any adequate protection to the Government or to the Wherry Act sponsors as a result of acquisition of these Wherry Act projects.

One of the most disturbing features about this provision in the House bill is the mandatory requirement that Wherry Act projects be acquired by the Federal Government. This approach departs from past actions of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee. All three of these committees recognize that acquisition could be advantageous to the Government or project owners under some circumstances and establish a procedure for acquisition in such cases.

H. R. 11742, however, assumes that the Federal Government is solely responsible for the construction of these projects, and requires the Government to buy the housing, regardless of whether it is needed. Admitting that there was a Federal impetus behind the construction of Wherry Act housing, there was, nevertheless, an element of business risk for profit or loss. Until the Senate has had an opportunity to thoroughly explore this basic assumption in the House bill, we should not adopt a wholesale purchase program which treats all projects more or less the same, and which could in many cases unjustly enrich project owners, or could saddle the Federal Government with housing for which it has no need.

Let me repeat that this problem has been considered by four committees of the Congress. Each of these committees has prepared a recommended solution to the problem of acquiring Wherry Act projects. The language contained in H. R. 11742 differs from all of the other approaches. It has not been considered by any committee of the Congress. I do not say the formula provided by H. R. 11742 is good or bad. I do say that the Congress should have an opportunity to consider it. If this amendment is accepted, it will permit the conferees of the House and Senate to discuss the problem and to arrive at a solution equitable to all concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I strongly urge that the Senate adopt my amendment to the substitute offered by the able Senator from Arkansas, adopt his amendment, as thus amended, and pass the bill in that form.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to say, in support of the Senator's motion, that I am very much disappointed, indeed, with the long delay in House action on the bill, thus placing this needed legislation in a position of danger. Also, I am very much disappointed by its attitude on public housing. I have consistently felt that the administration has not taken a broad enough view of the need for public housing, and I have consistently felt, with the Senator from New York, the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators on the committee, that the authorization for 35,000 units did not meet the situation realistically at all.

However, it is clear that only a day or two remain in the session, and that if the housing bill is to be passed, we may as well face the fact that we shall have to accept the 35,000-unit limitation. Otherwise, we may jeopardize the entire bill, which contains provisions relating to housing and urban renewal in disaster areas, which are extremely important to communities in my State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, correspondence which I have had with Representative SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 18, 1956.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: The Senate, by unanimous consent, approved today three disaster relief housing bills, S. 2854, S2855, and S. 2859. Copies of the bills, together with the committee reports, are enclosed for your ready reference.

Anything you can do to expedite action on these measures by the House of Representatives will be deeply appreciated.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator.

MAY 21, 1956.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Senate today approved, by unanimous consent, S. 3844, designed to expedite Federal urban renewal assistance to disaster areas by cutting red tape and eliminating certain rigid requirements of existing law. Copies of the bill and of the unanimous favorable report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency are enclosed for your ready reference.

The provisions of this bill were originally contained in the amendments to the Housing Act recommended by the administration. In the interest of saving time, possibly as much as 6 weeks, in making the benefits of the proposed legislation available to the communities so sorely afflicted by flood disasters during the past year, the Senate committee decided to report it as a separate bill.

It is my understanding that your committee will hold an executive session on Wednesday of this week. I respectfully urge that sympathetic consideration be given to the desirability of acting on S. 3844 and a companion bill, H. R. 11282, introduced by Congressman at Large ANTONI N. SADLAK, of Connecticut, promptly and favorably so that it may be voted upon by the House in the near future.

Very many of the flood-afflicted communities in my own State of Connecticut are in need of the proposed legislation, and I assume the same is true of municipalities in other States which were the victims of major disaster in the past year.

The rigid requirements of present law have created many difficult problems. As just one illustration, the town of Farmington, Conn., has applied for urban renewal assistance in areas which before the August 1955 floods were almost completely residential. To date, it has been unable to obtain such assistance because the flood waters destroyed so many homes that the areas can no longer be termed "predominantly residential" as required for eligibility under existing law.

Your committee will deserve, and will have the gratitude, of the people of Farmington and other affected communities if it takes prompt and effective action to remove this and other requirements of existing law which were never intended to apply in a post-disaster situation.

May I also renew my request that your committee act upon three other disaster relief housing bills, S. 2854, and S. 2855 and S. 2859, which were approved by the Senate almost 5 weeks ago. These measures are entirely noncontroversial and, in my judgment, deserve separate treatment on a priority basis instead of being deferred for consideration along with the onmibus housing bill.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator.

JUNE 25, 1956.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, House Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In reviewing H. R. 11742, the proposed Housing Act of 1956, which was reported by your committee recently, I note that it includes the provisions of two bills in which I am vitally interested, S. 2854, to increase the amount of mortgage insurance for disaster victims, and S. 3844, to expedite urban renewal assistance to disaster-affected communities.

Although separate action, in the interest of saving time, would have been preferable on these two measures, both passed by the Senate many weeks ago, I appreciate your committee's approval of their provisions as part of the general housing bill.

Two other disaster relief housing bills which I introduced with other Senators as cosponsors and which were approved by the Senate on April 18, 1956, the same day as S. 2854, are not included in H. R. 11742. These are S. 2855, to provide shelter for disaster victims, and S. 2859, relating to rent-free accommodations in low-rent projects for disaster victims.

I hope it will be possible for your committee to consider these bills in the near future and take such action as may be necessary to complete the process of enactment either through offering them as amendments to H. R. 11742 on the floor or by reporting them as separate bills.

As you know, S. 2855 and S. 2859 were approved by the Senate unanimously, and as disaster relief measures should be entirely noncontroversial within your committee. I am confident that favorable action by your committee will be gratefully noted not only by the people of my own and other States afflicted by the 1955 floods but also by those who may be affected by future disasters.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator.

JUNE 30, 1956.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE, *Chairman,*
House Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In further reference to my letters of May 21 and June 21 concerning the advisability of separate action on S. 3844 and other bills arising from the flood disasters of 1955, I know you share my concern because of the decision of the Committee on Rules to table H. R. 11742, the proposed Housing Act of 1956.

As you are aware, S. 3844, to expedite urban renewal assistance to disaster-affected communities, and S. 2854, to increase the amount of mortgage insurance for disaster victims, were included in H. R. 11742. The prospects for their enactment as part of H. R. 11742 are made very doubtful because of the Rules Committee's apparent determination to keep that measure from reaching the House floor.

Under the circumstances, I hope your committee will decide to report out the Senate-approved bills, S. 3844, and S. 2854, as well as two others, S. 2855, to provide shelter for disaster victims, and S. 2859, relating to rent-free accommodations in low-rent projects for disaster victims.

I regret the necessity of bringing these bills to your attention so frequently. However, in view of the fact that they were approved by the Senate many weeks ago, it is becoming increasingly difficult to explain to people in the flood-affected areas of my own State and others why the House has been unable to take action. If the House has an opportunity to act on these measures, dealing as they do with disaster relief, I am sure they will be approved overwhelmingly and sent to the President for his signature. I strongly urge that your committee give the House the opportunity to do so.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to make a brief observation about the provisions of the bill as they relate to the so-called Wherry housing projects. We are not dealing with "peanuts" in those projects. There is involved some seven or eight hundred million dollars. I cannot conceive of anything which would be more injurious to the national interest than to adopt any proposition that compelled us to acquire all of these projects under the formula prescribed in the House bill. Personally, I like the formula prescribed in the military construction bill, and I hope those who represent the Senate in conference will give some consideration to that formula. It would be the height of folly for the Congress to direct the Government to acquire seven or eight hundred million dollars' worth of housing under present conditions.

We see a great many reports of what will be the size of the various military establishments over the next 2 or 3 years. Forces are being constantly shipped from one area to another. If we were to authorize the acquisition of all of these projects, including personal property, under the formula provided by the bill, it could well result in a loss of two or three hundred million dollars to the National Treasury. So far as I am concerned, I would oppose a conference report which went to that extreme degree. It could only result in the Government's buying the houses from anybody who, under the free enterprise system, undertook the hazard of building the Wherry housing projects.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not so much hazard, because the loans were insured.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course the loans were insured. Not only that, but in many cases rents have been collected from them for 7 or 8 years. This formula is most unrealistic, and the Government will be bilked if the Senate accepts any such proposition as the one included in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Georgia

that, as one of the conferees, I certainly will do what he is urging.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to reaffirm what the Senator from Georgia has said. The Armed Services Committee has gone into this problem with a good deal of care, and what the Senator from Georgia has stated so ably is the conclusion reached as a result of our discussions; namely, that the Government should take over this housing on a voluntary basis, but not on a compulsory basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. And certainly at some reasonable standard of value. We should not pay more than the fair market value of these units, because in most cases a considerable amount of rent has been collected.

Mr. President, I hope the conferees will give attention to the provision for military housing; I refer to what was known as the Capehart provision. If we proceed to reduce the strength of our Armed Forces by several hundred thousand men, on the theory that the development of new weapons makes such a reduction advisable, it certainly will not be necessary to construct the large amount of housing provided for in the Senate version of the bill. I hope the Senator from Indiana will not proceed on the basis of pride of authorship; I hope that for that reason he will not take the position that the amount of housing provided for in the Senate version of the bill should be constructed. We have become so involved with tremendously large sums of money that the ordinary Senator uses almost interchangeably the terms "billion dollars" and "million dollars"—except in the case of the few Senators who themselves have millions of dollars.

But the sum of money involved in this case is an extremely huge one. If necessary, we should reject the entire bill, rather than commit the Government to such a project.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. My position is—and I am certain it is the position of the Senator from Georgia and of all other Senators—that we wish to provide living quarters for the married personnel in both the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, regardless of how large or how small those Armed Forces are, and that we should use good common sense as to the building of the quarters.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Congress should keep in touch with the program, in view of some of the terrific mistakes which were made under the Wherry housing program.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me, so that I may present some figures in connection with this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to point out that now in the process of being contracted for is approximately $1 billion worth of this family housing for the military. Under the House version of the bill, which came to us a while ago, there is an authorization for approximately $1,500,000,000. The Senate version of the bill, which is offered as a substitute for the House version, would authorize $3 billion more for this military housing. Mr. President, we are just running away on the subject of military housing, to the extent of billions of dollars' worth. The same news article that carries the story of a balanced budget can carry the story of congressional authorization for an additional $3 billion for military family housing which is not reflected in that budget.

At one time the military said they needed only 50 percent of the possible capacity that they expected to build. Now they mention 90 percent.

I certainly agree with the Senator from Georgia that it is far beyond what we need; and in this case the amounts are running into the billions of dollars—fantastic sums of money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct.

Mr. President, I here and now predict that even as we are being called on in this measure to bail out those who built Wherry housing, if we authorize this $3 billion of financed housing under this bill, in 2 or 3 years the Senate will be called on to bail out, at the expense of the taxpayers, those who have constructed these projects. This is a matter with which we should proceed very slowly. It involves vast sums of money. It sounds very simple to say that we shall let a contract with a guaranteed loan. But if the Government moves a military post, we shall wind up with an obligation on the back of the same old man, the American taxpayer, under the provisions of the original contract.

This is a matter with which we should proceed with extreme care. I urge those who represent the Senate to keep this expenditure at a very minimum, at least until we know something about what will be the composition of the Armed Forces of the United States over the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to substitute the Senate bill, as is, for the House bill.

I particularly rise to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Early in this session—I believe in January, or not later than the early part of February—the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, initiated hearings on housing legislation. We heard from hundreds of witnesses over a period of 4 months. They testified at a great many hearings. We sought the best counsel we could get, from various segments of the people of this country. We took counsel with builders, architects, social workers, experts in housing, and people who are thoroughly familiar with the needs of the country in relation to public housing.

It was testified that there should be built each year in this country, in order to catch up with the accumulated backlog and care for the current needs, a minimum of 2 million new houses, of which 200,000 should be in the form of public housing units.

On May 24, after 4 months of hearings, the Senate passed the housing bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. On June 12, the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported a basically sound housing bill, although it was deficient in certain particulars, especially with reference to the size of the public housing program. Like the Senate bill, it had no provision for families of middle income.

We have heard a great deal about military housing, and about the Wherry housing, so-called. I think it is a subject of great importance.

I am in agreement with what has been said by many of my colleagues tonight. I believe that the provisions of the House bill would be dangerous and costly to this Government, but, after all, the heart of the housing proposals is basic assistance to families of low income, through new public housing, including proper provisions for our senior citizens. That is today, as it was when public housing was first adopted, the basic and fundamental purpose of any housing bill. We can gloss over it as much as we like, but it is still the fundamental purpose and justification for a housing bill.

The bill of the Senate which was passed on May 24 provided for 135,000 units of public housing, and 15,000 additional units for elderly people.

That was the minimum which the Committee on Banking and Currency felt it should report and recommend to the Senate. Mr. President, at the hearings it was clearly disclosed that the opposition to the amount recommended and that the recommendation for a vastly smaller amount came from Mr. Cole, the Administrator. He testified at the hearings. On page 103 of the Senate hearings I had this exchange with Mr. Cole:

Senator LEHMAN. I thought public housing was based on need, was based on the desire of the Nation to take care of people who need governmental assistance.

Mr. COLE. The 35,000 units recommended by the administration are based upon the demand largely, and, frankly, on the fact that Congress would not give any more.

Mr. President, there is not one word in the testimony taken at the many hearings which disclosed a need for public housing units less in number than recommended by the committee and included in the bill which was passed by the Senate.

It is no business of the administrator of an agency to tell Congress that he bases his estimate of what is needed on what he thinks Congress will agree to give him. That is an attempt to legislate by a man who I consider has little to recommend him as an administrator of this important activity.

We are told that if we do not agree to the House bill, the House will not meet us in conference. I cannot believe that the House would take such a position. I

cannot believe that 1 of the 2 coordinate bodies of Congress would seek to control the actions of the other body in a manner which would be clearly indicated if the House refused to meet a committee of the Senate in conference. If I did believe it, I certainly would under no circumstances be willing to agree to it.

However, the House originally approved 60,000 units of public housing. Under the provisions of the rule imposed on the House the number was later reduced to 35,000 units, and no public housing whatever was provided for elderly people. The administration insisted on a totally inadequate low-rent public housing program and no housing for the elderly. It is not content to permit tested and democratic legislative processes to function. It is afraid to permit Congress as a whole to work its combined will. It harks back, Mr. President, to the tactics of the Administrator and his General Counsel when they were Members of the House, and were voluble and violent opponents of the public housing program they are now called upon to administer by the present administration.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I would not be a party to the surrender of the responsibility, the integrity, and, yes, the dignity of the Senate to the Executive, even though I might be in total agreement with the Executive. Differences between this and the other body must be adjudicated in the proper forum of a conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is inconceivable to me that any Member of the Senate could vote otherwise.

However, Mr. President, we must not forget that if we agree to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], we will have no opportunity of negotiating in conference. I call that to the attention of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from New York is absolutely correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. In other words, we are surrendering our right to confer and negotiate on, and to consider public housing, if we adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Senate will agree to any such surrender or compromise or such tying of its hands as an independent body of Congress. Therefore I hope with all my heart that the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be defeated.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope very much that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be rejected. On the question of the adoption of his amendment I ask for a division.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas by the Senator from Indiana. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the Fulbright amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "$3,000,000,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$2,300,000,000"; and on line 6 to strike out "September 30, 1959," and insert "December 31, 1957."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I see no objection to that amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to take care of houses which are on airbases and to give us a chance to look the situation over before spending millions of dollars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I accept that modification of my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish to say that I cannot support an amendment which would cut down the housing units so greatly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the so-called Fulbright amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BENNETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I cannot serve on any conference committee which is estopped from discussing the most important part of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think it is unfair for the able Senator from New York to make any such statement, for the simple reason that the Senate has just voted on the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as a member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate, in place of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

ANNUITIES FOR WIDOWS OF JUDGES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of tomorrow).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senate amended the bill as passed by the House, by increasing from 1½ to 3 percent the contributory amount required of Federal judges. The conferees concurred in this feature of the Senate amendment, which now is contained in the conference report.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Mississippi has just stated to the Senate the first item in disagreement. Is it not true that as the bill came to the Senate, it provided that Federal judges would contribute only 1½ percent of their salaries, and that under that version of the bill it was possible for a Federal judge to pay only 1½ percent of only one month's salary, and thereafter his widow would be entitled to a pension of $5,300 per year for the remainder of her life?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, subject to the 10 percent deduction of his unpaid contributions. Now that provision is taken out, and a Federal judge will contribute 3 percent of his salary on a mandatory 5-year contribution in order to qualify.

Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the Members of Congress pay 6 percent of their salaries into a retirement fund. Of that 6 percent about 1¼ percent goes into a fund for the widows of Members of Congress. In other words, Members of Congress contribute about 1¼ percent of their salaries for a pension for the widows of

Congressmen, and the balance goes to the retirement program.

Under this bill a Federal judge will contribute 3 percent of his salary for the identical pension for which a Member of Congress pays 1¼ percent. The reason for that increased payment by a judge is that he receives a salary for life.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator from Mississippi is slightly in error when he uses the word "identical". When a Member of Congress retires, he must make an election as to the survivor benefits of his wife.

If he elects survivorship benefits for his wife, his own annuity is thereby reduced. Likewise, the time that the former member draws an annuity, it reduces the amount to which his widow will ultimately be entitled; so to that extent it is not the same.

Let me ask the Senator this question: As I understand, the conferees have retained the amendment adopted by the Senate, to require Federal judges to pay 3 percent of their salaries. Is that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. GORE. In the bill as it came to the Senate there was no requirement that a judge pay for 5 years before his widow would be entitled to an annuity. Have the conferees also retained the 5-year provision?

Mr. EASTLAND. The conference agreement is this: A judge contributes 3 percent of his salary. He must pay for 5 years to be eligible to participate in the fund. Then he can buy back whatever of his previous service he desires.

We took into the program about 110 or 120 living widows. The staff of the House Judiciary Committee states that the highest of those pensions would be either $2,700 or $2,900 a year. The lowest would be $900 a year. The average would be approximately $2,200 a year.

Dr. Myers, of the Social Security Administration, gave the distinguished Senator from Tennessee his figures on this subject and sat with us in the conference. We have molded the bill just as nearly as possible to the retirement program for Members of Congress. That is largely what it is.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the Senator upon bringing back to the Senate a bill which is much improved over the bill which originally came from the other body.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that there is still a basic question, it seems to me, as to the advisability of conferring survivorship benefits of a retirement system upon the survivors of men who have never been members of the system, who are not now members of the system, and for whom it is not contemplated that membership in the system will ever occur. I think that is a basic question. However, I think the bill is much improved over what it was.

The Senator has stated the improvements which have been made. I point out that for widows of former judges the bill will provide an annuity up to $2,700 or $2,900 a year. That is not an unconscionably large amount, but I wish to compare it with the $5 a month about which we debated for so long on the floor of the Senate for the needy old people. I understand that in conference that $5 has been reduced to $2.50 a month.

As the bill came to the Senate pensions would have been given free to widows of former judges, to the extent of $5,000 or $6,000 per year. The Senator has done a fine job in helping to bring this bill more nearly into conformity with the congressional retirement system, and I congratulate him.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EASTLAND

I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 11124, to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges.

The Senate amended the House-passed bill by increasing from 1½ percent to 3 percent the contributory amount required of Federal judges. The conferees concurred in this feature of the Senate amendment, which is now contained in the conference report.

The second item of conference was in relation to the right of a widow to obtain the annuity if a judge had failed to make deposits as required. The conference version allows the widow to accept the annuity with a reduction of 10 percent per year of the amount which the judge would have contributed to the fund after having paid in the 5-year mandatory amount had he made the total subsequent contributions. The conferees on the part of the Senate receded from this position and accepted the House version as amended.

The next item in conference by reason of the Senate amendment concerned subsection (g) of the bill. The House version provided that a judge who elected to bring himself within the purview of the statute was eligible after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service. The Senate version required that such service be as a judge of the United States, as defined in section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code. It further required that for this 5-year period contributions or deposits must have actually been made. The conferees agreed that the 5-year contributions should be made before a judge could be eligible to qualify for annuity, but also agreed that the 5-year payment should be of either judicial or civilian service, or both.

The next item in conference was in relation to the amendment of the Senate which provided that in the case of orphan children the amount payable to each orphan child should be not to exceed $480 per year. The conferees on the part of the House accepted this portion of the amendment.

The final item in conference applied to now existing widows. The House version of the bill made provision for existing widows of judges to participate as annuitants on the same basis as other widows, provided there was a 10 percent deduction of what their husbands would have contributed by reason of their allowable service. The Senate amendment struck the provision in regard to existing widows from the bill. The conferees agreed to reinstate the House provision with an amendment which would not require these widows to pay the 5-year mandatory contribution to be made by the judges which I have heretofore mentioned. This was necessitated by reason of the fact that the judge, now being deceased, could not make a contribution and that it would be unfair to require the widow to make the 5-year contribution before she could become eligible, particularly in light of the fact that she is subject to the 10-percent yearly reduction from her annuity to make up for what the judge would have contributed in order to become eligible.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What Federal judges are included?

Mr. EASTLAND. All United States judges.

Mr. LANGER. Are judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals included?

Mr. EASTLAND. All Federal judges are included.

Mr. LANGER. Does that include judges of the circuit court?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; they are United States judges.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, they hold office for life.

Mr. EASTLAND. They are all included.

Mr. LANGER. Are judges of the Court of Claims included?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Order No. 2596, Senate bill 2663.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2663) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be ctied as the "Area Redevelopment Act."

FINDINGS OF FACT

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level of prosperity and employment is vital to the best interests of the United States and that the existence of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in certain areas of the Nation is jeopardizing the health, standard of living, and general welfare of the Nation. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment within such areas by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as "the Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $17,500 per annum.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Government Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall be composed of the following members: The Administrator, as Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act, and the Administrator shall, in carrying out such duties, consult with such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof. Such Committee shall hold meetings at the call of the Chairman, and such meetings shall be held at least twice during each calendar year.

(b) The Administrator shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of 12 members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Administrator shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Administrator plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this act.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as "industrial redevelopment areas" those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. Any industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 12 percent of the labor force for the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which an application for assistance is made under this act, (2) 8 percent of the labor force during at least 15 months of the 18-month period immediately preceding such date, or (3) 6 percent of the labor force during at least 8 months in each of the 2 years immediately preceding such date, shall be designated an "industrial redevelopment area."

(b) In addition to those areas designated under subsection (a), the Administrator shall designate as "rural redevelopment areas" those rural areas within the United States (not exceeding at any one time 15 counties in any 1 State or 300 counties in the United States) in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income farm families, and a condition of substantial and persistent underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider among other relevant factors the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the farm families in each such area to the general levels of income in the same area, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of farm manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(e) As used in this act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator, upon determining that any area is a redevelopment area, shall appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a "local committee"), to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, commercial, industrial, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. In appointing such local committee, the Administrator shall include therein all members of existing local redevelopment committees who are willing to serve. Each local committee shall prepare plans and cost estimates, to the extent deemed desirable by it, for (1) the development of the resources of, and processing and marketing facilities in, the area which such committee represents, (2) the construction, rehabilitation, and alteration of industrial plants or other industrial and commercial facilities in such area, and (3) the purchase of machinery or equipment for use in such area, with a view to attracting new industries thereto and otherwise to stimulate economic activity therein. Each local committee shall enlist the support of local residents and private and public lending agencies in financing the carrying out of such plans. The Administrator shall, at the request of any local committee, make available to such committee such professional, technical, and other experts as may be necessary to enable such local committee properly to discharge its functions under this act.

(b) The Administrator may establish regional advisory committees to represent two or more redevelopment areas when he finds that the establishment of such committees will facilitate the carrying out of the purposes of this act. The members of such regional committees shal be appointed by the Administrator on the same basis as are members of local committees, and such regional committees shall cooperate with, and, to the extent possible, coordinate the activities of, the local committees within the regions represented by such regional committees.

(c) Of the sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available to the Administrator for the purpose of assisting the local or regional committees established under this section to defray their administrative expenses, but no part thereof shall be available for the purpose of paying salaries or traveling expenses of the members of such committees.

LOANS

SEC. 7. (a) Upon application approved by any local committee, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for industrial usage within the redevelopment area represented by such committee, and the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial or commercial plants, or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities, and the purchase of machinery or equipment for use, in such area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof; and

(4) the borrower will not cause a transferral to, or relocation in, any plant or facility under this section, of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. The maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan was made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 10 of this act, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, or more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which

such loan is made shall be supplied (1) by the State (including any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located, or (2) by one or more community or area organizations, or persons, firms or corporations within the redevelopment area in which such project is to be located, as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section: *Provided*, That in making any loan under this section with respect to an industrial redevelopment area, the Administrator shall require that not less than 5 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

(d) In making any loan under this section with respect to any plant or facility, the Administrator shall include in the loan agreement a provision that during the life of the loan the borrower shall not cause a transferral to, or relocation in, such plant or facility of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States. Such loan agreement shall further authorize the Administrator, in the event of a violation of the foregoing provision, to declare the unpaid balance of any such loan immediately due and payable, and, in default of payment, to proceed forthwith to enforce such loan agreement and the security thereon. For purposes of this subsection and subsection (a) (4) of this section a loan with respect to any plant or facility shall include a loan to assist in financing (1) the purchase or development of land to be utilized in connection with a plant or facility, (2) the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of a plant or facility, or (3) the purchase of machinery or equipment for use in a plant or facility.

(e) As used in this section, the term "borrower" includes any successor in interest to the borrower, or any agent, lessee or operating subcontractor thereof, or any person, firm, or corporation which directly or indirectly controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the borrower by reason of voting stock interest, common officers, directors or stockholders, voting trusts, or by any other direct or indirect means.

LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 8. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms; and

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. The maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan is made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 10 of this act, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, nor more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 9. (a) The Administrator may conduct studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which suhc grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute; and

(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section. The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 8 of this act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

(c) The Administrator shall by regulations provide for the supervision of the carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50 million for the purpose of making grants under this section.

FUNDS FOR LOANS

SEC. 10. To obtain funds for loans under this act, the Administrator may, with the approval of the President, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $225,-million. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated in every respect as public debt transactions of the United States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 11. Of the funds raised under section 10 of this act, not more than (1) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within industrial redevelopment areas; (2) $50 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within rural redevelopment areas, but the principal amount of loans from such fund which are outstanding at any one time within any one State shall not exceed $2,500,-000; and (3) $75 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for public facilities. Receipts arising from the repayment of any such loans shall be deposited in the fund from which such loan was made and shall be utilized for the purpose for which such fund was established.

PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

SEC. 12. Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government engaged in the procurement of any supplies or services for use by or on behalf of the United States shall—

(1) use its best efforts to award negotiated procurement contracts to contractors located within redevelopment areas to the extent procurement objectives will permit;

(2) where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas, if a substantial proportion of production on such negotiated contracts will

be performed within redevelopment areas and if such firms will contract for such portions of the procurement at prices no higher than those paid on the balance of such procurements;

(3) where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives, after the expiration of the period during which bids for any procurement are permitted to be submitted and if the lowest of such bids was submitted by a firm in an area other than a redevelopment area, negotiate with firms in redevelopment areas with a view to ascertaining whether any such firm will furnish the services or supplies with respect to which bids were theretofore submitted for an amount equal to, or less than, the amount of the lowest bid theretofore submitted for the furnishing of such services or supplies, and if any such firm can be found, award the contract for the furnishing of such services or supplies to such firm;

(4) assure that firms in redevelopment areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists will be given the opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualifed and on which small business joint-determinations have not been made, but whenever the number of firms on a bidders' list is exclusive, there shall be included a representative number of firms from redevelopment areas;

(5) in the event of tie bids on offers on any procurement, award the contract to the firm located in a redevelopment area, other things being equal;

(6) encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas; and

(7) cooperate with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government in achieving the objectives set out in this subsection.

INFORMATION

SEC. 13. The Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 14. In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000.

POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 15. In performing his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(2) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Administrator;

(3) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(4) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act;

(5) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this act, and the power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose;

(6) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this act; and

(7) establish such rules, regulations, and precedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 16. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this act, no further assistance shall be granted under this act with respect to such area, and, for the purposes of this act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining, for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeymen, and other job training needed in the locality.

RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 18. The Secretary of Labor shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located under which the Secretary shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing training for a new job. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding 13 weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 19. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3, of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, (2) the number and size of such contracts which were negotiated with such firms pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 12 of this act, and (3) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Administrator, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Administrator such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill—S. 2663—proposes the establishment of an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in industrial and rural depressed areas. The bill was reported from committee with broad bipartisan support of its basic objectives and provisions. Three minority Members have filed supplemental views in which they differ with the committee bill in two respects. Another member of the minority has filed individual views, while still another has submitted a minority report.

It is more than a decade since Congress declared it to be a policy of this Government to utilize its resources in order to establish conditions which would assure maximum employment throughout the United States. This was accomplished in the Employment Act of 1946.

During this period since the act was passed, the country has enjoyed economic growth and general prosperity. Many communities, however, have been plagued during most of the period with chronic unemployment. In addition, there are many rural areas throughout the Nation—of which, I am sorry to say, the South has more than its share—where a very low standard of living has prevailed throughout the years. The average per capita income in hundreds of these rural counties is less than a quarter that of the average income per person throughout the Nation.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility of the Federal Government to aid such areas is commonly acknowledged. This responsibility is in the interest of the areas which are subject to chronic unemployment and underemployment, and coincides also with the interests of the Nation. The fact is that these less fortunate areas exert a general drag upon the economy, and the Federal Government, in order to assure full prosperity for the Nation as a whole, should do all it can to eliminate pockets of unemployment and underemployment.

These views have been endorsed by all but one of the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Similar views have been expressed in the latest economic report of the President. In this report the President stated:

> The fate of distressed communities is a matter of national as well as local concern. * * * We should give serious thought to ways and means of extending prosperity to less flourishing sectors of the economy.

Our extensive hearings on this subject in connection with S. 2663 have indicated that a national policy to aid areas which are suffering from excessive unemployment and underemployment is long overdue. These communities cannot escape from the economic doldrums unless some Federal aid is extended to them.

At the end of my remarks I should like to insert a list of industrial and rural communities which might directly benefit from the proposed legislation.

S. 2663 is not regional legislation. It attempts to cope with a national problem and with unfortunate conditions which exist in many industrial and rural communities in a majority of the States. It should be stressed, however, that S. 2663 does not assume that the Federal Government will take over the total responsibility of rehabilitating distressed areas. On the contrary, we fully recognize that there is no substitute for self-help and that the initiative to rehabilitate a community must come from the residents in the area. We only propose that Federal help should supplement the needs of areas striving for rehabilitation.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE PROGRAM

Such a program must be tailor-made to fit the diverse needs of the various communities needing help. The bill proposes four types of programs in which the Federal Government would aid communities suffering from chronic unemployment and underemployment.

First. Loans: Experience has shown that many communities which embark on a rehabilitation program cannot attract sufficient capital to meet their needs. Capital in such areas is limited and is not as venturesome as it is in more prosperous communities. The area development program which we are proposing, therefore, provides for the establishment of two types of credit that would be extended to redevolpment communities:

(a) Loans that would help them in the establishment of industrial projects which would create additional jobs in these communities. The maximum that can be lent under this program is $150 million. One hundred million dollars may be extended to help industrial areas and $50 million to rural areas.

(b) Many of the poor communities lack the necessary public facilities which would make them attractive to new industry. The bill, therefore, provides for a revolving fund of $75 million which could be used to lend to these areas for the development of public facilities. It is recognized, however, that some communities are in such poor financial condition that they would not be in a position to obligate themselves to develop such facilities. The poorest communities will, therefore, be eligible to receive grants from the Federal Government. A maximum of $50 million is earmarked for the grants.

Except in cases of grants, the program requires that local capital participate in each case in promoting the industrial and public facilities projects. Even where grants are involved the program anticipates that only in the most extreme cases will the Federal Government finance the total cost of the project. As I have stated earlier, the program is based on the principle of self-help, and local participation is stressed throughout the program.

A major consideration in the minds of the supporters of this bill is that the proposed program not only would help rehabilitation of numerous local areas but also would contribute to economic expansion throughout the country. In no case can loans be made which would benefit a redevelopment area at the expense of another community in the country. Furthermore, the loans must be used for projects which would expand employment opportunities within the redevelopment area. Loans are not to be used to provide only temporary employment.

At present, many people in surplus-labor areas—whether industrial or rural—are obliged to go great distances or even to move permanently to another area to find jobs. The Area Redevelopment Program would help bring jobs to the communities where jobs are needed most and, therefore, reduce the need for migration.

Second. Training and retraining: In addition to the development of facilities, areas suffering from excessive unemployment and underemployment may not have sufficiently trained and skilled manpower resources to attract industry. The bill, therefore, provides that the Federal Government in partnership with State and local agencies would establish the necessary training facilities that new industry would require in the communities undertaking a program of redevelopment. Persons undergoing training would receive a subsistence payment equal to the average unemployment benefits in their respective States, if they are not otherwise eligible to receive unemployment benefits. It would be unrealistic to expect that persons who have been unemployed or underemployed for a long period of time could afford full-time training for new jobs unless they were provided some means of livelihood during the training period.

Third. Technical assistance: Market research and other technical information are needed by businessmen in order to secure potential customers. The program provides that such information would be made available to interested individuals in redevelopment areas.

Furthermore, many depressed areas have never realized their economic potential. The program, therefore, authorizes that technical aid be given to depressed areas which would help these communities to evaluate their needs and resources and would help them in furthering their economic growth.

Fourth. Procurement policies: Last, but not least, S. 2663 proposes that the Federal Government give special consideration in its procurement to areas suffering from chronic unemployment and underemployment. This can be achieved without any additional cost to the taxpayer. The bill urges Federal procurement agencies to award negotiated procurement contracts to firms located within redevelopment areas by permitting firms located in these areas to match the lowest bid made by companies located in more prosperous and fortunate communities. S. 2663 further encourages the awarding of contracts in the redevelopment areas by setting aside portions of procurement for negotiating exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas. Other things being equal, in the event of tie bids, the contract would be awarded to the firm located in a redevelopment area. Prime contractors are also encouraged to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas.

As I said, this can be accomplished without extra cost to the Government. Compassion for the suffering and struggles of persons in distressed areas is a compelling reason to give special con-

sideration to such areas in the procurement of supplies by the Federal Government.

ADMINISTRATION

The area redevelopment bill which we are proposing establishes a separate agency to administer the program. This was considered necessary since the program cuts across the various responsibilities of about a dozen separate agencies, none of which is geared by itself to fully carry out the program. I have stressed the need for active community participation in realizing the purposes of this program. This means that the program must receive the full support of the groups that are vitally concerned with the program; namely, agriculture, business and labor. It was, therefore, considered inadvisable to establish the agency as part of an existing department. Naturally, each of the existing departments is interested in furthering the common welfare, but the history of each of these departments shows clearly that it was created to advance largely the specific interest groups which it represents. The area redevelopment program goes beyond the improvement of business, labor and rural conditions; it is concerned with the total economic development of an area. It was, therefore, considered necessary to establish a new agency to carry out the area-redevelopment program. But in order to fully benefit from existing programs, the bill establishes a Government advisory committee to aid the Administrator of the program to carry out his responsibilities.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, we believe that the provisions of S. 2663 would benefit the total economy and not just a few selected areas or communities. The program deserves our immediate and wholehearted support. Such action would alleviate untold suffering and would help the people in the poorest areas to share in some measure in the ever-rising standard of living which should be the birthright of every American.

Mr. President, at this point I yield to the Senator from Arkansas who, I believe, desires to offer some amendments to the bill which I am prepared to accept.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer my amendments, identified as "7-23-56-A," and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a statement explaining them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendments and explanation are as follows:

On page 19, lines 6 through 8, strike out the material in parentheses.

On page 19, line 9, strike out the word "farm."

On page 19, line 10, insert after "persistent" the words "unemployment or."

On page 19, line 16, strike out the word "farm."

On page 19, line 18, strike out "same area" and insert in lieu thereof "United States."

On page 19, line 19, strike out the word "farm."

On page 23, beginning with line 8, strike out all through line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment."

On page 23, line 15, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "Subject to section 15 (5), the."

On page 24, beginning with line 21, strike out all through line 22 on page 25.

On page 26, line 15, strike out "and."

On page 26, line 18, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "; and."

On page 26, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment."

On page 26, line 21, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "Subject to section 15 (5), the."

On page 30, line 6, strike out "$225 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$275 million."

On page 31, line 9, strike out "$50 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$100 million."

On page 31, line 14, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6 million."

On page 35, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public."

On page 35, line 4, strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)."

On page 35, line 7, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

On page 35, line 16, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)."

On page 35, line 24, insert after "assigned to" the words "or held by."

On page 35, line 24, insert after "him" the words "and all legal and equitable rights accruing to him."

On page 36, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this act, for additional periods not to exceed 10 years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan."

On page 36, line 3, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)."

On page 36, line 10, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)."

On page 36, line 14, strike out "this act, and the" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "this act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise as in the case of mortgages assigned to the Administrator. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Administrator as a result of loans made under this act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The."

On page 36, line 21, after the word "purpose" insert the following: "without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney."

On page 36, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 7 and 8 of this act."

On page 36, line 22, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(9)."

On page 37, line 4, strike out "and."

On page 37, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

"(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, procure the temporary (not in excess of 6 months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classifications laws, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $50 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and."

On page 37, line 5, strike out "(7)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)."

On page 39, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 19. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security thereof, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Administrator, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Administrator (A) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (B) with intent to defraud the Administrator or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Administrator makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Administrator, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (C) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Administrator, or (D) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Administrator which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Administrator shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 20. No loan shall be made by the Administrator under this act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Administrator the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Administrator for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of 2 years after any assistance is rendered by the Administrator to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within 1 year prior

thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Administrator occupying a position or engaging in activities with which the Administrator shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this act."

On page 39, line 24, strike out "SEC. 19" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 21."

Page 40, line 18, strike out "SEC. 20" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 22."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO S. 2663

The amendments to S. 2663 consist of 3 principal substantive amendments, and a number of technical amendments based on the Small Business Act and similar statutes.

DEFINITION OF RURAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

The principal change made in section 5 (b) would be to eliminate the arbitrary limitation of rural redevelopment areas to 300 counties in the United States and to 15 counties in any one State.

The need of a rural area for redevelopment under the bill is entirely unrelated to counties and county lines. Some States have large counties, others have small counties. In all respects, counties are inappropriate factors to be considered.

The limitations on the number of counties in each State would have served to prevent undue concentration of the program in one or a few States. This same result is accomplished by the limitation in section 11 on the amount of loans in any one State from the fund established for projects in rural redevelopment areas.

The definition of rural redevelopment areas would also be changed to permit consideration of unemployment, as well as underemployment, and to permit consideration of all low-income families in rural areas, without limitation to low-income farm families. In addition, the relation of the income levels in the area to general levels of income in the United States would be taken into consideration.

These changes would permit the administrator to take into consideration, in designating these rural areas for redevelopment, the entire economy of the area, including villages and towns, and also mining and small industrial areas located in these rural areas.

TRANSFER OR RELOCATION OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The amendments would delete the finding by the Administrator required by section 7 (a) (4) that the borrower will not cause a transferral to or relocation in, any plant under this section of business operations otherwise conducted by the borrower so as to effect a reduction in employment in any other area in the United States. It would also eliminate the requirement of section 7 (d) and (e) that the borrower must covenant, in the loan agreement, that he and his successors will not cause such a transfer or relocation of business operations as long as the loan is outstanding.

These requirements are so strict as to raise a question whether any loans could be made, either in industrial or in rural redevelopment areas. They would have the result of freezing economic activities, subject to the penalty of foreclosure of the mortgage if a reduction in employment of a single person were to result 10 or 20 years after the loan was made.

AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR LOANS

Under the bill as reported, the Administrator would be authorized to borrow up to $225 million from the Secretary of the Treasury to establish three revolving funds: $100 million for loans in industrial redevelopment areas; $50 million for loans in rural redevelopment areas, limited to $2,500,000 in any State; and $75 million for loans for public facilities.

The amendments would increase the total to $275 million, and the revolving funds for rural redevelopment areas to $100 million, with a ceiling of $6 million for any one State.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

The findings required in sections 7 (a) and 8 (a) for making loans for private or public facilities (in either industrial or rural redevelopment areas) would be changed by the amendments to include a finding that "there is a reasonable expectation of repayment" of the loan. This is similar to, but less stringent than, the comparable requirement imposed by the Small Business Act of 1953.

The powers of the Administrator would be increased in a number of respects, based on the powers granted the Small Business Administrator:

1. A new section 15 (1) would authorize him to adopt a seal, and would provide specific authority to employ persons, to provide bonds for them and to pay the costs of notaries.

2. A new section 15 (5) would authorize him to extend loans for as much as 10 years beyond the statutory period to assist in their liquidation.

3. He would be authorized to obtain deficiency judgments, and to obtain hazard insurance and services and supplies costing up to $1,000 without following the advertising requirements of Revised Statutes, section 3709 in connection with property obtained by him as the result of loans under the act.

4. He would be authorized to obtain property necessary or appropriate to the conduct of his loaning activities under sections 7 and 8.

5. He would be authorized to employ consultants and to pay them up to $50 a day plus $15 per diem.

A new section 18 would be added, based on the Small Business Act, imposing penalties on wilfully overvaluing securities or making false statements to the Administrator in connection with his activities, and also imposing penalties on employees who commit certain improper acts, including embezzling, making false entries, receiving improper profits or fees in connection with the agency's transactions, or improperly releasing information about the agency's activities, or speculating in securities of concerns receiving assistance from the agency.

A new section 19 would be added, also based on the Small Business Act, which would require any business enterprise receiving a loan to certify the names of the expediters it employed, and to agree not to hire, for 2 years after the loan is made, any agency employee having a position involving discretion with respect to granting assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding that the Senator's amendments will be considered en bloc?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, Mr. President. I understand the committee is disposed to accept the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the committee has reviewed these amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD instead of being stated. I understand the chairman of the committee is willing to accept them.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. Although I am willing to accept one of the amendments of the Senator from Arkansas, I am reluctant to accept his amendment dealing with Government contracts for defense areas. I think the other amendment of the Senator from Arkansas improves the bill by providing for additional assistance to rural areas, which I believe need assistance greatly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are two amendments. Amend-B must also be offered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief explanation of that amendment.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

The bill, as reported, in section 12, beginning on page 31, requires that Government agencies engaged in procurement shall:

1. Use their best efforts to award negotiated contracts to contractors in areas "to the extent procurement objectives will permit."

2. "Where deemed appropriate" set aside portions of procurements for negotiation with firms in areas, at no higher prices than others.

3. "Where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives," let contractors in areas meet or better low bids from nonarea contractors.

4. Assure that firms in areas on bidders lists get chance to submit bids on all procurements they are qualified for.

5. In the event of tied bids, and other things equal, award contract to area.

6. Encourage subcontracting in areas.

7. Cooperate in achieving the objectives.

This amendment would strike this entire Section 12. The purpose of the bill apparently is to create new employment opportunities. This purpose is not accomplished by shifting procurement from one area to another. No new jobs are created by this practice, and, on the contrary, it will benefit one area to the detriment of another.

Inevitably the use of procurement for relief purposes makes it more expensive. It makes procurement subject to political determinations. It puts small firms at a disadvantage in that it makes it more difficult for them to bid. It affords great opportunity for favoritism.

The use of the Government's procurement authority to channel contracts to redevelopment areas is entirely inconsistent with the Government's financial interests. It is also inconsistent with the ordinary principles of business. It is obviously to the best interests of the Government and the taxpayer to buy the best product at the lowest price. It is also the normal and reasonable expectation of a manufacturer who makes the best product at the lowest price to have a chance to make the sale.

There are occasions when departures are made from this principle. The Congress has come to the conclusion that the importance of favoring and encouraging small businesses is so great as to warrant special consideration for them. Section 12 of the bill would hurt small businesses. In certain cases it has proved necessary to use the procurement authority to promote the national defense, for example to encourage the production of strategic minerals and to promote dispersal. But with the exception of such primary considerations as small business and national defense, the use of the procurement authority for anything but the economical and efficient procurement of needed supplies is entirely wrong.

The most objectionable provision in the section is paragraph 3. This provides that, if the low bidder on a procurement is not from a redevelopment area, the procuring may negotiate with firms from redevelopment areas after the bidding has closed and may award the contract to such a bidder at the low bid or a lower figure. At first glance, it might seem that this would not cost the Government anything. But it is frequently expensive to prepare and submit a bid. And the immediate result of this provision would be to reduce the number of bidders. Re-

sponsible bidders would not go to the expense of preparing a bid, and attempting to squeeze the last cent out in order to make the bid the lowest, if a bidder from a redevelopment area can then come in and take the order at that price.

While paragraph 3 is the most objectionable provision, the others are almost equally undesirable. Paragraph 2 provides for set-asides for such firms. This would conflict with set-asides for small business. Paragraph 4 requires that firms in redevelopment areas must be given an opportunity to submit bids on all procurements for which they are qualified, however much this may delay the procurement, and however high their bids may have been in the past. Paragraph 5 provides that all tie bids must be awarded to firms from these areas.

All these provisions assume that the firms in redevelopment areas will not be able to get the business in the ordinary way, by submitting low bids, with the resulting benefit to the taxpayers. All of these provisions, by interfering with the normal and proper procurement rule of buying the best article at the lowest price, will result in an undetermined subsidy to these firms, at the taxpayers' expense.

It is highly questionable that there is any statutory authority for the present system of awarding contracts to so-called depressed areas. In the past, I understand, the defense establishments have relied on language in the Defense Production Act. However, the Director of the ODM, Mr. Flemming, has testified that act does not provide such authority. This section of the bill would give legislative sanction to the present system and extend it to permit "bid matching." If procurement is to be used as a means of affording relief, there may well be other objectives which have an equal claim. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare normally would not have jurisdiction over procurement. I would assume that would be a matter which would be handled by the Armed Services Committee so far as military procurement is concerned and perhaps other committees for nondefense procurement. This is a very broad subject that ought to be considered thoroughly and not merely from the standpoint of the commendable desire to assist employment.

The section is inconsistent with the basic principle of the bill, which is to create new business and employment opportunities. The taxpayers of the entire Nation, including those in the so-called depressed areas, would be better served by following ordinary procurement rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second amendment be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

On page 31, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 18 on page 33; and renumber the following sections and all cross references accordingly.

On page 40, beginning with "the number" on line 9, strike out all through "and, (3)" on line 11.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, would it be asking too much to have the Senator tell the rest of us what the amendment provides?

Mr. KENNEDY. The second amendment strikes out the portion of the bill dealing with the channeling of Government procurement contracts into distressed areas which was completely objectionable to my Republican colleagues. It was a provision of the bill which I thought desirable; but in order to expedite the passage of the bill through Congress, I am willing to accept the amendment.

I believe it was the purpose of the Senator from New Jersey to offer a similar amendment. On behalf of the Democratic members of the committee, I accept the amendment which would strike out this provision.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator tell us how the amendment helps rural areas?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, this is the first amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. First, it provides for an increase from $50 million to $100 million in the loan fund to be available for rural areas.

Second, the original bill, before it was amended by the Senator from Arkansas, provided a limitation of 300 counties in the United States and 15 in any single State which would be available for assistance under the rural development program. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, there would be no restriction on the number of counties which could receive assistance.

There is however, a limitation of $6 million which can be loaned in each State under the rural development program.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in section 3, provision is made for the setting up of an organization to be known as the Area Redevelopment Administration. Under the bill a separate administrator is to be appointed by the President at a salary of $17,500 per annum.

The administration objects to such an administrator acting outside the regular departments of the Government. The administration says there is no necessity for such a position because the work will be conducted as functions of the Departments of Labor and Commerce. Therefore, I submit amendments which I should like to have read. Then I will explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from New Jersey will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, it is proposed to strike out lines 10 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter called the Secretary) shall establish within the Department of Commerce, an Area Redevelopment Administration headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the administration of this act as the Secretary may prescribe.

Strike out, wherever it appears, the word "Administrator" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment is very easy to understand. The bill as it comes to the Senate from the committee contains a provision to which the minority on the committee object. It provides:

In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as "the Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $17,500 per annum.

In other words, the Area Redevelopment Administration would be entirely separate from the other departments of the Government.

After conferring with members of the administration and of the departments concerned with the matter, and with the present Administrator of these matters, we have a picture which indicates that at present the Department of Labor determines where the so-called depressed areas are. The Department of Labor then turns the matter over to the Department of Commerce, which takes care of whatever development is needed in those areas to restore employment and to bring conditions back to a normal status.

So my amendment simply provides:

In order to carry out the purposes of this act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter called the Secretary) shall establish within the Department of Commerce, an area redevelopment administration headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the administration of this act as the Secretary may prescribe.

The question is whether the Area Redevelopment Administration shall be within the Department of Commerce or within some other existing department of the Government, or shall be a separate administration, as is provided in the bill.

The minority members of the committee objected to the bill as reported, which provided for a separate administrator. Three of the minority Senators joined in offering the amendment I have submitted, and the other two expressed their approval of the amendment in separate views.

Mr. President, this is a very fundamental question in our whole organizational setup. I shall read from the supplemental views in the report, at page 50:

The bill—

As it comes to the Senate—

would assign the administration of the area redevelopment program to a new and independent agency established by the bill. This runs counter to the current trend toward incorporating new undertakings such as this within existing departments or agencies. This trend is sound and is steadily gaining

wider public acceptance. The Hoover Commission reports have performed an important public service in crystallizing this view and fostering its adoption. More experience in this matter has been gained since the days when it was popular to create a new agency almost any time the Government undertook a new operation or function. Where, as in this case, the functions to be performed are substantially related to the work of a department, it would be much more efficient to set up the administration within that department. This was recognized in S. 2892, the administration's bill—

Which I, together with some cosponsors, introduced earlier this year—

which proposed putting the area redevelopment program in the Department of Commerce, which is already engaged in similar activities, in the Business and Defense Services Administration. Interdepartmental and interagency cooperation can then be handled smoothly and effectively through the advisory committee consisting of Cabinet officers and heads of independent agencies.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am offering the amendment to put this matter back where it has been functioning successfully.

Because this is very fundamental, and the administration feels very strongly about the matter of reorganization, and believes that this agency should be within the departments of the Government, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I think it would be a mistake to accept the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, for a very fundamental reason. The program provides substantial assistance to rural areas. There is no legitimate reason why control over that particular program should be placed in the Department of Commerce.

In addition, it involves very heavily matters in which labor is interested. I think a department which has a great responsibility to assist commerce is not the proper agency to assign a program in which labor is tremendously interested and which can have significant effects on labor.

Although there are in the program substantial elements which will be of assistance to business, I do not see any reason why those elements of the program should take precedence over the rights of farmers, labor, and the general public.

Therefore, the bill provides for an independent agency to be headed by an administrator appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The administrator's authority should not be taken away from him and placed in the Department of Commerce under the control of an Assistant Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say that the Secretary of Labor has ample responsibilities here. He is on the advisory council. The entire Government must function in this matter through the joint operation of the departments with which the Secretary of Labor must confer.

The Secretary of Labor does not feel that this Commission should be in the Labor Department. The Labor Department determines where the areas concerned are located. That is done, and should be done, through the Department of Labor.

The matter then goes to the Department of Commerce, which is able to set up, through industry, and through whatever other assistance is necessary, distress relief areas.

It seemed to the administration and to the minority members of the committee that this was a sound organizational setup.

Mr. KENNEDY. Since under the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas $100 million is to be expended for rural areas, I do not see why the program should not be in the Department of Agriculture, and I think the Department of Labor might have equal claim to it.

Because of this diversity of interest involved, because of our desire to give the Administrator broad authority, and because we wanted the Administrator to be appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, the bill provides that the Area Redevelopment Administration shall be a separate agency, and therefore able to speak for farmers, businessmen, and labor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the bill, as amended by the Fulbright amendment, provides $100 million support for rural areas, and $100 million support for industrial areas?

Mr. KENNEDY. There is more than that provided. There is an additional $75 million for loans to communities for the construction of public facilities and $50 million for grants to communities for such facilities. There is, however, a balance between money made available for industrial purposes and money made available for rural purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say also that the problem in rural areas is a problem of small business and individually owned businesses and entrepreneurs who are trying to get started and trying to make new products and trying to get along. The amendment offered on the Republican side would place control over the tiny, new elements of business in a man who has done more than anybody else to encourage the growth of giant combinations of business, who has never recognized the fact that small business should ever exist, who has established one of the worst records in the history of the United States for favoritism to huge enterprises and combinations of giant organizations.

The amendment would put at the mercy of Sinclair Weeks, whose failures are known to every Member of the Senate, this program by which he would be able to administer chloroform to what little remaining small business we have in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. He is 100 percent correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that, as I understand the bill, and it was my privilege to be a cosponsor, it provides for an area redevelopment administration, and an advisory committee is provided for. On that advisory committee will serve the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of the General Services Administration, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and others.

The struggle which is now taking place is similar to that which took place when we adopted the Small Business Administration bill. The question then before the Senate was whether or not we would put the Small Business Administration under the control of the Secretary of Commerce or make it an independent agency. We decided in the Senate, by vote, that we would leave the agency as an independent agency.

I desire to say that had the agency been put under the Department of Commerce, it would have been just as useful as a dodo insofar as assistance to small business is concerned.

In this instance we have an opportunity to help areas which need help, and the bill is designed to do that. If we started to divide up the measure on the basis of which group in the society is to be represented in the Cabinet, as the Senator from Massachusetts said, let us put it under the Department of Agriculture. The agency to do the job is an independent agency, where there is some imagination, where there is some perspective, where there is some drive. The Secretary of Commerce is not noted these days for any great push in aiding commerce, either intrastate or interstate. That program is rather static. I gather that what is needed is not to depress further areas which are already depressed, but to do something to lift up the depressed areas.

I support the position of the Senator from Massachusetts. I hope the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey will be rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that the Senate is operating under controlled time. The Senator from New Jersey has 11 minutes remaining to him. The Senator from Massachusetts has 8 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I should like to commend the able Senator from Massachusetts and other members of his committee for doing such fine work in formulating and reporting the bill. I should like to ask the Senator a question. As a matter of fact, did not the subject matter receive the most careful study, not only by the Senator's committee, but by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, by both of those committees. The Committee on the Joint Economic Report made an exhaustive

report on the question of loans. As I recall, the Senator from Alabama introduced a bill on that subject some time ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Joint Economic Report which made the studies. Numerous recommendations were made, many of which are incorporated in the bill.

I am particularly pleased that the provision was put in the bill which refers to rendering technical assistance to rural counties of low-income areas. My colleagues will remember, when I introduced my bill in January 1955, there was contained in it a provision which called for technical assistance to 500 rural counties of low income. There are 1,000 such counties in the United States, I believe, under the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, that program will be carried out under the terms of the bill. I think the Senator is right in resisting the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield back the time remaining to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to yield first to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the bill was introduced on July 28, 1955. I should like to know why its consideration has been deferred until the closing hours of the session, when it is apparent that the House will refuse to give any consideration to it at this time. Why are we devoting this time to the bill in the closing hours of the session?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am afraid that is something the Senator will have to ask of the leadership on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not presume to speak for the House. I do not know what the House will do. I hope that by the Senate's acting on the bill, the House will decide to act on the bill. It has not been acted on previously for the same reason that many other bills have not been acted on yet. First, the bill was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It went to that committee. Many bills that have been introduced have not reached the calendar. There are some bills on the President's program which have not been scheduled for consideration at the present time. We hope that the Senate will pass the bill. Then what the House does will be its own responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. I have full confidence in the ability of Mr. Sinclair Weeks to carry out this or any other program. I say that in answer to the Senator from Oklahoma, who expressed lack of confidence in the Secretary of Commerce's taking advantage of any program to protect small-business men, the Senator from Oklahoma attacked the amendment on the ground that the Secretary of Commerce was not interested in the problems of small-business men.

I point out to him that the Secretary of Commerce whom he attacked is the same Secretary of Commerce who recently denounced the bill sponsored on the Democratic side of the aisle, which proposed to give twenty or thirty million dollars to one shipping company. With the support of the Secretary of Commerce, that bill was overwhelming defeated by the Senate. It was later brought back by the majority side and is again on the Senate Calendar. It is a bill which, I am confident, if it is brought up again, will again be overwhelming defeated. I refer to the bill which would compel the Government of the United States to buy 20 ships from a certain company at a price averaging $1,600,000 each, when the record will show that these same ships were originally sold by the Government to this company about 12 years ago at an average price of about $800,000 each. In addition the sponsor of the bill proposed that the company be given a tax exemption on its ill-gotten gains. That bill was opposed by Sinclair Weeks, and I commend him for his opposition.

I do not think anyone on this side of the aisle has to apologize for the Secretary of Commerce, and I venture to say that no one on that side of the aisle will again attempt to defend this raid on the Treasury of the United States which was stopped by the help we received from the Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent, and, if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is also necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Curtis	McCarthy
Allott	Dirksen	Mundt
Barrett	Duff	Payne
Beall	Dworshak	Purtell
Bender	Flanders	Saltonstall
Bennett	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Bush	Ives	Thye
Butler	Jenner	Watkins
Capehart	Knowland	Wiley
Carlson	Kuchel	Williams
Case, N. J.	Malone	Young
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	

NAYS—43

Anderson	Humphrey, Minn.	McClellan
Bible	Humphreys, Ky.	McNamara
Clements	Jackson	Monroney
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Kennedy	Neuberger
Ervin	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Frear	Laird	Pastore
Fulbright	Langer	Russell
Gore	Lehman	Scott
Green	Long	Smathers
Hayden	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hennings	Mansfield	Stennis
Hill	Murray	Symington
Holland	Potter	Wofford

NOT VOTING—10

Byrd	Kefauver	Robertson
Chavez	Millikin	Welker
Daniel		
George		

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). On this vote the yeas are 43, and the nays are 43. Since the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey to the committee amendment has not received a majority vote of the Senate, the amendment to the amendment is rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, after line 24, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to add a new subsection, as follows:

Provided further, That no loan, grant or other financial assistance shall be authorized as provided by this act if the proposed project, plant or facility is for the rendition of a service to the public, for which, if rendered by an individual, partnership or private corporation, the rates or charges would be subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless there shall first be a report or finding by such State regulatory body that said service being rendered to the public in the area served by the proposed project, plant, or facility is inadequate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in both sections 8 and 9 of the proposed legislation there are proposals which would enable the Federal Government to get into public business, such as power and other businesses of that type. This amendment would prevent any financial assistance for any proposed public facility rendering service to the public of such kind.

I am greatly disturbed about the entire bill, but I do not want any avenues left open whereby the Federal Government can get into any business. That is why I offer the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I will accept the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona is very grateful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield back my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield back all time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 23, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

Such loans authorized under this section may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis. No direct loans shall be made under this section unless the Administrator shall determine that a participation is not available upon reasonable terms; and no immediate participation shall be purchased unless he shall determine that a deferred participation is not available upon reasonable terms.

On page 23, line 13, after "loan" it is proposed to insert "made or participated in."

On page 23, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "such" and before "shall" insert "(other than a participation)."

On page 23, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "making any loan" and insert in lieu thereof "granting any financial assistance."

On page 23, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "loan is made" and insert in lieu thereof "assistance is granted."

On page 24, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "making any loan" and insert in lieu thereof "granting any assistance."

On page 24, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "loan is made" and insert in lieu thereof "assistance is granted."

On page 24, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "participation" and insert in lieu thereof "financial contribution."

On page 25, between lines 7 and 8 it is proposed to insert the following:

The Administrator shall include in any participation agreement entered into under this section involving any loan with respect to any plant, facility, or equipment appropriate provisions to insure compliance with the requirements of this subsection.

On page 30, line 2, after "loans", it is proposed to insert "(including participations in loans)."

On page 31, line 8, after "loans" it is proposed to insert "(including participations in loans)."

On page 31, line 10, after "loans" it is proposed to insert "(including participations in loans)."

On page 31, line 12, before "loans" it is proposed to insert "such."

On page 31, it is proposed to strike out lines 17 and 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "any such loans shall be deposited in the fund applicable to such loan and shall be utilized."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the content and purpose of my amendment.

Present section 7 (a) of S. 2663 authorizes the Administrator to make certain loans but no provision is made for the Administration to participate with private lending institutions in making such loans. The question, therefore, may be raised as to whether the language of present section 7 (a) precludes the making of participation loans. Under similar circumstances, Congress deemed it advisable to amend section 207 (b) of the Small Business Act (1955 amendments) to provide specific authority to make participation loans in connection with the Small Business Administration disaster-loan program.

The language incorporated in the suggested amendment is similar to that contained in sections 207 (a) and (b) of the Small Business Act. The inclusion in that act of this special authority to participate in making loans with private financing institutions has enabled the Small Business Administration completely to avoid any charge that this Government agency is competing with private banks or other lending organizations. Thus, during the last fiscal year, more than 70 percent of the loans made by SBA were made in participation with banks.

S. 2663, in its present form, virtually precludes the participation of private lending institution in the programs established under the bill. Section 7 (c) provides that funds equal to 10 to 25 percent of the aggregate cost of any project must be supplied by either the State or by a community organization or private concern within the development area. However, if such funds are supplied as a loan, any security for the loan must be subordinated to the Administration's loan and may not be repaid until the Administration's loan has been repaid in full. These conditions may well preclude private financing sources from supplying in the form of a loan any of this portion of the project's cost.

When the requirements of section 7 (c) have been met then under 7 (b) the Administration is authorized to make a loan but the amount of the loan is limited to 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project.

It is possible under the present bill for private lending institutions to supply additional funds toward the aggregate cost of the project. However, if a loan from the Administration is necessary, then it would appear that the private financing institution and the Administration would be in direct competition with each other as to the amount of financing they would be willing to supply and, more important, their security position after the loan is made. Since, traditionally, the Government in its lending programs has been reluctant to accept a subordinate security position, it would appear that unless the Government were authorized to participate with private lending institutions, the participation of private concerns would be discouraged.

The new language would not only permit the Administration to participate with private lending institutions when the Administrator found it feasible to do so but also would eliminate the element of competition between private and Government lending sources. Under a participation program, private loans to cover the cost of the project could be encouraged. If they were made on a deferred participation basis, the participation agreement would, in effect, be a guarantee of the private financing without any direct, immediate spending of Government funds.

Inclusion in the bill of authority to participate with private lenders does not in any way tie the hands of the Administrator. If private capital is available for these projects the Administrator may utilize it to the maximum extent on a fair and equitable basis. If it is not available, the Administrator may make a direct loan without it.

Mr. President, I ask consideration of the amendment, which extends into this new undertaking principles already adopted in the Small Business Administration, and permits a maximum use of private funds instead of Government funds.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment has not been printed. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. It has not been printed.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is a very complicated amendment. As I understand, it provides that no action can be taken by the Administrator until there has been an attempt made to get not only a direct loan but also a deferred participation loan. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; those elements in the present law persist.

Mr. KENNEDY. I spent a good deal of time working on other amendments which the Senator offered to the bill, but I must say to him that the amendment he now offers would be a most unfortunate amendment of the program provided for by the pending bill. I hope the Senator's amendment will not be adopted, even though I understand that he is very eager to exhaust every method of securing private capital before allowing a governmental loan. I should regret to see the Senate adopt the amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. We have had experience with the proposed procedure in the Small Business Administration.

Mr. KENNEDY. From what I know of the Senator's amendment, I understand it would provide that no action could be taken by the administrator until there had been an attempt made either to get a direct loan or deferred participation. I am afraid it would result in a weakening of the program by introducing burdensome delays and red tape; therefore, I would regret to have the amendment adopted.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from

Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce to the Senate that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who had intended to propose an amendment to the bill no longer plans to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wish to say that I believe we will regret this sort of legislation. I cannot help but believe it is wrong. All we do is to take from one section of the country and give to another, and to throw people out of work in one section, and give employment to people in another section. It is like taking money out of one pocket, and putting it into another. I shall vote against this sort of legislation, because I do not believe it is good legislation and because I do not believe it is in the best interest of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the extension of Federal functions in the manner and to the degree proposed by Senate bill 2663 constitutes an unwarranted invasion of private rights and is premised upon the faulty hypothesis that Federal intervention is the only alternative and sole redemption to the problem of so-called distressed areas.

I am opposed to the type of relief program suggested by this legislation. I disagree with the implied assumption of the advocates of this bill that economic reverses in certain areas of our country constitute either a critical or a permanent danger. Such conditions as are intended to be met by Senate bill 2663 are perfectly normal to the economic cycle of American enterprise, and, contrary to the apparent thinking of the proponents of this legislation, their final relief lies in the continued application of individual incentive and personal initiative. The unseating of this principle by appeals to governmental beneficence can only aggravate the problem and, indeed, negate the very foundations of the American economy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the whole history of this country's development refutes the contention of those who would invoke extreme Federal remedies in such situations. In the West, for instance, we have experienced the "boom" development of certain areas, only to realize, at some later date when the economic sources were dissipated, the collapse of whole communities, which exist today only as "ghost towns." During such transitions, our people did not seek governmental assistance for the artificial stimulation of areas whose economic wells had run dry. They accepted the tribulations of their ventures with stout hearts and strong backs, just as, in the beginning, they accepted their triumphs. They look, even today, upon these shadows of their history as a reminder of the opportunities which were then available to them, and as an inspiration for future achievements.

It is not too difficult to understand the psychology behind S. 2663, however, for we have reached an unfortunate stage in our Country's progress where we find the time-honored virtues of incentive and self-sufficiency being supplanted by the easier maxim of "let the Government do it." Hence, I keenly suspect that the fear of unemployment in America is not so much a genuine reaction of working people as it is a phobia afflicting certain politicians and pseudoliberal, left-wing theorizers, who would substitute for our free enterprise system the awful specter of the planned, super-state.

This legislation is based on the theory that the Federal Government must act. such a conclusion is not only contrary to the real facts of the unemployment problem, but is completely at variance with the potential of private capital which is actively seeking places of investment. At every turn, however, the free enterprise system is being thwarted in its desire to help the country and save itself.

Mr. President, to a great extent, then, unemployment pockets persist today because, instead of seeking jobs, too many Americans are letting jobs seek them. Thus, to a degree, the efforts of the "big Government planners" have been successful. The American psychology has been distorted and our citizens have become so afraid of unemployment that, in their fearful irrationality, inspired by the planners, they have succumbed to the stagnated belief that the former incentives and opportunities no longer exist and that they must depend upon the Federal Government for survival.

Nothing could be more fallacious, and nothing could be more contrary to the prescribed function of the Congress than to enact legislation giving impetus to this negative, defeatist concept. Economically, we do not have to have these distressed areas in America; so if anyone wonders why we have over 150 of them in this booming economy, it is clearly because somebody does not want the free-enterprise system to succeed, and the subsequent psychology of fear is keeping them in existence.

If it is the ultimate sense of the Senate at this time to pass legislation to alleviate the more desperate problems in this field, however, I propose that such action that is taken be as consistent as possible with the economic structure which we are endeavoring to support. The prescriptions of S. 2663 are completely antithetical to this objective. The recommendations of the administration, on the other hand, which are embodied in S. 2892, which was introduced by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, far more accurately reflect the true problem involved and the remedies which can justifiably be applied toward its solution. The administration's approach is one of encouragement, through the greatest kind of participation by private enterprise, with Government grants only as a last resort. Therefore, I believe, if we must have legislation in this instance, that S. 2892, not the present bill, S. 2663, is the approach which should be adopted.

Mr. President, I wish to warn Members of the Senate and to warn the people of the United States of the words that someone in gone-by history spoke—I do not remember who it was—to the effect that people do not lose their liberties all at once, but they lose them a little bit at a time.

Mr. President, in this country we have come to accept too readily the thesis that we can meddle with our free-enterprise system and not destroy the freedom we intend to protect.

Mr. President, I intend to rise at every opportunity to try to defeat those who are endeavoring to destroy the last bastion of freedom in this world—the American private-enterprise system.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the sponsors of this bill a question. I notice there is a limitation on the extent to which rural areas may benefit from this bill. May I ask if there is any limitation on the extent to which industrial areas may be benefited?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment which I offered, and which was accepted, limited that situation, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. What does it do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It removes the limitation on rural areas.

Mr. AIKEN. Otherwise, without the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, this would have been a bill decentralizing industry in rural areas. It would require redevelopment of existing industrial areas where there has been more than 18 percent unemployment for a 15-month period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. It would have provided assistance to the 300 lowest income rural areas in the country. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas took off the limitation of 300.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator feel that the rural areas would have equal advantage with the industrial areas?

Mr. KENNEDY. No; the Senator is completely wrong. It provides for an equal amount with reference to the rural and industrial areas. It strikes out the provision which was open to question and which would have prevented any migration from one area to another.

Mr. AIKEN. Does it not still require the development of old industrial areas, even though they may be in heavily populated areas and subject to attack?

Mr. KENNEDY. It does not refer to that question at all. It provides loans to an area suffering from critical unemployment, but it does not do anything about industrial migration.

Mr. AIKEN. I wanted to make sure that we are not acting on a bill that would prevent limiting the development of decentralization.

Mr. KENNEDY. This bill does not deal with that question at all. The Senator from Arkansas would not have

offered the amendment in regard to decentralization, I am sure, if it provided otherwise.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree that the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas makes the bill look considerably different.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

CONGRESS VOTES FOR FREE TRADE TO DESTROY AMERICAN WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Congress voted, in 1934, to destroy the American workingmen and investors. As a result the legislation proposed tonight is inevitable on account of that policy we have followed for 22 years.

The Secretary of State testified before the Senate Finance Committee last year, when the bill H. R. 1 was before the Senate Finance Committee, to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, that it was to be expected that some industries would suffer, that there would be depressed areas, and that he favored Congress appropriating money to reimburse investors and to furnish transportation for working men and women to move from a depressed area to another area where they might find jobs.

CONGRESS TRANSFERRED ALL CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

That 1934 Trade Agreements Act was first passed in 1934 for 3 years as an emergency measure, but has been continually renewed and for 3 years in 1955 to June 14, of 1958, they called it "Reciprocal Trade," although the catch phrase did not occur in the legislation.

Only 15 Senators out of 96 Members of this august body voted against its extension.

The Congress by that act transferred the constitutional responsibility of the legislative body to the President, to regulate foreign trade and the national economy—and by that act gave him full authority, according to the Secretary of State, to transfer that responsibility to any nation on earth under the auspices of any organization he might "spearhead."

So, in 1947, he caused to be organized the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, to be located at Geneva. Thirty-five nations of which we are 1—each with 1 vote are proceeding to divide our markets among them.

It might just as well have been located in Moscow or Peking—and still could be removed to either of those areas if the President so desired.

The Congress is helpless unless the act is repealed or allowed to expire on June 14, 1958.

THE ITO AND IOTC

Later, the International Trade Organization came on, and the Congress did not accept it. The International Office of Trade Cooperation will die in the House with the close of this Congress.

However, I invite attention to the fact that it means nothing when Congress does not approve of these organizations. Since it approved the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—and by that action gave the President full authority to establish the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva.

DRIVING AMERICAN FIRMS AND INVESTORS ABROAD

So, Mr. President, Congress established a policy of driving American firms and investors abroad, and by driving these firms and investors out of their established American areas deliberately caused the depressed areas. Congress itself then caused the depressed areas, which it now seeks to alleviate through the further appropriation of the taxpayers' money.

FINANCE COMMITTEE CONFERENCE ON TEXTILES

Our Finance Committee had a 3-hour conference with the Chairman of the Tariff Commission as to what we should do to cause him to make a full investigation to determine what was the matter with the textile industry. Any 10-year-old schoolboy could tell us what is the matter with the textile industry.

The textile factories in Japan, largely financed by American taxpayers, that pay 14 to 19 cents an hour for labor, and import their product into this country under virtual free-trade conditions, is running the American higher wage living standard working men and women and the American investor out of the business.

The textile industry is doomed in this country along with the chemical, mining, crockery, machine tool, glass, and 5,000 other products.

So, if Congress continues to vote for the very thing that brings about the depressed areas, it had better vote for the appropriation to reimburse the investors and to move the working men and women—or at least to feed them. It would be helpful to Congress if they would read the Constitution of the United States just one more time. It provides, article I, section 8, that Congress shall regulate foreign trade and the national economy.

The Congress is designated by the Constitution because every precinct in America is represented in both the House and the Senate.

It does not say that any foreign trade and national economy shall be regulated in Geneva by 34 foreign nations. Yet that is exactly what is happening, since each nation has one vote. We are members of that General Agreement on Tariff and Trade, with 1 vote out of 35.

So now that Congress has caused the depressed areas by its own action, the legislation proposed by the Secretary of State to appropriate money to reimburse the investors and to transport the working men and women to more fertile areas is under way.

It is the Russian way—except they do not need legislation—they do it by Executive order.

I shall vote for this legislation because of my inability to repeal, before this vote, the "mother" act—the basis of the continual lowering the duties or tariffs that were utilized to equalize the wages and cost of doing business here and in the chief competing nation on each product.

REVERT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—revert to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy.

The Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, would then adjust the duties—article I, section 8—on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—take the profit out of low-cost wages at the water's edge and give the American workingmen and investors equal access to the American markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would not like to call Senators here this late at night. I suggest that we wait until tomorrow to vote on the passage of the bill.

POSITION OF OUTDOOR GROUPS ON FISHERIES LEGISLATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram to me from leading American outdoor groups on S. 3275, the so-called fisheries reorganization legislation. I concur generally with the purport of the message.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

All national conservation organizations representing millions of sportsmen and other conservationists and the State fish and game directors urge approval of S. 3275 as amended and passed by the House. We are opposed to establishing any kind of needless, costly, and disjunctive several-man commission in Interior Department. We are unalterably opposed to separating the management of those invaluable related resources and still insist upon a United States Fish and Wildlife Service with a single responsible administrative head under an Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife as agreed with Bonner committee, with Secretary Fred A. Seaton in line with the President's program, and as agreed with entire commercial fishing industry. Amended S. 3275 would provide immediate relief to distressed commercial fishing industry and we stand by the agreed organizational pattern in House bill.

Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Spencer M. Smith, Secretary; Forest Conservation Society of America, C. H. Stoddard, Executive Director; International Association of Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners, B. F. Stiles, President; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, National Conservation Director, Midwest Association of Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners, Glen D. Palmer, President; National Parks Association, Fred M. Packard, Executive Secretary; National Wildlife Federation, Charles H. Callison, Conservation Director; Outdoor Writers Association of America, Michael Hudoba, Conservation Director; Public Affairs Institute, Dewey Anderson, Executive Director; Sport Fishing Institute, Richard H. Stroud, Executive Vice President; Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, John A. Biggs, President; Wilderness Society, Howard Zahniser, Executive Secretary; Wildlife Management Institute, C. R. Gutermuth, Vice President.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREE ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] may be appointed as a conferee on the second supplemental appropriation bill for consideration of items pertaining to atomic energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H. R. 3489. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage (Rept. No. 2807).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 4285. A bill for the relief of Harvey Chih Sung, his wife, Wang Wen Chun Sung, and children Grace Yuen Chien Sung and Flora Yuen Pin Sung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4286. A bill to revise the basis for establishing wartime service connection for multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 4287. A bill for the relief of Nicola Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF BASIS FOR ESTABLISHING WARTIME SERVICE CONNECTION FOR MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, knowing full well that at this late time in the session no action can be taken on it, but a legislative record needs to be made on this problem, and I hope the very introduction of the bill awaiting committee hearings next year will have some effect on the Veterans' Administration in the meantime. Veterans are, in my judgment, suffering a gross injustice because of lack of attention by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to further amend the second proviso of paragraph I (c) of part (I), Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent degree of disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from active service, shall, in the absence of affirmative evidence to the contrary, be deemed to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service.

I have, and I am sure that many of my colleagues have also had, correspondence with veteran constituents who are suffering from this insidious disease and who have attempted unsuccessfully, to prove their disability is service connected.

Mr. President, the cause of multiple sclerosis is unknown; the etiology and course of the disease remain obscure. In the early stages it is almost impossible to diagnose, and some eminent neurologists feel that only by postmortem examination can a positive diagnosis be made.

By the very nature of the disease, placing the burden of proof of service connection upon the veteran is an undue and impossible burden. In the interest of those veterans suffering from multiple sclerosis and facing a life of increasing disability and decreasing productivity, and the crushing problems of their families, this bill is a reform that should be adopted.

Mr. President, I do not introduce this bill lightly. I introduce it only after I have checked its substance with medical authority. I am told that medical knowledge at this time in regard to this very serious disease is such that medical science cannot tell the origin of the disease, but medical science is of the opinion, I have been advised by competent medical authority, that if the disease develops within 3 years, which is covered in this bill, it is a safe assumption that it developed during the time of military service.

I wish to say, once again, Mr. President, that when we are dealing with disability cases involving veterans, all doubts should be resolved in favor of the veteran. When there can be any question at all as to whether or not the multiple sclerosis from which a veteran has suffered may have been developed and aggravated by military service, the veteran should have the benefit of the doubt, at least, Mr. President, until medical science can write a clear case to the contrary, which it is unable to do at the present time.

I am satisfied that under existing regulations the Veterans' Administration could have done something about those cases. I hope the introduction of my bill will make it perfectly clear that there are those of us who mean business in regard to this subject in seeing that justice is done at an early date. I strongly recommend favorably consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4286) to revise the basis for establishing wartime-service connection for multiple sclerosis, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ALLEVIATION OF EXCESSIVE UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2663) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF VISAS AUTHORIZED TO BE ISSUED TO ELIGIBLE ORPHANS — AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted amendments, in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3570) to increase the number of visas authorized to be issued to eligible orphans under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS OF AMERICANS AGAINST GERMANY AND JAPAN—AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT AND WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 4205) to provide funds to pay nationals of the United States who have war damage claims against Germany and Japan, without additional direct appropriations therefor, and to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL RECORD MATTERS

By Mr. GORE:

Speech delivered by him on the subject of The Plight of Independent Agencies.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

RECESS TO 9:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 26, 1956, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 25 (legislative day of July 16), 1956:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard H. Phillips	Roy S. Benson
Jack P. Monroe	David J. Welsh
Robert H. Speck	Donald T. Eller
Arnold W. McKechnie	Almon E. Loomis
Arthur H. Taylor	Edward C. Stephan
William O. Burch, Jr.	Whitmore S. Butts
William E. Howard, Jr.	Frank A. Brandley
Ralph K. James	William E. Gentner, Jr.
Thomas A. Ahroon	Leonidas D. Coates, Jr.
Michael F. D. Flaherty	Ephraim P. Holmes
Edward A. Hannegan	John T. Hayward
Robert T. S. Keith	Lynne C. Quiggle
Basil N. Rittenhouse, Jr.	Joseph E. Dodson
	Vernon L. Lowrance
John F. Davidson	Charles C. Kirkpatrick
Charles O. Triebel	Alfred G. Ward
Reynold D. Hogle	
Goldsborough S. Patrick	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 1956

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast blessed us with the gift of a new day, grant that during all its hours we may seek the higher and nobler levels of living.

May we have the insight and the inspiration, the skill and the energy, to make this day radiant and vibrant with that which is beautiful and best.

We pray that we may never look upon the work in which we are engaged as just a job, but as a joy and an opportunity to have a part and a place in the vast areas of human service and in the building of a better world.

Make us realize more fully that man cannot live by bread alone and that it is not enough to help him gain economic and social security, but that he needs that inner spiritual security which comes from faith and trust in Thee.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who came to give us the abundant life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE POTOMAC

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2568) to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2879)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2568) to amend title I of the act entitled "An Act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.

JAMES C. DAVIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2568) to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment provided that the bridge to be constructed should be a six-lane bascule-span bridge. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment struck out the provision of the Senate bill that the general location of the bridge, approaches, interchanges, and connecting roads on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior shall be subject to his approval. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate bill provided that the Secretary of the Interior shall retain control and jurisdiction over certain park lands in the vicinity of the bridge. The House amendment provided that the Secretary should retain such jurisdiction only upon completion of the bridge. The House recedes.

JAMES C. DAVIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Bailey	Bell	Brooks, Tex.
Bass, Tenn.	Boykin	Broyhill
Baumhart	Brooks, La.	Burleson
Carnahan	Hoffman, Ill.	Priest
Chatham	Johansen	Prouty
Clevenger	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Davis, Wis.	Lane	Short
Dingell	Long	Sieminski
Dolliver	McDowell	Simpson, Pa.
Dowdy	Morrison	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Nelson	Thornberry
Gamble	O'Hara, Minn.	Vinson
Gordon	Patman	Whitten
Gregory	Phillips	Wickersham
Hébert	Powell	Wilson, Calif.
Hillings	Preston	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. DIRKSEN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1243. An act for the relief of Kyu Lee;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Salvatore di Morello;

S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions;

S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Kinoshita;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the com-

mittee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5299) entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5712) entitled "An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3820) entitled "An act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation."

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill H. R. 9591, entitled "An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes."

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this week it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order during the remainder of this week for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVII.

May I say that it is understood that any bills on which the Speaker will recognize Members who offer motions to suspend the rules will be taken up with the minority leader. His views, of course, will be given consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give us some idea of the bills that would be called up under suspension? The other day we had a number of what in my opinion were nonessential bills called up under that procedure. I should like to know before acceding to this unanimous-consent request that any bills called up under this abnormal procedure are necessary and essential to the welfare of the people of this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the question of considering a bill under suspension of the rules involves many factors. I would not want to unnecessarily put down what bills would be taken up or ask the Speaker to do so because the Speaker decides when he will recognize a Member to make such a motion. That is in the jurisdiction of the Speaker to determine. Certainly, if there was a rule granted, I am sure a Member would not want to have his bill considered under suspension of the rules, as I certainly would not, and I do not think the Speaker would, where there might be some doubt as to getting the necessary two-thirds vote. Now, referring to the bills that might be called up, there are two or three projects in which Members on your side are greatly interested. I certainly would not want them brought up, and I cannot imagine that they would want them brought up under suspension of the rules if they can be considered in the usual way under a rule.

With reference to the gentleman's inquiry, there has been an understanding, or I should say there has been a conversation between the leadership on my side and the leadership on the gentleman's side, and no bills will be brought up under suspension without the leadership on your side being conferred with and advised. I think that certainly should satisfy any Member.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I assume that when those bills were called up the other day under suspension that there was prior consultation between the leadership. Is that not true?

Mr. McCORMACK. The situation the other day was different than now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PASSMAN, GARY, ROONEY, CANNON, FERNANDEZ, LANHAM, NATCHER, DENTON, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, FENTON, FORD, and HAND.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a report on the bill, H. R. 12130.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

VERENDRYE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historical site, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2886)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, and 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
GRACIE PFOST,
STEWART L. UDALL,
E. Y. BERRY,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
WILLIAM R. LAIRD III,
W. KERR SCOTT,
GEO. M. MALONE,
FRANK A. BARRETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendments to the bill:

As agreed to by the managers on the part of the House, the conference committee version of H. R. 1774 differs from the bill as approved by the House in only one respect.

The House managers have agreed to a Senate amendment to section 1 of the House-passed version, which amendment subjects the lands authorized to be conveyed to a reservation to the United States of the right to flood such lands in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir Project. This amendment will preserve in the United States the right to exercise flowage easement rights over such minimal portion of the lands involved as will result from the flooding of a portion of the monument lands by the filling of the Garrison Reservoir behind Garrison Dam, presently under construction by the United States Corps of Engineers. Even with this flooding—at high water level and at normal pool level—of a portion of the monument lands along the north and west boundaries thereof, it is noted that the summit of Crow High Butte, the monument's principal feature, will still be 259 feet above maximum pool level of the reservoir.

In all other respects, the conference committee version of H. R. 1774 is identical to the House-approved bill.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
GRACIE PFOST,
STEWART L. UDALL,
E. Y. BERRY,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KANEOHE BAY, OAHU

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7890) to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "of section."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 8837, an act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "1954" and insert "1956."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "their present terms" and insert "the terms for which they were elected."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "1956," and insert "1958."

Page 14, line 8, strike out all after "Sec. 8." down to and including line 12 and insert "Subsection (a) of section 7 of this act shall take effect upon the approval of this act. The remainder of this act shall first take effect with respect to the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and apply to each legislature thereafter. The 28th and 29th legislatures of said Territory shall continue to be governed by the same provisions of said organic act which were in effect prior to the approval of this act, except that portion of section 55 of said organic act which is deleted by subsection (a) of section 7 of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11522, an act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive.

Page 1, line 7, strike out "(b) Section" and insert "That (a) section."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

Page 2, line 13, after "3" insert ", and by substituting a comma for the period at the end of such subsection (a) and adding the following words 'and the word "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, any Territory of the United State, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.' "

Page 3, line 10, strike out "Guam,' " and insert " 'Guam.' "

Page 3, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 16 on page 4 and insert:

"SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 8 of the act of September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 917), as amended, is further amended (i) by inserting the words 'the Governor of Guam,' immediately following the words 'the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico,', (ii) by inserting the word 'Guam,' immediately following the words 'Puerto Rico,' where such words appear for the second time in such subsection, (iii) by inserting the word ', Guam,' immediately following the words 'not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico', and (iv) by inserting the word 'Guam,' immediately following the words 'Puerto Rico,' in the second sentence of such subsection."

Page 4, strike out all after line 16 over to and including line 23 on page 5 and insert:

"SEC. 8. Section 12 of the act of August 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 434), as amended, is further amended (i) by inserting the words 'the Governor of Guam,' immediately following the words 'The Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce of Puerto Rico,', (ii) by inserting the word 'Guam,' immediately following the words 'Puerto Rico,' where such words appear for the second time in such subsection, (iii) by inserting the word 'Guam,' immediately following the words 'not exceeding $10,000 each for Puerto Rico,', and (iv) by inserting the word 'Guam,' immediately following the words 'Puerto Rico,' in the second sentence of such subsection."

Page 9, line 12, strike out "and" and insert "as amended, and."

Page 13, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 25. The Library Services Act (Public Law 597, 84th Cong., 2d sess.; 70 Stat. 293) is amended—

"(a) in subsection (a) of section 4 by inserting 'each to Guam and' after '$10,000';

"(b) in subsection (a) of section 6 by inserting 'and of Guam' after 'Virgin Islands';

"(c) in subsection (c) of section 6 by inserting 'Guam,' after 'Puerto Rico,'; and

"(d) in subsection (a) of section 9 by inserting 'Guam,' after 'Puerto Rico,'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN HIGHWAY, TELEPHONE, AND PIPELINE WITHDRAWALS IN ALASKA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4096), an act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "Public lands" and insert "Lands."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF SCHOOLS IN IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11695), an act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, line 8, after "sale", insert "or transfer."

Page 10, after line 25, insert:

"(d) Subsection (e) of section 3 of such act is amended by striking out 'subsection (c) (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (c) (4)'."

Page 14, lines 14 and 15, strike out "following the sale" and insert "in which occurred the sale or transfer."

Page 14, line 16, after "sale", insert "or transfer."

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. BARDEN. It does not affect the operation of the bill. The only amendment, aside from correction of the language was that the Senate put in after "sale", the words "or transfer." The House used the word "sale", but the Senate felt it should be "sale or transfer" as it relates to housing projects. I presume the gentleman understands what that was. It was to take care of a sudden impact that might be the result of immediate transfer, and provides extension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOCKTON AIR FORCE STATION AND STOCKTON ANNEX

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9970, an act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif., with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "ninety-six and eighty-five" and insert "one hundred and eighteen and forty-four."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FURTHER THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10432, an act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $100,000 annually for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLACKAMAS NATIONAL GUARD TARGET RANGE

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9699, an act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "charge, except as indicated below" and insert "payment of any kind."

Page 3, line 2, strike out all after "thereto" down to and including "aid" in line 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING FLIGHT INSTRUCTION DURING RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAMS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5738, an act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after "the" where it appears the second time, insert "Army and the Secretary of the."

Page 2 line 7, strike out "units.'." and insert "units, respectively.'."

Page 2, strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 22 of the act of March 4, 1925 (ch. 536, 43 Stat. 1276), as amended (34 U. S. C. 821), is further amended by—

"(1) deleting in subsection (b) the words "who suffer disability, including members"; and

"(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(c) The courses of theoretical and practical naval training prescribed for members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps may include flight instruction.

"'(d) The Secretary of the Navy may, for a period of 4 years after the effective date of this amendatory act, provide, or contract with civilian flying or aviation schools or educational institutions to provide, such personnel, aircraft, supplies, facilities, and instruction as are necessary for flight instruction of members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.'"

Page 2, strike out lines 21, 22, and 23, and insert:

"(1) Any member who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while engaged in flight instruction, under—,"

Page 3, strike out lines 9 and 10.

Page 3, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert:

"(2) Any member who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while performing authorized travel to or from, or while attending—."

Page 3, strike out line 24 and lines 1 and 2 on page 4.

Page 4, line 8, strike out "(1) or."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "(1) or."

Page 4, strike out all after line 19 over to and including line 2 on page 5 and insert:

"(c) Subject to review by the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the military department concerned, under regulations to be prescribed by him, shall determine whether an injury, disease, or illness was sustained, or contracted, in line of duty and was the proximate result of the performance of military training by the member concerned, or of his travel to or from that military training."

Page 5, line 12, strike out all after "person" down to and including "or" in line 14.

Page 6, strike out lines 14 to 23, inclusive.

Page 7, lines 6 and 7, strike out "the Air Force and the Secretary of the Army" and insert "each military department."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. HANFORD MACNIDER

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11677, an act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, United States Army Reserve (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Lines 3 and 4, strike out "United States Army Reserve (retired)" and insert "Army of the United States (retired)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Army of the United States retired to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME LIMIT WITHIN WHICH AWARDS OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL DECORATIONS MAY BE MADE

Mr. KILDAY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1637) to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2906)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1637) to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN STENNIS,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1637) to extend the

time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

S. 1637 passed the Senate on May 21, 1956, and provided that a decoration or device in lieu of decoration which, prior to the enactment of the bill had been authorized by Congress to be awarded to any person for an act or service performed while on active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or while serving such forces, could be awarded at any time not later than one year after the enactment of the bill for any act or service performed between June 27, 1950, and July 27, 1953, if written recommendation had been submitted to the appropriate office in a military department before the enactment of the bill.

On July 16, 1956, the House passed the bill with amendments which would authorize an additional year within which new recommendations for military awards and decorations could be filed with the military department and extending the time from one to two years in which recommendations already received could be processed and awarded.

In conference the Senate managers took the position that the authority to award decorations for service performed between June 27, 1950, and July 27, 1953, should be limited to those for which recommendations have already been received. Furthermore, the position was taken that no more than one year should be allowed for the military departments to process the recommendations already on file and that the period of two years, as contained in the House amendment, was not necessary.

The managers on the part of the House realize that with the passage of time it becomes more difficult to make fair evaluations of suggested awards and consequently agree with the position of the Senate that an additional period of time, within which new recommendations for awards based on Korean service can be submitted, should not be granted. Furthermore, for those recommendations already on file one additional year within which the awards can be processed and made should be sufficient.

The House recedes from its amendment.

PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1637) to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOAN OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11613 with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) the first sentence of section 4 (a) of the act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 363), is amended by inserting immediately after 'Far Eastern' the words 'or European.'

"(b) Section 4 (c) of such act is amended by striking out 'December 31, 1956' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1957.'

"(c) Section 5 of such act is amended by striking out 'respective Governments under the Mutual Security Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'recipient Governments under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or provided by the recipient Governments under reimbursable provisions of such act'."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain briefly the changes that were made?

Mr. RIVERS. Last week the House passed the bill H. R. 11613, which was designed to lend to the friendly nations of NATO countries 25 ships.

In 1953 we had a similar bill which provided for the lending of 25 ships to friendly far-eastern countries. Under the 1953 act only 18 ships were lent, leaving 7.

When the House bill H. R. 11613 went to the other body the Senate struck out everything after the enacting clause and changed it so that the remaining seven vessels under the 1953 act could be lent to friendly European nations.

In all, the two acts would have authorized 50 ships.

Instead of having 50 ships authorized the other body struck out the 25 under H. R. 11613. We only have 7 then that were authorized under the 1953 bill. This bill extends the expiration date of the 1953 law and authorizes the European nations to participate in the provisions of the law so far as the remaining 7 ships are concerned.

We took this because half a loaf we felt was better than none.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND GRANTS TO PUEBLO INDIANS

Mr. HALEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5712) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2907)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5712) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. In the administration of the lands to be held in trust by the United States pursuant to this Act, together with any remaining lands comprising the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any officer or agency of the United States hereafter administering such lands, shall make the livestock grazing capacity of the lands held in trust under sections 1 and 2 hereof available to the Zia and Jemez Indians to the extent of 400 cattle units yearlong, and the remaining lands available to the non-Indians included in the provisions of the Executive Order (Number 8697) signed by the President on February 28, 1941."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES A. HALEY,
B. F. SISK,
JOHN J. RHODES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5712), to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

H. R. 5712, as reported by the House, contained two sections. The Senate added section 3 which provided that in the administration of the trust lands in question as well as any remaining lands comprising the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant, the Secretary of Agriculture would make the livestock grazing capacity of the lands available to the Zia and Jemez Indians to the extent of 400 cattle units yearlong. The amendment also provided that the remainder of the grazing capacity on the entire grant would be available to non-Indians regardless of the trust provisions.

Declaring that this section would have defeated the purpose of the bill, the House managers refused to accept the amendment and agreed to a substitute amendment which provides that in the administration of the lands to be held in trust by the United States pursuant to this act as well as any remaining lands comprising the Ojo del Espiritu Grant, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any agency of the United States (Department of the Interior) charged with the administration of such lands shall be assured that the livestock grazing capacity of the lands held in trust under sections 1 and 2 hereof available to the Zia and Jemez Indians shall not be in excess of 400 cattle units yearlong. The amendment also provides that the remaining lands available to non-Indians under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act as provided by Executive order (No. 8697) signed by the President on February 28, 1941. The managers believe this amendment to be the most equitable provision that can be made.

JAMES A. HALEY,
B. F. SISK,
JOHN J. RHODES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5712) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public

domain adjacent thereto, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman explain this is a unanimous conference report and who signed it?

Mr. HALEY. It is a unanimous report.

Mr. MARTIN. Who were our conferees?

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE AND TITLE 32 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard," with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

1. CHANGES TO CORRECT TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS

(1) The analysis of part II of subtitle A of title 10 is amended by striking out the item "49. Miscellaneous Prohibitions and Penalties ------961" and inserting in place thereof the item "49. Miscellaneous Prohibitions and Penalties. [No present sections]."

(2) Section 270 (a) (renumbered section 273 (a)) of title 10 is amended by striking out the figure "673" and inserting in place thereof the figure "674."

(3) Subtitle A of title 10 is amended by inserting the following after chapter 47:

"CHAPTER 49.—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

[No present sections]

(4) Section 866 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the word "commisisoned" and insert in place thereof the word "commissioned."

(5) Section 1210 of title 10 is amended by striking out the figure "1408" and inserting in place thereof the figure "1208."

(6) The analysis of part III of subtitle A of title 10 immediately preceding chapter 101 is amended by striking out the word "generally" in item 101 and inserting in place thereof the word "Generally."

(7) Section 3352 (a) of title 10 is amended by inserting a comma after the word "prescribe."

(8) Section 3963 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the word "dietition" and inserting in place thereof the word "dietitian."

(9) Sections 4342 (c) and 9342 (c) of title 10 are amended by ctriking out the figure "(6)" and inserting in place thereof the figure "(5)."

(10) Section 4778 of title 10 is amended by striking out the word "Association" and inserting in place thereof the word "Associations."

(11) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 5589 of title 10 are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Original appointments to the active list of the Navy in the grade of ensign in the line, in the Supply Corps, and in the Civil Engineer Corps may be made from male—

"(1) warrant officers;

"(2) chief petty officers; and

"(3) first-class petty officers;

in the Regular Navy, for the performance of duty in the technical fields indicated by their warrants or ratings.

"(b) Original appointments to the active list of the Marine Corps in the grade of second lieutenant may be made from male—

"(1) warrant officers;

"(2) master sergeants; and

"(3) technical sergeants;

in the Regular Marine Corps, for the performance of duty in the technical fields in which they are proficient."

(12) Section 5792 of title 10 is amended by striking out the figure "15" and inserting in place thereof the figure "16."

(13) Section 5861 of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "or 5773" and inserting in place thereof the words "5773, or 5784."

(14) Section 5862 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "or 5773" and inserting in place thereof the words "5773, or 5784."

(15) Section 6148 (f) of title 10 is amended by striking out the figure "375" and inserting in place thereof the figure "376."

(16) Sections 6324 and 6396 (c) (3) of title 10 are amended by striking out the figure "47" and inserting in place thereof the figure "41."

(17) The analysis of chapter 573 of title 10 is amended by striking out the figure "8398" and inserting in place thereof the figure "6398."

(18) The analysis of chapter 831 of title 10 is amended by striking out the item:

"8208. Regular Air Force: commissioned officers on active list; female commissioned officers, other than those designated under section 8067 of this title to perform professional functions."

and inserting in place thereof the item:

"8208. Regular Air Force: commissioned officers on active list; female commissioned officers, other than those designated under section 8067 of this title to perform professional functions."

(19) Section 101 of title 32 is amended by striking out the word "additions" and inserting in place thereof the word "addition."

(20) Section 307 (b) (1) of title 32 is amended by inserting a comma after the words "Army National Guard of the United States."

2. CHANGES FOR UNIFORMITY OF EXPRESSION

(1) Section 510 (d) of title 10 is amended by striking out the word "in" after the word "Reserve" and inserting in place thereof the word "of."

(2) Section 512 (a) of title 10 is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "in" after the word "Reserve" and inserting in place thereof the word "of"; and

(2) by striking out the word "such" before the word "participation" and inserting in place thereof the word "his."

(3) Section 823 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "When" and "when" and inserting in place thereof the words "If" and "if", respectively.

(4) Section 1481 (a) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "regular member" and inserting in place thereof the word "Regular."

(5) Sections 3202 (b) and 8202 (b) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "50 percent" and inserting in place thereof the word "one-half."

(6) Sections 3259 and 8259 of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army" and "Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force" and inserting in place thereof the words "Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe" and "Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe", respectively.

(7) Sections 3444 (b) and 8444 (b) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "A person" and inserting in place thereof the words "An officer."

(8) Sections 3633 and 8633 of title 10 are amended by striking out the word "leave" and inserting in place thereof the word "authority."

(9) Sections 3638 (2) and 8638 (2) of title 10 are amended by striking out the word "proper."

(10) Sections 4504 and 9504 of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "abroad or in" and inserting in place thereof the words "inside or outside."

(11) Sections 6325 (b) of title 10 is amended by inserting the words "of this title" after the figure "5597."

3. CHANGES TO REFLECT THE COMMONWEALTH STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

(1) Section 101 (3) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "Puerto Rico," and inserting before the period the words "or Commonwealth."

(2) Sections 774, 2274 (a), 3062 (a) (1), 4502 (a), 4502 (b), 4747, 4778, 8062 (a) (1), 9502 (a), 9502 (b), and 9778 of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "its Territories" and inserting in place thereof the words "the Territories, Commonwealths,".

(3) Section 808 of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "or Territory, a" and inserting in place thereof the words ", Territory, Commonwealth, or."

(4) Section 846 of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "its Territories, and its" and inserting in place thereof the words "or the Territories, Commonwealths, and."

(5) Section 847 (b) of title 10 is amended by inserting the word ", Commonwealths," after the word "Territories."

(6) Sections 849 (d) (1), 888, 2668 (a), and 2669 (a) of title 10 are amended by inserting the word "Commonwealth," after the word "Territory," wherever it appears.

(7) Section 3074 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "its Territories, its" and inserting in place thereof the words "the Territories, Commonwealths, and."

(8) Sections 3500 (1) and 8500 (1) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "its Territories" and inserting in place thereof the words "any of the Territories, Commonwealths,".

(9) Section 5986 (a) of title 10 is amended by inserting the words "the Territories, Commonwealths, or possessions," after the words "United States,".

(10) Section 7308 (a) of title 10 is amended by inserting the word "Commonwealth," after the word "Territory," in clause (1).

(11) Section 7545 (a) of title 10 is amended by inserting the word "Commonwealth," after the word "Territory," in clause (1).

(12) Sections 7652 (a) and 7653 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "its Territories, or its" in clause (1) and inserting in place thereof the words "or the Territories, Commonwealths, or."

(13) Section 7655 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "abroad or in the United States" and by inserting the word "anywhere" after the word "exercise."

(14) Sections 9773 (a) and 9773 (c) (4) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "its Territories" and inserting in place thereof the words "the Territories, Commonwealths."

4. MISCELLANEOUS NATIONAL GUARD CHANGES

(1) Section 101 (30) (B) (renumbered section 101 (31) (B)) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "competent authority" and inserting in place thereof the words "an authority designated by the Secretary concerned."

(2) Sections 591 (a), 3351, and 8351 of title 10, and sections 305, 307, and 308 (including catchlines) and the analysis of chapter 3 of title 32, are amended by striking out the words "individual" and "individually", wherever they appear.

(3) Sections 672 (a), 672 (b), and 673 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "any member or unit" and inserting in place thereof the words "any unit, and any member not assigned to a unit organized to serve as a unit."

(4) (a) Sections 1332 (a) (2) (A) and (B) of title 10 are amended to read as follows:

"(A) one point for each day of—

"(i) active service; or

"(ii) service under sections 316, 503, 504, and 505 of title 32 while performing annual training duty or while attending a prescribed course of instruction at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary concerned;

if that service conformed to required standards and qualifications;

"(B) one point for each attendance at a drill or period of equivalent instruction that was prescribed for that year by the Secretary concerned and conformed to the requirements prescribed by law, including attendance under section 502 of title 32; and."

(b) Section 1333 (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the days of service credited to him under section 1332 (a) (2) (A) of this title."

(c) Section 1332 (2) is amended by striking out the words "for drill, equivalent instruction, or membership,".

(5) Section 1334 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "Except for any later period of active duty, time" and inserting in place thereof the word "Time."

(6) Sections 3351 and 8351 of title 10 are amended by striking out the word "in" following the words "for service" wherever they appear and inserting in place thereof the words "as a member of."

(7) The analyses of chapters 333 and 833 of title 10 are amended by striking out the word ": enlistment" in items 3261 and 8261.

(8) The catchlines of sections 3261 and 8261 of title 10 are amended by striking out the word ": enlistment."

(9) Sections 3261 (a) (3) and 8261 (a) (3) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "for service in the Army National Guard of the United States" and "for service in the Air National Guard of the United States", respectively.

(10) Section 3259 of title 10 is amended by inserting the words "in the Army" after the words "held by him."

(11) Section 3259 and 3352 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "in the Army National Guard of the United States was" and inserting in place thereof the words "has been."

(12) Sections 8259 and 8352 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "in the Air National Guard of the United States was" and inserting in place thereof the words "has been."

(13) Sections 4301 (c) and 9301 (c) of title 10 are amended by inserting the words "of the United States" after the word "Army National Guard" and "Air National Guard," respectively.

(14) The analysis of chapter 3 of title 32 is amended by striking out the item "301. General Federal recognition of officers and enlisted men." and inserting in place thereof the item "301. Federal recognition of enlisted members."

(15) Section 301 of title 32 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 301. Federal recognition of enlisted members

"To be eligible for Federal recognition as an enlisted member of the National Guard, a person must have the qualifications prescribed by the Secretary concerned for the grade, branch, position, and type of unit or organization involved. He becomes federally recognized upon enlisting in a federally recognized unit or organization of the National Guard."

(16) Section 307 (a) of title 32 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To be eligible for Federal recognition as an officer of the National Guard, a person must—

"(1) receive an appointment with a view to filling a vacancy in a federally recognized unit or organization of the National Guard;

"(2) have the qualifications prescribed by the Secretary concerned for the grade, branch, position, and type of unit or organization involved; and

"(3) except as provided in subsection (d), pass an examination for physical, moral, and professional fitness to be prescribed by the President, and subscribe to the oath of office prescribed by section 312 of this title."

(17) Section 307 (d) of title 32 is amended by striking out the words "section 301 of this title" and inserting in place thereof the words "subsection (a) (1) and (2)."

(18) Section 315 (including the catchline) and item 315 in the analysis of chapter 3 of title 32 are amended by striking out the words "and reserve."

5. MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES

(1) (a) The following clauses of section 101 of title 10, as listed in the left-hand column, are renumbered as shown in the right-hand column:

Old number	New number
(25)	(26)
(26)	(27)
(27)	(28)
(28)	(29)
(29)	(30)
(30)	(31)
(31)	(32)
(32)	(33)
(33)	(34)

(b) The following sections of title 10, as listed in the left-hand column, are renumbered as shown in the right-hand column:

Old number	New number
270	273
271	274
272	275
273	276
274	277
275	278
276	280
684	686

(2) Section 510 (c) of title 10 is amended by adding the words "(other than for training)" at the end thereof.

(3) Section 815 (a) (1) (C) of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "his pay for not more than 1 month" and inserting in place thereof the words "1 month's pay."

(4) Section 827 (a) of title 10 is amended by striking out the word "other."

(5) Section 938 of title 10 is amended by striking out the words "of the department."

(6) Section 2664 (d) of title 10 is amended by inserting the words "take and" before the word "use."

(7) Sections 2664 (e) and (f) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "An officer" and inserting in place thereof the words "A person."

(8) Section 3296 (b) of title 10 is amended by striking out clause (2) and by redesignating clauses (3) and (4) as "(2)" and "(3)", respectively.

(9) Sections 3299 (b) and 8299 (b) of title 10 are amended by striking out the word "and" and inserting in place thereof the word "that."

(10) Sections 3305 (a) and 8305 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "that grade" in the third sentence and inserting in place thereof the words "the grade of colonel."

(11) Sections 3306 (a) and 8306 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "promotion to that grade" in the second sentence and inserting in place thereof the words "promotion to the grade of brigadier general."

(12) Sections 3307 (a) and 8307 (a) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "for promotion to that grade" in the second sentence and inserting in place thereof the words "for promotion to the grade of major general."

(13) Sections 4342 (e) (4), 6954 (a) (1) (B), and 9342 (e) (4) of title 10 are amended by striking out the words "the date prescribed by proclamation of the President, or concurrent resolution of Congress under the joint resolution of May 11, 1951, ch. 49, 65 Stat. 40" and inserting in place thereof the words "February 1, 1955."

(14) The last sentence of section 4621 (a) of title 10 and the last two sentences of section 9621 (a) of title 10 are amended to read as follows: "Except for articles and items acquired through the use of working capital funds under sections 172–172j of title 5, sales of articles shall be at cost, and sales of individual clothing and equipment shall be at average current prices, including overhead, as determined by the Secretary."

(15) Sections 4621 (b) and 9621 (b) of title 10 are amended—

(1) by striking out the words "Except for articles acquired through the use of working capital funds under sections 172–172j of title 5, the", and inserting in place thereof the word "The"; and (2) by adding the following new sentence: "Activities conducted under this subsection shall be consistent with sections 172–172j of title 5."

(16) Section 6325 of title 10 is amended by adding a new subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) A warrant officer who retires under section 6321, 6322, or 6323 of this title may elect to be placed on the retired list in the highest grade and with the highest retired pay to which he is entitled under any provision of this title. If the pay of that highest grade is less than the pay of any warrant grade satisfactorily held by him on active duty, his retired pay shall be based on the higher pay."

(17) Section 8549 of title 10 is amended by inserting the words "or appointed with a view to designation under that section" before the words, "may not."

(18) (a) Section 9344 of title 10 is amended by striking out subsection (d).

(b) Section 9346 of title 10 is amended by striking out subsection (d).

(19) Section 9351 (a) of title 10 is amended by striking out the word "Academic" and inserting in place thereof the word "Academy."

(20) Section 109 of title 32 is amended by—

(1) striking out the period at the end of subsection (a) and inserting in place thereof the words "and State defense forces."; and

(2) inserting after the words "National Guard" in subsection (b) the words "or its State defense forces."

(21) (a) Section 23 is deleted.

(b) The following sections listed in the left-hand column are renumbered as shown in the right-hand column:

Old number	New number
24	23
25	24
26	25

Old number	New number
27	26
28	27
29	28
30	29
31	30
32	31
33	32
34	33
35	34
36	35
37	36
38	37
39	38
40	39
41	40
42	41
43	42
44	43
45	44
46	45
47	46
48	47
49	48
50	49
51	50
52	51
53	52
54	53

(c) Section 50 (renumbered sec. 49) is amended by striking out the figure "49" wherever it appears and inserting in place thereof the figure "48."

(d) The schedule of laws repealed, in section 54 (renumbered sec. 53), is amended—

(1) by inserting the words "(less § 17)" in the column designated "Section" (Statutes at Large), and by striking out the word "Uncodified" in the column designated "Title", opposite the entry "Mar. 2" under the year "1899";

(2) by striking out the figure "1350," in the column designated "Section" (U. S. Code), opposite the entry "Feb. 2" under the year "1901"; and

(3) by striking out the figure ",6" in the column designated "Section" (Statutes at Large), the figure ",88" in the column designated "Page", and the figure ",473" in the column designated "Section" (U. S. Code), opposite the entry "June 19" under the year "1951."

(22) Section 31 (renumbered sec. 30) is amended by inserting the words "under section 3496 or 8496 of title 10, United States Code," before the words "shall be paid."

(23) Section 50 (a) (renumbered sec. 49 (a)) is amended by striking out the words "amendments to it" and inserting in place thereof the words "superseding it to the extent of the inconsistency."

(24) Section 50 (c) (renumbered sec. 49 (c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting the words "and offenses committed" after the words "Actions taken"; and

(2) by inserting the words "or committed" after the words "have been taken."

(25) The schedule of laws repealed, in section 54 (renumbered sec. 53), is amended—

(1) by striking out the figure "1" in the column designated "Section" (Statutes at Large) opposite the entry "May 5" under the year "1950" and inserting in place thereof the figure "1 * "; and

(2) by inserting the following footnote:

"*Repeal of sec. 1 of the act of May 5, 1950, ch. 169, is effective on the effective date of chapter 47 of title 10, U. S. Code, enacted by sec. 1 of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PART II OF TITLE III OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4090) to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration are hereby authorized and directed, acting jointly, (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for installing automatic radiotelegraph call selectors on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than two radio operators, and other such safety devices, and the feasibility thereof, (2) to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than March 1, 1957, and (3) to include in such report their recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object. I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] if it is not true that the Senate version of this bill, H. R. 4090, to all intents and purposes, is entirely different from the bill with a similar number which I opposed in the House recently. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to verify that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce after public hearings reported H. R. 4090 with a new title and wording. Instead of the bill requiring cargo vessels of 1,600 tons or more with only one radio operator to install a call-selector device, this bill as passed by the Senate authorizes and directs the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Commerce and the Coast Guard to investigate the device and to report back so that at the next session of Congress a report will be available as to the need and desirability of such a device.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that H. R. 4090 as it would be considered here today is innocuous and is a fair way to settle a controversy. The bill as passed by the House made this gadget mandatory if the Federal Communications Commission found it satisfactory. This amended bill does not get the cart before the horse, and is a constructive way of approaching the subject of safety.

Accordingly I can assure my friends, who joined me in opposing this legislation when it came to the House previously, that I have no objection to this bill, and therefore I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support this. I think it is constructive legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for study by the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration with respect to the need for automatic radiotelegraph call selectors and other such safety devices on certain cargo ships of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVING PRESENT $1,000 LIMITATION WHICH PREVENTS SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FROM SETTLING CERTAIN CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF CRASH OF A NAVAL AIRCRAFT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12170) to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the $1,000 limitation contained in the first section of the act of July 3, 1943, as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b), shall not apply with respect to claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane near Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., on June 5, 1956, and the crash of a United States Navy airplane near Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., on June 9, 1956.

"SEC. 2. With respect to claims filed as a result of the airplane crashes described in the first section of this act, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy shall, within 30 months after the date of the enactment of this act, transmit to the Congress a report setting forth—

"(1) each claim settled and paid by the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, with a brief statement concerning the character and equity of each such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid; and

"(2) each claim submitted which has not been settled, with supporting papers and a statement of findings of facts and recommendations with respect to each such claim.

"SEC. 3. No part of the amounts awarded under this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] concerning an airplane accident that happened up in his State. The Senate added a provision inserting the usual counsel fees provision and also an amendment to have the bill embrace the victims of another accident that happened prior to the date that the one indicated in the bill happened.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9810) to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "fair", insert "appraised."

Page 1, line 11, after "General", insert "upon an independent appraisal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the balance of the week when the House adjourns from day to day it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock on the following day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 630) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of this week it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII; that it shall also be in order during the remainder of this week for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the resolution was agreed to.

HOUSING ACT OF 1956

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 618 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to the said bill except that it shall be in order for any member of the Committee on Banking and Currency to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill H. R. 11742 and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 12328, and such substitute shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H. R. 11742, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is to make in order the so-called housing bill, and I would like to give you a little history of the situation so that we may all clearly understand what has happened and what is about to happen.

The Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a voluminous bill on public housing and other housing which contained all of the features of the old housing bill and then added a few more. Now, that bill contained everything, including the kitchen stove. The Committee on Rules declined to give a rule on that bill, so another bill was prepared which I believe was not submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but that bill left out the kitchen stove and gave you all the rest of it, including public housing.

The Committee on Rules then took up that bill, which was a perfectly legitimate and proper thing to do, if the committee decided to do that, and reported out this rule.

Now, my complaint about it is that the rule is probably the most drastic gag rule that I have seen presented in my time here in the House, and I have seen some pretty drastic ones. This rule makes it in order to substitute the new bill, which no committee has considered, in place of the bill which the committee did consider. It prohibits the offering of any amendment on the original bill, and then it prohibits the offering of any amendment on the substitute bill. So, what you are given the slight privilege of doing is, at the conclusion of a lot of speeches and a lot of hot air, you are going to be accorded the privilege of saying "Aye" or "No"; that is all, and that will occur at the conclusion of general debate. The bill will be considered as read, the roll will be called, and you will say "Aye" or you will say "No." You Members of the House are denied all opportunity to participate in the formation or amendment of this very important and costly legislation.

Mr. GROSS. How about pro forma amendments?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No pro forma amendments. I do not think that is what we ought to do in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman if under the rule a parliamentary inquiry would be in order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the Speaker recognizes the gentleman for that purpose.

What I do not like about this situation is this. Every since public housing or more properly socialized housing—ever since socialized housing was passed by the Congress, this House has historically, year after year and year after year, whenever the housing bill came up, stricken public housing from the bill. This House has been against public housing—Congress after Congress.

What I want to say to you is that I think you ought to have the opportunity and the courtesy of being permitted merely to say, "We want an opportunity to vote on whether we want to strike out public housing or do not want to strike out public housing."

I am not insisting that you do either, but I do think that the dignity of this situation requires, in view of the history of this legislation, that Members be accorded the privilege of saying whether they want to put the handcuffs on themselves this morning or whether they do not want to put the handcuffs on themselves. If you want to handcuff yourselves so that you are not permitted to say anything about this bill all day long except "Yes" or "No," that is your privilege; go on and handcuff yourselves, if you want to. But what I am going to do is to give you the opportunity of saying, "I do not want to be handcuffed, I want the opportunity to vote on striking out public housing."

Of course, I used to have some allies on public housing over on the left side of the aisle in the days gone by. The Republican side, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], has always stood up and voted against this socialistic proposal that the general taxpayers should pay the house rent of the less fortunate taxpayers or nontaxpayers. That is what this is about.

The way I am going to seek to accomplish that is to permit you to vote on the question in the easiest way possible. And I think the easiest way possible to do it is for me to yield for an amend-

ment. I shall yield to the gentleman from Mississippi at the conclusion of the debate for an amendment which will simply say that this resolution is amended so that this House shall be accorded the small privilege of offering one amendment. And that amendment will not even permit you any latitude in what you shall do, but it will just permit you to vote "yes" or "no" twice. That is, you are going to be permitted to vote "yes" or "no" if this amendment is adopted on whether you want to be handcuffed on voting for or against public housing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana who has stood up on this floor so often and fought the battle against socialized public housing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, of course I must say to the gentleman that there was a day when I did vigorously oppose Federal public housing. As the gentleman knows, in recent years I have taken the position that it is not a question of whether or not you are for or against public housing. The question now is, When are you going to stop it? And I think we are on the road to getting it stopped.

And may I say, that while the gentleman's position has many attractions at this time, I find myself in opposition to him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. I am going to reverse the process and ask him a question. Can the gentleman see any earthly reason why this House should not be permitted to say "yes" or "no" on whether they want to be handcuffed on voting for or against public housing?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, may I say to the gentleman, I think I can answer that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HALLECK. I am happy to.

If that arrangement of the gentleman should prevail and public housing, the limited amount that is here included, with the workable provisions included, were to be stricken from the bill, this would be the situation. We have to have a housing bill to carry on through the other parts of this bill. If that bill goes over to the other body, we know it will probably have public housing to the extent of 135,000 units. Not 35,000 but 135,000 units would be put in the bill. Under those circumstances, in my opinion, we must have a housing bill. There is going to be some public housing in it. So far as I concerned, I think, coming into the closing days of the session, we might as well recognize what has prevailed in the last 2 or 3 years and go on with the passage of this bill at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his delightful contribution, which is always so welcome.

May I say in reply to the gentleman from Indiana, who tells you that we ought not to take these handcuffs off, that we ought not to permit ourselves to vote yes or no because another body is going to say, "No, we cannot do that," I should like to propound to the gentleman that if we cannot even be permitted to vote yes or no on a proposition because the other body says so, why do we not all resign and go home and let the other body run the whole show, as they are pretty well doing?

Mr. HALLECK. Was the gentleman asking me for an answer?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will give the gentleman a brief time to answer.

Mr. HALLECK. On Monday of this week we had 17 bills under suspension of the rules, and you did not even have a choice between one bill or the other. May I simply say to the gentlemen that there are some times when he recognizes as well as I that you have to be pretty practical about legislation. If the gentleman does not want any housing bill at all, then there are ways of accomplishing that. The only position I take is that this arrangement that has been worked out will assure us of a housing bill in line with what I think the majority wants.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think that things like this, of this great importance, that involve the right of men to be heard and the right of men to vote their sentiments, ought to be operated on this suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana that it has been "worked out." You ought not to "work out" things around here without giving the House an opportunity to participate in the "workout." All I am asking is that you be given a little bit of opportunity to participate in the "workout" by saying yes or no.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman agree with me that this rule is just as objectionable to those who want more housing than is in the bill as to those who want less than is in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course that is true. That is an argument why you should untie your hands and permit yourself to vote "yes" or "no" twice, once on the amendment and once on the bill. That is all I am asking that you have the opoprtunity to do. I am not asking for unlimited debate, I am asking that the House have some little limited amount of freedom, maybe just to express the idea and let it be known that we are around here and the whole business is not being run by the other body.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy task for me to stand here and be in opposition to the desires of my chairman, whom I regard and have always regarded during my 24 years in Congress as not only a great American but a great legislator.

The chairman has explained this rule, which provides for the bill H. R. 11742, known as the committee bill, to come before us. According to the rule, it cannot be amended, but it does provide that any member of the Committee on Banking and Currency can substitute the Widnall bill. It will not be open to amendment, either. And the rule does not permit a motion to recommit with instructions.

I am certain that many of you will wonder why I voted for this closed rule and am speaking in favor of it. I feel that many of you would like to know the reason for my supporting 35,000 units of public housing when in the past I have always opposed public housing. I desire to be practical.

As I rode down Pennsylvania Avenue this morning, I noticed an inscription on the Archives Building which read, "What is past is prologue." Therefore, my past experiences in the field of public housing compels me to be practical in the matter presently before us.

Many times the House of Representatives have voted against public housing. Then the other body voted each time for an unusually high number of public housing which was accepted by the House and became law.

The housing bill passed by the other body provides for 135,000 units of housing per year for 5 years. The committee bill provides for 60,000 units each year for 3 years, the Widnall bill which I am supporting, for 35,000 units each year for 2 years. The Widnall bill is a good compromise bill.

I am convinced that the Widnall bill which includes FHA and the improvement of FHA loans and includes military housing and many other features as well, which the public generally are supporting and the banks are supporting and the insurance companies are supporting must be passed. I am convinced if we did not have this bill here before us, there probably would be no bill. That would be unfortunate because FHA and all other good features of the bill expires September 30, 1956.

In the event we were to adopt the amendment, which I understand the gentleman from Mississippi is going to offer, which would give the membership a choice to vote on whether or not they wanted public housing and in the event the public housing was stricken from the Widnall bill by the House, we would go back to that experience that I mentioned—what is past is prologue. We would find, after days of conferences, which would take us into next week, what would happen would very likely be what has been our experience in the past, and that is the other body would put in housing and because they have come out, as I said and as I repeat, for 135,000 units over a 5-year period, so it is not likely that the other body is going to let this go any more than they have done so in the past when we have voted public housing out and they have put it in. Then, we decide on considerably more housing units than the 35,000 housing units. You might say this is a compromise on my part because I have never favored public housing, but when the public and the people generally write to you and say that they want the FHA loans and the insurance companies want it and they want the improvements and the military housing, it is pretty hard for LEO ALLEN at this time when we are trying to adjourn to support the amendment, knowing well that it will go to the other body and they will come back after conferences of days and days, and that there will be more public housing than the 35,000 units which the Widnall bill provides. I am

respectfully requesting that when the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Mississippi comes up that we accept this compromise knowing well that the other body will probably do as it has in the past. We have that proposition before us.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the gentleman inadvertently has not stated my position on this amendment quite accurately. This amendment will not strike out public housing, if you vote for it. If you vote for this amendment, all it does and all that is intended to do is when the bill gets on the floor of the House, some Member may, as he so desires, offer an amendment to strike it out. Then, the House can vote whether they want to strike it out or whether they want to follow the ideas expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], that it might be better to go along with the compromise proposal. That is all right, if they want to do that. But, what I am asking, and all that I am asking, is that you amend this rule so that you may have the opportunity, if you want the opportunity, to offer an amendment to strike it out and then the House will do as it pleases.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is my understanding of the gentleman's position. If I misstated it, I apologize to him

Mr. WIDNALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WIDNALL. Does not the substitute bill providing for the 35,000 units of public housing for each year, provide that a workable program and the elimination of slums must be approved by the community before they obtain public housing?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true. In view of the fact that there are many things required, the 35,000 units per year is very important, when you look at the overall picture, and when our people so generally favor so many things that are worthwhile.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the predicament we now find ourselves in is not due to any action on the part of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We went before the Committee on Rules and asked for an open rule. This rule we are discussing is the one we obtained. The gentleman from Virginia complains that this rule reported by his committee is a bad gag rule. But the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi which the gentleman from Virginia supports is a gag upon the gag. It gives you an opportunity to vote on only one section of the bill providing for public housing. Whether you like public housing or not, I am not going to enter that argument. Unless there is some public housing in this bill, you are going to get no legislation on the subject. Every Senator represents a State in which there is a city with congested areas or slums needing public housing. Those who do not need public housing, and never see it, have a settled aversion to it. But Members who come from Districts that need it are for it. A shining example is the support of public housing by the late Senator Taft who was the acknowledged leader of the Republican Party. Cincinnati, just across the river from where I live, abounds in with public housing largely through his efforts. I have been in conference with him, and I know how earnestly he advocated public housing for his people. Under this bill the Senate will have an opportunity to take it or leave it. It has been so engineered that there will be no conference. If you strike public housing out of this bill the Senate will not agree and the bill will die. We will have no title I, no college housing, no farm housing, no military housing, as provided herein and I am sure you will be compelled to explain to your constituents.

The able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] and his committee worked on the reported bill for about a year. They did a great work. The Rules Committee refused a rule after a very short hearing.

If you vote for this gag amendment you are imposing a gag upon a gag. The argument which the gentleman from Virginia made in regard to the rule applies to the amendment which he is about to offer. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry we are generating a little heat concerning this legislation. I am honestly convinced that if we are to have any housing bill at all it will be this bill that the Rules Committee has submitted to us.

We, of course, are very jealous of our own prerogatives; we are proud of the House. But we also must recognize that there is another branch of this Congress that is proud also of its prerogatives. Like all legislation, it is a question of give and take in the hope that we can reach a desirable end. There are many who find fault because there is too little public housing. Others say there is too much. Finally, the number of starts is a compromise and necessary to secure the support of the other body.

I think it would be very unfortunate if we went home without renewal of title I, and a continuance of efforts to relieve the drastic housing shortage as far as the military is concerned.

There are also in this legislation other matters like farm housing and college housing that are meeting with more or less demand throughout the country.

The gentleman from Virginia complains about the drastic rule. I know it is drastic, but it is no more drastic than we have had on many occasions in the past week on other pieces of legislation where the Members have had to vote "yes" or "no," on legislation on which if it had been brought up in the regular way would have brought amendments to make the legislation more acceptable. But we had to take it "yes" or "no," and it probably could not have been otherwise, either, because in our efforts to adjourn the Congress at a reasonable date we have to make some of these sacrifices of our privileges.

I say to you this legislation, while it does not meet all the requirements of the President, does not meet all the desires of the committee, we might as well, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has well said, face the realities of the situation: It is this bill or none.

Do we want to leave here without any housing legislation at all? If you do you will vote for the Smith amendment, and that will give you your vote as far as public housing or no housing is concerned.

The President does not believe that we should go home without some legislation, but he does not say because his attitude is never dictatorial. He does not say that we cannot go home without passing the bill, but he would like to see us pass some housing legislation before we adjourn. It would make his record of achievements improved.

Unless title I is passed we could well bring about a slowing down of the splendid construction program that is going on in private industry all over this country. Over a hundred thousand starts every month; and that, Mr. Speaker, contributes to the prosperity which we seek here in America. This bill is essential for the continuance of the program to aid private industry to provide the housing the country demands and needs. The building industry I repeat is a vital part of our national prosperity. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the absolute necessity for this public housing item, as the gentleman from Kentucky well said, is that the Senate will not permit any legislation unless we give them some public housing.

Mr. Speaker, we must be realistic about it, let us vote down the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Virginia. Let us pass the resolution in its present form because that removes us from an unfortunate predicament of our housing legislation. I again repeat it is this bill or no bill and by your vote on the Smith amendment that will be determined.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that amendment will not prevail.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman have any further request for time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for the purpose of offering an amendment to the rule to carry out what I have described in my previous statement.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 2, line 7, after the word "amendment" insert: "except one amendment to strike out title V authorizing public housing."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Under the wording of the gentleman's amendment no other amendment would be in order increasing the amount of public housing?

The SPEAKER. All that would be done would be to strike it out.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, let me say in the beginning that the gentleman from Indiana is correct in his statement as to what this amendment would do. That is to say, and let us get it straight, the amendment which I have offered does not strike public housing but, as the gentleman from Virginia explained a moment ago, it merely makes in order when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule a motion to strike the public housing section. I hope that is perfectly clear.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Then it is kind of a one-sided amendment. Those who would like to increase the amount above 35,000, and of course the committee itself reported a bill providing for 60,000 units, would not have an opportunity to increase it.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. If they want to vote for more houses they can vote for the committee bill?

Mr. COLMER. He is talking about this particular amendment, and he is technically correct about it. Of course, if the gentleman from Indiana wants more public housing, there is another way to arrive at it and that is to vote down the previous question on the rule if this amendment prevails or does not prevail; then he can get an open rule and get all the public housing he wants.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I am for the 35,000 units, and that is all I am for. That is plenty, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. COLMER. I am glad to get the gentleman straight on that, because I thought he was worried for a moment that he would not have an opportunity to raise it, and that was a little difficult for me to understand.

The gentleman from Virginia explained just what happened with reference to this housing bill. The Committee on Rules refused to grant a rule on the banking and currency housing bill, and the responsibility for that lies with those who are responsible, and I want to take my share of the responsibility for it as one of the members of that committee. If anybody else wants to take responsibility for it, they have that privilege.

Now, the time then came about, as it always comes about, when pressure is applied, and then a motion was made to reconsider, and this bill was reported out of the committee under a straitjacket rule. Now, we have been accustomed—and I want my liberal friends on the right to listen to this—we have been accustomed to having closed gag rules on revenue bills, but I say to you that this is the first time that we have ever had a closed rule on a public housing bill to my knowledge, and I do not think anybody can gainsay that. But, it is not only a closed rule, but under this rule, if approved here, and which you are going to vote on, and which I opposed in committee, you people over there on my left, the minority, are even denied the privilege of a motion to recommit with instructions. You have just got to take it or leave it.

Now, I say that is not the democratic process. It all comes back to this one question: Is this House going to reverse its position, or is it going to have an opportunity to reverse its position or an opportunity to stand with its traditional position of voting against public housing? Now, you cannot go back home and say, "Well, the Committee on Rules brought this thing out and there was not anything I could do about it; I just had to take it or leave it." You have an opportunity right here and now to say what you want to do about it.

Yes; you know what is going to happen. This bill is going over to the other body, you know, the responsible body over there, the body that has the privilege of legislating—they do not put themselves in any straitjacket—and it is going to come back here with 135,000 units, just as the gentleman said, or 200,000 or some other number from the conservative body over there, and then we are going to be asked, after the conferees meet, to strike a balance and take, well, let us say, half of it, and thereby get more public housing. Now, that is the way the thing has worked heretofore. I wonder sometimes if the people back home really know just what goes on up here and how we put ourselves in this unenviable position and then go back home and try to dodge the issue. The issue here today is whether you want to follow what you had the opportunity to do heretofore, and either vote for or against public housing. If you want to follow that procedure, then vote for this amendment. If you do not, then take the responsibility.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that the part relating to public housing is only that part on page 36. There are other elements contained in that title which do not pertain to public housing. I think the objective of those of us who are opposed to public housing is to have an opportunity to vote on the one section of public housing.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] that it might be better to offer an amendment to his amendment, confining it to that part of title V which is found on page 36, line 7, to line 10 on page 37, if that is agreeable to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the general housing bill, H. R. 11742, now before us for consideration, has many good features, but my only reservation is that it does not go far enough. However, it is a step in the right direction and it contains a number of programs that will keep our housing industry healthy and meet at least some of the housing needs of our less fortunate citizens.

At this point I would like to comment especially on the sections of the bill which deal with low rent public housing and with housing for our elderly citizens.

Frankly, it is a mystery to me why the merits of a public housing program even have to be debated. To those of us who know the terrible problems facing our low income groups, the urgent need for a large low rent public housing program is unquestionable. I find it hard to understand how anyone can oppose public housing. Just as our farmers need special support programs; just as our workingmen need laws to protect their rights; just as our businesses need various forms of Government support, so do our Nation's cities need low rent public housing, which is the only answer to the housing problems of our lower income groups.

The Congress has passed numerous laws designed to help our cities clear away their terrible slums, which are a blot both on the face and the conscience of the Nation. Unfortunately, I do not think the administration is pursuing the slum clearance program nearly as vigorously as it should. Our special Subcommittee on Housing held many days of hearings in various cities throughout the United States, and we learned that the slum clearance and urban renewal program in more ways than one is bogged down by redtape and buckpassing between administrative agencies.

But with the prodding of Congress, the slum clearance program finally seems to be gaining momentum. Nevertheless, if it is ever to get up full steam the Congress must at the same time provide for large numbers of low rent public housing units.

The blunt fact is that most of the unfortunate people now forced to live in slum areas do not have high enough incomes to enable them to afford decent, safe, sanitary private housing. Unless our Government provides decent housing for them at a rent they can afford to pay, these poor unfortunate people will merely be forced to move from one slum area to another.

The opponents of public housing have no answer to this problem and apparently are not concerned about the welfare of our low salaried citizens. Instead of facing it realistically and admitting the need for a large scale public housing program, they either take refuge in double talk or turn their eyes away from the problem which is so real and pressing for the families forced to live in slum areas.

The housing bill now before us provides for 50,000 units of new public housing a year for 3 years. In addition, it would provide an additional 10,000 units a year for 3 years of low rent housing for our forgotten elderly citizens, who have barely enough income to buy food much less pay rent for a decent place to live.

Frankly, I am ashamed of such a pitifully inadequate program. Now the Republican administration recommends a further reduction in the number of public housing units. This I cannot understand because I am doubtful whether 50,000 units of public housing a year can even begin to meet the public housing needs created by the slum clearance and urban renewal programs. It will not even touch the very real need for public housing that exists and will continue to exist in Philadelphia and our other metropolitan areas.

For years the home building industry, backed by the full support of Government housing programs, has built in excess of 1 million units a year for the private housing market, that is for people in the middle or higher income groups who can afford such housing. I think this has been a most desirable achievement because it has furthered the American goal of home ownership and has strengthened our national economy.

But unfortunately, the home building and real estate lobbies have not been satisfied with their tremendous profits. Whatever their motives have been, for some strange reason, they have waged a lobbying campaign against public housing for our lower income families. I can only hope and pray that these opponents of public housing will someday see the light.

In addition to providing 10,000 low rent public housing units a year for elderly citizens, the bill would make elderly single persons eligible under the regular public housing program. This feature of the bill would permit them to leave their dingy rooms and enjoy their remaining years in comfort. However, the administration proposes to strike this provision from the bill.

The bill further sets up an entirely new program for housing for the elderly which offers great promise. Long term, low interest loans would be made available to nonprofit corporations sponsored by charitable, fraternal and civic institutions desiring to build housing for elderly citizens, which would provide them with decent housing at a modest rental. However, the administration has ordered this provision stricken from the bill.

The bill also contains many other important provisions designed to bolster our home building industry and to meet other special housing needs.

To relieve the tight mortgage money situation prevailing in many areas, the bill would liberalize the secondary market program of the Federal National Mortgage Association which supports the private market for FHA and GI loans.

To increase funds for GI loans, the bill would authorize investment of 10 percent of the national service life insurance fund in GI loans in areas where mortgage discounts are heaviest. However, the administration is opposed to this feature also.

I am happy to see that the bill also has provisions to stimulate more FHA section 213 cooperative housing. Special aids to other essential housing programs featured in the bill are: liberalization of the vitally needed military housing program, a 5-year loan program for farm housing, and additional funds for college housing to help our institutions of higher learning meet the strain of ever increasing enrollments.

An extremely important section of the bill would attempt to breathe more life into the slum clearance and urban renewal program. For those families displaced by slum clearance operation whose incomes are just a little too high to make them eligible for public housing, but who can afford private housing, the bill would liberalize FHA mortgage terms to permit 40-year loans with no down payment. It would also permit higher mortgage ceilings so that FHA's urban renewal insurance program can really work in our larger cities.

I am pleased the bill proposes to do justice to the people and small businesses displaced by slum clearance operations. The bill would provide for payment of family moving expenses and also pay small business concerns moving expenses and other losses. Liberal term low interest loans would also be made available through the Small Business Administration to help the relocation of displaced small businesses. However, the administration is against helping these small businesses relocate.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of hard work has gone into this bill and I am glad to say it has many worthwhile features. My only regret is its failure to provide an adequate and realistic public housing program. I can only hope that the legislation which finally emerges this year will correct this failing and provide the large scale low rent public housing program that our country's welfare demands.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be amended to provide what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has suggested.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that there is an amendment pending now to the rule?

The SPEAKER. There was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi will be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my original amendment and I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 2, line 7, after the word "amendment", insert: "except the provision on page 36, line 7 to page 37, line 9."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], did have the floor, but he yielded it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi had the floor, but he yielded it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim the floor.

Mr. Speaker, what this does is to carry out my original intention when I spoke a while ago. The reason for this confusion is that this bill was introduced on one day, printed that night and some copies were hurried over from the Government Printing Office to the Committee on Rules by 10:30 o'clock so that we could gag you boys. No one had the opportunity to read or study the bill. We were told, or given to understand, that title V was the public housing title. It appears there are a number of other things in title V. The reason we are asking to restrict the original amendment is so that we may deal solely with the subject that I spoke about in my opening remarks, namely, the opportunity to discuss public housing. The amendment is so put that you can vote any amendments to public housing that you wish. For instance, there are a great many gentlemen here who feel like going along with the other body and increasing this public housing. This gives them the opportunity to do so if they so desire. It would also give you the opportunity to strike it out or to reduce it. That is the change in the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman certain that the amendment proposed would deal with the Widnall substitute bill, or would it deal with the original bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It follows right after the closed-rule provision on the Widnall bill, so it deals with the Widnall bill only.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The page numbers, if I understand correctly, referred to in the gentleman's motion to amend are the pages dealing with the Spence bill, not with the Widnall bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps it would be advisable for the gentleman to amend his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It looks to me as if we had better go on with this rule the way it is and adopt the bill, because the amendment as originally offered refers to the committeee bill. What we are hoping is that the substitute will be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it does not make much difference. I withdraw the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I move the previous question on the Colmer amendment and rule.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw the amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My parliamentary inquiry is, the gentleman from Virginia had an hour under the rule and

he yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi to offer an amendment. My understanding is that the gentleman from Virginia then lost the floor, control of the time.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] offered his amendment. Then he spoke and yielded back his time. Then I was recognized for an hour and I spoke and yielded back my time. Then the gentleman from Mississippi offered a substitute amendment. That meant he would be entitled to be recognized for 1 hour?

The SPEAKER. He withdrew the amendment and offered another amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, no other Member now could be recognized for an hour on the substitute amendment, because if it were so, I would want to be recognized.

The SPEAKER. Not if the previous question was ordered.

Mr. COLMER. Was the previous question ordered on my original amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the resolution.

Mr. COLMER. But on the original amendment.

The SPEAKER. On the original amendment. The Chair is willing to take that if that is the desire of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. That is it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported, so that we may know what we are voting on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 2, line 7, after the word "amendment", insert "except one amendment to strike out title V authorizing public housing."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the rule.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 91, noes 128.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, may we have the amendment read once more?

The SPEAKER. Technically, that would be out of order, but without objection the amendment may be read again.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there is a misunderstanding as to whether the title V referred to is in the Spence bill or the Widnall bill—they differ.

The SPEAKER. That is not a question for the Chair to determine.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 92, nays 299, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—92

Abbitt	Ashmore	Bolton, Oliver P.
Adair	Barden	Bonner
Alexander	Belcher	Bow
Alger	Berry	Brown, Ga.
Andrews	Betts	Brown, Ohio
Carlyle	Hyde	Robeson, Va.
Cederberg	Jackson	Rogers, Fla.
Chase	Jonas	Rogers, Tex.
Church	Jones, N. C.	Rutherford
Colmer	King, Pa.	Schenck
Coon	Landrum	Scherer
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Scrivner
Dies	McCulloch	Selden
Dorn, S. C.	McGregor	Sheehan
Durham	McMillan	Shuford
Evins	McVey	Siler
Fisher	Mack, Wash.	Smith, Kans.
Flynt	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Forrester	Mason	Smith, Wis.
Gary	Matthews	Taber
Gentry	Miller, Nebr.	Teague, Tex.
Gwinn	Minshall	Thompson, Mich.
Hale	Murray, Tenn.	Tuck
Haley	Nicholson	Vorys
Hardy	Osmers	Vursell
Harrison, Nebr.	Passman	Weaver
Harrison, Va.	Phillips	Williams, Miss.
Harvey	Poage	Willis
Henderson	Ray	Winstead
Herlong	Reed, N. Y.	
Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.	
	Richards	

NAYS—299

Abernethy	Derounian	Johnson, Wis.
Addonizio	Devereux	Jones, Ala.
Albert	Diggs	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Calif.	Dingell	Judd
Allen, Ill.	Dixon	Karsten
Andersen, H. Carl	Dodd	Kean
Andresen, August H.	Dollinger	Kearney
Anfuso	Dolliver	Kearns
Arends	Dondero	Keating
Ashley	Donohue	Kee
Aspinall	Donovan	Kelly, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Dorn, N. Y.	Keogh
Avery	Doyle	Kilburn
Ayres	Eberharter	Kilday
Baker	Edmondson	Kilgore
Baldwin	Elliott	King, Calif.
Barrett	Ellsworth	Kirwan
Bass, N. H.	Engle	Klein
Bates	Fallon	Kluczynski
Beamer	Fascell	Knox
Becker	Feighan	Knutson
Bennett, Fla.	Fenton	Krueger
Bennett, Mich.	Fernandez	Laird
Bentley	Fino	Lanham
Blatnik	Fjare	Lankford
Blitch	Flood	Latham
Boggs	Fogarty	LeCompte
Boland	Forand	Lesinski
Bolling	Ford	Lipscomb
Bolton, Frances P.	Fountain	McCarthy
Bosch	Frazier	McConnell
Bowler	Frelinghuysen	McCormack
Boykin	Friedel	McDonough
Boyle	Fulton	McDowell
Bray	Garmatz	McIntire
Brownson	Gathings	Macdonald
Broyhill	Gavin	Machrowicz
Buckley	George	Mack, Ill.
Budge	Grant	Madden
Burdick	Gray	Magnuson
Burnside	Green, Oreg.	Mailliard
Bush	Green, Pa.	Marshall
Byrd	Gregory	Martin
Byrne, Pa.	Griffiths	Meader
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Merrow
Canfield	Gubser	Metcalf
Cannon	Hagen	Miller, Calif.
Carrigg	Halleck	Miller, Md.
Celler	Hand	Miller, N. Y.
Chelf	Harden	Mills
Chenoweth	Harris	Mollohan
Chiperfield	Hays, Ark.	Morano
Christopher	Hays, Ohio	Morgan
Chudoff	Hayworth	Moss
Clark	Healey	Moulder
Cole	Heselton	Multer
Cooley	Hiestand	Mumma
Cooper	Hill	Murray, Ill.
Corbett	Hillings	Natcher
Coudert	Hinshaw	Norblad
Cramer	Hoeven	Norrell
Cretella	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Brien, Ill.
Crumpacker	Holifield	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cunningham	Holland	O'Hara, Ill.
Curtis, Mass.	Holmes	O'Konski
Curtis, Mo.	Holt	O'Neill
Dague	Holtzman	Ostertag
Davidson	Hope	Patterson
Davis, Tenn.	Horan	Pelly
Dawson, Utah	Hosmer	Perkins
Deane	Huddleston	Pfost
Delaney	Hull	Philbin
Dempsey	Ikard	Pilcher
Denton	James	Pillion
	Jenkins	Poff
	Jennings	Polk
	Johnson, Calif.	Price
Prouty	Seely-Brown	Van Pelt
Quigley	Sheppard	Van Zandt
Rabaut	Sieminski	Velde
Radwan	Sikes	Wainwright
Rains	Simpson, Pa.	Walter
Reece, Tenn.	Sisk	Watts
Rees, Kans.	Smith, Miss.	Westland
Reuss	Spence	Wharton
Rhodes, Pa.	Springer	Widnall
Riehlman	Staggers	Wier
Riley	Steed	Wigglesworth
Rivers	Sullivan	Williams, N. J.
Roberts	Talle	Williams, N. Y.
Robsion, Ky.	Taylor	Wilson, Ind.
Rodino	Teague, Calif.	Withrow
Rogers, Colo.	Thomas	Wolcott
Rogers, Mass.	Thompson, N. J.	Wolverton
Rooney	Thompson, Tex.	Wright
Roosevelt	Thomson, Wyo.	Yates
Sadlak	Tollefson	Young
St. George	Trimble	Younger
Saylor	Udall	Zablocki
Schwengel	Utt	Zelenko
Scott	Vanik	

NOT VOTING—41

Bailey	Gordon	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Hébert	Priest
Baumhart	Hoffman, Ill.	Scudder
Bell	Jarman	Shelley
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Short
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Simpson, Pa.
Burleson	Kelley, Pa.	Thompson, La.
Carnahan	Lane	Thornberry
Chatham	Long	Tumulty
Clevenger	Morrison	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	Nelson	Whitten
Dawson, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.	Wickersham
Dowdy	Patman	Wilson, Calif.
Gamble	Powell	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Johansen for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Tumulty against.

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Short.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. RILEY, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. DOLLIVER, Mr. AUGUST A. ANDRESEN, Mr. UTT, Mr. BUDGE, Mr. PILLION, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. BOSCH changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUSING BILL OF 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11742, with Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly to me for the purpose of clarifying what happened a few moments ago with reference to my amendment?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, a very unfortunate incident has just happened, and since it is confusing, I think I owe it to the House and for the RECORD to explain the situation.

My amendment was hastily drawn and was inaccurate in that it would not have achieved the desired purpose of giving the Members an opportunity to vote on public housing had it been adopted.

It will be recalled that there are two bills, H. R. 11742 and H. R. 12328, dealing with housing.

The amendment was prepared by me here at the desk just before the rule was called up. Inadvertently I picked up H. R. 11742, which contained the public housing section entitled V and drew my amendment rather hastily, I repeat, to fit that bill. This was a mistake. I should have drawn my amendment to apply to section IV of the bill, H. R. 12328, the bill under consideration.

This error was not discovered until it was too late to correct it. Many Members who voted against the amendment would have voted otherwise had the amendment been correctly drawn to achieve the objective sought.

I regret this mistake exceedingly. And, while it illustrates the difficulty of legislating in this hurried fashion in the dying days of the Congress, I must take full reponsibility for the error.

Therefore, the vote just taken was not a fair test of the sentiments in this House on the public housing question.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, this is an important piece of legislation; in fact, it involves authorizations in the billions.

I should like to say to the Members of the House that the Committee on Banking and Currency is not at fault because of the necessity which puts this bill before you in the haste and hurry of the closing hours of the Congress. We presented this bill to the Committee on Rules, as I recall, on June 29 in the hope that we would be able to get an open rule so that all germane amendments would be in order and we could debate this bill under the proper parliamentary procedures and then come out with a bill which was the will of the House and the will of the Senate and the will of the Congress of the United States. So, if there is any feeling of resentment by anybody about the fact that the bill now comes out this late and hobbled with a gag rule, it is not the fault of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

This bill represents an intensive study and long hearings. It represents more than a year's hard work by a subcommittee authorized by special resolution by the House of Representatives to study all of the facets of the housing problem. I want to express publicly my thanks to the members of the subcommittee who traveled with me all over the United States to various cities and sections all over the Nation in order to find out at the grassroots level the housing problems of the country. In my 12 years on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I measure my words when I say this, there has never been a bill presented to the Congress that has had as much study and constructive hard work as this bill represents today. We had more than 2,500 pages of hearings—not just here in Washington but all across the country. Then we had a month of hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. While no piece of legislation is perfect, the bill comes as near as any piece of housing legislation that has ever been presented to the Congress to meet the needs of the housing industry. Before I get into a detailed analysis, I want to bring your attention to several vital factors affecting housing generally. In the first place, the housing business in this country is not in good shape today. Housing starts for the last several months have been falling off at an alarming rate. In fact, in this year in which it was estimated by those in the housing agency that we would have 1,300,000 starts, we are going to do well if we have a million. Interest rates are high across the Nation for everybody who wants to buy and own a home. High discount rates have jumped up like phantoms in every section of the country—6 percent, 7½ percent, 8 percent, and 9 percent for veterans and people who want to utilize the FHA insured loans. The housing industry, as you know, is a very vital segment of the national economy. If Congress were to adjourn without passage of a housing bill, it is my considered judgment it would take a bite out of the national economy at the very minimum of perhaps $12 to $18 billion. Not only would you deny and defeat the people who want so much to own their own homes and to have decent shelter, but you would also adversely affect very seriously the prosperity of the Nation at the same time.

The bill itself, when we presented it to the Committee on Rules on June 29 was blasted by the administration. Although I think they were overtalking themselves. Now when I say it was blasted by the administration, I mean the housing administrator who said it was "ill conceived," "excessive," and so forth. But the plain fact is this: If what he said about the committee bill were true—and I certainly do not think that it is—90 percent or more of it would be applicable to the Widnall bill. The simple truth of the business is, and I want you to know it is that the substitute bill carries 90 percent or more of the same provisions of the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I think you would like to know the main items of difference between the two bills. In general, these are the items of difference:

In the first place, we wrote into the committee bill a section which would effectively provide housing for the old people. As chairman of the subcommittee, I received more mail in support of housing for the elderly than I did for any other section of the bill. In the light of the fact that people are living longer, that a greater percentage of our population is above 65 years, it is absolutely urgent that this Congress make some provision for the elderly people; something more than a token provision for housing for the elderly. So we have in the committee bill a section which would provide for direct Government loans to nonprofit organization to build housing for the elderly. It is our expectation that if that is written into law a great percentage of that housing would be built by private enterprise. That is not in the Widnall bill.

I mentioned a while ago the high discount rates across the country. There are sections of this country, not only in my Southland but even in California, where the high discount rates on mortgage money is almost unbelievable. So we put a section in the Banking and Currency Committee bill, which is before you, to utilize 10 percent of the national servicemen's life insurance fund in GI guaranteed home mortgages. Remember this is the money of GI policyholders; it does not belong to the Government; it belongs to the GI's in this country. We simply would authorize 10 percent of these funds to be invested in guaranteed home loan mortgages, with all of the qualifications and restrictions necessary to keep safe and secure the trust fund of the GI national servicemen's life insurance fund. It would provide $500 million for loans to GI's only. In the high discount areas this is essential. That is not in the Widnall bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman concerning the use of 10 percent of the National Servicemen's Life Insurance fund for secondary mortgages. I have worked with the chairman of the subcommittee, being a member of the subcommittee that investigated housing, for the past 2 years. We find there is urgent necessity for a second mortgage market to supplement FNMA, and that the investment of 10 percent of National Servicemen's Life Insurance fund in such mortgages would be a great benefit to the interest return. I enjoyed my association with the gentleman in the committee work. I find there was a conscientious effort to study out the housing program across the Nation by the subcommittee in every respect.

Mr. RAINS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama on the splendid speech he is making. I voted for the committee bill and I expect to vote for the committee bill if I have a chance. If we lose on it, I expect to vote for the Widnall bill. I voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COL-

MER], to give the right to every Member to express his will on public housing. I think that is the only controversial matter in this bill. I expect to support the Committee on Banking and Currency. We asked for home rule. I still want home rule. If I cannot get full home rule, I will vote for half of it.

Mr. RAINS. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, who is one of the most outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as we all know.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama. I want to point out that when the subcommittee was touring the country, among the cities visited was my city of Cleveland. The need of the secondary mortgage market I think was quite obvious to the committee, more so in Cleveland than in many parts of the country because of the land title situation and the devious requirements incident to home ownership.

I want to commend the gentleman for the fine work he has done on this committee.

Mr. RAINS. I appreciate the gentleman's kind remarks.

I want to get back now to the other differences between the two bills, so that you may know what you are voting on.

There are some differences as reflected in the liberalization of credit in the committee bill. They are minor, in my opinion.

There are some differences in cooperative housing in which the committee bill gives more special assistance to certain cooperatives than does the substitute bill.

The other important difference, I think, is the public housing feature, and this is a title in which the Members are very much interested. The difference between the two bills is this: In the Banking and Currency Committee bill there are authorized 10,000 units per year of housing for each of 3 years for elderly people; there are 50,000 units each year for 3 years of public housing generally, based on need.

In the substitute bill there are 35,000 units only, and these are subject to the workable program requirement. So that is the difference between the two bills on the item of public housing.

I should like to say to you, even though I come from an area where public housing is not as critical as it is in many of the great cities of the country, that it is my considered judgment that we ought not to have legislation on this difficult and important subject of housing without a considerable number of units to assist the cities in clearing slums and in providing for the truly unfortunate and underprivileged. So it is my judgment that the minimum housing we ought to provide under housing is 50,000 units a year.

Apart from these differences, the bills are about the same. In each of the bills there is the item for military housing, title 8 as we knew it in the Housing Act of last year. It is a section of the bill which is very much desired by the military in order to provide some adequate housing on military bases for the men, and this was advocated by General LeMay in his appearance before our committee.

In the bill also, I may say to the friends of agriculture, for the first time in a long time there is a 5-year program in each bill for farm housing through the Farmers' Home Administration. They are identical in each bill.

There is also the college housing program which is, as I recall it, identical in each bill.

And there are the items transferring the various public housing projects to military establishments, and so forth. They are identical in each bill.

So what you actually have is a choice between what I am sure is a better bill—the committee bill—and the substitute bill which is not a bad bill. If the substitute bill had more units of public housing, had really effective provisions to get housing for the elderly, and took care of the lending agencies, I would say myself that it was a good bill. Why not? It represents substantially the work of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Housing Subcommittee as I said, for a full year. But you do have these three major differences. They make the difference between a good housing bill and a bill that does not effectively meet the real needs.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I must comment further upon the administration's actions after the Banking and Currency Committee reported H. R. 11742. The administration issued a press release charging that the committee bill was unrealistic, excessive, and ill-conceived. These charges were an unwarranted attack upon a committee of the House and, in my judgment, were completely unfounded and were a deliberate attempt by the administration to sabotage a good bill. Actually, this was done purposely and in order to throw up a smokescreen to hide the deficiencies and shortcomings of the administration's housing bill, which was an inadequate and a half-hearted effort by the administration to correct known deficiencies of the Federal housing programs.

In broad terms, the committee bill has two primary objectives. The first is to help the home-building industry maintain its vital supporting role to a sound and prosperous overall economy. The second objective of the bill is to provide the necessary aids to meet a number of desirable and pressing special housing needs, for example, housing for the elderly, housing for lower income groups, farm housing, housing vital to slum-clearance operations, college housing, and military housing.

This month, July 1956, finds the home-building industry in one of the most serious conditions that the industry has experienced since the end of World War II. Right at the present time, housing starts are at an unseasonally low rate, FHA and VA applications have continued to decline while on the other hand, mortgage money is the tighest it has been since World War II. As a result, mortgage discounts have been steadily increasing at the expense of the builder and the home buyer who have been caught between rising costs and tightening mortgage money.

Housing starts in May were 24,000 below May 1955. In June, housing starts continued to slide, dropping 3 percent to 104,000 with private starts numbering 102,300. These private starts represented a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,070,000, the lowest point in 2½ years and approximately 200,000 below June 1955.

The dollar volume of residential construction has declined less than the number of units which, of course, reflects higher costs which pushed to a new high in June. Bigger and better homes are being produced, but this means, of course, that fewer lower-cost homes are being constructed.

It should be noted that May and June housing starts reflect mortgage conditions of 4 to 6 months ago. The much tighter mortgage conditions that now prevail will show up in housing starts 4 to 6 months from now unless some relief is forthcoming. Probable future housing volume is foreshadowed in VA appraisal requests and FHA applications being made at the present time. These, too, have been declining in recent months. VA appraisal requests in May and June were down slightly from April and May but nearly 40 percent below a year ago.

FHA applications have also shown sharp declines over a year ago although currently running about the same level in recent months. It would appear then that housing starts undoubtedly will not increase within the immediate future and may even show a further decline.

At the present time there is no indication that there will be any easing of the mortgage market in the near future. The overall money markets have become very tight during the spring and there has not been any easing of that condition to date. Bond prices fell in February after rising for some months and have continued down ever since.

Although many financial experts have been predicting that mortgage money shortages would be over by spring two events have combined to prevent that development. There has been an enormous demand for credit of all kind due to the tremendous business boom this year. This has been true in every area except for consumer financing where the decrease in new auto sales has meant a reduced demand. Inventory accumulation mostly of raw materials and semi-processed items, always a characteristic of an expansion phase, has been moving quickly and this, too, uses credit.

At the same time, savings have not been building up at a level needed to support all the new investment. This is particularly true for the savings and institutional fund accumulations so important for home building. Funds flowing into the major institutional investors who provide most of the housing credit are below last year. Last year at this time money began to tighten appreciably.

A combination of forces have been at work in the money market place—heavy demand and failure of supply to increase. The result has been, of course, less supply of money to go around for residential mortgage and construction financing. This in turn has resulted in increasingly higher discounts that had to be paid for this type of money.

Coupled with the well-recognized increasing costs of land, labor, community facilities, and materials, this decreasing supply of mortgage money is not only causing total production to fall but the home-building industry is being forced to abandon the low downpayment, low monthly carrying charge pattern of mortgage financing which has been a basic factor in development of mass production home building in the past 20 years. If the present trend continues, the average home buyer will progressively be deprived of the opportunity to acquire a suitable home at terms within his ability to pay.

The conclusion to be drawn from these forces is obvious. That is, of course, that the impact of higher costs, higher discounts, tighter mortgage financing will cause a decrease in the housing starts for this year and future years until some relief is given to the home-building industry. Building throughout the country has reflected the impact of these forces in the gradual decline of building being constructed at the present time and in the planning stage for the future. The industry will need every assistance it can obtain if it is to fulfill its job of providing more and better homes for the families of this country.

The committee bill would provide a much-needed stimulus to the rate of housing construction which is now far below the levels of a year ago. For one thing, the bill would liberalize the credit support to the home-building industry furnished by the mortgage purchase operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. By lowering the stock purchase requirement, it would reduce the costs of doing business with FNMA so that builders and mortgage lenders can more readily use the support facilities of FNMA. It would authorize advance commitments under FNMA's secondary market operation in order to furnish needed production support to home builders in many parts of the country. It would give special aid to the special assistance program of FNMA which is designed to support such worthwhile housing programs as urban renewal housing, cooperative housing, disaster housing, and military housing. FNMA would be directed to pay par for such mortgages for a limited period and the bill would provide additional funds to support these special housing programs.

To supplement FNMA's support and to combat the excessive discounts which have plagued GI loans in many parts of the country, the committee bill would authorize investment of 10 percent of the national service life insurance reserves in GI mortgages in those parts of the country where discounts are heaviest. This would provide a "shot-in-the-arm" of about $500 million to those areas in greatest needs of additional mortgage funds. Our bill contains protective features which would guarantee absolutely the safety of the national service life insurance fund, and the earnings of the fund would, in fact, be increased by the addition of higher yielding guaranteed mortgages to its portfolio.

In addition, builder participation in the GI and FHA loan programs would be encouraged by a provision in the bill authorizing higher commitments to builders so that they can obtain more liberal construction financing.

Taken together, these measures will provide a much-needed stimulus and should help to forestall any further decline in the home-building industry, which furnishes such a vital underpinning to our overall economy.

For the first time and at long last, our bill would provide aid for a deserving group of our citizenry whose housing needs have been too long neglected. The bill would provide two major programs to help meet the pressing housing needs of our elderly citizens in the 65-years-or-over age brackets.

For our elderly citizens in the most dire need, the committee bill would authorize 10,000 additional low-rent public-housing units a year for a 3-year period. The bill would also make elderly single persons eligible under the regular low-rent public-housing program. Thus, our bill would provide urgently needed housing help to those unfortunates among our elderly citizens who barely have enough income to buy food let alone decent and adequate housing.

As another means of meeting the housing problem facing elderly citizens, the committee bill would establish a new loan program within the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Two hundred and fifty million dollars would be provided for loans to nonprofit corporations desiring to build housing at moderate rentals for elderly citizens. To keep the rentals charged at the lowest possible level, our bill would provide financing to nonprofit charitable institutions at very favorable terms, that is, 50-year loans at 3½ percent interest. The committee bill contemplates that at least part of the financing will be provided by private capital.

H. R. 11742 provides one additional support to elderly citizens who want to buy homes under the FHA-insured loan program. This would be done by permitting a borrower over 60 years of age to borrow the required downpayment from a relative or some other individual.

For low-income families generally, our bill would provide a substantial number of low-rent public-housing units—50,000 units a year for a 3-year period. I believe this program to be the absolute minimum which can in conscience be endorsed.

Everyone would prefer to see the housing needs of our lowest-income families met by private industry. But the blunt and inescapable fact is that the real-estate industry has not yet found a way to supply decent, safe, and sanitary housing at rents which the lowest segments of our population can afford. Aside from the very great pressing need for low-rent public housing for low-income groups generally, the large-scale slum-clearance program—which everyone hopes will soon gain greater momentum—will displace increasing thousands of low-income families who must have subsidized housing aid.

The public housing units authorized by the committee bill fall far below the number which the Senate bill would provide. At the other end of the scale, I believe that the 35,000 public housing units a year for 2 years advocated in the administration housing bill, is too low a quota to meet the minimum need. I sincerely hope that those of my colleagues who have been opposed to public housing—or at least lukewarm to it—will reconsider. I am sure that they want the Nation's slum clearance and urban renewal program to succeed, and frankly, that can never happen unless we provide the public housing needed to rehouse the thousands of families who will be uprooted and who just cannot afford decent private housing.

H. R. 11742 contains a number of provisions designed to make the slum clearance and urban renewal program more effective. For those displaced families who can afford private housing, the committee bill would liberalize credit terms under the urban renewal insurance provisions of FHA's section 221. It would provide for higher mortgage ceilings so that section 221 housing can be built in more cities. It would enable people moving from slum areas to purchase modestly priced homes with a down payment of only $200 to cover closing costs and it would reduce their monthly housing expenses by permitting an FHA-insured loan up to 40 years.

The committee bill would give additional incentive to the production of multifamily rental housing in our cities. It would put pressure upon the FHA Commissioner to recognize a more liberal profit margin which experts in the field have stressed as necessary to attract private sponsors into building under FHA's section 220 program, which is designed to provide rental housing in urban renewal areas.

To provide more urban rental housing generally at modest rentals, our bill would increase the loan-to-value ratio for mortgages under FHA's rental housing program—section 207. This provision should attract additional sponsors by permitting projects to go forward with smaller equity investments.

H. R. 11742 would also recognize the hardship which displaced families and small business concerns suffer as a result of slum clearance operations. It would authorize payment for moving expenses and other losses, and also would authorize the Small Business Administration to make low-cost liberal-term loans to help the relocation of displaced small business concerns.

So far I have been talking almost exclusively about city dwellers. The committee bill does not overlook the housing needs of our Nation's farmers, which in my opinion are even greater than those of urban housing. It would extend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for a 5-year farm-housing program. Specifically, H. R. 11742 would authorize, first, $450 million for direct farm housing loans to be available during a 5-year period; second, an additional $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments on loans for potentially adequate farms; and, third, an additional $50 million for grants and loans for improvements and repair to keep houses safe and sanitary and also to encourage family-size farms.

The committee bill recognizes that an effective direct lending program under title V is a needed supplement to the insured farm housing loans available under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act meet an important part of farm housing need, but they do not reach all of the area of need by any means. For example, Bankhead-Jones Act loans are limited to owners to economic family-sized farms, whereas loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 are not.

Unfortunately, the title V farm housing loan program has been stymied in recent years by a failure on the part of the administration to implement it. Actually, the sum of approximately $500 million authorized by our bill over a 5-year period is not a new loan authority, but an effort to renew the unused loan authority which has accumulated under title V since its inception in 1949. I sincerely hope that by setting up the title V program as a much-needed long-term program to provide low-cost credit on liberal terms to farmers, we can obtain the administration's cooperation so that the title V program can function effectively.

The college housing loan program would be given continued life by authorization of an additional $250 million for such loans. The college housing loan program, first authorized in the Housing Act of 1950, has proved of immeasurable aid to our institutions of higher learning, and it is essential to continue such aid since the need for college housing is becoming more and more acute in view of the ever-increasing number of college students.

The committee bill gives special attention to the housing needs of our military services. The lack of adequate housing is one of the most serious problems facing our military services, and I believe it is vital to improve the efficiency and morale of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of our Armed Forces by insuring them of an adequate supply of good housing at a reasonable cost.

The title VIII military housing program would be extended for an additional 3 years up to September 30, 1959, and the construction of a total of 150,000 units would be authorized under the program. The average cost per unit would be increased so that the services can build housing which measures up to minimum desirable standards.

The committee bill would also provide for transfer at a fair price of privately sponsored military housing built under title VIII prior to the Housing Amendments of 1955—the so-called Wherry housing—to the military establishments. This would put this housing where it belongs—in the hands of the military—and it would permit the services to improve the standards of such units and to rent them at lower rentals to military personnel. It would also relieve hardship on the present sponsors of the Wherry housing who are facing inevitable competitive pressure as the title VIII military housing program builds up in volume.

The committee bill contains a number of other important amendments affecting FHA programs. For example, it would liberalize loan ceilings for section 213 cooperative housing, and would provide a new commitment device to cooperative sponsors to stimulate the production of cooperative housing. It would also liberalize the FHA title I home improvement program so that home owners could obtain larger loans, with a longer repayment period. Another amendment would make it easier for families to buy existing homes by lowering the downpayment required in connection with an FHA-insured loan.

Another amendment in our bill deserves special mention. It set up a special fund under the Federal National Mortgage Association special assistance program to stimulate more construction of FHA section 203 (i) housing. Section 203 (i) is designed to encourage low-cost housing in outlying and rural areas.

There are other provisions in the committee bill which improve and perfect the existing machinery of Government housing legislation. They are covered in the more detailed summary and section-by-section analysis which I am attaching.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say that I am proud to have had a part in the creation of H. R. 11742. It is a bill based upon the most expert testimony we could assemble. It is a bill forged from hard work which reflects the problems we found at the "grassroots." It is a bill which recognizes the crucial role of a prosperous home building industry in our national economy. It is a bill which recognizes the diversity of our housing needs and which contains the tools necessary to satisfy those needs. I earnestly implore all of my colleagues to give the committee bill the special attention it deserves and I deeply hope that you will vote down the Widnall substitute, H. R. 12328, and then pass H. R. 11742.

I will be glad now to yield to answer any questions.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the secondary mortgage market provision is in both bills.

Mr. RAINS. They are practically the same in both bills, the secondary market is a lot the same.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Is there any provision in either bill limiting the commission that can be charged veterans? Under the big housing program they are being charged outrageous commissions; in my section of the country in order to get a loan they have had to pay as high as 10 percent.

Mr. RAINS. That is the reference I made a moment ago to the very high discount rates. There is nothing in either bill that will outlaw the charging of discounts. I do not think we have the authority to write it in the bill. It is a private enterprise transaction; but if you liberalize the method we have provided in the committee bill there would be sufficient mortgage credit to take care of the situation. That is what we want to do.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and to compliment him on the very fine job he has done in the field of housing. I would like to ask the gentleman, As I understand it there is provided an amount for rural housing?

Mr. RAINS. That is correct; it is $100 million a year for 5 years.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Did I understand the gentleman to say that under the substitute which will be offered in the form of the Widnall bill, there will be no provision for the aged? There are no units set aside?

Mr. RAINS. There are no units set aside in public housing and no nonprofit corporation section that would provide direct loans to build houses for the elderly. There are some minor provisions in the FHA bill that would be of assistance to individuals here and there. There is nothing to provide any very substantial amount of housing for the elderly.

Mr. SISK. I may say that from the State of California I have received more letters indicating greater interest on the part of the people in my area in this particular provision which you have in the committee bill providing for housing for the aged than any others.

Mr. RAINS. I may say to the gentleman that it is a good section. If we do not write it into this bill this year the public will demand that we do it next year. Remember what I say.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] and the Housing Subcommittee, of which he is chairman, for the recognition they have given in the housing bill to farm housing needs.

On March 30, 1956, a hearing was conducted in Birmingham, Ala., by the Housing Subcommittee. At that time, I made the following statement in which I discussed current farm housing needs:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, BIRMINGHAM, ALA., MARCH 30, 1956

I. THE NEED FOR BETTER FARM HOUSING

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, at the close of World War II, a great deal of attention was focused on providing better homes for our citizens. In the decade since the war, much urban progress has been made, but the improvement of homes for farmers has lagged.

Undoubtedly there are difficulties in achieving better farm homes. The farm population is widely dispersed and, of course, public housing developments provide no relief for poorly housed farmers. Furthermore, it is difficult to separate the farm home from the farm itself. They are a sort of business entity, and all too frequently farmers are forced to plow their profits back into the farming operation of the business. Consequently, the farm home is very often neglected.

Just what are current farm housing needs? Here again we see that the emphasis has been placed largely on urban rather than farm housing. While there are any number of studies available on urban housing needs, there are virtually none that adequately measure the needs for housing on the farm.

While the Economic Report of the President pays considerable attention to nonfarm housing, farm housing is overlooked. In 1953, the President received a report from his Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs, but this, too, failed to cover farm housing problems.

Under the Housing Act of 1949, title 42, United States Code, section 1476, the Secretary of Agriculture was directed "to prepare and submit to the President and to Congress estimates of national farm housing needs and report with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective."

When I recently requested such farm housing reports from the Department of Agriculture, I was told that none are available—that this provision of the act has been dormant.

Lacking a detailed study of farm housing needs and remedial programs, we can only construct the farm housing picture from census reports.

Today we are considering housing in Alabama and the South, and I think I can give a good example of farm housing needs from my own Sixth district. The last housing figures available from the Census Bureau showed that an average of 34 percent of farm houses in the eight counties of the Sixth District were dilapidated, had no private bath or toilet, and were not supplied with hot water. This 34 percent was an average. In one of these countries, 62 percent of the farm homes were without the conveniences I have cited.

I do not think that this illustration from my district is an exceptional one. The Sixth District of Alabama is in a farm income strata that runs through a large part of the South. In the face of conditions such as these, I believe that farm housing certainly merits the attention that this committee is so well prepared to give it.

II. PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE FARM HOUSING

As you know, there are three major programs designed to provide housing aid for farmers. Two of these programs are administered by the Farmers' Home Administration, one resulting from the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and the other from the National Housing Act of 1949.

Under the Bankhead-Jones Act, direct and insured loans are available for housing on family farms of reasonable size. Loans for smaller and part-time farms are covered by title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

A third source of home loan money for farmers is the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 which is the legislation responsible for the loans administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Bankhead-Jones Act

It is generally recognized that the number of direct loans that the Farmers Home Administration can make under the Bankhead-Jones Act is limited by the size of the appropriation. This appropriation is generally about $19 million a year.

A veteran's preference is extended in the direct loan program and properly so. But as a result of the preference and the size of the appropriation, nonveterans are virtually excluded from this program's benefits. This necessarily limits the program because many of the farmers who have inadequate housing are not veterans.

Under the same act, the Farmers Home Administration can insure farm loans up to a maximum of $100 million, but under this insured loan program, loans are limited to 90 percent of the value of the farm or 90 percent of the cost of acquiring the farm—whichever is less. In Alabama, the average farm is only worth about $6,000 and was probably worth less when it was acquired. Thus these insured loans are often inadequate.

Housing Act of 1949

Under Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, loans are authorized for farms which have a value of production between $250 and $1,199 yearly, and for farms which do not provide the full support of the operator and his family.

This latter program is a small farmer's program, and many of the farms so badly in need of better housing are small farms. The last agricultural census showed that there were about 19,000 farms in my district. Roughly 8,000 of these, or about 44 percent, were small farms that were eligible to participate in the loan program I am now discussing.

Unfortunately, during fiscal 1955 and 1956, the administration did not see fit to request an appropriation for this small farmer's loan program. Recently, the administration, in a reversal of policy, requested $5 million for this program for the remainder of the current fiscal year.

Veterans' Administration Loans

The final major program that includes farm housing is handled by the Veterans' Administration. Both direct and insured loans are authorized under this program. However, I call to the attention of this committee the fact that only a small percentage of the loans made under the Veterans' Housing Program are farm loans.

Through January 25, 1956, the number of farm housing loans made in Alabama by the Veterans' Administration amounted to only 5 percent of all housing loans since the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was passed in 1944. There were 52,859 home loans, but only 2,861 farm home loans in Alabama.

If we compare the dollar amount of farm housing loans in Alabama with other loans under the Veterans' Administration program, we see that farm housing accounted for only $6,843,057, compared with $388,030,902 for other types of home loans during the same period. Farm housing loans—dollarwise—were only 1.7 percent of other loans.

Figures I recently obtained from the Veterans' Administration show that in Tuscaloosa County, the county which contains the largest city in my district, 22 percent of the veterans have been successful in obtaining Veterans' Administration loans. In the seven other counties, which are largely rural, only 7 percent of the veterans have obtained loans. Thus the veterans in the agricultural counties of my district are obtaining only one-third as many loans as veterans in the county with the metropolitan center.

Why are these farm veterans failing to obtain housing loans? It is certainly not because they don't need them. As I have pointed out, a large percentage of rural homes in my congressional district are substandard.

There is reason to believe, however, that farm veterans are not getting loans because certain current loan practices of the Veterans' Administration are not working satisfactorily.

You are undoubtedly aware that in most rural areas, all veterans' loan applications are now being funneled to a private lenders pool known as the voluntary home mortgage credit program. Today, loan applications from rural veterans are passed to the private lenders pool and an effort is made to find loan capital for the rural areas where home loan capital is normally scarce.

Under present Veterans' Administration regulations, VHMCP lenders are allowed to make loans at a discount. For example, if a home seller is asking $10,000 for a home, the VHMCP will only make a loan at a discount, usually 2 percent. In other words, the lender will only make a loan for $9,800 on a $10,000 house, and the some seller is required to absorb the loss. The veteran is prohibited by law from making up the difference to the seller. Many sellers balk at the discount practice.

When the veteran fails to get an insured loan from a private lender, he then applies to the Veterans' Administration for a direct loan. There his application is often denied on the basis that the bona fide offer of capital that was made by a VHMCP lender was not accepted.

The irony here is that the veteran had nothing to do with the nonacceptance of the loan offer. The unsuccessful negotiation was actually between the lender and the seller and the veteran had no choice in it.

The Veterans' Administration says it cannot do otherwise. If it grants direct loans, after VHMCP negotiations fail, sellers will automatically turn down VHMCP offers, knowing that the veterans can then obtain direct loans at full value. This would invalidate the VHMCP and, under the law, the Veterans' Administration must work with private lenders.

There are sound arguments in favor of VHMCP—that it has provided new loan resources for veterans; that loans are undoubtedly well processed by our experienced private realtors; and that the Government's loan activities should not threaten this segment of our private business. Yet, the VHMCP as it now operates often not only does not give the veteran a VHMCP loan, but prevents him from getting a direct loan. Therefore, in my opinion, this program should be carefully reexamined.

III. CONCLUSION

While the present housing programs provide for farm housing, the fact that so few families have taken advantage of the farm loans available indicates the need for a careful reexamination of the entire subject. The presence here today of the Housing Subcommittee of the important House Banking and Currency Committee is an assurance that all phases of Federal housing programs, both farm and urban, are receiving the closest scrutiny. We are very pleased to have you gentlemen here in our State of Alabama, and hope that your stay will be both pleasant and profitable.

Mr. Chairman, it is evident from the recommendations made by the Committee on Banking and Currency in its report on H. R. 11742 that its members have given careful consideration to the problem of farm housing. A long-term program to provide low-cost credit on liberal terms to farmers is certainly an important section of the Housing Act of 1956.

Mr. RAINS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I wonder if the gentleman can get me straight as to which one of these bills takes care of the situation we have in Florida since our Supreme Court has ruled unconstitutional slum-clearance programs in conjunction with housing programs?

Mr. RAINS. In the committee bill there is no tie-in at all between slum clearance and the public housing program. In all fairness, I should say that there is a requirement in the Widnall bill which would provide for a workable

program. However, from studying the bill, I am convinced that the workable program requirement is not tied to families displaced by slum clearance. There were restrictions that were once in the bill that said that public housing could be used only for the purpose of handling those dislocated by governmental action. That is in neither the Widnall bill nor the committee bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to clear up the previous question asked by the gentleman from Florida. While this bill would not require a going slum clearance and urban redevelopment program, it would require a plan of action by the community to remove the slums that may be found in the area.

Mr. RAINS. It is not made a requisite. I shall include as a part of my remarks a summary of the committee bill.

SUMMARY OF H. R. 11742

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Section 101 dealing with FHA title I home improvement loans provides:

(1) A 2-year extension.

(2) An increase in the maximum loan amount to $3,500 (present ceiling is $2,500) and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans to improve multifamily structures.

(3) An increase in the maximum loan term to 5 years (present ceiling is 3 years).

(4) A sliding interest rate scale permitting a $5 discount on loans below $1,500 and a $4 discount on that portion of the loan which exceeds $1,500. Presently a $5 discount is charged regardless of loan amount.

(5) Discretionary authority to the FHA Commissioner to waive the present requirement that a new home must be occupied at least 6 months before borrower is eligible for a title I home improvement loan.

Section 102 amends the mortgage insurance program of FHA's section 203 by—

(1) Establishing the same mortgage limits for both new and existing housing. Under present law new construction enjoys a slight differential advantage. To prevent circumvention of FHA inspections, an existing home not built under FHA inspection would have to be at least 1 year old to qualify for the more liberal terms.

(2) Increasing by 5 percentage points the maximum loan which FHA can insure if the loan is closed by someone other than the owner-occupant. Presently a nonowner-occupant can insure up to 85 percent of the amount of the insured loan available to an owner-occupant.

(3) Increasing the maximum loan which can be insured for an individual whose home is damaged or destroyed by disaster to $12,000 (present ceiling is $7,000).

Section 103 would liberalize rental housing insurance under FHA's section 207 by—

(1) Permitting a loan up to 90 percent of value (present ceiling is 80 percent of value).

(2) Increasing loan ceilings to $2,250 per room (present ceiling is $2,000) and up to $2,700 per room for elevator-type structures (present ceiling is $2,400). In high-cost geographic areas the Commissioner is authorized to increase per room maximums by an additional $1,000. These liberalizations would establish loan ceilings per room for section 207 similar to those permitted for urban renewal insurance projects under section 220.

Section 104 would amend cooperative housing insurance under section 213 by providing—

(1) A new device to permit a cooperative sponsor to obtain a commitment for a loan up to 85 percent of replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. This would overcome the marketing difficulties involved in the present requirement that the cooperative be sold 100 percent before construction can begin. The sponsor would certify intent to sell to a cooperative upon completion. Until he sells the project, he would be regulated by FHA as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. Also, if the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative, he cannot use this special insurance feature again. In all cases the sponsor would be subject to the cost certification requirement of section 227.

(2) Authority to the FHA Commissioner to permit in high-cost geographic areas an additional $1,000 per room in computing the maximum permissible insured loan.

Section 105 would increase the FHA mortgage insurance authorization to make available an additional $3 billion.

Section 106 would amend the urban renewal insurance provisions of FHA's section 220 by—

(1) Providing for a profit and risk allowance of 10 percent of project cost (excluding land) for sponsors of urban renewal insurance projects, although the FHA Commissioner is authorized to prescribe a lesser percentage if he certifies that a 10 percent allowance is unreasonable.

(2) By making it clear that the present mortgage limits permitted for elevator-type projects are also available to the sponsors of garden-type apartments.

Section 107 would liberalize relocation housing insurance under section 221 by—

(1) Increasing the maximum permissible loan to $9,000 and to $10,000 in high-cost areas. (Present ceilings are $7,600 and $8,600, respectively.)

(2) Permitting no downpayment financing by requiring only that the borrower pay $200 in cash to apply toward closing costs.

(3) Increasing the permissible loan maturity from the present 30-year ceiling to 40 years.

Section 108 would amend the cost certification requirement—

(1) By making such certifications incontestable after the Commissioner's approval of the certification, barring fraud or material misrepresentation.

(2) By permitting an allocation of general overhead costs acceptable to the Commissioner to be included in the total certified cost.

(3) By permitting the owner of a multifamily housing project to obtain FHA-insured financing to cover the full amount of rehabilitation cost, provided he presently has sufficient equity in the property. This would correct an inequity in present law. In no case could the FHA-insured loan exceed the maximum loan-to-value ratios permitted by statute.

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Section 201 would establish a new loan program for rental housing for elderly families and persons, similar to the college housing loan program. This section would provide $250 million revolving fund to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for loans to nonprofit corporations for the construction or rehabilitation of housing for the elderly. No more than $50 million of the loan fund could be outstanding at any one time for related facilities such as cafeterias, community rooms, infirmaries, etc.

The interest rate could not exceed 3½ percent per annum and the maximum loan term would be 50 years. The cost of funds to the Administrator from the Treasury could not exceed 3 percent.

The bill would permit loans only when private capital is not available upon the terms and conditions provided in the bill.

The bill contains a provision prohibiting the use of this housing for transient or hotel purposes.

Section 202 would make low-rent public housing available to elderly persons (65 years or over):

(1) By making elderly single persons eligible for the regular public housing program.

(2) By authorizing the construction of units specifically designed for elderly persons. The section provides 10,000 units annually for a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1956.

(3) By increasing the permissible per room cost for units for elderly persons to $2,250 (present ceiling, $1,750).

Section 203 would amend FHA's regular home insurance program to make it easier for elderly persons to obtain mortgage financing. Where the mortgagor is 60 years of age or older, the bill would permit the required downpayment to be paid by an individual other than the mortgagor.

TITLE III—SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

Section 301 would liberalize the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association by—

(1) Exempting from the $15,000 limit on loans eligible for purchase the following: (a) Military housing loans insured under section 803 and (b) FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans made in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

(2) Reducing the stock purchase requirement to no more than 2 percent.

(3) Permitting advance commitments under the secondary market operations. Such commitments would be issued at a price high enough to provide production support to builders and yet sufficiently below the prices offered by the Association for immediate purchase to discourage excessive sales to FNMA pursuant to advance commitments. No stock subscription would be required unless the mortgage is actually purchased.

(4) Requiring FNMA until June 30, 1957, to pay par for special assistance mortgages.

(5) Increasing the advance commitment funds available for special assistance operations to $400 million (present ceiling is $200 million).

(6) Amending the present revolving fund for section 213 mortgages to make it clear that the $5 million limit per State is on outstanding commitments, in other words to make clear that the State suballocation can "revolve" exactly the same as does the $50 million nationwide revolving fund.

(7) Making it clear that any military housing loan insured under title VIII on or after August 11, 1955, is eligible for special assistance.

(8) Providing a $50 million revolving fund under the special assistance program to support FHA section 203 (i) loans. Section 203 (i) loans are designed to encourage low-cost housing in outlying and rural areas.

Section 302 would establish a new secondary market support program for GI loans. Under its provisions the Secretary of the Treasury could invest up to 10 percent of the reserves of the national service life insurance fund by purchasing VA-guaranteed loans in geographic areas where discounts on GI loans are heaviest. Both current reserves and future premiums could be used. Since the fund's reserves are approximately $5½ billion, the program could supply approximately $550 million in funds to support the market.

Only loans guaranteed after enactment would be eligible for purchase. To protect the fund from loss in case of serious default, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would be required to purchase the defaulted loan.

The program would expire on July 25, 1957, the present expiration date for the GI loan benefit of most World War II veterans.

The Federal National Mortgage Association would act as the Treasury's agent to

purchase and service loans. Payment for such services is limited to a maximum of three-fourths of 1 percent. Since the GI loans purchased would yield at least 4½ percent, the fund would earn a minimum of 3¾ percent on its mortgage portfolio.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 401 would amend the slum clearance and urban renewal program by—

(1) Eliminating the requirement for a separate redevelopment plan for any part of an urban renewal area to be cleared of slums or redeveloped. The requirement for a separate redevelopment plan is no longer necessary since the elements of such plans are included in the overall urban renewal plan and a separate redevelopment plan serves no useful purpose.

(2) Increasing the authority of the Administrator, without regard to the 10-percent State limitation, to enter into contracts for capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal projects not exceeding $100 million (present limit, $70 million) with local public agencies in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted a State have already been obligated.

(3) Providing for payments to individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by urban renewal activities to reimburse them for moving expenses and other losses of property except goodwill. Payments would be limited to $200 for individuals and families, and $5,000 for business concerns.

(4) Providing that an "urban renewal plan" shall not include the construction of additional hotel facilities unless it is shown they are actually needed. The urban renewal plan including the construction of a hotel shall contain a certification that a survey of anticipated profits has been made by a recognized independent firm, and that such survey indicates the need for such additional hotel facilities.

Section 402 would authorize the Housing Administrator to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

Section 403 would increase the urban renewal planning grant authorization from $5 million to $10 million.

Section 404 would extend to private nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning the same privilege with respect to Government construction planning advances, as that now enjoyed by tax-supported educational institutions of higher learning. Both such types of educational institutions receive equal consideration under provisions of the college housing loan program, and this change would place them on a parity with respect to planning advances.

Section 405 would provide additional assistance to small business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas. The Small Business Administration would be authorized to make loans, under liberal credit standards, to help displaced businesses to relocate. The loans would carry 4-percent interest and could extend for a term of 20 years. The bill would authorize $25 million for such loans.

TITLE V—PUBLIC HOUSING

Section 501 would provide 50,000 low-rent public housing units annually for a 3-year period beginning August 1, 1956. Provision is made for carrying over to subsequent years any unused portion of the annual quota.

Section 502 would direct the PHA to transfer farm-labor camps to local public housing agencies upon their request, without compensation, and within 18 months of enactment. First occupancy preference would be given to low-income agricultural workers, and second preference to other low-income families. In the case of Florida, any public housing agency acquiring such farm labor camps would be required, in the event of the sale of such project, to use the proceeds to construct new facilities for such workers and families.

Section 503 would—

(1) Provide for the transfer of 41 temporary defense housing projects constructed or acquired under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act of 1951, and two Lanham Act war housing projects, from the Housing Agency to the Department of Defense, effective July 1, 1956.

(2) Provide that "1951 act" defense housing not transferred to the Department of Defense must be disposed of as expeditiously as possible, not later than June 30, 1958, on a competitive bid basis; project IDA–2D1 at Cobalt, Idaho, to be sold for on-site use only.

(3) Direct the HHFA to convey the Lanham Act Tonomy Hill project (RI–37013) at Newport, R. I., to the Housing Authority of the city of Newport, and the Lanham Act Passayunk project (PA–36011 and PA–36012) in Philadelphia, Pa., to the Housing Authority of the city of Philadelphia.

(4) Amend the Lanham Act by adding a new section 614 to accelerate the disposition of those projects which must be sold for off-site use or as entire projects.

Section 504 would authorize the sale under prescribed conditions of two Government-owned projects, the Chinquapin Village housing project in Alexandria, Va., and the Techwood Dormitory in Atlanta, Ga.

Section 505 would direct the Public Housing Commissioner to authorize certain local housing authorities to make payments in lieu of taxes for past fiscal years. There are 10 cities which would receive payments under this amendment.

TITLE VI—MILITARY HOUSING

Section 601 would extend and liberalize the title VIII military housing program by—

(1) Extending eligibility for military housing insurance to the Canal Zone and Midway Island.

(2) Extending the program for 3 years until September 30, 1959.

(3) The aggregate total of mortgage insurance authorized would be increased to $2,475 million to provide for the construction of an additional 49,000 units (now 101,000). Correspondingly, it increases from $9 million to $21 million the total permissible monthly payment to amortize military housing mortgages. This authorization would cover, in addition to the 150,000 units of title VIII housing, some 82,000 units of Wherry Act housing.

(4) Permitting an average cost per dwelling unit of $16,500.

(5) Permitting the FHA Commissioner to waive or reduce the FHA insurance premium.

(6) Applying to title VIII housing the same net floor area limitations which apply to appropriated funds housing.

(7) Providing that plans and specifications prepared for the military departments follow the principle of modular measure in order that the housing may be built by conventional construction, on-site fabrication, factory precutting, factory fabrication, or any combination of these methods.

Section 602 would establish a new program requiring the Secretary of Defense to acquire the sponsor's interest in existing "Wherry" housing by—

(1) Directing the Secretary of Defense to acquire, operate, and improve such housing.

(2) Providing for the Secretary to acquire such housing by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer or through condemnation.

(3) Establishing a formula to be paid for the sponsor's interest in such housing: (a) the formula would be based upon the FHA Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost less the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds, or the actual cost (as defined in sec. 227 (c) of the National Housing Act), if such cost is less than the Commissioner's estimate. The appropriate base would then be adjusted to current cost levels and reduced by an appropriate allowance for physical depreciation; (b) to this amount would be added the current fair market value of all usable personal property and chattels used in connection with the maintenance and operation of such housing not included under the mortgage as security for the outstanding principal obligation; (c) to arrive at the amount to be paid for sponsor's equity, this gross amount would be reduced by the outstanding mortgage obligation against the project. A limit of $1,500 per unit is fixed as the maximum amount payable for the sponsor's equity interest in such housing under this formula.

(4) Providing authority for the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to acquire Wherry projects through condemnation, if either he or the Wherry owner disagrees with the price established under the prescribed formula.

(5) Authorizing the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with the mortgagee for the release of reserves for replacement, taxes, hazard insurance, etc., and the waiver of all future requirements for such accruals once the mortgage is assumed by the Secretary.

(6) Authorizing the Secretary of Defense to assign the housing acquired to military personnel. However, if such housing does not meet existing standards for public quarters, it may be assigned as rental quarters without loss to such personnel of their quarters allowance, until it is renovated to meet such standards.

(7) Establishing a revolving fund with an authorization for an appropriation not to exceed $50 million. This fund would be used for paying the purchase price for housing and other property acquired, principal, interest, mortgage insurance premiums, and all other obligations except those for maintenance and operation, for each project acquired. The fund could also be used for improving or altering such housing after acquisition in order for it to meet the standards established for public quarters. Receipts from rentals and withheld quarters allowances would be paid into the fund.

Section 603 would clarify congressional intent with respect to the rights of local communities to tax the interests of mortgagors under the Wherry Act mortgage insurance program. Alhough it is provided that this interest is not exempt from State or local taxes, the section provides that such taxes must be reduced by (1) any payments in lieu of taxes made by the Federal Government to the local taxing bodies with respect to the property, (2) any expenditures made by the Federal Government for streets, utilities, and other services for or with respect to the property.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Farm housing

Section 701 amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize, for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, (1) $450 million for farm housing loans, (2) $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments of loans for potentially adequate farms, and (3) $50 million for grants and

loans for improvement and repair of certain farm structures.

College housing

Section 702 would increase loan funds for college housing by $250 million, bringing the total authorization for such purpose to $750 million.

Public facility loans

Section 703 would make it clear that public facility loans are available to the Territories and possessions as well as to the continental United States.

Federal savings and loan associations

Section 704 would amend the Home Owners' Loan Act to permit Federal savings and loan associations to increase their maximum permissible uninsured home improvement loan from $2,500 to $3,500, thereby placing them on a parity with the increased loan amounts being recommended for FHA title I home improvement loans.

Federal Home Loan Bank Act

Section 705 would provide for a study by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board of means of improving the services rendered by the savings and loan associations, and would disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956, and prevent its taking effect (or, if it has become effective by the time the bill is enacted, would nullify it).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I first should like to pay a most richly deserved tribute to the gentleman who preceded me. I have had the honor and privilege of serving in Congress with Congressman ALBERT RAINS for 10 years. Since we represent adjoining districts, I have followed his work very closely. While he has been an outstanding Congressman in all respects, he has attained special eminence in the field of housing. Ever since he came to Congress in 1945 he has served on the Banking and Currency Committee which has responsibility for the housing bills. As a result of the expertness he acquired, he was honored by being named chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing which handles housing legislation initially. For 4 years he has served in that capacity. In my opinion, and I state my opinion unqualifiedly and without fear of contradiction, he is by far the outstanding authority in the United States today on the subject of housing. His vast store of knowledge with respect to this subject surpasses that of any other individual. This opinion is shared by all who are familiar with his career. He has devoted thousands of hours throughout the years to the mastery of this subject. He has held hearings in various parts of the country to obtain firsthand information at the grassroots level as to the needs of the people and the effectiveness of the programs which have been in existence. We in Alabama are very proud of his accomplishments and know that when he recommends a housing bill we can depend upon its soundness and desirability. I congratulate ALBERT RAINS for his praiseworthy contribution to the preparation of this bill.

I would like to emphasize that H. R. 11742 is not just a public housing bill. It has many other desirable and worthwhile sections. The section which concerns me most is the section providing a 5-year program to improve the housing of our farmers.

It has always seemed unfortunate to me that when housing programs and problems are discussed, it is always with reference to urban housing. I am not questioning the obvious need for federally supported programs to improve the quality of urban housing and to help eliminate city slums. All I ask is that fair and equal treatment be given to the very serious housing needs on our Nation's farms.

In fact, there is evidence that the farm housing problem is actually more serious. The 1950 census of housing showed 20 percent of farmhouses are so dilapidated that they need major repairs or need to be completely replaced. The percentage of urban homes in such sad shape was considerably lower.

The farm housing problem was serious enough in 1950, when farm income was close to 100 percent of parity. Now, with net farm income down nearly $4 billion since 1952, the difficulties facing many farm families in their attempts to correct farm housing deficiences have been multiplied.

The farm housing section of H. R. 11742 would go far toward meeting this serious problem. Section 701 of the bill would extend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for a 5-year farm housing program.

Specifically, the bill would authorize, first, $450 million for direct farm housing loans to be available during a 5-year period; second, an additional $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments on loans for potentially adequate farms; and, third, an additional $50 million for grants and loans for improvements and repair to keep houses safe and sanitary and also to encourage family size farms.

I am convinced that an effective direct-lending program under title V is a needed supplement to the farm housing loans available under the insured-loan program of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Insured loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act meet an important part of farm housing needs, but they do not reach all of the area of need, by any means.

For example, Bankhead-Jones Act loans are restricted to owners of economic family size farms, whereas loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 are not. Title V loans can help low-income farm families on small farms. Others in need of aid include owners of small tracts of land who round out their full-time farm operations with leased land. These small farmers who are denied aid under the insured-loan program of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Act can only be helped through an extension and expansion of the direct-loan program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

I would like to emphasize that the repayment record of loans made under the title V farm-loan program has been outstanding. Foreclosures have been few, indeed.

I would like to emphasize also that farm families cannot receive direct-loan assistance under the title V program unless they have been certified by farmer committees as being unable to obtain the necessary credit from private sources.

I would also like to emphasize that the farm housing section of H. R. 11742 does not provide a new loan authority. What it does do is to renew the unused loan authority which has accumulated under the title V program since its inauguration in 1949.

Despite the basic soundness and merit of the title V farm housing loan program, it is distressing to realize that not a single loan has been made under this program since December of 1953.

This has not been because of failure on the part of Congress. Consistently each year we have extended the title V farm housing loan program. In plain fact, it has been sabotaged by the administration's failure to implement it. I think this is but another indication of the indifference and callous attitude toward farmers on the part of the present administration.

H. R. 11742 would establish the title V loan program on a long-range 5-year basis to provide liberal credit for farmers. It is the hope of those of us who are concerned with the farm housing problem that by setting up the program on a long-term basis we can induce a change of attitude on the part of the administration so that the title V program can make a real contribution in helping to solve the farm housing problem.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Housing Act of 1956.

First, I want to say that I think this is the best housing bill that has been before the House in several years, and I want to take this occasion to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], who served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, for the fine work that he has done in this field during this Congress.

In March of this year, he brought his subcommittee, consisting of himself and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and others, to Birmingham to investigate housing needs in Alabama. I had the privilege of appearing before the subcommittee at that time.

This is a good bill. It contains legislation providing for the continuance of FHA housing; the continuance of, and liberalization of, the FHA repair provisions, increasing the maximum amount of a repair loan from the present $2,500 to $3,500 and extending the repayment period from the present 3 years to 5 years; it provides for a continuance of public housing which, after bitter fights ranging over a period of nearly 8 years now, since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, has come to be accepted, fairly generally, as an essential part of any well-rounded housing bill.

The first public housing project to be built in Alabama, following the passage

of the Housing Act of 1949, was in my hometown of Jasper, Ala. The project was appropriately named the William B. Bankhead Homes, in honor of the memory of a former Speaker of this House who, for many years, represented the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I now have the privilege to represent. Since then, many other public housing projects have been built all over the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. It is my understanding that all of them are fully occupied, and that most of them have long lists of persons who are waiting to live in them, if vacancies occur.

I am glad to see the public housing program continue. It will mean that many towns in Alabama will be able to obtain low-rent public housing projects.

I am also glad that this bill contains the provision it does for college housing and military housing, both of which, at this particular time, mean much to Alabama and to the country.

Also, I am happy this bill contains an authorization of $450 million for farm housing. This program was begun by the Housing Act of 1949. I recall the day in the fall of 1949 when the second housing loan of this type to be made in Alabama was closed at Russellville, Ala., and how, a few weeks later, the program was started in Walker County, Ala., by the closing of a loan at Jasper, Ala. The program has meant a great deal to the rural people of the Seventh Congressional District, and it has been a program that has been badly needed. I was disappointed when, in the 83d Congress, the money for this program was practically shut off. This authorization should give the program seventy-five to one hundred million dollars a year, thus enabling it to at least begin to fulfill the real needs of our rural people for housing.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to be entirely too easy to overlook the needs of the rural people, in housing and in other fields. People speak as if slums could occur only in city areas. I submit that some of the worst slums in America exist in the rural areas of the country. The greatest need for housing, by and large, is today in the rural sections of America. There are more houses without bathrooms and plumbing facilities on the farms of America than anywhere else. This bill takes cognizance of that fact, and provides for it in a realistic way, and thus makes me happy to have this privilege of voting for it.

I think many of us overlook the fact that the home-building industry is one of our foremost industries. It is a $10 billion industry. It furnishes jobs for the carpenter, the bricklayer, the painter, the plumber, the plasterer, the paperhanger, the electrician, and the architect. It furnishes jobs to those who produce the lumber, and for those who produce the materials that go into the building of the house, and the furnishing of it as well.

The American home is the center of American family life. It is the cradle of democracy. America's strength is the strength of her families. It is the strength of her homes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for a good many years, since 1937, anyway, we have had each year a housing bill of some type. We have gotten so that we expect housing bills to come on, and we have gotten to think that they are a necessity. A housing bill this year is less a necessity than at any other time.

The Senate passed a housing bill, and the House committee reported out a House bill which went to the Committee on Rules, as you have been advised. Now, in respect to the Senate bill, I think it was the worst, although most comprehensive, housing bill that was ever passed. It was a worse type of bill than even the bill the House committee reported out, if that were possible, causing the administration to characterize these bills in this fashion, and I am reading from a press release by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency the day that we went before the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule on the housing bill:

> Unrealistic, excessive, ill conceived are the terms applied today by Albert M. Cole, Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator, to many of the provisions of the housing bill reported out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and came before the House Committee on Rules. Mr. Cole said that the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the administration will continue to press vigorously for a bill that conforms to the principles of the legislation recommended by the President. The President's recommendations were the results of intensive study and consideration, not only of our housing needs but also of how we can best meet them under a sound economy, Mr. Cole said. The bill, as proposed, is unsound in many respects and contains serious excesses of many kinds.

Now, he was speaking for the administration. The Senate bill was decidedly obnoxious to the administration. The House bill was objectionable to the administration in this language used by Mr. Cole.

We commenced to study the bill a little bit following that—perhaps we should have done it before—and we found that there was need in only two particulars for a continuance of any housing bill. The title I modernization provisions expire on September 30, and, as has been said, it was quite essential that something be done before September 30 to continue the insuring of modernization loans.

In addition to that, the administration was somewhat concerned about the military housing. So, all that it was necessary to pass this year was military housing and title I.

In respect to the program itself on FHA financing, I received a letter from Norman P. Mason, Commissioner of FHA, inquiring how long we could continue at the present tempo of home construction with the present authorization. Mr. Mason, on June 29, also the day on which we went before the Committee on Rules, had this to say:

> Pursuant to your request I wish to advise that the insurance authorizations of the Federal Housing Administration are ample at the rates of building currently estimated for fiscal year 1957 to continue its mortgage insurance programs until sometime in June, 1957, without further authorization.

We could go until June 1957, without further authorization for FHA insurance. This program of FHA insurance has to do with so-called section 203's which have to do with the insurance of 1- to 4-family units; section 207's which have to do with multiple-family units; 213's which have to do with cooperative units; 220's which have to do with urban renewals; 221's which have to do with urban relocation; 222's which have to do with servicemen; 223's which have to do with miscellaneous programs, and title VII which has to do with yield insurance.

There was not any necessity for passing any continuance of a public housing program notwithstanding everything which has been said here. There is in the pipeline today in excess of 20,000 unused units authorized. So if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] had been permitted to amend the so-called Widnall substitute to strike out public housing, there would be still in the pipeline unused over 20,000 units that can be constructed this next year. So you do not have to do anything with public housing this year.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We have more than 20,000; we have 55,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I explain to the gentleman that I arrived at that 20,000 in this way; that at the present time, in this year, they have only used 4,371 of the 45,000 which we gave them last year, but they are honest enough to tell us that by the time the authority expires on July 31, they are likely to have to use 20,000, instead of 4,000.

The Widnall proposal is the proposal which was referred to by the administration as being the administration proposal. The workable program that has been referred to as a part of the Widnall proposal has to do with some essential objectives before public housing can be used. They have to do with cities providing by codes and ordinances for cleaning up their slums and depressed areas. It must have a comprehensive community plan; neighborhood analysis; administrative organization; financing; and housing for displaced families and citizens' participation.

Although in 1954, when we wrote the 1954 act, public housing had to be tied into slum clearance and urban development, and only to the extent shown it was necessary to find shelter for those who were being displaced by public works incident to slum clearance and urban development, that has been abandoned, and not only abandoned in the Senate bill and in the House bill, but abandoned likewise in the proposals here offered now by the administration through the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. I do not agree with them.

In 1955 the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency when talking about these restrictions which tied in with slum clearance and urban development said:

> I believe the purposes of these restrictions are essentially sound and should be adhered to.

The President told me that in July 1954. Until the President tells me that he has changed his mind I will not think that anybody else to the contrary notwithstanding is speaking on this question of the necessity for constructing public housing. So it was not necessary to pass any bill for public housing because we have ample authority. It was not necessary to do anything but to continue title I and something about military housing.

The proposal of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has been the subject of many conferences on a leadership basis, although they have known right along that I have been against that provision. I surely would have been glad to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to the rule had it been in such form that it could have been done.

What I am getting at is that the Widnall substitute which has been made in order as the only amendment which can be offered to this bill is a reflection of the administration's desires and is a reflection of the administration's position that only those things which are in the Widnall proposal are necessary for a sound and orderly continuance of the housing program.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, there are many good features in H. R. 11742. This bill would improve the various FHA insurance programs, would provide a much-needed stimulus to home building and mortgage credit, and would expand and improve other important Government-supported housing programs to meet special housing needs.

I wish to say that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], I believe, has had more to do with preparing this bill than anyone else. I think he knows more about housing in general than any man in the Nation.

One of the chief virtues of the bill is its recognition of the vexing shortages of mortgage capital which exist in many areas, particularly in the South and West, which are remote from the concentrated pools of investment funds which to a disproportionate degree are concentrated in the northeastern section of the United States. It has always seemed unfair to me that in times of credit stringency—when our smaller towns and communities and rural areas are starving for more mortgage-investment capital—at the same time many other areas enjoy relative plenty.

One of the means of smoothing out this geographic disparity is through a properly functioning Government-supported secondary market. That function is now, of course, carried out by the Federal National Mortgage Association, and in general under the provisions of present law, FNMA is providing substantial support in many areas. But I think its support role can be greatly improved and I am pleased that the bill would provide the means to do so.

Under present law a mortgage lender selling a loan to FNMA must buy stock in an amount equal to at least 3 percent of the principal amount of the mortgage. I think this requirement is too severe and in many ways it is like hitting a man when he is down because a mortgage lender selling to FNMA has been unable to place his mortgage in the private market and is using FNMA only as a last resort. The bill would ease this cost burden of doing business with FNMA and would reduce the stock purchase subscription to no more than 2 percent.

The advance commitment authority which the bill would bestow on FNMA in its regular secondary market operation will help builders to obtain necessary production credit support in areas where they are not now able to do so. The commitment price would be substantially below the market but it would provide the lender and the builder with assured take-out financing so that construction financing can be obtained locally. The bill would also liberalize the special assistance program of FNMA and would provide additional funds for this program which supports deserving types of housing, such as disaster housing, and housing for persons displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal activities.

In addition to improving FNMA's market support operations the bill would permit up to 10 percent of the veterans' national service life insurance reserves to be invested in GI loans in areas of the country where investment funds are in shortest supply as evidenced by excessive and burdensome discounts. The bill guarantees the veterans' insurance fund against loss.

These sections of the bill should improve the mortgage credit situation markedly in many parts of the country and I deeply hope that they will become law.

Special FNMA special assistance support would be granted by the bill to low-cost housing built under section 203 (i) of the National Housing Act. Under this section adequate housing can be built at a lower cost in outlying and rural areas because it does not have to completely meet the sometimes severe requirements imposed upon housing in built-up urban areas. I am most hopeful that the bill will stimulate this type of housing which is needed greatly for our lower income groups.

The bill contains a number of other perfecting improvements to the various FHA programs. For example, it would wipe out the small differential in the amount of down payment required on existing homes as against new homes. The FHA program is now an accepted institution in our land, and I think that the FHA-insured mortgage is one of the reasons why our economy has been able to maintain its strength. I am exceedingly proud to have played a role in the creation by Congress of the FHA amortized mortgage in 1934. Thanks to the long-term low-interest amortized loan which the great bulk of homeowning families enjoy today, we need not dread the specter of mass default and foreclosure which inevitably followed the period of the 1920's when mortgages were not amortized but were payable in full after a certain period, and when the whole mortgage structure was a house of cards resting on precarious foundations of first, second, and third mortgages.

The bill contains important provisions to support housing programs to meet other special housing needs.

I am glad to say that the bill does not overlook the housing needs of our farmers. Too often people think of housing problems as belonging exclusively to city dwellers.

To help meet this problem the bill would provide a 5-year $500 million loan fund for farm housing.

The bill recognizes that an effective direct lending program until title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is a needed supplement to the insured farm housing loans available for some purposes under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act meet some farm housing needs, but they do not reach all of the area of need by any means.

Actually, the sum of approximately $500 million authorized by the bill over a 5-year period is not a new loan authority. It renews and restores funds which the administration has failed to use. By establishing the title V program as a long-term program, I sincerely hope that the administration will stop trying to hamstring the program and will cooperate to really make it work.

Another very deserving program is the college housing loan program, first authorized in the Housing Act of 1950. The skyrocketing student enrollment facing our colleges and universities has created a most serious housing problem. Under the college housing loan program, these institutions are able to obtain liberal financing at a low interest cost and for a long repayment period. This has enabled them to build decent and adequate housing for students and faculty members. I think the college housing loan program has been singularly successful and I want to see it continue on the present basis. The $500 million authorized for such loans to date is virtually exhausted and I strongly endorse the additional $250 million which the bill would provide for loans under this program.

The bill also recognizes the extreme importance of helping our military services to provide good quality housing to military and key civilian personnel. It would permit the military services to build housing of better quality and would increase the program from the present approximately 100,000 units to a new total of 150,000 units.

The housing needs of the military would also be helped by a section of the bill directing the transfer to the military services of the so-called Wherry Act housing, that is, housing built under title VIII prior to the housing amendments of 1955. This would achieve the worthwhile objectives of putting military housing where it belongs under the operation of the military service concerned—enabling the military services to improve the acquired units—and would help prevent hardship to Wherry Act sponsors whose economic solvency is threatened by the growing competition of military housing built under the new title VIII military housing program.

I hope that the day is not too far distant when the private-building and real-estate industries can provide decent

housing at prices or rents which our low-income families can afford.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the aims and purposes of the Housing Act of 1956, now under consideration by the House.

The problem of housing is one that deserves the consideration of Congress. Through a period of years Congress has enacted legislation designed to be helpful in remedying housing shortage, and, to make it easier for families to acquire ownership of houses. Each year it seems that new problems arise that call for changes in existing law. Congress has responded to these new demands to a degree. But full recognition of the need has been difficult to obtain. The result has been compromise legislation that has not always been as effectual as it should have been. The present legislation, H. R. 11742, reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, provides many changes in existing law in an endeavor to meet the present-day needs. There is considerable difference of opinion as to the necessity of some or all of its provisions, and, as a result it is expected that substitute measures will be introduced before final action is taken.

It is my personal opinion that there is a greater need for some of the proposals contained in the committee bill than some are willing to concede. It is my intention to vote for such provisions as will most effectively meet the present-day needs. I am strongly of the opinion that good housing and sufficient in number is one of the fundamental requirements of a contented and satisfied people. Consequently, it is an inescapable obligation of Government to make certain that such exists whenever and wherever private interests fail to adequately provide such. The importance of good housing cannot be overlooked as a means of providing good citizenship, as well as healthful and satisfactory living conditions. It is too important to permit it to lag because of failure of private interests to meet the problem. In such cases the Government is not only justified but obligated to step in and meet the need.

The committee bill, H. R. 11742, is a comprehensive bill that merits favorable consideration. It can be correctly termed an omnibus housing bill. It is designed to expand and improve Government assisted housing programs to enable our people to acquire better housing and to assist our communities in their efforts to clear slums, arrest the spread of blight, and in general to promote more wholesome neighborhoods for better family living. The provisions of this bill are the result of an exhaustive and painstaking study and investigation into many phases of the housing and home finance industry. It takes a broad view in its concept of what is needed, and, it provides assistance not only for public housing needs, but also for private builders as well.

An examination of the committee bill will reveal that bill in its numerous and varied provisions is most meritorious, but, in addition to its general worthwhile character, it is particularly commendable in many of its special provisions. As an illustration of this fact, I point to the provision that has been made with respect to elderly persons, either in the single or family status. Under this section of the bill loans can be made to private nonprofit corporations to provide rental housing for such elderly persons. Related facilities would include cafeterias, dining halls, community rooms or buildings, infirmaries or other health facilities, and other necessary facilities in connection with such type of housing. Construction, however, must not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials. I think we are all aware of the difficulties faced by elderly people in obtaining suitable living conditions due to insufficiency of income and a desire to maintain a degree of independence from the necessity to rely on the willingness of family relationships to take them into their own family group. This so often creates a burden and inconvenience on the family group even though they are willing and anxious to care for their elderly relations. Thus, it can be seen, by this single illustration, how worthwhile the provisions of the pending bill are. Many more illustrations could be given that would include slum clearance, assistance in disaster areas created by floods and forms of disaster, assistance to small business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas, farm housing and farm labor camps, college housing for needy students, and, to enable municipalities to plan for development of appropriate housing and improvements. Much more could be said that would include increased loan provisions for home improvements, mortgage assistance and other numerous and varied programs of assistance designed to improve living conditions that otherwise might be prevented because of inability to obtain loans on terms and rate of interest that could not be met by low income families, even though their honesty was beyond question.

In conclusion, I wish to state that it is my intention, in the first instance at least, to support the committee bill in preference to the substitute that is to be offered. There are many reasons that could be given to justify such action upon my part. Without any attempt to enumerate all of them, I think it is sufficient to refer to only a few, for instance, the provision made to assist our elderly people is not contained in the substitute bill, and, there is a much less number of public housing units provided for. In addition, there are many restrictions and limitations contained in the substitute bill. Giving full and careful consideration to the whole matter, I am convinced that although the substitute bill does contain many provisions that are in the committee bill, yet, on the whole it is not as broad or inclusive in its entirety as is the committee bill. Hence, it is my intention to vote in favor of the committee bill. Of course, if on vote of the House it should be defeated in favor of the substitute bill, then, I would feel it is my duty to support the substitute bill in order that we may have at least some housing legislation at this session of Congress. It is my hope, however, that the House will approve the committee bill instead of and in the place of the substitute bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when I returned to the 84th Congress, and to the Banking and Currency Committee, on which I had served in previous Congresses, it was to dedicate myself to the task of broadening the horizons of life for those on the western slope waiting for the sunset. I, too, am on that western slope, and perhaps better than those who are younger do I understand the yearning of our senior citizens for a place in our national society broader than dependence, richer than sympathy, however loving.

I came to the 84th Congress fresh from an investigation and a study of the housing needs of our elderly men and women which at my own expense and during the interim between the 83d and 84th Congresses I had conducted with the interest of one close in intimate understanding and with something of the exhilerating zeal of one who throws himself into the advancement of a cause as a holy crusade.

On February 10, 1955, I introduced in this body the first bill for a housing program for our elderly. It envisioned homes for the aging and the aged, both married and single, within their financial means and located in or near the communities in which their children and friends reside and dear to them from memories of the past.

Eleven members of the Banking and Currency Committee, with one former member, the distinguished and beloved gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER], joined me as sponsors by introducing companion bills.

On February 10, 1955, I spoke from this well soliciting the interest and the help of my colleagues in the cause of obtaining housing—cheerful housing, housing within their means, housing in which age could find not only convenience and comfort, but that which is priceless, the dignity of independence.

AROUSED NATIONAL INTEREST

This, Mr. Chairman, was the start of the intensive drive, which today has become a national crusade enlisting the support of every young man and woman who ever had a mother or a father truly beloved and who wishes for all mothers and fathers, prematurely, in a mechanized youth-devouring age, forced into retirement, to have the chance of living with dignity in a world of ever broadening horizons.

Mr. Chairman, within 2 weeks I received over 5,000 letters. They came from every State in the Union. It seems that the newspapers had reported the matter, not with too much play-up, but because here was something that the great American public, composed of men and women with hearts, was interested in the public response was spontaneous and terrific. I ask my colleagues to consult their files and if I am in error to

correct me. At that period the mail from constituents supporting a housing program for the elderly was larger than the combined mail on all other subjects.

I had hoped for a select committee of the House exclusively to devote its attention to this phase of the housing problem. This hope was not realized, but there was created a housing subcommittee chairmaned by the distinguished and very able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], who deserves the gratitude of the House and of the country for a work well done and on the pattern of a scholarly and unbiased inquiry and not that of provocative controversy, which makes a loud noise and dies out in the echo of its own shouting.

The Rains subcommittee, however, was charged with the large responsibility of covering the entire field of housing. This included all public housing, military housing, college housing, mortgaging, financing and the many, many programs and phases necessarily, because the very foundations of our national defense were threatened by the woeful lack of housing for the defenders of our country in the armed services, much more time and attention had to be given in the travels and conferences of the subcommittee to military housing than to housing for our senior citizens.

It is to the credit of Chairman RAINS and the subcommittee, and to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, that in the bill reported out by the committee there are two programs for housing for the aged that if adopted would mark the greatest progress ever made by any country in providing for senior citizens the housing they have earned and deserve and that indeed would be the means of broadening for those on the western slope the horizons of life.

CLOSES DOOR ON THE AGED

In the Widnall substitute, the acceptance of which is to be forced upon us as a compromise, there is no provision whatsoever of any real validity for housing for the elderly. The Widnall substitute closes the door, and nails it tight, on all hope for a housing program in the 84th Congress for our senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking now to the country, to the 5,000 persons who wrote me in 2 weeks' time, to the countless thousands all over the country who have written to their respective Congressmen, to the ministers in the churches and the editors in newspaper sanctums and the men and women everywhere who will not rest until, for our elderly men and women, married and single, now woefully neglected and kicked about, this great rich Nation of ours has provided a housing program better than that of some tribes of the frozen North who, when age and winter came to their parents, sent them marching out in the night and the cold to perish. That way of solving the problem of housing for the aged, solution of the problem by the liquidation of the aged persons who create it, will never be accepted by the American people.

The Widnall substitute, which we are assured will be adopted as a compromise, gives the challenge to the American people. Come the 85th Congress, Mr. Chairman, and as sure as the day follows the night, there will be a select committee delegated to give its exclusive attention to housing for the elderly and from its studies pursued solely in this area will come legislation measuring to the expectations of the American people, attuned to the prayers of good people everywhere and abounding eternally to the credit and glory of the 85th Congress.

In failing to provide a housing program for the elderly, the 84th Congress will have missed the boat. I am utterly dumbfounded that those responsible for the drafting of the so-called compromise bill remembered everybody else and forgot only those who seem to have offended the drafters of this substitute by getting old.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the housing bill reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee and which largely was drafted by Chairman RAINS, the members and the staff of the subcommittee is the best housing bill that has been brought to the floor of this Chamber for a number of years. The best proof is that about 90 percent of the wordage in the substitute bill is almost a complete pick-up. The trouble is that in the 10 percent omitted is so much that the country could ill afford to lose. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to repeat that the Congress and the people of this country owe to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] gratitude and appreciation. He has labored day and night on the task of perfecting a housing program meeting the needs of all our people and constructively promoting the best interest of the building industry. In its numerous public hearings, under the guidance of its great chairman, the subcommittee has kept steadily and faithfully on the study level. It has sought always facts and expression of honest opinions, never quarreling controversy. The cities that it has visited it has left with the respect of the public, the press and of all the witnesses who appeared before it. Too much credit cannot be given the professional staff, under the direction of John Barriere, which I feel has done one of the outstanding jobs in the history of congressional investigations.

HASTY ACTION ON HOUSING

Once again, as has been our custom for many years, we are taking hasty, last-minute action on housing—one of the principal mainstays of this Nation's economy. Usually we wait until the last possible moment and then go to conference for some kind of a compromise solution with the Senate.

Now we seem to be getting ready to vary that routine. We've managed to wait until the last minute again without too much trouble. But instead of preparing to compromise so that some kind of bill can get through the closing hours and we can all go home, we are considering action that can most easily lead to no housing program for the Nation at all.

This, I submit, would be disastrous to the people of this Nation and its economy. Why can't we debate this housing issue on its merits, and reach some conclusions openly?

It seems to me that it is high time we recognize that, as Charles Abrams put it in the recently published Housing Yearbook:

> We have reached the point in our urban civilization when we must think in terms of salvaging our cities, as we think of salvaging our farms.

From my personal observations, I find that more and more citizens in places of high responsibility are conscious of having arrived at that point. There is an increasing determination to meet the challenge presented.

At the same time it is recognized that the Federal Government holds the key to permanent solutions for urban complexities. Our cities alone can no longer grapple successfully with the problems involved. We have a responsibility to pass housing legislation that will permit the orderly and progressive renewal of the great urban centers of this country.

We have not, however, passed a housing program big enough to have any relationship whatsoever to proven needs since 1949. As for low-income families, it has taken the Federal program 22 years to build as many dwellings as private enterprise has built in 16 months. What is there in the record that causes this Congress to shy away from a modest public-housing program such as is contained in the proposals under consideration?

I believe that it is high time in this country to have a housing program geared to needs, which certainly include at least the 135,000 units of public housing a year that were contemplated when Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949. Let us stop this dilatory attitude on housing matters when the stakes are the decent, healthful, and happy lives of thousands of American citizens.

DISPLACED BUSINESS TENANTS

Mr. Chairman, I should like to turn to another aspect of the slum-clearance program. We must recognize that when large sections of a city are selected for razing and demolition, inevitably hardships are created. There are thousands of small-business enterprises of all types and descriptions who are forced to leave their present business site and their present following of customers. Hardest hit are the small-business tenants who receive no compensation under existing condemnation proceedings for the cost of moving to a new location and for other costs incurred by the dislocation of their business. The need to do equity to these displaced small businesses has at long last been recognized and H. R. 11742 would do two important things to help these small enterprises.

First, it would permit reimbursement for moving expenses and other losses of property—except goodwill—up to $5,000 for any one business.

Second, the bill would provide the Small Business Administration with $25 million to make loans, under liberal credit standards, to help small businesses to relocate. The loans would be at 4 percent interest and could extend for a term as long as 20 years. This provision, I am sorry to say, is not contained in the substitute bill (H. R. 12328).

CONCERNING SECTION 227

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to turn to a special problem arising from

the cost certification requirement of section 227 of the National Housing Act. This problem was brought to my attention by the situation in the Hyde Park area of Chicago. Under present law and regulation, it appears that the cost certification requirement works inequitably when applied to the rehabilitation financing of existing structures to the point where the incentive on the part of the owner to improve such properties is almost nonexistent.

The effect of the existing law is to require a property owner to invest additional cash to finance improvements even where he has a substantial equity in the property. I realize that the original intent behind the language in section 227 with respect to rehabilitation financing was to prevent the use of section 207 or section 220 as a device for the owner to withdraw his equity with the proceeds of an FHA-insured loan. I am in general agreement with this objective but believe that section 227 as originally drafted went to far with respect to the rehabilitation of existing structures. It would seem quite desirable in my opinion to permit the owner to cover in full the costs of rehabilitation where he has a sizable equity in the property. It would seem especially desirable to provide additional incentive in view of the great emphasis now being placed upon the role which rehabilitation will play in the urban renewal program to fight the spread of blight.

In order to rectify this inequity with respect to existing construction, and to give additional incentive to rental property owners to improve their properties under sections 207 and 220, H. R. 11742 would amend section 227 to permit insured loans under these sections to cover the full cost of rehabilitation as well as the refinancing of any existing indebtedness provided that the total loan does not exceed the maximum percentage of value permitted by statute. Such a change would permit the owner in most cases to borrow the full cost of rehabilitation, but at the same time would not allow him to take out any of his equity in cash from the mortgage proceeds. While H. R. 12328 contains a comparable provision, I feel it is so restrictive as to afford almost no relief in this area.

HOUSING FOR THE AGED

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11742 would authorize two important new programs designed to furnish housing relief to elderly families and elderly single persons.

I believe strongly that the case for Government support to the aged in the housing field has been profusely and convincingly demonstrated and that such support should be provided without further delay.

There is statistical and sociological evidence galore to emphasize the problem which results from the disparity between the cost of adequate housing and the ability of many older people to pay for it. For this reason the problem cannot be solved in my judgment without Government support.

The bill would attack the problem of housing for the elderly on several fronts with a combination of programs designed to give both public and private support.

Section 201 of the bill would provide a new program designed to give relief to elderly families and single persons by encouraging the rehabilitation and construction of low-cost housing by private nonprofit groups. The bill would set up in the Housing and Home Finance Agency a new loan program to provide low-cost financing on liberal terms to nonprofit corporations interested in building decent housing for the elderly. The new loan program is substantially similar to the college housing loan program which has been singularly successful and which has provided needed housing to our colleges and universities for housing and related facilities for students and faculty members.

The bill would provide for loans to nonprofit corporations at an interest rate not to exceed 3½ percent per annum and for a term up to 50 years. Loans could be made for the full amount of the project cost. A revolving fund of $250 million would be established from which the loans would be made.

PROHIBITIVE FINANCING COSTS

The Banking and Currency Committee considered the alternative proposal contained in H. R. 12328, the substitute bill being offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] which would call for setting up a new program within the FHA for insured mortgage loans to provide financing for nonprofit corporations to build housing for the elderly. On the surface the proposal in H. R. 12328 would appear to have substantially the same objectives as the program called for in section 201 of the bill.

The basic flaw in the FHA-insured mortgage program proposed in H. R. 12328 is that it would impose prohibitive financing costs upon the sponsoring nonprofit corporation and would therefore defeat the very purpose sought, namely, to provide housing at a low cost to elderly families and persons. Under the mortgage insurance plan the interest would have to be at least 4¼ percent, which is the present rate for FHA rental housing, and when the one-half of 1 percent insurance premium payable to FHA is added, the results would be a gross financing cost to the corporation of at least 4¾ percent. Moreover, the maximum permissible loan term would probably be limited to 40 years which is the maximum term which FHA presently permits for all its multifamily housing operations. In contrast, the bill as reported by your committee would provide 50-year loans at a gross financing cost of 3½ percent.

The significance of these differences can easily be seen when translated in terms of comparative rentals. It is expected that the cost of the typical housing unit which would be built for elderly citizens under H. R. 11742 would be in the neighborhood of $7,000. The probable economic rent for such a unit would be at least $60 per month, if the insured mortgage device were to be employed. Under the program, contained under H. R. 11742, the economic rent for the same unit would be at least $10 per month less, thereby reducing the rent from $60 to $50 a month.

AID TO SPONSORING GROUPS

One of the special features of the bill in my opinion is the opportunity it will afford in many cases to sponsoring groups who will be willing to charge less than the economic rent to their elderly tenants. By subsidizing the difference between the rents to be charged and the economic rent, the sponsoring charitable, civic, fraternal, or other public-spirited nonprofit group, could offer dwelling units to elderly citizens at rent levels more in keeping with their ability to pay. Recognizing that the payment of such a subsidy would naturally place an economic burden on the funds of the sponsoring nonprofit organization, I believe that it is vital that financing be made available to such groups at the lowest possible cost and on the most liberal terms. In this way any rent subsidy which these groups may absorb could be kept to a minimum.

In order to meet the pressing needs of elderly families and persons in the lowest income groups, section 202 of the bill would authorize the construction of 10,000 low-rent public housing units annually for a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1956. The units to be constructed would be designed to meet the special needs of safety and convenience required by elderly persons. Both elderly families and elderly single persons would be eligible.

Frankly, I do not believe that section 202 is at all adequate. It had been my intention to offer an amendment to expand it along the lines of my bill, H. R. 3919, which would provide 250,000 units of public housing for the elderly at the rate of 50,000 units per year over a 5-year period. Unfortunately, the gag rule under which we are operating does not make this possible.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this committee will vote down the Widnall bill, H. R. 12328, and then approve the Spence bill, H. R. 11742.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, frankly I did not expect to be in this position several weeks ago when the Spence bill had been reported out of committee and was in the hands of the Rules Committee. The bill I have offered should provide a background for compromising vast differences in opinion with respect to the many phases of our housing law. It takes the best out of the Spence bill, the administration bill, and some out of the Senate bill, phases of the housing law on which there is substantial agreement as to continuance, agreement as to enlargement of the program, and agreement as to betterment of the program.

I would like to pay special tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], who has worked so hard as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, together with the other members of the subcommittee. He has a thorough knowledge of housing and has specialized in this field for years. The Rains housing subcommittee labored for long hours throughout the year hearing testimony throughout the country as to the needs of the people.

In the original Spence bill there are items with which I was personally in disagreement. It was the result of the work of the committee as supported by a majority of the committee, but we found this impasse before the Rules Committee, and we all knew that the only way we could get housing legislation in this session of the Congress was by some form of compromise. The Senate was unwilling to reconsider its bill. The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House was unwilling to reconsider its bill, so that a compromise seemed to be the only thing in order.

My primary interest since I have been a Member of Congress has been to help provide for the orderly development of our housing program. With a view toward breaking the log jam and in an effort to provide a bill acceptable to the House, last Friday I offered a substitute bill. I know that some have objected to what they term a gag rule, but this rule would not have been requested if it were not felt by many that it was the only way in which a housing program could be provided this year, that would be accepted by the Congress.

It seems to me that in the past too much emphasis has been placed on public housing in the overall housing program for the United States. In past years we have had 1,300,000 to 1,500,000 starts, and only a small portion, 35,000 or 45,000 units per year have been in public housing. To read some of the great metropolitan dailies you would think the entire housing program in America consisted of public housing, and that the whole program would rise or fall in accordance with final disposition. I have personally contended that there should be some public housing in any bill, until it was proven that private industry could provide decent housing, with modern sanitary facilities, for the low-income group. I know there are many who sincerely, over the years, have opposed any public-housing program because of the conviction that it had no place in our country.

You will recall that the distinguished Senator, Robert A. Taft, respected for his sound approach toward government, was convinced that at least 10 percent of the housing starts in any one year should be devoted to public housing. Since so much attention is focused on the public housing feature of the full housing program I want specifically to call your attention to the fact that in the substitute bill offered by me there are 35,000 starts in each of 2 years for a total of 70,000. This is in contrast to the program offered in the Spence bill where there would be 60,000 starts in each year for a 3-year period with 10,000 units to be set aside each year for housing for the elderly.

The Senate bill would provide 135,000 units until the authorization was exhausted, which would mean a program over 4 years of 135,000 units per year.

You should understand that in the bill that has been offered by me there is a requirement for what is called a workable program, that is a program for the eradication and elimination of slums. I feel there has been a good deal of misunderstanding with respect to that program. It is my belief that this should be a prerequisite for Federal aid to public housing just as it is a requirement for Federal aid to urban renewal, FHA mortgage extension and the urban renewal housing.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a little clarification at that point?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman's substitute includes what I think is a very attractive feature regarding the requirement for workable plans in a community before they can be eligible for public housing. As I understand, it was in the legislation that became law in 1954, not only that one but another requirement, and that was the administration's program; but it was not in the bill last year. Mr. Cole made a statement last year on that point. I want to ask the gentleman why it was not also included. He said, and I am quoting:

> Cities develop approved programs of urban renewal prior to participation in Federal public housing aid.
>
> Public housing be made available only to families displaced by slum clearance projects.

In a letter which was read into the RECORD, volume 101, part 10, page 12982, during consideration of the conference report—the gentleman remembers that, I am sure—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] read a letter which was sent up to him that day by Mr. Cole, the Administrator, in which he reiterated that position. I have the quotation here from it.

Now, will the gentleman explain just for our information why that provision which has been part of the administration's program heretofore was left out in the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. WIDNALL. I cannot speak for Mr. Cole on that because I do not have any statement from him, but it is my understanding that they found that in the development of the public housing program it tied it down too much, tied it down unreasonably in execution. There are also some States that could not qualify because of limitation by the constitutions of those States.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Some of us would like to know the administration's point of view with regard to that. That requirement was written into the law in 1954, as the gentleman recalls.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is right.

Mr. FISHER. Last year a change was made in conference. It had worked apparently fairly well, and so far as I know Mr. Cole has not retracted that viewpoint. Does the gentleman know if he has? Or has it come to his attention?

Mr. WIDNALL. The "workable plan" is currently being applied to urban renewal projects but it is not applied to public housing. It was taken out of the law last year.

Mr. FISHER. I am referring at the moment to displaced persons, so to speak, those displaced by slum clearance projects being the ones who would occupy a project. Has the gentleman heard anything from Mr. COLE to the effect he does not insist on the viewpoint it should be written into the law? That was his viewpoint last year.

Mr. WIDNALL. Personally, I have not heard that. The provisions of this bill as far as public housing is concerned meet with his approval.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman says he believes that. He says he has not heard from him. Is that an assumption on the part of the gentleman? That is what I want to find out. Has Mr. COLE told the gentleman that?

Mr. WIDNALL. I have been told that by people in his department.

Mr. FISHER. Has the gentleman talked to Mr. COLE about that himself?

Mr. WIDNALL. I have not personally talked with him about that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I can throw some light on this matter. I talked to Mr. Cole and much to my disappointment Mr. Cole is now of the opinion that he wants these 35,000 with a workable program only.

Mr. FISHER. I wanted that clarified and I think it should be clarified.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. A few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan made the statement that there was an abundance of public housing units in the pipeline. Is the gentleman aware of the statement that was made by Mr. Slusser, Public Housing Commissioner, in which he said on July 19:

> That to the best of our knowledge we should be able to contract for between 40 and 45 thousand units by July 31. At the present time that is our expectation based on reports to this office from our regional offices which are dealing with several hundred local housing authorities.

If that is true, it would indicate that there are no units available. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. WIDNALL. I have in my possession a press release made on July 23 by Public Housing Commissioner Slusser in which he said:

> I am confident that the PHA will be able to place under annual contributions contract by July 31 substantially all of the 45,000 units authorized by Congress.

That would mean practically all would be used up.

Mr. VANIK. How does the gentleman reconcile that with the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WIDNALL. Personally, I cannot reconcile the two statements.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Up to the present time of that 45,000 they have only entered into contracts for new annual contributions for 4,371. Then he went on further and said it was expected before July 31 that they would get another 15,000, I believe he said. So that by July 31

they would have contracted for a a little over 20,000 of the total of 45,000 units. So there will still be 22,500 left.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. If what the gentleman from Michigan says is correct, then there are no more units that will be available, according to Mr. Slusser. Is that not a proper observation of the statement made by both the newspaper statement and the letter addressed to members of the committee?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman loses sight of the fact that was a 2-year program. The 45,000 will continue for another year.

Mr. VANIK. Is that not only a 1-year program?

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe that contractual authority expires on July 31.

Mr. VANIK. On July 31 of this year.

Mr. WIDNALL. Without any further authorization.

Some reference has been made to lack of anything in this bill for the housing of elderly people. I want to specifically call your attention to three phases of the bill which would help the elderly.

Section 203 of the National Housing Act would be amended to provide that in the case of the purchase of a home by a person 60 years of age or older, the downpayment may be made by a person other than the mortgagor. This provision will benefit many who while having an assured income over the years have not been able to amass an amount sufficient to make the downpayment.

Section 207 of the National Housing Act is concerned with mortgages insured by FHA on rental housing. My bill intends to amend this section so that nonprofit organizations wishing to construct rental units exclusively for elderly persons or their families may have the advantage of an increased loan ratio. My bill provides for mortgage insurance based upon 90 percent of replacement cost in these instances as compared to a further proposal in the bill to increase from 80 percent to 90 percent of value the mortgage-insurance authorization in all other rental housing. It is further provided that the maximum mortgage amount per unit, in units assigned and designed for the elderly, may be $8,100. Church, fraternal, and labor groups have all indicated intense interest in sponsoring rental housing designed exclusively for the elderly. This will make it possible for them to construct that housing.

Three changes are proposed in the public housing section, and I would like to particularly call this to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. Extra costs for specially designed public housing for the elderly are authorized. Priorities are established for admission of elderly families to public-housing units, and single persons over 65 will be permitted to occupy public housing, so that in the construction of 35,000 units in any year under my bill, it will be possible for elderly families to obtain quarters in public housing which is exactly what they could have secured under the 10,000 units specifically assigned in the Spence bill. And there are many people who believe that it is unwise to try to set up a program for the future in America to have segregated housing for the elderly.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wonder if the gentleman ever heard the story of the man who wanted his horse to run. He got a fishpole and he put an ear of corn at the end of the fishpole, just out of reach of the horse. The horse ran faster and faster to catch up with the corn, but it was all rigged to give the horse an expectancy but no chance of realizing the expectancy because, as the fishpole was attached to the buggy, it moved forward just as fast as the horse. Now, does the gentleman not think that his treatment of this very serious problem of housing for the aged is somewhat on the pattern of that corn at the end of the fishpole?

Mr. WIDNALL. No; I do not agree with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then, can the gentleman show one substantial thing that he has in his bill that would help these elderly people?

Mr. WIDNALL. The second provision that I spoke of, which would permit the financing of special housing for the elderly by nonprofit organizations, and there are many throughout the length and breadth of America that have evidenced interest in that type of FHA insurance.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does the gentleman think that that begins to compare with the provisions in the Rains bill?

Mr. WIDNALL. I do, because I believe it is the way the majority of the people of America would want it handled and not by outright grants from the Government through a direct public-housing program especially designed for the elderly.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does the gentleman maintain that the majority of the American people wish to give the minimum to our senior citizens?

Mr. WIDNALL. I did not say that.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on the job he has done in putting this bill together. With specific reference to public housing for the aged, is this a requirement, or is it a permissive part of the bill? Am I correct in saying it is permissive?

Mr. WIDNALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And therefore under the provisions of the public-housing statute in this bill those units which are built for elderly citizens, for our senior citizens, would have to be in accordance with the local plan; is that not correct?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is true.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have been asked by some of the Members to clear up a situation that develops in the use to which special housing may be used. In the 1954 act we have this provision in section 513 which says:

> The Congress hereby declares that it has been its intent since the enactment of the National Housing Act that housing built with the aid of mortgages insured under this act is to be used principally for residential use, and that this intent excludes the use of such housing for transient or hotel purposes while such insurance on the mortgage remains outstanding.

It is my understanding, and I should like the gentleman to confirm it if he is of that opinion, that his substitute does not by implication or otherwise repeal or amend any of those provisions of the 1954 act which I have read.

Mr. WIDNALL. I do not believe that my substitute in any way affects or repeals the provisions the gentleman has just read. I believe that is a permanent part of the law.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman for the fine work he has done in the interest of FHA and other mortgage insurance programs. My questions are to that phase of this situation. It is my understanding that because of the interest rate situation at the present time money for FHA mortgages is quite scarce, particularly on mortgages of 30 years' duration and 5-percent downpayment. I am wondering if the gentleman can give us any information as to what mortgage money will be available or is available or what this Congress can do about it.

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe that under the Fannie Mae provisions in this act it is possible and will be possible to loosen up the market, that there is a liberalization of the use of Fannie Mae and it should materially affect the mortgage market. All the information I have received recently has been to the effect that mortgage funds are flowing better than they did several months ago.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. It is my information that FHA mortgages are being discounted as much as 5 percent and 6 percent. When a purchaser is buying a home and has to pay a 5 percent or 6 percent discount on the mortgage, that represents a very serious situation.

Mr. WIDNALL. That is true, and that has existed in several sections of the country. It is my hope that through provisions in this bill we are going to get a better flow of mortgage credit. There was a period when many of the lending institutions became loaded up with mortgages and stopped lending. I think they have reached the point where they are going back into the market again.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say to the gentleman that the building of homes is a tremendously important part of our entire national economy. It includes not only the labor going into the building of

the homes, but includes the labor going into the manufacture of all the equipment and the material that goes into the home. So building 1,300,000 homes in a year is a very definite part of our national economy. I would hope that the gentleman's committee would do everything it could to encourage the proper development of home building so long as that development can be justified by the demand of people for housing.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO].

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11742—the Housing Act of 1956—is a product of months of study and hard work. I am proud to be a member of the special Subcommittee on Housing, whose extensive hearings and reports formed the basis for much of the substance in the bill.

The bill is not a limited purpose of legislation designed to meet 1 or 2 phases of our housing need. Rather, it is a general omnibus housing bill with many worthwhile features which attempt to help all areas of the housing needs of our people. It proposes to do this by introducing new programs and by perfecting existing housing programs.

One section in the bill is designed to prop up our home-building industry which is one of the disturbing soft spots in our economy. Additional stimulus would be furnished by liberalizing the secondary-market support to GI and FHA loans supplied by the Federal National Mortgage Association. For example, the bill would authorize FNMA to issue advance commitments under certain conditions which would help provide much-needed production credit support for builders in many parts of the country. It would also provide additional funds for FNMA's special-assistance program which supports especially deserving housing programs such as cooperative housing, housing for disaster victims, and housing produced in connection with slum-clearance operations.

Another section of the bill recognizes the serious and persistent problem facing our low-income groups. Despite the huge strides in efficiency and productivity which the home-building industry has made in recent years, the plain fact remains that our lowest income groups cannot afford decent, safe, and sanitary private housing. The only answer to the housing needs of our lowest income families is low-rent public housing, which, through Government subsidy, permits rents which these families can pay.

To help meet the housing needs of these low-income families, the bill would provide for the production of 50,000 low-rent public-housing units each year for a 3-year period, a total of 150,000 additional units. Personally, I would have preferred to see the bill contain a larger public-housing program. Certainly a 50,000 unit annual total should be a rock-bottom minimum. Also, at long last, the bill proposes to do something real and tangible to meet the housing needs of elderly families and elderly single persons. The bill would provide housing relief to the elderly in several ways.

First, for those elderly families and single persons in the very low income groups, the bill would provide for 10,000 low-rent, public-housing units for 4 years, specifically for elderly families and single persons 65 years or over. This 10,000 units a year quota would be in addition to the 50,000 units a year the bill authorizes for the regular public-housing program.

Under present law, elderly single persons are not eligible for the regular public-housing program. The bill would eliminate this discrimination against elderly single persons and make them eligible for occupancy in public housing units.

The bill also provides an entirely new program designed to provide decent private housing at modest rentals for elderly families and single persons. It would set up a special loan fund in the Housing Agency to make loans to nonprofit, charitable corporations desiring to build housing for the elderly. By making the financing available at a low interest cost—3½ percent per annum for a long maturity—up to 50 years—the bill would permit these nonprofit corporations to provide good quality housing to elderly tenants at much lower rentals than would otherwise be possible.

Another section of the bill would make it easier for elderly folks to buy homes under the regular FHA program. Quite often the elderly family will have sufficient income to buy a home under the FHA program, but may not be able to meet the downpayment requirement without hardship. The bill would make it possible for another individual to supply the required downpayment.

Of special interest to urban communities are provisions in the bill designed to speed up the national program of slum clearance and urban renewal. In our hearings throughout the country, our subcommittee found that vitally needed slum clearance and urban renewal operations were too often bogged down in a maze of Government red tape and buck passing. It is my belief that passage of this bill will do a great deal to get more momentum into the slum clearance and urban renewal programs.

One of the knottiest problems is that of relocating the families who are forced to move. Since many of these families are in the lowest income groups, the need for additional low-rent public housing units to house such families is urgent. But in addition, we must find means of housing families whose incomes are too high to qualify them for public housing. The bill would expand or liberalize the FHA section 221 program which was originally provided to build sales and rental housing for families displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal operations.

So far, however, the section 221 program has been pretty much a dead letter with practically zero units at all being built. To make the relocation housing insurance program really work, the bill would provide higher mortgage amounts more realistically in tune with the high construction costs in metropolitan centers. It would also make home purchase much easier for displaced families by permitting them to buy with no downpayment. Under the bill they would be required to pay only $200 in cash to cover closing costs. Also, to permit lower monthly mortgage payments, the bill would extend the maximum repayment term from 30 to 40 years.

The bill would also do something to meet the crying need for rental housing at moderate rents in urban centers. It would liberalize the loan provisions for the two important FHA rental housing insurance programs. It would stimulate the production of section 220 rental housing which can be built in areas cleared of slums. It would also provide further incentive to sponsors to build section 207 rental housing projects in other parts of the city.

FHA's cooperative housing program under section 213 would also be given a boost by the bill. Cooperative housing offers great promise for producing modest cost housing, particularly in our larger cities, and I am hopeful that provisions of the bill will step up the production of this much needed housing.

The bill would also provide assistance to other important housing needs. For example, it would provide additional funds for loans to colleges and universities to build the housing acutely needed to cope with the ever mounting student enrollment.

The bill would not neglect the housing needs of farmers. It would provide a 5-year loan program to help eliminate substandard farm housing.

The housing needs of our military forces are given special attention in the bill. The armed services so vital to national security cannot maintain the morale and efficiency of our soldiers, sailors and airmen unless decent and adequate housing can be made available to them and their families. The bill would expand the scope of the military housing program and would make it possible for the military services to provide better quality rental housing for military and key civilian personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I think H. R. 11742 is a "must." It will help keep our housing industry rolling in high gear. And it will go far toward meeting the many special housing needs of the American people. I deeply hope that it will become law this year.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Kentucky, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the committee bill and I shall vote against the substitute if it is adopted. I am sure the substitute is an improvement after a fashion on the committee bill. It reduces public housing a great deal, down to 35,000 per year for 2 years.

I am opposed to the principle of public housing. It has been said that the late and lamented Senator Taft envisioned and supported this great program. I made a study of some of the speeches he made in support of his position. I think he was a man of considerable statesmanship. If you will go back into those speeches you will see

that he always envisioned it as a welfare program when he spoke about public housing, not a socialized program but a welfare program. The idea was that public housing to be justified under our existing free enterprise system should be confined purely to welfare purposes. When it got beyond that it would become socialism and therefore very objectionable, when it got beyond just admitting poor people, unfortunate people, the charity-case level of public assistance. But it has long since passed that stage, as you will find if you study public housing as it has operated in this country.

Not long ago I was reading a story which I could multiply many times, but it illustrates the point. This is from a press report. It stated that the Reverend F. Raymond Baker, Wilmington, Del., Housing Authority, protested increasing up to $4,800 the income that people could have and still be eligible to live in the public housing units up there, that you and I have to pay for for them to live in.

> I have been a member of the Wilmington Housing Authority, and during that time I have been interested in, first, housing for low-income families, and second, keeping the professionals from going too far with public housing.

Then he said:

> This increase that was proposed to $4,800 for a person to still be eligible to have the taxpayers help pay the rent marked the end of public housing for welfare and begins public housing as socialism.

That illustrates the point I am making.

Last year or the year before I offered an amendment which would limit this thing to low-income people. Of course the public housing people hit the ceiling when you do that. They want no part of it. That is demonstrated by the fact that no longer are they willing to hold it down to slum clearance. In the old days to justify this and make it sound innocuous and good, they said, "We have to have a place to put these unfortunate people who are pushed out on the streets when a slum is torn down." That makes sense, so we wrote it into the law in 1954, and we continued it for a year. But since the public housing program has long since passed the low-income stage for tenants, a mass of opposition developed to confining projects to occupancy by low-income people and refugees from slums that are torn down. The professional public housers in opposing the law to restrict occupancy of new projects to displaced slum dwellers, had to show their hands. They no longer make any bones about it. There is no longer any direct relationship at all between slum clearance and public housing as we know it today.

Public housing is now patterned to fit higher income people. Even middle income tenants are no longer a novelty. Yet you and I and every American taxpayer must foot the bill and help pay the rent bills for those people who manage to get themselves entrenched in a public housing unit where the rent is nominal, or in any event less than half of what the units would rent for if rented by private enterprise. So far as slum clearance is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am informed, and I think correctly, that no more than 20 percent of present occupants of public housing units in this country moved there directly from a dismantled slum tenement. Actually the percentage is probably less than 20 percent.

In the old days when Senator Taft talked about this, he always associated it with slum clearance. But, that is no longer the case. That distinction should be made. A lot of people are falling back on what Senator Taft said. You had better study what he said before you attempt to rely on that as an excuse for going along with this socialization long after it has passed the stage that Senator Taft talked about in his defense and justification of the program. This House has expressed itself in opposition to a continuation of socialized housing repeatedly the past few years. The Members hear from home. They are close to the people, and that accounts for this continuous opposition. All public housing would have been stopped 5 years ago if the other body had not persisted in keeping it going. Let me just for the record give you a few figures on how the House has reacted to this thing in the past few years. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] said that he is opposed to public housing, but that it is just a matter of stopping it gradually and getting a good stopping point. We have been trying to find a stopping place to the thing ever since it was authorized by a 5 vote margin here in 1949, after one of the most pressurized lobbying activities in the history of this Congress that got it adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Let us just read this. It is kind of interesting, I think in passing.

In 1951, the House by a vote of 181 to 113 said let us have only 5,000 units.

In 1952, the House by a vote of 192 to 168 said let us have only 5,000 units.

In 1953, by a vote of 245 to 157, the House said let us have none—let us stop it now.

In 1954, by a vote of 211 to 176, the House said let us stop it all now.

In 1955, in the vote on the Wolcott substitute, you recall, by a vote of 217 to 188, the House said, let us cut it all out.

And the gentleman from Indiana says, let us try to find a good stopping place. We have been told that for the last 5 years. Now is the time it will die a natural death—it is a dead duck unless we revive it here today. I, for one, am quite satisfied with the explanation that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] made when he said that we can go along very well without any housing bill being passed. He documented the reasons why that is true. The program will not suffer.

In respect to military housing, I understand that in the other body a simple resolution has been introduced which would continue the military part of it. Do not worry about it, that will be taken care of. The defense of this country is not going to suffer if this bill is defeated today. So why do you not stand up and vote the whole thing down. We will get along. We will save the taxpayers many billions of dollars too while we are doing it.

We are in as good a position to discontinue this experiment in socialism now as we will be a year from now. The time is ripe. The appropriation committee has repeatedly denounced it in recent years. I happen to have in my hand right now a report on the independent offices appropriation bill, 1954, dated April 17, 1953, and here is what that committee said about public housing then:

> The orginal budget estimates, in carrying out the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 for the fiscar year 1954, proposed 75,000 dwelling units. The committee is of the opinion that continuation of this program is not justified and is not in accord with the program for economy and a balanced budget.

I am fully aware of the fact that the machinery is greased for the substitute to sail through this body today, and I am sure the substitute will be adopted. The substitute is certainly a vast improvement over the committee bill. I hardly see how anyone could vote for that measure, calling for 180,000 new units with no restrictions of any kind. How anyone could face the folks back home after voting for that bill is too much to believe. So the substitute offered by Mr. WIDNALL is a vast improvement because it does contain the working agreement requirement and reduces the number of new units authorized. But it is still socialized housing and a little pregnancy is, after all, about as bad as a greater amount.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. Does the gentleman have any figures on the cost per unit to construct a public housing unit?

Mr. FISHER. If I can get 1 or 2 additional minutes, I would just like to read that into the RECORD too. I have it right here fresh.

Mr. SCHENCK. Is it approximately $12,000 a year?

Mr. FISHER. Oh, it is a lot more than that. Let me give it to you. Well, the average initial cost runs around $12,000—that is correct. But, that tells a small part of the story.

Mr. SCHENCK. Now $12,000 times 35,000 units would amount to about $420 million in a year plus all the interest in addition to that.

Mr. FISHER. But listen to this. I will try to run through this just as fast as I can. I wish the Members could understand this. It is absolutely amazing—I assure you, it is absolutely amazing.

The Federal subsidy runs approximately 200 percent over the development cost. That is in the hearings. If you want authority for that, read page 1217 of the hearings of the Independent Offices appropriation for 1957. That is all you need to do. It runs roughly 200 percent of the development cost. That would be $24,000, you see, because the

initial cost is $12,000. So over a 40-year period, actually the Government is paying in the form of subsidy about $24,000 for each of these units that is built. If you take the original bill which is before us here, where I make my computations— 180,000 units times $24,000 equals $4,320,000,000 over the life of the project for 40 years. Of course, the Widnall substitute calls for less than half as many housing units as does the Spence bill, the committee bill. Therefore the total cost would have to be computed from that, assuming that the substitute is adopted.

Mr. SCHENCK. Does the gentleman mean $24,000 per family unit?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct and that is over the 40-year period. That is the subsidy that the Federal Government pays on each of these things that is built.

Let us see if we can follow through on just one more point. I am glad the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] inquired about cost features. The gentleman believes in sound economy in the spending of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. SCHENCK. Is the gentleman taking from that figure any rental that is received?

Mr. FISHER. No, I am not. Of course, the gentleman understands that none of that rental goes back to the Treasury nor in payment on the bonds which were sold to pay for the project. That is used in the maintenance and operation and the buying of television sets and mowing the lawn for the tenants because the tenants would certainly not want to get out and mow the lawns in these public housing projects. All of that service is furnished, at taxpayers' expense, and more besides. None—or certainly practically none—of the rentals collected on these projects goes into the original cost of the construction or into reducing the annual Federal subsidy to pay on the bonds that have been sold. Rental money is used locally for various purposes. It is used for upkeep, for housekeeping of the premises, for refrigerators, perhaps TV sets, if the local housing authority elects, and things of that kind.

Mr. HIESTAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. The subsidy referred to is cost less rent?

Mr. FISHER. That is correct. Of course, if any rent goes into a reduction of the subsidy for the project then the project is not operating as it should. Public housing is supposed to be for low-income people who pay low rentals, and there is supposed to be no profit flowing from such an arrangement.

A few moments ago I gave you the totals on the cost of the proposed 180,000 new units which would be authorized under the committee bill. That does not tell the entire story, not by any means. Let me carry it a little further. In addition to the Federal subsidy which I have described, there is a tax windfall. That results from the tax-free bonds that are sold to pay for the construction cost of public housing projects. Those are the only Government bonds today that enjoy that advantage. And there is, of course, a ready market for them. A 2-percent yield on one of these tax-exempt bonds is the equivalent of a yield of 13.33 percent on a taxable bond held by an individual in the $80,000 to $90,000 individual income-tax bracket.

Now, you may ask where I got my figures on the amount of this windfall, in terms of cost to our taxpayers because of loss in revenue from the fact the bonds are tax-exempt. I get it from the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Housing. At page 314 of that report is found this language:

> It is estimated that for units completed under the Housing Act of 1949 the average tax loss (on tax-exempt bonds) will be about $4.90 per unit per month.

Let us do some computing. The $4.90 times 40 years equals $2,352 per unit. And that amount times 180,000 units equals $423,360,000.

Let us go even further in tracing the fantastic cost of this program. According to the Housing and Home Finance Agency the value of the contribution which local communities make by foregoing full ad valorem taxes on the projects occupied by these tenants, less in-lieu payments which are received from the Government, will approximate 50 percent of the Federal contributions over the life of the projects.

That, you can see, is no small item. We have already seen that the Federal subsidy per unit totals $24,000. Well, one-half of that would be $12,000, and $12,000 times 180,000 units equals $2,160,000,000. You see, no tax is collected by local communities from these projects. That is one of the conditions they must agree to before the project is built—that for 40 years not a dime of local taxes will be paid. In addition, streets, sewers, perhaps garbage collection, schools, police protection, and a multitude of other services are made available at the expense of local people and without any cost whatever to the occupants of these socialized projects.

There is one other cost item that should be mentioned. I refer to the administrative cost for handling public housing. That presently runs about $10 million annually. For 40 years that would total $400 million.

Now, when you add all of these cost items—the annual Federal subsidy, the tax windfall that is lost, the net loss in local taxes, and the administrative cost—all over the 40-year life of the projects, for the 180,000 units called for in the pending committee bill, the cost would total $6,880,423,360. You can see it runs into billions.

Already, Mr. Chairman, we have upwards of a half million public housing units in this country. That means we have nearly one-half million families who are wards of the Government so far as housing is concerned. Very few of those came in as displaced slum project tenants. In fact, a large number of them make more money each month than do many people who help pay their rent bills each month. Can you imagine it? How long is this sort of thing going to be tolerated?

I am informed that in Detroit families making as much as $3,800 annually may be eligible to move into a public housing project, and may remain if the income goes up to $4,500. A news report says in Dayton some such tenants earn as much as $5,800. And these reports can be multiplied all over the country. That, Mr. Chairman, is not public welfare. That is not charity. It is socialism because it is not applied to people who are in the public welfare category.

There is more reason, as I see it, why the Government would be justified in helping pay a man's grocery bill, or his medical bill, than his rent bill. Perhaps that will be the next step—not only to pay part of the rent bill each month, but also part of the medical bill, the dental bill, the grocery bill. Just where is this thing going to stop?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to urge the adoption of the Housing Act of 1956, as set forth in H. R. 11742.

This spring the House Banking and Currency Housing Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable ALBERT RAINS conducted a hearing in Cleveland, Ohio, in which it was brought out that low FHA appraisals and the tight money markets have forced many people into acquiring homes under land contracts and other high-cost devices. In some cases the funds were obtained through second, third or fourth mortgages at discount rates up to 10 percent. It was pointed out that in the Cleveland hearings that money was limited for new construction, and practically unavailable for the purchase of older homes with reasonable downpayments. The purchase of homes under these difficult conditions forced the purchasers to divide them up and sublet them contrary to the zoning laws in order to make current mortgage payments.

It was further pointed out in the Cleveland hearings that the lack of financing for the older residences and the high cost of such financing was creating a wide scale of breakdown of zoning and residential requirements resulting in the creation of new slums much more rapidly than slum clearance could correct the situation.

In Cleveland, as a result of an extensive slum clearance and redevelopment program, thousands of families will have to be relocated. In addition the city is constructing an inner belt highway system which will necessitate the relocation of 900 additional families. On the aggregate 18,000 families will eventually be displaced, of which 3,600 are estimated to be eligible for public housing. Thus in addition to the present supply there is an immediate urgent need in my city for 3,600 public housing units.

Cleveland has uniquely lead the Nation in the development of facilities for senior citizens whom we term as "golden agers." We have constructed a public housing project designed for senior citizens with special facilities for their comfort and for possible infirmities.

I hope that the committee bill will be supported because for the first time

provision is made for the construction of special housing facilities for senior citizens, the number of which is increasing in every community in America. In the Nation the population of 65 years and over has grown from 3 million in 1900 to an estimated 15,400,000 in 1960. In the decade 1940 to 1950 the national increase of citizens of 65 and over increased at the rate of 36 percent.

In my community the median income of heads of households of 65 years and over is $2,595 for homeowners, $1,675 for rentals. These people are generally not able to purchase a home under existing laws and there is a tremendous need on the part of these older persons for good low-cost housing. In my community, as well as in most urban districts in this country, there are insufficient rental units available within the economical means of senior citizens and but few of these have been designed for the use of senior citizens.

The legislation submitted by Mr. WIDNALL as a substitute for this bill makes no adequate provision for housing for an important segment of our population. America must be mature enough to recognize its obligation to those citizens who are caught in the squeeze of low income, low pensions, and rising costs of living which constantly widen the gap.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I want to express my appreciation for the splendid work that Mr. RAINS and his subcommittee has done in reporting the housing bill. After long labor, great consideration, and much traveling, the committee reported a bill which deserves to be considered under an open rule by this House. This body has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world, and yet by a rule its mental operations have been shackled. A padlock has been capped on the minds of its Members. We still have the right to deliberate but the right to decide is very limited.

Speech in the House is often futile, but under the circumstances it is more futile than usual. You have the right under the rule to decide whether you will take the bill or the amendment. I am going to vote against the amendment. If the amendment is voted down, I am going to vote for the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Colmer amendment to the gag rule on this bill. There was a mixup about that amendment which, by its terms, would have permitted a separate vote on public housing. I voted for the amendment, because I am against gag rules and against public housing. If the amendment had been adopted, I think we could have eliminated public housing from this bill. Some disagree. In any case, since the Colmer amendment lost, and this bill therefore comes up on a gag rule, with no opportunity for any amendments, I will vote to substitute the Widnall bill, because it contains less public housing, and requires each locality to provide a workable program for low-rent housing. My community can meet that test. Every community should be forced to meet it.

Other parts of the Widnall bill will provide and improve housing, and the conservation and development of urban communities in many ways. For instance, the bill provides property-improvement loans, housing for the elderly, college housing, military housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal, all of which I support. I think the whole program could be improved if we were permitted to go through it and consider amendments, as we usually do, but this is impossible. Therefore, while all of this detailed discussion and debate is interesting, it is rather futile. While there are things in both bills that I would like to support and others I would like to change, I will support the general administration program as contained in the Widnall substitute bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

It is my privilege to represent an urban district where there is a great deal of interest in public housing and in other housing measures. I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey that this public housing provision is overemphasized in the public mind; that it is in fact but a small part of the legislation now before the House. But, Mr. Chairman, we have a peculiar parliamentary situation here today and I would like to direct a question to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, ranking minority member of the committee.

Assuming that a Member of this House wants to support a liberal bill for public housing, under the present parliamentary situation would that best be accomplished by voting for the House bill or for the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. WIDNALL?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would say very frankly to the gentleman that the administration is very much opposed to the public housing provisions of the House bill. It is very much in favor of the provisions of the so-called Widnall bill which will be offered, I assume, as a substitute.

The Widnall bill provides for 35,000 public housing units, and is not only sanctioned but is recommended by the administration, and under the situation, it probably is the only public housing that could possibly under the rules be adopted.

So I would say to the gentleman that if he voted for the Widnall substitute, he would best be assured that there would be favorable action for 35,000 units, or, as a matter of fact, 70,000—35,000 each for 2 years; and under this procedure it is the only possibility by which we can be sure of any public housing.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. One further question: Would the gentleman's answer be the same in regard to housing for the elderly?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would say that under this situation the only hope we have for housing for the elderly is under the Widnall provisions.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan: Assuming that a Member voted against the Widnall substitute and the Widnall substitute carried, could he have an opportunity to vote for the measure as the chairman of the committee suggested?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I understand the gentleman, if we voted for the Widnall substitute——

Mr. MORANO. Against the Widnall substitute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Against the Widnall substitute? In other words, the Widnall amendment is defeated, then the question would come immediately on the committee bill.

Mr. MORANO. No, just the other way around: If a Member voted against the Widnall amendment, yet the Widnall amendment was carried, how then would the Member have an opportunity to vote for housing?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In the Widnall bill.

Mr. MORANO. No.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He would not have any opportunity, although it would be theoretically possible to defeat it when you get back in the House.

But if the Widnall amendment is adopted in the Committee it is certain there will be a vote in the House on the Widnall amendment. If the Widnall amendment is defeated in the House then the question would recur on the passage of the House bill reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MORANO. That is not quite clear to me.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Maybe I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MORANO. There is an unusual existing parliamentary situation. I favor public housing. I would like to have more public housing than is provided in the Widnall amendment. If I should vote against the Widnall amendment, would I be precluded or foreclosed from voting for some public housing, assuming the Widnall amendment would carry?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Theoretically and practically the gentlemen would be precluded from any more public housing than the 35,000 included in the Widnall amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman votes against the Widnall amendment the chances are he gets no housing legislation at all and, therefore, he would defeat the very purpose of his objective.

Mr. MORANO. I wanted to get clear on that. There are those who might like to vote against the Widnall amendment because they feel they can vote for a bill in which there will be more public housing than there is in the Widnall amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the Widnall amendment is defeated, the gentleman could vote for the committee bill which has many times more than that.

Mr. MORANO. If the Widnall amendment prevailed over a vote I might cast against it, then where would I be?

Mr. WOLCOTT. You would be supporting the 35,000 for 2 years, and that is all.

Mr. MORANO. I would be voting against that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Ohio indicated he wanted to vote for the most liberal bill and the more liberal proposal. The committee bill is the more liberal one. It provides for 50,000 units plus 10,000 units for our senior citizens. The Widnall bill proposes less. It provides only 35,000 units for 2 years.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman will concede, I am sure, that it depends upon what the interpretation of the word "liberal" is. If by "liberal" he means individual, then he will vote for the Widnall bill because that means less of State government. If he is in favor of big government he will vote for the committee bill.

Mr. VANIK. The gentleman from Massachusetts inquired as to which bill would provide for the greater number of housing units. It is the committee bill that will do that.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. We were informed here that if we vote for the committee bill there would be no public housing in the end.

Mr. VANIK. I cannot agree with that proposition. The committee bill provides for a lot less than the Senate bill. I am sure if the Spence bill is adopted by the House there is strong likelihood it will pass this Congress.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that on page 45 of the Widnall substitute, H. R. 12328, there is a provision providing the Housing Authority of the city of Tampa, Fla., with authority to pay to local governing bodies $22,959.85 in lieu of taxes for project years ending prior to April 1, 1956, which, as result of action of the Public Housing Commission denying this authority to the Tampa Authority

This action resulted from my request to the Banking and Currency Committee and to Congressman WIDNALL that this provision be included in this bill because it was not included in H. R. 11742, the request having been made to me by the Tampa Authority after H. R. 11742 had been voted out of the committee. The proposed action on this amendment, which in effect substitutes H. R. 12328 for H. R. 11742, will give the Authority the power requested and will make it possible for the local governing authorities to receive this payment.

Also the Widnall substitute provides a more liberal program for housing for elderly in the following respects:

First. Section 104 provides special mortgage insurance aids for private housing to be built for elderly persons and specific low-rent public housing provisions to be made available to elderly persons.

Second. The bill permits the required downpayment of a mortgagor 60 years of age or older to be paid or loaned by a third party under such conditions as the Federal Housing Commissioner prescribes.

Third. As to FHA rental housing, the bill would change section 207 program to provide more liberal mortgage multifamily elderly housing sponsored by nonprofit organizations.

These are steps in the right direction on a serious problem of making homes and housing for the elderly persons more readily available with emphasis on free enterprise as the vehicle for accomplishing this. It also follows the recommendations of the President.

I have long been concerned about this problem and have consulted with my distinguished colleague, Congressman WIDNALL, on this matter on numerous occasions. I am happy to see he has included these provisions in his substitute.

Title III of the bill strengthens the urban renewal provisions of present law and will make it easier for local planning groups to accomplish meritorious urban renewal projects. I have in mind proposed projects in Ybor City and other areas in my district where local citizens are preparing to attack this problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 11742, the general housing bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, is first rate housing legislation in my estimation.

One of the great virtues of the bill is its omnibus characteristic. It recognizes the many different types of housing needs in our country and contains provisions to improve and expand a dozen or more worthwhile housing programs.

For example, the bill would attempt to breathe new life in the home building industry by improving the availability of mortgage funds to home buyers and home builders. It would extend and improve the FHA title I home loan improvement program so necessary to the upkeep and modernization of our existing housing inventory. The bill would provide long overdue housing support to elderly families and elderly single persons. It would extend and improve the vital military housing program. It would set up the farm housing loan program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 on a long-term basis so that farm housing needs can be met. It would provide additional funds for the college housing loan program so that our institutions of higher learning can continue to build urgently needed housing for students and faculty members. The bill would attempt to stimulate much-needed rental housing in urban areas. There are many other important provisions but I cite these few examples to underscore the comprehensive nature of the bill and the support if would give to many areas of housing need.

I would like to address most of my remarks to the most controversial part of the bill, which is of course, the public housing section. For the life of me, I find it difficult to understand why the most urgently needed program is always the most controversial.

Those who know the shocking housing conditions of our city slums at first hand find it hard to comprehend how anyone can oppose a policy designed to correct these conditions and the vicious social evils which these areas breed.

All of us would like to see the private home-building industry, and the private real-estate industry supply decent housing in a decent environment at costs and rentals within the means of our lowest income families. There is no disagreement on that objective. But that is an objective so far unrealized. The blunt fact is that the only way to provide decent sanitary housing to our lowest income groups is through subsidized low-rent public housing. For some reason the word "subsidized" is a scare word. I am not in favor of all forms of subsidy. But I believe with a deep conviction that where a pressing social need exists which cannot be met through private enterprise, the Government must step in and lend a helping hand to local communities. And that is precisely what the low-rent public housing program does.

The public housing sections of H. R. 11742 are must legislation. The 50,000 units a year for a 3-year period, plus 10,000 units a year for a 3-year period for elderly families and single persons, are the absolute minimum which we must have. I would like to see a program of larger scope, but I recognize realistically that we will be lucky to get that many units unless the opponents of public housing should finally repent and see the light.

Now the need for low-rent public housing is a general one for all families in the lowest income groups who cannot afford decent private housing. But there is one phase of public housing need which I think deserves special emphasis. I refer to the public housing units needed in connection with a successful slum clearance program.

Mr. Chairman, I think in this area we find our friends who oppose public housing are on the horns of a dilemma. They are for slum clearance—or at least they pay lipservice to that objective—because they know it would be political suicide to come out and oppose clearance of our terrible slum areas. And yet these same people have the effrontery to oppose a public housing program of the needed magnitude, or indeed of any magnitude. Mr. Speaker, if I have ever seen an instance of hypocritical inconsistency, this is it.

Now everyone knows that when you clear a slum you tear down buildings and

dwelling units by the hundreds. There is no mystery about that—that is a simple fact for all to see. Now everyone also knows that the slum clearance laws require by statute that families displaced by slum clearance operations must be rehoused in decent, safe and sanitary accommodations which they can afford.

But what do we find when we examine the income status of the typical family now living in a slum and now being forced in increasing numbers to relocate as a result of slum clearance operations. The facts are incontrovertible. Percentages vary slightly but the simple fact is that at least half of these families have incomes so low that they cannot afford any kind of decent privately owned housing accommodations. If there were no alternative, the only place the people could move is to another slum.

The opponents of public housing can talk until doomsday but they cannot controvert these obvious facts.

Mr. Chairman, there is only one place that these low-income families can go and that is into low-rent public housing units. This is the only way that these families can bring up their children in reasonably decent housing in a reasonably decent environment.

And that, Mr. Chairman, is the dilemma in which the public housing opponents find themselves. Sooner or later they will have to stand up and be counted. They cannot be for slum clearance and against public housing because as I have shown, such an opposition is the height of hypocrisy and inconsistency.

I would like the record to be clear that I recognize that a substantial percentage of families displaced by slum clearance operations are fortunate enough incomewise so that they can afford decent private housing. I think it should be emphasized, however, that this is not always the case when a family happens to be a minority group. The minority group family may have the income but as we all know often does not have the freedom to live where he chooses.

I favor providing whatever legislative aid is necessary to help rehouse the families whose incomes are above the public housing ceilings. I am happy to say that H. R. 11742 has provisions designed to make the FHA section 221 program actually workable. Section 221 in theory was supposed to provide private sales and rental housing for the relocation of displaced families. But in actual fact it has been almost a complete failure. By making the changes proposed in H. R. 11742, I think we can correct this situation. By permitting no downpayment financing up to 40 years and by increasing the mortgage loan ceilings to more realistic levels, I think we can help many families now living in slum areas to move to decent neighborhoods and start on the road to home ownership. I am wholeheartedly for such a development.

But section 221 housing or any other privately owned housing cannot help our most unfortunate citizens who just do not have sufficient income. We must have public housing and we can never make a dent on clearing our Nation of costly disease-breeding vice-generating slums, unless we have a large-scale public housing program going hand in hand with slum clearance operations.

And we will have such a program, Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it. The opposition is strong and the fight will be never ending and difficult, but in the end we will prevail. Selfish interests and groups callous and indifferent to grave and pressing social need unfortunately can hold the upper hand over the short run. But in this great country of ours, righteousness and justice ultimately prevail and I am confident that the case for low-rent public housing will be no exception.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, housing our aging population is a very vital and integral part of a well-planned Government welfare program. This is a fact which must be recognized here today. We must make a determined effort to meet both the economic and the social needs of the growing number of older people in the United States. Recent changes in social-security legislation has been one step in the right direction. Adequate, decent, sanitary, comfortable housing must be the next step in meeting these needs.

As of April 1955 census data indicate that there were 14,018,000 individuals in the United States 65 years or older. In addition, as of that same date there were 33,276,000 individuals between the ages of 45 and 64. The number of persons 65 years and over has been steadily increasing over the past few years and is expected to continue on the upward trend. Income data compiled by Government and private sources indicate that a large percentage of the persons in this 65-or-over age category have incomes of less than $1,000. These elderly persons should not be required to live in substandard homes, nor could they be expected to buy or rent commercial homes at a rate equal to half their income.

The Paterson (N. J.) Evening News in a recent United Press story from Washington discusses the problem as follows:

PROVIDING HOMES FOR AGED TOP UNITED STATES HOUSING PROBLEM

(By Robert F. Morison)

WASHINGTON.—Government officials say the problem of housing for the aged is definitely greater than that involved in providing homes for minority groups.

The oldsters are one of the fastest growing segments of the Nation's population. And, with improved health standards, they are to become more and more numerous, experts say.

Recent census bureau estimates set the present number of men and women 65 and over at 14,128,000, up 15.9 percent from 1950. This was the second fastest growing age group in the Nation.

By 1975 there will be more than 20 million persons 65 and older, the estimate shows.

A Government study soon to get under way will try to establish rules for the guidance of those planning housing for the aged.

The Federal Housing Administration, with its many mortgage insuring programs, has a particular stake in the problem. The agency has called on Walter K. Vivrett, professor of architecture at the University of Minnesota and authority on housing for the aged, to make a study aimed at developing building standards to be applied by FHA in its mortgage insuring programs.

FHA has been approached by church, fraternal, and labor groups for advice on building various types of housing for the aged. More requests are expected in the future, even if the current housing bill before Congress does not contain a special program for the aged.

Among the problems in building houses and apartments for aged persons are where and how the bathroom should be located, should there be wider doors than ordinary to admit wheelchairs, should grab bars be located around the house, should there be bathtubs or showers, 1-story houses or 2, small kitchens or no kitchens in the case of multifamily units, should older persons be housed by themselves or nearer to neighborhoods they know, and whether signal bells should be scattered at strategic points around the house or apartment.

Proper precautions have to be taken, but officials stress that if extreme care is not taken too much may be done. "If we pamper them too much we'll make them feel peculiar," the official explained. However, they must have adequate housing and it must be laid out to make them comfortable, and living as easy as possible.

One other danger faces FHA and that is the possibility of extreme specialization.

"We've got to think of the house as an investment," an official said, "and be sure it has a resale value in the event it must be sold to people who might not want such special features as ramps instead of stairs."

Dr. Vivrett is expected to complete his study in about a month. FHA will then work out regulations to guide future mortgage insuring operations where older persons are concerned.

Recently the Federal-State conference on aging met here and urged an expansion of private home building for older persons. To solve the problem of overspecialization, the conference urged installation of needed devices as hand rails. But it called for small homes that would combine features needed for the aging and younger people buying their first home.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, those of us who have fought for adequate public housing to meet the urgent needs of families in the lower income brackets are deeply interested in this legislation. A great deal of investigation and study has gone into the preparation of this legislation. Many Members no doubt feel, as do I, that authority should have been provided for a greater number of public housing units, but it is certainly a step forward. I feel it is appropriate in this connection to bring to the attention of Members of the House another housing development taking place outside the United States, but for which the American taxpayers' money is being used. I have been informed by the International Cooperation Administration that Communist Dictator Tito, last December was given permission to use $4 million of United States counterpart funds to build a lush housing project in Yugoslavia. In addition to that, recently an additional $13 million was authorized for Dictator Tito's use to construct additional lush housing for the Communist elite of Yugoslavia. All of this is in addition to what Tito has been taking out of the

American taxpayers' pockets since 1948, which is already in excess of $1 billion.

It is a certainty that the housing project in Communist-occupied Yugoslavia for which the American taxpayer is footing the bill, will in no way compare with the public housing projects authorized in the legislation before us today. In the first instance, I am certain that Dictator Tito will build plush quarters for the Communist elite which certainly is not the case for public housing units contemplated for the American people themselves. It is the common practice of the Communist elite to live in the style befitting kings and czars, and in the grandeur of the nobility of the 19th century. Communist boss Tito and his henchmen have demonstrated an unusual ability to acquire all the comforts, luxuries, and grandeurs befitting a Communist czar. We may be certain that the good people of Yugoslavia who are the exploited victims of the Communist occupiers, will receive little or no benefits whatever from those public housing projects.

In the second instance, the public housing programs authorized for the American people contemplate that all the funds made available for the housing will ultimately be returned to the Public Treasury. Most of the housing projects authorized are on a loan basis. The only part the Government does not have repaid is that subsidy on the rental which is provided in order that the low-income bracket families can have decent housing. The so-called housing project in Yugoslavia is on an outright gift basis. Not one penny of the money used for Tito's de luxe housing projects will ever be returned to the pocketbook of the American taxpayer.

The irony of the situation is that the $17 million of the American taxpayer's money handed over to the dictator Tito represents a sum 2 and possibly 3 times as great as the amount of the taxpayer's money involved in the housing legislation now before us. There has been a great deal of pushing and tugging over this legislation and the usual amount of give and take in debate. All sides will have had their say-so before this legislation is enacted. Congress has had nothing to say about the $17 million handed over to Tito for his de luxe housing program.

It is a sad situation when we Members of Congress have to make a hard fight in order to make possible some badly needed housing for the American people while at the same time a ruthless Communist dictator who is dedicated to destroying everything that represents the American ideals, makes us pay for his de luxe housing under circumstances where all we can do is protest after the fact.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we have a choice of two bills on the subject of housing, and since I am anxious to help get as many housing units as possible, I would like to see H. R. 11742 passed by the House. This bill would provide 180,000 public housing units over a 3-year period.

It is vitally necessary to the stable economy of our Nation that the low-rent public housing program be continued. Healthy citizens need a healthy atmosphere. Since 1923 our overall population has increased by about 50 million. Obviously, housing requirements have increased proportionately, but housing construction, even now, does not appear to make adequate provision for those desperately in need of housing.

New private housing costs are actually prohibitive to a great number of people, and particularly to the people of my district. In Philadelphia alone, an average price for a new home privately constructed is approximately $11,500, and rental costs start at about $80 a month in privately owned apartment developments. To many of us, this may not seem unreasonable, but they are really exhorbitant to low-income families who are forced by circumstances to exist in old, substandard housing units in which living conditions leave a great deal to be desired.

Many of my constituents are unfortunately compelled to live in crowded dwellings, some of which have none of the sanitary facilities which you and I take for granted. There are no yards or play areas surrounding such places, and therefore our youngsters are forced to find such amusement or diversion as they can along the streets and in the alleys of the city. This kind of diversion is recognized as a major cause of the high crime rate and the high incidence of juvenile delinquency, and we are experiencing our share of that in Philadelphia. Surely we are agreed that such an atmosphere is not conducive to a physically and emotionally stable family life.

Low-rent public housing and slum clearance go hand in hand to contribute to a better America. Along with such work will be the addition of community facilities, the increase of open space, the reduction of overcrowding, and development of stronger citizen participation.

Good housing is almost a guarantee of good citizens, and I am glad to have this opportunity to speak in behalf of it and vote for it.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time a housing bill has come out of a House committee for consideration. All other bills have come out of the Senate and have been passed through conference reports. It represents a historic occasion and I am among those who hope that the House will follow through by giving our Nation at least minimum adequate means to meet the American dilemma in the housing field.

The prominent charge made by opponents to housing measures providing for expansion and improvement in the Government-assisted housing program for the Nation is that the program is socialistic because it puts the Government in the business of paying rent for low-income groups. Yet opponents do not deny, nor do I think anyone can deny, that nationally, adequate housing facilities for low-income families, particularly with reference to minorities and the aged, is one of the major problems for our country.

In Detroit, Mich., including the 1st, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th Congressional Districts, with a population of over 2½ million people, for example, there are a total of 12,081 public housing dwelling units. At the end of last year, by Housing Commission information, there were over 4,000 eligible persons waiting for placement, but for whom no housing was or is available. There were approximately 8,000 applications in total which were unprocessed. Through my own congressional office, I have received numerous letters from constituents who have been waiting for placement—on the eligible list—for as long as 4 years. In Detroit and nationally, it has been established by all the reliable reports we can wish to have that private housing has not been able to meet the needs for better housing, for slum clearance, and elimination of blight areas; that the need for enactment of an adequate Government-assisted program arises specifically from the lack of private housing facilities for people in these low income categories. As the National Housing Conference reports, current house construction is serving the upper income market and the upper half of the middle income market—not the low income groups who pay high rents at the sacrifice of other bare necessities and yet live in ghettos and slum hovels which are health and morale destroying.

The bill which we have before us in H. R. 11742 proposes 50,000 additional dwelling units; the President in his annual message to Congress proposed 35,000 units, yet in 1955, to complete the building program scheduled in the Housing Act of 1949, more than 600,000 low-rent dwellings were required. The total of 810,000 units represented the 1949 attempt of Government to meet the problem of 15 million substandard dwellings reported in the census figures of 1950. In other words, in 6 years when the program was to have been completed, only 199,378 units out of a total of 810,000 had been actually built or underway. Today with national population figures increasing and private housing not able to catch up with them, slum areas are growing. Government has not taken all the steps at its means to solve this problem. It is my understanding that over a period of years, a bank of authorized housing has been built up, which in the President's discretionary power could give approximately 100,000 dwelling units to the Nation. The fund, however, has not been fully utilized and it is regrettable that the President has not seen fit to push and use this authorization when there does exist a very concrete need to do so, as is evident from the reports of every reliable housing and building agency regardless as to its proposal on how to solve the problem.

In their arguments for private housing, the opponents of public assisted programs have not presented a realistic solution to the housing needs for the people in the category having the problem. If they would be realistic in their approach to this situation, a growing feeling is that an alternative and better solution would be to extend veterans' home loan guaranty provisions so that any eligible citizen may purchase a home on Government guaranty of mortgage. In the field of home purchasing, private financing policies of restriction based upon race have made housing, as

it pertains to minority groups, an even more severe problem. The National Association of Home Builders reported in January of this year that there is a backlog of effective demand for housing for Negroes alone, of the minority groups totaling 125,000 units annually. If the Government would stand behind or guarantee home mortgage for the citizen up to the limitations of the veterans' housing program, we would be able to make significant progress in solving our national housing problem.

In the meantime, for the current year, a Congress which is conscientious of national welfare should take action to solve a present problem by voting for passage of at least this minimum number of housing units.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except it shall be in order for any member of the Committee on Banking and Currency to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill H. R. 11742 and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 12328, and such substitute shall not be subject to amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WIDNALL moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill H. R. 11742 and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 12328.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the program embodied in this bill provides the tools with which the housing needs of the country can best be taken care of. It contains provisions of importance with respect to modernization and repair of property. A continuance of that program is urgently needed.

It improves the present program by raising the amount that may be borrowed from $2,500 to $3,500; by extending the term of the loan from 3 to 5 years; by making it possible for the Commissioner to waive 6 months of occupancy presently required under the law.

This is a clause in the housing bill that is practically the same in the Spence bill and in the Senate bill. It is urgently needed that we extend the college housing program. There is an additional authorization for $250 million in new college housing and for college facilities. Applications are coming in at the rate of $20 million a month for that program. It includes provision for low-cost housing for displaced persons which has not previously been discussed. It provides a better approach toward slum clearance and urgently needed public housing to be put on a sound and workable basis; a continuance of the new military housing program, and it provides for the disposition of defense housing built under the Lanham Act. It also provides for the acquisition of Wherry Act housing and for a continuance and liberalization of the farm housing program under title V of the 1949 act.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is much that will improve the existing housing program in this bill. It provides something that we all can join together and vote for, because it has in it the best from all three bills. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I assume this is what you call a short horse, 5 minutes on each side. However, on the other hand, I assume that everybody has made up his mind as to how he is going to vote. But, in order for the RECORD to be crystal clear, I want to repeat one or two things I said in my opening statement this morning. The truly vital things that are not in the Widnall bill—and I am not condemning all the elements of the Widnall bill, as I said this morning; they are in the main the provisions which were adopted by the Committee on Banking and Currency. But, the provisions that are left out, and they are urgent and important, are, first of all, the real true helps for housing for the elderly. We had people who came before the committee, representatives of many religious and patriotic organizations who asked that we insert a section in this bill patterned after the college housing program which provided for the building of dormitories for the children, so that the old people could have adequate housing. I am perfectly frank to say that if we are to spend any money of the Government's—and the major portion of this program would not be paid for out of the Federal Treasury, though some of it would to begin with—but if we are willing to spend money for college dormitories, for eating places in colleges, I think we ought to do something for the old folks of America. That is my honest opinion.

As I said this morning, if we do not do it in this bill, we may not be compelled to, but we will be anxious one of these days to have such a bill, because those people are getting to be a great segment of the population and we are not giving them the attention we should.

Let me say one other thing. Away from the metropolitan centers of this country a GI cannot get money for a mortgage loan. It is of no advantage to him to have a continuation of the GI home loan program, because he cannot get mortgage money unless he pays fabulous prices for discounts.

We earmark in the committee bill $500 million—none of it the Government's money, but the GI's money in the national service life insurance fund—and we give the insurance fund not 3 percent but 4½ percent investment, so that some of this money can flow out into these areas away from the big cities, so that the GI's of this country may have a chance to own a home. That is good, intelligent commonsense, I am quite sure.

In addition to that, no matter what the administration may say or anyone else may say, we need more than 35,000 units of public housing even to begin to meet the need. If you were to limit it—and I may say that I am proud that the Widnall bill does not do that—but if you were to limit it to those persons displaced by governmental action only, and let us remember the big highway program and how many people are going to be uprooted because of that, and also of other governmental actions in the big cities, then where will the needy come in?

So I say that the public-housing features in the bill are too small. The bill that came from the other body provided for 135,000 units. The Committee on Banking and Currency realized that it would be impossible to pass any such program as that through the House of Representatives. But we would like to be reasonable. We said 50,000 units and then 10,000 additional earmarked as housing for the elderly.

So, as I say, those are the three outstanding faults with the Widnall bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I must say that I am a little surprised at the gentleman's opposition to this substitute. I recognize his right to oppose it, but I had thought that we had worked out a compromise that we could be for. In any event, let me say to the gentleman that I am quite sure that if this substitute is not adopted the committee bill will be defeated and we will not have any housing bill at all. Would the gentleman want that to happen?

Mr. RAINS. No; the gentleman knows that I had no agreement not to support the committee bill. No such agreement was ever made by me. I am not condemning the Widnall bill in toto, but I am only mentioning those provisions that were in the other bill that were left out of the Widnall bill.

Mr. HALLECK. But as a practical matter—and I do not know what is going to happen on this vote; there may be some Members of the House who do not want any bill at all—we have got to be very careful that we do not wind up without any bill at all. I think that point ought to be made very clear. The Widnall substitute represents a great deal of work that has been done to get a housing bill.

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And to keep this great housing operation going.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one thing. I do not want to see us without any housing bill. I want to make that clear. We need a housing bill.

Mr. HALLECK. We are about to decide that now.

Mr. RAINS. But I would rather have the committee bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAINS. I will certainly yield to the distinguished majority leader for a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. It has been brought to my attention that one of the problems in getting the redevelopment housing program going under section 220 has been the variations from project to project in the allowance which the FHA grants for builder's profit. Does

this bill do anything to correct this situation?

Mr. RAINS. It certainly does. The situation to which the gentleman refers was brought to our attention during the housing study conducted by our Subcommittee on Housing. Our report on slum clearance and urban renewal pointed out that the FHA has taken an overly conservative position in the matter of the allowance for builder's and sponsor's services profit and risk. The FHA adopted a sliding scale approach under which allowances varied from perhaps 5 to 9 percent from project to project. This approach has not operated to facilitate the construction of redevelopment housing on cleared slum sites under the section 220 program. To correct this situation, the committee bill establishes a uniform approach, providing that the allowance for builder's and sponsor's services, profit and risk shall be a uniform 10 percent of all project costs except land, unless the FHA certifies that 10 percent is unreasonable and by regulation prescribes a lesser uniform percentage to be applicable for all projects and all sponsors. The FHA can reduce the allowance set by the Congress to 9 percent or 8 percent or any other lesser uniform percentage. There is no opportunity to give any project or any sponsor specially favorable treatment, because the allowance is exactly the same for everybody. The substitute bill includes this same uniform approach. There is no difference between the two bills on this matter.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I could not fail to point out that Alabama is indeed fortunate and proud to have as the spokesman for housing, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, one of her own native sons who is carrying on in the fine tradition and manner of the illustrious Congressman Henry Stegall, who did so much, together with the late Senator Robert Wagner, of New York, and Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, to provide better homes for the people of this great Nation.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the birth of low-rent public housing contained in the United States Housing Act of 1937 and I am happy in the knowledge that the bill before us will do much to improve the lot of many of our people who have not been fortunate enough to have homes that are decent and conducive to the upbringing of our most precious asset—children of today who will be the citizens of tomorrow. We must remember too that housing is not simply for those who are unable to pay for homes, but affects those who have arrived at the point of paying for a home and those who wish to repair and maintain homes which they already own.

The Government should step up its public housing, still desperately needed by many of our citizens. The Government should act to liberalize the secondary mortgage market; to improve its rural housing program, to step up the slum-clearance and urban-renewal programs, and to liberalize the home repair loan provision of FHA title I. The Government should act to help the farmer with his housing needs. It is upon these topics which I wish to speak briefly.

I also regret that the provision originated and sponsored by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] which would provide that the fund accumulated in the National Service Life Insurance Section of the Veterans' Administration will not be made available for veterans' housing. This is a most necessary provision and would, in my opinion, liberalize the mortgage market and enable veterans to obtain loans at a lower rate of interest. This money should be put to work for those whose premiums have made it possible and I also predict that the next Congress will take action to carry out recommendations on this matter contained in section 302 of the Spence bill.

It is not so long ago but what I can recall the sound of President Roosevelt's resonant voice as he said, "I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." And though we have traveled a long way in housing our Nation since the dark, oppressive days of the depression, it would be callous disregard of present housing needs were we to think the task completed. We still face a housing shortage and this shortage may become a crisis if we do not begin to plan, act, and build now. Part of the demand for housing is resulting from our constantly increasing population. We also suffer from a need for more housing for low-income families, more housing for middle-income families, and more housing for elderly people. Although we are constructing houses at a high rate, most of them are being built for higher-income families while more and more houses are sinking into the substandard class inhabited by persons unable to purchase new high-priced homes.

The Government should act to encourage the construction of new housing for the middle-income group and for elderly persons.

It is with sincere regret that the bill which will probably be adopted—the Widnall bill, H. R. 12328, does not contain any provision that will provide housing for our old people. I believe this is a sad mistake and I predict that in time these worthy citizens will demand and get adequate legislation to supply their needs.

There is a critical nationwide need for public housing. The 1950 census showed there were 15 million substandard dwellings in use. Only an adequate public-housing program, coupled with a less-restricted slum-clearance and urban-renewal program, can help eliminate this situation. If we do not act, we must resign ourselves to seeing many of tomorrow's citizens reared in urban jungles and unhealthy, vice-ridden alleys. Available statistics prove that public housing more than pays its way. A survey of 317 families in Columbus, Ohio, showed that private slums paying full taxes actually yielded less revenue than tax-exempt public housing paying the municipality 10 percent of its net rentals. And it should not be forgotten that the indirect costs of slums are a heavy drain on city treasuries, community chests, and on community well-being. Slums breed crime, delinquency, disease, fire, and social unrest, heavy debts for any community to bear.

The existence of 15 million substandard dwellings is, in my opinion, prima facie evidence that this problem cannot and will not be met by private enterprise. I do not feel that public housing is in competition with decent private housing. Families eligible for public housing are in the lowest income group, well below those for whom private enterprise provides decent dwellings.

Within my own Fourth Congressional District we now have over 1,600 public-housing units. There are also many cities in my district which are desirous of having public housing. It is my understanding that there are already pending at the national housing agency applications for 35,000 units. It is therefore evident that Congress will have to approve more units than the small sum requested in the administration's housing bill, and also that Congress will have to follow through and see that what Congress approves becomes a reality and does not wither away, if we want results.

I am aware that the chairman of this subcommittee has introduced legislation which would provide for 50,000 public-housing units annually for 3 years. At this time I would like to state my approval of this low-rent housing provision and also of the provisions for slum clearance and urban renewal. It is only through the use of both public housing and slum-clearance and urban-renewal programs that this portion of the housing problem can be eventually solved.

A man who is frequently forgotten or abused by the present Republican administration is the farmer, so it is not surprising that his housing needs have also been ignored by the administration. The farmer's needs have already been well covered here this morning. I would just like to state that I believe that it is the present administration of the Farmers' Home Administration which has failed to help the farmers, not the program adopted by Congress. It does not seem reasonable to me for the Farmers' Home Administration to approve only one-fourteenth of all the applications received from Alabama, only one-twelfth of all the applications received nationwide. Over 52,000 applications were received last year while only 1,456 direct loans were made and 2,909 insured commitments were made. Congress intended more than this for the farmer should be given and as the country expands and grows, this subject will become more vital. More attention and study must be given to the impact played by community facilities in the development of new land for housing purposes. Undoubtedly these community facilities will be an increasingly important portion of the cost in the price of new homes. The price of land and the completed lot has risen more in the 5 years than any other factor in the house price. We must be careful that this hidden cost does not place housing beyond the price reach of the mass market in the future. The solution to this problem of community facilities—sewers, water, and roads—may not lie in more direct Federal aid, I do not know, but certain the future welfare and the growth of the Nation

makes it imperative that the Federal Government give community facilities its foremost attention.

In conclusion, I believe that a good job has been done by the Rains subcommittee and that the value of its work is apparent to all who are familiar with this problem. Again I wish to compliment the gentleman from Alabama, the members of the subcommittee and the entire Committee on Banking and Currency for the fine work which has been done in the field of housing as this is vitally important to the health and well-being of all of our citizens. The Nation has indeed profited from your labors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time on the motion has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey to substitute the provisions of H. R. 12328 for the provisions of H. R. 11742.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 115, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed most unfortunate that in the hurry and confusion of adjournment rush, it appears now we are going to be negligent in meeting our legislative obligation to continue a Federal housing program that has proved most beneficial to the national welfare for a period of 20 years.

I very deeply regret that the manner in which this legislation is being presented to us today leaves no choice to those conscientious legislators who are vitally interested in trying to help enact a sound and adequate program to enable the multitudinous members of our low- and middle-income groups and the elderly to live in decent homes in accord with our Christian traditions. We have here unfortunately to choose between the most meager housing program that opponents of this objective can devise or no housing program at all.

Under these conditions, of course, I and a great many other Members will vote for the only thing we can, while pledging in our hearts and minds to work unceasingly on for the enactment of the more complete and expanded housing program still vitally needed in this country.

We all realize that the basic problem of providing public housing cannot be severed from the problems of slum clearance and urban renewal programs. The 1950 census showed there were 15 million substandard dwellings now in use in this Nation. Only a full public housing program coupled with a less restricted slum clearance and urban renewal program can eliminate this situation.

If we do not act on this measure before us, the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for veterans and home repair will die next September. If we do not accept this bill, the very modest authorized construction of 35,000 public housing units for the next 2 years will perish, along with the slum clearance and urban renewal program that goes hand in hand with it. The college housing program that has been advocated by our leading educators and that has proved so valuable is continued in this watered-down housing bill, as well as authorization for hospital construction that is in urgent need.

The token housing extension provisions of this bill will at least serve to keep the fundamental program alive. I urge you, then, to vote for it for that reason alone, while at the same time we dedicate ourselves to the expansion and improvement of it at the first opportunity in the future. Let us consciously realize that the family is the basic unit of our national life and the greatest encouragement for good family life and good citizenship is living in a decent home with healthful surroundings.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution No. 618, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment reported by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the rule and on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4221) to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting before the parenthesis at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "and the agreement (International Wheat Agreement, 1956) further revising and renewing the International Wheat Agreement for a period ending July 31, 1959, signed by Argentina, Australia, Canada, France, Sweden, the United States, and certain wheat-importing countries."

SEC. 2. Reference in any law to the International Wheat Agreement of 1949 shall be deemed to include the agreement (International Wheat Agreement, 1956) revising and renewing the International Wheat Agreement for a period ending July 31, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON AIRPLANES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 558) to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8000) to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution.

House Resolution 558 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 8000, to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

The bill provides that domestic airlines shall not sell or serve alcoholic beverages, including wine and beer, while in flight between points within the limits of the 48 States and the District of Columbia.

The purpose of this is to prevent any danger from arising as a result of the consumption of liquor by passengers and to prevent other unnecessary annoyances which might result from excessive drinking while in flight.

The bill was introduced as a result of appeals made by the Airline Pilots Association and the Airline Steward and Stewardesses Association after efforts to obtain relief by industry regulation failed.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side to the

adoption of the rule. I think the bill is a very good one, and one that should be passed by the House.

I have no further requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8000) to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8000, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill sponsored by our esteemed colleague and member of the committee, Mr. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, would amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight.

Really and truly that is all it is, and the bill is just that simple.

This is a short bill and provides simply that air carriers shall not sell or otherwise furnish passengers alcoholic beverages for consumption while in flight between points in the 48 States and the District of Columbia.

The bill has no other purpose than to promote safety in flight. During hearings on the bill, airline pilots and a representative of the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses Association cited several cases of intoxication on the part of passengers which constituted a definite hazard to safety.

This is something in which we cannot afford to take chances. The bill should be passed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 8000, a bill to prevent the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight. The bill is in every way defensible for reasons as follows:

First. The pilots who are charged with the duty of preventing passengers under the influence of alcohol from boarding the plane are now powerless to enforce this regulation because passengers say, "How can you prevent us from boarding a plane when you serve drinks on the plane?"

Second. H. R. 8000 had its origin in the appeals of the pilots' and stewardesses' association. They say:

> A multitude of socially undesirable incidents which have occurred since the liquor service was instituted, as well as the risk of a possible accident resulting from an inebriated passenger has justification for this bill.

Third. A testimony from the pilots and stewardesses in charge of the plane should be heard above all other testimonies. They know their business, and their lives are at stake as much as the passengers' lives are in danger. The airlines definitely should be more sensitive to the warnings of the experts in charge of their planes.

Fourth. One cannot blame the stewardesses for objecting to act as barmaids.

Fifth. Since the bill was formulated and the legislation was pending in the House, six of the largest companies have now gotten together and agree to dispense with the serving of alcoholic beverages while in flight. Strong action by the Congress, as I am sure will be received in the House, will fortify the agreement of the airlines. Opposition to or defeat of the measure on the floor of the House would more than likely encourage the airlines to go back to the practice of serving alcoholic beverages.

Sixth. Liquor service on the planes is becoming so demanding that it seriously interferes with the serving of the meals and tends to make meals the secondary consideration.

Seventh. If liquor is served on the planes, there is far greater temptation for the pilots and crew to imbibe than would be if no liquor was served.

Mr. Chairman, this is in every way a worthy measure and deserves the unanimous support of the House membership.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, I believe the following letter which I recently wrote to the president of the Air Transport Association and the letter which I received from him which I also include at this point with a copy of the proposed agreement with the CAA will express my feelings about this bill better than anything else I could say here. Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass this bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1956.

Mr. S. G. TIPTON,
President, Air Transport Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TIPTON: Thank you for your letter of July 16 enclosing a copy of the Standard Practice Agreement between the airline companies with regard to serving alcoholic beverages on board their aircraft.

As a frequent air traveler, I am acutely aware of the danger of serving alcoholic beverages aboard planes. It is my belief that the proposed agreement would be worse than the present situation because it would have in effect the stamp of official approval.

Air travel is a boon to our age and I boost it and support it every way that I can. The stand the airlines are taking concerning alcoholic beverages is to my mind most inconsistent with the expressed and demonstrated desire of the airlines to make air travel safe, comfortable and efficient.

The position of hostess is one that until the past year or so I felt was equal to that of most any profession a young woman could enter. With the increased drinking on planes—and it is continually growing worse—the standing of the profession of these women has certainly suffered.

Because of the very honest opinions I have expressed to you, I wish to inform you that I am immediately filing a protest to your proposed agreement with the Civil Aeronautics Board. I am calling on the CAB to lend its support to complete prohibition of all alcoholic beverages on planes, and I am urging the majority leader of the House of Representatives to call up the pending bill for passage.

Your letter to me, the proposed agreement and my response are also being entered into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that my strong feeling on this matter will not deter you from calling upon me at any time I can be helpful to the cause of aviation.

Sincerely yours,

IRIS BLITCH,
Member of Congress.

(Copy to all members Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.)

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1956.

Hon. IRIS F. BLITCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. BLITCH: Attached is an agreement which has been entered into between American Airlines, Inc.; Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; National Airlines, Inc.; Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Trans World Airlines, Inc.; and United Air Lines, Inc., which regulates the service of alcoholic beverages (not including beer or wine) on board their aircraft. Its terms are self-explanatory. As you will note, it is subject to the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as required by section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Our surveys indicate that over 80 percent of our passengers enjoy and approve the service of alcoholic beverages by the airlines. This being the case, it has seemed to us that a complete prohibition of the service was unwise, since it interfered unreasonably with the desires of a large majority of our passengers, and that such a prohibition would only be justified if it resulted in positive harm.

We have no evidence that alcoholic beverage service interferes with safety or unreasonably impairs the comfort or enjoyment of a minority of our passengers who do not care to drink, so long as the service is conducted in moderation, with dignity and with due concern for the comfort and convenience of all passengers aboard these airplanes.

It is the purpose of this agreement to assume this middle ground between strict prohibition, which would surely encourage surreptitious drinking on board aircraft, and completely unlimited service, which might, on occasion, be harmful. The standards of service laid down in this agreement do not alter substantially the practices which each airline had already established for itself, and will assure the maintenance of such practices.

Yours very truly,

S. G. TIPTON,
President.

STANDARD PRACTICE AGREEMENT

JUNE 27, 1956.

It is recognized that the determination whether to serve alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft is one which must be made by the individual carriers, with due regard

to applicable laws and regulations and their responsibilities as public-service enterprises. However, in the opinion of the undersigned it is desirable in the public interest to establish a standard practice with regard to such service. Therefore, it is agreed that:

1. For the purposes of this agreement, the term "alcoholic beverage" includes any form of distilled spirits, but does not include beer or wine.

2. None of the parties hereto will, in its advertising or other promotional efforts, emphasize the availability of alcoholic-beverage service aboard any of its flights.

3. Each party hereto will continue its policy of not encouraging the consumption of alcoholic beverages by its customers.

4. None of the parties hereto will serve more than two drinks, each of which shall contain no more than 1.6 ounces (the standard miniature bottle) of any alcoholic beverage, to any one customer.

5. Each party hereto will continue to refuse to serve alcoholic beverages to any person when it has reason to believe that such service will result in such person's becoming objectionable to other passengers.

6. This agreement shall apply to all flights operated by any party hereto between points in the continental United States.

7. This agreement may be executed in separate counterparts, all of which shall constitute a single instrument, and shall become effective when executed by all of the air carriers, operating domestically, serving alcoholic beverages (as defined herein), and when approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board pursuant to section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. This agreement shall remain in force indefinitely, subject to the right of any party hereto to withdraw therefrom upon 6 months' prior written notice to each other party hereto.

C. W. Jacob, American Airlines, Inc.; T. F. Armstrong, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; A. G. Hardy, National Airlines, Inc.; Donald W. Nyrop, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Warren L. Pierson, Trans World Airlines, Inc.; R. W. Ireland, United Air Lines, Inc.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the bill, H. R. 8000 introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, and also endorsed very heartily by the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I have flown a great many airplanes in my day, starting in 1917 and coming right down to the present moment in our country and in various parts of the world. I think I do know that intoxicating liquor and flying do not mix. I certainly wish to commend Mr. WILLIAMS for his very sensible and convincing argument, and I think I may appropriately say that of all the persons in the House of Representatives, he is the one who should have and did introduce such a bill. He knows that flying is dangerous.

I have been on planes in which the stewardesses spent a great deal of time serving liquor to passengers on the plane. No intoxicated person is theoretically now permitted to board a plane, but the rule is unenforceable. We should give our pilots and stewardesses every opportunity to be at their best when the plane is in flight and they should not be obstructed in their important and serious duties by having to take out time to serve passengers who may want something to drink that is intoxicating. Many persons will wonder why I am so heartily in favor of this bill, when I am the man in Congress who has told them about wine, some kinds of which are intoxicating. I merely talk for wine because wine is the end product of the grape and it is really a beverage rather than a liquor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this legislation. It should have been approved long ago. The bill is similar to a number of other bills pending before the House, including one by my colleague from Kansas the Honorable WINT SMITH. This bill should be passed without opposition. It ought to be approved as a safety measure. Furthermore, it ought to be approved as a matter of right, commonsense, and decency. Why should people riding on planes be served with liquor. It seems strange that they would even insist on it when they are only on the plane at most for a period of a few hours. As I said a moment ago, it is important that the legislation be approved as a safety measure. No one knows this better than the airline pilots and the stewardesses who are in charge of the planes. They are required to take every precaution available for the safety of the passengers and yet here is one where the stewardesses and the airline pilots have been overruled.

I call your attention to a resolution recently approved by the Airline Pilots Association. It reads as follows:

Therefore, be it resolved, That the Airline Pilots Association is opposed to the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard aircraft, the providing of setups aboard aircraft, or any other practices which will encourage drinking alcoholic beverages on board aircraft.

This legislation is also vigorously supported by airline stewardesses.

Of course, the use of intoxicating liquor does no one any good any time or any where. The excessive use of it is bound to result in harm. The question involved in this legislation goes beyond whether a person favors the use of intoxicating liquor. This involves a question of safety for those who operate the planes, as well as the passengers who ride the planes. I am amazed and disappointed that the management of the airlines would not be glad to cooperate in support of the resolution approved by the Airline Pilots Association. For years the air crews' unions have been urging nonalcoholic rules for domestic flights.

I quote from a statement that appeared in the last issue of Newsweek. Here is what it says:

Crew members have cited cases of overloaded riders slugging pilots, stewardesses cut by exploding champagne bottles, and other social problems of drinking on planes. A spokesman for the Airline Pilots Association points out that two drinks at altitude pack the wallop of four on the ground and that crews still must enforce the rules. "It is quite a job," this man added, "to be a bouncer and a pilot at the same time."

Again, I am deeply concerned that this proposal shall not be lost in the shuffle, but that it be enacted as promptly as may be done.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for bringing H. R. 8000 to the floor for consideration today. I think the bill is badly needed. Last February I introduced a bill similar to the one now under consideration. You are familiar with the provisions of the bill which simply prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carriers.

From my own personal experience as one who travels many air-miles each year between my office here and my home in Jasper, Ala., and from the testimony given before the committee, I am convinced that the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard our air carriers constitutes a hazard to safety. Time and again we know of incidents involving drunken passengers who have disturbed the orderly and efficient operation of our airlines—even to the point of necessitating special landings.

Although there is no evidence to show that liquor and drinking was the cause of any accidents in 1955, I am not willing that we should adopt a policy of wait and see. In this day of increased air travel, I think it is of utmost importance that we take every precaution for the safety and comfort of the air traveling public.

This is not a question of whether or not one condones or condemns drinking. The question to be answered is in terms of the safety and welfare of our citizens who are patronizing the airlines in increasing numbers.

We cannot afford to compromise with safety. I urge the House to approve H. R. 8000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr MULTER. I would like to know what if anything would be done about certain baggage that might contain liquor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This measure has nothing to do with that.

I am going to be brief as was the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. HARRIS, who was chairman of the hearings on this bill.

The real support for this bill, Mr. Chairman, comes from the people who operate the planes. The airline pilots and the stewardesses are heartily in favor of this bill.

Just recently I rode from Fort Dodge, my hometown in Iowa, to Chicago on a plane. Aboard the plane was a young pilot from my district who flies for Eastern Airlines. He brought up this very subject and said that his organization and every pilot he knew was heartily in favor of this measure. This had been confirmed by testimony before the committee by the authorized representatives of both the pilots and stewardesses.

The reports before the committee, and the testimony before the committee are replete with evidence that this legislation is very much desired by the people who operate the planes. Indeed, they consider it essential. It is not only a matter of efficient operation of the planes but also of safety.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Do I understand that this bill prohibits without limitation or condition the sale of liquor on planes and does not merely authorize the CAB to impose the necessary regulations and so forth?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The bill is very short. I will read it and the gentleman can answer for himself:

(c) No air carrier shall sell or otherwise furnish to its passengers alcoholic beverages (including wine and beer) for consumption while in flight within the limits of the 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. COUDERT. Have the air carriers indicated their support for this legislation?

Mr. DOLLIVER. There are some of the air carriers who are opposed to it.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Recently we had a terrible accident over Arizona because warnings that had been given by the persons who operate the planes with respect to safety operations and regulations, had not been heeded in time.

I once was on a plane when one of the passengers who was under the influence of liquor created a situation which was very dangerous. In fact, it was the only time I have ever been really frightened in many years of flying.

Certainly we should not wait until some great tragedy happens as the result of consumption of liquor on planes before we take action to prohibit its use under such hazardous circumstances.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out the real issue in this measure. This is really a safety measure.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it should be said here in view of the fact that our colleague from Minnesota made the statement a moment ago referring to the terrible tragedy that occurred over the Grand Canyon: Our committee has made some investigation of that horrible situation, and I think the record should show very clearly that our investigation here, out there, and in Los Angeles showed that there was no liquor involved anywhere in connection with that incident.

Mr. JUDD. Oh, I was not intending to suggest that; I was merely reminding the House that the people who pilot our planes had long urged that there be changes by the CAA in the safety regulations to meet today's changed conditions with so many more and faster planes. The authorities are now getting around to making those changes. We should make needed changes before accidents happen. We do not want the same sort of disaster to happen again through failure now to prevent drinking on planes.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not want any impression to be left that the Arizona tragedy was due to this cause.

Mr. JUDD. And I was not in any way suggesting that it was due to liquor.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Another matter aside from the safety factor is the treatment of passengers in that form of transportation. I fly west, as we Californians have to. Shortly before dinner time, the stewardess began to serve cocktails to those who wished them, and it was an hour and a half before she was willing or permitted under the regulations to serve dinner until every cocktail drinker on the plane had had his first and second, and nursed it along as long as he wanted to. I wanted dinner at the hour it should have been served. I spoke to the stewardess about it, but she said she could not do anything until this matter of serving the cocktails had been taken care of. I think it is an imposition on the traveling public, and I am very glad indeed to vote for this bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman.

What you have described is one of the incidental factors about this bill. There are a good many people, as has been stated, who do not care to engage in drinking who are irked a great deal on account of those who do. But that is an incidental matter to the real purpose of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the real issue here is the question of the operation of civil air planes on a safe basis. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], there is no reason why we should add to the already great hazards that are incident to flying. Rather, we should legislate to diminish those hazards. We have a fine safety record in this country. Let us pass this bill to further that safety record.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have read the report, and the CAB in their letter and the Department of Commerce state that in their judgment there is no safety problem involved. The CAB says it has asked the organizations of flight stewardesses and the airline pilots to document their cases because, they say, there is no evidence that they have found of these alleged dangers. Now, what is the situation? The committee says it did find cases.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would refer the gentleman to the hearings on this question. Both the stewardesses and the pilots appeared before us and recommended this legislation on the very ground I have suggested, namely, safety.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Did they document it? As I say, the CAB in the committee report says there was no evidence from those groups or anywhere else that it was anything other than talk or theory.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It may be talk and theory, but there is no question in my mind but that the people who operate the planes and who fly the planes are wholeheartedly in favor of this legislation. To my mind, they documented their case fully before the committee as to the safety factor involved.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think this is a matter, of course, that you can get quite emotionally stirred up about. That is why I wanted to try to bring it back to the reasoning behind it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Would this legislation cover airlines running to our Territories, the Territory of Alaska and Hawaii?

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is confined to points within the limits of the 48 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. PELLY. Why?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Because of the fact that when you get outside the continental limits of the United States you run into complications with respect to foreign airlines.

Mr. PELLY. You do not with respect to Alaska.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That was a matter that created some difficulties. They may come in later legislation.

Mr. PELLY. I hope it will.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I received a letter from the Stewards and Pilots Association, and, whether they have documented this or not, when you read the letter and the incidents they have had to contend with, no one can conclude otherwise than that this is necessary from a safety angle.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman's committee has heard a lot of evidence which we are not able to hear here. May I ask, Was the gentleman's committee unanimous in reporting this bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. My recollection is there were two votes against it in the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], has there been any single disaster attributable to the sale of liquor on planes?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Not that I know of; but I do not think we should wait until a disaster happens before we pass this bill.

Mr. COUDERT. Those pilots have flown many millions of miles?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the CAB request or approve of this bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The CAB has not requested it and has not approved it, but they do not run the planes.

Mr. COUDERT. They are responsible for the operation of the planes. The gentleman from Minnesota refers to this as a regulation. Is this not in effect legislating a regulation that could be just as well handled without any bill

such as this? The CAB is authorized to limit and to restrict the sale of liquor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. There were some members of the committee who felt that the CAB has the authority to make this regulation but they have refused to do so.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is there anything to prevent any passenger from buying one, two, or three bottles and taking those bottles on the plane with him and drinking them on the plane?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is now taken care of in the regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. CELLER. Does this bill make any change in that regard?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No.

Mr. CELLER. Then, a person can get as drunk as he may wish if he buys those bottles and goes on a plane. Why should you have this limitation as is prescribed in this bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course, I do not think any gentleman would get himself in that condition.

Mr. CELLER. I would not, but others would.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I urge an affirmative vote on this meritorious legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, as my colleague Mr. HARRIS said in the beginning, the purpose of this bill is so simple that it requires little, if any, explanation. However, I think it might be well to tell you what gave birth to this legislation.

Last spring while our committee was considering some aviation legislation, some representatives of the Stewards and Stewardesses Association and the Airline Pilots Association visited my office, and in a general discussion with me regarding desirable and needed changes in the laws and regulations in order to improve the safety factor in civil flying, these people asked me specifically if I would sponsor this legislation. It was at the instance of these people, who actually have to fly the aircraft, that I sponsored this bill, which would prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages on commercial airliners.

The pilots of these aircraft are charged with the responsibility of caring for the safety of the passengers.

In civil air regulation No. 43.45, presently in effect, the pilot is charged with this responsibility. I quote from that regulation:

> A pilot shall not permit any person to be carried in the aircraft who is obviously under the influence of intoxicating liquor or drugs, except a medical patient under proper care in case of an emergency.

In other words, this regulation places upon the pilot of that aircraft the responsibility to see that no passenger who is under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall board his aircraft.

The pilots tell me that since the airlines have started serving liquor on these aircraft they have found it absolutely impossible to enforce that regulation. That when they see a drunk attempting to board their aircraft, realizing that he may cause them trouble, they do not feel that they can properly and effectively enforce this regulation. The drunk tells them: "You are already serving the stuff on the aircraft, and do you mean to tell me you are going to kick me off because I am drinking?" Now, that is what these boys are up against.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I was just about to say to the gentleman that I thought his previous remark would take care of the point raised by my distinguished chairman [Mr. CELLER], in that he would not be permitted to board the plane if he was in the condition he mentioned in his suppositious case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is right. How is the pilot going to keep him off for being intoxicated if they are serving liquor on the aircraft?

Mr. KEATING. I can see that point, and I just want to call the attention of my chairman to the fact that apparently the present regulations are sufficient to cover his situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If there is any good defense of why liquor should be served on aircraft, will you tell this House what it is?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am afraid I could not present a good defense. Perhaps some of these other people could. But if there is anyone in this House that knows the hazards of flying, I think it is I. Flying, at best, is hazardous, even when everything is in good working order. I can assure you that anything which contributes directly or indirectly to placing an additional hazard on the safety of the passengers in civil aircraft should be eliminated if it is at all possible.

The CAB, which is one of the most arbitrary agencies in our Government—and I do not think anybody will dispute that—has refused to recognize that the problem exists, in spite of the fact that they already have civil air regulations which prohibit persons from boarding an aircraft while under the influence of liquor.

In the beginning it was my thought that the airlines would probably support this legislation if it were extended across the board to apply to all. As a matter of fact, I talked to several representatives of some of the major airlines regarding the legislation and they told me that they would be delighted to see the practice ruled out, because for them it was a nuisance, and they were compelled, because of competition, to serve liquor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. On the point the gentleman has made, serious consideration has been given by the various domestic trunklines of the country to an agreement among themselves in order to control this through their own actions, but because of the attitude of some of the companies involved no such agreement was ever entered into until after this bill was reported by the committee; is not that right?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is exactly right.

Mr. HARRIS. Following the action of the committee in reporting the bill, which indicated that there was a serious problem here, is it not a fact that the 6 major domestic trunklines now have an agreement or a program among themselves to limit the serving of alcoholic beverages in flight?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is right. Even they, while opposing this legislation, admit by their actions that the problem exists.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it would be advisable to include that agreements in the RECORD, and I shall do so as part of my remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As I heard the gentleman read the regulations, the pilot has the duty of keeping intoxicated people off the plane?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. The way it sounded, as the gentleman read it, it would seem as though he had the duty of putting them off after they got "boiled," after they had boarded the plane; is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should think so, whenever possible.

Mr. VORYS. If he is going to stop at various places, does he have the duty of going through the plane and seeing who is intoxicated since they took off and then put them off, and could he be disciplined by the CAB if he did not do it? It seems to me that the present regulations puts an intolerable burden on the pilot that only this proposed legislation will take care of.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank my friend from Ohio. He is absolutely right. With this regulation in effect, charging the pilot with the duty and responsibility of providing for the safety of his passengers against actions by intoxicated persons, it is absolutely impossible for him to discharge that duty if the airline itself is following a policy of contributing to the intoxication of the passengers.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I know the gentleman is deeply interested and concerned, as many of us are, in the safety of passengers in flight. I would like to ask the gentleman if he contends that it is also hazardous to smoke while in flight? I have had the experience where a person

who was stone-cold sober failed to put out a cigarette, fell asleep with the cigarette burning, and there was a near catastrophe.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course, smoking on an aircraft is a potential fire hazard.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Would the gentleman favor the passage of legislation prohibiting smoking while in flight?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would not advocate it without consulting the people who have to fly the aircraft. If they feel it is a safety hazard such as to require legislation in order to eliminate it, I would be the first to introduce it for them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I ask the question in all sincerity, because I know how sincere the gentleman is about this problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I know the gentleman is sincere, and recognize that smoking aboard aircraft might well be an additional safety hazard.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this to be meritorious legislation, certainly in the interest of the safety of the air-traveling public, and I urge its approval.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the question was asked, What good reasons are there for having liquor on board a plane? In the first place, the drinking of liquor is perfectly legal, and if one has the desire to drink liquor and does so one is not violating any law.

Secondly, I remember a story about a little titmouse that came upon a pool of liquor. The titmouse sipped the liquor and then perked up its head and said, "Where the devil is that cat that was chasing me yesterday?" In other words, it gave that little titmouse some courage. Liquor at times is helpful to humans.

A little bit of liquor once in a while even on a plane will not hurt. I am perfectly willing to drink a little liquor on a plane. It does not hurt me. It does not hurt the other passengers who have imbibed just a little liquor. If they drink too much, it is within the province of the stewardesses and those in charge of the plane to stop their imbibing. If there is intemperance then unruly passengers can be forced to disembark.

This bill strikes me as just a matter of appeasement. The old Bryson bill, which would prohibit advertising of intoxicating liquors in publications, has been kicking around this House for many years. That bill apparently cannot get to first base. So, by way of appeasement to the so-called drys, who are unappeasable—they are as unappeasable as inebriates themselves—they demand this bill. There is no reason for this bill. It is just a so-called sop to the drys. The committee that reported it will soon find that the drys will demand more. They will not be satisfied with only this bill.

This bill reminds me of the old days of prohibition. We had these questions up innumerable times. We finally ended the so-called noble experiment, called the 18th amendment. Are we to have those awful days all over again?

I remember during prohibition I went out to a town in the Middle West. I had been riding all night, and I wanted to get something that would warm me up a little bit, because it was a very cold night. I went to a denizen of the town and said, "Where can I get a little something to warm me up?" He said, "You cross the railroad track, go down to your right one block, and there is a schoolhouse. That's the only place in this here town where you cannot get it."

This story illustrates the futility of prohibitive liquor laws. They are unenforcible. They run counter to human wishes.

Let us not run the danger of opening the door on those awful events during prohibition. It strikes me as woefully ridiculous to pass prohibitive legislation at this time and in this era.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"FURNISHING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

"(c) No air carrier shall sell or otherwise furnish to its passengers alcoholic beverages (including wine and beer) for consumption while in flight within the limits of the 48 States and the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after "flight", insert "between points."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8000) to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight, pursuant to House Resolution 558, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ANNE YASGUR KLING

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 2915).

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ANNE YASGUR KLING

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Anne Yasgur Kling, St. Louis, Mo. The said subpena directed Anne Yasgur Kling to be and appear before said Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber, room 516, New Federal Building, 12th and Market, St. Louis, Mo., on June 4, 1956, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served on said Anne Yasgur Kling is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"TO ANNE YASGUR KLING, *Greeting:* Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on June 4, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m., at room 516, New Federal Building, 12th and Market, St. Louis, Mo., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To R. T. Collins and/or G. C. Williams, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 16th day of April, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by George C. Williams, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said George W. Williams being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Subpena for Anne Y. Kling before the Committee on Un-American Activities. I made service of the within subpena by personally handing the within-named individual at her residence, 1445 Partridge, St. Louis, at 4:50 o'clock, p. m., on the 24th day of April 1956.

"Dated 4-24, 1956.

"GEORGE C. WILLIAMS."

On May 29, 1956, a telegram was sent to Mrs. Anne Yasgur Kling, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 29, 1956.*

Personal report delivered.

Mrs. ANNE YASGUR KLING,
1445 Partridge Street, St. Louis, Mo.

Under continuing authority of subpena served upon you April 24, your appearance before Committee on Un-American Activities is hereby postponed from June 4 to Wednesday, June 6, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m., Courtroom 3, New Federal Building, St. Louis, Mo., instead of room 516, New Federal Building.

FRANCIS E. WALTERS, *Chairman.*

The said Anne Yasgur Kling, pursuant to said subpena and telegraphic communication, and in compliance therewith, appeared before a subcommittee of the said Committee on Un-American Activities on June 6, 1956, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th

Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said Anne Yasgur Kling having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely:

"Who was the Communist Party organizer in charge of the office during that period of time? (The period referred to was the period of the witness' employment in Communist Party headquarters.)

"Did Ralph Shaw serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, as far as you know?

"Was Shaw a member of the Communist Party at the time you were there?

"Will you tell us, then, the names of such individuals who were members of the Communist Party when you were there who we may not even know about?

"Will you tell us, please, who employed you first in the Communist Party headquarters in St. Louis?"

After Mrs. Kling had testified that she was one of two persons on the Communist Party payroll, the question was asked:

"Who was that other person?

"Did you know Harold Hall?

"Now we would like to know from you, who were members known to you of the railroad group of the Communist Party?

"Do you know to whom the name Bill referred as one of those responsible for electric?

"Do you know to whom the name Sue refers?

"The reference to packing is made here with the names following it of Joe and Helen? Do you know to whom those names refer?

"Can you honestly answer the question as to whether she was a functionary of the Communist Party at any time? ('She' referred to Helen Musiel.)

"Are you acquainted with Helen Musiel?

"Was Dr. Sol Londy a member of the Communist Party during the period that you were a member of the party?

"Were you acquainted with him (Dr. Sol Londy) between 1944 and 1947?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer such questions; and as a result of Anne Yasgur Kling's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon the said Anne Yasgur Kling.

The record of the proceedings before the subcommittee on June 6, 1956, during which the said Anne Yasgur Kling refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertaining to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
"ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"St. Louis, Mo., Wednesday, June 6, 1956.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The committee met at 9:45 a. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 3, United States Courthouse and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

"Present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., and GORDON H. SCHERER.

"Present also: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams, and Raymond H. Collins, investigators.

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"(After hearing the testimony of other witnesses, Mrs. Anne Yasgur Kling was called before the committee.)

"Mr. MOULDER. * * * Call the next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Anne Yasgur.

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Kling.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Anne Kling.

"Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

"Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mrs. KLING. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ANNE YASGUR KLING; ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, G. S. ROUDEBUSH

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. My name is G. S. Roudebush. I am a member of this bar, and represent Mrs. Kling.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

"Mrs. KLING. Anne Ruth Kling.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was your maiden name?

"Mrs. KLING. Yasgur, Y-a-s-g-u-r.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell your last name—Kling?

"Mrs. KLING. K-l-i-n-g.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you reside?

"Mrs. KLING. 1445 Partridge Avenue, University City, postal zone 14, Mo.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. No.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

"Mrs. KLING. In Bradford, Pa.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. In the summer of 1944.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been married?

"Mrs. KLING. We were married January 1, 1948.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was your employment between 1944 in St. Louis and 1948, if any?

"Mrs. KLING. I had various stenographic jobs, but I worked for the Communist Party in the Communist Party office for a period of time. And I sold subscriptions to New Masses magazine.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where was the Communist Party headquarters located at the time you were employed in the office?

"Mrs. KLING. I think it was on North Seventh Street here in downtown St. Louis.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That employment began when?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I believe—I am not sure—sometime in the winter of 1945.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long did the employment continue?

"Mrs. KLING. I started about the winter of 1945, and, well, I left the party payroll at various times to take ordinary stenographic jobs, and it was intermittent between the winter of 1945, probably, to the winter of 1946.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the Communist Party organizer in charge of the office during that period of time?

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, I will tell you anything that you want to know about myself and my activities, anything you want to know, I have nothing to conceal. I engaged in no criminal or no illegal activity.

"But I am not a tattletale, and I don't want to snitch on anybody.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for a direction that the witness answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer. And, as other witnesses have been advised, we are not directing you to answer the question in the spirit of a threat but for the reason that the committee is not satisfied and does not accept your response to the question, and for the further reason advising you of the possibility of the dangers of contempt proceedings.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, my lawyer advises me that the question of exposure of other individuals simply for the case of exposure is not a settled question in law, and until it is a settled question my conscience would prevent me from tattling on other people.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say that the full bench of the circuit court of appeals recently reversed a ruling of the three members of that court.

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. May I be heard on that, Mr. Scherer?

"Mr. SCHERER. I am just saying——

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I should say that I spoke yesterday on the telephone to counsel for Watkins in that case, and he told me that he was applying for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

"Mr. MOULDER. May I say, of course, that you are going under the presumption that we are merely seeking to expose somebody, which is not true. It is a wrong and false presumption.

"Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SCHERER. Don't you think we should further say now that we are now considering legislation and that testimony that this witness might give, if she would, would be helpful in that respect.

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes; we would take that position. Such information as you may be in a position to give us might aid this committee in its deliberations and consideration of legislation.

"Now do you still wish to refuse to answer for the reasons which you have given?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes. Telling on other people is an abhorrent thing to me.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Ralph Shaw?

"Mrs. KLING. That is the same question essentially. You are asking me to identify a person, and I just can't identify other people.

"I wish you would ask me what I did, how I behaved.

"Mr. SCHERER. You understand, madam, that that is not your responsibility as to whether you are going to tell what you know about other individuals.

"Our society and our courts could not function if any witness that came into a court or into a congressional hearing took it upon himself to say that he is not going to tell what he knows about other people.

"It is distasteful all of the time, even in the courtroom for a person to come in and say that he saw his neighbor beat his wife. He may not want to say that, but merely because he likes that neighbor he can't refuse to tell the court, nor could he refuse to tell a congressional committee what he knows merely because it is distasteful to him.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SCHERER. Our whole system of jurisprudence would fall if witnesses could take it upon themselves to say "I don't want to tell what I know about people merely because I don't like to do it, that it is distasteful."

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did Ralph Shaw serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, as far as you know?

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer the question in relation to other individuals. I am relying somewhat on counsel's advice that this question of holding people up to public scorn is an open question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you substitute in any way and——

"Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

"I think we have got to get this record straight, particularly insofar as this witness is concerned.

"If witnesses could come in and say they just don't want to tell what they know about other people because it might have an unfavorable effect upon them—I think I must ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer the question.

"Mrs. KLING. My conscience will not permit me to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. You are refusing to answer solely because your conscience will not permit you to answer?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SCHERER. We should state for the record certainly this committee is not asking these questions for the purpose of exposing any individual. The committee is asking these questions so that it will be better enabled to recommend to the Congress such legislation as it thinks necessary to deal with the Communist conspiracy which still exists in this country.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received sworn testimony that Ralph Shaw was an organizer of the Communist Party in St. Louis, but that there was a period of time when he was absent while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"Did you carry on the function of an organizer of the Communist Party at any time while Ralph Shaw was not here?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. I worked in the Communist Party office sometime during the winter of 1945, and I believe it continued to the winter of 1946 or thereabouts. I left, I quit the Communist Party in the summer of 1947. I have never attended any more Communist Party meetings. That was 9 years ago.

"I understand that I was expelled for desertion.

"That is the story.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then you would have no way of knowing, madam, whether this man Shaw or any of the other individuals about whom Mr. Tavenner wants to inquire are still members of the Communist Party and are still active. You would have no way of knowing?

"Mrs. KLING. That is true. That is absolately true.

"Mr. SCHERER. And it is possible that they might be?

"Mrs. KLING. It is possible; yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Was Shaw a member of the Communist Party at the time you were there?

"Mrs. KLING. I will answer any question about myself.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct now the witness to answer the question as to whether Shaw was a member of the Communist Party, because obviously he may still be a member of the Communist Party today, and may still be engaged in subversive activities against this country.

"And it may be that we will want to call Shaw or other people connected with Shaw to determine what the Communist conspiracy is doing at this present moment in this area. And as the result, we may want to recommend legislation to the Congress of the United States to deal with the continued activities of the Communist conspiracy.

"Mr. MOULDER. As requested by Mr. SCHERER, the witness is informed that the committee does not accept your response to the question, and you are directed to answer.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. What was the question? Excuse me.

"Mr. MOULDER. He asked you if——

"Mr. SCHERER. If Shaw was a member of the Communist Party at the time she was.

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. SCHERER, my conscience will not permit me to name other individuals whom I may or may not have known during the 3 years—9 years ago—that I was in the Communist Party.

"Mr. SCHERER. Yet you understand that people who were in the Communist Party at the time you were there may still be in the Communist Party today?

"Mrs. KLING. I have no way of knowing, Mr. SCHERER.

"Mr. SCHERER. Will you tell us the name—I know you don't have any way of knowing—will you tell us then the names of such individuals who were members of the Communist Party when you were there who we may not even know about?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot sit here and be a tattletale, Mr. SCHERER. I just can't do that kind of thing.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then, as I understand it, you are refusing to answer my questions solely because you feel that your conscience will not permit you to tell us about individuals who were members of the Communist Party when you were a member of the Communist Party who may be members of the party today.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Yes, Mr. SCHERER; for that reason and for the further reason that it is still an open question as to whether the law compels information about individuals which may not serve a legislative purpose.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer my question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Your response is not accepted by the committee, and you are directed to answer as requested by Mr. SCHERER.

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. All right.

"Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You did not answer the question that I asked you. My question was whether or not during the absence of Mr. Shaw you carried on the functions of an organizer of the Communist Party in St. Louis.

"Mrs. KLING. Let's see. What exactly did I do?

"I don't know that you would call it an organizer. I wrote leaflets. I ran them off on a mimeograph. I may have distributed them on the street corners. I participated actively. I don't believe I ever had the appellation 'organizer.'

"Mr. TAVENNER. My question was whether you served in that capacity during the absence of Mr. Shaw. It would be very easy for you to answer that question 'Yes' or 'No' according to whatever the facts are.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I would say—

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. I was not an organizer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you if you carried on the duties of an organizer of the Communist Party during the absence of Mr. Shaw.

"Mrs. KLING. The duties as an organizer, yes, I suppose that would be so, never being termed an organizer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Though you did not have the title of an organizer you carried on the work of Mr. Shaw when Mr. Shaw was in the Army, didn't you?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. I was carrying on work that might be called that of an organizer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ralph Shaw was your brother-in-law; wasn't he?

"Mrs. KLING. I will not bring in names, according to my conscience.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness——

"Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me, Mr. Scherer.

(Mr. Tavenner confers with the committee.)

"Mr. MOULDER. The request is made that you be directed to answer, and you are so directed.

"Mrs. KLING. Excuse me. The question again, please?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the witness the question.

(Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter, as follows:)

"'Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Ralph Shaw was your brother-in-law; wasn't he?'

"Mrs. KLING. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Had you been a member of the Communist Party before you accepted employment in the Communist Party headquarters?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where did you join the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. In St. Louis.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. In the summer of 1944.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time before coming to St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. No; I was a member of the Young Communist League in college, and, as a member of the Young Communist League, I wasn't a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. MOULDER. At what college was that?

"Mrs. KLING. Missouri University.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did functionaries of the Communist Party appear in your Young Communist League meetings from time to time?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I will have to think because that was 1943–44. That is 12 and 13 years ago and I really will have to think.

"Whether anybody—well, it could be but I couldn't say for sure.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did any functionary of the Communist Party who appeared before your group ever confer with you after leaving college about your becoming a member of the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. You know I think that when I left college I was so dedicated that I just went up to the Communist Party office and joined.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In Columbia or in St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. In St. Louis.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long a period of time before 1944 had you considered yourself a dedicated Communist?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, maybe I used the word dedicated ill-advisedly, but I was probably—let's see. I was a member of the Young Communist League toward the end of 1943 and through 1944, to the best of my knowledge.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, please, who employed you first in the Communist Party headquarters in St. Louis.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, that would involve more names, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; it would involve a name.

"Mrs. KLING. And I think that I will just wait and see what the Supreme Court has to say on this.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask a direction of the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mrs. KLING. My conscience will not permit me to answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons were employed in the headquarters besides you?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. I think the Communist Party payroll at that time consisted of two persons, myself and one other.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was that other person?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was that other person the organizer or was it a fellow employee, another person employed by the organizer?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Well, when the men went off to the Army the women of the Communist Party were supposed to take over and run things. But nobody got titles as far as I can remember.

"Mr. TAVENNER. But when the leadership of the Communist Party went in the Army, their wives took over?

"Mrs. KLING. I don't know that they were necessarily wives.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Or the men took over?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. You said 'or the men took over.'

"Mr. TAVENNER. No. The women took over.

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; I think that when the men went off to war women entered the factories to become riveters, et cetera. That is probably what happened.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You were one of those who wanted to keep the Communist Party going until the men got back?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; I guess you would say that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Well, did you maintain a list of the membership of the Communist Party at the time that you acted in that capacity?

"Mrs. KLING. There were lists of members. And I would address envelopes and ask members to attend meetings. Yes; lists were available to me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the dues secretary?

"Mrs. KLING. No; I wasn't the dues secretary.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer that question, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. May I interpose one question?

"You know who the dues secretary was, though, do you not?

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. Scherer, I don't really remember. I honestly don't remember.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any list of the membership?

"Mrs. KLING. Now?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

"Mrs. KLING. Oh, no; I left the party 9 years ago. And then I was expelled for desertion. That is my understanding.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How did the Communist Party raise the money with which to carry on its operations during the period of time you were serving in the capacity you have described?

"Mrs. KLING. I think it was mainly contributions from members.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. How soon after you became a member of the Communist Party in 1944 was it you became employed in the headquarters, Communist Party headquarters in this city?

"Mrs. KLING. I can't give you the exact time, but I believe it may have been around February or March of 1945. But my memory on that is faulty. I was employed but I can't give you the exact date.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Specifically what office was it in which you were employed? Was it on a district level or city level?

"Mrs. KLING. I think it was on the district level. Yes, I think it was the district.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The district level. And the district at that time consisted of the States of Missouri and Arkansas; did it not?

"Mrs. KLING. You know I have forgotten. You may be right. You may be right.

"Mr. TAVENNER. There were at that time organized groups of the Communist Party not only in St. Louis but in what is referred to as outstate Missouri. Isn't that true?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes, yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Kansas City and other places.

"Did you say 'Yes'?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the position that you spoke of in the district headquarters?

"Mrs. KLING. Let's see——

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say until 1947? I understood you to so state.

"Mrs. KLING. No; it wasn't—I don't believe—I think it was toward the end of 1946 that I was no longer employed, but I am not absolutely sure.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. In your earlier testimony you stated 1947, I understood.

"Mrs. KLING. My lawyer advises me that you may be confusing the date I left the party with the date I left working directly for the Communist Party.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. If you will give us the facts, whatever they are.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any document or memorandum that you could use to refresh your recollection?

"Mrs. KLING. No; I am sorry I don't. I am trying very hard to remember for you.

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. This paper she is looking at, Mr. Tavenner, is notes that I made of what she told me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is quite all right.

"Mrs. KLING. As far as I can remember, I sold subscriptions to New Masses magazine from around the fall of 1945 until January of 1946.

"No; that wouldn't be right.

"And I worked at the Communist Party office from around the winter of 1945—yes, this is correct—until the winter of around 1946. I believe this is correct.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The winter of 1946?

"Mrs. KLING. I honestly can't swear to this. I realize I am under oath, and I don't want to make a mistake.

"Mr. TAVENNER. All I want you to do is to be as nearly correct as you can.

"I believe you said you left the Communist Party in 1947.

"Mrs. KLING. Yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What time in 1947?

"Mrs. KLING. It was somewhere in the summer, June or July, possibly August, of 1947, I stopped attending meetings.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any Communist Party meetings after June or July 1947?

"Mrs. KLING. I don't believe so, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are not certain?

"Mrs. KLING. Let's see.

"I am fairly certain, but that is 9 years ago. And while I am under oath, I am not going to say 9 years ago——

"Mr. TAVENNER. You could be mistaken about that?

"Mrs. KLING. Possibly, possibly.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not it was the practice in the Communist Party to require the membership to subscribe for the Daily Worker?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; I think members were—they wanted the members to read the paper; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Why?

"Mrs. KLING. I suppose to inform them on their stand on current events.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Is it not correct that the Daily Worker carried the Communist Party line, the decisions of the Communist Party, which the membership should follow?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; that is true.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you familiar with the activity of Grace Granich in procuring directives from the Soviet Union and having them carried as news articles in the Daily Worker for the purpose of informing the membership of the Communist Party as to the Communist decisions?

"Mrs. KLING. I have never heard of—is it a woman?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

"Mrs. KLING. No.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you continue to subscribe to the Daily Worker to a much later date than 1947?

"Mrs. KLING. I may have. I don't think I did, but I may have. I know I wasn't subscribing to it in 1948; I am pretty sure I wasn't. But I can't honestly, you know, say.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive it regularly in 1948?

"Mrs. KLING. I don't really remember. I don't think so. But I don't honestly remember.

"I may have wanted to let the subscription run out and get the paper for nothing.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Why were you interested in receiving the Daily Worker after you had withdrawn from the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I really—

"You apparently have information that I did, and I guess if you have it then it is correct. But I can't remember that I was interested. I probably was letting a subscription take its normal course and didn't stop it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. King, I have read into evidence a document entitled 'Proposed Plan for Missouri State Building Conference, March 2 and 3, 1946' which sets forth the Communist Party plan in Missouri. This was at a period when you were in the district office of the Communist Party in St. Louis.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, may I interrupt to announce we are pleased and honored to have with us Congressman CHARLIE HALLECK of Indiana, floor leader of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Proceed.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

"I would like to read to you this part in the document. The heading of this part of the document is:

" 'THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR FULFILLING CONCENTRATION TASKS

" 'It is proposed that the minimum number of recruits shall come from the following industries:

" 'AFL, 26; electrical, 25; shoe, 25 (including AFL shoe workers).

" 'Packing, 25, including "KC" which may mean Kansas City.

" 'Auto, 15, including KC.

"Railroad, 15, including KC. Outstate, 25.

" 'Youth and vets, 25.

" 'Negro and professionals, 100 as a generally minimum figure.

" 'It is proposed that new branches and clubs shall be organized in the following places—'

"I will refer to that a little later.

"Do you recall at this time the success attained by the Communist Party in meeting the minimum requirements for fulfilling the concentration tasks in 1946?

"Mrs. KLING. The Communist Party was always having party-building conferences. They were always putting up goals to be met. And I honestly don't remember whether those aims were achieved or not. I rather think they weren't, but I couldn't swear to it.

"Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read the document):

" 'It is proposed that new branches and clubs shall be organized in the following places: 5 additional shop branches, at least 1 of these in KC; county clubs in Overland, Kinloch, and Kirkwood.'

"Do you recall whether clubs were organized in Overland, Kinloch, and Kirkwood?

"Mrs. KLING. No; I really don't know.

"Now I went to Kansas City for several months in 1946—I don't know whether you have that information or not—in an attempt to recruit members and build up the Kansas City party. Success was not too great, and I returned to St. Louis, I think, in the fall or the early winter months of 1947.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In Kansas City did you work among the railroad group referred to in this document, in which it was said that there should be 15 recruited in railroad, including Kansas City?

"Mrs. KLING. I don't believe I ever worked directly with any railroad group. I don't think there were any 15 members either.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How many were there?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, let me see. Ten years ago. There may have been 2 or 3.

"Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard testimony here that Otto Wangerin——

"Mrs. KLING. What is the name?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Otto Wangerin, a Communist Party functionary on a national level and one of the members of the railroad unit of the Communist Party—as it was described by the witness but which we think meant that he was one of the railroad commission of the Communist Party on a national level—came here to St. Louis and met with the Communist Party here for the purpose of concentrating work among railroad employees. The testimony is that he stated to the St. Louis group of Communists that the railroads were of vital importance to the Communist Party, that the very life of a democracy such as ours depends upon transportation, and no revolution could be complete unless the Communist Party controlled the railroads. Do you recall the appearance of Mr. Otto Wangerin?

"Mrs. KLING. I really don't. I don't recall him at all. The name isn't familiar to me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now you state that here in St. Louis there were 2 or 3 members of the railroad group.

"Mrs. KLING. No. You misunderstood me. I don't know what they had at St. Louis in the railroad group. I was talking about Kansas City.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Kansas City. There were 2 or 3 in Kansas City?

"Mrs. KLING. As far as I know and can remember now.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether Harold Hall was a member of the railroad group here in St. Louis?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, there we come to names again, and I honestly didn't know anything about their railroad group at St. Louis.

"Mr. SCHERER. Did you know Harold Hall?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer that, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. As requested by Mr. SCHERER, the witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. You are refusing to answer it on the basis that your conscience will not permit you to answer?

"Mrs. KLING. But not only that; but also that there may be an open legal question as to whether mere naming of names serves the purpose that the committee desires.

"Mr. SCHERER. We settled that this morning.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I assure you that this is no question of merely naming of names. There is information indicating that Mr. Hall is an important member of the Communist Party in St. Louis today. Your testimony on his activities and just what his activities were in the Communist Party may be of vital importance to us if you will give it to us.

"Mr. SCHERER. For the purpose of determining legislation which the committee now has and presently has under consideration.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, frankly I didn't have much to do with the industrial end of the party. I was more, well, how to put it—

"I don't believe I ever planned any of this, whatever it is that you are driving at. My own interests in the ideology were on an intellectual level, and I can't say that I ever concentrated in this area that you are talking about at all. I don't know the workings of it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The intellectuals in the Communist Party were used by the Communist Party to aid in recruiting in industry, in railroads, and in other vital areas in which the Communist Party was interested. Isn't that true? Wasn't that one of the principal functions of the intellectuals in the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I will say this for myself personally, that I don't recall signing up any member who was in industry. I myself didn't do this.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking your knowledge about things, not only just what you yourself did. You have told us that you were active in the headquarters of the Communist Party performing the duties normally exercised by an organizer while the leadership of the Communist Party was in the war. You have indicated that you have special knowledge of those things.

"Now we would like to know from you who were members known to you of the railroad group of the Communist Party.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, Mr. Tavenner, for the major period of my activities in the party, the party operated on a neighborhood basis. They had a South Side branch and they had a West Side branch. And I don't recall my participating in any industrial conference or working with any industrial unit. I was working with the neighborhood branches which were organized on the basis of where people lived and not where they worked.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, she has evaded answering the question of counsel, and I ask you to direct her to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness has been evasive, and the committee does respectfully direct you to answer the question.

"Mrs. KLING. I am sorry. I don't want to be evasive. I will try to answer the question. Would you ask me again?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

"Will you read the question, please?

"Mr. SCHERER. The question was whether or not she knew the names of those individuals who were in the railroad segment of the Communist Party.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for the exact question to be read.

"(Whereupon the record was read by the reporter, as follows:)

" 'Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking your knowledge about things, not only just what you yourself did. You have told us that you were active in the headquarters of the Communist Party performing the duties normally exercised by an organizer while the leadership of the Communist Party was in the war. You have indicated that you have special knowledge of those things.

" 'Now we would like to know from you who were members known to you of the railroad group of the Communist Party.'

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I have to say that I cannot tell names.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is redirected to answer the question.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Excuse me.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are directed by the committee to answer the question.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, on the grounds of conscience and the question, the open legal question of exposure, I will have to decline the answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. This very document, issued on the 3d day of March 1946, states that—

" 'In this campaign the aim of every comrade must be to recruit only those who will be active, who will contribute to achieve the following qualitative and quantitative improvements of our party organization.'

"And one of the qualitative items is this:

" 'Qualitative improvement in the existing neighborhood clubs and organization of series of new clubs in the important political and industrial sections.'

"And you have told us that you went to Kansas City for several months that same year after that time and engaged in recruiting work.

"Mrs. KLING. Trying to recruit.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You said that there were 2 or 3 members of the railroad group in Kansas City. Who were they?

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, I honestly don't remember their names. That is 10 years ago, and I don't remember their names.

"Mr. MOULDER. If you could remember, would you tell us?

"Mrs. KLING. No, Mr. MOULDER.

"Mr. ROUDEBUSH. If I may, as we do in court, object to the question as to what she might do.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In this document, issued in March of 1946, pursuant to which you engaged in recruiting work, appears this statement:

" 'Following are some of the proposed assignments:

" 'Electrical—'

"And then the name 'Dottie' appears after that, and the name 'Zollie.' We have had testimony here that Dottie referred to a Mrs. James Sage. We have heard testimony that Zollie referred to Zollie Carpenter.

"Do you know to whom the name 'Bill' referred as one of those responsible for electric?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer for the reasons I gave heretofore.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is respectfully directed to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The designation—excuse me.

"Mrs. KLING. I am sorry, but I cannot answer the question on the basis of the previous explanation.

"Mr. MOULDER. You mean you refuse to answer for the same reasons previously stated?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; that is right.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The designation of youth is made with the names after it of Ray and Sue.

"We have heard evidence that Ray referred to Ray Wolverin. Do you know to whom the name 'Sue' refers?

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. Tavenner, I will have to decline to answer that because I cannot be a tattletale, and also because there is a question of whether naming certain names would be helpful to the developing of legislation on these matters.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The reference to packing is made here with the names following it of Joe and Helen. Do you know to whom those names refer?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I decline to answer for the same reasons, the same two reasons given in my previous answers.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't Helen Musiel a functionary of the Communist Party here in March of 1946? By here I mean in St. Louis.

"Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that question.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. Helen Musiel is a witness that we have under subpena for this very hearing and who has failed to answer that subpena because of an alleged defect in the subpena. So it can be readily seen why this witness' testimony with reference to Helen Musiel is important.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mrs. KLING. I will decline to answer that. You are questioning me about things that occurred 10 years ago. A lot of the questions I honestly couldn't answer if I wanted to. But I will have to continue to decline the naming of other people because that kind of thing is just abhorrent to me.

"Mr. SCHERER. The matter of Helen Musiel is a very present matter before this committee. Any information that you have regarding Helen Musiel is vitally important to this committee.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Can you honestly answer the question I ask you regarding Helen Musiel, if you desired to answer it?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. That seems a hypothetical question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. No. You said that there are some people that you could not honestly answer. I am asking you if you can honestly answer that question as to Helen Musiel.

"Mrs. KLING. And the original question was, sir?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was whether or not Helen Musiel was a functionary of the Communist Party in March 1946.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. My best recollection is that I don't know.

"Mrs. TAVENNER. Did you work in the same office with her?

"Mrs. KLING. In March of 1946?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Any time in 1946.

"Mrs. KLING. There we are on names again.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; it is the same name that you couldn't remember a moment ago.

"Mrs. KLING. No. I was answering your specific question as to a specific time, Mr. Tavenner, before. Now you are asking a more general question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. You are unable to answer as to the specific date of March 2 or 3.

"Can you honestly answer the question as to whether she was a functionary of the Communist Party at any time?

"(The witness confers with counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. That is another question, sir. And I cannot answer a question like that.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question because it is vitally important. And what happened here this morning demonstrates the fallacy of the position she takes.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer for the previous reasons given.

"Mr. MOULDER. May I also ask you, do you know Helen Musiel? Are you acquainted with Helen Musiel?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I will have to decline to answer that question.

"Mr. MOULDER. And the committee cannot accept that response to the question. You are directed to answer the question.

"I said the committee cannot accept that reason for refusing to answer that question, and you are directed to answer.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. In view of the context of the question in relation to what happened this morning, the nonappearance of this person, I would like to state that as of now, I know nothing about this person.

"Mr. MOULDER. As of what?

"Mrs. KLING. As of now I know nothing about this person.

"Mr. MOULDER. I asked you if you were acquainted with her.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I decline to answer, Mr. Moulder.

"Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever know her?

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer on the basis of the previous reasons given.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. When was the last time you saw Helen Musiel?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot answer for the reasons previously given.

"Mr. SCHERER. When was the last time you had any contact with Helen Musiel?

"Mrs. KLING. I cannot name names here of other people. I am willing to tell you whatever you want to know about myself and what I did.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether Helen Musiel worked in the same office in the district headquarters of the Communist Party with you.

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer because it involves naming another individual, and I don't want to injure other people.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Another notation from the document of March 2 is 'Auto' followed by the name Maries. Do you know to whom Marie refers?

"Mrs. KLING. Gosh, I might and I might not, sir. So I will just have to decline on the basis that I do not want to harm other individuals.

"Mr. TAVENNER. There is also the notation 'Railroad' after which is the name Helen. Is that the same Helen who had the responsibility for packinghouse?

"Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that on the same grounds previously given.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. I want at this time also to refer to Schoemehl Exhibit 1. This is a Communist Party document entitled 'Organization Department, Report to Clubs, April 14, 1947' and it reads as follows, or at least part of it does:

"'Following consultation with the national organization commission of our party, the Missouri State board has made a number of important decisions. These decisions are for the purpose of strengthening our party and its leadership in order that our party can fulfill its role in organizing and leading the struggles of our class and our people in Missouri. These decisions on organization include:

"'1. That the Missouri district implement immediately and seriously its concentration policy in the electrical and machine industry by establishing a concentration section plus the assignment of one full-time person to head the concentration work.'

"Who was appointed as a full-time person to head that concentration work, if you know?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. I honestly don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You do not know?

"Mrs. KLING. No, sir. If I did know at one time I can't remember now.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The Communist Party did concentrate in the electrical and machine industry; did it not?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. At that time Ray Koch, who signed this document as organizational secretary, was in fact the organizational secretary; was he not?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. That is a name. I will have to decline to answer Mr. Tavenner, on the same grounds that I won't tattle on other people.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are certainly not tattling on Ray Koch, whose name is appended to this document as organizational secretary.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Well, if that is what the document says that is what it is.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you serve under him?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. That is a name question again.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mrs. KLING. That involves my disclosing a relationship with someone else, which might do harm to him because of my membership at the time. And so I have to decline to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. What was the reason for declining to answer that question? Would you repeat that?

"Mrs. KLING. That if I answered it might—well, if I were asked if I knew Joe Blow in 1946, and I said I did he might get in trouble because it might be assumed that since I was a member that he was a member.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What about your Government?

"Mrs. KLING. I have a high respect for my Government.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Don't you think your Government will get in difficulty if it doesn't do something about the Communist business, that the Congress may understand what is going on in the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, what is going on? I don't know what is going on in the Communist Party, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. And the only way we can find out is to call before this committee persons who do know. And you are in a position to give us the information as to some of the persons who may still be very active in the organization here in the city at this moment.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I don't know that, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now I want to ask you this question: In this original document which I mentioned to you, the one bearing date of March 2 and 3, 1946, reference is made to this, that there should be established at least one professional cell of the Communist Party. What is meant by a professional cell of the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, my interpretation of that would be it would be composed of people who were in the professions—the arts, and sciences, law.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The intellectuals?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes, I suppose you could say that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you were one of the intellectuals. Were you a member of a professional cell of the Communist Party?

"Mrs. KLING. No, I was not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a professional cell of the Communist Party during the period that you were active in the district headquarters?

"Mrs. KLING. Let's see. I honestly don't remember. My impression now is that the professionals were in the neighborhood clubs that I mentioned before. Now I am not sure about this.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection. We have had testimony from Mr. Schoemehl, who was in the Communist Party at the instance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the period of time that you were——

"Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. Here is a man who testified before this committee under oath and admitted his membership in the Communist Party and told why he was in the Communist Party. Did you know Mr. Schoemehl?

"Mrs. KLING. I don't want to bring in any names.

"Mr. SCHERER. You don't want to bring in any names because it might hurt that individual. How could it hurt Mr. Schoemehl? Mr. Schoemehl appeared before us on Saturday in executive session under oath and admitted his membership in the Communist Party, and told why he was in the Communist Party, and gave us an abundance of testimony. Now what happens to your argument or your statement that it is going to hurt him for you to tell us whether you knew Schoemehl?

"Mrs. KLING. Even on Schoemehl I am willing to say what I did, and talk about party structure and so forth, but not names.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have demonstrated here the utter fallacy of the position of this witness. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question whether she knew Schoemehl.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer on the grounds as previously stated.

"Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you said here you are going to tell all that you did in the Communist Party. How can you possibly hurt Schoemehl? We want to know what you and Schoemehl did in the Communist Party. He is willing for you to tell what he did, as far as he is concerned.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Well, these are matters of individual conscience. And because Mr. Schoemehl's conscience is not precisely that of mine in this regard, then I cannot follow in his footsteps. Just because one person does something doesn't mean that another person has to.

"Mr. SCHERER. Now Mr. Schoemehl told us about you, told us you were a member of the Communist Party.

"Mrs. KLING. All right.

"Mr. SCHERER. In that respect he was telling the truth; wasn't he?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes, he was. And I have nothing to hide, Mr. Scherer, on that basis.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then you knew him; did you not?

"Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that.

"Mr. SCHERER. What was your activity with Schoemehl in the Communist Party? It isn't funny. This is serious.

"Mrs. KLING. I am only smiling out of nervousness, Mr. Scherer. I am not very happy here, you understand. As a matter of fact——

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you about finished with this witness?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir. Will you tell us more about the professional cells of the Communist Party? Were they not considered as supersecret, that the membership of a professional cell of the Communist Party was not to be known even by other Communist Party members other than those on the very highest levels?

"Mrs. KLING. When I was a member and worker in the Communist Party the structure was very loose. And while the rule may have been that nobody was to know about any professional cell in actual practice people did know each other. And I think probably the chief difference in the form of activity was that the professionals met in homes, each other's homes instead of going to party headquarters.

"Mr. TAVENNER. They, in fact, were told not to be at meetings where other members of the Communist Party would see them or know of their identity as members of the Communist Party. Isn't that correct?

"Mrs. KLING. I am not sure. I never heard of a specific directive along that line, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That was what was expected of them, wasn't it?

"Mrs. KLING. I can't honestly say.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Kling, there is a bill pending in Congress now providing certain requirements for members of the legal profession in appearance before congressional committees and in courts with regard to their possible membership in the Communist Party. It is a subject which the chairman of this committee, in December of 1955, while in the course of hearings in Chicago, directed the staff to make a study of and report to the committee.

"Mr. MOULDER. That was the chairman of the full committee.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Of the full committee; yes, sir.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Walter.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Part of the consideration which the committee has been giving has been the activity of lawyers who are members of the National Lawyers Guild and who, at the instance of the Communist Party, have infiltrated that organization. Those lawyers, wherever we have found them, have been members of a professional cell of the Communist Party, the membership of which has been kept ultrasecret. That is one of the reasons that we are endeavoring to discover the extent, the character and extent, of a professional cell of the Communist Party which is reported to be here in St. Louis.

"In the position that you occupied, although it was as long ago as 1946, it seems to me that with the handling of the literature of the Communist Party out of district headquarters, and all the other information that would come to a person in the position that you were in, that you would know about the membership of the professional group of the Communist Party here at that time.

"Now is there any way in which you can aid the committee in regard to that? And when I say aid the committee I am not only speaking of names; I am speaking of the method by which the professional group of the Communist Party operated.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, Mr. Tavenner, as I stated before I honestly don't remember whether at that time when I was working for the Communist Party there was a separate professional cell. I am not sure about that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I can refresh your recollection. I started to do that a moment ago. The committee has received sworn testimony by Mr. Schoemehl that in 1938, which was before you became connected with the party here, the district organizer of the Communist Party assigned Dr. Sol Londe and the person who later became his wife to the organization of a professional cell of the Communist Party in St. Louis, and that Dr. Londe presented to him, Mr. Schoemehl, a directive to permit him to attend Communist Party meetings which were being conducted by Mr. Schoemehl so that they could become acquainted with the method by which Communist Party meetings were operated.

Mr. Schoemehl testified that Dr. Londe and the person who later became his wife, whose name I do not recall—and I am not certain that it is in evidence—attended 2 or possibly 3 of such meetings.

"Now does that refresh your recollection as to the existence of a Communist Party cell when you became a member in 1944 or at any time while you were a member?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, the structure of the structure of the Communist Party was constantly changing. The party was always trying to restructure itself in the branches and so on in order to find ways and means of a more efficient operation, make sure more members got to meetings and so on.

"I believe that from 1944 to 1945 the Communist Party was called the Communist Political Association. And I believe they dropped the cell structure, and that the groups met on a neighborhood basis. Now there may have—when it was restructured again after the establishment of the Communist Party they may have again established a professional cell. I can't swear to it. It could be. As far as I know, there could have been a professional cell at the time I was working in the Communist Party office. And I really can't remember whether it was at the time there were neighborhood groups or regular professional groups.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Well, was Dr. Sol Londe a member of the Communist Party during the period that you were a member of the party?

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer on the basis that I don't want to tattle on other people, and that it is an open question as to whether this—the same answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee cannot accept that response to the question, nor your reason for refusing to answer, and we respectfully direct you to answer the question.

"Mrs. KLING. I will have to decline to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the policy of the Communist Party at the time you were a member with regard to its membership being active in mass organizations?

"Mrs. KLING. Oh, the Communist Party was always eager to extend its influence and to put over its ideas with as many people as possible. And the members were supposed to behave in an exemplary fashion, and by the force of their behavior to convince other people that what they believed was the correct thing to believe.

"Mr. MOULDER. May I ask——

"Pardon me, Mr. Tavenner. Do you know Dr. Londe?

"Mrs. KLING. I decline to answer, Mr. Moulder.

"Mr. MOULDER. For the same reason previously stated by you?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes, sir.

"Mr. MOULDER. And the committee makes the same statement: We cannot accept that as a reason for refusing to answer, and you are directed to answer.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I will have to decline to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. Bearing in mind, if you will, the question did not ask you as to whether or not Dr. Londe was a Communist, or refer to any associations between you and him as Communists, but just a pure and simple question as to whether or not you are acquainted with him.

"(The witnes confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you finished? Would you answer the question, please?

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; I have been acquainted with Dr. Londe.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with him between 1944 and 1947?

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mrs. KLING. Mr. Moulder asked me a simple question and I gave a truthful answer. And now you are going to try to involve me in naming names in connection with party activities, and I cannot do that.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mrs. Kling, may I plead with you. I think probably you don't—I will ask you a question. Do you realize the seriousness and the threat of communism as a world conspiracy which seeks to control all free countries?

"Mrs. KLING. Well do you want a personal opinion on this?

"Mr. MOULDER. You don't recognize or see that danger in communism?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, what I don't as an individual see is the value of naming a few people around St. Louis——

"Mr. MOULDER. Our object here is to ascertain information which you possess, that you frankly refuse to give for the reasons which you have stated, which the committee does not accept. I remind you, and I am trying to impress upon you the seriousness of the threat of communism to our democracy, our Nation and all other free countries. And we are seeking to obtain information from you which would aid our Congress, the Congress of the United States, to be better informed to consider legislation to protect our national security against communism under a worldwide conspiracy of communism.

"I am pointing that out to you so that you, as an American citizen can cooperate with this committee in helping us secure legislation and take other steps that might be necessary to protect our national security.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I appreciate the high purpose of the committee, but as it involves my individual values as to telling on other people——

"Mr. MOULDER. But that is the very point. Don't you think that your own Government and your own country's welfare and freedom and security is far higher and above the position which you take in connection with individuals, which you take in protecting individuals? Don't you think that our Nation's welfare and security is far more important than that?

"Mrs. KLING. I can only answer that a person has to live with himself and with his own conscience. And I couldn't undertake to name a few people that I may or may not remember as being active 9 years ago when I was a member of the party.

"(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

"Mr. SCHERER. Madam, would you take that same position if a very close friend and associate of yours had been engaged in violating the Federal Narcotics Act and come in here before our committee and say you just

don't want to tell what he did insofar as dispensing narcotics? Would you take that same position if you had that information about him?

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I think that involves something criminal. And I don't feel I was engaged—I never did anything illegal or criminal.

"Mr. SCHERER. We didn't say that you did anything illegal. But the courts have held that the Communist Party is not a political party as we know parties, political parties in this country, but that the Communist Party is part and parcel of an international, criminal conspiracy far greater than any conspiracy to violate the Narcotics Act of the Federal Government. It is the greatest criminal conspiracy the world has ever known. It has been definitely established as such by the decisions of the courts. And the Congress of the United States has said so. So when you say that is a different situation that I presented to you, it is not a different situation at all. In fact, as I have said, the Communist conspiracy certainly is a far more danagerous thing to the security and welfare of this country than is a violation of the Narcotics Act of this country.

"I just wanted to demonstrate to you that the responsibility isn't upon you any more; it is upon the Congress. If it is in the courts it rests upon the court or the people as a whole. And when you are subpenaed to come and testify what you know, you are relieved of any personal responsibility. As I tried to explain to you this morning, the whole system of jurisprudence in this country would fail if a witness that is called into court could say that 'I don't want to tell what I know, even what I know about an accident case. I saw an accident happen, but it happened to be a friend of mine and I don't want to involve him, and I don't want to tell, therefore, whose fault it was.'

"If we followed your seasoning to a conclusion we would have no government at all, no judicial system. I am done preaching.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a direction to the witness to answer the question that I asked her, which was whether or not she knew Dr. Sol Londe between 1944 and 1947.

"Mr. MOULDER. I seem to recall that we did inform the witness that the committee did not accept her reply. But, if not why then you are so now advised and requested and directed to answer that question.

"Mrs. KLING. Well, I appreciate Mr. SCHERER's position, but on the basis that there is still an open question that may come before the Supreme Court soon—whether the naming of names is essential to the development of legislation—I decline to answer.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not there was a State law in Missouri during the time of the operation of the mass organizations when you were a member which required the licensing of an organization for the raising of funds by public subscription?

"Mrs. KLING. No, I don't know that, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. There are some States in which there are laws requiring organizations to procure licenses, such as when a cause party is held for the benefit of the Daily Worker, that a license be procured for that purpose.

"You are not aware of any such law in existence in Missouri while you were connected with the district office, are you?

"Mrs. KLING. No; I wasn't aware of that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is a matter that the committee is giving some consideration to.

"(Representative JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., withdrew from the hearing room at this point.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. You as an intellectual have been trained in the Communist Party. You are no doubt familiar with the Communist Party history. I want to ask you if you are familiar with the activities of the Trade Union Unity League which, of course, was prior to your membership in the Communist Party, but it was very active a short period before you came in.

"Mrs. KLING. Yes; the name is familiar, but I really don't know anything about it. Was that during the depression?

"Mr. TAVENNER. The Trade Union Unity League was organized in Cleveland August 31, 1929, and was an American section of the Red International of Labor Unions.

"(The witness confers with her counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Many of the labor unions at that time and for quite a period afterward were affiliated with the Trade Union Unity League. It was succeeded by the World Federation of Trade Unions, with its headquarters in Prague.

"The American Federation of Labor refused to join the WFTU. The CIO, for purposes of its own, did affiliate with it and tried to save it from Communist influence and, upon failing, withdrew from it.

"But the World Federation of Trade Unions, with its headquarters in Prague, continues until this day, and this committee is studying the problem of circulating its official bulletin to labor unions and wherever they think the Communist Party could gain anything by circulating it.

"I want to know if during your period of membership, from 1944 to 1947, the Communist Party here was active in any way in handling among labor unions this official publication of that organization published in Prague.

"Mrs. KLING. Not to my recollection; no.

"I thought that that had gone out of business in the 1930's.

"Mr. TAVENNER. As an organization in this country it did because the American Federation of Labor and the CIO wouldn't stand for it. But it still surreptitiously is circulating its propaganda of a very harmful nature among labor unions in this country. And the question has arisen, and there has been considerable study given to the question, of whether or not there can be a legal answer to the situation of stopping the delivery of it through the mails when it originates from a foreign country."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Anne Yasgur Kling, relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"Who was the Communist Party organizer in charge of the office during that period of time? (The period referred to was the period of the witness' employment in Communist Party headquarters.)

"Did Ralph Shaw serve in the Armed Forces of the United States, as far as you know?

"Was Shaw a member of the Communist Party at the time you were there?

"Will you tell us then, the names of such individuals who were members of the Communist Party when you were there, who we may not even know about?

"Will you tell us please, who employed you first in the Communist Party headquarters in St. Louis?"

After Mrs. Kling had testified that she was one of two persons on the Communist Party payroll, the question was asked:

"Who was that other person?

"Did you know Harold Hall?

"Now we would like to know from you, who were members known to you of the railroad group of the Communist Party?

"Do you know to whom the name Bill referred as one of those responsible for electric?

"Do you know to whom the name Sue refers?

"The reference to packing is made here with the names following it of Joe and Helen. Do you know to whom those names refer?

"Can you honestly answer the question as to whether she was a functionary of the Communist Party at any time? ("She" referred to Helen Musiel.)

"Are you acquainted with Helen Musiel?

"Was Dr. Sol Londy a member of the Communist Party during the period that you were a member of the party?

"Were you acquainted with him (Dr. Sol Londy) between 1944 and 1947?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and her refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 631) certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to the refusal of Anne Yasgur Kling to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of said committee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Anne Yasgur Kling to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, to the end that the said Anne Yasgur Kling may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Anne Yasgur Kling was called before the subcommittee on Un-American Activities last month in the city of St. Louis. She admitted under oath that she had been a member of the Communist Party and that she had been in the employ of the Communist Party in a number of capacities and that she was the sister-in-law of the chairman of the Communist Party of the State of Missouri. She, however, refused to answer any questions relative to the identity of any individuals in the Communist Party who were associated with her or testify as to any of their activities. Particularly, she was asked with reference to individuals who were active in the Communist group in the railroad industry and in the electric industry in the city of St. Louis and in the State of Missouri. She did not invoke the fifth amendment or any constitutional amendment in refusing to identify her fellow Communists although, as I said, she admitted her own membership in the party and her own employment by the party over a period of years. In refusing to answer these pertinent questions, she said and I quote:

But I am not a tattletale and I do not want to snitch on anybody. Telling on people is abhorrent to me.

Then in another place, she said:

My conscience will not permit me to name these individuals whom I may or may not have known during the years, that I was in the Communist Party.

In the opinion of the committee, she is clearly in contempt of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio the fact that this case is exactly in point with the case of the United States against Watkins which went to the Circuit Court of Appeals. The circuit court found that it was in contempt to refuse to answer questions without invoking some constitutional privilege.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Is not the Watkins case now pending before the Supreme Court?

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether the petition for certiorari has been applied for or not.

Mr. YATES. I am informed that it has been.

Mr. WALTER. I have no knowledge. But the last pronouncement of the court is that it is contempt, and I feel reasonably certain, as much as I can under present conditions, that this decision of the circuit court would be affirmed.

Mr. SCHERER. I do not think the Watkins case is on all fours with the facts in this case.

Mr. WALTER. This is probably a stronger case.

Mr. SCHERER. Much stronger.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALTER) there were—ayes 162, noes none.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute. The Supreme Court by a very strange decision sometime ago ruled that unless it was affirmatively established that a quorum was present there was a presumption that a quorum was not present. Therefore, in order to sustain whatever action is taken by the court in this case, it is necessary to establish the presence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman understand that that applies to the House as well as to committees of the House?

Mr. WALTER. I am very sorry to be compelled to report that the decision is given that interpretation in some quarters, although subsequent expressions of the Supreme Court cast considerable doubt upon the correctness of that interpretation. I want to be abundantly safe.

Mr. HALLECK. If a point of no quorum is made and a quorum is developed, would that not satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. The reason I asked for a division was in the hope that the Speaker would count a quorum.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present?

Mr. KEATING. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MASON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So, the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN W. SIMPSON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report (Report No. 2916).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN W. SIMPSON

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to John W. Simpson, 4539 Page Street, St. Louis, Mo. The said subpena directed John W. Simpson to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber, room 516, Federal Building, 12th and Market Streets, St. Louis, Mo., on June 4, 1956, at 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon the said John W. Simpson, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To: JOHN W. SIMPSON, 4539 Page Street, St. Louis, Mo., *Greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on June 4, 1956, at 10 o'clock, a. m., at room 516, New Federal Building, 12th and Market, St. Louis, Mo., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalities in such cases made and provided.

"To R. T. Collins and/or G. C. Williams, and/or United States marshal to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 16th day of April in the year of our Lord 1956.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Omar L. Schnatmeier, United States marshal, by James J. Keamer, deputy, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said Omar L. Schnatmeier, United States marshal, by James J. Keamer, deputy, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Eastern District of Missouri. Subpena for John W. Simpson before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

"I made service of the within subpena by delivering a true copy thereof on the within-named John W. Simpson at St. Louis, Mo., at 6:30 o'clock p. m., on the 9th day of May 1956.

"Dated May 10, 1956.

"OMAR L. SCHNATMEIER,
"United States Marshal.
"By JAMES J. KEAMER,
"Deputy."

On May 29, 1956, a telegram was sent to Mr. John W. Simpson, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 29, 1956.*
Personal report delivered.
Mr. JOHN W. SIMPSON,
4539 Page Street, St. Louis, Mo.:

Under continuing authority of subpena served upon you May 9, you are hereby directed to appear before Committee on Un-American Activities on Monday, June 4, 1956, 10 o'clock a. m., courtroom 3, New Federal Building, St. Louis, Mo., instead of room 516, New Federal Building.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The said John W. Simpson, pursuant to said subpena and the telegraphic communication, and in compliance therewith, appeared before a duly constituted subcommittee on June 4, 1956, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, and his said testimony not having been completed on said day, he appeared before the said subcommittee on the following day, June 5, to resume his testimony. The said John W. Simpson having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely:

"When and where were you born, Mr. Simpson?

"Where do you live?

"Mr. Simpson, you were employed, were you not, at the time that service was made on you at the Chevrolet plant of General Motors?

"How old are you?

"I ask that you tell us something of your educational background.

"How long have you lived in the city of St. Louis?

"Did you ever go to school?

"Where have you been employed since 1950?

"Are you married?

"Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions, and as a result of said John W. Simpson's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of a subpena served upon said John W. Simpson.

"The record of the proceedings before the subcommittee on June 4 and 5, 1956, during which the said John W. Simpson refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES HOUSE OF
"REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
"COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"St. Louis, Mo., Monday, June 4, 1956.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to call, in room No. 3, United States Courthouse and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER (Chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., and GORDON H. SCHERER.

"Present also: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

"Mr. MOULDER. The subcommittee will come to order.

"Let the record show that the Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives, pursuant to law and the rules of this committee, has duly appointed a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting this hearing, composed of Representatives JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., of Tennessee, who sits on my left, GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, who sits on my right, and myself, MORGAN M. MOULDER of Missouri, as chairman.

* * * * *

"Call the next witness.

"Mr. TAVENNER. John Simpson.

"Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, Mr. Simpson.

"Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I do.

"Mr. MOULDER. Be seated.

"TESTIMONY OF JOHN W. SIMPSON

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. SIMPSON. John Simpson.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have a middle initial?

"Mr. SIMPSON. W.

"Mr. TAVENNER. John W. Simpson.

"It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. I think you have been present in the hearing room and have heard the explanation I made to other witnesses about their right to counsel.

"You have?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Simpson?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I ask a direction.

"Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute.

"I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say to the witness, as we are required to say by the court decisions, that we do not accept your answer.

"We feel that to refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment as to where you were born is not a proper invocation of the fifth amendment. It couldn't possibly incriminate you in any way, shape or form to tell this committee as to when and where you were born. And if you persist in refusing to answer the question, you are in contempt of this committee.

"I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so advised and directed, and further advised that the statement by Mr. Scherer is not in the spirit of a threat but is to advise you of the dangers which you risk in being guilty of contempt by refusal to answer the question.

"Therefore, you are specifically directed to answer the question.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I am surrounded by a bunch of slick operators, and I am supposed to answer your question and have it twisted all to pieces?

"I continue to decline to answer that question or any other questions on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. Or any questions we ask you?

"Mr. SIMPSON. If I answer the question you twist it.

"Mr. SCHERER. You say you are surrounded by a bunch of slick operators?

"Mr. SIMPSON. By a bunch of slick operators.

"Mr. SCHERER. If that is the reason for refusing to answer, the witness is certainly in contempt of this committee, and obviously is not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith. He doesn't even believe he is incriminated, subjecting himself to incrimination by answering the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Any more questions, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

"Where do you live?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question. And, without repeating what I have said before, Witness, what I said with reference to your refusal to answer the other question applies with equal force to this question.

"Mr. MOULDER. And you are so directed.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Simpson, do you want the advice of an attorney before we proceed further?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I can't afford it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the bar association be called upon to give this man assistance.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Bar Association of the City of St. Louis has offered its services in providing counsel for witnesses if you so desire.

"Do you so desire?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I don't have the money.

"Mr. MOULDER. Well, do you so desire if, without charge, the bar association provides you with counsel without charging you any fee for that service? Do you so desire counsel under such circumstances?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I have no objection.

"Mr. MOULDER. I ask you do you so desire.

"Mr. SIMPSON. Not particularly.

"Mr. MOULDER. Or so request?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Not particularly.

"Mr. SCHERER. Let's pursue this a little further, if you don't mind, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MOULDER. Surely.

"Mr. SCHERER. You knew, did you not, before you came into this room today, from the great amount of publicity that the press has given to the fact that the bar association has made available lawyers to witnesses, you knew that fact; did you not?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I think I had better start refusing to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct——

"Mr. SIMPSON. Because I may incriminate myself.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed to answer.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I am going to rely on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do you read the newspapers?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, that I don't want to incriminate myself.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman——

"Mr. SCHERER. I suggest we proceed.

"The witness is obviously——

"Mr. MOULDER. I should first make this statement:

"The committee will request the Bar Association of the city of St. Louis to appear and represent you——

"Mr. SCHERER. No, I would'nt agree to that. Not after what this witness said. He said he doesn't want any particularly. He won't tell us whether he knew about the fact that lawyers were available. We don't have to go that far, to call a lawyer in here to represent this man when he says, when he indicates that he doesn't want any, and when he won't even tell us whether he knew about the offer of the bar association to represent individuals who didn't have money.

"Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we are in a position under these circumstances to stop this investigation and force a counsel upon this man, or practically force him.

"(The committee confers.)

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Simpson, you are advised that the Bar Association of the city of St. Louis has offered its services providing counsel without charge for witnesses who so request. Therefore, you are temporarily excused as a witness until tomorrow morning, giving you an opportunity to make such a request of the bar association, at which time you are directed to reappear with counsel if you so desire.

"Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

"That is at 9 o'clock in the morning.

"Mr. SIMPSON. Do I get to collect some dough?

"Mr. MOULDER. No, you are not excused yet.

"Call the next witness.

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess until tomorrow morning, at 9 a. m., Tuesday, June 5, 1956, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives MOULDER, FRAZIER, and SCHERER.

"(The testimony of John W. Simpson not having been completed Mr. Simpson's testimony was resumed on the following day, June 5, 1956.)

"UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
"COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"St. Louis, Mo., Tuesday, June 5, 1956.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee met at 9:15 a. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 3, the United States Court and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

"Present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., and GORDON H. SCHERER.

"Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams, and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

"(Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER and GORDON H. SCHERER were present at the time of convening.)

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"Very well, let's proceed. Call the next witness.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John Simpson, will you return to the witness stand, please.

"Mr. MOULDER. Would you be seated, Mr. Simpson.

"(Representative JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., entered the hearing room at this point.)

"TESTIMONY OF JOHN W. SIMPSON—RESUMED

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Simpson, yesterday afternoon you were provided an opportunity by this committee to seek counsel to represent you, as the committee advised you to do. Have you procured counsel?

"Mr. SIMPSON. The hours of the Bar Association of St. Louis are, Monday and Friday they are 10 to 12, and Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday they are 2 to 4. However, I went to the trouble to call up last night, or this morning, in case the janitor or somebody else was in. Nobody was in.

"Mr. MOULDER. No one was there.

"Did you call or speak or confer with any other attorney?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I don't have the money to pay lawyers.

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you employed now anywhere?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. You do have an income?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Have you attempted to confer with any attorney to see whether or not they would charge you, or what they

would charge you to represent you as counsel?

"Mr. SIMPSON. It is well known what lawyers charge. I don't have the money to pay lawyers.

"Mr. MOULDER. Then you have made no attempt to procure an attorney?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I made an attempt. I called them twice.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to have counsel to represent you?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I don't particularly care.

"Mr. SCHERER. I take the same position that I did last night.

"It is obvious from this man's statement now and last night that he doesn't want counsel.

"Under the Constitution a man has the right either in court or before a hearing and a committee such as this to represent himself. You can't force counsel upon a man. He has a constitutional right to represent himself. This man evidently doesn't want the advice of counsel.

"Mr. MOULDER. And the committee has no authority or funds, of course, to provide counsel for him.

"Mr. SCHERER. When were you subpenaed?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I don't know. I don't have it with me.

"Mr. SCHERER. Counsel, when was the witness subpenaed?

"Mr. SIMPSON. 16th of April, it says.

"Mr. SCHERER. I will repeat, Witness, the question I asked you last night.

"Do you read the newspapers?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I am going to do the same thing I did yesterday. I am going to plead the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. Were you in the room yesterday morning when the chairman of this committee made his opening statement?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I had to be.

"Mr. SCHERER. You were here.

"Did you hear what he said with reference to the St. Louis Bar Association furnishing counsel for witnesses who were unable to obtain counsel?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Nothing is wrong with my hearing.

"Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear that?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Oh, yes; I heard that.

"Mr. SCHERER. Did you read in the paper prior to your coming here yesterday morning that the bar association of——

"Would you look this way, sir, when I am talking to you. Let the record show that the witness is not even paying attention to this member of the committee while he is talking to him.

"I am asking you this question:

"Did you see in the papers prior to coming here yesterday morning—or did you have knowledge of the fact that the St. Louis Bar Association was furnishing counsel for any witness called before this committee that did not have the funds to secure counsel or was unable to obtain counsel for any other reason?

"Mr. SIMPSON. There is something I don't understand.

"Am I under oath?

"Mr. SCHERER. Yes, you are under oath. You were sworn yesterday.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I didn't know whether it continued.

"Well, will you repeat the question.

"Mr. SCHERER. Would it make any difference whether you were under oath or not, whether you told the truth? Would that make any difference, son?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment and possible self-incrimination.

"Mr. SCHERER. I will repeat my original question.

"Did you know prior to coming into this courtroom yesterday that the St. Louis Bar Association was furnishing counsel for witnesses who were unable to obtain counsel for one reason or another?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment and possible self-incrimination.

"Mr. SCHERER. It is obvious then that we should proceed.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Simpson, were you subpenaed by a deputy United States marshal on May 10 to appear as a witness in this hearing?

"(There was no response.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I correct my question by stating you were subpenaed on May 9?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Well, I think I can say that there's two dates on here. There's June 4, 1956, and April 16, 1956.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take out of your pocket that subpena that was served on you?

"Mr. SIMPSON. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I see it, please?

"(Document handed to Mr. Tavenner.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. This subpena bears date the 16th of April 1956. It was served on you, was it not, on the 9th of May? Do you recall?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. All right, hand it back to him.

"Mr. MOULDER. Who served the subpena?

"Mr. TAVENNER. A deputy United States marshal.

"Mr. Simpson, you were employed, were you not, at the time that service was made on you at the Chevrolet plant of General Motors?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment and possible self-incrimination.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

"Mr. SCHERER. You keep in mind what I said to you yesterday, that this committee does not accept your declination to answer. We feel that you are not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith in refusing to answer as to where you were employed, what your date of birth was and your residence.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The committee desires to inquire of you what knowledge you have regarding an organized group of the Communist Party in the automotive business in St. Louis. So I will ask you the question, if you will tell us, please, whether or not there was such an organized group of the Communist Party established within the automotive industry.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. MOULDER. Did I understand you to say you decline to answer?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer because of possible self-incrimination.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was there such?

"Mr. MOULDER. In connection with that, the purpose of directing you to answer is to warn you, not in the spirit of a threat, of the dangers in which you might be involved in connection with contempt proceedings, and for your own benefit we direct you to answer in order to give you an opportunity to avoid possible contempt proceedings.

Do you still wish to——

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities within the automotive industry at the present time?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you presently a member of any organized group of the Communist Party within the automotive industry?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

"Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

"Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, of possible self-incrimination.

"Mr. FRAZIER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. FRAZIER. That is all.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer, any questions?

"Mr. SCHERER. No.

"I ask you this:

"Yesterday you were asked where you lived at the present time. I am going to repeat that question, keeping in mind the warnings that were given you yesterday.

"Where do you now live?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer that question.

"Mr. SCHERER. And where were you born?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

"Mr. SCHERER. How old are you?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer, and further advised of the danger in which he places himself in connection with contempt proceedings for arrogantly and without due cause refusing to answer the question.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you tell us something of your educational background.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, of possible self-incrimination.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct him to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. How long have you lived in the city of St. Louis?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. Did you ever go to school?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Do you still decline to answer?

"Mr. SIMPSON. What is the question?

"Mr. MOULDER. We direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SIMPSON. Which question?

"Mr. MOULDER. Which Mr. Scherer propounded to you. He asked if you ever went to school.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. Where have you been employed since 1950?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Mr. SCHERER. Are you married?

"Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SIMPSON. I still decline to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. What is your full name?

"Mr. SIMPSON. John William Simpson.

"Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said John W. Simpson relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"When and where were you born, Mr. Simpson?

"Where do you live?

"Mr. Simpson, you were employed, were you not, at the time that service was made on you at the Chevrolet plant of General Motors?

"How old are you?

"I ask that you tell us something of your educational background.

"How long have you lived in the city of St. Louis?

"Did you ever go to school?

"Where have you been employed since 1950?

"Are you married?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony, and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 632) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of John W. Simpson to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, to the end that the said John W. Simpson may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in this particular case, John W. Simpson was subpenaed to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities. He was asked his name. He responded to that question and then interjected the fifth amendment to every other question asked, even as to his address. I could not conceive of a more clear case of contempt.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOSMER. Is it necessary that each one of these citations shall affirmatively show the fact that there was a quorum present in order to comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court?

Mr. WALTER. I think not.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House a quorum is always presumed to be present unless there is a count and it develops that a quorum is not present.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST WILLIAM E. DAVIS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 2917).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST WILLIAM E. DAVIS

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to William E. Davis. The said subpena directed William E. Davis to be and appear before said Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber, room 516, New Federal Building, 12th and Market, St. Louis, Mo., on June 4, 1956, at 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon said William E. Davis is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To WILLIAM E. DAVIS, *Greeting:* Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on June 4, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m., at Room 516, New Federal Building, 12th and Market, St. Louis, Mo., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To U. S. Marshal, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 16th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1956.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Omar L. Schnatmeier, United States marshal; James J. Keamer, deputy, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said Omar L. Schnatmeier, United States marshal; James J. Keamer, deputy, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Eastern district of Missouri, subpena for William E. Davis before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives.

"I made service of the within subpena by delivering a true copy thereof on the within-named William E. Davis at 1021 Park Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., at 4:50 o'clock, p. m., on the 8th day of May 1956.

"Dated May 10, 1956.

"OMAR L. SCHNATMEIER,
"United States Marshal.
"By: JAMES J. KEAMER,
"Deputy."

On May 29, 1956, a telegram was sent to William E. Davis, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 29, 1956.*

Personal report delivered.

Mr. WILLIAM E. DAVIS,
1021 Park Avenue, St. Louis Mo.:

Under continuing authority of subpena served upon you May 8, your appearance before Committee on Un-American Activities is hereby postponed from June 4 to Tuesday, June 5, 1956, 10 a. m., courtroom 3, New Federal Building, St. Louis, Mo., instead of room 516, New Federal Building.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The said William E. Davis was not called to testify on the 5th day of June 1956, the day on which he was directed to appear, and was called as a witness on June 6, 1956. The said William E. Davis, pursuant to said subpena and the telegraphic communication, and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said subcommittee on June 6, 1956, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said William E. Davis having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely:

"When and where were you born, Mr. Williams? Mr. Davis, I meant to say?

"How are you employed?

"How long have you lived in St. Louis?

"Were you living in St. Louis in 1950?

"Where were you living in 1951?

"Where did you go to school, Witness?

"Have you had any advice at all from any source as to how you should conduct yourself when you took the stand?

"Were you employed at any time at Emerson Electric Co.?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions, and as a result of said William E. Davis' refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon said William E. Davis.

The record of the proceedings before the subcommittee on June 6, 1956, during which the said William E. Davis refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertaining to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES,
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
"ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"St. Louis, Mo., Wednesday, June 6, 1956.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee met at 9:45 a. m., pursuant to recess, in courtroom No. 3, United States Courthouse and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

"Present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., and GORDON H. SCHERER.

"Present also: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"(After hearing the testimony of another witness, Mr. William E. Davis was called before the subcommittee.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William E. Davis.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. DAVIS. I do.

"TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM E. DAVIS

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are William E. Davis?

"Mr. DAVIS. That is right.

"Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. I want to ad-

vise you, as it is the practice of the committee with respect to all witnesses who appear before it, that they have the right to counsel if they desire it, and have the right to consult with counsel at any time during the course of the interrogation.

"When and where were you born, Mr. Williams? Mr. Davis, I meant to say.

"Mr. DAVIS. I decline to answer the question on the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I can't hear.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a direction?

"Mr. SCHERER. What was the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. The question was: When and where were you born?

"Mr. SCHERER. Did he give his name? Did you ask him his name?

"Mr. TAVENNER. I asked him if he was William E. Davis, and he said 'Yes.'

"Mr. SCHERER. Then I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to when and where he was born.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say to the witness, as we are required to say by the decisions of the court, that of course we do not accept your answer, that we cannot possibly see, sir, how to answer the question as to when and where you were born would incriminate you.

"Therefore, we think you are invoking the fifth amendment, improperly invoking it, in bad faith, and if you persist to refuse to answer the question as to when and where you were born, you are placing yourself in a position of contempt before this committee.

"Do you want to answer the question after my explanation?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. What do you mean by reasserting the privilege?

"Mr. DAVIS. Privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do you honestly perceive that to answer the question—do you honestly believe and contend that to answer the question as to when and where you were born might tend to lead to a criminal prosecution?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do you want a lawyer? Because I am afraid, sir, you are guilty of contempt. Do you want a lawyer to advise you as to whether or not you should answer that question?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do you mean to answer my question as to whether you want a lawyer would tend to incriminate you? I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"And Mr. Scherer and the committee are anxious to, of course, help you in that respect.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. It is obvious that this witness came here as the result of attending one of those conferences wherein they advised them to use the fifth amendment no matter what question was asked them.

"I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that counsel be permitted to ask a few more questions.

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

"Proceed.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I expect I ought to follow them up.

"Mr. SCHERER. That is what I say.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your full name, Mr. Davis?

"Mr. DAVIS. William E. Davis.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Speak a little louder, please.

"Mr. DAVIS. William E. Davis; William Edwin Davis.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you presently reside in St. Louis?

"Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How are you employed?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address in St. Louis?

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where he was employed. And I do not want to restate, but, Witness, what I have said to you with reference to the first question asked you, as to where and when you were born, applies also to the question asked you about your employment.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question, Mr. Davis.

"As we have advised other witnesses, the purpose of so directing you is not to threaten you in any way but to give you an opportunity to be advised that the committee doesn't accept your response to the question; and also to warn you of the possibility of your being in contempt of the Congress of the United States for refusing to answer such a question, such a simple question as you are now refusing to answer.

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is again directed to answer the question.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in St. Louis, living in St. Louis as recently as 1954?

"Mr. DAVIS. I was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you living in St. Louis in 1950?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living in 1951?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to where he was living in 1951.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. Where did you go to school, Witness?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. MOULDER. May I ask a question?

"Do you desire to have counsel or an attorney to advise you and to sit with you here in the hearing room, to advise you during the course of the examination now being conducted? I say, do you desire to have counsel?

"Mr. DAVIS. No.

"Mr. MOULDER. Would you answer the question for the record so that it will indicate?

"Mr. DAVIS. No.

"Mr. SCHERER. Have you had legal advice before you took the stand?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. As to whether he had legal advice.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. Have you had any advice at all from any source as to how you should conduct yourself when you took the stand?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. SCHERER. Were you born in the United States?

"(There was no response.)

"Mr. MOULDER. The question is were you born in the United States?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you an American citizen, Mr. Davis?

"Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you a natural-born citizen or naturalized citizen?

"Mr. DAVIS. Natural-born.

"Mr. MOULDER. Then you were born in the United States?

"Mr. SCHERER. Is that right?

"(There was no response.)

"Mr. MOULDER. Is that correct? Answer that question.

"Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Where were you born?

"Mr. DAVIS. A question like this is, as the Congressman on the right is always waiting for the door to fly open, you know——

"Mr. MOULDER. I have asked you a question: Where you were born.

"Mr. DAVIS. So he can lower the boom on me.

"Mr. MOULDER. We have no desire to trap you or lower the boom. We asked you a simple and reasonable and fair question. Would you answer the question as to where you were born?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed at any time at Emerson Electric Co.?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the St. Louis agent of the National Maritime Union at any time prior to 1951?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time held any official position in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you held a position under that of an official; that is, such as a steward or other similar type of position?

"Mr. DAVIS. In what?

"Mr. TAVENNER. In the UE.

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I again ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are again directed and requested to answer the question.

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any knowledge of Communist Party activities since 1954 at Emerson Electric?

"Mr. DAVIS. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. DAVIS. I reassert my privilege.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MOULDER. I neglected to ask you, Mr. Frazier, do you have any questions?

"Mr. FRAZIER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

"Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused, and he may claim his witness fees from the clerk of the committee."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said William E. Davis relative to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was

instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"When and where were you born, Mr. Williams? Mr. Davis, I meant to say.

"How are you employed?

"How long have you lived in St. Louis?

"Were you living in St. Louis in 1950?

"Where were you living in 1951?

"Where did you go to school, Witness?

"Have you had any advice at all from any source as to how you should conduct yourself when you took the stand?

"Were you employed at any time at Emerson Electric Co.?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of William E. Davis to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, to the end that the said William E. Davis may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER].

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the facts and circumstances in this case are similar to the Simpson case. The witness was asked where he was born and refused to answer. In addition to that, he was asked numerous other questions which were pertinent and important in connection with our investigation of subversive and communistic activities in the St. Louis area, all of which he refused to answer. Not only did he refuse to answer but he was contemptuous in his attitude and in his conduct in refusing to answer any questions propounded by either counsel or members of the committee. On each and every occasion he was advised that the committee refused to accept his response and he was duly directed to answer and advised of the danger and risk he was taking by refusal to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOULDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. This is the witness that even invoked the fifth amendment when you asked him whether he wanted a lawyer?

Mr. MOULDER. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST GEORGE TYNE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities I submit a privileged report (Report No. 2918).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST GEORGE TYNE

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to George Tyne, Broadhurst Theatre, New York, N. Y. The said subpena directed George Tyne to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber, room 1703, United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, N. Y., at the hour of 10 a. m., on August 15, 1955, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served on said George Tyne is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To GEORGE TYNE, *Greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on 15 August 1955, at 10 o'clock, a. m., at their committee room, 1703 United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, N. Y., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To Frank Bonora, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 1st day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1955.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Frank Bonora, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said Frank Bonora, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for George Tyne before the Committee on Un-American Activities. I made service of the within subpena by personal service on the within-named George Tyne at Broadhurst Theater, New York City, at 8:05 o'clock p. m., on the 11th day of July 1955.

"FRANK BONORA,
"Investigator."

The said George Tyne, pursuant to said subpena and in compliance therewith, appeared before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 15, 1955, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said George Tyne having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions; namely:

"Do you know Mr. Lee J. Cobb?

"Was any of the testimony that was given to this committee by Mr. Cobb about you untrue?

"Is it your card? (Card referred to was a Communist Party membership card which was handed to the witness.)

"Were you one of the 1,500 delegates who attended a peace meeting at Mexico City in August of 1949?

"Were you a sponsor of that meeting?

"Were you personally acquainted with Charles Glenn?

"I want to ask you whether or not this was a play designed to carry a Communist message?

"Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were engaged as director of this play?

"Mr. Tyne, are you a member of any unions, organized within the field of acting?

"Are you a member of Actors Equity?

"Are you a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Are you aware of the existence within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists of a caucus composed of members of the Communist Party who are also members of that organization?

"Have you at any time attended a caucus of members of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists who were members of the Communist Party?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions, and as a result of said George Tyne's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said subcommittee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon said George Tyne.

The record of the proceedings before the subcommittee on August 15, 1955, during which the said George Tyne refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertaining to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES HOUSE OF
"REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
"COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"New York, N. Y., Monday, August 15, 1955.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10 a. m., pursuant to notice, in room 1703 of the Federal Building, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER (chairman), presiding.

"Committee members present: Representatives WALTER, WILLIS, and SCHERER.

"Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Donald T. Appell and Frank Bonora, investigators; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

* * * * *

"Chairman WALTER. Have you a witness, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to call Mr. George Tyne.

"Mr. Tyne, will you come forward, please?

"Chairman WALTER. Mr. Tyne, will you raise your right hand, please? Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. TYNE. I do.

"TESTIMONY OF GEORGE TYNE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, MARTIN POPPER

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

"Mr. TYNE. My name is George Tyne.

"Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel, will counsel please identify himself for the record?

"Mr. POPPER. Martin Popper, member of the bar of the State of New York.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Tyne?

"Mr. TYNE. I was born in Philadelphia, Pa., February 6, 1917.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

"Mr. TYNE. I reside in New York City.

"Mr. TAVENNER. At what address?

"Mr. TYNE. 415 Central Park West.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in New York City?

"Mr. TYNE. Well, at this residence, sir?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Begin that way, yes, at that residence.

"Mr. TYNE. The reason I asked, is that I have been out of New York for most of my adult life. At this address, I have been, I think, about 2 years or 3 years.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

"Mr. TYNE. I am a radio, screen, theater, and television actor.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In what work are you presently engaged?

"Mr. TYNE. I am presently engaged in the theater.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What type of work in the theater?

"Mr. TYNE. As an actor.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. I understand from your testimony that you went to California in 1942. I have before me the testimony of Mr. Lee J. Cobb, which was taken before this committee on June 2, 1953. Mr. Cobb described to the committee his Communist Party membership, and the activities in the Communist Party which he was aware of, and he told the committee how he got into the Communist Party and the circumstances under which he left it.

"He advised the committee that in January or February of 1943 he was a member of a group of the Communist Party of which George Tyne, Elliott Sullivan, and Victor Killian were members. In referring to you, he uses the name George Tyne, also known as Buddy Yarus.

"Were you a member of the group of the Communist Party in 1943 of which Mr. Lee J. Cobb was a member?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. Mr. Tavenner, I would like to say that I see no legislative purpose in this committee and its inquiry into the theater, and I would like to voice my responsibility to the Constitution and say that this committee has no right to invade my inner beliefs and my conscience or my associations.

"Chairman WALTER. Maybe we could shorten this by asking you if you know Mr. Cobb. Do you know Mr. Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. TYNE. As I said before, my associations and my beliefs are my own.

"Chairman WALTER. That is not an answer to the question. Either answer the question or do not. If you don't, why don't you?

"Mr. TYNE. Because I feel that I have to answer this in my own way, and, secondly, I take no value in the word of a stool pigeon.

"Chairman WALTER. Now, just a moment; Mr. Cobb is not a stool pigeon, and I assume that because you have described him as such you are disturbed because he told about your activities with him in an illegal field. Isn't that why you describe him as a stool pigeon?

"Mr. TYNE. I am disturbed by anybody who appears before this committee as a stool pigeon, who curries favor, who tries to get jobs, and money, and gives names.

"Chairman WALTER. That is not a response to the question. Do you know Mr. Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. TYNE. I think that—one moment.

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I must repeat that I find——

"Chairman WALTER. Do you know Mr. Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. TYNE. I am trying to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. You have not answered it at all.

"Mr. TYNE. I have to answer it the way I can answer it.

"Chairman WALTER. Do you know Lee J. Cobb, and I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TYNE. I want to say I find this question an invasion of my private——

"Chairman WALTER. Do you know Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. TYNE. I repeat, sir, this is an invasion of my associations, and——

"Chairman WALTER. The Supreme Court has already passed on that; so you are in error, and now, do you know Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. TYNE. As far as I know, Mr. Walter, I haven't got your experience with the Constitution and the laws.

"Chairman WALTER. Do you know Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. TYNE. I must answer that I refuse to have my rights and my private associations invaded, and I cannot answer that question.

"Chairman WALTER. In other words, you refuse to answer the question?

"Mr. TYNE. I refuse to answer because I feel this committee has no right——

"Chairman WALTER. For what reason?

"Mr. TYNE. Because I feel this committee is invading my conscience, and my beliefs, and my rights as a human being, under the Constitution, and as a member of the fourth branch of the Government, the citizenry, and I cannot see any point to the inquiry of this committee, what legislative purpose in knowing——

"Chairman WALTER. For what constitutional reason do you refuse to answer the question?

"Mr. TYNE. I think that I have made my reason quite clear.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think that we should say to the witness that he has not given a sufficient legal reason for not answering the question, and in our opinion he is guilty of contempt.

"Chairman WALTER. Under the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, it is the duty of the committee to warn a witness when he takes the position that you have taken, that he is in contempt. I advise you, or at least I warn you, that in our judgment, you are in contempt for not giving a legal reason for not answering the question.

"(The witness consulted his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I would like to say that I beg to differ with the chairman.

"Chairman WALTER. All right. You have refused to answer the question. Ask the next questtion, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TYNE. There is no legislative purpose, and their point——

"Chairman WALTER. Let us get over that bridge. I have heard all that about legislative purpose before. We have another purpose, and it is within the law. The Supreme Court has passed on that, and we are doing a very distasteful job in accordance with the law. If you are not going to answer the question, all right. Ask another question, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Tavenner proceeds, may I ask a question?

"Mr. Tyne, Mr. Tavenner read to you the testimony of Mr. Cobb before this committee, and you classify Mr. Cobb as a stool pigeon. Was any of the testimony that was given to this committee by Mr. Cobb about you untrue? You have your opportunity now to say whether the testimony of this man, whom you classify as a stool pigeon, was true or untrue.

"Mr. TYNE. I will use this opportunity. I think this is a variation of the same question, and I feel this is an invasion of my rights as an individual, and I will not talk about my political, personal, or private beliefs, and I stand on my constitutional rights.

"Mr. SCHERER. He didn't say anything about your beliefs. He merely said you were a member of a Communist cell.

"Mr. TYNE. I have answered your question.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer my question as to whether or not anything Mr. Cobb said in his testimony before this committee about this witness was untrue.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TYNE. I say, again, that I stand on the basic rights, the Bill of Rights, of the Constitution, which says that Congress has no right to make inquiries or interfere or question my private beliefs, and the invasion of my associations and of my conscience. There is no legislative purpose in this committee making an inquiry into the theater. This is an area of ideas.

"Chairman WALTER. Just a minute. You are not the theater. You may think you are, but you are not the theater.

"Mr. TYNE. I am a proud member of this theater.

"Chairman WALTER. That is a difference.

"Mr. TYNE. I am a member and I want that clear, and I have worked many years in polishing my craft so I could be in this theater. I am very proud of my profession, and I am proud of my talent.

"Chairman WALTER. Yes, I suppose you are.

"Mr. TYNE. That makes me an integral part of the theater of America, of the United States of America.

Chairman WALTER. But I think that most people in the theater would think that you are presumptuous for attempting to speak for them.

"Will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tyne, I have before me a photostatic copy of a Communist Party registration card, which shows that the 1944 card number was 46948, the name is Buddy Yarus, and the address, 2008 Pinehurst, city of Hollywood, county of Los Angeles, State of California. The new card issued December 9, 1944. Will you examine the document please, and state whether or not you recognize it as having been your Communist Party card?

"(A document was handed to the witness.)

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I think this is the same question, sir, and just in another form.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, he has not looked at the card, and I think that you should direct him to look at the exhibit which was handed to him.

"Mr. TYNE. I have looked at the card, and I see it.

"Chairman WALTER. Is it your card?

"Mr. TYNE. Again I am not going to answer that, Mr. Chairman, because I feel this is an invasion of my rights and my beliefs.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TYNE. I have to repeat, sir, that I stand on my previous answer.

"Chairman WALTER. Which is what?

"Mr. TYNE. That I see no legislative purpose in this committee's inquiry into the theater, and I stand on my constitutional rights, and not only do I stand on it but I feel a responsibility to stand on my constitutional rights that this committee has no right to invade my beliefs, my associations, and how I think.

"Mr. SCHERER. I understand then that you are not relying on the fifth amendment?

"Mr. TYNE. That is right, and I would like to point out that I have no incriminating evidence to hide, and I recognize the validity of the fifth, and I think the people who have used it, and the privilege is wonderful.

"Chairman WALTER. Will you ask the next question, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you one of the 1,500 delegates who attended a peace meeting at Mexico City in August of 1949?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I must repeat, I think this is the same question, and you are trying to make some association or trying to find out what my political beliefs are.

"Mr. SCHERER. That is not the same question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TYNE. I think it is the same question, sir, and the same kind, and I must answer in the same way.

"Chairman WALTER. You are not under any obligation to answer, and you say that you must answer. You are not obliged to answer in that fashion.

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. It isn't a question of obligation. I have a right to answer as I see fit.

"Mr. SCHERER. In refusing to answer Mr. Tavenner's questions as to whether or not you attended this meeting in Mexico City, you are not relying on the fifth amendment; is that right?

"Mr. TYNE. That is right.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a sponsor of that meeting?

"Mr. TYNE. The same pattern, and the same question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TYNE. I repeat, sir, that I have a right not to have my personal affiliations, associations, and beliefs invaded by any committee, and I stand on that as my answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In ascribing to the committee the shows in which you participated in California, did you advise the committee that you took part or that you were the director of a show in 1953 entitled 'Going Down the Road'?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. Yes; I participated in this production.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you its director?

"Mr. TYNE. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of the July 15, 1953, issue of the Daily People's World, published in California. It carries an article over the name of Charles Glenn. Were you personally acquainted with Charles Glenn?

"Mr. TYNE. There we go again. That is the same question, and it is the same pattern. I will not reveal my associations and my beliefs to this committee.

"Chairman WALTER. You are not being asked anything about your beliefs at all. You are being asked whether or not you know Charles Glenn.

"Mr. TYNE. I am being asked about my associations.

"Chairman WALTER. Do you know Charles Glenn?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. From what I understand of the Constitution, I have a right to peacefully assemble with anyone.

"Chairman WALTER. We are not talking about that, and we are not questioning that. What we are asking you is whether or not you know this man.

Mr. TYNE. I think that I have made my position clear.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. TYNE. Then I repeat that this committee has no right to invade my political beliefs, and my associations, and my conscience, and I stand on that as my answer. No matter what way you ask me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tyne, the reviewer, Charles Glenn, has this to say about the show:

" 'Bourgeois theater entrepreneurs insist upon entertainment values, so called, and an abandonment of a minimizing of a "message"—'

"The 'message' is in quotation marks—

" 'A people's theater must insist on content, on the dramatization of the struggles of the people. It must insist as well on its "message" being clothed in a form lending itself to dramatic and entertainment value. Freedom Stage undoubtedly has this potential in its group, and so does Ellis, and this play proves it.'

"I want to ask you whether or not this was a play designed to carry a Communist message?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I think this question really reveals the purpose of this committee in New York City, in the sense that you are trying to control and censor and set up conformity as to what should appear on the stage in America. I think that this is an invasion of the first amendment as I believe it to be.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. TYNE. I see no legislative purpose, and incidentally, I think, as I understand the Constitution, that this committee has no right to legislate in this area.

"Chairman WALTER. Just a moment. I think not for your benefit, but I think for the benefit of the record it might be appropriate for me to read a part of the decision in the case of the United States against Josephson, in which the same question was raised.

" 'The argument of the appellant, and the amicus, is in substance that the committee's power to investigate is limited by Congress' power to legislate. Congress is prohibited from legislating on matters of thought, speech, or opinion.

" 'Ergo, a statute empowering a congressional committee to investigate such powers is unconstitutional. The mere statement of this syllogism is sufficient to refute it.'

"That is what the Supreme Court of the United States has had to say about what you are talking about.

"Mr. SCHERER. I want to keep the record straight. I ask that you direct the witness to answer Mr. Tavenner's last question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer Mr. Tavenner's last question.

"Mr. TYNE. May my attorney answer the legal argument?

"Chairman WALTER. No, I know what he will say.

"Mr. POPPER. I will say that you made an error, first of all, because that wasn't the Supreme Court.

"Chairman WALTER. It is the circuit court of appeals, but the Supreme Court refused to review.

"Mr. POPPER. That is the point. Very recently the Supreme Court decided to review it.

"Chairman WALTER. I am just keeping the record straight.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The chairman directed that you answer the question. You did not reply.

"Mr. TYNE. I have forgotten what the question was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will the reporter read the question?

"(Whereupon the reporter read the pending question as above recorded.)

"Mr. SCHERER. That is the question I asked Mr. Chairman to direct the witness to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. TYNE. I feel I have already answered that question in answering the previous questions, and this is the same question.

"Mr. SCHERER. For the record, I think it should be stated that we do not accept his answer, and we feel that the reasons given are not legal reasons for refusing to answer the question. In our opinion the witness is in contempt of the committee. I think that is in conformity with the Supreme Court decision.

"Chairman WALTER. That is correct.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think we should state our position, namely, that my amendment is a basis for a future action by this committee of a citation for contempt.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time that you were engaged as director of this play?

"Mr. TYNE. Here we go again. This is the same question, and I give you the same answer. This is an invasion of my private rights and associations and beliefs, and personal political beliefs, and I stand on that.

"Chairman WALTER. Is that the sole reason for your refusing to answer?

"Mr. TYNE. I also see no pertinency of any legislative purpose.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do I understand that you are not relying on the fifth amendment for refusing to answer this question?

"Mr. TYNE. Exactly, sir, and there is no question of self-incrimination. I have great respect for the fifth amendment and the people who use it.

"Mr. WILLIS. But you are not invoking it?

"Mr. TYNE. I am not invoking the fifth. I personally feel that I have to stand on what I think is my constitutional right which is that this committee or any section of Congress has no right to invade my privacy as a citizen, and my beliefs, and my associations.

"Mr. SCHERER. Even as to your membership in a criminal conspiracy which the Communist conspiracy is? Do you feel that way?

"Mr. TYNE. I am not in a position to argue any opinion.

"Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Tyne, are you a member of any unions organized within the field of acting?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I repeat the answer to this question is the same as the question about my association and my beliefs, and I see no pertinent points or any legislative purpose in answering your question because I think it is an invasion of my rights as an individual, my economic and political beliefs, and my conscience.

"Mr. WILLIS. I think he should be directed to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I have answered the question, and I stand on that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of Actors Equity?

"Mr. TYNE. That is the same question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Well then answer it.

"Mr. TYNE. I have answered the question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question as to whether or not you are a member of Actors Equity?

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. I must answer in the same way, and I repeat it, and this committee has no right to ask me of my associations and my beliefs and I stand on that as my answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Mr. TYNE. That is the same question and I give you the same answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I ask that the witness be directed to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. TYNE. I repeat, this committee has no right to inquire into my associations, my beliefs, and my conscience.

"Chairman WALTER. In view of the fact that that is not an answer, I am compelled to warn you that you are in contempt of this committee.

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. That is your opinion, and I disagree with it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of the existence within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists of a caucus composed of members of the Communist Party who are also members of that organization?

"Mr. TYNE. I think that your question is trying to entrap me, and I have already answered, and it is just the same thing all over again with another form and another word.

If you would like me to repeat what I believe and what I stand on, I will.

"Chairman WALTER. Never mind, you have already answered the question.

"Mr. TYNE. I am glad I made myself clear.

"Chairman WALTER. You haven't exactly made yourself clear, but we know what you are saying.

"Mr. TYNE. The committee has made itself clear, and I feel that I have made myself clear.

"Chairman WALTER. All right. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think that there should be a direction to answer Mr. Tavenner's last question. We do not accept his answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TYNE. I will gladly repeat my previous answer, that this committee or any section of Congress has no right to invade the rights of the individual, his beliefs, his conscience, his associations, and his right to assemble, period.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time attended a caucus of members of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, who were members of the Communist Party?

"Mr. TYNE. This is the same question with a few other adjectives and nouns. I repeat my answer to this question, that I stand on my constitutional right that this committee has no right to invade my rights and my associations.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask a direction?

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. TYNE. Yes, it has gone on, and it is very easy to see. It is getting a little monotonous.

"Chairman WALTER. It is not monotonous to us.

"Mr. TYNE. Certainly it is not to me, because I am very clear in my position. I stand on my constitutional right to say this committee has no right and no legislative purpose in invading this area of my thinking, and my associations, and my beliefs.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you aware of any effort made by the Communist Party to exert influence within any union of which you are a member?

"Mr. TYNE. This is another question to try to entrap me, and I repeat——

"Mr. TAVENNER. No, it is an effort to obtain facts, Mr. Tyne, which you apparently are unwilling to give the committee.

"Mr. SCHERER. Facts which, if he wanted to, he could give the committee. I know he has knowledge of the situation.

"(The witness consulted with his counsel.)

"Mr. TYNE. Would you please repeat the question?

"(Whereupon the reporter read the pending question as above recorded.)

"Mr. TYNE. I believe this is the same question in other words. I would like to say again that I think this committee has no right to invade my rights and I would like to see the day when the courts will uphold my feeling about this, and the feeling of a lot of people, that there is no legislative purpose in making inquiries into the theater, or inquiries——

"Chairman WALTER. We made it abundantly clear that we are not making any inquiry into the theater. We are just finding out, if we can, what elements there are in the theater which might at some time or other bring criticism upon decent and innocent people.

"Now go ahead, Mr. Tavenner, and ask the next question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

"Mr. TYNE. Does that prove that you have no legislative purpose, that statement that you just made, Mr. Walter?

"Chairman WALTER. Are there any further questions?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. TYNE. That is the same question.

"Chairman WALTER. Now, right now, are you a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. TYNE. Mr. Walter, if I were to answer that, that would be in my feeling, personally, that I would be violating the Constitution which says that Congress has no right to invade the beliefs and the associations and the conscience of the individuals of this country. That is my answer.

"Chairman WALTER. Are there any questions?

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer your last question.

"Chairman WALTER. We will proceed.

"Do you have a question?

"Mr. SCHERER. No."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said George Tyne relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"Do you know Mr. Lee J. Cobb?

"Was any of the testimony that was given to this committee by Mr. Cobb about you untrue?

"Is it your card? (Card referred to was a Communist Party membership card which was handed to the witness.)

"Were you one of the 1,500 delegates who attended a peace meeting at Mexico City in August of 1949?

"Were you a sponsor of that meeting?

"Were you personally acquainted with Charles Glenn?

"I want to ask you whether or not this was a play designed to carry a Communist message?

"Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were engaged as director of this play?

"Mr. Tyne, are you a member of any unions, organized within the field of acting?

"Are you a member of Actors Equity?

"Are you a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Are you aware of the existence within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists of a caucus composed of members of the Communist Party who are also members of that organization?

"Have you at any time attended a caucus of members of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists who were members of the Communist Party?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony, and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 634) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of George Tyne to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said George Tyne may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, George Tyne was a radio performer who was asked questions at certain hearings in New York with respect to his own Communist Party membership, and whether a Communist Party membership card in the name of Buddy Yarus was his Communist Party card. He was also questioned regarding the holding of a so-called peace meeting at Mexico City, of which he was a sponsor. He was asked whether a play, of which he was the director, was designed to carry a Communist message. He was also interrogated concerning the holding of caucus meetings of members of the Communist Party, who were also members of his labor union.

He refused to answer all of the questions asked him. He did not invoke the fifth amendment but said it was a matter of conscience with him not to answer questions concerning the activities that he undoubtedly was engaged in.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Was he asked whether he invoked the fifth amendment?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; he was asked whether or not he invoked the fifth amendment, and he said he did not invoke the fifth amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ELLIOTT SULLIVAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 2919).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ELLIOTT SULLIVAN

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Elliott Sullivan. The said subpena directed Elliott Sullivan to be and appear before said Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber, room 1703, United States District Court Building, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., on August 16, 1955, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon the said Elliott Sullivan is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To ELLIOTT SULLIVAN, *Greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Tuesday, August 16, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m., at their Committee Room, 1703

United States District Court Building, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To Frank J. Bonora, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 29th day of July in the year of our Lord 1955.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Frank J. Bonora, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said Frank J. Bonora, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Subpena for Elliott Sullivan before the Committee on Un-American Activities. I made service of the within subpena by personal service on the within-named Elliott Sullivan, at room 226, H. O. B., Washington 25, D. C., at 12 o'clock p. m., on the 29th day of July 1955.

"FRANK J. BONORA."

The said Elliott Sullivan, pursuant to said subpena, and in compliance therewith, appeared before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 16, 1955, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said Elliott Sullivan having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions; namely:

"Which of the unions were you a member of?

"Have you been active in the affairs of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Have you been active in the affairs of Actors Equity?

"I want to ask you whether or not during the period of time that you have been a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and Actors Equity you have been engaged in mass organization work of any character in response to advice or any understanding that you may have received from the Communist Party or its members.

"Were you a member of a Communist Party group in 1947 in the city of New York?

"Did you become a member of the Communist Party soon after your arrival or at an early date after your arrival in California or at any time while you were in California?

"Is anything that Mr. Berkeley told this committee under oath about you false?

"Will you tell the committee whether or not V. J. Jerome interposed in any activities of Communist Party groups in the city of New York, to your knowledge?

"Was his testimony true or false? (The witness referred to was Nicholas Bela.)

"What were the activities of the Communist Party within those groups? (The groups referred to were the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and Actors Equity.)

"Did you ever attend a caucus meeting of members of the Communist Party within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Will you examine the document, please, and state whether or not in that instance you were carrying out a Communist Party function?

"Mr. Sullivan, are you now a member of the Communist Party?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions, and as a result of said Elliott Sullivan's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon said Elliott Sullivan.

The record of the proceedings before the subcommittee on August 16, 1955, during which the said Elliott Sullivan refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertaining to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
"COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"New York, N. Y., Tuesday, August 16, 1955.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 1703 of the Federal Building, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER (chairman) presiding.

"Committee members present: Representatives WALTER, WILLIS, and SCHERER.

"Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Donald T. Appell and Frank Bonora, investigators; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

"Chairman WALTER. The committee will come to order.

"Mr. Tavenner, call your first witness.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Elliott Sullivan, will you come forward, please?

"His counsel is not here, and if you will bear with us just a moment, please.

"Chairman WALTER. We will wait a few minutes.

"(Whereupon, a short recess was taken by the committee.)

"Chairman WALTER. Will you raise your right hand, please, Mr. Sullivan?

"Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I do.

"TESTIMONY OF ELLIOTT SULLIVAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, BELLA S. ABZUG

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Elliott Sullivan.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify herself for the record?

"Miss ABZUG. Bella S. Abzug, 205 West 34th Street, New York.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Sullivan?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. San Antonio, Tex., July 4, 1907.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your name, please, sir?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. E-l-l-i-o-t-t S-u-l-l-i-v-a-n.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. New York City.

"Mr. TAVENNER. At what address?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. 2 Peter Cooper Road.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of New York City?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. On and off since 1929.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your profession or occupation is?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am an actor.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. I assume that, having followed the profession that you have, both on the stage and television and radio, it was necessary for you to become a member of various unions organized within those fields?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. That is a correct assumption; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Which of the unions were you a member of?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, it is apparent from the various aspects of the industry that I have been in that I have to be a member of the various unions involved, and so it is a matter of public record, but I do insist on challenging your right to ask me this question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a direction?

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I answer it in the way that I have before—that I believe you do not have the power to ask me questions regarding my associations.

"Chairman WALTER. In view of the fact that the Supreme Court has handed down a rather decisive decision recently, I feel that it is my duty to warn you that you have taken an incorrect position, and I again direct you to answer the question.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, it may be your opinion, Mr. WALTER, that this is an incorrect position, but I am firmly convinced that the Bill of Rights was meant to mean what it says, and I insist on my right to challenge your right to ask me about my associations.

"Mr. SCHERER. May I ask a question?

"I understand you are not relying on the fifth amendment in refusing to answer the question asked you by Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. That is correct, but I don't want any inference from that——

"Mr. SCHERER. I understand.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. That I don't believe that the fifth amendment isn't one of the amendments in the Constitution.

"Mr. SCHERER. But in refusing to answer this particular question of Mr. Tavenner you are not relying on the fifth amendment.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not taking the position that I am refusing to answer this question, Mr. Scherer. I am answering it in this fashion. If you want to know specifically whether I am invoking my privilege under the fifth amendment, I am not.

"Mr. SCHERER. That is all I want to know.

"I think we should further say to this witness—at least, it is the opinion of this member of the committee—that he is in contempt for refusing to answer this question.

"Mr. WILLIS. I certainly concur in it.

"Chairman WALTER. I don't think it makes any difference to him. So why tell him?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Of course it makes a difference to me, Mr. WALTER, to be in contempt. Why do you say that?

"Chairman WALTER. I was talking to Mr. SCHERER.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I beg your pardon, I thought you were making a public statement and I thought it was in the record that it doesn't make any difference to me. Of course it makes a difference, and I have a wife and two children, and I am very anxious to work and this is a big waste of time as far as I am concerned. The harassment that is involved in this is utter nonsense, and when you make a statement such as you don't think it makes any difference to me, I beg to differ with you very strongly about that. It makes a serious difference to my entire life, my appearance here, and I resent that remark.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sullivan, have you been active in the affairs of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Whether I have been active in my unions or not, again is a question which I believe to be an invasion of my personal right to associate with whom I please, and I will answer this question in this way but not under compulsion here.

"Chairman WALTER. Just a moment, let us straighten this out.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. That was a bad sentence, I agree.

"Chairman WALTER. Now that we agree it is a bad sentence, let us go to something else.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. He was about to answer it after he made that little speech, and he got off on the wrong foot, and now he is going to answer it.

"Mr. SCHERER. Let us keep this record straight. Wait a minute, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I don't believe the witness understands there has been a direction to answer. Maybe I misunderstood.

"Mr. SCHERER. There has not been a direction.

"Chairman WALTER. He started to answer the question and then got off onto something else. It was a bad sentence. Let us get around to this question. Have you been active in the affairs of your union?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Is that the question now?

"Chairman WALTER. Wasn't that the question, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been active in the affairs of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Again, I respectfully submit that as far as I am concerned, I believe that that question invades my ability to associate with whom I please, and therefore I challenge your power to ask that question.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to direct the witness to answer that question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I do answer this question in the way I have just stated.

"Chairman WALTER. All right. Is that your answer?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been active in the affairs of Actors Equity?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. This is the same question again and I answer it in the same way.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Because I believe that the right to associate freely has been fought for and won in unions, I think that it would be my right or any other individual's right to associate with whom they please in unions, but I also believe as I have stated before, that this committee does not have the power to ask me questions relating to my associations.

"Mr. SCHERER. You understand, Witness, that when the chairman directs you to answer a question, the committee is not accepting your answer and that is the reason for the direction to answer. Do you understand that?

"Chairman WALTER. He understands, he is represented by counsel.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't know anything about the legalisms, and if this is what you mean, I suppose I will take it.

"Miss ABZUG. The witness is giving his answers to the question.

"Mr. SCHERER. The Supreme Court has said that it is the duty of this committee to say to the witness that we do not accept his answer, and it is the duty of this committee to inquire whether he understands what the direction of the chairman means, and that is the reason I made the statement.

"Miss ABZUG. I can only say, Mr. Scherer, that there is no decision which holds that you do not accept an answer. You are raising a question as to whether he is answering the questions, and he is answering the question as he sees fit.

"Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sullivan, the committee has received a great deal of evidence over a number of years that the rank-and-file members, and those who are functionaries of the Communist Party are required by the Communist Party and expected by the Communist Party to take an active part in mass organization work.

"Testimony has been received from a number of individuals that they complied with that understanding and that directive by engaging in work of that type.

"I want to ask you whether or not during the period of time that you have been a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and Actors Equity, whether you have been engaged in mass organization work of any character in response to advice or any understanding that you may have received from the Communist Party or its members.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. If ever there was a loaded question, I just heard it, and I will repeat that the right of people to engage in union activity is one which I think by this time is inalienable, and I do not believe or rather I believe firmly that you do not have the power and the right to question me regarding my associations and my thought and my speech.

"Mr. SCHERER. Again, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will answer the question by repeating that I challenge this committee's power because I believe its jurisdiction is limited, and I don't believe any branch of the Government can inquire into people's individual beliefs or opinions.

"Chairman WALTER. Didn't you understand the question? Mr. Tavenner wasn't asking you about beliefs or opinions. He was asking you about activities.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, as far as I am concerned, I don't know how one can separate activities from beliefs. No one acts without belief.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Jerome Robbins?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I know him. I used to know him. I will amend that definitely, I used to know him.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you know him between 1944 and 1947?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't know what dates.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You said you 'used to know him,' when did you cease to know him?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not sure about that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When he testified before this committee, is that what you have reference to?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am sorry; will you repeat the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. You said that you have ceased to know him, and I am asking whether the time you ceased to know him began at the time he testified before this committee?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I would say that that is the case; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, my next question is, did you know him between 1944 and 1947?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. It is possible that I did; yes. I mean those dates, it is possible in those dates I did.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend Communist Party meetings with him?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. You are asking me again a question which is involving my associates and beliefs and I challenge your right to ask it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I am speaking of your action and your conduct, and I am not asking you about your beliefs.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, that is a matter of opinion, and I believe that you are asking me about my beliefs and this is why I answer this question this way.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robbins testified before this committee that you were a member of the group of the Communist Party of which he was a member, and in order to identify the matter a little further, another person in that group identified by Mr. Robbins was Lloyd Gough, also Jerome Chodorov, and Edward Chodorov, according to the testimony that he gave before this committee in New York, in 1953.

"Were you a member of a Communist Party group in 1947 in the city of New York?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Again I repeat that this question is outside of your power to ask and that is how I answer that.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, it is almost no longer a question of my rights, but of your lack of power to ask it, to ask questions regarding the tenets within the first amendment.

"Mr. WILLIS. As you said earlier, that is the amendment you are relying on throughout your testimony. You are not invoking the privilege of the fifth amendment in giving testimony against yourself?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. WILLIS. And throughout your testimony we may assume that that is the case without repetition?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, you may.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You told the committee that you went to Hollywood in 1937. Did you become a member of the Communist Party soon after your arrival or at any early date after your arrival in California or at any time while you were in California?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Again I challenge your right to ask this question as I have stated before.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well my answer again is along the same lines. I will not violate my rights although I believe you are trying to violate my rights.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Martin Berkeley in California?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I knew Martin Berkeley; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Martin Berkeley testified before this committee in 1951 and he described the difficulty that had arisen in the Communist Party in California which necessitated the bringing of V. J. Jerome, then the cultural secretary of the Communist Party in New York City to California to straighten it out, and Mr. Jerome picked Mr. Martin Berkeley for the performance of certain services in connection with that work. He described a faction meeting of the Communist Party which, he said, Elliott Sullivan attended. He is also known as Ely Sullivan. Upon being asked what his occupation was, his reply was that he is an actor.

"Did you attend any faction meeting of the Communist Party which was attended by Mr. Martin Berkeley?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will repeat my challenge to this committee that it does not have the right to ask me questions regarding my associations and I will say further that the long, tired list of men and women who have appeared before this committee who, in my opinion, have sold their honor and dignity and, in fact, the best traditions of American life for a mess of pottage, for a job, for a movie contract, I believe all these people will be judged and are being judged today by the decent people in this country.

"Mr. SCHERER. You are referring to the witness Berkeley, whose testimony Mr. Tavenner referred to; are you not?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am referring to him along with others.

"Mr. SCHERER. Along with others?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Is anything that Mr. Berkeley told this committee under oath about you false? In other words, did he lie to this committee, Mr. Sullivan?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will challenge your right to ask me that question, Mr. SCHERER.

"Chairman WALTER. Mr. SCHERER's question is whether or not Mr. Berkeley's testimony was true or false.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I merely repeat what I have said before.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. What was the question?

"Chairman WALTER. Was the testimony of Martin Berkeley, adduced by this committee, true or false?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I also believe that you do not have the right to ask me this question.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I do not believe that you have the power to ask me this question any more than you had the power at the time to ask him those questions.

"Chairman WALTER. But we had the power and the authority to ask him those questions, and the only difference between you and Berkeley is that he answered them and you won't. That is the only difference.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I insist that I am answering your questions to the best of my ability.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Sullivan, you attacked Mr. Berkeley and I am saying this to you. He was under oath when he testified before this committee and you are under oath, and if you say to us now that the man whom you attacked lied about you, then I am going to ask that the testimony of Berkeley and your testimony be referred to the Department of Justice, and we can ascertain whether Berkeley lied. You have the opportunity now to say whether this man whom you attacked lied.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. Here is your opportunity.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Because I am firm in my belief that you do not have the power to ask me any question regarding my associations, I will certainly not engage in any discussion with you under compulsion on this question.

"Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not V. J. Jerome interposed in any activities of Communist Party groups in the city of New York to your knowledge?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will again say that you are asking me questions that have to do with the area of freedom of speech and of association and I will answer that question in that way.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a direction?

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I answer that in the same way, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed by the Federal Theater project?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. No, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. At any time?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. No, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Again whether I was acquainted with V. J. Jerome or anyone else I believe is a question that invades my associations.

"Mr. WILLIS. He volunteered acquaintanceship with other witnesses.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I answer it in the same way, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mr. Lee J. Cobb?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you know him, in California, or New York, or both?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. In California.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cobb testified before this committee that you and certain other persons were members of the same Communist Party group that he was a member of. Will you tell the committee whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party group of which Mr. Cobb was a member?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Cobb is among those on the shameful list of people who have given testimony——

"Chairman WALTER. Let me get this straightened out. These people whom you have called shameful have made great contributions to the preservation of this Republic and these people have recognized the mistakes that they have made, and they have testified in closed and open session before this committee. I think they are deserving, and are receiving the credit from the vast majority of the American people.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Not from the papers I read, Mr. Walter.

"Chairman WALTER. If you stop reading the Daily Worker, maybe you will find out the truth.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I beg your pardon?

"Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Since you raised that point, I am talking about the many, many columnists and editorials in this country that have begun to denounce professional informers.

"Chairman WALTER. You hope. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with George Tyne, also known as Buddy Yarus, while you were in California?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I know Mr. Tyne, and I am not sure whether it was in California or here.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Victor Killian?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. While you were in California?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were either or both of those persons members of the Communist Party group with you in California?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Again you are asking me a question which has to do with my associations, and I do not believe you have the power to do so.

"Chairman WALTER. You say you did know this man Killian, is that correct?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I did know him.

"Chairman WALTER. Did you know V. J. Jerome?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, whether I knew him or not I believe again is a question which I have raised before, and I have answered it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee if you know what the Communist Party was endeavoring to accomplish in Hollywood within the moving picture industry at the time that you were there and at the time that you were a screen actor?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I take it that this question results from the stated purposes of this committee in its investigation in New York, in 1955?

"Mr. TAVENNER. There doesn't seem to be as much distance between New York and Hollywood as geography would indicate.

"Will you please answer the question?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well time certainly indicates there is a lot of difference.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I insist that the question is not pertinent, and again I will say to you that I challenge your right, and I do not believe you have the power to ask me this question because it involves the individual guaranty under the Bill of Rights.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Robbins in his testimony, which I referred to a moment ago, said that he was in a theatrical transient group of the Communist Party here in New York between 1944 and 1947. Will you tell the committee, if you know, what the Communist Party was endeavoring to do in the theater?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, whether I know or not, again I believe is in the area of private opinion and private thought, and I again say that I do not believe this committee has the power to invade that area with questions.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the Communist Party was endeavoring to do within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I again repeat my same answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sullivan, were you acquainted with Nicholas Bela?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I am ashamed to say that I have been.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you ashamed to say that because he told this committee facts within his knowledge?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am ashamed to say it because I believe he is one of those people, I know he is one of those people who has lost his dignity.

"Mr. SCHERER. Is he one of those who testified so that he could get a job or some personal preferment?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. There must be something at stake of that sort, for a man to lower himself to that extent.

"Mr. SCHERER. You people talk about witnesses being smeared. You are smearing this man by claiming that he perjured himself for some personal advancement, isn't that what you are doing?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, the worse smear is a word which is used by people for different reasons.

"Mr. SCHERER. You have smeared three witnesses who have testified before this committee.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't think I have. If I have smeared them, I don't think it is not merely that I am making this characterization of these people, but I believe many hundreds of thousands of people do.

"Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that you have stated that they testified falsely and that is perjury, because of some personal advantage that they would get?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't think the ultimate outcome or I don't believe the ultimate judgment is going to be either yours or mine, Mr. SCHERER, frankly, and I think it is going to depend upon what the American people feel about people like this.

"Mr. SCHERER. That isn't my question. My question was, isn't it in effect that you have charged these people with perjury, and haven't you smeared these three former associates with you in the Communist Party?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't know what the definition of 'perjury' is, but I do know what the definition is of an 'informer.'

"Chairman WALTER. Did they testify falsely when they said that you were a member of a Communist group with them?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. That isn't pertinent to my position, Mr. WALTER, and I believe that you do not have the right to ask me this question.

"Mr. SCHERER. I just think we should make it clear, Mr. Chairman, from time to time, who is smearing whom.

"Chairman WALTER. I think it is perfectly obvious.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Bela in the course of his testimony before this committee identified Elliott Sullivan, an actor, as a person known to him to be a member of the Communist Party.

"Was his testimony true or false?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Again I repeat, sir, that this man has forsaken his conscience and has given testimony true or false for undignified reasons.

"Mr. TAVENNER. My question is, was his testimony true or false?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I said regardless of what kind of testimony he gave, whether it was true or false, I believe that this man has forsaken his conscience.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was his testimony true or false?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not going to answer. I will answer that question by telling you again that the question is intended to determine what my beliefs are, and there is no power under this Government that can do that.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will tell you again, Mr. Walter, and as strongly as I know how, as a human being, that I do not believe that there is any branch of our Government that the very foundation of our Government, the rockbottom pinnacle, or whatever you want to call it, the basis of our democratic Government depends precisely on this very point, that people may not, or no branch of the Government may invade the individual rights of freedom of speech or association.

"Chairman WALTER. Do you suppose that this subcommittee, with its distinguished counsel, who prosecuted Tojo in Japan, would ask a question if he thought it was an improper question? Now, you feel as strongly as you do about it, and I feel as strongly as I do about it, and there is only one way to find out, and I assure you that you will be given that opportunity if I have anything to do with it.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. What are you implying, Mr. Walter?

"Chairman WALTER. I am not implying anything, I am just indicating to you that in my judgment you are in contempt, and I will ask the subcommittee to recommend to the full committee that you be adjudged in contempt, and I will ask the Congress of the United States to pass on such a resolution. We can find out whether or not the arm of Government that is charged with the responsibility of protecting its citizens from subversives has a right to ask the kind of questions and the only questions which will throw light on the conspiracy that we believe you have been a party to.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, you are making an accusation, Mr. Walter.

"Chairman WALTER. Well, were you?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I beg your pardon?

"Chairman WALTER. I say have you been a member of the Communist conspiracy, or the Communist Party?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. You don't have the right to ask me that question, because it is not a pertinent question, and it is a question that has to do again, as I say, with my personal beliefs, whether I was or I wasn't.

"Miss ABZUG. I would like to suggest, Mr. Walter——

"Chairman WALTER. You advise your client, and not me.

"Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I want this straight for the record, that I am not a conspirator, and that I have committed no crime, and I believe that in your statement a moment ago that you made some sort of an inference to that effect, and I resent it.

"Chairman WALTER. I didn't mean to make an inference, I was stating it as plainly as I could, that in my opinion you were a member of the Communist conspiracy.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Didn't you say I was going to have the opportunity? What is contained in a phrase like that, if there isn't some kind of an implied threat?

"Chairman WALTER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sullivan, you have not seen fit to deny or explain this testimony which very positively identified you as having been a member of the Communist Party. If that testimony be accepted as trustworthy, then during the period of time that you were a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, and during the time that you were a member of the Actors Equity, you were in a position to know what Communist Party activities were going on, if any were going on, within those organizations.

"What were the activities of the Communist Party within those groups?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will tell you again, and I respectfully submit that I do not believe that you have the power to ask me such a question, because it has to do with my associations, and if this is true there would be no reason why you wouldn't be able to ask me about my religion, and about many other kinds of things.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question, Mr. Sullivan.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I answer that question by telling you that I do not believe that you have the power to inquire into personal and private affairs of individuals and I want to say furthermore——

"Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore do you refuse to answer the question?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not refusing to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Then answer it.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I did answer it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. No; you are explaining, and you are endeavoring to avoid answering the question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, it is a matter of opinion.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Then let me rephrase the question, and put it more directly.

"Did you ever attend a caucus meeting of members of the Communist Party within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. My answer to that question is that I do not believe you have the power to ask me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. And therefore you won't answer.

"May I ask for a direction?

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I state again that I believe that this committee does not have the right under the first amendment to ask me questions which I believe violate my own personal thinking on this matter, the matter of association.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of the July 31, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker, which shows an advertisement under the auspices of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. There was a meeting referred to as Peace and Presidential Candidates. Those engaging in the program, or among those engaged were Howard DaSilva, Morris Carnovsky, and Elliott Sullivan. Do you recall the occasion?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I do not, no.

"(A document was handed to the witness.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the document, please, and state whether in the performance of your part of that program you were carrying out a Communist Party function?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Was your question whether or not I remembered this now?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No; my question was if that advertisement refreshed your recollection, would you tell the committee please whether while engaged in that program you were carrying out what you considered to be a Communist Party function?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I remember being present on this occasion here, and I have certainly no recollection of having carried out any Communist Party ideas or whatever it was you said, and despite that however, I still do not believe that you have the right to ask me this question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a copy of the May 5, 1947, issue of the Daily Worker, advertising a Carnival-Bazaar, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, in which Phil Leeds, Elliott Sullivan, George Keane, and others took part.

"Will you examine the document, please, and state whether or not in that instance you were carrying out a Communist Party function?

"(A document was handed to the witness.)

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Chairman WALTER. The committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

"(A brief recess was thereupon taken by the committee.)

"Chairman WALTER. The committee will be in order.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a question pending?

"(Whereupon the reporter read the pending question as above recorded.)

"Mr. SULLIVAN. In answer to this question, all of these questions which you have been asking me, and which I assume you will be asking me, are in the area of my associations, of where I entertained, and what I do as an individual, and I will say now, as I have all morning been answering these questions, that I will answer all of these questions in the same way. That is to say that my understanding of this form of government and our democracy is that this committee nor any other committee like it, has the right or the power to ask me such questions.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I have a direction?

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The committee does not accept your reason for your refusal to answer, and you are now being directed to answer the question.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't take the position that I am refusing to answer your questions. I am taking the position that I am answering your questions to the very best of my ability and my answer to the directed question is again that I do not believe that this committee has the right and the power and that it should not assume such right to ask me questions which are enunciated under the first amendment of the Bill of Rights.

"Chairman WALTER. Because you believe that we have no authority to ask these questions, you decline to answer them; is that right?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not declining to answer, Mr. Walter. I am answering.

"Mr. SCHERER. Obviously the witness is declining to answer, and just giving reasons for refusal to answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. It is a statement by the witness which is not a factual reply to anything that I have asked.

"Chairman WALTER. That is right. Go ahead and ask another question.

* * * * *

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I have a statement, Mr. Walter, that I would like to read.

"Chairman WALTER. Just a moment.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. May I read this, Mr. Walter?

"Chairman WALTER. We will put it in the record if it is relevant.

"Mr. Sullivan, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. WALTER, I don't believe that you have the right to ask me any question having to do with my personal beliefs or associations.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask you to direct the witness, Mr. Chairman.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Are you a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. I will tell you again, I answer that question by saying that I do not believe, or I challenge the right of this committee to ask such a question.

"Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Elliott Sullivan relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution No. 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"Which of the unions were you a member of?

"Have you been active in the affairs of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Have you been active in the affairs of Actors Equity?

"I want to ask you whether or not during the period of time that you have been a member of the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and Actors Equity, you have been engaged in mass organization work of any character in response to advice or any understanding that you may

have received from the Communist Party or its members.

"Were you a member of a Communist Party group in 1947 in the city of New York?

"Did you become a member of the Communist Party soon after your arrival or at any early date after your arrival in California or at any time while you were in California?

"Is anything that Mr. Berkeley told this committee under oath about you false?

"Will you tell the committee whether or not V. J. Jerome interposed in any activities of Communist Party groups in the city of New York to your knowledge?

"Was his testimony true or false? (The witness referred to was Nicholas Bella.)

"What were the activities of the Communist Party within those groups? (The groups referred to were the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and Actors Equity.)

"Did you ever attend a caucus meeting of members of the Communist Party within the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists?

"Will you examine the document please, and state whether or not in that instance you were carrying out a Communist Party function?

"Mr. Sullivan, are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 635) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Elliott Sullivan to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Elliott Sullivan may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sullivan is employed in the theatrical field, and was asked concerning his attempts to organize parts of his profession in the Communist Party. He was also interrogated concerning Communist Party activities within labor unions of which he was a member, whether or not in taking part in certain programs he was carrying out a Communist Party function, and his own membership in the Communist Party. He refused to answer pertinent questions propounded to him but did not invoke the fifth amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST PETER SEEGER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 2920).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST PETER SEEGER

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Peter Seeger. The said subpena directed Peter Seeger to be and appear before said Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER as Chairman, in their chamber, room 1703, United States courthouse, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., on August 18, 1955, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon Peter Seeger is set forth in the words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To PETE SEEGER, Route 9–D, Beacon, N. Y.,
Greeting:

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on 18 August, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m., at their committee room, 1703 United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York City, N. Y., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To United States marshal, New York City, N. Y., to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 1st day of July, in the year of our Lord, 1955.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by John F. Pickett, deputy United States marshal, southern district of New York, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said John F. Pickett, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Received this writ at New York, N. Y., on July 12, 1955, and on July 14, 1955, at Route 9–D, Beacon, N. Y., I served it on the within-named Pete Seeger by leaving the original thereof with him.

"THOMAS J. LUNNEY,
"U. S. Marshal, SDNY.
"By: JOHN F. PICKETT,
"Deputy U. S. Marshal, SDNY."

The said Peter Seeger, pursuant to said subpena, and in compliance therewith, appeared before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities on August 18, 1955, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Regulation 5 of the 84th Congress. The said Peter Seeger having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions; namely:

"May I ask you whether or not the Allerton Section was a section of the Communist Party?

"Did you take part in this May Day program under the auspices of the music section of the cultural division of the Communist Party?

"Did you sing this particular song on the Fourth of July at Wingdale Lodge in New York?

"Were you chosen by Mr. Elliott Sullivan to take part in the program on the weekend of July Fourth at Wingdale Lodge?

"Did you take part in that performance?

"Have you been a member of the Communist Party since 1947?

"Will you examine it please and state whether or not that is a photograph of you?

"It is noted that the individual mentioned is wearing a military uniform. That was in May of 1952, and the statute of limitations would have run by now as to any offense for the improper wearing of the uniform, and will you tell the committee whether or not you took part in that May Day program wearing a uniform of an American soldier?

"Did you also teach at the Jefferson School of Social Science here in the city of New York?

"Are you a member of the Communist Party now?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions, and as a result of said Peter Seeger's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon said Peter Seeger.

The record of the proceedings before the subcommittee on August 18, 1955, during which the said Peter Seeger refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertaining to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
"COMMITTEE ON
"UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"New York, N. Y.,
"Thursday, August 18, 1955.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 1703 of the Federal Building, Foley Square, New York, N. Y., the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER (chairman) presiding.

"Committee members present: Representatives WALTER, WILLIS, and SCHERER.

"Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Donald T. Appel and Frank Bonora, investigators; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

"Chairman WALTER. The committee will be in order.

"(After the completion of the testimony of several other witnesses, Mr. Peter Seeger was called as a witness.)

"Chairman WALTER. Will you call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Peter Seeger, will you come forward, please sir?

"Chairman WALTER. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. SEEGER. I do, sir.

"TESTIMONY OF PETER SEEGER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, PAUL L. ROSS

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Peter Seeger?

"Mr. SEEGER. That is my name.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name, please?

"Mr. SEEGER. S-e-e-g-e-r.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record?

"Mr. ROSS. Paul L. Ross, New York City.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Seeger?

"Mr. SEEGER. I was born in New York in 1919.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation?

"Mr. SEEGER. Well, I have worked at many things, and my main profession is a student of American folklore, and I make my living as a banjo picker, sort of damning in some people's opinion.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Has New York been your headquarters for a considerable period of time?

"Mr. SEEGER. No; I lived here only rarely until I left school and after a year or two or a few years living here after World War II, I got back to the country where I always felt more at home.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You say that you were in the Armed Forces of the United States?

"Mr. SEEGER. About three and a half years.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell us, please, the period of your service?

"Mr. SEEGER. I went in in July 1942, and I was mustered out in December of 1945.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attain the rank of an officer?

"Mr. SEEGER. No. After about a year I made Pfc, and just before I got out I got to be T–5, which is the equivalent of a corporal's rating, a long hard pull.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become a member of the Reserves?

"Mr. SEEGER. No, I did not.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Seeger, prior to your entry into the service in 1942, were you engaged in the practice of your profession in the area of New York?

"Mr. SEEGER. It is hard to call it a profession. I kind of drifted into it and I never intended to be a musician, and I am glad I am one now, and it is a very honorable profession, but when I started out actually I wanted to be a newspaperman, and when I left school——

"Chairman WALTER. Will you answer the question, please?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have to explain that it really wasn't my profession. I picked up a little change in it.

"Chairman WALTER. Is it your profession?

"Mr. SEEGER. It is my profession.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information obtained in part from the Daily Worker, indicating that over a period of time, especially since December of 1945, you took part in numerous entertainment features.

"I have before me a photostatic copy of the June 20, 1947, issue of the Daily Worker. In a column entitled 'What's On,' appears this advertisement:

" 'Tonight—Bronx, hear Peter Seeger and his guitar, at Allerton section housewarming'.

"May I ask you whether or not the Allerton section was a section of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SEEGER. Sir, I refuse to answer that question whether it was a quote from the New York Times or the Vegetarian Journal.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I don't believe there is any more authoritative document in regard to the Communist Party than its official organ, the Daily Worker.

"Mr. SCHERER. He hasn't answered the question, and he merely said he wouldn't answer whether the article appeared in the New York Times or some other magazine.

"I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer.

"Mr. SEEGER. Sir, the whole line of questioning——

"Chairman WALTER. You have only been asked one question, so far.

"Mr. SEEGER. I am not going to answer any questions as to my associations, my philosophical or religious beliefs or my political beliefs, or how I voted in any election or any of these private affairs. I think these are very improper questions for any American to be asked, especially under such compulsion as this.

"I would be very glad to tell you my life if you want to hear of it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Has the witness declined to answer this specific question?

"Chairman WALTER. He said that he is not going to answer any questions, any names or things.

"Mr. SCHERER. He was directed to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked 'Seeger Exhibit No. 1,' for identification only.

"Chairman WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of the April 30, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker which carries under the same title of 'What's On' an advertisement of a 'May Day Rally: For Peace, Security and Democracy.' The advertisement states:

" 'Are you in a fighting mood? Then attend the May Day rally.'

"Expert speakers are stated to be slated for the program, and then follows a statement, 'Entertainment by Pete Seeger.' At the bottom appears this: 'Auspices Essex County Communist Party,' and at the top, 'Tonight, Newark, N. J.'

"Did you lend your talent to the Essex County Communist Party on the occasion indicated by this article from the Daily Worker?

"Mr. SEEGER. Mr. WALTER, I believe I have already answered this question, and the same answer.

"Chairman WALTER. The same answer. In other words, you mean that you decline to answer because of the reasons stated before?

"Mr. SEEGER. I gave my answer, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. What is your answer?

"Mr. SEEGER. You see, sir, I feel——

"Chairman WALTER. What is your answer?

"Mr. SEEGER. I will tell you what my answer is.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. I feel that in my whole life I have never done anything of any conspiratorial nature and I resent very much and very deeply the implication of being called before this committee that in some way because my opinions may be different from yours, or yours, Mr. WILLIS; or yours, Mr. SCHERER; that I am any less of an American than anybody else. I love my country very deeply, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. Why don't you make a little contribution toward preserving its institutions?

"Mr. SEEGER. I feel that my whole life is a contribution, that is why I would like to tell you about it.

"Chairman WALTER. I don't want to hear about it.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think that there must be a direction to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SEEGER. I have already given you my answer, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. Let me understand. You are not relying on the fifth amendment, are you?

"Mr. SEEGER. No, sir, although I do not want to in any way discredit or depreciate or deprecate the witnesses that have used the fifth amendment, and I simply feel it is improper for this committee to ask such questions.

"Mr. SCHERER. And then in answering the rest of the questions, or in refusing to answer the rest of the questions, I understand that you are not relying on the fifth amendment as a basis for your refusal to answer?

"Mr. SEEGER. No; I am not, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked 'Seeger Exhibit No. 2,' for identification only.

"Chairman WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of the May 4, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker, which has an article entitled 'May Day Smash Review Put on by Communist Cultural Division, On Stage,' and the article was written by Bob Reed. This article emphasizes a production called Now Is the Time, and it says this:

" 'Now is the Time was a hard hitting May Day show of songs and knife-edged satire. New songs and film strips walloped the enemies of the people in what the singers called "Aesopian language." '

"Then there is bracketed off in the article this paragraph:

" 'Now Is the Time was a hard hitting May Day show of songs and knife-edge music section of the cultural division of the Communist Party. Script by Lee Hays.'

"And other persons, including Peter Seeger. Lee Hays is recited to be the MC, or master of ceremonies.

"Did you take part in this May Day program under the auspices of the music section of the cultural division of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SEEGER. Mr. Chairman, the answer is the same as before.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think we have to have a direction.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. SEEGER. I have given you my answer, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The article contains another paragraph as follows:

" 'This performance of Now Is the Time was given in honor of the 12 indicted Communist Party leaders.'

"And then it continues with Bob Reed's account of the show:

" 'This reviewer has never seen a show which stirred its audience more. Add up new material, fine personal and group performances, overwhelming audience response—the result was a significant advance in the people's cultural movement. Now is the Time is that rare phenomenon, a political show in which performers and audience had a lot of fun. It should be repeated for large audiences.'

"Mr. Lee Hays was asked the question while he was on the witness stand as to whether or not he wrote that play and he refused to answer. Do you know whether he was the originator of the script?

"Mr. SEEGER. Do I know whether he was the originator of the script? Again my answer is the same. However, if you want to question me about any songs, I would be glad to tell you, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. That is what you are being asked about now.

"Mr. TAVENNER. All right, I will ask you, but I would like to introduce that document in evidence and ask it to be marked "Seeger Exhibit No. 3," for identification only and to be made a part of the committee files.

"Chairman WALTER. Mark it and let it be received.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You said that you would tell us about the songs. Did you participate in a program at Wingdale Lodge in the State of New York, which is a summer camp for adults and children, on the weekend of July Fourth of this year?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. Again, I say I will be glad to tell what songs I have ever sung, because singing is my business.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I am going to ask you.

"Mr. SEEGER. But I decline to say who has ever listened to them, who has written them, or other people who have sung them.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sing this song, to which we have referred, 'Now Is the Time,' at Wingdale Lodge on the weekend of July Fourth?

"Mr. SEEGER. I don't know any song by that name, and I know a song with a similar

name. It is called Wasn't That a Time. Is that the song?

"Chairman WALTER. Did you sing that song?

"Mr. SEEGER. I can sing it, and I don't know how well I can do it without my banjo.

"Chairman WALTER. I said, did you sing it on that occasion?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have sung that song, and I am not going to go into where I have sung it. I have sung it many places.

"Chairman WALTER. Did you sing it on this particular occasion? That is what you are being asked.

"Mr. SEEGER. Again my answer is the same.

"Chairman WALTER. You said that you would tell us about it.

"Mr. SEEGER. I will tell you about the songs, but I am not going to tell you or try to explain——

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question. Did you sing this particular song on the Fourth of July at Wingdale Lodge in New York?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have already given you my answer to that question, and all questions such as that. I feel that it is improper to ask about my associations and opinions. I have said that I would be voluntarily glad to tell you any song, or what I have done in my life.

"Chairman WALTER. I think it is my duty to inform you that we don't accept this answer and the others, and I give you an opportunity now to answer these questions, particularly the last one.

"Mr. SEEGER. Sir, my answer is always the same.

"Chairman WALTER. All right, go ahead, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you chosen by Mr. Elliott Sullivan to take part in the program on the weekend of July Fourth at Wingdale Lodge?

"Mr. SEEGER. The answer is the same, sir.

"Mr. WILLIS. Was that the occasion of the satire on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights?

"Mr. TAVENNER. The same occasion, yes, sir.

"I have before me a photostatic copy of a page from the June 1, 1949 issue of the Daily Worker, and in a column entitled 'Town Talk,' there is found this statement:

" 'The first performance of a new song, If I Had a Hammer, on the theme of the Foley Square trial of the Communist leaders, will be given at the testimonial dinner for the 12 on Friday night at St. Nicholas Arena * * *. Among those on hand for the singing will be * * * Pete Seeger, and Lee Hays—'

"and others whose names are mentioned.

"Did you take part in that performance?

"Mr. SEEGER. I shall be glad to answer about the song, sir, and I am not interested in carrying on the line of questioning about where I have sung any songs.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I ask a direction.

"Chairman WALTER. You may not be interested, but we are, however. I direct you to answer. You can answer that question.

"Mr. SEEGER. I feel these questions are improper, sir, and I feel they are immoral to ask any American this kind of question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you finished your answer?

"Mr. SEEGER. Yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked 'Seeger Exhibit No. 4,' for identification only and to be made a part of the committee files.

"Mr. SEEGER. I am sorry you are not interested in the song. It is a good song.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present in the hearing room while the former witnesses testified?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have been here all morning; yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I assume then that you heard me read the testimony of Mr. Kazan about the purpose of the Communist Party in having its actors entertain for the benefit of Communist fronts and the Communist Party. Did you hear that testimony?

"Mr. SEEGER. Yes; I have heard all of the testimony today.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear Mr. George Hall's testimony yesterday in which he stated that as an actor, the special contribution that he was expected to make to the Communist Party was to use his talents by entertaining at Communist Party functions? Did you hear that testimony?

"Mr. SEEGER. I didn't hear it; no.

"Mr. TAVENNER. It is a fact that he so testified. I want to know whether or not you were engaged in a similar type of service to the Communist Party in entertaining at these features.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. I have sung for Americans of every political persuasion, and I am proud that I never refuse to sing to an audience, no matter what religion or color of their skin, or situation of life. I have sung in hobo jungles, and I have sung for the Rockefellers, and I am proud that I have never refused to sing for anybody. That is the only answer I can give along that line.

"Chairman WALTER. Mr. Tavenner, are you getting around to that letter? There was a letter introduced yesterday that I think was of greater importance than any bit of evidence adduced at these hearings, concerning the attempt made to influence people in this professional performers guild and union to assist a purely Communist cause which had no relation whatsoever to the arts and the theater. Is that what you are leading up to?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; it is. That was the letter of Peter Lawrence, which I questioned him about yesterday. That related to the trial of the Smith Act defendants here at Foley Square. I am trying to inquire now whether this witness was party to the same type of propaganda effort by the Communist Party.

"Mr. SCHERER. There has been no answer to your last question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is right; may I have a direction?

"Mr. SEEGER. Would you repeat the question? I don't even know what the last question was, and I thought I have answered all of them up to now.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What you stated was not in response to the question.

"Chairman WALTER. Proceed with the questioning, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I believe, Mr. Chairman with your permission, I will have the question read to him. I think it should be put in exactly the same form.

"(Whereupon the reporter read the pending question as above recorded.)

"Mr. SEEGER. 'These features'; what do you mean? Except for the answer I have already given you, I have no answer. The answer I gave you, you have, don't you? That is that I am proud that I have sung for every American, Americans of every political persuasion, and I have never refused to sing for anybody because I disagreed with their political opinion, and I am proud of the fact that my songs seem to cut across and find perhaps a unifying thing, basic humanity, and that is why I would love to be able to tell you about these songs, because I feel that you would agree with me more, sir. I know many beautiful songs from your home county, Carbon, and Monroe, and I hitchhiked through there and stayed in the homes of miners.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are getting away from the question. My question was whether or not you sang at these functions of the Communist Party. You have answered it inferentially, and if I understand your answer, you are saying you did.

"Mr. SEEGER. Except for that answer, I decline to answer further.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sing at functions of the Communist Party, at Communist Party requests?

"Mr. SEEGER. I believe, sir, that a good 20 minutes ago, I gave my answer to this whole line of questioning.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but you have now beclouded your answer by your statement, and I want to make certain what you mean. Did you sing at the Communist Party functions which I have asked you about, as a Communist Party duty?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have already indicated that I am not interested, and I feel it is improper to say who has sung my songs or who I have sung them to, especially under such compulsion as this.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party since 1947?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. The same answer, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"Mr. SEEGER. I must give the same answer as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have a throwaway sheet entitled "Culture Fights Back, 1953," showing entertainment at the Capitol Hotel, Carnival Room, 51st Street at 8th Avenue, in 1953, sponsored by the Committee To Defend V. J. Jerome. It indicates that Pete Seeger was one of those furnishing the entertainment. Will you tell the committee, please, whether or not you were asked to perform on that occasion, and whether or not you did, either as a Communist Party directive, or as what you considered to be a duty to the Communist Party?

"Mr. SEEGER. I believe I have answered this already.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have already told you sir, that I believe my associations, whatever they are, are my own private affairs.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You did know, at that time, in 1953, that V. J. Jerome was a cultural head of the Communist Party and one of the Smith Act defendants in New York City?

"Mr. SEEGER. Again the same answer, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. You refuse to answer that question?

"Mr. SEEGER. Yes, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. That is understood.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked 'Seeger Exhibit No. 5' for identification only.

"Chairman WALTER. It will be so marked and received.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photograph which was taken of the May Day parade in New York City in 1952, which shows the front rank of a group of individuals, and one is in a uniform with military cap and insignia, and carrying a placard entitled 'censored.'

"Will you examine it please and state whether or not that is a photograph of you?

"(A document was handed to the witness.)

"Mr. SEEGER. It is like Jesus Christ when asked by Pontius Pilate, 'Are you king of the Jews?'

"Chairman WALTER. Stop that.

"Mr. SEEGER. Let someone else identify that picture.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that he be directed to answer the question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer the question.

"Mr. SEEGER. The question—'Do I identify this photograph'?

"Chairman WALTER. Yes.

"Mr. SEEGER. I say let someone else identify it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked 'Seeger Exhibit No. 6.'[1]

---

[1] See Lee exhibit No. 1.

"Chairman WALTER. Make it a part of the record.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that the individual mentioned is wearing a military uniform. That was in May of 1952, and the statute of limitations would have run by now as to any offense for the improper wearing of the uniform, and will you tell the committee whether or not you took part in that May Day program wearing a uniform of an American soldier?

"Mr. SEEGER. The same answer as before, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer that question.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. I think the record should show that the witness remains mute, following the direction by the chairman to answer that question.

"Mr. SEEGER. The same answer, sir, as before.

"Mr. SCHERER. Again I understand that you are not invoking the fifth amendment?

"Mr. SEEGER. That is correct.

"Mr. SCHERER. We are not accepting the answers or the reasons you gave.

"Mr. SEEGER. That is your prerogative, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do you understand it is the feeling of the committee that you are in contempt as a result of the position you take?

"Mr. SEEGER. I can't say.

"Mr. SCHERER. I am telling you that that is the position of the committee.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The Daily Worker of April 21, 1948, at page 7, contains a notice that Pete Seeger was a participant in an affair for Ferdinand Smith. Will you tell the committee what the occasion was at which you took part?

"Mr. SEEGER. I hate to waste the committee's time, but I think surely you must realize by now that my answer is the same.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Ferdinand Smith was under deportation orders at that time?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I think that he was not under deportation orders until a little later than that.

"Chairman WALTER. What is his name?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Ferdinand Smith, a Communist Party member and former vice president of the maritime union.

"My purpose in asking you these questions, Mr. Seeger, is to determine whether or not, in accordance with the plan of the Communist Party as outlined by Mr. Kazan and Mr. George Hall, you were performing a valuable service to the Communist Party, and if that was the way they attempted to use you.

"Mr. SEEGER. Is that a question, sir?

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is my explanation to you, with the hope that you will give the committee some light on that subject.

"Mr. SEEGER. No; my answer is the same as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also perform and entertain at various functions held by front organizations such as the American Youth for Democracy? I have here photostatic copies of the Daily Worker indicating such programs were conducted in Detroit in 1952, at Greenwich Village, on May 10, 1947, and again at another place in March of 1948.

"Did you entertain at functions under the auspices of the American Youth for Democracy?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. The answer is the same, and I take it that you are not interested in all of the different places that I have sung, and why don't you ask me about the churches and schools and other places?

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is very laudable, indeed, and I wish only that your activities had been confined to those areas.

"If you were acting for the Communist Party at these functions, we want to know it. We want to determine just what the Communist Party plan was.

"Mr. SCHERER. Witness, you have indicated that you are perfectly willing to tell us about all of these innumerable functions at which you entertained, but why do you refuse to tell us about the functions that Mr. Tavenner inquires about?

"Mr. SEEGER. No, sir; I said that I should be glad to tell you about all of the songs that I have sung, because I feel that the songs are the clearest explanation of what I do believe in, as a musician, and as an American.

"Mr. SCHERER. Didn't you just say that you sang before various religious groups, school groups?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have said it and I will say it again, and I have sung for perhaps——

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. You are willing to tell us about those groups?

"Mr. SEEGER. I am saying voluntarily that I have sung for almost every religious group in the country, from Jewish and Catholic, and Presbyterian and Holy Rollers and Revival Churches, and I do this voluntarily. I have sung for so many, many different groups, and it is hard for perhaps one person to believe, I was looking back over the 20 years or so that I have sung around these 48 States, that I have sung in so many different places.

"Mr. SCHERER. Did you sing before the groups that Mr. Tavenner asked you about?

"Mr. SEEGER. I am saying that my answer is the same as before. I have told you that I sung for everybody.

"Chairman WALTER. Wait a minute. You sung for everybody. Then are we to believe, or to take it that you sang at the places Mr. Tavenner mentioned?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Chairman WALTER. What is that?

"Mr. SEEGER. It seems to me like the third time I have said it, if not the fourth.

"Chairman WALTER. Maybe it is the fifth, but say it again, and I want to know what your answer is.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. I decline to discuss, under compulsion, where I have sung, and who has sung my songs, that I have helped to write as well as to sing them, and who else has sung with me, and the people I have known. I love my country very dearly and I greatly resent this implication that because some of the places that I have sung and some of the people that I have known, and some of my opinions, whether they are religious or philosophical, or I might be a vegetarian, making me any less of an American. I will tell you about my songs, but I am not interested in telling you who wrote them and I will tell you about my songs, and I am not interested in who listened to them.

"Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker there was a conference program of the Civil Rights Congress on April 2, 1949, at which you were one of the performers.

"On August 27, 1949, the People's Artists presented a summer musicale at Lakeland Acres picnic grounds, Peekskill, N. Y., for the benefit of the Harlem chapter of the Civil Rights Congress, at which you were a participant.

"At another meeting of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, around May 11, 1946, you were a participant.

"Will you tell the committee, please, under what circumstances you performed, because you have said that you sang at all sorts of meetings, and now under what circumstances were your services acquired on those occasions?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir. I can only infer from your lack of interest in my songs that you are actually scared to know what these songs are like, because there is nothing wrong with my songs, sir. Do you know——

"Mr. SCHERER. You said you want to talk about your songs, and I will give you an opportunity. Tell us what songs you sang at Communist Party meetings?

"Mr. SEEGER. I will tell you about the songs that I have sung anyplace.

"Mr. SCHERER. I want to know the ones that you sang at Communist Party meetings, because those are the songs about which we can inquire. Just tell us one song that you sang at a Communist Party meeting.

"Mr. SEEGER. Mr. SCHERER, it seems to me that you heard my testimony, and that is a ridiculous question, because you know what my answer is.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. George Hall testified that the entertainment that he engaged in at the instance of the Communist Party, and for the Communist Party were not songs of a political character. He did say, however, that he was expected by the Communist Party to perform in order to raise money for the Communist Party.

"Now, did you, as Mr. Hall did, perform in order to raise money for Communist Party causes?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. I don't care what Mr. Hall says, and my answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That you refuse to answer?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have given my answer.

"Mr. SCHERER. Was Mr. Hall telling the truth when he told the committee about the entertainment he engaged in at the instance of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SEEGER. I don't feel like discussing what Mr. Hall said.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The American Committee for Yugoslav Relief has been designated as a front organization. According to the October 22, 1947, issue of the Daily People's World, in California, Pete Seeger headed the list of entertainers to appear at a picnic given by the southern California chapter of that organization.

"Did you participate in that program?

"Mr. SEEGER. If you have 100 more photostats there, it seems silly for me to give you the same answer 100 more times.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your answer?

"Mr. SEEGER. It is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. There are various peace groups in the country which have utilized your services, are there not?

"Mr. SEEGER. I have sung for pacifists and I have sung for soldiers.

"Mr. TAVENNER. According to the Daily Worker of September 6, 1940, you were scheduled as a singer at a mass meeting of American Peace Mobilization at Turner's Arena, in Washington, D. C.

"What were the circumstances under which you were requested to take part in that performance?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You were a member of the American Peace Mobilization, were you not?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you not a delegate to the Chicago convention of the American Peace Mobilization on September 5, 1940?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Chairman WALTER. Is that organization subversive?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

"Chairman WALTER. What is the name of it?

"Mr. TAVENNER. American Peace Mobilization, and it was the beginning of these peace organizations back in 1940.

"Did you take part in the American Peace Crusade program in Chicago, in April of 1954?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Of course, I would be curious to know what you think of a song like this very great Negro spiritual, I'm Gonna Lay Down My Sword and Shield, Down by the Riverside.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is not at all responsive to my question.

"Mr. SEEGER. I gave you my answer before I even said that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. If you refuse to answer, I think that you should not make a speech.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also perform a service for the California Labor School in Los Angeles by putting on musical programs there?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you teach in the California Labor School?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think for the record you should state whether the California Labor School has been cited.

"Mr. TAVENNER. It has.

"Mr. SCHERER. As subversive and Communist dominated?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, it has been.

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also teach at the Jefferson School of Social Science here in the city of New York?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct him to answer.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer. Did you teach at the Jefferson School here at New York?

"Mr. SEEGER. I feel very silly having to repeat the same thing over and over again, but my answer is exactly the same as before, sir.

"Chairman WALTER. Has the Jefferson School of Social Science been cited?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, and it has been required to register under the 1950 Internal Security Act.

"Mr. SCHERER. There are a number of people here who taught at that school, Mr. Walter.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer in evidence a photostatic copy of an article from the September 21, 1946, issue of the Daily Worker which refers to music courses at Jefferson School, and I call attention to the last sentence in the article wherein the name Peter Seeger is mentioned as a leader in one of the courses.

"I ask that it be marked 'Seeger Exhibit No. 7.'

"Chairman WALTER. It is received and so marked.

"Why don't you insert it in the record at this point, because there can be no objection to inserting it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I insert it in the record at this point:

"'SEEGER EXHIBIT NO. 7

"'[Daily Worker, New York, Saturday, September 21, 1946]

"'*Music courses at Jefferson School*

"'Three new courses in music will be offered by the Jefferson School of Social Science, 575 Avenue of the Americas, for the fall term beginning September 30.

"'The music of Beethoven, a series of 10 Tuesday evening forums, with records and discussions, of representative works of the great creative epochs of Beethoven's life, will be led by Irwin Freundlich. Mr. Freundlich is on the faculty of the Juilliard School of Music.

"'Horace Grenell, president of Young People's Records, will lead a workshop course in Creating Music.

"'A People's Songs Workshop, under the supervision of Waldemar Hille, former professor of music at Elmhurst College, will offer practical sessions in writing new songs and in selecting and editing songs for publication. The workshop leaders will include Herbert Haufrecht, Peter Seeger, Lee Hayes, and others.'

"According to the March 18, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker, it is indicated that you would entertain at a musical presented by the Jefferson Workers Book Shop. According to the November 25, 1948, issue of the same paper you would perform also under the auspices of the Jefferson School of Social Science. Also you were a participant in a program advertised in the Daily Worker of June 1, 1950, put on by the Jefferson School of Social Science, and according to an issue of February 15, 1954, of the same paper, you were expected to play and lecture on songs and ballads in the Jefferson School.

"Will you tell the committee, please, what were the circumstances under which you engaged in those programs, if you did?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you also engage in performances for the Labor Youth League in 1954?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before. Do you think that I sing propaganda songs or something?

"Mr. TAVENNER. In 1947, what was your connection with an organization known as People's Songs?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. I take the same answer as before regarding any organization or any association I have.

"Chairman WALTER. What was People's Songs, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. People's Songs was an organization which, according to its issue of February and March 1947, was composed of a number of persons on the board of directors who have been called before this committee or identified by this committee as members of the Communist Party, and the purpose of which, from information made available to the committee, was to extend services to the Communist Party in its entertainment projects.

"Mr. Lee Hays was a member of the board of directors, was he not, along with you, in this organization?

"(Witness consulted with counsel.)

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you not the editor of People's Songs, and a member of the board of directors in 1947?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You were actually the national director of this organization, were you not?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was the organization founded by Alan Lomax?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was the booking agent of People's Songs, an organization known as People's Artists?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee please whether or not during the weekend of July 4, 1955, you were a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the various entertainment features in which you were alleged to have engaged?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask for a direction on that question.

"Chairman WALTER. I direct you to answer.

"Mr. SEEGER. My answer is the same as before.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

"Chairman WALTER. The witness is excused.

"The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

"(The committee thereupon recessed at 12:40 p. m., to reconvene at 2 p. m., the same day.)"

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Peter Seeger relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"May I ask whether or not the Allerton Section was a section of the Communist Party?

"Did you take part in this May Day program under the auspices of the music section of the cultural division of the Communist Party?

"Did you sing this particular song on the Fourth of July at Wingdale Lodge in New York?

"Were you chosen by Mr. Elliott Sullivan to take part in the program on the weekend of July Fourth at Wingdale Lodge?

"Did you take part in that performance?

"Have you been a member of the Communist Party since 1947?

"Will you examine it please and state whether or not that is a photograph of you?

"It is noted that the individual mentioned is wearing a military uniform. That was in May of 1952, and the statute of limitations would have run by now as to any offense for the improper wearing of the uniform, and will you tell the committee whether or not you took part in that May Day program wearing a uniform of an American soldier?

"Did you also teach at the Jefferson School of Social Science here in the city of New York?

"Are you a member of the Communist Party now?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 636) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Peter Seeger to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the southern district of New York, to the end that the said Peter Seeger may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Peter Seeger was asked a number of questions concerning his activities in the Communist movement and concerning his connection with a Communist school in which the committee felt that he was an instructor. He was also questioned regarding his activities at Wingdale Lodge, a summer camp in New York. He refused to answer any of these questions but did not invoke the fifth amendment.

On the contrary, he specifically stated that he was not relying on the fifth amendment but that he just did not feel that the committee had any right to pry into his personal affairs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST OTTO NATHAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 2921).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST OTTO NATHAN

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena duces tecum to Otto Nathan, 55 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. The said subpena duces tecum directed Otto Nathan to be and appear before said Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, on Tuesday, May 29, 1956, at the hour of 10 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee, and to produce any, and/or all, United States passports issued to him by the Secretary of State, United States Department of State, Washington, D. C., or by any agent, agency, division, or bureau of the Secretary of State or the Department of State and received for the purpose of, or used to, travel outside the continental limits of the United States. The said subpena duces tecum served upon the said Otto Nathan is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To Dr. OTTO NATHAN, *Greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Tuesday, May 29, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"You are hereby commanded to bring with you and produce before said committee, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, the following: and he is to produce any, and/or all, United States passports issued to him by the Secretary of State, United States Department of State, Washington, D. C., or by any agent, agency, division, or bureau of the Secretary of State or the Department of State and received for the purpose of, or used to, travel outside the continental limits of the United States.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To Frank Bonora or R. T. Collins, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 7th day of May, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena duces tecum was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Ray T. Collins, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena duces tecum. The return of the service by the said Ray T. Collins being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Dr. Otto Nathan, before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

"I made service of the within subpena by personal service on the within-named Dr. Otto Nathan, 55 East 10th Street, New York City, N. Y., at 11:25 o'clock a. m., on the 10th day of May, 1956.

"Dated 10 May, 1956.

"RAY T. COLLINS."

On May 28, 1956, the following telegram was sent to Dr. Otto Nathan which is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 28, 1956.*

Personal report delivered.

Dr. OTTO NATHAN,
55 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.:

Under continuing authority of subpena served upon you May 10, your appearance before Committee on Un-American Activities is hereby postponed from May 29 to Tuesday, June 12, 1956, 10 o'clock a. m.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, *Chairman.*

The said Otto Nathan, pursuant to the said subpena and said telegraphic communication, appeared before a subcommittee of said Committee on Un-American Activities, on the 12th day of June 1956, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said Otto Nathan having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely:

"Now, forgetting any question respecting any beliefs or any associations, tell us now whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party.

"Was that affidavit true or was it false?

"Now, you are identified, or have you been identified, with the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

"Do you know a person by the name of Mary Price?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer such questions, and as a result of the said Otto Nathan's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena duces tecum served upon said Otto Nathan.

The record of the proceedings before the said subcommittee on June 12, 1956, during which the said Otto Nathan refused to answer the aforesaid questions, is set forth as follows:

(A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Representatives FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, CLYDE DOYLE, BERNARD W. KEARNEY, and GORDON H. SCHERER, met in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday, June 12, 1956, and hearings were conducted by the said subcommittee during that day, Otto Nathan being called as the last witness.)

Mr. ARENS. Otto Nathan, please.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. NATHAN. I do.

"TESTIMONY OF OTTO NATHAN, 55 EAST 10TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y., ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, LEONARD BOUDIN, 25 BROAD STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y., AND DAVID J. LEVY, OF MAASS, DAVIDSON, LEVY, FRIEDMAN & WESTON, 100 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

"Mr. ARENS. Kindly identify yourself, sir, by name, residence, and occupation.

"Mr. NATHAN. Otto Nathan, 55 East 10th Street, New York City, associate professor of economics, New York University.

"Mr. ARENS. You are appearing today, Doctor, in response to a subpena which was served upon you by the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir; but, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state here for the record that I have not been informed of the purpose of the present investigation and on the scope of my testimony.

"My counsel has requested, by letter of May 14, 1956, and repeatedly afterwards, to be advised as to the nature and purpose of the inquiry and the bills under consideration, but we have had no reply up to date. There has been no reply up to date.

"Mr. ARENS. Are you represented by counsel today?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes; I am.

"Mr. ARENS. Identify yourselves, counsel, please.

"Mr. BOUDIN. There are two counsels, Leonard B. Boudin, of 25 Broad Street, one of Dr. Nathan's counsel.

"Mr. LEVY. I am David J. Levy, a member of the law firm of Maass, Davidson, Levy, Friedman & Weston, 100 Park Avenue, New York City, counsel for the estate of Albert Einstein, of which Dr. Nathan is executor and cotrustee.

"Mr. ARENS. Does your subpena require you to produce certain documents, Doctor?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you have those documents with you?

"Mr. NATHAN. I have the passport here, Mr. Counsel.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you have another document, the new passport?

"Mr. NATHAN. I have the new passport here, but I am not willing to hand it over to the committee.

"Mr. ARENS. May I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this witness be at this time ordered and directed to transmit physical custody of this document to the committee?

"The CHAIRMAN. You were subpenaed to produce certain documents?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Documents you have with you and you are directed to deliver them over to the committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena duces tecum.

"(Representative KEARNEY left the hearing room.)

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to disclose everything in the passport, to read it into the record, everything the passport shows and says, and counsel can supervise me while I am doing that.

"The CHAIRMAN. You have been directed to deliver the subpena.

"Mr. NATHAN. I beg your pardon.

"The CHAIRMAN. You have been directed to deliver the passport over to the committee.

"Mr. NATHAN. I have been directed to produce a passport, and I am producing it here and I am willing, Mr. Chairman.

"The CHAIRMAN. Give it to the counsel.

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't feel that I am able to give the passport to the committee upon advice of counsel. I should like to state the reasons for my unwillingness to hand the passport over to the committee.

"First, the passport represents physical evidence of my right to travel, which is a natural right of every American citizen as established by the United States Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia. This passport was granted me after 2½ years of delaying tactics by the State Department and only after successful litigation by me. I do not want to run the risk of again being without a passport and thereby being again limited in my movements.

"Secondly, I feel——

"The CHAIRMAN. You, of course, are not intimating that we are going to keep your passport, are you?

"Mr. NATHAN. I beg your pardon?

"The CHAIRMAN. You are not intimating that we are going to keep your passport?

"Mr. NATHAN. I don't know, Mr. Chairman. I learned from the newspaper that last week two witnesses which appeared here have not had their passports returned.

"The CHAIRMAN. They will get their passports, there is no question about that.

"Mr. ARENS. Where were you born?

"Mr. BOUDIN. The witness hasn't finished his statement, Mr. Arens.

"The CHAIRMAN. Why do you not file whatever your lawyer gave you?

"Mr. BOUDIN. It may be the committee may find this satisfactory.

"The CHAIRMAN. All right.

"Mr. NATHAN. The second point is that the committee cannot justify its demand, which is unauthorized and unlawful:

"The passport is not needed by the committee as evidence, because I am willing to read everything it shows into the record. The counsel on the committee may verify it as I do so.

"The subpena merely requires me to produce the passport, but the passport remains my property and cannot be taken away from me as long as I am willing to establish whatever it shows.

"The retention of the passport by the committee, however temporary, is unauthorized and, in addition, would be an unlawful and unreasonable seizure under the fourth amendment of the Constitution.

"The retention of the passport would not only be tantamount to suspension of my rights which it evidences, but would infringe upon the authority of the executive branch of the Government which issued it, and upon the judicial branch which ordered its issuance.

"Mr. Chairman, I would like to say once more that I am ready and willing to read into the record everything this passport shows and says and that counsel can verify me while I do so.

"I would also like to say that I should have liked to submit a photostatic copy of the passport to the committee, but I was advised by the photostaters in New York that they are not permitted to photograph passports of the United States.

"I have finished my statement.

"Mr. ARENS. Where were you born?

"Mr. NATHAN. I was born in B-i-n-g-e-n, Germany.

"Mr. ARENS. When did you enter the United States?

"Mr. NATHAN. I entered the United States the first time late in September 1930. I don't know the exact date. I think it was the 30th of September 1930.

"Mr. ARENS. Are you a naturalized citizen?

"Mr. NATHAN. I am a naturalized citizen.

"Mr. ARENS. When were you naturalized?

"Mr. NATHAN. Exactly 17 years ago today on June 12, 1939, in the southern district of New York, and I would like to say I am very proud to be an American citizen. I was proud of it the day I was naturalized. I became a citizen after I acquainted myself with the United States and after I had been a teacher here at several universities and having become well acquainted with what it means to be an American citizen.

"I became an American citizen because I wanted to; I was not born an American citizen. I was always proud to be an American citizen, to fight for the values and the ideals which the United States and the American people have always been guided by.

"Mr. ARENS. Have you ever received a United States passport?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes, sir; I have received a United States passport.

"Mr. ARENS. Let us take the chronology of the passports which you have received. When did you receive your first passport?

"Mr. NATHAN. In 1939.

"Mr. ARENS. Where did you go on that passport?

"Mr. NATHAN. I went to Europe.

* * * * *

"Mr. ARENS. And then, since you made that trip, have you made application for still another passport?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes; I made an application for another passport in December 1952.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, in the course of the proceedings in your application for a passport, did you have an interview with the officials of the Department of State?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes; I did.

"Mr. ARENS. During the course of that interview, were you interrogated as to whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. Yes; I was. I was interrogated.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you answer the questions?

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Counsel——

"Mr. ARENS. Just a moment, please, sir. Did you answer the questions propounded to you by the officials of the Department of State as to whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Counsel, I think you know the answer. The answer is in the records which were deposited with the State Department and with the district court in the District of Columbia and with the court of appeals in the District of Columbia.

"Mr. ARENS. Would you answer the question that is outstanding on this record now?

"Mr. NATHAN. There is no need for me to answer that question again.

"Mr. ARENS. Answer it.

"Mr. NATHAN. I don't see any need for answering it.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question.

"The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. BOUDIN. Repeat the question.

"Mr. ARENS. The essence of the question is: During the conferences with the officials of the Department of State in the process of your trying to procure a passport, were you interrogated as to whether or not you are or have been a member of the Communist Party?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. NATHAN. Would you repeat the question, please, Mr. Counsel?

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, this is the third time right here in a row.

"When you were interrogated by the officials of the Department of State, did they ask you whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. I think I said before that they did ask me.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you refuse to answer the question as to whether or not you had been a member of the Communist Party?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. NATHAN. I did not refuse to answer.

"Mr. ARENS. What did you say?

"Mr. NATHAN. I submitted an affidavit.

"Mr. ARENS. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement here concerning the questions about my political beliefs, as well as about my political and private associations.

"First, I believe that under the first, fourth, and ninth amendments to the Constitution this committee has not the right to inquire into the political beliefs or political and private associations of Americans.

"Secondly, I further believe that any question about my political beliefs or political and private associations is not within the jurisdiction of this committee or pertinent to the purpose of the present investigation by the committee.

"Thirdly, although my political beliefs and associations have been widely known for many years and also I have always believed in stating them publicly at any time and place of my own choosing, among others in the court of appeals in Washington, I am for the reasons stated above not able as a matter of conscience and principle to answer any questions by this committee as to my political beliefs or political and private associations.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, forgetting any question respecting any beliefs or any associations, tell us now whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. NATHAN. With reference to the statement which I have just presented to the committee, I refuse to answer that question.

"The CHAIRMAN. I direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. NATHAN. I refuse to answer in view of the statement which I have just read.

"Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say that we do not accept his answer.

"Mr. ARENS. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. In view of the statement which I have just read, I am not able and not willing to make any statement about my political beliefs and associations.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. NATHAN. I have said a moment ago that I have had great pride in becoming an American citizen 17 years ago today. Before I became an American citizen——

"The CHAIRMAN. You are so proud of being an American citizen, why do you not answer these simple questions?

"Mr. NATHAN. Because I feel it is an infringement of my first amendment rights, Mr. Chairman. I have stated many times what my political beliefs are at times and places of my own choosing and I do not feel your committee has the right to ask me those questions.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then I understand that in refusing to answer the question, you are not relying on the fifth amendment?

"Mr. NATHAN. No, I am not relying on the fifth amendment. I am relying on the first, fourth, and ninth amendments.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, I lay before you a photostatic copy of an affidavit:

" 'STATE OF NEW YORK,

" *'County of New York, ss:*

" 'Otto Nathan, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

" 'I am not now and never have been a member of the Communist Party.

" 'Sworn to before me the 20th day of April 1953.'

"I ask you if that is your signature appended to that affidavit?

"Mr. NATHAN. Sir, I am unable to verify here a photostat which you submit to me without showing me the original.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you make an affidavit on April 20, 1953?

"Mr. NATHAN. I answered that question before, Mr. Counsel, that I submitted an affidavit to the State Department. There is no need to ask me that question a second time.

"Mr. ARENS. Wait just a second.

"Did you submit an affidavit to the Department of State under date of April 20, 1953, reading as follows: 'I am not now and never have been a member of the Communist Party'?

"Mr. NATHAN. I don't recall the date but I have made that statement.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you make it available to the Department of State?

"Mr. BOUDIN. Would you mind not pounding on the table?

"Mr. ARENS. I do not mean to reflect any discourtesy, Counsel. Counsel's comments are snide and he is not reflecting credit upon the bar. Did you at any time in April of 1953 submit an affidavit to the Department of State that you were not and have never been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. First of all, Mr. Counsel, it's not necessary that you raise your voice when you speak to me.

"Secondly, I have not understood the question, and I would like to have it repeated.

"Mr. ARENS. I will repeat it the third time. Did you submit an affidavit to the Department of State in April of 1953, that you were not and had never been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. NATHAN. I do not know, Mr. Counsel, why you repeat asking me the question. I answered it twice before in the affirmative.

"Mr. ARENS. Was that affidavit true or was it false?

"Mr. NATHAN. I resent that question, Mr. Counsel.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Answer the question.

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Chairman, I resent the implications that I have made a statement under oath which should not be correct. I refuse to answer. I think there is a limit beyond which counsel may not be permitted to go.

"I stand here on the record of 63 years. Nobody has ever suggested that a statement which I have made under oath was not correct.

"Mr. SCHERER. Was it correct? You can say now.

"Mr. NATHAN. No, I am not going to answer that question now, Mr. Congressman.

"Mr. ARENS. In 1948——

"Mr. NATHAN. I would very much like the chairman to ask the counsel not to ask such insulting questions.

"Mr. ARENS. If the affidavit was truthful——

"Mr. NATHAN. I don't want to be insulted by you, Mr. Counsel. In any law court of the United States a sworn affidavit is taken as truthful until proven to the contrary. Do you have proof that it's not true?

* * * * *

"Mr. ARENS. Now, are you identified, or have you been identified, with the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

"Mr. NATHAN. I said before, Mr. Counsel, that I do not intend to make any kind of statements about my political and private associations. I don't want to make any statements about that.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the witness be ordered and directed to answer that question.

"The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

"Mr. NATHAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement which I read before, I do not intend to make here today before this committee any statement about my political or private associations because I do not feel that the committee under the first, fourth, and ninth amendments has the right to inquire into those associations.

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you refuse to answer the question for the reasons given before?

"Mr. NATHAN. For reasons which I have stated before.

"Mr. ARENS. Now I lay before you a photostatic copy of a program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, bearing a list of a number of sponsors, including a person identified here as Dr. Otto Nathan, and ask you whether or not you are that person?

"Mr. NATHAN. I am one of the five or six hundred sponsors of that conference; yes, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you know a person by the name of Mary Price?

"Mr. NATHAN. Sir, I do not intend to make any statements about my private associations.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that he be directed to answer.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a Mary Price?

"Mr. NATHAN. I just said, Mr. Chairman, that I do not feel that I should make any statements about my private acquaintances and associations.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are not being asked anything except whether or not you know this person.

"Mr. NATHAN. I refuse to answer that question in view of the statement which I made before."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Otto Nathan, relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely:

"Now, forgetting any question respecting any beliefs or any associations, tell us now whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party.

"Was that affidavit true or was it false?

"Now, are you identified, or have you been identified, with the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

"Do you know a person by the name of Mary Price?"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena duces tecum under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. I offer a resolution (H. Res. 637) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Otto Nathan to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Otto Nathan may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Otto Nathan was interrogated concerning his membership in Communist organizations as well as his activities in the National Council for Arts, Sciences and Professions. He was also questioned regarding his acquaintanceship with Mary Price. He refused to answer pertinent questions asked him. He did not rely upon the fifth amendment but stated that the questions that we asked him were not pertinent to the investigation. He chose to decide what was pertinent to our inquiry, and in so doing I am sure placed himself in contempt. He refused to answer the pertinent questions that were propounded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the gentleman agree with me that in voting on these resolutions all of us who are here should be very careful to vote audibly, if we do not have a rollcall?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The fact is that under the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] that the Supreme Court presumes that there is no quorum unless a quorum is established as a fact, regardless of our rules, as to every one of these resolutions we have passed with the exception of the first one, we cannot say there was a quorum present.

Mr. WALTER. I do not agree with the gentleman. I am sure that having established a quorum it is presumed now that a quorum is present.

Mr. MASON. Look around and count a quorum.

Mr. WALTER. I could count a quorum, I will say, and the Speaker has so ruled.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Speaker agree with the gentleman from New York that it is very important that all Members vote audibly on these resolutions?

The SPEAKER. The Chair always assumes that a quorum is present, unless upon counting it is established a quorum is not present. Otherwise every bill we pass except by rollcall vote could be challenged. That would be my decision, notwithstanding anything that might happen in any other place in the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the ruling of the Chair, in view of the statement made here a short while ago that this particular case will be ruled out unless the fact is established, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ARTHUR MILLER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 2922).

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ARTHUR MILLER

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Arthur Miller. The said subpena directed Arthur Miller to be

and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, on Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 10 a. m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon the said Arthur Miller is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

"To ARTHUR MILLER, *Greeting:*

"Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly appointed subcommittee thereof, on Thursday, June 14, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m., at their committee room, 226 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

"To William A. Wheeler, to serve and return.

"Given under my hand this 1st day of June, in the year of our Lord, 1956.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Chairman."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by William A. Wheeler, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said William A. Wheeler being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Subpena for Arthur Miller before the Committee on Un-American Activities. I made service of the within subpena by personal service on the within-named Arthur Miller, at Reno, Nev., First National Bank Building, 15 First Street, at 3:30 o'clock p. m., on the 8th day of June 1956.

"Dated June 8, 1956.

"WILLIAM A. WHEELER."

Prior to June 11, 1956, Mr. Lloyd K. Garrison, attorney for Arthur Miller, requested by long-distance telephone message, a postponement of the hearing as a matter of convenience to his client, which postponement was agreed to, after which the following letter was received by the committee:

JUNE 11, 1956.

Mr. RICHARD ARENS,
Director, House Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ARENS: This is to confirm our telephonic conversation in which you adjourned the appearance of our client, Mr. Arthur Miller, before the House committee from Thursday, June 14, to Thursday, June 21, at 10 a. m.

I am now trying to reach Mr. Miller in Reno to confirm this date. I have every reason to suppose that it will be feasible, but I will communicate with you definitely about this as soon as I have reached Mr. Miller, which should be some time today or tomorrow.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD K. GARRISON.

P. S.—Since I dictated this I have reached Mr. Miller and he has assured me that he will be present on June 21 at the appointed hour.

The said Arthur Miller, pursuant to the said subpena and the said letter from his attorney, and in compliance therewith, appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities on June 21, 1956, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said Arthur Miller having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely: "Can you tell us who was there when you walked into the room?

"Was Arnaud D'Usseau chairman of this meeting of Communist Party writers which took place in 1947 at which you were in attendance?" which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions, and as a result of said Arthur Miller's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of a subpena served upon said Arthur Miller.

The record of the proceedings, before the subcommittee on June 21, 1956, during which the said Arthur Miller refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry is set forth in fact as follows:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C.,
Thursday, June 21, 1956.

"The committee met at 10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in the caucus room of the House Office Building, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER (chairman of the committee) presiding.

"Present: Representatives WALTER, WILLIS, KEARNEY, and SCHERER.

"Present also: Richard Arens, staff director.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

"Let the record show that the chairman has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Representatives WILLIS, SCHERER, KEARNEY, and myself.

* * * * *

"Call your witness.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Arthur Miller?

"Will you kindly remain standing while the chairman administers the oath?

"The CHAIRMAN. Raise your right hand, please.

"Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. MILLER. I do.

"TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR MILLER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR.

"Mr. ARENS. Please identify yourself, sir, by name, residence, and occupation.

"Mr. MILLER. My name is Arthur Miller. I live in Roxbury, Conn. I am a playwright.

"Mr. ARENS. You are appearing today, Mr. Miller, in response to a subpena which was served upon you by the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

"Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

"Mr. ARENS. And you are represented by counsel?

"Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

"Mr. ARENS. Counsel, will you identify yourself?

"Mr.. RAUH. My name is Joseph L. Rauh, R-a-u-h, Jr.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Miller, please tell the committee where and when you were born?

"Mr. MILLER. I was born on October 17, 1915, in New York City.

"Mr. ARENS. And give us a word, please, sir, about your formal education.

"Mr. MILLER. I went to public schools in New York City, to James Madison High School, Abraham Lincoln High School, the University of Michigan. I have a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Michigan and an honorary doctor of humane letters.

* * * * *

"Mr. ARENS. Kindly tell the committee, Mr. Miller, the dates on which you at any time have made application for a United States passport.

"Mr. MILLER. I couldn't be exact about the first application because I don't have the information with me, but to the best of my recollection it would be in 1946, I believe. That is when I received the passport. I am reasonably certain of that.

"Mr. ARENS. Your application was in 1946 and did you then, pursuant to the application, receive a passport?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes; I did.

"Mr. ARENS. Now tell us about any renewal of that particular passport.

"Mr. MILLER. That passport was renewed in Rome. I am sorry, I have given the passport to the State Department in my recent applications so I don't have all this information at my fingertips.

* * * * *

"Mr. ARENS. You applied in 1946 for a passport which was issued to you in 1947?

"Mr. MILLER. I believe that is the case.

"Mr. ARENS. Then it was renewed pursuant to an application filed in Rome shortly thereafter, a couple of years thereafter.

"Mr. MILLER. Yes; a couple of years thereafter.

"Mr. ARENS. When was your next passport application, do you recall?

"Mr. MILLER. The next one was in March of 1954.

"Mr. ARENS. Was a passport issued to you pursuant to that application?

"Mr. MILLER. No; it was not.

"Mr. ARENS. Then did you take any action respecting the application after there was a declination to issue the passport in 1954?

"Mr. MILLER. I did not take any action afterward but I did take action; I made an approach to the State Department via my attorney. I think I could explain the circumstances which would make this——

"Mr. ARENS. You withdrew your passport application; did you not?

"Mr. MILLER. I had no further use for a passport.

"Mr. ARENS. Excuse me.

"Mr. MILLER. I am sorry. I was just going to say that the passport was required because I was invited to go to England, rather to Brussels, Belgium, by the American-Belgian Society, which is a society in Belgium for the enhancement of relations between the United States and Belgium and they offered to pay my transportation and my expenses from New York to Belgium for the opening of a stage theater production of one of my plays called Crucible.

"I got the cable on Monday evening. I returned the cable, saying that I would love to be there. I applied for renewal of my passport on the following day, which was Tuesday. I had to be in Brussels on the following Tuesday, that was the opening of the play, so consequently, and the Belgian Airlines do not run on Monday, so I would have had to have had a passport no later than Friday. Consequently, it was a big rush, it is an abnormally short time to ask for a passport and the week passed and I heard nothing from the State Department, so I instructed Mr. Garrison, my attorney, to call and find out whether I would have it that afternoon or not.

"This was sometime Friday afternoon and Mrs. Shipley, of the State Department, told Mr. Garrison that she could not issue one without further investigation. He then explained that the passport would be useless to me. I had no plans to go to Europe whatsoever except for this free trip which I wanted to take any time after that. That was the end of the conversation with the State Department.

"Mr. ARENS. Then do you have pending at the present time a passport application with the Department of State?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes; I do. I applied, I guess this is the fifth week now. I applied 4½ weeks ago. I wanted to go to England.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you in 1955 have an employment arrangement contemplated with the Youth Board down in New York City?

"Mr. MILLER. I had no employment arrangement with the Youth Board. I had an employment arrangement with an independent

motion-picture producing company called Combined Artists, Inc. My contract with Combined Artists, Inc., was to the effect that I engage myself to write the outline and the finished screen play of a motion picture on the subject of juvenile delinquency.

"Mr. ARENS. That was to be in conection with the activities or work of the Youth Board, was it not?

"Mr. MILLER. The Youth Board was to cooperate with me in the research which would be required for me to write this script.

"I ought to say that the city of New York, this was a kind of odd contract which I must confess to this day baffles me slightly. But the nature of the contract was, as I understand it, that the city of New York, in return for the cooperation which it would give me in just permitting me to go along with the Youth Board workers into the streets at night and the slum areas and learn what I could from the children, would get 5 percent of the moneys of this picture, which could be a sizable amount of money if successful, and would not spend 5 cents on the city's part and had no other obligation.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you in the course of your negotiations or relationships with the Youth Board in New York City have occasion to appear before the board to express to the board certain actions which you allegedly took in connection with a previous passport application?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you make that appearance before the Youth Board in November of 1955? Do you recall the approximate time?

"Mr. MILLER. It was about that time. I am not very good about dates but it was in that time; yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Was there a controversy that arose with respect to whether or not you should be permitted to continue with your labors in connection with this script?

"Mr. MILLER. There was an attack launched upon my political fitness to write a screen play by one newspaper; it began with one newspaper and remained with one newspaper, for quite a time.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, did you appear before the board and, among other things, say to the board in the course of the discussion substantially what I am now quoting from the minutes of the board? [Reading:]

" 'Finally, some 2 years ago, I issued a statement which was printed in the press in reply to a State Department statement, and in this I categorically denied that I am supporting the Communist cause or contributing to it or was under its discipline or domination.

" 'Furthermore, in my application at about the same time for renewal of my passport, I had signed under the penalties of perjury that statement that I was not a member of any subversive organizations. I cite these statements, which, of course, are still true because they are part of the public record and have been for a long time.'

"I ask you now, Mr. Miller, if you made the statement before the Youth Board which I have just read to you from the minutes of that board of November 29, 1955?

"Mr. MILLER. I believe you read it correctly; yes, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you in your passport application deny under oath that you had supported the Communist cause or contributed to it or were under its discipline or domination?

"Mr. MILLER. The oath that I referred to was the standard oath that I had taken some years before in my first application for a passport. My understanding of the oath was that I wouldn't have been foolish enough to have tried to mislead the New York City Youth Board by referring to an oath which everybody signs who gets a passport if I had not in this case mistakenly understood the oath years later.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Miller—I beg your pardon.

"Mr. MILLER. Just one thing. I was asked—I am not yet clear whether there were minutes of that meeting at which I was present—I was asked by the chairman of the Youth Board whether this was the standard oath that I was referring to or whether it was some special oath. I said, 'No, it was the standard oath.'

"Now, I would have had to be a singularly obtuse individual to have referred the gentleman to an oath which he could have found by going across the street to the Passport Bureau if I had any impulse there to mislead him.

"I understood at that time—it was my recollection at the time, and I certainly would have signed such an oath had it been there—that that was the common oath taken. Oaths are in newspapers very often now, and that was my understanding at the time.

"I am sorry I made an error. It was by no means any attempt to mislead anybody. It was just by faulty memory of what I had signed some years before.

"Mr. ARENS. I am a little puzzled. You say you are sorry you made an error. What error?

"Mr. MILLER. I mistook that kind of oath for the oath that anyone takes who signs a passport application. I was referring to the oath that I had signed when I had taken out my passport application some years earlier.

"Mr. ARENS. Now I lay before you the photostatic copy of a passport application signed by one Arthur Miller in 1947—April 1947—and ask you if that is a true and correct reproduction of the passport application which you signed in 1947 and submitted to the Department of State in an attempt to procure a passport?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes, it is.

"Mr. ARENS. Is this the document to which you were alluding in your conversation with the Youth Board when you told the Youth Board that you categorically denied to the State Department under oath that you had been supporting the Communist cause or contributing to it or were under its discipline or domination? Is that the document to which you were alluding in your statement before the Youth Board?

Mr. MILLER. I beg your pardon. There seems to be a slight misunderstanding. When my passport—if I might I could clear this up in a moment.

"When my passport was denied by the State Department, I issued a statement in reply to a public statement by the State Department in which I denied such affiliations. That was what I was referring to in that particular wording that you are speaking of.

"Mr. ARENS. Well, did you sign a statement under oath to the Department of State in the course of your attempt to procure a passport in 1947 in which you denied that you had ever been supporting the Communist cause or contributing to it or were under its discipline or domination?

"Mr. MILLER. The only statement I have ever signed in relation to the State Department is the oath here in this passport application.

Mr. ARENS. Now, do you see in that passport application there any oath which in essence is a denial of support of the Communist cause or contribution to it or being under its discipline or domination?

"Mr. MILLER. No, I do not. I have just tried to explain, sir, that that was an error on my part in referring to the oath as I did. I would in any case have signed such an oath had it been in the passport application, and I have just stated that I made an error and I made the error in all good faith because I would have been a very stupid man to have referred to a passport application, thinking that no one would have the sense to look at it. I thought that is what I had said.

"The CHAIRMAN. Answer the questions, Mr. Miller.

"Mr. MILLER. I am sorry.

"Mr. ARENS. Am I clear that your present statement is that as of 1947, when you made this passport application to the Department of State, you would have taken an oath that you had never supported the Communist cause or contributed to it or been under its discipline or domination?

"Mr. MILLER. I was referring here to 19—the second attempt to get a passport in that document.

"Mr. ARENS. Let us get this record clear now.

"Would you in 1947 have taken an oath, even though you are now mistaken as to whether or not you did take one—would you have taken an oath in 1947 that you had not contributed to the Communist cause, supported it, or been under its discipline?

"Mr. MILLER. I would have taken an oath that I was never under the discipline of the Communist Party, the Communist cause; yes. I would have made a statement that I had been affiliated from time to time with organizations that were cited as Communist-dominated organizations but I would have certainly taken an oath at any time in my life that I was never under the discipline of the Communist Party or the Communist cause.

"Mr. ARENS. And would you have then taken an oath that you had never contributed to the Communist cause?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, that question would involve the later citation of certain organizations which I may have contributed a dollar or two to in the past which would now be called contributing to the Communist cause.

"The CHAIRMAN. What organizations are you referring to?

"Mr. MILLER. I have none in particular in mind.

"The CHAIRMAN. You had organizations in mind when you made that statement.

"Mr. MILLER. Well, let me think.

"I understand the Joint Anti-Fascist Committee has been cited. I believe that from time to time I would contribute to some drive of theirs during and after the Spanish Civil War; that would be one.

"The CHAIRMAN. But that was not cited after this?

"Mr. MILLER. I say, he is asking me whether I could take such an oath and I don't know the date of these citations.

"The CHAIRMAN. You said these organizations were cited after the date of your application for passport?

"Mr. MILLER. It is possible, sir, that some of them were cited before. I don't want to make that, I don't want to lay up against this definition any such line. I am trying to tell you as frankly as I can what the truth is.

"(Representative DOYLE entered the hearing room.)

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Miller, is it a fair summary, and if it is not you take issue with me, because we do not want to misinterpret your situation, is it a fair summary to say that in 1955, when you appeared before the Youth Board and this controversy arose respecting what you have described as your political beliefs, that you told the Youth Board in essence that you had never contributed to the Communist cause, that you had never been under Communist discipline, and that you had made an oath to your Government to that effect when you made application for your passport?

"Mr. MILLER. No; I would contest that, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. You straighten us out as to what the position was that you took before the Youth Board when the controversy arose respecting yourself in 1955.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. I would like to refresh my memory with just a glance at my statement there so I could——

"Mr. ARENS. The part which I read to you is here. It has been underlined so that I

would be able to refer to it here in this session today.

"Mr. MILLER. I would just like to clear one think up and this, perhaps—no, I guess it isn't technical.

"There are two statements referred to here, I think reasonably clearly, although it may seem to be a little meshed together.

"It says here that—

"'Finally, some 2 years ago, I issued a statement which was printed in the press in reply to a State Department statement.'

"That is a press statement. I believe I have a copy here which you can look at if you don't have a copy of it, and in this I categorically denied that I was supporting the Communist cause or was contributing to it or was under its discipline or domination. That was in reply, that press statement, to a State Department statement which said, in effect, that the State Department was exercising its right to deny a passport to anyone who it was believed was then under the domination of the Communist Party, and so forth.

"In my statement to the press I said I was not, and that I was not supporting any Communist cause, and that is what that statement refers to.

"Now, in addition, following that, there is a reference to this oath which I would like to separate. One is in error, the other is not. The oath I mistook in my memory for being the kind of oath that you refer to.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you, in essence, say to the Youth Board that you were not and had not been under Communist Party discipline and that you had not contributed to the Communist Party?

"Mr. MILLER. I dispute that, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you admit to the Youth Board that you had been under Communist Party discipline and that you had been contributing to Communist causes?

"Mr. MILLER. I was never under Communist Party discipline so, therefore, I would not be called upon to admit.

"As for contributing to causes, front groups and so forth, I won't deny that. I am here to tell you the truth and I wouldn't deny it there.

"The issue there, quite clearly, was whether I was trustworthy enough to write a screen play on juvenile delinquency without warping the truth about this very grave problem. Now, I understood perfectly why they would be concerned about this; I would be, too.

"I tried to indicate with what I said to them that this would not be the case and they already had an outline of this picture which was not written under duress, was not written while I was under attack at all, I was perfectly calm and quiet. It had been written some weeks or months before and they had all their experts and they themselves had been very enthusiastic about this outline, so there was no question about warping the material. All I was trying to get across was that I was not then supporting any group that might indicate that I would warp this material or that would make me untrustworthy.

"Mr. ARENS. That was the essence of your position before the Youth Board; was it not?

"Mr. MILLER. Substantially.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, Mr. Miller, in 1947, the very year in which you made this passport application in which you stated to the Youth Board the fact that you had sworn to the Department of State you had never been enmeshed in Communist activities, were you a sponsor of the World Youth Festival to be held in Prague?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. I beg your pardon, sir. You are not correctly summarizing.

"Mr. ARENS. Well, I will read it to you again. You said on this record under oath that I gave a correct recitation of what you said. I will read it to you again.

"Mr. MILLER. Excuse me.

"Mr. ARENS. The statement made by you before the Youth Board was:

"'Finally, some 2 years ago, I issued a statement which was printed in the press in reply to a State Department statement and in this I categorially denied that I am supporting the Communist cause or contributing to it or was under its discipline or domination.'

"You signed that under oath.

"Did you make the statement which I have just read to you before the Youth Board in New York City in 1955?

"Mr. MILLER. I made the statement but I question your interpretation of it.

"Mr. ARENS. Aside from my interpretation, did you make that statement?

"Mr. MILLER. Without request.

"Mr. ARENS. All right.

"Now, in 1947, the year in which you made the application for your passport, and a passport was issued to you, were you a sponsor of the World Youth Festival held in Prague, Czechoslovakia?

"Mr. MILLER. Excuse me, sir. It is perhaps a misunderstanding on your part. The moot application in this controversy was the one that was denied. I was not either literally or in my mind referring to any other because this was the one that was being brought up in the press and this was the one that was at issue. There was no issue about the previous passports because they had been granted. This was the one that had not been granted and this was the one I was referring to.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, in 1947, were you a sponsor of the World Youth Festival to be held at Prague, Czechoslovakia?

"Mr. MILLER. I could not recall that, but if there is any evidence——

"Mr. ARENS. I should like to refrseh your recollection. I lay before you now a photostatic copy of the New York Times——

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. ARENS. Of May 25, 1947, entitled 'The Dance: Prague Festival.'

"'A movement, rather late in getting underway but vigorous, nevertheless, has been started to see that the American dance is represented at the World Youth Festival to be held in Prague from July 20 to August 17, under the auspices of the World Federation of Democratic Youth.'

"Among the sponsors listed here is a person described as Arthur Miller. I lay that before you and ask you if that helps refresh your recollection?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, I would add, of course, that there were a good many other——

"The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

"Mr. MILLER. Mr. Walter, as far as I know I have no memory of it but I would not deny that I had done this.

"Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest that this exhibit be marked and appropriately identified and incorporated by reference in the record.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 1' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. ARENS. Now, in 1947 did you have difficulty with the Department of State over an incident in which the Department of State refused to sponsor transportation for students and participants attending this World Youth Festival? Do you recall any incident of that character?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't, but I would like to say now that in those times I did support a number of things which I would not do now.

"The CHAIRMAN. What things did you support that you would not support now?

"Mr. MILLER. I would not support now a cause or movement which was dominated by Communists.

"The CHAIRMAN. But you did at that time?

"Mr. MILLER. I did, yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Now I lay before you this photostatic copy of the New York Times, Wednesday, June 11, 1947, entitled 'Miller Fails in Plea.'

"'Efforts to obtain financial assistance for the project to send Arthur Miller's play, All My Sons, to the Prague Youth Festival this summer proved disappointing at a meeting yesterday of theatrical business people and representatives of the company.'

"There is also in this article reference to an incident which I shall now describe by reading another excerpt from the article concerning a gathering.

"'The gathering adopted the following resolution, recommended by Mr. Miller, to be wired to the Department of State:

"'"Urge you seriously to reconsider refusal to sponsor availability of transportation for students and participants attending World Youth Festival in Prague this summer. To my knowledge the participants have no special political affiliations."'

"I lay that now before you and ask you whether that refreshes your recollection and ask you as to your participation in the incident?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. This is of a slightly special nature and I would like to make one comment about it.

"Mr. ARENS. Please do.

"Mr. MILLER. It does refresh my recollection.

"Somebody wanted to do my play. I didn't know who they were but I was always in favor of having my plays done. As I recall, there was no money to send them over and I wanted to do what I could to have that play sent over.

"This particular thing, I believe, was just in the normal course of an author's life. I would have done it if they had wanted it to go to Australia.

"Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this document be marked and appropriately identified and incorporated by reference in the record.

"The CHAIRMAN. It will be incorporated.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 2' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. ARENS. Did you in this year 1947 sign a statement released by the Civil Rights Congress which, among other things, reads as follows:

"'The Communist Party is a legal American political party. We see nothing in their program, record, or activities either in war or peace to justify the enactment of the repressive legislation now being urged upon the Congress in an atmosphere of an organized hysteria.'

"Do you have a recollection in April of 1947, under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, in participating in the release of that statement?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, I wouldn't say that I participated in the release.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you sign the statement?

"Mr. MILLER. Sir, I don't—these things were coming across my desk.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you the document now and see if it refreshes your recollection. It is the Communist Daily Worker of Wednesday, April 16, 1947, indicating that 100 prominent Americans had issued this statement, including a person described here as Arthur Miller. I lay that before you and ask you if that refreshes your rccollection.

"Mr. MILLER. I see my name here. I will not deny I signed it. I just don't have any recollection of it.

"Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this document be marked and appropriately identified and incorporated in the record by reference.

"The CHAIRMAN. So ordered.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 3' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. ARENS. Now I lay before you the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 20, 1947, the very year we are considering here.

"Mr. MILLER. I beg your pardon, sir. I wish to establish one fact. You say the year that we are now considering?

"Mr. ARENS. We are considering the year 1947.

"Mr. MILLER. I realize that you are doing that but I have stated twice now and I want to make myself clear that the Youth Board statement was referring to that issue which was the last application of mine, which was denied, and the oath there.

"Mr. ARENS. Since you took issue with me on that, let me read to you a statement which you made before the Youth Board pinpointing it specifically:

" 'My only point here is that these things have been a public record, I mentioned, a year and a half, but actually I received my first passport in 1946 and the same holds true on that passport.'

"Do you recall making that statement before the Youth Board when there was a declination respecting your alleged fitness or unfitness to participate in that work?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. I would have to see the context of that statement.

"Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly look at it?

"The CHAIRMAN. I respectfully suggest that the record shows that the transcript which he is now examining was supplied to this committee as a verbatim transcript by the Youth Board pursuant to a subpena which was issued on the board by the committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. All right.

"Mr. MILLER. What I was referring to here was the question of being under the discipline of any Communist movement. I think that was the issue in this whole debate here.

"Mr. ARENS. That is correct.

"Mr. MILLER. I said I was not under the discipline of the Communist Party.

"Mr. ARENS. You had not been in 1946 and 1947 and the years prior to the time you had the controversy with the Youth Board?

"Mr. MILLER. That I was not under anyone's discipline.

"Mr. ARENS. Yes.

"Mr. MILLER. I was not implying there that I had never signed any petition or been involved, as you are indicating here; that was not what I was saying.

"Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly look at an advertisement appearing in the Washington Post of May 1947, 'Rob Communists of Their Rights?—Then Yours Go Out the Window, Too.'

"It is an advertisement protesting the flagrant violation, punitive measures directed against the Communist Party, and signed by a number of persons, including one Arthur Miller, identified as a playwright.

"I ask you if you have a recollection of lending your name to that cause or movement?

"Mr. MILLER. I see my name here. I would not deny I might have signed it.

"Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest that document be marked and appropriately identified and incorporated by reference in the record.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let it be marked.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 4' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. ARENS. In 1947, were you cognizant of the proceedings then pending in this country against a Communist agent known as Gerhart Eisler?

"Mr. MILLER. I remember reading about him.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you sign a statement in protest of the prosecution of Gerhart Eisler?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't recall that, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now a press release of 1947 of the Civil Rights Congress protesting the shameful persecution of the German anti-Fascist refugee, Gerhart Eisler, signed by a number of persons, including a person identified as Arthur Miller, playwright. I ask you if that refreshes your recollection.

"Mr. MILLER. I recall this. I would like to say, though, that I did sign a lot of things in those days.

"The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute.

"Did you sign that or is that a press release?

"Mr. MILLER. Oh, no——

"Mr. ARENS. That is a press release, Mr. Chairman, indicating the names of people who signed it. He has now identified it, or at least admitted his signature to the press release.

"Mr. MILLER. I am not denying being the sponsor of many of these things.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you a passport application——

"Mr. MILLER. At the present time I would not be doing it; that is all. This is the only point I want to make.

"Mr. ARENS. We will go on up into the years in chronological order. We want to stick with 1947 now and then we will move up a little later.

"Now I lay before you the passport application of a person where the signature Samuel Lipzen appears but the photograph is that of Gerhart Eisler.

"Did you know at the time you signed that statement protesting the persecution of Gerhart Eisler that he was a top-ranking agent of the Kremlin in this country and that, among other things for which he was being pursued by our Government, was passport fraud?

"Mr. MILLER. Sir, I would have had no knowledge of that, and in those days I would not have had the mood of investigating these things at all. I tell you quite frankly, this suited the mood that I was in and I would never have gone to any trouble about investigating that kind of thing in relation to a cause.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you participate in a statement issued by the Civil Rights Congress with reference to Eisler?

" 'The hysterical atmosphere contrived around the case indicates that this incident involving a German Communist kept here against his will is intended as the initial phase of a sweeping attack upon the entire labor and progressive movement in the United States.'

"Do you recall issuing a statement in conjunction with others under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress in 1947 bearing on this case?

"Mr. MILLER. I would like to make another point and that is——

"Mr. ARENS. Answer first of all whether or not you have a recollection.

"Mr. MILLER. I don't recall it.

"Mr. ARENS. Look at this exhibit here and see whether or not it helps refresh your recollection.

"Mr. MILLER. My point is simple.

"Mr. ARENS. First tell us whether or not this refreshes your recollection, whether or not you recall participating in the issuance of that statement and then go on with your statement.

"Mr. MILLER. I do not recall participating in it. I do not deny I may have done it. I do not have a memory of these things. It is 10 years ago.

"I would just make this simple point, and that is that I would have had no knowledge of the details here and they would not have been of great interest to me at the time. I was acting not as an investigator or as a lawyer, as someone who would be careful to any great degree about what he was supporting providing that it met the mood of the time that I was living in.

"Mr. ARENS. We will get into that proposition a little later. I want to know whether or not you can tell us whether you have a recollection.

"Mr. MILLER. I do not.

"Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest that this be marked as an exhibit and appropriately identified and incorporated by reference in the record.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mark it a part of the record.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 5' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. ARENS. Did you during this period which we have been discussing, we are beginning in 1947 and coming on right up; did you during this period know a man by the name of Millard Lampell?

"Mr. MILLER. I did; yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Did Millard Lampell, to your knowledge, recollection, solicit you to participate in a movement called Veterans Against Discrimination of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. MILLER. I would not recall that, sir. I don't remember that.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you recall Millard Lampell enlisting you to join in the movement to attack the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

"Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you recall an attack on the House Committee on Un-American Activities in which you were a participant?

"Mr. MILLER. I would say that in all probability I had supported criticism of the Un-American Activities Committee.

"Mr. ARENS. Would you want to give us a little bit clearer characterization of what you mean by the word 'criticism' of the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

"Mr. MILLER. I probably would have signed statements opposing the committee.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you sign statements or lend your name, prestige and influence toward a movement to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities?

"Mr. MILLER. I have no memory of that.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now a photostatic copy of a letter on the letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress, Millard Lampell, chairman, who, as the record reflects, has been identified as a hard-core Communist, which says:

" 'The Un-American Committee can and must be abolished.'

"Among others, the sponsors include the name of one Arthur Miller. I ask you whether or not that refreshes your recollection as to any of your activities?

"Mr. MILLER. My connection with this organization was, well, I might as well answer your question.

"I would say yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this be marked and appropriately identified and incorporated by reference in the record.

"The CHAIRMAN. It will be marked.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 6' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. ARENS. Now I lay before you a copy of an announcement of a mobilization, a rally, mobilized against the House Un-American Activities Committee, held under the auspices of the Civil Rights Congress, in which 1, 2, 3, 6 people are to speak at Manhattan Center in New York City, 3 of whom have been publicly identified as Communist agents, including on this list of people who are to speak at this rally to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities, one Arthur Miller.

"I ask you whether or not you are the Arthur Miller and whether or not you have a recollection of participating in that rally?

"Mr. MILLER. I am not clear whether I was a speaker or not.

"Mr. ARENS. The advertisement would so indicate, would it not?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, I have found that more than once there was a slight use of license, so to speak, and I found myself listed as a speaker many times, or several times at least. I recall people saying to me that I had made a speech somewhere some weeks ago and I would say, 'Where?' I had been a sponsor of something but I had not made a speech.

"I don't recall making that speech. It is quite probable that I supported it.

"Mr. ARENS. I respectfully suggest that the document be marked, appropriately identified, and incorporated by reference.

"The CHAIRMAN. It may be marked.

"(The document was marked 'Exhibit No. 7' and filed for the record.)

"Mr. DOYLE. May I ask what year that is, counsel?

"Mr. ARENS. 1947.

"Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Miller, on the use of your name on these various organizations that held rallies where your name is listed as a speaker, did you ever make any protest against the use of your name?

"Mr. MILLER. I would occasionally; yes. I would try to find whoever was responsible, which was not always easy. It was always after the fact, of course, and there was no way for me to redress the thing. I did make remonstrances.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you remonstrate the use of your name appearing in the public print in connection with a public caravan to come to Washington to protest the hearings by the House Un-American Activities Committee in which they were exposing Communists in Hollywood?

"Mr. MILLER. No; I would not have protested that. I was supporting that.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you participate in the caravan?

"Mr. MILLER. No; I did not.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you recall participating in a movement to defend Howard Fast?

"Mr. MILLER. If I can see the material?

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now a photostatic copy of a dodger of a protest meeting for Howard Fast 'and other victims' of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, signed by approximately a dozen people that are called to action here, including a person listed as Arthur Miller, and ask you whether or not you are the Arthur Miller?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes, and I would like to be permitted to make one comment.

"Mr. ARENS. We would be very glad to have you do so.

"Mr. MILLER. That was my opinion at the time. It did reflect my opinion that in my experience I know really very little about anything except my work and my field, and it seemed to me that the then prevalent, rather ceaseless, investigating of artists was creating a pall of apprehension and fear among all kinds of people.

"The CHAIRMAN. But did you know that those very artists were the chief source of supply for the funds that were used by the Communists in the United States? Did you know that when you were defending these people that they were the people who contributed thousands of dollars monthly in order to assist in the organization of labor unions that were Communist dominated?

"Did you know that?

"Mr. MILLER. Mr. WALTER, I will tell you——

"The CHAIRMAN. Or did you not care?

"Mr. MILLER. Quite frankly, that was not the consideration in my mind. The consideration in my mind was that, as far as I could see, there was a distinct pall of apprehension and fear. People were being put into a state of great apprehension and they were——

"The CHAIRMAN. Apprehension of what, Mr. Miller?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, in some cases just punishment and in some cases unjust punishment.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any artist who was prosecuted as a result of any information obtained from these hearings who was not a member of the Communist apparatus?

"Mr. MILLER. Quite frankly, sir, that wouldn't have been the issue in my mind, if you are asking me to tell you the truth.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are talking about the issue in your mind and, in view of the fact that you have raised this question repeatedly about your mood, your mind, may I ask you if you changed your mind since the revelations concerning Mr. Stalin have been made?

"Mr. MILLER. My mind was, I have been in—let me put it this way:

"I suppose that a year has not gone by that I have not altered my opinions or beliefs or approach to life, and long before that I had shifted my views as to my relations or my attitude toward Marxism and toward communism.

"The CHAIRMAN. When did you change your views about Marxism?

"Mr. MILLER. This is not, I was not, a Saul of Tarsus walking down a road and struck by a bright light. It was a slow process that occurred over years of really through my own work and through my own efforts to understand myself and what I was trying to do in the world.

"The CHAIRMAN. This is very interesting to me because within the last few hours there came to my office a very prominent lawyer who told me of a number of performers who had invoked the fifth amendment, and they did it largely because they did not want to be placed in the position of being an informer, but he said that there now has come to them an appreciation that the greatest informer in the world is the man who now speaks for the Communists, namely, Mr. Khrushchev. It was a very interesting thing, and he said that six of these performers now want to come before our committee and testify, people who invoked the fifth amendment.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Miller, this mood that you are talking about to defend people in the arts did not strike you apparently in 1945 with reference to Ezra Pound, did it?

"Mr. MILLER. I was very troubled by Ezra Pound's condition and to this day I think it is a tragic fact and I could not tell you right now in any cogent way what I think should have been done with Ezra Pound.

"My instinctive feeling is that he should have been let alone.

"Mr. ARENS. You must have changed your mind then since 1945; did you not?

"Mr. MILLER. I probably did, yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Let us clear the record.

"Who was Ezra Pound?

"Mr. MILLER. Who is Ezra Pound?

"Mr. ARENS. Who was he?

"Mr. MILLER. Ezra Pound is one of the great poets of this century.

"Mr. ARENS. And you, in effect, said in that statement which appeared in New Masses that he ought to be shot; did you not?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't recall such a statement.

"Mr. ARENS. Well, let me read it to you.

"Mr. MILLER. By the way, you didn't permit me to finish my statement.

"Mr. ARENS. I beg your pardon; go right ahead.

"Mr. MILLER. It happened one night I had bought a new radio during the war and I had a shortwave set and I turned on the shortwave and there was a voice which I had never heard but which spoke perfectly good American advocating the destruction of the Jewish people and justifying the cremation of Jews, and I was quite astonished because it was such a common American accent, and I waited to the end, and it was being broadcast from Italy, and it was Ezra Pound.

"I think I can be forgiven for feeling slightly perturbed about this man, but I will say now, despite that, it is a difficult and hard issue to settle, and I think it's a tragic one and sometimes there are no easy answers.

"Mr. ARENS. Ezra Pound was a poet who, during the war, was issuing statements and was writing plays and issuing poems which were anti-Communist and which were against the interests at that time of the United States of America.

"Is that not the essence of what he did? He was a propagandist, a writer; was he not?

"Mr. MILLER. Excuse me, sir. I had never had any knowledge of Ezra Pound's views at all, quite frankly, until I heard that broadcast and I realized that this man was a Mussolini propagandist who was broadcasting from the Rome radio.

"Mr. ARENS. That was in 1945?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Before your sympathies were aroused to defend the artists, poets, and playwrights who were being brought before this committee. Now, is that not correct as a matter of chronology?

"Mr. MILLER. Whether that was before, yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you not write in New Masses, in effect, criticizing those who would defend Ezra Pound on the same basis that you defended the Hollywood Ten?

"Mr. MILLER. I would like to see the statement, if I may.

"Mr. ARENS. I would like to show it to you and I would like to read for the record some of the statements.

"'Arthur Miller, writing for the New Masses'—

"which, of course, has been identified as the Communist publication repeatedly. Perhaps I had better read a good deal of it here so there will be no indication of taking anything out of context.

"Mr. MILLER. I trust you.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, with that background, and you correct me if I make a misrepresentation, Ezra Pound in 1945 was writing poems, plays, radio addresses which were anti-Communist and which were against the interest of this country, the United States of America, was he not?

"Mr. MILLER. There was also a war going on.

"Mr. ARENS. That is correct.

"Here is Arthur Miller's statement in 1945.

"'In the belief that Ezra Pound's trial for treason is of high importance to the future direction of American letters, and poetry in particular, I should like to offer my commentary on the reaction of five poets and a critic to the Pound case in the newspaper P. M. of Sunday, November 25. The majority of the reactions are alarming.

"'All six agree that Pound's contribution to literature was of the highest order. With this no man can argue.

"'If I may be pardoned some nonpoetical language, the boys are cutting the baloney pretty thick. Shapiro ought to know that Pound is not accused of not "reversing his beliefs" but of aiding and abetting the enemy by broadcasting propaganda calculated to undermine the American will to fight fascism. And Mr. Aiken ought to know by now that Pound did not betray himself to "man in the abstract" but to Mussolini whose victims are, to be sure, now buried and abstract, but who was a most real, most unpoetical type of fellow.'

"The article winds up:

"'In conclusion, may I say that without much effort one could find a thousand poets and writers who understand not only why Pound was dangerous and treasonous, but why he will be even more so if released. In a world where humanism must conquer lest humanity be destroyed, literature must nurture the conscience of man. A greater calamity cannot befall the art than that Ezra Pound, the Mussolini mouthpiece, should be welcomed back as an arbiter of American letters, an eventuality not to be dismissed if the court adopts the sentiments of these four poets.'

"I lay that article now before you appearing in the New Masses, and ask you whether or not you are the person who wrote that article in 1945 protesting the position of those who would excuse Ezra Pound because he was a poet and an artist?

"Mr. MILLER. Mr. Arens, I would like to make several points here which I think are of great importance.

"Ezra Pound was a—in the first place, this was a time of war. He was literally and in every conceivable way a traitor and there was no question about it, I don't think, in anybody's mind. I would not now say that I share all these sentiments by any means. This is a long time ago. I don't think I would be quite as virulent about it now.

"I, however, can understand quite easily how I could have felt this way. I felt this man threatened me personally. I am a Jew.

He was for burning Jews and you will have to pardon my excitement at the time if that was the situation.

"Mr. ARENS. I want this record to show that I am not undertaking by this question to defend Ezra Pound; I am only pointing out by this exhibit what would appear to be, absent any explanation, and inconsistency at least.

"(Representative Jackson entered the hearing room.)

"Mr. KEARNEY. Pound was convicted as a traitor and served time?

"Mr. ARENS. As were the 12 Communists.

"Mr. JACKSON. May I ask him a question?

"The CHAIRMAN. All right.

"Mr. JACKSON. I would like, in view of the witness' strong words of denunciation of Mr. Pound for his expressions of anti-Semitism and his understandable resentment of them, did you ever subsequently, and particularly since the denunciation in the Soviet Union of Stalin, ever make a public statement denouncing the shocking evidence of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union?

"Mr. MILLER. I am sorry to say that there was none. I am sorry to say something worse, that I was not shocked. This last stuff has been no great shock to me. I have had intimate evidence from a man I know who had a brother in the Soviet Union and who was, as I remember it, the editor or writer for some literary magazine there and who this man told me, I can't remember now because it's possibly 3 years ago, 4 years ago, he had completely dropped out of sight and was no longer responding to any mail. They were two brothers.

"This fellow told me that he thought that he had been the victim of purely anti-Semitic things.

"Now I have ceased these kinds of statements, as I said, which were befitting the frame of mind I was in. I ceased issuing statements right and left except when I am personally involved because I found I was being tangled in stuff that I was really not prepared to defend 100 percent, and I am ashamed to say that I should have and I did feel I was not completely ignorant of this. It isn't a matter of Khrushchev. I knew this before Khrushchev.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you know it in 1952 when you signed a statement in defense of the 12 Communist traitors who were convicted in Foley Square in New York City?

"Mr. MILLER. That I would make a differentiation about, quite frankly. This is a question which verges on, I don't know under what law this prosecution took place.

"Mr. ARENS. Under the Smith law, conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. That is part of the International Cominform apparatus.

"Mr. MILLER. I am opposed to the Smith Act and I am still opposed to anyone being penalized for advocating anything. I say that because of a very simple reason.

"I don't believe that in the history of letters there are many great books or great plays that don't advocate. That doesn't mean that a man is a propagandist. It is in the nature of life and it is in the nature of literature that the passions of an author congeal around issues.

"You can go from War and Peace through all the great novels of time and they are all advocating something. Therefore, when I heard that the United States Government wanted to pass a law against the advocacy without any overt action, I was alarmed because I am not here defending Communists, I am here defending the right of an author to advocate, to write.

"Mr. SCHERER. Even to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence?

"Mr. MILLER. I am now speaking, sir, of creative literature. These are risks and balances of risks.

"The CHAIRMAN. We will have a recess of about 5 minutes.

"(A short recess was taken with the following committee members present: Representatives WALTER, DOYLE, WILLIS, KEARNEY, JACKSON, and SCHERER.)

"(Representative VELDE entered the hearing room.)

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Proceed.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I was asking the witness a question which I would like to pursue.

"Witness, counsel asked you about your protesting the prosecution of the 12 Communists in Foley Square, and you said that you had protested that prosecution and, in explanation of that action on your part, you said 'I am opposed to the prosecution of anyone for advocating anything.' Do you recall that you made that statement?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. You understood, did you not, that the 12 Communists were prosecuted for advocating, teaching, and urging the overthrow of this Government by force and violence through unlawful means? Now, my question is, do you mean that you would be opposed to the prosecution of anyone today for advocating the overthrowing of this Government by force and violence? I cannot draw any other conclusion.

"Mr. MILLER. Mr. SCHERER, there is another conclusion which I would like to speak on for just one moment. The Smith Act, as I understood it and as I understand it now, does lay penalties upon advocacy.

"Mr. SCHERER. Upon what?

"Mr. MILLER. Upon advocacy of beliefs or opinions, and so forth. What I felt strongly about then——

"Mr. SCHERER. Not opinions. It does not lay any upon opinions.

"Mr. MILLER. I am not that close to the text of it, but my understanding of it is that advocacy is penalized or can be under this law. Now, my interest, as I tell you, is possibly too selfish, but without it I can't operate and neither can literature in this country, and I don't think anybody can question that.

"Mr. SCHERER. I am not asking you about advocacy generally.

"Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; but, sir, I understand your point.

"Mr. SCHERER. I do not understand yours.

"Mr. MILLER. I was trying to make it clear, sir. My point is simply that, if there is a penalty upon advocacy, what my protest was about was that idea taking hold so that people could say depending upon the ideas ruling the society at any particular time would depend the liberty of advocacy of any particular idea at any time.

"In other words, if advocacy of itself becomes a crime, in my opinion, or can be penalized without overt action, we are smack in the middle of literature, and I don't see how it can be avoided. That is my opinion. That is, where I can understand yours, I ask you to understand mine.

"Mr. SCHERER. We are not talking about literature. These 12 Communists were on trial for advocating the violent overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

"Does your theory or your belief carry so far as for you to sit here today and say that you are opposed to prosecution of anyone who today would advocate, teach, and urge the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, limiting it to that? Let us leave literature out of that.

"Mr. MILLER. You see, you are limiting it to that.

"Let me put it quite simply. If a man were outside this building and telling people to come in and storm this building and blow it up or something of that sort, I would say, "Call out the troops." There is no question in my mind about that. That is advocacy, but in the Smith Act, as I understand it, it is applicable and can be applied, given a sufficient public backing, to literature.

"Now, in my opinion, that cannot be equated with the freedom of literature without which we will be back in a situation where people as in the Soviet Union and as in Nazi Germany have not got the right to advocate.

"Mr. SCHERER. Let us go into literature. Let me ask you, do you believe that today a Communist who is a poet should have the right to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence in his literature, in poetry or in newspapers or anything else?

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. I tell you frankly, sir, I think if you are talking about a poem I would say that a man should have the right to write a poem just about anything.

"Mr. SCHERER. All right.

"Mr. JACKSON. Let me ask one question. Then I understand your position is that freedom in literature is absolute?

"Mr MILLER. Well, I recognize that these things, sir, are not, the absolutes are not absolute.

"Mr. JACKSON. My interpretation of your position is that it is absolute that a writer must have, in order to express his heart, absolute freedom of action?

"Mr. MILLER. That would be the most desirable state of affairs, I say; yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Even to the extent of advocating the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States at this time?

"Mr. MILLER. Frankly, sir, I have never read such a book.

"Mr. SCHERER. I did not say you have read it. I am asking you what your opinion is with reference to it.

"Mr. MILLER. I think a work of art—my point is very simple. I think that, once you start to cut away, there is a certain commonsense in mankind which makes these limits automatic. There are risks which are balanced. The Constitution is full of those risks. We have rights, which, if they are violated, or rather used in an irresponsible way, can do damage. Yet they are there and the commonsense of the people of the United States has kept this in sort of a balance. I would prefer any day to say yes, there should be no limit upon the literary freedom, than to say you can go up this far and no further, because then you are getting into an area where people are going to say, "I think that this goes over the line," and then you are in an area where there is no limit to the censorship that can take place.

"Mr. SCHERER. Do you consider those things that you have written in the New Masses as an exercise of your literary rights?

"Mr. MILLER. Sir, I never advocated the overthrow of the United States Government. I want that perfectly clear.

"Mr. SCHERER. I did not say you did. I want to get what you consider literature.

"Mr. MILLER. I didn't advocate that. I wouldn't call it especially an exercise in freedom. It was simply an effusion of mind. It didn't require a mandate to do it. The Masses was widely circulated. Writers were writing for it. Some of the greatest writers today have written for the New Masses.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then you believe that we should allow the Communists in this country to start actually physical violence in the overthrow of this Government before they are prosecuted?

"Mr. MILLER. No, sir; you are importing.

"Mr. SCHERER. I cannot draw any other conclusion from what you said.

"Mr. MILLER. You fail to draw a line between advocacy and essense. Our law is based upon acts not thought. How do we know? Anybody in this room might have thoughts of various kinds that could be prosecuted if they were carried into action, but that is an entirely different story.

"Mr. VELDE. May I say something here? As you sit in this room in your present mood,

are you opposed to the Smith Act? Would you advocate its repeal?

"Mr. MILLER. Sir, I have not got the Smith Act in front of me. I could tell you my sentiment as it relates to the Smith Act. I take responsibility for that opinion. In other words, I am opposed to the laying down of any limits upon the freedom of literature, and I am opposed to it because I think that that way lies a kind of repression of literature which is disastrous.

"In the Soviet Union there has been nothing written of any value in 25 years. You cannot lay down those limits and expect that they will just go that far.

"Mr. VELDE. I understand. In my opinion, you have a perfect right to advocate the repeal of the Smith Act if you want to.

"Mr. MILLER. I am just making one mitigation. I don't know the Smith Act well enough for me to sit here under oath and say that I am opposed to every single word in it. I couldn't do that because I don't believe I have ever read the thing. All I know is that that provision, according to the widest publication of the press, is in it, and I would be opposed to that provision.

"Mr. VELDE. In any event, Mr. Miller, you have not had a change of heart since 1947, during the trial of the 12 Communists?

"Mr. MILLER. In relation to censorship, I have always had the same opinion.

"Mr. SCHERER. This is not censorship.

"Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I used the word closely, but in relation to the limitation of the artist's right in society, I am opposed to it.

"Mr. SCHERER. All of us believe in freedom.

"Mr. KEARNEY. You are putting the artist and literature in a preferred class.

"Mr. MILLER. I thought we were going to get to this and it places me in a slightly impossible position, and I would be lying to you if I said that I didn't think the artist was, to a certain degree, in a special class. The reason is quite simple and maybe absurd but, if you are asking me what I think, I will tell you.

"Mr. JACKSON. One brief question.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let him finish that question.

"Mr. MILLER. I would like to answer Mr. Kearney.

"Mr. JACKSON. Very well, sir.

"Mr. MILLER. Most of us are occupied most of the day in earning a living in one way or another. The artist is a peculiar man in one respect. Therefore, he has got a peculiar mandate in the history of civilization from people, and that is he has a mandate not only in his literature but in the way he behaves and the way he lives.

"Mr. SCHERER. He has special rights?

"Mr. KEARNEY. Please.

"Mr. MILLER. I am not speaking of rights.

"Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to have the question I asked answered.

"The CHAIRMAN. He is trying to answer.

"Mr. KEARNEY. There are interruptions.

"Mr. MILLER. The artist is inclined to use certain rights more than other people because of the nature of his work.

"Most of us may have an opinion. We sit once or twice a week or we may have a view of life which on a rare occasion we have time to speak of. That is the artist's line of work. That is what he does all day long and, consequently, he is particularly sensitive to its limitations.

"Mr. KEARNEY. In other words, your thought as I get it is that the artist lives in a different world from anyone else.

"Mr MILLER. No, he doesn't, but there is a conflict I admit. I think there is an old conflict that goes back to Socrates between the man who is involved with ideal things and the man who has the terrible responsibility of keeping things going as they are and protecting the state and keeping an army and getting people fed.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, Mr. Miller, in June of 1947, did you participate in a call of cultural leaders for a bill of rights conference to be held in the Henry Hudson Hotel in New York City?

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. ARENS. Do you recall participating in that call for the conference?

"Mr. MILLER. I beg your pardon, sir, I was just talking.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you in 1949 in June participate in a call for a conference on civil rights, to be held in the Henry Hudson Hotel in New York City?

"Mr. MILLER. What year was this?

"Mr. ARENS. 1949.

"Mr. MILLER. Could I see that?

"Mr. ARENS. Yes; I lay before you this call to conference which, among other things, charges the FBI with being peeping Toms and using paid informers and going into every lodge, home, church, political meeting, and labor organization; something has to be done about it so you have a call to conference in New York City in 1949. Do you recall that [handed]? The name Arthur Miller appears there as one of those who is attacking the FBI.

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't deny having done this.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you recall attending the conference?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't believe I did, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. At the conference, according to the New York Times, there was a resolution introduced for the purpose of defending all the victims of the Smith Act about which we have been talking, but the conference decided it would not defend all the victims of the Smith Act; it would not defend the Trotskyites.

"According to this article, Paul Robeson, who was there, said:

" 'In speaking for denial of civil liberties to the Socialist Workers Party, Mr. Robeson asked the conference, "Would you give civil rights to the Ku Klux Klan?"

" '"No," chorused the delegates.

" '"These men are the allies of fascism who want to destroy the new democracies of the world," the singer shouted. "Let's not get confused. They are the enemies of the working class."'

"According to this article in the New York Times, July 18, 1949, this civil-rights conference in which you participated in setting up, or to which you lent your name, would deny civil liberties to the Trotskyites although they would give them to Communists.

"Do you recall the position of the Civil Rights Congress as reported by the New York Times in 1949?

"Mr. Miller. I recall. I would say that I would have signed this but I would add now that, first of all, it was not my speech you just quoted. It was someone else's.

"Mr. ARENS. I understand. I just asked you whether or not you were there.

"Mr. MILLER. I would have to say as well that this did not represent my view then.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you protest this position?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, I didn't protest here but I was very put out that anyone who had been prosecuted in that sort of way should not be defended.

"Mr. ARENS. Were you present at the session?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't believe so, sir. I don't believe I was there.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you remonstrate with the leadership of this Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. MILLER. I did not know about this position at the time because it was a general lapse of interest in what was going on, but I would say the degree of responsibility that is implied in my signing that thing, and I think it was wrong. I think that the Trotskyites or anybody else who suffered the penalties of a law should be defended regardless of opinion if he is brought up for prosecution under that law.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you learn of the position of this Civil Rights Congress that civil rights are for everybody including the Communists but not for Trotskyites? Did you learn of it at any time before I just read it to you?

"Mr. MILLER. I couldn't recall that. I think I have set forth my position on that.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you learn of the attacks by the Civil Rights Congress on the Federal Bureau of Investigation as fascism, American style?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't recall anything of that kind.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, did you know a man by the name of Kazan?

"Mr. MILLER. I did.

"Mr. ARENS. What was your relationship with Mr. Kazan?

"Mr. MILLER. He was the director of two of my plays.

"Mr. ARENS. And was he subsequently exposed as a Communist?

"Mr. MILLER. I believe so; yes.

"Mr. ARENS. And did he subsequently testify and admit that he had been a Communist, and identified before an agency of his Government people whom he had known as members of the conspiracy?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. ARENS. And did you then in 1953 criticize Mr. Kazan as a renegade intellectual?

"Mr. MILLER. No.

"Mr. ARENS. As an informer?

"Mr. MILLER. No.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you protest the position of Kazan when he testified before his Government and said, in effect, he had been a Communist, and identified people as Communists?

"Mr. MILLER. I have never made the statement about Elia Kazan's testimony in my life.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you at any time to any person level a criticism at Kazan because of his testimony before a committee of his Government in which he identified people as Communists?

"Mr. MILLER. I discussed Kazan's testimony, or not his testimony. I didn't know what his testimony was exactly, but I have discussed him with one or two people in my life.

"Mr. ARENS. Just answer the question. After Kazan had been your producer, worked with you in your plays and came down to Washington and testified before a congressional committee, 'Yes, I have been a Communist. Yes; I identify so-and-so and so-and-so as people who were in the conspiracy with me,' did you criticize him for that position? Did you break with him?

"Mr. MILLER. Are you asking me whether I broke with him? Is that the question?

"Mr. ARENS. The question is pretty clear, I believe. What was your position with reference to Kazan after he testified before a congressional committee?

"Mr. MILLER. You are putting two things together.

"Mr. ARENS. Take them one by one, any way you want to.

"Mr. MILLER. The fact is I broke with him, although that word is not descriptive of my act.

"Mr. ARENS. We will use the word 'disassociate,' then.

"Mr. MILLER. I am not at all certain that Mr. Kazan would have directed my next play in any case. I am not one to go about in the streets proclaiming my private business, and the public or whoever is interested would not know that perhaps other elements had come into this situation which have absolutely no political interest, and I would venture to say have no interest for this committee. The fact is that he did not direct any more of my plays. It may be in the future he will. I have said that in the New York Post, I believe. I believe I said that. I hesitate to take the brunt of this kind of characterization, so to speak, not really for political reasons but because there are private reasons involved here which I don't believe are of interest here.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt? I do not think we should take the time of this committee to have this witness put in a position where he tells about his private business.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course not. He is volunteering this statement.

"Mr. DOYLE. I do not think we should let him volunteer these confidential matters of his business and profession. They are not a concern of this committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

"Mr. DOYLE. I object to that procedure. I do not think we have any business leaving this witness in that position.

"The CHAIRMAN. There is no disposition to do that.

"Mr. DOYLE. Let us stop it then and go to the issue.

"The CHAIRMAN. All right.

"Answer the question.

"Mr. ARENS. The question is: Did you attack Kazan because he broke with the Communist Party and testified before a congressional committee?

"Mr. MILLER. I stated earlier, sir, that I have never attacked Kazan. I will stand on that. That is it.

"Mr. ARENS. That is the answer, then. Did you join with others in protesting the enactment of the Internal Security Act in 1950?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't even remember what the act was, to tell you the truth, and I am not prepared to deny or affirm it. You will have to show it to me. If it seems familiar, I will identify it.

"Mr. ARENS. Were you an initiating sponsor of an emergency defense conference held in New York City in 1952 for the purpose of protesting the enforcement of the Internal Security Act?

"Mr. MILLER. I have no recollection of it whatever.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, do you recall in 1948 the proposed visit of the Red Dean of Canterbury to the United States and any participation you may have had as a part of the welcoming committee?

"Mr. MILLER. Are you asking me whether I did that?

"Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir. Do you recall it? Do you have a recollection of it?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't, but I probably did it. That is my answer.

"Mr. ARENS. Were you a member of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you know at the time that you were a member of this of its Communist control and leadership?

"Mr. MILLER. Well, I suspected that the Communists were in control of it. I couldn't say that I knew it.

"Mr. ARENS. Excuse me. Did you protest at any time the control of the organization by the Communist Party?

"Mr. MILLER. In itself as such, no, but I did have actually no contact with these people excepting as I was being circulated for my name and various things and my participation in the Waldorf Peace Conference. Beyond that I don't recall having any business with them. I would have from time to time perhaps taken issue on some particular thing with some person or other, but I wouldn't have lodged a formal protest. I didn't lodge a formal protest.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you lend your name as a sponsor of the peace parleys of the World Congress for Peace held in Paris?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't believe that that is accurate. It is the only one that I actually believe I had nothing to do with.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now a photostatic copy of that organization World Congress for Peace to be held in Paris. Among the sponsors listed there is a person by the name of Arthur Miller. I ask you whether or not you have a recollection of that [handing].

"Mr. MILLER. The reason that I doubt this—I am not willing to swear that this is not so, but the reason that makes me doubt it is that while I have supported such causes without question, whenever the issues got—and there were several times which I can't pinpoint now, but I just vaguely remember where something was going to be carried into the international sphere, I would like to make the point that there I was loath, and I think there is no case that I would say I was ready to support criticism of this country abroad. I want to just amplify that for 1 second. It is very important to me because it does make a difference to me. This is involved in this because it is an international thing, and it is usable in Europe.

"After the denial of my passport by the State Department I was literally besieged by foreign newspapermen. Many of them, as far as I know they were all from non-Communist, and most of them in the country I know little about, France. They were from the rightist press and from the center press. They were after me to the point where I had to go to my home in Roxbury and hide out there because they wanted me to carry on a fight about this in the European press against the United States, and I refused to do it, and I refused to do it for a good reason, and that is that, whatever I may have supported, and however it looks, I do draw a line between criticism of the United States in the United States and before foreigners.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that representatives of the foreign press——

"Mr. MILLER. In New York.

"The CHAIRMAN. In New York tried to prevail upon you to attack your Government for publicity purposes in the nations they came from?

"Mr. MILLER. Sir?

"The CHAIRMAN. Are those people still employed in this country?

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't know. I would have no way of knowing. The statement is slightly extreme, sir, as compared to the facts. I don't think it needs me to say that the passport denial business is widely publicized in Europe, and many of these people feel disabled in the face of the Communist mockery of democratic institutions when they try to defend this, and many of them feel, I am sure, that it is an unwise policy in many cases, especially someone—not only in my case, but I think there was a question of a visa for Graham Greene once.

"The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about a particular thing because I think that those people ought not to be permitted to work in this country.

"Mr. MILLER. I am just telling you what I know. That is that they were eager, as a matter of fact the brunt of their tone and of their method of talking to me on the telephone was to aggravate this thing into an international issue of sorts, and I refused to do it because I don't believe, in other words, that anybody in Europe has got anything to teach us much in that regard, and it was a dishonest thing, it would have been a dishonest thing for me to have done. I felt very deeply about it. I felt very hurt about it because I believe I am a good representative of this country abroad and my plays are shown everywhere where there is a theater abroad.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you have that position with respect to Red China?

"Mr. MILLER. What position?

"Mr. ARENS. The position that you did not want to participate in anything affecting international relations.

"Mr. MILLER. No. In the last few years I would not participate in anything that was a Communist front of any kind.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you participate in a movement to embrace Red China by this country?

"Mr. MILLER. I recall nothing of the kind.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you a photostatic copy of a document called Far East Spotlight for Friendship with New China, calling for friendship cargoes to new China, a launching dinner; and the sponsors of the dinner or those who sent personal messages of support include one Arthur Miller. I ask you if that refreshes your recollection [handed].

"Mr. MILLER. This was, as it says here:

" 'The China Welfare Appeal, a new relief drive to aid the Chinese people.'

"It was headed up by Madam Sun Yat-sen, widow of the founder of the Chinese Republic. My recollection of this would be that, on the basis of its relief which is not what I was talking about a moment ago at all, I would have supported it.

"Mr. VELDE. What was the date of that?

"Mr. ARENS. May 1949.

"Did you support the China Welfare Appeal in the propaganda statement which they issued over the country:

" 'Not only has the export of medical supplies from the United States been made subject to burdensome restrictions and procedures, but a virtual embargo has been placed on all shipments to China. The history of such restrictions shows that they did not begin with recent events in Korea.'

"I lay before you a photostatic copy of a letter on the letterhead of the China Welfare Appeal, and ask you whether or not, although your name appears here on the letterhead, you lent yourself knowingly to that cause and movement?

"Mr. MILLER. You say my name does appear on the letter?

"Mr. ARENS. This is the reverse page. It had to be photostated on both sides. The name of Arthur Miller appears there [handed].

"Mr. MILLER. It is the China Welfare Appeal. As I recall, there was a need for medicines and penicillin, et cetera, which they weren't permitted to buy or something of that sort. I did support this.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you also support the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in the Spanish Refugee Appeal for which funds were solicited and transmitted to the Communists in Spain in 1949, and again in 1951?

"Mr. MILLER. This is not in mitigation of these other things. I think the Spanish case is quite different, however. I have always been, since my student days, in the thirties, a partisan of Republican Spain. I am quite proud of it. I am not at all ashamed. I think a democracy was destroyed there. I would have carried through pretty generally my feelings of the thirties into the forties, as regards the Spanish Civil War refugees.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, do you recall, in view of your observations respecting your plays being played abroad, coauthoring a play, Listen My Children?

"Mr. MILLER. Coauthoring a play?

"Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. MILLER. No; I don't.

"Mr. ARENS. Or do you recall authoring a play, Listen My Children?

"Mr. MILLER. What year would this have been?

"Mr. ARENS. 1939.

"Mr. MILLER. 1939?

"Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir; with Norman Rosten?

"Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes. Yes; I do.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now an original document in handwriting which we procured from the Library of Congress as the document there for the purpose of copyright. Could you tell us whether or not that is your handwriting, or Rosten's handwriting of this play which was there for copyrighting?

"Mr. MILLER. It isn't mine.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you coauthor with Rosten this play?

"Mr. MILLER. I did.

"Mr. ARENS. I would like to read you part of this play.

"Mr. MILLER. I beg your pardon, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Yes.

"Mr. MILLER. My recollection is clear now. I wrote a sketch about when I had been on

relief in—well, when I got out of college. It was not long after.

"Mr. DOYLE. What year was that that you got out of college?

"Mr. MILLER. I graduated in June of 1938.

"Mr. DOYLE. 1938?

"Mr. MILLER. And I subsequently got on to the Federal writers, Federal theater project, and I wrote a farcical sort of a play about standing and waiting in a relief office, and that was, I think, what you are referring to. It was a one-act sketch which was later amplified. Nothing ever came of it, I am glad to say.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you know that Norman Rosten was a Communist when you collaborated with him in the play Listen My Children?

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't know anything about that.

"Mr. ARENS. In 1936 he was publicly identified in the Daily Worker as a member of the Young Communist League.

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't make a comment about that. I wouldn't know anything about it. I would be inclined strongly to say that it wasn't true.

"Mr. ARENS. Let me lay before you a photostatic copy of the Communist Daily Worker of December 10, 1936, a public proclamation.

"Mr. MILLER. I can't prove as to whether he was a Communist or not. It is impossible.

"Mr. ARENS. I asked if you knew. If you do not know, that is the answer.

"Mr. MILLER. By the way, I would add that that doesn't mean he was a Communist, does it?

"Mr. ARENS. If he was a member of the Young Communist League?

"Mr. MILLER. I am just asking a question.

"Mr. ARENS. Did Listen My Children pertain to congressional investigating committees?

"Mr. MILLER. If it did, then it is not what I am talking about. What I am talking about is another thing. This is a long time ago.

"Mr. ARENS. Let me read:

" 'Curtain slowly opens. The committee members are engaged in activity of an extraordinary variety, amid an equally extraordinary environment. Profuse flag bunting over the walls. There are several huge clocks ticking ominously. Also a metronone which is continually being adjusted for tempo change.

" 'Secretary, at desk, pounds typewriter and, as alarm clock rings, she feeds the committeemen spoonfuls of castor oil. * * *

" 'In center of room, in rocker, sits a man. He is securely tied to chair, with a gag in his mouth and a bandage tied over his mouth. Water, coming from a pipe near ceiling, trickles on his head. Nearby is a charcoal stove holding branding irons. Two bloodhounds are tied in the corner of room.'

"Was that the play that you coauthored with Norman Rosten? Is that an accurate description of the play Listen My Children?

"Mr. MILLER. I would say that I find it amusing. I don't see what is so horrific about that. I think it is a farce. I don't think anybody would take it seriously that way.

"The CHAIRMAN. It is a little corny.

"Mr. MILLER. I was not, by the way, the author of that scene. I am saying this out of a kind of professional jealousy of my own writing.

"Mr. ARENS. Was it likewise just a little farce, your play You're Next, by Arthur Miller, attacking the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

"Mr. MILLER. No, that would have been quite serious.

"Mr. ARENS. Did you know that the play You're Next, by Arthur Miller, attacking congressional investigating committees, was reproduced by the Communist Party?

"Mr. MILLER. No; I have no knowledge of it.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now a photostatic copy of the Communist Daily Worker of New York, Wednesday, June 18, 1947:

" 'New York State Communist Party Building Congress—Program—'

"including You're Next by Arthur Miller.

"Mr. MILLER. Sir, you can't tax me with that.

"Mr. ARENS. I ask you only whether or not you knew it, sir.

"Mr. MILLER. I did not know it, and I say that you can't tax me with that. My plays have gone all over the world by all kinds of people, including the Spanish Government theater where Death of a Salesman has run longer than any modern play in history. I take no more responsibility for who plays my plays than General Motors can take for who rides in their Chevrolets. It is impossible. You can't do that. I am not a policeman to say you can do this or not. Plays are produced and people produce them.

"Mr. SCHERER. Before the Communist Party would use such a play it had to follow the Communist line?

"Mr. MILLER. Nothing in my life was ever written to follow a line. I will go into that if you will.

"Mr. ARENS. In view of your observations respecting your plays abroad, did you donate the rights of your play, All My Sons, to the Polish League in Poland?

"Mr. MILLER. Polish League of what?

"Mr. ARENS. League of Women in Poland, in 1947, September.

"Mr. MILLER. I don't remember it, but I will tell you this: You can't get any money out of Poland; and you can't get any money out of Russia; and you can't get any money out of any place on the other side of the Iron Curtain. It is quite possible—I have no recollection of it at all—that they simply took the royalties that were probably not even there and applied them to this fund. I have no communication, to my knowledge, from anybody.

"Mr. DOYLE. May I ask whether there is an identification of that, that the Polish League of Women is a Communist organization?

"Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir; a branch of the Congress of American Women. I should like, if you please, sir, if it would refresh your recollection, to read you an article appearing in the Daily Worker, September 29, 1947.

"Mr. MILLER. You say the Congress of American Women. Yes, they asked me to do this on the basis of a relief drive that they were having for the Polish children.

"Mr. ARENS. Then you have a recollection of donating the royalties of your play?

"Mr. MILLER. I just said so, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, I believe you alluded a few moments ago to your play The Crucible; is that correct?

"Mr. MILLER. Crucible.

"Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. ARENS. Are you cognizant of the fact that your play The Crucible with respect to witch hunts in 1692 was the case history of a series of articles in the Communist press drawing parallels to the investigations of Communists and other subversives by congressional committees?

"Mr. MILLER. I think that was true in more than the Communist press. I think it was true in the non-Communist press, too. The comparison is inevitable, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. What have been your activities or associations with Howard Fast?

"Mr. MILLER. In what respect?

"Mr. ARENS. Do you know him?

"Mr. MILLER. I have met him.

"Mr. ARENS. How long do you know him?

"Mr. MILLER. I don't know how to describe that.

"Mr. ARENS. Well, have you collaborated with him?

"Mr. MILLER. Collaborated with him?

"Mr. ARENS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. Are you cognizant of the promotion of yourself by Howard Fast?

"Mr. MILLER. No.

"Mr. ARENS. I lay before you a copy of the Communist Daily Worker of November 8, 1955, "I Propose Arthur Miller as the American Dramatist of the Day, by Howard Fast." Were you cognizant of his promotion of yourself as the dramatist of the day?

"Mr. MILLER. Let me say one thing about that sort of thing. The appreciation of dramatic values by people who have behind them an attachment, a remorseless attachment to the political line, is of no import to me. I don't believe it when they are against me and I don't believe it when they are for me. In this case I take no compliment out of this for one simple reason. That is, it happens that the Crucible, which, by the way, I began thinking about in 1938 and which they now say was written about the Rosenbergs about whom I had not heard when I started to write this play, it happened that the line in that play coincided at that moment. I have another example of that to which I will go into. This is not literary or dramatic criticism. This is a political artcle. You are taxng me with what he says. Now, the next play, as with Death of a Salesman which they called a decadent piece of trash in the Daily Worker, they were against it. I am not going to guide myself by what they think or don't think. From time to time I am sure Howard Fast or similar critics of plays have praised or blamed one or another of a hundred writers, all of whom you can't tax with that criticism. It isn't fair.

"Mr. ARENS. Now, your present application for a passport pending in the Department of State is for the purpose of traveling to England; is that correct?

"Mr. MILLER. To England, yes.

"Mr. ARENS. What is the objective?

"Mr. MILLER. The objective is double. I have a production which is in the talking stage in England of A View From the Bridge, and I will be there to be with the woman who will then be my wife. That is my aim.

"Mr. ARENS. Have you had difficulty in connection with your play, A View From the Bridge, in its presentation in England?

"Mr. MILLER. It has not got that far. I have had the censor in England giving us a little trouble, yes, but that is general. A lot of American plays have that difficulty.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you know a person by the name of Sue Warren?

"Mr. MILLER. I couldn't recall at this moment.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you know or have you known a person by the name of Arnaud D'Usseau, D-'-U-s-s-e-a-u?

"Mr. MILLER. I have met him.

"Mr. ARENS. What has been the nature of your activity in connection with Arnaud D'Usseau?

"Mr. MILLER. Just what is the point?

"Mr. ARENS. Have you been in any Communist Party sessions with Arnaud D'Usseau?

"Mr. MILLER. I was present at meetings of Communist Party writers in 1947, about 5 or 6 meetings.

"Mr. ARENS. Where were those meetings held?

"Mr. MILLER. They were held in someone's apartment. I don't know whose it was.

"Mr. ARENS. Were those closed party meetings?

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't be able to tell you that.

"Mr. ARENS. Was anyone there who, to your knowledge, was not a Communist?

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't know that.

"Mr. ARENS. Have you ever made application for membership in the Communist Party?

"Mr. MILLER. In 1939 I believe it was or in 1940 I went to attend a Marxist study course in the vacant store open to the street in my

neighborhood in Brooklyn. I there signed some form or another.

"Mr. ARENS. That was an application for membership in the Communist Party; was it not?

"Mr. MILLER. I would not say that. I am here to tell you what I know.

"Mr. ARENS. Tell us what you know.

"Mr. MILLER. This is now 16 years ago. That is half a lifetime away. I don't recall and I haven't been able to recall and, if I could, I would tell you the exact nature of that application. I understood then that this was to be, as I have said, a study course. I was there for about three or four times perhaps. It was of no interest to me and I didn't return.

"Mr. ARENS. Who invited you to attend?

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't remember. It was a long time ago.

"Mr. ARENS. Tell us, if you please, sir, about these meetings with the Communist Party writers which you said you attended in New York City.

"Mr. MILLER. I was by then a well-known writer. I had written All My Sons, and a novel Focus, and a book of Reportage about Ernie Pyle and my work with him on attempting to make the picture the Story of GI Joe. I did the research for that, so that by that time I was quite well known, and I attended these meetings in order to locate my ideas in relation to Marxism because I had been assailed for years by all kinds of interpretations of what communism was, what Marxism was, and I went there to discover where I stood finally and completely, and I listened and said very little, I think, the four or five times.

"Mr. ARENS. Could I just interject this question so that we have it in the proper chronology? What occasioned your presence? Who invited you there?

"Mr. MILLER. I couldn't tell you. I don't know.

"Mr. ARENS. Can you tell us who was there when you walked into the room?

"Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the philosophy behind this question and I want you to understand mine.

"When I say this, I want you to understand that I am not protecting the Communists or the Communist Party. I am trying to and I will protect my sense of myself. I could not use the name of another person and bring trouble on him. These were writers, poets, as far as I could see, and the life of a writer, despite what it sometimes seems, is pretty tough. I wouldn't make it any tougher for anybody. I ask you not to ask me that question.

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. I will tell you anything about myself, as I have.

"Mr. ARENS. These were Communist Party meetings, were they not?

"Mr. MILLER. I will be perfectly frank with you in anything relating to my activities. I take the responsibility for everything I have ever done, but I cannot take responsibility for another human being.

"Mr. ARENS. This record shows, does it not, Mr. Miller, that these were Communist Party meetings?

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. ARENS. Is that correct?

"Mr. MILLER. I understood them to be Communist writers who were meeting regularly.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question as to who it was that he saw at these meetings.

"Mr. JACKSON. May I say that moral scruples, however laudable, do not constitute legal reason for refusing to answer the question. I certainly endorse the request for direction.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question, Mr. Miller.

"Mr. MILLER. May I confer with my attorney for a moment?

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. Mr. Walter, could I ask you to postpone this question until the testimony is compelted and you can gage for yourself?

"The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you can do that, but I understand this is about the end of the hearing.

"Mr. ARENS. This is about the end of the hearing. We have only a few more questions. The record reflects that this witness has identified these meetings as the meetings of the Communist writers.

"In the jurisdiction of this committee he has been requested to tell this committee who were in attendance at these meetings.

"Mr. DOYLE. If I understand the record, the record shows that he answered that he did not know whether there were any non-Communists there, or not. I think the record so shows.

"Mr. MILLER. I would like to add, sir, to complete this picture, that I decided in the course of these meetings that I had finally to find out what my views really were in relation to theirs, and I decided that I would write a paper in which, for the first time in my life, I would set forth my views on art, on the relation of art to politics, on the relation of the artist to politics, which are subjects that are very important to me, and I did so and I read this paper to the group and I discovered, as I read it and certainly by the time I had finished with it, that I had no real basis in common either philosophically or, most important to me, as a dramatist. I can't make it too weighty a thing to tell you that the most important thing to me in the world is my work, and I was resolved that, if I found that I was in fact a Marxist, I would declare it; and that, if I did not, I would not declare it, and I would say that I was not; and I wrote a paper and I would like to give you the brunt of it so that you may know me.

"The CHAIRMAN. Have you got the paper?

"Mr. MILLER. I am sorry, sir. I think it is the best essay I ever wrote, and I have never been able to find it in the last 2 or 3 years. I wish I could. I would publish it, as I recall it, because it meant so much to me. It was this: that great art like science attempts to see the present remorselessly and truthfully; that, if Marxism is what it claims to be, a science of society, that it must be devoted to the objective facts more than all the philosophies that it attacks as being untruthful; therefore, the first job of a Marxist writer is to tell the truth, and, if the truth is opposed to what he thinks it ought to be, he must still tell it because that is the stretching and the straining that every science and every art that is worth its salt must go through.

"I found that there was a dumb silence because it seemed not only that it was non-Marxist, which it was, but that it was a perfectly idealistic position, namely, that first of all the artist is capable of seeing the facts and, secondly, what are you going to do when you see the facts and they are really opposed to the line? The real Marxist writer has to turn those facts around to fit that time. I could never do that. I have not done it.

I want to raise another point here. I wrote a play called All My Sons which was attacked as a Communist play. This is an example of something you raised just a little while earlier about the use of my play in the Communist meeting, of a different sketch that I had written. I started that play when the war was on. The Communist line during the war was that capitalists were the salt of the earth just like workers, that there would never be a strike again, that we were going to go hand in hand down the road in the future. I wrote my play called All My Sons in the midst of this period, and you probably aren't familiar with it—maybe you are—that the story is the story of an airplane manufacturer, an airplane parts manufacturer who sends out faulty parts to the Air Force.

"Therefore, what happened was that the war ended before I could get the play produced. The play was produced. The Communist line changed back to an attack on capitalists and here I am being praised by the Communist press as having written a perfectly fine Communist play. Had the play opened when it was supposed to have opened; that is, if I could have sold it that fast, it would have been attacked as an anti-Communist play.

"The same thing has happened with Salesman. Death of a Salesman in New York was condemned by the Communist press.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Miller, what has this to do——

"Mr. MILLER. I am trying to elucidate my position on the relation of art.

"Mr. ARENS. Was Arnaud D'Usseau chairman?

"Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. There is a question before the witness; namely, to give the names of those individuals who were present at this Communist Party meeting of Communist writers. There is a direction on the part of the chairman to answer that question.

"Now, so that the record may be clear, I think we should say to the witness—Witness, would you listen?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. We do not accept the reasons you gave for refusing to answer the question and that it is the opinion of the committee that, if you do not answer the question, that you are placing yourself in contempt.

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. That is an admonition that this committee must give you in compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you again direct the witness to answer the question.

"The CHAIRMAN. He has been directed to answer the question, and he gave us an answer that we just do not accept.

Mr. ARENS. Was Arnaud D'Usseau chairman of this meeting of Communist Party writers which took place in 1947 at which you were in attendance?

"Mr. MILLER. All I can say, sir, is that my conscience will not permit me to use the name of another person.

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. And that my counsel advises me that there is no relevance between this question and the question of whether I should have a passport or there should be passport legislation in 1956.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the witness be ordered and directed to answer the question as to whether or not Arnaud D'Usseau—A-r-n-a-u-d—the last name is D-'-U-s-s-e-a-u—was chairman of the meeting of the Communist Party writers in New York City in 1947 at which you were in attendance.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. MILLER. I have given you my answer, sir.

"Mr. ARENS. I ask you now, sir, whether or not Sue Warren was in attendance at this meeting of the Communist Party writers held in New York City in 1947?

"Mr. MILLER. I have given you my answer.

"Mr. VELDE. Do you know Sue Warren?

"Mr. JACKSON. Do you decline to answer the question?

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. I tell you, sir, that I have given my answer.

"Mr. JACKSON. I am not satisfied with that. That is entirely too vague. What I want is a positive statement as to whether or not you will answer that question.

"(The witness confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. MILLER. Sir, I believe I have given you the answer that I must give.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let us get that straight. As I understand, you decline to answer the question for the reason that you gave when you declined to answer the first question, or at least when you gave an answer that was not deemed acceptable; is that it?

"Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

"Mr. ARENS. Were you proposed for membership in the Stuyvesant Branch, 12th Assembly District, of the Communist Party by Sue Warren?

"Mr. MILLER. To my knowledge——

"Mr. ARENS. In 1943?

"Mr. MILLER. To my knowledge, I would not know that. I would have no knowledge of it.

"Mr. ARENS. Have you made application for membership in the Communist Party?

"Mr. MILLER. I answered that question.

"Mr. ARENS. I put it to you as a fact and ask you to affirm or deny the fact that you did make application for membership in the Communist Party and that the number of your application is 23345.

"Mr. MILLER. I would not affirm that. I have no memory of such a thing.

"Mr. ARENS. Do you deny it?

"Mr. MILLER. I would deny it.

"Mr. ARENS. Mr. Chairman, that will conclude the staff interrogation of this witness.

"The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

"Mr. VELDE. I would just like one question. We mentioned Norman Rosten a while ago, with whom you collaborated in a play in 1938, I believe it was. Do you know where he is today?

"Mr. MILLER. He is in New York City.

"Mr. VELDE. Do you have any contacts with him at the present time?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes.

"Mr. VELDE. Are you engaged in any business with him?

"Mr. MILLER. No. He is a writer. I know him.

"Mr. VELDE. That is all.

"(Representative DONALD L. JACKSON withdrew from the hearing room at this point.)

"Mr. DOYLE. I have one question.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. DOYLE.

"Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions but I want to make this brief observation. With your recognized ability in your specialized field, based on your testimony here that I have heard, let me ask you one question. Why do you not direct some of that magnificent ability you have to fighting against well-known Communist subversive conspiracies in our country and in the world? Why do you not direct your magnificent talents to that, in part? I mean more positively?

"Mr. MILLER. Yes, I understand what you mean. I think it would be a disaster and a calamity if the Communist Party ever took over this country. That is an opinion that has come to me not out of the blue sky but out of long thought. I tell you further that I have been trying for years now. I am not a fictionalist. I reflect what my heart tells me from the society around me. We are living in a time when there is great uncertainty in this country. It is not a Communist idea. You just pick up a book review section and you will see everybody selling books on peace of mind because there isn't any.

"I am trying to delve to the bottom of this and come up with a positive answer, and I have had to go to hell to meet the devil. You can't know what the worst is until you have seen the worst, and it is not for me to make easy answers and to come forth before the American people and tell them everything is all right when I look in their eyes and I see them troubled.

"I believe in democracy. I believe it is the only way for myself and for anybody that I care about; it is the only way to live; but my criticism, such as it has been, is not to be confused with a hatred. I love this country, I think as much as any man, and it is because I see things that I think traduce certainly the values that have been in this country that I speak. I would like more than anything else in the world to make positive my plays and I intend to do so before I finish. It has to be on the basis of reality.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Miller, I trust that you will raise your important voice in what must be apparent to you now as a conspiracy. I am frank to admit that I participated in some myself. I remember making a rather sizable contribution to this Anti-Fascist Committee because they were moving Jews away from Germany, and I know that a great many other people did but, it is indeed significant that, in all of these causes in which you participated because of the persecution of the Jewish people you never moved toward the assistance of people who were being persecuted by the Communists. That, I think, is very unfortunate.

"Mr. MILLER. I think it is not only unfortunate. It was a great error.

"Mr. KEARNEY. Do you think——

"Mr. MILLER. Let me finish this.

"Mr. KEARNEY. Pardon me.

"Mr. MILLER. In the face of an overwhelming ideal it has been the common experience of mankind, both good people and bad people, that detail goes by the board and fades into the walls. I believe now in facts. I look at life as to see what is happening, and I have no line. I have no preconception. I am devoted to what is going on. The hardest thing to do is to tell what is going on. It is easy to talk about the past and future, but nobody knows what is happening now.

"Mr. KEARNEY. Do I get from your answer now that you consider yourself more or less a dupe in joining these Communist organizations?

"Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't say so because I was an adult. I wasn't a child. I was looking for the world that would be perfect. I think it necessary that I do that if I were to develop myself, as a writer. I am not ashamed of this. I accept my life. That is what I have done. I learned a great deal.

"The CHAIRMAN. You have learned a great deal and made a greater contribution to what we think you now stand for than you realize because, by the errors that you committed, you are serving a very loud note of warning to a lot of other people who might fall into what you did, quite obviously."

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Arthur Miller, relative to the subject matter which under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer the questions, namely: "Can you tell us who was there when you walked into the room?

"Was Arnaud D'Usseau chairman of this meeting of Communist Party writers which took place in 1947 at which you were in attendance?" which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony, and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 638) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Arthur Miller to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Arthur Miller may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, here is a man of great talent, Arthur Miller, famous as a playwright, whose plays have been successfully produced in various parts of the world.

He is a Pulitzer prize winner for his play, The Death of a Salesman. He wrote Crucible, A View from the Bridge and All My Sons.

Passage of a contempt citation certainly will not help us abroad. Propagandawise our political status will not be helped—indeed will be hurt in foreign parts.

In France it will be said that an American of exceptional talent must languish in jail—witness the fate of Arthur Miller.

Miller's play, A View From the Bridge, is about to be produced in London, and I can readily see a reviewer of the play in the London Times saying: "In America the reward for writing a great play may at times be imprisonment."

What travesty.

We are our worst enemies. Watch and see how those who wish us ill will seize upon our improvidence—in distant parts.

What is his sin? He was candid in his examination. He told about all his own associations. He spoke openly and freely about his own views. He refused on conscience to play the role of informer. He would not disclose names at a meeting some 10 years ago. He refused to invoke the fifth amendment. Voluntary disclosure of names is one aspect of this difficult problem. But involuntary and collusive disclosure is another.

There is something obnoxious about an informer. One looks askance upon a squealer—an informer.

To what legislative end can the names sought help? Possession of these names is not for purposes of enforcement. Enforcement is not a congressional function. Certainly there is no legislative purpose to be served.

Our security apparatus must be very weak indeed if we have to depend upon coercion of individuals to live the life of informers. We seriously indict ourselves if we pass this bill of indictment.

Are there no other sources of information?

Are we saying that Arthur Miller is the only source for knowledge of these names at any meeting he attended?

What about our intelligence agencies, FBI and CIA?

What about the career or professional informer? Our intelligence system must be greatly weakened if we must rely upon men like Miller to ferret out Communists.

The Athenians forced hemlock upon Socrates. Are we to coerce Miller?

Like Miller, Socrates refused to forsake his unorthodox views. He refused to conform. History has condemned Athens. Counsel and members of the Committee on Un-American Activities seemed to question Miller concerning his plays. Note the following colloquy:

Mr. ARENS. Did Listen My Children pertain to congressional investigating committees?

Mr. MILLER. If it did, then it is not what I am talking about. What I am talking about is another thing. This is a long time ago.

Mr. ARENS. Let me read:

"Curtain slowly opens. The committee members are engaged in activity of an extraordinary variety, amid an equally extraordinary environment. Profuse flag bunting over the walls. There are several hugh clocks ticking ominously. Also a metronome which is continuously being adjusted for tempo change.

"Secretary, at desk, pounds typewriter and, an alarm clock rings, she feeds the committeemen spoonfuls of castor oil. * * *

"In center of room, in rocker, sits a man. He is securely tied to chair, with a gag in his mouth and a bandage tied over his mouth. Water, coming from a pipe near ceiling, trickles on his head. Nearby is a charcoal stove holding branding irons. Two bloodhounds are tied in the corner of room."

Was that the play that you coauthored with Norman Rosten? Is that an accurate description of the play Listen My Children?

Mr. MILLER. I would say that I find it amusing. I don't see what is so horrific about. I think it is a farce. I don't think anybody would take it seriously that way.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a little corny.

Mr. MILLER. I was not, by the way, the author of that scene. I am saying this out of a kind of professional jealousy of my own writing.

Mr. ARENS. Was it likewise just a little farce, your play You're Next, by Arthur Miller, attacking the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MILLER. No, that would have been quite serious.

Mr. ARENS. Did you know that the play, You're Next, by Arthur Miller, attacking congressional investigating committees, was reproduced by the Communist Party

Mr. MILLER. No; I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. ARENS. I lay before you now a photostatic copy of the Communist Daily Worker of New York, Wednesday, June 18, 1947: "New York State Communist Party Building Congress—Program," including You're Next by Arthur Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Sir, you can't tax me with that.

Mr. ARENS. I ask you only whether or not you knew it, sir.

Mr. MILLER. I did not know it, and I say that you can't tax me with that. My plays have gone all over the world by all kinds of people, including the Spanish Government theater where Death of a Salesman has run longer than any modern play in history. I take no more responsibility for who plays my plays than General Motors can take for who rides in their Chevrolets. It is impossible. You can't do that. I am not a policeman to say you can do this or not. Plays are produced and people produce them.

Mr. SCHERER. Before the Communist Party would use such a play it had to follow the Communist line?

Mr. MILLER. Nothing in my life was ever written to follow a line. I will go into that if you will.

As another point in the testimony we have the following between counsel and Miller:

Mr. ARENS. Are you cognizant of the fact that your play The Crucible with respect to witch hunts in 1692 was the case history of a series of articles in the Communist press drawing parallels to the investigations of Communists and other subversives by congressional committees.

Mr. MILLER. I think that was true in more than the Communist press. I think it was true in the non-Communist press, too. The comparison is inevitable, sir.

To his credit, when Miller landed in London recently at a press conference he showed no rancor, no misgivings; he praised the United States and its institutions; he decried anti-Americanism. He refused to give any comfort to Communist portrayals of this country. He defended his country to the core and gave it wholehearted support—as any patriotic American would.

I associate an author with his book, as I do a composer with his music, a painter with his painting, a dramatist with his play. Miller's plays are the very embodiment of our traditional American freedoms. Jefferson and Lincoln had philosophies not unlike that underlying Miller's works.

I feel kindly disposed toward Miller. I do not know him personally. I do know him through his dramas. Hurt him, you hurt his works. Imprison him, you chain his efforts. Condemn him, you bespatter his plays.

A Miller is not born every day. A Miller comes rarely. Do we foster talent, the type he has, by way of jail? Somehow I instinctively react unfavorably to a contempt citation against a man like Miller. Maybe I am a bit sensitive. But putting him in prison because he refused on conscience to become an informer seems like breaking a Stradivarius violin because you don't like the music it gives forth. It's like hurling mud at a Goya because of the material of the tapestry. It is as blasphemous as hurling a stone at a stained glass window of a cathedral because of its color scheme.

Maybe my premise is wrong, to wit: that I want a different rule applicable to a talented playwright like Miller than to the ordinary citizen. That is not the case. Miller was most cooperative, frank and respectful to the committee. The testimony includes 38 pages. Almost throughout his answers were responsive and objective, open and honest. He refused to hedge behind any constitutional guarantees. Only during the last few pages do we find any reluctance to answer—and then on conscience he refused to "inform" on others. He was never arrogant or testy or contumacious. But all these factors were lost sight of. Even the chairman complimented him. Note the following:

Mr. KEARNEY. Do I get from your answer now that you consider yourself more or less of a dupe in joining these Communist organizations?

Mr. MILLER. I wouldn't say so because I was an adult. I wasn't a child. I was looking for the world that would be perfect. I think it necessary that I do that if I were to develop myself as a writer. I am not ashamed of this. I accept my life. That is what I have done. I learned a great deal.

The CHAIRMAN. You have learned a great deal and made a greater contribution to what we think you now stand for than you realize because, by the errors that you committed, you are serving a very loud note of warning to a lot of other people who might fall into what you did, quite obviously.

I say that on balance, weighing all the circumstances, the legal and moral facets, the committee might have censured him and left it at that. Contempt citation is too harsh.

There are plenty of precedents for less harsh action by the committee.

I herewith set forth precedents—as same appeared in brief of Miller's counsel—where a refusal on grounds of conscience to answer a specific question by an otherwise respectful and cooperative witness—like Miller—has not been followed by a citation for contempt:

(a) Witness No. 1 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Radiation Laboratory, pt. 1, p. 356 ff.) that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1941. He refused to say whether another person was known to him as a member of the Communist Party. He was not cited for contempt.

(b) Witness No. 2 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Radiation Laboratory, pt. 1, p. 373 ff.) that she had been a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1941, but refused to answer questions about others. She was not cited for contempt.

(c) Witness No. 3 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Atomic Bomb Project, pt. 3, p. 3417 ff.) that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1938 to 1943. He refused to give the names of the other members of his group. He was not cited for contempt.

(d) Witness No. 4 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Atomic Bomb Project, pt. 3, p. 3453 ff.) that she had been a member of the Communist Party from 1939 to 1943. She refused to identify anyone as a member of her group. She was not cited for contempt.

(e) Witness No. 5 testified before this committee (Communist Activity in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 4, p. 4006) that she had attended meetings of the Communist Political Association in 1946, but declined to say whether she had attended meetings at the home of designated persons. She was not cited for contempt.

(f) Witness No. 6 testified before the Subcommittee (Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 721 ff.) on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1936 to 1942, but refused to say whether or not a designated person had been a member of his group. He was not cited for contempt.

(g) Witness No. 7 testified before the same subcommittee (Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1023 ff.) that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1935 to 1943, but refused to say who had been the senior professor in his group at a certain university. He was not cited for contempt.

(h) Witness No. 8 testified before the same subcommittee (Army Information and Education Program, p. 1498) that he had been a member of the Communist Party on two separate occasions but refused to identify others. He was not cited for contempt.

(i) At least four witnesses before this same subcommittee refused to answer questions about other persons during an investigation of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. These witnesses, though named by others as members of the Communist Party, denied membership and then refused to answer many questions, including questions pertaining to others. None of the witnesses were cited for contempt.

(j) Witness No. 13 admitted before the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee (State Department Information Program—Information Centers, part 8, p. 486)

and admitted that he was a Marxist and Socialist. He refused to answer numerous questions relating to his Marxist beliefs. He was not cited for contempt.

In each of the cases referred to above except those of witnesses 7 and 13 the refusals to answer were on grounds of conscience. Witness No. 7 pleaded the fifth amendment when asked to name someone else, but he was informed by the chairman that this constituted no defense since he had waived the privilege by testifying about his own activities in the Communist Party. Nevertheless he was not cited for contempt. Witness No. 13 pleaded the fifth amendment though the committee publicly took the position that this amendment was not a lawful defense; he was not cited for contempt.

It should be noted that most of the above persons, unlike Arthur Miller, were or had been in the Communist Party, and for extended periods of time, and therefore could have given a great deal of information about others. It is also to be noted that many of the above investigations, unlike that of Arthur Miller, concerned matters of serious import to our national security such as our atomic energy project. I urge this House committee to compare the activities of these witnesses and of those associated with them with Arthur Miller's attendance at 3 or 4 meetings of a Marxist study group in 1940 and 5 or 6 meetings of Communist Party writers in 1947.

Indeed in punishing a man like Miller the real punishment is the finding out that his tormentors in this very House are wrong.

Future Members of this body, years hence, might very well say that our action today is deplorable and that instead of giving him a halo we gave him a noose.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter sent by Arthur Miller to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this particular citation for the reason that I am convinced that Arthur Miller is not a Communist, nor is it claimed by the committee that he is.

While he is technically in contempt for having refused to give the names of others who were present at certain meetings, I believe it is going far afield from any legitimate legislative purposes of the committee to request such information.

I can understand his reluctance to answer these questions and, in fact, have been informed that there have been times in the past when the committee refrained from citing witnesses for contempt under similar circumstances.

Because he explained his position fully, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated July 6, 1956, sent by Arthur Miller to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, together with a memorandum submitted by his attorneys. I trust that the Members will vote against this citation.

JULY 6, 1956.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALTER: I am informed by my attorneys that at times in the past the House Committee on Un-American Activities has refrained from citing witnesses for contempt under circumstances not very different from those obtaining in my hearing. I would therefore like to present to your committee certain considerations which have moved me to decline the naming of those few people I recall as having been present at the meetings of Communist writers which I attended in 1947. I write here in the same spirit with which I entered the hearing room; I believed then and I believe yet that my own candor in speaking of my past associations is my best defense, for I know myself to be a person devoted to democratic institutions and opposed to totalitarianism, and the record of my work and my life, looked at as a whole, must, I believe, stand as proof of this.

The meetings in question occurred nearly 10 years ago. At that time the Communist Party, as far as I was aware, had not been declared a conspiracy but was legally recognized and accorded the common privileges of a political party; its candidates had run openly for office and its name was listed on the ballot. Association with it at that time entailed no criminal penalties. Literature published by the Communist Party was freely available in bookstores; its magazines and newspapers could be found on any newsstand. Only shortly before, the United States and Russia had been wartime allies. On the ground of their participating in illegal actions, therefore, I cannot justify myself naming these people. But in addition, the 5 or 6 whose names I know are, to my knowledge, as they were at the time, free-lance writers or minor figures in the theatrical world, and they have had no governmental or industrial function. Thus, it seems to me that from the standpoint of their dangerousness I should have to overlook the facts as I understand them, and to adopt a standard of behavior for myself based upon the concept that unless one does, in fact, agree to name anyone at all who one knew to have been associated at some time with the Communist Party, one must of necessity regard oneself as, first, in contempt of Congress, and secondly, as one who is shielding enemies of the Nation. I should like to examine these two deductions, and to show why I believe they do not follow from my unwillingness to name other people.

I have never believed that the rightness or wrongness of human actions can be judged on general principles. To kill a man, for instance, is murder, yet to kill him in battle is not the same as to kill him in a duel, or by accident in an automobile, or in the throes of a sudden passion. In consequence, I believe that although in this situation I could not in good conscience take the name of another, it is nevertheless possible that certain individuals under certain circumstances might well inform upon earlier associates without incurring what seems to me to be a drastic moral penalty. I can conceive that a man, misled and tricked by Communists, and in possession of firsthand knowledge of plans being carried through by them to harm this country, would wish to frustrate those plans, and in rightful anger against the perpetrators, bring their names easily to his lips.

I could not condemn such an action, but my case is quite different. I have no knowledge of any plan on the part of these people, past or present, detrimental to society or otherwise. I have no knowledge of any crime or criminal. I am left, therefore, with but two possible justifications for informing on these people; either that they misled or tricked me almost 10 years ago, made a dupe of me, and in return deserve my retaliation, or that in my view the cause of democracy would be somehow served by naming them. I emphasize before I proceed further, that I am speaking here of myself and of a specific situation in which I find myself, and that I am not attempting to lay down a general rule for all exigencies.

The truth is that no individual tricked or misled me. It was rather that history—my growing up in the depression and maturing in the midst of war, and many forces in my personal life—for a time led me to seek in Marxism a fount of authority from which might flow a stream of values, ethical, political, and dramaturgic, in which I could wholly have faith.

I matured at a time when authority in this country was shaken more violently and was less certain of itself than at any time, perhaps, with the exception of the Civil War period. My venturing into these few meetings was not, therefore, the responsibility of anyone but myself. I was a young man without experience, but I was an adult, and no one promised or offered me any inducement or profit.

What I sought to find from without I subsequently learned must be created within, namely, a standard of values and a personal vision of what is and what must come to be in society and the world. If the episode was unfortunate in that it marked me for what I was not, it was also a rather inevitable result of a hundred social and psychological forces maturing within me at a certain time of my life and in a certain place. To bring the names of others into this matter now would be to blame them, and in my estimate this would distort and falsify my history.

The specific nature of these particular meetings is also of moment to me as I deliberate upon the course I take now. I was never aware of any business transacted there excepting a running discussion of the relationships between the philosophy and credo of Marxism and the literary arts. In truth, I was not there to engage in political activity but to resolve the contradictions of belief which had always assailed me, belief not only about capitalism, but about what made literature good or bad, what the responsibilities were of the artist toward his fellow men, and so on. My recollection is that stories and poems were read at these meetings; current plays, novels and authors were discussed with an eye to perceiving which were "Marxist" and why. After a few such discussions I wrote a paper setting forth, for the first time in my life, my ideas about these questions, and I did so in order to locate myself once and for all as regards the tenets of Marxism. In writing the paper and in reading it to the group, it became obvious to me that these people did not possess the wisdom I sought, and more importantly, that from no outer source could I ever derive a satisfactory philosophy but must heed the commands which spoke from within me. Philosophically, if I might raise to that austere level a set of instinctive perceptions and insights, it was clear as well that I had no place in the Marxist scheme of things if only because it was inconceivable to me that a creative artist could or ought to be controlled by ideological requirements of any kind whatsoever.

If I say now, as I said at my hearing, that I came away convinced that my temperament and my viewpoints were diametrically opposed to those of Marxists, it is no contradiction to add that I yet hold in high respect my own motives and impulses which led me to strive toward that decision. It was not enough for me to know that I was uncertain about my beliefs and understanding, I had to actively seek answers. And it is that seeking, that kind of quest for ultimate truths which in itself is perhaps the core of my character and my talent, for whatever there is of originality and vigor in my plays is the result of discovery and the excitement that accompanies discovery. Thus, as I contemplate the act of naming these writers now I cannot escape a sense of casting a disfiguring ridicule upon my own actions in quest, actions done in good faith and issuing not in crime but, in my opinion, in a heightened

sensibility toward the values which must be preserved in a democratic society.

What I would protect here is not Communists or wrongdoers but my responsibility for my own actions. I say this for a particular reason, and it is that I believe myself to be a patriotic citizen, and my works a credit to this Nation; if that is true then I am, like any man, at least the sum of my experience, and I must accept my unwise acts with the wise, for all together have made me what I am. I have said, and I repeat, that the picture Marxism would draw of society and the nature of man is not true; the future Marxism predicted is not true; the moral claims of Communists to a more humane philosophy is a tragic sham, and the demands Marxism would enforce upon the artist are suicidal if accepted by him. Yet, since it was I and I alone, my own mind and spirit, which pressed me toward an investigation of my relation to Marxist thought some years ago, it is I who must accept the consequences of that quest.

There is one further point I would make because the matter is not widely understood outside the small circle of theater artists, and even there not always with the clarity it deserves. Like a few other dramatists I have not spent my career writing for hire. One is paid nothing for writing a play for the stage until and unless the public pays to see it. I have spent as long as 3 years on a single work and without the slightest assurance it would run 2 weeks when it was finished. I choose my own subjects and develop each work alone and independently, and each work carries my name and none other. For 20 years now I have spent the better part of every day forming and testing my vision of man and society, my sense of what is truly going on in the world around me, for a play such as I write has no force if it has not the force of evident truth. These plays speak my deepest feelings and are the most complete and unmitigated expressions of my viewpoints toward every kind of social manifestation and institution.

In the profoundest sense, therefore, these plays are myself, for good or for ill, and I have not the slightest doubt that they are both humane and democratic works which could not have been written excepting by one devoted to the democratic hope for man and that concept of his nature. If now, by virtue of my willingness or unwillingness to answer a single question about the identity of certain other writers and by this sudden standard my whole character and citizenship are to be judged, then it means to me that the labor of revelation lasting over 20 years is brought down to nothing in a single moment, and the daily struggle I have waged to speak clearly and in the most public of public places—the American stage—is altogether mocked.

Had I hidden my opinions and my views, my sense of reality, and my apprehensions for my fellowmen, and written trivia in the common commerce of the stage, I should perhaps feel differently, or had I sold my talent for security as I could have done a hundred times. But I have gladly risked everything time and again for the freedom our stage blessedly permits, that freedom to expose my thoughts untrammeled and unhired. Now to have to prove my fidelity to freedom, an idea to which the heart of my works is dedicated, would be an action in travesty of my labor itself.

If I must be judged, let me be judged by what my native impulses lead me to do rather than what necessity now makes opportune. If in truth I have done evil, the naming of others surely cannot mitigate that evil or erase it, and the refusal to name them cannot make that evil worse than it was. Nor can I believe that such a willingness betokens, in itself, respect for the Congress, or that in this instance unwillingness is a mark of disrespect, let alone of contempt. As I have done, so I do now, resting my case not upon protections of the law but on the spontaneous revelations in my works and on the record of my life. I cannot confess another man, therefore, and I ask the committee to consider where true respect lies in such a case and where contempt; it is no news to the world that there are words of agreement and assent which, in truth, demean, and conscientious reservations which magnify the dignity of the state.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR MILLER.

MEMORANDUM INDICATING POLICIES AND PRECEDENTS WHICH WOULD SUPPORT THE ACTION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IF IT REFRAINED FROM CITING ARTHUR MILLER FOR CONTEMPT

JULY 6, 1956.

On June 25, 1956, we requested 10 days within which to submit a memorandum indicating wherein, under existing precedents and in the light of Mr. Miller's testimony, the Committee on Un-American Activities might properly refrain from citing Mr. Miller for contempt. On June 27, 1956, the committee responded that the determination whether or not Mr. Miller would be recommended for citation for contempt of the Congress would be held in abeyance for a period of 10 days. We appreciate this allowance of 10 days which has made this memorandum possible.

At the outset, we must inform the committee that Mr. Miller respectfully declines to transmit to the committee the names of the persons who were in attendance at the 1947 meetings of Communist Party writers about which he was interrogated by the committee. Mr. Miller informed the committee at the hearing on June 21, that he would testify about his own activities frankly and fully, but that his conscience would not permit him to use the name of another person. Mr. Miller has carefully reconsidered his position in deference to the committee's renewed request in its letter of June 27. He has concluded that he could not live with himself if he were to do other than adhere to the position which he took before the committee.

We submit that this ought not to end the committee's consideration of all the circumstances of the case before arriving at a final decision as to whether or not Arthur Miller should be cited for contempt. As the precedents set forth in this memorandum will show, this committee on a number of occasions has refrained from citing witnesses for contempt who declined to name other people. And, as we hope also to show, in the light of these precedents, Arthur Miller's case presents the strongest possible grounds for withholding action.

I. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR THE COMMITTEE'S CONSIDERATION

Mr. Miller has asked us to submit to the committee the following additional material which reinforces his testimony before the committee and gives further evidence of his faith in democracy and his irreconcilable opposition to communism:

1. Copy of Arthur Miller's affidavit to the State Department dated June 25, 1956.

This affidavit, submitted in support of his application for a passport, constitutes a concise summary of his past activities and a strong and explicit statement of his convictions, and we believe that the committee would find it illuminating and helpful.

2. Copy of Arthur Miller's affidavit to the State Department dated July 3, 1956.

This affidavit contains additional data, not referred to in the committee's hearings, drawn from Arthur Miller's writings and further reflecting his democratic faith. We would particularly draw the committee's attention to pages 15 to 18 which have to do with Arthur Miller's relations with the foreign press. These pages show the patriotic position which he has consistently taken with the foreign press—refusing to lend comfort to Communist portrayals of this country, expounding its culture at the request of the State Department, and, as in the case of his interview in the leading Icelandic newspaper Morgunbladid of October 7, 1954, protesting vigorously against the tyrannical suppressions of liberty in Russia.

3. Translation of the Interview With Arthur Miller published in the Icelandic newspaper Morgunbladid of October 7, 1954.

This translation, submitted to the State Department and certified as correct by the consulate general of Iceland in New York on July 5, 1956, shows the vast gulf separating Arthur Miller from the Communists. It deserves special attention because of the strategic importance of Iceland to this country.

In view of the precedents referred to below for withholding contempt citations, we submit that these documentary evidences of Arthur Miller's outspoken democratic faith should be carefully considered and taken fully into account by the committee.

II. AUTHOR MILLER'S COOPERATIVENESS AS WITNESS BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE

Mr. Miller was a cooperative and helpful witness before the committee, answering all questions forthrightly except for the single matter of giving certain names which his conscience would not permit him to do. Mr. Miller was questioned in detail about his travel abroad and his applications for passports. He answered all these questions.[1] He testified that he had applied for and received a passport in 1946 or 1947 and that this passport was renewed in Rome "a couple of years thereafter." (Transcript, p. 872.) He testified that he applied for a passport in March of 1954 and that this application had been denied. (Transcript, p. 872.) He testified that he had an application for a passport pending at the present time. (Transcript, p. 874.) He testified that:

"After the denial of my passport by the State Department [in 1954], I was literally besieged by foreign newspapermen. Many of them, as far as I know they were all from non-Communist and most of them in the country I know little about, France. They were from the rightist press and from the center press. They were after me to the point where I had to go to my home in Roxbury and hide out there because they wanted me to carry on a fight about this in the European press against the United States, and I refused to do it and I refused to do it for a good reason, and that is that, whatever I may have supported and however it looks, I do draw a line between criticism of the United States in the United States and before foreigners." (Transcript, pp. 928–929.)

Mr. Miller was questioned in detail about his relationship with the New York Youth Board and about his past connections with certain Communist-front organizations, such as the Joint Antifascist Refugees Committee, the World Youth Festival, the Civil Rights Congress, etc. Mr. Miller answered all such questions frankly and without reserve. (Transcript, pp. 893 to 940.)

Mr. Miller was asked whether he had ever had any connections with the Communist Party. He answered this question with all the detail at his command after the lapse of

---

[1] Although we are confining this memorandum to existing legislative precedents, we feel duty bound to point out here that a witness is not guilty of contempt unless the questions he refuses to answer are "pertinent to the questions under inquiry," which in this case related to "passports." The Government must plead and prove the pertinency of each question a witness refuses to answer, and it is not enough to show that such questions might have led to later relevant questions. *Bowers* v. *United States* (202 F. 2d 447 (CADC, 1953)).

many years. He testified that in 1939 or 1940 he attended 3 or 4 meetings of a Marxist study course held in a "vacant store open to the street in my neighborhood in Brooklyn." (Transcript, pp. 941–942.) He testified that in 1947 he attended about 5 or 6 meetings of "Communist Party writers." (Transcript, p. 941.) Mr. Miller testified that "I went there to discover where I stood finally and completely. * * * I decided in the course of these meetings that I had finally to find out what my views really were in relation to theirs * * * and I discovered * * * that I had no real basis in common either philosophically or, most important to me, as a dramatist." (Transcript, pp. 942, 945.)

Mr. Miller held nothing back from the committee, no matter how painful nor far remote in time, except the names of certain writers at 5 or 6 meetings of Communist Party writers in 1947. In response to the question as to who was present, Mr. Miller testified:

"Mr. Chairman, I understand the philosophy behind this question and I want you to understand mine.

"When I say this I want you to understand that I am not protecting the Communists or the Communist Party. I am trying to and I will protect my sense of myself. I could not use the name of another person and bring trouble on him. These were writers, poets, as far as I could see, and the life of a writer, despite what it sometimes seems, is pretty tough. I wouldn't make it any tougher for anybody. I ask you not to ask me that question" (Transcript, p. 943.)

When pressed to respond he replied:

"I will be perfectly frank with you in anything relating to my activities. I take the responsibility for everything I have ever done, but I cannot take responsibility for another human being." (Transcript, p. 943.)

And again:

"All I can say, sir, is that my conscience will not permit me to use the name of another person." (Transcript, p. 948.)

This one declination to answer was in no sense a pro-Communist act, for Mr. Miller made it clear to the committee that his earlier cooperation with Communist-front organizations had been not only "unfortunate" but "a great error" (transcript, p. 953); that it would be a "disaster and a calamity" if the Communist Party ever took over this country (transcript, p. 952); and, above all, that he believed in democracy and loved his country as much as any man (transcript, p. 952).

It was after these statements that the chairman concluded the hearing with the following remarks:

"You have learned a great deal and made a greater contribution to what we think you now stand for than you realize because, by the errors that you committed, you are serving a very loud note of warning to a lot of other people who might fall into what you did, quite obviously.

"The committee is now adjourned." (Transcript, p. 954.)

Certainly this committee, in exercising its discretion, will wish to consider the respectful and cooperative nature of Mr. Miller's testimony.

III. ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF WITHHOLDING NAMES WHICH ARTHUR MILLER REJECTED

A subpenaed witness who is unwilling on grounds of conscience to disclose the identity of those whom he had formerly known as Communists, has alternative courses. Of the several courses open to Mr. Miller, he chose the one which was most creditable to him and most helpful to the committee.

1. He could have relied upon the fifth amendment when asked about his own activities and then relied upon the same provision when asked about others. The chairman adverted at the hearing to a "number of performers who had invoked the fifth amendment * * * largely because they did not want to be placed in the position of being an informer." (Transcript, p. 903.) By invoking the fifth amendment, a witness is legally safe, but he thereby deprives the committee of much information about himself which may be helpful.[2]

2. A second course—and one apparently utilized from time to time despite its unethical nature—is to testify about oneself and then forget the names of other persons. Sometimes this course is combined with the naming of one or more persons already known to the committee. Thus it would have been easy enough for Mr. Miller to have identified D'Usseau (previously identified by witnesses before this committee, Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area, pt. II, p. 1306), and then to have forgotten the names of the writers whom he had seen 5 or 6 times 9 years ago. But this course he rightly rejected.

3. The course taken by Mr. Miller—to disclose all details of his own past conduct and then honestly tell the committee he is unable within his conscience to identify other people—is not as safe as the other alternatives available to a witness in the position of Mr. Miller. But it is a more honorable course and one that provides the committee with information which may prove helpful to it.

IV. PRECEDENTS FOR REFRAINING FROM CONTEMPT CITATIONS

In the pamphlet entitled "This Is Your House Committee on Un-American Activities," prepared and released by this committee on September 19, 1954, the following question and answer appear:

"35. Does the committee endeavor to cite all of those witnesses who exhibit contempt for the committee in their appearance before the committee?

"No. The committee feels that it would be an unnecessary burden to the Department of Justice and the courts to pursue action against all such persons. The public record of such action by these individuals is believed sufficient to show the true nature of their contempt, arrogance, and perfidy."

Certainly, if the committee would consider not citing a witness who had been guilty of "arrogance and perfidy," the committee should now consider not citing one who has been respectful and cooperative. Moreover, Mr. Miller is a public figure in a field sensitive to public opinion, and the public record, carefully documented by this committee, with his admitted past political mistakes, has been given wide publicity and is there for all to see.

A formal statement of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has recognized the problem of conscience that may arise when a witness is asked to become an informer. The subcommittee has stated that it "made every effort to induce educators who had left the Communist Party to testify fully at all times. * * * And in almost every case, they were not pressed into extensive identifications of former associates when a reluctance to do so became apparent." (Report on Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, 83d Cong., 1st sess., p. 4.) The considerations underlying this policy of the Internal Security Subcommittee are, we submit, pertinent to Mr. Miller's case.

In the short time available to us, we have not been able to make an exhaustive search of the precedents before this and other committees dealing with subversive and un-American activities. But the precedents we have found in our brief search leave no doubt that a refusal on the grounds of conscience to answer a specific question by an otherwise respectful and cooperative witness has often not been followed by a citation for contempt. A summary of these precedents here follows. We have omitted the names of the witnesses in order that, if this memorandum should ever become public, they may be spared further notoriety. Also, we have made no examination of any cases which have been before the committee during the present session of Congress and in which, therefore, action might still be taken if it has not already been taken.

(a) Witness No. 1 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Radiation Laboratory, pt. 1, p. 356 ff.) that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1941. He refused to say whether another person was known to him as a member of the Communist Party. He was not cited for contempt.

(b) Witness No. 2 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Radiation Laboratory, pt. 1, p. 373 ff.) that she had been a member of the Communist Party from 1937 to 1941, but refused to answer questions about others. She was not cited for contempt.

(c) Witness No. 3 testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Atomic Bomb Project, pt. 3, p. 3417 ff.) that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1938 to 1943. He refused to give the names of the other members of his group. He was not cited for contempt.

(d) Witness No. 4. testified before this committee (Communist Infiltration of Atomic Bomb Project, pt. 3, p. 3453 ff.) that she had been a member of the Communist Party from 1939 to 1943. She refused to identify anyone as a member of her group. She was not cited for contempt.

(e) Witness No. 5 testified before this committee (Communist Activity in the Philadelphia Area, pt. 4, p. 4006) that she had attended meetings of the Communist Political Association in 1946, but declined to say whether she had attended meetings at the home of designated persons. She was not cited for contempt.

(f) Witness No. 6 testified before the Subcommittee (Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 6, p. 721 ff.) on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1936 to 1942, but refused to say whether or not a designated person had been a member of his group. He was not cited for contempt.

(g) Witness No. 7 testified before the same subcommittee (Subversive Influence in the Educational Process, pt. 12, p. 1023 ff.) that he had been a member of the Communist Party from 1935 to 1943, but refused to say who had been the senior professor in his group at a certain university. He was not cited for contempt.

(h) Witness No. 8 testified before the same subcommittee (Army Information and Education Program, p. 1498) that he had been a member of the Communist Party on two separate occasions but refused to identify others. He was not cited for contempt.

(i) At least four witnesses before this same subcommittee refused to answer questions about other persons during an investigation of the Southern Conference Educational Fund. These witnesses, though named by others as members of the Communist Party, denied membership and then refused to answer many questions, including questions pertaining to others. None of the witnesses was cited for contempt.

(j) Witness No. 13 admitted before the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee (State Department Information Program—Information Centers, pt. 8, p. 486) and admitted that he was a Marxist and Socialist. He refused to answer numerous questions relating to his Marxist beliefs. He was not cited for contempt.

In each of the cases referred to above except those of witnesses 7 and 13 the refusals to answer were on grounds of conscience.

---

[2] This is because a witness may not tell all about himself and then plead the fifth amendment to avoid testifying about others. *Rogers* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 367, 371).

Witness No. 7 pleaded the fifth amendment when asked to name someone else, but he was informed by the chairman that this constituted no defense since he had waived the privilege by testifying about his own activities in the Communist Party. Nevertheless he was not cited for contempt. Witness No. 13 pleaded the fifth amendment though the committee publicly took the position that this amendment was not a lawful defense; he was not cited for contempt.

It should be noted that most of the above persons, unlike Arthur Miller, were or had been in the Communist Party, and for extended periods of time, and therefore could have given a great deal of information about others. It is also to be noted that many of the above investigations, unlike that of Arthur Miller, concerned matters of serious import to our national security such as our atomic energy project. We urge the committee to compare the activities of these witnesses and of those associated with them with Arthur Miller's attendance at 3 or 4 meetings of a Marxist study group in 1940 and 5 or 6 meetings of Communist Party writers in 1947.

Our brief research into precedents additionally discloses that most of the witnesses who have been cited for contempt are entirely distinguishable from Mr. Miller. Some of them were contemptuous of the committee in their demeanor as well as in law and questioned the propriety and jurisdiction of the committee in a hostile fashion. Still others refused to answer questions which were preliminary or inconsequential in nature. Exceedingly few of the witnesses cited for contempt were friendly, dispassionate, and calm in their demeanor. Moreover, those persons who were respectful in manner and nevertheless cited for contempt, had been affiliated with the Communist Party over extended periods of time and could have given testimony based on certain knowledge of the facts. Mr. Miller, on the contrary, could not be certain who attended the meetings of the Communist Party writers as members of the Communist Party and who attended the meetings for the same purpose of inquiry and soul-searching as he did.

Our investigation has failed to disclose the citing of any witness who, in the words of the chairman, served "a very loud note of warning to a lot of other people who might fall into what" Mr. Miller did.

V. SOME FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The problem of conscience in cases of this sort is real and persistent, as it is in other areas of American life. We respect, for example, the right of a citizen to decline to bear arms even in time of war, if religious scruples forbid. In such cases it is necessary to distinguish between the true and the false conscientious objector. The determination is not always easy, but we do not refuse to make it because the task is difficult.

By the same token we recognize that the determination of when to respect a plea of conscientious unwillingness to inform and when to reject it may sometimes present the committee with hard choices, but this fact alone should not justify lumping all the cases together. At one end of the spectrum may be cases of Communist Party members with extensive information to offer; cases of obstreperous and defiant witnesses; cases involving Government and defense work in sensitive areas where every bit of knowledge may be important to the country. At the other end of the spectrum are cases such as Arthur Miller's, involving none of these elements. In between there may be various gradations.

We urge the committee not to part company with its own precedents and shut its eyes to the differences between one case and another. We have shown that in the light of those precedents, if there were ever a case for withholding punishment it is Arthur Miller's. His own democratic faith is beyond question. He was praised by the chairman for his recognition of past errors. He has promoted our democratic cause abroad. He was a cooperative and respectful witness. He answered all questions about himself. He did not seek refuge in the fifth amendment. He did not hide behind a conveniently forgetful memory. The persons he declined to name were dramatists and poets, unconnected with any government or defense activity. The few meetings he attended with them were taken up exclusively with discussions of Marxism at the literary level. He parted from these writers in opposition to their views. All this was 9 years ago.

We trust that the committee, considering all these factors, will not think it necessary for the protection of society to add to the ordeal which he has already undergone the further penalty of criminal punishment.

Respectfully submitted.

LLOYD K. GARRISON.
JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, as stated in the committee report, Arthur Miller, playwright, appeared before the committee under oath on June 21, 1956.

He was before the committee for an inquiry based on his alleged activities in Communist front organizations and to the extent that the questions dealt with these matters Mr. Miller answered the questions. However, in the course of the inquiry, it developed in the answers of the witness that he had in times past attended meetings at which there were in attendance individuals who were known to him to be members of the Communist Party. Inasmuch as the scope of the inquiry related to the activities of a number of Communist Party members during the period in question Mr. Miller was asked to identify those who were known to him personally to have been members of the Communist Party at that time, and who were in attendance at the meetings in question.

Mr. Miller declined to give the committee any information as to the identity of those individuals, relying not upon any provision of the Constitution in his declination, but upon his moral scruples. It is well based in the law that one cannot decline to answer pertinent and relative questions out of moral scruples no matter how laudable they may be. It should be pointed out and should be made perfectly clear on the record that if a declination of this kind is permitted by the committee, that is to say, a declination to answer questions not based upon legal grounds, it will certainly establish a very clear pattern for the future so far as witnesses are concerned and will in a large part destroy the utility of your House committee.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. This committee's investigations, I assume, are being carried on for the purpose of determining what legislation, if any, should be presented to the House; am I right?

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman tell the House please what legislation has been interfered with that you could not prepare or could not propose because you do not know the names of certain persons that associated with this man?

Mr. JACKSON. As the committee was very much interested in this particular period and in those who were members of the Communist Party because of an investigation in the area of passport frauds prevalent at that time it was the purpose of the committee and presently is the purpose of the committee to make such recommendations, as may be considered necessary to the House in that area. Whether or not the individuals concerned, who were said by Mr. Miller himself to have been members of the Communist Party, were able to give the committee information in that area, we do not know due to his declination.

Mr. MULTER. The point of my inquiry is—what difference does it make whether it was John Jones or Joe Smith or whether it was 1 person or 10 persons who are Communists? The fact has been established that there have been many Communists engaged in these activities, and I cannot see what difference it makes as to whether it was one person or another or a great number more or less. You have the facts as to the participation of these Communists in these activities. Why cannot you now bring in proposed legislation without this information that this man refused to give you on the grounds that would require him to "squeal", to use the colloquial term, about people who may or may not be Communists?

Mr. JACKSON. I would say to the gentleman that the crux of any conspiracy is those who comprise it. We have abundant testimony to indicate that there is and has been a sinister Communist conspiracy in this country. Unless we determine who the members of that conspiracy are and in what activity they are or have engaged, there is no purpose to be served by any investigation in the area. We believe it to be within the discretion of a witness to make a determination in his own mind as to whether or not individuals he knew to be members of the Communist Party are still members or are not members, nor whether they engaged or are still engaged in illegal activities. That is a matter for determination by the committee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Of course there has been a studied attempt made for a long time to convince the American people, or those who do not care what the facts are, that the Committee on Un-American Activities has but one function, and that is to write legislation.

I would like to call to your attention the powers and duties of the committee:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form

of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

Arthur Miller was not subpenaed for the purpose of squealing on anybody, as he and his high-priced lawyers would have you believe. He was subpenaed because there was information that he had been a Communist, that he was associated with Communists in these meetings, and at the moment he was applying for a passport to travel abroad. His request for a passport was denied. It was denied a year ago. The committee, in its efforts to write the kind of legislation necessary with reference to the issuance of passports, was interested in knowing who those groups were that were Communists.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that you have established a conspiracy? You have done a good job establishing that there is and was a conspiracy, and we know there are participants who are Communists. Obviously, from the reading of the duties by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] you are not a prosecuting agency. You have never pretended to be. What purpose can be served by determining whether or not this man's passport was properly or improperly issued? You have all the facts. What difference does it make whether there are 1 or 2 or 5 or more involved in this conspiracy? The fact has been established that there was a conspiracy. Why do you not proceed to legislate?

Mr. JACKSON. The committee is still investigating passport frauds. Merely to say that because we have a small amount of evidence in that area is enough to absolve everyone who has taken part in passport frauds is not enough. We have yet to complete the picture as to why it was done and how it was done and by what means.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman indicated that there was information that Arthur Miller was a Communist. On page 36 of the hearings, at the bottom of the page, this colloquy appears:

> Mr. ARENS. I put it to you as a fact and ask you to affirm or deny the fact that you did make application for membership in the Communist Party and that the number of your application is 23345.
>
> Mr. MILLER. I would not affirm that. I have no memory of such a thing.
>
> Mr. ARENS. Do you deny it?
>
> Mr. MILLER. I would deny it.

I would assume if Mr. Miller were guilty of perjury the committee would have referred the matter to the Department of Justice for action under the perjury statutes, rather than to come into this Congress and ask that he be held for contempt.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee might do that or the committee might continue investigation of the matter. Mr. Miller is not being cited for being a Communist. This matter is before the House for action today because Mr. Miller refused to name those who were said by him to have been members of the Communist Party during that period. In so declining to elaborate on his testimony he did not avail himself of the privileges that were his under the Constitution.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Does the committee have any information about the fact that he was a Communist, which does not appear in these hearings?

Mr. JACKSON. I will say to the gentleman that the committee had evidence that satisfied members of the committee as to Mr. Miller's activities on behalf of the Communist front. Else Mr. Miller would not have been subpenaed.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I shall be very happy to.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does not this present this kind of analogous situation: Is not this on a parity with a man saying to a grand jury: "I did not participate in the killing or the murder, but I was present at the time, and I refuse to testify to tell you who those people were on account of my conscience or because I do not want to talk about my friends"? In other words, would not your whole theory of the admissibility of evidence in this case be in jeopardy if this man were not cited for contempt and punished?

Mr. JACKSON. I think very definitely so. If the pattern is established by this or any other committee of permitting a witness before that committee to go so far into his activities in the Communist Party or a Communist front organization, and then to stop at his own discretion, the entire structure of congressional investigation is in danger, in very serious danger.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. If you will read the record of the testimony, Miller in substance said to this committee that he believed at the present time that a writer such as he was had the right to advocate anything, even to overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Did not the late Senator Taft, in a speech to the Executive Club in Milwaukee, state in effect that he considered it the right of any person to advocate anything, even Communist doctrines, as long as he was not engaged in a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence?

Mr. SCHERER. No. The Smith Act provisions would forbid advocating the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the act creating the Committee on Un-American Activities charged the committee with the duty of making certain investigations. Under the principle of self-preservation, the House of Representatives has the implied right to prevent acts which, in and of themselves, obstruct or prevent the discharge of legislative duties. As this inherent right was latent, undefined, and unpublished, and as common justice required that citizens be advised as to the extent and limitations of this power, a statute was passed making it a misdemeanor for a person to refuse to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry. The penalty for the violation of this statute is a fine of not more than $1,000, nor less than $100, and imprisonment for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

There are instances in which this governmental right or power comes into conflict with the right of a witness to refuse to answer questions, such as is the case where a witness refuses to answer because the answer might tend to incriminate him. The Committee on Un-American Activities has just presented the facts to the House of Representatives regarding the refusal of eight witnesses to answer pertinent questions propounded to them in the course of committee investigations. The House of Representatives adopted resolutions in each of these instances referring the facts to the proper United States attorney for prosecution, for their refusal to answer certain questions propounded to them. In some of the cases presented, the witness did not assert any constitutional immunity against testifying; some did not assign any constitutional reason for refusing to testify; some refused to do more than answer to their names, and some based their refusal to testify on their reluctance to give information relating to other persons.

The House of Representatives should not consider lightly the relinquishment of its right to institute contempt proceedings in such cases, for to do so would encourage a recurrence of such wrongful conduct and bring into disregard and disrepute important legislative functions.

The committee sought to elicit information, the receipt of which would have been an aid to Congress in better understanding the problems arising from Communist activities and the information sought would have been an aid in the finding of a legislative solution to some of these problems.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, first may the record show that on the previous citations I have voted to uphold the committee. But in the case of Arthur Miller I believe, after careful study,

that the committee has made a serious error. This case is different from the others because of some or all of these facts.

First. Mr. Miller was a completely cooperative witness and the last words of the distinguished chairman to him were "You have learned a great deal, and made a greater contribution to what we think you now stand for than you realize because, by the errors that you have committed, you are serving a very loud note of warning to a lot of other people who might fall into what you did, quite obviously."

Second. The committee has repeatedly in other cases of similar refusal refrained from citing for contempt even though in some of these the witnesses also refused to answer many other questions. Mr. Miller, perhaps because of his prominence, has been discriminated against and the committee has raised a double standard. For reference we should read the memorandum of Mr. Miller's attorneys submitted on July 6, 1956. It documents 13 such cases.

Third. The very few witnesses cited for contempt who were cooperative in their attitude were directly affiliated with the Communist Party and in a position to be positive of information needed by the Government. Mr. Miller, on page 36 of the committee report, flatly denied he had joined the Communist Party and wrote the committee:

> I have no knowledge of any plan on the part of these people, past or present, detrimental to society or otherwise. I have no knowledge of any crime or criminal.

Fourth. The House is in the same position as a judge who decides that the degree of contumacy or contempt is not sufficient to require punishment. The argument that the trial court can also exercise this privilege does not excuse our ducking our duty just because there may be present to some technical degree of contempt. The past record of the committee actions as previously cited, the acknowledged helpfulness of Mr. Miller to the committee, and the very full and frank answers given in all other instances, it seems to me, calls on us as judges to act on the true merits of this case.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if the contempt citation is voted it serves notice on all future witnesses before the House Un-American Activities Committee that they must answer all committee questions unless they plead the fifth amendment, conveniently claim forgetfulness, or deliberately lie. The ability of the committee to get useful, helpful information will be seriously damaged. This is not just a case of the House granting mercy, it is an opportunity for the House to exercise judgment and discretion toward a cooperative witness.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous occasions since I have been a Member of this body when there have been resolutions similar to those we are considering today. It was in the 81st Congress, if I recall correctly, that a resolution of this nature was directed at a witness who had appeared before the committee headed by the late beloved Congressman Frank Buchanan investigating the practices of lobbies and of lobbyists. On that occasion many on the other side of the aisle opposed the resolution and sought to bring about its defeat. This, I thought, tended to take a hearing for alleged contempt from the proper judicial tribunal and decide it in the climate of prejudice and favor and of partisan bias on the floor of this House. We in the House in voting on resolutions of this character are not passing upon the guilt or the innocence of the person sought to be cited. That is the province strictly and entirely of the courts. During my terms in the Congress, even at times when I thought the practices of some congressional committees did not conform to the recognized rules of American courts and of fair play, I uniformly have followed the rule of voting for resolutions of the type now before us. The passing of such a resolution does not constitute a finding either of guilt or of innocence. It does not constitute a finding of approval or of disapproval of anything the witness did or anything the committee did. It merely refers the matter to the proper tribunal. It is the duty of the House to maintain its own dignity, and whenever one of the committees of the House makes a prima facie case that any witness before it has been disrespectful of its authority, the proper procedure, of course, is to have the matter referred to the courts for judicial determinations of the facts and of the law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nays 9, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—373

Abbitt	Bolton, Oliver P.	Cretella
Abernethy	Bonner	Cunningham
Adair	Bosch	Curtis, Mass.
Addonizio	Bow	Curtis, Mo.
Albert	Bowler	Dague
Alexander	Boykin	Davis, Ga.
Alger	Boyle	Davis, Tenn.
Allen, Calif.	Bray	Dawson, Utah
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ga.	Deane
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Delaney
Andresen, August H.	Brownson	Dempsey
Andrews	Broyhill	Denton
Anfuso	Buckley	Derounian
Arends	Budge	Devereux
Ashley	Burdick	Dies
Ashmore	Burnside	Diggs
Aspinall	Bush	Dingell
Auchincloss	Byrd	Dixon
Avery	Byrne, Pa.	Dodd
Ayres	Byrnes, Wis.	Dollinger
Baker	Canfield	Dolliver
Baldwin	Cannon	Dondero
Barden	Carlyle	Donohue
Barrett	Carrigg	Donovan
Bass, N. H.	Cederberg	Dorn, N. Y.
Bates	Chase	Dorn, S. C.
Beamer	Chelf	Doyle
Becker	Chenoweth	Durham
Belcher	Chiperfield	Edmondson
Bennett, Fla.	Christopher	Elliott
Bennett, Mich.	Chudoff	Ellsworth
Bentley	Church	Engle
Berry	Clark	Evins
Betts	Cole	Fallon
Blitch	Colmer	Fascell
Boggs	Cooley	Feighan
Boland	Coon	Fenton
Bolling	Cooper	Fernandez
Bolton, Frances P.	Corbett	Fino
	Coudert	Fisher
	Cramer	Fjare
		Flood
		Flynt
		Fogarty
		Forand
		Ford
		Forrester
		Frazier
		Frelinghuysen
		Friedel
		Fulton
		Gamble
		Garmatz
		Gary
		Gathings
		Gavin
		Gentry
		George
		Grant
		Gray
		Green, Pa.
		Gregory
		Griffiths
		Gross
		Gubser
		Gwinn
		Hagen
		Hale
		Haley
		Halleck
		Hand
		Harden
		Hardy
		Harris
		Harrison, Nebr.
		Harrison, Va.
		Harvey
		Hays, Ark.
		Hays, Ohio
		Hayworth
		Healey
		Henderson
		Herlong
		Heselton
		Hess
		Hiestand
		Hill
		Hillings
		Hinshaw
		Hoeven
		Hoffman, Mich.
		Holland
		Holmes
		Holt
		Holtzman
		Hope
		Horan
		Hosmer
		Huddleston
		Hull
		Hyde
		Ikard
		Jackson
		James
		Jarman
		Jenkins
		Jennings
		Johnson, Calif.
		Johnson, Wis.
		Jonas
		Jones, Ala.
		Jones, Mo.
		Jones, N. C.
		Judd
		Karsten
		Kean
		Kearns
		Keating
		Kelly, N. Y.
		Keogh
		Kilburn
		Kilday
		Kilgore
		King, Calif.
		King, Pa.
		Kirwan
		Kluczynski
		Knox
		Knutson
		Kruger
		Laird
		Landrum
		Lanham
		Lankford
		Latham
		LeCompte
		Lesinski
		Lipscomb
		Lovre
		McCarthy
		McCormack
		McCulloch
		McDonough
		McDowell
		McGregor
		McIntire
		McMillan
		McVey
		Macdonald
		Machrowicz
		Mack, Ill.
		Mack, Wash.
		Madden
		Magnuson
		Mahon
		Mailliard
		Marshall
		Martin
		Mason
		Matthews
		Meader
		Merrow
		Metcalf
		Miller, Calif.
		Miller, Md.
		Miller, Nebr.
		Miller, N. Y.
		Mills
		Minshall
		Morano
		Morgan
		Morrison
		Moss
		Moulder
		Mumma
		Murray, Ill.
		Murray, Tenn.
		Natcher
		Nicholson
		Norblad
		Norrell
		O'Brien, Ill.
		O'Brien, N. Y.
		O'Hara, Ill.
		O'Konski
		O'Neill
		Osmers
		Ostertag
		Passman
		Patterson
		Pelly
		Perkins
		Pfost
		Philbin
		Phillips
		Pilcher
		Pillion
		Poage
		Poff
		Polk
		Price
		Prouty
		Quigley
		Rabaut
		Radwan
		Rains
		Ray
		Reece, Tenn.
		Reed, N. Y.
		Rees, Kans.
		Reuss
		Rhodes, Ariz.
		Rhodes, Pa.
		Richards
		Riehlman
		Riley
		Rivers
		Roberts
		Robeson, Va.
		Robsion, Ky.
		Rodino
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rogers, Tex.
		Rooney
		Rutherford
		Sadlak
		St. George
		Saylor
		Schenck
		Scherer
		Schwengel
		Scott
		Scrivner
		Seely-Brown
		Selden
		Sheehan
		Sheppard
		Short
		Shuford
		Simpson, Ill.
		Sisk
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Miss.
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, Wis.
		Spence
		Springer
		Steed
		Sullivan
		Taber
		Talle
		Taylor
		Teague, Calif.
		Teague, Tex.
		Thomas
		Thompson, Mich.
		Thomson, Wyo.
		Tollefson
		Trimble
		Tuck
		Tumulty
		Udall
		Utt
		Vanik
		Van Pelt
		Van Zandt
		Velde
		Vorys
		Vursell
		Wainwright
		Walter
		Watts
		Weaver
		Westland
		Wharton
		Widnall
		Wigglesworth
		Williams, Miss.
		Williams, N. J.
		Williams, N. Y.
		Willis
		Wilson, Calif.
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolverton
		Wright
		Yates
		Young
		Younger
		Zablocki
		Zelenko

NAYS—9

Celler	Holifield	Roosevelt
Crumpacker	Klein	Sieminski
Davidson	Multer	Thompson, N. J.

NOT VOTING—50

Bailey	Dowdy	Long
Bass, Tenn.	Eberharter	McConnell
Baumhart	Fountain	Mollohan
Bell	Gordon	Nelson
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Minn.
Brooks, La.	Hébert	Patman
Brooks, Tex.	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Burleson	Jensen	Preston
Carnahan	Johansen	Priest
Chatham	Kearney	Scudder
Clevenger	Kee	Shelley
Davis, Wis.	Kelley, Pa.	Sikes
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Siler

Simpson, Pa.	Thornberry	Wier
Staggers	Vinson	Wilson, Ind.
Thompson, La.	Whitten	Withrow
Thompson, Tex.	Wickersham	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Bell with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Patman with O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. KEARNS changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING INSURANCE AGAINST FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3732, with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Saturday, July 21, the Clerk had read section 1 of the committee amendment. If there are no amendments to section 1, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that in the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources. With specific reference to insurance against flood loss, the Congress finds that insurance against certain losses resulting from this period is not so available. Since preventive and protective means and structures against the effects of these disasters can never wholly anticipate the geographic incidence and infinite variety of the destructive aspects of these forces, the Congress finds that the safeguards of insurance are a necessary adjunct of preventive and protective means and structures.

Inasmuch as these disasters impede interstate and foreign commerce, hamper national defense, and cause widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare, without regard to State boundary lines, and in the absence of insurance protection from private or public sources, the Congress ought to provide for such protection in the case of flood, and study the feasibility and need for similar programs in the case of other forms of natural disaster against which insurance protection is not generally and practically available in all geographical areas.

(b) (1) It is the purpose of this act to authorize the establishment of a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risks of loss resulting from flood as hereinafter defined, and to require a study and report on insurance and reinsurance against still other natural disaster perils to the extent that such insurance or reinsurance is not available on reasonable terms and conditions from other public or private sources; and

(2) It is the further purpose of this act to encourage private insurance companies to write insurance covering the extent of the risks above the limits prescribed in section 10 (a) and to provide Federal reinsurance to the extent desirable and necessary to carry out this purpose.

(3) It is the further purpose of this act to authorize the establishment of a program of loans, and a program combining insurance and loans, to assist flood victims who have entered into contracts with the Administrator under this act.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) To assist in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator may appoint a Commissioner, and the basic rate of compensation of such position shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the Commissioners of the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(b) The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, shall apply to the functions vested in the Administrator by this act, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the issuing of insurance policies, the making of reinsurance agreements, and the making and guaranteeing of loans, and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

AUTHORITY TO INSURE AND REINSURE

SEC. 4. To aid in carrying out the purposes of this act, the Administrator is authorized to provide, upon such terms and conditions (including coinsurance requirements) as he may establish, insurance and reinsurance against loss resulting from damage to or destruction against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property (including property owned by any State or local government) due to flood, as hereinafter defined, occurring within the United States.

LOAN CONTRACTS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with any persons (not including State and local governments and agencies thereof) to the effect that, in the event of any subsequent loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real and personal property due to flood, as hereinafter defined, occurring within the United States—

(1) the Administrator will guarantee any public or private financing institution against loss of principal and interest with respect to any loan in an amount not to exceed such subsequent flood loss (as modified by subsection (f) of this section, relating to deductibility), which may be made by such institution to any such person in connection with such flood loss; and

(2) to the extent that a loan to finance such flood loss is not available from any such institution on reasonable terms, the Administrator will make a loan directly to such person in an amount covering all or part (as provided for in the loan contract between the Administrator and such person) of the difference between the amount of such flood loss (as modified by such subsection (f), relating to deductibility) and the amount of the loan available from such institution.

Each such contract shall contain such terms and conditions, and require from any such person such monetary consideration, as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation; but such monetary consideration shall be in the lowest practicable amount.

(b) Any loan made or guaranteed under this section shall bear interest at the rate, as determined by the Administrator, which is prevailing in the area where the money loaned is to be used but such rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid principal balance.

(c) Any Federal Reserve bank, when designated by the Administrator, is hereby authorized to act, on behalf of the Administrator, as fiscal agent of the United States in guaranteeing loans under this section and in otherwise taking action in connection with such guaranties. Such funds as may be necessary to enable such bank to carry out any such guaranty shall be supplied and disbursed by or under authority of the Administrator from the Disaster Loan Fund. Such bank shall not have any responsibility or accountability except as agent in taking any action in connection with such guaranties. Each such bank shall be reimbursed by the Administrator, from funds appropriated by the Federal Government, for all expenses incurred by the bank in acting as agent on behalf of the Administrator, including among such expenses, notwithstanding any other provision of law, attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation.

(d) Actions and operations of such banks under authority of subsection (c) of this section shall be subject to the supervision of the Administrator and subject to such regulations as he may prescribe. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe the term and incidental charges for loans guaranteed under subsection (c) of this section. The Administrator is further authorized to prescribe regulations with respect to the forms and procedures (which shall be uniform to the maximum extent practicable) to be utilized in connection with such guaranties.

(e) To the maximum extent practicable, loans under this section shall be on a long-term basis in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, if so requested by the person obtaining the loan.

(f) Loans under this section shall be made only with respect to amounts exceeding the first $500 of the amount of the loss.

(g) The face amount of all loan contracts outstanding under this section at any one time shall not exceed $2,000,000,000; but such amount may be increased, with the approval of the President, by not to exceed $500,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

(h) The provisions of sections 8, 9, 10 (a), 10 (b), 12 (b), 12 (c), 13, 14, 15 (e), 15 (g), 17 (a), 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23 of this act shall be applicable with respect to the loan contract program under this section.

COMBINATION OF INSURANCE AND LOANS

SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to establish, under such regulations as he may prescribe, a program combining insurance and loans in order to provide the greatest variety and amount of protection against loss to the greatest number of affected parties in accordance with individual needs.

ESTIMATED RATES AND FEES

SEC. 7. (a) The Administrator shall from time to time establish a schedule of "estimated rates" for insurance offered under the provisions of this act, which would be adequate, in his judgment, to produce sufficient proceeds to pay all claims for probable losses over a reasonable period of years. Such "estimated rates" shall be used as a basis for determining the fees to be paid by the persons insured. They shall be based on consideration of the risks involved and shall be uniform for similar risks within a given classification of property. They shall not include any loading for administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this act. The Administrator shall establish a schedule of fees to provide insurance protection at reasonable costs designed to achieve marketability: *Provided,* That no insurance policy shall be issued for a fee less than 60 percent of such "estimated rate," except that reduced fees may be established for insurance on any classification of owner-occupied dwelling units if the Administrator determines that without such reduction the owners of such dwelling units as a class could not afford to pay the fees chargeable for such insurance. The Administrator is authorized to establish such classifications of fees as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act based on the use of the property to be insured, the availability of insurance from private sources covering such property, and the ability of the insured to self-insure or reinsure and may establish differentials in levels of fees for such classifications: *Provided,* That all such fees shall be uniform for similar risks within a given classification of property. The Administrator shall from time to time pay into the Disaster Insurance Fund, hereinafter created, an amount equal to the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued and the amount which would have been charged if the "estimated rates" were applied.

(b) The Administrator from time to time shall also negotiate with insurance companies seeking reinsurance for the purpose of establishing fees for reinsurance offered under the provisions of this act. Such fees shall be based on consideration of the risks involved and shall be adequate, in the judgment of the Administrator, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses. The fees shall not include any loading for administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this act.

PROPERTY AND LOSS LIMITS

SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to provide for the determination of types and location of property with respect to which insurance or reinsurance shall be made available under this act, the nature and limits of loss or damage in any area (including subdivisions thereof) which may be covered by such insurance or reinsurance, and such other matters as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

RISK CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 9. The Administrator may from time to time issue appropriate regulations regarding the classification, limitation, and rejection of risks assumed by him under authority of this act.

POLICY AND PROGRAM LIMITS

SEC. 10. (a) The outstanding face amount of insurance issued by the Administrator under this act shall not exceed $250,000 per person: *Provided,* That the face amount of such insurance on any dwelling unit (including any structures and personal property connected therewith) shall not exceed $10,000.

(b) The Administrator may from time to time issue appropriate regulations regarding insurance coverage available to joint owners and subsidiary and affiliated corporations as he shall deem advisable to effectuate the purposes of this act.

(c) Each insurance policy issued by the Administrator shall contain a loss-deductible clause relieving him from any liability for paying the first $100 of a proved and approved claim for loss, plus 5 percent of the remainder, or such larger amount or percentage as may be specified by the Administrator upon issuance of the insurance policy, taking into consideration the class of risk involved.

(d) The face amount of insurance policies and reinsurance agreements outstanding at any one time under this act shall not exceed $3 billion (which limit may be increased with the approval of the President by further amounts not to exceed $2 billion in the aggregate if such increase is deemed advisable to effectuate the purposes of this act) minus the aggregate amount of claims proved and approved under insurance policies and reinsurance agreements issued under this act, but plus fees collected hereunder. For the purpose of applying this limitation, the face amount of any policy or agreement shall be deemed to be the original amount minus claims proved and approved thereunder.

REINSURANCE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

SEC. 11. (a) The Administrator is authorized to issue such regulations regarding reinsurance under this act as he deems advisable in order to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The premium rate and terms and conditions of any policy reinsured under the provisions of this act shall be subject to approval by the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator shall use his best efforts to encourage private insurance companies to undertake the issuance of insurance policies covering that portion of the loss in excess of the limits specified in section 10 (a) of this act resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property due to flood as defined in this act. The Administrator may seek to achieve this end by offering a program of appropriate reinsurance within the authority granted him by this act.

(d) Wherever practicable, the Administrator may encourage, by offering suitable reinsurance subject to the provisions of this act, the issuance by private insurance companies of policies insuring against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property due to flood.

NONDUPLICATION OF AVAILABLE INSURANCE

SEC. 12. (a) No insurance or reinsurance, or loan contract, shall be issued under the provisions of this act covering risks against which insurance is available on reasonable terms from other public or private sources.

(b) No insurance or reinsurance shall be issued under the provisions of this act on any property declared by a duly constituted State or local zoning authority, or other authorized public body, to be in violation of State or local flood zoning laws.

(c) After June 30, 1958, no insurance or reinsurance shall be issued under the provisions of this act in any geographical location unless an appropriate public body shall have adopted and shall keep in effect such flood zoning restrictions, if any, as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator to reduce, within practicable limits, damages from flood in such location.

USE OF OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES

SEC. 13. (a) In providing insurance or reinsurance under this act, the Administrator shall use to the maximum practicable extent the facilities and services of private organizations and persons authorized to engage in the insurance business under the laws of any State (including insurance companies, agents, brokers, and adjustment organizations); and the Administrator may arrange for payment of reasonable compensation therefor.

(b) In providing insurance or reinsurance under this act, the Administrator may use the services of other public agencies, and pay reasonable compensation therefor.

(c) The Administrator may supply, receive from and exchange with other agencies of the Federal Government, State, local, and interstate commissions or agencies, and private organizations experienced in the fields of insurance or reinsurance, such information as may be useful in the administration of the programs authorized by this act.

(d) In carrying out the functions authorized in this act, the Administrator may consult with other agencies of the Federal Government and interstate, State, and local public agencies having responsibilities for land use and flood control and for flood zoning and flood-damage prevention in order to assure that the insurance and reinsurance programs are consistent with the programs of such agencies. Where the program of the Administrator may affect existing or proposed flood-control works under the jurisdiction of agencies of the Federal Government these agencies shall cooperate with the Administrator in coordinating their respective programs. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator shall coordinate the administration of their respective programs relating to flood insurance and reinsurance for agricultural commodities.

CLAIMS PAYMENT AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14.(a) Under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, he shall arrange for prompt adjustment and payment of valid claims for losses covered by insurance or reinsurance under this act.

(b) Upon disallowance of any claim against the Administrator under color of any insurance or reinsurance made available under this act, or upon refusal of the claimant to accept the amount allowed upon any such claim, the claimant may institute an action against the Administrator on such claim in the United States district court in which a major portion (in terms of value) of the insured property is located. Any such action must be begun within 1 year after the date upon which the claimant receives from the Administrator written notice of disallowance or partial disallowance of the claim. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may be sued and he shall appoint one or more agents within the jurisdiction of each United States district court upon whom service of process can be made in any action instituted under this section. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon all United States district courts to hear and determine such actions without regard to the amount in controversy.

FUNDS AND TREASURY BORROWINGS

SEC. 15. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, the Administrator is authorized to establish three funds to be known as the (1) Disaster Insurance Fund, (2) Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and (3) Disaster Loan Fund.

(b) Into the Disaster Insurance Fund shall be deposited all insurance fees collected by the Administrator for insurance policies issued by him under this act. Into the Disaster Reinsurance Fund shall be deposited all fees collected by the Administrator in connection with reinsurance made available by him under this act. Into the Disaster Loan Fund shall be deposited amounts accruing to the United States in connection with loan contract transactions.

(c) Moneys in each of the funds may be invested in obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. Such obligations may be sold and the proceeds derived therefrom may be reinvested as above provided if deemed advisable by the Administrator. Income from such investment or reinvestment shall be deposited in the respective fund from which the investment was made.

(d) All salvage proceeds realized by the Administrator in connection with insurance made available under this act shall be deposited in the Disaster Insurance Fund; and all salvage proceeds realized by the Administrator in connection with reinsurance made available under this act shall be deposited in the Disaster Reinsurance Fund.

(e) The Administrator is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time and have outstanding at any one time, in an amount not exceeding $500 million (or such greater amount as may be approved by the President) notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations to be issued hereunder and for such purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations.

The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Funds borrowed under this section shall be deposited, in such proportions as the Administrator deems advisable, in the Disaster Insurance Fund, the Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and the Disaster Loan Fund.

(f) Moneys in the Disaster Insurance Fund, the Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and the Disaster Loan Fund may be used for the following purposes as deemed necessary by the Administrator:

(1) To pay from the Disaster Insurance Fund proved and approved claims for loss under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, insurance policies issued by the Administrator under this act;

(2) To pay from the Disaster Reinsurance Fund proved and approved claims under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, reinsurance agreements entered into by the Administrator under this act;

(3) To pay for the Disaster Loan Fund the amounts of loans made by the Administrator, amounts in payment of guarantees, and other nonadministrative expenses in connection with direct and guaranteed loans under this act; and

(4) To repay to the Secretary of the Treasury sums borrowed from him in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

(g) All administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this act shall be paid from funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 16. In carrying out his functions under this act, the Administrator shall appoint an advisory committee as authorized by section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 590, 645). Such committee shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 15 persons familiar with the problems of insurance or reinsurance, to advise the Administrator with respect to the formulation of policies and the execution of functions under this act.

STUDIES

SEC. 17. (a) The Administration shall undertake a continuing study of the practicability of extending the coverage of insurance programs similar to those authorized under this act to any one or more natural disaster perils, other than flood, against which, and for the period during which, insurance protection is not generally and practically available in all geographical locations from other public or private sources.

(b) The Administrator shall also undertake a continuing study of participation by private insurance companies in the programs authorized by this act, in order that the protection it authorizes can be provided, whenever practicable, through insurance policies issued by private insurance companies and reinsured with the Administrator, in lieu of providing such protection through insurance policies issued in the name of the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator shall undertake a continuing study of the feasibility of having private insurance companies take over, with or without some form of Federal financial support, the insurance programs authorized by this act.

ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS

SEC. 18. For the purpose of carrying out functions under this act the Administrator may—

(a) sue or be sued:

(b) without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529 and 41 U. S. C. 5), and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), enter into and perform contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, on such terms as he may deem appropriate, with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State or agency or political subdivision thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation and consent to modification thereof, and make advance or progress payments in connection therewith;

(c) without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529 and 41 U. S. C. 5), and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), by purchase, lease, or donation acquire such real and personal property and any interest therein, make advance or progress payments in connection therewith, and hold, use, maintain, insure against loss, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real and personal property as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act;

(d) appoint, pursuant to civil-service laws and regulations, such officers, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; define their authority and duties; provide bonds for such of them as he may deem necessary; and delegate to them, and authorize successive redelegations by them, of such of the powers vested in him by this act as he may determine;

(e) conduct researches, surveys, and investigations relating to flood insurance and reinsurance and assemble data for the purpose of establishing estimated rates, fees, and premiums for flood insurance and reinsurance under this act;

(f) issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and

(g) exercise all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this act and such incidental powers as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS IN REAL ESTATE ACQUIRED

SEC. 19. The acquisition by the Administrator of any real property pursuant to this act shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property.

TAXATION

SEC. 20. Nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any real property, acquired and held by the Administrator in connection with the payment of any claim under this act, from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 21. The annual report made by the the Administrator to the President for submission to the Congress under existing law on all programs provided for under this act shall contain a comprehensive report concerning (1) the operation of insurance, reinsurance, and loan programs authorized under this act, and (2) the status and result of studies authorized under section 17 of this act, together with such recommendations, if any, for legislative changes deemed by the Administrator desirable to improve the operation of programs authorized under this act. The annual report for the calendar year ending December 31, 1961, shall contain an express opinion of the Administrator, supported by pertinent findings, concerning the advisability of withdrawing in whole or in part Federal financial support for insurance policies to be issued at any time after June 30, 1962, offering protection as authorized in this act, taking into consideration the desirability of offering such protection. Such opinion shall be accompanied by recommendations for legislative changes deemed desirable by the Administrator in the event the opinion is to the effect that any such withdrawal of financial support is advisable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 22. As used in this act the term—

(a) "Flood" includes any flood, tidal wave, wave wash, or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landslide due to excess moisture, and shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed by regulation of the Administrator;

(b) "Person" means an individual or group of individuals, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, including State and local governments and agencies thereof;

(c) "United States," when used in a geographic sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(d) "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(e) "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

SEPARABILITY PROVISION

SEC. 23. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to any person or circumstance other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. SPENCE (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that our very able

and efficient Clerk may read a telegram, which is on his desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *July 16, 1956.*

Congressman BRENT SPENCE,

Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We are pleased that your committee has reported favorably a Federal disaster insurance bill. This legislation is tremendously important to our region and to the country. We hope you will continue to help passage of this legislation before adjournment. We are particularly glad your committee eliminated the requirement for States to share the cost and we feel it is important for the House and for the conference committee to concur in this action. The New England Governors Conference meeting in Newport, R. I., today expresses its appreciation for your fine cooperation in advancing this legislation.

Regards.

DENNIS J. ROBERTS,

Chairman, New England Governors Conference.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about the position I take today, or the position I took Saturday, on this bill, I am not asking you to vote "no," and I am not asking you to vote "yes," leaving that to your own decision. I am in favor of insurance for any contingency which may be covered by insurance. I am willing, if necessary, for the United States Government to go into the insurance business to that limited extent necessary in extraordinary situations, or to cover an area into which a private insurance company, or group of companies, may not properly enter. We will have an example of this shortly in a bill which will give the Government the authority to insure against a disaster resulting from some unknown condition which might arise after an atomic reactor is put into operation.

Nobody in this Congress, and certainly no member of a committee familiar with the atomic-energy program familiarly called atoms for peace, has any idea there will be such a disaster. We are dealing with a new industry, based upon an unknown and fearful power. Private insurance companies are willing to go into the field and to insure a private powerplant, using a reactor for the heat unit, to the extent of, say, $65 million. Suppose however, as a remote possibility, something should happen which would cause widespread damage in a congested area. Would $65 million cover it? Who knows? Therefore, the Government is asked to insure above this $65 million limit. This seems reasonable to me.

More important in this discussion, the Department of Agriculture has had long, and at times painful experience, with an effort to put the government into the insurance business, to cover crop failures. When I was on the Committee on Agriculture, the first 4 years I was here, this was an ever-present problem in this committee. Our intentions were excellent; the methods of working out the problem were strictly bureaucratic.

The regulations were so loosely drawn that a farmer could wait, almost until he could foresee failure, through a probable drought or other disaster factor, and then take out the insurance.

It was not necessary for insurance to be taken out widely over a possible disaster area. This is the fundamental concept of all insurance. Insurance requires, to be successful, that a large group of people insure themselves against whatever the hazard may be, at low premiums, so that these premiums are not burdensome on any of them individually, and then when a disaster strikes one of the insured, the entire group is able to carry the loss, and the insurance company is able to stay in business. The only way a Government insurance company can stay in business is to draw on the taxpayers of the entire United States as if they were all policyholders in the company.

Another problem we faced was—and I think this was subsequent to the reorganization of the crop insurance program—the elimination of a disaster area from future insurance. Is this the intent of flood insurance? If, for example, a flood strikes the area of some of my friends from Connecticut, will the Government pay the insurance contracted for under this bill, and then say that the area is barred from future insurance indefinitely, because it happened to have one disaster?

Coming back to the crop insurance program, which is still in operation, it was authorized by an act passed in 1938. The first policies were written for the 1939 crop year. From 1939 to 1947, inclusive, the Government lost $73 million. The program was then revised and limited. Between 1948 and 1955, inclusive, the loss was an additional $11 million. These figures do not include administration costs and I would estimate that such costs, for the 17 years, would come to another $1 million.

When I say "revised," I mean the program was limited to a certain few counties. It was not offered widely, as this flood program will be. Starting in 1948, with only 394 counties, it is now offered in almost 1,000 counties. We are trying here to cover "disaster," from natural causes, unlimited, which is a very different thing from crop failure in designated counties. The crop insurance program has a requirement that 200 farmers, or one-third of the producers, in any county must sign up, before that county is eligible for the insurance protection. It is a continuous contract, subject to cancellation by either party on or before a date specified in the contract.

I suggested on Saturday, Mr. Speaker, that I would try to get together a few questions and submit them to the Banking and Currency Committee, to be answered immediately if that is possible, and certainly to be answered before any program of this kind is offered to the people at large.

Is it the intent of the committee that this program shall be written as if all taxpayers in the United States were policyholders; that is, will the entire body of taxpayers subsidize this program, benefiting a limited few? If so, then we are openly taking the money of a large number of people, for the personal benefit of a few people, many of whom are at least partially responsible for the damages they have suffered, as I will try to explain.

If we are not to consider all taxpayers as premium payers, without benefit, then the presumption is that the premiums charged the policyholders in this program will be adequate to pay all costs and all losses. Is this the intent of the program, and of the committee which brings it to the floor? It is not so in the crop-insurance program.

If the committee says that it is the intent to cover all losses by the premiums collected, as would be necessary in a private insurance company, then does the committee mean that this will also include the overhead costs, or will the taxpayers be expected to set up a new agency, or a section in an existing agency, to carry on this program, without this overhead cost being charged against the fund built up by the premiums? If the Government is to set up such an agency, then I hazard a guess that there will probably be 50 percent more employees in it than would be required to conduct the same operation under private enterprise. Will the taxpayers be expected to pay for this, as they pay for the other operations of bureaucracy?

I am quite sure the Banking and Currency Committee cannot answer the next question, but I will ask it: Will a trained insurance executive be placed in charge of this program? Will actuarial methods be employed in setting it up, and setting the premiums?

Will an entire area be designated in advance as a distress area, and will a minimum number of policyholders be required for the area, in order to make residents eligible for such insurance? In commercial insurance, we apply the risk to an entire group of hazards, for example, automobile accidents, or fires, or deaths, or whatever it may be; in this program, the hazard must necessarily be applied to an area which might be struck by a flood. It is very important to know whether a few individuals will be given insurance in an area which meteorological records indicate is subject to periodic floods? In that case, it would almost be a safe bet that the policyholder would win. The experience of the Department of Agriculture would be helpful here.

Is it the intention to remove a flood area, where losses have been paid? This has been done with crop insurance. What percentage of the probable value, or the probable loss, will the policyholder be required to cover? Will the State, or the county, or the municipality, or any similar governmental agency or division, be required to join in this program, by helping underwrite the losses—for many of which they must take at least partial

responsibility—or is this to be entirely a Government subsidized and managed program? To what extent will the people be required to protect themselves, against floods or similar hazards? Out where I live, we form "flood control districts," as the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] pointed out on Saturday. We tax ourselves, we underwrite various flood-control projects, quite often with the help of the Army engineers, as well as with the State or county engineers, and we do everything we possibly can to protect ourselves from the losses which will be covered in this sort of insurance. Will the people of other States be required to do the same thing or are they being asked to put their entire faith in a Government which seems to think that a blank check is the sure cure for anything, from international friendship to producing more scientists in our schools?

Will the people be permitted to build, either individual residences and stores, or entire subdivisions, in areas which are known to be flood hazard areas? This is a common practice—human nature being what it is—in regions where floods are intermittent, but which history shows comes along at intervals, with some regularity? If so, what interval will the committee establish for a flood to be considered a disaster, rather than a recurrent problem to be expected according to established statistical tables?

Out where I live, we have rivers, as I said to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], where, if we fall in them, we get up and dust ourselves off; yet any year, if we have a heavy snow in the mountains, followed by a sudden hot spell and a rain, the waters rush down these rivers, completely filling them, and occasionally washing away heavy bridges the casual observer would never think could be affected. Yet I have seen, time and time again, homes and business properties built in these areas, with the customary optimism of the people of America, calm in the assurance that nothing could happen to them, or perhaps with a synthetic assurance, produced in the last 20 years, that if anything does happen, even if it is their own fault, the Government will take care of it.

As a matter of fact, what is a flood? There was a picture in the paper, Saturday morning, showing the picture of a home in Falls Church, with a flooded cellar. Is that a "flood," eligible for the insurance we are talking about? Certainly the waters that rushed down the streets of another city, to a height which flooded the stores and made it necessary for the police and firemen to check cars to see if there was any loss of life, is definitely a "flood," but how could anyone have known in advance, either that the floods would hit that particular spot or that his home would be the one hit, or that his car would be parked at that particular spot on that particular day? Is he to be permitted to come in after the accident, and take out insurance?

Carrying it a little farther, what about hurricanes, and the floods connected with hurricanes, which are actually not self-starting floods, so to speak, but disasters connected with some greater disaster? Are we to read the fine print on the back of these policies and find out that unless the flood started of its own accord, due to an excess of water, the policy will not pay off? We are not unfamiliar with the fine print on the back of insurance policies.

Will the proposed program retain the features discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]? In the coal areas, where I was born, entire communities are undermined by shafts and tunnels, which are constant hazards to the communities, with or without floods. The people living in these communities have been familiar with this situation, sometimes for three generations. Will they be permitted to shift this known hazard to the Government, or will all the people of the United States be expected to underwrite it, or will you have a situation where one house falls down because water happens to get in an old mine shaft, in which case the Government will call that a flood and pay for the damage, while residences a short distance away will fall down simply because the earth collapsed due to the mining operations underneath, with just as much damage to the property holders, but in that case, the Government will assume no responsibility?

I think I have asked this question by indirection, but I will ask it specifically. Will the United States designate in advance the distress areas where insurance may be written, or will anyone in the United States be permitted to buy the insurance?

Will we now open offices in every State in the United States, and possibly in counties inside the States, even if we have very few policies in force in that State or that county? If that is to be the program, then I suggest that this bill should carry, as its short title, the following: "Congress's Gift to Bureaucracy of 1956."

How long after a storm is reported as heading for Florida, or Connecticut, or Massachusetts, just for example, will a property be allowed to take out this insurance? As I remarked above, we had that little problem during the early days of crop insurance. Has any attempt at all been made to figure out the cost of this program to the American taxpayer? I can assure you that this is not a minor item in setting up this program, nor in passing this bill.

The paragraphs, in both the bill and the accompanying report, concerning which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and I had some exchange on Saturday, actually do give the Administrator the right to reduce premiums to groups of people who, in the Administrator's personal opinion, cannot afford to pay premiums based on actuarial requirements. This is the first time I have seen this concept of "ability to pay" applied to an entirely statistical program, such as insurance. I would really like to know whose idea that was, and how it got into the bill.

Finally, did anyone consult the Housing and Home Finance Agency, regarding this particular bill, or are we facing here a situation which is not entirely new to the Congress? In this instance, it is known that the idea before us sprung from a casual remark by the President at a Connecticut airport when, startled by the flood damages, he made a perfectly natural remark that there ought to be insurance against that sort of disaster. Now we are told this is the President's bill. Yet the Senate version of this bill was different from the House version. Are both of them exactly what the President wants? How can that be? I have no information whatever that the President specifically and personally approved either bill. Have we any indication that the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or the Federal Housing Administration in particular, which will inherit this headache, has indicated an approval of this particular bill, or of either bill? We cannot cover both in a blanket approval; they are different in important details, and these details might spell success or failure for the entire program.

The three important questions, boiled down, are obviously these:

First. Will we supply a crystal ball, on request, to any property owner? If not, how is he to know that he faces a flood hazard, and therefore should take out insurance? How many of the people who suffered losses in Florida or Connecticut or Massachusetts would actually have held flood insurance policies, when the floods hit them last year?

Second. Will the Government designate areas as flood-hazard areas, eligible for flood insurance? How about the individual who does not live in that area, but gets hit by an unexpected flood? In other words, why is this program better or as good, as a straight disaster relief plan, such as we have had for years, and which we reactivate or enlarge for any emergency—flood, hurricane, fire, or any other disaster? If we have this insurance, will all these other sufferers be barred from relief in the future? Or is this just an additional program, conceived to get and spend more money, and employ more people in government?

Third. How much will it cost the taxpayers? We know it will cost $7½ billion, because that is the authorization. How many Members are optimistic enough to think that will be all, Mr. Chairman? Not I, for one.

I suggest the committee reread the testimony of the representatives of the crop insurance program, in their own hearings, at page 75 et seq. This, as I said before, is a noble idea, but I challenge any member of the committee to say that it has been carefully thought out and the details and problems studied, as they should have been.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of insurance, for any purpose to which insurance may be applied. Like the President, I wish there were some way to insure against disasters. I think at the moment there ought to be some way to insure the Congress against having bills like this one, highly technical in nature, brought to the floor at 5 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon, in the last few days of a confused and confusing session.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amend-

ment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to try to give the House a better idea of what this bill seeks to do and to answer any questions, if I can, that may be in the minds of Members as to what this bill is intended to do and how we hope to accomplish its desirable ends.

I cannot recall any other instance in my short period of service here when there were more bills introduced on a particular subject than on this one. When our committee went into executive session, if my recollection serves me right, we had a count of some 72 Members of the House who had introduced bills on this subject; 25 Members, who were not members of the committee, came before it and testified in support of the principle of this bill asking that we bring to the floor of the House a disaster insurance bill. This is far from a perfect bill. It is the best we could do with a very difficult subject as an initial step.

Everybody understands, and we say explicity in our report, this bill is an experiment. It is an experimental plan which may or may not work, but let us put something into effect; let us try it, let us constantly survey it and review it, and then improve on it after we have had a year or two experience. In time we may be compelled to decide to repeal it. But it is our duty to at least make an initial try at solving the problem.

Let us understand, too, an insurance program or bill is not something new or novel in Federal Government activity. We have in existence today 15 different insurance plans sponsored by the United States Government, run by United States bureaus. Crop insurance is only 1 of the 15.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman tell us why the committee chose insurance for so difficult a subject as compared to straight disaster relief which does not have to tell in advance through some crystal ball where you ought to insure?

Mr. MULTER. We have been struggling along all through the years giving relief when a disaster occurred. We would move in and try to take care of a particular situation as it confronted us after the disaster. We have had bills year in and year out to prevent the damages caused by these disasters. We are still working on those programs. No one stands up here and says: "Let us forget about the disasters, let us not try to prevent the damage caused by them." We have had bills to try to lessen and to prevent such damage. We know from the information that has been submitted to the Congress that it will take 50 years to get existing and contemplated programs completed, which may prevent floods and which lessen the dangers of disasters of this kind.

We are not going to insure under this bill against all natural disasters, although some of the bills introduced asked for that. I am not so sure but what that should have been done. I think we should have included all natural disasters under this plan.

But the greater consensus of opinion seems to be: Let us move slowly, let us proceed with the subject of damage caused by floods, and if we can work that out and it works out all right, maybe we can broaden it. On the other hand maybe we will have to abandon it altogether.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman means to minimize the losses?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is right. I do not think we will ever prevent floods, but we can minimize the losses. The present estimate is that if we spend all the money we are spending and more, too, it will take us 50 years to get to the point where we can prevent many of these catastrophes and most of the damage that is caused by them.

Bear in mind that the committee was most reluctant to have the Government get into this new field of insurance. We begged, we pleaded, we cajoled the insurance underwriters to come forward with some plan, something by which they could get into this and do it privately. We asked them to come in with a plan so the Government would limit its activities to a reinsurance plan. We could not get them to do anything about it.

We groped around in the dark and came up with the best we could. We come before you and say: Here is the plan. Now, when the insurance companies come forward and say: We will write this insurance at a reasonable rate, the Government under this bill is restricted from selling insurance in that area or to those persons. This bill gives our people the right to buy this insurance from the Government only where the private insurance companies will not sell it.

My district and many of the districts in my immediate area do not need this bill. Thank God, we have not suffered these catastrophes. But if you ever had the experience we have had and that I have had—such as when it was my duty to go through some of these flood areas as chairman of a Subcommittee on Small Business that had jurisdiction over disaster loans—there is not a one of you who would not be up here saying that we must have this kind of a bill. Let us move forward and try to do something about it.

I started to indicate what happens in the insurance field. Somebody raised the question last week as to what can be the maximum loss that the Government can sustain under this program. The maximum amount of insurance under any condition that can be written under this program is $5 billion, $3 billion in the first instance and the President may allow additional insurance to the extent of $2 billion. But that does not mean there will be a $5 billion loss.

The best analogy I can give to you on that subject is in the fire-insurance field. Today there is more than $160 billion of fire insurance outstanding. Does anyone think that any one of the companies or all of the companies will have to pay out the maximum amount of $160 billion any time or in any one year? Does anyone believe that these insurance companies will have to pay the full face amount of the policies outstanding?

Let us take into account one more thing as an analogy with reference to what our losses may be. You have in the record testimony as to the maximum amount of losses in any one year caused by floods. It has never gone over $1.2 billion in any one year. The average is $240 million a year during the last 24 years. Some years it was as low as $2.8 million.

The insurance companies on their fire insurance with about $165 billion face amount of insurance outstanding have never been called upon to pay more than a maximum of 43 percent of the premiums collected. The maximum amount of premiums collected, according to the latest reports we have, was in 1954, which was $1,654,000,000, and the total amount of losses paid out was 43 percent of that. On their extended coverage, which takes in wind, tornado, and water damage out of aggregate premiums collected of $510 million in 1954, they paid out in losses 65 percent; not 65 percent of the face amount of the policies but 65 percent of the premiums. So, having that in mind, you must surely agree with me that we will never be called upon to pay the maximum of the insurance that is permitted to be written under this program.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. No one ever knows when or where these floods will come.

Mr. MULTER. The Lord does not tell us.

Mr. CANFIELD. One does not have to live alongside a river or a stream. The worst kind of floods are the flash floods that follow hurricanes, which can come at any time anywhere.

Mr. MULTER. That is true. Up to a few years ago, those of us in New York City said, "A hurricane will never strike New York City." Yet, we have been stricken twice by hurricanes in the last few years.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to associate myself with the gentleman and tell him that he has done a very commendable job. I can remember when he came out into my country and saw exactly what happened. The only relief we got for the individual, the little fellow that lived down along the river, was from the Red Cross.

Mr. MULTER. Quite right, sir.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am perfectly willing to agree that this is a novel idea, but I want you to tell the gentleman from Connecticut how that little fellow down

by the river was going to have this insurance before the flood came. How did he know the flood was coming?

Mr. MULTER. He now knows that it has come. If we pass this bill, he can get his insurance.

Another point you raise. After this program gets working, the State is called upon to participate, not in paying the loss——

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not in this bill.

Mr. MULTER. We took it out of this bill, the requirement for the State to pay part of the subsidy, because as the bill came to us from the Senate it required that in 1959 the States should begin to participate by paying a part of the premium. When we and the States see how this program is working in 1957, 1958, and 1959, then we will decide whether to bring the States in. Up to this moment many States have indicated that they will not or cannot participate in any program requiring them to take part in it, so far as financial assistance is concerned. There is no more reason for a State to pay part of this premium than to require such payments in crop insurance. We never required it under that program.

Mr. PHILLIPS. You will still have demands for distress payments.

Mr. MULTER. We cannot foreclose that. And I am sure if disaster occurs, where it is not covered by this law, we will come to their aid just as we have always done.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is a supplementary program, and you have not said yet how you are going to know in advance whether he will take out insurance.

Mr. MULTER. We had the weather people before us, and all of the other departments before us. They can tell us what areas need special attention. The States are required to participate in this program by setting up zoning regulations. States that do not do that will be excluded from the program. So will persons who violate the zoning restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIES: On page 25, line 13, after the word "States", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: *"Provided*, That after June 30, 1959, each State shall pay from time to time into the disaster insurance fund, hereinafter created, an amount equal to one-half of the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued after such date on property in such State, and the amount which would have been charged if the 'estimated rates' were applied."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment but reserve it at this time.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to restore to the bill that provision that was in the Senate bill which says:

That after June 30, 1959, each State shall pay from time to time into the Disaster Insurance Fund, hereinafter created, an amount equal to one-half of the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued after such date on property in such State, and the amount which would have been charged if the "estimated rates" were applied.

The House committee took that provision out of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, over the weekend I read the bill and the report of the committee carefully. The committee is quite frank in its presentation of this bill. It acknowledges that it is an experiment. They have no idea whether it will be successful. There can be no question about the fact that the people in New England and in the Carolinas have suffered tremendous losses on account of floods. I am sure all of us are deeply sympathetic with the tremendous problems presented by those floods.

However, there are some facts with reference to this bill that the Members should understand. In the first place, the total amount of policies that can be issued is stated at $5 billion; $3 billion in the bill, and the President has the authority to increase that amount $2 billion, and loans may be granted to the extent of $2½ billion.

In other words, here is a program which can commit the Government to an obligation of $7½ billion. I understand that premium fees will be collected and that the possible loss will not be $5 billion.

There is a provision for a subsidy of approximately 40 percent. However, there is another provision which gives authority to increase the subsidy in the cases of those who are unable to pay the premium rates.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to give very careful and sober thought and consideration to the plight of our Government. We are already committed to about $750 billion of obligations. I know it will be argued that the Government will not have to pay those obligations, but suppose we have a severe depression—and there is not a man who can say that we will not have another depression. In the long history of the United States we have had alternate periods of boom and depression and there may come a time when our country will face a severe depression. If that should happen what are we going to do with all of the direct and indirect obligations that we have already made?

The other body placed a provision in this bill requiring each State to pay one-half. That was taken out of the bill. And you heard the telegram of the governors of the New England States congratulating the committee because they removed it.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the time has come when we must say to the States and their governors, "Are you willing to shoulder your responsibilities? Some of you are always meeting in convention and denouncing Congress for violating States rights, and yet when any measure comes before Congress you are anxious for the Federal Government to pay the bill."

Why? Why should not each State contribute one-half of the cost of this program? The States are in far better financial condition than the Federal Government. I do not think there is a State in this Union that is in the serious financial plight of the Federal Government. Why should the State governors and why should we as representatives of districts impose upon this already overburdened Federal Government obligations that at least ought to be shared by our States?

The committee's report explains it by saying that the States have constitutional amendments and that they cannot afford to foot the bill. It is the same argument they used on the Federal aid to education bill. What can prevent the States from removing their constitutional amendments if they want to solve this problem of tremendous losses through floods? If there is a strong sentiment in the districts of these gentleman for some measure of protection, what is there to prevent the States of this Union from sharing the responsibility, and what will become of our States if Congress discharges all of the duties and responsibilities of government?

I fear, and I fear it sincerely, that we are going to reduce the States of this Union to mere instrumentalities. They are losing their entity. It is this process of the Federal Government's assuming all of the obligations and the governors and officials of the States being willing for us to do it, and applying pressure upon us to support that sort of policy, which is whittling down State sovereignty and States rights.

Mr. Chairman, suppose we pass this legislation and we add another burden of $7.5 billion of indirect obligations to the Federal Government. That would further increase the astronomical and staggering national obligation to heights that have never been known in the history of the world. Are we serving the interests of our States and of our peoples by continuing this policy? Are we serving the interest of America when we permit the States through their governors to petition us to undertake without their participation program after program? Yet when we suggest to them that they participate in a program some of them are not willing to do so; in fact, some of them had rather abandon a program than have to share in its costs.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do I take it that the gentleman would like the State of Texas to participate in the drought payments that are made by the Federal Government?

Mr. DIES. The drought relief is entirely a different proposition. We gave tremendous relief to the people of New England, and we ought to give it to them. Wherever there is a flood or a drought or a national calamity, as a matter of humanitarianism, whether here or abroad, of course we are going to help.

But here you have an entirely different proposition.

Do you know that under this bill you are going to insure the property of the States and the local units of government? Did you ever hear of anything as audacious as that? Do the governors and officials of States want the Federal Government, which has the greatest burden ever known in history, to insure their own property? Under this bill we are going to subsidize insurance for States that are infinitely better off than we are.

Let me say something else: Do you have any idea what faces us in the next 4 or 5 years? Suppose we go to war. I pray to God that we will not, but certainly we must anticipate that there is a real danger that America may be involved in the most disastrous war in history. Are we not going to need all of the money and all of the resources that we can possibly marshal? I read in the paper this morning that the cost of living had gone up to the highest point ever known. Do you know why that cost of living continues to go up? It is because this Federal Government continues to run deficits and borrow money through the most unsound methods ever known. Do you know how you are getting this money? You are not getting it honestly. You are selling bonds to your own agency, the Federal Reserve Bank, and it is a vicious process of inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I find that the House will not have an opportunity to consider the bill (H. R. 11799) reported by my committee known as the Overseas Fair Labor Standards Act; a rule was granted and reported to the House July 17.

I am informed that this bill will not be taken up because the Philippine Government is opposed to it because certain provisions are alleged to discriminate against certain Filipino workers in Guam.

This is a serious charge; this House deserves the facts, even though it will have no opportunity to act on the bill. At the outset I want to deny, categorically, that this bill discriminates against Filipinos or citizens of any other nation; it treats all alike.

But, by way of explanation, let me tell you why the bill ought to be passed.

The Supreme Court has decided, in one of its legislative moods, that we wanted the wage-hour law to be extended to our military and naval bases overseas, both in foreign countries and in certain territories and possessions. Needless to say there is absolutely no indication that Congress, at any time even considered applying the wage-hour law to overseas bases, either in foreign countries or in possessions and territories—and I know we never intended such coverage.

It has not yet been decided that the actual work done is "in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce", as required by the act; but this is just the next step.

So I appointed a subcommittee and we looked into the matter. We found that our overseas bases had been and were being built with native labor. We found that we had been paying whatever the prevailing wage was in the country where the base was being built; in North Africa, for example, we paid Arabs about 10 cents an hour. We also found that the Defense Department had agreed to reimburse its contractors if it came about, at some later date, that the wage-hour law was applicable. We also found that the wages to be paid were based on agreements between the foreign countries and this country, as worked out by the Department of State.

So we drafted a bill, H. R. 11799.

This bill says, as simply as we could say it, that we never intended the wage-hour law to apply to work done in constructing United States military and naval bases in foreign countries and in these possessions.

Insofar as the overseas bases in foreign lands are concerned, that ends it; insofar as Guam, Wake Island, America Samoa, and the Panama Canal Zone are concerned, we proposed to establish tripartite industry committees to determine what the minimum wages should be in the future.

Now why does this concern the Philippine Government?

Here is why: In one of these bases, in Guam, we have been using labor imported from the Philippines because we could not get native labor. We went to the Philippine Government and agreed to pay, not what they were getting in the Philippines, but 25 percent more, plus room, board, and medical and dental services and transportation to and from Guam. All of which amounted to approximately 54 cents per hour, or more than twice the 25 cents an hour minimum in the Philippines.

The United States has lived up to that agreement to the letter. Some 13,000 Filipinos have been imported to Guam under the above agreement.

But then the Supreme Court comes along and says that this work might be covered by the minimum wage law at some time in the future. This means that the some 13,000 Filipinos might be entitled to the difference between the minimum wage required of business in this country and what they have been paid in the past.

What will it cost the United States?

Let us remember, that by not passing this bill, we not only make it possible for these 13,000 Filipinos to get this unexpected windfall, but we make it possible for hundreds of thousands of other foreigners, Japanese, Iranians, Okinawans, Cubans, Turks, Greeks, and on and on to do exactly the same thing these Filipinos are planning to do to the United States.

The potential cost to this Government could be approximately one and one-half billions of dollars if we let this thing run on—I repeat, one and one-half billions.

Yet we are not considering it because the Government of the Philippines does not want us to do so. Yet, the Department of State, War, Navy, Air Force, Defense, Interior, and Labor want it handled.

Just one more word on this thing. I said at the outset that there was no discrimination involved; there is none. This bill treats the Philippine Government and the Filipino workers precisely and exactly the same as workers recruited from all of the other foreign countries where these bases are being built. The Filipinos will receive no more and no less fair treatment than we have provided for the nationals of all other countries in the world.

Yet, of all the countries involved, only the Philippine Government has seen fit to protest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion, unless we make available insurance equally to all peoples similarly situated, we should not have an insurance law. The theory of this insurance is that the insured will pay the premium for the insurance. It would be gaged on the actuarial experience and the probability of flood. If you make the State pay half of the damage and the loss—in many States there will be no insurance. In other States, there will be insurance. In many of the States where the necessity for the insurance is the greatest, there will be none. This is a difficult problem. Sometimes we have made forward steps that have cost us nothing. If we carry out the theory upon which this is based, it will not entail a great loss by the Government. Certainly I would not support an insurance plan by the Government that would make available insurance to some and not to others similarly situated because of lack of State action.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should make it clear at the outset that I do so as one who is opposed to the bill. But, I rise in support of this amendment because of the use in connection with this whole plan of the word "insurance." Mr. Chairman, insurance contemplates a spreading of the risk. There is no spreading of the risk under this bill because by its very terms, it is patent that the only ones who will be taking insurance will be those who are in the flood areas. One can say it is a complete subsidy, but when one reads the language on page 29 one can see that behind the bill is a risk provision for almost the total face amount of the policies if the Administrator so desires, at least as far as owner-occupied dwellings are concerned. Therefore, I rise in support of this amendment, in that by requiring all the States in which insurance is made, to participate in the plan we will at least be spreading the risk over the entire State, and will be coming perhaps closer at least to the term which is applied, mistakenly I believe, to this program in this bill, namely, "flood insurance."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I listened with interest to the telegram from the governors of the New England States, but I think there is a responsibility on the part of the individual States to do something about this particular program. Too often the States, as was so eloquently stated, run to the Congress with every problem they have, and expect the United States Government, the Federal Government, to take care of every problem that arises in the several States. Here is an opportunity for the States to do something for the very people for whom they desire that something be done.

It would seem to me that this is a reasonable request. The bill is a substitute for a Senate bill, and the Senate bill included this particular provision. As was stated so well by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], this is a bill where there is a great deal of discretionary power left with the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the administration of this particular bill. All of us realize the type of man who is Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] knows him as well as any man in this Chamber, and when he expresses some concern about how this will be run and whether this will be a great bureaucracy, I think the very nature of Mr. Cole indicates it will not be so.

As far as this amendment is concerned, there is a responsibility on the part of the State to do its share.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. This amendment, in principle at least, is consistent with the administration's recommendation on this subject?

Mr. BOLAND. That is right. This is an experiment. It is a complete experiment. One way to determine whether it is good is to get this adopted. This is one way to get this bill passed. It is the only way to get a flood-insurance bill during this session.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. It is my conclusion from listening to this argument that if this amendment succeeds you will destroy this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not share the gentleman's concern at all. I think if this amendment does not succeed you will destroy the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOLAND. I will.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman knows the interest of some States will not be as paramount as some others.

Mr. BOLAND. That is true.

Mr. FLOOD. Then we agree on that.

Mr. BOLAND. There is complete agreement on that.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman knows that many States will not participate. The funds will be raised to such an extent that it will be prohibitive.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman does not know now how many people will participate.

Mr. FLOOD. The passage of this amendment will completely destroy this bill.

Mr. BOLAND. I disagree completely with the gentleman. As a matter of fact, this amendment gives this proposal a real chance of being enacted into law, perhaps the only chance.

This committee must realize that this bill must go to conference with Members of the Senate. The Senate bill on flood insurance included the features of participation by States in the matter of meeting the cost of the fees charged for policies issued under this proposal. In the face of congressional adjournment and the Senate's position on this matter, it seems to me elementary that we will not get a flood insurance bill at all if this amendment is not written into the bill. As a matter of fact there is serious doubt that the bill will pass this very body unless we incorporate the amendment into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that those of us in this House who are deeply concerned about flood insurance take what we can get. The bill with the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] will have clear sailing with the Senate and I am confident will meet with approval of the President.

I ask the Members from those areas that are not affected by the ravages of floods to join us in passing this bill. It is in the nature of an experiment. There are enough safeguards to protect the interest of the taxpayer. The discretionary power provided to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance must be granted for this is in truth an experiment. It is an experiment that can, given proper drive and enthusiasm, succeed. It well might be proven in the days and years ahead to be one of the most worthwhile and beneficial programs that this Congress has passed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and as one who offered the amendment in committee striking the Senate amendment requiring State participation on a 50–50 basis after June 30, 1959. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has made a seemingly meritorious argument in support of his amendment to require State participation after June 30, 1959. I find myself, in most instances, believing as he believes on matters of this kind. I am not philosophically opposed to the idea. It sounds right and is ordinarily proper when Federal funds will be used. As a matter of fact when I began talking with representatives from my own State before I knew too much about this legislation I contended that it appeared to be a matter in which the individual States should participate. The more I studied this legislation, however, and the practical problems to flow from it, the more I was convinced that now is not the time to make a decision concerning State participation, even though such participation is postponed. I believe this amendment may well defeat the purpose of this bill and have the effect of keeping some States, perhaps many of them, out of this program even though they might wish to come in, and should be entitled to that privilege.

I am satisfied that this particular matter, as well as this entire legislation, has been very carefully and thoroughly studied. The Senate Banking and Currency Securities Subcommittee, after some eight or more hearings, in Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, District of Columbia, and finally Washington, and after careful consideration of many proposals, unanimously voted out this legislation, substantially as it is, without the requirement of State participation. The full Senate Banking and Currency Committee voted it out unanimously. I took occasion to study the debate on the floor of the Senate on May 10 when and where this amendment was adopted by a vote of 39 to 31, with 25 not voting. There were some in the Senate committee who originally took the position that the States should be required to participate. I believe the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Senator BUSH, at first took that position. After more careful study of the problems involved, however, he stated—and so did others—that he was convinced the States should not be required to participate for a number of reasons, and among those was the fact that practically every State has a constitutional prohibition against the use of public funds for private purposes. In addition, there is the serious question of the financial ability of many States even if the people of the States voted to remove the constitutional prohibition.

Mr. DIES rose.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I think I can anticipate what the gentleman is going to ask and I will try to give him an answer.

Mr. DIES. I do not think the gentleman understood this amendment. This amendment does not compel them to participate until June 30, 1959.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I was anticipating that question, and I am going to get into that. This amendment raises a constitutional question with the States.

Let us assume for the purposes of the argument that every State could have its legislature meet within the next 3 years and on that a constitutional amendment can be submitted for consideration by the people. The people of those States will still have to vote on the proposition. Let us further assume for purposes of argument, and this is a very doubtful assumption, that each of the States between now and June 30, 1959 would adopt a constitutional amendment authorizing the States to participate on a 50–50 basis. Under the laws of most of the States, a finding of a lack of public purpose, if made, could not be cured merely by a constitutional amendment. Some courts have already created a body of law indicating that such an amendment would likely be in conflict with provisions of the United States

Constitution dealing with a republican form of government, and equal protection of the laws to all persons, despite State action to the contrary. I cite article 10, section 4 of the Federal Constitution, and amendment No. 14.

I am convinced there are many States in the union which could not afford to participate in this program by 1959. Many others could never bear the burden.

The requirement now of State participation after June 30, 1959 will, in my opinion, cause lengthly and unnecessary delays in getting under way a program so desperately needed now.

It would handicap the program in most of the States and make it totally ineffective in the States that need it most.

However, let us not forget that this is not a State problem. If the State of North Carolina, for example, could stop the waters of some river from flowing into North Carolina from another State, and vice versa, it would be a different situation. Take New York State as an example. I understand that one of the worst flood areas we have in the country is created by the merging of two rivers, the Susquehanna and the Chenango. I am told that eight-tenths of the Susquehanna flows through Pennsylvania, that it comes to New York State only at Binghamton, which, at times, has been badly flooded. The Chenango River is in New York State.

Take the Delaware River. It affects New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. It may well affect others.

What will be the attitude of people in these States when they know that different courses may be taken in each State, and when they are told that after 3 years, they will not know whether or not their insurance will be continued, or whether the States in which they live will change their constitutions. They will not want to take out the insurance. When they buy it, they want some assurance that it will continue. The bill itself already raises enough doubt when it necessarily contains provisions requiring a report later by the Administrator as to the advisability of continuing the program longer.

The requirement of State participation is not needed to accomplish the essential purposes for which this amendment is proposed, namely, to provide an incentive to the States to reduce the flood hazards and, secondly, to reduce the possible cost to the Federal Treasury. These ends can be accomplished, practically, at least for the next few years, and effectively by the flood-zone provisions of this bill. Did you know that the Administrator can refuse flood insurance to property owners in any State in the Union where such property is located and used in violation of the State's zoning laws which laws, I should say, have to be approved by the Administrator of this flood-insurance program? After June 30, 1958, it withholds benefits from any area failing to adopt the flood-zoning restrictions deemed necessary by the Administrator.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If a community adopts flood zoning, and zones a particular area just for dwelling purposes and a dwelling is built in that place, even though it is known that it is a place that ordinarily floods, would this bill then continue insurance on that area?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. If it were zoned, I would think it would affect the insurance premiums because the Administrator has the right to set those premiums according to risk in a particular area. I would say that if there were zoning regulations prohibiting the building of a home or a business establishment in a certain area, such could not be done, or if permitted, I would think the doctrine of caveat emptor might apply. At least where the risk is greatest, the insurance premiums would be highest. This bill gives the Administrator a lot of authority.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The Administrator also has the right to place the premiums wherever he feels the occupants of owner-occupied dwellings can pay?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. He has a right to consider an area and to determine whether or not its people will be able to pay the premiums. I might say that particular provision to which you refer is one which I myself had some serious doubts about. Of course, the Administrator can do a lot of things. We have given the Administrator a tremendous amount of authority and power in this legislation and it is absolutely essential that we do so because we do not yet know enough of the answers. As I have said the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or rather its Securities Subcommittee, went all over the country and held hearings. That committee met in Washington and held hearings here in the District. The House Committee on Banking and Currency met for many days. It heard a comprehensive range of testimony from representatives of insurance associations and companies, from public officials and from private persons and public-interest organizations in those areas ravaged by floods and hurricanes. My own State, incidentally, during the several hurricanes in 1954 and 1955 sustained damages approximating $300 million.

Let me get back to what I was saying when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON] asked his question.

With such clear mandates to States and local governments to minimize losses by means of zoning laws, any added incentive in the form of monetary contributions by States ceases to have the same importance it would assume without such provisions.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. There are several States the constitutions of which forbid this kind of a proposition. I do not see how this amendment can help out the flood areas a single bit.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. It certainly cannot if the people of those States do not amend their constitutions immediately and make participation possible by June 30, 1959. Any taxpayer of the State could still take the matter into the courts. I doubt that many States will even attempt to amend their constitutions. There is too much uncertainty about this program. This amendment muddies the water further.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Does the gentleman believe a contribution on the part of the State as a payment of fees would cause the local authorities to enforce their zoning regulations,; that it might also cause them to establish zoning regulations which would reduce the cost?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Each State will be forced to adopt zoning regulations. If they do not, the potential flood victims cannot participate in this program. They cannot then buy the insurance which this legislation is intended to provide. This is not a program for States; this is a program designed to afford help to the people of the States, private citizens, potential flood-disaster victims, people whose homes may be wiped out from under them, whose only source of livelihood may be destroyed overnight. It is not charity. We are simply trying to make it possible for them to get, through their Government, what they are not able to get from any other source. This program will not work if only a few States participate. We cannot have a comprehensive flood-control program for the Nation without full participation. The Dies amendment will do far more harm than good at this time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Is there any analogy between this and crop insurance?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. There is analogy; yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Is it not pretty nearly on all fours with crop insurance?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I think the principle involved is the same. If this amendment is needed, it should be offered after we have gone through an essential trial an error period. Let us not encourage the people of our States to amend their constitutions until we know it is necessary, until we are convinced that the insurance rates, without State help, will be prohibitive.

This amendment will create all sorts of problems, part State and part Federal, problems of coordination between all Federal agencies and with each of the States. All kinds of inefficiencies and prorating of costs and damages difficult to calculate would result.

Without the States we will have one authority administering this program. With participation, in effect, we will have a number of insurance programs enmeshed with the same property subject to all programs. It would be fine to have State help, but I do not believe it will be practical. This Congress has repeatedly turned down State participation in our essential disaster relief programs.

I do not want to see this program under the legislative jurisdiction of every participating State and of the Congress

sitting here in Washington, until we are convinced it is imperative.

I have serious doubts that extension of the kind of insurance and loan guarantee protection provided by this legislation, for which property owners will have to pay, should be conditioned upon the requirement that the State first meet some fixed proration of disaster payments.

This is a disaster anticipation program where the Federal Government is the only one properly equipped to handle it. The monetary aspects, while important, will eventually become minor in comparison with the bureaucratic problems which must be solved and which can best be solved by 1 bureaucracy rather than by 51.

Flood-control projects are federally built and federally administered.

This is not a States rights amendment, as it would seem. The only rights the States get under the Dies amendment is to bear the burden of paying the expenses which the State itself has had no opportunity to prevent.

If you could give any State the power to stop a flood or a hurricane at State lines, then I would say we should not attempt the program without State participation—participation now—not beginning in July 1959.

Mr. Chairman and members of this Committee, I urge the defeat of this amendment. Let us have the experiment; let us go through the trial and error process before we muddy the water by entangling this necessary program with every State in the Union. It is a national not a State or a regional problem. There will be too many chiefs and not enough Indians if States are required to pay the devil and take the hindmost. It is the many little people we want to help—not the many chiefs whom some may want to hire.

In any event, whatever we do about this amendment, let us pass this legislation and abolish the fears that possess our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOUNTAIN) there were—ayes 82, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in this legislation and I want to commend the committee for bringing it in. I appeared before the committee in the interest of procuring legislation of this kind. But, there are some questions which arise in my mind under section 2 on page 22, and if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I would like to inquire from him the meaning in his mind of the words "recurring natural disasters."

In the first place, I am not sure what a recurring natural disaster is. It may be that there are certain rivers that have floods every year, and those disasters would be deemed recurring disasters. But, for example, the floods which occurred in Massachusetts and Connecticut last year, as the result of the hurricanes, were those recurring disasters? Would the chairman of the committee inform me what his conception of the word "recurring" is?

Mr. SPENCE. I should certainly say that recurring floods in the Ohio Valley would be natural disasters. I would not think that one flood in New England was a recurring disaster, although it might have been a great disaster. It seems to me that a disaster following a disaster is a recurring disaster. I do not know of any other definition that could be made of it.

Mr. HALE. It is impossible for me to hear the gentleman because his microphone is too low.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. By the gentleman's answer is he eliminating from this bill the series of floods and hurricanes that we have had in New York and New England over the past 5 years?

Mr. SPENCE. Is that the question: Can we get flood insurance whether it is a recurring disaster or not? Of course, any flood disaster that occurs, whether it is a recurring disaster or not, you can obtain flood insurance for.

Mr. HALE. Does the gentleman mean that any flood disaster is, ipso facto, a recurring disaster?

Mr. SPENCE. That it is recurring is not a necessary incident to getting the flood insurance. That is a statement of policy and has no effect upon the insurance; whether it is a recurring disaster or not you can obtain the insurance.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman may remember that I am particularly interested in forest fires because we had a disastrous forest fire in Maine in 1947 and forest fires recur in forest areas. Is it clear that that is the type of national disaster against which the Federal Government will insure?

Mr. SPENCE. Forest fires are not covered. The bill is limited to floods and the disaster and damage that follow floods.

Mr. HALE. Am I to understand that in the gentleman's opinion this bill would not include insurance against forest fires?

Mr. SPENCE. No. The Government is invading a field that no private enterprise has ever gone into and will not go into. It is not in competition with any private enterprise. It is limited to flood damage, damage that comes from flood.

Mr. HALE. In the gentleman's opinion the words "in the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods," mean that we cannot get insurance against any disasters except floods?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think flood insurance goes further than to insure against flood and the incidence of floods.

Mr. HALE. Then I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman that the words "recurring natural disasters, including", ought to be stricken from line 2 of the bill, so that the language should read, "The Congress finds that in the case of recurring floods," and so forth.

Mr. SPENCE. That may be extended in the future, but at the present time it is limited to floods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DODD: Page 26, strike out lines 12 to 16 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Each such contract shall contain such terms and conditions, and require from any such person such monetary consideration, as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation. In issuing such regulations the Administrator shall fix such monetary consideration at the lowest practicable amount, following generally the same principles as apply under section 7 (a) with respect to the establishment of fees for insurance."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is very desirable and while the Committee has taken no action on it I personally would accept it.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman. It is simply a clarifying amendment. It is practically self-explanatory. It puts the loan part of this bill on the same basis as the conventional or traditional insurance part.

The amendment clarifies a technical aspect of two important sections of the bill before the House. I refer to section 5 entitled "Loan Contracts" and section 6 entitled "Combination of Insurance and Loans." The amendment simply provides that in determining premium rates that the same principles shall be followed for the "loan plan" as are prescribed for determining the rates for conventional insurance.

As many Members of the House know, I have a great interest in the loan feature of this bill. In January of this session I introduced H. R. 7885. The sense of sections 8 and 9 of my bill, I am pleased to say, has been incorporated into sections 5 and 6 of the bill presently under consideration.

This "loan plan" is a good one and I think that time will prove that it will play a large part in making Federal flood insurance a practical reality.

I feel that the loan plan that I have presented will offer a unique solution to the dilemma of finding some form of insurance against floods which can be offered to the public at a low-premium rate without large Federal subsidies.

Briefly, the loan plan offers a solution which provides that a party can purchase a policy at a low-premium rate in which the Government would give the policyholder an absolute promise of a long-term, interest-bearing loan in the event of loss through flood disaster.

The absolute right to obtain such a loan would give the person holding such a policy the means by which the destroyed property could be promptly restored. The primary loss would ultimately lie on the person whose property was destroyed, but through the loan plan the loss could be spread out over a long period of time.

In order that the Government will not unduly enter into the banking business, the bill provides that the money shall be borrowed from private lending institutions with the Government acting as

guarantor. If the loan, for some unforeseen reason, cannot be had through a private lending agency the Government will then make the loan directly.

Thus, under this plan, a man owning a small factory or business concern which was destroyed by a flood, and left with only goodwill and know-how, would be provided as a matter of contractual right with the means to promptly put these two remaining assets back into operation. The repayment of the loan could be made over an extended period of time, and the burden could be spread out in the same way as depreciation.

The only risk that the Government would be taking under such a plan would be its obligation as guarantor to make good on any defaulting loans. It is anticipated that these expenses will be paid from the premiums taken in under the plan.

Under the provisions of the loan plan combinations of the usual insurance plan where reimbursement is made in cash and this novel loan plan where the insured gets a contractual right to borrow money are to be offered. Under the plan, a great variety of policies will be made available in which part of the reimbursement in the event of loss would be made in cash and part in a non-interest-bearing loan.

Thus, an individual or business concern that could only pay a very small premium rate could enter into a contract that would provide reimbursement in the form of a loan. Another party not willing to accept the burden of such a loan, and still unable to pay a substantial premium rate, could, for example, take out a policy which would provide him with 30 percent in cash and 70 percent in a non-interest-bearing loan, and with a slightly higher premium rate.

The Administrator under the bill before the House will thus be able to offer the public a multitude of policies which would be sold at premium rates in accordance with the degree of protection the person taking out the policy felt that he could afford.

The premium rate would largely depend on what percentage of reimbursements would have to be paid in cash. A person who wishes to be completely reimbursed in cash would pay a maximum premium rate.

The exact type of policy to be offered, and premium rates, I feel, are matters to be determined at a later date in accordance with administrative discretion.

It has been generally accepted that Federal flood insurance is essentially experimental. The loan plan embodied in sections 5 and 6 of the bill presently before the House will offer a great variety of policies to meet individual needs. I believe through the addition of this loan plan the possibility of a successful flood insurance program, with a minimum of Federal subsidies, is greatly enhanced.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the support of the Members of the House for the amendment to the "loan plan" that I have just introduced. By passing the amendment, the criteria for determining the premium rates for the loan contracts under the bill should be clarified.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question on the amendment?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand from the gentleman's statement that his amendment would make the provision on page 29 which has to do with the Administrator's right to reduce the rates also apply to the loan guarantee field?

Mr. DODD. If I understand your question correctly, I would say not.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I did not think that was what the gentleman meant. I wish the gentleman would explain it further.

Mr. DODD. I feel I have explained it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman specify the paragraph he is seeking to amend?

Mr. DODD. It is on page 26. It strikes out lines 12 to 16, and instead it states:

> Each such contract shall contain such terms and conditions, and require from any such person such monetary consideration, as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation.

In other words, it gives him the authority to fix the premium on the loan as it gives him the authority to establish the premium for the insurance.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But it does not give him authority to reduce the premium for the loan?

Mr. DODD. That is a different matter.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to compliment the gentleman on the stand he has taken all through the debate. Last Saturday when this matter came to the Chamber floor it appeared as if we would not have enough people here even to consider the bill. It was through the efforts of the gentleman from Connecticut and his colleagues that we were able to maintain a quorum and keep business going.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity of commending the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] for all the work that he has done on this bill.

I also wish to commend him for the loan provisions in sections 5 and 6 of the bill which were made part of this legislation at Mr. DODD's request.

In my estimation, the Dodd loan plan is one of the best features of this bill. I predict that the adoption of this bill with this provision in it will prove a monumental contribution in the field of Government insurance.

I was keenly aware of the gentleman from Connecticut's interest in the plight of the people of his State.

Almost a year ago when Mr. DODD was working on drafting a bill on flood insurance, I know that he had the interest of the flood sufferers of his State in mind, and yet he also had the interest of the American taxpayers in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Dodd loan plan provides for both flood sufferers and the American people.

I feel that Mr. DODD's plan will give insurance protection at a premium rate that potential flood sufferers can afford to pay, and for this, I feel the people in Connecticut and the people of my own State of Rhode Island who suffered so terribly in last year's floods will be grateful. The Dodd loan plan in my opinion will accomplish this without large Federal subsidies, and for this I feel the American people will be grateful.

Mr. DODD. I am most grateful for the very kind and generous remarks of my colleague [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I also want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Connecticut on his outstanding contribution to the consideration of this bill and also the many valuable services he has rendered in connection with flood relief and rehabilitation arising out of the terrible flood disasters we suffered in the Northeast last year.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the gentleman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I have a question on the matter of recurring floods. Would the gentleman like to clarify that?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I would like to talk about it. Recurring floods are not ineligible under the provisions of this bill.

Some question has been raised about this bill with respect to the experience required under the crop insurance program. It occurred to me it might be worth while to point out that there is a different situation here.

I think that we will make great progress in the field of flood prevention and it is not unreasonable to suggest we can look forward to a day when the risk in this field may be very negligible and premiums may be very low. You will have this insurance program, and all of the people engaged in it in the States and the Federal Government will be urging flood prevention as people in fire insurance urge and work on fire prevention. We have had some great success in that field.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. I have tried in considering this whole problem to get the best advice that I could. I think I said to this House in general debate that in my opinion we are faced with this kind of situation: Nobody knows, nobody can tell us when floods will occur, and believe me, this is not just a New England problem. In nearby Maryland the other night we

had six people drown and I do not know how much loss of property. We have similar disasters in the South, in the West, in the Middle East, and in the Southeast. It is difficult to foretell where and when this kind of disaster may occur.

We are faced with one of two alternatives: You can make this a matter of charity, and every time there is a disaster you can say, "All right, we will just hand out more money and do the best we can to put these people back on their feet"; or you can do it the way I think the American people want it done. That is, to give them a chance to pay for what they get and put this on a business basis.

The insurance companies will enter into it, for this bill provides for the participation of private insurance companies, with their tremendous know-how acquired over years of experience in determining the risks and fixing the premiums and making investigations of losses. That is the information I wanted to give the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

I think the gentleman's fear about a widespread bureaucracy is not well founded because these insurance offices are established and, I think, they are competent to do a good job in this field in cooperation with the Federal Government. I think it is as simple as that. I think if any of you who have ever had a flood, and if you never had one you are fortunate and I hope you never do, but if you have ever had a flood, you will understand better, I believe, what is involved here, and your people will feel badly if you pass by this opportunity to set up some kind of protection. Everyone says that it is experimental. And that is correct. It is experimental. That is true of almost every new field that we enter. The money that is provided, which sounds so great and large in amount, is substantial, but it is really not an appropriation—it is a backstop. As someone said here in the well of the House, the entire experience in the insurance field shows that total losses of this kind never do take place. I think we have a good bill here and I hope it is passed by the House.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Coming from the Naugatuck Valley, I know how much an insurance bill will mean to us. It will give the people an opportunity in that particular area, if these terrible floods should ever happen again, to restore their homes and businesses. I commend the gentleman for all the work he has done on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. DODD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. As the gentleman from Connecticut knows, I represent a large area of Long Island. In 1938 and 1944 and 1954 and 1955, we along the coast, as you in Connecticut, were hit with hurricanes. Our disaster on Long Island was caused by damage from the hurricane itself far more than the question of flooding as raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON]. Now the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] asked the chairman of the committee whether it included the damage that would come from hurricanes when he raised the point as to the word "recurring" because the question is raised as to whether these hurricanes are recurring. The chairman of the committee said, "No." I talked to a member of the staff of the committee and he indicates that the answer is "No." This is a very serious matter to us on Long Island.

Mr. DODD. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the gentleman is asking me if on Long Island where you have had hurricanes you would be eligible?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No, I am raising the question and I would like to have a member of the committee answer.

Mr. DODD. My understanding is that you ask if you had 2 or 3 hurricanes, would you be eligible for this type of insurance. Is that right?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I think you would be eligible for insurance, although the rates would probably be different from those in areas without recurring hurricanes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We are not attempting to duplicate any commercial enterprise insurance here where private industry will insure. A hurricane is different and insurance can be bought from the insurance companies.

Mr. DODD. Yes, hurricane insurance can be bought—that is true.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Then to make the question as simple as possible. Does this bill cover hurricane insurance?

Mr. McDONOUGH. It does not.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It does not?

Mr. DODD. If you mean by that water damage from a hurricane, I think it does.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Oh, yes.

Mr. DODD. I have answered that question and I think my friend agrees. You would be eligible under this program for insurance against damage suffered by high waves even if it was in the course of a windstorm.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if flooding from heavy rains through the clapboards of a house would be eligible for insurance. I know rain coming through the windows would not, but I understand that water coming through the clapboards of a house, as a result of an intense rain, would be considered so. Would the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. DODD. This is a technical question which I am not prepared to answer at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine work with reference to this much needed legislation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut for the tremendous amount of work and study that he has put into this matter. He has been in the forefront of the battle to push through some kind of a flood insurance bill in this session of the Congress. That ambition is about to be realized this afternoon. There were times when those of us who were genuinely interested in this program were disturbed that this would not come to pass. On late last Saturday when this bill was called up on the floor, it was touch and go as to whether or not a quorum could be mustered to consider it. Mr. DODD spent much time in contacting Members personally to express his deep interest and to request that they join in assisting us to get a flood-insurance bill through the House. His efforts have met with success today.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] on this bill today constitute his last speech in the well of this House from which he has spoken so eloquently on matters affecting the Nation and the world. This is his valedictory. His voice, his words, and his great ability are today mustered in a plea and for a cause that is of overriding importance to his great State of Connecticut. I compliment him for the service he renders today and for the outstanding record he has made as a Member of this House over the past 4 years. And, Mr. Chairman, I add my best wishes as he seeks to elevate himself in the public service of his State.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to emphasize that under this bill we are offering a plan for insurance where no insurance company will write insurance. If it is hurricane insurance in an area where an insurance company says it will only write the insurance for $50 a hundred, then it is an unreasonable rate. In that case the Administrator may say, "I will sell you insurance at a reasonable rate." In those areas where you can get insurance against hurricane damage but you cannot get insurance on floods caused by hurricanes, the Administrator may come forward and say, "I will sell you that insurance."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Will the gentleman explain to me whether the wording of the amendment will permit the Administrator to make lower rates for losses than those which are contemplated in the committee.

Mr. MULTER. I do not believe so. If I am wrong, I will yield to the gentleman from Connecticut to answer.

Mr. DODD. I did answer that.

Mr. MULTER. The agency that is to administer this program asked for this amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman tell me wherein the bill under consideration, the Senate bill, differs from the bill I introduced some time ago.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot tell the gentleman that precisely, but I will say to him that the Senate bill, as amended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, in the form in which we are now

considering it, is very similar to the bill the gentleman introduced.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether the meaning of the words "natural disaster," as he has just stated, would cover insurance only from water damage, and not from destruction by the wind.

Mr. MULTER. I will say if you cannot buy wind insurance—and I do not know any place where you cannot buy it—if the time comes when they cannot buy wind insurance at reasonable rates, then the Administrator may come forward and say, "I will write it."

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Then the language of the bill will apply where insurance cannot be purchased?

Mr. MULTER. Only where it cannot be purchased privately. If the Administrator finds it necessary to offer that kind of insurance because insurance companies will not offer it, the language here is broad enough to permit it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We are able to buy insurance against damage by windstorms from private companies, but a flood caused by wind is covered in this bill because you cannot get it from private sources. The damage arising from a flood caused by a windstorm may be insured against under the terms of this bill.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How about the question that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] raised on the word "recurring"? Do these hurricanes fall into the category of recurring storms?

Mr. MULTER. I did not hear his complete question, because I was called off the floor, but when I left he was reading from the statement of policy. We have in the bill a declaration of policy. After we passed that point in the bill, in committee, we went to work on the details of the bill. The declaration of policy may be broader than the details of the bill, but it is the details of the bill that will govern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the proposed legislation for Federal flood insurance is a measure which, in my opinion, is long overdue. We have had repeated dramatic examples of personal tragedies arising from hurricanes and floods over a period of many years. I am deeply concerned because of the major catastrophes wrought by floods and hurricanes in my own State of Rhode Island. I am acutely aware of the need for this type of protection for the people whom I represent. Likewise, I have been impressed by the enlightened support of congressional action on some sound insurance program before awaiting the crippling blow of a situation similar to that created by hurricanes Carol, Diane and the floods of last year as carried on by the Providence Journal-Bulletin. But this is not a regional problem. It is a national one. Flood and hurricane disaster, as we all know, may strike any part of the country, although in recent years, New England has borne the brunt of their destructive path. There is no immunity from this peril in any region of the United States.

I recall that in 1951, following the disastrous floods of the Midwest, President Truman requested the enactment of legislation providing for the financing of a Federal flood insurance program and repeated this request in 1952. This went unheeded. Again last year, President Eisenhower, moved by the tremendous loss and devastation caused by hurricanes and floods in our northeast region, stated that the Federal Government should examine the feasibility of providing this type of insurance. Personally, I cannot see how we can continue to ignore these wise suggestions. I believe that in the mind of a reasonable person there can be no question as to the need for this type of legislation. It is true that there may be some genuine difference of opinion as to the various features of the measure but I am more interested in the humane principle which lies behind it. It is the little fellow who is particularly at the mercy of flood damage—the small homeowner and the small-business man. I know of instances where homeowners, in limited financial circumstances, have lost their property by water damage and yet are faced with paying off the mortgage which survives as a grim reminder of their personal tragedy. Again, I have had the experience of knowing small-business men whose credit became so impaired by flood loss that they were unable to resume operations again. To extend a helping hand to persons such as these, to create a protective mantle insuring them against repetition of the crippling blow of floodwaters, represents one of the highest achievements which this representative body can accomplish. It is certainly a duty which we owe to the citizens in all communities throughout the country. I am not being critical when I say that many times we can be so concerned over the welfare of the people in other lands and with problems in areas outside our jurisdiction that we unwittingly neglect the welfare of the people of the United States.

As the people in my State know, I am vitally interested in the matter of flood control. But this involves engineering studies, the expenditure of tremendous sums of money and years of construction effort. Plans for adequate Federal flood control can proceed apace but Federal flood insurance ought not to be postponed on the theory that flood control alone may avert a disaster and make such insurance unnecessary. Plain logic dictates that flood insurance should be provided for now, and flood control moved along as rapidly as time and circumstances permit.

Mr. Chairman, I urgently recommend this legislation be enacted in the interests of the country as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 44, line 13, after the word "moisture", insert "subsidence or settling of soil following mining or other subterranean operations."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the subject matter of this bill I suppose I could get an extra 5 minutes on a point of personal privilege. But I am sure there is nothing personal in all this discussion of floods, so I will stick to my 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of us from about a dozen States concerned with the problem outlined in my amendment. In the coalfields of the United States, in about a dozen States in the hard and soft coal areas, floodwater damage not only is on the surface. The most acute and the most serious flood damage to property and even to persons in many instances, the direct result, not a mere incidence, of hurricane floods and other great torrential floods, is damage underground. I am not talking about damage by improper mining or damage by negligence.

The reason I come to you today, on the germaneness of this amendment, is because in the State of Pennsylvania at least there is no action that can be laid at law for surface subsidence resulting from this type of disaster. That has been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States. So in Pennsylvania the people have no legal recourse to obtain damage relief. Secondly, there is absolutely no insurance company in the world—even Lloyd's of London, believe it or not, which is practically a gambling house—will give insurance on this type of disaster.

So, first, the people of the mining regions cannot get this insurance for subsidence resulting from, if you want to call it excess moisture, flood damage.

Let me show you why in 100 miles of Pennsylvania over 100 years of mining has produced certain subterranean conditions over which man with his great engineering and scientific skill no longer has control. Believe me when I say that our greatest enemy in the mine is water. Water is our deadliest enemy and we cannot fight it alone. So when through a hundred years of mining you have subterranean conditions where water becomes the instrument of disaster and when you have these floods that come into our mines, our problem is not on the surface. The water rushes into the mines, our bulkheads and our barrier pillars are destroyed because the hydrostatic pressure of water when raised against our barrier pillars wipes out the surface supports. It is not an act of man but an act of God. The torrential hurricane floods are a great deluge in

our mountain valleys. We are in mountain valleys with wild streams rushing down in through mines which break the surface, destroying our surface supports. The surface subsides and there is no insurance relief, and there is no legal recourse under the law by decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

We are helpless and hopeless, and I ask you to include this in the right of insurance, not relief, not a grant, but under the bill as now amended. My State will join and probably should, and to that I do not object now that it is in the bill. That being the case I come here with this amendment and implore your aid.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Your amendment says "subsidence or settling of ground due to underground operations or otherwise." Now, that seems to have no connection with floods.

Mr. FLOOD. What I want to make clear to the gentleman is this. Our underground condition is of such a nature as the result of mining operations or other operations, including slides, for which man is not responsible, for over 100 years, which the gentleman knows, coming from a mining region, exists. And, when the water comes in, those barrier pillars and the supports are destroyed, not as the result of mining but as the result entirely of floods upon an existing physical condition, and then the surface subsides. As the gentleman knows, I have no recourse and can get no insurance, and I am defenseless.

Mr. SPENCE. Your amendment includes "or otherwise."

Mr. FLOOD. You mean, if somebody comes in, some dog robber, and robs a pillar? No; I do not mean that. I mean surface subsidence in the operation of the mine, as the result of or incident to—I like the gentleman's language—excessive moisture, whichever you prefer. The gentleman's phrase "incident to" defines my definition clearly.

Mr. SPENCE. That is not my definition. Your definition has nothing to do with floods; subsidence due to underground operation.

Mr. FLOOD. That is a direct incident of the flood, where the surface gives way because the support has been destroyed, not by the operation of the mine but by the excess pressure on the supports and pillars by floods, by excessive water causing the supports to burst and causing surface subsidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I wonder if the gentleman would amend my amendment to include the phrase "incident to flood." Or, if the gentleman does not prefer, I will ask unanimous consent later to revise my amendment and include it.

Mr. FENTON. All right.

Mr. Chairman, in a great many communities in the anthracite coal producing area, and especially in the 12th Congressional District, and adjacent districts in Pennsylvania, there is danger of disaster from floods as used in this particular bill, S. 3732.

I say, especially in my district, because I am very familiar with the mining problem and its attendant hazards there. It is safe to say that conditions in the other anthracite congressional districts are the same as mine and familiar to the Members of Congress representing those areas and they can of course speak for their own particular districts.

In the brief period that we had in discussing the bill during general debate it was confirmed by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. SPENCE] that "land subsidence due to underground or manmade subterranean excavation" was not a part of this bill.

In view of the fact that hundreds of my constituents have written me of their interest in supporting an amendment to aid them by securing inclusion in this legislation of provisions for their protection, I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

At the present time many large communities, such as Coaldale, Tamaqua, Mahanoy City, Shenandoah, Gilberton, St. Clair, Minersville, and others, are sitting on veritable seas of water—contained for the time being by barriers of coal.

Should any of these barriers or pillars be disturbed by excessive floods, such as occurred last August, I would hesitate to hazard an opinion as to the life and property damage that might ensue.

The communities mentioned heretofore are all located in my home county but there are other communities in Northumberland County such as Mount Carmel, Shamokin, and the surrounding townships to all these large communities that are in the same situation.

As I stated in debate, one of my communities, Tamaqua, had severe damage and one man lost his life in the flood last August.

My district borders on the area in the Pocono Mountains where so many children lost their lives and we certainly trust that provision can be made in this bill to make it as comprehensive as possible.

Mine subsidence in the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania could be very disastrous by either floods or just plain cave-ins due to the underlying structures giving way, and if the insurance feature of this bill could be granted to our people it would indeed act to alleviate the continuous threat to life and property always seriously aggravated by floods.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Knowing the amount of damage that the gentleman had in his district in the last flood I want to commend him for the work he has done in the interest of his district and in the interest of the people of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the proponents of this legislation, trying to convey to the Members of this House the fears that arise in the minds of the people of their districts because of floods which are imminent in their areas at certain seasons of the year.

The amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and concerning which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has just spoken, I think the House should realize does not refer merely to a matter of seasonal floods. This is a matter of daily concern throughout the counties in the coal areas of this country, when entire areas will subside because of the movement of any one of the pillars that have been left underground to prevent the passage of water. When the mines fill up there is absolutely no way for anyone to get down and examine the conditions underground. As the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON and Mr. FLOOD] so ably stated, many communities in the anthracite regions in the State of Pennsylvania actually are living on seas of water. If there is any break in any one of those barriers, it is not just a seasonal danger of flood which exists in some of the areas that have been pleaded for today, it is a condition which exists 365 days of every year. If this bill is to benefit the people of America because of flood damage, then I urge each and every one of you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. A very distinguished former coal miner, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], whom I represent in Congress, by the way, tells me that on the ticker just now is a flash that 19 more miners have died this year than last year. As the gentleman knows, many in the soft-coal districts have been drowned when the barrier pillars collapsed after great floods and hurricanes in his and my districts and that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. There is absolutely nothing you can do when you are underground to get away from it. One of the dangers that is current in the mind of every miner who goes underground is that in some operation they are conducting he will cut into an old operation underground which is filled with water, or cut into an underground sea of water and be wiped out without any hope of escape.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. MARTIN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Last year the country was shocked by appalling flood disasters that visited not only the Southern States but the Middle Atlantic States as well as the New England States.

This great country desired to do something to rehabilitate the people who suffered this great misfortune, and the President of the United States was sympathetic to appeals that came from every part of our country. Out of that sympathy of the President and his desire to help came this legislation.

I would not say that this bill is perfect. I am conscious of the fact that it can be perfected. But I know this is a great problem that demands the attention of this Congress. I advocate that we pass this legislation and send it to the committee of conference, where efforts will be made to try to work out a bill that will meet the great humane needs of the people of this country and will permit the President of the United States to carry out his desire to afford the American people some protection against such disasters. I urge support of this bill so that we can go to conference and write a bill that I believe this Congress will be proud of. True, it may take time and experience in the future to provide legislation which will be near perfection. But, this is a beginning. Let us make a start and pass this bill which the country needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, floods are the only major source of property damage, of all natural disasters, for which commercial insurers do not generally offer coverage. The reason for this is not difficult to find.

Following the widespread Mississippi River floods of 1895 and 1896, a company was organized to sell flood insurance in St. Louis, New Orleans, and Cairo, Ill. A considerable amount was sold through the Mississippi River Valley which had been subjected to numerous floods through the years. In 1899 another major flood was experienced in the valley. This was enough to bankrupt the company.

Other companies since then have attempted to sell flood insurance on a small scale. Their experience has shown that only those most exposed to flooding are interested in acquiring policies, or that following a period of a few years free from flood damages they permit the insurance to lapse.

The insurance industry has studied the problem and has been unable to solve, up to the present, the major problems which stand in the way of a sound program of flood insurance. Investigations on behalf of the industry have found that the determination of rates is extremely difficult. It is difficult to define a flood for insurance purposes. The base is too narrow to spread the risk adequately, and a major catastrophe with concentration of total loss represents a threat to the solvency of the insurer. Thus, the industry has largely avoided a field where perhaps the greatest need is manifest.

Floods are no respecter of persons; the poorest as well as the richest may suffer equally. They have been occurring since before the era of written history. The earth's formation and transformation were greatly influenced by floods. Floods are mentioned in the Bible. Man has been pitting his puny strength against the most destructive of nature's forces for many centuries to little avail.

No one can tell where or when the deluge next will strike.

They often come in the still of the night, snuffing out the lives of our family, neighbors, or friends. They destroy our homes, our businesses, churches, and schools. They bring fear and panic, the dread of the unknown and unexpected.

Long experience with floods has enabled the American Red Cross to develop a plan of action upon notice being had that such a disaster is being experienced somewhere in this broad land.

Even before the flow stills and the filth and debris settle, such activities as are available under Public Law 875 and the American Red Cross are rushed into action. Food, shelter, clothing, and medicines tend to the immediate needs of the unfortunate sufferers. Federal, State, and local government agencies all do valiant work. They help tide over the early period of shock that people experience following any disaster. But this help, fine as it is, is only temporary.

As the crushed and prostrate countryside gropingly begins to come to life, it comes to the full import of its situation. I hope that each one of you here in this Chamber will be spared that experience. It is a truly awesome feeling. That horrible realization that your home is destroyed, perhaps that some loved one has lost his life is stamped indelibly upon the mind of all who have experienced it. Perhaps as bad is the sensation, upon looking further afield, of realizing that the shop, the factory or the store where you earned your living is gone. With that first full comprehension comes a tragic sense of futility.

That is a senseless trick of fate which is repeated over and over, year after year. The broken homes, the burdensome mortgages on homes that no longer exist, the bills for stocks of little stores and inventories still unpaid for but which have disappeared in the angry, broiling waters weigh upon the sufferers. The urge to go on, to resume an active life, to participate once again in community affairs, to become producers once again suffers a cruel blow when brought face to face with the facts of life after a flood disaster.

Loans are difficult, if not impossible, to secure. Many communities never fully recover the full vigor of their accustomed way of life. This is not only a tragic thing to see or experience, it is something which we owe to our fellow Americans to combat with all of our ability.

The battle must be fought on all fronts. Flood control programs take time to carry out; they are costly. Nature has a habit of making even man's most complicated and magnificent works puny by comparison. Dams can be washed out by the fury of torrential rains and tempestuous hurricane downpours. We have seen many gallant, sometimes successful but ofttimes futile, battles with flood waters to save levees and the property they protect. It will be a long and costly struggle before the Nation's rivers can be controlled and rendered harmless. Meanwhile experience tells us we will continue to have floods.

We have before us now an opportunity to strike a firm blow at this killing and evil destroyer. H. R. 3732 is brought before this body after concentrated study. The testimony of the best informed authorities of the Nation, public hearings of many interested and responsible agencies and individuals have all gone into the preparation of this bill. I believe it represents the best possible solution at this point of how to help the flood sufferers of the future. As surely as the sun will arise again there will be more floods. We can and must do something to lessen the blows to our people, or at least to mitigate their effects.

This is frankly an experimental program, for a period of 3 years. The bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee is aimed at helping those most in need of help—to help those whose resources may be totally destroyed in the event of a flood of disastrous proportions. That is, for as nominal a fee as it is possible to determine in advance, on the basis of all available information, the home owner and the small businessman will be indemnified for his losses under the direct insurance portion. Or he may be assured of a line of credit to restore his property and an extended period of time to which to absorb the shock of his initial loss under the loan contract provision of the bill.

The Government is not seeking to replace private industry in setting up such a program for flood insurance and loan contracts. On the contrary, by means of this bill it is endeavoring to demonstrate that private industry can enter a field of activity from which it has been absent too long. By initiating a balanced program of insurance, reinsurance and guaranteed loans, the Administrator of this act is directed to utilize the services and facilities of the industry in selling the insurance and making adjustments. This is deliberate in the hope that the

industry will participate actively, and perhaps, in time take over.

Existing governmental agencies are utilized in the proposed program. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be the responsible head of the entire program. This is done in the interest of centralizing authority and responsibility in a single point of contact with Congress and the Executive.

To insure availability of flood insurance to those who might otherwise not be able to afford it, the Administrator is authorized to reduce fees by as much as 40 percent. Even further reduction is possible if the Administrator believes that any classification of owner-occupied dwelling unit could not afford to pay the fees chargeable for such insurance. This constitutes a subsidy, in effect. But against the cost of this subsidy may be balanced the gain of full economic activity of many who might otherwise lose heart and drop out or operate at less than their full capabilities.

There are, I believe, ample limitations contained in the provisions of the bill to prevent the disruption of orderly procedure and to emphasize its value to the home owner and small businesses. Small, nuisance claims are prevented, and a maximum limit is placed upon the face amount of insurance policies and loan contracts. The subsidy element is eliminated in reinsurance activities under this act.

I believe that this bill represents a sound, well-considered approach to the solution of a very difficult problem; that is, the protection of the economic well-being of potential flood sufferers. It will help those most who are most in need of help. The history of floods—the terrible experiences in recent months of our people in various sections of our country warrants and justifies the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, apparently it might be fortunate that I am not coming back next year, speaking to you now as I am after the two gentlemen who just preceded me. But, I wish to point out to you the definition of the word "flood" on page 44. I ask you to consider whether this means the flood in your neighbor's basement when your field next to it fills up due to a heavy rain. I ask you to consider the position which our Government will be in under so-called insurance, actually flood damage policies which will be written all over this country without limit except to $10,000 covering the damages which will result from the interpretations under the word "flood." We are all, everyone of us, concerned with how we can face these great national problems. But, I say to you in all sincerity, that we are shouldering our country with a tremendous debt in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HEISTAND].

Mr. HEISTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEISTAND. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is only logical that we should strike out the word "insurance" wherever it appears in this bill and substitute the word "subsidy."

I make this suggestion with all due deference to the distinguished gentlemen immediately preceding me.

First. Despite the fact that the program embodied in this bill involves subsidy, the word "subsidy" is not found in the bill. Instead the word "insurance" is used throughout. I shall urge the House to delete the word "insurance," and substitute the word "subsidy" or some similar word.

Insurance and subsidy are diametrically opposed in principle. Insurance involves voluntary sharing of loss caused by a peril common to those insured. Subsidy involves an involuntary tax burden carried by all even though—in the case of flood—only some are exposed to the peril. An insurance program is self-sustaining. A subsidy program is not. The flood damage programs proposed are not self-sustaining—they are not to be borne solely by those subject to the peril of flood. They are to be borne in part by all—involuntarily—through taxation. These flood programs are thus the antithesis of insurance. They are subsidy programs and conceded so to be by the sponsor of the Senate bill—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 10, 1956, page 7925. No reason is given in either House for calling these programs insurance when they are not.

The second development is the fact that in the field of atomic energy, the other body, in contemplating a program to indemnify against loss resulting from atomic reactor incidents in no place uses the word "insurance." It uses instead the words "indemnify" and "indemnification." While these words may not be an exact description of the program, they are closer to the mark than is the word "insurance." It suggests if the House avoids the use of the word "insurance" when describing a program of partial subsidy in connection with atomic energy, the same course should be followed when dealing with subsidy in connection with flood. Therefore, I urge that where the word "insurance" appears in any legislation being considered in connection with flood, that the word be deleted and that there be inserted in its place a word such as "subsidy" or "relief" or "indemnity."

Second. This point deals with the provisions of the legislation with reference to reinsurance. I suggest that all reference to reinsurance be deleted. If the basic program is not insurance the supporting program cannot be "reinsurance." If there is a subsidy involved in furnishing the so-called "insurance" then a subsidy must be involved in furnishing so-called "reinsurance." "Subsidy" has no more place in reinsurance, than it has in insurance. The bill clearly provides such subsidy. It uses the words "fees for reinsurance"—section 5 (b)—just as it uses the word "fees" for the so-called direct insurance—section 5 (a). By definition the fee for direct coverage is something different from, and less than, the "actual estimated rates."

There is another reason for deleting the "reinsurance" provision. This legislation proposes to set up a test program seeking to determine the feasibility, or lack of feasibility, of flood indemnification. If the test is to mean anything it must be a controlled test. The reinsurance program removes control, since it would permit a private insurer to make a favorable selection of the risks and unload through reinsurance the unfavorable selection on the experimental program. The resulting experience picture of the Government program would be distorted by the adverse selection. In addition, the amount of so-called reinsurance available under the proposed program is unrealistic and would aggravate the competing situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky whether the term "wave wash" in the definition of "flood," at line 10, page 44, of the bill is sufficient to give the protection to landowners along our Florida beaches which I feel confident the committee intended to give. In a letter which I received from Dr. M. E. Forsman, assistant director of the University of Florida Engineering and Industrial Experiment Station, he advised:

> The standard definition—terminology—for the term "wave wash" is "the erosive action on shores or embankments caused by the lapping or breaking of waves." (See Waves, Tides, Currents, and Beaches, Glossary of Terms and List of Standard Symbols issued by the Council on Wave Research, the Engineering Foundation, Berkeley, Calif.) The term "wave action" includes not only the action of wave wash but also such effects as the impact of waves on structures and natural formations. Generally, when such a structure as a pier or a jetty is damaged during a storm in Florida, it is the result of wave action as a whole, rather than that of wave wash by itself. Damage to beaches, dunes, dikes, and roads, however, is primarily the result of wave wash.

From the general purpose of the committee to give maximum protection to those who suffer property losses under circumstances covered by the bill, it is my understanding that the committee did not intend that "flood" should be restrictively interpreted. It is my understanding that, in defining that term by the words "wave wash," the committee intended to define "flood" to include "wave action" and "wave impact." Is that correct?

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, President Eisenhower strongly recommends this type of legislation. In principle the bill also has the endorsement of former President Truman. I believe a good case for the bill has been made before the Committee on Banking and Currency sitting here in Washington and throughout the flooded areas of the country. I cannot conceive of the House rejecting

this bill today in the closing hours of this session. I am sure that the humanitarian appeal made by our leaders has been heard.

Mr. Chairman, it has grieved us all many times in the past to witness the horrible aftereffects of flood disasters. Few of us in our lifetimes have failed to experience at first hand some of those effects. They are so total. They are so complete. They leave their victims absolutely helpless. Every year some portion of our great nation is struck, often in the still of the night, with much of the devastating suddenness and destructive force of an atomic bomb.

The lives that are lost from these catastrophes, thank Heaven, have tended to decrease during recent years. This is due in part to the efforts of our engineers in constructing great flood control works, and in part to the ever-increasing efficiency of our weather and flood warning services. But Mother Nature has a way of striking where there are no levees and dams, and all of the other impedimenta of the modern flood control engineer. She can even bring the rains and the hurricanes that will leave such downpours as will cause the floodwaters to cascade over these obstacles and continue to wreak havoc. So much so that in 1955 flood damages attained a new peak, earning the ill-omened title of the first "billion dollar year."

Behind that cogent phrase "billion-dollar year" lies a many-times-repeated tale of misery and woe. It has left behind many crushed homes, lost sources of livelihood, ruined communities, and irrevocably damaged farmlands. As the ugly brown waters recede they leave behind them many thousands of tons of mud and sand and wreckage. There are left behind crushed and silt-filled homes, factories, and stores. Many serious fire and health hazards remain. Survivors are faced with a well-nigh-unsolvable problem. How can they clean up the mess, how can they rebuild their homes, their business? How, in fact, can they go on living at all, now that their resources are destroyed?

After the first burst of generosity from their fellow Americans, from the American Red Cross, from the many official agencies which supply food, shelter, medicines, clothing, and other immediate needs, comes the final full realization of the true situation. The efforts of all these agencies are good, they are well meant, and are vastly appreciated. However, the flood victim faces a blank future. How is he to resume the everyday task of living, with his resources destroyed, even hope seems to have fled. He needs some sustaining force. This situation has been repeated monotonously, year after year, and until now there has seemed to be no answer.

For years there have been pious utterances in public places following the visitation of these flood disasters. How many times have we heard repeated: "Something ought to be done about it," "there ought to be a law." All right, something should be done about it; there ought to be a law. Here, right now, before this body, is an opportunity to do something about it.

It is frankly experimental. Private insurance companies have been unable to provide for this type of insurance because they have not been able to build up the necessary reserves; they have been unable to spread the risk. Losses are usually total within an area and no private enterprise has been able to sustain itself after 1 or 2 major catastrophes of this type. This has been the experience of the past. For many years now no private insurance companies have made any real effort to be active in this area.

The bill now before you will provide future victims of floods, some hope. It will enable them to rise from the wreckage of their homes and businesses and face the future with some confidence that they will be able to resume their place in the community. The community may again become a vital cog in the Nation's economy.

Once the soundness of such a program as this bill provides is demonstrated, as I have every assurance it will be, private enterprise should be able to take over, and the frightening aspects of floods may be alleviated somewhat.

This bill does not place the Federal Government into business in competition with its citizens. No one is now selling flood insurance. So, it is now up to us to "do something about it."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, in 1913 the Miami Valley in Ohio suffered a very severe flood. The cities of Dayton, Hamilton, and Middletown, all located in the Miami Valley, and located within the congressional district I have the honor to represent, suffered great financial and property losses. Many lives were also lost.

Floodwaters reached a depth of from 12 feet to 16 feet in the downtown and industrial areas of many cities. The condition of wrecked and partly wrecked buildings of all kinds including residential properties was almost beyond description. Family treasuries and family fortunes were completely wiped out in a few hours.

The people of this area, in true American fashion and tradition, began to dig themselves out of the muck and ruin of their property. Everyone helped. The National Red Cross and other relief organizations did a marvelous job and it would be impossible to recount all the wonderful work done and the contributions made.

The people also, Mr. Chairman, immediately began to seek ways to prevent a future reoccurrence of such a disaster.

Time will not permit a complete account here of all that was done. Sufficient to say here that the people of this flooded area by their contributions and their willingness to pay taxes, a flood-control system was designed and built. This was done entirely by the people of this area. No help was ever requested or received from the Federal Government. This was done in the true American way and spirit.

It is wrong, Mr. Chairman, for the Federal Government to supply flood insurance and is contrary to our tradition. I am opposed to this bill and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that the House will overwhelmingly pass this bill now before us, S. 3732, to permit Federal participation in providing insurance against damage by flood. I also hope that within the near future the Congress may enact what we could describe as a general disaster bill which will enable all our American citizens to adequately insure themselves against catastrophic personal and property loss from the ever-recurring ravages of the elements uncontrolled.

I have, of course, a particular personal interest in this current measure because of the terrible and incalculable damage that was visited upon the people of my district area and my State in the unfortunate and unhappy floods that descended upon us suddenly, less than a year ago.

In that tragedy of nature more than a hundred lives were lost and millions of dollars of property damage to businesses and individuals was incurred. Today our people still live in fear and doubt as to when we may be victim again of these wild flood ravages. Neither the individual nor the community nor the State alone or together can adequately provide protection from the enormous destruction that follows in the wake of these natural disasters. They earnestly, and in my opinion rightfully, look to the Federal Government and the Congress for assistance and this important measure is a step to grant them a modicum of vitally needed help.

To allay any fears of some of the sincere questioners of the merit of this bill, let us make it clear that the measure does not contemplate the invasion of private enterprise. The hearings and testimony reveal that every effort has been made to get the insurance companies to enter this field of liability but they cannot in reasonable financial wisdom embrace it. The only way that the matter can be accomplished is by temporary participation of the Federal Government. It is certainly obvious that if the private insurance companies could write this kind of insurance on a profit basis they naturally would do it. Last year, following the great flood destruction in our area there was a large market for flood insurance but private insurance companies were unable to offer the necessary protection due to the enormous risk factor.

In any case, it is quite relevant, I think, to remember that the people of the United States pay for the restoration from the damage anyway. As we all

realize the various agencies of the Federal Government, by Presidential direction, move into any natural disaster emergency and spend millions of dollars in repairing public buildings, vital bridges, and other factors that have to do with preserving the health and safety of the people. Situations of this kind can certainly be better handled economically if we can work out an insurance program.

It is generally agreed, of course, that this legislation is not letter perfect. It is not claimed to be. This is an experimental program. It will require perhaps long experiment and patient study to work out a final solution. The problem is basically to enact a legislative program through which the Federal Government can offer some degree of economic protection against natural disaster losses to all of our people, and do so without expending unreasonably great amounts of the Federal money.

This legislation then is the first attempt to solve this problem in the American way and tradition. It will, no doubt, require continuous revision and perhaps correction. Nevertheless, it is fundamentally a good bill and good for all Americans, and I earnestly hope that it will be approved here this afternoon.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not this bill in any sense carries any relief from the high levels and the high waves we have had along the shore of Lake Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It was along the lines of that general subject that I intended to address my remarks.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sure that the gentleman knows the problem which we have had for many years.

Ms. O'HARA of Illinois. As the gentlewoman knows, we have in Chicago, and in many other cities, of course, after heavy rains, the overflowing of our sewerage and drainage systems.

In the effect of a flood on property there is not any difference between that of an underground stream used for drainage and sewage purposes and that of a river flowing on the surface. So the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], representing a Detroit district, and those of us coming from cities similarly situated were interested that the definition of flood in the bill before us should be sufficiently inclusive to cover flood situations that might be caused in our own sections of the country. Let me read the definition:

"Flood" includes any flood, tidal wave, wave wash, or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landslide due to excess moisture, and shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed by regulation of the Administrator.

There was some thought in the committee of eliminating the words "shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed", and this elimination I opposed. The gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] and others said, "No; if that is done, how can we go back to our constituents in Michigan, Illinois, and other inland States saying that while we were seeking to help the people on the Atlantic seaboard and elsewhere and were drawing up a flood-insurance act for them we forgot the welfare of our own people." They could very well say to me in Chicago, "Here you were helping to protect the victims of floods and water damage through this insurance program in the other parts of the country; but why did you not think of Chicago, where we, too, suffer from floods?"

Along Lake Michigan we have another very serious problem, that of erosion, which causes great damage to property. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] on numerous occasions has brought this effectively to the attention of the House. I can say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that I think we have gone as far as we possibly could, certainly in the definition of flood that I have read, to make it clear that water damage is the test and that the Administrator has the authority to include in the coverage those properties that suffer through erosion.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I merely want to say I am glad the gentleman agrees with me on the extent of the definition of the term "flood" in the bill. I hope to offer an amendment later to narrow that definition.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Do I understand that the gentleman, coming from the great city of Cleveland, would wish to deny or to limit the coverage we expect in Chicago, Detroit, and other places?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Let me help the gentleman by pointing out that I do not come from the city of Cleveland; that I come from a district which extends along the shores of Lake Erie all the way from the city of Cleveland to the Pennsylvania border.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the limitation of time, the gentleman can offer his amendment, but there will be no more debate.

Does the gentleman desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. HALE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 22, line 14, strike out, in two instances, the word "recurring."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WILLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3732), to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 617, he reported the same back to the House, with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves to recommit the bill S. 3732 to the Committee on Banking and currency.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend or to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND UNVEILING OF JOHN BARRY MEMORIAL AT WEXFORD, IRELAND

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 244, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to represent the Congress at the unveiling of the Commodore John Barry Memorial at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956, the following Members on the part of the House: Messrs. ROONEY, of New York; Mr. MADDEN, of Indiana; Mr. O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, Mr. DEVEREUX, of Maryland; Mr. SHEEHAN, of Illinois; and Mr. KEARNEY, of New York.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 483, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures the following Members of the House: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. BOLLING of Missouri, Mr. KEATING of New York, and Mr. HILLINGS of California.

COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RECORDING STUDIO

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 105, Public Law 624, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Recording Studio the following Members of the House: Mr. GARY, of Virginia; Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee; and Mr. BOW, of Ohio.

RETURN OF BILL H. R. 9591 TO SENATE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request.

The Clerk read as follows:

JULY 24 (LEGISLATIVE DAY JULY 16), 1956.

Ordered, That the Secretary request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 9591) entitled "An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (64 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes."

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSON,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

BREACH OF CONTRACT DAMAGES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9969) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract, which was reported unanimously favorably by the committee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part I of subchapter Q of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income attributable to several taxable years) is amended by redesignating section 1305 as section 1306 and by inserting after section 1304 the following new section:

Sec. 1305. Breach of Contract Damages.

(a) General Rule: If an amount representing damages is received or accrued by a taxpayer during a taxable year as a result of an award in a civil action for breach of contract or breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship, then the tax attributable to the inclusion of such amount in gross income for the taxable year shall not be greater than the aggregate of the increases in taxes which would have resulted if such amount had been included in gross income for the taxable year or years during which such amount would have been received or accrued by the taxpayer but for the breach of contract, or breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship.

(b) Credits and Deductions Allowed in Computation of Tax: The taxpayer in computing said tax shall be entitled to deduct all credits and deductions for depletion, depreciation and other items to which he would have been entitled, had such income been received or accrued by the taxpayer in the year during which he would have received it, except for such breach of contract or for such breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship.

(c) Limitation: Subsection (a) shall not apply unless the amount representing damages is $3,000 or more.

SEC. 2. The table of sections for such part I is amended by striking out

"Sec. 1305. Rules applicable to this part."

and by inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 1305. Breach of contract damages.
"Sec. 1306. Rules applicable to this part."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1954, but only as to amounts received or accrued after such date as the result of awards made after such date.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out line 8 and all that follows down through line 19 on page 2 and insert:

"SEC. 1305. Breach of contract damages.

"(a) General rule: If an amount representing damages is received or accrued by a taxpayer during a taxable year as a result of an award in a civil action for breach of contract or breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship, then the tax attributable to the inclusion in gross income for the taxable year of that part of such amount which would have been received or accrued by the taxpayer in a prior taxable year or years but for the breach of contract, or breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship, shall not be greater than the aggregate of the increases in taxes which would have resulted had such part been included in gross income for such prior taxable year or years.

"(b) Credits and deductions allowed in computation of tax: The taxpayer in computing said tax shall be entitled to deduct all credits and deductions for depletion, depreciation, and other items to which he would have been entitled, had such income been received or accrued by the taxpayer in the year during which he would have received it, except for such breach of contract or for such breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship. The credits, deductions, or other items referred to in the prior sentence, attributable to property, shall be allowed only with respect to that part of the award which represents the taxpayer's share of income from the actual operation of such property.

"(c) Limitation: Subsection (a) shall not apply unless the amount representing damages is $3,000 or more."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, existing law provides for the averaging of certain types of income over the period in which such receipts were actually earned or accrued. Examples of this averaging technique are the treatment of back pay and patent infringement. However, at the present time averaging is not permitted in the case of receipts resulting from a judicial award in a civil action for breach of contract or breach of fiduciary duty or relationship.

In such cases the taxpayer is required to include the total award in gross income for the year in which it is received or accrued. This results, in the usual case, in a substantially higher tax than would be imposed if the taxpayer had received the income represented by the award in each of the taxable years to which the award relates.

In addition, the character of the income has sometimes been held to be changed by the fact of its lump-sum receipt as an award from the breach of a contractor duty. For example, it has been indicated that an award resulting from the breach of a contract involving a failure to pay over oil royalties does not give rise to a percentage depletion deduction to the injured party.

H. R. 9969 permits the taxpayer who receives an award in a civil action for breach of contract or a breach of fiduciary duty or relationship to obtain the advantage of spreading the award over the years to which it is attributable and makes it clear that the taxpayer may take such deductions as he would have been entitled to in the absence of the breach.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9969 provides that a taxpayer who receives or accrues an award in a civil action for breach of contract, or breach of fiudciary duty or relationship, may spread the amount of the award over the period during which it would have been received, except for the breach of contract or duty, if this results in a lesser tax than would result from including the entire award in gross income of the current year. Provision is also made for the allowance of appropriate credits or deductions.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF RÉSUMÉ

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 623) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs 50,000 additional copies of the résumé of bills reported by that committee during the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO HONORABLE BARRATT O'HARA TO ACCEPT AN AWARD

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12396) to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fulgencio Batista y Zaldivar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, Representative from the State of Illinois, is authorized to accept from the Republic of Cuba the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or other provision of law to the contrary, the named recipient may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 629) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by House Resolution 30 of the 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies and investigations, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This resolution provides $10,000 to complete some studies that have been made but which are not yet completed, and for printing a report, is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This has the approval of the committee?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF ONE PROTOTYPE SHIP, AND THE CONVERSION OF ONE LIBERTY SHIP, BY THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3821) to authorize the construction of one prototype ship, and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, to construct, outfit, and test one prototype merchant ship of the "Clipper" class, as designed by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, and to convert, outfit, and test one reserve fleet Liberty ship. Such construction and conversion outfitting, and testing shall be subject to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO SELL CERTAIN WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 177 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, and section 510 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to sell within 1 year after the enactment of this joint resolution to the highest responsible bidder who is a citizen of the United States, within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, for employment on essential trade routes 3 and 4 to Cuba and Mexico, any two war-built vessels under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, on an as is, where is, basis, provided that the Secretary of Commerce shall determine before entering into such sales that the purchaser possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable it to operate and maintain the vessels in service on that portion of essential trade routes 3 and 4 between Atlantic coast ports of the United States and Cuba and Mexico and to maintain adequate service on such portion of such routes. The upset prices of the vessels shall be their sales prices computed under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as of January 15, 1951, depreciated (after reduction for residual value) on a straight line basis for the period from January 15, 1951, to the date of execution of the contract of sale, on the basis of the portion of a 20-year useful life of the vessels remaining after January 15, 1951.

(b) Each such sale shall be on the basis of the payment by the purchaser of not less than 25 percent of the vessel sales price at the time of execution of the vessel sales contract, with the balance payable in approximately equal annual installments over the remainder of the economic life of the vessel, which economic life is to be determined by the Maritime Administration, with interest on the portion of the vessel sales price remaining unpaid at the rate of 3½ percent per annum. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance, with interest, shall be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessels in form satisfactory to the Maritime Administrator.

(c) (1) Such sales shall be made upon such conditions as the Secretary of Commerce deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(2) Vessels sold under this act shall be employed exclusively as dry cargo common carriers on that portion of essential trade routes 3 and 4 between Atlantic coast ports of the United States and Cuba and Mexico, until the end of their useful lives, as determined under subsection (b) of this act, or until they are replaced by new tonnage, whichever happens first. These restrictions shall run at law and in equity with the titles to the vessels and are binding upon all subsequent owners.

(d) Any contract of sale executed under authority of this act shall provide that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition, acquire ownership of any such vessel, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the actual depreciated sales price under such contract (together with the actual depreciated cost of capital improvements thereon); that in computing the depreciated acquisition cost of such vessel, the depreciation shall be computed on the vessel on the schedule adopted or accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury for income tax purposes as applicable to such vessel; that such vessel shall remain documented under the laws of the United States during the remainder of the economic life of the vessel or as long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the sales price, whichever is the longer period; and that the foregoing provisions respecting the requisition or the acquisition of ownership by the United States, and documentation shall run with the title to such vessel and be binding on all owners thereof.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2869)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as

follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(a) The following sections of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are further amended as follows:

"Section 1 (a) is amended by striking from the second sentence thereof the words 'to assist borrowers under this title in making the' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'or insured for' and by striking the word 'their' preceding the words 'farming operations.'

"(b) Section 1 (b) is amended by inserting after the word 'only' in the first sentence the words 'farm owners', by striking the words '(including owners of inadequate or under-improved farm units)', and by inserting in lieu of the words 'the major portion' the words 'a substantial portion'.

"(c) Section 1 (c) is amended to read as follows: 'No loan shall be made, or mortgage insured, unless the farm is a family-type unit of such size as the Secretary determines to be sufficient to enable the family to carry on successful farming of a type which the Secretary deems can be carried on successfully in the locality in which the farm is situated: *Provided, however,* That—

"'(1) loans may be made to veterans or mortgages insured for veterans, as defined in section 1 (b) (2) hereof, who have pensionable disabilities, with respect to farm units of sufficient size to meet the farming capabilities of such veterans and afford them income which, together with their pensions, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts to become due on their loans; and

"'(2) loans may be made or mortgages insured to owner-operators who are bona fide farmers who have historically resided on farms and depended on farm income for their livelihood, and who are conducting substantial farming operations on units which are less than family-type units, to repair or improve such farm units, and to refinance indebtedness of the owner incurred for agricultural purposes, if such farms are of sufficient size to produce income which, together with income from other sources, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts to become due on their loans; and

"'(3) loans in amounts not exceeding $15,000 per farm for the construction, improvement, repair, or replacement of farm dwellings and other farm buildings on farms the operation of which require no more than three farm families or three farm dwellings may be insured under this act.'

"(d) The second sentence of section 2 (b) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: 'except that, for loans under either part of the proviso in section 1 (c) of this title, the certification shall be based on the normal market value of the farm.'

"(e) Section 3 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) Loans made under this title shall not be in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm less any prior lien indebtedness, and shall be secured by a first or second mortgage or deed of trust on the farm. Loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as acquired or enlarged, in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located.'

"(f) Section 12 (b) is amended by striking the figure '$100,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$125,000,000.'

"(g) Section 12 (e) is amended by striking from the last sentence of item (2) the words 'to carry out the provisions of this title, relating to mortgage insurance' and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'of the Farmers Home Administration and may be transferred annually to that administrative expense account and become merged therewith.'

"(h) Section 16 (a) is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof before the word 'mortgages' the words 'or second' and by adding the following sentence at the end of said subsection: 'Loans insured under this section shall not be in excess of 90 per centum of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm, less any prior lien indebetedness.'

"(i) The following new section 17 is added:

"'SEC. 17. Until June 30, 1959, the purposes for which loans may be made or insured under this title shall include the advance of funds for refinancing secured or unsecured indebtedness of eligible farmers on farms of not more than family size who are presently unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance such debts with commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible credit sources at rates and terms which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill. No such loans shall be made to an applicant whose total indebtedness is in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the real estate and the reasonable value of the applicant's livestock and farm equipment, unless the aggregate of the outstanding indebtedness shall be adjusted so as to be within such values. The total amount of loans insured in any one fiscal year under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000.'

"SEC. 2. Title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended by striking the words 'Production and Subsistence Loans' in the title and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Operating Loans', and by the amendment of section 21 to read as follows:

"'SEC. 21. (a) The Secretary may make loans to farmers and stockmen who are operators of family-type farms and who are citizens of the United States for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs, the cost of reorganizing the farming enterprise or changing farming practices to accomplish more diversified or more profitable farming operations, the refinancing of existing indebtedness, and for family subsistence: *Provided, however,* That loans may be made to operators who are bona fide farmers who have historically resided on farms and depended on farm income for their livelihood, and who are conducting substantial farming operations on units which are less than family-type units, if the units are of sufficient size to produce income which, together with income from other sources, including pensions in the case of disabled veterans, will enable them to meet living and operating expenses and the amounts due on their loans.

"'(b) No loan shall be made under this section for the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program. No loan may be made to any one borrower under this section which would cause the total principal amount outstanding to exceed $10,000: *Provided, however,* That an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the sum made available by annual appropriation for loans under this title may be used for making loans to borrowers, which would cause such indebtedness to exceed $10,000 but in no event may any loan be made which would cause such indebtedness to exceed $20,000.

"'(c) The terms of loans under this section, including any renewal or extension of any such loan except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, shall not exceed seven years from the date the original loan was made.

"'(d) No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness under this section for seven consecutive years shall be eligible for loans hereunder: *Provided, however,* That in justifiable cases where the Secretary finds that the inability of a borrower to repay his indebtedness under this section within seven years is due to causes beyond the control of the borrower, the Secretary may extend or renew such loans to be repayable in not to exceed ten years from the date the original loan was made, and during such extended term may make additional loans to such persons, if necessary.'

"SEC. 3. Except insofar as they affect title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, the following sections of title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, are further amended as follows:

"(a) Section 41 (g) is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) Compromise, adjust, or reduce claims and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into or administered by the Farmers' Home Administration under any of its programs, as circumstances may require: *Provided, however,* That—

"'(1) compromise adjustment, or reduction of claims of $15,000 or more must be effected by reference to the Secretary of the Treasury or to the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of section 3469 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 194);

"'(2) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be based on a reasonable determination by the Secretary of the debtor's ability to pay and the value of the security and with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of such adjustment or reduction;

"'(3) releases from personal liability may also be made with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of adjustment of claims against—

"'(A) borrowers who have transferred the security property to other approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding secured indebtedness; and

"'(B) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of their outstanding indebtedness against the farm which is equal to the value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the county committees certify and the Secretary determines that the borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

"'(4) no compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be made upon terms more favorable than recommended by the appropriate county committee established pursuant to section 42 of this Act; and

"'(5) any claim which has been due and payable for 5 years or more, and where the debtor has no assets from which the claim could be collected and has no apparent future debt payment ability, or is deceased and has left no estate, or has been absent from his last known address for a period of at least 5 years, has no known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, may be charged off or released by the Secretary upon a report and favorable recommendation of the employee of the Administration having charge of the claim: *Provided, however,* That claims involving a principal balance of $150 or less may be charged off or released whenever it appears to the Secretary that further collection efforts would be ineffectual or likely to prove uneconomical.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 42 (a) is amended by inserting after the word 'county' in each of three places the words 'or area'.

"(c) Section 43 (d) is amended by striking the words 'as family-size farms'.

"(d) Section 51 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 51. The Secretary is authorized and empowered to make advances to preserve and protect the security for, or the lien or priority of the lien securing, any loan or other indebtedness owing to, insured by or acquired by the Secretary under any programs administered by the Farmers' Home Administration; to bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise acquire property pledged, mortgaged, conveyed, attached, or levied upon to secure the payment of any such indebtedness; to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; to operate for a period not in excess of 1 year from the date of acquisition, or lease such property for such period as may be deemed necessary to protect the investment therein; to sell or grant rights-of-way or easements over such property; and to sell or otherwise dispose of such property in a manner consistent with the provisions of section 43 of this Act. Any advances or expenditures under this section with respect to any insured loan or insured mortgage shall be paid out of the mortgage insurance fund.'

"SEC. 4. Section 1 of the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 999; 69 Stat. 223), is further amended by striking the figures '1957' and inserting in lieu thereof the figures '1959' and by striking the figures '$15 million' and inserting in lieu thereof '$65 million'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
G. M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11544) to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted language differing from that adopted by the House in a number of respects. The conferees have agreed upon a substitute amendment which in most respects is identical with the bill as it passed the House. Following are the major differences between the House bill and the substitute amendment recommended herewith by the Committee of Conference:

LOANS TO PART-TIME FARMERS

The definition of a part-time farmer appearing in section 1 (c) and also in section 2 of the bill, is almost the same as that adopted by the House. Eliminated from the definition is language inserted by the Senate which would have limited refinancing loans to part-time farmers to debts against the real estate and makes it clear that such loans may cover refinancing of any indebtedness for agricultural purposes, including those secured both by real estate and chattel mortgages.

LOANS FOR TENANT HOUSE CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

The conferees accepted a Senate provision authorizing insurance of loans of not to exceed $15,000 for the construction, improvement, repair, or replacement of farm dwellings and other farm buildings on farms, the operation of which require no more than three farm families or three farm dwellings.

5-PERCENT INTEREST RATE

Eliminated from the conference bill is a Senate provision which would have stricken from the existing language of the act reference to prevailing rates of interest in excess of 5 percent as one of the qualifications for eligibility for an FHA loan. The conferees retained the House language, which retains that provision in existing law, but they point out that it is not the intention of the act being amended nor of the conferees to use the facilities of the Farmers Home Administration for the financing of well-to-do farmers who should be able to obtain adequate credit from other sources and that the reference to payment of prevailing interest in excess of 5 percent in the act is only one of the qualifications established in the act for eligibility for an FHA loan.

"AVERAGE VALUE" CRITERION

The Senate amendment (sec. 1 (e)) would have eliminated from existing law the provision that FHA loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farms in the county. The conference amendment will retain this language in the existing law with a slight amendment to provide that improvement or refinancing loans (as distinguished from acquisition or enlargement loans) may be made with respect to farms above the "average value" level.

INSURANCE OF SECOND MORTGAGE LOANS

The House conferees accepted a Senate provision (sec. 1 (h)) which will authorize insurance of second mortgage loans on real estate, as well as first mortgage loans.

MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF OPERATING LOANS

The House conferees accepted the Senate formula with respect to the maximum amount of operating loans. This formula provides that no loan to any one borrower may exceed $10,000, with the exception that not to exceed 10 percent of the funds made available by annual appropriation for such loans may be used to make loans up to $20,000.

HARDSHIP CASES

The House bill provided that production loans might be extended beyond the present 7-year limitation only in instances of hardship occurring in areas declared by the Secretary of Agriculture or the President to be disaster areas. The language agreed to by the conferees will permit extension of such loans in the case of individual hardship without restriction as to area but with the provision that no such loan may be extended for more than ten years from the original date the loan was made.

EXTENSION OF "ECONOMIC DISASTER" LOAN PROGRAM

The Senate conferees accepted the provisions of Section 4 of the House bill extending for two years the operation of the Act of August 31, 1954, and providing an additional 50 million dollars in loan funds. There was no such provision in the Senate bill, due to the fact that this matter had been handled in separate legislation by the Senate.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
G. M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the watershed protection and flood prevention act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2902)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666) is amended as follows:

"(a) Amend the second and third sentences of section 2 to read as follows: '"Works of improvement" any undertaking for—

"'(1) flood prevention (including structural and land treatment measures) or

"'(2) the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water

in watershed or subwatershed areas not exceeding two hundred and fifty thousand acres and not including any single structure which provides more than five thousand acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity, and more than twenty-five thousand acre-feet of total capacity. No appropriation shall be made for any plan involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of $250,000, or which includes any structure which provides more than twenty-five hundred acre-feet of total capacity unless such plan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided*, That in the case of any plan involving no single structure providing more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity the appropriate committees shall be the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and in the case of any plan involving any single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity the appropriate committees shall be the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, respectively.'

"(b) Amend section 3 by striking out clause (2), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(2) to prepare plans and estimates required for adequate engineering evaluation;

"'(3) to make allocations of costs to the various purposes to show the basis of such allocations and to determine whether benefits exceed costs;'

and by renumbering clauses (3) and (4) as (4) and (5) respectively.

"(c) Amend clause (2) of section 4 to read as follows:

"'(2) assume (A) such proportionate share, as is determined by the Secretary to

be equitable in consideration of the direct identifiable benefits, of the costs of installing any works of improvement, involving Federal assistance, which is applicable to the agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, and (B) all of the cost of installing any portion of such works applicable to other purposes except that any part of the construction cost (including engineering costs) applicable to flood prevention and features relating thereto shall be borne by the Federal Government and paid for by the Secretary out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this Act;'.

"(d) Add after the word 'landowners' in clause (4) in section 4, the words 'or water users'.

"(e) Strike out the word 'and' at the end of clause (4) in section 4; strike out the period at the end of clause (5) and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'and'; and after clause (5) insert a new clause as follows:

"'(6) submit a plan of repayment satisfactory to the Secretary for any loan or advancement made under the provisions of section 8.'

"(f) Amend section 5 to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5. At such time as the Secretary and the interested local organization have agreed on a plan for works of improvement, and the Secretary has determined that the benefits exceed the costs, and the local organization has met the requirements for participation in carrying out the works of improvement as set forth in section 4, the local organization with such assistance as it may request from the Secretary, which assistance the Secretary is hereby authorized to give, shall secure engineering and other services, including the design, preparation of contracts and specifications, awarding of contracts, and supervision of construction, in connection with such works of improvement, and in order to properly carry out such services in such projects as to such structures therein providing for municipal or industrial water supplies, the local organization shall, and in such projects not providing for municipal or industrial water supplies, the local organization may, retain or employ a professional engineer or engineers satisfactory to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall reimburse the local organization for the cost it may incur for the services of such engineer or engineers as is properly chargeable to such works of improvement, except that if the local organization decides not to retain or employ a professional engineer or if the Secretary determines that competent engineering services are not available he may contract for a competent engineer to provide such services or arrange for employees of the Federal Government to provide such services: *Provided,* That at the request of the local organization which retains or employs a professional engineer or engineers as aforesaid, the Secretary may advance such amounts as may be necessary to pay for such services, but such advances with respect to any works of improvement shall not exceed 5 per centum of the estimated total cost of such works: *Provided further,* That, except as to the installation of works of improvement on Federal lands, the Secretary shall not construct or enter into any contract for the construction of any structure unless there is no local organization authorized by State law to undertake such construction or to enter into such contract, and in no event after July 1, 1956: *Provided,* That in participating in the installation of such works of improvement the Secretary, as far as practicable and consistent with his responsibilities for administering the overall national agricultural program, shall utilize the authority conferred upon him by the provisions of this Act: *Provided further,* That whenever the estimated Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvement in any watershed or subwatershed area shall exceed $250,000 or the works of improvement include any structure having a total capacity in excess of twenty-five hundred acre-feet, the Secretary shall transmit a copy of the plan and the justification therefor to the Congress through the President: *Provided further,* That any such plan involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of $250,000 or containing any structure having a total capacity in excess of twenty-five hundred acre-feet (a) which includes reclamation or irrigation works or which affects public or other lands or wildlife under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or (b) which includes Federal assistance for floodwater detention structures, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least thirty days prior to transmission of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army, if received by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the expiration of the above thirty-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Congress through the President: *Provided further,* That, prior to any Federal participation in the works improvement under this Act, the President shall issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this Act, and to assure the coordination of the work authorized under this Act and related work of other agencies including the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army.'

"(g) After section 7 insert the following two new sections and renumber subsequent sections of the Act to conform:

"'SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to make loans or advancements to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement provided for in this Act. Such loans or advancements shall be made under contracts or agreements which will provide, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate, for the repayment thereof in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the works of improvement first become available, with interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury upon its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan or advancement is made, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue. With respect to any single plan for works of improvement, the amount of any such loan or advancement shall not exceed five million dollars.

"'SEC. 9. The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.'

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable to all works of improvement and plans for such works under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Any plans for works of improvement with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized prior to the date of this Act to participate in the installation of works of improvement in accordance with such plan, or any plan for works of improvement which has received prior to the date of this Act the approval of congressional committees, as required by such Act, need not be submitted to the congressional committees as required by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act as amended by this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
PAT MCNAMARA,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANCIS CASE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted language differing in a number of respects from that adopted by the House. The conference report herewith submitted is a substitute amendment which differs from the House provisions of the bill in the following major respects:

(1) The waiting period of 45 days (recently reduced to 15 by H. R. 11873) before work can start on a project after the plans have been submitted to Congress, and the requirement in existing law that projects involving dams above a certain size must also be approved by the Committees on Agriculture before appropriations may be made, is replaced by a new provision that—

(a) Exempts projects involving less than $250,000 of Federal contribution to construction costs and containing no structure having more than 2,500 acre-feet capacity from the review by other Federal agencies and the Congress;

(b) Eliminates the waiting period presently contained in the act; but

(c) Requires approval by the "appropriate committees" of all projects submitted to Congress before appropriations therefor may be made and declares that in the case of projects not involving a structure providing more than 4,000 acre feet of total capacity, the appropriate committees will be the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate and that in the case of projects involving any structure with a total capacity in excess of 4,000 acre feet, the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate shall be the appropriate committees.

(2) Revises section 5 of the act to provide for the employment of professional engineers and other professional services for the design, preparation of contracts and specifications, awarding of contracts and supervision of construction. In the case of structures for municipal or industrial water supplies the local organization is required to secure such professional services but must be reimbursed by the Secretary of Agriculture for the cost of such services. In the case of other types of structures and facilities authorized under the act, the local organization may retain such professional assistance or may call upon the Secretary to perform any or all of such services for the local organization. This will not preclude use of both Government and private engineers on multiple-use structures. Although the wording of section 5 as agreed upon by the conferees is substantially different from the existing section in the act, it does not change nor diminish in any respect the authority and responsibility of the Secretary to cooperate with local agencies in all phases of the planning, development

and construction of works of improvement authorized by the act and to participate fully in such planning and construction to the extent agreed upon between the Secretary and the responsible local agency.

(3) Places an upper limit of 25,000 acre feet total capacity on the size of any single structure which may be included in a watershed plan.

(4) Requires the preparation of plans and estimates needed for "adequate engineering evaluation".

(5) Requires an allocation of costs to various purposes.

(6) Broadens the safeguarding of State water rights by making the act applicable to "water users" as well as "land owners".

(7) Provides that Federal loans or advancements to local organizations may not exceed five million dollars on any one project.

(8) Extends the benefits of the amendments to the act made by this bill to projects heretofore authorized.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. FRAZIER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2930)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On line 8, strike out "$461,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000"; and the House agree to the same.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,
WILLIAM M. TUCK,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PRICE DANIEL,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

S. 3386 authorizes the appropriation of funds for the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission. As it passed the Senate it carried an authorization of $461,000. The House of Representatives amended S. 3386 to reduce this sum to $100,000. The managers on the part of the House recommend that the total authorization for the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission be $150,000, the sum agreed upon by the conferees.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,
WILLIAM M. TUCK,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a Commission for the Celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2903)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the Act, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 103 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress), is amended by striking out '$1,500,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,000,000,000'.

"SEC. 2. Section 104 of the Act is amended by inserting after subsection '(i)' the following new subsection:

"'(j) For providing assistance to activities and projects authorized by section 203 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1448), but no foreign currencies which are available under the terms of any agreement for appropriation for the general use of the United States shall be used for the purposes of this subsection (j) without appropriation therefor.'

"SEC. 3. Sales of fruit and the products thereof under title I of the Act shall be exempt from the requirements of the cargo preference laws (Public Resolution 17, Seventy-third Congress (15 U. S. C. 616a) and section 901 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1241 (b))).

"SEC. 4. Section 201 of the Act is amended by inserting after the word 'urgent' wherever it occurs in said section the words 'or extraordinary'."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted language differing from the Senate language in several respects. The conferees have agreed upon a substitute amendment which differs from the House amendment in the following respect (references are to sections in the conference report):

Section 1 of the bill was identical in both the Senate bill and the House amendment and has, therefore, not been changed.

Section 2 of the conference bill is the language of section 2 of the Senate bill amended so as to make it clear that the provision is not an appropriation but merely an extension of the existing authority of the President as to the manner in which the foreign currencies accruing under the act may be used.

Section 2 of the House amendment has been eliminated from the conference compromise because the provisions therein made no change in existing law.

Subsection (a) merely restated the construction of the existing section 304 of the act. In this connection it is pointed out that section 304 does not apply to any transactions beyond the scope of the act and should not be construed to apply to dollar sales.

Subsection (b) was a restatement of the policy under which sales authorized by the act are now being conducted—a policy which it is the intention of the conferees should be continued—but while adding nothing to the policy, would have required administrative determinations in connection with each transaction under the act which would have added substantially to the complexity and the cost of administration.

Section 3 of the conference bill adopts substantially the language of the Senate provision, which was deemed preferable by the conferees in order to make it clear that dried fruits, such as prunes, raisins, etc., are eligible for inclusion within the provisions of

the section, and that a ship might carry a combined cargo consisting of both fresh fruits and canned or other processed fruits and would not be limited to a cargo of one type only.

Section 4 of the conference bill is the language of section 4 of the House amendment and did not appear in the Senate bill. It was accepted by the conferees in order to broaden the operations under section 201 of the act to permit use of food donated thereunder for refugees and other continuing "extraordinary" requirements.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
GEORGE M. GRANT,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WARREN D. COOPER AND HER SON, TEDDY DEVERE COOPER

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 269) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 8008) for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed make the following correction:

On page 2, line 1 of the House engrossed bill, strike out the date "September 2, 1934" and insert "September 23, 1934".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM H. RAY

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2851)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the figures "$5,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
E. L. FORRESTER,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House would appropriate the sum of $10,000 to Sam H. Ray, of Washington, D. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries he received resulting in the amputation of his right arm following an accident which occurred when he was 8 years of age, while he was working in the laundry at Ute Mountain Indian School at Towaoc, Colo.

The Senate reduced the sum to $5,000, and at the conference the sum of $7,500 was agreed upon.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
E. L. FORRESTER,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK HIRE OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12354) relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that just apply to districts with a population in excess of 500,000?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; it has been so changed. That is all this applies to.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does it apply to Resident Commissioners and Delegates?

Mr. THOMAS. If they have in excess of 500,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does that also apply to a Congressman at Large?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. All Congressmen at Large?

Mr. THOMAS. No, just those that have 500,000 or over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of section 11 (a) of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 509; Public Law 242, 84th Cong.; 2 U. S. C. 60g–1), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of such first sentence the following: "except that, in the case of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner the population of whose constituency is 500,000 or more, as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census, such basic rate shall be increased by not to exceed $2,500 per annum".

(b) The joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution providing for pay to clerks to Members of Congress and Delegates," approved January 25, 1923, as amended (2 U. S. C. 92), is amended by inserting immediately after "to be designated by each Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner" the following: "or, in the case of each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner the population of whose constituency is 500,000 or more, as currently estimated by the Bureau of the Census, not to exceed the foregoing number increased by 1, to be designated by each such Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, as the case may be."

(c) Applicable appropriations shall be available for the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. HERMAN E. MOSLEY

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1420) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$5,579.25" and insert $5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL H. SARVIS, SR.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3062) for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out all after "June 21," down to and including line 14 and insert "1953."

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 2. The acceptance of the sum authorized to be paid by the first section of this act by the said Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., shall constitute a sale by him to the Commodity Credit Corporation of all his right, title, and interest in and to such seed; and Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., shall not be liable for any transportation, loading, or warehouse storage charges which may have accrued on or after such date with respect to such 5,000 pounds of seed."

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume these have been cleared with the minority members of the committee?

Mr. FORRESTER. I have been so advised, yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, that being so, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYRUS B. FOLLMER

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11207) for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 640) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigating authorized by House Resolution 483, 84th Congress, incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1956, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $30,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise engaged.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual campaign resolution, I assume?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARD OF THE ORDER AL MERITO DELLA REPUBBLICA ITALIANA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12408) to authorize Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable William A. Barrett, and the Honorable James G. Fulton, Members of the House of Representatives to accept and wear the award of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana tendered by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, of the State of Massachusetts, the Honorable William A. Barrett, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable James G. Fulton, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, are authorized to accept the award of the Order "Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana," in the grade of "Cavaliere Ufficiale," together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable William A. Barrett, and the Honorable James G. Fulton any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or other provision of law to the contrary, the named recipients may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7855) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until June 30, 1956, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "'June 30, 1956'" and insert: "July 31, 1958."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until July 31, 1958, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONABLE PROPERTY PROGRAM FOR EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include three letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who have raised the points as to the effect of H. R. 7855 on the donable property program for education, health, and civil defense, I insert in the RECORD a letter received today from the Administrator of GSA, the Honorable Franklin G. Floete, which makes it clear that this bill merely extends the period of time during which the Administrator may negotiate sales of real and personal property which are available for sale under the law. The donable program is not affected by H. R. 7855.

Mr. Floete also advises that a bill to grant permanent authority to negotiate sales is being drafted so the periodic extension of the authority may be dispensed with.

The second point is with respect to the designation of contractors or agents of the Government to sell certain classes of property for the Government's account in order to increase the rate of return. By letter of July 3, 1956, which I place in the RECORD, the Administrator advises that any such an arrangement would not be undertaken until cleared with "the appropriate committees of the Congress in accordance with the reporting requirements of the bill." My reply of July 9, 1956, is also placed in the RECORD.

I feel certain that the clarification of these two points by the Administrator removes some concern as to the intended use of the authority to negotiate sales.

Re H. R. 7855

JULY 25, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: The extension of our authority to negotiate sales of real and personal property under section 203 (e) of the Federal Property and Admininstrative Services Act of 1949 as amended by H. R. 7855, if enacted, will not affect disposals for health, educational, and civil defense purposes under section 203 (j) and (k) of that act. H. R. 7855 deals with how sales are affected and not with the matter of eligibility.

This agency is now working on a revised draft of legislation to provide permanent authority to negotiate disposals of surplus property. This legislation will be submitted to the Congress at the opening of its next session.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
Administrator.

Re H. R. 7855, negotiated sales authority

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1956.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This is in response to your informal request to our Associate General Counsel for a statement concerning GSA's plans with respect to the use of service contractors to sell surplus property.

As you are aware, this agency has been endeavoring to bring about, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies, improvements in techniques for selling surplus personal property. One area in which current sales returns appear to be especially susceptible to improvement consists of certain highly technical categories of property. While emphasis has been and is being placed upon the use of clear and commercially understandable descriptions of technical materials listed in Government sales offerings, there has not been on hand in the Government an adequate supply of

personnel qualified to identify, describe, and lot such property in a manner to reach the best markets.

The possible use of private companies which normally handle the sale of such property has been under consideration for some time. GSA made a commitment to the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Government Operations Committee in testimony on May 24, 1955 that the value of service contracts for selected categories would be tested on an experimental basis.

Proponents of the use of service contractors claim that there can be increased net return to the Government by utilizing the technical and sales experience of companies normally selling certain types of property.

The Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in recommendation No. 17 of its report on surplus property, issued in April 1955, expressed concern about the low level of sales return being obtained for some technical types of surplus personal property. It recommended that GSA, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, undertake to dispose of selected categories of such property through the use of commercial concerns which normally handle sales of such property.

This agency has no fixed position about the use of service contractors. It does recognize that a problem exists with respect to good merchandising of certain technical categories.

Subsequent to the issuance of the above-mentioned report on surplus property, GSA and DOD began a series of meetings to explore the recommendation with the objective, provided there were mutual agreement between the agencies, of undertaking test contracts with service contractors for a few selected categories of property.

It was the consensus of the military departments that the first area to be considered should be electronic parts, components, and equipment. Joint meetings have been held with representatives of the electronic sales industry to obtain its initial overall reaction. There has been both support for and opposition to the proposal from industry representatives.

As we see it, however, there is a great deal of work which must be done before any test contracts can be ready for execution. The administrative problems are numerous and complex, some of which will be worked out with the General Accounting Office. Safeguards to protect the Government's property and to insure the competitive selection and utilization of qualified contractors are but a few of those problems.

As we interpret the provisions of H. R. 7855, there is nothing in the bill which would preclude GSA from entering into service contracts of the nature under consideration. Therefore, if H. R. 7855 is enacted, GSA and the Defense Department plan to continue to explore the electronic area. Another category for possible consideration is aircraft components, parts, and equipment.

Of course, if the point is reached where GSA and the Defense Department determine that such a test is feasible and in the public interest, before any trial service contract is executed, an explanatory statement of the proposed contract will be submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress in accordance with the reporting requirements of the bill.

These tentative plans with respect to the use of service contractors, if adopted, would affect a limited portion of Government surplus property sold. While this has been made clear in the few industry meetings we have held, there nevertheless appears to have arisen some belief that the use of service contractors was definitely planned for surplus property disposals in general, and that thousands of small businesses would thereby be adversely affected.

With the concurrence of Mr. Ray Ward of your staff, we are sending a copy of this letter to Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD.

We hope that this is fully responsive to your request.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1955.

Hon. FRANKLIN G. FLOETE,
General Services Administration.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLOETE: I am in receipt of your letter of July 3 in relation to H. R. 7855. The only purpose that prompted me to seek a letter from you was so that I could insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing that before any action is taken by you or your associates in connection with the use of service contractors, it will be after the same is submitted to the appropriate committees of both branches of the Congress, if the use of such contractors is decided upon. So far as I am concerned, I have no opinion to express, one way or the other.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

———.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with tomorrow's suspensions, one of them will be on the bill H. R. 8384, dealing with marketing orders on cranberries for processing.

There will also be a suspension on H. R. 11709, to increase the authorization for the appropriation of the Atomic Energy Commission. I understand that is the point-of-order bill in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Also, S. 3416, relating to the employment of Indians.

S. 3042, the Mineral Leasing Act.

Any other suspensions will be cleared with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and announced.

Mr. MARTIN. First of all will be any conference reports?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to what other legislation may be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. The first order of legislative business will be the bill H. R. 8902, relating to air carriers' reinvestment of proceeds from sale of property.

Mr. MARTIN. That will come ahead of the suspensions?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that will come ahead of the suspensions.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact that two calendars are to be called tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, the Consent Calendar and Private Calendar will be called tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The bill that was listed for consideration on the whip notice, H. R. 12050, was reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with one dissenting vote. It seeks to provide for certain insurance indemnities in connection with building of atomic reactors under the programs we presently have. Can the gentleman tell us when it is proposed that that bill might be called, or might it be considered under suspension tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable at this time to answer the first question, as to when it might be called. As far as the suspension is concerned, I can answer that, No.

Mr. MARTIN. For the information of the majority leader, and I am sure he must know this fact, that bill has now been out long enough so that any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a matter of special privilege.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but it is not special on going into the Committee of the Whole. It is special as to the rule. Under the rules, it has a preferential situation with relation to the rule itself, but the privilege does not extend beyond that.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, if the rule were adopted, and I certainly would expect it would be adopted, then I certainly would expect that upon the adoption of the rule the chairman of the committee would move that the House go into the Committee of the Whole to consider this measure, because it is important.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's expectation may not be the expectation of others.

Mr. HALLECK. I can understand that. That very often happens.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not very often, but occasionally.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HON. JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on August 31, 1894, in the small agricultural community of Liberty Hill, S. C., JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS was born. In his early youth he worked on his father's farm. He attended Clemson College, but when World War I came he enlisted in the United States Army and rose from a private to second lieutenant. He served with great distinction in the famous 30th Division.

After the termination of the war he attended law school at the University of South Carolina, and was graduated in 1921. Having been admitted to the bar,

he began the practice of law in Lancaster, S. C., not many miles from his native heath of Liberty Hill.

His first public office was his election to judge of probate in Lancaster County in 1922, which office he held until he was elected to this body.

Mr. RICHARDS began serving in the House of Representatives during the 73d Congress in 1933. He is terminating 24 years in this Congress. No man in the history of my State has served as long in the House of Representatives as this distinguished South Carolinian.

Dick, as he is affectionately known by us all, demonstrated his keen intellect and unusual ability early in life. After coming to Congress, he was assigned to the important Committee on Foreign Affairs, which he has headed with such great distinction. Few men in the history of this or any other parliamentary body have experienced more intimate association in the cause of peace with the leaders of the governments all over the world. He has jealously guarded the prerogatives of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has labored indefatigably to bring to every member of his committee on the Congress knowledge of our foreign policy, both economic and military. He has studiously sought to protect the fiscal integrity and responsibility of our Nation. He has lived the philosophy "That a nation is only as strong diplomatically and militarily as she is economically." This epitomizes DICK RICHARDS.

DICK RICHARDS longed to be at home in South Carolina with his family and his people. This is the compelling reason why he announced his retirement at the end of this session of the Congress. He leaves at his own choosing. He could have been reelected to Congress as long as he lives. There are other high positions of responsibility and trust in South Carolina which he could occupy if he but gave his consent to offer at the ballot box. DICK RICHARDS is a man who towers with the giants of South Carolina's political past. RICHARDS believes that the cause of world peace has improved. This is another factor in his decision to retire. He is confident of the future and those who will chart our course in the world of nations. He is confident of the leadership of America in the future days. DICK RICHARDS wants to retire now while he is still a young man. He has many things he wants to do. He has our best wishes in his unfinished endeavors.

Dick has never sought the plaudits of the crowd or played for the headlines. The major part of his 24 years in the Congress have come during the most critical hours of this country's existence in the world. He has participated actively in her rise to the leader of the world. This participation has been hard on him. He now seeks a more tranquil existence. While his decision to retire greatly affects the prestige of the Delegation of our State, and of our Nation, his wise counsel to the people of his native State during the remaining years of his life will be eagerly sought and generously given.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is the ardent wish of every Member of this body that DICK RICHARDS will have many years before him. While we hate to see him leave we know he deserves the course he has chosen. We know he will come back to the cloakroom and counsel us on the problems which confront and harass us. We will ever keep his membership in our Democratic ranks and we extend to him our greetings and best wishes to his family as long as he lives.

Personally, I have no better friend in the Congress. Our friendship has grown strong and fast over the years. His advice to me has been of immeasurable benefit. I am determined that his leaving this body will not deprive me and my family of the fine association which we have enjoyed with him and his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, at this point before I yield, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to my distinguished friend from South Carolina.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my good friend the very capable and distinguished Representative from the Fifth South Carolina District is retiring from Congress. He is at the height of his distinguished public career and he will be sorely missed not only by his colleagues from my State but by his colleagues from many of the other States.

When he has completed his present term in Congress he will have served longer as a Member of the House of Representatives than any other man in the history of my State. During this period in the Congress he has rendered outstanding service not only to his State but to the Nation. I consider him one of the foremost authorities on foreign affairs in the United States today. He has been able to help reconcile and adjust many of the problems which have arisen as a result of a confused and troubled world during one of the greatest of world wars and the problems arising out of that war.

He is from a distinguished South Carolina family. He is capable, sincere, ruggedly honest and sound in his conclusions. Moreover he has the courage of his convictions and does not hesitate to fight for those things that he believes are for the best interest of the people that he represents. We will miss him in the Congress. We will miss his stabilizing influence and his constructive leadership.

He is retiring voluntarily. In my opinion, he could have been reelected should he have so desired. Although we regret to see him go we bow to his decision and wish for him and his lovely family every success and happiness in whatever field of endeavor he chooses to enter.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 84th Congress, I will have served 10 terms—20 years, and they have passed rapidly. I have served with many Members—those who are yet here and many who have left our ranks for various reasons. These years have been pleasant years. They have been fruitful years. These years have been years of great experience. I have enjoyed the friendship of men from all walks of life, and all with a sincerity of purpose, and with this experience I feel that my life has been enriched. An experience I shall carry with me throughout the days of my life.

When I came to Congress in 1937, one of the first persons I met was DICK RICHARDS. I was impressed with his rugged personality, his character, his determination, his independence, and his unselfish political aspect on life. With the passing years my admiration for him, my respect for him has grown. I have never known a man for whom I have more respect. He is a fellow with the courage of his convictions.

I have served on the same committee with DICK RICHARDS. I have served with him in the House. I have traveled with him in foreign lands, and we have met common problems in almost all walks of life. All these experiences have impressed me, for he has been ready to meet any problem with the same calm judgment and decision of a man with his feet well on the ground.

He has a delightful family—all dedicated to the same program of living a well-rounded life. In his voluntary retirement he will be missed tremendously. Katharine will be missed; his boys and Jane will be missed by those of us who served with him and our families who enjoyed association with them.

Dick, in your retirement from the national scene to the land of your nativity and the soil you love so well, no persons will derive more pleasure from the happiness of the Richards family from South Carolina than will the Gregory family from Kentucky.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that J. G. Holland must have had a man like JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS in mind when he wrote:

God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who love honor; men who will not lie,
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.

DICK RICHARDS measures up to these standards.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing admiration for DICK RICHARDS and regret at his leaving. I have served with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs since I came to the House in 1943. During that time I have had an opportunity to observe him as a coworker and as a friend, as a leader guiding and directing the work of the committee, and as a statesman facing the complex issues which have confronted our Nation.

Let me first pay tribute to DICK RICHARDS as a chairman. It has been a real pleasure to observe the skill, the good nature, the wisdom and the firmness

with which he has directed the operations of the Foreign Affairs Committee. There has never been any doubt that Chairman RICHARDS was the man in charge. He frequently has found it necessary to say "No" to proposals made by members of the committee on both sides of the committee table. He has always been able to do so in a spirit of friendliness, of fairness, and nonpartisanship. I do not believe any member of the committee has ever taken offense or harbored resentment as a result of being overruled by our chairman. DICK RICHARDS is really at his best in presiding over a committee meeting. His patience and good humor, his ability to relieve tension with a timely anedote or homely phrase and his skill in pushing the work of the committee to completion has commanded the admiration of us all.

DICK RICHARDS is one who, I can say with all sincerity, deserves the designation of statesman. He has left his mark on the history of our Nation and on the course of world events. His decisions have always been the result of well-informed and carefully considered judgment. I have never known him to adopt a course of action because of political or personal considerations. He has on occasion expressed his disapproval, and even resentment, at the way matters have been handled by the executive. Nevertheless, he has forgotten his personal feelings in considering the legislation involved. The one consideration which has always determined his position has been what has been best for our country.

I feel the deepest regret, not only as a friend and a Member of the House but also as a citizen of the United States, that DICK RICHARDS is retiring from the Congress and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His absence will make a difference in the years to come. Let me join with my colleagues in wishing him well in the years to come and in assuring him that he will always be remembered.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as I stated to this august body on June 6, I learned about Chairman RICHARDS' decision to retire from the House of Representatives while with a special study mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This sad news was received with deep regret not only by those of us who have served with him in the House, but also by the many people in the Near and Middle East, in South Asia and the Far East, and in the Western Pacific, who have held him in high esteem as a man who represented and personified the noble traits and characteristics of our great democracy.

Chairman RICHARDS has served the people of his State, and our Nation, with exceptional distinction for over two decades. He has been a Representative in Congress during one of the most trying periods of our history, when the very foundations of our western civilization were subjected to an unprecedented onslaught from the forces of totalitarianism and of militant communism.

During this crucial period he has served his country well, fighting without partisanship or prejudice for the principles which made our Nation strong and free, and at all times placing the welfare of our people above all else.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. RICHARDS displayed those precious qualities of leadership which earned him deep respect and admiration of his colleagues. His leadership was marked by fairness, by firmness, and great courage. It has been a distinct privilege for me to be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs under his chairmanship.

I know that Chairman RICHARDS' experience and wise counsel will be missed sorely in these halls. We draw some consolation, however, from the hope that his great talents and his seasoned judgment will continue to serve our Nation, perhaps in a different capacity.

I join my colleagues in wishing Chairman RICHARDS, and the members of his family, many years of health and happiness.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues in the House, especially those of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee, we are going to miss our good friend DICK RICHARDS next year and thereafter very, very much, indeed. So many statements have been made regarding him this afternoon that I will not endeavor to repeat them, except to say that I endorse everything which has been stated regarding his character and his ability. As far as I am concerned personally, one of his outstanding characteristics is his possession of the art of being a master diplomat, and I make this statement because he has been the first man to persuade me to vote for a foreign-aid program since I came to Congress.

Although I have not had the good fortune to know or to serve with Congressman RICHARDS as long as the majority of the Members, I do count his leaving us as a real personal loss. To me, a very junior committee member, he has always shown the greatest degree of consideration, cooperation, and understanding that I could possibly expect. His native State of South Carolina can well be proud in having sent such a distinguished Representative to the Congress of the United States, a man not only of outstanding talents and ability but also a true gentleman in every sense of the word.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with all the fine things that have been said here today about my good friend and colleague, DICK RICHARDS, of South Carolina. Everything that has been said is more than deserved.

I personally entertain the highest respect for Mr. RICHARDS. He is the sort of man who commands respect and confidence by all those who associate with him. He is a man of action, of positive action, and has never been content to float along with the tide and to follow the line of least resistance.

It was Edmund Burke who once said: "For evil to exist it is only necessary for good men to do nothing." He was there striking at the conformist, the party-liner, the man of expediency. DICK RICHARDS is not that type. As he leaves the Congress he leaves behind him a record of accomplishments, built upon independent judgment, cooperation, and courage.

Mr. RICHARDS will be sorely missed in the future. The entire Nation will be the loser when such men of judgment, statesmanship, and courage retire from this body.

I am sorry to see him leave, but I join in extending all the good wishes in the world to my friend DICK RICHARDS and his family. They deserve the best.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the great chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman JAMES RICHARDS, of South Carolina.

I regret very much that he is leaving the House where he has made a remarkable contribution in the field of foreign affairs.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been privileged to serve under his wise and gentle leadership, and I am grateful to him for the good advice and good counsel which he generously gave to me on many occasions.

It is difficult for me to imagine Congressman RICHARDS in retirement. I find it hard to believe that with his active mind and with his inquiring disposition and with his strong physique he can long remain in any kind of retirement.

I hope that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State will utilize his long experience and his great ability in the interests of the United States in the field of foreign affairs.

By so doing, the President and the Secretary of State would at once buttress the topflight leaders in the field of foreign affairs and do something positive by way of bringing true bipartisanship to our national relations.

I join my colleagues in extending my very best wishes for a long and happy and healthy life to Congressman RICHARDS and his family.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to speak as a southerner in appreciation of the references to southern culture and tradition by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. I am confident that these comments will have a particularly strong appeal for the colleague we are honoring today. Yet one source of his greatness is his capacity for forming friendships that extend beyond all provincial interests.

I was talking with him just a few days ago about the fascinating history of the Nation's early settlements and the movement of people across the continent which our forefathers overcame.

Mr. RICHARD'S home city is Lancaster, S. C., and it was named for Lancaster, Pa. It stands as a symbol of the interrelated character of our scattered communities and the common origin of our American ideals and principles.

Those who have preceded me spoke eloquently of his great gifts and monumental contribution to our country. I shall try not to be unduly repetitious. There is the rugged character of the Scots in this good man. He reminds me of the statement of one of Jefferson's

biographers who noting that he was influenced greatly by one of his professors of Scottish descent paraphrased the familiar scripture: "Whom the Lord did not predestinate by Scotch ancestors he did foreordain by Scotch instructors."

His statesmanship reveals qualities of mind and heart that no single generation could produce. Spiritual ties to the past are visible in his career.

Mr. Speaker, I delight in the prospect of his happiness in the practice of law with his son, a friend of my lawyer son, and the rest from his heavy duties here, though it will doubtless be brief. His unmatched knowledge of many phases of foreign policy and his devotion to his country's welfare constitute a resource which I believe he will find a way to use for the Nation's good.

We all wish for him and his wife, Katharine, who has also won a place in our hearts, long life and continued usefulness.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the tributes being paid DICK RICHARDS, our distinguished colleague and friend from South Carolina.

Vermonters are sometimes considered a bit cold and austere by those who meet them for the first time. But once this veneer of reserve is broken one finds a warmhearted and friendly people who only desire a little time in which to appraise a man's true worth.

So, as a Vermonter, perhaps the highest compliment I can pay DICK RICHARDS is to say that should circumstances require him to establish a residence in the Green Mountain State he would be accepted immediately as one of us. His virtues and qualities, so readily apparent, are those which Vermonters cherish the most: love of liberty, strength of character, rugged independence of thought, and a willingness to fight for one's convictions.

This has been a better House because DICK RICHARDS has been a Member. Men of his stature cannot be replaced. We can only hope that his record will inspire others to try and measure up to the high standards of effective and devoted public service which have been so evident throughout his political career.

We hope that he and his charming wife will enjoy many years of good health and happiness together.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, DICK RICHARDS and I entered the House of Representatives in the 73d Congress, more than 23 years ago, and we soon became devoted friends.

I consider the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] one of the most outstanding Members we have had during these years. He is always sound in his thinking and convincing in his argument. This is one reason he is so highly regarded by the Members on both sides of this aisle. He never takes a stand until he is convinced he is right, and then he never varies from it. This was demonstrated sometime ago when he defeated the leadership on both sides of the aisle on an amendment to the mutual security bill.

I appreciate the friendship of this beloved, able Congressman throughout the years. His advice on many and varied problems, especially on foreign affairs, brought up on the floor of the House has been most helpful.

I do not know of anyone whose absence from this Chamber will be felt more than that of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [DICK RICHARDS]. His retirement is a voluntary one. I hope he will get some needed rest and that all good things will come to him, his lovely and devoted wife, and their fine family.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, DICK RICHARDS I salute you and wish for you the best than can come to a great American. Our districts, yours in South Carolina and mine in North Carolina adjoin. You have extended me many courtesies. I am grateful. My wife Agnes and our family, Cree, Carol, and Charles, join me in expressing to you and your devoted wife Katherine our very sincere good wishes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I, too, desire to pay tribute to one of the great personalities in the House of Representatives, the chairman of my committee, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS.

It has been my very great privilege to have served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of which Mr. RICHARDS has recently been the chairman.

Words cannot express my great respect and admiration for him. He has conducted the affairs of our committee diligently, fairly, and without political consideration. I know of no committee in this House which has functioned with so little political bias as our committee.

JIM RICHARDS, as we refer to him so affectionately, is a man who typifies the American boy of humble parentage who has risen to great stature in his State and more recently in the Nation. He has made an impact on this body. We shall long remember his devoted service and his kindly attitude toward all of us.

As he takes leave of us, I join with my colleagues in wishing him Godspeed and good health. Here is a man.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, to add my personal tribute to the Honorable DICK RICHARDS is an honor. It is also a joy carrying with it deep tones of sadness. This is a most peculiar combination of facts, but the facts are clear and true.

For the very name of JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS is different. He, too, is different from the average man. As one of the Representatives of South Carolina in the Halls of Congress, he became one of the great public servants of that State and one of the great public servants of our United States. In his capacity as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, he became known not only to his colleagues and to those in all branches of Government, but also to the leaders in all the capitals of the world. His ability and integrity placed him in the highest esteem of all who were fortunate to meet him. His fairness is a characteristic extolled by all. It was a joy to serve as one of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Every meeting was a pleasant experience—courtesy was shown to members and witnesses alike, humor came at just the right time and in the right instance. Tensions might mount, but Dick always cleared the air.

The deep tones of sorrow are present in my tribute because Dick is voluntarily returning to private life too young, too able, in these trying days when he is needed most in the affairs of our Nation. I cannot blame him for his decision. In private life he will be able to enjoy more time with his family—his lovely wife, their children and grandchildren. I wish them all many long and happy years together. I want to close with one of the baseball terms he loved, "I learned to hit that strike, reach for the curve, and let the foul ball go by."

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the eulogies being given DICK RICHARDS. As I have stated previously on the floor of the House, he is a great American who has met well the responsibilities thrust upon him in the difficult period since World War II. I think that when the history of congressional actions during this period is revealed, no Member of either body should deserve higher credit for the success of American foreign policy than DICK RICHARDS.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have served and worked with JIM RICHARDS for some time know him as a fair-minded and friendly chairman of that important committee. JIM RICHARDS has handled the affairs of the committee on a bipartisan basis so that he has been one of the real and cogent factors in the development of the basic present American positions in the foreign field.

The chairmanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has developed tremendously in stature under his leadership, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee is respected for its care and judgment in handling the interests of the United States of America where they arise throughout the world. I am glad to join with my fellow committee members and Members of Congress who have risen to express their personal regret that he is retiring at the end of the current session and will no longer be with us either in the House or with his colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, men in Congress stand out. There are those who are especially well balanced and handle difficult things well. One of these is my friend, JIM RICHARDS, of South Carolina, who is retiring after many years of fine service to our Nation as chairman and a leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

It has been my distinct pleasure to have had the privilege of serving with this gentleman, and I wish every good for him in the coming years.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of the 84th Congress, with service on lengthy and involved conferences with the other body on the huge mutual security and first and second supplemental appropriation bills, this is the first opportunity I have had to express my best wishes and Godspeed to the respected chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the dis-

tinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The people of the Fifth District and of the entire State of South Carolina are confronted with a tremendous problem in trying to replace a man of the stature of DICK RICHARDS in the House of Representatives. The people of the entire Nation suffer a great loss in virile leadership on the subject of foreign affairs in Dick's decision not to offer himself once again for the office of Representative in Congress from South Carolina.

I have had close liaison with DICK RICHARDS for many years. Not only has he been a close and affable friend, but as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State I have had many occasions to discuss and seek advice on many matters concerning that important branch of our Government with our learned chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. On some subjects, such as abolition of the partition of Ireland and civil rights, we would always disagree. But I am sure we always respected one another's opinions and our right to fully state and defend them.

DICK RICHARDS was truly a powerful leader here in the House on foreign policy. I know that on every issue presented to him as a Member for over 20 years and as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs his primary concern was always, "What is best for my country?"

Mr. Speaker, one must need feel sad at the departure of one of our most brilliant and capable colleagues after a long and devoted public career. However, I do know that, at the same time, we all wish him many, many years of happiness, good health, and further success in his return to private life and the practice of the law. His charming wife, his sons, and daughter will surely benefit by our great loss in having Dick at home in his beloved hometown of Lancaster.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to pay tribute to DICK RICHARDS who has announced his retirement from the Congress; although I do it with much sadness.

The Fifth District of South Carolina is losing a most able legislator, not only for themselves, but for our country as a whole. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, his ability, integrity, and leadership of this great committee placed him in a position of the highest esteem not only here in the House of Representatives, but throughout the world.

I deem it one of my personal fortunes to have been associated with DICK RICHARDS and it is impossible to express in words my admiration of and for him. I wish for him the best of luck and health in the coming years.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to come to the House of Representatives with Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS in 1933. It has been my very high privilege to serve with him for the past 24 years. I believe we are all more or less creatures of our environment and our associations. I feel in all sincerity that I am a better man for having known DICK RICHARDS and having had the privilege of associating with him through these years. DICK RICHARDS embodied many fine qualities. He is gentle, he is kind, he is considerate, he is charitable, he is courageous. I have never known a man who came nearer to having the courage of his convictions than my friend, DICK RICHARDS.

His tenure of office here, as I said, has been coexistent with mine. His family and my family have been closely associated. He visits me down in my gulf coast home, and I have enjoyed this splendid association. I think he deserves after these years of contribution to his country to return to his home in South Carolina and enjoy the rest and recreation to which he is so eminently entitled.

A great statesman, a great soldier, a God-fearing man. I am sure I speak the sentiments of all who have had the privilege of serving here with him when I say: "We wish you Godspeed in retirement."

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee, Mr. RIVERS, for his most eloquent references and comments concerning our illustrious friend, DICK RICHARDS.

I am proud to call DICK RICHARDS my friend, because he is not only an outstanding Member of this body, but also one of the truly great men I have known in public and private life.

His contributions to our Nation and to the world as chairman of our House Foreign Affairs Committee are immeasurable and monumental. His great ability, unselfish service, great Americanism, and peerless statesmanship, and his fine Christian idealism and gentlemanly qualities all mark him with the stamp of true greatness.

We will miss this great man in this House and I hope that the Government will find some way to profit by his tremendous store of knowledge of foreign affairs, great ability, his ripe experience, mature judgment, and noble ideals.

I congratulate DICK RICHARDS upon his outstanding service to the Nation and this House and hope that he and his family will enjoy much success, happiness, and peace in the years to come.

The House and the Nation can ill afford to lose the services and talents of this great American. "Ad multos annos."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friends on taking this time. My only regret is that it comes at a time of day when many who would wish to pay tribute to our friend are not able to be here.

Mr. RIVERS. The hour is late and time is running out.

Mr. VORY. I could not, however, let this opportunity pass without unburdening my heart. I can say some things here behind his back that I might not be able to say if he were sitting here, because he is a very, very dear friend of mine, and my heart is heavy at the thought that he is leaving our ranks.

But he is going back to the country where he had told me in the old days they had a nine-man baseball team out of the Richards family and most of them played barehanded. I am happy indeed to see him retire to the soil that he loves.

We were rooming together back in 1945 when we were on a mission requested by then General Eisenhower to inspect the German concentration camps. We took a day off and he and I went on a two-man pilgrimage to the spot where he told me the 30th Division broke the Hindenburg line. He was justly proud of his heroic work in World War I. He can have just pride in his heroic service here in these halls.

Through the 18 years I have been here I have known him as an independent, patriotic, straight-thinking statesman. We have sometimes fought back to back against others on both sides of the aisle, and sometimes side by side, and a few times I have fought with him toe to toe in parliamentary battles. He was always a faithful friend and a fearful foe.

The prestige and the respect in which he has been held has been demonstrated not by words but by the support he has received in his difficult task as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which brings controversial legislation to this floor for consideration. He has written historic legislation. He deserves a rest. But I confess it is my hope the people of his State may not permit him to rest and if they do call him to other service it would be a great thing for his State and for the country.

I want to pay my tribute to his fine family and to his lovely wife.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying a deserved tribute to my friend, DICK RICHARDS. During the 18 years I have served in this body I have known many fine Members, but I have never known a better man than DICK RICHARDS. He possesses those sterling qualities of mind and heart which endear him to those who know him.

I wish him Godspeed.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep regret that I have noted the contemplated retirement from Congress of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. Throughout my own period of service in this great body he has been an outstanding leader; recognized for his sound contributions and for his careful thinking.

My able predecessor, the Honorable Millard Caldwell, who was subsequently the Governor of my State, talked frequently with me about the gentleman from South Carolina. They had served together throughout Mr. Caldwell's service here and were then and are now fast friends. I recall very well the high

praise he accorded Mr. RICHARDS during that time. His predictions of increasing stature and responsibility for Mr. RICHARDS have been well borne out.

Our beloved colleague enjoys the respect and confidence of the House as do few who have served here. This respect and confidence have indeed been well earned. By his service he has built a monument which will long endure.

The Congress will miss his fine personality, his sterling friendship, and his great ability, and his constant courage.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be remiss, even at this late hour, if I did not say a few words with respect to DICK RICHARDS.

I came here not so many years ago as many of the Members who have spoken. Since the time of my arrival and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, I have always looked to DICK RICHARDS for counsel and for guidance. I have always found understanding and sympathy.

We in the House on occasion engage in partisan debate across the center of the aisle. But I think it is one of the hallmarks of the character of DICK RICHARDS that where the welfare of his country is concerned there is no middle aisle in his manner of thinking.

As chairman of the committee he has been thoughtful, gracious, and generous, and always eminently fair. I know that all of us in the House feel a personal sense of loss in the leaving of this body by DICK RICHARDS, but I think the true loss is more far-reaching than that which attaches to his personal stature. Men of his mind, his integrity, his character are sorely needed today, not only in his own State and Nation but throughout the world generally.

I join in wishing Dick and his family Godspeed and all the best of all good things.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to these moving tributes to my beloved friend and chairman, DICK RICHARDS, there has gone through my mind something I heard Dr. William J. Mayo say long ago. Most people think that the No. 1 requirement of a good surgeon is skill with his hands. But Dr. Will said they had learned through the years at the Mayo Clinic, where more than one-fourth of all America's medical school graduates apply for postgraduate work, that the first quality of a good surgeon is character. The second is industry. The third is a reasonable amount of native ability, and fourth, manual dexterity. I am sure we would agree that the first quality a man must have to be a good statesman is, also, character. That surely is the word that one first thinks of in connection with DICK RICHARDS. The thing that accounts for his remarkable hold upon the Congress, as a body, and upon the affections of all its Members of whatever party or section of the country, is the character of the man.

We on his committee know his ability, his extraordinarily penetrating mind, his capacity to listen to all the arguments of witnesses and then ask an incisive question or two that bring out the crux of the matter.

We know his unvarying fairness; we know his unfailing good humor, and his ability to take a tense and strained situation and relax it by some homely illustration or bit of wisdom from his beloved South Carolina.

We know his loyalty to his party and his friends, transcended only by his loyalty to his country and his God. Some of us were associated with him on issues where he stood against the leadership of his own party, as well as when we stood together and spoke against the official position of my party. His name is attached to amendments and pieces of legislation that made history, believe me, in the development of the foreign policy of the United States.

If I may add a personal word, since the years before 1950 when I was warning on every occasion that if we continued to drift and allowed the Communists to get control of China it would be disastrous to ourselves, he started calling me Cato. I was honored thereby. And he told me one day in more recent years, that while he had called me that jocularly, he agreed that we would either have to find ways to prevent further Communist expansion in Asia or else eventually we would be fighting it ourselves.

All this is so meager and inadequate a tribute to this extraordinarily fine, sterling, rocklike, but kindly character, a man who certainly exemplifies our country at its best, and I daresay exemplifies that part of our country from which he came and to which he now returns and which we lovingly call the South, at its most gracious and chivalrous best.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is really a great privilege to talk about my wonderful friend whom I have worked with and served with for over 22 years. DICK RICHARDS, in my judgment, is one of the finest men I have ever known, and I do know all of you 435 great men and women in this House of Representatives. I do not think we have ever had or ever will have a man better than DICK, because he always gave his best. He is not only a great man as concerns his district and his States, but I am sure this whole world. I remember when we declared war on Germany. We came in from Alaska. DICK RICHARDS was speaking. SAM RAYBURN had just spoken and JOE MARTIN was to speak. But DICK RICHARDS made at that time one of the greatest speeches I have ever heard, and if any of you did not hear that speech, you should look it up, because it was a masterpiece. I want to tell you, he can do more things well than any one man I have ever known. He does not get excited. I will tell you of an incident when Congressman MENDELL RIVERS and DICK RICHARDS and 1 or 2 others visited me down at our hunting lodge at McIntosh, on the Tombigbee River. We had a pretty big crowd. And Dick said, "Let us wait until they get theirs." RIVERS won't shoot a turkey or a deer or any of those things. And, Dick went out. I did not know he could shoot. And, when he came back, he had a deer, a big turkey gobbler, and a wild boar in less than 2 hours. Well, Mendell did not kill anything and neither did I, and it is just that way everywhere. I am sure the good Lord has His hands on DICK RICHARD'S shoulders, and if God be with you, who can be against you. I know that God is with him, and the people, too. I think that Mr. Eisenhower ought to do the identical thing he did to another great man, Mr. GEORGE. I wish he would just wrap Dick up and let him help the Congress and the President of the United States and thereby help this world.

You could look over the entire country and not find a man who is as good as DICK RICHARDS. I wish I did know the words to say in praise of this great man, but I do not believe old man Noah Webster put them in the dictionary. But, I do want to say that he always has his feet on the ground. We get excited sometimes and go back in that room when some of you men make a talk, and Dick would say, "Be quiet; don't say it that way. Say it this way."

I think we will see DICK RICHARDS again. This Nation cannot do without his services. In the first place, I do not believe he will be satisfied away down in that Carolina moon country. I want Dick to know that we have an Alabama moon, just a little bit further on and we will be thinking and pulling and praying that he will get just what he wants. He cannot get away from us, because I know all of us are going to be with him just as long as he is on this earth, and not only in this world, but in the world to come.

God bless DICK RICHARDS and all of his good family and his wonderful friends down in South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman's family came from DICK RICHARDS' area in South Carolina.

Mr. BOYKIN. My family is supposed to have built the first house in Camden, S. C. We left there and went down to Alabama and we named the town Camden, Ala.

I will tell you what happened one day. Mendell came down to my hotel on Sunday and he said, "Frank, DICK RICHARDS is in trouble." I said, "What kind of trouble do you mean? Do we have to take guns, or what?" And he said, "No, he needs a little help; he has some opposition down there."

I called my kinsman, Stuart Boykin, and I said, "Stu, Dick is in trouble." He said, "DICK RICHARDS in trouble? DICK RICHARDS is not in any trouble. Anyhow, what do you want me to do?" I said, "I want you to put a car in every county and get every one of those Boykins and every friend you have and get them busy."

Well, Dick won 3 to 1, but he did not need anybody's help, because he can stand on his own feet and look out for himself.

Yes, we did come from up in that country. We left Virginia and went down to Camden, S. C., and then down to Camden, Ala.

Now we are pulling and praying for that great man, DICK RICHARDS, and his wonderful wife, his darling daughter and his wonderful sons.

God bless DICK RICHARDS again.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for those wonderful remarks.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my happy privilege to have served with DICK RICHARDS since I first arrived here in 1947. I am very happy to concur in all of the remarks that have been made concerning him, and all the nice things that have been said about him, because they are so true.

There is not any doubt that his patriotism, his loyalty, his keen intellect, his gentlemanly demeanor will all be missed here, just as we shall miss his keen sense of humor, his great ability of being able to disagree so agreeably. He has certainly earned not only the fine title of statesman, but the finer title of friend. He has been the friend of every Member of this House.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from New York and I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I think Mr. RICHARDS himself would be surprised if he knew how great a hole would be made in the House by his leaving.

I have been privileged to serve under his leadership as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I being a very junior member when I first came under his guidance. It is difficult to realize how that committee can progress with the equanimity that we have shown, with the wisdom that we have tried to grasp at, without the leadership, the magnanimity and the keen insight of Mr. RICHARDS.

I wonder if the gentleman from South Carolina, whom I am addressing, would permit me to say to him, who has spoken so nobly of our friend, that it seems to me that those of us who come from a section of the country which has not known all the glorious chivalry of the South, have learned much from both of you. And as long as we remain in the Congress, the world will be a little bit richer because we have learned something of your heritage, of your patience and, let me repeat and note again, of your chivalry.

We have learned from DICK RICHARDS what it is to be a leader who never has to use more than kindly patience to take his flock where he knows they should go.

I think the United States today has lost an eminent leader. I should feel sorry indeed if I could bring myself to believe, as I cannot, that he will not serve again in some way, because I cannot imagine that Mr. RICHARDS will not continue to serve his State, his country, and his God.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON].

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as one who, like DICK RICHARDS, comes from the Deep South, I know and those of us who were raised and reared there know what we mean when we speak of a southern gentleman. We have no reference to attainments which are measured by material success, wealth, and such things. We refer to the quality of a person. To me DICK RICHARDS exemplified here and anywhere he was the highest of the qualities we mean when we say that he is truly a southern gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in speaking out publicly in just and deserved tribute to DICK RICHARDS.

On an occasion like this, it is hard to steer a course between emotionalism, which would embarrass our friend, and matter-of-factness, which would not do justice to our feelings. If I err on either side, it is the fault of my words and not of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, there are many on this floor who have enjoyed and profited from the friendship and counsel of DICK RICHARDS longer than I have had that privilege, but none can value their association with him more highly than I do. He was courteous and kind to me when I first came here as a freshman; through the years since, I am happy and proud to think that our friendship has grown closer. He has many times been generous with his time and his advice when it meant a great deal to me. He has stood as an example to all of us in his integrity and faith to his ideals, as well as an inspiration to us in his dedication to his work, his brilliance of mind, and that quality which draws men to him as lifelong friends.

The country has great need of men like DICK RICHARDS. His leaving Congress is a great loss to our National Government. I cannot believe that his people will leave him entirely in the retirement which he seeks; but this I know—wherever he is, whether in public or private life, DICK RICHARDS will be serving in some capacity, because that is the nature of the man.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is one of the finest men I have known in or out of Congress.

DICK RICHARDS possesses the qualifications for public office which I think are absolutely essential and for which there is no substitute. He is honest, he is able and he is courageous.

Leaving Congress with the respect of his colleagues as he does, I wish him the best of everything

My hope is that the years ahead will be happy for DICK RICHARDS and his loved ones.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member who leaves this body who is doing so with a greater respect and, in fact, affection in the hearts and minds of his colleagues than our distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. Mr. RICHARDS is one of the grandest men I have ever met. Honorable and trustworthy in every way, a man of integrity, a man possessed of great nobility of character, he is one who inspires others to greatness and to goodness. He has served in this body for a number of years. He leaves this House voluntarily. He served as chairman of the very important Committee on Foreign Affairs during one of the most trying periods in our Nation's history. He served as chairman of that committee with outstanding distinction and in a manner which leaves upon the pages of our history a record of service to our country that is second to none. DICK RICHARDS is not only a good man, he is a great man. He is also a great American. I extend to him my very best wishes and to his loved ones also I wish every happiness and success for countless years to come.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to join with our distinguished colleagues from South Carolina in conducting this well-deserved tribute to a great American. It has been my good fortune to have had the benefit of the advice and the inspiration of service with Representative RICHARDS for 20 years in the difficult days preceding World War II, during that war and after it.

It is typical of the conscientious and wise chairman of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House that he worked at full speed and effectiveness throughout this session, although he already had determined it would be his last in Congress. It was not in his nature to relax merely because he had decided not to stand for reelection.

With acute consciousness of the delicacy of balance between peace and war in the troubled world of today, Mr. RICHARDS has continued to study with intensity, to formulate his views with great care and, then, to expound them with vigor, sincerity, and courage.

We cannot tell our friend that he must not return to his beloved South Carolina and the opportunity to mix a bit of leisure with his work. Knowing in our hearts, though, that his keen mind will never retire, we can wish that there were some magical inducement, or mechanism, in our political scheme which would make it more difficult for a public servant such as he to remove his invaluable and effective counsel from a position of influence in the arena of government.

In whatever occupies our colleague's attention in the years ahead, let us hope there will be time and inclination to send forth to those who could profit from it the benefit of his long experience in perceptive appraisal of international developments.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who served in World War I.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in brief but very sincere tribute to the life, character and public service of my warm personal friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. It was my privilege to serve with him throughout the period of World War I in the 30th Division. I can give testimony of his great valor as a soldier. A better soldier never wore our country's uniform. As a fellow chairman in the House of Representatives, I am happy to pay tribute to him and to the great record of service that he has rendered—a man who possesses the highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood. He has made an outstanding record in public service. I join with my other colleagues in the House in wishing for him many years of happiness and prosperity in the future.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs under the able leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina. During that period of time I have learned to admire and respect DICK RICHARDS and to value his friendship and wise counsel.

We all realize that the chairmanship of any committee of the House of Representatives carries with it great responsibilities. In these critical times, and when this country has found it necessary to assume a position of world leadership, that is especially true of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Chairman RICHARDS has discharged those responsibilities in a courageous and statesmanlike manner, always placing the safety and welfare of his country first.

As a result of DICK RICHARDS' decision to retire at the end of his present term this body is losing one of its most able and most beloved Members. I join with his many friends and admirers in wishing for him and his lovely wife many future years of happiness and good health.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that I would like to say many things about my chairman, my very good friend, some of which he would not want me to say, so I will just put in a little laugh at this point and thank him for the humor that he puts into our tense moments in the committee. He has such an apt way of just tossing a little word into the discussion and all the tension is gone.

I go back beyond DICK RICHARDS' service here because I was here in 1928 as a wife and I watched a little from the gallery. I found a certain man always in the right place, always doing the right thing. I remember one day when I heard him make one of the finest speeches I have ever listened to. It was in the early part of the war. Then as we worked together on the Foreign Affairs Committee I used to laugh at him a little because he did not bother himself to work some of the time. He said: "Let the other people do some of it." So I began to laugh at him about that. Then after a number of years there was a morning when Judge Kee got up from his chair, put his hand on DICK RICHARDS' shoulder and went out into the other room. From that moment Mr. RICHARDS was chairman. We loved Judge Kee. We had loved Charlie Eaton. Many of us had been deeply fond of Sol Bloom, and we fought with him. He was a good fighter.

During the time that Mr. RICHARDS has been our chairman we have had many conditions, we have had many changes of viewpoint over certain problems. I have never known him to be unfair. I have never known him to be unjust. I have never known him to fail to give each of us an opportunity to express what we wanted to say.

Then came the moment when the President appointed the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and myself delegates to the United Nations. From the moment he was chairman I do not suppose any chairman ever worked harder, and certainly in New York in those very difficult 3 months—an assignment to which he went most reluctantly—no one could have done more for the United States than JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS. It was my great privilege to serve with him.

It was a privilege to see people suddenly realize that they were with a man who was a great person, and this was true of people from all over the world. There was a radiance about him; he seemed so withdrawing but always was ready to do his part.

With his leaving the Congress we lose something that is rare. We lose a person with such integrity, with such honor, with such loyalty; we lose a man who has friends everywhere, who could argue, discuss, and fight us in committee, but always leaving the room with us as his friends.

We shall all miss him. It is easy to understand why he would like to go back at this point in his life, because he still has much work to do. I am quite sure if any of us want his advice, his counsel, he will be more than ready to give it to us.

I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina for giving all of us this opportunity, particularly myself, to speak a little bit from our hearts about this great man who has been in our midst for many years and who we shall so miss.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, our great majority leader has often said that when you leave the Congress you will find you will have nothing really worth while to remember except the friends that you made. As I have sat here and listened to the heartfelt testimony of all the people who have known him and who have worked with him so long, my thought is: What a very wealthy man is DICK RICHARDS.

I hope you will not think it presumptuous of me, a freshman and the first woman from the Deep South to become a Member of the Congress for a long time, to say these few words. But I could not retire and lose the opportunity of saying how glad I am that I got here in time to know DICK RICHARDS.

God willing, and if I shall continue service in this body, I think I shall be always worth a great deal more to my fellow man because I have known DICK RICHARDS.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we members of the South Carolina delegation would like to thank the Speaker of the House for his patience and indulgence in giving the Members of the House an opportunity to show our colleague, Congressman RICHARDS, who is retiring from Congress this year, how much we appreciate the wonderful service he has rendered the people of South Carolina, the people of the United States, and the people of the world during his 24 years of service in the National House of Representatives.

I feel that there is nothing more important in this world than to let a person who is retiring from public life know that his services as a public servant have been appreciated by his constituents and the people throughout the world. I believe that I speak for the majority of the people in my home State of South Carolina, when I say that we deeply regretted last spring to read the announcement of my lifelong personal friend, Congressman RICHARDS' decision not to be a candidate to serve in the National House of Representatives again.

Congressman RICHARDS has been a source of inspiration to me personally ever since I have been a Member of this distinguished body. I have looked to Congressman RICHARDS for guidance and assistance ever since the day I was sworn in as a Member of Congress. He has always responded graciously, kindly, and sympathetically when I have called on him for assistance in solving some of the problems confronting my constituents. I admire Congressman RICHARDS as a person. His character is strong as steel and his heart as pure as gold. I don't believe there has ever been a man who has served in the National House of Representives who has more graciously given his energy and time to his constituents, to the people of his State, to the people of the United States, and to the people of the entire world. Congressman RICHARDS is nationally and internationally known and highly respected by every person privileged with his acquaintance.

The people of South Carolina, the people of the Nation and the entire world will miss the valuable services of Congressman RICHARDS when he retires from Congress. Congressman RICHARDS has served my State with distinction and future history, I am certain, will place him among the highest honored citizens in the United States for public service. I sincerely regret Congressman RICHARDS is retiring as a Member of this distinguished body as he is a compara-

tively young man, considering the age of some of our public servants. He has the experience and the seniority to continue as one of our greatest national leaders.

I hope that he will not completely retire from public service as we greatly need men of his type at the head of our Government during these critical readjustment years. We certainly need leaders of his type both in the Congress and at the head of our Government departments if we are to withstand the great pressure groups who are trying to break down the backbone of our Government at this time.

Congressman RICHARDS has served with distinction as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We all know this committee is and has been during the past 15 years one of the most important committees on Capitol Hill as we have found it necessary to legislate, not only for the United States, but for practically every country in the world. We are all aware of the pressure that has been placed on Congressman RICHARDS on different occasions in an effort to sway him away from the American way of thinking. We are all happy that he has never deviated one moment from the provisions of our Constitution and his training as a Christian gentleman. Congressman RICHARDS has made a record for us all to set our sights on in future years.

The Congress of the United States will suffer a great loss when Congressman RICHARDS bids the halls of Congress goodby. I will have lost one of the best friends I have ever had both from a personal standpoint and as a source of good advice on all legislative matters. I do not know that Congressman RICHARDS will ever be interested in holding a public office again; however, I do think that the President of the United States, after the next election, whether he is a Democrat or a Republican, should check the qualifications of this great statesman and offer him the position of Secretary of State or one of the highest ambassadorships available.

Again, I want to reiterate my great admiration for this fine gentleman who is about to bid farewell as a Member of the House of Representatives. I feel more like a brother to Congressman RICHARDS than a friend since he has always been a good friend of my family's, having roomed with my older brother in college and also played on the same football team with him at the University of South Carolina.

My very best wishes go out to Congressman RICHARDS and his lovely family in any future endeavor or profession he may decide to embark upon.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have great affection for so many of my colleagues from the Southland. I feel personally drawn to so many of them. One of the reasons may be the fact that my mother spent her girlhood days in Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. Speaker, I think DICK RICHARDS is a standout in the House of Representatives. I recall when I entered the House in the 77th Congress with the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina now in charge of the time and I listened to a most inspiring and most dramatic address made by our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I went home that night and I felt his remarks so keenly that I wrote him a letter telling him, among other things, that he was going to be an exemplar of mine in my approach to my assignment in the House of Representatives. I have been glad to follow him on so many occasions. It pleases me so much here today to hear Members on both sides of the aisle speak out from their hearts about their kind feelings toward him personally and regarding the record he has established in our body. I, too, feel that there is a place for him in State and national councils in the days to come, and I, too, subscribe to the thought that perhaps our great President may have something in mind for him even as he did for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time yielded me by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. I would like to say that in the past history of South Carolina there have been many men who have influenced world affairs, particularly in the field of international and foreign relations: Charles Pinckney, John C. Calhoun, James F. Byrnes, to name only a few. I do believe that our distinguished friend, DICK RICHARDS, ranks in that category in service to this country and to the entire free world.

I should like to mention one thing that perhaps most of the Members do not know, and that is that DICK RICHARDS' father is still living, 89 years old, is active, operates a country store and works every day. He served in the legislature many, many years ago. I know that DICK RICHARDS received much of his inspiration to enter the field of public service from his father, and I am sure one of the reasons he is retiring is that he wants to go back and be with his father and the rest of his family. For that I do not blame him.

DICK RICHARDS' uncle, John G. Richards, was Governor of South Carolina; served for 4 years with honor and distinction in the highest executive office in the State, during the 1920's.

DICK RICHARDS himself served for several terms as probate judge of his county. He was 24 years in this Congress, the last few years as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He served as a delegate to the United Nations. I think that is one of the greatest honors ever accorded any Member of this House, and it was done by the President of the United States, the leader of the other political party, showing his high esteem and high regard for the character and ability of our distinguished friend.

Not long ago the Government of Spain conferred upon DICK RICHARDS the Grand Cross of Isabel, a very high honor, Spain recognizing in the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] one of the great leaders of the free world today.

I will say this, that one of the greatest things about DICK RICHARDS, in my observation of his fine work here, has been his willingness to talk to and to see anyone, I do not care in what station in life he might be. Even while he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, burdened with the affairs of the whole country and the free world in the field of foreign relations, he saw everyone who came here from South Carolina who wanted to see him. He was always willing to see and talk with the rest of us of the delegation. I think that is the mark of a great man, to be willing to keep open the door of his office at all times to those who might want to drop in.

I wish DICK RICHARDS and his family well, and I hope that as many of you who come through South Carolina and can do so will drop by and see the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] at his home at Lancaster, S. C.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank my colleague. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join so many of our colleagues in the fine things that have been said about our good friend and esteemed colleague, DICK RICHARDS. I suppose if there was ever an instance when the roses are showered on the living, it is appropriate this afternoon.

The many fine tributes that have been paid to DICK RICHARDS is an illustration of the fine character of the man and the public service that he has rendered to his own district in South Carolina, to his State, and to the Nation.

I wish Dick were here and could hear all of the fine things that have been said about him. I know he would be deeply moved.

I have observed Dick, as many of you have, in many ways. I am his neighbor. For 14 years it has been my privilege to occupy a suite of offices in the House Office Building next to the offices of our colleague, DICK RICHARDS. Therefore, we have had occasion for a very warm association. Both being from the South, we have had some very interesting what are referred to as over-the-backyard-fence visits and conversations.

We have watched DICK RICHARDS as he has performed his public service here in the House of Representatives. We have seen him go down in the well of the House and fight for his country. We have observed him in the splendid leadership he has given to some of the toughest problems considered by the House of Representatives. We have sat with him and visited with him in the cloakroom.

As have a number of our colleagues who visit the gymnasium frequently, whenever we have the opportunity, I have been with him there and observed the sportsmanlike qualities he possesses. He is a tough competitor. I think perhaps he has been one of the most interesting competitors on the court that we call the paddle-ball court down in the gymnasium. Therefore, I have had occasion and opportunity to observe the man that he is from almost every side of life here in his service as a Member of Congress.

I think it is a very fine thing that since he has decided to leave the Congrees voluntarily he was destined to reach the climax of his public service as he bows out. He has demonstrated that leadership as chairman of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs. We can ill afford to lose the type of man DICK RICHARDS is, because to me he is an all-American.

We have heard recently in the past suggestions that former Presidents of the United States be made Members of the Senate of the United States and given a life membership in that great body. I think it would be well to suggest that DICK RICHARDS be made a Member of the House of Representatives at large, representing all of the United States of America.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gracious gentleman from South Carolina, who has helped me in many ways. I appreciate very much the opportunity to say a word or two in tribute and appreciation of DICK RICHARDS. Before he left I spoke one day on the floor of the Congress about him.

One of the reasons I felt so intensely sorry to leave the Committee on Foreign Affairs when I became chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was that I would not see and work with DICK RICHARDS on that committee any more. I enjoyed working with him for many reasons. He was always a great fighter, a great American, always fine, never bitter, never cruel, and it is so easy for us to become cruel and bitter in our struggle here in the Congress.

I would have enjoyed serving under DICK RICHARDS as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I would have valued his advice if I had stayed and taken the chairmanship of the committee. We lived through terrible war years when I served with him. He was always ready to be helpful. He was always the same whether he was talking with kings and queens or the presidents of other countries or to other high foreign dignitaries or whether he was talking to the so-called man on the street or the people who came from his district and from your district and mine before the committee—he was always the same. He is a fine, true gentleman. He was never awed by anybody. He thought that the little man was just as important as a king or queen or President of the United States. I would like, if you will, Mr. RIVERS, to take back to your lovely wife my great felicitations and my regret that she, too, is going. She was a real help and a very, very lovely woman. They had a very happy relationship with each other and with their family. I wish I could tell you all that is in my heart and in my mind about this great man. May he be extremely happy and not give up entirely his fine patriotic work for our country.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I came into the Chamber I did not realize this was the time when tribute was going to be paid to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I want to add my feeble word at this time to say that my service in this body has been enriched in the 14 years that I have served here by serving with DICK RICHARDS. For 2 years of that time I served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs under his leadership. During those 2 years I came to know DICK RICHARDS well and to admire the qualities of leadership and the fairness and good nature and patience that he exhibited as a chairman. I think I learned at that time how a chairman of a committee should conduct himself. I speak as one whose forefathers settled in the neighboring State of North Carolina before the Revolution and then moved to Kentucky where I was born. Now, I represent a district out in California. I am told that my family name is well known throughout the State of South Carolina and DICK RICHARDS has spoken to me at times of people bearing my family name in South Carolina. It makes me proud to look back over the years and realize that I come from the neighboring State where there was produced a man of great and sterling statesmanship like DICK RICHARDS. I pay tribute to him very sincerely.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues for their kind indulgence on this occasion. I thank you, too, for all the wonderful tributes you have made to this great American. Dick wanted to be here this afternoon but he was compelled to leave and go home. I know he is grateful. We are grateful.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this great American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

H. R. 8902

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, apparently, it was considered impossible or unwise to call up the rule on this bill this evening, as we understood was planned.

However, as I listened to the announcement of the program for tomorrow, including the suspensions, I understood that this bill would be the first order of legislative business and would be considered even ahead of any of the suspensions.

It was not my intention tonight and it will not be my intention tomorrow morning to take any more of the time of my colleagues than I believe absolutely essential in order to place the basic facts in the RECORD and before those who may be present.

While I am convinced that the proposal is unwise and that we will regret it, if it passes the House, I have undertaken to outline, at least, the fundamental reasons for my opposition in the minority report I filed July 9 as part II of report No. 2530 accompanying this bill. Copies of that minority report were available at the desk this afternoon, and I assume they will be here tomorrow. In addition to that, I have taken four special orders so as to present for the consideration of those who might be interested additional data I felt could be helpful.

The following are the citations in the RECORD covering those special orders:

First. July 18, beginning at page 13418.

Second. July 19, beginning at page 13584.

Third. July 23, beginning at page 14140.

Fourth. July 24, beginning at page 14305.

The testimony before the subcommittee is in the last part of the hearings on Civil Air Policy, beginning at page 541 on April 18, 1956, and covering some 64 pages of 628 pages of hearings.

In view of the interest which has been expressed to me by a number of my colleagues, I shall exercise the privilege, unless someone else does, of making the constitutional point of no quorum before we reach the stage of actual debate upon the bill and possibly also when the bill is to be read for amendment.

As I stated in my special order of Tuesday, July 24, I intend to offer the amendment recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, which I have had printed in the RECORD of that date at the top of the third column on page 14305.

It has been suggested to me that a possible point of order might be raised to the proposed amendment. I hope that will not be done because I feel strongly that the Members of the House should have a full opportunity of expressing their individual judgments as to the inclusion of this amendment in the bill, particularly since it is a constructive suggestion made by the Bureau of the Budget, in recognition of the fact that a problem does exist and since it has received the specific endorsement of the Comptroller General of the United States in his letter to me of July 17, which I placed in the RECORD July 18 at page 13419, and has received also the specific and reasoned endorsement of Vice Chairman Joseph P. Adams of the Civil Aeronautics Board in his letter to me of July 16, which I placed in the RECORD of July 18 at page 13421—and I call particular attention to the single paragraph at page 13421 entitled "Budget Bureau amendment".

It seems to me it would be most unfortunate if the Members of the House as a whole were to be deprived of the opportunity to express their considered opinions as to the wisdom of this recommendation. I think this is particularly true since we all recognize that in the vast majority of instances legislative committees do consider such amendments on their merits without regard to any technical application of the doctrine of strict germaneness.

However, if the point of order is made, I shall be prepared to present briefly my reasons for believing that the point of

order should be overruled and I hope that it will be overruled.

If the amendment is not approved by those who may be present to express themselves when the vote is taken in the Committee of the Whole, it is my intention to incorporate it in a motion to recommit and seek recognition to offer that motion because I firmly believe that the decision should be made by the full membership of the House, quite irrespective of what the result of that decision may be. It seems to me particularly important that this opportunity should be available to all Members of the House in view of the strong opposition of all the Government departments, in terms of the reasons they have expressed for their opposition and in view of the current proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board, which was begun on April 7, and which on July 3 reached the stage of a report of a prehearing conference. In it 33 airlines, now receiving subsidies—the only ones who would benefit by the passage of this bill—are parties.

I have already cited the excellent brief paragraph in the statement of Vice Chairman Adams of the Civil Aeronautics Board before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on April 20, 13 days after the CAB proceeding started. I want to restate now that single sentence since it expresses so succinctly and reasonably the fundamental reason why I believe the House should defer further consideration of this proposal at this very late hour in this session in order to have before it next year the considered decision and recommendations of the Board, grounded upon a thorough and complete economic report rather than a brief hearing on one day, mainly of the proponents of this bill.

Vice Chairman Adams said:

> I consider this kind of proceeding the best approach to the problem because it looks toward a policy consistent with the scheme of the Civil Aeronautics Act, fully supported by a complete economic record, and geared as closely as possible to the individual needs of the carrier.

I submit it would be sheer folly for us to ignore that advice, quite irrespective of the pressure exerted even this afternoon, apparently at the behest of Pan American, the most vigorous, persistent, and demanding of those who urge us to support this proposal. I can only express regret that it has been stupid enough to advocate this selfish windfall for it on the basis of some alleged beneficial results in our relations with our neighboring friends to the south.

I now definitely challenge the Pan Am lobbyists, who I assume will be outside this Chamber at 10 o'clock tomorrow, as they have been this afternoon, to submit one scintilla of credible evidence that passage of this bill will benefit anyone but Pan Am and its select companions in unwarranted windfalls, in depreciation on top of depreciation, in double subsidies. If Pan Am can do so, I will admit it and withdraw my minority report on this floor tomorrow. If it cannot or will not officially do this, I submit we have every right and duty to reject this bill in the interest of the taxpayers whose taxes Pan Am and its chosen few airlines want to raid.

UNWARRANTED CONTINUATION OF THE STATE OF EMERGENCY

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the termination of the national emergency declared to exist on December 16, 1950, as the result of the Korean war. It seems to me that this resolution should be adopted by this Congress before it adjourns to assure that the use of a declared condition of emergency is restricted to conditions which demand these extraordinary powers.

Throughout the 1,280 days of this administration every single day has been a day of national emergency. The administration has claimed on numerous occasions that it is responsible for peace in the Korean conflict and that it has restored the economy of the country to peaceful conditions. How then, can this same administration justify the continued use of emergency powers under the Korean declaration of emergency? Does this administration need emergency powers to carry on the ordinary responsibilities of Government? Is there a new condition existing in external or internal affairs which threatens the national emergency? Is it not an obligation of this administration to advise the people of this country as to the circumstances which justify the continued use of these extraordinary powers?

Is this Nation helping the cause of peace throughout the world by remaining in a state of emergency—a state in which we find no other member of the NATO group or any other member of the nations considered as friendly to America?

If world conditions do not justify a continuation of the state of emergency under which we now operate and if our national economy is as strong as they tell us it is, why should the condition of national emergency continue? The people of this country will refuse to believe another declaration of emergency if a crisis in world conditions should momentarily develop. They will assume "emergency" as a permanent condition in American Government.

The powers of the Executive with a declared state of national emergency permeate the entire statutory structure of the Government. Many important requirements of the law are suspended. The discretionary power of the Executive is broadened. Throughout the whole structure of our Government many important constitutional safeguards are suspended. The power to declare a national emergency is a privilege which should be exercised by the Executive with extreme restraint. He should continue these powers for the shortest possible period of time; he must carefully operate within the limitations of these powers, and he must surrender these extraordinary powers as soon as the conditions which necessitated them has passed.

If the present administration has not been able to lift the declared state of emergency during the past 1,280 days, it is extremely doubtful that it will be done before the administration goes out of office. Therefore, it is incumbent upon Congress to take immediate steps to do so by passage of this resolution.

ADMINISTRATION'S HANDLING OF SECURITY RISKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the present administration's inability to bring about a proper clarification of "security risks" in the Federal Government and its confusion in distinguishing between a disloyal and an unfit employee should definitely be clarified.

The administration's attempt to dismiss employees because of disloyalty, unfitness, or for political reasons as a security risk, is extremely disheartening to the American people, those dedicated to their Government and those who seek a strong and effective Civil Service.

I believe the attached statement of Mr. Michael E. Markwood, president, National Federation of Federal Employees, is very pertinent to this subject:

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL E. MARKWOOD, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, CONCERNING H. R. 11841, TO PROTECT THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES BY PREVENTING THE EMPLOYMENT BY THE UNITED STATES OF PERSONS FOUND TO BE DISLOYAL TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Michael E. Markwood, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees.

The National Federation of Federal Emplioyees wishes to endorse H. R. 11841, which is designed to provide certain safeguards necessary to the security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension or dismissal of employees, or rejection of applicants, where reasonable doubts exist as to their loyalty.

Long before the Congress saw fit to provide, by statute, for this basic qualification of Federal employees, such action was strongly urged by the National Federation of Federal Employees. At successive conventions of the National Federation of Federal Employees, resolutions were adopted unanimously calling for appropriate legislative steps to insure that only loyal citizens would be employed by our Government, and to provide effective means of separating from the service persons shown by competent evidence to be disloyal.

At our most recent national convention, held in Dallas, Tex., in September of 1954, the following resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the delegates there present:

"Whereas there has been set up in the Federal Government, by executive order, a loyalty and security program having for its

purpose the protection of the United States and the protection of its employees against unwarranted and unsubstantiated charges; and

"Whereas through lack of proper enforcement or through modification, alteration or repeal, the purposes of the program may cease to be an objective of Federal personnel policies: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the National Federation of Federal Employees direct its National Executive Council to seek enactment into the basic laws governing qualifications of Federal employees, comprehensive loyalty and security standards as a protection to the Federal Government and its loyal employees."

In view of the practical effect of the Supreme Court decision on the legislation previously enacted by the Congress to deal with this problem, legislation such as that now under consideration is urgently required. We feel that H. R. 11841 provides some substantial safeguards for individual rights of the employee and, of great importance, makes a clear distinction between those who are disloyal and those who, because of various personal traits of character or habit, are properly classified as security risks. Those in the latter category, it should be pointed out, can be effectively separated through the regular Civil Service procedures, for which ample authority and machinery exist.

The confusion over the distinction between those who are disloyal and those who are security risks never has been properly clarified. Experience has shown conclusively that in the public mind the stigma which attaches to the person adjudged disloyal is often shared equally by others who have been dismissed as security risks. That is unfair, that innocent families have suffered as a result, is clear from the record.

From this confusion, too, some stemming from a variety of understandable causes and some, unfortunately, apparently deliberate, developed what became known as the Washington "numbers game," which added no stature to its practitioners and served to bring an immensely important and necessary program into a degree of public disrepute.

It is gratifying to note that the third whereas of the proposed legislation reiterates a fact well known to those who have long dealt with Federal employees, namely, that the overwhelming majority of them are and always have been unswervingly loyal to our country.

In reviewing the language of the measure, we believe that paragraph (h) of section 4 should be amended beginning on line 12, as follows:

After the word "rate," strike out all language through the word "suspended" appearing in line 16, and insert therein the wards "he would have received had his service been uninterrupted by suspension or removal," and that in line 19 the words "except the accumulation of leave" be deleted. The word "other" should be inserted on that line before the word "purposes." The revised paragraph (h) would then read as follows:

"(h) Any employee suspended without pay under any provision of this section or of section 5 of this act who is reinstated or restored to duty on the ground that the appropriate authority has made final determination that there is no reasonable doubt of the loyalty to the United States of such employee shall be paid compensation at the rate he would have received had his service been uninterrupted by suspension or removal, reduced by any amounts earned by such employee through other employment during such period, and shall, for all other purposes be deemed to have rendered services in such position during such period."

We feel that this amendment dealing with the compensation of employees reinstated or restored to duty following suspension is reasonable and proper in the circumstances.

Under "Review of Reports of Investigations," section 5, line 24, on page 9, it is suggested that the words "having responsibility for operations in the area where the employee or applicant, who is the subject of such report" be added.

Under paragraph (b) of section 5, the present language indicates that the board shall consider such evidence as may be submitted to it by the appellant in writing or at a hearing before the board. The language does not make it clear as to whether a hearing or the submission of written material is at the discretion of the board or of the employee or applicant. We recommended strongly that this discretion be placed with the employee or applicant and that the language be amended accordingly.

Under paragraph (d) (2) of this same section, on page 13, the language is as follows: "No final adverse decision of the board shall be set aside unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that such decision is arbitrary or capricious, or otherwise not in accordance with law." Although that may not actually be the case, it would appear from this language that it is the intent, to a measurable extent, to predetermine what the actions of a court may be which, of course, would be contrary to our principles of equity and justice. It is suggested, therefore, that this subparagraph be eliminated, leaving to the sole discretion of the courts the action to be taken by them on the basis of the evidence in the individual case. Similarly, we believe that the suspension of any employee should be determined by the employing agency as opposed to suspension by court, far removed from the operations for which an agency head is charged with responsibility.

Under "Rules and Regulations of the Board," section 6, line 15, we recommend elimination of the words "by legal counsel," substituting therefor "by a person or persons of his own choosing." The present language would require representation by those authorized to practice law; whereas, employees in all phases of complaints and adjudication of them can be represented, for example, by a fellow employee, by representatives of the various veterans' organizations, and, in the case of members of the National Federation of Federal Employees, by a member of a local grievance committee or by a representative of our national headquarters staff. Not all of these could qualify under the language "legal counsel" in its strict sense.

The submission of documentary evidence, as set forth in section 7 on page 15, is highly desirable and we subscribe to the principle of granting the board and its subordinate boards the right to subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, as well as books, records, correspondence, or other documents as it may deem necessary to provide appropriate evidence on which to judge an individual.

An aspect of the whole security program which has troubled many of the most eminent leaders in the Nation has been that which affects the individual rights of accused employees such as, for example, the whole question of their right to face their accusers.

We recognize now as we have in the past that Government employment is a privilege and not a right and that the person taking Federal employment at the same time assumes very special responsibilities and indeed, as well, certain restrictions not placed on the general public. We recognize also that paramount above all else is the safety and security of the Government of the United States.

At the same time, every means should be earnestly sought to provide the fullest measure of all of our cherished and traditional American rights which is possible to do without sacrifice of our national security. We believe that the present legislation is a long step in that direction. However, we urge the inclusion of the proposed amendments which we have suggested as further clarifying steps and also that the committee give fullest consideration to the problem of individual rights which arises as a result of anonymity of accusers. Certainly, we do not believe that anything should be done which would inhibit or undermine the effectiveness of the security program; but the seriousness of the latter problem is manifest. If there is any way in which there can be a closer reconciliation of the issue, we urge that it be given the most careful and sympathetic consideration.

In conclusion, I should like to make a general observation. The effectiveness of any legislation is dependent in large measure upon the effectiveness of administration.

We believe that this is especially true of legislation such as this; and we believe further, that no persons in the Federal Government should be more carefully selected on the basis of experience, sound judgment, and judicial temperament than the review board provided under this legislation and the security officers who now are functioning in the various departments and agencies.

We are dealing here with the most critical of problems, concerned as they are on the one hand with the very life of our country and, on the other, dedicated as we all must be, in our American tradition, to respecting and maintaining the rights of the individual. It is imperative, therefore, for those who administer this program to have a full understanding of all of the complex issues involved and the capacity to fulfill their duties with wisdom, with equity, and with courage.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me to appear before the committee in connection with your consideration of this measure and I express the hope, on behalf of the National Federation of Federal Employees, that it will be reported favorably and enacted into law at the present session of the Congress.

STOP DESTRUCTION OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the closing of additional textile mills not only in New England, but in the South, as the result of increased, unfair Japanese competition is an ominous sign.

It is a situation, which the Congress should promptly consider, and I hope it will be able to do so before adjournment, since it is clear that unless some action is taken to protect the American textile industry, its operations will be further impaired and will ultimately be completely destroyed.

I have previously referred to the wide gaps, wide wage differentials and the wide differences in hours, working conditions and standards that exist between the Japanese and American textile industries.

There is another factor, however, that has not been given so much emphasis in the past, and that is the fact that, under our surplus agricultural products disposition procedures, we are now selling baled surplus American cotton out of American warehouses to Japanese textile manufacturers for a price which is about 25 percent less than the price charged to American manufacturers.

Thus, we have another very substantial differential added to the virtually impossible ones previously existing of sweat shop wages and conditions of productions.

The President and his advisors have previously considered the imposition of quotas through recourse to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or in some other effective manner, and also, I believe, they have been also considering possible implementation of the 1948 Geneva Resolution on the imports of woolens.

In the summer of 1955, prior to the adjournment of Congress, I visited the White House, together with other Members of Congress interested in this problem, and we held a long conference with the President and his advisors. The matter was discussed at considerable length and it was indicated that it would be given further and careful consideration.

Sometime in the fall of 1955, the New England Conference of Governors and governors of southern States also requested action on these proposed quotas. Repeated assurance have been given by administration leaders that no industry would be sacrificed by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements and that the importance of taking some action to protect this American industry was fully recognized.

It is clear that the situation regarding American textiles is steadily and seriously deteriorating. In fact, so serious is the situation at present that speediest possible action is required. It must and should be Executive Department action because regular action before the Tariff Commission and political action before the Congress require too much time.

In short, we have had an abundance of interest, some promises of sympathetic consideration but absolutely no relief. To the contrary cheap cotton has been made available to the Japanese, which further and greatly augments the problem. I am again urging the President and the Executive Department to act at once to save our textile industry and hope that some affirmative results will ensue.

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very thoughtful and timely article on Military Law: Return to Drumhead Justice? by William F. Walsh of the Texas bar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. This article ably discusses the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the various controversies that have arisen concerning it. Mr. Walsh particularly protests against recent proposals for amending the code emanating from the legal divisions of the armed services and generally proposing additional discretionary power at the command level to punish service offenders.

As a member of the original committee, which drafted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, I have been watching its operation with special interest. One thing has impressed me very deeply and that is that the United States Court of Military Appeals has, on the whole, done splendid work in laying sound foundations for the legal implementation of the code. Under the leadership of its distinguished Chief Judge Robert E. Quinn, former Governor of Rhode Island, able and distinguished and formal naval legal officer during World War II, and his associates, the court has achieved stature and commanded respect.

At lower levels, there is some question as to the adequacy of the code to cope completely, realistically and justly with legal problems that arise in the service.

It is my view that in the near future the Armed Services Committee should hold additional hearings, designed to appraise and evaluate fully the impact of the code to date, and consider possible revisions that would bring this document closer to all the objectives, which its sponsors originally set forth. Mr. Walsh's able article points out some of the problems, which should be considered and I believe that there are others that could also most appropriately command the attention of Congress:

MILITARY LAW: RETURN TO DRUMHEAD JUSTICE?

(By William F. Walsh)

The Uniform Code of Military Justice, the "Bill of Rights" for America's 3 million servicemen, is under attack by top military lawyers who have asked Congress to remove some of the basic legal safeguards given military personnel by the code.

Rear Adm. Ira H. Nunn, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, has described the new measures as "proposals designed to reduce unnecessary burdens imposed upon the services by the Uniform Code and to increase the powers of officers who exercise command." The "unnecessary burdens" which Admiral Nunn would reduce include the serviceman's rights against self-incrimination, the accused's right to have a full, fair investigation of his case before trial and the right to be tried before an independent judge free from the influences of command.

The code, passed by Congress almost 6 years ago, has been the subject of bitter debate since it became effective May 31, 1951. The act made sweeping changes in military law and established the United States Court of Military Appeals, a civilian "supreme court" for military cases, to which three veterans were appointed as judges.

(Chief Judge Robert E. Quinn, former governor of Rhode Island, was a Navy legal officer during World War II; Judge George W. Latimer, former justice of the supreme court of Utah, was an Army line officer; the late Judge Paul W. Brosman, former Dean of the Tulane University law school, was an Air Force judge advocate.)

In an early opinion, the new court stated that "We believe Congress intended, insofar as reasonably possible, to place military justice on the same plane as civilian justice and to free those accused by the military from certain vices which infested the old system."

It is this philosophy which is under attack today.

Many military commanders have been restive under the code since it was enacted. The first determined public attempt to do away with the basic provisions of the law appeared, however, in the 1954 annual report to Congress from the Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocates General of the Armed Forces.

Last year's report highlighted deepseated differences between the military lawyers, who claim the code will not work in wartime, and the court members, who consider the new proposals unnecessarily hostile to the purposes and intent of the Uniform Code. Both sides suggested that the House and Senate Armed Services Committees hold hearings on the new measures.

The heart of the problem lies in the need for swift and sure punishment to maintain discipline in the fighting forces, balanced against justice for the men concerned. The two viewpoints are not mutually exclusive: "Good justice has never had a bad effect on discipline," in the words of Prof. James Snedeker, brigadier general, United States Marine Corps, retired, former Chief of the Military Law Division in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

No one concerned with the problem thinks that the code, in its present form, provides all the answers. Two years ago the Court of Military Appeals and the Judge Advocates General agreed on 17 amendments which would save time and money and increase the informal disciplinary powers of commanders. The court, in last year's report, again recommended these changes.

SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS, NOT MERE PROCEDURAL CHANGES

The armed services went further, however, and insisted on substantive revisions in the code, rather than mere procedural changes. These new proposals would affect a man accused by the military from the time he becomes a suspect to the time of his last appeal, and would materially reduce his present rights.

Congress is presently holding hearings on legislation which includes many of the desirable amendments to which the court and the Judge Advocates agreed in 1953. (S. 2133 and H. R. 6583, 84th Cong.) The proposals which the Armed Forces sought in 1954 are still important, however, since they show the real desires of those who are administering military justice today.

One of the most important changes asked by the Navy and Air Force deals with the right against self-incrimination. Under the present law, no member of the Military Establishment, regardless or rank or assignment, may question a suspect "without first informing him of the nature of the accusation and advising him that he does not have to make any statement regarding the offense of which he is accused or suspected and that any statement made by him may be used as evidence against him in a trial by court-martial."

The Navy and Air Force want this restriction to apply only to persons who serve with a "military law enforcement or military crime detection agency" or who are otherwise conducting "an official military investigation."

In civilian life there would be nothing unusual in requiring that only policemen advise suspects of their rights. The soldier or sailor, however, is often questioned by a commanding officer who can take more serious action against him than any military policeman if he fails to "cooperate." If a company commander or first sergeant may question a man, induce him to answer by hinting at the penalty for disobedience and then use his statement against him, the privilege against self-incrimination might as well be eliminated completely in the military.

The privilege against self-incrimination is not protection for the guilty alone, but also saves the innocent from revealing facts which would be damaging in a case based on circumstantial evidence. An innocent person accused by the military will find little comfort in the fact that the case against him

is based on statements to his commander rather than to military police.

A second proposed amendment, to curtail the investigation required before a case can be sent to a general court-martial, was conceived by the Army and Navy. The present law provides that "No charge or specification shall be referred to a general court-martial for trial until a thorough and impartial investigation of all the matters set forth therein has been made." At this investigation, the accused has the right to counsel, the right to cross-examine the witnesses against him, and the right to call witnesses of his own.

The amendment proposed is simple: it would delete the words "thorough and impartial" and the sentence quoted above.

The only credible reason for removing these words is that the Army and Navy do not desire to give the accused a full and fair investigation of his case. That this is the actual reason is shown by a Navy suggestion regarding the identity of the officer who must perform the investigation. Under the law as it now stands, the officer who is to prosecute the case at trial cannot conduct the formal pretrial investigation. The Navy would change this so that the prosecutor could direct both the investigation and the trial, becoming both district attorney and grand jury.

The right to a thorough, impartial investigation is of vital importance to a soldier who may be stationed in remote places far from his family or from civilian lawyers and who can seldom afford to do his own investigating on an enlisted man's pay. (Of the 606 cases which the Court of Military Appeals had decided with written opinions by the end of 1954, all but 45 involved enlisted men.)

In addition, preliminary investigations in the service are often conducted by some agency, such as the Air Force Office of Special Investigations. The reports of these agencies are classified and are not normally available to the accused or his counsel; the agents themselves are not encouraged to talk to the defense about pending cases. Other military witnesses often sense that official approval is on the side of the prosecution and are afraid to help the defense.

Once formal charges are preferred, however, the case is sent to an officer who has no connection with the case. He holds hearings and calls as witnesses the persons who will testify at the trial. The accused and his counsel have a chance to discover the testimony facing them and to question the witnesses while their memories are fresh.

The effect of allowing the prosecutor to conduct the formal investigation should be considered with the fact that the prosecutor often recommends that charges be drawn in the first place and helps the accuser write the charges. Thus, under the new proposal, the accused would have to satisfy the prosecutor, whose mind is already made up, if he wishes to show his innocence before trial or wants to question some witness under oath.

The Navy, wisely anticipating that some persons might not desire to throw themselves on the prosecutor's mercy, has also suggested that the law make it possible for the accused to waive the whole investigation if he is suspected of a purely military offense such as desertion or disobedience.

A third service proposal would deprive the military judge of his independence from the court members. Until the Uniform Code became law, the "judge" was a member of the court who joined the "jury" in its closed sessions. He was not required to be a lawyer. Since he instructed the court privately about the law regarding the case, the accused had no way of knowing what the court was being told about the law. This system was the subject of long debate during the congressional hearings which preceded passage of the Uniform Code. Congress finally decided to give the military Law Officer the same powers and status he would have as a civilian judge and required that he be an attorney.

Under the code, the Law Officer instructs the court on the law during an open session and cannot advise the court members privately. The prosecution and the defense may both argue their views of the law to the Law Officer before he instructs the court. The instructions actually given are recorded by the court reporter for review on appeal. If the court members desire additional instructions, they must open the court so that the proceedings are on the record.

The Army and Navy, however, would return the Law Officer to his former status as a member of the court, where his legal mistakes could be made secretly without causing reversal on appeal.

In connection with this suggestion, Maj. Gen. Eugene M. Caffey, the Army Judge Advocate General, made the following statement:

"Experience has shown that, prior to the enactment of the present code when the Law Officer was a member of the court instead of an officer of the court, he was of greater assistance to the other members in explaining the intricacies of the legal problems involved than he is under the present system. Thus, the code has deprived the accused of a safeguard that he previously enjoyed."

General Caffey does not explain why the Law Officer today is unable to discuss the "intricacies of the legal problems involved" in open court where his words may be recorded. The truth is that hundreds of cases have been reversed under the Uniform Code because of errors in the legal instructions given to the court members.

If the military judges cannot accurately instruct the courts when they know their words will be reviewed on appeal, there is certainly no reason to believe that instructions will magically become more accurate because they are given informally in a secret session of the court. There is less reason to believe that the old procedure was a "safeguard" which was "enjoyed" by any accused.

LAW OFFICER . . . A PART-TIME ASSIGNMENT

The real problem is that the law regarding instructions is complicated, in civilian life and in the military. Civilian courts, however, have full-time judges who spend their lives perfecting their knowledge of this technical subject and who have hundreds of years of precedent to guide them. Duty as a Law Officer in the military is usually a part-time assignment and the officers concerned do not have time to become fully familiar with the law involved, particularly with only five years' experience under the code.

Nothing in the code prevents the military from making assignments as Law Officer a permanent duty, thereby creating a skilled judiciary. Not one branch of the service has yet seen fit to do so, however, and until that is done the part-time judges will continue to make mistakes.

Most citizens would probably agree that the solution is to improve the caliber of the judges, rather than to amend the law to make competent judges unnecessary.

As a member of the court martial, the Law Officer would lose his independence as a judge and again become only a legally trained member of the jury. Under the old system, the "law member", as he was called, conferred with the court members in closed sessions. He could change his rulings at any time during the trial. Although the court members could not openly overrule the law member on most issues, they could impress him with their viewpoints during a closed session.

If he later changed his ruling, the accused had no way of knowing the basis for the new decision and could only hope that some senior member of the court had not impressed the law member with rank rather than reason.

Even under the Uniform Code, the Law Officer is not a free man. Under the military system, a high-ranking officer is the "convening authority". He appoints the court members, the personnel of the prosecution and the defense, and the Law Officer. He refers individual cases to trial after his staff has reviewed them for "legal sufficiency". The Law Officer thus knows, at the time of trial, that his superiors have already approved the prosecution's case.

In a decision published last fall, an Air Force Board of Review found a case in which the Law Officer had ruled against the prosecution. The prosecutor obtained a recess and returned to the courtroom to announce that the convening authority disagreed with the ruling. The Law Officer reversed himself.

The board of review described the trial counsel's maneuver as a "* * * defiant act * * * apparently taken for the sole purpose of bolstering what had been, to that point, a losing position." Reversing the conviction, the board held "* * * that the trial counsel's solicitation and utilization of command authority could reasonably be interpreted by the law officer and all the members of the court to have ominously suspended above them the power and authority of their commander's office."

If law officers were assigned to Army, Navy and Air Force headquarters in the Pentagon, working out of convenient regional offices, they could be truly full-time judges independent of the commands in which they sit. Certainly the situation would not be improved by removing what independence the law officer may now enjoy.

Although the law officer could be more effective if independently assigned, the court members must ordinarily be chosen from within the command so that they are all available for trials when needed. The armed services have been persistent and ingenious in their efforts to control the court members. In September of 1953, a Navy court martial was made up of some members who had nothing else to do but act as professional jurors. The admiral, who was president of the court, a job comparable to that of the civil jury foreman, wrote fitness reports on these subordinates, based on his opinion of their performance on his court.

Reversing the case, the Court of Military Appeals held that, "A court member's freedom and independence of action must remain inviolate. For his actions and his motives he should be responsible only to God and his conscience."

One judge observed that "the reporting officer is so strategically positioned that he hears all, sees all, knows all, and can report on all. He is the captain who plots the course to be followed and the deviates are well known to him. A fair and just trial cannot flourish in that climate."

Another problem which the services seek to solve is the right of appeal to the Court of Military Appeals. In the opinion of the military lawyers, too many men convicted by courts-martial now ask the court to review their cases without listing specific errors in their requests. This causes delay in disposing of these cases, since the convictions do not become final until after the court denies these general requests.

ENDING THE INCONVENIENCE AND THE JUDICIAL APPEALS BOARD

The Air Force has asked Congress to end this inconvenience by establishing a three-man judicial appeals board for each branch of the service. Before asking the Court of Military Appeals to review his case, the accused would first be required to obtain a certificate of good cause shown from this new board. The accused would present his request to the appeals board and, if any one of the members agreed that his case had merit, he would be allowed to send his petition to the Court of Military Appeals.

Today, the last military review of a case is conducted before the Boards of Review in Washington, D. C. These boards, each composed of three senior legal officers, are actually a kind of appellate court. Both sides are represented by counsel and the opinions of the boards are published and distributed throughout the Armed Forces.

An interesting feature of the Air Force proposal is that it would not specifically forbid a member of the Board of Review from sitting on the new appeals board for the same cases. The accused might then be faced with the problem of convincing men who have already decided his case unfavorably that he ought to be allowed to carry his appeal higher.

The important feature of the plan, though, is that the services would completely control the right of the accused even to request that the Court of Military Appeals hear his case. Although the military lawyers have complained about the amount of work which the present procedure places on the court, the judges of the court have not protested and have described previous plans to limit appeals as undesirable.

The Court of Military Appeals makes its own rules of practice and procedure. If the judges ever decide that the situation is out of control, they can require each petitioner for grant of review to list the specific errors in issue and could refuse to accept petitions which do not do so. Such a procedure would appear more desirable than permitting the armed services to decide for themselves which cases should be aired in the highest court.

The armed services certainly have the right and duty to suggest to Congress any changes in the law which they feel necessary. The dangerous feature of the proposals made by the Judge Advocates General is their tendency to describe these amendments as economy measures or mere procedural reforms.

Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon, the head Air Force lawyer, points out that "the most recent budget request needed to operate the Court (of Military Appeals) for 1 year amounted to $320,000." He predicts that the court's wartime cost would be four times the present expense if 12 million men were in uniform as in World War II. General Harmon also deplores "the added transportation costs arising from forwarding the records of trial to Washington, D. C." in wartime.

There is no doubt that military justice is expensive. Military justice is also big business—bigger than the business of the civilian Federal courts.

During 1954, there were 247,000 courts-martial of all kinds held throughout the world. A total of 18,594 cases were reviewed by boards of review in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard during the year and 1,829 cases were docketed by the Court of Military Appeals, less than 1 percent of the cases tried.

In comparison, 101,269 civil and criminal cases were brought in the Federal district courts during fiscal year 1954, 3,481 cases were filed in the civilian courts of appeals, and 520 petitions for writs of certiorari were docketed in the United States Supreme Court.

There is no doubt that curtailing the soldier's rights against self-incrimination, eliminating the thorough and impartial pretrial investigation, and stripping the law officer of his independence might cut the costs of operating the Court of Military Appeals, since the records which do somehow reach the court are likely to contain little to review.

Although it is hard to believe that some delay in the small percentage of cases which are appealed to the court would actually "jeopardize the success of military missions," as Admiral Nunn has predicted, it is also apparent that there are ways to keep cases from ever reaching the court in the first place.

The real question is, however, whether the possibility of a million-dollar wartime court budget, a bigger postage bill, and a few months' delay in handling less than 1 percent of the military cases are enough reason for taking from the serviceman rights given by Congress only after careful study and loud public outcry against drumhead justice during World War II.

WE MUST PREVENT IMPAIRING OUR NATIONAL BANKING SYSTEM

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of this session a tremendous amount of pressure is being exerted to bring about the enactment of S. 256.

S. 256 seeks to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association.

A DANGEROUS BILL

Rarely has a bill so short in size and so brief in language had a wider effect on more people and carried with it more portent of danger.

EXISTING LEGAL PROTECTION SOUGHT TO BE DESTROYED

Since 1933 the National Banking Act has required that all national banks permit cumulative voting of stock by shareholders for the election of directors of such banks. The usefulness and the need for such right has become more evident year by year, and each year sees more State legislatures considering the enactment of a similar law. As of today, only seven States have no laws on the subject. Sixteen States have laws making cumulative voting mandatory. In 17 additional States cumulative voting is permissive.

Cumulative voting affords a minority representation on the board of directors and a voice in policymaking. It has never accomplished control. It prevents arbitrary and undisputed control of a board of directors by management or anyone else that can acquire a voting majority or control of 51 percent of the voting stock.

No one, no matter how biased, can give a single logical reason why minority stockholders are not entitled to representation on the board.

No one can deny that without cumulative voting, a minority of the stockholders can get no representation on the board, as a matter of right.

Unless this bill is defeated and existing law continued, an owner of 51 percent of the stock of a bank will elect 100 percent of the board of directors, and the owners of 49 percent of the stock will not be able to elect even 1 director.

All must admit that without representation on the board of directors there is no practical means of attacking the abuses of entrenched management.

The contention is sometimes made that since 1933 cumulative voting has not been resorted to in enough cases to continue the statutory mandate. It was not so resorted to because the mere right written into the statute was sufficient to require management to invite minority representation to the board, avoiding the necessity of a contest therefor.

This has reduced proxy contests and avoided contentious arguments at annual meetings. It must be remembered that national banks are not subject to the proxy rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Management of national banks, unlike that of other corporations, may solicit proxies from stockholders, at bank expense, in any manner it pleases, without notice to stockholders and without any supervision of any kind whatsoever of the proxy solicitation material.

The Federal Reserve Board has the right to remove directors of any national banks. It has attempted to use that power only once since 1933. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency, by their power of recommendation, can eliminate undesirable directors.

IS THIS GOOD LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE?

This bill was introduced in the Senate on January 10, 1955. No counterpart or similar bill was introduced in the House. A brief hearing was held on the Senate side on the morning of April 7, 1955, with six witnesses in attendance. The complete record, with the statements, questions, answers, and exhibits, consists of 29 pages. The bill was called up and passed the Senate on June 23, 1955. It was referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee on June 27, 1955.

The House committee's records, which under House Rules are available for inspection by every Member of the House, disclose that throughout 1955 and most of 1956, the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee advised inquirers that he had no intention of scheduling a hearing on this bill. The first notice of any such hearing appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 13, 1956, indicating that hearings would begin on Monday, July 16, 1956. There was no session of the House on Saturday, July 14, 1956, and few, if any, Members saw that CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until Monday, July 16, 1956, the morning scheduled for the commencement of the hearings. The written committee notices that the hearing would commence on July 16 were sent out on Friday, July 13, and were not seen by most members until the morning of July 16. One member of the committee complained that he knew nothing about the start of the hearing until 11:30 a. m. on July 16, although he had delivered a letter to the chairman about the matter on July 12, 1956.

Until July 17, 1956, the rules of the House Banking and Currency Committee provided that a quorum shall be a majority of the committee, to wit, 16 members.

At no time on the morning of July 16, 1956, were there more than 13 members present, and, during most of the morning, while witnesses were testifying, there were fewer than 7 members present.

On that morning, the witnesses were the Comptroller of the Currency and two bank officers, all supporting the bill. Most of the members were accordingly deprived of the right to ask questions of these witnesses. The Comptroller of the Currency was not invited to return for that purpose, even though the chairman was asked to make such request of him.

Neither the Secretary of the Treasury nor any representative from his office was asked to testify on the bill. If the Department submitted a report, it has never been made a part of the record.

The Comptroller of the Currency stated that the Treasury Department supports the bill. No one asked him what he meant by that. If he means himself, as a part of the Treasury Department, the words are surplusage. If he means the Secretary of the Treasury, he should have frankly added that he and the Secretary of the Treasury have consistently contended that only the Comptroller of the Currency has any jurisdiction over national banks and that the Secretary of the Treasury does not even have any right of review of the acts of the Comptroller of the Currency. We omit any reference to his behind-the-scenes influence.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was not invited to send a representative to testify. None appeared. If any report was obtained from it on this bill, it has not been made a part of the record. At least one board member is known to be opposed to this bill.

The Federal Reserve Board, which has indicated opposition to this bill, was not asked to send a representative to testify, and if any report from it has been received, it has been withheld from the record.

Examination of the committee files indicates that every witness who asked to be heard in support of the bill was given such opportunity. The same file indicates that many witnesses who asked to be heard in opposition to the bill were denied the opportunity to be heard. One representative of a very large shareholders' organization, the Federation of Women Shareholders in American Business, Inc., was denied the opportunity to be heard.

The majority report says that the Independent Bankers Association favors the bill, but no witness appeared on its behalf who could advise when, if at all, the stockholders had been polled on the subject and how many, who were not officers of banks, if any, indicated support of this bill. No statement by that association was offered for the record.

The testimony on behalf of the American Bankers Association, in support of the bill, should be discarded as worthless because it omits the above information and gives no details about any injury caused by the law.

The public hearing on July 16, 1956, lasted for less than an hour and a half. On July 16 the chairman directed an executive session at 10 o'clock on July 17, although that had been previously fixed as the time for the hearing of witnesses in opposition to the bill. Accordingly, there was less than 1 hour of public hearing on July 17. On July 18 and 19 there was 1¾ hours of public hearing, and on July 20 there was less than 40 minutes of public hearing. Beginning with the public hearings on the morning of July 17, the chairman, on his own and without authority from the committee, kept pushing witnesses to complete their statements, then limited them to 10 minutes of direct presentation, and limited the entire committee to 15 minutes for interrogation of each witness.

On July 19 the Chair announced that the committee would hear Members of Congress on the following morning at 10 o'clock, and at 11 o'clock the committee would go into executive session on the bill. Although a Member of Congress, who was also a member of the committee, was present and waiting to be called to testify at 10 o'clock, the chairman did not arrive and did not convene the hearing until 20 minutes after 10. The Congressman testifying had been authorized by 21 other Members of Congress to make statements on their behalf, indicating their opposition to the bill. At 11 o'clock on July 20, the chairman closed the public hearing, refused to permit the Member of Congress to complete his statement, and ordered the committee into executive session.

AUTHORITARIANISM AND TOTALITARIANISM ARE THE ANTITHESIS OF DEMOCRACY

The committee room was cleared and at 8 minutes after 11 o'clock, the chairman called the executive session of the committee to order and proceeded to consider the bill. At 11:45 o'clock there were pending before the committee a motion for the appointment of a subcommittee to make a complete study of the problem, a motion to substitute for that motion the pending bill, a motion to amend the substitute, a motion to limit all debate on the bill and on all amendments thereto to 5 minutes, a motion to amend that motion to limit debate on the bill and on all amendments thereto to 3 minutes, a motion that the committee vote on the bill, regardless of the pendency of the amendments, at 10 minutes to 12 o'clock. A point of order was made against the last motion, the point of order was overruled, an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and on a rollcall vote his decision was sustained. A motion was then made to amend the motion that a vote be taken at 10 minutes to 12. At that point a motion to adjourn was made and a rollcall vote demanded. Thereupon a motion was made to report out the bill. By this time it was after 12 o'clock. The committee had no permission to sit while the House was in session and the House was in session. A point of order was made against the motion to report the bill. The Chair insisted he would call the roll on the motion to report out the bill. A point of order was raised to that. Without passing on the pending points of order and without taking a vote on the motion to adjourn, or any of the other pending motions, the Chair insisted on calling the roll on the motion to report the bill, which was not concluded until at least 3 minutes after 12 o'clock.

The procedure followed was contrary to the rules of the House and of the committee and did violence thereto. Members were deprived of the right to discuss the bill. They were deprived of the right to offer amendments. Even if there were any merit to this bill, it should be sent back to the committee for consideration in accordance with the rules of the House.

The same antidemocratic procedure by which this bill was sought to be foisted on the House of Representatives is a typical picture of what may be expected by despotic management if this bill became law.

The minority will be given no opportunity to be heard. The majority will drown out the voice of the minority and "railroad" it into silence.

The result may well flood the courts with the kind of stockholder-bank litigation that required statutory enactments, not to curb the stockholder-corporate litigation, but to give the minorities the information they were entitled to receive.

Today the information is provided behind closed boardroom doors in a spirit of fairness and so as to allay fears and suspicions. Deny this right by enactment of this bill and the information will be supplied by court order and in a spirit of acrimony.

DO MAJORITY STOCKHOLDERS NEED ANY PROTECTION FROM THE MINORITY STOCKHOLDERS?

Many Members are desirous of perfecting this bill so as to protect the rights of stockholders and depositors.

It is obvious from the testimony adduced before the committee that neither the Comptroller of the Currency nor the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation attempts to give stockholders or depositors that protection.

Some general statements have been made in support of this bill, to the effect that minority stockholders elected as a result of cumulative voting might be a disturbing influence, and might hurt the bank's reputation, and might destroy public confidence in the bank. Not a single instance of any such happening has been presented to the committee.

The bankers who so testified admitted, upon interrogation by members of the committee, that their banks have prospered despite cumulative voting.

In one instance, where the bank first had resorted to reducing the number of its directors in order to keep a director from being elected by cumulative voting, it subsequently invited that very director, as the representative of minority stockholders, to become a member of the board. The banker had no explanation as to why the dividends paid by the bank were the same for 2 successive years although in the second year its earnings were less than in the prior year. Nor had he any explanation as to why the amount of dividends did not change from 1 year to another when the earnings increased considerably. That was in years when the minority director had no place on the board.

Nor did he pretend that the majority of the directors were improvident when after the minority director became a member of the board, the board increased the dividend rate by 77 percent. While the banker contended that the publicity

attendant upon the minority stockholders' attempts to get representation on the board had hurt the bank, he had no explanation for the fact that during all of that period, the bank's deposits and earnings were consistently increasing. He proudly admitted that the bank then was, and still is, reputed to be the best bank in the area.

The perils that the proponents of the measure sought to demonstrate to the committee are strawmen without substance and are based upon theoretical conjecture.

When one compares this committee's majority report on this bill with the statement of the Comptroller of the Currency, we wonder who wrote the report. The language is identical, including the punctuation.

Just a word about the figures in the report, which are lifted out of the Comptroller's statement. One hundred and sixty-seven shares are almost 17 percent of the total and exactly 33 shares short of 20 percent of 1,000 shares, one director is 20 percent of a board of 5. One hundred and forty-three shares are 23 shares short of 16⅔ percent of 1,000 shares and 1 director is 16⅔ percent of a directorate of 6. The same arithmetical regressive ratios prevail until we get to the last mathematical theory. Thirty-nine shares are exactly 1 share less than 4 percent of 1,000 shares, and 1 director is exactly 4 percent of 25 directors. Can a minority have less than one director on the board?

No one asked the Comptroller how few national banks have only 5, 6, or 7 directors and as few as 1,000 shares of stock. Except for the closely held one-man or family bank, there are none, and very few of the others. In any event, we are concerned here only with the bank whose stock is publicly held. The minimum capital with which the smallest national bank could have been started since 1933 is $100,000. With $1 par value stock, that means 100,000 shares, with $5 par it is 20,000 shares, and with $10 par it is 10,000 shares. At $100 par, which is unheard of, it is 1,000 shares. It has long been the policy of the Comptroller of the Currency that national bank boards be larger rather than smaller and very few, if any, have the minimum number of directors permitted by law.

No one could indicate to the committee a single instance where a director elected as a result of cumulative voting had ever even been charged with wrongdoing or indicted for a crime. Nor has anyone been able to name a single instance where a director or an officer recommended by minority stockholders or elected by minority stockholders as the result of cumulative voting, had been charged with wrongdoing or indicted for crime.

It stands admitted upon the record of this committee that not a single officer or director of a bank who has been indicted and convicted for embezzlement, larceny, forgery, or any other crime in connection with the operation of his bank, attained his position in his bank as a result of cumulative voting.

A president of the National City Bank who was indicted, but acquitted, for violation of the Banking Act was forced to resign because of that conduct. He was not the product of cumulative voting.

A former governor of the State of New Jersey, who committed suicide when his bank defalcations were exposed, was not the product of cumulative voting.

The State auditor of the State of Illinois, who just resigned because of check manipulations, had his dummy acting for him and a majority of the stockholders of a bank. That cannot be laid at the door of cumulative voting. They were forced upon the bank by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of which the Comptroller of the Currency is a member.

No one contends that because some bank directors and officers are thieves and embezzlers and forgers, that majority stockholders should be deprived of their right to elect directors on that account. But the contention is now made that because occasionally a minority stockholder or a group of minority stockholders might elect a troublemaker as a minority member of a board of directors, all minority stockholders should be deprived of their rights.

It must be borne in mind that there has not been a single specific case pointed out at any time or at any place of the election of more than a minority of a board as a result of minority stockholders voting their shares cumulatively.

Never, but never, despite all the mathematical computations in this committee's majority report, has a majority of a board been so elected.

Instead of seeking legislation to protect themselves against a possible troublemaker, the proponents of this bill would destroy the entire system.

One method of protecting the majority against a troublemaker is regulation of the solicitation of proxies. It is high time that that was accomplished by statutory enactment.

The statute should provide that it is a crime to purchase proxies. It should also be a crime to solicit proxies by false or fraudulent representations.

The entire method of soliciting proxies should be done under supervision of one of the bank regulatory bodies or of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has much experience with that subject matter.

The proxy solicitation on behalf of all stockholders should either be paid for by themselves or by the bank. There should not be one rule for one group and a different one for the other group.

But, most important, stockholders should not be deprived of their cumulative voting rights by the enactment of a statute which will deprive them of those rights as of the date of its enactment and with no means available to the stockholders to voice an opinion or a vote against it. That is what this bill would accomplish if enacted.

The very minimum of protection to which every bank stockholder is entitled is that the stockholders be given the choice to change their articles of association at an annual meeting to be held after the enactment of the statute, on proper notice to them, and such change should not be made effective until a substantial number of the stockholders take such action.

Almost every present day bank stockholder has acquired his stock since 1933, knowing that the law guaranteed him the right to vote his stock cumulatively.

This bill, without his consent, yes, against his will, deprives him of that very valuable right. Apart from any constitutional question involved, it is un-American, because it is unconscionable.

The argument is made in support of this bill that the law should not mandate what stockholders should do. We are told that they and they alone should make the choice. But by this bill, the same advocates deprive them of that very right. While taking it away from them, they tell the minority stockholders, "You can get that right back if, as and when you can get a majority of the stockholders to call a meeting for the purpose of considering your proposal," and, "if, at that meeting, you, the minority, can get the majority to give you the rights which are now given to you by law but which we now take from you by this bill."

One amendment sought to be offered to this bill was to continue the right of cumulative voting until any subsequent annual meeting at which, after due notice to all stockholders, they make the decision by a substantial vote to change the system of voting.

Another proposed amendment would regulate proxy solicitation. Still another would protect the bank against a bad director by setting up a procedure for his removal.

One practical effect of the enactment of this bill would be to drive into the national banking system, the State banks in those States where cumulative voting is either mandatory or permissive. It would put a premium on the State banks in 33 States leaving their State systems and going into the national system. This could be prevented by a simple amendment making State law on this subject apply to national banks.

This is a bad bill. In the language of the chairman before the bill was called up: "it is a vicious bill."

It should be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HARMFUL TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include letters and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have debated this afternoon a measure to alleviate the damage of tremendous floods, hurricanes, and water damage in New England and elsewhere throughout the country which were so

prevalent last summer and fall. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, we should take some step to stop the tremendous flood of textiles coming into this country competing with both northern and southern textile mills.

As part of my remarks I include an editorial from the Boston American and another editorial from the Lowell Sun dealing with the terrific importation of textiles from Japan.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Boston American of July 21, 1956]

TIME TO LISTEN

The gentlemen in Washington—and that includes the State Department—must know that American manufacturers cannot compete with Japanese textiles.

For more than 3 years, every spokesman for the cloth-making industry has been telling them that.

And, on at least 2 significant occasions, the 6 Governors of New England made the warning official by presenting it in the form of a joint resolution.

But deafness seems to be a common affliction in the National Capital, since the repetitious complaining has accomplished about as much as a drop of water falling on the Rock of Gibraltar.

In fact, during the protest period, imports from Japan have increased by more than 700 percent, for the very good reason that Japanese manufacturers can buy American cotton cheaper than American manufacturers and then they further pare down costs by paying their employees no more than 15 cents an hour.

Tariff laws are supposed to protect the United States citizen from foreign exploitation and ruin.

But they can't be expected to accomplish much in the way of protection unless they are applied to Asiatics and Europeans hogging the American market.

[From the Lowell Sun of July 17, 1956]

LET'S SAVE WHAT IS LEFT

According to reports our New England governors have called for relief of the textile industry. Is this just another call of the wild? Or will the governors actually do something to save what is left of our once vast textile industrial empire?

Shedding tears over a sad situation rarely corrects it. Presumably, the governors have made some polite effort to help New England's textile industry, but they have not extended themselves, or else so many of our once flourishing mills would not now be empty.

The governors, according to a report from their meeting in Rhode Island, are going to urge the administration to slow down in taking action which might jeopardize important segments of the American textile industry. Particularly, the plea is directed at the Government's broad policy on the imports of Japanese textile products, which have already done so much harm.

It is consoling, perhaps, to realize that our New England governors are aware of this bad situation. Actions, however, speak louder than words, and there is no reason why they shouldn't muster their Congressmen, establish a beachhead in Washington and demand consideration for New England's surviving textile industry before Japanese competition erases the last vestiges.

Pleading for help and consideration in this distressing situation when foreign competition is knocking the props from under both industry and labor will not suffice—prior efforts along this line have produced no relief.

I also include an article by William F. Sullivan, counsel of the Northern Textile Association showing that many textile mills will go out of business if this importation does not stop.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Lowell Sun of July 18, 1956]

WARNS MORE NEW ENGLAND MILLS WILL CLOSE IF JAPANESE TEXTILE IMPORTS AREN'T STOPPED—COUNSEL FOR NORTHERN GROUP SEES MORE LIQUIDATIONS IN THE OFFING

BOSTON, July 18.—William F. Sullivan, counsel for the Northern Textile Association, says more New England mills will go out of business unless something is done to halt the large-scale import of Japanese textiles.

He said in an interview last night that Japanes textiles are coming into this country at the rate of 244 million square yards a year, an increase of 700 percent over 1953.

Sullivan said also that Japanese mills pay their employees 15 cents an hour and can buy American cotton cheaper than it can be bought in this country.

"No manufacturer in New England or elsewhere," he said, "can compete with that. It will eventually mean the liquidation of more mills, not only in New England but in the South."

In Lewiston, Maine, Denis A. Blais, area director for the Textile Workers of America Union, called on the city's merchants not to buy or sell foreign-made textiles.

I include also a statement from Mr. Seabury Stanton, spokesman for the Northeastern Textile Association.

The statement referred to follows:

[From the Lowell Sun of July 18, 1956]

ADAMS PLEDGES AID TO TEXTILE INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Seabury Stanton, spokesman for the Northern Textile Association, says he has the promise of President Eisenhower's administration that it would work with industry toward solving the problem of textile imports.

Stanton met yesterday at the White House with Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and other administration officials at Adams' invitation.

Stanton, an official of the Berkshire-Hathaway, Inc., said "Adams assured me that the administration recognizes the seriousness of the problem and intends to work with industry in an attempt to solve it as soon as possible."

CONGRESS MUST NOT ADJOURN WITHOUT PASSING VETERANS LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, again let me say I shall do everything within my power to prevent the adjournment of Congress before certain legislation is passed providing benefits for the veterans, the bill for increased compensation for our disabled, and the so-called pension bill for the older veterans of World War I.

During the war, Mr. Speaker, our soldiers were expendable. We must not let the veterans become expendable today.

Let me remind the House that both the House and the Senate passed a very discriminatory bill providing survivors benefits. I do not see how anybody in the White House, Army, the Navy Department, or the Marine Corps could allow Congress to adjourn, if they could help it—and I include the White House also—without trying to equalize the benefits of the other people with those who have high rank.

FACTS VERSUS POLITICAL PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress is about to adjourn. The legislative record of the 83d and 84th Congress will serve as a blueprint for the American people to determine in the coming presidential election whether the present national administration has succeeded or failed in carrying out the promises it made to the American people in 1952. There is strong evidence already that the American public will soon be bombarded with misleading political propaganda through radio, television, newspapers, magazines, and oratory.

I wish to make a brief review of the record as it relates to the fantastic promises made 4 years ago by the candidate for President and other Republican political leaders. The American public in September and October of this year must be on guard against one of the most highly financed, well-organized, and expertly conducted political propaganda presidential campaigns in the history of our Nation. The chairman of the Republican National Committee has already announced the contracting for choice television time amounting to over $2 million. This amount is very small compared with the additional millions be spent between now and November 6.

Any Member who has been a close observer of the legislative processes of the Congress and the activities of the "White House Palace Guard" toward certain legislation can readily see that the Republican campaign promises in 1952 were discarded by the big business quartet who took over the executive department in January 1953. This governmental regency is made up of Secretary of Treasury Humphrey, representing the banking interests; Secretary of Commerce Weeks, representing the manufacturing interests; Secretary of Agriculture Benson, representing the corporation farmers; and Secretary of Interior McKay, representing the power utilities.

In the following paragraphs, I will outline facts which I hope will convince the most partisan that the above is correct:

AGRICULTURE

The older folks in the Middle West discovered 20 years ago that the great depression of the early 1930's was started by reason of the lack of prosperity and buying power in the farm areas throughout the country. We learned then that when the farmer cannot buy automobiles, tractors, combines, refrigerators, and hundreds of other necessities, the factory and craft workers in the cities and towns are soon unemployed.

In 1933, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Democratic Congress were given the responsibility to lift our country from the greatest depression in history, their first act was to pass legislation which would restore prosperity to the farmer. In the 1952 campaign candidate Eisenhower promised the farmers at Kasson, Minn., and Brookings, S.

Dak., that he would continue the Democratic farm parity program. He stated that he was not only for 90 percent of parity but thought it should be 100 percent in the market place. When the President appointed Ezra Taft Benson, at the request of the reactionary interests, a new Republican farm policy was started which immediately sent the American farm economy on a downward trend.

In the 20 years of Democratic administration—1933 to 1952—farm gross income rose from $2 billion a year to $31 billion, during the same period farm parity rose from 58 percent to 100 percent. During the last 6 months after 3 years of Republican policy, farm parity averaged 82 with a low of 80. A few months ago, the Democrats in Congress passed a farm bill which would have started the farmer back on the road to prosperity but the bill providing 90 percent parity, was vetoed by the President at the insistence of Secretary of Agriculture Benson. This administration has finally accepted the Democrats' soil-bank plan which Secretary Benson rejected last year as not being practical. By adopting this Democratic measure with an election in the offing, the Republican leaders hope that the farmer will forget his troubles until after the election on November 6. Nevertheless, the facts are that farm income has dropped in 3 years—1953 through 1955 inclusive—approximately $12 billion; farm mortgages have increased $1,100,000,000; and, farm bank borrowing by $1 billion; the livestock farm inventory has dropped $1½ billion. Over 600,000 small farmers have been driven from their land to join the crowded labor market in the cities by the "flexible Benson farm policy." These figures come from the Federal Bureau of the Census.

LABOR

In 1946, the Republican Party secured control of the 80th Congress and immediately proceeded to build up public opinion against the Wagner Labor Act. They passed the restrictive Taft-Hartley law which repealed or nullified the main provisions of the Wagner Act passed by the Democratic Congress and signed by Franklin Delano Roosevelt 10 years before.

Candidate Eisenhower in his 1952 speech both before the A. F. of L. and CIO national conventions stated that, if elected, he would remove the "union busting" provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. When he took office he made a good start by appointing the late Martin Durkin as Secretary of Labor. Evidently, Mr. Durkin was too active in urging the Republican Party to carry out its campaign promises to labor. Secretary Weeks and Secretary Humphrey cleverly proceeded through the White House back door to undermine Mr. Durkin and the Department of Labor. The promise which President Eisenhower made to Secretary Durkin that he would send a message to Congress recommending 19 changes in the Taft-Hartley law was revoked. When Secretary Durkin was informed that the message would not be sent to Congress, he resigned.

The present Secretary of Labor Mitchell, unfortunately is a Cabinet officer without portfolio. The Eisenhower "brain-trust" has turned all labor problems over to Secretary Weeks for solution. Not one promise that candidate Eisenhower and the Republican leaders made to organized labor in 1952 has been carried out. In fact, the National Labor Relations Board has been stacked with appointees whose former records with their big business connections have been decidedly antilabor. We know now that the President's speeches were made for nothing more than public consumption.

If the Eisenhower administration had been serious in its promises to labor, the power of the White House could certainly have persuaded a few of the 13 Republican members of the House Labor Committee to help carry out their party's promises to labor. The National Labor Relations Board with its newly appointed antilabor Republican membership has curtailed, postponed, or denied the vast majority of pending cases filed by labor unions before this semijudiciary body. Management cases are expedited and given very favorable consideration.

The prime reason for the success in so many States of the devastating and misnamed so-called right to work laws has been brought about with the aid, counsel, and prestige of the Eisenhower Cabinet.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

I hold in my hand the front page of last evening's Washington Star. It reads as follows: "Living costs suddenly hit all time high." The news item states in part:

> The Bureau of Labor Statistics disclosed today that the cost of living has reached an alltime high.

Millions of voters in October 1952 remember candidate Eisenhower being interviewed by housewives on television. He assured his interviewer that if he were elected President the cost of living would come down. We all remember ex-President Truman fighting year after year to keep the cost of living down. Since January 1953, the Executive Department has been silent and has made no effort to curb profiteering and reduce the cost of living.

TAXES

Secretary of Treasury Humphrey succeeded in forcing through the so-called rich man's tax bill which gives 73 percent of long run tax relief to corporations and only 9 percent to people with incomes under $5,000. The facts concerning this unfair tax legislation reveals that 80 percent of the American taxpayers only received 9 percent of the reductions in this Republican tax bill. When the Democratic Members of Congress fought to enact a tax bill giving an "across the board" $20 tax reduction credit to each and every taxpayer, opposition from the Executive Department defeated this legislation. Secretary Humphrey and this administration has also succeeded in increasing our national debt to an all time high and also increased interest rates on the same. The Democratic Members of Congress succeeded in blocking the bill sponsored by Postmaster General Summerfield to increase first class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents. If this bill were enacted it would be an additional tax of almost $300 million to the small bracket taxpayer.

SMALL BUSINESS

Since 1953, small business failures increased 21 percent. One of the main reasons for this is increased interest rates, tight money and refusal to process many loan applications. Since 1953, some 300,000 individuals and companies have applied to secure small business loans and of this number only 7,000 have received favorable action. This is a typical instance of an agency created under law to perform a certain task but now managed by an administration completely out of sympathy with the purpose of the law. Fearful of abolishing the Small Business Administration because of political repercussions, the Eisenhower brain trust has simply appointed people to head the program who do not believe in it. This process has been called repeal by appointment.

SOCIAL SECURITY

When social-security legislation was debated on the House floor in 1938, Republican leaders called it socialistic. Any expansion legislation since that time has been opposed by Republican leaders. Last week the White House palace guard opposed lowering the age limit for women from 65 years of age to 62, and the disabled to 50. Through a valiant fight by Democratic members the bill was enacted. In the Senate, social-security expansion won by a close vote of 47 to 45.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The President, as a candidate in 1952 spoke in Chicago and New York City stating that the country needed 340,000 new schoolrooms. After 3½ years through Democratic efforts, we finally succeeded in debating the bill on the floor of Congress. After long debate and amendments a coalition of Southern Democrats and a majority of Republican members defeated needed Federal aid for school construction. The remarkable fact is that President Eisenhower or his palace guard did absolutely nothing to persuade party support in final passage for this much-needed legislation. This bill provided that the Federal Government would aid critical school areas to finance school construction for the next 4 years. The legislation did not provide for any Federal control over local schools whatsoever, although this type of false propaganda was used to defeat the bill.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Tidelands oil, Dixon-Yates, power, mineral, and timber giveaways are a few of the important windfalls which the Republican administration succeeded or attempted to bestow upon their political benefactors during the last 3½ years. Ex-President Truman vetoed several of these flagrant giveaways during his administration. Through the opposition of Senate Democrats, the Dixon-Yates giveaway was exposed and defeated. President Eisenhower wrote a letter when this deal was pending urging that

the Government enter into the unfortunate contract. The administration through Attorney General Brownell is now defending a suit involving millions of dollars which the Dixon-Yates people are claiming as damage by reason of canceling the fraudulent contract.

The Dixon-Yates scandal will be a major campaign issue. Last week the power monopoly fought against the legislation which would permit the American public utilizing one of its last great power sites at Hells Canyon, Idaho. The Senate defeated the Hells Canyon project by a close vote. How long will the American people tolerate an administration which so wantonly disregards the rights of the American taxpayer to his God-given natural resources? Public power production in the West and at TVA was one of the main factors that contributed to winning World War II. President Truman in October 1952 in a speech in Montana dedicating Hungry Horse Dam said, and I quote:

> Take a good look at this great power development owned by the American people. If the Republicans win in November, it will be the last great public development of natural resources in a long time.

Those spoken words of President Truman were prophetic because this administration has diverted our natural resources to special privileged private interests since January 20, 1953.

MINIMUM WAGE—SLUM CLEARANCE

The Eisenhower palace guard actively opposed an adequate minimum wage but Democratic efforts finally succeeded in passing a $1 an hour wage minimum.

Slum clearance with proper public housing never has received enthusiastic support from the Eisenhower advisers. The President makes convincing speeches asking for housing and slum clearance but leaders of his party always do a good hatchet job on the legislation in committee and on the floor of Congress. No doubt the Republican leaders will repeat their vote-catching pledges on this much needed legislation in their 1956 platform.

Americans must remember that during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations the national income rose from 39 billion to approximately 300 billion. In January 1953, when we changed over to a tight money, high interest, trickle down economy, millions of working men and women in a short time felt the change in their economic status. That is probably one of the main reasons why the Democratic Party won the 1954 congressional election by the biggest margin accorded to either party in an off-year election since 1934.

President Eisenhower was the first President in this century who lost his Party's Congress in the first congressional election after taking office. The Republicans lost 9 governors in Northern States, including Maine, Pennsylvania, and New York, since big business took over the governmental saddle at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. In Indiana last November the Democratic Party increased its number of mayors from 28 to 72. This is evidence that the American voter is not misled by some newspapers and subsidized radio and television commentators, who devote columns and hours trying to sell this reactionary administration to the public.

FOREIGN POLICY

The Democratic Party under the leadership of President Truman established a foreign policy which, if properly administered and expanded, would present a solid front against the Kremlin and help curtail communism.

General Eisenhower in 1950, as the head of European defense, testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the Marshall plan, aid to Greece and Turkey, the Truman mutual security, and other programs saved Western Europe from communism. Today we have no policy in North Africa; the Formosa Straits area is ready to explode at any time, and the Middle East is a powder keg slumbering under an uneasy truce. The Truman 4-point program has been abandoned and replaced with armament agreements. The President of the United States did not know that tanks were being loaded at New York a few months ago to be shipped to Saudi Arabia. Nor did the people of the United States know that we were at the brink of war three times until the Secretary of State revealed the facts in a magazine article.

Mr. Bascom Timmons, a well-known Washington correspondent, said recently that in 40 years of covering Capitol Hill he had never found such cover-up, distortion, confusion, and censorship as that existing in Washington today. The U. S. News & World Report of March 23 stated that the Defense Department and the State Department are two separate operations on foreign problems without the proper discipline or direction from the Commander in Chief. One month ago Secretary Dulles publicly condemned neutral nations while our President had commented favorably on countries remaining neutral. Vice President Nixon, on his recent trip to the Philippines, joined Secretary Dulles in condemning neutrality, and especially India.

We must have a foreign policy that is courageous, consistent, and united. We must stop bluffing our enemies, boasting to our friends; and we must stop misleading the people at home. We must restore the prestige of America to the position it occupied before the Dulles bungling and confusion shattered world confidence in our leadership. America's free and prosperous democracy is the only hope for guiding all nations and races toward the path of world peace.

HUMANITARIANISM AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I arise to speak about a press statement of Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, on July 19, 1956, which speaks of nuclear weapons which create a minimum of widespread fallout hazard.

A distortion of fact was involved in this statement in my opinion. I am concerned over the repeated pattern of applying advertising agency techniques to alleviate the natural fears of hydrogen destruction which trouble our people and the people of the world. Huckstering is no substitute for policy as we grope for solutions to the atomic and hydrogen dilemma.

In one paragraph of Mr. Strauss' press release, he states:

> Thus the current series of tests has produced much of importance not only from a military point of view but from a humanitarian aspect.

How can anyone suggest that there are humanitarian aspects to hydrogen bombs? They are designed for destruction and contamination. They are the most inhumane device ever conceived by man.

If Mr. Strauss' motives are humanitarian I call on him to really implement President Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace plan. Only yesterday, this program suffered a defeat here in the House of Representatives when Mr. Strauss and the administration opposed a bill for the construction of reactors for the peacetime use of atomic energy.

If you can find humanitarianism in the use of weapons, and I doubt it, I call upon Mr. Strauss to support the suggestion of AEC Commissioner Thomas Murray that the United States accent the so-called small-yield weapons for use in military combat and in ground-to-air missiles for the defense of this continent. I believe these weapons are all but being ignored.

Two other statements in Mr. Strauss' press release are of great interest. I quote:

> Our tests to date have demonstrated that real progress has been made with respect to these objectives, including achievement of maximum effect in the immediate area of a target with minimum widespread fallout hazard.
>
> It has been confirmed that there are many factors, including operational ones, which do make it possible to localize to an extent not heretofore appreciated, the fallout effect of nuclear explosions.

Let us examine the facts: Explosions of a military nature utilizing atomic energy come from either a fissioning of heavy elements—that is, their splitting—or from the fusion of light elements—that is, their joining together.

But in any atomic weapon, fission is necessary. From every nuclear fission there is an attendant release of radioactive particles and a later radioactive fallout.

Thus for military atomic weapons, no matter how devised, there is attendant harmful radioactivity. I grant that some effects of this radioactivity can be reduced. A bomb can be detonated at a very high altitude and the immediate radioactivity and fallout can be reduced. However, such radioactivity as is released ultimately descends from the high altitudes for a postponed fallout. But of course the higher the altitude of burst the less the military effectiveness of the weapon.

Radioactivity can also be cut down by diminishing the yield of a weapon. If yield is to be reduced or military effectiveness diminished by high bursts it follows that the defense of the free world will require a greater number of weapons to accomplish our military objectives.

This year Senator ANDERSON recommended to the President that there be an increase in the production of special nuclear material for peacetime as well as weapons purposes. This suggestion was turned down by the President. I call upon the administration to tell us now if we must increase production and make more weapons to compensate for the loss of military effectiveness due to the doctoring of present devices.

No matter how much you change an atomic or hydrogen weapon there is still a great deal of radioactivity. An atom bomb or hydrogen bomb burst on a military target without dangerous radioactive fallout would be a miracle. Such a miracle has not been achieved.

Mr. Strauss' press release is designed to qualm fears. As for the American people, if a war were to occur, I am afraid that they would be struck not by Admiral Strauss' "humanitarian" bomb, unless, as a Washington Post editorial has stated, Admiral Strauss were willing to give his magic secret to the Soviet Union.

I would hope that the humanitarian expression in this press release did apply to the American people. Tomorrow, the Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, of which I am Chairman and which has been studying Civil Defense in the United States, will issue a report. I only hope that a few kind words are said in the administration about certain of our recommendations. For we recommend that the Federal Government initiate the only successful humanitarian approach—that is the construction of a system of shelters in which our citizens can find protection from the effect of hydrogen bombs. I believe that the time is at hand for a careful reexamination of our atomic energy and civil-defense policy. We are cutting our defense structures to the bone in dependence on hydrogen bombs. We have failed to consider and study war by other means with "small yield" weapons for battlefields rather than cities. We are ignoring the peaceful uses of atomic energy in an effort to satiate the desires of Admiral Strauss and certain utility interests. We have not told the American people the truth about civil defense and the catastrophic loss of lives which would result from a thermonuclear attack on the United States. We have ignored the need for a system of shelters for our people to repair to in the event of attack. We have brought forth no policy to meet the hydrogen dilemma.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICA'S SMALL FARMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons Americans are proud of their economic system and hold it up as a model throughout the world is our pattern of agriculture. We have built our agriculture around the family farm. Thus we have millions of families doing the bulk of their own work, making their own decisions, and living as first-class citizens in communities of their own choosing and their own building.

This pattern of family farming was carved out of our great frontiers almost from the beginning of the United States. The pioneers who moved our population front westward were families seeking to put their roots into the soil and establish their homes there. As a matter of national policy family farming has long been encouraged. In the Homestead Act of 1862, for example, Congress wisely decided to open the vast public lands to families with enough acreage to sustain themselves, rather than throwing the lands open without restriction to corporations and private exploitation.

Congress followed this pattern in the Reclamation Act of 1902 and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of references to a repetition of this pattern as the keystone of our land policy.

A stable population of families living on the land helped us to win two World Wars and, in peacetime, has helped us to share the great abundance of America's resources fairly among all of our population.

But recently we have seen signs of alarm among the family farmers of our country. Farms are becoming bigger and fewer. The Census Bureau reported last year that "there are 600,000 fewer farms in the United States in 1954 than in 1950"—a decrease of 11.1 percent.

The number of farms in 1954 was smaller than for any year since 1890 and the decrease affected every State except one and every county except 180. In West Virginia there were 81,434 farms in 1950, but only 65,583 four years later. That is a decrease of 12,851 farms, or nearly one-sixth.

For the Nation as a whole the Census Bureau reported that almost half of the decrease in the number of farms occurred in those of less than 50 acres in size and about two-thirds of the decrease occurred in farms with an annual sales volume of less than $1,200. These are signs of possible trouble among our rural families—and trouble for America—if the trend should be allowed to go too far. In some areas it has already gone too far, and in many parts of the world it was allowed to go too far centuries ago. An excellent analysis of this situation came recently from a rather surprising source, a column on March 11 by the well-known columnists, Joseph and Stewart Alsop, who write in the conservative New York Herald Tribune and in other papers across the country.

The decay of Rome—

They began—

quite certainly began when the hardy farm citizens whose valor had made Rome great ceased to be able to maintain themselves and their families by farming their small holdings. In hardly more than a generation, over great areas of Italy, the family sized farms were swept away. They made way for vast, consolidated, slave-operated, absentee-capitalist holdings which were the equivalent in those days of what we now call industrialized farms.

This same social change, whenever it has come over any great nation of the past, has invariably marked a beginning of an ending. All around might be the evidences of the most hectic prosperity, except on the little farms. But when the little farms went, it was as though the nation's healthy roots in native soil were stricken and withered; and in the end the nation was stricken, too.

The Alsop brothers, writing from the vantage point of Washington and New York City rather than from that of a farm, went on to deal with the lessons of history and to bring their analysis down to this date and this country:

The warnings of history need to be remembered, at the moment, for the rather simple reason that there would be no really grave American farm problem if it were not for the plight of the family-sized farms. Not all the big farms are prosperous, of course. But almost all of them can take care of themselves, and a great many of them are still enormously prosperous, like the industrialized rice growers recently described in this space, or the rather numerous industrialized cotton growers who can profitably produce cotton at 8 to 9 cents a pound but are now selling their cotton for 31 cents.

The people who are not prosperous are the folk on the family-sized farms. They are so unprosperous, in fact, that this Nation is virtually beginning to be divided into two nations. A single statistic tells the story. Per capita farm income has now declined to the level of $860 a year, whereas the per capita income of Americans off the farm now stands at the level of $1922. Farm folks are much less than half as well off as other folk in America.

They then warned, as we all must know, that if this condition persists, farm families will have to pull up their stakes, as the Roman farmers did, and seek better opportunities elsewhere. And they pointed out that there are plenty of signs here in America that this is happening.

They could have cited many more signs than they did. Net farm income has fallen about one-fourth in the past 3 years—from $14.9 billion a year to $10.8 billion a year.

Farm prices have fallen from an index at 267 at the beginning of 1953 to 247 in June of 1956. They hit a GOP low of 223 in December of 1955.

Farmers have been put in a gigantic squeeze by falling prices for their commodities on one side, and continuing high prices for what they have to buy in their production and in their living, on the other side. This squeeze has resulted in a drop in the parity ratio from 95 percent to 80 percent in 3 years.

Farmers are going deeper in debt in an effort to hold on to their land and their way of life.

Farm owners borrowed $2.4 billion on farm mortgage security in 1955, the largest amount since 1923, according to estimates of the Farm Credit Administration, announced June 5, 1956, by T. A. Maxwell, its Deputy Governor and Director of Land Bank Service.

The $2.4 billion estimate was 26 percent more than in 1954 and 219 percent more than the 1937–40 average.

Farmers of West Virginia have been hit by these price drops as much as any other farmers have been. From January of 1953 to June of 1956 they took

the following cuts in grain crops they produce:

	Inauguration, Jan. 15, 1953	Now, June 15, 1956
Rye ..... bushel	$1.75	$1.45
Buckwheat ..... do	1.65	1.45
Corn ..... do	1.76	1.50
Oats ..... do	.95	.85
Barley ..... do	1.38	1.15

Some of our livestock commodities have been hit even harder. About 75 percent of the income of our West Virginia farmers is derived from livestock and livestock products:

	Inauguration, Jan. 15, 1953	Now, June 15, 1956
Milk ..... hundredweight	$5.60	$4.60
Milk cows ..... per head	160.00	115.00
Hogs ..... hundredweight	18.60	16.20
Beef cattle ..... do	19.70	13.30
Calves ..... do	29.10	19.00
Turkeys ..... pound	.39	.29
Chickens ..... do	.24	.20
Eggs ..... dozen	.551	.38

In spite of the fact that prices and income have declined month after month, the administration has failed to take any action. In fact its leaders have frequently preached that prices must come down further. Its leaders have also kept telling farmers that everything was getting better. The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, said a few months after he had taken office—April 7, 1953—that "our analysts anticipate that prices of farm products during the spring and summer will be steady." The parity ratio a few days later fell to 92.

In the summer of 1954—June 30, 1954—a few months after his Department statisticians reported a 4-percent drop in farm prices in 1 month, Benson said:

> It does not indicate a general weakening in the farm price structure.

Six months later the parity ratio had dropped to 86, but Benson said:

> I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling.

Six months later—June 15, 1955—he said:

> I am confident we have seen the worst of the transition which agriculture goes through following every major war.

And 6 months later—January 16, 1956—he said that "a new buoyancy in the market place—and a new hope—a new vigor and zest—can be anticipated and surely it should be reflected promptly in prices and income."

The next official announcement of the parity ratio put it at 81 percent.

This is the same man who said on July 6 of his first year in office:

> I did not become Secretary of Agriculture to stand idly by while farmers suffer from high costs and falling prices.

Yet, today, July 25, 1956, the Washington Post and Times Herald headlines on its front page: "Living-Cost Index Hits Record High."

This reminds me of the two policemen who came upon a knifing victim in an alley. As one officer bent over the prostrate form, the other asked: "Is he really hurt."

"Two of the wounds are fatal," the first officer reported, "but the other one ain't so bad."

The small farmers have received even less help proportionately from this administration than have the big ones. In fact, there are many reasons to believe that this administration regards small farmers as something of a nuisance, something to be gotten rid of so that there will be more of the pie for big farmers.

Secretary Benson had no more than taken his oath of office and installed his top assistants when this attitude became public knowledge. On April 24, 1953, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, told a meeting of farm editors that he felt "it would be better if the marginal farmer got out of farming and into industry." Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John H. Davis told the same meeting, according to the United Press, that "farming today can no longer be considered as a haven for those with less than average ability."

Another Assistant Secretary, Earl L. Butz, told the National Farm and Ranch Congress at Denver in March of 1955:

> Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else. Farming takes capital and managerial capacity (the Denver Record Stockman, March 10, 1955).

Now it is true that the administration claims to be a great friend of the small or low-income farmer. In fact, the President sent Congress a special program to help these farmers early in 1955. Although there was nothing new in his program—it merely collected proposals which have been made for years and emphasized programs already in effect—his recommendations would have helped considerably if only his administration would pursue them vigorously. But the fact is that they went in the opposite direction the administration had been taking for more than 2 years.

In fact, the President put in charge of his new program Under Secretary Morse, whose attitude is less than sympathetic, if not hostile, to the problems of small farmers.

One of the recommendations was additional credit for low-income farmers, but the Administration has gone the opposite direction by at least three policies:

First. The loan funds of the Farmers' Home Administration, which are made available to small farmers only after local bankers are unable to justify loans, were slated for cuts in three successive budgets.

Second. The Administration's very first budget shows a cut of $1.8 million from the Truman budget for FHA administrative funds and its second budget shows a cut of $4.5 million, or 17 percent, from the previous appropriations for this important agency.

Third. The Department of Agriculture boosted interest rates on FHA loans by one-half of 1 percent in 1954. In addition it quietly raised the interest rates on special disaster loans from 3 to 5 percent, but soon after the press discovered this action, Congress forced the Administration to go back to the lower rate.

Small farmers need help but they have never asked for charity. They have repaid their FHA loans ahead of schedule and with interest. They have used Government programs in the past to put a foundation under their operations so that they could be first-class citizens in our rural communities. They need more of this help. Farmers whose operations are so small that they cannot earn a decent standard of living even when prices are high and growing conditions are favorable should be given the opportunity to enlarge their operations. This is why adequate credit is so essential and is also why the "tight money" policy of this Administration has hurt so many small farmers. The pattern of family farming in America must be watched over with great vigilance. It cannot be taken for granted, and it certainly cannot survive the economic wringer through which it is being wrung. It is a vital part of our democracy—economic, educational, spiritual and productive democracy.

To strengthen our family farms is to strengthen our entire Nation and by doing this we are setting an example which will help us win the victory in the battle for men's minds around the world.

NATIONAL BE KIND TO HUMANS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, we have a happy habit in the United States of commemorating an event, or honoring some person, or calling attention to a cause, or a national product, by having a day designated for that purpose. When we exhausted the days, we started on the weeks. I recall, for example, that we have recently celebrated National Irish Linen Week; National Kraut and Frankfurter Week; National Honey for Breakfast Week; National Hillbilly Homecoming Week, and Cat Week.

In fear of running out of weeks, we are starting to designate months, for example, "Clean Oil Month," or without such calendar limitations, "Better Bedding Time." In fact the appropriations subcommmittee on which I serve, is now putting up money for a Geophysical Year, and I look forward to an Interplanetary Decade.

Before we get completely away from the weeks, I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that May 6 to 12 was "Be Kind to Animals Week," and then to pass along to you, and the next Congress, a suggestion I received recently from two very distinguished constitutents of mine.

Both live in Riverside, the county seat of my home county. Both, as I said, are well-known citizens of the United States. I commend the suggestion to you, Mr. Speaker, and I now read the letter, in which it is made:

> The Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILLIPS: At a time when the world and our Nation is involved in many tensions, a thought for the other fel-

low and particularly for the Golden Rule, may help in some relaxation of these tensions.

Therefore, we, the undersigned residents of Riverside County, and of the 29th District in the State of California, having noted the solicitude expressed on occasion by the Congress of the United States and by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in declaring national weeks for special events, industries and organizations, note further that possibly through oversight, no particular observation has been made in regard to the treatment of the individual who lives in the United States by the individual who lives in the United States.

Therefore, we plead that a resolution be framed and submitted to the Congress of the United States, and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will fill the void for a greatly needed observance—a "National Be Kind to Humans Week."

We, especially one of the undersigned, do not deprecate the kindness and consideration which inspired a "National Be Kind to Animals Week." This one undersigned constituent feels that he can only reciprocate by observing a "National Be Kind to Humans Week." This should be a week during which all humans and animals in our country, will be called upon to give special consideration to the human individual—a dog's best friend.

We appreciate the loving thoughts which celebrate "Mothers Day" and "Fathers Day," but there is no set period during which the entire race of mankind is reminded of the Golden Rule, and to "do unto others."

A "National Be Kind to Humans Week" could serve as a reminder to all of us that kindness toward each other can help to make this a better world, and its influence might spread throughout the other weeks in the year.

We hope that you, our Representative, will join in the spirit in which this is sent, and that together, with our fellow-citizens, we can celebrate soon, a "National Be Kind to Humans Week."

Respectfully yours,

LEE DUNCAN.

RIN TIN TIN.

This letter, as you will see when I hold it up, Mr. Speaker, is written from Rancho Rin Tin Tin, Riverside, Calif., and is signed by Rin Tin Tin and by his friend and coworker, Lee Duncan.

On behalf of the Congress, I know you will want me to thank them both for the suggestion. In the final confused and nerveracking days of the session, I can think of nothing more appropriate than a suggestion that we establish a "National Be Kind to Humans Week."

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1957

Mr. PASSMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) on account of death in family.

To Mr. VURSELL indefinitely on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. BAUMHART (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for the balance of week on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEARNEY.

Mr. HINSHAW, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York.

Mr. BONNER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS and to include the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and further to extend his remarks and include an article, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $150.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCARTHY (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Shelley.

Mr. Rivers.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3882. An act to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5712. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto;

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6794. An act to authorize certain members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept and wear decorations, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines;

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate;

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8474. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9547. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 (e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 11636. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish;

H. R. 11696. An act to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska;

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States;

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce;

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 256. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts, owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen;

H. R. 604. An act to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska Highway at the Alaska-Canadian border in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda;

H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of William J. Bohner;

H. R. 1952. An act for the relief of Clarence Christensen;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 2325. An act for the relief of Joseph Santo;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of Emanuel Mathes;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 4127. An act to exempt courses leading to standard college degrees offered by nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning from the provisions of section 227 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 prohibiting the enrollment of eligible veterans under that act when such courses have been in operation for less than 2 years;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Maria Pintos and her daughter, Eugenia Pintos;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 4899. An act for the relief of Helmut Kiestadt;

H. R. 5256. An act to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5488. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, Mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 5881. An act to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects;

H. R. 6081. An act for the relief of Patricia May Stevens;

H. R. 6243. An act to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6247. An act to amend subdivision a of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 6403. An act to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations;

H. R. 7121. An act to validate payments of mileage made to United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 7893. An act to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 8226. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 8265. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply;

H. R. 8617. An act to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service;

H. R. 8940. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Hulah Reservoir to provide water for the city of Bartlesville, Okla.;

H. R. 8971. An act for the relief of Hamazasp Psakian, Mrs. Varsenick Psakian, and Nune Nona Psakian;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of John L. Hughes;

H. R. 9260. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9265. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the audit of government (Territorial and county) accounts;

H. R. 9918. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and execute a contract with the Riverside Irrigation District, Ltd., of Idaho, relating to the rehabilitation of the district's works, and other matters;

H. R. 9947. An act for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine;

H. R. 10088. An act for the relief of Rupert Waltl;

H. R. 10111. An act to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions;

H. R. 10679. An act granting the consent of Congress to the establishment by the States of Mississippi and Arkansas of a bi-State commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 10946. An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the Territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958;

H. R. 10983. An act for the relief of P. R. Cox;

H. R. 11024. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80), as amended by the act of July 12, 1952 (66 Stat. 592, 48 U. S. C. 116a);

H. R. 11254. An act to amend section 104, title 4, United States Code;

H. R. 11653. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11706. An act for the relief of Kim Chung Hi;

H. R. 11861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; and

H. J. Res. 642. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 26, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2078. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to a letter dated August 3, 1955, relating to the cases of Edward (Shou Shrue) Keh, and his wife, Martha Mel Sing Keh, nee Chen, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2079. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to a letter dated January 16, 1956, relating to the case of Chih-jen Tu Aka, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2080. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of operations by Federal departments and establishments in connection with the bonding of officers and employees, pursuant to section 14 (c) of the act of August 9, 1955 (6 U. S. C. 14); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee of conference. S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made (Rept. No. 2906). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 5712. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto (Rept. No. 2907). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 2911). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3941. An act relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period; with amendment (Rept. No. 2912). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11910. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 2913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-third intermediate report on public opinion survey to influence postal rate legislation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities, proceeding against Anne Yasgur Kling; without amendment (Rept. No. 2915). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against John W. Simpson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2916). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against William E.

Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2917). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against George Tyne; without amendment (Rept. No. 2918). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against Elliott Sullivan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2919). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against Peter Seeger; without amendment (Rept. No. 2920). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against Otto Nathan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2921). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Proceeding against Arthur Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 2922). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3436. A bill to provide that sums paid to States from moneys received from national forests may be used for governmental purposes other than for the benefit of public schools and public roads; with amendment (Rept. No. 2924). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10662. A bill creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2927). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House administration. House Resolution 623. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the résumé of bills reported by the Veterans' Affairs Committee during the 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2928). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 629. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 2929). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee of Conference. S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt" (Rept. No. 2930). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of Conference. H. R. 12130. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2931). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10468. A bill creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 641. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 412; a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; without amendment (Rept. No. 2933). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7824. A bill for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai) and Moy Chun Ngan (Edith Moy); with amendment (Rept. No. 2908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9579. A bill for the relief of Nicola Marcello; without amendment (Rept. No. 2909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; without amendment (Rept. No. 2910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9384. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Albi; without amendment (Rept. No. 2925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 9640. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 12405. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the United States of America and the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 12406. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee to the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 12407. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 12409. A bill to extend further the periods during which elections may be made under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 by active members of a uniformed service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 12410. A bill to provide that certain proposed appropriations for the executive branch of the Government shall be determined on an annual accrued expenditure basis; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. J. Res. 699. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the termination of the national emergency proclaimed to exist on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Res. 639. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of national civilian air policy and its enforcement; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the Massachusetts State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 12408. A bill to authorize Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, and the Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, Members of the House of Representatives to accept and wear the award of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana tendered by the Government of the Republic of Italy. Passed House.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 12411. A bill for the relief of the Aurex Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12412. A bill for the relief of the Aurex Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 12413. A bill for the relief of Pak Sung Soo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 12414. A bill for the relief of the estate of Richard Anthony Nunes, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 12415. A bill for the relief of Julia Wei-hsien Wu Chou, David Chou and Teresa Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 12416. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin S. Pecson, his wife Leticia Simpao Pecson, and his children Mary Mediatrix S., Benjamin S., Jr., and Carmelita Cresencia S. Pecson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 12417. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 12418. A bill for the relief of Gisela Ilse Beyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 12419. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth McDevitt, alias Mary McDaid, alias Sister Mary Jerome; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 12420. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Gay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1204. The Speaker presented a petition of Albert P. Russo, national rehabilitation officer, ITAM World War Veterans of the United States, Providence, R. I., urging that no legislation be enacted into law that would put into effect any of the Bradley Commission recommendations which would in any way sever, reduce or endanger existing statutes pertaining to veterans' compensation, pension, or insurance benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Turkey Celebrates 33d Anniversary of the Declaration of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to send greetings to the people of Turkey, President Jelal Bayar, and His Excellency Haydar Gork, Ambassador of Turkey, on the occasion of the celebration of the 33d anniversary of the declaration of the Republic, October 29, 1956.

Turkey has enjoyed uninterrupted independence since the formation of the Ottoman Empire in 1299. Republic Day stands for the Turkish people for what an independence day stands for any free nation. It is a day consecrated to celebrations in remembrance and confirmation of the principles of the Ataturk Revolution, which made the continuation of the independence of Turkey possible and on which the existence, freedom and way of life of modern Turkey is based.

Modern Turkey dates from October 29, 1923, when it formally became a republic with Mustafa Ataturk as its first president. The creation of the new republic marked the birth of the new Turkey. Under the dynamic leadership of Ataturk, a vigorous reform program was started and quick progress was registered in industrialization and modernization of the country. The major aims have been to increase agricultural, raw materials and industrial production; to encourage the investment of domestic and foreign capital and to expand Turkey's export trade to increase the income of the country and to produce goods from indigenous raw materials, thereby saving foreign exchange. Thus, Turkey has set up fine goals for the country. It is trying to turn Turkey from the backward country that it was three decades ago into a modern state equipped to exploit its rich resources so that it can both pay its way in the world and afford a steadily rising standard of living. A great deal has been done in this direction. Turkey's revolution has not been merely a change in government; it has been moving forward the calendar from the ox-cart age to the machine age.

Turkey has been held up as a shining example of how to make a peaceful transition from autocracy to democracy. Justifiably proud of its enormous progress in recent years, Turkey continues to work and plan for even greater economic development in the future. And to assume a climate where peaceful progress can flourish, it fulfills an invaluable role as one of the strongest and most determined partners in the free world's defense force.

In a notoriously troubled region, Turkey is looked upon as a solid bastion against Communist expansion, prepared both to defend its frontiers and to persuade its neighbors to guard their own. This stanch nation, which has made phenomenal strides in its relatively short history as a modern republic, has no delusions about the Communists and their aggressive intentions. "We Turks are proud of our freedom and we are ready to die for our freedom." So reads a sign at the last Turkish station in the foothills of the Caucasus facing the Soviet border—a simple declaration that is amply supported by Turkey's actions as a member of the free world's united defense forces.

Construction of Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement by me in connection with the vote on Senate bill 1333, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The Hells Canyon bill has been killed and the blood is on the hands of the Republican Party and its leader, the President.

This is one time when White House lobbying and pressure was so forcefully used in a feverish attempt to defeat a bill that there is no doubt where the responsibility lies.

Two articles side by side on the front page of yesterday's New York Times show as clearly as anything just what is wrong with the present administration.

The headline of one article said, "White House Bids Senate Bar Dam at Hells Canyon—It Exerts Intensive Pressure To Reject Federal Power Bill."

The headline on the adjoining article read, "President Hears Prospects for His Program Are Slim."

Many Members on this side of the aisle have complained, and rightly, about the lack of Presidential leadership in this administration. If the prospects of the President's program are slim, responsibility must be borne by the White House itself. The kind of leadership which would get a program moving has not been exerted.

Yet in the instance of the bill providing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, all at once we see feverish activity on the part of the White House to defeat it. It is a remarkable thing that when what is at stake is a giveaway and a tremendously costly favor to a private power monopoly, this administration exerts every pressure known to it.

In this connection I call Senators' attention to an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post. It is a brief editorial and goes straight to the point. I quote it:

"The administration reportedly is using its influence to prevent any waivering Republican Senators from voting for the Hells Canyon bill when it comes up this week. Completely apart from the merits of this measure, why is it that the administration, which failed so dismally to prevail on the school construction bill and which has had great difficulty in getting its idea on foreign aid accepted, seems to be able to muster its strongest artillery for the essentially negative purpose of stopping legislation?"

I am glad that these newspapers are letting the people of the Nation know at last the true character of this administration.

Away All Boats—A Tribute to the Motion Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statment in tribute to the motion picture industry and a picture concerning the United States Navy, entitled "Away All Boats," which is a saga of amphibious warfare in the South Pacific in World War II.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON—TRIBUTE TO MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY AND AWAY ALL BOATS

It is good that Americans are reminded from time to time of the great personal sacrifices which have been made by individuals throughout our country's history—sacrifices which have helped to establish and insure the freedoms we enjoy. We do not want to take for granted these contributions to our way of life.

The motion-picture industry of the United States has been notably helpful as an agency of reminder. Through the medium of the screen, in theaters over the land, film producers and exhibitors have frequently brought to our better understanding and appreciation what some of these tremendous sacrifices and patriotic efforts have been.

This type of cooperation is especially important now in view of the imperative need for more men to join the United States Navy. Pictures like Away All Boats, a saga of amphibious warfare in the South Pacific in World War II, should do much to bolster naval recruiting nationwide.

This new motion picture, currently being released, will be seen in Washington. I hope that every one of our citizens has the opportunity to see it. It is certainly one of the most realistic and spectacular film stories

ever photographed. In addition, it should be an inspiration to young and old.

The picture was produced with the cooperation of the Department of Defense and the Navy, and reflects credit on our Armed Forces.

Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, Chief of Information, of the United States Navy, has this to say of the picture: "Away All Boats, one of the great stories of World War II, is not only highly entertaining, but inspirational to a degree which places it among the finest motion pictures about the services."

Carl Sandburg, who might be called "Dean" among contemporary American writers, has this to say about Away All Boats: (It) * * * "is one of the best sea stories ever done, giving wonderful personality to a ship that has rare and strange adventures, bringing into fine focus the vivid human character of the ship."

The motion-picture industry is to be commended for its magnificent accomplishments in portraying stories of heroism and courage as they are reflected in momentous epochs of our Nation's growth and development. Away All Boats is such an achievement. I want to congratulate Universal-International, the film studio which made it. I want to pay special tribute to the producer, Howard Christie; president of Universal-International, Milton Raekhil; and to the director of the picture, Joseph Pevney; and particularly to the fine cast of players of Away All Boats, headed by Jeff Chandler, George Nader, Julie Adams, and Lex Barker.

Nor do I want to overlook the author of the best seller, from which the screen play was taken—Kenneth M. Dodson. Mr. Dodson's book has been transferred to the screen with dynamic grandeur. He should be as proud of the outcome as Americans should be thrilled to see the film version of Away All Boats.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Fourth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to bring to the attention of the House Members that today the people of Puerto Rico are celebrating the fourth anniversary of the inauguration of their Commonwealth.

Exactly 4 years ago, that the Commonwealth came into being. Fifty-eight years ago, on this date, the Armed Forces of the United States landed in Puerto Rico. The message of freedom our troops carried to the Puerto Rican people came to full fruition on the 25th of July of 1952. Thus Puerto Ricans became a self-governing, free people, constituted by themselves into a sovereign body politic, associated with the United States in accordance with the terms of a compact which the Congress had offered them and which they freely accepted.

The relationships now existing between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States are firmly established, because they have for their foundation the basic concept of freedom—of free determination. That this was the desire of the people of Puerto Rico can well be pointed to as one of the outstanding examples of how the principles upon which our institutions are based, when properly nurtured to a people, no matter what their previous political allegiances might have been, develop and fructify in any climate.

For since the founding of Puerto Rico by Juan Ponce de Leon in 1508, to 1898, when Puerto Rico was separated from its allegiance to the Spanish Crown, they had lived under monarchical institutions. They had attained a certain development but they had developed, also, a quest for freedom, which they considered could be attained only within the democratic institutions which had become the creed of the New World. Puerto Rico felt that it belonged in the New World not only geographically but politically and spiritually.

Being a small island with very difficult problems, lacking natural resources and having a very dense population, they have not sought to navigate by themselves over the troubled waters of international life, and their association to the United States for the 54 years previous to the creation of the Commonwealth, had developed in them a profound sense of solidarity with the people of the mainland. Since 1917 they were invested with United States citizenship. Thus, they proposed to Congress a new type of political unit within our system. The Congress in turn offered them the terms under which it could be accomplished. They accepted the terms and the Commonwealth was thereby born.

We should rejoice that the Commonwealth has been a success. We should take pride in the accomplishments of the people of Puerto Rico which must be viewed as being also our own accomplishments.

Dues for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the plan for campaign financing initiated by the Democratic Party of Lancaster County, Pa., under the chairmanship of Dr. David R. Eaby.

This plan, called "Dues for Democracy," is one method for obtaining the funds necessary for political campaigns in times when the costs are continually rising. It obviates the obligations that may arise from the acceptance of single large contributions.

Five envelopes, with a covering letter, are sent out to large numbers of people. The people are asked to keep the envelopes carefully at hand, and at the first of each month to enclose a single dollar bill in one of the envelopes and mail it back to the Democratic Party when the regular monthly bills are being paid.

In this manner a total contribution of $5 is made to good political activity in a relatively painless fashion.

The success of the early returns from this plan indicates that it might well be duplicated elsewhere. The Democrats of Lancaster County are to be congratulated on their plan for financing political activity in the best democratic spirit.

Iran Celebrates the Birthday of the Shah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Congress will not be in session when Iran celebrates the birthday anniversary of the Shah on October 26, 1956, hence, I wish to take this opportunity to send greetings to His Imperial Majesty Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi Shah-In-Shah in honor of this event.

Iran, usually known in Europe as Persia, has many thousands of years of recorded history, and museums of great cities the world over hold many relics that bear witness to her glorious past. Since early times, Iran has been both victor and vanquished, but it has always succeeded in maintaining its culture, traditions, and customs. In addition, it has also greatly influenced the invaders with its own high civilization.

Iran has made noteworthy contributions to world culture. Iranian artists and master craftsmen have produced superior examples of paintings, carpets, brocades, mosaics, ceramics, to mention only a few areas of achievement. Persian literature and philosophy has throughout the centuries enriched the minds of great writers and thinkers the world over.

In the past two decades Iran has been making steady progress in its economic affairs. During this period, substantial advances have been made in modernization and public works throughout the country. The government is aware of the towering economic problems confronting the nation and is exerting great effort toward seeking methods of improving all sectors of the Iranian economy. In its program of economic development Iran is placing major emphasis on agriculture, industry, development of mineral resources, expanding commercial activities, increasing exports, with the objective of raising the standard of living of the people.

Another major factor in the improvement of the country's economy has been the cooperation extended through the United Nations and the United States

technical assistance programs which have been operating in Iran.

Spokesmen for Iran sum up her hopes and aspirations thusly:

As the basis for the progress of the nation has been laid, Iran looks toward the future with optimism. Iran seeks only peace and friendship with the rest of the world and the opportunity to provide a greater measure of well-being for all its inhabitants.

No more laudable policy could serve as the guide for any nation.

Live Musical Programs of the National Broadcasting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on the live musical programs of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

On Monday morning, July 30, 1956, the National Broadcasting Co. will initiate a new daily radio network program which will present the Nation's outstanding popular orchestras in 2 hours of "live" musical entertainment. This program, which will be titled the "NBC Bandstand," will be broadcast through the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., and its affiliated stations and will reach virtually every home in the Nation.

This program deserves our attention I think, not only because of the magnitude of its conception, but because it is "live"—that is to say, the music is transmitted directly to listeners at the very instant it is played by the musicians. Moreover, the Nation's foremost bandleaders will be in personal touch with the listeners during the show. Such a presentation, in this age of recorded sound, should serve to stimulate and heighten interest in the popular music which is so much a part of our heritage.

The National Broadcasting Co.'s inauguration of NBC Bandstand and the consequent return of the "live" band to the radio network after years of transcriptions and recordings is particularly noteworthy because of the sensational interest it has created among the leaders in the world of music. NBC Bandstand has the enthusiastic support and backing of the American Federation of Musicians, James E. Petrillo, president; the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Broadcast Music, Inc.; as well as leading music publishers and musicians everywhere.

This is true Americana. Popular music has been woven into the fabric of life in this country ever since the days of the American Revolution, when the fifes and the drums of the Continental Army struck up the tune of Yankee Doodle. Down through history, we have always found songs to celebrate our victories, mourn our losses and mark the stages of our growth across the continent. Songs like Tenting Tonight, Over There, Home on the Range—all these and many more call up memories of the Nation's past.

In the same way, popular music has served to strengthen and preserve our distinctive regional cultures. The chanties that were sung by our seafaring men can still be heard today, and so can the immortal melodies of Stephen Foster, the songs of the prairies and the ballads of the mountains. Only in recent years, have we begun to appreciate the value of this vast body of music and now we see our musical scholars laboring to collect and preserve such songs lest they be lost forever.

Serious students and critics of popular music seldom give it much attention until it has ceased to be popular. So it is that today we read learned critiques of the same jazz music that was at the height of its popularity 30 or 40 years ago. It has taken about the same length of time for jazz to reach beyond the United States and make itself known in other countries. Today jazz can be heard everywhere outside the Iron Curtain and it has made us millions of friends.

In recognition of the vitality of popular music as a part of our history and culture, I consider the NBC Bandstand an important new landmark in American entertainment.

Col. George W. Combs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in Washington, the news capital of the world, it is not easy for one reporter to win distinctions that cause him to stand out among his fellows. But such a reporter is Col. George W. Combs. As an example of the esteem in which he is held by his friendly competitors, he has been elected treasurer of the National Press Club 14 times, establishing a record in the 48-year history of journalism's largest professional organization. This distinction is illuminated by the fact that he has never sought the office; he has been drafted each year for the past 14.

On Freedom of Press Day last year, the Press Club unveiled its first official flag at ceremonies here. Casting about for a fitting speaker, one who symbolized the things for which the day and emblem stood, the newsmen selected Colonel Combs.

He spoke briefly, but his talk was a stirring affirmation of the constitutional right of the people to have the news reported accurately, fairly and fearlessly. His admonition to the press to preserve and protect that right might well be a text for today's schools of journalism, yet they came out of nearly half a century of practice, the fruit of a good newspaperman's life.

I had long been told of the legend of Colonel Combs and had been a faithful reader of his stories, and his column "Maryland in Congress," which always kept Maryland citizens abreast of all legislation of interest to our State. Following my election to Congress, it was my privilege to learn firsthand of his devotion to his work, and the way in which he regularly visited the Members of the Maryland delegation to discuss their activities on a personal basis.

It was with real regret that I learned of the Colonel's decision to retire. He will be greatly missed.

Under his guidance several of the newer recruits of the Washington Bureau of the Sun have learned the intricacies of covering Capitol Hill. The Colonel can retire with the confidence that these reporters will perpetuate the great traditions that George Combs established.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today is the fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning this achievement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON
COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

My responsibilities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs must of necessity keep my attention focused on the development of the off-shore areas within the political jurisdiction of the United States, whatever their present political status.

Today, I am happy to call attention to one of those areas whose present political status represents clear proof that our constitutional system will always offer the right solution to whatever problems of a political nature may arise under our flag. This is illustrated in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Fifty-eight years ago, to this day, the military forces of the United States landed in Puerto Rico as an incident in the Spanish-American War. The Spanish-American War was a war of liberation: Three years after the Treaty of Paris was signed, Cuba became an independent republic. In 1946, the Philippines became an independent republic. In 1952, Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth, voluntarily associated to the United States. The Congress in each instance has done for the peoples of these islands or groups of islands exactly what their people wished and had struggled for within the framework of the Spanish monarchy from which they were separated under the terms of the Treaty of Paris of 1899.

Before the Commonwealth, Puerto Rico was termed a possession of the United States. The people, gradually, under successive acts of Congress, assumed more and more responsibility in the conduct of their own affairs. Since 1900, Puerto Rico and the United States have lived in economic union. In 1917, the citizens of Puerto Rico were vested with United States citizenship. This created a fundamental link between the islanders and the mainlanders. In 1950, the Congress, recognizing the full political maturity attained by the people of Puerto Rico, offered them a compact embodied in Public Law 600, 81st Congress. Under the compact, the people of Puerto Rico were to adopt their own constitution. The relationships to exist between the new body politic and the United

States were embodied in what is known as the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act.

Overwhelmingly the people of Puerto Rico accepted the terms of compact and within its framework created their Commonwealth. Congress ratified the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The Commonwealth is now a fait accompli. It has been for 4 years. Today the people of Puerto Rico celebrate the fourth anniversary of their Commonwealth. I think we must congratulate them for their achievement. I think we should be proud of their achievements. The people of Puerto Rico have now as much control over their own political life as the people of any State of the Union. With few exceptions, the laws of the United States apply in Puerto Rico equally as if Puerto Rico were a member State of the Union.

The Commonwealth is indeed unique in our political system. The Spanish language lacking one word which would be the exact equivalent of Commonwealth, the Puerto Ricans call themselves an "Estado Libre Asociado". Retranslated into English this would mean a "Free Associated State". This is indeed a true description of their status. They have not been admitted into the Union, but they are associated to the Union, in a manner compatible with its Federal nature. And thus, in spite of distance, in spite of dissimilar historical origins and cultures, a firm bond of common loyalties and allegiances between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States has been established and consecrated. Thus we practice what we preach in advocating freedom for all peoples. I believe it fitting to bring these facts to the attention of the Senate. I believe that the fact that Puerto Rico has so uneventfully attained the political status of its people's wishes, that they are enjoying freedom in security in association with the United States, cannot but help cement the sentiments of solidarity and cooperation so necessary for the entire Western Hemisphere in its determination to maintain these lands, presented to mankind by the genius of Columbus, as the bulwark of freedom, democracy, and peace, lands hallowed by free peoples who base their political principles in the unswerving respect for the dignity of man.

Iraq Celebrates 24th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of independence of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Congress will not be in session when Iraq celebrates her 24th anniversary of independence on October 3, 1956, hence, I wish to take this opportunity today to salute the people of Iraq, His Majesty King Faisal I, and His Excellency Moussa Al-Shabandar, Ambassador of Iraq, in honor of this occasion.

The day Iraq was admitted to the League of Nations as a full-fledged and sovereign member, October 3, 1932, marked the beginning of her era of independence. The Iraqis political background before that momentous event tells the familiar story of imperialism and colonialism. In the words of Mr. Adnan Pachachi, Secretary of the Embassy of Iraq:

Prior to the first World War Iraq was an integral part of the Ottoman Empire. As a result of the war and the disintegration of that Empire Iraq was placed under British mandate in accordance with article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Iraqis who had hoped to gain independence after the overthrow of Ottoman rule were naturally disappointed with the arrangement and revolted in 1920. As a result of that revolt the British Government * * * agreed to the establishment of an national government with a wide measure of local autonomy. However, through negotiations lasting 9 years, Iraq, under the wise guidance of His Majesty King Faisal I, was able to terminate the mandate and gain for it full independence. In 1930 a treaty of friendship and alliance was concluded by which the British Government recognized the independence and sovereignty of Iraq and undertook to sponsor its application for membership in the League of Nations. When the Assembly of the League unanimously approved the admission of Iraq on October 3, 1932, Iraq became a fully independent and sovereign nation.

Since independence, the people of Iraq have continually devoted considerable efforts in the complex area of economic development with a view toward bettering conditions and raising living standards. In this connection, a generous portion of the Nation's revenues has been earmarked for economic improvement, new irrigation canals and ditches have been built; thousands of pumps have been installed along the riverbanks to supply water to the adjacent lowland. However, much remains to be done and other long term projects are planned which will eventually raise the level of living of the people.

The Great Circle Route to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1955, the California delegation, comprising 30 Members of the Congress, instructed a subcommittee to draw up its statement of position of the California delegation concerning its great interest in the Great Circle Route case. Following is the complete statement:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: No doubt you have examined the Pacific from a global viewpoint and are well aware of the fact that a great circle embraces in one hemisphere the entire Pacific Ocean and Antarctica, and in the remaining hemisphere lies most of the land mass of the world. On that great circle are Singapore, Taipei, Tokyo, Dutch Harbor, San Francisco and Los Angeles, Lima and Buenos Aires. The shortest route from Panama to Manila skirts the Bering Sea. It is to great circles that we must look for our air commerce routes, and that particular great circle connects our Pacific port cities with those of the Orient and Latin America.

That is why some days ago the Members of Congress representing the State of California met and unanimously agreed that we should present to you our considered judgment that the sound economic development of our State requires that the restrictions on Pan American World Airways' trans-Pacific route be not reimposed so that it may operate between our Pacific ports and the Orient over the great circle route.

We in California believe that with the great new long-range aircraft, we should have an opportunity to fly directly on the great circle route to the Orient and not be obliged, as we now are, to travel a needless and time-consuming extra 1,238 miles over the central Pacific. This is not only an unnecessary imposition upon people in California, but constitutes a heavy burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation when they are required to pay for the subsidy needed when passengers and mail are carried over the longer central Pacific route.

We are concerned with any further delay that would be incurred by a needless continuance of the restrictions which in their last temporary certificates, now up for review, prevented Pan American from operating a service between Tokyo, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, and on to Latin America. Such an operation would provide a service over the direct route from Japan to the United States, connecting in California with established American-flag service to Latin America. The Canadians are now operating a competing route from the Orient over the Great Circle to Vancouver and on to Latin America. Routes connecting the Orient with Latin America over the Great Circle are important world trade routes with all of the economic, political, and military considerations which are involved. We in California feel strongly that we should have a competitive American-flag service.

In your letter to Acting Chairman Gurney of the Civil Aeronautics Board of February 1, 1955, you said, "I desire to hold in abeyance my decision concerning the use of the Great Circle route by Pan American pending further study and later report on the economic and technical feasibility and the military and foreign policy implications of nonstop service between the west coast and the Orient."

In view of the wide interest of California in this matter and the broad national interest considerations which are involved, the California congressional delegation met and authorized the undersigned subcommittee respectfully to urge that you reach a decision which will permit Pan American to fly the entire Great Circle above described, which she has long been prepared to do. Obviously, fair play dictates that the permission extend for the same 7-year period which you recently fixed in renewing Northwest's Pacific certificate.

Respectfully yours,
CARL HINSHAW,
Chairman, the California Delegation.
CECIL KING,
JOHN SHELLEY,
WILLIAM MAILLIARD,
CHARLES TEAGUE,
Subcommittee Members.

Mr. Speaker, I am now in receipt of a telegram from Mr. A. O. Beckman, president, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., supporting the

view of the California delegation, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 24, 1956.*

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building:

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce recently actively participated in Civil Aeronautics Board Docket No. 5031, known as the reopened Transpacific Certificate Renewal case. The proceeding was reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the direction of the President of the United States to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the great circle route to the Orient. Pan American inaugurated air service across the Pacific to the Orient from California Gateways in 1935 and has provided service since that time. However, Pan American was and has been denied the right to use the Great Circle route to the Orient even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter to Tokyo via that route. Present route restrictions require Pan American's Tokyo service from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island en route. These mandatory circuitous routings have caused many passengers who would logically be routed through California Gateways to choose other more direct routes. Carriers not serving California Gateways advertise this fact and thereby attract additional traffic away from California Gateways.

The California businessman is already at a considerable disadvantage with his competitors for the Japanese and Chinese markets because of great distances involved. Certification of Pan American to serve Tokyo via the great circle route will considerably offset these handicaps. In another docket No. 7725 presently before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Northwest Airlines, who are presently certificated to fly the Great Circle route to the Orient from Seattle have applied for permanent authority to serve this route. We take no position as to whether this application should be granted or denied. However, we feel that if a decision is now to be made as to the permanency of the certificate for service to Tokyo from the west coast, there is no question but that Pan American who has been serving the west coast to Orient traffic for over 21 years should be given at least equal consideration along with Northwest. Failure to grant Pan American the Great Circle route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted to any other carrier would be manifestly unjust to Pan American and the west coast Gateways it serves. The matter of subsidy is not involved in either proceeding, since both Pan American and Northwest Airlines have been free of subsidy in the Pacific operations during and since 1955. However, if present routing restrictions are not lifted and if Pan American is not permitted to fly the shorter great circle route from California Gateways via Portland and Seattle to the Orient it does not appear that they will be able to remain in a competitive position and stay off subsidy. Tokyo at present occupies the dominant position as the gateway to the Orient. Over 50 percent of the total United States-Orient traffic is generated by Japan. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through California Gateways. It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification should be given to the primary Gateways and the carrier handling the traffic, in this instance Pan American. The Civil Aeronautics Board should give favorable consideration toward the permanent certification of this much needed more expeditious air route between California Gateways and the Orient which has already been established as convenient and necessary to the public.

A. O. BECKMAN,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

A Disgrace to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about discrimination against the colored people in the South. Always somebody claims that this kind of information hurts our cause in Europe. Further, they point to the fact that there is joy in Russia when information like this is broadcast to the world.

I wonder what these same people have to say when they read in the public press of the raping of a white girl by seven Negro soldiers in Bamberg, Germany. This kind of information does bring joy in Russia. Incidents of this kind, more than anything else, have caused us to lose more good will in Germany and the remainder of Europe, than all the incidents in America combined.

Mr. Speaker, to point out this fact I enclose newspaper articles on this subject. To be certain that the incident I have in mind cannot be questioned I have verified the newspaper reports, and I enclose herewith a letter from the Department of the Army, confirmed by the Department of State, to the effect that the raping of the white girl in Bamberg, Germany, was committed by seven Negro soldiers, whose names are included in the letter from the representative of the Department of the Army, dated July 23, 1956.

This incident has not appeared in any Washington paper, so far as I have been able to ascertain. I wonder why?

SEVEN SOLDIERS HELD IN ASSAULT CASE AT GERMAN CITY

BAMBERG, GERMANY, July 14.—United States Army commanders here promised today to do all they can to improve German-American relations, despite a wave of local German anger at GI's.

The Bamberg City Council Thursday demanded the withdrawal of American troops stationed here after the alleged criminal assault of a 15-year-old girl by seven American Negro soldiers.

The soldiers, all members of the United States 85th Infantry Regiment which came here last November from Fort Riley, Kans., have been arrested on formal assault charges.

GERMANS ANGRY AFTER SEVEN GI'S RAPE SCHOOLGIRL, 15

BAMBERG, GERMANY, July 13.—United States Army commanders moved quickly today to patch up strained relations with local authorities after the Bamberg City Council last night called for withdrawal of American troops from this Bavarian city.

The unprecedented demand was sparked by the alleged raping of a 15-year-old schoolgirl by seven American soldiers. Formal charges against the 7 were filed yesterday, less than 72 hours after the alleged assaults occurred.

United States 10th Infantry Division commander, Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, came here today to make a personal investigation of the case. He met Bamberg Mayor Luitpold Weegmann to inform him of the Army's action in the case.

The Bamberg City Council also decided last night to limit official German-American relations here to the "minimum necessary" and ordered American soldiers barred from the biggest outdoor swimming pool because they were "causing a public nuisance."

Army officials seemed taken aback by the city council resolution. It was the most vehement protest in a barrage of criticism by local authorities and the West German press against what the Germans claim is an increase in Allied—and in particular American—indignities. The United States Army has denied there is any upward trend in the number of incidents involving GI's, but added that it is "not standing on statistics."

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of July 17, 1956]

DISGRACE TO UNITED STATES

People of Bamberg, Germany, are incensed at the gang-raping of a 15-year-old girl by seven American soldiers. It is not difficult for us to sympathize with the fury of those townspeople.

Through insistent questioning the News and Courier has learned from the Associated Press that the seven United States soldiers are Negroes. The continued stationing of an army of occupation 11 years after the end of a war is irritating enough to a proud people. (The South bore Reconstruction the same length of time.) The assignment of Negro troops to an all white country is an additional affront. When the troops—of any race or color—behave like criminals, our country is degraded.

As to supplying Communist propaganda—a charge often hurled at Southerners who defend segregation—what couldn't the Communists do with the Bamberg story?

JULY 18, 1956.

Lt. Gen. WALTER L. WEIBLE,
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.:

Advise me today if seven United States soldiers of the United States Army accused of raping 15-year-old girl in Bamberg, Germany, were white or colored.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: In further reply to your telephonic inquiry of July 20 regarding the incident in Bamberg, Germany, involving seven American soldiers, I am able to furnish the following information.

On July 9, 1956, in the vicinity of Armeestrasse, Bamberg, a German National, Erika Loos, born: October 1, 1940, allegedly was assaulted and raped by seven American soldiers. The soldiers accosted her while she was walking in a wooded area near Armeestrasse in company of a German national, Wilfried Pillukat, age 23 years.

The following soldiers are involved in this case: Pfc. Edward L. Brown, RA12472599, age, 18 years; Pfc. James E. Wilson, Jr., RA13529546, age, 18 years; Pvt. Raymond L. Kasey, RA13518257, age, 18 years; Clifton Franks, RA17428325, age, 20 years; Pvt. James Gordon, RA53193867, age, 23 years; Melton S. Carter, RA13347072, age 24 years; and Pfc. Fred R. Chandler, RA17440356, age, 21 years. All of these soldiers are assigned to Company H, 85th Infantry Regiment, APO 139, and, as you were previously advised, all soldiers involved in the incident were Negroid.

Preliminary investigation indicates that one soldier did not actively participate in the crime, but was present throughout the time the offense was committed. Another soldier attempted rape but did not accomplish the act. On July 11, 1956, all soldiers were charged with violation of article 120 (rape),

Manual for Courts-Martial, 1951. All soldiers are now confined in the provisional guardhouse, Nuremberg subarea, APO 696, pending completion of a full investigation and probable trial by general court-martial.

I trust that this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

LEWIS F. SHULL,
Lieutenant Colonel, GS; Deputy Chief, Liaison Division.

A Fishy Shipping Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letter:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 24, 1956]

A FISHY SHIPPING BILL

Senators who watch the public purse ought to guard against a last-minute effort to slip through a new giveaway in the form of a shipping trade-in bill. This bill purports to encourage coastwise shipping operators to trade in old vessels to the Government at world market prices so as to promote the construction of new tankers. In the process it would confer a wholly unwarranted windfall on some operators. It would commit the Government, for example, to buy some 35 tankers from the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp. at $1,600,000 each even though the company purchased these self-same tankers from the Government 9 years ago for approximately $960,000 apiece.

Surely it is not necessary to permit artificial enhancement of this sort in order to encourage new ship construction. This is precisely the problem that dogged the Government after World War II and led to some messy scandals. World market values can hardly be a valid criterion for ships acquired from the Government at low prices, in this instance Pan-Atlantic, after using the depreciation tankers for nearly 9 years, would end by getting back nearly twice what it paid for them. Other shipping operators, some of them enjoying operating subsidies, would benefit in similar fashion. Such brazen invitations to raids on the Treasury tend to discredit worthwhile efforts to modernize the merchant marine.

The House passed the Bonner bill on the unanimous calendar after a slippery maneuver that brought the measure up when few members were on the floor. Courageous opposition led by Representative ZELENKO previously had prevented approval. In the upper House Senator WILLIAMS has fought the bill vigorously, and he ought to be joined by others who see the bad precedent it would set. Obviously the bill would be a wonderful bargain for the shipping companies, but for the taxpayers it would be no bargain at all.

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington D. C., July 24, 1956.

Mr. ROBERT H. ESTABROOK,
Editorial Page Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ESTABROOK: I have read with interest the editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning, A Fishy Shipping Bill.

I never inject myself in the editorial policy of the papers, yet I do think papers should be careful in the slanting of their editorials, and in the correctness of the facts on which they are based. Evidently the writer of this editorial did not take occasion to read the bill itself, the report, or the hearings.

The fact of the matter is that over the past 18 months of this Congress the Merchant Marine Committee has held many days of hearings, examining every phase of merchant shipping, in an effort to find ways and means of getting new ideas and new life into water transportation. The inability of domestic shipping to revive or even survive with traditional methods of cargo handling and traditional ships was painfully evident from all of the testimony. The Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp. is one of the first existing operators to develop a workable proposal. In fact, in my 16 years as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives, this company is one of the few that has advanced a new idea in coastwise waterborne commerce.

The bill would authorize the charter of war-built T–2 tankers from the Reserve Fleet under 5-year firm charters at a rate based on the current going rate of charter hire for charters of that duration. The charter period would begin with the delivery to the charterer of each pair of tankers by the Government. The charterer would be obliged to build on each tanker, at his own expense, a new superdeck, costing approximately $200,000 each, in order to fit the vessel to carry trailer bodies full of dry cargo. The deck installation would have to be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of Commerce and by the Secretary of the Navy. At the expiration of the charter and the return of the converted tanker, in class, to the reserve fleet, the superdeck would remain on the vessel and be the property of the Government. The idea of fitting superdecks on tankers was employed with tremendous success in World War II, to permit the carriage of fully assembled aircraft and other vital military supplies overseas to the war zones. The Navy strongly endorsed the proposed type of conversion, and testified that in such case the tankers would be more valuable at the expiration of the charter period than they are at the present time.

In addition, at the time of receiving delivery of each pair of tankers under charter, two C–2 dry-cargo vessels would be traded in to the Government for an allowance of credit to be applied against the cost of construction of one completely modern, high-speed, 32,000-ton combination cargo-tanker ship of not less than 18 knots speed. The superdeck, speed, and size of the new combination ships to be built were strongly endorsed by the Department of Defense. The program for delivery to the operator of the chartered tankers in pairs and the trade-in to the Government of the dry-cargo vessels in pairs would run concurrently. Thus, any default by the operator in carrying out his obligations to proceed with the desirable new construction would mean forfeiture of the valuable trade-in vessels.

The bill provides an allowance for the value of the traded-in C–2 dry cargo vessels of an amount equal to whatever the world market value might be on the day of trade-in, to be applied directly to the building of the new vessels. The payment would be made directly by the Government to the shipyard.

In the event of enactment of the legislation, Pan-Atlantic's program contemplates charter of 20 Government-owned tankers, the trade-in of 20 12- to 14-year-old C–2 type dry cargo vessels, and the construction of 10 new cargo-tank ship vessels.

In order to achieve its purposes, the bill provides that the entire program must be started within 2 years from date of enactment. The authority of the bill is available to any operator who can meet its conditions.

I might call to your attention that the C-type vessels, of which the C–2's are one class, were the best and most modern dry-cargo vessels built in the World War II program. It was testified that the acquisition by the Government of these vessels would up-grade the Reserve Fleet, and that they are far too valuable for national emergency reserve purposes to be permitted to be sold foreign.

When this proposal was made I directed the committee staff, along with the attorney for Pan-Atlantic, to collaborate with the Maritime Administration in drawing up a bill to be submitted to the committee, which bill I introduced. The Maritime Administration objected to the fixed charter and the fixed allowance for the traded-in dry-cargo vessels. The committee felt that the charter rate for this length of time was fair. Under present law, the Department of Commerce has authority to allow the foreign value for traded-in vessels, which price was therefore fixed in this bill as being fair to the operator if the Government denies him the right to dispose of his property to his best financial advantage.

Now, with respect to the procedure in the House, this bill was placed on the Consent Calendar. It was objected to. I announced that I would go to the Rules Committee for a rule, which I did the afternoon after the Consent Calendar was called. Later the Rules Committee called us for a hearing on the application for a rule. We were before the committee 2 days. The bill, as usual, remained on the Consent Calendar. I was called out of town because of the death of a very close friend. When I returned to the House, the Consent Calendar was being called, and this bill had been called and passed, without objection, before I reached the floor. Had I been present, I would have brought to the attention of the House that a rule had been requested, but I would not have objected to the bill, because I have utmost confidence and faith in its fairness and its constructive purposes.

Finally, I wish to call to your attention that there is no provision in the bill whatsoever which would, as your editorial reads, "commit the Government, for example, to buy some 35 tankers from the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp. at $1,600,000 each."

A copy of the bill and report are enclosed.

With assurance of my high esteem.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

Cambodia Celebrates Its Third Anniversary of Independence November 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference.

Because the House of Representatives will not be in session at the time of the

event, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the people of Cambodia, His Excellency Khim Tit, Premier of Cambodia, and His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador of Cambodia on the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of independence of Cambodia, November 9, 1956.

On November 9, 1953, Cambodia achieved real and complete independence. That was the date when the French Government turned over to His Majesty Norodom Sihanouk, former king of Cambodia, effective command of the National Army and full military power throughout the kingdom. At the same time it granted the Royal Cambodian Government full political, economic, financial, diplomatic, and judicial powers as well as control of the police.

At the end of World War II. King Sihanouk succeeded in getting France to renounce its protectorate over Cambodia. On January 7, 1946, a modus vivendi was signed giving Cambodia a certain measure of autonomy. Three years later a new agreement was signed on November 8, 1949, which recognized Cambodia as an independent state associated with France in the French Union. This independence was nonetheless too theoretical, since much of the power and many services were still in French hands.

During the same period King Sihanouk set in motion the transformation of the absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy and the creation of a unicameral legislature elected by universal adult male suffrage. A constitution was promulgated on May 6, 1947.

In June 1952, anxious to give his people and his country real freedom, the King decided to take the powers of government into his own hands and to engage in an all-out campaign for full independence. The open defiance of the French by King Norodom echoed far beyond the confines of Cambodia.

The main theme for the campaign, later called the Crusade for Independence, was that to be able to ask the Cambodian people to fight the Communist menace, it was necessary to grant them complete liberty, to give them courage and a reason for fighting. The people would have no incentive to sacrifice and die, only to see their country still dominated by a foreign power.

In the words of His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador of Cambodia:

His Majesty then initiated negotiations with France. These talks were long and difficult. The King himself traveled to the United States, Japan and Thailand in an attempt to draw world attention to the indomitable will for liberty which the Cambodian people were displaying. This liberty was a primary condition for uniting the nation to defend itself against Communism.

At the end of almost 2 years of constant effort, on November 9, 1953, Cambodia obtained full and true independence. It was this independence that permitted King Norodom Sihanouk to unite his people under the banner of the battle for independence and against the menace of Communist invasion. It gave them the will to defend their liberty and the determination to repulse an overt Communist attack in June 1954. It gave them the courage and incentive, in international diplomacy, to negotiate on equal footing with the Communist powers concerning the armistice agreement of Geneva (July 21, 1954).

Only a year before energetic King Sihanouk succeeded in achieving complete freedom from the yoke of colonialism for his kingdom. He was not prepared, therefore, to see the newly won independence bargained away at Geneva. It was a David and Goliath scene as Cambodia stood its ground. At Geneva the Cambodian delegation was the only one to obtain advantageous concessions for its country.

Only by granting full independence to the Asiatic peoples can the Communists be deprived of the contention that they are liberating those peoples from colonial rule. Full sovereignty for all people is the only way to rally them at this hour to the cause of the West and to persuade them that it is in their own interests to fight to the death against the Communists.

As Cambodia approaches a new year of national life it is my hope that she will continue to maintain her independence and I sincerely wish for her peace and prosperity.

Cumberland University, Famed Tennessee Law School, Continues To Serve the Nation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include the reproduction of an article written by Mr. Hugh Walker which appeared in the July 22, 1956 edition of the Nashville Tennessean magazine concerning Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Cumberland University for more than 100 years has produced outstanding leaders in this Nation. Many of these leaders have served in Congress and several are serving at the present time. Friends and former students of this great institution will be pleased to learn that while the celebrated law school at Cumberland University will continue to function in its traditional manner, the literary department of the school will be reopened in the fall semester.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further request that there be reproduced in connection with this article, so that the articles appear jointly, another article which appeared on March 28, 1949, outlining the first century of progress of Cumberland University.

The articles follow:

CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY

(By Hugh Walker)

Like painted clocks and watches everywhere, the clock in the tower of Memorial Hall at Cumberland University says its 18 minutes past 8.

Some say those painted faces mark that tragic moment in history, back in 1865, when Abraham Lincoln died. Others contend it is the time of day when the hands are in balance on the dial, and best display the name of the watchmaker.

Be that as it may, the people of Lebanon tell you the big clock tells the wrong time of day.

They are sure that it's just before the dawn at Cumberland.

In September, they're going to reopen the "lit school," more formally known as the school of arts and sciences.

There is a feeling of happy anticipation in Lebanon now that the historic old school "on the city's western border" will again open her doors, offering a liberal arts education to boys and girls of middle Tennessee.

"Folks here in Lebanon have always been proud of their university," Allison Humphreys, Jr., a Cumberland graduate whose law career has carried him to assistant attorney general of Tennessee, said last week. "They are proud of the culture it created, the scholars it graduated, the growl of the big red Bulldog on the football field."

Now, through a happy marriage of town and gown, the people of Lebanon and Cumberland's administrators are shaping a future for the school they believe will be bright.

Only through the continued operation of the university law school has Cumberland retained unbroken her link with the past. During the 5 years that the School of Arts and Sciences has been closed, the law school has never missed a class. Attendance has been small—but regular.

Now the university (it once had many schools) will reopen with the freshman class of a 2-year college, offering courses in secretarial science, English, languages, physical education, mathematics and science, biology, chemistry, music, voice, and religion.

Thirty students have already signed for the freshman class—and school officials are hoping for a round hundred. Scholarships given by Lebanon firms, clubs, and individuals are expected to swell the total.

Out on the campus, during the hot summer days, there is a growing sense of expectancy, of a long-worked-for event about to happen.

The catalog is printed. The classrooms with their tall windows and old-fashioned desks, are painted and clean. The grass is freshly cut.

Equipment in the new cafeteria is gleaming and ready for use. In the library long rows of carefully dusted books await the student who would "explore the frontiers of man's achievement."

The new president, the dean, the business manager, the registrar, members of the faculty—all are working with an eye on the calendar. They have geared their efforts to be ready for the great day when the bell rings, the doors swing open—and the new students come buzzing down the hall.

For Dr. Charles Havens, Cumberland's boyish 33-year-old, brown-eyed president, the battle is nearly won. As Lebanon's chosen "commanding general" in the campaign to revive the institution, he is in a good position to judge.

"Cumberland will open," says Havens, "and move forward, a step at the time."

The people in Lebanon don't doubt it. They believe every word of it. And they have said so with hard cash. "Havens is the man for the job," said a young doctor. "If it can be done, he will do it."

"Havens is just the man we were looking for," said a Lebanon druggist. "The people want the university to operate, and he will make it go."

A young educator remarked: "A college will be worth more to Lebanon than a new factory."

It is easy to see that the attachment between Havens and the community is mutual. The young educator, puffing his

pipe and singing and whistling as he works, has brought a great reserve of brain and muscle to Cumberland. People appreciate his spirit and drive—in the best tradition of the historic Cumberland Bulldog.

"This is a democratic and cosmopolitan community." Havens said. "There are many people here who are truly educated. They don't care how much money you've got, or what kind of car you drive. If you're working, they're for you."

Havens came to Cumberland from Martin Junior College at Pulaski, Tenn. He received his A.B. degree from Centre college in Kentucky and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at Vanderbilt university.

Upon assuming the presidency early last year, Havens was faced with the immediate task of moving the law school from Memorial hall to its historic quarters at Caruthers hall, on West Main street, two blocks from the main campus.

The move required money, and there was none for the purpose. Havens went to the alumni for help. The old grads came through.

More than 21,000 law books were transported in handmade crates to the "law barn," as it is affectionately called by the students. A secondhand truck was secured and president, professors, and students pitched in to make the move in 35 truckloads.

Havens knows exactly what he is working for.

"We are going to have a liberal arts college," he said. "We are tied to no sect, church, or denomination. We have no thought control and no 'party line' of any kind, and we never will have.

"Our school will be founded on the principles of Christianity, democracy, and freedom.

"We are not going to try to imitate the big universities. An intercollegiate athletic program, at this time, would be an overextension of our ability. We will encourage intramural athletics and physical education, and when we grow big enough we'll see about taking on others our size.

"I believe that a successful school must have good teachers, good meals, clean classrooms, and clean toilets. We will have them."

Havens beams with pride as he ushers his visitors into the refurbished and historic Caruthers Hall, built in 1877 and named for Judge Robert L. Caruthers, founder of the university. In spotless rows the 21,000 books are arranged in perfect order, including the latest books and documents in the legal field. He is proud of the fact that the university, out of its slender resources, is spending $5,000 a year to keep the law library up to date.

The school of arts and sciences has been closed since 1951. In that year the Southern Baptist Convention, which had operated the university since 1947, returned the school to its original board of trustees, purchased the Ward-Belmont college property, and moved to Nashville to establish and operate Belmont Baptist College.

The law school, with Judge Sam B. Gilreath in charge as acting president of the university, never did close, but temporarily moved its operations to Memorial Hall.

Cumberland has had a long and proud history. The school was organized in 1842, the main building being located on College Street, Lebanon, about a mile from the present campus. Judge Caruthers was president of the first board of trustees.

Cumberland was originally a Cumberland Presbyterian Church school. In 1906, following a merger of the churches, it became affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The university since 1951 has not been affiliated with any church body.

More than 8,000 lawyers received their degrees from the school of law. The most famous was Cordell Hull, of Carthage, Secretary of State under Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II. The office building of the law school faculty is named for Hull, and a lounge in the building displays an oil painting of the distinguished statesman.

Many Members of Congress, Supreme Court Judges (State and Federal), 9 United States Senators and 9 State governors were graduated from Cumberland.

Ex-Govs. James V. Allred, of Texas, and Fuller Warren, of Florida, received their law degrees at Cumberland, as did Judge A. B. Neil, chief justice of the supreme court of Tennessee, and the present Governor of Florida, Leroy Collins. Many prominent members of the Nashville bar and a good portion of the Tennessee State Legislature are Cumberland graduates, and Gov. Frank Clement was a student there.

At various times during its long history the university has operated a school of theology, a preparatory school, a medical department (in Memphis), a school of music, a business college, and the Cumberland annex, the former Lebanon College for Young Ladies.

In 1863, during the War Between the States, the main building of the university was burned to ashes.

Goodspeed's History of Tennessee relates that the building was set afire by a Confederate soldier, a former Cumberland student, who became incensed at Federal occupation of the university campus.

"Endowment, buildings, and real estate were swept away," wrote Dr. W. P. Bone in his History of Cumberland University. "All that the school had left were its debts and its good name. But the institution still lived in the hearts of men."

It was at this time that the legend of the phoenix became a part of Cumberland's history. Dr. W. E. Ward, an alumnus of the college of arts and founder of Ward Seminary, Nashville, visited the ruins of the burned buildings.

On the one column still standing Ward wrote the word "Resurgam" (I will arise), and later the motto "E cineribus resurgo" (I arise from the ashes) appeared on the university seal.

The phoenix, ancient and legendary Egyptian bird of immortality, is pictured on the seal, rising from the fire of its own cremation with a great flutter of golden wings.

Cumberland yearbook is called "The Phoenix," and the spirit of "rising from the ashes" has helped the school through many a crisis.

But students at Cumberland, and professors, too, have enjoyed their lighter moments on the gently sloping, shady campus.

In the fall of 1934 Judge Albert Williams of Nashville, then a member of the law school faculty, addressed the entire student body during the weekly "assembly" at Caruthers hall, at the start of the school year.

"Cumberland has produced many great men," said the judge proudly. "Her graduates serve in the Congress of the United States. Some of our boys have become great lawyers and judges, great teachers and preachers." Then he looked the students straight in the eye.

"And some of our boys," he continued, "are in State penitentiaries. What will you do, and what will you be, when you leave Cumberland?"

Cumberland had fine athletic teams, and in the old days her red-shirted Bulldogs held their own against such teams as Sewanee, Vanderbilt and Georgia Tech.

It was against this last-named team, however, that the doughty Bulldogs came to grief in a manner never equalled anywhere in the United States, before nor since.

In 1916, just prior to World War I, its athletic program impaired by growing demands of the military, Cumberland had no football team. It did, however, have a contract to go to Atlanta and play Georgia Tech, for which the Bulldog team was to receive the then-considerable sum of $400.

As the date for the game approached, an enterprising law student named George Allen conceived the idea of "making up" a team on the spot, traveling to Atlanta by rail and engaging the redoubtable Yellow Jackets according to schedule.

The young promoter found plenty of "takers" and everything worked out as planned—except that Tech won the game 222 to 0. The Yellow Jacket backs just ran until they were exhaused, charging up and down the field.

Cumberland's greatest gain of the day was a two-yard loss.

The story is told by the old grads that a Bulldog back, having received the pass from center, dropped the ball, and it bounced in the direction of a teammate.

As the charging Yellow Jackets bore down, the fumbler yelled, "Pick it up! Pick it up!"

"Pick it up yourself," said the other back. "You fumbled it!."

Now a golfing companion of President Eisenhower, Allen was also a friend of President Truman and President Roosevelt. He is author of the book, Presidents Who Have Known Me.

Surviving members of the two teams who played in the 1916 game are planning a reunion this fall in Atlanta.

In modern times the university had its best football team in 1934, when the team won a never-to-be-forgotten 14 to 0 victory over Sewanee. The team's captain, quarterback Lindsey Donnell, led the Nation that year in number of yards gained from scrimmage.

Back in 1842 the citizens of Lebanon put up $10,000 in cash to bring Cumberland to the town, and from that day to this it has been the people of the community, with the loyal help of the alumni, who have kept the school going. Practically all the $10,000 came from the original board of trustees, which included Jordan Stokes, Sr., Robert L. Caruthers, and Josiah S. McClain, the first white child born in Wilson County.

In 1895, when Memorial Hall was completed, it was announced that $20,000 was still due the contractors. The greatest part of the money previously used, Dr. Bone writes, had been raised in Lebanon, and Lebanon had been apparently drained dry. It was simply a question of getting $20,000 more from people who thought they had already done their utmost.

Judge E. E. Beard, the school treasurer, said "We can raise the money, and we will." He made a stirring appeal, the people of Lebanon dug deeper, and the money was raised.

It was in a similar situation, in the spring of 1954, that the people of Lebanon contributed $56,000 toward the opening of the university this fall.

Druggist Homer Shannon explained the bond of affection between "town and gown" in Lebanon: "Lebanon people love the school. Many of them went to school there. They have put their money into it because they want it to live, and it will."

Lebanon banker Roy Cripps said: "In Cumberland Lebanon has a valuable cultural heritage, passed on to us by great men of another generation. We are not going to let it die."

Athens Clay Pullias, president of David Lipscomb College, is a graduate of both the law and literary schools at Cumberland, and a member of the board of trustees.

"Cumberland University has achieved a tremendous place for itself in the unique history of American education," Pullias said. "I am confident that as the school population doubles in the next 15 years the school will develop another generation of outstanding public servants, in the rare image of Cumberland men and women of the past."

In Nashville Edward Potter, Jr., president of the Commerce Union Bank and chairman of Cumberland's board, said:

"I am not an alumnus of Cumberland, but I came from Watertown and Smithville, and I have known and admired the school's history and tradition for a long time.

"I like the kind of men that Cumberland turns out. As long as it lives, and as long as I live, I am going to support the school."

Recently, Dr. Lacy Laban Rice, former president and chancellor of the university, was in the Cumberland observatory repairing and adjusting the fine telescope he gave the school several years ago.

Working for love and not for money, Dr. Rice labored from dawn to dark at his task. He first joined the Cumberland faculty in 1894. He is 86 years old.

Lebanon people close to Cumberland agree that one man, more than any other, has kept Cumberland's charter and name in Lebanon, and had never lacked for determination and faith in the fight to reopen the Lit School. He is William D. Baird, once a football and baseball star at Cumberland, now mayor of Lebanon.

Over in Caruthers hall President Havens has put small plaques on the walls. They say that the paint was given by one Lebanon firm, the paper and plaster by another, the venetian blinds by still another. The electric drinking fountain, the portable aluminum ladder, the librarian's desk and chair—all are gifts of people who love Cumberland.

Havens' "buck a month" club, organized among graduates of the law school, brings in a small but steady trickle of dollars from men who want the old school to survive.

Rubbing his chin and thinking of the people who are helping him, Havens said thoughtfully: "They don't come any better."

And because of that, he believes, old Cumberland will open her doors this fall, and resume her rightful place in the many-towered Camelot of American education.

And once again the great bird will rise from the ashes, with a mighty fluttering of wings.

CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY, FAMED TENNESSEE LAW SCHOOL AND HISTORIC CHRISTIAN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION, ENTERS SECOND CENTURY OF PROGRESS

(Remarks of Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, in the House of Representatives, Monday, March 28, 1949)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Cumberland University, located at Lebanon, Wilson County, within the Fifth District of Tennessee, recently rounded out its first hundred years of service as a great southern educational institution.

On the occasion of this great and famed old university entering upon its second century of progress, I desire to commend the record of service and achievement of this historic school in Tennessee, and to add my own tribute to the rich tradition of accomplishment which has characterized the long existence of Cumberland University both as an academic and literary institution and as a school of law.

The tributes and felicitations to Cumberland University have been many and deserved. Some of the tributes have taken a material form and constitute an expression of confidence in the future of the institution. Other tributes have been in words of appreciation for the great work and great contributions of this Tennessee institution. These expressions emphasize the role of importance in Southern education that has ever been the part of Cumberland University.

Cumberland has produced many outstanding leaders for our country. From its halls have passed young men and women who have taken their places in the fields of Christian education, the legal profession, and other phases of public service, and in that highest calling—good citizenship.

Cumberland University counts among its distinguished alumni, a Secretary of State; 2 Justices of the United States Supreme Court; 16 United States Senators, one, the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the Honorable Bert H. Miller, being now a Member of the United States Senate.

In this body, Mr. Speaker, many sons of Cumberland have served with distinction. I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that more than a hundred Members of the House of Representatives of the United States have been educated at Cumberland University. Of that number, 12 may be counted today as Members of this present body.

These distinguished alumni include our colleagues the Honorable Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi Fourth District; Hon. Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico at Large; Hon. Oren Harris, Arkansas Seventh District; Hon. Wright Patman, Texas First District; Hon. Omar Burleson, Texas 17th District; Hon. Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky Fourth District; Hon. Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri Second District; Hon. Anthony F. Tauriello, New York 43d District; and five members of the delegation from the State of Tennessee, including the dean of the Tennessee delegation and national president of Cumberland University Alumni Association, Hon. JERE COOPER, Ninth District; also Representative ALBERT GORE of the Fourth, and TOM MURRAY of the Eighth District of Tennessee. As the Representative of the Fifth District, in which Cumberland University is situated at Lebanon, it was also my own great privilege to have attended this great school in Tennessee.

The continuing progress in education at Cumberland University has been noteworthy in every respect and its citations for advancement and continuing excellence have been numerous. It was of interest to the alumni as well as the countless friends of Cumberland when the American Bar Association added its own accolade of deserved praise with official scholastic recognition of the excellent attainments of Cumberland's School of Law. This recognition was richly merited.

As a tribute to this institution, I should like to quote briefly from G. Frank Burns, writing in the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat:

"The real gift of the Cumberland University School of Law, looking back over the century * * * is not its graduates who have won fame and renown but rather the spirit of faith in the lasting tenets of democracy, passed on, like an unfailing torch * * * to five generations of young men and women."

The worth of this fine old school lies in its achievement of fine men and women, humble and great. Its external growth from a one-room institution of learning a century ago to its present plant of fine buildings is but the material evidence of its surging and progressive spirit.

Recently, the president of Cumberland University, Dr. Edwin S. Preston, visited Washington and called upon President Truman and invited him to visit Cumberland University in Tennessee. There was also a meeting of Cumberland University alumni in the Washington area on the occasion of Dr. Preston's visit in the Capital at which some 70 alumni of the university gathered to hear an address by Dr. Preston and a report on plans for the second century program at Cumberland University.

In this connection I desire to include in the RECORD a portion of a transcription which was presented at this meeting and entitled "The Romance of Cumberland University"—a great and inspiring story written by Col. Dixon Merritt, of Tennessee.

I request that this be included in the RECORD because of the general interest in the progress of this famed law school in the heart of Tennessee and because of the best wishes which countless friends extend to Cumberland as it begins its second century of progress.

The story is as follows:

"THE ROMANCE OF CUMBERLAND—THE STORY OF A CHRISTIAN INSTITUTION

"That May morning of 1842 was a great day for a university to be born and the name by which it was christened—Cumberland—was already a great name not alone in history and geography but even then in education. The place, too, was great. Lebanon, the city of cedars, the city of settled and seasoned culture, the city where Sam Houston had practiced law—Sam Houston, Governor of Tennessee, the "Raven" of the Cherokees of Oklahoma, the hero of Texas independence. Three of Lebanon's citizens—a governor, a Congressman, and a Supreme Court Justice were members of Cumberland University's first board of trustees appointed in that good national year of 1842.

"Eighteen forty-two—how long ago was that? The gulf is hardly to be spanned by a mere measure of years. Stephen Collins Foster was publishing his first song and furnishing a musical setting for the Old South. Missouri and Arkansas were America's farthermost west. John Tyler in the Presidency was muddling the Whig Party's greatest opportunity, and Clay and Webster were maneuvering, each striving to be the one to supplant him, and Hayes and others were maneuvering to lead the Democratic Party back to mastery.

"But best-laid plans of mice and men—no one of the four were to succeed though Clay won the Whig nomination. In the cool of the shade of the Hermitage, 18 miles west of Lebanon, sat Andrew Jackson, worn out with 8 years in the Presidency, with a long life of unparalleled turmoil. He sat and planned—planned deeper and better than the recognized leaders of either party. It was his protege, James K. Polk, who was to lead the Democrats back to power to crush the mighty Clay in his final bid for the Presidency, to win for the United States Texas and the all but illimitable lands beyond—the new Southwest which was to furnish from that day to this so large a part of the patronage of the new university. In that decade, Tennessee, heart of the old Southwest, was in a position almost of dominance in varied fields. For 1842 was the middle year in that remarkable stretch of 44 years during which Tennessee placed one of its sons on a national ticket in 8 of the 11 national campaigns.

"Into that kind of Tennessee, Cumberland University was born. Its early years were lush, green years. The civilization of the Old South was at its high tide and plenty rode on a springing harvest.

"The general assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the people of Lebanon thought it hard to find the funds to get the university going. When did people anywhere not think it hard to raise money for any cause? They thought it hard then, but a quarter of a century later in the great war's bitter aftermath they looked back with longing on those early days and knew that the first great task was an easy one. From 1842 to 1860—only a little while, the space from babyhood to a high-school diploma—in that 18 years the alumni of Cumberland University had come to fill in large measure the places of importance in the wide land. Some of them were already in the Congress of the United States, where from eight decades down to the present, Cumberland University graduates were to outnumber those of any other university in the United States.

"Other and more numerous sons of Cumberland were in the branches of State and Federal courts of both original and appellate jurisdiction. They were filling chairs in colleges all over the United States and were administering the affairs of colleges and sem-

inaries and other educational institutions. Still numerous others were in administrative positions in the church bodies, were in the pulpits of important churches, and were carrying Christian civilization to far places on the mission fields of the world.

"Cumberland was powerful—a young giant in a young land and its prospects opened out fair and full to a glorious future.

"The great red flower of war sprang up and shadowed the land. Prejudice and passion and hatred raged. Brother's hand was at brother's throat and all the splendid fabric wrought through the prosperous years was ready to split into tatters. Lebanon was not on the whole secessionist and Cumberland was not. A majority of its trustees, mostly citizens of Lebanon, opposed secession and a number of them remained staunch Unionists through all that followed. The faculties were divided and students, of course, were divided also. Cumberland's magnificent building stood deserted not destined to withstand the shock of war—that building lay in ashes before the end, but there remained wrecked amid the ashes a lone Corinthian column, the building pitiable, but it was a valuable asset, for there was found written upon it, when friends of the university returned, the single Latin word 'resurgam,' in translation 'I will arise.' The word was marked up there with a piece of charred wood by Dr. W. E. Ward, an alumnus, who stood sorrowfully among the ashes of his alma mater. That word scrawled in charcoal became the voice of faith crying among the desolation and Cumberland did arise, not bigger, but stronger, than in the booming years before the war. Friends who in the old days had given of their wealth now gave of their poverty and the institution struggled into motion.

"The new day had fully dawned and the board of trustees recognized it by conferring upon Judge Nathan Green, Jr., the title of chancellor rather than that of president. For more than 30 years Chancellor Green directed the affairs of the university. For 63 years he occupied one of its chairs of law. Yet his position cannot be called unique because he had a faculty hardly less notable than himself for length of service. His great colleague in the law school, Dr. Andrew B. Martin, taught for 40 years; Andrew Hayes Buchanan taught mathematics in Cumberland 45 years and made his living through working during vacations with the United States Geodetic Survey; William Duncan McLaughlin taught Latin and Greek 45 years and made his living milking cows; and John Iradelle Dillard Hinds taught chemistry for 31 years and supported himself by filling prescriptions in the drug store. Walter Verrell Vester taught for 44 years; Winsted Paine Bone, 47.

Against such a record of devotion, brick and mortar and money and bonds do not count. Out of a century of that tradition of special training and Christian service what has Cumberland produced?

It is easy to see and measure the fruit of this as of other trees—they are on the topmost branches. Of the thousands of Cumberland University alumni who have done the world's work in common ways, no record stands out, but among the lot have been almost 450 ministers of the Gospel. There have been some 50 college and university presidents, some hundred college professors, 116 Congressmen, 11 Governors of States, some score of Federal judges, 2 United States Ambassadors, 2 Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and 1 Secretary of State of the United States. In all, more than 12,000 public servants have been numbered among Cumberland alumni.

Judged by its fruit, it is a goodly tree which early in 1946 the Tennessee Baptist convention received from the friendly hands of the trustees who had conducted the affairs of the university under Presbyterian auspices. At that time, Tennessee College for Women, a Baptist institution located in Murfreesboro, was incorporated into the university. Since then the convention board of trustees and administration of Cumberland University have diligently labored and constantly toward developing a strong and practical second-century program. There has been no pruning of the tree—there will be none. There has been some strengthening of the branches. The school of law, lustiest, shall it be said, of the branch has been strengthened and enlarged in its program in accordance with recommendations of leading educators and representatives of the legal profession.

On the other main branch, the college of arts and sciences, Cumberland stands stanchly by the liberal arts' ideas. One of the immediate goals is attainment of approval by accrediting agencies, and these goals, if not definitely in reach, are clearly in sight of attainment. Drawing closer to attainment is a larger and better faculty and adequate buildings for administration. Close to the heart of the sponsors is the goal of a large residence for women where special facilities and opportunities will be provided.

The second-century program does not contemplate a different Cumberland—it does contemplate a stronger edifice on its existing foundation. It is not expected now or ever that Cumberland will become large. It will remain a small Christian institution. As such it will continue to afford opportunity for broad basic education and specialized training in a few selected fields to a limited number of young men and young women without regard to Christian affiliation. Thus Cumberland University faces the future. May the promise of the future ahead measure up to the performance of the century that is passed.

National Guard in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of warning members of this House that the National Guard is in profound danger.

Once again our National Guard, which has never failed our Nation in repulsing enemies from abroad, is faced with a fight for its very existence.

This is not a struggle for survival against the forces of alien aggression. The National Guard could handle such a battle by itself. Now this mortal threat which is leveled at the guard, and all it stands for, exists, unfortunately, within our own Government.

I regret that it is necessary to inform this House that once again the Army General Staff has embarked on a power grab that, if not stopped, and stopped soon, will destroy the National Guard and every vestige of the civilian control of the military that is a keystone of our form of government.

I am aware that Congress, and particularly this House, has frequently in the past repulsed the Army General Staff's grab for power.

The Nation, and the National Guard, are deeply indebted to the Congress for the resolute manner in which it has rebuffed the plans of the Army General Staff.

Ever since the Army General Staff came into being, it has waged a vicious vendetta against what the National Guard stands for.

Why? Simply because the guard, with its decentralized control, its broad base of citizen participation, and its belief in civilian control of the military, has been an implacable obstacle to the Army General Staff plans for imposing the Prussian military system and organization over our Nation.

I need not remind this House that such a supreme general staff has been the goal of the Army General Staff. I am sure that we all believed that Congress had once and for all settled the matter in 1946 and 1949 by vigorously rejecting the Army General Staff demands for a supreme staff. This Congress did in the most pointed and unquestionable terms by rejecting the Army General Staff's Collins plan—which would have planted such a system in America. In addition, Congress also wrote into the National Security Act the most emphatic prohibitions against a supreme general staff.

We thought that by law we had defeated the proponents of this plan and in so doing we had erected a permanent protection for our National Guard.

Such prohibitions against a supreme general staff were imperative if the National Guard were to survive. The moment a supreme staff is created in this country, the National Guard will start to die. As history has proved, National Guard types of military forces cannot survive the Prussian type of highly centralized militarism under a supreme general staff.

Ever since prior to World War I the National Guard has been both an obstacle to, and a target of, the Army General Staff.

It is no secret that the Army General Staff has starved, squeezed, and impeded our National Guard. But because the guard is strong in heart and the democratic philosophy on which it is based is consonant with our form of government, the guard has persevered and survived in spite of the Army General Staff.

Is there any wonder, then, why Congress and our National Guard have both opposed every attempt to induce acceptance of the single Chief of Staff-supreme general staff system in the United States?

In a sense Congress and the National Guard are both vitally interested parties. The Prussian system would mean the end of the National Guard and it would also sound the doom of civilian control over the military.

The danger I refer to is not rumor. It is not speculation. It is not imagination.

It is real. It exists at this very moment.

The documentary evidence is conclusive. The master plan for creation of a supreme general staff has been drawn by the Army General Staff. The moment it goes into effect our democratic institutions go into decline.

The greatest citizen army in the world's history, our National Guard, at

this very moment has a knife poised at its throat.

There is no secret about the Army General staff blueprint. It was published with all basic points in the New York Times of June 24, 1956.

Our Nation is indebted to the New York Times for exposing this plan to destroy civilian control of the military by erecting a Prussian-type of supreme staff.

This is what the Army General Staff's master plan would do:

First. Convert the Department of Defense into a supreme general staff.

Second. Put a super single chief of staff in command of the great supreme general staff and all the Armed Forces.

Third. Eliminate the civilian Deputy and Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Fourth. Replace them with military officers.

Fifth. Give the super chief of staff control over manpower, industrial requirements, weapons requirements, and national strategy. He would be the most powerful man in the world.

Sixth. Although the Secretary of Defense and the President would be nominally superior to the super chief of staff, as well as Congress, they would get only such information and "facts" as the chief of staff decided they could have.

Seventh. The military services would be merged into one huge armed force, in accordance with the whims of the super chief of staff.

Eighth. The inevitable result would be the elimination of the National Guard.

Ninth. The Marine Corps, too, would be eliminated. Like the National Guard, it has no mention and no place in the master plan.

Tenth. The Secretaries of the Military Departments are also eliminated.

Each of these features in themselves are loaded with disaster for our Nation. As a whole, this Army general staff plan would be the end of our form of government.

Congress and the people are entitled to know what is going on in the Pentagon.

Secretary Wilson, speaking at Quantico recently, condemned the Prussian single chief of staff system and service merger.

Yet at the very moment he was speaking the Army general staff was pushing its master plan to accomplish what Secretary Wilson publicly condemned.

Secretary of the Army Brucker has also demonstrated his awareness of this vital issue and has publicly announced his strong opposition to the integrated single service concept. Despite this, however, his general staff officers have prepared an official staff paper which is a blueprint for the very type of organization which Secretary Brucker has condemned. The very fact that the Army general staff officers would dare to write and secure the publication of such a plan vividly illustrates the stubborn persistence of the supreme general staff proponents, and the difficulty which Secretary Brucker encounters in exercising civilian control over the general staff.

This Army supreme general staff plan would destroy every iota of civilian control over the Army. It would even eliminate Secretary Brucker's job. This demonstrates the bold arrogance of the Army proponents of this plan. More than this, however, it indicates in a most compelling fashion the Army general staff's deep and shocking lack of gratitude toward Secretary Brucker who has proved to be one of the most able and loyal Secretaries the Army has ever had.

Congress must not let this Army general staff blueprint for Prussianism succeed.

It is contrary to every principle of military efficiency.

It is contrary to every sacred principle of our form of government.

It is, also, contrary to every major provision of the report of the Hoover Commission task force on national security.

It is cause for alarm and indignation on the part of every citizen.

It would be the death knell of our National Guard.

Because of the great service of the New York Times in exposing this Army general staff master plan for usurping the powers of Congress and the civilian authorities over the military, Congress and the Nation are now alerted.

In the face of an alerted nation, the Army general staff will not be able to put into effect its plan to convert our Nation into a general-staff state.

Eleventh Anniversary of Independence of Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of independence of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Because Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Indonesian people, President Sukarno, and His Excellency Moekarto Notowidigdo, Ambassador of Indonesia, on the occasion of the celebration of the 11th anniversary of independence of Indonesia, August 17, 1956.

By far one of the most important of the southeast Asian countries recently emerged from colonial status into nationhood is Indonesia. The question of Indonesian independence was a burning issue in the postwar era. The rapidity with which Indonesia became the focus of international attention was likewise phenomenal.

Surprising though the strength of the Indonesian independence movement may have been to the outside world, various nationalist groups in the East Indies had been developing since as early as 1905. Western ideas infiltrated mainly in the wake of economic penetration. Not only did a small intellectual class receive European education, but the traditional life of the villages changed with every decade. With the war's end the colonizing power in Indonesia was faced with a fait accompli—Indonesian independence. On August 17, 1945, the Indonesian people proclaimed their independence. Therewith the sign was given to break forever the traditional colonial bonds.

Despite persisent attempts through military force, economic pressures, and widening of internal cleavages, restoration of colonial rule was impossible. Fortunately Indonesian leaders understood the gravity of the problems facing a nation in such a period of transition.

Dr. Sukarno vigorously enunciated the democratic principles and ideology of law to which the new Republic would be dedicated. He spoke of a psychological foundation of free Indonesia, a philosophy with deep thoughts and spirit and thorough desires on which to erect the building of free Indonesia, stable and eternal.

Dr. Sukarno made the following appeal to his people:

> If we want to live as a nation, a free nationality, a free member of the world, to live with humanism on a democratic basis in a society with social justice in peace and security, then we must not forget one condition to make this true: We must struggle, struggle and struggle again. Don't think that with the creation of free Indonesia our struggle comes to an end. No, I tell you, in free Indonesia our struggle must be carried on, only in another form. We shall fight on together as one united people.

Indonesia strongly desires peace. In the words of Mohammed Hatta:

> Only in a peaceful atmosphere can it rehabilitate its war-damaged economy and lift its citizens out of the poverty in which they have lived so long.

The Republic realizes that cooperation with other countries is essential. It has made the United Nations the focal point of its overall policy of seeking good relations with all other nations. Indonesia is intent upon pursuing a policy of peace and friendship with all nations on a basis of mutual respect and noninterference with each other's structure of government.

Writing in the periodical Foreign Affairs, April 1953, Mohammed Hatta very aptly delineated the guiding philosophy behind Indonesia's foreign policy:

> Talk of the brotherhood of man in a world in which racial discrimination makes possible the existence of such a policy as "apartheid," or talk of everlasting peace in the atmosphere of the cold war, indeed seems incongruous. Be that as it may, the Republic of Indonesia feels it its duty to strengthen the ideals of peace, however weak its voice or feeble its power. It believes that these ideals will become reality in the long run. It believes in the commonsense of mankind. The peoples' desire for peace, as opposed to their lust for war, becomes stronger from century to century. Evil often prevails over the forces for good and destroys what civilization has built up over the ages. But man, rational by nature, will eventually make a positive and definite choice of good over evil, peace over war. The discovery of weapons of war which become progressively more terrifying and destructive will strengthen men's love of peace and arouse hatred of war. It is this conviction that leads the Republic of Indonesia to believe that the struggle for world peace is today a policy based on reality.

This explains why the Republic of Indonesia has not alined itself with either the American bloc or the Russian bloc in the existing conflict, and why it is not prepared to participate in any third bloc designed to act as a counterpoise to the two giant blocs. To do that would merely create new suspicions and new enmities. And though Indonesia's policy has often been termed one of neutrality, it is not that either. "Neutrality" has a precise meaning in international law, defining a condition of impartiality toward belligerent states. * * * As a member of the United Nations, the Republic of Indonesia cannot adopt an attitude of neutrality. It is committed to international solidarity. * * *

But in practice, of course, international solidarity has not been achieved; world solidarity has cracked into two pieces. Under present conditions it would not be possible for Indonesia to be other than neutral if a war broke out. The existence of war is a special case in the life of nations. * * *

Western nations tend to hold that there is no middle position for the weaker countries, and that they must choose. * * * Indonesia plays no favorites betwen the two opposed blocs and follows its own path through the various international problems. It terms this policy "independent," and further characterizes it by describing it as independent and "active." By active is meant the effort to work energetically for the preservation of peace and the relaxation of tension * * * through endeavors supported if possible by the majority of the members of the United Nations.

Some Comments on the Joint Policy for Land Acquisition on Reservoir Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the joint policy for land acquisition on reservoir projects approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior January 13, 1954—Order No. 2744, as published in the Federal Register—provides for the acquisition in fee title of the bare minimum of land in connection with such projects. By action of its board of directors, meeting at Rolla, Mo., June 20, 1954, the National Wildlife Federation protested that this policy tended to ignore the wildlife and recreational values adversely affected, or created, by such developments. The federation pointed out that the general public, which pays or helps pay for Army Engineer and Reclamation projects, has a right to expect access to Federal reservoirs for recreational purposes. Furthermore, the failure to protect wildlife and recreational values, or to take advantage of the opportunities created by many such projects to enhance wildlife and recreational values, is the opposite of conservation. The federation's resolution follows:

The board of directors of the National Wildlife Federation, representing through its 47 State affiliated wildlife organizations more than 3 million sportsmen-conservationists, respectfully urges the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army to give reconsideration to section 6 of Order No. 2744, approved January 13, 1954, for publication in the Federal Register establishing a joint policy for land acquisition on reservoir projects for the following reasons, to wit:

1. The values of federally financed impoundments of water used in seeking appropriations in Congress take into consideration recreational and wildlife values to the general public.

2. The tremendous increase in the numbers of hunters, fishermen and recreationists in the United States requires full utilization of all recreational resources to meet increasing demands.

3. Nonreimbursable Federal funds invested in governmentally financed impoundments and structures are derived from taxes imposed upon all citizens of the United States. Fair and adequate development of wildlife and recreational values alone can justify the taking of such tax money for local and sectional flood control and irrigation projects.

Under the present policy the general public will be denied the enjoyment of recreation and wildlife values reasonably incident to a coordinated and comprehensive development of such projects. On the contrary the greatly enhanced benefits and increased land values will accrue not to the public, but to the riparian owners of contiguous land. Wildlife and recreation values, including adequate public access to and public use of impounded water and contiguous riparian land, should be protected by acquisition of reasonable land areas in depth above the high watermark of all such federally financed projects.

Legislation like H. R.159 and H. R. 160, providing for reconveyance of lands acquired for the Belton and Whitney Reservoirs in Texas, has been proposed as retroactive application of the Army-Interior joint policy. Several similar bills, pertaining to other Federal reservoirs, have been introduced. Two such reconveyance bills were enacted during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, one applying to the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Georgia and Florida, the other to the Demopolis Reservoir in Alabama.

The National Wildlife Federation and other conservation organizations did not protest the Jim Woodruff and Demopolis Acts because the language specified that lands required for public purposes should not be reconveyed. It seemed clear that Congress previously had provided for recognition of wildlife management and public recreation as public purposes in the Coordination Act—Public Law 732, 79th Congress—and in section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, which reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such lands.

As a matter of fact, under the specific authority of the aforementioned laws, the Army had granted a 25-year license to the Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission of Florida to manage 7,273 acres of the Jim Woodruff Reservoir lands as a waterfowl-management and public-shooting area.

The Army insisted, however, that under Public Law 300 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, even the lands licensed to the State of Florida had to be sold back to the former owners. This resulted in a nationwide controversy and in introduction of H. R. 11197 by Congressman BOB SIKES. The purpose of Mr. SIKES' bill, which was passed by the House July 23, 1956, is to hold in public ownership the excellent waterfowl marshes on the Florida side of the Jim Woodruff Reservoir.

Since the disillusioning Jim Woodruff experience, the Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, and other conservation organizations have opposed reconveyance legislation unless amended to provide adequate protection of the public interest in the wildlife and recreational values. H. R. 159 and H. R. 160 contain no such protective language. Amendments approved in committee further restrict consideration of conservation values by changing the words "public purposes" to "project purposes."

The conservation groups also have indicated these bills, and other pending reconveyance bills, because they propose the sale of project lands to a favored group at a price which does not reflect the increased value accruing as a result of the expenditure of public funds. It is a sheer hand-out to the former owners or to the speculators who have cornered the options.

The nationwide significance of this problem was discussed by Mr. Harold Titus, the noted conservation editor of the magazine Field and Stream, in the issue for August 1956. The article by Mr. Titus follows:

While South Dakota conservationists watched fences go up and food and cover plants flourish on seven new game-management areas along the Fort Randall Reservoir, residents of Florida and Georgia just about abandoned hope that the Jim Woodruff Reservoir on their boundary would ever support similar projects. Bewildering shifts in Army engineer land policies had game officials in those Southeastern States completely confused and frustrated.

It has been reported in these columns that land acquisition around new impoundments constructed by Federal construction agencies is being curtailed. Instead of purchasing enough acreage so that public access and public recreational areas on newly created water would be assured, it now appears that in most cases the shoreline is to remain in private ownership. Furthermore, on certain projects where descriptions bordering the reservoirs have already been acquired, those portions which are not to be flooded seem due to be sold back to former owners at bargain rates. At least this is the interpretation placed on recent Army decisions by

several of the country's largest national conservation organizations.

The situation came to attention when the Army reversed itself on an agreement involving the Jim Woodruff Reservoir. Back in January 1955 a 25-year license was granted the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission to set up a game-management area on 72,000 acres of lands along the reservoir that had been acquired by Army engineers. Then, a few weeks ago, Army brass informed Florida that, after all, the land in question would serve no public purpose, that because it fails to do so the Army has no authority for retaining it, and that it would be offered for sale to former owners. Top-notch waterfowl marshes on the Georgia side of the impoundment also appeared to be going up for sale to private parties.

The Georgia Conservation League made a roaring protest, and Congressman BOB SIKES of Florida introduced a bill to prevent reconveyance of any lands that Florida can use for public purposes. The fate of these efforts may have been decided by the time this reaches print. And the chance that South Dakota isn't going to benefit from those Fort Randall improvements may possibly have materialized as well.

This is no localized controversy. Plans for wildlife projects on Engineers Corps lands are pending in Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Mississippi, according to the National Wildlife Federation. If the Army's current determination to reduce all reservoir ownership to flooded acres prevails, many hopes entertained by conservationists for needed recreational facilities are going out the window. As this is written, the situation is far from clear.

Robert Dinwiddie: Grandfather of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks by me and others in connection with Dinwiddie Day, celebrated at Portsmouth, Va., on July 6, 1956, honoring Robert Dinwiddie, Grandfather of the United States.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Truly great events in history and the leaders who determined their outcome have often been blurred by subsequent occurrences. Nevertheless, with the passage of time, sometimes centuries, key figures in such events tend to emerge into their due stature.

One such leader in American history was Robert Dinwiddie, Lieutenant Governor and Commander in Chief of the Colony and Dominion of Virginia, from July 4, 1751, to January 12, 1758. His career is significant for the key part played by him in American colonial government and westward expansion.

It was my privilege to participate in some of the preliminary planning for the commemorative program in his honor in Portsmouth, Va., held on July 6, 1956, which was officially proclaimed by Mayor Fred A. Duke as "Dinwiddie Day."

The chairman of the committee for Dinwiddie Day arrangements was a well-known civic leader of Portsmouth and Norfolk County, Frank D. Lawrence. A notable part of the program was the renaming on July 6, 1956, of the principal hotel of Portsmouth as the Governor Dinwiddie and of its ballroom as the Washington Room, in honor of the colonial governor and his young protege, George Washington.

It is eminently fitting that the principal address was made by Counselor Ronald William Bailey of the British Embassy in Washington as the personal representative of the Ambassador, Sir Roger Makins, and that the special guests included members of the Dinwiddie family of Virginia.

Called to order by Chairman Lawrence, who also acted as toastmaster, the program started with the British and United States national anthems, sung and played by Rev. Ernest K. Emurian. The invocation was given by Bishop William A. Brown.

Among his first comments, Toastmaster Lawrence summarized the background of the occasion. The first feature event was the unveiling of a splendid portrait of Robert Dinwiddie, painted by Maurice Gompf of Portsmouth especially for this ceremony, and also a portrait of George Washington. The toastmaster then revealed that the original suggestion for naming the hotel as the Governor Dinwiddie was made by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, a native of Portsmouth, who spoke briefly stating that the idea had grown out of his reading the excellent biography of Robert Dinwiddie by Louis K. Koontz.

REMARKS OF REV. ERNEST K. EMURIAN, INTRODUCING RONALD WILLIAM BAILEY

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, 15 years ago, in those anxious months that preceded the fighting on the North African Coast in World War II for the control of Egypt and the Suez Canal, the British diplomatic offices in these strategic regions of the Near East were scenes of vitally important negotiations concerned with the problems of defense against pending invasions.

A young British diplomat, then on his first assignment in his country's foreign service, was stationed in these areas. Observing events from exceptional vantage points, he witnessed the unfolding of momentous historical crises—a memorable start for any young career officer.

A graduate of the University of Cambridge in England, where he was awarded the degree of master of arts, our speaker entered the British Foreign Service in 1939. After serving at Beirut in Lebanon, and Alexandria and Cairo in Egypt, he was appointed to the Foreign Office in London. Returning to Beirut in 1949 as First Secretary, he served, while on that assignment, as Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires in 1949 and again in 1951.

Transferred to the British Embassy in Washington in 1952, he was promoted in 1955 to be Counselor and Head of the Chancery, which position he now holds.

Thus, in our speaker we have one whose years of study, training, and observations of historical crises combine to qualify him eminently to address us on this occasion.

May I present Counselor Ronald William Bailey.

Before making his address, Counselor Bailey read the following message from Ambassador Makins:

"On the occasion of Dinwiddie Day, I am happy to send my good wishes to the people of Portsmouth who are commemorating the life and service of one of the most outstanding of Virginia's colonial governors. Robert Dinwiddie labored hard for the cause of understanding in friendly commerce between Virginia and Britain and for the growth and development of this Commonwealth. I rejoice that two centuries later his ambitions in both directions have been so amply fulfilled."

ADDRESS BY RONALD WILLIAM BAILEY

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here with you in Portsmouth on this auspicious day and in such distinguished company.

The English visitor to the United States always feels particularly at home in Virginia, partly because of the traditional southern hospitality which is so readily and generously extended to him, partly because of the historic links, and also because almost every city and village bears a familiar English name. I was brought up in and near Southampton, England, and from there it is but a few miles to Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight. From here in Portsmouth, Va., it is equally but a few miles to Southampton and Isle of Wight Counties.

An Englishman feels at home, too, because he finds here, perhaps more than anywhere else in this great country, a sense of the order and stability and tradition which he flatters himself is so especially characteristic of his own homeland.

In language, in government, in law, we have a common background, springing from the English settlements on these shores in the early 17th century, the continual immigration of English-speaking peoples over the years, and the unceasing intellectual and political exchanges between our two countries. The ties of Britain and Virginia are cemented, moreover, by a surprising amount of personal contact, by businessmen and sailors and tourists.

Britain is by far the largest overseas customer for Virginia tobacco, and therefore you have many business links with us. One interesting point is that in order not to harm the Virginia trade, no tobacco was allowed to be grown in England from the 17th century until 1910. Even now, the conditions under which it may be grown are so onerous that only a very few people, and those mostly in my own county of Hampshire, actually grow it today.

In a naval area such as this I have no need to remind you of the sea. Many of your vessels put in regularly at British ports, and a large proportion of our Navy has at one time or another been within a few miles of where we are today, while merchant shipping maintains a steady exchange of commerce.

We diplomatists quickly come to learn that there is a limit to what we can do to foster international understanding and good will. Understanding depends so largely on national attitudes—and national attitudes depend on individual people. Personal contact can do ten times as much as anything else in making people feel kindly towards other nations; ties of business and commerce, and arrangements for the exchanges of teachers and students and clergymen and civic leaders are the best vaccine against those twin diseases, Anglophobia and anti-Americanism. The diseases are very much in the decline, and they will be eliminated, as surely as polio and other scourges.

Despite the violent rift of 1776, and the period of suspicion which followed, the good relations between the English-speaking peoples on the two sides of the Atlantic have been restored. For me it has been a great experience to be able to play my small part in working together with my American colleagues in such intimate cooperation upon the problems and challenges which beset the world today.

I am particularly honored to be asked to represent my Ambassador this evening, and to be called upon to address you on the subject of a great figure who was an example of the bonds which tie Britain and Virginia together, and who was destined to play such

an important part in the historical development not only of Virginia but also of the United States of America.

Let us cast our minds back a little over 200 years. On November 20, 1751, there sailed into the Tidewater Robert Dinwiddie, the appointed Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, accompanied by his wife and two daughters, Elizabeth and Rebecca. Although in name the Lieutenant Governor, the governorship properly was an honorific title. In fact, Dinwiddie was known and carried out his duties with all the authority and panoply to which the rank entitled him, including residence in the governor's palace at Williamsburg.

What manner of man was he? He was then some 58 years of age, already quite elderly by the standards of those times, having been born in Scotland in 1693. His father was a businessman engaged in the import and export trade, and he himself had begun life in the same way. At the age of 30 he had been appointed a collector of customs in Bermuda, and because of his vigilance and zeal in exposing a long-practiced system of fraud, he received the appointment of Surveyor-General of Customs of the Southern Ports of the Continent of America in 1738. For a time then, he appears to have made his home in Virginia. In 1749, and for 2 years or so, he is said to have carried on business in London, trading with the Colonies.

A portrait of the Governor is described in the "Dinwiddie Papers" of the Virginia Historical Society (which are the main source of my information) as being "noble in its expression of earnest purpose, candor and benignity." There is no doubt that he was, as we shall see, a conscientious, shrewd and hard-working official.

What sort of country did he find? In a dispatch to the board of trade dated January 1755, he gives a very detailed description of the land, the system of government, the production, and the imports and exports. The principal items of production and export were tobacco, iron, beef, and pork, Indian corn and wheat, together with skins, furs, and two mysterious items called snakeroot and jenzang. A footnote to the report explained that jenzang was ginseng. But I must confess that that was not very explicative. So I consulted the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which explains that it is used in China as a medicine to encourage vitality. Apparently in price it varies from $6–400 per ounce, but although it is said to have special powers, the action of the drug appears to be entirely psychological. The Encyclopaedia Britannica is equally skeptical about the efficacy of snakeroot as a cure for snake bite. But at least these were valuable exports.

The total annual value of all the exports is given as somewhat less than a million dollars. Imports to an almost equal value consisted of all the necessaries for clothing, tools and ironware, together with strong beer and "other family necessaries." The population and prosperity of the colony were fast increasing and new towns were constantly being founded. Among these in the first year of Dinwiddie's governorship was this very Portsmouth where we are tonight.

The population of Virginia was given by Dinwiddie, using a calculation based on the number of those paying tithes, as some 295,000, or less than one-tenth of what it is now. There were then 49 counties, fewer than now, but all of them bearing present-day county names. Those to the west were evidently larger and have since been subdivided. Norfolk County is given as having a total population of some 7,500 souls. It was about this period that the West, a near West though it was, began to appear in American life. Alexander Spotswood, who was Governor of Virginia from 1710 to 1722, had explored the country of the Blue Ridge with his Knights of the Golden Horseshoe and had penetrated as far as the Shenandoah Valley. That was some 30 years before, and since then there had been further movement and settlement toward the west. But the French, supported by Indian allies, having crossed Lake Erie, were pressing down the Ohio River, establishing themselves in what is now the Pittsburgh area of Pennsylvania and raiding the most westerly British settlements.

Meanwhile, in 1749, 2 years before Dinwiddie's arrival in the colony, the Ohio Company had been organized, partly to aid in securing for the English control of the valley, and partly to trade with the Indians. They had a pathway blazed joining a series of small fortified posts to connect Cumberland on the Potomac with the Monongahela River. The first general manager was the Virginian, Thomas Lee, who died in 1750. He was succeeded in that capacity by Lawrence Washington, the elder half-brother of George. Lawrence in turn died in 1752 and George Washington succeeded to the managership of the family estates at the age of 20. He was a skilled surveyor, and he excelled in all outdoor pursuits. He assumed the somewhat nominal duties also of adjutant of 1 of Virginia's 4 military districts. It is probably, therefore, no mere coincidence which led Governor Dinwiddie in the following year to select George Washington to go on a special mission into the Ohio Valley.

Britain and France being officially at peace, Governor Dinwiddie decided first to convey a warning to the French to desist from their encroachments into the Ohio Valley lands claimed by the British Crown. One messenger having failed to make contact with the French Governor, Dinwiddie decided to send George Washington. He was commissioned on October 31, 1753, his post of adjutant giving him the rank of major. He and his small party laboriously made their way, under difficult wintry conditions, to the French headquarters near Lake Erie and saw the commanding officer, who received him with courtesy, but left him in no doubt of the French intention to take possession of the Ohio Valley.

The difficulties of traveling in midwinter in these untrod areas are vividly described by George Washington in his account of the journey, and how, having tried to cross a partly frozen river by raft, he and a companion were forced to spend the night on an island and next morning were able to complete their crossing of the river on the ice, which had fortunately formed as a bridge by the time dawn broke.

In the meantime, the Governor had been turning his mind to the preparation of military power to resist the penetration by these hostile forces of the far-flung parts of the State of Virginia. But it was no easy task, for there were no regular forces in the area, and the settlers, most of whom were small freeholders, were reluctant to leave their lands in the coastal plains for the discomforts and hazards of a military expedition in distant parts, leaving no one to control and run their small farms.

But Governor Dinwiddie, as his correspondence shows, was painstaking and persevering in the extreme. He tried, without much success, to enlist the support of the neighboring States. He used considerable powers of persuasion upon them, but most of them preferred to take the easy course and let things be. He had the difficulty common to all governments—and individuals for that matter—of raising enough money for their purposes so that he could provide the wherewithal for such troops as could be recruited.

In January 1754, in a letter to Lord Fairfax, Governor Dinwiddie said he proposed to dispatch forthwith 200 men to protect those already sent by the Ohio Company to build one of their forts, and that he had commissioned Maj. George Washington to command 100 men to be raised in Frederick County and Augusta. Washington made for Winchester, Va., which was a meeting place with friendly Indians and one of the last outposts before the frontier country. He learned that the French had occupied a fort which they named Fort Duquesne on the present site of Pittsburgh. In a skirmish he attacked and took some prisoners who were sent to Williamsburg. But just over a month later the French brought up reinforcements, and after 9 hours' siege he was forced to capitulate. The French let him and his men go, after having disarmed them and extracted a promise that Virginia would not build another fort in the Ohio Valley for 1 year.

In February 1755, the metropolitan forces for which Governor Dinwiddie had appealed arrived in Virginia under the command of General Braddock. Governor Dinwiddie attached great hopes to the ability of these forces to assume the offensive and drive the French out of this part of the frontier. Unfortunately, although Braddock's forces consisted of 1,300 well-armed men, chiefly regular, and were attacked by only some 300 French and Indians, they were caught divided and off their guard. Braddock died of his wounds, but Washington, who was an aide-de-camp of the general's with the honorary rank of colonel, escaped unhurt, even though he had 4 bullets through his coat and 2 horses shot from under him.

This defeat was a great blow to Governor Dinwiddie, and he was highly annoyed both at the conduct of some of the men and also at the decision of Colonel Dunbar, who after Braddock's death had assumed the command, to retreat and take up winter quarters in Philadelphia.

With great energy, even though he no longer had the support of the regular troops, he set about strengthening and reorganizing the Virginia Regiment. He appealed to the Burgesses urgently for funds, making them realize that as a result of this unexpected defeat the rich lands of Virginia lay wide open to invasion. The Burgesses were galvanized into support and produced adequate sums. Dinwiddie worked indefatigably, obtaining supplies, sending out recruiting officers, and helping to organize the Virginia Regiment into an efficient group. In particular, he was concerned to find a suitable leader. Dinwiddie was a man of considerable perspicacity, and he had come to appreciate those qualities which were already to be seen in Washington as a young man and for which in the judgment of history he is so renowned.

On August 14, 1755, he appointed Washington, then 23 years of age, colonel of the Virginia Regiment and commander in chief of all the forces "now raised and to be raised for the defense of this His Majesty's Colony and for repelling the unjust and hostile invasion of the French and their Indian allies." With this commission went detailed instructions on the recruitment, organization, and pay of the Virginia Regiment. Roads were built and forts constructed and, although no major engagements ensued, Washington was able, with his force of 700 men, to prevent any further French incursions during the remaining period of Dinwiddie's governorship. (Shortly after, more metropolitan forces expelled the French and Fort Duquesne was renamed Pittsburgh after the British statesman.)

But Governor Dinwiddie was by now 64 years of age. He had suffered a stroke and partial paralysis, so that he asked to be relieved of his governorship and to return to England. Permission was granted, and he set sail in January 1758, maintaining his administrative correspondence to within a short time of his departure. As a token of his esteem he gave many books from his

library to William and Mary College, where they unfortunately perished by fire. On his arrival in England, he made his home in Bristol, but continued to take great personal interest in the affairs of Virginia, and on a number of occasions intervened with the metropolitan government in London in support of Virginian interests. He died in 1770 at the age of 77.

I must add that Robert Dinwiddie's coat of arms bore the motto in Latin "Ubi Libertas Ibi Patria" (Where There Is Liberty There Is My Fatherland). Those are the sentiments which the English peoples have carried with them to the four corners of the world and where they have taken firm root, as in this very soil of America.

Such then was the man we are honoring this July 6, which the Mayor of Portsmouth has decreed shall be known as Dinwiddie Day. This hotel has now taken his name. Dinwiddie Street passes its door and appropriately follows a course parallel to Washington Street.

George Washington is known as the Father of the United States, and because of the part which Governor Dinwiddie played in the discovery and commissioning of this young man as the commander in chief of the armed forces of Virginia, it has been suggested that he should be known as the Grandfather of the United States of America

Certainly he is a man who merits the highest honor from Virginians, from Americans, and from Englishmen. In a time when your land was in its infancy, he came out from England and gave his strength and his health for the defense and the expansion of Virginia. A loyal Englishman, he was a loyal servant of Virginia, too. He would, I think, have been distressed had he lived another score of years and seen the rift between the two countries he had served.

But if he could return here today, I do not think that he would be saddened by what he saw. He would rejoice at the fabulous success and prosperity of Virginia and of the United States. And he would rejoice to see that the political separation of Britain and America, under the inspired leadership of his protege, George Washington, had not brought to an end the feelings of brotherhood nor the commercial ties which linked the people of the two countries in his own day. I think that if Dinwiddie were able to return here now, he would be able to see that, even if the future did not take quite the course he expected, the things that he stood for—the prosperity and the friendship of our peoples—have been achieved as abundantly as he could ever have dreamed.

RESPONSE OF JOHN MARSHALL DINWIDDIE

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests and fellow Virginians. It is a great honor for me to represent the Dinwiddie family of Virginia and it gives me much pleasure to be here with you tonight. Up in my home in Alexandria, we know a lot about George Washington, because it was his hometown, and about his association with Governor Dinwiddie.

There is a street named Dinwiddie here in Portsmouth. Arlington and Richmond, Va., have one and so does Pittsburgh, Pa. And there is Dinwiddie County in our State. I dare say that the present generation knew very little of their meaning until Mr. Bailey's enlightening talk on Governor Dinwiddie here tonight.

I think it is a wonderful thing for Mr. Lawrence and his associates to rename their hotel the Governor Dinwiddie. They are to be congratulated for they have made history here tonight in focusing attention on Governor Dinwiddie, who not only helped establish Portsmouth, but who did so much to make possible the founding of our Nation.

Thank you very much.

San Francisco Host to National Japanese American Citizens League Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to the 14th biennial national convention of the Japanese American Citizens League—JACL—which will be held in San Francisco over the Labor Day weekend, from August 30 to September 3, with headquarters in the historic Sheraton-Palace Hotel.

JACL, as most Congressmen are aware, is the only national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry; its name identifies its constituency and the reasons for its being. All of its members are native-born or naturalized citizens of the United States; most, but not all, are also of Japanese ancestry.

Its twin slogans, which express its purposes and objectives, as well as summarize its activities and achievements, are "For Better Americans in a Greater America" and "Security Through Unity."

CONVENTION PROGRAM

The convention begins with a meeting of the national board, composed of the elected officers and district council chairmen, on Thursday morning, August 30. The national council, composed of the official delegates representing 88 chapters and members in 32 States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, and Japan, begins their deliberations the following day, Friday, August 31. Climax of the convention is the traditional banquet on Labor Day, when the outstanding Japanese American in the United States for the past 2 years will be announced as the Nisei of the Biennium. The last such award was presented to Sgt. Hiroshi Miyamura, Gallup, N. Mex., Congressional Medal of Honor winner and one of the 10 outstanding young men in the Nation as selected by the United States Junior Chambers of Commerce. Guest speaker at the banquet will be Maxwell M. Rabb, Secretary to the Cabinet of the United States and adviser to the President on minority problems. The final event will be the Sayonara ball on September 3.

For the first time, special events will be held for the newly naturalized citizen parents, for the ladies, and for the younger citizens. And Convention Queen Sharon Nishima of Sacramento, representing the host district council, will reign over the festivities.

Jerry Enomoto, immediate past president of the San Francisco host chapter, is the convention chairman.

OFFICERS TYPICAL AMERICANS

Typical of the cross-section of America that comprises JACL are its officers.

National president is George Inagaki, of Venice, Calif., a former nurseryman recently turned real estate salesman.

National vice president is Ken Tashiro, of Orosi, Calif., a farmer.

National vice president is Tak Terasaki, of Denver, a pharmacist.

National treasurer is Dr. Roy Nishikawa, of Los Angeles, an optometrist.

Board secretary is William Mimbu, of Seattle, an attorney.

Thousand club chairman is Shig Wakamatsu, of Chicago, a chemist.

Dr. Thomas T. Yatabe, first constitutional national president, of Chicago, a dentist, and Hito Okada, immediate past national president, of Salt Lake City, Utah, an insurance agent, are also members of the board.

Chairman of the Pacific Northwest district council is Dr. Kelly Yamada, of Seattle, another optometrist.

Chairman of the northern California-western Nevada district council is Yas Abiko, of San Francisco, a newspaper publisher.

Chairman of the central California district council is Jin Ishikawa, of Fresno, another attorney.

Chairman of the Pacific southwest district council is Dave Yokozeki, of Los Angeles, an attorney and motion picture executive.

Chairman of the intermountain district council is George Sugai, of Payette, Idaho, a businessman.

Chairman of the mountain-plains district council is Robert Horiuchi, of Denver, an accountant.

Chairman of the midwest district council is Abe Hagiwara, of Chicago, a social worker.

Chairman of the eastern district council is William Sasagawa, of Philadelphia, an engineer.

National director is Mas Satow of San Francisco; Washington representative is Mike Masaoka of the District of Columbia; Pacific southwest director is Tats Kushida of Los Angeles; and legal counsel is Frank Chuman, also of Los Angeles.

SAN FRANCISCO APPROPRIATE SITE

The city by the Golden Gate, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is particularly appropriate for a gathering of this kind, for no other city in America has been more closely identified with Japanese Americans and their destiny than San Francisco.

Gateway to and from the Orient, it was through this port that the first immigrants from Japan arrived three quarters of a century ago, to make their own significant contributions to the building of western America. It was here that the Treaty of Peace was signed 5 years ago, opening a new and greater era of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Japan.

San Francisco has always been closely associated with the Citizens League movement since its inception in the midtwenties. One of the earliest chapters was organized here. In 1929 in San Francisco, a meeting of the California chapters decided to federate into a national association to promote the citizenship of the then young Japanese American minority and the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in this Nation, who at that time were subjected to considerable legal and other forms of

racial discrimination. Though the First Biennial National Convention was convened in Seattle in 1930, and the Second Biennial 2 years later in Los Angeles, the Third Biennial which established the present organizational structure of the JACL was held in this city by the Golden Gate in 1934.

National headquarters before the war was, and at the present time is, located in San Francisco.

Probably its most memorable meeting was in the spring of 1942, when an emergency meeting of the National Council was held in San Francisco to determine the course of action which Japanese Americans should take in a war in which they were too often confused with the enemy. It was decided that Japanese Americans would agree to cooperate with the Government in their own evacuation, although they thoroughly disagreed with the necessity for such action and the reasons for what has been described as "our worst wartime mistake."

But, the dedicated loyalty of the Japanese Americans was demonstrated in that mass movement, and the Government and the public at large were forced to reappraise the devotion and allegiance to the United States of these unfortunate victims of wartime hate and hysteria.

"CHANGING PERSPECTIVES" THEME

Symbolic of the changed and improved status of Americans of Japanese ancestry is the convention theme, "Changing Perspectives."

Using the tools of democracy, JACL has in the 10 short years since the end of World War II, been able to provide that leadership which has enabled Americans of Japanese ancestry to be accepted as welcome and worthy partners in the American way, whereas a decade ago they were held to be suspect by their own Government.

Through the Congress particularly, and State legislatures as well, JACL has been able to eliminate legal sanctions which at one time numbered more than 500 discriminatory statutes directed against people of Japanese ancestry. The great and priceless privilege of citizenship at long last, in 1952, at a time when the 12th Biennial National Convention was in session in San Francisco, was granted to loyal resident alien Japanese. At the same time, the Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 was repealed and token immigration from Japan authorized under our quota system. The courts of the United States and of the several States, struck down as unconstitutional, laws which discriminated against those of Japanese ancestry solely on the basis of race and, at that time, "ineligibility" to citizenship. The American public at large has come to recognize Japanese Americans for what they are—individual citizens who have demonstrated in combat and at home during World War II that their loyalty is second to none.

Now that their legal status as first-class Americans has been secured under JACL's leadership, "Changing Perspectives" as the convention theme offers some 2,000 or more official delegates and boosters, a challenge to chart the future program and objectives of the JACL in the light of the greater opportunities now available to all Americans of Japanese ancestry.

It is my hope that the members of the JACL will never forget or abandon the basic purposes of the organization. I believe there will always be a valid place in our country for community and national service through active citizens groups dedicated to the goal proclaimed in JACL's mottoes, "For better Americans in a greater America" and "Security through unity." The spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to a splendid cause which have always characterized and motivated both the JACL leadership and membership should also be retained, for these are rare qualities which are sorely needed in this troubled world today.

I know that my colleagues in Congress join with me in the wish that the 14th Biennial National Convention to be held in San Francisco over the Labor Day weekend will result not only in enjoyment and fellowship for JACL members, but also in the formulation of constructive and forward-looking plans and programs which will bring a greater measure of happiness and prosperity to our Japanese Americans and to their fellow citizens in the years to come.

Report of Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement on the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

Copies of the report have been provided to the Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate, and to the President of the United States.

In this connection, there is also included a copy of a letter from the President to Dr. James P. Baxter III, Chairman of the Board of Visitors.

The 1956 Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy and the letter indicated follows:

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, 1956

To the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives.

1. APPOINTMENT OF BOARD

The Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy was appointed in accordance with the provisions of sections 1055–1056 of title 10, United States Code. Pertinent extracts from the code are appended to this report, marked exhibit A.

2. PERSONNEL OF THE BOARD

The membership of the Board as constituted for the year 1956 was as follows:

Senators: RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; LISTER HILL, Alabama; WAYNE C. MORSE, Oregon; CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan.

Representatives: CARL T. DURHAM, North Carolina, representing CARL VINSON, Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland.

Presidential appointees: Gen. Lucius DuB. Clay, chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., New York, N. Y.; Dr. John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Francis M. Dawson, dean of the College of Engineering, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Dr. James P. Baxter III, president, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Dr. John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Col. Charles J. Barrett, professor of foreign languages, United States Military Academy, was appointed Executive Secretary for the Board by the Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

3. PRELIMINARY DATA

In the summer of 1955 the Chief of Legislative Liaison, United States Army, consulted with Members of the Congress concerning suitability of dates for the annual visit. After consideration of all factors affecting the choice, the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy notified the members whose terms extended into 1956 that the period of February 2–4 had been designated for the visit. Announcement of those dates was sent to all new members as notification of their appointment was received.

The Superintendent likewise caused to be distributed to all members certain reports and informational material, and a suggested program for the visit. A list of the data furnished is appended as exhibit B.

4. CONVENING OF THE BOARD

Present for the annual visit were the following members: Mr. Kelley, Mr. Evins, Mr. Hoeven, General Clay, Dr. Dickey, Dr. Carmichael, Dr. Dawson, Dr. Baxter, Dr. Hannah.

Dr. Baxter was unanimously elected Chairman of the Board of Visitors for 1956.

Illness and pressure of congressionall business combined to prevent the attendance of Senator RUSSELL. Illness also caused the absence of Mr. DURHAM. Conflicting responsibilities made it impossible for Senators HILL, MORSE, and POTTER and for Mr. MILLER to participate in the visit. The members of the Board actually in attendance were beset by similar conflicts and many of them were forced to arrive late or to depart early. All of them devoted the maximum available time to the inspections and deliberations of the Board.

Dr. Dickey was in attendance on the first day of the visit only and departed shortly thereafter for a 3-month mission in Europe. He therefore did not participate in the preparation of this report.

5. PROCEDURE

The program followed by the Board in its visit is appended hereto, marked exhibit C.

It is appropriate to note that the annual visit began with snow, rain, and icing conditions, and that the review which terminated the formal part of the visit was held in a snowstorm. Except for travel delays, the visit was not appreciably affected by the weather.

6. COMMENTS

(*a*) *Morale*

1. Cadets: The Board in all its contacts with cadets found evidence of excellent morale. Cadets are proud of the Military Academy, proud of its role in the history of our country, and proud of their part in maintaining the standards for which the Military Academy is known. The Board has been informed that the period after Christmas leave, and particularly that part of it which

immediately follows the semiannual examinations, is a time of low spirits. If what the Board saw is low spirits, no concern need be felt for the morale of the Corps of Cadets.

2. Remainder of the command: The officers and enlisted men observed by the Board were alert, intelligent, and interested in their work. They seemed to be deeply aware of their part in accomplishing the mission of the Military Academy and to find their reward in realization of the importance of the tasks entrusted to them.

(b) Discipline

Problems of discipline appear to be effectively handled and high standards are being maintained.

(c) Curriculum

The Board realizes that the curriculum of the United States Military Academy is tailored to the mission of preparing its graduates for a single career; i. e., that of an officer in the military service of our country. The Board is, however, greatly interested in the extent of extracurricular endeavor, principally in the educational field, which is open to all cadets, particularly those who are intellectually gifted. Seminars in progress at present range from the commonplace problems of personal finance to the more abstruse matter of relativity. The Board also notes with approbation the widespread interest of the cadets in debating, which should bear dividends in effectiveness of expression and the ability to make a logical presentation.

(d) Instruction

1. Academic: The Board is pleased with the methods of instruction in use at the United States Military Academy, and particularly with the maintenance of small sections, in which individual work and participation are possible. To some extent this lessens the rigidity of the curriculum, permitting the more able students to penetrate more deeply into the subject matter while others accomplish only the minimum.

The Board was impressed with the caliber of the instructors it observed in the classrooms. They appeared not only to be thoroughly conversant with their subjects but also to possess those qualities which permit them to draw their students into discussion, thus permitting the latter to derive the benefits of active participation in group work.

2. Military: No actual tactical instruction was observed. The Board visited the instruction plant of the Combined Arms Detachment of the 1802d Special Regiment where it saw adequate and well-maintained equipment and talked with several instructors, particularly with noncommissioned officers who conduct the weapons training and the basic tactical training of the cadets. Training aids are up-to-date and embody many interesting features. It is believed that the military instruction is up to the standards of the Military Academy.

(e) Physical equipment

The conversion of the riding hall to academic space has now begun, and is tentatively set for completion in September 1957.

Removal in 1957 of the academic activities from the present West Academic Building will permit the first step to be taken in alleviating the crowded housing conditions of the Corps of Cadets. More than two-thirds of the cadets are living 3 in a room designed for 2 occupants. Beds, study tables, clothespresses, and racks for the equipment of three cadets occupy most of the available space. While no health problem appears so far to have arisen, and the morale of which mention has already been made is excellent, a very distinct disadvantage to the cadet exists in the lack of suitable study conditions. Were study rooms available in the barracks, present conditions would be immensely improved. But since the cadet lives, works, and sleeps in the same crowded room where the distractions of 3 occupants greatly outnumber those of 2, he cannot devote to his studies the attention which they merit. Considering his limited study time, he is working under an academic handicap.

It is to be noted that the overcrowding is most prevalent in the fourth class, which is precisely the one in which the cadet is often faced with the need to develop new habits of concentration in the preparation of his daily tasks.

The facilities for housing cadets at West Point are substantially below the standards maintained in civilian colleges and universities which provide housing for their students.

It is planned to convert the West Academic Building, after 1957, into additional housing space for the Corps of Cadets. Its location immediately adjoining the present barracks area contributes to the desirability of the plan. It will not eliminate the overcrowding, but any reduction of the overcrowding is a step in the right direction.

It is the belief of the Board that the plans for conversion of the West Academic Building to barracks space should be carried to the point where the work may be started immediately upon release of the building. Meanwhile planning for barracks space in addition to that to be obtained by conversion of the academic space to be outdated in 1957 should be undertaken, and actual construction should be accomplished as soon as possible. Expansion of the Corps of Cadets beyond the figure which is currently projected should be deferred until the physical plant is made adequate for its housing.

(f) Fiscal affairs

Though all major items of equipment are available for training the Corps of Cadets and for maintenance of the Military Academy, there is apparent a sensible economy in administration. No indication of extravagance or of assigning high priority to the procurement of minor items has been seen.

(g) Filling cadet vacancies

Currently the Corps of Cadets is below its authorized strength and it was also below strength before the departure of those who failed the first term's work. The Military Academy has not been filling its vacancies at a time when civilian institutions of learning are being deluged with applications. The Military Academy is in competition with civilian colleges for the same outstanding young students. The education at Government expense which is characteristic of the service academies is offset by the scholarships, some of them carrying both tuition and board, which are available in many colleges today.

It is important that the Military Academy obtain its share of the outstanding young men who enter college each year. Any tendency toward mediocrity in the officer corps of our military services must be combated in every possible way.

It is currently proposed to increase the number of Presidential competitive appointments to the Military Academy. These appointments have been reserved for nearly a century for the sons of members of the regular components of the Armed Forces. Increasing the number of appointments from this source would permit the admission of a greater number of young men familiar with military life and possessing a high degree of motivation for a military career.

Authority exists under the law for appointment of qualified alternates and qualified competitors to fill vacancies which exist after the composition of a new class has been determined. A limiting factor here is the size of the pool of qualified prospects. There are many young men of suitable academic ability, character, and leadership potential who are not eligible for Presidential appointment and who would be interested in a military career and enrollment in the Military Academy were they aware of its opportunities.

It is suggested that inconsistencies of geographical distribution, lack of familiarity with the approaches to Congress, or the accident of birth into a family without service connection, be offset by authorizing the Superintendent to fill vacancies still existing after the entrance of a new class, plus the qualified alternates and qualified competitors whose admission is currently provided for by law. A suitable procedure might conform to the following outline: Any interested young man could make application for admission directly to the Superintendent; the applicant would be required to establish his eligibility for admission as prescribed for all prospective appointees; the Superintendent could then select from this group the individuals to fill any remaining vacancies, considering the same factors which are used in the selection of the qualified alternates and the qualified competitors.

It is a certainty that there are young men in the country today who are unaware of the opportunity West Point offers, or who consider appointment to the Military Academy unobtainable. Greater dissemination of information about the Academy is necessary and the Board is pleased to note the scheme of expanded publicity which was reported to it. It is hoped that these proposals may be immediately implemented in order that the country at large, and particularly its eligible young men, may know more about the Military Academy.

The Board hopes that the Corps of Cadets may be soon returned to its authorized strength and that every measure, including necessary legislation, will be taken to assure that the annual quota of admissions be filled.

(h) Possession of money by cadets

For many years receipt of money from outside sources by cadets was prohibited. This was in the interest of democracy; it placed all cadets on a plane of financial equality, making it impossible to distinguish the rich man's son from the poor man's son.

In past years—the exact time is not known to the Board—the prohibition was removed. Possession of outside funds is now both recognized and tolerated. Though changing norms of social behavior undoubtedly have their effect among the cadets, there remains a question concerning the desirability of preserving the former standards in money matters.

In view of the increased compensation recently authorized for cadets, an increase which it was expected would be sufficient to permit all cadets to graduate free of debt, it is believed that study should be given to the desirability of returning to the democratic principle which was in force for so many years.

(i) Status of permanent professors

There is at West Point a devoted group of officers who have been selected for the 21 permanent professorships (the dean of the academic board is included). In addition to their educational qualifications, they possess the characteristics and abilities sought in general officers. Five of them were actually general officers before they accepted their present responsibilities; in the past 10 years there have been 2 others, 1 of whom is now retired, 1 deceased.

While these patriotic officers have been devoting their finest efforts to the preparation of tomorrow's leaders in our Army, many other officers of no greater ability or promise have been promoted to general-officer rank. And whereas in the small Army of 50 years ago there were relatively few colonels and that grade carried considerable importance, today's expanded numbers have so submerged the professors of the United States Military Academy as greatly to diminish their prestige.

The Board considers it unjust that professors should be denied the opportunities for advancement in rank and recognition to which their qualifications would entitle them

in other military fields. In the view of the Board their responsibility for training future military leaders is fully as worthy of recognition and rank as are the assignments of other general officers of the Army. Since promotion is the most tangible recognition of worthy performance of important duties, it should not be denied to outstanding officers willing to make a lifetime career of training future military leaders.

The Board believes that the relative importance of the direction of instruction at West Point vis-a-vis that of other general officer assignments has not been properly evaluated. It believes that steps can be taken within the general-officer ceiling figure whether as now established or as it may later be amended, to permit recognition of the worth of distinguished teaching officers at West Point. It believes that the time has come for providing suitable advancement for meritorious officers whose service to the country has been distinguished, deserving, and apparently insufficiently appreciated.

(f) Chaplain, United States Military Academy

The moral and the spiritual are among the most important phases of instruction at the United States Military Academy. This Board has reviewed, and concurs in, the comments of the Board of Visitors for 1955 concerning the chaplaincy at West Point. The present method of selection of the Chaplain should be continued. The pay of the office should be sufficient to attract to it young clergymen of suitable caliber. In addition, the size of the Corps of Cadets is now such as to require the time and labors of more than one man. Currently an assistant is provided, utilizing the chapel fund for his payment. It is proper that the need for an assistant be recognized and that provision be made by the Government for his maintenance and remuneration. Legislation has been introduced (S. 2137) to authorize the appointment of an assistant and to establish a suitable pay scale for both clergymen. This Board considers the proposed legislation worthy of support.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board makes the following recommendations:

(a) Barracks

That detailed planning be undertaken so that the present West Academic Building may be converted to barracks space for cadets as soon as the building can be released from its present use; also planning for the construction of sufficient additional barracks to permit housing all cadets, two to a room, with adequate additional study space in all barracks buildings.

(b) Filling cadet vacancies

That the Superintendent be authorized to fill the corps of cadets to its authorized strength each year, after the new class and qualified alternates and qualified competitors have entered, from among those qualified young men who have made application to him and whose academic ability, character, and leadership potential warrant their selection for a military career. Such procedure, if adopted, must not jeopardize the present method of filling vacancies by congressional appointment nor reduce the number of appointments to which each Member of the Congress is entitled.

(c) Dissemination of information

That every step be taken to inform the youth of our country of the opportunity which West Point offers, and to interest them in the military career, so that the Military Academy may receive its share of the talented young men who enter college each year.

(d) Possession of money by cadets

That a study be made, with report to the Board of Visitors for 1957, of the feasibility and desirability of limiting the amount of money in the possession of cadets to that which all receive alike from their cadet pay.

(e) Improvement of status of permanent professors

That the senior officers permanently assigned to the Military Academy receive the same opportunities for increased rank and recognition to which their qualifications would entitle them if serving at stations other than West Point.

(f) Chaplain, United States Military Academy

That the present method of selection for this important post be continued, that the chaplain's pay be set at a figure which will provide him a living comparable to that in other important posts of the Protestant clergy, and that he be given the necessary assistant in his ministration to the United States Corps of Cadets.

8. CONCLUSION

The members of the Board of Visitors, as citizens of the United States, take pride in the work of the United States Military Academy and in the spirit which characterizes the performance of all who are connected with it. In our judgment the loyalty and enthusiasm of the Corps of Cadets, reflecting the same qualities in the members of the faculty and of the staff, would be an inspiration to every American. It is our belief that the Military Academy is accomplishing in full measure its mission and that its graduates go forth today with the same high ideals and same fine qualities which have made their predecessors worthy defenders of the American way of life.

AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
United States House of Representatives.
JOE L. EVINS,
United States House of Representatives.
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
United States House of Representatives.
FRANCIS M. DAWSON,
Dean of the College of Engineering, State University of Iowa.
JAMES P. BAXTER III,
President, Williams College, Chairman.
LUCIUS D. CLAY,
Chairman of the Board, Continental Can Co.
LEONARD CARMICHAEL,
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.
JOHN A. HANNAH,
President, Michigan State University.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 23, 1956.

Dr. JAMES P. BAXTER III,
President, Williams College
Williamstown, Mass.

DEAR DR. BAXTER: I have reviewed the Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy with great interest, and have forwarded it to the Secretary of Defense for further study and initiation of appropriate action on its recommendations.

It is gratifying to me, as I am sure it was to the Board, that the conversion of the riding hall to academic space is underway, and is expected to be completed in the fall of 1957. It is encouraging to see the recommendations of a previous year being brought to fruition. I hope the suggestions now presented for further improvements in the physical facilities, so as to permit housing all cadets two to a room, as well as those concerning the filling of cadet vacancies can meet with the same favorable results.

Through this report—and through the interest and effort that lie behind it—you and the other members of the Board continue to make a valuable contribution to the future of the Military Academy. Please convey to each member who participated my sincere appreciation.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

The Plight of Independent Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me on the subject "The Plight of Independent Agencies."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLIGHT OF INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

We are entering on that recurring period in our national life when the record of an administration is subject to review in detail in order that the people may express their choice at the polls on the basis of information and understanding. And when, as it appears will be the case in November 1956, one of the candidates for the Presidency is the man invested with the authority of that high office, a more searching examination of his administration must necessarily be made. Those of us who belong to what the British call the "loyal opposition" are gratified indeed that we can present our case, confident that our voices need not be mute in sympathy for suffering, that we need not be silent in compassion. We are glad that the President has regained strength and hope that he will be able to take responsibility on the hustings for the acts of his administration.

This is the way it should be. It would be dangerous to our institutions if the electorate in November were denied the opportunity to analyze the record of the past 4 years, to comprehend in all its implications the somewhat novel concept of the Presidency presented by this administration, to judge if such a concept has resulted in honest and in responsible Government, and to decide if such a concept is adequate to meet the challenge of the next 4 years.

I refer to the concept of the Presidency implicit in a system where the Chief Executive assures the people of the Nation of his honesty and good intentions, his faith in the maxims that govern decent human conduct, while he permits his subordinates and his aides to take such actions which repudiate his promises, ignore his publicly stated intentions, and without his interference they proceed to run the Government according to their private and personal understandings or wishes as to his administration's objectives. This is what happens, I believe, when a President is unable or unwilling to identify those routine and ministerial functions appropriate for delegation, and as a consequence surrenders to his subordinates excessive executive powers, beyond the powers contemplated by Constitution, statute or by tradition. By such delegations the office of the Presidency has been diminished in the Eisenhower administration as the requirements of the office have been adjusted to fit the deep-rooted habits, inclinations and necessities of the President.

I do not now wish to discuss the results in terms of America's prestige abroad, nor to speculate about the effect in chancelleries around the world as the cacophony of conflicting views expressed by officials of this administration assaults their ears. Nor am I going to discuss the confusion in the Congress and the Nation with respect to our Nation's requirements for defense, as divergent views are aired, and contradictory evidence is sifted to get at the truth, while we

wait in vain for the responsible Chief Executive to exert the powers of his office to support his public promises.

I wish to discuss the results of the policy of delegation of his responsibilities by the Chief Executive in one specific field, an area concerning which I have some personal knowledge and with respect to which the essential facts I will present as illustration are in the public domain.

I am going to discuss the record of this administration with respect to the conduct of the independent agencies of Government during the past few years. My indictment is a harsh one, for I believe that never since 1887 when the oldest of the independent agencies now existing, the Interstate Commerce Commission, was created by the Congress has there been such a deliberate effort to make those agencies subservient to the demands of partisan objectives. I believe that never before has there been a studied usurpation of their powers, a deliberate erosion of their integrity, and a calculated sabotage of the purposes for which they were created.

For this the President of the United States must accept responsibility, for this attempted prostitution of the Independent Agencies has been undertaken by his personal secretariat as they have seized for their domain responsibilities deliberately assigned by Congress to other officials, responsibilities never intended to be discharged from the Executive Offices at all. This illicit transfer to the Office of the President of the power to decide issues intended by the Congress to be determined elsewhere has achieved a centralization of authority without accountability wholly foreign to the traditions of democratic institutions, and alien to the spirit in which the independent agencies were created by the Congress.

The unauthorized transfer of power has not been openly attempted. It is not acknowledged, although the record is plain, nor is its significance fully understood. But the transfer has been made, and the schemes of irresponsible cabals in secret have been substituted for the planning of responsible officials. With arrogance and with contempt the will of Congress has been defied as the Bureau of the Budget and the secretariat of the White House have undertaken to control, to manage, to subvert the purposes and to corrupt the administration of the independent agencies of the Federal Government.

This is not forthright government. Honest government is not achieved by the simple assembling of eminent men to play on a so-called "team." Honest government is achieved by faithful execution of the laws enacted by the Congress. When Congress created independent agencies it intended that they should be independent, in fact as well as name. Congress did not intend those agencies to become subordinate divisions of the Bureau of the Budget nor the organization at the White House. These agencies, usually headed by boards or commissions, were set apart from the old-line departments of the executive establishment deliberately. Their isolation was intended to shelter them from the pressures of partisan politics. The bills of divorcement were not accidentally contrived. In each case the nature of their responsibilities was such that in the judgment of the Congress it appeared to be essential that these specific agencies should be insulated from the shifts in partisan fortunes reflected in the quadrennial elections. The statutes creating the major independent agencies are not alike. Nor is there necessarily any similarity in the tasks assigned to them. Some, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, perform regulatory, quasi-judicial, or quasi-legislative functions. Others, like TVA and AEC, are distinguished by great managerial responsibilities.

Some of the boards and commissions were given long and staggered terms by statute to assure that continuity in program and policy would be unaffected by changes in administration. By statute some boards and commissions are bipartisan. Others are nonpartisan, nonpolitical in composition. The arrangements and the safeguards differ, but in each case the purpose of the Congress was the same. These great independent agencies were intended to be kept out of politics, to discharge the jobs entrusted to them on the basis of law and fact, in fairness to the people their responsibilities affect. That was the clear intention of the Congress, an intention deliberately ignored by this administration. Today we find the independent agencies of Government whirling at the partisan center of Government, the White House, not moving calmly on the political periphery as Congress intended, and as their responsibilities require. We find the men appointed to administer their affairs subservient to the politicians in the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, the almost faceless secretariat who undertake to run the Government in the name of the President of the United States.

This is something new in Federal administration. It is a total change in climate. Only 10 years ago the Atomic Energy Commission was created. The awesome nature of the tasks before it made it clear that its decisions should be unaffected by partisan considerations, and the confidence of the public required evidence of its total separation from political pressure. The requirement was so self-evident that, to the best of my recollection, it caused no particular comment that a Democratic President appointed to the first Commission four Republicans and one man described as an Independent. No Democrat was chosen. No one commented on the political significance of his selections. There was no political significance.

The first Commission was composed of Lilienthal (then an Independent in politics; in 1952 announced his affiliation with the Democratic Party); Strauss, Republican; Pike, Republican; Waymack, Republican; Bacher, Republican (Dr. Bacher was a scientist; his political affiliation is not given in Who's Who; it is stated by his friends that he is a registered Republican).

Those five Commissioners were expected to act not as Republicans, or Democrats, or political independents, but as public servants invested with specific responsibilities under their statute. They were not members of a partisan team. All that is changed. Today it is not rare, it is commonplace in fact, for the press to refer to the AEC Commissioners by partisan tags, to identify the opinions, and the testimony, of Commissioner Murray, for example, as those of the sole Democratic holdover remaining in office, and the Chairman of the Commission is most celebrated for the end runs he attempts on the partisan team of which he is a member. Today the heads of all the independent nonpolitical agencies of Government are expected to be members of a political team, and the plays are called by the Bureau of the Budget in the Office of the President.

Now the Bureau of the Budget has important functions to perform, legitimate functions that are essential to the administration of the executive establishment. But nowhere among its duties can be found the responsibility of managing the independent agencies of Government. Yet that is precisely what the Bureau has undertaken to accomplish under the present administration. That is exactly what was attempted in the case of Dixon-Yates. The illicit exercise of power was the source of the corruption, now acknowledged. There would have been no scandal at all, if at the very beginning the will of Congress had been recognized, if each agency concerned had performed the functions assigned to it by statute, if accountable officials had made the decisions, and the Bureau of the Budget had been restrained in its calculated program of usurpation.

In that one episode—the affair of Dixon-Yates—we can see what has happened to some of our independent agencies of Government during the past 3 years. In that one episode we can see what happens when the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the President usurp authority, defy the statutes adopted by the Congress, and endeavor to marshal the independent agencies of Government in support of the narrow partisan objective they assume to be desired by the Chief Executive. In that one episode we can observe the methods employed, the devices used. From the history of that one episode we can appraise the understanding or attitude of the President with respect to the place and function of independent agencies in the executive establishment, his comprehension of their statutes and traditions, his concern for their integrity. In that episode with its lengthy public record we are free to judge the ethical standards, the probity, and the wisdom of his advisers. From that one episode the people can consider just how much of the routine of Government safely can be delegated to his subordinates by the President of the United States, just how much compliance with the acts of Congress he has demanded of his agents as they discharge his delegated duties.

Let me make clear that I do not rise to say "we told you so." I am not going to discuss the "Answer of the United States" filed in response to the claim for damages asserted by the private power combine as a consequence of the order of the President that the contract I am discussing should be canceled. Suits for breach of promise are somewhat foreign to my experience. In this, as in other cases, the courts must determine the degree of injury, if any, sustained by castoff favorites. I am concerned with a question of public morality, of administrative probity. I am using Dixon-Yates as a case study of what happens when men attempt to pervert the statutes enacted by the Congress. I am using Dixon-Yates to show what happens when the Bureau of the Budget, and the Office of the President, usurp responsibilities for which other men are accountable under the law. I am using it to show what happens when political considerations are permitted to abrogate statutory obligations, and I am using it to demonstrate how little the actions of his subordinates have reflected the public statements of the President, how long such statements have been used to conceal wrongdoing.

So far as the public was concerned, I suppose, the story of Dixon-Yates began on June 17, 1954. Then the President of the United States, clothed in his constitutional powers as head of the executive establishment, advised by his Attorney General, ordered the AEC, over the objections of a majority of the Commission, to contract with Dixon-Yates to provide a supply of power to deliver to TVA primarily for sale by TVA to the city of Memphis. But there was a story behind the story, and that tale began in early November of 1952 when the State I have the honor in part to represent, the region, and the Nation, read the promise of a candidate who said:

"If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency."

What private commitments had been made on his behalf I do not know. What conflicts arose between public and private assurances, I am not aware, but it was early apparent that the President of the United States regarded the future of TVA as a troublesome problem about which he preferred to remain uninformed. The continuity of its efficiency was one of the routine problems delegated to his staff. It is a matter of record that he never conferred with members of the Board of TVA to get the facts. Under the new concept of administra-

tion, the President, elected by the people, responsible to them for the execution of the laws enacted by their representatives in Congress, made an exception of those statutes administered by "holdovers." Responsibility for the nonpolitical, nonpartisan agencies of Government was delegated to the politicians, and the men who decide who will see the President failed to recognize that the members of the Board of TVA were not holdovers by chance or political ineptitude, but by deliberate design, because the Congress planned it that way. Their terms of statutory length were specifically intended to provide a new administration with the advantage of advice based on knowledge of the problem of the law, of the facts. The men selected by the President to manage his time refused to recognize that holdovers were simply officials accountable under the law. They were not hostile politicians, nor were they saboteurs. They were men of honor, administering the laws adopted by the Congress. Throughout the Government they were ignored, as the politicians took over the area marked "nonpolitical" by the Congress.

In the case of TVA the responsibility for management appears to have been delegated by the President to Mr. Joseph Dodge, a banker of Detroit, then Director of the Budget. He passed the test of party regularity no doubt, and the more exacting standard of personal compatibility. The weakness of the delegation lay in the fact that Mr. Dodge knew nothing whatsoever about the problem, that he had never taken the special oath required by Congress for that particular job. The rules of the team to which Mr. Dodge was appointed prevented him from consultation with the responsible officials, but happily for his peace of mind he had connections in the world of finance, and there was made available to him "for the payment of expenses only" the services of one Adolph Wenzell, a vice president of First Boston Corp., well known as a private utility financing house, and Mr. Wenzell was secretly established at the Bureau of the Budget to plan the future of TVA, to determine, we are asked to suppose, how the promise of the candidate that "if I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency," would be honored by the Chief Executive of the Nation. Mr. Wenzell conferred, but not with TVA. There were rounds of conferences and consultations about the future of TVA, consultations with AEC and FPC, with private utility magnates who had fought the TVA for over 20 years. There were no consultations with the men who were charged under the law with responsibility for the agency's management, none with the men who were sworn to uphold the act as it was adopted by the Congress.

And slowly out of all the secret meetings Dixon-Yates was born. With that act the illegal transfer of power was clear. The Bureau of the Budget in the Office of the President had seized in secret the responsibility given by statute to the Board of TVA. With that act, the intention of the Bureau of the Budget under this administration was crystal clear. The Bureau was prepared to nullify the acts of Congress which have created independent agencies of government. The Bureau had assumed control, and in secret from a central point the independent agencies of government were expected to be run. The destruction of one independent agency, TVA, was the objective the team was first required to take, and as it developed one of the consequences was the surrender of the integrity of other independent agencies as their chairmen were ordered into play. The Chairman of the AEC, Admiral Strauss, was on the team. He overrode the objections of a majority of the Commission he heads to play a leading part. The newly appointed Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Kuykendall, was assigned a position. The Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission won his letter, and the Attorney General of the United States gave his nod of approval to the assault on TVA. The team was solid, well-trained and coached. Each man was in position behind the then Director of the Budget, Mr. Rowland Hughes, who had succeeded Mr. Dodge, when, on June 15, 1954, Mr. Hughes recommended to the President of the United States that he should assert his constitutional powers as head of the Government and order the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a contract with Dixon-Yates.

It was Mr. Hughes who had piloted the negotiations to this conclusion. It was Mr. Hughes who deceived the President about the facts in the situation, but there is no record that the President subjected him to serious questioning, and we can assume the Director of the Budget thought he was responding to the President's desires. There is no record in the whole affair to indicate that the President made a searching examination of the facts. There is no suggestion that he was aware, or that he cared if he understood about this gross invasion by one independent agency of the jurisdiction of another. Mr. Hughes may have realized, in small degree, the vulnerability of the arrangement he proposed. Adroitly he inserted a concluding sentence in his memorandum, a sentence intended to insulate the President against the doubts which might be stimulated by public discussion of the contract so secretly negotiated.

He wrote in this final sentence of his memorandum to the President:

"Hearings are scheduled for the very near future in the Congress, at which Admiral Strauss and his staff will explain the terms of the proposal prior to actually entering into the contract. These hearings, if held, will undoubtedly bring out further orations about the TVA."

Well, Mr. Hughes was right. There was some oratory. In the hearing room and in this Chamber the illegality and the unwisdom of the contract was debated at considerable length. But Mr. Hughes was correct in the judgment about the effect on the President. The oratory which he had taken pains to discount in advance had no influence at the White House, and during the debate a deluge of misinformation about the TVA, a barrage of vicious attack, flowed in a steady stream to the Senate from the Bureau of the Budget, and from AEC. The "team" was hard at work, its confidence unshaken.

Our arguments were ineffective here, the Congress adjourned, and plans for Dixon-Yates went forward at the White House, at the Atomic Energy Commission, in the Securities and Exchange Commission, all coordinated under the watchful eye of the Director of the Budget. Plans went forward, but problems multiplied too.

By mid-August the President felt obliged to advise the press that the entire record of the Dixon-Yates negotiations would be made public. He appeared to believe that such a promise of "full disclosure" would give the people confidence in the probity of the whole proceeding, a confidence somewhat shaken by that time. Partial and selected disclosure was considered adequate by his subordinates, however, and the record shows that the public promise of the President was not respected by the subordinates to whom he delegated performance. Months later it was discovered that on order from the Bureau of the Budget, the name of Wenzell had been stricken from the chronologies of events made public. The President had spoken to the people to reassure them. But the Bureau of the Budget had spoken to AEC. In August, of course, no one outside the "team" knew there was this significant deletion. No one could contrast the public statement of the President with the private performance of his aides. No one but members of the team knew about Mr. Wenzell, and they were silent. His function as the architect of TVA's destruction was a secret within the inner circle. His participation in the Dixon-Yates was hidden.

In August of 1954 little was known of the steps by which the President had been led to make this calamitous decision. The partial record released in response to the direction of the President outlined only a part of the history. Before the whole story was revealed there had to be hearings before committees of the Congress, repetitive and wearying, as official after official refused to answer questions on the grounds of his confidential relation to the White House. There had to be hearings before the SEC on questions raised by the State of Tennessee and the distributors having contracts to purchase power from TVA. Long and tedious sessions were endured before the facts were developed. If the controversy was reported to the President, we may assume that the legal issues raised, the discussion of equities involved, the questions of probity presented were all explained away as the "oratory" so sagely predicted by the infallible Mr. Hughes.

But the slow disclosure of the truth was under way, and at length the name of Wenzell was added to the lengthening roster of personnel involved in Dixon-Yates. The public first heard of Mr. Wenzell, long of First Boston and late of the Bureau of the Budget, when on February 18, 1955, a Senator rose in his place in this Chamber. The distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL, first brought to the attention of the Congress and the public notice of Mr. Wenzell's participation in the affair. The Senator corresponded with Mr. Hughes about it in an effort to get the facts, and his later testimony revealed that the Director of the Budget had discussed the matter with the President and that he had advised the Chief Executive that the charges of the Senator from Alabama were not based on fact. They were probably described by Mr. Hughes as more "TVA oratory" for the President to ignore.

The explanation of the presence of Mr. Wenzell offered to the Senator from Alabama by Mr. Hughes underestimated the sagacity and the knowledge of his inquirer. Mr. Hughes advanced the peculiar explanation that Mr. Wenzell had been employed as a consultant by Mr. Dodge to study TVA's methods of cost allocation and accounting. That was all. Now the Senator from Alabama knew, if Mr. Hughes and Mr. Dodge did not, that a study of TVA's accounting procedures did not require the importation of an investment banker from New York. He knew that under the law TVA's power accounts are kept according to standards prescribed for utilities by the Federal Power Commission, that they are subject to annual audit by the General Accounting Office, and that they have been widely praised by persons not necessarily fully approving of the program entrusted to TVA by the Congress to manage. The recent Director of Internal Revenue, T. Coleman Andrews, for example, testified before a committee of the Congress when as a member of the General Accounting Office staff he was in charge of TVA's annual audit. He said:

"TVA probably has the finest accounting system in the entire Government and probably one of the best accounting systems in the entire world. It is an excellent system. There is no private enterprise in this country that has any better."

This devious explanation for the presence of Mr. Wenzell in the Bureau of the Budget was not good enough for the Senator from Alabama. It was not good enough for the senior Senator from Tennessee, who later summoned the banker to testify before the committee over which he presided, and before whom the outline of the story was finally revealed. It was not good enough for

anyone with an inquiring mind, or a reasonable fund of relevant information.

It was good enough for the President of the United States, however, although it was indicated in correspondence between Mr. Dodge and Mr. Wenzell, later presented to the Senate committee, that the President had known about the presence of Mr. Wenzell in the Bureau, that he had read and commended his written report. If he had in fact read the lengthy document, he knew that it was no report of accounting matters. It was a charter of dismemberment for TVA. But the explanation given by Mr. Hughes to the Senator from Alabama was repeated by the President 4 months later. And even later when general understanding of the role of Mr. Wenzell was fairly clear, a record of a conference with the press reveals this final reference to Mr. Wenzell:

"Question. Mr. President, on the basis of what you have been told about the role of Adolphe Wenzell in this Dixon-Yates contract, do you regard that role as proper?

"Answer. Indeed, yes." (From the President's press conference, July 6, 1955. New York Times, July 7, 1955.)

Apparently the President had not been told enough about the activities of his subordinate to form a reasoned judgment, and he was too complacent and indifferent to find out for himself.

It is true that the President was deceived by his advisers, but it is just as true that the deception was easy to accomplish because he was so ill-informed and indifferent to the basic problems. If the basic issue had been recognized he would never have suffered the humiliating consequences he must now endure. He would never have so belatedly discovered that the contract he personally ordered in his capacity as head of the Government was conceived in fraud, that it was illegal in execution, and that its real objectives were concealed. He would never have intervened as he did, with a personal letter to "Dear Stub", the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to demand a "waiver" of the statutory period for consideration, a "waiver" that the Department of Justice of the United States now admits the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy could not legally grant. He would never have signed a letter incorporating in its text the long familiar contentions of the private power lobby, which has for more than 20 years tried to nullify the acts of Congress creating TVA. If the President had understood the issue he would never have presented Mr. Wenzell to the public in the guise of a consultant employed in connection with a study of bookkeeping problems. He would not have told the public that the banker's role was "proper." If the President had understood the issue he would not have permitted the grave questions raised by responsible officials to be dismissed as "oratory" by his aides.

It is true, as I have said, that the President was misled by the advisers he had selected. It is true that at the time they presented a united front. In July of 1954 the President told the people through the press that the Attorney General had advised him of his right to order AEC to enter into the contract over the objection of a majority of the Commission. In October the records of his conferences disclose the limitations of his information but he assured the public that the Federal Power Commmission considered Dixon-Yates a proper contract, and further, as justification for his decision, the President remarked that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission "was at the focal point of making this contract," and added that he "couldn't think of any man in Government whom he trusts more as to his integrity, his commonsense and his business acumen."

This is an extraordinary concept of the responsibility of the President, who was willing to substitute the "commonsense and business acumen" of Admiral Strauss for the provisions of statutes enacted by the Congress. The President should have been aware, if Admiral Strauss was not, that his good opinion of the admiral's "business acumen" endowed the latter with no right to use the prestige of the great agency he heads to promote the scheme hatched in the Bureau of the Budget to destroy the TVA. The President should have been aware of that.

The power of the President to decide is a solemn power. It is a lonely grant of authority. And when the power is exercised without concern to know the facts, or without the will to understand the issues, then the power to decide is a frightening responsibility. The basic question in Dixon-Yates was not the propriety of a specific contract. That was collateral. The basic issue was a question of administration integrity, not the provisions of an agreement. The basic question raised related to the faithful execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, execution based on understanding of the statutes' purposes. The President of the United States should have known then that by these recommendations the Director of the Budget was usurping the responsibilities assigned by Congress to other and accountable officials. The President should have known then what the Department of Justice now admits, that the contract proposed for AEC to sign was not within the subject matter assigned to AEC by Congress.

This secret and illicit assumption of power by the Office of the President is at the heart of the scandal of Dixon-Yates. The President failed to understand that the independent agencies of Government, the nonpolitical boards and commissions, are not to be managed from the White House or the Bureau of the Budget. He has failed to comprehend that it is essential for them to remain outside the arena where partisan issues are fought. If he had made this clear to his aides there would have been no problem. There would have been no "team" play required. The head of the Securities and Exchange Commission would never have been ordered by Mr. Sherman Adams, sometimes described as Deputy President of the United States, to adjourn a hearing so that the testimony of Mr. Wenzell might be postponed lest his statements influence action pending in the Congress. The whole shameful corrupting business could have been avoided if the President had understood and accepted the acts of Congress which require a special place in the executive establishment for the agencies which report to him, to the Congress, and to the people, as independent agencies of Government.

It is time for the Congress to speak up about this disturbing development. The court will determine the equity of the claim advanced by Dixon and Yates. The President must decide what to do about his faithless advisers. The Congress itself must speak out in defense of the integrity of these agencies it has created. They are captive now to politicians, through control by the Bureau of the Budget. This is a matter of equal concern to both sides of the aisle. It is as important to Republicans as to Democrats that probity of administration be guaranteed in the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the TVA, AEC, and all the others. It is a responsibility of the office of the President to preserve their independence, to protect them from political invasion, to shield them from the special interests who would destroy or corrupt them. It is as important to one party as another to know that the men who decide are the men who are accountable under the statutes they administer, that they are not subject to manipulation by the Bureau of the Budget, nor the Assistant to the President.

The Congress cannot delegate its responsibilities to speak, to protest, the responsimility of its Members to interpret the record for the people.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, July 16, 1956)

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all who art above all and through all and in all without whom life has no spiritual source, no divine meaning or destiny but with whom there is power for the present and hope for the future, we seek Thee as our fathers before us have sought Thee in every generation and who by faith were led over frowning peaks to the pleasant valleys and still waters beyond—so lead us on, for Thou only art our guide and deliverer, our rock and our refuge.

Now that the sands of another session have almost run out we acknowledge that at best we have been but unprofitable servants. Into Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves and all that has been said and done here in sincerity of purpose. Wilt Thou bless and strengthen all that within these hallowed walls has been worthily spoken and done as these servants of the peoples' choice have followed flickering lights in a darkened hour. Pardon and overrule in Thy wisdom what has been done unworthily or left undone or done amiss. And now as to another chapter of the Nation's life there is about to be written "The End," may the Lord bless you and keep you—may the Lord make his face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you—may the Lord lift up the light of his countenance upon you and give you peace—peace in your own hearts, peace in this dear land where still burns freedom's holy light—peace throughout all the earth to men of good will now and evermore. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 25, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of G. Lewis Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Tunisia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

G. Lewis Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Tunisia.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], from the Committee on Armed Services, I report a group of flag and general officers for appointment and promotion in the Army and Navy. Included in this group is the nomination of Capt. Chester C. Ward to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years; Brig. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army in the rank of major general; Maj. Gen. Ridgely Gaither for special assignment in the rank of lieutenant general, Col. Charles H. Schilling for appointment as professor of military art and engineering, United States Military Academy, and the appointment in the Regular Army of 18 general officers as well as the promotion and appointment of 19 Reserve commissioned officers of the Army. I ask that these nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. President, there is a special report filed by the subcommittee which passed on the nomination of Chester C. Ward, which I ask unanimous consent may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Capt. Chester C. Ward, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral;

Col. Charles H. Schilling, for appointment as professor of military art and engineering, United States Military Academy;

Brig. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., United States Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army, as major general, Regular Army and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Joseph Howard Harper, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

The report, presented by Mr. STENNIS, is as follows:

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF CAPT. CHESTER C. WARD TO BE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY WITH RANK OF REAR ADMIRAL

On July 6, 1956, the nomination of Capt. Chester C. Ward, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy with the rank of rear admiral for a term of 4 years was received in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. In accordance with the standing rules of the committee, this nomination was not eligible for consideration until 7 days had elapsed following its receipt. On July 19, a subcommittee whose members are the signatories to this report was appointed to consider the nomination. An open hearing at which the Secretary of the Navy testified was conducted on July 20, 1956.

No objections to the nomination of Captain Ward have been received by the committee. There have been no allegations, or even intimations, that Captain Ward is not qualified to fill the position to which he has been nominated. On the contrary, there was testimony that Captain Ward's performance of duty in the Navy has been outstanding, that he is highly regarded in the legal profession, and that his character is unassailable. The subcommittee finds this testimony to be true and correct.

Despite Captain Ward's obvious qualifications and the realization that the authority to appoint a Judge Advocate General of the Navy is vested in the President, the subcommittee has paused before recommending confirmation of the nomination. The hesitation results from the knowledge that a line selection board had, within the last year, recommended for promotion to rear admiral a legal specialist other than the nominee. Of course, there is no requirement of law that the President nominate as the Judge Advocate General the officer picked by a selection board composed of military personnel. On occasions in the past when the committee has inquired into the nonselection of certain officers, representatives of the executive branch have been quick to point out that the selection system has withstood the test of time and that while it may not be without defects, it is the best of all practical methods for selecting from a larger group a limited number of officers who are to be promoted. Acting on these representations, the committee has approved each year literally thousands of nominations that were based on the recommendations of selection boards. Considering that the line selection board picked another officer in preference to Captain Ward, it is somewhat surprising in this instance to observe that the executive branch was unwilling to accept for a statutory office the person selected as best qualified by a board of officers senior to him. We are inclined to believe that such a practice is not good for officer morale, even though we recognize there can be no absolute rule on the subject.

The timing of the nomination is also unusual in that the term of Rear Admiral Ira H. Nunn, the preceding Judge Advocate General, expired on June 18, 1956. The committee was informed that the selection of his successor required such care and deliberation that it was impractical for a nomination to be submitted in sufficient time that there would be no hiatus in the occupancy of this office. It is unfortunate that the selection was delayed.

Notwithstanding the comments above, the subcommittee has had brought to its attention no sound reason for not consenting to the nomination of Captain Ward. While there may have been reasonable expectation that the person recently picked by a selection board would succeed to the position of Judge Advocate General, there is no statutory requirement or other obligation that precludes the President from appointing another person. Although this procedure may create doubts concerning the faith Navy officials and the President have in the selection system, there assuredly is no reflection on Captain Ward's character or ability and the subcommittee recommends that his nomination be reported favorably to the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I also report, from the Committee on Armed Services, a group of 215 appointments in the Navy and Naval Reserve in the grade of captain and below and a group of 147 promotions in the Regular Army in the grade of colonel and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the Vice President's desk, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanley C. Allyn to be a representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the general conference of the UNESCO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations to the United Nations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William M. Rountree to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations to the Mississippi River Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the Senate is to proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2838, H. R. 12080, the ominibus rivers and harbors bill. I see the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on the floor, and he is ready to proceed with the bill.

First, however, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arizona for the purpose of making an insertion in the RECORD, and that the time be not charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CHARGE OF "GIVEAWAY" IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have spoken out several times on the use of the big doubt technique, which is being employed by opponents of the Eisenhower administration to plant seeds of doubt with the public that there is some sort of giveaway of our natural resources. Anyone acquainted with the true facts knows this is not true, but one of the problems seems to be a lack of knowledge concerning the facts.

For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point a tabulation on the national wildlife management system, approved by the Bureau of Land Management on June 6, 1956. I commend the reading of this to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as it explodes the giveaway charges and exposes them as a fallacy—another example of the big doubt technique.

I also ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Grants Pass Editor Debunks Al Sarena Giveaway Charge" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABULATION ON NATIONAL WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM APPROVED BY BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ON JUNE 6, 1956

The national wildlife management system is made up of approximately 17 refuges and 1 million acres of federally owned land either administered or supervised by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. These lands are divided into three categories, which are: (1) Wildlife refuges, or those areas managed for the primary purpose of wildlife protection and propaganda; (2) game ranges, or areas where wildlife management may be only one of several uses, such as grazing and mineral development, and where the Fish and Wildlife shares jurisdiction with another Federal agency; and (3) cooperative units, or areas still owned by the Federal Government but which are managed for wildlife and other purposes by the States under certain conditions stipulated by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Oil and gas leasing on such lands has been authorized since passage of the Mineral Leasing Act in 1920.

Since 1920 there has been a total of 612 leases granted on lands embraced by the national wildlife management system.

Seven such leases were granted between 1920 and 1947.

A total of 270 was granted between 1947 and January 20, 1953, when the present administration took office.

Three hundred and thirty-five oil and gas leases have been issued since January 30, 1953.

This clearly illustrated that: (1) It is incorrect to charge that this administration opened up the national wildlife areas to oil and gas leasing, since intensive development of these areas for oil and gas purposes was begun in 1947 and continued through 1952; (2) oil and gas leasing has been fairly constant during the past 9 years, with no sudden acceleration of activity in any given period; and (3) the Department of the Interior has for many years been carrying out the intent of Congress by permitting, where feasible, oil and gas development on the national wildlife management areas.

If, for the purposes of discussion, one were to consider wildlife refuges alone, disregarding game ranges and cooperative units, here is what the record shows:

A total of 37 oil and gas leases issued from 1920 to this date.

Thirteen such leases issued between 1947 and January 20, 1953, when the present administration took office.

Seventeen such leases issued between January 20, 1953, and this date.

On game ranges this administration has issued 251 oil and gas leases. The previous administration issued 241, beginning in 1947.

The cooperative unit total show 67 leases issued by this administration, 16 by the previous administration, beginning in 1947.

Outstanding leases

	Wildlife refuges	Game ranges	Cooperative lands	Total
1920 to 1932	6			6
1933 to 1946	1			1
1947 to Jan. 20, 1953	13	241	16	270
Jan. 21 to Aug. 31, 1953	5	28	2	35
Sept. 1, 1953 to Nov. 30, 1955 [1]	6	222	65	[1] 293
Dec. 1, 1955 to date	6	1		7
Total	37	492	83	612

[1] Stop order 95 percent were in Fort Peck and Railroad Valley.

[From the Capital Journal, Salem, Oreg., July 18, 1956]

GRANTS PASS EDITOR DEBUNKS AL SARENA GIVEAWAY CHARGE

(By Frank Streeter in Grants Pass Courier)

If the issuance of patents for the 23 mining claims of Al Sarena Mines, Inc., in Jackson County was the monumental giveaway of national resources claimed by United States Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER and his cohorts in Congress, then the Democrats proposed to give away twice as much as the Republicans.

The first paragraph of the congressional committee's majority report—adopted exactly on party lines states:

"Since receiving its patent from the Interior Department, Al Sarena Mines, Inc., has not mined 1 cupful of ore from the national forest land conveyed to it. Since receiving its patent from the Interior Department, however, Al Sarena Mines, Inc., has cut more than 2 million board-feet of timber from this former national forest land."

On Wednesday, the editor of this newspaper asked the two resident stockholders of Al Sarena, H. P. and C. H. McDonald, about this committee statement.

We were informed—and the men executed a sworn affidavit attesting the truth of their statement—that they did cut some 2 million board-feet during the calendar year of 1954, after receiving their patent February 11 of that year.

However, they stated in their affidavit, more than two-thirds of that timber came from the eight claims to which the Truman Democratic administration conceded them patent rights.

The remaining less than one-third of the cut came from 3 of the 15 disputed claims, none from 12 of the claims they were supposed to have sought title to for the sole purpose of "mining" timber.

The entire cash receipts for the cut was $24,000, some $16,000 from the undisputed claims and some $8,000 from 3 of the remaining 15.

The cash was used, primarily, to pay debts contracted during the long fight to obtain patents and to pay taxes to Jackson County, they added.

They have "mined" neither timber nor ore since the calendar year of 1954, they said, because of lack of capital. However, they have done considerable work on the property during the period.

So much for the alleged giveaway of timber.

Our readers also should keep in mind the fact that the filing dates on the various claims range from 1897 to 1939, long before the timber on them had any market value.

The 1872 mining law, in effect when the patents were issued, gave both mineral and surface rights with the patent. It provided what showing the claim owner must make to warrant a patent.

Al Sarena Mines, Inc., was incorporated in 1935, purchased some 21 claims held by others and filed some additional claims of its own.

The property contains gold, silver, lead, and zinc, among other minerals. The cost of obtaining those ores is a problem the owners have been seeking to meet, plus securing of needed capital for development.

There are a 100-ton pilot mill, bunkhouses, assay laboratory, messhall, toolshed, diesel-electric power facilities and heavy investment in access roads, etc., with more than a mile of tunnels and underground workings.

In the face of the record, Senator NEUBERGER and his political cohorts have insisted that the McDonalds are not interested in mining and have been devoting their efforts since 1935 to setting up a phony mining record for the real intent of grabbing a batch of Federal timber. In other words, in 1939 and subsequently, the McDonalds must have been sufficiently clairvoyant to know that the timber stand on the claims eventually would have substantial value.

The big-shot politicians who have seriously set about—at huge Government expense—creating this impression in the minds of the public must think they are dealing with morons.

The cost of the so-called Al Sarena congressional investigation runs into many more thousands of dollars, far more than the value

of the timber on the claims, including the portion already harvested or still standing.

The McDonalds believe they have a mining property that one day will be valuable. Perhaps they have been bitten by the same bug that makes hundreds upon hundreds of the mining fraternity work and starve and dig and dig in search of the bonanza they firmly believe lies just around the corner.

Who can say they are wrong? Federal mining policies initiated during the New Deal regime of the late Harold Ickes all but ruined the domestic mining industry, especially in the production of gold.

We have talked with many a miner in this area who hangs on in the belief that there will be a change.

What may be too costly an operation today may become a source of substantial profit in another day.

Finally, Oscar Chapman, over a 4-year period, never did reject the applications for any of the patents. His solicitor merely ordered that they be kept on ice.

A lawyer friend of Chapman offered to represent the McDonalds in their fight for patents, his terms being $2,000 in cash and $8,000 more if the patents were granted. Acceptance of that proposition might have thawed out the ice.

We have charged repeatedly that Senator NEUBERGER has deliberately attempted to mislead the public, for political reasons, as to the circumstances surrounding the Al Sarena mines matter.

We have offered to demonstrate that our charges are well-founded by debating the matter with him in public here or in Medford. NEUBERGER's reply to a local political supporter was that he was not interested in such a debate because the editor of this newspaper is not a public official.

NEUBERGER thus demonstrates that his interest in Al Sarena is purely political and not for the purpose of acquainting the public with the facts.

A newspaperman does not need to be a public official to assemble facts on a subject of public importance.

The willingness of this writer to face Senator NEUBERGER before the people of southern Oregon in a discussion of the Al Sarena case still stands.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

One should realize that the Interior Department will always be the subject of controversy. That is because there are inherent conflicts in the development and preservation of natural resources. Things that appear important in the eyes of one group seem utterly unimportant, and perhaps harmful, to an equally dedicated group in another field.

Whatever is done, therefore, will be wrong in the eyes of some people, and since most of these groups are organized with paid secretaries and elaborate propaganda facilities, no matter how some of the controversies over resources are resolved, there will be loud complaint from somebody.

For instance, Interior is charged with the development of irrigation works and hydroelectric power on many of our streams. If you don't build the dam you are failing to develop our natural resources. If you do build it the holding back of the water is apt to be destructive of the fishing interests downstream, or, as in the Northwest, it may prevent the fish from going upstream to spawn.

If water is held back behind dams for summer irrigation uses, the holding it back obviously interferes with the the normal flow of the stream and with the vested rights of downstream landowners.

The Department can't flood a canyon to hold back water for hydroelectrc or irrigation purposes without affecting the natural scenery, possibly covering up some minerals, and doing an injury to wildlife.

If the Department tries to hold wildlife refuges completely inviolate, then the oil will be drained out from under some of them by adjacent wells, and the Department will be criticized for the loss of the oil resources. If oil drilling in the refuge is permitted, the wildlife people will scream that it is destructive of wildlife.

The Department is the protector of migratory birds, but when ducks by the thousands settle over the lands of farmers, it has to make the decisions as to whether it will permit the farmers to be ruined or will face up to the accusation that it is permitting the destruction of ducks.

The Department is the guardian of Indian rights. If Indian land is needed to build a resource project, the Department is confronted with the unpleasant alternative of recommending a fair price for the Indian lands, which may be so high as to render the project infeasible, or of violating its statutory responsibility to its Indian wards.

So, whatever is done, you will probably be told that it is being done wrongly according to some group, and this charge will of course be amplified by the opposing political party.

Furthermore, the fundamental political philosophy of this administration is materially different from the preceding administration, which had the undoubted tendency of centralizing all power and authority in Washington and of keeping minute Federal control of all public lands, minerals, water, and other resources under the strict control of Federal bureaucracy.

The magnitude of the Interior Department operation is, indeed, vast. It reduces to absurdity the loud hue and cry that has been raised by smear artists and other political opponents of the administration over a few areas of discontent.

Interior is one of the largest of the Government departments. It has about 50,000 employees, scattered all the way from the Aleutian Islands through Alaska, Guam, the Pacific Islands, to Samoa, all across the United States, to the Virgin Islands.

Interior is composed of 14 separate bureaus and agencies, many of which are major.

They comprise the Bureau of Land Management, controlling 468 million acres of public lands, 178 million in the United States and 290 million in Alaska; the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the welfare of 400,000 Indians; the whole National Parks and Monuments System, abou^ 200 of them; the government of our Territories, Alaska, Guam, Samoa, and the Pacific and Virgin Islands; the Fish and Wildlife Service; the Geological Survey; the Bureau of Mines; the Bureau of Reclamation; the Bonneville Power Administration; the Southwestern Power Administration and Southeastern Power Administration, the marketing agencies of all Federal public power, except in the Tennessee Valley.

It has the responsibility of the whole minerals program of the United States and of the electric industry for defense purposes.

Any one of these agencies has enough achievements to more than take the time allotted here. To enumerate a very few things:

It has inaugurated a vast program of Indian education, putting 14,000 more Indian children in schools than were there before and releasing hundreds of competent Indians from Federal wardship.

It has received about $275 million of income from bonus bids for oil leases on offshore lands in the Gulfs of Mexico and California, which it has leased for oil under the provisions of the so-called Tidelands bill passed last year by Congress.

Contrary to popular conception, it has greatly enlarged the areas of the national parks. It is sponsoring mission 66 for the further development of the National Park System, almost doubling the visitor facilities in the national parks.

It has created more wildlife refuges than we evere had before. Contrary to present political accusations, its regulations restrict oil drilling and other invasions of the wildlife refuges more than did those of the preceding administration.

It has carried forward programs for the seeding and development of western public lands.

It is carrying forward a great program for the desalting of water, which bids hope of ultimate success in resolutionizing great arid areas of the world.

It is active in the program of study of weather modification (cloud seeding) to precipitate rain.

It helped originate and is sponsoring President Eisenhower's program for the nationwide development of water resources, to be participated in not only by the Federal Government but by the States, cities, and local people.

It is sponsoring numerous hydroelectric power developments in partnership with public agencies and private individuals. Its program in this connection of allowing other levels of Government and private individuals to become partners in these developments will save literally hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal investment, taking that load off from the Federal taxpayers and permitting the capital to be supplied by the savings of people who are ready to supply it.

It is continuing a program for the development of irrigation projects throughout the West. Contrary to current political propaganda, there have been several new starts and developments of water and irrigation projects in the West, and legislation authorizing the upper Colorado project has now become law. It provides for a monumental hydro development, comparable to the Hoover Dam.

This administration has reinstituted the philosophy under which the country was originally developed, of permitting private individuals and local government units to develop and to manage natural resources, so long as their management is not harmful to the national welfare.

It is following the philosophy of Lincoln, when he said, "In all that the people can individually do for themselves, Government ought not to interfere," and, "The object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or not so well."

It is following the philosophy of Jefferson, when he said, "If Washington were to tell us when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want for bread."

And it does not believe, as the previous administration believed for 20 years, that all wisdom is necessarily confined to the District of Columbia.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate Calendar No. 2838, H. R. 12080, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, H. R. 12080, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. One of the items in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill is the Millwood Reservoir and Alternate Reservoirs, Little River, Okla. and Ark.

I wish to call attention to the Senate that there is contained in the hearings on this item testimony and endorsement by the Corps of Engineers. There was also before the committee information from the Arkansas-White-Red Basins Inter-Agency Committee Report, dealing with the seven upstream dams which are a part of the project to modify the Millwood Dam. The Arkansas-White-Red Basins Inter-Agency Committee has for its chairman the district engineer of the southwest division of the Corps of Engineers at Dallas. The committee has on its membership representatives of the governors of 8 States and 5 Federal agencies.

Mr. President, it is my great hope that the development of the water resources of the Little River, Okla. and Ark., complies substantially with the recommendations made in volume F, Red River Basin below Denison Dam, of the report of the Arkansas-White-Red Basins Committee, 1955, from which the above-mentioned material is a part. It will be noted, by examination of this report, that the agencies making the study found that hydroelectric power and municipal water supplies were a very substantial, in fact, a major part of the benefits accruing to this development.

The seven tributary reservoirs would have an installed capacity of 205,000 kilowatts and an annual output of 375 million kilowatt hours. The water is of an excellent quality and on the basis of minimum mean daily flow of 747 cubic feet per second, the equivalent water supply would be 483 million gallons per day. However, by regulation, at least 1 billion gallons per day of excellent quality water can easily be developed for municipal and industrial purposes.

Flood control storage for the seven reservoirs is 1,361,000 acre-feet, which is the equivalent of 11.3 inches runoff over the drainage area above the reservoirs.

Mr. President, we must utilize the maximum potential of dam sites to bring about a full utilization of the water resources of this area. Water has become the prime raw material for industrial development. Hydroelectric power is the twin which makes possible full industrial development.

It is for these reasons that I ask that the report of the Arkansas-White-Red Basins Inter-Agency Committee, relative to the potential development of the Little River, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE RIVER MULTIPLE-PURPOSE PLAN, OKLAHOMA AND ARKANSAS

1. General information:

Project name: Little River multiple-purpose plan, Oklahoma and Arkansas:

Location: On tributaries and main stem of Little River, Sevier County, Ark., and McCurtain County, Okla.

Major purposes: Flood control, power, and water supply.

Planning data located at Corps of Engineers district office, Tulsa, Okla.

2. Scope of investigations:

The major portions of the investigations for this plan are of survey scope. Some features of the studies are of preliminary examination scope as discussed hereinafter.

3. Description of project:

PHYSICAL FEATURES

The Little River multiple-purpose plan includes the following:

Mountain Fork project, consisting of the Sherwood (narrows) and the Broken Bow Reservoirs on Mountain Fork; Pine Creek Reservoir on Little River; Lukfata Reservoir on Glover Creek; DeQueen Reservoir on Rolling Fork Creek; Gillham Reservoir on Cossatot River; Dierks Reservoir on Saline River.

The project is a solution for the major flood, power, and water-supply problems of the area. Pertinent data for the above units are shown in the following tabulation:

Item	Mountain Fork project		Pine Creek Reservoir	Lukfata Reservoir	DeQueen Reservoir	Gillham Reservoir	Dierks Reservoir
	Sherwood	Broken Bow					
Location:							
Stream name	Mountain Fork.	Mountain Fork.	Little River	Glover Creek	Rolling Fork	Cossatot	Saline.
Stream mile	44.4	19.6	145.3	16.8	22.8	47.7	57.0.
State	Oklahoma	Oklahoma	Oklahoma	Oklahoma	Arkansas	Arkansas	Arkansas.
Reservoir area (acres):							
Top of flood-control pool	18,900	15,000	20,700	6,320	6,540	8,220	4,760.
Top of power or conservation pool	13,100	12,400	11,500	3,830	4,940	6,220	3,290.
Reservoir storage (acre-feet):							
Flood control	237,000	232,000	382,000	174,000	103,000	166,000	67,000
Power drawdown	391,000	83,000	198,000	145,000	100,000	172,000	70,000
Power dead storage, sediment and other	105,000	578,000	82,000	63,000	101,000	147,000	42,000
Total storage	733,000	893,000	662,000	382,000	304,000	485,000	179,000
Runoff controlled in flood-control storage (inches)	7.4	5.8	11.3	11.2	11.4	11.2	11.1.
Dam type	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1).
Crest length (feet)	1,690	1,855	6,145	3,325	2,640	2,280	2,900.
Height above streambed (feet)	192	203	126	207	169	192	160.
Spillway—type, all concrete	Uncontrolled	Uncontrolled	Uncontrolled	Uncontrolled	Uncontrolled	Controlled	Uncontrolled.
Design capacity (cubic feet per second)	124,000	196,000	176,000	127,000	72,000	175,000	64,000.
Outlet works, number of controlled openings	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.
Design capacity (cubic feet per second)	16,900	16,100	8,400	16,300	8,000	19,400	15,500.
Power installation, number of generators	2	3	1	2	1	2	1.
Total, capacity (kilowatts)	50,000	75,000	15,000	20,000	13,000	25,000	7,000.

[1] All rolled earth fill.

PROJECT USES

Flood control: The individual reservoirs in the plan would have controlled the maximum flood of record at their respective dam sites except for Sherwood (Narrows) and Broken Bow which would have controlled the second flood of record. The seven reservoirs of the Little River Multiple-Purpose plan would prevent about 76 percent of the average annual flood losses in the Little River Basin below the dam sites to the upper limits of the authorized Millwood Reservoir. The seven reservoirs would have reduced the peak discharge of the maximum flood of record (April 1945) at the authorized Millwood dam site from 125,000 cubic feet per second to 99,200 cubic feet per second and the peak stages from 268.5 mean sea level, to 267.0 feet mean sea level. Flood protection afforded on tributaries below the respective dam sites is shown in the following tabulation:

Reservoir	Stream	Percent of flood losses
Mountain Fork (Sherwood and Broken Bow).	Mountain Fork	84
Pine Creek	Little River (between dam site and mouth of Glover Creek).	89
Lukfata	Glover Creek	63
DeQueen	Rolling Fork	87
Gillham	Cossatot	63
Dierks	Saline	71

Power: Each power project is planned to operate in conjunction with other projects of the Little River System and Denison Reservoir. In most cases, the critical hydroperiod for the Little River Basin occurred at a different time than the Denison critical hydroperiod. This allows for diversity of stream flows and is mutually beneficial to both the Little River projects and Denison Reservoir.

The Sherwood project with an installed capacity of 50,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 88.2 million kilowatt-hours. The maximum capacity at minimum head would be 50,000 kilowatts.

The Broken Bow project with an installed capacity of 75,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 127.9 million kilowatt hours. The maximum capability at minimum head would be 75,000 kilowatts.

The Pine Creek Project with an installed capacity of 15,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 44 million kilowatt hours. The maximum capability at minimum head would be 14,900 kilowatts.

The Gillham Project with an installed capacity of 25,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 45.5 million kilowatt hours. The maximum capability at minimum head would be 14,900 kilowatts.

The Lukfata Project with an installed capacity of 20,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 37.2 million kilowatt hours. The maximum capability at minimum head would be 17,400 kilowatts.

The DeQueen project with an installed capacity of 13,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 20.5 million kilowatt hours. The maximum capability at minimum head would be 11,200 kilowatts.

The Dierks project with an installed capacity of 7,000 kilowatts would have an annual power output of 11.6 million kilowatt hours. The maximum capability at minimum head would be 6,300 kilowatts.

Water supply: In the Little River Basin both surface water and ground water are used for supplying water needs. The present use of domestic and industrial water in the basin is about 3 million gallons per day. It is probable that future use of water from this basin will have little relationship to the present use. The Little River watershed is a forested, mountainous area in which lumbering is the principal industry. These factors in themselves would indicate a small future water use, but there are other factors which make it possible that future water use will be great. These factors are that the chemical quality of water in the Little River is excellent and that the use of water by paper-pulp mills, which are frequently located in the vicinity of forests, could be very large. A demand for this excellent water could develop from outside the basin, possibly as far away as the Dallas, Tex., area. If the water was used for the dilution of waste liquors from paper-pulp mills the use could run as high as 160 million gallons per day for each mill, according to a statement by the Dierks Coal & Lumber Co. It would take only a few such mills to utilize the entire regulated flow of the Little River.

Provision of draw-down storage in the Little River projects for production of hydroelectric power would provide a regulated outflow which would be of a fluctuating nature, because of the necessity of using this power for peaking purposes on the system load. These fluctuations would be severe immediately below the powerplants, but would be considerably dampened during flow through natural pools in the streams. The proposed installed capacity of the powerplants in this basin was based on a system operation in conjunction with the Denison project. During the critical hydroperiod in the Little River Basin the Denison powerplant would have no difficulty in carrying the extra load, so the power installations reflect the ability of the Little River projects to assist with the load during the critical hydroperiod of the Denison project. In connection with outflow from the reservoirs during dry periods, the assumption was made that each project would operate at a rate equal to its installed capacity for at least 5 percent of each day. Under this assumption, data concerning power drawdown storage and average daily outflow during dry periods would be as in the tabulation below. It is these flows upon which the water-supply benefits for the Little River multiple-purpose plan are based.

Reservoir	Power draw-down storage (acre-feet)	Minimum mean daily outflow (cubic feet per second)
Pine Creek	198,000	120
Lukfata	145,000	90
Sherwood (Narrows) Broken Bow	474,000	310
DeQueen	100,000	75
Gillham	172,000	110
Dierks	70,000	42
Total	1,159,000	[1] 747

[1] Equivalent to about 483,000,000 gallons per day.

RECREATION AND PUBLIC USE

Mountain Fork (Sherwood and Broken Bow): Opportunity for day-use recreation for the population of eastern McCurtain County is found at Beavers Bend State Park and on the streams and lakes in this area. The nearest existing lake of any size is Lake Texoma, about 90 miles west of the project, where facilities are present for recreational opportunities associated with a large water area.

Broken Bow Reservoir would adequately provide such a lake area for the county and this region of the State. The attendance at the State park (195,146 in 1954) would indicate that a regional attraction for tourist and vacation use has resulted from the facilities and services available. The extension of the park to include a part of the proposed reservoir, with other development of the project, would appreciably supplement the regional attraction.

Sherwood (Narrows) Reservoir would provide additional recreational values for this region through a large water area in a scenic region of Oklahoma. Local needs, in connection with a large lake area, would be satisfied by many sites for day-use activities. This reservoir is proposed to be operated with the Broken Bow Reservoir, which adjoins downstream. The fluctuations of the lake resulting from such operation would encourage permanent installations, such as extensive concessions and organized camps to be developed on the lower Broken Bow project. The two projects, in combination, would be a major recreational resource for the region.

Pine Creek Reservoir: The population of southeast Oklahoma is adequately served for recreational opportunities by Lake Texoma and the streams and forests of the Ouachita Mountains. The Pine Creek Reservoir would be of importance, with the other considered projects of the Little River Basin, in a regional lake area which would serve three adjoining States. A lake of 11,500 acres in a scenic area will have considerable value in providing recreational attraction for State and out-of-State visitors.

Lukfata Reservoir: The Lukfata Reservoir would be of importance, with the other considered projects of the Little River Basin, in a regional lake area which would serve three adjoining States. The lake impounded by Lukfata Reservoir is in an area of high recreational potential. The other projects of the basin would be of greater individual importance in providing opportunities for recreation; however, this project will be of value by itself and in the systems of reservoirs in providing a regional recreational area.

DeQueen and Gillham and Dierks Reservoirs: The opportunity for day-use recreation serving the sparse rural population and small communities of eastern McCurtain County, Okla., and Sevier County, Ark., is obtained from existing streams, forest areas, and an Oklahoma State park. The nearest water areas of any size and with available facilities are Lake Texoma, approximately 150 miles west, and Lake Sam Greeson, 75 miles east. The visitor attraction of Beavers Bend (195,146 visitors in 1954) indicates the recreational potential of this area and the needs which the proposed reservoir may satisfy beyond that for the local population. The DeQueen, Gillham, and Dierks Reservoirs would provide important recreational values for this region through the creation of large lake areas in a scenic region of Arkansas.

4. Interrelationship with other projects and programs—scope of hydrologic investigations—survey scope.

EFFECTS OF PROJECT OPERATIONS

Flood control: The 7 reservoirs operating in conjunction with Millwood Reservoir and the Red River projects of Hugo, Boswell, and Denison Reservoirs would have reduced the peak stage of the maximum flood of record at the Fulton, Ark., gage (April 1945), located on the Red River about 3 miles below the mouth of the Little River, from 37.4 feet to 27.4 feet (0.4 foot above bankful), and the peak discharge from 276,000 cubic feet per second to 132,000 cubic feet per second.

Power: When power is generated at Sherwood, the average discharge from the reservoir during the Denison critical hydroperiod would be 826 cubic feet per second. This discharge would provide a regulated inflow into Broken Bow Reservoir in excess of the inflow during the same critical hydroperiod at Broken Bow, and would insure a minimum power potential at the Broken Bow plant of about 11,250 kilowatts.

CORRELATION WITH OTHER PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

Other than drainage improvements and land-treatment measures there are no other projects or programs proposed in the Little River Basin. The effect of the seven-reservoir plan operated alone and in conjunction with Millwood Reservoir and other authorized projects is discussed above. The frequency of flooding with the Little River Reservoirs operating has not been determined; however, preliminary considerations indicate that frequency of flooding would be reduced sufficiently to make drainage feasible on Glover Creek below Lukfata Reservoir, on Mountain Fork River below Broken Bow Reservoir and in the reach of Little River immediately below Pine Creek Reservoir. It is considered that the frequency of flooding would not be sufficiently reduced to make drainage feasible in that reach of the Little River immediately above the mouth of Mountain Fork River. Operation of the reservoirs should be coordinated with the adopted flood-forecasting service for overall water management of the basin.

CORRELATION WITH WATER REGULATORY LAWS

No investigation has been made to determine the interrelationship of established water rights under the laws of the States of Oklahoma and Arkansas, and the operation of the multiple-purpose plan.

INTERRELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER FUNCTIONS

Low flows: The flow records at gaging stations in the Little River Basin show that some periods of no flow have occurred during the 20-year study period. There is no conservation storage provided in the seven-reservoir system other than that proposed for power purposes, but it is intended to make the power releases available for domestic and industrial uses.

MINERALS

Pine Creek Reservoir: No known mineral deposits of present or potential economic importance exist within the reservoir site. The Oklahoma Geological Survey reports gravel deposits having an estimated reserve of 150,000 cubic yards are present in the SE¼SE¼ of sec. 9, SW¼NW¼ of sec. 15, and

NW¼NE¼ of sec. 16, T. 5 S., R. 21 E., McCurtain County. These deposits lie slightly above the proposed shoreline of the reservoir. These deposits were not examined by Federal Bureau of Mines engineers.

Lukfata Reservoir: The Lukfata Reservoir will not affect any known mineral resources.

MOUNTAIN FORK PROJECT

Sherwood Reservoir: Veins containing lead, zinc, and copper minerals have been prospected in the vicinity of Watson, adjacent to the east side of the reservoir site. None of the deposits has proved to be of economic importance.

Shale has been produced from deposits within the reservoir site for use in road surfacing. A plentiful supply of this shale is available in the area surrounding the proposed reservoir. No other mineral resource of potential value is known to exist in and adjacent to the reservoir site.

Broken Bow Reservoir: Outcrops of shale, sandstone, chert and novaculite cross the reservoir site. The novaculite adjacent to the east edge of the reservoir site contains some manganese deposits that have been worked sporadically on a small scale. The proposed reservoir would have no adverse effects on these deposits.

DeQueen Reservoir: Several inactive zinc-lead-copper mines and prospects are situated in or adjacent to the reservoir site. One of the mines, the Bellah in secs. 27 and 28, T. 7 S., R. 32 W., and one or more prospects will be inundated by the proposed reservoir. The Bellah mine was worked during the Civil War as a lead mine and later as a zinc mine intermittently until 1912. Production data are not recorded, but reports indicate that the mine was developed by several shafts and ore was mined above two of the levels driven from the main shaft. The mine workings have been inaccessible for many years so that evaluation of the property relative to remaining mineral resources is not possible. Prior to construction of the dam, the mineralized zone should be tested laterally and to depth for possible extensions of ore deposition. The Davis mine, in the NW¼ sec. 10, T. 7 S., R. 32 W., is adjacent to the north end of the reservoir site. The mine was worked sporadically from 1842 until 1918. Recorded production was 2,000 tons of lead-zinc ore. The property will not be affected by the reservoir.

Three inactive antimony mines are situated adjacent to the proposed reservoir and two prospects are within the reservoir site. The two prospects, both of which will be inundated, are the Hankins and the Lignitz, in the SE¼NE¼ and the SW¼NE¼ sec. 26, T. 7 S., R. 32 W., respectively. There is no tangible evidence that either of the prospects disclosed mineralization of potential economic value. The three mines are east of the reservoir site in secs. 19 and 20, T. 7 S., R. 31 W. The Otto mine has been the chief producer of the three. It was reopened in 1951 for exploration under a D. M. E. A. contract, but was inactive in 1952 and 1953. The other two mines, both of which have yielded small tonnages of antimony ore, are the Brewer and the Valley.

Gillham Reservoir: Mineral resources of economic importance have not been noted in the reservoir site. In the vicinity of the proposed reservoir, a small tonnage of antimony ore has been produced from a property in sec. 6, T. 7 S., R. 30 W., about a mile south of the dam site; and quartz crystals are found occasionally in plowed fields in the N½ sec. 27, T. 5 S., R. 30 W.

Dierks Reservoir: The reservoir site contains no known mineral resources of economic importance. Some prospecting for copper ore has been reported in sec. 16, T. 7 S., R. 29 W., but there is no evidence that an ore discovery was ever made in the locality.

5. ECONOMIC EVALUATION

A summary of monetary costs and benefits is shown in the table.

Fish and wildlife aspects

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the State game and fish department state: The project would flood out some (see list below) of the finest fishing streams in Oklahoma and Arkansas, replacing a small-mouth bass fishery of exceedingly high value with a type of fishing common in the vicinity. A need does not exist in the area for additional opportunities for lake or reservoir fishing.

Reservoirs:	*Miles of streams*
Pine Creek	14
Lukfata	16
Mountain Fork:	
Sherwood	19
Broken Bow	20
DeQueen	6
Gillham	13
Dierks	6

There are only four sizable streams in the entire State of Oklahoma which furnish this high quality type of fishing and one of these has been dammed and many miles of stream fishing eliminated. Projects presently proposed in the Little River Basin would eliminate large portions of the remaining three streams in Oklahoma.

The mission of fish and wildlife administration is to provide qualitative and quantitative fishing and hunting opportunities for the public. This involves the achievement of diversification in fishable and huntable species and the concomitant variations in methods of harvest which the public demands. This stream and the accompanying streamside habitat provide much needed diversification and thereby occupy an extremely important position in the State fish and wildlife resource picture.

Considering the absence of any needs for additional opportunities for lake fishing, the drawing of fishermen from existing and authorized and previously recommended reservoirs, and the quality of fishery that would be destroyed, only negative fishery benefits could be assigned to these reservoirs.

Many acres (see list below) of habitat of value to upland game, big game, and fur animals would be destroyed by inundation in the reservoir areas. The reservoir sites occupy an important part of the deer habitat, and its destruction would further increase the critical need for more big game hunting. The annual influx of 10,000 or more deer hunters into the Kiamichi Mountains for a short open season indicates the importance of this type of hunting within the area.

Operation of the reservoirs would render it of minimum use for waterfowl as little or no foods would be produced in the steep-sided, fluctuating impoundment. Such minor benefits would be more than offset by the removal of many acres (see list below) of excellent waterfowl habitat from the maximum zone of flooding in the lower Little River Valley as a result of flood-control operation of the reservoirs.

Reservoir	Acres of forest game loss	Acres of upland game, big game and fur animals habitat loss	Acres of waterfowl habitat loss
Pine Creek	----------	14,600	8,300
Lukfata	----------	4,700	9,100
Mountain Fork:			
Sherwood	----------	15,100	5,800
Broken Bow	----------	13,300	
DeQueen	2,800	5,500	3,000
Gillham	2,300	6,900	2,300
Dierks	3,400	3,800	3,400

The Tulsa district Corps of Engineers indicates that based on past experience the project would provide greatly increased fish and wildlife utilization as compared to the use made of the preimpoundment area.

The conservation, maintenance, and management of fish and wildlife as a means of natural resource development of the reservoir areas is one of the desirable functions of the project. To accomplish this, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oklahoma Game and Fish Department propose construction of an afterbay below the reservoirs in order that a constant flow of water (see list below) may be released into the stream at all times, except during flood periods. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Arkansas Game and Fish Department propose minimum releases of water to provide for a flow at all times below the dams, of the specified amount (see list below), or the natural inflow of the reservoir, whichever is the lesser. To further accomplish this purpose, it is provided that lands are to be furnished to the appropriate State game and fish department for game-management purposes. These lands should be purchased, initially developed, and after developments are established placed under wildlife management by the State game and fish department. These measures would serve to compensate in part or whole for the loss of fish and wildlife habitat.

Reservoir	Proposed streamflow below dam site (cubic feet per second)	Land for game management purposes (acres)
Pine Creek	400	22,900
Lukfata	180	13,800
Mountain Fork:		
Sherwood	490	15,000
Broken Bow	600	13,000
DeQueen	[1] 50	8,000
Gillham	[1] 50	9,000
Dierks	[1] 50	7,000

[1] Minimum streamflow to be as shown, or natural inflow into reservoir.

ASSOCIATED COSTS REQUIRED TO INSURE THAT THE BENEFITS CLAIMED WILL BE FORTHCOMING

All costs required to realize the power and water-supply benefits claimed are included in the project analysis. However, additional facilities would be required to make the power and water available to the consumer.

Supporting programs.

Nonmonetary costs.

Nonmonetary benefits.

6. Basis for arriving at scale of development selected:

The reservoirs of the Little River Multiple-Purpose Plan are considered to be adaptable for development of flood control and power projects and would be operated as a system for flood protection in the Little River Basin and on Red River below the mouth of Little River. The scale of development is based on prime power releases at each of the 7 reservoirs operated as a system for the critical dry period from July 1938 to January 1941, inclusive, for power storage, and the flood-control storages are based on studies of the 3 major floods of record in the Little River Basin with the 7 reservoirs operated as a system. These studies indicate the flood-control storages equivalent to about 11 inches of runoff are desirable in each of the reservoirs.

7. Repayment and cost allocation.

8. Other considerations.

9. Additional investigations required:

The investigations that have been made are considered adequate for the purpose of

project evaluation. However, prior to authorization, review of economic data and of plans and cost estimates would be required. Other features that would need additional work include: coordination of the potential power production with that of other projects; investigation of recreation, fish, and wildlife, mosquito control, pollution, minerals and archeological aspects; investigation of water-supply needs and possible solutions, including source and quality; and investigation of ability and attitude of local interests toward meeting requirements for local participation. A thorough study will be needed of hydroelectric power operation of this project and other Little River projects as part of a widespread system in the AWR area to insure increase in benefits due to diversity in flow. Also, to be investigated would be the economic aspects of using water for production of power and later withdrawing it from the stream for water supply or of allocating definite storage in the reservoirs for water supply.

The plan presented in this evaluation statement is subject to modification upon completion of further studies of water resources development in the Little River Basin. Present indications are that hydroelectric power, under current criteria for economic analysis, should not be included in the initial development, but should be included in the long-range plan. These studies also show that Broken Bow and Gillham appear to be the more favorable units for flood control and water supply.

Monetary costs and benefits

[In thousands of dollars]

Item project [1]	Pine Creek Reservoir	Lukfata Reservoir	Mountain Fork project	DeQueen Reservoir	Gillham Reservoir	Dierks Reservoir	Total
Construction costs:							
Federal	17,679	17,429	47,297	11,588	17,309	10,596	[2] [3] 121,895
Non-Federal [2]							
Total	17,679	17,429	47,297	11,588	17,309	10,596	[2] [3] 121,895
Annual equivalent construction costs	620	614	1,633	408	609	373	[2] [3] 4,257
Annual operation, maintenance, and repair:							
Federal	226	255	644	202	265	169	1,761
Non-Federal			15				15
Total	226	255	659	202	265	169	[3] 1,776
Other annual economic costs [4]	72	67	578	42	100	26	885
Total annual economic costs	918	936	2,870	652	974	568	[3] 6,918
Annual monetary benefits:							
Primary	181	230	3,975	[6] 117	1,164	[6] 110	[7] 5,777
Secondary			239		91		330
Total	181	230	[8] 4,214	[6] 117	[9] 1,255	[6] 110	[7] 6,107

[1] Purposes for all projects are flood control, domestic and industrial water supply, and hydroelectric power.
[2] Division of Federal and non-Federal costs have not been determined.
[3] Cost and annual charges shown in tabulation include the items listed below. Where annual equivalent costs are not set out separately, they have been estimated and included in the total annual economic costs totals for the line items of the individual projects.

Reservoir	Item			
	Minimum basic public-use facilities		Coordination of planning fish and wildlife measures	Preliminary estimates for investigations by U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	Cost	Annual charges		
Pine Creek	192.0	20.0	6.0	6.0
Lukfata	40.0	16.0	4.0	4.0
Mountain Fork	415.0	43.0	12.0	12.0
DeQueen	89.0	15.0	6.0	3.5
Gillham	125.0	20.0	6.0	4.0
Dierks	71.0	13.0	6.0	3.0

In addition, the estimates for the Mountain Fork project include a Federal construction cost of 964.0 for remedial fish and wildlife measures; annual equivalent construction costs of 34.0; and annual operation maintenance and repair costs of 25.0 (10.0 Federal and 15.0 by appropriate fish and game agency); a total annual economic cost of 59.0. The measures recommended and the costs thereof have not yet been completely worked out and agreed upon between the fish and wildlife agencies and the construction and planning agencies. Other estimates of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service as indicated below have not been included in the project estimates.

Reservoir	Remedial fish and wildlife costs		
	Federal construction cost	Annual equivalent cost	Annual operation maintenance and repair
Pine Creek	1,000.0	35.3	26.0
Lukfata	800.0	28.3	20.0
DeQueen	400.0	14.1	6.0
Gillham	450.0	15.9	8.0
Dierks	350.0	12.3	6.0

[4] Includes net loss of agricultural production within project area after deducting compensation cost for acquisition of project lands. This amount also includes estimates of taxes foregone as a result of Federal construction of power projects. These amounts are tabulated in the following table.

Reservoir	Net loss of agricultural production	Taxes foregone
Pine Creek	6	66
Lukfata	4	63
Mountain Fork (Sherwood and Broken Bow)	33	545
DeQueen	9	33
Gillham	6	94
Dierks	0	26

[5] These benefits are not additive. See footnotes 6, 7, 8, and 9 below.
[6] These amounts are for primary power benefits only. These primary power benefits are based on alternative private steam-electric stations and Federal hydrotransmissions. Primary power benefits based on two other methods are listed below:

Reservoir	Method and primary power benefits	
	Private steam and transmission	Private steam and transmission with taxes and interest rates comparable to those used for the hydroproject (Bureau of Budget Circular A-47)
Pine Creek	111.0	86.0
Lukfata	221.0	138.0
DeQueen	108.0	69.0
Dierks	103.0	72.0

[7] The flood-control benefits have been estimated for the plan operating as a system. The total flood-control benefits for the plan total 442.0, of which 349.0 are primary benefits and 93.0 are secondary benefits. About 105.0 and 78.0 of these benefits have been tentatively assigned to the Mountain Fork and Gillham projects respectively. The total benefits shown as 6,366.0 include 442.0 flood-control benefits; 2,658.0 primary power benefits (secondary power benefits of 266.0 not used); and there are 3,266.0 water-supply benefits for the Mountain Fork (2,410) and Gillham (856.0) projects. Water-supply benefits are not included for Pine Creek, Lukfata, DeQueen and Dierks Reservoirs.
[8] Includes primary power benefits amounting to 1,699.0 on alternative private steam-electric stations and Federal hydrotransmissions; power benefits would be 1,487.0 based on private steam-electric stations and private hydrotransmissions, and 912.0 (in accordance with Bureau of Budget Circular A-47) based on steam-electric station and hydrotransmission costs using taxes and interest rates comparable to those used for the hydroproject. This figure also includes water-supply benefits evaluated by AWR expedient procedures amounting to 2,410.0 (primary 2,191.0, secondary 219.0). Flood-control benefits amounting to 105.0 are included.
[9] This figure includes primary power benefits of 321.0 and primary and secondary water-suppy benefits of 856. Flood-control benefits amounting to 78.0 are included. Power benefits would be 299.0 based on private steam-electric stations and private hydrotransmissions and 185.0 (in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular A-47) based on steam-electric stations and hydrotransmission costs using taxes and interest rates comparable to those used for the hydroproject.

Mr. KERR. I yield back the remainder of my 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1956 may well represent a new milepost in development of the seaborne commerce of the State of Oregon. The Senate Public Works Committee deserves commendation and appreciation for the forward-looking program of water resource improvement which the bill encompasses. I particularly thank the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Of especial importance to the economic well-being of the people of Oregon is the provision which was made for authorization of a deep-water harbor at Yaquina Bay on the Oregon coast. My colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], deserves great credit for the untiring effort he has given in support of the Yaquina Bay project during the various hearings before engineering boards and before committees. His leadership has brought forth a real accomplishment. It was my pleasure to offer the motion, which the committee accepted, for adoption of the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors which calls for deepening the channel entrance to a depth of 40 feet and improving the vast and roomy inside channel to a depth of 30 feet.

The $19,800,000 harbor improvement project has long been sought by officials of the ports of Newport and Toledo, Oreg., by many commercial interests and local residents. Furthermore, establishment of a deep-water harbor at Yaquina Bay is of far-reaching importance to the adjacent territory which has great potential for economic expansion. Provision of adequate deep-water harbor facilities at Yaquina Bay is the key to unlocking vast development.

The shipping potential of the Oregon seacoast is far from fully developed, and the establishment of facilities at Yaquina Bay for the handling of deep-draft vessels is a logical step in tapping the resources of the area. The Yaquina Bay region has a considerable supply of merchantable timber. Business interests have indicated faith in the future of the area by planning investments which will create many job opportunities. The opening of Yaquina Bay to large seagoing ships will give added impetus to the area's prospects for growth and development.

Deepwater facilities at Yaquina Bay have collateral benefits in providing a port of refuge and a possible base for future American naval operations. Completion of the harbor works at Yaquina Bay will provide the only deep-draft channel on the Oregon seacoast between the mouth of the Columbia and Coos Bay, a distance of 250 miles. In the future, coastal shipping threatened by adverse weather or other difficulties can find refuge at Yaquina Bay. In addition, the mountainous terrain surrounding the harbor offers distinct defense advantages for naval craft, while still permitting nearby access to the open sea.

Development of good, deep-draft shipping facilities has long been a matter of vital necessity to this area of the Oregon coast, an area otherwise handicapped by transportation deficiencies and isolated from the commercial opportunities afforded it by the vast timber resources surrounding it.

The Yaquina Bay Harbor development project will open new horizons for the development of Oregon. I am proud to have been privileged to participate, with my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE], in working toward this goal. It is a goal of economic prosperity for the middle reaches of Oregon's seacoast and seaboard.

Mr. President, at the appropriate time I intend to offer an amendment to the bill now pending, when the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is ready.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is my purpose to make a statement on the bill which is now before the Senate.

This is a combined omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill, title I dealing with river and harbor authorizations, and title II dealing with flood-control authorizations. The last general authorization bill was the act approved September 3, 1954. The Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives held extensive hearings on many river and harbor, beach-erosion, and flood-control projects, including some multiple-purpose projects, modifications of projects, additional basin authorizations, and pending preliminary examinations and surveys. The Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, testified on all the items contained in the bill. Local interests and Members of the Congress were afforded full opportunity to present their views on the matters under consideration.

H. R. 12080 is a comprehensive bill to carry forward these important programs for development and improvement of the rivers and harbors of our Nation, for protection of our citizens against the ravages of floodwaters, and for the general development of the Nation's water resources. The report of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives—House Report 2639, 84th Congress—contains a full discussion of the principles incorporated in the formulation of H. R. 12080, and a description of the projects included therein.

The Committee on Public Works of the Senate has thoroughly considered the provisions of the bill as passed by the House and finds itself in substantial accord with the provisions adopted by that body. In addition, the committee has held hearings on other projects which were proposed for consideration subsequent to the close of the House hearings. Those considered fully justified for authorization at this time have been included in the bill.

This report contains descriptions of all projects and modifications recommended by the committee and tabulations listing under separate titles the projects as passed by the House and those recommended by the Senate committee.

The river and harbor and flood-control construction programs have been progressing satisfactorily since the end of World War II. Comprehensive authorizations have been made periodically to keep the programs moving forward in balance. Additional authorizations are believed necessary at this time to continue the unified basin water resources developments now in progress, to round out basin programs where changing conditions have shown the necessity for extensions of modifications, and to provide for individual projects found to be necessary and justified. The authorizations contained in the bill are the minimum amounts required for uninterrupted progress for the next 3 years.

These public-works programs contemplate full coordination with other related programs to produce the ultimate economic utilization and development of our water resources, and will contribute materially to the economic well-being of the Nation. In addition, these programs constitute a backlog of economically justified improvements which can be placed under construction at rates of speed and sequence of locations as may be most suitable to variations of unemployment. They constitute a prudent investment of Federal funds in a permanent improvement known to be sound from an engineering standpoint, and economically feasible as to the benefits that will accrue therefrom. It should also be pointed out that the Federal investment in certain multiple-purpose features in projects included in the bill will be returned to the Treasury.

The committee believes that this legislation is urgently needed for the protection of lives and property, for the improvement of the Nation's harbors and waterways, and for the general enhancement of the national economy. Delay would have unfortunate results in retardation of projects, and postponement in realization of the benefits that would result therefrom.

The committee recognizes the necessity for maintaining a balance in these new authorizations with present and prospective future budgetary developments. In order to preserve and strengthen the welfare and economy of the Nation, our water resources development program must be continued, and even increased as rapidly as fiscal requirements will permit. In recommending enactment of this bill, the committee realizes that the total authorizations included therein do not exceed the total amounts included in the last several similar bills when allowance is made for present-day costs.

The estimated cost of the projects reported in this bill (titles I and II) are based on current prices, which in general are those prevailing at the present time. They differ in general from the estimated amounts in the project documents depending upon the date of the document.

The total amount of monetary authorization in this bill, broken down into

the major categories, is indicated in the following tabulation:

Monetary Summary of Bill (Cost of New Work)

TITLE I. RIVERS AND HARBORS

Bill as passed by the House:	
Section 101:	
Navigation projects	$58,087,000
Beach-erosion projects	5,270,000
Section 104: Eradication of water hyacinths	5,063,000
Section 107: Upper Fox River, Wis	300,000
Section 109: Illinois and Mississippi Canal	2,000,000
Total title I	80,604,000
Projects recommended by Senate committee:	
Section 101:	
Navigation projects	45,459,000
Beach-erosion projects	20,000
Total Senate amendment	45,479,000
Total title I	126,083,000

TITLE II. FLOOD CONTROL

Bill as passed by House:	
Section 203:	
New projects or modifications	181,522,000
Increased basin authorizations	592,300,000
Lower Mississippi River Basin	289,445,000
Section 207: Missouri River Basin, Department of the Interior	200,000,000
Total title II	1,263,267,000
Projects recommended by Senate committee:	
Section 203:	
New projects or project modifications	121,171,000
Increased basin authorizations	61,000,000
Total Senate amendment	182,171,000
Total title II	1,445,438,000
Grand total	1,571,521,000
Increase recommended by Senate amendments	227,650,000

The committee notes that the House bill contains several projects on which the reports of the Chief of Engineers have not been fully processed and transmitted to Congress, in compliance with established procedures. The committee held hearings on several similar projects and has recommended amendments for including those projects in the bill. Information presented to the committee indicated that the studies on those projects had progressed sufficiently to determine with reasonable accuracy their estimated cost and economic feasibility. These projects are of an emergency nature and their authorization at this time is considered warranted. The committee does not desire, however, to establish a precedent in situations such as these, and believes that complete and full justification of the economic feasibility of these projects should be established before appropriations are made for their construction.

A description of the projects and items recommended as amendments to the bill are included in this report.

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Federal program for the improvement of the Nation's rivers and harbors is now in its 132d year. During the entire history of this all-important Federal undertaking the work involved in this program has been efficiently and competently supervised by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. The program has produced the best system of inland waterways to be found anywhere in the world and in addition has opened for all forms of navigation about 300 harbors.

This program includes about 2,300 navigation projects with an estimated cost of $4.3 billion, of which appropriations to date have totaled about $2.1 billion, leaving $2.2 billion to complete the authorized navigation work. Inclusion of the multiple-purpose projects that serve navigation purposes would increase the estimated cost to $6.5 billion, of which $3.2 billion has been appropriated to date. In addition, about $1.6 billion has been appropriated by the Congress for the maintenance and operation of these improvements. About 50 percent of the funds appropriated has been for the inland and intracoastal waterways, 40 percent for seacoast harbors, and about 10 percent for the Great Lakes.

The importance of the system of inland waterways is indicated by the vast annual increase in the tonnage and in the variety of commodities that move over these waterways. For each ton of freight that uses the improved inland waterways there is returned to the Nation as a general benefit a saving in transportation costs. While these savings may be considered as a prime factor in the use of the system of inland waterways, another factor just as important is that the improved waterways have to a large extent been responsible for the growth and the development of the interior sectors of the country. Low-cost water transportation has enabled the movement of products from the mines, forests, and the farms to a widespread consuming area. It has also enabled the distribution, at low cost, of semifinished and finished products from industrial communities that have been established on these waterways to the consumer spread over almost the entire Nation. The importance of our improved ports cannot be overemphasized, both in times of peace and in times of national emergencies. The larger ports serve their purposes in national and international commerce. The smaller ports from which the benefits are more of a domestic nature play a very vital part in the economic life of the country. These ports have frequently been constructed in the interests of the fishing industry which serves to supply the Nation with low-cost seafood products, and to serve as harbors of refuge and ports for recreational craft.

The coastal harbors of the United States have been improved under this program to meet the demands of modern, deep-draft, ocean-going commerce. Channel depths of 35 feet prevail in harbors on the Atlantic seaboard and gulf coast and range up to 45 feet in depth as in New York Harbor. On the west coast, harbors and channels from 30 to 40 feet are generally available. There are 20 coastal ports which handle 10 million tons or more of cargo annually. For major coastal harbors, the cost of the Federal improvements, including maintenance and operation, averages less than 4 cents per ton of cargo handled.

The improved connecting channels of the Great Lakes constitute the most important waterways system in this country and perhaps in the world, an importance which will be greatly augmented by the St. Lawrence Seaway now under construction. These harbors and improved channels provide the basic transportation system for the industrial Midwest. At the present time, depths of 21 feet are controlling generally for the Great Lakes harbors and connecting channels. Eleven harbors on the Great Lakes now handle 10 million tons or more annually of the commodities that move over this waterway, and in 1954, a total of 91.2 billion ton-miles of cargo was handled on this system. The cost of Federal improvements of major Great Lakes ports averages about 1½ cents per ton of cargo handled.

The inland and intracoastal waterways which have been improved by the Federal Government have a total length of over 28,000 miles. Much of this length, however, represents shallow-draft channels improved many years ago which are no longer of material importance to commercial navigation. About 80 percent of modern waterborne commerce is carried on 12 waterways with an aggregate length of 5,800 miles. These include such waterways as the Gulf Intracoastal and the lower Mississippi River, with its extension up the Ohio to the Pittsburgh area and up the Illinois River to the Great Lakes system at Chicago. In 1954 traffic on our inland and intracoastal waterway system totaled 82.5 billion ton-miles. These waterways and the improved barges, towboats, and other equipment of modern waterway operators carry commodities of all kinds ranging from crude petroleum to finished automobiles. One modern tank barge will carry almost as much as 100 tank cars normally used in rail traffic. Estimates show that savings in transportation costs which are passed along to the public have been very great and that the system of inland and intracoastal waterways is returning in such benefits about $3 for every Federal dollar expended.

The committee has been impressed by testimony as to the increasing use of larger and more economic vessels. These vessels, with deeper draft, greater lengths and beams, have accelerated the need for progressive modification of the navigation program. The use of these larger and deeper draft carriers will result in eventual betterment of the economy and a lowering of prices to the consuming American public.

This, the committee believes, is the main reason that the navigation survey program should be kept current in order

that the improvements can be kept abreast of transportation trends. Since the survey program is the basic source of the entire navigation program, the committee feels that the backlog of surveys assigned by the Congress to the Corps of Engineers should be adequately financed.

The program for beach erosion prevention and shore protection is relatively new in comparison to the navigation program. Federal interest stems back to 1930, when the Beach Erosion Control Board was established and authorized to make studies of this nature in cooperation with the States and other governmental bodies. Half of the costs of these studies is contributed by the sponsoring agency and half by the Federal Government. The scope of the studies as originally authorized was expanded by legislation after 1930, and finally, in 1946, the Federal Government undertook to participate in the construction of the actual works for the protection of shores. Since the program is in its infancy, there are only 45 projects authorized by Congress, and only 11 of these have had construction appropriations. The total Federal cost is about $15.7 million, of which about $3.7 million has been appropriated to date, leaving a balance of $12 million to complete.

Projects in title I of bill as passed by House

SECTION 101. NAVIGATION

$80,604,000.

Amendments—Projects recommended by Senate committee

SECTION 101. NAVIGATION

Project and document No.:	*Federal cost of new work*
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.	$2,300,000
Barataria Bay, La.	1,700,000
Minnesota River, Minn.	5,000
St. Anthony Falls, Minn.	19,893,000
Port Washington Harbor, Wis. (H. Doc. 446, 83d Cong.)	1,761,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.	19,800,000
Total, navigation	45,459,000

BEACH EROSION

Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Island, Kauai, T. H.	20,000

TITLE II. FLOOD CONTROL

Title II includes the flood-control projects, project modifications, basin authorization increases, and certain miscellaneous matters, that have been considered, and will provide the basis for a logical and orderly continuation of the national program for flood control throughout the United States and its possessions for the next 3 years. This title also includes project modifications for the great project for the lower Mississippi Valley.

The first Federal flood-control program began on the lower Mississippi River when Federal participation in that project was authorized in 1879. The special flood problems on the Sacramento River were given recognition in the River and Harbor Act of 1917. The national flood-control program had its inception in the Flood Control Act of 1936. The first appropriations under the national program were for fiscal year 1938. It can thus be seen that the program has been under way but 18 years. Included in this period are 5 years during which we were mobilizing and at war, when the civil-works program was necessarily on a maintenance basis only. The committee is impressed with the noteworthy progress which has been made on the flood-control program to date, and considers this bill, including the additional authorizations, a very valuable addition to the overall program.

The basic policy now established by flood-control legislation is that flood control throughout the United States is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States and local communities, and that the Federal Government should undertake flood-control improvements or participate in them if such projects are economically justified, and if the lives and social security of the people are otherwise adversely affected. Existing legislation embodied in the 1936 act, as amended by subsequent acts, establishes in some detail the procedures under which the Federal Government can and should participate in flood-control activities. The extent to which local interests should contribute to Federal flood-control work, the manner in which investigations are carried out after congressional authorization and the results reported to Congress, after coordination among the affected States and interested Federal agencies, and the consideration of comprehensive development of water resources in conjunction with flood control are all matters which are governed by law.

It has long been recognized that flood control is merely one of the purposes for which our water resources should be developed. Congress has recognized in past flood-control acts, and there has been incorporated into this bill, full consideration of what the committee believes to be a desirable improvement program for the use and control of our water resources in addition to the specific purpose of flood control. The projects and basin plans included in this bill, in the opinion of the committee, give full weight to the navigational possibilities; the development of hydroelectric power; the conservation of water for municipal, industrial and agricultural uses; the utilization of recreation potentialities in connection with reservoirs; the preservation of fish and wildlife; the abatement of stream pollution; and the provision of improved sanitary facilities. The committee feels that no program for flood control and navigation would be comprehensive or in the best interests of the Nation unless all these factors were considered.

The committee notes that for certain flood-control reservoir projects, the recommended requirements of local cooperation provide for a cash contribution from local interests to compensate for land enhancement values. The committee does not believe this procedure warranted at this time with respect to reservoir projects. It has not been the general policy in the past to require such payments. The benefits are widespread, are not identifiable as they are in local protection projects, and difficulties would be met in their proper assessment against the beneficiaries. The committee has therefore eliminated such requirements from certain projects recommended for inclusion in this bill.

Projects in title II of bill as passed by House

SECTION 203

$1,263,267,000.

Amendments—Projects recommended by Senate Committee

ITEMS ADDED (SEC. 203), FLOOD CONTROL

Project	Document No.	New projects or modifications	Increased basin authorizations
Connecticut River Basin			$6,000,000
Housatonic River Basin		$5,090,000	
Susquehanna River Basin	H. Doc. 394 (84th)		30,000,000
Tombigbee River, Miss.-Ala.	H. Doc. 167 (84th)	512,000	
Alabama River at Montgomery		1,300,000	
Red-Ouachita River Basin		53,235,000	
Grand River at Lansing, Mich.	S. Doc. 132 (84th)	9,825,000	
Oswego River at Auburn, N. Y.	S. Doc. 133 (84th)	305,000	
Missouri River at Williston, N. Dak.		1,200,000	
Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebr.	S. Doc. 136 (84th)	1,214,000	
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak.		400,000	
Willow Creek Dam, S. Dak.		1,250,000	
Red River of the North Basin	S. Doc. 141 (84th)	632,000	
Upper Wabash River, Ind.	H. Doc. 435 (84th)	45,500,000	
Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va.	S. Doc. 137 (84th)	708,000	
Columbia River Basin	S. Doc. 51 (84th)		25,000,000
Total		121,171,000	61,000,000

Mr. President, the committee made only two changes in the bill as passed by the House. The authorization for the Connecticut River Basin was increased from $13 million to $19 million to take care of the Mad River Dam and Reservoir project added by the committee, and the Federal cost of the Tombigbee River local protection project was increased by $512,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the committee amendments, together with an amendment I am now submitting for the Des Moines River project in Iowa, in which the two Senators from Iowa and the people of Iowa are deeply interested, be considered as acted upon en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the committee amendments and the amendment now submitted by the Senator from New Mexico are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, together with the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "act", to strike out "appeared" and insert "approved"; after line 16, to insert:

"Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.: Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors,

dated June 19, 1956, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000."

On page 3, after line 13, to insert:

"Barataria Bay, La.: In accordance with the report of the division engineer, dated April 9, 1956, at an estimated cost of $1,700,000."

On page 4, after line 20, to insert:

"Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Modification of the existing project in the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 5, 1956, at an estimated cost of $19,893,000."

On page 5, line 3, after "$2,539,000", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the channel may be extended five-tenths of a mile upstream to mile 14.7 at an estimated additional cost of $5,000"; after line 13 to insert: "Port Washington Harbor, Wis.: House Document No. 446, 83d Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of $1,761,000."

After line 24, to insert:

"Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.: In accordance with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated June 19, 1956, at an estimated cost of $19,800,000,"

On page 7, after line 14, to insert:

"Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay, Island of Kauai, T. H. House Document No. 432, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,000."

On page 10, after line 19, to insert:

"SEC. 107. That the improvement of Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cutoff, Miss., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1950, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 256, 84st Congress, is hereby modified to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done on this project, within the limits of the Federal portion of the project, over and above any items required as a part of local cooperation for the project, insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with project modification adopted in said act: *Provided*, That such payment shall not exceed the sum of $44,000: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations thereto and shall not have precedence over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority: *And provided further*, That no reimbursement to local interests shall be made until they have met all the requirements of local cooperation in the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress."

On page 11, at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "107" to "108"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "108" to "109"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "109" to "110"; on page 17, after line 5, to insert:

"SEC. 111. Whenever, during the construction or reconstruction of any navigation, flood control, or related water development project under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Engineers determines that any structure or facility owned by an agency of government and utilized in the performance of a governmental function should be protected, altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both; or to preserve the safety or integrity of such facility when its safety or usefulness is determined by the Chief of Engineers to be adversely affected or threatened by the project, the Chief of Engineers may if he deems such action to be in the public interest, enter into a contract providing for the payment from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of such project, of the reasonable actual cost of such remedial work, or for the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed as modifying any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, or as indicating a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The provisions of this section may be applied to projects hereafter authorized and to those heretofore authorized but not completed as of the date of this act, and notwithstanding the navigation servitude vested in the United States, they may be applied to such structures or facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters of the United States.

On page 18, at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "110" to "112"; after line 14, to insert:

"Short Sands Section of York B, York County, Maine."

After line 16, to insert:

"Sachem's Head Harbor at Guilford, Conn."

After line 19, to insert:

"Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, and up White's Creek, Del.

"Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.

"Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, with a view to elimination of the water chestnuts (Trapa Natans)."

On page 19, after line 5, to insert:

"Savannah River, with a view to providing 9-foot navigation to Augusta, Ga."

After line 19, to insert:

"Camp Pendleton Harbor and Oceanside, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted toward recommended beach erosion control measures at Oceanside, Calif., in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control.

"Anaheim Bay, Calif., with a view to determining the extent of Federal aid which should be granted in equity without regard to limitations of Federal law applicable to beach erosion control."

On page 20, at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "111" to "113"; on page 22, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out $13,000,000 and insert "$19,000,000"; after line 15 to insert:

"The project for the Mad River Dam on Reservoir on the Mad River above Winsted, Conn., in accordance with plants to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $5,820,000: *Provided*, That the Federal Government shall acquire the necessary lands and rights-of-way and maintain and operate the project after completion."

After line 21, to insert:

"HOUSATONIC RIVER BASIN

"The project for the flood control dam and reservoir on Hall Meadow Brook in Torrington and Goshen, Conn., is hereby authorized in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $2,420,000: *Provided*, That the Federal Government shall acquire the necessary lands and rights-of-way and maintain and operate the project after completion.

"The project for the flood control dam and reservoir on the East Branch of the Naugatuck River in Torrington, Conn., is hereby authorized in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $2,670,000: *Provided*, That the Federal Government shall acquire the necessary lands and rights-of-way and maintain and operate the project after completion."

On page 23, after line 11, to insert:

"SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN

"The project for flood protection on the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, New York and Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 394, 84th Congress, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $30,000,000 for partial accomplishment of that plan."

On page 25, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Tombigbee" and insert "Mobile"; after line 5, to insert "(Tombigbee, Warrior, and Alabama-Coosa)"; in line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "$19,199,000" and insert "$19,711,000"; after line 16, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the report of the Division Engineer, dated June 11, 1956, at an estimated cost of $1,300,000."

On page 28, after line 9, to insert:

"RED-OUACHITA RIVER BASIN

"The general plan for flood control on Red River, Tex., Okla., Ark., and La., below Denison Dam, Tex., and Okla., as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946 is modified and expanded, at an estimated cost in addition to that now authorized of $53,235,000, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report on Millwood Reservoir and alternate reservoirs, Little River, Okla. and Ark., except as follows:

"(1) The Sherwood Reservoir on Mountain Fork River is authorized in addition to the six other reservoirs upstream from the Millwood Reservoir, recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

"(2) In the case of such seven upstream reservoirs, the basis for determining the cost allocated to hydroelectric power and water supply purposes shall be the incremental method of allocation whereby the cost allocated to power and water supply should be limited to the cost of adding power and water as purposes in the project, and all flood control and land-enhancement benefits shall be nonreimbursable; and

"(3) Such seven reservoirs shall be constructed either prior to or concurrently with Millwood Reservoir.

"The States of Arkansas and Oklahoma shall have priority of use, consistent with the laws of such States, of any water supplies originating within their respective boundaries and developed, conserved, or improved by any project now or hereafter authorized as part of the general plan for flood control on the Red River."

On page 29, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "Purgatoire" and insert "Arkansas"; after line 19, to insert:

"The first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of the Markham Ferry project on the Grand River in Oklahoma by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma,' approved July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), is amended by inserting after 'as recommended by the Chief of Engineers,' the following: 'or such additional flood storage or pool elevations, or both, as may be approved by the Chief of Engineers'."

On page 32, after line 7, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on the Grand River, Mich., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 132, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,825,000."

After line 17, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on Owasco Outlet, tributary of Oswego River, at Auburn, N. Y., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 133, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $305,000."

On page 33, line 6, after the word "Congress," to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That with respect to any power attributable to any dam in such plan to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, the construction of which has not been started, an equitable proportion of such power as may be determined by the Secretary of Interior, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract

made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed"; after line 14, to insert:

"The general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin set forth in House Document No. 475 and Senate Document No. 191, as revised and coordinated by Senate Document No. 247, 78th Congress, approved in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, are hereby modified to include the payment by the Corps of Engineers to the city of Williston, N. Dak., from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Reservoir project, a sum of $1,200,000, which payment is to compensate for the replacement of the municipal water supply and water treatment facilities of said city which will be damaged, impaired, and rendered inoperative by the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir in said basin.

"That portion of title III of the act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 641, 84th Cong., 70 Stat. 474, 480) that pertains to the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District in lieu of protecting said Lewis and Clark Irrigation District in connection with the development, construction, and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, is amended to read as follows:

" 'That in lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, the sum of $1,935,000 of the funds herein or hereafter appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River shall be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, and the sum of $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities therein. The substitution of land acquisition for the protection shall be made and the Secretary of the Army shall acquire such land and improvements if all of the landowners, except the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivision or agencies, on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to said landowners, and within the amount provided herein for such land acquisition. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire lands and improvements owned by the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivisions or agencies pursuant to the provisions of this or any other act except that no limitation of time shall apply within which property of the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivisions or agencies shall be offered for sale if property of the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivisions or agencies is acquired pursuant to the provisions of this act. If all of the landowners except the State of North Dakota or its political subdivisions or agencies on or before June 30, 1957, have offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to said landowners, within the amount provided for such land acquisition, and the Secretary of the Army determines that the acquisition of lands and improvements of the State of North Dakota and any of its political subdivisions or agencies is necessary, the institution of condemnation in the appropriate United States district court is authorized.'

"The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, is authorized and directed to undertake the construction and to provide suitable sewer facilities, conforming to applicable standards of the South Dakota Department of Health, to replace certain existing water or sewer facilities of (1) the St. Joseph's Indian School, Chamberlain, S. Dak., by facilities to provide for treatment of sewage or connection to the city system not exceeding $35,000 in cost; (2) Fort Pierre, S. Dak., sewer facilities not exceeding $120,000, and water facilities not exceeding $25,000; and (3) the city of Pierre, S. Dak., sewer facilities not exceeding $210,000; and (4) the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, is further authorized and directed to pay to the Ridgeview School District, Ridgeview, S. Dak., $10,000 as reimbursement for the public-school building provided by said district as required by State law for children living at or near the Cheyenne Agency of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., which school building was constructed on reservation lands and is being flooded out by the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this section out of any sums appropriated for the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project, Missouri River.

"The project for enlargement and improvement of the existing dam and reservoir on Elm River, a tributary of the James River, S. Dak., for better utilization of the site capacity, is hereby authorized, in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $1,750,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall acquire the necessary lands or easements and agree to maintain the project after completion."

On page 37, after line 14, to insert:

"The project for flood protection in the Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebr., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,214,000."

At the top of page 38, to insert:

"RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN

"The project for flood protection on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minn., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 141, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $632,000."

After line 16, to insert:

"The project for the upper Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,500,000."

On page 39, after line 2, to insert:

"The project for flood protection on Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va., is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $708,000."

On page 40, after line 9, to insert "Eel River Basin"; on page 42, after line 20, to insert:

"The project for Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir on the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho, for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 51, 84th Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000, for partial accomplishment of the project, and the authorization for appropriation for the Columbia River Basin is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided*, That with respect to any power attributable to such project an equitable proportion of firm power as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, or such portion thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contracts made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State of Idaho."

On page 45, after line 12, to insert:

"SEC. 206. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple-purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out any authorized navigation or flood-control survey, or review investigation, involving improvements which may be useful in developing water supplies, the Corps of Engineers shall consult with the State or States affected and the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a view to including in the reports thereon submitted to Congress, plans for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and such reports shall include the views and recommendations of the States and the United States Public Health Service on the plans for water supply. Features for providing water-supply storage capacity, facilities, or services may be included in any navigation, flood-control, or multiple-purpose project recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers, subject to the following provisions of this section.

"(c) Before construction of any project including water supply provisions is completed, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated to water supply. Such costs shall be determined by the Chief of Engineers in such manner that all authorized purposes served by the project shall share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction. The schedule of payments by States or local interests of such costs may provide either for paying the share of the construction expenditures during construction of the project, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred; or for equal annual payments for the construction costs, and interest on the unpaid balance, plus annual payments for operation, maintenance, and replacement costs as incurred: *Provided*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the completed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue.

"(d) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose project on which construction has not been initiated, or any existing project, may be modified or its operation changed by the Secretary of the Army to provide additional storage capacity, facilities, or services for water supply as he considers reasonable: *Provided*, That before construction is completed, or in the case of projects under construction or completed, before changes for the benefit of water supply are made in the project, or before operation is modified in the interest of water supply, State or local interests shall agree to pay the costs allocated thereto as provided in subsection c of this section: *Provided further*, That such modifications which would seriously affect the purposes for which the project was authorized or constructed or which involve major structural or operational changes shall be made only upon the specific authority of Congress.

"(e) The plans for any authorized navigation, flood-control or multiple-purpose project on which construction has not been initiated may be modified to include provisions for future water supply when directed by resolution by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief

of Engineers: *Provided,* That the cost of such provisions for future water supply shall not be more than 30 percent of the total estimated cost of the project and reasonable assurance is given by States or local interests that the use of the future water supply provided for will begin within not more than 10 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes, and that necessary water rights for such use have been or can be obtained: *Provided further,* That States or local interests indicate a willingness to pay for such water supply in accordance with subsection c above, beginning when the water supply is used, and costs allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but not to exceed 50 years after the time the project is first available for the storage of water for water supply purposes: *And provided further,* That in arriving at the costs to be repaid, the interest charges on the initial cost of provisions for future water supply during the period until the water supply storage is used will not be included, but in no case will the interest-free period exceed 10 years.

"(f) Responsibility for complying with any applicable State law relating to water supply or water use shall rest with the State or local interests contracting to pay the costs allocated to water supply or utilizing the water supply services.

"(g) That part of the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701h), pertaining to modification of reservoir projects is hereby repealed, except as to contracts and agreements in force at the date of this act."

On page 49, after line 16, to insert:

"SEC. 207. (a) In order to provide adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Grapevine and Garza-Little-Elm Reservoir projects in Texas to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real-estate requirements of the projects the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to reconvey any such land heretofore acquired to the former owners thereof whenever (1) he shall determine that such land is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use, and (2) he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided: *Provided, however,* That prior to January 1, 1958, no lands heretofore acquired for the Grapevine Reservoir project lying below elevation 557 feet shall be reconveyed pursuant to this section or revested pursuant to the act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797).

"(b) Any such reconveyance of any such land or interests shall be made only after the Secretary (1) has given notice, in such manner (including publication) as regulations prescribe to the former owner of such land or interests, and (2) has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interests from such former owner in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such application shall be made within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice, but on good cause the Secretary may waive this requirement.

"(c) Any reconveyance of land therein made under this act shall be subject to such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest, except that no mineral rights may be reserved in said lands unless the Secretary finds that such reservation is needed for the efficient operation of the reservoir projects designated in this act.

"(d) Any land reconveyed under this act shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States (the Government shall receive no payment as a result of any enhancement of values resulting from the construction of the reservoir projects specified in subsection (a) of this section), or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restrictions, and condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land caused by the United States. In addition, the cost of any surveys or boundary markings necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee.

"(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest.

"(f) As used in this section the term 'former owner' means the person from whom any land, or interests therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children, or the heirs at law.

"(g) The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this section to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

"(h) Any proceeds from reconveyances made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(i) This section shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment."

On page 52, at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "206" to "208"; on page 53, after line 20, to insert:

"Stump Creek, tributary of North Fork of Mahoning Creek, at Sykesville, Pa."

After line 24, to insert:

"Watersheds of the Illinois River, at and in the vicinity of Chicago, Ill., the Chicago River, Ill., the Calumet River, Ill., and Ind., and their tributaries, and any areas in northeast Illinois and northwest Indiana which drain directly into Lake Michigan with respect to flood control and major drainage problems."

On page 54, after line 8, to insert:

"Soquel Creek, Calif."

After line 11, to insert:

"Streams at and in the vicinity of San Mateo, Calif."

On page 55, after line 2, to insert:

"Kihei District, Island of Maui, T. H."

At the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "207" to "209"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "208" to "210"; and at the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "209" to "211."

CHAVEZ AMENDMENT

On page 31, after line 12, insert "The project for the Saylorsville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 6, 1956, at an estimated cost of $44,500,000;"

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for myself, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, for himself and other Senators, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 42, to strike out line 21 through line 10 on page 43.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How much time do we have, on each side, on amendments to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement provides that the time shall be limited to 1 hour, equally divided.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I believe the bills and committee reports have not yet reached the desks of the Members of the Senate.

The amendment which I have just offered on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, proposes to strike from the authorization the Bruces Eddy project on the North Fork of the Clearwater River in the State of Idaho. I shall summarize very briefly why I have proposed the deletion of this project.

It would do irreparable damage to natural resources and to wildlife. The Bruces Eddy project is opposed by virtually every outdoor organization in the United States, such as the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Management Institute, the National Parks Association, the Sierra Club, the National Audubon Society, and the Outdoor Writers Association of America. These groups are eager to preserve our natural legacy of resources and grandeur.

These groups are interested in guarding the heritage of the next generation of Americans and future generations yet unborn. The Bruces Eddy project, if constructed, would imperil the feeding grounds and future survival of the largest elk herd remaining in the United States, if not in North America. The dam would probably wipe out a great steelhead trout migration in the Clearwater River system. The Bruces Eddy Dam, and its companion dam, the Penny Cliffs project, would wipe out a considerable portion of the largest unspoiled primitive territory anywhere in our country, within the majestic Selway-Lochsa wilderness area, a region first explored 150 years ago, in 1805, by Meriwether Lewis and William Clark.

Mr. President, I believe these values are worth preserving. I believe they should not be totally despoiled and threatened, just for a limited amount of power and flood-control benefits.

I made a speech in the Senate on June 1, 1955—well over a year ago—predicting that the scenic resources of the Clearwater River watershed would inevitably be imperiled if the full development of the Hells Canyon site were abandoned. I prophesied that such would be the outcome. Unfortunately, my prediction has come true.

I consider it to be significant, and somewhat ironic, that the very Senators who opposed the high Hells Canyon project are now leading the fight for the Bruces Eddy project. Hells Canyon

Dam would have provided 3,880,000 acre-feet of storage for flood control. Bruces Eddy Dam will provide only 1,433,000 acre-feet of storage for flood control.

Hells Canyon would have had an installed capacity of hydroelectric power of 800,000 kilowatts. Bruces Eddy will have an installed capacity for hydroelectric power of 240,000 kilowatts.

Hells Canyon would not have destroyed any values pertaining to anadromous fish and wildlife preservation or outdoor recreation. Bruces Eddy will endanger greatly all those values.

For these basic reasons, it is my opinion that the Senate today, and Congress later, should not include in the bill the authorization of the Bruces Eddy project. That is the purpose of the amendment I have offered to the Senate. I hope Senators will see fit to adopt my amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on this particular amendment, although perhaps I shall use more time after the opponents of the amendment have spoken.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the junior Senator from Oregon. I call the attention of the Senate to page 42, line 21, of the bill, which reads:

> The project for Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir on the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho, for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 51, 84th Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25 million, for partial accomplishment of the project, and the authorization for appropriation for the Columbia River Basin is hereby increased accordingly: *Provided*, That with respect to any power attributable to such project an equitable proportion of firm power as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, or such portion thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contracts made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State of Idaho.

Originally the Senator from Idaho had suggested providing a definite amount of kilowatt power, but the committee decided not to do so, because then every State in the Union would want to have an allotment. We felt that an equitable available amount of power should be provided for Idaho, because it was believed that such a course as affecting Idaho in this instance, and other States in other instances, would be more correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the language of the bill with respect to Bruces Eddy is entirely acceptable to the Senator from Idaho. The reason it was proposed was that the States of Oregon and Washington have refused to ratify a compact relating to the equitable distribution of power. So with respect to a project like Bruces Eddy, it was necessary to include this safeguard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee amendment has already been approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield back his time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield back my time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement on this subject. I thought the Senator from Oklahoma was in charge of the time of the proponents of the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. How much time does the Senator from Idaho desire?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like 6, 8, or 10 minutes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon. I realize he is a great champion of wildlife, that he is qualified not only to represent the interests of his own State of Oregon, but that he presumes the right to reflect the thinking of the people of my State of Idaho.

I regret that the junior Senator from Oregon has injected into this controversy, if it be one, any reference to the Hells Canyon Dam. For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the geography of the particular area, I point out that the proposed Bruces Eddy Dam is 100 miles, approximately, from the site of Hells Canyon. Furthermore, Hells Canyon is on the main Snake River, upstream from the confluence of the Clearwater and the Snake Rivers. Bruces Eddy Dam would be located on the north fork of the Clearwater River.

In the debate on Hells Canyon Dam during the past week I attempted to point out that about 20 reservoirs and dams have been built on the Snake River, as a result of which today almost 3 million acres of arid land have been reclaimed. On the Clearwater River, I do not know of a single dam for flood control or reclamation. The only dam structure is near the city of Lewiston, where a project was built many years ago by the Potlatch Lumber Co.

When the Senator from Oregon says little flood control value benefit will accrue from the proposed Bruces Eddy Dam, he is completely erroneous. The record will show that in the devastating floods of 1948, and even during the past spring, there was always a constant hazard or threat from the floodwaters discharged by the Clearwater River.

I mentioned in the debate the other day that the Clearwater River has three branches which jointly discharge about one-half of all the water carried by the Snake River into the Columbia River at Pasco, Wash.

I concede altruistic motives to the junior Senator from Oregon when he says that throughout the United States the fish and wildlife organizations are opposed to the Clearwater project in northern Idaho, because they want to preserve that great primitive area for the use of the people of the Nation. We in Idaho want the people of the United States, including the sportsmen, to utilize to the fullest the wonderful, magnificent fish and wildlife resources of the Snake River watershed. But we demand the right to utilize our water and power resources.

At the hearing before the Subcommittee on Public Works last week, I testified that about 2 years would be required for the Army engineers, after the authorization of this project, to complete the studies and the design; and that it would be about 2 years from now before a report could be submitted by the Army engineers on the Bruces Eddy project, at which time Congress would have an opportunity to make a determination as to the desirability of constructing that project.

So far as the fish and wildlife values are concerned, I testified also that I desired to cooperate in every way with the great wildlife organizations, even though they reflect the thinking of people in States several thousand, or at least many hundred, miles distant from Idaho.

About a year ago I was successful in having some funds provided to enable the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to initiate studies of fish and wildlife resources in the middle Snake River area, including the Clearwater River watershed. In the present session I was able to get an allocation of $200,000 from the lower Columbia River sanctuary fund for the specific purpose of determining the fish and wildlife values in that section of the great Columbia River Basin.

I emphasize at this time that there is no intent whatsoever on the part of the Senator from Idaho or the persons who are interested in this proposed development to flout the will of the fish and wildlife interests of our State, or even of the other States of the Union.

I want to stress that it will require 2 years to complete the fish and wildlife study. So, 2 years hence, Congress will have an opportunity to make an evaluation of the various aspects from an engineering standpoint and from a flood control and power standpoint, and make an appraisal of the fish and wildlife benefits involved in the proposed Clearwater project development.

Under such conditions, I am positive no effort will be made by anyone to interfere with the interests of the fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield for a question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho said that opposition comes from outside the State of Idaho. Does the Senator from Idaho regard the Idaho department of fish and game as being inside or outside the State of Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. So far as the Senator from Idaho is concerned, from the experience he has had in observing authorizations of such multipurpose projects, he is fully aware that never is any project proposed that does not provoke some opposition, and the Senator from Idaho knows there is some opposition. I am glad that point has been raised. Possibly the Senator from Idaho does not use the political technique that some Senators, as, for instance, those from the State of Oregon, may use, but the Senator from Idaho certainly is not going to flout the will of the people of the State of Idaho. That is the reason why it will require 2 years to complete the studies. In that interim, those who are making charges that to build the dam would be disruptive of the fish and wildlife resources of that area, will have an opportunity to make an

appraisal of the actual facts. Then, in the wisdom of this body, a determination may be made as to what shall be done with the Bruces Eddy project.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1954 — UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me momentarily for a unanimous-consent request, because I must leave the Chamber? I have consulted the minority leader and the members of the committee concerned, who are agreeable to it. I send it to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The proposed unanimous consent-agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That it shall be in order, after the adoption of this agreement, to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 6888, amending the act of September 3, 1954, and that debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the title of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is the sheepherders bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] gave me a list of bills he would like to have considered, and the leadership plans to call them up by motion sometime before the session is concluded. So that all Members may be on notice, those measures are:

Calendar No. 2837, Senate bill 4164. That is the bill providing for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator. It is an urgent bill. It was reported from the committee of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is chairman.

Calendar No. 2608, H. R. 11002. That is a bill to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia.

Calendar No. 2677, H. R. 11554, to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels.

I call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to that bill. This was the bill I objected to yesterday, because there was a note on my calendar that the Senator from Delaware wanted to be heard. I think it is another bill in which the Senator from Delaware is interested. As I understand, the Senator from Delaware has no objection to Calendar No. 2677, House bill 11554, being considered. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct. The committee adopted an amendment which was agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from Delaware will give me a good grade for doing that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Texas read the bill numbers again?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 2837, Senate bill 4164; Calendar No. 2608, H. R. 11002; Calendar No. 2677, H. R. 11554; and Calendar No. 2841, H. R. 10624.

That does not mean only those bills will be scheduled. It does not mean we shall not take up bills on which we have not given notice. But we are going to try to be fair with all Senators. I assure the Members on the minority side that no measure will be taken up unless the majority leader has given advance notice of it. I am going to give every Member as much advance notice as possible. I have read into the RECORD a list of measures which Members on the minority side would like to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to ask the Senator from Texas if he referred to Calendar No. 2841.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 8241, H. R. 10624.

There is at the desk unanimous-consent agreements on a bill from the Finance Committee involving an individual veteran. There is also at the desk a unanimous-consent agreement on a bill involving theater admission taxes. We understand there will be no opposition to that bill, and it will be called up.

I should like to inquire of the Chair what other unanimous-consent agreements are at the desk. We just entered into a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the sheepherders bill. Are there any others? There is an agreement on the depressed areas bill. There will be final passage of that bill. There are five consent agreements altogether.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that none of the time which has been used for this discussion be taken out of the time of my friend, the Senator from Idaho. If he needs any more time, we shall be glad to yield him time. I am very grateful to him for yielding to me, as I have to leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield the Chair 1 minute so he may ask a question of the Senator from Texas? Was H. R. 4392 on the list read by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Calendar Nos. are 2837, 2608, 2677, and 2841. I do not know the bill numbers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Texas.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for himself and other Senators. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, again attempting to reply to the question raised by the Senator from Oregon, may I say the Senator from Idaho has no information that there is any opposition to the Bruces Eddy project on the part of the Idaho State Game and Fish Commission; but if there is, this proposal is still logical, because it provides an interim of 2 years for a study of all the fish and wildlife problems, and enables all opponents to come forward during the investigation and present the facts. Many false charges and allegations have been made, and in order to clarify the situation and get the true facts, an authorization is necessary to make it possible for the Congress to give the Army Engineer Corps funds with which to make the study, because the Senator from Oregon knows that without an authorization it is impossible to get any funds for engineering studies.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho a question, prompted by references during the Hells Canyon debate and during the remarks of the junior Senator from Oregon this morning, to the effect that the Clearwater River is a very important stream for fish migration. The junior Senator from Arizona has fished the streams of Idaho very regularly. In fact, 1 week from today that is what the junior Senator from Arizona intends to be doing in the State of Idaho.

I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether the Clearwater is an important fish migration stream.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho believes there is a certain amount of fish migration, especially of steelheads.

In reply to the question the Senator from Arizona has asked, I should like to refer to a letter which I received from General Itschner, Assistant Chief of the Army Engineers, under date of July 6, 1956, wherein the information submitted is that at Lewiston Dam, just a few miles upstream from the confluence of the Clearwater and the Snake, only 33 salmon and only 8,000 steelheads passed up the Clearwater River during the year 1954; and that during the same year 80,000 salmon and 30,000 steelheads passed up the Snake River at Lewiston,

just above the confluence with the Clearwater. So it would appear that the lack of accurate information concerning fisheries would support the proposal which is being made at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield 3 additional minutes to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the representatives of the Army engineers appeared at the hearings last week before the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, and urged authorization of this project, which was recommended in April of 1955. The Army engineers pointed out that this project has a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. On several occasions General Itschner has pointed out that the Bruces Eddy is one of the best, if not the best undeveloped sites in the Columbia River Basin.

Mr. President, on that basis I think the Senate should endorse the recommendations submitted by General Itschner and the authorization contained in the omnibus bill, which was reported with only one opposition vote, insofar as the Bruces Eddy project is concerned.

I can see no reason why this project should be related in any way to the recent controversy over Hells Canyon. Again, I say that Bruces Eddy Dam would be located 100 miles from the site of the proposed Hells Canyon Dam, and is on an entirely different river watershed. In 1948, when the devastating floods occurred, much of the water which was discharged by the Clearwater River resulted in the loss of many lives in the Portland area.

Mr. DWORSHAK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed with my remarks on the Neuberger amendment a letter addressed to me, dated July 6, 1956, from Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for civil works.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1956.

Hon. H. C. DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: In accordance with your request of July 3, 1956, I am pleased to supply the following information on distribution of fish and other wildlife in relation to dams in the upper Columbia and Snake River Basins, developed in connection with the joint fisheries engineering research program of the Corps of Engineers and the Federal and State fish and wildlife agencies.

Distributional studies showing the number of fish involved at each dam site have indicated that the number of salmon entering the Snake River and proceeding past Ice Harbor dam site and spawning in the pool area and upstream from that point is less than previously conceived. The inclosed tabulation shows the number of fish passing the various sites and the periods for which records are available.

Former runs of salmon in the Clearwater River have been largely blocked since 1927 by the Washington Water Power dam near the mouth of the river at Lewiston. Fishways installed in the dam at the time of its construction operated satisfactorily during periods when water was being passed through the spillway, but were not effective when water was diverted through the powerhouse. Recent attempts by the State of Idaho to restore the runs have met with very little success. An average of only 26 salmon have passed over the dam each year between 1950–53, and observations during 1954 indicated no salmon passing the dam. The river sustains a relatively small run of steelhead trout amounting to approximately 8,000 fish annually during 1950–55. While no specific estimates are available, it is apparent that only a minor portion (probably less than 25 percent) of these fish pass the Bruces Eddy dam site.

While successful means of passing young fish downstream at high dams remains to be developed, the problems are currently being studied. In forwarding the report on Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs Dams, the Chief of Engineers stated that upon recommendation of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and within the limits of estimates given for fish-passing facilities, fish hatcheries may be constructed in connection with either or both of the projects in order to replace actual loss of spawning grounds caused by construction of the dams, and that such hatcheries may be transferred to the State of Idaho without reimbursement, such hatcheries to be constructed without limitation as to the removal of downstream obstructions.

Both of the above dams, and particularly Bruces Eddy, are within the winter range used by the elk herd of the region, although only a very small percentage of that winter range lies within the proposed reservoirs. The portion of the river to be inundated by the reservoirs has very steep sides with little forage for animal life in the bottom of the valleys. Most of the browse is located on benches practically all of which are above the pool elevation. The major winter feeding areas are situated on side draws of the river system upstream from the reservoir areas. A cooperative big-game census by the United States Forest Service and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game during the most critical winter in recent years (1948–49) indicated that about 100 elk were within the 9.5-mile length of the upper reaches of the Bruces Eddy Reservoir area. Construction of the dams should be accompanied by a concerted effort on the part of the responsible agencies to regulate the elk and to improve the supply of available winter feed.

I trust that this will serve your purpose and that you will feel free to call upon us for any further information we may have at any time.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Major General, United States Army;
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Distribution of fish in Upper Columbia and Snake River Basins

ENUMERATION BY ACTUAL COUNTING OF FISH

	Year	Average number of fish passing site		Fish passing site during 1954	
		Salmon	Steelhead	Salmon	Steelhead
Bonneville Dam	1938–54	466,000	144,000	457,000	176,000
McNary Dam	1954–55	260,000	80,000	236,000	75,000
Rock Island Dam	1933–55	60,000	3,000	125,000	5,000
Clearwater (Lewiston Dam)	1950–55	33	8,000	None	9,000

NUMBERS ESTIMATED BY STUDY METHODS

Snake River at Lewiston	1954			80,000	30,000
Grande Ronde River	1954			7,000	
Salmon River	1954			65,000	25,000
Imnaha River	1954			4,000	
Upper Snake and tributaries	1954			4,000	5,000

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Idaho has again expired.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Idaho desire to have further time?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Not at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Idaho that I am familiar with this project, inasmuch as I was there with a group from the Public Works Committee a few years ago. I was certainly most impressed with the project, and I am pleased to know that at this time the Public Works Committee has included it in the authorization. I am very much in favor of the project, and I appreciate very much the substance of the remarks the Senator from Idaho has made with reference to the merits of the project.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, how much time remains to the opponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senator from Idaho knows quite as much about the geography of the Columbia River watershed as I do. When he said the Clearwater dams were not tied in with the proposed Hells Canyon dam, because they were 100 miles away, he is of the knowledge, just as I am, that the water which comes down the Snake River

and the water which comes down the Clearwater River, all flows to the ocean through the same conduit. Therefore, they are tied in together.

I was interested in the question which was asked by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has been such a leader in river-development projects, both in his own region and elsewhere in the Nation. I call to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi the fact that the Senator from Idaho opposed the Hells Canyon project, which all of us know is in the same watershed as the Clearwater projects. However, the Hells Canyon project would have a storage capacity of 3,880,000 acre-feet, whereas Bruces Eddy Dam would have a storage capacity of only 1,433,000 acre-feet. Furthermore, the Hells Canyon project would have an installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts, whereas the Bruces Eddy project would have an installed capacity of only 240,000 kilowatts.

Furthermore, to my knowledge, not one leader of a conservation group opposed the Hells Canyon project. What is more, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, who in my opinion is the greatest biologist in the United States today, the founder of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, a lifelong Republican, and the brother of a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, came out in favor of the Hells Canyon project, although he said that all his life he had been cool toward public power. But Dr. Gabrielson said publicly that he realized the abandonment of the flood-control benefits at Hells Canyon would force, inevitably, the construction of dams on the Clearwater River and on the Salmon River, where the greatest fish migrations in the country would be damaged, and where North America's largest surviving elk herd could be wiped out for loss of feed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. First, I wish to read a brief statement; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Idaho, just as he very courteously yielded to me.

Mr. President, let me say that the Idaho Department of Fish and Game has had this to say:

> The program of dam construction, as proposed by the Corps of Engineers for the Clearwater River drainage, would most certainly block and annihilate all runs of salmon and steelhead above the point of construction. In fact, it might well be that the salmon and steelhead will be almost completely annihilated from the entire Clearwater River drainage, since there is only a very small portion of the river below the proposed dam sites that is suitable for spawning purposes.

Those are the words of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game.

Now I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. During the intervening 2 years, the State of Idaho Fish and Game Department and other alleged opponents of this project will have ample opportunity to present their views; and the matter to which the Senator from Oregon has referred will be taken into consideration.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether it is not true that not a single gallon of the water coming down the Clearwater River is in the Snake River in the vicinity of Hells Canyon Dam. When the Senator from Oregon says they are both parts of the same watershed, that is true; but the Snake River drains the southern half of Idaho, and the Clearwater drains the northern section of Idaho, and has no relationship whatever to the Snake River, because the confluence is at Lewiston, Idaho.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I beg to disagree with the distinguished Senator from Idaho. There is every bit of relationship. The whole flood danger in the Pacfic Northwest in the Columbia Basin is on the lower Columbia, from The Dalles to the sea; and both the Clearwater and the Snake Rivers contribute their flow to go down the lower Columbia from The Dalles to the sea. So there is a definite relationship. These rivers are part of the same system.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly the Senator from Oregon does not contend, does he, that any dam could be built upon the Snake River, upstream from Lewiston, to control the flood waters of the Clearwater River watershed?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No. I agree; the Senator from Idaho is correct as to that.

I make the point of the inconsistency of the Senator from Idaho, who was perfectly willing to abandon the nearly 4 million acre-feet of storage for flood control purposes at the Hells Canyon Dam site, but now on the floor of the Senate he is advocating that 1½ million acre-feet of storage be provided at Bruces Eddy, to the irreparable damage of some of the greatest wildlife elk herds and fish migrations in North America.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Oregon certainly wants to be reasonable. Is he not willing to permit these studies to be made during the 2-year period, so that when the facts are submitted the Congress will be enabled to make a determination as to whether the dam should be constructed?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from Idaho claim that studies cannot be made unless there is an authorization? So far as Hells Canyon was concerned, the Senator from Idaho never made such a contention. Why did not the Senator favor an authorization at Hells Canyon?

Mr. DWORSHAK. There is this great difference: The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineer Corps have jointly spent $1½ million for engineering studies with respect to the proposed Hells Canyon Dam, whereas on the Clearwater, without any authorization the Army Engineer Corps has advised that it will be unable to spend a single dollar during the next few years on engineering studies with respect to the Bruces Eddy Dam.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator be satisfied with an authorization in this bill for a study of the wildlife values, the outdoor and recreational values, and the fisheries values of the Clearwater River watershed, without an authorization for actual construction of the dam?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is not willing to accept that proposal, because for several years efforts have been made to get funds to enable the Army Engineer Corps to initiate engineering studies on the Clearwater site, particularly for Bruces Eddy Dam. Unless we authorize this project it will be impossible to initiate such studies. The Senator from Idaho is unwilling to have our State, with its three great watersheds placed in a deep freeze because people in adjoining States arrogantly assume the responsibility for dictating how the State of Idaho shall develop its power and water resources.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator speaks of a deep freeze. He was willing to put Hells Canyon in a graveyard. The Senator referred to the adjoining States. Hells Canyon is half in our State. The Senator took the leadership in putting it beneath a tombstone.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho emphasized only one fact during the recent debate on Hells Canyon, and that was that until such time as the States of Oregon and Washington were willing, in good faith, to ratify a compact covering the distribution of water benefits in the seven States in the basin, the State of Idaho would be unwilling to approve the high Hells Canyon Dam. In the instance of the Clearwater project, now under debate, that is entirely within the State of Idaho, and has no relationship whatsoever, except that it is a flood menace to the lower basin States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Idaho was willing to approve private power dams, which would use the same water. He did not ask for a compact with respect to them.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is an entirely different matter. The record will show that when any private dam is built, the builders gamble with the money of the sponsors, and there is no possibility of demanding the prior right to use water from upstream sources. Furthermore, any private development on the Snake River within the State of Idaho must comply with the State laws, which give priority to the rights of Idaho to control the use of water within the State.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to obtain the floor in my own right. However, I desire to ask the Senator a question first.

Does not the junior Senator from Oregon find the argument of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] fantastic in regard to the effect of Bruces Eddy upon our whole flood control and storage problem in the Pacific Northwest? The Senator points out, on page 38 of the report, that a short time before the vote on Hells Canyon the Senator from Arizona read a letter from the Governors of the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, as follows:

> If the Congress at this session wants to advance power development of the Pacific Northwest and provide flood-control storage, they should take out the bill bottled up in committee, providing for authorization and

construction of Penny Cliffs and Bruces Eddy projects on the Clearwater River.

When they were opposing Hells Canyon these gentlemen, in opposition to what I consider to be the people's interest in their own water resources, were arguing that Bruces Eddy was a substitute, in part, for Hells Canyon. But the Senator from Idaho is taking the opposite position in reference to Bruces Eddy, that, after all, Hells Canyon has nothing whatever to do with Bruces Eddy.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I find that the opponents of Hells Canyon can very conveniently run with the hare or hold with the hounds whenever they desire.

It is quite interesting that the Republican Governors of the three States were so opposed to Hells Canyon, with 800,000 installed kilowatts capacity, and now are so fervently in favor of Bruces Eddy, with only 240,000 installed kilowatts capacity.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 16 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to thank Senators for coming in at 9:30. We are hopeful of avoiding a rollcall during the period from 12:30 until 2 o'clock. We are desirous of getting through with this bill so that we can take up the theater-tax bill and certain conference reports.

The Senator from Oklahoma must be at a social-security conference at 11 o'clock.

We can talk indefinitely on the pending bill, but I doubt if we can change the end result. The bill will be passed. Every Senator should have an opportunity to record his views and give full expression to them. However, in so doing, I wish Senators to know of the problem we have during the lunch hour, and the problem which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has in connection with the social-security bill. For that reason the Senate convened at 9:30 this morning, even though it did not get away until midnight last night.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it is with great hesitation that I rise to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I realize his concern with reference to Hells Canyon. I did everything within my power to help him get the Hells Canyon authorization bill passed by the Senate. I thought it should have been passed. I still think it should be passed. But there is no relationship whatsoever between Hells Canyon and Bruces Eddy. Hells Canyon, if built, would be on one branch or tributary of the great Snake River. Bruces Eddy is on another tributary, more than 100 miles away. None of the water impounded in Bruces Eddy would ever reach Hells Canyon, and none of the water impounded in Hells Canyon would ever reach Bruces Eddy. They are just as separate and distinct, and differentiated, as though one were a tributary to the Atlantic and the other a tributary to the Pacific.

The evidence before the committee was that there would be no damage to the wildlife of the area by reason of the Bruces Eddy project. I think the count by the appropriate agency of the Government disclosed either that 7 salmon had gone upstream in 6 years, or 6 salmon had gone upstream in 7 years.

The evidence was that the hunting ground of the elk and the moose, which is rightly a concern of many enlightened people, is many miles—and in my judgment 100 miles—away from this reservoir site.

There is another reason why I am compelled to oppose this amendment. I know of no State which has received more money during the time I have been in Congress for the conservation of its water resources than the great State of Oregon. Mr. President, I have supported every dollar that has been authorized or appropriated to build reservoirs in and for the people of the great State of Oregon. Since I came to the Senate nearly 8 years ago, I do not remember, however, that so much as one dollar has ever been appropriated for a water-conservation project in the State of Idaho. I may be in error about that, but I do not remember one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KERR. I ask for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from Oregon intimated that the Senator from Idaho should not have opposed the Hells Canyon project. I did not agree with the Senator from Idaho, but Hells Canyon is on the border of Idaho. It is just as much on the border of Idaho as on the border of Oregon. Certainly, the Senator from Idaho had an appropriate interest in Hells Canyon, because it concerned a great reservoir which borders his State and obtains much water from the watersheds within his State.

However, Bruces Eddy is entirely within the State of Idaho. It is at least 100 miles, and perhaps farther, from the closest point in Oregon. I say to the great Senator from Oregon that I do not believe the Senate will consider the protestations of the Senator from Oregon with reference to a project in Idaho, especially when, so far as I know, this is the first great project of this kind the Senator from Idaho and the people of that State have asked Congress to authorize, and is a project which has been approved by the Army engineers for many years.

The Senator from Idaho has gone even further. He has said that it will be 2 years before any money can be appropriated to carry out the authorization. We know that is correct. There will have to be planning money and study money. So far as the construction is concerned, it will be a minimum of 2 years before anything can be done. He has said that if in that time it is made apparent that wildlife and fishlife would be unduly damaged or endangered, he will not push for construction funds. I never saw a fairer attitude. I believe the Senate will be impressed by it.

In my own judgment, fish and wildlife will be helped by the reservoir. In my judgment, sportsmen and recreational facilities will be greatly benefited by the reservoir. When we think of the fact that our good friends from Oregon—and we have all gone all out to help develop the resources of that great State, one of the finest in the Union—have had their State benefit to the great extent I have indicated, it comes with poor grace from a Senator from that great State, which has had so much help in the development of its natural resources by the Federal Government, to oppose a project for the neighboring State of Idaho, which could not possibly adversely affect the State of Oregon and which, so far as I know, is the first one of such appropriations which has been either authorized or considered for authorization by Congress since I came to the Senate nearly 8 years ago.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Like the Senator from Oklahoma, I have devoted many years to trying to help develop the Columbia River Basin. Not once did I ever oppose either the State of Oregon or the State of Washington in their efforts to get their full share for the development of that great basin. As a matter of fact, the people of my State sometimes complain that I vote for a $90 million project on the Columbia, and possibly get no more than $500,000 for the Rio Grande. I try to explain to them that the difference is that the Columbia River is that kind of river. I believe in this instance that my friend from Oregon has not made a case. I hope the Senate will vote down his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for some questions?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield myself 3 minutes so that I may answer questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has visited Lewiston and has gone up the Clearwater River a short way. Of course, he has read the journal of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Lewis and Clark came down the Clearwater.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I found that in the Clearwater there were enormous numbers of what are commonly called salmon, but which perhaps, strictly speaking, should be called steelhead trout. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the steelhead trout, in the spawning season, go up the Columbia River and up the Snake River and then up the Clearwater in large numbers?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; and then up the North Fork, which would be blocked by the Bruces Eddy Dam.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a dam at Bruces Eddy would be about 500 feet high?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It would be 570 feet high.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it be possible to devise fish ladders by which the steelhead trout, in carrying out their odyssey

of returning from the sea, could return to their original spawning ground?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Thus far, biologists have not been able to devise ladders or other devices which might make it possible for migrating fish to go over a dam that would be as high as the Bruces Eddy Dam. The kind of fish ladders that are used at Bonneville and McNary, for example, are between 70 and 120 feet high.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore it would mean that the movement of the steelhead trout from the sea to the point of their origin would be effectively shut off. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there not a difference between tame nature and wild nature; and that while a lake created by a high dam creates tame nature, it also somewhat reduces wild nature?

Mr. NEUBERGER. There are certain migratory fish which will spawn only in running, extremely cold water. An artificial lake, such as is created by a reservoir, completely modifies and changes that condition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Should we not preserve some of nature's sanctuaries which are wild, and not tame?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We have all too few of them left today.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. I should like to call my request to the attention of the Senators on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time been consumed?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I shall ask for the yeas and nays at the close of my remarks. I will ask the Senate for the courtesy of granting us a yea and nay vote on the amendment. I have always been cooperative when I have been asked to support a request for yeas and nays. I do not know of one time, in my 12 years in the Senate when I have not supported a request for a yea and nay vote. I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. I want to know whether on this issue the two Senators from Oregon may have the same courtesy extended to them. Very frankly, we want to put our colleagues on record on this issue.

Mr. President, from my almost 12 years in the Senate I know when an issue gets crystallized and gets set, and I also know that sometimes one loses an inning but still wins the game in the long run.

I wish to make three points in my comments on this issue. I am in complete disagreement with the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Oklahoma. In the first place, Idaho does not own the Clearwater River. Oregon does not own the Columbia River.

RIVER BELONGS TO PEOPLE

These two rivers belong to all the people of this country. When we are developing these rivers, we are not developing them for Idaho alone, or for Oregon alone, but for the people of the Nation as a whole.

I never have and I never shall ask for a vote for the development of a project in Oregon for Oregon without benefits to the Nation, on the Columbia River or on any other river. If I did not think it was for the best interests of all the people of the country, I would not ask for its development in the first place.

Mr. President, we hear the Senator from Idaho talk about a compact, as though the people of the United States ought to require that 3 or 5 States get together on the matter of a compact concerning projects on these rivers. I have always taken the position that a compact has nothing to do with the rights of all the American people and their rights in and ownership of navigable streams. These streams do not belong to the States through which they run.

I am not making a provincial argument on this question when I am urging the best and fullest development of the power resources and the water resources of the streams in the Pacific Northwest. I am asking it for the benefit of the people in Oklahoma and in Massachusetts and in every other State of this country.

NOT A FEDERAL PROJECT; A BLIND FOR PARTNERSHIP PROPOSAL

Mr. President, the second point I want to make is that I think I recognize that nothing is going to be done about it today, but we are going to have to come back to this record in view of what I now predict. This is a private utility scheme as made clear by the administration, the Corps of Engineers and the Pacific Northwest Power Corporation.

Mr. President, they have been out for some time, as part of the strategy to scuttle Hells Canyon, to build up support for Bruces Eddy. One need only read the Senate hearings on the Hells Canyon bill (S. 1333) to read that the opponents of the high dam claim that the much smaller Bruces Eddy storage would make up the loss of 3,880,000 acre-feet of storage that high Hells Canyon would provide.

I wish to warn the Senate today that this is also a part of the private utility partnership scheme in this country, to wipe out the people's interest in public power and gradually to build smaller dams and give them over to the private utility companies as partnership dams. Remember what I say here today, because we will come back to it within the next 10 years. Within 10 years from today there will be a great private utility movement in this country to get control of the power now being generated at great public dams in this country. That is their long-time scheme.

Mr. President, I want to say that I am proud to stand here on the floor of the Senate today and oppose Bruces Eddy at this time until greater progress is made in stopping the giving away of our power resources in this country. Now is the time, before we authorize this dam, to make a study of what the program is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in the third place, that there is no basis for the argument of the Senator from Idaho. Congress did not authorize a study of Hells Canyon Dam. It has been studied for many years. We ought to have a study not only of Bruces Eddy, but we ought to have a study of it in relationship to the private utility scheme, the long-time scheme they have in mind gradually to take over the power-generating resources of the streams of this country. Bruces Eddy is only the first step; Penny Cliffs is waiting in the wings. Dams on the Salmon River are the logical next step of the administration despite the havoc they would wreak on fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for his courage and foresight in bringing before the Senate today the effect of Bruces Eddy on the whole conservation program. There is no question about the fact, Mr. President, as to what the experts will say about the effect not only on wildlife but on fishlife, and the great economic interest of the fishing industry in our section of the country. Bruces Eddy is an anticonservation project. I would say to the conservationists across this Nation that they are being driven out by the construction of Bruces Eddy. Steelhead and salmon runs on the Clearwater Forks are doomed to unnecessary destruction. A great wilderness area and elk feeding grounds are at stake. These are irreplaceable resources that are imperiled by high-price, low-power dams.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I would say that this is a straight Federal authorization and has no relationship whatsoever to a partnership plan for any participation by a private utility.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Cougar Dam is a federally authorized dam. What have we been fighting against for the past several years? The attempt on the part of the administration to make Cougar Dam a partnership dam. The next move will be to get it deauthorized as a Federal project and turn it over to the Idaho Power Co. or some other private utility company. The record is replete with that game, and it is a shell game, and I have no intention of going into that kind of a scheme for the benefit of the private utilities of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the Senator knows that the Idaho Power Co. does not operate within that entire area. It is many miles removed.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Idaho Power Co.——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to use a little time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if the usual investigation has been made, if witnesses have been heard on the recommendation in the report on H. R. 12080, and if the conclusions in the report represent the conclusions of the committee after the investigation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The hearings were held on the House side. They had plenty of time to go into all these projects. We received the bill only 3 or 4 days ago and added some amendments. But the hearings were held on the House side, and the Senate committee is satisfied with the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, that the Senator from New Mexico has been chairman of the committee longer than has any other Senator since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have always found his conclusions to be fair and as objective as any could be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of August 24, 1954, reports that the Pacific Northwest Power Co., composed of the 4 giant private utilities of the Pacific Northwest, is investigating building 2 large power and water-storage dams, Penny Cliffs and Bruces Eddy.

That is showing their hand, Mr. President; and we shall live to rue the day if we authorize the Bruces Eddy project so far as the people's interests are concerned.

The administration has made clear that Bruces Eddy is a partnership proposal. Just read the President's budget submitted this year for fiscal 1957 on page 651:

> Participating projects, Corps of Engineers, civil (under proposed legislation, 1957): There is included in the budget for 1957 a supplemental appropriation of $10 million to provide for the Federal share, in cooperation with States, local governments, or private groups, in the development of partnership water resources projects, such as John Day Reservoir, Oregon and Washington, Green Peter Reservoir, Oregon (including White Bridge Reservoir), and Bruces Eddy Reservoir, Idaho. Provision is also made for similar projects which are as yet unspecified.

This is another giveaway not only for a power site but a great fish and wildlife area. The administration's partisan zeal for the private utilities would wash out a great steelhead and salmon spawning area for profit dollars.

Nor is this all. The Corps of Engineers testimony makes it clear that Penny Cliffs, even more destructive of outdoor values, is the next step. This is the bitter and expensive price for the administration's throttling of Hells Canyon.

Bruces Eddy at a cost of $122 million will have power facilities of 240,000 kilowatts; Penny Cliffs will cost $200 million for 292,000 kilowatts. Compare Hells Canyon for $308 million with more water storage and 680 million kilowatts at site with more downstream.

This is the price of a false partnership where the people's resources are handed over for shortsighted exploitation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I reject the notion, and I think the American people reject the notion, that the vast territory along the Clearwater River belongs to the people of Idaho. Most of this realm is in national forests. It belongs to the people of the United States, just as Crater Lake National Park, in my State of Oregon, belongs to the people of the United States. Congress had before it the Echo Park authorization. Echo Park is wholly within Utah and Colorado, but the people of all the United States rose up in wrath to protect it, and it was not authorized.

I am familiar with the vast Clearwater wilderness. I have ridden through it, I have walked through it, and I have camped in it. I think it is one of the most marvelous regions in our Nation. I believe the people will regret the authorization of Bruces Eddy Dam and Penny Cliffs Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota subsequently said: Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from conservation organizations in my State and elsewhere in support of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon, opposing the authorization of the Bruces Eddy Dam in Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that these telegrams, expressing the opinions of my constituents, be printed in the RECORD at the point just before the vote on the Neuberger amendment.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *July 25, 1956.*

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.:

Minnesota Conservation Federation urges support of Neuberger amendment which would delete authorization of Bruces Eddy Dam in Idaho from rivers and harbors omnibus bill, H. R. 12080.

AGNES L. NELSON,
Secretary, Minnesota Conservation Federation.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *July 25, 1956.*

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sierra Club urges amendment to H. R. 12080 eliminating Bruces Eddy Dam from North Fork Clearwater River, Idaho. Wildlife and recreational values Clearwater of national as well as local significance, studies these values still in progress.

A. STARKER LEOPOLD,
Vice President, Sierra Club.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 24, 1956.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge deletion of Bruces Eddy Dam, Idaho, from rivers and harbors omnibus bill, H. R. 12080. This dam would flood out critical big game ranges and block migrations of sea-run fish. Conservationists of Northwest and throughout Nation oppose authorization of this project. We respectfully request your support of the amendment that would delete this high dam from the bill.

Charles H. Callison, Conservation Director, National Wildlife Federation; C. R. Gutermuth, Vice President, Wildlife Management Institute; Mike Hudoba, Conservation Director, Outdoor Writers Association of America; Joe Penfold, National Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America; Howard Zahniser, Executive Secretary, Wilderness Society; David R. Brower, Executive Director, Sierra Club; Kenneth D. Morrison, Public Relations, National Audubon Society; Stanley E. Little, Executive Director, National Campers & Hikers Association, Inc.; E. A. Seaman, Executive Secretary, Sport Fishing Institute; Fred Packard, Executive Secretary, National Parks Association; Jack O'Connor, Chairman, Committee for the Preservation of the Clearwater, Idaho, Wildlife Federation; H. T. Jones, Secretary, Idaho Wildlife Federation; Rollin Bowles, President, Oregon Division, Izaak Walton League of America; Bruce Yeager, President, Oregon Wildlife Federation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question]. The "noes" appear to have it——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have some correcting amendments on which I should like to have action taken at this time.

On page 25, line 16, I move to strike out "$1,585,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,073,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate is working against time, and there are many typographical errors in the printed bill, I ask permission that all the typographical errors be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from New Mexico will send the corrections to the desk, the corrections will be made en bloc.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

I ask also that after the bill has been passed, it be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 16, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "$1,761,000" and insert "$2,936,000."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is agreed to.

All time has been yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 12080) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. FREAR in the chair) appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may resign as a conferee on the omnibus flood control bill, H. R. 12080, and that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] be named in my place.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, that is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR CERTAIN INJURIES TO MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2831, H. R. 2845, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday that amendments to the bill will not be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2845) to amend the veterans regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an explanation of the bill as reported by the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize a special monthly allowance (statutory award) of $47 for the loss or loss of the use of both buttocks.

Recognition of certain specific disabilities in the form of special statutory awards is well established in veterans' laws. One of such awards applies presently to the loss or loss of use of a creative organ, a foot, a hand, or blindness in one eye. This $47 monthly rate is in addition to any other compensation to which the veteran may be entitled. In view of the severity of the type of disability contemplated by this bill and the unusualness of its occurrence, the committee feels fully warranted in providing this special rate and believes that it should be enacted into law.

There are not statistics available on which to show the number of veterans who might qualify for the additional compensation sought to be provided by this bill. It is believed to be comparatively small, however.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRIVATE FINANCING OF MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2677, H. R. 11554, with the understanding that amendments to the bill will not be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11554) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment which was agreed to on July 23, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is pending an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to call up his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The committee has amended the bill. I have no amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Delaware has withdrawn his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not have an amendment to offer. What is the number of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H. R. 11554, Calendar No. 2677.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have no amendment to that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REGULATION AND LICENSING OF PAWNBROKERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2608, H. R. 11002, to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; and that no amendment be in order except committee amendments, if there be any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11002) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read a third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2829, H. R. 12270; and that no amendments, other than committee amendments, be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12270) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The request is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the military construction bill; and that no amendments except committee amendments be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 33, line 11, after the word "acquisition," to strike out "$37,760,000" and insert "$21,510,000", on page 62, line 11, after the word "States", to strike out "$759,123,000" and insert "$742,873,000"; in line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "$1,377,184,000" and insert "$1,360,934,000"; on page 71, after line 17, to insert:

"SEC. 419. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this or of any other act, no contract shall be entered into by the United States for the construction or acquisition of family housing units by or for the use of

military or civilian personnel of any of the military services unless—

"(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a written report stating the intent to construct or acquire such units, certifying that the number of units to be constructed or acquired is consistent with the long range troop strength to be stationed at the location of such units, and showing the location, number, and estimated cost of such housing units, and the existing housing at such location; and

"(2) (a) a 180-day period has elapsed since the submission of such report, or (b) the committees have advised the Secretary of Defense, in writing, that there are no further questions to be asked concerning the project contemplated in such contract."

On page 72, at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "419" to "420"; on page 73, at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "420" to "421"; and at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "421" to "422."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared pertaining to military construction and the military personnel program in general be printed immediately after the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

The military construction program is a must item for national defense and I hope that it will be passed quickly. At the same time that we consider this, I think it is necessary to review our overall legislative program with respect to the Armed Forces. The closing days of a session tend to get a little hectic and it is healthy to consider where we started from, where we have gone, and where we go from here.

The President established the priority in Armed Forces legislation in April. When forwarding to the House the letter by the Secretary of Defense on the personnel situation in the Armed Forces, the President said: "Only when we have created a career military service which can compete with the attractive opportunities available in civilian pursuits will we be able to stop the wasteful losses from our Armed Forces and attract individuals to those services. We cannot move too soon in our efforts to increase the number and quality of volunteers for long-term career military service in both enlisted and officer ranks."

This is the number one objective of the administration as regards the Armed Forces. The testimony we have heard from various witnesses in the hearings has reinforced this view. One, we need to get competent people and provide them with an attractive career that will keep them. Two, we need bases and additional facilities. Three, we need the equipment to modernize and improve the forces we have and are building.

This Congress has met most of the administration requests for legislation to improve careers in the Armed Forces. We have extended and improved servicemen's survivor benefits; we have enlarged the provisions for dependent medical care; we have authorized the augmentation of the Regular officer strength; we have provided greater incentives for medical and dental officers in the services. We have given all services the right to retire officers in their highest temporary grade. There is still a chance that we will give relief to personnel who now have to forfeit their entire rental allowance when living in substandard public housing.

All these things have been done to make a career in the Armed Forces more attractive and more stable. Most of them come under the heading of fringe benefits and in most areas they serve to put us back into the running with civilian industry. Since the war, industry has put on a great spurt in the matter of fringe benefits and this year's legislative achievements will enable the Armed Forces to come closer to balancing what industry has to offer.

But fringe benefits are not the whole answer. There is also the question of pay scale. We want to raise the enlistment rate of the Armed Forces as a whole. The rate for fiscal year 1955, when 15.7 percent of all first-term enlistees were willing to reenlist, is not good enough. But the problem is still more critical in the technical specialties. We expect civilian industry to be more interested in and to offer more money to the man who has the most know-how to sell. And of course industry is doing this. And as a result, electronics technicians are only reenlisting at the rate of 6.9 percent as against the overall 15.7 percent. Only 8.1 percent of the armament technicians are signing on again.

These men have more to sell. They ought to have. We have spent as much as $75,000 training each of these specialists to maintain and operate the equipment produced by our advanced technology as opposed to an average of $15,000 for the average training. The specialist has spent 2 or 2½ years of his 4-year tour in school and the time he has spent on the job has been mostly on-the-job training. As one of General LeMay's briefing team expressed it, the first-tour specialist has probably broken more equipment than he has fixed.

Then about the time the Armed Forces are ready to begin getting a return on their investment in this man, his tour of duty is up. He is offered twice the same salary and roughly the same fringe benefits to work for private industry. Maybe he likes the service and has the normal quota of patriotism but he has a family to support. So he gets out and takes the job with industry.

We don't hesitate to spend five times the average amount on his training because we know that he has to know how to do his job. But we have not seen fit to pay him a penny more salary than his less-specialized brothers. This is what we will have to do if we want to keep him and translate his expensive training into what it was intended to produce—combat-ready and stable Armed Forces.

I am pleased to note that the Defense Department has already taken note of this problem and now has a committee, headed by the very able Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, president of General Electric, to study this problem and to submit its findings to the Secretary of Defense. I feel that the Senate should show its continued interest in the problem and indicate that it is expecting proposals for legislation to be submitted to the next session. As long as every year sees every fifth man getting out of the service, we cannot hope to have true combat readiness, true stability in our forces, true economy of operation. As long as this situation continues, we cannot hope to have true national defense.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is one little matter, in the form of a committee amendment, which was not included in the regular committee amendments, and which is at the desk and should be included in the military construction bill. It relates solely to matters which may be in the housing bill which may become law. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the military construction bill was passed, for the purpose of offering the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 71, line 19, to strike out the words "or of any other act", and insert in lieu thereof "act or any other provision of law except a provision of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (H. R. 12270) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement with reference to Calendar No. 2829, H. R. 12270, a bill just passed by unanimous consent. In view of some newspaper articles which have been published with reference to the bill, I think I should make a brief statement.

It will be recalled that the President of the United States vetoed the original bill which was passed by the Congress because it required the Department of Defense to come into agreement with some of the committees of the Congress before some of the projects could proceed. One of the newspaper articles stated that this bill was in defiance of the President's message. I am afraid that whoever wrote that article did not read the provision very carefully, because the provision was drawn to conform to the language used in the President's message. I have no hesitancy, and I never have had, in opposing any Chief Executive when my views have differed from his. If that can be called defiance, I have defied every President with whom I have served during my tenure in the Congress.

This bill was drawn in recognition of the fact that the President had veto power and could exercise it.

The President said in his message:

> I am persuaded that the true purpose of the Congress in the enactment of both of these provisions was to exercise a close and full legislative oversight of important programs of the Department of Defense. This purpose can be properly attained by requiring timely reports from the Executive. Such reports would provide the Congress with the basis for any further legislative action it may find to be necessary.

The provision of the bill which was inserted in lieu of that to which the President objected, which required commit-

tees to agree with the executive department, is as follows:

SEC. 419. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this or of any other act, no contract shall be entered into by the United States for the construction or acquisition of family housing units by or for the use of military or civilian personnel of any of the military services unless—

(1) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a written report stating the intent to construct or acquire such units, certifying that the number of units to be constructed or acquired is consistent with the long range troop strength to be stationed at the location of such units, and showing the location, number and estimated cost of such housing units, and the existing housing at such location; and

(2) (a) a 180-day period has elapsed since the submission of such report, or (b) the committees have advised the Secretary of Defense, in writing, that there are no further questions to be asked concerning the project contemplated in such contract.

The language of the bill does not give the committees power to veto any of these projects, but it does require that full information be furnished and that the committee be given a reasonable period of time to consider the information and determine legislative needs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is a member of the subcommittee that originally wrote the bill which was vetoed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first of all I should like to say that there was no intent on the part of the subcommittee or the committee, in the original language, of defying the President or invading the proper powers of the Executive. I have always felt that the whole is greater than any of its parts, and that if Congress had the authority to grant authorization it could also place a limit on the authorization.

The language which is incorporated in the bill, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has pointed out, is not intended in any sense as an invasion of the Executive power or as an attempt to snub or to rebuff the President. Rather, the language is in keeping with the spirit of the President's suggestions in his veto message. As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, it does not give the Committee on Armed Services any veto power.

I might say in that connection that in the Reorganization Act there is explicit provision whereby when reorganization plans are submitted to the Congress, a resolution of approval or of disapproval has a privileged status, and it is within the power of the Congress to suspend the operation of any reorganization plan until the resolution has been acted upon.

In the language here involved there is no such provision made. The committee by affirmative action can shorten the period of 180 days. If the 180 days should elapse without any action whatsoever, then the housing proposals or projects would be authorized on the initiative of the executive department.

I appreciate the fact that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has seen fit to make his statement, because I think the RECORD should be clear that the committee—and I am sure I speak for the minority members of the committee in this particular matter as well as joining the distinguished chairman in speaking for the full committee and for the majority members—had no intent to snub the President or anything of that sort, but, rather, desired to attempt to place language in the bill which would provide for letting the Congress know what the Defense Department proposed with respect to the authority for the acquisition or development of housing units.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I could, of course, elaborate on what the Senator has said by stating that similar language appeared in bills which have been signed by the Chief Executive. In one of those bills the language was much stronger, because the bill provided that the Public Works Committees of both Houses of Congress should take affirmative action by resolution before the executive branch could proceed. I could speak my views as to the right and power of Congress to deal with the question of providing limitations, but we are confronted with a condition and not a theory.

For that reason the amendment was drawn to conform to the views expressed by the President in his message and in the effort to secure legislation in this important matter.

NEW AND IMPROVED OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE WEAPONS—SECURITY METHODS IN STATE OF FLUX—SLOW DOWN LAND PURCHASES—WITHDRAWALS

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services if it is not true that the Armed Forces are undergoing a complete review in the light of improved weapons, both for defense and offense, and that, according to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and others who have made public statements recently, there is very likely to be a reduction in the number of foot soldiers as such—surface ships and a greater consolidation of Air Forces—with a consequent lessening demand for housing in certain areas?

NATIONAL DEFENSE—STATE OF FLUX

Mr. RUSSELL. If we are to believe some of the rumors which are going around, there will be not only a reduction in the number of foot soldiers in the Army, but also a reduction of forces in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force. Of course, it would be the height of waste and the height of folly for the Government to build a large amount of housing for soldiers who will not be in uniform or in units of the Armed Forces next year as will be the case if the proposed program or plan is carried through.

Mr. MALONE. It has been the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada, gained from the top military strategists, that national defense is in a continuous state of flux, because of the new and potential weapons, higher speed planes, and guided missiles which are coming into the picture.

Plans are constantly being revised, as has been the case from the beginning of time, probably speeded up now on account of the atom bomb and potential new source of energy. Therefore, fewer foot soldiers, fewer surface ships as such, can be utilized, and a further consolidation of the air forces will be necessary.

The remaining foot soldiers will be trained commando-type troops who can be set down and moved quickly anywhere in groups of 1,000, 10,000, or 50,000 men and picked up when the job is done.

MORE COOPERATION NEEDED

If that be true, then is it not necessary when even the Committee on Armed Services is not certain of exactly what will be needed, that there should be more cooperation between the armed services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Committee on Armed Services certainly has sought to cooperate with the executive branch of the Government, but we get some very conflicting reports at times. It seems that the left hand in the Department of Defense at times does not know what the right hand is doing.

One Under Secretary, in charge of manpower personnel, testified that there was no program planned to reduce personnel for a period of several years. But we know that Admiral Radford, Secretary of Defense Wilson, and Secretary of State Dulles have expressed other views.

We are merely trying to keep in touch with a very fluid situation and are undertaking to discharge our responsibilities to the American people as their representatives in Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall ask for the regular order. As was announced previously, there is to be a luncheon at 12 o'clock. We hope it will not be necessary to have any votes between 12 and 12:30. If we continue to talk until 12 o'clock, it will mean that a dozen Senators may have to miss the luncheon.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, a situation exists throughout the country in which Government bureaus, with special reference to the armed services, are withdrawing large areas of land without coordinating such withdrawals with the Armed Services Committee or the administration or the legislatures of the States affected when as a matter of fact the reorganization now under way may vitally change their needs and activities.

So it is not necessary, as is stated in the House report on H. R. 12185, which was just passed by the House to direct the armed services to observe the laws of the States where located and to require congressional approval for more than 5,000-acre withdrawals of public lands.

The Members of Congress—I can speak for the senior Senator from Nevada—want the armed services to have everything they need but he also wants them to fully utilize all of the lands they have already withdrawn and to obey the laws of the States with special reference to

the appropriation of water, mining, fish and game, grazing, taking into full account the economic structure of that State.

I want to commend the chairman, Mr. RUSSELL, of the Senate Armed Services Committee and his colleagues for a job well done.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a very great need for close coordination of the program.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. STENNIS subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate this morning passed H. R. 12270, which is the military construction bill. I believe those of us who handled the bill ought to make some brief remarks at least with reference to two sections of the bill, which have already been covered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is a member, with me, of the subcommittee which handled the first military construction bill this year—the bill that was vetoed.

I refer to the two points in the bill that were covered in the President's veto of the original measure. The second military construction bill eliminated entirely one of the features to which the President had objected, namely, with reference to the Talos installations, by deferring those installations so far as procurement is concerned, but not disturbing the present program of experimentation and other items that go into the development program.

The other item I wish particularly to mention is with reference to military family housing projects. The President objected to a feature of the bill which required committees of Congress to give their approval to those projects. We left that feature out of the second bill, and merely provided that before construction can begin on those projects, they will have to be reported to the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. That procedure is in line with the President's mention of the subject matter in his veto message, when he said that there was no objection to the executive branch of the Government reporting to the congressional committees.

Therefore we handled the matter largely on the basis mentioned in the veto message.

I wish particularly to point out, for congressional history, that this provision carries with it the implied authority for those committees to act during a congressional recess or adjournment. In other words, the Senate committee and the House committee could act when Congress was not in session. The bill contemplates that the committees would have the power to receive those notices and to waive the time element involved should they see fit, should some question be raised about this later; but, certainly, this is clear.

Yesterday, in the rush of things, a press report on the action of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate stated that we had attempted to ignore the points the President had made in his veto message. That is entirely erroneous. We recognized the President's points and we adopted the reasoning given in the veto message. The bill which was passed this morning carries out the points that are mentioned in the veto message.

Therefore I am glad to make this statement at this time.

TAX ON ADMISSIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2835, H. R. 9875.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9875) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds $1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$1" and insert "90 cents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill was reported by the Finance Committee. It provides for taxes to be imposed on general admission for which the charge is 90 cents or less, or in case of season or subscription tickets, if the amount which would be charged for a single admission is 90 cents or less. The measure was passed overwhelmingly by the House. The bill was reported by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] from the Finance Committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to me that we shall have the opportunity to vote upon—and I am sure approve—the measure, which would eliminate the wartime excise taxes on all admissions less than 90 cents.

The House passed a similar bill only last Saturday, exempting admissions up to $1. On yesterday, had not the parliamentary situation prevented it, I had planned to bespeak the prompt and friendly consideration of this measure by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and his colleagues on the Senate Committee on Finance.

I realize that this was hardly necessary. The able Senator from Virginia and his committee acted with speed and sureness to make certain that this urgently required relief would be extended to thousands of small-business men in this country.

More than 5 years of consideration of the problems of independent motion picture theater owners of this country compel me to urge upon my colleagues the utter necessity of some relief for these hard-pressed small-business men. Both as chairman of a subcommittee of the Small Business Committeee 3 years ago, and more recently as a member, I have sat through many days of hearings in which motion-picture theater owners have painted a dreary picture of their operations.

I would be less than frank if I were to suggest that tax relief is the magic formula which will put the industry on its feet. Tax modification can be no more than a relief measure, but I must emphasize that it is a mighty important relief measure. We have in this Congress provided millions, yes, billions, of economic aid to people all over the world. Commonsense tells me that we owe an equal responsibility to thousands of American citizens.

It just does not make sense to continue to impose upon an industry a wartime tax designed not so much as revenue as to restrict expenditures in wartime for leisure hour entertainment. Now 10 years later, the tax, even though reduced from its former level, is still imposed. I would not feel so keenly about this if the industry taxed were a prosperous one, well able to afford the tax. But the contrary is the fact—almost unique in our booming economy, the motion-picture industry, and especially the exhibitors are worse off today than they were a decade ago, despite sharp population gains and a far greater customer potential. Its principal competitor, television, is not only tax free so far as operations are concerned, but enjoys its unparalleled prosperity as the result of channels made available free of charge to all licensees.

The tax relief measure passed by the other House and now about to come before us does not eliminate entirely the excise tax on admissions. But by making it nonapplicable to all admissions of 90 cents or less, it takes an important step in helping thousands of small theater owners in the smaller towns whose admission charges are less than 90 cents.

I want to take this opportunity to again sincerely thank the able Senator from Virginia, and all of the members of the Finance Committee. I am sure that all of us will welcome the chance to cast our votes for this urgently necessary relief bill.

WARTIME EXCISE TAXES SHOULD BE REPEALED BILLS ACCEPTED PIECEMEAL

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada has continuously had bills before this Congress to repeal all wartime excise taxes, convinced that war emergency taxes are unfair in peacetime; and that when the emergency is over, the taxes should be immediately repealed, then if the Government has to have the money which it does not, if we would quit trying to support the world with our taxpayers' money, equalize the taxes from all sources.

In any case such taxes should be repealed. Congress has accepted this idea a part at a time since I introduced the

original bill for a flat repeal of all of them.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if the House did not pass a bill that would have made admissions for which there was a charge up to $1 tax exempt?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. In the Finance Committee it was suggested that to make it an acceptable bill we should fix the exemption at 90 cents, and that it would be then an acceptable bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

WARTIME EXCISE TAXES SHOULD BE REPEALED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, the Congress and the administration are always reluctant to relinquish any taxes once levied—they always find a place for the money.

Untaxed competition has gone a long way to destroy the moving-picture business. Many folks depend upon these houses for entertainment and they are entitled to consideration.

In addition wartime excise taxes are so obviously unfair and so patently should be repealed, that this bill should pass.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks which the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] has made on the bill. He has very clearly stated the reasons why the tax should be eliminated. I am very sorry the Senate Finance Committee has reduced the figure from $1 to 90 cents. I feel sure small theater operators all over the country, and I know it is true of those in the great State of Connecticut, will be afforded some very welcome relief because of the Senate's action today, if the bill becomes law. I shall be very happy to see the Senate take favorable action on the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in commending the Senate Finance Committee. I hope the Senate will pass the pending bill. The wartime tax which was put on theaters was all right before television and some other modern means of entertainment were widely developed. Statistics reveal that 40 percent of the small theaters have gone out of business. Not only has that resulted in less employment, but the value of the property of men who own small theaters has deteriorated greatly.

I am confident that we shall be doing justice when we pass the bill and it becomes a law. I think the Senate Finance Committee, by its unanimous vote to remove the tax, has made a great contribution to the national economy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I join the other Senators who have urged the immediate passage of this bill. In the interest of justice, and in order to expedite a revival of the businesses of the average theater operators in the United States, the bill should be passed. We feel it is just. We feel it is necessary for the survival of the small theater operators, and that the enactment of the bill will result in a great contribution to the economy of the country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address a question to the Finance Committee members, and ask why the reduction from the $1 figure as contained in the House bill was made to the 90-cent figure, which now appears in the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. KERR. The Senate Finance Committee wanted to pass the bill as it came from the House. We were advised that there was a better than even chance of its being vetoed if the provision providing for a tax reduction for admissions up to $1 was retained in the bill. We were advised that there would be a much better chance to have the bill enacted if it provided for the elimination of taxes on admissions below $1. For both reasons the committee adopted the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I accede to the judgment, because I realize it is a friendly judgment, of the members of the Finance Committee, but I greatly regret the fact that they found it necessary to reduce the figure approved by the House in order to get relief for a part of the seriously affected motion picture industry.

I am very sure that the committee would have approved the House bill as it came from the House, except for the situation the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has disclosed. I am very sorry that the attitude of those in high places, financially, in the Government has thus operated to withhold relief from a very important part of the motion-picture industry which still will not obtain the relief provided by the bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in 1947, I urged that the Senate repeal this excise tax and many other excise taxes. That speech of mine and the recommendations I made at that time were based upon the report of the Committee for Economic Development. The committee is headed by a great American named Paul Hoffman. I wish to state, as I said the other day in the Foreign Relations Committee, that I think the 1947 report of the Committee for Economic Development is still the soundest tax report which has been made to the Senate of the United States since I have been a Member of this body. That group of businessmen—and there was not a Government official among them; they included some outstanding tax economists, but they were in private practice or in private industry—recommended as early as 1947 the elimination of many of the excise taxes, and the drastic reduction of many others. They pointed out that, after all, excise taxes were imposed, in the first place, not primarily for revenue-raising purposes, but, rather, to curtail production during the war, when we wanted all the sinews of our economy to be devoted to the successful prosecution of the war.

I am glad that now, at long last, we have gone this far in accordance with the report of the Committee for Economic Development. I think this tax should be eliminated entirely, but I agree that we have to take one step at a time.

However, we still have a long way to go in doing justice to Americans who have unfair excise taxes imposed upon them, because, Mr. President, by and large these taxes are not imposed on the basis of the ability to pay, but they are imposed on the basis of ease of collection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statements made regarding the reduction of the tax on theaters. I also regret that we could not include in the bill the $1 figure; but in any case I am glad the committee reported this bill. I sincerely hope the Senate will pass the bill because I know of no industry which needs relief more urgently than do the small theaters of the country. I congratulate the chairman of the Finance Committee on this proposed legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I strongly favor the bill, and I called a special meeting of the Senate Finance Committee to act on the bill. The bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

The bill H. R. 9875, as reported by your committee, amends section 4231 (1) of the 1954 Code to provide that no tax is to be imposed on a general admission for which the charge is 90 cents or less (or in the case of season or subscription tickets if the amount which would be charged for a single admission is 90 cents or less).

Under present law general admissions are free of tax if the charge is 50 cents or less. As in the case of this present 50-cent exemption, the 90-cent exemption applies only to admissions up to the level of the exemption, and does not affect admissions for which the charge exceeds the level of the exemption. Thus, under the bill as amended by your committee, the tax on an admission price of $1.50 (before tax) would be 15 cents, that is, it would be based upon the entire $1.50 and not merely the portion of the charge in excess of 90 cents.

Since the 90-cent exemption applies only to paragraph (1) of section 4231, this exemption will not be available in the case of admissions to horse or dog racing at a racetrack, to charges for the permanent

use or lease of boxes or seats, to sales outside of the box office in excess of the established price, to sales by proprietors in excess of the regular price, or to amounts paid with respect to cabarets. The taxes imposed in these cases will remain the same as under existing law.

Information made available this year indicates that motion-picture industry conditions are now worse than in 1953 when Congress voted to repeal the tax on admissions to motion picture theaters. It has been stated that more than half of all the theaters presently are faced with economic problems, since 5,500 are operating in the red while another 5,400 are operating at or near the break-even point.

As in 1953, television is believed to be the primary cause for the difficulty faced by the motion-picture and other similar industries. While the exemption of 90 cents or less for admissions to motion-picture theaters and other places of amusement will not remove the competitive problem presented by the advent of television, it is believed that it will better enable these industries to adjust their long-range plans to the new competitive situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control, if it is understood that the other side will do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9875) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The present occupant of the chair desires to have the RECORD indicate that he voted in favor of the bill which has just been passed.

Mr. BUTLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I urge the approval of the measure to eliminate the wartime excise taxes on all admissions of less than 90 cents.

My colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the other members of the Committee on Finance have done excellent work on this problem. We would be most remiss if we failed to endorse their recommendation to give this urgently needed and long overdue relief to small business all over the country.

This wartime tax has long since ceased to serve whatever legitimate purpose, if any, it might already have had. If the industry bearing the brunt of the tax were rolling in wealth, we might be less concerned about repeal. But it is not. In fact, the motion-picture industry generally, and the motion-picture exhibitors in particular, have fallen on lean days of late—this in the midst of unprecedented prosperity elsewhere in our economy. Television, its chief competitor, suffers under no comparable burden.

I am sorry to say that the House-passed tax relief measure does not entirely eliminate the tax. But, by exempting all admissions of 90 cents or less, it takes a great step forward in coming to the aid of these small businesses.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote for this vital measure.

DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

During the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9875) reducing the tax on admissions,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take 2 minutes at this time, because I see that the Chaplain of the Senate is on the floor.

I think it is only fitting on this last day before the Chaplain leaves Washington that some Member of the Senate express what I am positive is the feeling of all 96 of the Members of the Senate—namely, our sense of gratitude and great personal debt to the Chaplain of the Senate for the devoted spiritual leadership he has given to us as a body and to many of us as individuals.

Mr. President, Frederick Brown Harris is not only a great spiritual leader, but also a fine, gentle human being. When one comes to know him personally, as I have come to know him, one understands why this great spiritual leader has the wonderful human qualities which he constantly manifests in his associations with mankind.

Mr. President, the Chaplain of the Senate is about to leave the United States to visit Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, Japan, and possibly other countries of Southeast Asia. I know he goes with the good wishes of every Member of the Senate. He is a close personal friend of the President of Korea, Syngman Rhee, who was a member of Foundry Methodist Church when Dr. Harris was its minister.

Mr. President, when Dr. Harris leaves the United States to visit Korea he goes in a very real sense as an ambassador; I think he goes with great diplomatic powers—that is, diplomatic powers derived from his position of spiritual leadership. I understand that in all probability he will also go in an official capacity; and I think he should go in an official capacity, as an official diplomatic representative of our Government to Korea and to the other countries he will visit.

Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, let me say I do not know of anyone who is available to the Government of the United States who is better qualified to go on this journey in an official capacity. I think the Chaplain's close relationship, for example, with the President of Korea places Dr. Harris in an exceedingly fine diplomatic position to work out—if there are some, and we believe that perhaps there are—any misunderstandings which may exist between our country and Korea. I know of no better diplomat to work out those differences than the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. President, I close not only by thanking him for his services as Chaplain of the Senate, but personally I wish to thank him for the beautiful friendship and counsel I have enjoyed from this great Christian leader, who is a true representative of what the Christian religion stands for.

INVESTIGATION RELATIVE TO IMPORTS OF DISTILLED SPIRITS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2830, Senate Resolution 314, with the understanding that no amendments to the resolution will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 314) favoring an investigation and report to the Senate on alleged inequities in the policy of the United States with reference to imports of distilled spirits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 314) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that this unfair and inequitable trade situation should be brought to the attention of the United States Committee for Reciprocity Information and the United States Tariff Commission with the request that efforts be made to correct the conditions hereinabove described, and that a report on the matter be rendered to the Senate during the first regular session of the 85th Congress.

The preamble was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR AND AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2837, Senate bill 4164.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 4164) to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "The position of Commissioner shall be in GS–18 of the General Schedule established by the

Classification Act of 1949." and insert "The basic compensation of the Commissioner of Public Roads shall be $17,500 per annum."; and after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 4. There shall be hereafter in the Department of Commerce, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided for by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be subject in all respects to the provisions of the act of July 15, 1947 (61 Stat. 326), as amended (5 U. S. C. 592a), relating to Assistant Secretaries of Commerce.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, order, or regulation, the head of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce shall be a Federal Highway Administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe or as may be required by law.

SEC. 2. The term "Commissioner of Public Roads", as used in all laws, orders, and regulations, shall be deemed to mean "Federal Highway Administrator" on and after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 hereof, there shall be a Commissioner of Public Roads in the Bureau of Public Roads who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Federal Highway Administrator. The basic compensation of the Commissioner of Public Roads shall be $17,500 per annum.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes."

ADMISSION OF ALIENS SKILLED IN SHEEPHERDING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2249, House bill 6888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6888) to amend the act of September 3, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3 (a) of the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) There shall not be issued more than 385 special nonquota immigrant visas under this act; except that there may be issued not more than an additional 350 such special nonquota immigrant visas during a period beginning on the effective date of this act, as amended, and ending July 1, 1957: *Provided*, That special nonquota immigrant visas, without regard to the numerical limitations of this section, shall be issued to the wives and minor, unmarried children of the aliens who are found eligible for special nonquota immigrant visas under the provisions of this act or who were admitted under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306), or the act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50), if they are accompanying or following to join such aliens, and are otherwise eligible to receive immigrant visas and admissible to the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That the marriage is found to have occurred prior to July 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. A new section 5 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The quota deductions required under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306), and the act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50), are terminated, effective June 1, 1955."

SEC. 3. A new section 6 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The provisions of law relating to the deportation of aliens on the ground that they were excludable at the time of entry as aliens who had obtained visas by fraud or misrepresentation or as aliens who were not of the nationality specified in their visas shall not apply to an otherwise admissible alien, admitted to the United States between December 22, 1945, and November 1, 1954, both dates inclusive who misrepresented his place of birth, identity, or residence in applying for a visa if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the misrepresentation (a) was predicated upon the fact that the alien had reasonable grounds to fear repatriation to his former residence or homeland where he would be persecuted because of race, religion, or political opinions, and (b) was not committed for the purpose of evading the quota restrictions of the immigration laws or an investigation of the alien at the place of his former residence or elsewhere."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 2663, in view of the fact that the committee handling the pending bill, House bill 6888, is occupied at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2663) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There was a third reading of the depressed area bill last evening, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the time been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is remaining time which has not been yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, provided the minority leader will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I am a member of the Subcommittee of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee favorably.

I am for a depressed area bill. I believe it is necessary. But the bill upon which we shall vote shortly is by no means or by no stretch of the imagination the bill which was reported by the subcommittee.

There were two objectives, when we applied ourselves to the question of depressed areas. One was an affirmative one. It was our desire to find ways of rehabilitating depressed areas. The second objective was perhaps a negative one. It was to make certain that this activity was conducted without creating depressed areas elsewhere. A great deal of time, thought, and study of many months and many hearings and meetings were devoted to the bill by the committee.

But the bill upon which we shall be voting today is in no way the bill which was reported by the committee. The very heart has been taken out of the bill. The very safeguards which were placed in the bill have been stricken out by the action the Senate took yesterday on the amendments presented to the Senate. None of them were explained.

We now have not a depressed area bill, which will correct depressed areas, but a bill which will create additional depressed areas.

Let me read one section which was stricken from the bill yesterday, without explanation, and, in my view, without an opportunity having been afforded to most of us even to understand the amendment. One provision on page 23 of the bill, numbered (4) reads as follows:

The borrower will not cause a transferral to, or relocation in, any plant or facility under this section, of business operations otherwise conducted by such borrower and to effect

a reduction in employment in any other area within the United States.

That provision was placed in the bill to protect the industries which presently are operating. It was stricken out yesterday by the action of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Connecticut said the heart was taken out of the bill. It is true that the section on page 23 was stricken out. I would have preferred that the section remain in the bill. But it was my best judgment, after considering all the factors, that unless the amendment were accepted, the bill would not pass.

It seems to me that the whole purpose of the bill is to do something to relieve unemployment and to prevent unemployment from developing in other areas.

Therefore, I think the language on page 16, line 7, "expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States," provides sufficient safeguards.

Mr. PURTELL. I certainly respect the judgment of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, but I do not defer to his judgment in this matter.

The very fact that the Senate struck from the bill yesterday the protective language—and I can assure Senators that the bill would not have been reported as it was from the committee if that language had been deleted—means that the heart has been taken out of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may I have 5 additional minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. I say again, as I said before, that the objectives of the bill as it was reported by the committee were twofold. The first was to make certain that something constructive would be done to provide employment in areas which are depressed.

But we were very positive in our action in the committee to make certain that the safeguard would be included to prevent the creation of other pockets of unemployment throughout the country. We have now stripped the bill of that safeguard.

There is another thing which has been done to the bill, which I think it is important to set forth. On page 31, there was contained a provision which would have been very helpful in meeting the unemployment situation in many depressed areas. It had to do with procurement by Government agencies. That would have been of great help, Mr. President, but the sections having to do with procurement by Government agencies were struck from the bill yesterday.

I am for a depressed-areas bill. I want to help such areas as may need help by seeing to it that their citizens are employed or trained for employment. But I do not want to see areas in which there exist high wages and good working conditions, and in which workers are organized, denied the right of continued employment by the deletion which was made from the bill yesterday.

Mr. President, let me say that if the bill passes in its present form and becomes law, I can assure my colleagues that operations will be exactly as I have stated. We shall see pockets of unemployment in areas where wages are high, working conditions are good, and workers are organized, because the inducement to go elsewhere will exist, and the prohibitions against that eventuality have been stricken from the bill.

I believe that Senators, who probably have not had an opportunity to study the amendments offered yesterday—7½ pages of them—should have an opportunity to look at the bill, note what has been done to it, and determine whether or not in fact it will really help depressed areas. I believe if such a study were given to it, the bill would be defeated, or at least sent back to committee, where the kind of bill I think the people who live in depressed areas want to see enacted, could be prepared and reported to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I remind the Senator that there is a luncheon at 12 o'clock. I have been trying to accommodate 15 Senators who are going to be present at that luncheon, which will take place from 12 to 2 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I have a right to speak on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has that right, of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is of the greatest regret to me that, after what happened to the bill last night, I shall be unable to support the bill, especially because I appreciate very greatly the work which has been done upon it by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. But, very definitely, there is not now before the Senate the bill we reported from the committee. It has been changed. Last night the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] offered an amendment, which deletes the whole of section 12, and dangerously weakens the provisions which would protect workers and areas from dispersal or from loss of their jobs.

As I said, I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Massachusetts, because I worked with him, and we tried our best, in a bipartisan way, to draft an effective bill.

I urged that my amendment be accepted last night to retain the operation of this development program in the Department of Commerce, as provided in the administration bill. I yielded to the majority in many respects in the conferences we had. I yielded on the question of dollars. I yielded on some other provisions, in order to get a reasonable bill before the Senate. Several improvements I urged were accepted. But the provisions we had all agreed upon to protect workers in highly industrialized areas were deleted last night by the acceptance of the Fulbright amendment. My enthusiasm for this bill is further decreased by the unwillingness of the majority party to accept my amendment and the guaranty-loan amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

In the light of those conditions, I feel it is necessary to oppose the bill. No hearings were held on the changes proposed in the bill by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The proposals were made suddenly last night, without notice or explanation. We did the best we could to make a study of the amendment overnight. I feel it is necessary for me to vote against the bill. The best action we could take would be to recommit the bill for further consideration, so we may have a really worthwhile bill which would not be unjust to many workers in my State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from California will do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is there any additional time desired on this side of the aisle? If not, I am willing to yield back my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me half a minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield half a minute to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withhold the yielding back of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that, in my judgment, this is the best bill we can have passed at this session. The positions the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] have taken are not in accordance with the facts. There may be many provisions I would have preferred to see in different form, but, in my opinion, the bill is satisfactory as it is. It treats rural and industrial areas equally. I think it is the best, and possibly the only, bill that can be passed at this session, and, in my opinion, it should be passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. We are in the closing days of the session, and I think it is well for the Congress to keep in mind that the quality of legislation which is passed, rather than its quantity or volume, is more important to the American people. For that reason, and also based on the statements made by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New Jersey, I believe the bill should be defeated.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I prepared in support of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD prior to the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS IN SUPPORT OF S. 2663

The bill now before the Senate, S. 2663, represents a careful and comprehensive effort to deal with the serious and prolonged problems of unemployment and underem-

ployment in certain industrial and rural areas of the United States.

It does this by establishing a Redevelopment Areas Administration which is authorized by means of loans for new and expanded business and commercial enterprises, by loans for special public facilities, and by grants for such public facilities to help these redevelopment areas to help themselves.

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATE URGENT NEEDS

For many years committees of Congress have pointed out the urgent needs for new industry in many of the areas of this country where unemployment has reached high levels and has remained almost unchanged for a period of years. They have revealed similar needs in areas where low incomes and underemployment in rural towns and counties have resulted in lower standards of family living, business failures, and severe local government and community problems.

The extensive hearings held by the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this year, together with the field studies made by the subcommittee's staff assistants, conclusively demonstrated that these problems continue to be acute today in many areas in many parts of the country.

While national productivity and national income are at high levels, there are many pockets which do not share in this prosperity. The greater number of people are enjoying improved living standards. But in all too many areas there remain thousands of families suffering acutely from want of a job, or inadequate earnings, with family and community conditions deteriorating because there is no present hope or prospect of new employment.

DECLINING INDUSTRIES HAVE LEFT DEPRESSED COMMUNITIES

Many of these pockets of depression have existed for a period of years. Some are of long duration. Industries upon which they once depended for a living have declined. Industrial replacement programs have not made up for the jobs lost. Textile mill areas, coal mining regions, railroad shop communities, farm machinery and ordnance centers are typical of such drains in our pools of opportunity.

Courageous local efforts to bring in new industry or to expand existing businesses have been made. But these have failed to meet the urgent needs, and the question now before the Senate is whether the resources of the Federal Government shall now be made available to help these pockets of unemployment and underemployment to cure themselves—by the only real cure, which is employment, and the making of a contribution to the production of goods and services for the people of our Nation.

LOW-INCOME RURAL AREAS ARE ALSO IN DISTRESS

The needs of the low income rural areas are no less urgent than those of the distressed industrial areas. Many rural counties in the United States have an average per capita income as little as one-fourth that of the average for the country.

While these counties tend to be more heavily concentrated in the Southern States, these low income rural areas are to be found in many other sections as well. The cut-over areas in some Midwest States and the Indian communities in many of our plains and mountain States reveal distress almost to the point of desperation.

In all of these regions both the inhumanity and the economic waste of failing to utilize our great human resources more fully were apparent to the committee. With local resources exhausted and all other efforts to enlist new industry or commerce unsuccessful, the question is again posed to this Congress: Can the Federal Government fail to bring to these areas the means of helping themselves which they so desperately want?

BROAD SUPPORT FOR REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I shall not take the time of the Senate to detail the wide and representative and almost unanimous representations that were made to the committee in support of the essential lines of this program. Government officials, on a national, State, and local level, representatives of many chambers of commerce, officers of State and local industrial development organizations, businessmen, union leaders, Indian spokesmen, and university, church, and other civic leaders all joined in the appeal for such a Federal program.

Nearly 1,200 pages of hearings, well summarized in the committee report which lies upon the desk of each Senator, outline the needs, the recommendations and the earnest appeals of these areas. I could give personal testimony from my own observations of the urgent needs and well-nigh universal and bipartisan desires of these communities for a chance to help themselves, which this bill would afford. Southern Illinois comes vividly to mind in this connection.

The 1956 Economic Report of the President, following earlier recommendations of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, stated:

"The fate of distressed communities is a matter of national as well as local concern. * * * We should give serious thought to ways and means of extending prosperity to the less flourishing sectors of the economy."

BILL REPRESENTS POOLING OF MANY PROPOSALS

Various bills were introduced in this Congress, and I am of course glad to see that the Labor Committee has acted upon the general framework of the bill which I introduced, S. 2663, with the cosponsorship of distinguished Members of this body, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I later introduced with improving modifications at the conclusion of the hearings. But I am also glad to note that ideas and suggestions incorporated in the measure introduced by Senators on the other side of the aisle were also included in the bill as reported by the committee.

I was gratified too that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] also presented a series of amendments. Knowing of his interest in meeting this problem and of his concern as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency with such programs, I am glad that the Senate has had the benefit of his careful suggestions. The bill as amended and now before the Senate therefore represents a program to which many have contributed and which I hope the Congress generally will support, whatever may be our disagreements on some details of its provisions.

SUMMARY OF ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF S. 2663

I would like now to review briefly for the information of Senators the main provisions of S. 2663.

1. Administration: It establishes an Area Redevelopment Administration headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

2. Redevelopment areas: It authorizes the Administrator to designate "industrial redevelopment areas" where substantial and persistent unemployment has existed for an extended period of time. It also authorizes him to designate "rural redevelopment areas" where there exist the largest number and percentage of low income families and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. Definitions and standards for the designation of such areas have been spelled out for the guidance of the Administrator on the basis of available and relevant economic data.

3. Local redevelopment committees: The Administrator is directed in a redevelopment area to appoint a local redevelopment committee which is broadly representative and which shall include members of existing local redevelopment committees who are willing to serve. Such committees are given the primary responsibility for preparing plans, cost estimates and recommendations for the industrial and commercial loans mentioned hereafter. The Administrator is permitted also to set up regional advisory committees representing two or more redevelopment areas when that will facilitate the carrying out of the purposes of the act.

4. Industrial and commercial loans: Upon an application approved by a local area committee and subject to the requirement of local participation of not less than 10 percent and as much as 25 percent, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in the purchase or development of land for industrial use, the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial or commercial plants or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities, and the purchase of machinery or equipment.

The Administrator cannot make such loans however unless he finds that the project will provide more than a temporary alleviation of the area's problems, that the funds are not otherwise available on reasonable terms, that the amount of the loan plus other funds is enough to complete the project and that there is a reasonable prospect of repayment.

No loan can be in excess of 75 percent of aggregrate cost of the project or for more than 40 years. All such loans would bear interest at a rate equal to that paid by the Administrator on funds from the Secretary of the Treasury (current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States) plus one-half of 1 percent. The Administrator must also require that not less than 5 percent of the total cost of the project shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources.

The loan funds are set up as revolving funds separately as follows:

(1) $100 million for industrial redevelopment areas;

(2) $100 million for rural redevelopment areas.

5. Assistance for new and expanding plants: The intention of the bill not to give the Federal Government's assistance to any runaway industry or to the "pirating" of industry is made clear at the outset in section 2. It is there stated as the purpose of the legislation to assist redevelopment areas to alleviate their unemployment or underemployment by providing new employment opportunities and by expanding existing facilities without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

6. Public facilities loans: The Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities. He may do this, however, only if he finds that such assistance will provide more than a temporary alleviation of their employment problems and will tend to improve the opportunities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities in such an area. He must also find that the funds are not otherwise available on reasonable terms and that the amount of the available funds plus the loan are adequate to insure its completion.

Limitations on the amount of the loan and its maturity, the requirement for local participation and the rate of interest are as above provided for industrial and commercial loans. The revolving fund from which such public facility loans may be made is:

(3) $75 million.

7. Public facilities grants: The Administrator is also authorized to make grants for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and for the construction, rehabilitation, etc., of public facilities. He may do this, however, only if he finds as before

that such public facility project will provide more than a temporary alleviation of the unemployment or underemployment problem and will tend to improve the opportunities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities there. He must also find that the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to its cost in proportion to its ability, that the project will fulfill a pressing need in the area, and that there is little probability that it can be undertaken without such assistance.

The bill authorizes $50 million to be appropriated for such grants.

8. Procurement: The bill as reported provided a number of programs for channeling procurement by Government agencies, where deemed appropriate, into redevelopment areas. Because of his feeling that these need further study, the Senator from Arkansas proposed to eliminate these provisions at this time, and the Senate approved his amendment.

9. Information: The Administrator is authorized to aid redevelopment areas by furnishing technical information, market research, and other forms of information obtainable from Government agencies. He is also authorized to furnish to procurement divisions of the various departments and agencies of the Government, the names and addresses of redevelopment area firms desirous of obtaining Government contracts.

10. Technical assistance: The Administrator is likewise authorized to provide technical assistance to such areas including studies of their needs and potentials and including also the help of staff members or the employment of private firms or institutions under contract for such purpose. Appropriations for such technical assistance are authorized in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000.

11. Vocational training: The Secretary of Labor is authorized to determine the vocational training needs, and he and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within their respective jurisdictions are directed to furnish the training assistance required in such areas (HEW—vocational education; Labor—apprenticeship and other job training).

12. Retraining subsistence payments: The Secretary of Labor is directed to enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located to enable the States to make weekly retraining payments for not more than 13 weeks to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation who are certified to be undergoing training for a new job.

13. Advisory committees: Governmental and public advisory committees are established to assist the Administrator, and conferences on problems of special, hard-hit industries are authorized.

14. Miscellaneous: The bill includes necessary administrative provisions and powers, requires the Administrator to make a comprehensive and detailed report to Congress and authorizes to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

BILL PROVIDES DOMESTIC POINT FOUR PROGRAM

I believe that the adoption of this measure by Congress and its wise and careful administration will bring a new day of hope and opportunity to many areas and to literally millions of our people who want nothing more than a chance to work and to live in self-respect and decency.

This bill proposed no easy handout. It holds out the prospect of work, of new jobs, of increased production, of expanding business and commerce, of more healthy community life and above all of a fuller utilization and development of the Nation's most precious resources, its human resources.

It is a domestic point four program, which we badly need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has previously been ordered to a third reading and read the third time.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have previously been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monouments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent; and, if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—60

Aiken	Hayden	McClellan
Anderson	Hennings	McNamara
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bender	Holland	Morse
Bible	Humphrey, Minn.	Murray
Carlson	Humphreys, Ky.	Neely
Case, N. J.	Ives	Neuberger
Chavez	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Payne
Douglas	Kefauver	Scott
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Eastland	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kuchel	Sparkman
Ervin	Lehman	Stennis
Flanders	Long	Symington
Frear	Magnuson	Thye
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
George	Mansfield	Wofford
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Young
Green		

NAYS—30

Allott	Curtis	Millikin
Barrett	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Goldwater	Purtell
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Hruska	Russell
Bush	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Schoeppel
Byrd	Martin, Iowa	Smith, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.	McCarthy	Watkins
Cotton		Williams

NOT VOTING—6

Capehart	Laird	Potter
Daniel	Langer	Welker

So the bill (S. 2663) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act."

FINDINGS OF FACT

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level of prosperity and employment is vital to the best interests of the United States and that the existence of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in certain areas of the Nation is jeopardizing the health, standard of living, and general welfare of the Nation. It is therefore the purpose of this act to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment within such areas by providing new employment opportunities and developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as "the Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $17,500 per annum.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Government Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall be composed of the following members: The Administrator, as Chairman, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of General Services, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act, and the Administrator shall, in carrying out such duties, consult with such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof. Such Committee shall hold meetings at the call of the Chairman, and such meetings shall be held at least twice during each calendar year.

(b) The Administrator shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of 12 members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Administrator shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Administrator plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this act.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as "industrial redevelopment areas" those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. Any industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 12 percent of the labor force for the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which an application for assistance is made under this act, (2) 8 percent of the labor force during at least 15 months of the 18-month period immediately preceding such date, or (3) 6 percent of the labor force during at least 8 months in each of the 2 years immediately preceding such date, shall be designated an "industrial redevelopment area."

(b) In addition to those areas designated under subsection (a), the Administrator shall designate as "rural redevelopment areas" those rural areas within the United States in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider among other relevant factors the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(e) As used in this act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator, upon determining that any area is a redevelopment area, shall appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a "local committee"), to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, commercial, industrial, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. In appointing such local committee, the Administrator shall include therein all members of existing local redevelopment committees who are willing to serve. Each local committee shall prepare plans and cost estimates, to the extent deemed desirable by it, for (1) the development of the resources of, and processing and marketing facilities in, the area which such committee represents, (2) the construction, rehabilitation, and alteration of industrial plants or other industrial and commercial facilities in such area, and (3) the purchase of machinery or equipment for use in such area, with a view to attracting new industries thereto and otherwise to stimulate economic activity therein. Each local committee shall enlist the support of local residents and private and public lending agencies in financing the carrying out of such plans. The Administrator shall, at the request of any local committee, make available to such committee such professional, technical, and other experts as may be necessary to enable such local committee properly to discharge its functions under this act.

(b) The Administrator may establish regional advisory committees to represent two or more redevelopment areas when he finds that the establishment of such committees will facilitate the carrying out of the purposes of this act. The members of such regional committees shall be appointed by the Administrator on the same basis as are members of local committees, and such regional committees shall cooperate with, and, to the extent possible, coordinate the activities of, the local committees within the regions represented by such regional committees.

(c) Of the sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act, not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available to the Administrator for the purpose of assisting the local or regional committees established under this section to defray their administrative expenses, but no part thereof shall be available for the purpose of paying salaries or traveling expenses of the members of such committees.

LOANS

SEC. 7. (a) Upon application approved by any local committee, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for industrial usage within the redevelopment area represented by such committee, and the construction, rehabilitation, or alteration of industrial or commercial plants, or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities, and the purchase of machinery or equipment for use, in such area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof; and

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 14 (5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan was made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 10 of this act, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, or more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied (1) by the State (including any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located, or (2) by one or more community or area organizations, or persons, firms or corporations within the redevelopment area in which such project is to be located, as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section: *Provided*, That in making any loan under this section with respect to an industrial redevelopment area, the Administrator shall require that not less than 5 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the development area, within which such project is to be located.

LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 8. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof; and

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 75 percent of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 14 (5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan is made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate equal to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in section 10 of this act, plus one-half of 1 percent per annum.

(c) In making any loan under this section, the Administrator shall require that not less than 10 percent, nor more than 25 percent, of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Administrator shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 9. (a) The Administrator may conduct studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation

with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area, or part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute; and

(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section.

The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 8 of this act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

(c) The Administrator shall by regulations provide for the supervision of the carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50 million for the purpose of making grants under this section.

(e) Provided further, no loan, grant, or other financial assistance shall be authorized as provided by this act if the proposed project, plant, or facility is for the rendition of a service to the public, for which, if rendered by an individual, partnership, or private corporation, the rates or charges would be subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless there shall first be a report or finding by such State regulatory body that the said service being rendered to the public in the area served by the proposed project, plant, or facility is inadequate.

FUNDS FOR LOANS

SEC. 10. To obtain funds for loans under this act, the Administrator may, with the approval of the President, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $275 million. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations issued under this section and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligaions. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated in every respect as public-debt transactions of the United States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF REVOLVING FUNDS

SEC. 11. Of the funds raised under section 10 of this act, not more than (1) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within industrial redevelopment areas; (2) $100 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for projects within rural redevelopment areas, but the principal amount of loans from such fund which are outstanding at any one time within any one State shall not exceed $6 million; and (3) $75 million shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans for public facilities. Receipts arising from the repayment of any such loans shall be deposited in the fund from which such loan was made and shall be utilized for the purpose for which such fund was established.

INFORMATION

SEC. 12. The Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 13. In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000.

SEC. 14. In performing his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Administrator;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned and all legal and equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this act, for additional periods not to exceed 10 years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderely liquidation of such loan;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise as in the case of mortgages assigned to the Administrator. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Administrator as a result of loans made under this act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Administrator deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 7 and 8 of this act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this act;

(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, procure the temporary (not in excess of 6 months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services

by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $50 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

(11) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 15. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this act, no further assistance shall be granted under this act with respect to such area, and, for the purposes of this act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining, for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeymen, and other job training needed in the locality.

RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 17. The Secretary of Labor shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located under which the Secretary shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly training payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redeveloped areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing training for a new job. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding 13 weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

PENALTIES

SEC. 18. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security thereof, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Administrator, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Administrator, (A) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (B) with intent to defraud the Administrator or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Administrator, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Administrator, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (C) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Administrator, or (D) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Administrator which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Administrator shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES

SEC. 19. No loan shall be made by the Administrator under this act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Administrator the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications, made to the Administrator for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such persons; and (2) execute on agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of 2 years after any assistance is rendered by the Administrator to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within 1 year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Administrator occupying a position or engaging in activities with which the Administrator shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this act.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 20. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. Such report shall be printed and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3, of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Administrator, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Administrator such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 21. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to state that this morning, when the vote was taken on the depressed areas bill, I was unavoidably absent. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECORD will so show.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. ELLENDER), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H. R. 11682. A bill to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2811).

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY BY ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. REPT. NO. 2808)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report an original bill to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. The bill relates to two appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. The

House has these appropriaitons in a special bill; but because of the lateness of the hour, it is my opinion that we may have trouble getting to that bill until tomorrow. Therefore, I believe this bill should be on the Senate Calendar. It involves the expenditure of about $24 million. The budget estimate is for about $14 million. It is essential to the defense of our country that the bill be passed, because it will require authorization.

I will discuss what we may be able to do with it, later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 4288) to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

PAYMENT OF WAR DAMAGE CLAIMS AND RETURN OF VESTED ASSETS (S. REPT. NO. 2809)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 23, 1956,

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 4205) to provide funds to pay nationals of the United States who have war damage claims against Germany and Japan, without additional direct appropriations therefor, and to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "GASOLINE PRICE WAR IN NEW JERSEY" (S. REPT. NO. 2810)

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report entitled "Gasoline Price War in New Jersey," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4288. A bill to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above bill when reported by Mr. ANDERSON from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 4289. A bill in behalf of Ming Shiu Cheng, also known as Elizabeth Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 4290. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to the waiving of requirements with respect to the time of filing of applications for review of determinations of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 4291. A bill for the relief of Shu Yen Lin, his wife, Shau Ying Lin, and children, Hang Shan Lin, Gee Chek Lin, Gee Ming Lin, Chi Fong Lin; and

S. 4292. A bill for the relief of Menelaos Spyridon Coulouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 4293. A bill to promote individual liberty and development through international understanding; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 4294. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 4295. A bill for the relief of Sophie Schipul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 4296. A bill to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and other authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4297. A bill to amend the acreage reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act to permit inclusion of acreage up to 30 days prior to harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CARE AND TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS AT FACILITIES OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr WELKER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and other authorities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of Senate Report No. 1850, entitled "Treatment and Rehabilitation of Narcotic Addicts," which relates to the same subject matter contained in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the portion of the report referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4296) to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and other authorities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The portion of Senate Report No. 1850, presented by Mr. EASTLAND, is as follows:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE EXISTING TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM

The Federal Government operates two world-famed narcotics hospitals, the Public Health Service Hospitals at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. The land, plant, and equipment of these two institutions represent a total original investment of $10.5 million, covering more than 2,000 acres. Estimated operating costs for fiscal 1957 are $5,328,100. Men and women are treated at Lexington, and men only are admitted to the Fort Worth hospital.

Many of the physicians and scientists assigned to the hospitals are internationally known, and they work with the benefit of the finest research facilities. The hospitals have pioneered in the development of methods of treatment. Here are conducted studies dealing with the nature of drug addiction and the abusive use of narcotic drugs, while other research aims at finding improved methods of treatment and rehabilitation of persons addicted to the use of narcotic drugs. These hospitals have beds for 2,313 patients, and 1,574 are now reserved for narcotic addicts. During 1955, there were 3,638 addict admissions, and during the 20 years the hospitals have been in operation more than 35,000 addict-patients have been admitted for treatment and psychiatric care, for a total of almost 54,000 separate admissions.

These Public Health Service hospitals, despite a shortage of psychiatrists and other professional help, are doing highly creditable jobs. They withdraw the addicts from drugs; they restore them to health physically; and they teach the addicts good work habits and train them to be self-supporting. However, if we measure success in terms of the number of permanent "cures," these two important institutions, for reasons we discuss below, are failing to accomplish their full mission.

FINDINGS

Existing procedures and facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts are inadequate and require substantial improvements

1. Less Than 15 Percent of the Victims of Drug Addiction Are Being Successfully Cured Today

Less than 15 percent of the thousands of addict-patients who have been treated at Federal narcotics hospitals have remained free of the drugs thereafter. One out of every three addicts treated comes back for another "cure." In fact, 40 percent of the admissions to Lexington and Fort Worth are repeaters. This rate of relapse is one of the most discouraging aspects of treatment. Addict after addict testified before our subcommittee that they had returned to the use of drugs within a month or even the day after their release from Lexington and Fort Worth, although they spoke highly of the method of treatment at the hospitals. Even Federal officials in charge of the hospitals agree that cures, in the strict medical sense, are presently impossible for the vast majority of drug addicts. With young people this is especially tragic, for it means a lifetime of slavish addiction to drugs, criminal activities to support themselves and their habit, and spreading their addiction to others. This failure cannot be attributed to the treatment methods within the institution. Rather, it is the result of two main weaknesses: First, poor admission procedures which permit voluntary addicts to come and go at will and, second, the utter lack of community followthrough programs to receive the addict-patient upon his discharge.

2. Seventy-five Percent of the Drug Addicts Who Volunteer for Treatment in Federal Narcotics Hospitals Demand To Leave Before They Fully Benefit From Medical and Psychiatric Treatment

Voluntary patients account for two-thirds of the admissions to Federal narcotics hospitals. Only 25 percent of these remain for the recommended minimum period of 4½ months. Of the 75 percent who do not stay for the minimum period of treatment, 50 percent leave in less than 30 days. Only the one-third admitted under court orders are required to remain the full time prescribed by the hospital staffs.

Commenting on this abnormally high rate of turnover, Dr. Harris Isbell, Director of Research, Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky., testified:

"Drug addicts frequently come to the hospital for a very superficial reason. Some of them may come there because they are mad at a peddler who suddenly raised his prices; that is their only reason for coming. Others may come simply to get the degree of addiction reduced to where their habits do not cost so much. Many of them come under pressure from their families, not really of their own free will, their own wish, and accord.

"Addicts are a group who, even in treatment, will vacillate. They are very changeable and immature people. One day they may be really desiring to get away from addiction. This frame of mind may last for a matter of days or weeks, then they will have a change of mind."

Many addicts have been in and out of our Federal narcotics hospitals as high as 20 and some as high as 30 times, although never staying long enough at any one time to be cured of drug addiction. The result is a revolving door type of operation which is expensive for the hospitals, and of very little benefit to the addict-patient and the community.

3. Voluntary Admission Is a Loose, Hodgepodge Procedure, Without Federal or State Control or Supervision

Because of the voluntary system of admissions, the Federal narcotics hospitals are processing, and often reprocessing, a continuous stream of drug addicts. Their addiction to narcotic drugs and their stay at the Federal hospitals are confidential.[1] In most instances State authorities do not know they are under treatment, and the Federal authorities are prohibited by law from telling them. This prohibition applies not only to disclosing their names to appropriate agencies, but it applies also to clinical data which might otherwise be forwarded to community social and welfare agencies to help the addict when he returns home. The Federal Government has no followup facility for rehabilitation, and the effect of the law is that it even prevents the hospital authorities from advising and working with State and municipal agencies in order that a discharged addict patient might receive every opportunity for rehabilitation and, in the event of relapse, that he might be promptly recommitted.

Hospital authorities told the subcommittee that, because of the law, they do not know what happens to two out of three discharged addict-patients. They are released upon their own demand to descend upon an unsuspecting community like carriers of a contagious disease, except that these individuals also plague the community with crime to support themselves and, inevitably, their recurring narcotic addiction.

[1] Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C., 260 (d)) "* * * and the record of his voluntary commitment shall be confidential and shall not be divulged."

4. State and Local Treatment Facilities Are Meager, and State Courts Lack Authority To Commit Drug Addicts Directly to Federal Narcotics Hospitals

It is a regrettable weakness in the Federal program that permits an individual addict from any city or State to volunteer for treatment and leave as he wishes, and yet denies to State courts the authority to commit an addict to the Public Health Service hospitals, even on a reimbursable basis. This is particularly significant when we recognize that State and local-treatment facilities are extremely meager.

Because of the enormous capital investment which would be required to establish suitable treatment facilities, only one State, New York, has been able to assign a hospital solely to the treatment of drug addiction. It is available, however, only to addicts under 21.

New Jersey has a special narcotics commission working on a new set of laws and regulations making it possible for drug addicts to receive treatment in the State hospital system. Los Angeles County in California has a plan also in process of development which would provide treatment in county hospitals. Measures to permit treatment in State institutions are under consideration in California and Ohio.

Because of the limited State narcotics hospital facilities and, also, because of the abuses inherent in the voluntary-type admission in the Federal hospitals, many Federal and State authorities told the subcommittee that it was a matter of urgency that the Surgeon General be authorized to accept in Federal narcotics hospitals, drug addicts committed for treatment by State courts. We were cautioned, at the same time, that all efforts to cure drug addiction without long-term supervision have met with consistent failure and that, consequently, State commitment authority must depend upon establishment of local rehabilitation programs.

Attorney General Jacob K. Javits of New York, chairman of the committee on narcotics of the National Association of Attorneys General, made several constructive proposals to the subcommittee regarding treatment and rehabilitation and presented the following resolution by the National Association of Attorneys General which was adopted at its meeting at Bretton Woods, September 1955:

"Narcotic drugs

"Whereas this association, by appropriate resolutions adopted at its annual meetings in 1952, 1953, and 1954, established a committee on narcotic drug control, which has sought to advance the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic drug addicts, and has urged the enactment by the Congress of legislation to permit the institutionalizing of such addicts in appropriate Federal hospitals upon commitment thereto by the courts of competent jurisdiction of the States and other measures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 49th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General:*

"1. Supports the enactment of legislation by the Congress now contained in the Payne bill, Senate Joint Resolution 19, to permit narcotic addicts committed from the States to be treated in the special United States Public Health hospitals, subject to reimbursement for the care cost, and urges its members to work for such enactment.

"2. Supports the development of a permanent national narcotics policy and urges a national review conference to be called under the auspices of the Federal Government to consider means for the coordination of existing Federal and State narcotics laws and procedures, stricter enforcement of laws dealing with the narcotics traffic, and the establishment of a program of research into the causes and cure of narcotic addiction through the National Institutes of Health, with the aid of a national council."

5. Community Followup, or Rehabilitation Facilities and Services for the Discharged Addict-Patient Are Virtually Nonexistent

A major weakness in current efforts to treat and rehabilitate drug addicts is the almost complete lack of followup or post-hospitalization facilities on the community level to check upon and aid the addict once he leaves the Federal narcotics hospital. The Federal Government does not and should not take the initiative in following through hospital care by providing the addict with rehabilitation services after he has returned to his home community. This is an area which properly calls for action by State and local governments, but it is also one in which inaction can completely nullify Federal efforts. Emphasizing the vital importance of community followup, Dr. Raphael R. Gamso, medical superintendent of Riverside Hospital for juvenile addicts in New York City said:

"The period in the hospital is a very important period, but the period after return to the community is equally important, probably more so, because when a person leaves the hospital he is again subjected to the same forces which caused him to use drugs, and if we cannot protect him from those forces and help him to sustain himself, he has lost the benefit of hospital care."

The situation as it was described to us by medical authorities, enforcement officials, probation officers, and even the addicts themselves can be summarized as one of rejection and abandonment by the home community. This is not solely because they have been drug addicts, but because inevitably most of them have criminal records, and according to law enforcement opinion and statistics, a majority of today's addict population became involved in law violations prior to addiction.

Some of the specific difficulties encountered by returned addicts in New York City and outlined in a special report prepared for the subcommittee by Mr. Morris Kuznesof, United States probation officer, Southern District of New York, are typical of many of the problems described to the subcommittee in cities throughout the country:

"Because, as a rule, the public abhors the addict, his problems of adjustment are greater after he returns from the hospital, than are other prisoners released from jail. In the first place, he cannot let a prospective employer know where he has been, or that he is a former user, as addicts are considered to be very undependable, unreliable workers. To add to his difficulties, the New York State Employment Service will not refer any adult individual who has a history of narcotics use, presumably for the same reasons.

"The returned addict requires a good deal of help immediately after his arrival. If he does not have a sympathetic family, which can supply his needs, he must turn to social agencies for help. Private casework agencies have religiously refused to assist former addicts. Local psychiatrists have also refused to accept the cases of addicts, even though they were able to pay the fee."

As long as State and local communities thus fail to provide even the minimum aftercare programs, the vast expenditures of funds and energy at our Federal narcotics hospitals will be virtually wasted. Dr. G. Halsey Hunt, Assistant Surgeon General, USPHS, in his testimony before the subcommittee stated:

"It is our increasingly overpowering feeling that hospital care is only the first step, and that the local communities to which the patients return after they leave the hospital must, if treatment is to be successful in any appreciable number of patients, pick up the ball and provide facilities for rehabilitation of the individual in his home environment."

That the failure of the local communities to provide suitable followthrough procedures and facilities is mainly responsible for the narrow success of Lexington and Fort Worth in obtaining permanent cures, is pointed up in the testimony of Dr. Harris Isbell, Director of the Addiction Research Center, at Lexington:

"The main weakness we suffer from is the lack of followup treatment. A man may come to us and stay for 4½ months, and a lot of money is spent on him; he then goes back to his local community and leaves our jurisdiction. It is hardly appropriate for the Federal Government to go into those cities and set up followthrough facilities and agencies to aid the addict.

"A man can go through a period of institutional care and leave with all the best intentions in the world, returning to his community to find there is nothing there for him. He cannot get a job, and he has no resources, he has nothing. He goes to the social agencies and finds that they are already tremendously overburdened with many other problems. They are afraid of the addict and will do nothing for him, and in order to eat that man almost immediately has to drop back into some kind of criminal activity. But the minute he goes back into criminal activity, he is going to head back to drugs. A person going home after a period of institutionalization * * * needs a great deal of help, support, supervision, which is, I think, properly the responsibility of the community."

Only two communities—Chicago and Detroit—offer rehabilitation services on a local basis.[2] Both of these agencies attempt to help the former addict adjust to a normal, drug-free life in the community by providing a variety of services. For example, workers help the ex-addict find a job, give him financial assistance to tide him over until he gets a job and encourage him to talk over his emotional problems with professionally trained members of the staff in an effort to better understand himself and prevent relapse. The Detroit clinic, with two full-time employees and the part-time assistance of a psychiatrist, is unable at the present time to offer the comprehensive services originally envisioned for the clinic. Its main contribution so far has been in the identification of addicts for hospital treatment.

Experience at these two clinics has already indicated that this phase of treatment, like the hospital phase, must contain a strong element of coercion to bolster the addict's resolve to stay off drugs. Dr. Walter A. Adams, director of the Chicago clinic, in a statement prepared for the committee, indicated that almost all of the addicts who come to his clinic are poorly motivated to persist in the long-term efforts required for successful rehabilitation. Dr. Raphael Gamso not only recommended that comprehensive aftercare services be made compulsory for released addict patients, but also that such services be thought of as a 5- or 6-year program for each patient.

Federal law may have contributed, at least in some degree, to the failure of the States and local communities to adopt programs to aid the discharged addict, for as we have stated, even if adequate facilities and services were available at the present time, Federal hospital authorities would be absolutely prohibited by law from forwarding the names and related clinical data to such community agencies. The confidential nature of the hospital records, therefore, actually may have prevented local communities access to the very information essential to them in determining the extent of the problem and, of course, the necessity for followthrough facilities.

[2] New York City has an aftercare clinic which is an adjunct of Riverside Hospital and therefore available only to juvenile addicts who have received treatment at Riverside. The Public Health Service also has a pilot followup clinic located in New York City, but it is oriented primarily toward gathering information and is staffed by two social workers.

6. No Facilities Exist for Isolating the Chronic or Incurable Drug Addict

Medical authorities and law enforcement officers repeatedly warned of the existence of a "hard core" of chronic or "incurable" narcotic addicts who were neither susceptible to treatment nor isolated to prevent the spreading of drug addiction. Dr. Kenneth Chapman, consultant, Narcotic Drug Addiction, Community Services Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, in his testimony before the subcommittee, stated:

"There is a hard core, and this is the group we hear about repeatedly, who cause the general feeling that drug addiction is incurable. It is those people we continually see, those people who are continually in the hands of the police, who are continually in the hospital, are continually seeking drugs. This hard core are the ones we see all the time; they are the ones who cast doubt on the possibility of any successful treatment."

Despite this knowledge—that chronic addicts are not amenable to cure, that they infect others with drug addiction, that they habitually engage in crime, and that, thus, they are a menace to society, neither the Federal nor State Governments has met the threat with special facilities nor the isolation, or quarantine, of these individuals. The danger of the situation is pointed up in testimony by Dr. Isbell, when he says:

"A chronic, relapsing addict with a long record might be taken in just for withdrawal of drugs; if we feel we can do nothing for him we will just take him in for 2 weeks or 30 days, after which we will discharge him again."

The pattern is endless, and so is the cost in terms of crime, taxpayer dollars, and human havoc. These incurable addicts who have in reality lost their power of self-control and who are dangerous to the health and welfare of the community not only are habitual criminals but also spread their addiction to others, much on the same order as persons with contagious diseases. Experts agree, therefore, that both in his interest and in the interest of community protection, the chronic drug addict must be quarantined or otherwise confined for long periods of time or permanently if relapses continue after releases from isolation or confinement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That voluntary commitments to the Federal narcotics hospitals be abolished and that all admissions be processed through the appropriate district court of the United States for civil-type commitment requiring a mandatory period of treatment, or by State court commitments under the conditions hereinafter outlined.

2. That the Surgeon General be authorized to accept addicts committed by a State on a reimbursable basis under State court orders requiring a mandatory period of treatment.

3. That each State be assigned a quota of addict-patients which may be committed to Federal narcotics hospitals at any one time, therefore assuring that each State has fair and equal opportunity to avail itself of the limited facilities. In those few States where the number of addicts requiring treatment exceeds the established quota of patients at Lexington and Fort Worth, such States should assume the responsibility of establishing their own special hospital facilities for the treatment of drug addiction.

4. That States desiring to participate in the commitment program, in order to become eligible, must have satisfied the Surgeon General that suitable followthrough, or posthospitalization facilities have been established to aid and assist the drug addict upon his discharge from the Federal narcotics hospital and to determine any relapse to addiction. That the USPHS continue to provide technical and advisory assistance to States and local communities in developing followup programs.

5. That, for a successful followthrough program, commitment orders for drug addicts should provide for at least a 3-year probation status upon release from Federal hospitals, including mandatory provisions for regular reporting, and physical examinations and for recommitment upon relapse without the institution of new proceedings.

6. That no drug addict be treated at Federal narcotics hospitals on more than three occasions, after which, if found to have relapsed again to the use of drugs, he should be subject to State or Federal proceedings designatiig him as an habitual narcotic addict and committing him to an indeterminate quarantine type of confinement at a suitable narcotics farm which, it is recommended, be established with joint Federal-State planning and financing, such arrangement to include either:

(a) individual States, or

(b) a group of States entering into a compact for such purpose.

7. That the Public Health Service Act be amended to authorize the divulgence of information relating to narcotic addicts to appropriate Federal and State authorities in charge of treatment and rehabilitation programs and to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

8. That the Surgeon General continue and expand, where needed, the existing Federal research program into the causes, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts, and that annual reports on the progress of such research be made to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

It should be noted that these recommendations for treatment and rehabilitation are not intended as a substitute for criminal confinement and punishment of those addicts who are convicted of law violations. They should pay their debt to society the same as nonaddicts, and proper law enforcement and confinement in such instances will do much toward minimizing the narcotics traffic and addiction in the United States.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL BANK ACT OF 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Soil Bank Act of 1956, so as to establish a more fair and just method of payment under the program.

The bill provides that a crop may be placed in the soil bank not less than 30 days prior to harvesting.

In addition, it provides that payment shall be made on the basis of a net return of normal yield, rather than on appraisal of the crop. This would provide a more justified rate of payment, based on the productive history of the farm. The policy of payment based on appraisal, adopted by the Department of Agriculture, will result in reduced payments to farmers in instances following damage to crops by weather and other natural causes.

SOIL BANK IN LIMITED OPERATION

As you know, the omnibus soil-bank bill—just recently passed by the Congress and signed by the President on May 28—has been put into limited operation.

Naturally, in the administration of a program so broad as to cover the whole

field of American agriculture, difficult problems will arise.

As a matter of fact, one such problem has already come up.

I refer specifically to the method for determination of payment under the acreage reserve provisions of the soil-bank bill.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PAYMENT POLICY FOR 1956

For 1956, the Department of Agriculture has announced that the method of payment, under the acreage-reserve program, will be based on appraisal, rather than on the net return realized from a normal crop.

There is an inherent danger in this kind of computation for payment.

For example, two men looking at the same crop may evaluate it differently; likewise, the same man, looking at two different crops, may have a difficult time establishing a common standard of judgment.

Bob Moses, radio director of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, recently telegraphed the concern of his organization over the difficulties that will result from this kind of payment determination. He has indicated—and I agree—that very real problems will arise.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Moses has indicated that some of these may possibly result in legal proceedings against the Department.

WILEY BILL TO IMPROVE METHOD OF PAYMENT

In order to avoid the problems which are already looming on the horizon from this kind of action—and which may result in much lower return to the farmers, I am introducing a bill which would provide uniform standards by which payment for crops would be made.

These standards, as I have indicated, would be: payments based on the net return of the normal yield, rather than on the appraised yield. This would be a fairer compensation to the farmer.

I am glad to report that a companion bill in the House, H. R. 11958, offered by Representative POAGE, of Texas, has been reported out of the Agriculture Committee, and is now on the House Calendar. Since it is imperative that this kind of specific guidance be available to carry out the soil-bank program, I am hopeful that the Senate will be able to act on it quickly—if possible, prior to adjournment.

I have recently contacted Secretary Benson, pointing up this inherent problem in the method of payment, as well as enumerating other factors to be taken into consideration in the administration of the soil-bank program.

I should like to point out that it is feasible administratively to accomplish what Congressman POAGE and I am seeking to assure legislatively.

In the event, therefore, that in these closing jampacked hours of the session, it proves impossible for the Congress to complete action on a legislative mandate, I trust that the Secretary, after proper review, will see his way clear to acting on this subject by administrative interpretation.

I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to Secretary Benson printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4297) to amend the acreage reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act to permit inclusion of acreage up to 30 days prior to harvest, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

JULY 25, 1956.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you to urge, most respectfully, that the conservation-reserve program, for participation under the soil bank, be put into operation immediately.

In addition, I am urging that nonbasic commodities receive equal treatment, under the conservation-reserve program, with that received by the so-called basics under the acreage-reserve program.

The provisions of the soil bank, I believe, should be liberalized as much as possible, so that Wisconsin farmers, and those of other States, may have the fairest possible chance to participate.

As you are aware, the State of Wisconsin will have wider opportunity to participate in the soil bank under the conservation reserve than under the acreage reserve, since the overwhelming portion of our Badger farm income is from sources other than the basics.

We must, of course, provide maximum opportunities under both programs.

Contrary to the announced policy by the Department, however, I believe the amount for payment in the acreage-reserve program needs to be a sum comparable to that which would have been realized from the net return of a normal crop—payments being based on normal yields, rather than on appraised yields. This would be a fairer compensation for the farmer.

As you know, a very serious problem arises in appraising crops, since it would be extremely difficult to make uniform appraisals of different crops which would be fair to all farmers.

We know, of course, that the basic purpose of the soil bank is not to be a substitute for disaster insurance. However, if—under unusual circumstances—adjustment can equitably and properly be made so as to provide as wide a participation as possible, it would not only provide much needed help for the farmers, but would accomplish the objectives of the soil-bank program.

The intent of Congress in the enactment of the soil bank program—we must acknowledge—was to bolster farm income as well as to reduce production of surplus products and conserve the nation's soil.

Recently, as you may know, in Wisconsin, there have been disasters resulting in tremendous economic loss for our farmers. In Polk, Fond du Lac, Marathon, Iowa, and other counties of Wisconsin, many of the crops have been completely "wiped out" by hail storms.

And so, I am urging that this situation be examined with the objective of thus providing all possible assistance to the disaster-struck farmers.

Under the discretionary powers granted by the Soil Bank Act, I believe that these requests mentioned above could be carried out by your Department.

May I mention, too, that in contacts with farmers throughout my state, I have found that information is sadly lacking on the procedures for qualifying under the soil bank program—not only in disaster instances—but even under the normal terms of eligibility for the program.

I am sure that this can be remedied, and that you will do so as quickly as possible.

I know, too, that you are extending great effort toward providing as wide a participation in the program for 1956 as possible.

Consequently, I believe that it would be sound policy to quickly carry out the conservation reserve program, under a liberalized policy for the benefit of the farmers of Wisconsin and the Nation.

With kindest personal regards, and looking forward to hearing from you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF MINNESOTA RIVER, MINN. (S. DOC. NO. 144)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated November 16, 1953, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Minnesota River, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate Document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Statement by him relating to Dr. Benjamin Reifel, of South Dakota, named the American Indian of the Year.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Newsletters by him on the subject The Great Conspiracy—The Soviet Road to World Conquest.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to file a report during the adjournment of the Senate summarizing its activities during the 84th Congress, second session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may file two reports, already agreed to unanimously, during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF G. LEWIS JONES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO TUNISIA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign

Relations, I desire to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of G. Lewis Jones, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Officer of class 1, to be Ambassador of the United States to Tunisia. Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations expects to consider this nomination.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8000. An act to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight;

H. R. 9969. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar; and

H. R. 12408. An act to authorize Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, and the Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, Members of the House of Representatives to accept and wear the award of the Order "Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana" tendered by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 271) correcting the enrollment of House Joint Resolution 511, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 497. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California;

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

S. 1243. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1324. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act;

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes;

S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions;

S. 2216. An act to amend the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497); and

S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 8000. An act to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to probihit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9969. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 wih respect to the readjustment of tax in the case of certain amounts received for breach of contract; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar; and

H. R. 12408. An act to authorize Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable William A. Barrett, and the Honorable James G. Fulton, Members of the House of Representatives to accept and wear the award of the Order "Al Merito della Repubblica Italiana" tendered by the Government of the Republic of Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COVERAGE OF EMPLOYEES OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE WITHIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2858, House bill 3489, to bring employees of Gallaudet College within the Federal life insurance program, and transferring certain publications from fourth to second class material.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3489) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment.

AREA DEVELOPMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] a question with respect to the jurisdiction involved in the bill just passed relating to redevelopment of depressed areas.

I recall to the Senator's mind that on January 4 of this year I wrote him a letter. In that letter I called attention to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction under rule XXV of the subject matter of the bill just passed. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has been most cooperative and most helpful in behalf of the passage of the bill. I think the amendment which he offered to the bill, and which the Senate adopted, was a fine contribution to the bill.

In reply to his question, rule XXV of the Senate rules, found on page 32 of the Senate Manual, provides that the Committee on Banking and Currency shall have jurisdiction over—

Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

We note the exception. However, it seems to the Senator from Alabama that general jurisdiction over legislation dealing with financial aid to commerce and industry would be in the Committee on Banking and Currency, with the exception set out in the rule.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To make the record with regard to future action under this legislation, let me say that a similar bill passed in the House was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Full Employment Act of 1946, which is quite similar to this legislation, came from the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate.

With respect to the last inquiry, assuming that this legislation becomes law, and an administrator is appointed pursuant to the provisions of the bill, the question of the confirmation of the nomination of such administrator would come before the Senate. Is it not the Senator's view that such nomination would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. HILL. I should think, from reading rule XXV, without committing myself too definitely, that the likelihood is that the nomination would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

We know that a rule was laid down by the Supreme Court many years ago, in a decision written by Chief Justice John Marshall, in the case of Muskrat against United States to the effect that it would not pass judgment or make a decision except when there was a live issue, when there was litigation or specific controversy in court. It seems to me that under rule XXV, general jurisdiction in dealing with financial aid to commerce and industry would be, and is, in the Committee on Banking and Currency, with the exception noted in the rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Cannot the Senator from Alabama assure us that so long as he is chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—which we hope will be many decades—he will not claim jurisdiction over the confirmation of the nomination of any administrator appointed under this act, and will willingly concede jurisdiction to the Committe on Banking and Currency?

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his hope. I certainly hope his hope will be realized.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I will say that this question has never been considered by the committee, and I do not feel that I can speak for the committee, without consideration by the committee, or at least consultation with members of the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the question of jurisdiction should arise, I would be clearly in the middle, as I am a member of both committees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So was the Senator from Illinois at the time he introduced this measure.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is very painful to have to acknowledge that the Senator from Illinois is no longer a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Naturally his first allegiance now must be to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on this subject, together with two letters bearing on the subject, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

On January 4, 1956, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare asserting the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, over the bill S. 2663 and reserving the privilege of requesting an opportunity for that committee to consider the bill. A copy of this letter was sent to the Senator from Illinois, the sponsor of the bill and the chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on it. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

On June 28, 1956, I wrote a letter to the majority leader indicating my intention to ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

It had been my intention to move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. However, I realize that at this stage of the session such a motion, if successful, would have the result of killing the bill. I have also been assured by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that he agrees that jurisdiction of this matter in the future would lie within the Committee on Banking and Currency. This would include jurisdiction over the confirmation of the administrator of the program provided for in the bill. (May I ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], to confirm this understanding?)

I have also received informally, advice from the Parliamentarian that, in his opinion, confirmation of the Administrator and future legislation dealing with the substance of this bill should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

So far as I am concerned personally, therefore, I am willing that the bill be considered by the Senate on its merits without a motion to refer it to the Committee on Banking and Currency. My own decision, of course, would not prejudice the right of any other member of the Committee on Banking and Currency to make such a motion.

For the record, however, I wish to state reasons for my belief that the substance of the bill lies within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Under Senate rule XXV, the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction over matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Banking and currency generally.

"2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule."

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare presumably would claim jurisdiction of this bill as a matter "relating to the following subjects:

"1. Measures relating to education, labor, or public welfare generally.

"10. Vocational rehabilitation."

The House bill, which is a companion to S. 2663, H. R. 11811, was referred in the House to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Another bill dealing with the same subject, introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], S. 2892, was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Although the purpose of the bill S. 2663, as set forth in its title, is to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas, an examination of the bill will show that its principal programs to meet this purpose are such as would come under the category of "financial aid to commerce and industry," the language of the rule defining in part the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. This language of the rule is followed by the phrase "other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule." Thus, it is clear that the rule contemplates that all such matters of "financial aid to commerce and industry" not otherwise specifically assigned should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, regardless of what the purpose of such aid is. It is clear that the Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction over matters relating to employment or unemployment where the method of dealing with this problem is a method within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Employment Act of 1946, which the committee report on S. 2663 cites on page 2 as background justification for its bill, was itself originated by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There are many other matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency that relate to employment; for example, housing programs and the Small Business Administration.

JANUARY 4, 1956.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: S. 2663, the Distressed Areas Act, was introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, for himself and seven other Senators, on July 28, 1955, and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on that day.

The bill provides for a number of forms of financial aid to commerce and industry in distressed areas, which are within this committee's jurisdiction under rule XXV. Accordingly, I feel it is necessary to advise you that this committee is compelled to reserve the privilege of requesting an opportunity to consider the bill.

In view of Senator DOUGLAS' interest as principal sponsor of the bill, I am taking the liberty of sending him a copy of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JUNE 28, 1956.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: I understand the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare today voted out a bill S. 2663, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

I enclose, for your information, a copy of a letter which I wrote to Chairman HILL of that committee on January 4, 1956. I did not receive a reply to this letter.

On January 9, 1956, S. 2892, to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The purpose of this bill is obviously identical to that of S. 2663.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency has before it H. R. 11811, "To alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas," which will be reported in a few days.

I believe an examination of S. 2663, as it was reported by the Labor Committee, will clearly show that the Committee of predominate jurisdiction is the Committee on Banking and Currency. This committee under rule XXV has jurisdiction over matters relating to "Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule," and, of course, "Banking and currency generally." The principal programs under S. 2663 consist of financial assistance for industrial plants and public facilities.

It is my intention to ask that the bill, S. 2663, be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, if the House should pass H. R. 11811 or, a similar bill, to ask that it be referred to this committee when it reaches the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I felt that it was necessary, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to raise this question, because I believe it is my duty to protect the jurisdiction of that committee under the rules. So in the future there should be no confusion on this question, particularly with regard to the Parliamentarian's possible ruling.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason I ask the Senator to yield is that I must leave the Chamber.

I wish to explain, in 30 seconds, why I voted against the so-called depressed

areas bill. I wish to make the explanation while the able Senator from Arkansas is present in the Chamber.

The reason I voted against the bill was that, while I was in complete sympathy with the original bill reported by the committee, I felt that the amendments of the Senator from Arkansas were extremely unwise. I felt that they destroyed the safeguards provided in the committee's bill for protecting workers in areas that are now prosperous. With these safeguards deleted by Senator FULBRIGHT'S amendments I could not vote for the bill.

REQUEST TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT PERIOD

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to file, during the adjournment of the Senate, a report summarizing its activities during the 2d session, 84th Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the Senator from Arkansas cleared that request with the minority leadership?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I have not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the Senator to do that and then to renew his request. He will have ample time in which to do it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

PAULINE H. CORBETT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3957) entitled "An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
WILLIAM LANGER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

E. L. FORRESTER,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, the conference report is on a claims bill, on which the House has receded from its amendment to a Senate bill. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; the Senate amended a House bill by providing a larger amount, and the House has receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the conference report is signed by all the conferees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS BILL LEGISLATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from a great number of responsible organizations urging the Senate to take up the House-passed civil rights bill at this session of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 25, 1956.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of our organizations we urge that the Senate take up the House-passed civil rights bill in this session. Under circumstances prevailing in the Senate votes on procedural motions to bring up the bill are votes on civil rights.

David Dubinsky, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO; Emil Mazey, United Automobile Workers; Willard Townsend, United Transport Service Employees, AFL–CIO; Francis Shane, United Steelworkers, AFL–CIO; A. Philip Randolph, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL–CIO; Kenneth Peterson, International Union of Electric Workers, AFL–CIO; Patrick M. Malin, American Civil Liberties Union; John Blue, American Council on Human Rights; Leo Pfeffer, American Jewish Congress; Kenneth Birkhead, American Veterans Committee; John J. Gunther, Americans for Democratic Action; Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Bernard Weitzer, Jewish War Veterans; Clarence Mitchell, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mrs. William T. Mason, National Council of Negro Women.

SHIPMENT OF CERTAIN PERISHABLE AND OTHER COMMODITIES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. It deals with some amendments to the ICC Act and shipments of certain perishable and other commodities in interstate commerce. I also ask that my letter to the chairman of CAB be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

On behalf of myself and the junior Senator from California (Mr. KUCHEL), I introduced early in this Congress S. 1192, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder.

S. 1192 would exempt from regulations as freight forwarders nonprofit cooperatives and shipping associations engaged in facilitating for their own members utilization of air transportation in the interstate shipment of agricultural and horticultural products. This bill would extend the same exemption in air transportation for agricultural, horticultural, and floricultural commodities that is presently extended to surface carriers of these same products as a matter of national policy.

In this coming air age, when competitive rates are essential to survival, it is particularly vital that the economies of consolidation and bulk handling be provided to growers and shippers of perishable and specialized agricultural products, especially cut flowers and decorative greens. This is vital to the Pacific Northwest and in fact, to the entire west coast.

Such competition helps both the producers and the consumers, as well as commercial aviation.

We deferred action on the bill because the Civil Aeronautics Board was conducting an investigation into this problem. On April 30, 1956, the Board issued decisions, opinions, orders, and regulations which contained provisions substantially accomplishing the purpose of S. 1192.

Inasmuch as the CAB has done administratively what S. 1192 proposed to do legislatively, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has decided to table this bill. I have requested notification by the CAB should it ever contemplate any change in its decision.

JULY 26, 1956.

Hon. JAMES R. DURFEE,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, S. 1192, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to exempt operations in the transportation of livestock, fish, and agricultural, floricultural, and horticultural commodities from the act and from regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board thereunder, is presently pending before my committee.

The committee has decided to table S. 1192 at this time because it believes that the Board action in Docket No. 5947, et al., the Air Freight Forwarder Investigation, insofar as it relates to the subject matter of this legislation, substantially accomplishes the purpose of my bill. In other words, the committee is satisfied that the administrative action taken by the Board makes unnecessary enactment of S. 1192 to provide the relief requested by cooperatives and shipping associations engaged in the air transportation of agricultural and horticultural products, including decorative greens, for their members.

The committee is of the opinion that the Board decisions, opinions, and orders of August 30, 1955, and April 13, 1956, effective June 12, 1956, and the regulations issued thereunder, in this matter are appropriate to the problem.

In the meantime, I would appreciate it if you would advise me if there is any change whatsoever in the Board's treatment of these agricultural shipping cooperatives and associations.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

PROGRAM FOR THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that I have agreed with the minority leader,

and the Senate has agreed, to recess at 5 o'clock this afternoon for a reception in the Old Supreme Court Chamber in honor of our colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. It is our plan to recess the Senate for that purpose from 5 to 6 o'clock this afternoon.

The leadership has also agreed that we will try to avoid rollcalls before 2:15 o'clock this afternoon. It is now 12:40, and we shall try to avoid rollcalls between now and 2:15 this afternoon. I understand the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has a speech of about 20 or 25 minutes, and that the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has a speech that will take about an hour to deliver.

Some minor resolutions and some noncontroversial bills may be brought up by unanimous consent, if that is possible, during that time. After 2:15 this afternoon, depending on action by the House, we may take up some conference reports and some other proposed legislation, as to which announcement has been previously made.

I wanted to make that announcement now so that Senators would be on notice about our agreement and about our plans.

THE GAS BILL INCIDENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on the 3d of February, in connection with the debate on the natural gas bill, I made a speech which became the background for an investigation by a select committee of the Senate under Senate Resolution 205.

The time for filing the report of that committee was twice extended due to unexpected developments in the inquiry. The result was that the report was finally made while the Senate was in recess at Eastertime, early in April. It was therefore filed with the Secretary of the Senate and has never had occasion to be presented on the floor of the Senate or to be made a part of the official proceedings as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Inasmuch as the RECORD, of course, does carry my original speech and the debate that followed incident to the adoption of the resolution creating the select committee, I have thought it appropriate that the report of the committee be made a part of the published RECORD of Senate proceedings for this session. I had expected that it might naturally be introduced at the time when bills dealing with elections and campaign contributions were considered. Since that does not now appear likely to happen and we are facing adjournment within a day or two, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the report of the select committee under Senate Resolution 205 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1724) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There follows the report of the select committee which the Senate established by Senate Resolution 205. Specifically, the select committee was given the task of investigating the charge made by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which was in essence that there had been an attempt to influence his vote on the Harris-Fulbright bill, S. 1853, the so-called natural-gas bill.

[S. Res. 205, 84th Cong., 2d Sess.]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES—FEBRUARY 6 (LEGISLATIVE DAY, JANUARY 16), 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie over under the rule:

"FEBRUARY 7, 1956.—CONSIDERED AND AGREED TO

"Resolution

"Resolved, That there is hereby established a select committee to investigate the circumstances involving an alleged improper attempt through political contributions to influence the vote of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in connection with the Senate's consideration of the bill S. 1853, the natural gas bill.

SEC. 2. The Vice President shall appoint 2 members from the majority and 2 members from the minority Members of the Senate who shall constitute the select committee. A chairman shall be selected from among the members appointed upon their first meeting to be called by the Vice President.

"SEC. 3. The select committee is hereby authorized and directed to conduct an immediate investigation of these circumstances and report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at the earliest possible date, in no event later than March 1, 1956, and upon the filing of its report, the select committee shall case to exist.

"SEC. 4. For the purpose of this resolution the select committee is authorized (1) to make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondnce, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; and (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable.

"SEC. 5. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed $10,000."[1]

ORGANIZATION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE

Its scope and authority

On February 7, 1956, the Vice President appointed the following Members of the Senate to the select committee in accordance with the resolution: WALTER F. GEORGE, senior Senator from Georgia; CARL HAYDEN, senior Senator from Arizona; STYLES BRIDGES, senior Senator from New Hampshire; and EDWARD J. THYE, senior Senator from Minnesota.

The select committee met on the afternoon of that day and selected the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. GEORGE, as chairman, and former President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. BRIDGES, as secretary. The committee reconvened on the morning of February 8, 1956, selected Charles W. Steadman as its chief counsel, organized its staff, and began preparation for hearings which commenced on the morning of February 10, 1956. These hearings were continued on February 20, February 28 and 29, and March 2, and were concluded on March 5, 1956. A total of 22 witnesses appeared and testified under examination by the committee. This testimony covers 849 pages in the report of proceedings (transcript).

[1] As subsequently amended to extend the life of the committee until March 31, 1956, and increase the amount of the funds to $20,000.

The committee brought before it, by means of subpena and otherwise, all of the persons that it believed might have pertinent testimony on the subject of this investigation.

The select committee was limited in its scope and confined in its authority by the express direction of the Senate, to immediately inquire into the limited area surrounding the circumstances of the complaint made by Senator FRANCIS CASE on the floor of the Senate on February 3, 1956. It was from this that Senate Resolution 205 stemmed and became the basis for this inquiry.

In his speech, Senator CASE announced his decision to vote against the natural gas bill. He assigned as a reason what seems to be a charge that there had been an attempt to influence his vote improperly on the natural gas bill through an attempted contribution of $2,500 to his campaign fund. He did not make this charge specifically. He did specifically disclaim that there had been an effort to bribe him. The select committee thus had some difficulty in discerning the exact nature of the complaint. This problem was somewhat aggravated by reason of the fact that, as the inquiry disclosed, the information known to Senator CASE on February 3, 1956, would have made it difficult for him to have known whether there was an attempt, improper or otherwise, to influence his vote. This factor prevented Senator CASE from being more definite. Because of this uncertainty the committee was required to make a penetrating examination of the complaint's character and content in a move to ascertain the exact circumstances into which it was to make inquiry. The committee does not intend to cast any reflection upon Senator CASE.

Statement of facts and comment

Mr. Howard B. Keck, who is president of Superior Oil Company of California, in 1947 or 1948 established, without any clearcut arrangement, a personal campaign contribution fund from which he gave money to Elmer Patman at various times, both in cash and by check, and so it would be available for various purposes. The distribution of this fund was left to Patman's judgment because, as Mr. Keck stated, "I am quite busy and there has to be someone who expedites those matters." Over the years, this fund averaged five or six thousand dollars a year. In 1954, however, Patman received $9,000, $8,000 of which was paid by a single check dated March 2, 1954. In 1955, Patman received either $8,500 or $9,500 from Mr. Keck. Keck was unable to establish the exact amount. It was testified that this discrepancy was caused by the fact that neither Patman nor Keck maintained any records, and Patman, under the arrangement, accounted to Keck orally when he happened to see him. According to Keck, the contribution to Senator FRANCIS CASE was not at his instruction, and, as Patman said, "I didn't tell him (Keck) until after the speech, and then I called him and told him that it was his money."

Elmer Patman "expedites" Mr. Keck's personal campaign funds, and is an attorney who has served as a full-time employee of the Superior Oil Company of California since approximately 1943. Previously, he had been chief enforcement officer, oil and gas division, Texas Railroad Commission. Patman, who testified that he performs legal duties for the company, has authority to employ the services of lawyers in other States. His arrangement with Howard Keck has been a personal one which he carried out while performing his company duties. It began when "A number of years ago, Mr. Keck began to trust me with matters over and beyond my official duties." The Superior Oil Company of California paid his entire salary and expenses, and bargained for all of his time.

Some 25 years ago Elmer Patman, while working and attending law school in Washington, D. C., met and became friendly with John Neff. Neff ultimately became a practicing attorney in Lexington, Nebr. During the intervening years, Patman maintained contact with Neff, and in 1947 employed his friend on behalf of Superior Oil Company of California to assist in the preparation of a brief concerning the Anglo-American Treaty. Again in early 1955 Patman, on behalf of the company, employed Neff to work as a lobbyist on conservation matters then before the Nebraska State Legislature. This employment of Neff by Patman was brought to Mr. Keck's attention.

In October 1955, John Neff was retained by Superior Oil Company of California, through Elmer Patman, at $1,000 a month. The ostensible purpose of this employment was that Neff would be available to handle legal problems of the company in the State of Nebraska. Both Neff and Patman confirmed in testimony that the only work performed by Neff in connection with this employment was that of determining the attitude of Senators with regard to the Harris-Fulbright bill, and the distribution of personal campaign funds of Mr. Keck. Concerning Neff's retainer, Keck "knew sometime after he was put on retainer in October that he was reemployed." He said that he approved of what Mr. Neff had done in attempting to make the contribution to Senator CASE. Mr. Keck testified, however, that no contribution that he had ever made had been "tied into any legislation." On October 1, 1955, Patman telephoned John Neff, and offered him employment as an attorney for the Superior Oil Company of California. It was indicated that this employment would be on a monthly retainer basis and would last for several years. Patman, in this conversation, suggested that Neff determine the "attitude of the Nebraska Senators with respect to the Harris-Fulbright bill." In this or a subsequent conversation on October 8, 1955, Patman also indicated that $5,000 would be available as a contribution to the Republican Party of Nebraska.

It is of the utmost significance that all of the activity that came to light here and everything that was done in this case was with respect to a bill pending before the Senate—S. 1853, known as the natural gas or Harris-Fulbright bill.

The $7,500 which Howard Keck handed to Elmer Patman became involved with the Harris-Fulbright bill. This money was a generator of the activity in this case—$5,000 of it was actually used for campaign contributions that had a relationship to the Harris-Fulbright bill. This money was given by Mr. Keck to Mr. Patman pursuant to the "loose arrangement" between them.

Based upon Mr. Keck's own testimony, his personal funds that were distributed through the arrangement with Mr. Patman averaged $5,000 to $6,000 yearly. It is therefore apparent that a sum approaching $50,000 has been distributed in political contributions by Elmer Patman. The very fact that insofar as the record reveals, this political fund was established with Mr. Keck's money rather than corporation funds lends emphasis to his awareness that these moneys were intended to be used for political purposes. There can be no reasonable criticism of Mr. Keck's desire to have elected to public office candidates who share his beliefs. This is a basic element that every person considers in making campaign contributions, and indeed in voting for a candidate. His contributing to the campaign of those candidates is a thing that he is fully entitled to do.

There appears to have been here, however, a remarkable laxity in the supervision and direction of the activities of Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff through whom the Keck fund was flowing. Patman was given almost appalling latitude by Mr. Keck, who contented himself with merely handing the money over to Mr. Patman, apparently with a hope that it would reach and serve deserving causes.

The select committee does not subscribe to the point of view that the distribution of this fund through others should insulate Mr. Keck from the consequences of the chain of events which were initiated by the use of his money. This does not relieve him of a responsibility to take such steps as will reasonably assure the propriety of its use rather than permitting his resources to drift with uncertainty.

The actual designation of the purpose for which the money was to be used was delegated to Patman, whose activities seem to have been uncontrolled. Mr. Patman's intended objectives were beclouded by an evasive line of testimony, but his intended accomplishments were not beyond discernment.

Mr. Patman was interested in the enactment of the Harris-Fulbright bill. He hired Mr. Neff. Both he and Mr. Neff testified that Mr. Neff was not hired as a lobbyist. Both testified that Mr. Neff was hired on a long-term basis to perform general legal services for the Superior Oil Company of California and work on conservation matters in Nebraska. But both testified further that their conversations in October 1955, at which time Mr. Neff was retained, embraced three principal matters: (1) Terms of employment, (2) attitude of the Nebraska Senators with regard to the Harris-Fulbright bill, and (3) availability of the $5,000 contribution to the Nebraska State Republican Committee. According to the testimony of both Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff, Mr. Neff's activity with respect to the Harris-Fulbright bill was to be confined to determining the attitude of the Nebraska Senators on this bill. He did this on October 11 and 12, 1955, and reported to Mr. Patman, giving him this information sometime after October 12 and before October 28, 1955. His mission with respect to the Harris-Fulbright bill would then seem to have been accomplished. Yet his activity was only beginning. He conferred with Mr. Patman in Washington on October 28, 1955. He was given $2,500 by Mr. Patman for the Nebraska State Republican Finance Committee. He gave this to Mr. Joseph Wishart, chairman of that committee, in Washington on that same day.

He went to Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on November 1, 1955, and spent part of November 2 in Sioux Falls trying to learn Senator CASE's attitude on the natural-gas bill. On the same day, after he left Sioux Falls, he stopped in Storm Lake, Iowa, to find out Senator HICKENLOOPER's attitude on the natural gas bill. He made a subsequent trip, or perhaps two trips, to Des Moines, Iowa, for the same purpose. There he talked with Mr. Robert K. Goodwin, Republican National Committeeman for the State of Iowa. Mr. Goodwin made inquiry about Neff and refused to become involved with him. He telephoned Wyoming to determine the attitude of Senators O'MAHONEY and BARRETT on the natural-gas bill. He went to Billings, Mont., to solicit information concerning the position of Senators MANSFIELD and MURRAY respecting this bill.

After a trip to Washington about the 12th of January 1956, where he received $2,500 for Senator CASE from Mr. Patman and $2,500 from Mr. Patman for another contribution to the Nebraska committee, he made a second trip to Sioux Falls. On this occasion he left $2,500 with Mr. Ernest Kahler in an attempt to contribute it to Senator CASE's campaign fund.

From the time of Mr. Neff's employment by the Superior Oil Company of California on October 1, 1955, to February 1, 1956, Mr. Neff's own testimony was that he had performed no services for the Superior Oil Co. except in connection with the Harris-Fulbright bill. During this period, on his statements for fees he included the expenses which he incurred on these miscellaneous junkets and for the activity in which he engaged respecting the Harris-Fulbright bill. These statements were sent to the Superior Oil Co. through Mr. Patman. Mr. Patman testified that he readily approved them without any inquiry as to their nature or the nature of the services in which these expenses were incurred. But across the face of three of the bills submitted by Mr. Neff, Mr. Patman wrote the words, "Natural Gas Bill" or "Natural Gas Act."

These facts which bear upon the scope of Mr. Neff's employment are of vast interest here for they bear directly upon what was hoped to be accomplished by his activity, and the activity itself is a bold witness to these intentions.

The following evidence spoke eloquently:

(1) The extensive activity of Mr. Neff in five separate States, and his expressed interest, to a greater or lesser extent, in the attitude of the Senators of those States in oil and gas legislation;

(2) From October 1, 1955, to February 1, 1956, Mr. Neff performed work solely in connection with the Harris-Fulbright bill under his retainer from the Superior Oil Company of California;

(3) The contribution of $2,500 in cash in each of two States;

(4) The typewritten list of the entire Senate membership divided into groups of "For," "Doubtful," and "Against," with certain Members singled out by unexplained signs or marks which Mr. Neff inadvertently left on Robert K. Goodwin's desk, and

(5) The initialed approval of Mr. Neff's expense accounts by Mr. Patman and the Houston office general attorney of Superior Oil Company of California.

In the light of this evidence the select committee finds it difficult to believe that Mr. Neff was on a frolic of his own and that he acted only upon his own initiative outside of Nebraska and his second trip to South Dakota. Mr. Patman testified that Mr. Neff had a lot of initiative. But it is hard to believe that Mr. Neff was entirely self-propelled. It may be that some of the things that he did were done without express consent from his employer, but it is certainly difficult to conceive that there was not an implied authority or an implied consent given to him for the conduct of his activities as disclosed by the record. The activity of Neff and Patman in dispensing Keck's money can only be characterized as galloping irresponsibility.

Whatever the long-term purpose of Mr. Neff's employment might have been, it is indelibly clear that the immediate objective was concentrated activity on the natural-gas bill and such activity was ratified and condoned by Mr. Patman, whether or not all of it was directly ordered by him. In utter disregard of his legal knowledge and training, Mr. Neff acted with consummate indiscretion in making his promiscuous contacts.

Issues presented

On the state of the record what are the issues presented?

1. Did the activities here constitute a bribe or an attempt to bribe or otherwise to influence illegally the vote of Senator CASE on the natural-gas bill?

2. Was there an improper attempt to influence the vote of Senator CASE on the natural-gas bill?

3. Did the activities of Mr. Neff and Mr. Patman constitute lobbying?

4. Was the $2,500 contribution which was made to Senator CASE's campaign fund a political contribution by the Superior Oil Company of California?

5. Did the payment of salary and expenses and of fees and expenses of Messrs. Patman and Neff by Superior Oil Company of California constitute a political contribution by the corporation?

Findings and conclusions

A. The select committee finds and concludes that there was neither a bribe nor an attempt to bribe.

The evidence is clear that the contribution which Mr. Neff attempted to make to Senator CASE's campaign fund was not conditioned upon the Senator's agreeing to vote for the natural gas bill or to take any other specific action. Senator CASE himself, while being unclear on the one hand as to the exact nature of the thing of which he was complaining, did define it at least negatively to state that he did not consider this attempted campaign contribution to be an offer of a bribe. The record is replete with testimony, moreover, that the contribution was given without the attachment of "strings." And there was some testimony to the effect that it did not make any difference how Senator CASE voted on the natural gas bill. Self-serving declarations, of course, do not make something other than that which it is. But the committee has not ignored this testimony. It is worth observing that the conduits of contribution, Messrs. Patman and Neff, had satisfied themselves that Senator CASE would vote for the bill before the contribution was made. In this sense, it is possible to conclude that the contribution was in the nature of a reward to Senator CASE for his supposed intent to vote in favor of the legislation. Or perhaps a kind of insurance to the donor that Senator CASE would continue to think and act favorably, the contribution being the premium on the policy.

While Mr. Neff appears not to have violated the statute governing this matter [2] in his attempt to contribute to Senator CASE's campaign, his conversation with Mr. Wendell Edson deserves comment. He may have come closer to a violation of the statute when he indicated to Mr. Edson that he would contribute to Senator HICKENLOOPER'S campaign if the Senator favored the natural gas bill. As Mr. Neff testified, "twenty-five hundred just seems to stick out everywhere."

Mr. Edson was not closely or officially connected with Senator HICKENLOOPER, however, and perhaps was too remote for such an offer to constitute an infraction of the law. The committee also regards a certain amount of Mr. Neff's conversation here as just talk. While Mr. Neff succeeded in not violating any law here, he appears to have had every intention to do so.

B. The next issue confronting the select committee was whether there had been an improper attempt to influence the vote of Senator CASE on the natural gas bill. To state it differently, this contribution was something other than a bribe or an attempted bribe; its exact character, however, and its significance presents a most complicated problem. In essence this can be reduced to the question of whether this was a bona fide campaign contribution as distinguished from a gift to a Member of the Senate in connection with pending legislation, the relationship of the gift to the campaign being only incidental.

Mr. Neff testified that when he saw Mr. Kahler on November 2, campaign contributions for Senator CASE were discussed at least to the extent that Mr. Kahler expressed the view that Senator CASE might need "funds, or campaign funds, or help." Mr. Kahler has denied that the subject of campaign funds was discussed at the time of Mr. Neff's first meeting with him on November 2, 1955. However, Mr. Kahler appears to have left the impression with Mr. Neff that he had a close relationship with Senator CASE, and it would have been reasonable for Mr. Neff to have concluded that Mr. Kahler was a proper person to whom a contribution for Senator CASE might be made.

This will point out the need to have every candidate for Federal office designate a person or persons as fiscal agent or agents who shall be officially authorized to solicit and accept campaign contributions. Such information should be made a matter of public record by being published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community where such agent or agents live.

But was this a bona fide campaign contribution?

It was made from a fund with respect to which there was testimony that it had as one of its purposes the election of people to public office who were sympathetic to the views of the founder of the fund, Mr. Keck.

Senator CASE had established a committee for soliciting or receiving contributions, although Mr. Kahler was not a part of that committee, and had a campaign for reelection approaching, so this is not in the nature of a contribution for a remote campaign.

As it has been stated before, there is uncontroverted testimony that there were "no strings attached." There was also testimony that Mr. Neff had inquired of Mr. Patman whether the contribution should be made before or after the vote on the natural gas bill. Mr. Patman testified that this matter should be left to Mr. Neff's judgment.

On the other hand, the fact is inescapable that Mr. Neff's mission in going to South Dakota in November 1955, and to Senator CASE's office in Washington, D. C., in January 1956, was for the purpose of ascertaining Senator CASE's position on the natural gas bill. Also, Mr. Patman gave Mr. Neff the $2,500 for Senator CASE after Mr. Neff had informed him that Senator CASE was favorably inclined toward the bill. Within a few days after this, and before the vote on the bill, Mr. Neff exercised his "judgment" and made the contribution.

The list of the Members of the Senate which Mr. Neff had and which he inadvertently left on the desk of Mr. Robert Goodwin in Des Moines in early November, set forth Senator CASE's name in the column of those Senators whose position on the bill was "doubtful."

These factors make it difficult to believe that this contribution had much more than an incidental connection with Senator CASE's campaign. Contributions are entirely within the bounds of propriety when the purpose for which they are given is the election of the Member and not for the purpose of influencing his vote.

The circumstances here partake of a meaning making almost inexorable the conclusion that the paramount motivation for this contribution was interest in the natural gas bill as contrasted with aiding Senator CASE's campaign. It thus follows that the offer of the contribution was for the purpose of influencing the Senator's vote.

C. One of the issues presented in this inquiry is whether or not the enumerated activities of Superior Oil Company of California employees brought them within the purview of the Federal Lobbying Act.[3]

If representative government is to continue as the great forum of public expression, individuals and organized groups must be able to petition or otherwise manifest their views to their elected representatives. This is a right conferred by the Constitution. The very expression of such opinion is a vital and necessary service to Congress inasmuch as the presentation of a comprehensive study of particular legislation, to be successful, must be extensive and informative. Legislators are thereby provided with valuable knowledge which might not otherwise be available. Important legislation involves the consideration of a multitude of complex problems which can be solved only through careful analysis and on the basis of extensive practical experience. An individual or group seeking to guide legislation places before Members of Congress the collective ideas, opinions, and conclusions of those represented. Legislators may then evaluate the issues in light of the advice and material brought to their attention by people representing all sides of a controversial subject. It is also by virtue of this presentation of research and experience by groups on opposite sides of proposed legislation that the problem may be brought into proper focus and perspective. This is analogous to our adversary system of dispensing justice wherein evidence and arguments are presented by opposing litigants, then weighed and evaluated by a tribunal in the interest of right and justice.

Attempts to guide and influence the course of legislation by individuals or groups has been defined as lobbying which, as pointed out above, is, in its proper use, a necessary and beneficial adjunct to the orderly processes of government. The danger to rational and enlightened legislative decision is not in being subjected to the arguments of individuals or groups seeking to express their views on particular legislation, but is in the difficulty of evaluating the information furnished when there is concealed from the Member of Congress the identity, purposes, and financial participation of those seeking to influence legislation. Another danger is that of combining political contributions and lobbying. Like oil and water—they do not mix.

It is the conclusion of the select committee that Mr. Neff was engaged in lobbying. In an inept fashion, Neff intended to and in some instances did make contact with Senators. It is significant that he sought to determine their attitude with regard to the natural gas bill. It would be nonsensical to assume that he would have gone to the extensive trouble which he did in acquiring this information unless he further intended to use the information in a manner calculated to bring those opposed or indecisive to a point of view favorable

---

[2] 62 Stat. 692 (1948) provides: "Offer to Member of Congress. Whoever promises, offers, or gives any money or thing of value, or makes or tenders any check, order, contract, undertaking, obligation, gratuity, or security for the payment of money or for the delivery or conveyance of anything of value, to any Member of either House of Congress, or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, either before or after he has qualified, or to any person with his consent, connivance, or concurrence, with intent to influence his action, vote, or decision on any question, matter, cause, or proceeding which may at any time be pending in either House of Congress, or before any committee thereof, or which by law may be brought before him in his capacity as such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, shall be fined not more than three times the amount of such money or value of such thing or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both."

[3] Title III, 60 Stat. 841 (Aug. 2, 1946), the Federal Lobbying Act, sec. 307, "Persons to Whom Applicable," provides: "The provisions of this chapter shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined in ch. 8 of this title, and duly organized State or local committees of a political party), who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes: (a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States; (b) to influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States."

to the bill. There is certainly no prohibition upon gathering information with respect to the potential position of a Member of Congress on any given legislation.

Whether the circumstances of this case required the registration of any persons involved in this inquiry is another question, but is not one necessary for this committee to decide. The incident examined by the select committee does emphasize the need, however, for a substantial clarification of the definition of those acts that constitute lobbying, the areas within which lobbying shall be permitted or proscribed, the ethical standards of conduct which will distinguish between proper and improper contact with Congress respecting legislation, the requirements for full and complete disclosure of those seeking to influence legislation, and the nature and identity of their participation both financially and otherwise. It is the committee's considered opinion that the language of the present Lobbying Act is too vague and loosely defined. Had the act been clear, the course of events examined here might never have happened.

D. Was the $2,500 contribution to Senator CASE's campaign fund made by the Superior Oil Company of California?

The testimony is that this money and, in fact, all of the $7,500 which Mr. Patman gave to Mr. Neff in this situation, was the personal money of Mr. Keck and was not that of Superior Oil. The committee, however, had no opportunity to audit the record of Superior Oil and is entirely dependent upon the statements made in the record concerning this point.

E. The circumstances here have raised the question of whether there was a political contribution by a corporation, in a sense different from that discussed above. The select committee has considered this. The Superior Oil Company of California paid all of the salary and expenses of Mr. Patman and bargained for all of his time. This same corporation paid Mr. Neff's fees and expenses. To the extent that Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff devoted their time to the dispensing of Mr. Keck's funds for political campaigns, was the Superior Oil Company of California making a political contribution? The select committee does not believe that this constituted a political contribution and was not proscribed by the law governing elections and political activities [4] nor was in any other sense illegal. This view has been followed by the courts in a related case.[5]

Disposition of $2,500 contribution

During the course of the hearings the select committee received in evidence the $2,500 which Mr. Neff had attempted to contribute to the campaign fund of Senator CASE. The Senator did not commingle this money with other campaign funds and ultimately on February 1, 1956, divested himself of any semblance of title through rejection of this intended gift.

Whether Senator CASE ever had title or color of title to this money or whether it was an incomplete gift is not necessary to decide. The law abhors a vacuum in title, in the posture of this case as we find it, when the gift was finally rejected by Senator CASE complete ownership of the money became that of Mr. Keck.

In the record there are some variances in statements by witnesses. In addition, there are several specific instances of conflict in and contradictions of sworn testimony. The committee has judged the credibility of each witness on the basis of the record. The matter of perjury is not within the province of this committee to determine. Nor has it been the purpose of the select committee to draw final conclusions regarding any other possible violations of Federal statutes. Such considerations are left to the Department of Justice.

Summation

The select committee, after examining the witnesses and evidence under the revealing light of public scrutiny, has concluded that the objective of the individuals who initiated and carried out this chain of events was to influence by political contribution the vote of a Member of the United States Senate. The select committee condemns such activity.

Lobbying is proper; contributions are proper—but they must not be combined for an ulterior purpose.

This is a case of irresponsibility run riot. Mr. Howard B. Keck delegated his judgment and responsibility with respect to the use of his private funds to an employee, Elmer Patman. Patman, in turn, delegated his judgment and responsibility to John Neff, a friend and Nebraska attorney. Mr. Neff, in a space of 4 months, covered 5 States and sought out the attitude of 10 United States Senators concerning a single piece of legislation. A sum totaling $10,000 was at least considered and spoken of by Mr. Neff as contributions, and $5,000 of this was actually contributed. He exercised incredibly poor judgment. Mr. Patman was responsible for the direction of Mr. Neff's activities and directed this activity either expressly or impliedly. Both Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff are severely censured for their failure to act as responsible citizens in these circumstances.

Mr. Donald Ross, United States Attorney for Nebraska, arranged an appointment for Mr. Neff with Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA of Nebraska. In appreciation of past favors Mr. Neff opened savings accounts for each of Ross' five children and sent the pass books for these accounts to Mr. Ross. He refused to accept them and returned the books within 15 minutes after receiving them. This committee believes that Mr. Ross' conduct in this matter is not reproachable and that he was merely a victim of an environment created by Mr. Neff.

Recommendations

The select committee makes these recommendations:

1. That the Justice Department examine the transcript of these hearings in order to determine whether or not any Federal statutes have been violated, and whether or not there has been any perjury by witnesses in connection with these hearings, and take such action as is appropriate.

2. That the Congress make a thorough and complete study of the Federal Lobbying Act.

The language of the present act is drawn so loosely as to make it difficult for even the best intentioned citizen to determine permissible and proscribed areas of activity, as well as whether he is required to register under the act.

3. That the Congress make a study and reevaluation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

4. That the Congress consider the advisability of amending the election laws to require:

(a) That every candidate for Federal office designate a person or persons as fiscal agent or agents who shall be officially authorized to solicit and accept campaign contributions; that such information be made a matter of public record by being published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community where such agent or agents live, and that evidence of such publication be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) That every person, political committee, group, or other organization making any campaign contribution or contributions, the total sum of which is in excess of $5,000 during any 1 calendar year for the furtherance of the campaign or campaigns of any and all candidates for Federal office, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate a detailed account thereof including the name and address of the person or persons making such contributions, the date or dates made, the amount of such contribution or contributions, and the names and addresses of the candidates to whom said contribution or contributions were made. This information shall be filed not later than 30 days prior to the election. This report should include all contributions received prior to that date. Thirty days after the election a second report should be filed including therein all contributions received subsequent to the date of the first report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have another request to make, and then I shall speak briefly.

The first recommendation by the select committee in its report was that the Justice Department examine the transcript of its hearings to determine whether or not any Federal statutes had been violated in the matter which was the subject of the inquiry or in the proceedings thereunder. The subject, it was generally known, was under investigation by the Department of Justice. Day before yesterday, late in the afternoon, it was announced by Attorney General Brownell that certain indictments had been returned by a Federal grand jury in the matter. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to place in the RECORD at this point an account of that action as reported in two of the Capital City newspapers.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1956]

TWO LAWYERS INDICTED IN GAS LOBBY—NEFF AND PATMAN ACCUSED WITH OIL COMPANY IN OFFER TO SENATOR

(By Morrey Dunie)

Two lawyers and the Superior Oil Co., key figures in last winter's natural gas lobby investigation, were indicted yesterday by a Federal grand jury.

The attorneys were John M. Neff, of Lexington, Nebr., who admitted offering a $2,500 campaign contribution to Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, while working for the oil company, and Elmer Patman, of Austin, Tex., a full-time lawyer for Superior.

The six-count indictment alleges a conspiracy to violate Federal lobbying laws, an attempt to influence CASE unlawfully, and four violations of the lobbying statutes.

Although the indictment came as a surprise, the grand jury has been investigating the Neff-Patman-Superior matter since last February, Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr., said yesterday the probe will continue.

Case ignited the situation February 3 when he dramatically disclosed to the Senate that he had rejected a $2,500 contribution by a lawyer who favored the natural gas bill.

Despite the furor raised by Case's disclosure and a unanimous Senate vote to investigate it, the natural gas bill passed the Senate by a vote of 53 to 38. But President Eisenhower, although favoring the measure to exempt natural-gas producers from direct Federal control, vetoed the bill.

The President said he favored its objectives but felt he should veto the legislation because of the "arrogant" efforts of a small segment of the gas and oil industry "to push it through * * * in defiance of acceptable standards of propriety."

Neff, Patman, and Superior were charged with conspiring between October 1, 1955, and February 6, 1956, to carry out alleged lobbying

[4] 62 Stat. 723 (1948), amended, 63 Stat. 90 (1949).

[5] See *United States* v. *Construction and General Laborers' Local Union No. 264* (101 Fed. Supp. 809, D. C. W. D. Mo (1951)).

activities without meeting the registration requirement of the lobbying laws.

Part of the conspiracy, the grand jury alleged, arose when Neff and Patman received money from Howard B. Keck, president of Superior, "to be used principally to aid in the passage" of the Harris-Fulbright (natural gas) bill.

The conspiracy count also charged that Neff and Patman were to "make personal contact" with various Senators and to "cause to be compiled a pamphlet or brochure entitled 'The Natural Gas Issue—Background,' which would fail to disclose thereon its author or sponsor, and which would be designed * * * to support and influence the passage" of the measure.

Among the overt acts mentioned by the grand jury to support the conspiracy accusation were allegations that Patman gave Neff $2,500 last October 28 and $5,000 more last January 12, and Neff talked with Senators ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican of Nebraska, and CARL T. CURTIS, Republican of Nebraska, concerning the then-pending gas bill and that last October 28 Patman gave Neff a list of Senators "who were considered to be favorably disposed" toward the measure as well as those opposed to it and other Senators whose positions were considered doubtful.

In the second count, Neff and Patman are charged with unlawfully offering CASE $2,500 "with intent on the part of said defendants, to influence the action, vote and decision of the said FRANCIS CASE" on the natural gas proposal.

William A. Paisley, the Justice Department lawyer who conducted most of the grand jury's investigation, said this charge is based on a law pertaining to Congressmen and is comparable to a bribery offer.

The remaining four counts in the indictment charged substantive violations of the lobbying regulations. The allegations are:

1. That Neff was employed by Superior for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage of the natural gas bill; that he personally contacted HRUSKA and CURTIS in an effort to persuade them to vote favorably on the bill, and that he did these things without first registering as a lobbyist.

2. That Patman received money to be used in obtaining the passage of pending legislation; that he caused the issuance of the pamphlet designed to influence passage of the natural gas measure, and that he did not register as a lobbyist.

3. That Patman received $3,000 May 23, 1955, from Keck for lobbying purposes but did not file a statement giving the data on the contribution.

4. That Patman received $5,000 from Keck last November 9 and $2,500 from Superior last December 5 for lobbying activities and did not file the statements required by law.

Attorney Rober Robb, representing Patman and Superior, said yesterday, "We're confident we'll be vindicated." According to the Associated Press, Neff had "no comment at this time" on the indictment.

Paisley said the maximum penalties possible are: For conspirary, a $5,000 fine and/or imprisonment for 1 year; for giving money to a Congressman with intent to influence him, three times the amount of the money and/or 3 years imprisonment; each lobbying violation carries a maximum of a $5,000 fine and/or 1 year imprisonment.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 24, 1956]

TWO INDICTED IN GAS BILL LOBBYING—NEFF, PATMAN NAMED ALONG WITH OIL FIRM—UNITED STATES CHARGES STEM FROM $2,500 OFFER TO SENATOR CASE

(By Howard L. Dutkin)

A Federal grand jury today indicted Attorney John M. Neff, Elmer Patman, a lawyer for the Superior Oil Co. of Austin, Tex., and the corporation itself on charges of violating the Lobbying Act.

The charges stem from a $2,500 offer as a campaign contribution from Mr. Neff to Senator CASE, Republican, of South Dakota, during congressional consideration of the natural-gas bill.

Neff and Patman also were indicted on charges of offering "a thing of value" to a Member of Congress to influence his actions. The oil company was charged only with conspiracy.

Senator CASE, whose revelations brought about an inquiry in which Messrs. Neff and Patman and Superior Oil were named, learned of the indictments from a reporter for the Star. The Senator refused to comment.

PROBE TO CONTINUE

The indictment was returned before Federal Judge Charles F. McLaughlin in United States district court. Attorney General Brownell announced that the grand jury investigation, underway since last February, would continue.

Neff and Patman also were indicted on four other counts charging violations of the Lobbying Act.

Maximum penalty for the conspiracy charge is a $5,000 fine and 12 months' imprisonment. Maximum for the charge of trying to buy a Congress Member's actions is a fine of 3 times the amount of the bribe plus 3 years in prison.

The indictment charged that the two attorneys and the oil company organized the alleged conspiracy beginning in October 1955. The conspiracy extended, it was asserted, until last February during which time the natural gas bill had been passed by the House and was awaiting Senate debate.

WERE NOT TO REGISTER

The indictment declared that the heart of the conspiracy was that Neff and Patman should collect from the oil company and from Howard B. Keck, president of the corporation, funds to be used to push through the natural gas bill.

As part of this, the indictment charged Neff and Patman were to press for passage of the legislation without registering as lobbyists.

The two men, it was asserted, were to contact Senators and to bring pressure on others to persuade Senators to vote for the bill.

Among the overt acts listed as furthering the conspiracy were:

1. On January 12, 1956, Patman gave Neff $5,000.

2. On the same day Neff visited Senator CASE's office to discuss the bill, but did not see him.

3. Neff also discussed the bill with Senators ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska, and CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska.

4. On October 28, 1955, Patman gave Neff $2,500.

5. On the same day Patman gave Neff a list of Senators. The list included names of those considered in favor of the bill, those considered against it and those whose positions were doubtful.

6. Patman and Superior distributed a brochure on the gas issue to Senators in violation of lobbying provisions.

In another count of the indictment, Neff and Patman were charged with unlawfully, knowingly, and willfully offering $2,500 to Senator CASE to influence his vote.

DISCLOSED OFFER

The Senator voted against the bill and revealed the offer to the Senate after rejecting it.

Patman also was accused of personally visiting Senators to press for passage of the measure while having failed to register as a lobbyist with the House Clerk and the Secretary of the Senate.

The gas bill, although passed by the Senate, was vetoed by President Eisenhower who, at the same time, criticized the actions of some interested parties.

Following Senator CASE's revelation, the Senate organized inquiries into the gas bill situation and lobbying in general.

The case was presented to the grand jury by Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney and William A. Paisley, special assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have no desire to reopen debate either on the natural gas bill or the incident which was thrust upon me in relation thereto, and for which those active in the legislation here in the Congress, pro or con, had no responsibility whatsoever. I do think, however, that in order that the record may be clear for anyone who may have occasion to review this matter in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I should speak briefly on three aspects of the affair.

First, I did not make my speech of February 3 as a means of making charges against anybody. I made it to give my reasons for voting against the then pending bill.

As clearly and directly as I could, in that speech and in subsequent discussion of it, I said that the fact that the attempt to put a large sum of money into my campaign fund by a party or parties interested in the passage of the pending bill gave weight to the argument that somebody expected to make large profits from the passage of the bill and made me concerned lest the bill did not adequately protect the public interest.

I made no charge of bribery as such. Nobody made any proposition to me. No promise was made by me—nor was any asked. But I wholly agree with the conclusion of the select committee that—

> Contributions are entirely within the bounds of propriety when the purpose for which they are given is the election of the Member and not for the purpose of influencing his vote. The circumstances here partake of a meaning making almost inexorable the conclusion that the paramount motivation for this contribution was interest in the natural gas bill as contrasted with aiding Senator CASE's campaign. It thus follows that the offer of the contribution was for the purpose of influencing the Senator's vote (p. 9 of report).

The day that I established the identity between the man who had left the money in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., 9 days before I ever heard about it, with the name mentioned only casually in a letter received 2 months earlier as having inquired about my position on the gas bill, that day I immediately by telegram directed that it be returned if possible, and at the first moment I could get recognition, made my speech on the floor of the Senate the next day.

In fact, when I first heard that such a sum as $2,500 in hundred-dollar bills had been left with a person not connected with my campaign in any way, I had requested that the money be held intact in the way in which it was received and not spent, deposited, or mingled in any way with any funds for my benefit.

My speech of February 3 told of the incident to illustrate why I thought we

should retain Federal regulation until it was certain that the legislation carried adequate protection for consumers and the public interest.

Second, I wish to have the record clear that there was uncertainty as to how I might vote on the natural-gas bill.

My letter of December 14, written in response to the inquiry made through the party at Sioux Falls said that while I inclined to favor it, I was retaining "freedom of action" should it appear upon analysis that the bill had issues which conflicted with what I understood to be its main purpose—"maintaining State control for intrastate development."

The letters in my office, written on January 11 and 12 in response to letters from constituents, presumably the letters which Mr. Neff saw when he called at the office and talked with my legislative clerk, those letters clearly left in doubt how I might vote on the bill. They carried this language:

> The bill has received a great deal of discussion by proponents and opponents, and I shall be very much interested in following the debate on the floor. I should like, of course, to be assured that the natural gas consumer will not be charged exorbitant prices for the product, but I question the advisability of the Federal Government exercising control of commodities at their source.

There was no pledge in any letter to vote one way or another on the bill.

I mention these points, Mr. President, only because it appears that some persons thought I was committed to vote for the bill and that if so, I should have continued to vote for it regardless of the offer of the money for reelection purposes. They possibly have not known of these passages in my letters and they overlooked what I have stated earlier—namely, that the attempted use of large sums of money to influence a vote of itself, in my opinion, indicated that the bill offered extraordinary profits to some and was deficient in protection of the public interest.

As for Mr. Neff's idea of how certain or uncertain my vote was, his letter to the effect that I was a wise legislator to withhold judgment until the debate on the bill took place and the fact that I was in the "doubtful column" on the list which the select committee discovered appear to be reasonable indications.

So, I would have the record clear on the fact that I had not been committed to vote on the bill one way or the other until I made the speech of February 3.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the select committee and its work. Seldom, if ever, has a committee been created that placed upon exceedingly busy senators the extra chore that service on this particular committee entailed.

To each of the four, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], whose abilities and high sense of honor have so eloquently been mentioned on the floor of the Senate in recent days, chairman; the distinguished and venerable Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a man whom I admired long before I came to this body; the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], dean of the Republican Senators, who entered the Senate when I first entered the House of Representatives, and with whom I shared my first national radio hookup as a freshman Member of Congress many years ago; and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], loved and respected in my State of South Dakota, which was the State of his birth—to each of these Senators I wish to express my deep appreciation for the diligence with which they applied themselves to the extra burden of work and to the impartiality with which they pursued their responsibilities.

My President, I also wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, and to the distinguished minority leader, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, of California. They were courteous to me in every respect during the ordeal or during the proceedings incident to the creation of the select committee and in all matters relating thereto.

They submitted to me the resolution which they proposed to present to the Senate. They consulted with me on its wording and made a modification in it. It is true, of course, that I did not ask for the resolution, but I felt that the resolution should be presented, and it was their judgment that it should be. I certainly wanted to cooperate with them.

So to the members of the select committee and to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader I express my full appreciation for their courtesies and for their meeting of their responsibilities, which were extraordinary and which were over and above the normal duties they had at that particular time.

In this matter, as I suppose in any other, a very complicated pattern develops through trivial incidents which have no natural relationship, but which profoundly affect the course of its development. As I reflect on it, I suppose the committee was led at the outset to think that in one respect my account of the affair was deficient, namely, my statement that I had had no idea of the connections or interests of Mr. Neff other than that found by mention of his last name in a letter of inquiry many weeks earlier. The committee had reason to think, until the evidence in sworn testimony showed otherwise, that I might have had a visit or visits, by telephone or otherwise, with Mr. Neff concerning his interest in my vote.

But a careful checking of telephone calls, which was made unknown to me, both here and in Sioux Falls, a checking of itineraries, and direct testimony under oath of all parties concerned, however, fully sustained by statements that there had been no such visits and no direct contacts or acquaintance between me and any of the persons connected with the Superior Oil Co.

As a final comment, Mr. President, I wish to express the hope that the additional recommendations of the Select Committee dealing with improvements of our laws relating to campaign contributions and the conduct of elections will be given further attention by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

In that connection, I would suggest that consideration be given to a revolutionary approach to campaign contributions that would make it legal for any person or any organization to contribute to political campaigns "provided"—and I put "provided" in quoted letters by way of emphasis—the contribution be made by traceable means—check or draft—and that it be made not later than 15 days prior to an election and that it be reported not later than 10 days before the election by the candidate or committee to whom it is given. Such a change would make it possible for labor organizations, trade associations, professional societies, corporations or individuals, to contribute directly within specified amounts and get away from subterfuge, split committees, and devices of whatever character that our outdated election laws now invite.

The people, Mr. President, can be trusted greatly—if they are given the facts on which to make their judgments.

The security of our institutions rests with the freedom of informed expression whether in the ballot box or in the Halls of Congress. I close by repeating a sentence from my remarks on the resolution creating the select committee, February 6, when I said:

> My faith, Mr. President, is the belief that Government can be free, that good laws can be written, only when the minds of the men who write them are free.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4058) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and

for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. TABER, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. HAND, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, throughout the 20 years of Democratic leadership in this country—under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman—tremendous strides were taken in the field of civil rights.

Minority groups in the United States for the first time caught sight of their deserved goal of first-class citizenship.

It is acutely distressing to me that progress toward this goal has been halted in the tangles of a parliamentary jungle.

This is especially distressing in view of the fact that the very minimum of what we could expect in the way of progress was contained in a bill which had passed the House. But when the bill reached the Senate, it was sucked into the legalistic quicksand.

Senate activities on the subject of civil rights, far from being concerned with the merits of the bill at hand, were confined solely to parliamentary maneuvering. To bottle up the bill, on the one hand, and to spring it loose, on the other.

It is a sad departure from the role of this body to consider legislation on its merits.

I believe there were two major issues before the 84th Congress—support of the Supreme Court's decision on segregation in schools and at least a minimum advance in civil rights legislation. I do not like to think we have failed.

INTERNATIONALISM OR ISOLATIONISM?—BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a great struggle is going on within the American mind to determine whether our "internationalist policy should be continued at its present pace and form or whether we shall revert to isolationism.

No matter where a person stands in this internationalist-isolationist axis, we cannot deny that the success of our foreign policy depends first of all upon a thorough knowledge and understanding of the behavior of this earth's peoples—not just the diplomats, nor the politicians, but the common people of all lands. Without an intimate knowledge and thorough understanding of their deepest motivations, their interests, and their cherished ambitions, we cannot expect to tailor our policies to the environment in which they must operate.

The great battle which goes on throughout the world to free men's minds from the straitjacket of communism—is one that will go on endlessly. Some of the greatest battles to free men's minds will be fought in the less-well-developed areas of the world.

Areas that will achieve greater significance as we progress; areas in which we lack adequate knowledge of the cultural background, habits, customs, mores, and the underlying motivations and interests of these people.

I therefore propose, Mr. President, a plan which is set forth in a bill which I now introduce; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD, so that it may be studied by Members of Congress and by the people of this country, for consideration in the next session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4293) to promote individual liberty and development through international understanding, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds that, in order to complement the notable efforts of the private and governmental organizations of this country to diffuse the principles of individual freedom and development, it is necessary to obtain a broader base of understanding with all peoples of the world, particularly in areas less advanced economically. Therefore the purposes of this act are (1) to encourage the establishment and development of programs of study of the cultural background, habits, customs, mores, and underlying motivations and interests of such people in order that we may obtain a knowledge and understanding of them which, if available, would make it possible to bring to them a better comprehension of our principles of individual freedom and development, and (2) to assist people in economically less advanced areas to better develop their human and natural resources by providing more and better facilities for learning.

SEC. 2. The United States Commissioner of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") is authorized and directed to make grants out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this act, subject to the provisions of this act and such other conditions and requirements as the Commissioner may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, to public and nonprofit private universities and colleges in order that such universities and colleges may (1) develop and carry out programs of organized study by United States citizens of the cultural background, habits, customs, more, and underlying motivations and interests of the people in foreign countries in which such studies are invited, and (2) establish or expand, or both, centers of learning in foreign countries for the purpose of providing to the people in economically less advanced areas of the world access to modern techniques and sciences in order that they may develop their human and natural resources. Wherever possible the programs provided for in clauses (1) and (2) of this section shall be undertaken conjunctively.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to receive grants provided for in this act a college or university shall—

(1) submit a program, acceptable to the Commissioner, to carry out the purposes of this act or part of such purposes, and agree to use and use any such grants only as provided in such program;

(2) provide in such program for such participation in the cost of such program as may be possible, and for the encouragement of private foundations and organizations to take part in such participation;

(3) provide in any such program for study in foreign countries that only mature individuals of high intellectual capacity, having at least 3 years of education beyond the high school level, will be selected to make such study, and that such individuals will make such study in supervised organized groups; and

(4) provide in any such program for study in foreign countries that all information obtained in such study will be collected in usable form and made available to the Commissioner.

(b) Except as specifically provided in this act colleges and universities shall be allowed the widest possible discretion in developing programs to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. In order to more effectively carry out the purposes of this act, the Commissioner shall—

(1) coordinate the programs undertaken under this act by colleges and universities;

(2) make arrangements with any Federal departments or agencies offering language training in order that such training may be made available as needed to individuals participating in programs under this act; and

(3) collect information obtained in programs under this act and make such information available to the Librarian of Congress for public use.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I recently heard a man of God say:

If we are to understand these people, we must speak with them; and if we are to speak with them, we must meet with them; and if we are to meet with them, it must be on their own level.

No words could express more adequately our needs and our weapons in the struggle to free men's minds.

To complement the present private and Government efforts to facilitate our gathering progress in these areas, I am submitting a program to encourage study abroad by Americans of the social, economic, cultural, and ethnic attributes of the nations of the world—but particularly of those areas in which such knowledge is lacking.

In the past 180 years our Nation has gone from one extreme position to another. Our first President announced in his Farewell Address the principles which were to guide American foreign policy for more than a century. He said:

Our detached and distance situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. * * * Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

The Monroe Doctrine confirmed this policy in 1823 when the President said:

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers.

It was not until our participation in World War I that we attained a sense of international awareness. This was short-lived. During the roaring twenties and through the thirties we saw a reversal of that feeling. We were bombarded with isolationist propaganda.

We had the Oxford movement in which students swore they would never again enter military service to fight for their country. The general acceptance of an extreme isolationist position blinded us to several incidents in the 1930's that were the storm flags—the forerunners and indicators of what was to follow during the 1940's. Despite this, only a vicious attack upon Hawaii destroying the greater part of the American fleet, finally electrified an isolationist, sleeping people into action.

By the end of World War II the leadership of the world had been thrust upon us. During the ensuing years we have devoted $50 billion in economic and military assistance to our friends and neighbors throughout the world in an attempt—

First. To make them economically strong and able to resist the onrushing tide of communism;

Second. To give them military supplies for self-protection against Communist military force, and

Third. To provide technical assistance and know-how as well as supplies with which to develop and build their own economies against the poverty which is an invitation to communism.

Moreover, our assistance has not been limited to our wartime allies. We have demanded of the conquered—not the historical tribute of conquering nations—but merely the will to rebuild themselves along lines which would offer possibilities for individual and moral freedom.

To accomplish this, we have exacted tribute—but it has been from ourselves, the victors.

Is it any wonder then, that even the most internationalist and generous of us, is dismayed by some of the apparent results of this policy?

Today it is difficult to pick up a newspaper without finding some reference to Cyprus, or India, or Israel, or Japan, or Italy, or even France or Great Britain with whom we have cherished the ideals of equality and fraternity for over 200 years—without finding evidences of resentment of the United States.

In some degree, our troubles are the heritage of leadership. Britain found out in the last century that leadership cannot be carried on without offense to some people—part of the time. In part, our problems spring from our great wealth, because starvation and disease is no stranger to most of the world's peoples.

Another element should be added to this: The surge of national consciousness, now possessing many countries of the world—a surge not unlike our own 200 years ago. We, as a nation, should understand this in others better than any other nation on this earth. Russia understands it, and reverts it to her own purpose.

We have this perplexing, contradictory world: The victorious nation exacts tribute of itself, and its generosity is returned with resentment, and sometimes insults.

As a natural reaction to foreign criticism and distrust of the United States, Americans are showing an inclination to return to the hibernation of the isolated state.

There has arisen in this country a perplexity and frustration evidenced by the following excerpts from letters I have received on this subject:

MARCH 23, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: * * * I think it is time that America started looking out for herself, and for her citizens, instead of being so much concerned with foreign nations. To give aid of any kind to any nations such as India is the rankest nonsense in my opinion. I don't mind paying high taxes for anything that will benefit this Nation, but I do strongly object to being taxed to support Frenchmen who won't pay an income tax, or socialistic experiments in Great Britain, dams in Egypt * * *.

JUNE 19, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: People are convinced that most of this money goes down the drain as pure waste. We have demonstrated that we can neither purchase friends with our American dollars, nor stem the tide of communism by trying to play the role of Santa Claus. Fifty-four billion dollars since 1945 is a tremendous sum of money, especially from a government that is terribly in debt and unable to meet its current expenses without borrowing. Is it not time to call a halt to this reckless and wasteful showering of billions on nations that secretly dislike us? * * *

JUNE 18, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: If you wish to keep faith with the voters, scuttle foreign aid entirely——lock, stock, and barrel. No more money down Tito's rathole or any other. This is one program that the President is entirely wrong on. It is unconstitutional, unproductive, creates nothing but ill will, and is too costly.

The idea of security and friendship through it, is false and erroneous. Point out one friend, or any security gained through it. We will always have to defend ourselves and any allies, and we haven't a real durable friend on the world of nations, other than by way of getting out of us what they can.

This does not mean we should follow a program of isolation, but merely one of worldly good sense. Let's use this sense instead of our cents * * *.

I quote these letters, Mr. President, as an example of the thinking I am sure is being indulged by a great many people. I would not say it is the thinking of a majority, but of a great number of people in the United States.

More and more Americans are beginning to believe, as they did in the 1930's, that we should resolve ourselves into Fortress America and simply ignore the rest of the world. Can we do this? Should we do this? To these questions I shall devote myself briefly.

Because of its geographical location, an isolationist philosophy has always been natural to our great country.

This was pointed out in the Monroe Doctrine and in the Farewell Address of our first President, to which I have already referred.

To the east and to the west, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans formed a great barrier which permitted us to live through most of the history of this Nation in an isolated paradise. We were blessed with friendly folks to the north, and, except for two short periods, have had peace on our southern borders.

During the last 50 years, the new fast ships, and more lately the airplane, have moved Europe and Asia closer to us than the adjoining county seat was in our grandfathers' day. In this way, we have been forced into extending the horizons of our own thinking. We have had to start thinking of other countries and our relationship to them, as European countries have had to do for centuries. As our economy expanded, we demanded and received more raw materials—rubber, tin, uranium—almost endless is the list of raw materials we have swallowed up and used in our industrial machine.

In addition to these changes, after World War II the world looked to us as the sole surviving source of supply and for moral leadership. The other countries looked to us for military leadership. They looked to us for manpower, for technical know-how. The strongest nations—Japan, Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Italy—and most of the industrialized world were prostrated by their war efforts; so the rest of the world sought our leadership, and it was necessary for us to extend our generosity to them and enable them to rebuild their countries and their economies. This position of world leadership is not one that the United States wished; it is not one that it asked for; and it is not one that we seek to retain—just for the sake of leadership. These, then, are a few of the inexorable forces that have led us to world leadership.

Having shown an unprecedented beneficence toward our former allies and our former enemies, the American people find it hard to understand why dislike for United States is apparently so widespread. But if, in response to this dislike, we abdicate leadership, there will be a vacuum, and no peace. Without peace, there will inevitably be engulfment by or war with the Soviet bloc.

We cannot abandon this leadership. The alternatives are too stark in their reality. But continuing leadership does not necessarily mean that we must continue foreign aid in its present form. There are other alternatives.

Since this leadership is inevitable, so far as the foreseeable future is concerned, we must, as practical Americans, and also as idealists, determine what elements not fully employed in the past can make that leadership fruitful in expanding man's desire to be free and to achieve a peaceful world.

It is not my intention at this time, Mr. President, to go into certain fundamental mistakes and grevious errors that have been made in the last 15 years in American foreign policy.

But one of the things we must ask ourselves is: What aspects of our actions have failed to bring other nations to a recognition of the value of individual freedom that we cherish in our hearts? And we must ask ourselves whether we really believe in that freedom, or whether we are merely rendering lip-service to it.

In the assistance which we have given to other countries, we may have paraded our own wealth arrogantly—and with too much emphasis on the material aspects of our achievements.

What we do have in America, we have achieved because of the Spartan sacrifices of our forefathers, their devotion to Almighty God, and an enterprising nature that has become indigenous to this country.

We have fought for freedom again and again.

We have established an elaborate governmental process to enshrine and preserve the principles of freedom.

We, who are Americans, must just as surely and certainly believe that this spark of freedom, this desire to be free, this desire to speak freely, to worship freely, to assemble freely, and to publish the fruits of our mind freely—all of these must exist in the breast of every man and woman alive upon this earth.

The true nature of freedom includes the compulsion to provide to all who live the same rights which we have ourselves. Obviously, we can never reconcile communism with this statement of freedom.

We know and recognize—as a part of our basic belief—that as each and every one of our fellow creatures is endowed with this great individual dignity, it must be nourished and fanned to flame wherever it exists.

So, Mr. President, if through our great military, economic, and technical assistance, we have failed to carry forth to other nations the spark of this great fundamental belief, there must be a logical reason for this failure. It is ironic that we could share with others so much of our material wealth, and yet so little of the essence of America.

Why is this true and what can we do?

We must, as has been said, understand these people, meet with them, and speak with them, but on their own level.

That is to say, Mr. President, we must understand the minds, the hearts, the cultural, national, and ethnic backgrounds of all the peoples of the world. We must, in effect, undertake motivational research in our efforts to make truly free the minds of the world's peoples.

For example, what do we actually know about the Arab nations, other than what is recorded in the history books? What is the great surge of nationalism doing to the attitudes of the Arab peoples, and what do they really dream of and hope for? And what do we know about the thinking of the Indonesians and the Burmese? And what about Africa, with its teeming millions? Here will probably be fought the most decisive battle of all, for men's minds; yet we know very little about them. And, last, what do we know about the millions behind the Iron Curtain, the countries now under Communist domination in southeast Europe, who have contributed so many thousands of builders and dreamers to our great American melting pot.

The answer must be that we know so pitifully little about a great portion of the world that will help us to preserve or lose our freedom.

I therefore propose, Mr. President, a plan which is set forth in a bill that I have introduced, to be studied by this Congress and by the people of this country, for consideration in the next session of Congress.

I propose that we make grants to American universities, to facilitate study abroad by mature and highly qualified students with a minimum of 3 years of college education. The grants would go to institutions willing to organize student teams for extended study, under faculty supervision, in nations where they are invited. To encourage university assistance to other peoples, some of these grants would go to universities which will undertake to organize schools and facilities for the training of local people, as well. By joining the education of Americans with the provision of knowledge to foreigners, through universities operating abroad, I hope to obtain the mutuality of effort which is necessary for the furtherance of international understanding and to provide a long-run basis for continued interchange of knowledge on a private basis.

More than 50 universities and colleges have well-developed programs for the study of particular areas of the world. By the addition of funds, we can exploit the existing resources of our American educational system to further international understanding. International understanding is best gained through "on-the-ground" laboratory work abroad; and the heavy costs of foreign study cannot, of course, be fully met by tuition payments. After the initial stages of development, I would hope that additional institutions of higher education would enter this field, which may be so productive to our future welfare. I further hope that as this program proves itself successful, additional financing can be found among private foundations and American business, to the end that the Federal Government may recede from the primary position.

Currently, many Americans are studying abroad, to gain fuller understanding of foreign areas and ideas. Last year, some 6,000 or 7,000 Americans were enrolled in foreign universities. Nearly 3,000 of these were supported by the GI bill, approximately 1,000 held United States Government grants, 600 or more had grants from private sponsors, and between 300 and 350 were studying on socalled "junior-year-abroad" arrangements.

A number of well organized and effective programs has been in operation to assist American study abroad. Under the well-known Fulbright-Smith-Mundt program, some 6,000 Americans have studied in foreign universities. But these grants are made only for study at the graduate level and in 1954 only 38 percent of the grants went to students who had just received their bachelors degree. In other words, a degree above that of bachelor is required in order to qualify for these grants, for the most part.

A number of American universities have made it possible for their students to study abroad in the third year of their college education. These programs are supervised by American faculty members and have the general purposes of providing American students an opportunity to live in another country, to acquire fluency in another language, and to obtain a better understanding of another culture. Certain American foundations have undertaken to finance study abroad by Americans. Perhaps chief among these is the Ford Foundation. In its last fiscal year the Ford Foundation granted 161 foreign area training fellowships which, in some instances, financed foreign travel. With few exceptions, these grants have been made to graduate students or faculty members. The Ford Foundation has also made grants to a number of universities for the support of their foreign-area studies. In addition, a number of American colleges and universities have partnership relations with foreign institutions which have involved exchanges of students and instructors.

There is much to be gained by giving American universities the chief role in the prosecution of this plan. Existing State Department programs have had some difficulty in distinguishing themselves from American diplomacy and foreign policy objectives with a consequent diminution of their value in furthering international understanding. It is recognized that the history of the Fulbright program has shown, according to a report of a recent conference on international exchange, that the most successful Fulbright projects have been those in which Commissions, American and foreign universities, professional societies, and private educational philanthropic foundations have collaborated. An additional advantage in making the university the focal point of this program is that the benefits are more likely to redound to the university staff and student body as a whole than just to the individual who pursues his own studies abroad. The long-range benefits to universities of this program are found in the fact that these young students who gain knowledge and interest will become the future scholars of their staffs, the future applicants for foundation grants.

In the interest of gaining true understanding, we shall avoid sending excessive numbers of cloistered scholars to work with other cloistered scholars. The purpose and intent of this program is not to furnish scientific people or people who have been perfected in professions, in an interchange with the world, but to send students to those countries to live with them, to study the language, and to learn to really know the peoples of the various individual countries. Despite the very great value of some of the existing programs, the emphasis on several years of graduate study, in the words of a conference organized by the Institute of International Education, "inevitably limits the peoples-speaking-to-peoples aspect of the exchange." In order to permit the unspecialized student to participate effectively in this program, I propose that the language training facilities of Federal agencies be opened for intensive use by participants prior to their study abroad. To date, language barriers have deterred extensive travel and study in many newly important nations; evidence of this is found in the fact that almost 40 percent of the Fulbright applications have been made for scholarships in the United Kingdom. I may also suggest that language barriers have prevented a full understanding of many of the peoples of the world.

The institutions receiving grants would be allowed the widest possible discretion feasible to develop and direct the program, including the selection of students. The Commissioner of Education would have general responsibility for

administering this program, including the approval of the proposed program by the various institutions to the end that duplication is minimized. The universities involved shall cooperate with the Commission of Education and with the Librarian of Congress to accumulate and make available for general use the product of the studies abroad financed by this plan.

I do not contend that this proposal will itself solve the major problem of our time. But, by gaining understanding and knowledge by Americans of foreign peoples—that is, foreign to us, but not to themselves—I believe we can add another rung to the ladder of peace. As Secretary of State Dulles has said:

> We believe that human contacts are designed, not to serve governmental purposes, but to enable the members of the human family to have the understanding and the knowledge of each other which is a foundation for durable peace.

So, Mr. President, I offer this bill for the consideration and study of Congress. In the language of the bill, the purposes of the bill are—

> (1) To encourage the establishment and development of programs of study of the cultural background, habits, customs, modes and underlying motivations and interests of such people in order that we may obtain a knowledge and understanding of them which, if available, would make it possible to bring to them a better comprehension of our principles of individual freedom and development, and (2) to assist people in economically less advanced areas to better develop their human and natural resources by providing more and better facilities for learning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator for the scholarly address which he has just delivered. I know that he has given this subject a great deal of thought and consideration. I want him to know that many of us on this side of the aisle consider that he has made a distinct contribution to a better understanding of the foreign policy of this country, and that we appreciate the fact that he has come forward with some recommendations which have a great deal to merit and which we hope will be given serious consideration.

The Senator from Colorado is to be highly complimented for his very able address.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank my good friend for his more than kind words. It is my sincere hope that the bill will provoke discussion and later, legislation, to accomplish its purposes, which I am sure are the purposes of all Americans, including all Senators, no matter on which side of the aisle they may sit.

RETURN OF ALIEN PROPERTY SEIZED DURING WORLD WAR II

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on a subject which I regard most important to our national interest.

Time will not permit consideration of legislation proposing return of alien property seized during World War II. I appreciate the hard work of the Senate Judiciary Committee in studying this expansive subject and reporting a comprehensive bill to the Senate. It is to be hoped that the work of the committee will merit action on this important subject early in the next session.

One very important and timely aspect of return of seized property is the need for manifestation of good faith toward the government of West Germany. I think no one will disagree with me when I say that the present government of West Germany under the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer is the most friendly to the United States of any government in our history. It shares our ideals and principles of democracy and there is between our Government and the Adenauer government a feeling of mutual confidence and of a common purpose in maintaining freedom and resisting dictatorship whether of the right or of the left. West Germany's participation in NATO, its opposition to neutralism and its continuing and firm resistance to seemingly attractive Soviet proposals show that it intends to adhere not only to the partnership agreement it has made with us, but also that it intends to be a partner of firmness and strength. Our self-interest in the present posture of West Germany compels our sincere manifestation of complete good faith.

A second aspect of this important problem is our adherence to the moral law. We are not a government of men and we cannot afford to temporize on an issue so fundamental as our recognition of the right of private property. Seizure of property during a time of conflict is not confiscation. It is a temporary measure to support national security. Return of seized property is an American principle supported since the founding of our Government. Any action to subvert that principle would be unthinkable.

The closing hours of this session void any opportunity to consider the merit of this important issue. I am in hopes it can be brought before the Senate early in the next session of the Congress.

REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY—X

THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today concludes the series of remarks on the international situation and foreign policy which I began last January. This final statement is the tenth in the series. It is in the nature of a summing up.

When this series was initiated some months ago I knew that time would not permit me to discuss this subject as fully as it ought to be discussed. While the sum of these remarks is extensive, as the Members who have listened patiently to them are well aware, there are, nevertheless, gaps, important gaps.

I have passed over many details in the previous statements on southeast Asia, north Africa, the Middle East, the African Continent, Latin America, Europe, the Far East, and the Soviet Union. Moreover, lack of time has made it impossible for me to survey our good relations with Canada, our not-so-good relations with south Asia, and the status of our relations with the Southwest Pacific. Yet each of these areas is the scene of developments that are of great significance to the United States.

In this, as in so many other matters which confront us, the press of Senate business leaves us little choice. We do the best that we can and then hope that it is not too little.

I do not know whether this series of statements has done justice to the question of the international situation and our foreign policy. It is only one Senator's effort. While I do not regret the effort, I recognize its limitations.

Even the limited attempt may be regarded in certain quarters as unwarranted. I know that there are some who hold foreign policy to be of little concern to the Senate or Congress. Foreign policy, they say, is too remote from the interests of ordinary citizens. But, Mr. President, if World War II could cost Montana the grief of 4,000 casualties, as it did, then foreign policy is not remote from the interests of the citizens of my State. If the Korean conflict could inflict 500 casualties on my State, as it did, then foreign policy is a matter of vital importance to the Senators from Montana. If, in a decade, national-defense requirements can extract $300 billion from the earnings and wages of the American people and aid programs place on them an additional charge of $50 billion, as they have, then foreign policy is of the greatest significance to every citizen of this country.

If foreign policy can influence the course of world events toward peace or war, as it does, then the Senate of the United States has more than a casual concern in the matter.

This body has a deep obligation. We have a profound obligation to make what contribution we can to improving the Nation's foreign policy. In a nuclear age, with the dangers of sudden atomic annihilation ever present, it is perhaps an obligation beyond all others.

The Constitution reminds us of that obligation if, in our concern with pressing and important domestic issues, we are prone to forget it. From the Constitution, the President derives the power to conduct the foreign policy of the United States. And from the Constitution, the Senate derives the responsibility "to advise and to consent" in foreign relations.

The President's power is not expressed in the Constitution but it is clearly implied. The Senate's responsibility is not expressed but it, too, is clearly implied.

I have upheld the powers of the Presidency in foreign policy even when it has seemed to me that the President was intent upon delegating them to the Congress. I shall continue to do so. In the same fashion, I have sought to uphold the responsibilities of the Senate in foreign relations whenever, in my opinion, the executive branch has tended to overlook or circumvent them. And I shall continue to do so.

This Government, Mr. President, functions best when neither branch—the executive or the legislative—encroaches on the powers of the other. It functions best when neither branch abandons its

responsibilities to the other. It functions best in foreign relations when there is cooperation coupled with independence on the part of both branches in seeking to serve the interests of the people of the United States.

It was with these thoughts in mind, Mr. President, that I began this series some months ago with an initial statement entitled "A Review of Foreign Policy Is Needed." Now, at the conclusion of the series, I am convinced that such was the case. A review has been needed. It has taken place in part and is continuing to take place. The newspapers of the Nation are heavily engaged in the process. Many Members of the Senate and House have made outstanding contributions to it. There are signs that the executive branch is finally awakening to its necessity.

This general review, Mr. President, is helping to clarify the international situation and the needs of foreign policy to which the situation gives rise. It has already shown that throughout the world we are dealing today with a set of facts that is vastly different from those of a few years ago or even a year ago. It has shown, too, that while the international facts have changed, our foreign policy has not changed. At any rate, that it has not changed sufficiently to keep pace with shifting international developments.

I have had no desire to be critical of the executive branch in this review. I have said many times that the President and the Secretary of State do the best they can with the enormous responsibilities in foreign policy which rest on their shoulders. I have pleaded many times on this floor for an understanding of their problems and the difficulties which confront them. On many occasions I have given support to their efforts when they desperately needed support in this Chamber.

It is one thing, however, to recognize that the national interest requires a nonpolitical approach of this kind. It is another to equate a nonpolitical approach in matters of vital importance to the Nation with a blind and uncritical acceptance of the views of the executive branch in foreign relations. If we differ with that branch, if we perceive in good conscience weaknesses in our policies, we have an obligation to speak out.

Mr. President, that is what I have been trying to do in this series of statements. My understanding of the international situation has differed in important respects from that of the executive branch. I believe I have perceived weaknesses in the policies which we pursue in connection with that situation. And I have spoken out freely and frankly.

I have tried to avoid a partisan approach in this matter. I have tried to be objective and constructive in these statements. But I have not tried to avoid facing the facts as I see the facts, or the logic, in terms of our policy which flows from the facts.

Mr. President, a total picture emerges from the type of review I have been pursuing these past few months. In this picture, the world situation is neither black nor white. It is many shades of gray. It contains elements which give hope for peace, freedom and human progress. It contains others which clearly threaten these goals. It contains still others whose significance is yet unknown.

On the one hand, there is no question that Western Europe has recovered in an economic sense from World War II and in some respects is more prosperous than ever. There is no question that Latin America is in the midst of a vast economic expansion. There is no question that massive colonial areas have emerged into national independence in Asia, and that this transition is now extending into Africa. There is no question that the enemy states of World War II, principally Germany and Japan, have been restored and for the present remain linked with other free nations. There is no question that the Soviet system is in the grip of obscure but powerful internal forces released by the death of Stalin and that, in consequence, the danger of war in the west has receded, at least for the moment.

All of these developments and others provide hope for the future. We ought to welcome them. We ought to take comfort in whatever part our foreign policies of the past decade may have played in bringing them about.

Reassuring though they may be, however, the total world situation does not provide cause for optimism, unless it is a whistling-in-the-dark optimism. It does not afford occasion for the fatuous assumption that all is well with the world and our foreign policies have made it that way.

There is another side to the coin, another side of the international situation. It is a dark side. For each positive, encouraging aspect of the international situation, there is a negative, discouraging aspect. Furthermore, there are some negatives for which I have looked in vain for positives.

If we take, for example, the positive fact of the recovery of Western Europe, we find that we must balance it against a negative. The European nations and, in a larger sense, all of the Western nations are not acting to reinforce the unity which made recovery possible. What, as a result, is happening to European unity? What is happening to NATO? Both these and other bases for the common action of the free nations are crumbling. As they crumble, what will happen to the recovery and newfound strength of the Western nations? I may be wrong, Mr. President. I hope I am wrong. It seems to me, however, that the Western nations may be entering into a new era of devil-take-the-hindmost, not too dissimilar from that which preceded World War II. We may be entering into it in a blind binge of prosperity that is taking place on the brink of disaster.

Turning to the Western Hemisphere, what of the tendencies toward estrangement as between ourselves and the other American Republics? Are these cause for optimism, especially when the Soviet Union moves rapidly to fill the widening gaps? I was delighted that the President was able to attend the Inter-American Conference recently in progress in Panama. That is all to the good. Inter-American relations, however, will require consistent and constant effort if they are to be effectively maintained.

What, we may ask, of the growing pressures within Germany to separate from Western Europe? What of similar separatist pulls on Japan?

The achievement of national independence in most of the former colonial areas of Asia is a step toward freedom, and, as such, is to be welcomed by this country. But what of the vast array of social, economic, and political problems in these countries which demand solution even if they are the brutal and misleading solutions of totalitarianism? What of the growing Soviet and Chinese Communist influence in these newly independent states? Are these, too, causes for optimism?

And what of the turmoil within the Soviet empire itself? This turmoil may have relaxed for the moment the tyranny of a Stalin and the aggressive threat which is posed. That is a development which is to be welcomed and encouraged. At the same time, however, we ought not to lose sight of the fact that this very change has enabled Soviet totalitarianism to penetrate more effectively abroad, with diplomatic and economic means, by increasing the acceptability of communism.

In the light of these negatives, it would be wise, Mr. President, for the executive branch, for all of us, to restrain our optimism. It would be wise to temper our optimism with the sobering realities which I have just summarized. And in the light of the unsettled conflicts in Korea, Formosa, Indonesia, the Middle East, and Kashmir, it would be wise to temper our optimism a great deal. For these negatives—each of which contains the seeds of war—the positives are, as yet, nonexistent, or, at best, only dimly discernible.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, that I am not suggesting that we go from a fatuous optimism to a bleak pessimism in our approach to foreign relations. One is as meaningless as the other, and an effective foreign policy has little to do with either.

An effective foreign policy has to do, first, with an accurate perception of the facts of the international situation, with an understanding of the world as it is and not as we would wish it to be. It has to do with an evaluation of those facts in terms of our national interest in peace, freedom, and progress. It has to do, finally, with intelligent action calculated to serve the national interests in the light of the facts and their evaluation.

An effective foreign policy, Mr. President, is one which recognizes that there is no virtue in action for the sake of action but does not use this principle as an excuse for inaction when action is essential. It is one which recognizes that there are some situations in which to do less is better than to do more, to say less better than to say more.

An effective foreign policy is one which recognizes human limitations. It is one which contains sufficient humility and religious faith to recognize that history is not shaped by one nation alone and cannot be reshaped by one nation alone.

This review has led me to the conclusion that our foreign policy is deficient in many of these characteristics of effectiveness. I say this not in criticism of individuals but in the hope that we may reduce the deficiencies. I do not believe we shall ever eliminate them as long as policy is made and conducted by human beings, be they Republicans or Democrats.

There are, however, degrees of deficiency, and it is the responsibility of this Government to take all reasonable measures to reduce the deficiency.

There is a road to a better foreign policy, Mr. President. I have tried to indicate where that road is to be found. Throughout this series, I have pointed to many situations in which I believe weaknesses exist. I have advanced ideas which I believed would help to correct them. Other Members of the Senate have done the same. It is a hopeful sign to me, as I know it must be to them, to see evidences of an awakening awareness in the executive branch to weaknesses in policy, to see a gradual incorporation of some new ideas into policy.

The need, however, is very great. It cannot be met from the Senate alone, or from Congress alone. The responsibility for meeting it, the responsibility for improving our policies, lies largely within the executive branch. It is that branch which must strive to make certain that the international facts which go into the formulation of policy are actually facts and not the fiction of bias, wishful thinking, or fear. It is that branch which to a large extent must interpret these facts into countless decisions which safeguard the total interest of the people of the United States. It is that branch which must act on these decisions—act honestly, act intelligently, act promptly, act firmly, and with a singleness of purpose.

Mr. President, if that is the case, it is clear that the executive branch, and particularly those parts of it involved in foreign policy, must function with efficiency and with confidence if we are to have an effective foreign policy. In my opinion it has not functioned in that fashion in the recent past. Out of a concern with this failure, I have sought with other Senators to establish a Joint Congressional Committee for Central Intelligence. Out of the same concern, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the State Department of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have sought to restore some measure of confidence and morale in the Department of State. Out of the same concern, I have many times stood here in the Senate and denounced the multiplicity of voices in the executive branch which from time to time take unto themselves the responsibility for speaking for the Nation on foreign policy. This practice, Mr. President, appears to be on the decline, but it has not yet disappeared entirely. As a result of it, we have come very close to talking ourselves into a war on a number of occasions. We shall not have an effective foreign policy until it is clear that it is the President, and, on his behalf, the Secretary of State, who alone speak for this country to other nations.

Mr. President, the questions which I have been discussing concern essentially the mechanics of foreign policy. There is another factor, the fundamental factor. That is the attitude of our people and how it is expressed in our relations with other peoples. In the last analysis, we shall have the kind of foreign policy we desire and deserve. If we are fearful, if we are arrogant, if we are indifferent, if we are petty, sooner or later our foreign policy will reflect these characteristics and no matter what artful words or how many words the policy may be clothed in, these characteristics will not be concealed. If, on the other hand, as a Nation, we proceed at home, as befits the traditions of this country, with a sure faith in ourselves, in our institutions, and in the spirit of human freedom which gave birth to them, we need not fear for the effectiveness of our foreign policy. We shall have a foreign policy that is attuned to the heart of America and to the heart of decent humanity throughout the world. We shall not need massive aid programs or massive word programs. The policy will speak for itself. We shall have a foreign policy dedicated beyond the power of words to dedicate—dedicated to peace, to freedom, and to human progress.

In the last analysis, the choice does not lie with the President or with the Congress. This choice lies with the people of the United States.

At the conclusion of my 10th speech in the series on foreign policy, I take occasion to pay my respects publicly to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

To him I owe much for the advice and counsel he has so freely and willingly given during the time I have had the opportunity and the privilege of serving with him and under him on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The impression which the Senator from Georgia has made upon me in my thinking will last throughout the rest of my life. I say publicly that I owe to him a debt which I can never be able to repay in full, but which I hope in the years ahead I may be able to repay in part.

Mr. President, we are in the final hours of the 2d session of the 84th Congress and I want to take a few moments to pay one final tribute to our great and distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator of the Senate, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

We in the Senate have expressed our sincere regret on several occasions that Senator GEORGE will not be with us when Congress reconvenes in January. But the plain and simple fact remains that the absence of Senator GEORGE from these chambers will set in motion a chain reaction of regret emanating from the Senator's home State of Georgia, throughout the Nation and the world.

The folks back home in Georgia will miss their senior Senator because of his unceasing and untiring efforts in their behalf. I know they will remember him fondly for the many contributions he has made for the State's welfare and betterment.

The senior Senator from Georgia is a recognized leader of national standing, a Senator at large for the entire country. His legislative record has always been one guided by the best interests of America. There is no more vivid or timely illustration than the Senator's recent brilliant leadership in expanding the social-security program.

The Senator is world renowned for his positive action and guidance in the field of foreign policy, doing what he could to keep the democracies free and to stop the onrush of aggression and subversion. I want to say that it has been one of my most cherished experiences to have worked with the distinguished Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee during my years in the Senate.

We in the Senate will all miss the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, but his departure is not all sadness. Senator GEORGE is not retiring into oblivion after 34 years of service in the Congress of the United States. He will continue to serve this great Nation of ours, but in a new capacity as United States representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

We should be thankful that the United States and the free world, as well as the Senate, will continue to benefit in the years to come from the service, counsel, and advice of one of the Nation's greatest statesmen.

I do not say farewell to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, but I do wish him Godspeed in his new post as ambassador to NATO.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak; and

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the follow-

ing bills and joint resolutions of the House:

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolutions of the House:

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act incorporating the Archeological Institute of America" to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 84) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, page 14428 of the RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate on Wednesday, July 25, 1956, contains an incorrect account of the amendment which I offered to the housing bill. The RECORD fails to include the following portion of my amendment:

On page 28, beginning on line 14, strike out all through line 23 on page 29, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"'(m) For the purpose of increasing the supply of low-rent housing for elderly families, the Authority may assist the construction of new housing or the remodeling of existing housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for such families. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 10 (g), any public housing agency, in respect to dwelling units suitable to the needs of elderly families, may extend a prior preference to such families and may waive the provisions of clause (ii) of section 15 (8) (b) with respect to such units: *Provided*, That, as among such families, the "First" preference in subsection 10 (g) shall apply.'

"(c) Section 15 (5) of such act is amended by inserting after the word 'Alaska' the following: 'or $2,250 in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families'."

The failure to include this portion of my amendment in the RECORD has created the impression that the public housing features of the housing bill which passed the Senate last night differ from the public housing features of the bill which passed the House yesterday afternoon. Such an impression is erroneous and should be corrected. I want to make it absolutely clear that the public housing provisions of the bill which passed the Senate last night are absolutely identical with the public housing features of the bill which passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Indiana to ask unanimous consent to change the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to what his amendment does?

Mr. CAPEHART. My only purpose is to have my statement appear in the RECORD. My statement speaks for itself.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not necessarily represent the interpretation of the other members of the committee; does it?

Mr. CAPEHART. The RECORD neglects to show the complete amendment which I offered last night.

Mr. MONRONEY. But it does not change the legislative position.

Mr. CAPEHART. It does not change anything; it merely corrects an error.

IMPORTATION OF WATCHES

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to a statement made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 10, page 12301, by our late colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley. He was referring to the importation of watches.

The watch industry to which Senator Barkley referred is what we in America would term small business. Often taxes and importations are the difference between the success and failure of our American business. The Senator has brought to our attention how important it is to carefully study all such matters.

Mr. President, on July 23, 1955, the Senate passed a bill which removed excise taxes on motorcycles. This action permits the motorcycle builders of our country to continue in business. If the excise tax had not been eliminated, they would have been forced into bankruptcy, which would have meant the loss of the investment and the loss of jobs to many Americans.

Mr. President, it is the duty of Congress to give careful consideration to subjects of this character, which mean gainful employment for Americans and sound investments for our people.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Senator Barkley on July 30, 1955, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARKLEY

Ever since 1930, when I was the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Metals of the Committee on Finance, which considered the tariff on watches and other products made of metals, I became interested in and somewhat acquainted with the watch industry and the tariff on watches.

During the consideration of a bill, we finally arrived at the tariff rates to be imposed on imported watches dependent on the number of jewels in a watch. Because of the importance of skilled watchmakers in the manufacture of precision instruments in connection with our defense, the Tariff Commission made an investigation and recommended an increase in the tariff on watches, which President Truman declined to put into effect, but which President Eisenhower has inaugurated by an increase in the tariff on watches.

The tariff on a watch which contains 17 jewels is $3.15. The tariff on a watch which contains 21 jewels is $10.75.

In recent years—in the past 2 or 3 years—a practice has developed in the Swiss watch industry, in cooperation with certain American importers, to bring into this country 17-jewel watches which have been so manufactured as to contain 4 concealed components into which jewels can be inserted—the 4 components are concealed by a metal plug or some sort of device—so that the watches come in as 17-jewel watches, on which there has to be paid only the $3.15 tariff.

After those watches come into this country, the little plugs or metal pieces are removed, four jewels are inserted, and the watches then become 21-jewel watches. The tariff duty paid on such watches was only $3.15 instead of the $10.75 which would have to be paid on a watch which contained 21 jewels.

The Treasury Department wrestled with the problem, and endeavored to prescribe regulations to take care of the loophole, which permits a practice which is unfair to American watch manufacturers and to importers who have to pay a tariff of $10.75 on watches which contain 21 jewels, and as to which there has been no device of deception put into the watches. The matter is in court and has not yet been settled.

Working with the problem, members of the House Ways and Means Committee drafted an amendment which would suffice to plug the loophole, which cannot be plugged without congressional action. The Ways and Means Committee reported the bill, and it is on the House Calendar. Because of the situation which now prevails, and because the Rules Committee of the House announced it would grant no more rules on legislation at this session, the House cannot act.

However, hoping that they would send the bill over, the Finance Committee unanimously authorized me to report the bill when and if the bill came to the Senate. Since it will not come to the Senate, it cannot be put on the calendar.

I had intended to offer an amendment to this bill. Since the bill deals with revenue matters, such an amendment would be in order. I had intended to offer the amendment to the House bill, but inasmuch as the House would not consider the bill, and inasmuch as we would not get anywhere by taking action on it, and the result would be to

kill the bill if the amendment were attached to it—which I do not desire to do—I have protected my right to offer the amendment, because the bill still remains on the calendar of the House, and the intention of the Finance Committee is to report the bill when it comes to the Senate. It is intended to report it in January. For that reason, I am not offering the amendment to the pending bill; but I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I had intended to offer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

(Copy of the proposed amendment is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 10, p. 12302.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Pennsylvania probably recalls that very recently a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report submitted a report which touched on the watch industry. The minority members of the subcommittee, of whom I am one, felt the report was highly erroneous when its findings were based on assumptions which were cut out of whole cloth.

As a result, on yesterday I submitted and asked to have printed the minority views of myself, Representative WALCOTT, and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri. I should like to refer the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania to those views when they are printed, because I think he will suspect the real temper and thinking of the full membership of the committee, which is entirely different from that which is reflected in the report of the majority itself.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Arizona suggests. It will be a pleasure for me to read the minority views.

I have brought up the matter only because the statement of our late distinguished colleague, Senator Barkley, was, I think, quite to the point. I think this is a matter to which all of us must give great consideration; otherwise many of our important industries will go out of business.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Was the Senator referring to the subcommittee's report?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I was referring to a statement made by the late Senator Barkley about a year ago in the Senate. I think it was to the point. I have placed it in the RECORD, in the hope that many of my colleagues will refer to it and read it.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much disappointed in the action of the subcommittee. I do not think it is in conformity with the best interests of our economy or our national defense. I commend to our colleagues the minority views, which will be available, because it is important to the economy of the country and vital to the national defense to maintain the American watch industry, particularly the jeweled watch industry.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

THE PORT OF BALTIMORE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in a very real sense, commerce is the lifeblood of the economy of the excellent port of Baltimore. Likewise, the prosperity of the great Free State of Maryland is inextricably entwined with commerce moving through the port of Baltimore. On this theme, I have prepared a statement entitled "Foreign Trade and the City of Baltimore," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN TRADE AND THE CITY OF BALTIMORE

Early Baltimoreans were a seafaring people. For many years following the establishment of Baltimore Town in 1729, the economic life of the community was heavily dependent upon foreign trade.

The period between the Revolutionary War and the close of the War of 1812 has been called Baltimore's "Golden Age." This was the period when Chesapeake-built "Clipper Ships" roamed the seven seas, trading Baltimore-made goods for raw materials and products in almost every corner of the globe. These ships, swifter than any others then afloat, carried the lion's share of all world commerce, owing largely to the crippling effects of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars upon European shipping. Baltimore's growth was so rapid that, by 1800, it had become the second city of commercial importance in the country.

After the War of 1812 there was a letup in this rapid rate of growth, partly because the new Erie Canal made serious inroads into the city's trade with the West. Construction of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad in 1827, the first railroad to be built in the United States, was Baltimore's answer to this threat.

An even more serious roadblock, however, lay ahead—the Civil War. Because of Maryland's position as a border State, Baltimore enjoyed little of the war prosperity of the cities of the North and the hitherto rich markets in the South were casualties of the conflict.

For the next half century Baltimore labored under great difficulties. Then came World War I, which ushered in a new prosperity. In the 1920's many important industrial establishments located in the city. Shipping took a new lease on life, and Baltimore again became an outstanding seaport. World War II accentuated the movement. In less than 2 years, more than 270,000 workers were employed in the city's busy industrial plants, two-thirds of them engaged in the production of steel, the building and repair of ships, and the manufacture of aircraft and electronics equipment.

Much of this wartime growth has been retained, until today Baltimore is the sixth largest city[1] in the country, and, in terms of foreign trade tonnage, is the Nation's second largest seaport, and one of its most important centers of industrial, shipping, commercial, and financial activity.

BALTIMORE CITY TODAY

It is estimated that there are over 1,700 manufacturing establishments in the city of Baltimore today, with a labor force of over 130,000, which accounts for over 28 percent of the total civilian labor force of some 450,000 persons.

The total value added by all manufacturing operations in the city in 1953 was estimated at $1,021,000,000. Steel, copper, aluminum, chemicals, and other basic materials, in addition to a large variety of finished goods, are produced in the area. A fact which tends to be overlooked, however, is that the largest single industry is the port of Baltimore itself.

About 40,000 jobs are directly connected with ships and cargoes moving in and out of Baltimore Harbor. Of this number 3,400 are longshoremen. The wages of this group of workers alone amount to $7 million a year. Many more persons, of course, are indirectly dependent upon the operations of the port.

Port operations, it has been estimated, contribute at least $200 million per annum to the city's income, which accounts for about 14 percent of its net effective buying income.

Merchandise moving as foreign commerce through the port (that is, exports and imports moving from, to, or through Baltimore) is valued at more than $940 million, which is equal to over 60 percent of the estimated net effective buying income of the city, and to over 90 percent of the value added by manufacturing operations of all kinds.

GEOGRAPHICAL FACTORS

Baltimore's favorable geographical location has been an important factor in the growth of waterborne commerce and hence in the development of the city. It is the most westerly seaboard city on the North Atlantic coast and is the center of an elaborate transportation system, including facilities for transport by water, land, and air.

Three major trunkline railroads serve the city in addition to several local lines. More than 150 common carrier motortruck lines have terminal facilities in the area, and it is served by one of the largest and best-equipped airports in the country.

Baltimore is also served by 88 overseas steamship lines, 5 inland and Atlantic coastwise carriers, and 6 intercoastal steamship lines which connect with major Pacific coast ports and the interior Pacific coast areas served by them.

The fact that Baltimore is closer than any other United States Atlantic port to many of the important industrial producing and consuming points in the Middle West has made Baltimore increasingly popular as an entrance to and exit from the country. For example, Baltimore is only 429 miles from Akron, Ohio, in comparison with New York, which is 550 miles away. The distance from Cincinnati to Baltimore is only 560 miles in comparison with a distance of 644 miles between Cincinnati and Philadelphia, and 724 miles between Cincinnati and New York.

Since United States seaports in the North Atlantic area have overseas freight-rate parity with reference to ports in Western Europe, advantages in rates arising out of differences in land distances between points of manufacture and ports of shipment are often the determining factors in the total cost of transportation to European markets. The territory from, and to which, Baltimore has equal or lower local freight rates than its competitor ports (Philadelphia, New York, and Boston) includes one of the most important sources of outbound foreign commerce. This territory is described by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the United States Maritime Commission in their report "The Port of Baltimore" as including the territory delineated "from Elkton, Md., southward along the western Delaware State line to its southern limits; thence westward to Fredericksburg, Va.; thence southwest to Lynchburg, Va.; thence northward to Charleston, W. Va.; thence northward to the New York State line via Parkersburg, Wheeling, Pittsburgh, and Warren, and returning to Elkton, Md., through Williamsport, Lewiston and Harrisburg, Pa."

Much of the waterborne commerce moving through the port of Baltimore originates far beyond the borders of Baltimore City, even though substantial quantities of manufac-

[1] Being outranked only by New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Detroit.

tured goods produced in the city itself are themselves exported.

BALTIMORE'S POSITION AS A PORT

The water-borne commerce entering or leaving Baltimore either goes to, or originates from, all corners of the globe and many points along the United States coast. About one-third of the water-borne commerce moving through the port is classified as "coastwise" or "internal" trade. By "internal" trade is meant traffic between a port and a locality on an inland waterway, where the entire movement takes place over inland waterways. The distinction between internal and coastwise trade is not a clear one, however. Traffic moving from as far away as Massachusetts can actually reach Florida without entering the open ocean. Such commerce is classified as "internal," whereas if the same shipment should enter the open ocean between the same two points it would be classified as "coastwise" traffic.

Foreign commerce accounts for about two-thirds of the business of the port, and it is this part of the port's activity with which I am concerned in this address.

Measured in terms of tonnages, Baltimore is the second largest foreign trading port in the United States, being outranked only by New York. Because such a large proportion of the merchandise moving through Baltimore consists of bulk commodities, the port ranks slightly lower when compared in terms of value than it does when compared in terms of physical volume.

In 1954 Baltimore ranked third with regard to the value of exports and imports, being outranked by New York and New Orleans. In that year 16,832,000 tons of foreign shipping passed through Baltimore. This was more than half the tonnage passing through the port of New York and 1.2 million tons in excess of the tonnage moving through Philadelphia, the next ranking port.

In terms of value of exports and imports, New York is in a class by itself, with merchandise moving from and to the port in 1954 valued at $6,727,000,000. New Orleans was second with foreign commerce valued at $1,500,000,000. Baltimore ranked third with exports and imports valued at $941,000,000.

Since the close of World War II Baltimore has been more than holding its own compared with other Atlantic coast ports. In the 1937–39 period close to 11 percent of all exports moving through Atlantic coast ports (in terms of tonnages) were shipped out of Baltimore. In 1953 and 1954 the comparable percentage was 15.5 percent. In 1946 and 1947, when exports of coal to Europe were at their peak, exports from Baltimore accounted for close to 25 percent of exports from all Atlantic coast ports. With the exception of the war period 1941–46, when imports into Baltimore fell off relative to imports into other Atlantic coast ports, Baltimore has held its own as a port of importation. In 1953 and 1954 between 17 and 18 percent of all imports (measured in tonnage) into Atlantic coast ports came through Baltimore, which was about the same percentage as prevailed in the prewar period 1937–39.

Baltimore has long been known as the favorite port for such bulk commodities as iron ore, coal, sugar, fertilizer, and grains. Nevertheless, Baltimore is moving ahead as a general cargo port. There have been important increases in the trade of such items as coffee, antiques, art objects, automobiles, rugs, toys, machinery, and cigarettes.

According to figures recently published by the bureau of business and economic research of the University of Maryland, exports from the port of Baltimore have been growing more rapidly than exports from either New York or Philadelphia, and more rapidly, in fact, than all Atlantic coast ports considered together. Tonnages of exports leaving the port of Baltimore increased at an annual rate of 16.1 percent in the period 1935–50, compared with 4.4 percent for New York, 11.9 percent for Philadelphia, and 8.8 percent for all Atlantic coast ports considered together.

With the exception of 1945–47, the period in which there was a large bulge in exports, imports into Baltimore have been considerably larger than exports. Nevertheless, imports do not show the same rate of growth as do exports throughout the period. The statistics indicate that in this 15-year period imports into Baltimore increased at about the same rate as imports into Atlantic coastal ports as a whole, but at a considerably more rapid rate than imports into the port of New York.

Considering the volume of exports and imports together, Baltimore and Philadelphia have been growing more rapidly than has Atlantic coastal foreign trade generally and much more rapidly than trade through the port of New York.

Baltimore and Philadelphia continue to be rivals for the position of second largest port in the United States.

EXPORTS

Grains are Baltimore's most important single export, accounting in a recent period for almost 40 percent of total export tonnage. Iron and steel products have accounted for almost 20 percent and fertilizers for about 14 percent. Coal, which in the period immediately following World War II was the most important single export, reaching a high point of 75 percent of all exports, had dropped by 1950 to less than 12 percent.

Exports of these 4 leading groups of commodities (grains, iron and steel, fertilizer, and coal) accounted for well over 80 percent of Baltimore's total exports in 1950.

Grains shipped out of Baltimore (mostly wheat and corn) in recent years have gone to Germany, the United Kingdom, and Ireland. About two-thirds of the iron and steel products (unfabricated) exported are shipped to South America and Europe.

Canada is the largest customer for phosphate fertilizer and in recent years large quantities of both phosphate and nitrogenous fertilizer have gone to Korea. The bulk of the coal exported immediately after the war went to European countries. More recently it has been shipped to South America, Canada, and Japan.

Exports of machinery are relatively small, tonnagewise, but have been increasing in recent years. In 1950 they accounted for a little over 2 percent of Baltimore's exports. Such exports are varied, with sizable shipments of motor vehicles going to Brazil, agricultural machinery to Algeria and Turkey, mining and pumping machinery to South America and Europe, metalworking machinery to South Africa, and electrical machinery and equipment to Cuba and France.

IMPORTS

In the period 1936–1940 imports through the port of Baltimore accounted for about 18 percent of all shipments into Atlantic coast ports. Between 1940 and 1944 the percentage dropped sharply, reaching a low point of about 8 percent in 1944. Recovery was rapid, however, and after 1946 imports into Baltimore again accounted for about 18 percent of total Atlantic coast imports. Thus, even though the volume of imports into Baltimore has been increasing, it has not been increasing any more rapidly than have imports into Atlantic coast ports as a whole.

Baltimore's most important import is iron ore and iron ore concentrates which, in recent years, have accounted for over 40 percent of total imports. Ferro-alloys account for another 16 percent, iron and steel scrap for 2 percent, and other iron and steel items for 1.7 percent. Together, these items account for over 60 percent of all shipments into the port.

Next in order of importance is petroleum and petroleum products, which account for another 20 percent. Other products, making up the remaining 15–20 percent of imports, are sugar and related products, bananas, paper base stocks, and rubber.

Baltimore is an importer of a small number of important bulk commodities. In recent years, iron ore, ferro-alloys and other iron and steel products and petroleum have accounted for more than four-fifths of the port's total import volume.

According to statistics prepared by the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of the University of Maryland from unpublished United States Census data, more than 50 percent of the imports of iron ore into Baltimore in 1950 originated in Chile (compared with over 80 percent in 1946). Over 26 percent came from Sweden and 9 percent from Brazil. In 1951 the first shipments of iron ore were received from the Bethlehem-owned ore field south of the Orinoco River in Venezuela and it is likely that these imports will increase substantially. It is expected that eventually imports from this source will exceed 6 billion pounds annually. The United States Steel Corporation is also obtaining iron ore from South America and it is probable that a large part of these imports will enter the country at Baltimore.

Imports of petroleum and petroleum products into Baltimore have consisted principally of fuel oil, including bunker oil and crude petroleum. There have been small imports of gasoline, kerosene, lubricating oil, petroleum asphalt and other petroleum products. Practically all of the petroleum products imported into Baltimore come from Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles (including Curacao and Aruba). Small quantities, upon occasion, have come from Mexico and Colombia.

Some pig iron is imported into Baltimore, most of it from Germany and the Netherlands. Small quantities of iron and steel scrap have come from Germany, Japan, France, and the Netherlands.

Bananas come from the so-called "Banana Republics"—Honduras, Colombia, Panama, Guatemala, Costa Rica, and the Dominican Republic.

The great bulk of the paper base stock imported into Baltimore consists of wood pulp which originates, for the most part, in Sweden and Finland (87 percent of the total). Small quantities have come from Austria, Norway, and Canada.

More than 99 percent of the imports of "rubber and rubber manufactures" consists of unmanufactured rubber and comes principally from Malaya, Liberia, and Indonesia.

Baltimore receives such small quantities of manufactured goods that there would seem to be opportunity for development along this line. Increased imports of such goods, particularly from Western Europe and Japan, could be vital as part of the United States' contribution toward strengthening the countries of the free world. The port of Baltimore itself could contribute greatly toward stimulating such trade through programs designed to popularize imported merchandise. Trade fairs and exhibits of imported wares by large retail outlets are good ways of doing this. The leaders of Baltimore might be performing a great service for both themselves and their country if they were to think and act along such lines.

A RECENT FOREIGN TRADE SURVEY

A few months ago the League of Women Voters of Baltimore completed a survey showing the importance of foreign trade to the city. They did this by sending out questionnaires and by visiting many Baltimore manufacturing establishments. In all, they sent out over 330 questionnaires and received returns from approximately one-third of the companies contacted. In doing this work the league had the cooperation and advice of members of the staff of the bureau

of business and economic research of the University of Maryland, the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, a member of the staff of the Johns Hopkins University, one from Goucher College, and others.

The great bulk of the manufacturing establishments replying to the questionnaire indicated that they have a direct stake in foreign trade, and most of those interviewed expressed interest in promoting the development of foreign trade. Only a few companies reported that they felt competition from imported goods. Most of these companies, in turn, were of the opinion that import competition was not as serious as competition from domestic competitors.

The fact that a large part of the exports going through the port of Baltimore originate inland beyond the boundaries of the city, and similarly that a large part of the imports into Baltimore go inland far beyond the city, should not blind us to the fact that manufacturers in Baltimore also have a substantial direct interest in foreign trade. Eighty-five of the 120 companies reporting (71 percent) stated that they themselves were importers, exporters, or both. In the words of the survey itself, "These are companies that actually do the importing and exporting themselves. There are many more who buy imported goods from suppliers or basic metal manufacturers, or who sell to companies that export the finished products. Many companies did not seem to realize that some of the basic raw materials used in their products, such as chrome, manganese, tin, tanning acids, must be imported."

The survey also reveals that manufacturing establishments in Baltimore rely to a considerable extent upon foreign sources for raw materials that cannot be obtained in the United States or that can be obtained only at great difficulty or in insufficient quantities.

The bureau of business and economic research of the University of Maryland, in its Regional Interindustry Study of Maryland, published in September 1954, estimated that of the $530,300,000 of goods exported in 1947 through the ports of Maryland over $221,800,000 came from other States, leaving $308,500,000 of goods produced or manufactured in Maryland and shipped abroad. Of the value of imports at that time, namely, $208,700,000, more than $34,300,000 went to other States. The balance of $174 million of imports remained in Maryland for the use of Maryland industries and consumption. Of this amount, of course, a large share undoubtedly went to Baltimore.

Over 60 percent of the manufacturing establishments replying to the league's questionnaire reported that they felt no impact of import competition upon their business, whereas 29 percent reported that they did feel such competition. Only 3 percent, however, felt that import competition was really serious.

The questionnaire also contained questions asking for opinions regarding present levels of foreign trade and future policies to be pursued. Over 50 percent of those replying were in favor of expanded foreign trade and thought that governmental policies should be shaped accordingly. Ten percent were in favor of additional intensified protection of domestic markets against import competition, and 31 percent either expressed no opinion at all or had opinions that were not conclusive.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL LAND

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on a previous day H. R. 9591, to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes, passed the Senate but was later recalled from the House because of an error in amending the title.

I move that the vote by which the title was amended be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment to the title.

The motion was agreed to.

REAPPOINTMENT OF ARTHUR H. COMPTON AS CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2185, Senate Joint Resolution 180.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 180) to provide for the reappointment of Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the joint resolution provides for the reappointment of Arthur H. Compton as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of Arthur H. Compton, of St. Louis, Mo., on September 20, 1956, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

ACTION BY STATE OF FLORIDA RELATING TO ERADICATION OF MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senators who are in the Chamber may recall that the Senators from Florida have stated from time to time that the State of Florida proposed to match on a 50–50 basis the Federal appropriations for the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication campaign. A special session of the Legislature of Florida, called for this and other purposes, is in progress now. I have just received a telegram from the Governor of the State of Florida which reads:

> State appropriation for $5 million for fruitfly program passed both Houses, and I will sign bill this morning. Regards.
>
> LEROY COLLINS,
> *Governor.*

I wanted the Senate to know the legislature and the Governor of Florida had proceeded with the greatest possible dispatch to meet Florida's commitment in the matter.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2816, Senate Resolution 312.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 312) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2817, Senate Resolution 315.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 315) authorizing an increase in expenditures for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, for the purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, $10,000 in addition to the amount authorized in such section.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "CRITICAL MATERIALS"

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2818, Senate Resolution 318.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 318) to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 83, 84th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Critical Materials."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 1,550 additional copies of Senate Document No. 83, 84th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Critical Materials—Factors Affecting Self-Sufficiency Within Nations of the Western Hemisphere."

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2819, Senate Resolution 320.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 320) providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS] tell us how much money this resolution involves.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the resolution authorizes the expenditure of not to exceed $30,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, does the resolution state what the money is to be used for?

Mr. CLEMENTS. "To employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable." The word "it" refers to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the distinguished Senator know what the experts are to be used for?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The resolution would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate not more than $30,000 for miscellaneous investigations and for staff studies on the problems of the aging from August 1, 1956, through January 31, 1957.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think I shall have to ask that the consideration of the resolution go over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was present in the Committee on Rules and Administration when the resolution was before the committee. We understood the request had come with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The amount involved was $30,000. There was no opposition to the resolution, and it had the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My friend from Arizona, I think, has in his hands now a copy of the budget which was presented by the committee. It shows the cost of the extra staff members to be $16,125.33, and it shows an administrative cost, which would cover stationery, travel, hearings, and other incidental matters, of $13,874.67, or a total of $30,000.

I may say to my friend from Arizona that before requesting consent for the consideration of the resolution it had been cleared with the minority leader, and it had been cleared under the usual procedure, and by those on the committee who were thought to have an interest in the matter. If the Senator desires that the consideration of the resolution go over, there will be no hesitation on the part of the acting majority leader in suggesting that that be done, but I can assure the Senator from Arizona that the resolution has had the clearance which I mentioned.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall not object at this time, but I serve on the committee concerned. Unfortunately, I did not attend the meeting when it was suggested that the report be made unanimous. I am very much concerned about the tendency in the Congress to add additional research members to the staffs. We are seeing committees become overstaffed. Instead of being a temporary matter, we shall be asked next January 31 to extend the authority. I want to go on record as being against a further extension of staffs. I think the committees are being overstaffed to the detriment, not only of legislation, but to the detriment of the budget, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", and in line 12, after the word "concerned", to insert "and the Committee on Rules and Administration", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from August 1, 1956, through January 31, 1957, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HOUSE REPORTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2820, House Concurrent Resolution 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 254) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Reports Nos. 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244, current session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2821, House Concurrent Resolution 261.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 261) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil defense for national survival held during the current session by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2822, House Concurrent Resolution 262.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The concurrent resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 262) authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 40,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on Progress Report on Research in Medicine, Biology, and Agriculture Using Radioactive Isotopes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there obection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2823, House Concurrent Resolution 263.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 263) authorizing printing of additional copies of the hearing on labor-management problems of the American merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMISSION FOR CELEBRATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt", approved July 28, 1955. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: On line 8, strike out "$461,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

And the House agree to the same.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.,
WILLIAM M. TUCK,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION—CORRECTION OF ENROLLMENT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 511

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 271, to correct the enrollment of House Joint Resolution 511.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 271), to correct the enrollment of House Joint Resolution 511, granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

INSURANCE AGAINST FLOOD DAMAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that in the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources. With specific reference to insurance against flood loss, the Congress finds that insurance against certain losses resulting from this peril is not so available. Since preventive and protective means and structures against the effects of these disasters can never wholly anticipate the geographic incidence and infinite variety of the destructive aspects of these forces, the Congress finds that the safeguards of insurance are a necessary adjunct of preventive and protective means and structures.

Inasmuch as these disasters impede interstate and foreign commerce, hamper national defense, and cause widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare, without regard to State boundary lines, and in the absence of insurance protection from private or public sources, the Congress ought to provide for such protection in the case of flood, and study the feasibility and need for similar programs in the case of other forms of natural disaster against which insurance protection is not generally and practically available in all geographical areas.

(b) (1) It is the purpose of this act to authorize the establishment of a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risks of loss resulting from flood as hereinafter defined, and to require a study and report on insurance and reinsurance against still other natural disaster perils to the extent that such insurance or reinsurance is not available on reasonable terms and conditions from other public or private sources; and

(2) It is the further purpose of this act to encourage private insurance companies to write insurance covering the extent of the risks above the limits prescribed in section 10 (a) and to provide Federal reinsurance to the extent desirable and necessary to carry out this purpose.

(3) It is the further purpose of this act to authorize the establishment of a program of loans, and a program combining insurance and loans, to assist flood victims who have entered into contracts with the Administrator under this act.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) To assist in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator may appoint a Commissioner, and the basic rate of compensation of such position shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the Commissioners of the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(b) The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, shall apply to the functions vested in the Administrator by this act, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this act, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided,* That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the issuing of insurance policies, the making of reinsurance agreements, and the making and guaranteeing of loans, and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

AUTHORITY TO INSURE AND REINSURE

SEC. 4. To aid in carrying out the purposes of this act, the Administrator is authorized to provide, upon such terms and conditions (including coinsurance requirements) as he may establish, insurance and reinsurance against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property (including property owned by any State or local government) due to flood, as hereinafter defined, occurring within the United States: *Provided,* That after June 30, 1959, each State shall pay from time to time into the Disaster Insurance Fund, hereinafter created, an amount equal to one-half of the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued after such date on property in such State, and the amount which would have been charged if the estimated rates were applied.

LOAN CONTRACTS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with any persons (not including State and local governments and agencies thereof) to the effect that, in the event of any subsequent loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real and personal property due to flood, as hereinafter defined, occurring within the United States—

(1) the Administrator will guarantee any public or private financing institution against loss of principal and interest with respect to any loan in an amount not to exceed such subsequent flood loss (as modified by subsection (f) of this section, relating to deductibility), which may be made

by such institution to any such person in connection with such flood loss; and

(2) to the extent that a loan to finance such flood loss is not available from any such institution on reasonable terms, the Administrator will make a loan directly to such person in an amount covering all or part (as provided for in the loan contract between the Administrator and such person) of the difference between the amount of such flood loss (as modified by such subsection (f), relating to deductibility) and the amount of the loan available from such institution.

Each such contract shall contain such terms and conditions, and require from any such person such monetary consideration, as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation. In issuing such regulations the Administrator shall fix such monetary consideration at the lowest practicable amount, following generally the same principles as apply under section 7 (a) with respect to the establishment of fees for insurance.

(b) Any loan made or guaranteed under this section shall bear interest at the rate, as determined by the Administrator, which is prevailing in the area where the money loaned is to be used but such rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid principal balance.

(c) Any Federal Reserve bank, when designated by the Administrator, is hereby authorized to act, on behalf of the Administrator, as fiscal agent of the United States in guaranteeing loans under this section and in otherwise taking action in connection with such guarantees. Such funds as may be necessary to enable such bank to carry out any such guarantee shall be supplied and disbursed by or under authority of the Administrator from the Disaster Loan Fund. Such bank shall not have any responsibility or accountability except as agent in taking any action in connection with such guarantees. Each such bank shall be reimbursed by the Administrator, from funds appropriated by the Federal Government, for all expenses incurred by the bank in acting as agent on behalf of the Administrator, including among such expenses, notwithstanding any other provision of law, attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation.

(d) Actions and operations of such banks under authority of subsection (c) of this section shall be subject to the supervision of the Administrator and subject to such regulations as he may prescribe. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe the term and incidental charges for loans guaranteed under subsection (c) of this section. The Administrator is further authorized to prescribe regulations with respect to the forms and procedures (which shall be uniform to the maximum extent practicable) to be utilized in connection with such guarantees.

(e) To the maximum extent practicable, loans under this section shall be on a long-term basis in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, if so requested by the person obtaining the loan.

(f) Loans under this section shall be made only with respect to amounts exceeding the first $500 of the amount of the loss.

(g) The face amount of all loan contracts outstanding under this section at any one time shall not exceed $2 billion; but such amount may be increased, with the approval of the President, by not to exceed $500 million in any one fiscal year.

(h) The provisions of sections 8, 9, 10 (a), 10 (b), 12 (b), 12 (c), 13, 14, 15 (e), 15 (g), 17 (a), 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23 of this act shall be applicable with respect to the loan contract program under this section.

COMBINATION OF INSURANCE AND LOANS

SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to establish, under such regulations as he may prescribe, a program combining insurance and loans in order to provide the greatest variety and amount of protection against loss to the greatest number of affected parties in accordance with individual needs.

ESTIMATED RATES AND FEES

SEC. 7. (a) The Administrator shall from time to time establish a schedule of "estimated rates" for insurance offered under the provisions of this act, which would be adequate, in his judgment, to produce sufficient proceeds to pay all claims for probable losses over a reasonable period of years. Such "estimated rates" shall be used as a basis for determining the fees to be paid by the persons insured. They shall be based on consideration of the risks involved and shall be uniform for similar risk within a given classification of property. They shall not include any loading for administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this act. The Administrator shall establish a schedule of fees to provide insurance protection at reasonable costs designed to achieve marketability: *Provided*, That no insurance policy shall be issued for a fee less than 60 percent of such "estimated rate," except that reduced fees may be established for insurance on any classification of owner-occupied dwelling units if the Administrator determines that without such reduction the owners of such dwelling units as a class could not afford to pay the fees chargeable for such insurance. The Administrator is authorized to establish such classifications of fees as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act based on the use of the property to be insured, the availability of insurance from private sources covering such property, and the ability of the insured to self-insure or reinsure and may establish differentials in levels of fees for such classifications: *Provided*, That all such fees shall be uniform for similar risks within a given classification of property. The Administrator shall from time to time pay into the Disaster Insurance Fund, hereinafter created, an amount equal to the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued and the amount which would have been charged if the "estimated rates" were applied.

(b) The Administrator from time to time shall also negotiate with insurance companies seeking reinsurance for the purpose of establishing fees for reinsurance offered under the provisions of this act. Such fees shall be based on consideration of the risks involved and shall be adequate, in the judgment of the Administrator, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses. The fees shall not include any loading for administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this act.

PROPERTY AND LOSS LIMITS

SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to provide for the determination of types and location of property with respect to which insurance or reinsurance shall be made available under this act, the nature and limits of loss or damage in any area (including subdivisions thereof) which may be covered by such insurance or reinsurance, and such other matters as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

RISK CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 9. The Administrator may from time to time issue appropriate regulations regarding the classification, limitation, and rejection of risks assumed by him under authority of this act.

POLICY AND PROGRAM LIMITS

SEC. 10. (a) The outstanding face amount of insurance issued by the Administrator under this act shall not exceed $250,000 per person: *Provided*, That the fact amount of such insurance on any dwelling unit (including any structures and personal property connected therewith) shall not exceed $10,000.

(b) The Administrator may from time to time issue appropriate regulations regarding insurance coverage available to joint owners and subsidiary and affiliated corporations as he shall deem advisable to effecuate the purposes of this act.

(c) Each insurance policy issued by the Administrator shall contain a loss-deductible clause relieving him from any liability for paying the first $100 of a proved and approved claim for loss, plus 5 percent of the remainder, or such larger amount or percentage as may be specified by the Administrator upon issuance of the insurance policy, taking into consideration the class of risk involved.

(d) The face amount of insurance policies and reinsurance agreements outstanding at any one time under this act shall not exceed $3 billion (which may be increased with the approval of the President by further amounts not to exceed $2 billion in the aggregate if such increase is deemed advisable to effectuate the purposes of this act) minus the aggregate amount of claims proved and approved under insurance policies and reinsurance agreements issued under this act, but plus fees collected hereunder. For the purpose of applying this limitation, the face amount of any policy or agreement shall be deemed to be the original amount minus claims proved and approved thereunder.

REINSURANCE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

SEC. 11. (a) The Administrator is authorized to issue such regulations regarding reinsurance under this act as he deems advisable in order to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The premium rate and terms and conditions of any policy reinsured under the provisions of this act shall be subject to approval by the administrator.

(c) The Administrator shall use his best efforts to encourage private insurance companies to undertake the issuance of insurance policies covering that portion of the loss in excess of the limits specified in section 10 (a) of this act resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property due to flood as defined in this act. The Administrator may seek to achieve this end by offering a program of appropriate reinsurance within the authority granted him by this act.

(d) Wherever practicable, the Administrator may encourage, by offering suitable reinsurance subject to the provisions of this act, the issuance by private insurance companies of policies insuring against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property due to flood.

NONDUPLICATION OF AVAILABLE INSURANCE

SEC. 12. (a) No insurance or reinsurance, or loan contract, shall be issued under the provisions of this act covering risks against which insurance is available on reasonable terms from other public or private sources.

(b) No insurance or reinsurance shall be issued under the provisions of this act on any property declared by a duly constituted State or local zoning authority, or other authorized public body, to be in violation of State or local flood zoning laws.

(c) After June 30, 1958, no insurance or reinsurance shall be issued under the provisions of this act in any geographical location unless an appropriate public body shall have adopted and shall keep in effect such flood zoning restrictions, if any, as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator to reduce, within practicable limits, damages from flood in such location.

USE OF OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES

SEC. 13. (a) In providing insurance or reinsurance under this act, the Administrator shall use to the maximum practicable extent the facilities and services of private organizations and persons authorized to engage in the insurance business under the laws of any State (including insurance companies, agents, brokers, and adjustment organizations); and the Administrator may arrange for payment of reasonble compensation therefor.

(b) In providing insurance or reinsurance under this act, the Administrator may use the services of other public agencies, and pay reasonable compensation therefor.

(c) The Administrator may supply, receive from and exchange with other agencies of the Federal Government, State, local, and interstate commissions or agencies, and private organizations experienced in the fields of insurance or reinsurance, such information as may be useful in the administration of the programs authorized by this act.

(d) In carrying out the functions authorized in this act, the Administrator may consult with other agencies of the Federal Government and interstate, State, and local public agencies having responsibilities for land use and flood control and for flood zoning and flood-damage prevention in order to assure that the insurance and reinsurance programs are consistent with the programs of such agencies. Where the program of the Administrator may affect existing or proposed flood-control works under the jurisdiction of agencies of the Federal Government these agencies shall cooperate with the Administrator in coordinating their respective programs. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator shall coordinate the administration of their respective programs relating to flood insurance and reinsurance for agricultural commodities.

CLAIMS PAYMENT AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) Under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, he shall arrange for prompt adjustment and payment of valid claims for losses covered by insurance or reinsurance under this act.

(b) Upon disallowance of any claim against the Administrator under color of any insurance or reinsurance made available under this act, or upon refusal of the claimant to accept the amount allowed upon any such claim, the claimant may institute an action against the Administrator on such claim in the United States district court in which a major portion (in terms of value) of the insured property is located. Any such action must be begun within 1 year after the date upon which the claimant receives from the Administrator written notice of disallowance or partial disallowance of the claim. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may be sued and he shall appoint one or more agents within the jurisdiction of each United States district court upon whom service of process can be made in any action instituted under this section. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon all United States district courts to hear and determine such actions without regard to the amount in controversy.

FUNDS AND TREASURY BORROWINGS

SEC. 15. (a) To carry out the purposes of this act, the Administrator is authorized to establish three funds to be known as the (1) Disaster Insurance Fund, (2) Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and (3) Disaster Loan Fund.

(b) Into the Disaster Insurance Fund shall be deposited all insurance fees collected by the Administrator for insurance policies issued by him under this act. Into the Disaster Reinsurance Fund shall be deposited all fees collected by the Administrator in connection with reinsurance made available by him under this act. Into the Disaster Loan Fund shall be deposited amounts accuring to the United States in connection with loan contract transactions.

(c) Moneys in each of the funds may be invested in obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. Such obligations may be sold and the proceeds derived therefrom may be reinvested as above provided if deemed advisable by the Administrator. Income from such investment or reinvestment shall be deposited in the respective fund from which the investment was made.

(d) All salvage proceeds realized by the Administrator in connection with insurance made available under this act shall be deposited in the Disaster Insurance Fund; and all salvage proceeds realized by the Administrator in connection with reinsurance made available under this act shall be deposited in the Disaster Reinsurance Fund.

(e) The Administrator is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time and have outstanding at any one time, in an amount not exceeding $500 million (or such greater amount as may be approved by the President) notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations to be issued hereunder and for such purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations.

The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Funds borrowed under this section shall be deposited, in such proportions as the Administrator deems advisable, in the Disaster Insurance Fund, the Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and the Disaster Loan Fund.

(f) Moneys in the Disaster Insurance Fund, the Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and the Disaster Loan Fund may be used for the following purposes as deemed necessary by the Administrator:

(1) To pay from the Disaster Insurance Fund proved and approved claims for loss under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with insurance policies issued by the Administrator under this act;

(2) To pay from the Disaster Reinsurance Fund proved and approved claims under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, reinsurance agreements entered into by the Administrator under this act;

(3) To pay from the Disaster Loan Fund the amounts of loans made by the Administrator, amounts in payment of guarantees, and other nonadministrative expenses in connection with direct and guaranteed loans under this act; and

(4) To repay to the Secretary of the Treasury sums borrowed from him in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

(g) All administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this act shall be paid from funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 16. In carrying out his functions under this act, the Administrator shall appoint an advisory committee as authorized by section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 590, 645). Such committee shall consist of not less than 3 nor more than 15 persons familiar with the problems of insurance or reinsurance, to advise the Administrator with respect to the formulation of policies and the execution of functions under this act.

STUDIES

SEC. 17. (a) The Administrator shall undertake a continuing study of the practicability of extending the coverage of insurance programs similar to those authorized under this act to any one or more natural disaster perils, other than flood, against which, and for the period during which, insurance protection is not generally and practically available in all geographical locations from other public or private sources.

(b) The Administrator shall also undertake a continuing study of participation by private insurance companies in the programs authorized by this act, in order that the protection it authorizes can be provided, whenever practicable, through insurance policies issued by private insurance companies and reinsured with the Administrator, in lieu of providing such protection through insurance policies issued in the name of the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator shall undertake a continuing study of the feasibility of having private insurance companies take over, with or without some form of Federal financial support, the insurance programs authorized by this act.

ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS

SEC. 18. For the purpose of carrying out functions under this act the Administrator may—

(a) sue or be sued;

(b) without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529 and 41 U. S. C. 5), and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), enter into and perform contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, on such terms as he may deem appropriate, with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State or agency or political subdivision thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation and consent to modification thereof, and make advance or progress payments in connection therewith;

(c) without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529 and 41 U. S. C. 5), and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), by purchase, lease, or donation acquire such real and personal property and any interest therein, make advance or progress payments in connection therewith, and hold, use, maintain, insure against loss, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real and personal property as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act;

(d) appoint, pursuant to civil-service laws and regulations, such officers, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; define their authority and duties; provide bonds for such of them as he may deem necessary; and delegate to them, and authorize successive redelegations by them of such of the powers vested in him by this act as he may determine;

(e) conduct researches, surveys, and investigations relating to flood insurance and reinsurance and assemble data for the purpose of establishing estimated rates, fees, and premiums for flood insurance and reinsurance under this act;

(f) issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and

(g) exercise all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this act and such incidental powers as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS IN REAL ESTATE ACQUIRED

SEC. 19. The acquisition by the Administrator of any real property pursuant to this act shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property.

TAXATION

SEC. 20. Nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any real property, acquired and held by the Administrator in connection with the payment of any claim under this act, from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 21. The annual report made by the Administrator to the President for submission to the Congress under existing law on all programs provided for under this act shall contain a comprehensive report concerning (1) the operation of insurance, reinsurance, and loan programs authorized under this act, and (2) the status and result of studies authorized under section 17 of this act, together with such recommendations, if any, for legislative changes deemed by the Administrator desirable to improve the operation of programs authorized under this act. The annual report for the calendar year ending December 31, 1961, shall contain an express opinion of the Administrator, supported by pertinent findings, concerning the advisability of withdrawing in whole or in part Federal financial support for insurance policies to be issued at any time after June 30, 1962, offering protection as authorized in this act, taking into consideration, the desirability of offering such protection. Such opinion shall be accompanied by recommendations for legislative changes deemed desirable by the Administrator in the event the opinion is to the effect that any such withdrawal of financial support is advisable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 22. As used in this act the term—

(a) "Flood" includes any flood, tidal wave, wave wash, or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landslide due to excess moisture, and shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed by regulation of the Administrator.

(b) "Person" means an individual or group of individuals, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, including State and local governments and agencies thereof;

(c) "United States", when used in a geographic sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(d) "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(e) "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

SEPARABILITY PROVISION

SEC. 23. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to any person or circumstance other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. FREAR in the chair) appointed Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BUSH conferees on the part of the Senate.

SERVICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY AS CHAIRMAN OF A SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today I was most interested to read in the Washington Post an editorial dealing with a subject matter which has disturbed me considerably; and from my conversations with other Members of the Senate, I find that it has disturbed them, as well.

First, Mr. President, I should like to read the editorial. Let me say that by no stretch of the imagination could the Washington Post be considered to be a "Democratic house organ."

It consistently supported President Eisenhower in his campaign in the great crusade of 1952, and it has consistently supported him during his 3½ years of administration.

I think it is significant that this newspaper, which is one of the most friendly in the United States toward Mr. Eisenhower, his so-called team, and his administration, should publish this editorial, which I wish to read for the information of the Senate. After reading the editorial, I shall comment upon it.

The editorial reads as follows:

MR. HUMPHREY'S BITE

The interest of Treasury Secretary Humphrey in helping elect a Republican Congress in November is altogether understandable. Not so much can be said for Mr. Humphrey's judgment in agreeing to serve as chairman of the Bender-for-Senator Campaign Committee in Ohio. The committee reportedly was undertaken to raise a $400,000 campaign fund for Senator BENDER.

The Secretary of the Treasury has the ultimate responsibility for ruling on Federal tax cases from all over the country, including Ohio. Although Secretary Humphrey's personal integrity and honorable intentions are not in the slightest question, his position at the head of a campaign raising political funds might lend itself to misunderstanding on the part of persons solicited. The solicitations might be construed as alternatively a command or a come-in for favorable treatment. The chief fiscal officer of the Government, a senior member of the Cabinet, ought to be especially at pains to set an example in his conduct and to refrain from any political activity of the sort that might involve his office even remotely. Surely Mr. Humphrey, when he thinks about it, will see the impropriety of the extracurricular job he has undertaken.

Mr. President, I agree completely with the editorial in the Washington Post. I, along with many other Members of the Senate, was shocked at the lack of judgment, the lack of political acumen, and the lack of understanding of what occupation of the dual role of campaign chairman and political-fund raiser, on the one hand, and of the chief fiscal administrator of our Government, on the other hand could do our political system.

I have tremendous respect for the personal integrity, sincerity, and ability of the Secretary of the Treasury, even though I disagree with him on many political issues. I think every Member of this body shares that point of view, and appreciates the integrity of the Secretary of the Treasury; and by that I mean the present incumbent.

But, Mr. President, when the Secretary of the Treasury so far forgets the proprieties of his great office and the vast, overwhelming power of his office, as to actively engage as campaign chairman for a United States Senator, the Secretary of the Treasury is damaging the very fiscal machinery which he has taken an oath to administer with all propriety and with all due diligence.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that Mr. Humphrey should reevaluate and reassess the vast power he now holds as the Secretary of the Treasury. He holds power over our entire banking system, including the power to determine in most cases whether a bank shall have competition by means of the opening of a new bank in the same area, his control over the deposits of Federal funds in banks, and his right of determination as to which banks shall receive such deposits, all of which can affect the earning power of almost every bank in the United States, including those in the State of Ohio.

Furthermore, let me say that since there comes under the Treasury Department the vast Bureau of Internal Revenue, with its thousands of pending income-tax cases, and with the power of investigation over all income tax returns by the Internal Revenue agents being able to open and investigate any one of the individual income-tax returns made by any taxpayer of the United States, certainly the Secretary of the Treasury should place his office above any suspicion, justified or unjustified, of charges of political interference or political manipulation.

I have talked to some of the senior Members of this body, and not one of them can ever recall a time when a Secretary of the Treasury has ever injected himself into political fund raising or political campaign managing.

As I have said, Mr. Humphrey is a man of great integrity. But no matter how great his integrity may be, the things which will be done in his name in any political campaign, by the lieutenants in the lower echelons of money-raising activities, or the pressures which can be brought through junior lieutenants who might use his name for political power, may be extremely dangerous to a clean election and a fair election, an election in which any American voter who has vast financial interests may take a part—as a good American should—as a private citizen in the election of the candidate of his choice.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we in the Congress are as interested as we said we were when 85 Members of this body signed a clean election bill, in hopes of eliminating slush funds from politics,

and of identifying the donors of political funds, and of reviewing the expenditure of such funds, in order to ascertain whether they were properly expended, then I think the Senate should be concerned about this new excursion under the name of the "Great Crusade," into the political management of a senatorial campaign, by the chief fiscal officer of the United States Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I compliment the Senator on his statement. I agree with him that this is a very unusual step. I agree with the Senator that the Secretary of the Treasury has a very fine reputation as an individual, but it seems to me that he has shown a lack of understanding of the role of Secretary of the Treasury in our Government. It seems to me that an administration which was so sensitive with respect to the activities of fund raising in the case of the gas bill is for some reason or other very lacking in sensitiveness in this instance. I think the Senator will agree that the Secretary of the Treasury is in a better position effectively to solicit funds than anyone else in the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should certainly say that with his vast powers over fiscal matters, income-tax matters, and pending cases, the occupancy of the dual role which he has chosen for himself should, on mature reflection, convince the Secretary of the Treasury that his duty as the chief financial officer—as virtually a judge in fiscal matters—makes his position wholly incompatible with the management of a political campaign for Senator, for President, Vice President, or Member of Congress.

Mr. Humphrey should be allowed to participate as an individual American, and to donate what money he cares to donate, within the law, toward the election of the candidate of his choice. The very fact that he might say he favors the election of Candidate X as a Senator from the State of Ohio would have a great deal of effect in assisting that candidate. But when he is placed in charge of the campaign, with the money raising duties resting on his shoulders, that is a different situation.

I do not know whether the reports are accurate, but it is reported in the Washington Post editorial that a fund of $400,000 will be raised to elect a Senator from Ohio.

That is many times the legal limit. I do not know the source of the information, but it is published in a reputable newspaper. The report is that it is proposed to raise a $400,000 slush fund. If that be true, then the Secretary of the Treasury, unless he denies the $400,000 story, is today guilty of violation of the Corrupt Practices Act, which prohibits the expenditure of such a sum for the election of a United States Senator.

We are moving onto dangerous ground, when people become careless about the proprieties which should surround the office of a high official. He should not accept such a position as this.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know of any precedent in our history for such action on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have talked with senior Members of the United States Senate, with many men who for years have been dealing with the Treasury Department in connection with income-tax matters and other subjects under the jurisdiction of that Department. They tell me that they know of no precedent for this action. They cannot even recall a case in which a Secretary of the Treasury had served on a committee to raise funds.

It has seemed so important to the President that we keep our politics and our campaigns clean that, for that reason alone, he vetoed the gas bill. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota spoke today about certain indictments which had been obtained by the Department of Justice in connection with the campaign contribution issue involving an incident in which $2,500 was supposed to have been offered or donated toward the campaign of a United States Senator in South Dakota. Indictments have been obtained. With that action I have no quarrel. If the law has been violated, I hope those who violated it will be brought to justice.

But we have an entirely different question when the Secretary of the Treasury is placed in charge of a money-raising campaign. If the Washington Post story be true, that a $400,000 campaign fund is to be raised in behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Treasury, we shall find that the great confidence that should be reposed in the Secretary of the Treasury will be severely shaken.

I have just received a note from the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I inquired as to the limit, under the Ohio State law, for contributions to the election of a United States Senator. His staff informs me that this Ohio law limits it to $2,500, and not $400,000. I am also informed that the maximum amount in any State, under our present Federal Corrupt Practices Act, is $25,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma a question. If I correctly understood him, he stated that the newspaper article to which he referred indicated that Secretary Humphrey was raising funds in the State of Ohio for the senatorial campaign. Does the Senator know that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey will have nothing to do with raising funds, and that the responsibility in that connection has been placed in the hands of Joseph C. Schouvlin, of Springfield, Ohio, who is the chairman of the finance committee. Has the Senator taken the trouble to learn the facts in that connection?

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say in reply to my distinguished and beloved friend from Kansas that the Senator from Oklahoma is not so naive—nor is the Senator from Kansas—as to believe that the power of Mr. Humphrey's name and the influence of his office can be dissociated from the money-raising feature of any campaign, any more than the sun could be divided from the rest of the universe. He is the head of the campaign. There may be a dozen junior lieutenants or finance chairmen. The chairmanship is entirely in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury. The reports will all come to the chairman of the campaign committee.

When investigations are made—and they must be made, if this $400,000 figure is correct—the first witness to be called will be the chairman of the campaign committee. The distinguished Senator from Kansas knows that to be so.

The Secretary of the Treasury can no more take off his hat as Secretary of the Treasury and hang it on one peg, put on another hat as campaign manager for a senatorial political campaign, and walk out a different man, than he can put on a hat as chairman of the committee and avoid the money-raising issue. I say that because the Secretary of the Treasury is the director and chairman of that campaign. The Senator from Kansas knows that to be a political fact of life, and so does the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Oklahoma feel that all Cabinet members, whether Democrat or Republican, should be barred from any political activity?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say that a member of the Cabinet, certainly a member of the Cabinet in the sensitive position of Secretary of the Treasury, who controls all the banks and all the deposits and all the Federal money in the banks, and who heads the income-tax division and the income-tax investigators through a subagency, has no right to participate, in a managerial or any other official capacity, in the campaign of a United States Senator or in the campaign of a candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to have the Senator's frank view on the subject. I wonder how many of his good Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle—and I am not excluding the Senator from Oklahoma—subscribe to that theory so far as the last two Democratic administrations are concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. I can remember the last campaign very distinctly, when not one of the Cabinet members made a speech during the campaign. They felt it was improper to do so. The Secretary of State declined to make any political speeches. I do not recall any other Cabinet member making a speech. The Secretary of Defense declined to do so. Certainly a man who occupies the high position of Secretary of the Treasury should have a keen sensitivity about his relationship to the powerful and important and responsible position he holds,

and should not assume the duties of manager or chairman in a senatorial or a presidential campaign.

There is a very good reason why Federal law prohibits a national bank from making any contribution to any kind of political campaign. Yet now we hear of a man, who is in charge of all the banks and all the deposits of the Government in the banks, going onto the firing line and leading the charge, with his saber drawn, to do or die for dear old GEORGE BENDER.

I want him to be for GEORGE BENDER, if he chooses; but certainly, if he chooses to become chairman of his campaign, he should resign his position as Secretary of the Treasury. Either that, or he should resign his position as manager for Senator BENDER'S campaign.

I have no objection if he wishes to manage that campaign. It is a high calling to manage a campaign. I am happy to have had friends who were willing to manage my campaigns. However, it must be remembered that a Federal employee, even one in the humble position of postmaster or letter carrier, cannot, under the provisions of the Hatch Act, engage in political or campaign activities. Apparently that is not the case with the Secretary of the Treasury. If it is wrong for a postmaster, who has very little power to exert in a political campaign, to serve even as a member of a political committee, then it is certainly wrong, and it compounds the abuse and the evil, for a man who is in command of a very important post in our Government to forsake that high post and engage in the razzle-dazzle of campaign management and campaign expenditures.

Whether the Senator from Kansas believes it or not, the money raising which will be done during the campaign will be quite extensive. Perhaps it may be done without the Secretary's knowledge, but if so, it will only be because he will have put on earmuffs or have quarantined himself in a vacuum to avoid knowing who is putting up the money for the big fund to elect the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one final question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. By way of observation—and I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma agrees—I should like to say that George Humphrey is a reliable man and a man of great integrity, and would not do anything illegal or anything that was in conflict with the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with what the Senator has said. I have already said so a half dozen times in my remarks. However, he is a man of very poor political judgment. I am afraid he is so intent on electing a Republican Senate that he is willing even to put the high post of Secretary of the Treasury, with all its responsibilities and dignity, on the block of a political campaign, in order to win the seat for the hard-pressed Republican candidate in Ohio.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will agree to check the record in connection with the distinguished list of Democrats I hold in my hand. It is a list of distinguished Democrats who actively participated in campaigns of a few years ago. The list is headed by the name of the great Ickes, who occupied a very important Cabinet position. Then there is Jim Farley, who is a great Democrat. He is respected all over the country. Then there is Mr. Hannigan and also Louis Johnson. I wonder whether the Senator will reflect for a moment before he goes too far with his remarks about the present Secretary of the Treasury. I recognize the Senator from Oklahoma has a right to be alarmed. This is the first time I have heard the admission made by Democrats that there is a good chance of completely losing the State of Ohio. Formerly they had insisted they would win the senatorial seat in Ohio.

Mr. MONRONEY. I recall no campaign management or any money-raising activities by Mr. Ickes.

I remember that Mr. Farley was the campaign manager for President Roosevelt. I believe he retired as chairman of the Democratic National Committee after he took the position of Postmaster General. I do not know of any official position in a political campaign that was held by Mr. Louis Johnson. This is the first time that a Cabinet official has taken the position of campaign manager, after entering the Cabinet.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that Mr. Farley was Democratic national chairman during all the time he was Postmaster General?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes; he was.

Mr. MONRONEY. During the campaign. As soon as he was appointed Postmaster General, he sought his successor, who was appointed.

Mr. CAPEHART. He was Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee at the same time. I do not see anything particularly wrong with it, of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is what is beginning to worry me, that the Republicans do not see anything wrong in allowing these things to go on. A Secretary of the Treasury should have a greater perception of the duties of his office.

Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], concerning whose campaign I have been speaking, wishes me to yield to him. I shall be delighted to yield to him or to yield the floor. I shall be glad to yield the floor, but I promised to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has temporarily left the floor.

But in answer to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], let me say that Attorney General Brownell managed the Eisenhower campaign, and, along with Mr. Summerfield, raised money for the campaign. They did that before they became Cabinet members. Mr. Summerfield's position is recognized as having the duty to see to it that no Democratic postmaster is appointed if a living Republican can be found to fill the office. He is still in the Cabinet and may take an active part in the Republican campaign, I suppose. I do not believe there is any precedent within 100 miles for a man occupying such a sensitive position as Secretary of the Treasury to be appointed campaign chairman.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, mention has been made of Mr. Farley's name. I have been very closely associated with Mr. Farley since the time when I was First Assistant Postmaster General.

I wish to say what I know to be a fact, that it was the custom throughout many administrations, Republican and Democratic alike, to appoint as Postmaster General the man who had managed the campaign for the election of the President. Republican President after Republican President, and Democratic Presidents, also, named as their Postmaster General the man who was supposed to be the political manager of their campaign.

Anyone who attempts to compare such service in a political campaign with the service of the Secretary of the Treasury, under whose jurisdiction all taxes are collected, who has all power over banks, all power over the financial aspects of the country, in the campaign of 1956, when the great issue of small business versus big business will be debated—anyone who attempts to compare the service now undertaken by the Secretary of the Treasury with the service of Democratic and Republican Postmasters General in the past is making a comparison of incomparable services.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that James Farley was chairman of the Democratic National Committee from 1932 to 1940, and is it not also a fact that he was Postmaster General from 1933 to 1940?

Mr. MONRONEY. My memory does not go back that far, though I know, as the Senator from Wyoming said, that for dozens of years it has been customary for Democratic and Republican campaign managers to assume the duties of the Postmaster General. But does the Senator consider the sensitivity of the office of the Postmaster General to be comparable with the vast powers of the Secretary of the Treasury? The Senator is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee——

Mr. CAPEHART. I would say that the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Jim Farley, who was likewise Postmaster General and the manager of Mr. Roosevelt's campaign, was in a rather sensitive spot.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the distinguished Senator sees no difference in the control of the income-tax machinery, the control of the banks, and all the other vast powers possessed by the Secretary of the Treasury, perhaps that explains why the Secretary of the Treasury has been persuaded to undertake the job of campaign chairman.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have four bills to dispose of, and when we finish with them Senators

can talk politics into the night, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I asked recognition, but I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

COVERAGE OF EMPLOYEES OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE WITHIN THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2858, House bill 3489.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3489) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2851, House bill 4392.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4392) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] make a brief statement concerning the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, H. R. 4392 provides substantially the same treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies. Real estate trusts are organizations specializing in investments in real estate and real estate mortgages while the regulated investment companies specialize in investments in stocks and securities.

Under present law regulated investment companies, which distribute 90 percent or more of their ordinary income are taxed only on their retained earnings. In general, the beneficiaries of these companies are treated as if they had received the income directly from the same sources as the investment company. This bill removes the discrimination against real estate investments by according real estate investment trusts and their beneficiaries this same conduit type of tax treatment. The bill carefully restricts this tax treatment to what are clearly passive real estate investments. Your committee believes that any real estate trust engaging in active business operations should continue to be subject to the corporate tax in the same manner as is true in the case of similar operations carried on by comparable enterprises.

Your committee believes that the equality of tax treatment between the beneficiaries of the real estate trusts and the shareholders of regulated investment companies is desirable since in both cases the methods of investment constitute pooling arrangements whereby small investors can secure advantages normally available only to those with larger resources. These advantages include the spreading of the risk of loss by the greater diversification of investment; the opportunity to secure the benefits of expert investment counsel; and the means of collectively financing projects which investors cannot undertake singly.

In addition to providing equality of tax treatment between the trust beneficiary and the investment company shareholders, your committee believes that it is also desirable to remove taxation to the extent possible as a factor in determining the relative size of investments in stocks and securities on one hand and real estate equities and mortgages on the other. This is particularly important now because currently the financing of these real estate equities and mortgages is dependent largely on Government-guaranteed money, and investments by special groups, such as insurance companies and pension trusts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4392) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN BEQUESTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2852, H. R. 11834; and that the bill be considered without amendments, except committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11834) to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, under present law, a deduction is allowed for estate tax purposes for the amount of a bequest to charity. This deduction is allowed if the property actually goes to charity, with regard to the fact that the bequest was made outright to charity or that the bequest was only paid to charity because the named beneficiary renounced his right to receive the gift. In some cases it is not possible for a legatee to renounce and allow the property to go to charity under the terms of the will. Under this bill, if the surviving spouse of the decedent is over 80 at the time of the decedent's death and has a life estate plus a power of appointment over the corpus of a bequest in trust, he may name the charities in whose favor he intends to exercise the power of appointment within 1 year of the decedent's death, and if the power of appointment is exercised by his will in favor of the charitable organizations as he stated he would, the bequest will be treated as a bequest by the decedent to the charity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREIGN TAX CREDIT FOR UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2853, H. R. 7643; and that the bill be considered without amendments, except committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7643) to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill amends the foreign tax credit provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for tax years beginning on or after January 1, 1950. It provides that a United States recipient of a royalty for the use of copyrights, patents and other similar properties derived from sources within the United Kingdom is to be deemed for purposes of the foreign tax credit to have paid any income, war profits, or excess-profits taxes paid to the United Kingdom by which the royalty was reduced. This bill is intended to give the same tax result to recipients of royalties who have permanent business establishments in the United Kingdom as is given to royalty recipients who do not have permanent business establishments under existing tax conventions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLOWANCE AS DEDUCTIONS OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO MEDICAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2854, H. R. 12152; and that the bill be con-

sidered without amendments, except committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12152) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance as deductions of contributions to medical research organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to raise the charitable contribution limit for individuals from 20 to 30 percent of adjusted gross income in the case of contributions made to certain medical research organizations in the same manner as the limit for contributions to educational institutions, hospitals, and churches was increased by the 1954 Code. Under the bill, the contributions to medical research organizations that will qualify are only those made to organizations directly engaged in the continuous active conduct of medical research in conjunction with a hospital and only if during the calendar year in which the contribution is made the organization is committed to spend the contribution for such research within the 4 years following the year the contribution was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLACEMENT OF GUAR SEED ON THE FREE LIST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2833, H. R. 9396. I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9396) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, testimony was given on the bill before it passed the House. It was stated that none of these beans are grown in the United States. I want to be certain that the RECORD is correct about that.

The information I have is that in 1955 more than 100,000 acres of these beans were planted in Texas. In 1956, 65,000 acres have been planted. Experiments are now being conducted with the guar plant, and the question I wish to address to the chairman of the Committee on Finance is this: Is this tariff exemption extended for an indefinite period?

Mr. BYRD. It is; the bill extends the period indefinitely.

Mr. THYE. I believe it would be a mistake to do that, because if it proves advisable to grow these beans in the Southwest, there will then be an expansion of the acreage grown. The development of this plant should be encouraged.

If imported guar beans are to be placed on the free list, the planting of this type of crop in the United States will be discouraged. Therefore, I believe the exemption should not be for more than 1 or 2 years, until a definite report can be made.

Mr. BYRD. I will accept an amendment providing for a 2-year exemption.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished chairman for permitting this amendment to be made on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Virginia submit the amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The amendment provides an exemption for 2 years from the date of passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On what line will the amendment appear?

Mr. THYE. I do not have a copy of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment be made at the appropriate place in the bill, so as to provide for a limitation of the exemption for 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the chairman of the committee is that a proviso be included in the bill to limit the exemption to 2 years. Is that the sense of the amendment?

Mr. THYE. And that that amendment appear in the appropriate place in the language of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to the bill.

Guar seed is the seed of a grass-like plant, and is used principally to produce a type of gum used in the paper industries and recently in the processing of uranium.

The plant does not grow well in the United States. It is true that some is being grown experimentally. The seed is in great demand but is available only in very limited quantities.

Making it free of duty would be of assistance to consumers in the United States in the purchase of limited quantities in foreign countries.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to admit free of duty any stained glass or any prefabricated panels consisting of stained glass set in reinforced concrete with fastening devices which may be imported within the 12-month period commencing on the date of enactment of this act for use in the construction of a new sanctuary and auxiliary buildings of the First Presbyterian Church of Stamford, Conn.

Mr. BUSH. The amendment was discussed with the chairman of the Committee on Finance. I believe he is willing to accept it.

Mr. BYRD. I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall yield to Senators for the purpose of submitting reports and making insertions in the RECORD. There are 4 or 5 bills we are endeavoring to have considered. The Senator is trying to catch a plane. Reports can be filed until midnight.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the bill has not been passed yet, and I have an amendment to offer to it. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1201, par. 1774), is amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1774. Altars, pulpits, communion tables, baptismal fonts, shrines, mosaics, or parts of any of the foregoing, and statuary (except casts of plaster of paris, or of compositions of paper or papier-mache), imported in good faith for the use of, either by order of or for presentation (without charge) to, any corporation or association organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes."

(b) This section shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of enactment of this section, and to mosaics covered by entries or withdrawals which have not been liquidated or the liquidation of which has not become final on such date of enactment.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, this amendment is the same language as that contained in H. R. 11035, which unanimously passed the House of Representatives on Tuesday. It provides for the duty free entry of mosaics imported for religious purposes.

Under present law, altars, pulpits, shrines, statues, and related items, imported by or for the use of organizations operated exclusively for religious purposes, are exempt from import duties. The bill provides for the inclusion of mosaics imported for those purposes in the list of exempted items.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9396) was read the third time and passed.

EXEMPTIONS FROM TAX IMPOSED UPON CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2832, H. R. 7634, under the same conditions previously requested, that only amendments that are acceptable to the chairman of the committee be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7634) to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill, under the conditions stated by the majority leader? The Chair hears no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, at the appropriate place, to insert a new section as follows:

(g) For the purposes of this subtitle if property is sold or disposed of solely as the result of proceedings brought pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 309, 15 U. S. C. 4), or pursuant to section 15 of the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 736, 15 U. S. C. 25), and none of the defendants in such proceedings have been named as defendants in criminal proceedings because of the acts complained of in the civil action at the time of filing such civil action, such sale shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies.

(h) In the case of property sold to which the preceding subsection applies the requirements of (a) (1) dealing with investment in similar or related property shall be satisfied if the proceeds of the sale are invested with the approval of the Secretary in other property for use in a trade or business.

(i) The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the amendment provides that where property is sold because of a civil suit under the antitrust laws, a taxpayer is given 1 year to reinvest the proceeds in property to be held for productive use in a trade or business. If the civil action seeking divestiture is in any way connected with a criminal proceeding against the defendant named in the civil action, then the benefits of this section do not apply. The proceeds of the sale must be invested in property held for productive use in a trade or business with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. The language of section 1033 requiring investment in similar properties has been changed to permit reinvestments, with the approval of the Secretary, in other business properties. However, it is anticipated that the Secretary's approval will be withheld where the properties acquired are not closely related in use to the property sold.

By adding these subsections to section 1033 dealing with involuntary conversions generally, the basis rules and the replacement fund rules in that section will govern reacquisitions.

In other words, what the amendment means is that if a company is forced to divest itself of property under the antitrust laws because of court action, no tax shall apply, provided the money is reinvested in property used in a productive business within the course of a year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, did that provision pass the House?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; my understanding is it has not passed the House. I understand the House committee was favorable and agreeable to it.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from New Hampshire have any idea of the loss to the Treasury which would be incurred by adoption of the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not think in the end there would be any loss. If, as the result of a civil suit, a company was ordered to divest itself of property, and there was any criminal undertaking or criminal connection with the civil suit, the amendment would not apply.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Treasury approved the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand so. I cannot vouch for it, but that is my understanding.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is this the amendment that was offered in the Finance Committee, and which the Finance Committee discussed and finally rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Not to my knowledge, but it may have been. I am not on the Finance Committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is this not the amendment that applies only to the Hilton Hotel group?

Mr. BRIDGES. I presume it might apply to that group, but it would apply to anybody who was forced to divest himself of property under an antitrust suit in a civil suit.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire know of anybody else than the Hilton people to whom the amendment would apply?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that it would apply even to the Hilton people.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I recall, both the Treasury and the Department of Justice are opposed to this amendment at this time.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment was considered in the committee and was not approved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the effect of this amendment to free from the capital-gains tax the gains which a company might make if it sold a hotel for more than it paid for the hotel?

Mr. BRIDGES. It postpones the application of the capital-gains tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It frees from the capital-gains tax the profits which might be made from the sale of a hotel if the sale had been ordered under a civil procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. If it is an involuntary sale.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. There would be a very substantial tax saving to the beneficiary under the amendment, would there not?

Mr. BRIDGES. There would be a postponement of the tax.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. The postponement would be dependent upon what, on ultimate disposition, the property might bring.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. If the hotel were sold at a time when the market was high, the amendment might result in a substantial tax saving. If the hotel were sold when the market was low, there might not be any tax.

Mr. BRIDGES. The tax on the new property might take the place of the old, because the basis of the old property continues. I realize that this amendment is being proposed on the floor. I have not approved of a good number of the measures which have been passed in the last few days. I am not forcing my amendment, but it seems to me when the Federal Government steps in, and, by compulsory action, forces the sale of property against the wishes of the owner, or an owner sells property under orders to dispose of the property, then there should be some leeway in the taxes, regardless of whether a hotel or any other type of property is involved.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe the amendment ought to have the consideration of the committee. The amendment was before the committee. The committee laid it aside for further consideration.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman of the committee feels that way, the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw the amendment, with the assurance that the committee and its staff will study the matter and give prompt consideration in the new Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an explanation of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Under present law an exemption is provided in the case of the tax on the transportation of persons for commutation or season tickets for single trips of less than 30 miles or for amounts paid for commutation tickets for 1 month or less. Present law also provides an exemption from the transportation tax for charges not in excess of 35 cents.

This bill increases the exemption I have just referred to from 35 cents to 60 cents. When this bill was reported out by your committee this exemption was contained in subsection (b) of section 4262. Since the President signed H. R. 5265, relating to the application of the transportation tax to foreign travel, the section referred to is changed to section 4263.

The 35-cent exemption was first provided when the transportation tax was imposed

in 1941. Since 1941 prices of transportation services have advanced considerably with the result that this exemption is now considerably less effective in exempting commutation travel than at that time. Railroad coach fares in the eastern part of the country, for example, since 1940 have increased 68 percent or approximately the equivalent of the increase provided by this bill in the exemption level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7634) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COVERAGE OF EMPLOYEES OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE WITHIN THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 2858, House bill 3489. That bill was previously taken up, and then was temporarily laid aside; and I thought the bill had been passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3489) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment on page 1, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the postage on the periodicals defined in section 203 of the act of July 3, 1948 (39 U. S. C. 291b), under the heading "Controlled Circulation Publications," shall be at the same rate as prescribed in such section of such act, regardless of the weight of the individual copies which rate shall remain in effect until otherwise provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act covers generally officers and employees of the United States Government and of the government of the District of Columbia including certain Government owned and controlled corporations. In view of the status of Gallaudet College as a private corporation, its officers and employees were not included under the provisions of this act. This bill brings such employees under the Federal insurance program.

The Senate amendment changes the classification "controlled circulation publications" from that of fourth-class to that of the second-class category.

The committee has just finished a study of this mail classification, and has concluded that this amendment will correct a longstanding inequity in mail classification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3489) was read the third time and passed.

REVIEW OF CUSTOMS TARIFF SCHEDULES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2834, House bill 12254, under the same circumstances, namely, that only amendments acceptable to the chairman of the committee be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12254) to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill merely extends until March 1, 1958, the time in which to make certain studies now being made by the Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 12254) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States.

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation; and

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

IMPORTATION FREE OF DUTY OF CERTAIN SHOE LATHES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2836, House bill 10177, under the same circumstances, namely, that only amendments acceptable to the chairman of the committee will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10177) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "act", to insert "and prior to the expiration of 2 years after such date."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer. I have previously submitted the amendment to the distinguished chairman of the committee. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after "linseed oil," wherever it appears, the following: "or printing papers, coated or uncoated."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment.

Under existing law and customs regulations, magazine publishers are entitled to a drawback of 99 percent of the duty they pay on imported Canadian paper, provided that the same paper is reexported to Canada in the form of magazines. This leads to endless and obvious bookkeeping and production problems, to make sure that the imported paper goes into the exported magazines.

The American paper manufacturing industry has no objection to this amendment. Magazine paper is in extremely short supply.

Canadian circulation of American magazines is roughly 5 percent of total circulation. The tariff on magazine paper, which this amendment would not change, is prohibitive. Hence, there is no possibility that more than 5 percent of our magazines will be printed on Canadian paper; and it is extremely unlikely that the use of Canadian paper would even approach that percentage.

This amendment would merely permit "substitution" such as already is provided for in section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 for sugar, metal, ore, flaxseed or linseed, or flaxseed or linseed oil. In other words, the magazine publisher, if he sent 100 tons of magazines to Canada, could import 100 tons of Canadian magazine paper with a drawback. He then could put this paper into his general paper "bank" and could use it for either domestic or foreign-circulated magazines.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10177) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the mutual-aid appropriation bill conference report has been agreed to by the House of Representatives; the social security bill conference report has also been agreed to by the House of Representatives; and the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill is now in progress. As I understand, the conference report on the executive pay bill has also been agreed to by the House of Representatives.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, it has been agreed to by the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So all of those conference reports may be called up either later in the day or on tomorrow; and I should like all Senators to be on notice in that connection.

Mr. President, I should also like to give notice, if I have not already done so, that we plan before we go out either today or tomorrow to consider Calendar No. 2751, H. R. 2128, to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls.

I should like Senators to be on notice that there is a possibility that that bill will be considered.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

AMORTIZATION OF GRAIN-STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2472, House bill 9083, under the same conditions; namely, that only amendments acceptable to the chairman of the committee be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9083) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 169 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amortization of grain-storage facilities) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (d) thereof "December 31, 1956," wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1958"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Cross reference.—

"For special rule with respect to gain derived from the sale or exchange of property the adjusted basis of which is determined with regard to this section, see section 1238."

(b) Section 1238 of such code (relating to amortization in excess of depreciation) is amended by inserting after "section 168 (relating to amortization deduction of emergency facilities)" the following: "or section 169 (relating to amortization deduction of grain-storage facilities),".

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply only with respect to sales or exchanges of property on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Section 172 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to net operating loss deduction) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The net operating loss deduction shall be, in lieu of the amount specified in section 122 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, the sum of—

"(A) that portion of the net operating loss deduction for such year, computed as if subsection (a) of this section were applicable to the taxable year, which the number of days in the taxable year after December 31, 1953, bears to the total number of days in such year, and

"(B) that portion of the net operating loss deduction for the taxable year, computed under section 122 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 as if this paragraph had not been enacted, which the number of days in the taxable year before January 1, 1954, bears to the total number of days in such year. A corresponding pro rata computation (notwithstanding subsection (e)) shall also be made in determining the adjustments to the taxable income of such taxable year for the purposes of the second sentence of subsection (b) (2)."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to options to buy or sell) is amended by striking out "a privilege or option to buy or sell property" and inserting in lieu thereof "a privilege or option, acquired after February 28, 1954, to buy or sell property."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective as if enacted as an original part of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 4. Section 1321 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to inventory liquidation of LIFO inventories) is amended by striking out "January 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1957."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 4272 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the tax on the transportation of property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Farm commodities: The tax imposed by section 4271 shall not apply to amounts paid for the transportation by or for the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm of an agricultural commodity (including livestock and poultry) in continuous movement from the farm on which such commodity was produced to a processing or distributing plant located within the local marketing area for such commodity."

(b) Section 3475 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the tax on the transportation of property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Farm commodities: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to amounts paid by or for the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm for the transportation of an agricultural commodity (including livestock and poultry) in continuous movement from the farm on which such commodity was produced to a processing or distributing plant located within the local marketing area for such commodity."

(c) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to amounts paid after December 31, 1954. The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to amounts paid after November 30, 1942, for transportation which begins after such date.

(2) No interest shall be allowed or paid in respect of any overpayment of tax resulting from the amendments made by this section.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. While we are sending for certain Senators who wish to be present when this bill is discussed, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who wishes to make a statement. He has been very courteous in facilitating the pending business. I am sure the Senator from Ohio will have finished his remarks by the time we can secure the attendance of Senators interested in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENDER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I was at the Department of Commerce attending a hearing in connection with a small employee-owned airline in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York, when I learned of the most unfortunate attack on the Secretary of the Treasury by a Senator for whom I have great respect. In my opinion, he was the last person who should have been expected to make such an attack.

I was elected a Member of the House of Representatives in 1938. I served seven terms there. Six times I was elected at large in the State of Ohio, and thus had to run as a Senator runs, statewide.

At the time of the lamented death of the late great Senator Robert A. Taft the question arose as to who should be the candidate for his unexpired term. Among those who encouraged me most was the great Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey.

Almost throughout my life I have known George Humphrey. I have al-

ways had profound respect for him. He has been my close, intimate friend; and I resent any implication that George Humphrey would do anything dishonorable or would use his office in any way in any political campaign, or otherwise, to influence an election. He is not for sale.

As a matter of fact, here is a letter Secretary Humphrey wrote on September 30, 1954:

SEPTEMBER 13, 1954.

DEAR ———: I am not a member of any campaign fund soliciting committee, and I cannot be. In my official position it would be ridiculous for me to solicit funds. That is elemental.

Sincerely,

G. M. HUMPHREY.

I have an Ohio Republican Senate Finance Committee. I have a list of some of the most prominent people—Republicans and Democrats—on my finance committee. A man who spent most of his life as a Democrat, Mr. Joseph C. Schouvlin, of Springfield, Ohio, is chairman of my finance committee. The secretary and treasurer of the finance committee is Fred J. Milligan, of Columbus.

Senators can understand why there are so many Democrats on this committee. It is because my opponent is a part-time Democrat. Democrats do not know whether he is coming or going, nor do the Republicans. And we all understand that there are no seats in the center aisle.

Personally, I know that George Humphrey is not in any way connected or associated with any financial effort that is being made in my behalf. This finance committee contains the names of 165 prominent citizens of Ohio, and I should say that 150 of them had formerly voted for my opponent, when he was a candidate for governor at various times. However, the people simply do not like someone who is riding both horses at the same time.

Regarding Mr. Humphrey's part in my campaign, he is not my campaign manager. Mr. William Cody Kelly, of Cincinnati, is my campaign manager. Mr. Humphrey agreed very enthusiastically to accept the chairmanship of my committee. Certainly there is not a Member of the Senate or the House would say that the Secretary of the Treasury ever permitted a case to be "fixed" before the Treasury Department.

As a matter of fact, 97 percent of the employees of the Treasury Department are holdover employees. They were frozen in their positions. Secretary Humphrey has made no objection to that. George Humphrey would not do a dishonorable thing. He would not do anything in the way of political chicanery, or "fixing," under any circumstances.

There is not a member of this body who will say that George Humphrey is not the ablest man in the Cabinet. When I announced my candidacy for reelection to the Senate every member of the Cabinet, in addition to the President, sent me a letter thanking me for the cooperation I had given him.

I have not been partisan on this floor. I have not been petty. I have made few speeches on this floor. I have been in Congress and in politics too long not to know that sometimes one makes a terrible mistake by talking too much in a legislative body.

As a Member of Congress, let me say that we have not elected a Democrat in Ohio as a United States Senator since 1934; and we are not going to elect a part-time Democrat this year. The Republican Party is for me, and most of the Democrats in Ohio are for me in this election. I can give their names.

All the Republican Representatives in Congress from Ohio held a meeting in my behalf. They are supporting me enthusiastically, as is the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Some of the Democratic Representatives in Congress from Ohio are supporting my candidacy.

Frankly, what is wrong with George Humphrey being my chairman? He has not used his office in any way. Ninety-seven percent of the people in his Department are holdover employees, and he certainly has no desire to do anything dishonorable. Anyone in Cleveland, Democrat or Republican, who knows George Humphrey knows something of his character and something of his service. He is serving in the position of Secretary of the Treasury at great financial sacrifice to himself. He is doing it as a public service. Senators know that when he appears before committees he is forthright and honest, and just as frank as is the President himself.

I am a member of the Government Operations Committee. The President said to me, "Do not brush anything under the carpet. If there is anything wrong with the Government, I want it out in the open." That attitude is also characteristic of George Humphrey.

So far as being chairman of my campaign committee is concerned, he is not my manager. He is not the chairman of my finance committee. He is not asking anyone for a dollar. That is not necessary, judging from the response I have received in Ohio.

Last night Mr. Harriman was at the home of my opponent. He said, "He is a regular Democrat." Mr. Harriman certainly was talking for votes from the delegation in Ohio.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is Mr. Harriman a regular Democrat?

Mr. BENDER. I do not know what he is. In my opinion, Mr. Harriman has about as much chance of being nominated by the Democratic Party as I have; and I am not a candidate for President on the Democratic ticket, as is my opponent. My opponent is a candidate for President, Vice President, and United States Senator. Heretofore, when he ran for governor, some of the Republicans laid down and played dead, and many Republicans supported him. For what reason I do not know. But they are not supporting him this year; nor are the Democrats.

I will be back here next January to take my oath of office. I have the support of the substantial citizens of my State, rich or poor.

George Humphrey is not for sale, nor am I for sale. George Humphrey encouraged me to run for the Senate 2 years ago. He is acting as my chairman because he has a deep affection for me, and—I say this very humbly—an appreciation of my public service.

I resent any implication that he is in any way using his office or using the Treasury Department to bludgeon people into contributing to my campaign. That is not George Humphrey. No Senator can point to a case that he has fixed for anyone. They must all take their place in the courts and must present their arguments in the regular way. There has been no fixing in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury for any taxpayer who has been derelict in any fashion.

Therefore, I deeply resent the implication on the part of anyone that George Humphrey is doing this for any other purpose except that he is fond of GEORGE BENDER and appreciates my public service. Many of my Democratic friends have said to me, "We don't want a part-time Democrat."

At the Atlantic City Governors' Conference my opponent said he did not know how he would vote on organizing the Senate. Democratic Senators, whether they are from the North or from the South, know how they will vote to organize the Senate. I respect them for it. We on this side of the aisle, while some of us may be from the North or the West or the East, certainly know how we will vote to organize the Senate. It is perfectly absurd for someone to say that he does not know how he will vote to organize the Senate.

That has been the record of my opponent. We have the worst highways in Ohio of any State in the Union, even though we are the fifth richest State and the fifth largest State in the Union. Yet we have the worst highways. The Cleveland Press, which supported my opponent for mayor and governor, has said so. It has said that Ohio had the worst highways in the country.

I know that to be a fact, because I have driven over them. I know what a jeopardy they constitute.

Our mental institutions are in a bad way. Our schools lack $283 million for the construction of necessary schoolrooms.

For these reasons, and others, I say that Republicans as well as Democrats are supporting me in my campaign. So far as Mr. Humphrey doing anything for me is concerned, he is doing no more than other Cabinet members have done in the past.

What do people expect of Republican members of the President's Cabinet to do except support Republican candidates? That is doing no more than Democratic members of the Cabinet do when they support Democratic candidates. The Hatch Act provides that a candidate may not ask an employee of the Federal Government for financial help. Certainly there is no violation of the Hatch Act in this instance. No Federal employees are contributing to my campaign. George Humphrey has nothing to do with the financial end of my campaign. That is being handled by Joseph C. Schouvlin, of Springfield, and 165 prominent Republicans and Democrats, some rich and some poor, who are

banding together to get rid of a chameleon in Ohio politics. I know the Republican Party and I know the Democratic Party favor my getting rid of him. The people of Ohio want a full-time Senator on the job. Even my severest critics say that I work here. And they know I get my orders from within and not from without. I have supported President Eisenhower to the best of my ability because I believe in him.

AMORTIZATION OF GRAIN-STORAGE FACILITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9083) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period of amortization of grain-storage facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to deductions from gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(gg) Loss in value of certain news collection and dissemination service franchises.—

"(1) In general: In the case of a taxpayer who on June 18, 1945, was engaged in the newspaper or a similar business and held on such date a franchise of a news collection and dissemination service described in paragraph (2), the loss in value of such franchise resulting from court decision which had the effect of destroying exclusive rights granted to the holder of such franchise by the terms of such franchise or the bylaws of such service.

"(2) Franchises described: Paragraph (1) shall apply only to a franchise of a news collection and dissemination service which—

"(A) was acquired by the taxpayer prior to June 18, 1945, and

"(B) when acquired by the taxpayer granted to its holder substantially the same exclusive rights as holders of similar franchises were granted by the bylaws of such service in effect on June 17, 1945.

"(3) Year in which allowed: The deduction allowed by paragraph (1) shall be allowed only for the taxpayer's taxable year which includes June 18, 1945."

(b) Notwithstanding any period of limitation or any other provision of law or rule of law, in the case of any taxpayer who had acquired a franchise described in section 23 (gg) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, the time for filing a return under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 for his taxable year which includes June 18, 1945, shall, at his election, not expire prior to January 1, 1957. Such election shall be made by filing prior to such date a return for such year in which the deduction allowed by section 23 (gg) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is claimed by the taxpayer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the chairman of the committee accept the amendment?

Mr. BYRD. I am sorry that I cannot accept the amendment. It would overrule the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit in the Reporter Publishing Co. case.

This case held that the loss of value of an exclusive right to a news release wire service by reason of a Supreme Court decision did not result in a tax deductible loss since the internal revenue laws do not permit a deductible loss for the reduction in value of property which the taxpayer still owns. On June 18, 1945, the Supreme Court held in the Associated Press case that the granting of an exclusive franchise for a news release service in an area was in violation of antitrust laws.

This amendment will allow taxpayers who owned exclusive franchises to wire services on June 18, 1945, to take a deduction for the loss of value occasioned by the Supreme Court decision in the Associated Press case. Under the amendment, a taxpayer has until January 1, 1957, to file another return for the taxable year which includes June 18, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Inasmuch as the chairman does not accept the amendment, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the amendment falls.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand, but I wish to say something for the RECORD.

Mr. President, in support of my amendment, I should like to say that prior to the Supreme Court decision of June 18, 1945, all news services such as the Associated Press were granted as exclusive franchises. That Supreme Court ruling abolished their exclusiveness and made the services available to anyone who cared to pay for them. Naturally, anyone holding a franchise prior to this Supreme Court decision had a much more valuable property, but due to that ruling, found his franchise had depreciated to a considerable extent.

This amendment is to allow anyone who had such a franchise to legally depreciate same as a business loss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to rule that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina is not in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 5, line 8, to insert the following:

SEC. 6. Depreciation on buildings, roads, and dams.

(a) Section 270 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding before the word "casualty" the words "depreciation allowable under section 167 (b) (1) with respect to roads."

(b) This section shall be applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to explain that this is an amendment for the relief of a particular person. I had hoped to make it more general, because it involves general needs, but the Treasury Department offered objection to making it too broad. It relates to what has come to be called the hobby clause. It allows losses for a period of 4 years of $50,000 a year on a hobby, so called, but if the loss occurs for 5 years, it is concluded that it involves something more than a hobby.

The case which the amendment is intended to reach is this, Mr. President. There is in the State of Vermont a very estimable citizen who has directed his large means to increasing the attractiveness of the State as a tourist resort. He has built a road to the top of one of our mountains, Mount Equinox, at Manchester, Vt., and has placed at the top a hotel and restaurant. Increasingly during the 4 years in which this development has been in existence, more and more thousands of persons have driven up that road and paid the toll which is required for entrance upon it. It is one of the very great attractions of the State, not undertaken for personal profit, but undertaken for the sake of State development.

This man had expected that the loss would be less than $50,000 a year. Unfortunately, the severity of our winters has so affected the maintenace and the upkeep of the road that it has not been possible up to this time, and not possible in the coming year, to keep the loss below $50,000. In consequence of this, this public-spirited citizen will be held up for taxes on the losses of 5 years, because this year he will not succeed in keeping the losses below $50,000.

This is a matter of great interest to all the citizens of my State, not particularly to this man. If we can permit him, which seems a reasonable thing, to charge off depreciation on the highway which has to be rebuilt every year, this year's losses will fall within the $50,000.

It seems to be clear that from now on the chances of keeping within the $50,000 will get better each year, so that this amendment will safeguard the enterprise.

As I originally presented the amendment, Mr. President, it was for building roads and dams. When I first considered it, it covered depreciation in general. The Treasury Department called attention to the fact that race horses depreciate, and that under my suggestion as I first made it, a man with a stable of race horses might claim depreciation.

I have finally whittled the amendment down to the form in which it has been presented today, making it a particular amendment to fit a particular situation. I believe I have covered every objection the Treasury has offered. That being the case, I am asking the chairman of the Finance Committee whether he is willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment was considered by the Finance Committee very fully. It is true, the Senator from Vermont has made certain changes in it, but I think it would establish a very dangerous precedent, and we would be attempting to pass a general law for one specific purpose.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, that was not my intention, in the first place, but the Treasury Department has driven me to it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it opens up the whole question of how far we should go. It is with deep regret, and with great admiration for the Senator

from Vermont, that I do not feel justified in accepting his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman of the Finance Committee does not accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed at the proper place in the bill, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. (a) Part I of subchapter Q of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income attributable to several taxable years) is amended by redesignating section 1305 as section 1306 and by inserting after section 1304 the following new section:

"SEC. 1305. Breach of contract damages.

"(a) General rule: If an amount representing damages is received or accrued by a taxpayer during a taxable year as a result of an award in a civil action for breach of contract or breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship, then the tax attributable to the inclusion in gross income for the taxable year of that part of such amount which would have been received or accrued by the taxpayer in a prior taxable year or years but for the breach of contract, or breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship, shall not be greater than the aggregate of the increases in taxes which would have resulted had such part been included in gross income for such prior taxable year or years.

"(b) Credits and deductions allowed in computation of tax: The taxpayer in computing said tax shall be entitled to deduct all credits and deductions for depletion, depreciation, and other items to which he would have been entitled, had such income been received or accrued by the taxpayer in the year during which he would have received it, except for such breach of contract or for such breach of a fiduciary duty or relationship. The credits, deductions, or other items referred to in the prior sentence, attributable to property, shall be allowed only with respect to that part of the award which represents the taxpayer's share of income from the actual operation of such property.

"(c) Limitation: Subsection (a) shall not apply unless the amount representing damages is $3,000 or more."

(b) The table of sections for such part I is amended by striking out

"SEC. 1305. Rules applicable to this part."

and by inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 1305. Breach of contract damages.

"SEC. 1306. Rules applicable to this part."

(c) The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1954, but only as to amounts received or accrued after such date as the result of awards made after such date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this amendment in the form of a bill, passed the House of Representatives too late to be reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate. The staff has gone into the amendment carefully and thoroughly, and the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee is familiar with it. For the benefit of the Senate I should like to say that the amendment adds a new section to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 providing that a taxpayer who receives an award in a civil action for breach of contract, or breach of fiduciary duty or relationship, may spread the amount of the award over the period during which it would have been received if the breach of contract or duty had not occurred. The amount received from the breach of contract is included in gross income in the current year but if the tax would have been less had it been spread over the period in which the income would have been earned in the absence of the breach of contract or duty, the tax imposed in the current year attributable to this income is to be greater than the sum of these taxes which would have been imposed had the income been earned and reported for tax purposes in the prior years.

Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee and the staff that the amendment is acceptable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendment has been unanimously adopted by the House, with the approval of the staff I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 7. Section 613 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) Change in rate: In the case of taxable year ending after December 31, 1953, which includes the effective date of a change in the rate of percentage depletion, the allowance for depletion for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of:

"(1) that portion of a tentative allowance computed without regard to such change in the rate of percentage depletion which the number of days in the taxable year before the effective date of the change bears to the total number of days in the entire taxable year; plus

"(2) that portion of a tentative allowance computed as if such change in the rate of percentage depletion were applicable for the entire taxable year, which the number of days in the taxable year on or after the effective date of such change bears to the total number of days in the entire taxable year.

"The rules prescribed in this subsection shall also apply for the taxable year for which a rate of percentage depletion first applies. For the purposes of this subsection, effective date of change means 'effective date of change' as defined in section 21 (c)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the chairman of the committee accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BYRD. I should like to hear an explanation of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the amendment was approved by the House. The amendment would prevent discrimination against fiscal year taxpayers with respect to depletion allowance.

When the Revenue Act of 1951 was passed, it extended depletion allowance to additional industries, but applied only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950.

Taxpayers who filed returns on a calendar year basis got depletion allowance for a full year. Those whose fiscal year began on December 1 would be denied depletion allowance for 11 months. This discrimination was corrected by the passage of Public Law 594, July 21, 1952.

However, when the Revenue Code of 1954 was passed, the original wording of the 1951 act was used without modifying the law in accordance with Public Law 594.

The amendment would again correct this inequity.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Treasury approve the amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes, the Treasury approves the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator that if the amendment were included in the bill and the House objected to it, it might mean the death of the whole bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The House approved the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. But the House approved it without the authorization of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It was approved by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is the amendment the one which was offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania at a meeting of the Committee on Finance, and which was rejected?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. No; this is the first time it has been offered. I did not know anything about it until yesterday afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania think that the Committee on Ways and Means will accept the amendment?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. BYRD. If we include in the bill an amendment which is not agreed to by the House, the whole bill may be in danger.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I realize that; but I have been talking with members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am informed that the amendment is acceptable to them.

Mr. BYRD. It is not the same amendment which the Committee on Finance rejected; is it?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Oh, no.

Mr. CAPEHART. It has to do purely with the depletion allowance for fiscal year taxpayers.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the amendment result in any loss to the Treasury?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. No.

Mr. SMATHERS. In other words, all that is sought to be done is to shift to a fiscal year program.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct. It would not decrease or increase taxes; it would simply protect those whose fiscal year begins after a certain date.

Mr. SMATHERS. But in allowing a shift in fiscal year programs, would any loss be caused to the Treasury?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; the amendment would simply place such persons on the same basis as persons who use the calendar year for their fiscal operations.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania submitted his amendment

to the Treasury; and does the Treasury approve it?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes. The omission of this provision was an oversight when the act of 1954 was passed. The law was corrected in 1952; but when the act of 1954 was written, Congress overlooked the inclusion of this provision.

I have just been informed that the House Committee on Ways and Means waived their right to consider the amendment, that it was then considered by the Committee on Rules, and passed the House unanimously.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. I will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia having accepted the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Section 7805 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rules and regulations) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Unpublished ruling: Where a taxpayer files a return in accord with an unpublished ruling issued to another taxpayer in a similar situation and the ruling had not been revoked prior to the time the return was filed, such taxpayer shall be treated as if the unpublished ruling had been issued to him."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective as if enacted as an original part of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to correct an obvious injustice to some taxpayers.

The Internal Revenue Service has been allowing some taxpayers to deduct the interest paid on money borrowed to purchase annuities prior to 1954 and, for no rhyme or reason, so far as I can see, has not been allowing it to others.

It seems that those who are enjoying the exemption asked for and received favorable rulings from the Internal Revenue Service saying the deduction was proper. Other persons reading in the newspapers of these rulings quite naturally assumed the ruling represented the policy of the Government and governed themselves accordingly. The Internal Revenue Service is holding, however, that unless specific rulings have been received by each and every taxpayer in the same situation, he must pay the tax.

My amendment does not go to the merits or demerits of allowing the deduction. Such deductions have been discontinued. But it does provide that all taxpayers shall be treated alike in the period when the allowances were allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BYRD. I will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to H. R. 9083, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. FREAR'S amendment is as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following:

"SEC. —. That (a) notwithstanding sections 23 (1) and 113 (b) (1) (B) and (C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, and sections 167 and 1016 (a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, any taxpayer who, with the consent of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, did, during the period January 1, 1941, to January 1, 1956, change from the 'retirement' to the 'straight line' method of computing the annual depreciation allowance with respect to certain kinds and classes of property, may, in computing the adjusted basis of such property, elect (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to determine the adjustments for depreciation sustained prior to March 1, 1913, and depreciation 'allowed or allowable' after February 28, 1913, and prior to January 1, 1956, as hereinafter provided. Such election shall be effective only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955.

"(b) If the taxpayer elects as provided in subparagraph (a) above, then in determining the adjusted basis of all property of the kinds and classes subject to the change from the 'retirement' to the 'straight line' method of computing the annual depreciation allowance, the following adjustments shall be made, in lieu of the adjustments provided in section 1016 (a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in respect of all periods prior to the effective date of the election:

"(1) For depreciation sustained prior to March 1, 1913, on those assets (of the kinds and classes subject to the change from the 'retirement' to 'straight line' method of computing the annual depreciation allowance) owned by the taxpayer (or if a substituted basis is used, by the taxpayer's transferor, donor, or grantor) on March 1, 1913, for which the taxpayer claims (or claimed) as basis cost (or if a substituted basis is used, the transferor's, donor's, or grantor's cost) and which were—

"(i) retired prior to the date the taxpayer changed from the 'retirement' to the 'straight line' method of computing the annual depreciation allowance and, in determining the annual depreciation allowance (A) were included at their full cost without adjustment for depreciation sustained prior (by reason of the deductions so allowed) in deductions in computing the taxpayer's taxable income and, (C) with respect to any year ending after January 1, 1930, resulted (by reason of the deductions so allowed) in a reduction of the taxpayer's taxes under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or any priar income, war profits, or excess-profits tax laws; or

"(ii) on hand when the taxpayer changed from the 'retirement' to the 'straight line' method of computing the annual depreciation allowance, except where subparagraph (b) (2) is applicable.

The depreciation so determined shall be allocated (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) among all property of a like kind or class on hand on the first day of the first taxable year for which the election is effective.

"(2) For the amount of the reserve prescribed by the Commissioner under terms and conditions set forth at the time he consented to the taxpayer's change to the 'straight line' method which is applicable to assets disposed of by sale, casualty, or 'abnormal' retirement (for which the taxpayer was permitted, because of special obsolescence, a deduction for Federal income tax purposes) after the date of the taxpayer's change to the 'straight line' method and prior to the effective date of the election under this statute.

"(3) For depreciation properly allowable prior to January 1, 1956, under terms and conditions prescribed by the Commissioner at the time he consented to the taxpayer's change in the method of computation of his annual depreciation allowance.

"(c) If the taxpayer elects as provided in subparagraph (a) above, then in determining the adjusted basis of all property of the kinds and classes subject to the change from the 'retirement' to the 'straight line' method of computing the annual depreciation allowance, during the taxable years between the date of such change and the effective date of the election, and during that period only, the following adjustments shall be made (except for determining adjusted basis for the purpose of section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939) in lieu of the adjustments provided in section 113 (b) (1) (B) and (C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 1016 (a) (2) and (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954:

"(1) For the amount of the reserve prescribed by the Commissioner under terms and conditions set forth at the time he consented to the taxpayer's change to the 'straight-line' method as applicable to such assets at the time of the change to the 'straight-line' method, and,

"(2) For the depreciation properly allowable under the terms and conditions set forth by the Commissioner at the time he consented to the taxpayer's change to the 'straight-line' method.

"(d) If the taxpayer elects as provided in subparagraph (a) above, then, in determining equity invested capital under sections 458 and 714 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, accumulated earnings and profits as of the date of the change to the 'straight-line' method (and for each year thereafter), shall be reduced by the depreciation sustained prior to March 1, 1913, as computed under subsection (b) (1) (ii) above; in the determination of the adjusted basis of assets for the purpose of section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (and in addition to any other adjustments required by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939), the basis shall be reduced by depreciation sustained prior to March 1, 1913 (as computed under subsection (b) above), together with any depreciation properly allowable under subsection (c) (2) above for any period prior to the year for which the excess profits credit is being computed.

"(e) The election provided in this section may also be made by any corporation which acquired property, in a transaction described in section 373 (a) or in section 112 (b) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, from a corporation which would have been entitled to elect under subsection (a) if its existence had not been terminated; and an election made by such an acquiring corporation shall be given effect as if the acquiring corporation were the same corporation as the corporation whose property was acquired.

"SEC. —. (a) Section 373 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph reading as follows:

"'(3) Adjustment for property acquired from "retirement" method corporations: In a transaction described in subparagraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, if the corporation whose property was acquired used, at the

date of transfer, the "retirement" method of computing the annual depreciation allowance with respect to any kinds and classes of property, and if the acquiring corporation adopts or adopted with respect to any of those kinds and classes of property a method of computing the annual depreciation allowance other than the retirement method, then the basis of all property of those kinds and classes which was transferred and with respect to which the acquiring corporation adopts or adopted a method of computing the annual depreciation allowance other than the retirement method shall (in lieu of the adjustment required by subsection 1016 (a) (3) (A) of this subtitle) be reduced by depreciation sustained prior to March 1, 1913, with respect to all property of those kinds and classes which was either—

"'(A) retired prior to the date of transfer and which, in determining the annual depreciation allowance under this subtitle or prior income tax laws, (i) was included at full cost without any reduction for depreciation sustained prior to March 1, 1913, and (ii) was allowed as a deduction in computing taxable income, and, (iii) with respect to any year ending after January 1, 1930, resulted (by reason of the deductions so allowed) in a reduction for any taxable year of the taxes of the corporation whose property was acquired, under this subtitle, or prior income, war-profits, or excess-profits tax laws, or,

"'(B) on hand at the date of transfer to the acquiring corporation.

"'The depreciation so determined shall be allocated (in the manner prescribed by the Secretary or his Delegate) among all property of a like kind and class received from the corporation whose property was acquired.'

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, my amendment is just and equitable to all concerned. The Treasury, I understand, has agreed with the taxpayers who would be affected and with the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. In fact, it is my understanding that the Treasury actually drew up the phraseology of the proposed amendment. The bill is designed to alleviate the situation in the case of taxpayers who, during the period between 1941 and 1955, changed from the "retirement" to the "straight-line" method of accounting for depreciation. The affected taxpayers will be allowed substantially the same amount of deductions in the aggregate which would be allowed taxpayers who had at all times used the "straight-line" method.

For a great many years prior to 1941 almost all railroads employed the so-called retirement method of accounting for depreciation on certain roadway property in accordance with the accounting regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The same method of accounting was followed for tax purposes.

In 1942 the Interstate Commission ordered class I railroads—that is, those having a gross revenue of more than $1 million per year—to change, not later than January 1, 1943, from the "retirement" to the "straight-line" method of accounting for depreciation on certain roadway property. This change occurred during World War II, when property was required for wartime transportation needs and when it was not in the national interest to permit the retirement of any part of the property.

For these and other compelling reasons, the railroads applied to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for permission to make the change ordered by the ICC for tax purposes as well. The Commissioner decreed that only 70 percent of the cost of the property involved could be taken as depreciation, since some of the property had been owned prior to 1913, and any depreciation that would have been taken, if the property was subject to "straight-line" depreciation from the time of its acquisition, would not be available as a tax deductible item, because there was no Federal income tax up to that time.

Subsequent litigation brought by the taxpaying railroads, while not entirely settling the matter, tends to give the railroads involved in the litigation substantially more than would the amendment here proposed. In some cases it would allow the railroads to go back to 1943, open up their returns for those excess profit tax years, and receive refunds which would then be subject to the payment of 6 percent interest by the Treasury until the present.

This amendment would solve the difficulty, by giving the taxpaying railroads an opportunity to charge off a total of about 90 percent of the cost of the property for years beginning after December 31, 1955. This 90 percent would, of course, be spread over a proper future period of depreciation.

I am advised by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the adoption of this amendment would prevent the possibility of a very substantial refund for past years and would grant the relief, which the courts have indicated is proper, over a period of years in the future.

I may also say that the Finance Committee has not held hearings on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia accept the amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment. It may involve as much as $500 million. It was considered by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. No decision was reached. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that the proper procedure would be to offer the amendment at the next session and have hearings held on it. I regret to say, inasmuch as I regard the Senator from Delaware as one of the most able members of the committee, that I cannot accept an amendment of such importance without full committee consideration.

Mr. FREAR. I understand it would be asking a great deal of the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment, since no hearings have been held on it; but the Senator from Virginia, like the junior Senator from Delaware, is very conservative when it comes to matters of Government expenditures. I wanted to try to save the Government the 6-percent cost on any litigation in the future. If the chairman insists on not accepting the amendment——

Mr. BYRD. I would not want to take the responsibility of accepting it.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am very much in sympathy with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware; in fact, I should be glad to be a cosponsor of it. What I am about to say to the chairman of the committee will not be said as a member of the committee, but as a Senator. I feel there is so much involved that it ought to have further consideration, although I am very much in favor of the amendment he has suggested.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am unable to accept the amendment.

Mr. FREAR. If the chairman of the committee is unable to accept the amendment, I withdraw it, without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware withdraws his amendment.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be received and printed in the RECORD, without being stated by the clerk, and that I may explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the amendment not be read, but be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

Add a new section as follows:

"That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by renumbering section 121 and 122, and by inserting after section 120 a new section as follows:

"'Sec. 121. Gain from condemnation by United States of real property held by an individual who has attained the age of 60.

"'(a) General rule: In the case of an individual, gross income does not include gain from the condemnation by the United States, or from the sale to the United States under threat or imminence of condemnation, of real property held by the taxpayer for more than 6 months, if—

"'(1) such real property is taken by the United States, or such sale occurs, after December 31, 1955, and

"'(2) the taxpayer has attained the age of 60 years before the close of the taxable year in which such property is taken or such sale occurs.

"'(b) Exception. This section shall not apply to an individual who is engaged in the trade or business of buying or selling real property.

"'(c) Age test in case of real property held jointly by husband and wife: In the case of real property held by a husband and wife as joint tenants, or as tenants by the entirety, the age requirement contained in subsection (a) (2) shall be treated as having been met by both the husband and wife, if it is met by the spouse who, during their married life, has received the larger aggregate earned income. For purposes of this subsection, the

term "earned income" has the meaning assigned to such term in section 911 (b), except that such term does not include any amount received as a pension or annuity.

"'(d) Cross reference:

"'For special treatment of gain from condemnation by the United States, or sale under threat or imminence thereof, of real property, see section 1203.'

"(b) The table of sections for part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"'SEC. 121. Cross reference to other acts.' and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 121. Gain from condemnation by United States of real property held by an individual who has attained the age of 60.

"'SEC. 122. Cross references to other acts.'

"SEC. 2 (a) Part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to treatment of capital gains) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 1203. Real property acquired by United States through condemnation.

"'(a) General rule: If for any taxable year the taxpayer has a section 1203 gain, then with respect only to an amount equal to the amount of the section 1203 gain, the rate of tax under section 1201 (b) (2) shall be 10 percent (in lieu of 25 percent).

"'(b) Definition of section 1203 gain: For purposes of this section the term "section 1203 gain" means any gain from the condemnation by the United States, or from the sale to the United States under threat or imminence of condemnation, of real property held by the taxpayer for more than 6 months.

"'(c) Rules for application of section:

"'(1) In general: This section shall apply only if—

"'(A) the taxpayer has gain from the condemnation by the United States, or from the sale to the United States under threat or imminence of condemnation, of real property held by him for more than 6 months, which is required to be taken into account in computing his taxable income for the taxable year;

"'(B) such property is taken by the United States, or such sale occurs, after December 31, 1955;

"'(C) for such taxable year the net long-term capital gain of the taxpayer exceeds his net short-term capital loss;

"'(D) the taxpayer is not engaged in the trade or business of buying or selling real property; and

"'(E) the taxpayer elects (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) to have the special treatment provided by this section apply to such gain.

"'(2) Amount of gain: The amount of section 1203 gain for any taxable year shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"'(A) the amount of the gain recognized for the taxable year from the condemnation or sale of real property to which this section applies; or

"'(B) the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss.

"'(3) Adjustments in computations with respect to alternate tax: For purposes of the computation under section 1201 (b) (2), proper adjustment in the amount taken into account shall be made for any amount for which special treatment is provided by this section.

"'(b) Cross reference—

"'For exclusion from gross income of gain from condemnation by the United States, or sale under threat or imminence thereof, of real property of a taxpayer who has attained 60 years of age, see section 121.'

"(b) The table of sections for part I of subchapter P of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"'SEC. 1203. Real property acquired by United States through condemnation.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (f) of section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is amended by renumbering paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively, and by inserting before paragraph (3) the following:

"'(1) For exclusion from gross income of gain from condemnation by the United States, or sale under threat or imminence thereof, of real property of a taxpayer who has attained 60 years of age, see section 121.

"'(2) For special treatment of gain from condemnation by the United States, or sale under threat or imminence thereof, of real property, see section 1203.'

"(b) Section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to sale or exchange of residence) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(k) Cross references:

"'(1) For exclusion from gross income of gain from condemnation by the United States, or sale under threat or imminence thereof, of real property of a taxpayer who has attained 60 years of age, see section 121.

"'(2) For special treatment of gain from condemnation by the United States, or sale under threat or imminence thereof, of real property, see section 1203.'

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from taxation the amount gained as a result of condemnation by the United States of real property held by persons 60 years of age or over, and providing special treatment for such gains in cases where real property is held by persons under 60 years of age.

The amendment has been discussed with the chairman of the Finance Committee. It has been considered by the committee. I also offered the amendment in March of this year. I did so for a very definite reason. There is a provision of law respecting involuntary conversion of real property. That is, if a citizen is forced to sell his property because of the construction of a Federal project, he is given 12 months to invest the proceeds of the sale in a similar farm or business. Nevertheless, great anguish and hardship are caused for persons who are forced to leave their property because of construction of a reservoir, for example. Many such persons have lived on their farms for a lifetime, and have reached the age of 60, 70, or 75. They have a large equity in the land, but it was purchased at a time when the cost of the land was very low. The capital gains tax on such property is very high. In order to protect themselves from the 25 percent capital gains tax, they must buy another farm in another locality. I think it is most unfair.

I have discussed the amendment with the chairman of the committee. The amendment would eliminate the capital gains tax in the case of persons who are forced to sell their property as the result of the construction of a Federal project, and who are 60 years of age or over. In my opinion, there is no justification for requiring such people to take advantage of our involuntary transfer tax statute in order to protect their holdings, or requiring them to buy homes or farms or businesses in order to save the 25 percent capital gains tax. It simply is not normal for persons of that age to start farming operations in another community.

My proposal would also reduce the capital gains tax for such persons from 25 percent to 10 percent where the property owner has not attained the age of 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia accept the amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment was considered by the Finance Committee. While it was not rejected, it was not approved. I have a good deal of sympathy for certain features of the amendment. I feel it would be unwise at this stage to accept it and have it go to conference, because the House might object to it. If the House objected to it, it might imperil the passage of the entire bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I wonder if the Senator will give us some assurance that we may take up the matter next January?

Mr. BYRD. I certainly give the Senator from Kansas, who is one of the most able members of the committee, full assurance that we shall take the matter up when we convene next January, and go into it very fully, and I hope arrive at a satisfactory solution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I withdraw my amendment.

AMORTIZATION OF GRAIN-STORAGE FACILITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9083) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Are there further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended. The committee amendment is a substitute for the text of the bill.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 9083) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which grain-storage facilities may be constructed in order to qualify for rapid amortization, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate. I may say that it is understood that they will be the regular conferees on behalf of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, and once more, regrettably, we have failed to act on civil-rights legislation.

In my judgment, the bill approved by the House of Representatives, by a vote of 279 to 126 is a reasonable bill. It is a good start toward assuring justice for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

I am prepared to vote on this bill now, in the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the Senate floor, and indeed, have been prepared and eager to vote for a long time.

It is a source of regret to me that the present majority on both the committee and on the floor has not brought it up.

We are all aware, of course, of the fact that the hour is so late in this session as to make almost impossible the chance to bring this bill up.

I had hoped that the issue could come up early in the Congress, so as to avoid precisely the sort of last-minute logjam which we are now encountering.

We all know that it would probably take nothing short of a miracle to revive the Civil Rights bill, but I am still hoping that such a miracle can come to pass.

Like my colleagues, I have received a telegram from a number of leading trade unions and other national organizations, urging action on this subject. I have been pleased to hear from my own State, as well—from many Wisconsinites deeply interested in the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a supplementary statement which I have prepared on the civil-rights subject. I ask that it be preceded by the text of a wire from the leading groups to which I have referred. Their spokesmen have urged that the Senate meet head-on this problem, by voting procedurally to take it up, rather than to allow the rules to snarl us in redtape and prevent action on this subject.

There being no objection, the telegram and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 25, 1956.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of our organizations we urge that the Senate take up the House-passed civil-rights bill in this session. Under circumstances prevailing in the Senate, votes on procedural motions to bring up the bill are votes on civil rights.

David Dubinsky, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO; Emil Mazey, United Automobile Workers; Willard Townsend, United Transport Service Employees, AFL–CIO; Francis Shane, United Steelworkers, AFL–CIO; A. Philip Randolph, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL–CIO; Kenneth Peterson, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO; Patrick M. Malin, American Civil Liberties Union; John Blue, American Council on Human Rights; Leo Pfeffer, American Jewish Congress; Kenneth Birkhead, American Veterans Committee; John J. Gunther, Americans for Democratic Action; Edward F. Snyder, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Bernard Weitzer, Jewish War Veterans; Clarence Mitchell, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mrs. William T. Mason, National Council of Negro Women.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have long been deeply interested in the promotion of civil liberties.

Back in the 80th Congress in 1947 and 1948, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we succeeded in reporting out an antilynching bill to the floor of the Senate. I was proud of this effort which overcame a good deal of opposition inside the committee.

Unfortunately, we could not thereafter achieve passage of the bill in the full Senate.

FOUR KEY POINTS IN PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Then, from the very start of the present Congress, I have been deeply interested in the President's program on civil rights. In the main, it has been keyed to four points:

1. Creation of a Federal commission to study and evaluate civil rights and to make reports periodically to Congress and to the President. This commission—which could prove extremely helpful—would possess subpena and other powers. This would enable the Members to gather factual information necessary to base a sound program in the future.

2. Creation, in the Department of Justice, of a new and much needed division devoted exclusively to the civil-rights field.

As we are well aware, at present, this very important legal field is relegated, in the Department of Justice, to a mere section. And it has been the feeling of the President, in which I concur, that its extreme importance requires that it have full status in that Department.

3. Necessary creation, in the Department of Justice, of a new Assistant Attorney General to head up this division on civil rights.

4. The amending of the existing civil-rights statutes now on the law books so as to provide civil remedies in a field which has been exclusively confined to criminal sanctions.

I believe that this program of the President has been well thought out. If it is enacted, we will have launched our ship upon the calm seas of study, thought and rational action.

The President's program is a modest program. It is not a cure-all. It will not solve difficult racial relations overnight. But it provides an indispensable first stage.

REASONS FOR THE FOUR PROVISIONS

Certainly it is important that we have the necessary personnel and facilities to enable a proper appraisal in this field—a subject in which there is such strong emotion in both the North and the South.

It has always been my thought that the best legislation is that which is founded upon the best research. The creation of the proposed Commission would, therefore, provide us the background that is necessary for the comprehensive protection of civil liberties in this country.

There is nothing in this Commission in its appraisal of factual material, which should be objected to by any calm thinking person. It would simply be a fact-finding organization. It would have the concurrent duty of making recommendations to the President and the Congress. Along this line, no reasonable person should object to increasing the appropriate facilities in the Department of Justice.

Finally, in this connection, I call attention to the fact that this modest program provides no criminal sanctions. That means no increase in penalties and no reduction of States' rights. It just permits the Department of Justice to do the job that it is charged with doing under existing law.

Perhaps the most important new feature in the civil-rights field which is contained in the President's program, is the setting up of civil remedies as part of the existing civil rights statutes.

This is a change in the philosophy of approach to this field. Heretofore, it has been considered by those who wanted quick action, that a criminal approach was the best approach. This immediately raised the bugaboo of alleged invading of States rights and it has caused a chronic controversy in this field. The Southern States have utterly opposed what they construed as "interfering in their own police power under the Constitution."

By contrast, the proposed new approach is not to carry criminal penalties, not to develop a vast new addition to the Federal Criminal Code—which would be bitterly opposed, but rather to try the approach of legal action under the civil law.

The Attorney General of the United States had testified before our Judiciary Committee that he preferred the civil approach to the criminal approach, and that is why it is in the President's program.

WISCONSIN STATUTE FOR NONDISCRIMINATION

Now, let me point out that in my State of Wisconsin, we have a law prohibiting discrimination against qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry.

Wisconsin also provides that its schools shall not exclude any person on account of his religion, nationality and color. We provide in section 40.51 that "no separate school or department shall be kept."

In other words, we don't believe in segregation. We welcomed the United States Supreme Court decision for desegregation. That decision is now the law of the land, and it must be carried out expeditiously.

WISCONSIN'S TRADITION OF FAIRNESS

Our State has a long tradition of fairness. We believe in judging each one on his own merit, not on the irrelevant base of the color of his skin or the church or the temple in which he worships.

Recently, the State of Louisiana, unfortunately, passed a law banning all nonsegregated athletic contests.

As a result, the University of Wisconsin, holding fast to the principle of nonsegregation, felt that it had no alternative but to cancel our proposed football contest with Louisiana. We did not and do not intend to leave at home a Wisconsin Negro player simply because the color of his skin is regarded as a bar in Baton Rouge.

A good football player, a good baseball player on the Milwaukee Braves or any other team; a good boxer or track or field man or any other athlete is entitled to be judged as a man, not to be penalized because of his ancestry.

When Negro boys died in battle in the uniform of our land—in the Argonne or at Iwo

Jima or at Tagu, they died as Americans. Why should anyone, now or ever, forget their sacrifice and deny elementary justice to people of this or any other race?

Why should a Negro child grow up under the terrible cloud of being considered as a "second class citizen?"

Why should America be untrue to its own traditions of the pursuit of happiness by one and all?

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I have said on many occasions, among others during an address I delivered before the retail gasoline dealers at their convention at Wausau, Wis., on June 25 of this year, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 1840 (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to give greater equality of opportunity to small business. These provisions have just been added to H. R. 9424.

I favor the antimerger provisions of this bill, but I am even more enthusiastic about the antiprice discrimination provisions which have been added to it.

H. R. 1840 was passed by the House by a vote, as I recall it, of 393 to 3. Hearings had been held in the House, but the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee also conducted comprehensive hearings. It is the American way to give all sides a fair opportunity to present their arguments. I believe all had a full and fair opportunity to be heard. Their testimony was fully considered.

The evidence confirmed me in my belief that the equality of opportunity provisions are sound and are needed to save small business.

What the bill would do to help the difficult situation in which small business finds itself is, to put it simply, this:

First. The Robinson-Patman Act was passed to outlaw price discrimination.

Second. We are accustomed to a one-price system when we go into a department store or a grocery store to buy at retail. The store does not offer me one price and my neighbor a different price. The act intended that big corporations in dealing with their wholesalers and retailers should act in a similar way, having in mind differences in costs and transportation rates and service rendered in return by the buyer.

Third. In 1951, the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Detroit Standard case—*Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* ((1951) 340 U. S. 231)—decided, in a prosecution for price discrimination, that it was a complete and final defense to prove that defendant had lowered his price to meet the legal price of a competitor, and had done so in good faith. The Supreme Court decided that this was an absolute and final defense, although it had been thought by the Government, on the basis of the legislative history, and the statutory language of the act, that such proof merely shifted back to the Government the burden of going ahead, and the burden of final proof that the defendant's action had also tended substantially to lessen competition. The Court's decision blocked the Government from going ahead to prove that defendant had hurt the competitive system.

Fourth. Up to that time, the Robinson-Patman Act had been pretty effective and the small people had not found it too difficult to do business. Since that decision, more and more small retailers have found themselves in serious trouble as a result of price discrimination by large interstate concerns who are moving into the territory of the small concerns. The pattern of this big-business attack often seems to be that the big concern takes advantage of a lowered price to make a similar price cut, and then extends it broadly so that there is such a price war that the small-business store is badly hurt or driven out of existence. Of course, if the Government could prove that these price wars were started through collusion, the law in its present state, even with the Supreme Court decisions, would permit prosecution. However, such collusion is very hard to prove in a court case.

Fifth. Under these circumstances, the proposed bill, which has been supported by hundreds of small people in Wisconsin and throughout the country, in both telegrams and letters to me, I believe, would restore the status quo ante, as it existed prior to the Supreme Court case. Now, meeting a competitor's price is a complete defense. However, this bill would permit the Government to go ahead and try to prove, if it could, that meeting the competitor's price had set off such a substantial price war as to injure or destroy enough competitive business to satisfy a court that the defendant's action had substantially lessened competition. This is a needed protection for the small fellow. We certainly do not want America to be just a series of assembly lines, with workmen sitting alongside doing routine tasks as the line of machinery or goods passes by. I hope that I shall never see this happen. And I believe this bill will help to delay, if not prevent, any such result. The independent is essential to the strength of the American way of life.

Sixth. It has been made clear, I believe, in the course of the subcommittee hearing, that H. R. 1840 would not outlaw absorption of freight costs unless it was part of a discriminatory pricing practice, which would be illegal anyway. We have added a rider to make this clear. I believe it has also been made clear that a small man meeting a price of his next-door neighbor would not be substantially lessening competition, even though he might take business away from his immediate competitor. As in so many antitrust cases, the question of how many people have to be hurt before a violation occurs, is a question of degree, which it is impossible to specify by statute in advance. American pricing policies and American competitive practices are, by the very nature of our way of life, fluid and complex. Any rigid, overly specific statute dealing with them would freeze their flexibility unwisely. The best antitrust law is fluid and adaptable to a myriad of complex and differing situations.

I believe this bill meets these standards and helps our American way of life, and I hope we shall all promptly consider it on the floor and help to get it passed.

The premerger notification provisions of the bill would give the Government, which is charged with protecting the people's interests, a prior "look-see" before big companies combine to become giants, before growing monopoly stalks the land. We have written in exemptions for innocuous situations. We have done everything to make the notification process simple. But we cannot permit combines to grow by devious devices unknown to the public.

I have worked for this bill. I have fought for this bill. I have insisted it be reported out of committee. I urge its adoption.

FAILURE OF CONGRESS TO PASS BILLS RELATING TO CERTAIN WAR VETERANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity to say it is too bad that Congress is about to adjourn without taking action on a House bill for the relief of World War I veterans and a House bill providing for a small increase in compensation for disabled veterans.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement regarding the proposed legislation for veterans which passed the House and is now before the Senate Finance Committee. Up to this date the various governmental departments have not responded to the request of the committee for their opinion either for or against this proposed legislation. Very extensive hearings would be required, because we have a number of requests to be heard either for or against these bills. The Finance Committee never acts until first it receives from the Treasury Department and the other departments concerned reports as to whether they approve or disapprove of the proposed legislation.

As chairman of the Finance Committee, I wish to state that there has been no effort to suppress or prevent consideration of the bill; but we cannot proceed to consider it until we have received the proper reports.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may state that the distinguished chairman of the committee went into that matter very fully on yesterday. However, I wished to make a statement regarding the matter because I think the committee will be taking up the measure next January.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO ENCOURAGE SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS TO ENGAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in view of the interest shown by small business in Senate bill 3672, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade—which bill is before the Senate Finance Committee—I wish to state for the RECORD that the departmental reports received by the committee from the Small Business Administration, the Export-Import Bank, and the Treasury Department, indicate that some study should be given to the Western Hemisphere Trade Act, which Senate bill 3672 would amend. I have instructed

the staff of the Finance Committee to compile the necessary information and data for a committee study early in the next session of the Congress.

SAFETY DEVICES ON HOUSEHOLD REFRIGERATORS SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2747, House bill 11969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11969) to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to strike out "ninety days" and to insert in lieu thereof "one year."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Indiana will not insist on having action taken on the amendment at this time; there are one or two other matters to be brought up first.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree; but the amendment will be the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the pending question will be on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

EXTENSION OF A CERTAIN LEASE OF A TRACT OF LAND IN THE RANGE LIVESTOCK EXPERIMENT STATION, MONTANA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 4058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4058) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946, which was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "of", insert "not less than."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me ask what the amendment is.

Mr. ELLENDER. The House has amended the bill so as to provide that the royalty shall be "not less than" 1 percent, instead of the Senate provision of 1 percent.

I have discussed the matter with the author of the bill, and he is satisfied with the House amendment. The royalty is 1 cent a yard for the material excavated or removed by the railroad. Since the words "not less than" are used in the House amendment, the royalty could be raised to more than 1 percent—for instance, to 2 percent, or even to a larger percentage, if that were desired; under that provision, the percentage could be fixed at whatever amount the Department of Agriculture and the railroad company agreed upon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Do I correctly understand that the amendment has the unanimous approval of the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASED INDUSTRIAL USES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS TO REDUCE SURPLUSES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I have prepared on Senate bill 3503, a bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

In the last hours of the 2d session of the 84th Congress it has become apparent that while much progress has been made and great support has been forthcoming for S. 3503, I recognize the fact that there is not now sufficient time for final action on the bill which I consider to be the only solution to the establishment of a permanently sound and prosperous farm economy in America.

I am gratified by the progress which has been made and the tremendous support which has been rallied for this bill in the Senate and for companion bills in the House of Representatives.

I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], for conducting hearings on the bill. I am grateful to a number of my Indiana colleagues in the House of Representatives who have introduced companion bills and who have filed statements with the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture in support of the plan.

I want to express my gratitude also to the many farmers, farm organizations, scientists, economists, editors, heads of schools of agriculture, and experts on the staff of the Department of Agriculture for the support they have given to this permanent answer to what we commonly call the farm problem.

So tremendous has been their support and so complete is the record on this bill that I am certain the next session of the Congress will write it into law. This just has to be the answer to the farm problem.

The bill to which I refer of course is that seeking the establishment of a $100 million a year crash program of research and development to discover new industrial uses for every day products on the farm. For myself and 33 other Senators who joined as cosponsors I introduced this bill on March 21 and have been working tirelessly for its passage ever since. I have pointed out to the Senate before and I hope to have the opportunity to do so many times again that such a program, even on the basis of the technical knowledge already developed, would insure a market of fair and profitable prices for everything which can be produced from the soil of America's farms. With such a program we would never again know and feel the price depressing effects of the surpluses which have accumulated because our American farmers produced so much more than could be consumed in existing markets.

Now we in this Congress have enacted farm legislation to curtail for the moment the production of our farms to try to strike an even balance between production and consumption. But I believe we all recognize that this is simply a necessary expedient of the moment and that it cannot be the permanent answer to a prosperous farm economy.

No segment of our citizenry has done a finer production job than the American farmer. He was asked to do it and he did it. Likewise, the Federal Government has done an admirable and necessary job in helping the American farmer to produce more by the expenditures of vast sums of money in the development of new production methods over the years. But at the same time, Mr. President, I believe we all recognize that the Government has not kept pace with the situation by providing funds—just as necessary—to develop new uses and new markets for the things the farmer has produced. If we are to solve the surplus problem—get rid of existing surpluses and assure that they never again will accumulate—we must approve the program outlined in S. 3503 and its companion bills in the House of Representatives.

I pledge to you that if I am reelected to the Senate in November, I will continue with the help of all those who support such a plan, to advocate the adoption of the program as soon as possible. This I must do. I recognize that our national economy cannot remain sound and strong unless our farm economy also remains sound and strong.

I like to believe that most of my actions in the Congress are devoted to that legislation which will create jobs. To maintain a sound economy we must keep our people working. We must assure an economic situation in which there will be jobs because jobs make trade and trade makes jobs and the combination of the two will forever assure a healthy and prosperous economy and healthy, happy and prosperous people.

S. 3503 would do just that.

THE WATCH INDUSTRY AND PRECISION SKILLS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of July 23 carried an article which I believe to be of broad interest to the Senate. Therefore, I ask permission to have it printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article reports on the publication on July 18 of Senate Report No. 2629, unanimously adopted by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, of the Joint Economic Committee, and entitled "Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy—Case Study: Watch Industry and Precision Skills."

This is a most timely report. Within the next few weeks, the President will be reviewing the effects of the July 1954 increase of 50 percent in watch tariffs, in accordance with provisions of the Tariff Act which require such a reexamination 2 years after the "escape clause" is invoked. The underlying reason for the 1954 decision to boost tariffs, one will recall, was that the skills of the domestic watch industry were deemed essential to national defense. The Joint Economic Committee's report points out with compelling logic, and after a careful analysis of the facts, that, in general, import restrictions are prejudicial to our security because they impair the strength and security of the free world. After a thorough review of the watch case, the committee concluded that the consideration of defense essentiality did not warrant using an increase in the tariff and other restrictive devices to protect the domestic watch industry, for this would impose a burden on other industries and consumers. The report notes that:

The burden on other industries and on the trade of the free world will detract from national security.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the approach by the executive branch to the problem of examining defense essentiality of any industry must be of the most serious and soul-searching variety. In this connection, I should like to cite one of the important series of conclusions and recommendations of the committee which speaks clearly and logically about this problem.

In the very limited number of cases where the balanced assessment of all factors reveals a few industries need special treatment in the name of defense and if these are industries whose manipulation would have international repercussions, the alternative means to aid these industries should be weighed carefully in each individual case.

(a) Tariff increases, direct and indirect, should be eschewed for the burden they throw on other industries, on consumers, and on foreign trade essential to our system of world alliances, and for the reduced incentive to the domestic industry to increase its efficiency or improve its products.

(b) Quotas have the same disadvantages as tariffs plus the additional difficulties of rigidity in application and favoritism in assigning shares.

(c) Subsidies have many of the same effects as tariffs but are likely to throw a smaller burden on consumers and to require budget controls to provide for an annual review of their costs. This latter feature is a useful one.

(d) Stockpiling of durable items not subject to obsolescence but difficult to manufacture or to import in time of war represents a solution to some situations. But just as the tariff should not be used to hide a military cost, neither should military stockpiling hide a depressed industry relief cost.

(e) Standby facilities have a limited role: Existing facilities which cannot be put to current alernate use might be preserved if there is some prospect of their being needed in an emergency; but in industries which depend mostly on a high level of active skills, standby is not a helpful solution.

(f) Expanded research and development is something which should be undertaken without regard to temporary shifts in a cold war; only a sustained effort over many years can reap the full benefits of such an approach.

Mr. President, I hope that the unanimous findings of this subcommittee will point the way to sound future policies, in the best interests of our national security, not only in connection with the pending watch industry study, but also in connection with appeals from other industries which, on grounds of defense essentiality, seek protection from foreign competition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE-SENATE PANEL ASSAILS TRADE CURBS TO AID WATCH INDUSTRY—REPORT SAYS PROTECTION IN NAME OF DEFENSE IS UNWARRANTED, RESTRICTIONS CAUSE BURDEN

WASHINGTON.—A House-Senate economic subcommittee attacked the use of tariffs and quotas to protect the domestic watch industry against competing imports.

It said protection of the watch industry through trade restrictions in the name of defense is unwarranted. The group's report questioned whether the industry was as essential to defense as domestic watchmakers claimed.

The report stems from hearings the subcommittee conducted earlier this year on the relationship between United States foreign policy and special aid offered domestic industries because they are essential to defense. The hearings were focused on the watch industry.

The economic subcommittee's majority asserted trade restrictions to help the United States industry were unwarranted, first, because "it will not be effective in preserving the domestic industry, and second, it represents an undue burden on other industries as well as consumers. The burden on other industries and on the trade of the free world will detract from national security."

Imports of Swiss-made watches, the subcommittee also declared, "can stimulate the ingenuity and efficiency of the (domestic) watch industry." Spokesmen for Swiss manufacturers, at the hearings, said American watch styling, design, and manufacturing efficiency were outdated.

The report said, too, failure to produce watches in wartime is not likely to cripple the country's defense efforts. In fact, United States watch plants, according to the House-Senate panel, would probably have "higher priority" assignments to fulfill than producing watches.

The greatest contribution to defense of domestic watchmakers, the subcommittee study declared, is the "general pool of managerial, engineering, and production line skills in the manufacture of microprecision military end products." Though this skill is valuable, the subcommittee asserted, "it is not unique."

An increasing number of concerns not connected with watch production "are showing an ability to work to equally close or closer tolerances" than watchmakers, "and to develop complex weapons systems employing such components," the group claimed.

The subcommittee recommended the country's goal ought to be to expand its defense-skilled manpower, not to restrict trade.

Other subcommittee conclusions:

Importance of very high jewel counts has been exaggerated in advertising of some watches. Beyond 15 or 17, in a conventional watch, added jewels have little significance.

Criticism of the Swiss watch cartel by American interests should be in terms of whether it provides our consumers with products at lower prices and of better quality than would home or other foreign producers. "We have no valid reason for dictating the form of internal business organization in a foreign country."

Representative TALLE, Republican, of Iowa, in a dissent, criticized the majority for its flat opposition to trade restrictions in the face of Government decisions that such restrictions were warranted.

UNIFORM RETIREMENT DATE OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 912.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 912) to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel, and the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, which were on page 2, strike out lines 14 through 16, inclusive, and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the House merely struck from the bill the Senate provision that the mandatory retirement age of Foreign Service officers be increased from 60 to 65 years. Of course the House amendments leave the law the way it reads at the present time. With that one change, the bill was passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

POLLING OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS ON BILLS AND OTHER MEASURES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to announce that I have been approached from various angles and various sides to sign bills which committees have not voted to report. These are attempts to resort to the old practice by which committees were polled, and bills and other measures were placed on the calendar for action, although they never had received consideration by the committee concerned. It was an evil which was abolished by law, namely, by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1945.

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I wish to say that I cannot sign any of these polled bills. I cannot pretend to be a legislator making laws for other people to obey, if I myself violate the law under which the Senate acts.

STASSEN VERSUS NIXON

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three editorials making some very pertinent and timely comments on the recent statement by Harold Stassen.

The first editorial, entitled "Sad Sack," was published today in the Washington Daily News.

The second editorial, entitled "Stassen Versus Nixon," was published in the July 25 issue of the New York Daily Mirror.

The third editorial, entitled "Get Off the Team," was published on July 24 in the New York Journal American.

There being no obection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 26, 1956]

SAD SACK

Depending on your idea of humor, the case of Harold Stassen's maneuver to dump Vice President NIXON gets funnier and funnier, or sadder and sadder.

Mr. Stassen's announcement that he would promote Gov. Christian Herter of Massachusetts for second place on the Republican ticket hardly got out of his press conference before his little world started caving in around his ears.

GOP Congressmen got together in groups and jeered him. Republican Senators hooted him. President Eisenhower dealt him a smart jab to the chin. From left and right, he was cuffed and mauled. Democrats howled in glee.

Then came the haymaker, Governor Herter, the man Mr. Stassen was going to use to eliminate Mr. NIXON, let it be known he would put the Vice President's name in renomination at the Cow Palace convention next month.

And while Mr. Stassen was trying to pick himself up off the floor, we were reading a biography which glowingly said of him: "He is a durable politician who can't be counted out."

No wonder. He never hears the bell.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of July 25, 1956]

STASSEN VERSUS NIXON

Since Harold Stassen came out of Minnesota as the "boy wonder" governor, he has been a problem to the Republican Party.

For four Presidential elections now, Harold Stassen has sought the Presidency. There has never been any particular reason why any party should choose Stassen as its candidate, but he has convinced himself of his own perfections and has expected that all others will agree with him.

In 16 States, as the Mirror reported yesterday, Eisenhower and Stassen clubs have come into existence. Such clubs do not arise spontaneously in 16 States. That requires organization and management. It means that someone is organizing them. It means that someone has arranged for finances for them. Certainly, it has not been the Republican National Committee that is doing the job for Stassen, because that body is pledged to the Eisenhower and NIXON ticket.

Harold Stassen is trying to split the Republican Party not because he hates Nixon but because, accepting the law of probabilities, it is apparently Stassen's hope that he may step into the Presidency by accident. Should an accident occur, Stassen hopes that it will not be NIXON but Harold Stassen who moves his valise into the White House.

Harold Stassen's obsessions with the Presidency have cost the United States plenty. He has long posed as an authority on international affairs and as a great liberal. He succeeded Paul Hoffman as the principal giver-away of the American taxpayers' earnings.

At first, President Eisenhower was much impressed by Stassen's liberal generosity and when the Congress voted Stassen out of office, the President appointed him to a position within the White House and indicated that Stassen was his Secretary of Peace. Out of that came a considerable but sub-rosa conflict between Harold Stassen and John Foster Dulles, because Stassen, sitting in the White House, barging in on the President out of turn, was attempting to run the State Department even when Dulles was in Washington. It is no secret that on more than one occasion Herbert Hoover, Jr., had to save an ugly situation that arose from Stassen's meddling. Anyhow, the story goes that Stassen has outworn his welcome.

President Eisenhower's training, before he came to the White House, was that men who work together work as a unit. In the Army, the fellow who under-cuts his associates finds that all the others gang up on him. Eisenhower has organized the President's office on the basis of what he calls his "team." He expects teamwork and he expects his associates and subordinates to go through channels. Within the White House family, the chain of command is quite clear and it functioned admirably while the President was ill. In fact, the operation was so smooth that it can be termed businesslike, which is a description not often heard in connection with anything in Washington.

Stassen is on the team but is playing solo. His proposal of Herter for the Vice Presidency is a transparent one. Christian Herter is now Governor of Massachusetts and has not chosen to succeed himself because of ill-health. His particular malady is arthritis. Also he was born in France and were his candidacy challenged, it could lead to a prolonged action in the courts to determine whether he is constitutionally entitled to the office. Stassen knows all this. He is running Stassen, not Herter. And Stassen is not wanted.

[From the New York Journal-American of July 24, 1956]

GET OFF THE TEAM

The proposal by Harold E. Stassen that Vice President NIXON withdraw as a candidate for renomination on the Republican ticket at the San Francisco convention reflects neither good judgment nor good taste.

President Eisenhower has many times expressed his personal preference for Mr. NIXON as a running mate, and his confidence that their maximum assurances for reelection would be thus achieved.

The American people have shown in all the surveys that have been conducted that they are of the same opinion.

Mr. Stassen's opinion is strictly his own, and almost exclusively his own.

He has never had much influence with the American people, and less right to speak for them.

As a presidential candidate himself, he was never able to get off the ground.

Nominally a member of the Eisenhower team by virtue of an appointment under the present administration, he has served with dubious distinction and has now come to the end of his usefulness.

Being so plainly incapable of teamwork, Mr. Stassen should get off the team.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2634. An act relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes;

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3458. An act to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes;

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3556. An act to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, second session;

S. 3592. An act to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service;

S. 3616. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes;

S. 3650. An act for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine;

S. 3658. An act to amend the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), so as to authorize, by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted;

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments here listed, and for other purposes;

S. 3779. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 3820. An act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 3875. An act to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

S. 3926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes;

S. 3968. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the

State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3969. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3970. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3998. An act to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery, known as the Holden trout hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt.;

S. 4060. An act to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, to include employees in the Motor Vehicle Service;

S. 4215. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1954, authorizing the sale of certain vessels to Brazil;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Sam H. Ray;

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 12237. An act to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundations known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians;

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week;

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island;

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishments of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco;

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the Eleventh World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; and

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

SAFETY DEVICES ON HOUSEHOLD REFRIGERATORS SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11969) to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes on the bill. I have been informed that the distinguished Senator from Indiana is about to propose an amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have already offered it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have suggested to him that, although I am reluctant to do so, yet because of the lateness of the hour, I shall accept the amendment. I have been in touch with the author of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has already been stated. It will be stated again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to strike out "90 days" and insert in lieu thereof "1 year."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I understand that the author of the bill is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, but I wish to make a few remarks on the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am delighted that the author of the bill is accepting the amendment. It is very important. I think I am opposed to the bill, but I wish to see this amendment in it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to speak very briefly on the bill.

First, at the beginning of the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill to provide for this same type of legislation. It so happened that on the same day the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] introduced a similar bill. I think it may be interesting to know the origin of the idea so far as I was concerned.

One day I received a letter from the then Governor of my State, Governor Persons, with which he enclosed a letter which a lady had written him, attaching a newspaper story about the dreadful epidemic of deaths of young children as the result of crawling into deserted iceboxes and refrigerators and having the door close on them, resulting in their suffocation. She asked if something could not be done about it.

The governor sent the message to me. I wrote the lady and told her that I was referring the matter to Representative ROBERTS, of Alabama, on the House side, and asking him to introduce a bill. I told her that I would introduce a similar bill in the Senate. That was done; and on the same day I introduced my bill, the Senator from Montana introduced a similar bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me go one step further, and then I shall be glad to yield.

In that Congress, on July 7, 1954, a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] conducted hearings. It was decided at that time—and I think we all concurred in the decision—that the industry, the manufacturers, had not moved far enough into their studies and techniques relating to these safety devices to justify our requiring them at that time to install such devices. So instead of reporting a bill, the committee reported a Senate resolution which called attention to the need, and the fact that the industry had not moved far enough, but at the same time suggested to the cities and States throughout the country that they enact ordinances to take care of discarded iceboxes.

In this Congress hearings were not conducted on the Senate side, but were conducted on the House side. A good many of the manufacturers showed that they had perfected devices, and that they are actually now marketing refrigerators with such devices. So the bill passed the House with an amendment suggested by one of the large builders, that the time be extended to a year and 90 days.

The effect of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is to lengthen that period by 9 months, making it 2 years. So the manufacturers will be given 2 years' grace within which to comply with the regulations which may be issued by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama is being very generous indeed in giving me credit for introducing a bill on the same day he introduced his bill. As a matter of fact, I introduced my bill more than a week later. The man who has done the most in the Senate to push this particular legislation—and the Lord knows, it has been badly needed all these years, because of the large number of deaths of children—is the Senator from Alabama himself. He has displayed a keen and persistent interest in this subject. The determination he has shown is indicative of his interest in the welfare of the children of our country and I give him all the credit for the measure which is now before the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certainly grateful to the Senator from Montana.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. As the Senator knows, I do not think the bill reaches the real trouble, which is in the old refrigerators and iceboxes which are left in the open. I ask the Senator if he has given any thought to the question of the liability of the manufacturer should the apparatus which is approved not work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I have not. I recognize the problem which the Senator first mentioned, but that is beyond the scope of the jurisdiction of Congress to control. That is the reason why, 2 years ago, the Senate adopted a resolution calling the attention of the cities and the States to the need for regulation.

Mr. BRICKER. But it is a question for consideration in passing a bill of this kind, is it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is the Senator referring to the old, discarded boxes?

Mr. BRICKER. No. I am talking about the apparatus which might be placed upon a modern refrigerator, and which might not work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The largest manufacturers are already installing such devices. I display an advertisement from General Electric Co. This is specialty advertising. It reads: Child-safe magnetic door. They are making a specialty of it.

I also have before me an article on the Admiral refrigerator, with pictures.

Here is a letter from the Admiral Corp., telling what it has done, together with a news release.

I exhibit some of the advertising literature of the General Electric Co. It says, "A child can't be trapped inside." The largest manufacturers are already installing such devices.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think undoubtedly they will see to it that their devices are perfected so that they need not be liable. They are given 2 years before they are required to comply.

Mr. BRICKER. They are given a year, as I understand, under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, after the device, whatever it may be, is approved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was a year and 90 days in the bill as reported from the committee, and the amendment of the Senator from Indiana would extend the time by 9 months, making the period 2 years.

Mr. BRICKER. Two years from the time the bill is passed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is really 2 years and 90 days from the date the bill is enacted.

Mr. BRICKER. I still believe that the bill does not meet the real problem we face. I am fearful that the law of negligence might be completely changed by Congress passing a bill requiring these devices, especially in the light of the fact, as the Senator says, that many of the companies have been devoting their efforts to the perfecting of such devices. I am in favor of the companies doing everything they can, and I think they are. I think the evidence before the House committee shows that. In the light of that fact, does the Senator feel that a bill of this kind is necessary in the public interest?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. None of the big manufacturers have objected to the bill, and I think there is ample time for others to develop the techniques necessary to enable them to comply.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, there will be an opportunity next year for Congress to look into the subject, if there are any bugs in the act which might make the manufacturer liable for any death which might occur.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a portion of the report which was made on Senate Resolution 272 in 1954, being an excerpt from Report No. 1753, 83d Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Your committee's Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interests held hearings on April 27, 1954, on S. 2876 and S. 2891. These bills, in substance, would have provided imprisonment and fines for any person introducing or delivering for introduction into interstate commerce a refrigerating unit unless it were equipped with a latch which would enable it to be opened from the inside.

Testimony adduced at those hearings indicated that during the 6-year period, 1948–53, there has been a total of nearly 50 cases in which 1 to 5 children have crawled into a discarded icebox or refrigerator and suffocated. At least 79 children, ranging in age from 2 to 12 years, with the average age being 5 years, have died in these incidents.

There are more than 50 million iceboxes, refrigerators, freezers, and other such airtight cabinets in use today and they are being discarded at the rate of approximately 2 million to 3 million a year. Experience has shown that these refrigerators and other airtight containers, when once discarded, constitute attractive nuisances and inviting places for games by small children. In the light of these tragic facts, your committee cannot remain impassive.

Some opponents of S. 2876 and S. 2891 based their opposition to those measures, at least in part, upon the ground that the bulk of new refrigerating units would not become obsolete for 15 or 20 years. Your committee was not impressed with this argument. Our responsibility to the small children of the Nation is a continuing one, and if there existed today an invention that would make such refrigerating units, when discarded, harmless to children, your committee would have recommended passage of legislation of the general nature of either S. 2876 or S. 2891.

However, testimony adduced at the hearings has failed to establish the existence of a device which would provide a proper seal for a modern refrigerator door and which would, also, allow the door to be opened easily by a small child. (See appendix for pressures required for proper sealing.) Obviously, such a device would have to be set in motion by the slightest touch, because a child in the dark becomes frantic. Even the simplest type of a latch might present an insuperable obstacle to small tots who, as experience has demonstrated, lock themselves up in a bathroom and have to be rescued by the police or firemen.

Manufacturers of refrigerating units have assured your committee's Subcommittee on Business and Consumer Interests that their laboratories are exerting continued efforts and will intensify their efforts to invent some adequate type of safety device. Furthermore, they have stated that when such a device is invented, it will be made available upon reasonable terms to the whole industry. The subcommittee will keep abreast of the progress of such inventions, with a view to compelling adoption of such throughout the industry. In fact, if such an invention is not developed within the reasonably near future, it may be necessary for your committee to consider legislation that would authorize funds to be spent by appropriate agencies of the Government to do what the industry would then have shown its incompetency to accomplish.

Some opponents of S. 2876 and S. 2891 have pointed out the fact that a number of States and municipalities have enacted legislation or ordinances making it a crime for anyone to discard a refrigerating unit without removing the door thereof or taking some similar effective precaution. Civic groups have cooperated by bringing to the attention of the public the dangers of discarded refrigerating units. Some groups have conducted campaigns to call to the attention of homeowners that they had a discarded icebox in their yards and to encourage them to make them harmless to children.

State and local laws do have an advantage that Federal legislation would lack. If properly enforced, that can have an immediate effect in reducing the death of children. Furthermore, they can bridge the 15-year gap where Federal legislation would be largely ineffective. The Congress cannot and does not wish to usurp State police powers. It cannot enact legislation making it a crime to discard a refrigerating unit without removing the door thereof. The Congress can reach this problem through its power over interstate commerce. Whenever it is feasible, the Congress can and should enact legislation banning from such commerce a refrigerating unit that can become a menace to children. This would, in 15 to 20 years, remove almost completely this modern hazard to the lives of our children. In the meantime, State safety laws upon this subject are imperative. Even if legislation of the type embodied in S. 2876 and S. 2891 were feasible now, this resolution would still be needed to call to the attention of State governors and legislators that Federal legislation in this matter is inadequate without an exercise of the equally important State police powers.

Under existing conditions, enactment of Federal legislation of the type contained in S. 2876 and S. 2891 would result in banning from interstate commerce a useful and necessary product until discovery or invention of a device which would provide a proper seal while allowing a door of a refrigerating unit to be opened easily from the inside.

Accordingly, the only present solution is to call these varying, effective areas of Federal and State jurisdiction to the attention of the governors and legislators of the States and urge the consideration of appropriate legislation and ordinances by the States and municipalities which may not be aware of the deficiencies of Federal legislation upon the subject. This resolution would provide this solution and your committee recommends unanimously that the resolution be adopted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 11969) was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE PAY ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. This is an important conference report. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

TITLE I. EXECUTIVE PAY

Title I of the conference substitute establishes salary levels for Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and other executives of the Federal Government generally conforming to the salary levels for such officials provided by the bill as passed by the House. The salary levels for Cabinet officers, $25,000, for the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General, $22,500, and for the Secretaries

of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, $22,000, are the same as in the House bill.

Principal differences in the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House are: First, chairmen of major boards and commissions are in salary level $20,500 under the conference substitute, compared to levels of $19,500 and $20,000 in the House bill, and, second, assistant secretaries of executive and military departments, including Assistant Postmasters General, administrators of certain bureaus and agencies, and members of major boards and commissions are placed in the $20,000 salary level under the conference substitute, compared to a salary level of $19,000 in the House bill. The salaries of governors of Territories and possessions are placed at $19,000 under the conference substitute.

The conference substitute establishes a proper alinement between salaries of Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and the heads of the various agencies, independent establishments, and bureaus in accordance with the level of the duties and responsibilities of such positions.

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of specified numbers of administrative assistants and other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office. The conferees on the part of the House agreed to the total number of such positions as contained in the Senate amendment, including 3 positions, 2 for the assistants to the deputy assistants to the President and 1 secretary to the Cabinet.

In accordance with the bill as passed by the House, the conference substitute increases the maximum salaries under the Classification Act of 1949, grade GS–18, and under the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, salary level 20, from $14,800 to $16,000, with appropriate adjustments in salary steps for the immediate lower grade and levels provided in those acts. Maximum salaries for chief medical officers and assistants in the Veterans' Administration are increased, under the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House, to maintain the existing relationship between such salaries and the salaries of other Government officials and of classified and postal field service positions.

TITLE II. TERMS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS AND SUCCESSION TO DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

Title II of the conference substitute establishes 6-year, staggered terms of office for United States Civil Service Commissioners: provides for designation by the President of a vice chairman of the commission: and provides a line of succession to perform the duties and responsibilities of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission by the vice chairman, in the absence of the chairman, and by the other member of the commission in the absence of the chairman and vice chairman.

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title III of the conference substitute provides for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of general counsels of the Post Office Department, a general counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a general counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to replace the existing offices of the chief legal officers of such Departments, which will be abolished.

The Senate amendment authorized the director of the administrative office of the United States courts to place a total of 4 positions in grade GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and provided that the positions of 7 directors of commodity offices, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, shall be in grade GS–16 of such schedule. The conference substitute does not contain such provisions, but increases by 11 positions the total number of supergrade positions which a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to place in appropriate grades of the general schedule. It should be clearly understood by the Civil Service Commission that it should give immediate consideration with respect to an immediate adjustment in the classification of these positions.

Three positions allocated by the Senate bill in grade 18 for Deputy Administrators for the Agricultural Research Service are contained in the conference substitute.

TITLE IV. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

The conference substitute contains a complete revision of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The House bill contained no such provision.

The conference substitute greatly liberalizes retirement benefits of Federal employees. The cost to the Government of the added benefits is estimated at $310 million a year. The major new employee benefits provided by the conference substitute are:

Annuities will be computed at (a) 2 percent of the high average salary multiplied by all years of service in excess of 10 plus 1½ percent of such salary multiplied by the first 5 years of service, plus 1¾ percent of the years of service from 5 to 10, or (b) 1 percent of high average salary, plus $25, multiplied by total years of service, whichever is greater. Under present law annuities are computed on the basis of 1½ percent of high average salary, or 1 percent of such salary plus $25, multiplied by total years of service, whichever is greater.

The annuity of an employee electing a survivor annuity will be reduced by 2½ percent of the first $2,400 and 10 percent of the balance. The present reduction is 5 percent of the first $1,500 and 10 percent of the balance.

Optional retirement is authorized at age 62 after 5 years of service, with the right to elect survivor benefits. Present law provides an annuity after 5 years of service, but requires 15 years of service for election of survivor benefits.

The present right to retire on a reduced annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service is continued.

The reduction factor for retirement before reaching age 60 is changed from 3 percent a year to 1 percent for each year the retiring employee is under age 60 and 2 percent for each year under age 55.

Disability benefits are liberalized by providing a minimum of 40 percent of the average salary, or the annuity which would have been earned at age 60, whichever is the lesser.

Retirement is provided for the first time to members who complete at least 20 years service and are at least 50 years of age in cases where they are separated from their positions by other than resignation or expulsion.

An annuity is granted upon involuntary separation after attaining the age of 50 years with 20 years of service, and the existing provision for annuity upon involuntary separation after 25 years of service, regardless of age, is continued.

Upon death of an employee after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee, the surviving widow or widower will receive an annuity equal to 50 percent of the earned annuity of the decedent, beginning the first month after such death.

Survivor annuities of children of an employee who dies after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee who dies, are increased by an average of 150 percent.

An annuitant who is reemployed and serves at least 1 full-time year on active duty in a position covered by the Retirement Act will receive an annuity based on his reemployed service as well as his annuity based on the original retirement. Any lump-sum leave credit will not be reduced by reason of annuity paid to him during reemployment.

The contribution on the part of employees and agencies will be 6½ percent per annum and 7½ percent per annum for Members of Congress. The bill that passed the Senate required 7 percent from employees and 8 percent for Members. The bill as reported from the House committee required a contribution of 6 percent from employees and 7 percent from Members. The conference agreement, will, in my estimation, place the system on a fully funded basis.

Members of the civilian faculties of the Naval Academy and naval postgraduate school, and United States commissioners who meet certain tests of minimum compensation and service, are brought into the civil service retirement system.

TITLE V. SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS

The conference substitute authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish not more than 120 scientific and professional positions in lieu of 45 now authorized in the Department of Defense and not more than 25 such positions in the National Security Agency, to carry out research and development functions relating to national defense and military and naval medicine. It authorizes the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to establish 30 such positions in his agency. A salary range of $12,500 to $19,000 is established for such positions by title I of the conference substitute.

I should add that the conferees of both the House and the Senate were unanimous in agreeing to the conference report. The House has already adopted the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2839, H. R. 11833.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11833) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide for a Great Plains conservation program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill would implement the Great Plains program proposed by the President on January 11, by—

First. Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into 10-year contracts with farmers and ranchers in the Great Plains area providing for changes in land use and other measures for soil and water conservation; and

Second. Permitting wheat acreage to be counted as planted for the purpose of computing future allotments where unfavorable weather conditions prevent planting and the producer gives appropriate notice of that fact.

The authority provided by this bill would be in addition to that provided by the present ACP program, the Soil Conservation Service program, and the soil bank. Unlike the soil bank, it is directed toward changing land use rather than reducing production. Unlike the current ACP program, it provides for 10-year contracts, and would not be subject to the maximum payment limitation and small-farm provision of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The purpose of the program is to obtain needed changes in land use to meet the climatic conditions of the area and avert serious wind erosion and resultant economic distress. The program provided for by the first section of the bill would continue only through 1971 and the cost of such program exclusive of administrative costs, would be limited to $150 million over the entire period and $25 million in any year.

The provision of the bill permitting wheat acreage to be counted as planted where unfavorable weather conditions prevent planting is similar to section 307 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 which, however, is limited to the period 1956 to 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am very glad the pending bill has come before the Senate and is apparently on its way to becoming law.

On January 9, President Eisenhower sent a special farm message to Congress. In that message he outlined nine points of a program, the enactment of which he believed was highly essential for the welfare of agriculture.

The pending bill represents the last of the nine points to be acted upon during this year. All the points, with one exception have been authorized, and they have been enacted by Congress in about the form in which they were requested by President Eisenhower.

The one exception was not exactly a request, but a suggestion that Congress might wish to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price support loans. Nothing has been done about that. Nearly every other item in the President's message has been acted upon, and acted upon almost in the form in which the President requested it.

I do not believe any President has ever had such an almost complete response to requests made to Congress on behalf of an agricultural program that President Eisenhower has had this year.

I am sure we all appreciate the work of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and of all the other members of the committee, who contributed toward bringing all these requests of the President before Congress for action.

Mr. CARLSON. The legislation proposed by the pending bill is important to the Great Plains area, of which Kansas is a part. I commend the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for bringing this measure before the Senate. I hope we will complete action on it promptly, because it is important to a long-range program. We have been operating our program of soil conservation on an annual basis. I believe we must make plans to carry it out on a several-year basis. On that basis this proposed legislation is very important.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that when this bill is enacted into law, it, together with the legislation which has already been passed, will give sufficient authority to the Department of Agriculture and provide a great deal of incentive to landowners and operators to restore to grass hundreds of thousands of acres which probably should never have been plowed in the first place, except for the fact that the emergency made it necessary to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I merely wish to say that I too believe that the pending bill is one of the most forward-looking pieces of conservation legislation we could possibly pass. It will surely do a great deal of good in the Great Plains area, of which Kansas is a part, where there has been plowed land which, except for emergency reasons, perhaps should never have been plowed and cultivated.

Being a tie-in with the acreage conservation reserve of the soil bank, I am sure the bill will have a long and enduring effect upon soil fertility and the overall conservation of land resources. I am delighted that the bill has been brought before the Senate, and I wish to commend the chairman of the committee for making it possible for us to vote for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad that Senators are remarking on the work of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and of the distinguished ranking minority member of that committee. The Chair will recall that at the beginning of this session the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was divided 8 to 7 on one of the most difficult pieces of legislation which ever has been considered in the Senate since I have been a Member of this body. When the first action was taken by the Congress the President was not in accord with it. There was much chance of friction, but under the able leadership of the chairman of the committee and ranking minority member, and of all other members of the committee, a very constructive program of legislation has been accomplished. I am proud to have been a member of that committee, and I am proud to acknowledge the fine and constructive leadership of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished minority member of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I merely wish to second, so to speak, the remarks of the Senator from Florida, and I wish to pay a tribute to the Senator from Florida, which I had hoped to do yesterday, with reference to the farm credit legislation which has been reported and acted upon.

As the Senator recalls, we had some differences of opinion, but, finally, when the conference report was presented, many of the details were worked out to our mutual satisfaction. I think the Senate will long remember that the Senator from Florida took care of one of the most important items of farm legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate these cordial remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I remember when we were asked to break up the prairies and raise wheat. We broke up hundreds and thousands of acres which otherwise we would not have broken up. The bill which is about to be passed, Mr. President, will contribute 80 percent toward the reseeding, and terrific benefit will be derived by all the farmers in the Northwest area.

I wish to compliment the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and especially the chairman of that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 11833) was passed.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it has become the practice of the Committee on Foreign Relations, at the end of a Congress, to prepare and have printed as a Senate document a legislative history of the committee's activities during the Congress. This is in the nature of a report to the Senate on all the measures referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, that have received its consideration.

The report will be completed after the Congress adjourns and will be approximately 70 pages long. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that the report entitled "Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 84th Congress" be printed as a Senate document after the adjournment of the Congress and that an additional 1,000 copies be printed for the use of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, since the document will not be available for some weeks, I have had prepared a brief summary of the treaties, bills and resolutions acted upon favorably by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

This has been a very fruitful 2 years for the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee reported and the Senate approved 32 treaties, 34 bills and joint resolutions, and 30 Senate and concurrent resolutions. This is a far greater volume of committee business than for any other Congress since the committee first started keeping such records in 1947.

The 2 years behind us saw the security of the United States strengthened through the Mutual Security Act of 1955 and the Mutual Security Act of 1956, through the so-called Formosa Resolution, through ratification of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and of the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China, and through the adherence of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty and the termination of the occupation regime.

Our friendly relations with other countries were strengthened by the approval of such measures as the Austrian State Treaty, the new convention with Panama, double taxation conventions with a number of countries, and several treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation.

A great deal of legislation was enacted improving the operations in various ways of the Foreign Service, the Department of State and the United States Information Agency. Bills and resolutions relating to our participation in certain international organizations were also approved.

I am particularly proud of the fact that in all its deliberations and activities, the Committee on Foreign Relations displayed no partisanship. Measures were weighed on their merits and decisions were based on whether or not the matter under consideration would advance the security and well-being of this Nation.

I want to thank my colleagues on the committee for making this record possible. Both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee have worked diligently and hard to accomplish the heavy work before the committee. In particular the ranking members, Senator GREEN and Senator WILEY, deserve great credit because I have relied on them heavily in guiding the committee through the past 2 busy years.

In order that there may be readily available a summary of work of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Senate during this Congress, I should like to insert a brief review of the foreign policy matters considered since we began our work in January of 1955.

TREATIES APPROVED

1. Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Ex. K, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 1, 84–1): This treaty brought together eight nations with interests in Southeast Asia in a mutual pledge to regard aggression in the area as a matter of common danger to be met in accordance with their constitutional processes. Approved February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82–1.

2. Termination of the occupation regime in Germany (Ex. L, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 6, 84–1): This agreement restores sovereignty to Germany and terminated the occupation regime. Approved April 1, 1955, by a vote of 76–2.

3. NATO protocol on the admission of Germany (Ex. M, 83–2, Ex. Rept. 6, 84–1): This protocol invited Germany to become a member of the North Atlantic Treaty. Approved April 1, 1955, by a vote of 76–2.

4. Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China (Ex. A, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 2, 84–1): This treaty was one between the United States and the Republic of China by which the parties agree to regard an attack on Formosa and the Pescadores, and such related positions as might be subsequently mutually agreed on, and on United States Territories in the Western Pacific, as a threat to their security and to take such measures to meet it as were in accordance with their constitutional processes. Approved February 9, 1955, by a vote of 64–6.

5. Austrian State Treaty (Ex. G, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 8, 84–1): This treaty restored full sovereignty and independence to Austria. Approved June 17, 1955, by a vote of 63.3.

6. Geneva Convention on the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (Ex. D, 82–1; Ex. Rept. 9, 84–1): This convention prescribed the treatment to be accorded to wounded and sick of the Armed Forces in the field. Approved July 6, 1955, by a vote of 77–0.

7. Geneva Convention on the Wounded and Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea (Ex. E, 82–1; Ex. Rept. 9, 84–1): Similar rules were set forth for the wounded, sick, and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea. Approved July 7, 1955, by a vote of 77–0.

8. Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War (Ex. F. 82–1; Ex. Rept. 9, 84–1): Provisions affecting the treatment of prisoners of war were revised and strengthened in this convention. Approved July 6, 1955, by a vote of 77–0.

9. Geneva Convention on Civilian Persons (Ex. G, 82–1; Ex. Rept. 9, 84–1): The rights of civilian persons in territories under military occupation were set forth in this convention. Approved July 6, 1955, by a vote of 77–0.

10. Panama Treaty (Ex. F, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 10, 84–1): The convention eliminated on a reciprocal basis double taxation on incomes. Approved, February 25, 1955, by a vote of 72–0.

11. Double Taxation Convention on Incomes with Japan (Ex. D, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 3, 84–1): The convention eliminated on a reciprocal basis double taxation on incomes. Approved February 25, 1955, by a vote of 72–0.

12. Double Taxation Convention on Estates and Gifts with Japan (Ex. E, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 3, 84–1): The convention eliminated on a reciprocal basis double taxation on gifts and estates. Approved February 25, 1955, by a vote of 71–0.

13. Double Taxation Convention on Estates with Belgium (Ex. G, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 3, 84–1): This convention eliminated on a reciprocal basis double taxation on estates. Approved February 25, 1955, by a vote of 74–0.

14. Double Taxation Convention with the Netherlands (Ex. I, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 12, 84–1): The provisions of this treaty were hereby extended to the Netherlands Antilles. Approved July 29, 1955, by a vote of 86–0.

15. Double Taxation Convention with the Netherlands (Ex. I, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 12, 84–1): A modification in the convention listed immediately above was made by this protocol. Approved July 29, 1955, by a vote of 86–0.

16. Double Taxation Convention on Income with Italy (Ex. C, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 12, 84–1): This was a standard income tax convention. Approved July 29, 1955, by a vote of 86–0.

17. Double Taxation Convention on Estates with Italy (Ex. D, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 12, 84–1): This convention was patterned after previous such conventions to eliminate double taxation on estates and inheritances. Approved July 29, 1955, by a vote of 86–0.

18. Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation Treaty with Germany (Ex. E, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 11, 84–1): This was one in a series of friendship, commerce, and navigation treaties with nations of the world. Approved July 27, 1955, by a vote of 83–0.

19. International Telecommunications Convention (Ex. R, 83–1; Ex. Rept. 5, 84–1): This convention revised and brought up to date the International Telecommunications Conventions adopted at Atlantic City in 1947. Approved April 1, 1955, by a vote of 74–1.

20. Great Lakes Fisheries Convention (Ex. B, 84–1; Ex. Rept. 7, 84–1): The United States and Canada agreed on the regulations and control of fishing practices in the Great Lakes. Approved June 1, 1955, by a vote of 79–0.

21. Protocol to the Slavery Convention of 1926 (Ex. F, 83–2; Ex. Rept. 1, 84–2): The purpose of the protocol was to transfer to the United Nations certain procedural functions formerly performed by the League of Nations. Approved January 25, 1956, by a vote of 84–0.

22. Protocol modifying the Convention of 1890 concerning the creation of an International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs (Ex. P. 82–2, Ex. Rept. 2, 84–2): The protocol made it possible for the Union to increase its maximum annual budget from 125,000 gold francs (approximately $40,838) to 500,000 gold francs (approximately $163,350) and increase assessments of members—that of the United States from $2,233 a year to $8,658. Approved January 25, 1956, by a vote of 84–0.

23. International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material (Ex. Q, 83–1, Ex. Rept. 3, 84–2): This convention promoted international trade by unifying and simplifying the regulations governing the admission of samples and advertising materials into the territory of the parties to the convention. Approved February 22, 1956, by a vote of 76–0.

24. Protocol relating to certain amendments to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Ex. F, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 4, 84–2): The protocol amended the International Civil Aviation Convention so as to eliminate the requirement that annual meetings of the International Civil Aviation Organization Assembly be held and provide instead that the Assembly should meet not less than once every 3 years. Approved April 19, 1956, by a vote of 81 to 0.

25. Convention Concerning Customs Facilities for Touring (Ex. A, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 5, 84–2): The convention on a reciprocal basis allowed tourists to bring into and take out of the countries parties to the convention duty-free a limited amount of personal effects and souvenirs. Approved April 19, 1956, by a vote of 81 to 0.

26. Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles (Ex. B, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 5, 84–2): The purpose of this convention was to admit to participating countries automobiles duty-free for private use for visits of not more than 6 months' duration. Approved April 19, 1956, by a vote of 81 to 0.

27. International Wheat Agreement, 1956 (Ex. I, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 7, 84–2): This agreement extended the International Wheat Agreement for another 3-year period, from July 1956 to July 1959 in order to assure supplies of wheat to importing countries and markets for wheat to exporting countries at equitable and stable prices. Approved July 11, 1956, by a vote of 85 to 2.

28. Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights with Iran (Ex. E, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 9, 84–2): The treaty established a comprehensive reciprocal basis for the protection of American commerce and citizens and set forth the privileges and immunities of consular officers. Approved July 11, 1956, by a vote of 88 to 0.

29. Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation with Nicaragua (Ex. G, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 9, 84–2): This was one in a series of friendship, commerce and navigation treaties. Approved, July 11, 1956, by a vote of 88 to 0.

30. Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation with the Netherlands (Ex. H, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 9, 84–2): This was another one in the series of friendship, commerce and navigation treaties with nations of the world. Approved, July 11, 1956, by a vote of 88 to 0.

31. Supplementary Double Taxation Convention with France (Ex. J, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 10, 84–2): The convention modified and supplemented previous arrangements entered into with France for the avoidance of double taxation on income. Approved July 19, 1956, by a vote of 88 to 0.

32. Tax Convention with Honduras (Ex. K, 84–2, Ex. Rept. 10, 84–2): This was the first convention for the avoidance of double taxation on incomes entered into with an American Republic. It followed the usual pattern of such conventions. Approved July 19, 1956, by a vote of 88 to 0.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY CONGRESS

1. Mutual Security Act of 1955 (S. 2090, S. Rept. 912, passed Senate June 2, 1955, by a vote of 59–18; approved July 8, 1955, Public Law 138): This act extended the mutual security program for another year and authorized not to exceed $3,280,800,000 for various types of foreign aid.

2. Mutual Security Act of 1956 (H. R. 11356, S. Rept. 2273, passed Senate by a vote of 54–25, June 29, 1956; approved by the President, July 18, 1956, Public Law 726): This act extended the mutual-security program for another year and authorized not to exceed $3,927,575,000 for its various purposes.

3. The Formosa resolution (S. J. Res. 28, S. Rept. 13, passed Senate, January 28, 1955, by a vote of 85–3; approved January 29, 1955, Public Law 4): By virtue of this joint resolution, the President was authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area.

4. The International Claims Settlement Act (H. R. 6382, S. Rept. 1050, passed Senate July 25, 1955; approved by the President, August 5, 1955, Public Law 285): This legislation provided for the settlement of certain claims of nationals of the United States against Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Italy.

5. Strengthening the Department of State (S. 2237, S. Rept. 546, passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved by the President August 3, 1955; Public Law 250): Three Deputy Under Secretaries of State, in addition to 10 Assistant Secretaries of State, were provided for the Department of State.

6. International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (S. 3116, S. Rept. 1664, passed Senate March 26, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The purpose of this bill was to authorize on a permanent basis a program of cultural exchange and participation in international trade fairs.

7. Relinquishment of Consular Jurisdiction in Morocco (S. J. Res. 165, S. Rept. 2274, passed Senate July 3, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The resolution provided congressional approval for action by the executive branch in renouncing certain rights of extraterritorial jurisdiction enjoyed by the United States over its nationals and certain so-called proteges in Morocco.

8. Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1956 (S. 3581, S. Rept. 1726, passed Senate, April 12, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The purpose of the bill was to strengthen the Foreign Service of the United States by making service for the Government of the United States in posts abroad more attractive and making possible a better administration of the Service.

9. Basic authority for State Department (S. 2569, S. Rept. 1175, passed Senate July 28, 1955; not approved by the President before adjournment): By this bill the Department of State was given basic authority for certain activities, which heretofore have been contained in annual appropriation bills.

10. Foreign Service annuities (S. 1287, S. Rept. 620, passed Senate June 24, 1955; approved by the President May 1, 1956, Public Law 503): The bill increased the annuities for Foreign Service officers or who retired prior to July 1, 1945, by $324 a year. A like increase was provided for their survivors.

11. United States Information and Educational Exchange Act amendments (S. 2562, S. Rept. 1608, passed Senate March 19, 1956; approved June 4, 1954, Public Law 555): This bill required persons having an exchange visitors status to return to their country of origin or some third country for a period of 2 years before being able to apply for an immigration visa.

12. Passport visa fees (H. R. 5844, S. Rept. 1370, passed Senate January 16, 1956; approved February 10, 1956, Public Law 403): The bill authorized an increase in the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $2.

13. Foreign Service Act amendments (H. R. 4941, S. Rept. 127, passed Senate March 30, 1955; approved March 31, 1955, Public Law 21): The integration of Foreign Service and Department of State personnel was authorized by this act.

14. International Bureau for the Publications of Customs Tariffs (S. J. Res. 178, S. Rept. 2138, passed Senate June 11, 1956; approved by the President July 11, 1956, Public Law 680): The joint resolution enabled the United States to pay an increased assessment for membership in the International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs retroactively to April 1, 1950.

15. American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood (S. J. Res. 195, H. J. Res. 644, S. Rept. 2612, passed Senate July 20, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The joint resolution enabled the United States to raise its contribution to the American International Institute for Protection of Childhood from $10,000 to $25,000 annually.

16. World Health Assembly (S. J. Res. 183, S. Rept. 2611, passed Senate July 20, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The joint resolution authorized an appropriation of $400,000, which will enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold its 11th world assembly in the United States in 1958.

17. New York World Trade Fair and Oklahoma Semicentennial (S. J. Res. 194; H. J. Res. 604, S. Rept. 2611, passed Senate July 20, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The resolution authorized the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City April 14 to 27, 1957, and in the Oklahoma semicentennial celebration to be held in various communities in Oklahoma from January 1 to December 31, 1957.

18. Pan American Games in Cleveland in 1959. (S. J. Res. 186, S. Rept. 2614, passed Senate July 20, 1956, not approved by the President before adjournment): The joint resolution authorized an appropriation of not to exceed $5 million for expenses of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

19. NATO Parliamentary Conferences (H. J. Res. 501, S. Rept. 2140, passed Senate July 5, 1956; approved by the President July 11, 1956, Public Law 689): The resolution authorized the appointment of 9 Members of the House and 9 Members of the Senate to meet jointly and annually with representatives of other parliaments from other NATO countries to discuss problems related to the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic Treaty area.

20. Claims of Vatican City for World War II damages (H. R. 10766, S. Rept. 2292, passed Senate June 27, 1956; approved by the President July 3, 1956, Public Law 656): The bill authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $964,199.35 in full and final settlement of all claims of the Vatican City for losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces in the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo, during World War II.

21. Niagara Frontier Port Authority (S. J. Res. 145, H. J. Res. 549, S. Rept. 2616, passed Senate July 20, 1956; not approved by the President before adjournment): The consent of Congress was given by this measure to the negotiating and concluding of an agreement between New York and Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority, for the transfer of the operation of the present highway bridge over the Niagara River to this Authority and for the transfer of all property, rights, powers, and duties of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority to the new entity.

22. Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission (S. 985, S. Rept. 867, passed Senate July 18, 1955; not approved by the President before adjournment): The Commission authorized by this bill would explore with Canada the possibilities of further rail and highway connections between the United States and Alaska through Canadian territory.

23. Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission (H. R. 5469, no report, passed Senate August 2, 1955; approved by the President, August 5, 1955, Public Law 298): The bill extended the time during which the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission may file a report.

24. Fee stamp requirement (H. R. 5841, S. Rept. 550, passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 101): By virtue of this act, the requirement that fee stamps be affixed to certain consular documents was repealed.

25. Service charge (H. R. 5842, S. Rept. 551, passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 102): This act repealed a provision of law relating to authenticating copies of records in the Department of State.

26. Firearms (H. R. 5860, S. Rept. 552, passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 104): Certain security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service were authorized under this act to carry firearms for the protection of United States officials at international conferences and distinguished foreign visitors to the United States.

27. Olympic games at Detroit (S. J. Res. 14, S. Rept. 27, passed Senate February 8, 1955; approved February 15, 1955, Public Law 6): Official endorsement was given to an invitation of the United States Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 games at Detroit.

28. Olympic games at Squaw Valley (S. J. Res. 51, S. Rept. 275, passed Senate May 13, 1955; approved June 13, 1955, Public Law 69): A similar endorsement was given to a proposed invitation to hold the Olympic winter games at Squaw Valley, Calif.

29. Los Ebanos Bridge (H. R. 2984, S. Rept. 514, passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 98): The construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande was authorized.

30. Rio Grande City bridge (H. R. 4573, S. Rept. 515, passed Senate June 17, 1955; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 100): The act authorized the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City.

31. Ogdensburg Bridge Authority (H. R. 8547, S. Rept. 1939, passed Senate May 9, 1956; approved by the President May 18, 1956, Public Law 529): The bill continues in effect Public Law 722, approved August 19, 1950, an act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successor and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.

32. St. Marys River projects (H. R. 8807, S. Rept. 1940, passed Senate May 9, 1956; approved by the President May 18, 1956, Public Law 530): This measure extended for an

additional 3 years the time during which the International Bridge Authority of Michigan may commence the construction of a toll bridge and related projects across the St. Marys River at or near Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

33. Highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada (S. 3527, S. Rept. 2141, passed Senate June 11, 1956; approved by the President July 11, 1956, Public Law 687): The bill authorized the State Highway Commission of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the waters between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick.

34. Passamaquoddy (S. J. Res. 14, S. Rept. 506; passed Senate June 14, 1955; approved January 31, 1956, Public Law 401): The purpose of the joint resolution was to provide for a survey to determine the economic feasibility of tidal power projects in Passamaquoddy Bay in Maine and New Brunswick at a cost not to exceed $3 million.

SENATE AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

1. Study of foreign aid (S. Res. 285, S. Rept. 2278, passed Senate July 11, 1956): This resolution directed the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Appropriations and Armed Services Committees, to undertake an exhaustive study of foreign aid proposals and authorized $300,000 therefor.

2. Study of disarmament (S. Res. 93; S. Rept. 547; passed Senate July 25, 1955): This resolution authorized a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a complete study of the disarmament problem and proposals relating thereto and report its recommendations to the Senate.

3. Peace (H. Con. Res. 157, S. Rept. 565; passed Senate June 17, 1955): Congress hereby expressed the fundamental desire and hopes of the American people for peace and calls upon other nations to renew efforts to strengthen the peace.

4. Reduction of armaments (S. Res. 71, S. Rept. 1173; passed Senate, July 28, 1955): This resolution suggested consideration of a proposal related to exploration of the possibilities of limiting the proportion of every nation's resources devoted to military purposes, both direct and indirect, so as to increase steadily the proportion devoted to improving the living levels of the people.

5. Colonialism (H. Con. Res. 149; S. Rept. 855; passed Senate by a vote of 88 to 0, July 14, 1955): The Congress expressed the sense that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

6. Self-determination (S. Res. 127, S. Rept. 854; passed Senate by a vote of 89 to 0, July 14, 1955): The purpose of this resolution was to reaffirm Senate support of one of the fundamental principles of the Atlantic Charter—"the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

7. Greetings to the Sudan (S. Con. Res. 70, S. Rept. 1485; passed March 19, 1956): The concurrent resolution extended the greetings of the Congress to the Sudan on the occasion of its independence.

8. Greetings to Pakistan (H. Con. Res. 223; passed Senate without reference to the committee, March 21, 1956): This resolution extended the greetings of the Congress to Pakistan on the occasion of its becoming a republic.

9. Greetings to the Red Cross (H. Con. Res. 232, S. Rept. 2139; passed Senate June 6, 1956): On the occasion of its 75th anniversary the Congress extended its greetings and appreciation to the American National Red Cross.

10. Greetings to the German Bundestag (S. Res. 263, S. Rept. 2134; passed Senate June 7, 1956): The Congress, by this resolution, extended greetings to the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany for the unveiling of a bust in honor of Carl Schurz.

11. Uprising in Poland (S. Res. 302; passed July 2, 1956, without reference to the committee): This resolution commented on the resistance of the people of Poznan, Poland, to their subjugation and urged the President to continue to offer food and sustenance to the people of that country.

12. Sir Winston Churchill (S. Res. 139, S. Rept. 1174); passed Senate July 28, 1955): The Senate by this action paid a tribute to Sir Winston Churchill's leadership and statesmanship on the occasion of his retirement from the position of Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

13. Atom bombs (S. Res. 134, S. Rept. 868; passed Senate July 18, 1955): The Senate herewith endorsed efforts of our chief delegates to the United Nations to take appropriate steps to work to establish within the United Nations procedures to receive, assemble, and report on radiological information collected by the various States with particular emphasis on radiation effects on human health and safety.

14. NATO Parliamentary Conference (H. Con. Res. 109, S. Rept. 548; passed Senate July 1, 1955): This resolution authorized a 14-member bipartisan congressional delegation, drawn in equal numbers from the Senate and the House, to attend the 1955 gathering of parliamentarians from NATO countries in Paris for the discussion of common NATO problems.

15. Opium samples tests (S. Res. 287, S. Rept. 2483; passed Senate July 12, 1956): The resolution recommended that the results of tests of opium samples be communicated to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

16. Proscription of heroin (S. Res. 288, S. Rept. 2483; passed July 12, 1956): This resolution called upon the United Nations to urge the governments of those countries which have not yet taken action to proscribe heroin to do so at the earliest possible moment.

17. Negotiation with Mexico for effective narcotics control (S. Res. 289, S. Rept. 2483; passed July 12, 1956): The Senate in this resolution requested the President to commence negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of concluding a treaty which will result in a more effective control of the traffic in illicit narcotics.

18. Urging ratification of the narcotics protocol (S. Res. 290, S. Rept. 2483; passed July 12, 1956): This resolution asked the United Nations to urge governments of all countries which have not yet ratified or acceded to the narcotics protocol to do so at the earliest possible time.

19 and 20. Study of United Nations and Technical Assistance Programs (S. Res. 36, S. Repts. 23 and 12; passed January 31, 1955; S. Res. 133, S. Rept. 1021; passed July 29, 1955): These resolutions extended the life of two special subcommittees established by previous Congresses and authorized funds for their activities.

21. Study of Technical Assistance Programs (S. Res. 162, S. Rept. 1459; passed February 8, 1956): The resolution extended the time to investigate matters relating to technical assistance.

22. Subcommittee membership (S. Res. 83; passed March 22, 1955): The membership of the special subcommittee on the United Nations Charter was authorized to be increased by two members from the Foreign Relations Committee.

23. Study of Disarmament (S. Res. 185, S. Rept. 1396; passed February 8, 1956): The resolution extended the time for a study of proposals relating to international control and reduction of armaments and authorized $35,000 therefor.

24. Study of Disarmament (S. Res. 286, S. Rept. 2235; passed Senate, June 14, 1956): This resolution extended the time for the completion of a study of proposals relating to the reduction and control of armaments.

25. Clerical Assistance (S. Res. 29; passed January 18, 1955): This resolution extended for 1 year the authority of the Foreign Relations Committee to employ 2 additional clerical assistants.

26. Clerical assistance (S. Res. 161; passed February 3, 1956): This resolution extended for an additional year the authority of the Foreign Relations Committee to employ two additional clerical assistants.

27. Funds (S. Res. 128; passed Senate July 22, 1955): Additional funds of $10,000 were provided for the Committee on Foreign Relations under this resolution.

28. Funds (S. Res. 315, no written report; passed Senate July 26, 1956): The resolution provided additional funds of $10,000 for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

29. Opposition to seating of Communist China (H. Con. Res. 265, S. Rept. 2697; passed Senate July 23, 1956 by a vote of 86–0): The resolution expressed and reemphasized the sense of Congress that Communist China should not be seated as the representative of China in the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

30. Distinctions because of religious affiliations (S. Res. 323, S. Rept. 2790; on Senate Calendar July 25, 1956): The resolution opposed distinctions by foreign nations against United States citizens because of individual religious affiliations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY SENATE BUT NOT BY THE HOUSE

1. Submission of executive agreements to the Senate (S. 147, S. Rept. 2416; passed Senate, July 11, 1956): This bill would have required the President to transmit to the Congress all executive agreements made by the executive branch within 60 days of their signature, except those of a classified nature, which would be transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

2. FAO–ILO Contributions (S. J. Res. 97, S. Rept. 1172; passed Senate, amended, April 19, 1956): The resolution as amended would have authorized an increase in United States contributions to the FAO and the ILO, the amounts not to exceeed 31.5 percent of total assessed budget of the FAO and 25 percent of the total assessed budget of the ILO. The provisions affecting the FAO were included in the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

3. United States Information and Educational Exchange Act Amendments (S. 638, S. Rept. 1959; passed Senate, May 10, 1956): The bill concerned the International Educational Exchange Service conducted by the Department of State and the United States Information Service conducted by the United States Information Agency.

4. Interparliamentary Union (S. 3858, S. Rept. 2615; passed Senate, July 20, 1956): The bill would have authorized an annual increase in United States contributions to the Interparliamentary Union from $15,000 to $18,000.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE BUT NOT PASSED BY THE SENATE

1. University of the Americas (S. J. Res. 174, S. Rept. 2671, July 20, 1956): The purpose of the resolution was to provide for the establishment of a commission, to be known as the Committee on the University of the Americas, which would explore the possibility and desirability of establishing a great university in the Western Hemisphere as a center of higher education of the people of all the American Republics.

2. International Food and Raw Materials Reserve (S. Res. 316, reported July 18, 1956, no written report): The resolution would have favored the establishment of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve.

ROLLCALL VOTES ON FOREIGN POLICY MEASURES

Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, 82–0.

Termination of occupation regime in Germany, 76–2.

NATO protocol on the adherence of Germany, 76–2.

Mutual Defense Treaty with China, 64–6.
Geneva (Red Cross) Conventions, 77–0.
Austrian State Treaty, 63–3.
Double taxation (income) convention with Japan, 72–0.
Double taxation (estate) convention with Japan, 71–0.
Double taxation with Belgium, 74–0.
Double taxation with the Netherlands and Italy, 86–0.
Panama Treaty, 72–14.
German commercial treaty, 83–0.
International Telecommunications Convention, 74–1.
Great Lakes Fisheries Convention, 79–0.
Mutual Security Act of 1955, 59–18.
Formosa Resolution, 85–3.
Resolution against colonialism, 88–0.
Resolution on self-determination of people, 89–0.
Protocol to the Convention for an International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs, 84–0.
Commercial Samples Convention, 76–0.
Slavery protocol, 84–0.
Touring convention, 81–0.
Customs convention on temporary importation of private road vehicles, 81–0.
Commercial treaties with Iran, Nicaragua and the Netherlands, 88–0.
Protocol to the International Civil Aviation Convention, 81–0.
Double taxation with France and Honduras, 87–0.
International Wheat Agreement, 1956, 85–2.
Mutual Security Act of 1956, 54–25.
Resolution opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, 86–0.

Legislative record

Action on treaties:	
Held over from previous Congresses	31
Submitted to the 84th Congress	19
Total pending	50
Advice and consent given to	32
Withdrawn	1
Pending at the end of the Congress	17
Action on bills and joint resolutions:	
Referred to the committee	84
Rereferred to other committees	3
Considered but not acted upon	3
Provisions included or considered in connection with other measures	18
Reported or passed but not finally enacted	5
Enacted	34
Action on Senate and concurrent resolutions:	
Referred to the committee	70
Considered but not acted upon	22
Reported but not finally acted upon	3
Reported adversely	1
Agreed to	30
Nominations confirmed:	
Ambassadors	48
United Nations and specialized agencies	38
Department of State	8
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	3
Advisory commissions	8
International Cooperation Administration	2
Foreign Service	2,117
Total	2,224
Meetings:	
Full committee, executive	65
Full committee, public	35
Full committee, executive made public	24
Subcommittee, executive	5
Subcommittee, public	39
Conference meetings	8
Consultative subcommittee	13
Total	189

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1956, AND THE TOWNSEND MOVEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, early this June it was my privilege to address the 16th National Convention of the Townsend Clubs of America. The meeting, attended by senior citizens from throughout the Nation, was staged in St. Paul, the capital of the State I have the honor to represent in the United States Senate.

My mind went back to that occasion a few days ago when the Senate debated, and then passed, legislation calling for drastic revision of our social-security program. I could not help but reflect, as I listened to the arguments set forth by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that this event would not have been possible had it not been for the pioneer work performed by Dr. Francis E. Townsend and his followers.

The doctor is now 89 years of age. I feel certain that there must be pride and joy in his heart as he sees, though ever so gradually, realization of the objectives he originally espoused.

I believe in giving credit where credit is due. Therefore, I say that in all conscience we must confess our debt to the Townsend organization.

The measure we passed would permit benefits to women at age 62. The Townsend people have long argued that benefits for all—men and women—should be available at age 60 rather than at age 65. Thus, for the first time, we broke the age barrier and, by so doing, we recognized, I believe, that the Townsendites have been right all along.

We approved a program for disability insurance at age 50; and when we did we endorsed another principle held dear by the organized senior citizens of our land. Dr. Townsend, I am told, has always insisted that pension payments should be made available, not only to the aged, but also to those unable to work because of disability.

We extended coverage under the social-security system and thus moved another step closer to the principle of universality which Dr. Townsend and his followers have advocated over the long years.

These advances did not come easily; indeed, they have been won only in the face of formidable opposition; but, they have been won. They have been won just as other advances are going to be won toward a full answer to the social-security problem—a national social-security system under which our aged and disabled in America will enjoy a full and up-to-date share in our ever-expanding standard of living.

I submit that it is only proper that we pause for a moment to consider that the really important improvements recently voted in our social-security program represent acknowledgment that the Townsend organization and its membership are performing a valiant and effective service by keeping ever before the minds of the American people the importance of fair treatment of our senior American citizens.

THE GOLDEN RULE AND THE DIGNITY OF MAN

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there was just handed to me a note from my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who had to be away for a few moments. He asked, if I could be on the floor, to place in the RECORD a letter which Representative ELLSWORTH wrote to Charles W. Lowry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the letter to which I have just referred, and a letter from T. O. Toon, written to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.

Dr. CHARLES WESLEY LOWRY,
Chairman and Executive Director,
Foundation for Religious Action,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LOWRY: It was good of you to write me and I am glad to have the copy of the address by George C. McGhee. Mr. Ted Toon also gave me some printed material regarding the foundation. I am glad to know of the splendid work you are doing.

Your comments regarding the speech I gave in Portland in 1952 are gratifying. Incidentally, I was quite thrilled to hear President Eisenhower in a speech he made on the television networks within the last several months recite the same general premise regarding the universality of the Golden Rule. I was also glad to learn of the other times when the same thought with similar quotations from the other religions have been used. I think a great fundamental is involved there which, other than the few instances mentioned, has been almost entirely overlooked.

For years, since the end of World War II, and during the tedious years of the "cold war" I have been sorely disturbed by what I am sure is a general lack of understanding of the true nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.

It seems to me that the leadership in the United States and in the free world have never really grasped nor grappled with the fact that the Communist drive for world domination and complete world control is unlike all other conflicts between countries, races or governments in that the Communist ambition is total. They seek to control not only the whole world from a territorial standpoint but their conception of domination is total—economic, political, and spiritual. Their effort has cunningly merged all three into the one all-inclusive term "communism."

Apparently we have been so preoccupied with combating the traditional elements of international conflict, namely, the economic and the political, that we have either ignored or overlooked the third corner of the Soviet triangle, the spiritual, which holds the whole thing together—the fanaticism of the materialistic idea of communism itself.

I do not have any particular quarrel with what is being done in the economic and political aspects of this conflict which, of course, are supported by military force. I simply feel that we in the Western World are not going to make any real progress toward destroying the roots of the Communist evil until we too have completed our triangle by tying our other efforts together with a genuine, honest and dynamic effort to unite people everywhere on the one common ground which all can understand and in

which all believe regardless of their country, race, color or religion.

We might or might not be able to meet and defeat the Communist movement on strictly material grounds as we are now trying to do. We might or might not be able to outsmart them politically. But one thing we know for certain and that is that whereas they have to engage in an operation known as brainwashing to develop the equivalent of the spiritual side of their conquest, there already exists in the minds and hearts of all people the desire to treat and be treated with respect, kindness, and decency. However beaten down may be the flame of human dignity as the result of circumstances I am sure nevertheless that there exists in every human being that spark of desire for individual dignity and respect which might be fanned into a flame which of itself could completely destroy the diabolical Communist movement.

Our approach toward accomplishing anything in this direction is made the more difficult because we have ignored it too long. I have an idea that we have frightened people by our talk of force, our talk of strength and, perhaps, our showing of tangible evidence of these things by the very efforts we are making and the great expenditures we are making in the well intentioned effort to help people. I think it is likely also that in the political operations of the Western World we have here and there supported governments and individuals more interested in their own successes than in the welfare of the people. The point is that while I feel certain that our motives are of the purest and our intentions of the best, the hundreds of millions of human beings whom we are sincerely trying to help do not perhaps have any basis on which to have individual confidence in what we are attempting to do.

Obviously, the task of gaining their confidence is a monumental one. It surely cannot be done on the basis of organizations, crusades or drives—as we know those terms. Furthermore, I think it is certain that what I am talking about cannot be done by "us talking to them." Fortunately, if we have sense enough to know it, the Communists have already blueprinted the procedure for us. They made their plans some 30 years ago and have followed them right down the line. Their operation, as you know, is simple. They have taken peoples from all lands and indoctrinated, trained them and sent them back to their own people again to spread the word. You might be inclined to say that we have done and are doing the same thing, but that is not quite right. The nearest approach to it is our exchange student program, but that, I am afraid, is materialistic to the extent that it is mostly cultural and intellectual and has, so far as I know, very little of the down-to-earth spiritual element in it. The carrying the word of Christianity and the worldwide effort for conversions to Christianity is not the sort of thing I am talking about.

What I have in mind is, I expect, just too simple to be realistic. I think we should carefully work out a plan to reach articulate people from other lands of all races, creeds and color and sell them on the very simple truth to be carried back to their own peoples that we of the Western Christian World have the same basic belief in the Golden Rule and the dignity of man that they do and that this thing called communism is the exact opposite of their own beliefs and if accepted would destroy them spiritually as well as their material freedom.

When I began to answer your most welcome letter I had no intention of writing at such length. However, it has been some time since I have given expression to any of these thoughts so I have enjoyed dictating this. Nevertheless, I hope you will pardon my infringement upon your time to such length.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: The attached letter from Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH to Dr. Charles W. Lowry, Ph. D., chairman of the Foundation for Religious Action, reveals many of the all-important basic areas (which you ably bring out in your book, "Letter to a Generation"), wherein most of the peoples of the world can unite, using the Golden Rule outlined in their respective faiths and beliefs, in their fight and ours to retain the dignity of the individuals of all races, colors, and creeds. This basic area is open to the Western World. It is not possible for the rulers or those who are ruled by the Soviet hierarchy.

It would be appreciated if you will insert Congressman ELLSWORTH's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I feel that many of our people should have the opportunity of knowing the deep convictions of one of our many able Members of Congress.

Sincerely,

T. O. TOON.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF VERO BEACH, FLA.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2828, H. R. 10383.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10383) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill authorizes the General Services Administration to reconvey to the city of Vero Beach, Fla., two parcels of land, one of which was given by the city of Vero Beach to the Federal Government; the second of which was purchased from the city of Vero Beach for $15,000. Both parcels were to be used for the erection of a post office.

Since the time of the conveyances, the plans have been changed, and the Government will not erect a post office there.

The purpose of the bill is to return to the city, first, the parcel which it had given to the Federal Government; and second, to allow the Federal Government to sell the second parcel, which the Federal Government undoubtedly will sell at a profit, and thereby restore both pieces of land to the city of Vero Beach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK R. WILSON, OF IOWA

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, in the Palimpsest magazine, June 1956 issue, published by the Iowa State Historical Society, there appears an article setting out the outstanding record of service to community, State and Nation made by one of Iowa's distinguished sons—Frank R. Wilson.

Frank Wilson is of pioneer Iowa stock, his forebears having settled in Louisa County, Iowa, February 1838, the year Iowa was first made a separate Territory, and 8 years before statehood. He served long and with great credit with the Census Bureau, and although he officially retired in October 1951, he continued on in important assignments until 1953.

All Iowans are proud of the outstanding record and invaluable contribution made by Frank Wilson to our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the tribute paid to him by Dr. William J. Petersen, editor of the Palimpsest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANK R. WILSON

The story of Frank R. Wilson is typical of many men who were born, nurtured, and educated in the Hawkeye State and then went out to attain fame, and sometimes fortune, in their chosen fields. Distinguished Iowans by the hundreds who achieved renown far from their native hearth can be numbered in the ministry, in education, and journalism, in banking, insurance and industry, in medicine, law, and other professions, and as executives and administrators in our own Federal Government and throughout the world.

Although Frank Wilson accomplished Herculean tasks during the course of his lifetime, his name rarely appeared in the headlines. His work was that of a promoter for others—an "idea" man, a "leg" man, a supersalesman. It was largely his task to push notables into the limelight in order to achieve some objective that would redound to the common good. This was particularly true whenever he was called upon to serve the Federal Government. Mindful of Wilson's contributions to the war bond sales during World War I, Secretary of the Treasury Carter Glass wrote him as follows on September 16, 1919:

"I cannot permit you to leave the Department which you have served so well without committing to writing an expression of my genuine appreciation of your loyalty and devotion to the interests of the Government. You entered the Treasury in the service of the Federal Farm Loan Board where your intelligent work attracted the attention of my distinguished predecessor who gave you the opportunity for the greater employment of the admirable talents with which you are endowed by your appointment as Director of Publicity of the War Loan Organization. In that work you displayed the finest qualities of direction in campaigns that required imagination of the highest degree and a full understanding of all the elements of popular appeal. I am happy to have the privilege of saying that you were equal to a task that was of very great importance in the program of war finance and that I know of few men who could have done so well and none who could have excelled. In the years to come it will be a comfort to you to realize that you served your Government with

the enthusiasm and loyalty of a patriot in your country's period of greatest peril. You leave the Treasury with the deepest regret of those who have been associated with you, and I know I speak the mind of all when I say that you will carry with you into private life their every good wish for your health and happiness."

During much of his active life Frank Wilson served the Federal Government in various capacities for little compensation. Indeed, most of Wilson's personal estate was built up during the fabulous 1920's when his keen imagination, his driving energy and courage in the face of insuperable odds allowed him and his associates to reap rich rewards in the newborn motion picture industry. It took a man of rare insight and organizing ability to achieve the success he did before the financial debacle of 1929. Even then, Wilson had foresight enough to convert much of his paper stock into real estate, thereby saving some of the fruits of his labor.

Iowans will always be indebted to Frank Wilson for the deep interest he took in his native State. According to the Council Bluffs Nonpareil:

"He never lost his interest in Iowa. Today he probably knows more about each Iowa city than most of the local residents.

"As chief of publicity he always works on Iowa statistics first. He just can't wait to see what has happened to corn production, hog production and other activities in the greatest agricultural State in the Union.

"The Nonpareil hears from him frequently, with information about Iowa crop production."

Frank Wilson played such an important role in the United States Census Bureau that a special act was required to prevent his mandatory retirement until the Government could benefit from his ability to interpret the census of 1950. Little wonder that, upon his retirement from the Census Bureau, Frank Wilson received a gold medal for outstanding service, the highest award which the Government offers its civilian workers. Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer made the award to Wilson for his unique service as Director of Information of the Bureau of the Census. Wilson was the first Government information man to receive the award.

Hugh H. MacMillan, of the Detroit Free Press, praised Wilson for his unselfish devotion and his constant courtesy and kindness to newspapermen. Douglas Taylor, president of the American Association of Newspaper Representatives, lauded his thoughtfulness, helpfulness, and intelligent understanding of our interests. Roy V. Peel, former Director of the Census Bureau and now of the University of Utah, described Wilson as "indefatigable, ingenious, industrious—and incomparably the best information man in Washington." Letters in a similar vein came from such men as W. W. Waymack, editor of the Des Moines Register; Robert W. Burgess, Director of the Census; and Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce.

Perhaps the outstanding tribute was the following resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Newspaper Promotion Association:

"Whereas Mr. Frank Wilson is retiring from his position as Director of Information for the United States Census Bureau thus terminating many years of valuable public service; and

"Whereas Mr. Wilson has contributed extensively to the promotion of newspaper advertising and circulation by his unexcelled cooperation in making available the services and statistics of the United States Census Bureau to newspapers, advertisers, and advertising agencies; and

"Whereas Mr. Wilson has on innumerable occasions personally participated in newspaper programs and meetings designed to enlighten newspaper promotion management concerning the availability and utilization of the valuable and factual data released by the United States Census Bureau: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Newspaper Promotion Association extend to Mr. Frank Wilson its highest expressions of gratitude and appreciation and in token of its esteem extend to him an honorary life membership that he may ever know of the high regard and affection in which he is held by all."

WILLIAM J. PETERSEN.

MANPOWER OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I have had inquiries from time to time about the manpower of the armed forces of the nations of the world. Information on this matter is very difficult to obtain. Therefore, I requested that the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress look into the matter and give me the best available data from published sources. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which the Library prepared for me in this connection.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMED FORCES OF THE WORLD

Armed forces of the world—Estimates of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of each country (not including reserves) based on sources available to the public

Country	Army	Navy, including Marines	Air Force	Total	Remarks
United States	[1] 1,039,423	[1] 864,634	[1] 910,575	[1] 2,814,632	Strength on May 21, 1956.
Linked with United States by Rio treaty:					
Argentina	[2] 105,000	[2] 21,500	(4)	126,500	
Bolivia	[3] 3,000	(4)	(4)	3,000	Includes 1,000 officers. There is also an armed militia of 12,000.
Brazil	[2] 200,000	[2] 26,300	(4)	226,300	
Chile	[2] 20,400	[2] 3,859	[5] 6,070	30,329	
Colombia	[7] 40,000	[2] 3,589	(4)	43,589	Another source estimates army of 12,000 to 15,000.[2]
Costa Rica	[8] 10,000	(4)	(4)	10,000	The Costa Rican Army was abolished in 1948 and replaced by a civil guard of 1,200.[2] However, 10,000 were mobilized against revolutionaries in early 1955.[8]
Cuba	[2] 14,946	[2] 5,668	[2] 235	20,849	
Dominican Republic	[2] 12,000	[2] 3,000	[2] 2,400	17,400	
Ecuador	[9] 10,000	[2] 3,780	(4)	13,780	
Guatemala	[2] 7,500	(4)	(4)	7,500	Source used estimated size of Army from 7,000 to 8,000.
Haiti	[2] 4,040	[2] 300	[2] 152	4,492	
Honduras	[2] 2,500	(4)	(4)	2,500	
Mexico	[2] 300,000	[2] 8,000	(4)	308,000	
Nicaragua	[10] 7,500	(4)	(4)	7,500	Another source estimates forces at 3,220 besides 4,000 in trained reserves.[2]
Panama	None	None	None	----------	Panama has national police force of 3,370.[2]
Paraguay	[11] 7,000	[2] 1,900	(4)	8,900	
Peru	[2] 32,000	(4)	(4)	32,000	
El Salvador	[2] 3,000	(4)	(4)	3,000	
Uruguay	[12] 10,000	[2] 1,470	(4)	11,470	
Venezuela	[2] 10,000	[2] 2,200	(4)	12,200	
Linked with United States by North Atlantic Treaty:					
Belgium	[13] 114,000	[13] 5,000	[13] 21,000	140,000	
Canada	[2] 49,719	[2] 19,107	[2] 47,694	116,520	
Denmark	[14] 27,000	[2] 6,000	(4)	[14] 41,000	
France	[2] 565,000	[2] 70,800	[2] 117,000	752,800	
Germany (Federal Republic)	(4)	(4)	(4)	----------	Western Germany has 18,000 frontier police force. NATO plans call eventually for a West German armed force of 500,000 men.[15]
Greece	[2] 102,000	11,500	[2] 13,800	127,300	Another source estimates army at 110,000.[2]
Iceland	[2] None	None	None	----------	
Italy	[6] 230,000	[2] 38,000	(4)	268,000	
Luxembourg	[2] 3,000	(4)	(4)	3,000	
Netherlands	(4)	[2] 23,100	(4)	[16] 39,100	
Norway	[2] 15,000	(4)	[17] 6,900	[17] 33,000	
Portugal	[2] 64,000	[2] 7,235	[2] 1,855	73,090	
Turkey	[2] 395,000	[2] 19,250	[2] 8,500	422,750	Other sources estimate Turkey's armed forces from 360,000 [18] to near 850,000.[18]
United Kingdom	[20] 405,000	[20] 122,500	[20] 244,500	772,000	Estimated Apr. 1, 1956.

See footnotes at end of table.

Armed forces of the world—Estimates of the Army, Navy, and Air Force of each country (not including reserves) based on sources available to the public—Continued

Country	Army	Navy, including Marines	Air Force	Total	Remarks
Linked with United States by other security treaties:					
Australia	[21] 24, 230	[21] 14, 400	[21] 15, 000	53, 630	
Republic of China	[2] 300, 000	[3] 45, 500	(4)	345, 500	Another source estimates 500,000 in the Nationalist Army.[22] Source used estimates 41,000–50,000 in navy.[3]
Japan	[6] 150, 000	[6] 19, 400	[6] 10, 350	179, 750	Estimated for 1955. These are called self-defense forces. New York Times of July 2, 1955, has estimate of 168,000.
Republic of Korea	[2] 650, 000	[3] 10, 155	(4)	660, 155	
New Zealand	[2] 3, 905	[2] 2, 825	[5] 4, 245	10, 975	
Pakistan	[15] 150, 000	[3] 6, 600	(4)	156, 600	Another source estimated total armed forces of 190,000.[23]
Philippines	[23] 40, 000	[3] 4, 000	(4)	44, 000	
Thailand	[2] 30, 000	[3] 11, 100	[2] 4, 000	45, 100	
Communist nations:					
U. S. S. R	[2] 2, 800, 000	[3] 750, 000	[3] 800, 000	4, 350, 000	Has announced cuts totaling 1,840,000. It has been estimated that if the recent announced cuts are carried out, the Soviet Union will have a total force of 2,400,000 to 2,900,000.[24]
Albania	[25] 55, 000	(4)	(4)	55, 000	Source used estimated army from 50,000 to 60,000. Another source estimates 40,000.[3] Has announced cut of 9,000.[26]
Bulgaria	[25] 180, 000	[3] 3, 500	(4)	183, 500	Source used estimated army from 165,000 to 190,000. Another source estimates 200,000.[3] Has announced cut of 18,000.[26]
Czechoslovakia	[25] 225, 000	(4)	(4)	225, 000	Source used estimated army from 200,000 to 250,000. Another source estimates total armed forces including air and security forces at 390,000.[3] Has announced cut of 34,000.[26]
East Germany	[15] 95, 000	[15] 10, 000	[15] 8, 500	113, 500	Source used estimates army from 90,000 to 100,000 and air force from 7,000 to 10,000.
Hungary	[25] 172, 500	(4)	(4)	172, 500	Source used estimated army from 165,000 to 180,000. Has announced cut of 20,000.[26]
Poland	[25] 525, 000	[3] 15, 000	[3] 30, 000	570, 000	Source used estimated army from 450,000 to 600,000. Another source placed total at 300,000. [3] Has announced cut of 47,000.[26]
Rumania	[25] 172, 500	(4)	(4)	172, 500	Source used estimated army from 165,000 to 180,000. Another source estimated army at 250,000.[3] Has announced cut of 40,000.[26]
North Korea	[27] 500, 000	[27] 16, 000	[27] 20, 000	536, 000	500,000 may mean total force.
Communist China	[28] 3, 500, 000	[3] 53, 000	(4)	3, 553, 000	Estimates range from 2 million regulars [29] plus 1 million security troops to more than 5 million.[30]
North Vietnam	[31] 350, 000	(4)	(4)	350, 000	
Mongolian People's Republic	(4)	(4)	(4)		
Others: Europe:					
Austria	[32] 6, 500	(4)	(4)	6, 500	Estimates of final size of force range from 15,000 to 30,000.[33]
Finland	[2] 34, 000	[3] 1, 500	[2] 3, 000	38, 500	Army and air force figures represent limit placed by peace treaty.
Ireland	[9] 12, 500	[3] 560	(4)	13, 060	
Spain	[9] 425, 000	[3] 36, 000	(4)	461, 000	
Sweden	[9] 60, 000	[3] 13, 500	(4)	73, 500	
Switzerland	(4)		[9] 5, 000	5, 000	Has militia of 300,000 men who are in uniform at some time during the year.[34]
Yugoslavia	[7] 550, 000	[3] 6, 300	(4)	556, 300	Source used stated there were 500,000 to 600,000 in army in 1951.
Others: Middle East and Africa:					
Afghanistan	[23] 50, 000	(4)	(4)	50, 000	Another source estimates 40,000.[35]
Egypt	[36] 75, 000	[3] 5, 000	(4)	80, 000	
Ethiopia	[37] 20, 000	None	(4)	20, 000	
Iran	[2] 125, 000	[3] 1, 650	4, 224	130, 874	
Iraq	[23] 40, 000	(4)	(4)	40, 000	
Israel	[23] 50, 000	(4)	(4)	50, 000	
Jordan	[36] 20, 000	(4)	(4)	20, 000	
Lebanon	[2] 5, 000	(4)	(4)	5, 000	
Liberia	[2] 4, 000	(4)	(4)	4, 000	In addition has estimated frontier force of 1,260.[2]
Libya	(4)	[38] None	(4)		
Saudi Arabia	[23] 7, 500	(4)	(4)	7, 500	Is considered a para-military force.[38]
Syria	[39] 45, 000	(4)	(4)	45, 000	Another source states that Syria has an effective field force of 20,000.[39]
Union of South Africa	[40] 9, 000	(4)	(4)	9, 000	
Yemen	[41] 18, 000	[41] None	[41] None	18, 000	
Others: South and Southeast Asia:					
Burma	[42] 60, 000	[3] 2, 000	(4)	62, 000	Navy figure includes reserves.
Cambodia	[43] 40, 000	(4)	(4)	40, 000	
Ceylon	[4] 1, 655	[3] 712	(4)	2, 367	
India	[44] 350, 000	[3] 7, 700	(4)	357, 700	Another source gave number of army effectives as 250,000.[45]
Indonesia	[2] 110, 000	9, 800	(4)	119, 800	
Laos	[46] 5, 000	(4)	(4)	5, 000	Source used placed estimate from 4,000 to 6,000.
Nepal	[2] 45, 000	(4)	(4)	45, 000	Of these 20,000 are regulars.
Vietnam	[46] 150, 000	(4)	(4)	150, 000	

[1] U. S. Department of Defense. Press release, June 29, 1956.
[2] Steinberg, S. H., editor, The Statesman's Yearbook, 1955. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1955.
[3] Jane's Fighting Ships, 1955–56, London, 1956.
[4] No data.
[5] New York Times, Mar. 18, 1956, p. 7.
[6] Whitaker's Almanac, London, 1956.
[7] Mangelsdorf, Phil. Washington Evening Star, Sept. 16, 1955, p. A6.
[8] Holland, Henry F. Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, remarks of Jan. 20, 1955, reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 652.
[9] Information Please Almanac, 1956. Dan Golenpaul Associates, New York, Macmillan, 1955.
[10] Alistair Cooke in Manchester Guardian, Jan. 20, 1955.
[11] New York Times, May 6, 1954, p. 1.
[12] Embassy of Uruguay.
[13] Belgian Embassy.
[14] New York Times, Feb. 26, 1955, p. 4.
[15] Hanson W. Baldwin. New York Times, Sept. 29, 1955:6.
[16] Embassy of the Netherlands, from hearings on their defense budget.
[17] Thomas F. Brady in New York Times, Feb. 20, 1955, p. 21.
[18] Don Cook, New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 27, 1955, p. 3.
[19] New York Times, Nov. 27, 1955, p. E5.
[20] British Information Service. Labor and Industry in Britain, vol. XIV, No. 2, June 1956, p. 73.
[21] New York Times, May 29, 1955, p. 2.
[22] Murray Fromson. Washington Star, July 28, 1955, p. B18.
[23] New York Times, Oct. 2, 1955, p. E7.
[24] Hanson Baldwin. New York Times, May 20, 1956, p. E5. In a press conference on July 13. 1956, Harold Stassen, President Assistant for Disarmament, estimated that the Soviet announcement would leave their armed forces "close to 3 million."
[25] Hanson Baldwin. New York Times, May 15, 1955, p. E5.
[26] New York Times, July 31, 1955, p. 18.
[27] South Korean intelligence estimate reported in New York Times, September 6, 1955, p. 16.
[28] New York Times, Mar. 12, 1955.
[29] Jim B. Lucas, Washington Daily News, Mar. 25, 1955. Quoted in daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 28, 1955, p. A2171.
[30] Harrison E. Salisbury, New York Times, Aug. 21, 1955, p. E3.
[31] Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1955, p. 2.
[32] Frederick Brook, Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 5, 1955, p. 2.
[33] Christian Science Monitor, July 9, 1955, p. 6; and New York Times, Mar. 25, 1956; p. 3.
[34] Embassy of Switzerland.
[35] A. M. Rosenthal. New York Times, Dec. 22, 1955, p. 8.
[36] Hanson W. Baldwin. New York Times, Jan. 5, 1956, p. 8.
[37] The World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1955. Published by New York World Telegram and Sun, 1955.
[38] Embassy of Libya.
[39] Don Cook. Saturday Evening Post. Feb. 18, 1956.
[40] New York Times, Mar. 10, 1955, p. 6.
[41] The Middle East. A Political and Economic Survey, London, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2d edition, 1954, p. 106.
[42] Time. Aug. 30, 1954, p. 24.
[43] Embassy of Cambodia.
[44] Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 18, 1955, p. 17.
[45] Reporter, Feb. 24, 1955, pp. 39–42.
[46] Senator Mike Mansfield. Report on Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Oct. 6, 1955.

RETENTION OF OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2856, H. R. 11197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11197) to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Florida and Georgia, being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to require the United States to retain its ownership in certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir project for such period as those lands may be used for fish, wildlife, and recreational purposes by the State of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RATIFICATION OF SALE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2827, H. R. 9631.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9631) to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN FARM UNITS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2731, S. 3957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3957) to amend the act authorizing the exchange and amendment of certain farm units in order to limit the time during which applications may be made under such act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 258, 83d Congress, approved August 13, 1953 (all 67 Stat. 566), be amended to read as follows:

"That any entryman on an unpatented farm unit on a Federal irrigation project which shall be found by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to a land classification, to be insufficient to support a family shall be entitled, upon timely application to the Secretary to exchange his farm unit for another farm unit of unentered public land within the same or any other such project in the same State, or, upon terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary, for any other available farm unit on the same or any other such project in the same State. He shall be given credit under the homestead laws for residence, improvement, and cultivation made or performed upon the original entry, and if satisfactory final proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation has been made on the original entry it shall not be necessary to submit such proof upon the lieu entry. Rights under this act shall not be assignable.

"SEC. 2. The benefits of section 1 of this act shall, and those of the following sections may, be extended by the Secretary to (a) any lawful assignee of an unpatented farm unit on a Federal irrigation project who took the assignment in good faith not knowing and not having reason to believe the farm unit to be insufficient to support a family; and (b) any resident owner of private lands on any such project whose lands shall be found to be insufficient to support a family and (i) who, apart from his ownership of the lands to be conveyed pursuant to clause (iii) hereof and apart from his having previously exhausted his homestead right, if such be the case, is eligible to enter unappropriated public lands under Revised Statutes, section 2289, as amended (43 U. S. C. 161), (ii) who lawfully acquired his lands as an entire farm unit, and can show to the satisfaction of the Secretary that he has made reasonable and diligent efforts to bring those lands into a state of economically sufficient productivity, and (iii) who conveys, free from all encumbrances, to the United States all of his lands served by the project or such portion thereof as the Secretary may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, it is proposed to strike out

He shall be given credit under the homestead laws for residence, improvement, and cultivation made or performed upon the original entry,

And insert in lieu thereof

He shall establish residence on the exchange farm unit thus selected and perform thereon improvement and cultivation as may be required under Federal reclamation and homestead laws notwithstanding the fact that such requirements may have been performed in whole or in part on the insufficient unit relinquished to the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to alleviate, so far as practicable, the speculative abuses which have arisen in the settlement of public lands on reclamation projects and which have been brought to the attention of the committee. Previous legislation with respect to settlement has failed to authorize controls which are provided for in the amendment.

The amendment will provide curbs which are intended to prevent abuses which arise when an entryman transfers from a homestead which is submarginal to a more desirable homestead on a reclamation project. Heretofore many abuses have resulted because it has been possible for an entryman to claim a new homestead without the requirements of residence which applies to all homestead entries. It has been possible for an entryman to dispose of his new unit. This abuse should be curbed, and I am sure the amendment will accomplish that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BURIAL OF THE REMAINS OF AN UNKNOWN AMERICAN OF THE KOREAN CONFLICT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2848, H. R. 8157.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8157) to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving during the Korean conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to provide legislative authority for the interment of an unknown American serviceman who lost his life while serving overseas during the Korean conflict.

The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of Defense, first, to return to the United States the remains of an American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict and whose identity has not been established; and, second, to provide for the burial with appropriate ceremonies

on Memorial Day, May 30, 1958, of this unknown American in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., near or beside the remains of the Unknown Soldier of the First World War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSTALLATION OF RADIOTELEPHONE ON CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2846, H. R. 7536.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7536) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "any passenger or" and insert "more than six", and on page 4, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "June 1, 1956" and insert "March 1, 1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 15, after the word "Company", it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma and the word "and", and insert a new section as follows:

(3) vessels navigating on the Great Lakes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the amendment provides an exception for the Great Lakes fishing vessels. The operators of such vessels are very desirous of having the amendment included as an exception to the bill requiring ship-to-shore telephones.

The chairman of the committee has agreed to the amendment. He is not on the floor at the present time, but he has advised me that the amendment is satisfactory to him. The ships are never out of sight of land, and never out of hailing distance of another ship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7536) was read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT AND RETIREMENT OF DARRELL C. WILLIAMS, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 2850, Senate bill 2567.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2567) to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the President is authorized to advance Darrell C. Williams, now a lieutenant, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant commander, United States Navy, on the retired list of the United States Navy, with the retired pay and allowances of that grade; but no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act, prior to its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to notice previously given, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. KENNEDY in the chair].

RECENT NOMINATION AND CONFIRMATION OF PAUL HOFFMAN

Mr. CLEMENTS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. For what purpose does the Senator from Wisconsin desire me to yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to make an insertion in the RECORD, and make a comment with respect to the insertion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, one of the many reasons I advanced for opposing the appointment of Paul Hoffman as a delegate to the United Nations was that Hoffman, as the head of ECA, had been extremely derelict in his handling of a security case in his department involving one Theodore Geiger. Nothing has happened since the Senate debate on the Hoffman appointment that causes me to revise my judgment that Hoffman's handling of the Geiger case was irresponsible and that it indicates a contemptuous disregard on Hoffman's part, for our security program and for laws that are designed to protect this country against Communist subversion.

Information has come to my attention, however, that prompts me to reopen the subject of Theodore Geiger.

Mr. Geiger's attorney has brought to my attention what appears to be a sincere and candid account of Mr. Geiger's Communist past and of his subsequent rejection of communism. Since I have always believed that an avowed ex-Communist should have the fullest opportunity to make the record clear with respect to his conversion from communism, I have invited Mr. Geiger's attorney to set forth in a letter to me Mr. Geiger's version of this matter, on the understanding that I would insert the letter verbatim in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That letter has now been furnished to me, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: I am writing you on behalf of my client, Mr. Theodore Geiger. On July 11, you addressed the Senate on the question of the then impending nomination of Mr. Paul Hoffman as a delegate to the U. N. General Assembly. A part of your criticism of Mr. Hoffman related to his handling of the Geiger case when he was head of the Economic Cooperation Administration. Your remarks concerning Mr. Geiger give the impression that you have some serious doubt about his loyalty and integrity while he was employed by ECA, as well as about his present loyalty and integrity. I am sure you recognize that such doubts suggested by your remarks can adversely affect Mr. Geiger's reputation and his livelihood.

I have no doubt that you were completely sincere and forthright in your evaluation of Mr. Geiger's record based upon the information then in your possession. I also have no doubt that you were not aware of Mr. Geiger's words and deeds of the past 15 years which clearly and conclusively rebut any presumption, arising from his youthful mistake, that he may have been disloyal to the United States during the period of his Government service or that he is presently in any way sympathetic to alien philosophies or otherwise unreliable. I am confident that you will be interested to learn certain facts about Mr. Geiger which evidently were not before you at the time of your Senate address.

There is no question that Mr. Geiger was intellectually committed to communism in the late 1930's, but although he wanted to join the Communist Party and joined an

organization thinking it was the party, he never actually became a member. The Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 shocked Mr. Geiger into the realization of the cynical, undemocratic nature of communism and Soviet imperialism. The result has been that since 1940 Mr. Geiger has had no sympathy whatever with any Communist or Communist-dominated organization or with any Communist, Marxist, or Socialist philosophy or movement.

Mr. Geiger's experience with the Communist movement in the 1930's led him to a strong anti-Communist position in the immediately succeeding years. Although he supported assistance to the Soviet Union during World War II in order to hasten defeat of the Axis Nations, he was even then seriously concerned about the growth of Russian military potential, and he was never under any illusions that the Soviet policy following the war would be one of friendship and peace. Unfortunately, Mr. Geiger's literary activities did not commence until 1947, so there is no published material on the basis of which you could verify Mr. Geiger's position during World War II. His friends and associates during the World War II period were, however, very much aware of his unequivocal anti-Communist and anti-Russian views. If you want to check this, I suggest you contact William Y. Elliot, of Harvard University, who knew Mr. Geiger during this period.

At the conclusion of his military service, Mr. Geiger was hired as an economist for the Foreign Economic Administration and was assigned to its London mission which became a part of the State Department when the FEA was abolished. In this position, Mr. Geiger played an exceptionally vigorous role in the development of policies designed to prevent Russian sabotage of the Western European recovery effort. The various memoranda and reports which he wrote during this period reflect that he was thoroughly aware of the Communist threat and of the necessity for vigorous affirmative action to combat it.

Mr. Geiger returned to the United States in June 1947 in order to obtain necessary medical care for his wife. In August 1947 he became staff consultant to the Select Committee on Foreign Aid of the House of Representatives. In this position, he took the lead in urging that Western European nations be required to provide for adequate self-help as a condition of American economic assistance under the then developing Marshall plan. In addition, he strongly urged adoption of three important policies:

1. Creation of a Western European military defense alliance (2 years before NATO);

2. Inclusion of West Germany in the Marshall plan;

3. Creation of a separate agency to administer the Marshall plan, rather than having the State Department do so as proposed by the Truman administration, with this new agency to be run by businessmen so that it would have the imagination, initiative, and business judgment necessary for an effective program of American aid.

Mr. Geiger was employed by the Economic Cooperation Administration from April 1948 until October 1950. In 1951 he joined the staff of the National Planning Association, and has been employed by that association since. As you know, the NPA is a private organization financed by contributions from business firms and private individuals. It is dedicated to encouraging effective private planning by American private enterprise so as to avoid a Government-imposed planned economy. Mr. Geiger wholeheartedly and enthusiastically shares the objective and orientation of the NPA.

In 1951, Mr. Geiger was coauthor of Making Western Europe Defensible. This book dealt with the nature and magnitude of the Soviet threat and included some enlightening discussion of Communist tactics. It pointed out that the major Communist objective has been and is to "demoralize, confuse, divide, and enfeeble the will to resist aggression," and that the Communists may be expected to switch their tactics from one extreme to the other in furtherance of this objective.

In 1952 Mr. Geiger was coeditor of the Manual of Corporate Giving. This book included a chapter written by Mr. Geiger entitled "Public Policy and the Five Percent." In this Mr. Geiger took sharp issue with the view that "government is alone capable of socially responsible conduct and hence must assume the role of deliberate regulator and organizer of all private actions affecting the community." He advocated, as an alternative to government paternalism, that governmental functions be limited to providing a balanced structure of order within which individual actions remain free and decentralized, and that private business institutions be encouraged to contribute funds to educational, scientific, and welfare projects in order to keep the government out of these fields.

In 1953 Mr. Geiger wrote a book entitled "Communism Versus Progress in Guatemala." In this report Mr. Geiger alerted the Western Hemisphere to the grave threat posed by Communist penetration in Guatemala long before the American public generally was aware of this situation. He pointed out that the Guatemalan Communist Party was "only a local agent of Soviet imperialism," and discussed in considerable detail the manner in which they were able to infiltrate positions of power and influence in Guatemala through a well-managed conspiracy.

In 1955 Mr. Geiger participated in an NPA study group which wrote a book entitled "The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy." (This book, incidentally, has been reviewed favorably in conservative publications such as National Review, and has been reviewed unfavorably in such liberal publications as the Reporter.) One chapter of this book, written by Mr. Geiger, illustrates clearly that Mr. Geiger is strongly opposed to communism for fundamental moral reasons, as well as on political and economic grounds. Mr. Geiger wrote:

"Soviet communism is more dangerous than nazism or fascism because it is less irrational in its appeal than the others and because its intrinsic immorality is artfully concealed in a utopian vision of perfect community and universal plenty. * * * But, at bottom, it, too, is only a myth, and those who seek to realize it in human history are also victims of a double corruption. The irrationality of their goal of anarchic freedom and perfect plenty—that is, its unattainability—makes it powerless to prevent the diversion of their energizing will to power into the pursuit of narrower and merely self-interested purposes. Their failure of moral judgment, which permits them to choose an irrational goal, is also responsible for their fanatical error of believing that any means may be justified in attempting to achieve their end—even those morally inconsistent with it."

Mr. Geiger deeply regrets one aspect of his record since his break with communism in 1940. He regrets that he did not come forward forthrightly at any early date to inform the FBI and other interested agencies that, although he had not actually been a member of the Communist Party, he was involved in the Communist movement in the late 1930's. Thus, when Mr. Hoffman defended him in 1949 and 1950, he did so without benefit of full disclosure of the pertinent facts by Mr. Geiger. Mr. Geiger rectified this deficiency by telling his entire story fully, cooperatively, and candidly to the FBI in 1954. He realized then and realizes now that it would have been in the national interest had he spoken at a much earlier date and that he would thereby have spared himself and others much heartache and embarrassment.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD P. GREEN.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me hasten to add that I am in no position to vouch for the accuracy of most of the points made in this letter. I have no way of checking them, save through a laborious investigation. I have no way of knowing, for example, whether Geiger actually belonged to the Communist Party in the 1930's as was stated under oath by Professor William Canning, or whether, as is now claimed by Geiger, he was a dedicated adherent of communism who joined a subsidiary Communist oragnization thinking it was the Communist Party itself. Nor do I think this apparent conflict is an important one: In any event, Geiger was a Communist at heart, and had belonged to an organization which disqualified him for employment by the ECA.

Likewise, I am unable to vouch for Geiger's statement that he did not disclose his Communist background to Hoffman. Assuming, however, that he did not do so, we are still left with the fact that Hoffman refused to investigate the Geiger case after sworn testimony had been brought to his personal attention which described the Communist background of one of his chief assistants. Therefore, my judgment of Hoffman's handling of the Geiger case stands as previously stated.

Nor, finally, do I have sufficient information to give a personal opinion as to when Geiger made a definite break with communism.

I am able to say, however, from the limited inquiry I have been able to make, that Geiger appears to have been a firm anti-Communist in recent years. I am personally satisfied that when Geiger was interviewed by the FBI in 1954, he cooperated fully with that organization in naming his past Communist associates. I have also been favorably impressed with several of Geiger's writings on the subject of communism in recent years. His statement, in a booklet entitled "Communism Versus Progress in Guatemala," written in 1953, that "It is important to scotch at the outset any notion that the Guatemalan Communists are merely agrarian reformers—as the Chinese Communists were once mistakenly thought to be—or that they are not connected with and dominated by the worldwide apparatus of Soviet communism" is one example that indicates a genuine conversion on his part. Moreover, in his 1951 book, "Making Western Europe Defensible," Mr. Geiger indicates a keen awareness of the danger to the West posed by Soviet imperialism. While I do not agree with many of Mr. Geiger's suggestions as to how to meet that threat, such disagreement has to do with tactics rather than with objectives.

I congratulate Mr. Geiger on what appears to be a sincere repentence for his Communist past.

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the

consideration of Calendar No. 2732, Senate Resolution 281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 281) relative to the conservation and development of land and water resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported jointly by the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Federal Government" and insert "Congress"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "not only"; in the same line, after the word "encourage", to strike out "but to participate in"; in line 3, after the word "resources", to strike out "for all purposes" and insert "to establish national policy pertaining thereto"; in line 4, after the word "that", to strike out "the continued" and insert "any"; in line 5, after the word "this", to strike out "fundamental and"; in line 6, after the word "long-established", to strike out "national policy" and insert "principle"; in line 25, after the word "the", where it occurs for the first time, to strike out "congressional committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter" and insert "Congress"; on page 4, line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "traditional"; in line 10, after the word "the", to strike out "settled administration of the large body of organic"; in line 13, after the word "after", to strike out "full examination and consideration" and insert "approval" and after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed jointly to study, in consultation with other appropriate committees and executive agencies, and to design and to formalize a comprehensive and particularized set of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, including attention to the several specific factors recognized in section 4 of this resolution, all to the end that the Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers, as reflected throughout the text of this resolution. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works are hereby directed to submit to the Senate, as nearly as practicable during the first session of the 85th Congress, a detailed report with respect to their implementation of this section.

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit require that the Congress continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers to encourage the conservation and development of such resources, to establish national policy pertaining thereto, and that any nullification by the executive agencies of this long-established principle would constitute a usurpation of the legislative power.

SEC. 2. That land and water resources development should be planned in comprehensive bases and with a view to such an ultimately integrated operation of component segments as will insure the realization of an optimum degree of physical and economic efficiency.

SEC. 3. That the number of Federal agencies, offices, and organizations having to do with the planning and review of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should be reduced, rather than increased, and that technical and administrative routing and review procedures should be simplified and shortened in order to facilitate and to accelerate the submittal of reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects.

SEC. 4. That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress, and that they should fully disclose the details and results of all studies and analyses of all potential utilizations, costs, allocations, payout, and benefits, both direct and indirect, made by all interested operating agencies.

SEC. 5. That the preservation of the constitutional principle of separation of powers requires that any departure by the executive agencies from the observance and employment of the policies, standards, procedures, and techniques reflected in and growing out of the law governing the conservation and development of the land and water resources of the Nation be effected only after approval by the Congress.

SEC. 6. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed jointly to study, in consultation with other appropriate committees and executive agencies, and to design and to formalize a comprehensive and particularized set of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, including attention to the several specific factors recognized in section 4 of this resolution, all to the end that the Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers, as reflected throughout the text of this resolution. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works are hereby directed to submit to the Senate, as nearly as practicable during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, a detailed report with respect to their implementation of this section.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is present, and I am sure he will want to explain the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution No. 281 is a first step toward securing for the Congress the type of information we require for adequate consideration of water-resource projects. The resolution in this respect speaks for itself in connection with the direction for the development on behalf of the Senate of a definitive plan to advise the executive agencies of the character of information that is to be presented with or without recommendation for authorizing legislation.

The study will be made jointly by the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the coming recess, and the results will be presented as early as practicable during the 1st session of the 85th Congress. This study will be made in consultation with other committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerned, as well as executive agencies that have responsibility for the development of water resources. It is the intention of the sponsors of the resolution that the study and the report shall be objective and constructive, with the sole view of getting essential data before the Congress in concrete, understandable form.

The second phase of the resolution is the caution to the executive agencies against attempting to infringe on legislative prerogatives by putting into effect policies and programs, without even giving the Congress opportunity to consider them. In reporting this phase of Senate Resolution 281, we had currently in mind the failure to send to the Congress recommendations for legislative action to implement the recommendations of the President's Water Policy Committee.

In our hearings on Senate Resolution 281 we had no adequate explanation of the failure to send up recommendations, as the President had stated would be done. Hints that the Executive proposed to proceed to implement the recommendations by administrative fiat led to an alert to the Congress and a caution to the executive agencies to watch, look, and listen.

We have been particularly concerned about the additional layering process in the executive agencies in handling water resource projects. Our two committees are agreed, I believe, that there is now sufficient overhauling, review, and rereview of project reports before these documents get to Congress. To add other layers between the working agencies and the Congress smacks of pyramiding blockades against a constructive program of water development that is so vital to the Nation's progress and permanent prosperity.

The resolution, as amended, together with a comprehensive analysis, is printed in full in report No. 2686. Therefore, I shall avoid a further detailed discussion of the preamble and purpose.

Mr. President, I desire to express my appreciation of the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle, of both the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works. The unanimity of support for the proposals set forth requires that we approach the task we have recommended in a constructive manner, which we can assure the Senate we will do.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, whose cooperation with that of his colleagues has been most helpful in bringing to the Senate floor this constructive proposal.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am glad to agree with my friend, the Senator from Montana; and I do so on the basis of the hearings and the information obtained there. I also wish to concur in the committee's recommendations regarding this resolution. I do so with the greatest confidence in the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the distinguished minority leader has a statement

by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] to be placed in the RECORD?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I ask unanimous nonsent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by him on this resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The principal objectives of this resolution are found stated in essence in section 6, which declares that the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and on Public Works jointly study with other appropriate committees, standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources, and to design a comprehensive and authorized set of standards and overall criteria therefor.

Exception has been taken by some to some of the criteria which have been applied to projects submitted to operating agencies and to the Bureau of the Budget for their evaluation and report.

In order to fully understand the procedures whereby such reports are required and recommendations made thereon, it is well to consider the following:

Since 1943, under Executive Order 9384, the Bureau of the Budget has conducted a review of project reports on behalf of the President. This is in the interest of orderly operation of the executive branch. Such review is in recognition of the fact that such projects are a part of the Presidential program. It gives the President a chance to tell Congress whether a given project is consistent with the overall President's program, including fiscal policies. It informs Congress of any views or objections or modifications which the President may have regarding the subject project.

This review is made after the operating agency has worked out studies, plans, estimates, and details on the project.

There is a need for standards and criteria by which executive departments and agencies can be guided in preparing recommendations and reports.

This need arises because Congress often requires of an operating agency certain determinations and recommendations without setting out any criteria or even guideposts for its use. One of the latest examples of this is found in H. R. 8750, amending the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566—83d Cong.) as acted upon by the Senate on July 20, 1956. In that bill, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized "to prepare plans and estimates required for adequate engineering evaluations; to make allocations of costs to the various purposes to show the basis of such allocations, and to determine whether benefits exceed costs."

Yet the procedures, standards, and methods by which these things can be accomplished are not specified in the law. Obviously someone must prepare them for use by the Secretary of Agriculture and his appropriate agencies.

If Congress fails to act in this regard as it did in this particular instance, and many, many other instances, the need can be filled by the operating agency itself, or by the Bureau of the Budget, which is the agency for presenting overall views and approaches of the executive department.

To meet just such needs the Bureau of the Budget under President Truman issued on December 31, 1952, Budget Circular A–47, setting forth standards and procedures for the review of proposed Federal water and related land resources programs and projects.

As I understand it, the use of such general standards by the executive branch in the review of project reports does not determine the recommendations of operating agencies to the Congress regarding authorization of projects. That circular does not in any way change any of the requirements of existing law. In fact, there is express provision bearing on this very point, as stated in paragraph 4 of Circular A–47, in this language:

"The standards and procedures set forth in this circular shall not be regarded as authorizing any deviation from general or specific requirements of law."

Actions taken by the Bureau of the Budget under Circular A–47, therefore, are presentations of information and recommendations to the Congress by that agency on behalf of the President. The Congress, of course, in its action on legislation makes the final decisions on authorizations of projects.

That Congress has not been inhibited in the slightest by such recommendations, and even by its own policy with reference to some requirements for procedures is found in the omnibus bill for rivers and harbors and flood prevention projects which is currently pending in the Senate. In the bill H. R. 12080 as approved by the House, about one-fourth of the projects included therein had not even been processed through the Bureau of the Budget, and in fact the Bureau of the Budget had not received any reports thereon from the operating agencies. In those projects in the Senate Committee on Public Works projects for which no report had been received by the Bureau of the Budget as of the date of consideration thereof by the committee numbered about 18 or 20. In fact, in several instances there were not even any reports by the Corps of Engineers or any district or division thereof, and the projects were approved.

This is commented on to demonstrate that the Congress is the final and ultimate authority and that it exercises that authority in its own discretion and within its legitimate powers.

It is submitted that if the Congress is dissatisfied with the standards used by operating agencies or by the Bureau of the Budget, the remedy lies in prescribing such standards as the Congress itself may consider desirable. It is submitted that dissatisfaction with those standards should not serve as a basis for criticism of the agencies which use them so long as there is no congressional directive forbidding their use or required use of other standards. In short, the remedy lies with Congress.

To the extent that the attending resolution calls for the preparation of such standards with a direction that they be used in applicable cases, I can find no fault with it.

On the other hand, if there is displeasure by any Member of Congress with the use of such standards by the operating agencies or by the Bureau of the Budget, that displeasure should not be visited upon those agencies by way of criticism.

It should be remembered that when projects are referred to agencies for study and analysis it does not necessarily follow that a favorable report must be rendered thereon. Such a view would be prejudging the application, and would make totally unnecessary reference for recommendation. The purpose of referring such applications is to have the agencies furnish the Congress with sufficient data and information upon which Congress may then base decision to approve the application and authorize the project.

In short, if there is any fault to be found in the present situation, Congress in all fairness, should look to itself for its part in creating it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 281), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas on January 17, 1956, the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress the report (H. Doc. No. 315, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, consisting of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture, designated by the President May 26, 1954, with a recommendation that "* * * the Congress give prompt attention to its proposals"; and

Whereas it is stated, at page 84 of the Economic Report of the President, transmitted to the Congress January 24, 1956, that "in due course, legislative proposals will be submitted to implement the recommendations" of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, but no such proposals have yet been submitted to the Congress and instead it is indirected that the recommendations may be implemented by direct action of the executive agencies; and

Whereas notwithstanding that the conditions recited in this resolution result by reason of policies or actions under more than one national administration and by more than one branch and department of the Federal Government, it is desirable that this Congress initiate proper corrective action: Now, therefore, be it.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT REVIEW OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW AND JUKEBOXES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by authority of the Judiciary Committee, and after consultation with the leadership on both sides, I ask unanimous consent that a document constituting a review of the evidence relating to the copyright law, as it applies to jukeboxes, in connection with Senate bill 590, relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, which document is now in preparation, may be printed following the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT STAFF REPORTS ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the staff reports of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Committee on the Judiciary, on the hearings which were held during the year, and which now are in course of preparation, may be printed following the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ADMIRALS OF FORT BENTON

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that my distinguished senior colleague has yielded to me at this time, because I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Montana can proudly claim its fair share of prominent contemporary military leaders, but

I sincerely doubt that few communities can meet the record of Fort Benton, Mont.

No less than four admirals, now serving or having served in the United States Navy during World War II, have spent a part of their earlier years in Fort Benton. I refer to Adm. John Hoover, retired; Rear Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharp; Rear Adm. G. C. Towner; and Rear Adm. L. D. Sharp, retired. All four have lived in this small town on the Missouri River. In addition, Fort Benton boasts about its brigadier general, R. W. Curtis, who is serving in the United States Army; and Col. Karl Louther, of the United States Marine Corps.

The reason that I make note of this record on the Senate floor is that Fort Benton is a small inland town of only 1,200 to 1,500 population.

Fort Benton's naval record dates back to the late 1800's when it was the head of the navigation on the Missouri River, in the fur-trading days.

The people of Fort Benton have made a fine contribution to the armed services of the Nation, as have all the other towns and cities in the State of Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Montana Farmer Stockman, reprinted in the July 20, 1956, issue of the Miles City Star, of Miles City, Mont., be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Miles City Star of July 20, 1956]

THE ADMIRALS OF FORT BENTON

Many Montanans know that Adm. John Hoover (retired) of the United States Navy who was in charge of important naval forces in numerous engagements of World War II, grew up in Fort Benton, Mont. But not many know that three other admirals of the Navy with exceptionally fine service records also came from this little town on the Missouri.

On a recent naval tour in the Pacific the writer, while chatting with Rear Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharp one day, remarked that Admiral Hoover came from Fort Benton. "Yes, that's right," replied Admiral Sharp, adding that he too used to live in Fort Benton.

Admiral Sharp then went on to say that Rear Adm. G. C. Towner and Rear Adm. L. D. Sharp (retired) also came from Fort Benton. And he reminded us that Brig. Gen. R. W. Curtis of the United States Army and Col. Karl Louther of the United States Marine Corps came from Fort Benton.

Since its early pioneering days, many other young men from Fort Benton and its surrounding rural territory have served in the various branches of the armed services, as have men from all other Montana communities.

But we doubt whether any other town of 1,200 to 1,500 population in the United States has produced 4 admirals. Perhaps that is not so surprising a record for an inland town as it might seem. After all, Fort Benton used to be the head of navigation on the Missouri in the old fur-trading days and for a good many years thereafter.—MONTANA FARMER STOCKMAN.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, good news has come to the Nation's postal workers and to our other Federal employees. It had been feared that in Congress' rush to adjourn, this crucial retirement bill might have been lost.

But now it is a source of gratification to us of the Congress who have been interested in employees' welfare, yes, a source of gratification to vast numbers of civil-service retirees, their loved ones and dependents, that the Senate-House Conference Committee has at last reached agreement on the bill to liberalize civil-service annuities.

I have previously spoken on the floor on the importance of this issue.

I believe that those who have served this Nation faithfully are entitled to justice in their later years. That goes for the elderly letter carrier, whose problems I recently discussed with Bill Doherty, able president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. It goes, as well, for the retired employee of the Veterans' Administration, or the Defense Department, or the Department of Agriculture or any other individual who has served with honor in the civil service of our country.

INFLATION HAS DEPRECIATED THE DOLLAR

Too often, however, we have found that those who have served 25, 30, or more years, find in their later years that their meager civil-service retirement pension has been almost wiped out by the rise in the cost of living. Thus, too often, inflation has made a mockery of the benefits to which the civil service worker, himself, has patiently and hopefully contributed for years and years.

Of course, today, July 26, in the final hours of negotiation on this and other bills, inevitably a certain number of features of this bill have, unfortunately, been dropped, although we might have preferred to have them included.

The final version of the retirement plan is by no means as liberal, in several respects, as we might have hoped. Some good features of S. 2875 have, regrettably, been lost, as the House of Representatives conferees fought for their version. Rather than see the entire bill die, however, I urge enactment of the compromise.

REASONS FOR THIS BILL

Let the compromise, however, not be regarded as a so-called "last word" or as a conclusive meeting of this problem. Additional changes will, no doubt, prove necessary. Such changes should be made next year, when more time for study and agreement will be available.

Recently, a group of civil-service workers in La Crosse wrote to me outlining some meritorious reasons for enactment of S. 2875, the bill which originally had been advanced by our good friend from South Carolina, Senator JOHNSTON. I am taking the liberty of enumerating some of their reasons:

First. Congress and Federal employees have long recognized the need for a complete revamping of the retirement system, and this has been reflected in the numerous bills introduced during the recent sessions to amend the Retirement Act.

Second. To correct inequities existing that have developed as a result of piecemeal legislation.

Third. To provide greater incentive for career employees, particularly in scientific fields and engineering. The turnover of Government employees in the professional services is largely due to more rapid advancement and opportunities in private industry.

Fourth. To provide many long-justified and highly desirable liberalized features to meet the ever-increasing cost of living.

As an indication of the sentiment of the other civil-service organizations of my State, I send to the desk excerpts from many messages which I have received from these groups.

Down through the years, on many occasions, I have met with these organizations with our faithful postal workers, with our mail carriers on city routes and rural routes, with members of the National Federations of Federal Employees, the National Association of Retired Civil Service Employees, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, and others. They represent a grand group of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Green Bay, Wis., July 24, 1956.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I received your telegram today and wish to thank you for the help you have given the postal clerks on S. 2875. We hope you will support S. 2875 for it is far superior to the House version. We also feel that 6 percent employee deduction is great plenty even with the increased benefits. In the years 1921 to 1928 (fiscal) the Government did not contribute 1 cent toward our fund, the employees contributed $425 million by 1954 (fiscal) the Government only $33 million. We feel if the Government made its full share of the contributions in the fund there would be no need for a 7 percent employee deduction.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Respectfully,
HERBERT VAN HOUT,
Legislative Representative, Local No. 2247.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYES' COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Representing the more than 600,000 members who are affiliated with the Government Employes' Council, I wish to advise you that we are vigorously supporting S. 2875, the Johnston civil service retirement bill, and I urge that you give this most important bill your wholehearted support.

Private industry has made great strides in improving their pension plans. The improved standard of living makes it imperative that the Government do likewise.

The Government employees have paid more into the Civil Service retirement fund to date than the fund has paid out. Despite that fact, we are willing to go along with the one percent increase in the contribution rate provided for in S. 2875. The estimated cost to the Government of S. 2875, as figured by Chairman Philip Young of the Civil Service Commission, is $259 million.

The officers, delegates, and member unions of the Government Employes' Council, repre-

senting approximately 600,000 Federal employees, respectfully ask that you wholeheartedly and most actively support S. 2875, and we urge you to contact the leaders of the Senate to secure early consideration of S. 2875.

Most sincerely,
THOMAS G. WALTERS,
Operations Director, GEC/AFL-CIO.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Green Bay, Wis., May 2, 1956.

Hon. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Bill S. 2875 has now been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As of now our retirement program has many defects which this bill will correct.

We urge you to support this bill in any way you can, this bill has long been overdue and is badly needed now.

Thank you for past consideration on our problems.

Respectfully,
HERBERT VAN HOUT,
Legislative Representative, Local No. 2247.

RACINE, WIS., *April 23, 1956.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the Racine, Kenosha County rural mail carriers, I wish to ask you to vote in favor of S. 2875, a bill to improve the civil-service retirement system.

We believe it is necessary because of the increased economy of the country. Our present system does not provide an adequate living. If it were bettered and the age reduced, the Government would receive a better performance of duty due to the feeling of security it would give to the employee. We all know that if we feel free and secure we can do more with greater ease.

It is doubtful if many carriers would retire under age 60, but it would be nice to know that you would be free to do so should it become necessary. Illness in one's family sometimes necessitates a change in climate and works a definite hardship upon a man who has spent many years in his work; but who because of inadequacies in our present pension law, cannot retire.

We believe that the Johnston bill, if passed, would eliminate many of our difficulties.

Thank you for any assistance you can give.

Very truly yours,
L. G. POWELL,
President, Racine Kenosha Rural Letter Carriers Association.

LADIES AUXILIARY, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS,
Waterford, Wis., April 25, 1956.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Auxiliary of the Milwaukee Branch of National Association of Postal Supervisors would appreciate favorable action on the bill S. 2875.

Respectfully,
Mrs. VERONICA NELSON.

MADISON FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Madison, Wis., May 11, 1956.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Madison Federation of Labor at its Monday night meeting voted to request you to support bill S. 8275 and work for its passage as a great need to the postal employees.

Sincerely yours,
RUSSELL E. DRESSER,
President.
MARVIN E. BRICKSON,
Recording Secretary.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL NO. 3, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 12, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On behalf of the one thousand plus members of local 3, National Federation of Federal Employees, I urge your active support of S. 2875.

Thanking you kindly,
LEO S. HAURAHAN,
President, Local No. 3, NFFE.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *April 18, 1956.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Members of the National Federation of Government Employees, Local No. 3, at Milwaukee, Wis., note with interest that the Johnson bill S. 2875 has been reported out of committee.

Your support of this measure for the welfare of civil service personnel will be appreciated by the undersigned, member of the union and employee of the Navy Department.

Very truly yours,
(Mrs.) DOROTHY M. BIERMANN.

WISCONSIN STATE LADIES AUXILIARY, WISCONSIN STATE ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Madison, Wis., April 18, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER A. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I received information today that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a unanimous vote on Thursday, April 12, 1956, reported out S. 2875, the Johnson retirement bill for postal employees.

You, no doubt, know the provisions of this bill, which liberalize the retirement benefits for letter carriers.

I am sure you will agree that this is a good bill, and I will appreciate your favorable support when it comes up for action on the floor of the Senate.

Thanking you in advance for your support of this bill, I am,

Sincerely yours,
(Mrs.) KATHRYN AYEN,
State Secretary, Wisconsin State Ladies' Auxiliary, NALC.

LOCAL NO. 1100, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Ashland, Wis., April 13, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This will confirm our telegram message to you today which read as follows:

"Our Local No. 1100 strongly urges your support S. 2875. Request you solicit McCARTHY's support also. Letter follows."

Ashland, Wis., Local No. 1100, National Federation of Federal Employees, respectfully solicits the support of yourself and Senator McCARTHY on S. 2875, the retirement bill.

Your cooperation in this respect will be very much appreciated.

Respectfully yours,
MIKE J. GORDON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

EXEMPTION OF NAVY DEPARTMENT FROM CERTAIN REIMBURSEMENT PAYMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2826, House bill 7728.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7728 to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this measure would ratify and approve the transfer of certain real property, without reimbursement, from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of the Navy, which transfer was effected by quitclaim deed on March 29, 1951. The measure also affirmatively provides that the Department of the Navy is relieved from any obligation to compensate RFC for the property transferred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am delighted, as always, to yield to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Was the bill before the committee?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes, the bill was before the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. LANGER. Was it unanimously approved by the committee?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I see the chairman of the committee is present. I will ask him whether or not the bill was unanimously approved by the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am informed by the chairman that the report was unanimous.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7728) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLACING OF MINOR CHILDREN FOR PERMANENT FREE CARE OR FOR ADOPTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 2840, Senate bill 3021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3021) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to

strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end of chapter 53 a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER 54—INTERSTATE PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN FOR PERMANENT FREE CARE OR FOR ADOPTION

"Sec.
"1180. Placing child for permanent care or for adoption.
"1181. Placing child for permanent free care or for adoption for compensation.
"1182. Coercion or enticement of parent.
"1183. Definitions.

"§ 1180. Placing child for permanent free care or for adoption

"(a) No person, firm, corporation, association, or agency, either alone or through any agent or employee or other person, in any manner whatsoever, shall place, arrange for, or assist in arranging for the placement of any child for permanent free care or adoption in any home other than the home of a relative within the third degree of such child, under circumstances requiring or resulting in such child being transported in interstate commerce, unless such placement—

"(1) (A) has received the prior approval in writing of the public department responsible for child-welfare activities in the State in which the prospective foster or adopting parents resided at the time of placement, and (B) such approval is certified as having been given after an investigation has been made by the said public department or any licensed or authorized child-care agency in the State, selected by the said public department. The investigation shall be made of the circumstances surrounding said proposed placement (including the home environment of the prospective foster or adopting parents, the suitability of the prospective foster or adoptive parents for the particular child and whether such placement is in the best interests of the child). Such investigation shall include a study conducted by the public department of the State from which the child is placed. This study shall cover the background of the child and a determination that the child is legally free for adoption; or

"(2) is made by a child-care or adoption agency, licensed or authorized to place children for adoption;

"(3) is made after receipt by the foster or adoptive parents of a statement in writing from a public or private agency licensed or authorized to place children, asserting that the placement is in the best interests of the child, and that that investigating agency has taken into consideration the home environment of the foster or adoptive couple, and the suitability of the prospective foster or adoptive parents for the particular child. This provision shall only apply when the public department responsible for child-welfare activities in the State in which the prospective foster or adopting parents are domiciled or reside immediately at the time placement is made, has no statutory obligation to supervise, control, or regulate the importation of children.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to supersede the act entitled 'An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes and for other purposes,' approved April 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 193; D. C. Code, title 32, ch. 7b). In the event there is a conflict between this section and the act entitled 'An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes and for other purposes, approved April 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 193; D. C. Code, title 32, ch. 7b), the provisions of the later shall prevail.

"(c) Whoever violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years or both.

"§ 1118. Placing child for permanent free care or for adoption for compensation

"(a) Whoever, either by himself or through any agent or employee, or other person, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives any money or any other thing of value, or the promise thereof, in any manner whatsoever, for placing, or arranging for, or assisting in arranging for, the placement of any child in any home for permanent free care or adoption, under circumstances requiring or resulting in such child being transported in interstate commerce, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply in the case of money received or paid to a child-care or adoption agency in any State, either public or private, which is authorized or licensed by said State to provide permanent care for children or to place for adoption, as reimbursement for the reasonable and proper expenses of providing services by said agency. This shall not in any way interfere with the rights of an attorney to obtain a fee for services rendered directly in connection with the obtaining of an adoption decree.

"§ 1182. Coercion or enticement of parent

"Whoever, by himself or through any agent or employee or other person, whether in return for the payment or receipt of money or anything of value, or without any such payment or receipt, in any manner whatsoever persuades, induces, coerces, or arranges for a parent of a child (including a child en ventre so mere) to travel from or to another place in interstate commerce to place said child for permanent free care or adoption when the placement is made or will be made in return for the payment of money or anything of value, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"This provision shall not interfere in any manner with arrangements made by licensed or authorized maternity homes or shelters to arrange for the transportation of a natural mother from one State to another.

"§ 1183. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(a) The term 'child' means any individual who has not attained the age of 16 years.

"(b) The term 'interstate commerce' means transportation of persons or property between one State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, and another State, Territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or with a foreign country.

"(c) The term 'permanent free care' means the care given to any child on a permanent basis by any person who is not receiving compensation therefor, and is not related to the child, but such term does not include the free care provided to any child by any licensed or authorized child-care agency or juvenile court."

SEC. 2. (a) The analysis of part I of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after—

"53. Indians ..... 1151"

the following:

"54. Interstate placement of children for permanent free care or for adoption ..... 1180".

(b) That part of the index to title 18 of the United States Code which describes the contents of part I of such title, is amended by inserting after—

"53. Indians ..... 1151"

the following:

"54. Interstate placement of children for permanent free care or for adoption ..... 1180".

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] wishes to make a statement on Senate bill 3021.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement concerning the background of S. 3021, a bill to make criminal the commercialized interstate placement of children, which was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary and filed by me yesterday. This bill is the result of an intensive national 15-month investigation conducted by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, into the interstate "baby-selling" business.

The subcommittee held hearings in Miami, Chicago, and Washington, D. C., at which 89 witnesses testified, many of whom were engaged in the interstate baby racket. In addition, over 2,000 persons, half of whom were adoptive couples or natural parents who had had direct dealings with black market baby operators, were interviewed by the staff of the subcommittee in all sections of the United States.

The result of the overall investigation was to establish the existence of a large-scale interstate commercial traffic in children being placed for adoption, in which it is estimated that more than $15 million passes hands each year. A shocking development was the uncovering of positive evidence that the underworld has started to invade this field and that known racketeers are soliciting unmarried mothers in an effort to secure their children for the baby black market. A typical example of this type of activity involved William Manella, a Chicago racketeer with a long criminal record, who was found to be traveling throughout the United States inducing mothers to go to Chicago where their children were sold by professional baby brokers for fees ranging from $3,000 to $3,200.

Approximately 90,000 adoptions occur each year in the United States, of which about 25,000 are arranged by unauthorized persons without the benefit of proper safeguards. Many of these 25,000 children are placed across State lines for sums of money varying from $1,000 to $10,000. Because of the lack of a Federal law against interstate "baby-selling", no effective criminal action can be taken by the Federal Government. Thirty-three States, as well, do not prohibit the sale of children.

These situations are not isolated or localized in any one part of the country. Testimony was heard concerning a group engaged in shuttling babies in assembly-belt fashion between Miami, Fla., and New York for $1,500 to $2,500 per child. Professional couriers were utilized to transport the children by air into New York.

Testimony was also given with respect to a north Texas woman with a record of 27 arrests and 7 felony convictions, who was operating a large-scale interstate baby-selling business. Soliciting the unmarried mothers and adoptive parents by means of advertisements in Oklahoma City newspapers, her activities were curtailed only when two automatic

guns were found in her maternity home. The sheriff from this community in north Texas testified that the only action that could be taken with respect to the interstate baby-selling activities of this woman was to charge her with operating an unlicensed commercial maternity home, for which she received a small fine.

At the same hearing, testimony was heard concerning a Duluth, Minn., abortionist, who had a working arrangement with a Chicago attorney, by which children were placed throughout the United States. The mothers of these children were contacted by the abortionist in Duluth and referred to the attorney, who received from $2,000 to $3,000 per child placed. The grand jury in St. Paul, Minn., heard witnesses with respect to this case and found that although there was positive proof of children being sold across State lines, they were unable to take any affirmative action because there was no Federal law to meet this problem. As a result of this situation, Senator THYE, who has played a very active role in this investigation, introduced S. 1123, which has the same objectives as the bill under discussion. S. 3021 is an enlargement of Senator THYE's bill, and he, Senator WILEY, and Senator LANGER are cosponsors of this measure.

At the hearings conducted in Miami, Fla., it was established that a juvenile court judge in Augusta, Ga., and his probation officer, both of whom have since resigned, had been engaged in exploiting their official positions and placing children in an unconscionable manner for over 18 years. Many of the children were sent by airplane to New York, Chicago, and Hollywood in exchange for a fee which was personally retained by the judge. A steady supply of children was made available as a result of the judge's bringing a large number of unwarranted charges of unfitness against natural parents.

The existence of a substantial baby traffic was uncovered by the subcommittee in Phenix City, Ala., which flourished at the time that the National Guard was required to take control of the city. The physician and his wife who operated this traffic had on one occasion placed a child with Clarence O. Revel, reputedly the boss of the Phenix City underworld.

The first problem the subcommittee explored was to determine whether the States could control commercialized baby placement. Law enforcement officials reported from all sections of the country that due to the interstate nature of the activity that they were unable to cope with the problem on a State level. The State's Attorney of Cook County, Ill., Judge John Gutknecht, testified that although Illinois had passed a law against baby selling in July of 1955, he had found that when children went across State lines the prosecuting office of Cook County was unable to take effective action. The proposed statute does not in any way interfere with the rights of the States to grant adoption decrees, nor is it in conflict with any of the State laws regarding the placement of children. It simply makes criminal, actions which are at present, for all practical purposes, beyond the effective control of the States.

The proposed statute specifically exempts from its operation the activities of licensed or authorized adoption agencies making both intrastate and interstate placements of children. Nor does the statute interfere with the rights of doctors and lawyers to receive legitimate medical and legal fees.

Section 1181 makes criminal interstate baby selling and provides a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Section 1182 makes criminal the interstate solicitation of unmarried mothers when the solicitation is for the purpose of placing their children for profit.

Section 1180 requires that when a child is to be placed for adoption across State lines by a private individual a study must be made by the Department of Public Welfare before the placement can be made in the adoptive home. Under present conditions, the first study made of the adoptive home frequently occurs 6 months to a year after the placement, at a time when it is impossible to take any effective action if it is found that the adoptive home is not suitable. This section merely provides a safeguard against careless placement practices and procedures. The mechanics of this section have been carefully worked out with the cooperation of the departments of public welfare of the various States who are in uniform approval and have stated that they are prepared to implement the procedure if the statute is passed.

This bill has widespread support among public and private adoption agencies throughout the United States. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is affirmatively supporting sections of the bill relating to the placement of children for compensation.

In the past 10 years, the demand for children in the United States has increased so that at present there are 10 adoptive couples waiting for every available child. This is a healthy and happy development. Unfortunately, the inequality between the supply and demand has resulted in the development of the interstate "baby-selling" racket. It is my opinion that the present statute will go a long way toward eliminating those unscrupulous individuals who are exploiting this situation. In turn, many more children will be made available for placement through authorized adoption agencies.

The transfer of illicitly obtained property across State lines is subject to Federal penal action. It is only elementary justice that we afford the same measure of protection to children being placed across State lines.

Over 500,000 children will be placed for adoption in the United States in the next 5 years. It is our duty to give these children every opportunity to be placed in suitable homes. I, therefore, strongly urge the passage of Senate bill 3021 as a means of eliminating the professional baby racketeer from the American scene.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has worked hard on this matter, as have the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY,] who have been very much interested in it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In reference to the bill which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is now discussing, I became interested in this subject when I learned, through our own district attorneys in Minnesota, something about the traffic in babies sent into other States for the purpose of adoption. If some young unmarried woman were so unfortunate as to be expecting a child, often those who were interested in trying to obtain the child for adoption would advise the girl where to go, and the hospital bill would be paid. The child would be taken from her. The child would be placed for adoption. The mother would not know where the child was, or to whom it was given.

Many weeks would pass after the birth of the child. The mother, realizing what she had done, found herself the most unhappy, heartbroken person one could imagine. She would have given almost her own body to have recovered the child; but the child was lost to her.

Because of what I learned concerning this traffic I introduced a bill, and later the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota introduced bills. We finally combined the ideas of all three bills into one general bill.

If there ever was need for the enactment of a legislative measure, it is needed in this instance to wipe out this hideous traffic.

Can Senators imagine anything more deplorable or heartrending than the situation of a young unmarried girl in her teens who finds herself expecting a child, and does not know what to do? Someone comes to her and says, "If you will place yourself in my care, I will see that your hospital bill is paid and that you are taken care of. You will not have to disclose your misfortune to your friends."

Naturally, in her bewilderment, she would surrender to such promises. But when everything was over the child would be gone, and she would come to the full realization of what she had done. It would then be too late.

Those are some of the things which I learned as I investigated the question and became familiar with the problem through consultations with those in our own district attorney's office. That led me to attend the hearings which the Senator from Tennessee was conducting in Chicago, where he was obtaining information as to the illegal traffic in illegitimate children, and the illegal practice of inducing an expectant mother to go to some distant city to have her child and then surrender the child to someone who had no purpose except to sell that flesh and blood for a few measly dollars. We should enact legislation in order to put a stop to this racket.

I commend the Senator for the hearings he conducted so ably across the country to develop the information concerning this type of operation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. First I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution. It was he who first developed what was going on in this racket that we found all over the country. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say I hope the bill will pass. I am sure it will put an end to one of the most despicable rackets we have ever witnessed in this country. Our staff has estimated that each year approximately 25,000 babies are sold on the black market. In Chicago, for example, we found that women who had been in the penitentiary, not once, but several times, were operating houses, some of them very close to Chicago, where they were taking orders from shyster lawyers in the city of Chicago, for example. These women would get a certain amount of money, and the lawyers would charge anywhere from $2,500 to $5,000 for a baby. We had such lawyers before our committee. Some of them pleaded immunity under the Constitution. However, we did succeed in getting evidence which pretty well established the racket.

We first heard of the racket when Judge Donohou in St. Paul, Minn., made a scathing denouncement of a man he sentenced to the penitentiary for having violated a State law which prohibits this practice. I am sure that the bill, if enacted into law, will prevent the taking of black-market babies across State lines and will prevent conspiracies for that purpose. I cannot recommend too highly the passage of this bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on page 9, line 16, of the committee amendment there is a typographical error. I ask that the figure "1118" be stricken and the figure "1181" be substituted therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2842, S. 3517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3517) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

REORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. In order to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government that the Department of Labor should be enlarged to include all of the functions which properly belong to it, and in order to provide a firmer legislative basis for the carrying on of a more complete and efficient safety programs for the Federal Government, there is hereby created in the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Division under the direction of a Director of Federal Safety (hereinafter referred to in this act as the "Director"), who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), and who shall receive compensation at the rate established for grade 16 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL SAFETY DIVISION

SEC. 2. The functions of the Federal Safety Council, established pursuant to Executive Order 10194, dated December 20, 1950, are hereby transferred to the Federal Safety Division of the Department of Labor, which, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, shall be responsible, from and after the date of enactment of this act, for the direction and coordination of all safety educational programs and accident, injury, and related loss-prevention procedures conducted by the Federal agencies in furtherance of the purposes of section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The Federal agencies shall keep such records of injuries and accidents to persons covered by such act, whether or not resulting in loss of time or the payment or furnishing of benefits, and make such statistical or other reports and upon such forms as the Secretary may, by regulation, prescribe.

DUTIES OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Director, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary—

(1) to collect and analyze data regarding safety standards and programs presently in operation in the Federal agencies;

(2) to develop and promulgate new minimum standards for the conducting of safety educational programs by the Federal agencies;

(3) to develop and establish the minimum safe working standards to be maintained by the Federal agencies;

(4) to provide a clearinghouse function in the Division which will gather and make available to the Federal agencies appropriate assistance in all matters relating to employee safety;

(5) to promote uniformity by assisting and cooperating with the related health and fire prevention activities presently pursued by other Federal agencies;

(6) to develop programs designed to reduce the number of tort claims against the Federal Government resulting from injuries to private persons and property attributable directly or indirectly to officers and employees of the Federal Government;

(7) to inspect periodically the premises and interrogate the personnel of each of the Federal agencies to ascertain if the minimum standards developed and established pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) hereof are being maintained by such Federal agencies;

(8) to recommend annually to the Secretary for transmittal to the head of each Federal agency and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the amount which should be included in the budget of each Federal agency for the succeeding fiscal year for use by such agency in carrying out its safety educational programs to minimize hazardous work practices and conditions, such amount to be based on the need of each such agency for such a program; and

(9) to prepare for the issuance annually to the Congress by the Secretary a report showing (A) the progress made in the field of accident prevention in the Federal agencies through the reduction of the number of accidents and injuries among the officers and employees of such agencies by the elimination of work hazards and health risks, and (B) the amounts recommended to be included in the budget of each Federal agency pursuant to paragraph (8) hereof, together with any action taken by each such agency with respect to such recommendations.

APPOINTMENT OF TRAINED PERSONNEL

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall appoint not less than 10 qualified safety engineers, technically experienced in the field of accident prevention, regional directors where appropriate, and such other employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Federal Safety Division under this act. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of such Division, no political test or qualifications shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of qualifications, merit, and efficiency under the rules of the Civil Service Commission.

AUTHORITY TO INSPECT

SEC. 5. The Director of Federal Safety is hereby authorized to enter and to authorize the entry of appropriate officers of his Division, in order to inspect such places and such records, question employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as he may deem necessary to carry out his duties pursuant to this act.

FEDERAL SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Advisory Committee (hereinafter referred to in this subsection as the "Committee") to be composed of such qualified representatives of the Federal agencies, and such qualified representatives from national or international Federal Government employee unions and the Public Health Service as shall be appointed from time to time by the Secretary. In making such appointments, the Secretary shall insofar as practicable, take into consideration the various geographical areas of the United States. The committee shall be composed of 27 members of which no fewer than 9 members shall be appointed from national and international Federal Government employee unions. The length of tenure of committee members shall be determined by the Secretary. The heads of the Federal agencies shall nominate the representative and alternate of their respective agencies and the heads of national or international unions having Federal employee members shall nominate the union representatives and alternates. The members of the committee shall serve as such without additional compensation, except that all members shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties under this act.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to advise the Director of the Federal Safety Division with respect to—

(1) the development and coordination of effective safety educational programs and minimum safety standards in the Federal agencies, and

(2) the carrying out of his duties pursuant to the authority contained in this act.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND

SEC. 7. The Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor shall, prior to August 15 of each year, furnish the Secretary of Labor, for use in the prepara-

tion of the Department's annual budget estimates, the latest statistics showing the pure premium cost for past work injuries sustained by employees of the several Federal agencies and its bureaus, based upon the frequency, severity, and direct incurred loss experience of each agency and its bureaus under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The Department of Labor shall include in its annual budget estimates a request for an appropriation in an amount equal to such premium cost and shall, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each fiscal year, deposit in the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation such sums as may have been appropriated pursuant to such request, for the payment of benefits from such fund on account of the employees of the Federal agencies. Any sums so deposited shall remain available in such fund until expended.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 8. As used in this act—

(1) The term "Federal agency" includes (A) the executive departments, (B) the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, (C) the independent establishments and agencies in the executive branch, including Government corporations and instrumentalities of the United States wholly owned by the United States, and (D) upon the express consent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and after publication in the Federal Register of a resolution by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia of such consent, the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and

(2) The term "incurred loss" means the amount of loss, paid and outstanding, for which the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation has become liable during the preceding fiscal year.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR SAFETY PROGRAMS

SEC. 9. The head of each Federal agency, after receipt of the recommendations by the Department of Labor of the amount determined to be necessary to enable such agency to carry out its safety educational programs to minimize hazardous work practices and conditions, shall include in the annual budget estimates of such agency an amount equal to at least the amount so recommended, unless the head of such agency determines that the inclusion of such amount is inadvisable and forwards to the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a written report stating the reasons why such inclusion has been deemed inadvisable.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 24 OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 10. Section 24 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately preceding the first sentence thereof, and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device, a material fact in relation to the injury or death of a person compensable under the provisions of this Act or any extension or application thereof, or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, in relation to such an injury or death, or induces or compels any person to forego the filing of any claim for compensation or other benefits provided under this Act or any extension or application thereof, or retains any notice, report, claim, or paper, which is required to be filed under this act, or any extension or application thereof, or regulations promulgated thereunder, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

REPEALER

SEC. 11. Section 33 (c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act is hereby repealed.

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, S. 3517, as amended by the committee, is designed to reduce the Federal employee-accident rate and the cost of accidents in Federal employment, both financially and in terms of human suffering, by providing for the promotion and establishment of improved safety educational programs and new safety inspection procedures.

The bill seeks to accomplish this objective by creating within the Department of Labor a Federal Safety Division, which would be responsible, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Labor, for the direction and coordination of all safety educational programs and related loss-prevention procedures conducted by the various Federal agencies in furtherance of existing legislation to encourage safety and accident prevention, and for all of the functions now vested in the Federal Safety Council.

The bill was considered very carefully in committee, and the committee amendment is the result of hearings, and it embodies the suggestions which were made by both the majority and minority members. I believe that is an adequate explanation of the bill and of its purposes and objectives, and I ask for its approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED FREIGHT RATES, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as Senators know, all of the railroads operating in interstate commerce in the United States filed on December 20, 1955, certain tariffs to become effective February 25, 1956, providing for a general increase of 7 percent in interstate freight rates and charges. This filing was under a special permission granted by that Commission and the case was presented by the carriers upon affidavits and the only public hearing held in connection with the application was one conducted before Division 2 of the Commission for the sole purpose of cross-examining the witnesses who had filed verified statements.

A cooperating Committee of State Commissioners, composed of Wendell Tennis, of the Indiana Public Service Commission; Fred W. Clayton, of the Nevada Public Service Commission; and Hammond Fowler, of the Tennessee Public Service Commission, sat with Division 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission during the cross-examination, and with the full commission during the presentation of oral arguments of counsel, which was held on last February 20, 21, and 22.

On March 2, 1956, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order in the case, known as Ex Parte 196, which in substance granted a general increase of 6 percent with certain exceptions. The Cooperating Committee of State Commissioners disagreed. The committee decided unanimously that a further and fuller statement of their views in disagreement should be prepared and requested that this fuller presentation be printed in the report to be issued by the ICC containing its findings and conclusions on which the March 2 order had been based. Despite repeated efforts by Mr. Fowler, who was named by the Cooperating Committee of State Commissioners, to accomplish this, only a very abbreviated version of the State Commissioners objections was published, in a report otherwise some 120 pages long.

Mr. President, I think in their report the State commissioners presented some serious and valid arguments, worthy of publication and of knowledge not only of Congress but of the public. I ask unanimous consent that their dissenting remarks be printed at this point in my remarks.

I particularly recommend their report for study by the appropriate Senate and House committees. The State commissioners make, among other things, a very compelling argument that the ICC is relinquishing its control over rates by granting blanket increases when other blanket increases previously granted have not themselves been completely utilized by the railroads. I think both viewpoints should be open for public understanding and study and for congressional study, and therefore I am taking this means of making the State commissioners' views available for this purpose.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION EX PARTE 196, INCREASED FREIGHT RATES, 1956—SEPARATE VIEWS OF THE COOPERATING COMMITTEE OF STATE COMMISSIONERS, CONSISTING OF WENDELL TENNIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE INDIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION; FRED W. CLAYTON, OF THE NEVADA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION; AND HAMMOND FOWLER, OF THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC COMMISSION

On March 2, 1956, the Interstate Commerce Commission entered its order in this case authorizing a general increase in freight rates of 6 percent, subject to certain exceptions therein specified. The order stated that a report would be issued later containing the Commission's findings and conclusions upon which the order was based. The cooperating committee of State commissioners sat with division 2 during the cross-examination of witnesses and with the full Commission during the argument of this case. The cooperating committee of State commissioners disagreed with the conclusions reached by the Commission and filed separate recommendations, as follows:

1. Suspend for 6 months from date.

2. Make cost of service study.

3. Review and cooperate with State commissions to avoid as many section 13 cases as possible to accomplish proper cooperation rather than long and expensive litigation.

4. Interstate Commerce Commission needs further evidence and study prior to application of rates.

So that the reasons for those recommendations will be understood, we are submitting this statement of our views to be filed with the Commission's report.

The procedure following in this case was adopted following a conference between representatives of the railroads and three members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which took place in the office of the Chairman of the Commission on December 21, 1955, as set out in his letter of December 22, 1955, to Mr. Fred Carpi, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., a copy of which is filed herewith as appendix 1. Neither the State commissioners nor the members of the shipping public were represented at that conference. On December 27 the railroads filed an application for authority to depart from the tariff rules of the Commission to the extent necessary to permit them to publish a general increase of 7 percent by means of a master tariff and for the modification of outstanding orders of the Commission to the extent necessary to permit publication of the 7 percent increase in this way. The authority requested was granted by order of the Commission on the following day—December 28. On December 30 the master tariff was filed providing for a 7 percent increase in all rates to become effective February 25. At the same time the railroads filed a printed document entitled "Statement of Railroads in Justification of the Proposed Increases and Application for Fourth Section Relief and Modification of Outstanding Orders," together with supporting verified statements. On January 4 the Commission entered a further order establishing special rules of procedure. The special rules provided that all direct testimony should be presented by verified statements. Those opposing the increase were given until February 3 in which to file verified statements and the railroads were given until February 10 to file replies to these statements. A hearing for the purpose of cross-examining witnesses was scheduled for February 13, and oral argument was scheduled for February 20. No provision was made for regional hearings as had been done in prior general increase cases.

This procedure was reviewed by the Executive Committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and also by the members of the Southeastern Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners and the members of the Midwest Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners. These associations felt that the procedure was wholly inadequate and accordingly they joined in objections to the abbreviated hearing and a motion for adequate investigation which were filed by special appearance.

It was the view of the State commissions, as set out in their objections and motion, that the financial condition of the railroads, as shown in the verified statements filed in support of the application, did not make out a case requiring adoption of the extraordinary procedure outlined above, that such a procedure would work an injustice upon the shippers who are the beneficiaries of the hundreds of rate orders obtained from the Commission in lengthy and costly proceedings in which they had carried a heavy burden of proof, and that the record so made could not form an adequate basis for the carrying out by the Commission of the obligations imposed on it by statute. They pointed out that the railroads were asking the Commission to engage in a process of purely mechanical and mathematical ratemaking, whereby rates would be automatically increased by the amount of increases in unit prices of labor and materials without regard to whether there had been a corresponding increase in the overall cost of handling the traffic, and without regard to the lawfulness of the level of rates so arrived at. They pointed out that the railroads had not been able to retain the increases granted them in the recent past on important segments of traffic, that there were strong indications that on much important freight traffic the revenue-vanishing point of rate increases had already been reached or passed, and that the effect of granting the relief requested by the railroads would be to turn over to railroad management the duty imposed by statute on the Commission of adjusting the rate structure so as to prevent unlawful discriminations. These views of the State commissions were given short shrift. Their objections were overruled and their motion was denied by summary order without hearing or argument.

Despite our misgivings as to the procedure adopted by the Commission in this case, we accepted appointment as cooperating State commissioners. The record made by the railroads in this case and the action taken by the Commission on that record have amply justified our fears. We have reviewed the record carefully and we think that its inadequacy may be clearly and convincingly demonstrated.

THE EVIDENCE AS TO INCREASES IN COSTS

The major contention advanced by the railroads is that an increase in rates is essential to offset increases in costs. The only evidence submitted by the railroads in support of the contention that the costs have increased is the verified statement of Graham E. Getty which purports to show a total increase in cost of $591 million since September 30, 1955. This figure is only an arithmetical computation. The increase in the cost of labor was computed by adding to such cost in 1954 an amount obtained by applying the increases in hourly rates of pay to the number of hours paid for, together with the increases in payroll taxes applicable to the higher level of wages. Increases in material costs were computed by applying an index maintained by the Association of American Railroads. These figures, added together, amount to $591 million and the railroads contended that their total costs would be increased by that amount during the ensuing year. The Commission accepted this evidence as proof of such an assertion, finding that there would be "an increase in operating expenses of the railroads amounting to more than $500 million annually, consisting principally of increased wages, taxes, and increased costs of materials and supplies."

We can discover no support in the record for this finding. The record would support a finding that if the same quantities and qualities of materials and the same hours of labor were used in 1956 as in 1954 and there were no offsetting economies in operation, there would be an increase in operating expenses of this magnitude, but the missing ingredient in this record is evidence that the railroads will not operate more efficiently in 1956 than they did in 1954. This is recognized by Commissioner Freas in his separate opinion in which he points out that—

"It is not the price of given quantities of labor or material that is significant; it is the cost per unit of service rendered that affects the reasonableness of rates. In this respect the record leaves much to be desired."

That the record leaves much to be desired in this respect is an understatement. There is literally no evidence that the cost per unit of service will increase in the same ratio as do the prices of given quantities of labor and materials.

The assumption that 100 cents of every dollar of increase in the unit prices of labor and materials are automatically reflected in the total operating costs of the railroads flies in the face of the history of our American economy in general and of the railroad industry in particular. Our expanding economy testifies eloquently of the improved methods of production and operation which increase the productivity of labor and the life of materials almost from day to day. But it is not necessary to resort to general principles or historical trends to demonstrate the fallacy of this assumption. The past experience of the railroads makes it clear that the cost per unit of service does not increase in the same ratio as do the prices of given quantities of labor and materials. This is shown persuasively in the verified statement of the witness, George B. Tully, relating to the annual costs per thousand revenue net ton-miles to be borne by freight traffic. Mr. Tully has taken the total operating costs in each year and subtracted the revenue contributions of other services. He has thus included in freight costs not only the cost of handling the freight traffic but also the burden of the ever-increasing passenger deficit. In 1951 the cost per thousand revenue ton-miles for the railroads of the United States as a whole, after Federal income tax, was $11.90. For the 9 months ended September 30, 1955, the cost was only $11.91. During this same period the combined index of wage rates and material prices increased from 129.1 to 143.3, or approximately 11 percent. This entire increase in labor and material prices was absorbed without any increase in the unit cost of doing business.

That increases in the prices of labor and materials are not necessarily reflected in increased overall costs was demonstrated by Mr. Getty on cross-examination. His testimony as to how his theories would work out if applied to the 1953 costs was particularly dramatic in its complete contradiction of the conclusions he testified to in his verified statement. In 1953 the railroads carried 605.8 billion revenue ton-miles. In the 12 months ended September 30, 1955, they carried 603.5 billion revenue ton-miles, almost the same volume of business. In the 12 months ended September 30, 1955, the railroads incurred increases in the prices of labor and materials of $239.5 million over 1953, computed in the manner in which Mr. Getty computed the 1956 increases in costs. Yet their actual costs for those 12 months were $674 million less than in 1953. His method of computation, therefore, would have resulted in an overstatement of costs of $913.5 million. This figure should be compared with the net railway operating income of $1,130 million for the 12 months ended September 30, 1955. Had Mr. Getty appeared before the Commission a year ago, he presumably would have testified that the railroads were going to have a disastrous year in 1955. He would have been completely in error then, and there is no reason to assume that he is not equally in error now.

The explanation of why rising prices do not bring corresponding increases in unit costs is very simple. Reduction in operating expenses in the face of rising prices for labor and materials reflects the enormous strides taken by the railroads in modernizing their plants and improving their operations. This trend is continuing and the railroads are constantly increasing their efficiency. The most telling testimony on this point was that of Mr. J. E. Tilford, the President of the L. & N. Railroad, who demonstrated on cross-examination how his railroad had been able to overcome increases in labor and material prices by dieselization, the installation of modern freight yards, the mechanization of maintenance work, and other economies. With reference to further improvements in efficiency in the immediate future he testified: "I am on the firing line. I know we have to do it."

No one can be certain at this date whether the railroads can absorb completely the increases in labor and material prices to which Mr. Getty testified, and only time will tell. The decreases in the cost of doing business resulting from increased efficiency is a relatively steady, gradual decrease, whereas increases in costs resulting from increases in wage rates are sporadic. The cost per thou-

sand revenue net ton-miles in the months immediately following a major increase in wage rates will naturally show a sharp increase but this cost will gradually decline, assuming that there are no further increases in the meantime. We believe that a suspension of the proposed increase for 6 months, together with a study by the Commission's cost section, would enable the Commission to form an intelligent judgment as to the extent to which the railroads are able to absorb the increases in the prices of materials and labor.

Mr. Getty would have us believe that the decrease in operating costs between the year 1953 and the year 1955, referred to above, resulted from under-maintenance. The net income of the railroads for the 12 months ended September 30, 1955, was $925 million. This is the highest net income in their history. No explanation is offered as to why the railroads would permit their physical plant to deteriorate during this period of unprecedented prosperity and the only proof offered in support of the assertion that they did so is the cold statistics showing a reduction in their expenditures for maintenance. Mr. Getty conceded on cross-examination that he had made no study of the cause of this reduction but was simply expressing his conclusion derived from the figures themselves. There is nothing in the record to show that he was qualified to express such a conclusion. The testimony of the operating witnesses indicates that the reduction in maintenance expenditures was due to mechanization of track work, realization of economies resulting from capital improvements in way and equipment and other economies and not to a policy of under-maintenance. In this connection it should be noted that there were substantial reductions in costs in 1955 as against 1953 for all categories of expenses—transportation and traffic, general and all other, as well as maintenance of way and structures and maintenance of equipment. Surely the reduction in transportation expense was not due to under-maintenance. Nor could the reduction in maintenance of equipment have been due to this cause since Getty's exhibit shows that the percentage of bad order cars on October 1, 1955 (5.1) was practically identical with the percentage on December 31, 1952 (5.0). Before accepting this facile explanation, therefore, the Commission should have looked longer and further to the ascertainable facts.

In short, the railroads had the burden of proof in this proceeding, and it was their obligation to establish the extent, if any, by which their costs in 1956 will exceed their 1955 costs. They not only have failed to carry that burden, they have failed to present any testimony on this issue that rises to the dignity of competent evidence.

THE ALLEGED SHORTAGE OF FUNDS NEEDED FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

A second contention advanced by the railroads is that increased revenues are essential to enable them to make necessary capital improvements, including, particularly, additional investments in locomotives and freight cars, but we are unable to find any substantial evidence to support this contention. In the 9 years from 1946 to 1954 the average net income of the railroads of the United States was $643 million. For the 12 months ended September 30, 1955, the net income was $925 million, and for the calendar year 1955, the last 3 months of which included the increases in prices of wages and materials testified to by Mr. Getty, the net income was $917 million. In the period since the war the railroads of the United States have carried on a capital-improvement program which has increased their gross investment in transportation property by about $7 billion. At the same time, they have reduced their funded debt by $1½ billion and have increased their total long-term debt (including equipment obligations) by only one-half billion dollars. If the railroads were able to accomplish this with an average net income of $643 million, it is difficult to see why their capital-improvement program should have suffered in a year during which the net income exceeded $900 million, even making allowance for the reduced purchasing power of the dollar. No explanation is offered as to why the railroads should have skimped on capital expenditures in the year of their greatest prosperity, and we find it difficult to believe that they actually did so. Much was said about the need for additional freight cars, but there is nothing to indicate that there is any connection between the alleged shortage of freight cars and the asserted need for additional revenues. During 1954 there was an average surplus of 90,000 cars per day, according to William T. Faricy, president of the AAR. It is easy to understand why more freight cars were not ordered during that year. The railroads had a surplus and were unwilling to add to it. When business picked up in 1955 additional freight cars were ordered promptly, and this was done before the railroads knews whether they were going to obtain the increase requested.

The shortage of freight cars is an old story. It is doubtful if the railroads have ever had as many freight cars as they needed during periods of peak demands, but their present situation is as favorable as it has been in any year of high traffic volume. The total freight-carrying capacity of freight cars in the United States on December 31, 1954, was 93,196,281 tons, the highest figure in any year in history, except 1952 and 1953, which were only slightly higher. In 1947, the peak volume postwar year, the railroads moved 655 billion ton-miles of freight with a freight-car fleet having a total capacity of only 89,224,538 tons. In addition, the freight-car fleet is being used much more efficiently today than it was even 5 years ago. Between 1950 and 1955 freight ton-miles per train-hour increased from 20,343 to 25,300, an increase of almost 25 percent. Since orders for 70,000 new cars were placed in the 2 months of November and December, 1955, it seems clear that the car supply situation of the railroads lends no support to the contention that they have failed to keep up their freight-car fleet because of insufficient funds.

THE RIGHTS OF THE SHIPPERS AND OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Section 15a (2) of the Interstate Commerce Act provides:

"In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable rates the Commission shall give due consideration, among other factors, to the effect of rates on the movement of traffic by the carrier or carriers for which the rates are prescribed; to the need, in the public interest, of adequate and efficient railway transportation service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service; and to the need of revenues sufficient to enable the carriers, under honest, economical, and efficient management to provide such service."

It will be noted that there are three factors specified—the effect of rates on the movement of traffic, the public interest in adequate and efficient railway transportation service at lowest cost, and the need of the carriers for revenues. The Commission seems to have focused its attention on the needs of the carriers and to have disregarded the other factors specified in section 15a. It is, in our opinion, clearly apparent, that the railroads have not established that they need additional revenues and certainly they have not carried the burden of proof as to the contention that they face such a dire emergency as to require their needs to be met by the extraordinary and well-nigh summary procedures adopted by the Commission in this case. We now turn to the other factors which the Commission apparently did not consider but which certainly are worthy of consideration.

In a general-rate increase case the railroads consolidate their efforts. They have the necessary personnel and other resources which enable them to plan and present their case with the maximum of efficiency. Shippers, on the other hand, are disorganized. Each one is interested in the rates on his own commodity, and there is no one in a position to meet the railroads on even terms. The general public is not represented at all. If its rights are to be protected they must be protected by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, as we view it, it is the responsibility of the Commission to make sure that the pattern of rates resulting from the application of a general increase will protect the rights of the general public to the maximum possible extent. The procedure adopted by the Commission in this case is, it seems to us, one which disabled the Commission from performing this responsibility. Such a situation would be unfortunate at any time, but is particularly so in the present instance.

This is the fifth general increase case since World War II. In previous cases the Commission has authorized increases aggregating approximately 79 percent. If said increases were applied, therefore, to the extent that the Commission authorized them, it would be logical to expect an increase in railroad revenue per ton-mile approaching the aforesaid percentage. However, from 1946 to November 1955 the average revenue per ton-mile increased only about 40 percent. Even more striking is what happened to the 15-percent increase authorized in Ex Parte 175. The revenue per ton-mile for the United States was 1.336 cents in 1951; by 1953, the first year which reflected the full 15-percent increase, revenue had increased to 1.478 cents per ton-mile, or by approximately 10.6 percent, but by 1955 the revenue was down to 1.374 cents, or less than 3 percent above 1951. No explanation has been offered for this phenomenon, and the Commission can only speculate as to why the 15-percent increase in railroad rates has resulted in an increase of only 3 percent in revenue per net ton-mile. We do not see how the Commission can be satisfied that it is protecting the rights of the public unless it knows the answer to this question.

It is clear that, on the average, the railroads have availed themselves of only a small percentage of the Ex Parte 175 increases. They should be required to explain why they need an additional increase if they were unable or unwilling to take the increase already authorized. Assuming that the 6-percent increase in rates, with the exceptions and holddowns, means a net increase of 5 percent, the level of rates will be raised to approximately 88 percent above the 1946 level. There is real danger that the level of rates has already gone so high that the prescription of maximum reasonable rates has become meaningless. With such a level from which to work, the railroads are in a position to maintain a level of rates on noncompetitive traffic which is wholly beyond the bounds of reasonableness and can use excess revenues to cut rates on a selective basis where they meet the competition of other forms of carriers. Under such a pattern of rates shippers are no longer afforded any protection by section 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act and they are certainly not obtaining service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service.

It must be emphasized that the relief granted to the railroads in this proceeding is n't merely to permit increased tariffs to become effective. It also includes the amending of all outstanding rate orders. Shippers have lost the benefits of those orders, many of which were obtained only after long and costly litigation, without any

opportunity to present their case effectively and on the basis of a record which furnishes no justification for the action taken by the Commission. It may be suggested that if any particular rate has gone too high, the shipper can institute a proceeding before the Commission but this is a remedy which is far more apparent than real. In such a proceeding the reasonableness of the rate under attack will be measured against the increased level of rates authorized in this proceeding and the result is a foregone conclusion.

THE EFFECT ON THE MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC

The evidence is persuasive that the level of rates maintained by the railroads is already so high as to have a serious effect on the volume of traffic. In a rapidly expanding economy the volume of traffic handled by the railroads should be increasing from year to year if they are holding their relative share of the transportation business, but this is not the case. In only 4 years since 1941 (1946, 1949, 1950, and 1954) have the railroads handled a smaller volume of traffic than they handled in the year ended September 30, 1955, the most prosperous year in our history. There are other factors contributing to this situation but the high level of freight rates is certainly a major contributing factor. The railroads have recognized this fact themselves by the rate cutting which they have done on selected commodities in order to meet the competition of other forms of transportation. To what extent this rate cutting has been justified we are in no position to say—and neither is the Commission. One thing that does seem clear is that selective rate cutting combined with substantial increases in rates on other segments of the traffic has had a tendency to shift and distort the general rate burden and must inevitably result in injustices to many shippers. This is the impelling story which the coal industry told the Commission because the coal traffic is one of the segments that has felt more than its share of the impact of the increases. Even if the general freight rate structure is not too high, it may work great harm if it is not fairly distributed over all segments of traffic. There is no one in a position to probe this problem except the Commission. It has the facilities and it seems to us that it had a clear duty to investigate this subject thoroughly and to determine that the general rate burden would be distributed fairly and justly among the different commodities and types of traffic before it permitted the increases to go into effect.

Underlying this latest increase is a basic question of policy, i. e., whether the Commission is going to protect the rights of the public or leave those rights to the unrestricted and unregulated discretion of the railroads. While the railroads are privately owned, they have been vested with some of the powers of Government, including the power of eminent domain, without which they could not operate. Their property is devoted to a public use and is subject to governmental control. The Interstate Commerce Commission was created in order to protect shippers from arbitrary action by the railroads. It grew out of the abuses of railroad management. The act has been amended from time to time and the Commission has been given responsibilities to protect the carriers as well as the public, but the basic underlying purpose of the act has never been changed. If the Commission is going to authorize a level of rates so high as to give the railroads unlimited power to manipulate individual rates to serve their own purposes, it will have abdicated the responsibilities entrusted to it by Congress and the reasons for its continuance as a regulatory body will have ceased to exist.

COOPERATION WITH STATE COMMISSIONERS

The national transportation policy, as declared by Congress, is "to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof." Section 13 (2) of the Interstate Commerce Act directs the Commission to investigate any complaint forwarded to it by the railroad commission of any State and section 13 (3) authorizes it to hold joint hearings with any State regulatory body on any matters where the ratemaking authority of a State may be affected by the action taken by the Commission.

The Committee of Cooperating State Commissioners which sat with division 2 of the Commission in the instant case was designated by the President of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners upon invitation of the Commission, in the manner prescribed by what is known as the cooperative agreement between that organization and the Commission. Said association, a voluntary association composed of the several State regulatory commissions having jurisdiction, inter alia, over intrastate rates charged by rail carriers, originally entered into said agreement on May 3, 1922, and same was subsequently revised on October 14, 1925, and further amended by a supplement thereto adopted by said association at its annual convention on August 31, 1937.

Said supplement provides, at section 8 thereof, that:

"(a) Whenever a cooperating committee shall have concluded its work, or shall deem such course advisable, the committee shall consider whether it is necessary and desirable to make a report to the interested State commissions, and, if it shall determine to make a report it shall cause the same to be distributed through the secretary of the association, or through the general solicitor, to all interested commissions.

"(b) If a report of the Federal Commission will accompany any order to be made in said proceeding, the Federal Commission shall state therein the concurrence or nonconcurrence of said cooperating committee in the decision or order of said Federal Commission." (Proceedings, 49th annual convention, NARUC, p. 66.)

The Interstate Commerce Commission has a large technical staff. It collects and interprets a great deal of information relating to the financial conditions of the railroads, and it has access to much data not readily available to State commissions. The State commissions, on the other hand, have an intimate familiarity with the problems of transportation within their individual States which is not readily available to the Interstate Commerce Commission. For this reason it seems to us to be important that the Interstate Commerce Commission and the State commissions work more closely together as contemplated by the national transportation policy and the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act quoted above. With all deference to the Interstate Commerce Commission, we feel that it could profit by obtaining the views and assistance of State commissions. It does not obtain the assistance from the State commissions which is available by designating three representatives from State commissions to sit with the Interstate Commerce Commission in hearing evidence and argument and then dismissing them with courteous thanks.

In prior general increase cases the State commissions have generally deferred to the judgment of the Interstate Commerce Commission on the question of whether an increase in rates was necessary. In the proceedings before State commissions seeking the Ex Parte 175 increase, only three State commissions declined to permit the increase to go into effect. However, the State commissions felt, and we think properly, that they had a duty to consider the special problems arising in connection with particular commodities and particular movements which the Interstate Commerce Commission did not have before it in authorizing an increase in the general level of rates. While only 3 States declined to permit the increase at all, 31 of the States permitted the increase, subject to the exceptions and limitations which they considered necessary to preserve a lawful and symmetrical intrastate rate structure. In the section 13 cases, which followed the action of the various State commissions in allowing the increase subject to exceptions and limitations, a record was made in which the circumstances which led to the action of the State commission were fully explained. One would have thought that the Interstate Commerce Commission would consider the evidence as to special local problems and would show at least some deference to the special competency of the State commission to find the solution to those problems, but it has not done so.

The position of the Interstate Commerce Commission has been consistent. It has been that the State Commissions must allow each of the numerous general increases authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission in exactly the form in which that Commission has authorized them, not failing to cross a single "t" or to dot a single "i." Although the Interstate Commerce Commission has never itself considered the particular problems involved in the State proceedings, it has overruled, apparently as a matter of routine, the exceptions to the general increases ordered by the State commissions while permitting the railroads to make whatever exceptions they pleased. It thus has demonstrated its willingness to entrust the solution of local problems to the railroads but not to the State commissions.

We recognize the practical necessity for vesting in the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority over intrastate rates conferred on it by section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act, but we feel that such authority should be exercised with restraint and not used as an instrumentality to preempt the authority properly conferred upon the State commissions. If, however, the Interstate Commerce Commission is going to require State commissions to permit exactly the same increases on intrastate rates as are authorized on interstate rates without reference to local conditions, it seems to us that, at the very least, the Commission should have before it a record affording some basis for action before it authorizes an increase. In the light of the procedure which has been followed in this case and the wholly inadequate record, it is difficult for us to see how the commissions of the various States can grant the precise relief granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission unless the railroads present a far more persuasive case in the State proceedings than was presented in this case. It would therefore seem that the decision of the Commission in the instant case must inevitably lead to a multitude of section 13 cases with resulting confusion, disruption and uncertainty, unless the several State commissions should see fit subserviently to follow the lead of this Commission and to delegate their quasi-judicial ratemaking functions to the very carriers which these State commissions have a statutory duty and responsibility to regulate in the public interest.

WENDELL TENNIS,
FRED W. CLAYTON,
HAMMOND FOWLER,
Cooperating Committee of State Commissioners.

SALE OF LANDS IN RESERVOIR AREAS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2843, H. R. 11702.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11702) to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage-site development and use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The chairman of the Committee on Public Works is on the floor, and perhaps he may wish to give a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the bill is a good bill, and the report of the committee bears that out. I am in favor of enactment of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PARCEL OF LAND AT FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2847, Senate bill 4284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 4284) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir, Va.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Crestwood Construction Corp., for a fair value to be determined by the Secretary, 2.9178 acres of Government-owned land in Fairfax County, Va. The bill also provides that the United States will reserve a temporary easement for a roadway over 0.3096 acre of the land to be conveyed and a perpetual easement for a roadway over 0.2096 acre of the land to be conveyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey, on behalf of the United States of America, to the Crestwood Construction Corp., a Virginia corporation, for a fair value to be determined by the Secretary, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all that certain land situate in Fairfax County, Va., more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the northerly right-of-way line of the Old Southern Railway (abandoned), said point being the northeasterly corner of parcel B as described in a certain deed from the Southern Railway Co. to the United States of America, dated February 23, 1944, and recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, among the land records of Fairfax County, Va.; thence, along the northeasterly line of said parcel B, south 62 degrees, 49 minutes, 50 seconds east 103 feet to a point in the southerly line of said parcel B; thence, with the southerly line of said parcel B, as follows: South 64 degrees, 20 minutes, 50 seconds west 45.01 feet to a point; thence south 70 degrees, 48 minutes west 724.27 feet to a point; thence south 70 degrees, 30 minutes west 682.10 feet to a point; and thence south 70 degrees 51 minutes west 275.96 feet to a point; thence departing from the southerly line of said parcel B and running through said parcel B, as follows: With the arc of a 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the right, the chord of which bears north 60 degrees, 41 minutes, 49 seconds east 151.70 feet, an arc distance of 151.82 feet to a point; thence north 18 degrees, 9 minutes west 57.02 feet to a point in the northerly line of said parcel B, said point being common to the property of Crestwood Construction Corp. and W. S. Hoge III, and others; thence, with the northerly line of said parcel B, as follows: North 70 degrees, 51 minutes east 785.29 feet to a point; and north 70 degrees, 48 minutes east 721.31 feet to the point and place of beginning, and containing 2.9178 acres of land; and being a part of the same property acquired by the United States of America by the aforesaid deed recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, among the land records of said county, reserving to the United States, however—

(a) A temporary easement for a roadway over all that portion of said land to be conveyed to Crestwood Construction Corporation, said easement being described as:

Beginning at a point in the southerly right-of-way line of the Old Southern Railway (abandoned), said point being in the southeasterly line of parcel B as described in the aforesaid deed from the Southern Railway Company to the United States of America, recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, of the land records of Fairfax County, Virginia, said point being the extreme southwest corner of the above-described land; thence, departing from the southeasterly line of said parcel B, and running along a portion of the northwesterly line of the above-described land, and along the arc of a 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the right, the chord of which bears north 60 degrees 41 minutes 49 seconds east 151.70 feet, an arc distance of 151.82 feet to a point; thence running through the above-described land as follows: Along another arc of said 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the right, the chord of which arc bears north 67 degrees 58 minutes 38 seconds east 123.18 feet, an arc distance of 123.22 feet, to a point of tangency of said curve; thence north 71 degrees 14 minutes 6 seconds east 118.55 feet to a point of curvature of a 1,262.81-foot radius curve to the right; thence, along the arc of said curve, the chord of which bears north 77 degrees 16 minutes 56 seconds east 266.07 feet, an arc distance of 266.56 feet to a point in the southeasterly line of the above-described portion of said parcel B; thence, with the said southeasterly line of said parcel B, south 70 degrees 30 minutes west 379.44 feet to a point; and south 70 degrees 51 minutes west 275.96 feet to the point and place of beginning, and being a part of the property directed to be conveyed to the said Crestwood Construction Corporation by this act.

(b) A perpetual easement for a roadway over all that portion of said land to be conveyed to Crestwood Construction Corporation, said easement being described as:

Beginning at a point in the northerly right-of-way line of the Old Southern Railway (abandoned) said point being the northwesterly line of parcel B, as described in the aforesaid deed from the Southern Railway Company to the United States of America recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, of the land records of Fairfax County, Virginia, said point being common to Crestwood Construction Corporation and W. S. Hoge III, and others, referred to above, and running thence, through said parcel B, north 81 degrees 34 minutes 10 seconds east 281.48 feet to a point in the northwesterly line of said temporary easement described in subparagraph (a) above; thence with the northwesterly line of said temporary easement as follows: with the arc of a 1,262.81-foot radius curve to the left, the chord of which bears south 72 degrees 1 minute 45 seconds west 35 feet an arc distance of 35 feet to a point of tangency of said curve; thence south 71 degrees 14 minutes 6 seconds west 118.55 feet to a point of curvature of a 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the left; thence with the arc of said curve, the chord of which bears south 67 degrees 58 minutes 38 seconds west 123.18 feet, an arc distance of 123.22 feet to a point; thence departing from the northwesterly line of said temporary easement and running with the southwesterly line of the property directed to be conveyed by this act, north 18 degrees 9 minutes west 57.02 feet to the point and place of beginning.

CONVEYANCE OF LA PUNTILLA MILITARY RESERVATION, SAN JUAN, P. R., TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2849, H. R. 9506.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9506) to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3956) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9875) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount for the admission exceeds $1.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8384) to amend section 8c (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4090. An act to provide for a study by the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration with respect to the need for automatic radiotelegraph call selectors and other such safety devices on certain cargo ships of the United States;

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5738. An act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6040. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws;

H. R. 7855. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until July 31, 1958, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9699. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, California;

H. R. 10432. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11613. An act to extend the time limit which naval vessels may be loaned to friendly eastern nations and to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly European nations;

H. R. 11677. An act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Army of the United States (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list;

H. R. 11695. An act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by the Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions;

H. R. 12138. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 8384. An act to amend section 8c (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NEED FOR NEW ENERGY SOURCES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a few moments ago it was my privilege to hear an unusually able and esteemed Senator speak perhaps his closing public words to his colleagues, at a reception held in his honor. I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. The words were these:

> May God lead you aright—and He will if you give Him half a chance.

Mr. President, with the retirement of the senior Senator from Colorado and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the closing hours of this session approaching, the temptation to reminisce over the 84th Congress is great; but the temptation will be resisted by me except for a very brief reference.

I am proud of the many things accomplished by this Congress. I am pleased and proud to have had a part in some of its accomplishments. I take particular pride in enactment of a great highway program.

One of the keenest disappointments, on the other hand, that has come in my 18 years of service in the Congress was the defeat in the House of Representatives on the day before yesterday of the atomic-reactor bill. My own disappointment is unimportant. The meaning of this defeat to our country, however, is one of great importance.

I have just received from the vice president and general manager, Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., a telegram the first sentence of which I wish to read:

> I think the sense of all recent testimony and debate is that the program for atomic electricity should be accelerated in every reasonable maner as a matter of national prestige.

I fully agree with this statement.

Mr. President, it is my view that the Senate looked upon the atomic reactor bill in terms of the next generation, the next decade, perhaps even the next century. I am proud that the Senate so viewed it. We need to give thought to the future as well as to the present.

The present and future energy needs of this Nation are tremendous. Whether we continue to advance and increase our standard of living or whether we commence to retrogress will be determined by our basic decision as to the course of action followed in the development of energy resources.

The energy resources consisting of oil, gas, and coal are consumed by the industrial development necessary to provide for the increasing population of the United States and of the world, and the expanding economy of our Nation and of other nations of the world.

Because of increasing mechanization, increasing travel, production, and increasing military demands, we shall require more natural gas, more petroleum, more coal, in the future, both for energy and for chemical processes. The limited amount of energy available from falling water is rapidly being developed in hydroelectric projects. Energy from the sun, from the tides, and from the wind has so far shown but little possibilities for industrial use.

The world population today, Mr. President, is approximately 2½ billion. Have we given thought to what the world population will be 100 years from now, if the present rate of increase shall continue? Statistics indicate a world population then of 8 billion.

I invite attention to the fact that the rate of population increase within the United States is twice that of the world; and I am proud of that. I am proud to see America growing, expanding, in population and in economy. But, Mr. President, that growth, that multiplication of population both here and abroad, will require great quantities of energy. The energy requirements of the future pose a tremendous problem; and I believe the Senate had the problems of the future in mind when it voted 49 to 40 in support of the atomic reactor bill.

In the years from 1850 to 1950 the estimated total world consumption of energy was, to use a scientific term, "4Q." What is the meaning of the term "Q"? It is a scientific unit of measurement, a quantity equal to the heat value of 38 billion tons of coal. In the next 50 years it is estimated that there will be a consumption of 16Q. That is 4 times the consumption in the previous 100 years, and almost twice as much as was used during the time from the birth of Christ to 1850.

But what of the next 100 years? In the next 100 years, scientists tell us, energy will be required to the extent of 187Q. That is 47 times the amount that was used from 1850 to 1950.

From what sources will this almost incomprehensible quantity of energy come? There are about 32Q, we are told by scientists, in the world's coal supplies. Oil and gas would provide for the world another 5Q; oil shale, 1Q.

In other words, Mr. President, all the fossil fuel now known in the world and economically recoverable would provide less than 40Q.

Fuels from solar heat, tides, and wind might possibly add another 8Q, according to scientific estimates.

Compare this total with the energy needs for the next 100 years of 187Q. Where, Mr. President, must we turn for resources to make up that balance? To what sources shall our children turn?

One of the rewards, one of the satisfying compensations, for service in the United States Senate, enjoyed, I dare say, by every Member of the Senate, is the thought, the dream, the hope that by exercising wisdom and courage in our brief hour we may make the pathway of tomorrow easier and make life more abundant.

Other processes and other sources not now developed, such as atomic energy, must provide the quantitative difference between the needs of the next hundred years and the conventional sources of energy as we now know them.

This problem must not be considered only from a narrow national viewpoint.

I find it ironic that the defeat of the atomic reactor bill in the House of Representatives was brought about by the administration which has prime responsibility in this respect, together with the influence and lobbying efforts of two industrial groups. One of these industrial groups, coal, has already benefited vastly from the atomic energy program which uses approximately one-tenth of all the Nation's electricity, most of which is generated from coal. The other industrial group would, I sincerely believe, realize the greatest and most peculiar benefits from the proposed program. I speak of the private electric power industry. Their lobbyists, their lawyers, the minions of their influence, exercised their talents to the fullest.

Yet it is the private electric utility industry which would benefit the most, as I have said, from governmental demonstration of the feasibility, governmental demonstration of the practical utilization of nuclear energy in the generation of electricity.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished, able, and courageous chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am always very much interested in what my colleague says. If he does not mind, as we go along I should like to insert in the RECORD a number of matters which will illuminate the future history of this subject.

When the Senator says that the group which had a great possibility to profit was the private electric power industry, I must say that I agree with him.

Let us consider, for example, the situation with respect to the reactor at Monroe, Mich. The safeguard committee has had some question about the safety of that reactor. I am willing to assume that it will be the safest reactor which will ever be built; but, after all, it is a fast-breeder reactor, one which is supposed, eventually, to generate current faster than fuel is fed into it. Therefore, it is an extremely important experiment.

But the safeguard committee said a prototype ought to be constructed to test several of the theories.

Was it not the expectation of the great junior Senator from Tennessee, who introduced the bill, that under the terms of the bill, as he originally conceived it, it would have been possible to have built that prototype and to have had the Government test it, so that a safe prototype could have been built, safe for all the people of the United States and safe for the industry, as well?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ANDERSON. People say that is socialistic. Does not the Senator from Tennessee believe that it is the wisest safeguard which could be thrown around private industry?

Mr. GORE. I believe it is not only the wisest safeguard, but also the greatest benefit which could be now conferred upon private enterprise in the further development of this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would it not have been nice to protect at the same time, the welfare of the people who work in the plant and the people who live next to it?

Mr. GORE. Yes. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. Did his committee, or did any member of his committee, have in mind the desire, the intent, or the purpose, to harm in any degree the private electric utility industry by supporting the reactor bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can say to the Senator from Tennessee that not one member of the committee had such a feeling; otherwise, the bill would never have been reported by a vote of 14 to 0. Second, member after member of the utility industry was consulted about it, and it was made abundantly clear that what we were trying to do was to speed up the program, so that the United States could keep abreast of other countries.

If the Senator from Tennessee will indulge me, may I ask him if he saw a newspaper article which was published in the New York Herald Tribune, among other newspapers, on Wednesday, July 18, 1956, and which stated that an atomic plant of 100,000 kilowatts capacity was to be built by Russia in the Red Zone of Germany—East Germany?

Mr. GORE. I did; and I was surprised by it. I realized that, again, the Soviet Union had scored another first by this announcement. We have not announced such a program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the Senator from Tennessee realize that the announcement of this intention on the part of Russia preceded the actual construction of a 100,000 kilowatt plant in the United States?

Mr. GORE. There is no 100,000 kilowatt plant in the United States; none is under construction; and there is none for which a license has been granted.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Tennessee will indulge me for another minute, I am trying to select publications which are not regarded as flaming New Deal publications. I believe the New York Herald Tribune would not be regarded as an extremely left wing or radical, New Deal newspaper.

I now turn to Business Week, which I think is a very fine magazine, and which I read because I regard it as an excellent, conservative publication. In a copy which I had at home, the issue of July 21, 1956, I find an article on page 36, the headline of which is:

Britain Gets Edge Over United States in Atom Power Race in Japan.

The article says:

Unless the United States pulls up its sales socks, Japan will turn to Britain for most of its atomic help.

The article goes on to say that the Japanese Minister of State for nuclear affairs gave two reasons for turning to the British.

They offer to sell—immediately—a reactor that can produce power in commercially useful quantities. The Japanese are expected to order a 150,000-kilowatt reactor costing $41.7 million, for delivery in 4 years or less. The United States has been talking in terms of much smaller reactors.

I only ask the junior Senator from Tennessee, Does this check with his knowledge of the picture?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ANDERSON. That the British can offer a 150,000-kilowatt reactor?

Is there any American company which the Senator from Tennessee knows of that can offer to build a 150,000-kilowatt reactor and deliver it in 4 years or less to the Japanese?

Mr. GORE. I know of no American concern which has built such a reactor or which has a contract to build such a reactor. I believe there are several concerns that are fully capable, given adequate cooperation by the Government of constructing such reactors.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to have the Senator from Tennessee confirm, as I do, the accuracy of this observation in Business Week. I read the last paragraph of the article:

Unlike the United States, they—

The British—

do not demand that technical information about atomic equipment be kept from the public. This has political implications in Japan, where the Socialist opposition is clamoring for publication of atomic data.

I think it is fine that Great Britain has decided to make this information available to the public. Does the junior Senator from Tennessee know of any good reason why we should protect the people of America from the truth?

Mr. GORE. No, I do not. I think the people of the United States are entitled to the truth.

I should like to say further that the defeat of the reactor bill in the House of Representatives, which was brought about by a combination of the power trust—I will strike out "power trust" and say, brought about by a combination of the private power industry, the coal industry, and the administration will cause the United States to fall further behind in the development of nuclear power.

I take some consolation in my confidence that events will bring about the initiation of such a program within the next few months. But the delay will be costly—costly in terms of American prestige, costly in terms of American economic supremacy in this technical, competitive field.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to place some other material into his fine speech. If he would like me to wait until later, I shall do so.

Mr. GORE. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator from Tennessee familiar with, or has he seen, the article which was published in the New York Times of Sunday, July 22, 1956, the headline of which is:

Briton Sees Atom Power Gain from Revisions in Plant Design.

I believe I showed it to the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the article to which the junior Senator from New Mexico has just referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITON SEES ATOM POWER GAIN FROM REVISIONS IN PLANT DESIGN

LONDON, July 19.—Recent advances in the design of Britain's experimental atomic power reactors are expected to raise the electrical generating capacity of British nuclear powerplants in 1965 to about 3 million or 4 million kilowatts.

If achieved, this would double the nuclear capacity figure for 1965 of 1,750,000 to 2 million kilowatts originally forecast in a Government White Paper. Four million kilowatts is about one-fifth of the country's present capacity using conventional fuels.

A competent designer engaged on the nuclear power program declared today:

"We have achieved nothing that we were unable to predict, but we have advanced in big jumps instead of in small steps."

Among new developments in the design of reactor furnaces and their heat transfer systems he listed:

The ability to build larger pressure vessels and therefore larger reactors with a bigger capacity. This means, the designer said, that the larger power stations envisaged by the Central Electricity Authority will be markedly more economical to operate than the smaller-sized atomic power stations with the 100,000 to 200,000 kilowatt capacity originally planned.

The fact that a reactor designer has learned how to arrange the lattices of fuel rods so that the uranium takes longer to burn up. Greater efficiency has also been achieved by reduction in the size of reactor control rods, it was said.

The fact that improvements in steam technology and in the design and engineering of structural materials also have proved "of enormous value."

Some of the technical advances are expected to be mentioned in the second annual report of the Atomic Energy Authority to be published next week.

But it is unlikely that the improvements will increase the capacity of four new stations in the northwestern region of Westmorland and Dumfriesshire beyond about 100,000 or at most 150,000 kilowatts.

Two other stations, one on the southeast coast near Bradwell in Essex, and the other on the Severn estuary near Bristol, will have a capacity of from 150,000 to 200,000 kilowatts, it is believed. They are to be completed by 1961.

Thereafter, it is said, eight stations that are to be built in the second stage of Britain's atomic power program will have an individual capacity of about 350,000 or 400,000 kilowatts. These are to be completed by 1965.

A brief mention of British efforts to harness the hydrogen fusion reaction for the production of industrial power will be made in the Atomic Energy Authority's report. It is understood that little progress has been made on what a spokesman called the "much publicized and probably completely impractical lines."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to have the article printed; I think it is an extremely worthwhile article, because it points out that British nuclear powerplants in 1965 are expected to have a capacity of from 3 million to 4 million kilowatts, and they will supply a large percentage of British power.

Mr. GORE. By what year did the Senator say?

Mr. ANDERSON. By 1965.

Mr. GORE. Under the present program, how many kilowatts of capacity does the Senator from New Mexico think the United States will have in operation by 1965?

Mr. ANDERSON. We ought to have close to 1 million kilowatts at that time, about one-fourth of what the British will have. We might get it up to 1,500,000 kilowatts.

Mr. GORE. And less than one-half what the Russians expect to have 5 years ahead of that, in 1960.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. At the same time Mr. Philip Sporn, who is president of the American Gas & Electric Co., also made a statement in that regard. I may say that he is a very able man. He has been president of the group that built one of the fine plants supplying current at the Portsmouth, Ohio, plant, and did it in a very capable fashion. I have no criticism of him, but this is also from the newspapers. It is strange that we have to get our information from newspapers. We do not get it from the Atomic Energy Commission. In a luncheon meeting of the New York Society of Security Analysts, Mr. Philip Sporn estimated the annual output would be 2 trillion kilowatt-hours in 1975 in the United States. Inasmuch as we are going to have 2 trillion kilowatts, does he think it would completely destroy the American system if we have 1 million kilowatts of atomic energy?

Mr. GORE. I doubt that Mr. Sporn would think so. I was very much impressed with the testimony which Mr. Sporn gave before our committee. As the Senator will recall, for many hours he and I were almost alone in the conduct of the hearings, which ran more than 500 pages of printed testimony.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; we were almost alone. I look across the aisle and I see present the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. One of the things I enjoyed in the discussion we had on the atomic power situation a few days ago was that the Senator from Wisconsin remained on the floor and listened to all of it. When he listened to all of the discussion, he voted with us in trying to develop atomic power in the United States. I pay tribute to him, because knowledge is a wonderful thing when one comes to vote.

Mr. GORE. So is courage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Philip Sporn predicted that out of the two trillion kilowatts in 1975, only 100 million kilowatts would come from atomic energy. Apparently he does not feel it is going to destroy the whole structure of the electric power industry in the United States.

I am anxious to know whether the Senator from Tennessee agrees with that fine estimate.

Mr. GORE. I certainly do.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, we are drawing close to the end of the session. This material has not been available heretofore. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would mind if I introduced into the RECORD, during the delivery of his speech, three, what I regard as somewhat important, documents which will help in understanding what this program is, so that Senators may study the question when they get home.

The first deals with the reactor types which we think can be constructed. Senators go home and are asked, "What is this Duquesne Power Co. plant?" We say, "Well, it is a pressurized water reactor." The next question is, "Are there any more of them in the United States?" This statement attempts to answer the questions.

The Senator from Tennessee, who has been diligent in this work, recognizes that a pressurized water reactor will never become economically competitive with ordinary sources of generation of electric current. Yet the Shippingport plant, the Westinghouse-Duquesne powerplant, which many people talk about, is that kind. The Yankee Atomic Electric Group plant is that kind. And the Consolidated of New York is that kind of reactor.

I do not criticize that. I merely point out that these great plants which are going to be built are going to be of a type that can never become economically competitive with falling water, coal, or other fossil fuels.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator goes further, I should like to suggest that what he has just said illustrates the difficulty and the futility of depending solely upon private enterprise for all further development of large-scale nuclear reactors. It may be, as scientists have testified before the committee, the second generation of reactor, or the third, or the fourth that will break the economic bottleneck and achieve economical generation of electricity from atomic energy. When I use the term "generation of reactor," I do not mean a generation in terms of years, such as we think of when we speak of generations of people. I mean by that term, and the scientists mean by that term, to refer to a reactor as initially designed and constructed. Then, benefiting from the experience of construction and operation of that reactor, another reactor of improved design is constructed. And then a third, and perhaps a fourth may be built before the economic goal is reached.

Let us suppose that each reactor will cost $50 million. Fifty million dollars is a very large sum of money for one business corporation to sink into an experimental reactor.

Mr. ANDERSON. That might not work.

Mr. GORE. That might not work. The fourth reactor might work, but meantime the company will have sunk $50 million into a first "generation" reactor which, at best, would not be profitable, and which, at worst, might be a total loss.

Mr. ANDERSON. It might be hazardous and might be the type that might run away.

Mr. GORE. I go one step further: If, however, one company cannot afford such vast investments in "generations" of reactors, the whole people of the United States cannot afford the failure to do so, because the necessity of maintaining American leadership in the vital field of nuclear energy is so great, and the stakes are so high, that the American people, represented by their Government, must, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, forge ahead and demonstrate the feasibility of nuclear energy to meet the challenge of tomorrow.

I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy the Senator yields. I wonder if he will permit me to submit certain material for the RECORD?

Mr. GORE. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three brief statements may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point. One deals with reactor types as we now know them. The second deals with additional types of reactors. I will say to the able Senator from Tennessee that in his own State of Tennessee there is being constructed an aqueous homogeneous reactor. There are two, as a matter of fact. One has been completely built, and the second is under construction. When that is completed, there will be a third, and probably a fourth—I do not know—but after those have been completed, as the Senator from Tennessee well knows, then the Pennsylvania Power & Light will take the finished, proved product and use it in its plant if it feels it has a chance of commercial success.

Does not the Senator from Tennessee think that is a contribution to the private utility companies that should be made?

Mr. GORE. It is one that should be made, and one that is being made.

But the necessities of the situation require not only governmental development of the research phase, but also governmental construction and operation of large-scale reactors, because—as all the experts in this field have testified—there is no substitute for experience in the actual construction and operation of nuclear powerplants.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Tennessee is eminently correct, and this will prove the very thing he has been discussing. Therefore, I should like to submit this statement as to the additional types of reactors, and also a 1-page statement on the English reactor program and a 1-page statement on the Soviet Union program.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REACTOR TYPES

INTRODUCTION

A nuclear reactor, in its simplest form is an assembly of properly shaped and protected metallic uranium fuel rods, spaced geometrically in a vessel or structure with a "moderator" in between.

When the uranium fuel rods are so arranged the isotope 235 contained in normal uranium (1 part 235 to 140 parts 238) undergoes splitting or "fissioning." This in effect means the nucleus—the tiny center of the uranium atom—splits in roughly two parts, and emits neutrons and other radiation, and releases energy in the form of heat. The neutrons from the fissioning of the uranium atom's nucleus, are ejected with great speed, and as they pass between the fuel rods they are slowed down by the moderator to a speed where they are captured by more uranium atom nuclei, causing increasing numbers of them to fission.

Once started, this chain reaction increases at a tremendous rate until the control mechanism comes into effect. Essentially, the typical control system consists of metallic rods made of a material which readily absorbs neutrons and thus slows down the growth of the reaction. These rods are moved in and out of the assembly to expose more or less of their surface to the flying neutrons. The more rod injected into the assembly the more neutrons are absorbed and the slower the reaction.

Fuel rods can be many shapes and sizes, with normal uranium metal, or with varying degrees of enrichment with the isotope 235.

Moderators can be either plain water, heavy water, graphite, or some material which slows down neutrons but does not stop them.

The above general description is of a so-called heterogenous reactor, where fuel and moderator are distinctly separated.

Another system is where both fuel and moderator are ultimately intermixed and circulated within a confined area or vessels where the nuclear reaction takes place. Such a system is known as a homogeneous reactor.

A brief description of the present AEC prototype power reactor program types follows (the attached provides more detail on the technical characteristics of the reactors):

1. Westinghouse-Duquesne Power Co. Pressurized Water Type Reactor—60,000 kilowatt. Estimated total plant cost of $37,700,000, reactor cost $27,700,000.

The enriched uranium metal used as fuel is in the form of pellets embedded in zirconium metal to form long rectangular fuel rod assemblies. A group of these assemblies are suspended in a heavy walled pressure vessel or tank through which regular water is pumped under relatively high volume and pressure. The water acts both as a moderator and heat removal and transfer medium. The heat generated by the nuclear reaction is picked up by the water, circulated out of the pressure vessel through a heat exchanger or steam generator and back into the reactor. The heat exchanger produces steam in a separate system which drives a turbine and electric generator which in turn produces electricity for distribution in a regular utility system.

2. Yankee Atomic Electric Group—pressurized water type—134,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost of $33,400,000, reactor cost $17,600,000.

This is the same as No. 1 above with added design refinements.

3. Detroit Edison Group—breeder reactor—100,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost $45 million, reactor cost $36 million.

This type is designed to create by nuclear transformation more fuel of a different type than it burns up.

Here fuel rods, containing uranium highly enriched in the isotope U–235 are placed in a cluster in the reactor core. A liquid metal such as sodium is used as the cooling and heat-removal medium. Surrounding this reactor core is a blanket of thorium metal. The fast neutrons produced by fissioning of the U–235, in this reactor, are not slowed down by a moderator and strike the thorium atoms. The nuclei of thorium, upon absorbing the fast neutrons, become unstable and undergo a transformation into uranium–233 which is usable as a fuel. When enough of these transformed atoms have been created, the thorium blanket is removed and the U–233 is chemically recovered.

This system has not only the advantage of making its own fuel, but of operating at very high temperatures at low pressure. The liquid metal is pumped from the reactor, through a heat exchanger where steam is formed, and returned to the reactor. The steam from the heat exchanged is piped in a separate system to a turbogenerator for the production of electricity.

4. Consumers Public Power District—sodium graphite reactor—75,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost $24,300,000, reactor cost $13,500,000.

This design uses slightly enriched uranium fuel elements in a matrix of graphite. Here the graphite serves as a moderator.

The coolant and heat transfer medium is the liquid metal sodium. The sodium is pumped through piping imbedded in the reactor core, removes the heat and continues on to the heat exchanger where the heat generates steam and returns to the reactor.

This reactor system, too, operates at very high temperatures and moderate pressures.

5. Wolverine Electric Cooperative—Aqueous homogeneous—10,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost $3,574,000, reactor cost $2,486,000.

This type of reactor utilizes a liquid soluton of fuel and moderating material. Fully enriched uranium in the form of uranyl sulfate, is mixed with heavy water and circulated continuously through a small spherical pressure vessel in the center of the core. This vessel is large enough and of the proper shape so that when full of the fuel-moderator solution the critical chain reaction can take place. The rapidly circulating solution moves continuously from the core out to the heat exchanger, through a continuous chemical recovery unit, and back to the reactor. In this manner, the unneeded and deleterious byproducts generated in the fuel solution by the nuclear reaction are continuously removed. Unlike the heterogeneous systems, whose fuel elements have to be elaborately fabricated, removed periodically, dissolved in acid, and rebuilt, the homogeneous reactor cleans itself up on a continuous basis.

This system operates at moderately high temperatures and extremely high pressures.

6. Consolidated Edison Co.—pressurized water reactor—250,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost $55 million.

This is similar to the Yankee and Duquesne system of using light water as the moderator and heat transfer agent. It differs, however, in the use of highly enriched uranium fuel, and will have a thorium blanket around the reactor core, for the production of U–233. All of the core assembly will be contained within a heavy pressure vessel.

This system operates at moderate temperatures and pressures, and in this instance, a fuel oil fired super heater will increase the temperature of the steam generated to 1,500 degrees.

7. Commonwealth Edison Co.—Boiling water reactor—180,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost $45 million, reactor cost $34,200,000.

This design is somewhat similar to the pressurized water reactor designed, except in this case the light water moderator will be permited to boil and produce steam directly in the reactor vessel which will be piped directly to the turbine. This eliminates the cost of a separate heat exchanger system.

Slightly enriched uranium fuel elements will be used with normal water as the moderator by operating at a temperature of around 480 degrees, and at a low enough pressure, the water moderator will be permited to boil and produce steam within the pressure vessel containing the reactor core.

8. Rural Cooperative Power Association—Boiling water reactor—22,000 kilowatts. Estimated total plant cost $5,300,000, reactor cost $3,340,000.

This reactor is similar in design to the Commonwealth Edison reactor in that the light water moderator will be permitted to boil and produce steam within the reactor pressure vessel.

It differs from the Commonwealth Edison reactor in that it uses several "spikes" or fuel elements containing fully enriched uranium interspersed between the many normal uranium fuel elements.

ADDITIONAL TYPES OF REACTORS PROPOSED BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in connection with its consideration of legislation to accelerate the civilian atomic-power program, recommended five types of reactors for prototype development. This was on the basis of advice given by its consultant, Dr. W. H. Zinn, former director of the Argonne National Laboratory. These types, which are listed on page 9 of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy report on S. 4146 and described by Dr. Zinn at page 13 of the report, may be summarized as follows:

1. GAS-COOLED REACTOR

This type of reactor was conceived as one of the earliest proposals for construction at the Hanford production plant.

In essence, this design calls for normal or slightly enriched fuel elements interspersed through a graphite moderator. As the coolant, instead of using normal water flowing through the fuel element channels in the graphite moderator, a gaseous coolant would be used. Helium gas would be ideal for this purpose since it has a very low neutron capture cross-section hence would not absorb significant quantities of them.

It would be more difficult and expensive to design a gas-tight cooling system for a large reactor of this type, but several benefits would accrue.

1. A gas-cooled reactor can be operated at a much higher temperature than a water-cooled one could be.

2. The neutron economy would be higher and hence the reactor would be more efficient.

3. As a power reactor, both of the above benefits should be compounded, to give this concept a chance of being a more nearly competitive producer of economic power than several other systems. It avoids many of the inherent difficulties of other high-pressure and high-temperature systems, and theoretically will out-perform the existing low-temperature system now operating.

2. MODIFIED HANFORD TYPE (GRAPHITE MODERATED, LIGHT WATER-COOLED) REACTOR

Suggested here is a significant modification to the present design of the Hanford production reactor. Using the basic concept of normal or slightly enriched uranium fuel rods in a graphite moderator material, cooled by normal water, certain refinements suggest themselves.

For example, why not individually pressurize the fuel element tubes running through the graphite, which also serves as the coolant tube. By so doing, operating temperatures could be raised significantly and hence the reactor's efficiency. At the same time one eliminates the tremendously difficult problem of fabricating huge pressure vessels. Fabrication facilities as techniques do not exist to make such vessels for truly big reactors of say 300,000 kilowatts or larger.

3. HEAVY-WATER MODERATED REACTORS

The Savannah River production reactors are the biggest and most recent examples of this concept. Inherently this type has many advantages, particularly for the United States, in that plentiful supplies of heavy water and normal uranium are available.

The Savannah reactors were very conservatively designed to assure certain and continuous operation for national defense.

With much operating and design experience behind us, it is felt that improvements can be made.

For example, why can't this type of reactor be pressurized, and thus operated at higher temperatures and pressures? If mechanically it is uneconomic to pressurize the whole reactor core why not design pressurized fuel element and coolant tubes?

4. AQUEOUS HOMOGENEOUS REACTORS

Inasmuch as the Westinghouse-Pennsylvania Power and Light proposal under the power demonstration program is contingent upon the need for further experimentation with this system, particularly in a semi-full-scale model, it seems proper to build one forthwith.

This is basically a system wherein the uranium fuel, in the form of a soluble salt, is dissolved in water, and circulated continuously through the reactor vessel, the heat exchanger and the chemical recovery unit. The coolant serves also as a moderator.

The advantages are many: low-cost fuel preparation, and low-cost continuous fuel reprocessing, small reactor pressure vessel, reatively high temperatures and very high pressures can be obtained.

Disadvantages are several and serious: The fuel-moderator-coolant solution is highly corrosive, tends to form sludge, and to decompose under the heat and radiation; great difficulties can be expected in preventing leaks in parts of the system such as control valves and pumps.

5. LIQUID METAL-COOLED THERMAL REACTORS

Liquid metal, such as sodium or potassium, or combinations of both, have excellent possibilities as coolants for reactors. Some advantages are excellent heat transfer characteristics, small volume, and good nuclear properties.

It is therefore thought that many interesting applications of this coolant should be investigated. For example, a reactor could be designed to utilize liquid metal as a coolant, and heavy water or beryllium or beryllium oxide as a moderator. Thus you would have a thermal neutron reactor using normal or slightly enriched uranium fuel, which could operate at extremely high temperatures and efficiencies. Such concepts could be designed to utilize either the tank or tube design for containing the liquid metal coolant.

ENGLISH REACTOR PROGRAM

The English have two plutonium producing graphite moderated air-cooled piles in operation at Calder Hall. No incidental electric power is produced from these units. The first of two dual-purpose reactors being constructed at Calder Hall is now in trial operation and the second will start operation very shortly. These reactors will produce both plutonium and electric power and are graphite-moderated and gas-cooled. They are rated at approximately 75,000 electrical kilowatts each.

The second phase of the British nuclear power program consists of three stations, construction of which will start in March 1957 and will be completed by late 1960 or early 1961. The reactors for these stations will be redesigns of the Calder Hall gas-cooled type which promise to be both more efficient and somewhat lower in cost. They are rated at 300,000 electrical kilowatts per pair of reactors. These designs emphasize the production of electric power rather than the production of plutonium.

This phase of the power program will be constructed by private industrial companies under contract with the Central Electrical Authority.

The third phase of the program is scheduled to begin approximately 18 months after the start of the second phase, and to be completed by 1963. This program will consist of 3 or more power stations consisting of 2 or more reactors of roughly the same size as the phase 2 reactors and will bring to conclusion an overall program of 10 stations consisting of 20 gas-cooled reactors producing an estimated 2 million kilowatts of electricity. The total cost is estimated to be somewhere between six hundred million and seven hundred million.

The U. K. is planning to build a prototype 100,000 electrical kilowatt sodium graphite reactor which will produce power and some by-product plutonium. It might very well be that this type of reactor will supersede the gas-cooled reactors which make up the major British program.

The British are also building a fast reactor experience similar to the United States breeder reactor No. 2. It is possible that this design may find its way into the civilian power reactor program at some future date.

THE SOVIET UNION PROGRAM

As outlined in the paper delivered by Dr. Ivan Kurchatov in England recently indications are that by 1960 the Russians can be expected to have between 2 and 2½ million kilowatts of capacity generated from nuclear powered plants. A significant portion of this capacity may come into operation as early as the latter part of 1958. According to Dr. Kurchatov's statement the reactor concepts being developed include the following:

No. 1. Water moderated and water cooled thermal and epithermal (slightly more energetic than the so-called thermal range neutron but not as energetic as the so-called "fast" neutron) reactors of 200,000 kilowatts capacity.

No. 2. Graphite-moderated steam and water cooled reactors. This is the type used at the much publicized 5,000-kilowatt reactor station in Russia.

No. 3. Heterogeneous heavy water-moderated and gas-cooled reactor. (In this reactor the fuel elements and moderators are separated from each other.)

No. 4. A water-moderated thermal reactor which would furnish slightly radioactive steam directly from the reactor to a turbine. (This appears to be either a highly pressurized normal uranium light water-moderated concept of a slightly enriched light water-moderated boiling type reactor.)

No. 5. A homogeneous heavy water-moderated thermal-breeder using a thorium blanket. (Homogeneous indicating an intimate mixture of fuel and moderator.)

No. 6. A thermal graphite-moderated and sodium-cooled reactor. (This appears to be a standard graphite moderated normal uranium reactor which is cooled by circulating liquid metal through the core.)

No. 7. A fast sodium-cooled breeder reactor using the plutonium-uranium cycle. (This would appear to be utilizing a natural uranium blanket in which plutonium is produced by the reaction of neutrons being absorbed by the uranium atoms in the blanket.)

An authoritative interpretation of the Kurchatov statement indicates that probably the first three types outlined above are the most logical concepts to be used by the Russians for their announced power program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he realizes that in the drive to defeat this bill in the House of Representatives, there was introduced into the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, pointing out that he had called a conference of the directors of all the laboratories, to see whether anyone could suggest another type of reactor which might be built.

Mr. GORE. Yes. I must say that I regretted to see such a letter used. The letter had not been called to the attention of the joint committee, and the let-

ter referred to a meeting which likewise had not been called to the attention of the joint committee. The letter dealt with a meeting which was called, not by the Commission, but by the chairman himself. I was also surprised to see that the only expert who has actually directed the construction of a successful civilian reactor was not included in the group at the meeting. I refer to Admiral Rickover, who built the *Nautilus* and is now directing construction of the Shippingport plant, now under construction under the McMahon or 1946 act, which was repealed by the 1954 act.

I should like to state here that not one license has been issued under the 1954 act. The program has stagnated. Not a single plant is now under construction by terms of that act, now 2 years old.

I should like to read one sentence from the letter to which the able Senator has referred. It is a letter from Mr. Strauss, the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to Representative STERLING COLE. I shall read one sentence; and I hope that in doing so I shall not be unfair in taking the sentence out of context. The letter is a long one, and I believe the sentence to which I refer is a complete one taken alone.

As you know, the Commission staff and the Commission itself, with the exception of one member, believe that each reactor concept which has reached a stage warranting the expenditure of substantial sums for large-scale development, either is now in process as a specific project, is in the design stage, or is actually under construction.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico how many large-scale atomic reactors are actually under construction.

Mr. ANDERSON. The number is zero.

Mr. GORE. Under the 1954 act?

Mr. ANDERSON. With the exception of the Shippingport plant, which is under construction under the 1946 act. Everyone understands that.

When they say "all the types," I call attention to the fact that the gas-cooled reactor, which is the basis of the British system, under which commercial power is now being produced, was proposed for construction about 1944. Three million dollars was set aside for its construction, and a contract was given to the Monsanto Chemical Co. As soon as someone found out that it was likely to be a good reactor and was likely to produce commercial power at low prices, the contract was canceled. I say that, realizing that the Democratic Party to which the Senator from Tennessee and I belong was in control at the time. I do not know what prompted the cancellation of the contract, but certainly the hour has arrived when that process or type should be tested. It was one of the types that the Senator from Tennessee was hoping would be tested, as a result of his bill; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes. But that particular type has been ready for large-scale tests since 1946. However, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission is powerless to bring about the development of a large-scale reactor of this design or any other design unless a private concern makes to the Commission a proposal to construct such a reactor. An appropriation to the Atomic Energy Commission itself is not now authorized for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether the type he had under contemplation was the modified Hanford type, which is a modified graphite type of water-cooled reactor.

Mr. GORE. That is the advice of the experts in the field; and it is one of the types about which I was convinced there was need for further large-scale development.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator from Tennessee not recognize, and does he not recognize, that there has been more experience accumulated in the operation of the Hanford reactor than in the operation of any other reactor of comparable size anywhere in the world?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. Yet no company has come forward with a proposal to build a nuclear powerplant using the Hanford or the Savannah design.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Senator from Tennessee may remember that several years ago, the General Electric Co.—surely a very reputable concern—proposed to the Atomic Energy Commission that it would construct at Hanford a dual-purpose reactor, making both plutonium and power; and its survey showed that it would be able to do so at a cost of between approximately $4 million and $7 million for the cost of that reactor. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

I should like to add here that in making the remark that no private concern has come forward with a proposal to develop reactors of this particular type, I do not speak critically. Instead, I speak factually. I recognize and appreciate the great risk involved. I recognize with what hesitation a private utility should and does proceed in this risky field to invest large amounts of its stockholders' funds. Indeed, the State regulatory agencies and the Federal regulatory agencies will forbid a company from leaping over its head into an unprofitable field. The development of the art, therefore, has not reached the stage where we can safely place sole reliance upon private enterprise for development in this field.

I should like to see the Government demonstrate the feasibilities of the processes, thus facilitating and inviting the profitable and vigorous entrance into this field by private enterprise.

Mr. ANDERSON. I asked that question because the able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is on his feet. He has been urging that a dual-purpose reactor be constructed at Hanford.

I wish to say to both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Washington that in the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill—and just today the conference committee on that bill concluded action on its report—there is testimony by the present Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that he would like to see such a reactor built. Yet, when we introduced a bill which would give him a chance to do so, he pitched in and tried to defeat the bill.

Mr. GORE. And he succeeded, with the help of other persons and vested interests.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee for the statement he has made.

I should like also to commend the distinguished chairman of the joint committee and the Senator from Tennessee for the valiant fight both of them have been carrying on in connection with this very important problem.

Is it not a fact that if we are to have a dual purpose type reactor, one which will produce power as well as special nuclear material needed for our defense program, such an undertaking would almost have to be carried on and constructed by the Government? In other words, a dual purpose reactor is the kind of reactor which will provide power and weapons material.

Mr. GORE. Also a large quantity of very dangerous radioactive waste material.

Mr. JACKSON. Exactly. It is virtually impossible for an arrangement to be made with a private company to carry out such an objective. Is it not true that the General Electric Co. desired to build this type of reactor for the Atomic Energy Commission at Hanford back in 1953, under its first proposal?

Mr. GORE. I believe that is true.

Mr. JACKSON. As I recall, at the time it made its proposal there was no attempt to undertake this tremendous job by General Electric Co. as such, but it was the desire of General Electric to do it as manager, and as agent for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. President, I have many more thoughts on this subject. I doubt that the 84th Congress has considered a bill more important to the future of the free world than the atomic reactor bill. As I said earlier, its defeat was one of the keenest disappointments that has ever come to me in public life. However, disappointment to a Senator is not important. What is very important is that it means that the United States of America, which, whether it desires the role or not, is burdened with the political and economic leadership of the free world, will fall farther behind in the development of nuclear power. I predict that early next year the Congress will enact such a program. The Senate will vote, not 49 to 40 for such a program, but by a larger majority. I predict that the House of Representatives will see the error of its way, and that that vision will come by reason of the pressure of events. The secondary position of the United States of America, which 3 years ago had unquestioned leadership in this field, will become apparent to all within the next few months.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I am looking at pages 64 and 65 of the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1957. My attention was called to this testimony because I was present when it was given, and helped to bring it out.

I had mentioned the bill which bears the name of the Senator from Tennessee, and I said I thought it might be desirable to take some of the "bets" which looked promising, such as the dual purpose reactor, which the British had tried. I said:

> Now that you have opened the subject * * * we have indicated a program that might cost as much as three or four hundred million dollars if it is all to be done. One of the members of the Commission had an idea that $190 million ought to be obligated in fiscal year 1957. I am sure that it needs to go to any such figure as that.

Then the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] pointed to the chairman and asked:

> What would be the Commission's suggestion—

Meaning the Atomic Energy Commission—

> if a second bet was to be contemplated, as Senator ANDERSON referred to it, as a second bet?

Mr. Strauss replied, as appears on page 65:

> Senator, the majority of the Commission have taken the position, and I have not seen the report to which the Senator refers, which may make provision for this—that we would like, with each reactor concept which we consider has reached the point of a full-scale plant, to try to get industry to do it.

Finally he went on with reference to the dual purpose reactor, and said that he had wanted this done, but had been voted down by the Commission.

Would not the bill of the Senator from Tennessee have permitted the Commission to do that very thing?

Mr. GORE. In that respect, it would have authorized identically what the Chairman of the Commission said should be done, and which he recommended.

There is some mystery about this. Here is a program vital to the future of America and the future development in this strategic, important field, a program conferring authorization upon the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the goals which we have in common.

The bill was endorsed by a vote of 14 to 0 in the committee. Yet for some reason unknown to the junior Senator from Tennessee, powerful opposition developed, which brought about its defeat. I regret it, indeed. I have not attempted here tonight to speak with partisan connotations. I have tried to avoid that. I am keenly disappointed. However, I repeat that my disappointment is utterly unimportant, but the meaning of this defeat is important to America.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said. I have been at his side on this question, although I am not so well informed as he is on atomic energy. The great fight which he and the distinguished chairman of the joint committee have made in trying to bring life and light instead of death from atoms, I think will stand out as a stellar mark of the 84th Congress.

On the Congress side, I believe that the determination of a willful chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission apparently to take advice not from his technicians and scientists, so as to keep America abreast, but from politicians, thus forcing America to have a subsidiary role, a lesser role, in the development of atoms for peace than we might otherwise have will stand as a black mark on the 84th Congress. I regret that the bill was killed, not in this body, but in the other body. We may see the pain and loss of world leadership which will be the result of the ill-advised action of the Chairman of the Commission and Members of the House.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous references to the junior Senator from Tennessee. I thank him also on behalf of the chairman of the joint committee.

I wish to express particularly keen disappointment and embarrassment that a deliberate attempt was made to mislead the House of Representatives. I again read a sentence from a letter from the Chairman of the Commission which was read to the House of Representatives in the closing minutes of its consideration of this subject:

> As you know, the Commission's staff and the Commission itself, with the exception of one member, believe that each reactor concept which has reached a stage warranting the expenditure of substantial sums for large-scale development—

I now invite attention to the remarks of the able chairman of the joint committee, who has cited not one, but 2 or 3 types of reactors which are not only ready now, but have been ready and waiting for large-scale development. Continuing—

> either is now in process as a specific research group, is in the design stage, or is actually under construction.

The fact is that there is only one large-scale reactor under construction. As a member of the joint committee, I have no knowledge of any other reactor under construction.

I will ask the distinguished chairman of the joint committee if he knows of one other reactor for which even the core has been designed?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know anything about the designing work, but I know that in the case of two, small prototypes are being built, which it is hoped, after testing, will prove of sufficient importance to permit going ahead with something else. But if that is a program, I do not recognize it as such.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator recognize a similarity in the misleading sentence structure in this letter and the misleading sentence structure in the full page advertisements to which he and I recently paid our respects?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I do. I should like to say also that in the material which I inserted in the RECORD a few minutes ago, there was included reference, as one of the possible types we could build, to the heavy-water-moderated reactor, of which the Savannah River production reactors are the largest and most recent examples.

Those reactors were designed by Dr. Zinn, who was the consultant to the committee in the presentation of our report. Certainly, if anyone knows anything about reactors, Dr. Zinn knows, beginning with his first boiling-water reactor; and he testified that a similar type of reactor could be converted to generate power in a very simple fashion, and could be operated at high temperatures and pressures. He said he could pressurize the whole reactor core. Why not, he asked, design a pressurized fuel element and coolant tubes?

Mr. President, in that way I could go through the entire statement Dr. Zinn made.

I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee would not be interested in a small item, which appears at page 64 of the hearings. Again referring to the dual-purpose reactor, supported by both Washington Senators [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] and by the Oregon Senators [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], who are very much interested in this subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to read first from the testimony of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. This appears at page 64. I had asked him what we were going to do with the production which was not used up—that is, the mineral production from the uranium industry—and whether, if we did not use it up, we might not profitably use it in dual-purpose reactors. That was my question. This was his reply:

> Senator, the Commission decided some time in the spring of 1953 that the dual-purpose reactor approach was not a sound one from the point of view of the production of the development of economic power. When I became a member of the Commission in the summer of 1953, I questioned the soundness of that decision by the Commission.

That was the decision, I may say, Mr. President, not to build a dual-purpose reactor. Admiral Strauss said he questioned the soundness of that decision by the Commission. He continued:

> But in the winter of 1953–54, when the General Electric Co. made us a proposal for the dual-purpose reactor at Hanford, I was not able to carry the point.

Mr. President, all I say is that I cannot understand why he did not sit down and rejoice when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy carried the point for him. We took it to the Senate floor, and, by a vote of 49 to 40, we got him what his heart desired.

I could have recited for him that verse from the Bible:

> What he had worshipped without knowing, came we to declare unto him.

We gave him exactly what he wanted. What did he do? When the bill went to the House, he tried to defeat it. I

say that is the most amazing political performance I have ever seen.

I should like to point out that the conference of directors of laboratories was called and conducted without the knowledge of one of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. Many people know that in the closing days of the previous Congress, I introduced a bill, known as the Murray bill, which was designed to require the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to tell all the Commissioners what he had found out, and that there could be no secrecy among the members of the Commission.

I have in my hand a letter dated July 26, 1956, addressed to me by Thomas E. Murray, one of the Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In that letter he points out that he did not know that this conference was being held. He said in his letter:

On July 24, 1956, I became aware of another action by the Chairman which I consider also disregarded the provisions of section 21. I learned on that date that the Chairman had called a large meeting of "the most experienced reactor specialists in the country to meet in Washington for the purpose of evaluating our reactor development program" in relation to the pending Gore bill. Yesterday I was informed by the General Manager that at the instruction of the Chairman telegraphic invitations to this meeting were sent on July 10, 1956. The meeting was held on Friday, July 20, in the Chairman's office and attended by the Chairman, Commissioner Vance, the General Manager, the Deputy General Manager, and other principal staff concerned. I was neither invited nor apprised of the fact that such an important meeting was to be held.

This is a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, on whose suggestion I introduced the Murray bill, which was passed by Congress and signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. GORE. The inference was left in the House of Representatives that these scientists disagreed with the bill then before the House. Does the Senator have any information about what preliminary understanding they reached?

Mr. ANDERSON. The next paragraph of the letter says:

A copy of a document giving a preliminary summary of the meeting was furnished to me yesterday afternoon. In my opinion it tends to support the position I have taken with respect to acceleration of the power-reactor program.

I think it is tragic——

Mr. GORE. Has Commissioner Murray's position not been consistently in support of the acceleration program?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; exactly. But after the chairman summoned people from all over the country and heard their testimony, the letter which went to the House and which was read before the House seemed to suggest that the witnesses had testified against the Gore bill, when, as a matter of fact, they had supported the Gore bill very strongly. These men are on the firing line. They realize that the United States is not testing the atomic reactors which seem to give promise; that the people of Great Britain are testing reactors which promise to give atomic power; and that the Russians are building such reactors.

The only country under the sun which does not have a chance to build them is the country in which the atomic bomb was devised and developed and into which the people of this country have put $14 billion of their treasure. But they are not allowed to have it. It can only be done in Russia and Britain and Germany and France. I say it is a tragedy. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred may be printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: You will recall that at a hearing before your committee on July 23, 1956, I testified that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission without my knowledge released a statement relating to the results of the recent weapons tests. As I informed you, I believe this to be one of the most important statements ever issued by the Commission. On the basis of the information available to me, I cannot subscribe to it in its entirety. Furthermore, I believe that this action was a violation of section 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

On July 24, 1956, I became aware of another action by the Chairman which I consider also disregarded the provisions of section 21. I learned on that date that the Chairman had called a large meeting of "the most experienced reactor specialists in the country to meet in Washingon for the purpose of evaluating our reactor development program" in relation to the pending Gore bill. Yesterday, I was informed by the General Manager that at the instruction of the Chairman, telegraphic invitations to this meeting were sent on July 10, 1956. The meeting was held on Friday, July 20, in the Chairman's office and attended by the Chairman, Commissioner Vance, the General Manager, the Deputy General Manager, and other principal staff concerned. I was neither invited nor apprised of the fact that such an important meeting was to be held.

A copy of a document giving a preliminary summary of the meeting was furnished to me yesterday afternoon. In my opinion it tends to support the position I have taken with respect to acceleration of the power reactor program.

These instances make it clear to me that section 21, as now worded, has not succeeded in bringing about the result for which it was intended.

Very sincerely,

THOMAS E. MURRAY,
Commissioner.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. EASTLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the three Senators who have been discussing this matter for what I consider to be the great service they endeavored to render to the people of my State with reference to the dual-purpose reactor at Hanford. A few months ago I wrote to each one of the Senators, as I wrote to each member of the committee, and asked for such assistance as they could give toward the effort we were making to establish one of these reactors at Hanford. So much electric power is taken out of our Northwest system for the purpose of the Hanford installation that it resulted in a tremendous shortage of power in our area. We had received information from engineering authorities that it was feasible and would supply sufficient power to meet the installation needs at Hanford. Not only the people in my region of the country, but of the entire United States owe a great debt of gratitude to the three Senators for the leadership they have given to us in this matter.

I am perfectly willing to stand here and make the prediction, that it will be less than a year before the people of this country will be fully awakened to the facts being brought out in this debate, and they will insist that at the next session of Congress action be taken to rectify the great wrong which has been done by the failure to get the Gore bill through both Houses. The Senator from Tennessee has introduced a bill which I hope will eventually become the law of this country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. On the very first day of the next session of Congress I intend to introduce the bill again, and I join the Senator from Oregon in full confidence that the bill will be enacted early in the next Congress, because we shall bring unmistakably to the attention of the Congress the necessity of doing so. Events and time will establish the rectitude of our course.

Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I certainly wish to compliment my colleague from Tennessee for the very able fight he has made to see that the United States keeps on an even basis with other nations in the commercial development and use of atomic energy.

I also wish to compliment the able chairman of the committee [Mr. ANDERSON] for the outstanding leadership he has furnished as chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I should like to ask my colleague to make clear one point, namely, whether, in view of the requirements which have been set forth as conditions precedent to the development of reactors, such as my colleague has been discussing, by private industry, under the act of 1954, he feels that unless his bill is passed, or, at least, there is some Government leadership to show the way and to demonstrate the reactors, so that a reactor can be made which will be economically feasible, we are ever going to have any program and get it going under the present situation which will put us on an even basis or enable us to maintain our lead.

Mr. GORE. Briefly responding to my able colleague from Tennessee, the art of nuclear power has not advanced to a point where we can rely safely and solely upon private enterprise for all further development in the construction and operation of large-scale plants. Further participation of the Government in this vast program is absolutely essential to the realization of the fruition of this

program on which the American people have already spent $14 billion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I gained the impression from reading the debate in the House of Representatives that the issue was presented as one of public versus private development. But, is it not a fact that, looking forward, private development will be along the line of experimentation before private industry will be willing to accept the responsibility of such a large program?

Mr. GORE. I thought it was unfortunate that the debate took that turn in the other body. The development of atomic power is a task so great and so challenging as to require the combined efforts of both American industry and the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not similar to what we had at the beginning of the program. It would not have been expected that private industry in 1941 and 1942 would risk such a large amount of money. The Government had to show the way and make the initial investment. In that connection, are we not presented with almost a similar situation to the one which existed at the beginning of this great effort?

Mr. GORE. There must be further effort by both Government and industry.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have appreciated greatly the contribution which the Senator made in trying to make the program a feasible one and in pointing out the dangers existing in the present program.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the New York Times of July 19, 1956, published a news item headed "Reactor Barred at Brussels Fair—Belgium Forbids It in City for 1958 on Health Basis—Big Atom Plant Studied."

That was merely a tiny experimental reactor.

The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, at its 18th meeting on June 3, 1956, studied the building of a plant in Michigan, and it came to certain conclusions, one of which was the following:

> It appears doubtful that sufficient experimental information will be available in time to give assurance of safe operation of this reactor unless the present fast reactor program of the AEC is amplified and accelerated as detailed below.

A committee of the Atomic Energy Commission talked about a reactor to be built in the great State of Michigan and suggested that certain things which are contemplated in the bill of the Senator from Tennessee should be accelerated.

Does not the Senator think that was the very purpose of his bill?

Mr. GORE. Indeed, so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to read further:

> On the other hand, if it cannot be shown that breaching of the building during a melt down is impossible, then a much more extensive EBR–II program is required. The test reactor to be operated as EBR–II should then be a genuine prototype of the PRDC reactor.

Did not the Senator's bill contemplate the construction of prototypes for those reactors?

Mr. GORE. It did. It contemplated maintaining America's leadership in this vital field of nuclear power.

Mr. ANDERSON. Exactly.

Mr. GORE. And without such a program we are falling woefully behind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me read the last paragraph of the report:

> The committee considers it important that bold steps be taken to advance the development of the fast breeder reactor concept and commends the willingness of the Power Reactor Development Co. to risk its capital and prestige in advancing the development of this reactor concept. But the committee does not feel that the steps to be taken should be so bold as to risk the health and safety of the public. It is important for the AEC to provide sufficient development facilities and experimental information that the safety aspects of the PRDC reactor can be reliably appraised in advance of operation of the reactor itself.

Should that be regarded as a fight between public and private power, or was it an effort to help private power all over the Nation?

Mr. GORE. It was an effort to assist private enterprise to move into the field, to demonstrate, and to make it possible for both private and public enterprise to move vigorously in the development of atomic energy. I have no aversion to public power, but in the bill on which the Senate and the House voted we had completely removed the issue of public versus private power.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator that the bill on which the House voted went far beyond the Senate bill, so it is a bill completely divorced from the issue of public versus private power.

I commend the Senator from Tennessee for his willingness to adapt his program to the requirements of the other members of the committee. I think we could have reported a straight out-and-out public power bill if those concerned had been disposed to do so. We did not do so; we took a very substantially compromised route, in the hope that a political controversy or a fight between public and private power would not develop.

I commend the junior Senator from Tennessee for taking that broad-gage point of view.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HILL. I strongly commend the junior Senator from Tennessee upon his very able, very enlightening, and very challenging address tonight.

I also strongly commend the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], on the vision, the wisdom, and the will to carry on this fight.

I am confident that the efforts of these two Senators will be rewarded, and that they will win this battle. They must win this battle; they will win it; because if we are to keep America free and keep America strong, we must win the fight to which they have given, wholeheartedly, so much of their support and devotion.

I feel that the American people will realize and appreciate all that they are doing and that they have already done, and will give them their loyal support.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend, the distinguished and able senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I have felt throughout this fight, for more than 2 years, and I feel now, that the United States has an especial moral responsibility to be the first to bring the benefits of the peacetime uses of atomic energy, not only to our own people, but to the people of the world.

CONVEYANCE TO INDIAN TRIBES OF CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3927) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Secretary of the Interior at the request of any Indian tribe, band, or group is authorized to convey to such Indian tribe, band, or group, by such means as he may deem appropriate, title to any federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities (including any personal property used in connection with such buildings, improvements, or facilities) that are situated on lands of such tribe, band, or group or on lands reserved for the administration of its affairs, and that are no longer required by the Secretary for the administration of Indian affairs. Any tribe, band, or group to which property is conveyed pursuant to this act may dispose of such property whenever its governing body determines that the property is no longer needed for its use. If, at any time while property conveyed pursuant to this act remains in the ownership of any Indian tribe, band, or group, the Secretary of the Interior determines that such property is not being adequately maintained or properly utilized by such tribe, band, or group or that the property creates a health or safety hazard or other undesirable condition, he may declare a forfeiture of the conveyance and the title to such property shall thereupon revert to the United States. Such determination by the Secretary shall be final.
>
> SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term "Indian" shall include Eskimos and Aleuts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does the bill include the Eskimos and the Aleuts in Alaska?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

The House amendment merely provides that Eskimos and Aleuts in Alaska shall also be brought within the scope of the bill. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2916) for the relief of

Mrs. Alberta Bernard, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 695) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

JAMES W. MURPHY, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to submit a resolution recognizing the services which have been performed for the Senate during the last 60 years by Mr. James W. Murphy, the Chief Official Reporter of Senate Debates. I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 324), as follows:

Whereas James W. Murphy, senior Official Reporter of Debates for the Senate, will have completed 60 years of service to the Senate at the termination of the 84th Congress; and

Whereas James W. Murphy is 1 of 5 members of a distinguished family who have given uninterrupted service as reporters of debates for the United States Senate since 1848; and

Whereas the four other members were James W. Murphy's father, Edward V. Murphy, Sr., his brother, Edward V. Murphy, Jr.; and his two uncles, Dennis F. Murphy and James J. Murphy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby acknowledges the valuable service it has received from James W. Murphy and the members of his family who have served as Official Reporters of Debates, and expresses its appreciation for such service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that the Senate should not adjourn this session without formally recognizing the invaluable services which have been rendered to this body during the past 60 years by Mr. James W. Murphy, our present chief of the Senate reporters.

Those of us who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day know how completely and how accurately the proceedings are reported, even though they cover a multitude of subjects and an amazing flow of language, much of it extemporaneously spoken, some delivered after careful preparation. It is no mean achievement for a reporter to take down the rapid delivery of controversial debate, and I am happy to testify, as one whose service as a Member of the Senate began in January 1934, that I have never known anything but diligent, intelligent, and accurate reporting of our proceedings by Mr. Murphy and the very efficient staff he has gathered about him.

When we honor Mr. Murphy, we honor also a great family of Murphys who for 108 years have been taking down by shorthand the proceedings which have taken place upon the floor of this body.

Mr. Murphy is the son of Edward V. Murphy, who was the brother of Dennis F. Murphy, chosen by Senator John C. Calhoun as long ago as 1848 to give the Senate verbatim reports instead of the little summaries which had been the original style by which the activities on the Senate floor were reported to the public and made available in the formal records. For 48 years Dennis F. Murphy served the Senate in this capacity. His nephew, to whom I pay tribute today, has exceeded that record by 12 years, and I am ready to testify from my experience that no parliamentary body has ever had a better reporter than our present Chief of the Official Reporters. He began his service in the Senate on December 7, 1896. That was the beginning of the 2d session of the 54th Congress. We are now closing the 2d session of the 84th Congress, so that through 30 Congresses he has been a reporter of activities which began 26 years before the senior Member of this body, our beloved colleague, WALTER F. GEORGE, was first sworn in as a United States Senator. Mr. Murphy, who holds a degree of master of laws from the Law School of Georgetown University, has been a member of the District of Columbia Bar for 50 years. By association and training, as well as by personal capacity, he has been equipped to render this body the remarkable services which have accumulated to his credit during 60 years.

It is only fitting that in honoring Mr. Murphy we honor his uncle, who established the reporting service in 1848; his father, Edward V. Murphy, who beginning in 1860 was a Senate reporter for 59 years; his uncle, James J. Murphy, who was a Senate reporter for 20 years—1854–74; and his brother, Edward V. Murphy, Jr., who was one of the official corps of reporters for 25 years. I know of no similar record in the history of Congress or of any other parliamentary body.

Every Senator knows that the official reporters are in constant and intimate touch with Members of the Senate. They know the whole story of words that have been said upon the floor in the heat of debate and later withdrawn. They have been the repositories of many confidences, and I think it is to the eternal honor of the Murphy family and of the official reporters who now serve with our chief reporter, James W. Murphy, that none of them has ever been known to reveal a confidence.

I hope the resolution which I have presented may be adopted by a rising vote of the Senate in the presence of Mr. Murphy, who is sitting here.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before the question is put to the Senate, as the minority leader I should like to join—and I know I speak for all Members on this side of the aisle, as I am sure the Senator from Wyoming speaks for Members on the other side of the aisle—in paying tribute not only to Mr. Murphy but to his family, and to all the reporters who serve us so faithfully and well in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the minority leader in their expressions of appreciation for the fine service that has been rendered not only by the present member of the Murphy family who is now serving the Senate, but by those who have preceded him. They have done magnificent work over a span of years that amounts to a substantial portion of the history of the Senate itself. It is a work that will live as long as the records of the Senate are preserved.

I congratulate Mr. Murphy; I extend again my deep gratitude for his consistently fine services, and those of his able staff, and I commend the Senator from Wyoming for calling the attention of the Senate tonight to the fine service that has been rendered by a distinguished family.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to tell the distinguished Senator from Wyoming how happy I am that he has submitted the resolution, and how I have enjoyed hearing his words of tribute to Mr. Murphy and to the Murphy family. We know that Mr. Murphy is always helpful, efficient, and fine in every way. He contributes much to the work of the individual Members of the Senate, and to the Senate itself. He is, indeed, a great and devoted public servant, and a grand American.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for submitting the resolution. In support of the resolution, I want to say that in the 20 years I have been in the Senate I have always found Mr. Murphy to be a courteous gentleman and an efficient and able public servant. He typifies to my mind and in my mind what is fine about a career public servant, a public servant who has given his life to public service. I know I speak for many other Senators as well as myself when I express my appreciation to him, and extend to him my best wishes for everything that is good.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always delighted when I see the Senate unanimous about anything. I want to say the Senator from Wyoming could not have presented to us tonight a resolution about which we could be more unanimous, with more enthusiasm, than the resolution he has submitted, which gives us the opportunity to honor Mr. Murphy.

He is not only a great public servant, as has been repeated on the floor of the Senate, but he is a kindly and a gentle person. He is one who has taken a great deal of interest in the Members of the Senate, over and above his line of duty. When on occasion we have found ourselves ill, it has always been a beautiful thing to have had a word with Mr. Murphy.

I want to say we can call him friend because he has been our friend. I wish to say good naturedly that he is the only man who has ever been able to put words in my mouth, and he can speak for me any time that he wants to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. Murphy has not only done his work ably, but he has furnished something that is always welcome and helpful in the Senate. That is good humor and good cheer to the Members of the Senate in lightening their burdens and work. It is certainly wonderful that we have been able to have Mr. Murphy and so many capable members of his staff to help us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Wyoming in paying my respects to a man who

is one of the most able public servants I have ever had contact with. I know every Member of the Senate feels likewise. I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming would have any objection to the entire membership of the Senate joining in cosponsoring the resolution. I am sure the resolution sets forth the sentiments of each and every one of us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Delaware is correct when he states that the resolution represents the feelings of every Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I can enthusiastically support the resolution. Speaking for one Senator, I want to say that Mr. Murphy has been of valued service to me since I have been in the Senate. I believe it was Mark Twain who said "the difference between the exact word and almost the exact word is the difference between lightning and lightning bug." Mr. Murphy supplies us with the exact words, and I wish to thank him very much.

Mr. LEHMAN. I rise to express my great pleasure that the Senator from Wyoming has submitted his resolution, which I, of course, wholeheartedly support.

I think it is an amazing thing to see how accurately the proceedings are reported in this body. In the 7 years I have been a Member of the Senate, very, very few errors have come to my attention. I remember one instance when, through an inadvertence, the speech I made was attributed to another Senator. It was not a serious matter at all, but I brought it to the attention of Mr. Murphy. Even though the matter was trivial in character and of no importance at all, Mr. Murphy took the trouble to write me a three-page letter to explain the error and express his regret. That showed the pride Mr. Murphy had in his work, and the pride he has in those who work under him. I am glad there is taking place this recognition of Mr. Murphy and his work.

Mr. JENNER. I wish to express my personal thanks for the great service Mr. Murphy has rendered this body and this country. Many times he has been helpful to me, and I am sure to every other Member of the Senate. I know he exemplifies the best in public service today.

Mr. BENDER. I should like to associate myself with those who have spoken so favorably about Mr. Murphy. I have not bothered Mr. Murphy too much, because I have not said too much in the past 2 years. We all appreciate his work, and I hope hereafter we shall show our appreciation to all those who work here by raising their pay.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in connection with the pending resolution, I should like to join in paying tribute to Mr. Murphy. It was my pleasure to become acquainted with Mr. Murphy when I first came to the Senate, 10 years ago. Many a time Mr. Murphy has given me sound suggestions and very good advice. I have always appreciated his helpfulness and courtesy.

Mr YOUNG. Mr. President, I probably have more reason to be grateful for the fine work done by Mr Murphy than has any other Member of the Senate. As my colleagues know, I often have the habit of talking too rapidly. Mr. Murphy and his associates have ably recorded what I have had to say. He has been a wonderful public servant. I am very happy to join in these highly deserved tributes to him.

Mr CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, somewhat over a year ago I had occasion to make a little study of some of the veteran employees of the Senate. I found that right at the top of the list was our friend, Mr. Murphy. He has a record, both personally and through his family, that is unbeatable, as has been stated many times this evening.

He is a friend of all of us, and we wish him the best of everything in the world.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague in paying tribute to a great American. Mr. Murphy has been extremely kind to me on many occasions. He is always most efficient, and he has always shown extreme courtesy whenever he is called upon to do something out of the ordinary.

I wish for him many, many years of happiness.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, until this evening I thought I was the only Member of the Senate who had received such unusually fine treatment at the hands of Mr. Murphy. I should like to say that I realize now that he has treated all Members of the Senate alike, and I am glad to know of it.

I am always amazed that the Official Reporters record so accurately as they do what we Members of the Senate have to say, because often we become involved in hassles and do not speak too plainly, and sometimes we do not speak the best of English. The Official Reporters always straighten out such interchanges. I am deeply appreciative. One who has served us as well as Mr. Murphy has cannot be too greatly honored.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am one of the host of friends and admirers of Mr. Murphy, all of whom have been the recipients of his kindness and his courtesy.

Long ago I discovered that Mr. Murphy takes great pride in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; he wants the speeches and proceedings of the Senate, as recorded in the RECORD, to be presentable and readable and to represent the responsible body which he considers the Senate to be, and which all of us sincerely believe it to be.

I may add that Mr. Murphy has demonstrated a patience which contradicts his Irish name.

I congratulate him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I must assure the Senator from South Dakota that patience is one of the primary virtues of the Irish people. [Laughter.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I join in the words of praise and the expressions of gratitude to Mr. Murphy, for his wonderful public service.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, no one who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can fully appreciate how deeply indebted we are to Mr. Murphy for correcting the many mistakes we make in our extemporaneous statements. I take pleasure in paying tribute to him tonight for his excellent work, his genial character, and the many times he has protected me in the RECORD.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I take this occasion to join my colleagues in expressing my appreciation to Mr. Murphy on the occasion of the celebration of his 60th year of service to the Senate.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the most unusual publication printed in the United States. At the beginning of the assembly of material, unlike any daily newspaper or magazine, the Lord only knows how many pages and how much type will be required before "30" is written at the end of the galley proof to show that the Congress has completed its work for that day.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is different from most newspapers. It is said that there is nothing so old as yesterday's newspaper, and nothing so uncertain as tomorrow's. There is nothing so uncertain as today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or tomorrow's. As to the age of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, whatever words are spoken here are solidly engraved in the public record, as though they were engraved in the hard, lasting granite of the State of Vermont.

The city editor of this unusual publication has served not only this generation of Senators, but past generations. His father and uncles served at an even earlier time, to carry on the great tradition which results in the running play-by-play account of the transactions of the Senate becoming a living document for historians to see.

I am glad that slips of the tongue, split infinitives, and all the bad grammar which sometimes creeps into our speech during the heat of debate can be corrected by the able and competent Mr. Murphy, who has served us so well and so faithfully.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, during my necessary absence from the floor of the Senate earlier this evening, it is my understanding that the very able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] submitted a resolution paying tribute to Mr. James W. Murphy, dean of the Senate reporters, for the invaluable service rendered by him to all the Members of this body.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to join as a sponsor of this resolution, for I, too, wish publicly to express thanks and appreciation to this great public servant who has so unselfishly given of his time and talent in being helpful to me.

I sincerely trust that Mr. Murphy, a true friend to all of us, with God's help, will be with us for many years to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I should also like to have the privilege of associating myself with the resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], because, I may say, Mr. Murphy has been exceedingly kind to the junior Senator from Minnesota, and I think I owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are few documents more important than the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Locked in its pages are the debates, the resolutions, the bills, the memorials, the petitions, and the legislative actions that are the reason for the existence of the Senate. It is a document which affects our laws, our precedents, and our judicial decisions.

The basis of this record is the able, loyal, hard-working, highly skilled corps of official reporters who take down the debates. And presiding over them is a man dearly beloved by us all—James W. Murphy.

Day after day he sits at his desk in the official reporters' room, scanning the words that we utter in debate. His skilled hand puts on paper the highly complex activities which must be daily recorded and published for all the world to see. Under his deft touch, the technicalities, the contradictions, the subtle nuances, and the bewildering phrases arrange themselves in a neat and orderly fashion. They fall into place in such a way that they have coherence and logic and reason.

Jim Murphy is a man who is vital to the Senate. For many years he has made—and is still making—a contribution to the life of this Nation of which he can always be proud. He is a man of integrity, a man of good humor, a man of tact. I am very proud that I have this opportunity to say to him that we all respect his services, and regard him with affection and esteem. And I also want to say to his family and to his loved ones that he is a loyal American who has served his country well and faithfully.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the fine tributes paid Mr. Murphy. I want to take this occasion to thank him for his many acts of kindness and the cooperation he has invariably shown, and to wish him many more years of service and good health and happiness.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Mr. James W. Murphy, the very efficient Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate. The reporters of debates of the United States Senate, are, I think, models of efficiency and good temper. The strain of reporting the proceedings of the Senate is very great. Mr. Murphy handles a tremendous volume of work. He is always able to put our somewhat scrambled grammar into impeccable English. When we make faulty references to the classics and to English literature, he can be depended upon to straighten out our inaccuracies.

For scores of years Mr. Murphy has conducted the work of the office of official reporters of debates with great intelligence and efficiency. That was also true of his father and his uncle before him. For over a century the House of Murphy has preserved with accuracy the debates in this body.

I want to say that I think Mr. Murphy is one of the most remarkable and one of the finest human beings I have ever known. I only hope that too great a strain has not been placed upon him in the concluding days of this session. In company with all other Members of the Senate, I wish for him happiness and a long life. The accuracy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a tribute to his life.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, until the moment when I walked onto the floor, I did not know that the Senate was engaged in a very worthwhile endeavor, this evening, namely, in paying tribute to a man who has corrected more senatorial errors of grammar and rhetoric over the past many years than Senators have corrected for themselves in going through their remarks.

Mr. James W. Murphy is one of the most remarkable men I have ever known. The Senate of the United States has been fortunate in many respects in those who serve it; but certainly no one has contributed more to maintaining the dignity of the Senate and our public stature in the minds of our constituents than has Mr. Murphy. Not only is he a gentleman, but he is a very great scholar. He can correct any errors which we may make when we undertake to quote Shakespeare or anyone else, in delivering our statements here on the floor of the Senate.

I can only express the hope that long after I have gone to my last reward—whatever it may be—the Senate may have the services of Mr. James W. Murphy for another 60 years, because I think that would contribute as much to maintaining the position of the Senate in our form of government and in the American public mind as any other one thing that might happen.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate, but I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, and to express my appreciation of the work of Mr. Murphy and his colleagues.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was in the Chamber when the Members of the Senate began eulogizing Mr. Murphy; but I had to leave the Chamber at 8 o'clock, in order to attend a conference. Since I was afraid I might miss this opportunity, I spoke to Mr. Murphy personally.

I wish to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this man, who has meant so much to the Senate and to individual Senators over the past 60 years. It has not been at all unusual for him to look us up, to call us at our offices or at our homes, in order to straighten out some little matter which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He has been most efficient, most courteous, and most kind. Through the years, he has been a real asset to the Senate. I join my colleagues in wishing for him many more years of great happiness and good health.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not know how Mr. Murphy could have done a better job, and I do not know how he could have been more cooperative.

I wish to join in the remarks of all other Senators about Mr. Murphy, except I would like to multiply by about five times all the fine things that have been said about him.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Mr. Murphy, and I wish to associate myself with what my colleagues have said about him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a most worthy American, Mr. James W. Murphy, the senior official reporter of the United States Senate. He has always been most helpful to me. My hope is that his health will continue to be good, and that he will be with us for many more years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in paying this tribute to Mr. Murphy, our friend and our collaborator, the Senate adopt the resolution by a rising vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Before putting the resolution to a vote, let the Chair state, following the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], that the United States Senate without a Murphy would be the same as Ireland without a Murphy. [Laughter.]

We are very happy to pay this tribute to so fine a public servant.

I well recall the day when I first entered this Chamber—somewhat bewildered by the brilliant personalities around me and somewhat blinded by the glaring lights. But Mr. Murphy greeted me with a cordial smile and with the words, "If I can ever be of any help to you, please let me know." They are words the junior Senator from Delaware will long remember.

The question now is on agreeing to the resolution. Those in favor of agreeing to the resolution will please rise.

[The Members of the Senate rose and applauded.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is unanimously agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of the tributes which have been paid to Mr. Murphy be printed at the same place in the RECORD, so all of them will appear in continuity, and that they be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF LA PUNTILLA MILITARY RESERVATION TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9506) to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the pending business is Calendar No. 2849, House bill 9506.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey 3.24 acres of land, together with improvements thereon, known as La Puntilla Military Reservation, in the city of San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without monetary consideration therefor, in order that the more than 100-year-old naval arsenal may be restored and preserved as an historical monument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9506) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPIRATION OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on yesterday, the most succesful program in the history of veterans' legislation came to an end. I refer to the expiration of the educational and on-the-job and on-the-farm training provisions of the GI bill of rights and the vocational rehabilitation program for World War II veterans.

I am proud to have had the privilege to be one of the sponsors of the GI bill of rights and the vocational rehabilitation program, and to coauthor subsequent amendments to implement and expand the programs.

When Congress undertook these broad and imaginative steps 12 years ago, a new world of educational opportunities was opened. In my home State of Alabama alone, a total of 185,000 World War II veterans benefited from the GI bill and the vocational rehabilitation program. More than 8 million veterans received educational training and vocational rehabilitation throughout the country.

In these closing hours of the session, I shall not undertake to enumerate the many benefits which our veterans have derived from the programs and the profound effect the programs have had on the intellectual, cultural, the economic, and the scientific strength and well-being of our Nation. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, an article from the New York Times of July 22, an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, an article from the August issue of Coronet magazine, and the text of Eric Sevareid's CBS Radio News Analysis of July 23, which so well review and evaluate the success of the programs.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 22, 1956]

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—GI BILL, EXPIRING AFTER 12 YEARS, HAS BEEN, IT IS AGREED, AN OUTSTANDING SUCCESS

(By Benjamin Fine)

On Wednesday the GI bill of rights setup for veterans of World War II on June 22, 1944. expires. In 12 years, nearly 8 million ex-servicemen attended school and college, took on-the-job training or worked on farms. The whole program cost the Government $14,500,000,000.

Educators began last week to take stock of this great educational venture. At one time college campuses were swamped with veterans. A total of 2,200,000 veterans took advantage of the GI bill to go to college or graduate school, with up to $500 in tuition fees, and subsistence grants ranging from $75 to $110 a month from the Government.

There were misgivings at first. But the educators soon found that the veterans were characterized by maturity and strong motivation. The veterans were substantially older than their civilian classmates. And they wanted to make up for lost time.

Perhaps the situation at Yale University is typical of the institutions that found their campuses overcrowded with ex-servicemen. Some 15,000 veterans attended Yale in the 12 years. A maximum of 5,900 were enrolled during the spring term of 1947. Yale found that scholastically the vets did better work than the other students. But, as Richard R. Shank, head of the veterans' affairs program at Yale puts it, the University benefited also from the rise in standards achieved by the veterans.

BENEFITS CONFERRED

The GI bill, educators generally agree, opened avenues of educational opportunities to wide numbers of veterans qualified in every way except financially. It did so without directly subsidizing schools. Nor were the administrative controls too objectionable. Many veterans continued their education at the graduate level. This, of course, increased the country's supply of research scientists and Ph. D. scholars to teach as well as to man posts in private industry.

The GI bill discounted the theory, held in some quarters, that only those able to afford it should take graduate studies. It has given impetus to a fellowship program sponsored by industry and the Federal Government.

The Columbia University campus probably had the largest number of GI's of any institution. Some 85,000 veterans have attended Columbia since the program began. The peak year was reached in 1947 when 17,733 ex-servicemen were enrolled, comprising 74 percent of the male student body.

Contrary to expectations, few veterans gave up before completing their educational objectives. The ease and completeness with which the ex-GI's fitted into the academic environment proved heartening.

"Veterans seem to be more interested in public affairs and world problems, and in equipping themselves for sound citizenship," one official summed up. "They have brought to our campuses an atmosphere of serious purpose and a sense of responsibility."

The GI program is bound to have lasting results. It has trained 238,000 teachers, 450,000 engineers, 180,000 doctors and nurses, 113,000 scientists and 36,000 clergymen.

There is little doubt that the veterans brought a sense of maturity previously unknown to college campuses. This view was best expressed by Dr. Herold C. Hunt, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and former Chicago school superintendent and Harvard University professor.

HIGH LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT

Having shared the experience and responsibility of winning World War II," he said, "many veterans came to college with a deeper sense of values than those who came directly from high schools. Their seriousness brought good scholarship and a high level of achievement. The progress they are now making in their peacetime pursuits confirms this observation.

"As a former superintendent of schools, I have observed the benefits of the G. I. Bill of Rights at first hand. I feel that inestimable good has come from educational and training opportunities the bill made possible."

According to Dr. Henry T. Heald, president of New York University, who recently has been named as president of the Ford Foundation, the GI bill was one of the most enlightened pieces of legislation enacted by Congress in the wake of any military effort in which the Nation has been engaged.

Educators in all parts of the country, in almost every type of institution, speak highly of the GI program. Dean Fred W. Ajax, coordinator of veterans' affairs at Georgia Institute of Technology, says, "The veterans' program was worth every cent spent by the Government, both to the individual veteran and to the country. Federal aid to higher education in peacetime is more than justified by the results of the federally sponsored GI bill.

UNDER HANDICAPS

Not only were the GI's ambitious and eager to complete their courses, but many worked under tremendous handicaps. Some 600,000 disabled veterans received vocational rehabilitation, some of them in colleges. A striking example is the Tulane University veteran who had lost both hands and one eye but completed an architecture course with an outstanding record.

Many institutions created veterans' divisions. Brown University set up a separate college for ex-servicemen in the fall of 1946 for men whose academic background was not up to those of the regular students. All, however, who had the equivalent of a high school education had been told by Uncle Sam that they could go to college. College gave them this chance to show that acquired maturity and greater incentive to learn could offset any deficiencies of previous training.

They took the same course under the same faculty and with the same grading system as the students of the regular college. The only differences were that their classes and laboratories were held in the late afternoon and evening (thus utilizing the Brown plan during off-hour periods) and they did not participate in any extracurricular activities. They made good. Most of them were able to transfer successfully to the college proper.

Although in the main the GI program did an excellent job, in its early years some unscrupulous promoters made financial killings. They organized phony trade schools or other institutes to get a share of the free tuition funds. Some GI's in these schools, spent Government money on ballroom dancing, toying with photography or taking up horseback riding. The Government cracked down in 1948, when the Veterans' Administration tightened up its requirements.

Now the Korean veterans, 350,000 strong, are on the Nation's campuses and in the classrooms—not a large number, in comparison with their predecessors. But they are being made welcome by educators impressed with the success of the World War II veterans.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1956]

GI EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM ENDS

(By Jean White)

The world's largest veterans' training program—the educational GI bill of rights—closes out today but not without leaving its imprint on American life and education.

In its 12 years of existence, the GI bill gave more than 7,800,000 World War II veterans the chance to continue their schooling or learn new skills.

The GI bill training program has cost $14.5 billion. This investment, the Veterans Administration emphasized yesterday, is now paying dividends to the Nation from improved education and skills of its citizenry.

With the end of the educational provisions of the GI bill today, only a small handful of World War II veterans will continue their studies under Government grants. These enlisted in 1945 and 1946 under the Voluntary Recruitment Act.

KOREAN BILL IN EFFECT

But the veteran will not disappear from college campuses and training schools. Under the Korean GI bill, now in its 4th year, some 750,000 former GI's are expected to go to school this fall.

World War II was at its bitterest in Europe and the Pacific when President Roosevelt signed the GI bill into law on June 22, 1944.

Not all educators and college administrators welcomed the vast Government-financed educational venture. Some warned against all sorts of dire effects on education: rowdy

veterans overrunning colleges; millions loafing on Government expense; college standards and traditions overturned.

It took only a short time for the returning veteran-student to dispel these fears. On the whole, he was mature, serious, intense, determined to reach a job goal as quick as possible.

STANDARDS "VERY HIGH"

"The standards of performance of GI students were very high," a local college official said yesterday. "I hope students in the future can achieve as fine records as the returning servicement did."

He is O. S. Colcough, dean of the faculties at George Washington University. At the peak of GI enrollment, George Washington had 7,000 veterans on its student rolls at times.

Educational and training institutions in the Washington area had a big stake in the GI bill. Some 123,616 World War II veterans received training here.

Of the total, 54,193 went to institutions of higher learning, 46,820 attended trade and high schools, 13,946 took on-the-job or apprenticeship training, 8,158 enrolled for correspondence courses, and 499 received on-the-farm training.

Under Public Law 16—which also ends today except for special hardship cases—6,672 disabled veterans were helped to become self-reliant here. Of these, 2,750 went to institutions of higher learning.

One of every two of World War II's 15½ million veterans took some advantage of the educational provisions of the GI bill.

Of the more than 7,800,000 qualifying for tuition and monthly subsistence payments, 2,200,000 went to college. Another 3,500,000 attended schools below college level. On-the-job or on-the-farm training attracted 2,100,000 more.

A recent survey showed that the median income of veterans has gone up 51 percent over the last 6 years. This compares with a 19-percent rise for nonveteran males in the same age group.

TO OUR GI'S WITH THANKS

(By Martin L. Gross)

When 39-year-old ex-mess sergeant Joseph Cazulo-Alvarez, of Levittown, Long Island, received his bachelor's degree at the June commencement at nearby Adelphi College, he symbolized the end of what has been called "one of the noblest experiments in American history."

Of 350 graduates, Joe was the only GI of World War II still studying under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, more affectionately known to 15,600,000 veterans as the GI Bill of Rights. A few weeks later, on July 25, 1956, the famed educational program that brought the trench coat and baby carriage to America's colleges and vocational schools came to an end.

Joe Cazulo-Alvarez, the last ex-dogface at Adelphi, had been a staff sergeant in the Middle East until his discharge in 1946. For 5 years he worked as a chef at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, taking evening courses during 2 of the years. Then he decided to get a college education by studying full time. For this, the Government, according to the GI law, paid Joe's tuition and gave him $105 a month subsistence to help support his wife and pay the GI mortgage on his ranchhouse until he received his degree in dietetics and nutrition.

"I could never have done it without the GI bill," Joe says appreciatively.

Since the GI's bill's inception in 1944, almost every World War II ex-serviceman has used at least one of its many benefits. Over 7,800,000, or 51 percent, trained in schools, on the farm and on-the-job for every civilian occupation from nuclear physics to shoemaking. The bill turned out 440,000 engineers, 63,000 doctors, 23,000 nurses, 113,000 scientists, 237,000 teachers, 42,000 machinists, 36,000 ministers—all in drastically short supply in postwar America.

More than 4,500,000 vets bought homes under the small downpayment GI mortgages; 9 million collected unemployment benefits from the 52–20 club which terminated in 1949; some 300,000 received GI business and farm loans to develop everything from cattle ranches in Florida to two kiddie shops in Washington, D. C., opened by two ex-WAC's.

For all this, Uncle Sam's tab was some $19 billion. Has it been worth all that money? Has it really done the veterans and America any good?

After the Civil War, returning Union soldiers were given $100. Spanish-American War veterans, at first, got only a hopeful pat from Teddy Roosevelt. In 1932, disgruntled World War I servicemen made their bonus march on Washington only to be dispersed by the United States Army. Veterans, it seemed, were inexorably doomed to be the "lost" generation of the society they fought to protect.

Then on June 22, 1944, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the bulky Servicemen's Readjustment Act, Public Law 346, 78th Congress, with the comment: "[This] gives emphatic notice to the men and women of our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

Today, 12 years later, the record indicates that the GI bill has been a miraculously successful social experiment without precedent—with a resounding impact on the country's very way of life. At a cost of $1,800 per veteran, it has been a veritable banker, friend, counselor, cosigner and both rich and Dutch uncle to him. It has not only helped restore him to a position he might have had without the war, but as from all evidence made Mr. Ex-GI (average age 36½) the educational, financial, and professional leader of America.

He earns almost $600 a year more than the nonveteran ($3,631 against $3,065) according to last compiled figures in 1953, with probably a broader spread today. He is a college man (freshman) compared to the 10th grade education of the nonveteran. Courtesy of GI mortgages, the chances are better than average that he owns his own home; and he has unusually high representation in the skilled fields.

"The GI bill might seem expensive. The training program alone cost $14,500 million," a Veterans' Administration spokesman explains. "But just the extra income tax that vets who trained now pay Uncle Sam comes to over $1 billion a year. By 1968, they'll have paid the program off in full."

The first rumors of free schooling for vets were tossed off as latrine hearsay by GI's from New Guinea to Sicily. But 2 weeks after D-day, the legislation was passed unanimously and duly nicknamed "The GI bill of rights." The education provision guaranteed full tuition up to $500 a year plus textbooks and monthly subsistence that eventually became $75 a month for single students, $105 for married men and women, and $120 with a child.

Though the VA itself predicted that only 7 percent would take training, over 2,200,000 vets went to college on the GI bill. In 1948, for instance, 74 percent of all men students and 10 percent of the women at Columbia University were veterans. Two of every five were married.

Overnight, the American campus was transformed. Smith took in its first man in 70 years. Freshman skull caps disappeared. Hell Week at Cornell became Help Week. Well-traveled mature veterans needled harassed professors into reevaluating lectures they had delivered unchanged for 20 years.

The new student body was an eager, poor, hard-working group anxious to make up for lost time.

Now, with all the records in, Dean of Admissions Elwood C. Kastner, of New York University, which trained more GI's (75,000) than any other college, says, "The World War II GI's were among the best and keenest students we ever had. They caused colleges to expand and because of it the schools are now better able to meet the large enrollments. What we learned from them has increased the efficiency of educational techniques in our colleges."

Probably 48 percent of the GI students couldn't have gone to college without the bill. And of them, 2 out of 3 were gifted students.

Floyd T. Gould came home after 3 years overseas with no idea of what he wanted to do. He took a menial job in a laundry, then switched to selling soap. He tried, then quit, a typing course on the GI bill.

By 1948, disgusted, he went to the VA for free vocational counseling, a service 1,500,000 vets have used. When the tests showed he had an outstanding IQ and a natural tendency for sciences, he was enrolled in college as a GI physics student.

Now, 8 years later, exlaundryman Floyd Gould has 3 degrees, including a doctor of philosophy degree, and is an atomic physicist at the AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratory.

The vets proved to be a levelheaded group: 300,000 went back and finished grade and high school, and 3 million more studied trades including auto mechanics, upholstery, electronics, commercial art, etc.

Veteran Pat Anthony learned to be a lion tamer on the GI bill. The VA raised a bureaucratic eyebrow but finally approved his application to study the "trade" at Lewis Groebel's wild animal farm in California. Anthony's 10-lion act, valued at over $30,000, is now headlined by major circuses.

Actor Rod Steiger, famed for his TV role of Marty and Jud in the film Oklahoma, learned his craft as a GI student. Rod had only 1 year of high school before he went into service. He fought as a combat torpedoman in the Navy, and after the war got a civil-service clerk's job in Newark, N. J. Evenings, he did some amateur acting in the employee's dramatic group.

"Rod, you ought to study fulltime," the director told him one day. "You've got talent."

"On what?" Rod asked, and the director reminded him that the GI bill covered theatrical schools.

Stieger studied at the American Theatre Wing and the Actors' Studio, Inc., for 4 years before launching his successful career. Today he's one of the bill's most enthusiastic rooters.

"Without it," he says, "I'd probably still be a clerk in Newark."

The GI bill has no greater enthusiast than the ex-GI who lives in suburban comfort with his wife and 2 children in a $13,000 6-room ranch house—courtesy of the home-loan provision of the bill. Veterans—including a great many who couldn't otherwise afford it—have bought over 4,500,000 GI bill homes (24 percent of the homes built in the country), making them our largest home-owning group.

The GI bill has been bread and butter to the home-building industry, now the second largest in America, and to allied industries such as banking and building materials. In fact, 1 of every 6 people is gainfully employed either directly or indirectly by the home-building business.

A little riskier, but just as rewarding, has been the GI business and farm-loan program under which the Government guarantees 50 percent of a GI's bank loan up to $4,000. So far, Uncle Sam has backed 295,000 vets, an average of $3,000 each. Seven out of ten have been repaid in full to date, and only 1⅓ percent of the money has defaulted.

The life of the GI bill of rights has not been idyllic by any means. The 52–20 Club,

for example, came under attack as an invitation for veterans to loaf. Actually, the average ex-GI used less than one-fifth of his $20-a-week benefits. The majority did look for, and find, work.

The material benefits of the GI bill of rights to World War II veterans have been legion—education, jobs, businesses, farms, homes—but, greatest of all, it has given added self-respect and faith in America to an entire generation.

[From newscast by Eric Sevareid of July 23, 1956]

Good evening. This week an unprecedented social experiment comes to its official end after 12 extraordinary years. The GI bill of rights expires on Wednesday. Its balance sheet today makes one think back to impressions and forecasts of years ago and reflect on the unpredictability of the American person, upon how wrong one can be in attempting to plot his future course of behavior.

I can remember discussions with serious-minded American officers and soldiers during the war, in the Far East, in Europe, in Africa; men trying to guess what would happen to those millions of GI's about us, in their sloppy uniforms, what would happen when they were suddenly released back into the established order of peacetime society. Many were full of forebodings. Here were raw young men, their minds half formed, taught at one and the same time to accept the semislaver yof the military discipline, and the ultimate license, the right to kill. They would go back to orderly society, many thought, contemptuous of all restraint upon them, or, on the other extreme, bereft of personal initiative, expecting their lives to continue to be arranged by somebody else.

In particular, so many then thought, further education would be lost to these men; they would not accept disciplines again for years to come, self-disciplines least of all. Many would be too old, past the formative years that are best for awakening the mind to the world of ideas; they could turn out to be, in moral and intellectual growth, a lost generation.

I can remember, soon after the war, visiting my own university, seeing the strange, most uncollegiate trailers on the campus that housed the swarming thousands of GI students, their wives and children. The whole atmosphere of the place was changed; I asked a former philosophy professor of mine if the old academic spirit was being destroyed, if standards had been weakened and diluted to accommodate this mass. He said, "I was sure at the beginning all that would happen; but I was completely wrong. These are the best, most serious students we ever had; our standards have been tightened, not loosened."

And this was the general experience of most American colleges. It was a giant headache to the managers of the physical plant, but an astonishment, pleasure, and inspiration to those managing the minds of the young who wanted to understand the confusing world whose four corners they had lately been cast upon and told to save. Something unforeseen had happened to millions of green GI's. They had sounded, in Asia and Africa and Europe as if the whole world outside their own home town, bored them to tears, as if, once home, they would shut the rest of the world and its problems out of their minds forever. Many sounded bitter about their enforced role, as if they would expect the country to take care of them the rest of their lives.

The reverse occurred. The GI Bill of Rights tapped and revealed resources of personal independence and resolve that few had suspected. Nearly two and a quarter million veterans took advantage of the bill to go to college; in all some eight million took on some form of advanced training they had not had. There was some boondoggling, by both veterans and phoney, fly-by-night institution, but for the most part it was very serious business. The self-discipline of study was hard, at first, but surprisingly few gave up. College standards, courses, and instructions, were improved, not worsened by their presence.

And the American society is much better off by reason of this extraordinary experiment and demonstration. By the New York Times accounting the GI program has produced nearly a quarter million teachers, nearly a half million engineers, over a hundred thousand scientists, nearly two hundred thousand doctors and nurses and some thirty-six thousand ministers.

It is a record that all those currently uneasy about Federal aid to education might, very seriously, consider.

This is Eric Sevareid in Washington.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS IN WYOMING TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 3467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Shoshone Indan Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation are authorized to convey to the United States the tribes' interests in the 388.23 acres of land that are described in section 2 of the act, subject to a reservation to the tribes of all minerals, including oil and gas, and mineral rights, which may be exercised only in a manner that does not interfere with the construction and operation of the dam site and reservoir of Anchor Dam, a part of the Owl Creek unit, Missouri River Basin project in Hot Springs County, near Thermopolis, Wyo. The conveyance shall be for a price that is mutually agreeable to the tribes and to the Secretary of the Interior, based upon the fair market value of the land. The consideration payable to the tribes pursuant to this act shall be paid out of funds appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit and for the use of the respective tribes in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), as amended by the act of August 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 208).

SEC. 2. The lands that are referred to in section 1 of this act are: Lots 1 and 2, section 13, northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter, section 24, township 8 north, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, Wyoming, containing 388.23 acres.

SEC. 3. In the event of the failure or abandonment of the Anchor Dam feature of the Owl Creek unit the interest in the land acquired pursuant to this act shall be reconveyed by the Secretary of the Interior to the tribes and the title shall be held in the same manner it was held before such acquisition: *Provided*, That the purchase price paid by the United States shall be returned by the tribes.

SEC. 4. The portion of the construction costs of the Owl Creek unit that is allocable to the irrigable lands of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation shall be a lien against such lands, but the assessment and collection of such costs shall be deferred in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). The irrigable lands of the tribes shall be entitled to their pro rata share of the water storage and regulation benefits accruing from the construction and operation of the Owl Creek unit upon payment by the tribes, under appropriate contract, of their pro rata share of the annual operation and maintenance costs of the Owl Creek unit.

SEC. 5. The members of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes shall be permitted to fish on the lake created by Anchor Dam, without a license, as if the lake were within the exterior boundaries of the Wind River Reservation, but the Indians shall be subject to all other provisions of applicable conservation laws and regulations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. BARRETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON H. R. 9424

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit a favorable report on H. R. 9424.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have been requested by a Member who is out of the Chamber at the moment, to object to the report being filed. Therefore, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

TEN-YEAR REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to file a 10-year report of the Joint Committee to the Congress during the adjournment of Congress. The basic Atomic Energy Act was approved and became effective on August 1, 1946. A report covering the major accomplishments of the Atomic Energy Commission and the activities of the Joint Committee during the past 10 years is in preparation and is expected to be ready for publication in August. It is the desire of the Joint Committee to have this report reflect all the legislative actions of this Congress on atomic energy matters.

We hope that this report will be submitted to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as well as to Representatives COLE and DURHAM, and myself, before it is released.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. TALLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FALLON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MCGREGOR, and Mr. MACK of Washington were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 37, and 86 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchised automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises; or in terminating or not renewing franchises with the dealers;

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives.

FISH HATCHERY IN VICINITY OF PAINT BANK, VA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11548) to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct and operate a fish hatchery near Paint Bank, Va. The increasing pressure on sport fishing facilities throughout the United States emphasizes the necessity for additional hatchery facilities in many parts of the United States. Fish and Wildlife Service has determined that there is a need for a new hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, and has determined upon a suitable site.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment; if there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISCRIMINATION BY FOREIGN NATIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES CITIZENS BECAUSE OF INDIVIDUAL RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2844, Senate Resolution 323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 323) opposing distinction by foreign nations against United States citizens because of individual religious affiliations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wishes to make an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been asked, on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, to make a brief explanation of Senate Resolution 323.

The resolution in its present form is a committee revision of a longer resolution submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Members of the Foreign Relations Committee heard the Senator from New York on his resolution. We heard representatives of the State Department, and we heard representatives of the Defense Establishment in respect to the Lehman resolution, and we reached the conclusion that the resolution which we are submitting as a committee resolution is a very fitting resolution, and one which we think will accomplish at least the primary objective of the original Lehman resolution while at the same time avoiding any question as to whether or not we will be transgressing upon the rights of the executive branch of the Government.

Briefly, what the resolution does is to express, in the preamble, certain basic American principles which I do not think anyone can question, namely, that the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of United States sovereignty; and that it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles.

It is the sense of the Foreign Relations Committee that such a resolution would be of assistance to the State Department and the Defense Establishment in connection not only with pending negotiations, but future negotiations, for the principles of the pending resolution might in some way be encroached upon if we did not stand firm.

I submit the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senate may well congratulate itself for having approved the resolution reported from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reaffirming the traditional attitude of the United States Government toward discriminations practiced by any country among United States citizens on the basis of their religious faith.

I submitted Senate resolution 298, which formed the basis of the Foreign Relations Committee's action. I am glad that the Foreign Relations Committee saw fit to accept the language I used in my proposal, although the committee also saw fit to abbreviate some of it and to eliminate some of it.

It is not quite so strong a resolution as the one I originally introduced, but it clearly states the sense of the Senate in regard to the central aspects of this critical matter. The action of the Senate will be hailed by millions of people throughout our country and will be heard with respectful regard by millions beyond our borders as a redefinition of a principle which we have long supported as a Nation and which we have professed to support as a universal concept.

This is not a moment for assessment of blame nor for pointing a finger of responsibility at anyone. It is, however, a moment for revalidating the great American tradition—the tradition of the integrity of American citizenship.

Mr. President, I was glad, indeed, to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and justify at great length my advocacy of Senate Joint Resolution 298. I was proud to be associated in support of this resolution with 24 other Members of the Senate who cosponsored it with me. They have performed a public service in standing with me for this fundamental principle.

The Foreign Relations Committee and its distinguished chairman are to be congratulated for having given this matter the serious consideration that it did. Each member of the committee is to be congratulated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a prepared statement which I presented to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in support of this proposal. I believe it contains adequate justification for the action the Senate has just taken, and that it may serve to supplement the language of the resolution itself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION MONDAY, JULY 23, 1956

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee in executive session and to justify the pending resolution, S. 298.

As the members of this committee undoubtedly know, this resolution already has broad support in the Senate. It is cosponsored by 24 Senators in addition to myself. I would like to read their names—Senators DOUGLAS, LANGER, PAYNE, MURRAY, MORSE, BUSH, IVES, JACKSON, NEELY, PASTORE, DUFF, KUCHEL, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, CHAVEZ, PURTELL, BENDER, O'MAHONEY, BEALL, KEFAUVER, MCNAMARA, and MONRONEY. You will note that three members of this committee, Senators LANGER, HUMPHREY, and MORSE, are among the sponsors of this proposal.

I am aware that the representatives of the State Department are also present and are also to be heard at this session. I am aware, too, that the State Department has expressed its opposition to this proposal.

I wish to assure this committee and the State Department that this resolution is not intended as an affront to the Department or to the administration. It is not designed to make more difficult, in any way, the work of our Government in maintaining friendly relations with other countries in the world or advancing the security interests of the United States.

Indeed this resolution is proposed as a means of assisting our Government in its conduct of foreign affairs by making it clear that any representations on the points covered in this resolution made by the State Department in the past—and we are assured that such representations have been repeatedly made—are supported by the Senate of the United States.

But however this resolution strikes the State Department, and I would hope, as I have indicated, that the State Department would be unofficially pleased at the passage of this resolution, it, this resolution, surely does express the sentiment of the American people and the traditions of the United States. As such I cannot see how there can be any objection to the action taken by the Senate in expressing itself on the points contained in this resolution.

This resolution reaffirms the traditional policy of the United States. It does no more; it dares do no less.

I assure the members of this committee that no political motivations are reflected in this resolution. Since the introduction of this resolution I have been told that some of the practices concerning which I complained in a speech which accompanied the introduction of this resolution, the discrimination against Americans on the basis of their religious faith by Saudi Arabia and other countries, date back to a time before the present administration took office. I have been told that the base agreement with Saudi Arabia, which is one of the principal items of contention, was entered into by the Truman administration before the present administration took office.

Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned over when these practices started or which administration was responsible for them. I am not even interested in assessing the blame. I am interested only in the present and the future. I am interested in having the United States affirm now, before the eyes of the world, the traditional American concept of American citizenship and our traditional repugnance to any efforts made by any country to discriminate among American citizens on the basis of their religious faith.

Whatever the interests involved, whatever the stakes at issue, I cannot see how we can make any compromise with the fundamental principle of the integrity of American citizenship.

I believe that if we reaffirm this principle and reaffirm our opposition to discrimination against any American citizen on the basis of religious affiliation, we will gain a higher measure of respect from all the countries of the world, including even those which have been practicing the discriminations complained of.

For the United States Government to acquiesce in any way, under any condition, or for any consideration, to distinctions being made by foreign countries among our citizens, is to my mind intolerable, and it is inconsistent with our American traditions.

I am confident that the entire membership of the Senate, if given an opportunity, would express itself in similar fashion. This attitude is surely, I believe, the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

The current situation demands the passage of this resolution. The honor of the United States is at stake. We can do no less than express, as the sense of the Senate, that any governments which discriminate among United States citizens on the basis solely of their religion are acting in a manner abhorrent to our sense of morality. We can not permit, without protest, actions by foreign nations designed to make second-class citizens of some of our fellow Americans on the basis of their religious faith.

For a government to seek to make—and to succeed in making—our Government bow to its prejudices is indeeed a sorry sight.

We did not bow to the Barbary pirates in the 18th and early 19th century—why should we do it now for Saudi Arabia?

We did not bow to Austria in 1885—should we do it now for Saudi Arabia?

We did not bow to the Czar of Russia in 1911—should we do it now for Saudi Arabia?

I understand that it is maintained by those who would oppose this resolution that it would affront the Government of Saudi Arabia and that to do so would endanger our base rights in Saudi Arabia and the access which the free world has to Saudi Arabian oil.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Government of Saudi Arabia will sacrifice the very real considerations which led it in the first place to grant us the base rights merely because we insist on securing respect for our traditional concept of American citizenship. Saudi Arabia had its own reasons for granting us airbase rights at Daharan. I do not believe that Saudi Arabia will sacrifice its own security and other interests in order to insist upon its prejudices, or, as Secretary Dulles is supposed to have described them before this committee, its idiosyncrasies.

I do not think that Saudi Arabia, in order to indulge its prejudices, would destroy its profitable trade in oil with the free world. The Saudi Arabian oil leases and contracts, including the royalty arrangements, are, I assume, as advantageous to Saudi Arabia as to the free world.

I believe that the arrangements with Saudi Arabia are a two-way street. I believe that we should walk up our side of the street, head high, without acting as if we had cheated Saudi Arabia in the first place and hence must humbly accept any indignity which the Government of Saudi Arabia sees fit to visit upon us and some of our citizens.

Why do we want these bases—why do we want this oil? Is it not because we want to protect and defend our American way of life? And how can that way of life be protected and safeguarded if we barter away our rights and freedoms for an airstrip?

What is the situation that calls forth this resolution? The facts are simple.

First, the Saudi Arabian Government has made it a practice to refuse both entry and transit privileges to any United States citizen of Jewish faith or of Jewish descent.

Second, the Saudi Arabian Government has decreed and enforced a boycott against American firms and corporations in which persons of Jewish faith have an interest. This invidious practice is being carried on right here, on our own soil, by accredited diplomatic representatives of the Saudi Arabian Government.

And, third—and most insupportable of all—the Saudi Arabian Government, having granted to the United States the right to construct an airbase in Saudi Arabia, presumes to tell us that we must not station on this base or allow to land on this base any American soldier or other individual who is of Jewish faith or descent.

Permit me to underscore the significance of this last item. This is the Government of the United States acting to discriminate against its own citizens on the basis of their religious faith. It is the Government of the United States itself which is deciding whether an individual can serve its interests at the airbase, not on the basis of the qualifications of the individual—not on the basis of whether his or her skills are needed in our defense, and, if you please, in defense of Saudi Arabia itself, but on the basis of the individual's religious beliefs.

This situation must be corrected. It cannot, it must not, be permitted to continue.

That is the reason for my resolution. That is the reason why I have been joined by almost 30 of my distinguished colleagues in requesting this declaration of the sense of the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I want to correct one further area of misunderstanding about this situation in its relation to this resolution. It is maintained by those who would pigeonhole this resolution that a foreign country or any country has a right to admit whatever individuals it sees fit into its territory.

We ourselves exercise the right to deny certain individuals entrance into our country. We exercise it perhaps too arbitrarily. I wish to concede, before it is brought up, that the McCarran-Walter Act does discriminate against immigrants into this country on the basis of their national origin. This is an unfortunate truth.

But, Mr. Chairman, this has absolutely nothing to do with the pending question and there is no analogy involved.

Discriminations in our immigration law, on the basis of national origin, are directed only against those who seek to emigrate into this country as permanent residents. We do not discriminate on the basis of national origin, or on any other similar basis, among those who seek to enter the United States as visitors, or as businessmen, and surely not when they come here on the official business of their Government.

Any government has a fundamental right to exclude particular individuals on particular grounds. But this is not a matter of excluding individuals. This is a matter of excluding a whole class of American citizens on the sole ground of their religious faith—and not only exclude them from the

country, but exclude them from access to an American facility within that country.

Those who are designated as diplomats may be refused accreditation by a foreign government on the basis of being persona non grata. But we have never conceded that even our diplomats can be refused accreditation on the basis of religious belief. Indeed, on one historic occasion we denied to the Austrian Government the right to refuse accreditation to one diplomat on the basis of the religious faith of his wife.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a question of discrimination, it is a question of discrimination on the basis of religious belief—discrimination against American citizens on the basis of their religious faith. This we have never tolerated in the past, and we should not tolerate it now.

The resolution before you does not undertake to direct foreign policy. That is the business of the President.

This resolution merely expresses the sentiment of the Senate concerning discriminations against American citizens. That is the concern of the Congress and of the Senate. In the face of overt and persistent violation of our principles and traditions, this is not a matter to be left to the discretion of the State Department.

Now what would the proposed resolution do?

In the first place, it would call upon the President of the United States to proclaim to all nations that the Government of the United States tolerates no distinction based on religious faith among its own citizens, just as it makes none among the citizens and subjects of any other country, and that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations.

This is but a simple declaration of faith. It expresses what we all believe in. It pronounces no new doctrine—it merely reaffirms the traditional guidelines by which we in the United States have built this country into the great Nation which it has become.

Secondly, this resolution would state it as the sense of the Senate that no agency of the United States shall refrain from assigning any otherwise qualified American citizen to military, diplomatic, or other services within any foreign country solely because of that country's objection on grounds of religious affiliation to any American or class of American.

This, too, is but a simple declaration of faith. It reaffirms a standard of conduct for our Government which is contained in the Constitution itself, which states in article VI that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

And a religious test is exactly what the Air Force is imposing when it screens out personnel of the Jewish faith and refuses to assign them to a particular airbase solely because of their faith. Our military services should use a man's skills, knowledge and abilities as they are needed in the defense of our country without discriminations based on race, creed, color or religious faith. That our Air Force should ever have done so is deeply to be regretted. That it should continue to do so is intolerable.

The third portion of the proposed resolution would express it as the sense of the Senate that "every treaty, convention, or executive agreement entered into or renewed between any foreign state and the United States should expressly provide that no United States citizens shall, solely because of religious affiliation or derivation, be denied the advantages of travel, employment or trade or any other benefit made possible by such treaty, convention or agreement."

This, too, is but a simple declaration of faith. It puts into concrete terms what is set forth in the preceding two sections of the operative portion of the proposed resolution. While it comes about because of the Saudi Arabian situation, the application of this principle should be universally applicable. Such discriminations written into a treaty should never be sanctioned or tolerated by this Government. And I believe the Senate of the United States should so state in forthright and unequivocal language. That is what this proposed resolution asks the Senate to do.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask permission at this point to insert into the RECORD the text of the resolution in question, Senate Resolution 298.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a cardinal function of United States sovereignty; and

Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our laws and intolerable to our principles—an attitude which our Government has historically and successfully maintained in our relations with foreign countries on several notable occasions; and

Whereas recently certain United States servicemen, solely because of their religious faith, affiliation, or even derivation, have been denied assignments to certain United States military bases abroad and these and other United States citizens have been refused entry and travel visas by the governments of certain foreign countries, which governments have also directed and organized a trade and economic boycott against American citizens and classes of American citizens based solely on the religious faith, affiliation, or religious derivation of such citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that (a) the President of the United States should proclaim to all nations that the Government of the United States tolerates no distinction based on religious faith among its own citizens just as it makes none among the citizens and subjects of any other country and that it regards any such distinctions directed against United States citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations; and (b) no agency of the United States shall refrain from assigning any otherwise qualified American citizen to military, diplomatic, or other service within any foreign country solely because of that country's objection on grounds of religious affiliation to any American or class of Americans; and (c) every treaty, convention, or executive agreement entered into or renewed between any foreign state and the United States should expressly provide that no United States citizen shall, solely because of religious affiliation or derivation, be denied the advantages of travel, employment, or trade or any other benefit made possible by such treaty, convention, or agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the original Lehman resolution, I think the Senator from New York is deserving of high commendation for the statesmanship he has demonstrated again, as he has done so many times during his service in the Senate, in calling the attention of the Senate to the very important human rights and sovereignty problem he raised in his original resolution.

He is quite right in the remarks he has made, that the adoption of the resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations and its recommendation of the resolution to the Senate, and now its adoption by the Senate, will be taken note of around the world. It will demonstrate once again—and it is time we made it clear—that a basic idea of America, not only in foreign relations, but in domestic policy, is that there can be no question raised as to the rights of our citizens based upon religious faith.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wish to say there has been no legislation with which I have been connected since I have been a Member of the Senate which I consider to be more important than this resolution, and I am happy that the Senate has agreed to it today.

I believe the resolution affects every man, woman, and child in the United States, because it again defines the integrity and the importance of American citizenship, and the determination of those in high position to make certain that that integrity shall be safeguarded; that equal justice shall be done to everyone; and that no one shall suffer discrimination because of his religious faith.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I desire to express my full agreement with the remarks made in support of the resolution by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and by my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE]. It is well to emphasize that when a citizen of our country leaves its shores, he does not leave the Bill of Rights behind him.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very happy to return to the floor at this time when the resolution is being discussed. I thoroughly agree with the expressions which have been made as to its importance. I have long felt that the Government of the United States must again and again reassert its basic sovereignty in terms of protection of the rights of our citizens. The minute a nation forgets that fact, it starts to lose respect throughout the world. The resolution, which was originally offered by the distinguished Senator from New York, and the new resolution reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, constitute declarations not only of intent, but also of the fundamental purposes and principles of the American Republic.

We are deeply indebted to the Senator from New York for his leadership in this matter. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the other members of that fine committee who have expressed themselves on this matter are to be commended for the expeditious manner in which the resolution was handled.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for his remarks and also for his great assistance in the consideration and formulation of the resolution. The members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and, in fact, every Member of the Senate, is to

be congratulated on the adoption of the resolution. It again defines a doctrine and a tradition and a policy on which the United States was founded, and as a result of which the country has grown great over the 180 years of its existence.

I am very happy that the resolution has been agreed to. I not only wish to express my appreciation for that action but, what is more important, I wish to congratulate every Member of the Senate and the entire country on the adoption of the resolution.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2627, S. 3914.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3914) to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment.

CELEBRATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 546.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 546) to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 546. It is necessary that the joint resolution be passed if the funds which have been appropriated to the Alexander Hamilton Commission are to be properly expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONNEL EMPLOYED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 695) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress, was read twice by its title.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 695.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ALIBERTA BERNARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2916) for the relief of Mrs. Aliberta Bernard, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Aliberta Bernard, Natalia Kozlov Kavazov Kolubaev (Koljubajer, Kolubajev), Henry Lappeman, Christa Walther, and Pietro Trupia may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Riva Kagan and Jan Hovorka may, if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chiyoko Tominaga Beckmann and Antonietta Aurora Mattera Berg may be isued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Saveria Velona Gangemi and Joaquin Flores-Munoz may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Jocher Webb may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Odette R. Andrei, Aleftina Goddard, Sophia Kwang Huang, and Ingrid W. A. S. Tangarone may, if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yi Nyong Suk, the fiancee of Lt. James F. Brown, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yi Nyong Suk is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Lt. James F. Brown and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yi Nyong Suk, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yi Nyong Suk, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yi Nyong Suk as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joan F. Roby, Lina Gertrude Yakumeit Mattingly, and Berta Cabrera Vigil Frohlich may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 9. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 2, 1956, the Senate passed S. 2916, to waive a ground for exclusion in behalf of the beneficiary. On July 26, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 2916 to include the beneficiaries of 13 similar individual Senate bills and 2 similar individual House bills. One of the bills included in S. 2916, as amended, passed the Senate to include as beneficiaries the three minor children of the adult beneficiary. It has subsequently been determined that relief is not necessary for the minor beneficiaries, and their names were, therefore, deleted by the House of Representatives.

S. 2916 was also amended to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to those afflicted with tuberculosis in behalf of four persons. Three of these cases were recommended by the Department of State for the relief provided for in the bill, and the remaining case was recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 2916.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the 2 Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be rejected; that the Senate further insist on its amendments in disagreement, request a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS FOR FURNISHING WATER TO RAPID CITY, S. DAK.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3468.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3468) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts for furnishing water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "notwithstanding", to strike out "section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended (43 U. S. C. 485h (c)), or section 9 of the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590Z–7), or"; in line 8, after "14–06–", to strike out "M" and insert "W"; and on page 2, line 6, after the word "contracts", to insert "The priority authorized in this act shall be limited to revenue bonds the face value of which does not exceed $2,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I will state to the Senate that this is a Senate bill which has been approved by the chairman and other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The sponsor of the bill, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], is on the floor, and I am sure he would like to make a statement in connection with the measure at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this is a small bill which would give the Secretary of the Interior authority to amend contracts with reference to repayment for water to be taken from the reservoir at Rapid City, S. Dak., and to issue revenue bonds, to extend some mains, and to sell the water. The report by the Secretary of the Interior asks that a limitation be placed upon the amount of bonds which may be issued, and the amendment to the bill includes the placing of a ceiling on the amount of bonds which can be issued.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill, but I take it from the Senator's explanation that there is no question in this about the Federal Government not being compensated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am chairman, I ask unanimous consent to file with the Secretary of the Senate, after the adjournment, the following reports which will inform the Senate as to the results of various studies conducted by the Select Committee on Small Business during the past few months of this session of the Congress:

First. A Study on Fair Trade.

Second. Problems of Independent Motion Picture Exhibitors.

Third. Small-Business Participation in Government Procurement—1956.

Fourth. Supply and Distribution of Nickel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PATENT TERM RESTORATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield in order that I may ask him a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. My question is in connection with House bill 2128, a bill to provide patent term restoration. It is a bill to authorize the extension of patents. The bill passed the House without amendment and it has been on the Senate Calendar since July 20. I am hoping that we may be privileged to consider the bill and take action on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No one is more hopeful than is the Senator from Texas that we can get the bill through. There is considerable opposition to it from various Members who feel that veterans are being used in connection with the bill to benefit a number of corporations and persons who are contractors with the Government. I have attempted to resolve those differences. There have been many differences which have appeared in the past few days of the session which have not been resolved, and this is one of them. I shall continue to do my best to bring about some kind of a solution of the problem.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have consulted with members of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle, and I believe I have succeeded in removing most of the objections. I know it is utterly futile for me to try to get the bill to a vote at this time if there are objections made to it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the body of the RECORD my statement explaining the bill. I hope then, Mr. President, that it can be looked over between now and tomorrow and that possibly the generosity of the leaders on both sides of the aisle and those who may object to the measure may bring about a change of heart and that we may have favorable action on the bill tomorrow.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

H. R. 2128, A BILL TO PROVIDE PATENT TERM RESTORATION

I speak in behalf of the enactment of H. R. 2128, a bill providing for the extension of patents, the normal use or development of which was prevented or substantially curtailed by reason of: (a) the service of the owner or his spouse in the Armed Forces of the United States; or (2) Government stop orders; or (3) such owners having granted royalty free or nominal royalty licenses to the United States or to manufacturers furnishing goods to the United States, in order to promote the national defense program.

The presence of this legislation before you today arose from a recognition of the need for a bill of general applicability which will provide a remedy of relief where frustration of the patent contract was brought about by

acts of the United States or any of its agencies.

Passage by the House of Representatives and favorable recommendation by your Committee on the Judiciary is a demonstration of the determination of the Members of the Congress to redeem the merited reputation that our Government holds for discharging whatever obligations it assumes.

To fully appreciate the fundamental issues of the problem, it is essential that we contemplate the significant words of our Constitution by which Congress is directed and granted the power, "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries." Basically the question posed by this bill is whether or not the Congress, pursuant to this purposeful grant of power in the Constitution, already has passed legislation under which the Government has fully discharged the obligations it assumed by the issuance of patents to inventors.

From the testimony presented to your committee in hearings on this bill, I believe the conclusion is inescapable that the Government is at least morally bound to grant extension of the terms of patents under the conditions specified in this bill as it now stands.

Essentially, the rights granted to an inventor by the issuance of a patent under our laws are analogous to those which arise out of a simple contract. In exchange for the public disclosure and dedication of an invention, the Government of the United States solemnly undertakes to secure to the inventor the exclusive rights to the use of his invention for a full period of 17 years. That is the inducement to inventors which the Government has long offered by law and upon which inventors have been led to rely.

Now, as legislators we would be justifiably incensed if someone proposed that we enact a statute arbitrarily reducing the terms of patents heretofore issued and outstanding from the issued period of 17 years to a period of 13 years or even less. We would regard such a proposal as a clear violation of the obligations which the Government assumed when the patent was issued. And yet the result is the same when the Government, during public emergencies, issues an order directing that for a period of time the holder of a patent shall not use certain machines or articles or materials or processes the use of which is necessary to the use or development or manufacture or exploitation of a patented invention. A similar result occurs when the inventor himself is drafted into the armed services or is accepted for enlistment therein.

The fact that the Government does not take such drastic measures except during public emergencies does not justify the Government refusing to make reasonable restitution for that part of the 17-year period of the patent during which the action of the Government prevented or substantially curtailed the use and development of the patent. In my opinion, the provisions of this bill would provide no more than reasonable restitution in those classes of cases most directly affected.

The right to the exclusive use of a patented invention for the full period of 17 years is analogous to, if not in essence, a right of property. Where the Government expropriates private property for public use it is required by the Constitution to pay just compensation therefor. If public emergencies such as World War II or the Korean conflict force the Government to abridge the special obligations it assumed by the issuance of patents, the least the Government can do to make good its original undertaking is to extend the terms of such patents for a period corresponding to that during which the normal use or development of the patent was prevented or substantially curtailed.

We have no doubt that the profit motive constitutes a fundamental premise upon which the draftsmen of the Constitution and the patent laws hoped to stimuate inventors to exert themselves and to disclose the results of their work, and upon the basis of which also, inventors do these things. It does not seem realistic to take the position that either party to this compact was under any illusion that invention would be stimulated, or that inventors would be satisfied, by the granting and receipt of a nugatory right to exclude.

My conclusion is that unless H. R. 2128 is enacted into law, we cannot contend that our Government has fairly and justly carried out the obligations it assumed by the issuance of patents under our laws. To avoid such an unjust and distasteful consequence I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill for immediate passage without amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to say a word, if I may, with reference to the bill. I am the author of the bill. I can think of nothing which would render greater justice to veterans of the Nation than would the passage of this bill. I can think of nothing more harmful to the inventive genius of America than not to pass the bill. When a person is given a patent, it is for 17 years.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield——

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield to me, let me say that the Senator from Indiana has expressed my feeling, and it is the feeling of those who have expressed the hope that this bill may be considered and enacted. I have endeavored to study the question to find if there is any reason for an objection. When I go into the question I find that the Patents Division of the Commerce Department has no objection to the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. The only one who could object to it would be a manufacturer who wanted to use the inventive genius and the patents of the small inventor who invents some kind of a device and then during the war years is denied the right to use his patent. At the end of 17 years big manufacturers pick it up and continue to use it. I do not think it is fair.

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for the information of the leadership, I wish to say that we were unable to have a conference on the housing bill because, I believe, of the indisposition and difficulty of the conferees on the part of the House to meet; but I am very optimistic that perhaps at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning there will be a conference.

HARRIS-FULBRIGHT NATURAL GAS BILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Although it has been only 5 months since the President, acting on reasons entirely aside from the merits of the legislation, placed his veto upon the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill, we are already beginning to see that the effects of this veto are just what the President said they would be.

The President, who killed this vital legislation by his veto, and the 53 Senators who had voted for it, agreed that one of the consequences of the failure of that bill to become law would be a shortage of natural gas for distribution in the States which do not produce it but which use so much of it. As part of his veto message the President said:

"I must make quite clear that legislation conforming to the basic objectives of H. R. 6645 is needed. It is needed because the type of regulation of producers of natural gas which is required under present law will discourage individual initiative and incentive to explore for and develop new sources of supply.

"In the long run this will limit supplies of gas, which is contrary not only to the national interest but especially to the interest of consumers."

These remarks echoed the fears voiced by the Senator from Arkansas and other supporters of this legislation when it was before us last January. The President's veto of this bill had the effect, because of the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case, of requiring the Federal Power Commission to place upon the independent, competitive producers of natural gas the kind of regulation which heretofore had been applied only to utilities. In my first speech on the bill I said:

"Under Federal utility controls applied at the producer level, the only result—over the long pull—can be one of less gas at higher prices. Such is the probable consequence of unrealistic Government meddling with the competitive production of consumer goods."

Now, what has happened since, by reason of the veto, the FPC has begun to try to apply these unworkable regulations upon an industry for which they are poorly designed and on which they certainly cannot work to the benefit of the consumers or producers of this Nation? What is happening is just what I said would happen and what the President said would happen—Federal regulation is having the effect of taking natural gas away from the consumers who do not live in States where it is produced.

The evidence I submit to support this statement is significant but it marks only a beginning, for the withering hand of Federal control has only started to make itself felt. It is plain, though, that the trend to which I point is strong and will not be reduced until free competition and initiative and incentive have been restored in the field of natural-gas production.

I submit for the consideration of the Senators several news stories from reliable publications which are enlightening. The Oil and Gas Journal for June 11, 1956, points out in the following dispatch that since the veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill pipelines which carry natural gas from the producing States to the consuming States have been unable to purchase enough supplies to offset normal declines in their reserves. The article follows:

"[From the Oil and Gas Journal of June 11, 1956]

"GAS PINCH SPREADING—TRANSMISSION LINES SHORT OF NEW SUPPLIES IN GULF COAST; PRODUCERS REPORTEDLY FIND LOCAL MARKETS MORE PROFITABLE

"HOUSTON.—A shortage of new supplies of natural gas for interstate sale already is being felt by transmission companies operating out of the gulf coast area.

"Distributing companies in the East will soon feel the pinch also.

"That is the report of Wayne J. Johnson, president of Natural Gas Service Co. John-

son resigned recently as manager of the gas-supply department of Trunkline Gas Co. to establish his new concern. It will work primarily to develop new intrastate markets for independent gas producers. But it will also advise them on dealing with pipelines and the Federal Power Commission when selling interstate.

"Since veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill, Johnson says, interstate pipelines in south Texas and Louisiana have run into trouble. They have been unable to purchase enough new supplies to offset normal declines in their reserves.

"The only new reserves they have been able to connect are small ones. These were obtained when the producer faced a drainage condition, a financial obligation to sell, or had no other market.

"Local buyers gain: At the same time, Johnson says, purchasers of gas for consumption within the State of production are getting the gas.

"They are paying from 1 cent to 5 cents per thousand cubic feet above prices offered producers by interstate lines. Such prices for interstate movement have been blocked by the FPC on grounds they are not shown to be just.

"According to Johnson, industries that use gas in large quantities are showing increased interest in locating plants near the source of gas supply. This indicates the intrastate markets for gas in the gulf coast area will soon absorb most of the new gas reserves which otherwise would be sold for interstate transmission.

"There is little hope for new legislation removing FPC regulation of gas producers until consumers and distribution companies realize that supplies for interstate sale are actually drying up. Johnson predicts that pinch will be felt this winter but will become acute before satisfactory legislation can be enacted.

"Big question: As long as prospects remain as good as they now are for developing local markets, Johnson says, the attitude of those owning uncommitted gas reserves is this:

"Why sell gas in interstate commerce? You can never be assured under existing procedures of FPC that you will receive the prices contained in your contract. And they are arrived at only by long hours of arms-length bargaining and in tough competition with other interested purchasers.

"If FPC would call a conference of interstate pipelines, Johnson believes, it would soon discover a majority of them already are having great difficulty maintaining their supply position. The situation is rapidly getting worse.

"In the absence of legislation, Johnson suggests, the condition could be improved if the FPC would:

"Stop treating producers as guilty before trial by making them bear the burden of proof.

"Lay down some standards for determining when a producer's price is proper.

"Employ staff members who understand the producing end of the gas business.

"Establish field offices in producing areas with authority to issue temporary certificates and make preliminary decisions. This would end much of the delay in referring everything to Washington.

"Realize potential markets in areas of large gas reserves are more attractive to producers than interstate sales under the present FPC procedures."

And the Oil Daily in its issues of May 29, 1956, and June 4, 1956, finds that because of Federal regulation producers are withholding vast quantities of gas from interstate markets. In the meantime the industries of the gulf coast, the article estimates, believe they can attract enough new industries to absorb "nearly all the gas reserves which their producers are withholding."

In other words, this gas is going into the more friendly markets of industrial use at home, rather than into the pipelines which link the gulf coast producing areas to the colder climes of the Northern States where natural gas is so much cherished for home heat. The Oil Daily articles follow:

"[From the Oil Daily of May 29, 1956]

"DRIVE TO MARKET GAS INTRASTATE SPEEDED

"HOUSTON, May 28.—The natural-gas industry's drive to market its reserves intrastate and escape Federal Power Commission controls is gathering speed.

"It seems to be bearing some fruit, too. Whether enough to satisfy the appetites of operators and landowners remains to be seen.

"Two principal trends appear visible. First is an effort to develop intrastate gas markets by attracting new industries to producing States. Second is an apparent willingness on the part of some producers to build intrastate pipelines instead of selling gas to nearby interstate carriers, and an eagerness on the part of some consumers to snap up long-term reserves which might not be available if the interstate market were free.

"Dramatic evidence that many persons see a solid future for the intrastate gas business was offered here recently when Atlantic Refining Co. let it be known that it might be willing to sell the Houston Pipe Line Co. system, which it will acquire June 6, along with other petroleum properties of Houston Oil Co. of Texas. By one count, 19 firms have their names in the pot to bid on the wholly owned, wholly intrastate Houston Oil subsidiary if Atlantic decides to dispose of it.

"Now moving about 300 million cubic feet of gas daily, the system contains 714 miles of trunk, 196 miles of branch lines, 214 miles of gathering lines, and 1 compressor station, owns interests in auxiliary lines, and serves 80 Texas communities. It extends 210 miles southwest of Houston and 90 miles east, through one of the Nation's major gas-producing areas. And producers who turn thumbs down on interstate pipelines are clamoring to sell to it.

" 'It can buy all the gas it conceivably could use, and there is reason to believe that it can use a rapidly growing amount,' one source said.

"Texas gas consumption was growing pretty rapidly before the Phillips case dispute arose. Now some additional pressure has been exerted by Phillips Petroleum Co. and Texas Gas Corp., Houston, the latter in cooperation with a number of southeast Texas chambers of commerce.

"Phillips, trying to attract plants which consume petroleum and its products to a 900-acre site on Houston ship channel, already has assigned part of the acreage to Celanese Corporation of America and M. W. Kellogg division of Pullman Co. for polyethylene plants estimated to cost about $25 million each.

"Texas Gas et al. have just mailed out the first issue of a quarterly brochure entitled 'Plant Site' which describes the Port Arthur-Beaumont-Orange refinery and petrochemical triangle, cites area business indices like bank debits, electric power consumption and employment, and lists and describes acreage available to industry.

" 'We've had two or three out-of-State inquiries as a result of the first mailing,' said Russell M. Riggins, Texas Gas president. 'Some of these might have come in the normal course of events, but the increased availability of intrastate gas may be stepping up the tempo.'

"Examples of pipeline construction by producers and consumers are provided by Humble Pipe Line Co. and Reynolds Metals Co.

"Humble, sitting on major gas reserves, is building a 20-inch gas line from the King Ranch in southwest Texas to Corpus Christi; Reynolds has run a 16-inch carrier across Corpus Christi Bay to tap the large Flour Bluff field gas reserve.

"Some Oil Daily sources believe neither line would have been constructed if the FPC had not entered the gas fields.

"At any rate, there are signs that supply is becoming an increasingly urgent concern of interstate carriers. They have plenty of gas for current commitments and even enough for some additional expansion. But a spokesman for one such company has called the situation respecting new supplies 'the worst yet.'

" 'I know of no interstate line which has been able to buy any substantial amount of gas recently except in cases of distress—where a property is being drained or property owners are insisting on some revenue,' he said. 'Most producers seem to be sitting on their hands, waiting to see whether an intrastate market develops.'

"This analysis excepts producers who are out of reach of intrastate consumers. Some of those already have sold their gas production, lock, stock and barrel, a Houston oil man reported, and others are considering similar moves."

[From the Oil Daily of June 4, 1956]

"GULF COAST'S MARKET POTENTIAL FOR INTRASTATE GAS IS VIEWED

"HOUSTON, June 3.—Gulf Coast States, source of more than half the Nation's natural gas, can attract enough new industrial plants to absorb nearly all the gas reserves which their producers are withholding from interstate markets.

"So believes Gordon H. Turrentine, general manager of the Houston Chamber of Commerce.

"The former Houston banking executive makes only one stipulation—an important one: 'It will take an unpredictable amount of time.'

"His reasoning, in substance: Tremendous growth is predicted for many industries, particularly chemicals. In many, including chemicals, access to raw materials instead of nearness to markets dictates the choice of plant sites.

"Phillips Petroleum Co., Humble Oil & Refining Co., and Continental Oil Co. were among major gas producers whose annual reports this year speculated that veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill would stimulate efforts to sell gas intrastate.

"Turrentine was asked how successful he thought such efforts would be.

"The Oil Daily sought his opinions for several reasons. As a banker, he coauthored an annual review of gulf coast petrochemical construction which became a standard reference, and as a chamber official has addressed leading financial circles, including the New York Society of Security Analysts, on the coast's industrial outlook.

"More particularly, the chamber of late has been thrust increasingly into the role of go-between for buyers and sellers of intrastate gas.

" 'We've had more plant site inquiries recently than ever before.' Turrentine said, 'I mean for branch plants of large national corporations—we're not pirating from anybody.

" 'And look what's happening on the supply side. Just recently, two important producers—I'm not permitted to name them—asked us to put them in touch with intrastate customers who want large volumes of gas. A letter with the same kind of request came from an individual in the East; he represents a company with a lot of south Texas production.' "

"The chamber has a perfect record on one score, its general manager said: 'Nobody who, ever asked us to find a gas supply has gone away emptyhanded. And because of the Harris-Fulbright veto, more gas is available on the gulf coast than ever before.'

"Indicating how this gas might be absorbed, Turrentine said, is a prediction by Frank Soday, vice president of Chemstrand Corp., Decatur, Ala., that the petrochemical industry alone must expand 170 percent by 1975 to meet rising living standards.

"Petrochemicals' share of chemical output has been growing, the chamber official said, and the gulf coast has been getting a growing share of the Nation's new petrochemical plants. Although petrochemicals take only about 2 percent of the Nation's gas as feed stock, he said, the figure is misleading because it excludes the enormous fuel consumption of generally high-temperature processes.

"Abundant, assured supplies of fuel gas have attracted many other kinds of industries to the coast and can be counted on to attract more as Federal controls hamper deliveries in other parts of the Nation, he observed.

"In his address before the New York security analysts, Turrentine called the gulf coast's deep water and barge transportation 'a great equalizer.' As other coastal advantages he listed increasing availability of refinery off-gases, low-cost liquefied petroleum gases, and low production costs.

"That companies enjoying such prerogatives find it more economical to spot their plants near raw materials than near markets is best shown, he said, by the recent decision of Dow Chemical Co. to spend $45 million for expansion of its Freeport, Tex., facilities and $20 million to set up Louisiana plants, 'leaving little more than $10 million of its construction budget to spend elsewhere.'

"He said one Midwest firm which located a plant at Houston to produce for the southwest 'found, to its amazement, that it could ship Houston products to overseas customers cheaper than it could from its home plant, and that it could lay its products down on the Atlantic seaboard at prices competitive or better.'

"Texas already consumes some 57 percent of its natural-gas production, exporting only about 43 percent to other States, Turrentine pointed out."

Further evidence that Federal regulation is forcing natural gas into industrial uses and away from the interstate market comes in an interview with Mr. Ralph E. Davis, a respected consultant from Houston, Tex., in the Oil and Gas Journal for March 12. The interview follows:

"[From the Oil and Gas Journal of March 12, 1956]

"INDUSTRIAL BOOM IN GAS STATES

"HOUSTON.—Continued Federal control of natural gas going into interstate commerce may cause an industrial boom in the major producing States, especially along the gulf coast in Texas and Louisiana.

"Ralph E. Davis, Houston consultant, estimates that nearly 25 percent of the gulf coast's proved gas supply is being withheld from the market.

"Much of this gas—amounting to approximately 20 trillion cubic feet—would be available for intrastate consumption. But, according to Davis, limited amounts will be offered under present Government regulations for sale outside the State in which it is produced.

"The future of the natural-gas industry will depend largely on finding suitable intrastate markets, which are still free of Federal Power Commission regulation.

"Davis thinks 'substantially less gas is going to be made available for interstate lines' on account of the President's veto of the Harris bill which, to an extent, would have exempted producers from Federal price controls. As a result, he predicts a 'downward trend in the search for gas and development of gas unless there be a suitable intrastate market for it.'

"Davis, an oil and gas consultant for 36 years, has been in geological and engineering work since graduating from Wisconsin University 50 years ago this spring. He had been associated with many of the major gas-pipeline projects highlighting the growth of the gas industry.

"The burden of bringing new industries into the southwestern producing States, he feels, does not rest with chambers of commerce. Companies seeking to expand their manufacturing plants are looking for fuel. If necessary, they will move to the producing area to get it, Davis believes.

"Davis thinks that uncommitted reserves actually may increase in value as a result of Federal controls.

"Most of the big gas reserves in the United States except those on the gulf coast are committed to specific markets. In Texas and Louisiana there are sufficient uncommitted reserves for several major pipelines. Owners of these reserves are reluctant to sell if doing so places their production under Government price control.

"If members of the FPC set field prices too low, Davis fears that 'there will be such a withholding of gas to interstate pipeline companies, they will find it is not a satisfactory solution, even from the standpoint of the ultimate consumer.'

"He believes there's a good chance that present members of the FPC who are inclined to fix a low field price will be overruled by those who would be more realistic.

"'But we can't tell what the next Commission will be,' says Davis, whose testimony before the FPC has helped some of the biggest gas-transmission projects ever built.

"Proved gas reserves in this country represent only about 22 years' supply at the present rate of consumption. As Davis points out, 'it's very clear that the amount of gas and the amount of oil being found per well, or per million feet of hole, or per million dollars spent, is substantially less than it was 5 to 10 years ago.'

"If the Harris bill had been signed into law, operators would have had the incentive to continue their high rate of drilling as long as their discoveries warranted the increased expenditure. As a result of Federal controls the drilling rate, especially in gas-producing areas, is likely to level off or perhaps drop, Davis believes.

"But the drilling rate or the discovery rate no longer controls the amount of gas which will go to northern and eastern markets. Consumers are likely to feel the pinch within 2 or 3 years because of the reluctance of producers to release gas for interstate commerce."

To offset this growing tendency of producers to withhold their gas from interstate markets, some of the interstate pipelines are trying to develop their own sources of natural gas. But, as the following article from Petroleum Week of May 11, 1956, points out, this too is subject to the vagaries of Federal control—for, if the Supreme Court does not permit pipeline companies a "fair field price" for gas produced from their own fields, then the incentive for pipeline produced gas is demolished just as the incentive for the independent producer to find gas for the interstate market has been demolished. The article follows:

"[From Petroleum Week of May 11, 1956]

"GAS IS TOUGH TO GET, SO PIPELINES DEVELOP PRODUCTION

"Increasing producer reluctance to selling natural gas to pipeline companies is forcing some of the latter to seek, or add to, their own supply holdings. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., for instance, is going to spend $6 million this year to develop its own oil and gas production.

"Panhandle Eastern officials say that the Phillips decision and failure of legislation to ease the impact of that court ruling have made gas more difficult to buy. The company, therefore, sees development of its own reserves as a hedge against too much dependence on independent producers—and as a distinct aid when bargaining with other producers.

"W. G. Maguire, Panhandle Eastern's board chairman, says the company's reserves have been increased in the last few months by more than 500 billion cubic feet, to a total of more than 12 trillion cubic feet.

"In making the move, Panhandle Eastern is openly hopeful that the United States Supreme Court eventually will uphold the Federal Power Commission's fair field price formula. But the alternative is diminishing supply, at a time when demand continues upward.

"Maguire says Panhandle Eastern has been encouraged to step up the exploration of its long-held leases as a result of the FPC decision to allow the company a fair price for the natural gas which it produces from its own leaseholds.

"In the Panhandle Eastern case, FPC ruled that the company, when expensing its own gas production in its rate base, was entitled to the weighted average price of gas sold by independents in the same or nearby fields.

"Panhandle Eastern feels the high Court ultimately will approve the fair-field-price concept, despite the setback suffered when a United States circuit court remanded the case to FPC for further consideration. The lower court said FPC failed to give due weight to the cost of production.

"Panhandle Eastern's intensified deep drilling and exploration program is concentrated in western Kansas and in the Oklahoma Panhandle. The company expects to drill at least 60 wells this year—and more, if warranted.

"The new drilling program is taking place in the Hugoton Embayment of the Anadarko Basin, and in other parts of the basin, just outside the edge of the Hugoton Embayment.

"Most of the wells programed for this year will be at depths below the shallower zones from which gas has normally been found within the embayment.

"Though significant, Panhandle Eastern's action is not surprising. Such moves by pipeline companies were widely predicted in the wake of President Eisenhower's veto of the natural gas bill, which would have freed independent producers from direct Federal control.

"Industry sources were agreed, and the facts since then support them, that sales of gas in interstate markets would slow down as producers sought to avoid Federal controls.

"J. G. Dickinson, vice president of Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, testified before FPC recently that he knew of cases where gas has been sold in intrastate commerce for less than could have been obtained in interstate sales.

"The trend of pipelines to develop their own production is expected to continue unless they and independent producers are given assurance that they will be allowed a fair price for gas sold in interstate commerce.

"Dickinson, in his testimony, reported that his company was having trouble buying natural gas from independent producers because they feared their operations would be subject to Federal control.

"He added: 'There is no room for doubt that, in the interests of the consuming public, the pipelines should be encouraged to enter the exploration and development part of the gas business, rather than leaving it to the independent producers as they have in the past.'

"Independent producers also can be expected to continue efforts to sell more gas in intrastate channels. There also has been talk (but no action) of independent producers joining to build their own pipelines to industrial markets.

"There have been substantial efforts by producers, particularly in Texas, to entice industrial users into their States. But even

this plan may backfire, in time. There's a good chance that intrastate sales may be put under Federal control, too, if they continue draining supplies from interstate channels.

"And the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, at a recent meeting, considered the possibility of setting up a producer association to market gas. But, though it was conceded that something had to be done, no definite plan was drafted."

Still further evidence of how and why the Texas producers of natural gas are planning to keep that valuable commodity at home comes in an article published by Petroleum Week on June 22, 1956. The article points out that producers there are signing long-term contracts to supply new industries within the State, are encouraging the development of a new chemical and industrial center on the Houston Ship Channel and are hiring experts to help industry find new ways to make use of natural gas.

It is no wonder then that the article points out that "the long lines transmission companies are taking a grim look at the situation."

I call the Senators' attention to the following quotation in the article from a spokesman for the interstate transmission companies: "We haven't been able to get any gas since the veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill and neither has any other interstate pipeline company. A little is being sold, but it is the kind where the operator is in a bind and has to sell—where he has to do it in order to hold on to his lease and where his reserves are small or remote." This highly revealing article follows in full:

"[From Petroleum Week of June 22, 1956]

"KEEPING TEXAS GAS INTRASTATE

"What one Texas gas producer is doing to segregate interstate gas sales from intrastate sales is shown in the map above. It's cogent evidence of the fact that Texas gas producers want as little as possible to do with interstate sales.

"The problem of Texas Gas Corp., Houston, stems from the fact that one of its pipelines transports gas both intrastate and interstate. And, by Federal Power Commission definition, all this commingled gas is subject to Federal control. (Although producers hotly deny that the FPC view is legal.)

"Texas Gas can't halt its interstate sales to Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. and Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp. Long-term contracts forbid that. But it doesn't want the gas it sells intrastate to be subject to FPC regulation. So it is:

"1. Building 5½ miles of new line from its Winnie (Tex.) gas processing plant north to a connection with the Texas Eastern line.

"2. Eliminating the commingling of interstate and intrastate gas on its Winnie to Beaumont line by cutting the present Texas Eastern connection near Fannett, Tex.

"Thus, Texas Gas will wind up with a pair of interstate pipelines to serve Texas Eastern and Transco, and three intrastate lines to serve the growing industrial complex in the Beaumont-Port Arthur area.

"All this stems, of course, from producers' distaste for FPC regulation—the result of the United States Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case and of President Eisenhower's veto of the natural gas bill (PW—Feb. 24, 1956, p. 9).

"I. SHIFTING MARKETS

"Gas producers are searching out varied methods for developing local markets for Texas gas:

"They're signing up new industrial accounts.

"Humble Oil & Refining Co. has signed long-term contracts to supply several industries in the Corpus Christi area.

"Humble is building a 20-inch, 30-mile line from fields in the King Ranch area to serve various Corpus chemical and utility companies. It also is involved in a deal with Reynolds Metal Co. to supply gas for the $30 million expansion of Reynolds' alumina and aluminum reduction facilities now underway at Corpus. Reynolds is building a 12-inch, 15-mile line between Corpus and Humble's Flour Bluff field for this purpose.

"Magnolia Petroleum Co. is expected to complete a deal soon for sale of 20 million to 30 million cubic feet of gas daily from the Wadsworth field, Matagorda County, to Dow Chemical Co.'s plant in Freeport, Tex.

"They're fostering industrial development. Phillips Petroleum Co., for example, is developing a chemical and industrial center on the Houston Ship Channel. So far, it has sold acreage to Celanese Corp. and Pullman Co. Phillips officials say they have 'nibbles' from others, but they aren't talking until negotiations reach the signing stage.

"They're tapping the fast-growing petrochemical market for gas. The latest unofficial count tallied up 71 petrochemical plants in Texas alone. On top of that, the Manufacturing Chemists Association estimates that construction and expansion projects just completed, underway, or definitely scheduled in Texas, represents an outlay of $414.8 million.

"An example of what's going on is the bold step taken by Texas Gas: It's hired Dr. Willard M. Dow to head up research directed at promoting manufacture of more products from gas. Dow formerly was assistant director of research for United Gas, at Shreveport, La.

"The company's Winnie plant now is processing 200 million to 210 million cubic feet of gas daily. But another 70 million to 75 million cubic feet daily is simply being sold as fuel gas with no processing.

"Dow's job, in one respect, will be to upgrade this fuel gas into more profitable materials. First step, he says, will be a scrutiny of the company's situation: 'What can we offer and what does the market offer us?'

"Then will come an effort to meet the demands of potential buyers for additional materials.

"Texas Gas President Russell M. Riggin calls this project "part of our program to develop more uses for Texas-produced natural gas, so that it will not have to be exported under FPC regulation.

"One company has been set up specially to help independent producers find markets. Natural Gas Service Co. will deal either interstate or intrastate, but it has no retainer setup with any long-line transmission company. The company says it already is negotiating for an intrastate market for some 50 million cubic feet of gas daily.

"II. THE PRICE PICTURE

"Producers evidently will take a little less money in order to sell gas intrastate—but competition actually is lessening the price differential.

"Wayne J. Johnson, president of Natural Gas Service Co., says not much interstate gas is being offered at any price, "and the prices offered for intrastate gas—excluding distress sales—are competitive with interstate."

"One major gas producer reportedly has signed with an aluminum manufacturer to supply long-term gas intrastate for 12.5 cents per thousand cubic feet, plus escalation terms.

"Another major producer is understood to have agreed to sell gas to a synthetic fibers manufacturer for 5 years at 19 cents per thousand cubic feet. Price for the gas for which National Gas Service is dickering will be between 17 and 19 cents per thousand cubic feet.

"United Gas Co. has renewed and expanded a contract with another gas producer for intrastate sales of gas from the Magnet-Withers area, Wharton County, plus new deliveries from the Chocolate Bayou Field, Brazoria County.

"In both instances, the reported price is about 14.5 cents per thousand cubic feet, with escalation of ½ cent per year per thousand cubic feet. The contracts will run 20 years.

"III. THE LONG LINES' VIEW

"That the long lines transmission companies are taking a grim look at the situation is apparent.

"One interstate transmission company concedes that it is experiencing difficulty finding gas supplies to replenish the reserves.

"'We haven't been able to get any gas since the veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill and neither has any other interstate pipeline company,' a spokesman told Petroleum Week. 'A little is being sold, but it's the kind where the operator is in a bind and has to sell, where he has to do it in order to hold onto his lease, where his reserves are small and remote.'

"Before the veto, the management of this transmission company felt that a failure to enact the legislation would cause a temporary freeze on new gas development. Now it would appear the freeze actually has begun.

"These company officials think the freeze will thaw when the competition drives prices up so high the development of new gas reserves will again become too attractive to resist.

"Of course, that leaves open the question of the effect on consumers and the attitude of the FPC in the absence of legislation.

"IV. FOR THE FUTURE

"Few people think that the Southwest will ever be able to absorb all the gas it produces.

"Despite the drum-beating for "Texas gas for Texas use,' despite chamber of commerce forecasts, most industry people feel that a lot of gas will have to move interstate if it goes anywhere.

"Johnson, of Natural Gas Service, for instance, has an intimate knowledge of shut-in production in Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana. It is his best stock in trade.

"You'd be surprised at the number of wells shut in on the Gulf Coast," he says. "It is a tremendous amount of potential gas production.

"'But, even if all of us got busy right now, working around the clock, we'd never be able to find intrastate markets for all of it.'

"This puts the independent producer on the spot, even if he has a sizable reserve reasonably close to a connection.

"The majors can afford to 'hold on' to their gas longer, and they are actively seeking intrastate industrial sales now.

"If the independents continue to do nothing, they'll wind up having to sell interstate because there'll be no other market open.

"But the independents have a lot of problems. They've got to figure out how to tackle the collecting and transportation of gas for some distance—because, obviously, it would be impossible to set down a nice little industrial plant beside each small gas field.

"The independent producer has one inceasingly bright prospect: that an out-of-State purchaser will buy his gas in the ground, thereby avoiding virtually all Federal control. It would work like this:

"An industrial plant outside the producing State would purchase outright the properties of the gas producer—all the gas reserves, lease rights, etc. An interstate line then would contract to haul the gas to the industrial plant. The producer might or might not be retained by the industrial firm as operator of the properties. In either case, the producer would have removed himself from the transaction and therefore, from Federal control.

"The industrial concern would be using its own gas but could not possibly be classified as a "natural gas company" under the act.

"The only thing left to be regulated federally would be the transportation price charged by the interstate transmission line, which already is under Federal regulation.

"It isn't inconceivable that some transmission lines themselves might make such purchases, rather than undertake the task of exploring for and developing their own reserves.

"An expansion of exploration activity by transmission companies can be expected, however. Within the next 2 months, one such company probably will announce completion of its reorganization to develop gas reserves of its own."

I commend these articles to the particular attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who recently undertook to convince the Senate that figures provided by the oil and gas industry itself prove that the failure of the Harris-Fulbright bill in no way reduced the Nation's natural gas reserves.

I have caused to have made a careful study of the figures used by my able friend because on the surface they appeared to be convincing support for his position. However, as is so often the situation with conclusions arrived at by cursory methods, the figures actually prove exactly the reverse of what the Senator says they prove.

I wish now to discuss the Senator's statements and to submit a number of tables in support of my remarks.

The Senator from Illinois reminded the Senate that the proponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill argued that Federal utility-type regulation of the natural gas producer would result in the elimination of exploration for natural gas, and he then attempts to refute that contention by (1) showing that there was an increase in 1955 over 1954 of gas reserves found through discoveries of new fields, and (2) pointing out that 22 trillion feet of gas reserves were added during 1955, representing the greatest increase in the history of the industry. Here the Senator misses an important point and in so doing places an erroneous interpretation on the statistics he quotes—statistics which were, as he points out, put together by the oil and gas industry itself.

While it is true that the increase in reserves found through the discoveries of new fields is the direct result of exploration, this is not true for the reserves added during 1955 by reason of extensions and revisions. The latter are for the most part the result of developmental operations as distinguished from wildcatting or exploration operations. It would be well to explain at this point that in addition to such development operations, which include drilling of new wells to known productive horizons (levels) within the then known boundaries of proved fields, drilling of new wells resulting in the revision or extension of then known boundaries of pools or fields, natural gas reserves included in those classified as extensions and revisions are also added as the result of (1) changing economic condition which permit estimating the reserves to lower abandonment pressures; (2) recompleting or treating; and (3) improved techniques which make it possible to obtain better information concerning the physical properties of the reservoir or field and thus estimate the quantity of reserves more accurately.

These last three mentioned activities may be carried on with little or no expenditure of funds and they also bear no relation to exploration activities.

The most important fact in these statistics, then is that of the 22 trillion feet of natural gas reserves added during 1955, 16.3 trillion feet, or approximately 74 percent, were added as the result of revisions and extensions and not as the result of exploration. The fact that exploration increased reserves by only about one-fourth of the total is a sobering one when we remember that unless new fields are discovered in the future, through exploration, there will be no such fields in which revisions or extensions can be made to add to future natural gas reserves.

Now, here is another instance in which the Senator used the right set of figures to jump to the wrong conclusion. While it is true that total gas reserves added during the year 1955 (which include revisions and extensions) exceed the quantity of natural gas produced during 1955, what is most important to consider is that production during that year (10.1 trillion cubic feet) was nearly twice that of reserves added during that year through discovery of new fields (5.7 trillion cubic feet). This was also true in each of the years 1947 through 1955 (as shown by the table); that is, that production exceeded the reserves added through discoveries of new fields. Thus, we have been burning gas about twice as fast as the explorers—not the developers—have been finding it.

What is the actual factual situation with respect to our country's natural gas reserves? The importance of such determination cannot be exaggerated. By looking at table 1, which, with the exception of columns (4) and (8), is the same table furnished for the RECORD by the Senator from Illinois it is obvious that despite the yearly increase in production, the proved reserves—column (6)—have increased yearly from 147.7 trillion cubic-feet in 1945 to 223.6 trillion cubic-feet in 1955. Table 1 follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary of annual estimates of natural gas reserves for period Dec. 31, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1955*

[Millions of cubic feet, 14.65 p. s. i. a., at 60° F.]

Year	Natural gas added during year			Net change in underground storage	Net production during year	Estimated proved reserves as of end of year, col. (3)+(4)−(5)+prior year's (6)	Increase over previous year	Excess of net production over discoveries of new fields and new pools in old fields, col. (5)−(2)
	Extensions and revisions (1)	Discoveries of new fields and new pools in old fields (2)	Total of discoveries, revisions, and extensions, col. (1)+(2) (3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1945						147, 789, 367		
1946	[1]	[1]	17, 729, 152	[1]	4, 942, 617	160, 575, 901	12, 786, 534	
1947	7, 570, 654	3, 410, 170	10, 980, 824	[1]	5, 629, 811	165, 926, 914	5, 351, 013	2, 219, 641
1948	9, 769, 483	4, 129, 089	13, 898, 572	51, 482	6, 007, 628	173, 869, 340	7, 942, 426	1, 878, 539
1949	8, 061, 429	4, 612, 870	12, 674, 299	82, 746	6, 245, 041	180, 381, 344	6, 512, 004	1, 632, 171
1950	9, 172, 381	2, 877, 351	12, 049, 732	54, 301	6, 892, 678	185, 592, 699	5, 211, 355	4, 015, 327
1951	13, 013, 606	3, 039, 385	16, 052, 991	132, 751	7, 966, 941	193, 811, 500	8, 218, 801	4, 927, 556
1952	8, 934, 470	5, 411, 043	14, 345, 513	198, 850	8, 639, 638	199, 716, 225	5, 904, 725	3, 228, 595
1953	13, 371, 355	7, 081, 661	20, 453, 016	[2] 516, 431	9, 238, 540	211, 447, 132	11, 730, 907	2, 156, 879
1954	4, 632, 309	4, 966, 894	9, 599, 203	90, 906	9, 426, 509	211, 710, 732	263, 600	4, 459, 615
1955	16, 298, 125	5, 719, 069	22, 017, 194	87, 637	10, 118, 118	223, 697, 445	11, 986, 713	4, 399, 049
Total 1947 through 1955		41, 247, 532			70, 164, 904			28, 917, 372

[1] Not estimated.
[2] All native gas in storage reservoirs formerly classified as a natural gas reserve included in this figure.

Source: P. 21, Proved Reserves of Crude Oil, Natural Gas Liquids and Natural Gas, Dec. 31, 1955, vol. No. 10, published by AGA and APL.

What is not obvious from table 1, however, is the incontrovertible fact that while total gas reserves have increased, the effect of the yearly excesses of production over reserves obtained through discoveries of new fields, that is, through exploration, has brought about a serious decline in the expected life of the total reserves.

This is clearly demonstrated by table 2. It will be seen from table 2 that there has been a decline each year (except in the year 1949 when it remained at the 1948 level) in the life of the total natural gas reserves starting with an estimated life of 32.5 years in 1946 and ending with 22.1 years in 1955.

TABLE 2.—*Declining life of United States gas reserves*

[All volumes millions of cubic feet at 14.65 p. s. i. a.]

Year (1)	Estimated proven reserves (2)	Net production (3)	Year's supply (4)
1946	160, 575, 901	4, 942, 617	32. 5
1947	165, 926, 914	5, 629, 811	29. 5
1948	173, 869, 340	6, 007, 628	28. 9
1949	180, 381, 344	6, 245, 041	28. 9
1950	185, 592, 699	6, 892, 678	26. 9
1951	193, 811, 500	7, 966, 941	24. 3
1952	199, 716, 225	8, 639, 638	23. 1
1953	211, 447, 132	9, 238, 540	22. 9
1954	211, 710, 732	9, 426, 509	22. 5
1955	223, 697, 445	10, 118, 118	22. 1

Source: American Gas Association, 1955 Gas Facts table 5, p. 13 for years 1946–54. AGA, table 1, vol. 10 for 1955. Col. (4) calculated.

In other words, 10 years of the expected life of the country's natural gas reserves have been sloughed off during this period of 10 years. What will happen to our reserves in the future if this rate of decimation continues is obvious to anyone. I suggest that you try adding to and deducting from your personal bank account in this same manner and then determine the status of the bank account 10 years hence. These facts certainly lead away from—and not toward—the conclusion that "our natural gas reserves are continuing in good shape," which is where the Senator finds himself after his remarkable interpretation.

An interesting aside at this point is the fact that of the total gas reserves enjoyed by us up to the time of the passage of the

Natural Gas Act, practically none have been discovered by utilities subject to the kind of utility regulation which must be imposed on the independent producers of natural gas in the absence of the Harris-Fulbright bill.

There is no way, of course, in which anyone could determine how many more reserves might have been added through new field discoveries if the impending regulatory threat had not been present during 1955. It is certainly reasonable to assume that while the new reserves found during 1955 were somewhat higher than in 1954, they were lower than would have been the case if complete freedom of operation had been restored to the independent producer. In other words, the disease is still in a stage of incubation. We cannot measure its ravages until it has fully broken out and run its course.

Another fallacy which the Senator seeks to perpetuate is the notion that, willy-nilly, gas will continue to be discovered as an accident in the continuing search for oil. "Drilling, as I have said many times before, is primarily for oil; the discovery of gas is incidental to it," the Senator said. Fortunately, that, too, can be refuted by statistical facts which speak more eloquently than rhetoric.

I have had prepared, in table form, a comparison as between natural gas and oil reserves added during the years 1947 through 1955, and the percentage relationship which each bears to the total reserves added each year. This table follows:

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of natural gas and oil reserves to total of such reserves discovered during the years 1947 through 1955*

	Year	Natural gas		Total liquid hydrocarbons including natural gas liquids, barrels	Total liquid hydrocarbons and natural gas, barrels	Percent of natural gas	Percent of liquid hydrocarbons
		Thousand cubic feet	(6 to 1 equivalent), barrels				
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Extensions and revisions	1947	7,570,654,000	1,261,775,669	2,211,377,000	3,473,152,669	36.3294	63.6706
	1948	9,769,483,000	1,628,247,170	3,804,600,000	5,432,847,170	29.9704	70.0296
	1949	8,061,429,000	1,343,571,503	2,591,639,000	3,935,210,503	34.1423	65.8577
	1950	9,172,381,000	1,528,730,170	2,705,648,000	4,234,378,170	36.1028	63.8972
	1951	13,013,606,000	2,168,934,338	4,673,195,000	6,842,129,338	31.6997	68.3003
	1952	8,934,470,000	1,489,078,336	2,728,030,000	4,217,108,336	35.3104	64.6896
	1953	13,371,355,000	2,228,559,171	3,352,497,000	5,581,056,171	39.9308	60.0692
	1954	4,632,309,000	772,051,502	2,308,061,000	3,080,112,502	25.0657	74.9343
	1955	16,298,125,000	2,716,354,172	2,840,927,000	5,557,281,172	48.8792	51.1208
Discoveries of new fields and new pools in old fields	1947	3,410,170,000	568,361,666	504,731,000	1,073,092,666	52.9648	47.0352
	1948	4,129,089,000	688,181,501	461,164,000	1,149,345,501	59.8759	40.1241
	1949	4,612,870,000	768,811,668	982,982,000	1,751,793,668	43.8871	56.1129
	1950	2,877,351,000	479,558,500	623,099,000	1,102,657,500	43.4912	56.5088
	1951	3,039,385,000	506,564,167	464,750,000	971,314,167	52.1525	47.8475
	1952	5,411,043,000	901,840,501	578,096,000	1,479,936,501	60.9378	39.0622
	1953	7,081,661,000	1,180,276,835	687,602,000	1,867,878,835	63.1881	36.8119
	1954	4,966,894,000	827,815,668	672,326,000	1,500,141,668	55.1825	44.8175
	1955	5,719,069,000	953,178,168	544,305,000	1,497,483,168	63.6520	36.3480
Totals of discoveries, revisions and extensions	1946	17,729,152,000	2,954,858,673				
	1947	10,980,824,000	1,830,137,337	2,716,108,000	4,546,245,337	40.2560	59.7440
	1948	13,898,572,000	2,316,428,671	4,265,764,000	6,582,192,671	35.1924	64.8076
	1949	12,674,299,000	2,112,383,171	3,574,621,000	5,687,004,171	37.1440	62.8560
	1950	12,049,732,000	2,008,288,671	3,328,747,000	5,337,035,671	37.6293	62.3707
	1951	16,052,991,000	2,675,498,505	5,137,945,000	7,813,443,505	34.2422	65.7578
	1952	14,345,513,000	2,390,918,838	3,306,126,000	5,697,044,838	41.9677	58.0323
	1953	20,453,016,000	3,408,836,007	4,040,099,000	7,448,935,007	45.7627	54.2373
	1954	9,599,203,000	1,599,867,170	2,980,387,000	4,580,254,170	34.9297	65.0703
	1955	22,017,194,000	3,669,532,341	3,385,232,000	7,054,764,341	52.0150	47.9850

Source: American Gas Association and American Petroleum Institute.

It will be noted that the quantities in column 1 are the same as those shown in columns 1, 2, and 3 of table 1. In column 2 the Mcf of natural gas have been converted to barrels on a Btu equivalent basis of 6 Mcf equaling 1 barrel. This conversion equivalent is based on average countrywide figures and it is used in the industry for that purpose. Column 3 shows for the same three categories the barrels of oil reserves added during each of the years. Column 4 is the total of columns 2 and 3 and it represents 100 percent of the reserves (oil and gas) added. Column 5 shows the percentage of such total relating to gas reserves found and column 6 the percentage of oil reserves added.

Column 5 of this table 3 shows that in the year 1955 63 percent of the total reserves added through discoveries of new fields were natural gas reserves; 49 percent of the total reserves added through extensions and revisions were natural gas reserves; and that 52 percent of the total of all reserves added during 1955 were natural gas reserves. It is extremely difficult to understand how such relationships can be characterized as incidental. Of the total reserves added through discoveries of new fields, we see that in 1955 over 63 percent were gas reserves. The figures in column 5 indicate an increasing trend toward finding of relatively greater gas than oil reserves through discoveries in new fields. It is expected by the natural gas producing industry that this trend will continue because drilling has been deeper and because relatively more gas than oil has been discovered at the deeper levels.

Clearly, the statement that the discovery of gas is incidental to oil applies to the period of some years ago before the existence of pipelines which have brought producer and market together, but it has not been true for some time. It is entirely possible if this trend toward greater relative finding of gas continues, that in the not too distant future we may be referring to the incidental discovery of oil.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF VISAS TO BE ISSUED TO ORPHANS UNDER THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about Calendar No. 2730, S. 3570, the Langer bill and the orphan problem.

I understand that the Senate tomorrow probably will consider some amendments to Calendar No. 2249, H. R. 6888, which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] plans to call up. However, I wish tonight to make a few comments and to submit certain material for the RECORD in regard to S. 3570, which is the Langer orphan bill.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], introduced earlier this year a similar bill, and on July 21, 1956, he made very clear, in an able speech to the Senate, that the Langer bill would be acceptable if some action could be had on it. In his speech on July 21, the junior Senator from Oregon said:

The Senate Judiciary Committee, within the last few days, has reported favorably the bill by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], S. 3570, to extend the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act as it applies especially to orphans. This bill extends the time for issuing visas under section 5 of the Refugee Act from December 31, 1956, to December 31, 1959, and would increase the number of visas authorized in section 5 from 4,000 to 9,000. This bill follows closely the provision of my bill, S. 3753, and deserves, in my opinion, the full support from the Congress.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon and I—and I feel certain the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], also, if he were here—share the view that we do not particularly care how this justice shall be done, whether it be done by way of the Langer bill or the Neuberger bill, or by way of amendments to the sheepherders bill, which I understand the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] may offer tomorrow. Those amendments will not only take care of the immigration of some sheepherders, which I may say are sorely needed in my State, but also will do justice to the orphan problem.

I have in my hand some communications I have received from persons in my State who are very much concerned about the passage of the Langer bill before adjournment. I ask unanimous consent to have those communications printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIAN CELEBRITY TIME,
Hermiston, Oreg., July 20, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was my happy privilege yesterday to eat lunch with the

Harry Holt's of Crestwell, Oreg. What a joy it was to see their own lovely children in perfect harmony with their newly adopted eight Korean children of GI soldiers and Korean mothers.

Mrs. Holt and the older children were quite concerned about the fact that unless something is done before Congress adjourns the Refugee Act of 1953 will expire before many more children from Korea can be brought to this country. Mr. Holt is now in Korea and has many more children about ready to come to this country. Also, Mrs. Holt tells me there are hundreds of couples eagerly hoping the day will soon come when they can have their children of mixed blood here in America.

Even though the Senate is under tremendous pressure to adjourn in a few weeks, I am hoping and praying that the act can be extended. May we count on you to do your best to see that this Refugee Act is extended before Congress adjourns?

Sincerely,

H. P. SCONCE.

FOREST GROVE, OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are very anxious to have the Refugee Act of 1953 extended as we have a partly adopted child in Korea, and understand the quota has run out.

Besides our own interest in this matter we feel the extension of this act would benefit many a needy orphan and bring joy to the adoptive parents in this country.

We will appreciate your making an effort to see that this legislation is passed.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. SIMONTON,
RUTH SIMONTON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 42, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: We are very concerned about the Korean-American babies, and am writing to you to help us get the baby we have been promised.

We want this baby more than anything on this earth, and pray that you will pass bill S. 3570 so it will be possible to get the baby that has been promised us.

We have looked forward to this baby for a long time now. It means so much to us. We have the things we will need for her already, including a nice new crib.

Please help us. We have a lot of faith in you. There are many of us waiting for our babies.

Yours truly,

Mrs. EDITH WADDINGTON.

MALIN, OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We urge you to pass bill S. 3570 before Congress recesses.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. C. F. STREET.

ASTORIA, OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

MR. MORSE: We have a partly adopted child in Korea and we can not bring him home until the Refugee Act of 1953 is extended.

So we are asking you to do all you can to get it extended.

The quota has run out and we would like so much to bring him here where we can take care of him.

Thanking you sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT C. MILLER.

LYLE, *Wash., July 23, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We, the undersigned, wish to urge you to cast your vote for the extension of the Refugee Act of 1953. There are people interested in adopting these children; and some who have legally adopted children there now. The quota has run out and these children have no chance at life in a Christian family without extension of this act. We feel that since so many American boys have proved themselves delinquent fathers, that other American families who feel so inclined should be given the opportunity of taking these children who so badly need a home.

Mrs. Sylvia N. Gould, Everett J. Thoren, Irene Thoren, Mrs. Tom Bryan, Bird J. Clark, Kammer Clark, Bertie Sawtelle, Mrs. E. E. Rutchen, Mrs. R. L. Rideont, R. F. Niblock, Grace A. Niblock, Mrs. James Havens, Mrs. C. A. Hamlin, Mrs. W. L. Haffey, Mrs. R. R. Hunter, Mrs. Eva Hensley, Joy Brown, Mrs. K. L. Hewett, Mrs. L. G. Seaton, H. G. Webb, Mrs. Guy Webb, Donald L. Hutchins, Joyce Hutchins, Mrs. Edgar A. Guerin, Edgar A. Guerin, Mrs. Anna Omeg, Mrs. Wern Read, Mrs. W. Austin, Willard Austin, Carol E. Walker, Mrs. Olin Ensley, Mrs. Raymond Thomas, Mrs. Lester Roth, Mrs. Jack Bryan, James A. Curl.

ASTORIA, OREG., *July 20, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing this letter asking your support of the extension of the Refugee Act of 1953.

We have adopted two Korean-American orphan boys, ages 5 months and 16 months. As we understand, we will be unable to bring them home unless this act is extended; so we are asking your support of this bill.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE W. HUNSINGER.

HUMPHREYS DRUG CO.,
Heppner, Oreg., July 20, 1956.

WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I would like to stress the importance I feel attached to the pending legislation concerning proxy adoption of Korean war orphans. Will you please do all in your power to extend the Refugee Act of 1953 in order that we may bring to our home the orphan we have now at least partially adopted.

I am sure that you will attempt to do the honest thing, and I feel sure that you are capable of making sensible decisions. I also realize the stress of innumerable problems which are ahead of you in the closing weeks of Congress, and I am asking this consideration from you on behalf of underprivileged orphans that many of us are offering our homes to.

Acknowledgment of this letter is not necessary; rather than that, please help to clear this pending legislation through the Senate.

Very sincerely,

CLEMENT N. STOCKARD.

LAKE GROVE, OREG., *July 20, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We understand there is a bill before the Senate to extend the Refugee Act of 1953. We sincerely hope you not only vote for it, but use your influence to get it passed.

We have two Eurasian children in Korea, fully adopted, but being held there because the quota has been filled. Knowing how much better these children will be in a country where they will get food, shelter, and love instead of persecution and want, we are most anxious to have the legal door opened to them.

There is not only the moral obligation we Americans feel toward all uncared for children, but the more definite obligation, knowing our Armed Forces were responsible for these little Korean outcasts.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

BERTA BURCH BABB.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 21, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A very close friend has fully adopted a Korean orphan, now in Korea, but has been advised that the child cannot be brought to the United States because the immigration quota has been filled, and that the only hope of bringing the child home is dependent upon an extension of the Refugee Act of 1953, before Congress adjourns within the next few days.

I solicit your efforts in bringing about such extension of the Refugee Act of 1953, in order to enable the subject orphan, and others in similar circumstance, to enter the United States.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH D. BEEMER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 20, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the new bill presented by Senator NEUBERGER for extension of Refugee Act of 1953.

We have an adopted child in Korea which we wish to bring to the United States.

We will appreciate your cooperation regarding the passage of this bill which will assure the entry of many of these childen from Korea.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter,

We remain,

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. E. E. MUIR.

EUGENE, OREG., *July 21, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to urge immediate passage of Senate bill S. 3570 regarding extension of the Refugee Act.

We, along with many others, are in the process of adopting an American fathered, Korean orphan.

Unless this bill is passed many of these children will be left homeless.

Thank you for doing all you can to see this bill passed as soon as possible.

Rev. HAROLD E. COX.

CENTRAL EUROPEAN RELIEF COMMITTEE,
Portland, Oreg., July 20, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A letter from Mr. J. D. Wilson, chairman, Governor's Committee To Implement the Refugee Relief Act; tells me this morning that you are entirely on our side regarding liberalizing present immigration laws, particularly as to refugees.

I might add that I consider the McCarran-Walter Act as unfair to certain sections of Europe.

Sincerely yours,

Father ALCUIN HEIBEL, OSB.

BEND, OREG., *July 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to have bill S. 3570 passed before this recess. Would you help do this, please?

Thank you.

HELEN O. BRISTOW.
SELDEN T. BRISTOW.

CONCORDIA COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., July 23, 1956.
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter comes to you with the earnest request for your assistance in a matter which is of deep concern to some friends of mine and hence also to me.

My friends are in the process of adopting a Korean child. I understand that there is at present a bill in the Senate to extend the Refugee Act of 1953. Unless this act is extended, they will not get their child, since, as you know, the quota of Korean children has already been filled.

I will, therefore, deeply appreciate your doing everything in your power to have this Refugee Act of 1953 extended. Thank you very much for your cooperation in this matter.

Cordially yours,
ARTHUR G. WAHLERS, *Pastor.*

HOOD RIVER, OREG., *July 24, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: We would like to urge you to do all you can to pass bill S. 3570 so children of our American soldiers can be brought to the States to be brought up as good citizens in a Christian nation.

Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. VERNON POLSON.

ESTACADA, OREG., *July 24, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I am writing in regard to bill S. 3570, about adopting GI refugee children and urge that it be passed so those who have already fully or partially adopted children; who are waiting for visas, be allowed to come to America and join their parents.

Hoping and praying that this goes through, I am,

Mrs. LEWIS PAULI.

INDEPENDENCE, OREG., *July 21, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to ask you to please pass bill No. S. 3570. This will allow us to apply for and to adopt a foreign child.

We want to adopt a child so badly and have tried to adopt one through many sources including the Boys and Girl's Society in Portland. Also have our name on four different doctor's lists but to no avail. It seems impossible to adopt a child yet there are thousands in orphanages that need parent's love, care and guidance and a home. Also these foreign children will have an opportunity to live normal lives that they are deprived of in many foreign countries.

To be able to adopt a child would make us very happy as well as hundreds of childless couples.

I believe too, that this is a wonderful missionary opportunity to bring these children into American Christian homes and raise them to be American citizens.

We urge you to please pass this bill.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. JACOB WARKENTIN.

BOARDMAN, OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator DICK NEUBERGER,
Oregon Representatives,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIRS: I sincerely request that you pass bill S. 3570, as these poor children are so badly in need of homes.

Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. LELON MCLOHTH.

COTTAGE GROVE, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you please vote in favor of extending the time limit and increasing the quota on the Childrens Refugee Act, S. 3570?

We, who are trying to adopt these GI children from Korean and Japan, will be ever grateful to you in Washington for your help in getting this bill through so that the 500 children already adopted to American families may be brought home, as well as about 5,000 others for whom homes in our Christian land are available and waiting.

Thank you for your favorable vote for bill S. 3570.

Yours truly,
Mr. and Mrs. C. W. UMPLEBY.

WILLAMETTE NURSERY CO.,
Portland, Oreg., July 23, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We herewith would like to request that you would kindly support the bill for extending the Refugee Act of 1953, especially as it concerns the admittance of American-Korean orphans.

Moreover we feel it to be the duty of the United States Government to take over the care of these unfortunate children, for the United States Government sent the fathers of these children into the foreign countries and is therefore responsible for their conduct.

We appreciate very much anything you can do for these orphans. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM A. K. LAMMERT.

ALBANY, OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please vote yes on bill S. 3570. We feel the Refugee Act of 1953 should be extended so that more GI orphans from Japan and Korea can be adopted. They are our responsibility, and we feel this bill should be passed.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. V. J. GRAF.

LEBANON, OREG., *July 21, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We understand that due to the Refugee Act of 1953 the quota set for the refugees to enter the United States has now been filled.

We also understand that presently is a bill submitted to the Senate to extend the Refugee Act of 1953. We ask as taxpayers and voters that you earnestly support this bill in order that we may complete our adoption of a Korean child, since we have already completed necessary forms for the adoption. We might add that there are several people just as interested as we.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM R. BOYD.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 24, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It has come to my attention that there is before the Senate bill No. S. 3570 to increase the amount of children allowed to enter under the Refugee Act. This would allow 9,000 orphans to enter instead of 4,000, raise the age limit from 10 to 14 years and extend the time limit to December 31, 1959.

I understand that the quota is already filled and that there are still many children of GI parentage in the orphanages, and a waiting list of prospective parents wanting them.

If you would be so kind as to look into the matter and help us, as prospective parents, to get the children we would be very grateful.

If you could push this bill to the utmost of your ability and get it passed before Congress recesses next week it would help us tremendously. The present bill expires December 31, 1956, so it would have to be acted upon this week. So please act upon bill No. S. 3570, and help these children and us.

Thankfully yours,
LOUISE JOANNE KRETTLER.

ALBANY OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

DEAR SIR: I sincerely urge you to pass the bill S. 3570 for the extension of the Refugee Act of 1953. If it is passed it will allow over 500 children who have been partially or fully adopted and who are waiting for visas, to come to America. Otherwise they cannot join their parents as the quota is filled now. Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely, in the service of our Lord,
Mrs. DONALD RALSTON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, those communications deal primarily with a group of proposed foster parents of some Korean orphan children fathered by American soldiers in Korea. The American faster parents are desirous of bringing some of those orphan children into this country. This they could do under the Langer bill. In fact, among the communications which have just been ordered to be printed in the RECORD is a communication from a man who is at present in Korea, seeking to bring back a baby which he and his wife have selected; but because of the quota restriction they are not allowed to do so.

I do not intend to take the time to argue the morality or the social conscience of this proposal; I simply say it is so obviously humanitarian, it is so obviously right from the standpoint of human values, that Congress certainly should not adjourn, in my judgment, without the passage of the Langer bill or the adoption of the amendments which I understand the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] plans to offer tomorrow to the so-called sheepherders bill, which I think is Calendar No. 2249, H. R. 6888.

Mr. President, I hope that certainly action will be taken on this matter, because a human problem is involved. It is a project which, in my opinion, is from the standpoint of the human values involved, so sound that, in our haste and our desire to get away from Washington and to return home, we should not forget what I think is our obligation to the orphans whom American foster parents want to adopt and bring into the United States.

BLACKLISTING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Blacklisting Respectable at Present?" published in the Louisville Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS BLACKLISTING RESPECTABLE AT PRESENT?

Blacklisting was once a dirty word in America. Although there never was a time when it wasn't used—against union organizers at one time, against people of certain races or religions at another—it was always done as discreetly as possible, for there was a general feeling among Americans that no man's job should hinge on his political, economic or religious beliefs, or on what someone thought his political, economic or religious beliefs were.

The Fund for the Republic, basing its report on a study begun in 1954, says that blacklisting for political beliefs is widespread in the movie, radio and television industries. That comes as no special surprise. It has been widely known that the practice has been used for several years.

FUND ONLY GIVES DATA

The Fund for the Republic, itself the target of slings and arrows, is drawing no conclusions from its report. In the words of its board chairman, Paul Hoffman, it "has brought in no indictments, and has offered no recommendations." If any progress is made, Hoffman said, "in resolving the conflicts of interest, viewpoint and principle involved * * * this progress must ultimately turn upon public knowledge and understanding of the actual situation and its problems. This report seeks only to supply the data * * *."

We are curious as to what, if anything, the public will do with the data supplied. Will it defend blacklisting as a necessary evil in these times? Will it become indignant about the practice? Or will the public shrug it off as a matter of little or no importance?

Blacklisting seems to us dangerous on many grounds, not the least of which is the fact that it condemns many without a trial. The entertainment business, with which the fund's report deals, is extraordinarily sensitive. Seeking to appeal to mass audiences, it wants to offend no one.

AN INDUSTRY TERRORIZED

Thus a spokesman for any group and even some spokesmen for nonexistent groups can whisper a word that a certain individual is a persona non grata, and that individual finds himself having to prove his innocence. And frequently he finds himself not only out of a job but unable to get another one.

In this way frequently anonymous individuals can terrorize an industry, as Red Channels, a publication which purported to list individuals in radio and television having Communist connections, terrorized radio and TV.

This is not what we like to think of as the American way. Yet it is, according to the Fund for the Republic report, going on all the time. We will have to wait to see whether the people of the country are interested enough to demand that something be done.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a. m., tomorrow; and that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, there be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills, the presentation of petitions and memorials, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERCORPORATE RELATIONS BETWEEN GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORP. AND MANILA ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice of the possibility of calling up Calendar No. 2841, H. R. 10624, relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce that, so far as I am informed, there will be no further business transacted tonight. Although there may be insertions made in the RECORD, there will be no yea-and-nay votes.

I have just been handed two additional bills which may be considered tomorrow, H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10622, both reported from the Committee on Public Works, and both relating to the construction of bridges.

I wish to express my gratitude to all Senators for the patience and understanding they have shown during the long sessions of the past few days.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to call up a conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Cannot the Senator have it brought up tomorrow?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House has agreed to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Senators are very tired at this hour.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It should not take more than a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Most of the "minute" matters take about 10 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This concerns a very important piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the conferees of the Senate and House have come to a unanimous conclusion on what I think is one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation which will be passed by this Congress, the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

The House has approved the conference report on the Senate bill which was introduced by me. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report on S. 3275. The Senate conferees accepted the House amendments. The House has approved the Senate bill with the House amendments.

I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are a number of Senators who are interested in this general subject matter. After consultation with the distinguished majority leader, I informed Senators on this side of the aisle that, except for insertions in the RECORD, the Senate was about to conclude its business for today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are always exceptions, I may say to the distinguished minority leader. I desired to make a little statement, but I was interrupted by the Senator from Washington who said he desired to have laid before the Senate a conference report on an important wildlife measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the conference report has not come from the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Washington will arrange to get the papers, the conference report will be called up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What has happened to them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The chairman of the committee will have to inquire about that. The message transmitting the conference report has not come over from the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will ask that it be laid before the Senate tomorrow. I simply thought that since we were all unanimously in agreement, the business of the Senate could be expedited by having the conference report approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas tries to specialize in that subject; but conference reports, as in the case of all other measures passed by the House, must be transmitted in a message to the Senate. The conference report in which the Senator is interested has not been received from the House.

Normally, the Senator who has handled the conference report submits it to the Senate and asks for its consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall wait until tomorrow morning, with the understanding that I shall have an opportunity to call it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The leadership is desirous of having all conference reports laid before the Senate. If the Senator from Washington will notify the leadership, the majority leader will be glad to cooperate with him.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, yesterday, July 25, the people of Puerto Rico celebrated the fourth anniversary of their commonwealth status, and I believe it but fitting and proper that we in the Congress pay tribute to them for the remarkable progress which they have been able to accomplish under this form of self-government.

It was just 4 years ago that Governor Muñoz-Marín, one of this hemisphere's most illustrious figures, officially announced the birth of the Puerto Rican commonwealth. In proclaiming the constitution of the new associated state to be in effect, he heralded the domestic autonomy of his people while reaffirming their affinity with their fellow citizens in the United States. The ties of affection and responsibility forever bind us together, for Puerto Ricans are still Americans first. Completely free in terms of local government, our island compatriots are happy, just as we are here in the United States, to pledge primary fealty to the Stars and Stripes.

Proud to be free, and Americans, Puerto Ricans are mindful each day of the economic and social blessings which are promoted and guaranteed under the compact of 1952. Under the leadership of two of the most outstanding citizens of the island, Governor Muñoz-Marín and Resident Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN, together with their association with the United States, Puerto Ricans

today, recognize no barrier to continued progress.

The people of Puerto Rico have shown a remarkable capacity to adjust themselves to changing conditions and circumstances; for making a practical appraisal of, and for taking appropriate action to meet, those circumstances and conditions. Because of the small size of their island and because of its very limited natural resources, they realized that isolation and separation from the United States was not in their best interest. On the other hand, because of their geographical position, 1,000 miles from Miami and 1,500 miles from New York, because of their cultural background, because they are a fully developed people by themselves, admission into the United States Union was not considered the most favorable way to maintain bonds of union with the United States. They brought us a formula conceived in the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-government, unique in the annals of our political system. In accordance with this formula, their bond with the United States does not mean incorporation into the Union, but rather an association with the Union by solemn compact. Of course, it is not separation. Under the aegis of a common citizenship, they maintain a voluntary association with the United States. Thus, they have created their Commonwealth, their free state, with a constitution of their own adoption. They exercise the right of decision in all matters of their everyday life, while the United States, with their consent, performs, relative to Puerto Rico, the same functions as it does in the States of the Union.

In a little over a decade, Puerto Rico's gross national product has climbed more than 300 percent, while wages and salaries have risen some 400 percent. Basic to such progress has been the cultivation of outside capital and the modernizing of ancient agricultural methods. Four hundred new factories and a large number of agrarian programs have been put into operation since the epochal year 1947, when the entire economy of the island began to be revitalized and enlarged with the institution of the Commonwealth constitution.

This veritable industrial revolution, with its attendant beneficial effects on housing, education, and other social factors, has transformed Puerto Rico from the poorhouse of the Western World to a showcase of democracy. It is enormously significant that thousands of visitors from some fourscore foreign lands have studied the Puerto Rican way to a better life under the United States technical-assistance program. It is safe to assume that these observers will give the lie to Communist propaganda.

Four years ago the flag of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was raised to the top of the mast in Puerto Rico to fly alongside the Stars and Stripes. Both flags flying together are a symbol of a noble association.

We are proud of the Puerto Rican people and their efforts to reach a higher station in life. We should continue to help them as much as we can in their unemployment problem, heretofore extensive and appalling. They are trying to create new opportunities so that they will not have to leave their homeland to make a living. They are developing industrially.

The greater the interest and encouragement on the part of the people of the United States in pointing the way for Puerto Rico to achieve higher standards of living, the greater an asset Puerto Rico will be as an associate—both politically and economically. Thus, the greater would be the prestige of the United States before the world, especially before our good neighbors below the border who are kinsmen of Puerto Rico's people.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to extend to the people of Puerto Rico my heartiest congratulations for having made such an excellent selection in choosing their official representatives. Resident Commissioner A. FERNÓS-ISERN, their representative in the Congress since 1947, has done an outstanding and effective job in presenting to the Congress the many problems affecting Puerto Rico. His sincerity of purpose and sterling character have been indelibly imprinted upon every Member of Congress, without exception. Though he has no vote, he has frequently stated to me that he has the votes of 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 96 votes in the Senate of the United States. His activities on behalf of the Puerto Rican people have, on more than one occasion, amply demonstrated the correctness of this statement. As many of us here in the Congress will recall, it was he who was chairman of the constitutional convention which drafted the constitution of Puerto Rico. It was he who was chosen as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations when the President of the United States informed the United Nations of Puerto Rico's self-governing status. In his official capacity, as a representative of the people of Puerto Rico, he has justly earned the admiration and respect of every Member in both Houses of the Congress. His warm personality has endeared him to all of us, and I, for one, hope that the people of Puerto Rico will see fit to retain such a worthy representative in the public service for many long years to come. His great contribution to our cause and the cause of the Puerto Rican people is inestimable.

In Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, Puerto Rico has an equally outstanding citizen. As chief executive, he has unquestionably performed outstanding public service in their behalf. He is, in fact, a great leader. It was during his administration that successful efforts were made in industrializing Puerto Rico so that more people could obtain more jobs, which in turn provided them with an increased standard of living. The people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States owe to him an everlasting debt of gratitude for the great public service which he has, and is, rendering. The record of progress which already has been made under his administration is one in which we can all take just pride.

It was through the leadership of these men that Puerto Rico has advanced, and is continuing to advance, under a truly self-governing associated status with the United States.

On this the fourth anniversary of its self-governing status, I am confident that the Congress and the people of the United States join with me in extending to the people of Puerto Rico best wishes for continued success and Godspeed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Puerto Rican," which was written by Bill Baggs, one of our State's most humorous, and, at the same time, most effective and excellent reporters. This serious column about Puerto Rico is most informative, and deserves the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUERTO RICAN

(By Bill Baggs)

(There are 80,000 people from Puerto Rico or of Puerto Rican descent living among us in this community. Each one is a citizen of the United States. Probably the Puerto Rican is the poorest understood citizen of our country. These notes are made on the eve of the fourth anniversary of the island becoming a full and free partner in the United States.)

Perhaps no people on earth have taken such giant steps toward democracy and its economic blessings in the past 10 years as the Puerto Ricans.

For 400 years the island was ruled by Spain and for 50 years by the United States.

Ten years ago the lack of sanitary and educational facilities would have shocked the most backward section of the continental United States. Today, you can almost see civilization climbing into the spectacular, green limestone hills and the mountains beyond.

INDUSTRY COMES

Essentially the problem of Puerto Rico is over-population. It is one of the most densely-populated places in the world. In Florida, our average is 51 people per square mile. In Puerto Rico the statistic is 643 per square mile.

The land is fertile. Testimony of the rich soil is given by the fine tobacco crop, sugar, coffee, a number of vegetables. Irrigation is needed. Modern agricultural technique is needed. To balance the economy, industry is needed.

In recent years industry has rolled into Puerto Rico like a high, continuing tide. One may observe the strong hand it places on the economy. A great discovery has come with industry: The Puerto Rican is a magnificent industrial worker. This is especially so wherein fingerwork in industry is required. The Puerto Rican has long, thin fingers with a grand dexterity.

PREYED UPON

Overpopulation pushes the Puerto Rican into the continental United States, mostly, it appears, in New York and Miami, and there have mushroomed anti-Puerto Rican feelings among people in this country. This possibly was inevitable.

Many are the Puerto Ricans who come with little education and no money to compete in the cities of the United States. They are preyed upon by the politician in many instances. Among us are people who take great economic advantage of the Puerto Rican. It is not difficult to do.

One must travel to the island, back into the country, where the Jibaro or countryman,

lives. There one finds a splendid man. In his native circumstances, the Jibaro is a delightful, frank, honest man. He is as generous as man becomes. One who has been among them knows this to be so.

TO APPRECIATE

But in the severe competition of the cities, the Puerto Rican becomes, by necessity, hardened. They often do rash things. There was the young man a few years ago here who attempted to stick up a fellow. The fellow refused to be bullied whereupon the Puerto Rican began to cry and reveal his frustration. In a small half of a house, his five children and a wife waited for him to bring home something to eat. His only prospects were to rob.

One may say, and one can hear it said, that the Puerto Rican should go home. This is foolish and empty talk. The Puerto Rican is at home. Wherever his feet are on the soil of the United States he is at home.

Democracy and its economic goods were cultivated only in late years by this fellow. One must understand this to understand the Puerto Rican. To appreciate him one should travel to Puerto Rico and see the best advertisement the United States has for Latin eyes in this hemisphere.

WEEKLY HEALTH BULLETIN OF THE CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues in this body and our fellow legislators in the House of Representatives will welcome the information I propose to impart in the next 2 minutes.

All of us are aware of the numerous requests we receive in the course of a year; and we are equally aware, I am sure, of the very few times when we receive any public thanks for whatever we have been able to accomplish.

I am happy to report that the Connecticut State Department of Health, in its weekly bulletin dated July 16, 1956, has published an article which is entitled "Thank Your Congressman." The article points out that the young people of Connecticut and other citizens who are most susceptible to the dreaded disease of crippling poliomyelitis are being protected against this scourge by the action of their elected Congressmen who, with the other Members of the Congress, passed the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act in 1955.

The article states that until July 16 of this year, 494,586 doses of vaccine have been received in Connecticut, through this act of the Congress.

I wish to publicly acknowledge this thanks from the Connecticut State Department of Health, and to express, in the name of my colleagues from Connecticut, our appreciation. I feel, too, that I may speak for my other colleagues in the Congress in acknowledging this recognition, which I hope may serve as a precedent for others.

FISHERIES DIVISION IN DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that many persons have a deep and vital interest in Senate bill 3275, to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes. It is a most important bill. All portions of the conference report on the bill have been unanimously agreed to by the conferees.

When I rose tonight, I assumed that the conference report had come to the Senate. However, it turned out that the conference report came to the Senate after I began to speak.

I do not know why by unanimous consent we could not consider and approve the conference report tonight, because so many Members are interested in it. However, in view of the fact that it was agreed that no other conference reports would be taken up tonight, I shall wait until tomorrow.

I wish to state that there is great interest in this measure, and there have been press releases and many other statements about it, in hopes that final action would be taken on it tonight.

I am sure there will be no objection to it tomorrow. The first thing in the morning, I hope to have the indulgence of the leader and the whip and all other Members who are "whipping us around" at this time of the year, so we may take final action on this very important piece of proposed legislation. All of it is agreed upon. I am sure that when all the Members return home, they will be able to point with pride to this measure as one of the accomplishments of this Congress. Many Members thought the conference report would be agreed to tonight.

The report is at the desk, and tomorrow morning I shall call it up at the first opportunity.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, that he may have "whipped around" a little from time to time, although I have not been conscious of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. CLEMENTS. But I take it that there are no saddle sores on my friend. [Laughter.]

THE CASE FOR GOING TO CONFERENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a research memorandum prepared for some of us who serve on the Banking and Currency Committee. The memorandum has been prepared by the exceedingly able staff of the committee.

In fact, Mr. President, I think this is a good time and place to say that in my judgment the committee, in its activities this year, would not have been able to accomplish nearly so much as it has accomplished under the very fine leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], without the exceedingly able work of the members of the committee staff. Not only are they an able brain trust, but they are really an exceptional brain powerhouse.

When we came to realize what the House of Representatives has done in the case of the Senate housing bill, S. 3855, which passed the Senate on May 24, and when we realized that the House had really ignored the Senate bill, and had considered a bill which bore little relationship to it, we asked our committee staff to prepare a research memorandum on conference procedures in the Congress of the United States. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the memorandum which the staff has prepared for us, under the title, "The Case for Going to Conference."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR GOING TO CONFERENCE

1. The Senate housing bill (S. 3855) was ignored by the House in a power play to avoid a conference.

2. The congressional conference committee system is a legislative mechanism which has been evolved over many years to meet certain imperative needs. It is recognized as a means of abbreviating legislative procedure and of harmonizing disagreements between the Houses. It is also recognized as a means by which essential legislation can be put through a Senate and a House of Representatives whose majorities, on certain issues, may be fundamentally opposed to one another.

3. There is no doubt but that the conference committee system has become a vitally important part of the legislative process in Congress. For many decades the overwhelming majority of major legislative measures has been the result of conference committee deliberation.

4. Under the rules of the two Houses, as amended in recent decades, the managers are subject to a reasonable degree of control by the House and Senate. There is now much less conference committee legislation than was formerly the case.

5. The composition of a conference committee makes it a particularly appropriate device for offering construction suggestions in regard to a bill that may have been altered several times in the course of its progress through the two Houses. For the members of the conference committee are also members of the standing committees of the two Houses which, working separately, have studied the bill carefully at the committee stage and have handled it on the floor. By meeting together in conference certain members of these informed committees can discuss the points of view of their respective bodies and arrive at a practical adjustment.

6. Long experience proves that the conference committee system is an essential part of the machinery of congressional government. Students of Congress are agreed that it is a necessary feature of our form of government. It achieves results, action, conclusion. Under our bicameral system, despite admitted defects, it is essential to have some arrangement for reconciling differences between the two Houses.

7. In the latest study of the congressional conference committee (1951), Prof. Gilbert Y. Steiner, of the University of Illinois, concludes that: "The conference committee is both a practical and satisfactory device to achieve this accommodation. It has not been a consistently irresponsible 'third house' of Congress. Conference committees have sometimes been reckless, and sometimes have flouted the will of a congressional majority, but the number of such instances is small. Conference committees may be and have been controlled by effective rules and precedents."

8. In his recent book on The Legislative Struggle (1955), Bertram M. Gross writes that: "The differences between measures approved by each of the two Houses are often

of crucial importance to individual Members of Congress, private organizations, and executive officials. Conference committees become the only practical method of settling these differences." And he cites the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 as an example of the use of the conference committee to liberalize a measure (at p. 319).

9. Over the years, and especially in recent times, the courts have come to use the statement of the managers with increasing frequency as an extrinsic aid in helping them determine the intent of Congress. The courts give as much weight to such statements as they do to the committee reports prepared by the standing committees. In instances where a bill is almost completely rewritten in conference, the statement of the managers is the best extrinsic aid available to the court in determining intent.

10. From the earliest days of Congress the conference committee has been the accepted method of adjusting differences between the House and the Senate. This device has been used extensively by every Congress since 1789. Most important legislation goes through conference.

11. The conference committee is today perhaps the most unique and powerful legislative institution in America, and the least dramatic. It is a notable fact that American legislatures stand alone among modern bicameral legislative bodies in providing a formal method for adjusting differences between them. Since few, if any, important bills ever pass both Houses of Congress in precisely identical form, and since the final shape of differing measures must be determined in conference, the strategic role and importance of ad hoc conference committees will readily be appreciated.

12. In general, writers on Congress regard the conference committee as an admirable device for achieving its purpose. The advantages claimed for the system are that it settles differences between the two Houses in most cases, that it serves to expedite legislative business and prevent deadlocks, and that it facilitates majority party control of legislation.

Mr. MORSE. The memorandum points out the great importance of the conference procedure in the legislative process in the Senate, and in the House as well. I am glad that we were finally able, parliamentarywise, to resolve our difference with the House without getting into a controversy with the House over its attempt to circumvent the conference procedure.

That is about all I think we can say for the action we took last night on the housing bill. In my judgment, it was an act which, in terms of history, will be recognized as a legislative tragedy. I am very sad to think that we approved in the Senate last night a housing bill which deleted public housing for the old people.

I never wish anyone any misfortune, but I am satisfied that if my colleagues in the Senate did not have the advantage of the "public trough" we enjoy from the standpoint of our economic sustenance, and if we had to be dependent for our livelihood on the limited resources available to thousands of our old people, who I feel, were done a tragic injustice last night, perhaps we would have a better understanding of the humanitarianism of the section in the Senate bill which was approved by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and by the Senate, and which, in my judgment, ought to go to conference. It sought to provide at least 10,000 units of housing for the destitute aged.

So again I think there will be a day of reckoning, because, in my opinion, such injustices as we did last night will be recognized by the American people, and I think an accounting will be demanded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 4203) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries, to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy, to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I again rise to urge my colleagues in the United States Senate to amend the Federal election laws before adjourning this session. For a Senator seriously to ask that the Senate, at this late stage in the session, consider a bill not previously cleared for debate by either the Senate Democratic Policy Committee or the Republican Policy Committee, is an extraordinary request and requires some explanation, even though the bill has been reported by the committee to which it was referred and has been on the calendar for more than a year.

The request, Mr. President, is made most seriously and the remarks I am about to make are, in part, an exhortation that the Senate enact legislation modernizing our grossly inadequate and outmoded Federal election machinery, and in part a review of the legislative history of proposed legislation designed to achieve these desired ends.

NO PROBLEM MORE VITAL TO DEMOCRACY

Mr. President, in my opinion, no problem of self-government by a free people which can be laid before their elected representatives is any more vital to the people's welfare than the one of providing that electoral and legislative decisions shall, in the long run, truly represent the people's will and the people's wishes, under the restrictions of constitutional government. That is the very essence of the Republican form of government to which we all subscribe. Popular rule, with written self-restraints to guarantee rights of minorities, is the one fundamental doctrine of any workable democratic process of government which clings to the ideal of human dignity and human freedom.

How to preserve such a Government from subversion by tainted elections and by tainted legislative decisions is a question which demands of everyone concerned with it a consideration beyond all thought of petty advantages to be gained momentarily by persons or parties.

CITIZENS' VOTING RIGHTS EQUAL

It is also fundamental to the American philosophy of Government that no one citizen is entitled to a greater share in the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship at the ballot box than another. To follow that philosophy of popular sovereignty through to its logical and rightful conclusion, no citizen in this country is entitled to a greater or lesser share in the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship by reason of his wealth or poverty. Rich or poor as a man may be, he is equal to any other before a jury in a courtroom, and in the weight to be given to his will by his exercise of the citizen's voting franchise.

No doctrine of inequality at the polls—as between citizen and citizen—should ever be tolerated within this great and free country of ours, if the status of a citizen of the United States is to mean what I believe it to mean. I feel about citizenship in the United States very much as the apostle Paul must have felt when he stated simply and proudly, "I am a citizen of Rome." And if I interpret correctly the wishes or the will of the vast majority of the citizens of this country, they all wish to be equal in influencing the selection of their governmental agents by use of the ballot.

VOTING RESULTS MUST NOT BE WEIGHTED BY WEALTH

They believe in the principle of one vote per citizen. They do not believe in the depths of their hearts that voting results should be weighted in favor of citizens of large means who not only cast their individual votes but subscribe large sums of money to obtain the election of candidates whom they favor. The use of the money power to influence elections, legitimate as it is, is a matter that disturbs the people of this country greatly. It has been disturbing to them for many years. The people of this country all recognize, as you and I do, that the expenditure of money is necessary to carry on political campaigns. But time and time again our people and their legislative representatives have been outraged by the lavish and massive

use of money by a few persons of great wealth to influence election results. They have been so affronted by this occasional abuse of the money power by rich men or small minorities with riches at their command, that they have called it correctly a corrupt practice.

We all know that the lavish expenditure of private moneys and special interest moneys in the political life of our country is not confined to any one political party. We all know that sometimes vast sums of money have been expended to obtain political results by the triumph of one party alone, or by the candidates of one party. We knew, too, that at other times and in other places large and improper sums have been spent to corrupt the electoral and legislative process by secret expenditure of large sums of money for the control of public officers in both of the major parties of this country.

In our consideration of the problems facing the Senate's current inquiry into lobbying and campaign expenditures, or the problems before us in working for that real reform of our election laws upon which we are now engaged, we must always remember one truism. Neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party can boast a monopoly of political virtue and honor in this country. And neither party can contemplate its entire history, in city, State, and national campaigning, without regretting some episodes of the past.

And what is true of these two parties, singly, in this respect, has also been proved true of so-called bipartisan government so many times in local elections that we should all be aware of one thing—and remember it. So-called bipartisan or nonpartisan election victories and legislative victories, have also been bought corruptly by invisible governments, rich and powerful.

FREE GOVERNMENT IS MENACED

It was during my speech in opposition to the Natural Gas Act that I laid down this proposition:

> The concentrated money power of the great oil companies, wielded today to influence the decision of National Government by contributions to both parties in many parts of the United States, is a menace to the proper functioning of free government within this country.

In saying this I did not accuse the owners and managers of the oil companies of political corruption. I meant only that by means of lawful but massive campaign contributions and institutional advertising and by other lawful means, that they are able to exert an undue and disproportionate influence on the election of public officials and on the course of legislation in both State and the National Legislatures.

MUST CURB IMPROPER USE OF MONEY POWER

It is absolutely incumbent upon us that we investigate to the limit, and enact laws to curb the concentrated, undue and lavish and improper use of the power of money to influence elections and legislative decisions.

This money power works through both parties, at national, State and local levels. Of course, it is not the oil and gas industry alone which has used vast and improper expenditures, in this country's political life. There are others. Going back over the long struggle of the people of this country to rid themselves of political corruption, one may mention other highly reputable industries, other highly reputable divisions of commerce and industry, which have sometimes used the same improper but legal weapon, the massive use of money in politics. In our history we have seen abuse of the money power in politics and government by the mining industry, the railroads, the big insurance companies, the banks, the shipping lines—just to name a few occasional offenders. The whisky trade, to name another. And within our very recent memories are revelations of similar abuse of money power in politics by industries and commercial enterprises of no such status as these lines of industry which I have just named. I refer to the horse racing, dog racing, slot machine divisions of a nationwide gambling industry. Now, all the people within all these industries are legally and morally entitled to use campaign contributions up to a certain extent. They are entitled in law to lobby within certain limits. They all have a right to see that their views and interests are given proper representation in the government of the people. Our problem is where to draw the line and the limit, beyond which the use of the money power is improper and corrupts our electoral and legislative process.

This is both a complex and deceptively simple question.

INERTIA HAMPERS REFORM

Year after year our people, or some of them, have tried to deal with this complex problem of the corrupt practice in national, State and local elections. Hardly a year has gone by for the last generation but what some bill designed to correct an admitted national evil has been introduced in the Congress. But there is a natural inertia, I believe we all must confess if we are honest, in any body of elected representatives of the people, when it comes to any change in the rules which govern their own elections. They have adjusted themselves to living under the old ones. They have won their seats in legislative assemblies under the old ones. A great many other matters are brought before them for legislation. And reform of the election laws, however, much needed, has, therefore, languished far too long in my opinion, and in the opinion of so many other Senators and voters that it has now come before us as a matter of urgent necessity.

An extended study of the provisions regulating Federal elections and of the practices of our election campaigns has convinced me that the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, the basic law governing Federal elections, requires a considerable overhauling. For some 5 years, as a member of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, I participated in the investigations of election contests in Ohio, Maryland, New Mexico, Michigan, and several other States. In fact, part of the time I guided these investigations as the chairman of the subcommittee. This experience left no doubt in my mind that the act of 1925 was inadequate, even at the time of its enactment. Some of these inadequacies went to the substance of the law and some were due to the shortcomings of its language.

MAJOR DEFECTS OF CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

The 1925 act has eight major defects:

First. It makes no attempt to limit or provide for publicity for expenditures in primary elections, conventions, or caucuses, despite the fact that in approximately one-third of our States success in the primary is, in effect, tantamount to election. Since Federal law does apply to general elections in all of the States, the exemption from that law of primaries and other nominating devices results in an incomplete and distorted picture of campaign finance.

Second. Existing law fails to place any effective limitation on contributions or expenditures even in final elections. This failure is due to several factors, including the fact that existing law regulates only the contributions received and the expenditures made by candidates themselves and does not apply to political committees which support them unless those committees are national in character. Moreover, the existing law establishes such unreal limitations on expenditures which a candidate may lawfully make that it invites, encourages, and even demands evasion.

Third. Existing law fails to fix the responsibility clearly either for improper expenditures or for failure to file reports in compliance with such law. Furthermore, it allows ad hoc political committees, created frequently with a candidate's complete awareness, to participate in exceedingly questionable campaign practices on behalf of that candidate, without providing that the candidate on whose behalf such practices are engaged in shall bear responsibility, even though he may be cognizant of such practices.

Fourth. The provisions of existing law insofar as it concerns the reporting of contributions and expenditures are confusing and onerous and provide many opportunities for evasion or avoidance.

Fifth. Existing law fails to provide adequate publicity for even the small number of reports filed in compliance with its provisions.

Sixth. Existing law does not apply to large numbers of organizations, both national and intrastate in character, which, while not directly supporting particular candidates, frequently exercise a controlling influence over election.

Seventh. Existing law provides no adequate means of checking the reports that are made or of enforcing the penalties prescribed for its violation.

Eighth. Existing law does not apply to any committee operating only within one State in behalf of a candidate for elective Federal office. It thus exempts a large number of organizations formed for a single purpose—to influence a Federal election—from any effective control or regulation.

PROVISIONS OF HENNINGS BILL

Mr. President, so much for the defects of existing Federal election laws. I now wish to discuss two bills dealing with election reform which have been

introduced in the Senate. One of them, S. 636, was introduced by me on January 21, 1955—over 18 months ago—on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. This Senate bill, S. 636, which bears Senate Calendar No. 629, was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Rules and Administration by Senator GREEN more than 13 months ago. It has remained on the Senate Calendar since, waiting for the Senate to act on it. This bill contains the following provisions:

First. To extend the coverage of Federal law regulating corrupt practices in general elections to primaries and caucuses held for the purpose of selecting candidates for elective Federal offices.

Second. To extend the coverage of Federal law regulating financial activities of interstate political committees to all political committees expending more than $100 annually which are active in campaigns for elective Federal office.

Third. To centralize, to the extent that such is practicable, responsibility for campaign practices and tactics.

Fourth. To improve, and make more realistic, reporting requirements imposed on candidates for elective Federal office and political committees supporting such candidates.

Fifth. To increase the amount candidates for elective Federal office may legally spend to seek nomination or election.

Sixth. To provide for legislative supervision of the enforcement by executive agencies of the Federal Government of Federal laws regulating corrupt practices in Federal elections.

Seventh. To limit the amount that an individual may spend or contribute in the aggregate to a total of $10,000.

LIMITATIONS IMPLICIT IN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY

Those are the principal purposes of the bill, as laid down by the majority of the Rules Committee which has endorsed this legislation. Within that purpose of establishing realistic limits of expenditure, you may be sure, the principle that expenditures shall be so limited that no few rich contributors may dominate political decisions within the country is implicit. It is implicit by reason of that entire philosophy of democratic, popular government in action expressed so ably by Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and others. That is why a specific limitation of $10,000 as any one individual's contribution in a national election was written into the bill.

BILL APPROVED BY RULES COMMITTEE

The bill, as finally adopted by the majority of the Rules Committee provided for a complete repeal of the old Corrupt Practices Act, which had proven so ineffective. In reporting it, the majority suggested that legislation in the field of political expenditure on radio and television might well be incorporated as amendments. Majority members of the committee also have favored inclusion of the provisions of a bill now before the House of Representatives, giving tax exemption on political contributions up to $100 by individuals. This would be to encourage larger numbers of small contributions by average citizens in the moderate income group, and make the campaign funds of both major parties less dependent on a few gifts by big contributors.

Altogether, a good many months before there was any talk of a bipartisan bill to amend the Corrupt Practices Act, the leadership of the majority party within the Senate had S. 636, an honest elections bill, ready for debate on the floor of the Senate. It was ready for debate just as soon as a green light should be given under normal processes of congressional procedure.

BILL CAREFULLY DRAFTED

Mr. President, this honest elections bill, S. 636, represents, I believe the most adequate and advanced attempt ever made in this country to enact a satisfactory election law. It is a measure based upon earlier proposals made by many distinguished Members of this body. It incorporates the wisdom of congressional committees over a period of three decades. It was drafted on the basis of recommendations made by such committees and with full attention to the advice and counsel of lawyers, political scientists, party officials, and officeholders.

LITTLE INTEREST IN ELECTION REFORM UNTIL SENATOR CASE MADE CHARGES

This bill has been the subject of a good many speeches, both in the Senate Chamber and elsewhere, and the subject of a great deal of editorial comment by papers throughout the country, but until early February of this year, it received little interest in the United States Senate. In early February, an event occurred which created a great deal of interest in the Senate on the subject of election reform. This incident was the revelation by the junior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. FRANCIS CASE, that he had been offered a campaign contribution by an oil lobbyist in appreciation for his anticipated vote in favor of the natural gas bill. Senators will recall that on February 6, the distinguished majority leader called for an investigation of the incident reported by Senator CASE. Senators will recall that on the same day I attempted to have the resolution to make such an investigation broadened to cover the entire subject of the influence of money to influence legislation in the Congress and Federal elections. Senators will recall that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, I announced on February 7 that this subcommittee would hold a meeting while the Senate was in session to investigate Senator CASE's charges, and that I obtained unanimous consent for the subcommittee to meet for this purpose. Senators will recall that simultaneously a select committee was appointed pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate to investigate the charges of Senator CASE, and that this select committee claimed exclusive jurisdiction over the subject matter, and that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections was, in effect, thwarted in its efforts to conduct its investigation of the general subject, beginning with the charges of Senator CASE. Senators will recall that President Eisenhower vetoed the natural gas bill, charging arrogance on the part of certain lobbyists. Senators will recall that, pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate, a select committee of eight Senators was chosen to make a broad investigation into lobbying and campaign contributions. Senators will recall that the select committee had great difficulty in agreeing on rules of procedure, and that on March 8, I gave notice during a session of the Senate that I would move at the end of one week to discharge the committee if it had not organized itself as a committee, with a chairman and committee rules and was ready to proceed with a thorough investigation. Senators will recall that thereafter it appears that the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying has been functioning quietly and has issued a few reports.

JOHNSON-KNOWLAND BILL OBTAINS 85 COSPONSORS—LEGISLATION BY ACCLAMATION

During the time that these events which I have listed were transpiring, there appeared to be more and more interest in the enactment of adequate Federal election laws, and on February 28, 1956, another bill, S. 3308, known as the Johnson-Knowland bill, was introduced by the distinguished majority leader on behalf of himself and the distinguished minority leader, and a good many other Senators on both sides of the aisle. This bill was permitted to lie on the table for an extended period to enable other Senators to add their names to the list of cosponsors. At the time, it was introduced on February 28, it had 20 cosponsors. On March 5, 49 Senators were cosponsors, and on the 6th of March 62 Senators had signified their sponsorship. By the 14th of March, at least 85 Members of this body joined the list of cosponsors of this bill. The situation created by the new and overwhelming enthusiasm for this bill amounted to a new kind of legislative or parliamentary action—legislation by acclamation. Mr. President, I do not exaggerate. At the time that this bill was cosponsored by the 85th Senator, the Senate consisted of only 95 Senators—the seat which had been occupied by the late Senator Harley Kilgore was still vacant. Therefore, if only 10 more Senators had signed the list of cosponsors, we would have had a parliamentary situation which I dare say would have been unique in the history of legislative bodies. Often, when an idea occurs to a legislator which he feels is likely to be overwhelmingly popular, he is apt to restrict its sponsorship to himself alone, or to his committee handling this type of legislation, or at the very outside, to Members of his own party. But here we were presented with no such ordinary situation. Here the principal sponsor sought the counsel and advice not only of Members of his own party, but the leadership of the opposing party. In concert, the Senate leaders used their great persuasive powers in an effort to induce all Senators to become cosponsors of this bill.

HENNINGS DECLINED TO BE COSPONSOR

As much as I would have liked to join with the 85 Senators in the mounting drive to reform the election laws, I declined to become a cosponsor because even though S. 3308 was in fact in most respects almost a carbon copy of S. 636, which I had introduced myself more than a year earlier, it did not cover primary elections and was in my opinion deficient in certain other respects. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, who had felt the effects of large campaign contributions used against her in the 1954 primary election in her State, also declined to become a cosponsor of the Johnson-Knowland bill, S. 3308. I do not have personal knowledge as to the reasons why the other few remaining Senators failed to join.

Now let it be clearly understood that I am, in no sense critical, of the efforts of the majority and minority leaders to win universal approval for their bill. Quite the contrary, in fact—I am full of admiration for their large success in obtaining 85 names as cosponsors of this legislation—I imagine an all-time high in cosponsorship in the history of the United States Senate. It behooves any legislator to win as many adherents as possible to his cause.

As a Senator who sponsored a bill which was reported to the Senate only after long months of hearings and study in committee, I was greatly impressed by the enthusiasm and speed with which the 85 Senators put forward their bill. Mr. President, I must confess that at times I was filled with concern lest I be the only Senator not to sign my name to the list of cosponsors.

SENATE APPEARED TO LOSE INTEREST IN ELECTION REFORM

However, time passed. The Senate chose a select committee of eight distinguished Senators to make a broad investigation of lobbying activities of all kinds, and that committee has been at work for some months now. Knowing that the select committee was at its job of ferreting out, in every nook and cranny, the full story of lobbying activities, the Senate, as a body, appears to have relaxed from the tension of modernizing the Federal election laws and, I think it is fair to say, for the last 3 or 4 months has made no further move toward reforming the Federal election laws. S. 3308 has been resting with the committee to which it was referred and where it did languish, and languishing, it did die.

Mr. President, I have outlined—as briefly as I can—the inadequacies of our present election laws, and the reforms contained in the bill which I sponsored along with other Senators, S. 636, which is now on the Senate Calendar. I have also, Mr. President, briefly outlined the legislative history of these bills and the interest of Senators in enacting amendments to the Federal election laws, which reached its zenith at the time when the 85th Senator added his name to the list of cosponsors of S. 3308, and which appears to have since declined.

Does the failure of the Senate to debate and pass an honest-election bill reflect a lack of interest in this subject on the part of people, generally, in the country. I think not. We cannot expect the public to maintain their interest in a subject constantly in a state of white-hot heat. The public will focus its attention on particular legislative problems from time to time. Under our political system, there are always many problems to be solved. Each day brings new crises and new problems. The attention of the public can be centered on these problems, not all at one time, but one after another.

I have referred to a number of recent editorials in metropolitan papers as indicating the continuing interest in this subject by thoughtful people. I say, Mr. President, that it is in order for the Senate to adopt some substantial legislation amending the Federal election laws. It seems to me we must, at the very least, enact a law which would provide for a full disclosure on the part of substantial contributors to campaign funds, and the expenditures of campaign funds by candidates and political committees. In addition, it is obvious to everybody that we should amend our Federal election laws to lift the ceilings on the maximum amounts that can be expended by candidates and political committees to realistic limits. With these basic reforms enacted during this session, Congress would have gone a long way toward enacting an adequate Federal election law. The responsibility for failing to enact such legislation will rest with both political parties if we adjourn without enacting such legislation.

Therefore, at this late hour, when we have heard that there is a possibility of the Senate adjourning sine die tomorrow or the next day, I call upon Senators to come forward with their suggestions and with their assurances of support for enacting, at the very least, a few reforms in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks some newspaper headlines which will provide a bare outline of the course of events. In this way, Senators can get a full and graphic picture concerning the course of the proposed Federal elections reform legislation during the 84th Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

January 21, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: HENNINGS Offers Bill To Revise Election Laws.

January 22, 1955, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: HENNINGS Urges Overhaul of United States Election Laws.

January 22, 1955, Kansas City Times: For Vote Law Reform—Deficiencies Are Found by HENNINGS.

January 27, 1955, Liberty Tribune, Liberty, Mo.: Senator HENNINGS Proposes Reforms in Election Laws.

January 29, 1955, Labor: Editorial: Now Is Time To Stop Buying of Elections.

March 18, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Hearing April 12 on Bill Revising United States Vote Laws.

April 7, 1955, Washington Post: Hearings Will Open Tuesday on Election Law Overhaul.

April 9, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: HENNINGS Urges Realism in Controls Over Campaign Spending.

April 10, 1955, Kansas City Star: Vote Law Look—Hearings Start Tuesday on Proposed Revision of Intolerable Election Controls.

April 10, 1955, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Election Reform Fight To Get Start Tuesday.

April 11, 1955, Christian Science Monitor: Congress Starts to Dig Into Campaign Costs—Horse and Buggy Laws Under Study.

April 12, 1955, Richmond Time-Dispatch: Plugging Election Law Loopholes.

April 12, 1955, Washington Star: Hall and Butler Support New Political Funds Law.

April 12, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Parties Agree Campaign Fund Top Is Too Low.

April 13, 1955, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: HENNINGS Elections Bill Backed By New York Political Analyst.

April 13, 1955, Washington Star: Campaign Fund Laws Termed Almost A Joke.

April 14, 1955, New York Herald: For Tighter Campaign Fund Rules—Witnesses Ask Federal Policing.

April 14, 1955, New York Times: Witnesses Urge Vote Law Teeth.

April 16, 1955, Labor: Stop Buying of Elections, HENNINGS urges.

April 24, 1955, New York Times: Campaign Spending Again Under Study.

April 26, 1955, Denver Post: Spending Free For All (editorial).

May 26, 1955, New York Times: Revisions Urged In Election Laws.

May 29, 1955, Gallup poll, Washington Post: Election Spending Curbs Backed.

June 13, 1955, Washington Star: Senate Group Approves Campaign Fund Limits.

June 15, 1955, New Orleans Times: Limit Campaign Money (editorial).

June 15, 1955, Washington Post: GOP Group Holds up Judgment on Revision of United States Election Laws.

June 16, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: New Campaign Controls Voted by Senate Group.

June 16, 1955, Kansas City Times: More for Votes—Under Hennings Proposal Spending of Candidates Could Be Increased.

June 17, 1955, Detroit News: Spending Gag (editorial).

June 18, 1955, Labor: Senate Group Okays Bill To Stop Buying of Elections.

June 19, 1955, Courier-Journal: Clean Money for Campaign Costs.

June 20, 1955, Thomas L. Stokes, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Hennings Bill Would Bare Vote Funds.

June 24, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: For Clean Campaign Funds (editorial).

June 24, 1955, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Republicans Rap Hennings Bill On Elections.

June 28, 1955, Thomas L. Stokes, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Trying To Separate Politics From Money.

June 30, 1955, St. Louis Labor-Tribune: Senator TOM HENNINGS Bill Would Encourage Donations To Political Parties by More Little Individuals.

July 5, 1955, Washington Star: Hennings Sticks To Plan for Vote Laws Revision.

July 5, 1955, Moberly Monitor-Index: Senator HENNINGS Stands Pat on Campaign Bill.

July 7, 1955, Kansas City Times: Campaign Spending Control.

July 10, 1955, GOP drafts proposal on vote reform.

July 30, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Action Deferred on Hennings Election Laws Measure.

July 31, 1955, Washington Post: Brownell's Shift Blasted by Hennings.

August 22, 1955, George Sokolsky, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Bought Elections. (In this column, Mr. Sokolsky criticized the Congress for having failed to enact S. 636 during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, and urged that this bill be passed during the 2d session.)

January 26, 1956, Christian Science Monitor: Campaign Spending Reforms Bog Down.

January 31, 1956, New York World Telegram: HENNINGS Calls Gas Monopoly Corruptor of Politics.

January 31, 1956, New York Post: Charges Gas Lobby Buying Elections.

January 31, 1956, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: HENNINGS Blasts Money Power of Great Oil Firms.

January 31, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: HENNINGS Says Gas Bill Would Also Protect Oil Monopolies.

February 1, 1956, New York Herald Tribune: Lobbyists for Gas Bill Assailed by Two Senators—AIKEN and HENNINGS.

February 1, 1956, Festus Democrat: HENNINGS Calls for Probe of Giant Oil Firms.

February 16, 1956 Washington Star: Senate Beats Two Moves To Probe Gas Funds.

February 6, 1956, Washington Evening Star: HENNINGS Asks Broad Quiz of Outlays of Both Sides.

February 6, 1956, New York Post: HENNINGS Asks Full Gas Grab Probe.

February 7, 1956, New York Times: Gas Lobbies Shun Publicity's Glare.

February 7, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Case To Appear Before Special Group; Hearings by HENNINGS, Too.

February 7, 1956, St. Joe News-Press: HENNINGS Group Cuts in Ahead of Special Probers—Calls Senator CASE To Testify on $2,500 offer.

February 7, 1956, Columbian Missourian: Senator HENNINGS Jumps the Gun; Calls CASE to Public Hearing.

February 7, 1956, Washington Post: Senate Approves Gas Bill, 53 to 38—Agrees To Probe Donation to CASE Campaign.

February 8, 1956, Washington Post: Senate Sets Up Group To Probe CASE Gift; HENNINGS Quiz Stymied.

February 8, 1956, Globe-Democrat: Special Senate Group To Hear CASE in $2,500 Inquiry, HENNINGS Is Left Without Witnesses.

February 8, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: HENNINGS To Quit Committee Post in Conflict Over Gas Bill Inquiry.

February 9, 1956, Sikeston Standard: Senators Cool to HENNINGS Type Probe.

February 10, 1956, News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.: Will HENNINGS be muzzled?

February 10, 1956, Mr. Childs, Washington Post: Law Firm Lobbies Need Investigation.

February 11, 1956, AFL–CIO News: HENNINGS Asks Oil Price Probe.

February 11, 1956, Washington Post: CASE Asks for Probe of all Gas Bill Wires (telegrams).

February 12, 1956: Washington Post: Hope Seen for Political Funds Law.

February 11, 1956, Drew Pearson: Wires Pulled to Block Lobby Probe.

February 13, 1956, Cape Girardeau: HENNINGS Says Election Fund Regulations "Demand Evasion."

February 13, 1956, Columbia Tribune: HENNINGS Quits Senate Elections Subcommittee to Clear Way for Further Gas Bill Lobby Probe.

February 13, 1956, Washington Star: Broader Lobbying Probe Seen.

February 13, 1956, Palm Beach, Fla.: Campaign Contributions To Be Aired by HENNINGS.

February 14, 1956, Washington Post: The Senate's Honor (editorial).

February 17, 1956, Washington Star: Gas Bill Vetoed by Eisenhower.

February 19, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: HENNINGS Is Right.

February 13, 1956, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Oil and Gas Interests May Try To Defeat HENNINGS.

February 16, 1956, Washington Star: Senate Sets Full Probe of Campaign Funds.

February 16, 1956, David Lawrence: Campaign Coin Has 2 Sides: Whole System of Political Donations Criticized.

February 18, 1956, Labor: Senate Must Act To Clear Its Good Name.

February 19, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Oil Men and Money Everywhere in National and State Politics.

February 19, 1956, Washington Star: Clean-up Bill Would Put Probity Into the Art of Getting Elected.

February 23, 1956, Washington Post: Senate Votes 79 to 1 for Wide-Open Inquiry Into Lobby Activities.

February 25, 1956, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Election Laws To Be Stronger for Campaign.

February 25, 1956, Washington Post: Leaders See Reforms in Time for 1956 Election.

February 25, 1956, Washington Star: Split on Primaries Seen Slowing Campaign Bill.

February 26, 1956, Baltimore Sun: Johnson Says Group Will Write Competent Lobby Act.

February 27, 1956, Washington Post: Honest Elections Bill (editorial).

February 27, 1956, Springfield News: Hennings Hits at Spending by Big Oil Firms.

February 27, 1956, Moberly Moniters Index: Hennings to Insist Source of Political Donations Be Given.

February 27, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Hennings Says Group Seeks to Kill Checks on Primary Funds.

February 29, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Clean Politics" bill Backed By Senate Leaders.

March 1, Washington Post: Move Promised on Vote Rights.

March 1, Washington Post: Leaders See Quick Action on Reforms.

March 2, 1956, Washington Star: Gas Fund Quiz Closes; Leaves Links Unclear.

March 4, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Hennings Bill Foes Must Kill It the Hard Way.

March 6, 1956, Washington Post: Honest Vote Bill Draws New Support.

March 8, 1956, Washington Star: Good Bipartisan Cause (editorial).

March 14, Sikeston Standard: Senate Group Will Speed Elections Bill.

March 14, Washington Star: Early Passage Sought of Election Reform Bill.

March 5, Kirksville Express: Hennings Does Not Think Proposed Lobbying Law Good Enough.

March 15, Baltimore Sun: Senate Clean Election Bill Faces Delays.

March 17, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Hennings to Play Vital Role in Election Debate.

March 27, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: Hennings Says Group Seeks To Kill Checks on Primary Funds.

March 24, 1956, St. Louis Globe-Democrat: Ten thousand dollars Is Enough (editorial).

March 24, 1956, St. Louis Post-Dispatch: It Costs Too Much to Run.

March 26, 1956, Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N. J.: Action Urged on Regulating Contributions.

March 22, 1956, Washington Post: Election Bill Progress.

April 3, 1956, Hackensack (N. J.) Record: Is Congress Backing Out?

April 14, 1956, Labor: A Way to Cut Huge Spending in Elections.

May 30, 1956, Asheville (N. C.) Citizen: Elections Bill is Stymied.

May 31, 1956, Washington Post: Doubt Noted on any Likelihood of Revising Political Spending Laws.

June 9, 1956, Washington Daily News: Too Many Senators Spoil Bill.

June 18, 1956, St. Louis Post Dispatch: Four Months, No Action.

June 25, Washington Post: Honest Elections.

June 27, Washington Post: An Honest 1956 Election.

June 29, Washington Post: Put It To a Vote.

July 6, Washington Post: Memo to the Leadership.

July 6, Christian Science Monitor: Action for Honest Elections.

July 10, Washington Post: Campaigns Under the Rug?

July 14, Washington Star: On Stalled Bills and Adjournment—Lawmakers Criticized on Lobby Probe and Campaign Expenditure Revision.

July 14, Washington Post: Thought for Senators.

July 16, Drew Pearson, Washington Post: Action Promised on Election Bill.

July 19, Washington Post: Clean Elections in the Closet.

July 21, New York Times: Election Spending.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 6, 1956]

ACTION FOR HONEST ELECTIONS

A fellow who won't mend his roof before it rains sometimes has to get wet in doing the job. That's the position of Congress today regarding election law reform.

For years there has been wide agreement that repairs are necessary. More than a year ago Senator HENNINGS introduced a bill on which hearings were held and committee approval obtained. But Senate leaders thought the bill needed revision. Also, it was raining—the partisan atmosphere and the campaign contributions of an election year were already in evidence.

Then, in February, came the sensational disclosure that $2,500 gifts were being offered Senators whose thinking about the natural gas bill was satisfactory. Congress—and especially the Senate—decided something would have to be done.

Two investigations were started. That headed by Senator GEORGE was limited to ramifications of the Case case. A select committee to deal with the broader questions first was stymied to force the shelving of the energetic Senator GORE as prospective chairman, then was bogged down in side issues under the chairmanship of Senator MCCLELLAN.

Senate leadership also went to work on a second course—legislation. Senator JOHNSON, majority leader, and Senator KNOWLAND, minority leader joined in offering an alternative to the Hennings bill. There had been objections that the latter failed to deal with labor union contributions and would regulate primaries as well as elections.

The primaries feature was dropped in the Johnson-Knowland bill, and it was shaped mainly along lines of insuring honest reporting of contributions. Within a few days 85 Senators put their endorsement on this bill. But 4 months later it hasn't gotten out of committee.

This is not due merely to a desire to put off the roof mending. Earnest study has been given to improving the bill. Clarifying and useful changes have been made. But between those who want one or another controversial extension of the measure and those who have no enthusiasm for fixing roofs—especially when election-year campaign gifts have begun to shower down—the bill appears blockaded.

If anything at all is to be done this year to help make elections more honest, quick and vigorous action will be required. Prompt passage by the Senate would give the Johnson-Knowland bill a chance to get through the House before adjournment at the month's end.

It seems to us that the good faith of the Senate is now involved. Under the last of scandal it made a great show of willingness to expose abuses and enact reforms. With exposure having been maneuvered into a quiet backwater of committee inaction, only the chance for improved legislation remains. The very least the Senate can honorably do is insure the better reporting of campaign contributions provided in the Johnson-Knowland bill.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 19, 1956]

CLEAN ELECTIONS IN THE CLOSET

In the absence of any apparent effort to bring the honest elections bill to the floor, we conclude most reluctantly that the Senate leadership has no intention of seeking action on this essential corrective. We earnestly hope we are wrong. It would be sad to think that the fine spate of senatorial indignation, following the disclosure by Senator FRANCIS CASE of the brazen attempt to influence his vote on the natural-gas bill, was merely for effect. Yet what is the public to think of the failure to take any effective steps to check this kind of corruption?

The honest elections bill, as drawn up by Majority Leader JOHNSON and Minority Leader KNOWLAND themselves and indorsed by 83 other Senators, has 2 essentially simple objectives. It would require far more comprehensive reporting of campaign contributions and would set more realistic limits on campaign expenditures. It also would empower television and radio stations to make time available to the candidates of major parties without the obligation to make equal time available to the nominee of every last splinter group. A third desirable objective—an income-tax deduction of up to $100 for political contributions—was eliminated from the Senate bill in the expectation that the House, which must initiate money bills, would act on it.

These are not radical objectives; but the Johnson-Knowland bill, which is in the form of a substitute for the Hennings bill, probably represents the most that realistically could be accomplished at this session of Congress. Even this mild reform has run into some trouble. Senator GOLDWATER has threatened to introduce an amendment drastically restricting the campaign participation of organized labor. Some unions in turn object to the language of the bill as already too restrictive on them and too weak in other particulars.

But none of these difficulties furnishes a valid excuse for the failure to extract the bill from the Rules Committee for a vote on the floor. There is good reason to think that some of the objections could be overridden or compromised as in the case of at least one previous question. Even if the difficulties should prove insurmountable, the leadership could at least say honorably that it had done its best. As things look now, citizens who are disturbed by the smudge written over the good name of Congress by the improprieties in the gas bill fight and by other long-recognized abuses will have to voice their protests during the campaign and at the polls. Perhaps it will be necessary to remind Senators that if they are too reluctant to clean house the voters can do it for them.

[From the New York Times of July 21, 1956]

ELECTION SPENDING

Existing legislation to control campaign expenditures in national elections has for years been hopelessly ineffective and totally unrealistic. Although present laws limit a candidate to spending $25,000 and $5,000 for Senate and House respectively, it is known that actual expenditures often run much higher—over $100,000 per candidate for the Senate in one recent case.

Present law limits the national committee's expenditures to $3 million each; but it is estimated that the real cost of electing the 83d Congress ran anywhere from $75 to $200 million. Individual contributions are supposedly limited to $5,000; but it is easy to evade this legal restraint.

At the time of the furor last winter over the natural gas bill public interest was aroused once again in the necessity of bringing campaign-control laws up to date. The Senate leaders had at their hand the Hennings bill which had been reported by the Rules Committee in June 1955. In addition to raising the monetary limitations and making other changes, that bill also covered primaries—an important point that made it both more effective and less popular.

The Senate leaders have had plenty of time to get action on the election bill they themselves introduced that excluded consideration of the primaries. What has happened? Nothing, except a desultory and pointless "inquiry" by Senator MCCLELLAN into lobbying on the natural gas bill.

While one may fairly have doubts as to the effectiveness of any campaign-expenditures control bill at all, the least that both parties owe the public is a law as stringent as the Hennings bill, with the additional provision that small political contributions be deductible from income tax. It is incumbent on Congress—in its own as well as the public interest—to give us a decent, workable revision of existing campaign expenditure laws and give it to us before the presidential election.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished occupant of the chair for his indulgence at this late hour.

I also thank my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] for remaining.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I was glad to be on the floor when the Senator from Missouri spoke.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his observation.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands (Rept. No. 2813).

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon (Rept. No. 2814); and

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations (Rept. No. 2812).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. CHAVEZ), from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. R. 10468. A bill creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 2815); and

H. R. 10662. A bill creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; (Rept. No. 2816).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS AND A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO SUBMIT A REPORT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to file for printing, after adjournment, a brief report on the subject of Upper Columbia River Development, on which hearings were held this session by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and a special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk 34 nominations of postmasters, unanimously approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I believe that in all the strain under which we work, it is worth while once in a while to remember that occasionally a bright ray of sunshine comes through.

Yesterday when the able Senator from South Carolina reported the nominations of 100 postmasters the able minority leader came over to him and said, "I take this is a part of the bill for aid to distressed areas." [Laughter.]

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico said, on the same day, that inasmuch as 100 postmaster nominations had been reported, he took it for granted that there were 100 distressed areas. There are 34 postmaster nominations on this list, so evidently 34 more distressed areas have been found. [Laughter.]

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 4298. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted, and unanimously agreed to:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. Res. 324. Resolution expressing the appreciation of the Senate for the services rendered by James W. Murphy and members of his family as Official Reporters of Debates.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. This is a bill dealing with the cooperation of the States. It is not my hope or expectation that any consideration will be given to the bill at this time. It is being introduced merely for the purpose of submitting it to the States and getting the ideas of State officials as to the type of legislation which should be enacted to provide for cooperation between the States and the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4298) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1256) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 26, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 497. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California;

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

S. 1243. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1324. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act;

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes;

S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions;

S. 2216. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497);

S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State;

S. 2634. An act relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes;

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional matter for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3458. An act to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes;

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3556. An act to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, 2d session;

S. 3592. An act to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service;

S. 3616. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes;

S. 3650. An act for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine;

S. 3658. An act to amend the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), so as to authorize, by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or alloted;

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments here listed, and for other purposes;

S. 3779. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 3820. An act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 3875. An act to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

S. 3926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes;

S. 3968. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3969. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3970. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individuals members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3998. An act to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery, known as the Holden trout hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt.;

S. 4060. An act to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, to include employees in the Motor Vehicle Service;

S. 4215. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1954, authorizing the sale of certain vessels to Brazil;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundations known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians;

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week;

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island;

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishments of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco;

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; and

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

Statements by him on retirement of Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, and Senator GEORGE, of Georgia.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 10:30 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1956, at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 16), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Lewis Jones, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Tunisia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 16), 1956:

UNITED NATIONS

To be representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio.
Athelstan F. Spilhaus, of Minnesota.
Mrs. Helen C. Russell, of California.

Mrs. Elizabeth E. Heffelfinger, of Minnesota.

Asa T. Spaulding, of North Carolina.

To be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Herold Christian Hunt, of Massachusetts.

Robert McClintock, of California.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

Edward T. Wailes, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

To be members of the Mississippi River Commission

Brig. Gen. Lyle E. Seeman (colonel, Corps of Engineers).

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo (Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey).

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Thomas E. Sikes, Columbus.
Reita A. Williamson, Flintstone.

ILLINOIS

Eric R. Kylen, Hinsdale.
Wilbur M. Abel, Lowpoint.
Stanley J. Fisher, Macomb.
Wilburn R. Spencer, Murrayville.
Harry W. King, Sycamore.
Oliva S. Bradford, Table Grove.
Virden L. Peach, Walnut.

INDIANA

Donald F. Clark, Hammond.
Delbert E. Cantrall, Red Key.

IOWA

Edward J. Wesselink, Pella.
Melvin Hartvig Albertson, Ridgeway.

KENTUCKY

Miles M. Davis, Paris.

MARYLAND

Emory F. Holbrook, Conowingo.
Maurice Anderson Spalding, Gaithersburg.
Edward C. Kaighn, Greenbelt.
Margaret F. Williams, Worton.

MICHIGAN

Walter B. Steele, Muskegon.

MINNESOTA

Floy A. McCoy, Monticello.
Sigurd A. Bertelsen, St. Paul.

MISSISSIPPI

Reece L. Cupit, Columbia.
Euree J. Grantham, Mendenhall.

MISSOURI

Leona B. Tirmenstein, Benton.
Rebecca J. Jackson, Dearborn.
Eugene H. Terry, Exeter.
Warren J. Thomas, Marble Hill.
Fred W. Torwegge, Jr., Potosi.
Charles I. Snodgrass, Tuscumbia.

MONTANA

John K. Pendergraft, Corvallis.

NEW MEXICO

Chester E. Haley, Chama.

NEW YORK

Margurette E. Stark, Altona.
Christopher Raymond Cole, Jr., Croton Falls.
Donald J. Clark, Earlville.
Herman R. Sievert, Fort Hunter.
Ruth Clark, Fort Johnson.
Herman E. Story, Freehold.
Louis G. B. Stebbins, Glens Falls.
James Gordon Thomson, Huntington.
Fred H. Woolschlager, Lowville.
Gus J. Cutrone, Marlboro.
Philip S. Levy, Newburgh.
William E. Way, Peconic.
Donald E. Anderson, Saranac Inn.
Paul W. Brown, Sloansville.
Edward P. Humbert, Spring Valley.
Walter R. Ulmer, Treadwell.
Arthur T. Judge, Troy.

NORTH CAROLINA

Richard E. Gordon, Tabor City.
Eleanor E. Vise, Burlington.
Dennis F. Evert, Edgeley.
Roland G. Swen, Gilby.
Edith M. Lyle, Havana.
Elmer O. Severson, Fessenden.
Edward Barth, Fort Yates.
Ira V. Martin, Hettinger.
Clyde E. Ellison, Leonard.
Harold D. Walland, Rugby.
Alfred G. Lettenmaier, Sanborn.
Ardell C. Bakko, Walcott.
Robert G. Brown, Wimbledon.

OHIO

Voldo P. Smith, Cygnet.

OKLAHOMA

William N. Hamm, Covington.
Kendall E. Campbell, Hunter.

OREGON

Leonard M. Bizon, Hubbard.
John P. Ivers, Oceanlake.
George H. Carl, Oswego.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert S. McGaughey, Luthersburg.

TENNESSEE

Charles Frank Heaton, Roan Mountain.

TEXAS

Loren A. Turner, Burleson.
David L. Clabaugh, Carthage.
James D. South, Clyde.
Arthur E. Tarver (Mrs.), Cotulla.
Elias F. Crim, Jr., Henderson.
Melvin J. Nagel, Mathis.
Christine E. Upchurch, Midkiff.
Faye H. Traylor, New Waverly.
Albert B. Russell, Reklaw.
Jean F. Walker, Sheridan.

VIRGINIA

Virginia C. Foskett, Lynnhaven.

WEST VIRGINIA

Amanda C. Caldwell, Barnabus.
Arnold Grant Porterfield, Bluefield.
Elber O. Drake, Boomer.
Edward Russell Peveler, Bradshaw.
Margaret Ann Arnold, Capels.
Dorothy R. Bland, Capon Springs.
William H. Stepp, Chattaroy.
Edna Saxton, Handley.
John H. Wiseman, Hines.
Guy S. Holliday, Layland.
Florence D. Caldwell, Lookout.
Buren R. Hill, Pineville.
Lorraine D. Tennant, Pursglove.
Charles C. Workman, Red House.
Marshall H. Kirk, Red Jacket.
James Denton Dinsmoor, St. Marys.
Joseph A. Bolman, Shinnston.
Edna L. Unger, Unger.
Jack G. Burnett, Whitesville.

WISCONSIN

Robert J. Antes, Evansville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1956

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou knowest that daily we are challenged by great issues and perplexing problems, but may we always meet them with courage and conviction and a splendor of faith that nothing can dim or eclipse.

Purge us from everything that dwarfs and dulls our capacity for noble service, and may our minds and hearts be impervious to all selfish desires.

Show us how we may build a more blessed social order and may we never be too callous to care, too blind to see, and too indifferent to heed the needs of humanity.

Help us to hasten the coming of that glorious day of prediction, when there shall be peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12237. An act to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3911. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.;

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes";

S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

S. 2060. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices;

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3391. An act to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farmworkers;

S. 3879. An act, to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover compensatory damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; and

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6040) entitled "An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8750) entitled "An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11124) entitled "An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11544) entitled "An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12138) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 4, 22, 27, 33, and 36 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1637) entitled "An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 3897) entitled "An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes."

ANNUITIES TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF JUDGES

Mr. CELLER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2934)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) item 375 in the analysis of chapter 17 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 371, is amended and a new item 376 is inserted immediately thereunder, to read as follows:

"'375. Annuities to widows of justices.

"'376. Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of judges.'

"(b) The catchline to section 375 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 375. Annuities to widows of justices'.

"SEC. 2. Chapter 17 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof, immediately following section 375, a new section reading as follows:

"'§ 376. Annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of judges.

"'(a) Any judge of the United States may by written election filed with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts within six months after the date on which he takes office (or within six months after the enactment of this section) bring himself within the purview of this section.

"'(b) There shall be deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this section a sum equal to 3 per centum of such judge's salary, including salary paid after retirement from regular active service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a) of this title or after retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371 (a) of this title. The amounts so deducted and withheld from the salary of each such judge shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a fund to be known as the "judicial survivors annuity fund" and said fund is appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds and allowances as provided by this section. Every judge who elects to bring himself within the purview of this section shall be deemed thereby to consent and agree to the deductions from his salary as provided in this subsection, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all judicial services rendered by such judge during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he or his survivors shall be entitled under the provisions of this section.

"'(c) Each judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this section shall deposit, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the judicial survivors annuity fund created by this section a sum equal to 3 per centum of his salary received for service as a judge of the United States (including salary received after retirement from regular active service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a) of this title and salary received after retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371 (a) of this title), and of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate or Resident Commissioner in Congress and for any other civilian service within the purview of section 707 of title 5. Such interest shall not be required for any period during which the judge was separated from all such service and was not receiving salary under section 371 (a) or 373 of this title. Each judge may elect to make such deposits in installments

during the continuance of his judicial service in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Notwithstanding the failure of a judge to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of the widow of such judge shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount of such deposit, computed as of the date of the death of such judge, unless such widow shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under subsection (o) of this section: *Provided*, That no deposit shall be required from a judge for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for any honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"'(d) The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest from time to time, in interest-bearing securities of the United States or Federal farm loan bonds, such portions of the judicial survivors annuity fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for the payment of annuities, refunds and allowances as provided in this section. The income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of said fund for the purpose of paying annuities and of carrying out the provisions of subsections (f), (g), (i), and (j) of this section.

"'(e) The amount deposited by or deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this section for credit to the judicial survivors annuity fund created by this section covering service from and after August 1, 1920, shall be credited to an individual account of such judge.

"'(f) If any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this section resigns from office otherwise than on salary under section 371 (a) of this title, the amount credited to his individual account, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31st of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him.

"'(g) In case any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this section shall die while in office (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a) of this title), or after retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371 (a) of this title, after having rendered at least five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in subsection (o) of this section, for the last five years of which the salary deductions provided for by subsection (b) of this section or the deposits required by subsection (c) of this section have actually been made—

"'(1) if such judge is survived by a widow but not by a dependent child, there shall be paid to such widow an annuity beginning with the day of the death of the judge or following the widow's attainment of the age of fifty years, whichever is the later, in an amount computed as provided in subsection (n) of this section; or

"'(2) if such judge is survived by a widow and a dependent child or children, there shall be paid to such widow an immediate annuity in an amount computed as provided in subsection (n) of this section, and there shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of the annuity of such widow, but not to exceed $900 per year, divided by the number of such children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser; or

"'(3) if such judge leaves no surviving widow or widower but leaves a surviving dependent child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to the amount of the annuity to which such widow would have been entitled under paragraph (2) of this subsection had she survived, but not to exceed $480 per year.

"'The annuity payable to a widow under this subsection shall be terminable upon her death or remarriage. The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (A) his attaining the age of eighteen years, (B) his marriage, or (C) his death, whichever first occurs, except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability. In case of the death of a widow of a judge leaving a dependent child or children of the judge surviving her the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection. In any case in which the annuity of a dependent child, under this subsection, is terminated, the annuities of any remaining dependent child or children, based upon the service of the same judge, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such judge.

"'(h) As used in this section—

"'(1) The term "widow" means a surviving wife of an individual, who either (A) shall have been married to such individual for at least two years immediately preceding his death or (B) is the mother of issue by such marriage, and who has not remarried.

"'(2) The term "dependent child" means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, who is under the age of eighteen years or who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support.

"'Questions of dependency and disability arising under this section shall be determined by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts subject to review only by the Judicial Conference of the United States the decision of which shall be final and conclusive. The Director may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as he shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any dependent child who is an annuitant or applicant for annuity under this section, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any examination.

"'(i) In any case in which (1) a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this section shall die while in office (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a) of this title), or after retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371 (a) of this title, before having rendered five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in subsection (o) of this section, or after having rendered five years of such civilian service but without a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity benefits provided by subsection (g) of this section, or (2) the right of all persons entitled to annuity under subsection (g) of this section based on the service of such judge shall terminate before a valid claim therefor shall have been established, the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31st of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date title to the payment arises, in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"'First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries whom the judge may have designated by a writing received by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts prior to his death;

"'Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow of such judge;

"'Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of such judge and the descendants of any deceased children by representation;

"'Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such judge or the survivor of them;

"'Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such judge;

"'Sixth, if none of the above, to such other next of kin of such judge as may be determined by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of such judge at the time of his death.

"'Determination as to the widow or child of a judge for the purposes of this subsection shall be made by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the definition of these terms stated in subsection (h) of this section.

"'(j) In any case in which the annuities of all persons entitled to annuity based upon the service of a judge shall terminate before the aggregate amount of annuity paid equals the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31st of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, the difference shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in subsection (i) of this section.

"'(k) Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the termination (other than by death) of the annuity of any person based upon the service of a judge shall be paid to such person. Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the death of any person receiving annuity based upon the service of a judge shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"'First, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such person;

"'Second, if there is no such executor or administrator payment may be made, after the expiration of thirty days from the date of the death of such person, to such individual or individuals as may appear in the judgment of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other individual.

"'(l) Where any payment under this section is to be made to a minor, or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"'(m) Annuities granted under the terms of this section shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued. None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable, either in law or in equity, or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"'(n) The annuity of the widow of a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this section shall be an amount equal to the sum of (1) 1¼ per centum of the average annual salary re-

ceived by such judge for judicial service and any other prior allowable service during the last five years of such service prior to his death, or retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371 (a) of this title, multiplied by the sum of his years of judicial service, his years of prior allowable service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of prior allowable service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his years, not exceeding fifteen, of prior allowable service performed as an employee described in section 698 (g) of title 5, and (2) ¾ of 1 per centum of such average annual salary multiplied by his years of any other prior allowable service, but such annuity shall not exceed 37½ per centum of such average annual salary and shall be further reduced in accordance with subsection (c) of this section, if applicable.

"'(o) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, the years of service of a judge which are allowable as the basis for calculating the amount of the annuity of his widow shall include his years of service as a judge of the United States (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a) of this title), his years of service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States not exceeding five years in the aggregate and not including any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, and his years of any other civilian service within the purview of section 707 of title 5.

"'(p) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a widow eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity under this section and any annuity to which she would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section, but in computing such other annuity service used in the computation of her annuity under this section shall not be credited.

"'(q) The judges of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam and the District Court of the Virgin Islands and judges of the United States, as defined in section 451 of this title, who are entitled to hold office only for a term of years shall be deemed judges of the United States for the purposes of this section and shall be entitled to bring themselves within the purview of this section by filing an election as provided in subsection (a) of this section within the time therein specified. In the case of such judges the phrase "retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 371 (a) of this title" as used in subsections (b), (c), (g), (i) and (n) of this section shall mean "retirement from office by resignation on salary under section 373 of this title or by removal or failure of reappointment after not less than ten years judicial service", and the phrase "resigns from office otherwise than on salary under section 371 (a) of this title" as used in subsection (f) of this section shall mean "resigns from office otherwise than on salary under section 373 of this title or is removed or fails of reappointment after less than ten years judicial service".'

"SEC. 3. Paragraph (7) of subsection (a) of section 604 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(7) Regulate and pay annuities to widows and surviving dependent children of judges and necessary travel and subsistence expenses incurred by judges, court officers and employees, and officers and employees of the Administrative Office, while absent from their official stations on official business.'

"SEC. 4. The first paragraph of section 605 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'The Director, under the supervision of the Judicial Conference of the United States, shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget annual estimates of the expenditures and appropriations necessary for the maintenance and operation of the courts and the Administrative Office and the operation of the judicial survivors annuity fund, and such supplemental and deficiency estimates as may be required from time to time for the same purposes, according to law. The Director shall cause periodic examinations of the judicial survivors annuity fund to be made by an actuary, who may be an actuary employed by another department of the Government temporarily assigned for the purpose, and whose findings and recommendations shall be transmitted by the Director to the Judicial Conference.'

"SEC. 5. Funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act may be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"SEC. 6. A judge who resigned prior to the date of enactment of this Act and who on that date is receiving salary under section 371 (a) of title 28, United States Code, or who resigned, was removed or failed of reappointment prior to the date of enactment of this Act and who on that date is receiving salary under section 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall be considered a judge within the meaning of section 376 of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, and as such shall be entitled within six months after the date of enactment of this Act to make the election authorized by and to receive the benefits of that section. A judge who retired from regular active service under section 260 of the Judicial Code of 1911 or the Act of August 5, 1939, chapter 433, and who is living on the date of enactment of this Act shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act to have retired from regular active service under section 371 (b) or 372 (a), as the case may be, of title 28, United States Code.

"SEC. 7. In the case of a living widow of a judge of the United States as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code, who died prior to the date of enactment of this Act, an annuity shall be paid as provided in section 376 of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, as if such judge had died on such date and had elected to bring himself within the purview of such section 376, but had not made the deposit provided for by subsection (c) of the said section: *Provided*, (a) That such widow has not remarried; and (b) that the amount of such annuity and the reduction therein because of such deposit not having been made shall be computed on the basis of the actual length of judicial and other allowable service of such judge: *And provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (g) of such section 376 such annuity shall be payable even though such judge had not rendered five years of civilian service prior to his death. In the case of a judge of the United States as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code, who dies within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in subsection (o) of section 376 of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, but without having made an election as provided in such section 376 to bring himself within the purview of that section, an annuity shall be paid to his widow and surviving dependent children as provided in such section 376 as if such judge had elected on the day of his death to bring himself within the purview of such section 376 but had not made the deposit provided for by subsection (c) of the said section. An annuity shall be payable under this section computed on the basis of the actual length of judicial and other allowable service of the judge and subject to the reduction required by subsection (c) of such section 376 even though no deposit has been made, as required by subsection (g) of such section 376, with respect to any of such service."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
KENNETH B. KEATING,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate passed the House bill but amended it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provision as a complete substitute. The House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate and insisted upon its version and requested a conference to which the Senate agreed.

The conference report recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and to agree to the same with amendment, the amendment being to insert in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment the matter agreed to by the conference, and the House agree thereto.

In substance the conference report contains the language of the bill as it passed the House except in a few instances. Both the House and Senate versions differed in only five points.

The first point in dispute was the rate of contribution which an eligible judge should make from his salary into the fund. The House version provided for a rate of 1½ percent of such judge's salary, while the Senate version fixed the rate at 3 percent. The conference accepted the Senate version and fixed the rate at 3 percent.

The second point at variance was the length of service required of a judge in order that his widow might qualify for an annuity. The House version provided that the judge should render at least 5 years of civilian service, which service would include service as a member of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Federal Government. The Senate version required that a judge serve 5 years as a judge of the United States as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code. The conference adopted a 5-year service provision and further provided that it include civilian service as provided for in the House version. However, such service must be covered either by salary deductions or by deposits covering previous Federal civilian service.

The House version provided that in a case where a judge left no surviving widow or widower but did leave a surviving dependent child or children, the maximum amount that such child or children could receive was $480 per year per child, or a gross maximum of $1,200 per year, divided by the number of such children, whichever was the lesser. The Senate version provided for a maximum of $480 per year for each child. The conference adopted the language of the Senate and fixed the maximum for each child at $480 per year.

The House version provided that if a judge failed to make the required deposit to cover previous allowable Federal service, credit would be allowed for that service but the annuity of the widow of such judge would be reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount of such deposit, computed as the date of the death of such judge, unless such widow should elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit in calculating the amount of the annuity to be paid. The Senate version contained no such a provision to cover credit for previously rendered service, unless the required deposit was paid into the fund for all previously rendered service. The conference adopted the language of the House bill with regard to this particular provision.

The House version also provided for annuities for living widows of a judge who had died prior to the enactment of this act. The provision further provided that such widow would be eligible regardless of the length of service rendered by the deceased judge. The Senate version contained no such a provision to cover the case of living widows of deceased Federal judges. The conference adopted the language of the House bill and also provided that annuity should be payable regardless of the requirements that a judge either have rendered 5 years of allowable civilian service or to have served less than the 5 years as a judge but to have paid back into the fund the required deposits for previously rendered service. Thus the language adopted by the conference would cover all cases of living widows of Federal judges who died prior to the enactment of the act.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
KENNETH B. KEATING,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11124) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman to explain what changes have been made in this bill.

Mr. CELLER. The House bill was practically accepted in its entirety, with one major exception, namely, that the contribution to be made by the judges to the annuity fund for their dependents was increased from the House provision of 1.5 to 3 percent.

Otherwise practically the entire bill was accepted.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that they are at least paying something toward annuities for their dependents.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I will say to the gentleman that the 3 percent practically keeps the Government in the black on the matter of the payment of annuities to dependents of the deceased judges.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUDITH KAO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5808) for the relief of Judith Kao, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, after "act", insert ", for a period of 4 years or until such time as she has completed her schooling, whichever occurs sooner."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NIKOLAI E. KHOKHLOV

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 10984) for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Lines 7, 8, and 9, strike out "section 212 (a) (28) of the said act shall be inapplicable in the case of such alien" and insert "his past membership in the classes defined in section 212 (a) (28) of the said act of which the Attorney General has knowledge prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall not hereafter be a cause for his exclusion from the United States."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the other body took expeditious action on this most meritorious measure. The beneficiary of this bill was a high-ranking official in the Soviet Union, and had an important task cut out for him in the international Communist conspiracy. Showing great courage and considerable sacrifice, he came over to our side and provided United States Government agencies with information of tremendous value in our fight against the mortal danger presented by international communism.

Mr. Khokhlov has well deserved asylum in this country. He has been very helpful to committees of the Congress and is continuing extensive activities in enlightening the American people to the danger they face, disclosing the ominous nature of international communism and the foul dealings of Soviet agents in this country and abroad.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTERLEE HUTZLER WEINHOEPPEL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11821) for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the act entitled 'An act for the relief of Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel,' approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. A196), is amended by striking out the following: ': *Provided further*, That failure to establish permanent residence in the United States within a period of 18 months following the enactment of this act shall result in the divestiture of United States citizenship acquired by Mrs. Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel under this act.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 246) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 1.
Page 7, line 9, strike out "Huskel" and insert "Heskel."
Page 27, strike out line 6.
Page 27, strike out line 7.
Page 31, after line 2, insert:
"0300-387762, Foo, You Sung.
"A-6958562, Fong, Wen Chih.
"E-094641, Garcich, John.
"T-359295, Han, Paul.
"A-8057156, Salamon, Anton.
"0300-170339, Shiah, Chyn Duog.
"0300-465873, Swee, Tong.
"A-6542172, Tai, Jun Tsei.
"A-8082020, Yen, Chan Park.
"A-9694637, Yeung, Foo.
"0300-471299, Yook, Leong.
"A-6695455, Tong, William Langson.
"A-9770864, Tong, Ruth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Isak Herstig."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Solomon Joseph Sadakne."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 617) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Olive Markley" and insert "Nelson Rupert Holland."

Page 6, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aston H. Savage may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act."

Page 6, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 10. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria LaSala and Gillian Allison Hackler may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited in each case as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

Page 6, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 11. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erna Barbara Kreutner may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, S. Sgt. Hubert Griffith, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act.

Page 6, line 8, strike out "9" and insert "12."

Page 6, after line 11, insert:

"SEC. 13. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud Kreen, the fiance of Pfc. J. B. Elswick, Jr., a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gertrud Kreen is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Pfc. J. B. Elswick, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Kreen, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gertrud Kreen, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gertrud Kreen as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

Page 6, after line 11, insert:

"SEC. 14. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olive Markley shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee."

Amend the title to read "a joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 618) to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and."

Page 1, line 10, preceding "may" insert ", Kalman Novak."

Page 1, line 10, preceding "may" insert ", and Bojana D. Bojovitch."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. WALTER. This joint resolution contains the names of a number of wives of servicemen. These women are inadmissible because they have arrested cases of tuberculosis. When the joint resolution went over to the Senate there were two more cases involved in which the facts were the same except they lacked reports, back reports have come from the United States Public Health Service to the effect that the cases of tuberculosis of these two young women are now arrested so that they are eligible for admission under the long-accepted policy of the Congress. One of these amendments was introduced by Senator BENDER and the other by Senator THYE.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 620) for the relief of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "Akilloglou," insert "Ezra Chitayat, Violet Chitayat, Georgette Chitayat, Linda Chitayat."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 636) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Thung" and insert "Tsung."

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Cecelia Therese Lynch, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Donald F. Lynch, citizens of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 637) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 4, line 18, after "and", insert "her son, John."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 639) for the relief of certain aliens, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Jaffa Kam."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN SUBSECTIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 651) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive.

Page 1, strike out line 9 and insert: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 3, strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marianne Koch Everson, Frieda Painter-Luenenschloss, and Maja Veara may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "6" and insert "5."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 662) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "act:" insert *"And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

Page 2, line 7, after "Hsieh", insert "Mario Infantino."

Page 2, line 8, after "Medic", insert "Yeup Yeon Micuch."

Page 2, line 9, after "Ordonez," insert "Hedwig M. Perrine."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 680) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 8 on page 2 and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Di Benedetto and Eida Mondillo may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited in each case as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 10, after "(9)" insert "and (12)."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page, 3, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 3, line 20, strike out "Mrs. Anneliese Martin (nee Fesslmayer)."

Page 4, line 2, strike out "Dickerson" and insert "Dickson."

Page 4, line 5, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 5, line 3, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 5, line 9, strike out "8" and insert "7."

Page 5, line 14, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 5, line 20, strike out "10" and insert "9."

Page 6, line 1, strike out "11" and insert "10."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING PROVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 681) to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "act:" insert *"Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "and."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "Blakeslee." and insert "Blakeslee, and Dr. Lewis de Huszovszky."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 683) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Spiridon" and insert "Spyridon."

Page 4, line 5, strike out "Pender and Mrs. Pender, citizens" and insert "Pender, a citizen."

Page 5, line 3, strike out "Panorea" and insert "Panoraea."

Page 6, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 27. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yumi Mense, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Alfred L. Mense, a citizen of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4184) to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons: Herbert Hoover, New York, N. Y.; William E. Hall, New York, N. Y.; Albert L. Cole, Pleasantville, N. Y.; James A. Farley, New York, N. Y.; Albert C. Wedemeyer, New York, N. Y.; Matthew Woll, New York, N. Y.; Jeremiah Milbank, New York, N. Y.; Stanley Resor, New York, N. Y.; James B. Carey, Washington, D. C.; J. Edgar Hoover, Washington, D. C.; Lewis L. Strauss, Washington, D. C.; Gen. Robert E. Wood, Chicago, Ill.; Frederic Cameron Church, Boston, Mass.; H. Bruce Palmer, Newark, N. J.; Edgar A. Guest, Detroit, Mich.; Nicholas H. Noyes, Indianapolis, Ind.; George A. Scott, San Diego, Calif.; E. E. Fogleson, Dallas, Tex.; Ernest Ingold, San Francisco, Calif.; Jesse Draper, Atlanta, Ga.; Julius Epstein, Chicago, Ill., and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Boys' Clubs of America (hereinafter referred to as the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this act, and the doing of such other acts (including the selection of officers and employees in accordance with such constitution and bylaws) as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to promote the health, social, educational, vocational, and character development of boys throughout the United States of America; to receive, invest, and disburse funds and to hold property for the purposes of the corporation.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any private corporation, association, partnership, firm or individual and to hold any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber and otherwise alienate real, personal or mixed property; and

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE: SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in New York City, N. Y., or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designation of classes of members shall, except as provided in this act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide. Each member of the corporation shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

(b) Each organization which is a member of the corporation as provided in the constitution thereof shall be entitled to all the benefits of incorporation under this act, but such benefits shall cease immediately either upon its resignation from the corporation, or in the event that its membership in the corporation is canceled or otherwise terminated by the board of directors, as provided in the constitution of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the enactment of this act the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the board of directors of the Boys' Clubs of America, the corporation described in section 16 of this act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified members of said board of directors, to wit: Hoyt Ammidon, New York, N. Y.; Wendell W. Anderson, Detroit, Mich.; Sewell L. Avery, Chicago, Ill.; Richard E. Berlin, New York, N. Y.; Arthur T. Burger, Boston, Mass.; Hendry S. M. Burns, New York, N. Y.; John L. Burns, New York, N. Y.; Peter Capra, New York, N. Y.; James B. Carey, Washington, D. C.; Colby M. Chester, New York, N. Y.; Frederic C. Church, Boston, Mass.; Albert L. Cole, Pleasantville, N. Y.; Carle C. Conway, New York, N. Y.; Donald K. David, New York, N. Y.; Morse G. Dial, New York, N. Y.; Robert W. Dowling, New York, N. Y.; Kempton Dunn, New York, N. Y.; Gilbert D. Eaton, Oakland, Calif.; Julius Epstein, Chicago, Ill.; James A. Farley, New York, N. Y.; Horace C. Flanigan, New York, N. Y.; E. E. Fogelson, Dallas, Tex.; Philip G. Geiger, Pawtucket, R. I.; M. Preston Goodfellow, Washington, D. C.; J. Peter Grace, Jr., New York, N. Y.; John S. Griswold, New York, N. Y.; Powell C. Groner, Kansas City, Mo.; Edgar A. Guest, Detroit, Mich.;

William Edwin Hall, New York, N. Y.; Robert B. Heppenstall, Pittsburgh, Pa.; William Edwin Hill, New York, N. Y.; Allan Hoover, New York, N. Y.; Herbert Hoover, New York, N. Y.; J. Edgar Hoover, Washington, D. C.; Arthur Huck, New York, N. Y.; Austin S. Iglehart, New York, N. Y.; Ernest Ingold, San Francisco, Calif.; Edward Ingraham, Bristol, Conn.; Gordon Jeffery, Toledo, Ohio; Frank R. Jelleff, Washington, D. C.; Grant Keehn, New York, N. Y.; James S. Kemper, Chicago, Ill.; Maj. William G. Kiefer, Louisville, Ky.; Philip Le Boutillier, New York, N. Y.; Philip Le Boutillier, Jr., Toledo, Ohio; James A. Linen, New York, N. Y.; John D. Lockton, New York, N. Y.; Fred Loock, Milwaukee, Wis.; David I. McCahill, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charles P. McCormick, Baltimore, Md.; Everett McCullough, Wichita Falls, Tex.; Ira McGuire, Muncie, Ind.; Charles R. Messier, Newark, N. J.; Jeremiah Milbank, New York, N. Y.; Theodore G. Montague, New York, N. Y.; W. B. Nicholson, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.; Nicholas H. Noyes, Indianapolis, Ind.; Harry L. Olden, Cincinnati, Ohio; Frank Pace, Jr., New York, N. Y.; August K. Paeschke, Milwaukee, Wis.; H. Bruce Palmer, Newark, N. J.; Richard S. Perkins, New York, N. Y.; Samuel F. Pryor, New York, N. Y.; Stanley Resor, New York, N. Y.; Capt. E. V. Rickenbacker, New York, N. Y.; Victor F. Ridder, New York, N. Y.; Fredric E. Schluter, Trenton, N. J.; George A. Scott, San Diego, Calif.;

Irving J. Scher, Milwaukee, Wis.; Grant G. Simmons, New York, N. Y.; P. C. Spencer, New York, N. Y.; Clifford L. Strang, Tonawanda, N. Y.; Edward K. Straus, New York, N. Y.; Lewis L. Strauss, Washington, D. C.; Kenneth C. Towe, New York, N. Y.; Maxwell M. Upson, New York, N. Y.; Virgil P. Warren, Atlanta, Ga.; Albert C. Wedemeyer, New York, N. Y.; Morgan W. Wheelock, New York, N. Y.; J. Dugald White, New York, N. Y.; Myron A. Wick, Jr., Stamford, Conn.; Alfred G. Wilson, Detroit, Mich.; William S. Wilson, New York, N. Y.; Matthew Woll, New York, N. Y.; Gen. Robert E. Wood, Chicago, Ill.; Gordon J. Wormal, Santa Barbara, Calif.; E. A. Wright, Detroit, Mich.; Paul S. Young, Schenectady, N. Y.; William Ziegler, Jr., New York, N. Y.

(b) Thereafter the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number as may be prescribed in the constitution of the corporation, and the members of such board shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such terms, as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors shall be the managing body of the corporation and shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

OFFICERS: ELECTION AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a chairman of the board of directors, a president, one or more vice presidents (as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation), a secretary, and a treasurer, and one or more assistant secretaries and assistant treasurers as may be provided in the constitution and bylaws.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

USE OF INCOME: LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of

such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS: INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

TRANSFERS OF ASSETS

SEC. 16. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Boys' Clubs of America, a corporation organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 9348, entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act incorporating the Archeological Institute of America' to increase the value of real and personal property that such Institute may hold" with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "Archeological" and insert "Archaeological."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the act entitled 'an act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America' to increase the value of real and personal property that such Institute may hold."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIMBER HEARINGS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file additional views in connection with the report on the joint hearings before a special subcommittee on the legislative oversight functions of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, and that the additional views be printed with the committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COLIN STAM AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that this year is the 30th anniversary of the organization of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. That committee was organized under the Revenue Act of 1926. During all the years following its organization the staff of that committee has most ably assisted all Members of Congress, as well as the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate with respect to legislative tax proposals. I am sure that there are many Members of Congress who can vouch for the fine service they have received from that staff. Since July 1, 1938, the committee staff has been headed by Mr. Colin F. Stam, who has at all times given us impartial and valuable technical advice and service on tax problems. Mr. Stam in his capacity as chief of staff of that committee has also assisted both the Ways and Means Committees of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate in the preparation of tax legislation. The joint committee staff has become an institution and has been recognized both here and abroad as a necessary adjunct of the legislative process. It is with a note of sadness that I have seen recently a tendency on the part of a very few to imply criticism of this great staff. The staff is now accepted by most of us as an inherent part of our legislative system.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members of the House who have received such splendid service from this able staff will resent any effort to belittle its work or to attack its integrity or impartiality. I wish to salute this staff for its fine work and to express the hope that it will continue to operate and perform the same service as it has in the past. Let us do nothing which may have a tendency to weaken the effectiveness of that staff.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The next order of business is the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ELISABETH VON OBERNDORFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9440) for the relief of Miss Elisabeth von Oberndorff.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

E. B. KAISER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6185) for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the E. B. Kaiser Co. of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $40,722.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said E. B. Kaiser Co. against the United States for compensation for additional work done in connection with the performance of subcontract No. 27–42 under contract No. W559 eng–5949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violat-

ing the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAL A. MARCHANT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1154) for the relief of Hal A. Marchant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DORN of New York and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN LAND AT FORT BELVOIR ACCOTINK DAM SITE MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9679) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to convey, on behalf of the United States of America, to the Crestwood Construction Corp., a Virginia corporation, for a fair value to be determined by the Secretary, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all that certain land situate in Fairfax County, Va., more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the northerly right-of-way line of the Old Southern Railway (abandoned), said point being the northeasterly corner of parcel B as described in a certain deed from the Southern Railway Co. to the United States of America, dated February 23, 1944, and recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, among the land records of Fairfax County, Va.; thence, along the northeasterly line of said parcel B, south 62 degrees, 49 minutes, 50 seconds east 103 feet to a point in the southerly line of said parcel B; thence, with the southerly line of said parcel B, as follows: South 64 degrees, 20 minutes, 50 seconds west 45.01 feet to a point; thence south 70 degrees, 48 minutes west 724.27 feet to a point; thence south 70 degrees, 30 minutes west 682.10 feet to a point; and thence south 70 degrees 51 minutes west 275.96 feet to a point; thence departing from the southerly line of said parcel B and running through said parcel B, as follows: With the arc of a 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the right, the chord of which bears north 60 degrees, 31 minutes, 49 seconds east 151.70 feet, an arc distance of 151.82 feet to a point; thence north 18 degrees, 9 minutes west 57.02 feet to a point in the northerly line of said parcel B, said point being common to the property of Crestwood Construction Corp. and W. S. Hoge III, and others; thence, with the northerly line of said parcel B, as follows: North 70 degrees, 51 minutes east 785.29 feet to a point; and north 70 degrees, 48 minutes east 721.31 feet to the point and place of beginning, and containing 2.9178 acres of land; and being a part of the same property acquired by the United States of America by the aforesaid deed recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, among the land records of said county: *Provided, however*, That simultaneously with the conveyance of the above described land to Crestwood Construction Corp., the said Crestwood Construction Corp. shall grant unto the United States of America, its successors and assigns, without cost, the following easements over those portions of the said land more particularly described in subparagraphs (a) and (b), as follows:

(a) A temporary easement for a roadway over all that portion of said land to be conveyed to Crestwood Construction Corp., said easement being described as:

Beginning at a point in the southerly right-of-way line of the Old Southern Railway (abandoned), said point being in the southeasterly line of parcel B as described in the aforesaid deed from the Southern Railway Co. to the United States of America, recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, of the land records of Fairfax County, Va., said point being the extreme southwest corner of the above-described land; thence, departing from the southeasterly line of said parcel B, and running along a portion of the northwesterly line of the above-described land, and along the arc of a 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the right, the chord of which bears north 60 degrees 41 minutes 49 seconds east 151.70 feet, an arc distance of 151.82 feet to a point; thence running through the above-described land as follows: Along another arc of said 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the right, the chord of which arc bears north 67 degrees 58 minutes 38 seconds east 123.18 feet, an arc distance of 123.22 feet, to a point of tangency of said curve; then north 71 degrees 14 minutes 6 seconds east 118.55 feet to a point of curvature of a 1,262.81-foot radius curve to the right; thence, along the arc of said curve, the chord of which bears north 77 degrees 16 minutes 56 seconds east 266.07 feet, an arc distance of 266.56 feet to a point in the southeasterly line of the above-described portion of said parcel B; thence, with the said southeasterly line of said parcel B, south 70 degrees 30 minutes west 379.44 feet to a point; and south 70 degrees 51 minutes west 275.96 feet to the point and place of beginning, and being a part of the property directed to be conveyed to the said Crestwood Construction Corp. by this act; said easement being for the following purposes:

A temporary easement for roadway purposes for ingress and egress to the remaining lands of the United States of America lying southwesterly of and contiguous to the property directed to be conveyed to Crestwood Construction Corp. by this act, which easement shall expire and terminate at such time as the land subject thereto shall be dedicated as a public thoroughfare, or as a part of a public thoroughfare by the said Crestwood Construction Corp., its successors and assigns, and accepted for maintenance as a part of the State road system of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

(b) A perpetual easement for a roadway over all that portion of said land to be conveyed to Crestwood Construction Corp., said easement being described as:

Beginning at a point in the northerly right-of-way line of the Old Southern Railway (abandoned) said point being the northwesterly line of parcel B, as described in the aforesaid deed from the Southern Railway Co. to the United States of America recorded in deed book 424, at page 411, of the land records of Fairfax County, Va., said point being common to Crestwood Construction Corp. and W. S. Hoge III, and others, referred to above, and running thence, through said parcel B, north 81 degrees 34 minutes 10 seconds east 281.48 feet to a point in the northwesterly line of said temporary easement described in subparagraph (a) above; thence with the northwesterly line of said temporary easement as follows: with the arc of a 1,262.81-foot radius curve to the left, the chord of which bears south 72 degrees 1 minute 45 seconds west 35 feet, an arc distance of 35 feet to a point of tangency of said curve; thence south 71 degrees 14 minutes 6 seconds west 118.55 feet to a point of curvature of a 1,082.67-foot radius curve to the left; thence with the arc of said curve, the chord of which bears south 67 degrees 58 minutes 38 seconds west 123.18 feet, an arc distance of 123.22 feet to a point; thence departing from the northwesterly line of said temporary easement and running with the southwesterly line of the property directed to be conveyed by this act, north 18 degrees 9 minutes west 57.02 feet to the point and place of beginning, said easement being for the following purpose:

A perpetual easement for a roadway purpose for ingress and egress to the remaining lands of the United States of America lying southwest of and contiguous to the property directed to Crestwood Construction Corp. by this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, strike "31 minutes," and insert "41 minutes."

Page 3, line 6, strike the language following the colon and all of lines 7 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "Reserving to the United States, however."

Page 4, line 20, strike the semicolon and insert a period.

Page 4, lines 20 and 21, strike "said easement being for the following purposes:" and strike all of lines 22 through 25 and on page 5, strike all of lines 1 through 7.

Page 6, line 11, strike the comma and insert a period.

Page 6, line 11, strike "said easement being for the following purpose:" and all of lines 12 through 16.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1140) for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Southwest Research Institute, of San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $8,200.84. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Southwest Research Institute against the United States for compensation for certain research work performed by the Institute for which the Institute believed it was to be compensated by the United States under contract H-76 or under an amendment thereto; but for which compensation has been denied by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK R. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1184) for the relief of Frank R. Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DORN of New York and Mr. FORD objected, and, under the rules, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EGBERT CARLSSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3361) for the relief of Egbert Carlsson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act providing for the barring of claims against the United States," approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to accept and consider any claim filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act by Egbert Carlsson, of McPherson, Kans., for compensation for the use by the Department of the Navy, from about November 1, 1943, through March 31, 1945, of certain lands in Lake County, Oreg., as part of an aerial gunnery range.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIROSLAV SLOVAK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3363) for the relief of Miroslav Slovak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DORN of New York and Mr. DONOHUE objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LEASE RENEWAL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4058) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for a term of 10 years that certain lease to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., bearing date August 16, 1946, of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, containing an approximate area of 241.67 acres, and also a strip of land for a right-of-way to said tract, executed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946, upon the general terms and conditions now contained in said lease but with specific provision that lessee shall pay annually a royalty of 1 cent per cubic yard on all material removed from said tract and shall in addition remove from the tract and deliver in a stockpile annually, free of charge, such quantity of sand and gravel suitable for use upon the walks and roads of the experiment station as would be required by the Government officials in charge of the station, not to exceed 100 carloads per annum; said renewal and extension to inure to the benefit of Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, following the words "a royalty of", insert "not less than."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. RANDALL McMAHON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10898) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon, Bonham, Tex., waive their respective rights to receive payments under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (which waiver is hereby authorized) arising out of the death of their son, John Michael McMahon (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC19213917), and repay to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs all amounts paid to them under such act for periods before such waiver becomes effective, then Mrs. Randall McMahon shall be relieved of liability to repay to the United States the amounts erroneously paid to her by reason of the death of the said John Michael McMahon under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.

SEC. 2. After such waiver becomes effective, no amounts shall be payable under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 to any person by reason of the death of the said John Michael McMahon. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transfer from the current appropriation made for payment of servicemen's indemnities to the National Service Life Insurance Trust Fund amounts sufficient to reimburse such fund for the liability for which the said Mrs. Randall McMahon is relieved by the first section of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ANTON M. LODMELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2419) for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Anton M. Lodmell, of Walla Walla, Wash., the sum of $138.40. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Dr. Anton M. Lodmell arising out of the occupancy and use by the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, of approximately 1 acre of his land situated in Umatilla County, Oreg., as a temporary road construction camp for the period July 1, 1948, to December 15, 1953: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS J. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3064) for the relief of Thomas J. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas J. Smith, of Beaver Dam, Va., the sum of $3,041.95, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss of salary, loss of annual leave, all caused by his having been separated without pay from the employment of the Public Housing Administration for the period from July 25, 1947, to March 1, 1948, which separation was unjustified and unwarranted as evidenced by the findings of the Civil Service Commission in their opinion dated February 5, 1948, directing his reinstatement: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. H. F. WEBB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3347) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,053.80 to Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb, of Forest, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents the payment for the loss of personal belongings of their son, Lt. Andrew F. Webb, United States Air Force, who was killed in action during World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. BRADY AND JOYCE BRADY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12073) for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill, S. 2823, an identical bill to the House bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William C. Brady and Joyce Brady shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees: *Provided*, That in the case of William C. Brady, he shall be required to comply with such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control office to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 12073) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CASES IN WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS SUSPENDED DEPORTATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 244 (A) (5) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 84.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-4402414, Feigenbaum, Lena.
A-1368567, Guszcza, Konstanty.
A-5540879, Johnson, William.
A-2436831, Schwartz, Albert.
A-1328350, Amado, Joseph Barbosa.
A-2550952, Baum, Louis.
A-3065105, Cinque, Luigi.
A-5448287, Donaldson, John Kelly.
A-2623371, Ekstrom, Gustav Fritz.
A-3576941, Gabartus, Joseph.
A-1418512, Gaines, Raymond Verand.
A-5981807, Gerber, Pauline.
A-4180130, Hernandez, Narciso.
A-3483987, Kolek, Frank.
A-1534631, Martenuk, Wasil.
A-1087241, Mendez-Perez, Feliciano.
A-1258280, Mendez-de la Rosa, Anastacio.
A-5069154, Monteiro, Anthony.
A-8281823, Morrison, John William.
A-5167345, Murphy, Donald K.
A-1297962, Okerstrom, Olof Edwin.
A-5038080, Palen, Adolph.
A-5407196, Rubenstein, Benjamin.
A-847270, Russo, Esteban.
A-2331492, Schwed, John.
A-5919577, Sikorski, Adolph.
A-8678037, Stamatopulos, Andreas Vasilios.
A-2784150, Tamayo, Maria Salazar de.
A-5574722, Zaks, Aber.
1300-134264, Castillo, Pedro Contreras.
A-5991679, Chomsker, Mones.
A-4722856, Garcia, Eliseo Vasquez.
A-5237203, Mascitti, Luigi.
A-3065941, Ruzycki, Walter Stanley.
A-5880176, Aguayo-Renteria, Felipe.
A-5543950, Abeson, Louis.
A-5163391, Briller, Clare Sadie.
A-4241143, Ceddia, Angelo.
A-5190234, Duffy, Dorothy B.
A-5294327, Fellmeth, Martin.
E-057893, Frumpkin, Paul.
A-5242017, Golbin, Margaret.
A-4177923, Gonzales, Louis.
A-2710779, Gutierrez-Galaviz, Miguel.
A-4192990, Kaganski, Chaim.
A-6824870, Kaplan, Morris.
A-4924358, Kryshtall, Alexander.
A-4781163, Laro, Francisco.
A-2513344, Lashuk, Maxime.
A-3084067, Lysyak, Lucas.
A-5624182, Marcus, Benjamin.
A-7142118, Melicharek, John.
A-4732368, Molina, Salvadora Ozuna.
A-4338054, Molina, Saturnino Paderas.
A-8846106, Race, Thomas Frank.
A-5772133, Radmilo, John.
A-4385372, Ramirez-Davalos, Dario.
0300-460796, Reisler, Betty.
A-4098680, Rodriguez-Borjas, Manuel.
A-3445360, Rubicz, Stefan.
A-10035249, Sedor, Walter Richard.
A-4683291, Shadletsky, Esther.
A-2935218, Silverman, George James.
A-5998756, Spector, Maurice.
A-5808720, Springer, James.
A-5758104, Tuxen, Jean Charles.
A-5767334, Wong, Man Jaw.
A-1802172, Zahran, Abraham John.
A-3807772, Zych, Walter Joseph.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 267) for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ellen Kjosnes, Unni Kjosnes, No Kum Sok (also known as Kenneth No), Jose Maria Arias-Ortega, and Katarzyna Pienkos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classified as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

"SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Giuseppe Scalia and Elizabeth Cacavas (Elisavet Ioannou Kakava). From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Giuseppe Scalia and Elizabeth Cacavas (Elisavet Ioannou Kakava) shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 212 (A) OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IN BEHALF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2916) for the relief of Mrs. Aliberta Bernard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Aliberta Bernard may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Aliberta Bernard, Natalia Kozlov Kavazov Kolubaev (Koljubajer, Kolubajev), Henry Lappeman, Christa Walther, and Pietro Trupia may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissable under the provisions of that act.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Riva Kagan and Jan Hovorka may, if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act,

be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chiyoko Tominaga Beckmann and Antonietta Aurora Mattera Berg may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Saveria Velona Gangemi and Joaquin Flores-Munoz may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

"SEC. 5. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER to the committee amendment:

On page 3, after line 5, after section 4, add new sections Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8, to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Jocher Webb may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Odette R. Andrei, Aleftina Goddard, Sophia Kwang Huang, and Ingrid W. A. S. Tangarone may, if found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yi Nyong Suk, the fiance of Lt. James F. Brown, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yi Nyong Suk is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Lt. James F. Brown and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above named does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yi Nyong Suk she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yi Nyong Suk, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yi Nyong Suk as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

"SEC. 8. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joan F. Roby, Lina Gertrude Yakumeit Mattingly, and Berta Cabrera Vigil Frohlich may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act."

Renumber section 5, to read "SEC. 9."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3196) for the relief of Helen Mar Stanger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Helen Mar Stanger, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Helen Mar Stanger shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Paul Edward Horn, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Paul Edward Horn shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

"SEC. 3. Elise Delree, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Elise Delree shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMIN HABIB NABHAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3255) for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Amin Habib Nabhan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Kaleel G. Nabhan, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and Nationality Act, sections 201 (a) and 202 (b) shall be held not to be applicable in the case of Giok Po Oey.

"SEC. 3. In the administration of section 3 and subsection (b) of section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, Panagiota Paganis shall be held and considered to be under 21 years of age: *Provided*, That the words 'if accompanying them' in section 3 of the said act shall not apply to the said Panagiota Paganis.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guiseppina Coppola shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

"SEC. 5. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yuriko Ito, the fiance of Dexter D. Good, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yuriko Ito is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Dexter D. Good and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Ito, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Ito, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yuriko Ito as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

"SEC. 6. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Toki Lewis shall be held to be classifiable as a nonquota immigrant.

"SEC. 7. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jo-Soon Duk, the fiancee of Wilbert F. Kline, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Lee Won Duk, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Jo-Soon Duk is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Wilbert F. Kline and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur

within 3 months after the entry of the said Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Elena Domantay, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Emilio Jose Domantay, a citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 9. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Florentia Bougades shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mrs. Anna Bougades, a citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 10. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Judith Wollner shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, at the end of the bill, add a new section, numbered section 11, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. For the purposes of section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Ljerka Zagar shall be held and considered to be under 10 years of age, and the assurances heretofore filed on her behalf by the prospective adoptive United States citizen father shall be held and considered to meet the requirements of section 5 (b) of the said act. Any application for a visa filed on her behalf pursuant to section 5 (a) of such act may be considered and processed notwithstanding the death of her prospective United States citizen adoptive father."

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUE YIN WONG (ALSO KNOWN AS WILLIAM YUEYIN WONG)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2834) for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOON SHEE (GOON JU HAI) AND MOY CHUN NGAN (EDITH MOY)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7824) for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai) and Moy Chun Ngan (Edith Moy).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai) and Moy Chun Ngan (Edith Moy) shall be granted the status of nonquota immigrants and shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai) shall be classifiable as a returning resident alien as defined in section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLA MARCELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9579) for the relief of Nicola Marcello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicola Marcello shall be classifiable as a returning resident alien as defined in section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. THEODORE (NICOLE XANTHO) ROUSSEAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11504) for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. On the rest of the bills on the Private Calendar there were no committee reports when the House convened this morning. I am reluctant to object to these bills. May I ask, will there be another opportunity for the sponsors to bring these bills up?

The SPEAKER. That is very doubtful. The time may be short between now and tomorrow. If the gentleman wants to take the responsibility of objecting, that is up to him.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 352 (a) of that act shall be held to be inapplicable to Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVELYN ALBI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9384) for the relief of Evelyn Albi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Evelyn Albi, of 711 Elizabeth Street, Denver, Colo., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Evelyn Albi against the Government of the United States, in connection with the $500 departure bond posted by the said Evelyn Albi on behalf of Elvira Bartolin on November 17, 1952: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST MARKS BAPTIST CHURCH OF QUITMAN COUNTY, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9640) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to the trustees of West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property described in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this act consists of a tract of land lying in the northwest quarter of section 34, township 28 north, range 1 west in Quitman County, Miss., more particularly described as follows: Starting at the northwest corner of said section 34; thence south along the west line of said section, a distance of 167 feet; thence south 73 degrees 58 minutes east, a distance of 437.2 feet to the center line of a road bearing north 00 degrees 50 minutes east; thence north 00 degrees 50 minutes east along the center line of said road, a distance of 61.9 feet to the point of beginning; thence north 73 degrees 58 minutes west, a distance of 223 feet; thence north 15 degrees 29 minutes east, a distance of 188.5 feet; thence south 72 degrees 32 minutes east, a distance of 174.5 feet to the center line of said road; thence south 00 degrees 50 minutes west, a distance of 191 feet to the point of beginning; containing, after deduction of right-of-way for road, 0.79 acre, more or less, together with the improvements thereon and the rights and appurtenances thereunto belonging or appertaining, and the equipment and chattels contained therein.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAL A. MARCHANT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 1077, the bill (S. 1154) for the relief of Hal A. Marchant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause the gas screw vessel *Jenny*, official number 256330, now owned by Hal A. Marchant, of Coulee Dam., Wash., to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges, upon compliance with the usual requirements for documentation, so long as the vessel is owned, and shall continue to be owned, by a citizen of the United States and the said vessel *Jenny* shall be deemed to be entitled to engage in such trade so long as it is so documented.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIROSLAV SLOVAK

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 1106, the bill (S. 3363) for the relief of Miroslav Slovak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Communications Commission is authorized to issue a license to Miroslav Slovak as an operator under subsection (L) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1082), notwithstanding the requirement of such subsection with respect to citizenship.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK R. DAVIS

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 1104, the bill (S. 1184) for the relief of Frank R. Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank R. Davis, of Ten Sleep, Wyo., the sum of $1,229.52. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for losses sustained as a result of his failure to secure a contract from the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior for the building of certain fences in Big Horn and Washakie Counties, Wyo., because his bid on such contract, which was mailed and registered at the post office at Ten Sleep, Wyo., on March 15, 1954, was not dispatched from such post office until March 18, 1954, and was therefore not received by the Bureau of Land Management office in Billings, Mont., in time for consideration in awarding such contract, even though such bid was lower than the successful bid on such contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Adair	Eberharter	Patman
Bailey	Gamble	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Gordon	Preston
Baumhart	Hébert	Priest
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Prouty
Blitch	Holt	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boykin	Hosmer	Richards
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Scudder
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Shelley
Burleson	Kelley, Pa.	Siler
Carnahan	Lane	Talle
Chatham	Long	Thompson, La.
Christopher	McDonough	Thornberry
Clevenger	Morrison	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Nelson	Vursell
Diggs	O'Hara, Minn.	Wickersham
Dowdy	O'Neill	Young

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-one Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume the gentleman proposes to take some time to explain what happened in conference on this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana does not intend to take any time, but I will be very happy to answer any questions as to the actions of the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2931)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16, 24 and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 6, 11, 17, 22, 23, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,017,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$67,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$68,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$167,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$873,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$33,595,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 18, and 27.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to amendment No. 2),
CLARENCE CANNON,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
JOHN TABER (except as to amendments Nos. 2 and 17),
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 2),
IVOR FENTON (except as to amendment No. 2),
GERALD R. FORD, JR. (except as to amendment No. 2),
T. MILLET HAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (except as to amendment No. 2),
WILLIAM KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

MUTUAL SECURITY

Military assistance

Amendment No. 1: Deletes Senate language proposing that the appropriation remain available until June 30, 1958.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,017,500,000 instead of $1,735,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,300,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Authorizes $67,500,000 for infrastructure instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Changes citation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Provides that the reappropriated funds shall remain available until June 30, 1957, as proposed by the House, instead of June 30, 1958, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Inserts Senate language restricting use of funds for Yugoslavia.

Defense support

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $68,700,000 for Europe instead of $63,700,000 as proposed by the House and $71,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $167,500,000 for Near East and Africa instead of $165,000,000 as proposed by the House and $170,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $873,500,000 for Asia instead of $865,000,000 as proposed by the House and $882,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $52,000,000 for Latin America as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Deletes the proposal of the Senate making $15,000,000 available until June 30, 1958.

Amendment No. 13: Restores language of the House providing that not less than $15,000,000 shall be used for assistance to Guatemala.

Development assistance

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $250,000,000 which includes funds for the special authorization for the Middle East and Africa and the President's Asian Fund.

Amendment No. 15: Deletes Senate language continuing funds available until June 30, 1958.

Technical cooperation

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $135,000,000 for technical assistance under section 304 (b) as proposed by the House instead of $140,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $15,500,000 for United Nations Technical Assistance as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Other programs

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $1,900,000 for the United Nations Refugee Fund instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $2,500,000 for Ocean Freight Charges instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $33,595,000 for Administrative Expenses instead of $34,145,000 as proposed by the House and $33,045,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes House language appropriating $100,000,000 for the special authorization for the Middle East and Africa in view of inclusion of this item in the amount provided under Amendment No. 14.

Amendment No. 23: Changes citation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes Senate language providing that 25 per centum of certain funds remain available until September 30, 1957.

General provisions

Amendment No. 25: Inserts Senate language excepting the Special Presidential Fund from the provisions of section 105.

Amendment No. 26: Restores House language providing that none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to carry out the purposes of section 13 of the Mutual Security Act of 1956.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to amendment No. 2),
CLARENCE CANNON,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
HENDERSON LANHAM,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
JOHN TABER (except as to amendments Nos. 2 and 17),
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 2),
IVOR D. FENTON (except as to amendment No. 2),
GERALD R. FORD, JR. (except as to amendment No. 2),
T. MILLET HAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state for the record that I have signed this conference report not because it meets with my personal views but because I believe it is the best conference report that apparently can be obtained under the circumstances.

I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], have all signed this report as managers on the part of the House, specifically taking exception to the decision reached under Amendment No. 2.

Amendment No. 2 is the amendment which fixes the amount of military assistance to be made available to our military allies, and it fixes it at just about a billion dollars or 33⅓ percent below the amount originally requested by the President.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Radford has stated that a cut of $1 billion would result in the reduction in the military program for Europe of $600 million; in the Korean military program of 23 percent; in the Formosa military program of 14 percent; in the Pakistan military program of 27 percent; in the Turkish military program of 24 percent; and in the Greek military program of 22 percent, as well as eliminating one-half of the sum requested for the advanced weapons program, considered vital at this time by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to share in the responsibility for that action. I think we are taking an unwarranted gamble in the field of national security. I regret the decision that has been made.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the gentleman from Massachusetts, there were 5 members of the conference committee from the House who did not agree to amendment No. 2. It should be pointed out, in addition to what has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts, that if this conference report is approved the President's original request for both economic and military aid will be cut approximately 20 percent. The reduction in the military figure itself will be approximately 33 percent. In my opinion, this reduction in the military aid portion of the program results in a very calculated risk, one which I think we are taking very unwisely. I wish to reemphasize my objection to the figure that was agreed to by the conferees. Every military leader who appeared before the mutual security subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations indicated that if a substantial reduction was made—and I repeat, a 33 percent cut was made—we would have to revise our own military plans and programs in all parts of the world.

It seems to me that we should reasonably abide by the recommendations of the military experts. In this case we are not. In my judgment, it is a very serious calculated risk. As I said, I wish to reemphasize my opposition to the amount which was agreed upon for military aid and assistance. In my judgment, the

figure that was included in the Senate version was far more preferable to what we finally agreed to in conference.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman to tell us specifically the increase over the amount authorized in the bill when it left the House?

Mr. PASSMAN. I may say the gentleman from Iowa that the total increase over the House authorization bill amounts to $11,595,000. The conference report is $344,355,000 below the amounts appropriated by the other body.

Mr. GROSS. How much new money is contained in this bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. The total amount of new money is $3,766,570,000.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report and I am opposed to these continued increases in foreign aid spending. This Nation of ours has $768 billion of public and private debt. With the $6 billion to $7 billion already in the pipeline for foreign handouts there should not have been a single new dollar appropriated for this purpose.

In addition to the $768 billion of public and private debt in this country, we are in arrears, for instance, in our contribution to the Federal employees retirement fund to the extent of $13,800,000,000. To make the Federal employees retirement fund actuarially sound today would call for an appropriation of $6 billion.

This bill is one of the contributing factors to the inflation we have and if this Nation is forced into financial bankruptcy this kind of spending will be one of the reasons.

I am opposed to any further appropriations for foreign aid, this foreign WPA extravaganza, with the billions already in the pipeline.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was going to extend my remarks at some length on this bill, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] stated my position clearly and adequately, and at this point I wish to embrace and concur in the remarks on this report made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 2, line 22, after the colon, insert the following: "*Provided*, That at least $50,000,000 on a grant basis shall be available for Spain, exclusive of interregional expenses: *Provided further*, That not less than one-half of the amount available for Spain shall be used for agricultural commodities."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided*, That at least $50,000,000 on a grant basis shall be available for Spain, exclusive of interregional expenses: *Provided further*, That not less than $18,500,000 of the amount available for Spain shall be used for agricultural commodities."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 3, line 19, insert ": *Provided*, That the United States contribution to the 1958 calendar year program shall not exceed 33.33 percent of the United Nations program."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 8, line 11, insert:

"SEC. 107. The Congress hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China, and it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

SUSPEND THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONNEL EMPLOYED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 695) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of any person as an attorney, accountant, expert, or professional staff member in assisting the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in the investigations authorized by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 1, line 3, after "person", insert "not presently employed by the Federal Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETURN OF ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 271) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 511) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935. If and when said resolution is returned by the President, the action of the presiding officers of the two Houses in signing said resolution shall be deemed rescinded, and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of said resolution, to make the following correction: On the last line of the enrolled resolution strike out "waived" and insert "reserved."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN ACTIONS BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to sundry resolutions of the House he did, on Thursday, July 26, 1956, make certifications to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the United States attorney, southern district of New York, the United States attorney, eastern district of Missouri, as follows:

To the United States attorney, District of Columbia:

House Resolution 637: The refusal of Otto Nathan to answer questions before

the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 638: The refusal of Arthur Miller to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

To the United States attorney, southern district of New York:

House Resolution 634: The refusal of George Tyne to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 635: The refusal of Elliott Sullivan to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 636: The refusal of Peter Seeger to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

To the United States attorney, eastern district of Missouri:

House Resolution 631: The refusal of Anne Yasgur Kling to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 632: The refusal of John W. Simpson to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 633: The refusal of William E. Davis to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2364) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9048) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to improve the mental health of the Nation through grants for special projects to develop improved methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY IN WESTERN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 221) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in western Oklahoma.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INCREASING BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF FORMER EMPLOYEES OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2937) to increase from $50 to $75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman the grounds of his objection to the bill, to see if we cannot reach some agreement in regard to it? It has been passed over on the Consent Calendar on 4 or 5 successive calendar days.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As far as the objectors are concerned, the basis of our request that it be passed over is the fact that there is an adverse report on the bill from the Civil Service Commission. Under those circumstances it certainly does not seem right that the bill be passed under unanimous consent.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10238) to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept certain land in Buncombe County, N. C., for cemetery purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 614) to authorize the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be stricken from the Consent Calendar. It has passed the House and should be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be stricken from the calendar.

There was no objection.

House Resolution 614 was laid on the table.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2374) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supplies from flood-control and river and harbor projects.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask what the objection is?

Mr. FORD. In my personal opinion, there is no objection, but 3 or 4 Members of this body have in the past asked that this bill be passed over. In deferance to their views, and since I am not certain that they are here now, I believe we ought to protect those Members who have so expressed themselves heretofore. On the basis of the previous action, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY REACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9743) to encourage maximum development of atomic-energy reactors for the generation of low-cost electric power and the production, utilization, and treatment of special nuclear and other materials, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several Members, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. COLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill is 1 of 2 bills of very great importance with respect to our atomic-energy program. A few days ago we spent a lot of time expressing ourselves as being anxious to move along with the peacetime development of reactors for producing atomic energy. This bill was reported unanimously by the joint committee. It is of great urgency. I was hopeful that the bill would pass at this time. Therefore, in order to bring it to a head, I must object to having the bill passed over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. HOLIFIELD objected.

BELTON RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 159) to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Belton Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WHITNEY RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 160) to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Whitney Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FISH AND GAME LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8250) to require conformance with State and Territorial fish and game laws and licensing requirements on Federal lands not subject to such laws.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the sponsor of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ALBENI FALLS RESERVOIR PROJECT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 598) to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11515) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state the reason for this request?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The bill involves the expenditure of $4,500,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that the reason?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9459) to amend section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WALTER, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. SADLAK objected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SADLAK and Mr. PATTERSON objected.

BOULDER CITY, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 514) to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GLEN CANYON UNIT, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11685) to provide for the acquisition of Navaho Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROVIDING 230,000-VOLT LINE FROM FORT RANDALL DAM, S. DAK., TO GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 672) to provide for a 230,000-volt line from the Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota to Grand Island, Nebr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know the reason for the gentleman's request. Apparently, this will be the last call of bills on the Consent Calendar. The money in this bill has already been made available by the Committee on Appropriations and the bill has the approval of the Budget Bureau, the Department of the Interior and the administrative officers. I wonder what the reason is for the gentleman asking that it go over again when this is probably the last call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am asking that it be passed over at the request of several Members, some of whom are not here and I am trying to protect their interest.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The money has already been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1079) to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs HAYS of Ohio, MULTER, and FULTON objected.

AMENDING FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5275) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1508), is amended by adding a new subsection (f) to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the corporation is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as it deems consistent with sound reinsurance principles, to provide reinsurance on any crop or plantation insurance provided in Puerto Rico by a duly authorized agency of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, add the following: "*Provided*, That no application for reinsurance authorized herein shall be approved, unless the corporation shall have determined that the reinsurance deemed necessary is not available from recognized private sources at reasonable costs."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SOIL BANK ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11958) to amend the acreage reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act to permit inclusion of acreage up to 30 days prior to harvest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. MASON, MARSHALL, and GROSS objected.

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS OF THE CROW TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3698) to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. MASON, HAYS of Ohio, and PHILLIPS objected.

CLAIMS OF NAVAHO AND HOPI INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4086) to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Indians entitled to the use thereof the lands described in the Executive order of December 16, 1882, and for adjudicating the conflicting claims thereto of the Navaho and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. HAYS of Ohio, SHUFORD, and ROGERS of Texas objected.

PROMOTING DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVED TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2074) to extend for an additional 5 years the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8353) to further the economic and efficient operation of the business of the Post Office Department by the expansion of the existing research and development program of such Department and the establishment of a postal service automatic equipment program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Postal Service Automatic Equipment Act."

SEC. 2. In order to expedite the policy and purpose of endeavoring to achieve greater economy and efficiency in the operation of the business of the Post Office Department through the establishment in such department of a research and development program under authority of the act, entitled "an act to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department", approved August 16, 1949 (63 Stat. 608; Public Law 231, 81st Congress; 39 U. S. C., secs. 847, 847a), the Postmaster General is authorized and directed—

(1) in general, to increase, expand, accelerate, and intensify the investigations, studies, and other activities of the Post Office Department authorized by such act of August 16, 1949, in connection with such research and development program; and

(2) specifically, to establish, administer, and maintain in the Post Office Department, on a continuing basis, in conformity with this act, such act of August 16, 1949, and other applicable law, a special program of research, development, improvement, experimental use and operation, and practical utilization, with respect to automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices for the postal service and postal operations (hereinafter referred to as the "postal service automatic equipment program" and more particularly described and set forth in section 3 of this act).

SEC. 3. (a) The immediate purpose of the postal service automatic equipment program shall be to provide, to the greatest extent practicable within the limits of appropriations and other funds available for such purpose, new, improved, and up-to-date automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices for United States post offices having appreciable need therefor in the light of (1) volume of mail, (2) conditions of operation, and (3) other conditions and factors pertaining to efficiency and economy with respect to the postal service and postal operations.

(b) In the administration and maintenance of the postal service automatic equipment program, the Postmaster General shall, among other actions, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this act, select and designate a representative number of United States post offices in which automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices will be utilized. Within a period of not more than 2 years following each such selection and designation, there shall be installed in such post office so selected and designated, to the greatest extent practicable, such automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices which, on the basis of comprehensive research and engineering studies, are suitable for the efficient and economical operation of such post office. The installation, operation, and maintenance of such automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices may be on an experimental or permanent basis, according to applicable conditions and factors which accurately reflect the needs and problems of the postal service and postal operations in such post offices and elsewhere in the postal establishment.

(c) The Postmaster General shall keep accurate and comprehensive records of the utilization, under the postal service automatic equipment program, of automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices in United States post offices, including—

(1) the costs thereof;

(2) the savings therefrom;

(3) the effect on the postal service and postal operations;

(4) appropriate comparisons of costs with costs of operation in United States post offices in which automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices are not utilized;

(5) the extent to which the utilization of such machines, equipment, and devices is accomplishing the policies and purposes specified or referred to in this act; and

(6) such other information as may be necessary to ascertain with reasonable accuracy the results of postal operations from the standpoint of (A) public service, (B) revenues earned, (C) costs of operation, and (D) overall economy and efficiency in the postal service.

(d) The Postmaster General shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, an annual report of the operation of this act containing information provided by the records under subsection (c) of this section, together with such other information, and such recommendations, as he deems advisable or appropriate.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the policies and purposes of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to further the economic and efficient operation of the business of the Post Office Department by the establishment of a postal service automatic equipment program, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 6, strike out line 6 to line 22 inclusive and insert: "General is specifically authorized and directed to establish, administer, and maintain in the Post Office Department, on a continuing basis, in conformity with this act, such act of August 16, 1949, and other applicable law, a special program of research, development, improvement, experimental use and operation, and practical utilization, with respect to automatic machines, automatic equipment, and other automatic devices for the postal service and postal operation (hereinafter referred to as the 'postal service automatic equipment program' and more particularly described and set forth in section 3 of this act)."

On page 3, line 14, after "United States", strike out "post offices" and insert "postal installations."

On page 3, line 15, after "therefor", strike out "in the light of (1) volume of mail, (2) conditions of operation, and (3 other conditions and factors pertaining to efficiency and economy with respect to the postal service and postal operations."

On page 3, line 25, after "such", strike out "post offices" and insert "postal installations."

Page 4, line 2, after "utilized", insert ", to the extent available."

On page 4, line 10, strike out "post office" and insert "postal installations."

On page 4, line 8, after "are", insert "available and."

On page 4, line 16, after "such", strike out "post offices" and insert "postal installation."

On page 4, line 22, after "United States", strike out "post offices" and insert "postal installations."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "post offices" and insert "postal installations."

On page 6, line 10, after "SEC.", strike out "4" and insert "5."

On page 5, line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing, requiring, or permitting—

"(1) the separation or furlough of any employee in the postal field service, in any part, division, or service thereof, or in any classification or category of such employees, or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to further the economic and efficient operation of the business of the Post Office Department by the establishment of a postal service automatic

equipment program, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12025) to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 4228, a similar bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). It shall be the duty of the Commission (a) to study the problem of providing more adequate office space for the White House Office and the other agencies of the Executive Office of the President, and (b) within 6 months after the approval of this act to report to the President such findings and recommendations as it deems appropriate.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 7 members as follows:

(1) Two Senators appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Two Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) Three persons appointed by the President of the United States from the executive branch or from private life.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Commission members appointed from the Congress and the executive branch shall serve without additional compensation. Commission members appointed from private life shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of Commission duties. All Commission members shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of Commission duties.

(e) Within the limits of its appropriations, the Commission is authorized to appoint such personnel, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to make such expenditures as, in its discretion, it deems necessary.

(f) The Commission is authorized to request and secure the advice or assistance of any Federal agency. Any Federal agency furnishing advice or assistance to the Commission may expend its own funds for this purpose, with or without reimbursement from the Commission, as may be agreed upon between the Commission and the agency.

(g) Thirty days after the submission of its final report the Commission shall cease to exist.

SEC. 3. Appropriations to the President for "Expenses of management improvement" shall be available for necessary expenses of the Commission, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary for such expenses.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: Page 3, line 1, strike out "1923" and insert "1949".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY TO ACT AS NOTARIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3266) to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in places where the Coast and Geodetic Survey is serving which are not within the jurisdiction of any one of the several States, commanding officers of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels, and such other officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey as the Secretary of Commerce may designate, may exercise the general powers of the notary public in the administration of oaths for the execution, acknowledgment, and attestation of instruments and papers, and the performance of all other notarial acts. The powers hereby conferred shall be limited to acts performed in behalf of the personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or in connection with the proper execution of the functions of that agency.

SEC. 2. No fee of any kind shall be paid to any officer for the performance of any notarial act herein authorized. The signature without seal together with indication of grade of any officer performing any notarial act shall be prima facie evidence of his authority.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD SUPPLY FUND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4011) to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman reserve the right?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. BONNER. This does not cost anything. It is an administrative matter in handling the affairs in the Coast Guard.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4116) to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONSTRUCTION OF DAM ON THE NORTH BRANCH OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4099) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state why he asks that the bill be passed over? This is absolutely necessary.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It is on the Potomac River in my district, and I do not know what it is all about. Nobody has spoken to me about it.

Mr. HYDE. This does not affect the gentleman's district at all. It is on the North Branch of the Potomac.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice, and I will speak to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWALS OF RESERVATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12185) to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or the Congress, on and after the date of enactment of this act, the provisions hereof shall apply to the withdrawal and reservation for, restriction of, and utilization by, the Department of Defense for defense purposes of the public lands of the United States, including public lands in the Territory of Alaska: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, the term "public lands" shall be deemed to include, without limiting the meaning thereof, Federal lands and waters of the Outer Conti-

nental Shelf, as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462), and Federal lands and waters off the coast of the Territory of Alaska.

SEC. 2. No public land, water, or land and water area shall, except by act of Congress, hereafter be (1) withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, or entry for the use of the Department of Defense for defense purposes or (2) reserved for such use if such withdrawal or reservation would result in the withdrawal or reservation of more than 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any one defense project or facility of the Department of Defense since the date of enactment of this act or since the last previous act of Congress which withdrew or reserved public land, water, or land and water area for that project or facility, whichever is later.

SEC. 3. Any application hereafter filed for a withdrawal or reservation, the approval of which will, under section 2 of this act, require an act of Congress, shall specify—

(1) the name of the requesting agency and intended using agency;

(2) location of the area involved, to include a detailed description of the exterior boundaries and excepted areas, if any, within such proposed withdrawal or reservation;

(3) gross land and water acreage within the exterior boundaries of the requested withdrawal or reservation, and net public lands, water, or public land and water acreage covered by the application;

(4) the purpose or purposes for which the area is proposed to be withdrawl or reserved, or, if the purpose or purposes are classified for national security reasons, a statement to that effect;

(5) whether the proposed use will result in contamination of any or all of the requested withdrawal or reservation area, and if so, whether such contamination will be permanent or temporary;

(6) the period during which the proposed withdrawal or reservation will continue in effect;

(7) whether, and if so to what extent, the proposed use will affect continuing full operation of the public land laws and Federal regulations relating to conservation, utilization, and development of mineral resources, timber and other material resources, grazing resources, fish and wildlife resources, water resources, and scenic, wilderness, and recreation and other values; and

(8) if effecting the purpose for which the area is proposed to be withdrawn or reserved will involve the use of water in any State lying wholly or in part west of the 98th meridian, whether, subject to existing rights under law, the intended using agency has acquired, or proposes to acquire, rights to the use thereof in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriations, use, and distribution of water.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of each military department, under regulations prescribed by him, and approved by the Secretary of Defense, shall, with respect to each military installation or facility under the jurisdiction of his department—

(1) require that all hunting, trapping, and fishing at the installation or facility be in accordance with the fish and game laws of the State or Territory in which it is located;

(2) require that licenses for hunting, trapping, or fishing be obtained from the State or Territory in which such installation or facility is located. With respect to members of the Armed Forces, such license will be required if such State or Territory authorizes the issuance of a license to a member of the Armed Forces on bona fide military duty for not less than 30 days at any installation or facility therein, without regard to residence requirements, and upon terms no less favorable than those terms upon which such a license is issued to residence of such State or Territories; and

(3) develop, subject to any requirements of safety or military security, in cooperation with the Governor (or his designee) of the State or Territory in which the installation or facility is located, procedures under which designated fish and game or conservation officials of that State or Territory may, at such time and under such conditions as may be agreed upon, have full access to that installation or facility to effect measures for the management, conservation, and harvesting of fish and game resources.

(b) Whoever is guilty of an act or omission which violates a requirement prescribed by the Secretary of a military department under subsection (a) (1) or (2) of this section, which act or omission would be punishable if committed or omitted within the jurisdiction of the State or Territory in which the installation or facility is located by the laws thereof in force at the time of such act or omission, shall be guilty of a like offense and subject to a like punishment.

(c) This section does not modify any rights granted by treaty or otherwise to any Indian tribe or to the members thereof.

SEC. 5. The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is hereby further amended by revising section 3 (d) to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'property' means any interest in property except (1) the public domain; lands reserved or dedicated for national forest or national park purposes; minerals in lands or portions of lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain which the Secretary of the Interior determines are suitable for disposition under the public land mining and mineral leasing laws; and lands withdrawn or reserved from the public domain except lands or portions of lands so withdrawn or reserved which the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Administrator, determines are not suitable for return to the public domain for disposition under the general public-land laws because such lands are substantially changed in character by improvements; (2) naval vessels of the following categories: Battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, and submarines; and (3) records of the Federal Government."

SEC. 6. All withdrawals and reservations of public land for the use of any agency of the Department of Defense, heretofore or hereafter made by the United States, shall be deemed to be subject to the condition that all minerals in the lands so withdrawn or reserved are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and no disposition shall be made of minerals in such lands except under the applicable public-land mining and mineral leasing laws: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall apply to lands withdrawn or reserved specifically as naval petroleum, naval oil shale, or naval coal reserves.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in urging enactment of H. R. 12185, a bill having the identical purpose as my bill, H. R. 10394, which was considered concurrently with the reported measure.

Pennsylvania—through its fish and game commissions, and through numerous conservation organizations and private citizens—was in the forefront of the 39 States which officially endorsed this legislation through their official agencies.

So that the record will be complete, I wish to point out, through a section-by-section analysis, a detailed explanation of the bill's provisions.

SECTION 1—BASIC PURPOSE

Section 1 of the reported measure deals with the withdrawal and reservation for, restriction of, and utilization by, the Department of Defense for defense purposes of the public lands of the United States.

This section declares that, notwithstanding any other provisions of law—except in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or the Congress—the provisions of the act will take effect upon enactment. Lands and waters included within the scope of the bill include: public lands of the United States; public lands of the Territory of Alaska; Federal lands and waters of the outer Continental Shelf, as defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act—in 67th United States Statutes at Large, page 462—and Federal lands and waters off the coast of the Territory of Alaska.

The committee, in employing the term "public lands," intends it to apply in its technical or legal sense, as distinguished from "reserved public lands" or "withdrawn public lands," and "acquired public lands." It should be noted that section 1 makes clear the application of the provisions to all public lands—as defined therein, and in this report—but does not preclude application of some of the provisions of the bill to other real property owned or controlled by the United States.

It will presently be seen that all or parts of section 4, section 5, and section 6 apply not only to public lands, but to certain other Federal real property as well.

SECTION 2—ACREAGE LIMIT

Section 2 contains the basic provision of the bill, which establishes a requirement that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres in the aggregate for defense purposes may hereafter be made only by act of Congress.

The section contains language which would preclude the making of a number of cumulative withdrawals, each for less than 5,000 acres, where all would be used for any one defense project or facility of the Department of Defense.

Testimony of witnesses for the Department of the Interior made it clear that the great majority of individual applications for any one project or facility in fact involve lands of less than 5,000 acres, and as may be noted below, the Department of Defense in its report does not object to this section of the act. In testimony given subsequent to the receipt of the Defense Department report, witnesses for the Department of Defense directly negatived a question as to whether the 5,000-acre breaking-point in the bill would unduly hamper or interfere with carrying out of the defense mission.

SECTION 3—APPLICATION

Section 3 would lay a more adequate base for fully determining at the local

level and for congressional consideration the resource impact of proposed withdrawals.

Defense agencies would continue to file applications for withdrawal or reservation of public lands with the appropriate local land office of the Bureau of Land Management, or with the Department of the Interior, just as is done under present procedure. Continuance of this procedure would accomplish the same dual effect achieved by existing practices: First, the recordation of the application in the appropriate office has the effect of segregating, temporarily, the lands requested from all forms of entry under the lands laws, thus serves as a sound antispeculation measure; second, continuance of existing procedure would provide notice at the local and State level—through requisite Federal Register publication and/or press releases issued by Bureau of Land Management State supervisors—that the application had been made.

Thereafter, if the aggregate acreage of public lands included within the proposed withdrawal or reservation falls within the requirements of H. R. 12185 as evidenced by the public lands records maintained by the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Interior would then develop, for transmission to the Congress, proposed legislation having as its purpose effecting the withdrawal requested, and containing such provisions for continued operation of the public lands laws within the area proposed to be withdrawn as may be determined to be compatible with the intended military use.

To achieve these objectives, section 3 would require applications to specify, in addition to the name of the requesting agency, using agency location and description of boundaries of the area, and gross acreage involved: the purpose or purposes—unless classified for national security reasons—for which the area is proposed to be withdrawn; whether contamination will result, and if so, whether such contamination will be permanent or temporary; the extent, if any, to which the proposed use will affect full operation of the public land laws and Federal regulations relating to conservation, utilization, and development of mineral resources, timber, and other material resources, grazing resources, fish and wildlife resources, water resources, scenic, wilderness, recreational and other values; and, if the area to be withdrawn involves the use of water in any State lying in whole or in part west of the 98th meridian—that is, the reclamation States—the agency would be required to state whether, subject to existing rights under law, it has acquired or intends to acquire rights to the use of the water in conformity with State laws and procedures relating to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

Relating to these requirements in the proposed bill to the findings of the committee, as set out hereinbefore, should make abundantly clear the reasons why they are included, and the results the committee believes will be achieved.

One observation needs to be made: the record made by the committee suggests that applicant defense agencies have tended to turn to the clause "if the purpose or purposes are classified for national security reasons" as a device to relieve them of the burden of making known the general purpose for which such areas are to be withdrawn. It does not appear that such generalized terms as "gunnery range," "bombing range," "missiles range," and the like would seriously threaten the national security, particularly when the areas involved may range from 1,500 to 3,000 square miles in area, an area of such size that it simply cannot be subtly and deftly removed from the operation of the public lands laws without generating substantial local interest, and interest of the State or Territory affected.

SECTION 4—FISH AND GAME LAWS

Section 4 has as its objective substantially reducing the areas of present and continuing conflict between State and Territorial officials and the commanding officers of military installations and facilities involving the management, conservation, and harvesting of fish and game recourse, and the enforcement of fish and game laws of the State or Territory within military installations or facilities.

This section, as was noted in the comments on section 1, applies not only to reserved public land reservations, but to acquired lands as well; its broad purpose is to make State hunting, fishing, and trapping laws applicable as Federal laws on all military installations.

Section 4 (a) (1) would require that all hunting, trapping, and fishing on all military installations and facilities—including those falling presently within the "exclusive Federal jurisdiction" status—be in accordance with the fish and game laws of the State or Territory in which such lands are located. It would require that State or Territorial licenses be obtained for hunting, trapping, and fishing on such areas if local law (i. e., State or Territorial law) authorizes license issuance to Armed Forces members on bona fide military duty for not less than 30 days at any installation within the State or Territory involved, without regard to residence requirements, and upon terms no less favorable than those upon which such a license is issued to residents.

This subsection anticipates affirmative action being taken by some States before hunting, trapping, or fishing within such reservations must be licensed by State law; it does not anticipate that for such activities outside such reservations the same preferred treatment must be afforded military personnel. Since subparagraph (1) of section 4 (a) requires that all hunting, trapping, and fishing at the installation or facility be in accordance with the fish and game laws of the State or Territory in which it is located, the clear intent is that such activities can be conducted if at all, only in accordance with State law relating to season and bag limits, methods of taking, etc., even though the military personnel are not required to comply with State licensing requirements within the reservation because of the State's failure to establish preferential treatment with respect to residence.

In other words, hunting within all such reservations—with or without State provisions establishing preferred military treatment—can only be conducted after the effective date of the act, if in compliance with State fish and game laws, excepting licensing. The State may or may not provide for preferred treatment outside such reservations to be assured State licensing within such reservations, if the State has met the residence waiver requirements of this subparagraph.

Possible dual construction of the clause "for not less than 30 days" deserves clarifying comment: if an individual is actually assigned on bona fide military duty by orders providing for duty status at the installation involved, so that his orders require his presence at the installation for a minimum of 30 days, he would then be eligible for a license under the preferred status provisions when first physically present for duty on such orders.

Subsection 4 (a) (3) mandates the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the appropriate governor or his designee, and subject to safety and military security requirements, to develop procedures whereby State or Territorial fish and game or conservation officials may have full access thereto "to effect measures for the management, conservation, and harvesting of fish and game resources."

The quoted language anticipates not only that the obvious results will be achieved, but the possibility that—in areas where insufficient military personnel are present to adequately enforce fish and game laws, such as the case at Camp McCoy, Wis., referred to above—State game officials may be deputized as Federal marshals to assure adequate enforcement.

Subsection 4 (b) provides that violations of the State and Territorial fish and game laws made applicable to military installations and facilities are violations of Federal law, and subject to like punishment as though committed or omitted within the State or Territorial jurisdiction.

Lastly, subsection 4 (c) specifically recites that rights granted by treaty or otherwise to any Indian tribe or members thereof are not modified by the provisos dealing with fishing, trapping, and hunting.

SECTION 5—MINERAL LANDS, SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSITION

Section 5 would amend in two particulars the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended.

First, it would except from the real property-disposition provisions of the 1949 act, minerals in withdrawn or reserved public domain lands which the Secretary of the Interior determines are suitable for disposition under the public land mining and mineral leasing laws.

Second, it amends the 1949 act to provide that only those withdrawn or reserved public domain lands surplus to the needs of Federal agencies found by the Secretary of the Interior—with the concurrence of the Administrator of General Services—not suitable for restoration to public land status by virtue of their having been substantially

changed in character by improvements, would hereafter be subject to the real property disposition provisions of the amended 1949 act.

Both of these amendments would clarify the operation of existing law; one would make it clear that only when determined by the Secretary to be not suitable for mining or mineral leasing purposes would the mineral estate pass with the title to the surface estate being disposed of under surplus property provisions; the other would reverse the roles of the Secretary and the Administrator so as to provide that the Secretary would make an initial judgment of the nature with which his Department is most familiar—suitability of lands for public land uses, a traditional Interior function—and if the Administrator concurs in a finding of nonsuitability, the lands would be disposed of as surplus.

SECTION 6—OIL, GAS, AND MINERALS DISPOSITION

Finally, the reported measure provides, in section 6, that all minerals in withdrawn or reserved public lands—except lands withdrawn or reserved specifically as naval petroleum, naval oil shale, or naval coal reserves—are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and that no disposition thereof shall be made except under the applicable public land mining and mineral leasing laws.

Enactment of this section into law actually constitutes a restatement of the law as it is today, in the view of the committee and the Department of the Interior. In short, as declared above, the provisions of section 6 of the reported bill will serve to remove whatever doubts may exist, if any, as to the laws which govern the disposal of any and all minerals, including oil and gas, in public lands of the United States heretofore or hereafter withdrawn or reserved by the United States for the use of defense agencies.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 12185, the reported measure, is a clean bill I introduced, after consideration by the committee of H. R. 10371, together with 12 other bills having an identical purpose. I believe reference to those bills and to their authors will suffice to indicate the widespread support for this legislation among Members of the House.

Bills having the same purpose as H. R. 12185, include H. R. 10362, by Rpresentative ASPINALL, of Colorado; H. R. 10366, by Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska; H. R. 10367, by Representative BUDGE, of Idaho; H. R. 10372, by Representative FERNANDEZ, of New Mexico; H. R. 10377, by Representative METCALF, of Montana; H. R. 10380, by Representative PFOST, of Idaho; H. R. 10384, by Representative ROGERS of Texas; H. R. 10394, by Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; H. R. 10396, by Representative UDALL, of Arizona; H. R. 10548, by Representative YOUNG, of Nevada; H. R. 10725, by Represenative COON, of Oregon; and H. R. 11001, by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

PURPOSE OF H. R. 12185

Broadly stated, H. R. 12185 has as its purpose and objective returning to the Congress in one major respect—land use for defense purposes—the direct exercise of the responsibility fixed by the Federal Constitution in the legislative branch for effecting policies and procedures assuring maximum public benefit through multiple resource utilization of the public lands and other real property of the United States.

Specifically, the reported measure deals with the withdrawal and reservation for, restriction of, and utilization by, the Department of Defense for defense purposes of the public lands of the United States and Alaska, the outer Continental Shelf lands of the United States, and Federal lands and waters off the coast of Alaska. If the reported bill is enacted, such proposed uses by agencies of the Department of Defense involving more than 5,000 acres for any one project or facility could only be effectuated—notwithstanding any other provisions of law, except in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or the Congress—after compliance with its terms, and after approval of such proposals by specific act of Congress.

H. R. 12185, in addition, would set out clear-cut statutory requirements for the utilization and disposition of certain of the resources found within existing and future military installations and facilities so as to assure highest and best management, conservation, utilization, and development thereof on a continuing basis. To achieve these objectives, first, the bill would lay a more adequate base for fully determining at the local level and for congressional consideration the resource impact of proposed withdrawals; second, H. R. 12185, if enacted, would substantially reduce the areas of present and continuing conflict between State and Territorial officials and the commanding officers of military installations and facilities involving the management, conservation, and harvesting of fish and game resources, and the enforcement of fish and game laws within military installations and facilities; third, the bill would amend in two particulars the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, so as to clarify operations thereunder involving the disposition of the mineral estate in withdrawn or reserved public domain lands, and to redefine the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to disposition of public lands withdrawn or reserved and subsequently declared excess to the needs of Federal agencies; and, fourth, the bill's provisions would remove whatever doubts may exist, if any, as to the laws which govern the disposal of any and all minerals, including oil and gas, in public lands of the United States heretofor or hereafter withdrawn or reserved by the United States for the use of Defense agencies.

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The first of these objectives would be accomplished by continuing in effect—but by redefining the requirements—the present procedure whereby the requesting defense agency files an application with the appropriate land office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for withdrawal, restriction, or reservation of a specified area. Such applications for use of areas embraced within the terms of the bill will hereafter be required to specify: The name of the requesting and intended using agency; the location and gross and net acreage involved; purpose or purposes of the withdrawal, restriction, or reservation; whether contamination will result from the proposed use or uses; use period; effect of use on continuing full operation of the public land laws, and full resources utilization, management, and development; and the relationship of the proposed use to laws and procedures of the States of the reclamation west relating to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

HUNTING AND FISHING PROVISIONS

To accomplish the second objective, with respect to all military installations and facilities, the bill would require that hunting, trapping, and fishing thereon be in accordance with the fish and game laws of the State or Territory in which such areas are located; and that State or Territorial licenses be obtained for hunting, trapping, and fishing thereon if local law authorizes their issuance to Armed Forces members on bona fide military duty for not less than 30 days at any installation within the State or Territory involved, without regard to residence requirements, and upon terms no less favorable than those upon which such a license is issued to residents.

Further, the bill would mandate the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the appropriate governor or his designee and subject to safety and military-security requirements, to develop procedures whereby State or Territorial fish and game or conservation officials may have full access thereto to effect measures for the management, conservation, and harvesting of fish and game resources.

By the terms of the bill, violations of the State and Territorial fish and game laws made applicable to military installations and faciilties are made violations of Federal law, and subject to like punishment as though committed or omitted within the State or Territorial jurisdiction.

The bill specifically recites that rights granted by treaty or otherwise to any Indian tribe or members thereof are not modified by the provisions dealing with fishing, trapping, and hunting.

MINERAL LANDS AND SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

The third objective would be accomplished by amending the amended Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to: make it clear that minerals in withdrawn or reserved public domain lands which the Secretary of the Interior determines are suitable for disposition under the public land mining and mineral leasing laws are excepted from the real property disposition provisions of the amended 1949 act; similarly, only those withdrawn or reserved public domain lands excess to the needs of Federal agencies found by the Secretary—with the concurrence of the Administrator of General Services—not

suitable for restoration to public-land status, by virtue of their having been substantially changed in character by improvements, would hereafter be subject to the real property disposition provisions of the amended 1949 act.

OIL, GAS, AND MINERALS DISPOSITION

Finally, the reported bill would accomplish the fourth objective by declaring that all minerals in withdrawn or reserved public lands except lands withdrawn or reserved specifically as naval petroleum, naval oil shale, or naval coal reserves—are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and that no disposition thereof shall be made except under "the applicable public land mining and mineral leasing laws."

Adoption of this provision, as indicated above, will set at rest any doubts as to congressional policy of long standing—as expressed in the mining laws of 1872, as amended, and the 1914 and 1920 Mineral Leasing Acts and related laws—with respect to orderly disposition of the mineral resources, including oil and gas, of the public lands.

COMMITTEE CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

In recommending immediate favorable action on H. R. 12185, Mr. Speaker, I speak for the committee, for myself, and for thousands of our conservation-minded citizens when I reiterate what our committee has said before. The program for the defense of our Nation's human and natural resources should not—and must not—be so conducted as to destroy the very resources it is aimed at preserving.

H. R. 12185 is a bill for the recapture by the Congress of a degree of those powers which the executive branch of the Government has acquired over a long period of years with respect to utilization of this Nation's most valuable assets, the human and natural resources of the public lands.

Its early enactment will operate to return to the legislative branch the degree of control the committee believes necessary to assure that defense use of the public lands presently held will more nearly conform to long-established maximum public multiple resource use policy, and will make certain that future public lands acquisition by the military will be so conditioned as to assure conformance with the same policy.

The positions of the Departments of Defense and the Interior, as well as General Services Administration, as indicated on pages 42 and 43 of the committee report, House Report 2856, are generally without objection to the reported bill. With respect to the asserted objection of Defense to the committee amendment bringing outer Continental Shelf defense restrictions within the purview of the congressional review required by the bill, it should be noted that the Bureau of the Budget cleared a statement presented by Interior witnesses in support of that amendment; further, as we have observed in the report that any move to restrict petroleum exploration and development of shelf resources dictates a combined approach by the Congress and the executive branch, and not simply unilateral executive action.

This legislation is landmark legislation; it will have a far-reaching effect in the direction of wiser conservation, development, and utilization of invaluable resources belonging to the people of the United States.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously recommends enactment of H. R. 12185. I support it as a Californian, and as a matter of vital interest to the citizens of my State; I urge the support of the entire Congress, since it is legislation of paramount importance to the entire Nation, to today's citizens, and tomorrow's citizens.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, during the past 6 months, conducted a series of exhaustive hearings into the policies and procedures affecting the withdrawal and utilization of the public lands of the United States. It became evident, very early, that the question of lands held and used by the Department of Defense alone would require all of the time we could devote to the subject during this Congress.

The reported legislation was developed and introduced at the midpoint in these proceedings, which consumed 18 days of hearings, hundreds of additional man-hours of committee member and staff research and work, and resulted in the 25,000-word report on H. R. 12185, House Report 2856.

I believe that the RECORD should contain a summary of the committee's findings with respect to matters so vital to the people of my own State of Colorado, and to the Nation.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE FINDINGS

On the record made, and on the testimony, statements, and departmental reports received, the following conclusions are indicated:

1. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT CONTROL PROCEDURES

That the matter of the Department of the Navy's requests in 1953 and 1955 for joint use with the Air Force of the 3.5-million acre Nellis-Tonopah range in southern Nevada, the Air Force turndown of that request on an asserted "Air Force saturation use" basis, the activities of the Navy in pumping funds into the Fallon Naval Auxiliary Air Station in northwest-central Nevada prior to reasonable assurance that public land range facilities would be available in proximity to Fallon NAAS, the Air Force decision to declare more than 2 million acres at Nellis-Tonopah range surplus to their needs when pressed by the committee to justify their further retention, and the Navy's immediate assertion that such Air Force action was "too late" if the $16 million Federal investment at Fallon was to be protected—all reflect what can only be labeled an inexcusable deficiency in the control procedures established by Defense to assure conformity with its directives relating to public-land acquisition and utilization.

The record strongly suggests that since post-World War II neither on an intra-military department basis, nor on a coordinated inter-Defense Department basis—at least insofar as public lands acquisition policy is involved—has there been sufficient long-range planning and detailed periodic review fundamental to any program aimed at economic real property utilization. The Defense Department directive of August 27, 1955, on paper, constitutes a salutary step in the direction bringing Defense utilization of public lands of the United States more nearly into line with the long-standing congressional policies involving public lands management and use.

Until reports from all military departments have been received by Defense purusant to the August 27, 1955, directive, fully evaluated, and related to present holdings, and to pending and proposed applications, the committee believes that no additional public land acquisitions for military purposes should be effected, except in cases of most urgent necessity, and then subject to findings thereafter made.

2. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT UTILIZATION REVIEW

The approval by the individual military departments, and subsequently by the Department of Defense, of applications now pending in the Department of the Interior for withdrawal of an additional 8 million acres of public lands—when neither the requesting agency nor the Defense Department had in hand any utilization records on more than 25 million acres of existing holdings necessary to approval or disapproval—is inexplicable, and cannot be viewed as justification of the need for additional lands.

The history of practices indulged in by the defense agencies with respect to public lands acquisition dictates early congressional action on legislation having as its purpose recapturing the power of Congress under the property clause.

3. REVIEW BY MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

The committee findings set out in the foregoing are, it appears, equally applicable to the Departments of the Army, Air Force, and Navy. In fact, no good reason presents itself for the Defense Department to consider a request for approval of proposed land acquisition in the absence of a showing that the requesting military department has instituted and enforced such control procedures as will fully justify continued retention of existing holdings, and thus relate existing holdings to proposed acquisitions.

4. DEFENSE HOLDINGS AND MULTIPLE-RESOURCE USE

The committee record makes it clear that the policy of defense agencies has been, almost without exception where public lands are involved, to insist on withdrawals of huge practice or training ranges from all forms of public use. Further, it is clear this is done notwithstanding the fact that in many instances substantial multiple-resource utilization and development would be entirely compatible with the proposed military use, with the result that vast mineral, grazing, timber and other materials, fish and wildlife, and water resources, together

with wilderness, scenic, and recreation values, are locked up—with consequent local impact and attendant diminution or destruction of valuable public resource assets.

The tentative agreement of the Navy to permit very substantial multiple-resource activity within the proposed 2.8-million-acre Black Rock-Sahwave gunnery range Nevada withdrawal—if the withdrawal order which may be written incorporates with precision the conditions and limitations of use—reflects, in the view of the committee, an immense stride in the right direction. That the original Navy intent, and desire, was to close the area to all forms of public use, however, would seem to very adequately point up the problem facing the Congress. That the Navy's "agreement" was arrived at only after hundreds of hearing man-hours and staff work had been devoted to its particulars, also suggests that the legislative branch can have no assurance that executive agencies will employ a maximum multiple resource use approach unless Congress, by statute, establishes clear-cut and mandatory conditions precedent to finalizing of any major withdrawals of public lands for defense, or other purposes.

5. FISH, GAME, AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES

We have stated in our report accompanying H. R. 12185 that the record made by the committee conclusively establishes these points: That the existence of huge Federal military reservations containing extensive fish, game, and wildlife resources and the activities of military personnel thereon has given rise to violate objections on the part of local officials with respect to activities countenanced therein; that on too many such areas the State fish and game laws and implementing regulations fixing seasons, bag limits, methods and times of capture, and similar limitations, have been totally or largely ignored; that State fish and game conservation officials have routinely been denied access to millions of acres of public lands within military reservations for the purpose of effecting measures for the conservation and management of fish, game, and wildlife resources; that the public at large has similarly been denied access to millions of acres of military reservations during established hunting seasons, notwithstanding the fact that many such areas are only intermittently used and cannot be seriously labeled "closed for security reasons"; that interpretation of the State laws governing taking and possession of these resources has largely been left by the Defense Department, and the Departments of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, to local commanders, with the not unnatural result that there are almost as many interpretations as there are local military commanders; that in too many instances such areas have taken on all the aspects of exclusive military hunting preserves, closed to the public at large, closed to the Federal and State officials charged with responsibility for fish and game law enforcement, and therefore islands of highly irregular fish and game management within what Congress and the States and Territories would like to believe is a sea of uniform policy governing the wise and orderly use of these valuable public resources; finally, that directives, regulations, and orders of the Defense Department promulgated with the declared intent of harmonizing the military-local situation appear to be largely matters of form, and of only limited substance.

With respect to the general findings set out above on this subject, it is submitted that such findings speak for themselves. The history of military-local relations—and, indeed, the history of the relationship between Defense agencies and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service—makes it clear that the military cannot, or will not, yield in its insistence on immunity from State and Territorial fish and game laws, within exclusive Federal jurisdiction areas.

It is equally clear that local officials will not recede from their insistenee that if military personnel are going to fish and hunt, then either as a matter of law or a matter of sound Federal-local policy they must conform to season and bag limits, methods of taking, and so forth, as prescribed by State law.

In light of the abuses of sound conservation practices that have unquestionably been permitted to prevail at a number of military reservations, and the inability or unwillingness of the respective military departments and the Department of Defense to remedy the situation, action by Congress is a must.

DEFENSE POSITION ON PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. Speaker, in its report accompanying H. R. 12185, there is set out in detail the House Interior Committee's reaction to the Defense position—as articulated through the Department of the Navy—with respect to the Navy-claimed authority to conduct petroleum exploratory operations outside of areas set aside specifically as naval petroleum reserves. Put succinctly, the committee position is that there is no such authority in the Navy—absent further congressional action—with respect to public land areas withdrawn "for naval purposes" or on the outer continental shelf.

On the other hand, if the Navy, with the concurrence of the Department of Defense, is convinced that there is a deficiency in petroleum reserves for defense purposes, it should proceed forthwith to: First, request establishment, by Presidential Executive order, of additional naval petroleum reserves; or, second, request congressional legislation for establishment of such additional reserves. Similarly, if the Navy believes that lands withdrawn "for naval purposes" should be classified as "naval petroleum reserves," it should move expeditiously to secure their reclassification. Finally, if the Navy believes that the Outer Continental Shelf Act of 1953 constitutes a direction or mandate for the initiation of exploratory drilling there by the Navy—it is suggested, in light of the views of this committee and the House Appropriations Committee on the San Nicholas Island matter—that the Department of the Navy consider requesting legislation by the Congress clearly establishing such authority.

The committee has no judgment as to the need for creation of additional naval petroleum reserves, nor does it have a judgment as to the desirability of the Navy—or any other Federal agency—to conduct exploratory petroleum drilling operations. Such matters involve basic legislative policy, and should be so treated, particularly in light of the very substantial contribution made in dollars and petroleum resources by the development of Continental Shelf areas to date, and as anticipated in the near future.

Finally, if the proposed Air Force-Navy withdrawal in peacetime of airspace areas embracing millions of acres over the Gulf of Mexico would have the effect of precluding leasing activity by the Secretary of the Interior of the soil and seabed of the shelf, then it is clear that this, too, calls into question resource policies of such import as to warrant a joint executive-legislative assault on the matter, not unilateral executive action.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join in support of this legislation. I submit that the committee findings speak for themselves, and speak loudly for immediate action by the Congress to bring control of these resources back to the Congress. H. R. 12185, Mr. Speaker, is must legislation.

SALE OF CERTAIN WARBUILT VESSELS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 685) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain warbuilt vessels.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We have not reached that point yet.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask whether or not the opponents of this proposal were allowed to come before the committee and present their views on this matter.

Mr. BONNER. I beg your pardon, but I was unable to hear the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman in charge of the bill as to whether or not the opponents of this legislation were given an opportunity to come before the committee and present their views.

Mr. BONNER. There were public hearings on the bill. I know of nobody that appeared in oppositon.

Mr. BOLAND. I know of some objection to it on this side.

Mr. BONNER. They never appeared before the committee.

Mr. BOLAND. I do not know whether anybody was given the opportunity to appear before the committee.

Mr. BONNER. We sent out a notice of hearing, notified the trade and industry. That is the only way we have of doing it.

Mr. BOLAND. I notice this bill was filed July 13, and I was just wondering

whether or not those segments of the industry that might be opposed to it, or individuals were given an opportunity to come before your committee and oppose the bill.

Mr. BONNER. I may say to the gentleman that there were witnesses before the committee from the Maritime Commission and various Government departments. There was no objection before the committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Does the Maritime Commission favor this legislation?

Mr. BONNER. They reported favorably on it; yes.

Mr. BOLAND. The report carries no indication of what the views of the Maritime Commission may be on this bill. The only view expressed is by the Comptroller General.

Mr. BONNER. Let me ask the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. TOLLEFSON] who is the ranking member of the comittee, and Mr. ALLEN of California, who were present at the hearing.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. What was the question?

Mr. BOLAND. Whether or not the Maritime Comission favors the legislation. I find no reference to the Maritime Commission's views on this proposal in the report.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The Maritime Commission agreed to the sale of these ships.

Mr. BOLAND. Why was it not included in the report?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I could not answer that.

Mr. BOLAND. With the assurance of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee that the Maritime Commission favors this proposal, and with the further assurance that the possible opponents to this legislation had the opportunity of appearing before the committee and presenting their views, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FISH HATCHERY IN WEST VIRGINIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12303) to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 3831) may be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish, construct, equip, operate, and maintain a new fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 12303) were laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY SHIP REPAIR ACT OF 1954

The Clerk called the resolution (S. J. Res. 187) to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ST. FRANCISVILLE BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11720) creating the city of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of St. Francisville Bridge Commission created by section 9 of this act (hereafter in this act referred to as the "commission"), and its successors and assigns, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto, across the Wabash River at or near the city of St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., in accordance with the General Bridge Act of 1946, at a point suitable to the interest of public navigation. The commission is also authorized to purchase from its owner, maintain and operate the existing ferry operating between St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., and in connection with the acquisition of such ferry, is authorized to purchase the vessels used in operating a ferry between St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., the franchise granted for operating such ferry, and all real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, and owned on the date of enactment of this act by the owner of such ferry.

SEC. 2. The commission and its successors and assigns shall have the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property in the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana, as may be needed for location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and proceedings therefor shall be the same as proceedings for condemnation of private property for public purposes in such State. The commission, its successors and assigns, may enter into agreements with such States, and any political subdivisions thereof, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any real estate or other property owned by such State or political subdivision.

SEC. 3. The commission and its successors and assigns may fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army under the General Bridge Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The commission and its successors and assigns may provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge as may be constructed, and approaches (including any approach highways which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing and improved highways), and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto, and the cost of the ferry and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the commission, bearing interest at the rate of not more than 6 percent per annum. The principal and interest of such bonds, and any premium to be paid for retirement before maturity, shall be paid solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act, and such payments may be further secured by a mortgage on the bridge or ferry or both. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone, or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 30 years from their respective dates, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places, as the commission may determine. The commission may repurchase and reserve the right to redeem all or any of such bonds before maturity in such manner and at such prices, not exceeding 105 percent of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the commission before issuance of the bonds. The commission, when it deems it to be to the best interest of the commission may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds before their maturity. Such refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times, not exceeding 40 years from the date of enactment of this act, as the commission may determine. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission with respect to the purchase, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or ferry, or both, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of the trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporation. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting, and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustees and the bondholders, as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with law.

Such bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of interest at the rate of more than 6 percent per annum on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values. The face amount of the bonds shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, amounts which, when added to any other funds available to the commission for the same purposes, will be not less than the cost of the bridge and approaches, and the lands, easements, and appurtenances, used in connection therewith and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry. The cost of the bridge and approaches and

approach highways shall be considered to include interest during the construction of the bridge and for 12 months after construction has been completed, and to include all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses incident to the construction of the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary real estate and other property, and incident to the financing thereof. If the proceeds of the bonds issued, when added to any other funds available to the commission for the same purpose, exceed the cost as finally determined under this section of the bridge and approaches, and the lands, easements, and appurtenances, used in connection therewith and the cost of ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund provided for in this act. Before the preparation of definite bonds, the commission may, subject to the provisions of this act, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates, with or without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definite bonds when such bonds as have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. The rates of toll to be charged for the use of the bridge shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches under economical management, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as they fall due, and to pay for redemption or repurchase of all or any of such bonds redeemed or repurchased before maturity as provided in section 4. All tolls and other revenues from the bridge are hereby pledged to such use and to their application as required by this section. After payment or provision for payment from such tolls of all such cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches, and the reservation of an amount of money estimated by the commission to be sufficient for such purposes during an ensuing period of not more than 6 months, the remainder of the tolls collected shall be placed in the sinking fund, at intervals to be determined by the commission before the issuance of the bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in their application to all traffic falling within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged for officials or employees of the commission or the Government of the United States in discharge of their duties.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of the bridge has been completed, the commission shall file with the Secretary of Commerce a sworn itemized statement, showing the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real estate or other property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction of the bridge and approaches, and acquisition of the ferry and other property associated therewith.

SEC. 6. (a) After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment has been provided and is being held for such payments, the commission shall transfer by deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance, an undivided one-half interest in the physical structure of the bridge and its approaches to the State of Illinois or any municipality or agency of such State authorized by or pursuant to law to accept such undivided one-half interest (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Illinois interest") and an undivided one-half interest in the physical structure of the bridge and its approaches to the State of Indiana or any municipality or agency of such State authorized by or pursuant to law to accept such undivided one-half interest (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Indiana interest"), under the conditions that the bridge shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Illinois interest and the Indiana interest as may be agreed on. If no Illinois interest or Indiana interest is authorized to accept, or does accept, such one-half interest in the bridge and approaches under such conditions, then the bridge shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the commission, and the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and approaches under economical management, until such time as an Illinois interest and the Indiana interest is authorized to accept, and does accept, such bridge and approaches under such conditions. Whenever the bridge and approaches are transferred under this section, the commission, its successors or assigns shall (if the ferry and other property have not already been disposed of) sell the ferry and franchise, and the real estate, equipment, and other property associated with the ferry, as soon as practicable at such price and upon such terms as the commission, its successors or assigns, may determine.

(b) The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may make advances to the commission under the terms and subject to the conditions of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, and may purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, the commission under the terms and subject to the conditions of title 11 of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

(c) If the State Highway Department of the State of Indiana consents, amounts apportioned to that State out of sums appropriated under the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, may be allocated for the construction of such bridge and approaches, in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply in the case on the Federal-aid primary highway system. If the Department of Public Works and Buildings of the State of Illinois consents, amounts apportioned to that State out of sums appropriated under the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, may be allocated for the construction of such bridge and approaches, in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply in the case of projects on the Federal-aid primary system.

SEC. 7. The commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridge and approaches (including the approach highways which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto by negotiating and entering into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Public Works and Buildings of Illinois, Lawrence County, Ill., Knox County, Ind., the city of Vincennes, Ind., or any other county or municipality in the States of Illinois and Indiana, whereby the commission may receive financial aid in financing the construction of the bridge and approaches. The commission, in its discretion, may avail itself of all the facilities of the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Public Works and Buildings of the State of Illinois, or any county or municipality in the State of Indiana or the State of Illinois, with regard to construction of said bridge, and the commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State Highway Department of the State of Indiana, or the Department of Public Works and Buildings of the State of Illinois, or any county or municipality in the State of Indiana and the State of Illinois, whereby said highway departments, municipalities, or counties, or either of them may construct, operate, and maintain, or participate with the commission in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridge and its approaches.

It is hereby declared to be the purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches across the Wabash River at or near the city of Saint Francisville, Ill., and to authorize the commission to promote said object and purpose, with full power to contract with either State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Public Works and Buildings of Illinois, or any municipality, or county, or cities in the States of Indiana and Illinois, or all of them, in relation to the construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridge and approaches.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall require the commission to maintain or operate the ferry if it is purchased under this act, but in the discretion of the commission, its successors and assigns, the ferry, franchise, and all or any real estate, equipment, and other property acquired in connection with the ferry may be sold or otherwise disposed of, or may be abandoned or dismantled, or both, whenever in the judgment of the commission, its successors and assigns, it may seem expedient to do so. The commission, its successors and assigns, may fix such rates of toll for use of the ferry as it may deem proper, subject to the conditions prescribed in section 5 with respect to rates of toll for the use of the bridge. All tolls collected for the use of the ferry and the proceeds of any sale or disposition of the ferry or any other property connected therewith shall be used, so far as may be necessary, to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such ferry and property, and any amounts not so used shall be paid into the sinking fund provided for bonds.

Within a reasonable time after the ferry has been acquired under this act, the commission shall file with the Secretary of Commerce a sworn itemized statement, showing the cost of acquisition of such ferry and the cost, if any, of acquisition of the franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property associated with the ferry.

An accurate record of the cost of the ferry, franchise, real estate, equipment, and other property; the expenditures for maintaining and repairing them; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the city of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession, may contract, and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law an equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply same to the purpose of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

(b) The commission shall consist of Roy Rucker, of Bridgeport, Ill.; Lawrence L. Bell, Dr. Carl McCammon, Clyde Leathers, and Virgal Deckard, of St. Francisville, Ill.; Oscar Laue, Oris Wright, Gilbert Shake, and William Steele, of Vincennes, Ind.; the mayor of the city of St. Francisville, Ill., shall serve as a member of the commission ex officio, without compensation; such commission shall be a public body corporate and politic. Each member of the commission shall qualify within 30 days of the date of enactment of this act by filing with the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act. Each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in the same manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy occurring in the commission by reason of failure to qualify, death, or resignation shall be filled by appointment by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

(c) Before any bonds may be issued under this act each of the members of the commission must give bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, conditioned upon his faithful performance of all duties required by this act. The cost of such surety before and during the construction of the bridge shall be paid, or reimbursement made, out of the proceeds from the sale of bonds; thereafter such cost shall be an operating expense of the commission, to be paid from tolls.

(d) The commission may establish rules and regulations for the government of its business not inconsistent with this act. The commission shall from time to time select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A majority of the members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 10. The commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenue and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $10 for each day actually spent in the business of the commission but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed $1,200 and of each other member shall not exceed $600 in any one year. The members of the commission shall be entitled to receive expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the commission. The commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and such other experts, assistants, and employees as it may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from funds provided under authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon have been paid and all other obligations of the commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payments shall have been made, and after the bridge has been conveyed to the Indiana interest and the Illinois interest, or otherwise disposed of as provided in this act, the commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the Commissioner of Public Roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a pubic hearing in the city of St. Francisville, Ill., notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in Knox County, Ind., and in a newspaper published in Lawrence County, Ill. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the commission shall be divided and distribution made between the "Indiana interest" and the "Illinois interest," as may be determined by the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or permit the commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds provided under this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the commission, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 12. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

SEC. 13. The commission, and its income, property, and franchises shall be exempt from all Federal taxation.

SEC. 14. All provisions of this act may be enforced or the violation thereof prevented by mandamus, injunction, or other appropriate remedy brought by the Attorney General of the United States in any United States district court having competent jurisdiction of the subject matter and of the parties.

SEC. 15. (a) The financial transactions of the commission shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the places where the accounts of the commission are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the commission and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement of assets and liabilities, capital, and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Congress informed of the operation and financial condition of the commission, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditures, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the commission at the time submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Pages 9 and 10, strike out subsection (b).

Page 10, renumber subsection (c) "(b)."

Page 17, lines 13 and 14, strike out section 13.

Page 17, line 14, strike out "14" and insert "13."

Page 17, strike out all of lines 20 through 25 inclusive, and strike out all of page 18, and on page 19, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive.

Page 19, line 4, strike out "16" and insert "14."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF ONE WAR-BUILT CARGO VESSEL

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 666) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell one war-built cargo vessel, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION RESERVE SHIPYARD AT WILMINGTON, N. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 12116) to provide for the conveyance of the Maritime Administration reserve shipyard at Wilmington, N. C., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the North Carolina State Ports Authority to the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDING MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3113) to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Ohio a question? In reference to 4 or 5 of these bills he has objected. In some cases I agree with him. May I ask whether or not he is going to maintain that position? Because the official objectors committee in several instances would have requested that the bill be put over. We want to be protected so that if the gentleman withdraws his objection it will not indicate that we have agreed that the bill should be approved. I am just asking the question.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio is going to object to any bills from the other body and all bills.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the gentleman's position is firm, so that we can be assured that these bills will not come up

subsequently, though we may have our own views on them?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF CERTAIN GREENHOUSES AND OTHER STRUCTURES ON SQUARE 576 WEST IN WASHINGTON, D. C., AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF OTHER FACILITIES IN PLACE THEREOF, AT THE BOTANIC GARDEN NURSERY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3881) authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING SECTION 2011 (C) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10622) to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill or some member of the committee make a brief statement as to what this bill does?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to prevent undue enrichment for the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Undue enrichment by the Federal Government?

Mr. KEAN. No, for the Federal Government. Under the estate tax laws, an estate is allowed to deduct 80 percent of the tax that is paid to a State. Sometimes the amount cannot be determined.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know about that.

Mr. KEAN. This bill extends it a little longer than the original period.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2011 (c) (relating to the period of limitations on the credit for State death taxes) is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph (3) as follows:

"(3) If a claim for refund or credit of an overpayment of tax imposed by this chapter has been filed within the time prescribed in section 6511 of this title or section 322 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, then within such 4-year period, or before the expiration of 60 days after the final disposition by the Secretary or his delegate of the said claim for refund, or before the expiration of 60 days after a decision by any court of competent jurisdiction becomes final with respect to a timely suit instituted upon such claim."

and by adding after "section 6018" and before "except that" the following: "of this title, or of sections 821 or 864 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1949 in those cases where a timely claim for refund or credit for overpayment of taxes imposed by the said sections has not been finally disposed of at the date of enactment of this act;"

SEC. 2. That section 7851 (a) (2) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(C) TAXES IMPOSED UNDER THE 1939 CODE: Notwithstanding any contrary provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or the provisions of subparagraph (A), section 2011 (c) of this title, as amended, shall apply with respect to estates of decedents dying on or before the date of enactment of this title."

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective in all circumstances in which it would have been effective if it had been enacted as part of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the period of limitations on credit for State death taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"'(3) If a claim for refund or credit of an overpayment of tax imposed by this chapter has been filed within the time prescribed in section 6511, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days from the date of mailing by registered mail by the Secretary or his delegate to the taxpayer of a notice of the disallowance of any part of such claim, or before the expiration of 60 days after a decision by any court of competent jurisdiction becomes final with respect to a timely suit instituted upon such claim, whichever is later.'

"SEC. 2. Section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to the period of limitations on the credit for State death taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"'(3) If a claim for refund or credit of an overpayment of tax imposed by this chapter has been filed within the time prescribed in section 910, then within such 4-year period or before the expiration of 60 days from the date of mailing by registered mail by the Secretary or his delegate to the taxpayer of a notice of the disallowance of any part of such claim, or before the expiration of 60 days after a decision by any court of competent jurisdiction becomes final with respect to a timely suit instituted upon such claim, whichever is later.'

"SEC. 3. (a) The amendment made by section 1 to section 2011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be effective as if it were a part of such section on the date of enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(b) The amendment made by section 2 to section 813 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall be effective as if it were a part of such section on the date of enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OAHE, GAVINS POINT, AND FORT RANDALL DAMS AND RESERVOIR PROJECTS, MISSOURI RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2093) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, to undertake certain public works and grant compensation for certain property damages as a result of the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects, Missouri River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will reserve his objection to the bill?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will reserve the right to object.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is of vital importance. It so happens that the Corps of Engineers is destroying certain property in the development of the Missouri River program.

One portion of this bill authorizes the Corps of Engineers to reimburse property owners of property on tidal lands on which they have not the right now. There is no objection to this particular bill and I know of none.

The second portion of the bill is to authorize the Corps of Engineers to replace a schoolhouse that has been flooded out. If this bill does not go through it means there will be no school facilities for the schoolchildren in a certain town and this bill attempts to provide that facility.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people who were not concerned about other schoolchildren. So I object.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, THOMAS, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, ROONEY, FOGARTY, TABER, PHILLIPS, HAND, and BOW.

DAM ON THE NORTH BRANCH OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 794, the bill (S. 4099) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HYDE. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment so that I may ask a question?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I reserve it.

Mr. HYDE. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Ohio that the consent asked for in this bill is simply to build a dam, at no expense to the Government, by the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., which means employment in a distressed employment area for nearly 1,000 people. Now, I do not think the gentleman wants to arbitrarily take it upon himself to do away with jobs for 1,000 people in a distressed area.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If that dam is to employ 1,000 people, it will not be put on the North Branch, because I am familiar with it. I object, Mr. Speaker.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2226) to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CANNELTON BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10662) creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing the Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ohio, and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question or two? This simply authorizes the construction of an interstate bridge across a river.

Mr. DENTON. Across the Ohio River. It has been approved by the leadership of both sides. There was an objection, but amendments have been proposed to do away with the objection by the interested agencies.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman is getting the preferential treatment that the States of Maryland and Virginia are getting in the building of a bridge across the Potomac River at Alexandria, Va. Are the taxpayers of the entire country going to build the bridge, as in the case of the Potomac bridge, or are the States of Indiana and Ohio going to build it?

Mr. DENTON. It will be done by a bond issue.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the people of Indiana for building their own bridge with private money and through private enterprise.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I notice this bill was placed on the calendar yesterday sometime, possibly late in the afternoon.

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. HESELTON. I would like to inquire of the author of the bill or the gentleman who reported it whether the facts were known sufficiently early so this bill could have been brought to the floor under the normal procedure and handled with an understanding on the part of the entire membership rather than under this consent procedure in the next to last or third from last day of this session.

Mr. DENTON. They were not, because the report was shunted back and forth between the departments and we had a great deal of difficulty and trouble locating it, and they found it just the day before.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill would have been out a long time ago except for the delay of the Army engineers in getting the report. We could not get the Army report over, but finally got a clear slate for the bill. Presently the people have to go several miles to get over from Indiana to Fort Knox. This sets up a bridge commission, which does not cost anything, and it is highly desired by the Governors of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky.

Mr. HESELTON. Further reserving the right to object, and I am deeply sympathetic with the gentleman, but I want to inquire whether there has been any public hearing, any notice to anybody, any action by the committee.

Mr. DENTON. There have been public hearings.

Mr. HESELTON. When?

Mr. DENTON. This week, just as soon as we got the report.

Mr. HESELTON. What day?

Mr. DENTON. I think it was Monday or Tuesday. All departments were notified.

Mr. HESELTON. Are there any printed hearings?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know whether the hearings were printed, but there are transcripts of the hearing.

Mr. HESELTON. Is the committee report available?

Mr. DENTON. It is available.

Mr. HESELTON. Printed?

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission created by section 9 of this act (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Commission"), and its successors and assigns, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto, across the Ohio River at or near the cities of Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., in accordance with the General Bridge Act of 1946, at a point suitable to the interest of public navigation.

The Commission is also authorized to purchase from its owner, maintain and operate the existing ferry operating between Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., and in connection with the acquisition of such ferry, is authorized to purchase the vessels used in operating a ferry between Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., the franchise granted for operating such ferry, and all real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, and owned on the date of enactment of this act by the owner of such ferry.

SEC. 2. The Commission and its successors and assigns shall have the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property in the State of Indiana and the State of Kentucky, as may be needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and proceedings therefor shall be the same as proceedings for condemnation of private property for public purposes in such State. The Commission, its successors and assigns, may enter into agreements with such States, and any political subdivisions thereof, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any real estate or other property owned by such State or political subdivision.

SEC. 3. The Commission and its successors and assigns may fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge and ferry in accordance with this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army under the General Bridge Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Commission and its successors and assigns may provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge as may be constructed, and approaches (including any approach highways which, in the judgment of the Commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing and improved highways), and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto, and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the Commission, bearing interest at the rate or rates of not more than 6 percent per annum. The principal and interest of such bonds, and any premium to be paid for retirement thereof before maturity, shall be paid solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act, and such payments may be further secured by a mortgage on the bridge or ferry, or both. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone, or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 30 years from the date of enactment of this act, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places, as the Commission may determine. The Commission may repurchase and reserve the right to redeem all or any of such bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices, not exceeding 105 percent of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the Commission before issuance of the bonds. The Commission, when it deems it to be to the best interest of the Commission may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds before their maturity. Such refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times, not exceeding 30 years from the date the construction of the bridge has been completed, as the Commission may determine. The Commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of

the Commission with respect to the purchase, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or ferry, or both, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of the trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporation. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting, and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders, as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with law.

Such bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the Commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of interest at the rate of more than 6 percent per annum on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values. The face amount of the bonds shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, amounts which, when added to any other funds available to the Commission for the same purposes, will be not less than the cost of the bridge and approaches, and the lands, easements, and appurtenances, used in connection therewith and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry. The cost of the bridge and approaches and approach highways shall be considered to include interest during the construction of the bridge and for 12 months after construction has been completed, and to include all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses incident to the construction of the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary real estate and other property, and incident to the financing thereof. If the proceeds of the bonds issued, when added to any other funds available to the Commission for the same purpose, exceed the cost as finally determined under this section of the bridge and approaches, and the lands, easements, and appurtenances, used in connection therewith, and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund provided for in this act. Before the preparation of definite bonds, the Commission may, subject to the provisions of this act, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates, with or without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definite bonds when such bonds as have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. The rates of toll to be charged for the use of the bridge shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches under economical management, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as they fall due, and to pay for redemption or repurchase of all or any of such bonds redeemed or repurchased before maturity as provided in section 4. All tolls and other revenues from the bridge are hereby pledged to such use and to their application as required by this section. After payment or provision for payment from such tolls of all such cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches, and the reservation of an amount of money estimated by the Commission to be sufficient for such purposes during an ensuing period of not more than 6 months, the remainder of the tolls collected shall be placed in the sinking fund, at intervals to be determined by the Commission before the issuance of the bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The Commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in their application to all traffic falling within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall prevent all use of such bridge except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted. No toll shall be charged officials or employees of the Commission or the Government of the United States or any State, county, or municipality in the United States while in the discharge of their duties, or municipal police or fire departments when engaged in the proper work of any such department.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of the bridge has been completed, the Commission shall file with the Secretary of Commerce a sworn itemized statement, showing the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real estate or other property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction of the bridge and approaches and acquisition of the ferry and other property associated therewith.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall require the Commission to maintain or operate the ferry if it is purchased under this act, but in the discretion of the Commission, its successors and assigns, the ferry, franchise, and all or any of the real estate, equipment, and other property acquired in connection with the ferry may be sold or otherwise disposed of, or may be abandoned or dismantled, or both, whenever in the judgment of the Commission, its successors and assigns, it may seem expedient to do so. The Commission, its successors and assigns, may fix such rates of toll for the use of the ferry as it may deem proper, subject to the conditions prescribed in section 5 with respect to rates of toll for the use of the bridge. All tolls collected for the use of the ferry and the proceeds of any sale or disposition of the ferry or any other property connected therewith shall be used, so far as may be necessary, to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such ferry and property, and any amounts not so used shall be paid into the sinking fund provided for bonds.

Within a reasonable time after the ferry has been acquired under this act, the Commission shall file with the Secretary of Commerce a sworn itemized statement, showing the cost of acquisition of such ferry and the cost, if any, of acquisition of the franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property associated with the ferry.

An accurate record of the cost of the ferry, franchise, real estate, equipment, and other property; the expenditures for maintaining and repairing them; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 7. (a) (1) After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment has been provided and is being held for such payment, the Commission shall transfer by deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance, an undivided one-half interest in the physical structure of the bridge and its approaches to the State of Indiana or any municipality or agency of such State authorized by or pursuant to law to accept such undivided one-half interest (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Indiana interest") and an undivided one-half interest in the physical structure of the bridge and its approaches to the State of Kentucky or any municipality or agency of such State authorized by or pursuant to law to accept such undivided one-half interest (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Kentucky interest"), under the condition that the bridge shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Indiana interest and the Kentucky interest as may be agreed on. If no Indiana interest or Kentucky interest is authorized to accept, or does accept, such one-half interest in the bridge and approaches under such conditions, then the bridge shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated, and repaired by the Commission, and the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and approaches under economical management, until such time as an Indiana interest and a Kentucky interest is authorized to accept, and does accept, such bridge and approaches under such conditions.

(2) The Commission is authorized to transfer, by deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance, the bridge and its approaches and all other assets and property of the Commission to the Indiana Toll Bridge Commission, or to any similar agency of the State of Kentucky, or to both of them jointly, if the grantee agrees to assume the liabilities and obligations of the Commission with respect to such bridge and property. Tolls collected by the grantee shall be used only to pay (A) the bonds outstanding at the time of the transfer, plus accrued interest, (B) the reasonable cost of maintenance and operation of the bridge and approaches until such bonds and interest have been paid, and (C) the assumed liabilities and obligations. After a fund has been accumulated which the United States Commissioner of Public Roads determines is adequate to carry out the preceding sentence, such bridge shall thereafter be free of tolls, and shall be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the grantee. The bridge and its approaches may not be transferred under this paragraph after payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment has been provided.

(3) Whenever the bridge and approaches are transferred under this subsection, the Commission, its successors or assigns, shall (if the ferry and other property have not already been disposed of) sell the ferry and franchise, and the real estate, equipment, and other property associated with the ferry, as soon as practicable at such price and upon such terms as the Commission, its successors or assigns, may determine.

(b) (1) The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may make advances to the Commission under the terms and subject to the conditions of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, and may purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, the Commission under the terms and subject to the conditions of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

(2) If the State Highway Department of the State of Indiana consents, amounts apportioned to that State out of sums appropriated under the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, may be allocated for the construction of such bridge and approaches, in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply in the case of projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system. If the Department of Highways of the State of Kentucky consents, amounts apportioned to that State out of sums appropriated under the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, may be allocated for the construction of such bridge and approaches, in the same manner and subject to the same terms

and conditions as apply in the case of projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

SEC. 8. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridge and approaches (including the approach highways which, in the judgment of the Commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto by negotiating and entering into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Highways of Kentucky, Perry County, Ind., Hancock County, Ky., the city of Hawesville, Ky., the city of Cannelton, Ind., or any other county or municipality in the States of Indiana and Kentucky, whereby the Commission may receive financial aid in financing the construction of the bridge and approaches. The Commission, in its discretion, may avail itself of all the facilities of the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Highways of the State of Kentucky, or any county or municipality in the State of Indiana or the State of Kentucky, with regard to construction of said birdge, and the Commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State Highway Department of the State of Indiana, or the Department of Highways of the State of Kentucky, or any county or municipality in the State of Indiana and the State of Kentucky, whereby said highway departments, municipalities, or counties, or either of them may construct, operate, and maintain, or participate with the Commission in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridge and its approaches. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and to authorize the Commission to promote said object and purpose, with full power to contract with either the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Highways of Kentucky, or any municipality, or county, or cities in the States of Indiana and Kentucky, or all of them, in relation to the construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridge and approaches .

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the city of Cannelton Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession, may contract, and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply the same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

(b) The Commission shall consist of Edward F. Clemens, John Conway, and Robert Cummings, of Cannelton, Ind.; and Arnold Mulzer, of Tell City, Ind.; and C. D. Mayfield, of Hawesville, Ky.; such Commission shall be a public body corporate and politic. Each member of the Commission shall qualify within 30 days of the date of enactment of this act by filing with the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act. Each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in the same manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy occurring in the Commission by reason of failure to qualify, death, or resignation, shall be filled by appointment by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

(c) The first five members of the Commission shall hold office for 4 years. At the end of that time, the members of the Commission shall be divided into three classes by drawing lots so that two members shall be in the first class, two in the second class, and one in the third class. The members of the Commission of the first class shall hold office for an additional 2 years, the members of the second class shall hold office for an additional 4 years, and the member of the third class shall hold office for an additional 6 years, after the first 4 years has expired. Upon the expiration of the term of any member of the Commission, his place on the Commission shall be filled by appointment for 6 years made by the Commissioner of Public Roads, who may reappoint the member whose term is expiring.

(d) Before any bonds may be issued under this act, each of the first five members of the Commission must give such bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, conditioned upon his faithful performance of all duties required by this act. The cost of such surety before and during the construction of the bridge shall be paid, or reimbursement made, out of the proceeds from the sale of bonds; thereafter such cost shall be an operating expense of the Commission to be paid from tolls.

(e) The Commission may establish rules and regulations for the government of its business not inconsistent with this act. The Commission shall from time to time select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 10. The Commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $10 for each day actually spent in the business of the Commission but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed $1,200, and of each other member shall not exceed $600 in any 1 year. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to receive a traveling-expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the Commission. The Commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and such other experts, assistants, and employees as it may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the Commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon have been paid and all other obligations of the Commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payments shall have been made, and after the bridge has been conveyed to the Indiana interest and the Kentucky interest, or otherwise disposed of as provided in this act, the Commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the Commissioner of Public Roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the Commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of Cannelton, Ind., notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in Perry County, Ind. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the Commission shall be divided and distribution made between the Indiana interest, and the Kentucky interest, as may be determined by the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize or permit the Commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds provided under this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the Commission, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 12. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

SEC. 13. The Commission, and its income, property, and franchises shall be exempt from all Federal taxation.

SEC. 14. All provisions of this act may be enforced or the violation thereof prevented by mandamus, injunction, or other appropriate remedy brought by the Attorney General of the United States in any United States district court having competent jurisdiction of the subject matter and of the parties.

SEC. 15. (a) The financial transactions of the Commission shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the places where the accounts of the Commission are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Commission and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement of assets and liabilities, capital, and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the Commission, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditures, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the Commission at the time submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 12, strike out all of lines 8 to 14 inclusive.

Page 12, line 15, strike out "(2)" and insert "(b)."

Page 19, strike out lines 1 and 2.

Page 19, line 3, strike out "14" and insert "13."

Page 19, line 9, strike out all of section 15, from line 9 through line 16 on page 20.

Page 20, line 17, strike out "16" and insert "14."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF LAWRENCEBURG BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10468) creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bridge to be built with Federal taxpayers' money or by a bond issue?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. It will be built by private funds, through the sale of bonds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and the people he represents for shouldering their own financial responsibilities. Recently I opposed a bill that ladled out $15 million for the building of a bridge across the Potomac River, between the States of Virginia and Maryland, with the taxpayers of the entire country paying the bill. That is why I want to commend the gentleman and his people.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission created by section 8 of this act (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission"), and its successors and assigns, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto, across the Ohio River at or near the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky, in accordance with the General Bridge Act of 1946, at a point suitable to the interest of public navigation.

SEC. 2. The Commission and its successors and assigns shall have the right and power to enter upon such lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use such real estate and other property in the State of Indiana and the State of Kentucky, as may be needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, and proceedings therefor shall be the same as proceedings for condemnation of private property for public purposes in such State. The Commission, its successors and assigns, may enter into agreements with such States, and any political subdivisions thereof, for the acquisition, lease, or use of any real estate or other property owned by such State or political subdivision.

SEC. 3. The Commission and its successors and assigns may fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with this act, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army under the General Bridge Act of 1946.

SEC. 4. The Commission and its successors and assigns may provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge as may be constructed, and approaches (including any approach highways which, in the judgment of the Commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing and improved highways), and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable bonds of the Commission, bearing interest at the rate or rates of not more than 6 percent per annum. The principal and interest of such bonds, and any premium to be paid for retirement thereof before maturity, shall be paid solely from the sinking fund provided in accordance with this act, and such payments may be further secured by a mortgage on the bridge. All such bonds may be registrable as to principal alone, or both principal and interest, shall be in such form not inconsistent with this act, shall mature at such time or times not exceeding 30 years from their respective dates, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places, as the Commission may determine. The Commission may repurchase and reserve the right to redeem all or any of such bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices, not exceeding 105 percent of the principal amount thereof and accrued interest, as may be fixed by the Commission before issuance of the bonds. The Commission, when it deems it to be to the best interest of the Commission may issue refunding bonds to repurchase and redeem any outstanding bonds before their maturity. Such refunding bonds shall mature at such time or times, not exceeding 40 years from the date of enactment of this act, as the Commission may determine. The Commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the Commission with respect to the purchase, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of the trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporation. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting, and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders, as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with law.

Such bonds shall be sold in such manner and at such time or times and at such price as the Commission may determine, but no such sale shall be made at a price so low as to require the payment of interest at the rate of more than 6 percent per annum on the money received therefor, computed with relation to the absolute maturity of the bonds in accordance with standard tables of bond values. The face amount of the bonds shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, amounts which, when added to any other funds available to the Commission for the same purposes, will be not less than the cost of the bridge and approaches, and the lands, easements, and appurtenances, used in connection therewith. The cost of the bridge and approaches and approach highways shall be considered to include interest during the construction of the bridge and for 12 months after construction has been completed, and to include all engineering, legal, architectural, traffic surveying, and other expenses incident to the construction of the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary real estate and other property, and incident to the financing thereof. If the proceeds of the bonds issued, when added to any other funds available to the Commission for the same purpose, exceed the cost as finally determined under this section of the bridge and approaches, and the lands, easements, and appurtenances, used in connection therewith, the excess shall be placed in the sinking fund provided for in this act. Before the preparation of definite bonds, the Commission may, subject to the provisions of this act, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates, with or without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definite bonds when such bonds as have been executed are available for delivery.

SEC. 5. The rates of toll to be charged for the use of the bridge shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches under economical management, to provide a sinking fund sufficient to pay the principal and interest of such bonds as they fall due, and to pay for redemption or repurchase of all or any of such bonds redeemed or repurchased before maturity as provided in section 4. All tolls and other revenues from the bridge are hereby pledged to such use and to their application as required by this section. After payment or provision for payment from such tolls of all such cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches, and the reservation of an amount of money estimated by the Commission to be sufficient for such purposes during an ensuing period of not more than 6 months, the remainder of the tolls collected shall be placed in the sinking fund, at intervals to be determined by the Commission before the issuance of the bonds. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and approaches, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested. The Commission shall classify in a reasonable way all traffic over the bridge so that the tolls shall be so fixed and adjusted by it as to be uniform in the application to all traffic within reasonable classes, regardless of the status or character of any person, firm, or corporation participating in such traffic, and shall event all use of such bridge except upon payment of tolls so fixed and adjusted.

Within a reasonable time after the construction of the bridge has been completed, the Commission shall file with the Secretary of Commerce a sworn itemized statement, showing the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the cost of acquiring any interest in real estate or other property necessary therefor, and the amount of bonds, debentures, or other evidence of indebtedness issued in connection with the construction of the bridge and approaches.

SEC. 6. (a) After payment of the bonds and interest, or after a sinking fund sufficient for such payment has been provided and is being held for such payment, the Commission shall transfer by deeds or other suitable instruments of conveyance, an undivided one-half interest in the physical structure of the bridge and its approaches to the State of Indiana or any municipality or agency of such State authorized by or pursuant to law to accept such undivided one-half interest (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Indiana interest") and an undivided one-half interest in the physical structure of the bridge and its approaches to the State of Kentucky or any municipality or agency of such State authorized by or pursuant to law to accept such undivided one-half interest (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Kentucky interest"), under the condition that the bridge shall thereafter be free of tolls and be properly maintained, operated, and repaired by the Indiana interest and the Kentucky interest as may be agreed on. If no Indiana interest or Kentucky interest is authorized to accept, or does accept, such one-half interest in the bridge and approaches under such conditions, then the bridge shall continue to be owned, maintained, operated,

and repaired by the Commission, and the rates of tolls shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and approaches under economical management, until such time as an Indiana interest and a Kentucky interest is authorized to accept, and does accept, such bridge and approaches under such conditions.

(b) (1) The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may make advances to the Commission under the terms and subject to the conditions of section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, and may purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, the Commission under the terms and subject to the conditions of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

(2) If the State Highway Department of the State of Indiana consents, amounts apportioned to that State out of sums appropriated under the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, may be allocated for the construction of such bridge and approaches, in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply in the case of projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system. If the department of highways of the State of Kentucky consents, amounts apportioned to that State out of sums appropriated under the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, may be allocated for the construction of such bridge and approaches, in the same manner and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply in the case of projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

SEC. 7. The Commission and its successors and assigns are authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridge and approaches (including the approach highways which, in the judgment of the Commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto by negotiating and entering into a contract or contracts with the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Highways of Kentucky, Dearborn County, Ind., Boone County, Ky., the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., or any other county or municipality in the States of Indiana and Kentucky, whereby the Commission may receive financial aid in financing the construction of the bridge and approaches. The Commission, in its discretion, may avail itself of all the facilities of the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Highways of the State of Kentucky, or any county or municipality in the State of Indiana or the State of Kentucky, with regard to construction of said bridge, and the Commission may make and enter into any contract or contracts which it deems expedient and proper with the State Highway Department of the States of Indiana, or the Department of Highways of the State of Kentucky, or any county or municipality in the State of Indiana and the State of Kentucky, whereby said highway departments, municipalities, or counties, or either of them may construct, operate, and maintain, or participate with the Commission in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridge and its approaches. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of Congress to facilitate the construction of a bridge and proper approaches across the Ohio River at or near the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., and to authorize the Commission to promote said object and purpose, with full power to contract with either the State Highway Department of Indiana, the Department of Highways of Kentucky, or any municipality, or county, or cities in the States of Indiana and Kentucky, of all of them, in relation to the construction, operation, and maintenance of said bridge and approaches.

SEC. 8. (a) For the purpose of carrying into effect the objects stated in this act, there is hereby created the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, and by that name, style, and title said body shall have perpetual succession, may contract, and be contracted with, sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, complain and defend in all courts of law and equity; may make and have a common seal; may purchase or otherwise acquire and hold or dispose of real estate and other property; may accept and receive donations or gifts of money or property and apply the same to the purposes of this act; and shall have and possess all powers necessary, convenient, or proper for carrying into effect the objects stated in this act.

(b) The Commission shall consist of O. M. Keller, Robert H. Nanz, Victor O'Shaughnessy, Walter G. Decker, Eugene M. Stallings, E. G. Harry, F. D. Dobar, E. P. Henderson, and Frank Hutchinson of Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Walter Ferguson of Union, Ky.; the mayor of the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., shall serve as a member of the Commission ex officio, without compensation; such Commission shall be a public body corporate and politic. Each member of the Commission shall qualify within 30 days of the date of enactment of this act by filing with the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States an oath that he will faithfully perform the duties imposed upon him by this act. Each person appointed to fill a vacancy shall qualify in the same manner within 30 days after his appointment. Any vacancy occurring in the Commission by reason of failure to qualify, death, or resignation, shall be filled by appointment by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

(c) Before any bonds may be issued under this act, each of the members of the Commission must give such bond as may be fixed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, conditioned upon his faithful performance of all duties required by this act. The cost of such surety before and during the construction of the bridge shall be paid, or reimbursement made, out of the proceeds from the sale of bonds; thereafter such cost shall be an operating expense of the Commission, to be paid from tolls.

(d) The Commission may establish rules and regulations for the government of its business not inconsistent with this act. The Commission shall from time to time select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 9. The Commission shall have no capital stock or shares of interest or participation, and all revenues and receipts thereof shall be applied to the purposes specified in this act. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to a per diem compensation for their services of $10 for each day actually spent in the business of the Commission but the maximum compensation of the chairman in any year shall not exceed $1,200, and of each other member shall not exceed $600 in any 1 year. The members of the Commission shall be entitled to receive a traveling expense allowance of 10 cents a mile for each mile actually traveled on the business of the Commission. The Commission may employ a secretary, treasurer, engineers, attorneys, and such other experts, assistants, and employees as it may deem necessary, who shall be entitled to receive such compensation as the Commission may determine. All salaries and expenses shall be paid solely from the funds provided under the authority of this act. After all bonds and interest thereon have been paid and all other obligations of the Commission paid or discharged, or provision for all such payments shall have been made, and after the bridge has been conveyed to the Indiana interest and the Kentucky interest, or otherwise disposed of as provided in this act, the Commission shall be dissolved and shall cease to have further existence by an order of the Commissioner of Public Roads made upon his own initiative or upon application of the Commission or any member or members thereof, but only after a public hearing in the city of Lawrenceburg, Ind., notice of the time and place of which hearing and the purpose thereof shall have been published once at least 30 days before the date thereof, in a newspaper published in Boone County, Ky., and in a newspaper published in Dearborn County, Ind. At the time of such dissolution all moneys in the hands of or to the credit of the Commission shall be divided and distribution made between the Indiana interest and the Kentucky interest, as may be determined by the Commissioner of Public Roads of the United States.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this act may be construed to authorize or permit the Commission or any member thereof to create any obligation or incur any liability other than such obligations and liabilities as are dischargeable solely from funds provided under this act. No obligation created or liability incurred pursuant to this act shall be a personal obligation or liability of any member or members of the Commission, nor shall any indebtedness created pursuant to this act be an indebtedness of the United States.

SEC. 11. The design and construction of any bridge which may be built pursuant to this act shall be in accordance with the standard specifications for highway bridges adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

SEC. 12. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "8" and insert "9".

Page 2, line 3, after "navigation" insert "The Commission is also authorized to purchase from its owner, maintain and operate existing ferry operating in the vicinity of Lawrenceburg, Ind., and in connection with the acquisition of such ferry, is authorized to purchase the vessels used in operating a ferry in the vicinity of Lawrenceburg, Ind., the franchise granted for operating such ferry, and all real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry, and owned on the date of enactment of this act by the owner of such ferry."

Page 3, line 5, after "bridge", insert "and ferry"; and in line 7 after "of", insert "bridge tolls".

Page 3, line 16, after "thereto", insert "and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry,"

Page 3, line 25, after "bridge", insert "or ferry, or both."

Page 4, line 23, after "bridge", insert "or ferry, or both,".

Page 5, line 21, after "therewith", insert "and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry."

Page 6, line 11, after "therewith", insert "and the cost of the ferry, franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property reasonably necessary to operate such ferry,"

Page 8, line 7, after "approaches" insert "and acquisition of the ferry and other property associated therewith.

"SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall require the Commission to maintain or operate the ferry if it is purchased under this act, but in the discretion of the Commission, its successors and assigns, the ferry, franchise, and all or any of the real estate, equipment, and other property acquired in connection with the ferry may be sold or otherwise disposed of, or may be abandoned or dismantled, or both, whenever in the judgment of the Commission, its successors and assigns, it may seem expedient to do so. The Commission, its successors and assigns, may fix such rates of toll for the use of the ferry as it may deem proper, subject to the conditions prescribed

in section 5 with respect to rates of toll for the use of the bridge. All tolls collected for the use of the ferry and the proceeds of any sale or disposition of the ferry or any other property connected therewith shall be used, so far as may be necessary, to pay the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating such ferry and property, and any amounts not so used shall be paid into the sinking fund provided for bonds.

"Within a reasonable time after the ferry has been acquired under this act, the Commission shall file with the Secretary of Commerce a sworn itemized statement, showing the cost of acquisition of such ferry and the cost, if any, of the acquisition of the franchise, and real estate, equipment, and other property associated with the ferry.

"An accurate record of the cost of the ferry, franchise, real estate, equipment, and other property; the expenditures for maintaining and repairing them; and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested."

Page 9, line 14, strike out "6. (a)" and insert "7. (a) (1)"

Page 10, after "conditions." in line 18, insert: "(2) Whenever the bridge and approaches are transferred under this subsection the Commission, its successors or assigns, shall (if the ferry and other property have not already been disposed of) sell the ferry and franchise, and the real estate, equipment, and other property associated with the ferry, as soon as practicable at such price and upon such terms as the Commission, its successors or assigns, may determine."

Page 11, strike out lines 3 through 9.

Page 11, line 10, strike out "(2)" and insert "(b)" and in line 11 strike out "Indian" and insert "Indiana".

Page 12, line 1, strike out "7" and insert "8."

Page 13, line 15, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Page 15, line 10, strike out "9" and insert "10."

Page 16, line 22, strike out "10" and insert "11."

Page 17, line 6, strike out "11" and insert "12."

Page 17, line 11, strike out "12" and insert "13."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing the Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFORMANCE WITH FISH AND GAME LAWS ON FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 734, the bill (H. R. 8250) to require conformance with State and Territorial fish and game laws and licensing requirements on Federal lands not subject to such laws.

I do this with the purpose of asking the objectors why objection was made since every State in the Union is interested in this bill. The bill merely provides that uniform hunting regulations be required on all Government property, that the hunter comply with the State law. That is all the bill does.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the reason the request was made is that the sponsor of the bill wished the right to make such a request.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I talked to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], and I understand that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] is now agreeable to permitting the bill to pass, and under the amendment it could be corrected in the next session of Congress if it were found that it did not work.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, with the amendment, I would not care for the bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF CERTAIN STRUCTURES IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 803, the bill S. 3881.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment? May I say this? I am not a member of the Committee on Public Works. My only interest in this proposed legislation is that it is a part of beautifying the capital of the United States. Everyone knows about these temporaries near the Botanical Gardens. They are a sore spot. I do not see any reason why we could not proceed with beautifying the city of Washington, especially the removal of these temporary structures. I do hope the gentleman will permit this bill to be considered.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the gentleman's very fine argument, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 641 and ask for its present consideration. May I say that up to a few minutes ago the printed copies had not arrived.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 412) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call to the attention of the House the report of a special committee appointed by the Governor and cabinet of the State of Florida to recommend legislative action relating to public-school education and other internal affairs of our State deemed expedient after consideration of recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The committee which has drafted this report is a very distinguished committee, headed by a very able former circuit judge of my district, the Honorable L. L. Fabisinski. Among its members are a former chief justice of the Florida supreme court, the Honorable Rivers Buford, a former president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Cody Fowler, and other outstanding Floridians.

I call this report to the attention of the House because of its sound findings and because of the high plane on which it is couched. I consider it a monumental work; one of the best I have seen on this subject.

I expect under permission to revise and extend my remarks to include the language of the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I respectfully recommend its careful reading.

The report follows:

A REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR AND CABINET OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA TO RECOMMEND LEGISLATIVE ACTION RELATING TO PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION AND OTHER INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF SUCH STATE DEEMED EXPEDIENT AFTER CONSIDERATION OF RECENT DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, JULY 16, 1956

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., *July 16, 1956.*

HIS EXCELLENCY, THE HONORABLE LEROY COLLINS, GOVERNOR, AND MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA.

HONORED SIRS: Your committee which was appointed to study the laws of the State of Florida and to recommend any changes, amendments, or additions thereto deemed expedient after consideration of certain recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, respectfully submits herewith its report.

In order that interested persons may know and understand the reasons for the creation of the committee and the purposes for which

it was formed, we submit a declaration adopted by the committee as follows:

It is the considered opinion of this committee that at the outset of its deliberations and in order that its members and other interested persons may better understand the reasons for its creation, a formal declaration of purpose should be made.

These are admittedly difficult times, when many ideas and suggestions are being expressed hurriedly and without due study. The carrying out of many of these ideas and suggestions would be harmful to our constitution, would increase tension and feeling between the various groups of our citizenry, and would seek to challenge the authority of the United States of America. After careful consideration and deliberation this committee has determined that its purposes and obligations are:

First: To maintain the public school system of the State of Florida.

Second: To endeavor to determine the best interests, from an educational standpoint, of all of the children of our State, to further such interests in every manner and to do all that is possible to achieve and maintain the highest possible intellectual, moral, and cultural standards of our school system.

Third: To eliminate or to mitigate as much as possible any hostile feeling which might arise between any class or group of our citizens.

Fourth: To comply at all times and under all conditions with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America and the constitution of the State of Florida.

Fifth: To determine, as thoughful and responsible citizens of the State of Florida and the United States, legislative measures to be considered by the Legislature of the State of Florida in keeping with the above-avowed purposes of this committee; to recommend such action to the representatives of our State and its various subdivisions and to the people of the State as a whole; and to call upon all of the citizens of our State to keep these purposes in mind and to strive in their own conduct to effectuate these goals.

In accordance with our understanding of the purposes of the committee as above set forth we respectfully recommend:

1. Enactment of a law vesting in County boards of public instruction full power to assign pupils to public schools on the basis of individual needs and abilities, providing for appeals from such assignments to the State board of education and for judicial review of such assignments, copy of such proposed law being filed herewith.

2. Enactment of a law regulating assignment of teachers, copy of such proposed law being filed herewith.

3. Enactment of a law vesting power in the governor to promulgate and enforce rules and regulations relating to the use of any State, county, or municipal park, building, or facility that may be necessary or expedient to preserve the peace and tranquility of the State and prevent domestic violence, copy of such proposed law being filed herewith.

4. Enactment of an act clarifying and codifying the law relating to the powers of the Governor by proclamation to declare the existence of an emergency in the State or any portion thereof and to use all law enforcement officers and departments, including the military forces of the State, to prevent or suppress disorder, copy of such proposed law being filed herewith.

In the performance of our assigned duty we were and are confronted with recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which violate accepted standards of judicial power, disrupt previous concepts of the relation between the Federal Government and the several States, disregard former decisions of the Court as to the rights of the States and the people, and destroy constitutional government as conceived by our forefathers.

These recent decisions of the Supreme Court transgress upon the rights of the people, encroach upon the powers of the executive department of the Federal Government, infringe upon the vested powers of Congress, ignore the rights of the States, violate the intent of those who wrote, proposed, and adopted our Constitution and the amendments thereto and in the aggregate constitute a usurpation of authority and a threat to constitutional government unparalleled in American history.

We, as members of your committee recommend, most emphatically, that the invasion by the Supreme Court of the rights of the States, of the legislative and executive departments of the United States and of the people be denounced in clear and unmistakable language and every lawful means be adopted to restore these rights, and curb this threat to our liberties.

The rights of a free people to protest against usurpation of power, to petition for redress of grievances, to demand that their public officers act within their assigned jurisdiction, are inalienable and inherent rights, which, as yet, have not been taken from us and we respectfully recommend that in the exercise of these rights that the legislature, in the name and in behalf of the State of Florida and its people, denounce the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court and demand, as is the right of a free people, that their just and inherent powers be held inviolate.

Candor demands the immediate statement that the preparation of the following statement was begun with a view of demonstrating the gravity of the tragic impact of the "desegregation decisions" of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the institutions and peoples of the several States and the complete lack of constitutional justification of the decisions reached in those cases. However, a study of many other recent decisions of the Court obviously stemming from the same concepts of constitutional government that, in the minds of the members of the Court, justified the desegregation decisions leads unavoidably to the conclusion that the problem under consideration is not one which concerns the State of Florida alone, but every State and every citizen of the United States.

Nor does the problem arise out of a mere mistake in the pronouncement of the law upon one isolated subject, important as that may be. The entire American system of government is at stake.

In view of the gravity of the situation, the question of segregation or desegregation in public schools, the seriousness of which cannot be overemphasized, actually becomes one of secondary importance.

The candid reader is requested to ask himself whether the opinions herein referred to, when properly analyzed, do not impel the conclusion that the Supreme Court of the United States has assumed the power, by judicial decree, to change the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and thus to amend the fundamental law of the land by the act of nine men, or a majority of them, rather than by the orderly processes set forth in the Constitution.

No matter how strongly the people of Florida may feel on the question of segregation, they recognize that citizens of other States have the right to entertain a different view. If the views of others attain that unanimity of popular support that is required to amend the Constitution of the United States, and such amendment be adopted, it is the duty of every American ctizen to yield gracefully to the will of the people of the country as a whole. On the other hand, every thinking American knows that surrender to the Supreme Court of power to change the Constitution in order to effect reforms which members of the Court may deem beneficient, will vest in that Court power to make changes inimicable to the public welfare, and will eventually lead to a complete loss of control of the Government by the people.

It is not the purpose of the present statement to attack or defend any of the decisions herein discussed insofar as the conclusions reached may or may not be sound or wise as abstract statements of what the law should be, or what the Constitution should, by amendment, be made to mean. Its sole purpose is to demonstrate the extent to which the Supreme Court has exceeded its jurisdiction, has attempted to change the Constitution and has usurped powers belonging to other Departments of the Federal Government, the States, and the people.

Before going further we ask the reader to reflect upon, and to read this statement in the light of, the following words of George Washington taken from his Farewell Address:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

As we have candidly stated above, the preparation of the following declaration was begun as a protest against the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the year 1954, abrogating the powers of the States to control their systems of education, but as we have studied the pronouncements of the Court in the recent past few months, we have come to the inevitable conclusion that the present membership of the Supreme Court of the United States has embarked upon a course of action designed to destroy the system of dual sovereignty, which is the unique feature and fundamental basis of our Union, to destroy the system of division of the powers of Government between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments, which is the greatest safeguard of the people against tyranny, and in complete disregard of the Constitution of the United States and the inherent rights of the sovereign States determined to arrogate to themselves final, complete, supreme, and exclusive power over the States, the Federal Government, and the people.

Your committee has set forth the basis of this conclusion in the following statement and respectfully recommends that the substance thereof be embodied in a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida as a protest of the people of this State against this threat to our rights, as a demand for return to constitutional government, and as a call to our fellow Americans to join with us in preserving our inherent rights as a free people for all future time.

A DENOUNCEMENT OF USURPATION OF POWER AND DEMAND FOR PRESERVATION OF OUR INHERENT RIGHTS

In the life of a democratic nation when it becomes necessary for the people to take notice of and enter a solemn protest against any usurpation of power by those who have been entrusted with high public office, and to demand, as of right, that public officers remain subservient to the people and that they desist from assuming powers which have not, by the people, been placed in their hands, the opinions of their fellow men require that the people set forth in clear and unmistakable language the causes which impel them to such action.

To the end that the declarations now about to be made may be thoroughly understood, and the motives which impel them may be fully appreciated, we first pronounce the following principles, each of which we hold to be an integral part of our American system of government:

1. All political power is inherent in the people and all government derives all its powers from the consent of the governed.

2. When the people form a government by the adoption of a written constitution the words of that constitution are but the instrumentalities by which ideas, principles, and plans present in the minds of those who adopt the constitution are recorded for accuracy and for preservation to posterity.

3. Those who are temporarily invested with power over their fellow countrymen, by being chosen to occupy public offices provided for in a constitution, are charged with a solemn responsibility to exercise only such powers as, under such constitution, have been entrusted to them.

4. A division of the powers of Government into three departments, executive, legislative, and judicial is expressed or implied in every constitution of the American Union, including the Constitution of the United States.

5. The Constitution of the United States is a grant of powers to the central Federal Government, and all powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, or to the people.

6. The judicial powers delegated to the Federal Government are vested by the Constitution in the Federal judiciary and include the power to interpret, construe and apply the Constitution of the United States.

7. The power to interpret, construe, and apply the Constitution is limited to an ascertainment of the ideas, principles, and thoughts that were in the minds of those who drafted and adopted the Constitution, including amendments thereto, and the application of those ideas, principles, and thoughts to particular factual situations from time to time presented to the courts. The application of constitutional principles may differ with changing conditions, but the principles themselves are unchanging and unchangeable except by the people and then only by the method provided in the Constitution.

8. A judicial construction of the Constitution enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States and understood and acquiesced in by the executive department, the Congress, and the people over a long period of time becomes as much a part of the fundamental law of the land as that which has been written in the Constitution itself, and is binding equally upon the people, the States of the Union, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

9. The Constitution of the United States may be amended only in the manner provided in that Constitution. In the course of history since the adoption of the Constitution the people have 21 times found it expedient to amend the Constitution, and when that unanimity of public opinion which justifies a change in the Constitution has developed among the people they have found no difficulty in effecting the changes they found desirable.

10. The assumption by any public official, or group of public officials, of power to change the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, other than by the method provided by article V of the Constitution, is an abuse of public trust and a tyrannical usurpation of power.

Under the Constitution of the United States when evidences of the assumption of tyrannical powers appear in the Executive or in the Congress the people may, by means of the ballot, protect and preserve their liberties by the repudiation of those in office. But when the Federal judiciary, which is insulated from the heat of political differences by the life tenure of its membership, enters upon a course of action inimicable to the rights of the people, this method of reform is unavailable. Under such circumstances those restraints which characterize men capable of self-government require that by orderly and peaceable means the inherent and unalienable rights and powers of the people shall be utilized to restore those rights of which they have unjustly and unlawfully been deprived.

We call to the attention of all thinking Americans the following unwarranted and unauthorized acts of invasion of the powers reserved to the States and to the people:

By decisions rendered May 17, 1954, in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka; Harry Briggs, Jr., et al.*, v. *R. W. Elliott, et al.; Dorothy E. Davis, et al.*, v. *County School Board of Prince Edward County, Va.; Frances B. Gebhart, et al.*, v. *Ethel Louise Belton, et al.* (347 U. S. 483, 98 L. Ed. 873) the Supreme Court of the United States denied to the sovereign States of the American Union the power to regulate public education by the use of practices first declared constitutional by the State of Massachusetts, adopted by the Congress, approved by the Executive, affirmed and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States and practiced by States for more than a century.

It has based these decisions upon matters of fact as to which the parties affected were not given an opportunity to offer evidence or cross examine the witnesses against them.

It has cited as authority for the assumed and asserted facts the unsworn writings of men, one of whom was the hireling of an active participant in the litigation. Others were affiliated with organizations declared by the Attorney General of the United States to be subversive, and one of whom, in the same writing which the Court cited as authority for its decision stated that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions."

In reaching its conclusion the Supreme Court has disregarded its former pronouncements and attempted to justify such actions by the expedient of imputing ignorance of psychology to men whose knowledge of the law and understanding of the Constitution could not be impugned, and has expressly predicated its determination of the rights of the people of the several sovereign States of the American Union upon the psychological conclusions of Kotinsky, Brameld, and Myrdal, and their ilk, rather than the legal conclusions of Taft, Holmes, Van Devanter, Brandeis, and their contemporaries upon the bench.

In reaching its conclusion the Court, professing itself to be unable to ascertain the intent of those who adopted the 14th amendment to the Constitution, arbitrarily chose to repudiate the solemn declaration of its meaning rendered under the sanctity of their oath of office by the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States at a time when all of its members were contemporaries of those who proposed, discussed, debated, submitted and adopted the amendment.

However much as citizens of other States may approve and applaud these decisions, they dare not embrace the theory upon which they are based nor the fallacies therein contained lest they themselves by the application of the same theory and fallacies bring destruction to their institutions and to their liberties.

In a decision rendered May 21, 1956, in *Railway Employees Department, American Federation of Labor, International Association of Machinists, et al.*, v. *Robert L. Hanson, et al.*, (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 633), the Supreme Court of the United States held that a union shop agreement negotiated between certain railroads and certain organizations of employees of such railroads which had been authorized by an act of the Congress superseded the right-to-work provisions of the Constitution of the State of Nebraska and the State statutes enacted pursuant thereto.

The effect of this decision, made in a case instituted by free American citizens to enforce their rights under the Constitution of the United States, was to deny these American citizens the right to work at their chosen trade unless they became members of and contributed to the funds of organizations to which they did not wish to belong and to which they did not wish to contribute of their substance.

The effect of this decision was to advise these free American citizens that their right to be immune from any deprivation of liberty or property without due process of law, supposedly guaranteed to them by their Federal Constitution, did not extend to their right to work, supposedly guaranteed by the constitution of their State, as against the demands of a nonofficial labor organization that they pay to it money to be expended in the negotiation of labor contracts, the terms of which these citizens might or might not seek or desire.

The effect of this decision is to vest in the Congress the power to prohibit, permit, or require, closed shops, union shops or open shops or to outlaw unions in each and every industry in America whose activities come within the present expanded concept of interstate commerce.

The effect of this decision is to abrogate, with respect to all employment in interstate business, the constitutions and laws of those 17 sovereign American States which have sought to protect the rights of their citizens to a free and open labor market, making union membership optional with each worker, protecting him on the one hand from an employer who might desire the destruction of the union, and on the other hand from the union which might desire to exploit him or advocate policies which he did not endorse.

By a decision rendered January 16, 1956, *Dantan George Rea* v. *United States of America* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 213), the Supreme Court of the United States held that it was within the power of the Federal courts to enjoin an officer of the executive department of the Federal Government from testifying in the courts of the State of New Mexico in a criminal prosecution of one charged with a violation of a statute of that State prohibiting the possession of marihuana.

In so doing the Court assumed power to direct the activities of executive officers of the Federal Government to the extent of forbidding them from testifying voluntarily, or under the process of a State court, as to matters within their knowledge in a case in which no question of privilege or national security was involved.

In so doing the Court assumed power to control the administration of local justice in State courts by the indirect method of forbidding witnesses to testify in such State courts while giving lipservice to the letter of the rule which denies to the Federal courts any power to control the acts or proceedings of State courts.

In so doing the Court assumed power to fix the rules of evidence which should control the administration of justice in State courts.

In so doing the Supreme Court refused to follow the law as established by former decisions of that Court, which were followed and adhered to for many years.

By a decision rendered April 2, 1956, in *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 415), the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that, so long as the present Federal law providing punishment for sedition exists, the sovereign State of Pennsylvania and those 41 of her sister States who have enacted laws against sedition, are without power to enforce their statutes enacted for the purpose of preserving the lives and safety of their citizens from those who would by force and violence overthrow the Government of the United States, the States themselves, or any of their political subdivisions.

This decision was rendered in the case of an acknowledged member of the Communist

Party who had been duly convicted in the constitutional trial courts of Pennsylvania of violating the sedition laws of that Commonwealth.

In reaching the conclusion announced, the Supreme Court refused to follow the previously accepted construction and interpretation of the Constitution of the United States as stated in unmistakable language in prior decisions of that Court.

In reaching the announced conclusion, the Court decried, and seemed to find obnoxious the fact that under the Pennsylvania law a private citizen could set in motion the legal processes by which those charged with conspiracy against the Government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania could be brought to trial and, if found guilty, be punished by due course of Pennsylvania law.

In reaching the announced conclusion the Court dismissed with a casual comment in a footnote to its decision the solemn declaration of the Congress that "Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

In reaching the announced conclusion the Court did not limit the impact of its judgment to statutes involving sedition against the Government of the United States, but expressly pointed out that a State has no power to enact laws for its own protection, but must rely upon the Federal authorities for the suppression of sedition against the State itself or its political subdivisions.

In a decision rendered April 23, 1956, in *Judson Griffin, et al.* v. *People of the State of Illinois* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 483), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution of the United States rendered illegal the imprisonment of one charged with armed robbery and duly convicted in the trial court of Illinois, unless the State of Illinois provided the defendant, free of charge, with a transcript of the proceedings to be used in an appeal of his conviction.

The basis of this decision was that, since the law of Illinois authorized appeals in criminal cases, and the particular defendant in question was insolvent, the 14th amendment required the State to pay the costs of his appeal.

The effect of this decision is to place upon each of the States the duty of guaranteeing the financial ability of every citizen to exercise constitutional rights.

By a decision rendered April 9, 1956, in *Harry Slochower* v. *Board of Higher Education of the City of New York* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 449), the Supreme Court of the United States held that the city of New York had violated the Constitution of the United States by the summary discharge of a public employee who had refused to answer questions relative to his communistic activities and claimed the benefit of the fifth amendment to the Constitution in so doing.

In so holding the Court held invalid a charter provision of the city of New York designed to provide for the removal, as quickly as possible, of those public employees who were deemed by the people of that great city to be unfit to be entrusted with any part in the administration of the public affairs of the city.

In so holding the Court revoked the prompt removal from a State school of a teacher whose influence was deemed by the school authorities to be inimicable to the best interests of the students in such school.

In so holding the Court construed the due process clause of the Constitution to give to the Federal courts the power to examine into minute details of all administrative State action and to apply arbitrarily to such State action the personal concepts of the Justices of the Supreme Court rather than fixed principles of constitutional law.

These, and other decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, can lead the student of law, of government, or of history to but one unavoidable conclusion:

As presently constituted, the Supreme Court of the United States has embraced the philosophy that the Constitution of the United States is not a declaration of fixed or definite principles, unchanging in their meaning, although varying in their application to different factual situations. On the contrary, recent decisions are obviously the result of a theory that changing conditions and variations in social and economic practices justify the Court in changing, by judicial fiat, the meaning of the Constitution in order that it may serve what the members of the Court deem to be the best interests of the people.

Unless the application of this concept of the powers of the Supreme Court of the United States in regard to the rights of the people, the powers of the different departments of government, and the separate and distinct powers of the States and of the Federal Government be stopped, the inevitable result will be to end the American system of constitutional government, and to substitute therefor government by a judicial oligarchy under which the States, and the executive and legislative departments of the Federal Government may exercise only such powers as the Federal judiciary deems fit to permit them to exercise.

Now, therefore, we the people of the State of Florida, speaking by and through our duly elected representatives in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, do hereby solemnly declare:

That the Supreme Court of the United States of America as presently constituted knowingly, willfully, and over the most respectful protest of litigants before the Court, including many of the sovereign States of the Union, has determined to, and has entered upon a policy of substituting the personal and individual ideas of the members of the Court as to what the Constitution of the United States should be for the letter of the Constitution as it was written by our forefathers, the meaning of the Constitution as it was understood by those who drafted it and voted for its adoption, and the intent of the Constitution as it has been declared by the Highest Court of the Nation over many years and in many able decisions.

That the personal, social, economic, and political ideas of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States do not constitute the proper criterion for the admeasurement of States rights or the powers of the several departments of the Federal Government or the rights of individual citizens.

That acts of the Federal judiciary in willfully asserting a meaning of the Constitution unsupported by the written document, the history of the times in which it was adopted, the construction placed upon it by contemporary courts and the meaning ascribed to it by the people for generations constitutes usurpation of power which, if condoned by the people and allowed to continue, will destroy the American system of Government.

If wise and beneficient men may make changes in the Constitution that are beneficial in the light of changing conditions, others may, with equal propriety make changes which will destroy the rights of the people. It was to guard against conferring the power upon public officials to make mistakes that the people reserved unto themselves the power to amend the Constitution when changing conditions demand a change in the basic law.

That while disobedience to constituted authority is the mother of anarchy, it is the history of free men that they will not supinely permit Government to become the master of the people, and will never yield unrestrained authority to any group of public officers.

That is the duty of every public official sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and of every citizen who would maintain the principles of Government under which this Nation has grown to its present greatness, regardless of their views as to the abstract justice of the result of any of the acts of usurpation herein enumerated to insist, and we do hereby insist and demand that the Supreme Court of the United States recede from its arbitrary assertion of power to change the fundamental law of the land to meet the personal views of its members as to the present needs of the people, leaving to the people themselves the responsibility of determining when, and to what extent, their Constitution should be amended.

And to this end we respectfully and earnestly urge the executive officers of the Nation, the Congress of the United States, the governor and the attorney general of each of our sister States, and the bar of America, the traditional defender of constitutional government, and all who love and revere the Constitution of the United States, to join us in this declaration, and to do everything within the scope of their personal and official authority to initiate and effect an amendment to Article X of the Constitution of the United States defining the powers reserved to the respective sovereign States, enumerating and defining the powers so reserved to include, among others, the power to regulate the fields of activity mentioned in this report.

We attach to this report an appendix of notes on decisions referred to in the above proposed resolution.

We hope that our labors have provided some suggestions for the legislative and executive departments of our State that will be helpful in preserving the rights of our State and of our people.

Respectfully submitted,

Judge L. L. FABISINSKI,
Chairman.
Judge RIVERS BUFORD,
Vice Chairman.
Judge MILLARD SMITH.
CODY FOWLER.
LUTHER MERSHON.
J. LEWIS HALL.
JOHN T. WIGGINTON.

APPENDIX—A DENOUNCEMENT OF USURPATION OF POWER

Notes

Brown v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U. S. 483, 98 L. Ed. 873): In this case the Supreme Court of the United States held that the maintenance of separate but equal educational facilities for white and colored citizens was, as to the colored citizens, a violation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States because it denied to such citizens the equal protection of the law.

An analysis of the opinion of the Court discloses the following elementary fallacies:

(a) The Court first asserts its inability to determine the meaning ascribed to the amendment by those who drafted it and those who voted for its adoption. This conclusion is wholly unjustified. Before, contemporaneously with, and for nearly a century since the adoption of the amendment segregated schools were maintained, and the constitutional legality of the practice was affirmed by every court in which it was questioned.

The Supreme Court of the United States in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U. S. 537, 41 L. Ed. 256), firmly established the rule that State action providing "separate but equal" facilities to citizens of different races complied with the amendment. This decision, while dealing with transportation, referred specifically to schools. This decision was rendered by a Court composed of men, all of

whom were adult contemporaries of those who proposed, discussed, debated and adopted the amendment. One was a member of the Supreme Court during that time. One was a justice of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. One had been a member of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Illinois, one the Attorney General of his State, one an officer in the Union Army, one a District Attorney in his State, and others were active practitioners of law, at or before the time of the ratification of the 14th amendment. If doubt existed as to the meaning of the amendment, the solemn pronouncement of these men rendered under the sanctity of their oaths of office as to matters necessarily within their knowledge—the intent of the people in amending the Constitution—should, by all legal precedent, be conclusive.

If doubt still persisted, the answer to the specific question is made apparent by the application of elementary rules of constitutional construction. It is never presumed that the Constitution is redundant, or that any part of it was inserted idly or that any amendment to it does not in some respect change its meaning. Applying this rule and considering the 14th amendment in connection with the 15th amendment and assuming that the 15th amendment has and serves a purpose we have a guide to the construction, intent, and purpose of the 14th amendment. The 15th amendment guarantees the right to vote. It does nothing more. If the 14th amendment guarantees the right to vote, the 15th amendment adds nothing to, takes nothing from, and does not alter the meaning of the Constitution. The 15th amendment was not proposed until after the 14th amendment had been declared to be a part of the Constitution. It was obviously the thinking of the Congress which proposed, and of the legislatures of States which adopted it, that the 14th amendment did not guarantee the right to vote or they would not have proposed and adopted the 15th amendment. This is also demonstrated by the fact that the 14th amendment, in section 2, provides for the reduction of a State's representation in the House of Representatives in proportion to the number of adult male citizens disfranchised by State law, except for crime.

If the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment did not guarantee the intangible right of a citizen to vote, it was not the intent, the thinking, or the purpose of those who adopted the 14th amendment that it should extend to and guarantee the equally intangible and less fundamental right to identify, as distinguished from equality, of educational opportunities.

If all these things were not convincing to open, legal minds, the reconsideration of the problem by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78, 72 L. Ed. 172), wherein the Court said:

"The case then reduces itself to the question whether a State can be said to afford to a child of Chinese ancestry born in this country, and a citizen of the United States, the equal protection of the laws by giving her the opportunity for a common school education in a school which receives only colored children of the brown, yellow, or black races. The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear.

* * * * *

"The question here is whether a Chinese citizen of the United States is denied equal protection of the laws when he is classed among the colored races and furnished facilities for education equal to that offered to all, whether white, brown, yellow, or black. Were this a new question, it would call for very full argument and consideration, but we think that it is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

This reaffirmance of the State's right to maintain segregated schools in an opinion by Mr. Justice Taft, speaking for a unanimous court, should be conclusive.

(b) The Court says in the Brown case:

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* this (a contrary) finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected."

The socialistic, communistic, un-American writings, associations and activities of the "modern authority" cited by the Court have been so often detailed they will not be recited here. One of these "authorities," however, demands further consideration. Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, a self-styled social engineer, wrote a book entitled "The American Dilemma" which is cited by the Supreme Court as one of the modern authorities whose psychological knowledge justifies the substitution by the Supreme Court of his conclusions for the solemn legal judgment of William Howard Taft, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Louis Dembritz Brandeis, Willis Van Devanter, James Clark McReynolds, George Sutherland, Pierce Butler, Edward Terry Sanford, and Harlan Fiske Stone. It is Dr. Myrdal's writing that the Supreme Court accepts as sound and conclusive on legal questions. It is his thinking that the Supreme Court adopts as their thinking. It is his assertions that the Supreme Court accepts as verity. Rejecting the opinions and decisions of their great predecessors on the bench, it is to him the Supreme Court goes for guidance in deciding cases. What else does Dr. Myrdal say? He says that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions."

Reluctantly, sadly, we reach the conclusion that the Supreme Court has determined that Dr. Myrdal is correct in this assertion and has resolved to correct the situation by a process of judicial amendment of the Constitution that will entirely change our form and system of government.

(c) In the Brown case, the Court says:

"Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the education and mental development of the Negro children."

If this be accepted as true there is a corollary that must inevitably follow. If white children, particularly in those areas where the colored population exceeds the white, are required by compulsory school attendance laws to attend nonsegregated schools and are thus required by law to come into close daily contact with a group which (the Supreme Court says) is regarded as being inferior, there will be an effect upon the development of the white children at least equal to the assumed effect of segregation upon the colored children. This effect will be particularly acute in those areas, the existence of which cannot be denied, in which parents financially able to do so will send their children to private segregated schools, leaving in the integrated schools only those white children who cannot afford private schools. The equal protection of the law is guaranteed to the white race as well as to the colored. Equal protection is not attained, and cannot be attained, by substituting one undesirable situation for another. The premise stated by the Court does not, therefore, justify or logically support the conclusion drawn.

In its decision the Court lays stress upon what it terms the "intangible considerations," which from the Brown case, the Sweatt case and the McLaurin case, may be said to include the following: "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school," "to engage in discussions and exchange of views with other students," "the intellectual commingling of students," "position and influence of the alumni," "traditions and prestige (of the school)." The court blithely ignores the fact that these "intangibles," and truly they are intangible, represent the culture, learning, industry, intellectual attainments, personalities and characters of the individuals who make up the student bodies and alumni of the educational institutions to which they appertain. These intangibles are not, have never been, and cannot be made the property of the State to sell, barter, or give to others.

The 14th amendment does not mention race or creed or color. It relates to the rights of individual citizens, and, as to matters within its scope, guarantees to each citizen of the United States the equal protection of laws. If identity of educational opportunity, as distinguished from equality of opportunity, is guaranteed to each individual by the amendment a student, or the parents of a student, assigned to a particular classroom presided over by a particular teacher who fully meets the requirements fixed by the State as to moral, cultural, and educational requirements, prefers another classroom presided over by another teacher because such other teacher has a more desirable family background, or some of the students assigned to the other classroom move in a more desirable social circle, or because the students assigned to the other classroom have a superior average intellectual quotient and the existence of such intangibles gives such student, or his parents the right to demand that the student be taught in the classroom and by the teacher of his, or his parents' choice, our entire educational system might well be disrupted. Under the 14th amendment there can be found no legal distinction between the hypotheses here stated and the statement of constitutional (?) law pronounced in Brown versus Topeka.

(d) Many of our citizens prefer that, at certain levels, male and female students be taught in separate institutions. The 14th amendment does not permit that either male or female citizens be denied the equal protection of the laws. The rationale of *Brown* v. *Topeka* makes it a violation of the Constitution for a State to maintain segregation of the sexes at any level in public education because the intangibles of separate institutions of learning cannot possibly be made to be identical.

(e) Perhaps the most remarkable pronouncement found in the opinion of the Court in *Brown* v. *Topeka* is the statement that:

"Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, this finding (that that decision was wrong) is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* contrary to this finding is rejected."

This statement can only mean that the Supreme Court of the United States, as presently constituted, now declares that the subconscious genius of the American people of the 1860's was such that they wrote into the Constitution principles which were beyond the educational attainments of even the members of the Highest Court in the land to perceive, understand, and appreciate until the present personnel came to the bench.

Railway Employers Department, American Federation of Labor, International Association of Machinists, et al. v. *Robert L. Hanson, et al.* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance)

p. 633): To those who may regard this decision as a victory for organized labor, we would point out the reason stated by the Court as the foundation upon which its conclusion is based:

"Industrial peace along the arteries of commerce is a legitimate objective; and Congress has great latitude in choosing the methods by which it is to be obtained. The choice by the Congress of the union shop as a stabilizing force seems to us to be an allowable one."

Industrial peace becomes more important under this decision, than the rights of American citizens to join or refuse to join a union and supersedes the guaranty of liberty contained in the 5th and 14th amendments in this respect. To the ardent unionist who sincerely believes that strong unions are essential to the welfare of labor, this may seem a wise and beneficent conclusion. But the Congress is not always composed of men sympathetic to the labor movement. It is by no means inconceivable that a Congress might be elected which would actually be hostile to labor. Should such a Congress enact a statute forbidding the employment by the railroads of any person who did not relinquish his union membership because the Congress believed that industrial peace along the arteries of commerce would be best served thereby, the decision in this case would, if followed, require that such a statute be upheld by the courts. If it is allowable under the Constitution for Congress to require union membership of any class of persons engaged in interstate commerce, it is equally allowable for Congress to forbid such membership.

The acceptance of this decision by trade unions is to surrender constitutional guaranties and grant to Congress the power of life and death over the labor movement in America. The temporary benefits to be attained by this holding represent a dear price for the freedom of American labor that will be surrendered.

Judson Griffin v. *People of the State of Illinois* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 483); Florida and many other States provide free transcripts of record for insolvent defendants in criminal cases, but it is the voluntary act of such States in the exercise of their inherent powers of Government.

The most significant feature of this decision is the shockingly frank admission by one of the Justices who writes into the records of the Court the following: "Candor compels acknowledgment that the decision rendered today is a new ruling. * * * The judicial choice is not limited to a new ruling necessarily retrospective, or to rejection of what the requirements of equal protection of the laws, as now perceived, require. For sound reasons law generally speaks prospectively.* * * We should not indulge in the fiction that the law now announced has always been the law. * * * it is much more conducive to law's self-respect to recognize candidly the considerations that give prospective content to a new pronouncement."

This is a bald assertion of power in the judiciary to amend the Constitution. To give to language having a clear and definite meaning to those who wrote it a new and different meaning is just as clearly an amendment to the Constitution as changing the language of the document itself. To assert that meaning can be "perceived" in the Constitution today which was not perceived by those who adopted it, and which could not be found by Taft, Holmes, McReynolds, Van Devanter, and their contemporaries, is to ascribe to those who now view it the powers of supermen. If the Constitution requires each State to furnish transcripts of record to each insolvent defendant in criminal cases, then such requirement was a part of such constitutional provision from the time of its adoption. If, on the other hand, such requirement was not a part of such constitutional provision at the time of its adoption, then it can lawfully be made a part thereof only by the constitutional processes of amendment. To substitute the "perception" of the members of the Supreme Court as to the meaning of the Constitution for the intent of the people in adopting it is to completely destroy the power of the people to fix in the Constitution the principles of the government under which they are to live.

States plan the government of their citizens, businessmen arrange their industrial and economic affairs, and individuals chart the course of their lives in reliance upon the stability of the Constitution, the correctness of its repeated construction and the integrity of the courts to protect them in their constitutional rights as those rights have been fixed, understood, and applied over long periods of history. If this may no longer be done the stability of our political, economic, industrial, and social orders has passed away and that which we know as the American way of life has been replaced by a system in which the rights of men are measured only by the vicissitudes of the sociological thinking of nine men.

Without attempting in any way to be facetious, we ask this question: Under this decision does not a citizen, who has the constitutional right to exercise his franchise, but who is unable to pay his transportation to the polls, have the right to demand that the State provide such transportation? If the State does not do so, his constitutional right to vote has been placed beyond his reach by the act of the State in locating the voting place in his precinct at a place not immediately adjacent to his home.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. *Steve Nelson* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 415): The rationale of this decision is that Congress has power to "provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent nation and to guarantee to each State a republican form of government," and, consequently, when Congress enacted a statute against sedition the States are rendered impotent to enforce any State law on this subject because the Congress has occupied the field. It is perfectly proper for the State to punish the possessor of a 6-gallon still for illegally manufacturing moonshine whiskey, and for the Federal authorities to punish the same man for the same act, because each sovereignty has forbidden the same act. It is also proper of the State to prosecute a man for operating a numbers racket and for the Federal authorities to prosecute the same man for a violation of the Federal statutes licensing gambling, when the operation in each case was the same, but such same act constituted a violation of the criminal laws of different sovereigns. But under this decision the same rule does not apply to an act designed to effect the destruction of each and both these sovereigns.

Obviously when the Congress has exercised its powers of regulation of legitimate activities within the scope of Federal regulation, and has adopted a comprehensive scheme designed to cover the subject, further State regulation may necessarily be an infringement upon the powers of the Congress. But that does not mean that an act forbidden by Federal statute may not also be forbidden by State law. Nor does the power given to the Congress to protect the Nation, however exercised, render a sovereign State of the Union impotent to protect itself from those who would plot and conspire to overthrow its government and enslave its people.

Harry Slochower v. *Board of Higher Education of the City of New York* (— U. S. —, 100 L. Ed. (Advance), p. 449): The significance of this decision is two-fold:

First: The Court either disregards the reasons assigned for the decision in *Brown* v. *Topeka*, or it regards the dangers of communistic influences upon students as being of insufficient importance to justify the removal of instructors.

In the Brown case great emphasis is laid upon the so-called "intangibles" connected with education in public schools. Most Americans consider an atmosphere of patriotism, of love of American institutions, of democracy and of respect for those leaders of the past who have contributed to the building of the Nation as the most universal and valuable intangibe in the atmosphere of American schools. Certainly a Communist or ex-Communist, or one who is unwilling to answer questions as to his communistic affiliations is incapable of contributing to the maintenance of that atmosphere in his classroom.

The New York statute held invalid by this decision was designed to remove such persons from a position of trust in the New York school system at the earliest possible moment. The return of Professor Slochower to his classroom denies to the students, who are assigned to his classes, the most valuable intangible of the traditionally American institution of learning.

Second: But more important: This decision disregards the fact that a State, in its relationship with individuals, occupies two capacities—it is a sovereign and, as such, acts in the capacity of a sovereign, but it is also an employer of the services of men and women, and in this phase of its activities it is governed by the same rules of law that govern other employers of labor and services. It was never the intention of those who proposed and adopted the 14th amendment to regulate the acts of the States except in their sovereign capacity. Under the 14th amendment the State, in the making, construction and execution of laws, in the administration of justice, may not deny any person the equal protection of the laws or due process of law. The effect of the present decision is to hold that in its relationship with its employee, in performing its obligations arising out of its contract with that employee, the State has denied the employee due process of law. As a matter of fact, if there was any wrong committed by New York, it was in the breach of a private contract, a simple contract of employment. By the precedent of this ruling, any State employee who has been discharged for dishonesty, immorality, neglect of duty, or any other cause, has the right to appeal to the Federal courts for a determination of the propriety of grounds for such discharge, or the methods used by the State in determining the existence of such grounds. The basic misconception of the Court in the application of the 14th amendment to contractual and proprietary acts of the State as distinguished from governmental acts, or acts of sovereignty.

To demonstrate that this is not a fanciful criticism, it is only necessary to turn to the decision of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Black* v. *Cutter Laboratories* (100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 681). In that case a majority of the Court sustained a decision of the highest court of California which affirmed the right of a private employer to discharge an employee because such employee was a member of the Communist Party. Three members of the Court, however, dissented, declaring that it was a violation of the Constitution for the State to recognize the right of contract under which the employer acted. The fact that the Court even entertained a case in which the question presented was whether the State violated the Federal Constitution in declining to require the employer to reinstate the employee is indicative of an entirely new approach to the scope of the Federal Constitution and the power of Federal courts.

Danlan George Rea v. *United States of America* (— U. S. —) 100 L. Ed. (advance), p. 213): In this case the facts were: A Federal officer had served an invalid search war-

rant issued out of a Federal court and found evidence of the illegal possession of marihuana. The evidence so obtained was suppressed in the Federal court. The officer, then, acting as a private citizen, swore out a warrant in the State court charging a violation of the statute of the State. The Supreme Court held that this officer should be enjoined from testifying in the State court to facts within his knowledge.

It is settled law that the Federal courts will not receive evidence illegally obtained by Federal officers. It is equally well settled that Federal courts will, and do, receive evidence illegally obtained by State officers, even when such evidence has been rejected by the State courts.

It is also settled law that States have the right to receive, and a majority of them do receive, evidence illegally obtained by State officers.

It is debatable question, with which we are not here concerned, whether the best interests of society will be served by receiving evidence obtained by an illegal search and thus bring the guilty to justice, and use other means to punish the officer who violates the rights of citizens, or, on the other hand, rejecting this evidence, freeing the guilty offender, and by this means discouraging illegal searches by public officers. But this is a matter clearly within the right of each of the sovereign States to decide. The Federal Government and each State may fit its decisions to its own determination of public policy.

The effect of the decision cited is to vest in the Federal courts the power of fixing the rules of evidence in the State court. When the Federal officer testifies in the State court he does so as a private citizen. If the Supreme Court may properly arrest the proceedings in the State court and determine—in advance of the trial—what evidence the State court may properly receive at the trial, every attribute of State sovereignty in the administration of State law has been destroyed.

It is significant also that the Court here assumes supervisory powers over executive officers of the United States, thus invading the functioning of another department of the Federal Government.

CONCLUSION

This history of mankind, and particularly the history of the 20th century, clearly indicates that those who would assume dictatorial powers over nations of men find it expedient to begin by offering the people transitory benefits in consideration for the surrender of the powers of government.

The destruction of the local powers of government, the centralization of the administration of measures designed to maintain national security into one or a few individuals, and the control of labor are three of the most potent tools of the dictator. Couple these with an acknowledgment of the authorty of any agancy of government to abrogate or modify constitutional safeguards, and the foundation of a dictatorship has been laid.

Constitutions are prepared in an atmosphere of calm deliberation and are designed to insure the liberties of the people not only in times of social, economic, and political quietude, but during periods of stress and crisis as well, when men may be tempted to meet temporary exigencies by following the leadership of anyone who promises relief from immediate and pressing problems.

The United States is currently experiencing an era of unprecedented prosperity, but we should not forget the panics and depressions of the past, or blindly assume that they will not reoccur.

Only by a return to, and a strict observance of, the fundamental principles of government, now being destroyed by the Supreme Court can we provide the most reliable assurance that under such conditions government of the people, by the people, and for the people will not perish.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this rule would authorize 2 hours of debate on the well-known Fryingpan-Arkansas project which affects the State of Colorado. I am not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but I have been familiar with this project. For a number of years I lived in the southern part of the State that will be affected by this project. I hope you will give proper consideration to the merits of this legislation. I want to point out that the Arkansas River has its beginning on the continental divide near the well-known town of Leadville which was made famous by silver production. Most of you know that the Arkansas River from that high point down until it joins the Mississippi River in lower Arkansas is a river that means much to the people of the State of Colorado. This project intends to utilize and develop the water and apply it at a place where it can be used by the people of the State. The project is estimated to cost approximately $160 million and contemplates the construction of reservoirs and a dam and, in turn, the water will be used for municipal flood control, irrigation, and other valuable uses to which water can be put in this area. It has been studied by the Bureau of Reclamation for a number of years and it is upon the recommendation of the Bureau and the recommendation of the administration that this bill comes to you for consideration.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would the gentleman state the official position of the chief executive of the State of Colorado and the agencies handling this matter and also the agencies in western Colorado that are affected by this bill and this project? As I remember, at the beginning of the gentleman's remarks, the gentleman said that it affected only the southeastern part of the State. The gentleman knows this bill is important to the western part of Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is true. We have a policy committee headed by the Governor of the State of Colorado. This committee has thoroughly examined this project and recommends the enactment of this legislation. I might point out that this will help us in the State of Colorado as it relates to our interstate agreement and will bring about a development that has long been needed throughout the years. Most of you recognize that the reclamation project has to do with the taking of water and storing it and using it for multiple purposes. The main use in this instance is for city and irrigation purposes. I hope, when you have fully evaluated what it means as it relates to conservation of water and its proper use, that you will vote for and adopt this rule. The details of the plan, as I have indicated before, have been thoroughly examined by the Bureau of Reclamation and they have recommended it as being feasible and all of the money will be repaid except that part which is allocated to flood control, which is the usual arrangement. It is a project which authorizes and directs repayment under the reclamation laws of the United States.

I trust you will grant the rule in this case so that we can go into the merits of this matter and provide for the proper development of water in this area.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting piece of legislation. You might say that this is probably one of the finest types and kinds of transmountain water projects that we can fully support. I think I should remind you of some history. The reason I mention history is that in my district we have a typical example of what we mean by transcontinental water. Transcontinental water from one side of a mountain range to the other. It is not a difficult task with the amount of information and experience we have developed from the standpoint of engineering. Only a few miles from home, the backbone of the Continental Divide extends from the boundary of Canada to Mexico. Running through the center of Colorado is the top of that Continental Divide.

In working out the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the engineers drilled a tunnel over 13 miles long, through the heart of the Rocky Mountains, a very interesting project. They began on each side, on the east side and the west side. The engineers worked out the tunnel starting from opposite sides, and when they met somewhere in the center of the backbone of the Rocky Mountains, they were less than a quarter of an inch off on their calculations. So we have a tunnel of 13 miles through the Rocky Mountains that brings water from a watershed on the west side of the Rocky Mountains over to the east side. This was the very first project that brought water into an area and did not extend the project to more acres of land. It is strictly 100 percent supplemental supply of water. I hope you understand those words "supplemental water". The water comes through a tunnel in the Rocky Mountains and runs to the east side where the irrigation section is already in existence; the irrigation ditches and the watergates are there, all organized carefully, and owned locally for about 50 or 60 years of farming. The area will receive this supplementary water.

Now to the Fryingpan project, and it is exactly the same proposition. We bring this water from a watershed on the west side of the mountains through a tunnel for use on the east side. Actually what we will do is to bring a new river into the southeast section of Colorado that will be distributed to the farmlands, already parched by many seasons of drought. This will also supply extra water to municipalities.

Let me say the greatest natural resource in the United States today and the most precious of all is not gold or

silver or uranium. It is water. Our water is our most precious resource. You cannot put a dollars-and-cents value on it; you cannot say it is worth so much. It is invaluable and cannot be measured by any measuring stick, as far as dollars and cents are concerned.

I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague on his fine statement. I am glad he is stressing the fact that no new land is to be brought under cultivation in this process. This is merely to provide supplemental water for land that is already under irrigation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for a consent request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made prior to the conference report on the foreign giveaway bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us is one which makes the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in order. Let me say just a few words about the project. I am not going into the technical details. The bill making the project possible was introduced in the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses. It has been approved by former administrations and former Budget Directors and former officials of the Department of the Interior. It is approved this year by the President of the United States. The President in his message on the state of the Union again reiterated his support of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

Money has been provided in the budget for the start of this project recommended by the administration and the Bureau of the Budget. We have had long hearings before our committee on this subject.

I recognize that there are some Members of the House who are not happy about irrigation projects of any kind, but I just hope you will adopt this rule and permit the membership of the House to hear in detail what the Fryingpan-Arkansas project really does. They ought to listen to the arguments pro and con and not hastily kill the rule so that the merits of the bill cannot be discussed. I seldom vote against the rule even though I may be against the proposal in the bill. Even on foreign aid I have voted for the rules but I have never voted for foreign aid. But I take this position, and I think the membership of the House should take this position, and the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Rules, is a magnanimous gentleman and I hope he will take the same position, that the House ought to have the opportunity to listen to the arguments and then come to a decison. Some of us have already prejudged it and our decisions are already made. I know there are some of us, and I am included, who maybe like to believe what we want to believe and that is as far as we go; but there are arguments pro and con on this bill. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project has been under study since 1936 by the Interior Department. In 1951 legislation was brought before the Congress for this project. So it is nothing new.

Remember, this provides supplemental water for a project that is already established, a going irrigation project. This project will supply only 6 or 7 inches of additional water on land already irrigated, but it does supply a large lot of electrical energy and it supplies water for municipal purposes which is needed badly in this area. The committee's conclusion on that is this:

> The committee concludes that the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is sound from an engineering, economic, and financial standpoint, and that the project is urgently needed to supplement the water supply for existing acreage now under cultivation and for municipal use in the Arkansas Valley.

I urge my colleagues that you keep an open mind, that you adopt the rule, even though you intend to vote against the bill. Let us have the opportunity of having the bill discussed and if you are able to go along with the decision of the administration, it would please many Members of this House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman has made a long study of this matter. It has been before the committee for 4 years. The gentleman understands the amendments that were placed in the bill by the House committee. Is he satisfied after his diligent study that the users in western Colorado where there will be a small amount of water transported to the eastern part of the State are protected thoroughly in their present use and in their potential use necessary to that economy?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is my considered judgment that they are thoroughly protected. I urge a favorable vote on this rule and then the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill upon which a rule has been presented, and which we are now considering, is with minor exceptions the identical bill which the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress refused to consider. The House refused to consider the bill at that time because that rule asked you to consider a bill that was economically unsound and unfeasible. The bill that you are now being asked to consider is economically unsound and unfeasible.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you just what we are being asked to do. A few years ago some of the bright schemers in the Bureau of Reclamation dreamed up a project called the Gunnison-Arkansas project. When they finally published the book calling for the Gunnison-Arkansas project they found out that trans-mountain diversions of that project were so preposterous and so impossible that even the Bureau of Reclamation would not attempt to come before the Congress and ask to have it passed.

I call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has tried to get their hands on every copy of this report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 122]

Adair	Diggs	Morrison
Bailey	Eberharter	Nelson
Bass, Tenn.	Forrester	O'Hara, Minn.
Baumhart	Gamble	Patman
Bell	Gordon	Powell
Blitch	Hébert	Preston
Boykin	Hillings	Priest
Brooks, La.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, Tex.	Holt	Richards
Brownson	Hosmer	Scudder
Burleson	Jensen	Shelley
Carnahan	Johansen	Siler
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Christopher	Kelly, N. Y.	Thompson, La.
Clevenger	Lane	Thornberry
Davis, Tenn.	Long	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	McDowell	Wickersham
Deane	Mollohan	Willis

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 374 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FRYINGPAN - ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the salient features of this bill to which I think the Members should pay particular attention at this late hour of the session.

This bill calls for the expenditure of approximately $155 million—$55 million of this will be used for the redevelopment and reregulation of the Arkansas River. You have heard that this will provide supplemental water, and that is true. There will be no new land brought under irrigation under this bill, but if this bill is passed it will provide only 6 inches of water for the land now under cultivation. If the Arkansas River were reregulated, it would provide approximately 5 of the 6 inches of water that is called for in this bill.

Where do you get this tremendous figure then of $155 million? Therein lies the secret of this entire project, because this is the opening gun for the Gunnison-Arkansas project. This bill calls for the transmountain diversion of 60,000 acre-feet of water at an expenditure of $100 million. Maybe $100 million in this day and age, in the manner in which

we throw money around here, does not mean much to the Members, but to the folks back home in my district that is a lot of money. If we spend that amount of money we want to know what we are going to get with it.

Let me show you some of the things that will be involved. You are going to put in a dam over on the west side of the Rocky Mountains at an elevation of approximately 9,000 feet. Then you are going to run water in an open ditch to a tunnel which will be driven through the Rocky Mountains, and then dropped down in a series of dams on the east side until that water gets into the Arkansas River.

In the first place, if you would read the testimony that was heard before our committee, you would be astounded, because you would find that the people who came up from the Bureau of Reclamation testified first that they were going to run this water in an open ditch and that they did not expect they would be able to get the full flow of water because it might freeze. I asked the Bureau witnesses, "How much would it cost if you had to cover this ditch or put it in a pipe?" And they said, "It would increase the cost by $75 million."

Then the second time they came up they rechecked, and they decided they could now operate this project with the ice frozen over. It would not freeze so much that they could not operate their project during the winter.

Then the third time they came up—and I hope you will listen to this, and I hope that sometime you will go to the Rocky Mountains in the dead of winter, because there you will find that even the fastrunning mountain streams are all frozen over. But the men from the Bureau of Reclamation had the effrontery to come up and tell our committee that they had suddenly made a discovery that the water which would be put in the reservoir would pick up enough heat in the summertime that as they ran it into this open ditch it would not freeze in the winter.

If there was ever anything more preposterous than that advanced by supposedly reputable engineers I would like to know what it is.

Let us look at what happens when you drive this tunnel through the mountain and put the water over on the other side.

The first attempt they are going to make, they tell you, will be to put the water into what is called the Twin Lakes development. The Twin Lakes Development Co. was a corporation which was started during the depression by a group of people who then lived in Colorado. They made a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of several million dollars. The project was so bad they could not pay their interest; they fell behind in their loan, and it became necessary for the Twin Lakes Development Co. to go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and ask for more money and the renegotiation of that loan.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; I will not yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will not yield.

When they went to the RFC they had to have the Reconstruction Finance Corporation write off a half million dollars and then to give security for the increased loan which they got they put up 35,000 shares of stock, and the loan was to be repaid on the basis of 4 percent interest. When that loan, as one of the assets of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had to be liquidated, the RFC advertised bids, and among other places where they advertised was the city of Denver. The people in Denver, the people in Colorado who are before Congress and begging you to pass this bill, did not have enough faith in the investment paying 4 percent interest that they would even pay the amount of money the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had in it. The best offer they would make was this: That if they would throw in the 35,000 shares of stock for nothing and knock off $100,000 of the loan then they would buy it.

The 35,000 shares of stock have disappeared, and there has not been one person who appeared before any committee of the House or the Senate in behalf of the Twin Lakes Development Co. who says they are willing to sell to the United States or to the Bureau of Reclamation this dam. The fact of the matter is I have in my files letters from officers telling me they do not want to sell, but want to keep it. I understand the stock is now owned somewhere in the East.

The next dam they propose to take over is one belonging to the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., which has a dam on the west slope. They have some water rights, but there has not been any official before any committee or any member representing the board of directors of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. saying that they will sell this property to the United States for any price agreed on.

They next propose to drop the water down farther.

For $100 million you are going to be asked to put an inch of water over on some of this farmland.

Now, in the name of good business, in the name of commonsense, and in the name of trying to keep this Government somewhere near being economically sound, I urge this House that when the vote is taken on this rule the Members stand up to their convictions which they had 2 years ago.

Just this morning word came to me that certain groups downtown—they asked that notice be sent out that certain people in the executive branch are very much in favor of this project.

Let me tell you that this particular project was also presented when our President belonged to another political party, and I opposed it then not because of the political affiliation of the President but because I thought he was wrong then. The political affiliation of the President has not changed my position. The House of Representatives refused to go along with it then and I urge you to refuse to go along with it now. This bill is the most fantastic thing I have ever seen. The Colorado River project which this House has voted upon by comparison is an excellent project and there was a great deal of discussion on that matter.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I have before me the committee report presented at the time the rule on this bill was considered and defeated 2 years ago. I notice in that old report there was a wishy-washy letter from the Director of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DONOVAN. I notice the report that was submitted at the time the rule was defeated in the last Congress contained a communication from the Budget Director which withheld the Budget Director's approval of this bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. I notice in this report there is nothing from the Budget Director whatsoever.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct and as near as I can understand, the Bureau of the Budget has not approved this project.

Mr. DONOVAN. Would the gentleman care to speculate for the benefit of Members of the House as to why there is no mention of the Budget Bureau's recommendation in this report?

Mr. SAYLOR. My own speculation is, and it is purely speculation, as to why there is no report is that the thing is so financially infeasible that even the Bureau of the Budget cannot go along with it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the gentleman been able to identify the ownership of the stock of the Twin Lakes Corp.?

Mr. SAYLOR. I have not been able to, nor has anybody been able to come before our committee and tell us who owns that 35,000 shares of stock.

Mr. DONOVAN. If this bill passes, will the Twin Lakes Corp.'s financial embarrassment be straightened out?

Mr. SAYLOR. It will be to the advantage of certain people, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to argue the merits of a bill on the question whether or not a rule should be adopted. Unless the project is so bad or the legislation so out of order that it should not conceivably be considered by the House, or unless it does not rise to importance or significance in the legislative program to warrant its consideration, then in the normal course of events the rule should be adopted and the merits of the project, whatever they are, decided under the terms of debate established in the rule.

Let me give you a little history of this project in order to indicate to you whether or not it does rise to sufficient importance to be considered by this body

on its merits. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project was first taken up in 1936 by a Democratic administration and those studies went forward until 1951 when the project was favorably reported by a Democratic administration and approved by a Democratic Secretary of the Interior. That is not unusual. The same thing happened with the upper Colorado Basin project. Democrats have engineered and planned these projects; then the Republicans come along and take them over as they have in this instance. I am glad this administration recognizes worthwhile projects.

This program has been scheduled as one of the key items of the present administration's legislative program. This bill has been before the Senate of the United States twice and on both occasions passed the United States Senate without any opposition whatever. Now, if it is such a sour project and so wholly infeasible, why on earth can its sponsors get the United States Senate to pass it on what amounts to unanimous consent? The Senate passed it in the 83d Congress and just recently passed it again without a single dissenting vote.

In his budget message for fiscal 1956, the President recommended enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of this project, and in addition to that, the budget message which he sent up contained money to initiate the project even prior to the time that it was authorized. The President's state of the Union message urged that the project be authorized in order that the money could be spent.

Now, I say to you, does that kind of history lay the basis for refusing to grant a rule upon this project where we can get into a clear discussion of what is involved in it and what is not involved in it?

It seems to me plain, with the legislative history of this bill, having twice passed the United States Senate without any opposition, having been engineered by a Democratic administration and approved by a Democratic Secretary of the Interior; approved, by all of the executive agencies of both administrations that have ever looked at it, and then to say that this project does not even warrant the dignity of a rule and consideration on this floor seems to me to be an argument that should not carry very much weight. For that reason I want to express the hope that the House will adopt the rule and hear the bill on its merits.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I realize that a very heavy obligation rests upon me today because I have been the sponsor of this project since its inception. I have been in the House now for some 14 years, and I cherish above everything else the confidence and good will of my colleagues. I think you will recognize that I am not going to mislead you or misrepresent this project to you. This project is of great importance to the people of my district because of the desperate need for this water.

Now, there are some who are opposed to this project. I have great affection for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. However, he is wrong in his conclusions on this project. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is setting his engineering ability up against the skill and experience of the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation and other independent engineers, all of whom have approved this project, and stated it is feasible from an economic and engineering standpoint.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman brings up the bugaboo of a larger project. Is it not a fact that this is a single project within itself and does not need a larger project; in fact, the report from the committee states that it is disassociated entirely with the project, the Gunnison-Arkansas project, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania made reference.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely right. This is an independent project, and is not dependent on any other project. There is no other project contemplated so far as this project is concerned. This project stands by itself; it is self-liquidating, and any talk about any other project is entirely without foundation.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said that the project is not feasible. The feasibility ratio is 1.47 to 1, which I submit speaks well for the economic value of the project.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Many of us in the House realize how hard and diligent the gentleman from Colorado has worked in behalf of this project. I think he made a very significant statement a moment ago when he said that those of us who had the opportunity to know him had confidence in his judgment. I hope that the House will take the recommendation of the gentleman from Colorado and cast a vote in favor of the rule and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], said, give the House an opportunity to hear this bill debated on its merits and not on any preconceived notion.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and I greatly appreciate his support of this project.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman from Pennsylvania called attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget had not approved this project. Has the President given his approval to this project?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Five million dollars are in the budget for this fiscal year to start construction of this project. If that does not constitute approval of a project, I do not know what other proof can be submitted.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. There is a report of the Interior Department and attention should be called to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to that report.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman is absolutely right. I regret that this bill is here in the closing days of the session. It is not my fault. This bill was reported by the House Interior Committee in February of this year. This bill went to the Committee on Rules on April 9, and it has been there since that time until it was reported yesterday. This bill has been twice favorably reported by the House Interior Committee, the first time in the 83d Congress, and again in this Congress.

This bill has been twice passed by the United States Senate, first in the 83d Congress and again on July 12, just 2 weeks ago. Senator MILLIKIN and Senator ALLOTT have been sponsoring the project in the Senate during this Congress. Governor Johnson, of Colorado, also sponsored this legislation during the time he was a Member of the United States Senate. There has been no partisanship so far as this legislation is concerned. Democrats and Republicans join in requesting passage of this bill.

This project has been approved by 2 administrations, 1 Democratic and the other Republican. Mr. Oscar Chapman approved the project when he was Secretary of the Interior on May 4, 1951. Mr. Douglas McKay later approved the project under the present administration on April 28, 1953.

The project has the personal endorsement of President Eisenhower.

In his state of the Union message to Congress on January 5, 1956, the President recommended the construction of this project, and said:

> The development of our water resources cannot be accomplished overnight. The need is such that we must make faster progress and without delay. Therefore, I strongly recommend that action be taken at this session on such wholly Federal projects as the Colorado River storage project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

I submit, therefore, that this is a feasible project. It has the approval of the budget, and has been twice reported by overwhelming votes by the House Interior Committee, and twice approved by the United States Senate.

As I understand in the closing days of the session it is the intention of the House leadership to consider only those bills which have a chance of passage. I want to remind the Members of the fact that a companion bill, S. 300, has passed the Senate, I might state without opposition, without any objection being raised. So here is a bill that has a chance of becoming law at this session.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not private enterprise can do this job out there?

Mr. CHENOWETH. This project is too large for private enterprise to construct. Otherwise it would have been constructed long ago. Except for the fact that this is too large a project for local and private capital to construct, we would not be here today asking for this legislation. The President, in his recommendation of this project, has called attention to the fact that we should

build only those projects which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, flood control, power, as well as municipal and industrial water supply.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making and to remind him and the membership generally that, as majority leader in the 83d Congress, I attempted then to obtain a rule for the consideration of this measure; and, when the vote came on that rule, the people on our side by an overwhelming majority supported the rule. I trust it will be that way again. On that vote in the 83d Congress, 138 Republicans voted for the rule, with only 61 against; while only 50 Democrats voted for the rule and 134 voted against.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the fine support which the gentleman from Indiana has given this project.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Of course, the gentleman knows that I have been a consistent supporter of this measure.

Mr. CHENOWETH. And I greatly appreciate his support.

Mr. PRICE. And I shall continue to support it. I am very glad to have the expression of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that he has just made. I am sorry that he did not feel the same way about our atomic reactor program.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not have time in this debate on the rule to discuss that legislation, but I do sincerely appreciate the support of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I agree with the gentleman that there are some things that the Government must assist in. I felt that one of the most important things was keeping the United States ahead of the rest of the world in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and for the development of industrial power.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I want to say that I voted for the rule the last time and I intend to vote for the rule again.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman very much and appreciate his support.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I hope the rule will be adopted so that we may present the details of this project. I am sure that after you hear just what this project does, and learn of the great benefits which will be derived therefrom, you will support this bill, which I am proud to sponsor.

This is not a giveaway proposition. This money will be repaid to the United States Government with interest, except that part allocated to irrigation which, under our reclamation laws, is interest free.

I want to again stress the fact that no new land is being brought into cultivation by this project. Supplemental water will be made available to land which is now under irrigation. The project also provides for domestic water and for the development of hydroelectric power, the revenues from which will be used to assist in the payment of the allocation to irrigation, which is beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a meritorious project and deserves the consideration of the House. I urge my friends in this House, on both sides of the aisle, to support this rule so that we may present to you the details of this project. I feel we are entitled to this rule, and I hope this resolution will have your support.

Mr. Speaker, I want again to refer to the fact that the Senate has passed this measure. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] yesterday announced his retirement from the Senate, because of ill health. I think I need not remind you of the high esteem in which he is held in the United States Senate. Senator MILLIKIN has sponsored this project in the Senate over the years. I would like to refer my colleagues to the RECORD of yesterday to the tributes paid Senator MILLIKIN on the floor of the Senate by both Democrats and Republicans. Members on both sides of the aisle joined in these tributes to a great American. I mention this so that you may reflect whether or not a man of the stature of Senator MILLIKIN would sponsor a project which is unworthy of consideration. The Senate thought enough of this project to pass this legislation without a dissenting vote.

I am anxious to impress upon the House that this is not a new project, hastily conceived and lacking necessary engineering data and support. This project has been under consideration for many years, and has had the exhaustive study of the Bureau of Reclamation. Many years ago we had men in Colorado with vision who conceived the idea of bringing surplus water from the western slope of Colorado to the Arkansas Valley, in eastern Colorado, in order to provide water that is badly needed, both for supplemental irrigation and for domestic purposes. This project is the culmination of their dreams. Many of these pioneers in water development have passed on to their reward, but others are living and will see their hopes realized if this project is constructed.

The intense interest in this project, and the desperate need for this water, resulted in the organization of the Southeastern Colorado Water Development Association. Membership in this association is distributed over the entire Arkansas Valley. I wish to take this opportunity to commend the officers and directors of this association, who have given so unselfishly of their time and energy in order that this project might become a reality.

The REA cooperatives in this area are very much interested in this project and have given the same their enthusiastic support. Three cooperatives will purchase this power, being the Southeast Colorado Power Association, at La Junta; the San Isabel Electric Association, at Pueblo; and the Sangre de Cristo Electric Association, at Salida. These REA associations serve more than 35,000 rural people living in 17 counties in southeastern Colorado, comprising approximately one-fourth of the State's total area.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House if water rights have been cleared up out there. Is there not still some controversy about the water rights?

Mr. CHENOWETH. No; there is no controversy. I will say to my distinguished friend from Florida, we have pretty well settled our water problems in Colorado. This project has the approval of the Colorado Water Conservation Board which speaks officially on all water matters affecting the State. No other State is involved. We are dealing with water that has been allocated to the State of Colorado under the upper Colorado River compact.

Mr. HALEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman say it has been adjudicated. I understood there was still some controversy out there.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] has inserted in this bill an amendment which I am sure fully protects the water users on the western slope. The gentleman heard the colloquy a moment ago between my colleague, Mr. ASPINALL, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], where Mr. MILLER stated it was his opinion that these rights are fully protected in this bill. This is a project over which there is no serious controversy in the State of Colorado. I do not say everyone approves the project. I do not think the gentleman will find any project anywhere that has unanimous endorsement.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman tell the members of the committee if he knows who owns the controlling interest in the Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co.?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am glad the gentleman brought up the matter of the Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co. My friend [Mr. SAYLOR] is seeking to bring in a collateral issue which does not belong here. I know the officers of the Twin Lakes Co. I know the history of this company. I should like to correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania in a statement he made. I know he did not intend to mislead you.

At the time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was liquidated by direction of Congress, I think the gentleman will find that the affairs of the Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co. were in pretty good shape. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was well satisfied with that loan. The interest and the principal were paid up to date. I do not think there was any dissatisfaction over the loan made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Twin

Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co. A conservancy district will be formed under Colorado laws which will enter into contract for the repayment of this money.

All of the property in the district will be pledged for the repayment of this money to the Government.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the letter which is in the files and the report from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that says that on the initial renegotiation they had to write off a half million dollars, and when they sold the bonds on liquidation they had to lose another $100,000, plus the 35,000 shares of stock.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the gentleman recognizes the fact that in the liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a good many loans were not paid in full. There was no question that this was a good loan. There was no trouble in finding a purchaser for this loan. The affairs of the Twin Lakes Co. were in good shape. I think everyone was pretty well satisfied with the deal that was made. However, the Twin Lakes Co. is not involved in this legislation except their reservoir is to be enlarged and becomes a part of the project. The Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co. is a separate and independent enterprise. I think the gentleman will find that the Twin Lakes Reservoir and Canal Co. endorses this project. The gentleman referred to the fact that they opposed this project, which is not the case.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Is it a fact that this bill contains approximately $2 million of nonreimbursable moneys for the preservation of fish?

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right. I think that is not uncommon in legislation of this kind, because this area is recognized as one of the finest fishing areas in the whole country. I think it has been the practice of Congress in projects of this kind to allocate nonreimbursable funds for the development of fish and wildlife resources.

Mr. PILLION. Can the gentleman tell us how many fish will be propagated and saved by this project? I do not mean to be facetious.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am sure the gentleman does not expect me to answer a question like that, but I can assure him this money is going to be well spent and that the sportsmen of this country are going to receive many benefits from this project. I would like the gentleman to come out to Colorado and see for himself just what we have.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman recall any testimony taken before our committee on the subject of the preservation of fish life?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know what the gentleman is leading up to here. I am very fond of the gentleman. He is one of my very close personal friends. I think he is trying to divert attention from the merits of the project. I do not know what he is referring to. Whatever we spend for this purpose will be a good investment, I will say to my friend from New York.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to again urge the adoption of this rule, so that H. R. 412, a bill authorizing the Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion project, can be considered. Many of you have spoken to me concerning this project, and have expressed your interest. I do appreciate your support. This project means much to Colorado and I hope you will vote for this rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, this is a highly controversial bill. When it came before the House a year or so ago we defeated it decisively. I think it would be a mistake to grant a rule. All we will accomplish is to spend the rest of the afternoon fighting over this bill. In the closing hours of the session we can devote our time to bills that have some hope of passage.

It seems to me the thing to do is to end this promptly and to defeat the rule and proceed with the business of closing this session of the Congress. I have sat here for months when the House did not meet but 2 or 3 days a week and we had very little business. Many of us who live a long way from here were compelled to stay here and, now in the last hours of the session, they bring up controversial bills and we do not have an opportunity to devote sufficient consideration to them. I think this is a bad way to legislate and we should dispose of it by defeating this rule here and now.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is laboring under a mistake if he thinks this rule was overwhelmingly defeated when it was last before the House. As a matter of fact, and this can be verified from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it was defeated by one vote. If there had been one vote more in favor of the rule it would have permitted the Speaker, and I was Speaker at that time, to cast a vote in favor of the rule which would have determined the vote.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will give me a couple of extra minutes I would gladly yield, I have only 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have the rollcall before me.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman give me 2 minutes?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry.

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot yield then. You have plenty of time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will tell you about it.

Mr. MARTIN. You put it in on your own time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will do so.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, let us look at this bill as it really is. There is no public power, associated with this legislation. It is an irrigation bill. It answers the needs of the people of Colorado for water. Those of us who live in the East may not realize what water means to the people in these arid regions. Water means to them their very lives and existence. These irrigation projects have not worked out too badly. They have been under heavy burdens of costs; they have held out fairly well; and they have contributed to the building up of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, what do we find confronting us today? We find a great section of our country asking for an opportunity to be heard through legislation in this House of Representatives. The people of Colorado are asking that they have their day in court. Are we going to deny that? I cannot believe we are. Here is legislation recommended by President Eisenhower after a personal inspection. He recommends this bill. Only this morning he called me on the telephone and said he hoped this legislation would pass. It was a part of his program for the building of the West. The bill comes with the endorsement of the Bureau of the Budget and they have even made an allowance for the initial plant. The bill comes here with the support of the other body; the Senate having already given its overwhelming approval.

The legislation comes with the approval of the committee on the Interior. Should not all these endorsements warrant our giving the bill a chance to be considered? I repeat, are we going to say that we will deny the gentleman from Colorado, who has served here for 14 years, an opportunity to have his bill considered in the House? I do not think we are. I hope when the roll is called we will adopt this rule and then give consideration of the bill on its merits.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such of the remaining time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that every year or two we have "Fryingpan." So in bringing before you a rule for consideration of this matter I feel very much like the old saying, "Here is where we came in"; because just 2 years ago a similar rule was under consideration right at the close of the session. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is usually very accurate. I know he always wants to be accurate. So first I wish to correct his statement as to the rollcall on that rule, because I have it before me. It was defeated by 7 votes, 188 yeas and 195 noes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on a question of the record.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will have to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman also will notice by looking over the RECORD that a number of Members changed their votes. At one time it was only 1 vote difference.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, this is the final record.

Mr. MARTIN. If anyone wants to know what the real record is, I call their

attention to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 9, page 12453.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And I call attention to page 11786 of the daily RECORD, which was the final rollcall on the rule. The vote as recorded in the permanent RECORD was yeas 188, noes 195.

However that may be, here we are again in the same situation that we were 2 years ago when this bill came in 3 days before the adjournment of Congress and was fully discussed on the merits, and the Congress decided they did not want to waste any time on it at that late date. That is what I hope the Congress will do at this time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Very briefly, please.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman knows the great esteem and affection I have for him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, but let us not take time on that right now.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman does not attach any blame to me for bringing this bill up at this late date, does he?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This is a good time for me to pay my respects to the gentleman from Colorado, to whom I am greatly devoted. The gentleman has tried as assiduously as anybody could do get this matter up. I do not think he has missed a day of either calling the committee or me to know when I was going to get a rule out for him on Frying Pan. Now there is talk around here that if we do not pass this thing the gentleman would not return here. I would not do anything in the world to prevent his returning to Congress, but if we pass this thing today he would not have anything more to brag about. He would not have any issue. I want to keep this thing alive. As long as we can keep him fighting for it we can keep him here in Congress. He will not have any issue to run on if you do this thing to him. Please do not do it.

My friend complains about this bill staying in the Rules Committee. Here is the fact about that. This Frying Pan proposition just has not got the merit to get through the Congress for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. It came before the Rules Committee, it is true. I discussed it with the Rules Committee and we held a hearing on it in the Rules Committee, and it just could not muster enough votes to get a rule.

How did it get here? I do not know exactly, but there have been some funny things going on around here, and somehow or other this thing got all mixed up with the project called Hells Canyon, and there were some good folks around here who were for Hells Canyon and some who were for Fryingpan and they got the idea that if we could get them both up that they would both win. Well, that looked good for a time, but after a while Hells Canyon went to that place in a hurry by direction of the United States Senate.

Now the fellows who were thinking, "Well, we'll get them both out and pass them both," they just kind of got inadvertently blocked on this deal and Hells Canyon is out and Colorado Fryingpan is just trying to stay in.

You all want to go home and are hoping you can get out of here tomorrow night. If you bring this bill up on the floor of the House with 2 hours of debate and the numerous amendments to be offered, and the committee amendments that will be offered you will be here until midnight before you get through with it and then there will be other matters that you have got to take care of. I do not think we ought to use up time fooling with this thing which you just know is not going to pass.

I hope you will defeat this rule because this just has no chance.

They have brought in the fate of our good friend from Colorado. I want to say this for Mr. CHENOWETH, we have given him a good run for his money. He has made a good fight. I would not want to do anything to hurt him, because my good friend Mr. CHENOWETH, there is no person in this House who is more enthusiastic or works harder in the interests of his constituents, but I want to keep him still having something to work for.

It was said on both sides that in Colorado this thing had all been settled. I do not think it has been settled, because I have one letter here from the west side of the mountains—I do not know who these people are, but it is from a water-protective association. They do not want it.

The good Lord put this Colorado River over on the west side of the Rocky Mountains. The advocates of this bill now wish to dig a hole through the mountains and put part of it over on the east side of the mountains. I think if it was intended to be over on the east side of the mountain the good Lord would have put it over there himself. But this generation of people have been thinking they were powerful smart and they think they are smart enough to do anything, including putting the Colorado River from the west side of the Rockies over to the east side of the Rockies. I am afraid we have been so smart in this generation that maybe we have discovered the things that will ultimately lead to our complete destruction.

This tunnel is going to cost an awful lot of money. They have not any more idea what it is going to cost than the man in the moon. For example, 2 years ago they said it was going to cost $179 million. This year they say now it is going to cost not more than $154 million. It is the only thing I have heard of in the last few years that has gone down instead of up except farm products.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman expresses surprise about the estimated cost of this project going down. It is not surprising to me when you marvel at all of the things not being completed. I think it has been the history of these irrigation and reclamation projects throughout the country and throughout the years that before they are finally finished they cost 2 to 3 times the original estimate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, and this will be no exception.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will have to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I appreciate what the gentleman has said about me very much, although it may not all be deserved.

There is a limitation of $157 million in this bill, so the cost cannot go beyond that figure. I personally think the project will be constructed for much less than that amount. I am sure every effort will be made to build this project at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me say that if the gentleman from Colorado returns, as we hope he will, he will be here in the future asking for $250 million. See if I am not right. And he is so persuasive and persistent he will probably get it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe, under the circumstances, it is only fair that Members should have a chance to express their views in respect to this proposed legislation. The bill, I am informed, has been on the calendar for several months. I am also advised it has passed the Senate by a good-sized vote. Perhaps that is beside the question, but I do feel that those who favor the bill, as well as those who oppose the measure, ought to have a chance to express their views. This is not a question of whether you are for or against the proposal. Not at all. It is a question of whether we are willing to listen to the debate and then decide whether or not we want to support it or vote against it. It seems to me it is pretty drastic to be unwilling to even listen to the discussion. Let me repeat—this is not at all a question of whether you are for or against the measure. It is only a question of whether you are willing to listen to the debate on both sides of the question and then decide whether you favor it or not.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 194, answered "present" 3, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—179

Addonizio	Bennett, Mich.	Cederberg
Albert	Bentley	Celler
Allen, Calif.	Berry	Chase
Allen, Ill.	Boggs	Chenoweth
Andersen, H. Carl	Bolling	Church
Andresen, August H.	Bolton, Frances P.	Coon
Arends	Bolton, Oliver P.	Corbett
Aspinall	Bow	Cretella
Auchincloss	Bray	Crumpacker
Avery	Brown, Ohio	Cunningham
Ayres	Broyhill	Curtis, Mass.
Baker	Budge	Curtis, Mo.
Baldwin	Burdick	Dawson, Utah
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Deane
Bass, N. H.	Canfield	Dempsey
Bates	Cannon	Dingell
Beamer	Carrigg	Dixon
		Dolliver
		Dondero

Donohue	McCormack	Rooney
Dorn, N. Y.	McGregor	Sadlak
Dorn, S. C.	McIntire	St. George
Edmondson	Mack, Wash.	Schenck
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Schwengel
Engle	Mahon	Scott
Fernandez	Mailliard	Scrivner
Fisher	Marshall	Seely-Brown
Fjare	Martin	Sheehan
Ford	Meader	Short
Frelinghuysen	Merrow	Sieminski
Fulton	Metcalf	Simpson, Pa.
Gathings	Miller, Calif.	Sisk
George	Miller, Md.	Smith, Wis.
Gubser	Miller, Nebr.	Talle
Halleck	Morano	Teague, Calif.
Hand	Moss	Thompson, Mich.
Harden	Moulder	Thomson, Wyo.
Harrison, Nebr.	Multer	Tollefson
Harvey	Nicholson	Trimble
Hays, Ark.	Norblad	Tumulty
Heselton	O'Neill	Udall
Hill	Osmers	Van Pelt
Hinshaw	Passman	Van Zandt
Hoeven	Patterson	Velde
Holmes	Pelly	Vorys
Hope	Pfost	Wainwright
Horan	Philbin	Weaver
Hyde	Price	Westland
Jenkins	Prouty	Wharton
Johnson, Calif.	Radwan	Widnall
Jones, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.	Wier
Judd	Reed, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Karsten	Rees, Kans.	Williams, N. J.
Kearns	Reuss	Wilson, Ind.
Kilday	Rhodes, Pa.	Withrow
Knox	Riehlman	Wolcott
Krueger	Roberts	Wolverton
Laird	Robsion, Ky.	Young
LeCompte	Rodino	Zablocki
Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.	
Lovre	Rogers, Mass.	
McCarthy	Rogers, Tex.	

NAYS—194

Abbitt	Fountain	McCulloch
Abernethy	Frazier	McDonough
Alexander	Friedel	McMillan
Alger	Garmatz	McVey
Andrews	Gary	Macdonald
Anfuso	Gavin	Machrowicz
Ashley	Gentry	Mack, Ill.
Ashmore	Grant	Madden
Barrett	Gray	Mason
Becker	Green, Oreg.	Matthews
Belcher	Green, Pa.	Miller, N. Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Gregory	Mills
Betts	Griffiths	Minshall
Blatnik	Gross	Morgan
Blitch	Gwinn	Mumma
Boland	Hagen	Murray, Ill.
Bonner	Hale	Murray, Tenn.
Bosch	Haley	Natcher
Boyle	Hardy	Norrell
Brown, Ga.	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Buckley	Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burnside	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Ill.
Bush	Hayworth	O'Konski
Byrd	Healey	Ostertag
Byrne, Pa.	Henderson	Perkins
Carlyle	Herlong	Phillips
Chelf	Hess	Pilcher
Chiperfield	Hiestand	Pillion
Chudoff	Hoffman, Mich.	Poage
Clark	Holifield	Poff
Colmer	Holt	Polk
Cooley	Holtzman	Quigley
Cooper	Huddleston	Rabaut
Cramer	Hull	Rains
Dague	Ikard	Ray
Davidson	Jackson	Riley
Davis, Ga.	James	Rivers
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Robeson, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Jennings	Rogers, Fla.
Delaney	Johnson, Wis.	Roosevelt
Denton	Jonas	Saylor
Derounian	Jones, Mo.	Scherer
Devereux	Jones, N. C.	Selden
Dies	Kean	Sheppard
Dodd	Kearney	Shuford
Dollinger	Kee	Sikes
Donovan	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Doyle	Kilburn	Smith, Miss.
Durham	Kilgore	Smith, Va.
Elliott	King, Calif.	Spence
Evins	King, Pa.	Springer
Fallon	Kirwan	Staggers
Fascell	Klein	Steed
Feighan	Kluczynski	Sullivan
Fenton	Knutson	Taber
Fino	Landrum	Taylor
Flood	Lanham	Teague, Tex.
Flynt	Lankford	Thomas
Fogarty	Latham	Thompson, N. J
Forand	Lipscomb	Thompson, Tex.
Tuck	Whitten	Wright
Utt	Williams, Miss.	Yates
Vanik	Williams, N. Y.	Younger
Walter	Wilson, Calif.	Zelenko
Watts	Winstead	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Cole	Coudert	Keating

NOT VOTING—56

Adair	Forrester	O'Hara, Minn.
Bailey	Gamble	Patman
Bass, Tenn.	Gordon	Powell
Baumhart	Hébert	Preston
Bell	Hillings	Priest
Bowler	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boykin	Holland	Richards
Brooks, La.	Hosmer	Rutherford
Brooks, Tex.	Jensen	Scudder
Brownson	Johansen	Shelley
Burleson	Kelley, Pa.	Siler
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Lane	Thompson, La.
Christopher	Long	Thornberry
Clevenger	McConnell	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	McDowell	Vursell
Diggs	Mollohan	Wickersham
Dowdy	Morrison	Willis
Eberharter	Nelson	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Keating against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Christopher for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Mr. Rutherford for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Bell with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. CHELF changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAGEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. JENSEN. I voted "nay." The gentleman from Iowa, if present, would have voted "yea."

I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. REED changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BENTLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MINSHALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PERKINS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DISPLACED BUSINESSES

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the housing bill passed by the House and sent to the other body is a provision for the reimbursement up to $2,000 of small business tenants for expenses incurred in moving when dispossessed by reason of urban redevelopment.

In the bill reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee reimbursement up to $5,000 was provided, also loans at low interest rates for the reestablishment of displaced businesses. In the Banking and Currency Committee I had endeavored to have the maximum for moving expense reimbursement set at $50,000, and in this endeavor had been supported by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee that had accorded a public hearing to the representatives of the Hyde Park district in Chicago. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for the great and outstanding service he has rendered small business at all times. I can assure him that among the displaced small business tenants in the district in Chicago that I have the honor to represent his name always will be cherished.

Mr. Speaker, the $2,000 reimbursement provision, provided the bill is passed by the other body and becomes a law, will be at least a token of the interest of the Congress in the plight of the small-business tenants who are being uprooted from locations where they have been long established. They are paying heavily the price of urban progress, and while the bill we passed would give them some relief, very much more remains to be done. This is an area for study and legislative action that should command the attention of the 85th Congress immediately on its reconvening.

That my colleagues may know how serious is the plight of the displaced small-business tenants, I am taking the liberty of presenting for your reading, without first asking the consent of the writer, the following personal letter from my mail of this morning:

DEAR SIR: Our Ford dealership at 5518 Lake Park Avenue, Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill., is being taken away from us.

We will lose our investment in leasehold improvements of $85,000, in shop equipment, wiring, exhausts, heating, etc., in the amount of $60,000; in furniture and fixtures and signs in the amount of $21,000, and in possible inventory loss of approximately $50,000. A grand total of $216,000.

We do not own the building in which our business is established. We are merely tenants, and as a result of condemnation we are forced to go out of business and we are faced with bankruptcy and a loss of well over $216,000, as well as the loss of 10 long, hard years devoted day and night in establishing whatever goodwill exists.

One partner loses also 20 years of prior work in the same location as a garage operator.

Our business employs over 50 people with an annual payroll of $285,000. All of them will lose their jobs. Both my partner and I (we each own 50 percent of the stock in our corporation) have earned a living for our families through this Ford dealership. Now our means of livelihood is being taken away from us.

Perhaps a bit of background will give you further insight into the horror of what this means.

Prior to 1947 we, Mr. Morris Cohen, and the writer, Edward France, applied to the Ford Motor Co., for a Ford franchise. After 6 long months of waiting and praying, we obtained their consent.

We both invested practically every cent we had in the world—money that had been slowly saved over many prior years—in order to get our business started. Over the period of these last 9 years we both worked practically day and night and many times into the early mornings trying to build up a business that we felt had the possibilities of continuing for many years to come—one which would provide security for us even as we grew older. That security is now being taken away from us by Government condemnation without 1 cent of payment.

At the time that we obtained our franchise, we negotiated a 10-year lease with our present landlord. We agreed that we would make certain leasehold improvements and as a result received a reasonable rental. We since have put in many times the original amount committed.

Just a couple of years ago we were in new negotiations with our landlord for a 10-year extension of our lease. Everything was agreed upon and all that had to be done was to sign the lease. The papers were drawn by our attorney and everything was all set. Then the news of the contemplated Hyde Park redevelopment came out. Our landlord upon advice of his counsel then refused us an extension.

Unfortunately there is no place in the immediate Hyde Park area to which we can move. We must, under the terms of our franchise with Ford, stay within a 1-mile radius, and there is no such place. With no place to move, and not enough money to move all of our equipment nor to remodel a different place if there were something else available, we have no alternative but to close up our business—just lock the door and walk away from it broke.

Of course we can hold a public auction to sell some things, but have you ever witnessed a distress auction? Valuable parts and equipment usually bring about 2 cents to 5 cents on the dollar. The bulk of our investment is attached to the building, some of which cannot be moved or would be too costly to move.

I cannot find words in the English language to describe this situation other than the word "horror."

When we have read in the papers in the past of certain foreign governments appropriating private businesses and putting out on the streets its owners, I am sure that we have all been horrified at this gross injustice. Nonetheless, here is a situation about which we have no one to whom we can raise our voices in complaint or askance.

Does this all seem fair? Can a business be completely destroyed and wiped out; its owners bankrupted, its employees discharged, with absolutely no consideration to its owners because they happen to be tenants rather than property owners?

Does it seem fair to ask men who have built up a valuable Ford business, who have invested their life's savings, who have undertaken certain personal obligations such as, among other things, purchasing homes for their families, who have worked 20 years of working hours in less than half that time, to walk away from their business broke?

It is most amazing to know that practically every lawyer, every politician, and every layman, who has heard of our problem, just won't believe it. They are all so certain that at least we will be partially reimbursed for something.

Would to God that this were so.

However, it merely means trying to start all over again after 20 long years of work and savings.

Is there no help for us or others like us, despite our large investment?

Please visualize for a moment our positions being reversed and this is happening to you or yours. After building and working and saving and sweating and worrying, everything is taken away from you, through no fault of yours, and you are left broke with no one to talk to about it, because the law is quite clear—it can take whatever you have because you happened to have been a tenant in your business as against being the owner of the building?

Need I say more?

My purpose in writing is to show that any contemplated Federal-aid law certainly should provide some help to those who stand to lose large fortunes as well as small ones. We are given to understand that the current legislation being considered will assist businessmen up to the amount of $2,000. If this is correct, it certainly would represent a very fine gesture, but would not, even remotely, bring about the result for which it was originally intended; namely, to prevent businesses from sustaining such heavy losses, as is apparent in our particular case.

May we take this opportunity to thank you personally for every effort you have bent in order to rectify a most unjust situation and may the good Lord smile upon you in your every activity.

Yours very truly,

RITZ CENTRAL MOTORS, INC.,
EDWARD FRANCE.
MORRIS COHEN.

P. S.—At this writing, the newspapers have just announced that the pending legislation has been pigeonholed, which could mean no assistance whatsoever. Every day lost means that many more people will suffer terribly.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 7643. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules;

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives;

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Reports Nos. 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244, current session;

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil defense for national survival held during the current session by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations;

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 40,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on "Progress Report on Research in Medicine, Biology, and Agriculture Using Radioactive Isotopes";

H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution authorizing additional copies of the hearing on Labor-Management Problems of the American Merchant Marine; and

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution authorizing a correction in enrolled bill H. R. 8008.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid on admissions exceeds $1;

H. R. 10177. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3957) entitled "An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment to the bill H. R. 9591, entitled "An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes."

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF COMPENSATION OF HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2935)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—BASIC COMPENSATION FOR HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as 'Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956'.

"SEC. 102. The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $25,000.

"(1) Secretary of State.
"(2) Secretary of the Treasury.
"(3) Secretary of Defense.
"(4) Attorney General.
"(5) Postmaster General.
"(6) Secretary of the Interior.
"(7) Secretary of Agriculture.
"(8) Secretary of Commerce.
"(9) Secretary Labor.
"(10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"SEC. 103. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $22,500.

"(1) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
"(2) Comptroller General of the United States.
"(3) Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.
"(4) Under Secretary of State.
"(5) Deputy Secretary of Defense.

"(b) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $22,000.

"(1) Secretary of the Army.
"(2) Secretary of the Navy.
"(3) Secretary of the Air Force.

"SEC. 104. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $21,000.

"(1) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
"(2) Director of Central Intelligence.
"(3) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
"(4) Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the annual rate of basic compensation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be $22,000 so long as such office is held by the present incumbent.

"(5) Administrator of General Services.
"(6) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
"(7) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
"(8) Director of the International Cooperation Administration.
"(9) Director of the United States Information Agency.
"(10) Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.
"(11) President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.
"(12) Under Secretary of the Treasury.
"(13) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.
"(14) Deputy Postmaster General.
"(15) Under Secretary of the Interior.
"(16) Under Secretary of Agriculture.
"(17) Under Secretary of Commerce.
"(18) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
"(19) Under Secretary of Labor.
"(20) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"SEC. 105. The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $20,500.

"(1) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.
"(2) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.
"(3) Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.
"(4) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.
"(5) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
"(6) Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board.
"(7) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.
"(8) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
"(9) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.
"(10) Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.
"(11) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
"(12) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.
"(13) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.
"(14) Chairman, National Mediation Board.
"(15) Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board.
"(16) Chairman of the Renegotiation Board.
"(17) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.
"(18) Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board.
"(19) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.
"(20) Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.
"(21) Comptroller of the Currency.
"(22) Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.
"(23) Deputy Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.
"(24) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
"(25) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
"(26) Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.
"(27) Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.
"(28) Deputy Director of the United States Infromation Agency.
"(29) Deputy Under Secretary of the Department of State (3).
"(30) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
"(31) First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

"SEC. 106. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $20,000.

"(1) Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State.
"(2) Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.
"(3) Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service.
"(4) Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.
"(5) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
"(6) Administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
"(7) Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, Department of Labor.
"(8) Archivist of the United States.
"(9) Assistant Directors of the Bureau of the Budget (2).
"(10 Assistant Postmasters General (5).
"(11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (3).
"(12) Assistant Secretaries of Commerce (3).
"(13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (9).
"(14) Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare (2).
"(15) Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (3).
"(16) Assistant Secretaries of Labor (3).
"(17) Assistant Secretaries of State (10).
"(18) Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (3).
"(19) Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force (4).
"(20) Assistant Secretaries of the Army (4).
"(21) Assistant Secretaries of the Navy (4).
"(22) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
"(23) Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense.
"(24) Commissioner, Community Facilities, Housing and Home Finance Agency.
"(25) Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.
"(26) Commissioner, Public Housing Administration.
"(27) Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.
"(28) Counselor of the Department of State.
"(29) Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
"(30) Deputy Administrator of General Services.
"(31) Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
"(32) Director of the Bureau of Prisons.
"(33) Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
"(34) Director of the National Science Foundation.
"(35) Director of Selective Service.
"(36) Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.
"(37) General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.
"(38) Librarian of Congress.
"(39) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.
"(40) Public Printer.
"(41) Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(42) Under Secretary of the Army.
"(43) Under Secretary of the Navy.
"(44) Under Secretary of the Air Force.
"(45) Members of boards and commissions (excluding chairmen):
"Civil Aeronautics Board (4).
"United States Civil Service Commission (2).
"Council of Economic Advisers (2).
"Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington (3).
"Federal Communications Commission (6).
"Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1).
"Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (6).

"Federal Maritime Board (2).
"Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States (2).
"Federal Power Commission (4).
"Federal Trade Commission (4).
"Federal Home Loan Bank Board (2).
"Interstate Commerce Commission (10).
"National Labor Relations Board (4).
"National Mediation Board (2).
"Railroad Retirement Board (2).
"Renegotiation Board (4).
"Securities and Exchange Commission (4).
"Subversive Activities Control Board (4).
"Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority (2).
"United States Tariff Commission (5).

"(b) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $19,000.

"(1) Architect of the Capitol.
"(2) Assistant to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
"(3) Commissioner of the United States Court of Claims (12).
"(4) Governor of Alaska.
"(5) Governor of the Canal Zone.
"(6) Governor of Guam.
"(7) Governor of Hawaii.
"(8) Governor of the Virgin Islands.
"(9) Legal adviser, solicitor, or general counsel of an executive or military department (excluding the Department of Justice).

"(c) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $18,000 per annum.

"(1) Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission (3).

"SEC. 107. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $17,500.

"(1) Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(2) Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration.
"(3) Administrator, Farmers' Home Administration.
"(4) Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(5) Assistant Architect of the Capitol.
"(6) Assistant Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
"(7) Associate Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
"(8) Chief Assistant Librarian of Congress.
"(9) Chief Forester of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(10) Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
"(11) Commissioner of Customs.
"(12) Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration.
"(13) Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.
"(14) Commissioner of Narcotics.
"(15) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service.
"(16) Commissioner of Public Roads.
"(17) Commissioner of Reclamation.
"(18) Commissioner of Social Security.
"(19) Deputy Administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
"(20) Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service.
"(21) Deputy Public Printer.
"(22) Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture."

(b) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be $17,000 per annum.

(1) Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration (3).

(2) Treasurer of the United States.

"SEC. 108. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, the chairman or other head of each independent board or commission in the executive branch shall receive, during the period of his service as chairman or other head of such board or commission, annual basic compensation at a rate which is $500 more than the annual rate of basic compensation prescribed by this title for the other members of such board or commission.

"SEC. 109. Section 105 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President.

"'The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, and of eight other secretaries or other immediate staff assistants in the White House Office, as follows: Two at rates not exceeding $22,500 per annum, three at rates not exceeding $21,000 per annum, seven at rates not exceeding $20,000 per annum, and three at rates not exceeding $17,500 per annum.'

"SEC. 110. (a) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall receive such compensation, in addition to his pay and allowances under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, as will make his compensation equal to $20,000 per annum in addition to such allowances.

"(b) The Deputy Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall receive such compensation, in addition to his pay and allowances under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, as will make his compensation equal to $19,000 per annum in addition to such allowances.

"(c) The Director, National Institutes of Health, the Chief, Bureau of Medical Services, and the Chief, Bureau of State Services, of the Public Health Service, shall each receive such compensation, in addition to his pay and allowances under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, as will make his compensation equal to $17,500 per annum in addition to such allowances.

"SEC. 111. The annual compensation for each of the offices established by section 1 (d) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1953, effective August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 639) shall be established by the Secretary of State at a rate not more than $19,000.

"SEC. 112. Section 2 of Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 712), is amended by striking out '$12,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$15,000'.

"'18	12,500
19	13,600
20	14,800"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'18	12,800
19	14,000
20	16,000'.

"SEC. 116. Section 3 of the Act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C. 15b), is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) The last sentence of section 3 (b) is amended to read: 'During the period of his service as such, the Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of $17,800 a year.'

"(b) The last sentence of section 3 (c) is amended to read: 'During the period of his service as such, the Deputy Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of $16,800 a year.'

"(c) That portion of section 3 (d) which precedes the proviso is amended to read: 'Each Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director and shall be paid a salary of $15,800.'

"SEC. 117. (a) The first section of the Act approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, 80th Congress), as amended, relating to salary limitations on research and development positions requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel in certain departments and agencies, is amended by striking out '$10,000' and '$15,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,500' and '$19,000', respectively.

"SEC. 113. Section 527 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, approved August 26, 1954 (Public Law 665, Eighty-third Congress (68 Stat. 832)) is amended by striking out '$15,000 per annum' and inserting in lieu thereof '$19,000 per annum'.

"SEC. 114. (a) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule contained in section 603 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out:

"'GS–17	13,975	14,190	14,405	14,620
GS–18	14,800'			

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'GS–17	13,975	14,190	14,405	14,620
	14,835			
GS–18	16,000'.			

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a scheduled rate of grade 17 or 18 of the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled rate in effect on and after such date;

"(2) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate between two scheduled rates of such grade, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

"(3) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate which is in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive such higher rate of basic compensation until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such Act, as amended.

"SEC. 115. The Postal Field Service Schedule in section 301 (a) of the Act of June 10, 1955 (Public Law 68, 84th Congress), is amended by striking out:

12,800	13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300	
13,900	14,200	14,500	14,800			

13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300	14,600	
14,300	14,600	14,900	15,200			

"(b) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g)), relating to salary limitations on research and development positions requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel in the Public Health Service is amended by striking out '$10,000' and '$20,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,500' and '$19,000', respectively.

"SEC. 118. The salary amendments contained in section 116 shall not affect the authority of the Civil Service Commission or the procedure for fixing the pay of individual officers or employees under the statutes therein amended; except that the existing rate of basic compensation of any officer or employee to whom such section applies which is less than a rate of $12,500 per annum shall be increased to such rate on the effective date of this title.

"SEC. 119. Section 12 of the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U. S. C. 113a), relating to salary limitation on technical experts or scientists for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases, is hereby amended by striking out '$15,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$19,000'.

"SEC. 120. This title shall take effect at the beginning of the first pay period commencing after June 30, 1956.

"TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ORGANIZATION OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

"SEC. 201. (a) The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States', approved January 16, 1883, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 632), is amended by inserting immediately after the first paragraph thereof a paragraph as follows:

" 'The term of office of each such Commissioner shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of office of the Commissioners holding office on the effective date of this paragraph (including the term of office of an individual appointed to fill any vacancy in the Commission existing on such effective date) shall expire, as designated by the President, one at the end of two years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of six years, after such effective date; (2) any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (3) upon the expiration of his term of office a Commissioner may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.'

"(b) Such first section of such Act of January 16, 1883, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

" 'In addition to designating a Chairman of the Commission from time to time, pursuant to section 1 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1949, the President shall from time to time designate one of the Commissioners as Vice Chairman of the Commission. During the absence or disability of the Commissioner designated as Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of such Commissioner, the Commissioner designated as Vice Chairman shall perform those functions of the Chairman which were transferred to the Chairman by the provisions of section 2 (a) (2) to 2 (a) (6), inclusive, of such Reorganization Plan. During the absence or disability of both the Commissioner designated as Chairman and the Commissioner designated as Vice Chairman, or in the event of vacancies in the offices of both such Commissioners, the remaining Commissioner shall perform such functions. During the absence or disability of all three Commissioners, or in the event of vacancies in the offices of all three Commissioners, the Executive Director shall perform such functions; but the Executive Director shall at no time sit as a member or acting member of the Commission.'

"SEC. 202. (a) This section and section 201 (b) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) Section 201 (a) shall take effect on March 1, 1957.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. (a) The President shall hereafter appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a General Counsel of the Post Office Department, a General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The existing office of Solicitor of the Post Office Department and the existing offices of General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be abolished effective upon the appointment and qualification of the General Counsels of such respective departments provided for by subsection (a) or April 1, 1957, whichever is earlier.

"SEC. 302. The positions of three Deputy Administrators of the Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, shall be in grade GS–18 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by section 505 (b) of such Act.

"TITLE IV—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

"SEC. 401. The Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'Definitions

" 'SECTION 1. Wherever used in this Act—

" '(a) The term "employee" shall mean a civilian officer or employee in or under the Government and, except for purposes of section 2, shall mean a person to whom this Act applies.

" '(b) The term "Member" shall mean the Vice President, a United States Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and, except for purposes of section 2, shall mean a Member to whom this Act applies.

" '(c) The term "congressional employee" means an employee of the Senate or House of Representatives or of a committee of either House, an employee of a joint committee of the two Houses, an elected officer of the Senate or House of Representatives who is not a Member of either House, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives and the employees in their respective offices, an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and a person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, a member of the Capitol Police force, an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and an employee of a Member if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

" '(d) The term "basic salary" shall not include bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, military pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulation: *Provided*, That for employees paid on a fee basis, the maximum amount of basic salary which may be used shall be $10,000 per annum. For a Member, the term "basic salary" shall include, from April 1, 1954, to February 28, 1955, the amount received as expense allowance under section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and such amount from January 3, 1953, to March 31, 1954, provided deposit is made therefor as provided in section 4.

" '(e) The term "average salary" shall mean the largest annual rate resulting from averaging, over any period of five consecutive years of creditable service, or at a Member's option over all periods of Member service subsequent to the date of enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 used in the computation of an annuity under this Act, a Member's or an employee's rates of basic salary in effect during such period, with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect.

" '(f) The term "fund" shall mean the civil service retirement and disability fund created by the Act of May 22, 1920.

" '(g) The terms "disabled" and "disability" shall mean totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position last occupied by the employee or Member by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part within the five years next prior to becoming so disabled.

" '(h) The term "widow", for purposes of section 10, shall mean the surviving wife of an employee or Member who was married to such individual for at least two years immediately preceding his death or is the mother of issue by such marriage.

" '(i) The term "widower", for purposes of section 10, shall mean the surviving husband of an employee or Member who was married to such employee or Member for at least two years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage. The term "dependent widower", for purposes of section 10, shall mean a "widower" who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, and who received more than one-half his support from such employee or Member.

" '(j) The term "child", for purposes of section 10, shall mean an unmarried child, including (1) an adopted child, and (2) a stepchild or recognized natural child who received more than one-half his support from and lived with the Member or employee in a regular parent-child relationship, under the age of eighteen years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age eighteen is incapable of self-support.

" '(k) the term "Government" shall mean the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations and Gallaudet College, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

" '(l) The term "lump-sum credit" shall mean the unrefunded amount consisting of (1) the retirement deductions made from the basic salary of an employee or Member, (2) any sums deposited by an employee or Member covering prior service, and (3) interest on such deductions and deposits at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter compounded annually to December 31, 1956 or, in the case of an employee separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this Act before he has completed five years of civilian service or a Member separated before he has completed five years of Member service, to the date of the separation or transfer. The lump-sum credit shall not include interest if the service covered thereby aggregates one year or less, nor shall it include interest for the fractional part of a month in the total service.

" '(m) The term "Commission" shall mean the United States Civil Service Commission.

" '(n) The term "annuitant" shall mean any former employee or Member who, on the basis of his service, has met all requirements of the Act for title to annuity and has filed claim therefor.

" '(o) The term "survivor" shall mean a person who is entitled to annuity under this Act based on the service of a deceased employee or Member or of a deceased annuitant.

" '(p) The term "survivor annuitant" shall mean a survivor who has filed claim for annuity.

" '(q) The term "service" shall mean employment which is creditable under section 3.

" '(r) The term "military service" shall mean honorable active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marnne Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, but shall not include service in the National Guard except when ordered to active duty in the service of the United States.

" '(s) The term "Member service" shall mean service as a Member and shall include the period from the date of the beginning of the term for which the Member is elected or appointed to the date on which he takes office as a Member.

" 'Coverage

" 'SEC. 2. (a) This Act shall apply to each employee and Member, except as hereinafter provided.

" '(b) This Act shall not apply to the President, to any judge of the United States as defined under section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code, or to any employee of the Government subject to another retirement system for Government employees.

" '(c) This Act shall not apply to any Member or to any congressional employee until he gives notice in writing to the officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this Act.

" '(d) This Act shall not apply to any temporary congressional employee unless such employee is appointed at an annual

rate of salary and gives notice in writing to the officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this Act.

"'(e) The Commission may exclude from the operation of this Act any employee or group of employees in the executive branch of the United States Government, or of the District of Columbia government upon recommendation by its Commissioners, whose tenure of office or employment is temporary or intermittent.

"'(f) This Act shall not apply to any temporary employee of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, of the courts specified in section 610 of title 28 of the United States Code, or to construction employees or any other temporary, part-time, or intermittent employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress are authorized to exclude from the operation of this Act any employees under the office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Library of Congress, respectively, whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration.

"'(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any Executive order, this Act shall apply to each United States Commissioner whose total compensation for services rendered as United States Commissioner is not less than $3,000 in each of the last three consecutive calendar years (1) ending prior to the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 or (2) ending prior to the first day of any calendar year which begins after such effective date. For the purposes of this Act, the employment and compensation of each such United States Commissioner coming within the purview of this Act pursuant to this subsection shall be held and considered to be on a daily basis when actually employed; but nothing in this Act shall affect, otherwise than for the purposes of this Act, the basis, under applicable law other than this Act, on which such United States Commissioner is employed or on which his compensation is determined and paid.

"'Creditable service

"'SEC. 3. (a) An employee's service for the purposes of this Act including service as a substitute in the postal service shall be credited from the date of original employment to the date of the separation upon which title to annuity is based in the civilian service of the Government. Credit shall similarly be allowed for service in the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. No credit shall be allowed for any period of separation from the service in excess of three calendar days.

"'(b) An employee or Member shall be allowed credit for periods of military service prior to the date of the separation upon which title to annuity is based; however, if an employee or Member is awarded retired pay on account of military service, his military service shall not be included, unless such retired pay is awarded on account of a service-connected disability (1) incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or (2) caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in line of duty during an enlistment or employment as provided in Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), part I, paragraph I, or is awarded under title III of Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, except that for purposes of section 9 (c) (1), a Member (A) shall be allowed credit only for periods of military service not exceeding five years, plus any military service performed by the Member upon leaving his office, for the purpose of performing such service, during any war or national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress and prior to his final separation from service as Member and (B) may not receive credit for military service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retired pay under any other provision of law. Nothing in this Act shall affect the right of an employee or a Member to retired pay, pension, or compensation in addition to the annuity herein provided.

"'(c) Credit shall be allowed for leaves of absence granted an employee while performing military service or while receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended. Except for a substitute in the postal service, there shall be excluded from credit so much of any other leaves of absence without pay as may exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year.

"'(d) An employee who during the period of any war, or of any national emergency as proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, has left or leaves his position to enter the military service shall not be considered, for the purposes of this Act, as separated from his civilian position by reason of such military service, unless he shall apply for and receive a lumpsum benefit under this Act: *Provided*, That such employee shall not be considered as retaining his civilian position beyond December 31, 1956, or the expiration of five years of such military service, whichever is later.

"'(e) The total service of an employee or Member shall be the full years and twelfth parts thereof, excluding from the aggregate the fractional part of a month, if any.

"'(f) An employee must have completed at least five years of civilian service before he shall be eligible for annuity under this Act.

"'(g) An employee or Member must have, within the two-year period preceding any separation from service, other than a separation by reason of death or disability, completed at least one year of creditable civilian service during which he was subject to this Act before he or his survivors shall be eligible for annuity under this Act based on such separation. If any employee or Member, other than an employee or Member separated from the service by reason of death or disability, fails to meet the service requirement of the preceding sentence, the amounts deducted from his salary during his period of service for which no eligibility for annuity is established based on such separation shall be returned to him upon such separation. Failure to meet this service requirement shall not deprive the individual or his survivors of any annuity rights which attached upon a previous separation.

"'(h) An employee who (1) has at least five years' Member service and (2) has served as a Member at any time after August 2, 1946, shall not be allowed credit for any service which is used in the computation of an annuity under section 9 (c).

"'(i) In the case of each United States Commissioner who comes within the purview of this Act pursuant to section 2 (g) of this Act, service rendered prior to, on, or after the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 as United States Commissioner shall be credited for the purposes of this Act on the basis of one three-hundred-and-thirteenth of a year for each day on which such United States Commissioner renders service in such capacity and which is not credited for the purposes of this Act for service performed by him in any capacity other than United States Commissioner. Such credit shall not be granted for service rendered as United States Commissioner for more than three hundred and thirteen days in any one year.

"'(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any military service (other than military service covered by military leave with pay from a civilian position) performed by an individual after December 1956 shall be excluded in determining the aggregate period of service upon which an annuity payable under this Act to such individual or to his widow or child is to be based, if such individual or widow or child is entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled), at the time of such determination, to monthly old-age or survivors benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act based on such individual's wages and self-employment income. If in the case of the individual or widow such military service is not excluded under the preceding sentence, but upon attaining retirement age (as defined in section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act) he or she becomes entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) to such benefits, the Commission shall redetermine the aggregate period of service upon which such annuity is based, effective as of the first day of the month in which he or she attains such age, so as to exclude such service. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, upon the request of the Commission, inform the Commission whether or not any such individual or widow or child is entitled at any specified time to such benefits.

"'Deductions and deposits

"'SEC. 4. (a) From and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 there shall be deducted and withheld from each employee's basic salary an amount equal to 6½ per centum of such basic salary and from each Member's basic salary an amount equal to 7½ per centum of such basic salary. From and after the first day of the first day period which begins after June 30, 1957, an equal sum shall also be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for payment of his salary, pay or compensation, or in the case of an elected official, from such appropriation or fund as may be available for payment of other salaries of the same office or establishment. The amounts so deducted and withheld by each department or agency, together with the amounts so contributed, shall, in accordance with such procedures as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited by the department or agency in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund. There shall also be so credited all deposits made by employees or Members under this section. Amounts contributed under this subsection from appropriations of the Post Office Department shall not be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates.

"'(b) Each employee or Member shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular services during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this act, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary.

"'(c) Each employee or Member credited with civilian service after July 31, 1920, for which, for any reason whatsoever, no retirement deductions or deposits have been made, may deposit with interest an amount equal to the following percentages of his basic salary received for such service:

	"Percentage of basic salary	*Service period*
Employee	2½	August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926
	3½	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942
	5	July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948
	6	July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1956
	6½	After October 31, 1956
Member for Member service	2½	August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926
	3½	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942
	5	July 1, 1942, to August 1, 1946
	6	August 2, 1946, to October 31, 1956
	7½	After October 31, 1956

"'(d) Each employee or Member who has received a refund of retirement deductions under this or any other retirement system established for employees of the Government covering service for which he may be allowed credit under this Act may deposit the amount received, with interest. No credit shall be allowed for the service covered by the refund until the deposit is made.

"'(e) Interest under subsection (c) or (d) shall be computed from the midpoint of each service period included in the computation, or from the date refund was paid, to the date of deposit or commencing date of annuity, whichever is earlier. The interest shall be computed at the rate of 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter compounded annually. Such deposit may be made in one or more installments.

"'(f) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, amounts deducted under subsection (a) and deposited under subsections (c) and (d) shall be entered on individual retirement records.

"'(g) No deposit shall be required for any service prior to August 1, 1920, for periods of military service or for any service for the Panama Railroad Company prior to January 1, 1924.

"'*Mandatory separation*

"'SEC. 5. (a) Except as hereinafter provided, an employee who shall have attained the age of seventy years and completed fifteen years of service shall be automatically separated from the service. Such separation shall be effective on the last day of the month in which such employee attains the age of seventy years or completes fifteen years of service if then beyond such age, and all salary shall cease from that day.

"'(b) Each employing office shall notify each employee under its direction of the date of such separation from the service at least sixty days in advance thereof: *Provided*, That subsection (a) shall not take effect without the consent of the employee until sixty days after he has been so notified.

"'(c) The President may, by Executive order, exempt from automatic separation under this section any employee when, in his judgment, the public interest so requires.

"'(d) The automatic separation provisions of this section shall not apply to any person named in any Act of Congress providing for the continuance of such person in the service, to any Member, to any congressional employee, to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol, or to any employee in the judicial branch who has been appointed to hold office for a definite term of years.

"'(e) In the case of an employee of The Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, or an employee who is a citizen of the United States employed on the Isthmus of Panama by the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government, the provisions of this section shall apply upon his attaining the age of sixty-two years and completing fifteen years of service on the Isthmus of Panama or in the Territory of Alaska.

"'*Immediate retirement*

"'SEC. 6. (a) Any employee who attains the age of sixty years and completes thirty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"'(b) Any employee who attains the age of fifty-five years and completes thirty years of service shall, upon separation from the service prior to attainment of the age of sixty years, be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"'(c) Any employee the duties of whose position are primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, including any employee engaged in such activity who has been transferred to a supervisory or administrative position, who attains the age of fifty years and completes twenty years of service in the performance of such duties, may, if the head of his department or agency recommends his retirement and the Commission approves, voluntarily retire from the service and be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9. The head of the department or agency and the Commission shall give full consideration to the degree of hazard to which such employee is subjected in the performance of his duties, rather than the general duties of the class of the position held by such employee. The word "detention", as used in this subsection shall be construed to include the duties of—

"'(1) all employees of the Bureau of Prisons and Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated,

"'(2) all employees of the Public Health Service assigned to the field service of the Bureau of Prisons or to the field service of Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated,

"'(3) all civilian employees employed in the field services at Army or Navy disciplinary barracks or at confinement and rehabilitation facilities operated by any of the United States armed services, and

"'(4) all employees of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia, its industries and utilities,

whose duties in connection with persons in detention suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia or offenses against the punitive articles of the Uniform Code of Military Justice require frequent (as determined by the appropriate administrative authority with the concurrence of the Commission) direct contact with such persons in the detention, direction, supervision, inspection, training, employment, care, transportation, or rehabilitation of such persons.

"'(d) Any employee who completes twenty-five years of service or who attains the age of fifty years and completes twenty years of service shall upon involuntary separation from the service not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"'(e) Any employee who attains the age of sixty-two years and completes five years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"'(f) Any Member who attains the age of sixty-two years and completes five years of Member service, or who attains the age of sixty years and completes ten years of Member service, shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9. Any Member who attains the age of fifty-five years and completes thirty years of service shall, upon separation from the service prior to attainment of the age of sixty years, be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9. Any Member who completes twenty-five years of service, or who attains the age of fifty years and completes twenty years of service, shall, upon separation from the service (other than separation by resignation or expulsion), be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9. No Member or survivor of a Member shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this Act unless there shall have been deducted or deposited the amounts specified in section 4 with respect to his last five years of Member service.

"'*Disability retirement*

"'SEC. 7. (a) Any employee who completes five years of civilian service and who is found by the Commission to have become disabled shall, upon his own application or upon application by his department or agency, be retired on an annuity computed as provided in section 9. Any Member who completes five years of Member service and who is found by the Commission to have become disabled shall, upon his own application, be retired on an annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"'(b) No claim shall be allowed under this section unless the application is filed with the Commission prior to separation of the employee or Member from the service or within one year thereafter. This time limitation may be waived by the Commission for an individual who at the date of separation from service or within one year thereafter is mentally incompetent, if the application is filed with the Commission within one year from the date of restoration of such individual to competency or the appointment of a fiduciary, whichever is the earlier.

"'(c) Each annuitant retired under this section or under section 6 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, unless his disability is permanent in character, shall at the expiration of 1 year from the date of such retirement and annually thereafter, until reaching age 60, be examined under the direction of the Commission. If the annuitant fails to submit to examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability is satisfactorily established.

"'(d) If such annuitant, before reaching age 60, recovers from his disability or is restored to an earning capacity fairly comparable to the current rate of compensation of the position occupied at the time of retirement, payment of the annuity shall cease (1) upon reemployment by the Government, (2) one year from the date of the medical examination showing such recovery, or (3) one year from the date of determination that he is so restored, whichever is earliest. Earning capacity shall be deemed restored if in each of 2 succeeding calendar years the income of the annuitant from wages or self-employment or both shall equal at least 80 percent of the current rate of compensation of the position occupied immediately prior to retirement.

"'(e) If such annuitant whose annuity is discontinued under subsection (d) is not reemployed in any position included in the provisions of this act, he shall be considered, except for service credit, as having been involuntarily separated from the service for the purposes of this act as of the date of discontinuance of the disability annuity and shall, after such discontinuance, be entitled to annuity in accordance with the applicable provision of this act.

"'(f) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this act and compensation for injury or disability to himself under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, covering the same period of time. This provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either act for any part of the same period of time. Neither this provision nor any provision in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall deny to any person an annuity accruing to such person under this act on account of service rendered by him, or deny any concurrent benefit to such person under such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, on account of the death of any other person.

"'Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the right of any person entitled to an annuity under this Act shall not be affected because such person has received an award of compensation in a lump sum under section 14 of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, except that where such annuity is payable on account of the same disability for which compensation under such section has been paid, so much of such compensation as has been paid for any period extended beyond the date such annuity becomes effective, as determined by the Department of Labor, shall be refunded to the Department of Labor, to be covered into the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund. Before such person shall receive such annuity

he shall (1) refund to such Department the amount representing such commuted payments for such extended period, or (2) authorize the deduction of such amount from the annuity payable to him under this Act, which amount shall be transmitted to such Department for reimbursement to such fund. Deductions from such annuity may be made from accrued and accruing payments, or may be prorated against and paid from accruing payments in such manner as the Department of Labor shall determine, whenever it finds that the financial circumstances of the annuitant are such as to warrant such deferred refunding.

"'Deferred retirement

"'SEC. 8. (a) Any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of this Act after completing five years of civilian service may be paid an annuity beginning at the age of sixty-two years computed as provided in section 9.

"'(b) Any Member who on or after January 1, 1956, has been or is separated from the service as a Member after completing five years of Member service may hereafter be paid an annuity beginning at the age of sixty-two years, computed as provided in section 9. Any Member who is separated from the service after completing ten or more years of Member service may be paid an annuity beginning at the age of sixty years, computed as provided in section 9.

"'Computation of annuity

"'SEC. 9. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the annuity of an employee retiring under this Act shall be (1) the larger of (A) 1½ per centum of the average salary multiplied by so much of the total service as does not exceed five years, or (B) 1 per centum of the average salary, plus $25, multiplied by so much of the total service as does not exceed five years, plus (2) the larger of (A) 1¾ per centum of the average salary multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds five years but does not exceed ten years, or (B) 1 per centum of the average salary, plus $25, multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds five years but does not exceed ten years, plus (3) the larger of (A) 2 per centum of the average salary multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds ten years, or (B) 1 per centum of the average salary, plus $25, multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds ten years: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 per centum of the average salary: *Provided further*, That the annuity of an employee retiring under section 7 shall be at least (1) 40 per centum of the average salary or (2) the sum obtained under this subsection after increasing his total service by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of sixty years, whichever is the lesser, but this proviso shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"'(b) The annuity of a congressional employee retiring under this Act shall, if he so elects at the time his annuity commences, be (1) 2½ per centum of the average salary multiplied by his military service and service as a congressional employee, not exceeding a total of fifteen years, plus (2) 1½ per centum of the average salary multiplied by so much of the remainder of his total service as does not exceed five years, plus (3) 1¾ per centum of the average salary multiplied by so much of the remainder of his total service as exceeds five years but does not exceed ten years, plus (4) 2 per centum of the average salary multiplied by so much of the remainder of his total service as exceeds ten years: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 per centum of the average salary. This subsection shall not apply unless the congressional employee (1) has had at least five years' service as a congressional employee, (2) has had deductions withheld from his salary or made deposit covering his last five years of civilian service, and (3) has served as a congressional employee during the last eleven months of his civilian service: *Provided further*, That the annuity of a congressional employee retiring under section 7 shall be at least (1) 40 per centum of the average salary or (2) the sum obtained under this subsection after increasing his service as a congressional employee by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of sixty years, whichever is the lesser, but this provision shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"'(c) The annuity of a Member retiring under this Act shall be an amount equal to—

"'(1) 2½ per centum of the average salary multiplied by the total of his Member and creditable military service;

"'(2) 2½ per centum of the average salary multiplied by his total years of service, not exceeding fifteen, performed as a congressional employee prior to his separation from service as a Member, other than any such service which he may elect to exclude;

"'(3) 1½ per centum of such average salary multiplied by so much of his total service, other than service used in computing annuity under clauses (1) and (2), as does not exceed five years, performed prior to his separation from service as a Member, and other than any such service which he may elect to exclude;

"'(4) 1¾ per centum of such average salary multiplied by so much of his total service, other than service used in computing annuity under clauses (1) and (2), as exceeds five years but does not exceed ten years, performed prior to his separation from service as a Member, and other than any such service which he may elect to exclude; and

"'(5) 2 per centum of such average salary multiplied by so much of his total service, other than service used in computing annuity under clauses (1) and (2), as exceeds ten years, performed prior to his separation from service as a Member, and other than any such service which he may elect to exclude.

In no case shall an annuity computed under this subsection exceed 80 per centum of the basic salary that he is receiving at the time of such separation from the service, and in no case shall the annuity of a Member retiring under section 7 be less than (A) 40 per centum of the average salary or (B) the sum obtained under this subsection after increasing his Member service by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of sixty years, whichever is the lesser, but this provision shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"'(d) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee retiring under section 6 (b) or 6 (d) or a Member retiring under the first or second sentence of section 6 (f), shall be reduced by one-twelfth of 1 per centum for each full month not in excess of sixty, and one-sixth of 1 per centum for each full month in excess of sixty, such employee or Member is under the age of sixty years at date of separation.

"'(e) The annuity of an employee retiring under section 6 (c) shall be 2 per centum of the average salary multiplied by the total service: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 per centum of the average salary.

"'(f) The annuity as hereinbefore provided shall be reduced by 10 per centum of any deposit described in section 4 (c) remaining unpaid, unless the employee or Member shall elect to eliminate the service involved for purposes of annuity computation.

"'(g) Any employee or Member retiring under section 6, 7, or 8 may at the time of retirement elect a reduced annuity, in lieu of the annuity as hereinbefore provided, and designate in writing his wife or husband to receive an annuity after the retired individual's death computed as provided in section 10 (a) (1). The annuity of the employee or Member making such election, excluding any increase because of retirement under section 7, shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of so much of the portion thereof designated under section 10 (a) (1) as does not exceed $2,400 and by 10 per centum of so much of the portion so designated as exceeds $2,400.

"'(h) Any unmarried employee or Member retiring under section 6 or 8, and found by the Commission to be in good health, may at the time of retirement elect a reduced annuity, in lieu of the annuity as hereinbefore provided, and designate in writing a person having an insurable interest in the employee or Member to receive an annuity after the retired individual's death. The annuity payable to the employee or Member making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in section 9 and by 5 per centum of an annuity so computed for each full five years the person designated is younger than the retiring employee or Member, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum.

"'(i) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee who is a citizen of the United States, shall be increased by $36 multiplied by total service in the employ of either the Alaska Engineering Commission or The Alaska Railroad in the Territory of Alaska between March 12, 1914, and July 1, 1923, or in the employ of either the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama between May 4, 1904, and April 1, 1914.

"'Survivor annuities

"'SEC. 10. (a) (1) If a Member or employee dies after having retired under any provision of this Act and is survived by a wife or husband designated under section 9 (g) such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 per centum of so much of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 9, as may apply with respect to the annuitant, as is designated in writing for such purpose by such Member or employee at the time he makes the election provided for by section 9 (g).

"'(2) An annuity computed under this subsection shall begin on the first day of the month in which the retired employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon the survivor's death or remarriage.

"'(b) The annuity of a survivor designated under section 9 (h) shall be 50 per centum of the reduced annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), and (h) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the annuitant. The annuity of such survivor shall begin on the first day of the month in which the retired employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon the survivor's death.

"'(c) If an employee dies after completing at least five years of civilian service, or a Member dies after completing at least five years of Member service, the widow or dependent widower of such employee or Member shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (e), and (f) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the employee or Member. The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall begin on the first day of the month after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon death or remarriage of the widow or widower, or upon the widower's becoming capable of self-support.

"'(d) If an employee dies after completing five years of civilian service or a Member dies after completing five years of Member service, or an employee or a Member dies after having retired under any provision of

the Act, and is survived by a wife or by a husband, each surviving child who received more than one-half of his support from such employee or Member shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 40 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $600, or (3) $1,800 divided by the number of children. If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $720, or (3) $2,160 divided by the number of children. The child's annuity shall begin on the first day of the month after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon (1) his attaining age 18 unless incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after age 18, (3) his marriage, or (4) his death. Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the annuity of the child, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child had not survived the employee or Member.

"'(e) In case a Member separated from service with title to a deferred annuity under this Act, either prior to, on, or after the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956, shall hereafter die before having established a valid claim for annuity and is survived by a wife or husband to whom married at date of separation, such surviving wife or husband (1) shall be paid an annuity equal to one-half of the deferred annuity of such Member beginning the first day of the month following the death of such Member and terminating upon the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or husband or (2) may elect to receive a lump sum credit in lieu of annuity if such wife or husband is the person who would be entitled to the lump-sum credit and files application therefor with the Commission prior to the award of such annuity.

"'*Lump-sum benefits*

"'SEC. 11. (a) Any employee or Member who is separated from the service, or is transferred to a position wherein he does not continue subject to this Act, shall be paid the lump-sum credit provided his separation or transfer occurs and application for payment is filed with the Commission at least thirty-one days before the earliest commencing date of any annuity for which he is eligible. The receipt of payment of the lump-sum credit by the individual shall void all annuity rights under this Act, unless and until he shall be reemployed in the service subject to this Act. This subsection shall also apply to any employee or Member separated prior to the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 after completing at least twenty years of civilian service.

"'(b) Each present or former employee or Member may, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries for the purposes of this Act.

"'(c) Lump-sum benefits authorized under subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section shall be paid in the following order of precedence to such person or persons surviving the employee or Member and alive at the date title to the payment arises, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"'First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated by the employee or Member in a writing received in the Commission prior to his death;

"'Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of the employee or Member;

"'Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of the employee or Member and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"'Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of the employee or Member or the survivor of them;

"'Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of the employee or Member;

"'Sixth, if none of the above, to other next of kin of the employee or Member as may be determined by the Commission to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of the individual at the time of his death.

"'(d) If an employee or Member dies (1) without a survivor, or (2) with a survivor or survivors and the right of all survivors shall terminate before claim for survivor annuity is filed, or if a former employee or Member not retired dies, the lump-sum credit shall be paid.

"'(e) If all annuity rights under this Act based on the service of a deceased employee or Member shall terminate before the total annuity paid equals the lump-sum credit, the difference shall be paid.

"'(f) If an annuitant dies, any annuity accrued and unpaid shall be paid.

"'(g) Any annuity accrued and unpaid upon the termination (other than by death) of the annuity of any annuitant or survivor annuitant shall be paid to such person. Any survivor annuity accrued and unpaid upon the death of any survivor annuitant shall be paid in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"'First, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of the survivor annuitant;

"'Second, if there is no such executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of thirty days from the date of death of such survivor annuitant, to such next of kin of the survivor annuitant as may be determined by the Commission to be entitled under the laws of the survivor annuitant's domicile at the time of his death.

"'*Additional annuities*

"'SEC. 12. (a) Any employee or Member may, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, voluntarily contribute additional sums in multiples of $25, but the total may not exceed 10 per centum of his basic salary for his creditable service from and after August 1, 1920. The voluntary contribution account in each case shall be the sum of such unrefunded contributions, plus interest at 3 per centum per annum compounded annually to date of separation or transfer to a position not within the purview of this Act or, in case of an individual who is separated with title to a deferred annuity and does not claim the voluntary contribution account, to the commencing date fixed for such deferred annuity or date of death, whichever is earlier.

"'(b) Such voluntary contribution account shall be used to purchase at retirement an annuity in addition to the annuity otherwise provided. For each $100 in such voluntary contribution account, the additional annuity shall consist of $7, increased by 20 cents for each full year, if any, such employee or Member is over the age of fifty-five years at the date of retirement.

"'(c) A retiring employee or Member may elect a reduced additional annuity in lieu of the additional annuity described in subsection (b) and designate in writing a person to receive after his death an annuity of 50 per centum of his reduced additional annuity. The additional annuity of the employee or Member making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum, and by 5 per centum for each full five years the person designated is younger than the retiring employee or Member, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum.

"'(d) Any employee or Member who is separated from the service before becoming eligible for immediate or deferred annuity or who transfers to a position wherein he does not continue subject to this Act shall be paid the voluntary contribution account. Any employee or Member who is separated from the service after becoming eligible for a deferred annuity under section 8 may elect to receive, in lieu of additional annuity, the voluntary contribution account, provided his separation occurs and application for payment is filed with the Commission at least thirty-one days before the commencing date of annuity.

"'(e) If any present or former employee or Member not retired dies, the voluntary contribution account shall be paid under the provisions of section 11 (c). If all additional annuities or any right thereto based on the voluntary contribution account of a deceased employee or Member terminate before the total additional annuity paid equals such account, the difference shall be paid under the provisions of section 11 (c).

"'*Reemployment of annuitants*

"'SEC. 13. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an annuitant heretofore or hereafter retired under this Act shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer.

"'(b) If an annuitant under this Act (other than (1) a disability annuitant whose annuity is terminated by reason of his recovery or restoration of earning capacity, (2) an annuitant whose annuity was based upon an involuntary separation from the service, excluding a separation under the automatic separation provisions of this Act, or (3) a Member retired under this Act) hereafter becomes employed, or on the date of enactment of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 is serving, in an appointive or elective position, his service on and after the date he was or is so employed shall be covered by this Act. No deductions for the fund shall be withheld from his salary, but there shall be deducted from his salary, except for lump-sum leave payment purposes under the Act of December 21, 1944, a sum equal to the annuity allocable to the period of actual employment, and this provision concerning the lump-sum leave payments shall also be effective in the case of each retired employee separated from reemployment after December 15, 1953, and before the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956: *Provided*, That if such annuitant serves on a full-time basis for at least one year in employment not excluding him under section 2 (b) from coverage, (1) his annuity upon termination of employment shall be increased by an annuity computed under subsections (a), (b), (d), (e), and (f) of section 9 as may apply based upon the period of and the basic salary (before deduction) averaged during such employment, and (2) his lump-sum credit shall not be reduced by annuity paid during such employment. The employment of an annuitant under this subsection shall not operate to create an annuity for or in any manner affect the annuity of any survivor.

"'(c) If a Member heretofore or hereafter retired under this Act hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such employment and resumed in the same amount upon termination of such employment: *Provided*, That if such retired Member takes office as Member and gives notice as provided in section 2 (c), his service as Member during such period shall be credited in determining his right to and the amount of his subsequent annuity: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to a Member appointed by the President of the United States to a position not requiring confirmation by the Senate.

"'Payment of benefits

"'SEC. 14. (a) Each annuity is stated as an annual amount, one-twelfth of which, fixed at the nearest dollar, accrues monthly and is payable on the first business day of the month after it accrues.

"'(b) Except as otherwise provided, the annuity of an employee shall commence on the first of the month after separation from the service, or on the first of the month after salary ceases provided the employee meets the service and the age or disability requirements for title to annuity at that time. The annuity of a Member or of an elected officer of the Senate or House of Representatives shall commence on the day following the day on which salary shall cease provided the person entitled to such annuity meets the service and the age or disability requirements for title to annuity at that time. The annuity of an employee or Member under section 8 shall commence on the first of the month after the occurrence of the event on which payment of the annuity is based.

"'(c) An annuity shall terminate on the last day of the month preceding the month in which death or any other terminating event provided in this Act occurs.

"'(d) Any person entitled to annuity from the fund may decline to accept all or any part of such annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commission. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect.

"'(e) Where any payment is due a minor, or a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate: *Provided*, That where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, payment may be made to any person who in the judgment of the Commission is responsible for the care of the claimant, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"'Exemption from legal processes

"'SEC. 15. (a) None of the moneys mentioned in this Act shall be assignable, either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no recovery of any payments under this Act from any person when, in the judgment of the Commission, such person is without fault and such recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience; nor shall there be any withholding of recovery of any moneys mentioned in this Act on account of any certification or payment made by any former employee of the United States in the discharge of his official duties unless the head of the department or agency on behalf of which the certification or payment was made certifies to the Commission that such certification or payment involved fraud on the part of such employee.

"'Administration

"'SEC. 16. (a) This Act shall be administered by the Commission. Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to perform, or cause to be performed, any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this Act into full force and effect.

"'(b) Applications under this Act shall be in such form as the Commission shall prescribe, and shall be supported by such certificates from departments or agencies as the Commission may deem necessary to the determination of the rights of applicants. The Commission shall adjudicate all claims under this Act.

"'(c) Questions of dependency and disability arising under this Act shall be determined by the Commission and its decisions with respect to such matters shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review. The Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the disability or dependency of any person receiving or applying for annuity under this Act, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any such examination.

"'(d) An appeal to Commission shall lie from any administrative action or order affecting the rights or interests of any person or of the United States under this Act, the procedure on appeal to be prescribed by the Commission.

"'(e) Fees for examinations made under the provisions of this Act, by physicians or surgeons who are not medical officers of the United States, shall be fixed by the Commission, and such fees, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in connection with such examinations, shall be paid out of the appropriations for the cost of administering this Act.

"'(f) The Commission shall publish an annual report upon the operations of this Act and shall include in each such report a statement with respect to the status of the fund on a normal cost plus interest basis.

"'(g) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to select three actuaries, to be known as the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System. It shall be the duty of such Board to report annually upon the actuarial status of the system and to furnish its advice and opinion on matters referred to it by the Commission, and it shall have the authority to recommend to the Commission and to the Congress such changes as in the Board's judgment may be deemed necessary to protect the public interest and maintain the system upon a sound financial basis. The Commission shall keep or cause to be kept such records as it deems necessary for making periodic actuarial valuations of the Civil Service Retirement System, and the Board shall make such valuations at intervals of five years, or oftener if deemed necessary by the Commission. The compensation of the members of the Board of Actuaries, exclusive of such members as are in the employ of the United States, shall be fixed by the Commission.

"'Civil service retirement and disability fund

"'SEC. 17. (a) The fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of benefits as provided in this Act.

"'(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to accept and credit to the fund moneys received in the form of donations, gifts, legacies, or bequests, or otherwise contributed for the benefit of civil-service employees generally.

"'(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately invest in interest-bearing securities of the United States, such currently available portions of the fund as are not immediately required for payments from the fund, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of the fund.

"'(d) The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of public-debt obligations for purchase by the fund. Such obligations issued for purchase by the fund shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of five years from the date of original issue; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such average rate. Such obligations shall be issued for purchase by the fund only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase in the market of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest.

"'(e) The Commission shall submit estimates of the appropriations necessary to finance the fund on a normal cost plus interest basis and to continue this Act in full force and effect.

"'Short title

"'SEC. 18. This act may be cited as the "Civil Service Retirement Act".'

"Members of faculty of Naval Academy

"SEC. 402. (a) On and after the effective date of this title persons employed as members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School shall be included within the terms of the Civil Service Retirement Act, and on and after that date the Act of January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092), as amended, shall not apply to such persons.

"(b) In lieu of the deposit prescribed by section 4 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, an employee who by virtue of subsection (a) is included within the terms of such Act shall deposit, for service rendered prior to the effective date of this title as a member of the civilian faculty of the United States Naval Academy or of the United States Naval Postgraduate School, a sum equal to so much of the repurchase price of his annuity policy carried as required by the Act of January 16, 1936, as amended, as is based on the monthly allotments which were registered with the Navy Allotment Office toward the purchase of that annuity, the deposit to be made within six months after the effective date of this title. Should the deposit not be made within that period no credit shall be allowed under the Civil Service Retirement Act for service rendered as a member of the civilian faculty of the United States Naval Academy or of the United States Naval Postgraduate School subsequent to July 31, 1920, and prior to the effective date of this title. If the deposit is made, such service shall be held and considered to be service during which the employee was subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act.

"Continuation of prior rights

"SEC. 403. Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this title shall not apply in the case of employees or Members retired or otherwise separated prior to its effective date, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if this title had not been enacted. In the case of any Member heretofore separated with title to an annuity under the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the annuity of such Member and of any survivor of such Member shall be computed, and shall be paid only from and after the effective date of this title, as if the Act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 692), had been in effect on the date of the separation of such Member.

"Vice President

"SEC. 404. In the case of any person holding the office of Vice President on the effective date of this title, service performed in such office shall be considered service during which he was subject to the Civil Service

Retirement Act for the purpose of section 3 (g) thereof.

"Forfeiture of annuities of persons remaining outside United States to avoid prosecution

"SEC. 405. The Act entitled 'An Act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes', approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1142), is amended by adding at the end of section 2 thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(c) In any case in which, after the date of enactment of this subsection, any person under indictment for any offense within the purview of the first section of this Act willfully remains outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, for a period in excess of one year with knowledge of such indictment, no annuity or retired pay shall be paid, for any period subsequent to the end of such one-year period to such person or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, on the basis of the service of such person, as an officer or employee of the Government unless and until a nolle prosequi to the entire indictment is entered upon the record or such person returns and thereafter the indictment is dismissed or after trial by court the accused is found not guilty of the offense or offenses charged in the indictment.'

"Effective date

"SEC. 406. This title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Short title

"SEC. 407. This title may be cited as the 'Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956.'

"TITLE V—ADDITIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

"SEC. 501. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the Act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress), as amended, are amended to read as follows: '(a) the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than one hundred and twenty positions in the Department of Defense and not more than twenty-five positions in the National Security Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, as the case may be, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"'(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed thirty positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.'

"(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made to such Act of August 1, 1947, by subsection (a) of this section shall affect any position existing under authority of subsection (a) of the first section of such Act of August 1, 1947, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under authority of subsection (a) of such first section of such Act of August 1, 1947, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 502. Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Subject to subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to establish and, from time to time, revise the maximum numbers of positions (not to exceed twelve hundred and twenty-six) which may be in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule at any one time, except that under such authority such maximum number of positions shall not exceed three hundred and twenty-nine for grade 17 and one hundred and thirty for grade 18.'

"SEC. 503. (a) The United States Civil Service Commission, the Librarian of Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, respectively, with respect to those positions within the purview of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), respectively, of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the appropriate authority, with respect to those positions under jurisdiction of such authority which are allocated to or placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (including such positions so allocated or placed on a temporary or present incumbency basis), under any provision of law (including any reorganization plan) other than the above-specified subsections, which is in effect on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, shall submit, so long as such provision of law or reorganization plan remains in effect, to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

"(1) the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in all of such grades during the immediately preceding calendar year, the total number of such positions allocated to or placed in each of such grades during such immediately preceding calendar year, and the total number of such positions in existence during such immediately preceding calendar year and the grades to or in which such total number of positions in existence are allocated or placed,

"(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position, title and a statement of the duties and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent,

"(3) the position or positions in or outside the Federal Government held by each such incumbent, and his rate or rates of compensation, during the five-year period immediately preceding the date of appointment of each such incumbent to such position, and

"(4) such other information as the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority submitting such report may deem appropriate or which may be required by the Congress or a committee thereof.

"Nothing contained in this subsection shall require the resubmission of any information required under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection which has been reported pursuant to this subsection and which remains unchanged.

"(b) In any instance in which the Commission, officer, or other appropriate authority so required to submit such report may find full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security, such Commission, officer, or authority is authorized—

"(1) to omit in such annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is found to be detrimental to the national security,

"(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

"(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present all information concerning such items.

"And the Senate agree to the same."

TOM MURRAY,
EDWARD H. REES,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
FRANK CARLSON,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

The conference substitute consists of five titles:

(1) Title I. Executive Pay
(2) Title II. Terms of Civil Service Commissioners and Succession to Duties of Chairman
(3) Title III. Miscellaneous Provisions
(4) Title IV. Civil Service Retirement
(5) Title V. Scientific and Professional Positions

The House bill related only to executive pay.

TITLE I. EXECUTIVE PAY

Title I of the conference substitute establishes salary levels for Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and other executives of the Federal Government generally conforming to the salary levels for such officials provided by the bill as passed by the House. The salary levels for Cabinet officers ($25,000), for the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General ($22,500), and for the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force ($22,000), are the same as in the House bill.

Principal differences in the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House are: (1) Chairmen of major boards and commissions are in salary level of $20,500 under the conference substitute, compared to levels of $19,500 and $20,000 in the House bill and (2) Assistant Secretaries of executive and military departments (including Assistant Postmasters General), administrators of certain bureaus and agencies, and members of major boards and commissions are placed in the $20,000 salary level under the conference substitute, compared to a salary level of $19,000 in the House bill. The salaries of governors of Territories and possessions are placed at $19,000 under the conference substitute.

The conference substitute establishes a proper alinement between salaries of Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and the heads of the various agencies, independent establishments, and bureaus in accordance with the level of the duties and responsibilities of such positions.

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of specified numbers of ad-

ministrative assistants and other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office. The conferees on the part of the House agreed to the total number of such positions as contained in the Senate amendment, and the conference substitute approves such positions without regard to the assignment and distribution thereof.

In accordance with the bill as passed by the House, the conference substitute increases the maximum salaries under the Classification Act of 1949 (grade GS–18) and under the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (salary level 20) from $14,800 to $16,000, with appropriate adjustments in salary steps for the immediate lower grade and levels provided in those acts. Maximum salaries for chief medical officers and assistants in the Veterans' Administration are increased, under the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House, to maintain the existing relationship between such salaries and the salaries of other Government officials and of classified and postal field service positions.

TITLE II. TERMS OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS AND SUCCESSION TO DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

Title II of the conference substitute establishes 6-year, staggered terms of office for United States Civil Service Commissioners; provides for designation by the President of a Vice Chairman of the Commission; and provides a line of succession to perform the duties and responsibilities of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission by the Vice Chairman, in the absence of the Chairman, and by the other member of the Commission in the absence of the Chairman and Vice Chairman. The bill as passed by the House contained no such provision. However, this provision of the conference substitute is identical to the recommendation of the House committee in House Report No. 1844 with respect to the terms of office of Civil Service Commissioners and succession to the responsibilities of Chairman of the Commission in his absence.

TITLE III. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title III of the conference substitute provides for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of a General Counsel of the Post Office Department, a General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to replace the existing offices of the chief legal officers of such Departments, which will be abolished. The House bill contained no such provision.

The Senate amendment authorized the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to place a total of 4 positions in grade GS–18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, and provided that the positions of 7 directors of commodity offices, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, shall be in grade GS–16 of such schedule. The bill as passed by the House contained no such provisions. The conference substitute does not contain such provisions, but increases by 11 positions the total number of supergrade positions which a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to place in appropriate grades of the general schedule. It is the understanding of the committee on conference that the Civil Service Commission will immediately consider the 11 positions in question to determine if they merit these grades.

Three positions allocated by the Senate bill in grade 18 for deputy administrators for the Agricultural Research Service are contained in the conference substitute. The bill as passed by the House contained no such provision.

TITLE IV. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

The conference substitute contains a complete revision of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The House bill contained no such provision.

The conference substitute greatly liberalizes retirement benefits of Federal employees. The cost to the Government of the added benefits is estimated at $310 million a year. The major new employee benefits provided by the conference substitute are:

Annuities will be computed at (a) 2 percent of the high average salary multiplied by all years of service in excess of 10 plus 1½ percent of such salary multiplied by the first 5 years of service, plus 1¾ percent of the years of service from 5 to 10, or (b) 1 percent of high average salary, plus $25, multiplied by total years of service, whichever is greater. Under present law annuities are computed on the basis of 1½ percent of high average salary, or 1 percent of such salary plus $25, multiplied by total years of service, whichever is greater.

The annuity of an employee electing a survivor annuity will be reduced by 2½ percent of the first $2,400 and 10 percent of the balance. The present reduction is 5 percent of the first $1,500 and 10 percent of the balance.

Optional retirement is authorized at age 62 after 5 years of service, with the right to elect survivor benefits. Present law provides an annuity after 5 years of service, but requires 15 years of service for election of survivor benefits.

The present right to retire on a reduced annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service is continued.

The reduction factor for retirement before reaching age 60 is changed from 3 percent a year to 1 percent for each year the retiring employee is under age 60 and 2 percent for each year under age 55.

Disability benefits are liberalized by providing a minimum of 40 percent of the average salary, or the annuity which would have been earned at age 60, whichever is the lesser.

An annuity is granted upon involuntary separation after attaining the age of 50 years with 20 years of service, and the existing provision for annuity upon involuntary separation after 25 years of service, regardless of age, is continued.

Upon death of an employee after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee, the surviving widow or widower will receive an annuity equal to 50 percent of the earned annuity of the decedent, beginning the first month after such death.

Survivor annuities of children of an employee who dies after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee who dies, are increased by an average of 150 percent.

An annuitant who is reemployed and serves at least 1 full-time year on active duty in a position covered by the Retirement Act will receive an annuity based on his reemployed service as well as his annuity based on the original retirement. Any lump-sum leave credit will not be reduced by reason of annuity paid to him during reemployment.

Members of the civilian faculties of the Naval Academy and Naval Postgraduate School, and United States commissioners who meet certain tests of minimum compensation and service, are brought into the civil service retirement system.

Status of civil-service retirement fund

In the judgment of the managers on the part of the House, the conference substitute is both generous and realistic. It provides greatly liberalized retirement benefits and at the same time improves the financial soundness of the civil-service retirement fund.

The financial condition of the retirement fund has deeply concerned the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for some time past. Recommendations of the committee based on its extensive study of methods of financing the fund were presented to the House and printed in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress.

The committee found that there are three essentials to proper financing of the retirement fund. They are (1) employee contributions to the fund in amounts related to benefits provided and to recognized standards for a staff annuity system, (2) equal contributions to the fund by the Government as a payroll cost of each department and agency, and (3) appropriations by the Government to the fund in amounts which, when added to such contributions by the employees and matching contributions by the Government, will place in the fund each year the sum required to maintain it on a "normal cost plus interest" basis.

The normal cost plus interest basis for financing the retirement fund is defined in the conference substitute. In brief, it requires appropriations to the retirement fund each year to cover that part of the Government's share of accrued normal costs for the current year which are not met by the matching contributions of the departments and agencies and, in addition, interest on the past deficiency of the fund. When added to the contributions of the employees and of the departments and agencies, such appropriations will maintain the fund on a sound basis and the present deficit ($13,435,000,000 at June 30, 1955) will not be further increased.

The Civil Service Commission estimates that upon approval of the conference substitute an appropriation of approximately $555 million will be required each fiscal year to maintain the retirement fund on a normal cost plus interest basis. The fund also will receive $582 million from employee deductions and a like amount from contributions by the departments and agencies.

The normal cost plus interest method of financing the retirement fund is recommended by the board of actuaries of the civil service retirement and disability fund, by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel (created by Public Law 555, 82d Cong., to study all Federal retirement systems) and by independent actuarial and retirement authorities. It is the traditional basis of appropriation estimates by the Civil Service Commission for financing the fund.

It is emphasized that the major portion of the past deficiency, on which the Government pays interest, results from two factors—first, the "starting load" when the retirement system was first established, that is, the requirement to pay annuities based on long periods of service during which little or no contributions were made by the employees being retired under the system, and second, numerous increases in benefits throughout the years since with no accompanying provision for adequate financing. This condition necessitates the adoption of a firm basis for financing the retirement fund which will prevent further increase in the deficiency. The conference substitute contains the three essentials for financing the retirement fund on a normal cost plus interest basis, which will accomplish this purpose. It requires employees' contributions of 6½ percent of salary and matching contributions by the departments and agencies. It directs the Civil Service Commission to submit annual estimates of appropriations necessary to finance the fund on a normal cost plus interest basis and to continue the retirement system in full force and effect.

These and certain other fiscal adjustments provided by the conference substitute will greatly strengthen the financing of the retirement fund and assure its soundness in the future. The benefits granted by the conference substitute are the maximum benefits that could be granted Federal employees within the limits of sound financing.

The conference substitute authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish not more than 120 scientific and professional positions

(in lieu of 45 now authorized) in the Department of Defense and not more than 25 such positions in the National Security Agency, to carry out research and development functions relating to national defense and military and naval medicine. It authorizes the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to establish 30 such positions in his agency. A salary range of $12,500 to $19,000 is established for such positions by title I of the conference substitute. The bill as passed by the House contained no such provision. However, the House in this Congress already has passed H. R. 11040, to create a substantially larger number of such positions. It is expected that the need for additional positions of this type will be reexamined early in the next Congress.

The conference substitute also increases, from 1,200 to 1,226, the maximum number of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule in the Classification Act of 1949 which a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to establish in accordance with that act. The existing provision for reports by the Civil Service Commission to Congress on the total number of such positions and the number thereof in each supergrade, contained in the Senate amendment, is replaced in the conference substitute by a requirement for reports to Congress by the Commission, and by other authorities authorized to establish like positions, setting forth, in addition to such information, information with respect to qualifications of incumbents of these positions and other information that is deemed appropriate or required by the Congress or a committee thereof.

The language in the conference substitute is identical to many sections of S. 2875, as reported to the House, and in other respects to the language contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. In this respect attention is directed to a more complete analysis in House Report No. 2854 and Senate Report No. 1787, reports on S. 2875.

TOM MURRAY,
EDWARD H. REES,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement represents one of the most substantial liberalizations of the Federal employees retirement system. Annuities of present employees and their widows will be increased by about 25 percent and those of children by 150 percent.

The last major revision of the Federal employees retirement system was made in 1948, in the 80th Congress, at which time I had the honor to be chairman of the committee that developed many of the programs which this piece of legislation improves. In 1948, for the first time we provided survivors' benefits for widows and children of Federal employees. Before that time there had been no survivor benefits for children and widows of Federal employees. These benefits are greatly liberalized by this legislation.

Under this bill a retiring employee may provide an annuity for his widow by merely taking a reduction of 2½ percent on the first $2,400 of his annuity and 10 percent on all above that as compared to the present 5 percent on the first $1,500 and 10 percent on all over that.

One of the major improvements made by this legislation is a revision of the formula for computing the annuity of those Federal employees who are retiring. Today an employee receives 1½ percent on highest 5-year average salary multiplied by his years of service. Under the bill he will receive 1½ percent for the first 5 years, 1¾ percent for the next 5 years, and 2 percent for the remainder of his service.

Another major benefit in the bill affects those employees who retire at ages less than 60. Presently the reduction formula for each year under 60 is 3 percent per year. Under the bill it will be 1 percent for each year under 60, and 2 percent for each year under 55.

Another major benefit is a provision for a minimum annuity of 40 percent of an employee's average annual salary if retired for disability regardless of age.

Still another provision will permit an employee with 20 years service and age 50 to receive an immediate annuity if involuntarily separated. The retirement at 25 years at any age at involuntary separation is retained. This provision is particularly important because it permits employees with 20 years' service at age 50 to retire and retain their Government insurance at the full face value until age 65 with no cost to them. The 30-year, age 55 retirement provision in present law is retained in the conference bill.

The bill (S. 2875) which the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported last week with language I drafted, while not considered by the House as a whole, was very beneficial in the conference. A large portion of its language, provisions and policies is contained in the conference bill.

I can assure the Members that the employees will be pleased with the provisions of this bill. If you could have seen the smiles and congratulations coming from the officials of the employee organizations you would surely appreciate their satisfaction with its provisions.

I can assure the Members that all provisions of this bill have been thoroughly considered in conference. I firmly believe that it is a good bill and represents a major advance in the modernization of laws affecting all Federal employees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on H. R. 7619 contains a number of major bills added to a bill which passed the House last session and which was limited to the adjustment of the rates of compensation for the heads of the executive departments and agencies.

The Senate added four more titles in addition to executive pay, as follows:

Title I, executive pay.

Title II, terms of Civil Service Commissioners and succession to duties of Chairman.

Title III, miscellaneous provisions.

Title IV, civil-service retirement.

Title V, scientific and professional positions.

I will discuss the major points contained in the conference agreement consecutively as they appear in the bill.

Title I relates to executive pay. It establishes salary levels for Cabinet officers at $25,000 per annum, for the Under Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Director, Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General at $22,500, and for the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force at $22,000.

Salaries for the chairmen of major boards and commissions is placed at $20,500, Assistant Secretaries of executive and military departments, including Assistant Postmasters General, administrators of certain bureaus and agencies, and members of major boards and commissions at $20,000, and salaries of governors of Territories and possessions at $19,000 per annum.

The conference agreement establishes a proper alinement between salaries of Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, and the heads of the various agencies, independent establishments, and bureaus in accordance with the level of the duties and responsibilities of such positions.

It also increases the maximum salaries under the Classification Act of 1949—GS–18—and under the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955—salary level 20—from $14,800 to $16,000, with appropriate adjustments in salary steps for the immediate lower grade and levels provided in those acts.

Maximum salaries for chief medical officers and assistants in the Veterans' Administration are increased to maintain the existing relationship between their salaries and the salaries of other Government officials and of classified and postal field service positions.

Title II establishes the terms of Civil Service Commissioners as a 6-year staggered term of office and also provides for a line of succession to the Chairmanship through the other Commissioners in the absence of the Chairman.

Title III provides for the appointment by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, of General Counsels of the Post Office Department, Department of Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to replace the existing offices of the chief legal officers of those Departments.

Title IV contains a complete revision of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. It liberalizes retirement benefits of Federal employees. The cost to the Government of the added ben-

efits is estimated at $345 million a year, $35 million of which will be absorbed as the net result of increased employees' contributions. The major new employee benefits provided by the conference agreement are:

At the present time, civil service annuities are based upon 1½ percent of the highest average annual salary over a period of 5 consecutive years times the total years of service. This bill will change that formula so that it will be 1½ percent for the first 5 years of service, 1¾ percent for the next 5 years of service, and 2 percent for the remainder, multiplied by the years of service.

The annuity of an employee electing a survivor annuity will be reduced by 2½ percent of the first $2,400 and 10 percent of the balance. The present reduction is 5 percent of the first $1,500 and 10 percent of the balance.

Optional retirement is authorized at age 62 after 5 years of service, with the right to elect survivor benefits. Present law provides an annuity after 5 years of service, but requires 15 years of service for election of survivor benefits.

The present right to retire on a reduced annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service is continued.

The reduction factor for retirement before reaching age 60 is changed from 3 percent a year to 1 percent for each year the retiring employee is under age 60 and 2 percent for each year under age 55.

Disability benefits are liberalized by providing a minimum of 40 percent of the average salary, or the annuity which would have been earned at age 60, whichever is the lesser.

An annuity is granted upon involuntary separation after attaining the age of 50 years with 20 years of service, and the existing provision for annuity upon involuntary separation after 25 years of service, regardless of age, is continued.

Upon death of an employee after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee, the surviving widow or widower will receive an annuity equal to 50 percent of the earned annuity of the decedent, beginning the first month after such death.

Survivor annuities of children of an employee who dies after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee who dies, are increased by an average of 150 percent.

An annuitant who is reemployed and serves at least 1 full-time year on active duty in a position covered by the Retirement Act will receive an annuity based on his reemployed service as well as his annuity based on the original retirement. Any lump-sum leave credit will not be reduced by reason of annuity paid to him during reemployment.

Members of the civilian faculties of the Naval Academy and Naval Postgraduate School, and United States Commissioners who meet certain tests of minimum compensation and service, are brought into the civil-service retirement system. Contributions of the employees will be 6½ percent and Members 7½ percent.

STATUS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

In the judgment of the managers on the part of the House, the conference agreement is both generous and realistic. It provides liberalized retirement benefits and at the same time improves the financial soundness of the civil-service retirement fund.

The financial condition of the retirement fund has deeply concerned the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for some time past. Recommendations of the committee based on its extensive study of methods of financing the fund were presented to the House and printed in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress.

The committee found that there are three essentials to proper financing of the retirement fund. They are, first, employee contributions to the fund in amounts related to benefits provided and to recognized standards for a staff annuity system; second, equal contributions to the fund by the Government as a payroll cost of each department and agency; and, third, appropriations by the Government to the fund in amounts which, when added to such contributions by the employees and matching contributions by the Government, will place in the fund each year the sum required to maintain it on a normal cost-plus-interest basis.

The normal cost-plus-interest basis for financing the retirement fund is defined in the conference agreement. In brief, it requires appropriations to the retirement fund each year to cover that part of the Government's share of accrued normal costs for the current year which are not met by the matching contributions of the departments and agencies and, in addition, interest on the past deficiency of the fund. When added to the contributions of the employees and of the departments and agencies, such appropriations will maintain the fund on a sound basis and the present deficit—$13,435,000,000 at June 30, 1955—will not be further increased.

The language in the conference agreement is identical to many sections of S. 2875, as reported to the House, and in other respects to the language contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. In this respect attention is directed to a more complete analysis in House Report No. 2854 and Senate Report No. 1787, reports on S. 2875.

AMENDING TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. COOPER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2936)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 37, 47, 56, 92, 96, 97, 98, and 101.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 17, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 55, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 76, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 94, and 99, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 4, line 17, and on page 5, lines 1, 8, 10, and 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "August" each place it appears and insert "December".

On page 4, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "August" and insert "September".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 6, lines 3, 5, and 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "August" each place it appears and insert "October".

On page 6, lines 16 and 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "December" each place it appears and insert "October".

On page 6, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out all after "Act." down to and including line 24.

On page 7, lines 4, 7, and 17, strike out "1957" and insert "November 1956".

On page 7, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "1957" and insert "1956".

On page 7, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "January 1957" and insert "November 1956".

On page 7, line 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "such Act" and insert "the Social Security Act".

On page 7, line 25, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "December" and insert "October".

On page 8, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "118" and insert "114".

On page 8 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 6 and all that follows over to and including line 14, on page 14, and insert:

"(q) (1) The old-age insurance benefit of any woman for any month prior to the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five shall be reduced by—

"(A) 5/9 of 1 per centum, multiplied by

"(B) the number equal to the number of months in the period beginning with the first day of the first month for which she is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit and ending with the last day of the month before the month in which she would attain the age of sixty-five.

"(2) The wife's insurance benefit of any wife for any month after the month preceding the month in which she attains the age of sixty-two and prior to the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five shall be reduced by—

"(A) 25/36 of 1 per centum, multiplied by

"(B) the number equal to the number of months in the period beginning with the first day of the first month for which she is entitled to such wife's insurance benefit and ending with the last day of the month before the month in which she would attain the age of sixty-five, except that in no event shall such period start earlier than the first day of

the month in which she attains the age of sixty-two.

The preceding provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to the benefit for any month in which such wife has in her care (individually or jointly with the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such wife's insurance benefit is based) a child entitled to child's insurance benefits on the basis of such wages and self-employment income. With respect to any month in the period specified in clause (B) of the first sentence, if such wife does not have in such month such a child in her care (individually or jointly with such individual), she shall be deemed to have such a child in her care in such month for the purposes of the preceding sentence unless there is in effect for such month a certificate filed by her with the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, in which she elects to receive wife's insurance benefits reduced as provided in this subsection. Any certificate filed pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be effective for purposes of such sentence—

"(i) for the month in which it is filed, and for any month thereafter, if in such month she does not have such a child in her care (individually or jointly with such individual), and

"(ii) for the period of one or more consecutive months (not exceeding twelve) immediately preceding the month in which such certificate is filed which is designated by her (not including as part of such period any month in which she had such a child in her care (individually or jointly with such individual)).

If such a certificate is filed, the period referred to in clause (B) of the first sentence of this paragraph shall commence with the first day of the first month (i) for which she is entitled to a wife's insurance benefit, (ii) which occurs after the month preceding the month in which she attained the age of sixty-two, and (iii) for which such certificate is effective.

"(3) In the case of any woman who is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit to which paragraph (1) is applicable and who, for the first month for which she is so entitled (but not for any prior month) or for any later month occurring before the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five, is entitled to a wife's insurance benefit to which paragraph (2) is applicable, the amount of such wife's insurance benefit for any month prior to the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five shall, in lieu of the reduction provided in paragraph (2), be reduced by the sum of—

"(A) an amount equal to the amount by which such old-age insurance benefit for such month is reduced under paragraph (1), plus

"(B) an amount equal to—

"(i) the number equal to the number of months specified in clause (B) of paragraph (2), multiplied by

"(ii) $\frac{25}{36}$ of 1 per centum, and further multiplied by

"(iii) the excess of such wife's insurance benefit prior to reduction under this subsection over the old-age insurance benefit prior to reduction under this subsection.

"(4) In the case of any woman who is or was entitled to a wife's insurance benefit to which paragraph (2) is applicable and who, for any month after the first month for which she is or was so entitled (but not for such first month or any earlier month) occurring before the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five, is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit, the amount of such old-age insurance benefit for any month prior to the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five shall, in lieu of the reduction provided in paragraph (1), be reduced by the sum of—

"(A) an amount equal to the amount by which such wife's insurance benefit is reduced under paragraph (2) for such month (or, if she is not entitled to a wife's insurance benefit for such month, by an amount equal to the amount by which such benefit was reduced for the last month for which she was entitled thereto), plus

"(B) if the old-age insurance benefit for such month prior to reduction under this subsection exceeds such wife's insurance benefit prior to reduction under this subsection, an amount equal to—

"(i) the number equal to the number of months specified in clause (B) of paragraph (1), multiplied by

"(ii) 5/9 of 1 per centum, and further multiplied by

"(iii) the excess of such old-age insurance benefit over such wife's insurance benefit.

"'(5) In the case of any woman who is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit for the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five or any month thereafter, such benefit for such month shall, if she was also entitled to such benefit for any one or more months prior to the month in which she attained the age of sixty-five and such benefit for any such prior month was reduced under paragraph (1) or (4), be reduced as provided in such paragraph, except that there shall be subtracted, from the number specified in clause (B) of such paragraph—

"'(A) the number equal to the number of months for which such benefit was reduced under such paragraph, but for which such benefit was subject to deductions under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 203 (b),

and except that, in the case of any such benefit reduced under paragraph (4), there also shall be subtracted from the number specified in clause (B) of paragraph (2), for the purpose of computing the amount referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (4)—

"'(B) the number equal to the number of months for which the wife's insurance benefit was reduced under such paragraph (2), but for which such benefit was subject to deductions under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 203 (b) or under section 203 (c), and

"'(C) the number equal to the number of months occurring after the first month for which such wife's insurance benefit was reduced under such paragraph (2) in which she had in her care (individually or jointly with the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit is based) a child of such individual entitled to child's insurance benefits.

Such subtraction shall be made only if the total of such months specified in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the preceding sentence is not less than three. For purposes of clauses (B) and (C) of this paragraph, a wife's insurance benefit shall not be considered terminated for any reason prior to the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five.

"'(6) In the case of any woman who is entitled to a wife's insurance benefit for the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five or any month thereafter, such benefit for such month shall, if she was also entitled to such benefit for any one or more months prior to the month in which she attained the age of sixty-five and such benefit for any such prior month was reduced under paragraph (2) or (3), be reduced as provided in such paragraph, except that there shall be subtracted from the number specified in clause (B) of such paragraph—

"'(A) the number equal to the number of months for which such benefit was reduced under such paragraph, but for which such benefit was subject to deductions under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 203 (b) or under section 203 (c), and

"'(B) the number equal to the number of months, occurring after the first month for which such benefit was reduced under such paragraph, in which she had in her care (individually or jointly with the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit is based) a child of such individual entitled to child's insurance benefits.

and except that, in the case of any such benefit reduced under paragraph (3), there also shall be subtracted from the number specified in clause (B) of paragraph (1), for the purpose of computing the amount referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (3)—

"(C) the number equal to the number of months for which the old-age insurance benefit was reduced under such paragraph (1) but for which such benefit was subject to deductions under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 203 (b).

Such subtraction shall be made only if the total of such months specified in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the preceding sentence is not less than three.

"(7) In the case of a woman who is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit to which paragraph (5) is applicable and who, for the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five (but not for any prior month) or for any later month, is entitled to a wife's insurance benefit, the amount of such wife's insurance benefit for any month shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the old-age insurance benefit is reduced under paragraph (5) for such month.

"(8) In the case of a woman who is or was entitled to a wife's insurance benefit to which paragraph (2) was applicable and who, for the month in which she attains the age of sixty-five (but not for any prior month) or for any later month, is entitled to an old-age insurance benefit, the amount of such old-age insurance benefit for any month shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the wife's insurance benefit is reduced under paragraph (6) for such month (or, if she is not entitled to a wife's insurance benefit for such month, by (i) an amount equal to the amount by which such benefit for the last month for which she was entitled thereto was reduced, or (ii) if smaller, an amount equal to the amount by which such benefit would have been reduced under paragraph (6) for the month in which she attained the age of sixty-five if entitlement to such benefit had not terminated before such month).

"(9) The preceding paragraphs shall be applied to old-age insurance benefits and wife's insurance benefits after reduction under section 203 (a) and application of section 215 (g). If the amount of any reduction computed under paragraph (1), under paragraph (2), under clause (A) or clause (B) of paragraph (3), or under clause (A) or clause (B) of paragraph (4) is not a multiple of $0.10, it shall be reduced to the next lower multiple of $0.10."

On page 19, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert before "amended" "each".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 20 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22, and insert "section.".

On page 22, lines 3 and 7, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "begins" each place it appears insert "not earlier than".

On page 23, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "a State" and insert "the United States or of a State".

On page 23, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments after "individual" insert "(i) did not attain retirement age in such month or in any prior month, and (ii)".

On page 24, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Trust Fund" and insert "Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund".

On page 26, line 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out all after "Act." down to and including "cause." in line 23.

On page 27, line 24, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "retirement age," and insert "the age of 65,".

On page 28, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "attains retirement age" and insert "becomes entitled to old-age insurance benefits".

On page 31, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "directors" and insert "collectors".

On page 31, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "directors" and insert "collectors".

On page 32, lines 1 and 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "or pursuant to sections 6011 (a), 6071, 6081 (a), 6091 (a), 6302 (b)" and insert "or to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to subtitle F".

On page 32, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "or chapter" and insert "or to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on tax returns under subtitle F of such Code".

On page 33, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "hereinafter provided" and insert "provided in this section".

On page 34, lines 7 and 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Commissioner of Internal Revenue pursuant to sections 6011 (a), 6071, 6081 (a), 6091 (a), 6302 (b)" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to subtitle F".

On page 34, lines 16, 17, and 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Commissioner of Internal Revenue on tax returns under chapter 2" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate on tax returns under subtitle F".

On page 39, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Trust Fund" and insert "of the Trust Funds".

On page 39 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 18 to 25, inclusive, and insert "amount estimated by him as taxes which are subject to refund under section 6413 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to wages (as defined in section 1426 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) paid after December 31, 1950. Such taxes shall be determined on the basis of".

On page 40, lines 5 and 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "and sections 6011 (a), 6071, 6081 (a), 6091 (a), and 6302 (b)" and insert "and to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to subtitle F".

On page 43 of the Senate engrossed amendments, after line 15, insert:

"(j) Section 3121 (l) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

"(1) by striking 'TRUST FUND', in the heading, and inserting in lieu thereof 'TRUST FUNDS'; and

"(2) by inserting after 'Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund' the following: 'and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 19, line 9, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "of 1930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and—

(1) on page 19, line 17, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "'; or '" and insert "a semicolon".

(2) on page 20, line 9, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "produced.'" and insert "produced; or'.".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "doctor of medicine or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 44, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)".

On page 44, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Indiana,"

On page 45, line 25, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "of the Social Security Act".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 46, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 47, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)".

On page 47, after line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert "'Policemen and Firemen in Certain States'".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 48, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)".

On page 48, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert a comma after "States" and before the quotation marks.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(i) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1956. The amendments made by paragraph (1) of subsection (c) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1954. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of subsection (c) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1955. The amendment made by paragraph (3) of subsection (c) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1954. The amendment made by subsection (d) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1955. The amendment made by subsection (h) shall apply with respect to the same taxable years with respect to which the amendment made by section 201 (g) of this Act applies.

"(2) (A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply only with respect to service performed after June 30, 1957, and only if—

"(i) in the case of the amendment made by paragraph (1) of such subsection, the conditions prescribed in subparagraph (B) are met; and

"(ii) in the case of the amendment made by paragraph (2) of such subsection, the conditions prescribed in subparagraph (C) are met.

"(B) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of subsection (b) shall be effective only if—

"(i) the Federal Home Loan Bank Board submits to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary approves, before July 1, 1957, a plan, with respect to employees of Federal Home Loan Banks, for the coordination, on an equitable basis, of the benefits provided by the retirement system applicable to such employees with the benefits provided by title II of the Social Security Act; and

"(ii) such plan specifies, as the effective date of the plan, July 1, 1957, or the first day of a prior calendar quarter beginning not earlier than January 1, 1956."

If the plan specifies as the effective date of the plan a day before July 1, 1957, the amendment made by paragraph (1) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to service performed on or after such effective date; except that, if such effective date is prior to the day on which the Secretary approves the plan, such amendment shall not apply with respect to service performed, prior to the day on which the Secretary approves the plan, by an individual who is not an employee of a Federal Home Loan Bank on such day.

"(C) The amendment made by paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall be effective only if—

"(i) the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority submits to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary approves, before July 1, 1957, a plan, with respect to employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the coordination, on an equitable basis, of the benefits provided by the retirement system applicable to such employees with the benefits provided by title II of the Social Security Act; and

"(ii) such plan specifies, as the effective date of the plan, July 1, 1957, or the first day of a prior calendar quarter beginning not earlier than January 1, 1956.

If the plan specifies as the effective date of the plan a day before July 1, 1957, the amendment made by paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to service performed on or after such effective date; except that, if such effective date is prior to the day on which the Secretary approves the plan, such amendment shall not apply with respect to service performed, prior to the day on which the Secretary approves the plan, by an individual who is not an employee of the Tennessee Valley Authority on such day.

"(D) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, on or before July 31, 1957, submit a report to the Congress setting forth the details of any plan approved by him under subparagraph (B) or (C)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 49, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$200" and insert "$150".

On page 49, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 51, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800".

On page 51, lines 10 and 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "be deemed to be the gross income derived by him from such trade or business; or" and insert "be deemed to be 66⅔ percent of such gross income; or".

On page 51, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800".

On page 51, line 25, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800".

On page 52 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 4, 5, and 6 and insert: "equal to 66⅔ percent of his distributive share of such gross income (after such gross income has been so reduced); or".

On page 52, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800.".

On page 53, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)".

On page 53, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(7)" and insert "(6)."

On page 53, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "after 1956" and insert "on or after December 31, 1956."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 59, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "September" and insert "November"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 60, after line 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert: "Extension of Period for Filing Proof of Support and Applications for Lump-Sum Death Payment"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS OF ALIENS WHO ARE OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 118. (a) Section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after subsection (s) (added by section 102 of this Act) the following new subsection:

"'Suspension of Benefits of Aliens Who Are Outside the United States

"'(t) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no monthly benefits shall be paid under this section or under section 223 to any individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States for any month which is—

"'(A) after the sixth consecutive calendar month during all of which the Secretary finds, on the basis of information furnished to him by the Attorney General or information which otherwise comes to his attention, that such individual is outside the United States, and

"'(B) prior to the first month thereafter for all of which such individual has been in the United States.

"'(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any individual who is a citizen of a foreign country which the Secretary finds has in effect a social insurance or pension system which is of general application in such country and under which—

"'(A) periodic benefits, or the actuarial equivalent thereof, are paid on account of old age, retirement, or death, and

"'(B) individuals who are citizens of the United States but not citizens of such foreign country and who qualify for such benefits are permitted to receive such benefits or the actuarial equivalent thereof while outside such foreign country without regard to the duration of the absence.

"'(3) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in any case where its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States in effect on the date of the enactment of this subsection.

"'(4) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any benefit for any month if—

"'(A) not less than forty of the quarters elapsing before such month are quarters of coverage for the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit is based, or

"'(B) the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit is based has, before such month, resided in the United States for a period or periods aggregating ten years or more, or

"'(C) the individual entitled to such benefit is outside the United States while in the active military or naval service of the United States.

"'(5) No person who is, or upon application would be, entitled to a monthly benefit under this section for December 1956 shall be deprived, by reason of paragraph (1), of such benefit or any other benefit based on the wages and self-employment income of the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such monthly benefit for December 1956 is based.

"'(6) If an individual is outside the United States when he dies and no benefit may, by reason of paragraph (1), be paid to him for the month preceding the month in which he dies, no lump-sum death payment may be made on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income.

"'(7) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 203 shall not apply with respect to any individual for any month for which no monthly benefit may be paid to him by reason of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"'(8) The Attorney General shall certify to the Secretary such information regarding aliens who depart from the United States to any foreign country (other than a foreign country which is territorially contiguous to the continental United States) as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this subsection and shall otherwise aid, assist, and cooperate with the Secretary in obtaining such other information as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1956 and in the case of lump-sum death payments under section 202 (i) of such Act with respect to deaths occurring after December 1956."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 66, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "subparagraph (1)," and insert "subdivision of this subparagraph,".

On page 67, lines 8 and 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "subparagraph (1)" each place it appears and insert "subdivision of this subparagraph."

On page 67, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "in" and insert "under."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"EFFECT ON BENEFITS OF CONVICTION OF ESPIONAGE, SABOTAGE, TREASON, SEDITION, OR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES; EMPLOYMENT BY COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 121. (a) Section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after subsection (t) (added by section 118 of this Act) the following new subsection:

"'Conviction of Subversive Activities, Etc.

"'(u) (1) If any individual is convicted of any offense (committed after the date of the enactment of this subsection) under—

"'(A) chapter 37 (relating to espionage and censorship), chapter 105 (relating to sabotage), or chapter 115 (relating to treason, sedition, and subversive activities) of title 18 of the United States Code, or

"'(B) section 4, 112, or 113 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended,

then the court may, in addition to all other penalties provided by law, impose a penalty that in determining whether any monthly insurance benefit under this section or section 223 is payable to such individual for the month in which he is convicted or for any month thereafter, and in determining the amount of any such benefit payable to such individual for any such month, there shall not be taken into account—

"'(C) any wages paid to such individual or to any other individual in the calendar quarter in which such conviction occurs or in any prior calendar quarter, and

"'(D) any net earnings from self-employment derived by such individual or by any other individual during a taxable year in which such conviction occurs or during any prior taxable year.

"'(2) As soon as practicable after an additional penalty has, pursuant to paragraph (1), been imposed with respect to any individual, the Attorney General shall notify the Secretary of such imposition.

"'(3) If any individual with respect to whom an additional penalty has been imposed pursuant to paragraph (1) is granted a pardon of the offense by the President of the United States, such additional penalty shall not apply for any month beginning after the date on which such pardon is granted.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall not be construed to restrict or otherwise affect any of the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to prohibit payments of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes', approved September 1, 1954 (Public Law 769, Eighty-third Congress).

"(c) Section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(17) Service in the employ of any organization which is performed (A) in any quarter during any part of which such organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization, and (B) after June 30, 1956.'

"(d) Section 3121 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(17) service in the employ of any organization which is performed (A) in any quarter during any part of which such organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization, and (B) after June 30, 1956.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 28 of the House engrossed bill, restore line 19 and all that follows over to and

including line 4 on page 29; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 72, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(b)" the first place it appears and insert "(c)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 29, lines 23 and 24, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "of 1930 (46 Stat. 470; 5 U. S. C. 693)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and—

(1) on page 30, line 7, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "'; or'" and insert "a semicolon".

(2) on page 30, line 22, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "produced.'" and insert "produced; or'".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "doctor of medicine or"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 73, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)".

On page 74, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, insert a comma after "United States" and before the quotation marks.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 74, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(f)" and insert "(h)".

On page 74, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$200" and insert "$150".

On page 74, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "30" and insert "20".

On page 75, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$200" and insert "$150".

On page 75, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "30" and insert "20".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 75, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(g)" and insert "(i)."

On page 76, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800."

On page 76, lines 5 and 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "be deemed to be the gross income derived by him from such trade or business; or" and insert "be deemed to be 66⅔ percent of such gross income; or."

On page 76, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800."

On page 76, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800."

On page 76 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 24, and on page 77 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert "to 66⅔ percent of his distributive share of such gross income (after such gross income has been so reduced)"; or

On page 77, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 78, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(h)" and insert "(j)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "(k)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(l)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 79 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 1 through 17, and insert:

"(m) (1) The amendments made by subsection (a) and paragraph (1) of subsection (h) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after 1956. The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after October 1956. The amendments made by subsection (c) and paragraph (2) of subsection (h) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1956. The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d) shall apply with respect to service with respect to which the amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of section 104 of this Act apply. The amendments made by paragraph (1) of subsection (e) shall apply with respect to service performed after 1954. The amendment made by paragraph (3) of such subsection shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1954. The amendments made by paragraph (2) of subsection (e) and by subsection (f) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1955. The amendment made by subsection (l) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1956. The amendment made by subsection (l) shall apply with respect to certificates filed after 1956 under section 3121 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

On page 79, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)."

On page 79, line 23, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)."

On page 80, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)."

On page 81, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)."

On page 82 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 9 through 20, and insert:

"(3) Any tax under chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is due, solely by reason of the enactment of subsection (f), or paragraph (2) of subsection (e), of this section, for any taxable year ending on or before the date of the enactment of this act shall be considered timely paid if payment is made in full on or before the last day of the sixth calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted. In no event shall interest be imposed on the amount of any tax due under such chapter solely by reason of the enactment of subsection (f), or paragraph (2) of subsection (e), of this section for any period before the day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(4) Any tax due under chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which is due, solely by reason of the enactment of subsection (d) and an effective date prescribed pursuant to paragraph (2) (B) or (2) (C) of section 104 (i), for any calendar quarter beginning prior to the day on which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approves the plan which prescribes such effective date shall be considered timely paid if payment is made in full on or before the last day of the sixth calendar month following the month in which such plan is approved. In no event shall interest be imposed on the amount of any such tax due under such chapter for any period before the day on which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approves such plan."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of subsection (c) in the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment (beginning on page 87, line 18, of the Senate engrossed amendments) insert the following:

"(c) Section 3 (a) of such Act is further amended by inserting the following new clause immediately before the period at the end thereof: ', and (4) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care (including expenditures for insurance premiums for such care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of such expenditure for any money as exceeds the product of $6 multiplied by the total number of individuals who received old-age assistance under the State plan for such month'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of subsection (c) in the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment (beginning on page 89, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments) insert the following:

"(c) Section 403 (a) of such Act is further amended by inserting the following new clause immediately before the period at the end thereof: '; and (4) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care (including expenditures for insurance premiums for such care or the cost thereof) not counting so much of such expenditure for any month as exceeds (A) the product of $3 multiplied by the total number of dependent children who received aid to dependent children under the State plan for such month plus (B) the product of $6 multiplied by the total number of other individuals who received aid to dependent children under the State plan for such month'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of subsection (c) in the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment (beginning on page 91, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments) insert the following:

"(c) Section 1003 (a) of such Act is further amended by inserting the following new clause immediately before the period at the end thereof: '; and (4) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care (including expenditures for insurance premiums for such care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of such expenditure for any month as exceeds the product of $6 multiplied by the total number of individuals who received aid to the blind under the State plan for such month'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of subsection (c) in the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment (beginning on page 92, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments) insert the following:

"(c) Section 1403 (a) of such Act is further amended by inserting the following new clause immediately before the period at the end thereof: '; and (4) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan in the form of medical or any other type of remedial care (including expenditures for insurance premiums for such care or the cost thereof), not counting so much of such expenditure for any month as exceeds the product of $6 multiplied by the total number of individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan for such month'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PART II—SERVICES IN PROGRAMS OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE, AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN, AID TO THE BLIND, AND AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

"OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 311. (a) The first sentence of section 1 of the Social Security Act is amended to read: 'For the purpose of enabling each State to furnish financial assistance, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to aged needy individuals and of encouraging each State, as far as practicable under such conditions, to help such individuals attain self-care, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 2 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and' before clause (10) thereof, and by striking out the period at the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following new clause: 'and (11) provide a description of the services (if any) which the State agency makes available to applicants for and recipients of old-age assistance to help them attain self-care.'

"(c) (1) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 3 (a) of such Act are each amended by striking out ', which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance,'.

"(2) Clause (3) of such section 3 (a) is amended by striking out 'which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose' and inserting in lieu thereof "including services which are provided by the staff of the State agency (or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision) to applicants for and recipients of old-age assistance to help them attain self-care'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the second line of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment strike out "SEC. 311" and insert "SEC. 312"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the second line of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment strike out "SEC. 312" and insert: "SEC. 313"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the second line of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment strike out "SEC. 313" and insert "SEC. 314"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the third line of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment strike out "and 313 (b)" and insert "313 (b), and 314 (b)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 101, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "each succeeding fiscal year" and insert "each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years."

On page 102, lines 2 and 3, strike out "the Federal percentage" and insert "80 percent of the total."

On page 102 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the sentence beginning in line 13.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"PART V—AMENDMENTS TO MATCHING FORMULAS

"AMENDMENT TO MATCHING FORMULA FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 341. Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1956, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $60—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $30 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30, and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services which are provided by the staff of the State agency (or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision) to applicants for and recipients of old-age assistance to help them attain self-care.'

"AMENDMENT TO MATCHING FORMULA FOR AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

"SEC. 342. Section 403 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1956, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $32, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $32 with respect to one such dependent child and $23 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $32—

"'(A) fourteen-seventeenths of such expenditures, not counting so much of the expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $17 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $18, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $18 with respect to one such dependent child and $12 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $18; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services which are provided by the staff of the State agency (or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision) to relatives with whom such children (applying for or receiving such aid) are living, in order to help such relatives attain self-support or self-

care, or which are provided to maintain and strengthen family life for such children.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"AMENDMENT TO MATCHING FORMULA FOR AID TO THE BLIND

"SEC. 343. Section 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1956, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $60—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $30 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under Clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services which are provided by the staff of the State agency (or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivisiou) to applicants for and recipients of aid to the blind to help them attain self-support or self-care.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"AMENDMENT TO MATCHING FORMULA FOR AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

"SEC. 344. Section 1403 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1956, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $60—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $30 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, including services which are provided by the staff of the State agency (or of the local agency administering the State plan in the political subdivision) to applicants for and recipients of such aid to help them attain self-support or self-care.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 345. The amendments made by this part shall be effective for the period beginning October 1, 1956, and ending with the close of June 30, 1959, and after such amendments cease to be in effect any provision of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this part had not been enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

"SEC. 351. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 403 of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon the following: ', and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $18'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 406 of such Act is amended by striking out '(except when used in clause (2) of section 403 (a))'.

"(c) Section 1108 of such Act is amended by striking out '$4,250,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$5,312,500', and by striking out '$160,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$200,000'.

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and all succeeding fiscal years."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 123, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "1957" and insert "1958."

On page 123, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "1956" and insert "1957."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age fifty, to reduce to age sixty-two the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age eighteen, to extend coverage, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ROBERT S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 18, 28, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 54, 56, 62, and 64. With respect to these amendments (1) the House either recedes or recedes with amendments which are technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming in nature, or (2) the Senate recedes in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

Amendment No. 2: Section 101 (a) of the House bill amended section 202 (d) (1) of the Social Security Act so as to provide for payment of child's insurance benefits to disabled children aged 18 or over who are receiving (or are eligible to receive) such benefits before attainment of age 18. The Senate amendment provided for payment of such benefits to such disabled children even if they were not receiving (and not eligible to receive) such benefits prior to attaining such age. In the case of both the House bill and the Senate amendment, however, the disability must have begun before attainment of age 18. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 9: Section 101 (f) of the House bill provided the effective date for the provisions on child's insurance benefits for disabled children. Generally, these provisions would be effective January 1, 1956, in the case of children who attained age 18 after 1953. The provisions of the Senate amendment on this subject would be effective generally September 1, 1956.

The House recedes with an amendment making the provisions on child's insurance benefits for disabled children, as contained in the Senate amendment, effective generally January 1, 1957.

Amendment No. 10: Section 102 (a) of the House bill reduced the age at which women

could qualify under the old-age and survivors insurance system for old-age insurance benefits, or for benefits as the wife, widow, or dependent mother of an insured worker, from 65 to 62. These provisions were generally effective after December 1955 (and lump-sum death payments in case of deaths after 1955).

The Senate amendment provided for the same reduction in the qualifying age. However, in the case of benefits payable to a woman as the wife of an insured worker (without having in her care a child of the worker entitled to child's benefits) and in the case of old-age insurance benefits payable to her, the benefits were to be reduced in order to take account of the earlier entitlement to the benefits. The reduction would be equal to 20 percent of the benefit which would be payable at age 65 in the case of old-age insurance benefits for which the woman qualifies at age 62 (with a proportionately lower reduction for each month after 62 that she delays in qualifying). In the case of wife's insurance benefits, the reduction for a woman qualifying for the full period between age 62 and 65 would be 25 percent of the benefit which would be payable at age 65.

The Senate amendment would generally be effective beginning September 1, 1956, in the case of widow's and parent's benefits and beginning January 1, 1957, in the case of wife's insurance benefits and old-age insurance benefits for women.

The House recedes with an amendment making the provisions effective generally November 1, 1956, and with technical amendments, including a technical amendment designed to simplify the computation of the actuarial reduction and the administration of these provisions in cases where a woman is entitled to both an old-age insurance benefit and a wife's insurance benefit. The effective date provided under the conference agreement would apply for purposes of all four types of benefits for women—old-age, wife's, widow's, and parent's insurance benefits, and (in the case of lump-sum death payments) where the death occurs after October 1956.

The conferees have been advised of the great difficulty which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will have not only in beginning benefit payments for the month of November 1956 to the large number of women who will file applications for early retirement benefits after the enactment date, but also in handling the very substantial additional workloads resulting from the disability and other provisions of the 1956 amendments. The conferees urge the Department to take immediate measures to staff up, to train its employees, and to take all other immediate measures to insure that it will do the best possible job in discharging its increased responsibilities under these amendments.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 12: Section 103 of the House bill provided for payment of disability insurance benefits to certain insured disabled individuals who have attained age 50 but have not reached age 65 and whose disability has lasted not less than 6 months. It also provided for reduction of such benefits, and child's insurance benefits for a disabled child age 18 or over, if another Federal benefit or State workmen's compensation benefit is payable by reason of physical or mental impairment. In addition, the House bill provided for suspension of these benefits based on disability pending determination of whether the disability has, in fact, ceased in cases where the Secretary believes the beneficiary is no longer disabled, and for withholding of such benefits for refusal, without good cause, to accept rehabilitation services available under an approved Federal-State program.

The Senate amendment contained the same provisions except for (1) technical or clarifying changes; (2) the addition of a provision exempting an individual from loss of benefits for months for which he refuses to accept rehabilitation services where the refusal relates to surgery or medical services or where the refusal is based on adherence to the teachings of a church or sect that teaches its members to rely solely on spiritual means for curing impairments; and (3) the addition of a provision establishing a separate Federal disability insurance trust fund composed of amounts equal to one-half of 1 percent of wages and three-eighths of 1 percent of self-employment income.

In the case of the House bill the new disability insurance benefits would first be payable for months after December 1955. In the case of the Senate amendment they would first be payable for months after June 1957.

The House recedes with an amendment under which refusal to undergo surgery or medical services would not exempt an individual from loss of benefits unless such refusal is based on adherence to the teachings of a church or sect which teaches its members to rely solely on spiritual means for curing impairments. The amendment also makes technical and conforming changes.

In providing in the conference agreement that determinations of disability for cash disability benefits be made by State agencies under the same arrangements as are now utilized in making determinations for the disability freeze, it is understood and expected that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will fully utilize his authority to review and revise determinations of State agencies in order to assure uniform administration of the disability benefits and to protect the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund from unwarranted costs.

Amendment No. 13: Section 104 (a) of the House bill amended section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act so as to provide coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system, on the same basis as other agricultural labor, for service performed in connection with the production and harvesting of gum-resin products. The Senate amendment deleted this provision of the House bill, thereby continuing in effect the present exclusion from coverage of such service. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 14: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 104 (b), which would amend section 210 (a) (1) (B) of the Social Security Act so as to exclude from coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by foreign agricultural workers lawfully admitted to the United States from any foreign country (or possession thereof) on a temporary basis to perform agricultural labor. Section 210 (a) (1) (B) presently excludes from coverage such service performed by workers so admitted from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and the other British West Indies. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 15: Section 104 (b) of the House bill amended section 210 (a) (6) of the Social Security Act so as to provide coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system for service performed in the employ of a Federal home loan bank (and subject to its retirement system) and for service performed in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority (and subject to its retirement system). The Senate amendment deleted this provision of the House bill, thereby continuing in effect the present exclusion from coverage of such service. Under the conference agreement the provisions of the House bill providing coverage for such service performed by employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and by employees of Federal home loan banks, are retained. As explained in connection with the explanation of amendment No. 25, the extension of coverage in the case of Federal home loan banks will become effective only if the conditions specified in subparagraph (B) of section 104 (1) (2) of the bill as agreed to in conference are met, and the extension of coverage in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority will become effective only if the conditions specified in subparagraph (C) of such section 104 (1) (2) are met.

Amendment No. 17: Section 104 (c) (2) of the House bill amended section 211 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act so as to provide that income derived from a share-farming arrangement by the owner or tenant of land may be included in computing his net earnings from self-employment if the arrangement provides for his material participation in the production (by the other party to the arrangement) of agricultural or horticultural commodities and such participation in fact exists. The Senate amendment added language to make it clear that the income so derived by the owner or tenant of land may be included in his net earnings from self-employment where he participates materially in the "management of the production" of such commodities. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 19: Section 104 (d) of the House bill amended section 211 (c) (5) of the Social Security Act so as to provide coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employment lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, and optometrists. Under the House bill, of the professional self-employed individuals presently enumerated in section 211 (c) (5), only physicians and Christian Science practitioners would continue to be excluded from such coverage. The Senate amendment provides for the exclusion of the performance of service by an individual in the exercise of his profession as a doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, or Christian Science practitioner (or the performance of such service by a partnership). The House recedes with an amendment extending coverage to the performance of service by an individual in the exercise of his profession as a doctor of osteopathy (or the performance of such service by a partnership).

Amendment No. 20: This amendment added to section 104 of the House bill a new subsection (d), which would amend section 218 (d) (6) of the Social Security Act to allow certain States (Florida, Georgia, Indiana, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and Hawaii), and the political subdivisions of such States, under certain conditions to divide their retirement systems into two divisions or parts, one consisting of the positions of members who desire old-age and survivors insurance coverage and the other consisting of the positions of members who do not, with each such division or part being treated as a separate retirement system. The provision added by this amendment would also allow employees of certain States (Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Hawaii) who are covered by a retirement system, and who are compensated in whole or in part from Federal grants for unemployment compensation administration under title III of the Social Security Act, to have their positions (or all other positions in the department in which they are employed, or all positions in such department) treated as a separate retirement system for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance coverage. The House recedes with a clerical amendment and with an amendment deleting Indiana from the scope of the amendment.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment added to section 104 of the House bill a new subsection (e), which would permit certain States (Florida, Nevada, New Mexico, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, and Hawaii) to modify their State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act at any time prior to July 1, 1957, without regard to certain requirements contained in section 218 (d) of that

act so as to provide old-age and survivors insurance coverage under such agreements for school district employees who are not required to hold teachers' or administrators' certificates. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment added to section 104 of the House bill a new subsection (f), which would amend section 218 of the Social Security Act so as to permit certain States (Florida, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and South Dakota) to modify their State agreements to provide old-age and survivors insurance coverage under such agreements for employees in any policeman's or fireman's position covered by a retirement system, notwithstanding the provisions of such section 218 which preclude old-age and survivors insurance coverage of employees in any such position. If the retirement system covers positions of policemen or firemen (or both) and other positions as well, the policemen or firemen (or both) may be treated as having a separate retirement system for these purposes. The House recedes with clerical amendments.

Amendment No. 23: This amendment added to section 104 of the House bill a new subsection (g), which would amend section 211 (a) (7) (B) of the Social Security Act so as to permit inclusion, in the computation of net earnings from self-employment for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance, of certain remuneration received by any minister in a foreign country who is a United States citizen and whose congregation is composed predominantly of United States citizens. The House recedes with clerical amendments.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25: Section 104 (e) of the House bill contained the effective dates applicable to the provisions of the House bill which extended coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system. Senate amendment No. 24 deleted section 104 (e) of the House bill, and Senate amendment No. 25 inserted a new subsection containing the effective dates applicable to the coverage provisions in the bill as it passed the Senate.

The House recedes with an amendment. In view of the period of time which has elapsed since the passage of the bill in the House, the conference agreement retains the effective dates contained in the Senate amendment. In the case of coverage provided by section 104 (b) of the House bill which was restored by the conference action on amendment No. 15, the conference agreement provides that the amendment made by paragraph (1) of such section 104 (b) (relating to coverage of employees of Federal home loan banks) shall become effective only if the Federal Home Loan Bank Board submits to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary approves, before July 1, 1957, a plan for the coordination, on an equitable basis, of the benefits provided by the retirement system applicable to employees of Federal home loan banks with the benefits provided by title II of the Social Security Act, and such plan prescribes as the effective date thereof July 1, 1957, or the first day of a prior calendar quarter beginning not earlier than January 1, 1956. If the plan specifies July 1, 1957, as its effective date, the conference agreement provides that the amendment made by such paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to service performed on or after July 1, 1957. If the plan specifies as its effective date a day prior to July 1, 1957, the conference agreement provides that the amendment made by such paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to service performed on or after such day.

The conference agreement contains a similar requirement with respect to the amendment made by paragraph (2) of section 104 (b), relating to coverage of employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The plan with respect to such employees must be submitted by the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Otherwise, the conditions and provisions described above with respect to the amendment made by paragraph (1) of section 104 (b) also apply with respect to the amendment made by paragraph (2) of section 104 (b).

The conference agreement requires that, on or before July 31, 1957, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall submit a report to the Congress setting forth the details of any plan, described above, approved by him.

Amendment No. 26: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 105. Subsection (a) of the new section 105 would amend section 209 (h) (2) of the Social Security Act to provide that cash remuneration paid by any one employer in any calendar year (after 1956) to an employee for agricultural labor will constitute "wages" for old-age and survivors insurance purposes if such remuneration is $200 or more (regardless of the basis on which paid) or if such employee performs agricultural labor for that employer (for cash remuneration computed on a time basis) on 30 days or more during the year. Under present law, such remuneration only constitutes "wages" for old-age and survivors insurance purposes if it is $100 or more during the year.

Subsection (b) of the new section 105 would amend section 210 of the Social Security Act (with respect to service performed after 1956) so as to provide that where a crew leader furnishes individuals to perform agricultural labor for another person such individuals would be deemed to be employees of the crew leader for old-age and survivors insurance purposes, and the crew leader would be deemed not to be an employee of such other person. The term "crew leader" is defined as an individual who furnishes workers to perform agricultural labor for another person, if he pays their wages (either on his own behalf or on behalf of such person) and has not entered into a written agreement designating him an employee of such person.

Subsection (c) of the new section 105 would amend section 213 (a) (2) (B) (iv) of the Social Security Act so that an individual receiving $100 or more but less than $200 as wages for agricultural labor during a year will receive (as under existing law) one quarter of coverage.

The House recedes with amendments changing the $200 figure in the amended section 209 (h) (2) of the Social Security Act to $150 and changing the 30-day provision to 20 days.

Amendment No. 27: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 106, which would amend section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act (effective with respect to taxable years ending after 1956) so as to change the optional method for the computation of farm self-employment income.

Under existing law, a self-employed farmer who computes his income on a cash receipts and disbursements basis may deem 50 percent of his gross income from farming to be his net earnings from self-employment attributable to farming, if such gross income is $1,800 or less; and he may deem $900 to be his net earnings from self-employment attributable to farming if his gross income from farming is more than $1,800 and such net earnings as otherwise computed are less than $900.

Under the new section 106, the optional method of computing net earnings from farm self-employment would be extended to self-employed farmers who report income under an accrual method, and to members of farm partnerships. In addition, such optional method of computing net earnings would be changed so that a farmer whose gross income from farming is $1,200 or less may deem such gross income to be his net earnings from self-employment from farming, and a farmer whose gross income from farming is more than $1,200 may deem $1,200 to be his net earnings from farm self-employment if such net earnings as otherwise computed are less than $1,200. This optional method of computing net earnings from farm self-employment would be extended on the same basis to a member of a farm partnership with respect to his distributive share of the gross income of the partnership.

The House recedes with amendments. Under the conference agreement, if the gross income derived by a self-employed farmer from his farming operations is not more than $1,800, he may, at his option, deem his net earnings from self-employment derived from such farming operations to be 66⅔ percent of such gross income. If the gross income derived by a self-employed farmer from his farming operations is more than $1,800 and the net earnings from self-employment derived by him from such farming operations are less than $1,200, he may, at his option, deem his net earnings from self-employment from such farming operations to be $1,200. The conference agreement provides similar rules with respect to a partner's distributive share of the gross income of a partnership engaged in farming operations.

As under the Senate amendment, the conference agreement provides that, for purposes of applying this provision, the gross income derived by an individual from one or more farming operations and his distributive share of the gross income of one or more farm partnerships shall be aggregated and treated as having been derived from a single trade or business.

As under existing law, payments made to a partner which are guaranteed payments within the meaning of section 707 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 will be treated as income from a trade or business separate from the partnership.

The Senate amendment would have applied to taxable years ending after 1956. Under the conference agreement, this amendment will apply to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1956 (including the calendar year 1956).

Amendment No. 29: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 108, which would amend section 214 (a) (3) of the Social Security Act so as to provide a special fully insured status for an individual with respect to whom all but 4 of the quarters elapsing after 1954 and prior to July 1957 (or, if later, the quarter in which he attains retirement age or dies) are quarters of coverage as defined in section 213 of such act, but with a requirement of a minimum of 6 such quarters of coverage. Section 214 (a) (3) presently provides such special insured status only where all of the quarters elapsing after 1954 and prior to July 1956 (or, if later, the quarter in which the individual attained retirement age or dies) are quarters of coverage, with the same 6-quarter minimum. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 30: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 109, which would amend section 215 (b) (4) of the Social Security Act so as to provide that up to 5 years of low earnings (or no earnings) may be dropped out in the computation of an insured individual's average monthly wage, regardless of the number of such individual's quarters of coverage; under present law only 4 such years may be dropped out unless the individual has 20 or more quarters of coverage. Subsection (b) of the new section 109 sets forth the conditions under which an individual may take advantage of the new 5-year dropout provision, limiting the application of such provision to those who become entitled in the future to old-age insurance benefits or (under specified circumstances) to recomputations of benefits on the basis of earnings after initial entitlement. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 31: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 110, providing that the primary insurance amount of an individual who dies or becomes entitled to old-age insurance benefits in 1957 shall be computed under section 215 (a) (1) (A) of the Social Security Act with a starting date of December 31, 1955, and a closing date of July 1, 1957, if this method of computation would result in a higher primary insurance amount and the individual had not less than 6 quarters of coverage after 1955 and prior to the quarter following his death or entitlement to old-age insurance benefits. In any such computation (using July 1, 1957, as the closing date), the total of the individual's wages and self-employment income after 1956 would be reduced to $2,100 if it exceeded that amount. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment added to the House bill a new provision (sec. 111), amending section 205 (b) of the Social Security Act so as to provide that an applicant for benefits, or any other individual who believes that his or her rights may be prejudiced by a decision of the Secretary, must file his request for a hearing (if he desires to file such a request as permitted under present law) within a period of 6 months from the date on which notice of the Secretary's decision is mailed to him or within such longer period as the Secretary may prescribe. Where notice of any such decision has been mailed to an individual prior to the date of the enactment of the bill, the period within which such individual may file his request would run for at least 6 months after such date. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 33: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 112, which would amend section 203 of the Social Security Act (effective with respect to taxable years ending after 1955) so as to provide that service performed outside the United States as a member of the Armed Forces shall be considered for purposes of the "work clause" as employment within the United States and not as noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States; the remuneration for such service would be included under the regular annual earnings test. Under the present provisions of section 203, a member of the Armed Forces serving overseas is regarded as engaged in "noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States" and as a result is subject under the work clause to the special 7-day test. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 34: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 113, which would amend section 202 (e) of the Social Security Act so as to provide that if a widow remarries and such remarriage is terminated by the second husband's death but she is not his widow for purposes of entitlement to old-age and survivors insurance benefits, such remarriage shall be deemed not to have occurred and she may again become entitled to widow's insurance benefits based on the wages and self-employment income of her first husband. The House recedes with an amendment changing the effective date from, generally, September 1956 to November 1956.

Amendment No. 35: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 114, which would amend section 202 of the Social Security Act to provide that where an individual failed to file proof of support by the insured worker as required for husband's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefits, or to file application for a lump-sum death payment in the case of a death occurring after 1946, within the period prescribed by law, and there was good cause for such failure to file in time (as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare), such proof of support or such application shall be deemed to have been filed within the prescribed period of time if filed within 2 years after the expiration of such period or within 2 years after August 1956, whichever is later. The amendment would apply only to lump-sum death payments, and monthly benefits for months after August 1956, based on applications filed after August 1956. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 41: The Senate amendment added a new section 117 to the bill, amending section 205 (c) (5) of the Social Security Act (relating to the time limitation for correction of earnings records) to provide that under specified circumstances an individual's earnings record could be corrected, even after the time limitation has run with respect to a given year, to include self-employment income for that year in any case where wages for that year were deleted from the records as having been erroneously reported. The amount of self-employment income to be included could not be in excess of the amount of wages deleted. The correction could be made only to the extent of the individual's self-employment income (or his net earnings from self-employment) not already included in his earnings record as self-employment income which is included in a tax return or statement filed before the expiration of the time limitation following the taxable year in which the deletion of wages is made. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 42: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 118, amending section 202 of the Social Security Act to add a new subsection (t) at the end thereof, providing that no benefits may be paid to certain aliens who are outside the United States.

Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (t) provided that the prohibition against payment shall apply to any individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States for any month after the third consecutive calendar month during all of which the Secretary finds, on the basis of information furnished to him by the Attorney General or which otherwise comes to his attention, that such individual is outside the United States and prior to the first month for all of which he has been in the United States. The prohibition would not apply to individuals who are citizens of a foreign country which the Secretary finds has in effect a social insurance or pension system which is of general application in such country and which pays periodic benefits, or their actuarial equivalent, on account of old age, retirement, or death, if United States citizens who are not citizens of such foreign country and who qualify for such benefits are permitted to receive such periodic benefits or their actuarial equivalent while they are outside of such foreign country for periods of 3 months or longer.

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (t) provided that a person who is, or on application would be, entitled to a monthly benefit under section 202 for June 1956 would not, because of this provision, be deprived of such benefit or of any other benefit based on the wages and self-employment income of the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such monthly benefit for June 1956 is based.

Paragraph (3) provided that no lump-sum death payment may be made on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of an individual who died while outside the United States and whose benefits were not paid under paragraph (1) for the month preceding the month in which he died.

Paragraph (4) provided that the deductions under subsections (b) and (c) of section 203 of the Social Security Act on account of work or failure to have a child in the beneficiary's care would not be applied for any month with respect to the benefits of any individual if his benefits for such month are not payable by reason of paragraph (1).

Paragraph (5) provided that the Attorney General shall certify to the Secretary such information regarding aliens who depart from the United States to any foreign country (other than a country which is territorially contiguous to the United States) as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this subsection, and shall otherwise aid, assist, and cooperate with the Secretary in obtaining such other information as may be necessary for this purpose.

The House recedes with an amendment which contains a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment. Under section 118 (a) of the conference agreement, a new subsection (t) will be added to section 202 of the Social Security Act.

Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (t) provides that no monthly benefits will be paid under section 202 of the Social Security Act, and no disability benefits will be paid under the new section 223 of that act, to any individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States for any month which is (A) after the sixth consecutive calendar month during all of which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds (on the basis of information furnished to him by the Attorney General or information which otherwise comes to his attention) that such individual is outside the United States (as defined in sec. 210 (i) of the Social Security Act), and (B) before the first month during all of which such individual has been in the United States (as so defined).

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (t) provides that the suspension of benefits described in paragraph (1) will not apply to any individual who is a citizen of a foreign country which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds has in effect a social insurance or pension system which is of general application in that foreign country and under which (A) periodic benefits (or the actuarial equivalent thereof) are paid on account of old age, retirement, or death, and (B) individuals who are citizens of the United States but not citizens of such foreign country and who qualify for such benefits are permitted to receive such benefits (or the actuarial equivalent thereof) while outside such foreign country without regard to the duration of such absence. The requirement set forth in subparagraph (B) of the preceding sentence would not be met by an insurance system in any foreign country under which, for example, Americans are precluded from receiving benefits by reason of their absence from that foreign country (regardless of how lengthy the period is before the benefits are cut off). Another example of a situation in which a foreign insurance system might fail to meet the requirements of such subparagraph (B) would be a case where such system has conditions to the receipt of payment which, though not phrased in terms of absence from the country, have the same effect as if such system expressly required presence in the foreign country concerned for the benefits to continue.

Paragraph (3) of the new subsection (c) provides that the suspension of benefits provided in the new paragraph (1) will not apply in any case where its application would be contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States in effect on the date on which this bill becomes law.

Paragraph (4) of the new subsection (t) makes the suspension of benefits inapplicable to benefits for any month (including derivative benefits) if the wage earner on whose record the benefits are based has, before such month, either (A) had 40 quarters or more of coverage, or (B) resided in the United States (as defined in sec. 210 (i) of the Social Security Act) for 1 or more periods aggregating 10 years or more.

In addition, paragraph (4) makes the suspension of benefits inapplicable to an alien who is outside the United States while in the active military or naval service of the United States.

Paragraph (5) of the new subsection (t) provides that no person who is, or upon application would be, entitled to a monthly benefit under section 202 of the Social Security Act for December 1956 shall be deprived, by reason of the provision in paragraph (1) suspending the benefits of aliens, of such benefit or any other benefit based on the wages and self-employment income of the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such monthly benefit for December 1956 was based.

Paragraph (6) of the new subsection (t) provides that if an individual is outside of the United States when he dies, and if no benefit may be paid to him for the month preceding the month in which he dies, no lump-sum death payment may be made on the basis of that individual's wages and self-employment income.

Paragraph (7) of the new subsection (t) provides that subsections (b) and (c) of section 203 of the Social Security Act (relating to deductions on account of work or failure to have a child in care) will not apply with respect to any individual for any month for which no monthly benefit may be paid by reason of paragraph (1) of the new subsection (t).

Paragraph (8) of the new subsection (t) provides that the Attorney General shall certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare such information regarding aliens who depart from the United States to any foreign country (other than Canada or Mexico) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the new subsection (t). In addition, the Attorney General will be required to otherwise aid, assist, and cooperate with the Secretary in obtaining such other information as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of the new subsection (t).

Section 118 (b) of the conference agreement provides the effective date for the new subsection (t). It will apply to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 31, 1956, and to lump-sum death payments under section 202 (i) of that act in the case of deaths occuring after December 31, 1956.

Amendment No. 46: This amendment adds, to the portion of the House bill preserving the relationship between railroad retirement and old-age and survivors insurance, a new subsection (c) amending section 5 (k) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 (relating to financial interchange). The Senate amendment provides the same type of financial interchange provisions between the Railroad Retirement Account and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund (established by amendment No. 12) as are presently provided with respect to such account and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, with corresponding technical changes in other provisions of such section 5 (k) (2).

The House recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 47: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 121, amending section 216 (e) of the Social Security Act (relating to the definition of "child") and section 202 (d) of that act (relating to benefits payable to children, as defined in section 216 (e)). Subsection (a) of the Senate amendment would add a new class of persons to the definition of child, so that in the case of a deceased individual, the definition would include a child with respect to whom such individual has stood in loco parentis for not less than 5 years immediately preceding the day on which such individual died. Subsection (b) of the Senate amendment would add a new paragraph (7) to section 202 (d) of the Social Security Act providing that a person who is a "child" by reason of the changed definition of that term in subsection (a) shall be deemed dependent upon the individual standing in loco parentis with respect to him if at the time of such individual's death, the child was living with and receiving at least three-fourths of his support from such individual. Subsection (c) of the Senate amendment provided that the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits for months beginning after the date of enactment.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 48: The Senate amendment added a new section 122 to the House bill. Subsection (a) of such section 122 would insert a new subsection "(u)" at the end of section 202 of the Social Security Act, consisting of two paragraphs. Under paragraph (1) of the new subsection (u), monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act would not be paid to any individual for any month after the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been notified by the Attorney General of the United States that such individual is or has been convicted of an offense under chapter 37, 105, or 115 of title 18 of the United States Code, or under section 4, 112, or 113 of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Paragraph (2) of the new subsection would provide for the Attorney General to furnish to the Secretary a complete list of the names of all individuals heretofore convicted of offenses specified in paragraph (1), and to notify the Secretary of the name of each individual hereafter so convicted. Such list and notification would be furnished as soon as practicable.

Subsection (b) of the Senate amendment would provide that the new subsection (u) should not be construed to restrict or otherwise affect any of the provisions of the act of September 1, 1954, which prohibits payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses.

The House recedes with an amendment substituting new language for the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment. Under section 121 (a) of the conference agreement, section 202 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (u).

Paragraph (1) of the new subsection (u) provides that if an individual is convicted of any of the offenses specified in that paragraph, and if the offense was committed after the date of the enactment of the bill, then the court may impose a penalty in addition to all other penalties provided by law. The additional penalty is that in determining whether any monthly insurance benefit is payable under section 202 of the Social Security Act or under section 223 (relating to disability) of that act to the individual so convicted for the month in which he is so convicted or for any month thereafter, there is not to be taken into account (A) any wages paid to such individual or to any other individual in the calendar quarter in which such conviction occurs or in any prior calendar quarter, and (B) any net earnings from self-employment derived by such individual or by any other individual during a taxable year in which such conviction occurs or during any prior taxable year. The offenses specified for which the additional penalty may be imposed are offenses under chapter 37 (espionage and censorship), chapter 105 (sabotage), and chapter 115 (treason, sedition, and subversive activities) of title 18 of the United States Code, and offenses under sections 4, 112, and 113 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended.

The imposition of the additional penalty is left to the discretion of the court. However, in those cases where the court imposes this penalty, the convicted individual will lose, for the month of conviction and all months thereafter, monthly benefits (including disability benefits) to the extent that such benefits are based on the employment or self-employment record of any person for the period in which the conviction occurs or for any prior period.

For example, if an individual is convicted in December 1957 of an offense committed in January 1957, and if the court imposes the additional penalty provided by the new paragraph (1), then for purposes of determining any monthly benefit which would otherwise be payable to such individual for December 1957 or for any month thereafter, such individual's insured status and his average monthly wage shall be determined by omitting all wages paid to him for the last quarter of 1957 and for all prior quarters of 1957 and prior years and by omitting all net earnings from self-employment derived by such individual during 1957 (assuming that he is a calendar-year taxpayer) and during all prior taxable years.

If the convicted individual referred to in the preceding sentence is entitled to a monthly benefit based on the earnings record of a second individual, or if at some time in the future he makes application for such a monthly benefit, there must be omitted all wages paid to such second individual for the quarters specified in the preceding paragraph and all net earnings from self-employment income by such second individual during the taxable years specified in the preceding paragraph (with the exception that in this case the taxable year in which the conviction occurs will be determined by reference to the taxable years of such second individual, rather than by reference to the taxable year of the individual convicted).

It is to be emphasized that the additional penalty applies only to the individual convicted of the offense, and does not prejudice any of the rights of other individuals. Thus, if the penalty is imposed with respect to an individual, the entitlement of his wife, children, or parents to monthly benefits on the basis of his earnings record is to be determined as if no such penalty had been imposed. He is to be permitted to make application for benefits (if he is not already entitled to benefits) in the manner provided by law, if such application is necessary for others to become entitled to benefits on the basis of his earnings record. Similarly, section 203 (a) of the Social Security Act (relating to maximum benefits) is to operate as if the penalty had not been imposed. That is to say, in computing the maximum benefits which other individuals may receive on the basis of any earnings record, he will be deemed to be "entitled" to the benefits to which he would be entitled but for his conviction, even though the court-imposed penalty prevents the payment of any such benefit to him or reduces the amount thereof.

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (u) provides that the Attorney General is to notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as soon as practicable after the additional penalty has been imposed with respect to any individual. However, the period with respect to which the penalty is to be applied is dependent not on the date of such notification but on the time when the conviction occurs.

Paragraph (3) of the new subsection (u) provides that if the President of the United States grants a pardon of any offense with respect to which the additional penalty has been imposed, the penalty will not apply to months beginning after the month in which the pardon is granted. In the case of such a pardon granted to any individual, the determination of whether any monthly benefit is payable on the basis of his earnings record or the record of any other individual, and the determination of the amount of any benefit so payable, will be made as if he had not been convicted. However, the pardon will not affect monthly benefits for any month which begins on or before the date on which the pardon is granted.

Subsection (b) of section 121 of the conference agreement provides that the amendment made by subsection (a) of that section (which adds the new subsection (u)) is not

to be construed to restrict or otherwise affect any of the provisions of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 769, 83d Cong.), which prohibits payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses.

Subsection (c) of section 121 of the conference agreement amends section 210 (a) of the Social Security Act to exclude from the term "employment" service performed in the employ of certain Communist organizations. If any organization is registered at any time during any calendar quarter which begins after June 30, 1956, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization, then service performed in such quarter in the employ of such organization does not come within the definition of the term "employment." The same rule is provided in the case of any organization which fails to register but with respect to which there is in effect, at any time during the calendar quarter in question, a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization. Whether or not there is in effect on any day a final order requiring registration is to be determined in the manner provided in title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended.

Subsection (d) of section 121 amends section 3121 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from the term "employment," for purposes of the taxes imposed by chapter 21 of such code, service which is not treated as employment for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act by reason of the amendment made by subsection (c) of section 121.

Amendment No. 51: Section 201 (b) of the House bill amended section 3121 (a) (9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (which excludes from "wages" certain payments made to employees after they attain retirement age) to reflect changes made elsewhere in the bill with respect to the definition of retirement age. Section 201 (c) of the House bill made the necessary changes in section 3121 (b) (1) of the code (relating to the exclusion of service performed by gum-resin workers from "employment" for purposes of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) to correspond with the changes made by the House bill in section 210 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act (relating to the exclusion of such service from "employment" for benefit purposes). The Senate amendment deleted both section 201 (b) and section 201 (c) of the House bill. In view of the action taken by the conferees with respect to amendment No. 10 (relating to definition of retirement age) and amendment No. 13 (relating to coverage of service performed by gum-resin workers), the House recedes with an amendment which restores section 201 (b) of the House bill.

Amendment No. 52: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 201 (b), which would amend section 3121 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the exclusion of service performed by certain foreign agricultural workers from "employment" for purposes of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) to correspond with the changes made by amendment No. 14 in section 210 (a) (1) (B) of the Social Security Act (relating to the exclusion of such service from "employment" for benefit purposes). In view of the action taken by the conferees with respect to amendment No. 14, the House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 53: Section 201 (d) of the House bill made the necessary changes in section 3121 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the exclusion of certain service from "employment" for purposes of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) to correspond with the changes made by the House bill in section 210 (a) (6) of the Social Security Act which extend coverage to service in the employ of the Tennessee Valley Authority and to service in the employ of a Federal home loan bank. The Senate amendment deleted this provision of the House bill. In view of the action taken by the conferees with respect to amendment No. 15, the House recedes with an amendment which restores with clerical changes the provisions of the House bill.

Amendment No. 55: Section 201 (e) (2) of the House bill made the necessary changes in section 1402 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the treatment of income derived from share-farming arrangements for purposes of the tax on self-employment income) to correspond with the changes made by the House bill in section 211 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act (relating to the treatment of such income for benefit purposes). The Senate amendment added to this provision of the House bill the same language as that which was added by amendment No. 17 to the provision of the House bill dealing with the treatment of such income for benefit purposes. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 57: Section 201 (f) of the House bill made the necessary changes in section 1402 (c) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the treatment of certain professional self-employed individuals for purposes of the tax on self-employment income) to correspond with the changes made by the House bill in section 211 (c) (5) of the Social Security Act (relating to the treatment of such individuals for benefit purposes). The Senate amendment made the same change in this provision of the House bill as that which was made by amendment No. 19 in the provision of the House bill dealing with the treatment of such individuals for benefit purposes. The House recedes with an amendment conforming to the conference action on amendment No. 19.

Amendment No. 58: This amendment added to section 201 of the House bill a new subsection (e), which would make the necessary changes in section 1402 (a) (8) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the computation of net earnings from self-employment, in the case of a minister serving in a foreign country, for purposes of the tax on self-employment income) to correspond with the changes made by amendment No. 23 in section 211 (a) (7) (B) of the Social Security Act (relating to the computation of such net earnings for benefit purposes). In view of the action taken by the conferees with respect to amendment No. 23, the House recedes with clerical amendments.

Amendment No. 59: This amendment added to section 201 of the House bill a new subsection (f), which would make the necessary changes in section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correspond with the changes made by amendment No. 26 in section 209 (h) (2) of the Social Security Act (relating to the treatment of remuneration for agricultural labor as "wages" for old-age and survivors insurance benefit purposes) and in section 210 of that act (relating to the treatment of service performed by and for crew leaders for old-age and survivors insurance benefit purposes).

Paragraph (3) of the new subsection (f) would amend section 3102 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (which permits an employer paying cash remuneration for agricultural labor to deduct the Federal Insurance Contributions Act employee tax from such remuneration even though at the time of payment it is not clear whether or not such remuneration constitutes "wages") to reflect the change in section 209 (h) (2) of the Social Security Act made by amendment No. 26 and the change in section 3121 (a) (8) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 made by this amendment (No. 59).

The House recedes with amendments conforming to the conference action on amendment No. 26.

Amendment No. 60: This amendment added to section 201 of the House bill a new subsection (g), which would make the necessary changes in the last two sentences of section 1402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the optional method of computing net earnings from farm self-employment for purposes of the tax on self-employment income) to correspond with the changes made by amendment No. 27 in section 211 (a) of the Social Security Act (relating to the optional method of computing such net earnings for old-age and survivors insurance benefit purposes).

The House recedes with amendments which conform to the conference action with respect to amendment No. 27.

Amendment No. 61: This amendment added to section 201 of the House bill a new subsection (h), which would amend section 3121 (l) (8) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include as a foreign subsidiary of a domestic corporation, for purposes of the provisions of law permitting the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to employees of such subsidiaries, any foreign corporation of whose voting stock not less than 20 percent is owned by a domestic corporation. Under present law, more than 50 percent of the stock of the foreign subsidiary must be owned by the domestic corporation in order for the employees of the foreign subsidiary to be eligible for such coverage. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 63: Section 201 (g) of the House bill amended section 3121 (k) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend until the end of 1957 the period during which employees of an organization which has filed a certificate waiving its tax exemption under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act may add their names to the list of employees concurring in the filing of such certificate. Under present law, no names may be added to any such list after the expiration of 24 months following the first quarter during which the certificate was in effect. The Senate amendment extended the period provided by the House bill for an additional year, i. e., until the end of 1958. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66: Section 201 (i) of the House bill contained the effective dates applicable to the provisions of the House bill which made the necessary changes in chapter 2 (tax on self-employment income) and chapter 21 (Federal Insurance Contributions Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reflect the changes in coverage under the old-age and survivors' insurance system which were made in the House bill. Senate amendment No. 66 deleted this subsection of the House bill, and Senate amendment No. 65 inserted a new subsection containing the effective dates applicable to such provisions in the bill as it passed the Senate. The new subsection also included special provisions to permit a minister, whose income as a minister, for any taxable year ending after 1954 and prior to 1957, would have constituted net earnings from self-employment, if the bill as amended by Senate amendment No. 58 had been then in effect, to elect to have the provisions of such amendment apply with respect to taxable years ending after 1954 and prior to 1957.

The House recedes with amendments. In view of the period of time which has elapsed since the passage of the bill in the House, the conference agreement, except as noted below, retains the effective dates contained in the Senate amendment. The amendment made by subsection (b) of section 201 of the House bill, which was restored by the conference action on amendment No. 51, shall apply with respect to remuneration paid after October 1956. The amendments made

by subsection (d) of the House bill, which were restored by the conference action on amendment No. 53, shall apply with respect to service with respect to which the amendments made by subsection (b) of section 104 of the bill apply. (For an explanation of the effective date of these amendments, see amendment No. 25.) The amendment to subsection (a) of section 1402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (made by sec. 201 (i) of the bill as agreed to in conference) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1956, rather than to taxable years ending after December 31, 1956, as provided in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement also makes necessary technical and conforming changes in the Senate amendment.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68: Section 202 of the House bill amended section 1401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase each of the rates of tax upon self-employment income prescribed by existing law by three-fourths of 1 percent, and amended sections 3101 and 3111 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act to increase each of the rates of the employee tax and the employer tax prescribed by existing law by one-half of 1 percent. The increase in the tax on self-employment income would apply with respect to taxable years beginning after 1955, and the increase in the employee and employer taxes would apply with respect to remuneration paid after 1955.

Senate amendment No. 67 deleted section 202 of the House bill. Senate amendment No. 68 added to the House bill a new section 202, which amended the same sections of law as were amended by the House bill. Under the Senate amendment, the rates of tax prescribed in section 1401 upon self-employment income would each be increased by three-eighths of 1 percent; and the rates of the employee tax and the employer tax prescribed in sections 3101 and 3111, respectively, would each be increased by one-fourth of 1 percent. The increase in the tax on self-employment income would apply with respect to taxable years beginning after 1956, and the increase in the employee and employer taxes would apply with respect to remuneration paid after 1956.

The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 69 and 70: These amendments added to the House bill a heading for a new title III and a declaration of the purpose of such new title, which would amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act and would consist of the matter contained in amendments Nos. 71 through 98. In view of the action taken by the conferees with respect to the latter amendments, the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, and 76: These amendments, which comprise part I (relating to matching of assistance expenditures for medical care) of the new title III of the bill, would amend sections 3 (a), 403 (a), 1003 (a), and 1403 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to provide separate dollar-for-dollar matching of State expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled where such assistance is furnished in the form of medical or other remedial care, up to a maximum of (1) $8 (or, in the case of aid to dependent children, $4 for each child recipient and $8 for each adult recipient) multiplied by the number of individuals receiving assistance in any form under the State plan, plus (2) certain additional amounts. State expenditures for assistance in the form of cash payments would continue under the present formula (as amended by amendments Nos. 89, 90, and 91). The amendments relating to medical care would be effective July 1, 1957 (and would continue in effect even after the expiration of such amendments Nos. 89, 90, and 91). With respect to amendments Nos. 71 and 76, the House recedes; and with respect to amendments Nos. 72, 73, 74, and 75, the House recedes with amendments limiting the dollar-for-dollar matching for medical care expenditures to a maximum of $6 (or, in the case of aid to dependent children, $3 per child and $6 per adult) multiplied by the number of individuals receiving assistance under the State plan.

Amendments Nos. 77, 78, 79, 80, and 81: These amendments, which comprise part II (relating to services in programs of public assistance) of the new title III of the bill, would amend titles IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act so as to make it clear that the public assistance programs under those titles include not only the provision of financial assistance but also the furnishing of services designed to help needy individuals to attain self-support or self-care (or, in the case of aid to dependent children, designed to maintain and strengthen family life and to help the relatives caring for dependent children to attain self-support and personal independence). These amendments also require (effective July 1, 1957) that each State plan include a description of the services (if any) to be furnished by the State for this purpose, and make it clear that Federal payments to a State with respect to the costs of administering the State plan may include payments with respect to such services. With respect to amendment No. 77, the House recedes with an amendment making changes in title I of the Social Security Act (relating to old-age assistance) which have substantially the same purpose with respect to self-care as the changes made in titles IV, X, and XIV of that act by the Senate amendments; and with respect to amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, and 81, the House recedes with clerical and conforming amendments.

Amendments Nos. 82, 83, and 84: These amendments, which comprise part III (extension of aid to dependent children) of the new title III of the bill and become effective July 1, 1957, would amend section 406 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to add first cousins, nephews, and nieces to the list of the relatives with one of whom a needy child must be living in order to be eligible for aid to dependent children under title IV of that act. These amendments also eliminate the requirement that a needy child between 16 and 18 years of age must be regularly attending school in order to be eligible for aid to dependent children. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 85, 86, 87, and 88: These amendments comprise part IV (relating to research and training) of the new title III of the bill. Amendment No. 86 would authorize the Federal Government (through grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements) to participate in the cost of research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of the public assistance and related programs; the authorized appropriation for this purpose would be $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1957 and such amount as the Congress may determine thereafter. Amendment No. 87 would authorize the Federal Government to make grants to States (as defined in sec. 1101 of the Social Security Act) to enable them (either directly or through nonprofit institutions of higher learning) to provide various types of training for personnel employed or preparing for employment in the public assistance programs; the authorized appropriation for this purpose would be $5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1958 and such amount as the Congress may determine thereafter, and the Federal share of the cost of such training would be 100 percent during the fiscal years 1958 through 1967 and 80 percent thereafter. With respect to amendments Nos. 85, 86, and 88, the House recedes; and with respect to amendment No. 87, the House recedes with an amendment under which the program of training grants for public welfare personnel would terminate at the end of the fiscal year 1962 and the Federal share of the cost would be limited to 80 percent during each of the 5 years of the program.

Amendments Nos. 89, 90, 91, 92, and 93: These amendments, which comprise part V of the new title III of the bill, would amend the matching formulas applicable to title I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act (relating to old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, respectively). Amendments Nos. 89, 90, and 91 apply to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and for purposes of assistance under those programs would (1) increase the ceiling on the Federal payment with respect to any individual from $55 to $65 and (2) provide that five-sixths of the first $30 per recipient can be counted instead of only four-fifths of the first $25; however, these increases would not be available to any State unless it maintains its average expenditure per recipient from State funds. Amendment No. 92 would extend until June 30, 1959, the temporary matching formula for aid to dependent children which was provided in section 8 (b) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 and which is currently in effect. Under amendment No. 93, all of these amendments would become effective October 1, 1956.

With respect to amendments Nos. 89, 90, and 91, the House recedes with amendments (1) providing that the Federal ceiling for purposes of titles I, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act shall be $60 and that four-fifths of the first $30 per recipient can be counted, (2) eliminating the requirement that a State maintain its average expenditure per recipient from State funds in order to receive the Federal increase, and (3) changing the matching formula contained in title IV of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to dependent children) so as to provide that the Federal ceiling for purposes of such title shall be $32 with respect to the first dependent child in any home, $23 with respect to each additional child, and $32 with respect to each relative with whom the child is living (instead of $30, $21, and $30, respectively, as in present law), and that fourteen-seventeenths of the first $17 per recipient can be counted (instead of four-fifths of the first $15, as in present law).

With respect to amendment No. 92, the Senate recedes in view of the action taken on amendment No. 89 in regard to aid to dependent children.

With respect to amendment No. 93, the House recedes with an amendment providing that the changes made by amendments Nos. 89, 90, and 91 shall cease to be effective after June 30, 1959.

Amendments Nos. 94, 95, 96, 97, and 98: These amendments comprise part VI of the new title III of the bill. Amendment No. 95 would amend sections 403 and 1108 of the Social Security Act (effective for the fiscal year 1957 and subsequent fiscal years) so as to permit Federal matching (under the program of aid to dependent children) of expenditures in the Virgin Islands for relatives with whom dependent children are living, and so as to increase from $160,000 to $300,000 the maximum Federal payment to the Virgin Islands under all the public assistance programs in any fiscal year. Amendment No. 98 would make the same changes in the case of Puerto Rico (except that the increase in the maximum Federal payment would be from $4,250,000 to $5,312,500). Amendments Nos. 96 and 97 would make certain changes in the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act with respect to the determination of need.

With respect to amendment No. 94, the House recedes. With respect to amendment

No. 95, the House recedes with an amendment combining its provisions with those of amendment No. 98 (relating to Puerto Rico), limiting the maximum Federal payment in the case of the Virgin Islands to $200,000, and making certain technical changes. With respect to amendments Nos. 96 and 97, and with respect to amendment No. 98 in view of the action taken by the conferees on amendment No. 95, the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 99: This amendment added to the House bill (as a part of a new title IV) a new section 401, which would amend section 403 of the Social Security Amendments of 1954.

Subsection (a) of such section 403 presently provides that service performed by an individual after 1950 and before 1955 as an employee of an organization (1) described in section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from tax under section 501 (a) of such code and, (2) which failed to file a waiver certificate, may, notwithstanding such failure to file, be deemed to constitute "employment" for old-age and survivors insurance purposes if the Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes were paid (and not refunded) on the good-faith assumption that the certificate had been filed, and if the individual so requests. The Senate amendment extended for 2 years the period during which such service can be counted under subsection (a), so that the subsection would apply to service performed after 1950 and before 1957 (but only where the individual was employed by that organization before the enactment of the bill).

Subsection (b) of such section 403 presently provides that service performed for such an exempt organization after 1950 and before 1955, where the organization filed the waiver certificate but the employee failed to sign the list of concurring employees, may be deemed to constitute "employment" for old-age and survivors insurance purposes to the extent that the Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes were paid (and not refunded) with respect to such service, if the employee so requests before 1957. The Senate amendment extended for 2 years the period during which such service can be counted under subsection (a), so that the subsection would apply to service performed after 1950 and before 1957 (but only where the employee was employed by that organization before the enactment of the bill), and also extends for 2 years (until January 1, 1959), the period during which the employee can file his request.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 100: This amendment added to the House bill a new section 402, which would amend section 521 (a) of the Social Security Act (effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1956) so as to increase the annual authorization for child-welfare services from $10,000,000 to $12,000,000. The House recedes with an amendment providing that such increase shall be effective only with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1957.

Amendment No. 101: This amendment added to the House bill a new title V, which would establish a United States Commission on the Aging and Aged.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment of title: The Senate amendment conformed the title of the bill to the bill as amended by the Senate. Under the conference agreement the title of the bill is conformed to the bill as agreed to in conference.

JERE COOPER,
WILBUR D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point on the conference report just adopted and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, we have reached another milestone in improving our social-security program. The conference committee report makes a number of important liberalizations in the system.

First, disability insurance protection is provided under the social-security system to over 35 million persons.

Second, social-security benefits are provided to women beginning at age 62.

Third, coverage under the social-security system is increased by over 250,000.

Fourth, the Federal share of public assistance to 5 million needy aged, disabled, blind, and dependent children is increased.

Fifth, Federal funds are provided for helping to meet the medical-care needs of the 5 million persons on public assistance.

Sixth, the program for aid to dependent children is broadened and strengthened.

Seventh, additional Federal encouragement is provided for helping the 5 milion public-assistance recipients attain self-support and self-care, and to maintain and preserve family life.

Eighth. Federal support is provided for research in social security.

Ninth, Federal funds authorized for child-welfare services are increased $2 million a year.

Tenth, Federal public-assistance funds for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are increased.

Mr. Speaker, these 10 provisions greatly strengthen and improve our social-security program.

I will now describe the provisions in more detail:

I. COVERAGE

(a) Self-employed professional groups: The House-passed bill provided coverage for all presently excluded self-employed professional groups except physicians. The Senate bill in addition excluded osteopaths. The conference agreement follows the House version of the bill.

(b) Farm operators and share farmers: The House bill made no change in the reporting of income requirements for farm operators. The Senate bill permitted the optional method of reporting to farmers on the accrual basis of accounting.

The Senate bill also provided that where annual gross farm income is between $400 and $1,200 the farmer could report either his gross income or his actual net earnings. Where a farmer's gross income is over $1,200 and where his net earnings are less than $1,200, the Senate bill provided that the farmer could report either his actual net earnings or $1,200. Where both a farmer's gross and net income is over $1,200, the Senate bill would have required his reporting his actual net earnings.

Under the conference agreement, a farmer will report two-thirds of his gross income where it is $1,800 or less as his net income. Where his gross income is over $1,800, he may report either his actual net income, or if his net income is less than $1,200 he may report $1,200 as his net income. The conference agreement would also permit members of farm partnerships to use the optional method of reporting.

The conference agreement substantially follows the House-passed bill by providing that rentals will be credited as self-employment income where the owner or tenant of the land participates materially with the individual working the land in the production or the management of the production of an agricultural or horticultural commodity.

Share farmers would be covered as self-employed persons, confirming the current interpretation of the law.

(c) Ministers: The conferees accepted the new Senate provision which would cover ministers outside the United States where they serve a congregation predominantly made up of United States citizens even though their employer may not be a United States employer.

(d) Agricultural workers: The House-passed bill made no change in the coverage requirement for agricultural workers. The Senate bill would have covered such workers where they, first, are paid $200 or more in cash wages in a calendar year by one employer; or, second, perform agricultural labor for an employer on 30 days or more during a calendar year for cash wages computed on a time basis.

Where farmworkers are recruited and paid by a crew leader, the crew leader would have been deemed to be the employer if he is not, by written agreement, designated to be an employee of the owner or tenant and if such crew leader is customarily engaged in recruiting and supplying individuals to perform agricul-

tural labor. Under such circumstances the crew leader would have been deemed to be self-employed.

Under the conference agreement farmworkers who, first, are paid $150 or more in a calendar year by one employer; or, second, perform agricultural labor for an employer on 20 or more days during the calendar year for cash wages computed on a time basis would be covered.

The conferees accepted the Senate provisions relating to crew leaders.

The conferees accepted the Senate provision which would exclude from coverage agricultural workers from any foreign country who are admitted to the United States on a temporary basis.

The conference agreement also provides for an exclusion from coverage of persons producing or harvesting gum resin products as provided in the Senate bill.

(e) State and local employees: The conference agreement accepted the new provisions added by the Senate relating to the States named in the Senate bill except Indiana was deleted from the named States. It is my understanding that this deletion was at the request of the State of Indiana.

(f) Employees of nonprofit organizations: The conferees accepted the Senate version relating to nonprofit organization employees.

(g) Federal employees: The Senate deleted the House provisions granting coverage to Tennessee Valley Authority and Federal Home Loan Bank employees. The conference agreement would grant coverage to these employees.

(h) United States citizens employed by foreign subsidiaries of American corporations: The conferees accepted the Senate provision which would extend coverage to United States citizens employed by a foreign subsidiary of a domestic corporation where the corporation owns not less than 20 percent of the voting stock of the foreign subsidiary. At the present time there is a 50 percent ownership requirement.

(i) Adjustment of benefit provisions for newly covered persons: The conferees accepted the Senate provisions relating to insured status, the drop-out of years of low or no earnings, and starting and closing dates.

II. BENEFITS FOR PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED PERSONS

The conferees for the most part accepted the Senate version of the provisions granting benefits to the permanently and totally disabled.

The conference agreement deletes the provision of the Senate bill whereby individuals who refuse to undergo surgical or medical service in connection with rehabilitation would have been deemed to have done so with good cause.

III. RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

The House-passed bill would have reduced the retirement age for women from age 65 to age 62. The Senate bill would have provided full benefits at age 62 for widows and surviving dependent mothers only. Other women beneficiaries would be provided reduced annuities if they retire before age 65.

The conference agreement follows the Senate bill.

IV. SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS WHO LEAVE THE UNITED STATES

The conferees accepted the Senate provision suspending benefits to aliens who leave the United States with amendments making the suspension inapplicable if such a person has been a resident of the United States for 10 years or has paid contributions for 10 years or where there is a reciprocal treaty relating to benefits. The Senate provision was also amended to provide such a person would have to be outside the United States for 6 months before his payments would be suspended.

V. FORFEITURE OF BENEFITS UPON CONVICTION OF CERTAIN CRIMES

The Senate bill would have terminated an individual's benefits if he has been or is convicted of treason and certain other crimes under the Internal Security Act.

The conference agreement amends this provision to provide that benefits may be terminated only by a court.

VI. EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF PERSONS LISTED BY THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The conference agreement would exclude persons listed by the Board from coverage.

VII. FINANCING

The House-passed bill would have increased social security taxes by one-half of 1 percent on each the employer and employee, effective January 1, 1956. The self-employment tax would have been increased by three-fourths of 1 percent.

The conference agreement follows the Senate version whereby taxes would be increased one-fourth of 1 percent on each the employer and employee, effective January 1, 1957. The increase for the self-employed would be three-eighths of 1 percent. Similar increases would be made in each of the scheduled increases in taxes now contained in the law.

The conferees accepted the Senate provision establishing a separate trust fund for these increases which would be used only for the payment of disability insurance benefits.

The conferees also accepted the Senate provision providing for an increase in interest received by the Trust Fund.

VIII. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

The House-passed bill did not contain any amendments to the public-assistance titles of the Social Security Act. The Senate bill would have increased the maximum amount matchable under the old-age assistance aid to the blind and the permanently and totally disabled to five-sixths of the first $30 plus one-half of the remaining amount up to a maximum of $65 if the States complied with a "pass-along" provision.

Under the conference agreement, matching would be on the basis of four-fifths of the first $30 plus one-half of the next $30 up to a maximum of $60.

The maximum amount matchable in the aid to dependent children program would be increased by $2.

The Senate bill provided for a new medical care program with 50–50 matching up to a maximum of $8 for adults and $4 for children recipients. The conference agreement reduces this amount to $6 and $3, respectively.

The Senate bill would have provided that in determining need a State could disregard up to $50 in earned income. The conferees deleted this provision. The conferees also deleted the Senate provision to the effect that there should be no discrimination based on sex in determining need.

The conferees accepted the Senate provision authorizing grants to States, public and nonprofit organizations for research and demonstration projects.

The conferees also accepted the Senate provision relating to training grants with an amendment providing that the Federal share would be 80 percent for 5 years.

The conference agreement contains the Senate provision deleting the requirement that a needy child must attend school between the ages of 16 and 18, as well as the Senate provision including first cousins, nephews, and nieces within the persons eligible for payments under the ADC program. Parents and other relatives in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would be made eligible for payments under the ADC program.

The Senate bill raised the ceiling on Federal matching for public assistance for the Virgin Islands from $160,000 to $300,000. The conference agreement raises this amount to $200,000.

The conferees accepted the Senate provision raising the ceiling for Puerto Rico from $4,250,000 to $5,312,500.

The conferees accepted the Senate provision increasing the authorization for child welfare programs from $10 million to $12 million a year with a change making the increase effective for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. The conferees agreed to delete the Senate provision which would have established a Commission on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, I inserted a press release announcing the conference agreement on H. R. 7225 in the RECORD on Saturday, July 21. This release will be found at page 13889, and it contains a more detailed description of the conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached another milestone in our social legislation. A major achievement has been made in providing insurance benefit payments for disabled workers. The lack of disability insurance payments has been a long-recognized shortcoming in our social security insurance program. We have also made another major contribution to the social security program by reducing the age at which women beneficiaries may become eligible for benefits. We have now reached practically universal coverage under the system.

It has been my good fortune to have voted for the original Social Security Act and the many improvements which has been made since that time. I have long fought to add disability insurance benefit payments to the program. I am very happy that these benefits are now being added to round out the protection for our American workers.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7225, the Social Security Act

Amendments of 1956, provides several major changes in the present law. As the ranking Republican Member of the Conference Committee on the part of the House, I would like to summarize these changes.

First, the bill provides for the payment of cash disability benefits at age 50 to covered individuals who are permanently and totally disabled.

Second, it provides for the payment of women's benefits at age 62 instead of the present 65. Widows and surviving dependent mothers would be given full benefits at age 62. Working women and wives would be given reduced benefits if they begin to draw them between age 62 and 65.

Third, additional self-employed persons are brought into the social security system. Among these, lawyers and dentists represent major new coverage groups. In my opinion, it is unfortunate that we have delayed so long in extending coverage to these groups. The bill which I sponsored in 1954 would have covered both lawyers and dentists at that time. Physicians will continue to be excluded under H. R. 7225.

Fourth, social-security taxes will be increased effective January 1, 1957, by ¼ of 1 percent for each the employee and employer, making the rate at that time 2¼ percent each. The self-employment tax will be increased from 2 to 3⅜ percent at the same time.

Fifth, the bill increases present public assistance payments. The matching formula for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children at the present time for the first 3 of these programs is four-fifths of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment, up to a maximum of $55. The maximum amount matchable for these 3 programs would be increased from $55 to $60 and the formula would be changed so as to provide matching of four-fifths of the first $30 and one-half of the next $30 up to a maximum of $60. The aid to dependent children formula is presently four-fifths of the first $15 of a State's average monthly payment plus one-half of the next $15 up to a maximum of $30 for an eligible adult and for the first child. Each additional child is subject to a maximum of $21. The amount matchable would be increased by $2.

The increase in cost over present law for the first year amounts to $98 million for aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and old-age assistance and $48 million for the first year for aid to dependent children. The conferees deleted the pass-along provision from the Senate bill.

I have always been vitally interested in the special problems of the blind and have taken a leading role in developing legislation on their behalf. For this reason, I am glad to call attention to the increased Federal matching for the aid-to-blind program.

Sixth, a new program would be added whereby the Federal Government would match on a 50–50 basis State expenditures on vendor payments in behalf of public-assistance recipients needing medical care up to a maximum determined by multiplying $6 per month times the number of adults and $3 per month times the number of children. This program will cost $65 million in the first year. This new program is one which I first introduced in bill form last year on behalf of the administration.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there are many other changes provided by H. R. 7225, but I believe that the above summary contains the highlights.

In 1954, during the Republican 83d Congress, when I had the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I assumed responsibility for sponsoring and leading the battle for the administration's social-security program. That legislation has been one of the landmarks of the Eisenhower administration during its first term. It demonstrated, once and for all, that the Republican Party did not intend to turn the clock back in this area, but would take the lead in placing the retirement and survivorship protection of the American people on a firmer foundation.

That social-security bill which I sponsored and which Congress enacted into law in 1954 provided a number of important improvements in the existing program. First, and, I believe, most important, the basic protection of social-security coverage was finally extended to practically the entire gainfully employed population of the United States. For example, some 6 million farm owners and their families were brought into the system for the first time, an accomplishment of tremendous significance to the farm families of America. I recognize that a great many of the farmers of this country do not retire at age 65 and do not want to retire at that age. As a result, the retirement benefits of the social-security program are of uncertain value to many of these individuals. On the other hand, the survivor benefits of the system are of inestimable value to widows and dependent children upon the unexpected and untimely death of the family breadwinner. It has been my sad experience that my farmer friends and neighbors are certainly as susceptible to crippling injury and sudden death as the result of farm accidents as are individuals in other occupations, and probably more so. The new survivorship protection which we provided in 1954 should bring a new sense of security and peace of mind to our farm homes throughout the land.

These facts are equally true, I think, with regard to the millions of other self-employed individuals who were brought into the system for the first time under my bill in 1954. Personally, I have always wished that there were some practical way by which these individuals, including farmers, could be brought into the social-security system on an optional and not on a compulsory basis. I think that it is unfortunate to force people to take part in this type of retirement and survivorship system if they do not want to or do not need to. On the other hand, it has been demonstrated that an optional social-security system would cost just as much as private insurance, and would, therefore, be out of the reach of those of our people most in need of this basic protection for themselves and their loved ones. By extending the system to all, it has been possible to keep the costs relatively low, and thus within the means of the average individual.

The 1954 amendments also contained a number of other improvements in the existing system. Coverage was broadly extended with regard to farm workers. Moreover, my bill substantially improved the so-called "work clause" which had operated to deny benefits to individuals, otherwise eligible for benefits, who had earnings in excess of $75 a month. Under my bill, the allowable amount of earnings was increased to $1,200 a year. In addition, my bill provided across-the-board increases in benefits for all social security beneficiaries. These increases were modest in amount but helped in some measure to offset the rise in the cost of living which had struck with especial severity at our older citizens.

In comparing the action of Congress in 1954 and the action today with regard to this bill, I feel that certain comments are in order.

I believe that it was most unfortunate that no public hearings were ever held by the Committee on Ways and Means on this bill. This seems extraordinary in view of the billions of dollars involved and, even more important, in view of its significance in terms of human needs, upon which no value in dollars can be placed.

I believe it is unfortunate that the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as this House as a whole, has had no opportunity to determine what other areas of improvement within the social security system might be appropriate. For example, no effort was made to study a possible increase in minimum benefits, even though such an action would have benefited all of our retired workers and not just a selected few. The Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means made every effort last year to have this and other problems considered but to no avail. Frankly, I believe that the utter refusal by the majority to even consider an increase in the present minimum cash benefits demonstrates a callous disregard of the needs of our older citizens.

In many ways, the bill as agreed to by the conference committee represents a distinct improvement over the House bill. The provision for a separate trust fund with respect to the increased contributions required by disability benefits is a sound one. No one has the faintest conception what cash disability benefits ultimately will cost. The special trust fund will permit the Congress and the public to keep a close check on the finances of this new program. The overall lower cost of the conference bill is a distinct advantage.

I believe that the conferees have done an excellent job in resolving the differences between the House and Senate bills.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of Congress when the first social-security legislation was passed. It was then considered as an old-age pension law. We, in Ohio, had an old-age pension law for a year or two, and, of course, I was somewhat familiar with the principle. I felt that probably the most

deserving persons who should have help under this kind of legislation would be the deserving blind people, and I offered an amendment to the bill in the Ways and Means Committee providing for "aid to the indigent blind." In spite of all my earnestness, the Ways and Means Committee refused to accept my amendment. I then followed the matter up and offered my amendment on the floor of the House. Again, in spite of all my earnestness, the House of Representatives turned me down. The newspapers and magazines saw the fairness of my proposition and as a result, when the bill came before the Senate, my amendment was adopted and became a part of the first social-security law.

I mention this to show that from a humble beginning, where the poor blind woman who held out her tin cup on the street corner could not qualify for help, the principle of "public assistance has spread until today the social-security activities of the Government reach out and include nearly all our people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss some of the changes in this great and important system made in the legislation under consideration today.

The conferees on H. R. 7225, the Social-Security Act Amendments of 1956, have accomplished successfully a very difficult and complex task.

The bill embraces a great many important changes, both in the old-age and survivors insurance system and also in the public assistance program. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues some of the most significant of these changes.

First of all, H. R. 7225 contains an entirely new disability insurance program. It provides for the payment of cash benefits at age 50 to individuals who become permanently and totally disabled. The idea of disability insurance has been a controversial one over the years. There have always been sharp differences of opinion, not over the theoretical desirability of such a program, but over whether it could be practically administered and whether it could be financed on a sound basis. I believe that the conference bill provides for about the best approach to this problem that we can achieve at this time. However, we should watch the development of this program with great care.

Secondly, the bill lowers the age at which women can become entitled to benefits. Widows and surviving dependent mothers would be given full benefits at age 62. Working women and wives would be given reduced benefits if they begin to draw them between age 62 and 65. Working women would receive 80 percent of their full benefit should they retire at age 62. If they delay retirement they would be given five-ninths of 1 percent for each month's delay up to age 65. Wives would be given 75 percent of their full benefits should they begin to receive benefits at 62. For each month's delay up to age 65 they would receive twenty-five thirty-sixths of 1 percent. Should a woman accept a reduced benefit, this benefit would continue to be payable and it would not be increased upon their reaching age 65.

Third, the bill extends coverage to additional self-employment individuals, including lawyers and dentists. I believe it safe to say that when this bill becomes law, doctors of medicine will be the only self-employed group not covered by social security.

Fourth, it must be understood that the liberalizations provided by this bill must be paid for in order to keep the finances of the system on a sound basis. As a result, the social-security tax will go up one-quarter percent next January 1, after which it will be 2¼ percent each on employee and employer. The self-employment tax will go up to 3⅜ percent on the same date.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the changes involving the old-age and survivors' insurance program. Several other changes are provided with respect to public assistance.

For example, with regard to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the maximum amount which the Federal Government will match is increased to $60 from the present $55. The matching formula is also changed to four-fifths of the first $30 and one-half of the next $30 up to a maximum of $60, instead of four-fifths of the first $25 and one-half of the next $30 up to a maximum of $55, as under present law. In addition, and this is very important, there will be a $2 increase in the amount matchable with respect to the aid to dependent children program.

Finally, the bill provides a new program with respect to matching medical care payments for the needy. Under the bill, the Federal Government will match on a 50–50 basis vendor payments by the States with respect to medical care for public-assistance recipients. The bill provides a ceiling on the program equal to $6 per month times the number of adults and $3 per month times the number of children receiving assistance.

Summarizing the entire bill, it provides: First, disability benefits under OASI; second, lowering the OASI benefit age for women to 62; third, coverage of all self-employed except doctors of medicine; fourth, increased social security taxes January 1, 1957; fifth, increased Federal share under public assistance; and sixth, Federal matching of State payments with respect to the medical care of public assistance recipients.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the conference report on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1956 contained three major improvements in the law—improvements which will lower the retirement age for women, provide benefits to totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50, and extend coverage to dentists, lawyers, and certain other professional, self-employed groups.

The contents of the conference report are particularly pleasing because I have worked for these major improvements for a number of years.

As early as February 26, 1953, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, proposing that the retirement age for women be lowered to age 60 and that totally disabled workers be made eligible for benefits regardless of age.

This bill, H. R. 3554, 83d Congress, was the result of a long and thorough study assisted by outstanding experts on social security.

Two years later, on March 18, 1955, I reintroduced my proposal in an improved form. This time it was embodied in two separate bills: H. R. 1635 which proposed to lower the retirement age for women to age 60; and H. R. 5057, which called for the payment of social-security benefits to totally disabled workers, again without age limitations.

The progress made toward the achievement of these goals in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1956 will prove of tremendous benefit to thousands of American people. It will alleviate the problem of numerous widows, surviving dependent mothers, working women, and wives of workers, who will be able to retire at an earlier age.

At the same time, this new legislation brings new hope and relief to many American families which have been subjected to hardships because the principal wage earner became disabled, and was unable to draw social security benefits until age 65.

I join with my distinguished colleagues in supporting the conference report on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1956 in the firm belief that this constructive and farsighted legislation merits our whole-hearted support.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, broadening social security to provide payment to disabled persons at age 50 or over, at the same time lowering women's eligibility age to 62, is a solid achievement of the 84th Congress in providing for the general welfare and, at the same time, strengthening purchasing power for those most in need of such help.

I am proud that I voted for this bill, H. R. 7225, when it passed the House July 18, 1955. I am proud today to have voted for the conference report on the final bill following Senate action July 17, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, this broadening of coverage is a landmark of progress in legislation that is humane and economically wise. As predicted by the veteran Senator WALTER F. GEORGE in the last great speech of his long career, this advance is but a beginning. If our Nation continues in peace and freedom, as we all pray daily that it will, it is as certain as tomorrow's sunrise that future Congresses will further improve the Social Security Act, passed in 1935 against virtually solid Republican opposition and now supported by both parties with only a small hard core of die-hard dissenters.

There is no logic, no justifiable reason for denying benefit payments to insured workers who become totally and permanently disabled at 49 or 48 or 38 or 28 years of age.

The line of age 50 was chosen in taking this first step toward complete coverage for disability because members of the House Ways and Means Committee felt that the area from age 65 to age 50 was all that could be successfully proposed in the first legislative action by Congress.

Lest anyone leap to the conclusion that this is in any sense a raid on the Public Treasury or on taxpayers, let me say at once that it is a pay-as-we-go

program, that the additional cost of insuring workers against permanent and total disability is to be met out of an additional one-quarter of 1 percent payroll tax to be paid by the workers themselves and a like amount to be paid by the insured workers' employers, the combined amount to be earmarked and reserved to pay disability benefits. This removes any possibility of draining the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that very strong arguments can be made for lowering eligibility for disability payments below age 50, for removing any age qualifications whatever, and for making the eligibility test identical with the test for the payment of survivors benefits; namely, earnings in insured employment for the same number of years and quarters and amounts as now required for eligibility under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the act.

If a young worker has been working in insured employment for 10 years, during which both he and his employer have been taxed and have been paying into a fund to cover him, his dependents and survivors against the hazards of old age, death, and disability, it seems to me quite likely that permanent and total disablement of that worker at age 30 is quite likely to confront him, his wife, and young children with a more difficult and potentially more tragic situation than is likely to arise upon disablement at or after age 50, when dependency is likely to be less frequent and for shorter periods, since most of the children will have grown up beyond the dependency cut-off age of 18, or will be approaching that age.

At whatever age disability occurs, the insured worker and the members of his family are confronted with expenses beyond normal living expenses for able persons either of working age or in retirement. Medical care, surgery, therapy, prosthetic appliances, and other devices are often needed in addition to frequent nursing care.

All of these considerations, it seems to me, point to the need for, and the likelihood of, further improvements in the Social Security Act at an early date to lower the disability eligibility age until it is removed altogether and also to provide for the cost of medical, hospital, therapy, appliances and nursing care.

I shall continue to support and work actively for such further improvements.

Mr. Speaker, as so often happens in public policy and legislation, that which is morally right turns out to be economically right. This will be proven again in the 84th Congress' historic extension of the Social Security Act to cover disability and to lower the eligibility age for women.

The payments that can now be made to the totally and permanently disabled and to women upon reaching age 62 will strengthen mass purchasing power in precisely those areas where it is most needed, namely, in families whose income is threatened or has been cut off, and for the necessities of life itself, food, clothing, shelter, fuel, and medical care.

This bill passed the House with bipartisan support, only 31 voted against it, but 23 of those 31 were Republicans.

A year later, in July 1956, all the weight of the present administration through its Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was thrown into the fight in an effort to defeat the disability provisions of the bill, with the result that they passed the Senate by the narrow margin of 47 to 45. Forty-one Democrats voted for the George amendment adding disability to the bill as in the House version. Only 7 Democrats voted against it. But 38 Republicans voted against the George amendment adding disability, only 6 Republicans voted for that amendment. In conclusion, I want to quote and endorse the words of Senator GEORGE in closing the debate on his amendment:

Mr. President, I undertake to say that this is the most important question I have ever presented to the American people. Senators may do as they please now. Within the next Congress they will accept this principle. Regardless of promises or obligations, I do not believe that the Senate will so far desert the working people of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, before voting on H. R. 7225 with amendments agreed to by the Conference Committee, I want to express concern over the amendment relating to agricultural workers and crew leaders. This is a Senate-approved amendment to section 201 (f) (2) of the measure. I call attention to the statement of the Department of Labor circulated belatedly to members of the Conference Committee which voices strong opposition to the amendment.

The statement declares that the amendment will be most unfortunate for the migratory agricultural workers. The statement predicts that "deductions would be made from the worker's pay envelope without in many cases being recorded with the Social Security Administration, thus defeating the purpose of the amendment and thus depriving the migrant of honestly earned benefits under the Social Security Act."

The statement bases its prediction on the Labor Department's "long experience with the so-called crew leader system, under which approximatly 350,000 migrant workers travel and secure their jobs."

There is a distinction—

The Department points out—

between crew leaders and legitimate labor contractors, who actually employ and pay agricultural workers. These labor contractors are now considered as employers for income tax and social security purposes under rulings of the Internal Revenue Service. Their operations are not affected by this proposed legislation.

Unlike the recognized labor contractor, the crew leader is generally only one step removed from migrant worker status himself. He may be a crew leader today and a migrant worker tomorrow, and vice versa. He is not, except in a few States, licensed, nor is he bonded. He usually has no place of business, no fixed residence, no facilities whatever for keeping records, and in many instances is illiterate.

The crew leader's charge for service averages around 12 percent of the workers' meager earnings. Crew leaders, having no responsibility toward workers or farmers, have been known to abscond with entire payrolls, leaving the migrants and their families destitute, without work, money or transportation.

While many migrants are now recruited directly by the farmers or through the employment service, section 201 (f) (2) would tend to force the workers to come under the crew leader system. The employer would find it more advantageous to have his entire work force under crew leaders and thus avoid employer-employee responsibilities.

This section would give statutory recognition to the crew leader system and would confer upon it a legal status inappropriate to its nature and most unfortunate for the migrant workers. Deductions would be made from the worker's pay envelope without in many cases being recorded with the Social Security Administration, thus defeating the purpose of the amendment and depriving the migrant of honestly earned benefits under the Social Security Act.

Moreover, from the standpoint of labor law administration, a dangerous precedent would be established by this amendment in its recognition of the practice of using a middleman to allow employers to shift their responsibilities for complying with labor legislation. This action might be a step in the direction of removing long recognized responsibilities of employers under other labor laws—workmen's compensation, for instance, or child labor, or the field of minimum wages."

These are telling arguments against this amendment and afford valid grounds for grave apprehension. I believe acceptance of this amendment carries with it an obligation on the part of Congress and especially of the Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member to follow closely the operation of this amendment in practice. If the Labor Department's unqualified forebodings are borne out by experience I believe the Congress should rectify the situation by legislative action. The least favored and least protected segment of our economic society—the approximately one million migratory agricultural workers—should not be left to the even more unhappy state which the Department of Labor declaration implies is in store for them under this amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the social security bill of 1956 makes several significant changes in existing social security law:

First. It provides for payment to persons covered by social security who are totally disabled and who have reached the age of 50 years. Payments begin in July 1957. I see a great field of controversy in the determination of when and if a person is totally disabled. Such has been the experience of countless individuals seeking to establish this point to meet the requirements of workmen's compensation and Veterans' Administration laws.

Second. It reduces from 65 to 62 the age which women may qualify for payments as follows:

(a) If they are widows or surviving, dependent mothers of covered workers, they are eligible for full payment.

(b) If they are wives of workers covered by the Social Security Act or covered workers themselves, they may at age 62 elect to receive 80 percent of the payment. It should be pointed out that they then do not become eligible to receive the full amount at a later

date. This would be effective November 1956.

Third. Increased contributions are a part of the law to meet the increased costs. Effective January 1, 1957, taxes would be increased one-fourth of 1 percent for each, the employer and employee, making the rate 2¼ percent on each. The self-employment tax will be increased from 3 to 3⅜ percent.

Fourth. Eligibility for payments under Aid to Dependent Children program is broadened to include first cousins, nephews, and nieces.

Fifth. Beginning in taxable year 1956, coverage is extended to professional groups, except physicians.

Sixth. Formerly farm operators must have earned a net income of $400. Under the new bill where gross income is $1,800 or less, two-thirds of the gross income may be considered as net income for social-security purposes. Where the gross income is over $1,800, it is deemed that the net income is at least $1,200 for computation purposes. This provision is to be effective on the 1957 income.

Seventh. Agricultural workers are covered after they earn $150 or work 20 days or more during a calendar year.

Eighth. Under this bill, the Federal Government also increases funds available for matching State aid in public assistance programs. This would apply to aid for the needy aged, aid to the blind, and aid to disabled dependent children.

Ninth. The new bill would also continue old-age and survivors program aid for dependent childen beyond the age of 18 if such children are disabled.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the amendments to the Social Security Act constitute substantial improvements for our senior citizens. It is with regret, however, that I note that some of the amendments adopted by the Senate were eliminated. Two in particular stand out: First, the provision which would have allowed recipients of old-age pensions to earn up to $50 a month without having their assistance diminished by such earnings. This amendment is so worthy that I intend to fight for it next year. It will add to the dignity of those receiving pensions and it is certainly a justified right. Secondly, I regret the elimination of the Senate provision that there be no discrimination based on sex in determining need. In my State of California, as well as in many other States, there is ample evidence that local authorities try to give less amounts to women than to men and there is certainly no evidence that the cost of living is any higher for men than it is for women.

On the affirmative side, I am happy to see that many of the things which Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and I fought for are included in the final bill. Outstanding, of course, is the reduction in the retirement age for widows and surviving dependent mothers from 65 to 62. Working women and wives will be given graduated benefits from 62 to 65, starting at 80 percent of the full amount they will receive at 65. Of great benefit also is the payment to those permanently and totally disabled of benefits beginning at the age of 50. It is interesting to note that members of the Christian Science Church and other churches who rely on spiritual healing and who refuse rehabilitation services would be deemed to have done so with good cause.

The bill, of course, also extends the social-security coverage to farm operators and share farmers, to ministers and to agricultural workers, as well as employees of nonprofit organizations. However, physicians were eliminated at the insistence of the American Medical Association.

Under the matching formula for pensions, the pensions will be increased from $55 to $60 and, although the final bill does not include the so-called pass-along provision adopted by the Senate which would have required the States to increase the pensions they pay by the same $10 amount, we in California have already taken care of that matter through the State legislature so our pensioners will receive a much-needed and well-deserved $10 increase.

I have a happy feeling that my efforts to help our senior citizens receive adequate pensions, under improved conditions, have been substantially successful. We still have a long way to go and I am pledged to continue the fight.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that this morning the Senate passed a bill to launch a broad new program of Federal aid to depressed areas of the Nation. As has earlier been stated by the President, we must help deal with the pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar our Nation's general industrial prosperity. Certainly it is well recognized that economic changes in recent years have often been so rapid and so far-reaching in their effect that areas generally committed to a single local resource or industrial activity, such as the textile industry, have found themselves temporarily deprived of their markets and their jobs. I do believe that for communities so hit, a real sense of responsibility must remain with the people living there, and with their State, but I also am just as firmly convinced that a soundly conceived Federal partnership program can be of real assistance to the people in their efforts to help themselves.

I am well aware of the many problems involved in any legislation of this kind, and that every proper effort must be made to make sure that the legislation as drawn will not encourage further dislocation but will rather direct itself toward being of help and assistance to those communities which are so earnestly striving to help themselves.

I do urge that at the earliest possible moment we in the House be given the opportunity of debating fully and completely this important measure.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, adoption of the conference report on H. R. 7225 represents the most historic and far-reaching improvements yet to be made in the Social Security System first enacted in 1935. This bill lowering the age at which women become eligible for benefits, providing disability insurance at age 50, expanding coverage to thousands of individuals not now covered, and increasing the Federal old-age assistance payment shares is a major step forward in providing the people of this Nation with a truly adequate and comprehensive social security program. However, there is still much to be done. We still have a long way to go before our present old-age programs, even with the enactment of H. R. 7225, are truly adequate to meet the ever-increasing problems of old age and disability.

Ever since coming to Congress 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly concerned with the problems facing the older citizens of our Nation. The problem of old age is one of the most serious facing us today. The poet Browning wrote the famous line, "Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be," but if we were to look at hard, cold facts today we could see that growing old brings on problems and complications which would test the strength of the youngest and strongest of us much less that of the older person.

OLD-AGE PROBLEM NATIONAL CONCERN

The problem of old age is of national concern. It touches each of us, young and old alike. Consider for a moment that since 1900 the number of persons over 65 has quadrupled while the total population has only doubled. From 1947 to 1952 the population aged 65 and over, increased an almost unbelievable 17 percent while the total population in that same time increased only 5 percent. By 1975 there will be more than 20 million Americans 65 and over. There are over 14 million today, and the average income for a man and his wife over 65 today—one of the 14 million—is only $1,500. Their average savings are less than $500. Millions of old folks, Mr. Speaker, living on such pitifully small incomes in these days of high costs of living. The situation is becoming, if it isn't already, a national disgrace.

During the last 50 years, our national economy has moved from one based primarily upon agriculture to one of huge industrialization, creating many new and unanticipated social problems, particularly with respect to our older persons who are being shunted more and more to an insecure, dependent and much too hopeless and helpless a position in our society. They are being deprived of work because of their age and being forced to retire prematurely when they have good, active years ahead of them. As a result, many of our older people have inadequate financial resources to maintain themselves and their families as independent and self-respecting members of their communities, are unable to find adequate housing for themselves and their families, are confronted with disabling health and medical problems, are driven by frustration and despair to private and public mental institutions and general hospitals, and are placed in increasing numbers on old-age assistance rolls.

Because of the enormity of the problem even further improvements in the Social Security System should be enacted. The program in operation today is not designed to adequately assist the Nation's older, disabled, and dependent citizens. Basically we are still operating under a 1935 law trying to solve the social-security problems of 1956. We do

all in our power to modernize our laws calling for highway construction, defense measures, and countless others, yet when it comes to the field of social welfare and social security we seem satisfied with things the way they are. It is no more logical to put the tremendous traffic of today on the roads of 1920 than it is to try to solve the problem of today's aged and disabled with programs developed two decades ago. Present law just is not designed to solve the tremendous problem confronting us today.

FURTHER IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED

For instance, lowering the age at which women become eligible for benefits as provided in H. R. 7225, while it is a significant improvement over existing law, does not go far enough. Ever since coming to Congress I have urged that the retirement age in general, for men and women alike, be lowered to age 60. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4471, with such a provision. I hope the day is not too far off when we truly face up to the problem and lower the retirement age to 60 for everyone.

Allowing disabled persons to obtain benefits at age 50, another provision of H. R. 7225, is a fine, progressive improvement in present law. It is estimated that in the first year of operation disability insurance benefits will be payable to about 250,000 workers, amounting to $200 million in benefits. Under the courageous leadership of Senator WALTER GEORGE this provision was retained in the Senate version of the bill in the face of determined opposition from the administration and an almost solid bloc of Republican votes against it. Actually, one could ask himself why must there be a disability age limit at all. When a person becomes totally disabled, bedridden, and unable to work, he is deserving of assistance. What we seem to be saying in H. R. 7225 is that a disabled person over 50 needs help, but a disabled person under 50 can take care of himself. Such is not the case, and everyone knows it. Yet the solution to the problem is shackled with this completely unrealistic age requirement. Disabled persons of whatever age need and deserve social-security coverage and until such is the case, we will not be adequately discharging our duties to them. My bill, H. R. 4471, would entitle a disabled person to assistance at any age, and I am pleased to see such able leaders as Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, take a similar stand on this issue.

I was extremely pleased to see coverage extended to over 250,000 self-employed individuals and their families under H. R. 7225. This, again, is a great improvement and one I have long striven for. But we see once more the piecemeal approach to the problem. The real solution is to extend coverage to all persons—to enact a truly overall and comprehensive social-security program for all today and not wait another few years to make a change here and a change there. The problem exists right now. We should not postpone the solution which we know to exist. Every moment lost just adds to the misery and tragedy of many of our older and disabled citizens. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom has said, "Social legislation must change with changing social and economic conditions." These are fine sentiments, but we do not seem to be living up to them.

Apparently there are those who think we are unable to afford, from a financial standpoint, to take such a step toward the solution of the problem. Is it possible that a nation as rich as ours cannot afford to provide security both financial and social to its older citizens who helped make it as rich and great as it is? I cannot believe that such is the case. Headlines blare out the good news that our economy is approaching the $400 billion mark. But how much publicity is given the fact that nearly three-fourths of all Americans over 65 years of age either have no income of their own or receive less than $1,000 a year? This is a sad commentary on our economy. While storage bins burst with surplus food, many of these older folks actually live on marginal or submarginal levels. I am convinced that our economy can withstand the expense of a real Social Security System.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND FREEDOM

In order for this Nation to continue to maintain the kind of liberty and freedom we have become accustomed to, Mr. Speaker, the Government must participate in programs which provide security for the individual against risks over which he has no control. It is not a negative concept of liberty or freedom which gives us our individual and collective strength, but rather the more positive approach involving the existence of those economic and social conditions necessary to enjoy the good life, and to exercise the privileges of free speech, press, and citizenship. We all know that a man who is unemployed, for instance, is far from free—that to him freedom is a hollow word hedged about with the misery which accompanies poverty and insecurity. By the same token we know that our old folks who live on a miserly old-age assistance pension are not really free and able to enjoy the liberties and rights which our form of government provides. Such problems as these led Franklin D. Roosevelt to observe that "in order to preserve our democratic institutions we need to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people." One group in America, Mr. Speaker, sorely in need of help in protecting such security is our older and disabled citizens. We must all be aware that millions of them have been watching and waiting to see whether this Congress would accept its responsibilities and enact legislation truly beneficial and helpful to the older folks. Some progress, indeed great progress has been made with the enactment of H. R. 7225. But we should not stop here. Having made such excellent progress this year I am confident that in the not too distant future we will see the dream of a truly comprehensive and adequate social-security program become a reality.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to support the adoption of the conference report on the social-security amendments of 1956, H. R. 7225, and in doing so would like to commend the House conferees in the work they did with the Senate conferees on this important and meritorious legislation.

It is my view that within the limits of the matters germane to the conference a very desirable bill has been brought back to the House of Representatives for final approval. In making this observation I would like to express the opinion that certain improvements that should have been accomplished during this Congress are neglected in this legislation. The improvements that I have in mind that were not taken care of by the bill as agreed to in conference include such meritorious amendments as a liberalized retirement test so that America's aged citizens could lead more productive lives through employment without loss of their social-security entitlement.

I also believe that consideration should have been given to blanketing-in the present aged who are not now covered under social security so that those persons who have reached retirement age, and are not now eligible for benefits through no fault of their own, could begin to receive them. In this connection I would point out to my colleagues in the House that I introduced legislation, H. R. 9272, on February 13, 1956, to provide for the blanketing-in of the present aged on a basis that would guarantee against impairment of the actuarial soundness of the trust fund. If my proposed amendment to the Social Security Act had been adopted, our aged American citizens who met the eligibility requirements could have begun to draw benefits without concern over the iniquitous "needs test" and the humiliation that attends the acknowledgment of poverty that is required in order to be eligible for public assistance today.

In supporting this legislation I would like to make particular reference to four improvements provided by the conference report that I regard as particularly significant and meritorious. The first of these improvements pertains to the reporting of earnings by farm operators and tenant farmers. The legislation as modified in conference would provide a liberalized income reporting method so that small farmers may receive credit for a higher portion of their total income and thus become entitled to larger benefits than would be available to them under existing law. This change will result in more farmers becoming eligible for OASI benefits and the benefits to which they will be entitled will be higher than they would have obtained under present law. Tenant farmers will be regarded as self-employed individuals so that both the tenant farmer and the landowner may obtain coverage under the OASI program.

Agricultural workers would also be benefited under the conference agreement. Such workers would not be subject to social-security taxes if they are only casually engaged in employment and are not paid $150 or more in cash wages in the calendar year by one employer or if they perform less than 20 days of work for an employer during the calendar year. This change will not exclude from coverage those agricultural workers who should have the benefits of the OASI program but will save the employer

of the occasional farmworker from the need of keeping records on casual employees that he hires for a very short time. In this respect another improvement that was adopted by the conferees was the exclusion from coverage of agricultural workers from foreign countries who are admitted to the United States on a temporary basis.

Another amendment that would be made to the Social Security Act by the conference agreement that I regard as particularly significant is the amendment providing disability benefits for the totally disabled individual upon the attainment of age 50. A serious benefit gap has existed in our social-security program to date in that disability benefits are not payable under the OASI system. It has always been my view that the family of a worker who is disabled is as much in need of disability benefits as is the family of a retired worker in need of retirement benefits or the family of a deceased worker in need of survivorship benefits. One of the principal purposes of the social-security program is that its benefits are the means whereby family ties have essentially remained intact where the untimely death of the principal wage earner of the family has occurred. I would point out to my colleagues in the House that the loss of income is just as complete under circumstances of total disability as it is under the circumstances of the death of the principal family provider. For that reason it is appropriate that disability benefits would be payable under this conference agreement.

It is true that the disability benefits provided by the conference agreement are available on a more conservative basis than benefits payable to the retired and to survivors under existing law. However, the conference agreement establishes a separate trust fund and allocates a separate tax payable to that trust fund so that as experience with this new aspect of the social-security program is gained a liberalization of the disability portion of the program may be undertaken if it is warranted. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the disability benefits that will become payable under the conference agreement on H. R. 7225 will do much to make the old-age and survivors insurance program more adequately meet an urgent need of the American people.

The third aspect of the report filed by the conferees on the social security amendments of 1956 that I regard as particularly significant pertains to the public-assistance titles of the Social Security Act. I am gratified to observe that the amendments provided in the conference agreement to these public-assistance titles will insure to our aged, our disabled, our blind, and our dependent children a liberalized benefit level that more realistically recognizes the cost of even the barest subsistence today. It should be recognized that people who are compelled to avail themselves of public assistance are entitled to an adequate benefit commensurate with the costs of their living requirements in our present-day economy. For that reason I would observe that the benefit increases provided under the conference agreement are most meritorious.

The fourth aspect of the bill to which I would like to specifically refer pertains to the lowering of the retirement age for women under the old-age and survivors insurance program, from 65 years to 62 years. I am convinced that this retirement age should have been lowered even further with respect to women who are unable to obtain work because they have not previously been a participant in the labor market and who are without means of support because of the death of their husbands. The amendment contained in the conference report lowering the retirement age for women is a step in the right direction. Women will now be able to make an election as to whether they will retire or will continue working at an earlier date than is possible under the present law and in this way the old-age and survivors insurance program is made more realistic and more adequate.

I would also like to commend the conferees on the action that they have taken to preclude the payment of benefits to persons convicted of crimes that are traitorous in their nature and that would deny recognition for coverage purposes to employment by communistic-front organizations. I also subscribe to the action of the conferees imposing more stringent limitations on the payment of benefits to aliens. It has always been my view that the old-age and survivors insurance program was established to provide for the welfare of American citizens and I strongly believe that it should be so limited. The payment of benefits to aliens constitutes a drain on the trust fund and results in the denial of benefit increases that might otherwise be possible for our American citizens. An amendment to public-assistance titles that merits the support of all Members of the Congress is the amendment that would provide on a 50–50 matching basis medical-care benefits. This amendment will do much to assure to our aged citizens the medical care that they, perhaps more than any other category of our citizenry, need so direly.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that in the time allotted to me I do not have a more adequate opportunity to discuss this conference report, the social-security program, and the changes that must be accomplished in the future to make the program more fully meet the needs of our American citizens. It is my view that the social-security law more vitally affects our American polity than any other Federal statute. For that reason I think the Congress of the United States should be particularly attentive on a continuing basis to effecting changes and improvements in the law as they prove feasible. I am confident the Congress will undertake such attentiveness and will review the operation of the program to make sure that it is fiscally sound, economically adequate, and humanely equitable.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to urge my colleagues in the House to support the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 7225.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years I have repeatedly and emphatically declared in this House my conscientious judgment that the enactment of and continuing improvement in our Social Security System is the greatest bulwark that can be legislatively erected against the danger of domestic inroads upon our people from subtle Communist propaganda and criticism of our so-called capitalist society.

It is, therefore, with the deepest earnestness I express the hope that this conference report will be adopted unanimously. In my opinion, such action will represent the most historic and far-reaching improvements yet made in the Social Security System that was first enacted in 1935.

The bill and conference report lowering the age at which women become eligible for benefits, providing disability insurance at age 50, expanding coverage to thousands of individuals not now within the System, and increasing the Federal old-age assistance payments is a major step forward in providing the people of this Nation with a truly adequate and comprehensive social-security program.

I am particularly gratified that our older citizens are being extended an additional measure, which could still be expanded, of assistance. The problem of reasonably helping our older people is one of the most challenging facing the country today. Since 1900, the number of persons over 65 has quadrupled, while the total population has only doubled. By 1975, there will be more than 20 million Americans 65 and over; there are over 14 million today. The average income for a man and his wife over 65 now is only $1,500. Just think of it for a minute, these millions of our older folks trying to live on such pathetically small incomes in these days of high living costs. At least we are beginning to deal with that deplorable situation, and I trust we will continue to give it even greater sympathetic consideration in our further actions.

Allowing disabled persons to obtain benefits at the age of 50 is a genuinely Christian and humane provision of this new legislation. Indeed, we may well question the justice of setting this arbitrary figure of disability at 50. It is quite obvious that disabled persons of whatever age need and should morally be granted social-security coverage. I look forward to the day when we will realistically realize that age is not a just factor in considering the needs of a disabled person. At whatever age such tragedy occurs, the individual and family members are plagued with expenses beyond normal living for medical care, medicine, correctional appliances, nursing care, and so on. Anyone who has experienced any temporary family sickness at all realizes the tremendous financial burden that accompanies sickness and disability these days.

Let us further appreciate that in setting up this program it is not in any sense an imposition on the Public Treasury or our taxpayers. The additional cost of taking care of these disabled persons is to be met out of an additional one-fourth of 1 percent payroll tax to be paid by the workers themselves and a like amount to be paid by the insured workers' employers, the compiled amount to be earmarked and reserved to pay disability benefits. This process removes

any possibility of depleting the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, another outstanding feature of improvement in this current legislation is the lowering of age limit at which women can become entitled to benefits. I refer, of course, to the provision to lower to 62 the retirement age for workingwomen, wives and dependent mothers. Widows and surviving dependent mothers will be given full benefits at age 62. Workingwomen and wives would be given reduced benefits if they began to draw them between ages 62 and 65, in accord with a well-defined formula. This is, indeed, a definite improvement in our long-neglected consideration of American women under this System. It still leaves an obvious inequity by excluding other groups of women from the same benefits.

We all know and experience proves that after the age of 50, or even before, in our modern industrial life, women who lose their jobs or are otherwise unemployed find it extremely difficult to get new positions, far more than men under the same circumstances. Women, therefore, are frequently forced into retirement much earlier than men and therefore need the benefits earlier. These are hard facts which must be dealt with sooner or later, but at least we are taking a step now in the right direction; I hope that we will continue this present promise of progress in this field.

There are, Mr. Speaker, many more sound and beneficial provisions in this bill, such as the extended coverage to certain farmers, ministers, agricultural workers, and self-employed individuals, including lawyers and dentists. All of these provisions have been carefully explained to the House and thoroughly justified. There is no need of repeating them here.

Mr. Speaker, these current improvements in our Social Security System, as spelled out in this legislation, are in entire accord with our Christian principles and traditions. They are within the capacity of this blessed and bountiful Nation to assume. We have been extremely anxious these last 10 years and extremely generous in providing billions of dollars to aid and assist friendly peoples, and even some enemies, all over the world. Some of those expenditures were and are undoubtedly wise in our self-interest, but the wisdom and practicality of certain others become ever more and more doubtful.

To those who question our own ability to reasonably participate in a sound Social Security System at the Federal level, I suggest they take a look at the staggering and astounding amounts of money that we have spent abroad. I ask them, in all sincerity, what will it profit us to spend abroad if we neglect to the point of discouragement and demoralization the welfare of our own people? I would remind them that the primary duty of this National Legislature is concern for the people of the United States.

This social-security measure is truly in accord with the exhortation of the President to legislate for the good of all Americans, and I now urge its unanimous adoption without further delay.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has just completed action on one of the most significant and humane pieces of legislation in recent history—I refer, of course, to the social security amendments of 1956. The enactment of this landmark legislation is another victory in the long struggle in which my Democratic colleagues and I have engaged, side by side, in providing a degree of self-respecting security for our elderly people, our disabled, and those who have suffered misfortune. I am proud to state that I have for many years worked long and hard to improve and strengthen our social-security program and that the amendments of 1956 achieve many of the objectives which I urged many years ago.

It is therefore appropriate on this occasion for me to review briefly just what has been accomplished by the 1956 social security amendments and indicate those areas where further improvements may yet be made. I am particularly interested in reviewing these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, because of the vital interest which I have always had in our social-security program and because of the contribution which I am proud to have made, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and of the Congress, toward enactment of this important legislation.

It will be recalled that in the summer of 1955 the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives originated and passed by an overwhelming majority this basic legislation. Certain changes were made in the bill by the Senate Finance Committee, and further changes were made on the Senate floor. Insofar as the major provisions of the bill are concerned, I still believe the House version was the soundest approach, but I am happy that the bill which has finally been approved does retain most of the improvements recommended by the House.

The five principal features of the 1956 social security amendments may be summarized as follows:

First, one of the most important provisions of the 1956 amendments was provision for disability insurance protection for the permanently and totally disabled at or after age 50. The inclusion of this provision rounds out the protection of our social-security program and provides one of the most humane actions which could have been taken by the 84th Congress. The gap which existed in our Social Security System prior to approval of these amendments was obvious. Previously, a worker who was insured under the System and who became disabled regardless of his age had to wait until age 65 before becoming eligible for any benefits, a situation which unquestionably was unsound and unfair. Certainly, a breadwinner who is unfortunate enough to become permanently and totally disabled at age 50, and who is a fully insured individual under social security, should not be forced to wait for 15 years before receiving benefits.

I am proud to state that the bill passed by the House of Representatives last year by an overwhelming vote included this humane provision and it was with gratification that I noted it was restored to the bill on the floor of the United States Senate, after having been removed by the Senate committee. It is estimated that some 250,000 individuals may become eligible for benefits during the first year under this provision of the bill, and this basic protection is extended to some 35 million insured persons.

Before leaving this point, Mr. Speaker, I must state that I would have much preferred not to see the age limit of 50 placed in the disability-insurance provision, but I recognized the practical legislative situation which existed. I do intend, however, to work for refinements and improvements in this respect at a later date.

Second, the bill provides for a reduction in the retirement age of widows, workingwomen, and wives, from age 65 to age 62. For a number of years, I have worked for a reduction in the retirement age for women. As the bill passed the House of Representatives last year, the retirement age for all of these categories of women was reduced uniformly from 65 to 62 upon my motion. As the bill came back to us from the Senate, provision was made for reduction in the retirement age to 62 with full benefits for widows, but it provides further for an actuarial reduction in retirement benefits for wives and workingwomen if they choose to retire at age 62 rather than 65. In the case of wives, 75 percent of full benefits may be received by them if they begin receiving them at age 62, and in the case of workingwomen, 80 percent of their full benefits may be received if they retire at 62 rather than 65.

As indicated, under the House version of the bill, all women could retire at age 62 with full benefits. I still think this was by far the better version, but I recognize the practical situation in that the modified version of the bill apparently was the only acceptable version to the Senate during this session.

In this connection I should like to emphasize that it was upon my motion that the Ways and Means Committee in 1955 included the original provision to lower the age limit uniformly for all women to age 62 with full benefits. I repeat that I am very sorry that the version which I recommended in committee and which passed the House was not accepted by the Senate.

Further, in this connection I think it appropriate for me to indicate that in the 83d Congress I introduced a bill—H. R. 2713, on February 6, 1953—which provided for the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 60. I believe that it is fair for me to state that my record shows my vital interest in this matter, and while I am glad that action has been taken to provide for lowering the retirement age to age 62, I still consider that improvements may be made in this area, and it is my intention to press for and support measures at a future date to make such improvements.

Third, coverage was extended to many additional individuals, so that now our social-security program is nearly universal in its coverage. Some 250,000 persons were added, and perhaps many

more, depending upon State and local action. Practically all self-employed professional people are now covered except physicians, who were left out at their request; coverage was made available to more State and local employees; provisions relative to sharefarmers were clarified and amplified; and further additional groups were brought into the System, such as employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Home Loan Banks, and others.

Fourth, provision is made for the payment of benefits after age 18 to the dependent child of a retired or deceased worker if the child has been permanently and totally disabled since before age 18. The mother of the child would also be eligible for benefits under this provision so long as she continues to have the child in her care. I think this provision, which originated in the Ways and Means Committee, is one of the most commendable in the entire bill, although it is of narrower application. The situation faced by those persons who are caring for a mentally or physically handicapped child is sad indeed, and their suffering is greater because of their concern as to what may happen when the family income may be cut off by death or retirement of the wage earner. This provision will help ameliorate, to a degree, this situation.

Fifth, a number of improvements were made with respect to grants-in-aid for public assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children. The Federal share for these programs was increased; the program for aid to dependent children was broadened and strengthened; Federal support for research is provided; Federal funds for child welfare are increased; and other changes are made.

I am not entirely satisfied, however, with these changes, important as they are. For the most part, they are a step in the right direction, and will enable our needy aged, blind, disabled, and dependent to have some improvement in their security, but I consider that my own bill on this subject, H. R. 10302, would have been much better. It would have placed these programs on an up-to-date basis, provided even higher assistance levels than is provided in the present amendments, and made other desirable changes. However, the provisions of the social security amendments of 1956 do make improvements in the grant-in-aid programs and I am pleased to see this done.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing are some of the major provisions of this important legislation. I regard this bill as one of the most forward-looking enactments which any Congress in recent years has approved. I am proud to emphasize that its basic framework was laid out in the bill originated last year by the Committee on Ways and Means and that I am happy to have had the opportunity of working hard for its enactment. I expect to continue to press for further improvements in our Social Security System, which now is reaching a well-rounded program of basic protection, soundly and equitably financed, for all our people.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H. R. 7225 to amend and liberalize the Social Security Act. I am extremely pleased to note that the conferees included the provision which will allow women to become eligible for benefits at age 62 rather than 65 under the present law. This was one of the provisions of the bill that I introduced, H. R. 6783, and was incorporated by members of the Committee on Ways and Means into H. R. 7225 with modifications. Although I would desire to see the age eligibility reduced to 60 for women, I accept the modification to age 62 by committee members and wholeheartedly support the recommendations in the conference report.

I am also pleased that this bill includes dentists and lawyers in the social-security program and that provision has been made for the continuation of monthly benefits for mentally and physically retarded children after age 18.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is fast approaching when the 84th Congress will pass into history. During both sessions these needed and desirable amendments to the Social Security Act have been studied and debated. The House-Senate conferees are to be commended for working out an agreement on this important measure so that we could have this report before us today. I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly adopt this report so that we may have a liberalized social-security law this year.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the title of this bill is self-explanatory—it is, in effect, a bill to modernize the whole social-security program in keeping with the policies which we on the Democratic side have been supporting and promoting ever since the original Social Security Act was passed.

This bill does many things to help many people—women approaching retirement age whose wait before collecting benefits will now be shortened in a great many cases; people on public assistance and aid to the blind and aid to dependent children who can look for a larger Federal contribution to their monthly benefits; and the sick and ill among the indigent who can look for Federal assistance toward medical and hospital expenses. Furthermore, practically all professional groups except medical doctors are now to be covered by social security. And the disabled have had opened to them under this bill a great new program for receiving social-security benefits at or after the age of 50.

On this occasion, as we prepare to pass this bill, I cannot help but think back a few years.

Mr. Speaker, as you drove down the Boulevard of the Allies, or down Bigelow Boulevard, toward Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle during those autumn days and into the late fall, the billboards called down at you a frightening message that the workers of our country were being victimized by a cruel hoax.

The billboards were Republican Party billboards; the "cruel hoax" to which they referred was social security—the social security law which Franklin Delano Roosevelt had signed into law the year before but which had not yet gone into effect regarding the payroll deductions and benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

The Republican Party was shedding immense — and expensive — billboard tears over the consequences of this terrible New Deal law—and was promising to repeal it.

Now I grant, Mr. Speaker, that all this may sound like ancient history to some. After all, it did happen 20 years ago. To the new voters of today, 20 years may appear to be an eternity—for certainly to their way of thinking it is a lifetime, at least.

OUTSTANDING NEW FEATURES IN 1956 SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

But the voter of any age today—whether he lived through the days I speak of 20 years ago and was aware of their significance, or whether he just heard about them at the family dinner table as the parents reminisced about the exciting and eventful era when this country was pulled from the depths of depression—each such voter knows that we have experienced in the United States in this interval of one generation a great change, actually a social revolution.

And, of course, social security—the social security law which 20 years ago the Republicans werc promising to repeal—has been a cornerstone of the structure of our society and economy.

During these past 20 years, there have been periodic changes and improvements in the social security law. The improvements, in nearly all cases, have been proposed, supported, and enacted primarily by Democrats and opposed, in most instances, by Republicans. So the billboards of 20 years ago are not entirely obsolete, although, of course, it would take a brave Republican, indeed, to campaign for office today on a promise to repeal social security. Rather, we find the Republican Party giving much lip-service to the social security laws, but going in for backstage maneuvers to weaken, if not destroy, the program.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION OBJECTED TO CHANGES

The new benefits are a case in point. The social security bill which is now before us for final action is, in many respects, a truly outstanding one. It incorporates some great new improvements, particularly the principle of paying retirement benefits at age 50 to workers who become totally and permanently disabled. Also incorporated into the bill is a long-overdue provision to permit widows to receive their survivorship benefits at age 62; for working-women to retire at 62; and for wives of retired workers to begin collecting their supplementary benefits at age 62. The Republican administration and its supporters in Congress sought desperately to block these improvements.

This marks the first time since the original social security bill was enacted in 1935 that there has been any break in the 65-year minimum age for retirement benefits. It establishes a new principle, and sets a precedent which, no doubt, will be expanded in the future. I foresee the removal of any age minimum for payment of benefits to the totally disabled

who are eligible by reason of their previous employment and earnings and contributions to the fund.

Now that we have established the precedent of permitting retirement for women at age 62, I foresee further reductions in the future of that age minimum for women, and probably some reduction, too, in the present 65-year minimum retirement age for men under the program.

In addition to these advanced features of the new bill, we have widened the coverage of the program to include lawyers, dentists, optometrists, veterinarians, osteopaths, and others. These groups heretofore had not been sure they wanted to be covered but finally became aware of the tremendous value to them and to their families of social-security coverage—particularly in survivorship benefits should the breadwinner die. Throughout our Nation now families are held together through social security which would in other years have been forced to separate upon the father's death. It has been a great, great thing for America.

REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION TO LOWERED RETIREMENT AGE

While the bill is an outstanding legislative achievement, it has in it some features which are unfair to those women between the ages of 62 and 65 who elect to take advantage of their new opportunity to retire before 65. As a result of Republican opposition to the whole principle of early retirement benefits, a Senate compromise had to be accepted which penalizes workingwomen by deducting from their retirement benefits a certain percentage for each month they lack of being 65 at the time they apply for benefits. This penalty is then supposed to remain in effect even after the woman reaches 65. That is too severe.

A workingwoman who wants to retire at age 62, as this bill permits, would receive only 80 percent of the monthly benefits that she would be eligible for at age 65. For each month that she delays retirement after 62, until she is 65, the benefit will be increased by five-ninths of 1 percent. And while wives of retired workers can now apply for supplementary retirement benefits at age 62, if they do, they receive only 75 percent as much as they would be eligible for at age 65, and so on.

INTEND TO SEEK REPEAL OF PENALTY CLAUSE

These penalty provisions were not in the bill which passed in the House of Representatives last year. Nor were they in the bill which my committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, reported out last year. They were inserted in the bill in the Senate, as the price exacted by conservative Republican elements in the narrowly divided Senate in getting through the principle of retirement for women before 65. I think this limitation was unfair, and I intend next year to seek its repeal. I hope we have a sufficiently large Democratic majority in the Senate, as well as the House, next year, to enable us to overcome such tactics as occurred in the Senate this year on this provision of the social security bill. The House bill would have paid full benefits to all eligible women at 62, with no penalty clause. That is what I am for.

Going back to those billboards of 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker—the billboards along the Boulevard of the Allies overlooking the Monongahela River, and on Bigelow Boulevard overlooking the Allegheny, and across Liberty Bridge and up the Mount Washington roadway, and all over the city of Pittsburgh and the county of Allegheny 20 years ago—billboards proclaiming that the Republican Party would repeal social security because it was a cruel hoax on the worker, a tax on your pay envelope, a drag on recovery from the depression, interference with the private insurance business, a crushing burden on the economy, and so on—going back to those days, Mr. Speaker, we find that they were really not too far back, at that. For in this bill now before us, we experienced a straight out political battle between the two parties over liberalizing and improving the social-security law.

THE FIGHT OVER DISABILITY BENEFITS

It is clear from the debate and votes on the bill that the principle of improving social security to provide more generous retirement benefits at an earlier age is primarily still a Democratic principle, and opposition to that idea is primarily still a Republican principle, and a Republican administration concept.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the disability provision of the new bill, which is its most outstanding single new feature from the standpoint of social insurance against personal disaster, was put into the bill originally by my committee and by the House over the violent objections of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican leadership. It was retained in the bill in the Senate by the very narrowest of margins, on what turned out to be an almost solid party line vote—the overwhelming majority of the Democrats voting for it and the overwhelming majority of the Republicans voting against it. And the Eisenhower administration, as I said, was 100 percent opposed to it and used every conceivable device to line up Republican votes against it.

The Republicans were saying, in effect, that a 50-year-old worker who is totally and permanently disabled should be required to sit around for 15 years and wait until he is 65 before collecting any of the social-security benefits he had earned during his working career. How indifferent can one be to human needs—to the needs of the average family and worker?

REPUBLICAN PARTY UNAWARE OF PEOPLE'S REAL NEEDS

But we do not have to depend upon the social-security debates and votes alone to see how the amazing attitude displayed by the Republican Party 20 years ago over the "cruel hoax" of social security still dominates that party when it comes to human needs and human problems. We have concrete evidence of the vast differences between the two political parties on all social issues and on human needs each time Congress takes up any important legislation affecting the people generally.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO PAY THE EXPENSES OF AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3314) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3314) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation and related matters, but such committee members (other than ex officio members) shall not be deemed to be employees of the United States and shall not receive compensation.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply authorizes payment of the expenses of advisory committees which are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill was requested by the Department.

The total expenditures estimated by the Department are about $5,000 a year. These committees are departmental committees appointed by the Secretary for the purpose of advising on soil and water matters. This pays their expenses when on official duty.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that this bill was a part of the housekeeping bill of the Department of Agriculture bill which the House passed some time ago but which we were told would not be taken up in the Senate on account of other provisions?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. This is one of the items which appeared in the bill we passed and on which the Senate has not acted. The Department has asked for this particular bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman had made that explanation in the first place, it would not have been necessary to have a suspension.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in relation to giving the Department of Agriculture any more money for anything I would like to comment on an article which appeared in the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of last Sunday. The article is headed, "Hamilton Cattleman Helps To Square Away Pentagon", and tells about the Deputy Defense Secretary, Reuben B. Robertson, of Hamilton, Ohio, who is supposedly putting the Pentagon on a business-like basis. In the same article, it tells about his herd of 55 Black Angus cows back in Hamilton Ohio, and I quote, "the herd was losing so much money we had to sell them," said Robertson, "but I would say that the Military Establishment is in a pretty business-like condition."

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how anomalous you can get but it is pretty obvious that if Mr. Robertson is the right man to put the Pentagon on a business-like basis then the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, has gotten the agriculture in this country in a horrible mess if this great expert, Mr. Robertson, can run the Pentagon but can't afford to keep his farm.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AGREEMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 8384) to amend section 8c (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8c (2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U. S. C. 608c (2)), as amended, is further amended by inserting the word "cranberries" between the words "and not including fruits, other than olives," and the words "and grapefruit, for canning or freezing" where they appear in said section.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is the author of this measure which was reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I would be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts if he desires me to do so at this time.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Colorado was up here awhile ago he said he put his bill in in March, and a rule was just reported out. Mr. Speaker, I never did get a rule, and I put mine in in January. But, I want to thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to present this bill.

Friends and neighbors of mine came to my house last Christmas and asked me to put in a bill that might help them overcome the condition that they are now in. The cranberry industry has lost money for the last 2 or 3 years. Every barrel that they pick and screen and put on the market costs them money. So, they wanted a marketing order.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether most of us know too much about these marketing orders, but this is only one out of a great many. I was surprised when I looked it up to find that there were marketing orders on citrus fruits; 12 on other fruits; 4 on tree nuts, that is, walnuts and pecans and so forth; and 65 on milk and milk products, which includes cheese and butter, and so forth. They found some fault because the Attorney General got an indictment against this organization a couple of years ago.

Mr. Speaker, all this order does is to allow these cranberry growers to go to the Department of Agriculture and submit plans so that they may get an order to do business. After the Department has had a public hearing on it, they set up rules and regulations by which the farmer must do in order to sell his fruit. Then it is brought back to the growers themselves and if two-thirds agree, the order goes into effect.

Now what is the matter with that?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What we want to know is what is a marketing order that enables them to sell? What is the nature of it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. They go to the Department and get an order. For instance, they might have something to do with the size of the berries, the price of the berries, anything that enters into the sale of the article.

Mr. MASON. You mean they cannot sell without this marketing order?

Mr. NICHOLSON. They can, but the Attorney General may get them for fixing prices. I just read to the gentleman from Illinois a number of orders that were in existence now, and what they were. Everybody has them, I suppose, except the cranberry people. The only change in the law this bill makes is that it puts the word "cranberries" between "olives" and "grapefruit."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Does this affect cranberries for processing and canning as well as fresh cranberries?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, it does. Mr. Speaker, the district I represent raises more cranberries than the whole of the rest of the world put together, and the growers of cranberries there are composed of men who own from 1 acre up to 20 acres. There are only 2 or 3 big growers, and Members who have been screaming about helping small business have a chance here to get on the small-business wagon and take a ride with them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman mean to say that our Thanksgiving and Christmas cranberries come from the gentleman's district?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, if you get the right kind; if you get the best, they come from my district.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does this proposal contemplate fixing the price of cranberries?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No; it does not contemplate that.

Mr. KEATING. Could that be done under the proposed legislation?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not know whether it could or not—yes; they could establish a price for a box or a barrel of cranberries.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman consider that this is a conservative measure?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I certainly would consider it a conservative measure. The people who are in this business are conservative businessmen. The livelihood of a great many of them depends upon this business. As I said in the first place, they have lost money. This may give them an opportunity to get to where they will be making money again.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who grows nearly as many cranberries and nearly as fine ones as we do in my district in New Jersey. This is a serious matter which deserves the support of the whole House.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram here from the American Farm Bureau Federation which supports the passage of this bill to include cranberries. It is addressed to the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, a Member whom we all respect and admire and who thinks that this is a good bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for the excellent work he has done on this matter. I am in full agreement with everything he has said, and I intend to support his bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been a very able legislator and has served his country well in the Congress of the United States. He has presented a bill worthy of our consideration. It is in the best interest

of the people he represents. I congratulate him on the statement he has made here today.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I certainly thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman spent one evening telling me about the cranberry industry and how difficult it was for the small growers to make any money. If this bill does anything to help them, I am for it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I want to help the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am in favor of this measure. I think it is a sound one. I have had the opportunity to observe the gentleman now for two sessions. I think he is a remarkable and able legislator.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want the gentleman to know I am going to vote for his bill. I do not know all the provisions in it, but I am certainly for it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. As a Representative from the State of Maine which consumes cranberries produced in the gentleman's district, I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryand. Can the gentleman tell us what the position of the Department of Agriculture is on his bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not have the least idea.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Can the gentleman give us some information as to why segments of the canning industry are opposed to it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. There are segments of the canning industry that are opposed to it. They always have been, because they are in a certain line of business, like canning corn, beans, fish, and a hundred and one other things, and they are afraid we want to get into that business. We have enough troubles with cranberries without inviting other troubles.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. I join with the gentleman in support of the legislation. I have been very much interested in the bill as it has been processed through the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I came over here for the purpose of voting against the gentleman's bill, but he has been so convincing in his arguments that I have changed my mind and am going to support it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This program has worked well with other products. I see no reason why cranberries should be discriminated against. I am for this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I shall support the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

With the exception of a few large cranberry corporations, the cranberry farmers of Wisconsin, as far as I can determine, are wholeheartedly in support of the legislation. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I attended all the hearings on the bill and supported the legislation in the committee. I have also informed a great number of my colleagues in the House that this legislation is desired by the great majority of cranberry farmers in my State.

I am glad I had the opportunity to help my colleague [Mr. NICHOLSON] on the bill and I hope it passes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, for all the assistance he has given me on this bill. He has worked unceasingly with me in an effort to have action taken on this legislation during this session. I am sure that the cranberry growers in Massachusetts as well as the cranberry growers in Wisconsin appreciate his wholehearted support of this bill. The people of Wisconsin can be justly proud in having such a conscientious, hard-working legislator as LESTER JOHNSON representing them in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman I support his bill because I want to support the farmers of Massachusetts, and I hope the gentleman will help support the farmers of Iowa.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is evidencing great leadership in the way he is handling this bill on the floor. I join with the gentleman, and sincerely hope the bill will pass overwhelmingly by a voice vote.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. May I add that if this bill passes, as we hope it will, it will be because of the great popularity of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts has been my friend over the years, and I would vote for the bill even if it were a bad bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to inform the gentleman I have enjoyed my association with him as a committee colleague, and I have enjoyed the popularity that he has in the House of Representatives. I think he has earned the support and respect of this House, and I hope his bill passes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am for this bill both on a personal and on a merit basis. The gentleman now in the well of the House who is the sponsor of this bill represents the Cape Cod district. I love to spend my summers in Cape Cod and when I go up to Cape Cod I delight in telling friends up there that I am a personal friend of their Congressman and for me that has been an open sesame.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, this takes a two-thirds vote and I hope it is unanimous.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have had such a fine testimonial meeting here that I am rather reluctant to say anything about this bill. It is very disturbing to me to have to oppose my very good friend from Cape Cod, the author of the bill, but there are things that should be of vital concern in connection with this type of legislation. I feel I must say something about the bill, and why I am opposed to its passage even under suspension of the rules. I wish my colleague from Massachusetts well and I am glad that there have been so many fine testimonials for him. But there are principles involved in this legislation which, probably, do not seem of great consequence to some, but it does create a monopoly in the production and processing of cranberries. The gentleman represents a district that produces and controls about 85 percent to 90 percent of the cranberries produced in this country. Under existing law, the cranberry growers have the right to have a marketing order in the marketing and production of fresh cranberries. This bill seeks to give a control over the processing of cranberries throughout the country, and with that control they will not only be able to dictate the price of cranberries under a marketing order for the sale of fresh cranberries, but also for the processing and sale, and quantity of fresh cranberries that goes into processing in this country. The men in the production of cranberries who also now control 85 percent of the processing of cranberries and who are for this bill

were indicted by the Federal Government last April, in 1955. It is a long indictment.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That was in 1954.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. April 8, 1955, is the date of the indictment.

I am sure my friend recognizes the implications connected with his bill, but I am sure he is not aware of the extent of this bill if it is enacted into law, because it does give the growers of cranberries, and 2 large processors, now controlling 85 percent of the processing of cranberries in this country, a complete monopoly, and it removes the effect of the indictment that the present administration has secured against those cranberry producers that now control nearly all of the cranberry production in the country.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I would like to associate myself with what the gentleman is saying. This bill is not for the benefit of the small grower but for the benefit of the monopolistic grower, very definitely, and is very detrimental to the interests of the processor. If I am correct in this, this is a bill to exempt from the antitrust laws people who are now violating the antitrust laws.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is the effect of it.

Mr. HAND. I yield to no one, in my affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I do not like his bill. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. One reason for the indictment is that they put the smaller operators out of business and they have succeeded in that.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. Is it not true that this is an amendment to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, and we should read the complete act, for it means that if we exempt cranberries the next step will be tomatoes and corn and all the other canned products to which we have referred, and you may have a monopoly in those particular fields. I speak for Indiana and many other areas, that this is merely getting the camel's nose under the tent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. I might point out that our Committee on Agriculture has refused to include other commodities when it came to the processing and canning of those commodities. A year or so ago we refused to give a marketing order, including citrus fruits. Grapefruit was already under the order, but citrus fruits had been excluded. We also refused to amend the law for cling peaches. They can put it into operation for certain fruits and vegetables and asparagus, but they cannot go to the extent that this proposes for cranberries.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I share with my colleagues great admiration and affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] but I have been informed by processors in my area, who employ a great many people, that they are very much opposed to this legislation, because it adds cranberries to the list of other items which are already under these orders. These orders are detrimental to the interests of large numbers of our people for the benefit of only a few, so I must oppose this bill.

Will the gentleman point out specifically how such a marketing order will affect those in the canning industry, and elaborate on the reasons for their objections, because the gentleman is a recognized expert on that subject.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not claim to be an expert, and I thank the gentleman for the compliment, but it is the beginning of a long line of requests to amend the law to be included under the provisions of the marketing orders for many other commodities. I do not care whether it is cranberries or some other commodity, we should not give a monopoly to any group in this country, whether processors or canners.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The big cranberry combine you are talking about does not exist, because 45 percent of the cranberry growers do not have anything to do with that anyway. This bill, as far as I am concerned, is a help only to the small growers throughout Massachusetts. I do not know about New Jersey or Wisconsin.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I recognize that, for I know the gentleman would never have introduced this if it had not been his idea that it helped the small grower. But if the National Cranberry Association is a small grower—they represent thousands of other growers and they also do the processing, and they, together with the United Cape Cod Cranberry Co. and a few other companies up there in that area, control 85 percent of the production and the processing of cranberries in the United States——

Mr. NICHOLSON. No; they do not.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have it here in the indictment. I do not think the attorney general of the State of Massachusetts or the district attorney for that particular district would get an indictment against these defendants if they had not felt justified.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Now, listen——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield; I do not have sufficient time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. MACK of Washington. In my district there are a great many cranberry growers and they have plots of from 1 to 5 acres. These people are owners of these cooperative associations that do the packing, so it is small people who really own the packing plants, who do the canning, and they have small tracts, from 1 to 5 acres.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I commend the gentleman on the statement he is making.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman on his statement in opposition to this bill and state that I thoroughly agree with it.

If the effects of this bill were restricted to fresh cranberries only, I could heartily favor it; but since it includes processed or canned cranberries, I must oppose it. I represent one of the greatest canning centers in the United States. I have learned that the processing and marketing of canned foods represents a cycle which often consumes more than a full year. Under this bill, you would be placing the canning industry in the position of accepting quotas and other marketing conditions on the raw product which they use. This, of course, would have a tremendous effect on the cost of that raw product and the selling price which the canner must receive in order to make a fair profit. Yet, oftentimes the canner must wait a full year before he sells, and during that period of time marketing conditions may have changed, resulting in a selling price not justified by the investment in the raw product.

The principle involved here is serious and, in my opinion, should not be applied to anything but fresh or perishable commodities. This bill could well mean the start of more and more inclusions under Federal marketing orders of canned fruits and vegetables. It would well mean chaos to the great canning industry.

I strongly urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that H. R. 8384 has been brought up under suspension of the rules. By using this procedure all amendments to the pending legislation are barred from consideration by the House of Representatives.

We in Wisconsin have had considerable experience with marketing orders, particularly as they have been applied to milk producers. As I have stated in the House Agriculture Committee and on the floor of the House on several occasions, our experience in Wisconsin with marketing orders makes it imperative that to adequately protect the individual producer of an agricultural commodity several amendments are necessary and should be included in H. R. 8384 before this legislation is enacted into law.

The first amendment which I believe is necessary is a provision guaranteeing to each individual cranberry grower the opportunity of casting his ballot for or against the approval of such a marketing order as proposed by H. R. 8283. Many Members of the House may not be familiar with the procedure that is used in approving or disapproving marketing orders. At the present time

it is possible for a market association or cooperative to cast the ballots for their member producers. In this way the two-thirds vote required for approval does not necessarily reflect the wishes of two-thirds of the individual producers.

In view of the fact that the motion before us today is to suspend the rules and preclude the consideration of amendments, I will be unable to offer my amendment assuring each individual cranberry grower a chance to vote his wishes regarding a marketing order on cranberries for canning or freezing.

The second amendment which I believe is most desirable for the House of Representatives to consider along with this legislation is the addition of a section to this bill which will assure that in the event 66⅔ percent of the cranberry growers individually vote in favor of the establishment of a Federal marketing order, future amendments to said marketing order can be adopted or rejected without affecting the order itself. Presently our dairy farmers in Wisconsin who are operating under Federal milk marketing orders have run into great difficulty because the regulations established by the Department of Agriculture provide that in the event an amendment to an order is rejected by the industry, the entire order becomes ineffective. Our experience in Wisconsin has convinced us that provisions must be written into the law providing that each amendment to a Federal marketing order should stand on its own feet. The rejection of any amendment should not nullify the order.

The two amendments which I have outlined above are necessary to give adequate protection to the individual cranberry growers in the United States. Thirty-four percent of our national cranberry production comes from Wisconsin. I have attempted to poll as many cranberry growers as possible. I did not receive any replies regarding this legislation from many of the growers that I contacted in our State. From my contacts, however, I could tell that there was not a unanimity of opinion regarding this legislation among the growers in my congressional district. It is therefore very desirable that the amendments which I feel are necessary to this legislation be adopted. I shall vote against suspending the rules on this legislation which will bar consideration of these amendments by the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD of today's proceedings a letter received from Eatmor Cranberries, Inc., of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.; 2 letters from Mr. B. C. Brazeau, president of Indian Trail Cranberry Growers, Inc., of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.; and a wire from Mr. William Huffman, Jr., secretary-manager of the William F. Huffman Farms, Inc., of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.:

EATMOR CRANBERRIES, INC.,
Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., February 15, 1956.
Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: We are in receipt of your letter of February 7 along with a copy of bill H. R. 8384, relative to including canned and processed cranberries under the Federal marketing order.

We have sent copies of your letter and bill to our directors for their information and, I presume, you will be hearing from them shortly.

It is my understanding that Mr. C. A. Searles, president of our organization, has contacted you favorably regarding this bill.

We wish to thank you for your interest in this matter and informing us of this proposed legislation.

Very truly yours,
EATMOR CRANBERRIES, INC.
LES SORENSON, *Manager.*

INDIAN TRAIL CRANBERRY GROWERS, INC.,
Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., May 31, 1956.
Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD,
United States House of Representatives
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: Reference is made to the House bill (H. R. 8384) permitting processing grade cranberries to be included under Federal marketing orders.

We are an agency which could be said to be representing about 24 Wisconsin cranberry growers. Our growers would represent perhaps about 15 percent of the Wisconsin production. We handle the sales for these growers and furnish technical and other services for their growing operations. The writer himself is a cranberry grower, who last year produced a little less than 9,000 barrels. This would be a little less than 1 percent of the national cranberry crop and a little less than 3 percent of the Wisconsin crop.

We wish to register our vigorous opposition to the proposed bill. It is our opinion that the growers in our organization would be solidly against it, and there is considerable opposition in other segments in the State. We consider the measure both unnecessary and undesirable. Some kind of fresh fruit grades for inspection purposes would be a good thing for the industry, but this can be easily accomplished without marketing orders. The difficulty that the cranberry industry has experienced in recent years stems from excessive carryovers. Great strides are being made at the present to eliminate these excesses, and it is entirely possible that the situation will be well in hand even this year.

Very truly yours,
INDIAN TRAIL, INC.,
B. C. BRAZEAU,
President.

INDIAN TRAIL
CRANBERRY GROWERS, INC.,
Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., June 13, 1956.
Hon. MELVIN LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: I was very much interested in learning of the proceedings at the subcommittee hearing in connection with bill No. H. R. 8384 relating to legislation permitting processing grade cranberries to come under a Federal marketing order. There is one point that was touched upon in a rather indirect manner but which should probably receive considerably more emphasis. The national cranberry industry is unusual in the fact that one cooperative controls well over half the national cranberry crop. A second large cooperative controls another substantial percentage. Together they probably control over three-quarters of the national cranberry crop. The canning of cranberries is dominated by these two organizations, particularly the larger one.

A marketing order could regulate the grading by law in such a manner that many of the independents would not be able to market their fresh fruit in the normal way and would have to seek out processing outlets. These outlets are not readily available outside of these two cooperatives. Thus, a marketing order could have the effect of eliminating many of the independent operators and forcing them to seek out the security of one of the larger cooperatives in order to find a market for the berries graded out of the ordinary channels by provisions of an order. With this situation existing in the cranberry industry, a marketing order could put an end to some of the small and independent businesses. This does not seem to be consistent with the American idea of free enterprise or the democratic principle of protecting the minorities.

The issues connected with this legislation and with marketing orders have never really been put to the growers. I have been told by several people including some of those in favor of this legislation, that a marketing order would be turned down by a grower vote anyway. I believe this to be the case, for I have talked with a number of growers in the State of Wisconsin and have not found any outrightly favoring this procedure. I have heard of a few who are apparently at least in favor of the enabling legislation. However, it must be remembered that those who are promoting this idea have been at work for many months, whereas the opposition has made no attempt to organize as yet. We should like to defeat the idea at this stage rather than have the legislation passed and be put to the expense and effort of developing the opposition at a later stage.

In support of this legislation it has been said that the cranberry industry needs some grading standards. It is true that this would be helpful as a working basis in marketing. However, these are already in the process of being established, and this will be accomplished very satisfactorily without the necessity of any enabling legislation or any marketing order.

Sincerely,
B. C. BRAZEAU.

WISCONSIN RAPIDS, WIS., *May 7, 1956.*
Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please note opposition of undersigned cranberry grower to House bill, H. R. 8384, Federal marketing agreements or Federal marketing orders affecting cranberries or cranberry products not—repeat, not—necessary Federal direction of cranberry marketing not—repeat not—desirable merchandising and sale of cranberries and cranberry products by growers of their sales agencies according to demand of free-market answer to large industry carry-over.

WILLIAM F. HUFFMAN FARMS, INC.
WILLIAM HUFFMAN, Jr.,
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield myself 10 additional minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Like all Members of the House, I have deep love and affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON], but I have had the opportunity to study this. Just recently a gentleman from my district who was former president of the National Canners' Association as well as of the Illinois Canners' Association, talked to me about this and he is quite afraid of what this might lead to eventually if it should be passed, and I think he had justifiable reason for believing as he does. Therefore I find myself in the position of opposing this legislation as it is here now before us under a suspension.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is not this equal to giving a green light to the setting up of a monopoly in the whole canning industry if you let them get by with this particular thing to the detriment of the people? Would it not establish a precedent to monopolize other facets of the canning industry?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no question about that because other producing areas with different commodities have come before our committee and have tried to be included under the processing end of the marketing order law, and our committee has refused to permit them to come in.

I think this bill ought to go back to our committee for full and complete hearings on it and the implications in connection with it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin made the statement a moment ago that a rule had been granted by the Committee on Rules. I am not aware that any rule had been granted on this bill. I am certain that if a rule was granted it was not at the request of the chairman of the committee. I am quite sure the gentleman was mistaken about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman must have been in error. I am not aware of any rule having been granted.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. If this legislation were passed, might it not set an example that would be very embarrassing later on with respect to other fruits and vegetables and result perhaps in a great injustice done to our whole canning industry?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would become exceedingly difficult to refuse others after we let one commodity get in, and I am not against cranberries.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOYLE. I hope the gentleman is not going to put too much faith in an indictment. I think we generally know that an indictment is scarcely of any probative value. Without going into the controversy as to the merits of this bill, I think we can generally agree that an indictment is not proof of the facts alleged.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I would hate to have anybody's friends indicted.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman in his statement.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Minnesota in this matter. I feel that the Wisconsin canners feel as he does about it.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has correctly stated that while this bill seems quite innocuous, there is a principle involved which could do great harm to the canning industry and to the vegetable growers of the country. The simple fact is that this legislation would make it possible for the creation of a monopoly by those who are producing and processing cranberries.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter involving cranberries alone. It cuts across the whole canning industry. Under existing law, cranberry growers have the right to have a marketing order in the marketing and production of fresh cranberries. This bill would give them control over the processing of cranberries throughout the country. If such a favorable advantage were given to them, this industry would be in a position to dictate the price not only of cranberries under a market order but also for the processing and sale and quantity of fresh cranberries that goes into processing all over the country. I do not believe that we, today, should make such an eventuality possible.

I am informed that if the bill is approved it would, as I have already stated, make a monopoly possible and under existing conditions this monopoly would be controlled by two canners who already have a monopoly of 90 percent of the production of canned cranberries. This body should be fully advised of the possibilities which exist if this bill is written into law. I trust it will be defeated, notwithstanding my very great affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish also to associate myself with the viewpoint that has been expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota. I am inclined to feel that there is protection at the present time for the producers of cranberries. But this goes a step forward and the opening of this door can lead to a very great deal of fear and possible detriment to the general canning industry. Therefore, I would be opposed to this bill for the reasons the gentleman has given and those I have just given.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from Minnesota on this matter. I believe he has made some very important points.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that the test here is whether you favor monopoly in a particular line of activity or you are against it. If you are for a monopoly in cranberries and in the production and the processing of cranberries, then you should vote for the bill. If you are opposed to that, then you should vote against the bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. The committee has approved this bill and the Department of Agriculture has approved the bill. I do not understand the gentleman's objections. Many other items are already included in present legislation. I do not understand why olives and grapefruit are allowed and cranberries denied the same opportunity.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry I have not made myself clear to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Is it not correct that the Department of Agriculture is in favor of this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I believe so, but the Department of Agriculture might also be in error in their judgment as to the merits of this bill.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's viewpoint.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill is more important than it seems, and it is unfortunate that it should appear under suspension of rules in the closing hours of the session, so that it cannot receive the attention of the membership that it deserves. Very briefly, the bill exempts from antitrust provisions marketing agreements for processed cranberries. This means most of the market, because most cranberries are now processed. What happens under the proposal is that if two-thirds of the producers, by number or by volume, agree to a marketing order and 50 percent of the handlers likewise agree, everybody is bound by the agreement, and the marketing agreement is thereby exempt from the provisions of the antitrust law. You will note that the language "by number or by volume" means that one large grower could pretty much control the situation, even though a number of small growers might be opposed.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that some growers may favor this legislation, although they have not told me so, and I do not think it would ultimately be to their benefit. Every conversation or message that I have received from my district opposes the bill. I have not been able to find a list of those favoring it, because another vice of the present proceeding is that we are going forward without having printed hearings on the bill available to us.

The canners and processors of cranberries are all opposed and, of course, it is not in the interest of consumers.

I especially object to this type of proceeding. This bill was introduced in the House on January 12, 1956. During

all the intervening months, no action whatever was taken on it. It is a poor proceeding to attempt to jam it through in the closing hours with 40 minutes of consideration and no hearings available.

The sponsors of the bills, of course, are the National Cranberry Association, who are already in legal trouble as a result of monopolistic practices. These practices force the small independents to pay much higher prices, and makes it difficult if not impossible for them to compete. I have a memorandum which indicates as follows:

> The processing industries, canners and freezers, have vigorously opposed these efforts because they know that the controls provided for in the marketing law were not designed for crops for processing or adapted to canned or frozen fruits or vegetables. Processors also know that the proposed controls would adversely affect the growers of these commodities. The controls could take away the grower's freedom of choice in making up production schedules, limit his activities to historical patterns, and ultimately price his product off of grocers' shelves.
>
> Canners and freezers likewise know that unnecessary production and marketing controls adversely affect consumers by increasing the price of processed fruits and vegetables and by limiting the selection of quality, grade, size, and variety. Most important, the complete absence of any need is a compelling reason for opposing artificial and arbitrary production and marketing controls over canned and frozen fruits and vegetables. The fact is that farmers and canners and freezers have worked out their economic salvation without the necessity for Federal Government intervention.

A marketing order can control quantity and quality, limit production, allocate available fruit, limit supply for each consumer market, and generally apply a system of controls which is contrary to our whole system.

I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is clearly not in the public interest, and I hope it will be defeated, although I have my doubts since the Democratic leader of the House has come out strongly in favor of it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBESON].

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a high regard for the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and I have equally an effectionate regard for him.

I happen to represent a district in which are located a great many canners and I share the concern of the gentleman from Minnesota regarding this bill. I also represent a great many people who like to eat a cranberry or two on their turkey. I think we should give more consideration to the merits of a bill of this sort. As of the present time, I am opposed to it and there seems to be a great deal of opposition among the people, whether there is opposition among their Representatives or not. I think we better come back and consider the merits of the bill and what it is we are voting for. I do not know whether this would create a monopoly or not. However, I am not in favor of monopolies if that is the intent of the bill and, therefore, I express opposition to the measure.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to speak in favor of the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts, a long time speaker of the house there, a distinguished member of that legislature. He is accused here, and without reason, of doing something he should not do, promoting a monopoly for the cranberry boys, and an indictment is handed out. Now, if this is true, I will say to my colleague, as much as we favor your bill, I do not want to go to jail over the thing. I am worried to death about this monopoly issue. I own a few acres of land, and they put wheat and corn on it. Only last week I got a notice from the Department of Agriculture—I have a friend who does the work on the farm; I just pay the losses—that I must sign up if he or I want to grow some wheat. Who is running that monopoly on the production of wheat? My heart bleeds. Now they want to take in cranberries, which goes well with turkey along about Thanksgiving and Christmas, and turkeys are cheap now. I do not take any stock in that monopoly argument. What are you afraid of? A year ago you were afraid of the Communists in Russia; now you are afraid of the cranberry growers. Think of it. There will be a monopoly here if this bill goes through. That is the talk. Of course it will not get through the Senate. And, if you let the cranberry growers continue to grow and make a little something, then the rest of the fellows, the blueberry growers—we have those in my district—and the blackberry growers and the red raspberry and the black raspberries and all the other raspberries—laugh if you want to—will be telling us what to eat because they will have a monopoly. I do get confused. I have been frightened half to death in the last 6 months and longer, to learn what is going to happen to our country here if we do not give other nations everything they want. And then these three neutralists, I think they call them—did you see that cartoon in the Tribune yesterday, the pigs in the pokes, where we spend all this money for those three nations which are now neutrals? I want to say to my good friends on the Republican side and the farmers who had so much legislation in their behalf, and most of which they did not, do not, want.

May I ask my colleagues who are so fearful of monopoly—why is it that I cannot grow and sell what I wish on the 2 or 3 acres I own? Just who has a monopoly of growing wheat? It does not seem to me they ought to come in here and be squawking about monopoly. I wonder, too, all of you, why so many got up and expressed such great affection and respect for the gentleman from Massachusetts, paid him so many compliments, why they now are disposed to cut his throat on the ground that he is promoting a monopoly. It does not sound right to me.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is quite well known that I am not a farmer nor am I an agricultural expert. However, I listened for weeks on agricultural legislation; confusion compounded on confusion that no one can readily understand any legislative proposals whether on cranberries or wheat. I listened to the bleeding hearts for the little farmers; they have had their say for many weeks and all were interested in the results as it concerns their own respective districts. Now my very good friend from Massachusetts, whom I greatly admire, has a little problem that concerns cranberries, so all the agricultural sections of the country move in on him. I note that my colleagues, who represent wheat, corn, cotton, soybeans, peanuts, butter, cheese, or whatever their districts represent, are alert and ready to champion the cause for the products grown in their respective districts. So, what is the matter with my friend presenting his case for cranberries? The way his proposal has been challenged it would appear the Members are indignant that he would even mention cranberries.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. All I want to say to my friend from Minnesota is that you are sometimes wrong. I have listened to you for years. I listened to the gentleman from out in Minnesota tell the House that if you put colored margarine on the market, you would ruin the butter business; put colored oleo on the market and the butter business would be finished. Yet, the facts are that you were wrong; it may be that you are wrong today about the cranberry business. The facts are that the butter business has not gone to pieces, it has increased in volume, and we are consuming more butter now than we ever did. So, maybe the cranberry growers want legislation to protect their industry as does every other branch of our agricultural life. I will support the legislation of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN there were—ayes 119, noes 62.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on this I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. COOLEY and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 58.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX ON ADMISSIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9875) amending the Internal Revenue Code of

1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only with respect to that portion of the amount paid for any admission which is in excess of $1, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "$1" and insert "90 cents."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has amended H. R. 9875. As you will recall that bill which was passed by the House on July 21, 1956, increased the exemption from the Federal excise tax on admissions from 50 cents to $1.

The Senate amendment which goes to the level of the exemption reduces the exemption granted under the House bill from $1 to 90 cents. The Senate report indicates that this action was taken because it was felt that exemption of 90 cents is sufficient to provide relief for the small theaters who are in the most need of relief and to cut the revenue loss to be expected from the bill. It was estimated that the revenue loss which would result from the House bill would amount to $70 million. As a result of the Senate amendment, the revenue loss which can be expected under the bill is $60 million.

I suggest that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

MONEYS RECEIVED FROM NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3436) to provide that sums paid to States from moneys received from national forests may be used for governmental purposes other than for the benefit of public schools and public roads, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask for some explanation on this bill? In my State, the public schools receive a good deal of their money from this source, and I would like to get some justification for taking away this money at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. It does not take away any funds from the schools. It provides for an additional use that the money can be used for. But, I would prefer to yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. On February 2 of this year, I introduced this bill. Since 1908, we have been returning to counties where stumpage is cut, 25 percent of the forest receipts. In 1908, and there was then a great need for schools and roads, a rider on the appropriation bill for that year enacted into law and specified that that money had to be spent for schools and roads and for no other purpose. Then in 1911, the Watershed Act, known as the Weeks Act, included the same proviso. It was also inserted in the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Land Acquisition Act. But since that time, Federal and various State laws have made it possible for the counties, even the poorer counties to take care of their schools and roads. There are many of them in my own district and many of them in Pennsylvania and northern California. Some of your poorer counties cannot balance their budget for other governmental purposes. This does not require any appropriation or anything of that sort. They have been getting this money for about 50 years. This merely allows the county government which is some of the best government that we have in this country because it is home folks, to balance their county budget.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the individual counties will still be getting the same amount of money, but they will be allowed to use it in their own discretion rather than be compelled to spend it only on schools and roads?

Mr. HORAN. That is right—for schools, roads, and other governmental purposes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But presumably, the purpose of this is that they want to convert from schools and to other uses. Is that correct?

Mr. HORAN. Many of the counties are very well fixed as far as roads and schools are concerned, but they are hard put to it to balance the other parts of their budgets.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I object to consideration of H. R. 3436. The facts concerning this bill should, I believe, be clearly recorded. H. R. 3436 was first introduced on February 2, 1955. Except for an executive meeting, no hearings were held on it in a year and a half. Although hearings were scheduled for June 29 of this year, I have been unable to learn that they were in fact held. Certainly the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was not heard; yet it has a crucial stake in this matter and should have been an indispensible witness.

On July 25, this bill was suddenly reported and placed on the consent calendar and, the very next day, was called up. I objected and will continue to object to its consideration under these circumstances. Even the committee report is not yet available. I do not believe that the committee had a report from the Department of Agriculture. I know that it had no report from the Budget Bureau or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fact, discussions are presently going on between Agriculture and HEW, in an attempt to reach some conclusions as to the merits of this bill. And although there has been no official word, it is my clear understanding that HEW does not favor this legislation.

All of this, of course, concerns only the manner in which the bill has been handled. Far more important are its merits—or rather lack of merits. Under present law, every State in which there are national forests receives 25 percent of the total revenues from these lands for specific use for schools and roads. In my own State of Oregon, these funds are, by statute allocated to the counties on a basis of 75 percent for roads, 25 percent for schools. In Washington, no specific division of the funds is required by law, though efforts are being made to enact such a statute. In Oregon, schools received over one and a half million dollars from this source in 1954. In Washington, schools received $1,229,000 in 1954, $1,617,000 in 1955. Clearly, these are a substantial and important source of help to our hard-pressed schools.

This bill now proposes to make these funds available to the counties for general governmental purposes. Every school official I have talked to—and they are numerous—is vehemently opposed. Every one of them says that, if this were done, the schools would simply lose out. Local property taxes and State taxes bear the bulk of school costs, but each county bears the burden of county government. Understandably, county commissioners would be powerfully influenced to use this money for county expenses. They could then shift virtually all the school costs to the local community and the State. To pass this bill would mean that the schools would lose these desperately needed funds.

A few years ago, a similar provision of law gave to schools in Oregon counties an earmarked share of revenues from the so-called O and C lands in Oregon. An Oregon Senator, since defeated, pushed through a bill like this one, making those school funds available for general county use. What was the result? In almost every case, the schools suffered. One county took the money from the schools and spent it instead on a new courthouse. In another county, the superintendent of schools tells me that, since the law was changed, schools have received absolutely no money from this previous source of funds. Our former Senator may have been willing to sacrifice the schools in this way; I am not.

The Washington State Commissioner of Education has advised me that, contrary to statements made on the floor of this House, Washington's schools badly need this money. Every school official I have talked to in Oregon says the same thing—and says further that if this bill goes through, they will lose this revenue.

I am not unmindful of the problems our counties face in trying to meet their costs of Government. I am not unsympathetic to their needs. As a citizen, I

will give them my wholehearted support in any wise program to meet these problems. But this is emphatically not the way to do it. It is a false and foolish solution to rob our schools in order to pay for our courthouses. In this prosperous country, our schools are already inexcusably starved for funds. Is it really true that we must sacrifice our children still further, take money from their schools to meet our other obligations of Government? I do not believe it. This is asking our children to bear our burdens for us. It is just plain wrong, and no amount of argument will make it right.

The people closest to this problem are the local school people in our States and counties. They are the ones who, every day, have to face this terrible problem of trying to give our children a decent education without enough money to do the job. To show how they feel I would like to include here the telegrams I have received just since this bill came up today:

EUGENE, OREG., *July 26, 156.*

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

The Oregon county school superintendents in annual session this date unanimously adopted a resolution opposing loss of school revenue from Federal forest land receipts.

ERROL C. REES,
President, Oregon County School Superintendents Association.

SALEM, OREG., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Oregon Representative in Congress,
Office of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Without time for study, I would oppose any last-minute measure that would decrease in slightest money now being distributed directly to Oregon public schools through timber sales.

REX PUTNAM,
Superintendent, Public Instruction.

EUGENE, OREG., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Please oppose any contemplated change in Federal forest fund distribution.

RITA H. SIMMONS,
Wheeler County School Superintendent,
Fossil, Oreg.

EUGENE, OREG., *July 26, 1956.*

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I oppose any change at the present time in the distribution of the Federal forest funds.

VEDA E. COUZENS,
Union County School Superintendent.

MEDFORD, OREG., *July 26, 1956.*

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Oppose the proposed change in the present apportionment of national forest receipts at this time.

OFFICE OF COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT, JACKSON COUNTY,
ALF B. MEKVOLD.

SALEM, OREG., *July 26, 1956.*

MRS. EDITH GREEN,
Congresswoman, Washington, D. C.:

I oppose any change at this time in the redistribution of Federal forest land.

AGNES C. BOOTH,
Marion County School Superintendent.

EUGENE, OREG., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Eugene schools appreciate greatly your efforts to save school share Federal forest receipts. Eugene received approximately $100,000 annually equal two mills property tax. Advise if we can help you.

CLARENCE HINES.

SEATTLE, WASH., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your strong opposition to H. R. 3436. Detrimental to public education.. Under this legislation schools in Washington would have lost $1,616,932 last year, even more this year.

Mrs. Arthur Skelton, President, Washington State Congress of Parents and Teachers; H. Allan Anderson, President, Washington State School Directors Association; Winfield Fountain, President, Washington Education Association; Fred Delamare, Vice President, Washington Public School Business Personnel Association; Mrs. Mary Pierce, President, Washington County Superintendents Association; Pearl A. Wanamaker, Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2585) to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc., a parcel of land containing approximately 1,375 square feet and located on the northerly side of Selman Road, Prince Georges County, Md., and separated from the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md., by Selman Road and Cherry Hill Road, in exchange for that parcel of land now owned by the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc., containing approximately 3,126 square feet and located on the southerly side of the said Selman Road, Prince Georges County, Md., and adjoining other lands of the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md.: *Provided,* That the lands so acquired from the Powder Mill Development Co., Inc., may be acquired subject to such reservations and outstanding interests as the Secretary determines will not interfere with the use thereof in connection with the Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Md.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORN of South Carolina: On page 2, immediately after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666) providing that no appropriation shall be made for certain plans unless such plans are approved by resolutions adopted by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the provisions of section 5 of such act requiring transmittal of a copy of such plans and the justification therefor to the Congress, shall not apply with respect to the Coneross Watershed Project in the State of South Carolina."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there is any objection to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11709) to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, second session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of Pub-Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, is hereby amended by striking the figure "$295,495,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$319,595,000."

SEC. 2. Section 101 (c) 2 of Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, is amended by striking the figure "$15,900,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$25,000,000."

SEC. 3. Section 101 (c) of Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection, reading:

"10. Project 57–c–10, amended reactor development project, $15,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 11709 is a bill to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, enacted earlier this year, to authorize an increase in the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation for fiscal year 1957, of $24,100,000. Public Law 506 authorized $295,495,000.

This increase in appropriation must be authorized in conformance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Appropriations hereby authorized would be used for "acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction or expansion, and for other purposes."

Subsequent to the enactment of Public Law 506, the Atomic Energy Commission determined that additional appropriations would be needed to carry on expanded activities on two highly impor-

tant research and development programs.

One program is a recently initiated, high-priority undertaking requested by the military. It will be necessary for the AEC to construct new laboratory facilities on a modest scale at two of its important weapons research laboratories. In addition certain facilities, including instrumentation, must be constructed at one of its test sites. This activity is estimated to cost $9,100,000.

The second important program, requiring additional funds is the important civilian reactor development program. The AEC has determined that it will need an additional $15 million during fiscal year 1957 to finance its research and development commitments already made to private industry. Under its current civilian power reactor development program, the AEC also envisions the possible necessity of constructing fuel element fabrication and reclaiming facilities, and to undertake additional development work in cooperation with private industry if any such new proposals are made.

I would add, at this point, the above-mentioned $15 million requested by AEC to design and construct new types of power reactors was requested by AEC subsequent to the submission of its original fiscal 1957 budget. It has no relationship to the accelerated civilian power program proposed in the legislation considered by the House last Tuesday (H. R. 12061).

It is vitally important to the AEC that this authorizing legislation be passed. As you recall, the second supplemental appropriation bill passed by the House last Tuesday night contained a proviso appropriating the $24,100,000 required for this program and authorized by this bill and subject to the passage of this bill. If this bill fails to pass neither the Senate Appropriations Committee nor the conferees can approve the appropriation of this money.

The legislation subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy heard testimony from AEC witnesses justifying this increased authorization. The joint committee has favorably reported out H. R. 11709 and recommends that the bill do pass.

I feel I can speak for all of my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in urging immediate favorable action on H. R. 11709.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], has stated the facts with reference to this bill. There are no requests for time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 589 was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. There are a great many bills with Senate amendments. I think they can go over until tomorrow. Unless we get along with some of the rules which have been granted, it will be impossible to get these bills considered in the House. Tomorrow will be too late.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

PAYMENT OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION COST FOR PERSONS SELECTED FOR APPOINTMENT IN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES AND ALASKA

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11515) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 808, as amended, 5 U. S. C. 73b–3) is further amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof new subsections as follows:

"(b) Appropriations for the departments shall be available in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, for expenses of travel of persons selected for appointment to positions in the continental United States and Alaska for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage and for expenses of transportation of their immediate families and their household goods and personal effects and for advances of funds to the extent authorized by section 1 (a) and (b) of this act, from their places of actual residence at time of selection to their first duty station. Such travel expenses may include per diem and mileage allowance for persons selected for appointment as provided for civilian officers and employees by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. Travel and transportation expenses may be allowed whether the person selected for appointment has been appointed or not at the time of such travel. However, the travel and transportation expenses authorized by this subsection shall not be allowed unless the person selected for appointment shall agree in writing to remain in the Government service for 12 months following his appointment unless separated for reasons beyond his control and acceptable to the department or agency concerned. In case of violation of such agreement, any moneys expended by the United States on account of such travel and transportation shall be recoverable from the individual concerned as a debt due the United States.

"(c) Appropriations for the departments shall be available in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for expenses of travel while away from their homes or regular places of business of persons who are found qualified to perform in positions for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage and who are invited by an agency or department to visit it for purposes connected with employment. Such travel expenses may include per diem in lieu of subsistence and mileage allowance as provided for civilian officers and employees by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) The authority of the Civil Service Commission to determine for purposes of this act positions for which there is a manpower shortage shall not be delegated. The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 7 of this act shall expire 5 years from the date of their enactment into law."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF THE WILMINGTON, N. C., RESERVE SHIPYARD

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 12116) to provide for the conveyance of the Maritime Administration reserve shipyard at Wilmington, N. C., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the North Carolina State Ports Authority to the United States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to convey to the North Carolina State Ports Authority all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to so much of the lands to which the United States has title on the date of conveyance comprising the Wilmington (North Carolina) reserve shipyard, subject to the general laws of the United States, and subject to the provisions and reservations set forth in this act, said lands being located in New Hanover County, N. C., and being the same lands conveyed by North Carolina Shipbuilding Co. to the United States under deeds dated August 18, 1943, and November 3, 1944, said deeds being recorded in the land records of New Hanover County on September 2, 1943, in volume 355 of deeds at page 67 and on November 10, 1944, in volume 359 of deeds at page 446, respectively, consisting of 175 acres, more or less except the building presently being occupied by the Naval Reserve under permit from the Maritime Administrator.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall be in exchange for a conveyance to the United States by the North Carolina Ports Authority of a tract of land consisting of approximately 323 acres on the west bank of the Brunswick River in Brunswick County, N. C., more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Tract numbered 1, being in Town Creek Township, Brunswick County, and beginning at a point in the western right-of-way (30.0 feet from its centerline) of North Carolina Highway Numbered 130 where the southern property line of the former State of North Carolina "Governor Russell" tract intersects said right-of-way, said point being approximately 5,270 feet southwardly from United States Highway Numbered 17, 74, and 76 and said point being 575 feet northwardly from a culvert under said Highway 130; and running thence from said beginning point and along said highway and along said western right-of-way north 14 degrees 33 minutes west 1,900 feet to the southeast corner of the O. D. Williams 2-acre tract of land as recorded in Brunswick County registry in book 107 at page 424; running thence with their southern line south 70 degrees west 422 feet to their southwest corner; running thence with their western line north 22 degrees west 295 feet to the southwest corner of their 2.9 acre tract as recorded in the Brunswick County registry in book 107 at page 423; running thence with their western line of said last tract north 22 degrees west 305 feet to their northwest corner, said point being in the eastern line of

the WMFD radio station 29.34-acre tract of land (said line having a call of south 17 degrees 48 minutes west 378.25 feet); running thence south 17 degrees 48 minutes west with said line to its terminus, a distance of 24 feet more or less; continuing thence with the lines of said radio station tract south 62 degrees 48 minutes west 389.48 feet and north 72 degrees 04 minutes west 1,318.7 feet to a point, its southwest corner at the Old River Road, said point being in the western line of aforementioned Governor Russell tract; running thence with the western line of said Governor Russell tract and with said Old River Road south 3 degrees 15 minutes west 1,099.5 feet, south 10 degrees 55 minutes east 271 feet, south 21 degrees 25 minutes east 558.2 feet, south 53 degrees 30 minutes east 351 feet, south 85 degrees 20 minutes east 175.5 feet, south 35 degrees 45 minutes east 495 feet to a point, the southwestern corner of said Governor Russell tract, said point being also in the northern line of the R. M. Powell tract; running thence along their dividing line north 89 degrees east 1,830 feet to the point of beginning, containing 116 acres more or less; and being the southwest portion of the aforementioned Governor Russell tract of land bounded as follows: On the north by the lands of O. D. Williams and Radio Station WMFD, on the south by the lands of R. M. Powell, on the east by State Highway Numbered 130 and O. D. Williams, and on the west by the Old River Road.

Tract numbered 2, being in Town Creek Township, Brunswick County and beginning at a point in the eastern right-of-way (30.0 feet from its centerline) of North Carolina Highway Numbered 130 where the southern property line of the former State of North Carolina "Governor Russell" tract intersects said right-of-way, said point being approximately 5,270 feet southwardly from United States Highway Numbered 17, 74 and Numbered 76 and said point being 575 feet northwardly from a culvert under said Highway Numbered 130; and running thence from said beginning point and along said highway and along said eastern right-of-way in a north and northwesterly direction a distance of 4,920 feet more or less to the southwestern corner of the United States Maritime Commission tract of land; running thence easterly with their southern line 850 feet more or less to the edge of the Brunswick River; running thence southwardly with said river to the southern line of aforementioned Governor Russell tract, said line being also the northern line of the R. M. Powell tract; running thence westwardly along their dividing line 1,100 feet more or less to the point of beginning, containing 101 acres more or less and being that portion of the aforementioned Governor Russell tract bounded as follows: On the north by the United States Maritime Commission tract; on the south by R. M. Powell (Governor Russell's southern line), on the east by the Brunswick River, and on the west by the North Carolina State Highway Numbered 130.

Tract Numbered 3, being in Town Creek Township, Brunswick County, and beginning at a point in the western right-of-way (30.0 feet from its centerline) of North Carolina Highway Numbered 130 where the southern property line of the former State of North Carolina "Governor Russell" tract intersects said right-of-way, said point being approximately 5,270 feet southwardly from United States Highway Numbered 17, 74, and 76, and said point being 575 feet northwardly from a culvert under said Highway Numbered 130; and running thence from said beginning point and along the aforementioned southern line of the Governor Russell tract south 89 degrees west 1,830 feet to the Old River Road; running thence with said River Road south 16 degrees 30 minutes east 635 feet, south 8 degrees east 640 feet, south 27 degrees 15 minutes east 497 feet to R. M. Powell's southwest corner; running thence along his southern line south 71 degrees 30 minutes east 1,200 feet to aforementioned western right-of-way of North Carolina Highway Numbered 130; running thence along said western right-of-way and along a curve to the left to the end of said curve, said point being 850 feet more or less as measured along the arc of said curve; running thence with the tangent of said road north 14 degrees 33 minutes west 530 feet to the point of beginning containing 54 acres more or less; the same being that portion of R. M. Powell's tract of land which is bounded as follows: On the north by the south line of aforementioned Governor Russell tract, on the south by R. M. Powell's southern line, on the east by the State Highway Numbered 130, and on the west by the Old River Road (Powell's western line).

Tract Numbered 4, being in Town Creek Township, Brunswick County, and beginning at a point in the eastern right-of-way (30.0 feet from its centerline) of North Carolina Highway Numbered 130 where the southern property line of the former State of North Carolina "Governor Russell" tract intersects said right-of-way, said point being approxiately 5,270 feet southwardly from the United States Highways Numbered 17, 74, and 76, and said point being 575 feet northwardly from a culvert under said Highway Numbered 130; and running thence from said beginning point and along said highway and along said eastern righ-of-way south 14 degrees 33 minutes east 526.6 feet to a point; running thence north 87 degrees 76 minutes east 1,150 feet more or less to the Brunswick River; running thence northwardly with said river 490 feet more or less to R. M. Powell's northeast corner, said point being in the southern line of aforementioned Governor Russell tract; running thence along their dividing line south 89 degrees 10 minutes west 1,100 feet more or less to the point of beginning, containing 13 acres more or less; said tract being the northern portion of the R. M. Powell tract of land which lies east of State Highway Numbered 130, south of the aforementioned Governor Russell tract, west of the Brunswick River and has a road frontage of 526.6 feet; said above-described tract of land being subject to a lease from R. M. Powell to United States Maritime Commission as recorded in the Brunswick County registry in book 113 at page 222.

Tract numbered 5, beginning at the southwest corner of the Paul S. Austin tract (as recorded in the Brunswick County registry in book 90 at page 231), said point being in the southern line of the former Governor Russell tract of land, said beginning point being also at the intersection of said southern line and the Old River Road and being south 89 degrees 1,830 feet more or less from the intersection of said Russell line with State Highway Numbered 130 at a point approximately 5,270 feet southwardly from the junction of said State Highway Numbered 130 with United States Highways Numbered 17, 74, and 76 at the Brunswick River Bridge area; and running thence from said beginning point and along said old River Road south 16 degrees 30 minutes east 635 feet to a turn in said road; running thence south 8 degrees east 640 feet to another turn in said road; running thence south 27 degrees 15 minutes east 497 feet to the intersection of said road with the centerline of an old tram roadbed, said intersection being the southwest corner of the R. M. Powell tract of land; running thence with the extended southern line of said Powell tract, if said line were extended westwardly, south 71 degrees 30 minutes west 1,000 feet to a point; running thence north 7 degrees 10 minutes west 2,000 feet to a point which is the southern line of the aforementioned Governor Russell tract, said point being south 89 degrees west 700 feet from the beginning point as measured along said Governor Russell line; running thence north 89 degrees east 700 feet to the point of beginning, containing 32 acres, more or less.

Tract numbered 6, beginning at the southwest corner of the Paul S. Austin tract (as recorded in the Brunswick County registry in book 90 at page 231), said point being in the southern line of the former Governor Russell tract of land, said beginning point being also at the intersection of said southern line and the Old River Road and being south 89 degrees west 1,830 feet more or less from the intersection of said Russell line with State Highway No. 130 at a point approximately 5,270 feet southwardly from the junction of said State Highway No. 130 with United States Highway Nos. 17, 74, and 76 at the Brunswick River Bridge area; running thence from said beginning point and along the Old River Road north 35 degrees 45 minutes west 495 feet to a turn in said road; running thence north 85 degrees, 20 minutes west 175 feet to another turn in said road; running thence north 53 degrees 30 minutes west 351 feet to a stone in another turn in said road; running thence south 4 degrees 10 minutes east 640 feet to a point in the aforementioned southern line of Governor Russell tract, said point being south 89 degrees west 700 feet from the point of beginning, as measured along said southern line; running thence north 89 degrees east 700 feet to the point of beginning, containing 7 acres more or less.

Together with the land required for the construction of a suitable railroad connection between the property hereinbefore described and the Atlantic Coastline and Seaboard Railroads in the vicinity of Navassa, N. C.

SEC. 3. The lands to be exchanged hereby shall be appraised by competent appraisers and any difference in value thereof shall be adjusted by a payment by one party to the other; in the event that such adjustment shall be in favor of the North Carolina Ports Authority, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the obligation of the United States under this section.

SEC. 4. The conveyance authorized in section 1 hereof shall be subject to the following conditions, rights, reservations, and limitations:

(a) There shall be reserved to the United States the title to all equipment, machinery, supplies, and steel buildings, with the right of ingress and egress without limitation as to time by employees or contractors of the United States or purchasers of any of such equipment, machinery, supplies, and steel buildings to facilitate its removal from the site.

(b) The State Ports Authority of North Carolina shall secure such undertaking from the North Carolina Highway Commission as may be required to secure the closing of the State highway presently crossing the property to be conveyed to the United States and to provide suitable access roads to serve the said property at such time as is required by the Maritime Administration.

(c) The conveyance by the United States shall contain a provision that in the event that the United States shall, through purchase, condemnation, or requisition, reacquire title to said lands, the purchase price to be paid therefor shall not exceed the depreciated cost of improvements placed thereon by the North Carolina Ports Authority and that this condition shall run with the land.

(d) The conveyance by the United States shall contain a provision that during any emergency declared by the President or the Congress of the United States, and upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property is useful for any national defense purpose, the United States shall have the right to the immediate, full, and unrestricted possession and control of all or any part thereof upon payment of a rental based on the depreciated costs of improvements

made by the North Carolina Ports Authority without any rental based on the value of the land and that this condition shall run with the land.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to sell such installations, improvements, equipment, machinery, supplies, and other facilities located at the present shipyard which he deems unsuitable or unnecessary for use at the new site to be conveyed to the United States under section 2 hereof. The net proceeds of such sales, after deduction of expenses incurred in connection therewith, shall be available for use in developing the property to be conveyed to the United States herein.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $9 million, or so much thereof as may be necessary to transfer to the lands conveyed to the United States under section 2 and reerect and install thereon structures and properties reserved to the United States under section 4, and for the design, layout, grading, and preparation for the establishment of a modern shipyard suitable for the construction of such merchant type vessels as may be required in a national emergency.

SEC. 7. The conveyance authorized in section 1 shall not be consummated until an appropriation has been made pursuant to the authorization in section 6 hereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. I demand a second so we can have just a word of explanation on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman whether this is one of the bills that was on the Consent Calendar this morning?

Mr. BONNER. It was one that was passed over. I asked myself that it be passed over so that it could be considered in this manner.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill briefly?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. At Wilmington, N. C., the Maritime Commission has one of the standby reserve shipyards. The city of Wilmington has grown up around this shipyard. A 7-mile track running through the city supplies the shipyard. The port of Wilmington has grown a great deal. The State port authority offers to give the Maritime Commission more land at the site of the reserve fleet, than there is in this standby yard.

The committee employed an expert builder, an engineer, in fact, the engineer who built this yard, to go down and survey the property and ascertain whether or not it was a fair and proper exchange.

The engineer reported back to the committee—and it is in the hearings—that you could not build modern ships at this shipyard because there was not enough depth in the property and there was not enough available property around it to take care of material; and the spur railroad track could not supply the shipyard with material were it in full operation and also supply the industrial area that has grown up around the shipyard.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman if this bill was previously objected to and passed over without prejudice?

Mr. BONNER. No; but since the gentleman has asked that question I would like to give some other facts about it.

The bill contains a proviso that the city will pay some money to the Federal Maritime Commission if it is found there is a difference in the values of the properties to be exchanged and that that should be done.

The committee went down to look at this shipyard. Its present condition is deplorable. It would have to be rebuilt from the ground up.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has called attention to a committee amendment providing that if after appraisal there is found to be a difference in value of the property in favor of the Federal Government that the State shall reimburse the Federal Government for the difference.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The questions is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 3956 to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "American Samoa Labor Standards Amendments of 1956."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) in subsection (a), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following new paragraph:

"(3) if such employee is employed in American Samoa, not less than the applicable rate established by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with recommendations of a special industry committee or committees which he shall appoint in the same manner and pursuant to the same provisions as are now applicable to the special industry committees provided for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by this act. Each such committee shall have the same powers and duties and shall apply the same standards with respect to the application of the provisions of this act to employees employed in American Samoa as pertain to special industry committees established under section 5 with respect to employees employed in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands. The minimum wage rate thus established shall not exceed the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 13 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (e):

"(e) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to employees for whom the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish minimum wage rates as provided in section 6 (a) (3), except with respect to employees for whom such rates are in effect; and with respect to such employees the Secretary may make rules and regulations providing reasonable limitations and allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions to and from any or all of the provisions of section 7 if he shall find, after a public hearing on the matter, and taking into account the factors set forth in section 6 (a) (3), that economic conditions warrant such action."

SEC. 4. Section 16 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (d):

"(d) In any action or proceeding commenced prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under this act or the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 on account of his failure to comply with any provision or provisions of such acts with respect to work performed in a possession named in section 6 (a) (3) at any time prior to the establishment by the Secretary, as provided therein, of a minimum wage rate applicable to such work."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I fully support and I am happy to see this worthy bill come to passage in the Congress. The work being done in Samoa for the development of a sound industry and to raise the economy of American Samoans does credit to our Government and to the private enterprise devoted to the task. It would only be proper, however, to point out that the Congress has not solved a most pressing problem for which H. R. 11799 was designed. I sincerely hope that all interested groups and particularly organized labor, the Department of State and the Department of Defense will come to a satisfactory agreement in the intervening months before the new Congress assembles. If they do so, legislation can be speeded in the next Congress and I am certain that there can be substantial agreement amongst the members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The passage of S. 3956 clearly indicates the confidence of this Congress in the good faith and in the high standards of operation and cooperation being displayed by all concerned in the continued improvement and development of those who live in American Samoa.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 11799) and H. Res. 600 were laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 602 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R.

8902) to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and pending that yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution indicates, this is an open rule providing for an hour's general debate on the bill H. R. 8902 to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 as amended.

The purpose of this bill is to assist subsidized air carriers in buying new aircraft. It provides that in determining the subsidy element of rates to be paid to air carriers for the transportation of mail, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall not take into account net capital gains realized by the carriers from the sale or other disposition of depreciable property used in their normal operations provided that the net gain so realized is reinvested in other equipment within a reasonable time to be determined by the Board.

The bill does not affect the taxability of capital gains realized by the air carriers.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, all I know about this bill is what I have heard here today. However, after extensive hearings in the other body by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as I understand it, the committee reported it unanimously. The bill then went to the floor of the other body and with the entire membership present it was passed unanimously there.

It came to the House and it is my understanding that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce here voted it out practically unanimously, with the exception of one Member.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have always understood that we should not refer to actions in the other body. In the course of trying to place facts before the Members of this House I have refrained from doing that and I am not going to violate that rule at this time, even though reference has been made to a vote there and to an alleged attendance of "the entire membership" being present, other than to state flatly that neither assertion is correct.

May I add that there was nothing like unanimity of opinion in the other body on the essential amendment which I hope may be passed upon by the House, an amendment suggested by the Bureau of the Budget, which has the complete and wholehearted endorsement of the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General, the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and also the endorsement of our colleague, the then Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Hon. Ross Rizley. It is true two other members of the Civil Aeronautics Board have supported this bill but, I submit, with very little persuasiveness.

I do not intend to impose on the House here today with any detailed argument pro or con with reference to the bill. It is now 13 minutes past 3 o'clock. We came in this morning at 10 o'clock. Last night I sat on this floor and heard the statement made that this bill would be called up before any other legislative business. You know what the present situation is.

I regret deeply there are not more Members present to express their own convictions in the Committee of the Whole as to this particular measure, because, in my honest judgment, it is a windfall of the worst kind. It is discrimination on discrimination and if it is passed here over the protest of every department in the Government, we will all live to regret that action. Yet, considering the kind of a program we have had to face this week, certainly those who are not here now cannot be criticized fairly.

I am sorry that there are only 30 minutes on each side to debate the complex and difficult issues in this matter, but perhaps that is not unusual, because if you will ask one of the boys to bring you the hearings on this bill you will find at the back end of a hearing labeled "Civil Air Policy" there are a few pages devoted to this bill. If you examine those hearings and ask some questions, I do not think my colleagues on the subcommittee will dispute the fact that they were under certain pressure the morning of the hearing.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. Yesterday he took this floor and admitted that the membership of this House voted on a bill without knowing what they were doing. He admitted that the amendment he offered had been hastily drawn; that the error had not been discovered at the time, and he said: I regret this mistake exceedingly.

And, this is the significant thing I want to repeat to the few of you who are here at this time:

> And, while it illustrates the difficulty of legislating in this hurried fashion in these dying days of this Congress, I must take full responsibility for the error.

And, that is characteristic of that gentleman. He is willing to stand up and take the responsibility publicly for an unfortunate incident yesterday afternoon. It is in the RECORD of yesterday at page 14461, rollcall 119, 92 for and 299 against. And, he added:

> Therefore, the vote just taken was not a fair test of the sentiments in this House on the public-housing question.

We should, and I know we do, respect and honor that sort of complete honesty which always characterizes the gentleman's conduct here, even when we disagree with him on an issue before us.

I submit to you that on this matter which does not have the support officially of a single agency of the Federal Government but has the active opposition of people who have wide experience, who have established reputations of competency, who know what they are talking about should receive something more than 30 minutes consideration on a side, particularly when I happen to be the only one from the committee, as far as I know, who is going to speak in opposition to this bill and to this rule. I assume my colleagues and my friends on the committee will want all their time, and they should have it. But surely who have a right to know the reasons for opposition.

This is not a pleasant position I have this afternoon. I do not enjoy it. I would infinitely rather prefer to have avoided coming to the floor and taking issue on this matter, but I cannot escape that duty and I will not try to do so. I do not care whether there are 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, or 50 people on this floor who may vote in opposition to this proposal or for the amendment I want to submit to you. Now, if a point of order is made, possibly it will not be before you, but I shall offer it. I think we have as much right to consider a serious suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget as to this kind of a bill, divorced from technicalities, as the other body has.

There are a lot more things I wish I had time to say about this bill. But we are confronted with a strict time limitation. While I think that is most unfortunate, we must do the best we can to understand the issues pro and con and the clear, cold facts. If we can do that, this bill will not pass here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it in order for me, unless I obtain the consent of the gentleman from Mississippi, to offer an amendment to the rule?

The SPEAKER. The only way the gentleman can offer an amendment is if the gentleman in charge of the rule will yield for that purpose and for that purpose only.

Mr. HESELTON. May I inquire whether the gentleman would permit me to offer an amendment which would extend the time 30 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's silence indicates refusal.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, this bill was considered by the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and agreed to unanimously by the subcommitte. It was brought to the full committee. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] had a very urgent call somewhere else at the time the vote was being taken, and the vote was unanimous without him. The gentleman has filed a minority report to this bill, which he has the privilege of doing,

of course, and he has the privilege of feeling as strongly in the matter as he would like.

But the bill itself arises because of certain language contained in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which has been interpreted both by a majority of the Civil Aeronautics Board as it was then constituted and the Supreme Court differently from what I believe was the original intention of the Congress and certainly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There is one member of the committee present who was a member at the time the Civil Aeronautics Bill was passed, but that language is as follows:

> After saying that the Civil Aeronautics Board in fixing mail pay and subsidy for air carriers shall take into consideration the need of each such carrier for compensation sufficient together with all other revenue of the carrier to enable such carrier to maintain and continue development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, and the Postal Service and the national defense.

In a case which was brought up on an entirely different subject but affecting that portion of the act the Supreme Court held that—

> Income from all sources such as the sale of flight equipment must be counted in determining the all-other-income provision referred to.

The Board had taken the position that it could disregard for this purpose that part of the income which the carrier received from the sale of its routes. That is in the Supreme Court case. The Board's purpose in doing so was to safeguard the incentive for future voluntary route transfers. However, the Court said there was no justification in the law for this position of the Board.

The Board had prior thereto permitted the sale of flight equipment—not only permitted it, they could not stop it—but any profits that might arise from the sale of flight equipment were considered in a time of open rates—that is, when rates were not fixed to be a part of the other income, but during closed rate periods when the rate was set—that such capital gains from the sale of assets were not considered as other income. The Board believes it is necessary for them in view of this decision of the Supreme Court to open the rates of subsidized carriers and consequently to leave free until another determination has been made this question.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Then this bill provides that when they sell outmoded equipment that money shall be considered as capital gains and not as income for tax purposes?

Mr. HINSHAW. No, it is the profit from the sale, not the sale itself.

Mr. MASON. Yes. The profit from the sale shall be considered as capital gains and not as income.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

Mr. PATTERSON. After the tax is paid.

Mr. HINSHAW. After the capital gains tax has been paid. It has nothing to do with the tax being paid.

Mr. MASON. No, but this substitutes capital gains for the profits on the sale instead of income gains.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, not profits from operation.

Mr. MORANO. If the gentleman will yield, provided, of course, that the money is reinvested.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly what I was going to say.

May I add to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], provided that the funds realized as profit should be reinvested in other similar equipment within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. MORANO. That is the point I wanted to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In order that we can clear up this point so there will be no misunderstanding about it, there is no subsidy here for any capital gain for any other provision which they provide. This bill merely provides that when airline companies have capital gains from the sale of obsolete or secondhand equipment, when applied to the purchase of new equipment, their subsidy will not be reduced as the result of that transaction.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the effect of it.

Mr. HARRIS. It in no way changes the capital gains provision.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct. It in no way changes that provision.

The companies affected by this act are Alaska Airlines, Pacific Northern Airlines, Continental Airlines, Northeast Airlines, Pan American Airlines, Panagra Airlines, Braniff Airlines, 13 local service carriers which I shall not name, 3 helicopter carriers which I shall not name, and about half a dozen local Alaska carriers, and the Hawaiian carriers.

The ones it does not affect at the present time are American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, TWA, United Airlines, Western Airlines, and for the time being Northwest and Delta. I say for the time being because they have been off subsidy for a very brief period and might have to go back on again.

These airplanes which have a value of something like $900 million total will become reduced in value, but on the other hand there is a very strong market at the present time for secondhand airplanes. Their values on the market are much higher than was anticipated at the time. As a matter of fact, it is possible to get more for an airplane than the original cost even after it has been used up, so to speak, through 8 or 10 years of use. There is a reason for that which I shall not go into just now, but on the other hand that is why the capital gains are rising.

The reason why the bill is necessary is that all of these companies are ordering new equipment. The sale of these airplanes and the money realized from them net is expected to be applied to the purchase of new airplanes. There is $1,600,000,000 worth on order of these great jets and turboprop airplanes. Approximately 375 of the 4-engine aircraft that are affected are a part of the Reserve Civil Air Fleet of the United States Military Establishment. We have provided for certain conversion moneys through the defense budget, and these airplanes are all available on 48 hours' notice to the United States Government. We are not required to purchase airplanes by our appropriations in this Congress because these airplanes are being paid for and being used in commerce and the pilots and crews and so forth are all available free to the people of the United States in the event of any emergency.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Why is it that the bill applies only to certain airlines and not to all airlines?

Mr. HINSHAW. Because it only applies to the certain airlines that are still under subsidy.

Mr. MASON. In other words, it applies to the subsidy airlines, but not to those that are not receiving a subsidy.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. The rich airlines can do anything they want to do with their capital gains. But it is the subsidized airlines that the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Supreme Court would take the money away from and make it apply against this subsidy.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that the fleet of airplanes, which the gentleman just referred to represents an element in our national security and represent an overseas fleet?

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, there is a great element of our national security involved here.

Mr. MORANO. And it represents a very important element in this fight for economic penetration which is being carried on by the Soviets.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, sir; as a matter of fact it is expected that the Soviet Government will come out very shortly, as the British Government has, with the Vickers Viscount and offer an Ilyushin or something like that, a big turbojet transport on the world market.

Mr. MORANO. Exactly. Does that not mean, while I am one of those who believes that, perhaps, Russia will never drop the hydrogen bomb on us and that she would rather fight us in the air by peaceful economic penetration, that that is the way they can do it by winning the air with these jets?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. This is a highly meritorious measure and should be adopted.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the United States Coast Guard for the very remarkable performance of its search and rescue service in connection with the collision this morning of two great ocean liners, the Italian Line *Andrea Doria* and the Swedish vessel *Stockholm*. It has been my privilege to have been very closely identified with the Coast Guard since I have been a Member of the Congress. In my opinion it is one of the most efficient agencies of the Government. It has a magnificent record of service and certainly in this catastrophe it has lived up to its highest traditions.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, am thrilled by the way the Coast Guard responded to last night's S. O. S. On a lesser scale, however, it can be said and it should be said that the United States Coast Guard is engaging in sea and air rescue work daily and nightly. "Semper Paratus" is the Latin motto of the Coast Guard. That means "always prepared." The Coast Guard last night lived up to the highest tradition of that motto and we have many, many reasons to be proud of this dedicated service.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman. It was a remarkable performance. I think the United States of America can be proud of the very fine service rendered on this occasion.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to the excellent job that was done by the United States Coast Guard in connection with this collision. I had occasion last night to be awakened and I was advised at 3 o'clock in the morning that the mayor of Philadelphia and his wife were aboard the Italian liner. I was in contact with the Coast Guard all through the night and I cannot praise them too highly. The mayor of Philadelphia has made a telephonic broadcast from the *Ile de France* and he has the highest praise for the excellent job done by the Coast Guard, and everybody in connection with the rescue.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman. Other services as well as commercial and private vessels did cooperate but I mention particularly the United States Coast Guard because it was the directing agency and it deserves great credit for its performance.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I only want to take a minute or two of the little time that is left before adjournment in order to put my colleagues on notice that in the other body an attempt is being made to increase at this time the number of immigrants that this country admits annually under regular immigration quotas. This attempt is being made while only a few hours have gone by since the Senate passed S. 2663, a bill designed to provide assistance in certain economically depressed areas. In that bill, it is stated that this country suffers from substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment.

One of the States most painfully affected by unemployment is the State of Pennsylvania. The coal regions present an appalling picture of mines caving in, unattended buildings collapsing, homes being ruined by lack of money to keep them in good repair—and above all—of miners living on a gradually diminishing pittance provided by public and union welfare funds.

Within the current decade, immigration to the United States has by far outnumbered the quotas established by the Congress. This country has admitted since the end of the war well over half a million refugees and displaced persons, in addition to immigrants reaching us from all corners of the world both under the quota and outside of the quota. Our nonquota admission of immigrants exceeds twice the number of immigrants entering under the quota. The liberal provisions of the law admitting outside of the quota all natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, and all wives and children of United States citizens, regardless of their place of birth, has made our entire immigration quota simply a basis from which we operate. Immigration from Mexico was in the past fiscal year 5 times higher than only 4 years ago and it is rising rapidly in the current fiscal year.

There is now before the Senate a bill, H. R. 6888, which passed the House last year. Certain desirable amendments were recommended to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by my colleagues on the House Committee and by myself. It is hoped that these amendments, which do not endanger the security, the economy, and the national welfare of this country, will be adopted. But a very dangerous action has developed in the other body. Dozens of amendments have been proposed to the bill H. R. 6888, and each of them tries to emulate the other one in an attempt to wreck our quota system.

It is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy at this time how many more immigrants would be permitted to come to the United States under the amendments piled up in the other body. It is unthinkable that the House would go along with a policy designed to pile up unskilled immigrants on top of unemployed workers walking the streets of our congested urban centers. I am certain that my colleagues in the House who are familiar with the situation in their districts, as I am with the situation in my district and State, would join me in rejecting the amendments providing for a numerical increase in the total immigration to this country.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the United States Coast Guard for their outstanding rescue work in the collision between the *Andrea Doria* and the *Stockholm* off Nantucket, Mass., which is in my congressional district.

Through the years, the small Coast Guard stations, cutters and air-sea rescue units have performed innumerable feats of bravery along the coastline in my district. They have saved the lives of hundreds of fishermen whose boats have been wrecked in storms off our coast.

The rescue work of the Coast Guard personnel in this latest sea disaster is unsurpassed in bravery, and I am doubly proud to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

AMENDING AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this bill unless certain amendments are accepted. There has been a lot of discussion for and against it, but not much explanation of it. Let me try to describe what this bill does, although I am certainly not an expert in this field or on the committee.

All these years under the Civil Aeronautics Act, we have had certain ground rules, by which subsidies for airlines are figured.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In view of what the gentleman said a few moments ago, I assume he is not opposing the rule?

Mr. JUDD. No, I am not now opposing the rule. The only reason I am speaking now is that the rule provides only 1 hour's general debate on the bill and there may not be time then. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding me 5 minutes.

In order to encourage aviation in our country and help the airlines, especially the smaller ones, to get started, our Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 laid down the policy of paying subsidies to try to ensure a return of about 8 percent on capital investment. The subsidy for each line is figured every year, and to determine what the line has to have in order to be able to attain such a return, the CAB has to figure out what the operating revenue of the line is, how much it has earned from its flights, and, as has already been explained "all other revenue," as the act describes it. That has been held by the Supreme Court to include profits made, or capital gains, on the sale or other disposition of old equipment or other property that is used or is useful in its normal operations.

As the gentleman from California has pointed out, after taking depreciation on their equipment, they can now sell the old planes at a high price, sometimes above original cost. Thus they can sometimes make an enormous profit in the form of capital gains. This bill does

not affect the taxes they must pay on such capital gains; it merely changes the ground rules by which the subsidies are figured.

It would amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act so that in determining subsidies for air carriers for transportation of mail, the CAB shall not take into account capital gains realized by the carriers from the sale of depreciable property used or usable in the carrier's normal operations, provided that the net gain, after capital gains taxes are paid, is reinvested in similar property—that is, new and presumably better planes.

These old rules have worked well. Our airlines have made spectacular growth under them. Most of the lines, all of the larger ones except about two, have already managed to get off subsidy. Now we come along and propose in this bill to change the ground rules in the middle of the game, so that the ones who are not off subsidy are to get a second dip into the Treasury. That is what it amounts to. They would not have to deduct their capital gains from subsidies received. Their profits from sale of depreciable property would not be considered as revenue in figuring their subsidy.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is partly right and partly wrong on that. They have changed today and what they have done for a matter of 2 years. There originally was no such thing. In these 2 years the capital gains have been applied on open rate operations but not on closed rate operations.

Mr. JUDD. I recognize that fact.

Mr. HINSHAW. It has been about half and half.

Mr. JUDD. But the further fact is that this amounts to a tremendous windfall for the airlines that are not being subsidized—I mean for the lines that are still on subsidy. It in a sense penalizes the ones that are off subsidy and rewards the ones that are still on subsidy.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely wrong when he says this is a windfall to the people not on subsidy.

Mr. JUDD. I corrected it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is entirely incorrect.

Mr. JUDD. I corrected my original misstatement. I said it is a windfall for the ones that are on subsidy. That is the reason for my opposition.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I disagree with the gentleman, but I will get some time and explain it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is urged that this bill must be passed so that the companies will have greater incentive to modernize, to get new equipment, and so on. What are the companies going to do that are not on subsidy when they have to buy new equipment?

For example, Pan-American is still on subsidy. It has ordered, so I understand, some $260 million worth of new equipment. If this bill is passed it will enable Pan-American to get a much larger subsidy from the Government, because it will not have to take into account in figuring its need for subsidy, the profits from the sale of its old equipment, which may run up to $100 million. Under present rules those profits would be deducted from the amount of subsidy otherwise payable. Under this bill it could keep all the profits for purchase of new equipment and claim the whole subsidy besides.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. No, I am sorry I cannot yield at this time.

TWA has to compete over some of the same routes with Pan American. TWA is getting and would get no subsidy at all. But Pan American would get a larger Federal subsidy than now because it would not have to include as revenue the money it has made as capital gains from the sale of its depreciable property.

It seems to me that to be fair and equitable, either TWA should get back on subsidy or that Pan American should get off subsidy, if airlines hereafter are to be able to disregard in figuring subsidies their capital gains from sale of their property.

The Department of Commerce was asked to estimate what would have been the effect if this bill had been law on the books the last 5 years. It estimated that the Government—the taxpayers, you and I—would have had to pay out $22 million more in subsidies than we did; and that $17 million of it would have gone to one company, Pan American.

There is an even worse result than increased payments to lines now on subsidy. If you pass this bill why should any of them ever again try to get off subsidy? Of course, they would want to stay on subsidy indefinitely.

Under this bill if an airline is on subsidy and sells its equipment at a considerable profit, it can deduct that profit from its income, or not figure it in its income, and thus get a subsidy of the total amount it is estimated to need, not counting that profit. It seems to me that is unfair. We should not change the ground rules in the midst of an operation under which most of the airlines have managed their affairs very well. Most of them are off subsidy. Let us encourage the rest of them to get off subsidy too.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, frankly, I do not know too much about this legislation, though I have carefully read with much interest the enlightening debate had in the other body on July 9.

This bill was most carefully considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the other body, it was debated at great length. It passed the Senate 52 to 22—more than 2 to 1. That debate was not only interesting, it was enlightening. Then when it came over to the House from the other body it was carefully considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and with the single exception of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the bill was approved by the House committee.

It is my understanding that this legislation will enable a lot of the little lines—some of the larger ones, too—those mostly in need, to sell old equipment that has become obsolescent or obsolete, that they can take that money and apply it on new equipment, bring their planes and equipment up to date without having to be charged with capital gains on the funds they derive from the sale of old or wornout equipment.

We all have a great deal of pride in our Air Force and our commercial airlines. I do want to bring out one point. In time of emergency, when we get into war—we have gone through this experience before—we have depended a great deal upon our commercial airlines, not only for certain equipment, for transportation purposes and all that, but for the pilots and the crews, the mechanics as well as the pilots and navigators, who contributed much to the defense of our Nation in time of war. For the little it would cost it seems to me to be money well spent to pass legislation of this kind that would allow feeder lines all over the country, and some of the larger airlines, to sell old dilapidated or wornout equipment and to modernize their planes in order to keep this Nation strong, not only in a commercial sense in time of peace but as a defense in case we should become involved in war.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is not one of the facets of this subject the matter of the dignity of this country in its representation abroad insofar as our air equipment is concerned?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad that the gentleman brought out that very significant point.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not to the best interest of the people of the United States to have our American airlines operating in international travel use the best in safe and modern equipment so as to compete with foreign airlines?

Mr. SHORT. There is no doubt about that. The gentleman from New York has traveled on every continent, he has visited our diplomatic posts abroad, and has had talks with representatives of foreign governments in practically every country he visited. I do not care whether it is Europe, Asia, Africa, or South America, it always gives me a little pride and satisfaction to hear these people in foreign countries look with great admiration at our great airliners abroad and with pride to the accomplishments of the United States.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not also true that the foreign-flag airlines are completely backed by their governments and supported by their governments?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. MORANO. Entirely.

Mr. SHORT. Entirely is my understanding.

Mr. MORANO. And our overseas airlines have to compete with that type of operation.

Mr. SHORT. They face more or less the same kind of competition that our maritime activities and our merchant marine do.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is it not also true that when we have good equipment, money comes back to the Treasury through the transportation tax and the hauling of additional passengers in the airline service? I have been told that as much will come back through taxation by having good equipment as this would benefit any airline.

Mr. SHORT. That also is very true, and you should not overlook the safety factor—the lives that will be saved by having the most up-to-date and modern equipment to prevent the large number of accidents that we have witnessed in recent months.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include letters and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, just to get the RECORD straight here for a moment, I want to refer to the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota. The gentleman from Minnesota made a comparison between TWA and PAA with respect to a subsidy. Now, the difference is this. TWA has a very lucrative run, especially overseas. It operates between New York, England, France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, and the Azores, while Pan American on the other hand has a run which is not lucrative at all. It flies from New York into the Congo, from New York into Iceland, into Norway, and during the bad seasons, naturally that route is not traveled at all. Another aspect that I think the gentleman should take into consideration is the fact that TWA, which you have taken as an example, also has the right of operation right here in the States, which is definitely lucrative. Surely the gentleman knows, using the airlines as much as he does, that it is impossible, for instance, on a weekend to get a reservation from Washington to New York or to Boston or Pittsburgh, and all of these other airlines which are not subsidized have these density routes. Certainly they are very lucrative. On the other hand, the smaller feeder lines that are coming in here, which are part of our great transportation system, naturally have to be helped.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that by giving them this extra profit you are, in effect, increasing their subsidy? Why do we not keep this on a strict subsidy basis rather than letting them take this extra profit derived from the sale of obsolete equipment and building up their profits?

Mr. PATTERSON. There is absolutely no excess profit as far as the subsidized lines go.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think we should keep in mind that none of these profits derived from the sale of old equipment will be allowed unless all that money is spent for new equipment. It cannot be paid out in dividends. They have to take the funds that they derive from the sale of the old, obsolete equipment and invest all that in new planes—the latest, most up-to-date equipment.

Mr. PATTERSON. For instance, one of the lines running into Alaska would have to use the funds derived from the sale to possibly build a hangar, due to inclement weather, and other conditions that they have to operate under up there.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, are they not buying this new equipment now, anyway?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not think they would be able to buy it unless they are given a lucrative run, or assistance in form of a subsidy if that is what the gentleman is referring to. The purpose of this legislation as I understand it, is to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act so in the determination of subsidies to be paid to air carriers the Civil Aeronautics Board shall take into consideration the need of each air carrier for compensation for the transportation and operation sufficient to insure the performance of satisfactory service. Further to continue development of air transportation to the extent demanded by our Government.

Another aspect of this legislation that might be overlooked is the one pertaining to national defense. In time of a national emergency our fleet of civil air transports could be employed in the matter of a few hours because of the modification of the new commercial planes that are now on order with Boeing, Douglas, and Pratt & Whitney. These 45 jet transport aircraft will supplement the Civil Air Reserve Fleet and will decrease the cost to our armed services of maintaining a standby arm of our Air Force.

If we are to lead the world in civil air transportation our carriers must receive assistance if they are to compete in world competition. They must be permitted to retain profits from the sale of equipment in the same manner as the domestic trunk route carriers.

The high level of profit of nonsubsidized trunk carriers is not an indication of greater efficiency than subsidized carriers, but rather the result of the Government granting them density traffic routes for which a subsidy is not required. A great many of our House Members who travel weekly between Washington, New York, Newark, and Boston realize that such domestic route carriers need no subsidy.

Further, Mr. Speaker, a criticism has been voiced that the bill is too broad in that it permits the carriers to reinvest in "other property similar or related in service or use."

The term "property" is defined as "depreciable property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations." If the carrier reinvests the profits from the sale of property in property other than that defined, such profits are subject to recapture and offset against subsidy. The term "property used or useful" is a term which has been the basis on which the CAB has determined the carriers investment base for computing the return element in mail rates since 1938. Under the terms of this bill it will continue to judge whether the carriers have properly invested profits from equipment sales.

Some terribly important and distressing news has recently filtered through the Iron Curtain: Russia is now building up a large commercial air force.

At this moment Russian slave laborers are toiling in factories to create this force. They are assembling the most modern jet engines known and installing them in more planes equipped with the latest devices for speed and comfort. They are being paid next to nothing for their sweat. And so within 2 years, according to reports, Russia will have the fastest and cheapest Air Force in the world, all at government expense.

What does this mean? First of all, it means that the United States, long respected as the greatest airpower in the world, may become a poor second. Unable to match the jet speed and comfort of the Red planes at their cheap labor costs, our great airlines will ground operations. Thousands of people employed in all the varied phases of the aircraft industry will become unemployed. A great fountain of wealth will be turned off. Our leadership and prestige in the free world will be crushed. Communist propaganda will be able to spread all over the world.

Most important, our military defense will be gravely imperiled. Not many people realize how vitally commercial carriers are needed to transport troops and equipment in times of crisis. In the event of a crisis in the Middle or Far East, for instance, thousands of American soldiers and massive piles of equipment would have to be moved long distances immediately. Otherwise, local Red aggression would be in complete control before we could make a first line of defense.

Right now, however, our military planes can transport only one airborne division to such an area in time to be of aid. We must have a sizable commercial force of the type Russia is now building to move our men and equipment in time. Otherwise, all other great defense preparations will sit helplessly on American shores, while Red carriers pour in troops and equipment to enslave millions of freedom-loving peoples.

In short, the Russian buildup means one thing—a much larger commercial air force is needed on the home front. At the moment our great commercial airlines lead the world. They are the largest, fastest, and most efficient in history. The Russian carrier menace, however, threatens to undermine this leadership and as a result the whole free world.

So we must aid our airlines in their hours of need because alone they cannot compete with Russian Government-

supplied slave labor. We must build up a reserve supply which can be used as carriers of troops and equipment in crucial times. Our airlines must continue to receive increased subsidies to meet the Red threat.

Furthermore, this reserve can be used very well in peacetime. It will not sit rusting in musty hangars at the taxpayers' expense. It can, and must, be used in peace, to transport military troops and equipment to all destinations. If so used, not only will more men be trained in the use of these carriers, but the cost to the taxpayer will be greatly reduced.

An increased commercial air force is not only essential for defense reasons, but represents millions saved monthly in tax dollars. Since our airlines cannot accomplish the needed increase by themselves due to competition, I strongly urge the retention and increase of Government subsidies to help them meet this dangerous Red threat. Each dollar of subsidy we pay will save millions of free world lives and millions of the taxpayers' money.

ANSWER TO A MEMORANDUM CONCERNING H. R. 8902

Recently a representative of a certificated air carrier distributed a fallacious document which, if followed by Congress, would place H. R. 8902 in great jeopardy. In the belief that Congress wants to have available a rebuttal to this memorandum, a rather detailed answer is necessary.

In quotations are the arguments advanced in the incorrect memorandum. Factual answers appear directly below each quotation.

Claim 1:

"H. R. 8902 or S. 3449 will permit subsidized airlines to place all profits from the sale of equipment into a separate account for the purchase of new equipment and these profits could not be taken into consideration in determining the airlines' subsidy needs."

Answer: Subsidized carriers may retain profits after payment of capital-gains taxes under H. R. 8902 only if within a reasonable time such profits are reinvested in other property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations. This bill would aid the subsidized carriers in narrowing the competitive financial gap between them and the nonsubsidized carriers. These carriers, even though their profit level has been substantially above that of the subsidized carriers, have always been permitted to retain their profits from equipment sales to aid them in their financing of new equipment.

Claim 2:

In other words, if an airline which receives $10 million a year in subsidy should realize a profit of $50 million from the sale of equipment, it would be permitted to place the entire $50 million in a separate account toward the purchase of new equipment and still claim $10 million in subsidy.

Answer: The nonsubsidized carrier is even better off than the subsidized carrier, in that there are no restrictions on the manner in which the nonsubsidized carrier may use its $50 million. If you were to follow the implied reasoning of the author of this statement, then the passenger and cargo rates charged to the public by the nonsubsidized carriers should be reduced to reflect the profits which these carriers receive from the sale of flight equipment. Such ratemaking is not recommended as a ratemaking principle nor is it believed that any ratemaking body for public utilities, railroads, buses, or airlines could justify returning to the public profits realized from the sale of flight equipment, in the form of reduced rates. This is just what the author of the above statement would recommend for the subsidized airlines. Having been paid a reasonable subsidy determined to be so by the CAB, for a service rendered, he would now have the CAB confiscate the value of the subsidized airlines assets when they most need them. The scale of justice would not be in balance.

Claim 3A:

Since such profits have been used to reduce Government subsidy in the past, that procedure could not be followed under H. R. 8902 or S. 3449.

Answer: This statement is just not true. Subsidized carriers operating under closed rates retained profits from equipment sales during the entire period from 1939 to 1954 and it has been only during approximately the last 2 years that the CAB changed its ratemaking policy to recapture these profits.

Claim 3B:

Therefore, Government subsidy payments would be increased, at least for the next 2 or 3 years.

Answer: Mr. Harmar Denny and Mr. Chan Gurney, members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, in testifying before the Aviation Committee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which is sponsoring H. R. 8902, have this to say regarding the above statement:

Argument against enactment of these bills is advanced on the basis that the United States Government may as a result of the enactment be obligated to make increased subsidy payments to the airline industry. Conceding that this may be so for a few years, it is our opinion that the investment will pay off in the long run because of the greater profitability of our carriers when assured of leadership in world aviation. Admittedly, this is a matter of judgment. But it is a relatively safe judgment to assume that our carriers will do substantially better when equipped with the finest equipment in the world and in sufficient numbers than they will if the equipment programs are restricted by lack of Government support at this time. We believe that, in the long run, these bills will be of material assistance to the subsidy carriers to become self-sufficient.

Claim 4A:

If H. R. 8902 had been in effect for the last 5 years, the total benefits that would have been realized by the airlines would have amounted to $21,900,790. Of that amount, Pan American would have received $17,288,000, while 47 other airlines would have been eligible to share in the remaining $4,612,790.

Answer: It is not difficult for a reader of this memorandum to conclude that the writer will resort to any means at his command to smear Pan American and to defeat this bill. The bill was supported by all the subsidized carriers which include the local service carriers, the helicopter operators, the territorial carriers, the international and overseas operators, and the entire civil transport industry, including the nonsubsidized carriers with one exception—Northwest Airlines, which has its harpoon sharpened for Pan American and is responsible for the above statement. The writer of this statement well knows, that without capital gains from the sale of flight equipment it will be impossible for subsidized carriers to carry out the financing of their reequipment programs. The above statement has cited figures from the minority report as to the amount of capital gains which the Board has taken into account during the 5 years 1951–55 to support an argument that the bill would benefit only Pan American World Airways. Look closely at the list of companies in this part of the report. The vast majority of the carriers listed are local service and territorial carriers. During the period from 1951 to 1955 the workhorse of their operations was the DC–3 twin engine airplane. During this entire period there was no suitable replacement aircraft available for purchase, and it was necessary for them to retain for their growing service all of the aircraft in their possession. Under these circumstances there would, of course, be no sale of flight equipment and hence no equipment sales profit available for the CAB to use to apply to the reduction of subsidy.

Referring again to the figures in the minority report, you will see nothing to indicate whether these carriers sold equipment and retained profits under the Board's policy of permitting carriers to retain profits while operating under closed rates, which policy was in effect prior to 1954. The truth of the matter is that these figures merely demonstrate that certain carriers which were on subsidy during the 1951–55 period were also on open mail rates, and that they sold flight equipment with the firm hope that they would be able to convince the CAB that the profits realized should be retained by the carriers in order to finance the purchase of new equipment during this period.

Pan American, from 1952 through 1955, added to its operating fleet some 45 DC–6B's, 3 DC–6A's, and 7 DC–7B's. It has turned out that Pan American's sale of flight equipment in order to make funds available to purchase this new equipment was a grave mistake as the financial benefits of such sales has inured entirely to the United States Treasury because of the CAB's erroneous policy of confiscating such profits during this period. This historic record of the amount of equipment sales profits which have been taken from the carriers to reduce subsidy is of no relevance in determining who will benefit from the legislation we are here considering for the future. Many of the local service carriers placed orders for new equipment which will cost them between $500,000 and $600,000 per aircraft, and others are considering such orders, and will eventually be required to place them, if they are to continue to develop their services. How can any one say that these small carriers with an average net worth of only $800,000 will not benefit from the sale of their DC–3 fleets in the

financing of the purchase of their replacement fleets? Without the benefit of the profits from flight equipment sales many of them will be unable to finance either by borrowing the necessary funds or by marketing their equity securities. All carriers will benefit from this legislation and should be put on the same footing with the right to dispose of equipment when they see fit and to retain the proceeds to reinvest in new equipment.

Claim 4B:

However, since the bigger airlines have planned large reequipment programs in the near future, the benefits would easily amount to huge windfalls, especially in the case of Pan American.

Answer: Equipment sales profits are no more a windfall to subsidized carriers than to nonsubsidized carriers. The profits which come from the sale of flight equipment in this present period of inflation, or any other period, are the rightful property of the subsidized carriers, just as they are for the nonsubsidized carriers, and have resulted not from anything either the carrier or the Government has done, but are the result of economic forces and inflation. In all industry economic factors of inflation and deflation must be faced. The increase in value of old flight equipment, and the profits realized during inflation or losses incurred during depressions under this bill are for the account of the subsidized carriers which assume the risk. There is no windfall here, but rather a just treatment of the subsidized carrier's property.

Claim 5:

Benefits to be derived from the bills by all airlines, except Pan American, would be negligible because the smaller airlines' subsidy requirements are not as high, they do not have as much equipment for sale at this time, and they will not realize a very big profit when it is placed on sale.

Answer: The true facts are these: Out of some $33 million of subsidy paid in 1955 Pan American received only $1 million. The remaining $32 million went to support the national interest routes of the local-service carriers, the helicopter operators, the territorial carriers, and a few foreign and overseas carriers.

The present-day value of the aircraft fleets owned by the subsidized carriers, other than Pan American, is estimated at $100 million. The author of the above statement does not regard the profits which might be derived from the sale of this equipment as important to the smaller airlines in the financing of their reequipment program. The value of the fleets of the local-service carriers alone in today's market is some $15 to $20 million. This amount can be compared with the total net worth of these companies of only $10,500,000. Permitting these carriers to retain profits from equipment sales would more than double their net worth, triple or quadruple their borrowing power to provide for the financing of new equipment, and would vastly improve their position for financing through equity securities.

Claim 6:

Subsidy-free airlines will not benefit from the passage of either H. R. 8902 or S. 3449, but instead, will be penalized indirectly.

For example, Pan American, which stands to gain the most, has on order new jet airplanes costing in excess of $260 million. In selling its old equipment it will realize a profit up to, or perhaps more than $100 million. Under H. R. 8902, Pan American, in addition, would receive its complete subsidy requirement amounting to millions of dollars. Trans World Airlines, one of its competitors but much smaller in size, must also purchase new equipment if it is to compete effectively. Since TWA operates subsidy free it would receive no Government assistance in financing. Therefore, the Government, in effect, will be giving Pan American, one of the biggest United States carriers, additional financial assistance to compete with a smaller carrier that stands on its own and does not drain tax dollars out of the Federal Treasury.

The effect of H. R. 8902 would be even more discriminatory in the case of Northwest Airlines which competes with Pan American in the Pacific. Pan American's Pacific revenues alone, over its exclusive central Pacific route, amount to nearly $60 million annually, while Northwest's total international revenues amount to only $21 million. Thus, Northwest, operating subsidy free, must also obtain comparable jet equipment to meet the competition, but it must buy its planes without the additional financial benefits that its competitor, which is many times its size, would receive under such legislation.

Answer: Our heart goes out to poor TWA and Northwest which are members of the domestic trunkline group which operate the most lucrative domestic routes and in the year 1955 earned some 10.5 percent on their investment. Such earnings compare with the earnings of the subsidized foreign and overseas carriers of only 4.6 percent. Pan American competes with TWA in the Atlantic and Northwest in the Pacific. Pan American requires no subsidy in either of these areas on the routes which are competitive with these two American competitors. Subsidy is provided only to support those routes which though not economically self-supporting are operated in the national interest. These include the routes to Iceland, Scandinavia, and Africa in the Atlantic area and to Australia and routes in the Far East in the Pacific area.

One should not lose sight of the fact that Northwest and TWA required subsidy until a year or so ago. The aircraft which these carriers will sell to help finance their requirement program were aircraft which were used during the period in which these carriers were receiving subsidy. Profits from such sales for Northwest and TWA are no different than the profits which the present bills would permit the subsidized carriers to retain on the sale of their equipment.

Claim 7:

In case there is a need for legislation of this type for local service carriers and other small airlines, perhaps it could be accomplished by eliminating any big carrier with annual operating revenues in excess of $50 million or even $100 million. Such a limitation would give aid where aid might be needed, but would prevent any of the biggest United States carriers from gaining an even bigger advantage over its smaller but subsidy-free competitors through Government assistance.

Answer: We are considering here legislation dealing with the appropriate treatment of gains on the sale of flight equipment by subsidized air carriers. What is difficult to understand is how anyone can maintain that the principles embodied in this bill are right for an airline with gross revenues of $49 million and wrong for one with gross revenues of $51 million.

One of the glories of this country is that, unlike some others, we do not have different rules of law for different people. We have the same rule of law for everyone. This has been true of our aviation legislation in the past, and we must keep it true in the future.

The memo says the bill should not apply to subsidized carriers with gross revenues exceeding $50 million. What does this mean in plain English? At the moment there is only one such carrier—Pan American World Airways, Inc. The amendment might just as well say that this bill shall apply to all subsidized airlines except Pan American. That is precisely its effect.

Discrimination of this sort is indefensible. Grant that Pan American is now a large company, but it did not start that way. It started in 1927, with a dozen World War I pilots each putting up $25,000, and many long years elapsed before it had revenues of $50 million. It got those revenues by tackling jobs first in South America, then across the Pacific, and finally across the Atlantic, which no one else wanted to tackle at the time, and performing them to the satisfaction of its customers and to the credit of its Government. Pan American is a typical American success story of starting small and growing big, through hard work, under the free enterprise system.

There is no airline whose ability to finance new equipment is of greater importance to the United States. Pan American conducts essential national interest service to parts of the world in the Middle East, in Africa, and in the Orient, in which the United States has the most vital interest. Unlike our domestic airlines it has to compete against foreign-flag airlines, solidly backed by their governments and paying their employees half the American standard of wages or less. It is vital that such a company should always have the very best equipment. Last fall Pan American took the lead in ordering jet transports, the first American built, from the Boeing Airplane Co. in Seattle, the Douglas Aircraft Co. in Los Angeles, and the Pratt-Whitney Engine Co. in Hartford, thereby triggering a flood of orders to our American aircraft and engine builders which now exceeds $1 billion. These airplanes ordered by Pan American and other American flag lines will keep our air transportation in the forefront in time of peace, and would be of inestimable value to the national defense if emergency should occur. Pan American now has the job of financing these orders. Pan American needs what this bill provides just as much as does the feeder airline which is transforming its fleet from DC–3's to F–27's, and it is just as important for the country that it have this.

It is said that if this legislation had been on the books in the past, a large share of the benefit would have fallen to Pan American. This is due in part to

the fact that the feeder airlines were simply not able to sell equipment since they had no available replacement for the DC–3. It is due also to the fact that the CAB kept Pan American on an open mail rate much longer than it did other lines. It is due in part to the simple fact that Pan American provides such a large share of the international service where subsidy is required because of the through traffic and intense foreign competition.

STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS COMMENDING PAN AMERICAN'S ORDERS FOR JET AIRCRAFT

Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force: "I am delighted to learn that the Boeing and Douglas Companies teamed up with Pratt & Whitney Aircraft have contracted with Pan American World Airways to build and deliver to them a great fleet of modern, long-range jet transports capable of operating anywhere in the world.

"These aircraft will use much of the technical knowledge which has resulted from our efforts to build superior air weapons as well as many engines and other accessories which have been developed as part of our jet Air Force buildup.

"We are naturally pleased that peaceful purposes will be served by these developments.

"This large commercial order which follows satisfaction of our military requirements make three positive contributions to our efforts to maintain our Air Force at all times qualitatively superior through an age of peril.

"1. The civil operator's emphasis on capability coupled with our emphasis on performance will result in a better product at lower cost.

"2. As each of these airplanes will become a part of the Civil Air Reserve Fleet, our emergency lift capacity will be greatly increased at no cost to the Department of Defense.

"3. These large orders just placed by Pan American will strengthen the airframe, engine and accessory industries on which we rely for the development and production of improved bombers and fighters. A strong and vigorous industry is essential to our national security. Commercial aircraft production properly planned will increase the competence and decrease the cost to our armed services of maintaining a dynamic aircraft industry."

Ross Rizley, Chairman, CAB: "Pan American's pioneering-built jet transports will have a significant contribution to make to the commerce, the postal service, and the national defense of the United States. Pan American, Boeing, Douglas, and Pratt & Whitney are to be congratulated on ushering in the jet age and bringing benefits of jet transportation to the public. Such implementation of congressional policy in developing air transportation should now assure continued world leadership for the United States flag.

"The magnitude of this order is best demonstrated by the fact that it is larger than the entire aircraft investment of all United States airlines in 1938, the year the Civil Aeronautics Act became law."

Reuben B. Robertson, Deputy Secretary of Defense: "The Department of Defense is pleased to learn of Pan American World Airways' decision to purchase a fleet of 45 jet transport aircraft from the Boeing Aircraft Co. and Douglas Aircraft to be powered by Pratt & Whitney jet turbine engines.

"The three military services rely, as they have in the past, on the civil air carriers to supplement the available military transportation in times of emergency. These new fleets of jet transports will be a welcome addition to our reserve.

"The great potential lift that these new ships provide as a result of their speed and range should make it possible to more effectively support our overseas forces at no added cost to the taxpayer."

The June 16 issue of Time and Tide published this item:

A journalist who interrogated men of all grades within the BOAC as to how it came about that Pan American Airways, with more than twice the number of aircraft of the BOAC and with twice the work, manages with less administrative staff, got the reply:

"Ours is a nationalized industry with masses and masses of paper work—while Pan American is a private enterprise and has to show a profit; so it streamlines."

This might well serve as an epitaph on nationalization.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to explain the way I understand this matter for the benefit of the Members of the House who have not digested this minority report. I want to ally myself with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, in the position they are taking. I want to draw an analogy which is as follows: Let us take a truckline in your district. That truckline is operating under a subsidy from the United States Government and gets a chance to sell a truck for $2,000 that it has been using. The truckline owner has depreciated it down to a thousand dollars. That leaves $1,000 of capital gains. He pays 26 percent on his capital gains. But under the subsidy arrangement $1,000 would be subtracted from his subsidy. So this is a bill to give a double subsidy to these poor little airlines. If the Members will turn to page 5 of this minority report they will see a list of those who would have received benefits had this law been in effect since 1951. They are: Pan American, $17 million plus; Braniff, $1½ million plus; Delta $1½ million, approximately; and Trans-World $1,295,000. So the little airlines will get about $4 million. Pan American would get $17 million under this bill if this proposal had been in effect since 1951.

Mr. Speaker, every man in the United States who is in business, when he sells some of his equipment for more than the figure to which he has depreciated it, or more than he paid for it, pays a capital-gains tax on it. That is what these people should do. In addition to paying a capital-gains tax on that equipment and getting out on the basis of not having it charged against their subsidy, they are also getting a subsidy from the United States Government.

The man who has a capital gain in private business has to pay the capital gains tax. That is that. But why should not the subsidy of these airlines be reduced the amount of the capital gains if they sell some of their equipment? Why should the taxpayers give them not only the subsidy but the additional capital gains to add to their capital plant investment without going through the regular mill of income tax payment?

Mr. Speaker, if you will get the minority report that Mr. HESELTON has, you will see that a former Member of this House, the Honorable Ross Rizley, now a Federal judge, took the same position that Mr. Joe Adams on the Board took and Mr. HESELTON and Mr. JUDD are taking; that is, that this present formula should not be disturbed and that a gift should not be given to these people. It says in the minority report that there would have been a $21,498,000 gift given during the last 5 years, but if you set this precedent, how many hundreds of millions of dollars will be given in the next 10 or 15 or 20 years? I say, let the CAB formula stay as it is. Let these people have their capital gains on any equipment which they can sell at a profit, above the depreciated price; let them pay capital gains on that just as I have to do in my business and everybody else has to do. Otherwise, let it be subtracted from the amount of the subsidy that the Government would otherwise pay them, and then they will be on a fair and square basis with the rest of the airlines of the country, and they will not get the additional advantage that the airlines which are not on subsidy do not have. The airlines that are not on subsidy today have to buy their new equipment just the same as these people.

Let me explode this myth about being ready to go to war. Every young man in this country is also ready to go to war, too, to protect the Government as well as the equipment that we have. The railroads and trucklines and in effect the people and all resources are available for call if the national interest demands it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 178, answered "present" 1, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—184

Alger	Burnside	Derounian
Allen, Calif.	Bush	Devereux
Allen, Ill.	Byrd	Dies
Arends	Cannon	Dixon
Aspinall	Carlyle	Dodd
Auchincloss	Carrigg	Dollinger
Bates	Cederberg	Dolliver
Beamer	Chenoweth	Dondero
Belcher	Chiperfield	Donohue
Bennett, Fla.	Colmere	Dorn, S. C.
Bennett, Mich.	Cooley	Edmondson
Bentley	Corbett	Elliott
Berry	Coudert	Fallon
Betts	Cramer	Fascell
Blatnik	Cretella	Fenton
Bonner	Crumpacker	Fernandez
Bow	Cunningham	Fisher
Boyle	Dague	Flynt
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Ga.	Fogarty
Brownson	Davis, Tenn.	Friedel
Broyhill	Dempsey	Fulton

Garmatz	McConnell	Sadlak
Gathings	McCormack	Schenck
Gavin	McCulloch	Scherer
George	McDonough	Schwengel
Grant	McDowell	Scott
Gubser	McMillan	Scrivner
Gwinn	Machrowicz	Seely-Brown
Hale	Mack, Ill.	Selden
Haley	Mack, Wash.	Short
Halleck	Magnuson	Shuford
Harden	Mailliard	Sieminski
Harris	Marshall	Sikes
Harrison, Nebr.	Martin	Simpson, Ill.
Harvey	Meader	Simpson, Pa.
Hays, Ark.	Merrow	Smith, Miss.
Herlong	Miller, Md.	Springer
Hess	Miller, Nebr.	Staggers
Hiestand	Mills	Steed
Hill	Morano	Talle
Hillings	Murray, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Hinshaw	Nicholson	Teague, Tex.
Horan	Norrell	Thompson, Tex.
Huddleston	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Hyde	O'Neill	Trimble
Ikard	Osmers	Van Zandt
Jackson	Patterson	Velde
Jenkins	Pelly	Wainwright
Johnson, Calif.	Prouty	Westland
Jones, N. C.	Radwan	Widnall
Kearns	Rains	Wier
Kee	Reece, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Keogh	Rees, Kans.	Williams, Miss.
Kilday	Reuss	Williams, N. Y.
Kilgore	Riehlman	Willis
King, Calif.	Roberts	Wilson, Calif.
Klein	Robsion, Ky.	Withrow
Laird	Rogers, Colo.	Wolcott
Lankford	Rogers, Fla.	Wolverton
LeCompte	Rogers, Mass.	Younger
Lipscomb	Rogers, Tex.	
Lovre	Rooney	

NAYS—178

Abbitt	Frazier	Morgan
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Moss
Addonizio	Gary	Moulder
Albert	Gentry	Multer
Alexander	Gray	Mumma
Andersen, H. Carl	Green, Oreg.	Murray, Tenn.
	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Andresen, August H.	Gregory	Norblad
	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Hagen	O'Konski
Ashmore	Hardy	Ostertag
Avery	Harrison, Va.	Perkins
Ayres	Hays, Ohio	Pfost
Baker	Hayworth	Philbin
Baldwin	Healey	Pilcher
Barrett	Henderson	Pillion
Bass, N. H.	Heselton	Poage
Becker	Hoeven	Poff
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	Polk
Boggs	Holifield	Price
Boland	Holland	Quigley
Bolling	Holmes	Rabaut
Bolton, Frances P.	Holt	Ray
	Holtzman	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hull	Rhodes, Pa.
	Jarman	Riley
Bosch	Jennings	Robeson, Va.
Bray	Johnson, Wis.	Rodino
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	St. George
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Burdick	Judd	Sisk
Byrne, Pa.	Karsten	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Canfield	Kearney	Spence
Chelf	Keating	Sullivan
Chudoff	Kilburn	Taber
Church	King, Pa.	Thomas
Clark	Kirwan	Thompson, Mich.
Coon	Kluczynski	
Cooper	Knox	Thompson, N. J.
Curtis, Mass.	Knutson	Tollefson
Curtis, Mo.	Krueger	Tuck
Davidson	Landrum	Tumulty
Dawson, Utah	Lanham	Udall
Delaney	Latham	Utt
Denton	Lesinski	Vanik
Dingell	McCarthy	Van Pelt
Dorn, N. Y.	McGregor	Vorys
Doyle	McIntire	Walter
Ellsworth	McVey	Watts
Engle	Macdonald	Weaver
Evins	Madden	Wharton
Feighan	Mahon	Whitten
Fino	Mason	Williams, N. J.
Fjare	Matthews	Winstead
Flood	Metcalf	Wright
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Yates
Ford	Miller, N. Y.	Zablocki
Fountain	Minshall	Zelenko

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hand

NOT VOTING—69

Adair	Donovan	Patman
Anfuso	Dowdy	Phillips
Bailey	Durham	Powell
Barden	Eberharter	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Forrester	Priest
Baumhart	Gamble	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Gordon	Richards
Bowler	Hébert	Rivers
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Hope	Scudder
Brooks, Tex.	Hosmer	Sheehan
Burleson	James	Shelley
Carnahan	Jensen	Sheppard
Celler	Johansen	Siler
Chase	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Taylor
Christopher	Lane	Thompson, La.
Clevenger	Long	Thornberry
Cole	Mollohan	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	Morrison	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Nelson	Wickersham
Deane	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Ind.
Diggs	Passman	Young

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Baumhart against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Preston against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York, for, with Mr. Forrester against.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana for, with Mr. McDowell against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. James.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Rutherford with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Long with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Young.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Chase.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Messrs. MILLER of California, GARY, HAGEN, PHILBIN, CURTIS of Missouri, CURTIS of Massachusetts, BALDWIN, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. O'NEILL and FOGARTY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8902) to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8902, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have the attention of my colleagues for a few minutes in order to try to clear some of the atmosphere. I have heard the rumors and the talk going through this Chamber during the rollcall on the rule. I have heard it as it has passed from one lip to another, passing the word around as to what they interpret this bill will do. That is the reason I ask, as sincerely as I ever asked my colleagues in this House, to listen to me for just a few moments.

I have, in my experience, as I know you have, tried to understand what is in a bill when we bring it to this House for consideration. The fact that some feel, because the word has been passed around, that this is a bill designed for a particular company or a special group makes me feel that I should say to you that this bill is designed to help all airline companies on subsidy, all airlines that serve the public, that serve the people of the United States and throughout the world provide the safest and most efficient air service that is possible. This is not a bill designed for any one group or individual.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], a member of the committee, said during the debate on the rule, this bill will apply to all 13 local service air carriers operating throughout the United States. That is No. 1—and I want to get it straight. It is designed to help local airlines service carriers who are on subsidy serving the people in the more rural areas of the country, continue to provide efficient and safe service to the public. Braniff, Continental, and what are the others? Mr. HINSHAW, you have them there.

Mr. HINSHAW. Northeast, Allegheny, Alaska, Pacific, Continental, a half dozen local carriers in Alaska, plus the foreign carriers, Pan-Am, Panagra, and Braniff.

Mr. HARRIS. All of these are carriers who are operating under the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act. All of these are carriers that are trying their best. They have a good record, notwithstanding the fact that we have had some terrible air tragedies, but the overall record is exceptionally good.

This bill is to permit these carriers to apply the capital gains they realize from the sale of old, dilapidated, second-hand aircraft and equipment to the purchase of new aircraft in order that they may give safe and more efficient service to the public without having it taken away from them in open-rate hearings before the Board by the reduction of their subsidy, which is for the purpose of operation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I heard the list read and I wondered about this. There is one foreign carrier of ours that I know about, TWA. The reason they are not on the list is that they are not on subsidy?

Mr. HARRIS. They are not on subsidy. That is the reason they are not on the list.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman was recounting a few moments ago the local service carriers that are involved in this legislation. Would the gentleman care to have me read them?

Mr. HARRIS. All 13 of them in the country are involved. They touch every district and every State in the United States.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have a list of them which I will furnish the gentleman to put in the RECORD if he cares to do so.

Mr. HARRIS. Perhaps we had better take the time to read them so everybody will know who they are: Allegheny, Bonanza, Central, Empire, Frontier, Lake Central, Mid-West, Mohawk, North Central, Ozark, Piedmont, Continental-Pioneer—you know they merged—Southern, Southwest, West Coast, and Wiggins.

All are small, local-service airlines.

Mr. Chairman, when the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed in 1938, section 406 (b) contained this language:

> The need of each * * * air carrier for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service, and, together with all other revenue—

Now, remember those words—

> of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense.

Under the section the Board has administered the program as they thought was intended so that capital gains that might be realized from the sale of property and equipment would not be included as income or as a part of their operating expenses to work so as to reduce their subsidy.

Two years ago, in 1954, the Western Airlines had a case which went to the Supreme Court.

The question there involved was the sale of an air route. The Board determined, as was its policy, that capital gains should not be used as the term "all other revenue" and, therefore, it was not to be applied to their operating expense in connection with their operations. Therefore, it was not to be taken away from them on their subsidy payment.

The case went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court decided that the Board's interpretation was not within the intent of Congress and, therefore, even though the words "all other revenue" had been so interpreted by the Board, the Court said then it must be interpreted that any capital gains an airline company received must be considered in the operation of the company as a part of all other revenue. And as a result, their subsidy to that extent must be reduced. Now what this bill does, and I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, that this bill does not affect the taxable feature whatsoever. It does not reflect on any air carrier that is not on subsidy because—let us get this part of it straight right now—when an air carrier that is not on subsidy—TWA and Northwest, for example, but Northwest may very well be on subsidy if they get the route across from Minneapolis to Anchorage—but if they have capital gains from the sale of their equipment, they can apply it to the purchase of new equipment or actually pay it out in dividends.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. KEARNS. Is Allegheny Airlines included in this?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for an observation?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Actually, what this bill is doing is changing the present situation where we give them money with one hand and then take it away from them with the other.

Mr. HARRIS. In one sense, it can be so construed, but what it means is this: We are in a jet age today where these more expensive planes are coming off the assembly lines. They are big jet operations costing $5 million and $6 million. Local airline services are trying to develop a prototype plane by which they can serve the people of the country safely which will cost $500,000 and $600,000 each. If they do not have some way by which they can meet the high cost of this equipment, we will be endangering the traveling public.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman referred, and I know fairly, to the Western Airline case. I examined the records in that case. Is it not a fact that the Western Airlines Co. received a route and never flew it? Then they sold it to United Airlines and they had approximately $1.5 million or $2 million of profit and involved in this some of the money was for the sale of slot machines.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not go into the case that carefully. I was merely using the Western Airline case because it was the case that has brought about this dilemma, the sale of equipment was not involved at all. It was an entirely different point of consideration. And then by dictum "all other revenue" regardless of what the source is brought under the decision. That is the reason today the Board must, in construing the Supreme Court decision, provide that the subsidy be reduced to the extent of the capital gains even though it is applied to the purchase of new equipment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I notice the Bureau of the Budget originally opposed H. R. 8902 and then made a suggestion that the bill be amended. Is your bill, as amended, to conform to their objection?

Mr. HARRIS. No; well let me explain that very briefly. They came to us with a recommendation. The recommendation was in opposition to the bill. Then our subcommittee held hearings. And do not let anyone think that we did not go into it thoroughly. We do know something about it, notwithstanding the inference earlier this afternoon.

Here are copies of the hearings which we held, complete hearings available to you.

Then the subcommittee reported to the full complete. When we took it up in the full committee we got another letter from the Department, a supplemental letter, in which they changed their prior recommendation and recommended an alternate proposal.

Then we sent the bill back to the subcommittee in an effort to try to comply with what they recommended as nearly as possible. We could not comply, because virtually what they wanted was to make a loan to these subsidized air carriers and have it pay out over a period of 7 years at an 8-percent interest rate. That was ridiculous in my opinion.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. As one who for over the past 10 years has served on the Appropriations subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the CAB and airline subsidies, and as one who has had some little to do with the separation of airmail pay from subsidy money and who through the years has had a part in the substantial reduction of airline subsidies, I voted for the rule and I am going to vote for this bill. I think this is simply the question of giving the airlines some incentive to get new equipment. If the proceeds of the sales of their present equipment were to be given to the stockholders of the companies I would not go along on this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Neither would I.

Mr. ROONEY. But under the terms of this bill, and I have made a careful study of this matter, the proceeds of the sales of this equipment are to be used solely for the purchase of new and similar equipment.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, and consequently to provide safe and more efficient service to the public.

If these companies that are on subsidy are not permitted under this program to purchase this new equipment it will put them at a disadvantage; and, certainly, with all carriers that serve the public—and that disadvantage will be to the extent that they will not have new equipment, they will not have the safe equipment, they will not be able to go on the market and purchase high-cost new equipment. The inflation we have had over the past several years has "propped up" the cost tremendously. And it will further inure to the benefit of the nonsubsidized carriers as against the subsidized carriers. To that extent we will be endangering, in my opinion, the safety of the people who travel by air.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain to the Committee that the airlines do pay the tax on the capital gains.

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, certainly. I stated that awhile ago. There is no tax feature involved.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. So the Government is not going to lose at all.

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. JUDD. Except by paying the high subsidy.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not true that in acquiring the latest and best new equipment, specifically, the jet equipment, the great lines and the small lines are going to have to rely upon the credit and go to the banks and borrow money?

Mr. HARRIS. They must.

Mr. COUDERT. And will not the failure of this bill adversely affect their credit situation and discourage the purchase of new equipment?

Mr. HARRIS. Failure to pass this bill will mean they will have to take it out of their operating revenue; and let me tell you the local service airlines have not paid a dividend, they have not made altogether a million dollars in 1955. How they can stay in business if we are going to treat them in this manner I do not know.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman accept an amendment that would exclude from the benefits of this bill airlines that have a gross revenue of over $50 million, and thereby confine it to the small companies that everyone wants to help?

Mr. HARRIS. I doubt if that would be in order because the bigger airlines carry many more people than do the others, and I do not think it would be in the best interest and the safety of the flying public.

Mr. JUDD. But the gentleman knows that if this bill had been the law for the last 5 years the little companies would have got only $400,000; the big companies would have got $22 million and one of them would have got $17 million. The gentleman does not dispute that, does he?

Mr. HARRIS. It was the law until 2 years ago when the Supreme Court decided otherwise.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would like to say at this point in the debate I think Aer Floet, which is the Russian line, is going to be subsidized. It is going to be in real competition with our lines and every other line in the world.

Mr. HARRIS. I know there is keen competition in the transport field in this country, the keenest competition I know of in any industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I know that there is involved here in addition to what we have heard around as to the competitive element of some company, that if we pass this bill it is going to put "me" in less favor than somebody else. Now, that is the fact behind the scene. I know many of you have had the memoranda which has been sent around by one of the companies, the one company that I know of opposing the bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yeld to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. With regard to these local airline carriers, is my understanding correct that to a large extent they are flying DC–3 equipment, which is no longer being manufactured?

Mr. HARRIS. They have not been manufactured for many years. We have been unable yet to develop a prototype plane they could get economically out in the market because they have not the money. We are trying to say you can add to it with the sale of this equipment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. If my understanding is correct, because of the difficulty of even getting replacement parts, these local airlines will soon be called upon to replace their airplanes. If this bill is not passed, would we not in effect be putting a premium on flying airplanes which would eventually become unsafe? If we defeat this bill would we not in effect be encouraging these carriers to transport our citizens in obsolete equipment?

Mr. HARRIS. Our committee has been trying to develop a prototype plane in the last few years. We have some coming on but it is going to cost money.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. Does not this legislation also involve the national defense aspect?

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, it does involve the national defense aspect because they have to use old antiquated equipment. When these new planes are flying through the air at the rate of several hundred miles an hour you have to have the kind of equipment you can depend on if you are to have safe travel in the air.

I know there is a lot of feeling about this in some instances as to a windfall, but I am telling you in all sincerity it is a responsibility that we ought to understand. We should know what is involved here because the future safety of millions of people who travel by air is involved and I just do not want any of them traveling under unsafe conditions.

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CARLYLE. Is it not true these companies that receive this benefit were given a permanent certificate in the last few years?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, in the last Congress. The Congress certificated all 13 carriers in order for them to receive this benefit.

Mr. CARLYLE. Until that time they had to get a new certificate every 2 years?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. Some of them were operating on a temporary permit.

Mr. CARLYLE. And there are feeder line companies involved?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommends the adoption of H. R. 8902. The effect of the bill is to permit the subsidized airlines to use any profits they make from the sale of their obsolete equipment and property as part payment for the acquisition of more modern equipment and property. The principle embodied in the bill is one which has been followed in the past by the Civil Aeronautics Board except when the particular capital gain is made during the time when the Board is reviewing the subsidy rates of the carrier which realized the capital gain.

Unfortunately, in the case of some carriers these periods of review have been extremely long.

Recently, however, the Board has raised a question as to whether it should not utilize all capital gains made by the carriers to reduce the subsidy to which they would otherwise be entitled under the Civil Aeronautics Act, thus forcing the subsidized carriers to use the capital gain to pay their operating expenses rather than to finance improvements in their equipment and facilities. This question having been brought to the attention of your committee and the corresponding committee in the other body, it became clear that the policy question involved was of sufficient importance and urgency to require consideration and decision by the Congress. The matter has now been studied by both committees, and a bill similar in principle to the one now before the House has been passed by the Senate.

The issue of policy is a reasonably simple one. Should the subsidized airlines be permitted to reinvest any capital gains made upon the sale of their obsolete property and equipment, after payment of the necessary taxes, or should they be required to use those gains for the payment of their ordinary operating expenses? After extensive hearings and careful consideration, your committee has reached the conclusion that the subsidized airlines should be permitted to use the capital gains thus made in the provision of capital improvements. There are many compelling reasons for the committee's decision.

First. The subsidized airlines must be permitted to utilize their capital gains in this fashion in order to prevent discrimination between the subsidized airline concerned and its nonsubsidized competitor. At the present time a large part of the air-transport system operating within the United States receives no subsidy from the Government. Under existing law, these nonsubsidized airlines, which in general are the larger

and older airlines, are permitted to use any profit they make from the sale of their old equipment as part payment for the purchase of new equipment. If a subsidized airline cannot do this, and is required to use its capital gains for operating expenses, it is thus forced to finance entirely through bank loans or other outside sources. Thus, the competitive disparity between the older and stronger nonsubsidized airline and the newer and weaker subsidized airline is increased, and the possibility of the latter eliminating the necessity for subsidy is reduced.

Second. If our international airlines are not permitted to use their net capital gains in the acquisition of new equipment they are placed at a further competitive disadvantage with their foreign-flag competitors. Our international airlines compete with airlines which are largely government-owned and financed. While it has been the policy of the United States to have its airlines operated under private ownership and through private financing, we must recognize that this imposes upon our airlines a competitive handicap. If they cannot use their net capital gains as a part payment for new equipment, we increase this handicap, contrary to the public interest.

Third. The policy of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is designed to encourage our carriers to operate the finest and most modern air transport equipment available. This policy is maintained in the interest of providing for the shipping and traveling public the best air transport service available, and of providing for the military forces a fleet of the most modern and efficient transports as an auxiliary for the national defense. Any policy which forces an airline to utilize any profit it makes from the sale of old equipment for the payment of operating expenses impairs the incentive of that airline to sell its old equipment and buy new.

Fourth. Not only does this policy impair a carrier's incentive to dispose of the old equipment, but in many cases it would make it impossible for the carrier to acquire new equipment except at exorbitant rates of interest. As the Members know, the air transport industry of the United States is preparing for its most revolutionary development. The industry has committed itself to purchase more than $2 billion worth of operating property and equipment by 1960. This includes 199 jet transports and 224 turbo props. The local-service airlines have placed orders for about 30 new and modern aircraft to replace the DC–3's which they have been operating during most of the 10 years of their existence. Our territorial carriers are promoting the development of new aircraft designs which will improve their services in the territories, particularly under the difficult conditions presented in Alaska. In providing for these new developments the carriers are following precisely the policy laid down by Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act. The financial burden which will be imposed upon the airlines by these developments is perfectly obvious, since the total investment of the airlines in 1955 was only $1,400,000,000. Part of this development is being provided by the resources of airlines which are not now subsidized, but the subsidized airlines must participate equally. It would be contrary to the public interest, and contrary to the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Act, to deprive these carriers of the use of gains they make on the sale of their old equipment for the financing of this new development.

The carriers which will be affected by this legislation fall into four major categories:

First. The local-service airlines. As the Members know, the local-service carriers are those carriers which have been established during the past 10 years whose efforts are devoted to providing service to the smaller communities throughout the Nation. Your committee is proud of their record of achievement during these 10 years. There is no group which makes such earnest efforts to provide a good service to their communities, or who make such strenuous efforts to operate their airlines with maximum efficiency in order to reduce the subsidy paid to them. By any standards, the amount of that subsidy is being reduced. However, their efforts to eliminate or reduce much further the subsidy burden will be thwarted unless they can acquire new and more efficient aircraft. A number of new aircraft have been ordered. They cost approximately $540,000 each, as contrasted with their present DC–3's, which cost in the neighborhood of $125,000. The idea of preventing these carriers from utilizing any book profits they may make from the sale of their old equipment for the purchase of new seems to me to be plainly contrary to the public interest.

Second. The second class of carriers are those serving our Territories, particularly Alaska. Here again we have a class of subsidized carrier which has been struggling with inadequate equipment. They are small airlines, and those of us who are familiar with the scope and character of the service they provide are proud of them, too. Any governmental policy which thwarts their efforts to improve their service through better equipment is a bad one, and the Congress should prevent its adoption.

Third. The third group of carriers are our international carriers, whose responsibility it is to maintain American-flag service all over the world against foreign competition, which is heavily subsidized and largely government-owned. This country is fortunate in being able to say that its international air transport system is the finest in the world, notwithstanding the effectiveness of the foreign competition which they face. It is among this class of carriers that reequipment requirements are the heaviest burden in terms of dollars. They must be equipped with jet transports. They cannot maintain their position in the absence of the most modern equipment, and no obstacle should be placed in their path toward the achievement of those ends.

Fourth. The fourth class of carriers are the newest. Our helicopter operators in three metropolitan centers have been authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board to conduct helicopter services. Their contribution to more efficient and convenient transportation within these congested areas is just beginning. They are heavily subsidized at the present time, by reason of inadequate equipment. No matter how hard they work, no matter how efficient they become, no matter how much traffic they carry—they cannot reduce subsidy substantially without improved helicopters. They are in the process of developing and buying these new helicopters. They, also, must be permitted to use the capital gains from sale of their old equipment to make a part payment on the new.

The House will wish to know the effect of the establishment of this policy upon the amount of subsidy that must be appropriated by the Congress each year for the maintenance of these various classes of carriers. Your committee is prepared to answer this question. We reached the conclusion, as stated in our report, that this bill would, over a period of years, permit the reduction of subsidy. After studying the efficiency of the equipment presently available to these carriers, as well as the efficiency of the equipment which could be designed and acquired, it was perfectly plain that subsidy would be reduced. We also reached this conclusion on the basis of the past experience of the entire industry. As is well known, airline fares are one of the few prices which have not increased during the past decade. This record has been established notwithstanding an increase in the average airline paycheck by some 135 percent, and the cost of other things the airline must buy by some 90 percent. In spite of these increases in the overall costs of airline operation, the domestic trunklines have been able to reduce their unit costs from 31.13 cents per available ton-mile in 1946 to 26.25 cents. This is a 16 percent reduction. This reduction reflects the successive additions of more modern airplanes—the DC–4, then the DC–6, then the DC–7, and the various developments of the Constellation aircraft. With the increased efficiency of those aircraft came unit cost reductions, notwithstanding increases in overall costs. We can expect the presently subsidized airlines, through the acquisition of more efficient equipment, to achieve these same results, and with them corresponding subsidy reductions. As I have pointed out, in many cases no reductions can be anticipated in the absence of new equipment.

While your committee was convinced of the necessity of permitting subsidized carriers to invest their capital gains in new equipment, it considered that this should not be left to the discretion of the carriers. These carriers are subsidized, and it was considered necessary to treat them differently in this respect than a nonsubsidized business. A nonsubsidized business is free to take its capital gains and devote them to any purpose it sees fit, but it was your committee's opinion that this discretion should not be allowed the subsidized airlines. Consequently, it was provided that if a subsidized airline fails to invest these gains in new property or equipment within a reasonable time after the

gains are realized, the gains will be used to reduce the subsidy to which that airline would otherwise be entitled. It will be the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board to administer and enforce this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this bill to the favorable action of the House. It only writes into law a principle by which any thrifty person or corporation should be guided, and that is that your capital should not be used to pay your daily expenses. It should be used to acquire new and improved capital assets.

A criticism has been voiced that the bill is too broad in that it permits the carriers to reinvest in "other property similar or related in service or use."

The term "property" is defined as "depreciable property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations." If the carrier reinvests the profits from the sale of property in property other than that defined, such profits are subject to recapture and offset against subsidy. The term "property used or useful" is a term which has been the basis on which the CAB has determined the carriers investment base for computing the return element in mail rates since 1938. Under the terms of this bill it will continue to judge whether the carriers have properly invested profits from equipment sales.

CAB MAIL RATES

Open rate period: Period of time necessary to complete all the steps in the rate-making procedures—Public hearings, briefs and oral arguments before the Board. This period may extend over a period ranging from a year to 10 years. Pan American's Atlantic division rate case extended from 1946 to 1953 and was settled finally in 1956.

Rates during open rate period: Rates during open rate periods are established on the basis of actual revenues received during the period, actual expenses incurred less any items of expense which the CAB decides are not justified and a return on actual inivestment at 7 percent. As the CAB has construed profits realized from the sale of equipment, during open rate periods, as "all other revenues" such profits are included in revenues and thus are applied to reduce subsidy. Hence all profits from equipment sales realized by Pan American during the period 1946–53 were used to reduce subsidy. During open rate periods carriers are paid on the basis of "temporary rates" which are in effect payments on account, and are adjusted upward or downward when final rates are determined.

Prospective rates: These rates are made for future periods and are based on estimates of revenues and expenses for such future period. Normally the investment base on which return is computed is taken as the investment at the date at which the rate is effective. For prospective periods the rate of return which the CAB has found to be reasonable is 8 percent for domestic operations and 9 percent for international and overseas operations. The difference in rate of return (7 percent as compared to 8 and 9 percent) is to reflect the fact during operations under prospective rates the risk of making a return is entirely with the carriers, while rates made for open rate periods are theoretically supposed to provide a 7-percent return on a "cost plus return" basis. In practice no carrier ever realizes a rate of return even approaching this level during open rate periods.

LOCAL SERVICE AIRLINES

H. R. 8902 is of particular importance to the local service airlines because of the currency of its timing. Five years ago it would not have had a fraction of the importance to the local carriers that it has now because 5 years ago there was no prospect that the local carriers would in the near future commence a new equipment program and there was indeed no really suitable DC–3 replacement upon which to base such a program.

Today, however, the situation is quite different. The DC–3's have now passed the 20th anniversary of their initiation into scheduled flight service. (By coincidence this anniversary fell on the 80th anniversary of Custer's last stand.) There is now at least one suitable new airplane approaching a production status and numbers of used but modern postwar equipment are becoming available for purchase by the local carriers. The next 5 years will undoubtedly witness a major reequipment of the local airlines with both newly designed and used modern aircraft if H. R. 8902 becomes law.

The local service airlines have no extensive capital resources of their own with which to finance a reequipment program. As a matter of fact, as of December 31, 1955, the combined earnings of all 13 local service carriers for the 10 years in which the industry has been operating amounted to a deficit of $326,000. They were, in other words, $326,000 in the hole. The earnings record of the industry has been a most discouraging one so that the flotation of equity capital in major amounts will be extremely difficult unless the benefits of H. R. 8902 become available to the industry. The principal financial resource of every local carrier is, in fact, its flight equipment, and every local carrier will rely principally on the proceeds of the sale of its present flight equipment to finance new and modern aircraft. If the proceeds of the sale of old equipment are confiscated by the Civil Aeronautics Board under mail-rate policies which regard those proceeds as a chargeable setoff against mail pay, then the only resource readily available to the local airlines for financing new equipment has been torn away from them.

Most of the local airlines bought their DC–3's as war surplus and paid approximately $50,000 or $60,000 per aircraft; this is the equivalent of about $3,000 per passenger seat in the aircraft. Inflation and the general development of the air transport market has raised the current worth of even these old aircraft up to more than twice such a purchase price, but new aircraft suitable for local service, such as the "Friendship" transport being developed by Fairchild Aircraft & Engine Co. and already ordered by some of the local carriers, will cost a minimum of $600,000 per plane or about $15,000 per seat. These modern aircraft will have relatively higher earning capabilities than the old DC–3's, and they will certainly be able to pay for themselves over a period of operation in the expanding local air transport business, but money must be available as at least a downpayment on them. As previously pointed out, the only readily available source of such a downpayment is the proceeds of sale of the old units of the local service fleet, and H. R. 8902 thus becomes the immediate pivot point of the whole reequipment program of the local carriers and of the financial progress expected to issue from such reequipment.

THIS BILL WILL BENEFIT ALL CARRIERS, NOT ONLY A FEW

The claim has been made that the benefits of this bill would go to only a few airlines, and primarily Pan American Airways.

This just is not a true statement of the facts. The bill was supported by all of the subsidized carriers which include the local service carriers, the helicopter operators, the territorial carriers, the international and overseas operators, and the entire civil air transport industry, including the nonsubsidized carriers. All subsidized carriers are in the same boat. Without capital gains from the sale of flight equipment, it will be almost impossible for them to carry out the financing of their re-equipment programs.

Figures from the minority report have been cited as to the amount of capital gains which the Board has taken into account in the past, to support an argument that the bill would benefit only a few. I would like to have you look closely at this list. The vast majority of the carriers listed are local service carriers and territorial carriers. During the period 1951 to 1955, the workhorse of their operations was the DC–3 twin-engine airplane. During this purchase, and it was necessary for them to retain for their growing service all of the aircraft in their possession. Under these circumstances there would, of course, be no sales of flight equipment and hence no equipment sales profits available for the CAB to latch on to for us in reducing subsidy.

Looking again at the figures set forth in the minority report, you will see nothing to indicate whether these carriers sold equipment and retained profits under the Board's policy of permitting carriers to retain profits while operating under closed rates, which policy was in effect prior to 1954. The truth of the matter is that these figures merely demonstrate that certain carriers which were on subsidy during the period referred to were also on open mail rates, and that they sold flight equipment with the firm hope that they would be able to convince the CAB that the profits realized should be retained by the carriers in order to finance the purchase of new equipment during this period.

Pan American, from 1952 through 1955, added to its operating fleets some 45 DC–6B's, 3 DC–6A's, and 7 DC–7B's. A comparison of the cost of flight equipment as shown on Pan American's balance sheet in its annual report at December 31, 1951, with its balance sheet as of December 31, 1955, shows a net increase in flight equipment of some $69

million. It has turned out that Pan American's sale of flight equipment in order to make funds available to purchase this new equipment was a grave mistake as the financial benefit of such sales has enured entirely to the United States Treasury because of the CAB's erroneous policy of confiscating such profits during this period. This historic record of the amount of equipment sales profits which have been taken from the carriers to reduce subsidy is of no relevance in determining who will benefit from the legislation we are here considering in the future.

Many of the local service carriers have placed orders for new equipment which will cost them between $500,000 and $600,000 per aircraft, and others are considering such orders, and will eventually be required to place them, if they are to continue to develop their services. How can anyone say that these small carriers will not benefit from the sale of their DC–3 fleets in the financing of the purchase of their replacement fleets? Without the benefit of the profits from flight equipment sales, I am sure that many of them will be unable to finance, either by borrowing the necessary funds or by marketing their equity securities. The figures cited in the minority report are of no relevance in determining who will benefit from this legislation in the future. All carriers will benefit and should be put on the same footing with the right to dispose of equipment when they see fit, and to retain the proceeds to reinvest in new equipment.

BENEFITS TO AIRLINE FINANCING

The Civil Aeronautics Act provides that the Board fix mail rates—including subsidy where required—to permit the carriers, under honest, economic and efficient management, to maintain the type of service required to further the commerce, postal service and national defense.

The Board fixes the rates of return to the subsidized carriers, and can make such adjustments as it finds necessary, in either direction, with the opening of a rate case on the initiative of the Board itself, or the carrier in question.

Subsidy rates for future periods have in the past been fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board on a basis designed to provide the domestic airlines with approximately an 8 percent return on their investment, and the international aircarriers with a return of some 10 percent. This latter amount has recently been reduced to 9 percent. In both instances, the carriers were permitted to retain capital gains on the sale of flight equipment during these future periods when they were on closed rates. However, the Board has frequently been unable or unwilling to handle rate cases expeditiously, and therefore, carriers kept on an open rate for greatly extended periods of time have had their subsidy reduced by the amount of capital gains. The rates of return, at best, have not been excessive, and some question has been raised as to whether they have been adequate. Stocks of the subsidized carriers are selling generally below their book value, and many of them have experienced serious problems in obtaining equity capital.

The Aviation Securities Committee of the Investment Bankers Association of America, in a report dated June 24, 1954, stated:

When the Civil Aeonautics Act was passed in 1938, the primary purpose of the act was to encourage the sound development of air transportation in the United States. For many years the act was regarded as an exceptionally fine piece of legislation, and it has been most effective in accomplishing its major objective. In recent years, however, the interpretation of the act appears to have taken on an increasingly restrictive character, to such a degree that, in our opinion, the carriers operating services requiring Government financial support are not receiving the income necessary to enable them "to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the Postal Service, and the national defense."

We believe that investor confidence in the air transportation industry is at one of the lowest points that it has been since the Civil Aeronautics Act was passed in 1938, and and we believe that prompt action by the administration and the Congress is needed to restore investor confidence in this essential industry.

WILL ULTIMATELY REDUCE SUBSIDY REQUIREMENTS

It is difficult to say with any degree of precision exactly what the short term cost of this bill will be in subsidy requirements. Nonetheless, there are good reasons to believe, as the committee stated in its report on this bill, that the ultimate effect will be to reduce subsidy requirements. This, as has been pointed out previously, is confirmed by the experience of the air transport industry in being able to reduce its unit costs as new and more economical equipment has been acquired. It is largely for this reason that the average air fare today stands just about where it did in 1938—which means that, in terms of 1938 dollars, fares have actually been reduced over 50 percent. This has not been the case with other transportation fares. My information is that the average airline pay check has increased some 135 percent in this same period, and that the cost of the things which airlines must buy to operate their business has almost doubled, as represented by a better than 90 percent increase in the consumers' price index from 1938 to 1955.

From 1946 to 1955, the domestic trunklines have been able to reduce their available ton-mile unit costs from 31.13 cents in 1946, to 26.25 cents (16 percent reduction) at the end of 1955, according to CAB Form 41 reports. This reduction reflects the successive additions of DC–4's DC–6's DC–7's and Constellation aircraft to the fleets of the domestic trunklines. There is no reason to doubt that similar reductions will be possible for other carriers when they acquire more suitable aircraft. This, in turn, will mean lower subsidy requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] for the very splendid and spirited statement he has made on this bill now before the House. I can readily understand the feeling that he has shown in presenting this matter to the House, for the reason he knows that the House Committtee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has given this matter very careful consideration. Copies of the hearings are here in the House and readily available to anyone who may desire to see them. The hearings will show that the committee went out of its way to examine this question from every standpoint. The best that I can say in favor of the legislation is the fact that after that careful study had been made and hearings held, by the committee, the committee reported the bill unanimously with one exception. That individual is as sincere as any of us who voted for the bill but unfortunately he was not present when the vote was taken by the committee, and thus my reason for saying that it was unanimous with one exception.

Let us bear in mind, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House that has had jurisdiction over the question of aviation for these many years, and has provided a splendid record of accomplishment, is the committee that has made a study of this question, and through the hearings it developed to the satisfaction of every member of that committee, with the exception of one, that this legislation was necessary and would be helpful in strengthening our air service. I do not know of anything that is more discouraging than to be a member of a committee that has given the study to a matter such as this and then to realize, through no fault of its own, but through lack of understanding on the part of a good many Members who voted against the rule without knowing as fully as they should, what really is at stake. The fact is that a whispering campaign has been carried on throughout this House on both sides of the aisle against this bill. All sorts of statements that cannot be substantiated have been made. A close study of this proposed legislation will reveal that this bill if adopted will be one of the finest and most helpful things that could be done to improve flight equipment and is certain thereby to provide a higher degree of safety, more efficient equipment for use in time of emergency and enable our air transportation to operate more efficiently and thereby sooner be taken off of subsidy.

I certainly hope that the membership of the House will check with the members of the committee who have made a study of this matter in order that they may get the real story that underlies the adoption of this bill by the committee by almost a unanimous vote.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I am very happy the gentleman from New Jersey made that statement. There are all kinds of rumors around. Many, many of the Members are misinformed, and I agree with the gentleman. We heard much of the testimony, and the committee reported this bill out almost unanimously, and I hope also that all Members will vote for this bill.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I have just taken his advice, and I checked with two members of the committee who are sitting near me, and both of them are opposed to the bill. They explained they were not present when this so-called unanimous consent vote was taken, except one.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I suggest the gentleman talk to somebody who was present and attended the hearings and who knows something of what is in the bill.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I voted for the rule and I shall vote for this bill. But, I hope when our time comes you will not forget the individual taxpayer on this basis, that on every tax dollar it is estimated Uncle Sam now takes in, corporations pay 19 and we pay 31 cents. There should be a more balanced spread with less gap.

Mr. WOLVERTON. This bill does not in any way adversely affect that situation.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. My good friend has twice referred to a vote that was unanimous, except for one. I do not want to leave any misapprehension. I wish he had mentioned my name, because I was the one. There has been reference to a whispering campaign. I have not whispered about this. I placed in the RECORD every available piece of information I could in a special order, because I wanted the Members to have it. I think my friend will agree with me, and I am sure that another member of my committee will agree, that I left the committee hearing because I did not want to oppose the bill in view of the position the rest of the committee had taken.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think the best answer I can make to the gentleman is the fact that when I did refer to him I referred to him as one who was as sincere in his viewpoint as those with opposite views. My high regard for him is such that there could never be at this or any other time any intention on my part to in any way, directly or indirectly, say anything that would be discourteous or disparaging to the gentleman, because I have such a high regard for him. I value his friendship and consider him one of the most sincere, conscientious, and able Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time for such disposition as he may wish to make of it, to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of my friend from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. It is utterly impossible for me and would be for anybody else in the few minutes available to meet fully the arguments that have been presented so ably by the gentleman from Arkansas, my friend, the chairman of the committee. However, I am going to try to hit the high spots.

This is windfall legislation of the worst character. I do not believe it is intended as such by the members of the subcommittee or the full committee. That it is windfall legislation is not my opinion alone; that is the opinion and it is in the record expressed by the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Everyone could see it who chooses to read it. That is the judgment which was expressed. He was joined by a former colleague of ours, who was then Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Honorable Ross Rizley, now a member of the Federal bench.

It does remain an indisputable fact that the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to this legislation. I took the precaution to ask them after the amendment had been adopted if they were still opposed, and they said they were. That, too, is a matter of public record. The General Accounting Office, through Mr. Campbell, expressed opposition before the committee and went into detail as to why that agency was opposed to it. I took the precaution of asking him, following the action of the committee, if he still remained opposed to the legislation as it was amended. I placed his letter in the RECORD and it is available to all Members. He said flatly he was opposed. The fact remains that there is opposition from every Federal agency involved.

There is support individually by 2 members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and I submit that support is heavily outweighed by the compelling reasons for the opposition which has been expressed fully and publicly.

Why is it described as windfall legislation? Well, because the Department of Commerce presented a tabulation as to who would have obtained the benefits of this bill had it been on the books during the last 5 years. That is in the minority report which is available at the desk if anyone is interested. It occupies 1 full page, page 4 of the minority report.

The sheer fact is that four airlines would have received $21,498,000 in unjustified double subsidy out of the $21,900,790. Those are not my words, they are not my figures, but the figures of the Department of Commerce submitted to this Congress.

A great deal of concern has been expressed as to what would happen to the feeder airlines, the smaller airlines. The sheer fact is that these four big airlines, Pan American with $17,288,000; Braniff, with $1,515,000; Delta, with $1,400,000; and the International line of Trans-World, before it went off subsidies, with $1,295,000, would have been the chief beneficiaries. As I recall the figure, 29 other airlines—it is all in the RECORD—would have received nothing under this bill. Some of you are served by airlines which are off subsidies—American, Eastern, National, Capital, Delta, Northwest, TWA, and United, and others. Mr. Chairman, they will not receive 1 penny if we pass this bill. They have had initiative and foresight and ability enough to take themselves off the Federal Treasury, off the taxpayers' shoulders and no specious or fine spun arguments presented by apologists for subsidies can contradict that fact.

Only yesterday afternoon Capital announced that it was purchasing some 14 new modern jet airplanes for $53 million, on top of 15 turbojets for $15,400,000 more not out of the Federal Treasury but out of funds they have earned. You will not find any lobbyists for that line outside this Chamber with cups in their hands crying about their weaknesses. These lines have demonstrated their independence and their success. Some smaller airlines have gone out and borrowed money ranging from $650,000 up to $2, $3, and $4 millions, not out of the Federal Treasury but from the record of their own earnings and their competence in the business world, as examples of those who show what private enterprise can do and do not spend time and money whining about their lot and scheming to get more and more handouts.

The people who have received the benefit of the most subsidy over the years are the people who are insisting most vocally that they should receive this additional benefit, and they are in large measure among the large airlines of this country. The official figures which I have show that as of July 18 of this year 32 airlines have received $502,915,000 of subsidy from the Federal Treasury. Pan American World Airways, Inc., has received $219,768,000. But it wants more and is working desperately to get it.

It has been pointed out by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget that this is depreciation piled on depreciation, that these aircraft have been fully depreciated in many instances. But what they want is double depreciation. That is the sort of thing you are confronted with under the terms of this legislation. Whether it is intended I do not have any idea but you must draw your own conclusions.

The suggestion has been made that safety is involved, the suggestion has been made that these airlines are trying to get rid of old, dilapidated equipment and that somehow or other they are unable to do it. I asked the Vice-Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to tell me what the situation was. On page 13422 of the RECORD of July 18 is a table he furnished. The depreciated cost as of December 31, 1955, of all the aircraft involved was $127,005,000, but the estimated market value was $228,895,000, more than double. Pan American's depreciated loss was $79,147,000; the estimated market value was $130,200,000. No wonder it wants this bill.

The aircraft are being sold all the time. The profits are being realized all the time. Yet they want to go into the Federal Treasury and ask the American taxpayer not just to pay single subsidies but to pay twice, to pay a double subsidy.

If I thought this had any effect whatsoever on the equipment proposition, on the modernizing of equipment, which could not be accomplished without further demands on the overburdened taxpayers. I would not be here before you making this statement.

Some suggestion has been made that there are some airlines interested in

opposing this bill because they are in competition. Why should they not be interested? All they want is a decent break without handicaps imposed by unwarranted legislation. That is true.

Who are those airlines who will not receive one single, solitary dollar or penny out of this bill? American, Capital, Caribbean-Atlantic, Delta, Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans World, United, Western, American Air Export & Import, The Flying Tiger Line, Riddle Airlines, and Slick Airways. I submit we should respect them and their interest in free and fair competition.

So you can see that in spite of all the fine and emphatic words presented in favor of this legislation, there is offered a very serious question as to whether we should endorse it at this dying hour of this session. I hope in the very few minutes you have, you can examine the facts. If you can, the decision here tonight will not be in doubt.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have the warmest regard for my friend from Massachusetts. I was a little surprised, however, to find that his objection to this bill seems to stem very largely from the fact that one particular carrier would be a substantial beneficiary of this bill. He neglected, however, to advise the House that this one particular carrier is the only certificated carrier that competes only in the world market with subsidized foreign-operated companies, often by governments, to wit, Pan American World Airlines. The others like American and Eastern, that he named, have large and profitable domestic markets. Perhaps they can afford to continue without subsidies. Perhaps they can afford to acquire these new $6 million jets in place of the $2 million piston planes now in use. Pan American Airlines has, as I recall it, made contracts for hundreds of millions of dollars of jets which obviously means its credit is of the utmost importance and that this bill is of great importance to it as well as other lines that have to go to the banks for credit to purchase new equipment. In my humble judgment this bill is necessary for lines which intend to keep equipment up to date and who may have to go into the credit market for the funds to buy new planes of the most modern kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that the members of the committee today understand exactly what we are trying to do. The Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce studied this problem for nearly 3 months. We studied it in previous years and, I believe, the committee is familiar with the problem confronting us today. The arguments against this legislation remind me of the man who put vitamin pills in his drink because he wanted to build himself up while he was tearing himself down. That is exactly what the opponents of this bill are trying to do. They say they want to subsidize the local service carriers that go into the remote sections of our country, but they do not want to let them apply their capital gains in the purchase of new equipment. And, in so doing, you are cutting the throat of all the local service carriers in the country. You will not have to worry about having an Allegheny Airlines or an Ozark Airlines, if you do not pass this legislation. The suggestion has been made that we guarantee loans to the local carriers so that they can get the financial assistance that is necessary to carry on their very vital work. The gentleman from Massachusetts has mentioned some reports or some estimate that was made over the past 5 years concerning subsidies and the fact that the larger carriers had gotten the bulk of the benefit. Well, that has been true over the past 5 years, but that will not be true over the next 5 years. The local service carriers today are using equipment which was produced 20 years ago. It is worn out and some of it is even approaching the dangerous stage. It is necessary for every local service carrier in the country to purchase new equipment today because the DC–3 which was built 20 years ago no longer will do the job and even if it would do the job, it would probably cost more money to operate the DC–3's than it would to operate and carry the additional payload in a Martin or a Convair.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from Illinois is a very distinguished, experienced, and fearless flier himself. He is talking a lot of hard sense. He mentioned the Ozark Airlines. That is one of the small feeder lines serving communities in Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, and maybe 1 or 2 spots in Indiana. They have mostly old DC–3's, as the gentleman has just pointed out.

Unless they can replace that equipment soon they will simply have to go out of business, and the people in a lot of these fairly good-sized towns will be denied service that they so sorely need.

So, from the standpoint of safety and economy and numbers, bear in mind that to replace these planes costs 2 or 3 times as much as the others.

I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making, and I hope the Members of this House will pass this legislation that passed the other body by a vote of 52 to 22, more than 2 to 1, after long exhaustive hearings, after most enlightening and elevating debate over in the other body on the 9th of this month, and which has been seriously considered not just today or yesterday, or a month ago, but for 3 or 4 months by the able Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I thank the gentleman, and I want to tell you that if we do not help these little local air carriers we are going to cut down the total revenue of the trunk carriers, the domestic carriers all over the country, because they will lose a great deal of passenger traffic fed into their terminals by these local lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. QUIGLEY. My question is this: If these local feeder airlines are stuck with this old, wornout, dilapidated equipment, these 20-year-old DC–3's, how are you going to sell them to make all this capital gain?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman that there just happens to be a market for these DC–3's. There is a market in contract carrying and there has been a great expansion in the executive type use of aircraft in this country, an expansion that has amazed us.

Mr. QUIGLEY. But if the DC–3's are not safe for commercial passenger-carrying how can they be safe for the use of the executives of companies?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I might say to the gentleman that these airplanes can be reconditioned for cargo aircraft and other uses but I hope the gentleman is not going to force Allegheny Airlines to carry passengers in these dilapidated, wornout, 20-year-old DC–3's indefinitely.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I just say to the gentleman that there is a peculiar situation in the matter of aircraft at the present time, apparently a temporary situation, but there is a tremendous demand for second-hand aircraft, a tremendous market, and the craft are selling for a good deal more than they sold for 4 years ago because of the demand.

Mr. QUIGLEY. But I do not see how, if they are not safe for commercial traffic, they can be considered safe for individual use.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to call attention to another facet of this replacement program that we should not lose sight of and that is that most of these new planes will be built in this country by Pratt-Whitney, and Boeing on the west coast, and others, and it will create many jobs for our American people and take care of our little manufacturers and subcontractors.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

I wanted to cover the question of capital gains, but it appears I won't have time. However, I think that the statements that were made regarding capital gains were very, very misleading and were not entirely accurate. Under this bill, capital gains would be applied.

We want to take the subsidized airlines and give them the same opportunity to exist as the nonsubsidized airlines have today, and I believe that this is a very sound proposal.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Is it not true that the subsidized airlines will have to use this

money for new equipment where the non-subsidized airlines can pay it out to their stockholders in dividends?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is exactly correct. This bill will apply only to the subsidized airlines.

Our airline industry today is faced with one of the biggest reequipment programs that we have ever seen.

This year the airlines of this country have on order 308 piston-powered planes, they have on order 244 turboprop planes, they have on order 156 jet-type commercial transports, a total of 708 planes costing over $1 billion.

I want to mention that in 1946 your DC–6 that was used by the commercial airlines cost $587,000. Today they cost $1,494,442. That is three times what they cost in 1946. The Convair in 1947 cost $134,640. It now costs $600,000.

This is legislation to keep these people in business.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, we are considering here legislation dealing with the appropriate treatment of gains on the sale of flight equipment by subsidized air carriers. What is difficult to understand is how anyone can maintain that the principles embodied in this bill are right for an airline with gross revenues of $49 million, and wrong for one with gross revenues of $51 million.

One of the glories of this country is that, unlike some others, we do not have different rules of law for different people. We have the same rule of law for everyone. This has been true of our aviation legislation in the past, and we must keep it true in the future.

Opponents say the bill should not apply to subsidized carriers with gross revenues exceeding $50 million. It has been suggested that an amendment should be offered to accomplish that purpose. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] made that suggestion. What does this mean in plain English. At the moment there is only one such carrier—Pan American World Airways, Inc. They might just as well say that this bill shall apply to all subsidized airlines except Pan American. That is precisely its effect.

Discrimination of this sort is indefensible. Grant that Pan American is now a large company, but it did not start that way. It started in 1927, with a dozen World War I pilots each putting up $25,000, and many long years elapsed before it had revenues of $50 million. It got those revenues by tackling jobs first in South America, then across the Pacific, and finally across the Atlantic, which no one else wanted to tackle at the time, and performing them to the satisfaction of its customers and to the credit of its Government. Pan American is a typical American success story of starting small and growing big, through hard work, under the free-enterprise system.

There is no airline whose ability to finance new equipment is of greater importance to the United States. Pan American conducts essential national interest service to parts of the world in the Middle East, in Africa, and in the Orient, in which the United States has the most vital interest. Unlike our domestic airlines it has to compete against foreign flag airlines, solidly backed by their governments and paying their employees half the American standard of wages or less. It is vital that such a company should always have the very best equipment. Last fall Pan American took the lead in ordering jet transports, the first American built, from the Boeing Airplane Co., in Seattle, the Douglas Aircraft Co., in Los Angeles, and the Pratt-Whitney Engine Co., in Hartford, thereby triggering a flood of orders to our American aircraft and engine builders which now exceeds $1 billion. These airplanes ordered by Pan American and other American flag lines will keep our air transportation in the forefront in time of peace, and would be of inestimable value to the national defense if emergency should occur. Pan American now has the job of financing these orders. Pan American needs what this bill provides just as much as does the feeder airline which is transforming its fleet from DC–3's to F–27's, and it is just as important for the country that it have this.

It is said that if this legislation had been on the books in the past, a large share of the benefit would have fallen to Pan American. This is due in part to the fact that the feeder airlines were simply not able to sell equipment since they had no available replacement for the DC–3. It is due also to the fact that the CAB kept Pan American on an open mail rate much longer than it did other lines. It is due in part to the simple fact that Pan American provides such a large share of the international service where subsidy is required because of the through traffic and intense foreign competition. I am proud to say that I represent the district in which the able, competent, and farsighted president of this company lives. He is Juan Trippe, of Greenwich, Conn. I hope the bill will pass as reported by the committee without amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, this debate has gotten into the situation where, I think, it needs to be simplified. Let us look at some of the realities involved. I want to emphasize two or three things about which there seems to be some misconception.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a tax bill. This does not affect the tax basis for any of this money which is received as capital gains in any way. It does not affect that at all. If any impression has been gained in any of this debate that it does affect the tax matter, that is certainly erroneous.

Next, I want to emphasize what has been said that this affects only subsidized lines. It has no effect whatever upon lines that are off subsidy. That is important when you talk about these various airlines. Certain of them are prosperous enough and have good enough routes and enough traffic that they do not require any subsidy from the Federal Government. Some of them have not such profitable lines and those are paid subsidies.

The third thing I want to emphasize is that actually this whole situation has arisen only in the last 2 years. It has arisen by reason, as some of us view it, of a misinterpretation of the intent of the Congress with respect to the original law which was passed in 1938 respecting civil aviation. In the original Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938 "all other revenue" was never meant to mean funds from sale of assets. The effect given to that phrase by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the courts can be rectified by this bill. I hope it is enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, it is very vital that we remember in these closing days of the 84th Congress it is very apt that we rush through legislation and sometimes, as has happened in the discussion of the rule on this bill, we listen to misinformation and misrepresentation. Unfortunately something happened in the discussion on the rule and the vote on the rule, because I feel confident that many people voted against the rule only because they thought there was something sinister about this particular legislation. Now, there is nothing sinister about it. There is only one thing that I would like to speak on. If you are interested in the little fellow, if you are interested in the 13 small feeder lines, if you are interested in carrying on the advancement of air transportation, and all types of transportation, you will want to support this measure. The large companies, particularly 2 or 3 large companies, are going to benefit, but I say to you not in the same proportion and not in the same percentage that the small companies will benefit. I like to think of the small companies serving my State of Indiana, parts of Illinois and Ohio and Michigan. You can multiply that situation by all the States, and these smaller companies are the people who today are in a pinch. These are the ones that would like to buy new equipment; these are the ones that would like to improve their service in order to render better service to their local communities.

We have passed legislation to permit the building of better airports, and we are going to have better transportation of all types if we can pass this bill, which is strictly a new accounting system. That is about all it is. It is not giving any more money to any one company than the amount to which it is entitled. May I suggest, too, that some of these big companies to which we have been referring are the people who have pioneered in the field of aviation, and they are also the people who today are conducting certain air routes that are not at all profitable. These are money-losing air routes, but, at the same time, they are rendering a service to the community

and to the Nation. It is in this general interest that I support H. R. 8902.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 8902, a bill which has received very careful consideration by our committee. The bill reverses what I consider to be a very unfair accounting practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to receive and to pass on misinformation. It is easy to receive and to pass on rumor of misinformation and hence lead the Members astray in their consideration of a measure of this sort. There comes no windfall to anyone in this legislation. There is no giveaway; no windfall. And, I say that because of this: These subsidized carriers, the carriers that are still subsidized, are the only companies in the United States that cannot make a capital gain and keep it, under the rules of the Civil Aeronautics Board adopted pursuant to a Supreme Court decision. The reason they cannot keep it is because the Civil Aeronautics Board is requiring them to credit that capital gain against subsidy payments received by them. Let us take the large carriers that are not on subsidy. They can make capital gains to suit themselves and either keep them, reinvest them in airplanes, or pay them out in dividends. No one has challenged that statement, and I ask anyone who disputes that to rise and say so. That is a fact. The only carriers who are required to credit capital gains back are the subsidized carriers, the very ones who need it most. They are the ones who need it.

I really think we ought to agree to this bill. We have had long consideration of it in our subcommittee, as to what to do to benefit the subsidized carriers and get them off subsidy so they will not need subsidy any more. This is one of the ways to get them off subsidy and aid them to get new aircraft which will operate cheaper per-seat-mile so they can get off subsidy.

Another thing that the Civil Aeronautics Board is attempting to do is to grant them routes which are profitable. I hope that is understood.

I have much more that I could say, but I should like to yield to anyone who has a question that I might answer at this time, because I am sure that Members have questions.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The carriers that are not on subsidy have to spend their money to buy new equipment—and it is money that they do not get as handouts from the Government—they have to spend it for new equipment in order to stay in business. That is what they are doing.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to point out to my friend that unsubsidized are unrestricted.

Mr. JUDD. Why, of course.

Mr. HINSHAW. At the present time.

Mr. JUDD. And the ones who are still on subsidy want all those benefits that the others have earned by getting off subsidy, plus a larger subsidy. Why do they not get off subsidy and then they can get the same benefits? That is the inducement for them to get off subsidy.

Mr. HINSHAW. They would be very happy to do it, to get off subsidy, if they could.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have been trying to work out in my mind just exactly what we are faced with here. We have certain airlines in this country, some of which are subsidized by Federal funds and others which are not. My understanding is that back in 1939 we passed a law relating to subsidies and how the payments should be based; is that correct?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And in figuring out what they should get, the question came in of other revenues. Then it was a question of applying that law to all of them, and the Supreme Court, 2 years or so ago, in a decision interpreted "other revenues" in such a way as far as the subsidized carriers were concerned, but it did not apply to the unsubsidized lines.

Mr. HINSHAW. It did not apply to them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Because they were not subsidized.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And what you are doing now is saying that in 1939 we passed a law, and we meant what we said in 1939, regardless of what the Supreme Court said that we intended to say.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And in doing so this other income or "other revenues" is to be interpreted the same for subsidized lines as for unsubsidized lines.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is 100 percent correct, and I wish every Member of the House could understand it as he does.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] to close the general debate.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, let me try to make this unmistakably clear to everyone who is listening to the debate on this bill: This bill in no way affects the tax liability of any airline company for any capital gains or losses which it may incur in the sale or disposition of air-transportation equipment and similar property. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could not bring in such a bill if it so desired. That is exclusively a matter within the jurisdiction of another committee of this House. This goes only to determining "other revenue" in connection with the ratemaking clause of title IV of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

Title IV of the Civil Aeronautics Act provides for air-carrier economic regulation. Section 406 deals directly with the setting and fixing of rates for the transportation of mail. Section 406 (a) gives to the Civil Aeronautics Board the authority to fix rates. Secton 406 (b), with which we are concerned today, simply defines the ratemaking elements which the Board must take into consideration in determining the rates to be paid by the United States Government for mail which is transported by the various subsidized airlines affected by this section.

It provides, and it provides wisely, that the Board may fix one rate for the transportation of mail by carrier A and, if the economic condition of that company in the judgment of the Board so authorizes and justifies it, it may set an entirely different rate for carrier B.

All of us hope that the time is not far removed when every airline in this country can be taken completely off subsidy. I say to this Committee as sincerely as I possibly can that the passage of this bill by this House and enactment of it into law will be a step forward into removing every officially operated airline in America from subsidy.

The only purpose of this bill is to restore what was the law before the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision which changed the law without going into the full intent of section 406 (b), which defines the ratemaking elements in arriving at the amount of subsidy. This bill will simply rewrite the intent of Congress.

It is my understanding that the amount of profit which an airline company can earn before going off subsidy is up to 8 percent for domestic operations and 9 percent for overseas operations. Whenever the net profit of any airline exceeds the figure of 8 percent on the invested capital of that company, then the subsidy ceases to exist. I think it will be a step forward toward saving the taxpayers' money, toward taking all these airlines off subsidy, to enact this bill into law.

I want to make one more point, that in this day of modern air transportation, the more economical, efficient, and safe air transportation equipment an airline has the better service it will be able to give to the air-traveling public, the safer the transportation they will have, and the more reasonable the rates for air transportation will be to those who use these airlines.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will approve this bill and that it will pass by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, be amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"In determining all other revenue of the air carrier, the Board shall not take account of losses on the sale or other disposition of property, nor of gains on such sale or other disposition provided that the proceeds shall, within a reasonable time, be reinvested in other property similar or related in service or use."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective with respect to gains or losses realized on or after January 1, 1956, whether or not the Board shall have entered a final order taking account thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 486), is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(b)' and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(2) In determining "all other revenue" of an air carrier for the purposes of paragraph (1), the Board—

"'(A) shall not take into account any loss on the sale or other disposition of property, and

"'(B) shall not take into account any gain on the sale or other disposition of property, if the net gain (after applicable taxes) is (within a reasonable time to be fixed and determined by the Board) reinvested in other property similar or related in service or use.

For the purposes of this paragraph, the term "property" means depreciable property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations.'

"SEC. 2. This act shall be effective with respect to gains or losses realized on or after January 1, 1956, whether or not the Civil Aeronautics Board shall have entered a final order taking account thereof."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: Page 2, line 11, strike out all of lines 11 through 22, inclusive, and insert in place thereof the following:

"(2) In determining all other revenue of the air carrier, the Board shall not take into account the net gains (after any losses and expenses resulting from the disposition of flight equipment) derived from the disposition of any flight equipment of such carrier, if (A) such carrier notifies the Board in writing that it intends to reinvest in other flight equipment the proceeds derived from such disposition, (B) such proceeds, less all applicable taxes, are placed by such carrier in a funded reinvestment reserve immediately upon the receipt thereof, and (C) within a reasonable period to be determined and fixed by the Board, such proceeds are actually reinvested in other flight equipment by such carrier.

"(3) Hereafter in determining that portion of the carrier's mail rate which is payable by the Board (which portion is hereinafter referred to as 'subsidy') the Board shall compute such carrier's depreciation expense and return on investment after first deducting the net gains not taken into account in determining all other revenue of such carrier from the original cost to such carrier of the flight equipment in which such net gains have been reinvested.

"(4) In the event the Board determines that the carrier no longer requires subsidy, there shall be deducted from all subsidy to be paid to such carrier after the effective date of this amendment, or there shall be otherwise recovered from such carrier, an amount equal to the total net gains not taken into account in determining all other revenue of such carrier minus the total amounts by which such carrier's depreciation expense has been reduced on account of and solely by the application of paragraph (3) above. (Such amount shall be determined as of the date the carrier no longer requires subsidy.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The amendment, Mr. Chairman, goes far beyond the scope of this bill. It not only has to do with subsidy payments, but the effect of it would be a loan from the United States Government to the air carriers on a repayment basis of 7 years. Furthermore, it goes beyond the scope of subsidy requirements to the extent that it affects air carriers after they go off subsidy and provides a formula whereby "the total net gains not taken into account in determining all other revenue of such carrier minus the total amounts by which such carrier's depreciation expense has been reduced on account of and solely by the application of paragraph (3)."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard?

Mr. HESELTON. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman. I realize it would be advisable for me to concede the point of order since I have sought the advice of a gentleman whom we all respect, the Parliamentarian of the House. However, I have given him a memorandum in connection with it. I am not going to impose upon the Chair or the House to refer to it in detail. I would like to refer, however, to a ruling of John J. Fitzgerald, which is to be found in Cannon's Precedents, section 2993, which seems to me to go to the heart of the matter. It is as follows:

An amendment to a section which is relevant to the subject matter and which may be said to be properly and logically suggested in the perfecting of the section and the carrying out of the intent of the bill would be germane to the bill and thus is in order.

There are other precedents. Whether it is in point or not, I would regret that any doubt might not be resolved in favor of the germaneness of the amendment since it does so directly affect the bill and since it is obviously the sort of amendment that may well be considered and is considered by committees and by the other body all the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts extends beyond the scope of the language contained in section 406 (a) at lines 13 and 14 of the committee amendment.

The language therein contained is very narrow in its scope and applies to one specific phase of the operation.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts extends beyond loss on the sale of property, the matter contained in the amendment; therefore, the entire amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is not germane and the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "property" and insert the word "aircraft"; and in lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "property, similar or related in service or use" and insert the words "new and modern aircraft."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported by the committee has the word "property" in it in line 14. It does not refer to aircraft which have been discussed this afternoon at length.

"Property," I suppose, is anything owned by anybody; in other words, anything to which a person has title.

In the Western Airlines case which has been referred to in the debate, the property included a route that had never been used by the airline which was certificated and was sold at a large profit to another airline. It also involved certain assets and privileges, in fact, it involved coin machine privileges which I understand were quite profitable.

The district court of appeals here in the District unanimously rejected the effort on the part of the Western Airlines to have that excluded as part of their other revenue in determining the amount of subsidies they should receive. The Supreme Court affirmed this decision.

Further than that, of course, if this is a tenable proposition, the words of the bill as reported by the committee requiring reinvestment should be changed.

The amendment I have suggested, and I certainly will not belabor it, is that we confine ourselves to the sale of aircraft if we are going to pass this bill and that we permit this particular allowance to be made only if there is a reinvestment in new and modern aircraft. In that we do not open the door to the sale of hotels which are held by some airlines and to other classes of property; that we confine ourselves exclusively to the sale of these so-called dilapidated aircraft which have increased in value over a hundred percent in the last few years according to the CAB. If that is what we want then I submit the amendment is in order and without this amendment the bill could increase the subsidy without justification and should be rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, Is this language similar, or the effect of it similar, to the provisions of the bill that passed the Senate?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not know. I developed the amendment independently because I wanted to confine this. I do not know what the Senate did.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the gentleman another question, and it might be pertinent. Would the gentleman support the bill if his amendment is adopted?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely not.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to my friend that it was not my intention to embarrass him. I asked the question not to be facetious. I was honest and sincere in my question.

Mr. HESELTON. I know that and I never meant any suggestion otherwise. The gentleman is one of my finest friends, I hope and believe. I honor and respect him. But I do want to perfect bad legislation even if I cannot vote for the revised version.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I can assure my good and warm friend the feeling of friendship he expressed is mutual. I will have to oppose the amendment under the circumstances because, as an example, every airline in the country that operates has to have not only aircraft but they have to maintain hangars, they have to have some place of operation, they have to have a place for maintenance. In many instances it is necessary to make changes and improvements. In instances they may sell old equipment of that kind and of that nature. If that is true, I do not see why

there would be any difference in the treatment of an air company that owns a rather extensive hangar and equipment. It is necessary to maintain the new type of aircraft coming in. In 1959 and 1960 we are going to have these new aircraft coming in, different from all aircraft we have today. They are going to be the jets that cost $5 or $6 million and they are going to have to have new equipment, new ways and methods of maintaining and taking care of them, just as essential as the aircraft itself.

I am not for the application of this to hotels that the gentleman mentioned before. That is the reason we amended the bill after we received the alternate recommendation of the Budget Bureau. We used the term in the bill, that is "used and useful in aircraft service." That is what our bill contains. We had our staff to work it out. We wanted to eliminate this questions of hotels, restaurants, and other properties that might become involved. What we are interested in here is permitting the aircraft companies to use the sale of their old equipment as in use now and when they have capital gains therefrom, to apply on the purchase of new equipment and those things necessary for the operation of that new equipment.

Mr. Chairman, from this viewpoint the gentleman's amendment is unsound and I would ask that it be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there has been too much misinformation around here or any rumors that I have heard which were not justified. There is some difference of opinion on definition of terms. The gentleman from California says this is not windfall legislation, that it does not give any windfall to the airlines on subsidy. What it gives is what I would define as a windfall; but if anyone does not like that word, let us call it an extra bonus. If we vote to allow an airline hereafter to keep all the profits it makes out of the sale of its old equipment on which it has taken depreciation to a point below the sale price, and then to keep its full subsidy, too, if that is not an extra bonus I do not know what to call it.

Under the present ground rules, a line's net profits from such sales are counted as a part of its revenues in computing the amount of its subsidy. It gets a net subsidy of whatever is left after the amount of such capital gains is subtracted from the total amounts necessary to give it an 8 percent return on its capital investment.

The plea has been made that the subsidized airlines must have this bill in order to buy new equipment. But the unsubsidized airlines must buy new equipment, too. Are they not put at an unfair advantage?

May I ask why are some of these lines, especially the big ones, still on subsidy? Why does Pan American, for example, have to have such a huge subsidy year after year? It has been said it is because it has these less profitable routes, less lucrative routes to distant places around the world. In some cases there is certainly some truth in that argument. But it is not the whole story. Pan American has carried on some expensive practices that I think any of you who have kept track of the industry can understand.

For instance, after the Philippines got their independence, they established and tried to build up a line across the Pacific. They started out with one flight a week, with American crews and later two a week. Whatever service the Philippine Airline offered, Pan American doubled it. It finally forced the Philippine Airline to give up its Pacific run. It systematically overscheduled the route, even if some planes carried only 10 or so passengers. It could make up its losses from Federal subsidy. Repeatedly it has used such methods to try to run its competitors out of business, even American competitors. Because other companies are off subsidy, they cannot make up what they would lose if they were to overschedule, from subsidies on that route or routes in other parts of the world. That is one reason for Pan American's need for subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, the net result of this bill might not be to induce the companies to buy new equipment. But it certainly would provide an inducement for them to stay on subsidy forever. Why should they get off subsidy if they can have all of the benefits of being on subsidy and, under this bill, all the benefits of being off subsidy, too?

I do not think it is fair to those who have to buy their new equipment without subsidy, to give an extra bonus of their capital gains, after taxes, to those that still are subsidized.

And, furthermore, it is not fair to the taxpayers, because it is bound to increase the amount the taxpayer has to pay in subsidies.

The Department of Commerce is against the bill, the Bureau of the Budget is against it, the Comptroller General is against it, and half of the members of the CAB are against it. Why are these agencies that are especially interested in sound aviation against it?

I hope that, when the proper time comes, this bill will be recommitted for further study. I think you all know that the Department of Commerce and the CAB are already engaged, have been for the last 2 or 3 months, in a fresh study of this whole situation. If you examine the committee's own report, on page 6 you will find this letter from Secretary Sinclair Weeks, part of which I quote:

> We realize that there are problems facing all of the air transportation industry in terms of the capital needs arising from technological advances which must be implemented if we are to attain our goal of a healthy and unsubsidized air carrier industry in all respects. This problem is one in which the Government has a great interest and a real solution can come only from deliberate judgment based upon analysis of all factors involved and consideration of the needs of all of our air transportation, both subsidized and nonsubsidized. Problems such as these will not necessarily be solved merely by increasing the Government's potential subsidy obligations in a very limited area.
>
> We strongly urge, therefore, that these bills be set aside at this time and that the Board be permitted, and all due speed, to proceed to its investigation and to make its report and its recommendations.

Now, it seems to me that is the sensible and the wise thing to do.

Look what Mr. Adams, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has to say:

> I strongly believe that the present method of awarding subsidy on the basis of the need of a particular carrier is abundantly fair to the carrier, prevents waste of Government funds, and contains adequate inducement to the carriers to maintain and develop the quality and quantity of air transportation required in the national interest.

Those are the very three objectives we want and which we are told this new bill is supposed to accomplish. But Mr. Adams says the present law is doing them well already.

Mr. Chairman, Why do we not send this bill back to the committee, and if these interested agencies do not come up with an adequate solution, recommend a plan that requires legislation, take it up again in January?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HESELTON. Was the request for this amendment or all amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HESELTON. But not to another amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. But not to other amendments.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me for an answer to a question that he asked?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman asked me a question that many people are interested in. I quote a letter from Mr. Adams, Vice Chairman of the Board as to what subsidy is. He said:

> It includes a reasonable profit element, after taxes, which now stands at 7 percent on the invested capital for a past period and 8 and 9 percent for a future period, depending on whether domestic or foreign operations are involved.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has said that these domestic subsidized lines are guaranteed a yield of 7 percent and overseas lines a greater yield. The planes that would be sold at this time can be sold at a profit, the used planes, because there is a shortage of planes, and there has been a tremendous increase in the freight and the passenger load.

If they are sold at a profit, that profit, of course, after paying the 26 percent capital gains tax is offset against their existing subsidy to reduce the subsidy, to reduce what the taxpayers have to pay in the form of subsidy.

Airplanes are subject to call for national defense. So are the railroads, so are the truck lines, so are the young men and the young women.

As far as safety of passengers is concerned, if these planes are not safe, the CAB has regulations to keep them from flying. So let us not worry about the safety of these planes. If they are safe, they fly; if they are not safe, they do not fly.

The argument that it will help airlines to get new equipment is an obvious one. Of course it will. It would help truck lines, if applied to them. It would help me in my private business if I could get a favorable ruling, so that they would get a yield from more revenues and from the subsidy, too. It would give them the additional advantage of their capital gains as an offset against a reduction in subsidy.

This means that we are putting in a new formula. I go along with the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, with the Bureau of the Budget, and with the administration, as well as the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, when they say that this goes a little further than we want to go. Let us use the formula which we now have.

They talk about these lines as struggling lines. If you went out to buy one of them, you would find out what you would have to pay. You would have to pay plenty for them. If they need an additional subsidy, let us consider that case based on the merits of the case and not open the door to subsidies, willy-nilly, to all lines, whether they need it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it is very regrettable that the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, elected to have so much to say about the practices of Pan American Airlines, which to him seem so deplorable. I do not know anything about the practices of Pan American Airlines. The last thing in the world I am interested in is trying to defend them. But I am very much interested in the requirement of airlines to purchase new equipment, because if the airlines, in order to keep abreast of the times, in order to serve the public, have got to keep investing enormous sums of money in new equipment, as they do, they need some help. The airlines have got to spend a great deal of money in the next few years, at least the long-distance airlines, for jet aircraft, and the amounts involved there are simply fantastic.

It seems to me that this proposed legislation is one of the best ways of getting the airlines to modernize their equipment. It will encourage them to serve the public better and better meet competition of foreign-owned airlines, which is certainly one of the major problems of our subsidized airlines that operate overseas.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman object to using the word "aircraft" instead of "property" and confining it to new and modern aircraft?

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman's amendment is needlessly restrictive. It would probably be aircraft in most cases, but I can imagine that it would be in some instances, for example, spare parts. As far as hotels and so on are concerned, I would be perfectly willing to leave them out.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the committee in working out this amendment used the term "property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations." That is the language of the committee amendment, which limits it to the necessary property in connection with the operation of their aircraft.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from Arkansas will recall with what very great care we discussed this very language in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY].

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I take this time to invite the attention of the members of the Committee to the particular line of argument that has been advanced by the proponents of this measure. They tell you in one breath that this bill is designed to aid the small, local feeder carriers, the kind of carriers that serve your community and mine if you are a typical Member of Congress. Then in the next breath they talk about the great equipment expansion program the airlines face in the next 5 or 6 years, and they start talking about $4 million, $5 million, and $6 million jets. If Allegheny Airlines has any intention of buying a $4 million, $5 million, or $6 million jet airliner, it may just as well abandon its idea of serving any of my constituents, because there just is not any place in the central part of Pennsylvania where it will be able to land such planes. There is only one airline that will really benefit from this bill because there is just one airline covered by this bill, that has any farflung plans for spending millions and millions of dollars to equip itself with jet equipment during the next 5 or 6 years. That, in my opinion, is the sole purpose behind the bill. It is brought in here in the closing days with the hope that in the confusion the thing will pass, and that it will be passed with many of us thinking we are helping the local small feeder airlines, when actually we are just passing out a great big bonanza, a great big windfall, to one big airline.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Is the gentleman opposed to the purchase of Convairs? I understand Allegheny Airlines purchased some Convairs recently. I want to know if the gentleman is opposed to the improvement of the equipment.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Not at all. I hope they keep improving it. But, before Allegheny thinks about buying jets, they had better check the airports in the 19th District in Pennsylvania, or they may find they may not be able to land these fancy new planes.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. I can give the gentleman some up-to-date information. I learned as late as last night and this morning that the Allegheny Airlines, which the gentleman mentioned, have purchased Martin 404's.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I am glad to have that latest information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I note that Capital Airlines has ordered and is taking delivery on a substantial number of turboprop, British-made planes, and yesterday or this morning I noted in the papers that this airline has ordered 14 British Comet jet commercial airliners. I should like to know from some member of the committee whether Capital Airlines comes within the scope of this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Capital Airlines does not come under the scope of the legislation because it is not a subsidized carrier. It is out of subsidy.

Mr. GROSS. They are not a subsidized carrier?

Mr. HARRIS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. They are subsidized through airmail contracts, are they not?

Mr. HARRIS. No; they are not subsidized. They have airmail contracts, but they get paid for their service.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to hear the gentleman say they are not subsidized because I do not want to hear of any airline in this country being subsidized directly or indirectly by the taxpayers of this country and then going over to Britain to buy their airplanes.

Mr. HARRIS. We have made very great progress in getting our aircraft industry off subsidy in the last several years. We are still making progress every year.

Mr. GROSS. We certainly have helped subsidize the British aircraft industry, and I hope we do not find out some day that we are also using the taxpayers' money to subsidize airlines that buy their planes in Britain or some other foreign country. I want them made in America.

Mr. HARRIS. I repeat again. That is not involved here at all and neither is the question of any tax paid by any company involved. That should be clearly understood. There is much misinformation on that point. No taxes are involved at all.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I have not heard anything about taxes not being involved in this bill. Were not its purposes supposedly accomplished by the quick depreciation and rapid amortization certificates which almost all airlines receive?

Mr. HARRIS. No; this does not change that policy at all.

Mr. VANIK. Then they get this in addition to the quick amortization privi-

lege which almost all the airlines took advantage of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I certainly favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] because if this bill should happen to pass, I certainly think we should restrict the type of equipment that is to be purchased under the terms of this bill to that type of equipment we have heard a lot of crying about here today—the great need for maintaining the finest and the safest aircraft. So, certainly, it is my hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted. Primarily though, I rise to ask the gentleman from Arkansas a question. I listened here all afternoon. The question has to do with the reason for this bill being here. I appreciate the various arguments that have been made by the committee for the bill, but who asked for this bill? Who is in favor of this bill? Who wants the bill? I have not heard of anyone apparently outside the committee, and I might say I have the highest regard for the chairman as well as all members of the committee—it may be entirely justified but I have heard no one who wants the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I might say that the Air Transport Association of America is the original sponsor of the legislation because of the Supreme Court decision of 1954 which the Board has invoked in its open-rate proceedings to reducing the subsidy and actually charging it out of the operations of the company.

Mr. SISK. Do I understand that that association is restricted to subsidized airlines only?

Mr. HARRIS. No—all airlines of the country are members of the Air Transport Association.

Mr. SISK. Do I understand that the gentleman means to say that all airlines in the country favor this particular legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. The association represents all the airlines.

Mr. SISK. Both subsidized and nonsubsidized?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes—and the local airlines conference which is composed of about 13 local airline services.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill and shall vote against it, but with the possibility in mind that it might pass, I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one or two questions of the committee: Are there any airlines not now subsidized which will be subsidized following the passage of this legislation?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. No, there are no additions or no new airlines that would be included as a result of the legislation.

Mr. MCCARTHY. What do you mean by being included? If the revenue of certain airlines, as I understand it, rise above a certain point, they are not then eligible for subsidy payments; is that correct?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is true, but the Civil Aeronautics Board makes that determination.

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is at the present time. If part of their revenue at the present time is derived from capital gains, it means their revenue for the purposes of determining subsidy will be reduced by that amount and they would be eligible for a subsidy again?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. MCCARTHY. And the effect of this bill is likely to increase the amount of the subsidies paid to the airlines.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. No, it is not.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I think you have to make some provision for the acquisition of new equipment, and believe that this is the best possible means of doing so.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman's question can best be answered by saying that the chances are that the passage of this measure will help to remove certain lines eventually and more quickly from the subsidy they are presently receiving.

Mr. HESELTON. That opinion, of course, is completely contrary to the chairman of the CAB, who says that the Board has estimated that it will amount to $46,487,000 in fiscal 1957. This bill will substantially increase the amount of the subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding.

I would like to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include a statement I made before the Civil Aeronautics Board in behalf of the Allegheny Airlines which is one of the feeder airlines in Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Members of the Board and Mr. Brown, my name is CARROLL D. KEARNS. For the past 10 years I have served as United States Representative in Congress for the 24th District of Pennsylvania, consisting of Erie, Crawford, and Mercer Counties, and numbering well over 410,000 people.

My interest in the application of the Erie Municipal Airport Authority for an investigation as to the need of air transportation between Erie, Pa., and Detroit, Mich., is longstanding and is very natural inasmuch as I represent, among others, the city of Erie, the third largest city in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and one of the leading cities in diversified industry in the country.

Gentlemen, it is my firm conviction that Erie needs air service to Detroit in order to develop toward its proper position as Pennsylvania's Great Lakes port and the gateway to the west on the Great Lakes.

Erie can develop as it should only if it has behind it a market area which will ship and do business via Erie, instead of the already well-established and well-served centers of Cleveland, Ohio, and Buffalo, N. Y.

The cities of the Pennsylvania hinterland need to diversify their economy because their traditional industries of coal and oil are no longer adequate. In order to diversify new industry must be attracted, especially lighter industry, whose principal offices are in the Midwest. But these industries, particularly the ones supplying the vast automotive industry of Detroit, demand rapid air transportation—preferably nonstop—but in any event one-carrier service. And only one carrier can do this—Allegheny Airlines.

I appear before you this morning to request, therefore, that you give to Erie what it has never had before—a chance to develop as Pennsylvania's Great Lakes port. Cleveland has developed, Buffalo has developed—but Erie—never. The reason for this is basically topographical. The historical layout of the railroad system has never favored Erie. But now new highways are being planned and developed to handle the bulk cargo which will be going in and out of Port Erie.

Erie wants the chance to complement its highway system with one-carrier air service from the Pennsylvania hinterland to Erie, and then on out to Detroit, and west.

That is the gist of my appeal, gentlemen. I thank you for your courteous attention and for the opportunity to appear before you this morning.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACDONALD:

Page 2, in lines 14, 16, 18, and 19, strike out "property" and insert "flight equipment."

Page 2, strike out lines 20 through 22, and insert quotation mark at the end of line 19.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take much of the time of the House because we have just been through this same matter.

The amendment suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] provided that this bill should affect only airplanes.

The amendment I suggest reads: "flight equipment."

I think even those among you who believe in this bill also know that this is a very loosely drawn bill in many ways. I call the attention of the membership to its provisions. It says that this tax benefit—no matter what else it is, it is a tax benefit—goes to "property." In other words, in subsection (b) it says that they shall not take into account any gain on the sale or other disposition of property—I will skip a few lines—"if reinvested in other property similar or related in service or use."

We who travel the airlines know what property it is that can be used by an airline. When we look at the definition further, starting in line 20 which defines this so-called property, it says:

For the purposes of this paragraph, the term "property" means depreciable property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations.

I do not think anyone in the House would dispute the fact that it is useful to have a restaurant at an airport or to

operate a hotel where there are not adequate hotel facilities at or near the airport. I would like to ask some member of the committee whether or not there is any safeguard in this bill which would prevent an airline from setting up a corporation, selling the assets, the airplanes, to that corporation, then leasing back the equipment after they have taken full benefit of this tax allowance which we are giving them?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I think it is well defined here and would exclude any possibility such as that. This provides that the proceeds from the sale of equipment must be reinvested in similar equipment which is used or useful in flight service.

Mr. MACDONALD. The gentleman goes back to "property used or useful in the carrier's normal operations."

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That is true. That is the wording. It is "used or useful in the carrier's normal operations" and it is intended that all of the money secured will be reinvested in flight equipment or similar equipment. They have to have a little bit of leeway to include the purchase of parts and certain facilities that are necessary.

Mr. MACDONALD. The gentleman in his answer to me uses the words "flight equipment." I take it he is supporting my amendment?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I have given considerable study to the gentleman's suggestion and, personally, I am in full support of the intent of the gentleman's amendment. I certainly cannot speak for the committee with regard to his amendment. I will say, however, that it is limiting to a large degree the expenditure of this money.

Mr. MACDONALD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire if the gentleman can advise us as to what the definition of "flight equipment" would be? What would he intend it to include?

Mr. MACDONALD. If I am to believe the statements made by the gentlemen of the committee, it would be carrying coals to Newcastle for me to define "flight equipment."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) Mr. MACDONALD was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARRIS. Here is what I am trying to get at, and I may say I am very much impressed with the objective the gentleman wants to accomplish. What I am trying to get at is supporting equipment that is necessary in maintaining aircraft, necessary to flight operations, and so forth, included in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. MACDONALD. It would be.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman accept an amendment to his amendment including the words "flight and supporting ground equipment"?

Mr. MACDONALD. Support, referring back to flight equipment?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes, I would.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman says flight equipment only. Would that make it impossible to include stands and so forth that go with the carrier's normal ground operation?

Mr. MACDONALD. No. If it was normal, say, as in Alaska, to use buoys and hangars which run into the sea, I certainly would include that. This is not a restrictive amendment in the sense that it is a restriction on property. I merely want to have it very clear that the House is passing only on flight equipment and not going into the broad field of what these airlines use as property when related as being used or useful in their carrying operations, because it now includes restaurants, hotels, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If it does, it was not the intention of the committee to include it.

Mr. MACDONALD. No. I think the committee will readily agree with me in restricting this to flight equipment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed at great length in the committee, as the gentleman knows, as to what is sought here and what we intend to do. No one in the committee wants to give a windfall to anyone who might take advantage because they have property they want to dispose of which has nothing to do with the operation of the airline. The gentleman recalls that very well.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HARRIS. In our full committee we discussed it, too. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing to ask unanimous consent that his amendment be amended to include "flight equipment and supporting ground equipment."

Mr. MACDONALD. If the word "supporting" is descriptive and if it were clear what the word "supporting" was referring back to, I would accept it, if it meant ground equipment that deals with flight equipment, including gasoline tanks.

Mr. HARRIS. Maintenance, operation, and such?

Mr. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what we are worried about.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is what I am worried about, too.

Mr. HARRIS. That is just as necessary as the aircraft that flies the air. If the gentleman would ask and obtain unanimous consent to include "supporting ground equipment," I will accept the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think we are all in accord with the purposes sought by this amendment. Some of us are in disagreement as to just how far the amendment goes, of course. I am wondering if on page 2, line 22, the insertion of the word "flight" after the word "normal" would not take care of this entire controversy.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman accept this language, "only pertaining to air flight"?

Mr. HARRIS. Well, I do not think I could, because I do not know just what you mean by that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am further trying to define your word "support," because I think anything that is used to aid equipment and to aid the passengers is a supporting measure in the use by the airlines.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. I should like to direct this question also to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] to supplement the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi.

I think all of us are trying to achieve the same objective at this time. Would it meet the approval of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] to insert on line 22, page 2, after "normal" the word "flight", so that lines 21 and 22 as amended would read:

> For the purposes of this paragraph, the term "property" means depreciable property used or useful in the carrier's normal flight operations.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman be agreeable if we said "flight and ground equipment."

Mr. MACDONALD. I should think "equipment pertaining directly to flight equipment".

Mr. HARRIS. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind. I think he has the same thing in mind we would all like to accomplish. Since it is going to be necessary to work this out in conference, if we get to conference, and since we understand what we would like to do, I am going to suggest that we accept the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, then I move to strike out the last word and talk about something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I only intended to use 3 minutes, but so long as I cannot talk about what I wanted to, which I think would be of great interest, because for a long time I have been trying to learn what is the opposition to NIXON and why they did not want him as a candidate. I have not been able to learn except from some Democrats,

until recently, when Stassen came along. I wished to explain to the House, if I could—I do not really mean explain; that is too presumptuous—but I wished to give to the House my idea of what Stassen was trying to get at and why he is against NIXON. But now somebody has objected to my speaking out of order, so I cannot do that and I will be forced to wait until a little later on.

Now I must talk about this motion to strike the enacting clause from this bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORANO. I did not understand the gentleman had offered a motion to strike the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Michigan sought recognition in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the gentleman offer a motion to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman should pay attention to the proceedings in the Committee. The Clerk has it.

Mr. MORANO. He did not read it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not my fault; maybe he did not think it was worthwhile. Does the gentleman want it read now?

Mr. MORANO. I should like to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan sought recognition in opposition to the amendment. He was recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment and for no other reason. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, in other words, I am correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will concede the gentleman is correct. I understand, Mr. Chairman, I had asked permission to proceed out of order and somebody objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct; somebody objected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And then I sent to the clerk's desk a motion to strike the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not offer the motion to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In order that we may have orderly procedure, I shall offer the motion now and ask unanimous consent to withdraw it, and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that course will be followed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I should like very much to ask the gentleman if he does not believe it would be unthinkable not to have the Republican Party unanimously vote to nominate RICHARD NIXON the Vice President of the United States. It would be unthinkable and tragic not to reward complete loyalty and great ability with anything else. The President and the country need him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would be happy to answer, but I cannot do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 24, strike out "January 1, 1956" and insert "August 15, 1956."

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, this will be the last amendment I shall offer. It is preliminary to a motion to recommit I shall offer. It will also be the last few words I shall say on this bill.

The bill itself provides for an effective date of January 1, 1956. In my judgment, there is no justification whatsoever for that. Here we are on July 26 at 6:35 in the evening, and we want to legislate back to January 1, 1956. At least we should have the opportunity to legislate a bit ahead, assuming this bill is going to pass. I do not think it is.

I want to stress something the gentleman from Minnesota stressed, only I want to add to it. The reason I am offering a motion to recommit is this: This is in effect an effort to repeal the needs provision for a subsidy. The gentleman from Minnesota quoted Colonel Adams' statement before the committee, but beyond that I want to quote one more sentence or two that he used:

And yet, these bills would in effect disregard the actual need of the particular carrier seeking subsidy support by prohibiting the Board from looking at the profits from the sale of equipment—the very same equipment which through depreciation allowances already might have been paid for by the traveling public and the Government through its award of subsidy.

That is what I have been saying to you all afternoon.

I understood last night that this bill would be the first order of legislative business today, and look at the clock. I say this is no way for us to legislate, whether it is good, bad or indifferent. That is the basic reason why I am offering this motion to recommit, but there is another fundamental reason.

There is a pending proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board covering this very thing. Thirty-three of these airlines are parties to it. It was started in April of this year. On July 3 of this year a preliminary report was made. We have the whole situation in the hands of an administrative body. Colonel Adams says this, and it is the basis on which I will offer a motion to recommit.

I consider this kind of proceeding—

He is referring to the one that has been pending 3 or 4 months and will be finished by the time we get back.

I consider this kind of proceeding the best approach to the problem because it looks toward a policy consistent with the scheme of the Civil Aeronautics Act, fully supported by a complete economic record, and geared as closely as possible to the individual needs of the carriers.

I respect my friend who offered the amendment we just adopted, but if there was any perfect illustration of why we should not be asked at 20 minutes of seven, two nights before adjournment, to pass this legislation blindfolded, the example is right there.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, my very good friend for whom I have the highest regard, the author of the amendment, Mr. HESELTON, of Massachusetts, obviously has some pretty deep feeling about this matter, and he is entitled to his opinion and I respect it. I want that well understood, and he knows it. Apparently, he has some feeling, according to his statement a moment ago, and the manner in which he has expressed his views on this whole proposition of air subsidy. I know that he has had some feeling about it over the years. It is not new. It is not my fault. It is not the fault of the committee. It is not the fault of the leadership or the Membership of the House necessarily that we could not get to this bill until late this afternoon. It was scheduled for the first business under the rule, but there were conference reports and unanimous consent requests and there was other business, and it was necessary, and consequently I do not feel we owe him an apology for not getting this up until when we did this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, obviously his amendment is for the purpose of further confusion—that is my opinion—further confusing this whole matter. I realize it is pretty difficult sometimes to wade through the confusion and get to the facts. I want to read to you a letter or rather from a copy of a letter that was writen to Mr. HESELTON. It was under date of July 26, 1956. It is signed by Mr. John F. Floberg, Conference of Local Airlines—that is the local service airlines throughout the United States.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Does the gentleman say I received any letter from Mr. Floberg at any time?

Mr. HARRIS. I have a copy of a letter and it is addressed to you.

Mr. HESELTON. I should think he would send it to me—but that is all right.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume the gentleman received it or it would not have been delivered to me. This is a copy and I assume the gentleman has the original. It is as follows:

CONFERENCE OF LOCAL AIRLINES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: I see on page 14575 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 25, 1956, that you yesterday stated on the floor of the

House that there could not be produced "one scintilla of credible evidence that passage of this bill (H. R. 8902) will benefit anyone but Pan Am and its select companions in unwarranted windfalls, in depreciation on top of depreciation, in double subsidies. If Pan Am can do so, I will admit it and withdraw my minority report on this floor tomorrow."

You will recall that I testified as vigorously as I know how in favor of H. R. 8902 before the Interstate Commerce Committees of both the House and the Senate. I pointed out at that time that the local service airlines had 165 DC–3's, all of which were candidates for replacement by suitable modern aircraft. I likewise pointed out that the financial condition of the local service airlines was such that the only possibility of financing the downpayment on modern replacements would come from the profits that might be realized on a sale of the DC–3's.

Let there be no doubt that H. R. 8902 is the pivot point on which the reequipment programs of the local service airlines presently depend. Whatever the benefits of the bill may be to other large carriers, the enactment of legislation assuring the local service carriers of the availability of the capital proceeds of old flight equipment is essential if we are to forestall preservation of the equipment status quo which carriers with it preservation of the subsidy status quo.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. FLOBERG.

Here is a wire from Jess B. Bennett, assistant to the president of the Braniff Airways, Inc.:

JULY 26, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Braniff Airways is happy to respond to your inquiry as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday at page 14575, and to say that H. R. 8902 is not exclusively designed for the benefit of Pan American World Airways. Braniff Airways is presently facing an $85 million reequipment program covering turboprop and jet aircraft and will need every cent it can realize from the sale of its existing equipment to finance this huge undertaking. Passage of H. R. 8902 will materially assist in this effort. We strongly urge your support of this measure.

JESS B. BENNETT,
Assistant to the President, Braniff Airways, Inc.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Is that telegram addressed to me?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; it is.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not peculiar that these people will give telegrams addressed to me to someone else without giving it to me? I would think they would have the common decency, if they are going to furnish some communication to be used in debate, to see to it that I got the communication addressed to me before it reached the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Did the gentleman get this wire?

Mr. HESELTON. No.

Mr. HARRIS. I assure the gentleman I had no intention to take any advantage of him.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I might say to the gentleman that I talked to the person who wrote this letter today. I was aware that the letter had been written. I inquired of him if it had been delivered or had been received by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], and I understood that it had been directed, sent, and received.

Mr. HARRIS. The other point I want to make very clear that this legislation will do is that it will be of great help to the airline industry all over the country.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, all I can say is that if that letter was delivered the same day it was written it is the fastest delivery service that has been rendered since Summerfield has been Postmaster General.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: Page 2, strike out lines 11 and 12, and insert the following:

"(2) In determining for the purpose of paragraph (1) 'all other revenue' of any air carrier having total gross receipts (including amounts not included in all other revenue under the provisions of this paragraph) of less than $50 million during the previous calendar year, the Board."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman but I do not think any point of order will apply because it is a restrictive amendment.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the desire to help the small feeder airlines, and we have just heard a letter and a telegram from the conference on local airlines and from the head of the largest of the smaller airlines.

If this bill is primarily to help the small airlines, my amendment provides an opportunity to demonstrate it. Now is the time to stand up and be counted and really help the small airlines. Because all this amendment does is to provide that the new rules shall apply only to those subsidized airlines whose gross revenues are under $50 million a year.

Most of these small feeder airlines now earn from 2 to 6, maybe some of them $12 million a year. Every one of the small feeders, plus Continental, Northeast, and Braniff are included within this limitation. If we want to help the smaller airlines, just vote for this amendment and then we will not need to kid ourselves that this bill is just designed to help the small companies. That will then be the fact.

Under this amendment the bill will give aid where the aid might be needed. I certainly am not opposed to helping the small lines, but I do not like to help them in a disguised form where they get in effect two subsidies, one hidden. The amendment will give greater help to the small lines to get new equipment, and it will prevent any of the biggest United States carriers from gaining an even greater advantage over their smaller and subsidy-free competitors.

Much has properly been said about the need of the subsidized airlines for adequate credit for their reequipment program. That is just as true for the unsubsidized as for the subsidized. If airlines that now receive a Government subsidy to guarantee them 8 percent return on their capital investment do not have a good credit background I do not know who does. I wish Uncle Sam would guarantee me 8 percent return on whatever business enterprise I might undertake.

I hope the Members will accept this amendment because this amendment will do what the bill was intended to do—help the small feeder lines.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I could not accept this amendment. It is just as necessary for the international carriers and the large carriers to be safe as it is for the feeder line carriers.

Mr. JUDD. When the gentleman goes home to Arkansas, what line does he ordinarily ride?

Mr. HARRIS. I ride the American Airlines.

Mr. JUDD. Is that a subsidized line? You seem to suggest that it is only safe to ride subsidized lines; or rather, that they must be subsidized if they are to have good, safe equipment.

Mr. HARRIS. American Airlines was developed on a subsidy.

Mr. JUDD. American, United, Eastern, TWA, Northwest, all of these lines are safe. They buy new equipment also, but they are not on subsidy.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman will admit, however, in selling any equipment of the Ameican Airlines and others that he mentioned, the capital gains that they receive from the sale of that equipment can be applied to the purchase of new equipment?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly it can.

Mr. HARRIS. It can also be applied to pay dividends to stockholders?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. That is one of the inducements to get off subsidy.

Mr. HARRIS. Then why penalize a carrier that is on subsidy?

Mr. JUDD. If you allow it to keep what it gets in the way of profits from selling depreciated equipment, and its full subsidy besides, you are rewarding it. Furthermore, it can use its capital gains to buy new equipment and turn around and pay dividends to its stockholders out of its operating revenues. It could pay not 8 percent but 10 or 12 percent under this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. JUDD. It could.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is in error because the Board determines what the percentage of return is and fixes what it shall be. The gentleman knows there has not been 8 percent made by any of these airlines.

Mr. JUDD. But they could exceed that under the bill. However, I do not want to get diverted from the main point. If you are interested in the smaller airlines you will accept this amendment.

It was said in either the letter or the telegram just read that not all of this aid would go to one big airline. No, not all; but more than 80 percent would go to one airline.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUIGLEY. I am in full accord with the gentleman's position and I urge adoption of his amendment. This amendment would make a good valuable bill out of the legislation before us.

Mr. JUDD. This would also remove from it any shadow of suspicion and end the rumors that some have talked about hearing.

Mr. QUIGLEY. This will give help where the help is needed.

Mr. JUDD. And it will not put an extra burden on the American taxpayers to pay an additional subsidy to our largest airline.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman's amendment would say that all nonsubsidized air carriers and all subsidized air carriers except one would be permitted to have this?

Mr. JUDD. It would say that the little carriers that people have been bleeding about all afternoon are the ones that would get this special assistance.

Mr. HARRIS. Who would profit from this?

Mr. JUDD. There would be only one that would not profit? What is its gross revenue? Over $200 million a year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I have the very highest regard for him. I feel as he stated he feels that subsidies should be eliminated and I wish they could be eliminated from all airlines including the airline to which he referred. I want to say that the amendment which the gentleman has offered not only has no legitimate and valid basis but it violates the principle of equal treatment of all citizens which has been embedded in the Constitution and laws of our country.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Will not the gentleman agree with me that this amendment is not only discriminatory, it is arbitrary? Would not the gentleman also agree with me that perhaps this would punish a company that started out small and got big, then you attempt to punish and discriminate against that company for doing that? It is fundamentally against free enterprise if you get right back to the basic objective of the amendment.

Mr. FLYNT. The gentleman from Connecticut is eminently correct. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is punitive and discriminatory in its nature.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering here legislation dealing with the appropriate treatment of capital gains on the sale of flight equipment by the subsidized air carriers. The principles embodied in this bill are either right or they are wrong. The committee thinks they are right and I join with the committee in that opinion. I can understand some of the arguments to the contrary, but I cannot understand the arguments advanced by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I cannot agree with him. What I cannot understand is how anyone can maintain that the principles embodied in this bill are right for an airline with gross revenues of $49 million but wrong for one with $50 million.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There are no airlines in the range of $50 million gross revenues, except one, that are on subsidy and thus affected by this bill. The others that will be helped by this bill run from about $20 million down to $2 million plus one line that has over $200 million revenue a year. If what the gentleman says is correct, then our whole graduated income-tax system is discriminatory and punitive because it certainly discriminates between taxpayers who earn $2,000 a year and those who get $200,000 a year.

Mr. FLYNT. But all taxpayers in the same category and the same bracket pay the same taxes, and are covered by the same laws and the same regulations.

Mr. JUDD. That is what I want to do with airlines.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, all the airlines in the same category get the same treatment.

Mr. FLYNT. Under the bill as drawn, they will. Under this, they will not.

Let us examine this amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. In plain language it means simply this, that there may or may not be only one company covered by the amendment at this time, but the amendment might as well say that this bill shall apply to all subsidized airlines as well as Pan American. That would be clearly unconstitutional clearly discriminatory, and clearly punitive.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Would it not also, in your opinion, say to the people, if we are going to discriminate, we are also going to attempt to penalize the big companies and also attempt, by the provisions of this particular amendment, to keep the small companies smaller? No incentive would be given to the small companies to advance.

Mr. FLYNT. The gentleman from Indiana is exactly correct. And, I want to say that discrimination of the kind advanced by the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely indefensible. It is true that Pan American, the company to which the gentleman referred, is now a large company, but it did not start that way. It started in 1927 with a dozen or so World War I pilots each putting up a small amount of capital. They have gotten to where they are because of initiative, hard work, and perseverance under the free enterprise system in America, and I want every one of the airlines to have the same opportunity Pan American had when they started.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman is making a fine statement. These 12 pilots put up $25,000 apiece to start Pan American. They were far-sighted, courageous, and they were real Americans, with the free enterprise system behind them. And, you cannot vote for an amendment of this kind to punish them for doing just that.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman is making a fine argument for opposing the bill, because he says we should not have discrimination on the basis of income; yet this whole bill discriminates between those who allegedly have to have subsidy and those that are self-supporting. It is discrimination on the basis of income. Why should not a company succeed with so much Government help?

Mr. FLYNT. I think the success of any group under the free enterprise system depends upon the stamina and the hard work and the efforts they put into it. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am on this committee, and I have listened to this debate for well onto 2 hours with a great deal of interest. I think it is unfortunate that the membership should get to this situation where you are in a fight on the floor of this House between two airlines.

Now, I know the gentleman from Minnesota in coming forward with this particular amendment is doing so because he is naturally favoring Northwest Airlines, which is in his own area, Minneapolis-St. Paul. And, I think we might as well say that, and I think the gentleman will probably admit that that is true.

The gentleman from Minnesota is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and he ought to know that if there is anything that this country has to have it is an airline that circles the globe. I believe that we are the only country that has such an airline, and we need it very badly in our foreign relations. He will recall how disturbing the situation developed about a year and a half ago when it became a question whether India was going to let us continue to have bases there to keep this line around the world. It is true, if China had not gone Communist, Northwest would have acted and probably would have gone around the same route now as Pan American.

Let us put this up as a practical matter. If all Pan American had to do was to fly from the United States to Europe, it would be a profitable proposition, but they are flying in the Near East, in the Far East, in the most unprofitable places where practically all the profits that they make on their European operations are lost in the unprofitable areas. The result of it is that they have to have a subsidy. Northwest Airlines, for which the gentleman from Minnesota is speaking, has profitable domestic business with which to make money, and it has one of the most profitable overseas airlines in going through the northwest to Alaska and then to Japan. But that is as far as it goes, to Hong Kong. That is a profitable area to operate in. If it were to take in all the unprofitable areas which

Pan American has to do, then I say it would also be on subsidy.

The reason I have brought this out on the floor of the House is that I think the Members of the House ought to be acquainted with what the issue is on this amendment. I have not said anything about what I am going to do on this bill yet, but I do think that the Members ought to know what the issue is that is being brought up through this particular amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has brought up Northwest Airlines. Northwest has the north Pacific route to the Orient and carries about one-fourth of the traffic across the Pacific. The lush central Pacific route to the Far East through Hawaii is Pan American's exclusively. It carries three-fourths of the traffic. It earns on that route alone almost three times as much as Northwest does on all its international operations. I do not believe anyone need feel sorry for Pan American. Furthermore, Northwest buys its own equipment. It is off subsidy. Pan American is not.

Mr. SPRINGER. If Northwest flew the routes in the nonprofitable areas that Pan American has, it would be on subsidy, too. The gentleman knows that and every member of the committee knows it.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Would it not be consistent to vote against the bill and the principle involved in the bill rather than offer this kind of an amendment?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am impressed with the argument that the gentleman is making now. I am also impressed with the fact that the gentleman said he does not know what he is going to do on this bill. I should like to ask him as one who sat with the committee during the hearings, and has sat with us through this afternoon, whether there is any great urgency in the matter of passing this bill at this time, in this session?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I shall answer the gentleman as frankly as I can. I have flown, or I did fly one of these small routes in my particular area. If any of the Members have flown them recently, they have seen the equipment that they have. It is pretty bad. I assume it is safe or the CAA would not approve it. But I will say that it is bad.

Whether this is the solution or not, I am not going to say. But I do say that these airlines that I am talking about, particularly the small ones, are going to have to find some way with which to finance new equipment if they are going to have planes that are in good condition, instead of these old DC–3's.

I am not saying that this is the solution. But I am saying that it is a solution which the committee has offered, and the decision whether you want these small airlines to keep flying this old equipment for the present is one that you are going to have to make today.

Mr. BOLAND. Can the gentleman tell me about the orders that the small airlines are now putting in for jet engines or turbo-prop engines?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes additional.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had enough debate on this. I think we ought to be permitted to vote, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request and let us proceed.

Mr. SPRINGER. I should like to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentle lady will yield for the purpose of the unanimous consent request, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, following the remarks of the lady from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise here to talk on the intricacies of this bill. Several hours ago, as it seems to me, we had a vote on the rule. Because of the fact that it is getting late in the session and I really knew so little about this bill I voted "no" on that rule which did not indicate whether I approved the pending measure or not. But now that the gentleman's amendment was offered excluding only one airline, it has brought about a bad situation, it seems to me.

I have the highest regard for the gentleman who offered that amendment, but I cannot let this moment go by without rising to defend the committee that is presenting this bill to us. Without meaning to do it, I am sure, but certainly it struck me that that is exactly what has been done, the gentleman impugned the motives and the honesty of almost the entire membership of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BLITCH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am distressed beyond words that the gentlewoman should have received any such impression, because I had no such thought or intention. Members of the committee with whom I have debated this afternoon are among my best and most respected friends in this House. When I disagree with any person on a matter like this, it is not in the slightest degree to suggest that they are not working for just as worthy and sincere objectives, and with just as honest motives as I hope they credit me with having.

Mrs. BLITCH. I know the gentleman really did not mean that.

Mr. JUDD. I did not have the slightest idea that any such impression was given, but if it was given, I disavow it.

Mrs. BLITCH. I am glad to hear that. I knew the gentleman would.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8902) to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 602, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further proceedings on this bill be temporarily dispensed with in order to permit the House to take up some other matters.

Mr. HESELTON. I must object, Mr. Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Florida and Georgia, being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; and

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of House Joint Resolution 511.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3021. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of

the House to the bill (S. 3732) entitled "An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. BUSH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7619) entitled "An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3386) entitled "An act to amend the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt', approved July 28, 1955."

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2941)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 27, 38, 48, 60, 61, 84, and 90.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 34, 36, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50, 55, 63, 66, 68, 69, 71, 75, 76, 80, 81, 83, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94 and 95, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Sanitary engineering activities: For an additional amount for 'Sanitary engineering activities', for carrying out the purposes of the Act of July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), not otherwise provided for, $3,000,000, including $1,800,000 for grants to States and $200,000 for grants to interstate agencies."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,120,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $200,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 30, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, 86, and 96.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to amendment No. 84),
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
T. MILLET HAND,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $150,000 for the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Foreign operations

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

Independent offices

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $2,500,000 for "Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service," instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, and 23: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Interior and related agencies

Amendments Nos. 24, 25, and 26: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Deletes language proposed by the Senate appropriating $35 million for acquisition of strategic minerals.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 28: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $250,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 31: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $1,060,000 for construction instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee has denied the sum of $190,000 for employee housing at the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 34: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Related Agencies

Amendment No. 36: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38: Deletes Senate language appropriating $10,000 for the National Memorial Stadium Commission.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Labor

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $300,000 to the Office of the Solicitor to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes Senate language appropriating $350,000 for Grants in education of the mentally retarded.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $2,050,000 for Grants for library services instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $34,050,000 for Payments to school districts as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 54: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 55: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $3,000,000 for sanitary engineering activities instead of $4,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee agrees that $250,000 of the amount appropriated shall be available for enforcement activities.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 60 and 61: Deletes heading and Senate language appropriating $150,000 for the Foreign Quarantine Service.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $200,000 for construction of dental research building as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 64 and 65: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates $300,000 for general office building, National Institutes of Health, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Public works

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $1,740,400,000 for operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,780,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 72, 73, and 74: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 75: Deletes title number as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $12,750,000 for construction and rehabilitation Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conference committees are in agreement that available unobligated balances may be used for implementing loan contracts for the construction of irrigation facilities with the Terra Bella and Madera irrigation districts.

Amendments Nos. 77 and 78: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Defense—civil functions

Amendment No. 79: Appropriates $2,120,000 for construction, general, rivers and harbors and flood control instead of $2,520,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee agrees to the language of the Senate report with respect to Sheridan, Wyo. Funds for the St. Anthony's Falls lock and dam, Minnesota, are disallowed.

CHAPTER VIII

Department of State

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $30,000 for missions to international organizations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Deletes Senate language making not to exceed $3,500,000 of foreign currencies available for educational, scientific, and cultural purposes.

Amendment No. 85: Reported in disagreement.

Related Agencies

Amendment No. 86: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IX

Treasury Department

Amendments Nos. 87 and 88: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Narcotics, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90: Deletes Senate language appropriating $6,000,000 for the construction of three patrol vessels for the Coast Guard.

The committee of conference believes that there is a grave danger to personnel and equipment in the shrimp industry in Gulf of Mexico waters from recent aggravations in those operations. Therefore, the committee directs that the Coast Guard increase the vigilance of its surveillance in the troublesome areas by maintaining at all times a minimum of two vessels on active duty. If this is done, the committee is hopeful that in time operations will again be conducted on a safer and calmer basis.

The conferees of House and Senate direct the Coast Guard to operate at least two vessels in the area involved, until the matters in disagreement are settled. The State Department is also directed to work toward settlement. New vessels are not needed, therefore no funds are allowed.

CHAPTER X

District of Columbia

Amendments Nos. 91 and 92: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates $10,000 for Settlement of claims and suits as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that the sum appropriated in amendment number 93 shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

Legislative branch

House of Representatives

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates $50,000 for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XII

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendment No. 96: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to amendment No. 84),
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
T. MILLET HAND,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12350) and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is an agreement between the managers on the part of the House and the Senate. We bring back 42 amendments in technical disagreement. On 25 of them I will move to recede and concur. We will bring them up seriatim.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the same one we had up the day before yesterday. The other body has added a very considerable amount to it, largely items which were submitted to the other body with budget estimates after we had gotten to the point where we could go no farther with the budget estimate and bring a report in. The conference report involves about $2,161,629,438 which is approximately $200 million above what it was when it left the House. I think the conference report is probably as good as we could get with everything considered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees on the pending second supplemental appropriation bill, I did not concur in the action of the conference with regard to amendment numbered 84, an item of $3½ million in Israeli pounds under the title Department of State education, scientific and cultural activities. These Israeli pounds, now lying in Israeli banks doing nothing, accumulated as the result of a book program under the economic cooperation act. The deserving purposes contemplated in the expenditure of these $3½ million of Israeli currency are many and varied; adoption of the Senate language would most certainly strengthen our American point of view and ideals all through that troubled part of the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 2, line 3, insert:

"FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $1,400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11544, 84th Congress, or similar legislation amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: On page 2, line 4, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the General Counsel,' $85,000: *Provided*, That

this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11544, 84th Congress, or similar legislation amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$45,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: On page 3, line 6, insert:

"Operation and regulation: For an additional amount for 'Operation and regulation,' $13,968,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for hire of aircraft is increased from '$370,000' to '$570,000.' "

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$13,968,000" named in said amendment insert "$10,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 3, line 12, insert:

"Establishment of air navigation facilities: For an additional amount for 'Establishment of air navigation facilities,' $54,075,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$35,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 3, line 15, insert:

"Maritime activities

"Ship construction: For an additional amount for 'Ship construction' for design, construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation of a nuclear-powered merchant ship, $22,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount which may be transferred to 'Salaries and expenses,' for administrative and warehouse expenses for the current fiscal year, is increased from '$1,115,000' to '$1,315,000': *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6243, Eighty-fourth Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$22,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$18,000,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$1,315,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,215,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 4, line 6, insert:

"Reimbursement to District of Columbia

"For reimbursement to the Highway Fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, $665,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"Reimbursement to District of Columbia

"For reimbursement to the Highway Fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, $200,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 4, line 12, insert:

"Bureau of Public Roads

"Federal-aid highways (Trust Fund): For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $1,150,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund; which sum is composed of $186,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, $875,000,000, the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, $85,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957, and $30,401, $14,097, $1,034,766, and $985,204, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 8, 1938, section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943, and section 9 of the act approved September 7, 1950, as amended (23 U. S. C. 13a, and 13b), and section 7 of the act approved June 25, 1952, and $935,532 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across dams in accordance with the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709): *Provided*, That at such time, but no later than June 30, 1957, as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the amounts available and estimated to become available in the Highway Trust Fund during the fiscal year 1957 are sufficient for carrying out, on a current basis, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, this appropriation shall reimburse the appropriations for 'Federal-aid highways' for all expenditures subsequent to June 30, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Federal-aid highways (Trust Fund): For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1956, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $800,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund; which sum is composed of $186,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, $610,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, and $30,401, $14,097, $1,034,766, and $985,204, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 8, 1938, section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943, and section 9 of the act approved September 7, 1950, as amended (23 U. S. C. 13a, and 13b), and section 7 of the act approved June 25, 1952, and $935,532 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across dams in accordance with the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709): *Provided*, That at such time, but no later than June 30, 1957, as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the amounts available and estimated to become available in the Highway Trust Fund during the fiscal year 1957 are sufficient for carrying out, on a current basis, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, this appropriation shall reimburse the appropriations for "Federal-aid highways" for all expenditures subsequent to June 30, 1956."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are 25 amendments on which the House, in my judgment, should recede and concur. They are merely technical disagreements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments which are in technical disagreement, and on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur, as follows: Nos. 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement, as indicated.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 6, line 1, insert:

"Federal-aid highways

"Reduction in appropriations: The appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, and the unexpended balances as of June 30, 1956, of appropriations granted under this head for prior fiscal years are rescinded effective June 30, 1957, or such earlier date as all expenditures from such appropriations made after June 30, 1956, have been reimbursed by appropriations from the highway trust fund: *Provided*, That the sums rescinded shall revert to the general fund."

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"Payment to Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians

"For payments, as authorized by law, to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians, in settlement of their claims for damages resulting from the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, $437,500, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 10, line 11, insert:

"Fisheries loan fund

"For initial capital for the fisheries loan fund, for financing and refinancing of operations, maintenance, replacement, repair, and equipment of fishing gear and vessels; and for research into the basic problems of fisheries, as authorized by law, $10,000,000, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3275, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 10, line 21, insert:

"FOREST SERVICES

"Acquisition of lands for Cache National Forest

"For the acquisition of lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest, Utah, $50,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 11, line 21, insert:

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for 'Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission,' $163,400, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3386, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 40; page 12, line 3, insert:

"BOOKER T. WASHINGTON CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For necessary expenses of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission to carry out the year-long celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington and to promote the spirit of interracial goodwill, and revive interest in the practical policies, programs, principles, and philosophies of Booker T. Washington, $225,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 12, line 18, insert:

"BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

"Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed $47,000 may be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906), for the purposes of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1957."

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 13, line 4, insert:

"Promotion and further development of vocational education: For an additional amount for 'Promotion and further development of vocational education' for grants to States for extension and improvement of practical nurse training, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 13, line 24, insert:

"Assistance for school construction: For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title III and title IV of the act of September 23, 1950, as amended, including payments upon applications filed on or before June 30, 1956, and not to exceed $500,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies and not to exceed $15,000,000 for title IV, $108,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 15, line 3, insert:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"For an additional amount for 'Grants to States and other agencies', $1,000,000, for grants for special projects under section 4 (a) (2): *Provided*, That not more than $2 of these funds shall be expended for any project for each $1 that the grantee, or the grantee and the State, expends for the same purpose: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3875, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 15, line 13, insert:

"Assistance to States, general: For an additional amount for 'Assistance to States, general', including $1,000,000 for grants for graduate training of professional public health personnel, pursuant to the provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, $1,040,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 16, line 5, insert:

"Hospitals and medical care: For an additional amount for 'Hospitals and medical care,' including $2,000,000 for grants for advanced training of professional nurses, pursuant to the provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, $2,050,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 16, line 15, insert:

"Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health: For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health', $200,000, for administration of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 849, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 17, line 4, insert:

"Grants for construction of health research facilities: For grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, $30,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 849, Eighty-fourth Congress."

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 17, line 9, insert:

"Construction of animal quarters: For construction of facilities for housing animals for the National Institute of Health including preparations of plans, equipment, and the temporary diversion of such facilities for office space, $1,371,000."

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 17, line 17, insert:

"Construction of library facilities: For the preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings for the National Library of Medicine, $350,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3430, Eighty-fourth Congress."

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 18, line 7, insert "including the employment of aliens;".

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 18, line 23; insert "together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1956, of prior year appropriations made available under this head to the Atomic Energy Commission, and, in addition, any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U. S. C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 484: *Provided*, That of such amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum."

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 20, line 8, insert: "to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1956, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for 'Plant and equipment', for the activity 'Equipment not included in construction projects', shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for 'Operating expenses', and the remaining balance of such appropriations shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That, in the event additional feed materials capacity is constructed by private industry with its own funds, the amounts included in this appropriation for such construction may be transferred to the appropriation for 'Operating expenses'."

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 21, line 22, insert:

"General provisions

"Any appropriation available under this or any other act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this act during the fiscal year 1957 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

"Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation herein made to the Atomic Energy Commission may be transferred to any

other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

"No part of any appropriation herein made to the Atomic Energy Commission shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 22, line 23, insert: "of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Alamogordo Dam, Carlsbad project, New Mexico; and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Dickinson unit, North Dakota, Missouri River Basin project."

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 23, line 7, insert:

"Administrative provisions

"The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to participate in the construction of the bridge required in the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, Arizona, Colorado River storage project; and may transfer for this purpose to the Secretary of the Interior funds available for the construction of public lands highways: *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall not exceed the cost of placing such bridge upon and across the dam under the provisions of the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709; 21 U. S. C. 64–70)."

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 24, line 3, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE

"Contributions to international organizations

"Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1957 shall be available for contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, as authorized by the act of July 11, 1956 (Public Law 689), in an amount not to exceed $6,000."

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 24, line 21, insert:

"Cleveland Pan American Games

"For necessary expenses of the III Pan American Games, 1959, $100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the III Pan American Games Act of 1956 (S. J. Res. 186, 84th Cong.) or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 26, line 20, insert:

"CHAPTER XII

"Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 143, 84th Congress, $1,312,538, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. TABER (interrupting the reading of the amendments). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: page 6, line 12:

"CHAPTER III

"Foreign operations"

"Export-Import Bank of Washington

Not to exceed $4,000 of the funds previously made available for Administrative Expenses of the bank shall be available for the purchase of one motor vehicle for replacement only.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 6, line 21; insert:

"PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, $50,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 4228, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$20,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 7, line 9, insert:

"FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Federal Flood Insurance Administration, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; $500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (S. 3732, 84th Cong.), or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FLOOD INSURANCE

"For expenses necessary to carry out the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work under this appropriation; $500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (S. 3732, 84th Cong.)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement:

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 7, line 20, insert:

"PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"Administration expenses: For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses', $750,000 and the limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration is increased from '$12,475,000' to '$13,225,000' and the limitation thereunder on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from '$950,000' to '$1,010,000': *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of legislation authorizing the Administration to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$750,000" named in said amendment insert "$200,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$13,225,000" named in said amendment insert "$12,675,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$1,010,000" named in said amendment insert "$980,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 8, line 10, insert:

"FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

"The limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on administrative expenses of the Association is increased from '$3,775,000' to '$4,275,000', and the limitation thereunder on expenses of travel is increased from '$150,000' to '$200,000': *Provided*, That $200,000 of the foregoing increase in administrative expenses shall be available only upon the enactment into law of the amendments to subsection 303 (b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, contained in S. 3855, 84th Congress, with respect to nonrefundable capital contributions by mortgage sellers, or legislation of similar effect."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: in lieu of the sum of "$4,275,000" named in said amendment insert "$4,025,000"; and in lieu of the first sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment insert "$175,000"; and in lieu of the second sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment insert "$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: On page 11, line 2, insert:

"ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for 'Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission,' $55,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton', approved August 20, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $25,000, in addition to the sum of $175,000 heretofore authorized to be appropriated, as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.' "

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$55,000" named in said amendment insert "$40,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: On page 14, line 14, insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $290,000: *Provided*, That of this amount (a) $85,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, (b) $45,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 11549 or S. 3958, 84th Congress, and (c) $20,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11253 or S. 3620, 84th Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $270,000: *Provided*, That of this amount (a) $85,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, and (b) $45,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 11549 or S. 3958, 84th Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: On page 14, line 23, insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, $300,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$150,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: On page 15, line 20, insert: "Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 86: On page 25, line 4, insert:

"RELATED AGENCIES

"Funds appropriated to the President

"President's Special International Program

"For an additional amount for the 'President's Special International Program,' for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, $5 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3116, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 86, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$4 million."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the House has agreed to the Senate amendment providing for $200,000 for additional narcotics agents needed to intensify and fortify the campaign to cut down drug addiction in our country and help foreign police ferret out and jail those who develop and smuggle in illicit drugs.

Had the Treasury Department come to the House subcommittee with a request of this nature, I am certain the item would have been incorporated in the House bill. I am both surprised and distressed that the Treasury did not do so because it is represented in the Interdepartmental Committee which recommended additional agents last February. Since then the House Ways and Means Committee, following an exhaustive study, has called for such action.

When I addressed the House on February 7 last, I pointed out the need for more men in the Bureau which has begun to suffer some attrition in agents due to extra funds needed for special investigations. I referred to the findings of both House and Senate committees and I expressed the hope two things would soon come to pass, first that the Congress would enact into law a bill providing more severe penalties and improved enforcement procedures and secondly, the number of enforcement agents would be increased substantially. When the President signs this second supplemental bill both will have been accomplished.

The narcotics situation in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Texas, needs immediate attention. I want no dope peddlers plying their nefarious trade in my home area of North Jersey, close to New York, and I want to see reinforced Federal strength in this area. I want also to see the little group sent to Europe and the Far East bolstered and helped in their mission to get at the source of supply.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this conference report may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD

and to include certain tabulated statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FALLON, DAVIS of Tennessee, BLATNIK, JONES of Alabama, DONDERO, and MACK of Washington.

PROVIDING INSURANCE AGAINST FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

REINVESTMENT BY AIR CARRIERS OF NET GAINS FROM THE SALE OR OTHER DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HESELTON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HESELTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HESELTON) there were—ayes 93, noes 88.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 153, answered "present" 1, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—196

Abernethy	Flood	Morgan
Addonizio	Forand	Moss
Albert	Ford	Moulder
Alger	Fountain	Multer
Andersen, H. Carl	Frazier	Mumma
Andresen, August H.	Frelinghuysen	Murray, Tenn.
Ashley	Garmatz	Natcher
Ashmore	Gary	Nicholson
Aspinall	Gathings	Norblad
Auchincloss	Gentry	O'Brien, Ill.
Avery	Gray	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Green, Oreg.	O'Konski
Baldwin	Green, Pa.	Ostertag
Barrett	Gregory	Perkins
Bass, N. H.	Griffiths	Pfost
Bates	Gross	Philbin
Becker	Gubser	Phillips
Bentley	Hagen	Pilcher
Betts	Hardy	Pillion
Boggs	Harrison, Nebr.	Poage
Boland	Harrison, Va.	Poff
Bolling	Hays, Ohio	Price
Bolton, Frances P.	Hayworth	Prouty
Bolton, Oliver P.	Henderson	Quigley
Bosch	Heselton	Rabaut
Boyle	Hiestand	Ray
Bray	Hoeven	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Brown, Ohio	Holifield	Robeson, Va.
Budge	Holland	Rodino
Burnside	Holmes	Roosevelt
Byrd	Holt	St. George
Byrne, Pa.	Holtzman	Saylor
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Sheppard
Canfield	Jenkins	Sikes
Cannon	Jennings	Simpson, Ill.
Cederberg	Johnson, Wis.	Sisk
Chelf	Jonas	Smith, Miss.
Chudoff	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Church	Judd	Sullivan
Clark	Karsten	Taber
Cooley	Kean	Talle
Coon	Keating	Thomas
Cooper	Knox	Thompson, N. J.
Cramer	Knutson	Tollefson
Curtis, Mass.	Laird	Tumulty
Curtis, Mo.	Landrum	Udall
Davidson	Lanham	Utt
Davis, Tenn.	Latham	Vanik
Dawson, Utah	LeCompte	Van Pelt
Delaney	Lesinski	Vorys
Denton	Lipscomb	Walter
Dingell	McCarthy	Watts
Donovan	McDonough	Weaver
Dorn, N. Y.	McDowell	Wharton
Doyle	McVey	Whitten
Edmondson	Macdonald	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. J.
Engle	Madden	Willis
Evins	Magnuson	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Matthews	Winstead
Fino	Metcalf	Wolcott
Fjare	Miller, Calif.	Wright
	Miller, Nebr.	Yates
	Miller, N. Y.	Zablocki
	Minshall	Zelenko
	Mollohan	

NAYS—153

Alexander	Cunningham	Gavin
Allen, Calif.	Dague	George
Allen, Ill.	Davis, Ga.	Grant
Andrews	Dempsey	Gwinn
Arends	Derounian	Hale
Beamer	Devereux	Haley
Belcher	Dixon	Halleck
Bennett, Fla.	Dodd	Harden
Bennett, Mich.	Dollinger	Harris
Berry	Dolliver	Harvey
Blatnik	Dondero	Hays, Ark.
Blitch	Donohue	Healey
Bonner	Dorn, S. C.	Herlong
Bow	Durham	Hill
Broyhill	Elliott	Hillings
Bush	Fallon	Hinshaw
Carlyle	Fascell	Horan
Carrigg	Fenton	Huddleston
Chenoweth	Fernandez	Hyde
Cole	Fisher	Ikard
Colmer	Flynt	Jackson
Corbett	Fogarty	Jarman
Coudert	Friedel	Johnson, Calif.
Cretella	Fulton	Jones, Ala.
Crumpacker	Gamble	Jones, N. C.
Kearns	Norrell	Selden
Keogh	O'Brien, N. Y.	Short
Kilburn	O'Neill	Shuford
Kilday	Osmers	Sieminski
Kilgore	Patterson	Simpson, Pa.
King, Calif.	Pelly	Springer
Klein	Polk	Staggers
Krueger	Radwan	Steed
Lankford	Rains	Teague, Calif.
Lovre	Reece, Tenn.	Teague, Tex.
McConnell	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, Tex.
McCulloch	Reuss	Thomson, Wyo.
McGregor	Roberts	Trimble
McIntire	Robsion, Ky.	Van Zandt
Machrowicz	Rogers, Colo.	Velde
Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.	Wainwright
Mahon	Rogers, Mass.	Westland
Mailliard	Rogers, Tex.	Widnall
Marshall	Rooney	Wier
Martin	Sadlak	Williams, Miss.
Meader	Schenck	Williams, N. Y.
Merrow	Scherer	Wilson, Calif.
Miller, Md.	Schwengel	Withrow
Mills	Scott	Wolverton
Morano	Scrivner	Young
Murray, Ill.	Seely-Brown	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hand

NOT VOTING—83

Abbitt	Diggs	Passman
Adair	Dowdy	Patman
Anfuso	Eberharter	Powell
Bailey	Forrester	Preston
Baker	Gordon	Priest
Barden	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Bass, Tenn.	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baumhart	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Bell	Hope	Riley
Bowler	Hosmer	Rivers
Boykin	James	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Scudder
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Sheehan
Brownson	Kearney	Shelley
Buckley	Kee	Siler
Burdick	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Burleson	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Carnahan	King, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Celler	Kirwan	Taylor
Chase	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Chatham	Lane	Thompson, Mich.
Chiperfield	Long	Thornberry
Christopher	McCormack	Tuck
Clevenger	McMillan	Vinson
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Morrison	Wickersham
Deane	Nelson	
Dies	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Hess against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Tuck with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Bell with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Rutherford with Mrs. Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Chase.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hope.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. James.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Brownson.

Mrs. BLITCH and Messrs. FERNANDEZ, BONNER, and WILSON of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MATTHEWS and WATTS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 12270) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 33, line 10, strike out "$37,760,000" and insert "$21,510,000."

Page 71, line 1, strike out "419" and insert "420."

Page 71, line 24, strike out "420" and insert "421."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Then Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, accepting the Senate amendments to this bill involves two matters. First, the deletion of authorization of the four Talos sites. This is a matter, of course, which can be reconsidered next year in the light of the development of these missiles at that time.

The second Senate amendment relates to keeping the Congress and the Armed Services Committees aware of the proposed construction of family housing for all the military services. It will be noted that the language inserted by the Senate requires the submission of detailed information.

Section 2 (a) of the amendment requires that a 180-day period elapse from the submission of the report before action can be taken to enter into a contract for housing. This requirement is very importantly limited, however, in subsection (b) of section 2, in that the committees may advise the Secretary of Defense at any time within the 180-day period that they—the committees—have "no further questions to be asked concerning the project."

It will be possible for the respective committees to take prompt action, and, I would assume, in most instances in much less than 180 days.

The language will also permit action while the Congress is not in session, although I am sure it will be the intention of the House Committee at least to have the departments furnish their plans for family housing in such timely fashion as will permit full committee deliberations. This will not be difficult, and will merely require good planning on the part of the military departments.

FISHERIES ACT OF 1956

Mr. BONNER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2942)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the fish, shellfish, and wildlife resources of the Nation make a material contribution to our national economy and food supply, as well as a material contribution to the health, recreation, and well-being of our citizens; that such resources are a living, renewable form of national wealth that is capable of being maintained and greatly increased with proper management, but equally capable of destruction if neglected or unwisely exploited; that such resources afford outdoor recreation throughout the Nation and provide employment, directly or indirectly, to a substantial number of citizens; that the fishing industries strengthen the defense of the United States through the provision of a trained seafaring citizenry and action-ready fleets of seaworthy vessels; that the training and sport afforded by fish and wildlife resources strengthen the national defense by contributing to the general health and physical fitness of millions of citizens; and that properly developed, such fish and wildlife resources are capable of steadily increasing these valuable contributions to the life of the Nation.

"The Congress further declares that the fishing industry, in its several branches, can prosper and thus fulfill its proper function in national life only if certain fundamental needs are satisfied by means that are consistent with the public interest and in accord with constitutional functions of governments. Among these needs are:

"(1) Freedom of Enterprise—freedom to develop new areas, methods, products, and markets in accordance with sound economic principles, as well as freedom from unnecessary administrative or legal restrictions that unreasonably conflict with or ignore economic needs;

"(2) Protection of Opportunity—maintenance of an economic atmosphere in which domestic production and processing can prosper; protection from subsidized competing products; protection of opportunity to fish on the high seas in accordance with international law;

"(3) Assistance—assistance consistent with that provided by the Government for industry generally, such as is involved in promoting good industrial relations, fair trade standards, harmonious labor relations, better health standards and sanitation; and including, but not limited to—

"(a) services to provide current information on production and trade, market promotion and development, and an extension service,

"(b) research services for economic and technologic development and resource conservation, and

"(c) resource management to assure the maximum sustainable production for the fisheries.

"The Congress further declares that the provisions of this Act are necessary in order to accomplish the objective of proper resource development, and that this Act shall be administered with due regard to the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure, enjoyment, and betterment, and with the intent of maintaining and increasing the public opportunities for recreational use of our fish and wildlife resources, and stimulating the development of a strong, prosperous, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry.

"REORGANIZATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, and the position of Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife. Such Assistant Secretary shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the same rate as other Assistant Secretaries. The Commissioner shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall receive compensation at the same rate as that provided for Grade GS 18. There is also established a United States Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department, consisting of two separate agencies, each of which shall have the status of a Federal bureau. There shall be a Director of each of said Bureaus appointed by the Secretary at Grades GS 17 each. One of the agencies shall be known as the "Bureau of Commercial Fisheries" and the other agency shall be known as the "Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife." The United States Fish and Wildlife Service, except as prescribed by this Act, shall succeed to and replace the presently existing Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department.

"(b) The functions of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service hereby established shall be administered under the supervision of the said Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, who shall be subject to the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

"(c) All functions and responsibilities placed in the Department of the Interior or any official thereof by this Act shall be included among the functions and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, as the head of the Department, and shall be carried out under his direction pursuant to such procedures or delegation of authority as he may deem advisable and in the public interest.

"(d) In order to make a proper distribution between the two Bureaus of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service established by this Act, the previously existing functions, powers, duties, authority, liabilities, commitments, personnel, records, and other properties or matters previously handled by or administered through the former Fish and

Wildlife Service of the Department, shall be distributed as follows:

"(1) The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries shall be responsible for those matters to which this Act applies relating primarily to commercial fisheries, whales, seals, sea-lions, and related matters;

"(2) The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall be responsible for those matters to which this Act applies relating primarily to migratory birds, game management, wildlife refuges, sport fisheries, sea mammals (except whales, seals and sea-lions), and related matters; and the funds and allocations, appropriated or otherwise, relating to the matters covered by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be distributed between such Bureaus as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine.

"(e) Except as changed by the terms of this Act or by subsequent laws or regulations, all laws and regulations now in effect relating to matters heretofore administered by the Department of the Interior through the former Fish and Wildlife Service as heretofore existing, shall remain in effect.

"(f) In recognition of the need for authority to execute the purposes of this Act effectively, the Secretary of the Interior shall exercise such general administrative authority consistently with the terms of this Act as he shall find to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act effectively and in the public interest. In order to allow sufficient time to place the reorganizations under this Act into effect, the Secretary is authorized to establish an effective procedure and date of such reorganizations, notice of which shall be published in the Federal Register. Such reorganization shall be accomplished as soon as practicable after the approval of this Act, but not later than ninety (90) calendar days after such approval.

"LOAN PROCEDURES

"SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized under rules and regulations and under terms and conditions prescribed by him, to make loans for financing and refinancing of operations, maintenance, replacement, repair, and equipment of fishing gear and vessels, and for research into the basic problems of fisheries.

"(b) Any loans made under the provisions of this section shall be subject to the following restrictions:

"(1) Bear an interest rate of not less than 3 per centum per annum;

"(2) Mature in not more than ten years;

"(3) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this section unless reasonable financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

"(c) There is hereby created a fisheries loan fund, which shall be used by the Secretary as a revolving fund to make loans for financing and refinancing under this section. Any funds received by the Secretary on or before June 30, 1965, in payment of principal or interest on any loans so made, shall be deposited in the fund and be available for making additional loans under this section. Any funds so received after June 30, 1965, and any balance remaining in the fund at the close of June 30, 1965 (at which time the fund shall cease to exist), shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the fund the sum of $10,000,000 to provide initial capital.

"(d) The Secretary, subject to the specific limitations in this section, may consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal, or security, of any loan contract to which he is a party.

"INVESTIGATIONS, INFORMATION, REPORTS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall conduct continuing investigations, prepare and disseminate information, and make periodical reports to the public, to the President, and to Congress, with respect to the following matters:

"(1) The production and flow to market of fish and fishery products domestically produced, and also those produced by foreign producers which affect the domestic fisheries;

"(2) The availability and abundance and the biological requirements of the fish and wildlife resources;

"(3) The competitive economic position of the various fish and fishery products with respect to each other, and with respect to competitive domestic and foreign-produced commodities;

"(4) The collection and dissemination of statistics on commercial and sport fishing;

"(5) The collection and dissemination of statistics on the nature and availability of wildlife, progress in acquisition of addtional refuges and measures being taken to foster a coordinated program to encourage and develop wildlife values;

"(6) The improvement of production and marketing practices in regard to commercial species and the conduct of educational and extension services relative to commercial and sport fishing, and wildlife matters;

"(7) Any other matters which in the judgment of the Secretary are of public interest in connection with any phases of fish and wildlife operations.

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS—ASSISTANCE OF OTHER AGENCIES

"SEC. 6. (a) There shall be transferred to the Secretary all functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the head of any other department or agency, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to relate primarily to the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of commercial fisheries; but nothing in this section shall be construed to modify the authority of the Department of State or the Secretary of State to negotiate or enter into any international agreements, or conventions with respect to the development, management, or protection of any fisheries and wildlife resources or with respect to international commissions operating under conventions to which the United States is a party.

"(b) There shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior so much of the personnel, property, facilities, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be necessary in connection with the exercise of any functions transferred to the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The Secretary may request and secure the advice or assistance of any department or agency of the Government in carrying out the provisions of this Act, and any such department or agency which furnishes advice or assistance to the Secretary may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Secretary as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the department or agency.

"POLICIES, PROCEDURES, RECOMMENDATIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, with such advice and assistance as he may require from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, shall consider and determine the policies and procedures that are necessary and desirable in carrying out efficiently and in the public interest the laws relating to fish and wildlife. The Secretary, with the assistance of the departmental staff herein authorized, shall—

"(1) develop and recommend measures which are appropriate to assure the maximum sustainable production of fish and fishery products and to prevent unnecessary and excessive fluctuations in such production;

"(2) study the economic condition of the industry, and whenever he determines that any segment of the domestic fisheries has been seriously disturbed either by wide fluctuation in the abundance of the resource supporting it, or by unstable market or fishing conditions or due to any other factors he shall make such recommendations to the President and the Congress as he deems appropriate to aid in stabilizing the domestic fisheries;

"(3) develop and recommend special promotional and informational activities with a view to stimulating the consumption of fishery products whenever he determines that there is a prospective or actual surplus of such products;

"(4) take such steps as may be required for the development, advancement, management, conservation, and protection of the fisheries resources; and

"(5) take such steps as may be required for the development, management, advancement, conservation, and protection of wildlife resources through research, acquisition of refuge lands, development of existing facilities, and other means.

"STATE DEPARTMENT—COOPERATION

"SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary shall cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Secretary of State in providing representation at all meetings and conferences relating to fish and wildlife in which representatives of the United States and foreign countries participate. The Secretary of State shall designate the Secretary of the Interior or the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, or a person designated by the Secretary of the Interior to represent the Department of the Interior, as a member of the United States delegation attending such meetings and conferences and also as a member of the negotiating team of any such delegation.

"(b) The Secretary of State and all other officials having responsibilities in the fields of technical and economic aid to foreign nations shall consult with the Secretary in all cases in which the interests of fish and wildlife are involved—with a view to assuring that such interests are adequately represented at all times.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall be represented in all international negotiations conducted by the United States pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in any case in which fish products are directly affected by such negotiations.

"(d) The Secretary shall consult periodically with the various governmental, private nonprofit, and other organizations and agencies which have to do with any phase of fish and wildlife with respect to any problems that may arise in connection with such fish and wildlife.

"REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES AND IMPORTS

"SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to activities of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service under this Act, and shall make such recommendations for additional legislation as he deems necessary.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to make a report to the President and the Congress, and, when requested by the United States Tariff Commission in connection with section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (67 Stat. 72, 74), or when an investigation is made under the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U. S. C. 1332), the Secretary is authorized to make a report to such Commission, concerning the following matters with respect to any fishery product which is imported into the United States, or such reports may be made upon a request from any segment of the domestic industry

producing a like or directly competitive product:

"(1) whether there has been a downward trend in the production, employment in the production, or prices, or a decline in the sales, of the like or directly competitive product by the domestic industry; and

"(2) whether there has been an increase in the imports of the fishery products into the United States, either actual or relative to the production of the like or directly competitive product produced by the domestic industry.

"THE RIGHTS OF STATES

"SEC. 10. Nothing in this Act shall be construed (1) to interfere in any manner with the rights of any State under the Submerged Lands Act (Public Law 31, Eighty-third Congress) or otherwise provided by law, or to supersede any regulatory authority over fisheries exercised by the States either individually or under interstate compacts; or (2) to interfere in any manner with the authority exercised by any International Commission established under any treaty or convention to which the United States is a party.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 12. (a) The authorization for the transfer of certain funds from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior and their maintenance in a separate fund as contained in section 2 (a) of the Act of August 11, 1939, as amended July 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 376), shall be continued for the year ending June 30, 1957, and each year thereafter.

"(b) Subsection (e) of section 2 of the aforesaid Act of August 11, 1939, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) The separate fund created for the use of the Secretary of the Interior under section 2 (a) of this Act and the annual accruals thereto shall be available for each year hereafter until expended by the Secretary.'"

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "To establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
ALAN BIBLE,
JAMES H. DUFF,
FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

S. 3275 as passed by the Senate created a United States Fisheries Commission of five members, the Chairman of which would administer the Fisheries Division of the Department of the Interior in the capacity of an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The wildlife functions of the present Fish and Wildlife Service would be assigned to a new Wildlife Service.

Under the House amendments to the bill, there would be appointed an Assistant Secretary for Fisheries and Wildlife and a Commissioner of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, under whom would be a Bureau of Wildlife and a Bureau of Fisheries, each with a Director. The Secretary of the Interior could allocate overlapping functions of the two Bureaus to one or the other, and could establish a single division to handle functions common to both Bureaus. A revolving fund of $10 million was authorized for financing operations, maintenance, replacement, repair and equipment of fish gear and vessels and for fishery research and the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act was made permanent, and the ceiling on the amount available under its terms was removed.

The bill agreed upon is substantially as amended by the House. Jurisdiction of seals and sea lions has been allocated to the Commercial Fisheries Bureau and funds for the two Bureaus are to be distributed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The reference to wildlife in the section relating to transfer of functions of the Department of Agriculture in the House amendments has been deleted, since it is not the intention to disturb that Department's control of wildlife in the national forests. Also, there is no intention to affect the activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority in its fishery work. Likewise, the section referring to the Government Corporations Control Act in the sections setting up the revolving fund in the House amendments had been stricken as inappropriate to the other financing provisions.

While both the Senate bill and the House amendments, and consequently the bill agreed upon, provided that nothing in the bill should supersede any regulatory authority over fisheries exercised by the States, the managers are extremely concerned over the wasteful practices in taking fish to the extent that our fisheries resources are depleted. The States should take appropriate action to punish such occurrences.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
FRANK W. BOYKIN,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO SELL CERTAIN WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 685) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, and section 510 (h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to sell within 1 year after the enactment of this joint resolution, to a citizen of the United States, within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, for employment in the Pacific Coastwise domestic trade between points in continental United States, four C4–S–B2 vessels, to be designated by the Maritime Administrator on an as, where is, basis, provided that the Secretary of Commerce shall determine before entering into such sales that the purchaser possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable it to operate and maintain the vessel in service in the Pacific Coastwise domestic trade between points in continental United and to maintain adequate service in such trade. The sales prices of the vessels shall be their sales prices computed under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as of Jenuary 15, 1951, depreciated (after reduction for residual value) on a straight line basis for the period from January 15, 1951, to the date of execution of the contract of sale, on the basis of the promotion of a 20-year useful life of the vessels remaining after January 15, 1951.

(b) Each such sale shall be on the basis of the payment by the purchaser of not less than 25 percent of the vessel sale price at the time of execution of the vessel sales contract, with the balance payable in approximately equal annual installments over the remainder of the economic life of the vessel, which economic life is to be determined by the Maritime Administration, with interest on the portion of the vessel sales price remaining unpaid at the rate of 3½ percent per annum. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance, with interest, shall be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessels in form satisfactory to the Maritime Administrator.

(c) (1) Such sales shall be made upon condition and agreement that the purchaser recondition the vessels satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce in a domestic shipyard for use as container ships.

(2) Vessels sold under this act shall be employed exclusively as dry cargo common carriers in the Pacific Coastwise domestic trade between points in continental United States until the end of their useful lives, as determined under subsection (b) of this act, or until they are replaced by new tonnage, whichever happens first. These restrictions shall run at law and in equity with the titles to the vessels and are binding upon all subsequent owners.

(d) Any contract of sale executed under authority of this act shall provide that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition, acquire ownership of any such vessel, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the actual depreciated sales price under such contract (together with the actual depreciated cost of capital improvements thereon); that in computing the depreciated acquisition cost of such vessel, the depreciation shall be computed on the vessel on the schedule adopted or accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury for income-tax purposes as applicable to such vessels; that such vessel shall remain documented under the laws of the United States during the remainder of the economic life of the vessel or as long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the sales price, whichever is the longer period; and that the foregoing provisions respecting the requisition or the acquisition of ownership by the United States, and documentation shall run with the title to such vessel and be binding on all owners thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "to", insert "the highest responsible bidder who."

Page 2, line 9, strike "sales" and insert "upset."

Page 2, line 11, strike out "Jenuary" and insert "January."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "promotion" and insert "portion."

Page 3, line 7, strike out "container ships" and insert "lift-on-lift-off ships or roll-on-roll-off ships or other container-type designed primarily for the handling or carriage of consolidated cargo shipments."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Page 2, line 1, strike out "four C4–S–B2" and insert "any four war-built."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISHERIES ACT OF 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries, to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy, to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina tell us what the difference is between the House bill and the Senate bill as it comes to us from conference?

Mr. BONNER. The bill is substantially as passed by the House. The Senate wrote some new language, but I assure the House the language the Senate put in the bill is an expression of the House language in just another way. It took from Fish and Wildlife seals and put them over in commercial fisheries.

Mr. MILLER of California. Then, substantially the bill is the same?

Mr. BONNER. I assure the gentleman the bill is substantially the same, and lo and behold it meets the many objections of commercial and sport fishermen.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

PAPERWORK MANAGEMENT

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration have permission to file part I of its report on paperwork management, and that the committee also have permission to file other parts of this report with the Clerk of the House subsequent to sine die adjournment, for printing as House reports of the 84th Congress, 2d session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, this comes from the Committee on House Administration?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell me how I can get from the House Committee on Administration information that has been filed with the Department of Defense telling how many Congressmen went where and at what cost?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ORDER, ET CETERA, IN CONNECTION WITH PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONY

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 667) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 16, strike out "standing" and insert: "standing,".

Page 7, line 3, strike out "'SEC." and insert: "SEC."

Page 7, line 14, strike out "President-elect.'" and insert: "President-elect."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This amendment only provides for the insertion of a comma between the words "standing" and "moving."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF PROPERTY OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11489) to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "to" and insert: "shall".

Page 2, line 1, after "purposes" insert: "or for the general business activities of said institute, subject to the proviso that said institute shall maintain the said Octagon House and outbuildings as historical buildings which shall be preserved for their architectural and historical significance, which buildings shall be accessible to members of the general public without charge or payment of a fee of any kind at such reasonable hours and under such regulations as may, from time to time, be prescribed by said institute."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIFTS OF SECURITIES TO MINORS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11090) concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 7, line 14, strike out all after "custodian." down to and including line 18.

Page 7, line 23, strike out "became" and insert: "become."

Page 8, strike out lines 8 to 14, inclusive.

Page 8, line 15, strike out "9" and insert: "8."

Page 8, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 9. The next friend or legal representative of a minor, in whose behalf securities are held by a custodian under this act, or the minor in his own right, no later than 1 year after reaching 21 years of age, shall be entitled to maintain an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia against such custodian, or his estate for an accounting and delivery of the securities and unexpended income, in the event of the death, inability or neglect to act of such custodian."

Page 8, strike out lines 18 to 25, inclusive.

Page 9, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

Page 9, line 4, strike out "12" and insert: "10."

Page 10, line 11, strike out "13" and insert: "11."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE HELEN DOUGLAS MANKIN

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I arise to inform the House of the unfortunate accidental death on yesterday of Mrs. Helen Douglas Mankin, a former Representative in this body from the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia. Mrs. Mankin lived a full and eventful life. She was the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton Douglas. Mr. Douglas, her father, established the Atlanta Law School, which throughout the years has been one of Atlanta's and Georgia's recognized outstanding law schools.

Mrs. Mankin was a member of the legal profession, having graduated from the Atlanta Law School in 1921. She practiced law in Atlanta, Ga., from her graduation until the time of her death.

She took an active part in the civic and political life of her county and State, having served from 1937 to 1946 as a member of the General Assembly of Georgia from Fulton County.

Upon the resignation of Congressman Robert Ramspeck in December 1945, Mrs. Mankin was elected to fill his unexpired term, and she served as a Member of the United States House of Representatives until January 3, 1947.

Mrs. Mankin served as an ambulance driver and mechanic with an American hospital unit attached to the French Army during World War I. She served overseas for 13 months, and was decorated with Medaille de la Reconnaissance. In recognition of her service during World War I, she was made a citizen of Luzancy (Marne), France. Mrs. Mankin also took an active part in women's organizations. She was a national president of the Women's Overseas Service League. She was a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club. She also was a member of the Georgia Association of Women Lawyers, the American Bar Association, the Georgia Bar Association, and the Atlanta Bar Association.

Her many friends will learn of her untimely passing with deep sorrow.

I extend deepest sympathy to the members of her family in this time of bereavement.

DISPOSAL OF FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY AT OBSOLESCENT CANALIZED WATERWAYS

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7596) to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "dams)" insert: ": *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not be effective with respect to the Big Sandy River, Ky., and the Rough River, Ky., pending and until a determination has been made by the Secretary of the Army that the project structures and appurtenances including real property will not be required in connection with any improvements for navigation or other allied purposes under consideration in surveys of the Big Sandy River and Rough River now authorized."

Page 2, line 20, after "areas" insert: ": *Provided*, That in lieu of preparing dam numbered 3 on the Big Sandy River for abandoning such funds may be expended for modification of the lock and restoration for said dam either as a movable or fixed type dam but not to exceed $50,000, contingent upon local interests furnishing such additional funds as may be necessary and agreeing to accept the property and take over operation and maintenance of the said structure."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what these changes do?

Mr. BURNSIDE. They will do away with 25 obsolete dams and locks. The administration wants this done. This was sent to the House committee and we reported it by a unanimous vote of that committee. There was an amendment by the Senate that would take care of the situation where the property was being leased to a small city at a cost of $60,000. The city will match these funds.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULINE H. CORBETT

Mr. DONOHUE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Ohio explain the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will be very happy to explain it.

This is a concurrent resolution that is introduced every 4 years. May I say I introduced this at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, Senator HAYDEN. It is to clear out the folding rooms. Briefly, it requires that each Member be given notification of all the documents down there, and he has 60 days to claim any documents he wants, not the ones to his credit, but accumulated odd documents. After that, whatever is left over and not claimed is to be disposed of so there can be room in the folding rooms for incoming documents, books, and so forth.

I understand that this has been done every 4 years, since I do not know how far back, but for a long time. This is just a routine resolution.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, not long ago there was considerable controversy, at least in the press, about the executive department's inability to get the record of the campaign expenses of the two parties. Does this have anything to do with the publication of those reports?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Not to my knowledge. If they are down there and I find them, I will see that the gentleman gets them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want them. I took copies when they came in.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Then why did not the gentleman give them to the press?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just wanted to know if the rest of them could get them if they wanted to. If the gentleman is so smart about it, I think I will object to this one. Let him think about it for a while.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12215) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. COLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, because I feel that this is a bill that should be adopted by the Congress, however, I take this opportunity to give expression to what I feel to be a most discouraging, destructive, disillusioning, and disappointing situation. For over a month two bills have been on the calendar of the House which would do more to remove the logjam of reactor development of peacetime uses of atomic energy than anything else conceivable that the Congress can do. It appears that no action is going to be taken on those bills. That is to my mind tragic. The responsibility for the failure of this Congress to do the things that it should do to promote the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy must rest squarely on the persons having the responsibility for this Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that the President is very anxious about this bill and has been constantly urging its passage. He joins in the expression the gentleman from New York has given here tonight. This is a bill that should be passed before we leave, and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held lengthy hearings on the bill to provide Federal public liability indemnity program for atomic energy plants and the industry as well as spokesmen for the insurance companies of this country came before our committee and joined in our effort to provide through the bill the necessary relief for the great utilities of this country who are spending millions of dollars in the development of atomic power?

Mr. COLE. The gentleman is entirely right. This bill was reported by the joint committee unanimously with one exception. It determines and fixes the liability of the persons who are expected to own and operate these reactors. Here the Congress by law has called upon private capital to move into this field. Private capital has shown its readiness to do so, but it has hesitated to do so until its liability, when it does so, is determined by law. That is what this bill is designed to do and is intended to do.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and I rise to ask the gentleman from New York if I am not right, is that we will not only lose 6 months or more of very valuable time in the race for leadership in atoms for peace, but we may have a tendency to discourage the industrial groups that are planning to help us carry the load of that research and leadership.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman is entirely right. The reactor development program will be delayed just so long as the Congress fails to measure up to its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw by reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill (S. 4203) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill that the gentleman said was thrown out earlier in the day?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I did not say that. This has never been thrown out so far as I know.

The SPEAKER. This bill has not been before the House.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 11 u. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"u. The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes all Territories and possessions of the United States, the Canal Zone and Puerto Rico."

SEC. 2. Section 31 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "development" in the first sentence thereof the words "and training."

SEC. 3. Section 31 b. and section 31 c. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, are amended by redesignating the sections as section 31 c. and 31 d. respectively and by adding a new section 31 b. reading as follows:

"b. The Commission is further authorized to made grants and contributions to the cost of construction and operation of reactors and other facilities and other equipment to colleges, universities, hospitals, and eleemosynary or charitable institutions for the conduct of educational and training activities relating to the fields in subsection a."

SEC. 4. Section 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"r. The Commission is authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by it, to grant easements for rights-of-way over, across, in, and upon acquired lands under its jurisdiction and control, and public lands permanently withdrawn or reserved for the use of the Commission, to any State, political subdivision thereof, or municipality, or to any individual, partnership, or corporation of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, for (a) railroad tracks; (b) oil pipelines; (c) substations for electric power transmission lines, telephone lines, and telegraph lines, and pumping stations for gas, water, sewer, and oil pipelines; (d) canals; (e) ditches; (f) flumes; (g) tunnels; (h) dams and reservoirs in connection with fish and wildlife programs, fish hatcheries, and other fish-cultural improvements; (i) roads and streets; and (j) for any other purpose or purposes deemed advisable by the Commission: *Provided*, That such rights-of-way shall be granted only upon a finding by the Commission that the same will not be incompatible with the public interest: *Provided further*, That such rights-of-way shall not include any more land than is reasonably necessary for the purpose for which granted: *And provided further*, That all or any part of such rights-of-way may be annulled and forfeited by the Commission for failure to comply with the terms and conditions of any grant hereunder or for nonuse for a period of 2 consecutive years or abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof. Copies of all instruments granting easements over public lands pursuant to this section shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 5. Section 182 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by striking the last sentence thereof and substituting in place thereof the following:

"All applications and statements shall be signed by the applicant or licensee. Applications for, and statements made in connection with, licenses under sections 103 and 104 shall be made under oath or affirmation. The Commission may require any other applications or statements to be made under oath or affirmation."

SEC. 6. Chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by redesignating sections 229, 230, 231 as sections 231, 232, 233 respectively, making appropriate amendment to the Table of Contents and adding two new sections, 229 and 230, reading as follows:

"SEC. 229. Trespass upon Commission installations:

"a. The Commission is authorized to issue regulations relating to the entry upon or carrying, transporting, or otherwise introducing or causing to be introduced any dangerous weapon, explosive, or other dangerous instrument or material likely to produce substantial injury or damage to persons or property, into or upon any facility, installation, or real property subject to the jurisdiction, administration, or in the custody of the Commission. Every such regulation of the Commission shall be posted conspicuously at the location involved.

"b. Whoever shall willfully violate any regulation of the Commission issued pursuant to subsection a. shall, upon conviction thereof, be punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000.

"c. Whoever shall willfully violate any regulation of the Commission issued pursuant to subsection a. with respect to any installation or other property which is enclosed by a fence, wall, floor, roof, or other structural barrier shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 230. Photographing, etc., of Commission installations: It shall be an offense, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both—

"(1) to make any photograph, sketch, picture, drawing, map or graphical representation, while present on property subject to the jurisdiction, administration, or in the custody of the Commission, of any installations or equipment designated by the President as requiring protection against the general dissemination of information relative thereto, in the interest of the common defense and security, without first obtaining the permission of the Commission, and promptly submitting the product obtained to the Commission for inspection or such other action as may be deemed necessary; or

"(2) to use or permit the use of an aircraft or any contrivance used, or designed for navigation or flight in air, for the purpose of making a photograph, sketch, picture, drawing, map, or graphical representation of any installation or equipment designated by the President as provided in the preceding paragraph, unless authorized by the Commission."

SEC. 7. Section 229 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 231. Other laws: Sections 224 to 230 shall not exclude the applicable provisions of any other laws."

SEC. 8. All land and interests in land, owned by the United States within the boundaries of the county of Los Alamos, State of New Mexico, containing approximately 70,800 acres, are hereby transferred, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, to the Atomic Energy Commission. The Atomic Energy Commission shall exercise administrative control over all land and interests in land transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission by this act, notwithstanding the manner of their acquisition by the United States nor their status at any time prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to transfer to the Atomic Energy Commission, without compensation therefor, for use in connection with the Atomic Energy program, all that real property and interests therein, comprising approximately 200 acres, of the Weldon Spring Ordnance Works, Weldon Spring, Mo., as delineated on map designated exhibit A attached to "Department of the Army Permit to Use Weldon Spring Ordnance Works Military Reservation, Mo.," dated January 25, 1955, on

file in the Atomic Energy Commission, and all or any part of the personal property therein at the time of approval of this act: *Provided*, That when the Atomic Energy Commission, or its successor in functions, determines that the real property herein authorized for transfer is no longer required for the purposes stated, the real property, together with buildings and permanent improvements thereon at the date of such determination, shall, at the option of the Secretary of the Army, be returned to the Department of the Army without compensation therefor.

SEC. 10. There is hereby retroceded to the State of Kentucky the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired from the State of Kentucky by the United States of America, over lands in McCracken County, Ky., within the present boundaries of the Paducah project of the Atomic Energy Commission. This retrocession of jurisdiction shall take effect in accordance with the law of the State of Kentucky.

SEC. 11. Section 101 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting the word "use," between the words "possess," and "import,".

SEC. 12. Section 103 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting the word "use," between the words "possess," and "import,".

SEC. 13. Section 103 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting the words "an alien or any" between the words "issued to" and the words "any corporation."

SEC. 14. Section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting between the words "licensee of the Commission" and the words "to permit any employee" the words "or any other person authorized access to Restricted Data by the Commission under subsection 145 b.".

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York and his colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] come before the House at this late date pleading for legislation which they claim is necessary for the President's atoms for peace plan.

Where were the gentlemen on Tuesday, July 24, when we had a bill before the House that would have accelerated the atomic-powered reactor program by supplying $400 million for the purpose of actually building large power reactors? The gentlemen were in this Chamber cutting the bill to pieces and opposing and voting against the legislation.

The record can be found on page 14288 of the July 24 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the vote plainly shows that almost the solid Republican Party membership voted against House bill 12061, the power reactor acceleration bill. Regardless of how much the gentlemen accuse the Democrats for blocking the atoms for peace program—they can never erase that vote. That vote was the showdown.

Private industry has failed to make good for the past 2 years on their promises and it is my opinion that they will continue to fail for the next 2 years.

They will first ask for subsidized liability insurance.

They then will ask for special tax amortization for their capital plant investment.

The utilities will raise their power rates to their consumers to cover these uneconomic investments.

The private companies who have so far failed to build power reactors will also request many other Government subsidies in the form of long-range contracts paying them high prices for plutonium. They will want the Federal Government to furnish fuel for their reactors at prices lower than Government cost.

They will want their used fuel rods processed by the Government at lower than cost and they will want the deadly radioactive waste disposed of by the Government free or at subsidy prices.

Yes they will find many reasons why they cannot proceed. They will come back to the Congress again and again for special legislation for their selfish benefit and for their private profits.

In the meantime we will lose the international race for leadership to either England or Soviet Russia. This prediction will not come true if we face the fact and proceed in the next 4 or 5 years as we have in the past and continue the development of atomic energy for peacetime uses of all kinds.

When we get through the uneconomic phase of research and development, which I predict will continue for several years, then the economic techniques can be made available on a fair and equal basis to all the people of America and the free world.

I append hereto two newspaper editorials from the Washington Post and Times Herald:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 24, 1956]

ATOMIC POWER BY EXAMPLE

Prospects for prompt and meaningful American leadership in atomic power development are wrapped up in the Gore-Holifield bill now before the House. This bill, which has been approved by the Senate, would authorize the construction of working demonstration power reactors to serve Atomic Energy Commission installations. We hope that the House will pass it. Several weeks ago, before the Senate had acted, we expressed the view that it might be preferable to have top nuclear scientists and engineers first recommend the reactor types that offered the most promise for pilot models. We are now persuaded that the program for building a number of different types, as indorsed by AEC Commissioner Murray, affords more hope for the perfection of techniques that will be of use to a power-short world.

Indeed, this seems to us the most important consideration. Were the question simply one of furnishing power to AEC plants this undoubtedly could be done more cheaply by other means. The United States as a country rich in fossil fuels and with plentiful and relatively cheap electric power, has less incentive than many other nations to develop nuclear power promptly. Moreover, certain nuclear techniques now seem more promising than others, and on a basis of strict economics the construction of a number of different types of reactors might seem wasteful.

But the proposal must be judged on more than its immediate economic merits. The principal question is: How much importance does the United States attach to a practical nuclear power program that will safeguard its own future interest and stimulate development abroad in the fashion envisaged by President Eisenhower? This newspaper regards such a program as of tremendous importance, not only as the most significant kind of technical assistance, but also as a much needed and dramatic diversion from nuclear war. It is on this point that Government leadership is imperative.

It is no reflection on the efforts of private industry to say that the outlook for early private development of economic nuclear power is not bright. One pressurized water reactor is under construction at Shippingport, Pa., and others are in the advanced planning stage. But it is unlikely that private industry can afford to experiment with new techniques that are now expensive but ultimately may prove more economical. Atomic development by private industry ought by all means to be encouraged, and in this connection passage of the bill to provide governmental insurance for atomic powerplants seems to us imperative. But the hope of private participation is not a substitute for Government initiative as the House Appropriations Committee recognized in its report blasting AEC Chairman Strauss for duplicity in opposing the program.

Here the formula in the Gore-Holifield bill seems an ideal one. The power will be produced for a governmental purpose not in competition with private industry, and the process will afford practical experience with actual operating plants. This experience with reactor types is essential in order to afford a realistic test and ultimately reduce the cost, and it cannot be obtained through mere pilot plants. The role is an entirely proper one for the Government, and its assumption now should hasten the day when the bright dreams of plentiful atomic power will become a reality.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26, 1956]

ATOMIC POWER DEFERRED

Defeat in the House of the Gore-Holifield bill for the construction of atomic power reactors is a tribute to the obstructionism of Lewis Strauss. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission mesmerized the administration into opposing the bill on the ground that the job of developing atomic power can be handled adequately by private industry. This is the same sort of soft soap Admiral Strauss has consistently handed out respecting radiation hazards from nuclear weapons. His begging of the essential questions on the status of atomic power development so infuriated the House Appropriations Subcommittee that it accused him of "duplicity" and "fraud."

In point of fact the private versus public power issue was wholly extraneous. The reactors to have been built by the Government would have provided power for the Atomic Energy Commission only—and as an incidental to their main purpose, of demonstrating the feasibility of various types of reactors. Only one privately constructed reactor is now in the building stage. Additional plants have been proposed, but because of the cost of atomic reactors and the availability of plentiful cheap power from other sources, there is little incentive for private industry to build on a scale necessary to test new reactor techniques. There will be very little incentive at all unless the House passes a separate bill to provide governmental reinsurance for private atomic power reactors.

The pity of all this is that the administration through the Strauss influence, was placed in the position of sabotaging President Eisenhower's own bright dream of plentiful atomic power for the world. What the

House has said, with administration blessing, is that this country will take no practical step to advance American leadership in atomic power development. In other words, we leave the initiative in underdeveloped areas to the Russians.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of sections 2 and 3 of H. R. 12215, now under consideration.

As you will note, these sections amend the existing section 31 a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, which authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to "exercise its powers in such manner as to insure the continued conduct of research and development activities in the fields specified below, by private or public institutions or persons, and to assist in the acquisition of an ever-expanding fund of theoretical and practical knowledge in such fields. To this end the Commission is authorized and directed to make arrangements (including contracts, agreements, and loans) for the conduct of research and development activities relating to." The act then continues to outline the areas in which authority in this section is to be exercised.

As you know, one of the pioneers among the educational institutions of the United States in perceiving the great necessity to train engineers in the field of nuclear physics was the Penn State University. Realizing this obligation on the part of educational institutions, the Penn State University on its own arranged for the financing and construction of a research reactor which is now in operation on its campus at State University.

Likewise, the University of North Carolina at about the same time undertook on its own a similar project. The foresight and initiative of these institutions deserve the highest commendation.

The Atomic Energy Commission has felt for some time that the existing language of the Atomic Energy Act was not sufficiently clear and, therefore, it has been understandably hesitant to enter into all the various types of arrangements which is felt were necessary to assist universities and other non-profit institutions in providing them with the facilities to carry forth this important training and research work. For this reason they have requested the clarifying language which appears in section 2 and 3 of S. 4112.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. Based upon the information I have accumulated as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I realize full well that an ever-expanding program for the construction of training facilities at universities and nonprofit institutions must be undertaken. I am sure the Commission is in favor of such a program and it should be given this clarifying language to permit it to proceed without delay.

As the amendment is now drafted it would permit the Commission to assist not only in the initial setting up of facilities, but also to assist in the continued operation thereafter. It is heartening to note that it is the clear intent of this amendment to permit the Commission to assist the early pioneers in this field in the continued operation of facilities already constructed by their own initiative. I, therefore, urge each and every member to lend his support to the adoption of this amendment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 12215) was laid on the table.

BENBROOK RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12006) to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) in order to provide adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Benbrook Reservoir project in Texas to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real estate requirements of the project the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to reconvey any such land heretofore acquired to the former owners thereof whenever (1) he shall determine that such land is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use, and (2) he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided.

(b) Any such reconveyance of any such land or interests shall be made only after the Secretary (1) has given notice, in such manner (including publication) as regulations prescribe, to the former owner of such land or interests, and (2) has received an application for the reconveyance of such land or interest from such former owner in such form as he shall by regulation prescribe. Such application shall be made within a period of 90 days following the date of issuance of such notice, but on good cause the Secretary may waive this requirement.

(c) Any reconveyance of land therein made under this act shall be subject to such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations (including a reservation to the United States of flowage rights) as the Secretary may determine are in the public interest, except that no mineral rights may be reserved in said lands unless the Secretary finds that such reservation is needed for the efficient operation of the reservoir project designated in this act.

(d) Any land reconveyed under this act shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price for which the land was acquired by the United States, adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States (the Government shall receive no payment as a result of any enhancement of values resulting from the construction of the reservoir project specified in section 1 of this act), or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restrictions, and condition to which the reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land caused by the United States. In addition, the cost of any surveys or boundary markings necessary as an incident of such reconveyance shall be borne by the grantee.

(e) The requirements of this section shall not be applicable with respect to the disposition of any land, or interest therein, described in subsection (a) if the Secretary shall certify that notice has been given to the former owner of such land or interest as provided in subsection (b) and that no qualified applicant has made timely application for the reconveyance of such land or interest.

(f) As used in this section the term "former owner" means the person from whom any land, or interests therein, was acquired by the United States, or if such person is deceased, his spouse, or if such spouse is deceased, his children.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this act to any officer or employee of the Department of the Army. Any such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under rules and regulations approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Any proceeds from reconveyances made under this act shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. This act shall terminate 3 years after the date of its enactment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania:

On page 2, line 13, after the word "notice", insert a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

On page 2, line 18, after the word "rights", insert "and mineral rights, if any."

On page 2, line 19, after the word "interest", insert a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

On page 2, line 24, strike out the word "equal" and insert "full current appraised value."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to take 5 minutes at this time. I have discussed these amendments with the author of the bill and I think they are in furtherance of the aims which the author has for this bill.

I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 4, line 1, after the word "reservoir", add the words "Belton Reservoir."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMED FORCES CODE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point concerning an action in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without calling to the attention of the House the magnitude of its action yesterday in clearing for the President's signature the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code entitled "Armed Forces" and title 32 entitled "National Guard." The enactment of this bill is one of the most important legislative actions of this or any other Congress.

The work of drafting the bill commenced more than 8 years ago in furtherance of the program of the Committee on the Judiciary to enact into law all 50 titles of the United States Code. With the enactment of this bill, 13 of the 50 titles will have been so enacted and 1 title will have been consolidated with another. The Subcommittee on Revision of the Laws, of which I am chairman, has been supervising and directing this program and is engaged now in the preparation of bills to enact into law additional titles of the Code. That Committee's law revision counsel, Dr. Charles J. Zinn, has been engaged in this work with the Committee on the Judiciary and its predecessor, the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, for 18 years. In recent years he has had the able assistance of Mr. C. F. Brickfield and Mr. Joseph Fischer, assistant law revision counsel.

The draft of this bill was initiated in the Pentagon originally by the Army and shortly thereafter by the Air Force. Two years later, at the suggestion of the then chairman of my subcommittee, the late Honorable Joseph R. Bryson, the Department of the Navy created a staff to work along with the Army-Air Force Codification Group. On several occasions during the intervening years the Committee on the Judiciary published preliminary and revised drafts of the bill which were circulated widely for suggestions and comments.

I should like to give credit to the numerous people who have been associated with this work for varying periods of time in the Pentagon:

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense: Dr. F. Reed Dickerson.

For the Department of the Army: Col. Alfred C. Bowman, Col. Archibald King, and Lt. Col. Joseph P. Ramsay.

For the Department of the Navy: Lt. Col. George M. Lhamon—United States Marine Corps—Comdr. Enser W. Cole, Comdr. Katherine E. Shilling, and Lt. Comdr. Charles J. Murphy.

For the Department of the Air Force: Mr. James B. Minor and Mr. Allan J. Morrison.

The other professional personnel who have worked on the codification of military laws, with dates of service, are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Lt. Col. George E. Baya, March 23, 1948, to September 28, 1948.

Capt. James L. Bennett, June 27, 1949, to August 31, 1949.

Maj. Cyrus Bernstein, June 1, 1949, to June 15, 1949.

Maj. William C. Brewer, November 12, 1948, to August 1, 1950.

Lt. Col. J. B. Conyers, November 1, 1948, to December 23, 1949.

Maj. Joseph S. Costa, June 15, 1950, to June 29, 1950.

Capt. Raymond Coward, April 14, 1948, to June 30, 1948.

Lt. Col. J. G. Currie, April 10, 1948, to May 17, 1948.

Lt. Col. Hugh Fullerton, December 15, 1949, to January 1, 1950; June 21, 1950, to July 21, 1950.

Col. Leland G. Gardner, January 27, 1949, to June 27, 1949.

Lt. Col. Henry Glenn, August 1, 1950, to August 15, 1950.

Capt. Roderick F. Greig, May 15, 1948, to September 28, 1948.

Col. George F. Guy, January 9, 1950, to February 9, 1950.

Lt. Col. Herbert H. Hauge, June 27, 1949, to August 31, 1949.

Col. W. H. Harris, March 8, 1948, to April 19, 1948.

Capt. Oliver H. Hughes, December 11, 1950, to October 3, 1951.

Lt. Col. Kirk Jeffrey, September 11, 1950, to October 3, 1951.

Col. John F. Koster, October 12, 1949, to December 14, 1949.

Mr. John H. Marion, June 1, 1948, to March 1, 1949.

Mr. Ronald F. Moist, August 21, 1951, to October 1, 1951.

Capt. John Neary, December 11, 1950, to March 22, 1951.

Maj. William F. Redmon, January 1, 1948, to January 3, 1951.

Lt. Col. William M. Vance, Oct. 27, 1948, to March 27, 1952.

Capt. Jack Wilson, March 16, 1951, to January 28, 1952.

Col. Arthur F. Young, September 15, 1949, to October 31, 1949.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Lt. Harold R. Allison, Jr., April 21, 1951, to October 19, 1951.

Cmdr. Earle Bennett, September 5, 1950, to February 15, 1952.

Lt. William J. Bryson, August 20, 1951, to April 29, 1952.

Lt. William M. Calvert, October 15, 1950, to February 29, 1952.

Lt. Comdr. Anargyros E. Camarinos, October 24, 1950, to January 7, 1952.

Col. John E. Curry, October 24, 1949, to February 13, 1950.

Cmdr. William H. Hewitt, October 24, 1950, to February 1, 1954.

Lt. Comdr. John J. Karmelich, August 6, 1951, to January 30, 1952.

Lt. Comdr. Clarke A. Knicely, October 1950, to August 17, 1951.

Lt. Comdr. Michell Koteff, October 24, 1950, to July 31, 1952.

Cmdr. John P. Luddy, October 24, 1950, to June 9, 1952.

Cmdr. Francis X. Markey, September 5, 1950, to August 27, 1951.

Mr. Leslie C. McNemar, October 24, 1949, to June 9, 1950; August 1, 1950, to June 20, 1951.

Lt. Robert N. St. Mary, October 31, 1950, to January 29, 1952.

Lt. Donald F. Whitcraft, October 3, 1950, to April 30, 1951.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. William E. Gilmore, September 8, 1949, to January 12, 1951.

Mr. John K. V. Goff, March 9, 1949, to June 3, 1952.

Lt. Col. Kirk Jeffrey, December 22, 1950, to September 10, 1951.

Mr. Ronald F. Moist, September 16, 1949, to August 20, 1951.

During the intervening period that this bill has been in preparation and pending before the Congress there was almost daily liaison between the officials in the Pentagon and my subcommittee so that the bill as passed reflects the views of the Armed Forces and our committee with respect to principals of legislative drafting and codification.

Although this is only one bill of a number in the program of our committee it is one of the most important in that program. With the enactment of this bill it will be possible to find and keep up to date all the laws relating to the Armed Forces and the National Guard. These laws are now scattered throughout some 70 volumes of the Statutes at Large and although they were incorporated into titles 10, 32, and 34 of the United States Code until the enactment of this bill those titles were prima facie evidence of the law. Now titles 10 and 32 constitute the law and may be amended directly. This will be a tremendous boon to the Congress, the Armed Forces, and the public generally.

May I just add one word regarding the sheer size of the bill. It is more than 800 pages in length printed in smaller type than the normal bill style. If it were printed in the usual style it would undoubtedly comprise more than 2,000 pages. The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary consists of 1,147 pages. Incidentally that report will be indispensable to the users of the new Code inasmuch as each section of the Code is explained in detail in the report—with the source of the new section of the existing law, both in the United States Code and in the Statutes at Large, being indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the Members of the House and particularly to the members of the Committee on Armed Services for their splendid cooperation in bringing this project to such a successful conclusion.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to relinquish 5 minutes of the time allotted to me to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 109th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Liberia. My visit there last

fall gave me some little understanding of the difficulties that face these freedom-loving people on every hand. It is particularly heartening to have renewed evidence of their courageous refusal to accept help from Russia, in President Tubman's speech of today in which he reaffirms his pledge to maintain Liberia's alinement with the free world.

I take pleasure in including herewith a Monrovia press release and excerpts from President Tubman's speech.

PRESIDENT TUBMAN OF LIBERIA RENEWS COMMITMENT TO FREE WORLD

MONROVIA, Liberia, July 26.—In a speech celebrating Liberia's Independence Day, President William V. S. Tubman today acknowledged his country's "deep debt of gratitude to the Government and people of the United States for their aid in establishing Liberia" 109 years ago and declared that "we shall not be seduced from our firm commitments to the free world."

He stated that the confidence of the United States "in our unswerving devotion to the cause of democracy has strengthened us in our earnest endeavors to keep the torch of liberty ever beaming on the African continent." He pledged that "we shall continue to work with all our might and main in the United Nations * * * to defeat the forces presently at work to deprive us and them of our liberties."

The President said "we are gratified to state that in addition to maintaining our national existence, we are rapidly developing our human and physical resources, not by ourselves alone but by the conscientious application of a new formula based on mutual respect and equal confidence in the free interchange of skills and private investment capital for essential raw materials needed to reinforce the cause of freedom, justice and equality for men and nations everywhere."

Liberia, with a population of approximately 2 million, is the only Negro Republic in Africa. Its government is modeled directly after that of the United States. It was founded in West Africa in 1822 with the assistance of the American Colonization Society which was seeking a solution to the problems of Negro slavery in America and was conceived by such American patriots as Henry Clay, John Marshall, Bushrod Washington and James Monroe.

Liberia became an independent state in 1847. It was an ally of the United States in World War I and World War II, and is a charter member of the United Nations. It currently furnishes the United States each year with 80 million pounds of rubber and 1,250,000 tons of the world's purest iron ore.

Following are excerpts from the President's speech:

"It cannot escape us on this occasion to record our deep debt of gratitude to the Government and people of the United States of America for their undiminishing interest in, and heightening support of our well-being and prosperity. Though they were themselves deadlocked in a desparate civil struggle to preserve their union from chaos and disintegration, they nevertheless reaffirmed to the world their inherent devotion to the cause of freedom, justice and equality when they extended the tenets of democracy to this continent.

"Moreover, regardless of the idiosyncrasies of some segments of their population, they have generally and consistently fostered and upheld the democratic principles that oppose segregation. Their confidence in our unswerving devotion to the cause of democracy has strengthened us in our earnest endeavors to keep the torch of liberty ever beaming on this continent; and they as well as the others of our sincere western friends and collaborators in the battle for freedom may be assured that we shall not be seduced from our firm commitments to the free world.

"Today we are gratified to state that in addition to maintaining our national existence, we are rapidly developing our human and physical resources, not by ourselves alone, but by the conscientious application of a new formula based on mutual respect and equal confidence in the free interchange of skills and private investment capital for essential raw materials to reinforce the cause of freedom, justice and equality for men and nations everywhere.

"As in the past, we shall continue to work with all our might and main in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, at home as well as abroad, with our allies to defeat the forces presently at work to deprive us and them of our liberties.

"On this glorious Independence Day when the hearts of all Liberians are filled with joy and ecstacy over the accomplishments of their fathers. I pledge you, I pledge this Nation. I pledge myself to a newer and a more dynamic liberty—the liberty to develop.

"Our pioneer fathers, few as they were, obtained our liberties through hard trials and tribulations. Our predecessors maintained those self-same liberties by virtue of courage and perseverance. Now more than ever when the eyes of the world are turned upon Africa, it is our duty to develop our liberties on a grand scale; for that liberty which continues to lie dormant, existing only in the minds of men, is on the pathway of deterioration. This must not happen to us.

"The liberty to develop must supersede and transcend all our other liberties, for it must give force and effect to each and all of them. It must be based upon the unification policy which is welding our population into a strong, virile and united people. It must be based upon the open-door policy which is bringing into the country more and more enterprises and concessions, teaching new skills, employing more people, and putting more money into circulation."

PASS THE BILLS FOR THE VETERANS BEFORE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry that Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, is not going to run for the Senate again. A man of great charm and wit and great knowledge, his work and his great ability have been invaluable to the Senate and to the country. I know of no one who has given more than Senator MILLIKIN in his work for the veterans, which I am thinking of especially. He never forgets them. He never let them down. He had a wonderful war record himself and knew their problems.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yielded to you a moment ago. I just want to join you.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman in just a minute. I know his loyal support in all veterans matters.

I know the Members are anxious to get away. I also know that veterans all over the country wish that Senator MILLIKIN were chairman of the committee handling our veterans' legislation.

I would like to remind the House which passed the pension bill and the increase compensation bill of 10 percent for service-connected cases that when Senator MILLIKIN was chairman of the committee he often used to take our reports for their legislation, and then he would bring out bills and pass them. The Speaker knows and all of the Members who have been here a long time know that even at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning of the last day of our sessions the Senate has passed bills—our House bills—and if they amended our bills, they sent them over to us and we passed them.

Mr. Speaker, the House has already passed this legislation I speak of and I beg the Members of the House to see that the legislation comes over here from the other body.

I have referred to the other body because there is no excuse for holding up this legislation. It has been over there for weeks and the Committee on Finance can take our hearings and approve and report the bills. It is only justice that that be done.

I remember during the war days when we voted to send our men to war. It was no joke. It was no joke in arming those men, it was no joke to send them away from their families. We promised them everything under the sun. It was no joke when they were wounded or disabled. Do we so soon forget them?

Today we have passed bills on all kinds of subjects involving great appropriations. Bills on our national resources and our greatest national resource is our soldiers and veterans. But we do not have to adjourn until the Senate acts. I for one shall do everything in my power to prevent adjournment.

I think in your hearts every Member here would like to honor our veterans and feel that he or she is grateful for what they have done. How are we going to face them if you do not show it by helping them?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

REPLY TO MISLEADING STATEMENTS ABOUT ILLINOIS

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in remarks entitled "Gangster Slayings," appearing in the July 24, 1956 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, our able colleague from Georgia, Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, made certain remarks about the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, and about city and State officials, that are completely unsubstantiated by fact and transcend fair comment.

Our able colleague was a great prosecutor in his own State. His opposition to civil rights legislation has become so intense that it apparently has conquered the passion for fact that marked his career as a great prosecutor.

In his remarks of July 24, our able colleague made reference to slayings and crime in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

An examination of the most recently published Uniform Crime Reports Bulletin of the Federal Bureau of Investigaton discloses that for the calendar year 1955, per 100,000 population, the State of Illinois had 5.7 murders or nonnegligent manslaughters. The State of Georgia had over twice as many, or 13.6.

Nonaggravated assaults—which are merely uncompleted murders—Illinois had 77.8 per 100,000 population, while the State of Georgia had 193.3.

Burglaries, per 100,000 population, Illinois, 335.3; Georgia, 462.4.

Larceny and theft: Illinois, 619.4; Georgia, 989.2.

In cases of automobile theft, per hundred thousand population, the State of Illinois had 123.3, while Georgia had 208.3.

By this reference to FBI crime reports, I do not attempt to suggest that there is a great crime wave in the State of Georgia, as was inferred about the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago in the gentleman's remarks on July 24; nor do I suggest that the officials of the State of Georgia are in league with gangsters, as was suggested by the gentleman in his remarks concerning officials of the State of Illinois.

To make such an inference would be a great wrong to the Congressman and Congresswoman from Georgia who stand high upon the roll of the finest and most patriotic people in the Nation. It would be a great sin against the people of Georgia whom I have by personal experience found to be among the most law abiding and friendliest in the Nation.

Obviously, the FBI reports are predicated upon many factors—as are headlines concerning Illinois crimes. These factors make comparisons and conclusions predicated thereon unjustifiable.

I am certain that the gentleman from Georgia did not intend to slander the State of Illinois or the city of Chicago, but rather I believe that he has fallen into an attempt to justify his own evaluation of a situation, rather than arriving at a conclusion based upon fact.

CRIME STATISTICS—GEORGIA AND ILLINOIS

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the past years, Chicago has made steady progress in the improvement of its law enforcement efforts and stepped up its ever continuing fight against gambling and the racketeers. The citizens are confident the greatest city in the Middle West will continue its fight against crime and corruption.

A Report on Chicago Crime for 1955 by the Chicago Crime Commission states that major offenses reported in Chicago for the year of 1955 showed a decrease of 13.9 percent. The people of Chicago can point with pride to this fact—a definite step forward towards their goal of making Chicago a crime-free city.

Statistics do not seem to corroborate the observations or statements of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] made on the floor of the House on July 24, as recorded at page 14316 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that major crimes such as murder, rape, manslaughter, or aggravated assault are more prevalent in a northern State than in a southern State. A check of the figures published in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reports, Annual Bulletin, 1955, shows the fallacy of making any such statements. Taking the States of Illinois and Georgia as States indicative of the crime rates in the North and the South, the following facts can be ascertained from Uniform Crime Reports. During the year 1955, total crimes—which include murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary—breaking or entering, larceny—theft, and auto theft—for the State of Georgia per 100,000 population was 1,930; for the State of Illinois, 1,309. In actuality, this shows an increase of 521 offenses per 100,000 in the State of Georgia over the State of Illinois. These figures can hardly be used to support the theory that there is a greater incidence of crime in Illinois than in Georgia.

Taking the crime trends for the largest city in each of the two States—Atlanta and Chicago—the same trend can be seen as illustrated for the States as a whole. Once more Uniform Crime Reports is used for the basis of the conclusions here reached. The figures used are for the same crimes as listed for the comparison of the two States. On the basis of offenses per 100,000 of population, approximately 2,800 crimes were committed in the city of Atlanta. Breaking the figures down further, the crime rate per capita was 0.028. Using the same set of figures for the city of Chicago, offenses per 100,000 of population were approximately 1,300, or 0.013 per capita.

Again the figures verify the fact that, although a greater number of crimes were committed in the city of Chicago than in Atlanta, on the basis of population more crimes were committed in Atlanta than in Chicago. Even though due consideration must be given to the fact that all statistical figures are subject to certain variables, it seems possible to draw only one conclusion—that the crime rate is definitely higher in Georgia than in Illinois.

If it is considered that the atmosphere in which a person is reared contributes to his capacity for commiting major crimes in any given community, then it would seem to be safe to conclude that life in the State of Georgia fosters a greater tendency to commit crimes than does life in the State of Illinois.

Crime is a problem in each of the 48 States. It can be decreased only by the willingness of the citizens, the courts, and law-enforcement officers of each State to wage a constant battle against crime and corruption.

I have no intention to indulge in controversy with my colleague from Georgia who is a member of the same subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee but I do arise to set the record straight.

SENATOR BENDER'S OHIO CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a letter from United States Senator GEORGE BENDER in connection with a statement which I made last Monday regarding the appointment of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey as chairman of the Senator's Ohio campaign committee.

In order to make all facts in this matter available, I am inserting this letter in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
July 26, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: I am certain that you would not wish to convey any misunderstanding of the true situation with respect to the appointment and the acceptance by my longtime friend, Mr. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, as chairman of the Bender-for-Senator Campaign Committee.

This committee has no relationship whatever to any fund-raising or fund-expending activities being pursued on my behalf in the State of Ohio. The finance committee has been publicized throughout the State of Ohio and is headed by Mr. Joseph C. Shouvlin, of Springfield, Ohio, a very reputable and highly esteemed, independent citizen of our State. Mr. William Cody Kelly, of Cincinnati, Ohio, is serving as my campaign manager.

Mr. Humphrey's position as chairman of my committee is designed to provide the best possible guidance and advice to me in the conduct of my campaign on the highest possible level. It has become a well-established practice in Democratic, as well as Republican administrations in recent years, to designate the party national chairman to a Cabinet position. I do not believe that this in any way conflicts with the performance of duties and responsibilities assumed by these Cabinet officials. I am certain that nothing in the coming campaign would detract in any way from the outstanding record of performance achieved by our Secretary of the Treasury.

With my deep appreciation of your interest in maintaining the highest possible standard of political campaigning, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. BENDER,
United States Senator.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may be permitted to file a report during the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DR. RAY W. GIFFORD, JR.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I, with a number of my colleagues, might pay our tribute of appreciation and affection to Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr., assistant attending physician of the Congress, who is about to complete his tour of active duty as lieutenant commander of the Medical Corps of the Navy.

Dr. Gifford has been a vital and an important part of the 84th Congress. He was here on the convening of the first session and is leaving on the adjournment of the second session. In the long hard months intervening, when often we were working around the clock and under tremendous pressures, he has been friend and physician. His warm personality, his great professional ability, and his willingness at all times to forego matters of personal concern the better to serve us have been a large contribution. He has taken in each of us a warm personal interest, truly the family physician in the finest and noblest sense. He leaves us with our deep appreciation. Our loss in his departure will be the gain of the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, to which noted institution he is returning as consultant in internal medicine. To Dr. Gifford and his charming wife go our good wishes for everything fine in the years ahead.

In bidding farewell to Dr. Gifford we again are reminded of how much we and the country owe to Adm. George W. Calver, who as physician to the Congress for many years, has kept the lawmakers of the Republic on their feet physically through the wear and tear, the strains of long hours, and demands on endurance when normal precautions were difficult, and the legislative work had to go on to meet the problems and the crises of the moment. Dr. Calver is a great American, respected and beloved by all in the Congress, and a physician who has reflected the highest honor and distinction on the Medical Corps of the Navy. It goes without saying that one working in association and under the command of Admiral Calver must be outstanding in professional standing and personal attributes.

Dr. Gifford was born in Westerville, Ohio. He received his B. S. degree at Otterbein College in 1944, being first in his class. He again was first in his class when in 1947 he received his M. D. degree from Ohio State University College of Medicine. In 1952 the University of Minnesota conferred upon him the degree of M. S. in medicine. He served his internship at the Colorado General Hospital, 1947–48, his senior internship in medicine at the Ohio State University Hospital, 1948–49, and was a fellow in medicine at the Mayo Foundation, 1949–52.

From 1952 to September of 1954, when he came to the Congress as its assistant attending physician, he was instructor in medicine in the graduate school of the University of Minnesota and consultant in internal medicine in the famous Mayo Clinic. He is the author or coauthor of more than 15 articles dealing with cardiovascular diseases.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. I join with the gentleman from Illinois. I have had pleasant professional relations with Dr. Gifford. He is a very sincere man and he has considerably improved my health.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois. I, too, owe a lot to Dr. Gifford. I wish him well in his return to private practice.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in the statement the gentleman from Illinois has made. I think that Dr. Gifford has done a grand job, and I feel that he goes back to Mayo Clinic with the support and friendship of all of the Members of Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois with respect to Dr. Gifford. He was a grand fellow and a most excellent physician. I wish him well.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] in paying tribute to Dr. Raymond W. Gifford who has served with such distinction on the staff of Dr. Calver, the attending physician for the House of Representatives. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Gifford for his many kindnesses and his excellent treatment since he has been assigned here to the Capitol of the Nation. I am sorry that he is leaving us. But he has performed his tour of duty with the Navy, and as I understand is now returning to the staff of the Mayo Clinic from which he came to us for service in the Navy. We have been lucky to have him as long as he has been with us. In his service here he has demonstrated a rare and high professional competence, and the type of personal interest and attention to his patients that make the medical profession the respected one that it is. I have never known a doctor who has served here in the Capitol I would rather have as my own personal doctor. If he were stepping out of Dr. Calver's office into private practice in this city I would continue to seek his advice and help when necessary. In my opinion Dr. Gifford meets in every way the highest and the best standards of a profession dedicated to the health and welfare of mankind. He is not only a competent, careful, and highly skilled practitioner, but one who is deeply conscientious in his advice and care of those seeking his advice. He exemplifies the best in the medical profession—in learning, native appitude, and sense of responsibility to his basic oath. I wish they were all like him, but that cannot be—any more than we can all be top legislators or public servants. But I welcome this opportunity of saying that he has attained and accomplished the highest level there is in professional competence and the personal relationships in his chosen field—and I know he will take a deep satisfaction in that and in maintaining them. I am grateful to my colleague for providing this opportunity for saying thanks to Dr. Gifford, who truly deserves it.

POSTPONING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I was granted for today be vacated and that instead I have permission to address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VETERANS PENSION LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I shall do everything in my power to prevent the adjournment of Congress until the Senate has passed our veterans bill.

STRIPED PANTS, OVERALLS, AND GHOST WRITERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, [Mr. PHILLIPS], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, as you undoubtedly have been doing yourself the last few days, I have been cleaning up my correspondence and particularly that little pile of notes and clippings which every Congressman has on his desk, under a souvenir paperweight. I came across a most intriguing item, and I rise today to talk about it.

This is a paragraph from the U. S. News & World Report, on the page which carries the copyright head Washington Whispers. I quote it in its entirety:

A State Department official says this of agricultural attachés maintained abroad by the United States Department of Agriculture: "A lot of these attachés know farming well, but let's face it—that's all they know. They seem interested only in farming, they bore foreign dignitaries, forget the proper dress, and are giving the impression that the

United States is crowded with country bumpkins."

This refers to one of the ablest groups of men in any nation in the world, the agricultural attachés of the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they "know farming well," as the clipping says; it may surprise the State Department employee who inspired that item, but that is exactly what they are expected to know, and why they give their lives to representing American agriculture, sometimes under difficult conditions. I doubt if they "bore foreign dignitaries," as this charges, but I may concede that at times they prefer overalls to striped pants, or the characteristic Stetson of the West, or the straw hat of Iowa, to the black Homburg; but if I recall Emerson correctly, he said:

It is only when mind and character slumber that the dress can be seen.

And that William Hazlitt wrote, very appropriately, in one of his Political Essays:

Those who make dress a principal part of themselves will, in general, become of no more value than their dress.

After reading this clipping again and enjoying the same good laugh you have had today, I began to wonder if the State Department has not unwittingly revealed its own Achilles' heel in the remark in which the item must have originated. I will turn this time to Shakespeare, who has one of his characters saying in All's Well That Ends Well:

The soul of this man is his clothes.

Mr. Speaker, before I pay tribute to these able and courageous missionaries and salesmen of American agriculture and the American way, I would like to comment briefly, if I may, on some of their counterparts in the Department of State. I have been familiar personally with our agricultural attachés for more than 21 years and with the Foreign Service of the State Department for more than 48 years, and I speak today from experience and observation. This clipping is not based, in my opinion, on some casual comment, Mr. Speaker; it is part of a deliberate effort to destroy, or at least to nullify, the action of the Congress which 2 years ago returned the agricultural attachés to the Department of Agriculture and took them back from the Department of State, where the service had been almost destroyed, as I shall now point out. In the intervening 2 years there have been intermittent efforts on the part of the State Department to destroy this separation.

I do not accuse the top officials of this attempted sabotage; they cannot know everything that goes on in a department so large that it occupies, in Washington alone, the huge building erected for the Army (before the Army moved to the even larger Pentagon) and in addition, occupies some 21 or more apartments or temporaries in the western end of this otherwise beautiful city.

Instead of being critical of this State Department acrobat who now finds himself in what must be a somewhat familiar position in that department, with his foot in his mouth, I rise to thank him for bringing the matter into the open. I will talk first about the people in the State Department who represent the same general level as these agricultural attachés. I concede, at the start, Mr. Speaker, that they may know the proper pants, coats and hats, for all formal occasions; I will not concede that they never bore foreign dignitaries, having talked to some of the representatives of other nations myself. We are all agreed that they do not, as a rule, know farming, and I again call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that peculiar as it may seem to the State Department, that is exactly why the agricultural attachés are sent abroad.

Some of the Members must occasionally watch a TV program known as You Bet Your Life. A few weeks ago a contestant appeared and was asked, as usual, several questions. In this case, the first was:

Give the name of the British statesman known as Lord Beaconsfield.

The contestant did not know. Any schoolboy could have answered that Lord Beaconsfield was Disraeli, Prime Minister of England under Victoria in one of the greatest eras of that nation, when England secured control of the Suez Canal.

The next question was:

What was the name of the last king of Spain before the present regime?

The contestant did not know. The average citizen of the contestant's age would have answered "Alphonso" instantly, and recalled not only the famous profile, and the blood problems of that family, but his friendship with our own Nation.

There was one other question, as I recall. The contestant was given the names of a married couple and asked to give their better known names. They were Fibber McGee and Molly. Even I, who practically never watch anything on TV except John Cameron Swayze and Sergeant Bilko, knew that.

Now comes the payoff, Mr. Speaker. When the contestant was asked his occupation, he replied that for 13 years he had been a ghost writer for the top echelon of the State Department. I hasten to add this was under a previous administration, but since some of us find it difficult to see many changes in the faces in some of the agencies and departments, perhaps this disclaimer is pointless. The foot is still in the mouth and the ghost writers apparently still do not know that Lord Beaconsfield was Disraeli.

I pass to a few personal experiences. Just about a year ago I went abroad, primarily for the 3 weeks "Kur," at a little German spa near the Rhine; but last year with equal intent to inspect again the United States cemeteries and memorials, six of which we are right now this week dedicating in France, England, and Italy. I had also agreed to meet the then-new Comptroller-General in Madrid and inspect the newest European office of that agency. The subcommittee on which I serve had some influence in setting up these money-saving European offices.

I had asked nothing of the State Department, although I rise to remark that the sections which have to do with what might be called VIP travel are helpful and competent. I want particularly to thank Miss Marcelle Lecompte, of the Paris office, for courtesies over the years. Last year I had bought a little Volkswagen, driven it to the Spanish border, and planned to take the "Talgo" to Madrid. I wrote the Madrid Embassy and asked them to check my hotel reservations, telling them when I would arrive. I received a letter saying the hotel confirmed the reservations and adding, without my request, that someone from the Embassy would meet Mrs. Phillips and me at the depot. We arrived; we were not met. I took a cab to the hotel and checked in. Two hours later, a cultured voice phoned to ask if I had arrived and to offer any help I needed. I said, no thanks, I was to meet Mr. Campbell that evening. The cultured voice, which I am sure would never split an infinitive, told me that the Comptroller had canceled his reservation. Since I was there to meet him, and had had no notice of changed plans, I may be excused for being startled by this news.

To make a long story short, I found that Mr. Campbell had made the reservations through his own GAO office in Madrid, and had never canceled them. The State Department had simply taken upon itself to cancel them for him, without authorization, because they had not been made, I presume, through State Department channels.

You may picture Mr. Campbell arriving, tired and hot, late that evening only to be told that the State Department had canceled his rooms. Fortunately, and by the greatest good luck, the hotel could still give Mr. and Mrs. Campbell a room.

I now come back to the cultured voice. It suggested a car for the following morning. I said that, like all farmers, I could probably walk to the Embassy, but that I'd be glad to ride if a car were available. I asked mildly if I could count on the car with any more assurance than their offer to meet me at the depot. The voice was startled almost out of its broad "a." "Did you come by train?" it said. "Didn't I write you that I was coming by train and give the time and the train?" I asked. "Yes," stammered the voice, "but the Paris office notified us you were coming by automobile." I suggested equally mildly that I usually knew what I was doing, a little better than any office that had not even been consulted.

But this, Mr. Speaker, was only the start; the best is still to come. Since we were to inspect an airfield and have a briefing at the Air Force Headquarters, an affable and competent young officer was assigned to help the Comptroller and me. On the way back he made the usual offer of other help. I said, rather casually, that I had a letter from the head of the Catholic Rural Life Conference to his old friend who was now the Papal Nuncio in Madrid. They were brought up together and went to school together in the same Italian province. I wanted to know if someone could telephone and ask when it would be convenient for me to call. My courage has rarely been challenged but I confess it does not extend to tackling a European telephone.

I presume this again requires the "proper channels," for the young officer called me up that afternoon with some embarrassment and said he had taken the matter up with the Embassy. I gather that my simple request caused near consternation. The reply was that the Papal Nuncio was the highest diplomatic official in Madrid; that such inquiries as I contemplated would have to be handled by our Ambassador, who was then out of town, and that an appointment might be arranged in about a week.

I thanked the officer. The next morning I drove around to the Nuncio's residence, and sent in my card and the letter. In less than 2 minutes the Nuncio's secretary came out, literally on the run, to apologize for keeping me waiting even until the Nuncio finished with the visitors then with him and to say that the Nuncio had known I was to be in Madrid and hoped that I would call. We had a long talk, on water and agriculture, subjects which apparently the cultured voices in the Embassy had not included in previous conversations.

I am convinced that the young men now joining the State Department staffs, who know what clothes to wear, and what drinks to serve at a cocktail party, sometimes forget, if they ever did know, that even diplomats are human, and that a Papal Nuncio may once have been a parish priest in Canada, and is still interested in the well-being of his rural people.

One final experience, Mr. Speaker. For 23 years I have written a weekly column for the newspapers of my county, and for the last 14 years, of my district. I have borrowed the use of typewriters in embassies and consulates and private offices, in London, Berlin, Warsaw, Moscow, Paris, and all way stations. Only once have I been refused; last year in Madrid. The cultured voice called me again, the afternoon before we left Madrid and again asked if it could be of any help. In the free and easy way of a farm boy, I said, "You sure can, please let me use a typewriter this afternoon for about an hour." I could sense a shocked silence. "What's the matter," I asked, "haven't you got one that isn't being used?" "Well, yes," said the voice, "there is one right here in this office." "May I use it?" I asked. An anguished voice replied, and this is literally what it said, "Oh, Mr. Congressman, if anyone saw a Congressman in this office, using a typewriter like a clerk, I could be severely criticized."—P. S. I went out to the Air Force Headquarters and used a typewriter.

Enough of that, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to suggest that a knowledge of the proper dress may be desirable, but I suspect that taking young men out of Harvard or Columbia, without business experience, or any experience for that matter, has not always strengthened the foreign service, and I submit has not put men into the diplomatic frontlines, in a world controversy which has moved from the battlelines to the bottlelines, if I may be excused a very poor pun. They do not always have the backgrounds for the responsibilities we place on them. The future of this Nation depends as much on these cultured young men as it may on the farm boys in uniform who are being taught to handle atomic warheads. At the moment my confidence in our efforts abroad is not 100 precent.

To restore it, Mr. Speaker, I will talk about the outstanding job being done by our agricultural attachés since we got them back from under the control of the State Department.

My first personal experience with the agricultural attachés was in 1935. I was chairman of the assembly committee on agriculture, in the California State Legislature, and we were struggling with the ever-present problem of the prices paid producers at the farm, and the prices paid for the same commodities by the housewives. Canada tried to solve it, and the report of the Canadian commission was excellent and voluminous. The news had reached this country that one of the accomplishments of the new Nazi regime in Germany was a solution of this problem. I took off that summer, to find out, and also to check into farming conditions in Russia.

In Paris, Berlin, and Moscow, I was given desk room in the offices of the agricultural attachés, and every help and courtesy. They ran down leads for me in the libraries, and in Russia I was allowed to read confidential reports on the efforts to convert the farmers to communism. This applied both to 1935 and 1937. Niels Nielsen was our attaché in Paris; Lloyd Steere was in Berlin. Dr. L. G. Michael covered the Polish and Russian areas. I did not meet him personally until later. Harry Reed was in Germany working on livestock matters, and his figures, based on ability and experience, were so much better than those of the Hitler government that they were used by the Germans in preference to their own, at the time. Among other names I recall were Les Mallory, who is now, I think, in Jordan; Les Wheeler who was then in the Washington office, and Fred Motz, who ought to have special mention because, when the shift took place from Agriculture to the State Department, he chose to sacrifice advancement in the Foreign Service and thus his own income, to stay with Agriculture. Since the value of an agricultural attaché, like that of a Congressman, is in direct ratio to tenure and what we call seniority, Dr. Motz deserves special commendation. He stuck it out and has seen the attachés returned, as they should be, to the Department of Agriculture.

I do not know if the idea of the shift had its origin in Agriculture or in State. Certainly State seized on it with alacrity. The reasoning, on the part of some attachés, was understandable. They were not part of the official family, in many embassies; if the Ambassador gave a reception, they were not always invited. The Foreign Service was always getting itself added salaries, better retirement provisions, and other benefits; the attachés were left out. Agricultural attachés were expected to remain just that, agricultural attachés. The longer they worked at the job, and the more friends they made and the more contacts, the better results they could get. Around them, the young men who started on the lower rungs of the diplomatic ladder became assistant secretaries, vice consuls, and sometimes even chargés d'affaires, and once in a long time, even a minister. This was too much for some of the more ambitious attachés; they supported the move to State.

The switch just about ruined the agricultural attaché service. The State Department would put a young man on the job and call him the agricultural attaché. Whether he knew barley from wheat, or the difference between an orange and a pear, or which end of the cow got milked, was incidental. The result was that the young man, however bright, considered the job a temporary one and already had his eyes firmly fixed on the upper rungs of the Foreign Service ladder. The reason why the appointment of Mrs. Pearl Mesta to the post of Minister to Luxembourg hit the Foreign Service so hard was that this was one of the few remaining Legations to which a Minister could be appointed from the regular Foreign Service list. It had been given to an outsider, instead of one of the fraternity whose shield is a cocktail glass, inverted, on a field, quartered, of morning coat and trousers.

Two things happened at once; we lost our best men, either by resignations, or by "promotions"—and I put the word in quotation marks—save in a few instances, and the service began to deteriorate, rapidly.

Where once we had been able to move American farm commodities, sometimes by having a few items included in an international contract, involving many commodities, and making its major profit from international exchange, we now had few, if any, such deals. Often these were made without real profit to the contracting broker; he wanted the fruit or the other commodities, for his Nation, for the benefit of its citizens. Even these stopped.

The reports, on which the farmers once depended, became, to all intents, valueless. The reasons were obvious; when the agricultural attachés represented the farmers their reports came through promptly and were circulated in time to do some good. When they represented the State Department, the reports had to follow the procedures of that overstuffed department. The attaché got the information, if he could, considering his probable inexperience. He took it to the proper section of the Embassy. He could not have direct contacts with men in other nations from whom he could get statistical information; all this had to go through several echelons of Foreign Service officers. The report eventually got to Washington; it was referred to the Department of Agriculture for comment. It went back to the State Department to have the commas and the semicolons checked. Finally it got to the farmers who grew the products which were covered in the report. By that time the report was only of historic interest, if of any interest at all. The season was either underway or over. Humorous as this sounds, I do not exaggerate.

Then we changed back, and the agricultural attachés again represent the farmers. The change in the morale of the service is so marked that it has been

commented on in my hearing, dozens of times, here and abroad. We get our reports promptly again. They are excellent reports. Mr. Clayton Whipple became the active head of the Washington office. He had been the mainspring of the most successful part of the point 4 program. Our attachés are going to all parts of the world and opening new chapters of friendship for America.

Last year I flew into Paris, from Spain, just to be present at the first general conference held by a Secretary of Agriculture, for these agricultural attachés. It was held in the Paris Embassy. Three Congressmen were there. Attachés were there, who were located in a dozen countries. The morale was high. The results were excellent. The old doors were opening for American farmers.

So you will realize, Mr. Speaker, why I smile when I read that some employee of the State Department tries to influence a news item by saying that these farm attachés "know farming well, but that's all they know." Or that they "forget the proper dress," or give the wrong impression. I leave it to your good judgment, Mr. Speaker, which group is creating the wrong impression, if either, and I rise today to give thanks, in the last few hours of my last session, that we had these agricultural attachés in the past and that we have them again, loyal and competent, back home where they belong, in the Department of Agriculture.

A LOOK AT THE 84TH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress, and the first Congress in which I have had the privilege to participate, is coming to a close. It has been a great personal experience to serve my country and the people of Chicago's great Southwest Side.

My service in the 84th Congress, besides being most gratifying personally, has left me with lasting impressions concerning our Government.

If I were to identify my impressions of Congress, I would probably select as the deepest the observance of men of all walks of life, from every section of the country, laying aside subjective influences and legislating for the best interest of the Nation.

Seeing men like our distinguished Speaker, majority leader, minority leader, and other leaders of the House giving up opportunities to earn fantastic sums in private business to carry out their responsibilities to the people bespeaks the fact that there is something more in Congress than partisan politics. These gentlemen assume and perform their duty in due humility and with full appreciation of the faith and trust placed in them by their people, and are cognizant of the many compensations attached to such service which cannot be measured in monetary terms.

The rigid rules governing ordinary legislative procedure are time consuming and often frustrating to a Member eager to see promptly enacted measures he deems to be for the benefit of the country and the people whom he represents. However, even the slowness of the legislative process has great merit because it affords opportunity for thorough study and free decision upon matters affecting the country.

Personal friendships that transcend party lines and withstand the most bitter political controversy demonstrate to one that Congressmen are not the long-bearded ne'er-do-wells so often depicted in cartoons, but rather are plain, ordinary Americans carrying on their Nation's business.

Although it was charged in the fall of 1954 during the campaign preceding the election that if the Congress was Democratic our democratic processes would be stalemated with a Congress controlled by a party different than that of the President. The record of this Congress belies this contention because nothing approaching a partisan cold war has developed. The President's rash prediction of such a situation in the 1954 campaign discloses that he is a poor prophet.

The President found a majority of his own party deserting the administration on votes involving Federal aid to school construction, the mutual aid program, the United States Organization for Trade Cooperation, and others.

Although the Democratic Congress differed from the President in the areas of farm price supports, tax reduction, power matters, and social security, it joined with him on all matters in which the interest of all the people of America were at stake. They differed with him when legislation was designated to benefit only those with special interests. These differences, however, did not result in a stalemate of the Congress; on the contrary, they merely generated political thinking on issues that vitally affect the people and refute entirely earlier charges of disunity.

The record of the 84th Congress is something that I am proud to have had a part in. The 84th Congress discloses that regardless of the outcome of the next election the next Congress will be one of moderation. Since Congress more thoroughly reflects the thinking of the people than any other branch of the Government, it is evident that the people of the United States are more and more approaching moderation in their Government, with the extremists on the right and left becoming a distinct minority.

There remain issues to be resolved before this country can be said to be truly at peace with prosperity. The rights of our individual citizens regardless of race, creed, or national origin need additional legislative protection. Assistance is needed in our educational facilities. This assistance obviously must come from the Federal Government, but should come in such a fashion that local control over such facilities may be retained. Additional strides must be taken in the area of housing for the lower income groups and the aged; clearing of the slums; additional legislation is needed in the fields of labor and management relations so that these two great segments of our society engaged in production might meet across the bargaining table upon an equal basis. Additional legislation is needed in the field of social security, aid to our dependent children and the handicapped. Legislative progress must be made in the development of atomic energy, for the conservation and development of our natural resources. In the field of foreign policy, bolder steps must be taken to insure our own national security and peace in the world.

Obviously, no Congress will ever achieve the completion of all the problems that might face the Nation. The best that can be hoped for is that each Congress makes a step forward to the securing of the rights and the enjoyment thereof described in the document which gave birth to our liberty:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

STATISTICS ON ARRESTS, ET CETERA, OF WHITE AND NEGRO POPULATIONS OF VARIOUS AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have been exposed this year to two speeches entitled in the RECORD "Where is the Reign of Terror?" and "Racial Differences." These speeches by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] devoted themselves primarily to presenting certain statistics comparing white and Negro populations of various areas of the United States as to arrests and commitments to prison on felony charges, rates of illegitimate births, rejections from armed services through failure of the qualification test and number of cases of venereal disease.

The statistics which the gentleman set forth are unquestionably significant and disturbing. It may be that they were surprising to many Members, but no one has challenged them. As the gentleman from Mississippi said on July 5, "Thus far, no one has come forward to dispute the authenticity of this data, or the obvious conclusions to be drawn therefrom." I do not come forward now to question the authenticity of the data, but I am most concerned about the conclusions to be drawn from them. Over the past 2 days in debate on this floor many of my colleagues have been drawing conclusions which seem to be based on similar data to that presented by the gentleman from Mississippi but conclusions in this field of racial comparisons are by no means obvious, and the conclusions which such presentations tend to suggest are not, for me, at all conclusive.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of his March 27 speech the gentleman disavowed any belief that one race is a super race and the other is a race of degenerates. His main purpose, as he stated it, was to open the eyes of

those who have been blinded by leftwing propaganda and brainwashed by a biased press. If there be any Member of this House who was saved from blindness or brainwashing by the gentleman's efforts, I certainly wish to join in extending a vote of thanks for the salvation of a fellow Member. Yet, despite the high purpose for which the data was presented and the absence of racist philosophy which the gentleman professed, I fear that the statistics, as presented, can easily be misinterpreted. The gentleman's own remarks contribute to this possibility of misinterpretation.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman stated in one of his speeches that "the fact remains that there exists ethnic differences between the Caucasian race and the Negro race which cannot be changed by the hand of man." The listener might wonder, of course, which differences the gentleman had in mind. The House was then told that "in the days before this brainwashing crusade began, editors did not fear to print the truth." As an example of this fearless editorship of the truth he then quoted the 11th edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica in its dissertation on the Negro. If this dissertation constitutes the truth, then it is clear that the gentleman holds the Negro race to be degenerate in respect to mental capacity and this must be one of the differences which he considers beyond the power of man to change. The quoted passage bluntly states that, "mentally the Negro is inferior to the white" as a race, for the reason that the growth of the Negro's brain is arrested by the premature closing of the cranial sutures. The Negro's brain consequently does not achieve as great a volume as the white man's.

I might read this entire astounding passage, including the sentences which gentleman failed to include, which modify the sweeping generalization made at its outset, but the exact wording would be tedious and unenlightening. This passage of truth about the Negro which the gentleman has offered to offset the current propaganda is of only historical interest. The authority which the 11th edition of the encyclopaedia quoted, when it was published back in 1911—even the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, had not reached Congress when that edition appeared—the quoted authority for this description of the Negro's mentality was F. Manetta, an Italian, who made what Britannica described as a long study of the Negro in America and published a book on his findings in 1864.

Mr. Speaker, it is incredible to me how anyone can imagine that a book written about the American Negro, a study which took place during the years of his enslavement, could serve as standard of truth concerning the Negro's capabilities. In the year in which that book was published, 1864, less than 5 percent of the American Negroes could read and write. In 1864, psychology could make no pretense of being a science, and anthropology was a discipline that was barely known in this country. In fact, it is still not well known among us, for the gentleman from Mississippi has referred nostalgically to the days when sociological and "anthropoidal experts" saw their findings honestly printed. The American Negro does not need any "anthropoidal" or ape experts, to study him. (He does need anthropologists.) Not only were anthropology and psychology in their infancy in 1864, but the first rating scale of intelligence was not devised until 40 years later by Binet.

So it strikes me as a great disservice to American Negroes to represent a preemancipation sociologist as a speaker of truth on the question of the Negro's mental capacity. The idea that the volume of the brain determines a person's intelligence is absurd on the face of it. What hope would there be for the female sex, if it were true, and how would we explain their many achievements? Modern science has long since dropped the idea. What ridiculous distortions of the truth we could find, if we accepted uncritically everything that we read in the 1911 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Some rather unflattering things are said about the school system in certain Southern States, for example, which we know would not be said today. I shall not accuse the Encyclopaedia Britannica of having been "brainwashed" because it has brought its entry on Mississippi up to date in subsequent editions.

So that the record is clear on this subject of mental capacity of the American Negro, I shall read the dissertation in the latest edition, No. 14, the 1955 printing, of the Encyclopaedia Britannica:

> In reviewing the comparative studies of the differences between the Negro and the modern European, Carr-Sanders concludes that "there seems to be no market difference in innate intellectual power. The differences are rather differences in disposition and temperament * * * . The apparent arrest of development may not be so much an inevitable result of the kind of mental faculties which are inherited as the coming into play of a peculiar tradition."

That statement, Mr. Speaker, is in step with the findings of modern students on this subject. One of the most thorough investigators of this question, Dr. Otto Klineberg, of Columbia University, has had the following to say in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences:

> The results obtained by the tests of the army psychologists (World War I) also showed a marked superiority of northern over southern Negroes as well as a superiority of Negroes in several of the northern States over whites in several of the States of the South. The argument that these facts can be explained on the basis of a selective migration of the most intelligent Negroes from the South to the North and that the change on environment is therefore not responsible for the difference between the two groups has been refuted by recent studies at Columbia University, which have failed to reveal any selective factor of this kind and have, on the other hand, demonstrated a definite tendency for the test scores of Negro children to improve proportionately to the length of time they have lived in the more favorable environment.[1]

The record is clear, Mr. Speaker, despite the momentary efforts which are made to stress the backward stage of Negro social comportment as compared to the whites—the record is clear that great progress is being made toward diminishing the grounds for unfavorable comparisons of Negroes to whites. Many Members from the South have proudly indicated the attention which their States have given to raising the level of education, health care and housing for their Negro population. Surely these efforts are being made not simply out of a legalistic regard for the requirements of the "equal protection of the laws" phrase in the 14th amendment, but more importantly because the people of these States recognize that the present differences found between the white and black populations are socially conditioned and they wish to ameliorate these conditions for the mutual advantage of all. They may differ quite strenuously with some of us over the question of the rate at which social improvements for the Negroes can or should be made, but their attempts at improving Negro education and housing are hardly consistent with any present theory that the present differences between the races "cannot be changed by the hand of man." The suggestion that differences between groups in the rate of crimes, or level of intelligence are inevitably fixed is surely not taken seriously.

Before the storm blew in which we are presently experiencing over the Supreme Court's decision concerning segregation in the schools, a number of studies were made in States with heavy Negro populations into the same question which I have been discussing. In Jacksonville, Fla., for example, a biracial survey committee of the Council of Social Agencies made a study of the city's Negro community in 1946. They found that, with respect to crime, the Negroes committed relatively more offenses than the whites and were sentenced to prison in relatively greater number. The report went on to say, however, that—

> It is well to point out that students of crime are almost unanimous in their conclusion that race as such has very little, if anything, to do with the actual amount of crime committed. Rather they attribute the excess of criminality in certain groups to such factors as economic conditions, health, and housing, community environment, the administration of justice, and attitudes toward law enforcement.[2]

I am sure that reasonable people recognize the sense of those findings. They are the fruits of modern education, for all to pick who are willing. If such statements by the Council of Social Agencies in a fine southern city constitutes "brainwashing," then the House Committee on which I serve should be renamed, the Committee on Brainwashing and Labor.

A similar ray of understanding was cast by a study published by the University of Virginia in 1934, entitled "Negro Crime in a Small Urban Community," namely, Charlottesville, Va.

Professor Lightfoot, of the Textile Industrial Institute in Spartanburg, S. C.,

---

[1] Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, "Mental Tests," vol. V, p. 325.

[2] Jacksonville Looks at Its Negro Community, the Council of Social Agencies, Jacksonville, Fla., page 74.

reached the following conclusion in his study:

> The effect of unfavorable environment in producing delinquency is particularly well illustrated in all of the case studies. In fact, suggestions all through this study point to the conclusion that Negroes who get into difficulties do so in large part as a result of defective environment—that is, their physical surroundings, their economic standing, and their treatment by the white people—rather than through any inborn racial characteristics.[3]

This same point is borne out most clearly in a statement made by Solicitor Basil Whitener, of Charlotte, N. C., a few years ago:

> I have had but one major case to come out of Fairview Homes, the public housing project for Negroes, since I've been solicitor. But I can't count the number which have originated in the poverty- and disease-ridden sections of the city. The same thing is true regarding white people. Aside from the natural differences to be expected because of advanced progress in civilization of the white man, I'd say the crime rate is comparable in slum areas of both races. There are just more Negro slums.[4]

Is not this the point, after all, Mr. Speaker? "There are just more Negro slums." And these slums exist in northern cities as well as southern communities, in my own State of New Jersey, as well as in the District of Columbia. There are also slums of the mind for Negroes as well as slum neighborhoods. A tremendous job of slum clearance must be done in the fields of education, housing, and health. The task is being tackled strenuously in many areas of the country, because people believe that the present differences between the Negroes and white population are heavily conditioned by environment. It is no service to any of us to have the so-called racial differences stressed without mentioning the remedies which are being successfully applied.

Right here in the District of Columbia tremendous advances in the economic and educational standing of the Negro population have been taking place during recent decades, even while a heavy Negro immigration has been under way from areas with less opportunities for Negroes than exist here. Whatever frictions of adjustment to the integration of the schools may be publicized by the forthcoming study of that subject by the Committee on the District of Columbia there is no blinking the fact that despite heavy migration from the outside the Negro in this city has been steadily making himself a more useful and respectable citizen. For example the percentage of Negro females who are clerical workers in the District has increased from 3 percent of the total in 1940 to 23 percent in 1950, and Negro males increased their participation in this type of work from 9 percent to 17 percent in 1950. The proportion of all Negro males in other occupations has remained relatively constant, except, that a smaller proportion are now engaged as laborers. The median number of school years completed by Negroes in the District increased from about 7.9 years in 1940 to 8.9 in 1950, and by 1960 we should see the figure far closer to the level of the white population than it has ever been before. The Negroes of this city have more than doubled the number of homes they own since 1930, and the median value of these homes has increased 19 percent more than the median value of homes occupied by white owners during this period.

It is clear that where the opportunities are extended, the Negro is seizing them to improve his economic standing, and he is thereby helping to overcome the differences between his group and white people which can be so easily but so shortsightedly attributed to race. This is the social fact which deserves emphasis, in my mind, because from a recognition of this situation flows the courage, the patience and the compassion required to push forward the work of slum clearance in all its aspects, on the one hand, and the generation of tolerance and respect on the other.

[3] Negro Crime in a Small Urban Community, Publications of the University of Virginia, Phelps-Stokes Fellowship Papers, No. 12, 1934.

[4] The Charlotte News, February 18, 1955, editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask my friend from California, or ask anyone who can tell me, when we are going to adjourn, so that I may know the proper time to be here for that speech.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we shall adjourn fairly early. I trust I may have the chance to address the House, and if not, I shall ask permission to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to be here when the gentlewoman speaks, but I want to know now, if I may, what her remarks may be about so I may do a little research work on the same subject.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be talking about veterans' legislation. May I say to the gentleman that he has been extremely helpful in securing veterans' legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I certainly thank the gentlewoman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted I was given the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD immediately before the passage of the atomic-energy omnibus amendment bill presented by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY]. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks at that point some editorials which appeared recently in the Saturday Evening Post, and some extraneous articles from newspapers pertaining to the remarks which I shall make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

STASSEN AND HIS TEAM PLAY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it may be assumed that many are interested in the political situation which confronts the Republican Party at the moment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is the gentleman addressing the House?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am trying to address the Speaker, because I think the Speaker is more interested than the gentleman. I see my friend from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] here. I know he is interested in the same situation, which intrigues me, so if you gentlemen will come down here to the front we can discuss the matter face to face. Thank you all.

This is the incident which has been bothering me.

For some time I have been endeavoring to learn the source of and the reason for the opposition to our former colleague, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON. I have inquired of my constituents when I have been home. I have read the papers. I have consulted my colleagues. I have asked the Library of Congress, the Research Department, to see if they could learn just what was back of this opposition to DICK NIXON. I was unable to get any satisfactory answer or, in fact, any answer at all except from some Democratic politicians who said that he was altogether too severe in what he had to say about the Democrats and their political philosophy.

I do not know that he ever said anything very bad about them. I thought that at times he had been rather weak in his statements and in criticism. Then, just yesterday it was, some of my colleagues on the Republican side took me aside and said, "Why are you fussing around, trying to find the reason for the opposition to the Vice President. We can tell you." I said, "Well, all right, that is fine. Why did Stassen do that—being a member of the Eisenhower family, the official family and on the team?" Why did he publicly state that with NIXON on the ticket we would get less votes than with some other candidate?

If he has any political sense at all he knows better." I do not think he is the quarterback on Ike's team, but I know he is a big fellow and thinks the world of himself and might, maybe, in his conceit, think he was getting his orders direct from the White House. Well, they said, "That is not so. There is a group in New York—not New Jersey, but in New York who have plenty of money and very able, adroit, skilfull—let us put it—lawyers—also some people in the banks and big money outfits who make large loans, do big business with nations and groups abroad. The lawyers get big fees and the bankers get a whale of a big commission or slice and the big Wall Street moneychangers, out of the billions floating around in our dealings with other countries." As I understand it, under the Roosevelt administration which it was said was to drive the moneychangers out of Washington, the drive was not wholly successful. They did not get clear out of the country—they stopped over in New York—they crossed to New Jersey. It would not harbor them.

Mr. TUMULTY. No, they are in the Republican Party now, as I understand it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. The big money boys that are Stassen backers are in the Republican Party, or so they claim, they claim they are now reformed, honest, and decent. But in my opinion they are what they have always been—money grabbers—lacking in patriotism, thinking and acting only for their own selfish interests. I congratulate you people over there in Jersey for denying them sanctuary. In any event, they hang out in New York City at the moment. Stassen got in with those gentlemen and the more foreign aid they could get—the aid did not go across—the dollars stayed here but they would send some junk that they picked up from Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia—none in New Jersey—they picked up this junk for those good dollars that the Congress appropriated and sent it over there. And Stassen was working for that group on a sort of a 50–50 basis.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. That is where they picked Stassen up, going through Philadelphia when he was president of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They made a mistake in getting him. He will do their dirty work—but he is so obsessed with his idea—his conviction of his own importance that he will doublecross them at the first opportunity.

Mr. TUMULTY. We were glad to give him to them. I wonder whether Stassen was a part of the junk they picked up?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; wait a minute. I made a couple of talks here a few years ago about the gentleman. He was not described as good junk. I never even received a congratulatory message or any message from him at all on either. He did not thank me or publicly approve of it.

Now, this other group is an entirely different group. This gentleman said to me, "You know that drive against NIXON originates in New York. He is just too intelligent, too aggressive, too honest for them. Those boys are furnishing the money with this other group of moneyed men." I said, "Well, who are they?" He said, "Well, they are the friends of those Rosenberg spies who were convicted and executed. He said they blame NIXON for starting that drive against the Commies which finally got the Rosenberg spies when he got after Hiss."

Well, if that is so, you get the picture and now you see the artists who drew it. The big money for the Stassen drive comes out of New York, and you learn that the friends of the Commies are hooked up with the other outfit. It looks as if that is the kind of a drive that Stassen is putting on. But it looks to me as though if he will just publicize the source of his financial aid and the real names of his scrubs and Red backers and let the people of the country know that DICK NIXON is being opposed by these money changers and being opposed by friends of the Rosenbergs, not only will NIXON not lose any 6 percent of the vote—and I admire the Governor of Massachusetts, as we all do—we served with him, and we know he is a wonderful, fine man, a lieutenant of Hoover, who distributed food after World War I. NIXON will get a far larger vote than would any other candidate for Vice President. Stassen is just thinking about Stassen.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Are these friends of the Rosenbergs who are in New York the money changers, in your opinion?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, there are two distinct groups. The lawyers and the big bankers, the money chasers whose god is the dollar. You see, they are just one group. That group, on the one side, which handle these international funds. Out of which they get millions and for the appropriation of which Stassen is partly responsible.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And the other ones are the friends of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. And the friends and backers—the supporters of any and all Commies.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And in the gentleman's estimation——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know. I am just repeating gossip which seems to be all too true. Perhaps I should not, but it comes from a source that is reliable and is quite in line with the Commies' procedure.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gossip that the gentleman heard is that these people within the two groups are the people who were supporting Stassen in his opposition to our former colleague, Mr. NIXON.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the situation. Stassen is working for Stassen, using his pretended opposition against NIXON for his own advancement. But he gets his money from the source indicated and is being used by those who supported the Rosenberg spies and others of that disloyal group.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman will concede that he is not advancing very rapidly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who, Stassen?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I saw a cartoon, I do not know whether it was in the Washington Star or the Chicago Tribune I think it was, where he was hanging on to this something coming from the ceiling—on a rope. It was not around his neck but he had hold of it and he was going all right. But the rope broke and he was going down—down through the floor and into the cellar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Stassen?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; Stassen was going down—down to the bottom—on his bottom.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. He was Stassenated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that—Stassenated? Yes; I think that was the idea.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. He was Stassenated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not think that was all that he deserved. I think he should have something worse than that done to him but that would do for a starter. Stassen does not care anything about that good and great Governor of Massachusetts, Chris Herter. Stassen is just promoting Stassen and aiding his Red international backers.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The rules prohibit discussing exactly what he may have deserved in the estimation of those who think highly of Mr. NIXON.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, we all think highly of Mr. NIXON. I know on your side you are all unanimous in your high regard for him; very much like it was today here with our friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Nicholson—you all loved him and praised but some voted against him. I assume you all respect and admire NIXON. I know you do but some of you of course will vote for your own candidate come November—and with that no one will complain.

If you put up a ticket after Eisenhower is through his next term—which will be around 1960—of NIXON and KENNEDY, if I am around—and I do not expect to be—I will vote for both on that ticket NIXON and KENNEDY. That would make a wonderful ticket of outstanding, patriotic young Americans.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman says our distinguished former colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, is a distinguished and fine representative of the American people and is worthy to be on anyone's ticket?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have it right so far as you have gone—but you might well have said much more in his praise. Having served 6 years with him on the Committee on Education and Labor I cannot do otherwise than agree with you. He certainly is an outstanding, able, sincere young man, and I am sure will be deemed qualified and deserving by the people of this country in time to come for any office he may seek, but I hope that he has a switch in his party convictions. It would be a wonderful ticket, NIXON and KENNEDY, or KENNEDY and NIXON.

But I am not trying to take over Stassen's role of suggesting anyone as a candidate. You know how it is, somebody comes along and suggests something to you and you think you thought

of it and then you find you did not, but I wanted to pretend I did, and I think there is something to this idea of the dollar worshipers and Reds backing Stassen in the effort to keep NIXON whom they fear off the Republican ticket.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman think the Scripps Howard paper may have had any support of Stassen's move against our former colleague, the distinguished Vice President, Mr. NIXON?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never had any support from any national newspaper that I know of. I know, having been here a couple of years I am supposed to know everything; as a matter of fact I know nothing at all of the newspaper business.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The basis of my question is that they apparently had some advance information and perhaps fostered this a little with the New York crowd the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Scripps-Howard?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know about that. But they have been against the Reds always. I would not want to say anything about Scripps-Howard papers because I do not know. Have no idea of their political policy.

Mr. TUMULTY. It seems to me that Stassen by his move has demonstrated lack of judgment and lack of regard for his leader. It seems to me he has shown lack of party loyalty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where does the gentleman get the idea that Stassen was ever loyal to any party? To any idea?

Mr. TUMULTY. I never got that idea; I was just making the observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is not that expecting too much of Mr. Stassen—that is that he be loyal to anyone, to anything other than to his own selfish ideas, if he is a member of Ike's team he is throwing his passes the wrong way.

Mr. TUMULTY. We all expect a lot of everyone, but I was speaking by and large.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You were what?

Mr. TUMULTY. Speaking by and large of the Republican Party itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the gentleman wants it he be given 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want me to take the 5 minutes and then yield it to him? I would be glad to do so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I was just enjoying this colloquy so much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You and I are two at least. I do not wish to longer delay adjournment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOSMER, of California for Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, on account of personal emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HESELTON, today and tomorrow, for 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MINSHALL, for 30 minutes today, Friday, and Saturday.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DIES.

Mr. KING of California in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas and to include extraneous material.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York and to include a statement.

Mr. HESELTON, the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole today on H. R. 8902, and include certain related matter.

Mr. LAIRD on the cranberry bill, and include a wire and three letters.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), and include a statement.

Mr. HAND and include an article.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous material.

Mr. WOLVERTON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. CORBETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS in two instances relative to the record of the 84th Congress.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Sam H. Ray;

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4090. An act to provide for a study by the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration with respect to the need for automatic radiotelegraph call selectors and other such safety devices on certain cargo ships of the United States;

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5738. An act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6040. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9699. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10432. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11613. An act to extend the time limit which naval vessels may be loaned to friendly eastern nations and to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly European nations;

H. R. 11677. An act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Army of the United States (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list;

H. R. 11695. An act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by the Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions;

H. R. 12138. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. R. 12237. An act to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 497. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California;

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

S. 1243. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1324. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act;

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes;

S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions;

S. 2216. An act to amend the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497);

S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State;

S. 2634. An act relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes;

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3458. An act to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes;

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3556. An act to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, 2d session;

S. 3592. An act to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service;

S. 3616. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes;

S. 3650. An act for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine;

S. 3658. An act to amend the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), so as to authorize, by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted;

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments here listed, and for other purposes;

S. 3779. An act to amend the Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah:

S. 3820. An act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 3875. An act to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers.

S. 3926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public-health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes;

S. 3968. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3969. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3970. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3998. An act to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery, known as the Holden trout hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt.;

S. 4060. An act to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to include employees in the motor vehicle service;

S. 4215. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1954, authorizing the sale of certain vessels to Brazil;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians;

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week;

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island;

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishments of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco;

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958;

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959;

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Sam H. Ray;

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3882. An act to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5712. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto;

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6794. An act to authorize certain members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept and wear decorations, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines;

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate;

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son, Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth.

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8474. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9547. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 (e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 11636. An act to amend chapter 8 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish;

H. R. 11696. An act to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aluets, or Eskimos in Alaska;

H. R. 12237. An act to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States;

H. J. Res. 511. Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce;

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2081. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee of Conference. H. R. 11124. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children or judges (Rept. No. 2934). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of Conference. H. R. 7619. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2935). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7225. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2936). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2937. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to House Resolution No. 18 pertaining to an investigation into the activities of foreign freight forwarders and brokers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11481. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River; with amendment (Rept. No. 2940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 12350. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1957 and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2941). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BONNER: Committee of conference. S. 3275. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the development, conservation for preservation, management and use of fisheries resources, to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2942). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3957. A bill for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett; without amendment (Rept. No. 2943). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 268. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2944). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Report on Farm Management in the United States Government pursuant to House Resolution 262 (84th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 2945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11830. A bill for the relief of George Nakamura; without amendment (Rept. No. 2938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 12421. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the recodification of retailers' excise taxes imposed by subtitle D, chapter 31, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 12422. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 12423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treating severance pay received by former members of the Armed Forces as a long-term capital gain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12424. A bill to exempt severance pay received by former members of the Armed Forces from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 12425. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to bonds filed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 on installment obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 12426. A bill to amend the name and corporate purposes of the Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12427. A bill to provide for a special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the arts, crafts, and other cultural activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 12428. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 12429. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 12430. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 12431. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 12432. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 12433. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 12434. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 12435. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a plan and make recommendations for consolidation in a single executive agency of the responsibility for, and supervision of, activities involving Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 12436. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to define comprehensive plan and to provide for multipurpose development of water resources for optimum public benefit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 12437. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to define comprehensive plan and to provide for multiple-purpose development of water resources for optimum public benefit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 12438. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the northwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 700. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution relative to faith in the Word of God and renewed observance of the 10 Commandments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution relative to faith in the Word of God and renewed observance of the 10 Commandments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution urging the free nations to join in an International Magna Charta agreement with respect to protection of private property of foreign nationals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Res. 642. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of national civilian air policy and its enforcement; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 643. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of national civilian air policy and its enforcement; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. Res. 644. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of national civilian air policy, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIES:

H. Res. 645. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certification of nonscheduled air carriers as scheduled air carriers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. Res. 646. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate certification of nonscheduled air carriers as scheduled air carriers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UTT:

H. Res. 647. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate certification of nonscheduled air carriers as scheduled air carriers; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 12439. A bill for the relief of Antonio Frezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 12440. A bill for the relief of Stanley Teitzel and F. M. Crawford Lumber, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 12441. A bill for the relief of Ursula Gwendolyn Kunze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 12442. A bill for the relief of Quan Yee Lum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 12443. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 12444. A bill for the relief of Michael Spak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 12445. A bill for the relief of Wai Ling Vivian Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 12446. A bill for the relief of Felix Rincon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):

H. R. 12447. A bill for the relief of Antonio Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 12448. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Uglesic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 12449. A bill for the relief of Emmy B. Heinrichmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Reimbursement of the State of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, extracts from House and Senate Reports, 74th Congress; the report on June 8, 1955, of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Claims, and a statement prepared by me on May 3, 1955, all relating to H. R. 5253, relating to the claims of the State of California.

The matters follow:

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Daily Digest, vol. 101, pt. 12, p. 377]

"Claims: Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Subcommittee No. 2 ordered reported to the full committee H. R. 5253, amended, for the relief of the State of California."

Following is the favorable report on the bill, H. R. 5253, providing for the payment for the sum found by the Court of Claims to have been expended by the State of California, as determined by that court pursuant to the Knowland Act of September 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 1032):

"H. R. 5253

"A bill for the relief of the State of California

"This bill was introduced by Congressman CECIL KING, of California, and provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State of California, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of money expended by such State as reported in findings Nos. 24, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 40 of the commissioner's report to the Court of Claims, filed May 28, 1953, No. 49912. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the State of California for reimbursement for all expenses incurred by such State in maintaining its militia and in recruiting, equipping, and supporting voluntary forces for the national defense during the War Between the States, including expenses resulting from indebtedness incurred for such purposes.

"In 1861 Congress passed an act authorizing the payment of the claim, but the Government contended that under the Chase (then Secretary of the Treasury) regulations, which the act did not set aside or waive, the law in regard to interest could not be complied with.

"Here the matter has rested ever since. The amount expended by the State of California at the request of the United States Government has never been in dispute; nor has it ever been contended that this claim was not the obligation of the United States, under the wording of the appeal made to California by President Lincoln.

"Finally Congress passed an act, Public Law 834, in the 81st Congress, 2d session, conferring on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to make findings of fact, waiving the Statute of Limitations. The Court of Claims gave judgment for a part of the claim, but found that in its judgment, under the Chase regulations, some claims for interest were not reimbursable.

"The court did find and make the following conclusions in the report of the commissioner filed May 28, 1953 (No. 49912):

"'MILITIA EXPENDITURES

"'24. Under the direction and superintendence of certain high ranking officials of the California militia, the State expended pursuant to the foregoing statutes the sum of $468,976.54 on account of its militia forces, itemized as follows:

Equipment	$179,000.00
Subsistence	37,075.47
Transportation	63,589.97
Supplies	64,805.78
Incidental expenses	8,779.16
Drill expenses	70,251.15
Organizational expenses	6,778.61
Pay of militia:	
State staff officers	7,063.82
Militia generally	30,902.58
Band	730.00
	38,696.40
Total	468,976.54

"'Of the total sum of $179,000 expended on equipping the militia, $70,140 was for uniforms and cavalry equipment with an additional $32,511.25 for like purposes, and the balance of $76,348.75 was applied to purposes which are not disclosed in the record.

"'The commanding general of the Department of the Pacific, United States Army, consulted with and advised the governor and members of the California legislature, and at all times promoted and encouraged the reorganization and strengthening of the California militia, but it is not shown that he or any other official of the United States requested or demanded the course of action taken with respect to the militia, or directed, superintended, or conducted the program.

"'EXTRA PAY TO VOLUNTEERS

"'31. Pursuant to said acts, the State of California expended the principal amount of $1,459,270.21 as extra pay to the California volunteers for their services in the United States Army. In addition, California expended $3,000 to print the relief or extra pay bonds.

" 'BOUNTY PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTEERS

" '33. The bounty payments made by the State of California pursuant to said act, amounted to the principal sum of $900,839.50.

" 'RECRUITING EXPENSES—VOLUNTEERS

" '34. By an act approved April 10, 1863, Statutes of California, 1863, at 246, the California Legislature appropriated the sum of $24,260 for the purpose of meeting the expenses incurred in recruiting various units of California volunteers then in process of formation. The specific sum appropriated was identified as the moneys then in the State treasury arising from the exchange of gold for legal tender notes in the payment by the State treasurer of the Federal war tax assessed against the State of California.

" 'The sum appropriated was apportioned so as to provide the commanding officer of each regiment and battalion with $898.51 for each of the companies of his command, to be distributed to defray recruiting expenses in the proportion of $498.51 to each captain, and $200 to each lieutenant. It was provided that the recruiting officers would produce vouchers for necessary traveling expenses, for subsistence of their recruits previous to being forwarded to the general rendezvous, and for all other necessary incidental expenses.

" 'The entire sum was distributed by the State treasurer to the various commanding officers of the regiments and battalions. A complete set of vouchers with respect to expenditures made by various recruiting officers was filed by only one of the commanding officers, whose regiment received $8,985.15 under the act. The record in this case also indicates that some other company officers of a battalion filed proper vouchers, but the amount of their expenditures is not shown.

" 'Except for the sum of $8,985.15, there is no satisfactory evidence that the sum appropriated was properly expended by the recruiting officers.

" 'PAY OF VOLUNTEER OFFICERS

" '35. Under United States War Department regulations the pay of line officers, including those in the California volunteers, commenced as follows: (a) Captains and second lieutenants from the date the company was raised to the full minimum number, or when mustered in by special order; and (b) first lieutenants from date the company was raised to one-half the minimum number. In paying line officers, these rules were applied by the United States without exception.

" 'In California, officers commissioned by the State of California, who were engaged in raising volunteer troops, had difficulty bringing the enrollment to the mustering-in strength. As a consequence, their Federal pay did not commence until considerable time and effort had already been expended by them. To compensate their officers for such premustering services California enacted the act approved April 4, 1884, Statutes of California, 1863–64, at 424, the preamble of which provided:

" ' "Whereas the burden of raising the Volunteer Companies of this State for the service of the United States is borne principally by the captains and lieutenants of those companies, after having been examined and accepted by a board of Army officers, and after receiving their commissions from the State; and

" ' "Whereas the said officers receive no pay for their services until they are declared mustered into the service of the United States, which with a first lieutenant, is when his company is raised to one half the minimum number, and with a captain and second lieutenant, [fol. 91] when the company is raised to the full minimum number, or when it is mustered in by a special order; and

" ' "Whereas, owing to the tardy manner in which volunteering has progressed under the governor's call for volunteers of February 5, 1863, the officers of the companies called for have been subjected to great expense in raising their companies, in some cases having been compelled to abandon the enterprise in order to procure the means to subsist themselves and their families."

" 'This act set up the line officers' relief fund. It provided for the payment from the fund to the line officers of the California volunteers the same pay and allowances as received by the regular United States Army officers of the same grade for the period from the time the volunteer officers received their commissions to the time of their muster into the Federal service. The act further provided that there was to be deducted from the amount thus computed any amounts received by such officers during the abovementioned period, either from the Federal Government for services or from the State under provisions of the act of April 10, 1863. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act, the sum of $65,000 was appropriated, and it was further authorized that bonds in this amount be issued, bearing interest at 7 percent per annum, redeemable July 1, 1874.

" 'Pursuant to this act, California paid $23,277.34 to its volunteer line officers to compensate them for services performed prior to their induction into the Federal forces, and for which they were not and could not be compensated under the War Department regulations.

" 'CALIFORNIA ADJUTANT GENERAL'S EXPENSES

" '36. By an act approved April 25, 1855, Statutes of California, 1855, at 136, concerning the State militia, the California legislature provided that the State adjutant general was quartermaster general and inspector general, and was charged with the protection and issuance of all arms and property, to receive and keep reports and records, and to make an annual report. His salary was fixed at $3,000 per year.

" 'By the act approved April 24, 1862, heretofore referred to in finding No. 18, the organization and function of the (fol. 92) State militia were more broadly defined. The adjutant general was designated to serve as ex officio chief of staff, quartermaster general, commissary general, inspector general, and chief of ordnance. His salary was continued at $3,000 per year.

" 'The regular staff of the adjutant general had consisted of 1 assistant and 1 clerk. During the war years his office was responsible for the payment of bounties and extra pay and his clerical help was considerably increased.

" 'The California expenditures for its adjutant general during the period from April 15, 1861, to August 20, 1866, amounted to $14,850.05 for the salary of the adjutant general, and $23,233.12 as wages of clerks and porters, or a total of $38,083.17.

" 'In addition, the sum of $2,639.34 was expended for rental of office space for the adjutant general during that period.

" 'After the war the adjutant general's office continued to administer the affairs of the militia which later became the National Guard.

" 'INTEREST PAID ON EXTRA PAY AND BOUNTY INDEBTEDNESS

" '38. The interest paid by the State of California between April 27, 1863, and July 1, 1889, on the original relief (extra pay) and bounty bonds, issued pursuant to the California acts of April 27, 1863, and April 4, 1864, to the date of their redemption or conversion at times prior to July 1, 1889, amounted to $302,364.60 on the relief bonds, and $366,206.26 on the bounty bonds, or a total of $668,570.86.

" 'By an act approved April 2, 1870, Statutes of California, 1869–70, at 646, the California legislature authorized the issuance of bonds known as the State funded debt bonds of 1873, to bear interest at the reduced rate of 6 percent per annum, for the purpose of liquidating and refinancing the funded indebtedness of the State. Pursuant to said act, and on January 2, 1873, various new bonds were exchanged for relief bonds to the extent of $239,500, and for bounty [fol. 93] bonds to the extent of $605,000. Thereafter and until July 1, 1889, the State of California paid interest on such new bonds in the sum of $233,025 on the converted relief indebtedness and in the amount of $598,950 on the converted bounty indebtedness or a total of $831,975.

" 'The total interest payments to July 1, 1889, on the relief and bounty indebtedness amounted to the sum of $1,500,545.86.

" 'After July 1, 1889, and until July 2, 1945, when all of the State funded debt bonds of 1873 were redeemed, the State of California paid interest on the new bonds issued in exchange for the original relief and bounty bonds, to the extent of $789,693.34 on the relief indebtedness, and in the sum of $2,032,900.85 on the bounty indebtedness, or a total of $2,822,594.19.

" 'The total interest paid by the State of California on all bonds covering the indebtedness incurred to finance the extra pay and bounty payments amounted to $4,323,140.05.

" 'CLAIMED DISCOUNT LOSSES ON BONDS

" '40. The State of California sustained net losses in the sum of $318,022 in the way of discounts on the sales of the original relief and bounty bonds because of stringent economic conditions during that period, and by reason of the premium of 7 percent allowed on the State funded debt bonds of 1873, which were exchanged for the old bonds. This net loss is established as follows:

	Relief bonds	Bounty bonds	Totals
" 'Discount on bond sales	$87,400	$175,160	$262,560
Less: Discount earned on redemptions	3,653		3,653
Net discount expense	83,747	175,160	258,907
Add: Seven percent increase in par value of State Funded Debt Bonds of 1873, exchanged for relief and bounty bonds and redeemed at par value	16,765	42,350	59,115
Total loss on discounts and additional cost of redemption of bonds exchanged for relief and bounty bonds	100,512	217,510	318,022'

"Totaling the amounts found due the State of California from the findings of fact set forth above, we find the amount due the State of California to be $7,537,248.15.

"No claim is made to moneys under finding 34 of the Court of Claims and hence the bill should be amended to eliminate that from the bill.

"This matter has been fully before the Court of Claims with a complete history of it from the beginning. It was sent to the Court of Claims for the express purpose of finding out what was due, and it would seem that we have no special duty to perform except to authorize an appropriation to pay the claim.

"Respectfully submitted.

"USHER L. BURDICK, M. C."

[74th Cong., 1st sess.; House of Representatives; Report No. 1162]

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(June 10, 1935, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed)

Mr. HOEPPEL, from the Committee on War Claims, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 1932):

"The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1932) for the relief of the State of California, after a hearing and careful consideration, report the bill back with an amendment and, as amended, recommend that the bill do pass.

"The State of California made large expenditures in aid of the Federal Government during the War Between the States under the act of July 27, 1861, which act in general terms invited and encouraged the States to contribute their own funds for purposes of national defense and promised reimbursement thereof.

* * * * *

"The records further show that California was prompt in complying with the call made upon the State by the National Government and furnished all the financial and material aid in its power to help the Government in the common defense. * * *

* * * * *

"A bill on all fours with the California case was passed by Congress and approved by the President in the 70th Congress to reimburse the State of Nevada. Nevada's war expenditures were made under exactly similar authority and circumstances, and on the recommendation of the Commanding General of the Pacific, as were those of California. The exigencies impelling the Legislature of Nevada to pass acts authorizing such expenditures were identical. Even the acts of her legislature were copied after those enacted by the Legislature of California. The considerations in the one case cannot be differentiated from the same consideration in the other. California should be reimbursed for the same reasons that Nevada was repaid.

"All States other than California incurring expenditures for national defense have been reimbursed by the United States, principal and interest, under general and special acts of Congress. * * *

* * * * *

"The total loss suffered by the State of California on account of the discount at which the orignal bonds were sold and on account of the discount at which new bonds were given in exchange for the old amounted to the sum of $318,027, which sum should undoubtedly also be reimbursed the State of California under the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury in the Pennsylvania case hereinafter referred to, but which has not been taken into the account by the Comptroller General in the accounting rendered August 14, 1930.

* * * * *

"The Secretary of the Treasury issued certain rules for the preparation and settlement by the Treasury Department under the acts of Congress approved July 17, 1861, and July 27, 1861, of claims for reimbursement of expenses properly incurred by the States, respectively, on account of their troops 'employed in aiding to suppress the present insurrection against the United States.' These rules are divided into nine sections. Section 8 of these rules reads as follows:

" 'Bounties or donations to men or their families to induce men to volunteer will not be recognized. Such bounties as may be authorized by law will be paid by the United States directly to the men authorized to receive them. Voluntary contributions, either by State or local corporations, or by individuals, in aid of families of volunteers, etc., constitute no charge against the United States, and will not be refunded.'

* * * * *

"The expenditures which were made by the State of California in order to compensate its volunteers for the depreciation of the currency, as it affected their rate of pay, could not be considered a wasteful expenditure of public funds, nor was it a bounty in any proper sense, but was, as the Army board reported, 'to do a plain act of justice.'

* * * * *

"Had it not been for this particular paragraph 8 of the so-called Chase regulations, so narrowly interpreted, the legislation enacted by Congress on July 27, 1861, would have been sufficient long ago to have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have settled the requests for reimbursement on behalf of the State of California.

* * * * *

"It is only upon such a technicality presented under the so-called Chase regulations, narrowing and limiting the plain intent of the act of 1861, that up to the present the State of California remains unreimbursed.

"CONGRESS DECLARES EXPENDITURES VALID

"However, Congress after many years of consideration of the expenditures as made acknowledged the merit, justice, and validity of such expenditures and thus swept aside this technical construction of the act of 1861 under the Chase regulations which the Army officers themselves stated were unjust and inequitable to apply thereto. * * *

* * * * *

"PRECEDENT

"No other State in the Union, with the possible exception of Oregon and Nevada, had to contend with such extreme, abnormal conditions during the period of the Civil War as California had to contend with; and for that reason the reimbursement of California at this time, in view of the reimbursement of Nevada during the 70th Congress, should create no apprehension as to establishing a precedent. * * *

* * * * *

"The failure to reimburse California at that time was solely due to the narrow construction of the act of 1861 by the Treasury officials made under circumstances described by Comptroller Gilkeson in his report to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of November 21, 1892 (embodied in the Secretary's annual report to Congress), as follows:

" 'The National Treasury was empty. He (Secretary Chase) was expected to devise ways and means to carry on the war and to defray the expenses. He knew that it was only by practicing the greatest economy that he could succeed. * * * It is not strange, therefore, that at that time he put a construction on this statute now regarded as a narrow one. * * * None of the conditions that surrounded Secretary Chase pertain today. It is the duty of those who control affairs to see to it that no wrong shall be done to the loyal States whose people so nobly sustained the Government.' "

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 3, 1955.*

RE H. R. 5253 (84TH CONG.) INTRODUCED MARCH 28, 1955, BY REPRESENTATIVE KING, OF CALIFORNIA

Under this bill California will be paid for claims she has proved in the Court of Claims under Public Law 834, a jurisdictional act approved September 25, 1950, for moneys advanced and expenditures made at the request of the Federal Government, in aid of the United States during the Civil War.

Senate Report No. 2446 and House Report No. 2696, 81st Congress, state:

"All States, except California have been reimbursed for moneys actually expended for costs, charges, and expenses in enrolling, equipping, transporting and paying volunteer troops during that war.

"Bills for direct reimbursement [all sponsored by Senator Hiram Johnson] have passed the Senate 9 times.

"All States other than California incurring expenses for national defense have been reimbursed by the United States, principal and interest, under general and special acts of Congress."

The House Committee on Wars Claims (now a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee) approved the California claims unanimously (H. Rept. No. 1162, 74th Cong.). Representative CELLER (now chairman of the House Judiciary Committee) was a member of that committee; see page 63 of that report.

The Court of Claims gave judgment in March 1954 under the above 1950 act for only a small portion of the claims. It held that because of the regulations of Secretary of the Treasury Chase respecting such claims, certain items were not reimbursable. Although the court found that California had actually advanced and expended nearly the entire amounts claimed, in aid of the Federal Government, it disregarded the following statements of both House and Senate Judiciary Committees:

"Had it not been for paragraph 8 of the so-called Chase regulations, so narrowly interpreted, the legislation enacted by Congress on July 27, 1861, would have been sufficient long ago to have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have settled the requests for reimbursement on behalf of the State of California."

The House and Senate committee reports each stated that in 1929 Nevada was reimbursed for expenditures "made under exactly similar circumstances," and that Nevada was "finally reimbursed for all these military expenditures and for the interest paid on money that was borrowed for the purpose of meeting such expenditures."

CONCLUSION

1. California's claims have been approved nine times by the Senate;

2. The House committee has reported favorably on these claims;

3. The Court of Claims has found that California advanced and expended the money at the request of the Federal Government;

4. A special Army board created by Congress has also found and reported to Congress that "the money was actually expended by the State" and approved the reasonableness of and the necessity therefor;

5. The Comptroller General has certified the aggregate expenditures as "the balance found due" to the State; and

6. Previous Congresses conducted no less than seven investigations into the merits of the claim and have reported their findings in the Senate and House reports.

Under H. R. 5253, California will receive back the money admittedly owing to her for so many years. Passage of the bill will remove the necessity of further action by Congress to amend the jurisdictional act of 1950 to require additional litigation and further delay in payment of the claim described on the Senate floor "as sacred an obligation, in my judgment, as the national bonds."

The Governors of California, its attorneys general, State treasurer, secretary of state, and State collector have urged Congress to enact this legislation.

Shabby Treatment of Our Federal Retirees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the closing hours of this 84th Congress are upon us,

and I am compelled to express my indignation at the apathy of this Congress in connection with the shabby treatment accorded our Federal retirees. These former civil servants are entitled to better treatment at the hands of their Government. Some twenty-odd bills were introduced by various Members of this House, including my own H. R. 11334, designed to grant some measure of economic relief to this group. The House committee has failed to consider any of these measures. Anyone who has given this problem even a cursory examination will agree that the present pensions are grossly inadequate and completely out of line with the present cost of living index.

H. R. 11178, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], is the bill most frequently mentioned by interested constituents of mine. It is indeed tragic that the distinguished Members of this House were not given the opportunity of acting on this or similar legislation such as S. 3725, the Senate-passed version which rests at this moment on the Speaker's desk. The economic objections raised against this legislation leave me cold. Since when have we placed a price on the welfare of our people? We lavish money all over the world to raise the standard of living of other nations in the interest of making the world safe for democracy. Yet the needs of the Federal retirees of our own land are ignored. What consistency is there in a policy that is parsimonious on the one hand, and profligate on the other? It is not my purpose to quarrel with the principle of fighting the cold war with dollars rather than lives, but it is a sad state of affairs when retired civil servants who have served their government long and well are denied an annuity that will provide something more than a mere existence.

I would like to serve notice here and now that if I am returned as a Member of the 85th Congress it is my intention to reintroduce this legislation and work for its passage with all the resources at my command, in order to bring about fair and equitable annuities for these deserving people.

Recodification of Retailers' Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 12421 providing for a complete recodification of that portion of chapter 31 of subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code which imposes retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage.

These retail sales taxes, duplicating those imposed by a majority of the States, were originally enacted as temporary taxes under wartime conditions. The continued encroachment by the Federal Government upon this major source of State tax revenues is tolerable only so long as the defense needs of the Government continue at their present high levels.

Until such time as reduced Government expenditures or replacement revenue sources permit the total elimination of these retail sales taxes, a complete recodification of the law is required, first, to relieve consumers of the burden of a 10 percent luxury excise tax on articles of everyday usage and necessity; and, second, to eliminate a long list of competitive inequities and compliance problems among the several hundred thousand retailers burdened with the duty of collecting these taxes.

The principal articles which would be relieved of the present 10 percent taxes under the bill are:

Silver-plated tableware.

All jewelry, clocks, watches, and related articles sold at retail for $5 or less.

All fur or fur-trimmed articles other than capes, coats, jackets, scarves, stoles, wraps, and similar garments.

Antiperspirants, deodorants, sunburn preventives, petroleum jellies, and aromatic cachous.

Handbags, wallets, key cases, and luggage sold at retail for $5 or less.

The enactment of H. R. 12421 will not result in a significant loss of revenue to the Government. While the exemptions provided under the bill for nonluxury articles of everyday usage and necessity will mean a tax savings to consumers of as much as $50 million annually, most, if not all, of this apparent revenue loss will be recouped through improved compliance and enforcement made possible by the adoption of a more equitable and certain statute.

In introducing H. R. 12421 at this time, I am hopeful that taxpayers will exercise the opportunity to study its provisions carefully and that the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Excise Tax policy will find it convenient and desirable to schedule public hearings upon it at an early date.

Lebanon Celebrates Its 13th Anniversary of Independence November 22, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my sincere felicitations to the people of Lebanon, President Camille Shamun, and His Excellency, Dr. Charles Malik, Ambassador of Lebanon, on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of independence of Lebanon, November 22, 1956.

After having heroically opposed in different epochs numerous invasions, the Lebanese still stand firm for their freedom and independence. With varying fortunes they maintained the high spirit of liberty. Like some of its neighbors, according to the peace settlements of the First World War, Lebanon was incorporated into the mandate system. The ensuing years until 1943 witnessed many attempts on the part of Lebanon to wrest itself from the jaws of quasi-colonialism. When the British and Free French drove out the Vichy French Government in 1941 they both declared the independence of Lebanon. In the summer of 1943 free popular elections were held resulting in a constitutional parliament, which elected His Excellency, Bechara El-Khoury, President of the Republic of Lebanon.

In 1944 and 1945 a score of powers recognized Lebanon's independence. In February 1945, Lebanon declared war on Germany and Japan, and on April 12 of the same year she signed the United Nations Declaration in Washington. Two final acts completed Lebanon's launching into international life; the signing of the Pact of the League of Arab States in Cairo in March 1945 and Lebanon's full participation as a sovereign and independent state in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. Lebanon has openly avowed that she intends to play her full part in the international field as a free and independent member of the Arab League.

Grave crises have arisen to plague the new government, but these occasions of friction have had the effect of strengthening rather than weakening Lebanon's independence, thanks primarily to the remarkable national unity which the diverse elements of her population were able to achieve.

Although Lebanon is primarily an agricultural country, the era since the end of the war has witnessed a remarkable development of her industries. In trade and commerce, Beirut is certainly one of the main centers of the Near East. The economic importance of Tripoli is growing, owing to the fact that it is one of the two termini of the oil pipeline from Iraq.

In the words of the Lebanese Ambassador, His Excellency Charles Malik:

> The significance of Lebanon should not be sought in the material sphere. Her significance is entirely intellectual and spiritual. She is the home par excellence in the Near East of freedom of thought and conscience. The country is above 80 percent literate, and it is estimated that every year more than a quarter of her population go to school. Thousands of students flock into her institutions from all over the Near East. The influence of Lebanese thought and life and traditions and outlook upon this army of students is incalculable. It was in Lebanon that the Arabic version of the Bible was made and the Summa of Saint Thomas translated into Arabic. The modern Arab literary, social and political awakening owes its original impetus and direction to Lebanese thought. The entire moral, esthetic, and intellectual climate of the Near East is unthinkable without the agency of the Lebanese. About 1 million Lebanese live in Lebanon, 1 million in North, Central, and South America, and another million spread over the rest of the world; and wherever they go, the children of Lebanon carry with

them their characteristic industry, their traditional tolerance, their spirit of adventure, their readiness to learn, and, above all, a genuine thirst for and respect for the truth.

No finer tribute could be paid to the stalwart people of Lebanon on this momentous occasion.

Tribute to Congressmen Cannon, Thomas, and Patman, Committee Chairmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress approaches adjournment and we reflect upon our work and service and accomplishments, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my own special tribute of regard and appreciation for the three chairmen and subcommittee chairmen of committees on which I am privileged to serve in the Congress.

It has been my good fortune and pleasure and certainly distinct privilege to be able to work with the members of the Committee on Appropriations and especially my colleagues of the two appropriation subcommittees on which I serve—namely, the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. My other committee assignment is represented by membership on the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. My three committee chairmen are the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who also serves as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations; the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, and the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. All of these gentlemen, my chairmen, are outstanding chairmen.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as we all know and recognize, is one of the most distinguished Members of this body. He is an able and skilled parliamentarian. He is equally outstanding as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. This year the appropriation bills have reached the floor of the House in advance of an earlier announced schedule. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, Mr. CANNON has worked diligently and devotedly on great public works projects for all sections of our common country, analyzing budget requests and evaluating the projects commensurate with the needs of the citizens of this Nation. Chairman CANNON'S years of experience and keen understanding of government and the needs of our Nation has resulted in the outstanding work of the Appropriations Committee which has been achieved this year under his leadership. He deserves the praise and thanks and gratitude of all of the citizens of this country for the valuable and exacting service which he has rendered.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my compliments and well-deserved tribute to my esteemed friend, Hon. ALBERT THOMAS, the distinguished Texas gentleman, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. All Members of this body recognize Congressman THOMAS as one of the most outstanding Members of Congress. He is esteemed, beloved, and respected. Esteemed and respected because of his fine abilities and beloved because of his genial, personable qualities—to be closely associated with and to work with AL THOMAS is a privilege and distinct honor. He has a penetrating and probing mind and devotes himself tirelessly to his duties and responsibilities. Congressman THOMAS is a leader and an able committee chairman. He knows and understands the issues thoroughly and has the ability to sift the chaff from the wheat and to achieve results. We respect and admire AL THOMAS immensely. He is deserving of the thanks of a grateful Nation for his valuable public service.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, another distinguished Congressman from Texas, who is chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. In the person of Congressman PATMAN, the people of his district, Texas, and the Nation have an outstanding representative. As a member of the committee of which he serves as chairman, I am privileged to serve under and work with another great committee chairman, whom I am pleased to call my friend. Congressman PATMAN has rendered an outstanding service in guiding and correlating the work of this committee which has a wide jurisdiction and a multiplicity and variety of programs of public service. The diligence and zeal with which WRIGHT PATMAN has pursued his duties as chairman of this committee to fulfill the objectives of the committee should not go by this session without public recognition. WRIGHT PATMAN has a big heart and generous nature and his impulses are motivated by the highest principles of dedicated public service. The energy and drive and untiring efforts of Congressman PATMAN are admired by all. I know he is not opposed to big business but, certainly, he is devoted to small business—to serving the independent merchant and the small-business men of this Nation, whom he considers vital and essential to the well-being and progress of our free-enterprise system. Moreover, WRIGHT PATMAN is beloved because of his fine personal qualities. He is not only a great chairman, he is also a fine friend and Christian gentleman.

So, Mr. Speaker, these men, my committee chairmen, are all outstanding Members of Congress and I do not want this session to end without paying my personal respects to them. They deserve this tribute and more for the important public service which they have rendered our country.

Why Martin Dies Supports Program To Help Farms and Small Towns and Solve Our Critical Water Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, history teaches us that no nation can survive unless its farms and small towns are prosperous. They are the backbone of every democratic country. During the 7 years I investigated and exposed thousands of Communists, I found very few on the farms and in small towns. Almost all of them were in the big cities. As long as our farms and small towns prosper, communism can never enslave America.

Because I have realized this vital truth since I entered Congress in 1931, I have supported many programs to help our farms and small towns. Here is a partial list of these programs I helped to establish by my speeches and votes: The Agricultural Adjustment Acts of 1933 and 1938, which helped farmers obtain fair prices while establishing and improving a program to support prices and adjust supplies of major crops; the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, which established a Government program to promote soil conservation and farm productivity; Rural Electrification Act of 1936, which helped farmers obtain electrical power through rural cooperatives; Farm Credit Act of 1935, which established the Farm Credit Administration to provide low-cost loans to farmers; Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, which established a program of Federal-State cooperation to meet hospital needs; School Lunch Act of 1936; Home Owners Loan Corporation Act of 1933 to help homeowners save their dwellings from foreclosure; the FHA, which has financed the construction of hundreds of thousands of homes in the United States; the Federal aid for library services in rural areas; the original Social Security Act and the 1954 amendment to it, which brought in self-employed farmers for the first time and which covered many additional farm employees; farm-to-market roads and highway construction, which have done so much to help the farms and small towns of America; the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which has provided credit to farmers unable to secure credit from other sources at reasonable rates; the drought-relief programs to aid the victims of drought; the farm programs now in operation; the Dies Agricultural Exchange Act of 1935; and many other programs too numerous to list.

These various acts have helped the people in the small towns who depend upon the farm economy for their source of income. When the farmers are prosperous, the small towns are prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have had a part in these various programs, and I shall continue to do everything I can to insure prosperity for our farms and small towns.

Our most pressing problem is water shortage. We must adopt a comprehensive and workable plan to capture and store the water that now runs to the ocean. Our Government has some of the ablest engineers in the world. We must depend upon their expert knowledge to work out an adequate and practicable plan that will insure ample water for our farms, ranches, towns, cities, and industries. At the next session of Congress I shall make it my No. 1 job to get this program under way. Our prosperity and future growth in Texas depend upon the solution of this critical problem. Prolonged drought and water shortage have already cost our people and Government untold millions.

Temporary relief, while necessary, is no satisfactory answer. We can and we must find a permanent solution.

Dr. Benjamin Reifel, of South Dakota—American Indian of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning Dr. Benjamin Reifel, of South Dakota, who has been named as American Indian of the year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

All of South Dakota joins in congratulating Dr. Benjamin Reifel in his selection as American Indian of the Year. It is an honor richly deserved. The 1956 award to the outstanding Indian will be made August 5 as one of the highlights of American Indian Days at Sheridan, Wyo.

Dr. Reifel was born on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota of Indian and German stock. He speaks the Sioux language and is thoroughly familiar with Indian conditions and Indian life.

His elementary education was obtained at a Rosebud Indian Reservation school and the public schools of the State. He completed his secondary education in 15 months at the South Dakota Agricultural Preparatory School. He graduated with a bachelor of science degree in agriculture from South Dakota State College in 1932.

In 1933 he entered Federal service as farm agent at Oglala, S. Dak., under the Pine Ridge Indian Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, in which capacity he served 2 years. From 1935 to 1941 he was given a greater responsibility as organization field agent which required traveling throughout the United States in assisting Indian tribes and bands to organize tribal and business councils.

In 1941, Dr. Reifel responded to the call of his country and entered the military service of the United States. He served through World War II and when released in 1946 had attained the rank of lieutenant colonel. Part of this service was in the European theater. He is currently a member of the Reserve Corps of the Army.

Following release from the military service Dr. Reifel returned to employment with the Bureau of Indian Affairs as tribal relations officer with headquarters at Billings, Mont.

After a short term as tribal relations officer he was appointed superintendent of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota. After 3 years of service in that capacity he resigned to enter Harvard University where he completed his work for a doctorate at public administration. During this period he was awarded a John Hay Whitney fellowship. So far as I know he is the only Indian in the United States holding a doctor's degree in public administration, or for that matter in any other field.

After completing his work at Harvard he returned to North Dakota to resume the superintendency at Fort Berthold. Later he was transferred to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation of South Dakota, his native State, where he served as superintendent. Following approximately 2 years of service as superintendent he was appointed area director by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Honorable Glenn Emmons, in August 1955.

Dr. Reifel has dedicated himself to the well-being of his people, the American Indian. Not only the Sioux Indian, but all Indians, can take pride in the honor that has come to one of them and is so well deserved.

J. Addington Wagner, National Commander of the American Legion, Turns His Back on Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows that if Mr. Wagner would tell the Senate that he would accept H. R. 12038 as No. 1 priority legislation without amendments that it could become law and give the service-connected disabled of our country $172 million next year. I am including the following telegram sent to Mr. Wagner and his reply:

JULY 20, 1956.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion non-service-connected pension bill, H. R. 7886, is blocking many pieces of legislation now pending in the Senate designed to help widows and combat-disabled veterans, including H. R. 12038, the bill which would give the Nation's 2 million disabled veterans a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation. Our service-connected disabled veterans will go without needed increases in compensation unless the American Legion immediately repudiates the non-service-connected pension bill, H. R. 7886, and advises Members of the Senate that compensation increases for the service-connected disabled should have the highest priority and that such legislation should be brought to the floor of the Senate immediately, with assurance from the American Legion that no attempt will be made to amend the bill to include non-service-connected pensions. Action on your part is imperative if our service-connected disabled veterans are not to become the victims of an ill-conceived drive by the American Legion for non-service-connected pensions. I tried in the committee to obtain first consideration for the service-connected disabled and lost to American Legion demands. I tried again on the floor of the House to give increases to the service-connected disabled priority over the American Legion pension bill and again lost as a result of American Legion pressure. In a third and final effort, I urge you to stand up and be counted on the side of the 2 million veterans of this Nation who suffered service-connected disabilities in its wars and restore to them priority consideration which the American Legion legislative program has denied.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives.

JULY 21, 1956.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives:

Re telegram July 20, apparently you are confused. The United States Senate is well able to conduct its business. I doubt very much that the Senate is in need of a directive from either you or the American Legion in order to evaluate and carry out its responsibilities. The American Legion heartily supports H. R. 12038 providing compensation increases for war widows and combat disabled veterans. We supported it in the House and we support it in the Senate. We believe that both this bill and our war veterans security bill, H. R. 7886, offer reasonable and vitally needed improvement in the present veterans' benefit program. We earnestly hope that the Senate will enact both of these bills into law.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, The American Legion.

H. R. 10237, the Government Employees Union Recognition Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will not be meeting again this session, the members of the subcommittee which studied H. R. 10237, the Government employees union recognition bill, wish to have their report on the legislation made known to the Members of the House. We feel that this was vitally needed legislation and regret exceedingly that it was not acted upon in this session.

The members of the subcommittee, all of whom have approved the report, are as follows: J. LESINSKI, chairman, G. PHODES, J. MOSS, R. CORBETT, and H. GROSS.

The report is as follows:

RECOGNITION OF ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 10237

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10237) to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, pass.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments are as follows:

(1) Page 1, and lines 3 and 4, strike out symbols "(U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 5, sec.

652)," and insert in lieu thereof "(5 U. S. C., sec. 652),";

(2) Page 2, line 4, strike out the symbol "(A)."

(3) Page 2, line 15, strike out words "rates of pay."

(4) Page 2, line 18, strike out period after "reprisal" and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following words:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall nullify any provision of any contract, agreement, or regulation reached by mutual agreement between a department or agency and an employee organization except as may hereafter be agreed to by the parties thereto."

(5) Page 2, lines 19 through 25, and page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out all of subsection "(e) (2) (B)."

(6) Page 3, lines 3 through 14, strike out all of subsection "(e) (3)."

(7) Page 3, line 15, strike out symbol "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof the symbol "(3)."

(8) Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation." and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the National Security Agency."

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The first and second amendments are technical amendments.

The third amendment is designed to clarify the intent of the legislation, leaving the question of rates of pay to be determined by congressional action.

The fourth amendment is added to assure that nothing in the bill will nullify any provision of any existing contract, agreement, or regulation without the consent of the parties thereto.

The fifth amendment strikes from the bill a provision that would set up an impartial board of arbitration to resolve disputes arising from disagreements between the employee organizations and the departments or agencies on the policies enumerated in the bill. The subcommittee felt that in spite of the merits of that provision, such elimination was necessary to maintain a proper relationship between employee and employer. It was felt that the bill, as amended, would supply an effective means by which an employee or his representative could take to the agency head any grievance.

Amendment 6 strikes from the bill a provision which the agency heads feel would empower the board of arbitration to remove an official and thus would conflict with established removal procedures. They argue that agency heads now have the authority to remove or otherwise discipline officials who do not observe laws or regulations.

The seventh amendment is a technical amendment.

The last amendment excludes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the National Security Agency from the provisions of the bill.

JUSTIFICATION

This legislation, by amending the act of August 24, 1912, provides statutory recognition of employee organizations and of the rights of officers and employees or representatives of such organizations to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal. No new or revolutionary proposal is advanced in the measure. Its enactment would provide for postal and Federal employees the same elementary rights that Congress has decreed should be given to employees in private industry by providing the means whereby their representatives can confer with administrative officials on matters of policy affecting working conditions and grievances. It is in keeping with modern advanced theories of sound personnel management.

Under this legislation, the Federal Government would not lose any of the final authority it now has in employee-employer relations; nor would the Government be a party to collective bargaining such as prevails in private industry. Federal employees would not be given any right to strike against the Government for settlement of grievances.

Extensive hearings on this legislation have been held and all sides of the issue have been thoroughly explored.

Need for this legislation has been recognized by all, it seems, except the Civil Service Commission. Employees and their organizations have for many years been urging its enactment. Surely, if adequate means for settling grievances of employees do exist, as claimed by Chairman Young of the Civil Service Commission, there would not be such a hue and cry raised by the employees and their representatives for statutory safeguards. Recognizing that regulations of the Civil Service Commission do exist which provide certain guidelines for agencies in matters of employee-employer relations, the committee wishes to emphasize that such regulations are not mandatory and that agencies have an extremely wide latitude within which they may, in their own discretion, operate. That the agencies often ignore or pay little heed to the regulations is evidenced by the numerous petitions and grievances of postal and civil-service employees on personnel matters, which are constantly being presented to Members of Congress and also by testimony before the subcommittee.

Not only have the employees and their organizations been most insistent in pointing up the necessity of this legislation, but so also have the American Bar Association and the Commission on the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) emphasized its value.

In a report in August of 1955, the labor relations law section of the American Bar Association approved a report which stated:

"Government as an employer has failed in many instances to practice what it compels industry to do. Legislatures which deny to Government agencies the use of some proper form of collective bargaining procedures so familiar in industry (at least in terms of collective negotiation), which attempt to restrict unduly the right of employees to organize and to petition the Government for redress of their grievances, need to review the problem more realistically."

The report further stated that—

"The progress made in recent years by labor organizations, the development of a more responsible labor leadership, the benefits secured by organized labor, have brought public employees to a recognition of the advantages to them which might result from more effective organization and more aggressive negotiation with governmental agencies. A government which imposes upon other employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar favorable basis, modified, of course, to meet the exigencies of the public service. It should set the example for industry by being perhaps more considerate than the law required of private enterprise."

The Hoover Commission in its report to the 81st Congress (H. Doc. 63, February 10, 1949), expressed the finding that:

"Federal employees while given some degree of protection against abuse, discrimination, and unjust treatment, are not provided a positive opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies and practices which affect their welfare."

The Commission recommended that—

"The heads of departments and agencies should be required to provide for the positive participation of employees in the formulation and improvement of the Federal personnel policies and practices."

Additionally, according to information recently made available, the Secretary of Labor at a Cabinet meeting in October of 1955, brought up the subject of extending greater recognition to unions of Government employees. Because of the objections of another Cabinet member, no further developments occurred on the proposal. It should also be pointed out that, in spite of the expressed adverse opinion of the Civil Service Commission on this legislation, the Commission over a year ago circulated, or caused to be circulated, a proposed executive order on recognition of Federal employee organizations. That proposed order was in many respects identical to the language and purpose of H. R. 10237. If that Executive order had been implemented, there might have been no need for the present legislation. Since it appears that no administrative action along those lines will be taken, your subcommittee highly recommends enactment of H. R. 10237.

Recognition must be given to the human element in all relationships where people must cooperate and work efficiently and under humane conditions. Enlightened personnel management experts have determined that good morale and efficiency are enhanced whenever employees are given an opportunity to have a say in matters which affect them.

Conversely, poor morale and lack of interest in the job are to be expected when arbitrary and unexplained personnel policies and procedures are formulated among the top echelon and then sifted down through the subordinate levels of management to the employees.

The Federal Government, having provided under the National Labor Relations Act and other legislation means by which employees in private industry can make proper approaches to management, would provide similar treatment, within reason, for its own employees. Such is the purpose of H. R. 10237. Your subcommittee strongly recommends immediate enactment of the bill.

Retirement From Senate of Senator Millikin, of Colorado, and Senator George, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, much has been said on the floor in tribute to two of our retiring colleagues, Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN, of Colorado, and Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia. I should like to offer my further remarks in connection with their long and distinguished service as United States Senators in the form of statements which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREDERICK PAYNE ON THE RETIREMENT FROM THE SENATE OF SENATOR EUGENE MILLIKIN, OF COLORADO

It grieves us all to note that the senior Senator from Colorado finds that his health will not permit his offering himself for another term of service in the Senate. This body and the whole Nation will be poorer as a result of the loss of his guidance and leadership

EUGENE MILLIKIN is the sort of man who was a continual inspiration to his colleagues. He was constantly sought out for advice and counsel by those on both sides of the aisle, by colleagues equal to him in terms of service as well as those many years junior to him. Possessed of a warm and friendly nature, a keen sense of humor, a brilliant mind which he employed so skillfully in every debate in which he engaged, EUGENE MILLIKIN was one of the most capable Americans ever to have taken a seat on the Senate floor. His cognizance of every situation which came before the Senate Committees on which he served down through the years were an invaluable contribution to the legislative process.

Not only has GENE MILLIKIN been a lasting friend to all of his colleagues, but he has been a great Republican, and one who has put the interests of all Americans before party and before the interests of the section of the country which he represented so well for so many years.

It is my hope that the Senator's retirement after a career of which he can well be proud, will restore his health, so that he may enjoy many years of pleasant rest which he so truly deserves.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREDERICK G. PAYNE ON THE RETIREMENT FROM THE SENATE OF SENATOR WALTER GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

I feel it a humble privilege to pay tribute to my beloved colleague and friend, WALTER GEORGE. When the Senate adjourns this summer, it will be losing one of the truly great men to have served in this body.

Statesman, lawyer, wise and patriotic American—Senator GEORGE has reached a position in life that few men are privileged to achieve. In his 34 years as United States Senator from Georgia, he has shown his stalwart character, his concern for humanity, and his personal magnitude to the entire world. This Nation can be grateful that WALTER GEORGE, following a brilliant judicial career in his home State, chose to answer the call of public service in 1922. As a junior Senator he worked long and hard, and fought for enactment of legislation in the interests of all the people. Rising in stature during the turbulent 'thirties, WALTER GEORGE emerged as one above mere personal consideration and political party. Never bracketed, never joining a wing or faction, and using his calm, common sense, Senator GEORGE won the admiration and respect of both sides of the aisle for his stands on legislation and for his position with respect to international affairs.

Like the clock above the President's chair, steadily measuring off the minutes of American history, WALTER GEORGE has sat in the Senate down through the years, the very conscience of the American way of life; and he has stood steadfast in his own beliefs, beliefs that have inspired two generations of Americans.

I, for one, believe that Senator GEORGE has left his greatest philosophic imprint in the minds of us all, for his role as one of the great peacemakers of our time. He has supported the bipartisan foreign policies of both Republican and Democratic administrations. He has risked censure from his own party, fearlessly following the dictates of his own convictions. Knowing the personal grief of war in the loss of his son in World War II, the Senator became firm in his determination to work for everlasting peace.

The true greatness of Senator GEORGE rose to new heights when, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he stood behind the President and the administration on the Formosa resolution to save the peace in Asia from the immediate threat of Communist aggression. As a man of peace, the Senator played an important role in the formation of summit conference talks at Geneva in 1955.

The accomplishments of our most respected colleague are great and many. As President Eisenhower's ambassador to NATO he will carry with him to the council tables of freedom these years of patient understanding, of cautious sagacity, and of toil for humanitarian ideals.

I want to wish the senior Senator from Georgia and his good wife God's blessings in the years ahead, and to join with a grateful Nation in thanks for a job well done. Few men have served their country as nobly as has WALTER GEORGE.

The Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently contained a considerable amount of discussion questioning the findings of the Office of Defense Mobilization in 1954 that the domestic watch industry was essential to the national defense. One must recall that the alleged essentiality of the domestic watch industry was one of the principal considerations which, I understand, was supposed to have led the President to decide to increase the tariff on watches 2 years ago. Now the finding of defense essentiality is being reviewed by the Office of Defense Mobilization, which will ultimately hold public hearings on the subject sometime this fall.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting that this same question has recently been examined by the distinguished Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy which held hearings on the subject for 4 days in June. Its findings have just been published by the Joint Economic Committee in its report on the subject of the relationship between defense essentiality and foreign economic policy, with particular reference to the watch industry as a case in point. The unanimous report of the subcommittee, which I have read with interest, is to be commended to the Members of this House as a most constructive and thoughtful document contributing to the development of sound foreign economic policy. I might add what I am sure Members of this House need hardly be reminded of—that the subcommittee which carried out this excellent work was chaired by our distinguished colleague, Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri.

I want to draw particular attention to one of the recommendations contained in the report which is especially pertinent to the 1954 watch decision. I quote:

The 1954 decisions on watches by the Department of Commerce, the Interdepartmental Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and of the President were not accompanied by completely developed analysis of defense essentiality. The industry appears to have been studied in isolation from other industries and any set of recognizable criteria. We urge that new decisions taken this year be supported in the public record with a full analysis of why the decision is taken, regardless of whether that decision is to call for more or less restriction of the watch imports.

Recent articles in the press have almost uniformly echoed this observation and have further indicated widespread agreement that, as the report states:

Attempts to restrict watch imports * * * are likely to have undesirable side effects on our worldwide trade relations and hence on national security far beyond any narrow gain in domestic watch production.

As a good example of the newspaper reports on this well-reasoned subcommittee report, I ask that the text of a column which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on July 23, 1956, be reprinted in the RECORD. It was ably written by Scripps-Howard staff writer Douglas Smith:

CONGRESS UNIT WOULD EASE WATCH TARIFFS

(By Douglas Smith)

WASHINGTON, July 23.—There should be no more barriers against the importation of watches, a congressional committee has declared.

The Joint Economic Committee, of which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) is chairman, says the tariff increase on watches 2 years ago did not improve the relative position of American watchmakers.

The committee's report is based on an investigation conducted by a subcommittee headed by Representative RICHARD BOLLING (Democrat, Missouri).

But this is only one more round in the perennial battle over watch tariffs.

The President can restrict watch imports without the approval of Congress if he considers it necessary to advance the national defense. The Office of Defense Mobilization now has a committee studying whether to recommend such action to the White House.

An ODM committee recommendation caused the President to increase the tariff on jeweled watches by 50 percent in 1954. The new congressional committee report suggests that recommendation was "dominated by domestic commercial considerations rather than either defense needs or foreign policy effects."

American jeweled watch manufacturers would prefer import quotas on their foreign (Swiss) competition, because even a substantial tariff increase might not do them much good. The one of 2 years ago helped them little, because the Swiss are able to make fine watches much more cheaply than American firms.

The American companies also are engaged in high-precision defense work for which they claim their watchmakers are a unique and highly essential pool of skills.

The congressional committee considered the plant-conversion idea old-fashioned, however. It said "it is safest to assume that never again will we have time to convert our industry over a period of years from a peaceful orientation to a military one."

Quadrennial Convention of the First Slovak Wreath of the Free Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 13, 1956, in my home city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., there will be held the quadrennial convention of an outstanding American fraternal society, the First Slovak Wreath of the Free

Eagle. Though not the largest, it is among the strongest fraternal groups composed of Americans of Slovak descent in the country. Under the magnificent leadership of an outstanding fraternalist, Matthew Cintula of Staten Island, N. Y., this organization now boasts a mmebership of over 8,000 and total aggregate assets of more than $2½ million. It is justly proud of its solvency of 119.08 percent or $391,346.13 above its margin of safety as prescribed by law.

Founded on September 24, 1896, in Bridgeport, Conn., where its home office is located at 650 Arctic Street, the organization was chartered by the Connecticut General Assembly on May 24, 1901, and was authorized to transact business as a fraternal society by the insurance commissioner of that State on October 5, 1914.

Among the several laudable objects for which this society was founded was the intent to "aid and assist each other in sickness or misfortune and to provide funeral expenses for deceased members."

Since January 1, 1918, the method of conducting business was changed to the level premium system, and the society is still operating on this plan. Policies for adults are issued on any of the following 4 plans: Ordinary life, 20-payment life, 20-year endowment, and endowment at age 65.

From January 1, 1938, the insurance certificates were based on the American Experience Table at 3½ percent interest, and from 1949 the interest was set at 3 percent.

Certificates of the organization based on the assessment rates of the American Experience Table grant cash surrender values, paid-up insurance, loans and automatic payment of dues after 36 monthly assessments. The maximum insurance benefit available is $2,500 in any 1 class, or $5,000 in all classes.

Nonmedical benefit certificates are now issued on any 1 of the 4 plans. For applicants from age 16 to 40 the limit is not over $1,000, while from age 41 to 45, the insurance limit is $500. I am informed that the society accepts members up to 55 years of age with a medical examination.

Reflecting its interest in young people, the organization has a juvenile branch which issues the following plans: Term to age 18, 20-year payment and 20-year endowment. All juvenile policies, except the term to age 18, have the same comparative values and advantages as adult policies, including cash surrender, loan or paid-up insurance.

At age 16, the member who has a term to 18 policy, may joint the adult department, and when he reaches 18 and is in good health, transfer to the adult branch is mandatory.

The Slovak Eagles, as they are informally called, have a very fine record for progress and fraternal spirit and I am proud to learn that many hundreds of this organization hail from the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. The organization is set up on the subordinate lodge system and is licensed to do business in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania. Branches are also maintained in Colorado, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, and West Virginia.

The first Slovak wreath of the Free Eagle has always been fortunate in the high quality of its officers and official staff. Among the leading figures in the society there are and have been, some of the most outstanding American fraternal leaders in America. Assisting President Cintula and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Carnicke, spiritual director, are the following officers: Stephen Gombar, vice president; Stephen Swartz, secretary; John V. Hudak, treasurer, who resides in Exeter, in my congressional district; Paul ine Bayan, Michael Soyka, Michael Chabak, Barbara Hojdic, and Michael Simko, supreme tribunal; John S. Nemergut, Emma Mack, Andrew Maczko, and Frank Benik, auditors; Matthew Cintula, John V. Hudak, Stephen Swarts, Andrew Kaza, and John Rusnak, finance committee; Anna Katusak, president of the juvenile order; Atty. John J. Vavrence, general counsel, and Dr. Arthur Sekerak, medical examiner.

Wilkes-Barre and Wyoming Valley have felt the beneficient influence of immigrants from Slovakia for more than 90 years. As my home city of Wilkes-Barre this year celebrates the 150th anniversary of its incorporation, it is a pleasure to welcome the Slovak Eagles on the occasion of their quadrennial convention during the week of August 13, and to wish them deserved success in their commendable fraternal endeavors.

Post Office Department Will Shortly Announce a New 3-Cent Stamp To Be Issued in Honor of Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that the Post Office Department will shortly announce a new 3-cent stamp to be issued in honor of Labor Day and as a tribute to the cause of labor and the workers of the Nation.

It is also gratifying to learn that the city of Camden, N. J., will be made the place for the first issue of such stamp on Labor Day, September 3, 1956.

In my endeavor to have such a stamp issued and the city of Camden, N. J., selected as the place of first issue, in conjunction with the several labor organizations of Camden and elsewhere interested in the matter, I have urged that it would be most appropriate in the issuance of such stamp to have Camden, N. J., selected for the honor of having the first issuance because of the fact that the founder of Labor Day was the honored and distinguished labor leader, Peter J. McGuire, of Camden, N. J.

In my endeavor to have such a stamp issued and Camden, N. J., selected as the place of first issue, I have had the helpful support of Morris C. Rothblum, Courier Post stamp editor and a member of the Camden Typographical Union, No. 132, and Louis W. Tomafsky, Joseph H. Johnson, also members of the Courier Post staff, and like Mr. Rothblum, members of local 132.

These gentlemen with Walker Gill prepared a resolution that was presented to and adopted by the Union Printers League of New Jersey on February 26, 1956, reading in part as follows:

Whereas Peter J. McGuire, a member of the carpenters' union and the founder of Labor Day, was a resident of the city of Camden, N. J., and his remains are interred here; and

Whereas Peter J. McGuire was a tireless worker in behalf of the labor movement: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Union Printers League of New Jersey * * * go on record requesting that the stamp issued commemorate Peter J. McGuire and that the city of Camden, N. J., be designated as the first-day sale office.

Furthermore, it seems appropriate that in this connection there be made a part of these remarks a sketch of a historical character relating to the establishment of Labor Day as a national holiday, and, also of each of the 48 States by separate legislative enactments.

Although there has been some controversy in the past as to whether the Knights of Labor in New York City or the New York City Central Labor Union originated Labor Day, it has been confirmed through investigation that the Knights of Labor had nothing to do officially with the declaration of such a holiday. The idea of a day to be set apart for labor was first made public by a resolution offered at a meeting of the Central Labor Union held on May 8, 1882, by Peter J. McGuire, at that time the general secretary of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, and later the vice president of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. McGuire suggested that the first Monday in September be made the day for paying public tribute to American industry, "as it would come at the most pleasant season of the year, nearly midway between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, and would fill a wide gap in the chronology of legal holidays."

The resolution was passed and a committee was appointed to prepare for the celebration. However, the first Labor Day observance was held not on the first Monday, but on Tuesday, September 5, 1882. About 10,000 union members marched up Broadway, after which they and their families and friends spent the rest of the day on the picnic grounds in Elm Park, where all sorts of amusements were provided. From a platform which had been erected on the grounds, the crowds were addressed by numerous labor leaders from 2:30 in the afternoon until nightfall. This first celebration was a great success and led to the establishment of the annual observance of Labor Day by which the American people, in the words of Mr. McGuire, "honor the toilers of the earth, and pay homage to those who from rude nature have delved and carved all the comfort and grandeur we behold."

The second Labor Day was celebrated Wednesday, September 5, 1883, and the parade on that occasion was reported as an imposing demonstration of the Central Labor Union. In 1884 it was decided by the Central Labor Union to hold

the celebration on the first Monday in September, which was the first of the month, and central labor bodies in other cities were urged to celebrate that day as a universal holiday for workingmen.

On October 7, 1884, a resolution was unanimously adopted by the American Federation of Labor convention to the effect that "the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as a laborers' national holiday, and we recommend its observance by all wage workers, irrespective of sex, calling, or nationality."

During the next few years Labor Day became officially recognized in scattered localities through municipal ordinances. State legislative recognition was developed as a result of a campaign conducted by organized labor, and, by the end of 1893, 23 States had enacted Labor Day laws. Oregon was the first State to pass such legislation by the enactment of a law in 1887 designating the first Saturday in June as Labor Day. This act was amended in 1893 to conform to the general plan of observing the first Monday in September as Labor Day, which by that time was widely accepted.

The increasing interest in setting aside a day for honoring the workers of America, and the efforts of the American Federation of Labor to get national recognition for such a day, resulted in the passage of a bill, known as the Kyle bill, by the Congress of the United States which made Labor Day a legal holiday for public employees. The bill was passed with very little discussion; the only objection raised was that for the sake of symmetry in national holidays, Labor Day should be fixed for the first day of September instead of the first Monday. However, since the holiday was being created by Congress, and not by an event, it was thought better to make it the first Monday to conform to the prevailing practice.

On June 28, 1894, President Cleveland signed the act and it became law. It reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first Monday in September of each year, being the day known and celebrated as labor's holiday, is hereby made a legal public holiday, to all intents and purposes, in the same manner as Christmas, the first day of January, the twenty-second day of February, the thirtieth day of May and the fourth day of July are now by law made public holidays.

The recognition thus accorded Labor Day by the action of the Congress and the Executive added to the significance of the movement and the prestige of the holiday. The act was acclaimed as establishing Labor Day as a national holiday, although it actually applied only to Federal employees.

By 1900 Labor Day had been officially recognized by most of the States, but it was not until February 1923 that the 48th State, Wyoming, fell into line. Most of the States in their original acts set the first Monday in September as the holiday. In Wisconsin and Wyoming, Labor Day is set by the governors, but in practice, of course, they designate the first Monday in September for the observance. Thus, Labor Day is now established both as a National and State holiday in all of our States.

The issuance of a post stamp to commemorate Labor Day and its founder, Peter J. McGuire, is most appropriate. It is appropriate that on each succeeding Labor Day, exercises are held in Arlington Cemetery, located near the city of Camden, N. J., to honor Peter J. McGuire, known as the father of Labor Day, who was buried there in 1906, the year he passed on into the Great Beyond.

Mr. McGuire was born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1852. At an early age he came to this country. He identified himself with trade-union activities, and eventually became general secretary of the Carpenters and Joiners International Union. In his effort to achieve recognition of labor's rights, he advocated the setting aside of a fixed day each year to be known as Labor Day. The day to be observed as a national holiday in tribute to labor and the workingman.

The tribute that is yearly paid to this great man is well deserved. We consider it an honor that he made his home in our city of Camden. He died in our city a poor but respected man. Though poor in earthly goods, he was rich in the honor and respect of his fellow man. His memory has continued through all the years that have intervened as a wholesome influence. His allegiance to the cause of labor is even yet an inspiration to all who believe in the dignity and importance of labor and the rights of workers.

There can be no higher compliment paid to this great man than for each to seek to emulate his character, his high regard for principle, his unswerving belief in the rights of man and his loyalty to America.

The issuance of a stamp in his honor and as a tribute to labor is highly appropriate.

Report to the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, as we reach the conclusion of the 84th Congress, it seems to me worth while to make a brief and informal report to my constituents on the state of the Union.

The most important thing to all of us is that America is at peace. Since the President concluded the tragic war in Korea, there have been no Americans in combat anywhere in the world. Moreover, while it must be said that there are lots of trouble spots, I am very optimistic about the maintenance of the peace. While the President's conference at Geneva may not have achieved concrete agreements, it has been increasingly obvious that there has been a greatly improved climate in our international affairs since that time. The change in the attitude of Soviet Russia is more than superficial. They may not have had a change of heart, but they are certainly changing policies, both by reason of difficulties in their own country, and also because of the firm policies and tremendous striking power of the United States. I have talked to Secretary Dulles, General Gruenther, and many other leaders on this point, and they are all convinced that Russia does not plan, nor does she dare to plan, aggressive war against us. If war should come, it would be the result of accidents, which we will certainly avoid if humanly possible.

Along with the peace has come the greatest prosperity in our national history. Inflation has been stopped, average pay and employment is at an all-time high, Federal taxes were cut $8 billion dollars, many nuisance taxes have either been abolished or reduced, and despite our enormous expenditures for defense and other necessary purposes, the budget has been balanced with a surplus of nearly $2 billion cash at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1956.

The American people have more houses, more automobiles, and more comforts than ever before, and this happy situation has been achieved without the false inflation and stimulation of a war economy.

At the same time, we continue to make giant steps in social progress. Our social-security system has been improved and strengthened, and we are making dramatic improvements in the public health.

The American society is the envy of the world, and is an example to the world of what can be accomplished under a system of full liberty and free enterprise.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

In the general field of national economy, we:

Authorized $33 billion for a 13-year highway-construction program, which when completed will completely rebuild and modernize our system of interstate highways.

Provided for substantial pay increase for all postal workers.

Increased minimum wage under Federal Labor Standards Act to $1 per hour.

Authorized 4-year program of airport construction with grants to States to implement program.

Increased criminal penalties under Antitrust Act.

Increased from $25 million to $125 million authorization to Small Business Administration to make disaster loans.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Passed improved social-security bill commencing benefits to widows and surviving dependent mothers at age 62 instead of 65, and provided certain disability benefits at age 50, and further extended coverage of law, and increased grants to States for aid to needy, blind, and dependent children.

Passed Federal flood insurance program, and in addition act permits FHA loans for homes damaged in floods and other major disasters.

Extended Salk polio vaccination program to July 1, 1957.

Extended school milk program.

Authorized Federal aid of $30 million annually for 3 years for construction of facilities for research into various crippling and killing diseases.

Extended modified version of housing bill.

SPECIAL NOTES

A special note should perhaps be made concerning the so-called Federal aid to education bill. As nearly everyone is aware, this was defeated since it included the Powell amendment preventing the expenditure of Federal funds to southern schools which discriminated against Negroes. Its passage was inevitably blocked largely but not entirely because of solid opposition by southern Democrats. The same thing can be said about the civil-rights bill which overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives, but did not have a chance of passing the Senate this late in the session.

Now, I want to refer particularly to a program which is very close to me, the appropriations for which are the concern of my subcommittee.

HEALTH RESEARCH

The National Institutes of Health, located at Bethesda, Md., close to Washington, are doing dramatic work in the field of research against the major diseases afflicting the people of this country. An enormous effort is being made in the field of cancer research, although with results that are not so far immediately encouraging. In the field of mental health activities, study of the heart, arthritis and related diseases, neurology and blindness, very substantial progress is being made. It is not too much to hope that within the next 5 years or less, assuming the continuance of a well-supported program of research, that major results will be accomplished. We must continue that support.

The Congress this year has been extremely generous and has, in the case of all the National Institutes, greatly exceeded the requests of the Bureau of the Budget.

I think it is interesting to look at the following tables showing how much more money Congress has appropriated than was requested, or than was appropriated last year:

National Cancer Institute

1956 appropriation	$24,978,000
1957 budget estimate	32,437,000
House allowance	34,437,000
Committee recommendation	48,432,000

Mental health activities

1956 appropriation	$18,001,000
1957 budget estimate	21,749,000
House allowance	23,749,000
Committee recommendation	35,197,000

National Heart Institute

1956 appropriation	$18,898,000
1957 budget estimate	22,106,000
House allowance	25,106,000
Committee recommendation	33,396,000

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities

1956 appropriation	$10,840,000
1957 budget estimate	13,345,000
House allowance	13,845,000
Committee recommendation	15,885,000

Dental health activities

1956 appropriation	$2,176,000
1957 budget estimate	2,971,000
House allowance	3,471,000
Committee recommendation	6,026,000

Microbiology activities

1956 appropriation	$7,775,000
1957 budget estimate	9,799,000
House allowance	8,799,000
Committee recommendation	13,299,000

Neurology and blindness activities

1956 appropriation	$9,861,000
1957 budget estimate	12,196,000
House allowance	14,196,000
Committee recommendation	18,650,000

This is one of the most interesting fields in which I have been active, and one which gives the greatest promise of future welfare of all Americans.

It has not been possible, in a brief report, to cover fields relating to special groups.

In conclusion, it is proper to say that in my judgment many laws have been passed which ought not to have been passed, and many have failed to pass which should have been favorably considered. The net result, however, is most encouraging progress for the state of the Union, which is already in a most highly satisfactory condition.

Territories of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I introduced a joint resolution directing the Interior Committees of both Houses of Congress to evaluate, at least once in every 2 years, the status of all the Territories of the United States, incorporated and unincorporated, and to determine their readiness for additional steps toward self-government.

I did not ask nor expect action on this resolution at this session, but I hope that action will be forthcoming early in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Such a resolution would proclaim to the world that we abhor colonialism and that we are ready and anxious to grant the fullest self-government possible to our Territories.

Mr. Speaker, we did not grant statehood to Alaska or Hawaii in this Congress, but I believe statehood for those two great Territories is more imminent than many think possible.

While we stopped short of statehood, I think the RECORD should show that the 84th Congress passed more beneficial legislation for the Territories than any Congress in recent times. I am proud that the great Interior Committee of the House, and the subcommittee I have the honor to head, the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, had an important part in considering and acting upon this legislation affecting the well-being of the people in the Territories, but other committees of Congress helped to round out this splendid program. They are to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii do not have the right to vote in this House or in committee, although they may speak in either place. In view of the limitations placed upon them, I believe they have done a remarkable job for their people. They have been industrious, persuasive, and always courteous.

Their own people know what they have accomplished, but I might note in passing that the legislation they sponsored, or for which they worked, has advanced the economic and social welfare of their Territories to a marked degree. Some of the steps made possible by this legislation will, I am sure, enable them to meet more fully and firmly, in the future, claims here and elsewhere that these Territories are not ready for statehood.

The delegates from Alaska and Hawaii can speak for themselves about what has been done for their Territories during the last 2 years, and more particularly during the session now ending. I should like to point out, however, that there has been much accomplished for other areas outside the continental United States for which we are responsible and which do not have elected representatives here.

One of the bills, now law, considers residence in American Samoa and/or Trust Territory as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes.

We passed an omnibus bill for Guam, as well as legislation affecting the judiciary and gasoline tax there.

This Congress acted favorably upon legislation creating the Virgin Islands National Park and extending the Social Security Act to the Virgin Islands.

Several measures for the benefit of Puerto Rico, ably represented by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, their Resident Commissioner, were approved.

In addition, we extended library services to all the Territories and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and we exempted travel to those places from the 10 percent Federal excise tax.

Last September and October members of the Territories Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings in many communities of Alaska where we met with residents from all walks of life and talked over with them the problems which confront those who live in that vast and vital Territory. It was a wonderfully enlightening experience for me as I know it was for other members who made the trip. I came away more convinced than ever that these fine people are completely justified in seeking to have Alaska admitted as a State and short of that working for social and economic improvements which can come to them only through the legislative processes of the United States Congress.

Those legislative processes, so far as Alaska is concerned, have not come to a halt or a slow walk in the 84th Congress. It is my understanding that close to 50 Alaska bills have become law during the past 2 years or are at the White House awaiting approval. Thirty-five of those measures under the jurisdiction of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were initially considered and approved by the Territories Subcommittee of which I am chairman.

These 35 bills which represent many, many hours of hearings and executive sessions, of course, are only part of the great number of bills which were approved by the full committee, but at this time I thought it would be of interest to concentrate on the accomplishments for Alaska.

If approved by the President, the Alaska Mental Health Act will provide the mechanism by which Alaskans will be able to take care of their own mentally ill in their own Territory under modern and humane procedures. The law permitting the Territory to assume bonded indebtedness, thus lifting a prohibition in force since Alaska's Organic Act was enacted in 1912, will allow the Territory to go ahead on its own in the matter of building public improvements up to the bonded indebtedness limit of $20 million.

A number of bills have been signed into law or are at the White House designed to aid in the settlement on public land in the Territory. I consider one of the most important, that measure which eliminated the requirement that an 80-rod space had to be reserved between public land entries on navigable waters in Alaska. Another measure would authorize the Interior Secretary to dispose of the lands to be restored from highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals, giving any adjoining landowner or claimant a preferred right to acquire the land subject to disposal.

The Interior Department through its Bureau of Land Management will start its program of clearing campsites along Alaska's highway this year through an enabling bill enacted into law.

Another measure is going to make it easier on homestead settlers who enter unsurveyed public lands. From now on they will be required to make only one final proof prior to survey instead of being required to submit proof twice, thus cutting a lot of unneeded redtape and speeding action on final acquisition of the land.

Among the other measures enacted during the past 2 years are bills to permit the Alaska Railroad to enter into 55-year leases on its property; authorize a yearly appropriation of $250,000 for Bureau of Reclamation investigations; extend until December of 1958 the present law allowing the Territory first refusal of surplus personal Federal property in Alaska; raise the annual compensation of the United States Commissioners so that those officials in Alaska may retain up to $12,500 a year from fees collected; establish a commission to study the feasibility of a railroad to the Territory and additional roads to connect the States and Alaska; abolish Old Kasaan National Monument; authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service to regulate the distance between set nets in Alaska waters; permit members of the Territorial legislature to run as candidates for the State constitutional convention which was held last winter at the University of Alaska; authorize the Secretary of the Interior to work out plans for establishment of facilities, such as office space for Customs and Immigration, at the Alaska-Canada border; permit homestead allotments granted to Eskimos, Aleuts and Indians to be alienated after 5 years of occupancy and use; permit the Territory to borrow funds from the Federal Government to supplement Territorial unemployment compensation funds; bring the Eskimos increased incomes by permitting the export of walrus hides from the Territory; and several more.

On the numerous measures now law or soon to be which were handled by committees other than the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was especially gratified when Alaska was included in the Highway Act for 1956, thus bringing the Territory within the Federal-aid highway program from which it had been excluded since 1916 when the program was conceived. Definite plans can now be made for a real road-building program because of the certainty of a stable, continuing source through which such roads will be possible. One of the great needs for developing any land is an integrated highway system which will connect communities and open areas to settlers. The application of that theory to Alaska will be a boon in the years ahead to that magnificent Territory of ours which I hope soon will be a State.

Social Security—Don't Confuse Us With Facts, Our Minds Are Made Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following exchange of correspondence setting forth the opposition of the Los Angeles County Medical Association to social security and my reply thereto:

LOS ANGELES
COUNTY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 28, 1956.

Mrs. MARY A. SMITH,
San Pedro, Calif.

DEAR MRS SMITH: Thank you for your letter inquiring as to the reasons the medical profession opposes the expansion of the social security bill now being considered by the United States Senate. The prime reason is simply one of economics. Those who are aware of the true facts know that the Social Security Administration is not solvent and that under present conditions it never will be. Practically every cent of the billions of dollars which have been contributed to social security has been spent by the Government and most of the present social security payments now come directly out of the general fund. Thus the taxpayers of this country are paying twice, once to social security and once to replenish the money taken from the general fund. In view of this factor, the medical profession does not believe it wise to add further debt to social security by lowering the requirements of those who could receive payments.

Of course, there are other factors. Speaking broadly and without reference to any specific case, we know that if there is no incentive for a person to rehabilitate himself, his efforts to again make himself self-supporting after illness or injury will be diminished. We believe social security would take this incentive from the ill or injured person.

This is a topic upon which actually a book could be written, however, I believe that the above will give you some idea of the reasons for our opposition to expansion of social security.

With every wish for an early improvement in your health, I remain,

Sincerely,

J. NORMAN O'NEILL, M. D.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1956.

Mrs. MARY A. SMITH,
San Pedro, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This is in response to your letter requesting comment on a letter which you received from Dr. J. Norman O'Neill, secretary-treasurer, Los Angeles County Medical Association, setting forth reasons why the medical profession opposes the expansion of the social security bill now being considered by the United States Senate. (This bill passed the Senate yesterday, July 17, 1956.)

These reasons are presented in two paragraphs. The first, and longest, paragraph is an attack on the financial soundness of the present Social Security System. The second paragraph refers to vocational rehabilitation. As is often typical of those who attack the whole Social Security System, opposition is expressed in broad general statements, unsupported by any factual material. The points made by Dr. O'Neill will be considered and answered in the order in which they were set forth in his letter to you.

First, there was mentioned the matter of economics, and it was alleged that "the Social Security Administration is not solvent and under present conditions it never will be." The simple fact of the matter is that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is completely solvent and actuarially sound. The total assets of the trust fund as of June 30, 1955, were $21,141,001,461.71. The source of this figure is the report of the Board of Trustees of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, Senate Document No. 119, 84th Congress, page 9. (The members of the Board of Trustees are: George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury; James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Charles I. Schottland, Commissioner of Social Security.)

The law requires that these assets be invested only in direct interest-bearing obligations of the United States and obligations guaranteed as to both principle and interest by the United States. In other words, the assets are invested in United States Government securities, which constitute the safest form of investment. This fact of course is recognized by businessmen throughout the country and, indeed, laws in every State of the Union class government bonds as the No. 1 preferred form of investment for regulated insurance companies, trusts, and so forth. Further, the interest which is collected from these securities goes into the trust fund. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, alone over $438 million in interest was received. The total amount of interest since the inception of the trust fund amounts to approximately $3.7 billion. In connection with the operation of the trust fund investment I hope you will read carefully pages 7 and 8 of the enclosed annual report, under the section entitled "Reality of the Trust Fund." As you will note, that report discusses and completely refutes the type of charge made by Dr. O'Neill in his letter to you.

Second, and in support of his first statement, Dr. O'Neill asserts that "practically every cent of the billions of dollars which have been contributed to social security has been spent by the Government and most of the present social-security payments now come directly out of the general fund"; and he further charges that "thus the taxpayers of this country are paying twice, once to

social security and once to replenish the money taken from the general fund." These statements are misleading and are completely contrary to the facts. They have been repudiated time and again. The investment of the assets of the trust fund in government securities, as required by law, is entirely proper. Amounts equal to 100 percent of contributions under the Social Security Act are permanently appropriated by law to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund which is completely separate from the general funds of the United States Treasury.

The allegation that the public will be taxed twice for social security has been answered fully and completely on a number of different occasions. For example, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in August 1949, said with reference to this:

"The investment of the excess income of the trust fund in government securities does not mean that the people have been or will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged."

Also, I refer again to the Annual Report of the Board of Trustees, signed by Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, as follows:

"When the Treasury pays back money borrowed from the trust fund, the public will not be taxed a second time for social security. If taxes are levied to redeem the securities held by the trust fund, these taxes will not be levied for the purpose of paying social security benefits. Rather, they will be levied for the purposes for which the money was originally borrowed, such as the costs arising out of World War II. Taxes would have to be raised to pay back the money borrowed to cover the cost of the war, whether the obligations were held by the trust fund or by other investors. The fact that the trust fund, rather than other possible investors, holds part of the Federal debt does not change the purpose for which these taxes must be levied."

To state the matter as simply and concisely as possible, the United States Treasury borrows from a number of different sources, including individuals, mutual savings banks, insurance companies, and various other classes of investors, including the OASI Trust Fund. Government securities in the hands of the OASI Trust Fund are fully as valuable as are Government securities in the hands of other investors. The investment of this trust fund are handled much the same as are other types of insurance systems set up by the Congress, such as Civil Service Retirement (established in 1920), United States Government Life Insurance (established in 1924), and others.

Facts about our Social Security System are readily available to Dr. O'Neill as they are to anyone who is broadminded enough to seek the truth. Actuarial estimates presented to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, of which I am proud to be a member, and to the Senate Committee on Finance, show that the contribution rates now in the law make the System wholly self-supporting. These actuarial estimates do not take into account the probability of a continuing rise of wage levels as has occurred throughout all American history. An increase in wage levels would have the effect of increasing income in relationship to outgo in the fund. In this connection, the Ways and Means Committee in its report on H. R. 7225, said:

"Your committee has always very strongly believed that the System should be actuarially sound. Your committee continues to believe that the tax schedule in the law should make the System self-supporting as nearly as can be foreseen, or in other words, actuarially sound.

In consideration of H. R. 7225 in 1955, as in all previous years, the committee was very careful to provide adequate financing for the new benefits provided. Actuarial testimony presented to the committee indicated that the System would be actuarially sound if the contribution rate was increased beginning with January 1, 1957. The committee nevertheless concluded that in order to be absolutely certain of the fund's actuarial soundness the increase in the rate should go into effect on January 1, 1956. As stated in the committee's report on the bill:

"The old-age and survivors insurance program as amended by this bill would be actuarially sound, and in fact its actuarial status would be improved since the cost of the liberalized benefits is more than met by the increased contributions scheduled (with such rise going fully into effect immediately with the inauguration of the new benefit provisions)."

As I have indicated above, the major portion of Dr. O'Neill's letter consisted of his first paragraph in which he attacked the financial soundness of the Social Security System itself. He then said, "Of course, there are other factors." He then referred merely to the matter of rehabilitation, stating that social-security disability benefits would remove the incentive from ill or injured individuals to rehabilitate themselves.

This argument deserves close examination. Rehabilitation is, indeed, vitally important and I yield to no one in the desire to encourage and promote efforts to rehabilitate and return to useful and fruitful life and work those individuals who unfortunately have been injured or disabled. As the report of the Committee on Ways and Means clearly demonstrates, the committee did carefully and thoroughly consider this whole subject in connection with disability benefit provisions. The committee states in its report: "We believe that everything possible should be done to support and strengthen vocational rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, where it is possible, is the most economical method of providing for disabled persons and is the most satisfactory for the individual." The committee, in order to avoid setting up barriers to vocational rehabilitation, specifically provided in the bill that a person who performs work while under a State rehabilitation program will not, solely by reason of this work, lose his benefits during the first 12 months while he is testing out a new earning capacity. At the same time, in order to prevent malingering, the committee included in the bill, as a specific safeguard, a provision that would stop the benefits of anyone, who, without good cause, refused rehabilitation available to him.

The arguments against disability benefits on the grounds that such benefits will prevent rehabilitation seem to ignore the very basic consideration that important as rehabilitation is, it cannot be a substitute for disability benefits, since (a) many disabled persons cannot be rehabilitated, and (b) even those who can be rehabilitated will need assistance during the process of rehabilitation. It is a mistake and misunderstanding to believe that a disability benefit system, as contemplated in the bill passed by the House of Representatives, is really antagonistic to or a substitute for rehabilitation. Actually such a system not only supplements but actually strengthens the rehabilitation program.

Dr. O'Neill may not be aware of the fact that the American Medical Association has taken a position with respect to workmen's compensation that the payment of disability benefits should make rehabilitation more feasible and effective. In December 1955 the house of delegates of the American Medical Association approved a report of a special committee on medical relations in workmen's compensation which stated in part:

"The physician's interest involves recognition that the amount and method of indemnification have a direct and important bearing on an effective rehabilitation regime. While overgenerous indemnity can dull the will for rehabilitation, inadequate indemnity requirements can destroy an employer's incentive to support rehabilitation by providing him with an easier or cheaper alternative. More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale, or force return to gainful employment in advance of clearcut medical indications."

That report proceeds to discuss important relationships between indemnity and methods of indemnity to the rehabilitation effort. It seems somewhat strange, both from the standpoint of commonsense and from the standpoint of logic that the medical profession could, on the one hand, agree that indemnity benefits under workmen's compensation are necessary and at the same time oppose disability benefits for the permanently and totally disabled as an entire group.

No other arguments are provided by Dr. O'Neill in his letter to you. He completely ignores the numerous safeguards written into the disability insurance benefit provision of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. For example, before an individual can qualify for disability benefits under that bill, he must be permanently and totally disabled as defined in the bill; he must have had at least 1½ years of coverage under the act during the 3-year period ending with the quarter of his disablement and he must have had at least 5 years of coverage during the 10-year period ending with the quarter of his disablement; and, in addition, he must be fully insured under the act. Benefits would be payable only after a 6-month waiting period. Benefits would not be payable to dependents of the disabled worker. Benefits would be suspended in the case of refusal without good cause to accept vocational rehabilitation.

All circumstances considered, the program of disability insurance benefits contemplated by the bill constitutes a very conservative program, and includes very tight prerequisites which much be met before a worker may become eligible. For example, the definition of the term "disability" requires inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration is more exacting than the disability provisions of commercial insurance policies now being issued, which permit a total disability that has persisted for 6 months to be compensated on the presumption that it is permanent until shown to be otherwise.

I hesitate to take this much of your time in responding to your letter, but I consider it so vitally important that the true facts about our Social Security System and the lack of any real factual basis for the malicious charges which have been made against it that the time to discuss these issues is warranted.

Sincerely yours,

CECIL R. KING,
17th District, California.

The Great Conspiracy—The Soviet Road to World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today, we behold a world divided not merely by geographical boundaries but also by antagonistic philosophies. One is based

upon man's dignity as a human being, the other upon atheistic communism. This half-slave, half-free posture of world affairs and individual attitudes is a carefully planned conspiracy to which I, as a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, have devoted a considerable number of my weekly newsletters.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to these observations pertaining to the Soviet road to world conquest, Mr. President, by asking unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL GAME OF CHANCE

WASHINGTON, May 2, 1955.—Once again, a seemingly changeable and inexact foreign policy, especially as it relates to the Far East, has brought this Nation to the brink of another major crisis, the outcome of which should be of great concern to all Americans.

Before proceeding further, however, let me state most insistently my fervent prayers that this country, and its allies, will not be "euchred" into a situation, the real nature and extent of which is beyond our present powers of comprehension. The word "euchred," in this context, is a deliberate choice, for by definition, the verb "euchre," in a game of chance means "the defeat of the trump-making side by winning three tricks." In my judgment, it is the one word which best describes the circuitous, almost masterful scheme, which the Communist conspirators are now attempting for the third time to perpetrate on the entire free world.

In this sense, I regard the "trump-making side," on all scores, as the community of free nations—all moral and ethical principles are inherently on the side of decency, freedom, and justice.

History already records the harassment and frustration which have accompanied the Korean Truce Conference of 1953 and the Far Eastern Conference, held in Geneva, Switzerland, in early 1954. Typically, and ingeniously, these discussions have been used as a propaganda device to facilitate the ultimate admission of Red China into the United Nations.

With complete disdain and impudence, the Red Chinese have ignored the provisions of the Korean Truce Agreement. In direct violation of this armistice and international law, they have imprisoned, without logical reason, American citizens, and the delay in the repatriation of these "forgotten men" has long since become the symbol of a betrayed trust. In addition, there is little argument that the Geneva Conference was a complete fiasco.

Now, we are importuned to sit down again at another conference. In the light of past performances, this, from our standpoint, could well be the third "losing trick." But, in any such international "game of chance," there must be some degree of risk, and I for one want to see the situation in Formosa settled quickly, if possible, as an affirmative step toward lasting peace. If a cease-fire can be negotiated with honor, if all imprisoned American citizens can thus be returned to their families, and if the Red Chinese demonstrate a heretofore nonexistent rigidity in the observance of the stipulations of all agreements, I would support the informed judgment of the President, consistent with the authority recently granted him by the Congress.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

WASHINGTON, May 9, 1955.—All too frequently, we as freedom-loving people overlook the real meaning—or more aptly, the real menace—of the international Communist conspiracy. Unfortunately, we often seem to forget the creepy conquests of the Russian dictatorship, and the inhuman brutality and devious cunning of these conquests. As a dictatorship and conspiracy, world domination is the all-pervading goal. The evil operations of the Kremlin, its agents and pawns, influence practically every phase of our free society.

This penetration is ceaseless, taking many forms, and is but part of a precisely conceived plan. Responsible experts have concluded that more than 20,000 trained, hard-core Communist Party members continue to function in this country, mostly in cloak-and-dagger secrecy. Unimpeachable testimony records extensive and repeated exposures of Communist infiltration in our industrial and defense plants. In accordance with a basic Communist doctrine that "the end justifies the means," it can be accurately predicted that infiltration is a prelude to active sabotage and subversion.

With utter abhorrence of the frightening prospect of another global conflict, and with full realization of the delicate international situation, there is no alternative to preparation and security. We must be alert to any eventuality. It is in this setting that I have introduced legislation which would prevent access to all defense facilities of persons likely to commit sabotage, espionage, and other subversive acts.

As expected, the self-appointed saints of American liberalism, with neurotic denunciation, are attacking this measure on the grounds that the rights of workers will be violated. These deluded individuals endeavor to popularize such idioms that my proposal would result in "a lot less freedom but no more security." These unfounded assaults tend to cloud the true purpose of the legislation and the vital need for adequate precautions. Contrary to these assertions, this bill would protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans and simultaneously safeguard our Nation.

I would remind these self-styled liberals that: "Communism is the religion of the devil; it is a distillation of evil; it is the very anti-Christ. We will never be safe from this evil faith until it is driven back to the hell from which it came." These are the words of Adm. William H. Standley, a wartime Ambassador to Russia, who can, with authority, attest to the real meaning and foreboding of the Communist conspiracy.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

A PAUSE FOR REORIENTATION

WASHINGTON, June 13, 1955.—This Nation's foreign policy respecting Yugoslavia, as a result of the recent, and much publicized, visit of Soviet officialdom in Belgrade, momentarily exists in a necessary atmosphere of indecision and imprecision. This needed pause for reorientation affords a calm, careful evaluation of the settlements reached between two countries dedicated, in varying manner, to the dogma of communism.

It will be recalled that in June of 1948 Yugoslavia severed relations with its patron benefactor when Marshal Tito refused total subservience to the Kremlin. Through this unprecedented breach, the community of free nations—in an early attempt at coexistence with totalitarianism—acquired a strange ally, an orphan of communism. Seemingly, with unusual haste, the origin and true nature of Tito's regime were ignored in a swell of economic and military aid.

In the years since World War II, the United States, as a part of its mutual security and other programs, has extended Yugoslavia grants-in-aid amounting to almost $644 million. This figure does not reflect military funds for obvious reasons. Curiously enough, while the Belgrade jamboree was in progress, the Congress was considering additional aid for Tito's Government.

Any appraisal of the effectiveness of this generosity would be shabby in the light of these late developments. The quiet and guarded renewal of diplomatic relations in 1953 should have telegraphed the intentions of these two quasi-partners to solidify again their mutual interests and problems—all stemming from the ideology of Godless communism.

While creating the illusion that the so-called neutralism of Yugoslavia will be maintained, it is interesting to note that the Belgrade conferences brought forth proposals, to which Russia and Yugoslavia affixed their approval, urging the admission of Red China into the United Nations, reunification of West and East Germany, peaceful use of nuclear energy, disarmament and the abolition of atomic weapons, the annexation of Formosa by Communist China, and others. This entire affair can best be characterized as another clever propaganda device, at which the Communists are most adept.

Much supposition surrounds the real motives of the mended Belgrade-Moscow axis, ranging from Russia's internal disorders to Tito's duplicity. In any event, the constant deceitfulness and depravity of the communist conspiracy must condition our future relations with Yugoslavia.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1955.—To suggest that our country should not participate in the forthcoming "meeting at the summit"—if it can be called that—is hardly a popular view. Public opinion has crystallized a pervading attitude, rightfully so, that every conceivable avenue of consideration in the search for lasting peace should be fully exhausted before any overt action is even contemplated.

With many of the unfortunate experiences of the Yalta and other conferences still fresh in memory, more especially as a consequence of the recent release of the Yalta papers, it can be reasonably assumed that our negotiations will reflect an enlightened understanding of rapport with the Communists. Moreover, we must never close our eyes to the real motivations, objectives, and treacheries of the international Communist conspiracy. The mistakes of the past most certainly must set the stage for any conference involving the extremely tenuous and complex problem of global peace.

At this point, it would seem timely and pertinent to observe that, in the past 25 years, the Soviet Union has been a party to 52 international agreements, 50 of which they have blithely violated. These have been the end result of some 3,400 meetings between representatives of the United States and Russia since 1933. But, in 7 or more years of discussions of more recent vintage, no semblance of accord has been reached on such major issues as the control of atomic weapons, the reunification of Germany, settlement of lease-lend, disarmament and world peace. Unproductive though this record might be, it nonetheless must be the setting for the coming four-power meeting, and we would be more than naive—if not indeed asinine—to expect that another series of discussions will cause an immediate or early abridgement of deep-seated differences between antagonistic philosophies of life and government.

Senator KNOWLAND, last week, properly summarized the sentiments of many when he said, "I do not believe we are bankrupt in our negotiating power. On the contrary, I believe we have an opportunity to cause some grave concern to the Soviet world." At Geneva, next month, the free world will

be at another crossroad in history. Rather than peace at any price, the path to peace must be charted by a solid demonstration of honor and good will on the part of the Russians in conjunction with an unflinching willingness to remove from bondage the many enslaved people now trapped in the shadow of the Iron Curtain.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE LEOPARD AND HIS SPOTS

WASHINGTON, September 12, 1955.—Are the partisans of world communism genuinely sincere in their recent grandiose efforts to create the countenance of men of good will, interested primarily in peace on earth? This question is on the lips of all God-fearing, peace-loving people everywhere.

Time, of course, will provide the answer. But the repugnant, historical pattern of world domination, conceived by Marx and Lenin, and implemented by the Bolshevik terrorists immediately following World War I and since, would seem to militate against an affirmative answer. Through constant and devious subversion and infiltration it envelops all it touches, and the free world—indolent, apathetic, and partially blind to the true nature and goal of the Red menace—often seems unable to summon the strength, the courage, and even the interest on which the very survival of freedom and liberty depend.

Let it not be forgotten that international communism has but one objective—world domination and total subservience to its philosophy and its ends—the accomplishment of which has followed a definite plan of several phases:

First, the overthrow of the Czarist regime in Russia after World War I for the purpose of obtaining a national base for international operations. Second, in the years prior to World War II, the consolidation of Russia under Communist control. Third, a program of expansion to assure support from surrounding satellite nations. Fourth, the instigation of moral, economic, and political turbulence in Europe. Fifth, the mastery of Asia by either direct or indirect means, the latter having proved most effective. Sixth, the mastery of Africa with its vast storehouse of natural resources. Seventh, the control of Latin America as a prelude to the economic strangulation of the United States. The fourth to seventh steps of this phased program have accelerated despite the recent conundrums at Geneva. None of these requires direct military intervention by Russia; on the contrary, results are obtained through the typical Kremlin-inspired tactics of subversion, subtle infiltration, and vicious propaganda. In the past year the scope of these tactics has been broadened to include a campaign of negotiated economic ties with the Communist orbit—thus the buildup of the Soviet merchant marine is no accident.

Since the meeting at the summit it would appear that there is a tendency to minimize the Red menace, and its spreading control in all corners of the globe. Rest assured the leopard has not changed its spots—our guard must not be dropped.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

A MATTER OF INDIFFERENCE

WASHINGTON, October 10, 1955.—It is unfortunate that so many of our own people do not realize to this day the hazard of Communist infiltration of free institutions, that they do not recognize the footprint of the Kremlin in our Government, our labor unions, and even our schools. "What can 25,000 card-carrying Communists do?" they scoff.

Ask the people of Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia? Ask them how a handful of people in the right places were able to open the gates of their country and place the lackeys of Red Russia in the very seat of their governments? Ask the people of Germany what six men and a painter by the name of Adolf Hitler were able to do to their homeland? Ask the people of the Soviet what Lenin and a few faithful followers were able to do to the Russian bear and her untold millions of martyred people? Ask the Christian world what 12 simple men, filled with dedication and purpose, were able to do in transforming the spiritual face of the earth?

Dedication and purpose, those are the keys that give a single man the power and strength of an army. That is a point the scoffers might well heed. And, all the rest of us have to do to betray America is precisely nothing. Be neutral and indifferent. Continue in our complacency long enough, and all of our troubles will be over. Neither an honorable dead man nor a cringing slave worries about maintaining the strength and integrity of free institutions.

Some of our own good neighbors may be an unwitting accomplice of those who exploit the decency and the traditional tolerance of our country. Not, I say, because they do not love America, but because they do not know the evil that would enslave them. If they could clearly see the beastliness of communism and the falsity of its pretended concern for peace and human welfare they would surely be able to summon the moral courage and the necessary action to oppose this diabolical philosophy in all its many guises.

The problem of protecting and enriching the fundamental principles upon which the American faith is based may cause some differences of opinion. But the meaning of those principles, their value to the continuation of our way of life, and our firm determination to preserve them are elements on which the American people must remain united. These issues are beyond political partisanship. On this common ground we can meet any challenge, and with God's help, I know we shall.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

IN THE BALANCE

WASHINGTON, November 7, 1955.—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It was thus that the great American tradition was begun. Here was the acknowledgment that man as a creature of God possesses a dignity which distinguishes him from the animal creation. He alone is endowed with the power of reason.

It has been upon this philosophy that our American institutions have been built. By our continued adherence to these fundamental truths, we are at the same time the envy of those who would destroy us and the hope of all men who cherish liberty.

Today we behold a world divided not merely by geographical boundaries but also by antagonistic philosophies. One is based upon man's dignity as a human being, the other upon atheistic communism. The latter, as its name discloses, denies the very existence of God. With equal fervor, it regards man as a mere slave, a pawn existing for the state. By false promises it deludes man's mind. It fosters dissention and creates turmoil. It first enslaves the mind of man and then by force and fear it destroys his liberty of action.

In an atmosphere of confusion, created by the false prophets of communism, the half-truths and the beguiling platitudes of their propaganda find so ready an acceptance by the unwary. In carrying out their program they are bound by no morality, for they recognize no moral law. Thus they lie, deceive, and by every diabolical tactic and device they penetrate, infiltrate and seek to capture and dominate man's every legitimate organization and institution.

There are many among us, however, who fail utterly to comprehend the magnitude of the menace or the proximity of the danger occasioned by the continual penetration of Communists and those who do their bidding. To them, I say it should require no extended argument, at this late date, to demonstrate that the problem of communistic infiltration and domination of our free institutions poses a constant threat to the maintenance of our hardwon liberty. The present counterfeit smiles of the Russians are but a continuing evidence of this menace, and should be dealt with accordingly.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

RUSSIAN ROULETTE

WASHINGTON, November 14, 1955.—That a staccato of Russian inspired frustration and deceitful Communist propaganda has accomplished the present Big Four Conference in Geneva cannot be denied. Equally true is it that the international Communist conspiracy—its devilish purpose and method of operation—has thus been exposed and illuminated to the scrutiny of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Following President Eisenhower's dramatic proposals "at the summit" in July last, a new hope for world peace was born in the hearts of all men. An unprecedented period of seeming good will on the part of the Russians popularly called "the spirit of Geneva," has since had a far-reaching impact. This climate has been cleverly and carefully cultivated by Soviet Russia. Here, many said, were the genuine evidences that the Communists wanted to live in harmony with the balance of the world. Now, they added, tensions could be relaxed.

As a poet once wrote, "Is life, then, a dream and delusion, and where shall the dreamer awake?" Recent events in Geneva can only shake these dreamers to reality—a shuddering, stark reality which reveals, for all to see, the hocus-pocus and falsity of the Red menace. The truth of this conclusion is demonstrated by Secretary of State Dulles' statement of last Friday that the Russians have practiced "grotesque propaganda" in an "infamous" attempt to delude the world.

In the costumes of masqueraders and puppets, with a great fanfare of synthetic gentility and friendliness, the agents of the Kremlin have effectively stymied the Big Four Conference. From the outset, this has been their design. These partisans of atheistic communism have not changed. They never shall. Their hostile plan for world domination and subservience, as conceived by Marx and Lenin, drives them irrevocably. But, there is something to be learned from this recurring duplicity of the Russians. It is this:

"By the fruits shall you know them." So does the Bible warn against those who make prideful, hypocritical speeches of their high intentions but whose actions are the opposite of their words. This bibilical quotation states a principle so fundamental and obvious that it is difficult to realize how our sometimes wavering and confused allies—and occasionally ourselves—have missed its application to Soviet Russia.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE DOPE OF COMMUNISM

WASHINGTON, November 28, 1955.—Any goal of world conquest, as envisioned by the international Communist conspiracy, must of necessity include the use of all possible military,

political, and economic weapons. Among others, these include psychological warfare, espionage, subversion, sabotage, propaganda, and the promotion of internal strife—all of which have already been practiced with alarming success by the Communists. But, the minions of the Kremlin have introduced another thoroughly inhuman device—that of moral ruin—which has received little attention. To carry out such an objective the Communists have established a far-ranging system for the distribution of narcotics.

Official emphasis as to the seriousness, both present and potential, of this new threat can be found in the repeated warnings by United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger, who has brought to light documented facts establishing that "the United States is a target of Communist China to be supplied with a flood of foreign-exchange-earning, health - and - morale - devastating heroin."

Commissioner Anslinger urged that this evidence "offers additional dramatic proof that we are not dealing with a petty adversary but rather with a formidable and far-reaching plot to gain foreign exchange (dollars) and at the same time to demoralize the people of the free world. Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China."

Warfare, in the minds of the vast majority of our population, is pictured solely in terms of direct combat, and the horrible recollections of two world wars and the Korean crisis, with their vast mortality and destruction, are indelible memories. But, the all-inclusive concept of indirect, yet constant, warfare, as a doctrine of the Communist movement, is something new to most of us. The danger of this concept cannot, and must not, be taken lightly.

Communist tactics are aimed at the destruction of freedom and the will to resist. They are based on the principle that a country can be destroyed as surely and as easily from within as from without. The evil traffic in narcotics and drugs, with its demoralizing results, in combination with the other more familiar weapons of subversion and infiltration, is in accord with these objectives, and brings into clear focus another monstrous wrong which the philosophy of communism permits and promotes in its followers.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

GREAT IS THE FORCE OF TRUTH

WASHINGTON, January 9, 1956.—In his message of last week to the Congress, President Eisenhower expressed the belief that the Communists have shifted their methods of operations. Instead of "violence, and the threat of violence," the President reported that the Communists are now relying upon "division, enticement and duplicity." To divide and conquer—an ancient device which, in the Communist scheme of things, knows no limits, respects no morals, observes no ethics.

Capitalizing on a mood of the times—universal hatred of war—the Soviets seek to accomplish their goal of world domination through tactics subtle and sinister. The Kremlin masters are admittedly dedicated to the overthrow of our Government, of our way of life. Yet with increasing clatter, always under the guise of so-called "liberalism," a significant minority in this country continues to attack and denounce—even pooh-pooh as ridiculous—the actions of our Government intended to safeguard our national security and freedom as we know it. Duped though these misguided, often well-intentioned, persons might be, they and all of us can take heed of President Madison's lasting words, "security against foreign danger is one of the primitive objectives of civil society."

Of late, these fanciful denouncements have been directed at the use of secret informers in matters of security, infiltration and subversion. On this point, J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, has warned: "The inroads that Communist propaganda has made in influencing law-abiding Americans, who fail to realize that criminal conspiracies are conceived behind closed doors under the cover of darkness, are disheartening. It is through the efforts of confidential informants that we have been able to expose the Communist conspiracy in the past and through them we must stake much of the future security of the United States."

Confidential informants are not something new. The Old Testament records their first use. Through the ages, as in our courts and law enforcement procedures, faceless informers have been the means of fortifying the absolute truth. To the press, and many of our financial institutions, the use of secret sources of information has become a custom zealously protected.

Freedom, liberty and justice are on the anvil, and it is utterly absurd to suggest that our destiny is to be shaped without urgent warnings and essential knowledge of any and all origins.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

WASHINGTON, February 20, 1956.—The full crescendo of military and political propaganda was unleashed last week by the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy. By its timing, one can only suppose that its purpose was deliberate. At the Soviet Communist congress, the remarks of party chief Nikita S. Khrushchev were pointedly phrased to dispel any wishful-thinking on the part of the free world that the Soviet empire would be torn asunder by internal disunity. More significantly, however, is the general impression that these vigorous top-level statements were intended to counteract the recent declaration of Washington, between the United States and England, which equally as vigorously accentuates the never ceasing menace of the Communist plot.

To understand the impulse of these fresh Soviet pronouncements is to understand the original battle plan of communism conceived by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels more than 100 years ago. These fundamentals, published as "The Communist Manifesto" in 1848, advocated the defeat of all enemies, not by armed force, but by a devious process of "slow-decay-from-within." It was not until 1903 that another Communist luminary by the name of Nicolai Lenin introduced the idea of the overthrow of freedom and liberty by force or violence.

In subsequent years, the Marx-Engels-Lenin dogma, in only slightly varying form, has dictated the growth of the Communist sphere of influence and control. For many years, the latter-day benefactor of world communism, Josef Stalin, firmly charted the course of eventual world domination. But now, the leaders of Red Russia, in a spasm of accusation, have attacked this atheistic idol by condemning "the cult of the individual as being alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism (in) making a particular leader the hero and miracle worker." With the knowledge that the seeds of the so-called practice of coexistence were planted during Stalin's regime, these latest proclamations suggest that the "slow-decay-from-within" philosophy, supplemented by armed intervention when necessary, is to be accelerated.

That this philosophy has succeeded is evidenced by the fact that the number of persons held forcibly under the Communist yoke has increased from 200 to 800 million in the last 10 years. This progress no doubt inspired Khrushchev's observation that "communism is on the march throughout the world, and will win through." The ultimate goal of communism has not changed in any respect since Marx defined it more than a century ago, and in the face of persistent activity, the free world must stand alert.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE CHILL OF INDIFFERENCE

WASHINGTON, April 9, 1956.—"Today we stand at the crossroad. Our Christian faith is challenged—our country is on the defensive. * * * The world's spotlight is on the United States of America and China. On this stage will be resolved, either the eventual destruction of Communist domination or the complete enslavement and ultimate liquidation of the Christian world—the free world." With a depth of understanding, Bishop O'Gara, recently released by the Chinese Communists, places in focus for all to see the continuing war for the minds of men.

In the past, when the enemy was recognizable, the problem of defending our heritage—liberty, justice, and freedom—could be more easily met. Not so today, for within our borders and ofttimes in high places, the enemy has been found; and, even more frequently, we are unable to see him.

The conspiracy of international communism is the facsimile of an enemy threatening our country and Western civilization. The task of dealing with it is difficult, for at the threshold we are met with the startling fact that in the lexicon of atheistic communism there is no such thing as truth. Confusion is its greatest weapon. A thinly concealed piety of purpose is its principal tactic. For those to be destroyed are the first to be confused.

The danger lies not alone in the false doctrines which emanate from those who advocate communism, but in the apathy of our people toward the nature of this awful menace. Slogans of beauty to catch the unwary—promises to those whose desires are great but whose industry is negligible—first capture the unsuspecting mind. Then through fear, retain possession of it.

We have seen followers of communism and those who make common cause with them belittle its effect and degrade those who oppose it. We have seen its manifestations when men of large intellectual capacity but no faith in God would betray our country and subvert our free institutions. We have seen its allies spread evil over a large portion of the earth.

Some of our own good neighbors may be unwitting accomplices of those who exploit the decency and traditional tolerance of our Nation. Only because they do not know the evil that would enslave them. If they could clearly see the beastliness of communism and the falsity of its pretended concern for peace and human welfare they would surely summon the moral courage and the necessary action to oppose this diabolical philosophy in all of its many faces.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Q. E. D.—THAT WHICH WAS TO BE DEMONSTRATED

WASHINGTON, April 16, 1956.—Though not on the best-seller list, a recent report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be a member, has already gained wide popularity. This report is entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America—What It Is—How It Works." To those who minimize the scope of the Communist conspiracy—to those who have been duped by the false platitudes of communism—to all Americans seeking to safeguard our bastion of freedom—this pub-

lication, reflecting as it does careful documentation, is sincerely recommended.

The opening paragraph, in terse terms, sets the theme of this very helpful booklet. It reads: "Founded in September 1919, the Communist Party of the United States of America is an organization unique in American history. It is not a true political party and differs fundamentally from all political parties in this country. It is in fact a Russian-inspired, Moscow-dominated, anti-American, quasi-military conspiracy against our Government, our ideals, and our freedoms."

Unlike the two major American political parties in which organization and discipline often leave much to be desired, the Communist Party, even within our borders, is a coordinated network of regimented agents, fully versed in the jargon, treachery, and objectives of the international Communist movement: "world conquest and more specifically the destruction of the American Government." As this Internal Security Subcommittee report states, "Since the Communist Party, USA, is in fact simply the American branch of the Russian Communist Party, it follows faithfully the conspiratorial pattern laid down by its parent body."

The report continues: "The Communist Party functions at all times of the year, every day of the week, and at all hours of the day. It is a full-time organization which is not restricted to election campaigns. It persistently seeks to permeate every phase of American life for its own subversive purpose. Communist agents may be found wherever and whenever there is an opportunity for Communist propaganda or the promotion of civil strife, whether it be the factory, the union, the church, the school, or the neighborhood. * * * Internally it thrives upon promoting clashes: between employer and employee, landlord and tenant, white and Negro, native-born and foreigner, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew; between the American people and their Government, and within every non-Communist organization."

Truly this is A Handbook for Americans for all Americans to read.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

HARDLY A STATUS QUO

WASHINGTON, May 28, 1956.—The ceaseless struggle between freedom and communism came closer to grips last week with the recognition of Red China by Egypt. Thereby, it is widely believed that the stage is set for another attempt to gain admission to the United Nations for Communist China. It is anticipated that out of the shadows of the Iron Curtain other countries will join in supporting this new drive to obtain a cloak of respectability for an aggressor nation.

This development poses many crucial questions, not the least important of which are these two: (1) What is the true relationship between Soviet Russia and Red China? and (2) how can this campaign in deceit be repulsed?

As to the first question, U. S. News & World Report magazine has published a condensed version of a book, titled "At Last—The True Story of Red China," written by a businessman, released only recently after more than 30 years in that country, which includes these timely statements: "The fact is, China has been conquered almost as thoroughly as if there had been a direct Soviet military invasion, followed by the establishment of a Russian-model military government that could control the cumulative power of 580 million people." Also, "Superficially it appears that the ties between the Soviet Union and Communist China are ones of partnership based on an identity of interest rather than domination of one by the other. But the evidence presented in this book demonstrates that China today is a giant slave state being exploited by the Soviet Union to conquer all of Asia as a major step toward world domination." Obviously, to admit Red China to the United Nations would be merely to extend and strengthen the tentacles of world communism.

To answer the second point, it may become necessary for the United States to exercise the much-discussed veto in the United Nations. The alacrity and frequency with which the Russians have used, or misused, this unusual power should dispel any moral or procedural reservations held by many Americans. Significant here is the incontrovertible evidence that the United States, in shouldering the burden in Korea, lost 33,000 young men with another 110,000 wounded or maimed—a costly sacrifice for the cause of freedom which Egypt and a few other countries blithely ignore in their mad haste to do the devil's bidding.

I shall continue to oppose, with all the vigor I can summon, the admission of Red China to the United Nations. The American people must face this issue squarely.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE GREAT CONSPIRACY

WASHINGTON, June 4, 1956.—The world is today witnessing a transformation in windowdressing. With skillful propaganda and astute timing, the master puppeteers of the Kremlin are again embarked upon a campaign of duplicity, cleverly intended to lull the free world into an attitude of resignation—or an attitude of "let's get along with the fellows, they're not really scoundrels." It can safely be reasoned that the extensive travels of top Communist leaders, the announced reduction in the Russian Army, the latter-day denunciation of Joseph Stalin, plus other equally transparent gestures, are part of the same old package but with a new design and new wrapping.

Time and again, the Congress has found that there exists an international Communist conspiracy which, in its origins, its development, its persistence, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, espionage, sabotage, terrorism and any other means deemed necessary, to suppress and subjugate Western civilization. In the face of incontrovertible history and mounting evidence, there can be little dispute on this point.

With an agility which can only come from decades of double dealing, it is possible for the Soviet Union to pursue a policy of "peaceful coexistence" or a policy of sympathetic support of actions to undermine the cause of freedom—whichever is momentarily profitable. It can even be said that both ends can be simultaneously served—witness the pilgrimage of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to Moscow while at the same time top military representatives of the community of free nations are being invited to observe the Soviet air force show in Moscow later this month.

You might ask, What can we as a Nation do to frustrate the international Communist movement? And, indeed, it should be made clear that the Soviets want us to lower our guard and that they want our attention distracted by side issues. The response to this question is contained in a more vigorous prosecution of anti-Communist legislation, increased exposure of Communist activities, and realistic warnings, widely publicized, of the dangers inherent in these new Communist tactics.

Make no mistake—the objectives of the great conspiracy have not changed. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, "The Communist leopard frequently changes his spots, but the same blood—bad blood—continuously flows through his veins."

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE HOUNDS AND THE HARE

WASHINGTON, June 18, 1956.—Ancient history records the tale of Mithridates VI, King of Pontus and Bithynia (about 63 B. C.), who concocted a confection, composed of 72 ingredients, which he claimed gave him special immunity. Now, it would seem that Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, has hit upon a similar formula though the ingredients are considerably different and more in numbers. The principal ingredient would seem to be a curious blending of American dollars with the Communist teachings of Karl Marx.

Just 1 year ago, the minstrels of the Kremlin, who wander with a purpose, journeyed to Yugoslavia. By way of a return engagement, only recently, Marshal Tito, with much pomp and ceremony, made a pilgrimage to Moscow. Simultaneously, on both occasions, this Government was being importuned to send more economic and more foreign assistance to Yugoslavia.

It is interesting to note that, since the end of World War II, the community of free nations has furnished Yugoslavia nearly $2.5 billion in aid. Of this amount, the United States supplied an estimated $2 billion. In the sense that Tito has added more ingredients to his Mithridates, he has also obtained financial help from Communist-bloc nations totaling about $464 million equivalent.

Singly, and together, these events are fully consistent with the duplicity which has sparked the spread of world communism. The plan of operation never changes. Such a double and deceitful game was once described as "to hold with the hare and run with the hounds," or to run with the hounds as if to catch the hare, all the while being the secret friend of the hare. Those among us who have any doubts as to Marshal Tito's real motives might ponder the meaning of this old adage.

These two meetings have served to strengthen the Belgrade-Moscow axis. There can be little mistake about this. These two partners have again demonstrated a solidness of mutual interests, interests which fit the pattern of the international Communist conspiracy, interests which are contrary to those of the free world. Support of this point of view can certainly be found in the coming gathering of Tito, of Yugoslavia; Nehru, of India; and Nasser, of Egypt; all of which has been carefully cultivated in advance by the Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia.

The need for a reappraisal of our policy with all of these countries is now more pressing than ever.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE POLISH UPRISING

WASHINGTON, July 16, 1956.—Food, the staff of life—or, more precisely, the lack of it—was the springboard for the recent insurrection at Poznan, Poland. The inadequacy of food is a problem which has long plagued the Communist world. Until food supplies can meet the needs—something more than a meager bill of fare—of the Iron Curtain, the Kremlin manipulators face a major dilemma. The history of communism is filled with instances of agricultural innovations. The now forgotten Russian 5-year plans to the contrary, these experiments have not brought the desired measure of stability and sufficiency.

Probably the most notorious illustration of the manner in which the Soviets have in the past handled this problem of inadequacy was the manmade famine engineered in the Ukraine during 1932–33 to force collectivization (state control) on the Ukrainian farmers. It is difficult to estimate the number who starved as a result of this famine, but it was between 4.8 million and 6 million people.

A unique solution, indeed, to a difficult problem—destroy the people, and the dilemma takes care of itself. The mastermind

of this diabolic famine of 1932–33 became known as the hangman of the Ukraine. He is the same Khrushchev who today masterminds the international Communist conspiracy, and who today endeavors to persuade the free world that he is a person of good will. From late reports, apparently only vast quantities of vodka will still Khrushchev's persistent nightmares of these mass murders.

It has been suggested that the Poznan uprising was similarly engineered to accomplish some devious Communist purpose. Certainly such a presumption would be in keeping with the duplicity of this foul conspiracy. But it might be more logical to assume that this was symbolic of a growing unrest among all oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain. It might conceivably trigger a renewed groundswell of hope for the liberation of these enslaved nations. To that worthy end, our Government and our allies must stand firmly with the courageous people of Poland. Anthony T. Bouscaren, director of the political science department of Marquette University, reflects public opinion on this issue when he says:

"Our foreign-policy theme must be liberation from Communist tyranny and opposition to a world half slave and half free. If the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains know for a certainty that we stand on their side without compromise, the forces which caused Khrushchev to denounce Stalin will grow and revolts on the East German (and now Polish) pattern will become a possibility. And this time we must be prepared to act."

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

TWO BIRDS WITH ONE STONE

WASHINGTON, July 23, 1956.—Yesterday's newspapers, in reporting on Russian affairs, blazoned front-page headlines such as these: "Khrushchev Sees New Soviet Gains," "Bulganin Admits Unrest in Satellite Countries," "Bulganin, in Warsaw, Assails Vacillation in Soviet Ranks." Each of these articles spring from comments by the two Soviet leaders, and it would certainly seem that these mouthpieces for communism are engaged in an annoying sally of double talk. Through the years, similar contradictions have been voiced to achieve some timely objective in advancing the cause of worldwide communism. There is much reason to suspect the same devious purpose in these latest instances.

In denouncing and downgrading Stalin, a long-time Communist idol, the Kremlin masters in the judgment of many seek "to kill 2 birds with 1 stone." First, all blame for unhappiness of life behind the Iron Curtain is laid firmly at the feet of the dead Stalin. And, secondly, by carefully cultivating the illusion that the Soviet Union cherishes peace, these same dictators hope to convince the free world of the absurdity of further expenditures for armaments. When viewed in these terms, all mystery is shorn from the actions of the Communist regime during the past year.

Said another way, the Communist policy has returned to the popular-front device, fashionable during the 1932–52 period in this country, of wooing and winning the cooperation of humanitarian and democratic organizations throughout the world. People of good will are now asked to believe that communism, without Stalin, offers the only hope for a peaceful and ideal way of life. In all of this, with typical propaganda deceit and thoroughness, freedom, justice, and universal welfare are the major themes. But the lasting historical fact is that communism, with or without Stalin, is still tyranny. And this tyrannical oppression of the Soviet Union extends to 11 satellite states and some 700 million enslaved persons, with what could hardly be described as durable control—witness the recent uprisings in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and elsewhere.

Transparency of these efforts "to kill two birds" is indicative in the reality that Khrushchev, while denouncing Stalin, has persistently refrained from attacking the doctrines of communism. The political philosophy of the Soviet Union is still, as always, based on godless communism, one of the most impelling objectives of which is the destruction of all capitalistic nations like the United States.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

The 84th Congress Has Accomplished Much in the Public Interest—Obstructions Overcome Means America Will Move Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the closing days of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, we arrive at the moment when it is time to evaluate our labors of the past 7 months. It is time to look to the record and do a summing up of the legislative actions and accomplishments of this Congress—a Democratic Congress.

Our opinions, as Members of Congress, will differ and in some instances, will be no doubt in direct conflict. However, I personally feel that a true evaluation of our achievements and accomplishments will reflect a good record and portray a picture of great worth and merit—a record that will provide service and assistance to the citizens of this Nation and a record of great credit to the Democratic Party. The legislation which we have enacted during this session of the Congress has assisted this Nation of ours to move decisively in the direction of peace, security and prosperity.

The legislative duties and actions have been many and far-reaching, both on the domestic front and in the field of international relations. A summary review of the legislation enacted in this session will indicate the tremendous task with which this Congress—the 84th Congress—has been confronted and has overcome roadblocks and obstacles to bring about great achievements.

AGRICULTURE

The welfare of the farmers of this Nation and of American agriculture has been one of the most seriously considered problems of this Congress.

During the middle of the session, Congress decisively passed a bill to return farmers' crops to high price supports and to increase cash income of farmers through acreage reduction by authorizing a soil bank program. However, the President vetoed this bill, stating that he objected to the high price supports which the Congress has overwhelmingly approved.

Later, after several weeks of further deliberation, the Congress passed a second major agriculture bill—a watered-down version of the original farm bill. The second farm bill retained the soil bank program but called for flexible and lowered price supports instead of high and firm price supports, consequently, the increased income for American farmers will not be as great under the second bill as under the one previously passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President.

The soil bank provisions of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts with producers for a minimum period of 3 to 10 years under which the producer would devote a designated part of his cropland to conserving uses. It further authorizes the Secretary to pay a fair share of the costs of establishing the conservation use and make an annual payment to the producer which will provide a fair and reasonable return for the land diverted to conservation uses. The cost of the program is limited to $450 million annually.

To further relieve the economic plight now being experienced by the farmers of this country, the Congress enacted legislation which exempts farmers from payment of the Federal excise taxes on gasoline and other special fuels used on the farm. This legislation is expected to give farmers about $60 million in tax relief annually.

The provisions of this bill extend to gasoline used in connection with cultivation of the soil; raising or harvesting any agricultural or farm commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, poultry, and wildlife.

In the vital field of soil conservation the Congress extended for 2 years the authority of the Federal Government to make soil-conservation payments to our farmers. Individual cash payments are made by means of annual refund checks paid directly by the Federal Government to the farmer. To finance this important program the Congress appropriated $250 million for the next fiscal year and continued the maximum payment which can be made to any individual farmer participant at $2,500.

Two legislative measures pertaining to tobacco enacted by the Congress should give increased benefits to Tennessee tobacco farmers as well as to tobacco farmers of other States during the years ahead. One measure adopted by the Congress rescinded an order by the Secretary of Agriculture which would have reduced tobacco acreage allotments for 1956 by about 10 percent less than the 1955 quotas. This congressional action in effect increased the 1956 quota by about 10 percent and established the 1956 quota on the same basis as the 1955 allotments. Another bill approved by the Congress provided for the establishment of quota allotments for each year on February 1, instead of the previous date of December 1. Through this adjustment the allotment quotas will be based on more accurate and up-to-date information and consequently give farmers some time saving in their acreage allotment calculations.

Another aid to the farmers of this Nation, as well as to other interests, was the allocation of funds to establish research centers in various sections of the country for the purpose of studying the forestry program. One of these research centers will be established at the University of the South at Sewanee, Franklin County, Tenn., and a substantial appropriation has been allocated for this purpose.

Total overall appropriation provided for all agricultural purposes for the fiscal year 1957—the period of 1 year extending from June 30, 1956, through June 30, 1957—was $1,993,744,968. This is more than $1 billion more than was appropriated for agriculture during the fiscal year 1956. However, $1.2 billion of this year's appropriation is earmarked to finance the soil bank program. The remainder of the funds will go to continue the work of the Agriculture Research Service, Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, Marketing Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, and the other loan, credit, and assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The farmers of this Nation would have received greater benefits under the first farm bill passed by the Congress which the President vetoed; however under provisions of the legislation approved, the farmers' plight should be somewhat relieved and American agriculture permitted to prosper.

HIGHWAYS

One of the major accomplishments of this session of the Congress was passage of a record $32.9 billion highway construction program—the biggest road-building program in this Nation's history.

This bill authorizes construction of 41,000 miles of super interstate highways which by 1969 will link most State capitals and other major cities from coast to coast. The total cost of this system will be $27.5 billion, with the Federal Government paying $24.8 billion and the States $2.7 billion. The remaining $5.4 billion will be spent on the primary and secondary highway system and on roads on Federal land.

This omnibus road bill, during the 13-year period, should put this country's roads in first-class condition, not only to facilitate traffic and commerce, but to also speed military communication in case of a national emergency.

Federal funds, under terms of the bill, will be allocated to the States on a matching basis, more liberal than the terms authorized in the 1954 Highway Act under which the Federal-State program formerly operated.

The matching formula for the Interstate System will be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State. Allocations for primary, rural, and urban roads will be made on a 50–50 matching fund basis.

This giant bill should take care of the great overall need for improvement of the roads of our country, and particularly improvement on rural, farm-to-market routes and city streets as well as interstate highways.

The commerce and population of our country are expanding year after year, and in the main, construction of adequate highways has not kept pace with this rapid expansion. There has been little argument over the need for sound highway legislation.

This big road bill is another of the major accomplishments of this session of the Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Preservation of the defensive strength of our country is the greatest guaranty of security for the free world against aggression.

With this in mind, Congress approved appropriations of more than $34 billion for the Department of Defense for the next year. This sum represents about $500 million more than was requested for defense purposes by the President. Of the total amount appropriated, more than $16 billion is for the Air Force—almost $1 billion more than the President requested. In recommending the larger amount of money for the Air Force, the Congress made an explicit demand that the extra funds be spent to expedite the production of heavy, long-range bombers for our defense.

There have been serious questions asked concerning this country's bomber construction program and it was the opinion of a majority of the Members of the Congress that acceleration of this program is necessary. This Congress felt that production of the giant B–52 bomber should be stepped up from the present light production schedule and the additional Air Force funds were appropriated for this purpose.

To bolster our national defense, greater emphasis is being placed on the application of atomic power by our Naval forces. The first nuclear-powered submarine—the *Nautilus*—is already in operation with our Naval Fleet, the second such submarine—the *Sea Wolf*—has been launched, and several others are in the process of construction and are included in the fiscal year 1957 shipbuilding program. Adequate funds were allocated by Congress to the Navy for the continued progress of this important phase of our defense program.

With the money which the Congress has appropriated for construction and research, the intercontinental missiles will be a reality in the near future. A portion of this research work is being accomplished at the guided missile center at Redstone Arsenal near Huntsville, Ala., and also at the great Arnold Engineering Development Center near Tullahoma, Tenn.

To help support our national defense effort and promote international security, the Congress has appropriated a total of $3.8 billion to be expended under provisions of the Mutual Security Act. Under this program, the United States provides economic and military aid and assistance to our overseas allies.

By cooperation with our allies in this mutual effort, the United States can obtain a far better defense program, and, according to many informed authorities, at a considerably lower cost. Military officials state that it costs $6,600 a year for our country to maintain an American soldier abroad, while it costs the United States only $789 to maintain an allied soldier in his own country.

Appropriation of this fund considerably strengthens our national defense network throughout the world. Through the cooperation of other free nations, the threat of war should be lessened and diminished and the goal of a secure peace made a reality.

EDUCATION

In the field of legislation affecting education, one of the most important measures approved by the Congress was enactment of the public library service bill which is primarily designed to assist in bringing books and library services to rural families.

This legislation authorizes the expenditure of $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period—the funds to be allocated to States matching the grants for this educational aid and rural library service. The bill specifies that no State will receive less than $40,000 a year for library services. Control over distribution of the funds provided in this bill is left entirely to the States as is the selection of books to be distributed to libraries.

In many of the cities and towns of our Nation, there are in many instances excellent library facilities, making available to the citizens the great wealth of knowledge stored in books. This enactment should serve to improve, if not equalize, educational advantages in this regard for our rural citizens.

The adoption of an undesirable amendment, in effect killed changes during this session of Congress for legislation which would have provided States with Federal funds to aid in constructing school buildings. There is a definite need in our country for better school buildings and other facilities to improve our overall school system. As our population continues to grow, more pupils enter school and many of our institutions are now overcrowded and in need of better schoolrooms.

Notwithstanding this recognized need, there are many who fear the ultimate possibilities of Federal interference or control of our State and local school systems should any improper type of Federal aid to education bill be adopted.

During past years, the Congress has approved legislation which has provided Federal assistance to our school systems, but none of these measures have had racial or religious issues or restrictions included in the provisions.

During the debate on the Federal aid to education bill, one amendment was adopted which would have prohibited grants from the Federal Government to schools which failed to promptly integrate children of all races. Actually, the amendment would have gone further than the Supreme Court decision on the question of segregation. This amendment would have withheld Federal aid to schools unless integration was promptly completed, or within 4 years as a maximum time limitation. The Supreme Court decision placed no such time limit on integration.

Shortly after this amendment was adopted, the House voted to kill the bill—thereby removing any chance for further consideration of the measure during this session of Congress.

Of particular importance to our schools and our school children was the passage by the Congress of a bill which increases the allocation from $60 million annually to $75 million for the school milk and lunch program. This is another important and significant measure approved by this Congress affecting the health and welfare of our schoolchildren.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT

A future power shortage in the Tennessee Valley area was probably averted through legislation affecting TVA approved by this session of the Congress. It can truly be said that this session of Congress has been a fruitful one for this agency of our Government.

Of major importance was the reaffirming by the Congress of TVA's authority to continue to use its own surplus corporate funds to install additional needed generating units at the John Sevier, New Johnsonville, and other TVA steam plants.

Under this authority, the Board of Directors of TVA can go ahead and use the agency's surplus corporate funds to add additional power capacity to these steam plants and forestall a predicted power shortage for the TVA area.

For the past 3 years there have been no new generating units added to the TVA system which would contribute to the agency's power system—and to complicate this factor, the demand for power is constantly increasing by industry, the REA's, municipalities, Government defense installations, and other consumers.

The TVA Board of Directors, recognizing that a power shortage was imminent, recommended to the Bureau of the Budget that four new generating units be started, one to be constructed in 1956 and the other three to begin in 1957.

The Bureau of the Budget adopted the board's recommendation, but then only recommended that the Congress approve sufficient funds to begin construction in 1956 for the one unit, then hinged the beginning of the other three units upon enactment of legislation of a complicated self-financing method which would have allowed TVA to issue bonds, but at the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and with other limitations and restrictions.

After many weeks of debate and long hours of hearings, the bond issue proposal was stalled and instead, the Congress reaffirmed TVA's authority to use its own corporate funds for the needed new generating units—thus giving TVA a temporary victory.

With this conclusive congressional authority, the TVA board of directors now have begun to build needed additions to the TVA power supply system.

This action can indeed be termed a signal victory for TVA and was only gained after bitter attacks by its enemies.

The TVA critics are on all sides and continually charge that this great agency of Government should stand on its own two feet. But these are empty charges because TVA is standing on its own feet—it is paying its own way and more in the many returns to the people of this Nation. It is also paying big dividends into the Treasury. Annual payments into the Treasury through 1957 will have exceeded $285 million. The navigation and flood-control programs of TVA are also paying dividends—in the form of increased river traffic and commerce and in the saving of human lives and property.

This great agency should be allowed to continue its progress—to serve the giant atomic installation at Oak Ridge and other defense installations—to continue to move forward in its navigation program—to expand its flood-control program—and to continue in every way to serve the people of our Nation.

Also of importance to the people of the Tennessee Valley area was the approval of the Congress of $1.1 million to begin construction of a new big dam on the lower Cumberland River. The lower Cumberland Dam, later renamed Barkley Dam, is one of the major dams needed for the full utilization and development of the Cumberland River. This project will greatly aid commerce and navigation, and improve flood control and also provide some 600 million kilowatts of hydro power annually when completed.

An important feature of the new dam will be the construction of a canal between the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers just above the proposed dam, thereby connecting these two important rivers and facilitating river transportation on the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers as well as the Ohio.

Late in this session of the Congress, the House-Senate Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommended legislation to authorize construction of a large number of large scale and smaller atomic reactors to produce atomic electric power. These reactors would have been built, owned, and managed by the Federal Government. The purpose of the program was to further development of the art of producing electric energy from the atom and to put America ahead of other countries which are making great progress in this field. The program was to run concurrently with the atomic reactor program now exclusively conducted by private industry—which, according to many observers is bogging down and lagging behind the rest of the world.

This important measure was approved by the Senate but lost in the House by a small margin in the closing days of the Congress.

The measure will be reconsidered at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

Significant of other natural resource projects in our Nation was approval of Congress for the development of the land and water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin. This legislation authorizes a series of storage reservoirs with hydroelectric plants; irrigation projects and a comprehensive plan of development of the water resources of this great river basin.

To further help in the development and conservation of the water resources of this Nation, the Congress has initiated a number of new reclamation and irrigation projects in the West as well as furthering other important conservation projects. There was also approved legislation which authorized $500 million to assist cities and other governmental units to construct waterworks and other utility conservation systems. The Federal Government would contribute 30 percent of the cost of these installations to further control pollution of our rivers and streams.

VETERANS

In an effort to improve the various veterans programs of this grateful Nation, the Congress this year appropriated $4.7 billion for all veterans benefits, an increase of $20 million more than was appropriated for the last fiscal year and $8 million more than was recommended by the President. This Nation has the greatest veterans program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents. These programs are being continued by the Congress at a level exceeding the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

With respect to funds for the hospital and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the Congress increased the appropriation by $21 million bringing the total overall cost to $51,635,000 for the next fiscal year. The veterans hospitals of this Nation represent an investment of more than $2.5 billion. Many of these buildings are the old Army cantonment-type and badly in need of repair and replacement. The additional funds appropriated by the Congress will get this work under way.

Included in this appropriation is $2,261,000 as the first installment toward an overall modernization program at the veterans hospital at Murfreesboro, Tenn. Also included is $1,500,000 for construction of a new general medical veterans hospital for Nashville and middle Tennessee to replace the old and inadequate facility of the Veterans' Administration.

Also of significance to the veterans of this Nation was the passage during this session of the Congress of legislation which will allow about 10,000 more widows of World War I veterans to be eligible for veterans pensions. These widows, because of previous legislation, had been disqualified from receiving pension benefits. This legislation will be of substantial benefit to many of the war widows who had previously been denied pension benefits.

This Congress has also approved legislation which provides educational assistance to children of veterans of World War I, II or Korea who died from service-connected disability. Monthly payments to the children range from $110 for full-time training to $80 for three-quarters and $50 for half-time training. This measure will provide educational benefits to more than 150,000 children of soldiers who died in the service of their country.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Another major accomplishment during this Democratic Congress was approval of major innovations in the social-security program which would give

additional benefits to about 1,225,000 workers of this Nation.

The two major changes in the Social Security Act would, first, allow physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; and, second, reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The disability plan will take effect on January 1, 1957, and make about 250,000 persons eligible for benefits.

The lowering of the age limit for women workers will provide benefits for about 325,000 workingwomen and 275,000 wives of workingmen. The bill also will provide benefits to about 175,000 widows at age 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

The broadening and liberalizing of this legislation for the benefit of labor and working men and women of this Nation can be considered another major achievement of the 84th Congress.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

As a member of the Independent Offices and Public Works Subcommittees on Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee, I could not, with a true sense of value, list the accomplishments of this session of the Congress without stating briefly some of the major provisions of the two appropriations bills which I have been most closely associated.

For the fiscal year of 1957, the Congress appropriated $856,727,000 to carry on the public-works projects of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior. This was almost $10 million more than was appropriated for fiscal 1956. These projects are in all areas of our country, the New England Basin, the south Atlantic Basin, the upper and lower Mississippi River Basins, the Ohio River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Basin, the Missouri Basin, the Rio Grande and Southwest area, the Colorado River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley Basin of California—thus this ball can truly be called an all-American measure.

For Tennessee and adjacent areas, the Congress appropriated $2,900,000 to continue construction of the Cheatham lock and dam; $2,250,000 to continue construction of the Old Hickory lock and dam; and $1,100,000 to begin construction of the Barkley Dam, which I have already discussed.

It was through the work of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittees that adequte appropriations and authority were granted to allow TVA to continue to function and to progress as earlier herein indicated.

The appropriations for the independent agencies of our Government is very important and carries great responsibility when it is considered that the appropriations are for some 18 agencies of our Federal Government.

The regulatory agencies in this group, which serve as arms of the Congress, need close attention by the Congress to assure a vigorous and effective prosecution of the law and programs administered in the public interest, health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of this Nation.

The independent agencies include our important regulatory Commissions and others.

These include the Federal Trade Commission which is an agency whose basic objective is the maintenance of free and fair competitive enterprise as the keystone of the American economic system by preventing monopoly or corrupt or unfair business practices; the General Services Administration, the housekeeping agency of our Government, which supervises Federal buildings, post offices and other building and Federal property management; the Federal Communications System which regulates interstate and foreign commerce in communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television; the General Accounting Office which performs an independent audit of Government financial transactions and serves as a watchdog on Federal expenditures, the Security and Exchange Commission which protects the interest of the public and investors against malpractices in the sale of securities in the financial markets and the Veterans' Administration which administers the vast veterans hospital program and extensive veterans benefit programs, among other of our important independent agencies of Government.

So Mr. Speaker the scoreboard of the record of this Congress is indeed a good one, much constructive legislation has been passed in the public interest. The Congress has moved decisively in overcoming obstructions and advancing in the direction of peace, security, and prosperity.

Unfinished Business of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has acquitted itself with distinction in many respects but we must acknowledge that in some important areas we are closing the door on much unfinished business.

While the enlightened program of Dwight D. Eisenhower has been the spark and inspiration for the good legislation enacted by the 84th Congress, we have failed to set as outstanding a record as we might have done if we had followed his direction more completely. Let us take stock of those items left undone in the single field of health, education, and welfare as we prepare to "close up shop."

I refer you first to the President's state of the Union message January 5, 1956. The President said:

To fulfill the individual's aspirations in the American way of life, good education is fundamental. Good education is the outgrowth of good homes, good communities, good churches, and good schools. Today our schools face pressing problems—problems which will not yield to swift and easy solution, or to any single action. They will yield only to a continuing, active, informed effort by the people toward achieving better schools.

The need for additional classrooms was the core of the report that came out of the White House Conference on Education, which made history as the first conference on education ever called by a President of the United States. In 1955 and again this year, the President brought before Congress a sound, long-range program designed to bridge the gap between the present and projected need and the anticipated and reasonable increase of schoolbuilding by the States and local school districts.

This is the plan he offered for meeting one of the most urgent problems facing our people in the effort to achieve better schools:

So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned, I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms. Such a program, which should be limited to a 5-year period, must operate to increase rather than decrease local and State support of schools and to give the greatest help to the States and localities with the least financial resources. Federal aid should in no way jeopardize the freedom of local school systems. There will be presented to the Congress a recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction.

Such a program should be accompanied by action to increase services to the Nation's schools by the Office of Education and by legislation to provide continuation of payments to school districts where Federal activities have impaired the ability of those districts to provide adequate schools.

The essential qualifications set down by the President were contained in S. 2905 which never saw the light of day. In the House these same essentials were embodied in the McConnell amendments which were defeated on the floor of the House. The final defeat of all legislation to relieve the critical shortage of classrooms is one of the tragic blunders for which we will be held accountable.

A vital piece of legislation which passed the Senate but became bottled up in Committee in the House is S. 3620 and its House counterparts H. R. 10620 and H. R. 11253. These bills which are identical in purpose would have authorized grants to institutions of higher learning and State educational agencies to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children.

It is estimated that there are approximately 1.5 million school-age children and youth who are so mentally retarded as to need special help from the Nation's schools. It is known that thousands of such children who could profit by some kind of educational program are not in school; others are not provided with curricula and services suitable to their needs. The major limiting factor in providing for these children is the severe shortage of professional personnel trained in the field of the education of mentally retarded children.

The legislation I refer to would have provided $500,000 for the first year of operation, which would have supported

approximately 200 persons in training to teach or conduct research in fields related to education of mentally retarded children.

In my State of Pennsylvania—and I am sure in many of the States represented by my distinguished colleagues the need for teachers for these children is both critical and distressing. How can we in good conscience go home without having done our utmost to meet this need in the face of the President's earnest request in his state of the Union message for "special attention to the problems of mentally retarded children"?

It is a matter of considerable concern to me and to other Members of the Congress that children generally did not fare very well at the hands of the majority in this session. Of course children do not vote, and particularly those children who are categorized as dependent, neglected or delinquent are sometimes forgotten in the press of the urgent business of some of our more impressive interest groups.

In spite of the Presidents' expressed concern for "increased child welfare services," and an "intensified attack on juvenile delinquency" the legislation that would have furthered both of these programs received little attention from either House.

Identical bills, S. 3297, H. R. 10283, and H. R. 10284, to amend and improve the child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, title V, part 3, were introduced in both the Senate and the House early in 1956.

The child welfare services program was initiated in 1935 to serve predominantly rural areas. By 1956, 21 years later, considerable progress in developing public child welfare activities in rural areas has been made. Today the number of children in the most urban State receiving child welfare services per 1,000 in the population is lower than the number of children in rural areas.

This legislation would have made it possible for States to make their own decisions as to where their need is greatest for child welfare work and allowed the use of the Federal funds in urban as well as rural areas. It also authorized the use of Federal grants to pay for foster care of children. Grants were also made available to encourage demonstration projects in special programs for children of either regional or national significance.

The Children's Bureau request for authorization for grants to the States of $12 million in 1958 and $15 million thereafter was amended to a flat $12 million.

Though hearings were held in the House no other action was taken.

The administration's legislative proposal contained in S. 894 and H. R. 3771 providing for grants to the States for the purpose of strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency suffered a similar fate, in spite of hearings which were held by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of both the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Many witnesses have testified to the urgent need for grants to the States to enable them to improve the work of juvenile courts, probation services, juvenile police, and institutions for delinquent children. The need for funds to increase the opportunities for training professional and nonprofessional workers and to increase research work was repeatedly emphasized.

The most recent reports from the Children's Bureau indicate that the number of delinquent children coming before the juvenile courts in 1955 increased by 9 percent over those so reported in 1954. Since 1948 the total increase is estimated to be 70 percent.

This, unfortunately, like the weather is another problem which everyone talks about but no one does much about.

Another major item of legislation on which no action was taken is H. R. 7770.

Consolidated reporting of wages for income-tax and social security purposes was recommended by the President in his budget message, in which he stated:

> I am recommending legislation to reduce the frequency of information returns made by employers withholding income and social-security taxes and to strengthen enforcement of these taxes. These amendments will not only cut down the reporting burden on private business but will also increase budget receipts, especially in later years.

This administration proposal provides for receiving annual reports from employers of their employees earnings rather than quarterly reports as under the present law. This change would have eliminated some 200 million wage items a year. To further simplify reporting for employers, the employee-filed statements of wages and of taxes withheld would be used for both income tax and old-age and survivors insurance purposes.

Of course I am fully aware that any process that would simplify procedures, cut redtape and save the taxpayers time and money could not expect to win approval from my good friends on the majority side of the House.

In his state of the Union message to Congress President Eisenhower said, in requesting "a well-supported, well-balanced program of research":

> As an integral part of this effort, I shall recommend a new plan to aid construction of non-Federal medical research and teaching facilities and to help provide more adequate support for the training of medical research manpower.

In his budget message the President again called for "legislation to authorize Federal assistance for the construction of medical and dental research and teaching facilities," and he reiterated his request in his health message on January 26 of this year.

The administration's proposals, H. R. 9013, H. R. 9014 and S. 3252 provided for both of these programs by assisting professional schools to achieve a desirable balance between research and teaching programs. As we know, S. 849, which passed, provides for medical research construction, but not for teaching or training facilities. This is buying the cart without the horse to draw it. I ask you, of what benefit will the finest research facilities be if we have no one to teach or train those who would do the research?

The logic of this half a loaf escapes me, when we might so readily have had the whole loaf and thus met the dual need.

In 1955 and again this year President Eisenhower recommended to Congress legislation to provide mortgage insurance for the construction of health facilities. The recommendation was included in the Administration's Omnibus Health bill, S. 886 and H. R. 3458, as title II of that proposal. When the so-called baby omnibus health bill was drafted, containing the bulk of the administration's program, this important provision was omitted.

Obviously this legislation would have facilitated the financing and development of needed health facilities. It would also have stimulated on a self-sustaining basis, a continuing flow of private credit to finance the construction, expansion, modernization and conversion of privately owned and operated health facilities.

Also omitted from the health bill enacted by the 84th Congress was the provision for public health grants as contained in title V of the administration's omnibus health bill.

This title would have authorized grants for support of public health services generally and for extension and improvement of such services, as well as providing grants for special projects.

And that is not the end of our sins of omission.

In spite of the plea of the President in his health message and also in his budget message Congress failed to enact the administration's proposal for provision of sanitation facilities and services on Indian reservations and tribal lands. The administration bills, S. 3112 and H. R. 9150 and H. R. 9209, would have authorized the Public Health Service to conduct surveys as to the need for domestic and community sanitation facilities and to develop and keep current a program of projects for the construction of such facilities.

Sanitation for the Indian population has been neglected for so long that the sanitary conditions under which thousands of Indians live are nothing short of primitive. No other group of persons in the United States lives under comparable conditions. The Indian population is, in fact, about half a century in arrears with respect to the application of sanitary science to disease prevention.

Also there was the failure of this Congress to take legislative action to carry out the President's recommendation in his budget message, which I quote:

> I recommend the transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University, with provision for construction of a new teaching hospital.

The proposals contained in H. R. 11788 and S. 4132 are substantially in agreement with the recommendations made by the members of the Freedmen's Hospital Commission. This was a group of outstanding citizens with specialized experience and knowledge in the fields of hospital administration, nursing, medi-

cine, and professional teaching, who were appointed by the Secretary of Welfare to study the complex problems affecting Freedmen's Hospital, Howard University's medical school, and the Washington community.

To have failed to enact this legislation deprives the historic and outstanding Howard University of an up-to-date and appropriate teaching facility and the citizens of Washington of a critically needed modern community hospital.

No more important nor courageous group of public servants exists in our entire Government structure than the officers and employees of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration. On May 29 a bill was introduced by one of our distinguished colleagues to furnish some protection for these devoted officers and employees. This bill, H. R. 11513, contains provisions for punishment and penalties for killing or assaulting Federal officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on official duty engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States.

I am informed that there have been numerous cases of assault, bodily injury, and threats of harm to such employees in pursuing their course of duty. Can you imagine the reaction these people, who have dedicated themselves to the enforcement of the very laws that protect the health of ourselves and our families, must have for our callous ingratitude as we put on our hats and walk away; without so much as a concern for their safety?

Again may I refer you to the words of the President of the United States in his special health message:

> Since World War II the costs of medical care have been increasingly met through voluntary health insurance. More than 100 million persons are now enrolled in prepayment health-insurance plans of some type. But health-insurance coverage is still not available to many who need it, and the character and amount of insurance protection in important respects remains inadequate.
>
> Health-insurance protection must be made more available to older persons and those living in rural areas, to the self-employed and those working in small organizations who cannot be reached through ordinary group-enrollment methods. There is particular need for much broader coverage against the cost of long term or other especially expensive illness, which can be a financial catastrophe for many families.
>
> The need for more and better health-insurance coverage can best be met by building on what many of our people have already provided for themselves—the voluntary health prepayment plans. Much can be done to encourage more rapid expansion and improvement of such plans.

In line with this recommendation the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare presented for the consideration of Congress the provisions contained in S. 4172, H. R. 12140, and H. R. 12153. These bills provide for the pooling of health-insurance plans in order to extend their coverage and protection.

Although this legislation was introduced late in this session, we have had ample time to act on such a vital measure. It could now be law if our friends in the controlling majority had had as passionate a concern for the ill, the aged and the people of rural areas, who would most benefit from this legislation, as they will loudly proclaim throughout the coming campaign.

If they mean what they say they should recess this Congress until September and come back and complete much of this unfinished business of the 84th Congress before the November election.

The Democrat Party has a choice of going to the people with a horrid record of things not done, or of following the advice of our great leader Dwight D. Eisenhower whose inspired program for the health, education, and welfare of our fellow human beings should be promptly enacted. For the responsible Democrat Party to adjourn this Congress now is proof that they no longer deserve the confidence of the people.

How the Encyclopaedia Britannica Was Gobbled Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the present study of the Ford Foundation-sponsored Fund for the Republic again points to the existence in the field of tax-exempt foundations of a number of serious problems.

The example of this fund under the management of Mr. Paul Hoffman and Mr. Robert M. Hutchins demonstrates the existence of a network of power and patronage of greatest concern to our Republic. Economic power and the power to mold public opinion rests in the hands of tax-privileged foundation managers. This power is not subject to any checks and balances.

In the American tradition of opposing concentration of power the TNEC, and before and after it, many congenial investigations and subsequent legislation have attempted to protect the public against the abuse of private control of our public life.

There has not been a comparable awareness of the dangers for our welfare that come from the concentration and the possible abuse of power in our multi-billion-dollar tax-exempt organizations. Because of the complete absence of public controls these privileged organizations can be used and have been used for political ends and as tools for the promotion of the private interests of some of their managers and their cohorts.

The purpose of a study of tax-exempt foundations is not to conduct a court trial by congressional investigation. Its objective is to explore free from any preconceived bias an existing social and economic condition. It should attempt to examine data that will give us a better understanding of the history and of the effect of tax exemption and of possible improvements of our law in the public interest. The hearings of such a congressional investigation serve the purpose of giving the parties an opportunity to present their facts, figures, and ideas. They are not meant to degenerate into a free-for-all of incriminations and offensive behavior. I had the intention of conducting the hearings of the House committee of which I was the chairman in such an impartial manner. Unfortunately, the sabotage of the committee hearings by a member of the committee minority prevented a collective and conclusive study of the subject in view of the time and available funds.

The reactions of the committee minority and of parts of a partisan effort were in themselves indications of the power of some of the tax-exempt foundations that we intended to study. If any confirmation of this power had been needed, its manifestations in connection with the history of this House committee have certainly convinced every fair-minded person.

An objective and continued study of tax-exempt organizations, of their fiscal and social, their legal and economic, as well as their subversive aspects, is as necessary today—even more so—as it was 2 years ago. We never did get around to study and to present to Congress a complete report on the concentration of economic, ideological, and political power in the hands of foundation managers.

Foundation spokesmen themselves have reportedly pointed to weakening in current foundation practices. They have criticized the practice of many foundations not to inform the public in understandable published reports about the practice of disguising business operations and fraudulent fund-raising schemes as tax-exempt institutions. Their complaints alone justify a further investigation of tax-exempt activities by Congress.

No doubt, the foundations recommending, and the ones adopting the policy of publishing detailed activity and financial reports, agree with me that tax exemption entitles the public to know what tax-exempt organizations do. All are aware of the fact that publicity of foundation tax reports is still very much a theory and that the practice of the United States Treasury does not facilitate the examination of allegedly public foundation tax returns. Even congressional committees find it most difficult to gather such data from Treasury offices.

An examination of these data is essential if we want an objective appraisal of promise or menace of tax exemption for America's future. All through history governments have fought the growing power and wealth of tax-exempt organizations in the interest of the public. Growth of tax-exempt institutions always went hand in hand with a growing burden on the remaining taxable pursuits. The dissolution of the Order of the Templars, the secularization of church property in many countries, the Reformation itself were due mainly to the withdrawal of so much taxable property from taxation that the economy could no more support the burden of reasonable public spending.

The return from tax-exempt funds quite obviously multiplies foundation capital much faster than corporate or other taxed funds will grow. The temptation to use these ever-growing funds for the political ends favored by foundation managers is ever present. Essentially under our system, they may use these funds for all, except political and nonpolitical educational activities is very difficult to define.

The Fund for the Republic is a good example of the tendency to take an active part in political propaganda and in partisan pursuits. Another well-known example is the involvement of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace in a most active and successful promotion of its peculiar type of foreign policy. The operation of the Ford Foundation in Indonesia at the present time may also constitute another example.

These are all indications of the existence of a patronage network operated by foundation managers. This network influences and sometimes controls our media of information, our schools and powerful cliques in both political parties. By strategically locating its men and by wisely using tax-exempt funds for favoring its friends it has gained a hold on many important positions, that deserves to be studied. The current concern with the Fund for the Republic and its president, Mr. Hutchins, suggests that we may look into Mr. Hutchins' activities as an example of the power structure that grows out of the control of tax-exempt organizations and results from their consistent political use.

The picture that presents itself from bits and pieces of available information is far from complete. It poses more questions than it answers. And it makes quite obvious that control of tax-exempt operations in the hands of skilled manipulators becomes control of our political and intellectual life.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica lists Robert Maynard Hutchins as chairman of its board of editors. In the Britannica Yearbook for 1955 it says that in 1950 he resigned from the presidency of the University of Chicago but continued as chairman of the editorial board after joining the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Hutchins then holds in addition to his job in the Fund for the Republic a second job equally important and spectacular, a second job that gives him a control position in American public life and public opinion. He certainly has succeeded in turning his university presidency into a steppingstone to prestige, to power, and to economic advantage.

As president of the University of Chicago, he had many opportunities for self-aggrandizement. Such is the power given to the presidency in such a major tax-exempt institution that under the guise of promoting the institution a shrewd operator can promote himself into commanding positions far beyond the objectives of the university.

Dr. Hutchins promoted himself into the control of the policies of the billion-dollar Ford Foundation. He selected many of its early personnel and beneficiaries and now, after having exhausted even the seemingly endless patience of its trustees, holds a sinecure paying an astonishingly big salary from the Fund for the Republic.

From his office as a university president, using funds of the Britannica, he launched an investigation of the American press. The Hutchins-Luce Commission on Freedom of the Press held American newspaper editors accountable—probably to the liberal friends of Mr. Hutchins—and it was therefore aptly called the Commission Against Freedom of the Press.

Mr. Hutchins, probably seeing himself a Thomas Jefferson of a future world state, launched the Committee To Frame a World Constitution. Under his direction, a preliminary draft for a world constitution was drafted. He signed that constitution. Did the trustees of the Ford Foundation and of the Fund for the Republic know that? Is it not a mockery of America if a man can become president of a fund for our Republic who, previously in a world constitution proposed by him, has ventured to abandon the Constitution of our Republic?

In a recent book on the Ford Foundation, the author, Dwight MacDonald, a man not unfriendly to the Ford Foundation, respects the well-known refusal of Hutchins to take the Communist Party as a serious menace. In earlier investigations Hutchins was asked to declare himself on communism. His answer, "I am not instructed on this subject," is characteristic of his shrewdness. The above-mentioned book attributes to Hutchins "a combination, not unusual with him, of logic and ignorance." It has been said that if Hutchins had ever studied a subject thoroughly instead of devoting his energy to the manipulation of men and of funds, he may have become a scholar; but then he would never have reached the positions of power, first in the tax-exempt university, then in the tax-exempt Ford Foundation and finally in the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

As a manipulator of men and organizations, Hutchins has refused the Machiavellian technique of using others as fronts to reach his goals.

The history of the Encyclopaedia Britannica is an excellent example of this technique of using power to get more power. The importance of the job of a chairman of the editorial board of the encyclopedia is illustrated by the policy of constant revision established in 1932. Since 1938, there have been more than 15 revised printings. In each of these more than 2 million words were changed. What an opportunity to indoctrinate the American people with one's idea on world government, freedom, the United Nations, foreign policy concepts, socialism, and so forth.

The place of the dictionary and of the encyclopedia in America is a unique one. In no other culture do dictionaries and similar reference books have such an importance in the life and learning of the people. The prestige of encyclopedias and dictionaries makes them unquestioned sources of authoritative information. The passion of the American for facts as documented by popular games and quiz programs is indicative of the nationwide occupation with the type of information offered by encyclopedic publications. The average American believes to have in his encyclopedia an arsenal for the searching mind, an objective source of reliable information, and a tool for intelligent participation in public affairs.

Because of their prestige and their impact on public opinion, encyclopedic books are a favorite target of the propagandist. Any distorted presentation of ideas and facts carried in a reference book promises to influence readers for a long time to come. Unlike the ephemeral impact of periodical and pamphlet literature, an article in an encylopedia will mold the minds of generations of students, of teachers, and of opinion leaders, the type of literate citizens who consult a reference book before making up their minds.

The propaganda experts of the Soviet Union have long ago recognized this for a fact. They have written and are rewriting history to suit their politics. At times their encyclopedia editors may find it hard to keep up with the fast changes of their official versions and interpretations of events. Similarly, when Hitler came into power, many of the German lexicons were edited, cut, rewritten to suit the new propaganda line.

The editor of an encyclopedia very often reflects the fashionable thought of its time. Sometimes, as in the often investigated case of the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences—financed by foundation funds—he becomes an instrument of factional pressure groups who exploit the grand opportunity for long-lasting propaganda, to impose their philosophies and social and political theories on the learning American public. In doing so they follow more the traditions of the French encyclopedists who were in business for propaganda, than that of the Royal Society that aimed for classification of factual controversy.

There has yet to be published a reference book that will point out to its readers the controversy in all the issues and facts presented. Such an ideal reference book will present the two or several opinions on the subjects covered. It will warn its readers of ideological traps and give them encouragement and opportunity to make up their minds for themselves. As it stands today, however, the very magnitude of the editorial job makes it possible for men with axes to grind to infiltrate the encyclopedia writing staff and to supplement the miserable word rates of 1 or 2 cents per word that they receive for their research and writing with the substantial satisfaction of imposing their partisan thought on millions and generations of more or less intelligent readers.

The importance of authorship by men with an ax to grind is not alone the impact of partisan subject matter on the reader. Because many of these articles carry the author's signature in a respected encyclopedia, the author gains added prestige and he becomes under sponsorship of his publisher an authority.

Consequently, control of a respected encyclopedia means power in the world of ideas and of the intellect. It means power over the readers and the teachers and students who turn to it for the truth. It means power over the minds of the writers who in their livelihood or in

their professional prestige depend on the appearance of their contributions. It means, beyond this, power over the minds of those who prepare themselves to contribute and who will act and write so that they may remain acceptable to the mighty publisher and his editorial organs.

Unfortunately, for at least one writing generation now, this magic prestige giving effect of encyclopedia writing has been exploited nearly exclusively for the benefit of the Socialists of all hues. Consequently, the taint of interventionism and reformism in all shades and forms is prevalent in these books. The infiltration of the American mind with intellectual and political concepts of such bias is nearly complete. A whole generation of teachers, textbook authors, ministers, journalists, labor leaders, and other opinion operators has never had a chance to become acquainted with ideas and arguments other than materialistic, anticonservative, and utopian. For more than three decades now our legislation and our foreign policy and the public opinion behind them have reflected this distorted and one-sided presentation of public problems.

The great expense connected with the creation of an encyclopedia accounts for a similarity between most reference books. Ideas and factual data in one such work are often lifted from another. For instance, the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, published in the thirties, was freely used by later reference books. In this manner ideas of Alvin Johnson, Harold Laski, Max Lerner, Bernard J. Stearn, Oskar Jaszi, Lewis Lorwin, and similar authors are reflected in other encyclopedic books. The resulting prestige produced, in addition to profitable lecture invitations, teaching and Government jobs, book articles, and textbook assignments, broadcasting programs, and so forth. The core group of editors and contributors became a powerful faction by mutual endorsement. It found easy acceptance by learned journals, professional organizations, book review sections and in the resulting mushroom growth of influence gained decisive influence on public thought.

If this can happen in a surreptitious way by mutual support of the professional writers employed to produce the text—how much more influence can result from a well-conceived strategy of a publisher using his encyclopedic publication consciously to influence public opinion?

This brings us to the main problem of the Encyclopaedia Britannica and its influence on American thought. Today, the Encyclopaedia Britannica and its affiliated and associated activities have become such a major factor in our public and intellectual life that it overshadows in importance and impact all other book publishing ventures.

In May 1942, William Lygate in the Saturday Review of Literature surveyed the history of the Encyclopaedia Britannica from its beginning in 1768 to its ownership by the house of Sears, Roebuck and Co. By 1942, this classic reference book had developed into a 32-million-word giant. Its 14th edition had cost $2 million to prepare and appeared 6 weeks before the stock market crash of 1929. In spite of losses in the publishing of the encyclopedia during the depression, Sears, Roebuck and Co. kept the famous old publication alive and in 1932 so reorganized its operations that revisions became a continuous activity. The resulting economies eliminated losses within 2 years. Three years after the editorial reorganization the publication began to make money again. The addition of the Britannica yearbooks and the establishment of a service offering answers to 50 questions free of charge to subscribers added to the popularity of the book. In 1939 as a result of radio promotion, sales and popularity of the encyclopedia continued to grow. In 1942 domestic sales alone reached $4 million. Considering this the encyclopedia was certainly one of the most important if not the most valuable reference-book publishers' property in the United States. It appeared somewhat misplaced under an ownership best known at that time for a successful operation of mail order merchandising and a growing chain of department stores, but not identified as a purveyor of scholarly publications.

The further fate of the encyclopedia may be best described by its reflections in the press. Thanks to the activities of several press agents, we have a play-by-play description of what the parties involved wanted the public to know. On January 30, 1943, Publishers Weekly blandly reported: "By outright gift from Sears, Roebuck and Co. the University of Chicago has acquired full property rights in the Encyclopaedia Britannica." The president of Sears, Roebuck in making the gift had declared: "As one of the great universities of the world, the University of Chicago is best equipped to conduct an enterprise of such educational importance as the Britannica." After acquisition of the enterprise Sears had successfully operated the publication for over 20 years. It was carried in its book at $1. The gift was in the traditions of the philanthropic Rosenwald family, a benefactor of Chicago University for many years.

As Publishers Weekly reports at the time of the donation, sales were good for the 24-volume sets and the annual supplements. At the same time Newsweek reported the gift and explained that Sears had decided that publication of the encyclopedia was scarcely a proper part of its retail business. "Had it not been for the generosity of Sears," the Britannica would have gone out of existence during the depression. It had been saved by the philanthropic efforts of Sears, Roebuck and was given to the university, a result of old cordial relationships between Sears and the institution of learning. The gift included the Junior Britannica and other connected minor publications.

The University of Chicago magazine about the same time published a version of the story accompanied with a photograph of smiling William B. Benton, then the university's part-time vice chancellor, and reported:

> There were 35 million words in the mouth of the gift horse which came to Chicago last month from Sears, Roebuck and Co.

Sears had long felt that the encyclopedia, a corporate entity, was an anomalous item on its books, and arrangements by which it was given to the university were completed in January. Gen. Robert E. Wood, the chairman of Sears, was instrumental in deciding on this donation. Vice Chancellor William Benton, instrumental in the arrangements, took over the chairmanship of the board of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., and President Hutchins also became a member of the still not completed organization. The university magazine explained:

> The encyclopedia is also anomalous as a university possession, although to a smaller extent than as the possession of a mail-order house. Only rarely have universities owned going businesses, their managements usually preferring the smaller but surer income from security holdings. The Britannica setup, however, is so arranged that the university will profit as the corporation profits but will not lose if the corporation loses.

The value of this gift was emphasized in this university publication by referring to the encyclopedia as the "oldest and most famous continuing publication in the world." However, in the university magazine, at this occasion no specific information about the legal provisions of the gift and of the succeeding arrangements between the university and any third parties was offered.

Time magazine, on February 1, 1943, apparently after interviewing officials of Chicago University, shed some light on the further development after the donation had been made by Sears. It reported:

> Sears' gift to the university was engineered by University of Chicago's kinetic vice president, William Benton. * * * He sees the Britannica as a logical adjunct to University of Chicago, which has always had a flair for combining scholarship with good publicity.

The story carries a picture of Benton captioned "He Took Stock in a Name," and explains that since the gift did not include the Britannica's—that is, Sears'—working capital and the university trustees did not want to risk endowment capital—why?—what were they told?—

> Result: Bill Benton himself agreed to put up whatever might be needed to keep it going, took an unnamed percentage of the stock from University of Chicago to back his investment. The university has an option to buy his stock (for the sum he put into it plus no interest) if the going is good, a further option on the whole works at 42-year-old Bill Benton's death. Meanwhile, Benton will devote at least part of his ample talents to making the university's gift pay.

Whatsoever the motives of the university trustees may have been, Sears, Roebuck and Co. knew nothing about this arrangement before its generous gift of an asset worth many million dollars was made. After the gift was made, Sears had no more right to interfere with university arrangements. Presumably they had meant to donate the publication to the educational nonprofit tax-exempt institution in the intention to have all its benefits accrue to the university.

In October 1955 Gen. Robert E. Wood was asked the following questions:

> 1. Did Mr. Benton who, according to Hutchins, conducted the negotiations with

you, indicate that he was to become personally the owner of two-thirds of the common stock of the enterprise donated to Chicago University?

2. Did you intend to donate this asset to the university as a charitable gift?

3. Mr. Hutchins in his report on the state of the university implied that Sears approved of the arrangement with Benton personally (not in his capacity of vice president of the university). Is he correct?

General Wood answered on November 9, 1955:

1. I was not advised that Mr. Benton was to become the owner of some of their common stock prior to the gift to the university. After the gift was made I was advised of this.

2. The intention was to donate this asset to the university as a charitable gift.

3. I am not familiar with Mr. Hutchins' report. However, as the arrangement with Mr. Benton was made after Sears made the contribution to the university, Sears had no authority to either approve or disapprove the arrangement with Mr. Benton.

Chicago University under Hutchins adopted a code of educational ethics that would exclude its staff from benefits in excess of their salaries resulting from their academic office. Robert M. Hutchins himself had repeatedly made the statement "education asks no profit." In an article in the Chicago Daily News, as president of Chicago University—February 17, 1944—he announced the formal adoption in 1943 of the principle previously advocated by him that neither the university nor faculty should profit financially from research conducted at the university. All earnings of faculty members from work done outside the university, including royalties on books, lecture and consultants' fees, and similar activities should be turned back to the university. The articles of the encyclopedia at least partly written by university staff members must have been subject to this strict rule and one can only wonder how the acquisition of substantial rights in the encyclopedia property by university officials, if not in conflict with the purpose of the donation, can be reconciled with Mr. Hutchins' article, "Education Asks No Profit." He says about books of professors:

The board of trustees agrees that the only practical way in which you can make sure that professors are doing the work, making the speech, or writing the book, solely for the usefulness of the outside activity and not for the money that is in it, is to take the money away and use it for the university.

The terms of investment most likely but certainly in terms of power, William B. Benton has done well by his transaction with Chicago University. Some light on the further development of his strange partnership with this institution of learning is shed by successive presidents' reports on the state of the university.

In his annual report after acquisition of the encyclopedia, Mr. Hutchins gave only a very hazy picture of the deal with Benton. The generosity of Gen. Robert E. Wood, of the board of Sears, Roebuck and Co., was praised and correctly stated that General Wood had decided that the encyclopedia should be owned by some university and that he had finally after previous negotiations for a sale of the assets of the encyclopedia, made a still more generous offer to give it to the University of Chicago. The report goes on to say:

Mr. Benton, vice president of the university, was very active in the negotiations with Sears and in seeking for sources of working capital, and finally became so much interested that to make it possible for the university to accept the gift he offered to provide the working capital himself. The university thereupon accepted General Wood's proposal. Mr. Benton was given two-thirds of the common stock of the corporation, the university retaining the preferred stock. Mr. Benton gave the university an option to buy half his stock at cost after 18 months and a further option on the balance of his stock at his death.

Mr. Hutchins in his report claims that "that arrangement was accepted by the board of trustees and by General Wood." In no place could there be found a published record on the following obvious questions. Who owns or did own the last third of the corporate stock? What, if any, compensation did R. M. Hutchins and other university officials including Benton receive from the encyclopedia since the year 1943? Why does Chicago University not exercise the option mentioned in Time magazine of February 1, 1943?

The encyclopedia was at the time of the donation not a broken-down corporation. Hutchins expected for the first year, $150,000; royalties to be paid to the university and $45,000 in the form of fellowships, and support of the university radio program Human Action. Mr. Hutchins expressed his thanks for the donation in the following words:

The university records its gratitude to General Wood and the board of directors of Sears, Roebuck and Co. for their contribution to the university's welfare and to the cause of scholarship and popular education.

In 1944 Mr. Hutchins reported that the university had received $159,141 for the editorial advice of the faculty for the year ending January 31, 1944, and $25,780 for the support of the radio program Human Events. In addition, the Britannica supported 18 fellows with an average annual stipend of $1,500 each, a total of $27,000.

In November 1943 the Encyclopaedia Britannica Corp. acquired from Western Electric Corp. the ERPI classroom films and changed their name to Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc. This placed the university, through its affiliate corporation, the Britannica, in leading position for the distribution and production of sound films. Thus, the Encyclopaedia Britannica Corp. became the preeminent producer and distributor of educational films in the United States. Shortly thereafter, the university received from Eastman Kodak the donation of its huge library of educational silent films. The Eastman Kodak Co. was led in this donation by the same philanthropic considerations as the Sears, Roebuck Co. in its gift to the university. Mr. Hutchins was already chairman of the board of the Britannica committee and also chairman of the executive committee of the film corporation. The films donated by Eastman Kodak became part of the Britannica program.

Mr. Hutchins in 1947 reported that though the university then still owned only the preferred stock of this corporation it had received in the years 1946-47 royalties of $400,000. Britannica, Inc., has rapidly expanded since its affiliation with the university. One of the projects which it undertook was the publication of a set of Great Books of the Western World which appeared in June 1948. The university had spent $10,000 for furthering the Great Book program. Then the Britannica began its publishing project and Mr. Hutchins became editor in chief of this series. For this purpose Hutchins took leave of absence from the university for 9 months from October 1, 1946.

In 1949, Hutchins reported that the university had received in cash $1,774,343 from Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. Britannica's sales had increased approximately fivefold from the acquisition of the property by the university. This increase created a shortage of working capital that caused the university to accept a million dollars in notes of the company in lieu of current royalties. These notes were in addition to the cash payments of $1,774,343.

In January 1951 Time magazine called the Encyclopaedia Britannica one of the most prosperous properties of the University of Chicago. William Benton had then already become Senator of Connecticut but still headed the Encyclopaedia Britannica's board of directors. Robert Hutchins, after his retirement as chancellor of the university, still presided over the encyclopedia's board of editors.

The boom in the sales of the encyclopedia succeeding the gift to Chicago University has never stopped. In 1944, Business Week pointed to the fact that wartime sales were limited only by reduced paper quotas and printing facilities. The Britannica claimed that since 1939 it had experienced an annual sales increase of nearly 35 percent.

In November 1944, William Benton reported that he really considered himself a fiduciary for the university and that the protective restrictions contained in his agreement with the university had given him full management responsibility without hope of dividends. But the fact remains that Benton and Hutchins—both now separated from Chicago University—continue to control an instrument of power by reason of their previous functions as officers of a nonprofit tax-exempt organization.

Future investigations may disclose the answers to the following questions:

What, if any, are the financial rewards collected by Hutchins, Benton, and their clique from the encyclopedia?

Who owns the one-third common stock not given to Benton originally?

Why does Chicago University leave control of this enterprise to Hutchins and Benton instead of making use of its option to repurchase the common stock held by Benton?

This example of the mixing of power politics and of private gains with the management of a tax-exempt university operation would be incompletely presented if I did not offer you additional bits and pieces of illustrative information. Though only incidental and incomplete fragments of a larger picture, they demonstrate the degree of interrelationship of business and charity in the Hutchins network of economic and intellectual patronage.

Here are some of the highlights:

Hutchins promoted the Great Book program of adult education. The encyclopedia published a high-priced edition of the Great Books under Hutchins as editor. Hutchins took 9 months' leave of absence from the university to edit the Great Books for the Encyclopaedia Britannica Corp.

There exists for the promotion of these Great Books a nonprofit, tax-exempt Great Book Foundation created by the university and the Britannica in 1943. Will you be surprised if I tell you that this Great Book Foundation received many hundred thousand dollars from one of the Ford funds? The Great Book Foundation in 1955 operated on a two million annual budget. Contributions came in 1955 from the University of Chicago, $131,000; from the Ford Fund for Adult Education, $775,000; from the Old Dominion Fund, $50,000; from Paul Hoffman—royalty of his book, Peace Can Be Won—$23,000; from the Encyclopaedia Britannica, $81,000; and from six other tax-exempt foundations, $63,000.

These funds undoubtedly helped promote the publication sales of the Great Books of the Western World and the Great Ideas—of a business venture under the editorial direction of Hutchins and under the management of Benton, a venture in which the Britannica Corp. had invested $1 million.

Another Ford fund donation of $220,000 was given to the Film Council of America. We have seen how the Encyclopaedia Britannica, a profit-making corporation, became the dominating distributor of classroom films. It gained its leading position in this field by benefiting from donations of films to the tax-free university by the Eastman Kodak Co., in 1943.

Will it surprise you that Hutchins made the head of the Britannica Films, Inc., Mr. Scott Fletcher, in 1951, head of the same Ford Fund for Adult Education that in 1955 so generously donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Film Council of America?

Among the directors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica listed in Poor's Register for 1956, we find the following names in addition to Hutchins and Benton.

Beardsley Ruml, another former officer of the University of Chicago, a former executive of the tax-exempt Laura Stillman-Rockefeller Foundation—a professional executive of nonprofit tax-exempt operations and now also a director of the Ford Fund Resources for the Future, Inc., thanks to Hutchins.

Walter Paepcke of the Container Corporation of America is also, due to Hutchins, a director of the Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Paul Hoffman of the Studebaker Co., of the Committee for Economic Development of the Economic Cooperation Administration, etc., became with Hutchins' help first president of the Ford Foundation and is now chairman of the board of the Fund for the Republic.

Among the other directors:

Curtis H. Gager of General Foods and of the Committee for Economic Development and Robert C. Praeble with a background in Marshall Fields' empire of publishing encyclopedia books competing with Britannica.

Of the directors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, Inc.:

George M. Shuster of Hunter College, New York City, made the grade as a director of the Fund for the Republic. Another director is Adlai Stevenson. The circle of influential members of the Hutchins-Benton-Hoffman network of patronage is great; it reaches into politics, into business, into foundations.

In view of the power of this network around the Encyclopaedia Britannica you can well understand the pressure in defense of R. M. Hutchins. You may have heard of a Treasury investigation of the tax-exempt status of the Fund for the Republic. The obvious political bias of the management of this fund marks it clearly as a political pressure institution for which tax exemption may not be granted. Yet it looks as if the powers supporting Hutchins and benefiting from his past and present power positions may be stronger than the law. Quite recently Victor Riesel, the labor columnist who has lost his eyesight as a result of his attacks on labor racketeers, has asked: "Why does the Fund for the Republic not study the injustices and the restraints of freedom in our labor unions?" I presume this and many other questions will have to wait for a new study of tax-exempt activities. In the meantime, all we can do is point to the existing and unexplored dangers for our Republic that rest in an unchecked and uncontrolled—if not uncontrollable—power of foundation and tax-free institutions, managements. If we have found a need for protecting the public through SEC legislation against business management conflicting with the public interest, should we not find ways to protect the public against the unbridled growth of power in the hands of the managers of tax-free funds who seek to subvert the public welfare?

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1956

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Campion Clifford, C. P., professor of history and political science, Passionist Seminary, Normandy, Mo., offered the following prayer:

O God come to our aid. O Lord make haste to help us.

Let us pray: O incomprehensible Creator, true fountain of life, and only author of all knowledge, vouchsafe we beseech Thee to enlighten our understandings and to remove from us all darkness of sin and ignorance. Thou who makest eloquent the tongues of those who want utterance, direct our tongues and pour on our lips the grace of Thy blessing. Give us a diligent and obedient spirit, quickness of apprehension, and the powerful assistance of Thy holy grace that what we do here may be to Thy honor and glory, the good of our own souls, and the best interest and welfare of our fellow countrymen and our great Nation.

O Holy Spirit of God, grant us the grace to be humbly grateful for all the blessings You bestow upon our land, and make us realize that the continuation of these blessings depends upon our fidelity in seeking Your guidance in all our endeavors and in all our ways.

O Seat of Wisdom, pray for us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 26, 1956, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, July 27, 1956, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchised automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises; or in terminating or not renewing franchises with the dealer;

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On July 20, 1956:

S. 976. An act to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract or parcel of land conditionally granted by it to the city of Montgomery, W. Va.;

S. 1895. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3163. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating in Hawaii and Alaska; and

S. 3412. An act to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war-risk insurance for an additional 5 years.

On July 24, 1956:

S. 1358. An act to authorize modification of the flood-control project for Missouri River Agricultural Levee Unit 513–512–R, Richardson County, Nebr.;

S. 2305. An act to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to authorize their disposal as surplus Federal property;

S. 2517. An act to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska;

S. 2711. An act to authorize medals and decorations for outstanding and meritorious conduct and service in the United States merchant marine, and for other purposes;

S. 2846. An act for the relief of Don-chean Chu;

S. 3073. An act to grant a franchise to D. C. Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes;

S. 3120. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended;

S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman;

S. 3388. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the port of Port Townsend, Wash.;

S. 3482. An act to provide for transfer of title of certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, New Mexico; and

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure.

On July 25, 1956:

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov;

S. 2092. An act transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth military reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal;

S. 2424. An act to provide that lock and dam numbered 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam;

S. 2895. An act to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia;

S. 3032. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact;

S. 3180. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park;

S. 3344. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Territory of Alaska certain lands in the city of Sitka, known as Baranof Castle site;

S. 3397. An act to amend section 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 3498. An act to extend authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

On July 26, 1956

S. 1708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersh;

S. 2280. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes;

S. 2572. An act to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes;

S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro;

S. 3705. An act to require periodic survey by the Secretary of Commerce on national shipbuilding capability; and

S. 3832. An act to provide for the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber research laboratories at Akron, Ohio.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission for the period ending June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 27, 1956.*

WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nomination of Samuel P. Zangari, to be postmaster at Wrightsville, Pa.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations on the executive calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of G. Lewis Jones to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Tunisia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., to be Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remaining Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Chester C. Ward, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of Roland S. Aronson and 146 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were received by the Senate on July 20, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of William A. Simunich and 217 other officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law, which were received by the Senate on July 18, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

Without objection, the Senate will resume consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Accordingly, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into and under the rule, there will be a regular morning

hour for the introduction of bills and presentation of petitions and memorials, and the transaction of other routine business, with statements limited to 2 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Educational Exchange Program, for the period July 1–December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVENTION WITH NORWAY, RELATING TO DISPOSITION OF A CERTAIN CLAIM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Chih-Jen Tu aka Arthur Tu from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the San Fernando Valley chapter of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, Van Nuys, Calif., relating to nuclear explosions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Donald A. Rothrock, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth L. Thomas, of Pomona, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Refugee Act of 1953; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Harold P. and Audrey R. Jacobsen, of Sisters, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Refugee Act of 1953; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Wagner, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the Refugee Act of 1953; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. R. 9424. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers (Rept. No. 2817).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 800. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure (Rept. No. 2820);

H. R. 6283. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney (Rept. No. 2823); and

H. R. 10006. A bill for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis (Rept. No. 2822).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas (Rept. No. 2821).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget (Rept. No. 2824).

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. CHAVEZ), from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H. R. 12006. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use (Rept. No. 2825).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Harry L. Bolen, of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Egbert Alfred Smith, deceased.

REPORT ENTITLED "FAIR TRADE" (S. REPT. NO. 2819)

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report entitled "Fair Trade," relating to a study on fair trade, based on a survey of manufacturers and retailers, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "MOTION PICTURE DISTRIBUTION TRADE PRACTICES—1956" (S. REPT. NO. 2818)

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report entitled "Motion-Picture Distribution Trade Practices—1956," relating to problems of independent motion picture exhibitors, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF DISTRIBUTION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of June 1956. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH JUNE 1956 AND MAY 1956, AND PAY, MAY 1956 AND APRIL 1956

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for June 1956 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In June numbered	In May numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In May was	In April was	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,382,276	2,367,409	+14,867	$925,984	$846,847	+$79,137
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,202,693	1,196,363	+6,330	466,038	425,075	+40,963
Department of Defense	1,179,583	1,171,046	+8,537	459,946	421,772	+38,174
Inside continental United States	2,178,330	2,162,327	+16,003			
Outside continental United States	203,946	205,082	−1,136			
Industrial employment	695,324	692,490	+2,834			
Foreign nationals	291,294	293,687	−2,393	28,071	29,444	−1,373

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the preceding figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the preceding employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the preceding employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the preceding employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1956, and comparison with May 1956, and pay for May 1956, and comparison with April 1956*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	June	May	Increase	Decrease	May	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	89,419	82,598	6,821		$29,906	$26,494	$3,412	
Commerce [1]	47,197	45,325	1,872		20,457	18,558	1,899	
Health, Education, and Welfare	46,124	45,483	641		18,551	17,052	1,499	
Interior	54,171	50,691	3,480		21,360	19,271	2,089	
Justice	30,876	30,380	496		15,437	14,078	1,359	
Labor	5,797	5,787	10		2,720	2,464	256	
Post Office	[2] 508,340	512,428		4,088	188,183	173,505	14,678	
State [3]	30,879	30,682	197		12,059	11,179	880	
Treasury	77,782	80,991		3,209	36,638	33,554	3,084	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	378	373	5		220	201	19	
Bureau of the Budget	430	422	8		289	261	28	
Council of Economic Advisers	31	28	3		22	22		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70			26	23	3	
National Security Council [4]	27	27			19	17	2	
Office of Defense Mobilization	267	273		6	172	161	11	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1	4	4		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions					14	17		$3
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	17	15	2		9	6	3	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	10	11		1	6	6		
American Battle Monuments Commission	718	763		45	106	98	8	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,637	6,447	190		3,560	3,215	345	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	575	565	10		294	267	27	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2			1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	600	592	8		345	315	30	
Civil Service Commission	4,255	4,167	88		2,110	1,862	248	
Commission of Fine Arts	9	9			1	1		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	172	173		1	108	99	9	
Farm Credit Administration	1,038	1,037	1		541	496	45	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,085	1,057	28		604	541	63	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,116	1,121		5	626	571	55	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,127	1,124	3		601	528	73	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	689	682	7		337	308	29	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	343	350		7	251	228	23	
Federal Power Commission	720	683	37		395	350	45	
Federal Trade Commission	641	625	16		383	347	36	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	128	124	4		61	63		2
General Accounting Office	5,542	5,514	28		2,663	2,441	222	
General Services Administration	26,429	26,382	47		10,058	8,966	1,092	
Government Contract Committee	23	24		1	9	7	2	
Government Printing Office	6,579	6,639		60	3,221	2,841	380	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,162	10,058	104		5,062	4,588	474	
Indian Claims Commission	13	13			10	9	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,907	1,912		5	1,022	947	75	
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3			2	2		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,861	7,653	208		3,821	3,143	678	
National Capital Housing Authority	258	256	2		100	93	7	
National Capital Planning Commission	34	32	2		17	17		
National Gallery of Art	330	328	2		113	105	8	
National Labor Relations Board	1,128	1,106	22		656	595	61	
National Mediation Board	107	109		2	76	63	13	
National Science Foundation	251	267		16	130	113	17	
National Security Training Commission	3	4		1	3	3		
Panama Canal	14,864	14,994		130	3,460	3,569		
Railroad Retirement Board	2,222	2,179	43		952	844	108	
Renegotiation Board	469	468	1		300	281	19	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	7	7			4	3	1	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	34	32	2		21	19	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	734	726	8		428	388	40	
Selective Service System	6,860	6,869		9	1,788	1,629	159	
Small Business Administration	821	801	20		472	436	36	
Smithsonian Institution	768	716	52		281	254	27	
Soldiers' Home	1,016	1,015	1		248	223	25	
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	32	1		22	21	1	
Tariff Commission	208	204	4		124	114	10	
Tax Court of the United States	146	147		1	95	92	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,708	14,321	387		6,757	6,107	650	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	3	3				1		1
United States Information Agency	10,831	10,797	34		3,086	2,832	254	
Veterans' Administration	176,653	177,631		978	64,616	58,161	6,455	
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	3	2	1		1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,202,693	1,196,363	14,896	8,566	466,038	425,075	41,078	115
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,330				40,963	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,940	1,913	27		1,183	1,052	131	
Department of the Army	434,716	431,415	3,301		164,081	151,879	12,202	
Department of the Navy	394,675	394,682		7	162,591	150,773	11,818	
Department of the Air Force	348,252	343,036	5,216		132,091	118,068	14,023	
Total, Department of Defense	1,179,583	1,171,046	8,544	7	459,946	421,772	38,174	
Net increase, Department of Defense			8,537				38,174	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,382,276	2,367,409	23,440	8,573	925,984	846,847	79,252	115
Net increase, including Department of Defense			14,867				79,137	

[1] June figure includes 1,522 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Subject to revision.
[3] June figure includes 8,629 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 8,626 in May, and their pay.
[4] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1956, and comparison with May 1956*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	88,107	81,276	6,831	
Commerce [1]	44,008	42,143	1,865	
Health, Education, and Welfare	44,333	43,691	642	
Interior	48,412	45,230	3,182	
Justice	30,343	29,851	492	
Labor	5,653	5,648	5	
Post Office	[2] 505,887	509,915		4,028
State [3]	8,029	7,902	127	
Treasury	76,794	79,991		3,197
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	378	373	5	
Bureau of the Budget	430	422	8	
Council of Economic Advisers	31	28	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70		
National Security Council [4]	27	27		
Office of Defense Mobilization	267	273		6
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	6		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	17	15	2	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	10	11		1
American Battle Monuments Commission	15	15		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,260	6,431	189	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	575	565	10	
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	2		
Civil Aeronautics Board	596	588	8	
Civil Service Commission	4,235	4,149	86	
Commission of Fine Arts	9	9		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	172	173		1
Farm Credit Administration	1,026	1,025	1	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,085	1,057	28	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,089	1,094		5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,126	1,123	3	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	689	682	7	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	343	350		7
Federal Power Commission	720	683	37	
Federal Trade Commission	641	625	16	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	128	124	4	
General Accounting Office	5,483	5,461	22	
General Services Administration	26,321	26,275	46	
Government Contract Committee	23	24		1
Government Printing Office	6,579	6,639		60
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,009	9,904	105	
Indian Claims Commission	13	13		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,907	1,912		5
Independent agencies—Con.				
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,861	7,653	208	
National Capital Housing Authority	258	256	2	
National Capital Planning Commission	34	32	2	
National Gallery of Art	330	328	2	
National Labor Relations Board	1,107	1,085	22	
National Mediation Board	107	109		2
National Science Foundation	251	267		16
National Security Training Commission	3	4		1
Panama Canal	557	548	9	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,222	2,179	43	
Renegotiation Board	469	468	1	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	7	7		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	34	32	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission	734	726	8	
Selective Service System	6,664	6,675		11
Small Business Administration	821	801	20	
Smithsonian Institution	766	714	52	
Soldiers' Home	1,016	1,015	1	
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	32	1	
Tariff Commission	208	204	4	
Tax Court of the United States	146	147		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,708	14,321	387	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission	3	3		
United States Information Agency	2,430	2,401	29	
Veterans' Administration	175,418	176,385		967
Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission	3	2	1	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,138,408	1,132,200	14,518	8,310
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,208	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,879	1,853	26	
Department of the Army	369,502	365,106	4,396	
Department of the Navy	363,023	362,821	202	
Department of the Air Force	305,518	300,347	5,171	
Total, Department of Defense	1,039,922	1,030,127	9,795	
Net increase, Department of Defense			9,795	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,178,330	2,162,327	24,313	8,310
Net increase, including Department of Defense			16,003	

[1] June figure includes 1,522 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Subject to revision.
[3] June figure includes 1,647 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,637 in May.
[4] Exclusive of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1956, and comparison with May 1956*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,312	1,322		10
Commerce	3,189	3,182	7	
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,791	1,792		1
Interior	5,759	5,461	298	
Justice	533	529	4	
Labor	144	139	5	
Post Office	[1] 2,453	2,513		60
State [2]	22,850	22,780	70	
Treasury	988	1,000		12
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	703	748		45
Atomic Energy Commission	17	16	1	
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	20	18	2	
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	27	27		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
General Accounting Office	59	53	6	
General Services Administration	108	107	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	153	154		1
National Labor Relations Board	21	21		
Panama Canal	14,307	14,446		139
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	196	194	2	
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	8,401	8,396	5	
Veterans' Administration	1,235	1,246		11
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,285	64,163	401	279
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			122	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	61	60	1	
Department of the Army	65,214	66,309		1,095
Department of the Navy	31,652	31,861		209
Department of the Air Force	42,734	42,689	45	
Total, Department of Defense	139,661	140,919	46	1,304
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,258	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	203,946	205,082	447	1,583
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,136	

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] June figure includes 6,982 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compated with 6,989 in May.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1956, and comparison with May 1956*

Department or agency	June	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,624	2,705		81
Commerce	2,673	2,675		2
Interior	8,357	8,485		128
Treasury	5,473	5,546		73
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	159	145	14	
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	1,123	1,063	60	
Government Printing Office	6,579	6,639		60
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,861	7,653	208	
Panama Canal	7,269	7,315		46
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,959	11,594	365	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	54,090	53,833	647	390
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			257	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 202,843	[2] 200,463	2,380	
Outside continental United States	[1] 34,824	[2] 35,386		562
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	223,084	224,924		1,840
Outside continental United States	6,130	6,176		46
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	168,002	165,614	2,388	
Outside continental United States	6,351	6,094	257	
Total, Department of Defense	641,234	638,657	5,025	2,448
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,577	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	695,324	692,490	5,672	2,838
Net increase, including Department of Defense			2,834	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of June 1956 and comparison with May 1956*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	June	May	June	May	June	May	June	May
England	7,318	7,272			32	32	7,286	7,240
France	23,698	23,929	16,307	16,380			7,391	7,549
French Morocco	6,144	6,096	204	207	961	1,027	4,979	4,862
Germany	106,690	108,284	84,148	85,095	634	1,422	21,908	21,767
Japan	140,364	140,929	79,802	[1] 79,802	18,412	18,458	42,150	42,669
Korea	5,843	5,965	5,843	5,965				
Libya	197	195					197	195
Netherlands	46	47					46	47
Norway	17	17					17	17
Saudi Arabia	455	445					455	445
Trinidad	522	508			522	508		
Total	291,294	293,687	186,304	187,449	20,561	21,447	84,429	84,791

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French and English reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Exclusive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of June totaling 2,382,276. This was a net increase of 14,867 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of May. This was the sixth monthly increase in succession.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government by months in fiscal year 1956, which began July 1, 1955, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1955	2,384,595	307	
August	2,385,043	448	
September	2,366,069		18,974
October	2,365,183		886
November	2,362,158		3,025
December	2,343,227		18,931
January 1956	2,346,750	3,523	
February	2,351,371	4,621	
March	2,352,657	1,286	
April	2,359,618	6,961	
May	2,367,409	7,791	
June	2,382,276	14,867	

Total civilian employment in civilian agencies during the month of June was 1,202,693, an increase of 6,330 over the May total of 1,196,363. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in June was 1,179,583, an increase of 8,537 as compared with 1,171,046 in May.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Department of Agriculture, up 6,821; Department of the Interior, up 3,480; Department of Commerce, up 1,872; and Department of Health, Education and Welfare, up 641. Reductions were reported by Post Office Department with a decrease of 4,088, Treasury Department with a decrease of 3,209 and Veterans' Administration with a decrease of 978.

In the Department of Defense increases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army, up 3,301, and the Department of the Air Force, up 5,216. This was the 14th consecutive monthly increase in civilian employment by the Air Force; total cumulative increase for 14 months was 41,915.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 16,003 and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 1,136. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in June totaled 695,324, an increase of 2,834.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,382,276 civilian employees certified to the committee by the Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 291,294 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies during June who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in May was 293,687. A breakdown of this employment for June follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
England	7,318		32	7,286
France	23,698	16,307		7,391
French Morocco	6,144	204	961	4,979
Germany	106,690	84,148	634	21,908
Japan	140,364	79,802	18,412	42,150
Korea	5,843	5,843		
Libya	197			197
Netherlands	46			46
Norway	17			17
Saudi Arabia	455			455
Trinidad	522		522	
Total	291,294	186,304	20,561	84,429

SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1956, ENDED JUNE 30, 1956

There was a net reduction of 2,012 in civilian employment by executive branch agencies of the Federal Government during fiscal year 1956, which ended June 30, 1956. The total at the end of the year was 2,382,276 as compared with 2,384,288 in June 1955.

Civilian and military agencies

There was an increase during the year of 5,086 in employment by the civilian agencies of the Government, and a decrease of 7,098 in civilian employment by military agencies. Employment by the civilian agencies at the year end totaled 1,202,693, as compared with 1,197,601 a year ago. Civilian employment by military agencies totaled 1,179,583 as compared with 1,186,681 in June of 1955.

Inside and outside continental United States

There was an increase of 8,202 in employment within the United States by the Federal executive agencies and a decrease of 10,214 in employment outside continental United States. Employment inside United States as of June 30, 1956, totaled 2,178,330 as compared with 2,170,128 a year ago. Employment outside the United States as of June 30, 1956, totaled 203,946 as compared with 214,160 a year ago.

Employment for the year is summarized as follows:

Federal civilian employment (June 1955–June 1956)

	June 1955	June 1956	Increase or decrease
Total	2,384,288	2,382,276	−2,012
In civilian agencies	1,197,607	1,202,693	+5,086
In military agencies	1,186,681	1,179,583	−7,098
Inside continental United States	2,170,128	2,178,330	+8,202
Outside continental United States	214,160	203,946	−10,214

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS OF ITS PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to file reports of investigations conducted by its Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations with the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment sine die of the Senate, 84th Congress, 2d session, and that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection is it so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 4299. A bill authorizing the conferring of appropriate degrees by the District of Columbia Teachers College on those persons who have met the requirements for such degrees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4300. A bill for the relief of Sime Ivanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. THYE, Mr. KERR, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 4301. A bill to provide for the extension of vocational education to persons in areas where programs are not now fully developed or available and for the development of vocational and technical education, including training and retraining, made necessary by scientific and technological developments, by encouraging States to establish area vocational schools and programs for the training and retraining of technicians and skilled workers in industry and agriculture and for training in other occupations essential to the Nation's security and economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 4302. A bill relating to the provision of housing for middle-income families and for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 4303. A bill for the relief of Elias Youssef Mikhael (Ellis Joseph Michael); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 4304. A bill for the relief of Margaret Nelson; and

S. 4305. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Eichhorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 4306. A bill to provide for stating appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4307. A bill for the relief of Leopold Katz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 4308. A bill to confer upon the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I recognize that on this last day of the session the obstacles to the Senate's considering any civil-rights bill are insurmountable.

At the same time I trust our colleagues in this body will not begrudge the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and me this final opportunity to record again our earnest desire that the Senate act upon H. R. 627 and to take the one step now at last open to us to advance toward that objective, the filing of a motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of that bill.

I therefore submit a resolution for that purpose on behalf of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and will lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 325) submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LEHMAN, is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 627, to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as this legislative waif is at last permitted to enter the parliamentary halls when it is too late for it to have any future, its dying eyes can perhaps look up at the walls of the Senate and see the otherwise invisible but no less real inscription which men have placed there for all civil-right measures: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

For how much longer will the Senate and the country permit man made rules to prevent us from even considering measures which the vast majority of the people desire?

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMPILATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. It merely provides for the printing of the social-security laws prepared by the Social Security Administration as a Senate document, for the use of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 326) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the compilation of social security laws, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, be printed as a Senate document; and 4,000 additional copies be printed, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance and 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF INDEX AND SUMMARY ENTITLED "CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMUNISM AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Under date of July 23, 1956, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, obtained unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed as a Senate document an index and summary entitled, "Congressional Investigations of Communism and Subversive Activities," covering a period from 1918 to 1956. At that time he also obtained permission to have printed 2,750 additional copies of the document for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, which would entitle the committee to a total of 5,250 copies, including 1,000 normally allocated for committee use, 1,500 which may be supplied by the Joint Committee on Printing under its standing authority and cost limitations.

The present resolution would authorize the printing of 2,750 additional copies as agreed to under the unanimous-consent request which, I am now informed, requires the adoption of a Senate resolution. The printing of these 2,750 copies comes within the $1,200 limitation authority of the Senate, and has been certified to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which latter committee indicated it had no objection to this procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 327) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations 2,750 additional copies of the index and summary entitled "Congressional Investigations of Communism and Subversive Activities," 1918 to 1956, prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, the printing of which as a Senate document was authorized on July 23, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONFERRING APPROPRIATE DEGREES BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the language in the District of Columbia Code authorizing the District of Columbia Teachers College to grant degrees.

The code authorizes that appropriate degrees be given at the completion of 4 years' work. As we interpret this provision in the code, it was not to have Congress determine the number of years that it may take for a student to complete the work for any particular degree, but rather to authorize the college to give the degrees which will qualify trained personnel to serve in the public schools of this city. Today any teacher, at any level in the school system, must have the master's degree to qualify for the highest entrance salary which the present law contains.

This bill does not alter the present organization of the public schools.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4299) authorizing the conferring of appropriate degrees by the District of Columbia Teachers College on those persons who have met the requirements for such degrees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATIONAL BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators GEORGE, FULBRIGHT, SPARKMAN, ERVIN, SCOTT, CLEMENTS, AIKEN, MONRONEY, YOUNG, SYMINGTON, HENNINGS, THYE, KERR, MCNAMARA, PAYNE, KENNEDY, MANSFIELD, WILEY, LANGER, LEHMAN, MURRAY, IVES, HUMPHREY of Minnesota, MAGNUSON, and CARLSON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the extension of vocational education to persons in areas where programs are not fully developed or available and for the development of vocational and technical education, including training and retraining, made necessary by scientific and technological developments, by encouraging States to establish area vocational schools and programs for the training and retraining of technicians and skilled workers in industry and agriculture and for training in other occupations essential to the Nation's security and economy.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4301) to provide for the extension of vocational education to persons in areas where programs are not now fully developed or available and for the development of vocational and technical education, including training and retraining, made necessary by scientific and technological developments, by encouraging States to establish area vocational schools and programs for the training and retraining of technicians and skilled workers in industry and agriculture and for training in other occupations essential to the Nation's security and economy, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill to be known as the Area Vocational-Technical Education Act. I am introducing the bill for myself and the following Senators: Mr. GEORGE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. THYE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. WILEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. CARLSON.

The bill is, as described in its title, a measure to "provide for the extension of vocational education to persons in areas where programs are not now fully developed or available and for the development of vocational and technical education, including training and retraining, made necessary by scientific and technological developments, by encouraging States to establish area vocational schools and programs for the training and retraining of technicians and skilled workers in industry and agriculture and for training in other occupations essential to the Nation's security and economy."

The economic picture in the United States and the world situation have changed markedly since 1917 when Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act, recognizing the importance of vocational training to the national welfare and national security. Just as the Smith-Hughes Act stimulated the growth of vocational education programs 40 years ago, the area vocational-technical school bill, drawing upon the tested and proven experience under the Smith-Hughes Act and related acts, will bring needed training opportunities to people in sparsely settled areas, to people in small towns that cannot afford to maintain the expensive equipment required in a sound vocational program, to people who need training or retraining to compete in the changing labor scene.

The bill will make possible the establishment of training programs, in keeping with the special needs of the several States and Territories, in rural areas where secondary schools are unable to operate comprehensive vocational-technical programs. A great contribution to our national strength and prosperity will result from the prevention of the waste of manpower which follows when large numbers of our people enter the labor market without skills or technical knowledge.

The vocational programs developed throughout the Nation under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Vocational Education Acts have proven highly successful. We are familiar with their excellent record of training efficient and productive workers in a wide range of occupations. We have seen the rich dividends which the programs have returned to the Nation—their contributions to the national welfare and national security through increased productive capacity of thousands of workers—on farms, in factories and offices, and in homes.

Yet many who need and can profit by vocational training are not reached by the present programs. There are three major reasons for this: First, our rapidly increasing population is placing ever-increasing demands upon present programs and facilities. Second, there are many communities, particularly those outside the metropolitan areas, which have no vocational programs at all or have programs in only a few vocational fields. Third, advancing technology is creating a demand for more specialized skills and more technical knowledge on the part of workers. These factors call for greatly expanded programs of training and retraining.

One of the most serious manpower problems confronting the Nation is the shortage of trained technicians. A look at the want ads in the Sunday papers, or the daily papers for that matter, shows the great demand for skilled workers and technically trained personnel. Department of Labor reports show the trend toward higher skills in jobs, in business and industry. For many years the proportion of the labor force in the higher brackets of skill and training has been increasing, and at an ever-faster rate. In January 1956, over 6 million more craftsmen and technical operatives were employed than before World War II. The trend is moving sharply downward for the unskilled, who constituted 36 percent of the labor force in 1910 and only 20 percent in 1950.

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, relating to automation and technological change, made it clear that jobs in the future—in all phases of our economy—will demand a higher degree of technical knowledge. Every industrial worker will not, of course, need to be a professional engineer, but there will be a sharply increasing demand for skilled technicians. At the present time, for every university trained, professional engineer there is required, on the average, a supporting crew of five technicians. Yet these workers are not now being trained in sufficient numbers to meet even the demands of today.

The shortage of technicians is making more critical our present severe shortage of engineers and scientists. Many of these professional workers are now being drawn into positions for which they are more than adequately trained, because supporting tech-

nicians are not available. The training of more technicians would constitute a major step toward relieving the serious shortage of engineers and scientists.

Vocational-technical schools, operating on a regional basis to provide training in the most economical manner, can provide much of the answer. Vocational educators know how to provide this training. They proved this under fire during World War II when they speedily produced the trained workers needed for war production. They need only the funds to stimulate the expansion of present vocational-technical programs.

Skilled workers are as important to the security of our country as material weapons of defense. During recent hearings before the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, declared: "I consider the lack of skilled manpower to be my most critical deficiency." General LeMay made it clear that the overall quality of airplane maintenance is below what it should be because of the lack of technically trained personnel. Our potential military strength is weakened by the shortages.

The complex weapons of today and those programed for the future cannot be properly maintained or operated by inexperienced and inadequately trained personnel. The best machines in the world are ineffective unless qualified men are available to maintain and operate them. The capability of our Air Force rests in large measure upon its ability to attract and retain skilled personnel.

One is the big items in the Air Force budget is the cost of training aviation technicians. It takes the Air Force 4 years to bring a man to the skilled technician level. During this time the Air Force has invested $22,500 in him and has received approximately 1½ years of productive effort from him. At the end of the 4-year enlistment, 90 percent of such men leave the service and return to civilian life.

A major reason for leaving the service is the competition of private industry for skilled technicians. In other words, the Air Force is training skilled technicians for private industry, at a terrifically high cost to the taxpayer. If more technicians were being trained through the economical facilities of the public schools, it would relieve this disturbing situation in a number of ways. If enlistees had some previous basic training in mechanics and technology, it would not cost the Air Force (and other branches of the armed services) so much (in time or dollars) to train its skilled technicians. A more adequate supply of skilled technicians would relieve industry's needs. Enlisted men would be encouraged to stay in the service and the wasteful expense of training a new mechanic every 4 years would be largely eliminated.

Information from behind the Iron Curtain reveals that the educational revolution in Russia poses as serious a threat to our Nation as their achievement in airpower or hydrogen weapons. The Communists have recognized the essentiality of highly skilled training in this technological age and have surrounded education with a new aura of prestige and importance. The Communists have established special schools for the training of technicians.

According to William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, who recently made a trip behind the Iron Curtain, there are at least 2,000 of these training schools, called "technicums." Life magazine, in its March 5, 1956, article on Russia stated there were 3,796 such schools. These schools have an estimated enrollment of approximately two and one-half million. Through them, Russia is turning out workers with highly specialized skills and advanced technical knowledge for industrial, agricultural, and many other occupations. Russia is reported to be training these technicians in foreign languages and exporting many of them to the underdeveloped nations of the world, where they not only teach work skills but the Communist doctrine as well.

We in the United States, not training enough technicians to take care of our own immediate needs, find it difficult to spare trained workers to go abroad and fight the Soviet propagandists with the example of the rewards of our own democratic way of life. As Mr. Benton says, we are entering into a struggle of a new type with Russia, a new cold war fought in the economic arena. And while we are fighting with, as Mr. Benton declares, "the blunted weapons of the old war," the Soviet Union is "schooling for export tens of thousands of capable engineers, scientists, schoolmasters, and technicians who will be used to win the confidence of the uncommitted billion men and women in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East who hold the world balance of power."

Let no one think for a moment that we can become complacement about our position of leadership in the world. The Soviets have made tremendous advances in the last decades and are now waging economic war upon the free world.

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, reports that the Soviet Union has become the second greatest industrial power in the world, and that while we still have a great lead, the Soviet rate of progress is faster than ours. One of the reasons for this, says, Mr. Dulles, is that a prodigious effort has been expended on scientific and technical education. In 1955, some 60 percent of graduating full-time Soviet students were in scientific and technical fields, compared with some 25 percent in the United States. And the conclusion Dulles draws is that "in technical, engineering, and industrial fields the Soviets can achieve any particular objective we can achieve." To counter Soviet advances in education, the United States must immediately focus more attention and emphasis on technical training. This is exactly what the measure we have introduced today is intended to accomplish.

Another serious problem of concern to the Nation relates to rural people, particularly the low-income farm family. Increased mechanization in agriculture and improved farming methods have increased productivity per man to such a level that it is no longer feasible for all farm children to remain on the farm. Many are forced to leave the land they love to seek jobs in the cities and towns. In general, they enter the labor market with little or no useful training because the small high schools they attended cannot afford a broad, diversified vocational program.

This measure, when enacted, will be of tremendous value to the farm youth of the Nation, because it offers a way to bring vocational education to far greater numbers of them. It will help both those who expect to remain on the farm and who need superior training to take advantage of the scientific and mechanical developments in farming methods and those who leave the land and seek other employment in the industrial, distributive, and business fields.

Congress in this session, as in the last session, has recognized the urgent need for providing vocational and technical training for greater numbers of our people by voting substantial increases in the appropriations for vocational educational under our existing programs. This year Congress, for the first time, voted the full funds authorized for vocational education under existing legislation. I am confident that the use of the funds will prove the wisdom of this action.

The bill which we have introduced today is a logical companion to the acts passed in earlier years. The bill will not duplicate the programs now being carried on under those acts, but on the other hand it will stimulate programs which will supplement and complement existing programs. The training programs which the bill will inspire will fill a clear gap in our educational process by reaching large numbers of our people who are now unable to pursue vocational and technical training in high school or to pursue training in college.

Passage of the bill will contribute importantly to strengthening the self-reliance of our people, to their economic welfare and that of the Nation and to building the strength and providing for the security of our country. I commend the bill to the earnest consideration of every Member of Congress.

JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION TO PREVENT CERTAIN PRACTICES BY PERSONS ENGAGED IN COMMERCE IN MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to confer upon the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes.

As a result of many complaints from cattle growers, small meat packers, and other groups in the meat industry, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly on June 21 began a series of hearings on monopoly problems in the meatpacking industry. The subcommittee has already heard enough testimony to convince it that changes are necessary in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, which gives the Secretary of Agriculture jurisdiction over unfair trade practices in this very important industry. Typical of the industry leaders who appeared before the subcommittee was E. F. Forbes, president of the Western States Meat Packers Association. He testified that the members of his association have been unsuccessful in obtaining any action on complaints of unfair trade practices. He said such complaints were being pigeonholed in the Department of Agriculture, and therefore urged that jurisdiction be transferred to the Federal Trade Commission, which has jurisdiction over similar antitrust matters in other industries. Mr. Forbes was one of several witnesses who called attention to the extension of chain food store operations from the field of retailing to meat packing and even operating feed lots. Another witness, Louis F. Bein, of Denver, Colo., pointed out how this growing chainstore practice resulted in the decline of livestock prices to the producers.

The bill I am introducing today gives the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to proceed against persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products where such persons engage in certain defined unfair trade practices. Through its sections containing definitions, its terms are made clearly applicable to packers, chain food stores also operating as packers, and to other persons engaged in the business of buying livestock for slaughter, manufacturing or preparing meats or meat food products for sale in commerce, or marketing meats, meat food products, livestock, dairy, or poultry products or eggs. In defining the unfair

trade practices at which it is aimed, this bill uses the same broad language which was used in the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. This broad terminology was approved by Congress years ago and is needed by any Government agency wishing to proceed against persons who violate the prohibitions of the act. If the Department of Agriculture had enforced the act as written in 1921, we would not need to introduce this bill today. The bill also sets out the procedures to be followed by the Federal Trade Commission in proceeding against such violators and contains the proper safeguards for the protection of persons so charged. It also provides for appeals procedures to be followed by either party to an action filed under the authority of the bill. The subcommittee is planning to continue its hearings into additional problems which have been brought to its attention from within the industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4308) to confer upon the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT ADDENDUM TO SENATE DOCUMENT 120, 84TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "LAWS CONTROLLING ILLICIT NARCOTICS TRAFFIC" (S. DOC. NO. 145)

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document an addendum to Senate Document No. 120, 84th Congress, of this session on "Laws Controlling the Illicit Narcotics Traffic."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Article prepared by him on expanding American engineering resource published in Wisconsin Professional Engineer.

A supplementary statement prepared by him on the need for support schools for the mentally retarded.

By Mr. IVES:

Statement concerning the approaching 30th anniversary of network broadcasting by the National Broadcasting Co.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement and editorial concerning Fund for the Republic.

THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as we appear to be near the end of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I wish to express my personal appreciation to our distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and our distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] for the wonderful job they have done this year in guiding the destinies of the Senate. They have had untold difficulties, but they have shown patience, understanding, and high intelligence, and I think we all owe them a debt of sincere gratitude.

THOMAS A. WOFFORD, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THOMAS WOFFORD, will not return to the Senate next year, for his duty has been one of representing his people for an unexpired term.

I wish to say here that I have enjoyed serving with my distinguished colleague, and I, like every Member of the Senate, and the people of my State and Nation, have benefited from his short but effective presence in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, THOMAS A. WOFFORD is a courageous man of conviction, who never hesitates to vote and speak in the way he thinks best for his country and his people. On several occasions he has spoken to the Nation for his people in a most capable and convincing manner that has won the respect and admiration of thousands who did not know him before he came to the Senate.

He knows, too, my colleagues, how to respect the convictions of others and to approach legislative problems with realism and understanding.

Mr. President, when TOM WOFFORD came to the United States Senate, there was no doubt as to which side of the aisle he belonged. TOM WOFFORD is a stanch and loyal Democrat who, for years prior to his service in this honorable body, had rendered distinguished service to the Democratic Party.

He is a young man and while he may be leaving us this year in the sense of vacating his seat in the Senate, I am sure we will all be hearing from and about him in the years to come.

We like and admire TOM WOFFORD and we shall miss him next session. He has been a good Senator for the people and for the Nation and as he leaves us he can return to the people of South Carolina knowing that he has done his duty well. He has the respect, confidence, and well wishes of us all.

Mr. President, I wish Godspeed to him, to his lovely wife, and to his wonderful family.

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ONE MAN TOWARD PEACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have before me an article by Arthur Krock, carried in the New York Times for Friday, February 27, entitled "The Contributions of One Man Toward Peace." In this article Mr. Krock discusses the Fulbright program and the great significance of the originator of the program and also of the Fulbright resolution in 1943.

Mr. President, I had the honor of coming to the Congress in the same year with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I think Arthur Krock's reference to him as an extraordinary public servant is well taken. The Senator from Arkansas has made a great contribution to the cause of international peace and international understanding, and the United States and the free world are better off because of the contributions of this one man. He is a man of great ability, great coverage, and great integrity. He has been a tower of strength to many of us with his wise counsel, steadiness, and understanding. The foreign policy of the United States is better because of his inspirational leadership and will become better still if we heed his advice and counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Arthur Krock concerning the Senator from Arkansas may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to ask that the very splendid article appearing in this morning's New York Times, an article written by Arthur Krock, and relating to the outstanding work of one of our colleagues, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], be printed in the RECORD. Since the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has had the article printed, I shall not duplicate the request, but I highly approve of the article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ONE MAN TOWARD PEACE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 26.—In his report to this Congress of the operations of Public Law 584 that was passed by the 79th 10 years ago, the Secretary of State made the following comment:

In terms of lessening the likelihood of another war by promoting greater people-to-people understanding, the program has been described as the most fabulously profitable investment ever authorized by the Congress of the United States. Altogether, nearly 22,000 persons have been exchanged with 28 countries at a lower cost to the American taxpayers than 5 hours of fighting World War II.

AID PROGRAM'S COUNTERPART

Public Law 584, informally known as the Fulbright Act, is the legislation by which teachers and students are exchanged between this and many other nations—today Israel was added. It was the cultural counterpart to our economic and military programs, all designed to promote through collective security a permanent and durable world peace. Secretary Dulles' report of its effectiveness to that end is not only an impressive documentation of the soundness of the concept. It is a reminder of the extraordinary service to the cause of international peace that has been rendered by one legislator—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas.

This service began September 21, 1943, with the passage by the House (of which the Senator was then a Member) of the Fulbright resolution, a cornerstone of bipartisan foreign policy and of the United Nations. The resolution committed the House

to "the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein." At a subsequent Republican conference at Mackinac Island, Mich., members of that party who had assisted FULBRIGHT in his project—among them the late Representative James W. Wadsworth and the late Wendell L. Willkie—put through a similar resolution. And, under the sponsorship of Senator Connally of Texas, the other branch of Congress approved the Fulbright resolution.

HULL'S DEBT ACKNOWLEDGED

In his memoirs—published by Macmillan, 1948—Cordell Hull, who as Secretary of State labored ceaselessly for the creation of the United Nations, made a number of appreciative references to the pioneering of FULBRIGHT. "My discouragement at the Soviet Government's rejection of the Four-Nation Declaration," he wrote, "was counterbalanced by the encouragement I received" by the House action. "* * * I felt that the passage of the Fulbright resolution * * * would give me a real advantage in Moscow because it would show Molotov and Eden that the people of the United States * * * wanted their country to take its full share in an international organization."

Three years after FULBRIGHT's first epochal contribution, Congress passed the Exchange Students Act which was the subject of Dulles' glowing report on its decennial. The gist of the legislation was this:

At the end of the Second World War American military equipment that cost many millions was stored in warehouses all over the world—bulldozers, machine tools, locomotives, food, clothing, etc. But the countries which badly needed these supplies lacked the dollars with which to buy them.

The Fulbright Act provided that these surpluses be sold to such governments for their own foreign currencies and credits. Part of these funds were set aside, through special agreements, for educational purposes only, a precedent having been established with enormous success in Belgium by Herbert Hoover in 1920.

EFFECTS OF THE ACT

By the time the Fulbright Act was 10 years old, over 12,000 foreign students, teachers, lecturers, and scholars had entered American life in cities and towns in all the States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska. Over 9,000 Americans had gone abroad in exchange. Of these two groups Dulles said to Congress:

"Systematic evaluation studies indicate that these people—from abroad—not only return home with a better understanding of the United States, but share that understanding with their fellow countrymen. * * * Many of them are becoming leaders in the national life of their countries: in India, at least half * * * have a voice in policymaking on an all-India level.

"Through their studies—Americans who were sent abroad—are adding continually to our store of knowledge about these countries * * * by example as well as by words explaining our way of life * * * and gaining new insights into America."

The details of the report bear out the claims by the Secretary that the program is "bringing about a new kind of chain reaction which may eventually work more powerfully for peace than nuclear weapons."

Senator FULBRIGHT's renomination by the Democrats of Arkansas, a one-party State, fortunately assures his reelection to continue his constructive labors for peace with freedom.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to join in the commendation of the Senator from Arkansas for the contribution he has made to the exchange program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senate should know that the Senator from New Jersey himself played a great part in the success of the program.

GEOMETRIC DESIGN STANDARDS FOR THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the law providing for the construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System should have the continued consideration of Congress.

The American Association of State Highway Officials recently met and adopted geometric design standards for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. This design supersedes that adopted August 1, 1945. At the meeting adopting the present design, 46 out of 48 States were represented. In addition, there was representation from the Bureau of Roads of the Department of Commerce.

In order that these standards may be understood by all of us, I ask unanimous consent that the same be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the standards were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS—COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND DESIGN POLICIES—GEOMETRIC DESIGN STANDARDS FOR THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS,[1] ADOPTED JULY 12, 1956

GENERAL

The National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is the most important in the United States. It carries more traffic per mile than any other comparable national system and includes the roads of greatest significance to the economic welfare and defense of the Nation. The highways of this system must be designed in keeping with their importance as the backbone of the Nation's highway systems. To this end they must be designed with control of access to insure their safety, permanence, and utility and with flexibility to provide for possible future expansion. Two-lane highways should be designed so that passing of slower moving vehicles can be accomplished with ease and safety at practically all times. Divided highways should be designed as two separate one-way roads to take advantage of terrain and other conditions for safe and relaxed driving, economy, and pleasing appearance. All known features of safety and utility should be incorporated in each design to result in a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways which will be a credit to the Nation.

These objectives can be realized by conscious attention in design to their attainment. All interstate highways shall meet the following minimum standards. Higher values which represent desirable minimum values, a device used in previous interstate standards, are not shown because it is expected that designs will generally be made to values as high as are commensurate with conditions, and values near the minimums herein will be used in design only where the use of higher values will result in excessive cost. In determination of all geometric features, including right of way, a generous factor of safety should be employed and unquestioned adequacy should be the criterion. All design features required to accommodate the traffic of the year 1975 shall be provided in the initial design; however, where justifiable, the construction may be accomplished in stages.

The association policy on geometric design of rural highways, the policy on arterial highways in urban areas, when adopted, and the standard specifications for highway bridges shall be used as design guides where they do not conflict with these standards.

TRAFFIC BASIS

Interstate highways shall be designed to serve safely and efficiently the volumes of passenger vehicles, buses, and trucks, including tractor-trailer and semitrailer combinations and corresponding military equipment, estimated to be that which will exist in 1975, including attracted, generated, and development traffic on the basis that the entire system is completed.

The peak-hour traffic used as a basis for design shall be as high as the 30th highest hourly volume of the year 1975, hereafter referred to as the design hourly volume, "DHV(1975)." Unless otherwise specified, DHV is the total, two-direction volume of mixed traffic.

CONTROL OF ACCESS

On all sections of the Interstate System, access shall be controlled by acquiring access rights outright prior to construction or by the construction of frontage roads, or both. Control of access is required for all sections of the Interstate System. Under all of the following conditions, intersections at grade may be permitted in sparsely settled rural areas which are a sufficient distance from municipalities or other traffic-generating areas to be outside their influence, and where no appreciable hazard is created thereby.

(a) The interstate highway is a two-lane highway having a DHV (1975) of less than 500.

(b) Each intersection at grade is with a public road or private driveway with little potential for traffic increase and on which the current ADT does not exceed 50 vehicles.

(c) Such intersections do not exceed two per side of the interstate highway per mile.

(d) Sufficient additional corner right of way at each intersection at grade is acquired to insure that access connections on the crossroad are sufficiently removed to minimize interference with the interstate highway.

(e) The right to eliminate, terminate, or reroute each such public road or private driveway is vested in the appropriate public authority at the time of initial construction.

Where a grade separation is called for under these standards and extraordinary conditions exist under which a grade separation would not be in the public interest, an intersection at grade may be permitted through agreement between the State highway department and the Secretary of Commerce.

RAILROAD CROSSINGS

Railroad grade crossings shall be eliminated for all through traffic lanes.

INTERSECTIONS

All at-grade intersections of public highways and private driveways shall be eliminated, or the connecting road terminated, rerouted, or intercepted by frontage roads, except as otherwise provided under control of access.

DESIGN SPEED

The design speed of all highways on the system shall be at least 70, 60, and 50 miles

[1] To supersede the design standards for the National System of Interstate Highways, adopted August 1, 1945.

per hour for flat, rolling, and mountainous topography, respectively, and depending upon the nature of terrain and development. The design speed in urban areas should be at least 50 miles per hour.

CURVATURE, SUPERELEVATION, AND SIGHT DISTANCES

These elements and allied features, such as transition curves, should be correlated with the design speed in accordance with a policy on geometric design of rural highways.

On two-lane highways, sections with sufficient sight distance for safe passing should be frequent enough and the total length of such sections be a sufficient percentage of the highway length to accommodate the DHV. Where it is not feasible to provide enough passing opportunities, a divided highway should be provided instead.

GRADIENTS

For design speeds of 70, 60, and 50 miles per hour, gradients generally shall be not steeper than 3, 4, and 5 percent, respectively. Gradients 2 percent steeper may be provided in rugged terrain.

WIDTH AND NUMBER OF LANES

Traffic lanes shall not be less than 12 feet wide.

Where the DHV (1975) exceeds 700 or exceeds a lower two-lane design capacity applicable for the conditions on a particular section, the highway shall be a divided highway. For lower volumes, the highway shall be a two-lane highway so designed and located on the right-of-way that an additional two-lane pavement can be added in the future to form a divided highway.

Efficiency and capacity of two-lane highways may be increased by providing added climbing lanes on upgrades where critical lengths of grade are exceeded or by providing more frequent and longer sections safe for passing.

MEDIANS

Medians in rural areas in flat and rolling topography shall be at least 36 feet wide. Medians in urban and mountainous areas shall be at least 16 feet wide. Narrower medians may be provided in urban areas of high right-of-way cost, on long and costly bridges, and in rugged mountainous terrain, but no median shall be less than four feet wide.

Curbs or other devices may be used where necessary to prevent traffic from crossing the median.

Where continuous barrier curbs are used on narrow medians, such curbs shall be offset at least one foot from the edge of the through-traffic lane. Where vertical elements more than 12 inches high, other than abutments, piers, or walls, are located in a median, there shall be a lateral clearance of at least 3½ feet from the edge of through traffic lane to the face of such element.

SHOULDERS

Shoulders usable by all classes of vehicles in all weather shall be provided on the right of traffic. The usable width of shoulder shall be not less than 10 feet. In mountainous terrain involving high cost for additional width, the usable width of shoulder may be less but at least six feet. Usable width of shoulder is measured from edge of through-traffic lane to intersection of shoulder and fill or ditch slope except where such slope is steeper than 4:1 where it is measured to beginning of rounding.

SLOPES

Side slopes should be 4:1 or flatter where feasible and not steeper than 2:1 except in rock excavation or other special conditions.

RIGHT OF WAY

Fixed minimum widths of right of way are not given because wide widths are desirable, conditions may make narrow widths necessary, and right of way need not be of constant width. The following minimum widths are given as guides.

In rural areas right-of-way widths should be not less than the following, plus additional widths needed for heavy cuts and fills:

Type of highway	Minimum width (in feet)	
	Without frontage roads	With frontage roads
2 lane	150	250
4 lane divided	150	250
6 lane divided	175	275
8 lane divided	200	300

In urban areas right-of-way width shall be not less than that required for the necessary cross-section elements, including median, pavements, shoulders, outer separations, ramps, frontage roads, slopes, walls, border areas, and other requisite appurtenances.

CULVERTS

All culverts shall be of sufficient length to accommodate the pavements, median, and shoulders.

BRIDGES AND OTHER STRUCTURES

The following standards apply to interstate highway bridges, overpasses, and underpasses. Standards for crossroad overpasses and underpasses are to be those for the crossroad.

Bridges and overpasses, preferably of deck construction, should be located to fit the over-all alinement and profile of the highway.

The clear height of structures shall be not less than 14 feet over the entire roadway width, including the usable width of shoulders. Allowance should be made for any contemplated resurfacing.

The width of all bridges, including grade separation structures, of a length of 150 feet or less between abutments or end-supporting piers shall equal the full roadway width on the approaches, including the usable width of shoulders.

Barrier curbs on bridges longer than 150 feet between abutments or end-supporting piers and curbs on approach highways if used shall be offset at least 2 feet. Offsets to face of parapet or rail shall be at least 3½ feet measured from edge of through-traffic lane and apply on right and left.

The lateral clearance from the edge of through-traffic lanes to the face of walls or abutments and piers at underpasses shall be the usable shoulder width but not less than 8 feet on the right and 4½ feet on the left.

A safety walk shall be provided in tunnels and on long-span structures on which the full approach roadway width, including shoulders, is not continued.

HELLS CANYON PROJECT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the bill for the great Federal project at Hells Canyon may be gone, but it is not forgotten. It will not be forgotten for a long time.

What has been lost with the abandonment of Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co. has been brought out by some of the press comments following the Senate vote on last Thursday, July 19. The responsibility for this loss has been squarely fixed on the pressure brought to bear by the Eisenhower administration, on behalf of the private utilities, on Senators on the other side of the aisle, all but two of whom voted for the destruction of this priceless national asset.

In view of the direct administration pressure to clear all obstacles for the Idaho Power Co., it will be interesting to see what action now will follow on Idaho Power's applications for $65,206,094 of quick tax write-offs for its Oxbow and Brownlee Dams. The Department of the Interior already has recommended to the Office of Defense Mobilization the granting of rapid tax amortization certificates which would, in effect, give Idaho Power an interest-free loan of more than $65 million. Such a financial windfall for the company contradicts the claims of Idaho Power Co. spokesmen that its dams will be built without expense to American taxpayers. It now appears that the American people will not only suffer the loss of power and flood control at Hells Canyon, but may also contribute tax dollars for the privilege of sacrificing those benefits to the less-than-full development resulting from the Idaho Power dams.

I will watch with interest the future action on the quick tax writeoffs sought by the Idaho Power Co. for its Brownlee and Oxbow Dams.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes on The Defeat of the Hells Canyon Bill in the Evening Star of July 21, 1956, an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 21, 1956, and a letter which I have written to the Washington Post in response to this editorial, and editorials from the Pendleton East Oregonian of July 20, 1956, and the Coos Bay Times of July 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 21, 1956.

To the EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD:

Your editorial of July 21 on Hells Canyon correctly states that among the issues in the Senate debate "the first and most important was whether the choicest power site on the North American Continent should be safeguarded for maximum development."

You are so right that the deliberate sacrifice of this maximum development is "an altogether proper issue for debate in the political campaign."

For the opposing side, you state the question whether it would be proper to deny the alternative, smaller, private development "when the chance for approval of a Federal undertaking is all but gone."

The Eisenhower administration and other Republican spokesmen for the Idaho Power Co.'s smaller project can hardly make use of this argument. The administration had no difficulty winning congressional approval this year of over $1 billion in Federal projects in the Rocky Mountain area, and it could effortlessly have won authorization of the Hells Canyon project. Far from having no chance of approval, Hells Canyon showed its unequalled merit by winning approval of both Senate and House Interior Committees and gaining 41 votes in the Senate, in the face of what the Post itself has recognized as extreme adverse pressure from the administration.

The administration's studied and calculated give-away of the irreplaceable Hells Canyon site will haunt the Republican Party, not as a regional, but as a national issue for years to come.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 21, 1956]

IN A CANYON

Underneath all the frothy rhetoric, there were two principal issues in the Hells Canyon debate in the Senate. The first and most important was whether the choicest power site on the North American Continent should be safeguarded for maximum development. The second was whether, since Congress has consistently failed to approve a high-level federally constructed dam at Hells Canyon, the lower-level private development proposed by the Idaho Power Co. and endorsed by the Eisenhower administration should be allowed to proceed as sanctioned by the Federal Power Commission.

It would be unbecoming of the Democrats to allow their irritation at administration pressure against the Hells Canyon project to preclude a vote on the confirmation of Assistant Secretary of the Interior D'Ewart. Mr. D'Ewart is entitled to a decision, irrespective of objections to his stand or charges that he displayed high-level indifference to smear tactics used in his behalf in the 1954 Montana senatorial campaign. But the deeper questions of the Hells Canyon controversy will continue to ring. This newspaper, which has no doctrinaire belief in public power as such, thinks that at a unique site such as Hells Canyon, Federal development is the only way to bring maximum utilization of resources. But when the chance for approval of a Federal undertaking is all but gone, would it be proper to deny the power-hungry Northwest an alternate if smaller source of energy through private development? The issue is an altogether proper one for debate in the political campaign.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1956]

DEFEAT OF THE HELLS CANYON BILL—EISENHOWER IS BLAMED AS SENATE REJECTS PUBLIC POWER PROPOSAL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The showdown on the Hells Canyon bill in the Senate this week should open the eyes of the public, at least that part of the public which is interested in proper conservation of our natural resources, including our water resources.

For it fixed responsibility upon President Eisenhower himself for the administration's conservation policy which has been severely criticized—and properly—because it permits exploitation of our natural resources by privileged private interests for their profit to the detriment of the public interest.

This was exposed in the personal pressure brought by the White House upon Senators, on a scale not heretofore seen in this administration, in the effort, ultimately successful, to swing enough votes to defeat the Democratic-sponsored bill. The measure provided for a Government-constructed high dam across the Snake River gorge along the Idaho-Oregon border to develop the river for production of hydroelectric power, flood control, navigation, and reclamation.

The effect of this administration maneuver goes far beyond Hells Canyon, in which the whole Pacific Northwest is interested, in its implications. It should finally awaken people all over the country to the administration's determination, as stressed here frequently, to turn over all still-undeveloped water resources to the private power monopoly to develop as it pleases, without proper consideration of the public interest, and at high rates to yield a handsome profit.

Once again the private power barons are back in the saddle in Government, from where they had been driven during the Roosevelt-Truman era. They realized the significant test inherent in what is done about development of the biggest yet undeveloped site—at Hells Canyon. Coordinating with the White House campaign of pressure upon the Senate, electric utilities conducted a high-powered drive themselves in personal contacts with Senators by telephone, wire and letter, beseeching defeat of the bill for public development of Hells Canyon.

They rallied behind the corporation known as the Idaho Power Co., though it is almost entirely Eastern-owned, which already has started to work on the Snake River under a license granted by the Federal Power Commission some months ago which Democrats and conservationists were seeking to annul by the bill which the Senate defeated, 51 to 41. The Idaho Power Co. plan calls ultimately for three small dams. Its plan, according to best expert evidence, will not realize the full potentials of the Snake River and will foreclose forever the proper development of the whole Columbia River system as projected by the United States Army Engineers.

In the most tense and dramatic scene in the Senate this session the Senators were reminded in closing debate of the inadequacies of the Idaho Power Co.'s plan; of how the people and industries in the developing region will be deprived of the full benefit of their water resources; of how they must pay 6.29 mills per kilowatt hour for electricity generated there by the Idaho Power Co. as compared with 3 mills if it were developed publicly. It was pointed out also how public development would be self-liquidating as are all such water resource enterprises, and would return a nice profit to the United States Treasury.

But in vain.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, Democratic leader who directed the fight for public development, was foiled when Senator FREAR, Democrat of Delaware, and seven of JOHNSON'S own Southern Democratic colleagues deserted him—Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON, of Virginia; ERVIN, of North Carolina; LONG, of Louisiana; EASTLAND, of Mississippi; SMATHERS, of Florida, and RUSSELL, of Georgia. Two Republicans deserted the administration and joined Senator JOHNSON'S cohorts—Senators WILEY, of Wisconsin, and LANGER, of North Dakota. Otherwise the vote was along strict party lines, with Democrats supporting public development and Republicans opposing it.

The administration's position revealed in the Hells Canyon battle is well known to anyone who has followed the course of events here; but never before had White House responsibility been so graphically revealed to the public.

Hitherto others were blamed, chiefly former Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, who was, of course, only following White House orders. Democrats had made such a target of Secretary McKay that he finally became too heavy a political liability and was yanked by President Eisenhower and sent into the race for the Senate in Oregon against Senator WAYNE MORSE. It was said then that it would hamper Democrats to have their target thus pulled away on the eve of the campaign. But the removal of the administration scapegoat and shield also seems to have worked to the disadvantage of the administration by leaving the President and his White House operatives exposed and in line of fire. At least, that was the effect in the Hells Canyon fight.

Now the blame can be laid where it belonged all the time—on the President himself.

[From the East Oregonian of July 20, 1956]

THE HELLS CANYON DECISION

The effect of the Senate's decision on the bill that would have authorized Hells Canyon dam cannot be fully measured today or tomorrow. As of the present it is a great victory for the Republican party and the Eisenhower admiinstration. The New York Times reported that the White House exerted more pressure to defeat the bill than it has placed upon any piece of legislation since Mr. Eisenhower took office. Was it a victory that the party will want to point to with pride for all time or will it prove in time to be a very costly victory? Only time can tell.

Future generations will not ask who built what dams in the Columbia Basin. They will measure the effectiveness of those dams. Were they constructed to achieve best possible use of the water resources of the basin? That will be the test.

We know what the answer would be had little Kettle Falls Dam been constructed instead of big Grand Coulee. We expect the answer will be the same when future generations look at the "substitute" that was accepted for big Hells Canyon Dam.

The people who won the Hells Canyon fight made their case on an issue that seems to us as phony as a wooden nickel. They said it was private enterprise (Idaho Power Co.'s little dams) versus creeping socialism (the big Hells Canyon Dam). This removed for them the necessity of arguing which project would achieve best use of water resources and they could avoid any discussion of the findings of the Federal Power Commission's examiner, which were that the high dam was preferable. The saddest side of this sham was hearing men from the Northwest who hadn't spouted any such nonsense about Bonneville, Grand Coulee, McNary, and the Dalles Dams talking it about Hells Canyon.

This victory will encourage them, of course, to fight every proposed Federal dam in the Columbia basin henceforth. There are many projects that should be built to assure comprehensive development of the water resources of the region—projects that private utilities cannot build. But they won't be built as long as men in the region are dedicated to fighting Federal development without regard for the welfare of the region.

Hells Canyon has been lost. It is, for us, a bitter defeat. We must prepare ourselves to swallow some more. Other projects that would accomplish full development of the region's water resources will be sacrificed on the altar of politics.

The victory of those who opposed Hells Canyon is made of some heady stuff. If the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation and the 308 report, bible for basin development, can be rejected by merely crying "socialism," it is entirely possible we may have seen the end of Federal development in the basin.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times of July 20, 1956]

POLITICS KILLED HELLS CANYON

The lineup of votes in the defeat of the Federal Hells Canyon Dam bill in the Senate, Thursday, indicates conclusively that the 51 Senators who voted against it did so from political motivation. Either they heeded the Eisenhower call or, more likely, gave private power and other industry campaign fund sources what they wanted.

All but 3 Republicans—LANGER and YOUNG, of North Dakota, and WILEY, of Wisconsin—voted against the bill and 9 Democrats joined the majority. The interesting fact of the Democratic opposition was that 8 of the 9 Senators were from the deep South and the other was from New England— both areas which oppose development of the Northwest as an industrial competitor.

We must assume that because this bill was such an important one all or most of the 96 Senators were familiar with the pros and cons of the issue. This being so it would be impossible for them to vote against the bill without outside influence.

Everything points to the superiority of the high dam. Even assuming that all three low dams—Brownlee, Oxbow, and low Hells Canyon—were built, and there is much doubt that they will be, they could come nowhere

near providing the advantages of the high dam.

The whole core of the private dam advocates' argument is that we must have power now in the Northwest power pool. This argument is utterly destroyed by the strong probability that the power from the low dams never will go into the power pool. The estimated rate which Idaho Power will have to charge is between 2½ and 3 times as high as Bonneville Power's rate. Power from the low dams couldn't be marketed in the BPA area because of this huge rate discrepancy, unless the whole Northwest rate structure were boosted tremendously to accommodate Idaho Power.

By stretching the imagination to believe that the three dams will contribute to the pool, one still has to write them off in comparison with the potential power output of the high dam. Private power advocates quote misleading figures about the capacities of the high and low dams which indicate that they are nearly equal. But the figures which count are those showing what firm power would be—power available at all times, including periods of lowest water. These are the figures in which 12-month industries are interested.

They show that the high dam would have, counting downstream benefits to other dams, a firm output of 1,124,000 kilowatts compared with the low dams' output, under the same conditions, of 680,000 kilowatts. The difference between them is equal to the whole firm capacity of Bonneville Dam. The Northwest loses the equivalent of Bonneville by the defeat of the high dam bill. The limitation to industrial growth here because of this loss is immeasurable, but it could mean the difference between mediocrity and superiority for the Northwest.

Add the loss of storage water, 2.8 million feet of it, by construction of the low dams. Private power people glibly say that other dams in the area will make up the difference. They refer to such proposed dams as the Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs, which would choke off one of the finest salmon runs in the world and flood a vast forest land and winter range for elk and deer. The high dam would not have required such destruction of fish and wildlife to provide flood control.

Finally, take the item of cost to the taxpayers, an item which private power people have exploited to the hilt by quoting highly questionable construction figures and ignoring others.

Construction costs of $430 million for a high dam and $133 million for the three low dams are cited by these people. But a Bureau of Reclamation engineering report listed the costs at $331.6 million for the high dam and $311.2 for the low. The Federal Power Commission, packed by the administration, released respective figures of $388.6 million and $191.4 million.

What figures are we to believe? We don't have to believe any of them because we don't have to consider them. These two factors, deliberately ignored by private-power people, make the initial construction cost irrelevant—Federal receipts for sale of power and fast tax writeoff for Idaho Power Co.

Just as Bonneville Dam is doing, high Hells Canyon would have paid for itself over the years. When its cost had been fully amortized, the dam would have belonged to the people of the United States and all receipts thereafter would have been money added to the Treasury.

Idaho Power Co. will finance the dam with its own funds, yes, but with the added boost of $338 million in fast tax writeoffs, money that the Treasury will lose, as an incentive to private business. That $338 million is greater than some estimates for the whole cost of construction for the high dam. And when the dam is paid for, who will own it? Why, Idaho Power Co., of course.

At this point the high-sounding philosophy of good old American free enterprise enters the picture. Federal monopolies are wiping out free enterprise, ex-Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay tells us. He does not mention that private utilities now control 80 percent of the Nation's power resources. He says that "I hope I shall never live to see the day when the Nation's businessmen and farmers have to come, hat in hand, to the bureaucracy in Washington to get permission to use electric power to establish themselves or to expand their enterprises." He does not mention that those same businessmen and farmers will have to come, hand in hand, to Idaho Power Co. or to Electric Bond & Share Co. or to whomever (heaven only knows) really controls private power facilities in this country, and who can wield tremendous power over industry by favoring one or another select corporation.

Fifty-one United States Senators folded under the greatest political pressure that has ever been on many of them, and the Northwest and the country lost one of the finest dam sites in the world. This tragedy will stunt development of the country for decades to come. Right-thinking people should remember that when they get an opportunity to answer to this crime in November's elections.

SENATOR MORSE, OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the outstanding record in the Senate of the senior Senator from the State of Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is well known to Members of this body. It is also well known to citizens throughout the country, many of whom are showing an interest in informing the people of my home State of Oregon of the necessity of keeping the senior Senator from Oregon on duty in the Senate. An example of this sort of expression of support was printed recently in the letters column of an Oregon newspaper. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the editor in chief of one of America's leading publishing houses which appeared in the Medford (Oreg.) Main-Tribune of June 28, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM AN EX-OREGONIAN

TO THE EDITOR: As an ex-Oregonian I look with interest and affection on everything Oregon does and stands for. One of the things that pleases me most is to observe the activities of WAYNE MORSE in the Senate. He is a great rugged individualist from the same political stockpile that contributed Senator Borah, of Idaho, and Senator George Norris, of Nebraska. I hope Oregonians will keep this dedicated man at the business of representing a great State in our Senate.

KEN MCCORMICK,
Editor in Chief, Doubleday & Co.

OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last evening I was absent from the Chamber when the tributes were paid to the dean of the reporters, my friend, Jim Murphy.

I remember well in my first few weeks as Senator meeting Mr. Murphy and reminiscing with him about our mutual friends and relatives in Boston. His eldest son was living in Brookline, Massachusetts, and Mr. Murphy's grandchildren and my children played together at times at my home in Chestnut Hill.

He has helped me in my work in the Senate. He has clarified, by his able editing, many of my remarks and made clearer and more forceful by his editing what I was trying to say.

Always pleasant, always patient, never rattled, seemingly with time for all, he has been one of the forces in the background that has made the Senate function successfully as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

I join in congratulating him upon his fine record of service and thank him for his friendship.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I happened to be absent from the Senate yesterday when tributes were being paid to Mr. Murphy. When I returned I congratulated him personally. I wish to pay my tribute to his great service and to associate myself with the fine remarks which have been made concerning him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber yesterday when tributes were made to James W. Murphy, that great gentleman and accomplished official reporter of debates who helps us all so much. It would not be possible for me to operate without the assistance of Mr. Murphy. He tells me he must make considerably more changes in my remarks in the RECORD than he did in those of my father-in-law, the distinguished former Senator from New York, James W. Wadsworth, Jr.

I am very glad and proud at this time to express my deep appreciation to him for all his help.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening I stepped out of the Senate Chamber when nice things were said about James W. Murphy, our official reporter. I could not let this occasion go without expressing my appreciation for the life that is lived among us. From the first day I came into the Senate, 17½ years ago, he has had a smile and a gracious greeting for me, a Republican. In those days Republicans were scant articles.

There is a saying that men are rich only as they give. He who gives great service gets great returns. I was particularly impressed with the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] about Mr. Murphy, when he spoke of the dignity of the gentleman and how much individual Senators owed him for the errors of grammar he found in their remarks and corrected. I know he aided me in that way. However, I found James W. Murphy a philosopher and a wit. He not only enjoyed right ideas, but I found also that he liked good Wisconsin cheese which, of course, is another indication that he is a wise man of good taste. I know of no one who has served individual Senators, including myself, more helpfully than he has. A great public servant he has been and never missed an opportunity to aid and assist.

The desire for friendship is strong in every human heart. We all crave the companionship of those who have understanding. James W. Murphy has understanding, that is why he has been a friend to so many of us. I too join with my associates in hoping that he will be with the Senate many more years and continue to render the wonderful service he has given in the past.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, much to my regret, I was not available on the floor of the Senate yesterday evening when the fine resolution submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] drew a rising vote of thanks from the Members of the Senate for the excellent and long service rendered to this body by James W. Murphy, our Official Reporter.

I, too, wish to join my colleagues in congratulating Mr. Murphy on his 60th year of reporting in the United States Senate. It is of personal interest to me that Mr. Murphy began reporting debates in the United States Senate 11 days before I was born. At that time the Senators from South Carolina were the late Benjamin R. "Pitchfork" Tillman and John L. M. Irby. Were they here today I know that they would certainly wish to join us in thanking Mr. Murphy.

Since that day in 1896 when he began reporting and until today he has probably seen at first hand more history made than any other living American. I was delighted to see in the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] the fact that the great South Carolina son, Senator John C. Calhoun, in 1848, engaged the services of the first member of the Murphy family to begin the first official reporting of Senate debates and that this fine family since that time has continuously reported the Senate debates.

In my few years of service in the Senate Mr. Murphy has rendered invaluable service to me, and I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him.

ROCK CREEK PARK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, early in the life of this, the 84th Congress, I introduced a resolution which had as its purpose the prevention of the use of the length of Rock Creek Park for an expressway, thus depriving the Washington community of a considerable part of that magnificent park and recreation area available to this growing National Capital area.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor to be chairman. Extended hearings were held on the proposal, but no committee action has been taken or urged.

I rise to say that the fact that the committee has taken no action is in nowise an indication of willingness on the part of the committee or the Congress to let Rock Creek Park become the location of such highway development as has been proposed. There were sufficient reasons why no action seemed needed by the committee on the resolution.

In the first place, while there was a real threat to a use other than that intended under law for Rock Creek Park, there developed evidence that the plan for a highway in Rock Creek Park in Maryland down to the District portion of the park was being abandoned. This apparent abandonment would seem to indicate that there was recognition that perhaps existing law clearly forbid the use of the park for such superhighways as were contemplated, and that further legislation was not necessary to insure preservation of the park to its intended purposes.

The National Park Service has clearly indicated an uncompromising opposition to the loss of Rock Creek Park to accommodate expressways or highways other than of the nature that now exist therein. I doubt that there is need for legislation beyond what is now on the statute books to guard this great park and preserve it. But should there be continuing threat to its loss to highways I will be found reintroducing my resolution next January and pressing for whatever steps seem to be required to make certain that Rock Creek Park will not be lost to the people and the Nation in order to satisfy roadbuilding appetites.

HOW SAFE IS THE POULTRY YOU EAT?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Daily News carried an item which said:

> Health officials in Ypsilanti, Mich., said the sudden fever and nausea that hospitalized 40 eastern Michigan college students was "Salmonella murium," caused by infected poultry, and is very distressing, but almost never fatal.

Poultry dishes are responsible for from one-fourth to one-third of nonmilk, food-borne illnesses in the United States. Occurrences such as the Michigan affair are frequent. Tragically, some poultry-borne disease outbreaks, such as psittacosis, result in fatalities. Such an outbreak only recently took three lives in Oregon.

One of the things that this Congress has failed to do is enact a compulsory poultry inspection bill which would require poultry and poultry products moving in interstate commerce to meet the same sort of standards for wholesomeness and purity that red meats and other foods and drugs are required to meet. Consumers and poultry workers must still wait a while for protection against the flow of filth and disease which some poultry plants are sending to market.

This is a matter that must have early attention of the new Congress. A bill must be passed which will provide real protection—not a bill watered down by processor pressure to the point that inspection becomes only an aid to marketing for the processors.

Eventually the poultry processing industry is going to accept inspection comparable to red meat inspection, with decent standards of wholesomeness and an enforcible penalties provision. It is unfortunate for reputable processors, for consumers, for workers in the processing plants, and for poultry producers, that an adequate bill was not passed this year.

One of the results of the delay is inevitably going to be increasing publicity about salmonella outbreaks, psittacosis outbreaks, and the unreliability of the wholesomeness and fitness of poultry and poultry products in the market place.

I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, an article which appears in the August issue of Redbook magazine entitled "How Safe Is the Poultry You Eat?" Besides appearing in the magazine, I learn the article is being distributed by thousands in pamphlet form.

I want to commend the authors of the story, Ruth and Edward Brecher, a distinguished team of science writers, and the publisher and editors of Redbook for the article's excellence and forthrightness. I believe they have done a distinct public service in writing and publishing How Safe Is the Poultry You Eat? The public is entitled to the facts.

I regret that such articles need to be printed. They will undoubtedly continue in the months just ahead, and they will do undeserved harm to poultry producers and reputable processors, the great majority, because a minority of unprogressive processors succeeded in blocking a bill in this Congress.

It is my sincere hope that it will not take another book like Upton Sinclair's The Jungle, which brought on red meat inspection in 1906, to get adequate poultry inspection, but that a proper bill can be passed quickly when the 85th Congress convenes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the August issue of Red Book.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW SAFE IS THE POULTRY YOU EAT?

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

(This article is the result of months of painstaking investigation. The facts are not pleasant. But to protect your family's health, you must know them and what to do about them.)

It happens in many families. No doubt it happens occasionally in yours.

For company dinner you serve roast chicken complete with stuffing, and everyone remarks how delicious it tastes. But a few hours later, one of the children complains of feeling sick at his stomach. He runs a fever, develops stomach cramps and suffers from diarrhea—perhaps also headache and vomiting. Soon another member of your family falls ill, and then another.

According to reports forwarded each week by State health officials to the United States Public Health Service: Somewhere between one-fourth and one-third of all foodborne disease outbreaks investigated in the United States during the past few years have been associated with poultry or poultry dishes.

Sworn affidavits from poultry-plant employees—members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, an AFL-CIO union—have been collected as part of the union's drive to clean up poultry processing throughout the country. They describe conditions so revolting that we wouldn't ask you to read about them if your own health did not depend on learning the facts and if your support were not needed for local, State and Federal cleanup efforts. Here is a typical affidavit:

"My name is Ruth V——— and I am a resident of ———. A large percentage of the chickens processed at this plant during the past year were sick. * * * I also processed many chickens that were full of worms. * * * They were very much alive. * * * When I asked the supervisors what to do about these chickens, I was told to scrape them out and send them on down the line."

Another affidavit describes chickens with scabs or sores on their bodies and then adds: "After taking the skin or cutting the sores

off, I would pack them in boxes and see them loaded on trucks to be taken to market. Others would have different parts that had turned green and would have the green parts cut off and the rest of the carcass would be packed and loaded for market."

Perhaps you think that this doesn't concern you, since the poultry you buy is obviously in fine condition. But don't be too sure. Even a chicken or turkey in the prime of health at the moment of slaughter may be seriously—and invisibly—contaminated by the time it leaves the slaughtering plant.

"In far too many plants," says Dr. Oscar Sussman, chief veterinarian of the New Jersey State Department of Public Health, "sick poultry and well poultry are handled by the same employees, scalded in the same pots, cut open on the same tables and chilled in the same vats, so that even though only 1 chicken in a hundred is infected to begin with, the whole hundred may be shipped to market carrying any one of some 26 diseases which are shared by man and bird.

MODERN METHODS DO NOT INSURE SOUND POULTRY

The story behind this national poultry scandal should interest all housewives—but particularly the younger generation. Older women can still remember, of course, the days when they purchased poultry alive, or at least with the head and insides still intact. Housewives in those days used to examine a bird carefully before buying it and knew how to make their selection on the basis of external good health. Later, at home, they inspected the liver, gizzard and other internal organs. If they saw signs of disease, the bird went back to the butcher. But the young housewife today has no such safeguard. Most of the poultry she buys is "ready to cook." Although this is an excellent way of buying if the poultry is healthy originally and is processed under sanitary conditions, it permits and even encourages the marketing of infected carcasses.

Fortunately, there are methods by which you can protect your family from poultry-borne infections—simple methods which you can apply in your own kitchen, but which are known to few young housewives today. We want to tell you about these methods and also about proposals for assuring that poultry is clean and safe to eat before it reaches your kitchen.

For 50 years now it has been illegal to ship beef, pork, lamb, or other red-meat products in interstate commerce unless they have been slaughtered under sanitary conditions and inspected by Government veterinarians. Many States also have compulsory meat-inspection laws. The results have been excellent; housewives throughout the country buy meat with confidence.

But when the meat-inspection laws were being passed, the poultry business was still relatively small, and poultry was not included under the laws.

True, there is a Government inspection service. But this inspection is voluntary rather than compulsory, and must be paid for by the poultry processor. Only those conscientious companies that are willing to pay the costs have Government inspectors on duty.

The result is that reliable companies use the voluntary inspection service, but the unscrupulous and unsanitary companies—the ones most in need of inspection—ship their poultry uninspected. Less than one-fourth of the poultry marketed in the United States today has been subjected to Federal inspection.

Even 20 years ago the problem was not too serious since poultry was for the most part slaughtered and processed on a relatively small scale. Then, during World War II, shortages of beef and pork tremendously expanded the market for ready-to-cook poultry. As compared with 143 million broilers marketed in 1940, more than 1 billion were marketed last year. We now eat nearly 7 billion pounds of poultry a year for which we pay about $4 billion.

For a closer look at the conditions under which some of our poultry is processed today, consider this description of one large poultry plant visited in 1955 by inspectors from the veterinary meat inspection division of the city of Newark, N. J.:

"Receiving platform—accumulation of manure and dead chickens * * * weighing scales unsanitary with accumulation of rust and cobwebs. * * * Wooden feeding troughs have accumulation of dirt, cobwebs and rusted pipes. * * * Sewer gutters contain an accumulation of stagnant waters and waste materials. * * * Accumulation of feathers strewn over floor. * * * Undigested food from chicken crops allowed to contaminate poultry. * * * Poultry not cleaned and washed prior to chilling. * * * No sterilizing facilities. * * * No suitable outer garments worn by most employees." Into such plants as these come sick chickens as well as healthy ones—and these are the very plants that lack Government inspection services.

The plants of reputable poultry processors, on the other hands, are marvels of efficiency, as well as sanitation. A farmer knows better than to ship sick poultry to these well-managed plants, for visibly unhealthy birds may be rejected at the doors. Each step in the processing is carried out under scrupulously sanitary conditions designed to prevent cross-contamination from one bird to another.

Before plucking, for example, the birds are scalded in a tank through which flows an adequate supply of fresh hot water. Better yet, hot water is sprayed on each bird individually. The birds are not cut open and drawn on a common table, but rather each bird is drawn on an individual tray which is cleaned and disinfected before reuse; or else the birds are hung on hooks and opened while hanging. A vacuum cleaner may be used to clean out the abdominal cavity, and the birds are washed inside and out with clean running water after evisceration. The final chilling, too, is performed by individual spraying rather than by immersion in a common vat.

Most important of all, a trained United States Department of Agriculture inspector stands over the processing line to inspect each bird and its internal organs as it passes by. Guided by Federal inspection standards, he occasionally reaches down and confiscates a bird whose liver looks suspicious or whose lungs show signs of disease. When the processing is completed, the birds that have passed inspection are packed in a sanitary manner, stamped with an emblem reading "Inspected for Wholesomeness—U. S." and safely transported to your butcher shop.

"At its best," says New Jersey's Dr. Sussman, "this system of preparing ready-to-cook poultry and canned poultry products is as safe as human ingenuity can devise. Poultry is a wonderful food. I eat lots of it myself. The only problem is that the average housewife, shopping in the average butcher shop, has less than one chance in four of getting an inspected bird prepared in this sanitary way."

The safest products of all, health officials agree, are canned poultry, canned poultry soups and other canned products generally. The large canners exercise many precautions to maintain the safety and quality of their products and, if one infected chicken should slip through their safeguards, the canning process assures that no harm will result. Safe also are various precooked "chicken dinner" products sold in frozen form. With these, too, the heat used in processing before the food reaches you assures safety when you buy. Fresh or frozen poultry, if healthy in the first place and if processed, stored and transported under sanitary conditions, is an excellent foodstuff and one which need cause no concern. In contrast to all such properly processed chickens are the so-called "New York-dressed" chickens, a type of poultry which most public health officials agree should long ago have been banned. To "New York-dress" a bird, you simply slit its throat and pluck the feathers. There is no way of telling whether the internal organs of the bird are healthy or not, since the carcass remains unopened. In this unsanitary condition the birds may be stored for considerable periods, or shipped from place to place, at varying temperatures, until they reach your meat market.

It's true that New York-dressed chickens are often chilled or frozen before transportation, but cooling procedures may actually add to the hazard.

"Perhaps the most objectionable of these procedures," says Dr. Joe W. Atkinson of the United States Public Health Service, "is that of cooling a large number of uneviscerated carcasses together in a tank or vat of water or ice-water slush. So far no satisfactory means have been devised for preventing leakage of fecal matter (bowel contents) from the vents of the carcasses during cooling, which usually requires from 2 to 6 hours. The water thus becomes contaminated by any diseased birds which are in the tank."

Don't assume you can avoid this hazard merely by refusing to buy poultry which is obviously New York dressed when you see it at your butcher's. Some butchers buy New York-dressed birds, process them in the back room and then display them as "ready to cook." Worse yet, many chickens are New York dressed initially and are then shipped to another processing plant where they are thawed, eviscerated, inspected, awarded the "Inspected for Wholesomeness—U. S." label and sent on to your butcher.

Several reputable poultry firms refuse to handle New York-dressed birds. The top level conference of State and Territorial health officers recommended last November that the interstate shipment of New York dressed poultry be banned.

Would such a law be practical? The answer is clearly "yes." Some 70 percent of our chickens are eviscerated immediately after slaughter today; there is no good reason why the remaining 30 percent should not be similary processed.

What are the diseases most likely to be transmitted from infected poultry to man?

A form of intestinal infection called salmonellosis is by far the most common. The American Public Health Association describes salmonellosis as "an acute diarrheal disorder with abdominal cramps a familiar symptom. Fever, nausea, and vomiting are frequently present. * * * Epidemics are usually traced to improperly prepared foodstuffs, particularly roast fowl."

Food poisoning caused by two kinds of germs known as staphylococci and streptococci comes next in frequency. Food poisoning often occurs even though no germs enter the human body alive, for these germs can produce a highly potent toxin which remains in the food. When you eat the food, you suffer symptoms which the American Public Health Association describes as "sometimes violent, with severe nausea, vomiting, and prostration; severe diarrhea in some cases." Even cooking the food thoroughly does not always prevent this type of food poisoning, for unlike the germs themselves, the toxins produced by the germs are very resistant to heat.

In addition to salmonellosis and food poisoning, some two dozen other diseases are shared in common by man and poultry. Several of these constitute a considerable risk for the workers who slaughter, process, and handle poultry. Fortunately, however, these diseases are not ordinarily carried to the consumer who buys eviscerated poultry.

The United States Department of Agriculture has two programs designed to improve

the poultry situation—a sanitation program and an inspection program. Both are voluntary, which means that only companies wanting the services and willing to pay for them are covered. The sanitation program involves the placement in a processing plant of a so-called sanitarian, who is in theory a representative of the Government.

The sanitation program was not established, however, under laws designed to protect the consumer. Rather, this is a service to aid the marketing of farm products. Public health officials cite many reasons why the presence of a sanitarian in a plant is no substitute for actual poultry inspection.

In the first place, the sanitarian is concerned only with the cleanliness of the plant in which the birds are slaughtered. The birds themselves may have been dying of any one of a number of diseases at the time of slaughter; that is no business of his.

Moreover, although the sanitarians are in theory representatives of the United States Government, many of them are not Government officials at all, but rather employees of the company they are supposed to regulate. Worse yet, the "Government sanitarian" responsible for policing a plant may actually be one of the owners of that plant.

The shortcomings of the Department of Agriculture sanitation program are well illustrated by the case of a large New Jersey poultry company we'll call X company, which is equipped to slaughter as many as 13,000 chickens daily.

On May 2, 1955, X company and the 2 brothers who owned it pleaded guilty to a charge of shipping unfit poultry from New Jersey to Pennsylvania. Before the court passed sentence on them, a Government official informed the judge of the company's past record.

Back in June 1952, 3 crates of poultry shipped by the company into New York City had been seized. "That shipment," the Government official declared, "contained a considerable number of birds decomposed and diseased, so much so that the shipment was classed as garbage."

Three months later, there was "another instance of unfit poultry having left the defendants' plant. * * *"

On September 29, 1953, moreover, 2 inspectors visited the X company plant, "and there again they found poultry in the defendants' plant that was unfit for use, for human consumption."

Yet another 866 pounds of X company poultry was seized in June 1954, and on June 10 the company plant was once again inspected. "At the time of that inspection," the official testified, both brothers "were present and were warned again, and evidence of sick and diseased birds was found on the premises.

"At that time it was suggested that they not accept into their plant birds obviously sick and unfit * * * but they indicated their desire to secure a greater amount of poundage in their killing operation through allowing many such birds to go through."

Yet throughout this period X company was supposedly operating under the United States Department of Agriculture sanitation program, with a Government sanitarian on duty. Who was he? None other than the vice president of the company—one of the brothers who pleaded guilty on May 2, 1955, to the charge of shipping unfit poultry.

The X Company case was initiated by the United States Food and Drug Administration, which might be called our last line of defense against unfit poultry. The FDA has a general responsibility for policing food, drug and cosmetic products in interstate commerce, and its field staff checks poultry along with thousands of other items. This agency is seriously undermanned; the total time it can devote to poultry policing from coast to coast is approximately the equivalent of six full-time inspectors. Just to visit each poultry plant in the country once, the FDA estimates, would take the available staff 3 or 4 years.

The understaffing of the Food and Drug Administration makes another poultry hazard more prevalent. Many farmers in recent years have been "caponizing" their male chickens, turkeys and ducks by implanting a pellet of a sex hormone called stilbestrol in the necks of the birds while they are still young. This hormone temporarily converts the male birds into eunuchs, so that they put on weight more rapidly and reach the market in a plumper condition.

The hazards of this process were first publicized when the owners of a mink farm reported that their mink had stopped producing young mink as expected. Investigation showed that the male mink on the farm had become sterile after eating poultry heads and necks in which stilbestrol tablets had been implanted. Stilbestrol is a highly potent hormone which causes sex changes in humans as well as animals and birds.

The Food and Drug Administration, after studying the problem, concluded that poultry caponized by stilbestrol pellets is safe for human consumption if the pellet is placed high upon the bird's neck so that it will be cut off with the head. Unfortunately, however, farmers are not veterinarians. It's easy to slip the pellet into some other part of the bird.

To minimize the danger of stilbestrol in the poultry we eat, FDA insectors examined poultry shipments and seized birds that were improperly caponized. These seizures were publicized in an effort to warn farmers of the risks. No human illness traceable to stilbestrol in poultry has yet been reported. Even so, it is unfortunate, to say the least, that the Government agency responsible for safeguarding the public from this hazard is so seriously handicapped.

Your most reliable guide to safe poultry today, unquestionably, is the "Inspected for Wholesomeness—U. S." label on each bird you buy. Much of the poultry bearing this label is as lean and safe as any housewife could expect. Even so, the standards used in inspecting this poultry fall considerably short of what public health officials recommend.

In the first place, under current standards the United States Department of Agriculture inspector seldom gets to see the birds until after they have been slaughtered, scalded, and plucked. By then any infection brough in by sick birds may have contaminated the processing line. Moreover, there are some sick birds that can be easily spotted while they are still alive, but whose carcasses may look normal after slaughtering. A reliable inspection system must provide for examination of the birds before as well as after death.

Next, the present standards do not take sufficient account of possible cross-contamination of healthy birds by infected birds. Companies that fail to take adequate precautions may still get the "Inspected for Wholesomeness—U.S." label.

Equally dangerous is the willingness of the Department of Agriculture to permit a plant to operate under inspection on some days or during certain hours, but to operate without inspection at other times. Thus unfit poultry can be killed, processed, and shipped during the hours when the inspector is not on duty.

In the past, Government inspectors have been expected to check as many as 1,200 birds per hour, or 1 every 3 seconds. That seems like a rapid enough rate for inspecting a bird and its internal organs. Yet, within the past few years, Department of Agriculture procedures have been changed to permit an even more rapid flow of birds past the inspector.

Despite such glaring faults, there is no doubt that the present inspection system does some good and that you're wise to insist on poultry bearing the "Inspected for Wholesomeness—U.S." stamp. During a recent year for example, Federal inspectors condemned almost 2 million birds weighing almost 7 million pounds.

Eliminating these birds was obviously a worthwhile effort. But, remember, less than one-quarter of the poultry actually marked is inspected at all. The unfit chickens processed each year by uninspected plants may well add up to tens of millions of pounds.

What must be done to clean up this poultry mess?

Four major reforms are currently under consideration.

First of all, it is proposed that all poultry shipped in interstate commerce must be inspected. In other words, poultry should be raised to the status of other meat products.

Compulsory inspection is supported by representatives of the reputable poultry processors themselves, such as the Institute of American Poultry Industries. It is also supported by such consumer-minded organizations as the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the American Association of University Women. The principle of compulsory inspection has recently been accepted also by such farmer groups as the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Farmers' Union. Indeed, during Senate committee hearings held in May 1956 compulsory inspection was even approved by the United States Department of Agriculture. Compulsory poultry inspection may be described as the minimum reform on which almost everybody is agreed except the less reputable poultry processors.

The Amalgamated Meat Cutters Union and many public health officials believe, however, that compulsory inspection alone is not enough. These groups are urging three additional changes:

1. Transferring the inspection service from the Department of Agriculture to the United States Food and Drug Administration. The Department of Agriculture is—and should be—the farmer's and marketer's friend, not the consumer's watchdog. The FDA, in contrast, is there to safeguard the public's health.

2. Requiring antemortem as well as postmortem inspection of all poultry.

3. Charging the cost of inspection to the Government rather than to the individual processing plants. This is simple justice as well as good sense. When the company pays for the inspector, it may well expect a voice in the way his services are performed. Many of the current flaws can be traced to the fact that, if an inspector really gets tough, the company can discontinue the service.

Several bills designed to make inspection compulsory, both antemortem and postmortem, and to place poultry inspection under the Food and Drug Administration, have come up recently before Congress. These bills are supported by the AFL–CIO, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, the Association of Food and Drug Officials, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs. If you agree that these changes are essential to safeguard the public health, write your Senators and Congressman in support of this legislation.

The Federal Government, of course, can regulate only poultry that crosses State lines, and approximately half of all poultry is eaten within the State in which it is raised and slaughtered. Yet compulsory Federal inspection, most authorities agree, is the most important step in solving the problem, for two reasons.

In the first place, Federal inspection can be made applicable to all poultry processed in a plant that ships any of its poultry from State to State. Thus, much intrastate poultry would benefit from compulsory Federal inspection.

Second, regulation of the purely intrastate plants by State action would be relatively simple once the big problem of interstate poultry plants was solved. Today, a State health department is greatly handicapped in efforts to clean up its small intrastate plants because plants in neighboring States continue to ship uninspected poultry into the State in competition with local poultry.

A few States and cities have already established inspection services. To help others, the United States Public Health Service has recently published a model ordinance describing poultry sanitation standards that can be enforced by any State or city, and it is currently working on a similar model poultry inspection ordinance. If you want this kind of protection for your community, urge your State and city officials to adopt these two ordinances.

Poultry is a nutritious food that deserves a frequent place on your family menu. For that very reason, it is especially important that all poultry reaching the market be processed under sanitary conditions and competently inspected for wholesomeness and safety.

Although the poultry situation is shockingly bad today, there are ways of protecting yourself and your family from the conditions we have described. You can press for better inspection and control of poultry on the national, State, and local levels. And, by following the rules outlined on page 33, you can play safe in your kitchen even while unsafe poultry is being sold in the stores.

CONFLICTING ADMINISTRATION STATEMENTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there are many Republicans these days who can sympathize with our would-be foreign friends who find it difficult to determine our position out of conflicting administration statements.

Mr. Nehru and others have had the riddle of whether Stassen or Dulles correctly stated the United States position on neutralism.

Republicans now have the problem of whether President Eisenhower's personal assistant, Harold Stassen, or Republican Chairman Len Hall has correctly stated the White House position on the Republican vice presidential nominee.

Both situations illustrate the confusion and the vacuum of positive leadership characteristic of the present administration of which former Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois spoke at the Democratic State convention in Denver, Colo., on July 20.

Governor Stevenson's address is an excellent analysis of this leadership vacuum and of the circus techniques now being put into motion to conceal the absence of real leadership from the voters during the coming campaign. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stevenson's address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON TO THE COLORADO STATE CONVENTION, BOULDER, COLO., JULY 20, 1956

It is always a pleasure for me to come to Colorado—partly because of the fresh, clear air and the beautiful mountains, and partly too because I always find so many lively and alert Democrats. This year you have even been spared the Republican invasion of recent summers.

When you took over the governorship 2 years ago, I said it was just the beginning of a Democratic renaissance in Colorado. I welcome the opportunity today to salute the man who blazed the trail—your great Governor, Ed Johnson.

And this year you are going to take over the first of your two seats in the United States Senate. I find it hard to think of two better men than your leading candidates for the senatorial nomination—Charles Brannan and John Carroll. (How useful it would be if some way could be worked out for Colorado to lend-lease its surplus political talent to one of our more underdeveloped States.)

The whole country needs a strong Colorado Democrat in the Senate next year. I can't imagine what better gift you could make—to the Democratic administration in Washington next January.

I make this confident prediction in full realization of the difficulties we face this year as a political party. Of course, there are difficulties. There always are. And I want to talk with you today about some of them.

The first is complacency, the national mood of complacency which has been created so skillfully by the present administration. Instead of informing us about our grim realities and our great opportunities, we get soothing lullabies about peace, prosperity, and progress. Instead of information we get propaganda. Even the Presidency has been used to reassure rather than educate. And a sugar diet leads to fatty degeneration.

And we haven't seen anything yet. Indeed, the heaviest barrage in political history is in the making to obscure a little longer—to the election if possible—a continuing failure of leadership in Washington that can prove disastrous. For if we continue to mark time in the face of historic change, if we remain stalled in the middle of the road, we may well wake up a generation hence to discover that the great social and political revolution of our times has passed us by, that we have lost the great struggle of the 20th century, that we have lost the cold war without firing a shot, that we are indeed no longer a dynamic, creative force in the world—a great Nation.

This, as I see it, is the great hazard of this election year. And the Republicans have the means of obscuring the leadership vacuum. They have the money. They will have the newspaper ads, and of course, the editorials. They will have the billboards, the leaflets, the radio and TV time and the big advertising agencies. With the aid of highly paid professional experts, the GOP appeal to relax and be thankful is being script-written like a sales campaign.

Did you read in the papers out here about the unveiling in Madison Square Garden last week of the Eisenhower 30-ton bandwagons—6 of them—and the dress rehearsal of how they will appear up and down the streets of America from September 1 to election day—with barrage balloons, searchlights, horses, and girls.

It's small wonder that Ringling Bros. and all the circuses have had to fold their tents this year, in the face of that kind of competition.

But bread and circuses are not enough. They couldn't save the Romans that way, and they can't save the Republicans. Money talks, but the allegiance of the American people is not for sale. Besides, it has become apparent for all to see that the Republicans are hopelessly divided, and that the President they all cynically call upon to lead the country, even the world, does not even lead his own party. In the last few days we have seen his party reject his views on school aid, foreign trade, and foreign aid, the keystone of his foreign policy.

The fact is that we have peace today because of our policy of strength and because President Truman and Secretary Acheson had the courage to do the unpopular thing and stand and fight in Korea. And insofar as peace is endangered today it is because the firm, purposeful, and sensible Voice of America is confused, contradictory, and an object of indifference, ridicule, and even contempt in many parts of the non-Communist world. Witness the recent absurd contradictions between the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State about neutralism and the morality of uncommitted nations—only the last of a long, humiliating series. The coalition of non-Communists was based on consent (unlike the Soviet-satellite coalition) and that consent is being withdrawn as confidence decreases. Peace is the great American aim, and the voters are asked to decide which party is best qualified to serve that aim. They are not going to decide on the basis of bandwagons and ballyhoo if they understand what's happened to America's world position in a few short years.

And if we are to restore a people's Government to the people we must also make it a lot clearer what we mean by "single interest government," by "big business government." There is nothing immoral about business, even big business. In one sense the business of America is business—that is, enterprise and efficiency and creating more comforts for more people.

What we mean is that the Eisenhower administration has granted opportunities for the few to profit at the expense of the many. I don't suppose we can any longer mention the Dixon-Yates contract which Mr. Eisenhower thought so well of not long ago and his Department of Justice now says was quite illegal.

But the examples are numerous—taxation policy, the use and the misuse of our natural resources, the use and misuse of our power potentials—electric or atomic. Likewise, the reluctance of this big business-minded Government to invest in public welfare—in homes we can afford to buy and keep; in medical services to keep us well and save us from financial disaster; in schools and teachers numerous enough and good enough; in farms we can afford to work, etc.

We can put it this way: the Eisenhower administration has wasted our opportunities for consolidating and expanding America's humanitarian and peaceful influence abroad, and for expanding the opportunities of the American people at home. Abroad the reservoir of good will once so full has sprung dangerous leaks. At home the reservoir of opportunity is at low watermark.

It is not only farmers who suffer from droughts; it is not only the small businessman who is withering. There is a drought in Washington—a drying up of the vision of our national capabilities.

Think of the opportunities that lie before us—for spiritual independence, for cultural growth, for freedom of thought and expression, for the use of our resources, for collaboration for peace with other nations. Instead we mark time and drift—and with an election coming on our Republican friends tell us "All is well; there are no issues."

Well, we won't quarrel with them for converting to their own use the principles or policies which were worked out under the bold leadership of Roosevelt and Truman. After all, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery and an administration that has no ideas of its own has the right, even the duty, to adopt those of a party that does. And after nearly 4 years of stumbling and fumbling we know those policies are not only good, but nearly foolproof.

I say that the issues are whether this country is going to go to sleep or go to work to meet its dark perils and bright prospects; whether we expect leadership or showmanship from our Government; whether we want talk or action; and whether we the people are going to decide for ourselves—or leave

up to a board of directors—what is good for us.

I say that there is a vacuum of executive direction in Washington; that this administration is living on borrowed time and on borrowed policies which are wearing out; that the Republican Party is hopelessly divided on domestic policy and even more so on foreign policy; that our Government is leaderless in fact and in principle in a time of acute peril. I say that there is no substitute for a President. I say that the ship of state badly needs vision on the bridge and a hand on the rudder.

In short, I say that to arrest this deadly drift the country sorely needs new executive management—and that means a Democratic victory in November.

Then we can resume once more the long journey to the Democratic goal of equal justice under the law in a nation in which free men should manage their own lives, each as he sees fit, free from fear of the secret police and free from fear of the lords of the money market. And it was not for ourselves that we sought this goal. It was also that this Nation may continue to stand, as it has stood for so long, as a "beacon to mankind."

It is this purpose that our opponents do not understand. Their materialism, their complacency, their blindness, have so shaken the confidence of the rest of the world in American leadership that our friends are anxious and our defenses against communism are crumbling. At home they have ignored the farmer, ignored the worker, ignored the small-business man.

Some of you, I am told, are farmers. Two weeks ago today I was in the dry areas of the Corn Belt in Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. Everywhere were the evidences of the new farm depression. Many a livestock man told me that with prices falling and costs inflexible or rising they were worse off than in the depression of the thirties. And the saddest thing of all was the spreading failure among the young farmers who started after the war and whose slender resources are now exhausted.

And President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have watched the farm depression expand during the past few years with a philosophic calm. But now they have adopted the Democratic idea of a soil bank. I don't know whether it was the word "bank" or the coming election that softened them up. They have even left off their preaching about the moral depravity of fixed price supports. It wasn't long ago that Democratic proposals of 90-percent supports were denounced as demogoguery and worse. But when the President proclaimed some price supports at 86 percent of parity—in an election year—that was principle. Evidently the difference between principle and demagoguery is 4 percent in this hound's-tooth administration, and the President who was applauded as a man of firm principles and flexible prices when he started has got around to flexible principles and firm prices—in an election year.

Actually, I used to wonder if Mr. Eisenhower didn't get parity and par mixed up—86 sounds so much better than 90 as a golf score.

To summarize my views on the farm situation would tax your patience, but I must add that in the recent book on the Eisenhower administration it says that at a Cabinet meeting last October that great agricultural expert, George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, said that he questioned whether much could be done about the farm problem, "except," as he put it, "to let natural processes do their work."

It was such unctuous words—let natural processes do their work—in another Republican administration that condemned the farmers to years of bleak and grinding poverty back in the twenties after the first war.

Well, I believe sometimes in letting natural processes do their work too. And I believe that natural processes will soon restore to Washington those of us who believe in the farmer—and believe in helping the farmer to help himself.

The vacuum of leadership is not confined to economic matters—on which President Eisenhower has said he is "conservative." This vacuum has proved even more ominous in the area of human freedom—where the President lays verbal claim to being "liberal."

If America is about anything, it is about the liberty of the individual. How has the Eisenhower-Nixon administration handled this precious responsibility?

First the President sat passively by while Senator McCARTHY conducted his campaign against freedom, terrorizing the Government, assailing the Foreign Service and the Army, and doing his general best to shoot up the town.

Then the President sat passively by while NIXON and other prominent colleagues shouted about all the Communists, fellow travelers and security risks they had cleaned out of the Government. But it turned out that there were no Communists and that they themselves had hired half the so-called security risks.

Then the President sat passively by while his Vice President tried by innuendo to cast a veil of disloyalty over the opposition party in the 1954 campaign. You in Colorado have good reason to remember Mr. NIXON'S contributions to that campaign, his vicious assaults on John Carroll and the unspeakable full-page ads that this self-righteous bunch published all over Colorado. But did I say that the President sat passively by? I am wrong; he sent the Vice President a letter of commendation at the very height of NIXON'S ill-will tour.

In the same way, the President has sat passively by while America has wrestled with the anguished problem of racial segregation and civil rights. Here, I said last February, is an area where prestige of the Presidential office could put to active, positive use—to help restore communication between the reasonable people of both sides, and to further our full understanding that the current of freedom and equality sweeping across the world is inexorable and irreversible, and that what is right is also law. Yet, while this great test of our moral maturity shakes the Nation, no word, no guidance has come from the White House.

Inertia is the rule across the board. But there is no executive pressure, no party coherence, no Presidential leadership.

Indecision is passed off as wisdom, postponement as statesmanship, stagnation as progress in this cynical attempt to conceal the vacuum of leadership behind a barrage of propaganda, deception, and ballyhoo.

The Republican formula is simple—it is pabulum on the Potomac.

And against the Republican cult of showmanship there stands the calm and traditional confidence of the Democratic Party that the American people can be trusted to act intelligently when they are told the truth.

This was the real secret of our 20 years' tenure of power. Against the massed power of nearly all the money in the country, nearly all the agencies of propaganda in the country, and all the disaffected and disgruntled people in the country, we won 5 successive elections. The string of victories was not broken until the Republican Party masked its purposes behind a great national hero in whom that party leadership did not believe and whom it had no intention of supporting.

To explain our success, the Republicans have built up one of the most curious myths in political history. Ignoring the obvious, they have evolved a theory that it was some sort of diabolical magic, all done with mirrors and sleight of hand. They will not, they cannot accept the truth that all the magic lay in having the courage to tell the people the plain truth. That courage, and that alone, comprised the witchcraft of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

But to have the courage to tell the people the truth you must believe in the people. You must believe that, if they are given the facts, they will make an intelligent decision. The party of privilege has never believed this—from Alexander Hamilton to Charles E. Wilson, George Humphrey, and the Eisenhower Cabinet—men so rich we are supposed to conclude they must be wise.

If you believe that you can manage the people better than they can manage themselves, you never can understand men like Roosevelt and Truman.

More than that, you can never understand America.

How ridiculous it all is—that our Nation, on the verge of its greatest and most exciting future, should stand uncertain and hesitant, mired in the materialism and complacency of its leadership.

Woodrow Wilson once stated the whole program of the Democratic Party in a phrase. Its destiny, he said, was to release the generous energies of our people.

This is our challenge. We must break the logjam. We must end the stagnation. We must cut the bonds that tie us to the ground.

There is work to be done. There is a chance for youth and vigor and imagination to provide the leadership which America and the world so desperately need. The slogans of yesterday, whether the slogans of liberalism or the slogans of conservatism, are not adequate to the crisis of today. In the spirit of this great convention, we must strike out on new roads, moving forward together toward freedom, toward abundance, and toward peace.

America was not born to stand still. It was born to move steadily ahead—to demonstrate to all the world the power of freemen and the meaning of freedom.

Let us start today. We have no time to waste. And the first milestone will be a Democratic victory in November.

FINAL TESTIMONY BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AIR FORCE OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, only last week final testimony was taken by the Senate Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

All that testimony has not yet been finally cleared by the Department of Defense; and therefore cannot be printed for some time.

For these and other reasons it would seem inadvisable for the committee now to submit a report to the full committee and the Congress.

In a sense the published testimony itself can be considered an interim report.

I desire to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the four other members of the subcommittee for their courtesy and cooperation in conjunction with the conduct of these hearings.

At this time also, for myself and all other members of the subcommittee, I especially want to thank its distinguished counsel, Mr. Fowler Hamilton, of New York.

Prior to the close of the hearings the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] stated:

I think our counsel, Mr. Fowler Hamilton, the counsel of the committee, has done a fine job in giving us all the facts. * * * Mr.

Chairman, may I just add, as I stated about the counsel a while ago, I believe the chairman chose his counsel and assistant counsel wisely and I commend the chairman in that.

Likewise, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] stated:

I would like to join in the commendation of the counsel. I think he has conducted himself with great fairness and ability and impartiality all through these hearings and I think he deserves the highest praise for the way he has conducted himself.

Mr. President, in the years I have been in Washington I have never seen a more outstanding job than that done by the able lawyer in question; and I am sure the American people will ever be grateful for his wise guidance throughout these hearings.

The record itself constitutes a permanent monument to his tolerance, his tact, his energy, and his extraordinary ability.

Both his bearing and conduct, as well as that of his fine assistant counsel, Mr. Ramsay Potts, were in the best tradition of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Missouri in his expressions concerning the counsel of the subcommittee, and I might add the name of Mr. Fred Rhodes who has helped the minority in their work concerning Air Force problems.

With what the Senator has said in relation to writing a report at this time I am heartily in accord. It cannot be done. I hope that we shall ultimately write a report which will be as nearly unanimous as we can make it. Whether that can be done as yet remains to be seen. I am glad the hearings have closed. I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman in connection with the hearings, although I might say, very frankly, that he and I did not always agree on the conclusions to be drawn from the testimony. But we did agree that Mr. Fowler Hamilton and his associate helped the subcommittee enormously and did a fine factual job. I am in hearty agreement with the Senator from Missouri in his commendation of those gentlemen, and I should like to add the name of Fred Rhodes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator. I mentioned the fine work of Mr. Fred Rhodes at the time of the last public hearing.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like, Mr. President, to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and of the ranking minority member, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I wish to compliment the chairman on the fair and earnest way in which he conducted the hearings. The hearings could not have been carried on successfully without the able support of an outstanding staff headed and directed by an able and distinguished lawyer, Fowler Hamilton. He lived up to all the expectations of those of us who served on the subcommittee. He always confronts problems in a lawyer-like manner. He is fair and objective. His objective at all times was to ferret out the truth in the interest of the security of the country.

We who sat through the long hearings know and appreciate the assistance which Fowler Hamilton gave to members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. He was ably assisted by Ramsey D. Potts, Edward C. Welsh, of the chairman's office, Wallace Engle, and other members of the Preparedness Subcommittee.

Mr. Fred Rhodes also, in his role as a representative of the minority, was helpful on any matter in which he could be of help or could make a contribution to the work of the subcommittee.

It is a compliment to the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri that he was able to get together such an excellent staff for both sides of the aisle in this all-important undertaking.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for his kind words, and know every member of the staff will appreciate them.

On the last day of public hearings I also complimented the entire staff, including the incomparable work of Mr. Welsh from my office.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Preparedness, I associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman and other members of the subcommittee. I forget exactly how many meetings we had. I think it was 66, of which I had the pleasure of attending 65.

To show the magnitude of the work, I believe I am correct in saying that there were about a million words of testimony taken before the committee. If my Biblical knowledge is correct, that is about as many words as are in the Bible, in both the Old and the New Testaments. That indicates very definitely the magnitude of the undertaking.

I never saw anyone show greater assiduity in the performance of an obligation than the chairman of the subcommittee showed. The relationships throughout the hearings were wonderful. The vast number of witnesses who were examined, the information which was gathered, and the reports which I hope will be made with unanimity to the Senate will make a most valuable contribution to the knowledge of the Senate and the whole country with respect to the posture of the military affairs of the Nation.

It was a real pleasure and privilege to have been a member of this subcommittee. I consider it to be a great honor to be associated with all members of the subcommittee, and I join heartily in all the expressions which have been made on the floor of the Senate this morning.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In turn it has been a privilege to be associated with the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, whose wise counsel and cooperation were so heartily given.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks which have been made concerning the work of the Subcommittee on Preparedness. It has been a rare privilege to serve with the other members of the subcommittee, who, I think, have given priority to this assignment, so far as possible, over all their other undertakings. I commend each member of the subcommittee for the devotion to duty which he has manifested; and I pay tribute to our chairman, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. He has brought to the discharge of his duties a comprehensive knowledge of the problem, a knowledge which, in my judgment, is second to none in America. He has shown complete devotion to the task assigned to the subcommittee, and has done a magnificent piece of work.

I also commend the work of the staff, particularly that of Mr. Fowler Hamilton, who, to use an expression which is frequently quoted in the decisions of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, brought to the discharge of his duties as chief counsel of the subcommittee the neutrality of an impartial judge in assembling and presenting the testimony. He deserves the thanks of the Nation for what he has done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, and am very grateful for what he said.

I close by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] for enabling us to set up this subcommittee to look into the problem of relative airpower which now confronts the Nation. I thank also the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] for lending from the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness, of which he is chairman, many members of his staff.

PRINTING OF MATERIAL IN FINAL ISSUES OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to ascertain whether it is planned, following the final adjournment of Congress, to permit Senators to have printed in the final issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speeches and other material which they will not be able to have ready for insertion in the final issue of the RECORD before adjournment, either today or tomorrow, whenever it will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator that that request is usually made, along with other requests, prior to adjournment, and we shall follow that course this year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I make my unanimous consent request, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as soon as I can complete its preparation, within the next 2 or 3 days, a reply to the statement which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some days ago, purporting to answer my criticisms of the National Labor Relations Board. I am

in the midst of preparing a reply to the Senator from New Jersey as to what I consider to be gross inaccuracies and distortions that honeycomb the statement the Senator from New Jersey placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that I may insert my statement, when I complete it, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, of course I have no objection to the Senator's doing that, but for the purpose of any further replies we may want to make, I believe we should like to have the same privilege.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I say, I have no objection to what the Senator from Oregon has requested, but I think we should have the same privilege.

Mr. MORSE. I take it for granted that the Senator from New Jersey would have that privilege, and I may say that I shall carry the fight all through the campaign this fall.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is all right with me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS TO ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2859, Senate bill 4288.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4288) to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition of real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, under the present law the Atomic Energy Commission cannot proceed with a certain project without the Congress enacting a law giving the Commission authority to proceed. The project involved happens to be a defense project, for which an authorization of about $15 million is desired by the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of a prototype reactor. There should be no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4288) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill just passed is a Senate bill. I believe it would be preferable to act on a similar House bill, H. R. 11709, strike out everything after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute the text of the Senate bill, as passed, in order to have proper legislative action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was wondering if the Senator from New Mexico has had an opportunity to compare the two bills, and ascertain whether the language of the Senate bill is precisely the same as that of the House bill, and that there is no difference, even in a comma or anything else. If so I wonder if it would not be better procedure for the Senate to pass the House bill. Otherwise, the House would have to act on what technically would be a Senate amendment to a House bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from California. I was informed that the papers on the House bill had not reached the Senate floor.

If the procedure suggested by the Senator from California is agreeable, Mr. President, I move that the vote by which Senate bill 4288 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House bill 11709.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a bill (H. R. 11709) to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 11709.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 11709) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 4288 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 4288 is indefinitely postponed.

MR. AND MRS. RANDALL McMAHON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2865, House bill 10898.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10898) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill merely corrects an accounting error on behalf of the parents of the deceased veteran. On the veteran's death, the Veterans' Administration made awards to Mr. and Mrs. McMahon out of the wrong veterans' fund.

This bill will permit a correction of the error to be made, relieving the McMahons of liability to the one fund and eliminates their rights to receive payments out of the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NEGOTIATIONS RELATIVE TO A COMPACT BETWEEN ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2861, House bill 11911.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11911) to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the original boundary between Arizona and California was the Colorado River as it existed at the time of the creation of the Territory of Arizona in 1864. The river has meandered a great many degrees in many places. It was determined that it would be necessary for the two States to come to an agreement with reference to determining the present boundary. The two States appointed commissions authorized by their State legislatures. The commissions made certain findings which have been ratified by the legislatures; but to make the findings effective the Constitution requires approval by Congress. The bill provides approval of the formal action taken by the two States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 11911) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERCORPORATE RELATIONS BETWEEN GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORP. AND MANILA ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2841, House bill 10624.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10624) relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, H. R. 10624, is to permit the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, to continue to operate and manage the Manila Electric Co., its subsidiary. The latter company has been continuously operated as a subsidiary prior to 1935, when the Public Utility Holding Company Act was enacted.

The Philippine Government, itself supports this bill. The Department of State supports the bill. The International Cooperation Administration supports the bill.

In supporting this proposed legislation, the Philippine Government has taken the position that a sale of the Manila Electric Co. would be detrimental to the Philippine economy.

The Department of State supports this proposal on the grounds that the very creditable performance of the Manila Electric Co. under its present ownership "advances the foreign economic policy of the United States by giving practical demonstration to foreign countries of the advantages which accrue to such countries through the investment of American capital."

The International Cooperation Administration is of the belief that the enactment of this bill would be in conformity with the objectives of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the passage of this legislation.

The Securities and Exchange Commission alone has indicated its opposition to this legislation, merely on the ground that this bill, if enacted, would represent a deviation from a present technical provision of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. The deviation, it is charged, springs from the fact that the additional integrated public-utility system here sought to be retained by General Public Utilities Corp., is located in the Philippines, a country not contiguous to our own. Otherwise, there is neither deviation nor objection.

The substance of the Commission's objection is predicated, not upon any inherent possible considerations arising out of the simultaneous operation of more than one integrated public utility system, but merely upon the fact that one of the systems is located in the Philippines, and hence not contiguous to our own country, where a domestic integrated public-utility system is being operated by the General Public Utilities Corp.

Considering the technical objection of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on the one hand, as against the substantive considerations advanced in support of the legislation, on the other, it is my opinion, Mr. President, that this bill is meritorious, deserves support, and should be enacted. The bill was passed unanimously in the House, and was reported from our committee without dissent.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I recommend the passage of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10624) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2862, House bill 6586.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6586) to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "section", to insert "7".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to add a new subsection to the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2006) to broaden the act to make cognizable claims by any religious organization functioning in the Philippines which is of the same denomination as a religious organization functioning in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2863, House bill 10468.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10468) creating the city of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, and authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, House bill 10468, as amended, would create the city of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission and authorize it to construct and operate a bridge, and to acquire and operate the existing ferry operating between Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky. The Commission may fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army under the General Bridge Act of 1946, and may fix such rates of toll for the use of the ferry as it may deem proper with due regard to rates of toll for use of the bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10468) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO AT CANNELTON, IND.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2864, House bill 10662.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10662) creating the city of Cannelton Bridge Commission and authorizing a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, House bill 10662 would create the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission and authorize it to construct and operate a bridge, and to acquire and operate the existing ferry operating between Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky. The commission may fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge and ferry, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army under the General Bridge Act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 10662) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2860, House bill 11682.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11682) to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the

agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a general statement concerning the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill provides permanent authorizing legislation for many activities heretofore authorized by appropriation act, thereby removing a ground for parliamentary objection to future appropriation acts. In addition, sections 4 and 5 extend to all agencies of the Department of Agriculture provisions heretofore applied only to the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service; section 8 provides authority for expenditures to extend courtesies to representatives of foreign governments, section 12 provides for travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in certain cases for temporary and seasonal classes and graders of agricultural commodities, and section 16 provides a working capital fund for the Forest Service.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Ogranic Act of the Department of Agriculture, enacted May 15, 1862 (sec. 520 Rev. Stat.; 5 U. S. C. 511), provides that the general design and duties of the Department of Agriculture shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people useful information on subjects connected with agriculture "in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word." Many of the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture are supported by this organic law. However, from time to time there have been included in the appropriation acts a number of provisions legislative in character, some of which have been substantive and others, perhaps the majority, have been of a facilitating or incidental nature.

In 1944 this committee reviewed the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act and proposed, and there was enacted into law, the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734), to provide basic authority for the provisions concerned. Since that time a number of facilitating provisions important to the effective operation of the Department's programs have been inserted in the annual appropriation acts. Recognizing that these additional legislative provisions may be necessary, the committee has scrutinized the appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture with a view to providing such permanent legislative authorities as are needed, adopting for this purpose the approach taken when the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 was enacted. Most of the provisions in the bill H. R. 11682 relate to authorities which appear in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Appropriation Act, 1957, and will provide legislative authority without change for provisions which have appeared in the appropriation act. Three of the items proposed—sections 8, 12, and 13—do not appear in the 1957 Appropriation Act. However, they fall within the general scope of the subject matter of the bill and have therefore been included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 11682) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIMINUTION, CONTROL, AND TREATMENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2813, Senate bill 4267.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4267) to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3914) to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

IMPORTATION OF SWISS 17-JEWEL WATCHES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] desires to make a brief statement. I yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there is one item of proposed legislation that I had hoped to see passed at the current session. Both the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] have recently discussed this measure at meetings of the Senate Finance Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member; but for reasons to which I shall refer in a moment, it now seems unlikely that this measure can be enacted in the closing days of the current session.

I had hoped to see this measure passed, not only because of its own substantive importance, and not only because of the strong support of this measure by the Senator from Georgia, but also because of the interest that was taken in this matter by our beloved colleague, the late Alben W. Barkley.

The measure to which I refer has been introduced in the Senate by our colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] as S. 4157. At the request of the administration, a companion bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis by Representative MILLS and Representative REED.

These bills are similar to, and designed to accomplish the same purpose as, a measure which was discussed on the floor of the Senate just a year ago by Senator Barkley. Speaking on the floor of the Senate on this same subject on July 30, 1955, Senator Barkley gave the following explanation of the proposed legislation which then was pending:

In recent years—in the past 2 or 3 years—a practice has developed in the Swiss watch industry, in cooperation with certain American importers, to bring into this country 17-jewel watches which have been so manufactured as to contain 4 concealed components into which jewels can be inserted—so that the watches come in as 17-jewel watches, on which there has to be paid only $3.15 tariff.

After those watches come into this country, the little plugs or metal pieces are removed, 4 jewels are inserted, and the watches then become 21-jewel watches. The tariff duty paid on such watches was only $3.15 instead of the $10.75 which would have to be paid on a watch which contained 21 jewels. * * * (This is) a practice which on its face seems to be designed to cheat the Treasury of the United States out of tariffs to which it is entitled.

That ends the quotation from Senator Barkley's remarks of July 30, 1955, concerning the legislation which he so cogently explained last year.

I deeply regret, however, that, apparently owing to the press of other business, the House Ways and Means Committee, which last year voted favorably on the predecessor legislation, as Senator Barkley pointed out in the remarks from which I have just quoted, has not yet called up this legislation for action. Accordingly, even though the Senate Finance Committee unanimously approved the principle of this legislation a year ago, as Senator Barkley advised the Senate at that time, and even though the Senate Finance Committee continues to be favorable to the principle of this legislation and intends to see it enacted once it reaches this body, nevertheless, since the legislation is essentially a revenue measure, the Senate Finance Committee has thus far refrained from taking any specific action prior to House action on the measure.

It may be that the Senate Finance Committee will want to take the initiative on this matter in the early days of the next Congress, without waiting any longer for House action, but I did not want to let the current session close without adding my views to those which Senator Barkley expressed last year. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who is not on the floor at this moment, has asked me to state that he is in full agreement with the views I am now expressing.

I should like to add, also, that the need for this legislation is even more urgent now than it was in July of 1955. In the interim, the Swiss watch cartel has devised new schemes and techniques for upjeweling watches; and these new schemes and techniques threaten the

very existence of our domestic watch manufacturing industry.

The revised bill which has been requested by the administration and which, as I have already mentioned, has been introduced in both the Senate and the House, is designed to stop these new techniques. This legislation, moreover, is necessary in order to prevent a serious threat to domestic production of watches in coming years, namely, a flood of imports which, taking advantage of the existing loophole in the customs law, may lead to the elimination of the remaining vestige of the American watch manufacturing industry. It is my earnest hope that the new Congress, at the earliest possible date in the session beginning in January, will put an end to the smuggling and tariff evasion that is going on in this area by enacting the legislation to which I have just referred.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I correct in understanding that no amendment will be offered?

Mr. SMATHERS. No amendment will be offered. I am merely stating that it is my hope that next year the Senate Committee on Finance will consider this measure, and that some action will be taken on it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 26, 1956.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to give a brief summary of the bill as agreed to by the conferees.

The main provisions of S. 3275, which the conferees agreed to unanimously, are as follows:

An Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife is provided for in the Department of the Interior. He is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

There is also to be a Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, to be appointed in the same manner and confirmed by the Senate, and a new United States Fish and Wildlife Service under the supervision of the Commissioner, which is to take the place of the present Fish and Wildlife Service.

Under the new Service there are to be two Bureaus—a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, to which is to be distributed the functions of the former Fish and Wildlife Service relating primarily to commercial fisheries, whales, seals, and sea lions; and a Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife with responsibility for those matters relating primarily to migratory birds, game management, wildlife refuges, sport fisheries, and sea mammals, except whales, seals, and sea lions.

However, the funds and allocations, appropriated or otherwise, relating to the matters within the jurisdiction of the two Bureaus are to be distributed between them as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine.

The $10 million revolving fund in the House amendment for loans for financing and refinancing maintenance repair and equipment of fishing gear and vessels is retained, as well as the provision of the House amendment making the Saltonstall-Kennedy funds permanent and removing the limitation of $3 million on the annual expenditure of such funds.

The reorganization of the Fish and Wildlife functions within the Department of the Interior is to be accomplished not later than 90 days after the approval of the act.

The investigations, reports and other functions which were the responsibility of the United States Fisheries Commission under S. 3275 as passed by the Senate are now to be made and exercised by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to commend the Senator, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for his interest in legislation with regard to fisheries. I believe the bill represented by the conference report will be of great assistance. As I understand, the bill comes from the conference substantially as it passed the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

I appreciate the help which both Senators from Massachusetts have given in this matter. The bill is the result of a year's work. I think we have a good fisheries bill for the first time in our Nation's history.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is the first time commercial fisheries have been properly recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HARRY M. CAUDILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6709, which has just been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6709) for the relief of Harry M. Caudill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$335" and insert "$330.90."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center; and

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 267. An act for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of Helen Mar Stanger; and

S. 3255. An act for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended;

H. R. 8353. An act to further the economic and efficient operation of the business of the Post Office Department by the establishment of a postal service automatic equipment program, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11504. An act for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; and

H. R. 12185. An act to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8353. An act to further the economic and efficient operation of the business of the Post Office Department by the establishment of a postal service automatic equipment program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 11504. An act for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12185. An act to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than five thousand acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACHIEVEMENTS AND MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED DURING 84TH CONGRESS (S. DOCS. 149 AND 151)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, after final adjournment, a statement reviewing the achievements of the 84th Congress, together with a digest of major legislation passed during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make at this time the same request on behalf of the minority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Both requests are the usual requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent requests? The Chair hears none, and they are so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT MATTERS IN THE RECORD AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

I did not clear this unanimous-consent request with the minority leader, but it is the usual request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF VISAS TO ELIGIBLE ORPHANS UNDER REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2730, Senate bill 3570.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3570) to increase the number of visas authorized to be issued to eligible orphans under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, to change the word "fourteen" to "twelve"; on page 2, line 8, strike the words "this section" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended,"; on page 2 following line 9 add a new section as follows:

SEC. 3. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, is amended by adding a new section 21 at the end thereof as follows:

"SEC. 21. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(a) Any alien admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under the provisions of either section 101 (a) (15) (A) or 101 (a) (15) (G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, who has failed to maintain a status under either of those provisions, and who has not been required to depart from the United States under the authority of section 241 (e) of said act, may apply to the Attorney General for adjustment of his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(b) If it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien is a person of good moral character, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, the Attorney General, in his discretion, may record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the order of the Attorney General approving the application for adjustment of status is made.

"(c) A complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such adjustment of status. Such reports shall be submitted on the 1st and 15th day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the adjustment of status of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon require the departure of such alien in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives passes such a resolution within the time above specified, the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was classified as a quota immigrant at the time of his entry, reduce by one the quota of the quota area to which the alien is chargeable under section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act for the fiscal year then current or the next following year in which a quota is available. No quota shall be so reduced by more than 50 percent in any fiscal year.

"(d) The definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166, 171; 8 U. S. C. 1101 (a) and (b)), shall be applicable in the administration of this act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from New York wished to be informed when this bill was taken up. He desires to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator withhold his request until his amendment has been stated?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to withhold my request. I offer my amendment, identified as "7-12-56—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from New York that the committee amendments to the bill will be considered first.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have consideration of the committee amendments first? Then the Senator from New York may offer his amendment, following which we may have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York is now in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read, but printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this act, divided into titles, chapters, and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the 'Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1956'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"TITLE I—GENERAL

	Page
"Sec. 101. Declaration of policy	6
"Sec. 102. Definitions	7
"Sec. 103. Immigration and Naturalization Commission	23
"Sec. 104. Organization of the Commission	24
"Sec. 105. Powers and duties of the Commission	25
"Sec. 106. Powers of Commission officers and employees	28
"Sec. 107. Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals	30
"Sec. 108. Hearings	34
"Sec. 109. Applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act	36
"Sec. 110. Judicial review	36
"Sec. 111. Detention and bail	39
"Sec. 112. Issuance and denial of visas	40
"Sec. 113. Establishment of offices and assignment of personnel abroad	41
"Sec. 114. Authorization of expenditures and travel	42
"Sec. 115. Judicial enforcement	43
"Sec. 116. Duty of investigative agencies	45
"TITLE II—QUOTA SYSTEM; SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION QUOTA	
"Sec. 201. Eligibility to become a quota immigrant; preference and newcomer groups; allocation of quota visas	45
"Sec. 202. Preference groups and newcomer groups; persons included	46
"Sec. 203. Quota visas, numerical limitation; reallocation of unused visa numbers	48
"Sec. 204. Priorities within preference groups; examination of applicants for immigration visas; allocation of immigration visas among nations	50
"TITLE III—IMMIGRATION AND DEPORTATION	
"Chapter 1—Aliens who are ineligible to receive visas; exclusion and admission	
"Sec. 301. Grounds of ineligibility to receive visas	52
"Sec. 302. Requirements for admission; grounds for exclusion	57
"Sec. 303. Limitations on exclusion	59
"Sec. 304. Exclusion; right to hearing; procedure	61
"Sec. 305. Waivers by the Commission	62
"Chapter 2—Miscellaneous provisions relating to admission of aliens; travel control of citizens and aliens	
"Sec. 311. Parole; bonds	63
"Sec. 312. Admission of nonimmigrants	63
"Sec. 313. Travel control of aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency	63
"Chapter 3—Issuance of entry documents	
"Sec. 321. Visa requirements	67
"Sec. 322. Visa applications	70
"Sec. 323. Reentry permits	73
"Sec. 324. Nonquota immigrant visas	75

Page

"Chapter 4—Provisions relating to entry and exclusion

"Sec. 331. List of alien and citizen passengers arriving or departing; record of resident aliens and citizens leaving permanently for foreign country 75
"Sec. 332. Detention of aliens for observation and examination; expense 78
"Sec. 333. Temporary removal for examination upon arrival 79
"Sec. 334. Physical and mental examination 81
"Sec. 335. Inspection 83
"Sec. 336. Immediate deportation of aliens excluded from admission or entering in violation of law 83
"Sec. 337. Entry through or from foreign contiguous territory; landing stations 86
"Sec. 338. Designation of ports of entry for aliens arriving by civil aircraft 88
"Sec. 339. Records of admission 89

"Chapter 5—Deportation: Equitable relief

"Sec. 341. General classes of deportable aliens 89
"Sec. 342. Limitations on deportation 92
"Sec. 343. Apprehension and deportation of aliens 92
"Sec. 344. Nations to which aliens shall be deported; cost of deportation 96
"Sec. 345. Voluntary departure 101
"Sec. 346. Adjustment of status 101
"Sec. 347. Removal of aliens who have fallen into distress 103

"Chapter 6—Special provisions relating to alien crewman

"Sec. 351. Lists of alien crewmen; reports of illegal landings 103
"Sec. 352. Temporary landing of alien crewmen 105
"Sec. 353. Hospital treatment of alien crewmen afflicted with certain diseases 107
"Sec. 354. Control of alien crewmen 108
"Sec. 355. Employment on passenger vessels of aliens afflicted with certain disabilities 110
"Sec. 356. Discharge of alien crewmen 110
"Sec. 357. Bringing alien crewmen into the United States with intent to evade immigration laws 111

"Chapter 7—Registration of aliens

"Sec. 361. Aliens seeking entry into the United States 111
"Sec. 362. Registration of aliens in the United States 111
"Sec. 363. Provisions governing registration of special groups 113
"Sec. 364. Forms and procedure 113
"Sec. 365. Notices of change of address 114
"Sec. 366. Penalties 115
"Sec. 367. Enforcement by the Attorney General 116

"Chapter 8—General penalty provisions

"Sec. 371. Prevention of unauthorized landing of aliens 117
"Sec. 372. Bringing in aliens illegally 117
"Sec. 373. Alien stowaways; detention and deportation 118
"Sec. 374. Bringing in and harboring certain aliens 119
"Sec. 375. Entry of alien at improper time or place; misrepresentation and concealment of facts 120
"Sec. 376. Reentry of deported alien 121
"Sec. 377. Aiding or assisting subversive alien to enter the United States 121
"Sec. 378. Importation of aliens for immoral purposes 121
"Sec. 379. Collection of penalties and expenses 122

"Chapter 9—Miscellaneous

"Sec. 381. Schedule of fees 123
"Sec. 382. Printing of certain blank forms 124
"Sec. 383. Members of the Armed Forces 125
"Sec. 384. Disposition of privileges at immigrant stations 125
"Sec. 385. Disposition of moneys collected under the provisions of this title 126
"Sec. 386. American Indians born in Canada 127
"Sec. 387. Central files; information from other departments and agencies 127
"Sec. 388. Burden of proof 129
"Sec. 389. Local jurisdiction over immigrant stations 129

"TITLE IV—CITIZENSHIP AND NATURALIZATION

"Chapter 1—Citizenship at birth and by collective naturalization

"Sec. 401. Citizens of the United States at birth 130
"Sec. 402. Persons born or residing in Puerto Rico 131
"Sec. 403. Persons born in the Canal Zone or Republic of Panama on or after Feb. 26, 1904 132
"Sec. 404. Persons born in Alaska on or after Mar. 30, 1867 133
"Sec. 405. Persons born in Hawaii 133
"Sec. 406. Persons living in and born in the Virgin Islands 133
"Sec. 407. Persons living in and born in Guam 135
"Sec. 408. Nationals declared citizens 136
"Sec. 409. Children born out of wedlock 137

"Chapter 2—Naturalization courts; eligibility for naturalization

"Sec. 411. Jurisdiction to naturalize 137
"Sec. 412. Eligibility for naturalization 138
"Sec. 413. Prohibition of the naturalization of subversives 138
"Sec. 414. Ineligibility to naturalization of deserters from the Armed Forces of the United States 139
"Sec. 415. Alien relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States because of alienage barred from citizenship 139
"Sec. 416. Enemy aliens; naturalization under specified conditions and procedure 140

"Chapter 3—General requirements for naturalization

"Sec. 421. Requirements as to understanding the English language, history, principles, and form of government of the United States 141
"Sec. 422. Requirements as to residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and favorable disposition to the United States 142
"Sec. 423. Temporary absence of persons performing certain duties 144
"Sec. 424. Requirement for lawful entry for naturalization; burden of proof 146
"Sec. 425. Resident Philippine citizens excepted from certain requirements 147
"Sec. 426. Constructive residence through service on certain United States vessels 147

"Chapter 4—Naturalization provisions applicable to particular groups

"Sec. 431. Married persons 150
"Sec. 432. Alien child born outside of United States of one or both citizen parents 151
"Sec. 433. Child born outside of United States of alien parent; conditions under which citizenship automatically acquired 153
"Sec. 434. Children adopted by United States citizens 154
"Sec. 435. Former citizens of United States regaining United States citizenship 154
"Sec. 436. Former United States citizens losing citizenship by entering the armed forces of foreign countries during World War II 158
"Sec. 437. Naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States; active duty service during World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict 159
"Sec. 438. Armed Forces naturalization outside United States; determination of honorable active-duty status 160
"Sec. 439. Former United States citizen losing citizenship under prior laws 161

"Chapter 5—Procedural and administrative provisions relating to granting and revocation of naturalization

"Sec. 441. Miscellaneous administrative provisions 162
"Sec. 442. Petition for naturalization; declaration of intention 165
"Sec. 443. Preliminary examination on petition 166
"Sec. 444. Final hearing upon petitions for naturalization; final order entered upon record; examination of petitioner and witnesses 170
"Sec. 445. Oath of renunciation and allegiance 172
"Sec. 446. Certificate of naturalization; contents 175
"Sec. 447. Revocation of naturalization 175
"Sec. 448. Certificates of citizenship; procedure 178
"Sec. 449. Cancellation of certificates; action not to affect citizenship status 180

"Chapter 6—Loss of citizenship; suits for declaratory judgment

"Sec. 451. Loss of citizenship 181
"Sec. 452. Suits to declare citizenship forfeited 183
"Sec. 453. Loss of citizenship through parent's expatriation; not effective until person attains age of 25 years 185
"Sec. 454. Citizenship not to be denied or abridged 186

Page
"Sec. 455. Proceeding for declaration of United States citizenship in the event of denial of rights or privileges as citizens 186

"Chapter 7—Miscellaneous

"Sec. 461. Functions and duties of clerks 187
"Sec. 462. Documents and copies 188
"Sec. 463. Fiscal provisions 190
"Sec. 464. Mail relating to naturalization 195
"Sec. 465. Publication and distribution of citizenship textbooks 195
"Sec. 466. Civil actions against clerks of court 196
"Sec. 467. Application of treaties; exceptions 198

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"Sec. 501. Joint congressional committee 197
"Sec. 502. Amendments to other laws 201
"Sec. 503. Repeal of prior law 207
"Sec. 504. References in other laws 207
"Sec. 505. Authorization of appropriations 208
"Sec. 506. Transfer of functions, personnel, and property 208
"Sec. 507. Savings clauses 210
"Sec. 508. Separability 212
"Sec. 509. Effective date 212

"TITLE I—GENERAL

"SEC. 101. Declaration of policy: The purpose of this act is to establish and provide for the administration of an immigration and naturalization policy which will give faithful and positive expression to the basic human values to which American political institutions are dedicated; promote entry of desirable immigrants on a basis responsive to national need and international responsibility; protect this country from infiltration by those who would destroy or impair its political institutions and, more specifically—

"To provide for immigration eligibility without regard to national origin, race, color, or creed;

"To foster the reuniting of families;

"To serve the needs of the domestic economy;

"To provide a haven for the persecuted and oppressed;

"To further the aims of American foreign policy;

"To establish high naturalization and citizenship standards and to insure that citizenship properly acquired by naturalization shall be of the same quality as citizenship acquired by birth;

"To establish just and orderly procedures for all phases of immigration and naturalization administration; and

"To codify immigration and naturalization law in clear terms and orderly arrangement.

"SEC. 102. Definitions: (a) As used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"(1) Adjacent islands: 'Adjacent islands' includes St. Pierre, Miquelon, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Trinidad, Martinique, and other British, French, and Netherlands territory or possessions in or bordering on the Caribbean Sea.

"(2) Advocate or teach subversive doctrine: To 'advocate or teach subversive doctrine' means to speak, write, publish, circulate, distribute, print, or display, or cause the speaking, writing, publication, circulation, distribution, printing, or display of, any matter continuing subversive doctrine, with knowledge of the content of such matter and understanding of its purport as subversive doctrine and for the purpose of propagating such doctrine. An organization advocates or teaches subversive doctrine by publishing, circulating, distributing, printing, or displaying, or causing the speaking, writing, publication, circulation, distribution, printing, or display of any matter containing subversive doctrine for the purpose of propagating such doctrine.

"(3) Alien crewman: 'Alien crewman' means any alien, employed in any capacity required for operation or service on board a vessel or aircraft arriving at the United States, who intends to land temporarily and to depart the United States with the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived or some other vessel or aircraft. It does not include any alien—

"(A) who either has been admitted for permanent residence or is in possession of a valid unexpired visa issued to him, and is entitled, under the immigration laws, to come into the United States; or

"(B) who is employed on a fishing vessel having its home port or operating base in the United States.

"(4) Blood relative: 'Blood relative' means any person who is characterized as such a relative at the common law and includes any person who is a child as defined in section 102 (a) (6).

"(5) Board: 'Board' means the Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals.

"(6) Child: 'Child' means an unmarried person under 21 years of age, and includes—

"(A) a stepchild, including an illegitimate child of a person's spouse;

"(B) a child legitimated while under 18 years of age in accordance with the law of the residence or domicile of the child or of the legitimate parent; and

"(C) except as used in sections 432, 433, and 434 a child adopted while under the age of 18 years in accordance with the law of the residence or domicile of the child or of the adopting parent.

"(7) Citizen: 'Citizen,' when referring to United States citizenship, includes any person who under any law prior to this act was a national of the United States.

"(8) Commission: 'Commission' means, unless the context otherwise requires, the Immigration and Naturalization Commission as an entity including the members of the Commission, the Administrator, and all employees and officers of the Commission.

"(9) Commission officer: 'Commission officer' means any official or employee or class of officials or employees of the Commission, or any other person or persons designated by the Commission individually or as a class to perform the functions of a Commission officer specified by this act.

"(10) Diplomatic visa: 'Diplomatic visa' means a nonimmigrant visa bearing that title and issued to a nonimmigrant at the direction of the Secretary of State in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe.

"(11) Entry: 'Entry' means any coming of an alien into the United States from a foreign port or place except a coming by any alien who is nonexcludible under the limitations on exclusion provided in section 303.

"(12) Immigrant: 'Immigrant' means any alien who seeks to enter the United States for permanent residence and who does not seek such entry as a nonimmigrant as defined in this section.

"(13) Immigration laws: 'Immigration laws' means this act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, deportation, or expulsion of aliens.

"(14) Land port: 'Land port' means any place of entry on the Canadian or Mexican borders of the United States.

"(15) Membership or affiliation: 'Membership' in or 'affiliation' with an organization which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine means voluntary membership or affiliation (including the giving, lending, or promising of money or other thing of value) when over the age of 16, with knowledge that the subversive doctrine is taught or advocated by the organization. Voluntary membership or affiliation shall not include membership or affiliation acquired solely by operation of law, or solely for the purpose of obtaining employment, education, food rations or other essentials of life, without belief in the subversive doctrine taught or advocated.

"(16) Naturalization: 'Naturalization' means the conferring of nationality of a national state upon a person after birth.

"(17) Naturalization court: 'Naturalization court' means a court authorized by this act to exercise naturalization jurisdiction.

"(18) Nonimmigrant: 'Nonimmigrant' means an alien who is within one of the following classes:

"(A) (i) An ambassador, public minister, or career diplomatic or consular officer who has been accredited by a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States and who is accepted by the President or by the Secretary of State, and the members of the alien's immediate family;

"(ii) Other officials and employees who have been accredited by a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States, who are accepted by the Secretary of State, and the members of their immediate families;

"(iii) Attendants, servants, personal employees, and members of their immediate families, of the officials and employees who have a nonimmigrant status under (i) and (ii) of this subparagraph;

"(B) (i) A designated principal resident representative of a foreign government recognized de jure by the United States which is a member of an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669) and accredited resident members of the staff of such representative, and members of their immediate families;

"(ii) Other accredited representatives of such a foreign government to such international organizations, and the members of their immediate families;

"(iii) An alien able to qualify under (i) or (ii) of this subparagraph (B) except for the fact that the government of which such alien is an accredited representative is not recognized de jure by the United States or is not a member of such international organization, and the members of his immediate family;

"(iv) Officers or employees of such international organizations, and the members of their immediate families;

"(v) Attendants, servants, and personal employees of any such representative, officer, or employee, and the members of the immediate families of such attendants, servants, and personal employees;

"(vi) Executive, legislative, or judicial officials or leaders of national opinion of any foreign state who seek political asylum in the United States, whose entry is certified by the Secretary of State to be in the interest of the United States, and the members of the immediate families of such officials or leaders;

"(C) An alien who qualifies as a person entitled to pass in transit to and from the United Nations headquarters district and foreign countries, under the provisions of paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of section 11 of the headquarters agreement with the United Nations (61 Stat. 758) or a representative of a foreign government and persons accompanying him, approved by the

Secretary of State for continuous transit through the United States;

"(D) An alien who is a bona fide representative of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information medium, who seeks to enter the United States solely to engage in such vocation, and the spouse and children of such a representative, if accompanying or following to join him;

"(E) An alien (other than one coming for the purpose of study or of performing skilled or unskilled labor or as a representative of foreign press, radio, film, or other foreign information medium coming to engage in such vocation) who is visiting the United States temporarily, for business, health, or pleasure;

"(F) An alien crewman;

"(G) An alien entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national—

"(i) to carry on international trade; or

"(ii) to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which he or his employer has invested, or is actively in the process of investing, a substantial amount of capital; and the spouse and children of any such alien if accompanying or following to join him;

"(H) An alien who is a bona fide student qualified to pursue a full course of study and who seeks to enter the United States to remain temporarily and principally for the purpose of pursuing such a course of study at an established institution of learning or other recognized place of study in the United States, particularly designated by him and approved by the Commission after consultation with the Office of Education of the United States, which institution or place of study shall have agreed to and shall report to the Commission the termination of attendance of each nonimmigrant student;

"(I) An alien—

"(i) who is of exceptional ability and who is coming to the United States to remain temporarily to perform services requiring such ability; or

"(ii) who is coming to the United States to remain temporarily to perform services or labor, if unemployed persons capable of performing such service or labor cannot be found in this country; or

"(iii) who is coming to the United States to remain temporarily as a trainee in agriculture, industry, commerce, or a profession;

"(J) an alien in continuous transit through the United States.

"(19) Nonquota immigrant: 'Nonquota immigrant' means—

"(A) an immigrant who is the parent of a resident citizen of the United States, or the child or the spouse of a citizen of the United States;

"(B) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(C) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and may, under section 435 (a) or 436, apply for citizenship;

"(D) an immigrant included within section 453 (b);

"(E) an immigrant who continuously for at least 2 years immediately preceding the time of his application for a visa has been, and who seeks to enter the United States solely for the purpose of, carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination, or professor of a college, academy, seminary, or university; and his spouse, and his children if accompanying or following to join him;

"(F) an immigrant who is an employee, or an honorably retired former employee, of the United States Government abroad, and who has performed faithful services for a total of 15 years, or more, and his accompanying spouse and children, if the principal officer of a Foreign Service establishment has recommended the granting of nonquota status to such alien because of exceptional circumstances, and the Commission approves such recommendation and finds that it is in the national interest to grant such status;

"(G) a woman who was a citizen of the United States and lost her citizenship by reason of her marriage to an alien, or by her husband's loss of United States citizenship, or by marriage to an alien and residence in a foreign country, and the children of such a woman accompanying or following to join her; and

"(H) an immigrant who was a citizen of the United States and who, under section 439, will be eligible to file a petition for naturalization upon the completion of 2 years continuous residence in the United States.

"(20) Organization: 'Organization' means a corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, associated for the purpose of taking joint action on any subject or subjects.

"(21) Parent: 'Parent' includes a stepparent or adoptive parent unless the Commission finds that the relationship was established for the purpose of obtaining nonquota status under this act; and, in the case of a posthumous child, the term 'parent' includes a deceased parent.

"(22) Passport: 'Passport' means any travel document issued by competent authority which is valid for the entry of the bearer into a foreign country.

"(23) Previously admitted alien or lawfully admitted alien: 'Previously admitted alien' or 'lawfully admitted alien' means an alien who has entered the United States for permanent residence under the immigration laws or whose status has been adjusted to that status, and who has not thereafter been deported or removed from the United States at the expense of the Government, or voluntarily departed from the United States in lieu of deportation.

"(24) Quota immigrant: 'Quota immigrant' means any immigrant who is not a nonquota immigrant.

"(25) Reentry permit: 'Reentry permit' means any permit to reenter, border crossing identification card, or other document which, by rule or regulation, may be used to evidence a right to reenter the United States.

"(26) Spouse, wife, or husband: 'Spouse', 'wife', or 'husband' do not include a spouse, wife, or husband by reason of any marriage ceremony at which the contracting parties thereto are not physically present in the presence of each other, unless the marriage has been consummated.

"(27) State: 'State' when referring to a State of the United States (except as used in section 411 (a)) includes Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

"(28) Subversive doctrine: 'Subversive doctrine' means a doctrine which aims to achieve or uses to achieve its goals by any of the following:

"(A) Opposition to all organized government, or all forms of law;

"(B) The overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means;

"(C) The establishment of totalitarian dictatorship in the United States;

"(D) The duty, necessity, or propriety of the assassination of any officer or officers of the Government of the United States, or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character;

"(E) The unlawful destruction of property; and

"(F) The extermination or persecution of persons on the ground of race, religion, or ancestry.

"The following shall be conclusively deemed to have advocated or taught subversive doctrine at all times:

"(G) The Communist Party of the United States or of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any other Communist Party in any other country, affiliated with either or both of these parties;

"(H) The National Socialist Party of Germany, or any of its paramilitary affiliates; and

"(I) Any successor to any of the parties or organizations enumerated in subparagraphs (G) and (H) of this paragraph, which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine.

"(29) Totalitarian dictatorship: 'Totalitarian dictatorship' means a system of government not representative in fact, characterized by (A) the privileged position of a political party organized on a dictatorial basis, with so close an indemnity between such party and its policies and the policies of the government, that the party and the government are practically indistinguishable, and (B) the forcible suppression of opposition to such party or government.

"(30) United States: 'United States', when used in a geographical sense, means the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands of the United States.

"(31) Unmarried: 'Unmarried', when used in reference to any individual as of any time, means an individual who at such time is not married, whether or not previously married.

"(32) War, occupation or refugee orphan: 'War, occupation or refugee orphan' means an immigrant who—

"(A) is under 10 years of age; and

"(B) (i) has been made an orphan by the death or disappearance of both parents; or

"(ii) has been abandoned or deserted by, or separated or lost from, both parents; or

"(iii) has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of the other parent, or the abandonment by the other parent and there is reasonable ground to believe that such other parent was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and the remaining parent is incapable of providing adequate care for such child and agrees to release him for immigration and adoption; and

"(C) is entering the United States for permanent residence with a citizen of the United States or with an alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or is coming to the United States to a public or private agency approved by the Commission, and such relative, person, or agency gives assurances, satisfactory to the Commission, that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated with respect to such child; and

"(D) with respect to whom assurances, satisfactory to the Commission, are given that such immigrant will be properly cared for.

"(b) 'Person' as used in sections 336, 354, 356, 357, 371, 372, and 373 of this act, includes any transportation company or the owner, master, agent, commanding officer, charterer, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft.

"(c) For the purpose of this act, any alien ordered deported (whether before or after the effective date of this act) who has left the United States, shall be considered to have been deported in pursuance of law, irrespective of the source from which the expenses of his transportation were defrayed or of the place to which he departed.

"(d) Nonimmigrants within the classes described in sections 102 (a) (18) (A) and (B), for so long as they continue to be within such classes, shall not be subject to the provisions or requirement of the immigration laws relating to ineligibility to receive visas, exclusion or deportation of aliens, except—

"(1) the requirements of passports and visas as a means of identification, and documents necessary to establish their qualification within such classes; and

"(2) such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe to protect the national health and security of the United States.

"SEC. 103. Immigration and Naturalization Commission: (a) There is hereby established, as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, a Commission to be known as the "Immigration and Naturalization Commission", composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, and who shall continue in office at the pleasure of the President. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman and one of the members as Vice Chairman who shall act in the absence or incapacity of the Chairman. The successors of the members shall be appointed and serve in the same manner as the members originally appointed under this act. Not more than 2 members in office at any 1 time shall be members of the same political party. The compensation of the chairman of the Commission shall be $17,500 per annum and that of the other members of the Commission shall be $17,000 per annum.

"(b) The members of the Commission shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness for the efficient exercise of the powers and performance of the duties vested in and imposed upon the Commission by this act. No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

"(c) Two of the members shall constitute a quorum of the Commission. The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but whenever the convenience of the public or interested persons may be promoted, or delay or expense prevented, the Commission may hold hearings or other proceedings at any other place. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

"SEC. 104. Organization of the Commission: (a) The Commission shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint and prescribe the duties of an Administrator and a General Counsel. The compensation of the Administrator shall be $17,000 per annum, and that of the General Counsel shall be $16,500 per annum.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this act, the Commission shall appoint and prescribe the duties of all other employees and officers that may be necessary for the efficient administration of this act in accordance with the civil-service laws.

"(c) The Commission may, from time to time, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, engage for temporary service such duly qualified consultants or other persons as may be necessary.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in this act, the compensation of all officers and employees appointed by the Commission shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

"SEC. 105. Powers and duties of the Commission: (a) Except as provided in sections 115 (b) and 367, the Commission shall be responsible for the execution and enforcement of the provisions of this act.

"(b) The Commission is authorized, without limitation of its general authority—

"(1) to perform such acts, conduct such investigations, make such orders, and, after hearings, to issue such rules and regulations, as are appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(2) to make studies of all phases of immigration and naturalization and international migration, and to make and publish reports with respect to any matters within the scope of this act;

"(3) to inquire into all matters of immigration, issuance of visas, exclusion, deportation, and status of aliens, and naturalization and revocation of naturalization and citizenship;

"(4) to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, and documents relating to any matters within its jurisdiction, including proceedings before hearing examiners pursuant to this act. If a witness whose testimony may be desired to be taken by deposition is in a foreign country, his testimony may be taken by deposition before an officer or person designated by the Commission or agreed upon by the parties by stipulation in writing to be filed with the Commission;

"(5) to hold public hearings in such places and at such times as it deems necessary and desirable;

"(6) to cooperate with, promote, and encourage civic, religious, and welfare groups engaged in educating, assisting, settling, and relocating aliens, in keeping with the policy of this act; and

"(7) To delegate to any officer or employee of the Commission any of the powers and functions conferred upon the Commission by this act as may be appropriate.

"(c) The Commission shall report periodically and at least annually to the President and the Congress on its administration of this act. Its report shall include the number of immigrants and nonimmigrants admitted, the number of visas issued, the number of visas refused, the character, causes and need of international immigration, and any other matter within the scope of this act.

"(d) The Commission shall cooperate and maintain liaison with all other governmental departments and agencies with a view to a coordinated, uniform, and efficient administration of this act.

"(e) The Commission shall upon certification from the Attorney General that upon information and belief an alien has violated any provision of this act, which violation, in his opinion, would constitute legal grounds for deportation or exclusion, cause appropriate proceedings to be taken.

"(f) The Commission shall be responsible for controlling and guarding the boundaries and borders of the United States against the illegal entry of aliens and shall appoint for that purpose such number of employees as it deems necessary and proper.

"(g) The Commission shall provide procedures for review of the recommendation of examiners in naturalization proceedings. In each case the Commission shall cause to be made to the court in which an application for naturalization is pending, a recommendation on behalf of the Commission.

"SEC. 106. Powers of Commission officers and employees: (a) Any officer or employee of the Commission authorized under rules and regulations prescribed by it shall have power without warrant—

"(1) to arrest any alien who in his presence or view is entering or attempting to enter the United States in violation of any law or regulation made in pursuance of law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, or to arrest any alien in the United States, if he has reasonable cause to believe that the alien so arrested is in the United States in violation of any such law or regulation and is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest; but the alien so arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay for examination before an officer of the Commission having authority to examine aliens as to their right to enter or remain in the United States;

"(2) to board and search for aliens any vessel in the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle within a distance of 25 miles from any external boundary of the United States, and within such distance to have access to private lands, but not dwellings, for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States; and

"(3) to make arrests for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under any law of the United States regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens, if he has reasonable cause to believe that the person so arrested is guilty of such felony and if there is likelihood of the person escaping before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be taken without unnecessary delay before the nearest available officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. Any such officer or employee shall also have the power to execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer under any law regulating the admission, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

"(b) Any officer or employee of the Commission designated by it, whether individually or as one of a class, shall have power and authority to administer oaths and to take and consider evidence concerning the right or privilege of any person to enter, reenter, pass through, or reside in the United States, or concerning any matter which is material or relevant to the enforcement of this act. Any person to whom such oath has been administered, under the provisions of this act, who shall knowingly or willfully give false evidence or swear to any false statement concerning any matter referred to in this subsection shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished as provided by section 1621, title 18, United States Code. No such statement made under oath shall be used as a ground for prosecution for perjury unless the person to whom the oath was administered was advised prior to the making of such statement that he was entitled to counsel and, if counsel was desired by him, given a reasonable time to procure and consult with counsel of his choice.

"(c) Any officer or employee of the Commission authorized and designated under regulations prescribed by it, whether individually or as one of a class, shall have power to conduct a search, without warrant, of the person and of the personal effects in the possession of any person seeking admission to the United States, concerning whom such officer or employee has reasonable cause to believe that grounds exist for exclusion from the United States under this act which would be disclosed by such search.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided in this act, final orders issued by Commission officers, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission, shall be deemed final orders of the Commission, subject to right of appeal provided in this act.

"SEC. 107. Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals: (a) There is hereby established a Board of Visa and Immigration Appeals which shall be an independent entity attached to the Commission for administrative purposes. The Board shall be composed of 9 members who shall be members of the bar of the highest court of 1 or more States and, except as hereinafter provided, shall be appointed for terms of 9 years each by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as soon as practicable after the enactment of this act. The President shall designate 1 of the members of the Board as the Chairman and 1 as Vice Chairman, who shall act in the absence of the Chairman. The term of service as Chairman and as Vice Chairman shall be 3 years. A member serving in either capacity shall be eligible for reappointment. The President shall fix the terms of the persons first appointed to the Board so that 3 of the terms will expire at the end of the third calendar year after the effective date of this act, 3 of the terms will expire at the end of the sixth such year, and 3 of the terms at the end of the ninth such year. Each member shall hold office for the term for which appointed, and thereafter until his successor has been duly qualified. The successors of

such members shall be appointed for terms of 9 years except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. Not more than 5 members of the Board in office at any 1 time shall be members of the same political party.

"(b) The members of the Board shall be appointed with due regard to their fitness for the efficient exercise of the powers and performance of the duties vested in and imposed upon the Board by this act. No Board member shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. The compensation of the Chairman shall be $15,500 per annum and that of the other members of the Board shall be $15,000 per annum.

"(c) The Board may meet in any place within or outside of the United States to promote the convenience of interested parties or the United States. The Board may hear and rehear any matters in a panel of not less than 3 members or en banc. In the latter event, a quorum shall consist of 6 members.

"(d) The Board shall have jurisdiction to review, upon the petition of the Commission or of any person aggrieved thereby, (1) all determinations denying, withdrawing, or revoking a visa, or any extension thereof, other than a visa the issuance of which is subject to the direction of the Secretary of State; (2) any determination as to the application or meaning of any Commission rule or regulation; and (3) any other determination made after a hearing, or required to be so made under this act or any regulation made thereunder.

"(e) The Board, sitting en banc, may make rules and regulations to provide for the exercise of its powers and the performance of its duties, including the rehearing or reconsideration of any decision, but no person shall be entitled to such a rehearing or reconsideration except as provided by such rules and regulations.

"(f) In its discretion the Board may hear and receive evidence in addition to that submitted at the proceeding which is being reviewed, and for that purpose may issue subpenas and take depositions to the same extent as the Commission may under section 105 (b) (4).

"(g) Every vote and official act of the Board shall be entered on record and all hearings before it shall be open to the public unless the Board determines that secrecy is requisite on ground of national security or fairness to a party to the proceedings.

"(h) After notice and hearing, where a hearing is requested, the Board shall render its decision by order in writing and a copy thereof shall be served upon all parties to the proceeding. A Board order shall become final 10 days after service, unless stayed by order of the Board.

"(i) The Commission shall supply the Board, upon its request, adequate facilities and services, including such professional, clerical, and other personnel as the Board may require to carry out its duties under this act; and the Board, within the limits of the appropriation therefor, is authorized to use funds for traveling and other expenses as may be necessary for the hearing and determination of such matters as may be brought before it.

"SEC. 103. Hearings: (a) All hearings pursuant to the provisions of this act except with respect to rulemaking shall be conducted (1) by examiners appointed and assigned to the Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, or (2) by the Board.

"(b) The Commission shall be represented at a hearing by such officer or employee as it shall designate.

"(c) Any party to a proceeding may appear at a hearing, or other proceeding under this act, or upon an administrative appeal and be heard in person or by attorney or by a representative duly qualified under Commission regulations to act in such capacity. Such party shall be advised of this right prior to each such hearing, proceeding, or appeal and be given a reasonable time to obtain and consult such attorney or representative of his choice.

"(d) All parties to a proceeding shall receive written notice of the hearing, at least 10 days in advance thereof, specifying the time and place thereof, together with a copy of the complaint or specification of charges, a statement of the authority pursuant to which the hearing is to be held, and the pertinent sections of the rules and regulations of the Commission with respect to hearings.

"(e) A hearing shall be open to the public unless the Board determines that secrecy is requisite on grounds of national security or fairness to a party to the proceeding. Upon motion to have a hearing held in secret, the hearing examiner shall refer the question to the Board for determination. The hearing examiner may, on his own initiative, refer to the Board for determination the question as to whether a secret hearing is requisite.

"(f) The examiner shall file his decision with reasonable promptness after the hearing, together with a written report reviewing the evidence and stating the reasons for his decision, and with a transcript of the entire record. A copy of the report and of the decision, together with a copy of the rules and regulations of the Commission with respect to taking appeals from the decisions of hearing examiners, shall be served upon each party. The transcript of the record shall be made available to each party.

"(g) Any decision of a hearing examiner shall be subject to review by the Board upon petition filed within 60 days after written notice of the decision has been served.

"(h) Upon timely application anyone who claims to be so situated as to be adversely affected by the exclusion, deportation, or failure to adjust the status of an alien or by the refusal or revocation of a visa may be permitted to intervene in the proceeding.

"(i) Any friend, relative, or organization, group, or private agency organized for the purpose of assisting aliens or foreign born persons or promoting foreign relations of the United States may, upon timely application, be permitted to appear and be heard in a hearing, proceeding, or administrative appeal under this act and file briefs or memoranda.

"SEC. 109. Applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act: Except as otherwise provided in this act the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act apply to administrative procedure and judicial review under this act.

"SEC. 110. Judicial review: (a) Any final order issued by the Board under this act, except any order in respect to the denial, withdrawal, or revocation of or refusal to renew or extend a visa or reentry permit shall be subject to judicial review upon petition of any person aggrieved filed within 60 days after the entry of such order. After the expiration of 60 days a petition may be filed only by leave of court upon a showing of reasonable grounds for failure to file the petition theretofore. The determination of quotas or allocation of quota visas by the Commission shall not be subject to judicial review.

"(b) A petition under this section shall be filed in the court of appeals for the circuit in which the petitioner resides or is detained or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"(c) A copy of the petition shall, upon filing, be forthwith transmitted to the Board by the clerk of the court; and the Board shall thereon certify and file in the court a transcript of the record in which the order complained of was entered.

"(d) Upon transmittal of the petition to the Board, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside the order complained of, in whole or in part, and if need be, to order further proceedings by the Commission or the Board. Upon good cause shown, the court may grant interlocutory relief by stay of the order or by such mandatory or other relief as may be appropriate.

"(e) The findings of fact by the Board, if supported by substantial evidence upon the whole record, shall be conclusive.

"(f) No objection that has not been urged before the Board shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(g) The judgment and decree of a court of appeals affirming, modifying, or setting aside any such order of the Board, shall be subject only to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certification or certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(h) The Commission shall have authority to participate in any proceeding in court arising under the provisions of this act, except the Supreme Court where it may participate with the consent of the Attorney General.

"(i) Nothing in this act shall limit or modify the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue a declaratory judgment in conformity with title 28 of the United States Code.

"(j) If a person claims that by an order of the Board he has been denied a right or privilege on the ground that he is not a citizen of the United States, he may, at his election, institute an action under section 455 for a judgment declaring him to be a citizen of the United States. The institution of such action shall stay all administrative proceedings and the execution of any administrative determinations in which the issue of citizenship is or was material.

"SEC. 111. Detention and bail: (a) Any person taken into custody under the provisions of this Act shall, except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) hereof, (1) be admitted to bail; or (2) be released, in the discretion of the Commission on his own recognizance or on the recognizance of any other individual or group. The Commission may require of a person released under this section compliance with reasonable conditions to assure his availability and to protect the national health and security of the United States.

"(b) The amount or adequacy of bail shall be only such as to assure the person's appearance, determined in the light of the circumstances of the individual.

"(c) The right of any person to bail in proceedings brought under this Act shall be inviolate, except in cases affecting the national health and security of the United States, and except as provided in section 343 of this Act.

"(d) Any person who is denied admission to the United States at a land port may be required to return to the contiguous country from which he sought admission.

"(e) the district court of the United States for the district in which the alien is being held in custody shall have authority to review any determination of the Commission under this section upon a showing in an appropriate proceeding that (1) the Commission is not proceeding with such reasonable dispatch as may be warranted by the particular facts and circumstances in the case of such alien; or (2) that the determination was arbitrary, capricious, or illegal.

"SEC. 112. Issuance and denial of visas: (a) The Commission is charged with the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act relating to the granting or refusal of visas, except that nonimmigrant visas issued to persons described in section 102 (a) (18) (A), (B), and (C), shall be is-

sued by the Commission at the direction of the Secretary of State, who shall have exclusive jurisdiction for that purpose and shall be governed so far as he deems it advisable by the principles of reciprocity. A report of every application for a visa and of the disposition of such application shall be made to the Commission in such manner and time as may be prescribed by rules and regulations.

"(b) A visa may be withdrawn from an alien under rules and regulations of the Commission at any time before his departure from the jurisdiction of the visa-granting officer on a substantially continuous trip to the United States.

"(c) Any applicant for a visa may within 60 days appeal to the Board any decision refusing, withdrawing, revoking, or refusing to renew a visa.

"SEC. 113. Establishment of offices and assignment of personnel abroad: The Commission may, after consultation with the Secretary of State, establish offices in foreign countries. In places where no such foreign office of the Commission is established, the Commission is authorized to confer or impose upon any consular officer, with the consent of the Secretary of State, any of the powers, duties, or functions imposed upon it with respect to the granting or refusal of visas, or to make such other arrangements with respect to the granting and refusal of visas as the Secretary of State shall approve and the Commission shall by regulation provide. Such consular or other officials shall, with respect to the duties delegated to them by the Commission, be subject to its supervision, regulation, and control. Any officer or employee of the Commission designated for foreign service shall, through the Department of State be regularly and officially attached to the diplomatic or consular mission of the United States in the country in which he is to be stationed, and when such officer is assigned to a country in which there is no diplomatic or consular mission of the United States, appropriate recognition and standing with full facilities for discharging his official duties shall be arranged by the Department of State, and passports shall be issued accordingly.

"SEC. 114. Authorization of expenditures and travel: (a) The Commission is authorized to make expenditures at the seat of government and elsewhere within and outside the United States as may be necessary for the exercise and performance of the powers and duties vested in and imposed upon the Commission by law, and as from time to time may be appropriated for by Congress including expenditures for (1) rent and personnel services at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) travel expenses; (3) office furniture, equipment and supplies, lawbooks, newspapers, periodicals, and books of reference (including the exchange thereof) and such other property as is necessary in the exercise and performance of the powers and duties of the Commission; (4) printing and binding; (5) cooperation with organizations concerned with immigration and naturalizations of aliens, settling, relocating, and educating aliens, study of populations and related matters in the United States or in any foreign country; (6) attendance at meetings and conventions when in the public interest, and (7) making investigations and conducting studies in matters pertaining to this act.

"(b) When officers, inspectors, or other employees of the Commission are ordered to perform duties in a foreign country, or are transferred from one station to another, in the United States or in a foreign country, or while performing duties in any foreign country become eligible for voluntary retirement and return to the United States, they shall be allowed their traveling expenses in accordance with such regulations as the Commission may deem advisable, and they may also be allowed, within the discretion and under written orders of the Commission, the expenses incurred for the transfer of their wives and dependent children, their household effects and other personal property, including the expenses for packing, crating, freight, unpacking, temporary storage, and drayage thereof in accordance with the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806; 5 U. S. C., sec. 73b–1). The expense of transporting the remains of officers, inspectors, or other employees who died while in, or in transit to or from a foreign country in the discharge of their official duties to their former homes in this country for interment, and the ordinary and necessary expenses of interment and preparation for shipment, are authorized to be paid on the written order of the Commission.

"SEC. 115. Judicial enforcement: (a) If any person has violated or if the Commission certifies that upon information and belief any individual is about to violate any provision of this act, or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, the Commission may apply to the district court of the United States for the district wherein such person resides permanently or temporarily for the enforcement of the provision, or the rule, regulation, requirement, or order; and the court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining such person from further violation of the provision, rule, regulation, requirement, or order, and enjoining upon him obedience thereto.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General, upon the request of the Commission, or where otherwise authorized by law, to institute in the proper court and to prosecute all necessary proceedings for the enforcement of the provisions of this act or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder and for the punishment of all violations thereof.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other law, prosecutions or suits may be instituted at any place in the United States at which the violation may occur or at which the person charged with a violation under section 375 or 376 may be apprehended. No suit or proceeding for a violation of any provision of this act shall be settled, compromised, or discontinued without the consent of the court in which it is pending and any settlement, compromise, or discontinuance shall be entered of record with the reasons therefor.

"SEC. 116. Duty of investigative agencies: All agencies of the United States exercising investigative powers shall keep the Commission advised of relevant information they may gather regarding any alien who may apply for admission or who may have entered the United States.

"TITLE II—QUOTA SYSTEM: SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION QUOTA

"SEC. 201. Eligibility to become a quota immigrant; preference and newcomer groups; allocation of quota visas: (a) Any person, regardless of race, color, national origin, or religion, is eligible to become a quota immigrant.

"(b) Except as hereinafter provided, the number of quota immigrants to be admitted in any one year shall be divided in the following proportions among the groups listed below:

"(1) Family Unification Preference, not less than 25 percent nor more than 35 percent.

"(2) Occupational Preference, not less than 5 percent nor more than 10 percent.

"(3) Asylum Preference, not less than 15 percent nor more than 25 percent.

"(4) National Interest Preference, not less than 20 percent nor more than 25 percent.

"(5) Newcomer Group, not less than 20 percent.

"(c) Any person may apply and, if eligible, be included within any one or more of the above groups.

"SEC. 202. Preference Groups and Newcomer Groups; persons included: (a) The Family Unification Preference shall include—

"(1) any blood relative of a citizen, through the third degree of consanguinity as computed under civil law (including any child who is married or over the age of 21); and

"(2) a spouse and any blood relative of a previously admitted alien through the third degree of consanguinity as computed under civil law (including any child who is married or over the age of 21),

whose inclusion in this preference group is requested by such citizen or previously admitted alien.

"(b) The Occupational Preference shall include persons whose immigration is especially advantageous to the United States because of their education, technical training, specialized skill, or exceptional ability to contribute to the national security, economy, health, culture, or welfare. After consultation with the Secretaries of State, Defense, Commerce, and Labor and the heads of such other departments and agencies as may be appropriate, the Commission shall, by rules and regulations, establish the requirements for qualification within this preference, including qualification upon application by a prospective employer.

"(c) The Asylum Preference shall include persons whose coming will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, national origin, color, religion, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship. Within this preference, a priority shall be given in the consideration of visa applications, but without priority in time of issuance of visas, to war, occupation, or refugee orphans as defined in section 102 (a) (32) to a maximum of 2,500 visas for such orphans. After consultation with the Secretary of State, the Commission shall, by rules and regulations, establish in terms of current world conditions the requirements for qualification within this preference.

"(d) The National Interest Preference shall include persons whose coming will advance the national interest of the United States by strengthening areas in the free world which may be assisted by emigration in the alleviation of acute political and economic problems. This preference may also include persons who have been displaced by war, other military activities, or their aftermath. Within this preference a priority shall be given in the consideration of visa applications, but without priority in time of issuance of visas, to war, occupation, or refugee orphans as defined in section 102 (a) (32) to a maximum of 2,500 visas for such orphans. After consultation with the Secretary of State and the heads of such other departments and agencies as may be appropriate, the Commission shall, by rules and regulations, establish in terms of current world conditions the requirements for qualification within this preference.

"(e) The Newcomer Group shall include all persons who seek to immigrate to the United States and do not come within any of the preference groups listed in this section.

"(f) A spouse and any child of any person included within a preference group shall also be included within such preference group if accompanying such person to the United States, or following, within a reasonable time, to join him.

"SEC. 203. Quota visas, numerical limitations; reallocation of unused visa numbers: (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the number of quota immigrant visas to be issued for any one calendar year shall be one-sixth of 1 percent of the population of the United States as determined by the

most recent official decennial census of the United States.

"(b) The total number of quota immigrant visas available for each calendar year to each of the groups listed in section 201 shall be determined, within the proportion therein specified, by the Commission, subject to the approval of the President.

"(c) If on December 31 of any calendar year, any number of quota immigrant visas allocated to any group or assigned to any nation remains unused, such number shall be reallocated for the following year to the Newcomer Group or such other group or groups as the Commission may direct, within the maximum proportions fixed in section 201. A visa regarded as used during any calendar year shall, if such visa becomes unused through expiration or failure of the person to whom the visa was issued to gain admittance to the United States, be reallocated for use during the calendar year following the expiration of such visa or of the failure to gain admittance. Such allocations shall be in addition to the regular allocation to such group or groups for the following year and shall be administered in the same manner as the regular yearly allocations, except that such additional allocations shall not be considered in determining the minimum allocations provided in section 204 (c).

"(d) During a national emergency declared by the President or by Congress, the President may reduce, or reallocate to another group, or postpone from year to year the number of quota immigrant visas then allocated to any or all of the groups listed in section 201, without regard to the percentage limitations set forth therein. Such action shall not affect the validity of a visa already issued to an immigrant who has left the territorial jurisdiction of the official who granted the visa.

"SEC. 204. Priorities within preference groups; examination of applicants for immigration visas; allocation of immigration visas among nations: (a) A person who seeks to be included in any of the preference groups shall be examined, to determine eligibility therefor, pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission, by the official to whom he applies for a visa.

"(b) Priority in the issuance of visas within the Newcomer Group shall be determined by the order in Greenwich mean time of the application for the visas allocated to the group. Applications, once filed, shall, unless disposed of, be carried over from year to year.

"(c) Of the total number of visas allocated to the Newcomer Group for any single calendar year, one-half of 1 percent of this number shall be assigned to each nation having a population of 200,000 or more, to be used by persons who are citizens or residents of that nation, who desire to immigrate to the United States. Not more than 10 percent of such number shall be issued to citizens or residents of any single nation.

" 'Nation' as used in this section means an independent state, a self-governing dominion, a mandated territory, a trust territory, a colony, a possession, or a dependency. However, if the Commission shall find that the assigned quota visas are not otherwise likely to be used, or that it would be otherwise desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission may treat as a single nation two or more nations as herein defined which are geographically or culturally related.

"(d) The Commission shall, by rules and regulations, adopted after public hearing—

"(1) establish the requirements for qualification within each of the groups listed in section 201;

"(2) specify the number or proportion of the total number of immigrant visas available for any single calendar year which are allocated for that year to each group, and the maximum proportion of the number so allocated which may be issued in any single month of such year;

"(3) determine relative priorities within the preference groups listed in section 201;

"(4) require such assurance of financial responsibility and documents as it deems appropriate before any application for a visa shall be considered as being 'received' or 'filed' within the meaning of this act so as to entitle any person to be listed, or obtain a priority, for a visa within any preference listed in section 201;

"(5) define 'residence' for purposes of the issuance of a visa, and provide for cases where the immigrant has changed his residence subsequent to his application for a visa; and

"(6) require of any alien who seeks to enter the United States such proof and tests as it deems appropriate to determine his classification as a previously admitted alien, a nonimmigrant, a nonquota immigrant, or his eligibility to be placed within any group listed in section 201.

"TITLE III—IMMIGRATION AND DEPORTATION

"CHAPTER 1—ALIENS WHO ARE INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS; EXCLUSION AND ADMISSION

"SEC. 301. Grounds of ineligibility to receive visas: No alien who is within any of the following categories shall be eligible to receive a visa for admission into the United States:

"(a) Aliens who are insane, idiots, imbeciles, morons, lepers, narcotic addicts, sexual perverts; aliens afflicted with chronic alcoholism, a dangerous contagious disease, or active tuberculosis. Any alien who would be admissible except for the provisions of this subsection may nevertheless be admitted if he or someone in his behalf obtains special permission from the Commission, and furnishes such bond as the Commission may require to comply with such terms and conditions as the Commission may impose, if the Commission finds, in each case, after consideration of the facts and circumstances, that such an admission is not contrary to the best interests of the United States and does not endanger the national health of the United States.

"(b) Aliens who have been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. This subsection shall not apply to a person (1) who has had but one conviction and that for a crime committed under the age of 18; or (2) who has been convicted of a petty crime; or (3) who has been convicted of political offenses; or (4) who has been convicted in absentia; or (5) to whom a pardon or amnesty has been granted in good faith. Conviction of crime shall not include a conviction where it can be shown that the prosecution was a form of political or religious persecution. Aliens ineligible under this subsection may be granted visas and admitted to the United States if it is determined that such aliens have been, for 5 years prior to making application for a visa, of good moral character, and that their admission to the United States would not be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

"(c) Aliens who practice or advocate the practice of polygamy.

"(d) Aliens who are prostitutes or who are supported by the proceeds of prostitution or who are coming to the United States for the purpose of engaging in unlawful commercialized vice.

"(e) Aliens who are paupers, professional beggars, or vagrants, or who are likely to become public charges.

"(f) Aliens who have been previously excluded or deported, or against whom an order of deportation was outstanding when they last departed from the United States, or who have been removed from the United States at Government expense in lieu of deportation, unless permission is given by the Commission to any such aliens to apply for a visa.

"(g) (1) Aliens who are over 16 years of age, and although physically capable, are unable to read and understand some language or dialect thereof, but this subsection shall not apply to nonimmigrants, nor to aliens who are coming to the United States to join a spouse or a relative within the second degree of consanguinity as computed under civil law, nor to those who are seeking refuge from persecution or oppression.

"(2) For the purpose of ascertaining whether an alien can read, the Commission officer shall use slips of uniform size, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type, in one of the various languages or dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular langauge or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made and shall be required to read and understand the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect.

"(h) Aliens who seek to enter the United States to engage in activities which would endanger the welfare, safety, or security, of the United States by violating the criminal laws of the United States or any State thereof.

"(i) (1) Aliens who—

"(A) have advocated or taught subversive doctrine; or

"(B) have been members of or affiliated with any organization which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine.

"(2) Aliens ineligible under this subsection may be granted visas and admitted to the United States if it is determined that such advocacy or teaching and membership or affiliation were terminated at least 5 years prior to application for entry, and that their entry would not be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

"(j) Aliens who seek to enter the United States under section 201 (b) (5), under contract to perform skilled or unskilled labor unless the Commission determines that unemployed persons are not available in the locality to which they are destined to perform such labor.

"(k) Aliens who have been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation relating to the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, or who have been convicted of a violation of any law or regulation governing or controlling the taxing, manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, or any salt derivative or preparation of opium or coca leaves, or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate; or aliens who are found to be or have been illicit traffickers in any of the aforementioned drugs.

"(l) Aliens who have been formally charged by duly constituted authorities with the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude, and which charge remains open and undisposed of at the time of application for a visa. Such charge of crime shall not include a charge made for political or religious purposes.

"(m) Aliens who are ineligible to citizenship by virtue of section 414 or 415.

"(n) Nonimmigrant aliens not in possession of valid passport or other valid travel document authorizing for a period of 6 months from the date of expiration of their visit or stay in the United States entry into another country.

"(o) Aliens who have knowingly and for gain assisted any other alien to enter, or attempt to enter, the United States in violation of law.

"(p) Aliens who have entered or sought to enter the United States by fraud which is willful and material, unless permission is given by the Commission to any such aliens to apply for a visa.

"SEC. 302. Requirements for admission; grounds for exclusion: (a) Every alien presenting himself at a port of entry for ad-

mission into the United States shall be admitted if he meets the following requirements, failing which he shall be excluded:

"(1) Be in possession of a valid unexpired visa or reentry permit issued to him; or

"(2) Be in possession of a valid visa or reentry permit issued to him which had not expired at the time he commenced a substantially continuous trip to the United States; or

"(3) Be in possession of a visa or reentry permit issued to him which prior to his departure he did not know and could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have learned was defective; or

"(4) He obtains, prior or subsequent to his arrival at a port of the United States, permission of the Commission to enter on the ground that he is eligible to receive a visa but was unable to obtain it because he fled in imminent danger of his life from political, racial, or religious persecution; and that his entry is consistent with the best interests of the United States.

"(b) Even though fulfilling the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, an alien shall be excluded if it is established—

"(1) that his visa or reentry permit was procured by willful and material fraud; or

"(2) that a condition specified in section 301 (a) has developed after the issuance of his visa; or

"(3) by new evidence, discovered after the issuance of such visa, that the alien would be ineligible to receive a visa under section 301 (b), (c), (d), (f), (h), (i), (k), (l), (m), or (o), were he to apply therefor at the time he presents himself at a port of entry for admission into the United States; or

"(d) that he is a stowaway except that a stowaway, if otherwise admissible, may be admitted in the discretion of the Commission; or

"(5) that being in possession of a visa, he seeks admission from foreign contiguous territory where he arrived on a vessel or aircraft of a noncontracting transportation line or, if a contracting, a noncomplying transportation line under section 337 (a), and has not resided in such adjacent islands or territory for at least 6 months subsequent to such arrival; or

"(6) that he is an alien accompanying and responsible for the care of an excluded alien helpless because of sickness or mental and physical disability or infancy, unless substitute care is obtained by or on behalf of the excluded alien.

"SEC. 303. Limitations on exclusion: (a) A person who is in possession of an unexpired United States passport issued to him shall not be excluded from admission into the United States; but if, after admission, it is established, in deportation or other legal proceedings, that the person is not a citizen, he shall be deportable.

"(b) An alien shall not be excluded from reentry into the United States if he—

"(1) is returning to the United States from foreign contiguous territory after a temporary stay of not more than 14 days, or after a longer stay which was involuntary and is either—

"(A) an alien previously admitted for permanent residence; or is

"(B) an alien who, prior to such stay, lived in the United States not less than 10 consecutive years; or

"(2) has an unexpired reentry permit issued to him except a permit procured by willful and material fraud, or if he has involuntarily overstayed the expiration date of his reentry permit.

"(c) A child shall not be excluded from the United States who is within one of the following categories and is accompanied by one or both of his parents:

"(1) A child under 1 year of age, one or both of whose parents are citizens of the United States, or is a person who is nonexcludable under this section; or

"(2) A child under 1 year of age born after the accompanying parent's visa or reentry permit was issued and whose accompanying parent is admitted to the United States; or

"(3) A child under 14 years of age who is alleged to be a citizen of the United States by virtue of the claim of citizenship of any accompanying parent who is in possession of an unexpired United States passport issued to him. Any child admitted to the United States solely by reason of this paragraph shall be deportable if at the time of such child's admission, the parent, by virtue of whose status he was admitted, was deportable and is deported within 5 years of such admission; section 342 (b) notwithstanding.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) an alien shall be excluded if, since his last departure from the United States, he has become ineligible to receive a visa under section 301 (b), (f) (h), (i), or (o), at the time he presents himself at a port of entry for reentry into the United States, or if he has been formally charged by duly constituted authorities in a foreign country with the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude, and which charge remains open and undisposed of at the time the alien presents himself for reentry. Such charge of crime shall not include a charge which was made for political purposes.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or prejudice the deportability of any person admitted into the United States under this section.

"SEC. 304. Exclusion; right to hearing; Procedure: No alien shall be excluded from the United States unless he is advised of the charges against him and accorded an opportunity for a hearing. Exclusion of an alien shall be ordered only upon a record adduced at such hearing. Evidence the disclosure of which the Attorney General personally certifies would seriously impair the usefulness of reliable and important sources of confidential information or would adversely affect the safety or security of the United States need not be revealed at such hearing. In all cases the alien shall be informed as fully of the nature of the charges against him as is consistent with the safety or security of the United States.

"SEC. 305. Waivers by the Commission: (a) The Commission shall prescribe rules and regulations providing for the exemption from the provisions of sections 301 and 302 of individual nonimmigrants or classes of nonimmigrants, described in section 102 (a) (18), (D), (E), (F), (H), (I), and (J) to further the national security, commerce, and culture of the United States, international trade, science, education, and travel. Such waiver shall be granted by the Commission on such terms and conditions as it shall deem to be appropriate, to protect the national health and security of the United States. Annual reports shall be made to Congress of all cases where waivers of more than 30 days duration have been granted.

"(b) The Commission may waive the provisions of section 301, except subsections (h), (i), and (l), and of section 302 (a), in the case of any previously admitted alien returning to the United States after a temporary stay abroad to an unrelinquished domicile in the United States of 7 consecutive years.

"CHAPTER 2—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO ADMISSION OF ALIENS; TRAVEL CONTROL OF CITIZENS AND ALIENS

"SEC. 311. Parole; bonds: The Commission is authorized to parole aliens into the United States upon such conditions as it shall deem appropriate, including the posting of cash deposits or bonds. Such parole shall not constitute admission of such aliens into the United States.

"SEC. 312. Admission of nonimmigrants: Nonimmigrants shall be admitted to the United States for such time and under such conditions as the Commission may deem appropriate, including the posting of cash deposits or bonds to insure that each such alien will depart from the United States (1) upon the expiration of such time or (2) upon failure to maintain the conditions specified by the Commission or (3) upon failure to maintain the status under which such alien was admitted, or any nonimmigrant status subsequently acquired under section 346.

"SEC. 313. Travel control of aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency. (a) When the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President, or, as to aliens, whenever there exists a state of war between or among two or more nations, and the President shall find that the interests of the United States require that restrictions and prohibitions in addition to those provided otherwise than by this section be imposed upon the departure of persons from and their entry into the United States, and shall make public proclamation thereof, it shall, until otherwise ordered by the President or the Congress, be unlawful—

"(1) for any alien to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States except under such reasonable rules, regulations, and orders, and subject to such limitations and exceptions as the President may prescribe;

"(2) for any person to transport or attempt to transport from or into the United States another person, with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the departure or entry of such person is forbidden by this section;

"(3) for any person knowingly to make any false statement in an application for permission to depart from or enter the United States with intent to induce or secure the granting of such permission either for himself or for another;

"(4) for any person knowingly to furnish or attempt to furnish or assist in furnishing to another a permit or evidence of permission to depart or enter not issued and designed for such other person's use;

"(5) for any person knowingly to use or attempt to use any permit or evidence of permission to depart or enter not issued and designed for his use;

"(6) for any person to forge, counterfeit, mutilate, or alter, or cause or procure to be forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered, any permit or evidence of permission to depart from or enter the United States; and

"(7) for any person knowingly to use or attempt to use or furnish to another for use any false, forged, counterfeited, mutilated, or altered permit, or evidence of permission, or any permit or evidence of permission which, though originally valid, has become or been made void or invalid.

"(b) After such proclamation as is provided for in subsection (a) has been made and published and while such proclamation is in force, it shall be unlawful, except as otherwise provided by the President, for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid passport.

"(c) Any person who shall willfully violate any of the provisions of this section, or of any order or proclamation of the President promulgated, or of any permit, rule, or regulation issued thereunder, may, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000, or, if a natural person, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation shall be punished by like fine or imprisonment, or both; and any vehicle, vessel, or aircraft together with its appurtenances, equipment, tackle, apparel, and furniture, concerned in any such violation, shall be forfeited to the United States.

"(d) The term 'United States' as used in this section includes the Canal Zone, and all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The term 'person' as used in this section means any individual, partnership, association, company, or other incorporated body of individuals, or corporation, or body politic.

"(e) Nothing in this act shall be construed to entitle an alien, to whom a permit to enter the United States has been issued, to enter the United States, if upon arrival in the United States, he is found to be inadmissible under any of the provisions of this section.

"(f) The revocation of any proclamation, rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this section shall not operate to bar prosecution for any offense committed, or the imposition of any penalities or forfeitures liability for which was incurred under this section, prior to the revocation of such proclamation, rule, regulation, or order.

"(g) For the purpose of this section, passports, vias, reentry permits, and other documents required for entry under this act may be considered as permits to enter.

"(h) No person other than any enemy alien or an alien stowaway shall, under this section, be excluded or denied permission to depart unless he is advised of the charges against him and accorded a hearing. Such exclusion or denial of departure shall be made only upon a record adduced at such hearing. Evidence the disclosure of which the Attorney General personally certifies would seriously impair the usefulness of reliable and important sources of confidential information or would adversely affect the safety or security of the United States need not be revealed at such hearing. In all such cases the alien shall be informed as fully of the nature of the charges against him as is consistent with the safety or security of the United States.

"CHAPTER 3—ISSUANCE OF ENTRY DOCUMENTS

"SEC. 321. Visa requirements: (a) The Commission shall, after public hearing, issue rules and regulations to govern the issuance of visas to aliens. In the case of—

"(1) a quota immigrant, the visa shall state the group, under section 201, in which the immigrant is included;

"(2) a nonquota immigrant, the visa shall state the particular nonquota category in which the immigrant is included;

"(3) a nonimmigrant, the visa shall state the nonimmigrant category in which the alien is included; and

"(4) in the case of any alien, the visa shall state the date on which it shall expire, and such additional information as may be required.

"(b) Each alien who applies for a visa shall be registered and fingerprinted in connection with his application, and shall furnish copies of his photograph signed by him for such use as may by regulations be required. The requirements of this subsection may be waived in the discretion of the Secretary of State in the case of any alien who is within that class of nonimmigrants enumerated in section 102 (a) (18) (A), (B), and (C).

"(c) An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding 120 days, as the Commission shall prescribe by regulations. A nonimmigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as the Commission shall prescribe by regulations; in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Commission shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to citizens of the United States who are within a similar class. If prior to the expiration date of his visa an alien has departed from the jurisdiction of the Commission officer who has granted the visa, on a substantially continuous trip to the United States, then as prescribed by regulations of the Commission the expiration date of such visa shall be extended so as to include the date of such arrival in the United States. If an alien for a good cause was unable to use a visa issued to him, and applies for a new visa within 1 year from the issuance of his original visa, his application shall be given priority in the appropriate group as of the date of his original application. Such application may be made at the place of his original application or elsewhere.

"(d) Prior to the issuance of an immigrant visa to any alien, the Commission officer shall require the alien to submit to a physical and mental examination in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission. Prior to the issuance of a nonimmigrant visa to any alien, the Commission officer may require the alien to submit to an examination, as prescribed by rules and regulations of the Commission, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the alien is eligible to receive a nonimmigrant visa.

"(e) Each immigrant shall surrender his immigrant visa to the Commission officer at the port of entry, who shall endorse on the visa the date and the port of arrival, the identity of the vessel or other means of transportation by which the immigrant arrived, and such other endorsements as may by regulations be required. Each nonimmigrant shall present or surrender to the Commission officer at the port of entry such documents as may be required by the rules and regulations of the Commission.

"(f) Subject to chapter 6 and other relevant provisions, any alien crewman may be temporarily admitted to the United States without a visa if his name appears in the crew list of the vessel or aircraft upon which he arrives and the crew list is visaed by a Commission officer pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission.

"SEC. 322. Visa applications: (a) Every alien applying for an immigrant visa shall make application therefor in such form and manner and at such place as may be prescribed by rules and regulations of the Commission. In the application the immigrant shall state his full name, and any other name which he has used; age and sex; the date and place of his birth; present address and places of previous residence; whether married or single, and the names and places of residence of spouse and children, if any; calling or occupation; personal description (including height, complexion, color of hair and eyes, and marks of identification); languages he can speak, read, or write; names and addresses of parents, and if neither parent living, then the name and address of his next of kin in the country from which he comes; port of entry into the United States; final destination, if any, beyond the port of entry; whether he has a ticket through to such final destination; whether going to join a relative or friend, and, if so, the name and address of such relative or friend; the purpose for which he is going to the United States; the length of time he intends to remain in the United States; whether or not he intends to remain in the United States permanently; whether he was ever arrested or convicted or was ever in prison; whether he has ever been the beneficiary of a pardon or an amnesty; whether he has ever been treated in an institution or hospital or other place for insanity or other mental disease; if he claims to be within a preference group or a nonquota immigrant, the facts on which he bases such claim; whether or not he is a member of any class of individuals ineligible to receive a visa to or excludable from the United States, or whether he claims to be exempt from such provisions of the immigration laws; and such additional information necessary to the identification of the applicant and the enforcement of the immigration and citizenship laws as may be required.

"(b) Every alien applying for an immigrant visa shall present a valid unexpired passport or affidivit in lieu thereof or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if such document is required under regulations of the Commission. The alien shall furnish with his application two copies of a certification by the appropriate police authorities stating what their records show concerning the immigrant; two certified copies of any existing prison record, and record of his birth, and two certified copies of all other records or documents concerning him or his case which may be required by the Commission. One copy of each document so furnished shall be permanently attached to each copy of the application and become a part thereof. In the event that the alien establishes that any document or record required by this subsection is unobtainable, the alien may be permitted to submit in lieu of such document or record other satisfactory evidence of the facts to which such document or record would, if obtainable, pertain.

"(c) Every alien applying for a nonimmigrant visa shall make application therefor in such form and manner as may be prescribed by rules and regulations of the Commission. In the application the aliens shall state his full name, the date and place of birth, his citizenship, the purpose and length of his intended stay in the United States; personal description (including height, complexion, color of hair and eyes, and marks of identification); his marital status; and such additional documents and information necessary to the identification of applicant and the administration of the immigration laws as may be required.

"(d) Except as may be otherwise prescribed by regulations, each copy of an application required by this section shall be signed by the applicant in the presence of the Commission officer, and verified by the oath of the applicant administered by the officer. One copy of the application for an immigrant visa shall become the immigrant visa, and the other copy shall be disposed of as may be prescribed by regulation. The application for a nonimmigrant visa or other documentation as a nonimmigrant shall be disposed of as may be prescribed by regulation. The issuance of a nonimmigrant visa shall, except as may be otherwise prescribed by regulation, be evidenced by a stamp placed by the Commission officer in the alien's passport, affidavit in lieu thereof or other travel document.

"SEC. 323. Reentry Permits: (a) Any alien who has been lawfully admitted to the United States and who intends to depart temporarily from the United States may make application to the Commission for a permit to reenter the United States stating the length of his intended absence or absences, and the reasons therefor. Such applications shall be made under oath, and shall be in such form, contain such information, and be accompanied by such photographs of the applicant as the Commission may prescribe by rules and regulations.

"(b) If the Commission finds (1) that the applicant under subsection (a) has been lawfully admitted to the United States and since admission has maintained the status required of him and such applicant desires to visit abroad and to return to the United States to resume the status existing at the time of his departure for such visit, (2) that the application is made in good faith, and (3) that the alien's proposed departure from the United States is not for a purpose contrary to the interests of the United States, the Commission may issue the permit which shall be valid for not more than 1 year from the date of issuance. For good cause and under such conditions as it may prescribe under rules and regulations, the Commission may extend the validity of such a permit for a period or periods not to exceed 6 months each.

"(c) During the period of validity such permit may be used by the alien to return to the United States on any number of occasions and upon the expiration of its validity, shall be surrender to the Commission.

"(d) A reentry permit shall not be denied or revoked or its renewal refused without opportunity for hearing.

"(e) A reentry permit may be revoked at any time while the alien is in the United States.

"SEC. 324. Nonquota immigrant visas: The Commission may, subject to this act, issue a visa to a nonquota immigrant upon satisfactory proof, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission, that the applicant is entitled to nonquota immigrant status.

"CHAPTER 4—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ENTRY AND EXCLUSION

"SEC. 331. List of alien and citizen passengers arriving or departing; record of resident aliens and citizens leaving permanently for foreign country: (a) Upon the arrival of any person by water or by air at any port within the United States from any place outside the United States, it shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer, or authorized agent, owner, or consignee of the vessel or aircraft, having any such person on board to deliver to the Commission officer at the port of arrival typewritten or printed lists or manifests of the persons on board such vessel or aircraft. Such lists or manifests shall be prepared at such time, be in such form, and contain such information as the Commission shall prescribe by rules and regulations as being necessary for the identification of the persons transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. This subsection shall not require the master or commanding officer, or authorized agent, owner, or consignee of a vessel or aircraft to furnish a list or manifest relating (1) to an alien crewman or (2) to any other person arriving by air on a trip originating in foreign contiguous territory, except (with respect to such arrivals by air) as may be required by rules and regulations issued pursuant to section 338.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the master or commanding officer or authorized agent of every vessel or aircraft taking passengers on board at any port of the United States, who are destined to any place outside the United States, to file with the Commission officer before departure from such port a list of all such persons taken on board. Such list shall be in such form, contain such information, and be accompanied by such documents, as the Commission shall prescribe by rules and regulations as necessary for the identification of the persons so transported and for the enforcement of the immigration laws. No master or commanding officer of any such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance papers for his vessel or aircraft until he or the authorized agent has deposited such list or lists and accompanying documents with the Commission officer at such port and made oath that they are full and complete as to the information required to be contained therein, except that in the case of vessels or aircraft which the Commission determines are making regular trips to ports of the United States, the Commission may, when expedient, arrange for the delivery of lists of outgoing persons at a later date. This subsection shall not require the master or commanding officer, or authorized agent, owner, or consignee of a vessel or aircraft to furnish a list or manifest relating (1) to an alien crewman or (2) to any other person departing by air on a trip originating in the United States who is destined to foreign contiguous territory.

"(c) The Commission may order recorded the following information regarding every resident person leaving the United States by way of the Canadian or Mexican borders for permanent residence in a foreign country: Name, age, and sex; whether married or single; calling or occupation; whether able to read or write; citizenship; country of birth; country of which citizen or subject; last permanent residence in the United States; intended future permanent residence; and time and port of last arrival in the United States; and if a United States citizen or national the facts on which claim to that status is based.

"(d) If the Commission shall find that the master or commanding officer, owner, or consignee of any vessel or aircraft, or the agent of any transportation line, as the case may be, has refused or failed to deliver any list or manifest required by subsection (a) or (b), or that the list or manifest delivered is not accurate and full, such master or commanding officer, owner, or consignee, or agent, as the case may be, shall pay to the Commission the sum of $10 for each person concerning whom such accurate and full list or manifest is not furnished, or concerning whom the manifest or list is not prepared and sworn to as prescribed by this section or by regulations issued pursuant thereto.

"(e) The Commission is authorized to prescribe the circumstances and conditions under which the list or manifest requirements of subsections (a) and (b) may be waived.

"SEC. 332. Detention of aliens for observation and examination; expense: (a) For the purpose of determining whether aliens, other than those who are nonexcludable under section 303. arriving at ports of the United States belong to any of the classes excluded by this act, by reason of being afflicted with any of the diseases or mental or physical defects or disabilities set forth in subsection (a) of section 301, or whenever the Commission has received information showing that such aliens are coming from a country or have embarked at a place where any of such diseases are prevalent or epidemic, such aliens shall be detained either aboard the vessel or at the airport of arrival of the aircraft, or at such other suitable place as the Commission may designate. Such detention shall, as the circumstances may require or justify, be for a sufficient time to enable the Commission to subject such aliens to observation and an examination sufficient to determine whether or not they belong to the excluded classes.

"(b) Pursuant to subsection (c) of section 333 of this act, such detention may be at the expense of the vesssel or aircraft on which such aliens arrive.

"SEC. 333. Temporary removal for examination upon arrival: (a) Upon the arrival at a port of the United States of any vessel or aircraft bringing aliens, the Commission officer at each port may order a temporary removal of such aliens other than those who are nonexcludable under section 303, for examination and inspection at a designated time and place, but such temporary removal shall not be considered a landing, nor shall it relieve vessels or aircraft, the transportation lines, or the masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees of the vessel or aircraft upon which such aliens are brought to any port of the United States from any of the obligations which, in case such aliens remain on board, would, under the provisions of this act, bind such vessels or aircraft, transportation lines, masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees. A temporary removal of such aliens from such vessels or aircraft ordered pursuant to this subsection shall be made by the Commission at the expense of the vessels or aircraft or transportation lines, or the masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees of such vessels, aircraft, or transportation lines, as provided in subsection (b) of this section and such vessels, aircraft, transportation lines, masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees, shall, so long as such removal lasts, be relieved of responsibility for the safekeeping of such aliens. Such vessels, aircraft, transportation lines, masters, commanding officers, agents, owners, or consignees, may with the approval of the Commission assume responsibility for the safekeeping of such aliens during their removal to a designated place for examination and inspection, in which event such removal need not be made by the Commission.

"(b) Whenever a temporary removal of such aliens is made under this section, the vessels or aircraft or transportation lines which brought them, and the masters, commanding officers, owners, agents, and consignees of the vessels, aircraft, or transportation lines upon which they arrived shall pay all expenses of such removal to a designated place for examination and inspection or other place of detention and all expenses arising during subsequent detention, pending a decision on such aliens' eligibility to enter the United States and until they are either allowed to land or returned to the care of the transportation lines or to the vessels or aircraft which brought them. Such expenses shall include maintenance, medical treatment in hospital or elsewhere, burial in the event of death, and transfer to the vessels, aircraft, or transportation lines in event of deportation, except where such expenses arise under section 336 (d) or in such cases as the Commission may prescribe in the case of aliens paroled into the United States temporarily under the provisions of section 311.

"(c) Any detention expenses and expenses incident to detention incurred (but not including expenses of removal to the place of detention) pursuant to section 332 and this section shall not be assessed against the vessel or aircraft or transportation line or the master, commanding officer, owner, agent, or consignee of the vessel, aircraft or transportation line if he or it did not know or could not have ascertained by exercise of reasonable diligence prior to the embarkation of the person transported that he was an alien; or that being an alien his visa or other documents authorizing entry were invalid or had expired; or that he was excludable under section 302 (b) (2) or (5).

"(d) Any refusal or failure to comply with the provisions of this section shall be punished in the manner specified in section 336 (b).

"SEC. 334. Physical and mental examination: The physical and mental examination of arriving aliens, other than aliens who are nonexcludable under section 303 of this act, shall be made by medical officers of the United States Public Health Service, who shall conduct all medical examinations and shall certify any physical and mental disease observed by them in any such alien. If medical officers of the United States Public Health Service are not available, physicians of not less than 4 years' professional experience may be employed for such service upon such terms as may be prescribed by the Commission. Such physical and mental examinations shall be conducted under administrative regulations prescribed by the Commission, and under medical regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General of the United State Public Health Service. Medical officers of the United States Public Health Service who have had special training in the diagnosis of mental disease shall be detained for duty or employed at such ports of entry as the Commission may designate and such medical officers shall be provided with suitable facilities for the detention and examination of all such arriving aliens who it is suspected may be excludable under section 302 (b) (2) and the services of interpreters shall be provided for such examination. Any alien determined excludable under this section may appeal to a board of medical officers of the United States Public Health Service, and such alien may introduce before such

board expert medical testimony at his own cost and expense.

"SEC. 335. Inspection: The inspection, other than the physical and mental examination, of aliens, seeking admission or reentry to, or the privilege of passing through, the United States shall be conducted by Commission officers, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe. Any person coming into the United States may be required by an authorized Commission officer to give under oath such information as will aid in determining whether he is a citizen of the United States or an alien; and, if an alien, to state under oath the purpose or purposes for which he comes, the length of time he intends to remain in the United States, whether or not he intends to remain in the United States permanently and such other items of information as will aid in determining whether he is excludable from the United States.

"SEC. 336. Immediate deportation of aliens excluded from admission or entering in violation of law: (a) Any alien (other than an alien crewman) arriving in the United States who is excluded under this act, shall be immediately deported to the country whence he came, on the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line bringing him, unless the Commission, in its discretion, concludes that immediate transportation is not practicable or proper. The cost of the maintenance including detention expenses and expenses incident to detention, as well as the transportation expense of the alien's deportation from the United States, shall be borne by the owner or owners of the vessel, aircraft, or transportation line on which he arrived, except that such maintenance cost and such transportation expense shall not be assessed against the owner or owners of such vessel or aircraft if he or they did not know and could not have ascertained by exercise of reasonable diligence, prior to the embarkation of the person transported, that he was an alien; or being an alien his visa or other documents authorizing entry were invalid or that he was excludable under section 302 (b) (2) or (5). Such expenses when paid by the owner or owners, or by the United States, may be recovered from such an alien who is both excluded and deported on grounds other than those contained in section 302 (b) (2).

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person (1) to refuse to receive any alien ordered deported under this section back on board such vessel or aircraft or another vessel or aircraft owned or operated by the same interests; (2) to fail to detain any alien (other than an alien crewman) on board any such vessel or at the airport of arrival of the aircraft when required by this act or if so ordered by the Commission, or to fail or refuse to deliver him for medical or other inspection, or for further medical or other inspection, as and when so ordered by the Commission; (3) to refuse or fail to remove him from the United States to the country whence he came; (4) to fail to pay the cost of his maintenance while being detained as required by this section or section 333; (5) to take any fee, deposit, or consideration on a contingent basis to be kept in case the alien is admitted or returned in case he is excluded; or (6) knowingly to bring to the United States any alien (other than an alien crewman) excluded or deported under any provision of law unless such alien is in possession of unexpired visa or other documents issued to him, authorizing him to enter the United States. If the Commission shall determine that any person has violated any of the provisions of this section or of section 333 of this act, such person may be required by the Commission to pay a sum not to exceed $300 for each violation.

"(c) If the vessel or aircraft, which brought the alien who has been ordered deported, has left the United States and it is impracticable to deport the alien within a reasonable time by another vessel or aircraft owned by the same person, the cost of deportation may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act and recovered from the owner.

"(d) The Commission may stay the deportation of any alien deportable under this section, if the testimony of such alien is desired on behalf of the United States in the prosecution of offenders against any provisions of this act or other laws of the United States. The cost of maintenance of any alien so detained resulting from a stay of deportation under this subsection and a reasonable witness fee for each day such alien is so detained may be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act. Such alien may be released either under bond in the penalty of not less than $500 with security approved by the Commission on condition that such alien shall be produced when required as a witness and for deportation, or on such other conditions as the Commission may prescribe, or both.

"(e) In the case of an accompanying alien excluded under section 302 (b) (6) and ordered deported, the master, commanding officer, agent, owner, consignee, or charterer of the vessel or aircraft in which such alien arrived in the United States shall be required to return the alien in the same manner as other aliens denied admission and ordered deported under this section.

"SEC. 337. Entry through or from foreign contiguous territory; landing stations: (a) The Commission shall have power to enter into contracts with transportation lines for the entry and inspection of aliens coming to the United States through foreign contiguous territory. Due care shall be exercised to avoid any discriminatory action in favor of transportation companies transporting to such territory or islands aliens destined to the United States, and all such transportation companies shall be required, as a condition precedent to the inspection or examination under such rules and contracts at the ports of such contiguous territory of aliens brought thereto by them, to enter into a contract which will require them to submit to and comply with all the requirements of this act which would apply were they bringing such aliens directly to ports of the United States.

"(b) The Commission shall have power to enter into contracts with transportation lines for the entry and inspection of aliens coming to the United States from foreign contiguous territory. No such transportation line shall be allowed to land any such alien in the United States until and unless it has entered into any such contracts as may be required by the Commission.

"(c) Every transportation line engaged in carrying alien passengers for hire to the United States from foreign contiguous territory shall provide and maintain at its expense suitable landing stations, approved by the Commission, conveniently located at the port or ports of entry. No such transportation line shall be allowed to land any alien passenger in the United States until such landing stations are provided, and unless such stations are thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Commission.

"(d) The Commission shall have power to enter into contracts including bonding agreements with transportation lines to guarantee the passage through the United States in immediate and continuous transit of aliens destined to foreign countries. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, such aliens may not have their classification changed under section 346.

"(e) As used in this section the terms 'transportation line' and 'transportation company' include, but are not limited to, the owner, charterer, consignee, or authorized agent operating any vessel or aircraft bringing aliens to the United States, or to foreign contiguous territory.

"SEC. 338. Designation of ports of entry for aliens arriving by civil aircraft: The Commission may by rules and regulations (1) designate as ports of entry for aliens arriving by aircraft any of the ports of entry for civil aircraft designated as such in accordance with law; (2) provide such reasonable requirements for aircraft in civil air navigation with respect to giving notice of intention to land in advance of landing, or notice of landing, as shall be deemed necessary for purposes of adminisrtation and enforcement of this act; and (3) provide for the application of civil air navigation of the provisions of this act where not expressly so provided in this act to such extent and upon such conditions as it deems necessary. Any person found to have violated any rule or regulation made under this section may be required by the Commission to pay a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $500 for each violation.

"SEC. 339. Records of admission: (a) The Commission shall cause to be filed as a record of admission to the United States, (1) the immigrant visa required by section 321 (e) to be surrendered by the alien when he presents himself at the port of entry, and (2) such record of the entry, reentry, admission, or return of any other alien as is necessary for the enforcement and administration of the immigration laws.

"CHAPTER 5—DEPORTATION: EQUITABLE RELIEF

"SEC. 341. General classes of deportable aliens: (a) Subject to the limitations prescribed in section 342, any alien in the United States shall be deportable who—

"(1) was ineligible to receive a visa or was excludable under the law existing at the time of receiving a visa or admission to the United States but received a visa or was admitted as a result of willful and material fraud which was willfully and materially committed or procured by him;

"(2) entered the United States without inspection;

"(3) has remained in the United States beyond the time granted to him; or otherwise knowingly violated a lawful condition of his admission to the United States;

"(4) becomes a public charge within 5 years after his entry from causes not affirmatively shown to have arisen subsequent to entry;

"(5) is sentenced to and confined to prison for a term of 1 year or more upon conviction in the United States of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed within 5 years after his entry; or within 10 years after entry, is sentenced more than once to such a term of imprisonment as a result of convictions in the United States of any crimes involving moral turpitude;

"(6) is convicted at any time after entry of the crime of prostitution, soliciting, procuring, or assisting a prostitute, or any other crime involving commercialized vice;

"(7) is convicted at any time after entry of violating or conspiring to violate any statute of the United States or of any State, Territory, possession, or of the District of Columbia, taxing, prohibiting, or regulating the manufacture, production, compounding, transportation, sale, exchange, dispensing, giving away, importation, or exportation of opium, coca leaves, heroin, marihuana, or any salt, derivative, or preparation of opium or coca leaves, or isonipecaine or any addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining opiate; and

"(8) within 5 years prior to the issuance of a warrant of arrest in deportation proceedings against him, advocated or taught subversive doctrine or was a member of or affiliated with any organization which advocated or taught subversive doctrine.

"(b) 'Conviction' as used in paragraph (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (a) shall not include a conviction—

"(1) for a crime committed by an alien under the age of 16; or

"(2) for a crime which has been pardoned or otherwise forgiven or expunged under applicable law; or

"(3) in any case where recommendation is made by the court which imposed sentence that deportation is not warranted, if prior to the making of such a recommendation due notice is given to the Commission and prosecuting authorities, and they are given an opportunity to be heard in the matter.

"(c) The Commission may, upon finding that (1) serious hardship would result from deportation, and (2) that continued residence of the alien in the United States would not be undesirable, determine that an alien deportable under subsections (5), (6), or (7) of subsection (b) by reason of a single conviction shall not be so deported.

"(d) Entry as used in this section means, in the case of a previously admitted alien, the time of his admission for lawful permanent residence, and in the case of any other alien, any entry as defined in section 102 (a) (11).

"SEC. 342. Limitations on deportation: (a) No alien shall be deported from the United States unless he is advised of the charges against him and given the opportunity for a hearing. Deportation of an alien shall be ordered only upon a record.

"(b) No alien shall be deported (1) who was admitted to the United States for permanent residence before his 14th birthday; or (2) who has lived in the United States for 20 years of more, other than as a nonimmigrant or as a fugitive from a criminal charge, the conviction on which would be a ground for deportation; or (3) for an act or omission to act or for a criminal conviction which occurred more than 10 years prior to the issuance of a warrant for his arrest in deportation proceeding.

"SEC. 343. Apprehension and deportation of aliens: (a) Whenever the Commission has reasonable ground for belief that an alien is deportable, it may issue a warrant for his arrest and detention, pending a determination as to his deportability.

"(b) When a final order of deportation is issued by the Commission against any alien, the Commission shall have a period of 6 months from the date of such order, or, if judicial review is had, then from the date of the final order of the court, within which to effect the alien's departure from the United States, during which period, at the Commission's discretion, the alien may be detained or released on bond or on any other conditions the Commission may prescribe. If deportation of the alien from the United States under the order of deportation has not been effected within the time prescribed, the alien shall become subject to such further detention or supervision pending eventual deportation as may be prescribed by the Commission. The Commission is authorized and directed to arrange for appropriate places of detention for those aliens whom it shall take into custody and detain under this section. For the purposes of this section an order of deportation heretofore or hereafter entered against an alien in legal detention or confinement other than under an immigration process, shall be considered as being made as of the moment he is released from such detention or confinement, and not prior thereto.

"(c) Any alien may apply to any court of appropriate jurisdiction for the purpose of obtaining his release from detention under subsection (b), and the court may for good cause order his release under such conditions as the court may prescribe. In determining whether good cause has been shown to justify releasing the alien, the court shall take into account such factors as (1) the age, health, and period of detention of the alien; (2) the effect of the alien's release upon the national health or security; (3) the likelihood of the alien's resuming or following a course of conduct which made or would make him deportable; (4) the character of the efforts made by such alien himself to expedite his departure from the United States; (5) the attitude of the representatives of the country or countries to which the alien's deportation is directed; (6) the reason for the inability of the Government of the United States to obtain passports, other travel documents, or deportation facilities from the country or countries to which the alien has been ordered deported; and (7) the eligibility of the alien for discretionary relief under the immigration laws.

"(d) Any alien, against whom a final order of deportation, heretofore or hereafter issued, is outstanding, shall, pending eventual deportation, be subject to supervision under regulations prescribed by the Commission. Such regulations shall include provisions which will require any alien subject to supervision (1) to appear from time to time before an officer of the Commission for identification; (2) to submit, if necessary, to medical and psychiatric examinations, (3) to give information under oath as to his circumstances, associations, and activities, and such other relevant information, as the Commission may deem fit and proper; and (4) to conform to such reasonable written restrictions on his conduct or activities as are prescribed by the Commission. Any alien who knowingly fails to comply with such regulations, or knowingly gives false information in relation to the requirements of such regulations, or knowingly violates a reasonable restriction imposed upon his conduct or activity, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or shall be imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(e) Any alien against whom a final order of deportation is outstanding by reason of section 341 (a) (1), (5), (6), (7), or (8), who willfully refuses to depart from the United States within a period of 6 months from the date of the final order of deportation under administrative processes, or, if judicial review is had, then from the date of the final order of the court, or fails or refuses to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to his departure, or who connives or conspires, or takes any other action designed to prevent or hamper or with the purpose of preventing or hampering his departure pursuant to such order of deportation, or who fails or refuses to present himself for deportation at the time and place required by the Commission pursuant to such order of deportation, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be imprisoned not more than 1 year.

"(f) An alien sentenced to imprisonment shall not be deported until such imprisonment has been terminated by the release of the alien from confinement. However, parole or probation shall not be a ground for deferral of deportation.

"SEC. 344. Nations to which aliens shall be deported; Cost of deportation: (a) The deportation of an alien shall in the first instance be directed by the Commission to any nation desired by the alien, unless the Commission, in its discretion, concludes that deportation to such nation would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States. No alien shall choose as the place to which he wishes to be deported any foreign territory contiguous to the United States or any island adjacent thereto or adjacent to the United States unless the alien is a native, citizen, subject, or national of, or had a residence in, such designated territory or island, or unless the Commission shall grant special permission, in the interest of avoiding undue hardship, and consistent with the interests of the United States.

"(b) If the alien fails to present to the Commission within 3 months following the date of the final order of deportation an official document or communication establishing that a nation, in accordance with subsection (a), will accept the alien into its territory, then deportation of the alien shall be directed by the Commission to any willing nation of which the alien is a subject, national, or citizen. If the government of such nation fails finally to advise the Commission within 3 months following the date of original inquiry, or within such longer period as the Commission shall deem reasonable under the circumstances of the particular case, whether that government will or will not accept such alien into its territory, then such deportation shall be directed by the Commission within its discretion either—

"(1) to the nation from which such alien last entered the United States;

"(2) to the nation in which is located the foreign port at which such alien embarked for the United States or for foreign contiguous territory;

"(3) to the nation in which he was born;

"(4) to the nation in which the place of his birth is situated at the time he is ordered deported;

"(5) to any nation in which he resided prior to entering the country from which he entered the United States;

"(6) to the nation which had sovereignty over the birthplace of the alien at the time of his birth; or

"(7) if deportation to any of the foregoing places or nations is impracticable, inadvisable, or impossible, then to any nation which is willing to accept such alien into its territory.

"(c) If the United States is at war and the deportation, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a), of any alien who is deportable under any law of the United States is found by the Commission to be impracticable, inadvisable, inconvenient, or impossible because of enemy occupation of the nation from which such alien came or wherein is located the foreign port at which he embarked for the United States or because of reasons connected with the war, such alien may, in the discretion of the Commission, be deported as follows:

"(1) If such alien is a citizen or subject of a nation whose recognized government is in exile, to the nation in which is located that government in exile if that nation will permit him to enter its territory; or

"(2) If such alien is a citizen or subject of a nation whose recognized government is not in exile, then to a nation or any political or territorial subdivision thereof which is proximate to the nation of which the alien is a citizen or subject, or, with the consent of the nation of which the alien is a citizen or subject, to any other nation.

"(d) No alien shall be deported to any nation in which the Commission finds that such alien would be subjected to persecution by reason of race, religion, or political beliefs, or which would permit him to enter only upon unreasonable or onerous conditions.

"(e) If deportation proceedings are instituted at any time within 5 years after the entry of the alien for causes existing prior to or at the time of entry, the cost of removal to the port of deportation shall be at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this act, and the deportation from such port shall be at the expense of the owner or owners of the vessels, aircraft, or other transportation lines by which such alien came to the United States. Such expenses shall not be assessed against such owner or owners if he or they did not know or could not have ascertained by exercise of reasonable diligence, prior to embarkation of the alien transported, that he was an alien; or that being an alien his visa or other documents authorizing entry were invalid or had expired; or that he was excludable under section 302 (b) (2) or (5). If such expenses are not collected from such owner or owners, they shall be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of

this act. Such expenses when paid by such owner or owners, or by the United States, may be recovered from such an alien who is deported on grounds other than health or becoming a public charge.

"(f) If deportation proceedings are instituted more than 5 years after the entry of the alien, or in the case of an alien crewman more than 5 years after the granting of his last temporary admission, the cost of deportation shall be payable from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act. The expenses incident to transportation of such an alien from the United States to the nation to which he is deported may be recovered from such alien who is deported on grounds other than health or becoming a public charge.

"(g) A failure or refusal on the part of the master, commanding officer, agent, owner, charterer, or consignee of a vessel, aircraft, or other transportation line to comply with the order of the Commission to take on board, guard safely, and transport to the destination specified any alien ordered to be deported under the provisions of this act, or a failure or refusal by any such person to comply with an order of the Commission to pay deportation expenses in accordance with the requirements of this section, shall be punished by the imposition of a penalty in the sum and manner prescribed in section 336 (b).

"(h) When in the opinion of the Commission the mental or physical condition of an alien being deported is such as to require personal care and attendance, the Commission shall, when necessary, employ a suitable person for that purpose who shall accompany such alien to his final destination, and the expense incident to such service shall be defrayed in the same manner as the expense of deporting the accompanied alien is defrayed, and any failure or refusal to defray such expenses shall be punished in the manner prescribed by section 336 (b).

"SEC. 345. Voluntary departure: (a) Upon application to the Commission, any deportable alien may before or after his arrest in deportation proceedings, be permitted to depart the United States to any country of his choice at his own expense in lieu of deportation; and shall be permitted so to depart if he proves ability to do so and good moral character for the preceding 5 years.

"(b) Any alien who may otherwise voluntarily depart under subsection (a), except that he is financially unable to do so at his own expense, may, upon application to the Commission, be permitted to depart and the expenses incident thereto be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act, if the Commission finds that his removal is in the best interest of the United States.

"SEC. 346. Adjustment of status: (a) Upon application and appropriate showing to the Commission the status of an alien in the United States shall be adjusted—

"(1) to any nonimmigrant status for which he qualifies under this act, if he is not deportable; and

"(2) to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if, were he applying abroad, no provision of law would bar his eligibility for admission and he could secure the reasonably prompt issuance of an immigrant visa.

"(b) Upon application to the Commission, the status of any alien in the United States shall be adjusted to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if he proves good moral character for the preceding 5 years and (1) has resided in the United States for 7 years, or (2) would, by his residence abroad, cause serious hardship to himself, or to a citizen or previously admitted alien who is his spouse or child. The status of an alien who is deportable under section 341 (a) (1), (5), (7), or (8) may be adjusted pursuant to this subsection only if he has resided in the United States for 10 years.

"(c) The status to which any alien is adjusted pursuant to this act shall date from the time of the grant of the adjusted status.

"(d) Adjustments of status under this section shall be granted by order of the Commission and no application therefor shall be denied without notice and opportunity for hearing in accordance with section 108 of this act. The number of quota immigrant visas authorized by this act shall be reduced to reflect adjustments of status under subsections (a) (2) and (b).

"(e) The Commission may, after notice and hearing, revoke an adjustment of the status of any alien within 2 years after such adjustment upon evidence which has become available to it after such adjustment and which establishes facts which would have barred such adjustment, or may revoke an adjustment of status within 10 years after such adjustment, for fraud which is willful and material committed or procured by the alien in obtaining such adjustment. On revocation of an adjustment of status, an order of admission to citizenship through naturalization issued to an alien whose status has been adjusted under this section, shall become subject to revocation, in accordance with section 447, for illegal procurement of such citizenship.

"SEC. 347. Removal of aliens who have fallen into distress: The Commission may remove from the United States any alien who falls into distress or who needs public aid from causes arising subsequent to his entry, and is desirous of being so removed, to the native nation of such alien, or to the nation from which he came, or to the nation of which he is a citizen or subject, or to any other nation to which he wishes to go and which will receive him, at the expense of the appropriation for the enforcement of this act.

"CHAPTER 6—SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALIEN CREWMEN

"SEC. 351. Lists of alien crewmen; reports of illegal landings: (a) Upon arrival of any vessel or aircraft in the United States from any place outside the United States it shall be the duty of the owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer thereof to deliver to the Commission officer at the port of arrival a complete, true, and correct list containing the names of all aliens employed on such vessel or aircraft, the positions they respectively hold in the crew of the vessel or aircraft, when and where they were respectively shipped or engaged, and those to be paid off or discharged in the port of arrival. The Commission may by rules and regulations, in stated categories of cases, require other information in lieu of or in addition to the information required in such lists, to be furnished at such time and place as the Commission may require.

"(b) It shall be the duty of any owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer of any vessel or aircraft to report, in writing, to a Commission officer, as soon as discovered, all cases in which any alien crewman has illegally landed in the United States from the vessel or aircraft, together with a description of such alien and any information likely to lead to his apprehension.

"(c) Before the departure of any vessel or aircraft from any port in the United States, it shall be the duty of the owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer thereof, to deliver to a Commission officer at that port a list containing the names of all alien employees who were not employed thereon at the time of the arrival at that port but who will leave such port thereon at the time of the departure of such vessel or aircraft and the names of those, if any, who have been paid off or discharged, and of those, if any, who have deserted or landed at that port. The Commission may by rules and regulations, in stated categories of cases, require other information in lieu of or in addition to the information required in such lists, to be furnished at such time and place as the Commission may require.

"(d) In case any owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer shall fail to deliver complete, true, and correct lists or reports of aliens, or to report cases of desertion or landing, as required by subsections (a), (b), and (c), such owner, agent, consignee, master, or commanding officer, shall pay to the Commission a sum to be determined by it, not to exceed $10 for each alien concerning whom such lists are not delivered or such reports are not made as required in the preceding subsections.

"(e) The Commission may prescribe rules and regulations defining the circumstances under which a vessel or aircraft shall be deemed to be arriving in, or departing from, the United States or any port thereof within the meaning of any provision of this act.

"SEC. 352. Temporary landing of alien crewmen: (a) An alien crewman shall be subject to all of the provisions of the immigration laws governing issuance of visas, admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens generally. Any alien crewman, including one whose name appears on a crew list visaed pursuant to section 321 (f) shall be excluded if he is within one of the categories listed in section 301 (a) and if his temporary landing would be contrary to the best interests of the United States. Subject to the provisions of section 305, the Commission may nevertheless permit any alien crewman to land temporarily in the United States for such periods of time as it may prescribe.

"(b) Sections 108 through and including 111 of this act shall not apply to any alien crewman temporarily landing under this section. The Commission shall, however, issue rules and regulations to provide appropriate expeditious hearings for any alien crewman who requests a hearing and who has been denied permission to land temporarily, or whose temporary permission has been canceled, or who has been ordered deported under subsection (c).

"(c) The Commission may, if it determines that an alien is not a bona fide crewman or does not intend to depart on the vessel or aircraft which brought him, cancel the permission to land temporarily granted to such crewman, take such crewman into custody and require the master or commanding officer of the vessel or aircraft on which the crewman arrived to receive, detain, and deport him pursuant to section 354 of this act.

"(d) Any alien crewman who willfully remains in the United States in excess of the number of days permitted him by the Commission at or subsequent to his landing shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof may be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned for not more than 60 days, or both.

"SEC. 353. Hospital treatment of alien crewmen afflicted with certain diseases: An alien crewman who is found on arrival in a port of the United States to be afflicted with any of the disabilities or diseases mentioned in section 355, shall be placed and treated in a hospital designated by the Commission, all expenses connected therewith, including burial in the event of death, to be borne by the owner, agent, consignee, commanding officer, or master of the vessel or aircraft, and not to be deducted from the crewman's wages. An alien crewman suspected of being afflicted with any such disability or disease may be removed from the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived to an immigration station, or other appropriate place, for such observation as will enable the medical examiners to determine whether or not he is so afflicted, all expenses connected therewith, to be borne in the manner here-

inbefore prescribed. In cases in which the Commission officer finds that it will not be possible within a reasonable time to effect a cure, the return of the alien crewman shall be enforced on, or at the expense of, the transportation line on which he came, upon such conditions as the Commission shall prescribe, to insure that the alien shall be properly cared for and protected, and that the spread of contagion shall be guarded against.

"SEC. 354. Control of alien crewmen: (a) Every alien crewman shall be detained on board the vessel on which he arrived, or at the airport of arrival of the aircraft, or at any other suitable place designated by the Commission, until completely inspected, including a physical examination. Any alien crewman who is excluded from the United States, or whose temporary admission is canceled, or who is ordered deported, shall also be detained in such vessel, airport or place. Such alien crewman shall be deported from the United States on, and as soon as, the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived departs. If the Commission finds that such detention or deportation is impracticable, or would cause undue hardship to such alien crewman, it may order him deported from the port of arrival or any other port on another vessel or aircraft owned or operated by the same transportation line as the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived, or if this is found impracticable on another vessel or aircraft.

"(b) Any person who fails to detain or deport any alien crewman as specified by subsection (a) of this section shall pay to the Commission a sum to be determined by it, not to exceed $1,000, for each alien crewman in respect of whom any such failure occurs.

"(c) Except as may be otherwise prescribed by rules and regulations issued by the Commission, proof that an alien crewman did not appear upon the outgoing manifest of the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived in the United States from any place outside thereof, or that he was reported by the master or commanding officer of such vessel or aircraft as a deserter, shall be prima facie evidence of a failure to detain or deport such alien crewman.

"(d) Except as otherwise provided by law, all expenses incurred in connection with detention and deportation under this section, including expenses incurred in transferring an alien crewman from one place in the United States to another under such conditions and safeguards as the Commission shall impose, shall be paid by the owner or owners of the vessel or aircraft on which the alien arrived in the United States. An alien crewman who is transferred within the United States in accordance with this subsection shall not be regarded as having entered or been admitted to the United States.

"SEC. 355. Employment on passenger vessels of aliens afflicted with certain disabilities: It shall be unlawful for any vessel or aircraft carrying passengers between a port of the United States and a port outside thereof to have on board upon arrival in the United States any alien crewman afflicted with feeblemindedness, insanity, epilepsy, tuberculosis in any form, leprosy, or any dangerous contagious disease. If the Commission finds that any such alien crewman was so afflicted at the time he was shipped or engaged and taken on board such a vessel or aircraft and that the existence of such affliction might have been detected by a competent medical examination at such time, the owner, commanding officer, master, agent, consignee, or charterer thereof shall pay to the Commission a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $500 for each alien crewman so afflicted.

"SEC. 356. Discharge of alien crewmen: It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to pay off or discharge any alien crewman employed on board a vessel or aircraft arriving in the United States without first having obtained the consent of the Commission. If the Commission shall find that any alien crewman has been paid off or discharged in the United States in violation of the provisions of this section, such person shall pay to the Commission a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation.

"SEC. 357. Bringing alien crewmen into the United States with intent to evade immigration laws: Any person who shall knowingly either sign on a vessel's articles, or bring to the United States, as one of the crew of a vessel or aircraft, from any place outside thereof, any alien, with intent to permit or assist such alien to enter or land in the United States in violation of law, or who shall falsely and knowingly represent to the Commission officer, at the time of application for a crew list visa, or at the port of arrival in the United States, that such alien is a bona fide member of the crew employed in any capacity regularly required for normal operation and services aboard such vessel or aircraft, shall pay to the Commission a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $5,000 for each such violation.

"CHAPTER 7—REGISTRATION OF ALIENS

"SEC. 361. Aliens seeking entry into the United States: No visa shall be issued to any alien seeking to enter the United States until he has been registered and fingerprinted in accordance with section 321 (b), unless he is exempted from being fingerprinted as provided in that section.

"SEC. 362. Registration of aliens in the United States: (a) It shall be the duty of every alien now or hereafter in the United States, who (1) is 16 years of age or older, (a) has not been registered and fingerprinted under section 321 (b) of this act, or section 30 or 31 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, or section 222 (b) or 262 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and (2) remains in the United States for 30 days or longer, to apply for registration and to be fingerprinted before the expiration of such 30 days. Aliens applying for alien registration shall make application therefor in such a manner and at such place as the Attorney General shall prescribe.

"(b) It shall be the duty of every parent or legal guardian of any alien now or hereafter in the United States, who (1) is less than 16 years of age, (2) has not been registered under section 321 (b) of this act, or section 30 or 31 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940, or section 222 (b) or 262 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and (3) remains in the United States for 30 days or longer, to apply for the registration of the alien before the expiration of 30 days. Application for such registration shall be in a form and manner and at such place as the Attorney General shall prescribe. Whenever any alien attains his 16th birthday in the United States he shall, within 30 days thereafter, apply in person for registration and to be fingerprinted.

"SEC. 363. Provisions governing registration of special groups: Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 361 and 362, the Attorney General is authorized to prescribe special regulations and forms for the registration and fingerprinting of (1) alien crewmen, (2) holders of border-crossing cards, (3) aliens confined in institutions within the United States, (4) aliens under order of deportation, and (5) aliens of any other class not lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"SEC. 364. Forms and procedure: (a) The Attorney General shall prepare forms for the registration and fingerprinting of aliens under sections 361 and 362 of this act. Such forms shall contain such inquiries as he may, after hearing, prescribe.

"(b) All registration and fingerprint records made under the provisions of this act shall be confidential, and shall be made available to the Commission and only to such other persons or departments or agencies as may be designated by the Attorney General.

"(c) Every person required to apply for the registration of himself or another under this title shall submit under oath the information required for such registration. Any person authorized by the Attorney General to register aliens under this title shall be authorized to administer oaths for such purpose.

"(d) Every alien in the United States who has been registered and fingerprinted under the provisions of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, or the Immigration and Nationality Act, or under the provisions of this act shall be issued a certificate of alien registration or an alien registration receipt card in such form and manner and at such time as shall be prescribed under regulations issued by the Attorney General.

"(e) Every alien, 16 years of age and over, shall at all times carry with him and have in his personal possession any certificate of alien registration or alien registration receipt card issued to him pursuant to subsection (d). Any alien who willfully fails to comply with the provisions of this subsection shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and may upon conviction be fined a sum not to exceed $50.

"SEC. 365. Notices of change of address: Every alien required to be registered under this title, or who was required to be registered under the Alien Registration Act of 1940, or the Immigration and Nationality Act, who is within the United States on the first day of January following the effective date of this act, or on the first day of January of each succeeding year shall, within 30 days following such dates, notify the Attorney General in writing of his current address and furnish such additional information as may by regulations be required by the Attorney General. Any such alien shall likewise notify the Attorney General in writing of each change of address and new address within 30 days from the date of such change. Any such alien who is temporarily absent from the United States on the first day of January following the effective date of this act, or on the first day of January of any succeeding year shall furnish his current address and other information as required by this section within 30 days after his return. In the case of an alien for whom a parent or legal guardian is required to apply for registration, the notice required by this section shall be given by such parent or legal guardian.

"SEC. 366. Penalties: (a) Any alien or any parent or legal guardian of any alien who willfully fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of section 362 of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, may be fined a sum not to exceed $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

"(b) Any alien or any parent or legal guardian of any alien who willfully fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of section 365 of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, may be fined a sum not to exceed $100.

"(c) Any alien or any parent or legal guardian of any alien, who files an application for registration containing material statements known by him to be false, or who procures or attempts to procure registration of himself or another person through fraud which is willful and material, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, may be fined a sum not to exceed $1,000, or be imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

"(d) Any person who with unlawful intent photographs, prints, or in any other manner makes, or executes, any engraving, photograph, print, or impression or any imitation in the likeness of any certificate of alien registration or alien registration receipt card authorized under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Attorney General, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, may be fined not to exceed $5,000

or be imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"SEC. 367. Enforcement by the Attorney General: The Attorney General shall enforce and administer the provisions of this act with respect to the registration of aliens within the United States. The Attorney General and the Commission shall furnish each other with such information as each may request with respect to any alien who has entered the United States.

"CHAPTER 8—GENERAL PENALTY PROVISIONS

"SEC. 371. Prevention of unauthorized landing of aliens: (a) It shall be the duty of every person, bringing or providing means for an alien to come to the United States, to prevent the landing of such alien in the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Commission. Any such person who fails to comply with the foregoing requirements shall pay to the Commission a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation.

"(b) Proof that the alien failed to present himself at the time and place designated by the Commission shall be prima facie evidence that such alien has landed in the United States at a time or place other than as designated by the Commisison.

"SEC. 372. Bringing in aliens illegally: (a) No person shall bring to the United States from any place outside thereof (other than from foreign contiguous territory) any alien (other than an alien crewman), (1) who is not in possession of a valid unexpired visa or other document authorizing such alien to enter the United States; or (2) who is excludable under section 302 (b) (2) or (5).

"(b) Any person who brings such an alien to the United States shall pay to the Commission a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $1,000 for each violation, unless such person did not know or could not have ascertained by exercise of reasonable diligence, prior to embarkation of the alien transported, that he was an alien; or that, being an alien, his visa or other documents authorizing entry were invalid or had expired or that the alien was excludable under section 302 (b) (2) or (5).

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to subject any person to a penalty for bringing to the United States any alien, (1) who is entitled by law to exemption from the provisions of section 302 (b) (2) or (5); or (2) who is admitted to the United States.

"SEC. 373. Alien stowaways; detention and deportation: (a) Until he has been inspected by the Commission officer, every alien stowaway shall be detained either at such suitable place as the Commission officer may designate or aboard the vessel or at the airport of arrival of the aircraft on which he arrived at the United States.

"(b) After inspection, if so ordered, the stowaways shall be deported and as soon as the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived departs, or if this is impracticable or impossible, on another leaving within a reasonable time after inspection.

"(c) The expenses of detention prior to as well as those of deportation shall both be paid by the person whose vessel or aircraft brought the alien stowaway to the United States.

"(d) Any person who fails to detain or deport an alien stowaway as required by this section shall pay to the Commission a sum, to be determined by it, not to exceed $1,000 for each such failure.

"(e) Unless he is in possession of a valid unexpired visa or reentry permit issued to him, or is admissible under section 302 (a) (4), the provisions of section 304 shall not apply to any alien who arrives as a stowaway, and such an alien shall not be permitted to land in the United States except pursuant to such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe for (1) medical treatment, or (2) detention pending deportation.

"SEC. 374. Bringing in and harboring certain aliens: (a) Any person who knowingly—

"(1) brings into or lands in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or attempts, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise; or

"(2) conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation; or

"(3) induces, or attempts to induce, either directly or indirectly, the entry into the United States of,

any alien who, to such person's knowledge, was not duly admitted by the Commission or is not lawfully entitled to enter or reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof may be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, or both, for each alien in respect to whom any violation of this subsection occurs.

"(b) No officer or person shall have authority to make any arrest for a violation of any provision of this section except officers and employees designated by rules and regulations of the Commission, either individually or as a member of a class, and all other officers whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws of the United States.

"SEC. 375. Entry of alien at improper time or place; misrepresentation and concealment of facts: Any alien who (1) knowingly enters the United States at any time or place other than as designated by the Commission, or (2) knowingly eludes examination or inspection by Commission officers; or (3) obtains entry to the United States by fraud which is willful and material, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, may be punished by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or by a fine of not more than $1,000, or by both.

"SEC. 376. Reentry of deported alien: Any alien who has been arrested and deported or excluded and deported, and thereafter voluntarily enters, attempts to enter, or is at any time in, the United States, without complying with provisions for advance consent as a condition of readmittance into the United States, or without being lawfully admitted, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, may be punished by imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or by a fine of not more than $500, or both.

"SEC. 377. Aiding or assisting subversive alien to enter the United States: Any person who, with knowledge that an alien is excludable under subsections (h) and (i) of section 301 of this act, aids or assists such alien to enter the United States, or who connives or conspires with any person or persons to allow, procure, or permit any such alien to enter the United States, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof may be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.

"SEC. 378. Importation of aliens for immoral purposes: Whoever shall, directly or indirectly, bring or attempt to bring into the United States any alien for the purpose of prostitution or for the purpose of engaging in any other unlawful commercialized vice, or shall hold or attempt to hold any alien for any such purpose in pursuance of such entry, or shall keep, maintain, control, support, employ, or harbor in any house or other place, for such purpose, any alien, in pursuance of such illegal entry, shall, in every such case, be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof may be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 and by imprisonment for a term of not more than 5 years. The prosecution of offenses under this section may be brought in any district into which such alien is brought by the person or persons accused, or in any district in which a violation of any of the provisions of this section occurs.

"SEC. 379. Collection of penalties and expenses: (a) Any penalties, fines or expenses assessed or imposed under sections 331, 332, 333, 336, 338, 344, 351, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 371, 372, and 373, of this act, after hearing and determination in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission, shall be paid to the Commission and be a lien upon the vessel or aircraft whose owner, master, officer, agent, charterer, or consignee has violated such sections. Pending final determination of liability for such penalty no such vessel or aircraft shall be granted clearance except that clearance may be granted upon deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such penalty or a bond with sufficient surety to secure payment thereof approved by the Commission.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not be regarded as the sole and exclusive means or remedy for the enforcement of any payment of any penalty, fine or expenses imposed or incurred under sections there specified. In the discretion of the Commission the amount thereof may be recovered by a civil suit, in the name of the United States, from any person made liable under any of such sections.

"CHAPTER 9—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 381. Schedule of fees: (a) The following fees shall be charged:

"(1) For the furnishing and verification of each application for an immigrant visa (which shall include the furnishing and verification of the duplicate), $5;

"(2) For the issuance of each immigrant visa, $10;

"(3) For the issuance, or extension, of a reentry permit, $5, except a border crossing card, $1; and

"(4) For the filing of each application for adjustment of status under section 346, $10.

"(b) The fees for the furnishing and verification of applications of visas by nonimmigrants of each foreign country and for the issuance of visas and extension thereof, to nonimmigrants of each foreign country shall be prescribed by the Commission in amounts corresponding, as nearly as practicable, to the total of all similar visa, entry, residence, or other fees, taxes, or charges assessed or levied against citizens of the United States by the foreign countries of which such nonimmigrants are nationals or stateless residents. Nonimmigrant visas issued to aliens coming to the United States in transit to and from the headquarters district of the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Headquarters Agreement shall be gratis.

"(c) Reasonable fees may be charged by the Commission in cases where such fees have not been established by law, to cover the cost of furnishing copies, whether certified or uncertified, of any part of the records, or information from the records, of the Commission. (The Commission may lend copies, for short periods, without charge.) No such fee shall be required from officers or agencies of the United States or of any State or subdivision thereof, for such copies of information furnished for official use in connection with the official duties of such officers or agencies.

"(d) No fees shall be charged under this act except as specifically provided by this section and sections 435 and 463.

"SEC. 382. Printing of certain blank forms: The Public Printer is authorized to print for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, upon prepayment, copies of blank forms of manifests and crew lists and such other forms as may be prescribed and authorized by the Commission.

"SEC. 383. Members of the Armed Forces: Nothing contained in this title shall be construed so as to limit, restrict, deny, or affect

the coming into or departure from the United States of an alien member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is in unform of, or who bears documents identifying him as a member of, such Armed Forces, and who is coming to or departing from the United States under official orders or permit of such Armed Forces. Nothing in this section shall be construed to confer upon any such alien any other privileges, rights, benefits, exemptions, or immunities.

"SEC. 384. Disposal of privileges at immigrant stations: (a) Subject to such conditions as the Commission shall prescribe, all exclusive privileges of exchanging money, transporting passengers or baggage, keeping eating houses, or other like privileges in connection with any United States immigrant station, shall be disposed of to the lowest responsible and capable bidder (other than an alien) in accordance with the provisions of section 3708 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and for the use of Government property in connection with the exercise of such exclusive privileges a reasonable rental may be charged. The feeding of aliens, or the furnishing of any other necessary service in connection with any United States immigrant station, may be performed by the Commission without regard to the foregoing provisions of this subsection if the Commission finds that it would be advantageous to the Government in terms of economy and efficiency. No intoxicating liquors shall be sold at any immigrant station.

"(b) Such articles determined by the Commission to be necessary to the health and welfare of aliens detained at any immigrant station, when not otherwise readily procurable by such aliens, may be sold at reasonable prices to such aliens through Government canteens operated by the Commission, under such conditions as the Commission shall prescribe.

"(c) All rentals or other receipts accruing from the disposal of privileges, and all moneys arising from the sale of articles through Commission-operated canteens, authorized by this section, shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for the enforcement of this title.

"SEC. 385. Disposition of moneys collected under the provisions of this title: (a) All moneys paid into the Treasury to reimburse the Commission for detention, transportation, hospitalization, and all other expenses of detained aliens paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act, and all moneys paid into the Treasury to reimburse the Commission for expenses of landing stations referred to in section 337 (c) paid by the Commission from the appropriation for the enforcement of this act, shall be credited to the appropriation for the enforcement of this act for the fiscal year in which the expenses were incurred.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this title, all moneys received in payment of fees and administrative fines and penalties under this title shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. All fees received from applicants residing in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and in Guam, required to be paid under section 381, shall be paid over to the treasury of the Virgin Islands and to the treasury of Guam, respectively.

"SEC. 386. American Indians born in Canada: Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the right of American Indians born in Canada to pass the borders of the United States, but such right shall not extend to non-Indians whose membership in Indian tribes or families is created by adoption.

"SEC. 387. Central file; information from other departments and agencies: (a) There shall be established in the office of the Commission, for the use of the security and enforcement agencies of the Government of the United States, a central index, which shall contain the names of all aliens heretofore admitted to the United States, or excluded therefrom, insofar as such information is available from the records of the Commission, and the names of all aliens hereafter admitted to the United States, or excluded therefrom, the names of their sponsors of record, if any, and such other relevant information as the Commission shall require as an aid to the proper enforcement of this act.

"(b) Any information in any records kept by any department or agency of the Government as to the identity and location of aliens in the United States shall be made available to the Commission upon request by the Commission to the head of any such department or agency.

"(c) The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall notify the Commission upon request whenever any alien is issued a social security account number and social security card. It shall also furnish such available information as may be requested by the Commission regarding the identity and location of aliens in the United States.

"(d) A written certification signed by any officer of the Commission designated by it to make such certification, that after diligent search no record or entry of a special nature is found to exist in the records of the Commission, shall be admissible as evidence in any proceeding as evidence that the records of the Commission contain no such record or entry, and shall have the same effect as the testimony of a witness given in open court.

"SEC. 388. Burden of proof: The burden of proof shall be upon any alien—

"(1) when he applies for a visa to show that he is eligible therefor under the immigration laws;

"(2) when he attempts to enter the United States without a visa or other entry document to show that he is not subject to exclusion under the immigration laws; and

"(3) in any deportation proceedings commenced within 5 years of his entry to show the time, place, and manner of his entry into the United States; but in presenting such proof he shall be entitled to the production of his visa, if any, and of other relevant documents in the custody of the Commission or other agency or department of the United States.

"SEC. 389. Local jurisdiction over immigrant stations: The Commission shall admit to the various immigrant stations the proper State and local officers charged with the enforcement of the laws of the State or Territory of the United States in which any such immigrant station is located in order that such State and local officers may preserve the peace and make arrests for crimes under the laws of the States and Territories. For the purpose of this section, the jurisdiction of such State and local officers and of the State and local courts shall extend over such immigrant stations.

"TITLE IV—CITIZENSHIP AND NATURALIZATION

"CHAPTER 1—CITIZENSHIP AT BIRTH AND BY COLLECTIVE NATURALIZATION

"SEC. 401. Citizens of the United States at birth: (a) The following are citizens of the United States at birth:

"(1) A person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof;

"(2) A person born in the United States to a member of an Indian, Eskimo, Aleutian, or other aboriginal tribe. This paragraph shall not impair or otherwise affect the right of such person to tribal or other property;

"(3) A person of unknown parentage found in the United States while under the age of 5 years, unless within 5 years after he is found, it is shown that he was born outside the United States;

"(4) A person born outside of the United States of parents both of whom are citizens of the United States and one of whom resided in the United States prior to the birth of such person; and

"(5) A person born outside the United States of parents one of whom is an alien, and the other a citizen of the United States who, prior to the birth of such person, resided in the United States for a period or periods totaling not less than 5 years.

"(b) Any person who is a citizen of the United States at birth under paragraph (5) of subsection (a) shall lose his citizenship unless he comes to the United States and resides continuously in the United States for at least 5 years between the ages of 14 and 28. Active service in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be considered as residence for this purpose. This subsection shall not apply to a child born abroad whose American parent is, at the time of the child's birth, residing abroad solely or principally in the employment of the Government of the United States or a bona fide American educational, scientific, philanthropic, religious, commercial, or financial organization, having its principal office or place of business in the United States, or an international agency of an official character in which the United States participates.

"SEC. 402. Persons born or residing in Puerto Rico: (a) All persons born in Puerto Rico on or after April 11, 1899, and prior to January 13, 1941, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, residing on January 13, 1941, in Puerto Rico or other territory over which the United States exercises rights of sovereignty and not citizens of the United States under any other act, are citizens of the United States as of January 13, 1941. All persons born in Puerto Rico on or after January 13, 1941, and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, are citizens of the United States at birth.

"(b) All inhabitants of Puerto Rico on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date, who were Spanish subjects, who after that date continued to reside in Puerto Rico or other territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and who have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality are citizens of the United States as of the effective date of this act.

"SEC. 403. Persons born in the Canal Zone or Republic of Panama on or after February 26, 1904: (a) Any person born in the Canal Zone on or after February 26, 1904, and whether before or after the effective date of this act, whose father or mother, at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States, is a citizen of the United States.

"(b) Any person born in the Republic of Panama on or after February 26, 1904, and whether before or after the effective date of this Act, whose father or mother at the time of the birth of such person was or is a citizen of the United States employed by the Government of the United States or by the Panama Railroad Company, or its successor in title, is a citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 404. Persons born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867: A person born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867, except a noncitizen Indian, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A noncitizen Indian born in Alaska on or after March 30, 1867, and prior to June 2, 1924, is a citizen of the United States as of June 2, 1924. An Indian born in Alaska on or after June 2, 1924, is a citizen of the United States at birth.

"SEC. 405. Persons born in Hawaii: A person born in Hawaii on or after August 12, 1898, and before April 30, 1900, is a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900. A person born in Hawaii on or after April 30, 1900, is a citizen of the United States at birth. A person who was a citizen of the Republic of Hawaii on August 12, 1898, is a citizen of the United States as of April 30, 1900.

"SEC. 406. Persons living in and born in the Virgin Islands: (a) The following persons, and their children born subsequent to January 17, 1917, and prior to February 25, 1927, are citizens of the United States as of February 25, 1927:

"(1) All former Danish citizens who, on January 17, 1917, resided in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and were residing in those islands or in the United States or Puerto Rico on February 25, 1927, and who did not make the declaration required to preserve their Danish citizenship by article 6 of the treaty entered into on August 4, 1916, between the United States and Denmark, or who, having made such a declaration have heretofore renounced or may hereafter renounce it by a declaration before a court of record;

"(2) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who, on January 17, 1917, resided in those islands, and were residing in those islands or in the United States or Puerto Rico on February 25, 1927, and who were not on February 25, 1927, citizens or subjects of any foreign country;

"(3) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who, on January 17, 1917, resided in the United States, and were residing in those islands on February 25, 1927, and who were not on February 25, 1927, citizens or subjects of any foreign country; and

"(4) All natives of the Virgin Islands of the United States who, on June 28, 1932, were residing in continental United States, the Virgin Islands of the United States, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or any other insular possession or Territory of the United States and who, on June 28, 1932, were not citizens or subjects of any foreign country, regardless of their place of residence on January 17, 1917.

"(b) All persons born in the Virgin Islands of the United States on or after January 17, 1917, and prior to February 25, 1927, and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States are citizens of the United States as of February 25, 1927; and all persons born in those islands on or after February 25, 1927, and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States are citizens of the United States at birth.

"SEC. 407. Persons living in and born in Guam: (a) The following persons and their children born after April 11, 1899, are citizens of the United States as of August 1, 1950, if they were residing on August 1, 1950, on the island of Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises rights of sovereignty:

"(1) All inhabitants of the island of Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date, who were Spanish subjects, who after that date continued to reside in Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and who have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality; and

"(2) All persons born on the island of Guam who resided in Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date, who after that date continued to reside on Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and who have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality.

"(b) All persons born on the island of Guam on or after April 11, 1899 (whether before or after August 1, 1950), subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, are citizens of the United States, except persons born before August 1, 1950, who have taken affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality.

"(c) This section shall not confer citizenship upon any person who was a citizen or national of a country other than the United States and prior to August 1, 1952, made a declaration under oath of his desire to retain his then political status.

"SEC. 408. Nationals declared citizens: All persons who, immediately preceding the effective date of this act, were nationals but not citizens of the United States are declared to be citizens of the United States as of the effective date of this act, except persons born before such date who have taken affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationality.

"(b) Any person upon whom United States citizenship is conferred by this section who is a citizen or national of a country other than the United States and does not desire to accept United States citizenship shall, within 2 years of the effective date of this act, make a declaration under oath of his refusal to accept, such declaration to be in the form and executed in the manner prescribed by regulations. From and after the making of such a declaration any such person shall not be a citizen of the United States under the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 409. Children born out of wedlock: A person born out of wedlock may not claim United States citizenship at birth under section 401 (a) (4) or (5) through his father unless his paternity is established by legitimation while he is under the age of 21.

"CHAPTER 2—NEUTRALIZATION COURTS; ELIGIBILITY FOR NATURALIZATION

"SEC. 411. Jurisdiction to naturalize: Exclusive jurisdiction to naturalize persons as citizens of the United States is conferred upon the following specified courts: District courts of the United States in any State, District Courts of the United States for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and for the District of Columbia and for Puerto Rico, the district court of the Virgin Islands of the United States, and the district court of Guam; also all courts of record in any State or Territory having a seal, a clerk, and general jurisdiction in actions at law or equity. Jurisdiction of all the courts herein specified to naturalize shall extend only over persons resident within the respective jurisdiction of such courts except as otherwise specifically provided in this title.

"(b) Petitions for naturalization may be filed in any State court having naturalization jurisdiction within the State judicial district or circuit in which the petitioner resides, whether or not he resides within the county in which the petition for naturalization is filed.

"(c) The courts herein specified, upon request of the clerks of such courts, shall be furnished from time to time by the Commission with such forms as may be required in naturalization proceedings.

"(d) A person may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States only in the manner and under the conditions prescribed in this title.

"SEC. 412. Eligibility for naturalization: The right of a person to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race or sex or because such person is married.

"SEC. 413. Prohibition of the naturalization of subversives: No alien may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States who within 5 years prior to the filing of his petition for naturalization or at any time subsequent thereto has advocated or taught subversive doctrine, or was a member of or affiliated with any organization which then advocated or taught subversive doctrine.

"SEC. 414. Ineligibility to naturalization of deserters from the Armed Forces of the United States: Any alien who, at any time during which the United States has been or shall be at war, deserted or shall desert the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, or who, having been duly enrolled, departed or shall depart from the jurisdiction of the district in which enrolled, or who, whether or not having been duly enrolled, went or shall go beyond the limits of the United States, with intent to avoid any draft into the military, air, or naval service, lawfully ordered, shall, upon conviction thereof by a court-martial or a court of competent jurisdiction, be permanently ineligible to become a citizen of the United States; and such deserters and evaders shall be forever incapable of holding any office of trust or of profit under the United States.

"SEC. 415. Alien relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States because of alienage barred from citizenship: (a) Any alien having been admitted for permanent residence and who being subject to military service applies or has applied for exemption or discharge from training or service in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps of the United States on the ground that he is an alien, and is or was relieved or discharged from such training or service on such ground, shall be ineligible to become a citizen of the United States.

"(b) This section shall not apply in the case of any alien who, after obtaining such exemption or discharge, thereafter waives his exemption and makes himself available for service in the Armed Forces of the United States. Length of residence for the purpose of citizenship as required in section 422 shall be computed from the date upon which the exemption is waived.

"SEC. 416. Enemy aliens; nationalization under specified conditions and procedure: (a) An enemy alien shall be naturalized if—

"(1) his petition for naturalization is pending at the start of the state of war;

"(2) his loyalty has been established after investigation by the Commission; and

"(3) he is otherwise eligible for naturalization.

"(b) No enemy alien may file a petition for naturalization unless he first receives permission to do so from the Commission. Permission shall not be given until the loyalty of such alien has been established after an investigation.

"(c) A final hearing shall be help upon a petition for naturalization of an enemy alien only after the Commission has been given at least 90 days' notice thereof. Such final hearing shall be continued for such reasonable periods as the Commission may request.

"(d) This section shall not prevent the lawful apprehension, detention, or removal of any enemy alien at any time prior to his naturalization.

"(e) As used in this section 'enemy alien' means an alien who is a native, citizen, subject, or denizen of any state with which the United States is at war except as the President may otherwise provide. Such status shall cease upon the determination by proclamation of the President, or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, that hostilities between the United States and such state have ended.

"CHAPTER 3—GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURALIZATION

"SEC. 421. Requirements as to understanding the English language, history, principles, and form of government of the United States: (a) No alien except as otherwise provided in this title shall be naturalized as a citizen of the United States upon his own petition who cannot reasonably demonstrate—

"(1) an understanding of the English language, including an ability to read and speak words in ordinary usage in the English language; and

"(2) a knowledge and understanding of the fundamentals of the history, and of the principles and form of government, of the United States.

"(b) Ability to read shall be tested on the basis of simple words and phrases, and no extraordinary or unreasonable condition shall be imposed upon the applicant.

"(c) The requirements of subsection (a) (1) of this section shall not apply to any person physically unable to comply therewith, if otherwise qualified to be naturalized, or to any person who (A) is over 50 years of

age on the effective date of this act, and (B) has been living in the United States for 20 years.

"SEC. 422. Requirements as to residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution, and favorable disposition to the United States: (a) No alien, except as otherwise provided in this title, shall be naturalized unless such petitioner—

"(1) immediately preceding the date of filing his petition for naturalization has resided continuously, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence, within the United States for at least 5 years and who has resided within the State in which the petitioner filed the petition for at least 6 months;

"(2) has resided continuously within the United States from the date of the petition up to the time of admission to citizenship; and

"(3) during all the periods referred to in this subsection has been and still is a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

"(b) Absence from the United States for 6 months or less during the period for which continuous residence is required for admission to citizenship, immediately preceding the date of filing a petition for naturalization, or during the period between the date of filing the petition and the date of final hearing shall not break the continuity of such residence. Absence from the United States for more than 6 months but less than 1 year during the period for which continuous residence is required for admission to citizenship, immediately preceding the date of filing the petition for naturalization, or during the period between the date of filing the petition and the date of final hearing, shall be presumed to break the continuity of such residence, but such presumption may be overcome by evidence satisfactory to the naturalization court that such individual had a reasonable cause for not sooner returning to the United States. Absence from the United States for a continuous period of 1 year or more during the period for which continuous residence is required for admission to citizenship (whether preceding or subsequent to the filing of the petition for naturalization) shall break the continuity of such residence, except in the case of a person eligible for the benefits of section 423.

"(c) In determining whether the petitioner has sustained the burden of establishing good moral character during the preceding 5 years and the other qualifications for citizenship specified in subsection (a) of this section, the court may take into consideration as a basis for such determinations the petitioner's conduct and acts before as well as during that period.

"SEC. 423. Temporary absence of persons performing certain duties: (a) Any alien who has been physically present and residing within the United States for an uninterrupted period of at least 1 year following lawful admission for permanent residence shall, notwithstanding any absences prior to or after the effective date of this act, be considered as residing in the United States for the purpose of naturalization within the meaning of section 422 (a), notwithstanding any such absence from the United States, if such absence was solely for the purpose of—

"(1) performing the ministerial or priestly functions of a religious denomination having a bona fide organization within the United States;

"(2) acting as a missionary, brother, nun, or sister, of a religious denomination or an interdenominational mission organization having a bona fide organization within the United States;

"(3) employment by or under contract with the Government of the United States;

"(4) employment by a public international organization of which the United States is a member under treaty or statute;

"(5) employment by or under contract with an American institution of research recognized as such by the Commission;

"(6) employment by or under contract with an American philanthropic agency recognized as such by the Commission; or

"(7) employment by an American firm or corporation performing work abroad under contract with the United States Government or engaged in whole or in part in the development of foreign trade and commerce of the United States, or an affiliate thereof which is substantially controlled by the American firm or corporation and is recognized as such by the Commission.

"(b) The benefits of subsection (a) of this section shall apply equally to the spouse and child of the alien, if living in his household.

"SEC. 424. Requirement of lawful entry for naturalization; burden of proof: (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, no alien shall be naturalized unless he has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(b) The burden of proof shall be upon such alien to show that he is a lawfully admitted alien, but in presenting such proof he shall be entitled to the production of all relevant documents in the custody of the Commission or any other department or agency of the United States.

"(c) Except as provided in section 437 no alien shall be naturalized against whom there is outstanding a final order of deportation pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this or any other act; and no petition for naturalization shall be finally heard by a naturalization court while a deportation proceeding is pending against the petitioner.

"(d) No finding of the Commission in any proceeding under this act shall bind the naturalization court with respect to the question of whether an alien has established his eligibility for naturalization under this title.

"SEC. 425. Resident Philippine citizens excepted from certain requirements: Any person who (1) was a citizen of the Commonwealth of the Philippines on July 2, 1946, (2) entered the United States prior to May 1, 1934, and (3) has, since such entry, resided continuously in the United States shall be regarded as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence for the purpose of petitioning for naturalization under this title.

"SEC. 426. Constructive residence through service on certain United States vessels: (a) (1) Any periods of time during all of which an alien who was previously lawfully admitted for permanent residence has served honorably or with good conduct, in any capacity other than as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States (A) on board a vessel operated by the United States, or any agency thereof; or (B) on board a vessel whose home port is in the United States, and (i) which is registered under the laws of the United States, or (ii) title to which is in a citizen of the United States, or a corporation organized under the laws of any of the several States of the United States, shall be deemed residence within the United States within the meaning of section 422 (a) of this title, if such service occurred within 5 years immediately preceding the date such alien files petition for naturalization. Service on vessels described in clause (A) of this paragraph may be proved by duly authenticated copies of the records of the executive departments or agency having custody of the records of such service. Service on vessels described in clause (B) of this paragraph may be proved by certificates from the masters of such vessels.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection, any periods of time prior to September 23, 1950, during all of which any person had served honorably or with good conduct for an aggregate period of 5 years on any vessel described in section 325 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 prior to its amendment by the act of September 23, 1950, shall be deemed residence within the United States within the meaning of section 422 (a) of this title, if such petition is filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 424, an alien entitled to claim the exemptions contained in this paragraph shall not be required to establish a lawful admission for permanent residence.

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, any periods of time prior to September 23, 1950, during all of which any alien not within the provisions of paragraph (2) had, prior to September 23, 1950, served honorably or with good conduct on any vessel described in section 325 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 prior to its amendment by the act of September 23, 1950, and was so serving on September 23, 1950, shall be deemed residence within the United States within the meaning of section 422 (a) of this title, if such alien at any time prior to filing his petition for naturalization shall have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and if such petition is filed on or before September 23, 1955.

"(b) Any alien who was excepted from certain requirements of the naturalization laws under section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940 prior to its amendment by the act of September 23, 1950, and had filed a petition for naturalization under section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940, may, if such petition was pending on September 23, 1950, and is still pending on the effective date of this act, be naturalized upon compliance with the applicable provisions of the naturalization laws in effect upon the date such petition was filed. Such an alien shall be subject to the provisions of section 413 and to those provisions of section 424 which relate to the prohibition against the naturalization of an alien against whom there is outstanding a final order of deportation pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this act, or which relate to the prohibition against the final hearing on a petition for naturalization if there is pending against the alien a deportation proceeding pursuant to a warrant of arrest issued under the provisions of this or any other act.

"CHAPTER 4—NATURALIZATION PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO PARTICULAR GROUPS

"SEC. 431. Married persons: (a) Any alien whose spouse is a citizen of the United States may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of this title except the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 422 (a) if such person—

"(1) immediately preceding the date of filing his petition for naturalization has resided continuously within the United States for at least 1 year, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence;

"(2) is living in marital union with the citizen spouse at the time of naturalization; and

"(3) has resided in the State in which he filed his petition for at least 6 months.

"(b) Any alien may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of this title, except that no prior residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court shall be required if—

"(1) his spouse is (A) a citizen of the United States, (B) in the employment of the Government of the United States, or of an American institution of research recognized as such by the Commission or an American philanthropic agency recognized as such by the Commission, or of an American firm or corporation performing work abroad under contract with the United States Government

or engaged in whole or in part in the development of foreign trade and commerce of the United States, or an affiliate thereof, which is substantially controlled by such American firm or corporation, or of a public international organization in which the United States participates by treaty or statute, and (C) regularly stationed abroad in such employment;

"(2) he is in the United States at the time of naturalization; and

"(3) he declares in good faith before the naturalization court an intention to take up or continue residence within the United States immediately upon the termination of such employment abroad of the citizen spouse.

"SEC. 432. Alien child born outside of United States of one or both citizen parents: (a) An alien child under the age of 18 born outside of the United States of citizen parents who have never thereafter ceased to be citizens of the United States, becomes a citizen of the United States if one of his parents takes up residence in the United States—

"(1) if such child resides at that time in the United States; or

"(2) upon the child's subsequent admission to the United States for permanent residence.

"(b) An alien child under the age of 18 born outside of the United States, one of whose parents at the time of the child's birth was an alien and the other of whose parents then was and never thereafter ceased to be a citizen of the United States, becomes a citizen of of United States if his alien parent is naturalized, or if the citizen parent completes 5 years of residence in the United States—

"(1) if such child resides at that time in the United States; or

"(2) upon the child's subsequent admission to the United States for permanent residence.

"(c) An alien child under the age of 18 born outside of the United States, one or both of whose parents is at the time of petitioning for the naturalization of the child, a citizen of the United States may be naturalized, on the petition of such citizen parent, upon compliance with all the provisions of this title, except that no particular period of residence in the United States is required if he resides permanently in the United States with the petitioning parent pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence. If the child is of tender years the court may waive any and all requirements of sections 421 and 422.

"SEC. 433. Child born outside of United States of alien parents; conditions under which citizenship automatically acquired: An alien child under the age of 18 born outside of the United States of alien parents, or of an alien parent and a citizen parent who has subsequently lost citizenship of the United States, becomes a citizen of the United States—

"(1) the naturalization of both parents; or

"(2) the naturalization of the surviving parent if one of the parents is deceased; or

"(3) the naturalization of the parent having legal custody of the child when there has been a legal separation of the parents or the naturalization of the mother if the child was born out of wedlock and the paternity of the child has not been established by legitimation, if such child is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence at the time of the naturalization of the parent last naturalized under clause (1) of this section, or of the parent naturalized under clause (2) or (3) of this section, or if such child thereafter begins to reside permanently in the United States while under the age of 18 years, pursuant to a lawful admission.

"SEC. 434. Children adopted by United States citizens: An adopted alien child under the age of 18 one of whose adoptive parents is a citizen of the United States may be naturalized on the petition of such adoptive parent upon compliance with all the provisions of this title, except that no particular period of residence shall be required. If the child is of tender years, the court may waive any and all requirements of sections 421 and 422.

"SEC. 435. Former citizens of United States regaining United States citizenship: (a) Any person formerly a citizen of the United States who (1) prior to September 22, 1922, lost United States citizenship by marriage to an alien, or by the loss of United States citizenship of such person's spouse, or (2) on or after September 22, 1922, lost United States citizenship by marriage to an alien ineligible to citizenship, may, if no other nationality was acquired by an affirmative act other than marriage, regain citizenship upon compliance with all requirements of this title, except—

"(1) no period of residence within the United States or within the State where the petition is filed shall be required;

"(2) the petition need not set forth that it is the intention of the petitioner to reside permanently within the United States;

"(3) the petition may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction, regardless of the residence of the petitioner; and

"(4) the petition may be heard at any time after filing if there is attached to the petition at the time of filing a certificate from a naturalization examiner stating that the petitioner and her witnesses have appeared before such examiner for examination.

Such person, or any person who regains citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 317 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, or section 324 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall have, after regaining her citizenship, the status of a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, whichever status existed in the case of such person prior to the loss of citizenship. Nothing contained herein or in any other provision of law shall be construed as conferring United States citizenship retroactively upon such a person, or upon any person who regained citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 317 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, or section 324 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act during any period in which such person was not a citizen.

"(b) No person who is otherwise eligible for citizenship in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall regain citizenship unless such person establishes to the satisfaction of the naturalization court that she—

"(1) has been a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States for a period of not less than 5 years immediately preceding the date of filing her petition to regain citizenship and up to the time of admission to citizenship; and

"(2) unless she has resided continuously in the United States since the date of her marriage and was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence prior to filing her petition to regain citizenship.

"(c) (1) A woman who was a citizen of the United States at birth and (A) who has or is believed to have lost her United States citizenship solely by reason of her marriage prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien, or by her marriage on or after such date to an alien ineligible to citizenship, (B) whose marriage to such alien shall have terminated subsequent to January 12, 1941, and (C) who has not acquired by an affirmative act other than marriage any other nationality, shall, from and after taking the oath of allegiance required by section 445, be a citizen of the United States and have the status of a citizen of the United States by birth, without filing a petition for naturalization, and notwithstanding any of the other provisions of this title except the provisions of section 413. Nothing contained herein or in any other provision of law shall be construed as conferring United States citizenship retroactively upon such person, or upon any person who regained citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 317 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, or section 324 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, during any period in which such person was not a citizen.

"(2) Such oath of allegiance may be taken abroad before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, or in the United States before the judge or clerk of a naturalization court.

"(3) Such oath of allegiance shall be entered in the records of the appropriate embassy, legation, consulate, or naturalization court, and, upon demand, a certified copy of the proceedings, including a copy of the oath administered, under the seal of the embassy, legation, consulate, or naturalization court, shall be delivered to such person at a cost not exceeding $5, which certified copy shall be evidence of the facts stated therein before any court of record or judicial tribunal and in any department or agency of the Government of the United States.

"SEC. 436. Former United States citizens losing citizenship by entering the armed forces of foreign countries during World War II: (a) Any person who (1) during World War II and while a citizen of the United States, served in the military, air, or naval forces of any country at war with a country with which the United States was at war after December 7, 1941, and before September 2, 1945, and (2) has lost United States citizenship by reason of entering or serving in such forces, or taking an oath or obligation for the purpose of entering such forces, may regain citizenship by taking the oath required by section 435 before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, or any naturalization court specified in section 411 (a). Certified copies of such oath shall be sent by such court to the Commission.

"(b) Any person regaining citizenship in accordance with the provisions of this section, or any person who regained citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940, or of section 327 of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall have, from and after such reacquisition of citizenship, the status of native-born, or naturalized, citizen of the United States, whichever status existed in the case of such person prior to the loss of citizenship. Nothing contained herein, or in any other provision of law, shall be construed as conferring United States citizenship retroactively upon any such person during any period in which such person was not a citizen.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, World War II is deemed to have begun on September 1, 1939, and to have terminated on September 2, 1945.

"(d) This section shall not apply to any person who during World War II served in the armed forces of a country while such country was at war with the United States.

"SEC. 437. Naturalization through service in the Armed Forces of the United States; active-duty service during World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict: (a) An alien, who while in the United States entered the Armed Forces of the United States and thereafter served honorably in an active-duty status at any time for a period or periods aggregating 3 years, and who, if separated from such service, was not separated except honorably or under honorable conditions, may be naturalized without regard to the other naturalization requirements set forth in this title if he is a person of good moral character, well disposed to the good

order and happiness of the United States, and attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and his petition for naturalization is filed while he is still in the service or within 1 year after the termination of such service.

"(b) Any alien, who while in the United States entered the Armed Forces of the United States, and thereafter served honorably for 90 days or more in an active-duty status during World War I, or during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946, or during the period June 25, 1950, and ending on July 1, 1955, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized without regard to other naturalization requirements set forth in this title if he is a person of good moral character, well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States, and attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States.

"SEC. 438. Armed Forces naturalization outside United States; determination of honorable active-duty status: (a) Any person entitled to naturalization under section 437 may be naturalized while serving outside the jurisdiction of any naturalization court, upon compliance with the applicable provisions of that section without appearing before any court. The petition for naturalization of any such person shall be made and sworn to before, and filed with a representative of the Commission, which representative is hereby authorized to receive such petition, to conduct hearing thereon, to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of such person for naturalization, to call witnesses, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner and his witnesses to the petition and the oath prescribed by section 445 of this act, and to grant naturalization and to issue certificates of naturalization. The record of any proceedings under this section shall be forwarded to and filed with the clerk of a naturalization court designated by the petitioner and made a part of the record of such court.

"(b) The executive department under which a person served shall determine, for the purposes of section 437, whether persons have served honorably in an active-duty status and whether separation from such service was under honorable conditions, but no person who is or has been separated from such service at his request on account of alienage, or who was a conscientious objector who performed no military, air, or naval duty whatever or refused to wear a uniform, shall be regarded as having served honorably or having been separated under honorable conditions for the purpose of this section and section 437.

"(c) No period of service in the Armed Forces shall be made the basis of a petition for naturalization under section 437 if the applicant has previously been naturalized on the basis of the same period of service.

"SEC. 439. Former United States citizens losing citizenship under prior laws: (a) Any person who was formerly a citizen of the United States and who, prior to the effective date of this act, lost his United States citizenship under the provisions of any law in effect prior to such effective date by the performance of an act or the occurrence of an event which, if such act had been performed or such event had occurred after the effective date of this act, would not have resulted in loss of citizenship under section 451 of this act, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of this title except the provision of paragraph (1) of section 422 (a), if such person—

"(1) immediately preceding the date of filing his petition for naturalization has resided continuously within the United States for at least 2 years, after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and

"(2) has resided in the State in which he filed his petition for at least 6 months.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to (1) any former citizen of the United States who is eligible to regain his United States citizenship under section 435 or 436, or (2) any person who, under section 413, section 414, or section 415, is ineligible for naturalization.

"CHAPTER 5—PROCEDURAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS RELATING TO GRANTING AND REVOCATION OF NATURALIZATION

"SEC. 441. Miscellaneous administrative provisions: (a) For the purpose of making recommendations to the naturalization court, the Commission shall provide for the examination of petitioners for naturalization as to their admissibility to citizenship. Such examination may be conducted before or after the applicant has filed his petition for naturalization. It shall be limited to an inquiry concerning the applicant's qualifications to become a naturalized citizen as required by law, and shall be uniform throughout the United States.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to promote instruction and training in citizenship responsibilities of applicants for naturalization including the sending of names of candidates for naturalization to the public schools, preparing and distributing citizenship textbooks to such candidates as are receiving instruction in preparation for citizenship within or under the supervision of the public schools, preparing and distributing monthly an immigration and naturalization bulletin and securing the aid of and cooperating with official State and national organizations, including those concerned with vocational education.

"(c) Employees of the Commission may be designated by the Commission to administer oaths and to take depositions without charge in matters relating to the administration of the naturalization and citizenship laws. In cases where there is a likelihood of unusual delay or of hardship, the Commission may, in its discretion, authorize such depositions to be taken before a postmaster without charge, or before a notary public or other person authorized to administer oaths for general purposes.

"(d) A certificate of naturalization or of citizenship issued by the Commission shall have the same effect in all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home and abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State and Territory, as a certificate of naturalization or of citizenship issued by a court having naturalization jurisdiction.

"(e) Certification and certified copies of all papers, documents, certificates, and records required or authorized to be issued, used, filed, recorded, or kept under any and all provisions of this title, shall be admitted in evidence equally with the originals in any and all cases and proceedings under this title and in all cases and proceedings in which the originals thereof might be admissible as evidence.

"(f) The officers in charge of property owned or leased by the Government are authorized, upon the recommendation of the Commission, to provide quarters, without payment of rent, in any building occupied by the Commission for a photographic studio, operated by welfare organizations without profit and solely for the benefit of persons seeking to comply with requirements under the immigration and citizenship laws. Such studio shall be under the supervision of the Commission.

"SEC. 442. Petition for naturalization; declaration of intention: (a) An applicant for naturalization shall make and file in the office of the clerk of a naturalization court, in duplicate, a sworn petition in writing, signed by the applicant in the applicant's own handwriting if physically able to write, and duly verified by two witnesses, which petition shall be on a form prescribed by the Commission and shall include averments of all facts which in the opinion of the Commission may be material to the applicant's naturalization and required to be proved upon the hearing of such petition.

"(b) No petition for naturalization may be filed unless the petitioner (1) has attained the age of 18 years and (2) has first filed an application therefor at an office of the Commission in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission.

"(c) Petitions for naturalization may be made and filed during the term time or vacation of the naturalization court and shall be docketed the same day as filed, but final action thereon shall be had only on stated days, to be fixed by rule or order of the court.

"(d) If the applicant is prevented by sickness or other disability from presenting himself in the office of the clerk to make the petition required by subsection (a) of this section, the petitioner may make such petition at any other place designated by the clerk.

"(e) Each petitioner for naturalization shall furnish to the Commission such photographs as it shall prescribe.

"(f) An alien over 18 years of age who is residing in the United States pursuant to a lawful admission for permanent residence may, upon an application prescribed, filed with, and approved by the Commission, make and file in duplicate in the office of the clerk of court, regardless of the alien's place of residence in the United States, a signed declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, in such form as the Commission shall prescribe. This subsection is not to be construed as requiring such an alien to make and file a declaration of intention as a condition precedent to filing a petition for naturalization nor is a declaration of intention to be construed as conferring or having conferred upon an alien United States citizenship or the right to United States citizenship, nor is a declaration to be evidence of an alien's lawful admission for permanent residence in any proceeding, action, or matter arising under this act or any other law.

"SEC. 443. Preliminary examinations on petition: (a) The Commission shall conduct preliminary examinations upon petitions for naturalization and make recommendations thereon to the naturalization court. Any employee of the Commission designated to make such examinations is authorized to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the qualifications of any petitioner for naturalization, to administer oaths, and to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, including petitioner before such employee and the production of relevant books, papers, and documents, and to that end many invoke the aid of any court exercising naturalization jurisdiction; and any such court may, in the event of neglect or refusal to respond to a subpena issued by any such employee or refusal to testify before such employee issue an order requiring such person to appear before such employee, produce relevant books, papers, and documents if demanded, and testify; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. The record of the preliminary examination authorized by this subsection shall be admissible as evidence in any final hearing conducted by a naturalization court.

"(b) As to each period and place of residence in the State in which the petitioner resides at the time of filing the petition, during the entire period of at least 6 months immediately preceding the date of filing the petition, there shall be included in the petition for naturalization the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each has personally known the petitioner to have been a

resident at such place for such period, and that the petitioner is and during all such periods has been a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

"(c) At the hearing on the petition, residence in the State in which the petitioner resides at the time of filing the petition for at least 6 months immediately preceding the date of filing the petition, and the other qualifications required by subsection (a) of section 422 during such residence, shall be proved by the oral testimony of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, in addition to the affidavits required by subsection (b) of this section to be included in the petition. At the hearing, residence within the United States during the 5-year period required by section 422 (a), but outside the State, or within the State, but prior to the 6 months immediately preceding the date of filing the petition, and the other qualifications required by subsection (a) of section 422 during such period and such places, shall be proved either by depositions taken in accordance with subsection (c) of section 441, or oral testimony, of at least two such witnesses for each place of residence.

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the requirements of subsection (a) of section 422 as to the petitioner's residence, good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and disposition toward the good order and happiness of the United States may be established by any evidence satisfactory to the naturalization court in the case of persons availing themselves of the benefits of section 423.

"(e) (1) A petitioner for naturalization who removes from the jurisdiction of the court in which his petition for naturalization is pending may, at any time thereafter, make application to the court for transfer of the petition to a naturalization court exercising jurisdiction over the petitioner's place of residence, or to any other naturalization court if the petition was not required to be filed in a naturalization court exercising jurisdiction over the petitioner's place of residence.

"(2) Where transfer of the petition is authorized, the clerk of court in which the petition was filed shall forward a certified copy of the petition and the original record in the case to the clerk of court to which the petition is transferred, and proceedings on the petition shall thereafter continue as though the petition had originally been filed in the court to which transferred, except that the court to which the petition is transferred may, in its discretion, require the production of two credible United States citizen witnesses to testify as to the petitioner's qualifications for naturalization since the date of such transfer.

"SEC. 444. Final hearing upon petitions for naturalization; final order entered upon record; examination of petitioner and witnesses: (a) Every final hearing upon a petition for naturalization shall be had in open court before a judge or judges thereof, and every final order which may be made upon such petition shall be under the hand of the court and entered in full upon a record kept for that purpose, and upon such final hearing of such petition, the petitioner and the witnesses, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, shall be examined under oath before the court and in the presence of the court. If the petitioner is prevented by sickness or other disability from being in open court for the final hearing upon a petition for naturalization, such final hearing may be had before a judge or judges of the court at such place as may be designated by the court.

"(b) The requirement of subsection (a) of this section for the examination of the petitioner and the witnesses under oath before the court and in the presence of the court shall not apply in any case where Commission employee has conducted the preliminary examination authorized by section 443 (a), except that the court may, in its discretion, and shall, upon demand of the petitioner, require the examination of the petitioner and the witnesses under oath during the final hearing.

"(c) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, no final hearing shall be held on any petition for naturalization nor shall any person be naturalized nor shall any certificate of naturalization be issued by any court within a period of 30 days after the filing of the petition for naturalization. The Commission may waive such period in an individual case if its finds that the waiver will be in the public interest and will promote the security of the United States.

"(d) The Commission shall have the right to appear before any court in any naturalization proceedings for the purpose of cross-examining the petitioner and the witnesses produced in support of the petition concerning any matter affecting the petitioner's right to naturalization, and shall have the right to call witnesses, including the petitioner, produce evidence, and be heard in opposition to, or in favor of, the granting of any petition in naturalization proceedings.

"(e) Upon timely application to the naturalization court, and notice to the Commission or the petitioner, as the case may be, the clerk of the court shall issue subpenas for witnesses named by the petitioner or by the Commission to appear on the day set for the final hearing. Additional subpenas shall be issued upon subsequent applications up to the time of the final hearing.

"(f) It shall be lawful at the time and as a part of the naturalization of any person, for the court, in its discretion, upon the prayer of the petitioner included in the petition for naturalization of such person, to make a decree changing the name of said person, and the certificate of naturalization shall be issued in accordance therewith.

"(g) If a final hearing upon a petition has not been had within 1 year following the date on which it was filed, the petitioner may file a motion requesting an immediate final hearing. The court shall thereupon require the Commission to show cause why a final hearing cannot be had and may, at its discretion, set such peremptory date for such final hearing as it deems reasonable and proper.

"SEC. 445. Oath of renunciation and allegiance: (a) An alien who has petitioned for naturalization shall, before being admitted to citizenship, take in open court one of the oaths (or make one of the affirmations) set forth in subsection (b) of this section, (1) to support the Constitution of the United States; (2) to renounce and abjure absolutely and entirely all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which the petitioner was before a subject or citizen; (3) to support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; (4) to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and (5) to bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law, or to perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by law. Any such alien shall be required to take the oath prescribed in subsection (b) (1) of this section unless by clear and convincing evidence he can show to the satisfaction of the naturalization court that he is opposed to the bearing of arms or the performance of noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States by reason of religious training and belief. In the case of the naturalization of a child under the provisions of section 432 (c) and 434 the naturalization court may waive the taking of either of such oaths or affirmations if in the opinion of the court the child is unable to understand their meaning.

"(b) As provided in subsection (a) of this section, the petitioner for naturalization shall take one of the following oaths (or make one of the following affirmations):

"'(1) I hereby declare, on oath (or affirm), that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear arms on behalf of the United States or perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by law; and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion: So help me God. In acknowledgment whereof I have hereunto affixed my signature'; or

"'(2) I hereby declare, on oath (or affirm), that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely and without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion: So, help me God. In acknowledgment whereof I have hereunto affixed my signature.'

"(c) In case the alien petitioning for naturalization has borne any hereditary title, or has been of any of the orders of nobility in any foreign state, the petitioner shall in addition to complying with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section, make under oath in open court in the court in which the petition for naturalization is made, an express renunciation of such title or order of nobility, and such renunciation shall be recorded in the court as a part of such proceedings.

"(d) If the petitioner is prevented by sickness or other disability from being in open court, the oath or affirmation required to be taken by subsection (a) of this section may be taken before a judge of the court at such place as may be designated by the court.

"SEC. 446. Certificate of naturalization; contents: A person admitted to citizenship by a naturalization court shall be entitled to receive from the court a document certifying to his naturalization in such form as the Commission shall prescribe.

"SEC. 447. Revocation of naturalization: (a) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorneys for the respective districts, upon affidavits showing good cause therefor, to institute proceedings in any court specified in subsection (a) of section 411 of this title in the judicial district in which the naturalized citizen may reside at the time of bringing suit for the purpose of revoking and setting aside the order admitting such person to citizenship and canceling the certificate of naturalization on the ground of fraud or on the ground that such order and certificate of naturalization were illegally procured. No such proceeding shall be instituted more than 10 years after the naturalization order was issued. If the naturalized citizen does not reside in any judicial district in the United States at the time of bringing such suit, the proceedings may be instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States district court in the judicial district in which such person last had his residence.

"(b) The person to whom was granted the neutralization alleged to have been fraudulent or illegally procured shall be served per-

sonally in any judicial district in the United States, unless personal service is waived, or shall be served by substituted service as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) If it is shown to the naturalization court that the naturalized person is absent from the United States, the court may order substituted service to be made, wherever feasible, by personal delivery of a letter abroad by an employee of the United States designated by the Commission, by letter sent by registered mail to the person at his last known address in the United States or abroad, and by publication of such letter in a newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of such address. If no answer or other motion has been filed by the naturalized person and if the court finds that he has actual notice or is evading service, it shall make a record of such finding, and may then proceed to hear the evidence in the case and enter its order.

"(d) The naturalized person shall have 60 days in which to answer or otherwise move from the time of personal or substituted service.

"(e) Where citizenship is revoked under subsection (a) of this section it shall not result in the loss of citizenship or of any right or privilege of citizenship which would have been derived by or been available to a spouse or minor child of the naturalized person had such naturalization not been revoked.

"(f) When a person is convicted under section 1425 of title 18 of the United States Code of knowingly procuring naturalization in violation of law, the court in which such conviction is had shall thereupon revoke the final order admitting such person to citizenship, and shall declare the certificate of naturalization of such person to be canceled. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the courts having jurisdiction of the trial of such offense to make such adjudication.

"(g) Wherever an order admitting an alien to citizenship is revoked or a certificate of naturalization is canceled, or both, as provided in this section, the court in which such judgment or decree is rendered shall make an order canceling such certificate and shall send a certified copy of such order to the Commission. In case such certificate was not originally issued by the court making such order, it shall direct the clerk of the court in which the order is revoked to transmit a copy of such order and judgment to the court out of which such certificate of naturalization was originally issued. It shall thereupon be the duty of the clerk of the court receiving such certified copy of the order and judgment of the court to enter the same of record and to cancel such original certificate of naturalization, if there be any, upon the records and to notify the Commission of the entry of such order and of such cancellation. A person holding a certificate of naturalization or citizenship which has been canceled as provided by this section shall, upon notice by the court by which the decree of cancellation was made, or by the Commission, surrender the same to the Commission.

"(h) The provisions of this section shall apply not only to any naturalization granted and to certificates of naturalization and citizenship issued under the provisions of this title, but to any naturalization heretofore granted by any court, or by any duly authorized officer of the United States.

"SEC. 448. Certificates of citizenship; Procedure: A person who claims to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or through the naturalization or citizenship of a husband, or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of section 1993 of the United States Revised Statutes, or of section 1993 of the United States Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of the act of May 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 797), or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of subsection (c), (d), (e), (g), or (i) of section 201 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1138), or of the act of May 7, 1934 (48 Stat. 667), or of paragraph (3), (4), or (5) of section 401 (a) of this title, or under the provisions of the act of August 4, 1937 (50 Stat. 558), or under the provisions of section 203 or 205 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1139) or under paragraph (3), (4), (5), or (7) of section 301 (a) or under section 303 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or under the provisions of section 403 of this title, may apply to the Commission for a certificate of citizenship. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the Commission that the applicant is a citizen, and that the applicant's alleged citizenship was derived or acquired, as the case may be, as claimed and upon taking and subscribing before an employee of the Commission or other designated officer of the United States the oath of allegiance required of a petitioner for naturalization, such individual shall be furnished by the Commission with a certificate of citizenship, but only if such individual is at the time within the United States, or serving abroad with the Armed Forces of the United States. For the purposes of this section, any person who has resided continuously in the United States since July 1, 1924, shall be presumed to have been lawfully admitted.

"SEC. 449. Cancellation of certificates; Action not to affect citizenship status: The Commission is authorized to cancel any certificate of citizenship, certificate of naturalization, copy of a declaration of intention, or other certificate, document, or record heretofore issued or made by the Attorney General or the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization or a Deputy Commissioner or hereafter made by the Commission if it appears to the Commission that such document or record was illegally or fraudulently obtained, or was created by willful and material fraud; but the person for or to whom such document or record has been made or issued shall be given written notice by registered mail, at such person's last-known address, of the intention to cancel such document or record, with the reasons therefor, and shall be given at least 60 days in which to show cause why such document or record should not be canceled. The cancellation under this section of any document purporting to show the citizenship status of the person to whom it was issued shall affect only the document and not the citizenship status of the person in whose name the document was issued.

"CHAPTER 6—LOSS OF CITIZENSHIP; SUITS FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

"SEC. 451—Loss of citizenship: (a) From and after the effective date of this act a person who is a citizen of the United States whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his citizenship by—

"(1) making a formal renunciation of citizenship before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States in a foreign state, in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State; or

"(2) making in the United States a formal written renunciation of citizenship in such form as may be prescribed by, and before such officer as may be designated by, the Commission, whenever the United States is in a state of war and the Attorney General approves renunciation as not contrary to the interests of national defense; or

"(3) obtaining, without compulsion, naturalization in a foreign state upon his own application, if such person is over 21 years of age at the time application is made; or

"(4) deserting the military, air, or naval forces of the United States in time of war, if and when he is convicted thereof by court-martial, and as the result of such conviction is dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the services of such military, air, or naval forces. Notwithstanding loss of citizenship under the terms of this or previous laws by reason of desertion committed in time of war, restoration to active duty with such military, air, or naval forces in time of war, or the reenlistment or induction of such a person in time of war with permission of competent military, air, or naval authority shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring citizenship heretofore or hereafter so lost; or

"(5) committing any act of treason against, or attempting by force to overthrow, or bearing arms against the United States, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court-martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction; or

"(6) departing from or remaining outside of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency for the purpose of evading or avoiding training or service in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States, or to avoid complying with any provision of any compulsory service laws of the United States.

"(b) (1) The officer before whom a renunciation is made under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section or a court convicting a person of the crimes specified in paragraphs (4) and (5) of that subsection shall report the name of the person involved and all relevant facts to the Commission.

"(2) Whenever a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States has reason to believe that a person while in a foreign state has lost his United States citizenship under paragraph (3) or (6) of subsection (a) of this section, he shall certify the facts upon which such belief is based to the Department of State, in writing, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State. If the report of the diplomatic or consular officer is approved by the Secretary of State, a copy of the certificate shall be forwarded to the Commission, which shall notify the person to whom it relates.

"SEC. 452. Suits to declare citizenship forfeited: (a) It shall be the duty of the United States district attorneys for the respective districts, upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, to institute proceedings in any court specified in subsection (a) of section 411 of this title in the judicial district in which the citizen may reside at the time of bringing suit, for the purpose of having a person's United States citizenship declared forfeited, if such person—

"(1) being under the age of 21 years, without compulsion obtained naturalization in a foreign state and without good cause, failed to enter the United States to establish a permanent residence prior to his 25th birthday; or

"(2) without compulsion took an oath or made other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof; or

"(3) without compulsion entered or served in the armed forces of a foreign state not being expressly authorized by the laws of the United States after he has acquired the nationality of such foreign state.

"If the citizen does not reside in any judicial district in the United States at the time of bringing such suit, the proceedings may be instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States district court in the judicial district in which such person last had his residence.

"(b) The respondent shall be served personally in any judicial district in the United States, unless personal service is waived, or shall be served by substituted service as prescribed in subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) If it is shown to the court that the respondent is absent from the United States, the court may order substituted service to be made, wherever feasible, by personal delivery of a letter abroad by an employee of the United States designated by the Commission, by letter sent by registered mail

to the person at his last known address in the United States or abroad, and by publication of such letter in a newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of such address. If no answer or other motion has been filed by the respondent, and if the court finds that he has actual notice or is evading service, it shall make a record of such finding, and may then proceed to hear the evidence in the case and enter its order.

"(d) The respondent shall have 60 days in which to answer or otherwise move from the time of personal or substituted service.

"(e) Whenever a person's citizenship is declared forfeited, as provided in this section, the court in which such judgment or decree is rendered shall make an order declaring that person's United States citizenship forfeited and shall send a certified copy of such order to the Commission.

"(f) No proceeding shall be instituted under subsection (a) of this section more than 10 years following the citizen's return to the United States.

"SEC. 453. Loss of citizenship through parent's expatriation; not effective until person attains age of 25 years: (a) A person having United States citizenship, who is under the age of 21 and whose residence is in a foreign state with or under the legal custody of a parent who hereafter loses United States citizenship under section 451 or 452 of this title, shall also lose his United States citizenship if such person has or acquires the citizenship of such foreign state and if such person attains the age of 25 years without having established permanent residence in the United States.

"(b) Any person who lost his United States citizenship prior to January 1, 1948, through the naturalization in a foreign state of a parent or parents may, within 1 year from the effective date of this act, apply for a visa and for admission to the United States as a nonquota immigrant under section 102 (a) (19) (D).

"SEC. 454. Citizenship not to be denied or abridged: United States citizenship, once acquired, shall not be denied or lost, except as provided in this act.

"SEC. 455. Proceedings for declaration of United States citizenship in the event of denial of rights or privileges as citizen: If a department, agency, or officer of the United States raises a substantial doubt as to the United States citizenship of a person, such person, regardless of whether he is in the United States or abroad, may institute an action against the head of such department or agency or such officer in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such person claims a permanent residence, for a judgment declaring him to be a citizen of the United States. If such person is outside the United States and has instituted such an action in court, and if the court shall find that the action was instituted in good faith and has a substantial basis, the Commission shall issue a certificate of identity, stating that citizenship status is pending before the court and he shall be admitted to the United States but shall be subject to deportation in the event that it is decided by the court that he is not a citizen of the United States.

"CHAPTER 7—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 461. Functions and duties of clerks. (a) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each naturalization court to forward to the Commission a duplicate of each petition for naturalization within 30 days after the close of the month in which such petition was filed, and to forward to the Commission certified copies of such other proceedings and orders instituted in or issued out of the court affecting or relating to the naturalization of persons as may be required from time to time by the Commission.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each naturalization court to forward to the Commission within 30 days after the close of the month in which a naturalization certificate was issued, a duplicate thereof, and to make and keep on file in the clerk's office a stub for each certificate so issued, and to forward a duplicate of each such stub to the Commission within 30 days after the close of the month in which such certificate was issued.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the clerk of each naturalization court to report to the Commission, within 30 days after the close of the month in which the final hearing and decision of the court was had, the name and number of the petition of each and every person who shall be denied naturalization together with the cause of such denial.

"(d) Clerks of courts shall be responsible for all blank certificates of naturalization received by them from time to time from the Commission, and shall account to the Commission for them whenever required to do so. A certificate of naturalization received by any clerk of court which may be defaced or injured in such manner as to prevent its use shall be not destroyed, but shall be returned to the Commission.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the clerk of every naturalization court to cause to be filed in chronological order in separate volumes, indexed, consecutively numbered, and made a part of the records of such court, all declarations of intention and petitions for naturalization.

"SEC. 462. Documents and copies. (a) A person who claims to have been naturalized in the United States under section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940 may make application to the Commission for a certificate of naturalization. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the Commission that the applicant was naturalized as claimed in the application and that he is still a citizen, such individual shall be furnished a certificate of naturalization by the Commission, but only if the applicant is at the time within the United States, or is serving abroad in the armed services of the United States.

"(b) If any certificate of naturalization or citizenship issued to any citizen or any declaration of intention furnished to any declarant is lost, mutilated, or destroyed, the citizen or declarant may make application to the Commission for a new certificate or declaration. If the Commission finds that the certificate or declaration is lost, mutilated, or destroyed, it shall issue to the applicant a new certificate or declaration. If the certificate or declaration has been mutilated, it shall be surrendered to the Commission before the applicant may receive such new certificate or declaration. If the certificate or declaration has been lost, the applicant or any other person who shall have, or may come into, possession of it is hereby required to surrender it to the Commission.

"(c) The Commission shall issue for any naturalized citizen, on such citizen's application therefore, a special certificate of naturalization for use by such citizen for the purpose of obtaining recognition as a citizen of the United States by a foreign state. Such certificate when issued shall be furnished to the Secretary of State for transmission to the proper authority in such foreign state.

"(d) If the name of any naturalized citizen has, subsequent to naturalization, been changed by order of any court of competent jurisdiction, or by marriage, the citizen may make application for a new certificate of naturalization in the new name of such citizen. If the Commission finds the name of the applicant to have been changed as claimed, the Commission shall issue to the applicant a new certificate and shall notify the naturalization court of such action.

"(e) The Commission is authorized to make and issue certifications of any part of the naturalization records of any court, or of any certificate of naturalization or citizenship, for use in complying with any statute, State or Federal, or in any judicial proceeding. No such certification shall be made by any clerk of court except upon order of the court.

"SEC. 463. Fiscal provisions: (a) The clerk of court shall charge, collect, and account for the following fees:

"(1) For making, filing, and docketing a petition for naturalization, $10, including the final hearing on such petition, if such hearing is held, and a certificate of naturalization, if the issuance of such certificate is authorized by the naturalization court.

"(2) For receiving and filing a declaration of intention, and issuing a duplicate thereof, $5.

"(b) The Commission shall charge, collect, and account for the following fees:

"(1) For application for a certificate of naturalization or declaration of intention in lieu of a certificate or declaration alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed, $5.

"(2) For application for a certificate of citizenship, $5.

"(3) For application for the issuance of a special certificate of citizenship to obtain recognition, $5.

"(4) For application for a certificate of naturalization under section 323 of the Nationality Act of 1940, or under section 343 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or under section 462 (a) of this act, $5.

"(5) For application for a certificate of citizenship in changed name, $5.

"(6) Reasonable fees in cases where such fees have not been established by law, to cover the cost of furnishing copies, whether certified or uncertified, of any part of the records, or information from the records, of the Commission. The Commission may lend copies, for short periods, without charge. Such fees shall not exceed a maximum of 25 cents per folio of 100 words, with a minimum fee of 50 cents for any one such service, in addition to a fee of $1 for any official certification furnished under seal. No such fee shall be required from officers or agencies of the United States or of any State or any subdivision thereof, for such copies or information furnished for official use in connection with the official duties of such officers or agencies.

"(7) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, no fee shall be charged or collected for an application for declaration of intention or a certificate of naturalization in lieu of a declaration or a certificate alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed, submitted by a person who was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 20, 1898, and before July 5, 1902; or at any time after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918, or who served on the Mexican border as a member of the Regular Army or National Guard between June 1916 and April 1917, or who has served or hereafter serves in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States after September 16, 1940, and who was not at any time during such period or thereafter separated from such forces under other than honorable conditions, who was not a conscientious objector who performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform or who was not at any time during such period or thereafter discharged from such military, air, or naval forces on account of alienage.

"(c) The clerk of any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 411 (except the courts specified in subsection (d) of this section) shall account for and pay over to the Commission one-half of all fees up to the sum of $6,000, and all fees in excess of $6,000, collected by any such clerk in naturalization proceedings in any fiscal year.

"(d) The clerk of any United States district court (except in Alaska and in the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States and in the District Court of

Guam) shall account for and pay over to the Commission all fees collected by any such clerk in naturalization proceedings. The clerk of the District Court of the Virgin Islands of the United States and of the District Court of Guam shall report but shall not be required to pay over to the Commission the fees collected by any such clerk in naturalization proceedings.

"(e) The accounting required by subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall be made and the fees paid over to the Commission by such clerks in their quarterly accounts which they are hereby required to render to the Commission within 30 days from the close of each quarter of each fiscal year, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission.

"(f) The clerks of the various naturalization courts shall pay all additional clerical force that may be required in performing the duties imposed by this title upon clerks of courts from fees retained under the provisions of this section by such clerks in naturalization proceedings.

"(g) All fees collected by the Commission and all fees paid over to the Commission by clerks of courts under the provisions of this title shall be deposited by the Commission in the Treasury of the United States, except that all fees received from applicants residing in the Virgin Islands of the United States, and in Guam, required to be paid under subsection (b) of this section, shall be paid over to the treasury of the Virgin Islands and to the treasury of Guam, respectively.

"(h) During the time when the United States is at war no clerk of a United States court shall charge or collect a naturalization fee from an alien in the military, air, or naval service of the United States for filing a petition for naturalization or issuing a certificate of naturalization upon admission to citizenship, and no clerk of any State court shall charge or collect any fee for such services unless the laws of the State require such charge to be made, in which case nothing more than the portion of the fee required to be paid to the State shall be charged or collected. A report of all transactions under this subsection shall be made to the Commission as in the case of other reports required of clerks of courts by this title.

"(i) In addition to the other fees required by this title, the petitioner for naturalization shall, upon the filing of a petition for naturalization, deposit with and pay to the clerk of court a sum of money sufficient to cover the expenses of supenaing and paying the legal fees of any witnesses for whom such petitioner may request a subpena, and upon the final discharge of such witnesses, they shall receive, if they demand the same from the clerk, the customary and usual witness fees from the moneys which the petitioner has paid to such clerk for such purpose, and the residue, if any, shall be returned by the clerk to the petitioner.

"SEC. 464. Mail relating to naturalization: All mail matter of whatever class, relating to naturalization, including duplicate papers required by law or regulation to be sent to the Commission by clerks of courts addressed to the Commission, or any official thereof, and endorsed "Official Business", shall be transmitted free of postage and, if necessary, by registered mail without fee, and so marked.

"SEC. 465. Publication and distribution of citizenship textbooks: Authorization is hereby granted for the publication and distribution of the citizenship textbook described in subsection (b) of section 441 and for the reimbursement of the appropriation of the Commission upon the records of the Treasury Department from the naturalization fees deposited in the Treasury through the Commission for the cost of such publication and distribution, such reimbursement to be made upon statements by the Commission of books so published and distributed.

"SEC. 466. Civil actions against clerks of court: (a) In case any clerk of court shall refuse or neglect to comply with any of the provisions of section 461 (a), (b), or (c), such clerk of court shall forfeit and pay to the United States the sum of $25 in each and every case in which such violation or omission occurs and the amount for such forfeiture may be recovered by the United States in a civil action against such clerk.

"(b) If any clerk of court shall fail to return to the Commission or properly account for any certificate of naturalization furnished by the Commission as provided in subsection (d) of section 461, such clerk of court shall be liable to the United States in the sum of $50, to be recovered in a civil action, for each and every such certificate not properly accounted for or returned.

"SEC. 467. Application of treaties; Exceptions: Nothing in this title shall be applied in contravention of the provisions of any treaty or convention to which the United States is a party and which has been ratified prior to the effective date of this act. No woman who was a national of the United States shall be deemed to have lost her citizenship solely by reason of her marriage to an alien on or after September 22, 1922, or to an alien racially ineligible to citizenship on or after March 3, 1931, or in the case of a woman who was a United States citizen at birth, through residence abroad following such marriage, notwithstanding the provisions of any existing treaty or convention.

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 501. Joint congressional committee: (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Immigration and Citizenship Policy (hereinafter referred to as the 'committee') to be composed of 14 members as follows: (1) 3 members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, 2 from the majority and 1 from the minority party, 2 members who are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, 1 from the majority party, and 1 from the minority party, and 2 members who are members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, 1 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party, all to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and (2) 3 members who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 2 from the majority and 1 from the minority party, 2 members who are members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, 1 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party, and 2 members who are members of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, 1 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party, all to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee of either the Senate or the House of Representatives from which he was appointed.

"(c) A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection and the committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

"(d) It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of (1) the administration of this act, and its effect on the foreign policy, national security, the economy and the social welfare of, and labor conditions in, the United States, and (2) such conditions within or without the United States which in the opinion of the committee might have any bearing on the immigration and citizenship policy of the United States.

"(e) The committee shall make from time to time a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives concerning the results of its studies together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

"(f) The Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General shall keep the committee fully and currently informed with respect to their activities in the administration of this act; and the Commission, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General shall consult with the committee from time to time with respect to their activities under this act.

"(g) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 and 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witnesses to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under the authority of this act.

"(h) The members of the committee shall serve without compensation other than that received for their services as Members of Congress but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session.

"(i) The committee is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, and clerical stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and the other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the committee other than expenses in connection with meetings of the committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session. The chairmen of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the chairmen of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives may assign members of the staff of the committees to serve on the staff of the committee, without additional compensation, except for the reimbursement of expenses incurred by such staff members as prescribed in this subsection.

"(j) The expenses of the committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee or by any members of the committee duly authorized by the chairman.

"(k) This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 502. Amendments to other laws: (a) Section 1546 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'the Attorney General or the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service', wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Immigration and Naturalization Commission.'

"(b) Section 1429 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'subsection (e) of section 336 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 444 (e) of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(c) Section 1114 of title 18 of the United State Code is amended by striking out 'any immigration officer' and inserting in lieu

thereof 'any immigration officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Commission.'

"(d) Section 8 (c) of the act entitled 'An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631; 22 U. S. C. 618), is amended by striking out 'sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 343 and 344 of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(e) Section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army', approved June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 316), is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 437 and 438 of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955'; and

"(2) by striking out 'such section 329' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such sections 437 and 438.'

"(f) Section 201 of the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 7; 22 U. S. C., sec. 1446) is amended to read as follows:

"'PERSONS

"'SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges on a reciprocal basis between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on the basis of reciprocity the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 102 (a) (18) of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955, for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Commission. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States shall, upon the warrant of the Immigration and Naturalization Commission, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 343 and 344 of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Immigration and Naturalization Commission as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for adjustment of status under section 346 of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(g) Section 1 (7) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by striking out 'immigration officers' and inserting in lieu thereof 'immigration officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Commission.'

"(h) (1) The first sentence of section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is amended by striking out 'section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(2) The second proviso to section 3 (c) of such act is amended by striking out 'section 203 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 201 (b) (5) of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955."

"(3) Section 4 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(4) Section 5 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5. The quota to which an alien is chargeable for the purposes of this act shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955 and no eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigrant visa if he is known or believed by the visa-granting officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws, with the exception of section 301 (j) of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955; and all eligible displaced persons, eligible displaced orphans and orphans under section 2 (f) shall be exempt from paying visa fees and head taxes.'

"(5) Section 6 of such act is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955'; and

"(B) by striking out 'sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'sections 343 and 344 of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(6) Section 12 (a) of such act is amended by striking out 'section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955.'

"(7) Section 12 (b) of such act is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955'; and

"(B) by striking out 'section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'title II of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955'.

"(8) Section 12 (c) of such act is amended by striking out 'section 212 (a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 301 (j) of the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955'.

"(i) The act entitled 'An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service,' approved March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1467; 5 U. S. C. 342c–d), is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Secretary of Labor' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'Immigration and Naturalization Commission'; and

"(2) by striking out 'Immigration Service' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commission'.

"(j) The act of August 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 858; 5 U. S. C. 342e), is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Immigration Service' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Immigration and Naturalization Commission'; and

"(2) by striking out 'Immigration and Naturalization Service' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Commission'.

"SEC. 503. Repeal of prior laws: The following laws and all amendments thereto are repealed:

"(a) The Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414, 82d Cong.);

"(b) The act entitled 'An act to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950', approved June 30, 1953 (Public Law 86, 83d Cong.).

"SEC. 504. References in other laws: Any reference in any law of the United States (other than in any law specifically repealed or amended by this act) or in any Executive order to any provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof, be deemed to refer to the corresponding provision of this act.

"SEC. 505. Authorization of appropriations: There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 506. Transfer of functions, personnel, and property: (a) Except as provided in this act, all functions of the Department of Justice and of all officers and employees thereof with respect to the immigration laws and the nationality and citizenship laws are transferred to the Commission and to the Board, as provided in this act. The Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice and the office of Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization are abolished.

"(b) Except as provided in this act, all functions of the Department of State and of all officers or employees thereof with respect to the immigration laws and the nationality and citizenship laws are transferred to the Commission and to the Board, as provided in this act.

"(c) Such officers and employees of the Department of Justice (including the members, officers, and employees of the Board of Immigration Appeals) and such officers and employees of the Department of State as the Attorney General and Secretary of State, respectively, determine to be employed in the exercise of functions transferred to or imposed upon the Commission and the Board under this act may be transferred to the Commission. The transfer of such personnel shall be without reduction in classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. Such of the personnel so transferred as do not already possess a classified civil-service status shall not acquire such status by reason of such transfer except (1) upon recommendation of the Commission within 1 year after such personnel have been so transferred and certification within such period by the Commission to the Civil Service Commission that such personnel have served with merit for not less than 6 months subsequent to the transfer, and (2) upon passing such suitable noncompetitive examination as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe. No officer or employee taking such examination shall be discharged or reduced in grade or compensation pending the result thereof, except for cause in the manner provided by law.

"(d) Such property and official records of the Department of Justice and of the Department of State as the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, respectively, determine to be used in the administration of the immigration laws and the nationality and citizenship laws are transferred to the Commission.

"(e) To assist in the orderly transferral of functions from the Department of State to the Commission as provided in this section, the Secretary of State, upon request of the Commission, is authorized to assign, for such periods of time as he deems necessary, officers of the Foreign Service for duty under the supervision and direction of the Commission. Any officer so assigned shall retain all the privileges and prerogatives provided by law or regulations for officers of the Foreign Service.

"SEC. 507. Savings clauses: (a) This act, except as otherwise specifically provided herein, does not affect the validity of any declaration of intention, petition for naturalization certificate of naturalization, or certificate of citizenship which is valid on the effective date of this act. With that qualification, the provisions of this act do apply to all judicial proceedings, suits, actions, and

prosecutions, civil and criminal, pending on the effective date of such provisions; to all administrative proceedings pending on such effective date, including any warrant of arrest, order of deportation or exclusion; and to any status, condition, right in process of acquisition, act, thing, liability, or other matter existing on such effective date. Except where the contrary intention clearly appears, no proceeding, administrative or judicial, shall be abated by the provisions of this act, but all such proceedings shall continue before or be transferred to the appropriate officer, Board, Commission, or other tribunal, or court, to be determined under the provisions of this act.

"(b) Nothing contained in this act, unless otherwise specifically provided herein, shall affect the validity of any declaration of intention, petition for naturalization, certificate of naturalization, or certificate of citizenship, which is valid on the effective date of this act; or the validity of any judicial proceeding, suit, action, or prosecution, civil or criminal, in which final judgment has been rendered prior to such effective date.

"(c) The admissibility of any immigrant presenting himself for admission on or after the effective date of this act shall be determined under the provisions of this act even though such immigrant's visa was issued prior to such effective date.

"(d) An application for adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, under the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is pending on the effective date of this act shall be regarded as a proceeding within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(e) This act shall not be construed to repeal, alter, or amend section 231 (a) of the act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 148½; 22 U. S. C. 1281 (a)); section 8 of the act of June 20, 1949 (Public Law 110, 81st Cong., 1st sess.; 63 Stat. 208); the act of June 5, 1950 (Public Law 535, 81st Cong., 2d sess.; title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 78, 82d Cong., 1st sess.); or the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 401).

"SEC. 508. Separability: If any particular provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 509. Effective dates: (a) Except as provided in subsection (k) of section 501 and in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the provisions of this act shall take effect at 12:01 o'clock antemeridian United States eastern standard time on whichever of the following days first occurs:

"(1) The 180th day following the date of appointment of the members of the Commission; or

"(2) The 365th day following the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) The following provisions shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act:

"(1) Section 103 (establishing the Immigration and Naturalization Commission);

"(2) Section 104 (relating to the organization of the Commission);

"(3) Section 105 (relating to powers and duties of the Commission), other than subsection (e), (f), and (g) of such section;

"(4) Subsections (a), (b), (e), and (i) of section 107 (establishing the Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals);

"(5) Section 109 (relating to the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act);

"(6) Section 113 (relating to establishment of offices abroad); and

"(7) Section 114 (authorizing expenditures and travel).

"(c) The provisions of subsections (c) and (d) of section 505 (relating to the transfer of personnel and property to the Commission) shall take effect on the date of appointment of the Commission, but only such personnel and property shall be transferred to the Commission prior to the effective date of this act, as prescribed in subsection (a), as the Commission from time to time requests and the Attorney General or Secretary of State, as the case may be, approves.

"(d) The Commission may adopt and publish in the Federal Register rules and regulations for the administration of any section of this act prior to the date upon which such section takes effect as provided in this section, but such rules and regulations shall be effective only on the date such section takes effect.

"(e) In the application of section 203 during the period following the effective date of such section and prior to the first day of the first calendar year which begins after such effective date, the number of quota immigrant visas to be available for issuance during such period shall be a number which bears the same ratio to the total number of quota immigrant visas available for a whole calendar year as the number of days in such period bears to 365 days."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the Lehman amendment be limited to 15 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has 15 minutes on the amendment and the majority leader has 15 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the pending amendment is identical with Senate bill 1206, which I introduced last year at the beginning of the 84th Congress, and which has been before the Senate Judiciary Committee ever since.

The Senate Judiciary Committee held some hearings last November on this bill and other proposals for substantial modification of the McCarran-Walter Act. Those hearings have not been printed, but I believe that most of the Members of the Senate have some knowledge of the issues and some acquaintance with the contents of my amendment, comprehensive as it is.

Mr. President, I have made many speeches on the floor of the Senate during this session, in previous sessions, and in previous Congresses, demanding action on overhauling the McCarran-Walter Act. In fact, substantial revision of this act was pledged by the spokesmen of both major national parties during the 1952 campaign. Since then, the President of the United States has made recommendation for changes—not so sweeping as those I should like to see—but steps in the right general direction.

Those Presidential recommendations have fitted into a nationwide pattern of criticism by hundreds of great organizations representing every stratum of our society and all the major religious faiths. Many of these organizations have endorsed the pending amendment, which, as I have said, is identical with S. 1206.

Particularly noteworthy among the organizations which have been demanding substantial modification of existing immigration and citizenship laws have been the CIO and the AFL—now the AFL–CIO—representing 15 million working men and women throughout the country. Indeed, in my judgment, organizations representing the overwhelming majority of the American people today demand modification of present law.

There have now been 4 years of experience under the McCarran-Walter Act. Each week and each day bring to light new examples of the inequities and injustices of the present law. Our foreign policy has been gravely handicapped by the terms of the present law. We have been made a butt of cruel gibes abroad when the contrast is pointed out between our professions of faith in brotherhood and equality, and our practice of discrimination under the terms of the McCarran-Walter Act.

I have been made aware, Mr. President, and have been kept informed of discussions of the possibility that some minor amendments to the present law and to the Refugee Relief Act might be considered and enacted before this session ends, and that we might be able to take some small steps forward in the direction of justice, or at least to provide for the entry of a few more persons from abroad into this country and the removal of some of the inflexible and dehumanizing barriers which now exist both in the McCarran-Walter Act and in the Refugee Relief Act.

Mr. President, I am in favor of any progress that can be made on this front, even inches of progress, and I shall vote, in the end, for any bill which represents any progress in this vital area.

But, Mr. President, I want the Senate to have a chance to consider and to vote not only on proposals for minor steps forward, but also on proposals for the major changes that everyone knows are needed. We are told that if we make any major changes in the McCarran-Walter Act this late in the session, they will be blocked in the House. I know that we cannot control the actions of the House, or of the House Immigration Subcommittee, or of its chairman. But I think we ought to do our duty as we see it and at least to face the issue—not merely the fringes of the issue, but the central issue involved here.

There is pending before the Senate on the calendar, a bill for the relief of the sheepherding industry, and my amendment was originally designed as a substitute for that bill. There is now pending a bill making provision for the admission of certain orphans into our country. I am for that bill. This sheepherders bill and the war orphans bill are the only immigration measures which the Senate Judiciary Committee has seen fit to report, of all the major proposals for immigration reform that are and have been pending before that committee.

I wish to address a few remarks to the sheepherders bill and the relationship of that bill to my amendment, even though that is not the pending bill. But it soon will be.

I am as sympathetic as is any other person to the needs of the sheepraising industry, even though we do not have many sheep in New York State. But although there are relatively few sheep in my State, we have many people and many other kinds of industries. The people have relatives and friends abroad. The people have families, some of whose members are abroad and would like to unite their families in this land of asylum and opportunity.

Many industries in my State have need of skilled technicians and of specialists in certain branches of those industries—tailors and capmakers, watchmakers and farmhands. The people of my State do not understand why Congress should show a special concern for the sheep and none for the people.

Actually, Mr. President, my amendment, the pending amendment, would meet the needs of the sheep-raising industry and of many other industries as well. It would meet the needs of the orphans, too. It would admit orphans and sheepherders into this country along with other classes of persons. I am sure that the sheep of Nevada and Utah and Idaho need to be tended, but so do the farms and factories of New York State.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will yield briefly for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from New York and to say that a thousand tailors and garment workers were badly needed in New York and Mr. Corsi had planned to bring them into the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

My amendment is not a special bill for the relief of sheepherders and the sheep-raising industry. It is a bill for the relief of the United States. This amendment would completely overhaul the McCarran-Walter Act and its major unjust features, while retaining those provisions of the law which are good and sound and constructive.

When I introduced S. 1206 last year, it was cosponsored by Senators GREEN, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, LANGER, CHAVEZ, MAGNUSON, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MURRAY, PASTORE, and NEUBERGER.

I assume that these Senators and many others join with me now in advocating the adoption of this substantial amendment which I have called up for consideration as a substitute for the pending bill. I wish to make it clear that if my amendment is adopted it will take care completely of the minor situation which is sought to be cured by the pending sheepherders' bill.

But, of course, my amendment goes much further. My amendment would eliminate from the law the iniquitous and discriminatory national origins quota system and substitute in its place a unified quota system which retains a fixed ceiling on total immigration into the United States—a ceiling more certain than that contained in the present law, but which would select people for admission into the United States on the basis of the individual worth and merit of the immigrants concerned, and on the needs of the United States. Immigration would be made flexible and adjustable to the changing needs of changing times.

The pending amendment would also strike out the intolerable distinctions and discriminations which now exist in the present law between native-born and naturalized American citizens, and which are among the most unjustifiable of the provisions of the present law. We must put an end to second-class citizenship in America.

The pending amendment would remove some of the boobytraps and pitfalls set forth in present law—boobytraps and pitfalls which now make admission into the United States a matter of whimsy and caprice, in some cases, on the part of consular officers and immigration officials.

The pending amendment would introduce justice and equity into the handling of aliens already in the United States. It would apply American standards of law and of justice to resident aliens as well as to American citizens.

The pending amendment would set up a statutory board for the review of decisions made by consular officers and immigration officers, thus remedying the incredible situation under which the decision of a consular officer, for instance, is absolute and nonreviewable, not even by the Secretary of State of the United States. A customs ruling on the admission of a sack of potatoes into the United States can be appealed as high as the Supreme Court but a decision by a consular officer as to the admission of a citizen's alien mother is as absolute as an imperial edict in some ancient monarchy or, to make a more modern analogy, one of the decisions of Stalin.

The pending amendment, moreover, would eliminate the waste and duplication of having both the consular service and the immigration service go over the same ground, do the same work, and expose every alien who enters this country to the double jeopardy of having two different sets of officials in different departments judge the same individual on the same set of facts.

Mr. President, I do not deceive myself into thinking that this amendment is going to be overwhelmingly approved. I agree that for the consideration of an amendment so comprehensive as mine, the Senate should have had the benefits of the detailed judgment of the Judiciary Committee. But, Mr. President, the Judiciary Committee refused to give the necessary study and attention to my proposal, and likewise overlooked the analogous proposals made by other Members of the Senate, and the recommendations of the President of the United States.

This is the only way left to me to bring this proposed legislation before the Senate for its consideration. This is the only way left to me to submit this measure in these closing hours of the session, to the Senate for a vote.

All of my colleagues, I am sure, have received during the past 2 years scores and even hundreds of letters, as I have, from individuals and organizations asking for the enactment of the principles which are contained in the pending amendment. These principles are not new; most of them have been advocated for many years. I, myself, have been advocating them for many years. If Senators are for wholesale immigration reform, they should vote for the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship or sponsorship in the actually pending amendment. The amendment was drafted by a score of the outstanding legal minds in America. It represents the best thought on this subject that is, in my judgment, anywhere available. I may say at this point that I would also be willing to support the recommendations of President Eisenhower, as translated into legislative form by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. There are some points in the Watkins proposals which represent steps backward. Most of them represent forward movements—although not far or fast enough—and I shall vote for them if a majority of the Senate will not support my proposals.

There is no partisanship and no politics in this proposal. This is not a Democratic proposal but an American proposal.

I know that everyone is anxious to get on with the pressing business that confronts us before adjournment. I must say in passing that I can think of no business more pressing than the business of reforming our immigration and citizenship laws. I am willing to go to a vote on this proposition without the detailed discussion I should like to make of the detailed terms of this amendment. I ask unanimous consent, however, to have printed at this point in the RECORD a detailed analysis of my bill—the pending amendment—which I prepared at the time I introduced the bill in the Senate more than a year ago.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1955.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill to replace the Immigration and Nationality Act, or so-called McCarran-Walter Act. The bill has for its title "The Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1955," and a similar bill is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the press release, explanatory statement, and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1206) to amend and revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, nationality, and citizenship, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

We are today introducing an omnibus immigration and citizenship bill to overhaul, revise, and replace the discriminatory, oppressive, and inhospitable immigration and citizenship laws now on our statute books.

Our bill is a recodification of the McCarran-Walter Act, preserving the technical advances it made over preexisting law, but modifying and humanizing the spirit and letter both of preexisting law and of the McCarran-Walter Act in conformity with the repeated pledges and commitments which have been made by both major parties and by the President of the United States in official communications and messages to the Congress.

Our bill conforms to the recommendations of scores of religious and nonsectarian organizations of all shades and complexions interested in immigration and citizenship, and dedicated to the free exchange of ideas and persons, within the limits of reasonable security safeguards and orderly immigration procedures.

Our bill carries out the recommendations of the nonpartisan Presidential Commission on Immigration and Citizenship, which made its report in January 1953.

We call on President Eisenhower, and on the leadership of both parties in both Houses, to help insure prompt, early and intensive hearings on our bill and on other pending proposals to amend the McCarran-Walter Act.

In the present state of world affairs we dare no longer tolerate on our statute books the present shameful law which is losing us friends abroad daily, holding us up to contempt in the eyes of free mankind, and working havoc among our own people.

It is intolerable that we should continue to maintain our own Iron Curtain—against visitors and alien immigrants alike—while criticizing the Iron Curtain abroad. And the daily examples of senseless cruelty and injustice against aliens already resident here, or recently arrived here, makes our advocacy of justice abroad seem like hollow sham and pretense.

Our bill provides full and comprehensive security against the admission of subversive and undesirable aliens into the United States. Indeed, our bill tightens existing loopholes which now permit millions—yes, millions—of unscreened aliens to flood across our northern and southern land borders, and prevents orderly apprehension and prevention of such illegal immigration, with its dangerous components of subversive, diseased, and criminal elements.

Our bill would remove the intolerable barriers which now keep renowned scientists, scholars, and men of letters from coming to our shores as visitors; and also businessmen and tourists. Our bill would remove this particular stigma of shame from our statute books.

Our bill would eliminate racism and national discrimination from our immigration laws.

Our bill would eradicate the status of second-class American citizenship which now is fastened on millions of naturalized Americans.

American citizenship, which was once inalienable, both for the native-born and for those who acquire citizenship by naturalization, has become, in the McCarran-Walter Act, a temporary license—subject to revocation on a score of grounds—many of them unsubstantial and even capricious.

Our bill would limit immigration, but would not stifle it. Our bill would permit immigration to be used, as it should be, as one of the tools and expressions of our foreign policy—meeting our national need at home, and the particular need of aliens abroad.

Our bill would help restore America to the role it has traditionally occupied—as the hope of the oppressed and the persecuted everywhere, an asylum for the brave, the venturesome and the freedom-seeking abroad—within the limits of our conservative capacity for assimilation.

Our bill recognizes that a limited amount of immigration, carried out in an orderly way, with due regard for selection, resettlement, and integration, is of benefit to America, not a danger to America.

All decent-minded Americans, if they knew the facts about present law, would join in demanding that Congress promptly remove the many boobytraps for citizens, for resident and immigrant aliens, and for visitors, now secreted in the McCarran-Walter Act. The law is a mess which must be cleaned up without delay.

DETAILED SUMMARY

A. NEW ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY; APPEALS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

(Titles I and III, secs. 103 through 111, 304)

Our present immigration and naturalization laws are administered by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, and by the consular service in the Department of State. Obviously, the administration of the immigration laws is remote from the major concerns of the Attorney General and of the Secretary of State. In fact, the Secretary of State has but nominal control over the immigration functions of the consular service.

This two-headed system is, in itself, the end product of a long series of transfers, consolidations, and separations which have accomplished little except to confirm the relative immunity of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of the consular service to cabinet-level direction. Both services have tended to become imbued, through the years with an anti-alien spirit. The predominant attitude is one of suspicion of the alien rather than of service to the immigrant.

For this, and other reasons to be cited, the proposed act terminates the major responsibility of the Department of Justice and the Attorney General and of the Secretary of State for immigration and naturalization, and vests this responsibility in a single new and independent agency, called the Immigration and Naturalization Commission (sec. 103).

Another outstanding defect of present law is the absence of adequate statutory appeals and review procedure. Under the McCarran-Walter Act, the alien overseas seeking admission to the United States has no assurance of uniform justice * * * no right of appeal from the decision of a consular officer. The alien who has landed in the United States has only limited rights of appeal and review and these rights are far from being either adequate or uniform.

In addition to eliminating the duplication between the Department of State and the Justice Department, the proposed act provides an orderly system of fair procedure and adequate review, by an independent quasi-judicial tribunal, of all administrative actions and decisions (secs. 107–111).

The desirability of the consolidation of all immigration and allied functions in one agency was recognized by the Hoover Commission. That body recommended outright transfer of the visa-issuing function from the State Department to the Justice Department.

Upon close study, however, it becomes clear that neither the State Department nor the Justice Department is equipped to discharge the full responsibility for this complex and highly sensitive operation. The business of the State Department is foreign affairs. That of Justice is legal counseling and the conduct of criminal and civil litigation. The best solution is the establishment of a separate independent agency concerned solely with immigration and naturalization.

The new Commission set up in the proposed act is a bipartisan body of three members appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate (sec. 103). Tenure is at the pleasure of the President. Provision is made for an administrator and a general counsel, both to be appointed by the Commission (sec. 104).

Under the McCarran Act a person seeking admission to the United States, whether as an immigrant or a visitor, applies to a State Department official, namely, a consul, for a visa. The consul's decision as to admissibility is final and unreviewable. At the port of entry, an official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice independently redetermines the alien's admissibility. This duplication is expensive to the Government and needlessly burdensome to the applicant. It precludes, moreover, uniform and reasonably predictable application of the law.

Under the proposed act, the functions of the Commission would include: the admission of aliens into the United States; the prevention of illegal entry; the deportation of aliens; the adjustment of status of aliens; the investigation of citizenship applicants prior to the presentation of the applications to the naturalization courts; and the institution of appropriate proceedings in various citizenship matters including denaturalization for fraud (sec. 105). Authority over the issuance of visas to diplomats and to U. N. officials would be retained in the State Department.

The proposed act empowers the Commission to establish its own field offices in foreign countries, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to take over the job of issuing visas to immigrants, visitors, and others desiring to go to the United States. But the Commission is authorized to delegate the visa-issuing authority to consular officers in areas where visa-issuing is not a full-time function. In such cases, the consular officer would work under the direction of the Immigration Commission, insofar as his immigration duties were concerned.

Under present law, administrative review in deportation and exclusion cases is not assured by statute; it exists at the pleasure of the Attorney General in the form of a Board of Immigration Appeals set up by executive order of the Attorney General. Nor is the Attorney General bound by the decisions of his Board. Under the proposed act, adjudicative functions within the Commission framework would be performed by hearing officers and finally by a Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals (sec. 108). The Board's independence is assured by a statutory grant of jurisdiction and by provision for fixed terms for Board members who would be appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and who would be removable only for cause (sec. 107). This Board is empowered to hear appeals and to review the decisions of Commission officers, including decisions on the denial of visa applications.

The membership of the Board is set at nine. The Board may act through panels of three or more members. (The present Board has a backlog of over 12,000 cases.) The Board is empowered to sit, in panels, in any part of the country or abroad.

As is generally true of other independent agencies, the Commission, under the proposed act, would be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (sec. 109). This assures a separation of prosecuting and adjudicative functions, and fair and open hearings. At the same time, the proposed act is sensitive to the needs of national security. Thus, in the case of the exclusion of an alien, evidence need not be revealed which the Attorney General certifies would seriously impair the security of the United States or a source of confidential information (sec. 304).

The provisions of the proposed act with respect to hearings are designed to afford fair treatment under clear and uniform procedures. The present law is subject to the objections that it contains complex provisions for different types of hearings in various situations affecting aliens. The proposed act provides uniform hearings on adequate notice. The proposed act requires that an alien be informed of his right to be represented by counsel. Hearings under the proposed act would be open and public, unless it is determined by the examiner or the Board that national security requires a closed hearing (sec. 108).

The proposed act would require that all decisions be based upon a record, be in writing, and state the reasons therefor.

Under the McCarran Act the alien may suffer lengthy confinement during any proceedings questioning his right to enter or remain in this country. The proposed act guarantees the privilege of reasonable bail. It would permit the denial of bail in cases involving the national health or security, or in the cases of aliens ordered deported but who have not left the country.

The Commission would have the power to impose reasonable conditions upon an alien released from custody, designed to assure his availability and to protect the public interest (sec. 111).

Board decisions, except in the case of visa denials, would be subject to limited review at the court of appeals level (sec. 110). This would be a significant change; the decisions of the present Board are, in legal effect, no more than recommendations to the Attorney General. The only recourse from a decision of the Attorney General is the writ of habeas corpus which is available only in a limited number of cases.

The proposed act gives the Commission authority to prescribe by rules and regulations many of the administrative details for the enforcement of the various provisions relating to immigration, exclusion, deportation, and naturalization. The Commission is given investigatory powers, and is required to report at least annually to the President and to Congress.

B. THE UNIFIED QUOTA SYSTEM—A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE NATIONAL ORIGINS SYSTEM

(Titles I and II, secs. 102 (a) (32), 102 (a) (19) (A), 201–204)

The proposed act abolishes the long-criticized and discredited national origins quota system of selecting immigrants.

This system has been described by religious leaders as an affront to the conscience of the American people. As pointed out in the report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, "the test it applied was not the individual worth of the immigrant, but rather the presumed superiority of people from certain areas of the world. Place of birth, not individual capacity or cultural background, was the test."

The national origins quota system has failed. It contemplated that 81.6 percent of quota immigration would come from northern and western Europe, and that 16 percent would come from southern and eastern Europe. Actually only 55.8 percent has come from northern and western Europe and 42.4 percent from southern and eastern Europe. One reason for this is that the countries of northern and western Europe have not wanted and have not used the immigration quotas assigned to them. Since the time the national origins quota system went into effect, only 44 percent of the total quotas available have been used, and 56 percent have remained unused, despite the existence in some countries of long waiting lists of applicants, some of whom have been waiting for 10 or 15 years for a quota number.

The total number of quota visas available under existing law is approximately 154,200 annually, derived from a formula of one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1920 population (excluding Negroes and Indians).

The proposed act, in establishing the new unified quota system (title II), uses the same basic percentage formula as in present law, except that the percentage of one-sixth of 1 percent is applied to the last decennial census (1950) and includes all our inhabitants. Calculation on this basis results in a total immigration quota of approximately 251,100 annually. This means an annual increase of approximately 97,000 in the total quota.

The number 251,000 based on one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1950 population, was not haphazardly arrived at. It represents the consensus of the most outstanding experts in regard to the number of immigrants who can be easily absorbed into our population and into the labor force. The American Federation of Labor and the CIO have supported this estimate. And it is, of course, based on the same percentage now written into the McCarran Act, except that the one-sixth percent is applied to our present population instead of to our population in 1920. The use of the 1920 population figure has no basis in logic or reason.

The McCarran Act took a few halting steps toward the abolition of racial barriers in our immigration laws, but at the same time erected new barriers. The McCarran Act created the so-called Asiatic-Pacific triangle, openly discriminating against so-called orientals. The McCarran Act established small maximum quotas for colonial areas, such as Jamaica, thus discriminating against Negroes.

The proposed act makes no radical departures from the traditional pattern of immigration flow to the United States, but sets up a completely nondiscriminatory framework, flexible enough to meet the changing needs of American policy requirements.

The unified quota system is, in fact, chiefly characterized by its flexibility. It is built around the seven following principles:

(a) The establishment of a series of preference groups whose detailed allocation to areas, nations, and classes of individuals, although made by the Commission, and subject to the approval of the President, is guided by a definition, written into the law, of four objectives sought to be served by immigration:

1. To provide for the reuniting of families, and the admission into the United States of close relatives of United States citizens and of alien residents of the United States.

2. To provide for the admission of persons of outstanding technical and professional skills whose services are urgently needed in the United States.

3. To provide for the admission of aliens whose coming will serve American foreign policy requirements of the United States by helping to solve economic and other problems of friendly nations.

4. To provide for granting haven and asylum in the United States for victims of racial, religious, and political persecution.

(b) The reservation of a portion of the total quota for new and self-initiated immigration, for persons without special ties to the United States, on a first-come-first-served basis for those otherwise qualified.

(c) The assurance of a minimum quota to all nations and areas.

(d) The assurance that no one nation will get a preponderant share of the total quota.

(e) The abolition of barriers to immigration based on race or national origin.

(f) The use of the concept of citizenship and residence as a fundamental qualification, rather than national origin in cases where it is found necessary to allocate visas by nations.

(g) The election of individuals on the basis of personal qualification and need rather than national origin.

Based on these 7 principles the unified quota system provides for the division of the total quota into 5 components. Four of these are preference groups; one is a nonpreference group, the so-called newcomer group.

The four preference groups, and the percentage range of the portion of the total of the quota allocated to each are:

1. Family unification: Not less than 25 percent nor more than 35 percent.

2. Occupational: Not less than 5 percent nor more than 10 percent.

3. Asylum: Not less than 15 percent nor more than 25 percent.

4. National interest: Not less than 20 percent nor more than 25 percent.

The newcomer group is allocated a minimum percentage of 20 percent of the total, plus such additional amounts as are not allocated to the four preference groups.

This is the total limit providing for quota immigration—the ceiling—adjustable every 10 years on the basis of the decennial census.

All quota allocations are required to come within this total limit. But the present deceptive system whereby a large proportion of the total available quota remains unused is abolished. As long as there are would-be immigrants who qualify and desire to come, the quota remains available. Unused quota visas are made available for use in the succeeding year.

For years some of the apologists for the national origins quota system have defended it—even while conceding its national and racial bias—with the argument that no better plan or system had been worked out and was available.

The unified quota system, as formulated in the proposed act, is such a plan. It sweeps away racial and national discrimination, substituting a scheme which assures a regulated and controlled flow of immigration from those areas of the world which logically look to the United States as a haven, and which are capable of contributing useful citizenship material to this country. The proposed act grants the Commission the necessary leeway to adjust immigration to actual needs; but statutory guides are laid down designed to insure a fair and equitable distribution of immigration, and a varied flow.

A major feature of the proposed act is its consolidation, within the quota, of all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere. This has been done in order to put all foreign countries on the same basis consistent with the best interests and needs of the United States. Thus the proposed act does not give nonquota status, as present law does, to aliens born in the Western Hemisphere, with the right to immigrate to the United States without limitation as to number.

Under the proposed law, all immigrants, except those in special classes defined as nonquota, will be required to qualify for 1 of the 5 groups, already described, into which the total annual quota is divided.

The first and largest of the five groups, the family unification preference group, includes the blood relatives of citizens of the United States, and the spouses and blood relatives of resident aliens—in both cases through the third degree of consanguinity as computed under civil law (sec. 202 (a)).

The occupational preference group (sec. 202 (b)) includes persons whose admission is especially advantageous to the United States because of their education, technical training and skill and ability to contribute to the national security, health, and welfare.

The asylum preference group (sec. 202 (c)) includes persons oppressed or persecuted because of their race, color, creed, national origin, or opposition to totalitarianism. This perference group will provide a special priority for 2,500 war, occupation or refugee orphans (as defined in sec. 102 (a) (32); also see the special section of this summary, p. 14, dealing with children and orphans).

The national interest preference group (sec. 202 (d)) is designed specifically to ad-

vance the foreign-policy interests of the United States by strengthening those areas of the free world whose acute political and economic problems may be alleviated by some emigration. This preference group will also include a priority for orphans.

Finally, the newcomer group (sec. 202 (e)) will consist of aliens who do not qualify for admission under any of the preference groups, but who desire to immigrate to the United States, and who possess all the other qualifications which are required of quota immigrants. The basis of the admission of qualified aliens in the newcomer group is first-come-first-served (sec. 204).

Annual allocations of the total quota among the five groups are to be made by the Commission, subject to the approval of the President. Any unused quota visas are to be reallocated from year to year among other groups (sec. 203).

Although priority in the issuance of visas within the newcomer group is to be determined in the order of application, it is provided that one-half of 1 percent of the number of visas assigned annually to the newcomer group shall be assigned to each nation having a population of 200,000 or more. This provision assures each nation with a population of 200,000 or more of an annual newcomer quota of no less than 250 visas (sec. 204 (c)).

It is further provided that no more than 10 percent of the newcomer group shall be assigned to any one nation. Inasmuch as the minimum in the newcomer group (20 percent of the total) would be about 50,000 annually, the maximum for any nation under such an arrangement would be 5,000. This figure could increase somewhat in proportion to the additions to the newcomer group authorized by the Commission and approved by the President.

A nation, as used in this connection, is defined to mean a colony, a possession or a dependency, all of which are given similar status. But the Commission is given the power to group individual nations into a single quota area (sec. 204 (c)). (See chart.)

Another major feature of the proposed act, to be considered in connection with the unified quota system, is the provision dealing with nonquota immigration. The McCarran Act adopted the main features of pre-McCarran law, except for a new grant of nonquota status to husbands as well as wives of United States citizens, while at the same time withdrawing nonquota status from college and university professors. Under the terms of the proposed act, professors coming to the United States to teach at acknowledged colleges, universities, etc., are restored to their traditional nonquota status.

The unified quota system based on one-sixth of 1 percent of the 1950 United States Census (150 million) provides for the annual issuance of 250,000 immigration visas to be allocated as follows:

Family unification preference, 25 to 35 percent—62,000 to 87,000 visas	Occupation preference, 5 to 10 percent—12,000 to 25,000 visas	Asylum preference, 15 to 25 percent—37,000 to 62,000 visas	National interest preference, 20 to 25 percent—50,000 to 62,000 visas	Newcomer group, 20 percent—50,000 visas
1. Children [1] 2. Parents [1] 3. Grandparents 4. Brothers and sisters 5. Uncles and aunts 6. Other close relatives —of citzens and resident aliens.	Persons especially selected because of their— 1. Special skills. 2. Technical knowledge. 3. Education. 4. Potential contribution to national security. The Commission to consult with Secretaries of State, Defense, Commerce, and Labor in making allocations.	1. Persons threatened with persecution or oppression. 2. Refugees from persecution or oppression. 3. May include up to 2,500 visas for orphans.	1. Visas to be allocated to areas of the world to alleviate acute political and economic problems. 2. May include "surplus population" and persons displaced by war or its aftermath. 3. Allocated after consultation with Secretaries of State and other Government agencies. 4. May include up to 2,500 visas for orphans.	1. To be allocated on first-come, first-served basis throughout the world. 2. Designed to take care of general immigration. 3. Every nation of the world over 200,000 population assured one half of 1 percent of visas in this group. 4. No nation can be issued more than 10 percent of visas in this group. 5. Nations geographically or culturally related may be grouped as one "nation."

[1] Children of citizens, and parents of resident citizens would be nonquota immigrants.

Unused quota visas occurring at the end of each year may be allocated to the various groups for the following year under rules and regulations of the Commission.

All immigrants under the unified quota system would be required to meet the health, education, economic, security, and other standards of the basic immigration laws.

In addition—and this is a vital feature—a nonquota status is given to parents as well as to children and spouses of American citizens (sec. 102 (a) (19) (A)).

At the same time that nonquota status is given to parents of American citizens, the proposed act deprives aliens born in the Western Hemisphere of their nonquota status, as already described.

The effect of these changes is to confine the nonquota status to very special classes of immigrants—children, spouses, and parents of citizens, professors, ministers, and 1 or 2 other technical categories—and to place all general immigration, including immigration from the Western Hemisphere, under the quota system.

Under present and preexisting law it is theoretically possible for all the 130 million natives of Latin American to apply for immigration to the United States without numerical restriction. The fact that immigration from Western Hemisphere nations has been kept within manageable limits in the past has been due largely to arbitrary refusal by consular officials to grant more than a limited number of visas in each country. Such a procedure is obviously unjustified in law and discriminatory in practice. The nonquota status for natives of the Western Hemisphere has thus been largely mythical rather than actual. Under the terms of the proposed act, Western Hemisphere nations would fare better than under the present nonquota status but would at the same time be placed on the same footing with all other nations, subject to the total numerical limitations and to all the other qualifications of quota immigration.

The abolition of the national origins quota system and of national quotas per se results in the wiping out of existing mortgages on the quotas of many small countries—mortgages left over from the operations of the Displaced Persons Act. Under that act, displaced persons who were admitted to this country were charged against the future quotas of the countries in which the aliens happened to be born. The practical result was to cut in half the future quotas of these countries. In the case of Latvia, for instance, one-half of its quota is used up until the year 2274; in the case of Estonia, until 2146; in the case of Poland, until 2000; in the case of Yugoslavia, until 2014; in the case of Turkey, until 1964. With the termination of the national origins quota system all these mortgages are brought to an end and immigration would begin, after the enactment of the proposed act, with a fresh start.

The proposed act would, in general, enable the United States to make its contribution toward a solution of European population and refugee problems, without the necessity of repeated emergency measures. The proposed act is designed to establish a permanent immigration policy based on world conditions which show no likelihood of alleviation for a long time to come.

The enactment of the proposed act will bring renewed hope to hopeless, persecuted, and distressed people in many lands. Enlightened immigration policies adopted by the United States will provide leadership for other countries which can absorb immigration. Millions of victims of war and of the aftermath of war may thus find opportunity for rehabilitation, to the benefit of the entire free world.

C. SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR CHILDREN, ADOPTED CHILDREN, AND ORPHANS

(Titles I, II, and III, secs. 102 (a) (32), 202 (c), (d), and 303 (c))

The proposed act gives special attention to children—natural-born, adopted, and orphans. The proposed act facilitates the admission into the United States of alien children of American citizens and of resident aliens, treating adopted children on the same footing as natural-born children.

In recent years there have been many appeals by both private and public agencies, and by thousands of individual citizens, for special legislation to permit alien orphans to be admitted to the United States for adoption.

There has also been a demand for legislation permitting orphans who are adopted abroad by our citizens, especially by our GI's, to be brought back to this country without securing in almost every case, as is now required, the enactment of a private bill.

And finally there has been increased agitation for "doing something" about the many illegitimate children, born abroad to GI fathers—children whose mothers cannot care for them, and who could be made available for adoption by childless couples in the United States.

All these demands have been met in the proposed act by a series of special provisions dealing with adopted children and with orphans.

The proposed act provides, in the first place, that children adopted abroad by American citizens shall be considered as nonquota immigrants, the same as natural-born children, and be admitted freely without being charged to any quota.

The proposed act then makes special provision for the annual entry of up to 5,000 war, refugee, or occupation orphans (as defined in sec. 102 (a) (32)). This is accomplished by providing a priority within the asylum preference group (sec. 202 (c)) and within the national interest preference group (sec. 202 (d)), for 2,500 orphans each, annually.

Thus permanent statutory authority is provided to allow the admission of 5,000 orphans annually—if that many are demanded for adoption and qualify. This should do

much to eliminate the flourishing "black market" in babies, and at the same time help solve a critical social problem in many countries of Western Europe.

"War occupation, or refugee orphans" are defined (sec. 102 (a) (32)) as children under 10 years of age who have been orphaned by the death or disappearance of both parents, or who have been abandoned or deserted by, or separated and lost from both parents. The definition also includes a child who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of the other parent where there is reasonable ground to believe that such other parent was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States. If the remaining parent is unable to care for the child and agrees to release the child for immigration and adoption, the child can be admitted into the United States for adoption.

All these orphans must be coming either to be adopted by American citizens or alien residents, on the basis of assurances given by such citizens or residents, or be coming under the sponsorship of a public or private agency approved by the Commission, with assurances that adoption or guardianship proceedings will be initiated for such orphans.

The provisions of the proposed act and the rules and regulations to be adopted by the Commission would adequately protect not only the American families who might wish to adopt these orphans, but would also protect the orphans' health and safety.

The McCarran-Walter Act makes no provision for an infant child whose birth occurs at a time when it is inconvenient or impossible for the parents to obtain the proper documents necessary for the child's admittance into the United States. Sometimes the children are born en route to the United States, or are born prematurely during a vacation trip to Canada or Mexico. The proposed act (sec. 303 (c)) would prevent the exclusion of any child under 1 year of age accompanied by his parents, one or both of whom are citizens of the United States. This protection would also extend to a child under 1 year of age who has been born to alien parents after their visa or reentry permit has been issued. These safeguards are designed to prevent arbitrary barring of infant children from admission into the United States with their parents.

D. SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR VICTIMS OF PERSECUTION; THE GRANTING OF ASYLUM

(Titles I, II, and III, secs. 102 (a) (18) (B) (vi), 202, 302 (a) (4))

One of the new features of the proposed act is a series of special provisions designed to translate into legislative effect the traditional United States policy of providing asylum for victims of political, racial, and religious persecution.

This undertaking is reflected, first, in the basic quota provisions (sec. 202), in which one of the preference groups is reserved for persecutees as defined (in sec. 202): "persons whose coming will further the traditional policy of the United States of offering asylum and refuge to persons oppressed or persecuted, or threatened with oppression or persecution, because of their race, national origin, color, religion, adherence to democratic beliefs, or their opposition to totalitarianism or dictatorship."

An additional innovation of the proposed act is an arrangement whereby the Secretary of State is given authority to certify for temporary admission into this country "executive, legislative, or judicial officials or leaders of national opinion of any foreign state who seek political asylum in the United States." [Sec. 102 (a) (18) (B) (vi).] This provision requires the Secretary of State to certify that the admission of such persons is "in the interest of the United States." Under these terms, officials of foreign governments who escape, for instance, from behind the Iron Curtain or are forced to flee from a Latin American country because of an armed uprising, may be granted, on the certification of the Secretary of State temporary haven in the United States as nonimmigrant visitors. Thus, the United States will be able to provide political asylum as Switzerland does.

In regard to this special class of refugees, there is no fixed requirement that they must satisfy all the standards established for other immigrants or even nonimmigrants. All such requirements may be waived at the discretion of the Secretary of State if the Secretary of State finds that the entry of these individuals is in the interest of the United States.

A further provision dealing with asylum from persecution (sec. 302 (a) (4)) authorizes the Commission to grant to a person fleeing for his life from political, religious, or racial persecution special permission to enter the United States, even though he may not have a visa. Such a fugitive must be otherwise eligible, in all respects, to receive a visa, and must have been unable to obtain the visa because he fled in imminent danger of his life from political, racial, or religious persecution.

E. NONIMMIGRANTS

(Titles I and III, secs. 102 (a) (18), 305)

With respect to various classes of nonimmigrants, such as visitors, diplomats, students, and treaty merchants (sec. 102 (a) (18)), it has always been necessary to vest power to waive what might otherwise be grounds for exclusion. Under the proposed act that power is vested in the Commission (sec. 305) in regard to all aliens except those in diplomatic categories (102 (a) (18) (A), (B), and (C)) who receive their visas at the direction of the Secretary of State. Waivers may be granted on such terms and conditions as the Commission deems appropriate to protect the national health and security, and all waivers of more than 30 days' duration must be reported annually to Congress.

The McCarran-Walter Act has been administered as though there were no logical basis for differentiation between an immigrant for permanent residence and a visitor seeking to enter the United States for business or for pleasure; or to lecture, to take part in a scientific seminar or conference, or a gathering of scholars or artists or for consultation with other specialists in the sciences or the arts.

Scientific research in a variety of fields, for instance, has suffered significantly in the United States, because of the inability of foreign scientists and scholars to enter after being invited here to attend such meetings and conferences. Many international conferences on science and technology which might otherwise be held in this country are now being scheduled elsewhere, to our great loss in scientific knowledge, business, and prestige.

Admission for permanent residence is properly denied to actual or potential subversives, but the privilege of even a temporary visit to the United States is now also being denied in the cases of persons whose political thinking appears to deviate in any marked way from orthodox political concepts. Were such a criterion to be applied on a reciprocal basis by other countries, no American citizen devoted to the principles of free speech, free press, and free worship would be admissible even as a tourist to totalitarian countries or to any countries with basic political concepts different from our own.

The purpose of the waiver provision in the proposed act is to restore reason and flexibility in the case of the nonimmigrant, subject only to measures necessary for the protection of the national health and security.

F. ENTRY, EXCLUSION, AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS; PROVISIONS TO PROMOTE THE SECURITY AND WELFARE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Titles I, III, and IV, secs. 102 (a) (15), 102 (a) (28), 301, 302, 323, 333–336, 341 et seq., 361 et seq., 367, 413, 414, and 422)

One of the major goals of the proposed act is to eliminate discriminatory and unnecessarily harsh provisions contained in the McCarran-Walter Act relating to exclusion and deportation; to guard against abuse of administrative discretion; and to provide adequate safeguards against the admission or retention in the United States of subversives or other undesirable aliens. This objective is sought to be achieved in various sections of title III.

It is recognized that the American people rightly desire that our immigration laws contain all provisions necessary to insure us against infiltration by subversive elements. Self-defense and commonsense require that every possible and reasonable precaution be taken to prevent the admission of individuals whose purpose is to subvert or overthrow the Government of the United States and our democratic way of life. The same strictures are pertinent in regard to the admission of criminal elements or other undesirables. In the proposed act every practical protection has been provided for our national security. Comprehensive and workable standards are established so that genuine subversives and anti-democratic elements are barred from admission. Provision is made for the deportation of those who, despite all precautions, obtain entry to this country.

In fact, the antisubversive provisions of the proposed act are designed to be more effective than those in the McCarran Act.

The McCarran Act erects such a confused and contradictory network of antisubversive provisions that it catches many anti-Communists in its web while allowing true subversives, both Fascist and Communist, to slip through.

Thus, while the McCarran Act erects a Maginot line of defense against all individuals guilty of dangerous thoughts or associations, who seek to come to the United States through the conventional channels of immigration, the McCarran Act establishes virtually no safeguards against the surreptitious entry of spies and saboteurs across the Mexican and Canadian borders. Nor does the McCarran Act contain any barriers against the admission of Nazis.

The proposed act (sec. 301) sets forth 15 categories of aliens defined as ineligible to receive visas. A valid visa is, of course, a prerequisite for admission. Exceptions from the rigid standards of eligibility and the right to waive some of the grounds of ineligibility are duly provided for, where an admission would not be contrary to the best interests of the United States. Generally speaking, aliens who are mentally defective, who have contagious diseases, who are criminals or subversive, or who are otherwise undesirable for the reasons enumerated in section 301 are ineligible to obtain visas.

Among the classes of aliens most clearly ineligible for admission are those who have advocated or taught subversive doctrine, or who have been members of or affiliated with any organization which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine. Aliens ineligible under these provisions may be admitted if their activities or affiliations were terminated at least 5 years prior to the application for a visa, and their entry would not be contrary to the best interests of the United States (sec. 301 (i) (2)).

The term "subversive doctrine" is defined in section 102 (a) (28) (A) to (F) inclusive, and under the three subsequent subsections (G) to (I) inclusive. In accordance with these provisions, certain organizations are defined as subversive per se. These are: The Communist Party of the

United States or of the Soviet Union; or any other Communist Party in any other country, affiliated with either the Communist Party of the United States or of the Soviet Union; the National Socialist Party of Germany or any of its paramilitary affiliates; and any successor parties to the abovenamed which advocate or teach subversive doctrine.

The definition of "subversive doctrine" is so written as to bar aliens who advocate: (a) Opposition to all organized governments or forms of law; (b) the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means; (c) the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States (which is itself defined in sec. 102 (a) (29)); (d) the duty, necessity, or propriety of the assassination of public officials; (e) the unlawful destruction of property, or the extermination or persecution of persons because of race, religion, or ancestry.

Membership in or affiliation with an organization which advocates or teaches subversive doctrine (sec. 102 (a) (15)) means voluntary membership or affiliation when over the age of 16 with knowledge that the organization advocates or teaches subversive doctrine. "Voluntary" membership or affiliation does not include joining a "subversive" organization when required to do so by law, without personal belief in the subversive doctrine taught or advocated, or solely for the purpose of obtaining employment, education, food, or other essentials of life.

The classes of undesirable applicants for admission also include those who seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in commercialized vice, who are paupers, professional beggars, vagrants, or who are likely to become public charges; and also aliens who have been convicted of violating laws relating to traffic in narcotic drugs (sec. 301 (c), (d), (e), and (k)).

Except where a charge of crime is made for political purposes, aliens who have been duly charged with committing a crime involving moral turpitude are ineligible for visas (sec. 301 (1)), as are those who desert from the Armed Forces or remain abroad in order to avoid military service (sec. 414).

Aliens who have assisted any other alien to enter the United States illegally are themselves barred, as are, of course, all aliens who have attempted to enter by willful and material fraud (sec. 301 (o) and (p)).

The proposed act makes improvements in the present system of keeping a check on undesirable aliens. All investigative agencies are directed to keep the Commission advised of relevant information they may gather regarding any alien who may apply for admission, or who may enter the United States, so that all such information will eventually be concentrated in one place, where it can be acted upon promptly and effectively, thus avoiding duplication, waste, and delay (sec. 116).

The proposed act is generally more uniform than the McCarran Act in its application of similar standards to all aliens. Substantially the same provisions relating to eligibility for visas are to be found in the sections relating to deportation and to naturalization (secs. 341, 413, 422).

As pointed out elsewhere, the proposed act, by creating a single agency to administer the immigration laws, minimizes the chances of cruel and unnecessary loss and injury to would-be immigrants, who, under the McCarran Act, may be granted a visa abroad by the consular service and denied admission at the port of entry by the Immigration Service (sec. 302).

Under the proposed act, visa-granting officers of the Commission are bound to exercise great care before issuing a visa (sec. 322), and the alien whose eligibility for admission is established is then assured that, except for one or more of several contingencies provided for in the proposed act (sec. 302 (b)), his trip to the United States will not be in vain, and he will be admitted.

The idea of making a visa a virtually certain guaranty of admission into the United States is also applied to reentry permits. Under existing law, a resident alien, duly admitted and about to leave the country for a temporary visit abroad, may apply for and receive a reentry permit. But the permit is of no practical validity. When the alien returns to an American port, he is treated as if he had never before been admitted, and he may, and frequently is, denied admission on any one of a wide variety of grounds. This is the notorious new-entry doctrine which the proposed act would abolish. Under the proposed act an alien having his home in the United States and desiring to go temporarily abroad may be denied a reentry permit on security or other grounds (sec. 323). But if he is granted a reentry permit, he is guaranteed a return to the United States, except under certain few and clearly defined circumstances (sec. 302).

The proposed act would nullify the effect of a visa or reentry permit in those cases where it was procured by willful and material fraud; or where new evidence, discovered after the issuance of a visa, would, if it had been known, have made the alien ineligible for a visa; or where he fails to meet other specified conditions contained in the proposed act (sec. 302 (b)).

As a general rule an alien previously admitted to the United States but who has gone abroad for a temporary stay is to be excluded only if, while he was abroad, he was convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude; or if he seeks to reenter to engage in criminal activities; or if, while abroad, he has advocated or taught subversive doctrine, or joined with or become associated with a subversive organization; or if he has for gain assisted any other alien to enter the United States in violation of law (sec. 303).

In these respects, the provisions of the proposed act in regard to reentry permits are similar to those governing visas: Aliens who are undesirable for security or for other reasons set forth in the proposed act are not admitted or allowed to enter the United States, even if they have a visa or reentry permit (sec. 302 (b)).

On the other hand, the possibilities for arbitrary, capricious, and otherwise unfair treatment of aliens is greatly minimized. Procedures are created for hearings and for appeals from adverse rulings, and all proper precautions are taken to provide safeguards against discrimination and other injustices, and to assure humane and impartial consideration to all who come to the United States to visit or to stay.

The proposed act requires the examination and inspection of all arriving aliens, other than those who are not excludable, and the prompt deportation of those who are not entitled to enter (secs. 333–336).

Nine classes of aliens who are or may become deportable are defined in the proposed act (sec. 341). These include aliens who are (1) found to have obtained admission through fraud; or (2) enter the United States without inspection; or (3) violate a condition of admission; or (4) became public charges within 5 years after entry for reasons not shown to have arisen after entry; or (5) are sentenced and confined in prison for a term of at least 1 year upon conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude, committed within 5 years after entry; or (6) within 10 years after entry, are sentenced more than once for such offenses; or (7) are convicted at any time after entry of any crime involving commercialized vice; or (8) are convicted at any time after entry of violating laws relating to narcotic drugs; or (9) within 5 years prior to the issuance of a warrant of arrest in deportation proceedings, advocated or taught or were members of or affiliated with organizations which advocated or taught subversive doctrine.

It is provided that conviction, as used in this connection, shall not apply to crime committed by aliens under 16 years of age, or those which have been pardoned, or to convictions where the court recommends that deportation is not warranted. In addition, the Commission is given authority to waive deportation for a single crime where serious hardship would occur and where continued residence in the United States would not be undesirable (sec. 301 (b)).

No alien who has been admitted for permanent residence before his 14th birthday may thereafter be deported, nor an alien who has lived as a permanent resident of the United States for 20 years or more (except as a fugitive from justice) (secs. 341, 342).

The proposed act contains detailed provisions for the arrest and detention of aliens believed to be deportable (secs. 343 et seq.). Ordinarily, the Commission is given a period of 6 months within which to effect the alien's departure. Aliens ordered to be deported are given an opportunity for judicial review, but meanwhile remain subject to supervision by the Commission.

Aliens who are to be deported may select the country to which they wish to go, if the country in question will receive them, unless prejudicial to the interests of the United States. If a deportable alien is unable to or fails to arrange to be received in the country of his choice, his deportation is then to be arranged by the Commission (sec. 344).

Appropriate provision is made to defray the expenses of deportation. Deportable aliens who can prove good moral character for the preceding 5 years are permitted to leave at their own expense without the stigma of deportation (sec. 345).

All aliens who remain in the United States for more than 30 days are required to be fingerprinted and registered, and to notify the Attorney General of any change of address (secs. 361 et seq.). But failure to carry a registration card or to notify the Attorney General of a change of address, while a misdemeanor if it is a willful failure, is not made, ipso facto, a ground for deportation, as such a failure is under the McCarran Act.

The proposed act contemplates that all information with respect to registration of aliens will be kept in a central place, and the Attorney General is given full authority to administer and enforce the registration provisions (sec. 367).

Scattered through the proposed act are provisions imposing maximum penalties, some giving the Commission authority to assess and collect fines, and other provisions defining offenses punishable by the courts. In addition, chapter 8 of title III contains general penalty provisions, in which a number of offenses are defined and appropriate penalties provided. This chapter also provides for the detention and prompt deportation of alien stowaways.

In general, the proposed act is much more definite than the McCarran Act in its treatment of aliens who apply for visas, who are admitted or excluded, and those who, if admitted, thereafter become deportable and are ordered to be deported. Full recognition is given to the gravity of the issues involved in the decisions to grant, revoke, or deny visas, or to exclude or deport.

The proposed provisions under which children admitted prior to the age of 14 and aliens who have resided in the United States for more than 20 years are made immune to deportation reflect tested principles long recognized in our general body of laws covering criminal offenses and civil liabilities.

The deplorable tendency in recent immigration legislation to remove limitations of time within which the Government is required to act in order to deport an alien is reversed in the proposed act. Under the

McCarran Act an alien living in the United States who joined the Communist Party at any time in the distant past—perhaps 20 or 30 years ago—is subject to deportation even though he may have left the party soon after joining, and may have subsequently become a strong anti-Communist.

Under the McCarran Act the Government is required to deport such an individual, thus causing great distress and hardship on members of his family. At the same time, the McCarran Act admits aliens who, 5 years or more previous to their admissions to the United States, may have been active members of the Communist Party.

It should be emphasized that the present provision for deportation of resident aliens who have, in the past, belonged to subversive organizations is retroactive and penalizes persons whose acts were not proscribed at the time the actions were taken. The proposed act eliminates this inconsistent retroactivity.

Banishment or exile is a severe penalty, the relic of another day and age. In many cases it is a much greater punishment than any provided by the criminal laws, and should not be imposed under conditions where no criminal prosecution could be brought. That goal has not quite been reached in the proposed act but the new proposals are a marked improvement, at the same time containing adequate provisions to guard the security, the health and the welfare of the United States.

G. ALIEN CREWMEN

(Title III, secs. 352, 354–357)

The provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act (secs. 251–257) which deal with the admission and exclusion of alien crewmen have been widely criticized as unworkable and unfair. The press of the major maritime countries of the world has been filled with reports of the abuse and unfairness involved in the procedures for handling alien crewmen who wish to land temporarily in the United States during the stay of their vessel, or while awaiting assignment to another vessel.

Under the terms of the McCarran-Walter Act, alien crewmen are for the first time required to fulfill the same requirements as immigrants coming to live permanently in the United States. Arriving at the port of entry, they are cross-examined concerning every detail of their past lives and political beliefs and affiliations. This questioning is neither appropriate nor necessary for crewmen who are coming here for only a few days.

Under the proposed act an alien crewman can be prevented from landing in the United States on any ground that would make him ineligible to receive a visa (sec. 352). However, unlike the McCarran Act, the proposed act gives the Commission the power to waive any provision barring the temporary landing of an alien crewman if it determines that the health and safety of the United States would not be thereby endangered.

The McCarran Act makes no provision for informing the excluded crewman of the reasons for denial of a permit to land, and it provides him with no administrative appeal from the decision of minor immigration officials.

The proposed act would not extend to alien crewmen the broad hearing and appeals procedures provided for aliens coming here as permanent immigrants, but the proposed act would provide for expeditious hearings under special rules and regulations, in cases where landing permits for alien crewmen are denied or revoked (sec. 352 (b)).

The proposed act retains all the necessary safeguards to prevent the landing of diseased alien crewmen, and to prevent alien crewmen from illegally remaining in this country by jumping ship, or by being discharged or paid off in the United States without permission of the Commission (secs. 354–357).

The McCarran Act sets an absolute time limit of 29 days for temporary landing permits. This restriction has worked considerable hardship on alien crewmen who have become subject to arrest as a result of sailing delays, or failure to obtain assignment on another ship. The proposed act would leave to the determination of the Commission the time limitation on a valid permit. All waiver cases for stays exceeding 30 days are required to be reported to Congress.

H. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS

(Title III, sec. 346)

Reasonable and flexible provisions for the adjustment of the status of an alien from that of a nonimmigrant to an immigrant or vice versa without the time-consuming and expensive necessity of leaving and reentering the country have long been needed in our immigration laws. Prior to the McCarran-Walter Act, this was possible only through the suspension of a warrant of deportation, a suspension which could be secured only in the case of an alien who had resided here for 7 years or who had lived here for 5 years and could prove to the Attorney General (a) good moral character and (b) that his deportation would result in serious economic detriment to a citizen or to a legally resident alien spouse, parent, or minor child.

The McCarran-Walter Act (sec. 247) established direct procedures for adjustment of status, permitting a resident alien to adjust his status from that of immigrant to nonimmigrant, and appearing to make it possible (sec. 245) for a nonimmigrant to adjust his status to that of an immigrant. The latter provision, however, seems to be more of a trap for the unwary than a grant of grace. The adjustment may be granted only in the discretion of the Attorney General when, both at the time of the application and at the time of the Attorney General's approval of that application, an immigrant visa is immediately available. The McCarran-Walter Act defines a visa as being immediately available only if the quota is not filled at the time the application for adjustment of status is filed. The McCarran Act provides, moreover, that the very act of filing an application for adjustment of status automatically ends the nonimmigrant status of the applicant. Thus, an alien who files such an application may become immediately subject to deportation if, all unknown to the alien, an immigration visa is not immediately available.

This is a clear illustration of the undue harshness of the McCarran Act, under whose terms broad discretion is granted to the Attorney General to exclude aliens from admission to the United States, or to deport them, but whose discretion to suspend deportation or to permit change of status is severely limited.

With respect to suspension of a warrant of deportation, the McCarran Act (sec. 244 (a)) drastically cuts down the rights existing under prior law. Under the McCarran Act the procedure is restricted to applications filed not more than 5 years after December 24, 1952, by aliens who last entered the United States more than 2 years prior to June 20, 1952. It requires a 7-year residence in the United States, and the Attorney General must be convinced that the alien's deportation would "result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien, or to his spouse, parent, or minor child who is a citizen or legally resident alien."

The proposed act (sec. 346) simplifies and combines the two procedures and makes it possible for any legally resident alien, as a matter of right, upon application and appropriate showing to the Commission, to adjust his status. If the adjustment sought is to the status of an immigrant, the alien need merely show that (1) if he were applying abroad, he would be eligible for admission, and (2) a visa is reasonably available in the group for which the alien is eligible. In a case where those facts cannot be shown, the alien may nonetheless obtain the adjustment if he proves good moral character for the preceding 5 years, and that he has resided in the United States for 7 years, or that his departure from the United States would cause "serious hardship to himself or to a citizen or a previously admitted alien who is his spouse or child."

I. CITIZENSHIP AND NATURALIZATION

(Title IV)

The corresponding title of the McCarran-Walter Act was presented to the American people as an advance, because it abolished racial barriers to naturalization. But at the same time the McCarran Act riveted into law a rigid second-class status for naturalized citizens of the United States and, under this title as elsewhere, vested tremendous power in the unreviewable discretion of the Attorney General. The proposed act grants to naturalized citizens full equality with natural-born citizens, except in cases where naturalization was procured by actual fraud. The proposed act makes other changes to simplify and clarify the law and to bring naturalization and denaturalization procedures back into line with traditional American standards of justice.

J. WHO IS A CITIZEN?

(Secs. 401, 402, and 408)

Citizenship is acquired either at birth or by naturalization. The proposed act (sec. 401) slightly broadens the category of citizens of the United States at birth, abolishing the undemocratic distinction between citizen and national (now applicable to persons born in American Samoa and Swains Island), and (sec. 408) extending citizenship to persons born in Puerto Rico before 1899 (sec. 402).

K. REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES FOR NATURALIZATION

(Secs. 413, 421–423, 431–434, 447)

Except in certain special cases, noted below, a 5-year residence in the United States is required for naturalization. The proposed act returns to pre-McCarran law by abolishing the McCarran Act's conclusive presumption (sec. 316 (b)), that absence from the United States for a period of 6 months or more breaks the continuity of residence for naturalization purposes. An alien absent for less than 1 year will, under the proposed act (sec. 422), be able to show that he had reasonable cause for not having sooner returned to the United States. Absences longer than a year without breaking the continuity of residence are permitted by the McCarran Act only in the case of a person absent in connection with the performance of religious duties (sec. 317). Under the proposed act (sec. 423) this exemption is extended to alien employees of specified types of United States organizations who may be sent abroad in connection with their jobs.

In view of the obvious desirability of having all members of a family group acquire United States citizenship as soon as reasonably possible, our law has always reduced the residence requirement in the case of the spouse of an American citizen and has permitted the naturalization of minor children through the naturalization of their parents. The proposed act reduces the required residence of a spouse of a United States citizen from 3 years to 1 year (sec. 431) and increases the maximum age for derivative naturalization from 15 to 17 (secs. 432, 433). Also the proposed act extends this privilege to legally adopted children (sec. 434). Abuse of these provisions, as through short-lived marriages entered into for the purpose of acquiring citizenship, is guarded against by the provision for revocation of any naturalization procured by fraud (sec. 447).

Subversive activity will bar naturalization. But instead of the vague and general

language of the McCarran Act (sec. 313), the proposed act gives a clear and definite test—precisely the same as that applied in an exclusion or deportation case—namely, no alien may be naturalized if at any time within 5 years of filing his petition for naturalization, or at any time prior to naturalization, he has either advocated or taught subversive doctrine or been a member of or affiliated with a subversive organization (sec. 413).

The proposed act retains the literacy requirement for naturalization, but restores it to the form in which it was prior to the McCarran Act, requiring that the petitioner be able to read. No writing requirement is provided (sec. 421).

In accordance with the modern trend in all fields of law, the proposed act permits naturalization on an affirmation rather than an oath in the case of a person whose religion forbids the taking of an oath (sec. 444).

No basic change is proposed in the procedure for obtaining naturalization. The proposed act does, however, restore the law to what it was prior to the McCarran Act in two important respects:

First, it eliminates the mandatory requirement of the so-called neighborhood check of the petitioner, leaving to the discretion of the Commission the scope of the investigation in any particular case.

Second, it deletes the provision of the McCarran Act (sec. 335 (d))—completely foreign to American concepts of proper administrative procedure—which permits the naturalization examiner, a subordinate employee of the Attorney General, to be represented in court by separate counsel, in cases in which the Attorney General has overruled the examiner.

Under the proposed act the court would have before it the complete record of the Commission's action on the naturalization petition, including, as a part of the record, the examiner's decision.

L. SPECIAL NATURALIZATION PROCEDURES FOR GI'S; EXPEDITED NATURALIZATION FOR WARTIME SERVICE IN KOREA

(Secs. 436–438)

The privilege of accelerated acquisition of United States citizenship through wartime service in the Armed Forces of the United States is granted, as in present law, to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Ninety days of such wartime service is required. In the case of Korea, the service must be during the period June 25, 1950, through July 1, 1955 (sec. 437 (b)).

Service in the Armed Forces during peacetime or other than in the Korean conflict is required to amount to 3 years in order to qualify the alien for citizenship (sec. 437 (a)). Arrangements for naturalization in the field and standards for determination of honorable service are also included (sec. 438) in the proposed act. A much simpler procedure is provided than under present law.

The proposed act reverts to the law as it was prior to the McCarran Act in restoring a simplified procedure for the naturalization of persons who lost their United States citizenship by serving in the armies of the allies of the United States during World War II (sec. 436).

M. LOSS OF CITIZENSHIP AND REVOCATION OF NATURALIZATION

(Secs. 447, 451, and 452)

Loss of United States citizenship, whether acquired by birth or by naturalization, is a drastic penalty. The McCarran Act (sec. 349) contains a long list of acts which automatically cause loss of citizenship. If citizenship was acquired by naturalization, those acts may include mere residence abroad for as little as 3 years (sec. 352). Moreover, the effect of these provisions in every case is to place upon the person whose citizenship is thus forfeited the burden of proving that he did not, in fact, commit he act on the basis of which our Government now strips him of citizenship.

Under the proposed act, two basic changes are made:

First, the list of acts which automatically would cause loss of citizenship is limited to (1) renunciation of United States citizenship, (2) obtaining naturalization in a foreign nation, (3) desertion in time of war, (4) leaving the country to avoid military service, (5) conviction for treason, or (6) an attempt to overthrow our Government by force of arms (sec. 451).

The McCarran Act (sec. 349) specifies additional grounds, e. g., taking an oath of allegiance to a foreign state, serving in its armed forces, accepting or serving in an office under a foreign government if foreign nationality is thereby acquired, and voting in a foreign political election. Under the proposed act only the taking of an oath of allegiance, or service in the armed forces of a foreign state after having acquired its nationality, in each case without compulsion, will result in a loss of citizenship. In such a case, as in a proceeding for revocation of naturalization, loss of citizenship would result only from a decree of a United States court in a proceeding brought by the Commission for forfeiture of citizenship, in which the Commission would have to sustain the burden of proof, e. g., to show that by swearing allegiance to a foreign state the defendant acted without compulsion (sec. 452).

All distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens are abolished by the proposed act so that mere residence abroad, even in the country of birth or former citizenship, will not, as it does under the McCarran Act (sec. 352), forfeit United States citizenship.

With respect to revocation of naturalization, the proposed act would restore the law to what it was prior to the McCarran Act. The basic ground for revocation of naturalization has always been fraud in its procurement. However, the McCarran Act (sec. 340) contains a broad definition of fraud which may include an unintentional concealment of a material fact, even where the petitioner for naturalization did not think it was material or had forgotten it. The McCarran Act also has provisions under which such things as refusal to testify before a congressional committee (sec. 340 (a)), residence in the country of birth (sec. 340 (d)), or joining a subversive or front organization (sec. 340 (c)), after naturalization, may give rise to a conclusive presumption that the naturalization was procured by fraud. These provisions are of doubtful constitutionality as they stand in the McCarran Act. However, the proposed act (sec. 447), eliminates them as un-American. It leaves naturalization revocable only for an act found by the courts to constitute fraud in its procurement. Action for revocation of naturalization must be brought within 10 years after citizenship was granted, an extension of the statute-of-limitations concept to the field of naturalization.

N. NO PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP

(Sec. 455)

Both under the McCarran Act and under prior law, a person denied a right or privilege of citizenship on the ground that he is not a citizen must seek confirmation of his status by suit for a declaratory judgment in the United States courts. However, under the McCarran Act, despite the fact that the Government may assert citizenship to be lost while the individual is abroad, the suit to confirm the citizenship status may be brought only if the plaintiff is within the United States (sec. 360 (a)).

Under the proposed act (sec. 455), the action could be instituted while the plaintiff is outside the United States and the court may, if it finds that the suit was instituted in good faith, order the issuance of a certificate of identity to the plaintiff, permitting him to come to the United States while the suit is pending. If he loses the case, the plaintiff is made immediately deportable.

O. JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

(Title V, sec. 501)

The McCarran-Walter Act established a joint congressional committee which was given broad—far too broad—powers in connection with the administration of our immigration and naturalization laws. The basic idea of a Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is a useful one. But the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act setting up this committee are violently inconsistent with sound Government practices.

Under the McCarran-Walter Act power is given to the joint committee to participate in the administration of the act. Subordinate administrators are required to report directly to the joint committee, a gross violation of the concepts of sound government and of the doctrine of the separation of powers as between the legislative and executive branches of Government.

Moreover, under the terms of the McCarran-Walter Act, membership on the joint committee is reserved to members of the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate. This reflects the basic philosophy inherent in the McCarran-Walter Act that immigration policy is solely and entirely a matter of police powers, of investigation, apprehension, prosecution, and punishment, and is of only legal concern.

The proposed act is based on quite another philosophy, namely, that immigration and naturalization policy has much wider ramifications, involving foreign policy, economic policy, and the public welfare generally.

Consequently, in the proposed act (sec. 501), the joint congressional committee is first of all confined in its jurisdiction and functions to matters of legislation and legislative inquiry; secondly, the committee is broadened to include representation of the Foreign Relations and the Labor and Public Welfare Committees, as well as of the Judiciary Committee. The joint committee is, of course, retained as a bipartisan committee. The distribution of membership in each House is as follows: 3 from the Judiciary Committee, 2 from the Foreign Relations Committee, and 2 from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Such a joint committee, with broad representation and clearly defined legislative functions, can usefully operate to keep a vigilant eye on the administration of our immigration laws and the effect of those laws and policies upon our relations abroad, upon our economy at home, and upon the welfare of the country as a whole.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on this vote we shall be judged by many American citizens and by many persons outside America as to our attitude toward the national origins quota system, toward the distinction between naturalized and native-born American citizens, and toward the many other evils in the present law to which I have barely alluded in these remarks.

For the sake of America and for the prestige of America abroad, I hope that the pending amendment will be approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I favor the enactment of the pending bill. The bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee with the understanding that I would not offer any amendments to it,

and that I would oppose any amendments to the bill. I am, therefore, in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York. I call attention to the fact that the amendment consists of 214 pages and 510 sections.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not want to leave the impression, does he, that the substitute was reported by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. WATKINS. No; I am talking about the amendment which is offered to the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator desire to leave the impression that the committee even looked at the amendment?

Mr. WATKINS. I will say some members did look at the amendment, yes, but I cannot say the whole committee did. It must be remembered that the Judiciary Committee is one of the busiest committees in the Senate. It has several thousand bills referred to it, and it is impossible for everyone on the committee to study everything before the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Was there any study made of the amendment by the committee? Does the Senator want to leave the impression that the amendment was studied by the committee?

Mr. WATKINS. No, I do not want to leave that impression. I do not think it was.

Mr. PASTORE. Can the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee give us any illumination—I think that is the proper word—on the question whether or not the amendment was studied at all by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. No, it was not.

Mr. PASTORE. I think the Senator has answered my question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I have only 5 minutes, but I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator will not agree with me that a bill, on which the amendment is based, was submitted to the Congress nearly 2 years ago, and no action was taken on it?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; it was submitted in 1952, substantially in the same form as the amendment now is.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was submitted in 1952, 1954, and in 1955, and no attention was paid to the bill or to the amendment which I now propose.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to point out that the amendment is very comprehensive in nature. It attempts to revise completely the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952. Much study would be required before a measure of this sweeping character could be adopted. I think it would be very unwise to do so at this time, and I think the Senator himself has indicated he does not expect to have the amendment adopted. However, I think the orphans bill should pass the Senate, even though there may be a proposal to take care of the same situation offered to a measure which will come before the Senate in a few minutes.

Therefore, I urge the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senator from New York. There are many provisions in the amendment of which I approve, but I urge Senators to vote against the amendment for the reasons I have given. It really cannot be considered on its merits at this juncture, with the limited time of 15 minutes to a side which has been allotted. Adequate consideration could not be given to the amendment in that time, and it would be very unwise to adopt it.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I understand correctly that the distinguished Senator from Utah introduced a bill which would carry out the recommendations of the President of the United States with reference to the amendment of the so-called Walter-McCarran Act?

Mr. WATKINS. I introduce four bills which would have carried out the President's recommendations. Hearings were held not only on those four bills, but also on a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York, which bill is represented by the amendment he is now offering to the pending bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of how many pages does the amendment consist?

Mr. WATKINS. 214 pages and 510 sections. It is a complete rewriting of the Walter-McCarran Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question or two about the bill. I want to know what the bill does with respect to the German quota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from North Dakota speaking about the bill or the amendment of the Senator from New York?

Mr. LANGER. I refer to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator from North Dakota should address his question to the Senator from New York. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota, so he may ask the question.

Mr. LANGER. What does the amendment do about the German quota?

Mr. LEHMAN. This is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. What does the amendment do with respect to the German quota?

Mr. LEHMAN. The amendment does away with the national origins quota entirely, and allows persons to come into the country on the basis of their merit and usefulness to the United States. It seems to me that is the best way to legislate on the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has used up all his time, had he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from New York has used 14 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we seem to be in a great hurry. I have another amendment to offer, so I shall yield back the time remaining to me on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute, identified as 7–25–56—A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator refer to the 13-page amendment?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it satisfactory to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, rather than read?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN'S amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) subsection (a) of section 2 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 400; 50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) "Refugee" means any person in a country or area which is neither Communist nor Communist-dominated, who because of persecution, fear of persecution, natural calamity, military operations, or events subsequent to September 1, 1939, is out of his usual place of abode and is unable to return thereto.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 2 of such act is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971 (a)), is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'two hundred and five thousand' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two hundred and fifteen thousand'; and

"(2) by striking out 'if accompanying them' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'and to the dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents (if the adoptive parenthood relationship existed prior to July 1, 1953) of such aliens and the spouses of such aliens, if accompanying or following to join them.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971b (a)), is amended by—

"(1) striking out in paragraph (2) the word 'escapees' and inserting in lieu thereof 'refugees'; and

"(2) striking out all of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(3) Not to exceed 20,000 visas to refugees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey, Spain, North Africa, Sweden, Iran, or the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside. Such visas shall be issued only in the area in which such refugees reside.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1771b (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The allotments provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be available for the issuance of immigrant visas to—

"'(1) the spouses and unmarried sons or daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons or stepdaughters and sons or daughters adopted prior to July 1, 1953, and the dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents (if the adoptive parenthood relationship existed prior to July 1, 1953), referred to in section 3 of this act, of persons referred to in subsection (a) of this section; and

"'(2) the dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents (if the adoptive parenthood relationship existed prior to July 1, 1953), referred to in section 3, of the spouses of such persons referred to in subsection (a) of this section.'

"(c) Section 4 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Not more than 1,200 aliens in Austria, Germany, Greece, and Italy, may be issued visas and be admitted to the United States under the terms and within the numerical limitations of this act, irrespective of the fact that they are found ineligible to receive visas or inadmissible to the United States under section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act insofar as it relates to aliens afflicted with tuberculosis. No alien shall be issued a visa under the provisions of this subsection unless (1) it is shown that arrangements satisfactory to the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service have been made that such alien, when admitted to the United States, will not become a public charge, and will not endanger the public health, and (2) such alien is a member of a family unit, consisting of qualified applicants for a visa under the provisions of this act, which he intends to accompany or follow to join in the United States. The provisions of section 7 (a) of this act shall not apply to any alien receiving a visa under the provisions of this subsection, but the Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for a special assurance to satisfy the requirements of the provisions of this subsection.'

"SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971c (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Not to exceed 9,000 special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans as defined in this act who are under 14 years of age at the time the visa is issued. No more than two such special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans adopted or to be adopted by any one United States citizen and spouse, unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers or sisters.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971c (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) When used in this act, the term "eligible orphan" shall mean an alien child (1) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and has in writing irrevocably released him for emigration and adoption; (2) (A) who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse while said citizen is or was serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is or was employed abroad by the United States Government or has resided for not less than 30 days in the country in which the orphan has been adopted, or (B) for whom assurances, satisfactory to the consular officer to whom a visa application on behalf of the orphan is made, have been given by a United States citizen and spouse that if the orphan is admitted into the United States they will adopt him in the United States and will care for him properly; and (3) who is ineligible for admission into the United States solely because the nonpreference portion of the quota to which he would otherwise be chargeable is oversubscribed by applicants registered on the consular waiting list at the time his visa application is made. No natural parent of any eligible orphan who shall be admitted into the United States pursuant to this act shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In no case shall an adoption by proxy be considered to be an adoption for the purposes of this section.'

"SEC. 5. Section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971d), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. (a) Any alien resident who (1) establishes that prior to July 1, 1953, he lawfully entered the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and that he is unable to return to the country of his birth, or nationality, or last residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or (2) establishes that if he were outside the United States he would be eligible to receive a special nonquota immigrant visa under the provisions of this act, or (3) was brought to the United States from other American Republics for internment, may, not later than June 30, 1956, apply to the Attorney General of the United States for an adjustment of his immigration status. In meritorious cases under clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, waive the requirement that such aliens establish lawful entry.

"'(b) If the Attorney General shall, upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of the case, determine that any such alien, provided for in subsection (a) of this section, has been of good moral character for the preceding 5 years and that such alien was physically present in the United States on the date of the enactment of this act and is otherwise qualified under all other provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress all the pertinent facts in the case. If, during the session of the Congress in which a case is reported or prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session in which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it approved the granting of the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to such alien, the Attorney General is authorized, upon the payment of the required visa fee, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution. If, within the above-specified time, the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, or, if either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not approve the granting of the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law.

"'(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any aliens admitted into the United States under the provisions of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, 2d session (60 Stat. 754), Public Law 402, 80th Congress, 2d session (62 Stat. 6).

"'(d) The number of aliens who shall be granted the status of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to this section shall not exceed 10,000.'

"SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971e (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as otherwise herein provided, no visa shall be issued to any alien under this act unless an assurance, in accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to this act, shall first have been given by a citizen or citizens of the United States that such alien, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such alien and the members of such alien's family who shall accompany or follow to join such alien and who propose to live with such alien will not become public charges and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent sons and daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons and stepdaughters and sons or daughters adopted prior to July 1, 1953, of such alien, and the dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents (if the adoptive parenthood relationship existed prior to July 1, 1953) of such alien and of such alien's spouse shall not be required to have such assurances made in their behalf. The assurances shall be submitted to the Administrator and it shall be the duty of the Administrator to verify the authenticity and bona fides of such assurances and such assurances shall be subject to final acceptance and approval by the consular and immigration officers. Blanket assurances, or assurances not submitted by a responsible individual citizen or citizens, or assurances not submitted by an organization recognized by the Administrator for the purpose of submitting such assurances, shall not be considered as satisfying the requirements of this section. The assurances for employment and housing shall be indexed and filed in such manner so as to show the specific address or addresses in the United States in which both the employment and housing are available, the type of employment and housing which are available, and the conditions and terms of the employment. This subsection shall have no applicability to the alien eligible under paragraph (6), (8), or (10) of section 4 (a) of this act, if such alien provides satisfactory evidence that he will not become a public charge.'

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 7 of such act (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971e (d)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) No alien shall be issued a visa under this act or be admitted into the United States unless he shall present to the consular officer at the time of making application for a visa or to the immigration officer at the time of application for admission a certificate of readmission guaranteeing for a period of 5 years (from the time of leaving the country where the visa is issued) his readmission to the country in which he obtains a visa under the provisions of this act if it is subsequently found that he obtained a visa under the provisions of this act by fraud or by misrepresenting a material fact.'

"SEC. 7. Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971i (c)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) No person shall be issued a visa or be admitted into the United States under the provisions of this act unless the consular officer and the immigration officer, after an inspection and examination of such person abroad, are entirely satisfied upon the basis of affirmative evidence adduced by the applicant that the applicant has established his eligibility for a visa and his admissibility into the United States under the immigration laws and regulations. The eligibility of an applicant under the provisions of this act shall be the exclusive responsibility of the consular officer. No person to whom a visa shall be issued shall be exempt from inspection and examination at a port of entry.'

"SEC. 8. Subsection (d) of section 11 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971i (d)) is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 9. Section 12 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971j), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. Section 20 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971q), is amended to read as follows:

"'TERMINATION

"'SEC. 20. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, no immigrant visa shall be issued under the provisions of this act after December 31, 1956.

"'(b) If any of the special nonquota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 3 of this act remain unissued on December 31, 1956, such unused visas shall be redistributed among those categories in section 4 (a) of this act that have (1) unfilled applications for visas, and (2) no visas remaining available for issue on December 31, 1956. Each such category shall be allotted a percentage of such unissued visas (to the extent necessary to fill applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956) equal to the percentage of the visas authorized under section 3 which is allotted to such category under section 4 (a). Any unissued visas remaining unallotted after the allotment provided by the preceding sentence shall be allotted among those categories which are not allotted sufficient visas under the preceding sentence to fill the applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956, until (1) all such unissued visas have been allotted or (2) all categories have been allotted a number of such unissued visas equal to the number of its applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956. No immigrant visa made available to the categories under section 4 (a) of this act by virtue of this subsection shall be issued after December 31, 1960.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.'"

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have a unanimous-consent agreement on a time limitation on this amendment?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. In accordance with the request of the majority leader, who is always courteous, I shall be glad, indeed, to limit my remarks to 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending amendment and on the bill be limited to five minutes to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have already submitted my amendment to the pending bill. I now call up the amendment.

This amendment would revise and liberalize the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, in order to carry out the intent of Congress and of the American people in regard to the admission of refugees and escapees into the United States.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary analysis of my refugee relief act amendment, a statement made by me before the subcommittee, and remarks prepared in support of the amendment.

There being no objection, the analysis, statement, and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1955.

ANALYSIS OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT AMENDMENTS

1. The term "refugee" is broadened to include persons who are displaced from their country of birth or nationality as a result of events prior, during, or subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and as a result of present political conditions, fear of persecution, military operations, etc., are unable to return to their natural place of abode. The term "refugee" is made to include escapees from behind the Iron Curtain obviating the necessity for two separate categories, which in the present law, have contributed to administrative delay and confusion.

2. The overall number of visas available for issuance is increased from 209,000 to to 224,000. The 15,000 increase is added to the present 10,000 allotment of visas (sec. 4 (a) (3)) for refugees residing in the NATO countries. New areas included within the purview of the act would be Spain and North Africa.

3. The restrictive and opprobrious term—"ethnic"—is struck from the act.

4. The maximum age for orphans eligible to be admitted under section 5 of the act, is increased from 10 to 14.

5. The provision for adjustment of status of aliens presently residing in the United States is broadened and liberalized.

6. The requirement for employment and housing assurances for qualified refugees has been modified to provide that these assurances may be given by individuals or by voluntary agencies recognized by the Department of State for the purpose of giving such assurances. One of the major problems arising under the present assurance requirements is that a specific job and housing facility must be underwritten by a specific individual prior to the time a refugee can be declared eligible for immigration. Authorizing the acceptance of such assurances from duly recognized voluntary agencies would greatly simplify the entire program.

7. The requirement of section 7 (d) of the present act that an alien, before being admitted into the United States must obtain a certificate of readmission into the country from which he departs for the United States is eliminated. It is felt that the requirements of the basic immigration law covering necessary travel documents and clearances are more than sufficient to protect the interests of the United States.

8. The requirement of subsection (d) of section 11, that a completely documented 2-year history of the alien be submitted as a condition of eligibility is repealed. This provision has resulted in interminable delays in the admission of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. The security requirements of the basic immigration law, as well as the additional requirements of this act, are deemed more than adequate to protect the security interests of the United States.

9. The final termination date of the act is extended from December 31, 1956, to December 31, 1960. Provision is made that after December 31, 1956, those visas which have not been issued in the various categories established in the act shall be reallocated to those categories which have exhausted their visa allocations and in which there is still a demand for visas.

10. Section 12 of the act which establishes a system of priorities for the issuance of visas is repealed. These provisions have proven to be largely unworkable and meaningless in actual practice.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES AND ESCAPEES, IN SUPPORT OF S. 1794 — AMENDMENTS TO THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased to appear before this subcommittee on the critical matter now pending before you, namely, the question of amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

As I understand it, the hearings today and tomorrow are to be devoted primarily to S. 1794, the bill introduced by myself in association with Senators HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, and DOUGLAS. But there is also pending before this subcommittee S. 2113, introduced by Senator WATKINS and others, consisting of the proposals submitted by President Eisenhower. There has also been introduced within the past 2 days a bill by the chairman of this subcommittee, S. 2149.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity or the time to study the bill you introduced, the Langer bill. I am sure that it contains constructive proposals. However, not having been able to study it, I shall direct my remarks today to my own bill, S. 1794, and the Watkins bill, S. 2113.

Although I am well aware of the fact that these hearings are on S. 1794, I am sure the subcommittee would want me to include reference to S. 2113 also and to compare the two bills. If I had had the time to study it, I would have liked to make detailed reference to the Langer bill as well.

Mr. Chairman, I know of your personal interest—and I am sure of all the members of this subcommittee—in the subject matter at hand. This subcommittee has conducted hearings in the recent past on the manner in which the Refugee Relief Act and the refugee relief program have been administered. You have heard a number of witnesses and have compiled a most useful record.

I am sure it is plain to you—as it is plain to the majority of the American people—that the refugee relief program, hopefully inaugurated with the passage of the Refugee Relief Act in the summer of 1953, has gone very badly. In my judgment, it has been a failure. It has brought heartbreak and disappointments to thousands and even hundreds of thousands. This program has floundered on the rocks of administrative redtape, of administrative obsession with so-called security, and of primary defects in the law itself.

Almost 2 years have gone by since the Refugee Relief Act was approved by this Congress and signed by the President. In those 2 years, only a small percentage of the authorized number of 209,000 refugees and escapees have been admitted to the United States. Under this act, which was passed for the primary purpose of admitting refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, only a handful—some say about 1,000—the official figure is about 6,000—of actual refugees and escapees have received visas for entry into the United States.

This discrepancy in figures is due to the fact that some of these refugees and escapees are also relatives of persons already legally resident in the United States, including citizens. Under the terms of the law, it is much easier for relatives to enter the United States than for refugees and escapees who have no relatives. I am heartily in favor of admitting relatives of American citizens and of permanently resident aliens into this country, but that isn't what we set out to do when we passed the Refugee Relief Act. We told the world that we were going to do a great and humanitarian act. We were going to do our part to provide haven and asylum for those who had fled and might yet flee from behind the Iron Curtain, and for those who constituted the

flotsam and jetsam of war and political upheaval in the Old World.

We were going to receive a fair number of these into America.

But the record shows that we have not. We have failed. Shame has been cast upon the prestige of the United States. While exhorting people from behind the Iron Curtain to take flight from tyranny, we have turned our backs upon them, once they have escaped. We have herded them into concentration camps in Western Germany, Australia, and Italy. There they live, I am told, under the most incredible conditions of hardship—behind barbed wire fences—not so very much different from the conditions from which they fled.

As far as coming to the United States is concerned, we tell them we are sorry, but the refugee relief program has such high standards of security and eligibility that they cannot come in. We have closed the door in their faces.

I have heard accounts of what goes on in those refugee camps, how the individuals and their families, wives and children live and subsist. I hope some of the witnesses who appear before this committee, in the course of these hearings, will tell you what they have seen, so that your heart may be wrenched, as mine was.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read from a bulletin sent out by the Americans Friends Service Committee, the great humanitarian voluntary agency of the Quakers, reporting on some of the conditions in the refugee camps in Germany. I should like to quote an excerpt from a report submitted by a Miss Gwen Gardner, a Friends Service Committee field worker, who has been working among and with these refugees, trying to find jobs for them in Germany, while they are waiting for permission to emigrate someplace, anyplace.

I am quoting from the report by Miss Gardner:

"Those of you who are cudgelling your consciences because you wonder if we ought to move DP's who prefer to stay where they are, come with us and visit Landshut. We'll show you things that will tear your heart and put your doubts to rest. Perhaps, as on my second visit with Doris Borrusch, the men will mob us in the dark corridor. They've got wind of our purpose. There is a man with an amputated arm. 'Aren't you the American Quakers finding jobs for people? Look, I'm a painter, too. Can't you get me a job?' and the tall thin man with pleading brown eyes: 'I'm a cook. I've worked with the Americans * * *' and the burly man with the working overalls: 'I'm a metal worker * * * you said you wanted metal workers. I'm 53, but I'm healthy. I can work.' But the whole camp is coming. There are rows of men advancing down the corridor. It's the same in the rooms. This gray-haired, square-built, honest looking man, follows us. 'I've got a trade. I'm a carpenter. I want work, too. I'm strong. I'm 55. But I'm stronger than that young man. He's sick. Don't help the young ones * * * they can get work. The employers take them. It's we older men who need your help. We'd work if they'd let us. Look at that chap. He's a welder. He's strong. He's fit. He doesn't drink. He wants to work. But he's nearly 60. Help him to get out of here.'

"Two young men, both too slightly built to be suitable for the iron foundry that Doris Borrusch has come to offer, pursue us out of the room after we've filled in the questionnaire and seen their papers. 'Please get us out of there. Please help us. Don't leave us. We'll rot if we have to stay here,' says the one who has had a 2 months' prison sentence for fighting. * * *

"We have 3 jobs to offer among 400 men. Which shall we choose? Whom must we reject? The ones who need our help most are the ones with handicaps, the ones who are sliding down * * * but the employers don't see it that way.

"Herr Marton, who has been filling in forms and interrogating since 7 a. m. looks tired and drawn, but he looks at me with a smile as we pack up our day's work as it gets dark, and says: 'I'm glad you've given me this to do. It's very worthwhile work. I don't think we shall do it in vain. We've got to get these people out of here * * * Some of them can be saved."

There is more, much more to this report, but I am not going to read any more. I wanted only to indicate the nature of our obligation * * * and the enormity of our failure thus far to contribute significantly to its solution.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, descriptions like this one should haunt our dreams and bedevil our consciences, until we do something about it.

Thanks in part—in very large part—to the hearings held by this subcommittee on the administration of the refugee relief program some weeks ago, which in turn were largely inspired by the Corsi incident—and I hope Mr. Corsi is going to testify on the legislative proposals now pending before you—national attention was focused on the failure of the refugee relief program.

As a result—and belatedly, if I must say so—President Eisenhower, just 2 weeks ago, sent a message to the Congress proposing certain amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. Even he admitted that "The purposes of the act are not being achieved as swiftly as we had all hoped." President Eisenhower said further in his message that "a number of the provisions of the act require amendment, if the act's objectives are to be fully achieved."

Mr. Chairman, I and other Senators, including members of this committee and Members of the House of Representatives, have been talking about the failure of this program for a long time. Regularly, for the last 18 months, we have been making speeches on the floor of Congress and elsewhere, warning against the collapse of the refugee program, decrying its frustration and urging its rescue, both by administrative improvement and by amendments to the law. Our voices were not much heeded in the past but now, at last, the President of the United States has taken cognizance of the situation, he has recognized it, and has proposed to the Congress a set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. He has also pledged that changes would be made—some of them have possibly already been made—in the administration of the act.

Let me say at this point that the amendments proposed by the President are, for the most part, sound ones. Some of them were proposed by Representative WALTER in the House early this year, and some by Representative CELLER. Other proposals for changes in the law, as contained in the President's message, are new and reflect both the experience of the administrators of this act, and a new-born anxiety on their part to make this program work. They know that they are going to be held to account before the bar of public opinion.

In any event, the President's proposals have been submitted to Congress and they have been introduced as S. 2113 by Senator WATKINS and others. The Watkins bill was introduced on May 31, just a week ago.

I introduced my set of amendments, S. 1794, on April 25, in association with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I shall explain in some detail the purport of our proposals.

I want to say, however, that I have no pride of authorship in the language of our bill. I would be glad to have S. 1794 amended, where appropriate, by this subcommittee, on the basis of either the President's recommendations or the Langer bill, in order that the best bill possible may be reported to the Senate and acted upon by both the Senate and the House.

I shall append to my testimony a detailed comparison between the President's proposals and those contained in S. 1794. I want to say, however, that, in my judgment, the President's proposals do not go far enough in several major respects. I do not think that the Watkins bill, S. 2113, would fully accomplish what we all want to accomplish—and I am sure that the distinguished members of this subcommittee, including Mr. WATKINS, share with me a desire to make the refugee relief work. I have no doubt of that whatsoever. While the Watkins bill, in its present form, would certainly improve the act, it would not do the job altogether.

There are several provisions recommended by the President, however—and one especially—which are not included in my bill and which I think are very good indeed. I will mention one of these provisions particularly at this point.

I refer to section 3 of the Watkins bill, which amends section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act by authorizing the admission of up to 1,000 aliens who are members of family units eligible to enter the United States under the Refugee Relief Act but who would otherwise be prevented from entering on account of tuberculosis.

I think this feature of the Watkins bill is an excellent, a very humane and forward-looking one. If my bill is reported out by this committee, I hope it will be amended by adding to it section 3 of the Watkins bill. I commend the administration and Senator Watkins for having proposed it. I will refer to the other sound feature in the Watkins bill, not covered in my bill, later on in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, before going into further detail about my bill or S. 2113, I would like to refer to my personal interest in this general subject. I have been concerned with the problem of American policy toward immigration—toward displaced persons and refugees—for many years—indeed, since World War I.

Even before I became a Government official, I took a very active part in the work of the Joint Distribution Committee, which, as most of you know, has played an important role as a voluntary agency in arranging for the immigration and resettlement of persons of the Jewish faith who have been subjected to persecution, or who have been uprooted and displaced by war and political unheaval.

When I became a public official of New York State, I took, of course, a special interest in what the Government was doing and should be doing about the problem. New York City is the place where most aliens and immigrants arrive. We have a higher percentage of naturalized citizens and of first-generation citizens in New York than in any other State in the Union. In my judgment, this has been a major factor, perhaps the most important single factor, in the tremendous growth and development of New York State, not only in population, but in industry, commerce and individual enterprise.

I would like to say at this point that I consider New York State to be in a way the most typical State in the Union in the sense that it represents in essence one of the basic ideas which have made America great—the idea of the melting pot.

It is natural, therefore, for New York State to have a special interest in the subject before us. And New York State has such an interest, I assure you.

I would also like to recall that I served for some years as Director-General of the United

Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—UNRRA. I was the first Director-General, and in that capacity I was responsible for the program to relieve the hunger and sufferings of millions of refugees and dislocated persons during and following World War II. We set up refugee camps all over Europe and the Middle East. We fed people by the millions. We arranged for their migration to other parts of the world which were ready to receive these displaced persons.

I have seen countless thousands of refugees with my own eyes. I think I know, to some extent, what it means to be a refugee. There is nothing more heartrending and more appealing to the humanitarian instincts in all of us, than the sight of a refugee camp.

So let us look at the legislation before us in human terms. It should not be just a matter of statistics, of visas issued, or aliens admitted. No, it should be a question of succoring hundreds and thousands of homeless persons—of persons who have gone through the hell of war and of displacement, of individuals who have survived slave labor camps and who have escaped from the unbelievable tyranny and indignity of Communist rule.

I would like to digress at this point from the subject of the refugee relief program and say a few words concerning our basic immigration and citizenship laws. To me the question of the refugee program is collateral to the more fundamental question of amending the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act. As you know, the refugee program must work within the framework of the restrictions and regulations of our basic immigration law. In my opinion, this is one of the reasons—not the only one, by any means—why the refugee program has not been more effective. I hope that we can make the refugee program work by amending it—and then get on with the major problem—that of amending our basic immigration laws.

There is one major administrative action which I believe must be taken to achieve the major purpose of the refugee program. The President and the Secretary of State can and should direct the responsible officials to turn the present cumbersome program into a "crash" program. Such a directive from the President would do a great deal to change the attitude of many of the officials connected with this program who have, until now, insisted that this legislation was merely permissive and really did not mean that refugees had to be admitted into the United States.

Yes, some changes in administrative attitude are necessary, if this program is to be snatched from the brink of failure. It is a fact that until the recent furor over the firing of Mr. Edward Corsi, no one in the administration seemed particularly concerned with the failure or success of the program.

Fortunately for our Nation, and for the refugees, Mr. Corsi had the courage to stand up and call attention to the failure of the program.

I do not know that in the last few weeks there has been an unusual flurry of activity on the part of the officials responsible for the operation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, one of the spokesmen for the administration who came before this committee some time ago and tried to explain the delays which have occurred in carrying out the operations of the Refugee Relief Act compared the processing of the applicants under the act as an automobile production line. The analogy with automobile production seems to come easily to the officials of this administration, for some reason or other.

It was explained that the slowness in issuing visas was due to the fact that it took time to establish a production line.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, feel that this figure of speech, comparing the handling of human beings with the production of automobiles, was a most unfortunate one. Human beings are not automobiles and cannot be assembled or disassembled as such.

No, Mr. Chairman; I do not believe that there is or was any excuse for the roadblocks thrown in the way of this program by the negative attitude of those who were in charge of it. Their attitude was, in my judgment, completely unjustifiable.

I have taken note of the assurances which have recently been given me that this attitude, on the part of the administrators of this program, has changed, at least on the part of the top administrators, and that they are now determined to carry out the program in the spirit in which it was originally intended.

I am willing to accept these assurances at something less than their face value, but still to accept them and to hope for the best if the Congress decides, in its wisdom, to continue to vest the administration of this program in the same hands which have held it up to now.

Even the administrators of this program now concede that amendments are necessary to the act. A year ago they said that no amendments were necessary. Now the President proposes some amendments and those in charge of the administration of this program are urging the Congress to follow the President's recommendations. Their conversion is tardy—and has been costly to the United States. And who can say what the cost has been to the human beings who have been forced to endure so much longer the sufferings and privations which have been experienced by the refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. That cost cannot be measured. It can only be felt.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the details of the legislation before us. I address myself to S. 1794, and also to the Watkins bill, S. 2113. As I said before, I have not had a chance to study the bill introduced by you Mr. Chairman, the Langer bill, S. 2149.

Comparing S. 1794 and S. 2113, Mr. Chairman, I would say that there are several good provisions in the Watkins bill which are not included in my bill. I have already referred to one of these, namely, section 3 of the Watkins bill, which authorizes the admission of 1,000 tubercular members of families otherwise eligible under the terms of the act.

There is also language in section 2 of the Watkins bill which permits members of family groups to follow rather than to accompany senior members of the family group who have been found eligible under the act and have been granted visas. Thus, under the terms of this provision, children, wives, and spouses could follow later, if for one reason or another they were not ready or not yet found eligible to accompany the member of the family who has been granted a visa under this program. There is no comparable provision in my bill. I strongly urge that the bill that is reported out include such a provision.

There is also a good provision in the Watkins bill which provides that the eligibility of the applicants under the refugee relief program shall be determined solely by the consular officer and shall not be subject to review by the immigration officer. This means that the consular officer will be given the authority to decide whether the applicant fulfills all the special requirements of the Refugee Relief Act, as distinct from the general requirements of the McCarran-Walter Act. Under the present Refugee Relief Act provisions, both the consular officer and the immigration officer have separate authority to determine whether an applicant is an eligible refugee or escapee. This has resulted in much confusion, delay, and contradiction between the rulings of the consular officer and the rulings of the immigration officer. I believe this is a very sound provision. There is no comparable provision in my bill.

Otherwise, and in general, Mr. Chairman, I believe my bill is broader and better in its terms, although there are a few provisions which are virtually identical in their effect. One such provision is in section 7 of my bill and section 10 of the Watkins bill, which would eliminate the present requirement of a 2-year security check on escapees and refugees—a provision which virtually defeats the whole purpose of the act and the program.

Under present law each applicant must provide documentation covering 2 years of his past life, showing everything that he has been doing during those 2 years, and that he is anti-Communist, among other things. For those who have just escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, this is an obvious impossibility, in all but rare cases. Both the Watkins bill and my bill recognize this fact and both bills would repeal this requirement which is found in subsection 11 (d).

The first major difference between the two bills is in the definitions. The Watkins bill relaxes somewhat the presently unworkable definition which requires an escapee also to be a refugee, under the very strict definition in section 2 (a) of the present law. My bill would combine the two definitions and eliminate entirely the term "escapee." I provide a simple, workable definition for "refugee," which would cover both refugees and escapees.

Under my amendment the term "refugee" would include persons who are displaced from their country of birth or nationality as a result of events prior, during, or subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and as a result of present political conditions, fear of persecution, military operations, etc., are unable to return to their natural place of abode. This would cover both refugees and escapees. There is no reason to make a distinction between refugees and escapees. Any distinction is only cumbersome and contributes to delay and confusion in interpretation. I believe in this respect my bill is preferable to the Watkins bill.

In my bill the definition of expellee—those of German descent who were forced to flee when the Communists approached—is left the same as in present law. In the Watkins bill this definition is modified somewhat—in an obscure way, in my judgment. I do not understand the reason for it.

In both bills the requirement for a valid passport is eliminated, and this is a good thing. Many refugees and escapees cannot obtain passports. They are stateless. Obviously, it is difficult for an escapee to get a passport from the officials of the country from which he has fled. This has been a great source of difficulty in the administration of the program. Both bills relax this requirement.

There is a related requirement in present law which has also been a source of frustration, confusion, and delay, and that is the requirement for a certificate of readmission to the country from which he migrates for each individual who is admitted under the refugee relief program. This has required agreements with other countries and resulted in endless delay. Some countries will not give certificates of readmission. My bill eliminates this requirement. The Watkins bill also eliminates it, but not quite as plainly, in my judgment, as S. 1794.

S. 1794 increases the quota for refugees now residing in North Atlantic Treaty countries by 15,000 and adds Spain and North Africa to the list of countries from which such refugees are eligible to be admitted into the United States. There are a number of Yugoslav refugees in Spain and a number of refugees of assorted national origins in North Africa whom we should surely include in the refugee program. They are as needy and as deserving as the others in the same group. This change is found in section 2 of S. 1794, amending paragraph 3 of section 3 (a) of the present law.

My bill would strike out the word "ethnic" wherever it appears in the bill, except in the definition of German expellees. I believe that this is an odious term, at best. It has no use and no place in those parts of the bill, other than in section 2 (c) of the act, in connection with German expellees. The term is repugnant to our national concepts. It should be eliminated. It serves no purpose but to obstruct and delay this program.

My bill would raise the age of eligible orphans from 10 to 14. There is no real reason to limit the definition of orphans to children of 10 years or under. All the responsible voluntary organizations working in this field are agreed on this fact. An orphan is just as appealing, just as desirable, and just as adaptable to the United States at the age of 14 as at the age of 10. The Watkins bill raises the age limit to 12.

It has been brought to my attention that there may be some difficulty in raising the age limit to 14 because of the requirement, by regulation, that persons of 14 years of age or older must undergo full security clearance. Setting the age limit at 13 years would obviate this difficulty. I am sure the committee will act justly in this regard.

My bill also repeals outright section 12 of the present act, a section which sets up a completely unworkable system or priorities for the issuance of visas. As far as I can learn, nobody has been able to understand thoroughly what Congress meant by section 12. This provision has been ineffective and it has caused delay and confusion without any constructive benefits for the United States or for the program. I propose the outright elimination of this section. I think it would speed things up considerably.

The provisions of both the Watkins bill and S. 1794 are similar in their effect in the important matter of agency assurances. The present act prohibits the use of agency assurances. This has been one of the chief barriers to the orderly operation of this program. The voluntary agencies have been ready, willing, and anxious to cooperate with this program and to help make it a success, but they have been severely handicapped in doing so by the language of this act—and by the administrative interpretation of it—which has prevented the voluntary agencies from providing the assurances and from assuming the responsibility for placing these immigrants in suitable housing and jobs.

There has been very bitter feeling about this provision and I believe it should be repealed and agency assurances should be accepted. These agencies are fine, upright, and reputable organizations. They did a marvelous job with the displaced-persons program. They can be trusted to perform similarly with the refugee relief program. The agency assurances worked with the displaced-persons program—and they will work with the refugee relief program.

The provision covering this matter in S. 1794, namely, section 6 (a) is, in my judgment, preferable to that in the Watkins bill.

Both bills have a provision relaxing present restrictions for individuals already in the United States who qualify under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act. The Watkins bill increases the number who will be so eligible from 5,000 to 10,000. I strongly approve of this increase in the number. It is not included in my bill.

Both bills relax the present requirement that an alien, to be eligible to have his status adjusted, must have entered the United States legally. I propose to eliminate that requirement, presuming that the alien has conducted himself in a proper manner while he has been in the United States, and has otherwise conformed to the requirements of admission as a legally resident alien. The Watkins bill would specifically authorize the Attorney General to waive this requirement in cases where he finds such a waiver justified. My bill would accomplish the same purpose and in a simpler way. In the case of both bills the Attorney General would be required to rule on whether the alien in question should, in fact, be considered a suitable person to have his status adjusted.

Finally, we come to two major differences—the most vital differences—between S. 1794 and the Watkins bill, S. 2113.

These two differences pertain in the first place to the administrative setup, and in the second place to the use of unused visa numbers under the program.

My bill proposes that the present provision of the law dealing with the administration of the program—a legislative monstrosity, in my judgment—be changed to make the Administrator of the program responsible directly to the Secretary of State and only to him, and to free the Administrator from subservience to any bureau in the State Department.

At the present time, under the present law, it is required that the Administrator be the Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs—an incredible confusion of functions. The Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs has enough to do. His is a police and review function. The Administrator of the refugee program should have no other job and no other responsibility. His is a humanitarian mission, not a police function.

I strongly urge upon this subcommittee the approval of my section 10, which sets up the Administrator of this program in direct line of responsibility to the Secretary of State. The President or the Secretary of State can redesignate the present Administrator, if they so desire. That is their responsibility. But the administration of this program should not be tied to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

I challenge anyone who believes in sound governmental and administrative principles to justify such an association.

I don't want to interfere with the orderly progress of the program. I can see that it would require quite a readjustment to break in a new Administrator in the middle of the program. But I think that this provision of my bill should be adopted. I am sure that the President of the United States will do what is necessary to keep the program going without interruption or delay. I think this change in the law will greatly accelerate the program.

Finally, Mr. President, my bill envisions, as the Watkins bill does too, the strong probability that many of the visa numbers in some of the categories established under section 4 of the present law will not be used up. I would hope this would not be true, but it is most likely to prove true. My bill would extend the life of the program until 1960 and provide that persons eligible under the act can be admitted until 1960.

My bill provides for the reallocation of unused visas among those groups which have the greatest need for visas.

In those categories under section 4 where there are long lists of applications which cannot be granted, the unused visa numbers would be distributed among the various categories in section 4 in proportion to the numbers of applications which have been filed and which have not been acted upon, due to the exhaustion of available numbers in those categories.

The Watkins bill would make these unused numbers available for a worldwide orphan pool. I do not think that such a pool would use up the unused numbers, nor do I think that this is especially the way to handle the orphan problem.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that President Eisenhower, in his message to the Congress, referred to the need for a provision for the use of unused numbers. He did not recommend the worldwide orphan pool as the only solution to this problem. He suggested it merely as an example of what might be done with the unused numbers. I refer you to the text of his message, the pertinent sentences from which I quote:

"I recommend that there be a provision for the use of unused numbers. Such unused numbers might well be used, for example, for orphans on a worldwide basis * * *."

The Watkins provision on this subject is not necessarily the last word on this matter, even as far as the President of the United States is concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have completed my summary of the differences and similarities between the two bills. I am going to submit for the record a detailed comparison between the two bills and a detailed analysis and justification for each provision of my bill.

I ask your permission, Mr. Chairman, that these two documents appear in the record at the completion of my remarks, to be made available to all the members of this subcommittee. I will file them subsequently.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like for a moment in conclusion to refer to the experience we had with the displaced persons program.

When the displaced persons program was launched in 1948, there was no staff. The displaced persons program was organized as an independent governmental agency, faced with the vast problem of creating a completely new organization. But with all these handicaps, and with a law which in many aspects was even more unworkable than the present refugee law, the record of the displaced persons program in bringing refugees to our country is so far superior to that under the refugee relief program and it defies comparison.

The Displaced Persons Commission worked out many of the techniques which have been followed by the Administrator under the present act. The Refugee Relief Administrator has belatedly followed the precedent established in the displaced persons program of stimulating the organization of State commissions to aid in the resettlement of the newly arrived immigrants. Under the displaced persons program there were 36 such State commissions. I would point out that these commissions were started 1 week after the displaced persons program got under way One year went by after the passage of the Refugee Relief Act before President Eisenhower wrote to the governors of the States requesting similar commissions to be created.

Under the displaced persons program 4,182 orphans were brought to the United States. The Displaced Persons Commission pioneered in working out arrangements with welfare agencies in the United States and with the various European governments to expedite and safeguard the adoption of these orphans. It is my information that the experience of the Displaced Persons Commission in this field has greatly aided the orphan program under the Refugee Relief Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would like to correct a serious error which has cropped up at various times in discussions of the comparison between the displaced persons program and the refugee program. This error relates to the thoroughness of the security checks utilized by the Displaced Persons Commission. Individuals under the displaced persons program were checked by the following governmental security agencies—the FBI, the CIA, the CIC, the CID, the Provost Marshall's office of the Army, the DP investigative staff, the Consul's investigative staff, and the investigative staff of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Certainly the security program under the Refugee Relief Act could hardly be more thorough.

In light of these facts it is appalling to me that in terms of comparative length of operations under the displaced persons program and the Refugee Relief Act, 152,528 visas were issued under the displaced persons program after 20 months of operation while over a similar period, only 34,810 visas have been issued under the Refugee Relief Act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have not belabored this point too much. I hope I have not spent too much time reciting the past failures of the program. I had not intended to deal disproportionately with the mistakes of the past, which are, of course, irretrievable.

Now we face the problem of rescuing this program, of salvaging it, and of making the best we can of it.

I assume that this subcommittee will report out some kind of a bill. I am sure that this is your purpose. I am sure that from all the proposals that have been made, a very constructive bill can be put together. I hope this will be done by appropriate changes in S. 1794.

My purpose in appearing here, however, is not only to explain my bill, but to appeal to you to speed action on a set of amendments to revise the Refugee Relief Act in a way that will permit the refugee program to be carried forward to completion and to make it truly possible for the authorized number of refugees, escapees, and relatives to be admitted into this country.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The Refugee Relief Act is due to expire at the end of this year. Under present operations, there will be remaining some 40,000 unused visas authorized under the terms of this act. It is my firm belief that the expiration date of the act should be extended, and amendments adopted which will make the act more effective and its administration more liberal.

The amendment which I am proposing would authorize a reallocation of the Refugee Relief Act visas which remain unused on December 31, 1956, and would make certain additional benefits available for orphans, similar to the provisions in S. 3570.

My substitute would redefine the term "refugee" to broaden it to include persons who are displaced from their country of birth or nationality as a result of events prior, during, or subsequent to the outbreak of World War II. It is also designed to broaden the term "refugee" to include the term "escapee" in order that the program can more fully work to help those escapees from behind the Iron Curtain—the group which has benefited least from this act.

Let us recall that this act is entitled "The Refugee Relief Act of 1953." The message from the President recommending this program described at length the plight of those who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain—of those who had been driven from their homes by war and disaster. That was the keynote of this program.

Unfortunately, the program has not worked to help escapees and refugees, but in its original form, and as a result of subsequent amendment, it has become primarily a bill for the relief of relatives of American citizens.

I am in favor of the reunification of American families, and the bringing together of relatives. I am also for assisting refugees and escapees under the terms of this act. It is for this reason that I feel that the proposed amendments should be adopted.

Hearings have been held on a bill containing the proposals now before the Senate in the form of the pending amendment. The Judiciary Committee has seen fit to recommend in S. 3570 proposals to assist in bringing orphans to the United States. I am for this bill and its provisions are incorporated in the substitute which I am proposing.

I hope that the amendments which I have proposed will be adopted. Many organizations throughout the Nation have wired and sent letters to Members of the Congress in recent weeks urging that there be an extension of the Refugee Relief Act, and a revision of some of its harsher terms.

I firmly believe that the American people support the full authorization to admit the 209,000 refugees under this act. Additional time is needed to accomplish this stated legislative purpose, and to complete the cases presently in the pipeline of the administration of the act.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall not press for the consideration of this amendment at this time because I understand that some of the basic provisions of my amendment are contained in another amendment to another bill which is soon to be called up by the leadership.

At the time when that bill is called up, I may have a few words to say about it. In the meantime, since I understand that some of the fundamental purposes sought by my amendment have been included in a proposal which the leadership is going to offer, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time; and I understand that the amendment of the Senator from New York has been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York has been withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, and Mr. PHILLIPS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1140. An act for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute;

H. R. 6185. An act for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.;

H. R. 7824. An act for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai);

H. R. 9384. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi;

H. R. 9579. An act for the relief of Nicola Marcello;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 10622. An act to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939;

H. R. 11515. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11720. An act creating the city of Saint Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near Saint Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12006. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use; and

H. J. Res. 685. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain warbuilt vessels.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.;

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes";

S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 2060. An act to amend the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices;

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingston, R. I.;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3391. An act to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes;

S. 3903. An act to amend the Agricultural Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes;

S. 4221. An act to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1140. An act for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute;

H. R. 6185. An act for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.;

H. R. 7824. An act for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai);

H. R. 9384. An act for the relief of Evelyn Albi; and

H. R. 9579. An act for the relief of Nicola Marcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Mass.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 10622. An act to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 11515. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 11720. An act creating the city of St. Francisville Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill., and Knox County, Ind., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12006. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 685. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

IMMIGRATION VISAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2249.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6888) to amend the Act of September 3, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6888) to amend the Act of September 3, 1954, which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3 (a) of the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) There shall not be issued more than 385 special nonquota immigrant visas under this act; except that there may be issued not more than an additional 350 such special nonquota immigrant visas during a period beginning on the effective date of this act, as amended, and ending July 1, 1957: *Provided*, That special nonquota immigrant visas, without regard to the numerical limitations of this section, shall be issued to the wives and minor, unmarried children of the aliens who are found eligible for special nonquota immigrant visas under the provisions of this act or who were admitted under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306), or the act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50), if they are accompanying or following to join such aliens, and are otherwise eligible to receive immigrant visas and admissible to the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That the marriage is found to have occurred prior to July 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. A new section 5 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The quota deductions required under the provisions of the Act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306), and the Act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50), are terminated, effective July 1, 1955."

SEC. 3. A new section 6 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The provisions of law relating to the deportation of aliens on the ground that they were excludable at the time of entry as aliens who had obtained visas by fraud or misrepresentation or as aliens who were not of the nationality specified in their visas shall not apply to an otherwise admissible alien, admitted to the United States between December 22, 1945, and November 1, 1954, both dates inclusive, who misrepresented his place of birth, identity, or residence in applying for a visa if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the misrepresentation (a) was predicated upon the fact that the alien had reasonable grounds to fear repatriation to his former residence or homeland where he would be persecuted because of race, religion, or political opinions, and (b) was not committed for the purpose of evading the quota restrictions of the immigration laws or an investigation of the alien at the place of his former residence or elsewhere."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have a unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the consideration of this measure; and I should like to inquire how much time is allotted on amendments to the bill. Are 30 minutes allotted to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, 1 hour is available on each amendment, and 2 hours are available on the bill—to be equally divided.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may yield now to the Senator from Illinois, then I shall yield again to the Senator from New York.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill. The amendment is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to ascertain the parliamentary situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me to yield to one Senator at a time, no Senator will have to wait more than 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, instead of having it read at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. BUSH) is as follows:

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY MR. DIRKSEN, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF, MR. CLEMENTS, AND MR. BUSH, TO THE BILL H. R. 6888, AMENDING THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1954

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 3 (a) of the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) There shall not be issued more than 385 special nonquota immigrant visas under this act; except that there may be issued not more than an additional 350 such special nonquota immigrant visas during a period beginning on the effective date of this act, as amended, and ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That special nonquota immigrant visas, without regard to the numerical limitations of this section, may be issued to the wives and children of the aliens who are found eligible for special nonquota immigrant visas under the provisions of this act or who were admitted under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306) or the act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50) if they are accompanying or following to join such aliens, and are otherwise eligible to receive immigrant visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That the marriage is found to have occurred prior to the effective date of this act.'

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 4. An alien shall not be ineligible to receive a visa and excludable from admission into the United States under the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182) (a) solely by reason of a single conviction of an offense or offenses each of which, if committed in the United States, would be a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, and for which the aggregate penalty actually imposed was imprisonment not to exceed 6 months or a fine not to exceed $500, or both; or (b) solely by reason of the admission of the commission of an offense or offenses or the commission of acts constituting the essential elements of an offense or offenses each of which, if committed in the United States, would be a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment not

to exceed 1 year: *Provided*, That the determination whether an offense or offenses committed outside the United States would, if committed in the United States, be classifiable as a misdemeanor or misdemeanors punishable by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year shall be based not on the applicable foreign law but on the provisions of the United States Code, and whenever such code fails to define an offense or offenses comparable to those committed, on the provisions of the criminal code of the District of Columbia: *Provided, however*, That no alien who was convicted of more than one offense or has admitted the commission of more than one offense or the commission of acts constituting the essential elements of more than one offense shall be eligible to receive a visa and admissible to the United States unless in the opinion of the consular officer at the time of application for a visa, and in the opinion of the Attorney General at the time of application for admission, the entry of such alien into the United States would not be contrary to the public interest.'

"SEC. 3. A new section 5 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (66 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5. On and after July 1, 1956, the quotas proclaimed under the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be subject to the provisions of the act of June 25, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009; 64 Stat. 219; 65 Stat. 96) or Sec. 201 (e) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 176), or of the Act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306), or the act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50).'

"SEC. 4. A new section 6 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. The provisions of law relating to the deportation of aliens on the ground that they were excludable at the time of entry as aliens who had obtained visas by fraud or misrepresentation or as aliens who were not of the nationality specified in their visas shall not apply to an otherwise admissible alien, admitted to the United States between December 22, 1945, and November 1, 1954, both dates inclusive, who misrepresented his place of birth, identity, or residence in applying for a visa if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the misrepresentation (a) was predicated upon the fact that the alien had reasonable grounds to fear repatriation to his former residence or homeland where he would be persecuted because of race, religion, or political opinions, and (b) was not committed for the purpose of evading the quota restrictions of immigration laws or an investigation of the alien at the place of his former residence or elsewhere.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding any provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163), the total of all quota numbers established under section 201 of that act (66 Stat. 175) which remain unused at the end of each fiscal year shall be distributed among the several quota areas in the proportion which the quota for each quota area bears to the annual quota of all quota areas combined.

"(b) No quota numbers distributed under subsection (a) of this section shall be distributed to quota areas which, under the proclamation of the President of the United States issued on July 1, 1952, have been allocated an annual quota in excess of 7,000 quota numbers.

"(c) The Secretary of State shall, at the end of each fiscal year, determine the amount of quota numbers available for distribution under subsection (a) of this section for each quota area. The Secretary of State shall proclaim the number thereof on or before October 1 following the end of each fiscal year. The quota numbers so determined and proclaimed by the Secretary of State shall be available for use in accordance with all the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163) relative to the eligibility for and the issuance of immigrant visas during the ensuing 12-month period, beginning October 1, and ending September 30, of the year immediately following.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General are hereby authorized, in their discretion and on a basis of reciprocity, pursuant to such regulations as they may severally prescribe, to waive the requirement of fingerprinting specified in sections 221 (b) and 262 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 191, 224), respectively, in the case of any nonimmigrant alien.

"SEC. 7. A new section 8 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (67 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. Not more than 1,200 aliens who are otherwise eligible to receive visas and admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act may be issued visas and be admitted to the United States. Irrespective of the fact that they are found ineligible to receive visas or inadmissible to the United States under section 212 (a) (6) of that act as far as it relates to aliens afflicted with tuberculosis: *Provided*, That the admission of each such alien shall be under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose and that in the case of each such alien a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act: *Provided further*, That such alien is the spouse, child, or adopted child of a United States citizen, or is a member of a family unit consisting of persons previously admitted to the United States for permanent residence, or qualified applicants for visas under the provisions of section 5 (b) of this act or the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 100; 68 Stat. 1044).'

"SEC. 8. Section 323 of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Any such adopted child (1) one of whose adoptive parents is (A) a citizen of the United States, (B) in the employment of the Government of the United States, or of an American institution of research recognized as such by the Attorney General, or of an American firm or corporation engaged in whole or in part in the development of foreign trade and commerce of the United States, or a subsidiary thereof, or of a public international organization in which the United States participates by treaty or statute, or of a religious denomination having a bona fide organization with the United States, and (C) regularly stationed abroad in such employment, and (2) who is in the United States at the time of naturalization, and (3) whose citizen adoptive parent declares before the naturalization court in good faith an intention to have such child take up residence within the United States immediately upon the termination of such employment abroad of such citizen adoptive parent, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws except that no prior residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or within the jurisdiction of the naturalization court or proof thereof shall be required.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out '4,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '9,000,' and (2) by striking out '10 years' and inserting in lieu thereof '14 years.'

"(b) Section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Any visa issued under this section to any eligible orphan who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service or business.'

"SEC. 10. Section 101 (b) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 171; 8 U. S. C. 1101 (b) (1)) is hereby amended by adding an additional subparagraph reading as follows:

"'(D) an illegitimate child, by, through whom, or on whose behalf a status, privilege or benefit is sought by virtue of the relationship of the child to its natural mother.'

"SEC. 11. Section 203 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 178; 8 U. S. C. 1153) is amended by striking the last word of paragraph 1 of said subsection and inserting in lieu thereof, the following: 'or following to join him.'

"SEC. 12. (a) Special nonquota immigrant visas allotted for issuance to aliens specified in sections 2, 4, and 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 400; 68 Stat. 1044), which remain unissued on January 1, 1957, may be issued to such aliens by consular officers as defined in section 101 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 167), within the numerical limitations prescribed in each of the several paragraphs of section 4 and in section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, except that geographical limitations pertaining to residence of such aliens and to the place of issuance of visas as such limitations appear in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, shall not apply to the aliens specified therein: *Provided*, That such alien is found to be eligible to be issued an immigrant visa and to be admitted to the United States under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided* further, That all special nonquota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under this act, shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 191): *And provided further*, That a quota number is not available to such alien at the time of his application for a visa.

"(b) Nothing in this act shall be held to extend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (66 Stat. 174; 68 Stat. 1044), and nothing in this act shall be held to authorize the issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas in excess of the number provided in section 3 of that act.

"(c) Aliens receiving visas under this act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 230).

"SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(a) any alien admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant under the provisions of either section 101 (a) (15) (A) or 101 (a) (15) (G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, who has failed to maintain a status under either of those provisions, and who has not been required to depart from the United States under the authority of section 241 (e) of said act, may apply to the Attorney General for adjustment of his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"(b) if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the alien is a person of good moral character, and that such action would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, the At-

torney General, in his discretion, may record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the order of the Attorney General approving the application for adjustment of status is made.

"(c) a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such adjustment of status. Such reports shall be submitted on the 1st and 15th day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session. If, during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the adjustment of status of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon require the departure of such alien in the manner provided by law. If neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives passes such a resolution within the time above specified, the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of his entry, reduce by one the quota of the quota area to which the alien is chargeable under section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act for the fiscal year then current or the next following year in which a quota is available. No quota shall be so reduced by more than 50 percent in any fiscal year.

"(d) the definitions in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 166, 171; 8 U. S. C. 1101 (a) and (b)), shall be applicable in the administration of this section.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An act to amend the act of September 3, 1954, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is the Senate now considering House bill 6888?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the majority leader speaks in a rather low voice, and it was difficult to hear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is the situation. We are considering Calendar No. 2249, H. R. 6888. Furthermore, there is at the desk the unanimous-consent agreement, which has been entered into, regarding the consideration of House bill 6888. In addition, the Senator from Illinois has offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to House bill 6888. We have a unanimous-consent agreement regarding consideration of the bill, namely, 30 minutes to each side on each amendment or motion, and 1 hour to each side on the bill. Is not that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], will control the time in opposition to the amendment; and the Senator from Texas will control the time available to those who favor the amendment, inasmuch as the Senator from Texas favors the amendment. Is not that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are on the calendar two bills dealing with this subject matter, one of which was introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. That bill contains two provisions, one relating to orphans, and the other relating to misrepresentation cases. That bill was pending; and it was to that bill that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] submitted his 200-page amendment and also another amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has the amendment the Senator from Illinois submitted been printed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is in mimeographed form.

Mr. EASTLAND. In other words, it is something cooked up, and not even printed, and not given committee consideration, but just offered on the last day, here on the floor; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall comment on that in a moment, Mr. President.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is another measure dealing with this subject matter, namely, House bill 6888, which is commonly known as the sheepherders bill. When that bill was passed by the House of Representatives some time ago, it contained not only a provision with respect to an increase in the number of nonquota sheepherders and their wives and children, but also quite a number of amendments to the Refugee Act and the Nationality Act. That is the bill the majority leader has called up at this time; and to that bill I have offered the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The substitute embraces both of the provisions of the bill of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], which has been laid aside. The substitute also embraces both of the provisions of House bill 6888; and, in addition, there are some other provisions which I shall undertake to explain.

By way of prelude, let me say that I am not insensible to the fact that this whole immigration problem is highly controversial, and that the cleavages are sharp, indeed. I was not the initiator of this effort; it has been going on for some time.

There have been quite a number of conferences, both formal and informal, with respect to some kind of an immigration bill.

Mr. President, I am a realist; and I am sensible of the fact that there are certain things the House of Representatives will accept, and there are certain things the House of Representatives will not accept. So the question is, Should we, in our efforts to get a whole loaf, finally reject any bread if we can get it?

Mr. President, I shall not let the figures stand in the way. I know that an argument can be made on figures on the Nationality Act and on the Refugee Relief Act. But I am also sensible of the fact that there are some human values involved, and I wish to be helpful, if I can.

The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has at one time or another offered the President's program. I have grave doubt—and I think others have grave doubt—that that program can at this session, and ostensibly on the last day, be consummated.

So the substitute now before us is the work which has been done by quite a number of persons. I sat in on some of the conferences; the Senator from Utah sat in; the distinguished Senator from Mississippi sat in.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Let us get the facts on that matter. It was the day before yesterday, was it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I think it was.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I brought up the matter on one or two occasions in the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I had some doubts that any action would be taken on any matter relating to immigration.

But, as I have indicated, in view of the difficulties of the bills which have been reported by the House committee and by the Senate committee, the desire to have some legislation in this field enacted, in order to meet certain emergency situations, is finally reflected in the substitute which now is before the Senate.

The substitute contains 13 sections. Let me see whether I can, within brief compass, explain each one of the sections.

The first section of the substitute is the sheepherder section. It would add an additional 350 nonquota numbers for sheepherders, and then also would make provision for their wives and children.

Mr. President, I know nothing about sheepherders. I understand that the Basques, who are identified here, are excellent sheepherders; and the people from the Western States have made clamor, month in and month out, that something be done to ease the restrictions, so that an additional number of these experienced, professional sheepherders can be brought into the country.

Section 2 is commonly referred to as the "loaf of bread" section. That simply means this: What is a felony in a foreign country might be a misdemeanor here. But if it is a felony under foreign law, it would preclude anyone from coming into the United States. This section provides that the case shall be decided on the basis of what our law defines as a felony or a misdemeanor; and if there has been a misdemeanor, such as a traffic violation, it would not stand in the way of issuance of a visa to someone who might make application in a foreign country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would rather continue this description. When I conclude it I shall be glad to yield. I wish to describe the various sections.

Mr. THYE. My observation relates to the question of the "loaf of bread." I thought I could make a contribution which would clinch the argument.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. THYE. There was a case in which a displaced person was refused entry into

the United States. She was qualified in every other respect, except that she had been known to take a loaf of bread when her babies were starving, and because of that fact of taking a loaf of bread she was denied the right to enter the United States. That is what is meant by the "loaf of bread" section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is entirely correct, and eloquently expressed. There may have been occasions when there were two misdemeanors under our law, but this section provides that the American consul and the Attorney General shall determine, in such cases, whether the applicant may come into the country.

The third section of the amendment is the one which lifts the mortgages on the quotas under the Displaced Persons Act. When the Displaced Persons Act was passed a number of years ago it provided that one-half the quotas of the countries affected should be mortgaged, so that the number who came in would be charged to the quota. The net result was that the Greek quota under the Displaced Persons Act was mortgaged up to the year 2017. The Lithuanian quota was mortgaged up to the year 2090. The Latvian quota was mortgaged up to the year 2274.

Section 3 simply lifts that mortgage. Its net effect would be that an additional 8,000 quota numbers would be available.

The fourth section is what is known as the misrepresentation section.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator means 8,000 a year, does he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The fourth section deals with the cases of misrepresentation. Certain persons got into this country, perhaps as refugees, escapees, expellees, or displaced persons, and then it was discovered that they had falsified the data in connection with their passports in order that they might not be sent back to a country or an area where they would be under persecution. There are a good many thousands of such people here, and they are subject to deportation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator stated that the Senator from Mississippi was in conference with respect to this amendment day before yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The fact is that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Mississippi were called in and shown, for the first time, this substitute, and we were informed that it would be offered as an amendment to the sheepherders' bill. We were not conferred with. We were not asked what our opinion was. There was no negotiation. We were simply called in and notified of what was to be done. Is not that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so. I was in the same situation. That was the first time I saw the amendment. I think we can call those meetings conferences. There was no negotiation. It was all done on a very informal basis. I am in the same position as is my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Speaking of conferences, is it not a fact that the items in the substitute were discussed by Members on both sides of the aisle, not merely for 2 days, but discussed informally over a period of weeks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, I so advised the Judiciary Committee one morning, after I had left the Appropriations Committee. I advised the committee that there was under consideration something in the nature of an omnibus bill, which would include a good many of these emergent provisions.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator informed the committee was that a bill would be agreed to by the chairman of our Subcommittee on Immigration and by the Judiciary Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Illinois was guilty of an inadvertence at that time in his rather feeble choice of language. But I did say that there were discussions in progress, in the hope that some kind of an agreement could be arrived at.

Mr. EASTLAND. I want the RECORD to show that the Senator from Mississippi has never agreed to this proposal, and has never been consulted about the wisdom of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is correct. I never consulted him about it. If others did, that is something that would not be known to me.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In order that the RECORD may be clear, is it not a fact that these discussions have been going on all during the 84th Congress, in an effort to arrive at some sound basis on which agreement could be reached, to clarify the law and remove some of the inequities which exist in the present immigration law?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is correct. It is only a good-will effort on the part of everyone to try to find something on which we can agree. If we cannot agree here, or if there can be no agreement as between the House and Senate, obviously nothing will be consummated.

Section 5 relates to the redistribution——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator was discussing section 4. I do not think he quite finished his description.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Section 4 relates to cases of misrepresentation. In every such case, in which documents and data are misrepresented, the Attorney General must be satisfied.

Section 5 deals with redistribution. It deals with the unused quota numbers at the end of the fiscal year, under the Nationality Act. It applies to those countries whose quotas are less than 7,000 a year.

The total number involved here would be, roughly, 18,224. There is no mystery about that number. It is arrived at in the following manner:

In the year 1955, the whole number of immigrants who might come in for permanent residence under the Nationality Act was estimated at 154,657. However, 61,629 of those numbers were not used. That is roughly about 40 percent. So in the case of countries which have quotas of less than 7,000, we take 40 percent of their quota, and that is the number they can get out of the whole reservoir of unused numbers.

Take Italy as an example. Italy would normally have a quota of 5,645. Forty percent of that number is 2,249. So out of the new quota numbers, she would be entitled to 2,249 if she undertook to use them. So when we put the figures together and apply them to all the countires involved we arrive at a figure of 18,224.

I should point out, Mr. President, that this is a permanent addition to the Nationality Act. This is not for 1 year; this will go on; there will be a continuous redistribution of the quota numbers which are not used. Actually it will apply to 82 quota areas. Fifty-nine of those areas would get only 40.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate continue with the consideration of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The country which would get the largest number out of this arrangement would be Poland, with 1,285. The second would be Italy, with 1,247. The third would be Sweden, with 1,313. The Netherlands would be fourth, with 1,250. That is section 5.

I know that there is controversy about it. However, I wanted to explain how the figure was arrived at and what the total number would be so far as the persons involved were concerned.

Section 6 is the fingerprint section. Many countries are extremely sensitive about the fingerprint requirement. When it was first drawn, it was quite different from the section that appears in the present act. What the proposal does is to give the Secretary of State and the Attorney General the right, on a reciprocal basis, to prescribe regulations with respect to fingerprinting.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry I cannot yield at the moment. I must go forward until I have finished.

Section 7 relates to tubercular cases, but only where they involve a family unit, or where a family might be torn asunder if one member were afflicted with tuberculosis. The number that can come in is 1,200. The application of the section would be controlled by the Attorney General and by the Surgeon General, and a bond must be given. There is a proviso in that section to the effect that it will apply only in connection with a family unit. A father and

mother and two children might want to come to this country, but one child might be tubercular, or the mother might be tubercular. Obviously the others would not come here and let one member of the family remain over there. This matter has been under consideration for a long time. I talked about it to the officials in Europe when I was over there last year. They pointed to a good deal of hardship that is involved because of the rather restrictive provision of the existing law.

Section 8 related to adopted children, and provides for their more expeditious naturalization, so that no prior residence would be required. To be sure, they must be identified with people who are over there for an American institution or corporation, or an international organization recognized by us, or on some other basis which gives some justification for the action.

Section 9 relates to orphans under the Refugee Act. It would add 5,000 to the number and increase the age from 10 to 14.

Section 10 relates to illegitimate children. The statute today contains a definition of a child. The child must be either a legitimate child or a stepchild or a child who might be legitimatized by law. Section 10 adds to the definition in the basic act the wording "illegitimate child as it relates to the natural mother."

Section 11 refers to what I would call preferred cases. Section 203 of the basic act, in referring to spouses or children of an immigrant, requires that they accompany him. This section adds the words "or following to join him."

Section 12 relates to the unissued nonquota visas under the Refugee Act. There are some 40,000 of those, as I recall, and this section would make it possible to take care of them, and to eliminate the geographical limitation, but those numbers would still be available for issuance.

Section 13 was suggested in committee by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. It relates to diplomatic personnel who may have lost their status under existing law. This section provides that such personnel may apply to the Secretary of State and then to the Attorney General for an adjustment of status, with the requirement that there be a report to Congress, and that Congress may, by resolution of either House, reject any report the Attorney General may submit.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Those are the 13 sections of the substitute bill we have before us. I first yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I noted what the Senator said with respect to the conferences which were held. They were very informal conferences; were they not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. They were held for the purpose of determining if it was possible to get some legislation out of the situation which had developed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I had introduced the President's program in four bills, which have been printed and are at the desk. I had proposed at that time that I might offer them to a pending measure, the so-called sheepherder's bill. However, I wanted to make sure that the conferences were informal and that they occurred on both sides, in an attempt to get something out of the situation that would help a human being. It may not be good politics, but it is good for people who are waiting to come to this country under the Refugee Act, and we should remove some of the restrictions which have proved to be rather impractical in administering the so-called Walter-McCarran Act. We wanted to do it in the interest of people. Is that not correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. I may say, in behalf of my distinguished friend from Utah, that he made a valiant and heroic attempt to advance the President's whole program. I believe he was forebearing indeed, when we take into account, in the late days of the session, the difficulties that develop in connection with adjustments which must be made in the Senate and between the Senate and the House. Therefore, to meet some of the emergency situations the distinguished Senator from Utah has made a great contribution, indeed.

Mr. WATKINS. Later I shall discuss some of the phases of the proposed legislation which I have offered, and compare them with the pending proposed legislation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Illinois has permitted me to be a cosponsor of the amendment, and I wish to congratulate him upon his very able presentation of this complicated subject. I regret very much that it has been necessary to omit many of the reforms in the immigration laws which have been so strongly urged by the President of the United States ever since he has been in office. I supported all the reforms which he has recommended and for which the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Illinois have so ardently fought. There is comfort in this bill for families, many of whom are in my State. I was glad to hear the Senator from Illinois point out the favorable effect of section 5 of the bill upon immigration from Poland and from Italy and from Sweden, for example. I am very happy that, while the pending proposal does not provide nearly the amount of relief which should be provided in connection with the unused-quota problem, it does definitely——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators who desire to converse will retire to the cloakroom. Senators will take their seats.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I merely wish to complete my sentence by saying that this is a modest but a definite step in the right direction, and I am very happy that we can have the feeling, at the close of Congress, that we have taken some action to relieve the harshness of existing law. I hope we can come back and continue the fight for reasonable and proper changes in the McCarran-Walter Act, so as to get rid of the quota problem and enrich our population by uniting families and bringing families together which have been separated by the harshness of the existing law.

I thank very much the Senator from Illinois for his great contribution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Illinois will explain further the practical application of section 12 with reference to a number of other laws. Will the Senator explain what it means as to applicants from Greece, Italy, and Spain? I mean, with reference to unused quotas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The general effect of the provision would be to permit the issuance indefinitely of visas to eligible aliens under the various categories of refugees, escapees, and so forth, within the numerical limitations set for each category, but such issuance would be by consular officers under the regular provisions of the act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. With reference to section 5 which reallocates a portion of the unused visas, what is the practical effect when it is considered in respect to section 12?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Section 5 is actually an amendment to the nationality act and is permanent legislation. It would increase in accordance with the unused quota numbers, so that the number would reach doubtless the total allowed under the origins act, namely, 154,000-plus, if all the numbers were used.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As has been pointed out, a large number of visas are now pending in Greece and Italy. What application would this have in the case of Greece?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Taking the 1955 figures, about 40 percent of the quota numbers were unused. They would be distributed among those countries that have a quota of less than 7,000.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have a list of the additional immigrants who would be able to come to this country under section 5. Is the Senator familiar with this document, which is entitled "Explanation of the Effect of the Proposed Section 5—Redistribution of Unused Quotas"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mentioned a moment ago that it applies to 89 areas, 59 of which would get 40, and some others, of course, would get a larger number.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would the Senator have any objection if I should ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not at all. I should be glad to ask such consent myself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the list to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED SECTION 5 (REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED QUOTAS)

In the fiscal year 1955, for which complete statistical data are available, 61,629 quota numbers remained unused.

The sum total of all quotas under 7,000 is 45,726 annually.

Under the formula devised in the proposed section 5, the additional numbers will be arrived at by calculating the percentage in which each quota under 7,000 participates in the total annual quota. Consequently, only 18,224 visas would be available for redistribution in the fiscal year 1956, and the effect, in numbers, will be as follows:

Country	Annual quota	Additional numbers
Afghanistan	100	40
Albania	100	40
Andorra	100	40
Arabian Peninsula	100	40
Asia-Pacific Triangle	100	40
Australia	100	40
Austria	1,405	560
Belgium	1,297	517
Bhutan	100	40
Bulgaria	100	40
Burma	100	40
Cambodia	100	40
Cameroons (British)	100	40
Cameroun (French)	100	40
Ceylon	100	40
China	100	40
Chinese	105	42
Czechoslovakia	2,859	1,139
Danzig	100	40
Denmark	1,175	468
Egypt	100	40
Estonia	115	45
Ethiopia	100	40
Finland	566	225
France	3,069	1,223
Greece	308	122
Hungary	865	344
Iceland	100	40
India	100	40
Indonesia	100	40
Iran	100	40
Iraq	100	40
Israel	100	40
Italy	5,645	2,249
Japan	185	74
Jordan	100	40
Korea	100	40
Laos	100	40
Latvia	235	93
Lebanon	100	40
Liberia	100	40
Libya	100	40
Liechtenstein	100	40
Lithuania	384	153
Luxembourg	100	40
Monaco	100	40
Morocco	100	40
Muscat (Oman)	100	40
Nauru	100	40
Nepal	100	40
Netherlands	3,136	1,250
New Guinea	100	40
New Zealand	100	40
Norway	2,364	942
Pacific Islands (trust territory)	100	40
Pakistan	100	40
Palestine (Arab Palestine)	100	40
Philippines	100	40
Poland	6,488	2,585
Portugal	438	174
Rhuanda-Urundi	100	40
Rumania	289	115
Samoa	100	40
San Marino	100	40
Saudi Arabia	100	40
Somaliland	100	40
South West Africa	100	40
Spain	250	100
Sweden	3,295	1,313
Switzerland	1,698	676
Syria	100	40
Tanganyika	100	40
Thailand (Siam)	100	40
Togoland (French)	100	40
Togoland (British)	100	40
Trieste, Free Territory of	100	40
Turkey	225	89
Union of South Africa	100	40
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,697	1,075
Vietnam	100	40
Yemen	100	40
Yugoslavia	933	371
Total	45,726	18,224

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois understand that the figures are correct with respect to the additional numbers set forth opposite the names of the various countries involved?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand so. I did not make the compilation, but I understand that it is correct.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Utah. I personally favor the recommendations originally proposed by President Eisenhower. I was opposed to the McCarran-Walter Act; I am sorry the bill before us does not go further than it does; but I wish to say that we are at least moving toward the kind of corrections in the act that are so badly needed. I am grateful to the two Senators for what they have done in bringing out this compromise, and I shall be glad to support the measure.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that this is a very complicated matter we have before us at this time, and I think the Senator from Illinois agreed with that statement.

We have an entirely new bill presented on the floor of the Senate, on the last day of the session, something which our committee has not gone into at all, so far as the amendment is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. In justice to the chairman of the committee, I wish to say that the two sections of the Langer bill and the two sections of the sheepherder bill did have consideration by the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this substitute has not been printed and has not been distributed to the Members of the Senate for their information. Is not that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The staff of the Immigration Subcommittee had nothing to do with the preparation of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not so far as I know.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Immigration Subcommittee and the Judiciary Committee had nothing to do with considering it; did they?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Officially, I am sure they did not.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from Illinois think that is the proper way to legislate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have drawn freely, however, on staff members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am in a peculiar position today. I control the time in opposition to the bill, although I expect to support the bill and to support the amendment. I believe I have a priority of obligation to those who may be opposing either the bill or the amendment, and after they have had time in which to present their views, I shall be glad to yield to those on the other side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] may desire.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation to the Senator from Mississippi. I realize that the course of action now being pursued is not in conformity with the usual procedure which we have known and recognized in this body, but it is equally true that the question of immigration and the adjustment of our immigration and naturalization laws have been with us ever since I came to the Congress, which has been a period of about 6 years. The subject was discussed before I came to the Congress.

I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if the staff of his committee is wholly unfamiliar with the provisions of the proposed amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. The staff is here. It was not discussed with me until the day before yesterday.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was discussed with me the day before yesterday, and I was told that this bill would be introduced.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I could hardly hear what the Senator from Mississippi was saying, but I have discussed the subject with staff members many times.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say what I said in any spirit of criticism at all. I hope the chairman of the committee will find it in his heart to look with a sense of tolerance upon what we are trying to do this afternoon. We recognize the fact that only a certain number of persons can come into our country from some other countries. There is a limit as to how far we can go. We realize that it is a complicated proposition and that it takes a great deal of time, but the problems raised by the amendment are nothing strange or new to the members of the Judiciary Committee. It is a very modest measure. It is not wholly acceptable to me, but I am perfectly willing to accept it and even to become a cosponsor of it, because I think it is a wholesome step in the right direction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] may be permitted to become a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. If this is such an intricate matter, such a complex matter, such a wholly strange matter; if we cannot find it in our hearts and in our consciences to accept it; then I shall not be too critical. But I do not think

that is the reason at all. Let us look at the matter objectively.

Eighty different countries are involved. Let us begin with the Nation at the top of the list—Afghanistan. Afghanistan is entitled to 100 as an annual quota. It is being allowed an additional 40 of an unused quota. If Senators will merely examine the list, within a period of two minutes they will understand the entire purpose of the amendment.

I plead with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to look upon the amendment with tolerance and to see if in his heart and mind he cannot accept it and go along with it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this is a matter which the Senate will determine.

Mr. PASTORE. I know; but the Senator from Mississippi, I understand, is aiming to oppose it on the ground that he has not had time to study it.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I have a speech I will make in my own time, in which I shall state the grounds on which I oppose the amendment. The Senator's understanding is not one of them. I have had time to study the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Mississippi oppose the amendment because his committee has not studied it, or because he disagrees with the amendment in substance?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall speak to the amendment in my own time.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that, but I have asked the question of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi as respectfully as I can ask it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The President has made certain recommendations in the field of modernizing, liberalizing, and reforming the immigration laws. A number of Democrats have introduced bills along the same line. Bills are pending in the House which would correct some inequities inadvertently created by the McCarran-Walter Act.

In an attempt to find a solution, in an attempt to find a meeting ground, the majority leader some time ago asked the staff of the policy committee to review the situation with the members of the staff of the House committee. Subsequently the subject was reviewed with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to shape our thoughts, our views, and our proposals in this field.

The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] was quite reluctant to withdraw from the program which he embraced. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had very strong feelings concerning his own bill. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] had their own views on proposed immigration legislation.

Finally, after meeting with each group individually, it was my opinion—and the minority leader shared the opinion—that it would be agreeable to all concerned for the pending proposal to be brought before the Senate. It was the feeling of the majority leader and the minority leader that the proposal would appeal to a majority of the Senate.

I must frankly say that until this morning I thought it was agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Apparently we are in complete misunderstanding about that.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] agreed that the bill should be brought up; but we certainly have not agreed to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A unanimous-consent agreement was entered the other day. Some time was spent by the staff, with the chairman of the committee, with the Senator from Indiana, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the majority leader. After reviewing all the problems and going over the bill with the members of the committee who were present, it was agreed that the sheepherders bill would be brought up, that this amendment would be offered, and a vote would be taken on it.

This morning I learned that there is objection to a certain section. I understand the Senator from Indiana intends to offer an amendment to strike from the bill the section which permits the redistribution of the quotas.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are in full agreement that, with the exception of section 5, the bill should pass.

Mr. JENNER. Absolutely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was informed by the Senator from Indiana a few minutes ago that he intended to insist on doing so. I urged him not to do so. He has told me that he intends to offer an amendment to strike from the bill the section which permits the distribution of unused quota. We shall have to vote on that.

I hope that amendment will not be offered. I hope that if it is offered, it will not be accepted. If it is accepted, I think we shall have practically no legislation.

I trust that a majority of the Senate will go along with the very modest, moderate approach which is made in this proposal.

I may say to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that until a few minutes ago I had entertained the thought that even the chairman of the committee would go along with the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Mississippi will give some reconsideration to that thought. The very crux of the bill is section 5. Without it, the bill would be nothing more than a shell or a mockery. After all, the purpose of bringing up the bill was to bring about a moderate liberalization of the law, within the quotas which are already permitted under existing law, which are unused by certain nations, and then only to the extent of 40 percent.

I had nothing to do with the negotiations and knew nothing about the bill until this very morning, when I was given a copy of it. I am not wholly satisfied with the liberality of the bill, but I am willing to go along and become a cosponsor of it.

I may say to the Senator from Indiana that I have strong feelings on the subject, as I know he has in the opposite direction. But he must understand that many of us who are asking a liberalization of the law are now coming forward with a proposition which is moderate and reasonable.

I hoped we would not meet with obstinacy on the floor, to the point that either the bill would be gutted completely, or we would not have a bill at all. I do not think that is fair, under the circumstances. I think we have made our case.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. JENNER. Section 5 strikes out the very basis of the national origins quota system which has been followed by the United States since 1925.

Congress has only recently passed a new law, which required 5 years of study. The bill under consideration has never been considered. It has not been printed. It strikes at the very basis of the national origins quota system, our whole immigration structure.

The Senator from Rhode Island says there would be nothing in the bill with section 5 deleted from it. The Senator is wrong. The bill would take care of sheepherders, orphans, tubercular persons, the fingerprint question, the education and crime aspects, and many other phases. It is a good bill; it should be passed; I am for it. At this late hour, in the session, this is the only kind of legislation which should be enacted. At this late hour the whole immigration system should not be destroyed. I object to section 5. That is the only section to which I object.

I am reliably informed that unless section 5 is stricken from the bill, the House will not act on the measure.

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot speak for the House. I gained the impression this morning that the matter had been discussed with the leadership of the House, and that apparently there may be some likelihood of agreement on this point.

But I come back to the argument made by the Senator from Indiana that the bill would destroy the very basic policy of our quota system.

Mr. JENNER. Yes, it would.

Mr. PASTORE. I challenge that statement. We are not changing the figures in the origins formula; all we are saying is that if certain nations are not using their quotas, we will take 40 percent of those who are invited to come but do not come and add them to the numbers of the desperate people who would very much like to come to the United States.

What is so un-American about that? What is so inhumane about it? What is there about it which distorts the basic concept of freedom that we enjoy in this country?

Mr. JENNER. I will try to to explain it to the Senator when I obtain the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I recall the Senator's attention to a fact, concerning which I think he will agree with me. The quota this year is still based on the

1920 census. Where the Senator from Rhode Island and I come from, the census figures have changed so much that if the 1950 census were used, it would help us.

Mr. PASTORE. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that even that situation is not being disturbed. We are not saying it is necessary to add to the quotas of countries that want to send their nationals to the United States. If such nations have filled their quotas, the law does not apply. For those who are eligible to come and who do come, section 5 does not apply. It applies only in the instances where the quotas are not used by certain nations to the extent of 40 percent. I think it is a very moderate improvement. I do not see why there should be so much objection to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Rhode Island and I are in agreement, I am sure, that the 1950 census is a much fairer and more up-to-date census, from our point of view, than is the 1920 census. The law is based on the 1920 census, not on the 1950 census. Therefore, section 5 is of help to us and our communities, because of the great change in the status of the population which has taken place between 1920 and 1950.

Mr. PASTORE. I wanted to resolve the proposition of the amendment without going into the aspect which the Senator from Massachusetts has mentioned. Otherwise, I think we would get into a controversy where there are differences, and sincere differences, on both sides, and we would not get anywhere. But I say the amendment is harmless, and I do not think its rejection could be predicated upon the argument that we have not had a chance to study it. I do not think the amendment is that difficult. I think fundamentally it is a question of whether a Senator is or is not in favor of it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Under the proposal it would not be possible for any more persons to come into the country than we are willing to accept. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. That is true.

Mr. KENNEDY. It also provides that if Great Britain or Ireland do not use their quotas, their quotas would be assigned to countries in which there are long waiting lists, and particularly where there are relatives of persons in this country waiting to come here.

Mr. PASTORE. Such persons would be admitted only in proportion to the amount of unused quotas.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me, and I now yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains on each side on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the opposition has 30 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time been used by the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time does the distinguished Senator from Mississippi desire?

Mr. EASTLAND. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, section 5 of the bill is an amendment to our basic immigration law. It is an amendment to the McCarran-Walter Act. Four or five years ago the Senate enacted that bill into law, over the veto of the President of the United States, and I cannot see any use in our marching back down the hill and taking a step that will weaken the basic immigration law of the United States.

Mr. President, our immigration and nationality laws prescribe an empirical formula to regulate the flow of aliens coming to this country for permanent residence from Europe. This empirical formula, free so far as possible from political pressures, is designed to regulate the flow of aliens from each of the European countries in a fair proportion to the number of persons in the United States from such country. May I pause to comment here, Mr. President, that this principle, known as the national origins formula, is designed not only to assure maximum assimilation of the quota immigrants whom we receive for permanent residence, but more important, it is designed to preserve and protect our American traditions, our American institutions, our American way of life, which, in the final analysis, are but reflections of the ideologies of the people who are Americans. This principle is so important, that I should like to read an excerpt from the report of the congressional committee which accompanied the law establishing the national origins formula:

> Since it is the axiom of political science that government not imposed by external force is the visible expression of the ideals, standards, and social viewpoint of the people over which it rules, it is obvious that a change in the character or composition of the population must inevitably result in the evolution of a form of government consonant with the base upon which it rests. If, therefore, the principles of individual liberty, guarded by a constitutional government created on this continent nearly a century and a half ago, is to endure, the basic strain of our population must be maintained and our economic standards preserved.

The proposed substitute strikes three significant blows at the National Origins Quota System.

In the first place, Mr. President, the substitute provides for a redistribution of approximately 18,500 unused quotas annually to those countries having less than an annual allotment of 7,000 quotas. The net effect of this provision, Mr. President, is to change the cultural pattern of our immigration system from northern and western Europeans to southern and eastern Europeans. As a practical matter, it would also mean that quota numbers normally available only to countries of the free world would be allocated to many countries under Communist domination.

This substitute, with the exception of section 5, I think, is all right; but it must be remembered that if the amendment is adopted, the Communist countries will be the greatest beneficiaries.

The importance of this situation, Mr. President, is not merely academic. it goes to the heart of our Republic and our basic Christian ideals. Ours is a constitutional republic, built upon concepts stemming from cultures which reflect themselves in the historic composition of our population. If we transfer the pattern of our immigration to countries and peoples who have historically maintained a totalitarian concept of government, it will only be a matter of time until our Republic will veer from its traditions of freedom and democracy. But, Mr. President, the increase in our annual immigration and the transfer of the cultural pattern of that immigration would be brought about not only by the provision which I have just pointed out in the substitute bill, but also by two other provisions, namely, the provision in the substitute bill removing quota mortgages under the displaced persons law and the provisions of the substitute bill transferring unused quota numbers under the Refugee Relief Act for utilization under the general immigration law.

Mr. President, under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, approximately one-half million persons were brought into the United States from the low-quota countries of southern and eastern Europe. In order to maintain the principle of our national origins quota system, the law provided for mortgaging of the quotas to which these people would be properly chargeable, but no quotas were mortgaged more than 50 percent for any 1 year. The substitute would eliminate these mortgages, so that, in effect, we would be increasing, in the course of the next several years, the total immigration into the United States from the southern and eastern European countries in the amount of approximately one-half million. In other words, Mr. President, the safeguards which the Congress wrote into the Displaced Persons Act, in order to maintain on a long-range basis the cultural pattern of our immigration system, would be wiped out, and an additional one-half million people from southern and eastern Europe would be admitted into the United States.

Mr. President, I do not suggest that northern and western Europeans are better than southern and eastern Europeans, or that Europeans, as such, are better than Asiatics. However, our whole immigration system is based upon the concept that for maximum assimilation and for the maintenance of our traditional concepts of liberty, it is in the public interest for us to maintain in our immigration system a pattern proportional to the cultural composition of our population. This is aside from the numerical limitations of our immigration system which would be greatly expanded by the provisions of the substitute.

Mr. President, there is a third aspect of the substitute which contributes to the destruction of the basic provisions of our immigration system, namely, the provisions relating to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. Mr. President, as I shall develop in the course of my remarks, the term "Refugee Relief Act" is a clear misnomer. Under the provisions of that act, some 214,000 aliens were embraced either for admission or for adjustment of status. The original act passed in 1953 included not only refugees but also nonrefugee nationals, virtually all of whom were from the low-quota countries of southern and eastern Europe.

The Senate committee report on the refugee bill contained the following language:

The committee wishes to emphasize, however, that the overall quota stated in the bill is an upper limit and is not intended as a mandate to those who will have the responsibility of administering the act requiring them to achieve the number declared by the Congress to be the maximum.

The committee is further of the opinion that the bill in its amended form allows ample time for completion of the quotas stated in the bill and it wishes to go on record as not in favor of future extensions of this legislation.

It is specifically stated by the committee that none of the safeguards provided in this legislation and in the Immigration and Nationality Act are to be sacrificed or compromised in the slightest degree in the interest of moving people for the sake of fulfilling quotas or allotments. The committee further states that if on the expiration date of this legislation the maximum number of visas authorized to be issued has not in fact been issued, the committee will not be disposed to entertain petitions for further extensions of time in order to utilize any visa numbers which have not been used by the expiration date provided for in the legislation.

The statement of the managers on the part of the House, which accompanied the conference report on the refugee bill, contained the following language:

The conferees desire further to stress that this legislation constitutes in no way a mandate to issue, within the prescribed period of time, the full number of visas allocated under this legislation. These are, in each case, maximum limitations, not quotas to be filled. It is to be clearly understood that this bill offers opportunities to enter the United States to a certain number of eligible aliens but that no special effort should be made to evade any of the provisions of this act or the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to bring in such number or any number. Similarly, it is the unanimous consensus of the conferees that no efforts should be made to induce aliens to seek entry to the United States under this bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall yield, although my time is limited. Before yielding, I should like to address a question to the minority leader. I wish to ask him whether I can have additional time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I shall yield additional time to the Senator from Mississippi, either on the amendment or on the bill itself.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator from California.

Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Mississippi was discussing the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act; is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that the only provision of the pending amendment to which he objects is section 5, which he feels infringes upon the McCarran Act.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not like some of the other provisions of the amendment, but I would go along with them.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I understood.

Let me say that actually the bill itself provides that the administration of the Refugee Act shall cease on the day when the act expires. But some of the quotas would be given to certain groups, under certain categories, such as expellees and those of ethnic origin. Those who were expelled from behind the Iron Curtain; and also those who escaped from behind the Iron Curtain would be given additional time in which to make use of those provisions, not only in the case of those from Germany and Austria, but——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I yielded for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. I wished to make that point clear.

Mr. EASTLAND. Most of them would go to the nationals of those countries, of course.

Mr. WATKINS. The administration of the act ends on December 31, 1956; that is provided in the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, let the Senator from Utah speak in his own time.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall.

Mr. EASTLAND. A little over a year after passage of the original Refugee Relief Act, it became increasingly obvious that even within the refugee categories prescribed by the law, there just were not sufficient bona fide eligible applicants, notwithstanding the fact that in violation of the mandate of the Congress, administration officials were undertaking to induce every possible applicant to seek entry into the United States. The law was then—on August 31, 1954—amended so that nonrefugee nationals within each ethnic group could use the visas originally allocated to so-called refugees. The practical effect of the amendment was to make the Refugee Relief Act not an act for the relief of refugees, but a general immigration act which struck at the heart of our National Origins Quota System.

Mr. President, it is now proposed in the substitute that the 50-odd thousand unused visas originally allocated under the Refugee Relief Act shall be transferred and used under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Where, Mr. President, is the solemn pledge written into the reports of the committees which handled the Refugee Relief Act that there would be no future extensions of this legislation? Should we not tear the appealing refugee label from this legislative device to circumvent our basic immigration formula?

Mr. President, the net effect of the three provisions I have discussed is to increase immigration into the United States by about 600,000 aliens, all of whom would be coming out of proportion to the formula for the maintenance of the cultural pattern of our society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 5 additional minutes to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 more minutes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, the instant bill was designed to meet a particular, specialized problem, by providing for the admission of a limited number of sheepherders and their spouses, and to correct a slight administrative problem which has arisen in the administration of the law. The proposed substitute goes far beyond the original measure, for it would make drastic changes in our overall immigration laws, changes which certainly deserve more deliberation than can possibly be given by general discussion on the floor of the Senate. At least, these sweeping changes should be given calm, deliberate study by the appropriate committees of the Congress which would present each body of the Congress with detailed facts and recommendations.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive of passing a bill in the Senate on the last day of the session, in this fashion. The bill is mimeographed, and not printed. Copies are not made available to Senators. The provisions of the amendment are not available to Senators at this time. There are no copies on the desks of Senators. With the exception of section 5, the provisions are all right, but I think section 5 would emasculate the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I think this is an exceedingly poor way to legislate—to bring up a bill of this importance on what we hope will be the last day of the session, and ask Members of the Senate to vote on a proposal which they do not have the privilege of reading. I had assumed that there would be no legislation on the subject, inasmuch as it had not been brought up before this hour. I do not now even have the privilege of obtaining such information concerning the proposed substitute as I could get through my eyes, because I have no copy of the proposed substitute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time have we left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 11 minutes remaining on the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time does the Senator from Utah desire?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am in favor of the amendment, with the qualifications which I have mentioned. I should like to have some time on the

amendment, and to have some time on the bill itself.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like at least 20 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Utah 5 minutes on the amendment and 15 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the proponents of the amendment has been exhausted. The opponents have 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASTORE. How much time have we on the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Senator's side there are 43 minutes remaining on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I will yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Utah. At the end of that time we can decide how much further we can go.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, before entering into a general discussion, I should like to call attention to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] to the effect that the Communist nations would benefit most from section 5 of the amendment, and that the increased quotas would go to the benefit of the Communist nations.

That is not a factual statement, because if both the McCarran Act and the Refugee Act are properly enforced Communists cannot get into this country. In fact, the Refugee Act is much stronger in respect to security than is the McCarran Act.

People who can come in may be natives of Russia, but they are escapees, who escaped from behind the Iron Curtain at the risk of their lives. They may be expellees of German ethnic origin, who have been expelled from countries which have gone behind the Iron Curtain. So the statement of the Senator from Mississippi is not factually correct.

Before the pending amendment is adopted, I should like to explain to my colleagues, to the administration, and to the people of the Nation just why I am not insisting on the adoption of my amendments which lie on the desk and why I am, rather, supporting the pending substitute.

First, I wish it made clear that though this amendment does contain seven provisions similar to the President's program, they are not by any stretch of the imagination major enough to be called a fulfillment by Congress of the President's request for an effective program of revisions to the Immigration and Refugee Acts. But they do make for progress.

Mr. President, let us look at the record. Senate bill 2113 was introduced by me on May 31, 1955. It had for its purpose the amendment of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to make it more workable and to widen its scope. Hearings were held on the bill soon after its introduction, and it was reported to the Judiciary Committee without recommendation. Later it was recommitted to the subcommittee, and since that time there has been no action, although I have frequently urged that something be done about this matter. Anyone who knows the situation in the Judiciary Committee knows that there was very little opportunity to have it considered.

Mr. President, I voted for the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, known as the McCarran-Walter Act. That act has been on the books since 1952. Experience within the operation of the law has revealed the necessity for some modifications. Our place in the world as the leader of the free nations has also indicated that some changes in it would seem to be desirable. However, I believe it is sound policy to consider the needs of our own country first, and then to legislate in accordance with those needs. These needs, of course, include the cooperation with free nations of the world, in order to help preserve our liberties. In this troubled world and under the Communist threat that cooperation seems essential. At least, that has been the decision of the executive department and of the Congress. That goes for both the Eisenhower administration and the Truman administration. However, I know of no responsible official at this time who desires to open wide our gates to all of those who might want to come to our shores to make their homes.

Consistent with the approach I have just outlined, I have proposed to offer amendments to H. R. 6888, which would have carried out the President's recommendations with respect to immigration made earlier this year. Those amendments were divided by subject matter into four divisions. They were, in effect, the same language I used in the bills which I introduced, namely, Senate bills 3167, 3168, 3169, and 3170.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an analysis of those amendments, statements of what they intended to accomplish, and an explanation of them.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO H. R. 6888 (7-9-56—E), SAME AS S. 3167

SUBSTITUTION FOR PRIVATE RELIEF IMMIGRATION BILLS

The need

1. Private legislation ties up Congress and committee.

2. System inequitable because not all deserving cases are considered.

3. Congressional committee works through a staff. Staff does not investigate but obtains reports from executive agencies, chiefly Justice. Proposal gives powers to agencies, which now investigate selected cases for the Congress, to act directly on every deserving case. The proposal does not seek to cut off right of any Member of Congress to introduce a bill. It should materially reduce the number.

The bill

Classes Eligible

Veterans; husbands, wives, mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters of (a) citizens and (b) permanently admitted aliens; clergymen, missionaries, Brothers, and Sisters in religious sense of the term.

Charges Forgiven

Any ground of inadmissibility, except those relating to certain subversive classes, for aliens seeking to come to the United States; any ground of deportability for aliens already here.

How Administered

By the Attorney General in both cases. With respect to those outside the United States only upon recommendation of the Secretary of State or the United States consul abroad.

Limitations

Five thousand in any calendar year total of both classes. Reduction of a quota number for each case unless alien had previously used a quota number or was or is a nonquota alien. Attorney General must be of opinion in each case that action would not be contrary to national interest, safety, or security.

EXPLANATION OF AMEEDMENTS TO H. R. 6888 (7-9-56—D), SIMILAR TO S. 3168

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS BILL

Amends H. R. 6888 by adding the following new sections:

Section 4: Repeals paragraphs 16 and 17 of section 212 (a) of the act which relates to aliens who have been excluded or deported or removed from the United States. It eliminates requirements that they obtain permission from the Attorney General before they may apply for visas or for entry to the United States. It would also repeal section 276 of that same act which requires prosecution of such aliens who return without having complied with the permission requirement.

The requirement is archaic. It existed in law before present quota system became a part of the law. An applicant for admission or for a visa should be judged on his present eligibility to enter and there are adequate other safeguards to protect this Government without this requirement.

Section 5: Amends section 212 (d) (4) of the act which provides for a waiver of visas and passports for nonimmigrants on conditions, one of which is "on the basis of unforeseen emergency in individual cases." Removing the word "unforeseen" permits greater administrative latitude.

Section 6: Eliminates the requirement of inspecting and of applying all grounds of exclusion to aliens coming from Alaska and Hawaii to the mainland United States. By definition, these Territories are part of the United States. Aliens who are already in these Territories are subject to all the provisions of the act. If an alien was deportable before he came to the mainland he remains deportable. An additional exclusion order avails nothing in his case; unnecessarily delays travel and ties up inspecting manpower.

Section 7: Amends sections 221 (b) and 263 (a) of the act which require the fingerprinting of all aliens applying for visas, and all nonimmigrants who came to the United States without visas who have remained for 30 days or more. The proposal would amend these sections to permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General respectively to waive fingerprinting of nonimmigrant aliens. There would be no change in requirement that every person coming here to reside permanently must be fingerprinted. No need to gild the lily on various reasons which prompt this proposal.

Section 8: Amends section 236 (a) of the act by clarifying statutory authority for separating the role of hearing officer from that of the officer who presents the Government's case in the conduct of selected admissibility hearings. It removes any doubt as to the authority of the Immigration Service to separate these two functions where the Service deems it advisable. All are agreed on the

desirability of separating them in certain contested cases. The law presently makes specific provision for such separation in deportation hearings but is silent on admissibility hearings.

Section 9: Amends section 238 (d) of the act to the extent that the Attorney General would be authorized, in his discretion, to dispense with examination-inspection in the case of aliens proceeding in direct transit through the United States, under safeguards, and subject to agreements with the aliens and carriers. Under the present law, though they may be exempted from documentary requirements, they must be inspected and examined and are subject to the exclusion and deportation provisions which apply to immigrants coming here to reside permanently. This proposal in effect creates something like the "free-port" which exists for customs purposes on goods which are merely stored in the United States waiting transshipment out of the country after they have been brought here from abroad by another carrier. The aliens involved are for the most part individuals who are traveling from Europe or the Orient destined to Canada or Latin America who are using our air gateways at New York, San Francisco, and Miami. The proposal facilitates international travel and encourages use of our own flag carriers by passengers desiring to use our more direct air routings to their ultimate destinations.

Section 10: Amends section 242 (b) of the act to furnish statutory authority for the Attorney General to commence deportation proceedings with an order to show cause, which procedure is presently in effect by regulation. Prior to the procedure now being followed, it was thought necessary to commence every deportation case by physical arrest which in most instances was not only unnecessary but frequently caused great fright and considerable anguish, particularly in cases involving infants, aged aliens, and persons who were not likely to abscond. While the authority for the new procedure under existing law is believed implicit in the statute, the proposed legislation would remove any doubt and prevent a possible challenge of a proceeding on this ground. The right to issue a warrant of arrest in the relatively few cases where it is found necessary to take an alien into custody or impose restrictions on him is not limited or restricted by this amendment.

Section 11: Amends section 245 of the act by deleting clause 5 of subsection (a). Under present clause an alien who seeks to adjust his status in the United States without reentry, as the husband or wife of an American citizen, cannot do so unless he had been in the United States for a year before such a marriage. All that the present statute accomplishes in most cases is to require the money put aside to start a new family unit in the United States to be expended on travel out of the country to obtain a piece of paper from an American consul abroad (there is no quota for these aliens—they come in extra-quota) and reenter with that document. There are ample other safeguards in the law to take care of the rare fraudulent marriage.

Section 12: Codifies several statutes relating to the naturalization of war veterans with proper safeguards to make certain that benefits are limited to those who have served honorably in an active-duty status. Veterans who have had active duty during wartime shall be eligible for naturalization regardless of length of service. Peacetime veterans shall be eligible for naturalization after 3 years. A person who was unable to serve the full 3 years because of a disability incurred during service is provided with a special exemption. The requirement that certain veterans must present proof of admission for permanent residence has resulted in many deserving veterans not being eligible for naturalization and this proposal would eliminate that requirement.

No person shall be regarded as having been separated under honorable conditions if he was separated on account of alienage, or if he was a conscientious objector, or if he performed no military, air or naval service whatever, or if he refused to wear a uniform, and will not benefit from this proposal. Citizenship granted pursuant to this proposal may be revoked if, at any time subsequent to naturalization, the person is separated from the Armed Forces under other than honorable conditions.

Sections 13 and 14: Not now required. They have been substantially enacted in Public Law 728 of July 18, 1956.

Section 15: Amends section 101 (b) (1) of the act by extending the definition of "child" to include an illegitimate child claiming benefits under the law through its mother and also to include adopted children under the age of 12 if, prior to seeking benefits under the immigration law, they have resided with the adoptive parents at least 2 years. The proposal would cover appealing and distressing hardship cases which have arisen in the case of illegitimate children and children of tender age who have been adopted.

Section 16: Amends section 202 (a) (5) of the act by removing the limitation which prevents an Asian whose quota is exhausted from coming under the quota or nonquota classification of the accompanying spouse. These privileges are presently available to aliens of other origins. There is no desire or plan here to change the requirement that a primary applicant for admission who is of Asian origin must be chargeable to the special Asian quota regardless of birthplace.

Section 17: Amends section 203 of the act to grant the same preference status to a spouse or child "following to join" an alien entitled to a preferred classification by reason of his special skills, as if the spouse and child were accompanying the alien. It is not possible for families to always travel together and the change would be desirable in order to cover the situations where the spouse or children follow the principal alien.

The proposal would also result in the fourth preference category under the quota being accorded a fixed 10 percent of the quota instead of the present undetermined portion, reducing the second category of preference immigrants from 30 to 20 percent.

The proposal would also establish the limitation wherein the immigrant would be eligible for fourth preference only on the approved petition of a United States citizen 21 years of age or over, and would include in that preference the spouse or child of a primary applicant.

Section 18: Amends section 281 of the act to give the Secretary of State wider latitude to waive visa fees for nonimmigrant aliens and to permit clarification of the existing provisions relating to the computation of such fees.

Section 19: Amends section 212 (a) (9) of the act. The proposal would have the effect of providing that in determining whether a criminal misdemeanor was committed, as a ground for exclusion of an alien, United States law shall control.

Section 20: Amends section 221 (f) of the act to eliminate the requirement for eventual individual documents for alien crewmen. The requirement for the issuance of individual documents has proved to be difficult to administer, unduly burdensome, and unnecessary. The present visaed crew list satisfies both the State and Justice Departments.

Section 21: Amends section 222 (a) and (c) of the act to eliminate the reference to "race and ethnic classification" information in applications for immigrant and nonimmigrant visas. The terms are not susceptible of definition and have served no useful purpose in the administration of the law.

Sections 22 and 23: Amend sections 353 and 354 of the act to broaden those sections by giving to veterans of the Spanish-American War and World Wars I and II, their spouses, children, and dependent parents broader foreign-residence privileges without losing United States citizenship.

Section 24: Amends the proviso to section 223 (b) of the act to give the Attorney General the right to extend the life of the reentry permit, for such period as he deems appropriate, of a wife or child of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed abroad, beyond the 1 year period allowed by present law. The existing law has resulted in hardship to alien spouses and children of servicemen stationed abroad.

Section 25: Adds a new subsection to section 323 of the act which would permit the expeditious naturalization of children adopted by United States citizens stationed abroad in the Armed Forces, or abroad in the employment of the United States Government, or abroad in the employment of an American firm or international organization. The new subsection would provide that there must be a showing that the child is residing and will continue to reside with the adoptive parents. At the present time the adoptive child is required to establish 2 years' residence and 1 year's physical presence in the United States during the 2-year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition. The proposal would remove these requirements. The citizen adoptive parent would be required to declare before the naturalization court an intention to have the child take up residence in the United States as soon as the adoptive parent terminates his service or employment abroad. This worthy proposal prevents unnecessary separation of families.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO H. R. 6888 (7-9-56—C), SAME AS S. 3169

JUDICIAL REVIEW BILL

The need

Repetitive court actions of administrative decisions by way of habeas corpus, declaratory judgment actions, applications for injunctive relief, etc.; enabling some of the more notorious among our deportable criminal aliens to defeat deportation for years.

The bill

Form of Review

1. Habeas corpus for any alien found deportable and held in custody or for any alien excluded from admission to the United States, or

2. Petition for review for any alien found deportable and not held in custody.

Limitations

1. Alien must not have physically departed United States after administrative order of excludability or deportability.

2. All administrative review must have been exhausted.

3. The administrative order must not previously have been determined to be valid in any judicial proceeding (unless new grounds presented or court finds prior proceedings inadequate or ineffective to test validity).

4. No action may be withdrawn without consent of both respondent and court.

5. Issue determined on administrative record and findings of fact in administrative proceeding if supported by reasonable, substantial and probative evidence shall be considered conclusive; except a trial de novo is provided when United States nationality is claimed.

6. Court action must be brought in vicinity where alien is located instead of at Washington, D. C. This will greatly serve to

eliminate the delays resulting from the congestion of the court calendar in the District of Columbia.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT TO H. R. 6888 (7-9-56—B) AS S. 3170

QUOTA BILL

1. Computation of quotas:

Formula	Total	Allocation
Present: ⅙ of 1 percent selected 1920 population	154,657	To each area according to its percentage of representation in United States population. (a) As at present 154,657
Proposed: ⅓ of 1 percent total 1950 population	219,461	(b) To aliens having special skills regardless of nationality 5,000
		(c) Increase of 100 for all minimum quota areas 5,000+
		(d) To each country in proportion to its share of total immigration to United States in last 3 decades 55,000+
Total		219,461

2. Cancels mortgage upon quotas resulting from Displaced Persons Act and previous sheepherder laws.

3. Permits use of unused quota numbers on basis of four geographical regional pools throughout the world: Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania. Unused quotas in each region would be be available for distribution each year to aliens entitled to preference status under the present law, if they were born within the region, regardless of the particular country in which they were born.

Mr. WATKINS. It should be also remembered that I introduced four bills at that time to carry out the President's recommendations. The amendments which I propose to offer to H. R. 6888 are identical in terms with the four bills which I have just mentioned. Since there has been considerable discussion of these amendments and some criticism, I think it would be helpful to highlight what my proposed amendments would not do.

First. They would not make a single change in the provisions of the law relating to the acquisition of citizenship; except for certain veterans of the United States Armed Forces and their close relatives, my amendments would make no changes as to the loss of United States citizenship.

Second. They would not add or subtract a single ground for deporting an alien from the United States.

Third. They would not lift a single one of the bars which now forbid the admission to the United States of an alien who would be a danger to the national security.

In a nutshell what the amendments seek to accomplish is the following:

First. They would transfer to the executive branch of our Government much of the discretionary powers in the enforcement of the immigration law which are now exercised by the Congress through the lengthy, inefficient, and expensive process of private legislation, without surrendering any of the powers of a Member of Congress to introduce such a bill when the executive branch cannot or will not act.

Second. They would incorporate into the law a number of technical amendments recommended by the people who administer the present law, including three provisions to enlarge the citizenship privileges of—and revise the expatriating provisions relating to—members of the Armed Forces, past and present, and their families. They would also grant legislative approval to four different administrative interpretations of existing law.

Third. They would guarantee the use but prevent the abuse of our judicial process by deportable or inadmissible aliens whose sole object is to prevent or delay their removal from this country.

Fourth. They would increase the maximum limitations upon the number of aliens who may obtain visas to come to the United States to live permanently. This does not mean that the amendments guarantee the admission of a greater number of aliens; they do increase the potential maximum number.

The four bills which I previously introduced, on February 8, 1956, were the only specific bills on which open hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I repeat what I have said several times on the floor, that extensive hearings were held on the bills which I had introduced to carry out the President's program. Therefore, there were hearings held on this proposal. Moves of various kinds have been made to try to get action on the bills, but we could not succeed in the Committee on the Judiciary. That is why we have sought this means of trying to get action on measures which have been properly before the committee and on which hearings have been held.

At those hearings, my bills, now represented by four of the amendments I proposed to H. R. 6888 were officially endorsed by the administration, and their enactment was urged by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, representing the two agencies of the Government directly concerned in the administration and enforcement of the immigration and nationality laws. No other bills or legislative proposals on that subject offered by a member of the majority have that endorsement.

In addition, Congress has had several proposals to consider which would have the effect of providing for the orderly termination of the refugee relief program and the complete utilization of the visas made available under that act.

Only the bill S. 3570, dealing with the orphan provisions of the Refugee Relief Act, has been acted upon by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

What then of the proposal before us? What does it contain, and what portion of the President's program does it adopt?

I ask unanimous consent to insert a memorandum describing what the bill contains and giving a section-by-section analysis.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOR H. R. 6888, TO AMEND THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1954

The draft of a proposed substitute for the bill H. R. 6888, amending the act of September 3, 1954, which is now pending on the Senate Calendar (Calendar No. 2249), retains the provisions of the reported bill providing (a) for the admission of 350 sheepherders and their spouses and children; (b) for the removal of the mortgages against the Spanish quota under prior sheepherder acts; and (c) for the correction of a situation which exists in the case of certain aliens admitted under the Displaced Persons Act who are in a deportable status because of misrepresentations made with reference to their nationality or place of birth to avoid repatriation to Communist-controlled countries.

In addition, the substitute bill would add several provisions which would modify the immigration and nationality laws as follows:

1. Cancel mortgages on quotas established by the Displaced Persons Act. This will allow 8,000 new quotas annually to Eastern European countries.

2. Provide a formula for the redistribution of approximately 18,500 unused quotas annually to those countries having less than an annual allotment of 7,000 quotas.

3. Authorize the issuance under the regular provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act after January 1, 1957, of the special nonquota immigrant visas which remain unissued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to aliens within the special categories of refugees, expellees, and escapees set forth in section 4 of that act, subject to the numerical limitations applicable to each category. In the case of escapees, the geographical limitations presently applicable are removed, as well as the present limitations in connection with the place of issuance of visas to such escapees. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 is not extended, nor is the authorized number of special nonquota visas increased.

4. Extend the period for the admission of refugee orphans and increase the allowable age from 10 to 14 years.

5. Admit approximately 1,200 tubercular immigrants.

6. Eliminate the fingerprinting requirement of the Immigration Act.

7. Provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain adopted children of United States citizens employed abroad.

8. Amend section 4 of the act of September 3, 1954, to extend the waiver of excludability in the case of a person convicted, or who admits the commission, of a crime involving moral turpitude which is classifiable as a petty offense to include an alien convicted on one occasion only of offenses which in the aggregate would constitute no more than a petty offense as defined in title 8 of the United States Code.

9. Correct a situation which exists in the case of certain aliens admitted under the Displaced Persons Act who are in a deportable status because of misrepresentations made with reference to their nationality or place of birth to avoid repatriation to Communist-controlled countries.

10. Amend the definition of the term "child" as used in titles I and II of the Immigration and Nationality Act in such a manner as to clarify the law so that the illegitimate child would, in relation to his mother, enjoy the same status under the immigration laws as a legitimate child.

11. Modify section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord first preference status under the quotas to spouses and children following to join principal aliens

who have been granted first preference, which is the same status presently accorded to spouses and children accompanying such principal aliens.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF SUBSTITUTE BILL

Section 1 of the substitute bill contains the provision for the amendment of the Sheepherder Act to permit the issuance of an additional 350 special visas to sheepherders and for the issuance of nonquota visas to the wives and children of sheepherders admitted under that act or the two previous sheepherder bills. This provision is the same as that contained in the reported bill.

Section 2 of the substitute bill would amend section 4 of the Sheepherder Act to extend the waiver of excludable grounds in the case of a person convicted, or who admits the commission of, a crime involving moral turpitude which is classifiable as a petty offense to include an alien convicted on one occasion only of offenses which, in the aggregate, would constitute no more than a petty offense as defined in title 8 of the United States Code. The provision is similar to the provision in H. R. 6888 as passed by the House.

Section 3 of the substitute bill would remove the mortgages on the quotas established under the Displaced Persons Act and the three Sheepherder Acts. This would have the effect of restoring to the future quotas approximately 325,000 numbers preempted under the Displaced Persons Act and the restoring of approximately 500 numbers to the quota for Spain, which were preempted under the Sheepherder Acts. Under H. R. 6888, as reported, the mortgages under the Sheepherder Acts are removed from the Spanish quota.

Section 4 of the substitute bill adds a provision relating to the correction of a situation which exists in the case of certain aliens admitted under the Displaced Persons Act who are in a deportable status because of misrepresentations made with reference to their nationality or place of birth to avoid repatriation to Communist-controlled countries. This provision is contained in section 3 of H. R. 6888 as reported by the committee. The provision as reported by the committee has certain refinements of language which make the section preferable to the provision contained in the substitute bill.

Section 5 of the substitute bill provides for the redistribution of certain quota numbers which remain unused at the end of each fiscal year under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The unused numbers would be redistributed under a formula to quota areas having an annual quota of less than 7,000 in the proportion which the quota for each quota area bears to the annual quota of all the quota areas combined. For example, the annual quota of Italy is 5,645 and the total quota under the Immigration and Nationality Act is 154,657. At the end of fiscal year 1955, there remained 61,629 unused quota numbers. Thus, on the basis of the proportion of 5,645 to 154,657, 2,249 of the 61,629 unused numbers would have been available for issuance in Italy. Such numbers would be available for issuance during the 12-month period beginning October 1 and ending September 30 of the year immediately following the close of the fiscal year involved. Since quota areas with annual quotas of 7,000 or more would not participate in the use of the unused quotas, it is stated that only 18,224 of the unused visas would have been available for redistribution in the fiscal year 1956.

Section 6 of the substitute bill provides for the elimination of the fingerprinting requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the discretion of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General on the basis of reciprocity in the case of aliens seeking to enter the United States temporarily. At the present time, the waiver can only be granted in the case of certain diplomats. The language of the provision was not contained in any of the versions of H. R. 6888, but is similar to the language contained in a bill, H. R. 11582, introduced by Congressman WALTER to amend the laws relating to passport review and procedure. That bill is now pending before the House Judiciary Committee.

Section 7 of the proposed substitute would add a provision to admit, under proper safeguards, 1,200 otherwise admissible aliens who are afflicted with tuberculosis and who are members of certain refugee and displaced person family groups or who are the wives or children of United States citizens.

Section 8 of the substitute bill would add a provision to provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain adopted children of United States citizens employed abroad. The provision is the same as the one which appeared in the subcommittee print No. 2 of H. R. 6888, but which was stricken when the bill was reported to the Senate. The adoption of such a proposal would take care of a number of meritorious situations which have been contained in private immigration bills, but which cannot be handled in that manner.

Section 9 would amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, by increasing the number of special nonquota immigrant visas available for eligible orphans from 4,000 to 9,000 and raise the cutoff date for eligibility from 10 years to 14 years. This provision is similar to S. 3570 which is now pending on the Senate Calendar.

Section 10 would amend the definition of the term "child" as used in titles I and II of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify the law in such manner that the illegitimate child would, in relation to his mother, enjoy the same status under the immigration laws as a legitimate child. This change is deemed necessary because under present administrative interpretation of the definition of "child" in the act, an illegitimate child may not be considered to be the child of his mother.

Section 11 would amend section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as it relates to the spouses and children of aliens accorded first preference status under the quotas. Under the existing provision, spouses and children accompanying such first-preference aliens are accorded the same first-preference status. The amendment would accord first-preference status also to spouses and children following to join aliens granted the first-preference status.

Section 12 would authorize the issuance, under the regular provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act after January 1, 1957, of the special nonquota immigrant visas which remain unissued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The special nonquota visas could be issued to aliens within the special categories of refugees, expellees, and escapees and orphans set forth in sections 2, 4, and 5 of the Refugee Relief Act, subject to the numerical limitations applicable to each category. However, in the case of escapees, as defined in the Refugee Relief Act, the geographical limitations presently applicable would be removed, as well as the present limitations limiting the place of issuance of the escapee visas. The authorized overall number of special nonquota visas under the Refugee Relief Act would not be increased and the provision would have the effect of terminating the refugee-relief program as such.

The general effect of the provision would be: (1) To permit the issuance indefinitely of the unissued visas available under the Refugee Relief Act to eligible aliens under the various categories of refugees, escapees, etc., set forth in that act and within the numerical limitations fixed for each category, but with specific provision being made that such issuance of the visas would be by consular officers under the regular provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and (2) the visas presently available to escapees in Western Germany, Berlin, Austria, the NATO countries, Turkey, Iran, and Sweden would be available to any escapee falling within the terms of the definition of an escapee regardless of his place of residence, and the class of escapees to whom visas could be issued would be enlarged. Thus, the 35,000 escapee visas available to escapees in Germany, Austria, and Berlin could be issued to any qualified escapee.

Mr. WATKINS. From a reading of the memorandum, Mr. President, it can easily be seen that only seven points are similar to the President's program. They are:

SIMILARITIES TO PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Section 2: Exclusion from United States of aliens who have committed or admit the commission of certain crimes. Somewhat similar to President's program, section 17 of S. 3168.

Section 3: Cancels mortgage on quotas which resulted from the Displaced Persons Act and the sheepherder laws. Substantially the same as President's program, section 1 (e) of S. 3170.

It must be remembered that the original sheepherders bill as reported from the Judiciary Committee canceled the mortgages on the Spanish quota of the previous sheepherder bills which have been enacted by Congress. Therefore, the principle we are talking about has already been used by those who oppose this measure because of the mortgage waiver provisions but who favor the sheepherders bill.

Section 4: Permits Attorney General to refrain from deporting displaced persons who obtained visas by misrepresenting identity and nationality. Substantially the same as President's program, section 7 of S. 3168.

Section 6: Permits waiver of fingerprinting of nonimmigrants. Substantially the same as President's program, section 4 of S. 3168.

Section 8: Permits expeditious naturalization of certain adopted children. Substantially the same as President's program, section 23 of S. 3168.

Section 10: Changes definition of illegitimate child so as to allow it privileges under immigration law if claiming through mother. Substantially same as President's program, section 13 of S. 3168. Fails to follow President's program of including certain adopted children in the definition.

Section 11: Authorizes first preference status to spouses and children of skilled alien if they are "following to join", as well as if accompanying, him. Substantially the same as President's program, section 15 of S. 3168.

In addition, the substitute amendment proposes, with respect to the refugee act, that the unused visas in Germany and Austria, to the extent of about 40,000—and that is about the only visas we have left, because they were not used, largely due to economic conditions in those countries—may be added to and used under the regular immigration act, and in that way permit the program to go forward.

The administration by the refugee relief program is done away with as of December 31 of this year.

Mr. President, some 40,000 people who have escaped from Iron Curtain countries will be able to get relief, similar to the relief we gave to NATO countries. All the Italian visas will be used, all the Greek visas will be used, as well as those in the Near East, and those in the Far East.

About all we have left which will be taken care of by the amendment and which is generally accepted by everyone are a few in Holland as well as the ones in Germany and Austria, which have not been used, in the class of escapees and expellees. The definitions are carried over.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The senior Senator from Utah has on several occasions presented the President's program on immigration and naturalization. I should like to ask the Senator, if we vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], whether it would take care of most of the President's recommendations.

Mr. WATKINS. It will take care of seven of them. I have very reluctantly agreed to go along and to work for the substitute. As the Senator from Illinois has explained, if we cannot get it all, at least we should move in the right direction. I appreciate the cooperation of the majority leader. I regret that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is a member of the majority leader's party, did not get the information with respect to the Dirksen substitute. I tried to talk to the members of the Subcommittee on Immigration on this side of the aisle. I did not feel I had the assignment to talk to anyone on the other side of the aisle, except in a general way.

The substitute was worked out under the direction of one of the staff members of the Majority Policy Committee, with whom I have conferred a great deal. Members of the staff of the Subcommittee on Immigration also helped in the work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to have 1 additional minute.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the majority leader has suggested that I have been somewhat generous on the allotment of time. However, if it is a matter of a minute, I shall be glad to yield the minute to the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wished to say that, so far as I am concerned, while I feel that the President's proposals should be accepted, and that they represent substantial progress, nevertheless, when we come to a practical situation such as confronts us now, people should be considered first. Therefore, if we bring in even only a few thousand people who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, and take off restrictions which are annoying but do not do us any good, we will accomplish something, at least. If I had not agreed to that course of action, I would never have been able to get consideration of this legislation by this body. The control was in the hands of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 5.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the proposed substitute for the bill H. R. 6888, primarily in regard to section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. JENNER. I believe I have 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JENNER. I yield myself 15 minutes. With the exception of section 5, I am in favor of most of the bill and believe it should be passed. It contains many good features. If the bill is passed with section 5 in it, because of the situation that exists in the House, we will lose all the good, humanitarian provisions in regard to orphans, sheepherders, and the tuberculosis section.

The proposed substitute, like the substitute proposed by the junior Senator from New York, does not come to the Senate with a report. Why? It has not been considered by the appropriate subcommittee or committee of the Senate. Why? It has no departmental recommendations and it likewise makes sweeping although less drastic changes in our immigration system than did the substitute offered by the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. President, the heart of our immigration system is and has been for many years the national origins quota system pursuant to which millions of aliens have gained admission to our shores and have become assimilated in our society. The theory underlying the national origins quota system is that we should apportion immigration visas to European countries in proportion to the historic population pattern of the United States so that we can preserve the cultural background of our society.

The national origins quota system was adopted after World War I, for two important reasons. Perhaps some of the Members of this body do not know what is back of this system.

It had long been apparent to serious observers after 1900 that the United States faced a period of great social stress with problems which we should find it difficult to solve, even if we maintained our earlier immigration policy. But that policy had been violently distorted from immigration by individuals and families who chose the hardships of exile into an organized mass movement bringing a million persons a year into our country, often with little enterprise on their part.

The closing of the American frontier, at the end of the 19th century, affected all social problems in the United States. We no longer had a reserve of unsettled lands to which families could migrate, and establish themselves in economic independence. We were rapidly approaching a period in which we should be face to face with the two problems which had plagued all earlier republics—the growing shortage of land and the growing numbers and influence of people without land or capital, dependent upon employment by others.

A great literature of warning and analysis was written on these subjects, even before World War I shattered the illusion of continuous progress. President Theodore Roosevelt wrote more striking and original comments on our social problems than did his fifth cousin.

Meanwhile immigrants who had become wealthy saw the possibility of organizing mass immigration of their compatriots, and the inflow rose higher and higher. We were admitting newcomers to the number of a million a year, mostly from areas far removed from Western Europe, which shared many of our political, economic, and family institutions. The costs of adjustment, which fell on our schools, our police systems, our city governments, our marginal workers, rose higher and higher.

With the end of World War I, vast numbers of rootless people turned their eyes toward America. Every ship carried its full quota. Every port city was overcrowded, every road leading to the ports was filled with people seeking to come to America to escape the burdens of reconstruction.

Something had to be done or the United States would have been inundated. After years of careful inquiry Congress decided on the formula that we now call the national origins quota. This meant that immigrants from each nationality would be admitted in direct ratio to the numbers of their nationality in our population, not in accordance with the numbers in foreign countries seeking admission.

One powerful argument in winning assent to the quota system was the overwhelming evidence that emigration from overcrowded areas does nothing to cure population pressure. New births keep the population of the old country at the same high level. Countries with a low standard of living have difficult problems but they can be met only by hard work in dealing with social problems people prefer not to face. We were under no obligation to transfer these problems to our soil.

The compromise we call the national origins formula was accepted as a compact which would dispute and conflict our national origins.

For this, Mr. President, we owe no apology to any nation. Our country has had and still has the most liberal immigration laws in the world. We have received a greater number of displaced persons and refugees than any other country in the world and because of certain liberalizing features of the present Immigration and Nationality Act, the numbers coming into our country steadily increase every year.

The proposed substitute, while not obviously destroying the national origins quota system, is a virtual overturn of the principles, and sets a precedent for complete destruction of the system. It would transfer from northern and

Western Europe 18,500 quota numbers to the countries of southern and Eastern Europe, which received lower quotas than countries with larger contributions to our population and tradition. It is a radical departure from the theory of trying to maintain the cultural pattern of our immigration in accord with the composition of our population. It is of serious consequence to our historic American institutions and our American way of life.

Remember, Mr. President, since the Second World War, this country has already opened its gates to over a million refugees and displaced persons by way of special legislation of one kind or another, all in derogation of the historic pattern of our immigration policy. I do not impugn the dignity or worth of any society when I point out that our system for admitting immigrants should be geared to the cultural background of our own people.

I know, Mr. President, from my service on the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I had the honor of being chairman in the previous Congress, that the Communist conspiracy directs continuous overtures toward those nationality blocs in this country which have an affinity to traditions and a society alien to the concepts of freedom upon which our Nation was built.

I say it is serious business for this Senate to so drastically revise the whole underlying theory of our immigration system with so little deliberation or consideration. This departure from the basic principles of our immigration system would be further extended by that provision of the substitute bill which would remove the mortgages on the quotas of certain countries because of the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. Mr. President, under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, we brought into this country approximately one-half million displaced persons, virtually all of whom came from the low-quota countries of southern and eastern Europe. The law provided that up to 50 percent of the quotas of countries from which these people came could be charged in any one year, but that they should all be charged against the appropriate quotas for some years. Now, the substitute bill would sweep away those quota charges which were made to help people who, in fact, did emigrate to the United States and who are here now as part of our society. The effect of this is not only to increase immigration to this country by approximately another one-half million, but also to further the violation of the basic policy of our country under the national origins quota system. This basic policy of our immigreation system would be further violated by the proposal of the substitute bill to transfer for use under the general immigration law some 50,000 unused quota numbers originally set up to be used under the so-called Refugee Relief Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. How does the distinguished Senator from Indiana arrive at the figure of half a million?

Mr. JENNER. It is the same number that would be brought in under the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator's amendment directed to that particular provision?

Mr. JENNER. I am going over the whole bill. I am not opposing anything except section 5.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator admit that so far as section 5 is concerned, the section which he desires to strike by his amendment, it concerns an optimum of 18,000?

Mr. JENNER. The figure is 18,000.

I remember all too well, Mr. President, the deliberations of the Judiciary Committee, the numerous conferences of that committee and the House committee at the time of passage of the Refugee Relief Act. At that time, it was emphasized, and by unanimous action of both committees it was written into the reports, that there would be no extensions of the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. The numbers prescribed in that act were to be maximum numbers and not necessarily to be used.

Of course, Mr. President, as everyone knows who has worked on that legislation, it is not and never was intended solely as an act for the relief of refugees. The fact is that most of the people who have come to our shores via this legislation are not and never have been refugees. This act was likewise an assault upon our basic immigration policy. The offense will be compounded if we now transfer, for use under the general immigration laws, quota numbers which were initially allocated under the Refugee Relief Act. Mr. President, there can be no point at which those who seek to revise our immigration laws would be satisfied. Notwithstanding the fact that the Immigration and Nationality Act is the most liberal immigration act in the history of this country and that this country is the greatest immigration receiving country in the world, the cry is always for more, more, and more. Europe's surplus population is said to be increasing by millions every year and in Asia the surpluses are of fantastic proportions. There are those, Mr. President, who apparently feel that they can solve the problems of Europe and Asia by transporting them to this country and, further, that we have some kind of duty to do so. Likewise, Mr. President, there are certain hyphenated American groups in this country whose principal allegiance and interest are in the welfare of some foreign nation and not in the interest of what is best for this country. Curiously enough, it is earnestly urged that somehow or other we will forward the interest of our foreign policy by breaking down our protective immigration system.

Suggestions are made in the corridors that we must break down our immigration system and parcel out more and more visas to certain countries, if we are to please the nationality blocs in great urban centers which control a large number of election votes. Mr. President, in my humble judgment, if this were true, it would be the strongest argument that can be posed for the maintenance of the national origins quota system, so that our immigration shall include a minimum of recruits to such blocs, whose interests are alien to those of this Nation.

Mr. President, on May 27, 1953, the Immigration Subcommittee under the then chairmanship of the Senator from Utah, Mr. WATKINS, conducted hearings on legislation dealing with the refugee problem. During the course of the testimony on that legislation by a representative of the American Legion, the record reveals the following statements by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]:

> In connection with your statement, I would like to say to you that the chairman of this committee voted for the McCarran Act and supported it and defended it in speeches only very recently and I am still very much in favor of it as a permanent immigration policy of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JENNER. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

What has happened, Mr. President, to cause the distinguished Senator from Utah to change his position respecting this basic law which he would now undermine? I say that if the pattern of our basic Immigration Act was sound 3 years ago as a permanent immigration policy of the United States, it is sound today.

Let me emphasize that the proposals which I have been discussing are not minor refinements of the law, but strike at the heart of our entire immigration policy which is built upon the national origins quota formula.

Recently it has been the fashion to criticize or apologize for the national origins formula, but no solid arguments have been raised against it.

I was profoundly shocked to discover that one source of criticism of our immigration policy comes from NATO, whose officials apparently share the view widespread among collectivists internationalists that nations do not have the right to choose who may or may not come to live within their borders.

Lord Ismay, in his report on "NATO, the First Five Years" says the NATO Permanent Council is engaged in a study of surpluses and shortages of manpower, and ways to "facilitate labor mobility between their countries." That means immigration policy, and it means the United States.

A few lines later Lord Ismay, speaking of the 1953 law to admit 209,000 extra immigrants, says:

> This action followed a recommendation of President Eisenhower which stressed the United States interest in strengthening the Atlantic Community.

The United Nations has more than once raised the issue of whether the U. N. should take up the question of immigration limits as a form of discrimination against minorities, forbidden by the U. N. provisions on human rights.

If NATO is going to be made a single territory for the migration of people, or if we have signed away under U. N. our right to decide who may become an American, it is time we all know where we are.

If Congress wishes to abandon the national origins formula, let us do so openly, with a record vote. But let us

close the door on the insidious practice of introducing one exemption after another until nothing is left of the compact.

I wonder, Mr. President, if Mr. and Mrs. America, out at the crossroads of this land, would understand why the Senate would pass, in the closing hours of the Congress, legislation so hurriedly proposed, legislation which would drastically alter our basic immigration policy.

Mr. President, in the name of the great unorganized Americans of this country, I urge the Senate to defeat section 5, at least, which strikes at the basic national origins quotas.

With section 5 removed, I feel certain there will be no objection to the bill. The other features are noncontroversial; they are humanitarian; they would do much good. But I fear that the entire bill may be lost if section 5 remains in it. I hope the Senate will see fit to strike out that section.

I ask for a division on the vote.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. JENNER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first of all, the way of the conciliator is hard. I am delighted that 12 of the 13 sections in the bill seem to have approval, at least so far as it is expressed by the Members of the Senate who heard the discussion this morning.

That narrows the issue to section 5, which is a modification of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I want to emphasize what the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island said. The quotas under the Origins Act are 154,200-plus. If, however, those countries used their quotas, there would be no unused quota numbers. Under the bill, they could, however, be issued under section 5. So we have made that overture to the world; we have assigned those quotas. They aggregate 154,000-plus in a single year. If the countries which are entitled to those numbers use them, the quotas will not be increased by a single migrant under section 5.

Mr. JENNER. What would occur under section 5 would be to interfere with our basic immigration policy and perhaps permit certain groups to come in who would disrupt our society.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute on the bill to permit the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to make a statement in reply to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. CLEMENTS. The only matter actually in controversy today is the distribution of the 18,500 persons, is it not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not true that very likely no more than three-fourths of the 18,500 numbers will be used, because many countries can use the number which is allotted to them now, if there are persons in those countries who desire to come into the United States; and as to the countries which do not use the additional 40 percent of the 18,500 those numbers could be reallocated under the act to any other country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful whether the numbers would reach those proportions.

Mr. CLEMENTS. So instead of talking about 18,500, we are actually talking about 13,000 or 14,000, at the most.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the cosponsors of this proposal.

I know the bill is not agreeable to every Senator, but I think it represents the best compromise which can be reached. I certainly hope the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois will be adopted, and that no amendments which would whittle it away will prevail.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I want to join in the commendation of the sponsors of this liberalized substitute for H. R. 6888. As has already been said, the proposed substitute is a modest and moderate attempt to remove some of the most flagrant abuses under our immigration and refugee laws. I hope it will be adopted. I think it is imperative that it be adopted. We ought to do much more.

I am sure, Mr. President, that my colleagues are aware of my long-time interest in, and sponsorship of, several measures designed to liberalize our immigration and refugee laws.

Mr. President, on March 4, 1955, I introduced a bill, Senate bill 1315, that would, if adopted, do all, and more, than the amendment now before us. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I have prepared, referring to Senate bill 1315, printed at this point in my remarks. I make the same request concerning a related press release issued March 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION REFORMS

Mr. President, S. 1315, a bill introduced on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], is a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is a bill designed partially to reintroduce the spirit of humanitarian compassion and democracy into our immigration laws.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was not a controversial issue in the recent election campaign. Candidates of both majority political parties made clear their understanding that our present laws were in some respects discriminatory and undesirable. The President of the United States has declared that to be his position. Our effort with this bill is to correct some of those discriminatory and undesirable portions.

Our bill does not constitute a complete revision of the present Immigration and Nationality Act. It does not go as far as I would like it to go. However, it is a fair beginning on which reasonable men of both parties can agree at this time. It would ameliorate some of the harsh provisions of existing law, making the law more flexible and adaptable to change in world conditions. It would aid us in carrying out our foreign policy objectives and thus help us to combat communism. It will also go far toward relieving the continuous pressure for emergency immigration legislation.

We introduce the bill in the spirit of modest progress and progressive change. We introduce it in the hope that it can represent a consensus of nonpartisan opinion designed to help democratize our immigration and nationality laws.

More specifically, the bill accomplishes the following:

1. Section 1 restores to professors eligibility for nonquota status (which they enjoyed prior to the McCarran Act) if a university requests their services. This proposed change is based on a feeling of confidence that our universities will select only well-qualified persons for employment on their teaching staffs. It, therefore abolishes the unnecessary red tape and delay involved in requiring universities to obtain clearance orders from the local employment service and then proving to the Immigration Service that the professor whose immigration is being sponsored is needed urgently in the United States. My amendment in no way changes the security requirements of our laws as they concern all who wish to enter the United States.

2. Section 2 would grant to certain adopted children the immigration status enjoyed by natural children. This change would have two important effects: (a) it would make it unnecessary for adopted children of American citizens, in many instances of servicemen, to wait their turn on the quota or, as happens so often, to require that Congress pass a special bill on their behalf; (b) it would make adopted children of aliens eligible for the same quota status or quota preference as that enjoyed by natural children, thus avoiding the heartbreaking situations in which adopted children force their family to delay their trip to the United States or have to be left behind.

As section 2 applies only to children adopted prior to their reaching the age of 14 years, and as it specifically excepts children adopted solely for the purpose of obtaining immigration preference for them, the danger of abuse is avoided.

3. Section 3 repeals the provision of the present law under which some quotas, generally those which are needed most urgently, are "mortgaged" for decades, in some cases even for centuries.

4. Section 4 ends one of the racially discriminatory features of the present law. It abolishes the racial ancestry blood test for persons "attributable by as much as one-half of (their) ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle." Henceforth, all visa applicants would be classified only according to their place of birth.

5. While section 4 still retains the national-origins principle, sections 5 and 6 would go far toward ameliorating its harsh effects. They do that without raising the existing overall quota ceiling of about 154,000. They simply provide that if, in any given year, no takers are found for any portion of these 154,000 members, that portion is not declared forfeited, as under present law, but is made available during the following year, without regard to national origins to (a) persons of special skills, (b) close relatives of citizens or alien residents, (c) persecutees, and (d) other groups of persons whose emigration to the United States would further our foreign policy.

Another change effected by this section concerns the problem of family unification. Under present law, a person qualifying under the national-need preference may enter this country with his wife and minor children, all of whom are covered by the preference. A person qualifying for preference as the brother of an American citizen, however, must leave his wife and children behind and

can get a preference for them only after he has arrived in this country. Under the change provided for by this section, the preference right shall apply not only to the person directly affected, but also to his spouse and minor children so as to enable families to enter this country as single units.

6. It has often been said that a man who tries to import a sack of beans into the United States and finds that it has been excluded, has the right of appeal, but a man who wants to bring his mother over, and finds that she has been denied a visa, has no such right. Section 7 of my bill is designed to change that situation. It is designed to modify the anomaly of the present Immigration Act under which authority for the acts of the Immigration Service (which acts in many instances through the Board of Immigration Appeals) is concentrated in the hands of the Attorney General, while authority for the acts of the Consular Service is diffused among the numerous consuls, each of whom is the final arbiter in the visa application cases before him. Section 7 concentrates responsibility in a Visa Review Board appointed by the Secretary of State, to which the sponsors of prospective immigrants may be allowed to appeal. This Board would assure that visa regulations are enforced uniformly throughout the world and would also safeguard against irresponsible and capricious acts by individual consular officers.

7. The concept of justice tempered with mercy is a part of our administration of law. It is deeply imbedded in our religious traditions. It was in conformity with that concept that Congress long ago gave the Attorney General discretionary authority to suspend deportation in deserving cases. That authority was severely curtailed by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the Senate majority report on which states harshly and cruelly:

"Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation."

Under section 8 of this bill the standards for suspension of deportation contained in the law in effect prior to the adoption of the McCarran Act are restored. As suspension of deportation will only be granted in the discretion of the Attorney General and only with the concurrence of Congress, I am certain that there is no danger of this humanitarian provision being abused.

8. Sections 9 and 10 are purely procedural.

Our proposal is a reasonable one. It provides a meeting ground on which those of us who opposed the 1952 act can unite with those who support it with certain reservations.

Senator Humphrey Asks Revision of Injustices in Immigration Laws

Revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act "to partially reintroduce the spirit of humanitarian compassion and democracy into our immigration laws" will be asked by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnsota, today in introducing a bill cosponsored by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, Senator KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Senator MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan.

"Our bill does not constitute a complete revision of the present Immigration and Nationality Act, but it does remedy some of the inequities and weaknesses of the present law," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Both major political parties have made clear their understanding that our present immigration laws are in some respects discriminatory and undesirable," Senator HUMPHREY said. "Our effort with this bill is to correct some of those discriminatory and undesirable portions.

"It does not go as far as I would like it to go. However, it is a fair beginning on which reasonable men of both parties can agree. It would relieve some of the harsh provisions of existing law, making the law more flexible and adaptable to change in world conditions. It would aid us in carrying out our foreign policy objectives and thus help us to combat communism."

Among changes proposed are:

1. Pooling of unused immigration quotas.
2. Restoring to professors and scientists eligibility for nonquota status if a university requests their services.
3. Granting certain adopted children the immigration status enjoyed by natural children in order to avoid breaking up families.
4. Eliminating prolonged "mortgaging" of quotas for future decades when they are now urgently needed.
5. Eliminate racial discrimination.
6. Provide preference rights to protect family unification.
7. Creating Visa Review Board to grant prospective immigrants the right to appeal.
8. Restoring discretionary authority to suspend deportation in deserving cases to provide for justice tempered with mercy.

"We introduced the bill in the spirit of modest progress and progressive change," Senator HUMPHREY said. "We introduce it in the hope that it can represent a consensus of nonpartisan opinion designed to help democratize our immigration and nationality laws."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, earlier this year I testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees, concerning S. 1794, a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Senators will note the relevance of that bill and of my remarks then to the business now at hand. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony just mentioned, as well as two press releases issued on January 9, 1956, and March 12, 1956, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REFUGEES, ESCAPEES, AND EXPELLEES ON S. 1794, CONTAINING AMENDMENTS TO THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to testify before your committee in support of S. 1794, a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The bill was introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself and contains amendments presently being considered by your subcommittee. I understand you are also considering S. 2113, the bill introduced by Senator WATKINS and others which includes proposals made by President Eisenhower, and S. 2149, which the chairman introduced this week. I will direct my remarks today primarily to the bill before the committee which I have cosponsored, S. 1794, but will also make some comparison of its amendments with those of the other two pending bills.

We all are gravely concerned by the situation that has brought about the need for these amendments. Our intention in passing the Refugee Relief Act 2 years ago was to give new life to those people—displaced by war and in flight from oppression—who had no homes and little hope. Many of them had spent years in refugee camps. Others had fled from behind the Iron Curtain in hope of finding freedom and new lives. America stood as a symbol of hope to them, for they knew that we had always welcomed refugees from oppression.

It was in this humanitarian spirit that the refugee relief program was proposed to the Congress. We wished to give hope for a new life to some of these uprooted people. And we knew from our own experience that people could come to this country and, in building new lives, would help build the United States.

But the bill as it was finally passed had written into it many restrictions which pleased only those who do not welcome new Americans to our shores. Many of us warned at the time that the restrictions might make the refugee relief program nearly unworkable. In considering the history of this act, we cannot help but wonder whether a certain reluctance to make it work has not compounded the difficulties.

The unfortunate failure of the refugee program is a matter of record. The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee presented to the Senate last Monday the most recent figures of accomplishment under this act. In the nearly 2 years since its enactment, 31,919 visas have been issued. When we compare this to the number of 209,000 refugees and escapees that we finally authorized to be admitted we see just how badly the act and its administrators have failed in carrying out its humanitarian purpose.

I would like to point out that this failure does not only mean heartbreak but embitterment to the 209,000 who might have been admitted under this program and to the millions of others who had hoped that they might be among the 209,000. It has serious consequences for the position and prestige of the United States in the world. Here again—as in the Immigration and Naturalization Act—the United States presents itself to the world as a nation that holds itself above other peoples, that does not welcome people from other nations to our country even when they are displaced and homeless and in need of our assistance. Most of us do not feel that this is the true spirit of America. Quite the contrary. But such iniquitous restrictions as those written into the Immigration Act and the Refugee Act speak louder than any of our protestations of good will and good faith. We cannot convince others in the world that we, in our hearts, are friends and equals of all people, everywhere, when our legislation embodies xenophobia and racist discrimination that proclaim the opposite. I will not labor this point. But I think that this consequence of our immigration and relief programs is of such gravity for us in our relations with other peoples and other countries that it is of vital importance in any consideration of the Refugee Relief Act.

This failure of the Refugee Relief Act was taken with much complacency by the administration until the recent unpleasantness in the State Department. But we have at last gotten an admission from the President that all has not been going as it should with this program. I welcome those proposals that President Eisenhower sent to Congress on May 27 and am glad to see that he agrees with many of the recommendations made in the Lehman-Humphrey-Douglas-Kefauver amendments introduced more than a month earlier.

At this time, I would like to go over the amendments proposed in Senate bill 1794, and indicate how they would improve the Refugee Relief Act.

First, the administration of this program would be placed in an office within the Department of State to be known as the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This Administrator would be responsible directly to the Secretary of State. Surely this program is sufficiently important and certainly complex enough that it requires the attention of a full-time administrator. If we are to achieve the humanitarian goal intended by the Refugee Relief Act it must be administered with greater vigor than has so far been the case. Continuing its administration as a part-time function of the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and

Consular Affairs will not allow such administration. There is no reason why the refugee relief program should be administered as one function of an administrator who has many other duties. To make the Refugee Relief Act a vigorous, effective means of bringing deserving people to our country it should receive the full attention of an administrator responsible solely to the Secretary of State. The recent appointment of Mr. Gerety as Deputy Administrator of the Refugee Relief Program does not correct this basic defect. I urge most strongly that the subcommittee support amendment of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 along the lines stated in section 10 of S. 1794.

The attitude of some of those who have been administering this law seems to be that the number of admissions authorized under this act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number, but it is not necessary to try to attain the goal of the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. That was surely not the intent of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees there are—numbers far beyond the help of this program—it seems clear that we should be striving to permit entry into the United States of every single person authorized under the act. Partly what is needed here is a change of attitude on the part of those dealing with this program—its administrators and the consular officials abroad charged with carrying out some of its functions. They should strive to achieve the maximum number of admissions allowable under this program and look to that number as a humanitarian goal to be sought and attained.

But, with only a year and a half left before the termination date of the Refugee Relief Act, the goal is far off. At the present rate it is doubtful that it will be reached by December 31, 1956. Even if we accept the present Administrator's analogy to an "assembly line"—and I do not care for the comparison of refugees to automobiles—it does not appear that the assembly line is going to pick up sufficient speed, now that the initial period of tooling is completed, to reach the full humanitarian goal within the time limit set by the law. For this reason, a way of extending the time for the effectiveness of this act should be sought. No one should be denied entry under the refugee relief program simply because of an arbitrary cutoff date. An attempt is made to utilize all of the authorizations for visas by an amendment proposed in our bill. This amendment provides that any visas not issued by December 31, 1956, shall be redistributed among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have requests pending for visas. Under this provision, the termination date would be extended to December 31, 1960, to allow time for action on these reallocated visa authorizations. The reallocation and extension of time will permit the refugee relief program to achieve its goal in permitting the maximum number of persons authorized under the act to enter the country. I strongly urge the subcommittee that it adopt this proposal as one of the amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

There are additional countries that should be added to the act since its passage in 1953. Refugees now residing in Spain and North Africa should be eligible for admission under the refugee relief program. There are refugees residing in both of these places, and to permit them entry under the act our bill would increase the quota for refugees now residing in North Atlantic Treaty countries by 15,000 so as to include these people. This additional number would raise the overall authorization from 209,000 to 224,000 refugees eligible for admission. But I point out that this is still considerably fewer than the number of 240,000 that the President proposed when he originally made recommendations for this program to the Congress.

Some of the requirements of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 have made it difficult and even impossible for otherwise highly qualified people to be admitted to this country under the program. One such requirement is the assurance that must be given by a citizen or citizens of the United States that the refugee will have employment and be able to support himself once he arrives in this country. The regulation provides that each such assurance shall be the personal obligation of the individual citizen or citizens making it. There is a further requirement that the employment and housing be listed with the Government so as to show that employment and housing is available to the refugee being considered for admission under the program. As negotiations for admission have nearly always been protracted, such a requirement has placed an impossible burden on those citizens who have sought to assist refugees in coming to this country. It is not surprising that this discouraging aspect of the program has become a real roadblock to its operation. I feel, that it is asking entirely too much of our citizens to expect them to hold employment and housing open a year or longer while waiting for a refugee to be cleared and admitted under this act. Voluntary agencies—with whose fine work we are all familiar—have been ready and anxious to assist in helping people qualify under the program in coming to the United States. But the restrictions in the act that these assurances must be given by individual citizens has prevented the agencies from taking part. There is no reason why these groups should not help refugees find suitable employment and housing so they can qualify for admission under the Refugee Relief Act. They did just such work in connection with the displaced persons program and performed a most useful and humanitarian service. The amendment contained in our bill would permit them to participate in the present program in a similar way. These voluntary agencies should certainly be allowed to give assurances of employment and housing—as they are willing to do—and so assist refugees in qualifying under the refugee relief program.

There is a similar provision in the Watkins proposal, S. 2113, but I do not think it is spelled out quite so clearly as in S. 1794. I am glad to see that the bill of the chairman, Senator LANGER, Senate bill 2149, makes another recommendation along these lines. As I understand it, the chairman's bill would permit other responsible persons who have resided in the United States for at least 2 years to give such assurances. The amendment would also extend this act to include dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents, I believe, and this is an equally worthy proposal that merits the consideration of the subcommittee. But I am sure the chairman is not unaware of the virtues of his own bill, so I shall not dwell on them at length.

To return to the Lehman-Humphrey-Kefauver amendments, there are further requirements of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 that have made it difficult or impossible for some people to qualify for admission though their character and skills are such that we would surely be grateful to have them as new citizens. The stipulation that a completely documented history of the past 2 years of the refugee's life must be supplied before issuance of a visa has proved a particularly onerous requirement. For those who somehow succeed in escaping from behind the Iron Curtain this regulation usually means that they must sit for 2 years in a refugee camp in order to provide themselves with a 2-year history.

Such a procedure defeats the purpose of the Refugee Relief Act and should be done away with. The present security requirements of the act, as well as of the Immigration Act which must also be met, are more than enough to insure that visas will not be granted any persons whose purpose in seeking admission might not be to the best interests of the United States. I note that the amendments proposed by Senator WATKINS, S. 2113, would also repeal this requirement of a 2-year history. I trust that the subcommittee will concur that this regulation should be removed from the law.

A similar requirement that has been almost impossible to fulfill for many of the refugees and especially those who have fled from behind the Iron Curtain is that of a valid, unexpired passport. The inclusion of such a requirement in a bill to aid refugees—many of whom are stateless—would be farcical, if it were not so tragic. Both the Watkins bill and our bill would relax this requirement.

A certificate guaranteeing readmission to the country in which the visa is obtained is coupled with this passport requirement. This is often impossible to obtain; some countries just do not give such certificates. Such an unrealistic provision should be eliminated from the law. The requirements of the Immigration Act covering necessary travel documents and clearances are more than sufficient to protect the interests of the United States.

There are some other changes that should be made in the Refugee Relief Act to make it more workable. As President Eisenhower said in his message to Congress urging many of these same changes in the law:

"The act limits the term 'refugee' to those who have not ben 'firmly resettled'. Experience has shown that this provision tends to exclude the hard-working and the adjustable, the very people we want most as new citizens."

All three bills before the subcommittee attempt to improve upon this definition so as not to exclude those very emigrants we would welcome. Our bill would include both refugees and escapees under this term and avoid a distinction made in the present bill that has led to confusion in interpretation and delay.

Another simple change in terminology recommended in our bill, S. 1794, is the dropping of the modifying word "ethnic" wherever it appears in the bill, except where it is clearly needed—in the case of German expellees. There seems to be no purpose for its inclusion at other places in the bill and it has connotations that are not in keeping with our traditions.

The priorities set up under section 12 of the Refugee Relief Act turned out to be unworkable and have led to delay and confusion in the administration of the act. Apparently just what was intended by these priorities has never been clarified. Our bill would repeal the entire section 12, and I think that by so doing administration of the act would be accelerated.

The provision of the Refugee Relief Act permitting the admission of 4,000 orphans restricts this quota to orphans under 10 years of age. There does not seem to be any good reason why orphans older than 10 should not be admitted under this program. Senator LANGER's bill, Senator WATKINS' bill, and our bill would all raise this age limit. Senator LEHMAN in his testimony before this committee a few days ago suggested that 13 might be the oldest age limit that could be fixed for eligibility without necessitating full security clearance. I am sure that the committee will give every consideration to the desirability of raising the age limit to whatever age seems most feasible for best admitting orphans qualifying under this section of the program.

Under the adjustment-of-status section of the act, for persons already in the United States, both bills would amend the act to relax the present requirement that a person

otherwise eligible must also have entered the country legally. President Eisenhower said in his message:

"I recommend to the Congress that the section be amended to permit the Attorney General to waive this requirement in meritorious cases where the person is otherwise qualified under this act. It is estimated that this would not involve more than a few hundred cases, but in the case of each individual human being such an amendment would satisfy the beneficent purposes of the Congress."

An additional liberalization of this section is suggested in the Watkins bill—that the number of people who might so have their status in this country adjusted be raised from 5,000 to 10,000. This is a most worthwhile proposal which I wish to support, though it is not in our original bill.

There are three other amendments in the Watkins bill not contained in S. 1794 that I consider worthy of adoption to improve the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. One would authorize admission of 1,000 persons who would otherwise be excluded as suffering from tuberculosis. These would be persons who are members of families and whose inability to be admitted to the United States might otherwise break up the family or prevent them from taking advantage of the act. As President Eisenhower said in making this same recommendation:

"We in the United States no longer regard tuberculosis with dread. Our treatment standards are high and modern treatment is increasingly effective. The United States, to its own benefit, could permit many of these families, within the existing numerical limitations, to enter under safeguards provided by the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States assuring protection of the public health and adequate treatment of the afflicted individual and also assuring that such individual will not become a public charge. I urge that the Congress give consideration to amendments that would enable this to be done."

May I join with the President in support of this measure that might prevent the tragic separation of families that have already undergone the trials of being broken apart from relatives and friends. This is a proposal in keeping with the finest spirit in which the refugee relief program was originally conceived and suggest that we can still return to that spirit in carrying it out, though the time is late.

Another amendment of the Watkins bill that I wish to support is the change in wording recommended in section 2 of S. 2113. This relatively minor change would make a great deal of difference to refugee families granted admission under the refugee relief program. Under the statute as it now reads, wives, children, and others eligible to enter the country accompanying someone entering on a refugee relief visa, must all come together, accompanying the senior member of the family. The proposal contained in the Watkins bill, which simply adds the words "or following to join them," would allow members of a family to follow later when for one reason or another they could not yet accompany the head of the family being admitted under this program. I urge that this provision be included in any amendments that the subcommittee sees fit to recommend to improve the Refugee Relief Act. It is a most worthy modification.

There is one final proposal in the Watkins bill in support of which I wish to join. That is the addition made in subsection (c) of section 11, which provides that "the eligibility of an applicant under this act shall be the exclusive responsibility of the consular office." Presently this eligibility is subject to the review of the immigration officer whose responsibility should rest solely in the application of the Immigration Act to the applicant. This authority of review by the immigration officer has resulted in conflicting rulings by the separate officers charged with this responsibility and has been one of the sources of delay in administering the Refugee Relief Act. By so clarifying the act that the responsibility for administering the Refugee Relief Act resides solely in the consular officer much of this confusion and delay should be eliminated. This will certainly improve the administration of the program. I strongly support this delimitation of authority and hope that it will be made a part of any recommendations for amending the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

May I come back again to a proposal which I just mentioned in passing, but which I wish to support as it embodies the humanitarian spirit of the Refugee Relief Act. I refer to the amendments of the chairman, contained in S. 2149, that would extend eligibility under this program to dependent parents, stepparents, and adoptive parents, as well as those who would be presently eligible for admission by accompanying the head of a family with a refugee relief visa. Here again, like the amendments we have discussed, these recommendations would in many cases mean the difference between a family being able to take advantage of the program and come to the United States or having to stay on in some dreary refugee camp or makeshift home in order to avoid parting from a loved member of the family.

These seem minor matters when we are drawing up a bill affecting hundreds of thousands, but we must never forget how much just such modifications as these can mean to the individuals whose whole lives turn upon them. I wish to support the amendments of the chairman, as they extend the benefits of this program in a way that should not have been overlooked.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that the amendments being considered by this subcommittee give new hope for the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 and those who should be helped by it to come to the United States and become useful citizens. I shall not refer again to the way in which this program has been hampered and almost blocked by those who do not wish to see it work. I would like to reiterate, however, that the success of this program is important not only for what it means to the lives of those many thousands we hope to assist by it, but that its success is important in the world for the good name of the United States itself.

In part, we are already known to the rest of the world for the quota system upon which the Immigration and Naturalization Act is built. While we have yet to correct the inequities that are written into that law, here, in amending the Refugee Relief Act, we can present a better face to the world—our true face. Let us show the world the spirit that truly moves our people. Let us extend the hand of welcome to those whose lives have been disrupted and whose homes have been lost. I trust that the subcommittee will give careful consideration to the amendments before it. I hope you will agree with me that they are worthy of our support.

JANUARY 9, 1956.

SENATOR HUMPHREY SEEKS TO AVERT YEAR-END CUTOFF ON REFUGEE QUOTAS

Extension of the cutoff date on existing refugee quotas was urged by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, today to keep 44,000 refugees from being "denied admission to the United States because of the failure of the administration to administer the program properly."

In a letter to Senator WILLIAM LANGER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees, Escapees, and Expellees, Senator HUMPHREY called attention to the recent public admission of Pierce J. Gerety, administrator of the program, that he would not be able to issue the 209,000 entry permits authorized under a special 3-year program before the present deadline of December 31.

"It would be a callous disregard of the misery in which many of these refugees have been living for long, weary years if we were to let more than one-fifth of the visas authorized by the Refugee Relief Act be wasted," Senator HUMPHREY said. "That the administration could have administered the act in such a way that it now must threaten to close the door on the hopes of many of these suffering people is a shocking disregard of the humanitarian intent of the Congress in passing this act."

Text of Senator HUMPHREY's letter follows:

"The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
"United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR: I am sure you share my concern at the recent announcement by the director of the refugee relief program, Mr. Pierce J. Gerety, that he will not be able to issue the 209,000 entry permits authorized under the present law by the cutoff date of December 31 this year. Mr. Gerety estimates that about 44,000 refugees will be denied admission because of the failure of the administration to administer the program properly.

"As I stated in testifying before your committee last June on amendments to the Refugee Relief Act, the attitude of some of those administering the law seems to have been that the number of admissions authorized under the act is merely a permissive figure—that they can issue visas up to that number, but it is not necessary to make an effort to attain the goal of the maximum number of entries under the refugee relief program. That was surely not the intent of those of us who voted to support this program. When we consider how many refugees there are—numbers far beyond the help of this program—it seems clear that we should be concerned that every single person authorized may obtain the relief intended under the act.

"As you know, one of the amendments contained in S. 1794, introduced by Senators LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, KEFAUVER, and myself would extend the expiration date of the refugee relief program to December 31, 1960. Under this amendment any visas not issued by the end of this year would be redistributed among those categories under section 4 of the act that have been filled but still have requests pending for visas. This reallocation and extension of the time would permit the refugee relief program to achieve its goal in permitting the maximum number of persons authorized under the act to enter the country.

"I would, of course, desire most of all that your committee recommend the adoption of those amendments which I have already supported before your committee. But, in view of Mr. Gerety's admission that the Administration will not be able to meet its obligation of issuing all visas authorized under the Refugee Relief Act, I hope that at the very least the committee will recommend an extension of the termination date of the act beyond December 31, 1956. I cannot know precisely how much additional time the Refugee Relief Administration may need to complete the issuance of all 209,000 authorized visas, but I am sure that the committee could ascertain this and make a recommendation for the necessary extension.

"It would be a callous disregard of the misery in which many of these refugees have been living for long, weary years if we were to let more than one-fifth of the visas authorized by the Refugee Relief Act be wasted. That the administration could have administered the act in such a way that it now must threaten to close the door on the hopes of many of these suffering people is a shocking disregard of the humanitarian intent of the Congress in passing this act.

"I trust that the subcommittee will take prompt action to insure that sufficient time will be allowed for the issuance of all visas authorized under the Refugee Relief program.

"Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

"Sincerely,

"HUBERT H. HUMPHREY."

MARCH 12, 1956.

SENATOR HUMPHREY ASKS PRESIDENT TO SPEED UP REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, in a speech prepared for the Senate today calls on President Eisenhower to act immediately to save the Refugee Relief Act from "a disastrous failure."

Warning that the refugee program will fall 44,000 short of its 209,000-person goal by December 31 of this year, Senator HUMPHREY points out that the President "can and should make administrative changes that would expedite the processing of the refugee entry permits."

"Humanitarian considerations alone are not the only reason we must not allow the refugee relief program to fail," Senator HUMPHREY declared, calling attention to the increasingly effective "redefection" campaign which the Communists have been waging among refugees and escapees during recent months. "The Communists, through amnesties, letters from relatives, and intimidation, are attempting to influence escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to return to their homes.

"The refugee relief program must be an essential part of our foreign policy in an attempt to meet and counter the redefection campaign of the Communists," Senator HUMPHREY declares. Every redefection, he warns, is a victory for the Communists, for they exploit it to "prove" that life in the West is worse than behind the Iron Curtain.

Senator HUMPHREY cited the recommendations to the President made by voluntary agencies which have been assisting refugees in their efforts to come to the United States, and insisted that something be done to carry them out.

The Committee on the Refugee Relief Program of the American Council of Volunteer Agencies for Foreign Service recommended two major administrative changes to President Eisenhower, the Minnesota Senator discloses.

The 11 civic and church groups making up the committee urged the President to make arrangements for transporting refugees as the Congress intended in the Refugee Relief Act. This has been done in Europe, but not in the Near and Far East, although the number needing such transportation has been known to the State Department since last August.

Other recommendations of the voluntary agencies, Senator HUMPHREY points out, concern the cumbersome procedures for security processing instituted under the program. Emphasizing that the refugees being admitted were already subject to the rigorous security screening provided under the McCarran-Walter Act, Senator HUMPHREY charges that "a whole additional apparatus of security trappings has been erected on top of the already top heavy provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

In addition to the recommendations of the voluntary agencies, Senator HUMPHREY cites the recommendations by the National Council of Churches of Christ to the Deputy Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, Pierce J. Gerety. Senator HUMPHREY quotes Mr. Gerety as admitting last month that the refugee program was going to fall 44,000 visas short of its goal.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the proposed substitute for H. R. 6888, which we are now discussing, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOR H. R. 6888 TO AMEND THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1954

The proposed substitute for the bill H. R. 6888, amending the act of September 3, 1954, retains the provisions of the reported bill providing (a) for the admission of 350 sheepherders and their spouses and children; (b) for the removal of the mortgages against the Spanish quota under prior sheepherder acts; and (c) for the correction of a situation which exists in the case of certain aliens admitted under the Displaced Persons Act who are in a deportable status because of misrepresentations made with reference to their nationality or place of birth to avoid repatriation to Communist-controlled countries.

In addition, the substitute bill would add several provisions which would modify the immigration and nationality laws as follows:

1. Cancel mortgages on quotas established by the Displaced Persons Act. This will allow 8,000 new quotas annually to eastern European countries.

2. Provide a formula for the redistribution of approximately 18,500 unused quotas annually to those countries having less than an annual allotment of 7,000 quotas.

3. Authorize the issuance under the regular provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act after January 1, 1957, of the special nonquota immigrant visas which remain unissued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to aliens within the special categories of refugees, expellees, and escapees set forth in section 4 of that act, subject to the numerical limitations applicable to each category. In the case of escapees, the geographical limitations presently applicable are removed, as well as the present limitations in connection with the place of issuance of visas to such escapees. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 is not extended, nor is the authorized number of special nonquota visas increased.

4. Extend the period for the admission of refugee orphans and increase the allowable age from 10 to 14 years.

5. Admit approximately 1,200 tubercular immigrants.

6. Eliminate the fingerprinting requirement of the Immigration Act.

7. Provide for the expeditious naturalization of certain adopted children of United States citizens employed abroad.

8. Amend section 4 of the act of September 3, 1954, to extend the waiver of excludability in the case of a person convicted, or who admits the commission, of a crime involving moral turpitude which is classifiable as a "petty offense" to include an alien convicted on one occasion only of offenses which in the aggregate would constitute no more than a petty offense as defined in title 8 of the United States Code.

9. Correct a situation which exists in the case of certain aliens admitted under the Displaced Persons Act who are in a deportable status because of misrepresentations made with reference to their nationality or place of birth to avoid repatriation to Communist controlled countries.

10. Amend the definition of the term "child" as used in titles I and II of the Immigration and Nationality Act in such manner as to clarify the law so that the illegitimate child would, in relation to his mother, enjoy the same status under the immigration laws as a legitimate child.

11. Modify section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to accord first preference status under the quotas to spouses and children "following to join" principal aliens who have been granted first preference, which is the same status presently accorded to spouses and children "accompanying" such principal aliens.

12. The purpose of section 13 is to allow for the adjustment of status of aliens who have been admitted to the United States as nonimmigrants in a diplomatic or semidiplomatic status, who have failed to maintain that status and who have been granted sanctuary by the Department of State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I hope the proposed amendments will be accepted and I am especially hopeful that section 5 will be retained in the bill. I have listened to the arguments against the amendment. But frankly, it seems to me admitting 18,000 men and women from all parts of the world, especially from eastern and southern Europe, would be in keeping with the best traditions of the United States, would be of great assistance to our country, and would benefit the countries of Europe which may be concerned. The uniqueness of our country, it seems to me, Mr. President, can be directly attributed to the varied backgrounds of those who today are citizens of the United States. It seems to me that we will be harming ourselves, as well as depriving those desirous of coming to the United States, if we refuse to adopt section 5 and the other amendments proposed today to H. R. 6888.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am going to yield 5 minutes, and I understand the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is going to yield 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the 10 minutes we may have a quorum call to notify Members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I desire to commend those who have proposed the amendment to the Immigration Act. It is a step in the right direction. It will enable persons who are worthy, and who have no other place to go to come into this country.

Furthermore, if there are unused quotas, an opportunity will be afforded to persons in countries that have used their quotas to enter this country.

For that reason I most sincerely hope the Senate will adopt the amendment to the Immigration Act, and that the proposal to strike section 5 from the bill will be rejected.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not always find myself completely in accord with the Senator from Indiana. However, this is one time when I feel the proposal he makes is so thoroughly in line with the best interests of the country and with orderly procedure in the Senate of the United States that I strongly support his motion to strike section 5 from the pending amendment.

I am amazed to hear Senators say that if section 5 is stricken from the bill, we may as well not have a bill; that we shall simply have a hollow shell. That asser-

tion does not appear to be in accord with the facts. First, there will be 8,000 persons admitted annually under the amendment of the displaced persons bill. That is certainly not to be disregarded from any point of view. There will be 5,000 orphans who will come in under the Refugee Act, and that is a group for which I have been particularly strong all along. The Senator from Minnesota, who is now present on the floor, will remember that after his original amendment relating to orphans had been rejected, I helped him line up support to reconsider the matter, so that orphans could be brought into this country under the displaced persons bill.

There are other important humanitarian changes involved. I am for every one of these humanitarian measures which have already been mentioned, and I am not going to cover them again, but they have to do with the lives of persons who have been singularly discriminated against under technical provisions of the law, and who will, under the amendment, if it is adopted, be given a chance to come into this country. I refer, for instance, to the case of a tubercular child who has been so affected by the existing law that the condition of that child prevented the whole family from coming into this country. Surely anyone who has any humanitarian concepts at all favors an amendment which will give relief in a case of that kind. Likewise as to children who have been adopted by our servicemen and civilian personnel in Formosa, Korea, Germany, and other countries. No one could complain against these measures, because they are humanitarian. The sum and substance of every one of them is to greatly outweigh in number of persons and in importance what is supposed to be done under section 5.

Section 5 proposes to change radically the fundamental policy of the Walter-McCarran Act. There is not any question about it. We all know that is the case. Let us not have anyone in our country so disillusioned as to find later, after we have voted, under one kind of pretense or another, that we have cut the stanchions and the foundations out from under a measure which was passed with great difficulty and which has, in a time of great movement of people throughout the world, rendered real service to this Nation.

Time does not permit me to go at length into this question, but it has been said that only 18,224 are involved under the redistribution language in section 5 of the bill. That would be the case under the present situation, when unused quotas of 61,000 would be involved. That would not be the case under other situations, and the Senator from Illinois, in his original statement, made it clear that the operation of the amendment could bring about the admission annually of 154,000 rather than the 90,000 who are coming in now. I not only object to sweeping the foundations out from under the law enacted after many years of effort, enacted over the veto of the then President, which was not a pleasant thing for any Senator who voted to override; but I am reminding the Senators that if the proposal is adopted they will radically change the philosophy of the present law without hearings, without any information ahead of time, and without giving a Senator a chance to study the proposed changes. The amendment has not been printed. I have only a mimeographed copy, which I hold in my hand, which was secured only a half hour ago.

If there is any order or soundness of procedure in that kind of approach, we may as well do away with our rules. We are dealing with a subject matter which is fundamental to the growth, the progress, the peace, and the continued prosperity of our country, and I refer, of course, to the troublesome question of immigration. The question ought to be studied and we ought to be given the chance to explore the matter thoroughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask for 4 minutes more from the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is not present.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Indiana told me I might have 9 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall yield time to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I shall yield some additional time to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we both can yield to the Senator from Florida. I ask unanimous consent that we may each yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is proposed to change legislation which was enacted with great pain and with great effort and after years of study, and which, by many people in the Nation, is regarded as having done a great job for national prosperity and security in the last few years. We are called upon not just to iron out the inhumanitarian aspects of the bill, but we are asked, in addition, to change the fundamental philosophy of that bill, which was passed, as I have already said, over the veto of a President, and which has remained in force many years, and which has served, as many people in this Nation believe, the welfare and the progress and the prosperity and the security and the peace of the people of the United States as a whole.

I hope we do not write the stamp of our approval upon any such irregular or careless or unfair procedure. This procedure meets the definition of all those adjectives, because nobody has had a chance to see it; nobody has had a chance to know what was coming out; nobody has had the advantage of a report from a committee which has studied it; and no one knows anything about it except what has been disclosed in the rather brief arguments by the advocates and opponents of the bill up to this time. I regret that I cannot illuminate the record further.

My brief study of the situation makes me feel that upon the broad shoulders and strong backs of 350 Basque sheepherders who would be admitted to the United States—under a policy we have frequently followed before, because we cannot interest American boys in the sheepherding business—we would be placing all of this tremendously large proposed change in the immigration laws of the Nation. Mr. President, it is not a fair thing; it is not an orderly thing; it is not a regular thing to do. In my judgment, it is not the American way to approach a problem of such magnitude, in connection with which every Senator should have the right to know what he is voting on—which right is completely denied him under the methods and approach followed here.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me, with the understanding that we shall be able to suggest the absence of a quorum, and that at the conclusion of the quorum call or the rescinding of the order for the quorum, the Senate will proceed to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, for himself, and other Senators, it is proposed to strike out all of section 5.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division has been called for.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question a division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

All time for the proponents of the amendment has expired. The opponents of the amendment have 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of any time under my control, with the understanding that we shall proceed at once

to vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. (Putting the question.)

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read a third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill, and I am sure that the minority leader will do likewise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the bill has been yielded back.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 6888) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3914) to amend sections 801, 802, and 1102 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "approval", to strike out "and to include in such report his reasons for withholding approval and what approved action he has ordered the Board to take in such case" and insert "including in such report the action he has ordered the Board to take and his reasons therefor unless he finds such report would be contrary to the interests of national defense or foreign policy, which finding he shall communicate to the Congress", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 801 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1014; 49 U. S. C. 601) is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The issuance, denial, transfer, amendment, cancellation, suspension, or revocation of, and the terms, conditions, and limitations contained in, any certificate authorizing an air carrier to engage in foreign air transportation, or any permit issuable to any foreign air carrier under section 402, shall be subject to the approval of the President of the United States in any case which he determines may affect the national defense or foreign policy of the United States. The President shall report to the Congress any case in which he withholds such approval including in such report the action he has ordered the Board to take and his reasons therefor unless he finds such report would be contrary to the interests of national defense or foreign policy, which finding he shall communicate to the Congress."

SEC. 2. Section 802 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Such negotiations shall be conducted in accordance with the principles set forth in section 1102 (b) of this act."

SEC. 3. Section 1102 of such act is hereby amended by inserting after "1102." "(a)"; and by adding the following subsection:

"(b) Discussions or negotiations with representatives of a foreign country or foreign countries for the conclusion or modification of any treaty, convention, or agreement regarding the establishment or development of air navigation, including air routes and services, shall be conducted in accordance with the following principles:

"(1) The Board shall advise any air carrier whose interests it knows or reasonably should know will be affected, and shall fully consult with its representatives, both prior to and during any such discussions or negotiations.

"(2) A representative of the air carriers shall be made a duly accredited member of the United States delegation to any formal negotiations. He may attend all negotiating sessions and meetings of delegation, and shall be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to consult with his principals during and throughout the negotiations and before any ultimate decision is reached."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who now occupies the chair, is in a position to explain this measure.

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Senate bill 3914 was reported by the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and subsequently reported from the full committee to the Senate.

Specifically, the bill does two things. First, it defines the President's power to override or reverse decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to overseas or territorial air routes, and confines it to cases involving matters of foreign policy or national defense.

It has been testified a great many times that the original action in allowing the President to review and reverse decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board was intended to apply only in the field of foreign policy or national defense. Consequently the bill would relieve the President from the pressures to review, continue, suspend, or cancel airline rights granted by the Civil Aeronautics Board, except in cases which are strictly confined to foreign policy matters or to our national defense.

The bill would request the President to report to the Congress on any such cases in which he withholds approval, and provides that if such report would be contrary to the interest of national defense or foreign policy, he need not report.

The second part of the bill deals with the rights of American air carriers to be represented and to participate in negotiations by the Civil Aeronautics Board with foreign countries, and through them, foreign airlines, before decisions are reached.

The bill would allow representatives of the domestic air carriers, the American flag lines, to have representation during negotiations in which routes are being negotiated by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the State Department.

The bill is the result of a long period of hearings conducted by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS.] The hearings clearly show that the rights of our American-flag airlines have not been properly represented in the negotiations to which I refer. In many instances those who conducted the negotiations failed to acquaint themselves with the economic aspects, or to speak up with respect to the economic damage which might be done to American airlines. In some cases the result would be greatly to increase the burden of Federal subsidies, without reference to the economic overcrowding of certain schedules which were granted.

I believe the bill meets most of the objections which have been raised by Members of the Senate, and I should like to see the Senate take action upon it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A couple of days ago I received a letter addressed to me by the Assistant Secretary of State. I thought it might be well to read the letter at this point, in order that the Senator may comment upon it if he cares to do so. The letter is as follows:

JULY 24, 1956.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your request, I am enclosing a copy of a statement by the Department of State in opposition to S. 3914.

You may be interested also in the fact that the Department of the Interior has expressed opposition to an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act identical to section 1 of S. 3914. They commented adversely on section 27 of S. 1119 last year, which is identical to section 1 of S. 3914. I am therefore attaching excerpts of a statement made by the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

I shall not read all of the comments of the Department of State. In part, they read, as follows:

Section 1 of S. 3914 would eliminate or limit the requirement of Presidential approval over certain actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board involving certificates for

United States carriers and permits for foreign air carriers.

The framers of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 recognized the separate functions of the Board and President with regard to foreign air carrier permits and to certificates for United States carriers involving other than purely domestic air transportation. In insuring that these independent responsibilities were reflected in the original legislation, the drafters established the framework in which the Board and other agencies of the executive branch could function in the overall interests of the United States. The Department believes that the proposal to eliminate or limit the President's authority to review the decisions of the Board in these fields fails to recognize the continued existence of these other aspects of the decisions. Consequently, it is believed that enactment would make it more difficult, if not impossible, to insure that the final decision in each case reflected the overall interests of the United States.

Sections 2 and 3 of S. 3914 would amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to prohibit the executive branch from discussing or negotiating with a foreign country the conclusion or modification of an air transport agreement (a) unless the Civil Aeronautics Board consulted fully, both prior to and during such discussions or negotiations, with any United States airline which would be affected; and (b) unless a representative of the United States air carriers was made an accredited member of the United States delegation to any formal negotiation.

The Department urges that the proposed amendments not be enacted, on the grounds that they are unnecessary and unwarranted. They are unnecessary because adequate practices and procedures already exist under which the airlines have ample opportunity to make their views known to the Government with respect to the conclusion or amendment of an air transport agreement with a foreign government. They are unwarranted because they would interfere with the normal functioning of the executive branch, hamper the Department of State in the conduct of foreign relations, and would give a segment of the air-transport industry a position superior to those of the traveling public and the communities which depend upon the industry for air communications with the rest of the world.

A summary of specific provisions of S. 3914, with the Department's views thereon, is attached.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON S. 3914, A BILL TO AMEND SECTIONS 801, 802, AND 1102 OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Section 1 of S. 3914 would eliminate or limit the requirement of Presidential approval over certain actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board involving certificates for United States carriers and permits for foreign air carriers.

The framers of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 recognized the separate functions of the Board and President with regard to foreign air carrier permits and to certificates for United States carriers involving other than purely domestic air transportation. In insuring that these independent responsibilities were reflected in the original legislation, the drafters established the framework in which the Board and other agencies of the executive branch could function in the overall interests of the United States. The Department believes that the proposal to eliminate or limit the President's authority to review the decisions of the Board in these fields fails to recognize the continued existence of these other aspects of the decisions. Consequently, it is believed that enactment would make it more difficult, if not impossible, to insure that the final decision in each case reflected the overall interests of the United States.

Sections 2 and 3 of S. 3914 would amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the executive branch from discussing or negotiating with a foreign country the conclusion or modification of an air transport agreement (a) unless the Civil Aeronautics Board consulted fully, both prior to and during such discussions or negotiations, with any United States airline which would be affected; and (b) unless a representative of the United States air carriers was made an accredited member of the United States delegation to any formal negotiation.

The Department urges that the proposed amendments not be enacted, on the grounds that they are unnecessary and unwarranted. They are unnecessary because adequate practices and procedures already exist under which the airlines have ample opportunity to make their views known to the Government with respect to the conclusion or amendment of an air transport agreement with a foreign government. They are unwarranted because they would interfere with the normal functioning of the executive branch, hamper the Department of State in the conduct of foreign relations, and would give a segment of the air transport industry a position superior to those of the traveling public and the communities which depend upon the industry for air communications with the rest of the world.

A summary of specific provisions of S. 3914, with the Department's views thereon, is attached.

---

1. Sections 1, 2, and 3 of S. 3914 would amend, respectively, sections 801, 802, and 1102, of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as "the act"). These sections of the act deal with certain aspects of international air transportation. For ready reference, the provisions of each section, as presently in force, are summarized below:

(a) Section 801: Provides that the issuance, amendment, transfer, or revocation (by the Civil Aeronautics Board) of any certificate authorizing a United States air carrier to engage in overseas or foreign air transportation, or air transportation between places in the same Territory or possession, or any permit issuable to any foreign air carrier, shall be subject to the approval of the President.

(b) Section 802: Requires the Secretary of State, in the negotiation of air-navigation agreements with foreign governments, to advise and consult with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(c) Section 1102: Requires the Civil Aeronautics Board, in executing the act, to do so consistently with United States treaty obligations, take into consideration applicable laws of foreign countries, and not restrict compliance with such laws on the part of the United States carrier.

2. Section 1 of S. 3914 would amend section 801 of the act to restrict the existing requirement of Presidential approval of specified actions of the Board. The nature of the proposed changes, and the Department's comments thereon, are as follows:

(a) Principle: Permits for foreign air carriers and certificates for United States carriers in foreign air transportation issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board would not be subject to Presidential approval except in those cases which the President determines may affect the national defense or foreign policy of the United States.

Comment: An objective of section 1 is to ease the burden of Presidential review and to reduce his work with respect to certain categories of CAB decisions. This is sound and worthwhile. However, with respect to this category of actions, the objective would not be obtained in actual practice, for the following reason: In order to determine whether a particular Board decision might affect the national defense or foreign policy of the United States pursuant to the provisions of section 1, it still would be necessary for the President to scrutinize every such decision. Thus, he would not be relieved of any work in this area. Moreover, it is difficult to conceive of a case which may not potentially involve foreign-policy considerations. Every certificate or permit involving foreign air transportation involves foreign countries and, accordingly, touches upon foreign relations. In addition, any individual Board action in this field cannot be treated independently as an isolated case, but must be considered in the context of other actions. Thus, no matter how free the surface of a certificate or permit may appear to be, it cannot be assumed to be devoid of foreign-policy considerations. Therefore, if the President were fully to discharge his responsibilities as proposed by section 1, it appears that all Board decisions in this area would continue to be subject to his approval.

(b) Principle: Certificates for United States carriers to engage in overseas air transportation (example: between the United States and one of its territories) or in transportation between places in the same territory or possession would no longer be subject to Presidential approval.

Comment: To the extent that air services in this field constitute portions of international services of our carriers they may in some instances affect foreign policy. The President should therefore have the opportunity to determine in each case whether any such consideration is involved. The proposed amendment would eliminate this opportunity.

Considerations other than those of foreign policy would also indicate that the President should retain the opportunity to review any case dealing with operations beyond the continental limits of the United States. Other executive agencies have expressed themselves on these points. The White House view is as follows:

"The termination of the President's authority to approve cases involving overseas and territorial air transportation would appear inadvisable, since national defense considerations may play an important role in such decisions."

(c) Principle: In any case relating to foreign air transportation in which he withholds approval, the President shall report to the Congress as to his reasons. He shall include in the report the action which he has ordered the Board to take.

Comment: Inasmuch as the considerations behind the President's decisions in regard to cases involving foreign air transportation generally involve national defense or foreign policy matters, disclosure of which might well be detrimental to the interests of the United States, provision for mandatory disclosures would be detrimental to the security of the United States and to the effective conduct of its foreign policy.

3. Section 2 of S. 3914 would amend Section 802 of the act by the addition of a sentence stating that the negotiations shall be conducted in accordance with the principles set forth in section 1102 of the act.

The Department's opposition to the proposed amendment of section 802 is based upon its opposition to the principles which are proposed for insertion in section 1102, i. e., its objection to section 2 of S. 3914 are related to its opposition to section 3 of that bill. Section 3 is discussed below.

4. Section 3 of S. 3914 would amend section 1102 of the act to include the principles and

procedures by which the Department of State and Civil Aeronautics Board would be bound.

International negotiations on air transport matters as well as other international negotiations require that the executive branch of the Government be able to follow such procedures and apply such information with regard to international relations, the public interest of the United States, and the national defense as may be pertinent in connection with any particular negotiation. The enactment of required procedures with respect to such negotiations would destroy the flexibility which is many times the essential qualification on which the ability to obtain an agreement in the best interests of the United States may depend. Therefore, from the standpoint of general principle, the Department recommends against the enactment of required procedures. The following is a summary of specific principles embodied in section 3 of S. 3914, with the Department's views thereon:

(a) Principle: The Civil Aeronautics Board must notify interested carriers and consult with such carriers' representatives both prior to and during any discussions or negotiations with foreign countries for the conclusion or modification of any treaty, and so forth, regarding air transportation.

Comment: It already is the usual practice for the Board to notify and consult with the most interested carriers both prior to and during formal negotiations. Recognizing the responsibilities of the Board under the act, the Department normally does not initiate discussions with the carriers. However, representatives of the Department generally attend the discussions between the Board and the carriers, and are also available for direct approaches by representatives of any carrier desiring to discuss their interests directly with officers of the Department. The views expressed by the carriers which relate to matters within the competence of the Department receive full consideration.

The Department believes that the proposed legislation to make the Board's consultation with the carriers a mandatory requirement at all stages of the negotiation would (a) unnecessarily rigidify routine discussions or negotiations; (b) unduly complicate and delay discussions between the Department and the Board during crucial stages of negotiations, when time is of critical importance and consideration of a given problem might take place at odd hours of the day or night simultaneously at several echelons of the Government both in Washington and the fields; (c) embarrass and hamper the Department of State in the conduct of United States foreign relations; and (d) interfere with the normal functioning and decision-making of the executive branch.

(b) Principle: A representative of the air carriers shall be made a member of the United States delegation to any formal negotiations.

Comment: (1) The individual carriers whose interests are affected in a given negotiation often have conflicting competitive interests. It is increasingly difficult to obtain unanimity among such airlines. The carrier representative rarely can speak for the industry as a whole.

(2) An accredited member of any United States delegation becomes bound by the United States position. This position, representing the composite views of various agencies of the Government, and various segments of the industry and the public, is almost always a compromise position. Were a carriers' representative accredited to the delegation and authorized to speak in the negotiations, he would be bound by reason of his accreditation to promote the United States position. This might in fact not be the position maintained by his principals.

(3) The United States interests in air transport negotiations are not confined to the air transport industry nor to the air carriers which might be directly affected. Those interests also include those of the traveling public and of the geographical areas to be served. In air transport negotiations, the Government is responsible for considering all the various interests. These interests often conflict. By requiring that a representative of one special interest group be accredited to the United States delegation, the proposed amendment would give that group a privileged position of influence paramount to those of the other interested groups.

(4) As a general practice, United States carriers already have the opportunity to designate a representative as an observer to the United States delegation in formal negotiations. This observer attends negotiating sessions and has the opportunity to report the events of those sessions to his principals. The Department believes that the observer capacity in which the carriers' representative has been serving on United States delegations is the most advantageous position which can in many instances be accorded. On the other hand, although the Department intends to continue such practice, it believes that legislation requiring adherence to the practice regardless of special circumstances would be adverse to the public interest.

(c) Principle: The representative of the carriers may attend all meetings of the United States delegation.

Comment: Normally the carrier representative does attend meetings of the delegation. However, Government representatives serving on delegations have duties and responsibilities which in many instances require such representatives to discuss matters which are not public knowledge and which cannot in the interest of the security of the United States and its international relations be divulged to persons outside the Government. Since the proposed amendment would preclude limited attendance when required for reasons of security of international relations, the Department must oppose enactment.

(d) Principle: The activity to be affected by section 3 of S. 3914 is any discussions or negotiations for the conclusion or modification of any treaty, convention, or agreement regarding the establishment or development of air navigation, including routes and services * * *."

Comment: The object of S. 3914 is to give United States air carriers a special voice in United States air transport negotiations affecting the routes and services of such carriers. The terms "any treaty, convention, or agreement regarding * * * air navigation" goes far beyond that object. It would require the Government to consult the carriers on air navigation negotiations not involving air transport matters affecting the economic interests of the carriers. As far as the Department is aware, this is not intended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the prior views of the Department of the Interior, which were expressed in connection with an earlier bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD CERTIFICATIONS IN OVERSEAS AIR TRANSPORTATION—VIEWS EXPRESSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

(Sec. 27, S. 1119, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; sec. 1, S. 3914, 84th Cong., 2d sess.)

BACKGROUND

Section 1 of S. 1119, 84th Congress, 2d session, repeats a provision previously proposed as section 27 of S. 1119, 84th Congress, 1st session, which would, in part, eliminate from section 801 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 the provision for Presidential approval of actions by the Civil Aeronautics Board on certificates of public convenience and necessity involving United States airline services in overseas air transportation (i. e., air transportation between the United States and a Territory or possession, or between two Territories or possessions, of the United States) or air transportation between places in the same Territory or possession.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR LETTER OF APRIL 26, 1955

By a letter of April 26, 1955 to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, the following objection was made to section 27 of S. 1119:

"The Territories and possessions of the United States are greatly dependent upon air transportation which is playing an increasingly important role in their economic life. In some of these areas, air service provides the only means of transportation other than overland or waterborne travel of the most primitive sort. Route certification, frequency of service and competition are questions of extreme importance to most of the United States Territories.

"The executive branch of the Federal Government has been vested with certain responsibilities for the social and economic development of the Territories. A major responsibility is the representation and protection of the interests of the residents of the Territories.

"At present, the Department of the Interior, the agency of the executive branch directly responsible for Territorial matters, is afforded an opportunity to review those decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board affecting service to or within the Territories at the time that the decisions are referred to the President for approval. The interests of the Territory concerned are fully taken into account by this Department in considering the recommended decision. The effect of section 27 of S. 1119 would be to concentrate in a single agency all authority for the certification of air transportation in the Territories with no opportunity for review or appeal by this Department.

"Because of the importance of air transportation to the Territorial possessions of the United States and the responsibilities of the executive branch to these possessions, we believe that a review and the approval by the President of recommended decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Board is desirable. We do not believe that such review and approval should be limited to cases affecting the national defense or foreign policy.

"It is the position of the Department of the Interior that, if favorable consideration is given by your committee to S. 1119, the existing language in section 801 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, should not be changed and that section 27 of S. 1119 should be amended accordingly."

The views of the Department of the Interior on the similar section 1 of S. 3914 were not obtained, nor was that agency invited to testify at the public hearing on section 1 of S. 3914 held on July 10. It is understood that the views of the Department of the Interior on this subject remain unchanged. S. 3914 has been favorably reported out by the Senate committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma would care to discuss some of the points raised by both the Interior Department and the State Department.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as I recall, the Interior Department sent no communications to us during the consideration of the bill. We heard from the State Department, from the Civil Aeronautics Board, and from the Comptroller General.

In order to be absolutely sure, after we had concluded the testimony and hearings on the question of limiting the President's right to reverse, change, modify, or veto a decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, following long hearings in which all parties were represented, we again invited the Budget Bureau, the President, the Executive Office of the President, and also the State Department to give us cogent reasons why the bill should not be passed.

Representatives from the various agencies appeared. I am sure that Members who heard the testimony will agree that it was confined strictly and exclusively to the power which the bill gives the President to review decisions involving foreign policy and the national defense.

We do not believe it is proper, and we do not think the President ought to have the right, from the economic aspect, after months or years of testimony, hearings, and formal pleadings before the Civil Aeronautics Board, to reverse decisions of the Board involving purely economic questions entirely outside the field of foreign policy and national defense.

We do not believe that the interested parties should be compelled, after exhaustive hearings and proceedings before the Civil Aeronautics Board, to go to the White House for a separate consideration de novo of all the evidence which has been placed in the record, except in cases involving foreign policy or the national defense.

Moreover, the American airlines involved in such cases would have no way of formally pleading their cases. They would be informally brought before the President, or those around him in the White House. No machinery is provided for an appellate review.

We felt that it was proper to confine the President's authority to cases involving foreign policy or the national defense, and to request—but not to demand—that he report to the Congress, when he reverses the Civil Aeronautics Board, his reasons therefor, but excusing him from doing so if in any way such a report would interfere with the foreign policy or our national defense. In such a case he would not have to report to the Congress.

We feel that if it is proper that the CAB be the administrative arm of the Government in determining these matters, then the President, who is without any machinery and without any procedure and without any hearings, should be relieved of this onerous duty, when 2 or 3 domestic airlines may be fighting for a route, except where he finds it is necessary on grounds of foreign policy or national defense, to intervene.

I believe the President himself would welcome being freed from the lobbying and the pressure and the pulling in one direction or another by various airlines which may be involved in such a case, and which, after losing their case, before the CAB after proper hearing, rush to the White House, and, with all the pressure that can be brought to bear, try to get the President to intervene or to reverse the decision of the administrative body which has been established as the regular administrative agency to deal with such matters.

With respect to the second objective, namely, to protect the American airlines from having routes in Latin America and in other places, which routes have been pioneered and supported and developed with subsidy money given away to foreign airlines without any adequate hearing and without any representative of American airlines participating in the discussions and negotiations. The bill provides that the American airlines shall be represented in such discussions and negotiations.

I may say to the minority leader that the foreign airlines are represented, because we all know that they are government-owned, or are agencies or arms or subsidiaries of the foreign governments themselves. Are we to deny to the American-flag lines the right to be represented in the negotiations respecting such routes? Our American airlines certainly should have a voice in such discussions and under the bill they would have the right to participate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To carry out the idea the Senator has mentioned, the bill provides:

> (2) A representative of the air carriers shall be made a duly accredited member of the United States delegation to any formal negotiations. He may attend all negotiating sessions and meetings of delegation, and shall be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to consult with his principals during and throughout the negotiations and before any ultimate decision is reached.

Does that not mean that the person who represents the air carriers will become, for this purpose, a representative of the State Department of the United States Government in carrying on negotiations with a foreign country, and that, furthermore, he may give his information to private interests before any decision is reached by our Government?

It seems to me that puts him in a very difficult position, and also brings private interests into a governmental status, at a time when negotiations might have nothing or very little to do with the airline in question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am afraid the Senator has not read the earlier provision, to the effect that the Board "shall advise any air carrier whose interests it knows or reasonably should know will be effected." Only the airlines which are affected would be represented, or a representative of those airlines could participate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But he would become a part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. He would become a part of the negotiations. He would become one of the negotiators. The foreign airlines are certainly represented by their governments, because they are government-owned airlines. The purpose of the provision is to give our airlines similar representation in the negotiations, for heretofore in some cases they have resulted in destroying or partially destroying American airlines.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be better—and I am merely asking the Senator the question because of the language in the bill—to change the phraseology so as to provide that the representative of the State Department must consult with representatives of the airlines before he goes into the negotiations?

Mr. MONRONEY. The difficulty with that is that the airlines merely read about the decisions in the newspapers. The consultations of the past have been on the most casual and superficial basis. Our airlines feel that they have become the fall guy. I should like to yield at this time to the able chairman of the subcommittee which investigated this matter.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the very distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I held hearings on these provisions for a number of days. It was absolutely clear that our American airlines actually had no access to the information or to the negotiations which were carried on. In one particular instance, on which we concentrated, the State Department team forced the CAB member, who was also a member of the team, to grant to a foreign government a certain air route. That action was very detrimental economically to our own American airline.

The American airline had nothing to do with the proceeding, although it had put money into the line and developed the route and the passenger traffic. The State Department simply forced them into that situation, and said they would let the foreign line, which is a foreign government-owned line, fly alongside on almost as many flights as it wished.

Naturally American airlines—and I am not speaking of the airlines only, but of the American aviation industry—feel they should have some voice in these matters, because without consultation these American airlines can very well be destroyed.

It was the belief of the committee—and I am confident the senior Senator from Kansas shares the belief—that we should set up such a procedure as would give representatives of the American aviation industry a voice in these negotiations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree heartily with what the Senator from Florida has stated about having a voice and an opportunity to consult before a decision is made. What I am trying to suggest is that the provision in the bill would make the representatives of the airlines a formal member of the delegation of our Government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Actually what would happen, from a practical standpoint, is that the representatives of the industry would not represent a particular airline. Usually 3 or 4 companies—TWA, Pan American, and Braniff—would be involved, and they would select one man to be the member of the team. His major concern would be the economic concern.

Of course he could be outvoted by the representative of the State Department

and the representative of CAB. In the final analysis, if the State Department representative says, after the negotiations, "We have to grant this route to the foreign airline, but I can not tell you why except that it is in the national interest to do so," the foreign airline would still get that route.

However, unless some such procedure as is suggested is provided our airlines have no way of knowing what is going on, and they have no opportunity to tell the representatives of the State Department how American airlines are affected and why some decisions can destroy them. Machinery like this would protect them.

Mr. MONRONEY. One incident which we believe proves the need of the airline the member being a duly accredited member is that the observers for the American-flag interests in the Indian negotiations were thrown out of the conference. Only in this way can we protect the growing interests of the American airlines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3914) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GOSHEN VENEER CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2788, H. R. 10092.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10092) for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who has been very courteous and patient, and who has been waiting a long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

INCREASING IMPORTS OF OIL

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, when Christian, the hero of John Bunyan's matchless masterpiece known as Pilgrim's Progress, set out from his hometown of Destruction to the Celestial City, he found himself sorely burdened with sin. Similarly, the present administration, in launching its campaign for 4 more years of control of the Federal Government, is hopelessly burdened with a record of unredeemed pledges, broken promises, and repudiated agreements to serve the American people. To one of those important broken promises with which every Member of this body is more or less familiar, the attention of the Senate is invited.

While House bill No. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements, was before the Senate or its Committee on Finance in the spring of 1955, I offered an amendment to the bill to restrict petroleum imports into the United States to 10 percent of the domestic petroleum demand for the corresponding quarter of the preceding year.

When the bill and the proposed amendments reached the floor of the Senate in May 1955, the bill was passed, but my amendment, which was supported by 38 Members of this body, on a rising vote was defeated, upon assurances from spokesmen or friends of the administration that if voluntary action by the petroleum industry should prove ineffectual the President would take immediate action to restrict imports to the 1954 level.

It is a notorious fact that notwithstanding the solemn promises of importers and the administration, foreign oil which for two decades has flooded our shores is now at the highest tide it ever yet has reached in all the years it has devastated our coal, oil, and railroad industries, and pauperized hundreds of thousands of coal miners, oil workers, and railroad men.

The solemn pledges of immediate and decisive action by the President were given in support of a substitute amendment to the bill which gave the President specific authority to impose and enforce limitations upon oil imports. That substitute amendment was accepted by the Senate and became a part of House bill No. 1.

No one can read the debate on the substitute amendment, particularly the statements of friends and spokesmen of the administration, without reaching the conclusion that it was not merely permissive but directive. Certainly not even the most vigorous advocate of unlimited oil imports can deny that it was the purpose of the Congress to place drastic restrictions upon them.

The positive assurances that the President would act immediately to keep oil imports at their 1954 level were given to the Senate by two of the most reliable and illustrious Republican Members of this body, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Let me quote from the remarks of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], on May 3, 1955, as reported in volume 101, part IV, on page 5389 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

> I supported the proposal adopted by the committee because I was assured by those in the administration responsible for the administration of the trade-agreements program, that if such amendment were adopted by the committee and by Congress, action would immediately follow and that imports of petroleum and its products would be definitely restricted.

Elsewhere in his statement on the same subject that day, the Senator from Kansas said:

> It is my judgment that we can all rely upon these assurances, and that the importation of petroleum and its products will forthwith be limited to a relationship to our domestic production and in an amount equal to the 1954 position.

Then the Senator from Kansas added these significant words:

> There can be no doubt in my mind as to the intent of the committee, nor, do I believe, as to the intent of the Senate in regards to limiting the oil imports to the average daily imports of the year 1954, based on the report of the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Let there be order in the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President: There is no question but that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] relied upon strong assurances from the administration that oil imports would not be allowed to increase above their 1954 level. On May 2, 1955—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 4, page 5299—the Senator from Colorado stated:

> The President is certainly the best informed of all those interested in our national security. When he is informed of the possibility that imports may be threatening that security he, under the amendment adopted by the committee, would have a careful study made; and if such threat is found to exist he must act to limit imports to a degree removing that threat.

Senator DANIEL then asked him:

> Does the Senator feel that action would be taken if over an extended period imports should be in excess of the ratio which existed in 1954?

Senator DANIEL then inquired:

> I do; and while I do not propose to put a jinx on the processes we have recommended, if those processes do not work, I shall be among the first actively to support special measures.

Senator MILLIKIN further stated:

> The amendment which the Senator from Texas and I have been discussing has been accepted by the administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is endeavoring to cooperate with the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator will suspend until we have absolute quiet in the Senate. Those who have no business with the Senate at the present moment will remain quiet.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Not only is the Senator talking about a subject which is important to many States, but I do not know of any Member of this body who is more qualified to speak on the subject of the damage being done to many of our States than the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for those undeserved but most highly appreciated words.

Mr. President, those guaranties did not come from any Senator on this side of the aisle; they did not come from men without authority to speak for the administration. The Senator from Kansas left no doubt that he had received his assurances directly from those in authority in the administration who had solemnly assured him that if the substitute

amendment were adopted, oil imports would be restricted to their 1954 ratio to domestic production.

That was the promise. What of the performance by this administration and the big oil companies, who joined in making the promise, that they would voluntarily restrict their importations?

Unfortunately for the hundreds of thousands of coal miners, oilfield workers, and railroad employees who have been pauperized by the flood of foreign oil, and compelled to live on governmental doles, the promise in question long since became as useless as "winter's withered leaves."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Gladly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that the States of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania have had the highest unemployment percentages of all the States of the Union?

Mr. NEELY. That is true now, as it has been throughout this administration.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not true that most of the unemployment is in the areas which are affected by the lessening of the production in mining operations?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. CLEMENTS. They are affected by the importation of oil from foreign lands.

Mr. NEELY. That is as true as the Gospel. Mr. President, the average daily oil imports in 1954 were 1,052,000 barrels, representing 16.6 percent of our domestic production.

Senators should bear in mind the fact that at the time the House bill was passed—in May 1955—imports were far ahead of the 1954 level. At the time of the passage of the bill they were at the rate of 1,248,000 barrels a day, an increase of 20 percent over the 1954 level.

The solemn promises given the Senate by the administration through its friends and supporters were not merely that the imports would be held to the then existing level, but that they would be cut back to the 1954 figure, which, as just shown, was $1,052,000 barrels a day.

Senators please note the manner in which this administration's promise has been redeemed. We have been told of the 20-percent increase in the number of barrels imported in 1955 over the number imported in the preceding year.

This astronomical increase augmented agony in thousands of poverty-stricken American homes and greatly increased the number of victims suffering from the devastation of imported oil.

But for the first 6 months of this year, 1956, oil imports reached a new high level of 1,402,000 barrels every day, representing 19.5 percent of our domestic production.

What happened in 1955 and in the first half of the current year is but the prologue to what the importers have planned to do during the rest of this year. According to their own schedule, filed with the Texas Railroad Commission, they purpose, in the last 6 months of 1956, to import oil not at the 1954 rate of 1,052,000 barrels a day but at the rate of 1,531,000 barrels a day, approximately 22 percent of our domestic oil production.

In 1950, I pointed out to the Senate that the oil imports had averaged 564,000 barrels daily for the preceding 4 years.

At that time I predicted that within a very short time the importations would reach the colossal total of 1 million barrels every 24 hours. Some of the press sharply criticized me for that statement, and charged that I was engaged in a wild flight of fancy. My critics said that it was utterly incredible that oil imports would ever reach such an extraordinary figure.

But just 1 year after I made my prediction, imports rose to 844,000 barrels a day. In 1952 the average was 958,000 barrels a day.

In 1953, my prophecy was more than fulfilled, as imports reached a daily average of 1,034,000 barrels.

As all Senators know, from the 1955 and 1956 figures, previously recited, the imports did not even momentarily pause at the devastating figure of 1,055,000 barrels a day.

So once more, coming events cast their aminous shadows, before and I now predict, on my responsibility as a Senator, that if this administration succeeds itself, then, before the end of the next 4 years the importations of foreign oil into the United States will be, not at the rate which they have been for the first 6 months or will be for the last 6 months of this year but at the rate of not less than 2,500,000 barrels a day. Please note that prediction.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who was one of those who heroically fought for some proper restrictions on imported oil.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not want to break into the excellent statement the Senator is making. It is a statement which should be made. I was one of the cosponsors of Resolution No. 1, which would have limited the importations of oil to 10 percent. I think it can be very definitely stated that the Senate Finance Committee, which considered that proposal, decided that if we could work out a program of voluntary reduction of imports, to keep it within the 16.6 percent of the 1954 domestic production, it would be much better than to tie the hands of the administration by enacting restrictive legislation.

I share the views of the Senator from West Virginia. I want to commend him for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate. We are now importing oil to the extent of approximately 20 percent of domestic production. I can assure the Senator that when I made the statement that he has quoted, I had assurance then and still contend they will be carried out. There is no doubt in my mind as to the intent of the Senate Finance Committee, and the United States Senate felt that oil imports would be held to the 16.6 percent level as recommended by the Presidential Commission on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. I say to the Senator I still stand on that statement.

I wish to assure the Senator from West Virginia I have been working on this problem myself, because I feel I have some obligation in view of the commitment I made to the United States Senate and to the country.

I hold in my hand a letter dated July 19, from Arthur S. Flemming, who, after all, is the Director of our Defense Mobilization, and who has charge of the program. In this letter he states that he is hopeful that he can secure the cooperation of the oil companies, so that it will not be necessary to write legislation that will be mandatory in nature. I share that hope. I could place the letter in the RECORD at this point, but if the Senator from West Virginia prefers that I not interfere with his remarks, I can have it placed in the RECORD after his remarks.

If the Senator from West Virginia does not object, I shall read the letter.

Mr. NEELY. I shall be glad to have the Senator proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. The letter reads:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1956.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: I appreciated very much receiving your very thoughtful letter relative to the oil import situation.

I am not sure that my last letter to the oil importers has been called to your attention. In case it has not I am enclosing a copy with this communication.

As you will note from the letter to the oil importers, we are continuing to keep in close touch with this situation.

Many of the importers have responded in a very fine manner to the suggestions we have made to them from time to time.

A few importers have not followed our suggestions for individual voluntary action in an effort to solve what we recognize to be a very important problem.

As I indicated in my last letter if a few importers refuse to follow the lead of the great majority of importers, it will be necessary for us to institute formal proceedings under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act. We would take this action reluctantly.

We feel, for example, that if the Government should decide to impose quotas, sooner or later this would lead to either direct or indirect price controls. In other words it would ultimately lead to Government regulations of the entire industry. We feel that this would be unfortunate.

Nevertheless, if a few of the importers finally conclude that it is impossible for them to approach this matter from a long-term point of view rather than from the point of view of their short-term interests, we will have no other alternative than to initiate formal action on the part of the Government.

My first step would be to hold a public hearing. I am still hopeful that the reports which are now coming in from the oil importers will make such action unnecessary.

I appreciate your very deep interest in this matter and want to assure you that if at any time you have any suggestions to make regarding the problem I will be more than happy to hear from you.

Very sincerely and cordially yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

I call that to the attention of the Senator from West Virginia and to the Senate for the reason that I am in full accord that if this does not result in limiting imports to 16.6 percent of domestic production, on which we had an agreement, I shall in the next session be urging legislation that will restrict imports by legislative or congressional enactment.

Again, in view of my commitment to the Senate, that if oil imports are not voluntarily limited, I will press for enactment of legislation that will limit these imports.

Mr. NEELY. The remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas are deeply appreciated, particularly the assurance that he will help to do whatever is necessary in the next session of Congress to remedy by legislation the deplorable situation of which we are complaining. His help is always welcome. "One blast upon his bugle were worth a thousand men."

In my opinion failure to present this factual record of the defiance of the Congress by this administration and its injury to hundreds of thousands of jobless Americans for the benefit of a few titanic oil-importing companies would be a dereliction of duty. The flood of oil from the Middle East and elsewhere has enriched just six American oil companies and a similar number of turbaned princes and shahs beyond the most fanciful dreams of the narrations of the famous Arabian Nights. This inaction and neglect of duty by this administration has brought desolation to scores of once-prosperous American communities, and privation and misery to a mighty host who have been robbed of their birthright, deprived of their opportunities, and stripped of their dignity as self-supporting human beings.

Figures made public today on the earnings for the first half of this year by the two largest importing companies show how they have translated the misery of hundreds of thousands of American workers into the most stupendous profits of all times. Those figures show that the earnings of the Gulf Oil Corp. for the first 6 months of 1956 reached an astounding total of $138,072,000, as compared to $91,871,000 in the similar period of 1955. This established a new record of earnings for the first half of any year in the history of this Corporation.

The earnings of the Standard Oil Corp. of New Jersey for the first 6 months of 1956 have just been reported by the company as $392 million, as compared with $344 million for the like period of 1955. These earnings also represented a new all-time record for this company for any first half of any year.

Mr. President, if any proof be needed that all this tremendous increase of earning power came from oil that was produced in the Middle East and elsewhere beyond the boundaries of the United States, all that is necessary is to look at the earnings as reported by our domestic oil companies for the first half of this year, and compare them with the same period in 1955. These reports show that earnings of the domestic companies are at practically the same level at which they were last year.

Mr. President, the administration has callously repudiated the solemn assurances given to the Congress by its spokesmen on the floor of the Senate only 14 months ago. As a result tens of thousands of persons in West Virginia, and the other coal-producing States, and many of the oil-producing States, are today the victims of all the suffering and humiliation which prolonged unemployment habitually provides.

This is the brief factual story of a betrayal of the American people, in terms of both dollars and human misery.

The processes for the limitation of oil imports, as provided in the substitute amendment to House bill 1, have utterly and completely failed to work. The oilwells of Texas, Louisiana, and various other States should be producing oil from 20 to 25 days each month at the present time, but because of the importation of this foreign oil they are restricted to an average of 16 days a month.

Of course the administration has made a shallow pretense of implementing the authority and direction of Congress to limit oil imports. Blazing headlines announced that the matter had been placed in the hands of the Director of Defense Mobilization. There were the usual highly publicized studies, hearings, investigations, and reports, which deceived the naive and all who were not informed about the matter.

After all that misleading window dressing had been displayed, the Director almost apologetically requested the importers to keep the flood of foreign oil within its 1954 limits. Oil imports for 1954 were far more than could be justified by any sense of justice and reality; but if that level could have been established as a maximum, it would have represented a step in the right direction, and the distressed coal miners and operators and the distressed independent oil producers and workers and the unemployed railroad men would even have been thankful for that much relief. But even that scanty relief was never granted.

The importers did not pay the slightest attention to the request of the Director. Their response was to increase imports in the astronomical manner above described.

What does the administration intend to do about this defiance of its request? It is my hope that the friends of the administration, such as the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], can at least prevail upon the State Department not to permit any further increases.

Mr. President, in order not to delay the adjournment of Congress a moment longer than necessary, I have refrained from touching upon many other relevant matters which should have been mentioned and which should have been emphasized in this address.

Let me conclude with the solemn warning to all the importing companies concerned: Unless they mend their ways and mend them substantially, in the matter of flooding the entire Nation with foreign oil, unless they stop robbing hundreds of thousands of working men and women of their jobs, at the beginning of the next session of the Congress legislation will be introduced; and with the help of such patriotic Americans as the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the 36 other Members of the Senate who joined in supporting my amendment last year, there will be enacted a law that will make it impossible for 4, 5, or 6 titanic oil companies to continue to condemn hundreds of thousands of honest American workers to misery and starvation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the closing hours of this session of Congress, I do not wish to let this opportunity pass without again stating that I think the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] has rendered a definite service in calling attention to the ever-increasing importations of foreign oil.

As I stated during the colloquy, I feel that I have some obligation to the United States Senate and to the country, because of a commitment I made and a statement that it would be the hope of this administration and the sincere hope of the junior Senator from Kansas that the importations of oil would be limited to 16.6 percent of the domestic production of the United States. At present the importations represent 20 percent. As I read from the letter of the Director of Defense Mobilization, who, after all, is in charge of this, we are hopeful that we can bring down these importations with the cooperation of the oil companies.

Again I quote from the letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, dated July 19, 1956, and signed by Arthur S. Flemming:

> As I indicated in my letter if a few importers refuse to follow the lead of the great majority of importers, it will be necessary for us to institute formal proceedings under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act. We would take this action reluctantly.

Mr. President, I hope it will not be necessary to take such action, but I wish to state to the senior Senator from West Virginia and to the Senate that if action is not taken, and if these importations are not held within bounds, in the next session of Congress I shall be cooperating with the senior Senator from West Virginia and other Senators in order to keep a commitment which I made to the United States Senate and to the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question.

Like other Members of this body, including the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I am very much interested in the extra importations of oil. I wonder what suggestion the Senator has for actual accomplishment in reducing the importations from 20 percent to 16.4 or 16.5 percent. How is it to be accomplished?

Mr. CARLSON. During the colloquy between the senior Senator from West Virginia and myself, I read a letter dated July 19, 1956, from Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, which I do not care to read again at this time, because it is already in the RECORD. He states definitely therein that many of the importers have responded in a very fine manner to suggestions which have been made to them. I have just read a sentence from the letter, stating that if they do not follow through with the suggestions of the Director of Defense Mobilization, proceedings will be instituted under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, there is a law which could be enforced. Instead of enforcing the law, the practice we are following is to ask the importers to be kind and gentle and voluntarily reduce their imports to a certain amount?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wyoming is exactly correct. As I stated earlier, I was one of the cosponsors of Senate Resolution 1, which would have limited imports by statute to 10 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the only effective way to accomplish such an objective, is it not?

Mr. CARLSON. I would not say it is the only effective way. I think, after all, by voluntary cooperation we can solve some of these problems. But if such cooperation is not forthcoming, I agree with the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point I wish to make is that the voluntary cooperation pattern as between an executive agency of the Government and corporations operating in our economy is totally foreign to the scheme of government under which we operate. Agreement between the executive and the corporations interested in a particular kind of business is merely government by men and not by law, to use the old phrase.

I think the time has come for the Senator to insist upon the statutory approach, because then we shall not be dependent upon corporations which have many interests to serve, and which, in their negotiations can urge many devious suggestions with respect to their purpose.

I hope that in the next session of Congress the Senator will—indeed, I know he will—carry out the suggestion he has made, and join in a concentrated effort to obtain a statutory solution of this most important problem.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I am working on the problem at the present time, in the hope that we can obtain voluntary cooperation of the importers. My thought rushes immediately to a good Biblical quotation: "Oh ye of little faith." I have faith. I think we must have faith that cooperation will be forthcoming, but if the importers do not cooperate, I assure the Senator from Wyoming that he and I will be working together on this problem. I have confidence in the administration of the Office of Defense Mobilization under the capable direction of Dr. Arthur Flemming, who is devoting his efforts and office to hold such importations within the bounds set by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If they do not understand that they must cooperate, we are not likely to find very much cooperation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., to the United States, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. HALEY, and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12116) to provide for the conveyance of the Maritime Administration reserve shipyard at Wilmington, N. C., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the North Carolina State Ports Authority to the United States, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 12116) to provide for the conveyance of the Maritime Administration reserve shipyard at Wilmington, N. C., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the North Carolina State Ports Authority to the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 511) granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. HEINRICH KRONE AND DR. VERNER DOELLINGER, MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN REPUBLIC BUNDESTAG

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to state that we have attending our session today two distinguished members of the German Republic Bundestag, namely, Dr. Heinrich Krone, who is the floor leader of the CDU Party in the Bundestag, and Dr. Verner Doellinger, a Deputy in the Bundestag. I ask them to rise.

The distinguished visitors rose and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very happy to join in the warm welcome to our visitors.

EXCHANGE OF LAND AT AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH CENTER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2585) to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center, which was on page 2, after line 11, insert:

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666) providing that no appropriation shall be made for certain plans unless such plans are approved by resolutions adopted by the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the provisions of section 5 of such act requiring transmittal of a copy of such plans and the justification therefor to the Congress, shall not apply with respect to the Coneross Watershed project in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES THROUGH USE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I want to commend the Defense Department, and particularly former Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete, for the interest and the businesslike manner in which they have developed an active program for construction of military family housing in foreign countries through the use of foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under the authority of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.). We are all extremely interested in developing and exploring every potentially sound program for the disposing of our surplus agricultural commodities, and particularly programs which promote sound trading with less emphasis on aid.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is expected to have on hand by August 1, 1956, some 10 million bales of cotton, 1 billion bushels of wheat, 920,000 bushels of corn, 25 to 26 million hundredweight of rice, and a 3-year supply of tobacco. Total investment in price support commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation is expected to be about $8.5 billion by August 1, 1956.

From the standpoint of requirements for family housing in foreign countries, there is a need for about 50,000 units at an average cost of $13,500 per unit, or a total of about $675 million. The major part of this need can and should be met through the use of the surplus agriculture commodity program. I have taken a special interest in this program and have sponsored legislation in our military construction subcommittee which will expand this program. I believe this approach to be sound from the standpoint of implementing needed housing programs in foreign countries at the least possible cost to our Government.

The military construction bill—section 407, Public Law 765, 83d Congress—contained a $25 million authorization for the Defense Department to build family housing overseas with foreign currencies received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. Implementation of the program is under the direction of

an interagency staff committee on agricultural surplus disposal on which the Department of Defense is represented. During calendar year 1955, some $50 million in currencies of 6 foreign countries was earmarked for military family housing. These countries included the United Kingdom, $15 million; Japan, $17 million; Spain, $8 million; Italy, $3.5 million; Finland, $5 million; and Austria, $1.9 million.

This program has made the most progress in the United Kingdom where contracts were awarded by the British Government in January 1956 for the construction of 1,500 housing units for American military families in Great Britain in exchange for foreign currencies received from $15 million worth of surplus tobacco. The sterling received for the tobacco will be transferred to the British Treasury for the account of the Royal Air Ministry. The Air Ministry in turn will provide the land and arrange for the construction of the family housing. Present arrangements call for a nominal rental of 1 pound per unit per year to the American Third Air Force for the duration of the stay of the United States forces in Britain.

While the present program being conducted in Britain consists entirely of tobacco, the total receipts of foreign currencies are being allocated to the military-housing program. In Japan, the $17 million for housing is a part of the total program of $85 million, with a breakdown of commodities as follows:

	Million
Wheat	$22.4
Barley	3.1
Rice	14.4
Cotton	34.1
Tobacco	5.0
Transportation	6.0
Total	85.0

The $8 million for housing in Spain is part of a $21 million program, with a commodity breakdown as follows:

	Million
Cotton	$7.75
Cottonseed oil	5.00
Tobacco	4.50
Corn	1.75
Transportation	2.00
Total	21.00

The $3.5 million for housing in Italy is part of a program totaling $50 million, with the following commodity breakdown:

	Million
Cotton	$36.6
Wheat	9.1
Tobacco	3.2
Transportation	1.1
Total	50.0

In Austria the $1.9 million for housing is part of a total program of $5.9 million, with the following commodity composition:

	Million
Corn	$4.5
Tobacco	.5
Cotton	.5
Transportation	.4
Total	5.9

The $5.25 million Finnish program of which most of the proceeds are for housing, has the following commodity composition:

	Million
Cotton	$2.9
Tobacco	2.2
Transportation	.150
Total	5.250

Last year, I sponsored an amendment to the military construction bill which increased the authorization from $25 million to $100 million for the use of foreign currencies under Public Law 480. We also have broadened the authorization for use of currencies acquired "through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation." This made possible transactions under the CCC Charter Act which contains broad authorization for barter-type operations. A proviso was also included in the military construction act last year for reimbursement to Commodity Credit over a period of years for quarters allowances forfeited by recipients of housing projects built with surplus commodity funds. These changes have attracted considerable interest from countries where military construction programs are in operation.

For example, it was not possible in 1955 to negotiate a program with France under title I of Public Law 480, because the French were not interested in taking United States surplus commodities. Broader authority included in the military construction bill has provided a new approach for negotiation for use of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in the construction of military housing in France.

Under the new plan a barter-type program is contemplated which is a team approach, consisting of an interested French bidder and a commodity merchant. Bids for the construction of housing projects will be taken from a French bidder, based on payment in surplus agricultural commodities. The bidder will provide the land and construct the housing, taking payments from the military authorities in construction progress certificates. The certificates will be delivered to a merchant dealing in agricultural commodities, who will deliver them to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a credit against commodity shipments. The dealer will then sell the commodities received on the world market (outside of France) for various currencies which will be converted into French francs which will be paid to the bidder.

I understand that this transaction has been discussed and approved by the French Government, and an invitation for bids was issued in Paris on July 12, 1956, covering about 3,000 units at a total cost of about $45 million.

This barter-type transaction has particular merit because of its flexibility. Under this type of operation it is no longer necessary to confine the sale of commodities to countries in which the housing is to be built. For example, wheat sold in Africa or the Middle East can be used to build the housing in France. Accordingly, barter can be used to finance construction on island bases where there would be no conceivable use for a considerable volume of surplus commodities.

Still another special type of transaction is represented by the Austrian and Finnish programs. In neither country is there a requirement for a United States military housing program, yet both countries have abundant timber resources and are capable of producing good quality prefabricated houses.

In November 1955, the Defense Department was successful in obtaining approval from the French Government for using Public Law 480 credits in Austria and Finland for the purchase of 600 prefabricated houses to meet a portion of the urgent United States housing requirements in French Morocco. The Austrian transaction will be entirely financed with Austrian schillings; however, appropriated fund dollars will be used to pay for the erection and completion of the prefabricated houses bought from Finland.

With about $85 million in Public Law 480 currency presently available and about $45 million tentatively allocated to the French barter transaction, the current $100 million authorization is exhausted. This program is moving in the right direction and is deserving of expanding the present authorization to $250 million, which will be going a long way in terms of assisting in disposing of our surplus agricultural commodities, and at the same time provide needed military housing.

I believe that we should also explore the possibility of enlarging the use of surplus commodity funds for the overseas base construction program, which offers an even greater potential. At present title I of the Agriculture Trade Development Act of 1954 currencies can be used for overseas base construction only where such use is specifically accepted by the foreign government in the title I agreement. However, it appears that the present limited volume could be greatly increased through the use of barter transactions once the mechanism of such transactions has been worked out, and, provided, the terms of various base rights agreements are modified to allow for such a procedure.

This program offers a tremendous challenge, and to be effective, it must have the full backing of the administration at the highest level to overcome some of the obstacles which will arise from the policies of the foreign governments concerned, as well as the various agencies of our Government. If it receives this support, I believe we can move ahead on an expanded program which will make a real contribution to the removal of our surplus agricultural commodities on a sound basis.

COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had prepared a statement in support of Senate Resolution 236, but did not have time, when that resolution was under debate, to include it in my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on Senate Resolution 236.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS ON COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS

Senate Resolution 236, which recognizes the serious problem of imported textiles and directs the Tariff Commission to expedite escape-clause investigations and give them precedence wherever practical. The resolution expresses the concern of the Senate over the textile-import situation and asks the President of the United States to give immediate consideration to the impacts of the import of textiles and textile products with the view of using authority which he already has under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and other legislation to bring this situation under control.

Textile imports into the United States have reached an alltime peak in the last few months. They have expanded 2½ times in the last 2 years. The imports have taken over two-thirds of the velveteen market, one-third of the gingham and blouse markets, and one-fourth of the table damask market.

Imports are now coming into the United States at an annual rate of 350,000 to 375,000 bales of raw cotton. If we translate this into United States cotton acres, we find that it is equivalent to around 600,000 to 650,000 acres of cotton, which are being displaced by imported cotton products. Senators will recall, I am sure, the discussion and debate on my amendment to include in the farm bill just 100,000 acres to be used for our very small farmers. At one point in the consideration of this proposal, strong opposition was voiced on the Senate floor that 100,000 acres was too much of an increase in the national allotment in the face of our extreme surplus situation, even for the relief of small farmers. But now we see the normal production of cotton from 600,000 acres being displaced by imported cotton products. This is an increase of 350,000 to 400,000 acres in the past 2 years.

Unfortunately, the end of the rapid increase in imports of cotton products has not been reached. Up to this point we have felt principally the impact of low Japanese wages and the full brunt of the tariff reduction on textiles at Geneva a year ago. The reduction in tariffs on imported cotton products covered about 80 percent of the types of material we consume in this country, and the tariff was reduced as much as 48 percent on some items.

Beginning on August 1, 1956, another element will enter the picture which will permit foreign countries to purchase American cotton at about 6 cents a pound below the domestic price. Therefore, imports are practically certain to increase greatly from many sources, not just Japan.

I have consistently supported legislation to encourage expanded trade with friendly countries because I strongly feel that we must have a sound program of multilateral trade. This resolution is not an attempt to deny entry of imports into the United States. What we do want is for the executive branch to carefully reappraise our textile imports with the view of placing a reasonable limitation on imports to remove the threat of foreign textiles taking over a greater part of the United States cotton farmers' best markets here at home.

I believe that the real issue confronting us here is a matter of where we draw the line. Unrestricted imports, increasing rapidly as they now are, tend to demoralize and create uncertainties in our entire market. I strongly feel that this resolution is an orderly approach in trying to preserve the foreign economic policy of the United States and permit countries to keep a fair share of the United States textile markets and, at the same time, protect our farmers from having their already surplus supplies increased by excessive imports.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly referred to as GATT, to which the United States and 34 other countries are a party, specifically recognizes the existence of the United States law containing import quota authority on agricultural commodities and their products. That agreement acknowledges that the use of import quotas under section 22 is not contrary to the agreement. So when the cotton industry seeks protection from the imports of foreign-made cotton products by a reasonable import quota under section 22, it is in no wise attempting to interfere with the foreign economic policy of the United States. This problem was not presented to Congress until the avenues for getting relief through the executive branch had been exhausted.

We cannot and should not be expected or asked to buy enough textiles from Japan or any other country to pay for every bale of cotton we sell. That would lead us to an impossible situation. Before we could regain our 5-million-bale export market for raw cotton, we would have to import 3 to 4 million bales of cotton in the form of textiles.

We would have increased our exports, but the farmers' total market would not be improved, as increased exports would have been offset by increased imports.

The real issue lies in the fact that the point has been reached when cotton textile imports are interfering with the cotton acreage reduction and price-support program of the United States Department of Agriculture.

United States supplies of cotton for the current season are at an all-time peak. Carryover on August 1, 1956, will be at an all-time peak. United States peacetime exports are lower than they have been in 100 years. United States cotton acreage has been cut 40 percent in the last few years, making current acreage the lowest since 1883.

In the face of this critical situation, while American farmers are cutting their acreage, the raw-cotton equivalent of textile imports has been constantly increasing and is currently two and one-half times the 1954 level, the first year of acreage controls since Korea. This quantity of cotton is the normal production of about 640,000 acres.

Estimates given to me by the cotton industry indicate that if no effective controls are placed on imports they will likely increase to about five times the 1954 level when the new raw cotton export program gets fully under way.

Current imports of raw cotton in the form of textiles are equivalent to about 11 times the 30,244-bale raw-cotton import limitation. Certainly, this seems to me to be clear proof that under existing law, import quotas should be set at reasonable levels at this time to protect our cotton program.

That is why I support Senate Resolution 236 which expresses the sense of the Senate that the President give immediate consideration to the impact of imports of textiles and textile products with a view to determining whether import quotas should be imposed with respect to textiles.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOSHEN VENEER CO.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is the pending business Calendar No. 2788, House bill 10092?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10092) for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is present, and I am sure he will wish to make some explanation of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, possibly the best statement I can make regarding the bill is that the Judiciary Committee has reported it unanimously. The matter has been pending since 1950. I am not as familiar with it at this time as I was in 1950. The Judiciary Committee filed its report, and a few years ago the Senate passed a bill awarding the Goshen Veneer Co. nearly $600,000. The pending bill provides for the payment of $295,000. It is a fact that the House passed a bill providing for a payment of $75,000. The Court of Claims took a look at the record and recommended payment of $75,000.

The company in question is an old company which had been in business for many years. I have seen their physical properties. I happen to know that they were forced out of business as a result of the Army and Air Force coming on the scene. I know the family and I know the business. They had a great reputation for many years, but finally they were put completely out of business by the Defense Establishment.

The Judiciary Committee went into the matter very carefully. On private bills, such as this, we have to listen to the testimony of those who have studied the matter. We cannot go into every little detail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments will be stated and considered en bloc.

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were:

On page 1, line 6, strike "$12,750" and insert in lieu thereof "$50,176.16."

On page 1, line 8, strike "$2,250" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,858.66."

On page 1, line 9, strike "$21,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,639.91."

On page 1, line 10, strike "$8,250" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,468.66."

On page 1, line 11, strike "$8,250" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,468.66."

On page 2, line 1, strike "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$88,542.42."

On page 2, line 3, strike everything following "Indiana," through and including "1954)" on line 7.

On page 2, line 15, strike "25" and insert in lieu thereof "10."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois object to the adoption of the committee amendments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly, Mr. President.

This claim has been before Congress for some years, but the RECORD is quite the 81st Congress, 2d session. The comgress, as is shown by Report No. 2946 of the 81st Congress, 2d session, the committee of the House of Representatives

found that the company had certainly been characterized by bad financial management during the period. I read from the report, Mr. President:

Neither the Army, the financial institutions, nor the officers of the company could produce any balance sheet showing the financial status of the company at any time subsequent to July 31, 1942, and up until the time the company was liquidated by the Army.

The recommendation was made that the claim be submitted to the Court of Claims. This was done. The Court of Claims heard both sides and handed down a decision on March 2, 1954, which is reprinted in the House report on this bill, 84th Congress, 2d session, Report No. 2050, pages 2 to 20.

By a unanimous decision of the Court of Claims the court summed up its opinion in the following paragraph:

While there is no obligation—

And I emphasize, now, the words "While there is no obligation"—

that can be enforced against the Government, we recommend a payment of $75,000. This would be in the nature of a gratuity, but in the light of all the facts of record it seems to us the payment of this sum would be a fair adjustment.

In conformity with this finding of the Court of Claims, the House passed a bill providing for the payment of $75,000. I think the Court of Claims is correct in saying that this is a gratuity, but it may be worth while paying it in order to get this company off our backs.

Nevertheless, the Senate committee proposed to pay this company $295,154.47 or $220,000 more than the House recommended.

I do not have the personal knowledge of this company that the Senator from Indiana has, but it seems to me to be rather bad procedure for the Senate of the United States to supersede the courts of the United States in these cases. We provided a Court of Claims to deal with just such questions—claims of individuals against the Government of the United States. The court has found no legal case, but a gratuity of $75,000 was recommended. The company and its attorney, apparently, are not satisfied with this, and they have been trying to get the Judiciary Committee to increase the amount. I am not questioning the good faith of the members of the Judiciary Committee. I, personally, think this amount is excessive, from the record which has been developed. Incidentally, the attorney's fee which, under the House bill, would amount to almost $19,000, has been increased, under the terms of the Senate amendment, to a little over $29,000, or $10,000 more.

So, Mr. President, with due respect to the Senator from Indiana, I hope very much that the committee amendments will not be adopted, thereby saving the taxpayers $220,000 and conforming to the findings of the Court of Claims.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this claim has been pending before this body for a long time. Former Senator Donnell of Missouri handled the claim. It went to the House, and the House sent it to the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims made its finding of $75,000 based on the book value of the company. The claimant is a family concern. It operated for 50 years, and it made a good profit. Along came the war, and the firm was asked to expand its facilities. It got in over its head. The Army and the banks took over, and it ended up in the situation in which it finds itself today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYEES OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE—MOTION TO RECONSIDER H. R. 3489

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate on yesterday amended and passed H. R. 3489, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage, and, in accordance with the rule, I move that the Secretary be directed to return the engrossed bill, with the Senate amendment, to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS ON AN ACCRUED EXPENDITURE BASIS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, when the Senate acted the other day on the conference report on S. 3897, I made a statement of my reason for not signing that conference report—because the heart of the bill had been killed by the House when it deleted the section providing for stating appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis.

Today I am introducing a bill to correct that deficiency and legislative disappointment to the people of our country and those who worked so hard on the Hoover Commission recommendations on this subject.

Inasmuch as there is not time for this bill to be considered this year, I shall reintroduce it next year when I hope the Republicans will regain control of the Senate and I will be chairman of the Reorganization Subcommittee which will consider such legislation. I introduce it now so that it may be spread on the record for consideration and study by all parties concerned between now and the beginning of next year when the matter can be considered again.

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he is ready to proceed with the consideration of S. 3338, which has come over from the House with amendments.

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to have the bill considered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Before the bill is laid before the Senate, will not the Senator from Oklahoma inform us what the amendments will do?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Should not the Presiding Officer first lay before the Senate the message from the House?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I prefer that that not be done at this time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, earlier this year the Senate passed S. 3338, a bill sponsored by the two Senators from Oklahoma and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The purpose of the bill was to freeze for a period of 18 months, beginning January 1, 1956, the rates being charged by agencies of the Department of the Interior to the rural electric cooperatives, Government installations, and municipalities which were customers purchasing electric power from agencies of the Department of the Interior.

The bill was unanimously passed by the Senate and went to the House. In the House committee, certain amendments were added. I shall not discuss those amendments for the reason that when the bill went back to the House, not only were the amendments which had been added by the House committee deleted from the bill as reported by the House committee, but also the language of the bill as passed by the Senate was amended so as to make the freeze applicable only to the customers of the Southwestern Power Administration, in view of the fact that that is the area where the Department of the Interior is at this time seeking to increase the rates charged to rural electric cooperatives and other preference customers.

Because of the fact that the bill was to be temporary in effect, expiring June 30, 1958, and that there was no purpose on the part of the Department of the Interior to raise rates elsewhere—the only place where the relief is needed is in the area served by the Southwestern Power Administration—the House limited its application to that area and passed the bill on that basis today.

Mr. CLEMENTS. May I ask the minority leader if, after having heard the explanation by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, he has any objection to having the bill considered at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects, which were on page 1, line 5, strike out all after "energy" down through and including "thereof)" in line 7, and insert "marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration"; on page 2, strike out lines 1 through 4, inclusive, and to amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern

Power Administration, and for other purposes."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2248, S. 4183.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I understand, wishes to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? There are two Senators on this side of the aisle who wish to be present when the bill is under consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I understand that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] wish to be present. I yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MUNDT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN LAND

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 4284. I understand there is now at the desk an identical House-passed measure, H. R. 9679, to remedy the situation resulting from two identical bills having crossed each other. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 9679, and that it be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 9679) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a local bill providing for the sale of a small piece of property at Fort Belvoir, the valuation to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 9679) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN KJOSNES AND UNNI KJOSNES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 267) for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ellen Kjosnes, Unni Kjosnes, No Kum Sok (also known as Kenneth No), Jose Maria Arias-Ortega, and Katarzyna Pienkos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classified as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Giuseppe Scalia and Elizabeth Cacavas (Elisavet Ioannou Kakava). From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Giuseppe Scalia and Elizabeth Cacavas (Elisavet Ioannou Kakava) shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, the Senate passed S. 267, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiaries. On July 26, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 267, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 4 similar individual Senate bills, and the beneficiary of 1 similar individual House bill.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 267.

The motion was agreed to.

HELEN MAR STANGER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3196) for the relief of Helen Mar Stanger, which were after line 13, insert:

SEC. 2. Paul Edward Horn, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Paul Edward Horn shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

SEC. 3. Elise Delree, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Elise Delree shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 2, 1956, the Senate passed S. 3196, to provide for the restoration of United States citizenship to a former citizen of the United States. On July 26, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 3196, with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar individual Senate bill, and the beneficiary of one similar individual House bill.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 3196.

The motion was agreed to.

AMIN HABIB NABHAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3255), for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan, which were after line 7, insert:

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, sections 201 (a) and 202 (b) shall be held not to be applicable in the case of Giok Po Oey.

SEC. 3. In the administration of section 3 and subsection (b) of section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, Panagiota Paganis shall be held and considered to be under 21 years of age: *Provided*, That the words "if accompanying them" in section 3 of the said act shall not apply to the said Panagiota Paganis.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppina Coppola shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

SEC. 5. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yuriko Ito, the fiance of Dexter D. Good, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that said Yuriko Ito is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Dexter D. Good and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Ito, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon

failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Ito, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yuriko Ito as of the date of the the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Toki Lewis shall be held to be classifiable as a nonquota immigrant.

SEC. 7. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jo-Soon Duk, the fiance of Wilbert F. Kline, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Lee Won Duk, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Jo-Soon Duk is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Wilbert F. Kline and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Jo-Soon Duk and Lee Won Duk as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Elena Domantay, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Emilio Jose Domantay, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Florentia Bougades shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mrs. Anna Bougades, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 10. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Judith Wollner shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant.

After line 7, insert:

SEC. 11. For the purposes of section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Ljerka Zagar shall be held and considered to be under 10 years of age, and the assurances heretofore filed on her behalf by the prospective adoptive United States citizen father shall be held and considered to meet the requirements of section 5 (b) of the said act. Any application for a visa filed on her behalf pursuant to section 5 (a) of such act may be considered and processed notwithstanding the death of her prospective United States citizen adoptive father.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 2, 1956, the Senate passed S. 3255, to grant to the minor child to be adopted by citizens of the United States the status of a nonquota immigrant. On July 26, 1955, the House of Representatives passed S. 3255, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 4 similar individual Senate bills and the beneficiaries of 6 similar individual House bills.

The amendments are acceptable and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 3255.

The motion was agreed to.

TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, tax-exempt status for organizations described in section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code has historically been construed strictly, and such was the intent of Congress in making the benefits available to organizations which have the noble purposes outlined in that section. Such a strict construction is necessary if the diversion from revenue from the income of these organizations is to be continued. Congress has, in certain instances and under separate statutes, provided that the privilege of tax exemption should not inure to organizations which conducted certain subversive activities, and the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, specifically provides that any organization required to register by a general order of the Subversive Activities Control Board shall not have the benefit of such an exemption. However, the Supreme Court, in the last session, reversed and remanded for reconsideration a final order of that Board which designated the Communist Party as such an organization.

The courts, should the issue arise, might feel bound by the Supreme Court's ruling in the Communist Party case and in the case of Pennsylvania versus Nelson, that Congress intended to invade or preempt the tax law field and make the existence of a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board the criterion for determining tax-exempt status. This would have the effect of removing the discretion to deny tax-exempt status vested by the internal revenue laws in the Department of the Treasury until such a final order of the SACB had been upheld by the courts.

Such a ruling would involve no more distortion of legislative intent than was manifested in the case of Pennsylvania versus Nelson, which struck down the sedition laws of 42 States by the implication that Congress intended to preempt the field.

In response to inquiries addressed to the Department of the Treasury, I have been assured that the administrative discretion vested in the Department by the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 is being maintained, and that a continuing check on all organizations which have been granted exempt status is being conducted. While their response in connection with my inquiry was reassuring, it was wholly satisfactory, for the Department stated when an organization was designated by the Attorney General as being a subversive organization, and included on his list, then that organization lost whatever tax-exempt status it had enjoyed previously as a result of the lofty purposes which may have inspired its formation—its original goal.

Infiltration is an insidious process. Many organizations conceived with the highest motives have been taken over by subversive elements, and of necessity the determination that such infiltration has impaired its usefulness and altered the true character of the organization is a time-consuming and involved process of gathering evidence and allowing the traditional opportunities of the group to be heard in its own defense before any designation of subversion is finally attached.

But the rationale behind this tax exemption is the usefulness to society of the organizations' possible contribution in humanitarian fields.

Long before an organization becomes subversive, and before such subversive course is susceptible of proof, those original goals have been distorted to make any contribution of such an organization useless, if not dangerous. They no longer deserve tax-exempt status.

The Department of the Treasury has stated that they work in close harmony with the Department of Justice in their continuing survey of this field through their liaison with that Department. Therefore, I am sure these Departments would have no objection to a strong declaration of national policy, expressed through a concurrent resolution, that this course of action is regarded as commendable and is encouraged by the legislative branch. I think that other agencies charged with law enforcement duties or which meet situations which would have bearing on the tax-exempt status of such organizations should be encouraged to report to the Treasury any evidence or indication of activities indicating a diversion from the corporate charter purposes of the group or organization under consideration.

For example, the Fund for the Republic, the same organization which created such an expression of outrage from all of us who believe in the integrity of the jury system in American jurisprudence by planting recording machines in jury rooms, in its annual report last year by the president announced that the Communist Party is merely another political party. His words were:

A political party—

Meaning the Communist Party—

has been identified with the "enemy."

Mr. President, I would not attempt to deny this person the right to make his report. Freedom of speech is so priceless a part of our American heritage, that opinions and conclusions should not be suppressed.

I do feel, however, that such activities as planting recorders in petit jury rooms during actual case deliberations by the jury, besides substantially impairing the rights of the parties in those cases to a fair trial, in accordance with fundamental processes of law, actually make a mockery of the jury system. And when studies financed from tax-exempt funds result in conclusions directly contrary to finding after finding of fact and declaration of national policy, as expressed by Congress, regarding the nature of the Communist conspiracy, such an organization's tax-exempt status may well deserve closer scrutiny. Certainly this should be done if such dubious projects continue to dominate its activities in the future.

Another glaring example is the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

The charter purposes of this organization were not furnished me by the Department of the Treasury, nor were copies of the executed forms which successfully resulted in the declaration that the organization would be tax-exempt. I think everyone would agree, however, that many of the activities of this group emphasize neither education nor scholarship. It is primarily engaged in promoting strife, discord, influencing legislation, encouraging litigation, and generally propagandizing the American people, while working hand-in-glove through its alter ego, the NAACP. This is the antithesis of the concept of the educational exemption, with its inherent components of tax-free funds for scholarships, aid to education, and individual self-development and environmental adjustment. It has, in effect, achieved the opposite result, in many areas of the Nation. I feel that thorough and objective consideration of the activities undertaken would lead to a reversal of this organization's present tax-exempt status. Political considerations should not govern tax law interpretation. Serious charges of the loyalty of the founders of this group have been made recently—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 23, 1956, pages 3214–3215—by responsible men. Whether these charges are true is primarily a question to be determined by the executive branch of the Government, which is charged with the proper administration of the laws, and which has large numbers of trained investigators at its disposal for that purpose.

I urge the Department of the Treasury, with the full cooperation of the Department of Justice, and other executive departments, to maintain a close and continuing scrutiny of the activities of all organizations presently tax-exempt under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code, and to unhesitatingly revoke any exempt status when those activities indicate a substantial deviation from the purposes and goals expressed in the corporate charter or other organic authority.

Also, I call on the executive branch to exercise its best objective judgment, based on a full knowledge of the facts required by law, in restoring to the revenue of this country any portion of funds which presently are tax-exempt because of inadequate investigation and inadequate evaluation of activities of tax-exempt organizations, when compared with the purposes expressed in their charters or other organic authority.

I shall continue to give this highly important matter my attention, and I urge the utmost scrutiny on the part of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department. I urge all interested parties to present to these Departments such facts as may be available.

Mr. President, I call these facts to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the people, to show the importance of continuing close attention to and scrutiny of these tax exemptions and the activities of those enjoying the very substantial benefits. At some future time, when more facts are available, after investigations have been completed, I plan to submit to the Congress a resolution in which I shall seek again to express the legislative will of the Congress with reference to these matters, which can become very difficult and very delicate.

I know that the administration of such studies and such policies is very, very difficult, indeed. I make no charges against anyone in connection with the administration now; but I wish to emphasize over and over again the necessity of the closest kind of scrutiny and a close watching of all the activities, because on the basis of the investigations I have made, I verily believe that these vast funds are being used for purposes not passed on and understood by the taxing authorities when the exemptions were granted. I think it is another one of the warning signs of our times that will continue to call for the closest scrutiny, not only in the administration, but also in terms of legislative consideration.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate has jurisdiction over legislation relating to flood control, improvement of rivers and harbors, public buildings, public roads, waterpower, bridges over navigable waterways, pollution of navigable waters, and public reservations and parks in the District of Columbia.

Since the beginning of the second session of the 84th Congress, 95 measures were referred to the committee. The committee approved 44 bills, of which 34 were passed by both Houses. Lease-purchase projects for 120 post office buildings, Federal office buildings, and courthouses in a total amount of $638,189,015 were approved by the committee.

Committee resolutions for review of previous reports for flood-control and river-and-harbor studies were adopted in a total number of 36, and the Corps of Engineers will report to the committee on these studies, after completion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a list of the activities of the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of activities of the Committee on Public Works, U. S. Senate, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Public Law	Date approved	Title of bill	Estimated cost
404	Feb. 10, 1956	H. R. 7930.—Russian River Basin, Calif., flood-control project.	$1,165,000
434	Mar 21, 1956	H. R. 2552.—Modification of Great Lakes connecting channels.	110,327,000
435	Mar. 24, 1956	H. R. 5556.—Preliminary examination, McGirts Creek, Fla.	4,000
455	Mar. 29, 1956	H. R. 6309.—Construction of Mississippi River Gulf Outlet.	88,000,000
457	do	H. R. 6961.—Name Buford Reservoir; change name to Laek Sidney Lanier.	0
494	Apr. 27, 1956	Name Lake Berryessa, Calif.	0
528	Apr. 18, 1956	H. R. 6769.—Facilities for customs and immigration activies.	0
537	May 24, 1956	S. J. Res. 166.—Change name of dam on Cumberland River to Barkley Dam.	0
627	June 29, 1956	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956	[1] 26,883,000,000 [2] 4,608,000,000

Public Law	Date approved	Title of bill	Estimated cost
630	June 29, 1956	Rockland Harbor, Maine, improvement	$710,000
660	July 9, 1956	Water Pollution Control Act	515,000,000
663	do	St. Marys River, Mich., project	2,358,000
667	do	Amend Lease-Purchase Act	0
682	July 11, 1956	Rock Island, Ill., Mississippi River	0
683	do	Charge tolls over Manette Bridge, Bremerton, Wash.	0
684	do	Authorizing adjustment of rentals at Clark Hill Reservoir	
685	do	Amending Flood Control Act of 1948	10,000,000
754	July 24, 1956	Modifying project for Missouri River, Richardson County, Nebr	163,500
779	do	Changing name of Government Locks to Hiram M. Chittenden Locks	0
782	do	Storage water at Benbrook Dam, Tex.	0

PASSED SENATE AND HOUSE

Bill No.	Title	Estimated cost
S. 1384	Return to former owners certain mineral interests in lands acquired by Secretary of the Army.	0
S. 2092	Missouri River Bridge, transferring jurisdiction from Department of the Army.	0
S. 2424	Naming lock and dam on Black Warrior River the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam.	0
H R. 7596	Providing for disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways.	0
H. R. 8750	Amending the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.	[3]
H. R. 11010	Muscatine Bridge Commission	0
H. R. 10679	Railroad bridge across Mississippi River (granting consent of Congress to bi-State Commission between Mississippi and Arkansas).	0
H. R. 11861	Amending the act authorizing Federal participation in protection of shores of publicly owned property.	0
H. R. 8265	Relating to use of storage space in Buford Reservoir for purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply.	0
H. R. 8940	Relating to use of storage space in Hulah Reservoir to provide water for city of Bartlesville, Okla.	0
H. R. 10423	Providing for conveyance of land within the Garza-Little Elm project to city of Lewisville, Tex.	0
H. R. 12080	Omnibus River and Harbor-Flood Control Act	$1,617,696,000

[1] Federal. [2] State. [3] Indefinite.

Summary of activities of the Committee on Public Works, U. S. Senate, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND PASSED SENATE

Bill No.	Title	Estimated cost
S. 1823	Authorizing construction of certain works of improvement in Niagara River for power and other purposes.	(1)
S. 3338	Relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.	0
S. 3445	Providing for construction and furnishing of a building for the U. S. Court of Claims.	$3,500,000
S. 4099	Granting consent of Congress to Pittsburgh Glass Co. for construction of a dam on North Branch of Potomac River.	0
S. 4116	Increasing membership of Senate Office Building Commission.	0
S. 4228	Providing for President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space.	0
S. 4164	Providing for appointment of Federal Highway Administrator and for other purposes.	0

(1) No Federal cost.

PROJECTS UNDER LEASE-PURCHASE ACT

Location, project and estimated cost:	
San Francisco, Calif., courthouse and Federal office building	$45,300,000
Parkersburg, W. Va., courthouse and Federal building	3,045,000
Kingsport, Tenn., post office building	1,146,000
Hudson, Mass., post office building	198,789
Bellflower, Calif., post office building	297,500
Sparta, Mich., post office building	103,400
Lansford, Pa., post office building	94,000
Tupper Lake, N. Y., post office building	107,554
Wayland, N. Y., post office building	56,250
Sioux City, Iowa, post office building	85,500
Sheboygan Falls, Wis., post office building	105,000
Philadelphia, Pa., post office garage	1,805,000
Los Angeles, Calif., custom house and Federal office building	30,800,000
Sacramento, Calif., courthouse and Federal office building	10,210,000
Minden, La., post office building	412,000
Oklahoma City, Okla., courthouse and Federal office building	7,140,000
Houston, Tex., courthouse and Federal office building	15,300,000
Greenville, Miss., post office and courthouse	1,200,000
Homewood Station, Pittsburgh, Pa., post office building	238,500
Guilford, Conn., post office building	154,600
Gering, Nebr., post office building	136,915
Pittsford, N. Y., post office building	135,395
Teaneck, N. J., post office building	404,740
Winnetka, Ill., post office building	326,000
Camden, Ala., post office building	272,000
Phoenix, Ariz., courthouse and Federal office building	8,600,000
Little Rock, Ark., Federal office building	9,150,000
Helena, Ark., post office and courthouse	1,020,000
Marshfield, Mo., post office building	324,000
Ronceverte, West Va., post office building	255,000
Boston, Mass., Federal office building	28,150,000
Emporia, Kans., post office building	600,000

PROJECTS UNDER LEASE-PURCHASE ACT—Con.

Location, project and estimated cost—Continued	
Leavenworth, Kans., post office and courthouse	$968,000
Sisseton, S. Dak., post office building	530,000
Mount Hope, W. Va., Bureau of Mines Building	700,000
Livingston, Ala., post office	279,000
Hot Springs, Ark., post office and courthouse	1,729,000
Miami, Fla., Federal office building	8,875,000
Sedan, Kans., post office building	218,000
Jonesboro, La., post office building	365,000
New Orleans, La., post office building	19,670,000
Laurel, Miss., post office building	829,000
Redwood Falls, Minn., post office building	440,000
Moorhead, Minn., post office building	555,000
Greenwich, N. Y., post office building	112,890
Beaver, Pa., post office building	310,000
Manning, S. C., post office building	364,000
Smithville, Tenn., post office building	263,000
McKinney, Tex., post office building	480,000
Terrell, Tex., post office building	392,000
Victoria, Tex., post office and courthouse	1,563,000
Washington, W. Va., post office and courthouse	1,400,000
Washington, D. C. (southwest area) Federal office building No. 5	25,250,000
Washington, D. C. (southwest area) Federal office building No. 6	16,275,000
Washington, D. C. (Food and Drug Administration), Federal office building No. 8	12,190,000
Washington, D. C. (Civil Service Commission), Federal office building No. 9	22,115,000
Washington, D. C. (southwest area), Federal office building No. 10	40,900,000
Dallas, Tex., courthouse and Federal office building	25,490,000
National City, Calif., post office building	345,000
Newark, N. J., Roseville Station, post office building	206,025
Jersey City, N. J., Bergen Station, post office building	234,220
Waukesha, Wis., post office building	408,000
Rittman, Ohio, post office building	126,775
Detroit, Mich., North End Station, post office building	451,077

PROJECTS UNDER LEASE-PURCHASE ACT—Con.

Location, project and estimated cost—Continued	
Washington, D. C. (U. S. Geological Survey), Federal office building	$22,260,000
Washington, D. C. (17th and Pennsylvania Avenue), Federal office building No. 7	27,450,000
St. Marys, Ohio, post-office building	(132,900)
Point Pleasant, N. J., post-office building	(136,500)
Oxford, Pa., post office building	109,000
Brooklyn, N. Y., East New York Station, post-office building	491,300
Denver, Colo., Terminal Annex, post-office annex	8,209,000
Scranton, Pa., Dunmore Branch, post-office building	94,300
Garland, Tex., post-office building	183,450
Grand Prairie, Tex., post-office building	245,000
Two Harbors, Minn., post-office building	107,000
Ontonagon, Mich., post-office building	106,000
Grundy, Va., post-office building	106,000
Newkirk, Okla., post-office building	(98,100
Refugio, Tex., post-office building	117,700
West Memphis, Ark., post-office building	138,045
Cashmere, Wash., post-office building	97,200
Madison, Tenn., post-office building	138,040
Camden, N. Y., post-office building	147,300
Maplewood, N. J., post-office building	357,600
Skaneateles, N. Y., post-office building	103,500
Newtown, Pa., post-office building	150,915
New Richmond, Wis., post-office building	147,600
Prince Georges County, Md., post-office building	994,935
Hartford, Conn., Federal Office Building	8,350,000
Monticello, Fla., post-office building	310,000
Ocala, Fla., post-office and courthouse	1,580,000
Milledgeville, Ga., post-office building	502,000
Breese, Ill., post office	271,000
Fort Dodge, Iowa., post office and courthouse	1,980,000
Baltimore, Md., Federal office building	19,170,000
Denton, Md., post-office building	415,000
Bemidji, Minn., post-office buildings	1,200,000

PROJECTS UNDER LEASE-PURCHASE ACT—Con.

Location, project and estimated cost—Continued	
Brainerd Minn., post-office building	$612,000
Moberly, Mo., post-office building	487,000
St. Louis, Mo., Federal office building	13,760,000
St. Louis Mo., Federal Records Center	6,740,000
Cincinnati, Ohio, Federal office building	21,700,000
Portland, Oreg., Federal office building	5,092,500
Sharon, Pa., post office building	898,000
Lafayette, Tenn., post office building	275,000
Daingerfield, Tex., post office building	216,000
Orange, Tex., post office building	620,000
San Marcos, Tex., post office building	576,000
Salt Lake City, Utah, Federal office building	7,600,000
Portsmouth, Va., post office building	3,575,000
Waynesboro, Va., post office building	380,000
Franconia, Va., warehouse building	7,500,000
Denver, Colo., courthouse	6,420,000
Benton, Ill., post office building	1,100,000
Brooklyn, N. Y., courthouse and Federal office building	12,200,000
Manhattan, N. Y., Customs court and Federal office building	65,100,000
Toledo, Ohio, post office building	4,950,000
Pittsburgh, Pa., Federal office building	23,960,000
Charleston, W. Va., courthouse and Federal office building	3,820,000
Wailuku, Hawaii, post office building	757,000

Legislation which is of national interest is discussed briefly as follows:

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAYS

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 provides for a 13-year program for the Interstate System and a 3-year program for the Federal-aid highway systems. Authorized Federal expenditures for the Interstate System amount to $24,825,000,000 which is in addition to the $175 million already authorized for 1957. Federal funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems amount to $1,850,000,000, and for forest highways, forest development roads, etc., there is authorized $208 million. Therefore, the aggregate total authorization of Federal funds amounts to $26,883,000,000. It is estimated that the States share would be $4,608,000,000, making a grand total of $31,491,000,000 for the program as authorized. The matching on the Interstate System will be on a 90–10 basis, while the matching on the primary and secondary systems would be on the 50–50 basis. Alaska is included for sharing in the program.

The act would permit reimbursement to utilities for part of the relocation costs. There would also be limitation on the weights and dimensions of vehicles traveling on the Interstate System.

Five important studies are to be made in cooperation with the States. They are study of equitable tax allocations, size and weights of vehicles, reimbursement for highways now constructed, a highway safety study and a revised need study.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

The Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1956 will provide a much needed impetus to the solution of the Nation's water problem program. The legislation is designed to strengthen the water pollution control activity and improves the act which has been effective since 1948. The act provides funds for research, investigations, training, and information programs, and provides financial assistance to States and Territories by authorizing $3 million annually for 5 years to assist them in meeting the cost of establishing water pollution control measures. In addition, there is authorized $50 million annually with a maximum of $500 million for funds to assist cities and communities in the construction of sewage treatment works. The Federal grant for any project will be 30 percent of total cost, or $250,000, whichever is the smaller. The act provides that 50 percent of the funds must be used for communities with less than 125,000 population.

THE WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

H. R. 8750 which has passed both the Senate and House of Representatives upon which agreement has been reached, amends Public Law 566, 83d Congress, which was approved August 6, 1954. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service to assist local organizations in planning and carrying out projects for flood prevention and to assist them in all phases of water conservation and utilization and disposal of water.

H. R. 8750 would grant authority to include in reservoirs which might be constructed, storage for municipal and industrial water supplies and would allow an increase in size of reservoirs to be considered from 5,000 acre-feet to 25,000 acre-feet. The increase in capacity would be used for irrigation water supply and other such purposes. The proposed amendments would provide that all of the construction costs of dams and other such structures for flood control be borne by the Federal Government with the local organizations continuing to provide the necessary rights-of-way and operation and maintenance. There are provisions that local organizations may employ professional engineers, if they so desire, or they may call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to perform any or all engineering services for the local organization with exception of those associated with municipal or industrial water supply.

H. R. 8750 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans or advancements to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvements. These loans or advances would be repaid in 50 years with interest. It is also provided that the present requirement of a 45-day waiting period before construction can be initiated is eliminated and any project involving less than $250,000 of Federal contribution to construction costs and containing no structure having no more than 2,500 acre-feet of capacity will not require review by other Federal agencies or Congress.

RIVERS AND HARBORS—FLOOD CONTROL

The committee approved a comprehensive rivers and harbors, beach erosion control, and flood control bill to carry forward these important programs for development and improvement of the rivers and harbors of our Nation, for protection of our citizens against the ravages of floodwaters, and for the general development of the Nation's water resources. Additional authorizations are believed necessary at this time to continue the unified basin water resources developments now in progress, to round out basin programs where changing conditions have shown the necessity for extensions or modifications, and to provide for individual projects found to be necessary and justified. Completion of these projects will contribute materially to the economic well-being of the Nation.

The river and harbor program has produced the best system of inland waterways and harbors on our seacoasts and the Great Lakes to be found anywhere in the world. Tonnages moved over these waterways and into our harbors have reached enormous figures and are increasing each year. The uses of these waterways have returned to the country large savings in transportation costs, and have been responsible for the growth and development of large sections of the Nation. They have proved invaluable both in times of peace and in times of national emergencies.

The accomplishments of the flood-control program have more than justified its cost, by returning in benefits more than $3 for each $1 invested, not taking into account the intangible benefits such as the saving in life and the economic security of hundreds of urban communities and farming areas.

Development of hydroelectric power is an important product of the multiple-purpose program. The present installed capacity of all multiple-purpose projects of the Corps of Engineers is more than 4 million kilowatts, and when projects under construction are completed, the total capacity will amount to about 7.6 million kilowatts. These projects make low-cost power available to many rural areas, and return the Federal investment to the Treasury in a short period of time.

The total authorization contained in the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill is $1,617,696,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as one of the minority members of the Committee on Public Works, I should like to say that this year, under the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Committee on Public Works has achieved what I regard as what probably will stand out as the launching of the greatest program of public works that has ever come from the Public Works Committee during any session of the Congress.

The highway program alone, with its 13-year program for the Interstate System, and its 3-year program for the regular categories of Federal highways, stands out as the largest highway program the Nation has ever undertaken.

In addition, the omnibus rivers-and-harbors flood-control bill—which the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], knows in detail, because he was chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on those projects—provides for probably one of the most comprehensive programs for river-and-harbor development that has ever been embodied in any one bill introduced in the Congress.

In addition to those two outstanding measures, there have been the antipollution bill, the Small Watersheds Act, and the great program of lease-purchase of buildings for Federal courthouses, post offices, and general Federal buildings. That alone is the greatest program of that character that has ever been presented.

So the Committee on Public Works certainly has made a great record this year; and I think it is due to the leadership of the chairman, the cooperation of the several members, and the cooperation of the good staff.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to state that I, personally, wish to thank each member of the Public Works Committee for his fine cooperation. I refer not only to the Members on our side of the aisle, but also to the Members on the other side of the aisle. I do not know how a chairman of any committee could have had finer cooperation than that which I have received; and I wish to thank each one of them openly.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

As a member of the Committee on Public Works on the minority side of the aisle, I wish to congratulate and pay my sincere respects to the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. CHAVEZ, and, indeed, to all the other members of the committee who have worked with him in fashioning a long series of great pieces of constructive legislation which is now the law of the land. Most of them have been enumerated by my friend from South Dakota.

Speaking as a Californian, I wish also to say that the very great achievement of this Congress in adopting air pollution legislation is in great part the result of the generous interest shown in that problem by the able chairman of the committee.

I wish also to commend the part which my very able friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], now presiding over the Senate, played in the work of the committee. Speaking from at least a parochial standpoint, on behalf of California, I assert that he participated in helping us to write into law one of the most constructive pieces of legislation this Congress has enacted.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very grateful for this opportunity to express my sentiments. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as well as those of my friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

It is only fair to remark that, as a result of the work of the past 2 years, every member of the Committee on Public Works formed not only an admiration, but an affection, for the distinguished chairman [Mr. CHAVEZ].

He has been ably assisted in the leadership by the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and by the senior minority member, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. They have provided a team of leadership which, as the Senator from South Dakota has stated, has put through probably the greatest public works program ever enacted in any session of the Congress.

I am proud to have been a member of that committee, and to have served under the leadership of these fine Senators.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to add my commendation to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from New Mexico, and all members of that committee. The committee has dealt with some of the most important legislation handled by the Congress during this session. It has dealt with some of the most involved problems. Due to the hard work of the chairman and members of the committee, we now have a good public roads program. As a result of their foresight and effective work we will now have a road program that will meet a long needed road problem.

Also I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], chairman of the subcommittee handling many problems involving North Dakota interests. The committee is to be commended for its very fine work.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] has said. Particularly I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, chairman of one of the subcommittees, for the very courteous treatment he accorded certain North Dakota citizens when they appeared before his committee. In all my experience of 15 years in the Senate I do not recall that I have ever seen a Senator miss his luncheon in order to afford a hearing to the citizens of my State, who were obliged to catch a plane.

For that reason, particularly, I wish to express my personal appreciation for the very fine service rendered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Also I wish to commend the work of the chairman of the Public Works Committee, who did so much at various times to help the people of my State.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Would the Senator say that he received better treatment in connection with public works from the Committee on Public Works than he has received from the Foreign Relations Committee in connection with the appointment of ambassadors? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is out of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their references to me as chairman of one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Public Works. Also, on behalf of the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. KERR], I express appreciation for the generous remarks regarding his work.

In turn, I wish to join in the generous remarks regarding the great work done by the chairman of one of the subcommittees, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma.

As to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, not only do I wish to join in the generous, fine, and accurate statements regarding his service, but I wish to go a little further and express my very personal appreciation and thanks for the undivided, unquestioned support, encouragement, and inspiration he has afforded me as chairman of one of the subcommittees, and for the leadership he has provided for the entire committee in the very fine and heavy work his committee has done.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in the complimentary mention of the work of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works. In addition, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the great road bill which has been enacted into law. Already several States have entered into contracts for the construction of interstate highways.

Earlier in the day I placed in the RECORD the plans and specifications outlined by representatives of 46 of the 48 States. I hope every Member of the Senate will carefully read those specifications.

I think it is the duty of the Senate and the House to follow very carefully this great road program. It is the greatest undertaking, aside from war, that America has ever engaged in. Its real success will be assured if Members of the Senate and House, as representatives of the people of this great country, give it the proper attention.

I believe that the same policy could profitably be followed in connection with other activities as we have followed in connection with the road program. It is a pay-as-you-use plan, and that is a sound governmental activity. I am in favor of all the great programs we are undertaking, but sometimes I am very much worried over how some of these programs are to be paid for. There must always be a payday.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues, who have said very complimentary things relative to the chairman of our committee and its members. It has been a very hard-working committee, and I think it has achieved marvelous results.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The present occupant of the chair would like to observe that he is especially grateful to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for his indulgence in yielding to members of the Committee on Public Works. I am especially thankful for their kind remarks about me. My association with the members of that committee has been one of the high privileges of my life.

I am also very grateful for what has been said about the great chairman of the committee [Mr. CHAVEZ], for his leadership, and about the other members of the committee, for their unselfish work on the committee.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota if the bill would provide for payments in lieu of taxes on Federal property which was acquired at a date earlier than 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. As far back as 1950.

Mr. AIKEN. How far back?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Nineteen hundred and fifty.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire if the case I have in mind would be covered by the bill. I have in mind the two towns of Jericho and Underhill, in Vermont, where 50 or more years ago the Government acquired an artillery range and used it for a generation for that purpose, and then gave it up. There is a possibility that there may be some "duds" in that land. For that reason it cannot be used for any purpose, and perhaps cannot be sold. There are several thousand acres involved. In the meantime, the towns, which used to get some benefit from the land, get no return from it at all. It is a total loss to the towns. Would such type of property be covered in the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. No. Only property acquired after June 30, 1950, would be covered.

However, property, as such, is not excluded, since the board which would be set up would be directed to make further inquiry and study into the extension of the principle of payments in lieu of taxes.

Rather than go in detail into the question raised by the Senator from Vermont, I should like to proceed with the opening discussion of the bill, which is a technical bill, and then return to answer questions raised by the Senator from Vermont and other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Minnesota had not started the discussion.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I had not started it. I was accommodating Members of the Senate who were paying greatly deserved tributes to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and other members of that committee.

Mr. AIKEN. The situation I have in mind has resulted in the the towns suffering great loss through the action of the Government, and they have no way of making good. Any legislation of the type now being considered should certainly provide for recompensing communities for such loss as these towns have sustained.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Not unless the properties have been acquired after the cutoff date, June 30, 1950.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator from Minnesota prepared to take up the pending business? If so, we have an understanding with the minority leader that we will have a quorum call so that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] may be notified before the bill is taken up. Therefore, Mr. President, I make the point that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that for the moment?

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have very diligently advised all Senators on this side of the aisle who are interested in the proposed legislation.

I have marked my calendar with the names of the Senators who are interested. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota had told me where he would be, and he was notified; and other Senators also have been notified.

Mr. MUNDT. We have located the Senator from Iowa, and I believe he will be here before we conclude the quorum call. I did not expect, and he did not expect, that a revolutionary piece of legislation such as this would be brought up at 4: 40 in the afternoon of the day on which we expect to adjourn before midnight. Therefore, we understood that we would have a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota obviously will wish to make an explanation of the bill, to which the Senator from South Dakota, I understand, wishes to propose amendments. Therefore, instead of requesting a quorum call now, it would perhaps be best to let the Senator from Minnesota proceed with his explanation.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, the Senator from Iowa expects to participate at great length in the debate. In order for him to do that effectively, I am sure he will wish to listen to the very persuasive arguments to be made by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Did I understand the Senator from South Dakota to say that there would be extended debate on this bill?

Mr. MUNDT. Fairly extended debate.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. The pending bill has been scheduled for consideration for the past 2 weeks or more. Certainly it is time for us either to take it up or not to take it up.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to yield to me so that I might inquire of the Senator from South Dakota if I understood him correctly in saying that there was going to be extended debate on the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Not too extended. I have a few brief notes to which I must refer to in the course of the debate; it will take some time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should like to have the Senator's further comment on what he considers extended debate.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe we can conclude the debate early next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, with the understanding that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I do. I should like to have a definition of what is meant by extended debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I shall be glad to answer the questions of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. From what I have heard of the discriminatory character of the bill and of the revolutionary things it proposes to do, I regard it to be such an important bill that I will make it my personal chore to make sure that there is a quorum present on the floor while the bill is being considered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was not with the idea of expressing any position on the merits or demerits of the bill that I asked my question of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I wanted to get the information because I thought it would be of help to the leadership in planning the afternoon and evening program.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate very much the consideration of the acting majority leader. In a spirit of reciprocity I may say that if the leadership insists on bringing this bill to the point of passage before adjournment, I shall cooperate fully in seeing to it that Congress can adjourn, I hope, before the Democratic convention begins in Chicago.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If Congress does not adjourn by that time, the senior Senator from South Dakota will be recorded as an absent Member of the Senate at the Republican convention.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I do not see the Senator from Iowa on the floor. Therefore, I believe we can have a quorum call at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I make a point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat his statement?

Mr. MUNDT. I make the point that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota did not yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; he did, as I understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of no quorum is not in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the leadership has called up the bill S. 4183, which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations. This bill, which is commonly known as a payment-in-lieu-of-taxes bill, would authorize, for a 5-year period, first, a very limited program of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950; second, payments of special assessments levied after the effective date of the act in urban or suburban areas, if

such assessments were also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons; and third, payments in lieu of taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property leased or sold to private persons under conditional sales contracts, if such property were owned by a taxable person.

The program would be administered by a five-member, bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. A taxing authority would be required to file an appropriate application, specifying the Federal property involved, the basis of its claim, and the period for which the claim is made, not to exceed 12 months in any single application. The Board, after determining the existence of a probable basis for the claim, and conducting a hearing if a basis is found to exist, would be required to determine and certify to the controlling Federal agency the amount of payment to be made to the local taxing authority. In the case of industrial or commercial real property, however, the applicant would be required to make a showing that Federal acquisition of such property has resulted in a financial hardship to the community in question. The actual payment to be made would be based upon the amount of local taxes which would have been payable had the property been privately owned, increased by any additional expenditures incurred by the taxing authority in furnishing services to the Federal property, and diminished by the aggregate of local-type governmental services furnished by the controlling Federal agency, further diminished by any additional credit against Federal liability resulting from any exemption, immunity, or reduction in the tax rate or amount, if such are available, under State or local law, to private persons as an inducement to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of the particular tax authority. The Board's decisions are made final and would be conclusive upon all taxing authorities and Federal agencies.

Mr. President, this bill represents the culmination of more than 7 years of continuous efforts by the Committee on Government Operations to develop a program which would afford some measure of relief to local communities which have suffered losses as the result of the presence of Federal tax-immune property in their jurisdictions, but would not do violence to the principle of Federal tax immunity or constitute an undue burden on the Federal Treasury. Through the years, many hundreds of witnesses have been heard; many volumes of testimony have been compiled; and numerous reports have been made by interested groups and carefully studied by the committee.

Mr. President, I think I should note that this bill is not, as was stated some time earlier, any sort of revolutionary departure in the public policy of this country. As a matter of fact, the bill covers only a very limited category of property and is no more revolutionary in nature than are the 55 existing laws which authorize similar Federal payments.

Mr. President, I note this for the RECORD because very often it has been said that we should study the question a little longer. We have been studying this problem for more than 20 years. Furthermore, Mr. President, the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations established by the Congress, which made its report to the 84th Congress, spent almost 2 years in exhaustive and comprehensive studies of the very subject matter which is now before us.

I should like to note, also, that a number of our colleagues have introduced bills upon this subject matter. I think 11 bills were introduced by various Members of the Senate, some of them with cosponsorship. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] introduced such a bill, as did the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. There were also other Members of this body who introduced measures directed toward the same objective, some of which were much broader in scope than the limited provisions of the bill which is now before us.

I introduced in this Congress, as well as in the 82d and 83d Congresses, measures directed toward regularizing and reorganizing the Government's program of payments in lieu of taxes. I emphasize this matter only because the argument that we should delay, the argument that we should study further the question and the argument that we should have more time, fall for lack of evidence.

When 20 years have been spent in the study of a proposal, it appears to me that there has been not only elementary, secondary, and higher education, but also just about all the graduate courses that could possibly be taken. It now appears that the time has come to stop studying and to move into action.

The purpose of the bill is to move into the field on a limited scale and, at the same time, to provide a continuing study with pragmatic tests. Applications from local taxing authorities would be considered by a competent Federal administrative board. Unless this is done, there would be nothing more than a study in the theory of government, and nothing could be done about its practical application.

I hold in my hands two volumes of testimony, compiled as a result of hearings conducted during this Congress. We also held hearings in the 83d Congress, and in the 82d Congress.

As I indicated earlier, the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations published a very extensive volume on this particular subject matter, containing some 200 pages in that report.

I desire to point out that the Committee on Government Operations concluded that if anything ever was to be done about the matter, there must be a beginning. Working carefully and closely with the Bureau of the Budget which represents the President and the departments of the Government, a bill has been prepared for the consideration of Congress which provides for a limited, 5-year program; a bill which has specific limitations as to the scope of the program; and which provides for a continuing study of the practical problems and the objectives, through a Federal board on payments in lieu of taxes.

I desire to have the RECORD show also that the Federal board to which I have alluded, and which is described in detail in the report, will study the matter, not on the basis of a generalized, visionary study, but rather on a case-by-case basis. Each locality having Federal tax-immune property would make an application to the Federal board for payments. The Federal board would determine the amount, if any, to be paid. Furthermore, its studies would be related to each situation presented.

One of the arguments which some persons have made against the bill is that it fails to cover certain areas or categories of properties in the States they represent.

But I point out that every piece of legislation, with few exceptions, has had a beginning point, as did, for example, social security, minimum wages, and the program for health and research.

This bill makes a beginning, in manageable proportions, so that we will know what we are doing; so that we can proceed case by case, locality by locality, on the basis of the facts, and not in any way overextend our responsibilities at the Federal level. At the same time, we will not ignore the crying needs of community after community, which at the present time find their tax base being whittled away by the acquisition of property by the Federal Government.

It is for that purpose that I defend the bill before the Senate. It is for that purpose that I took upon myself, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the responsibility for holding hearings. I wish to make it quite clear that I have no special interest in this legislation, except as a service to my colleagues.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the bill apply to public lands?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. It does not apply to public lands, so far as immediate payments are concerned. But the board would receive applications, evidence, and testimony as to the need for payments upon public lands. In other words, a State or a local authority may make its application and be heard upon it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. THYE. The thought occurred to me—and my colleague and I are confronted with the same problem—that the Federal Government owns property at Rosemount, in Dakota County, Minn. How would the bill affect the 8,000 acres

of Federal property which lie within that one county?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. The property would be subject to review by the Federal board. If there were any financial hardship in that particular community, the property would be subject to payment by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes.

Mr. THYE. A hardship must exist.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Almost 8,000 acres of excellent farmland have been taken over by the Ordnance plant, a part of it under the experimental operation of the University of Minnesota, some of it rented back to the farmers who live adjacent to the area, and who are farming it on a share basis.

The same question could be raised as to Indian lands in the State, and also as to the national forests.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Those lands would not be covered by the express language of the measure, although they would not be excluded from a study by the Federal board for further recommendation.

Mr. President, I now wish to yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]; then I shall decline to yield further until I have concluded my remarks. At that time I shall be glad to yield to my colleagues.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota upon the work he has done on this very important measure, which, as he says, has been in issue for a good many years. It is a matter of great concern to many of our communities.

I especially congratulate him because, as he said, he has approached the study from a completely disinterested point of view. He has given it very objective treatment. I think he has come forth with a bill which, while it does not go so far as my bill, or so far as I should like to see it go, is a move in the right direction. It is a step toward correction of the injustices done by the Federal Government when its operations impose additional tax burdens upon local government.

I am sorry the cutoff date had to be 1950, because I am one of those who feels that it does not give them the relief they should have. Nevertheless, I think much progress has been made, and I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I am grateful to the Senator from Connecticut. I assure him we were very much assisted by his splendid testimony before our committee, and I want to thank him for his participation and his leadership in making possible the consideration of this measure.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I do not want to have to cut off colloquy and debate on the bill, because it is the privilege of the Senate to debate. Since my adversary on this measure seeks to ask a question, I shall yield to him for that purpose, but with the clear understanding that I shall then proceed with my statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much. In answer to the questions asked by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota very accurately and candidly stated that the bill does not provide any payments for the kind of problem they presented, in public land States and rural areas. I wonder if it would be a fair summation, therefore, to say that the bill as it is now written provides cash subsidies for the cities and continuous studies for the rural areas and public land States?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is not true, because it is possible that there may be a Federal installation in rural areas, such as exists at Rosemount, Minn., which surely is out in the country. The bill applies without regard to whether an urban or rural area is involved, if there is a Federal installation that inflicts a hardship on the local communities; and local communities can be townships, sanitary districts, school districts, or counties.

I think it is wrong to try to prejudice the pending legislation by saying it is an urban versus rural fight. The truth is that most industries are in urban areas; but under the Federal Government's own dispersal program, there are times when industry finds itself far out in the country. It may not mean that there are chickens and cows and turkeys on that installation, but that does not in the least make it nonrural.

The bill would establish a very limited program. It is only for a 5-year period. It is within our means to extend or expand the program if the studies and recommendations which are made show the necessity for further action.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of correcting the RECORD?

Mr.HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Inadvertently, I think the Senator from Minnesota left the wrong impression.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I shall be happy to have the Senator correct the error.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator was right when he pointed out that payments in lieu of taxes for industrial and commercial property can take place whether the industrial property is in the city, where it always is, or in the country, when it can be found there. One of the difficulties of trying to enact comprehensive legislation of this kind, in the twilight of adjournment, is that we do not get a chance, in the turmoil, to concentrate on the language. The second section provides for payment of special assessments in urban areas. So the sanitary districts and the country areas would not receive anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. If the Senator from South Dakota will be more accurate and not quite so oratorical, he will see that the section says urban and suburban.

Mr. MUNDT. The language in section 2 reads: "special assessments levied after the effective date of this act upon real property situated in urban and suburban areas."

Suburban communities are considered the environs of big cities, and the provision does not affect such States as Nevada and other public-land States.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. It is true that it does not cover public lands.

Based upon these many years of study and consideration, the committee has come to the following conclusions:

First. There is an urgent need for immediate legislative action to relieve local taxing authorities from unjustified and inequitable burdens and hardships which have been imposed upon them as the result of large-scale Federal acquisition of various types of property which has operated to remove such property from the local tax rolls.

Second. Because of the extremely complex nature of the subject and the many variables which are involved, it is not possible to devise a comprehensive program which will operate in a fair and equitable manner, and which is not likely to involve huge expenditures of Federal funds and possible "windfall" payments to communities which have actually been benefited rather than harmed by the presence of Federal installations.

Third. The only equitable type of program which is possible is one in which payments are based upon individual cases and situations as they are presented and documented, and as information relative to each situation is compiled, evaluated, and assessed on its merits.

Mr. President, S. 4183 would provide for the beginning of such a program, on a 5-year trial basis. It would permit modest payments in limited areas and, in its major aspects, would permit payments only to those local taxing authorities which are able to show that, after weighing the benefits resulting from the presence of Federal installations against the burdens imposed on local taxpayers and local taxing authorities, they were still suffering financial hardships.

I want to underscore the fact that communities often receive benefits from those installations. I want to underscore the fact that many chambers of commerce have come to Washington to see their congressional delegations in order to get Federal installations. I want to make it clear that under this program payments on industrial or commercial real property should be made only when it can be demonstrated that there is financial hardship. What does that mean? It means financial hardship to the point where the local taxing authority is unable to meet the cost of local services which are necessary, even for the continuity of the Federal installation.

We are seeking elemental justice. I have not tried to delude anyone. I have talked with the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] in particular. It is not what they had hoped for. It is not what they had planned on. It is not what they deserve, and it surely is not what the public land States deserve. They get little or nothing from this particular bill, nothing

other than the possibility of further study and proposals, which are recommended. But I say the bill establishes the principle of the responsibility of the Federal Government for payments in lieu of taxes, if there is financial distress and hardship which Federal installations or the presence of Federal activities impose on communities.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I have said I would not yield, and I prefer to continue and complete my statement. I hope the Senator understands.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the bill would implement, in principle, many of the major recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Mr. Kestnbaum, relative to payments in lieu of taxes. Furthermore, it has the support of the administration and embodies the views and amendments submitted to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget.

Let me be very candid with my colleagues. I wanted what I thought was a more generous and comprehensive bill. I argued for weeks to bring out a better and more generous bill; but I thought if we could accomplish something, it would be better than to accomplish nothing. I thought if we could get the Bureau of the Budget and the President and the departments of Government to agree on this limited advance, it would be worth while. I am convinced that once the Federal board of five members for which the bill provides, is established, we shall see an improvement in the legislation in the years to come.

We shall see it cover wider areas and meet more definite problems. But I think we should recognize that we cannot pass such a bill—which enters into a new field of activity—on a regularized basis unless the President and the administration are in support. In this instance, we have their support. If the bill passes, the President will sign it. The Bureau of the Budget has worked closely with us. I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Robert Merriam, of the Bureau of the Budget, for the fine cooperation he has extended to the Committee on Government Operations, and also to others of the technical staff of the Bureau of the Budget who worked with our committee. It would have been impossible to prepare this measure without the expert guidance of our professional staff of the Committee on Government Operations. On the floor at this time there is with me Mr. Nobleman, who probably knows more about this subject than does anyone else in the United States, with the possible exception of Mr. Labowitz, of the Bureau of the Budget. He has worked on this matter for more than a generation.

This bill is what I call the result of judicious judgment, not exactly on the part of the Senator from Minnesota, but on the part of persons who know what this is all about, and who have spent years and years in studying it.

Mr. President, I desire to state very emphatically that nothing contained in the bill would have any effect on existing payments or revenue-sharing payments authorized by present law. So to the public land States, where there is revenue sharing with the Department of the Interior, I say that will continue; and where Federal payments are made to school districts in which there are Federal activities, they will continue. Similarly, let me say to my friends of the TVA that payments will continue to be made to the local governmental jurisdictions.

Finally, nothing contained in the bill would have any effect upon existing payments or revenue-sharing arrangements authorized by law.

I desire to state very emphatically that S. 4183 is most definitely not a give-away program; it will not open the gates to unlimited and unrestrained payments by the Federal Government to local communities; and it is not discriminatory.

Great care has been taken to incorporate in the bill adequate safeguards and various protective measures to insure that no community will receive payments to which it is not entitled. Some of these protective measures are: First, a provision denying payments to any community which is receiving a Federal payment for the same property under another Federal program; and with respect to commercial or industrial real property; second, the 1950 cutoff date; third, the requirement of a showing of demonstrable hardship; fourth, a rigid formula for determining the amount of payments, in the event of a showing of eligibility and entitlement; fifth, a provision that in no event can the Federal payment exceed an amount equivalent to the amount of the tax, had the property been privately owned by a taxable person; and, sixth, a provision that the Federal property will receive the same tax benefits offered by a taxing authority to private, taxable persons.

It has been alleged that this bill is discriminatory. Such an allegation is entirely without merit. It is true that the coverage of this bill is limited, and numerous communities will not receive payments if the Federal industrial or commercial property in their jurisdiction was acquired after June 30, 1950. However, without a cutoff date, the cost of this program would have been exceedingly high; the 1950 date represents the beginning of a period of expanded Federal acquisition; and a large number of communities have been able to accommodate themselves to the effect of Federal acquisition prior to that date. Moreover the fact that the bill covers only a limited category of property, does not make it any more discriminatory than the 55 existing laws which authorize some type of Federal payments to local communities, covering some and excluding others.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that point, because it is quite obvious that the opposition to the bill will be based on the fact that the bill does not cover every conceivable kind of property; and, as I have already sensed, an effort will be made to try to pile up, point by point, and Senator by Senator, enough opposition on the basis of the fact that the bill does not "do something directly for me," so as to defeat a very necessary program for the Federal Government, in its relationships with the local governments.

It may be somewhat reassuring to some of my colleagues to learn that if there ever was a States rights bill, this is it. This is a States rights, local rights bill. I have always believed in the integrity and stability of local government, and I believe in the rights and powers of State governments. I have only hoped that they would exercise them, so as to develop the strength necessary to give local services to the people.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it should be stressed that this bill does not constitute permanent legislation, although it may possibly point the way to permanent legislation, in the event that the Congress deems it desirable. If there are defects in the operation of this program—and I imagine there will be found to be—as applications and evidence which are presented to the Federal administrative board are analyzed and developed, the board will make reports and recommendations to the Congress for improvements, and the Congress will be in a position to make the final determination, in each area, based, not upon abstract studies, but upon concrete, documented evidence. I sincerely believe that this is one of the most important points of the bill.

Mr. President, I believe that every Member of this body is well aware of the dual nature of his responsibilities. As Members of the United States Senate, we owe a duty to the people of this great Nation to safeguard the Federal Treasury. At the same time, we owe an equally important duty to the people and governments of the States which we represent. Many of us in this body have been privileged to serve as State or local government officials. During that service, we have become very familiar with the serious fiscal problems of local governments. Their source of revenue is extremely limited, but the demand for services goes on. The basic source of income to provide these services to the taxpayers of each community throughout the land is the tax on real property. That tax is very high and has almost reached the point of diminishing returns. From this source, communities must have schools, police, fire, and numerous other necessary services. However, the Federal Government has been continuously acquiring real property in numerous communities, taking it off the tax rolls and depriving the local taxing authorities of vital income. In some instances, an overall benefit results to the community from the presence of the Federal installations. In other instances, however, the community is required to furnish additional services to such an installation, thereby burdening the community further while removing substantial portions of its revenue-producing property.

I can hear some say, "These communities ought to have other kinds of taxes." That may be true, but I have been the mayor of a city, and I know how difficult it is to get a State legislature to authorize a local community to have a new form of tax. If we want new forms of taxes,

through charter revision, it is quite a project of community organization to accomplish the task. Even though such things were accomplished, it is still fair to say that if the Federal Government acquires a substantial portion of the real property in a community, and requires services by the fire department, the police department, and many other departments of government, the Federal Government should make a payment to that community for such services.

It is this situation, Mr. President, that this bill aims to correct. Bear in mind, however, that no community will be able simply to walk in and tell the Federal Board that the Federal Government has acquired real property and that the local taxing authority should be reimbursed. On the contrary, the local taxing authority will be required to show that the Federal acquisition has resulted in demonstrable, provable hardship; and only after a careful examination by the board of all aspects of the situation will local taxing authority be able to obtain a payment, and even that payment will be subject to a carefully-designed formula, which will insure that the community will receive no more than the amount to which it can prove entitlement, on the basis of demonstrable hardship.

There is another consideration involved in this bill. As I have indicated previously, the real property holdings of the Federal Government have reached enormous proportions and entail tremendous expenditures.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the inventory of Federal property holdings which has been made by the General Services Administration. That contained a report which is known as Senate Document No. 100, Inventory Report of Federal Real Property in the United States as of June 30, 1955, 84th Congress, 2d Session. This report was prepared at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate and contains a summary of Federal holdings, as of June 30, 1955, running to 110 printed pages. When we examine this document, we begin to realize the proportions of Federal holdings of real and commercial properties in this country.

If Federal agencies are required, in proper cases, to make such payments as are provided for in this bill, it should serve as an incentive to these agencies to dispose of numerous substantial holdings of commercial and industrial real property which should be in the hands of private industry and on the tax rolls of the communities in which they are located. I think that point ought to be well understood. This legislation will act as an incentive, in some instances, for the Government to make adequate disposal of its property, to sell it to private investors, so that it can become taxable property under normal tax procedures.

Mr. President, S. 4183 represents the firm conviction of the Committee on Government Operations that no comprehensive program is possible and that the only feasible approach to a solution of this troublesome problem is by means of a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes, coupled with a case-by-case consideration by an administrative board of the relative merits of individual cases and situations, within limitations established by law. It is also our firm conviction that any further studies of this problem which are unrelated to specific situations are simply futile and meaningless. Virtually every one of the existing statutes which provide either for payments of taxes, in lieu of taxes, or shared revenue arrangements has been tailored to meet a specific need which became apparent in connection with consideration of other legislation. It is quite apparent that any future legislation must be based upon the result of the case-by-case studies made by the board which would be established by this bill. Mr. President, I have studied this problem for many years, as mayor of a good-sized city; as a member of the Committee on Government Operations; at one time as chairman of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations; and as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and its Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues. I am not exactly what one might call a "Johnny-Come-Lately" in this field. Based upon this experience, it is my sincere conclusion that S. 4183 is a reasonable, moderate, and logical approach which will enable the systematic compilation, on a case-by-case basis, of information relative to the needs of each community in which Federal property is located. The Congress will have the benefit of a report from the administrative board, detailing its activities, every 6 months; it will have a comprehensive report from the board, based upon the cases adjudicated by it and the field studies conducted with respect to other types of cases, within 2 years after the effective date of this act; and the Congress will have a solid foundation upon which to base further policy determinations.

I would like to say a few words with respect to the probable cost of the program provided for by the pending bill. The numerous variables involved in determining cost make any accurate estimate extremely difficult. That can only be determined as each application comes in, since it will be based upon, first, the assessed value of each piece of property; second, the applicable local tax rate for each specific piece of property; third, the adjustments which would be necessary under the formula provided for in the bill; and fourth, a determination of whether or not Federal acquisition of each piece of property in question has resulted in a financial hardship to the local taxing authority and the extent of such hardship in terms of demonstrated financial loss. It seems obvious that these matters cannot be determined in the abstract by any interdepartmental committee, composed of executive branch representatives, on a part-time basis. Anything less than a full-time study by a quasi-judicial body will be futile.

I mention this because I understand a proposal will be made to place the whole program in the hands of an interdepartmental committee, consisting of representatives of departments and agencies, who would study the problem on a part-time basis.

If we want to make sure that nothing is done, that is the way to do it. If anything is to be done about it, it will require full-time consideration by men and women who are skilled in fiscal problems, tax problems, and the relationship that exists between local governments and the Federal Government. Anything less than a full-time study by a quasi-judicial body will be futile. I can speak as somewhat of an expert on that point, because I have served on committees and subcommittees and Presidential Commissions on a part-time basis, and during my 7 years' service in the Senate I have served on a part-time basis in studying this problem.

To return to the question of cost, bearing in mind, the limitations previously referred to, the Bureau of the Budget has estimated that S. 4183 will involve somewhere between $12 million and $22 million annually for a 5-year period. This estimate is probably high, and it is anticipated that the actual amounts will be considerably less.

Mr. President, the time has come when we must face this problem in a forthright, realistic manner. We have studied this subject to death. What we need now is action. Certainly, a modest, experimental approach to this serious problem for a 5-year period, such as this bill would establish, with a report being made every 6 months, and an exhaustive report within 2 years, is not too much for hard-pressed communities to expect from the Federal Department.

It is true that we need more information. But the information we need can only be compiled in the manner provided for by S. 4183. We do not contend that the bill is perfect. We are convinced, however, that it represents the only realistic approach. We are confident that if each Member of this body searches his conscience, he will come to the conclusion that it is incumbent upon us to take some action right now. We are also confident that the reasonableness and moderation which characterize this bill will make it possible for a large majority of our membership to support it.

At this point I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the American Municipal Association, signed by Keith Seegmiller, executive secretary, National Association of County Officials, and by Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director, American Municipal Association.

The letter states, in substance, that these associations support the bill. These are our greatest local governmental associations. They support the bill and urge, as they say in the final paragraph of the letter, wholehearted support for the legislation. The letter was addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: There is before the Senate a bill which would grant financial relief to hard-pressed city and county governments by authorizing a limited program

of payments in lieu of local property taxes on federally owned property. The bill, S. 4183, is the product of years of study by independent boards and commissions and was introduced by the Senate Government Operations Committee after public hearings and studied deliberation. The bill has the support of the President.

The measure provides for payments in lieu of local property taxes on business and commercial property acquired by the Federal Government since January 30, 1950. Payments are also authorized for federally owned property leased or sold on conditional sales contract. Finally, the measure would authorize Federal agencies to pay their pro rata share of the cost of certain local improvement assessments for such items as streets, sidewalks, gutters, sewers, and other improvements that benefit Federal property.

A special 5-man board, appointed by the President with the confirmation of the Senate, would administer the program which automatically expires at the end of 5 years. There are numerous detailed safeguards developed by the Bureau of the Budget and the committee to protect the Federal Government from unwarranted payments.

This limited measure, we believe, will be a very constructive step in relieving the financial hardships suffered by many local government units because of the concentration of federally owned property for which services must be provided and from which no revenues are received.

It has been the traditional policy of the Congress to preserve the financial integrity of State and local governments and we would urge your wholehearted support for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

KEITH SEEGMILLER,
Executive Secretary, National Association of County Officials.

PATRICK HEALY, Jr.,
Executive Director, American Municipal Association.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the committee's decision to approve a program providing for three categories of payments was based upon the following considerations:

First. With respect to special assessments levied after the effective date of the act, it was felt that since a special assessment results in an ultimate improvement to the property, thus adding to its value, there is no reason why Federal agencies should not pay for improvements to their properties in the same manner as private taxable owners, provided, of course, the assessment is levied on real property owned by all other taxable persons.

Second. With respect to payments in lieu of taxes on the Federal Government's interest in real property leased or sold to private persons under conditional sales contracts, the property is being used for private purposes, and is operated by private, taxable persons, and the interest of the Federal Government is only that of a landlord, in the case of leased property, and is purely temporary in the case of property conditionally sold.

Third. With respect to industrial or commercial property acquired after June 30, 1950, the guiding consideration was the fact that the Federal use of such property is, for the most part, identical to that of private taxable property used to produce for the same purposes. Thus, if the property were privately owned, it would pay taxes; the mere fact of Federal ownership should not deprive the local taxing authority of taxes in cases where Federal acquisition or use has resulted in a hardship to the community. In the event that the local taxing authority is unable to demonstrate to the Federal administrative board that Federal acquisition has resulted in hardship, no payments would be made. The June 30, 1950, cutoff date was chosen because this date would cover the increased Federal acquisition of real property of this type, incident to the Korean war. In addition, it will serve to keep the cost of this program within reasonable bounds.

We can argue about a cutoff date from now until kingdom come, but it is absolutely essential that we do set a date; and the cutoff date we have chosen is a fair date, because it represents the point when the real inflationary impact was felt by our local communities. It was then that new requirements for schools and streets and highways and sewage systems and other services really made their heavy impact upon local governments. It was at that time, Mr. President, that the Federal Government stepped up its acquisitions considerably as a result of the Korean war and the program of defense and rearmament which became necessary for our national security.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I sat through the long hearings which have been held this year and last year on the question which now confronts the Senate in the pending bill. I participated in those hearings. Before I became a Member of the Senate I was State comptroller in the government of California. In that capacity I came face to face with the fact that the Federal Government has increased its property holdings in my State in a most prodigious manner. One county, for example, the county of San Bernardino, is owned almost three-fourths by the Federal Government. Cities in our State are owned almost entirely by the Federal Government and occupied by Federal installations.

During the hearings, my friend, the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], presided, and the able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and I jointly introduced a bill which would recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to participate in underwriting its just proportion of the cost of carrying on local governmental activities.

I say to my friend from Minnesota that he merits the commendation of his colleagues in the Senate and those who have been interested in the growing fiscal problems of local governments, the governments of our cities, our counties, and our special districts.

Mr. President, this problem is not new. It has grown with great rapidity, particularly in the past half dozen years. The problem, so far as attempts at a solution of it are concerned, has been with the American people and the Congress for a long time.

The late Robert A. Taft of Ohio was interested in the problem. My able colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has taken an active interest in it over a long period of time. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and many other Senators to whom my friend from Minnesota has alluded, have taken a keen interest in it, have introduced measures on the subject, and have worked valiantly in order that Congress might at last come to grips with it. It comes to grips with it in the bill which is now before the Senate. It is not what any of us wanted, but, as my friend from Minnesota has said, it recognizes the existence of the problem and accepts the moral responsibility of the Federal Government in a field too long overlooked by it.

To that extent, Mr. President, I very much hope that the bill may pass the Senate shortly, without what I am afraid will be restrictive amendments which will be offered on the floor by some of the Members of the Senate.

I repeat my congratulations to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that no Member of this body has been more diligent in getting action on this measure than has the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I feel free to say that he has talked to me about it, as the chairman of the subcommittee, a dozen or more times. He has testified before the committee. I am deeply grateful to him for his helpfulness.

In that statement, Mr. President, I should like to include the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who likewise came before the subcommittee and testified on a bill which he cosponsored with the junior Senator from California and the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, there is no partisanship in this measure. There is only an effort to recognize, as the Senator from California has said, the principle of Federal Government responsibility.

We know that this bill is not as broad in its coverage as we would like it to be, but, at least, it comes to the point. That is the whole purpose of the measure.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is my understanding of this measure correct that it does not pertain to farmland or to property acquired prior to 1950?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. It does not pertain to so-called public lands; that is correct.

It applies to no property acquired before 1950.

Mr. CURTIS. My reference was not to public lands; but I refer to agricultural lands which have been taken in recent years for various governmental purposes. The bill does not deal with such land, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. No, it does not.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much interested in the problem to which the Senator has addressed himself. I certainly hope that at a later date—I realize that this late in the session great changes cannot be made in the measure—the dis-

crimination—and it is discrimination—against prior acquisitions and against agricultural lands can be considered, and some relief granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his observation. I shall try to be exceedingly candid about the limitations of the measure. I would have the Senator know that the bill provides for a Federal board which, upon its own motion or application, can conduct studies and investigations, including specific field investigations, incident to the performance of any of its duties, as it may determine to be advisable, with regard to the fiscal and other problems of the taxing authorities, arising from the immunity of the United States to ad valorem, real, or personal property taxes imposed by such authorities anywhere. That includes agricultural land, and includes public and forest lands.

What I am trying to say to the Senator is that the payments now provided in the bill are to be made upon commercial and real properties in urban and suburban areas. But the authority of the Board to recommend payments by Congress for other lands is clearly spelled out.

So this is not a proposition which excludes public lands or rural areas.

Mr. CURTIS. Sometimes the property taken by the Federal Government in a city results in a sizable payroll in that community, which, in turn, helps the community.

In other instances very valuable farmland has been taken and has upset entire counties and townships in their tax bases. Yet, such farmland is held to be of a nature which is more or less unproductive, so far as the local economy is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. If land is taken by the Federal Government for industrial or commercial purposes, even if it is in the countryside, it is eligible for payment, if the financial hardship can be shown. No payment at all will be made unless financial hardship is demonstrated.

Mr. CURTIS. The case I had in mind occurred prior to 1950. The land was taken for military purposes. As I understand, that case would not come within the scope of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. It would not come within this particular proposal; except that if the land was taken for use as a military reservation, payments to the local governments may be made under other laws. An appropriation bill was passed only the other day providing $400 million in Federal aid to school districts where there are Federal activities which have made an impact on those districts. I happened to be the author of the original act. This payment would go to the locality.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram I have received under date of July 17, 1956, from the senate interim committee on public lands, of the State of California. I call the telegram particularly to the attention of the distinguished minority leader and his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], because the interim committee, which has spent much time in a study of the subject, says, in part:

The United States Senate is respectfully urged to give immediate passage to S. 4183 by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and to speed this beneficial measure on its way so that the House of Representatives may act upon it prior to adjournment of the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *July 17, 1956.*

Secretary of the Senate FELTON M. JOHNSTON and KEITH SEEGMILLER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution re urgency of congressional action on legislation for payments in lieu of taxes on Federal real property:

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has memorialized Congress on numerous occasions to give favorable consideration to legislation providing a system of payments in lieu of taxes on Federal properties; and

"Whereas the California State Senate feels such a great interest in this problem that it has created this State senate interim committee on public lands; and

"Whereas this interim committee for the past 2 years has worked actively and constantly toward the goal of action by the 84th Congress on such legislation; and

"Whereas, as a result of these activities and those of the counties and cities of America, the 84th Congress has had before it legislation based on the strong recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; and

"Whereas the United States Senate Committee on Government Operations on July 6 favorably reported out S. 4183, a greatly modified beginning measure for payments in lieu of taxes; and

"Whereas positive action by the 84th Congress is very much needed by the local governments who bear the burdens of Federal tax exemption: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate interim committee on public lands meeting in Sacramento in the State capitol this 14th day of July 1956, That the United States Senate is respectfully urged to give immediate passage to S. 4183 by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and to speed this beneficial measure on its way so that the House of Representatives may act upon it prior to adjournment of the 84th Congress."

SENATE INTERIM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I am very grateful for the expression of interest and support by an official committee of the California Legislature concerning the proposed legislation. They recognize the limitations of the bill, but they are broadminded enough to support its general purpose.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY'S remarks,

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Is it a privileged matter?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; it is.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report four bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and placed on the calendar.

The reports referred to are as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney; and

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 157. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas.

FBI INVESTIGATION WITHIN 24 HOURS OF KIDNAPING

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota,

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 800, one of the bills which has just been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I told the acting majority leader that I would yield at any time for any measure which might be called up because we wish to make progress.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, certainly there is no opposition by either the majority leader or the minority leader to the request made by the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 800) to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code, to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as the law now stands, a week is required, after a kidnaping occurs, before the FBI can enter the case. This bill will reduce that time to 24 hours.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am happy to yield for the purpose of the consideration of this bill. I am entirely in favor of the bill, and I commend the chairman of the committee for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 800) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS ON LAND BELONGING TO THE WEST MARKS BAPTIST CHURCH OF QUITMAN COUNTY, MISS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there is at the desk House bill 9640. The bill has come from the House, and merely relates to a reversionary interest in eight-tenths of an acre of land which was sold by the Government a number of years ago to a small Baptist church in my State. The bill merely will remove the reversionary clause, so some money with which to remodel the church can be borrowed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be laid before the Senate at this time, without having the bill referred to a committee. The bill has the clearance of the majority leader and the minority leader and the chairman of the committee, and the members of the committee have been canvassed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 9640) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss., which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much indeed for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am very happy to cooperate with the Senator from Mississippi in behalf of the Baptist church.

Mr. STENNIS. On behalf of the church, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota. He has been most generous.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the north branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington; and

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list; and

H. R. 10177. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 37, 52, 53, 57, and 86 and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9640) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church, of Quitman County, Miss.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 26, 1956, p. 14877, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Do I correctly understand that the $400,000 item for the upper harbor in Minnesota is included in the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank the distinguished chairman.

PURCHASE OF CRITICAL MINERALS—EXTENSION OF THE 1953 MALONE-ASPINALL ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Senate bill 3982, for which a $21 million appropriation has been provided in H. R. 12350, was an interim bill to keep the tungsten, fluorspar, columbium-tantalum, and asbestos mines open until the President's Cabinet Committee can come down with a permanent plan for the production of the strategic and critical materials without which we cannot make a jet engine.

It is a national defense act, Mr. President.

REMOVED TUNGSTEN FROM CRITICAL LIST

Tungsten, for example, has been on the critical list since 1934, and the continual argument has been that we have no tungsten in this Nation and must import it; and the bulk of it has been imported from South Africa, Burma, China, and, as we all know, China areas from which such shipments would be unavailable in wartime—and it is well recognized that such sales can be stopped in peacetime as the shipment of monozite sand was stopped by India.

FOUGHT A WAR TO GET TUNGSTEN

In addition, many people believe the Korean war might have been justified because large amounts of tungsten were available there and were imported after World War II started at great cost to our Government. We do not need to fight a war to get tungsten—the supply in this Nation is practically inexhaustible.

THE 1953 MALONE-ASPINALL ACT

The bill is an extension of the 1953 Malone-Aspinall Act which I sponsored in the Senate. That legislation included 8 critical minerals without which a jet engine cannot be made. It was designed to increase domestic production of these critical minerals. It resulted in increased production of such minerals—and in removing tungsten from the critical category.

COORDINATED OFFICE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE PURCHASE

The bill does not include the minerals of the original 1953 act, which the Director of the Office of National Defense has testified he can and will continue to purchase during the life of the act, which includes manganese, chromite, beryl, and mica.

I want to compliment the members of the House conference committee for receding from their position and agreeing upon a $21 million appropriation for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of the act.

The funds provided should keep the mines operating into 1957 when an additional appropriation can be provided.

COLUMBIUM-TANTALUM FROM NIGERIA

The greater part of the columbium-tantalum has been and is still coming from Nigeria, although we have one deposit in Idaho under a special contract. However, under the extension of the 1953 act, anyone who discovers a columbium-tantalum deposit will have a ready sale for it, and therefore the prospectors and explorers will go back into the hills.

Under the 1953 act we became more than self-sufficient in the production of tungsten, and, for the first time in nearly three decades, it is no longer considered a critical material. Under this legislation the mines will be kept operating until the President's Cabinet Committee has ample opportunity to present a permanent plan; whereas, if they shut down and some of them fill with water, we are back where we started.

S. 3982, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, was passed by both Houses and signed by the President. For it, $91 million was authorized by the Senate in H. R. 12350, with $35 million appropriated for the 1957 fiscal year.

NO CONNECTION WITH OFFICE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

It has no connection whatever with the appropriation for strategic mineral purchases by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

To produce the critical minerals, without which we cannot make a jet engine, it is necessary to guarantee a unit price on each material above the world price to equal the difference in the effective wages, or revert to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign trade and the national economy, and adjust the flexible duty or tariff to equal the difference.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this measure means a great deal to the State of Nevada. The funds to support the minerals extension program will benefit my State's economy greatly, and give the mineral industry a hope for the future. The stand of the Senate conferees in supporting restoration of funds to start these mineral purchases is most commendable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12350, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 26, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96 to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$45,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 9, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$13,968,000" named in said amendment insert "$10,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$35,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 11, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$22,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$18,000,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$1,315,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,215,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"Reimbursement to District of Columbia

"For reimbursement to the highway fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southwest section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, $200,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Federal-aid highways (trust fund): For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $800 million, to be derived from the highway trust fund; which sum is composed of $186,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, $610,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, and $30,401, $14,097, $1,034,766, and $985,204, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 8, 1938, section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943, and section 9 of the act approved September 7, 1950, as amended (23 U. S. C. 13a, and 13b), and section 7 of the act approved June 25, 1952, and $935,532 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across dams in accordance with the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709): *Provided*, That at such time, but no later than June 30, 1957, as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the amounts available and estimated to become available in the highway trust fund during the fiscal year 1957 are sufficient for carrying out, on a current basis, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, this appropriation shall reimburse the appropriations for 'Federal-aid highways' for all expenditures subsequent to June 30, 1956."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$20,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FLOOD INSURANCE

"For expenses necessary to carry out the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work under this appropriation; $500,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (S. 3732, 84th Congress)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$750,000" named in said amendment insert "$200,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$13,225,000" named in said amendment insert "$12,675,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$1,010,000" named in said amendment insert "$980,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$4,275,000" named in said amendment insert "$4,025,000" and in lieu of the first sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment insert "$175,000" and in lieu of the second sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment insert "$100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$21,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 37, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$55,000" named in said amendment insert "$40,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 52, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $270,000: *Provided*, That of this amount (a) $85,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, Eighty-fourth Congress, or similar legislation, and (b) $45,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 11549 or S. 3958, Eighty-fourth Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 53, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$150,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 86, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$4,000,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the Senate amendments numbered 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 37, 52, 53, 57, and 86.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in

the RECORD a tabulation of the items considered in the second supplemental appropriation bill stating the budget estimates, House allowances, Senate allowances, and the allowances of the conference committee.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12350)

Department or agency	Budget estimate	House action	Senate action	Conference action
CHAPTER I				
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION				
Salaries and expenses	$1,400,000		$1,400,000	$1,000,000
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL				
Salaries and expenses	85,000		85,000	45,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICE				
Commission on Increased Uses of Agricultural Commodities	150,000		150,000	150,000
Total, chapter I	1,635,000		1,635,000	1,195,000
CHAPTER II				
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and regulation	13,968,000		13,968,000	10,000,000
Establishment of air navigation facilities	54,075,000		54,075,000	35,000,000
Construction and development, additional Washington Airport	34,700,000			
MARITIME ACTIVITIES				
Ship construction	22,000,000		22,000,000	18,000,000
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS				
Reimbursement to District of Columbia			665,000	200,000
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	(1,150,000,000)		(1,150,000,000)	(800,000,000)
Federal-aid highways, reduction in appropriations	[1] Language		[1] Language	[1] Language
Total, chapter II	124,743,000		90,708,000	63,200,000
CHAPTER III				
FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK				
Administrative expenses	Language		Language	Language
CHAPTER IV				
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space			50,000	20,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	3,500,000		3,500,000	2,500,000
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY				
Federal Flood Insurance Administration				
Salaries and expenses	750,000		500,000	500,000
Public Housing Administration				
Administrative expenses	750,000		750,000	200,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	Language		Language	Language
Total, chapter IV	5,000,000		4,800,000	3,220,000
CHAPTER V				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
Acquisition of strategic minerals	91,670,000		35,000,000	21,000,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
Resources management	250,000		250,000	250,000
Payment to Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians	437,500		437,500	437,500
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	687,500		687,500	687,500
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE				
Construction	1,060,000		1,250,000	1,060,000
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES				
Fisheries loan fund	10,000,000		10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Department of Interior	103,417,500		46,937,500	32,747,500
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
FOREST SERVICE				
Acquisition of lands for Cache National Forest	50,000		50,000	50,000
RELATED AGENCIES				
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	30,000		55,000	40,000
National Memorial Stadium Commission			10,000	
Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission			163,400	163,400
Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission			225,000	225,000
Total, chapter V	103,497,500		47,440,900	33,225,900

[1] Rescission of general fund appropriation of $775,000,000 effective June 30, 1957, or such earlier date as all expenditures have been reimbursed by highway trust fund.

The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12350)—Continued

Department or agency	Budget estimate	House action	Senate action	Conference action
CHAPTER VI				
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR				
Salaries and expenses	[2] ($500,000)		[2] ($300,000)	[2] ($300,000)
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION				
Salaries and expenses	Language		Language	Language
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
Promotion and further development of vocational education	2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000
Grants for education of the mentally retarded	350,000		350,000	
Grants for library services	7,500,000		7,500,000	2,050,000
Payments to school districts			34,050,000	34,050,000
Assistance for school construction	108,500,000		108,500,000	108,500,000
Salaries and expenses	250,000		290,000	270,000
President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School	1,100,000		300,000	150,000
Total, Office of Education	119,700,000		152,990,000	147,020,000
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION				
Grants to States and other agencies			1,000,000	1,000,000
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
Assistance to States, general	1,040,000		1,040,000	1,040,000
Grants for waste treatment works construction	50,000,000		50,000,000	50,000,000
Sanitary engineering activities	4,100,000		4,550,000	3,000,000
Hospitals and medical care	2,050,000		2,050,000	2,050,000
Foreign quarantine service	150,000		150,000	
National Institutes of Health, operating expenses	Language		200,000	200,000
Construction of dental research building	200,000		200,000	200,000
Grants for construction of health research facilities	30,000,000		30,000,000	30,000,000
Construction of animal quarters	(1,371,000)		1,371,000	1,371,000
General office building	(300,000)		300,000	300,000
Construction of library facilities			350,000	350,000
Total, Public Health Service	87,540,000		90,211,000	88,511,000
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	207,240,000		244,201,000	236,531,000
Total, chapter VI	207,240,000		244,201,000	236,531,000
CHAPTER VII				
PUBLIC WORKS				
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION				
Operating expenses	1,740,400,000	$1,780,400,000	1,740,400,000	1,740,400,000
Plant acquisition and construction	158,300,000	158,300,000	158,300,000	158,300,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	1,898,700,000	1,938,700,000	1,898,700,000	1,898,700,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance	195,000	195,000	195,000	195,000
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
Construction and rehabilitation	12,700,000	2,500,000	12,750,000	12,750,000
Total, Department of the Interior	13,395,000	3,195,000	13,445,000	13,445,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control				
Construction, general			2,520,000	2,520,000
Total, chapter VII	1,912,095,000	1,941,895,000	1,914,665,000	1,914,665,000
CHAPTER VIII				
DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES				
Contributions to international organizations	Language		Language	Language
Missions to international organizations	30,000		30,000	30,000
Educational, scientific, and cultural activities	Language		Language	Language
Cleveland Pan American Games			100,000	100,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
President's special international program	10,000,000		5,000,000	4,000,000
Total, chapter VIII	10,030,000		5,130,000	4,130,000

[2] To be derived by transfer.

The second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957 (H. R. 12350)—Continued

Department or agency	Budget estimate	House action	Senate action	Conference action
CHAPTER IX				
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
BUREAU OF NARCOTICS				
Salaries and expenses			$200,000	$200,000
COAST GUARD				
Acquisition, construction, and improvements			6,000,000	
Total, chapter IX			6,200,000	200,000
CHAPTER X				
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
Settlement of claims and suits	($10,000)		(10,000)	(10,000)
CHAPTER XI				
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE				
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation			50,000	50,000
CHAPTER XII				
Claims and judgments	1,312,538		1,312,538	1,312,538
Grand total	2,365,553,038	$1,941,895,000	2,316,142,438	2,257,729,438

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and express particular appreciation of the fact that the bill contains $2 million to implement the so-called Bush-McCormack Act, having to do with small flood-control protective works. This breaks the bottleneck of time in connection with the construction of small projects for flood protection in the stricken river valleys of New England and elsewhere. Protective works in many parts of the country would save the Government a great deal of money.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to express my appreciation for the fine work done by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I think it is very important that the necessary adjustments have been made in the bill. Otherwise, the effects upon the mineral industry in various sections of the country would have been disastrous. I appreciate very much the work the Senator from Arizona has accomplished.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE

The presiding officer laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4228) to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, which was on page 3, line 1, strike out "1923" and insert "1949."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this amendment merely corrects an improper date in the bill, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF NONCURRENT AND OBSOLETE CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 268, which relates to the disposal of noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications. A similar resolution has been adopted every 4 years. The last time was in 1952, and prior to that in 1948. Every 4 years we try to dispose of useless documents.

The procedure which is followed is this: First, the Senator or Representative who may be concerned is notified. If he does not want the material, other Senators and Representatives are notified. If they do not want it, the departments of the Government are notified. After that, the remainder of the documents are sent to the Superintendent of Documents for disposal by him.

Whatever he receives from their sale as junk is credited to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such list as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer or either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before October 1, 1956.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives and Record Service, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 30 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and he shall submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) was considered and agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums

in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have been listening with interest to the discussion of the bill by the able Senator from Minnesota. I hope it will be possible to get under way, at least some form of method of payments by the Federal Government to various local entities of Government in hardship cases.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. This is not simply my bill; it is a committee bill. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I claim no pride of authorship. The bill has been prepared by technical experts on the staff and by the members of the committee. There was a dissent on the committee but the bill is a committee bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very forceful presentation of the committee bill in the Senate.

In my State there are a number of situations which this kind of bill might help to solve, if not solve it completely.

I cite a specific situation in the fine city of Grants Pass, Oreg., concerning which the city manager has written me at some length. He says, in part:

> Particularly, the United States Forest Service has their Siskiyou National Forest headquarters within the corporate area of Grants Pass. Their shop and yard area is completely surrounded by a residential area and is separated therefrom on three sides by city streets.

The area happens to be surrounded by a residential neighborhood of the city of Grants Pass. The people who live in that neighborhood want to get themselves out of the gumbo and dust, and to pave the streets. Of course, they are perfectly willing to assist themselves by paying proportionately their share of the improvement. But the United States Forest Service at present is unable to participate in the cost of any of those street improvements. Indeed, there has been an adverse ruling to this effect by the Comptroller General.

Yet the Forest Service is one of the chief owners and users of property in that area.

Under the bill which the Senator from Minnesota has introduced, and has discussed with such great clarity in the Senate, is there any possibility that the Forest Service would be able to participate in the street improvement program in the residential neighborhood of Grants Pass, Oreg.?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Absolutely; and not only be able to do so, but would. This is an instance of what are called special assessment levies. After the effective date of the act, the Federal Government would pay its fair share on the pieces of property it owned as compared with payments made on property owned by private persons, and with no discrimination. In other words, the tax rate which applied on private property would apply on the payment in lieu of taxes on the Federal property.

The payment for special assessments is one of the most important payments to be made under the bill, because so many communities are stymied, so to speak, by reason of large Federal holdings within the communities. When a community gets ready to pave a street or to install a storm sewer, a curb, gutter, or a new sidewalk, or to make any other improvement for which a special assessment is made, whatever the special assessment may be, the Federal Government heretofore has paid nothing. In all too many instances of that kind, the taxpayers of the community have had to bear a very heavy tax load.

The city of Grants Pass, Oreg., will never be happier than on the day the bill is passed.

So I urge that the bill should pass, for the benefit of and in order to help Grants Pass. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I congratulate him upon the bill he has presented, and I assure him of my hearty support of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD correspondence I have had with the officials of the city of Grants Pass, Oreg., and with the association of Oregon counties, concerning this measure.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
February 10, 1956.

Mr. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, *Senator,*
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: We are told that several bills are now before the Senate Government Operations Committee and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to municipalities on federally-owned property.

Our interest in these bills centers on the problem of providing the means and authority for Federal agencies to pay their fair share of the cost of building sewers, sidewalks, and street paving for that part of a street frontage along federally owned property.

Particularly, the United States Forest Service has their Siskiyou National Forest headquarters within the corporate area of Grants Pass. Their shop and yard area is completely surrounded by a residential area and is separated therefrom on three sides by city streets. Residents owning property abutting these same streets want to get themselves out of the mud and dust resulting from the unimproved nature of the street. The residents are willing to assess themselves to cover their proportionate share of the cost of improvements.

The United States Forest Service is unable to participate in the cost of any street improvement because of an adverse ruling from the Comptroller General. Local Forest Service officials are quite willing to participate in the street-improvement program and have the funds with which to pay for their share of the work.

It appears to us that an inequitable share of the Federal tax responsibility is placed on the taxpayers of the city of Grants Pass if they are to be expected to pay the entire share of costs of street improvement in front of federally-owned property. It is hoped that relief from such situations might be incorporated in the bills which are now under consideration in Congress.

May we respectfully solicit your support of legislation to relieve our city of an inequity in the sharing of cost of public improvement by reason of the existence of federally owned property in our city?

Yours very truly,

JOHN F. PORTER,
City Manager.

THE DALLES, OREG., *February 8, 1956.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Association of Oregon Counties is supporting request of National Association of County Officials for early hearings on bills providing payments in lieu of taxes on Federal real property. Will appreciate your requesting Senator MCCLELLAN, chairman of Government Operations Committee for such a hearing.

F. L. PHIPPS,
Executive Secretary, Association of Oregon Counties.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I wish to thank the Senator for his helpfulness and for his support.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan and then I shall yield the floor.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN MICHIGAN

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am frequently asked by my colleagues in the Senate about the unemployment situation in my State of Michigan. I wish I could give them some good news, but I have not been able to for many months. The latest official estimates from Michigan continue to be bleak.

January of 1956 started with more than 100,000 workers unemployed.

Since May of this year, more than 200,000 Michigan workers have been unemployed. The latest figures, for July, put the total at 230,000, or about 8.5 percent of the State work force.

Nor will it stop there. The September estimate is 250,000 to 260,000, when the auto plants lay off even more employees in the switch to 1957 models.

At the present time, several of Michigan's greatest industrial areas are on the Labor Department's list of areas of substantial labor surplus: Detroit, 9.2 percent; Flint, 10.1 percent; Lansing, 7.6 percent; and Muskegon, 7.5 percent.

And more than 38,000 Michigan workers had exhausted their unemployment benefits—maximum: 26 weeks—through June.

These statistics are massive and overpowering. If such a situation came along once in a decade or so, we might accept it as an uncontrollable act of fate.

The distressing thing is that heavy unemployment in Michigan has become more an annual occurrence than an exception. Irresponsible production scheduling by the auto companies, compounded by mad sales races between the giants, leaves the workers as helpless pawns.

The guaranteed annual wage principle launched by the United Auto Workers is a potential curb to this recklessness, but the program was too new to be completely effective this year.

The workers need protection. Corporation profits do not suffer by this temporary unemployment which lasts the entire summer. These profits even increase, thanks to favoritism of the big-business administration in Washington.

It is time some favoritism was shown for the workers.

A FINAL APPEAL FOR ACTION ON VETERANS LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 22 million ex-servicemen of the United States have been anxiously watching the final actions of this 84th Congress.

In particular, they and their loved ones have been deeply interested in the outcome of the vital veterans bills which the House of Representatives has approved, but which have remained in the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. President, I have repeatedly appealed for the full Senate to vote on this important legislation. Again and again on the Senate floor, I have urged that we be given the chance by the Finance Committee to vote on these bills.

DON'T PIGEONHOLE THOSE WHO BLED IN FOXHOLES

Surely, the one group in our Nation most entitled to our earnest attention consists of the men who saved this Nation on the field of battle. Surely, the one group of bills which is most deserving of not ending up in a pigeonhole is the group of bills for those who fought and bled in foxholes.

From all over my State, I have heard from the veterans of Wisconsin, from American Legionnaires, members of the VFW, DAV, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and others.

In addresses and messages to veterans' conventions of my State, I, in turn, have pledged my support of sound legislation on behalf of our veterans.

It is a source of deepest regret to me not to be able to vote, therefore, on this legislation.

SENATOR WILEY'S 17½ YEARS OF SERVICE TO VETERANS

I am, of course, deeply grateful to the veterans of Wisconsin for the warm support which they have given to me.

They recall that it has been my privilege to serve the ex-servicemen of our country since the time I entered the United States Senate, 17½ years ago.

It was my privilege to have served as one of the original cosponsors of the GI Bill of Rights—the historic law, whose educational provisions came to an end just a few days ago. Those school provisions provided for the sound schooling of almost 8 million American ex-servicemen.

It has been my privilege to sponsor legislation on behalf of our disabled veterans—particularly our combat wounded, on behalf of the new veterans' facility at Wood; on behalf of increases in pensions to widows of veterans; on behalf of setting up a special Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, and for many similar objectives.

SENATOR WILEY'S OPPONENT VOTED ANTIVETERAN

Veterans' leaders, in writing to me, have taken the initiative in pointing out the fact that, while I have a consistent record of serving the interests of ex-servicemen, my opponent in the Wisconsin Republican senatorial primary, has an exactly opposite record.

Time after time, my opponent has voted against the veteran. Time after time, he has sought to torpedo those who came through enemy torpedoes and shot and shell, and who did not expect that one of their own legislators would vote against them.

My own record stands for all to see as a consistent supporter of the GI.

The hour is late in the 84th Congress, but it is my earnest hope that it is not too late to revive veterans' legislation, which may unfortunately otherwise die.

I send to the desk now and ask unanimous consent for publication of a series of messages which I have received from Wisconsin and other veterans. In all instances where the messages have come from individuals writing officially on behalf of an organization, I have of course included their name.

In the instance, however, of messages from folks writing in an individual capacity, purely as individual citizens, I have respected the privacy and confidence in which they wrote.

I deeply appreciate these messages—both on the issue of H. R. 7886 and simultaneous opposition to the unwise recommendations of the Bradley Commission.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1956.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently appeal for your support of H. R. 12038 and H. R. 7886, pending bills to ease the plight of disabled veterans. These measures provide critically needed adjustments in present veterans' program. Both were passed by overwhelming vote in House. In behalf of disabled veterans who look to you for fair and forthright decision, I earnestly ask your energetic efforts to secure Finance Committee approval and vote on the floor.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, American Legion.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 21.—Timothy J. Murphy, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, today declared that "simple justice and the cost of living more than justify Senate and White House concurrence with House-approved legislation to increase compensation payments to service-disabled veterans by 10 percent."

Murphy, a prominent Boston attorney, pointed out that the House of Representatives, in a matter of a few days, had acted promptly to get H. R. 12038, the compensation bill, reported from committee and to the floor where it was approved by a unanimous 391–0 vote.

"This action," he said, "indicates the House's opinion as to the merits and worthiness of the compensation bill."

"Favorable Senate action on H. R. 12038, as well as on H. R. 7886, a vitally needed veterans' pension bill, also House-approved, which has been pending in the Senate for some time, when added to some good bills already approved, such as survivors benefits and educational aid for orphans, would constitute a reasonable program for veterans and their dependents in this Congress."

"Time is running out, but I hope the Congress stays in session until the compensation and pension bills have been enacted," Commander Murphy stated.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS AUXILIARY,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 21, 1956.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: It was with pleasure that your letter was received and its contents gave me the assurance needed in your message of continued interest in the welfare of our disabled veteran and his dependents. We in Wisconsin may be justly proud of the congressional record of our senior Senator.

Thanking you for the literature which was enclosed with your letter, I remain,

Sincerely,

HARRIET NEHMER,
National Chaplain, DAVA.

AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY,
UNIT NO. 67,
Lake Mills, Wis., June 27, 1956.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We the members of Clarence Bean-Warren George, unit No. 67, of the American Legion Auxiliary, urge your support of the American Legion-sponsored war veterans' security bill, H. R. 7886.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BETTY GERBER,
Secretary.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
POST, NO. 2977,
Jump River, Wis., June 25, 1956.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our post is genuinely concerned with the so-called economizing action being taken by the Bradley Commission.

We appreciate your past efforts regarding veterans affairs and we feel confident you will do all in your power to safeguard the hard earned veterans benefits now in effect.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. NAGEL,
Commander.

JENSEN-VAN THRULER
CHAPTER, NO. 15,
AMERICAN DISABLED VETERANS
OF THE WORLD WAR,
Sheboygan, Wis., June 6, 1956.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY: At our last monthly meeting a motion was made and approved to see to it that this bill H. R. 11310 be brought to your attention. With your help we could be sure that these veterans with service-connected cases would get what is coming to them. We, the members of Disabled American Veterans of Sheboygan, Wis., hope our compensation and pension program should be enacted into law prior to the adjournment of the present Congress.

Yours truly,

CARLSON KNOCKE,
Chapter Service Officer.

From a Legion leader in Oconomowoc:

"DEAR SENATOR: This is to inform you of our hearty approval of your expression of opposition to the report of the Commission headed by Gen. Omar M. Bradley. Support such as yours is invaluable to us, the veterans of World Wars I and II, as well as all veterans of combat actions of any sort, of the Armed Forces of the United States. We, as well as the widows and orphans of our less fortunate comrades in arms, appreciate your championing our cause.

"Your action assures you of the continued support of all the fair-minded people of Wisconsin, and, particularly, us, the veterans of both World Wars. We hope and trust that you will continue to fight in our behalf."

"HONORABLE SIR: I am submitting this petition to you, as a member of World War I and a member of the VFW to act in our behalf:

" "The World War I veterans seem to be the forgotten men. I believe this can be rectified by giving this pension.

" 'You have an outstanding record of accomplishment, that there is no doubt in mind you will do your best.'

"Very truly yours."

"DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you asking and hoping you will vote for and help pass some kind of pension for us veterans of World War I. We are all getting along in years and so far have received very little benefits and they are always trying to take away the veterans hospital benefits. There are a number of bills pending in this Congress, some of which would really help some. You have always been favorable to the relief of us oldtimers at other times, so do hope you can again give us some help when it is before the Senate.

Do hope you will again be returned to the Senate this fall and heartfully thanking you for what you have done for me in the past, I beg to remain."

"DEAR SENATOR: I respectfully request your support of bill H. R. 11310 which provides an increase in the compensation for totally disabled service-connected veterans.

"You have always been a fighter for the veteran."

"DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was very pleased to read a recent report of your talk in Appleton at the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in regard to your opinion of the Bradley Commission recommendations and in particular your stand against its recommendation to minimize and gradually eliminate veterans' pensions by tying them in with social security payments. Like yourself, I am definitely opposed to such action and I want to congratulate you in expressing yourself opposed to any such action."

From Pewaukee:

"As I am a World War I veteran, and am totally disabled, and cannot be gainfully employed it is quite hard to live. I am quite interested in what pension bill you pass on, and the President will sign into a bill before you adjourn for the summer. I have a petition which 45 residents have signed and were happy to sign.

"Can you let me know just when the veterans' bill or veterans' affairs will be brought up for voting. Another thing, will you furnish me with the names of those that vote against our pension bills.

"Mr. Senator WILEY, this community has always been 100 percent for you as long as I can remember. We hope you will do your very best in getting one of our bills into a law for us World War I veterans who are badly in need of help in our declining age and conditions. Thank you very kindly for your efforts.

"Yours in comradeship."

From Hartford:

"As a veteran of World War No. 1, I have recently attended several veterans' meetings as a member of the John E. Courtney Post, No. 19, American Legion.

"It seems that the veterans were disgusted with the way the Republican king-makers conducted the caucus.

"We all recall the same kind of deals that were handed out to Goodland and Zimmerman, but the people took care of the situation at the polls.

"You will find that many of the veterans who are Democrats are going to vote the Republican ticket at the September primary."

From an individual veteran in Milwaukee:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am a service-connected, blinded veteran. I would appreciate it very much if you would give your attention to the passing of bill H. R. 12038 during this session of Congress.

Thank you very much.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
WEST ALLIS CHAPTER, NO. 19,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 25, 1956.

DEAR HONORABLE SENATOR WILEY: I wholeheartedly agree on bill S. 1636. My main concern is H. R. 12038, the bill on the increase in compensation for the disabled veterans. These disabled veterans have been brushed aside for so long that the only ray of light we see now, is this bill, H. R. 12038, to be voted and passed by the Senate.

In comradeship,

FRANK J. CZECHOLINSKI,
Commander.

Whereas the first order of business of the American Legion is to work for the welfare and benefit of our disabled veterans, their dependents, widows, and orphans; and

Whereas the veterans of World War I are now reaching the age in life in which many of them are forced by physical disability and conditions within their realms of employment that now forces them to subsist on a very small income; and

Whereas at the present session of the Congress, the American Legion had introduced H. R. 7886 known as the war veterans' security bill; and

Whereas in April the American Legion representatives and representatives of other veteran organizations had presented their thought before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee; and

Whereas the House Veterans Affairs' Committee since then has not seen fit to take further action on this or any other bill for the consideration of veterans affairs; and

Whereas on April 23, 1956, the so-called Bradley Commission report was submitted to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for consideration; and

Whereas the Bradley Commission report does not bring any new or pertinent information on veterans' programs or veterans' benefits that is not already known to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 10th District Council of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, in conference assembled this 27th day of May 1956, at Mondovi, Wis., That we do heartily approve the stand of our national rehabilitation commission in their presentation of H. R. 7886; and be it further

Resolved, That the district adjutant be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Representative LESTER B. JOHNSON and urge him to use all of his influence to have the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to vote on H. R. 7886 as soon as possible and to further get it through the Rules Committee for consideration on the floor of the Congress and further that when this bill is up for consideration by the United States Senate that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator MCCARTHY and Senator WILEY, urging them to use all of their efforts to see that just and equitable legislation is passed for our veterans, their dependents, widows, and orphans and this to truly represent the thought of all 11,000 Legionnaires and auxiliary members of the American Legion and the 10th district of Wisconsin.

Adopted by the 10th district spring conference, May 27, 1956.

Attest:

DON STEVENSON,
10th District Commander.
ERNEST P. SOBOTTA,
10th District Adjutant.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. In order to expedite whatever consideration may be made of the bill, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have added to the bill as a committee amendment an amendment which would clarify the relationships of the language in the bill to the TVA. We thought it had all been clarified. On second reading and second thought, there may be some doubt. The amendment would merely exempt such installations as TVA, as it does all other installations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota's amendment is as follows:

"This act shall not extend, in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to power properties (including the portion of multipurpose properties allocated to power purposes) which are owned by or in the custody of the Authority. The Authority shall continue to make payments to States and local governments on account of its power properties and as a charge against its power operations in accordance with section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (May 18, 1938; ch. 32, 48 Stat. 66), as amended by section 39 of the act of June 26, 1940 (ch. 432, 54 Stat. 626; 16 U. S. C. 831 (1)), and payments which may be required hereunder on account of nonpower properties shall be in addition to the payments required by section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended."

2. Addition of the following immediately after the word "use" on page 17, line 9:

"No payments shall be made under this act on account of improvements constructed by a Federal agency after June 30, 1950, on land title to which was acquired by the United States or a Federal agency on or before that date."

3. Addition of the following after the word "property" on page 5, line 14: "(but not including use for a navigation dam or other navigation improvement or the navigation portion of a multipurpose dam or improvement)."

JOSEPH J. TIERNEY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 6283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6283) for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $184.60 to Joseph J. Tierney as reimbursement for funds representing a judgment rendered against him in the courts of Massachusetts arising out of an accident on December 29, 1954, when he was performing his duties as a chauffeur in the post office in Boston, Mass. The Post Office Department recommends the passage of the bill and gives in detail a history of the case. The committee concurs in the Department's recommendation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a very important bill, which is H. R. 1840, which is a part of title II of H. R. 9424, which has been reported by the Judiciary Committee, but I have not been able to get the bill up for action. I am very anxious to give Members of the Senate an opportunity to vote on H. R. 1840, which has passed the House with only 3 dissenting votes, and which has been reported by the Judiciary Committee. I had in mind offering——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does the Senator desire to speak against the bill now pending? One objection would not interfere with the bill being considered by the Senate, as the unanimous-consent request has already been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wanted to inquire if the bill was open to amendment, or whether it was submitted under a condition that no amendment which was not germane could be offered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is a question the Senator from Tennessee will have to address to the Chair.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is the bill open to amendment——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to my friend from Tennessee that I take it there will be opportunities during the evening to present the matter he has in mind. I hope he will not hold up consideration of the pending bill, which involves $184. Of course, the lateness of the hour would make it possible for any Member of the body to hold up practically any measure which might come before the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have no desire to hold up the measure which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the Senator has no desire to hold up the measure, will he not withhold any discussion of the matter he is interested in, and let the Senate act on the pending business?

Mr. KEFAUVER. My fear is that no other House bills will come before the Senate from the Judiciary Committee. Would the Senator defer action on this matter to see if, by some agreement, consideration could be obtained for the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The acting majority leader will be glad to have the pending bill temporarily laid aside, and I now make that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL POSITION OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR IN THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 199, which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 199), to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established one additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget, for which the compensation shall be the same as is now or may hereafter be provided for the two such positions heretofore authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 16a).

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4133) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

JOSEPH J. TIERNEY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2868, House bill 6283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6283) for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6283) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESS REPORT ON THE BURKE FIELD–FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me for what will be a very brief statement.

Mr. President, I have noticed with fascination the great speed with which the Senate is driving for adjournment. I did not realize the speed with which the Senate is acting these days until I read an item in this afternoon's edition of the Washington News, which reports that the Burke Field-Friendship Airport Subcommittee had already taken action urging the airlines and the armed services to use Friendship Airport, instead of having a new field built at Burke, Va.

While I prefer Friendship over Burke, this is certainly news to me, for I was not notified that I was a member of the subcommittee until receiving a letter from the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] a few hours ago—to be exact, at 12:45 this afternoon. If the subcommittee has taken such action, it has been taken without notice to me, without my knowledge, without my participation, and without my approval. Certainly that must also be true in the case of the other Republican member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], since he is not even in the country at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. For what purpose does the Senator from Florida wish me to yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Maine that if the chairman of the subcommittee was quoted in any way in connection with the matter referred to, the quotation was incorrect, because certainly the chairman has not taken any action in that regard.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me, to permit me to read into the RECORD the newspaper article to which I have referred?

Mr. MUNDT. Very well; I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on page 5 of the Washington Daily News for Friday, July 27, 1956, the following appears:

HILL UNIT URGES: TRY FRIENDSHIP

A Senate Appropriations Subcommittee assigned to look into the problem of a second Washington airport today drafted letters to airlines and the armed services urging them to try using Baltimore's Friendship Airport.

The subcommittee said Friendship, if it works out well, would be an alternative to construction of a new field at Burke, Va. Maryland Senators have long backed such a plan.

The Senate Tuesday night rejected President Eisenhower's request for funds to build an airport at Burke, killing the project at least until the next session of Congress.

The subcommittee plans to hold hearings and conferences on the matter.

It consists of Senators SPESSARD HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, chairman; WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, and CHARLES POTTER, Republican, of Michigan.

I know only what I read, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I followed the reading of the article, but nothing in the article indicates——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have not been asked to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I gladly request that the Senator from South Dakota yield to me, so that I may make a brief statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I gladly yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have followed the reading of the article, and I do not believe it contains any quotation attributed to the senior Senator from Florida. Am I correct?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will yield to me, let me say that the Senator from Florida is correct, except that the subcommittee is referred to, and I would presume that any statement coming from the subcommittee would come from the chairman of the subcommittee, although I realize that the statement referred to may have come from someone else. In my brief statement I did not mention the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from South Dakota to yield again to me.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like the Senator from Maine to understand that the Senator from Florida was not quoted in the article, and has not been correctly quoted to that effect in any place.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the Senator from Florida very much.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before commencing my discussion of Senate bill 4183, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Was the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and me, which was sent to the desk, printed; and has it been distributed to the Members of the Senate? I do not have a copy of the amendment on my desk, and during this discussion I think that all Members of the Senate should have copies of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator's question is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MUNDT. Then let me suggest that at this time the pages distribute the amendment to all Senators.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate who have just entered the Chamber may not understand what the pending measure is. It is Senate bill 4183, which proposes to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] recently addressed the Senate at some length regarding the reasons which persuaded the majority of the committee to report the bill favorably. He has given his arguments for advocating its passage at this time.

I now propose to discuss some of the deficiencies of the bill, as I see them. Since I am not certain how long I shall be able to proceed without interruption, I wish to be sure that the views of the minority of the committee are called to the attention of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the minority report, as prepared by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and myself, together with the individual views of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

There being no objection, the minority report and individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY REPORT

This legislative proposal (S. 4183) opens up a vast, unrestricted, undefined new program of annual expenditures by the Federal taxpayers through their Central Government. It seeks to provide Federal payments "in lieu of taxes" to certain urban communities whose problems have developed since 1950 and to initiate a type of Federal expenditure which is certain to expand rapidly and widely, without first measuring and defining the potential costs involved or the final destination to which this new fiscal path will inevitably lead.

We, the undersigned members of the Committee on Government Operations, therefore feel compelled to file minority views on S. 4183 for reasons which we believe, in all sincerity, are most compelling.

At the outset, we desire to make it perfectly clear that, with the majority, we are convinced that there is an urgent need for legislative action to relieve local taxing authorities from certain types of unjustified and inequitable burdens and hardships imposed upon them as the result of large-scale Federal ownership of various types of property, which acquisition has operated to remove such property from the local tax rolls. The need for a comprehensive program of uniform action in this field has long been apparent and has been recently pointed up and documented by the excellent report and studies of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

It is our sincere judgment, however, that the subject bill, S. 4183, fails to accomplish this objective, and would serve only to complicate further an already complicated situation, without granting appropriate relief to many of the hard-pressed local taxing authorities, now suffering from precisely the same problems this legislation proposes to correct for a favored few.

For the reasons set forth below, we are firmly of the opinion that we would be derelict in our duties and obligations to the American people, as responsible legislators if we were to lend our support to the pending measure:

1. The Congress does not have the requisite information upon which to act at this time.

S. 4183 provides for a 5-year program of (1) payments in lieu of taxes on industrial and commercial property acquired by the Federal Government since June 30, 1950, provided the local taxing authority can show that Federal acquisition has resulted in demonstrable hardship; (2) for payments of special assessments levied in urban communities after the date of enactment of the act; and (3) for payments in lieu of taxes on real property leased or sold to taxable persons under conditional sales contracts.

Although it would commit the Federal Government to making payments to local taxing authorities in the cases listed above, the Senate has no reliable information before it with respect to either the properties which would be covered by the subject bill or the potential cost of the program.

We recognize, of course, that it is difficult to determine the precise cost to the Federal Government of special assessments which local taxing authorities may levy on Federal real property in the future; we realize also that the potential cost of payments on property leased or sold under conditional sales contracts may also be difficult to obtain. The majority states that no cost estimates are provided because it is impossible at this time to obtain such estimates. We know, however, that cost estimates with respect to industrial and commercial property covered by S. 4183 can be obtained once these properties are identified; and we know that this information is presently available and can be ascertained by a proper study of these reports, and analyses already compiled by the GSA.

We therefore strongly disagree with the majority. It is our firm conviction that cost estimates can be obtained if a proper study is made of the coverage and scope of the pending bill. Such a study would enable the Congress to determine whether the costs of the program proposed would impose an unconscionable or undue burden upon Federal taxpayers and to effect adjustments which would keep the costs at a reasonable level, in order to insure that the Federal Treasury would be adequately protected.

To take action now on a bill which may cost the Federal Government several hundreds of millions of dollars during the next 5 years, without any firm indication of the precise extent of this obligation, would, in our judgment, demonstrate a lack of responsibility on our part and a dereliction of our solemn obligation to the Federal taxpayers.

Until such time as the Senate has before it the necessary information to enable Members of the Senate to assess the full scope and coverage of the program proposed by the subject bill, as well as reasonably accurate cost estimates, the Congress is not in a position to legislate. Certainly, no private enterprise in the world would undertake even a 5-year program without full knowledge of its extent and its costs. We know of no compelling reason why the Federal Government should depart from the practices of private business in this respect.

It should be emphasized that the passage of this legislation would establish a precedent for new Federal payments to communities from which it would be difficult if not impossible to retreat. Once started, the pressure would all be for the almost endless expansion of this concept of Federal payments to local communities with similar conditions or to other communities with different problems of like intensity and need. Once the Congress starts out on this uncharted sea of Federal expenditures, we shall find we have opened a virtual Pandora's box of related requests. Today, even the Bureau of the Budget and the majority members of the committee who voted to report this bill are unable to designate a figure naming the potential annual payments by the Federal Government which would be required if this legislation is adopted. Before the Senate enters upon such a voyage into the great unknown, we believe Congress should insist on establishing some points of reference and a chart clearly depicting to the Congress and the country whither we are actually bound.

2. S. 4183 is a discriminatory measure which will benefit certain urban communities without affording any relief whatever to the large majority of hard-pressed local taxing authorities, especially in rural communities.

As previously pointed out, the subject bill would provide payments in a very limited class of cases and to a very limited number of communities. Payments are limited, for the most part, to industrial or commercial properties acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950. Payments for special assessments are limited to "urban and suburban areas," thus completely ignoring similar problems in rural areas and the many serious problems created by vast Government holdings in our so-called public land States. In justification of this formula, the majority states that the limitation as to coverage is necessary to keep the costs down. It is our position that if this bill is designed to remove inequities, this limitation on coverage and date of Federal acquisiton is completely unacceptable. Not only does it discriminate, without justification, against communities in which other types of Federal tax-exempt holdings are located, but it sets a completely arbitrary date limitation.

The Senate has not been furnished with an information which would justify making payments on a limited class of real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950. We know of no reason why those communities which have Federal tax-exempt personal property, inventories, and other types of real property acquired prior to 1950 should not be given the same treatment and consideration, if they are able to demonstrate that the presence of Federal holdings and activities has resulted in serious fiscal and financial burdens for which they could be entitled to some relief as provided for properties covered by the bill.

In our opinion, the Congress would be violating its public trust if it were to enact legislation which would in effect increase the taxes of communities suffering economic hardships created by Federal installations established in 1948 or 1938 or 1928, or in some other year, in order to enable the Federal Government to make cash payments in lieu of taxes to certain other favored communities suffering identically the same economic hardships created by Federal installations established in 1952 or 1954 or in some other year after the rather mystic but completely arbitrary date of June 30, 1950. What right have we as the peoples' representatives to use the Treasury of all the people as a device for penalizing some so that others might profit?

It is our conviction that like circumstances should be treated with like remedies when they are caused by identical activities of the Federal Government. We reject the argument that "1950 should be used as a cutoff date so that the initial charges against the Federal Government will not be too great." To us, that indicates clearly that eventually it is expected that the act will be expanded. We wonder, how far? And at what great cost? And if communities with problems created prior to 1950 have equal claim against the Government for succor with those included in the convenient "after June 30, 1950" demarcation, why are not their problems considered at the same time?

Perhaps legally, Congress has the right to "pick and choose" by the selection of a calendar date but morally we believe we have the responsibility to meet like problems with like correctives, especially in a matter which by involving the Federal Treasury in an unmeasured and immeasurable program of expenditures is tantamount to adding indirectly to the tax burdens of all our people.

Finally, this bill gives no consideration to rural needs as against urban needs. Industries are usually located in urban areas. Other types of Federal activities, which are not covered under this bill, such as Indian reservations; game refuges; airbases; Army camps, posts and stations; and Federal grazing lands, are usually located in rural areas. Yet this bill would afford payments in lieu of taxes without affording any relief to hard-pressed rural communities. For example this bill would permit urban and suburban communities to make assessments against Federal property for sewer improvements, curbs and gutters, etc., but would not permit assessments against public land held by the Government for weed control, road maintenance and other services.

It is our firm opinion that any legislative action which may be taken with respect to this problem must give the same consideration to both urban and rural needs and should not be limited to one small class of properties which are usually located in urban areas. In short, what is needed is a long-range, comprehensive program, designed to treat all areas alike. Such a program, however, is only possible if we have the necessary facts and statistics upon which to base it. As noted previously, this information is available. All that is required is an accurate and complete study as to the extent of coverage that is necessary to provide equitable and essential legislation, and as to the cost factors involved, which we believe can be completed within the next 6 to 8 months. We would then be able to produce legislation which would be comprehensive in coverage and scope and would give relief to all distressed communities alike, regardless of the type of Federal property located within their respective areas, without regard to any artificial date of Federal acquisition, and without discrimination against rival areas.

The Senators preparing this minority report believe additional exploration, study, and analysis of all statistical information already compiled is required before Congress can act prudently or properly in writing and approving legislation on this very complicated subject. We propose later in this report a substitute measure providing for the compilation and submission of this information. What is needed, we believe, is not a quick step into the dark in a generous but injudicious effort to be of help to some, but a completely comprehensive piece of legislation which will meet all facets of this problem for once and for all in an effort to bring equity to all. Our laws in this area should rest on concepts of uniform treatment for like problems rather than on the capricious selection of a calendar date which divides "those who will have to pay more" from "those who will receive more from the Government," even though they confront identical problems created by precisely the same activities of the Federal Government of which they are all a part. The legislation required to meet this problem should be based on concepts of equity rather than on any plan which would evade major facets of the problem. What we need is legislation based on full study of all phases of all problems in this area which will fairly and properly relate urban and rural problems, old problems and new problems, and all aspects of the longstanding question of the extent to which the Federal Government should permit itself to be billed for payments in lieu of taxes on the vast and growing body of public property, public domain, and public holdings which is in the as-yet untabulated and unreported inventory of Uncle Sam's holdings. This, we believe, can and should be done. But passage of S. 4183 as reported to the Senate, as a part-time, part-help measure for some of the problems could well delay the enactment of the type of overall legislation required to bring together in one place for all to see and understand the relationships of the Federal Government in this field to the State and local governments. Before establishing firm precedents which could permanently commit us, we should first see and understand the full size of the complete problem.

3. This bill fails to provide for effective congressional review.

S. 4183 provides for the establishment of a five member Federal board which would exercise quasi-judicial functions. It would require that the Board shall receive applications for payments in lieu of taxes from local taxing authorities and issue orders directing the Federal owning agencies to make payments in amounts to be determined by the Board. The Board's decisions would be final and compelling.

The effect of such a provision is to give a five-member Federal Board the authority vested by the Constitution of the United States in the Congress, since once the Board ordered a payment to be made, the Congress would be obligated to comply and to appropriate the funds. Thus, the Congress and its Appropriations Committees would be relegated to a position of "rubber stamps," and deprived of their control over the resulting expenditures.

Such an abrogation of congressional responsibility is completely unjustified. To deprive the Congress of the United States of its constitutional responsibility for the protection of the Federal Treasury can never be justified, and no bill which would permit a Federal board to make final determinations with respect to the amounts of Federal funds which should be paid out, without any opportunity on the part of the Congress to review such expenditures, should be permitted to become law.

An abrogation by Congress: We call to the attention of all Senators, but especially those on the committees on finance and on appropriations, that not only once but several times the proposed legislation makes it clear that there is to be no congressional review of the decisions of the Board which the bill proposes to create. Once Congress has set this costly machine in motion, it completely loses control over the speed with which it moves or the expenditures which it creates.

There is not even the customary budgetary control by the Bureau of the Budget. There are no further determinations to be made by the Committee on Finance or by the Committee on Appropriations. All they can do is to provide the money that the Board orders to be paid by the Federal agencies involved. The bill is so drawn, even, that the agencies are ordered to make the payments from funds already appropriated where possible so that henceforth Congress stands by as a helpless "kibitzer" while the Board decides which communities participate and which are excluded, and as the Board makes what in effect are these great potential appropriations which under our Constitution it was expected only the Congress had authority to make and for which Congress should assume the responsibility.

4. S. 4183 fails to provide any criteria which the Federal board would be required to follow in determining whether a local taxing community has demonstrated financial hardship.

S. 4183 authorizes a Federal board to make payments to local taxing authorities for industrial or commercial-type real properties acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950, where the Federal acquisition or use can be shown to have imposed a financial hardship on such communities. However, nowhere in the bill is there any indication of what is meant by a financial hardship. On the contrary, this determination is left entirely to the discretion of the Board, which is empowered to establish rules and regulations governing the determination of actions to be taken upon applications presented.

The effect of this omission is to vest in an administrative agency absolute authority to establish the standards upon which it will make payments to local communities as well as to the amount of payments it will make.

To establish an administrative body and to vest in it such absolute powers, without providing statutory guidelines in the form of criteria and some specific limitations on the amount of Federal funds it can expend, is a complete departure from sound legislative practice and constitutes nothing less than an unheard of and unwarranted abrogation by the Congress of its constitutional taxing and appropriating authority. Such procedure is not only of doubtful wisdom and legality, but it also sets a precedent for future action which may return to plague the Congress in the future.

5. S. 4183 would enable communities which exerted much effort and pressure to obtain Federal installations to obtain payments from the Federal Government because of the presence within their boundaries of such installations.

It is a well-established practice of many communities to exert much pressure and effort to induce the Government to construct various types of Federal installations within their boundaries, and many communities devote much time and effort to this practice. The advantages to a community of the presence of a large Federal defense or industrial installation are, of course, well recognized. Not only do they add materially to the prosperity and the general economy of the area, but they also constitute new sources of revenue in the form of income, personal property, and real property taxes received from increased income earned by residents of the community and from large numbers of new taxpayers who are brought into the community as employees of the installation. Although the presence of such plants often requires communities to furnish additional services in the form of schools, police and fire protection, and water and sanitation facilities, the costs involved are usually more than offset by the increased income and by the taxes which are paid to the State and community as a direct result of the locations of the plants in the selected area. Nevertheless, under the pending bill, if such communities were able to make any showing that the presence of such installation resulted in financial hardship, they would be entitled to payments as an additional cash dividend added to the other economic advantages and benefits brought to the community for being chosen as the site for an important Federal installation.

It is our firm position that when a community outbids other communities by making all sorts of concessions and offering a variety of inducements to the Federal Government to locate an industrial installation in its midst, that community should not be permitted to come to the Federal Government for payments in lieu of taxes to compensate for alleged financial hardships of which they should have fully anticipated, but now assert have resulted from the presence of the Federal installation. Furthermore, these installations often replaced a vacant warehouse or an empty lot from which the community has previously received little or no revenue. In effect, the bill thus establishes a precedent which would likely plague the Government in the future, since such communities would become convinced that they would be relieved of any necessary costs to the community in supplying services to the installation upon the showing of financial hardship, regardless of the economic benefits that accrue to the State and the community.

It would see a simple matter of justice and equity that legislation of this type should not make it possible to reward the successful community bidding for a Federal installation by then giving it payments in lieu of taxes, after the novelty of the new development wears off and the problems begin to appear, and to further injure the nonsuccessful community bidder by causing it to pay higher Federal taxes so that some of the income from its citizens could be siphoned off through the Federal Treasury to the community that successfully outbid it when invitations were extended for the Federal installation. But this legislation as proposed stands mute on this matter. Should it be enacted, communities could well promise the moon when urging Federal officials to locate a Federal installation in their environs, and then return to the Federal Government a few years later to seek their Federal bonus in lieu of taxes to pay for the services so enthusiastically promised while competing for the new development.

We want specifically to acknowledge the existence of some community problems created by Federal installations which were not invited in, but which were caused because the Federal Government insisted on locating a certain installation in some specified area. Clearly in these cases, equity rests with the local community and certain compensatory Federal payments are merited in lieu of taxes to meet the problems created by this Federal action. We believe legislation should be enacted to meet these problems directly. We favor its inclusion in the overall legislative approach which we propose as a substitute. But in simple candor we must meet our responsibilities as legislators by pointing out that the pending legislation is not limited to situations of this type nor to hardships which are caused by Federal intrusion into a contented community as against those which come as easily anticipated difficulties along with the constructive and helpful effects envisioned when communities send delegations to Washington seeking Federal installations in their areas.

6. Amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the minority.

We of the minority desire to reemphasize and reiterate our serious concern over the financial plight of local taxing authorities which are suffering actual financial hardships as the result of Federal acquisition of various types of property, which acquisition or ownership was not solicited locally and has operated to remove such property from the local tax rolls. We are convinced, however, that much-needed relief can only be furnished by the establishment of a comprehensive program which will equitably provide for payments to all communities which can show that the presence of Federal property within their boundaries has caused them to suffer financial hardships. Such a program must be equitable and nondiscriminatory; it must be based on uniformity of treatment and not upon artificially established categories of property or cutoff dates which bear no relationship to the situation. It must treat problems of the same cause and nature with the same remedies regardless of calendar date and regardless of whether the problem is created in an urban or rural community.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations found that at the present time the great majority of Federal agencies have no general authority to make payments in lieu of taxes on their properties; that existing provisions of law are quite diverse and result in different treatment for similar properties of various agencies. Thus, on some classes of property, some agencies pay taxes; others make payments in lieu of taxes; and still others make no payments at all.

According to the latest available information, there are presently on the books some 55 laws dealing with Federal payment of taxes or in lieu of taxes, or shared revenue arrangements. Of this number, some 20 provide for a sharing of revenue between Federal and State and local governments; 18 authorize payments in lieu of taxes; and 17 authorize the payment of direct taxes. The situation is clearly a patchwork or crazy quilt which requires comprehensive action if the Federal Government is to administer the program intelligently and assume its proper responsibility in these matters. The pending bill would merely add another patch, a 56th law to the present hodgepodge of unrelated laws on this complicated problem.

The amendment proposed by the minority would lay the foundation for the development and establishment of an organized, comprehensive program, designed to treat in like manner all communities, whether rural or urban, which have like problems. Because of the clear lack of adequate information upon which to base such a program, it is our judgment that a study must be made, making use of all of the valuable materials and studies which are now available.

The substitute amendment which we propose would establish a Federal interdepartmental commission, headed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and representatives of the Department of Defense, Justice, Interior, and Agriculture, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, General Services Administration, and the Veterans' Administration, as well as representatives of such other departments or agencies as the President may deem advisable. This Commission would be required to make a comprehensive study of all of existing legislation dealing with payments by the Federal Government of taxes, or in lieu of taxes, and special assessments, as well as payments made pursuant to revenue-sharing agreements, grants-in-aid and other related programs where some Federal responsibility may exist, in either rural areas or in urban communities.

The Commission would be required to submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, on or before March 1, 1957, a comprehensive report detailing its findings with respect to the nature and effect of previous enactments and its recommendations concerning the extent, if any, to which there is need for new legislation to provide additional financial assistance uniformly and under like circumstances to State and local governments to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property, with specified formulas and criteria for application of the program. The Commission would place before Congress the exact and measured dimensions of the whole problem created by Federal ownership or operation, as it pertains to the tax income of States and local communities. It would include a recapitulation of problems, for example, caused by Federal Indian reservations, by the land utilization program in many Western States, by forest lands, game preserves and similar Federal holdings along with any needed proposals for adjusting and providing payments in lieu of taxes which would be related equitably and fairly with proposals for such payments on Federal holdings in city areas.

In short it would provide Congress and the country with the whole picture at one time, and place proposals to meet any Federal responsibilities in this area in one reconciliable pattern of payments, rather than simply adding one additional and unprecedented payment-proposal of unpredictable size and cost to an already far too complicated labyrinth of legislation in this field. The Commission would cease to exist upon transmission of its report to the Congress.

CONCLUSION

It is our sincere judgment that such a study as that proposed by our amendment would furnish the Congress with the vital information needed to enable it to legislate promptly, intelligently, and comprehensively. It would occasion no delay, so far as communities are concerned, since any legislation considered by the Congress in the next session could provide a retroactive date for the program to begin January 1, 1957, should it be considered the appropriate action. Even though Congress in the closing and crowded days of the present session were to rush through a hastily and inadequately considered bill such as S. 4183 in its present

form, payments to the favored selected communities could not begin before next year at the earliest.

Our proposed substitute would afford an opportunity for a realistic approach to a most complex problem and would not merely add an additional patch to the existing crazy quilt.

The advantages to be gained by the adoption of the substitute amendment are of such great importance that we urge its adoption. It would enable the Congress to have from an official and fully responsible interdepartmental commission all of the essential facts and cost factors available upon which to base an equitable program for payments in lieu of taxes, after the development of accurate and complete related information. This procedure would be clearly preferable to the adoption of a restricted program admittedly based on theory and on imponderables which have not yet been adequately evaluated. We believe this proposal to create a responsible official factfinding commission is also preferable to trying to present and consider during the crowded, closing days of this session, all of the needed amendments required by the committee bill if it is to provide equity for rural as well as urban problems and for all communities confronted by like problems whether originating before or after June 30, 1950.

For these reasons, we urge the rejection of S. 4183 and the adoption of the substitute proposal in lieu thereof which we have offered as a prudent, constructive, and positive approach to the problems which we all recognize, even though none of us today is able either to enumerate their quantity or to estimate the cost of their correction. No time need be lost by first getting the facts to which we are entitled, and much expensive embarrassment may be avoided if we get the official interdepartmental figures and recommendations before we venture out beyond the line of no retreat.

KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senator (South Dakota).
THOS. E. MARTIN,
United States Senator (Iowa).

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. MUNDT to the bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes, viz:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Commission on Payments to State and Local Governments Act of 1956.'

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or to any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, the Congress has recognized that the exemption of Federal property from taxation by State and local governments has worked hardship upon such governments in a number of instances, and heretofore has enacted a number of legislative measures providing relief in varying forms for such governments.

"(b) It is the purpose of this act to provide for a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of such previous enactments, and for an investigation to determine the nature and effect of any further legislation which may be required for the relief of State and local governments from such hardship.

"(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that no such additional relief shall be made to any State or local government with respect to any Federal property devoted to any Federal activity the establishment or retention of which within the territorial jurisdiction of such State or local government at any time has been solicited by such State or local government.

"COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Payments to State and Local Governments (referred to hereinafter as the 'Commission').

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of—

"(1) the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall serve as chairman thereof;

"(2) one representative of each of the following departments and agencies of the United States Government, each of whom shall be designated by the head of the department or agency represented by him from officers or employees of such department or agency: the Department of Defense; the Department of Justice; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Agriculture; the Office of Defense Mobilization; the General Services Administration; and the Veterans' Administration; and

"(3) one representative of each other department or agency of the United States Government named by the President, each of whom shall be designated by the head of such department or agency from officers or employees of such department or agency.

"(c) The Commission shall select a vice chairman from among its members. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(d) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of departments and agencies of the Government, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

"STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of all previous enactments of the Congress providing for—

"(1) the payment to any State or local government of any tax or special assessment with respect to any Federal real or personal property;

"(2) the making of any payment to any such government in lieu of the payment of any tax or special assessment with respect to any such property; or

"(3) the rendition of assistance to any State or local government through the making of grants-in-aid, the sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, or through the furnishing of services or facilities by the United States.

"(b) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which State and local governments derive benefits directly or indirectly through payments made to them (1) by persons residing or employed upon Federal property, and (2) for or in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

"(c) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive investigation to determine the extent, if any, to which there is need for legislation by the Congress to provide additional financial assistance for State and local governments to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. Such investigation shall include inquiry to determine—

"(1) the classes of Federal property, if any, with respect to which any such additional assistance should be granted;

"(2) the nature and extent of any such additional assistance;

"(3) the conditions, if any, under which such additional assistance should be granted;

"(4) the annual cost to the United States of providing such financial assistance with respect to each such class of Federal property and with respect to all such classes of Federal property; and

"(5) ways and means whereby State and local governments may be accorded effective right to apply property taxes in effect within their several jurisdictions to industrial plant equipment, materials, supplies, and inventories owned by private parties and used by them for commercial purposes within plant facilities owned or controlled by departments and agencies of the United States Government.

"(d) On or before March 1, 1957, the Commission shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a comprehensive report containing—

"(1) the text of all provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), together with an analysis of the purpose and effect of each such provision;

"(2) the findings of the Commission as to the facts disclosed by its studies and investigations made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

"(3) its recommendations, consistent with the policy prescribed by section 2 (c), as to any additional legislation the need for which has been disclosed by its investigation under subsection (c) of this section; and

"(4) a detailed analysis of the relationship between any recommendations so made and the provisions of existing law set forth in compliance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(e) Upon the transmittal of such report to the Congress, the Commission shall cease to exist.

"POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) To carry out the provisions of this act, the Commission, or any duly authorized member or employee thereof, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission, or such member or employee, may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or any duly designated member or employee, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, offices, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the United States information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act. Each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission,

upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish in the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Payments to State and local governments."

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR MCCARTHY

I shall support the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been offered by Senators MUNDT and MARTIN to S. 4183.

In my opinion, the Mundt-Martin procedure as outlined in their substitute is a much more realistic and appropriate approach to the problems which S. 4183 seeks to correct than the specific, partial remedies proposed by the committee bill.

Among other things, the committee bill in my opinion would produce a completely unjustified discrimination among communities on the basis of whether or not the problems from which they suffer as a consequence of Federal installations were initiated before or after June 30, 1950. I can see no rational justification for adopting a program of Federal expenditures which would penalize people in communities with problems created by Federal installations made prior to June 30, 1950, in order to provide benefits and payments to communities suffering from the same problems growing out of installations made by the general Government after June 30, 1950.

In addition, I think that Senators MUNDT and MARTIN are correct in recommending against initiating a program of Federal expenditures of this type before sufficient facts and figures are available so that Congress can have a clear-cut estimation of the total costs involved.

The Mundt-Martin substitute has the virtue of establishing an interdepartmental provision to provide us with these facts while in the same time establishing a procedure whereby payments in lieu of taxes to communities can still be initiated as of January 1, 1957, which is clearly as early as any community could begin to receive benefits under the terms of the committee bill.

In the event that the Mundt-Martin substitute is rejected by the Senate and a majority of the Senate decides that it wants to act in this session on the legislative provisions contained in S. 4183, I shall seek by other amendments to correct some of the deficiencies of the proposed bill in order to give it a greater degree of realism and equity.

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL AT THE NEXT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for an inquiry to be addressed to the leadership on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, provided it is understood that in yielding for that purpose, I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader and the minority leader, I should like to inquire about a matter which has given me and, I know, a number of my colleagues deep concern.

Mr. President, we strongly support the civil-rights program of the administration, which has been substantially embodied in House bill 627, which the House passed recently.

This measure is in no sense punitive or extreme. It is moderate, realistic, and sound, and its enactment is very much needed.

I wish the bill could have been enacted into law at this session of Congress. I recognize that this is not possible. I recognize, too, that if an effort had been made during the closing days of the session to force consideration, a filibuster would have resulted, which would have endangered the entire legislative program, and led, among other things, to the almost certain defeat of legislation vitally necessary to the security and welfare of the Nation. This situation must not be repeated. We are determined to press at the next session of Congress for orderly but prompt consideration of the bill.

I therefore ask both the majority leader and the minority leader as individuals, and as undoubted leaders in the next session of Congress, if they will give assurance that, whichever party controls the Congress, they will use their best efforts to secure prompt and early consideration of that measure.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the inquiry has been addressed to the majority leader and the minority leader. Inasmuch as the Senator propounding the question is on my side of the aisle, perhaps the distinguished majority leader will not feel that I am usurping any prerogatives by responding first to the question which was propounded to the leadership.

Speaking as minority leader, I will say, as I said on the floor of the Senate the other day, that I believe the calling up of a bill of this type in the last 4 days of the session is not a practical way of getting anything accomplished in the way of legislation of this kind, for the reasons which I publicly stated; namely, that under the rules three steps would have to be taken, provided the proponents of the measure could place themselves in a parliamentary situation to make the necessary moves.

First, there would have to be a motion to discharge the committee, if the committee had not reported the bill. That motion would be subject to unlimited debate. A cloture petition would have to be filed. Sixty-four votes would have to be obtained in the Senate in order to apply cloture. Each Senator would be entitled to 1 hour debate, even if cloture were adopted.

That would merely move the measure from the committee to the calendar. Then a motion would have to be made to proceed to the consideration of the bill or bills. That motion would be subject to unlimited debate, and again it would be necessary to go through the process of a cloture petition, and to obtain 64 votes. Again, each Senator would be entitled to 1 hour, even after the invoking of cloture.

Then we would be through with only the second step, at which point the bill would be before the Senate. It would then be subject to unlimited amendment, and cloture might have to be applied to each amendment, if it were possible to obtain the necessary 64 votes.

I think all of us who are familiar with the rules of the Senate and the tactical possibilities know that in the closing days of a session one cannot proceed with any hope of accomplishment with a bill of the character referred to.

I will say to the Senator that if the party which is now in the minority should take the responsibility for control of the Senate at the next session of Congress, of course, the procedure would have to be, first, that a bill must be introduced.

I would hope that such a measure could be considered early in the next session of Congress, not in the second year of the 85th Congress, but in the first year of the 85th Congress, and that following hearings—and certainly everyone, either for or against the proposed legislation, is entitled to be heard—the bill could be reported to the Senate, perhaps by March 1 or April 1 at the latest.

Then, if the bill had been reported to the Senate and had been cleared by the policy committee of the majority—if we should happen at that time to be the majority—I believe it would be incumbent upon me, as the leader, if I should hold that position at the time, to ask the Senate to consider the bill very early in the session, in order to avoid the parliamentary obstacle which otherwise, I am sure all Members of the Senate recognize, exists.

I am sure the Senator will also recognize that, until the bill has been introduced, until the committee has met, and until we see what kind of bill is reported, the able Senator would not expect merely a blank-check statement that, regardless of what it looked like, or how far it went, or whether it violated constitutional principles, there would be a blanket commitment to call up any kind of legislation. If the Senator is assuming legislation along the lines which the President has recommended—perhaps not word for word, but along those general lines—I would hope very much that the Senate could successfully act upon it at the next session of Congress.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. My question was directed to the specific legislation recommended by the President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that if that responsibility were mine—and, of course, that is a matter which is not in my control—I certainly feel that it should be brought up early. I would hope it would be brought up in 1957, and not in the last 4 days of the session in 1958, as was done in this instance, when a move was made in that direction, and there was discussion about obtaining consideration of that legislation in the closing days, when there were pending a great many other important bills, including social security, mutual aid, customs simplification, and other important measures which might have been jeopardized if we had been confronted with a full-scale, prolonged debate, or filibuster.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am sure that the minority leader is fully cognizant of my awareness of the situation, and my refusal to engage in futile action this year.

If the Senator from South Dakota will yield further, I should be most grateful for an expression of views on the part of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader's views on the present parliamentary situation do not differ greatly from those expressed by the minority leader. The minority leader has made a very good statement as to parliamentary procedure. It sounded almost as though he might have been a teacher of that subject at one time.

What the Senate or any other legislative body does depends on what the majority of the members of the committee which controls the proposed legislation wants done. In my own case, when a committee reports a measure, I have the responsibility of bringing it before the policy group, composed of nine members. I do not know who will constitute that committee in the next Congress. I do not know whether it will be a majority or minority committee. I do not know who will be assigned to the committee which will have jurisdiction over the proposed legislation. I do not even know who will be the President next year.

I will say to the Senator from New Jersey that more bills have been scheduled, and fewer bills remain on the calendar at the close of this Congress than in the case of any other Congress with which I am familiar. As a general rule, I do not think it is good practice—and I do not believe members of the legislative bodies think it is good practice—to discharge committees from the consideration of bills pending before them. It may be that the Senate would want to do that. I certainly would not wish to be a party to any such movement.

All I can say to the Senator is that when the committee acts, if I am the majority leader, and if I have responsibility for scheduling any proposed legislation, I shall take prompt action to bring it to the attention of the group over which I preside, namely, the policy committee. In the event the policy committee feels that it is a bill which should be scheduled for action, it will be brought to the floor of the Senate.

During this Congress almost 3,000 measures have been scheduled, considered by the Senate, and passed. I think there will be left on the calendar when we adjourn tonight fewer than 50 bills.

I realize the great political implications involved in connection with the subject which the Senator from New Jersey has mentioned. I realize that great political pressures have been brought to bear in the past few days, not only in connection with this subject, but many other subjects.

Last night at 1 o'clock I received a telephone call from Texas regarding a piece of legislation which the person who called wanted stopped.

I was awakened this morning by a call from another city in my own State. The caller was delivering political threats. Having served for 20 years in a legislative body, I am accustomed to those things, particularly in the dying days of the session.

I determine my course only on the basis of my judgment telling me a bill is in the national interest. I do not expect every Member of the Senate to share my viewpoint on legislation. I try to be very tolerant of those who do not. I do think it is important to state that I also schedule bills for consideration with which I do not agree; but I bring them before the Senate in order that the Senate may have an opportunity to express itself on them, provided a committee has followed the proper procedure and has reported them, and provided they have been cleared by the policy committee. I do not know that there is anything further I can add.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I should like to ask one more question of the Senator, if he will yield. Do I understand correctly that, after ample time had elapsed for consideration of a bill by a committee, and after it appeared that the committee had given no consideration to the bill, the majority leader would not feel, in any circumstances, that he should assist any movement to discharge a committee from further consideration of the bill, and to bring that bill before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know of no duty of the majority leader which requires him to be put in a straitjacket. The majority leader has expressed his general opinion on the general legislative subject.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. My inquiry was directed to a specific piece of legislation and was not an attempt to put the Senator from Texas into a straitjacket. No such attempt was intended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader has attempted to make his position clear, and he believes he has.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not believe I shall yield any further on this subject, because we have a very important matter before us. Perhaps as the evening progresses we can have further debate on that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have assured certain Senators, who have expressed the desire to discuss this subject at this session, that they will have an opportunity to do so before the Senate adjourns sine die.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. I am in hope that we can.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I have been standing here for 30 minutes, and I have not had a chance to say anything on the bill yet.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps the Senator will yield to me later.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to do so later.

The majority leader has pointed out that the majority had scheduled more bills for consideration by the Senate at this session than in any other session during any given time. In my opinion they have scheduled one bill too many. Perhaps they would be making a better record if they had not scheduled this bill for consideration, but had, instead, stopped it, because this is such a revolutionary bill, and certainly is not a bill which should be brought up for discussion by the Senate at 4:15 o'clock in the afternoon.

ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to impose upon the good nature of the Senator from South Dakota in order that I may briefly explain, before he gets launched on his subject, an important question which ought to be decided before Congress adjourns.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota is a bit appalled by the size of the manuscript in the hands of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not read manuscript ordinarily in the Senate, and I am not going to read one now.

Mr. MUNDT. Could the Senator give me some idea of the dimensions of the term "briefly" as he used it in his request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe it will take me more than 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator very much.

There have been before the Senate several very important antitrust bills. One of them is H. R. 9424, to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers.

The other bill, which came to the Senate in June, is H. R. 1840, on unlawful restraints and monopolies. It was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] as S. 11. It was introduced in the House by Representative PATMAN as H. R. 11. The bill which passed the House was introduced by Representative ROGERS of Colorado. Both of those bills went to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

In that committee we were permitted, by unanimous consent, on last Thursday to consider the first of those two bills. During the course of the discussion in committee that day, the Kefauver amendment was offered and was adopted by the committee. The result was that when the bill was reported with the Kefauver amendment added to the original antimerger bill, objection was made to the filing of the report, and the report was not filed until yesterday.

The Senator from Tennessee has been endeavoring to secure a decision by the Senate upon his bill, which is an amendment to the original antimerger bill. I tried to serve the Senator from Tennessee and the Senate by trying to separate the two bills. I do not believe that they can pass together. I should like, with the attention of the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader, to ask unanimous consent—but not before a quorum is called—that the Kefauver amendment, which is H. R. 1840, may be separated from H. R. 9424, by the withdrawal of everything but the text of H. R. 1840, and that a vote be taken on that bill. In that way, it will stand alone as the Kefauver amendment. That would give us an opportunity to have the judgment of the Senate on whether the bill should be considered at this session. If that should fail, an effort could be made to pursue another course.

I wanted to make this statement on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee and in my own behalf, in order that the Senate might know the problem that is before

us. Either we pass neither of the antitrust bills, or we pass one of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I have the floor. I yielded for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I yielded 3 minutes for a very illuminating discussion. I should now like to turn to my own discussion of a very important bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is right. However, I believe the Senator from Tennessee has only one question to ask. I shall not make my unanimous consent request until the Senator has finished his speech.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate that. If the Senator from Tennessee wishes to ask a question, I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is the Senator from Wyoming going to suggest a short length of time, perhaps 30 minutes, for an explanation or debate on the bill in his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the request is made, I believe we will have to do it, but these remarks now have been made merely so that the Senators who are present may know the problem which will be presented. I thank the Senator from South Dakota very much.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy to yield. I think it has been very useful for the Senate to be given that information.

Mr. President, the Senate has before it Senate bill 4183, reported from the Committee on Government Operations and bearing the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], authorizing the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

I said at the outset of my discussion that the point of view held by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and me is shared by a great many Senators from the so-called public land States, from States which do not have big metropolitan areas, but which do suffer from the same problems when the Government steps in as a big and mighty landlord in the area.

Probably the most significant word in the title of the bill is the word "certain," because it surely is true that this bill provides payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain real property. I might add that it is not only certain Federal real property, but it must be located in certain areas, and it must have located there at a very certain time. I should say, certain city areas. So, Mr. President, it is a bill containing in the title a key word to alert those Americans who are looking for legislation which covers the situation with some degree of uniformity and some degree of universality.

During the address of the Senator from Minnesota on this subject, it was brought out in various colloquies that certain types of Federal holdings were immune from any of the benefits of this bill, and that among the areas which are not going to receive any benefits by definition or by specification are the great public lands States of this country, States which happen to have in them Indian reservations, national parks, national forests, game and fish preserves, grazing lands, and a great variety of Federal holdings that fail to come within the narrow definition of being commercial or industrial operations and which, obviously, are excluded by the authors of the measure when they make the benefits apply only to urban and suburban areas.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why the Senator from Iowa and I, together with other Senators with whom we are associated and who have not signed the report because they are not members of the committee, but who share emphatically our point of view—one of several significant reasons why we are opposed to it in its present form is that it is grossly discriminatory. Any time we increase the tax burden of America we naturally increase the tax burden of citizens throughout the country.

So, Mr. President, what we have here is a Government device for inequitably distributing the tax burdens of America. It increases the tax burden of the people in rural areas to funnel money into certain urban areas where there are certain kinds of property meeting certain conditions, which originated at a very, very certain date.

Mr. President, I should like to point out further that the Senator from Minnesota, with more candor than enthusiasm, responded to an interrogatory by pointing out that while there are no cash benefits, while there are no cash payments, while there are no desiderata in lieu of taxes for rural communities, the committee did generously suggest that if the Board desired to do so it could study the problem, it could take a trip to an Indian reservation, it could go to a national park and look at the beautiful trees, but the bill makes no effort to treat rural properties in rural areas with the same logic with which it would treat properties in urban areas.

There is a gross, clear-cut discrimination which says, "We will provide for distressed areas, where there is Federal property in big cities, a cash subsidy; but for the same kind of conditions creating the same kind of distress in a rural area there will be no cash, no subsidy—just a continuing study and just the right to hope."

"It may be that someday they will be given the same favored treatment which the bill provides for certain kinds of Federal holdings in certain cities under certain circumstances"—but not now. All the rural communities get now is a study, a promise, and the right to hope.

So, Mr. President, that is the first big reason why the Senator from Iowa and I decline to go along with the majority of the committee. We recognize that Federal ownership creates a problem in areas around the country. The problem is acute in certain cities and it is equally acute in certain rural areas. We thought it would be a fine thing to treat the program with a uniform element of justice.

AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received under date of July 26, 1956, concerning the subject of aid to Yugoslavia. The letter gives definite information as to American foreign policy, its relationship to the Yugoslavian situation, and the relationship of Yugoslavia to Communist Russia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 26, 1956.

Senator HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In retrospect, the following is an aspect of the Yugoslavia situation which should be a matter of record.

I understand, and you said that your vote favoring aid to Yugoslavia was a vote of confidence in the administration's discretion and qualified knowledge. As such, it was a good vote in this era of international intrigue.

However, our foreign policy seems characterized by two different concepts: (a) An effort to avert military conflict, and (b) an effort to win the war of ideology being waged against democratic capitalism and Marxist-Leninism. Aid to Tito is given to sustain our efforts in both of these conflicts.

But, and here is a point that to my knowledge has not been made, our aid to Tito is not an effort to aid his economy. We do not want to see a Tito proclaiming a prosperous communism for such is an impossibility or so it seems to me. Tito's adherence to Marxism is anathema to us. We do not want to encourage or to aid Tito's domestic economy. Rather, and this also is the domain of the Secretary of State, it should be proclaimed to the world that Tito's Marxism needs our aid, the aid of a democratic capitalistic state.

We have aided Tito economically and militarily, but always so that we could use him for our means and never to stabilize Tito's Marxism. This point should be made clear.

DON RYAN.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE BENBROOK RESERVOIR PROJECT, TEXAS, TO FORMER OWNERS OF SUCH LANDS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 12006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12006) to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands, where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 1, beginning with line 3, to strike out down to and including line 5 on page 2, and insert the following:

That in order to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests in land heretofore

acquired for the Benbrook, Belton, Grapevine and Garza-Little Elm Reservoir projects in Texas to conform such acquisition to a lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real estate requirements of the projects the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to reconvey any such land heretofore acquired to the former owners thereof, subject to the limitations set forth in section 2, whenever (1) he shall determine that such land is not required for public purposes, and (2) he shall have received an application for reconveyance as provided in section 2: *Provided, however,* That prior to January 1, 1958, no lands heretofore acquired for the Grapevine Reservoir project lying below elevation 557 feet shall be reconveyed pursuant to this act or revested pursuant to the act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797), and that prior to January 1, 1957, no lands heretofore acquired for the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir project lying below elevation 529 feet shall be so reconveyed.

On page 2, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) In carrying out the purpose of this act, the Secretary is authorized to reconvey to the former owner, as defined in this section, all or any part of the land or interests therein heretofore acquired from such owner which the Secretary determines is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use: *Provided, however,* That whenever the former owner of such land has at any time after its acquisition by the United States sold or otherwise disposed of other land which has a common boundary with the land acquired from him by the United States he will be entitled to make application as provided in this section for conveyance to him of the same percentage of the land as the length of the common boundary of the land retained by him after such sale and the land of the United States bears to the total length of the common boundary of the land of the former owner and the United States, which boundary resulted from the acquisition by the United States of the land of the former owner, and the land so reconveyed shall constitute a single tract adjoining both the land of the former owner and the boundary of the real property of the United States as such boundary will exist after reconveyance by the Secretary of the land acquired by the United States from the former owner.

On page 3, line 7, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; on line 12, to change the section number from "3" to "4", and on line 15, to change the section number from "4" to "5."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The bill amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EX-WAC ENDS 2,300-MILE HORSEBACK JOURNEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as I was looking over my latest copy of the Great Falls Tribune I came upon one of the warmest human-interest stories that I have ever read. It is of particular interest to me because it concerns one of the fine communities in north-central Montana, the city of Malta.

Kathryn Elliot, an ex-Wac, has arrived home in Malta after completing a 2,300-mile horseback ride, 26 months after it began in Fort Lee, Va.

As the newspaper story points out, Kathryn would have arrived home many months sooner except for Brenda, Kathryn's half-blind saddle mare. Kathryn first met Brenda at a Fort Lee riding academy and became so fond of her that she could not bear to leave the horse behind. At the end of her Wac career Kathryn decided to return to Montana, only to discover that Brenda would not ride in a horse trailer, so she decided to ride Brenda all the way to Montana.

Kathryn and Brenda stopped off that first winter at Rhinelander, Wis., to visit an old Army buddy, Mary Silius. The second lap of the trip began last May with Kathryn riding Brenda and Mary driving a 1930 model A Ford, behind which was hooked a small trailer containing their camp equipment.

The two ex-WAC's completed their cross-country trip last Saturday when they arrived at Saco, a small town near Malta. On Monday they were given a grand welcome by the people of Malta and the surrounding community, including Kathryn's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Elliot, who have now sold their ranch and are living in the city.

Kathryn rode into town at the head of the parade with Mary bringing up the rear of the parade with the model A. In addition to Brenda, the 2 girls brought 4 dogs with them—Coco, a Scotch collie, a black spaniel, a basset hound, and a fox terrier.

In this day and age, when our newspapers are so full of crises and tragedies, it is, indeed, refreshing to read about the arrival of Kathryn Elliot and her entourage in Malta, Mont.

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the July 24, 1956, issue of the Great Falls Tribune be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-WAC ENDS 2,300-MILE HORSEBACK JOURNEY WITH ARRIVAL OF HER "ENTOURAGE" AT MALTA

MALTA.—Kathryn Elliot's 2,300-mile horseback ride ended here in her hometown Monday, 26 months after it began in Fort Lee, Va.

There was the matter of a year and a half stopover in Rhinelander, Wis., or the former Wac would have been home at least a year earlier.

The long layover in Wisconsin was because of Brenda, Kathryn's half-blind saddle mare.

When Kathryn first met Brenda, the mare was owned by a riding academy at Fort Lee. Kathryn, who spent all her early years on a ranch 10 miles north of Malta, became quite fond of the mare.

When Kathryn's enlistment was ended, she was reluctant to leave Brenda to the mercies of the riding academy's odd and sundry patrons and then learned nothing in the world could persuade Brenda to climb into a horse trailer.

Anyway, Kathryn didn't own a horse trailer, so she decided to ride Brenda all the way to Montana, stopping off that first winter at Rhinelander to visit an old Army buddy, Mary Silius.

Kathryn and Brenda arrived in Rhinelander early in the autumn of 1954. Kathryn got a job driving taxi, and Brenda was boarded out on a nearby farm.

In unfamiliar surroundings, Brenda got tangled up in some barbed wire and suffered severe cuts which required a veterinarian's care for several months.

The second lap of the trip began last May with Kathryn riding Brenda, and Mary driving a 1930 Model A Ford, behind which was hooked a small trailer containing their camp equipment.

Kathryn, Mary, and Brenda reached Saco Saturday. Since the Phillips County Saddle Club, of which Kathryn had long been a member, had arranged a formal welcome for Monday noon, the two girls and the brown mare cut across country Sunday to Saco Hot Springs, where they remained over Sunday night.

Monday morning about a dozen members of the saddle club rode out to the Stader School, 6 miles east of Malta, and met the wayfaring ex-Wacs.

There was a picnic lunch on the shady side of the schoolhouse. Many motorists drove from Malta. Among them were Kathryn's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Elliot, who now live in Malta, having sold their ranch.

After lunch, with Kathryn riding out front, the saddle club rode into town, Mary bringing up the rear of the parade with the Model A.

In addition to Brenda, the two girls brought four dogs with them—Coco, a Scotch collie, and a black Spaniel, a basset hound, and a fox terrier.

What will the two ex-Wacs do, now that their cross-country trip has ended?

"We plan to start a taxi service in Malta," Kathryn said. Brenda is comfortably stabled at the riding club's stable in a cottonwood grove on Milk River.

But some of Kathryn's old friends have their fingers crossed. "Wait until next spring," said one. "It wouldn't surprise me if she climbed on that horse again and rode into the sunset."

CERTAIN ELIGIBLE MINING CLAIMS FOR VALIDATION UNDER ACT OF AUGUST 12, 1953

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3941) relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the matter been cleared with the minority leader?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OF SUMS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4183) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. I continue with my statement in opposition to the first point

with respect to the bill in its present form and its amendment features. The Senator from Iowa and I have offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which would try to bring some degree of equity and universality to the bill. The pages have now distributed the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the desks of all Senators; and, so that it may appear at this point in the RECORD, without the necessity of its being read, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Commission on Payments to State and Local Governments Act of 1956.'

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. (a) Although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes, or to make financial contributions in lieu of taxes, to any State or to any political subdivision or instrumentality thereof with respect to any property of the Federal Government, the Congress has recognized that the exemption of Federal property from taxation by State and local governments has worked hardship upon such governments in a number of instances, and heretofore has enacted a number of legislative measures providing relief in varying forms for such governments.

"(b) It is the purpose of this act to provide for a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of such previous enactments, and for an investigation to determine the nature and effect of any further legislation which may be required for the relief of State and local governments from such hardship.

"(c) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that no such additional relief shall be made to any State or local government with respect to any Federal property devoted to any Federal activity the establishment or retention of which within the territorial jurisdiction of such State or local government at any time has been solicited by such State or local government.

"COMMISSION ESTABLISHED

"SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the executive branch of the Government a Commission on Payments to State and Local Governments (referred to hereinafter as the 'Commission').

"(b) The Commission shall be composed of—

"(1) the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall serve as chairman thereof;

"(2) one representative of each of the following departments and agencies of the United States Government, each of whom shall be designated by the head of the department or agency represented by him from officers or employees of such department or agency; the Department of Defense; the Department of Justice; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Agriculture; the Office of Defense Mobilization; the General Services Administration; and the Veterans' Administration; and

"(3) one representative of each other department or agency of the United States Government named by the President, each of whom shall be designated by the head of such department or agency from officers or employees of such department or agency.

"(c) The Commission shall select a vice chairman from among its members. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(d) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of departments and agencies of the Government, but shall be reimburse for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

"STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study of the nature and effect of all previous enactments of the Congress providing for—

"(1) the payment to any State or local government of any tax or special assessment with respect to any Federal real or personal property;

"(2) the making of any payment to any such government in lieu of the payment of any tax or special assessment with respect to any such property; or

"(3) the rendition of assistance to any State or local government through the making of grants-in-aid, the sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, or through the furnishing of services or facilities by the United States.

"(b) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the extent to which State and local governments derive benefits directly or indirectly through payments made to them (1) by persons residing or employed upon Federal property, and (2) for or in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

"(c) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive investigation to determine the extent, if any, to which there is need for legislation by the Congress to provide additional financial assistance for State and local governments to relieve hardship incident to the tax-exempt status of Federal property. Such investigation shall include inquiry to determine—

"(1) the classes of Federal property, if any, with respect to which any such additional assistance should be granted;

"(2) the nature and extent of any such additional assistance;

"(3) the conditions, if any, under which such additional assistance should be granted;

"(4) the annual cost to the United States of providing such financial assistance with respect to each such class of Federal property and with respect to all such classes of Federal property; and

"(5) ways and means whereby State and local governments may be accorded effective right to apply property taxes in effect within their several jurisdictions to industrial plant equipment, materials, supplies, and inventories owned by private parties and used by them for commercial purposes within plant facilities owned or controlled by departments and agencies of the United States Government.

"(d) On or before March 1, 1957, the Commission shall submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a comprehensive report containing—

"(1) the text of all provisions of law referred to it in subsection (a), together with an analysis of the purpose and effect of each such provision;

"(2) the findings of the Commission as to the facts disclosed by its studies and investigations made under subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

"(3) its recommendations, consistent with the policy prescribed by section 2 (c), as to any additional legislation the need for which has been disclosed by its investigation under subsection (c) of this section; and

"(4) a detailed analysis of the relationship between any recommendations so made and the provisions of existing law set forth in compliance with paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(e) Upon the transmittal of such report to the Congress, the Commission shall cease to exist.

"POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) To carry out the provisions of this act, the Commission, or any duly authorized member or employee thereof, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission, or such member or employee, may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission or any duly designated member or employee, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the United States information, suggestions, estimate, and statistics for the purpose of this act. Each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

"EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is a second very important discriminatory feature of the bill which I call to the attention of Senators, because I am afraid that having had the bill placed before them so late in the session, with all the confusion and turmoil attendant upon the closing hours or closing days, or if we should decide really to give adequate consideration to the bill, at least the closing week or two of the session, it seems to me that every Senator should read on page 2 a most amazing, discriminatory feature, which reads as follows:

Taxes upon real property removed after June 30, 1950, from the tax rolls of local governments by reason of its acquisition or use by the Federal Government for industrial or commercial purposes, where the acquisition or use by the Federal Government imposes financial hardship on the local government.

This is a novel device in Federal legislation. It says that a town or a city which was fortunate to have had a Federal imposition enter into its area after

July 30, 1950, will receive the benefit of a rich payment in lieu of taxes from Uncle Sam. In other words, if Uncle Sam moved his installation into a community on the 1st of July 1950 the local taxpayers will be relieved of a lot of burden which they would normally have to pay, and which they have been paying throughout the years, and which the people in the rural areas of America, including the farmers and ranchers of South Dakota, always have to pay.

If the Federal Government moved in on the 1st day of July 1950, the Federal Government, out of its rapidly diminishing Treasury, is going to send out green checks to make payments in lieu of taxes.

But what about the community across the State line or across the river or on the other side of the mountains, where the same kind of Federal installation moved in on the 29th day of June 1950, 2 days earlier? Everything else is the same. There is the same imposition, the same hardship, the same delegations coming to Washington, the same Federal interference with private industry, the same great tax-exempt privilege for the Federal holdings. The one difference is that in one town the Federal Government moved in on the 29th day of June 1950; in the other town, the Federal Government came in 2 days later.

The bill provides that where an industry moved into a town on June 29, 1950, the taxes of the people will be increased in an already tax-burdened community. Because of the new imposition, the taxes will be hiked. There will be new levies and a bigger tax bite.

What will be done with the money? It will be moved down the road 3 or 4 miles, or 10 or 15 miles, and will be given to a town having the same kind of federalized industry which moved in on the 1st day of July 1950, 2 days later.

Talk about dscriminatory legislation; talk about legislation conceived in haste and attempted to be passed in confusion in the closing moments of the session; I feel certain the sponsors of the bill would never have dared to bring this kind of bill in even as early as 12 o'clock noon of adjournment day. No; they waited until they could almost hear the first dim rumblings of the adjournment bells. That is the time to put through a piece of proposed legislation like this, which says to one community of the same size, having the same kind of decent Americans, and the same problems, "Sorry, old top; you are elected to be the all-American chump. We are going to make your taxes higher, because 'it didn't happen to you' at the right moment on the clock. We'll use your increased tax money to help decrease the taxes of your contributors in your competitor communities."

Mr. President, 48 hours would make the great difference between getting a tax bonanza and a tax penalty under the same circumstances. I feel sure that if we had a chance to consider the bill carefully during several days of debate on the Senate floor, discriminations like that would be eliminated.

I feel certain there are many strange supporters of the bill, among which I think I find the United States Chamber of Commerce, who really have studied carefully neither its actual provisions nor its ultimate implications. I say I think I find them, because they seem to blow hot and cold when they write to me about it. The Washington office of the United States Chamber of Commerce seems to say, "We are against socialism and against socializing, but we believe this is a pretty good idea; but"—and one of the buts is, "We do not think it is a good rule to apply in the country areas. We think it is all right in the big towns. Some of our friends in the big cities like it. Let us give it a trial run."

I guess there are not many members of the United States Chamber of Commerce among the ranchers and farmers in the rural towns and communities of America. In all events, the United States Chamber seems to favor for certain big cities what it disapproves for our great public-land States and rural areas.

I am sorry I did not bring my file of correspondence along. I did not even imagine the bill would be before the Senate at this late hour. I came fairly unprepared to discuss the bill, but in the course of the evening I expect it will be considered at length. I shall certainly not permit passage of this bill until I am sure all Members know for what they are voting in these waning hours of the 84th Congress.

I have here several volumes containing the inventory of Federal property on which it is proposed to make payments in lieu of taxes.

Even a partial list of the Federal property which it is proposed to relieve from taxation by having the Federal Government pay sums in lieu of taxes would be impressive. It is a pretty good-size list. I do not have time for all of it. I was pretty sure Senators would not want to vote away the people's money to make payments in lieu of taxes without knowing what they were doing. So I wanted to be able to answer any questions which might be raised.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. If the Senator had read the bill—I supposed he had—he would know that before any community would be enabled to receive benefits under the bill, it would have to demonstrate hardship under very definite criteria.

The Senator further knows that the only way those documents would be applicable to the bill would be if some amendments which the Senator from South Dakota intended to propose, and which he has discussed, were to be adopted. And then those documents would become reference material for the Federal Treasury.

The bill is limited to a very small number of payments. It is limited to those communities that have demonstrable hardship.

As the Senator has quite aptly pointed out, he is making a long speech, but he is short on facts; he is long on rhetoric, but he is short on substance, because the bill is limited specifically and definitely to certain criteria.

One of the complaints of the Senator in the committee was that the bill did not do enough for his people. He wanted it to apply to more people. Yet he fears now it is going to be a big bonanza. The bill is not even a bonanza. The payments as prescribed in the bill are so small that the main complaint which was made by the proponents of the bill was that they would not get something out of it.

We cannot have it both ways. We have to make up our minds where we stand.

I suggest that the Senator from South Dakota read the majority report and not simply the minority views. I suggest that he read the studies which have been conducted over 20 years. It is the equivalent of a postgraduate course on the subject in South Dakota or Minnesota, if he will read it.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Minnesota is quite right. Up to now I have been engaging simply in the rhetorical prelude to my factual statement. But I shall present a great many statistics and facts as we proceed.

I shall try to avoid the mistake my distinguished friend from Minnesota made and I shall not discontinue my speech as he did before I get down to the facts. During his rhetorical presentation, he was interrupted so many times that he never did get down to the factual data.

I seek to continue this discussion so we can get down to specifics as we proceed with this debate. The Senator is exactly correct when he states that in these documents there are included items which the committee excluded from the bill; but which I am confident Senators will agree should be included so we can treat all communities alike, this being proposed legislation passed by a public body which should consider the problems of its city and country cousins with the same consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. If the Senator from South Dakota will yield, since he is going to give us a dissertation on this bill, and since he is so very able, in his dissertation I hope he will take the 55 pieces of legislation which have been mentioned—55 separate forms of payment in lieu of taxes—and analyze them; and maybe we will not have so many tears over those who are going to be excluded, because they have already been included in other bills. The documents which the Senator mentions are very imposing documents.

Mr. MUNDT. I was unable to bring all my documentation. This is the first installment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Under provisions of law which were established long ago.

I know the Senator from South Dakota is fair. I know he believes in equity and justice. On the basis of that, after having delivered a great speech, which will be most interesting, if not thoroughly documented, I am sure he will find it necessary to vote for the bill, because he is a fair man, and because he wants to see progress made in this great field of Federal-State relationships. I want to thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. I have been so swayed by my colleague's testimony to my fairness, that before drawing another breath, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, as appendix C, a list of revenue-sharing Federal properties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the RECORD.]

Mr. MUNDT. They are not exactly 55 in number, but they are, according to the hearings, 21 in number, which is still a large number. It proves the point I shall make a little later. When we have 21 different approaches to one problem, the way to cure it is the way the Senator from Iowa and I suggested—make a thoroughgoing, interdepartmental study, with some reports which would synthetize the problem and put it under one head and give us one solution, instead of adding a new area of disruption and inequity—just one more poorly conceived patch on our present crazy quilt of legislation on this subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of correction?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. The report of the staff of the committee and the report of the General Services Administration to the Committee on Appropriations show conclusively that there are 55 existing laws in which there is some kind of Federal payments to local communities. I think that is a matter of factual evidence that should be submitted in the debate. In order to have that data in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the majority report may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, so that these facts can be clear, even if the judgment on the facts is not.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2424) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Government Operations, having considered various bills relating to payments in lieu of taxes, reports favorably an original bill, S. 4183, to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

S. 4183 would establish a temporary program of payments in lieu of taxes and special assessments on a very limited category of real property which has been removed from local tax rolls as a result of Federal acquisition. The major category of payments authorized would be at the discretion of a Federal board which would administer the program, and numerous additional safeguards have been included in order to insure against any undue or unjustified payments. It would also provide that the board shall conduct a comprehensive study and make a case-by-case analysis of virtually every phase of fiscal and related problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from local real and personal property taxes, including the operation of existing programs. The Congress would receive semiannual reports from the board on the operation of the program and, within 2 years after the date of enactment, a comprehensive report, accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation, detailing its recommendations on the necessity for a continuing policy.

Nothing contained in this bill would have any effect upon existing payments or revenue-sharing arrangements authorized by law.

S. 4183 is a modest attempt to deal with a problem which the Committee on Government Operations and other committees of the Congress have studied and considered for more than 7 years. It represents the firm conviction of the committee that no comprehensive program is possible, and that the only feasible approach to the problems involved is by means of a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes, coupled with a case-by-case consideration by an administrative board of the relative merits of individual cases. This bill would implement, in principle, many of the major recommendations, relative to payments in lieu of taxes, of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It has the support of the administration, and embodies the views and amendments submitted to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget.

This bill would authorize, for a 5-year period, (1) a very limited program of payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real properties acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950; (2) payments of special assessments levied after the effective date of the act in urban or suburban areas, if such assessments were also levied on real property owned by other taxable persons; and (3) payments in lieu of taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property leased or sold to private persons under conditional sales contracts, if such property were owned by a taxable person.

The program would be administered by a five-member, bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. A taxing authority would be required to file an appropriate application, specifying the Federal property involved, the basis of its claim and the period for which the claim is made (not to exceed 12 months in any single application). The Board, after determining the existence of a probable basis for the claim, and conducting a hearing, if a basis is found to exist, would be required to determine and certify to the controlling Federal agency the amount of payment to be made to the local taxing authority. In the case of industrial or commercial real property, however, the applicant would be required to make a showing that Federal acquisition of such property has resulted in a financial hardship to the community in question. The actual payment to be made would be based upon the amount of local taxes which would have been payable had the property been privately owned, increased by additional expenditures incurred by the taxing authority in furnishing services to the Federal property, and diminished by the aggregate of local-type governmental services furnished by the controlling Federal agency, further diminished by any additional credit against Federal liability resulting from any exemption, immunity, or reduction in the tax rate or amount, if such are available, under State or local law, to private persons as an inducement to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of the particular tax authority. The Board's decisions are made final and would be conclusive upon all tax authorities and Federal agencies, and may not be questioned by any court or Government accounting office.

Specific provision is made to insure that this bill will not affect payments by Federal agencies under existing programs authorized by law; that Federal property under an existing program would be excluded from the coverage of this bill and would not be subject to additional payments for the same period; and that in no event could the Federal payment on industrial or commercial real property exceed the amount of the tax which would be payable if such property had been developed and used by a taxable person for a typical private industrial or commercial use, either within the jurisdiction of that tax authority or in nearby comparable communities.

The Board, either on its own motion or upon application by a tax authority, would be required to make various studies relative to (1) fiscal and other problems of local taxing authorities arising out of Federal immunity from real and personal property taxes; (2) the nature and extent of payments to local taxing authorities under other Federal programs; including grants-in-aid and revenue-sharing programs; and (3) the nature and extent of benefits derived by tax authorities directly or indirectly through persons residing or employed upon Federal property and for or in connection with any property, trade, business, etc., situated or occurring upon Federal property. The Board would be required to report semiannually to the President and the Congress with respect to its operations during the preceding period and to file, no later than 2 years after the date of enactment, a comprehensive report, accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation, detailing its recommendations on the necessity for a continuing policy for compensating local tax authorities for losses sustained incident to the presence of Federal tax-exempt property within their jurisdictions, and with respect to the future treatment of properties for which payments are temporarily authorized under Public Law 388, 84th Congress (former RFC properties).

The Board would be authorized to employ personnel and procure the services of consultants, at rates not to exceed $50 per day, to conduct hearings or investigations, and to examine witnesses and compel their attendance by subpena. It would be required to maintain an accurate stenographic record of all testimony, a transcript of which would be filed in the office of the Board. The Board would cease to exist on December 31, 1963, 2 years after the terminal date for the filing of applications for payments.

Finally, the bill would establish a 12-member advisory committee, composed of representatives of the Federal Government, State governments and local taxing authorities, appointed by the President, which would be required to conduct studies of the administration of this act, as well as all other Federal legislation authorizing payments of taxes or in lieu thereof, by Federal agencies to local tax authorities, and problems arising in connection therewith. This committee would be required to consult with the Board, upon its request, in an advisory capacity in the solution of such problems, and transmit from time to time to the Board and to the President for transmittal to the Congress, a report summarizing the results of its studies, together with recommendations for administrative or legislative changes considered necessary or desirable for efficient, economical and equitable administration of such provisions of law.

BACKGROUND

General

State and local taxing authorities have been seriously concerned, particularly since 1939, over the increasing acquisition by the Federal Government of various types of property which has operated to remove such property from local tax rolls. Local governments depend upon property taxes for more than half of their total revenues, so that they are particularly concerned when the Federal Government acquires real estate and thereby removes it from the property tax base while at the same time activities on or associated with the Federal property may impose service burdens upon these local governments. From time to time, the Congress has acknowledged responsibility for reducing, to some extent, the adverse effects of these acquisitions upon local government revenues and fiscal structures by enacting numerous

statutory provisions which authorize payments by certain Federal agencies and departments or upon certain types of properties. However, the great majority of Federal agencies have no general authority to make payments on their properties. Furthermore, existing provisions of law are quite diverse and result in different treatment for similar properties of various agencies. Thus, those provisions of law which do exist fail to present any clear-cut, uniform policy. On some classes of property, some agencies pay taxes; others make payments in lieu of taxes; and still others make no payments at all.

The seriousness of the general problem appears to have been magnified by the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950, when large-scale Federal acquisitions of defense production facilities throughout the country resulted in the removal of substantial parcels of real property from local tax rolls. In addition, local taxing authorities have been and are being deprived of personal property tax revenues on inventories of such properties as a result of provisions in procurement contracts under which title to such inventories passes to the Federal Government prior to completion.

Studies of Federal-State-local tax relations

During the past 20 years, the fiscal problems of local governments resulting from Federal acquisition and control of real property, and the impact of Federal immunity from State and local taxation have been the subject of almost continuous study by governmental, quasi-governmental, quasi-governmental and private groups which have filed some 9 reports with recommendations.

The first of these was initiated by the President of the United States in 1935 when he appointed a committee consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and directed them to undertake a study of Federal ownership of real estate and of its bearing on State and local taxation. This committee made a brief study and submitted its report and recommendations to the President in 1938 (Federal Ownership of Real Estate and Its Bearing on State and Local Taxation, H. Doc. No. 111, 76th Cong., 1st sess.).

Following one of the recommendations of this committee, the President established a Federal Real Estate Board to study and make appropriate recommendations regarding the situation in different communities adversely affected by the loss of tax revenues on land acquired by the Federal Government. This Board submitted a 50-page report with recommendations to the President and the Congress in 1943 (Federal Contributions to States and Local Government Units With Respect to Federally Owned Real Estate, H. Doc. 216, 78th Cong., 1st sess.). The Board continued in a quiescent state until 1951 when it was finally dissolved.

During much of this same period, the Treasury Department, through a special committee, was conducting a study of the entire subject of Federal-State and local fiscal relations, including payments in lieu of taxes. This committee submitted a 595-page report (Federal, State and Local Government Relations, S. Doc. 69, 78th Cong., 1st sess.).

In January 1948, the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (Hoover Commission) retained the Council of State Governments to make a comprehensive study of the entire field of Federal-State relations. The Council submitted a 297-page report to the Commission in July 1948, which report was transmitted to the Congress in March 1949 (Federal-State Relations, S. Doc. 81, 81st Cong., 1st sess.).

In April 1949, the Secretary of the Treasury invited representatives of State and local governments to a conference on intergovernmental tax problems. Payments in lieu of taxes to State and local governments was one of the subjects under discussion, and the conference requested the Bureau of the Budget to work out comprehensive recommendations on this subject. The results of this undertaking will be discussed below.

During the same month, the Treasury Department prepared a staff memorandum (Payments to State and Local Governments on Federally Owned Real Estate, April 5, 1949, joint hearings before the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of the House and Senate Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 238–248) which it submitted for committee consideration.

In September 1952, the Associate General Counsel, Housing and Home Finance Agency, prepared a 61-page study on the subject of payments to local governments in lieu of taxes, for the section on municipal law of the American Bar Association (mimeographed memorandum prepared by Joseph Guandolo).

In May 1954, a detailed, comprehensive study of the whole subject of Federal landownership and the public land laws was prepared for and issued by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives (Preliminary Report on Taxes and Other In-Lieu Payments on Federal Property, Committee Print No. 23, 83d Cong., 2d sess.). This 133-page report contains a comprehensive analysis and factual presentation of virtually every phase of Federal-State-local relations as relates to Federal payments of taxes or in lieu thereof to local governments, and contains all of the pertinent statutes on the subject.

In March 1955, the General Services Administration submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations an inventory report on Federal real property in the continental United States, as of December 31, 1953, prepared at the request of that committee, a summary of which was issued as Senate Document No. 32, 84th Congress. This inventory covers all land, buildings, and other structures and facilities located within the continental limits of the United States, title to which is vested in the United States or in wholly owned Government corporations. A copy of this report was also filed with the Committee on Government Operations.

In February 1956, the General Services Administration submitted to the Committees on Appropriations and Government Operations a second inventory report covering Federal real property in the continental United States, as of June 30, 1955 (S. Doc. 100, 84th Cong.). This 112-page summary report reflected refinements in the data submitted earlier, and stated that considerable progress had been made in improving real property records throughout the Government. An inventory report on Federal real property outside of the continental United States, as of June 30, 1955, with complete supporting data, was submitted in March 1956 (S. Doc. 109, 84th Cong.).

In addition, numerous studies dealing with the impact of Federal tax immunity on State and local government fiscal structures have been prepared, from time to time, by various State and local government associations.

These materials contain a detailed breakdown, as of June 30, 1955, of every piece of real property owned by the Federal Government, both inside and outside of the continental limits of the United States, tabulated both by States and by agencies.

Finally, in June 1955, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations submitted a 311-page report with recommendations, which was accompanied by 15 additional volumes, totaling in all approximately 2,200 pages. One of these volumes was a 197-page report entitled "Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues," which contained an exhaustive study of the entire subject, with detailed recommendations concerning future Federal policy with respect to payments to State and local governments for Federal property holdings located therein.

Committee action in the 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses

Following a meeting of members of congressional committees and governors, called for the purpose of studying Federal-State tax relations, held in Chicago on September 26–27, 1947, the Senate Committee on Government Operations (then the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments) was designated to conduct a special study of the problems of coordination of Federal and State taxes, with the objective of strengthening the tax structures of local and State governments and compensating them for losses of revenues from former sources of taxation. In its report to the Senate (S. Rept. No. 1054, 80th Cong.) stress was placed by the committee on the importance of assuring the Federal, State, and local tax systems are adequate to the job assigned to them and on the need for determining whether they fit together into a combined tax system which is equitable, administratively efficient, and economically sound.

During the past 7 years, this committee has had pending before it numerous bills dealing with various aspects of Federal-State-local tax relations, in general, and of payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes, in particular.

In 1949, during the 1st session of the 81st Congress, the committee considered three Senate measures relative to the establishment of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which would have been required to study and make recommendations with respect to various aspects of intergovernmental relations, including intergovernmental tax immunities. Joint hearings were held by the Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations of both the Senate and House Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. At the hearings, which lasted for 5 consecutive days, 267 pages of testimony and exhibits were received and more than 20 witnesses were heard. A new committee bill, S. 1946, was reported favorably on June 13, 1949 (S. Rept. No. 488, 81st Cong.), but failed of passage following an objection on a call of the Senate Calendar.

In 1950, the committee considered S. 3147, which had been drafted by its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. It was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, for himself and 42 other Senators, and was substantially similar to S. 1946. The bill was reported favorably on June 22, 1950 (S. Rept. 1856, 81st Cong.), but failed of passage following an objection on the call of the Senate Calendar.

In 1951, during the 82d Congress, Senator HUMPHREY introduced S. 2268, which had been prepared and submitted to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget, after extensive study, in fulfillment of the assignment it had accepted at the 1949 intergovernmental relations conference, described in the preceding section, that the Budget Bureau develop a comprehensive set of recommendations on this subject. This bill was a broad, comprehensive measure designed to establish a uniform policy throughout the Federal Government with respect to payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes. It would have replaced some 20 piecemeal statutory provisions with 5 broad types of payments to State and local governments on federally owned real estate and included payments on a limited category of tangible personal property. No action was taken on this measure during the 82d Congress.

The committee also had before it a bill, S. 1166, recommended by the Hoover Commission, which proposed to establish a temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Rela-

tions, which would have been required to study the subject and report its recommendations to the Congress within a limited time. Since the committee members preferred to have the benefit of the report of this proposed Commission, it decided to take no action on S. 2268, but reported favorably S. 1166 on July 12, 1951 (S. Rept. 544, 82d Cong.). The bill failed of passage, following an objection on the call of the Senate Calendar.

Committee action in the 83d Congress

During the 83d Congress, the committee devoted considerable time and effort to the subject of intergovernmental relations, with special reference to payments in lieu of taxes to local taxing authorities. Early in 1953, hearings were held on S. 1514 and related bills to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, required to study, report, and submit recommendations, relative to various phases of Federal-State-local fiscal and other relations, to the President and the Congress. This bill was reported favorably on May 4, 1953 (S. Rept. 215, 83d Cong.), passed the Senate on May 6, and became Public Law 109, 83d Congress, on July 10, 1953.

The committee also had before it in the 83d Congress three bills which were designed to provide varying measures of relief to hard-pressed communities. S. 788, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY (identical to S. 2268, 82d Cong.), was designed to establish a uniform policy throughout the Federal Government with respect to payments in lieu of taxes. S. 2473, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, was designed to provide a permanent, continuing system for payments by the Federal Government to State and local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense production facilities. H. R. 5605 was designed to furnish temporary relief for local taxing authorities who were under an undue and unexpected burden as the result of the transfer of taxable real property from a Government corporation to another Federal department or agency, which transfer operated to take such property out of taxation.

The committee held hearings on S. 2473 in 1953, and again in 1954, in connection with its consideration of H. R. 5605. Following considerable further study, the committee decided to defer action on S. 788 and S. 2473, first, because their broad scope and coverage required further analysis, and second, because the committee was advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the President would formulate no policy with respect to the subject matter of these bills until he had an opportunity to review the final findings and recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which was then engaged in an intensive study of the areas covered by these measures. The committee decided, however, that the financial plight of the very small number of local taxing authorities which would be covered by H. R. 5605 entitled them to some measure of relief. Accordingly, it reported the latter bill favorably on July 21, 1954 (S. Rept. 1966), but it failed of final passage following an objection on the call of the Senate Calender.

Committee action in the 84th Congress

During the 84th Congress, the committee had before it 10 bills dealing with the various aspects of payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to local taxing authorities, which fell into 5 major categories: (1) The establishment of permanent and overall policies and procedures with respect to payment by the Federal Government of taxes or in lieu of taxes, represented by S. 1566 (HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, and GOLDWATER); S. 1657 (BUSH); S. 2390 (KNOWLAND); and S. 2754 (MALONE); (2) the establishment of a limited program of payments by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes with respect to Federal real and personal property acquired during and subsequent to the Korean war, represented by S. 826 (BENDER); (3) the establishment of a temporary, short-term program for the relief of local taxing authorities, designed to alleviate their acute fiscal difficulties, pending a more permanent solution, represented by S. 888 (MARTIN, of Pennsylvania) and S. 2377 (POTTER); (4) the establishment of a program authorizing payments of a very limited type, such as special assessments for public improvements, represented by S. 3534 (SCHOEPPEL) and S. 3785 (MAGNUSON); and (5) the elimination of certain types of Federal tax immunity with respect to State sales and use taxes on personal property, represented by S. 2100 (THURMOND). All but one of these bills, S. 3785, were introduced during the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

In 1955, during the first session of the 84th Congress, the committee considered and approved S. 2377 (similar in essential respects to H. R. 5605, 83d Cong., as reported by this committee and S. 888, 84th Cong.). This bill was reported favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute containing language identical to a companion measure, H. R. 6182, previously approved by the House of Representatives. After agreeing to the committee amendment, the Senate, on July 30, 1955, passed the companion measure, which became Public Law 388 on August 12, 1955. This act provided temporary relief for local taxing authorities by restoring to the tax roll certain real property which had been held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and was subject to local taxation, but which had been taken out of taxation by the transfer of such property to other Government agencies.

In July 1955, the committee held a preliminary hearing on the seven bills which were then before it. Further action was deferred, however, pending an opportunity to examine and evaluate the report and recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the receipt of the administration's comments and views on the pending bills. Following this hearing, the staff was directed to make an exhaustive analysis of the pending bills and the pertinent recommendations of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission and its Study Committee on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues, which had been referred to the committee on June 27, 1955. This study was embodied in a 17-page staff memorandum, to which was attached a 52-page appendix, all of which were incorporated in the record of the hearing. (Hearing before the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, 84th Cong., 1st sess., Payments of Taxes to State or Local Taxing Units, pt. I, July 25, 1955.) The bulk of the testimony received at this hearing was from various individuals and groups concerned with payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes to State or local taxing authorities. Since the executive branch agencies had not yet formulated a policy on this subject, they did not desire to present their views at that time.

Hearings on the pending bills in the second session of the 84th Congress were held on April 19 and 20, 1956. Although all of the executive branch departments and agencies were invited to participate, with the exception of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, they preferred to submit their views in the form of written statements for the record. For the most part, these statements contained detailed analyses of the effect of the various bills on the reporting agency, and evidenced much painstaking effort. The position of the executive branch was presented by representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense, in the form of oral testimony, supplemented by supporting materials which were submitted for the record.

Since the record in support of the pending bills had been fully presented at the earlier hearings by representatives of various State and local government associations, and was fully set forth in the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, witnesses from these associations agreed to limit their testimony to brief summaries and to the submission of statements for the record.

At the hearings, a representative of the Bureau of the Budget stated, in effect, that the administration was fully aware that large-scale Federal acquisition of real property, and Federal tax immunity may, and often does, result in serious financial hardships to local governments. However, the presence of Federal installations often results in benefits to a community which more than offset the burdens. Furthermore, care must be taken to preserve the traditional Federal immunity from local taxation. Accordingly, the solution was not to inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of taxes, which might involve the expenditure of huge sums of money, but rather to seek an accommodation which would lessen the severity of the Federal tax immunity, while avoiding a major breach of existing immunities and incorporating adequate safeguards against unnecessary or excessive Federal payments.

It was the position of the administration that the basic principle of an appropriate system must be that in a particular taxing jurisdiction, there is a demonstrable hardship caused by the recent removal of Federal properties from the tax rolls, and that the hardship is of such depth and importance that special Federal financial assistance is warranted.

The administration spokesman stated that—"the magnitude of the problem has led us to conclude that a limited and careful start should be made, through suitable legislation, toward making payments where communities demonstrate financial distress because of revenue loss directly attributable to the removal of taxable real property from the tax rolls as a result of Federal acquisition."

Based upon these considerations, the administration was unable to support any of the major bills pending before the committee, but was prepared to support legislation which would achieve a proper balance between a fair payment to the recipient local government and a fair charge to the National Government. It was their position, however, that such legislation should include (1) a limited designation of the kinds of acquired Federal properties which may be the subject of payments, (2) precise definitions of eligibility for particular categories of property, and (3) rules for charging for special services rendered to the National Government and crediting special benefits conferred by the National Government. With such an approach, the administration felt it should be possible to define and control the policy commitment and the resulting financial obligation of the Federal Government, in those cases where a substantial impairment of the finances of the local government is directly attributable to the removal of property from the tax base as a result of Federal acquisition.

Summing up its position, the Bureau of the Budget stated:

"We recommend that legislation be enacted now to provide the authority and mechanism for payments, during a period of 4 or 5 years, in cases of demonstrable hardship involving the recent removal of real estate from the tax rolls by reason of its acquisition by the National Government for industrial or commercial purposes, and including provision that during that period there shall be detailed field studies of specific local situations. We believe that additional legislation should await a reasonable period in which to acquire experience in administering this limited policy."

COMMITTEE ACTION

General

Following consideration of the testimony contained in the 477-page record of the hearings, the committee concluded that (1) because of the complexities inherent in the subject, and the large number of variables involved, it was unable to recommend favorable action on any of the pending bills; (2) that since the factual pattern varied in the 16,778 cities and 3,049 counties in the United States which may possibly be affected by Federal tax immunities, the only approach which would furnish a measure of relief to those local governments which are hard pressed as a result of Federal acquisition, was through a limited program of payments in lieu of taxes, coupled with a case-by-case consideration by an administrative board of the relative merits of individual cases; (3) that any further legislative action would have to await the accumulation by such a board of information concerning specific local needs and situations, compiled on a case-by-case basis, following field studies; and (4) that no amount of general study, unrelated to the specific variable factors in each individual case, would serve any useful purpose.

The committee was supported in these conclusions, not only by the Bureau of the Budget, which has had these matters under study for many years, but also by a number of the sponsors of the major bills pending before the committee, who testified in the hearings that, in their judgment, bills proposing to establish broad comprehensive programs had not received favorable action over the years because such an approach is not feasible.

Following further consideration and discussion, the committee directed the staff to prepare a bill embodying the considerations listed above. After a series of conferences with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the committee approved the subject bill, with an amendment proposed by Senator COTTON, which was designed to make available to Federal property any tax benefits which might be available, in any taxing jurisdiction, to private persons as an inducement to locate their establishments within the particular jurisdiction.

The committee's decision to approve a program providing for three categories of payments was based upon the following considerations:

(1) With respect to special assessments levied after the effective date of the act, it was felt that since a special assessment results in an ultimate improvement to the property, thus adding to its value, there is no reason why Federal agencies should not pay for improvements to their properties in the same manner as private taxable owners, provided, of course, the assessment is levied on real property owned by all other taxable persons.

(2) With respect to payments in lieu of taxes on the Federal Government's interest in real property leased or sold to private persons under conditional sales contracts, the property is being used for private purposes, and is operated by private, taxable persons, and the interest of the Federal Government is only that of a landlord, in the case of leased property, and is purely temporary in the case of property conditionally sold.

(3) With respect to industrial or commercial property acquired after June 30, 1950, the guiding consideration was the fact that the Federal use of such property is, for the most part, identical to that of private taxable property used to produce for the same purposes. Thus, if the property were privately owned, it would pay taxes; the mere fact of Federal ownership should not deprive the local taxing authority of taxes in cases where Federal acquisition or use has resulted in a hardship to the community. In the event that the local taxing authority is unable to demonstrate to the Federal administrative board that Federal acquisition has resulted in hardship, no payments would be made. The June 30, 1950, cutoff date was chosen because this date would cover the increased Federal acquisition of real property of this type, incident to the Korean war. In addition, it will serve to keep the cost of this program within reasonable bounds.

Cost

The committee gave considerable attention to the probable cost of the program established by S. 4183, and concluded that only rough estimates can be made, because it is impossible to forecast the special assessments which local taxing authorities are likely to levy on Federal property in the future; and it is difficult to estimate the cost of Federal payments on the Federal interest in real property leased or sold under conditional sales contracts, since the State laws with respect to such properties vary considerably, and the value of the Federal interest as well as the tax equivalent of that interest are difficult to estimate.

Concerning industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Government after June 30, 1950, although the properties falling into this category are generally identifiable, the potential cost of Federal payments on such properties cannot be determined without a prior determination of (1) their assessed value; (2) applicable local tax rates for each specific piece of property; (3) the adjustment which would be applicable under the formula provided in section 9 of the bill; and (4) whether or not Federal acquisition of the property in question has resulted in a financial hardship to the local taxing authority, and the extent of such hardship in terms of demonstrated financial loss.

With respect to the assessed value of the properties involved, although the cost to the Federal Government of each property is known, assessment practices in the thousands of assessment districts throughout the United States vary widely; and even in a single assessment district, the ratio of assessed value to full value may differ for similar properties. Finally, since each local taxing authority requesting payment under this act would be required to demonstrate to the Federal board that Federal acquisition has resulted in financial hardship, no estimate can possibly be made of the number of applications for payments which will be made or which applicants will qualify for payments. Furthermore, even if the Federal board finds that an applicant qualifies and hardship exists, the application of the formula contained in section 9 of the bill makes it impossible to provide a cost estimate, since no forecast may be made as to which factors will be applicable in a given case, which cases will be entitled to payments following the application of the formula, or the amounts which will finally be payable.

With the foregoing limitations in mind, the Bureau of the Budget has advised the committee that the payments for special assessments would probably range between $200,000 and $300,000 per year; payments for property leased or sold under conditional sales contracts might be in the neighborhood of several million dollars per year; and payments on commercial or industrial real property might run between $10 million and $20 million annually. It was stressed, however, that the numerous individual differences and imponderables involved made these estimates more in the nature of a guess than a reliable estimate.

From the foregoing it is clearly apparent that these questions can never be resolved by a general study, but can only be determined by an administrative board on the basis of its consideration of all of the factors involved in each case which comes before it.

Criteria of hardship

As previously shown, local taxing authorities would be entitled to payments in lieu of taxes on industrial or commercial real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950, only where it can be shown that Federal acquisition or use of such property imposes financial hardship upon the local taxing authority. The determination of the existence of this hardship is left to the Federal administrative board established by the bill, which is authorized to prescribe appropriate rules and regulations, and which would establish criteria of hardship for its guidance.

The committee felt that the Board should have some leeway in the establishment of these criteria. However, it is the committee's intention and understanding that in determining whether financial hardship exists the Board will consider, among other matters, the following factors:

(1) The extent to which Federal acquisition or control has increased or decreased the volume of services necessarily rendered and the amount of expenditures necessarily incurred by a taxing authority during any period for which payments are claimed;

(2) The extent to which such acquisition has increased or decreased the revenue resources available to such tax authority;

(3) The extent to which such acquisition or use has been demonstrated to have directly (a) increased to an unreasonable degree the tax burden of taxpayers of a tax authority, (b) diminished substantially the aggregate value of the real property included within the real property tax base of such tax authority, or (c) resulted in an overloading of the facilities and services of such tax authority;

(4) The extent to which such acquisition has resulted directly or indirectly in a general economic benefit to a tax authority by reason of the activity of Federal agencies; and

(5) The extent to which assistance from the government of the State is available to a tax authority in making financial readjustments to alleviate any distress occasioned by the acquisition, control or use of real property by Federal agencies.

Qualifications of Board members

As indicated earlier, the program of limited payments and large-scale studies proposed by this bill would be administered by a five-member, bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. It is quite apparent that this body will have an enormous amount of work to do if it is to accomplish its very important mission. Aside from its quasi-judicial functions, its major responsibilities will relate to the case studies of local situations which it will be required to make, and to its formulation of recommendations with respect to the future policy of this Government in the field of Federal payments to local taxing authorities in lieu of taxes.

It is the committee's sincere hope that the President will appoint to this Board individuals who are thoroughly qualified, by reason of background and training as well as some experience in the field of fiscal affairs or intergovernmental relations, in general, and Federal-State-local fiscal and tax relations, in particular.

CONCLUSIONS

S. 4183 represents the culmination of more than 7 years of continuing efforts by this committee to develop a program which would afford some measure of relief to local communities which have suffered losses as the result of the presence of Federal-tax-immune property in their jurisdictions, but which would not do violence to the principle of Federal tax immunity or constitute an undue burden on the Federal Treasury.

Through the years, many hundreds of witnesses have been heard; many volumes of testimony have been compiled; and numerous reports have been made by interested groups and carefully studied by the committee.

Based upon these many years of study and consideration, the committee has come to the following conclusions:

1. There is an urgent need for immediate legislative action to relieve local taxing authorities from unjustified and inequitable burdens and hardships which have been imposed upon them as the result of large-scale Federal acquisition of various types of property which has operated to remove such property from the local tax rolls.

2. Because of the extremely complex nature of the subject and the many variables which are involved, it is not possible to devise a comprehensive program which will operate in a fair and equitable manner, and which is not likely to involve huge expenditures of Federal funds and possible "windfall" payments to communities which have actually been benefited rather than harmed by the presence of Federal installations.

3. The only equitable type of program which is possible is one in which payments are based upon individual cases and situations as they are presented and documented, and as information relative to each situation is compiled, evaluated, and assessed on its merits.

S. 4183 would provide for the beginning of such a program, on a 5-year trial basis. It would permit modest payments in limited areas and, in its major aspects, would permit payments only to those local taxing authorities which are able to show that, after weighing the benefits resulting from the presence of Federal installations against the burdens imposed on local taxpayers and local taxing authorities, they were still suffering financial hardship.

The committee desires to emphasize that, despite any statements to the contrary, this is most definitely not a giveaway program, it will not open the gates to unlimited and unrestrained payments by the Federal Government to local communities, and it is not discriminatory.

The committee has taken care to incorporate in the bill adequate safeguards and various protective measures to insure that no community will receive payments to which they are not entitled. Some of these protective measures are: (1) a provision denying payment to any community which is receiving a Federal payment for the same property under another Federal program, and with respect to commercial or industrial property; (2) the 1950 cutoff date; (3) the requirement of a showing of demonstrable hardship; (4) a rigid formula for determining the amount of payments, in the event of a showing of eligibility and entitlement; (5) a provision that in no event can the Federal payment exceed an amount equivalent to the amount of the tax, had the property been privately owned by a taxable person; and (6) a provision that the Federal property will receive the same tax benefits offered by a taxing authority to private, taxable persons.

Any allegation that this bill is discriminatory is entirely without merit. It is true that the coverage of this bill is limited, and numerous communities will not receive payments if the Federal, industrial, or commercial property in their jurisdiction was acquired prior to June 30, 1950. However, without a cutoff date, the cost of this program would have been exceedingly high, and the 1950 cutoff date represents the beginning of a period of expanded Federal acquisition. Moreover, because the bill covers only a limited category of property, that does not make it any more discriminatory than the 55 existing laws which authorize some type of Federal payments to local communities, covering some and excluding others. Finally, it is stressed that this is not permanent legislation, although it may possibly point the way to permanent legislation. If there are defects in the operation of this program, as applications and evidence which are presented to the Federal administrative board are analyzed and developed, the board will make reports and recommendations to the Congress for improvements, and the Congress will then be in a position to make the final determination, in each area, based not upon abstract studies, but upon concrete, documented evidence.

It is the firm conviction of the committee that this program is extremely important in another connection. At the present time, the real property holdings of the Federal Government have reached enormous proportions and entail tremendous expenditures. If Federal agencies are required, in proper cases, to make such payments as are provided for in the subject bill, it should serve as an incentive to these agencies to dispose of numerous substantial holdings of commercial or industrial real property which should be in the hands of private industry and on the tax rolls of the communities in which they are located.

Finally, it may be stated that S. 4183 satisfies neither the opponents nor the proponents of a Federal payment-in-lieu-of-taxes program. It is, however, a sincere effort to solve a most perplexing problem and to pave the way, in a realistic fashion, for such improvements as may be needed, based upon the 5-year experience under this program.

It is the committee's sincere conviction that S. 4183 is the beginning of a program which is reasonable and logical and will enable the systematic compilation on a case-by-case basis of information relative to the needs of each community in which Federal property is located. The administrative board established by the bill is required to report to the Congress concerning its activities every 6 months; and the comprehensive report required to be submitted within 2 years, based upon the cases adjudicated by it and the field studies conducted with respect to other types of cases, will furnish the Congress with a solid foundation upon which further policy determinations may be based.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Outline of bill

This bill consists of 10 sections, of which the first 3 specify a short title, declare the general policy and establish special definitions. Sections 4 and 5 establish a Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments and prescribe its duties. Section 6 establishes an advisory committee and prescribes its duties, and section 7 details the proceedings of the Board. Section 8 provides for payments to be authorized and contains certain limitations; section 9 provides for the determination of payments and section 10 authorizes necessary appropriations.

Section 1. Short title

The act may be cited as the Payments to Local Governments Act of 1956.

Section 2. Declaration of policy

Subsection (a) states that, although the United States is under no constitutional obligation to pay taxes or make financial contributions in lieu of taxes to States or local subdivisions thereof with respect to Federal property, the Congress declares that it is national policy to avoid demonstrable financial hardship upon such local governments caused by the exemption of Federal real property from taxation by local governments, and declares it to be the policy of the United States to make contributions to local governments in lieu of (1) special assessments levied after the effective date of the act, (2) taxes on the interest of the Federal Government in real property leased or sold under conditional sales contracts to taxable persons, and (3) taxes on real property removed after June 30, 1950, from the tax rolls of local governments by reason of acquisition or use by the Federal Government for industrial or commercial purposes, where the Federal acquisition or use imposes financial hardship on the local government.

Subsection (b) declares that, in consideration for the payments authorized, the Congress expects the recipients thereof to make available to the Federal Government, its property and its officers and employees, and their families, all public services normally provided by them, upon the same terms and conditions as such services are made available to or with respect to other property and individuals.

Section 3. Definitions

Some words and phrases in the bill are defined restrictively or used in a special sense. Some of these are as follows:

"Federal agency" means any department, agency, officer, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and any corporation now or hereafter subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 846).

"Federal property" means any real property the legal title to which is held by the United States or any Federal agency.

"Controlling agency" when used in relation to any Federal property means the Federal agency which is charged with the duty of administering such property.

"State" means any State of the United States (District of Columbia is excluded).

"Tax authority" means any county, city, municipality, tax district, or other political subdivision or public entity of any State having authority under the law of such State to levy within its territorial jurisdiction any tax or special assessment upon real property.

"Tax" means any tax of general application levied according to value by any tax authority upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction, but does not include any tax levied upon the manufacture, purchase, sale, transfer, or use of any property, or any income derived from any property.

"Special assessment" means any levy, other than a tax, imposed after the date of enactment of this act by any tax authority directly upon real property situated within its territorial jurisdiction to defray the cost of any public improvement.

"Real property," when used in relation to any tax or special assessment, means any interest in land, and any improvement thereon, if such interest or improvement constitutes real property under law in effect within the tax authority imposing such tax or special assessment.

"Industrial or commercial use," when used in relation to any Federal property, includes any use made of such property for (1) the mining, manufacturing, fabrication, or repair of any article or commodity, (2) the generation of electrical energy, (3) the transportation of individuals or property, (4) the sale or leasing of any property, commodity, or service, and (5) the storage of property incident to any of the uses heretofore enumerated, but does not include the use of any such property for (a) the housing of individuals for which rent is received, (b) the storage of any agricultural commodity, and (c) any purpose for which the property, if privately owned or used, would by reason of its use be exempt from tax under laws applicable within the tax authority of its situs.

Section 4. Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments

This section establishes a bipartisan Federal Board for Payments to Local Governments, composed of 5 members, appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation, who would serve at the pleasure of the

President. They would receive annual salaries equivalent to the salary of the Commissioner of the United States Court of Claims ($14,800), and would not be permitted to engage in any other business. The chairman of the Board would be designated by the President; a vacancy in the Board would not impair the right of remaining members to exercise all of the Board's powers; and three members would constitute a quorum. The Board would be authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949; to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of its duties; and to procure the services of consultants at rates not exceeding $50 per day. It would cease to exist on December 31, 1963.

Section 5. Duties of the Board

Subsection (a) requires the Board to prescribe required uniform rules, regulations, and forms for the filing by tax authorities of applications for payments authorized by the act, the examination of such applications and the conduct of hearings thereof, and the determination of action to be taken upon such applications.

Subsection (b) provides that when any application is filed by one or more tax authorities, the Board shall examine such application to determine whether it states a probable basis for the making of any such payment, and if such probable basis is found to exist, to conduct a full and fair hearing upon such application. Upon the basis of evidence received at such hearing or obtained by field investigations authorized by subsection (c), the Board is required to prepare its report setting forth its findings of fact and conclusions as to the merits of such application; and then enter its order thereon, prescribing the amount, if any, awarded to each applicant, and the portion thereof to be paid by each controlling agency administering real property chargeable in whole or in part for such award.

Subsection (c) requires the Board, from time to time, either on its own motion or upon application by one or more taxing authorities, to conduct such studies and investigations, including field investigations, as it deems advisable, with regard to (1) fiscal and other problems of tax authorities arising out of Federal immunity from liability for payment of real and personal property taxes imposed by such authorities; (2) the extent to which such authorities derive benefits directly or indirectly from Federal payments under other provisions of law providing for payments of taxes, in lieu of taxes, grants-in-aid, sharing of revenues derived from properties of the United States, and the furnishing of services or facilities by the United States; and (3) the extent to which tax authorities derive benefits, directly or indirectly, through payments made to such authorities by persons residing or employed upon Federal property and for and in connection with any property, trade, business, occupation, or transaction situated or occurring upon Federal property.

Subsection (d) requires the Board, every 6 months, to submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, its report concerning its operations during such period, containing full and complete information concerning applications received and payments ordered by the Board during such period, together with such other information as may be helpful to the Congress in evaluating the operation of the act, and all other provisions of law authorizing payments of taxes, or in lieu of taxes, to States and to tax authorities.

Subsection (e) requires the Board, not later than 2 years after the enactment of the act, to submit to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, a report detailing its recommendations on the necessity for a continuing policy for the compensation of tax authorities for losses sustained incident to the presence of tax-exempt Federal property within their territorial jurisdiction, accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation to carry the program into effect. This report is required to be accompanied by appropriate proposed legislation to carry into effect any pertinent recommendations and shall include specific recommendations with respect to the future treatment of properties for which payments are temporarily authorized under Public Law 388, 84th Congress.

Section 6. Advisory committee

Subsection (a) provides for the establishlishment by the President of an Advisory Committee on Payments to Local Governments, composed of 12 members appointed by the President, of whom 6 would be officers or employees of Federal agencies, and 3 each from State governments and local tax authorities; 1 member would be designated by the President to serve as chairman.

Subsection (b) provides that this Committee would have the duty of (1) studying the administration of the act and all other Federal legislation authorizing Federal payment of taxes or in lieu of taxes to local tax authorities, and problems arising in connection therewith; (2) consult with the Board, upon its request, in an advisory capacity in the solution of such problems; and (3) transmit from time to time to the Board, and the President for transmittal to the Congress, a report summarizing the results of its studies, together with its recommendations for administrative or legislative changes which it may consider necessary or desirable for the efficient, economical, and equitable administration of such provisions of law.

Subsection (c) provides that committee members who are Federal officers or employees would receive no additional compensation for services rendered under the act; all others would receive compensation not in excess of $50 for each day of service, as the President may prescribe; and all members would be entitled to reimbursement for necessary travel and other expenses incurred in the performance of their duties under the act.

Section 7. Proceedings of the Board

Subsection (a) authorizes the Board, or any authorized member thereof or examiner designated thereby, to conduct any hearing or investigation authorized by the act; to administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses and receive evidence anywhere in the United States; and to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence relevant to the matter under inquiry. Attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing; and witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in United States district courts. The Board is authorized to invoke the aid of any district court in the event of disobedience to a subpena, in requiring attendance and testimony of witnesses and production of documentary evidence; and such district court may, in the event of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear and produce documentary evidence, if so ordered, and to give evidence relating to the matter in question. Failure to obey such a court order may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

Subsection (b) requires hearings of the Board to be public, and provides that each applicant in any proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel, to offer oral or documentary evidence, submit rebuttal evidence, and conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record is required to be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony must be filed in the office of the Board.

Subsection (c) provides that upon entry of the Board's order upon any application for payment under this act, the Board shall give notice thereof to each tax authority which was a party to such application; each such order will become final 60 days after its entry, unless the Board during such period has granted a rehearing upon request of any applicant who joined therein; not more than one rehearing may be granted upon any application; and an order entered by the Board after a rehearing shall become final upon its entry. The Board is required to transmit a certified copy of each final order to each tax authority joining in the application upon which such order was entered, and to each Federal agency charged thereby with the payment of any part of any award made thereby.

Subsection (d) provides that each final order of the Board shall be final and conclusive upon all tax authorities and all Federal agencies, and shall not be questioned by any court or any accounting officer of the Government.

Subsection (e) authorizes the Board to secure from any Federal agency any information necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each Federal agency is authorized to furnish such information to the Board upon request.

Section 8. Payments authorized

Subsection (a) provides that in accordance with the policies declared in section 2 of this act, and upon application made by one or more tax authorities with respect to one or more parcels of Federal property situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such authorities, the Board shall order payments to be made to each such authority in such an amount, if any, as the Board determines to be payable under section 9.

Subsection (b) requires that each application for payments shall specify the Federal property with respect to which claim is made for payment, the basis upon which such claim is made, and the period of time for which such claim is made.

Subsection (c) provides that each application for any payments made by any tax authority under this act shall be for a period not in excess of 12 months, beginning not earlier than January 1, 1957, and ending not later than December 31, 1961. It provides further that no more than one application may be filed with the Board for any period with respect to the same Federal property; and no application for any period may be filed after 6 months following the end of such period.

Subsection (d) prohibits payment under this act with respect to any parcel of Federal property for any period for which a tax authority is eligible to receive Federal payments with respect to the same property under any other provision of law authorizing payments of taxes or in lieu of taxes on real property, or under any revenue-sharing arrangement. Finally, nothing contained in the act shall bar the making of any payments under any other provision of law or revenue-sharing arrangement. (This is to insure that no tax authority will receive any payment under this act on property for which it is already eligible for Federal payments under any existing programs, and that this act will in no way affect such existing programs.)

Subsection (e) requires that upon certification by the Board to any Federal controlling agency of any final order awarding any payment to any tax authority under this act, such Federal agency shall pay such award from funds appropriated to such agency in the amount specified in the award.

Subsection (f) provides that the failure of any Federal agency to make timely payments authorized with respect to any Federal property would not subject such agency or any purchaser of property from such agency to the payment of any tax, penalty or penalty interest, or other charges. Likewise, it would not subject the Federal property to any lien, attachment, foreclosure, or other proceeding not specifically authorized by the act.

Section 9. Determination of amount of payments

Subsection (a) establishes three categories under which payments may be made under the act and provides that a tax authority may claim under one or more of these categories, and may collect the aggregate amount to which it can show entitlement. The first of these relates to special assessments, levied after the enactment date of the act, if such assessment was also levied upon real property owned by taxable persons; payments in this category would be the amount payable if such property were owned by private, taxable persons. The second category relates to real property leased or sold to private persons under a conditional sales contract; payments in this category would be the amount of tax which would be payable by a private, taxable person, diminished by the amount of any real-property tax payable by any lessee or purchaser with respect to such property for such period. The third category relates to real property acquired by the Federal Government after June 30, 1950, and which is devoted to or held for predominantly commercial or industrial use.

Subsection (b) provides that with respect to property in the third category, the amount payable, if any, would be a sum equal to "the nominal Federal liability," defined as the amount of real property tax which would have been payable if the property had been owned by a taxable person; increased by "the specific Federal liability," defined as the aggregate amount of the expenditures necessarily incurred by a tax authority during the tax period in furnishing directly to or on behalf of such property any facilities or services of kinds not customarily furnished by such tax authority to or on behalf of other properties of like class; and reduced by "the credit against Federal liability," defined as the agregate value of governmental services of kinds normally furnished by tax authorities which, during such period, were furnished within the territorial jurisdiction of such tax authority by Federal agencies controlling such property; and further diminished by any additional credit against the Federal liability resulting from any exemption, immunity or reduction in the tax rate or amount, if such are available, with respect to real property under State or local law, to private persons as an inducement to engage in industrial or commercial activities within the territorial jurisdiction of the particular tax authority.

Subsection (c) provides that no payment determined by the Board to be payable to any tax authority with respect to any Federal property shall exceed the amount which would be payable if such property had been developed and used by a taxable person for a typical private industrial or commercial use, either within the jurisdiction of that tax authority or in nearby comparable communities.

All payments authorized by this section will be made subject to the limitations and qualifications contained in section 8.

Section 10. Appropriations

This section authorizes appropriations to each Federal controlling agency, such sums as may be required for the discharge of its duties and obligations under this act.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is a good idea, and I should like to have the majority report printed at that point.

I think this tends to illustrate the confusion, when we have one governmental report stating that there are 21 pieces of legislation affecting Federal-local relations and another report which puts the number at 55. It is another indication that in the last 15 minutes or 15 hours or 15 days—whatever time it proves to be is all right with this Senator, but almost one of the last items before adjournment—we should not be acting on something which has this much confusion involved.

If Senators will read the amendment in the nature of a substitute which is on their desks, I think they will agree the way to end this confusion and these interminable studies is to provide for an interdepartmental study which can come up with one set of recommendations and really make progress, if there is a desire to free communities from problems which are older than July 1, 1950, as well as communities which have newer problems; and if there is a desire—and in this one I wish to emphasize the proviso, if there is a desire—to treat problems in rural areas with the same generosity that this bill proposes to treat problems in city areas, if they meet certain circumstances.

Before I get down to specifics, there is another generalization I should like to comment on. I would not call it a bill to provide payments in lieu of taxes. I would call it a bill to subsidize a new socialistic era in America. That is why I was shocked to find that the United States Chamber of Commerce was toying with the idea of supporting this proposal, breathing first a little hot and then a little cold, but winding up pretty much in the camp of those who say, "Let us take a whirl at it. Let us give it a trial. Let us see how it will work out in practice."

By way of illustration, here we have community A, and here we have community B. They are 50 miles apart, in the same State. Community A has an industry that moved there on the 1st of June 1950. Community B has an industry that moved in on the first of July 1950—30 days apart. Community B is a distressed area. So is community A. Problems have developed. Persuasive barristers come to Washington and appeal to the board by saying, "We have got to have help. We have got to have payments in lieu of taxes. Uncle Sam has moved in (of course, we asked him to come in). Now we have a Government operation where there used to be private employment and private enterprise. So we want payments in lieu of taxes. Otherwise we will go under."

Remember, the citizens of community A are going to be taxed for the support of community B, just as the farmers in South Dakota and in North Dakota are going to have to channel money into community B, which has these problems, and which had an industry move in on July 1.

What happens to community A? This is the way to start socialization. The way to stop socialism is not to pick up the check of every community that has a Federal installation. It is to turn Government-owned-and-operated factories back to private ownership. What is going to happen to community A, a community also having problems, but having private industry, 50 miles away from the socialized enterprise being run by Uncle Sam?

Community A is going to find it is having greater unemployment. It begins to falter and lag behind in its taxes. So we can envisage the chamber of commerce in community A getting people to come to Washington to talk to representatives of this Government of ours and saying, "Look, we want Uncle Sam to take over our shoe factory, or our watch factory, or our machine tools fabricating company. We want Uncle Sam to lease the plant, because otherwise it is going to close up, or its activities are going to decrease, or unemployment is going to increase. Uncle Sam, please take over."

Back in the minds of those persons will be the realization that if Uncle Sam does take over, it means that Uncle Sam, as treasurer, will start pouring money into the community in the way of payments in lieu of taxes. Thus, we subsidize and encourage the growth of socialism.

So what happens to community C? If the chamber of commerce or anybody else in America can devise a better scheme to subsidize socialism, to advance its spread, to make its expansion essential, I defy him to produce a better one. Eventually, Gresham's law of money is going to operate. The worst situation is going to destroy the best situation, and there will be a constant pulling downward in the direction of having more and more communities come to Washington and asking that Government operations move in, in an attempt to maintain their employment and maintain their school systems, and so they can get in on the ride—which means they will receive payments from Uncle Sam in lieu of taxes. Mr. President, that frightens me. It frightens me when great bodies which I respect—as I do the United States Chamber of Commerce—say, "We have socialism in our midst, and the Government does not pay taxes. So let us have the Government pay taxes, and thus encourage more communities to adopt socialism."

Mr. President, I am opposed to socialism; my record in opposition to it is very clear. But the way to stop it is to discourage its spread, not to put a premium on it, and make it essential to the preservation of a community. The way to stop it is to take the Government out of all these unnecessary activities and return them to private ownership, where private owners will pay the taxes which are expected of them as ordinary individual taxpayers in the communities.

ANALYSIS BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY OF CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

During the delivery of Mr. MUNDT's remarks,

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me, so that I may discuss another matter for a number of minutes, if it is understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield, if it is understood that I may yield for the purpose requested by the Senator from Kansas, and that I may be recognized at the conclusion of his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I request that my remarks appear in the RECORD at the end of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16, 1956, I commented on the Raymond Moley column in the July 16 issue of Newsweek, and included Mr. Moley's article in my remarks. Mr. Moley in his column had taken to task the purported factual recording of votes by Congressional Quarterly, and specifically its presentation of so-called support-for-President-Eisenhower votes. Mr. Moley charged that the Congressional Quarterly presented its statistical data in such a way as to create a bias in favor of the Democrats.

When I read the Moley column, I felt that it deserved the consideration of my colleagues who read the RECORD, and of the many other readers of the RECORD who subscribe to it to follow political trends; and, as chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, I was anxious that those of my colleagues who are candidates this year should be apprised of Mr. Moley's views.

The following day, I received a letter from Thomas N. Schroth, executive editor of Congressional Quarterly. Mr. Schroth concluded his letter with a request. He said:

> In the interests of fair play and the national policy of hearing all sides, particularly in an election year, we hope that you will give equal prominence on the floor of the Senate, to this letter and the attached analysis of Mr. Moley's figures which you put into the RECORD yesterday.

Of course, I will comply with his request. I now ask unanimous consent that Mr. Schroth's letter of July 17, and his analysis of Mr. Moley's figures may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I shall do more than that, I am going to give him the "equal prominence" he asks, by analyzing his letter and its claims as thoroughly as I know how.

First, Mr. Schroth compares the functions performed by Congressional Quarterly with those of the Associated Press. The Associated Press requires no defense from me. It is a news-gathering agency, and has never attempted to place any evaluation on the news which it furnishes its member papers. If the Congressional Quarterly had confined itself to merely factually reporting the activities of Congress, there would be no basis for any criticism by me or by other Senators whose voting records have been unfairly editorialized upon by the Quarterly.

In proof of its purported nonpartisan nature, the letter cites the number of newspapers who use the service. This is somewhat far-fetched for that purpose. Of course many newspapers use Congressional Quarterly. I subscribe to it; many Senators and Members of the House of Representatives do also. I am sure neither Mr. Moley nor I has questioned its value as a ready sourse of information on the activities of Congress. What we are questioning, however, is, not what it does, or how many people buy it, but how it presents its facts; the degree of editorial embellishment it employs; and, to put it bluntly, the obvious fact that it slants the explanation of its statistics, and even some of the statistics themselves.

Mr. Schroth next cited alleged Republican examples of use of their material to prove that the Republicans believed the Congressional Quarterly to be fair. He referred to the Senate Republican Policy Committee Memo No. 28, of July 21, 1955.

What Mr. Schroth is pointing to is a line on the second page of the memo which said:

> Survey shows Democrats lagging on President's program.

But Mr. Schroth conveniently did not cite the next two pages of the memo, which sharply criticized the statistical techniques employed by the Congressional Quarterly. I want to read pages 3 and 4 of this Senate Republican policy committee memo. It begins:

> WHO PROVIDES THE WINNING MARGINS?
>
> Congressional Quarterly makes some point that Democrats supplied the winning margin in 29 of the President's 33 victories in the Senate and all 18 of his 18 victories in the House. (CQ's test is whether Republican support alone was adequate to insure the President's victory in each case.)
>
> HOW VALID IS A COMPUTATION LIKE THIS?
>
> 1. With more Democrats than Republicans in Congress, some Democratic votes are needed to pass almost all bills (except in rare cases when unpaired absences may give Republicans a temporary majority—hardly possible on any major party issue). Why should these necessary Democratic votes be called a "winning" margin—implying Democratic support of the President and Republican opposition?
>
> 2. In the Senate many matters require two-thirds votes (treaties, vetoes). Both Democratic and Republican votes are needed to make up this two-thirds. Why should the Democratic votes be considered the "winning" margin? If enough Republicans had not voted with the President, the Democrats alone could not have carried the issue. Why not credit those Republicans with the "winning" margin?
>
> 3. Winning margin statistics are loaded when there are 2, 3, or more votes on amendments to a single measure (as was the case on the Formosa Resolution, the $20 tax cut, trade agreements extension, and the mutual-security measure). Multiple votes like these give a false impression of the number of winning margins. The picture is further confused when some votes are for an amendment and against the bill or vice versa.
>
> 4. The absurdity of claims to winning margins is shown by the fact that 90 percent of the Democrats might vote against the President's proposal, but if 10 percent help 100 percent of the Republicans to pass the bill, this 10 percent would be considered a "winning margin"—that President Eisenhower owes all to the Democrats. For example, suppose 78 Members of the Senate are present and voting (40 Democrats and 38 Republicans) as often happens. Republicans alone, even if 100 percent voted in favor of the President's measure (indicating solid party support), could not enact it. The Democratic votes alone could do it if they voted solidly for the bill which would never be the case if Republicans were solidly lined up for it, too, as on a party issue. If 36 (or 90 percent) of the Democrats opposed the President and 4 joined with the 38 (100 percent) Republicans, the measure would pass 42–36, and it would be said that the Democrats furnished the winning margin, even though 90 percent of them opposed the President. Would it not be just as correct to say that in the same vote 4 Republicans who might have opposed the President, but did not do so, supplied the winning margin? Isn't the real interpretation of situations like this that it was not the picayune Democratic margin that supplied the victory, but the 100 percent solid Republican support?
>
> 5. These so-called winning margins merely reflect the fact that few measures in Congress are ever passed without the crossing of party lines. Does it give a true picture of party performance to use this routine practice to give "winning margin" credits to either Republicans or Democrats? President Truman evidently did not think so when he lambasted the Republican 80th Congress which put the "winning margin" on many of his measures (and supplied the committee leadership and support of his measures as well).
>
> If tests of party support of the President are to be run, let's not run them ragged, but base them on fairer, more reliable yardsticks of party performance.

I want to turn now to a series of analyses of various issues of the Congressional Quarterly, to make clear the basis of the criticism leveled at it.

In its August 26, 1955, issue, it states, on page 1007, that during the first session of the 84th Congress, President Eisenhower had 44 victories in the Senate, and that Democrats "supplied the margin of victory 39 times." On the next page, the Eisenhower defeats are listed. But it omits attributing the defeats in any of these cases to votes supplied by the Democrats. Obviously, an unbiased presentation of those so-called defeat votes would treat victories and defeats in the same manner. Furthermore, it must be remembered that during the 84th Congress the Democrats had a numerical majority in both Houses; and one could attribute all legislation to the Democrats, inasmuch as they controlled the committees, and decided the form in which bills were reported, and which measures were to receive consideration by the Congress.

A more critical examination of the Senate yea-and-nay votes in connection with the Eisenhower victories shows that a number of those were on treaties which were ratified with no opposition. On the other hand, as Mr. Moley pointed out, there were many votes which were not listed by the Congressional Quarterly, but which do reflect victories or defeats for the President.

For example, to cite just one instance, there was the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]—who has graciously yielded to me—to House bill 6042, the Defense De-

partment Appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956. The purpose of the Mundt amendment was to eliminate section 638 of the bill. This section placed restrictions on the Defense Department in disposing or transferring to private contractors certain functions which could be performed more satisfactorily by private enterprise. The Mundt amendment was defeated, 48 to 33. Of the 33 votes cast for the amendment, 32 were cast by Republicans. Of the 48 votes cast against the amendment, 39 were cast by Democrats.

Significantly, Congressional Quarterly omits this amendment vote as an Eisenhower defeat although they make clear that it was a Republican loss on page 77 of the Congressional Quarterly Almanac covering 1955. Nor can the Quarterly plead an oversight, or that this was not an issue on which President Eisenhower had not publicly expressed himself. This is what the President wrote when he approved H. R. 6042:

Section 638 deals with the authority of the Department of Defense to rid itself of many of the manifold activities that it has been performing with its civilian personnel, and that can be adequately and economically performed by private industry without danger to the national security. That section states that funds appropriated in the bill cannot be used to enable the Secretary of Defense to exercise this authority if, in the case of any activity of the Department proposed to be terminated, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate or the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives disapproves such proposed termination.

The Constitution of the United States divides the functions of the Government into three departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, and establishes the principle that they shall be kept separate. Neither may exercise functions belonging to the others. Section 638 violates this constitutional principle.

I believe it to be my duty to oppose such a violation. The Congress has the power and the right to grant or to deny an appropriation. But once the appropriation is made the appropriation must, under the Constitution, be administered by the executive branch of the Government alone, and the Congress has no right to confer upon its committees the power to veto Executive action or to prevent Executive action from becoming effective.

I have cited this example to prove that Congressional Quarterly does not adhere to its supposed policy of determining whether a vote is for or against President Eisenhower by his public statement on such issues.

Let us see how the Quarterly puts together its statistical facts.

On page 58 of volume 10 of the Congressional Quarterly Almanac for 1954, in explaining the method of analyzing Eisenhower-issue roll salls, it says:

On this analysis, all Eisenhower-issue roll calls have equal statistical weight. Differential weighing might be desirable but cannot be done objectively.

A comparatively minor roll call, such as the one on ratification of the opium treaty, affects individual and over-all scores as much as a major roll call, such as the one by which the Senate rejected the Bricker amendment or the ones by which flexible farm price supports were approved.

If Senator A voted with the President on all roll calls except the one on the opium treaty, on which he voted against, he would have the same support and opposition scores as Senator B, who voted against the President on the Bricker amendments but with Mr. Eisenhower on all other roll calls, including the one on the opium treaty.

Similarly, controversial roll calls have no more statistical weight than noncontroversial votes, some of which were unanimous.

I am sure that none of my colleagues would agree that a vote on the ratification of an unopposed treaty should have the same weight as a vote for or against flexible farm price supports or for or against the Bricker amendment. I doubt that any expert on legislative procedures would agree that equal statistical weight should be applied to controversial and noncontroversial issues. The opium treaty referred to by Congressional Quarterly, a treaty against sin, was unopposed. It was ratified 71 to 0.

I believe I have made my point. And if every newspaper using the Congressional Quarterly material will realize the statistical method by which support for President Eisenhower is measured, I will feel that this discussion has served a very worthwhile purpose.

The 11th Annual Congressional Quarterly Almanac, covering the year 1955, repeats the listing of Eisenhower victories and defeats which appeared in the August 26, 1955, issue of the Congressional Quarterly, pages 1007–1009, to which I have already referred. Hence there was no effort to correct the errors.

Page 76 of this same Congressional Quarterly Almanac lists, quote, "Senate Democratic Losses." They include the following: Two votes on the disposal of rubber facilities recorded on March 23, 1955; a vote on the Capehart amendment to the Defense Production Act to permit continued employment in Government during peacetime of persons of outstanding experience and ability on a without-compensation basis which was adopted 46–45 on July 19, 1955; and a vote on the confirmation of John A. Hall to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, agreed to 43–41 on July 29, 1955. Now, obviously, if these were Democratic losses, as the Quarterly labels them, conversely, they must be Eisenhower victories. But you will search in vain to find them in the section dealing with Eisenhower defeats and victories.

The New York Times on July 16, 1956, in commenting on a speech by Adlai Stevenson at Rockport, Maine, said:

In his speech prepared for tonight, Mr. Stevenson said that the closing of the 84th Congress would end "another of democracy's experiments with divided government," the President of one party and the congressional majority of another.

He added that the Democrats were entitled to "legitimate pride" in a record of responsibility during the Eisenhower administration.

"No one can fairly charge," he said, "that the Democrats have placed party above country, or tried to make political capital out of irresponsible opposition."

I am still reading from the New York Times:

Mr. Stevenson cited the Congressional Quarterly as recording that Democrats had supplied the margin of victory in 39 of 44 Eisenhower victories in Congress in 1955.

The figures Mr. Stevenson cites are the very figures criticized in Mr. Moley's column. They are subject to the deficiencies and loopholes I have cited. I am sure that if Mr. Stevenson knew how they were put together, he would not have used them as factual material.

Let me go on with further analyses of how Congressional Quarterly presents data.

In its Quarterly Almanac, Volume 9, 1953, it reviews the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the first Republican Congress with a Republican President since President Hoover's Administration. On page 77 appears the heading, in large type: "President Prevailed on 74 of 83 1st-Session Rollcall—Tests of His Program—Needed Democratic Aid 58 Times." Thereafter in standard type, it says:

Fifty-eight times Democrats saved the President from munching charred crumbs * * * their votes providing the margin of victory when Republican defections or absences imperiled the happy glow.

I must object here to the use of such adjectives as "munching charred crumbs" or "imperiled the happy glow" in what purports to be a factual statistical journal.

Six pages later in the smallest readable type Congressional Quarterly provides itself with an "out" to cover against possible attacks of statistical error or editorial slant. Here is how they softened the blow:

In those 83 tests the President's position won out 74 times * * * but the President and his congressional supporters in the Republican Party needed help from the Democrats in scoring 58 of their 74 victories.

Note the difference in emphasis. The headline shouts: "Needed Democratic Aid 58 Times." The fine print explains:

The President and his congressional supporters in the Republican Party needed help from the Democrats in scoring 58 of their 74 victories.

There is no explanation of the fact that during most of this period the late beloved Republican leader, Senator Taft, was ill and necessarily absent. After his death, the Republicans no longer had numerical control of the Senate, and it is the Democratic votes cast with the Republican votes that the Quarterly is talking about.

I would not feel as strongly about Congressional Quarterly's self-imposed standards and criteria, if these were applied equally in all cases. It will be illuminating, therefore, to go back to the 80th Congress, when there was a Republican Congress with a Democratic President. What was the Quarterly's standard of values then?

Volume 7 of the Quarterly Almanac for 1948 explains their criteria thusly:

HOW CQ KEEPS PARTY UNITY AND BIPARTISAN SCORES

In making its party unity and bipartisan support studies, Congressional Quarterly classifies every record vote as follows:

1. A party-line vote is one on which a majority of Republicans vote one way and a majority of Democrats vote another.

2. A bipartisan vote is one in which a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats vote the same way.

Since both parties seldom attempt to bind their membership to a given position on an

issue, the record of a party is set by the way the party members vote. The party unity percentage, therefore, is a measure of the degree of a member's support of his party's policies as expressed by the actual votes of a majority of those of his political persuasion. This sometimes will produce a party record that may be at variance with "party line" as set by the administration or the top party leaders.

Bipartisan votes are on issues on which there is no substantial difference between the two major parties, though there may be a good deal of controversy within each party. Foreign policy is the prime example of the type of issue on which majorities of the two major parties are in agreement, though minorities in each party dissent. Another type of bipartisan vote is that on which there is little or no controversy of any type.

In other words, Mr. President, when a Republican Congress was in the position of supporting President Truman, as it did on so many issues, including the establishment of the Marshall plan during the 80th Congress, Republican votes were considered as bipartisan votes and not as "rescues." The term "rescues" was first used when Democrats first voted for President Eisenhower's program.

Significantly, the Congressional Quarterly for 1948 did not even carry the list of issues constituting the Truman program on which he was "rescued" and I emphasize that word, by the Republican 80th Congress. The technique of adding a heading which implies that the Democrats "rescued" President Eisenhower is one which was not adopted prior to the 83d Congress.

The editors of the Congressional Quarterly are well aware of the fact that many issues are bipartisan and do not represent victories for either side. There is no excuse for including such bipartisan support scores in tabulations showing support for President Eisenhower.

The Congressional Quarterly has been regarded by newspapers and others as a nonpartisan authoritative source of information on Congressional affairs. But the very fact that the Congressional Quarterly separates the bipartisan issues and lists them as they do, but then turns around and proceeds to include them in measuring the support for President Eisenhower, is proof that the presentation of Congressional data by this periodical is neither objective nor accurate.

The other Congressional Quarterly feature which Mr. Moley criticized dealt with the support given President Eisenhower by individual Senators and Representatives. The Congressional Quarterly measures support for the President in terms of votes on their selected issues which they consider to be included in the President's program.

If any President submits 100 proposals to the Congress and 50 of them are of a noncontroversial nature, no Senator who is recorded could possibly have a score of less than 50 percent. The inclusion in the Quarterly's tabulation of issues passed with little or no opposition, automatically narrows the spread between those Senators who have had to battle for the President's program, and those who support him on only noncontroversial issues.

All of us who serve in the Congress know that we give great consideration to the opinions of our party leaders. That is the reason we elect party leaders. If a Democratic Senator supports President Eisenhower on every issue where his party leaders also support the President, but opposes the President on every issue where the Democratic Party leadership is in opposition to the President, the question may properly be raised as to whether such a Senator is supporting the President or the leadership of his own party.

The Congressional Quarterly's method of showing support in percentages makes it impossible for any editor to determine what the true facts are. The Congressional Quarterly explains on page 82 of volume 9, the Congressional Quarterly Almanac for 1953, that in measuring effective support:

> Failures to vote are counted as "times at bat," so that such failure reduces effective-support score as much as an "anti-Eisenhower" vote.

The inclusion of the bipartisan issues in measuring support scores makes such a criteria manifestly unfair. Every Senator knows that when noncontroversial issues are scheduled, on which no opposition is expected, we attempt to meet the many other responsibilities each of us has in Washington. And on such occasion we may be absent from the floor when a vote is taken. Obviously, we are not deserting the President when we are not recorded on an issue which is agreed to by a majority of 70 to 0.

I believe I can best illustrate the validity of my criticism if we examine the reporting of my own voting record.

In its weekly report of August 26, 1955, Congressional Quarterly published my support of President Eisenhower. I was given a score of 50 percent on the 30 foreign policy issues which they included in the President's program. As a matter of the record, there were 33 such votes, not 30. I voted 19 times, and out of this number 17 times were for the administration's program, or an average of 89.5 percent. Seven of the 33 votes were taken on June 2, 1955. Several months before that date I had accepted an engagement which required me to be in my hometown of Ness City, Kans. Yet because I was unavoidably absent, and missed these seven votes, they were counted as being against President Eisenhower's program. Let me stress that not voting is included statistically as negative voting.

Nor am I alone in my views on the weaknesses and editorial slant of the Congressional Quarterly data. The senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has written me on this point. I have her permission to use her letter and will read it now, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in my statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
July 20, 1956.

The Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: I have read with interest your comments on the analyses made by the Congressional Quarterly.

I think that you may be interested in an experience which I had that bears out your observations about its Eisenhower support box score.

Last year one of our Republican colleagues used the Congressional Quarterly to chide me because the May 20, 1955, issue of the Congressional Quarterly reported that my support score of President Eisenhower was only 52 percent.

I think you will be interested in my reply to him. I wrote:

"You would place me in the same category with Representative OLIVER BOLTON, a stanch Eisenhower supporter, whose absences this year, like mine, were counted in the Congressional Quarterly analysis as votes against Eisenhower. Just as an illustration, Representative BOLTON is listed as giving the President this year only 11 percent overall support and only 14 percent support on foreign policy as compared to the 91 percent support on foreign policy last year.

"I was absent on nine of the votes this year in the Congressional Quarterly analysis—and all nine were marked as being against the President in spite of the manner in which I was announced. For example, were the absences not used against my Eisenhower score but rather my announced positions included, the record would show that this year my record on overall Eisenhower support is not 52 percent but 89 percent and on foreign policy is not 73 percent but 100 percent."

I believe that Congressional Quarterly does provide a valuable service. But I think that its publishers have a very serious obligation to avoid editorial slanting in their analyses if for only two reasons: (1) the very name of the publication causes many people to believe that it is an official publication of Congress, and (2) it represents itself to be completely objective.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine has raised the interesting point, that many people may believe that Congressional Quarterly is an official or semi-official publication of the Congress. I intend to study this matter fully to determine whether legislation should not be introduced to protect the use of the name "Congressional" just as the Congress has protected the use of such words as "United States" and "Red Cross" from commercial exploitation.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent at this point to include as part of my remarks a letter I received from the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] whose name was mentioned in Mr. Schroth's letter to me. Senator MARTIN'S letter completely refutes the statement that the junior Senator from Iowa used Congressional Quarterly material in his 1954 campaign.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1956.

The Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: Thank you for your request for information in connection with Mr. Schroth's letter to you of July 17 concerning Mr. Raymond Moley's article in Newsweek which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You asked me for my comments on Mr. Schroth's statement that "In Iowa, Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, Repub-

lican, also cited Congressional Quarterly throughout the campaign to advance his own cause and attack Senator Guy Gillette, Democrat, Iowa, whom he defeated."

I used the Congressional Quarterly table for the year 1953 showing the poor support of President Eisenhower by my opponent. In this table they had listed in one column votes in support and in another column votes in opposition to President Eisenhower's position. This table was labeled "relative support," and the percentage of support votes to opposition votes could easily be computed and a Senator's position among all the Senators could be determined. Votes on bipartisan rollcalls contributed to a Member's active support score, and many important policy issues were omitted. Even though I disagreed with their selection of issues, I used this table for the 1953 session of Congress. My computation based on their "relative support" table for 1953 showed my opponent as standing in 89th place among the 96 Senators in support or lack of support of President Eisenhower.

This table showing relative support was discontinued by the Congressional Quarterly in 1954 and new sets of figures were compiled showing in separate tables the active support and active opposition. I made known to Congressional Quarterly my objection to their selection of issues and the possible use of one table and not the other.

Page 906 of the Congressional Quarterly for the week ending July 16, 1954, carried a story on the Iowa Senate race. It contained a Congressional Quarterly voting score card measuring support for President Eisenhower on the few votes in Congress taken prior to July 1, I was shown as having supported President Eisenhower a lower percent of the time than my opponent. My low score was due in part to several trips I made to Iowa preceding the primary election held on the first Monday in June 1954. I had given President Eisenhower good support—much better than their report indicated, but absences from noncontroversial and uncontested rollcalls selected by Congressional Quarterly counted against my record just as much as a vote in opposition on a highly contested issue. My opponent's Congressional Quarterly support score was based in part on his votes on noncontroversial issues. I should add also that I was present on every rollcall where my vote was needed to protect the President's program.

Later, I made a complete analysis of my voting record and that of my opponent for the entire 1954 session of the 83d Congress. I had felt that the Congressional Quarterly's method of measuring support for President Eisenhower was unfair and accordingly I prepared my own analysis based on votes on the issues which were a part of the President's program, and which were opposed by the Democrat leadership in the House and the Senate. This is the table I used in my general election campaign against Senator Gillette in 1954 and it showed conclusively that my support of President Eisenhower was far above that of my opponent.

I did not cite or use Congressional Quarterly figures on votes recorded in Congress in the 1954 session. As a matter of fact, I cancelled my subscription to the Congressional Quarterly when it expired.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

THOS. E. MARTIN.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Congressional Quarterly is the only private publication in its field. It, therefore, has a virtual monopoly on this type of service. Like many monopolies, it must expect the more searching scrutiny of its operations. This requires that those of us, who are anxious to see a completely nonpartisan reporting of congressional activities, examine material in the Quarterly on a careful and critical basis. The editors of the Congressional Quarterly should be the last to resent attempts to do this.

It is the peculiarities and aberrations in the statistical procedures of the Quarterly which provide a solid basis for the criticism which I have made. I certainly believe that the listing of rollcalls and other data in the Quarterly serves a very helpful purpose. However, I am concerned when the Congressional Quarterly attempts to editorialize on their significance. Newspapers, in many instances, have uncritically adopted the Quarterly's headlines. The newspapers in many instances, do not attempt to interpret these headlines on the basis of the detailed Congressional Quarterly procedures which I have described.

Mr. Schroth, in his letter to me, said:

You may remember that it was William Allen White, in 1908, who first presented, with great difficulty, the complete record of a Senator in a campaign. We think that you will agree with us that the reporting of the complete record of the 84th Congress would be a shambles if newspapers had to unscramble the contradictory claims of partisan sources.

Certainly the newspapers, who maintain Washington correspondents, should expect their reporters to "unscramble the contradictory claims of partisan sources." They would not need Washington reporters at all if they were merely to accept the Congressional Quarterly's own evaluation of its nonpartisan character and therefore print the findings of the Congressional Quarterly as their own. Mr. Moley's complaint was that apparently at least one paper had done just that. My own personal experience and the experience of the Senior Senator from Maine also supports Mr. Moley's contention.

I have shown that these editorial remarks are slanted to favor the Democrats against the Republicans. Furthermore, the statistical techniques which are used to produce the data for the headlines are subject to serious criticism. I hope my observations will assist the Quarterly in producing more objective reports in the future.

Mr. President, I am hoping that Mr. Schroth, executive editor of the Congressional Quarterly, will now give this statement, along with his letter, equal prominence in the Congressional Quarterly, as I have given to his letter of July 17.

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1956.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: We feel that your challenge of the nonpartisanship of Congressional Quarterly on the Senate floor yesterday was made without full knowledge of the extensive use which has been made of Congressional Quarterly's facts and figures by the Republican national committee, the Senate policy committee, and individual Republican Congressmen when the statistics have favored their cause.

The complete accuracy and lack of bias of Congressional Quarterly is demonstrated by the diversified politics of the great number of newspapers, Members of Congress, and organizations who have used its material. The nonpartisanship of Congressional Quarterly has never been affected by the personal beliefs of any of its editors any more than the nonpartisanship of the Associated Press has ever been challenged because its president over many years has been Robert McLean, of the Philadelphia Bulletin, or by the fact that the late Col. Robert R. McCormick sat on its board.

When Leonard Hall, chairman of the Republican National Committee, was questioned by reporters on the CBS Face the Nation program about Senator KNOWLAND's disagreement with the President on a particular issue, he answered by citing the minority leader's 94-percent Eisenhower support score, and, to prove it was accurate, said: "These are not my figures. These are Congressional Quarterly's figures."

Perhaps you would be interested in just a few examples of Republican boasts, quoting Congressional Quarterly material:

From a news release, Republican National Committee, October 20, 1954: "Eisenhower got 53 percent better cooperation from Congress than Truman."

From the Senate Republican policy committee memo No. 28, July 21, 1955: "Survey shows Democrats lagging on President's program."

From the Senate Republican policy committee memo No. 32, August 18, 1955: "President's batting average drops under Democrats."

In the 1954 campaign Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, who defeated Representative Sam Yorty, Democrat, of California, repeatedly cited Congressional Quarterly's Eisenhower support and other figures in his campaign and attacked his opponent's record from Congressional Quarterly reports. In Iowa Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, also cited Congressional Quarterly throughout the campaign to advance his own cause and attack Senator Guy Gillette, Democrat, of Iowa, whom he defeated.

Congressional Quarterly's files have countless other examples of Republican publicity quoting Congressional Quartely's material. We also have similar quotations from Democratic sources as well as complaints from the Democrats when they think Congressional Quarterly's statistics are not to their advantage.

We feel that the manner in which Congressional Quarterly's material is used by papers as Republican as the Oakland Tribune, the Kansas City Star, and Chicago Tribune, as conservative Democrat as the Richmond News Leader and the Montgomery Advertiser, as liberal Democrat as the Louisville Courier-Journal and the New York Post, proves beyond a doubt, the nonpartisanship of Congressional Quarterly.

You may remember that it was William Allen White, in 1908, who first presented, with great difficulty, the complete record of a Senator in a campaign. We think that you will agree with us that the reporting of the complete record of the 84th Congress would be a shambles, if newspapers had to unscramble the contradictory claims of partisan sources. Congressional Quarterly's impartial reports are accompanied by documentation so thorough that each editor has been able to check the hundreds of items and draw his own editorial conclusions.

In the interest of fair play and the national policy of hearing all sides, particularly in an election year, we hope that you will give equal prominence on the floor of the Senate, to this letter and the attached analysis of Mr. Moley's figures, which you put into the RECORD yesterday. We might add that Newsweek, which published Mr. Moley's challenge of Congressional Quarterly's methods, has used Congressional Quarterly's material extensively for years, without any question of its accuracy and impartiality.

Sincerely,

THOMAS N. SCHROTH,
Executive Editor.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY
NEWS FEATURES,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1956.

Mr. JOHN DENSON,
Editorial Director, Newsweek,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. DENSON: Raymond Moley (Newsweek, July 16) is entitled to take whatever issue he pleases with Congressional Quarterly's methods of analyzing the votes of Senators and Representatives. But his statement that these methods "created a fatal bias" in Congressional Quarterly's findings is the first such challenge to Congressional Quarterly's nonpartisan policies, long recognized by responsible journalists.

For 11 years, at great cost in money and effort, Congressional Quarterly sought methods for recording the activities of Congress that would be free of the very bias Mr. Moley attempts to impute to Congressional Quarterly. However one chooses to judge the success of this effort, it remains a fact that Congressional Quarterly's solid reputation among editors and politicians of both parties rests on its factual, nonpartisan, and unbiased approach. It is a serious matter to have that good repute sullied in such a casual fashion.

While we have no wish to quarrel with Mr. Moley's method of determining the extent to which Republicans and Democrats have supported President Eisenhower, it is impossible to refute his charge of bias in Congressional Quarterly's method without at the same time pointing out the curious paradox in his own analysis.

Mr. Moley contends, in effect, that support of the Republican leadership in House and Senate is the same as support for President Eisenhower. He confuses party regularity with effective support for the President's own program, as transmitted in messages to Congress or in other statements.

The validity of this concept may be judged in the light of the Senate's vote on June 28 on a move to cut out of the foreign aid bill all assistance to Yugoslavia. President Eisenhower had asked for aid to Yugoslavia, and his Secretary of State had made a strong plea to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to allow the aid.

Yet it was Senator STYLES BRIDGES (Republican, New Hampshire), chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee, who offered and urged the amendment to cut off aid to Yugoslavia. Said Senator BRIDGES: "I want to say that no one has higher regard for President Eisenhower than I, * * * but that does not preclude me from performing my constitutional duty to debate this issue."

When the roll was called on Senator BRIDGES' amendment, 15 Democrats and 23 Republicans (including Senator BRIDGES and Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, California, voted for it, while 29 Democrats (including Minority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas, Majority Whip EARLE C. CLEMENTS, Democrat, Kentucky, and 21 Republicans voted against it. Thus a majority of Republicans present and voting supported their own leadership against the President, while a majority of Democrats supported their leaders and the President against his own leaders.

Nevertheless, according to the method accepted by Mr. Moley of determining who supports the President, the majority of Republicans who voted to cut off aid to Yugoslavia would be credited with backing the President, while the majority of Democrats who voted against the cut would be charged with opposing the President.

By the same token, use of this method precludes consideration of the House vote July 5 on the Powell antisegregation rider to the school aid bill. The President was clearly on record in opposition to the rider. Yet a 3-to-1 majority of Republicans followed Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican, Massachusetts, Assistant Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, Indiana, and Whip LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, Illinois, in voting for the Powell amendment, while a majority of Democrats voted against it. However, since Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, also voted for the rider, one could not say the two leaderships were opposed. Thus, using the method Mr. Moley advocates, the vote on the highly controversial Powell amendment, which was opposed by the President, could not be included in tabulating support for the President.

So much for the leadership standard of measuring Presidential support. Now for CQ's method, which, incidentally, was established before President Eisenhower was elected. CQ computes two separate items: support for the President and party unity.

In computing support for the President, we tabulate only those roll calls which are clear-cut tests of his program and leadership. In short, it must be proved from his own public statements whether we would have voted "yea" or "nay" if he had been Congressman Eisenhower.

Mr. Moley complains that this method, as used in CQ's Weekly Report of August 26, 1955, and included in the 1955 CQ Almanac, resulted in a "curious selection of issues," since it included many roll calls on which there was little or no opposition by Members of either party, and excluded other record votes on which the two parties were opposed.

We see nothing "curious" about a method which credits the President with a "victory" and the Members of Congress with an "assist" when they vote unanimously or nearly so for a measure which he has requested. Nor do we see anything "curious" about a method of measurement which ignores rollcalls on which the President's views are not a matter of public record, even though these votes may reveal sharp splits between the parties. Such votes, whether or not the President has revealed his views on the subjects, are recorded as separate statistics, known as party unity votes.

The ground rules for CQ's analysis of Presidential support, set forth in full in the issue to which Mr. Moley refers, acknowledge the difficulty of devising an unassailable method. But they concluded that "CQ decided that any attempt to eliminate or weight rollcalls would be subjective and "arbitrary." If this method leads to a "curious selection of issues," it is at least free of the subjective and arbitrary assumption that the President's Congressional leaders inevitably and invariably do his bidding.

May we suggest that Mr. Moley keep his eye out for CQ's forthcoming analyses of Presidential support and party unity during the second session of the 84th Congress, in order that he may clarify the apparent confusion regarding these two standards of voting and the rules by which the standards are applied.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS N. SCHROTH,
Executive Editor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill; and

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, District of Columbia, and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2226) to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez;

S. 2093. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, to undertake certain public works and grant compensation for certain property damages as a result of the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects, Missouri River; and

S. 3941. An act relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, and Mr. TALLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5274. An act extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill; and

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolutions of the House:

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enroll-

ment of the bill (H. R. 7619), to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

In section 104 (a), strike out subsection (b) following section 104 (a) (4) and insert the said subsection (b) immediately preceding section 105.

In section 118, strike out "116" and insert "117."

In section 9 (d) of the amendment made by section 401, strike out "first or second" and insert in lieu thereof "second or third."

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the engrossed bill (H. R. 3489) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955;

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 7643. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corp. for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America' to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold";

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai L. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

INVESTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN HYDROELECTRIC PUBLIC POWER

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, some time ago I wrote to the Legislative Reference Service, to the Director of that Service, Mr. Ernest S. Griffith, posing a number of question relating to the extent of the United States Government's investment in hydroelectric public power.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter which I directed to Mr. Griffith, under date of January 10, 1956, printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1956.

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRIFFITH: I have had a number of requests for information concerning the extent of the United States Government's investment in hydroelectric public power. Furthermore, questions have been asked of me along the following lines:

1. How much does the Federal Government have invested in hydroelectric power facilities, including generation plans and transmission lines?

2. How are these electric facilities paid for or amortized?

3. Do Federal hydroelectric systems make any payment to the Treasury? Do they make money for the Government?

4. Do hydroelectric facilities make any financial contribution to irrigation and reclamation?

5. Do Federal hydroelectric plants pay taxes, or make any payments in lieu of taxes? If so, how much?

6. Is the TVA paying its own way?

7. Does the TVA make a profit and, if so, where does the profit go? Is it reinvested, or does it come back to the Treasury?

8. Does the TVA pay taxes—local, State, or Federal?

9. What is the total Government investment in TVA? Will that investment ever be paid off out of the earnings?

The above questions are typical of the many inquiries I receive. I would greatly appreciate having someone in the Legislative Reference Service do a complete study for me on this question of public power on the part of the Federal Government along the lines that these questions indicate. The questions should not be interpreted as being exclusive. There is undoubtedly other information that will be pertinent and valuable.

I will appreciate your cooperation and helpfulness in this project.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I should like to note that I received from the Library of Congress, under date of March 21, 1956, a very excellent paper answering the questions I asked of the Library of Congress, and I hope that my colleagues will take the time somewhere along life's way to read the report from the Library of Congress. A number of questions have been asked by the public in general concerning the investment of the United States Government in hydroelectric public power facilities as to whether these investments were productive of resources and revenues to the Government; also questions relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority; as to whether it is paying its own way, as to whether it makes a profit, as to whether it pays revenue to local governments.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in reply to your letter of January 10, 1956, in which you requested information concerning the investment of the United States Government in hydroelectric public power. You listed several questions as typical of the inquiries received on the subject.

There is enclosed a compilation of factual information together with some analytical comments on the general subject of Federal hydroelectric power development. Power development by the Tennessee Valley Authority has been included in greater detail.

It is pertinent to mention that the Second Hoover Commission Task Force on Water

Resources and Power performed some good work in bringing the facts together on hydroelectric power development by the various Federal agencies. Regardless of one's viewpoint concerning the soundness of the conclusions or recommendations in the report, it is believed that the Report of the Task Group on Power Generation and Distribution contained in pages 275–598, volume 2 of the Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power, presents, in addition to its analysis, a complete factual study of the subject. This report contains not only summary information but contains detailed data relating to 7 Federal power systems or project groups including the Tennessee Valley Authority. In view of this recent study and the wealth of information available therein, the enclosed study which is based both on Hoover Commission compilations and the latest Agency reports, has been confined primarily to the questions listed in your letter.

We hope that you will find that it fulfills your needs.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE R. VAWTER,
Senior Specialist in Engineering and Public Works.

FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN HYDROELECTRIC POWER

FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC POWER IN RELATION TO TOTAL CAPACITY

Power is generated and sold in the United States by about 1,000 privately owned utilities, by State or local public bodies, and by the Federal Government.

The Federal Government is by far the largest single producer and supplier of electric power in the United States. During 1953 it produced over 13 percent of all electric utility energy produced in hydroelectric and fuel burning plants in the country.

The following tabulation prepared by the Hoover Commission Task Force on Resources and Power [1] shows for the calendar year 1953 the capacity of generating plants and the production of electric energy in the United States by type of generation and by class of ownership. It will be noted that at the end of 1953, 21.5 percent of the Nation's total installed capacity and 24.1 percent of the total utility plant capacity was in hydroelectric plants. The balance was in fuel burning plants, almost entirely steam-electric plants, owned principally by privately owned utilities. Of the total utility hydroelectric capacity 42.2 percent was in Federal plants.

Capacity of generating plants and production of energy in the United States by type of generation and class of ownership

	Capacity in kilowatts (Dec. 31, 1953)[1]						Generation in millions of kilowatt-hours (year 1953)					
	Hydroelectric		Fuel		Total		Hydroelectric		Fuel		Total	
	Amount	Percent of utility plants	Amount	Percent of utility plants	Amount	Percent of utility plants	Amount	Percent of utility plants	Amount	Percent of utility plants	Amount	Percent of utility plants
Utility plants:												
Privately owned	10,527,032	47.8	60,674,107	87.4	71,201,139	77.8	51,527	49.0	302,744	89.7	354,271	80.0
Non-Federal public	2,206,820	10.0	6,736,061	9.7	8,942,881	9.8	9,149	8.7	21,180	6.3	30,329	6.9
Federal	9,311,187	42.2	2,047,042	2.9	11,358,229	12.4	44,557	42.3	13,507	4.0	58,064	13.1
Subtotal	22,045,039	100.0	69,457,210	100.0	91,502,249	100.0	105,233	100.0	337,431	100.0	442,664	100.0
Industrial plants [2]	1,009,493		14,842,636		15,852,129		4,384		67,121		71,505	
Total	23,054,532		84,299,846		107,354,378		109,617		404,552		514,169	

[1] Source: Task Force Report, table A–4, vol. 2, p. 335.

[2] The industrial plants are operated by industries chiefly for their own power requirements.

1. How much does the Federal Government have invested in hydroelectric power facilities, including generation plants and transmission lines?

Estimates of the Hoover Commission's task force on Water Resources and Power show a total investment in Federal power generation and transmission facilities as of June 30, 1953, of $2,311,407,000. This includes in addition to hydroelectric generation, an investment of $227,127,000 in steam plants constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Considering also that the investment in transmission facilities of $268,862,000 by the TVA was made for both hydroelectric and fuel-burning power transmission and allocating about a third of this cost to fuel-burning power, we obtain a round figure of $2 billion as the total Federal investment in hydroelectric power facilities on that date.

For your convenient reference there follows the entire tabulation of present and authorized capacity of and investment in Federal Power Generation and Transmission Facilities from the Hoover task force study:

Present and authorized capacity of and investment in federal power generation and transmission facilities [1]

	Installed capacity (kilowatts) each system					Power investment (dollars) each system				
	Existing at June 30, 1953 (1)	Authorized additions to be completed by 1960 (2)	Authorized additions to be completed after 1960 (3)	Total existing, under construction, and authorized (4)	Percent of total (5)	Existing at June 30, 1953 (6)	Authorized additions to be completed by 1960 (7)	Authorized additions to be completed after 1960 (8)	Total existing, under construction, and authorized (9)	Percent of total (10)
Tennessee Valley Authority	4,310,050	7,524,700	1,750,000	13,584,750	39.1	924,513,490	1,701,776,458	449,612,000	3,075,901,948	31.8
Columbia River Basin	2,687,200	3,224,950	5,112,500	11,024,650	31.7	590,578,249	1,029,176,169	1,625,970,748	3,245,725,166	33.6
Hoover and Parker-Davis	1,594,800	104,500	0	1,699,300	4.9	238,576,977	15,983,194	0	254,560,171	2.6
Central Valley (California)	454,000	408,500	454,000	1,316,500	3.8	80,812,702	211,819,298	79,419,000	372,051,000	3.9
Missouri River Basin	262,700	1,089,250	1,389,800	2,741,750	7.9	106,587,440	615,881,132	586,477,083	1,308,945,655	13.5
Southwestern Power Administration	380,750	260,250	1,103,985	1,744,985	5.0	134,211,933	126,602,971	370,192,853	631,007,757	6.5
Southeastern Power Administration	747,000	563,000	1,204,500	2,514,500	7.2	212,426,000	171,110,000	336,611,400	720,147,400	7.5
All other Federal projects	59,364	44,900	22,200	126,464	0.4	23,700,131	21,850,976	8,316,340	53,867,447	0.6
Total capacity	10,495,864	13,220,050	11,036,985	34,752,899	100.0	2,311,406,922	3,894,200,198	3,456,599,424	9,662,206,544	100.0

[1] Investment costs are estimated in part by the task group on the basis of reported allocations in the respective groups. The total ultimate investment is based on available agency figures as to about 83 percent of the projects; as to the remaining 17 percent, the basis is task group estimates. The scheduled investment in transmission facilities is included in above totals, as a part of system totals. All projects included are considered by the Federal agencies as authorized for construction. The original TVA Act is considered by TVA as providing basic authorization for scheduled development in the TVA area. In general, funds have not been appropriated for projects not under construction.

Source: Task force report, table A–7, vol. 2, p. 338. (Agencies' publications and information furnished the task force.)

2. How are these electric facilities paid for or amortized?

The Federal Government advances all funds when it installs power facilities, and agency practices are generally that rates be set to assure repayment within 50 years of capital costs, operation and maintenance, and a portion of administrative costs, usually with interest on capital. The rate of interest is variously 2½ or 3 percent.

3a. Do Federal hydroelectric systems make any payment to the Treasury?

The extent to which the Federal hydroelectric systems make payments to the Treasury depends upon the policy of the agency based upon the wording of the authorization legislation. One approach to obtaining data on the subject is to analyze by major systems their experience in the light of this legislation:

TVA—section 14 of the TVA Act, as amended in 1935, declared as a matter of policy that, in order as soon as practicable to make the power projects self-supporting and self-liquidating, surplus power shall be sold at rates which, in the opinion of the Board, will produce gross revenues in excess of the cost of production of the power. Title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, requires that beginning with the year ended June 30, 1948, the Authority must

[1] Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power, June 1955. Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

retire from net power proceeds for the preceding year not less than $2.5 million of its outstanding bonded indebtedness. In addition, the act requires payments from these proceeds into the United States Treasury in amounts sufficient when added to the payments made on bonded indebtedness to total not less than $87,059,810 during the 10-year period ending June 30, 1958, and an equivalent amount during each succeeding 10-year period until an aggregate of $348,239,240 had been paid. Thus the requirements for repayment are not on an annual basis. The act also requires that new congressional appropriations for power facilities be repaid over a period not to exceed 40 years after the year in which the facilities go into operation.

TVA reports that its actual repayment of power investment costs is in excess of both the minimum requirements under the 1948 law and requirements determined on the basis of repaying one-fortieth of the plant investment at the end of the previous year. These and related figures are shown in the following table:

TVA repayments of investment in power program under provisions of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948 [1]

Fiscal year	Minimum repayments required under 1948 law		1/40 of plant investment at end of previous year		Actual and estimated payments	
	Year	Total period	Year	Total period	Year	Total period
1948	$10,500,000	$10,500,000			$10,500,000	$10,500,000
1949	2,500,000	13,000,000	$8,705,981	$8,705,981	6,500,000	16,000,000
1950	2,500,000	15,600,000	8,705,981	17,411,962	5,500,000	21,500,000
1951	2,500,000	18,000,000	9,149,627	26,561,589	9,000,000	30,500,000
1952	2,500,000	20,500,000	9,733,970	36,295,559	12,000,000	42,500,000
1953	2,500,000	23,000,000	12,256,316	48,551,875	15,000,000	57,500,000
1954	2,500,000	25,500,000	17,482,476	66,034,351	[2] 20,000,000	[2] 77,500,000
1955	2,500,000	28,000,000	[2] 22,845,649	[2] 88,880,000	[2] 50,000,000	[2] 127,500,000

[1] In addition to repayments under the provisions of the Government Corporations Act, 1948, bond redemptions of $8,572,500 and other repayments of $15,059,019 were made prior to fiscal year 1948. Thus, the total actual repayments through 1953 amount to $81,131,519.
[2] Estimated.

Source: Task force report, table A-30, vol. 2, p. 431.

Bonneville Power Administration: The Bonneville Project Act provides that rate schedules shall be drawn "having regard to the recovery * * * of the cost of producing and transmitting electric energy" at the Bonneville Dam project, "including the amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years." The Bonneville Power Administration in an agreement with the Corps of Engineers, under the terms of this act, is required to deposit in the United States Treasury the portion of its receipts earmarked to reimburse power costs of the project. The payments are designed to pay power operation and maintenance, including necessary replacements and return all costs allocated to power over a 50-year period beginning July 1, 1944, together with interest at 2.5 percent per annum on unamortized balances. A somewhat similar agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation covers payments on the Columbia Basin project. In addition to payment on project generation costs, the power revenues must cover BPA transmission and marketing costs, including operation and maintenance expenses, and depreciation and interest expenses on the transmission network. The rate of 2.5 percent is used in computing both interest during construction and the annual interest expense.

Bonneville Power Administration reports that $145,857,094 of capital investment in power production and transmission facilities has been repaid to June 30, 1953, an amount substantially in excess of scheduled requirements.

Hoover Dam: The investment in the Hoover Dam, powerplant and appurtenant structures, exclusive of $25 million allocated to flood control, is to be repaid with interest in 50 years. The interest rate was established at 4 percent by the Boulder Canyon Project Act and changed to 3 percent by the Adjustment Act.

The Bureau of Reclamation reports that the total repayment of Hoover Dam power investment to May 31, 1953, amounted to $14,451,782 out of a total power investment of $140,895,465.

Central Valley project: This project operates generally under the provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. Section 9 (c) of the act requires that power rates be such as to produce revenues "at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the operation and maintenance cost, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment of not less than 3 percent per annum, and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper." A repayment period for the power investment is not specified by law.

The Bureau of Reclamation reports that by June 30, 1953, a total of $44,249,000 had been repaid on the investment in commercial power facilities in the Central Valley projects, leaving about $36,564,000 as of that date to be repaid. The repayments of principal and interest are made to the Reclamation Fund of the United States Treasury.

Southwestern Power Administration System projects and Southeastern Power Administration System projects: Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 provides that surplus power at projects under the control of the Secretary of the Army shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior. The act specifies that "rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery * * * of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. * * * All moneys received * * * shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

There are no reports readily available covering repayments as such. Studies made by the Hoover Commission task force indicated that in both systems up to June 30, 1953, the operating revenues under the present rate structures were insufficient to pay for cost of operation and pay out requirements. There is now under consideration the need for increasing rates in order to repay proper allocations of cost with interest within a period of 50 years.

Missouri Basin projects: The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 provides in section 9 that rates for power be such as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior "will produce power revenue at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of annual operations and maintenance cost, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment at not less than 3 percent per annum and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems droper." The Fort Peck Act of 1938 covering the marketing of power from that project provides in section 6 that, "Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years."

The Missouri River Basin project is in the initial stages of operation and only a small percentage of the power investment has been repaid. The Bureau of Reclamation's Average Rate and Repayment Studies dated January 1954 show that the repayment of power investment to June 30, 1953, ranges from 3 to 100 percent for various projects, and amounts to 13 percent of the total power investment at that date, when computed upon the basis of present criteria for payout.

3b. Do Federal hydroelectric systems make money for the Government?

The question as to whether the Federal Government's electric utility business is a money-making proposition is a moot one. The answer may depend not only on facts or legislative intent such as were presented earlier in this study, but on what costs should properly be covered by Federal power rates to assure that power pays its way.

For example, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power took the position that if the Government's power operations are regarded as a business in which it is properly engaged, the Federal power rates should be sufficient to cover:

1. Actual operation and maintenance expenses.
2. Federal, State, and local taxes foregone, i. e., in the amount that would have been paid by privately owned companies producing equivalent power.
3. Amortization based on life of property with a maximum of 50 years.
4. Estimated replacement costs during amortization period.
5. Estimated fair return of 5½ percent (approximate rate allowed by regulatory commissions).

On the basis of the above 5 points, the task force estimates that revenues of the principal power projects have been greatly insufficient (about $114 million deficient in revenues in the year ending June 30, 1953 and $597 million from the beginning of operations).

The principal reason the Federal Government is able to charge lower rates, the task force indicated, is that it does not make any payment toward the cost of carrying on the Federal Government, and it has utilized the constitutional immunity of Federal facilities from State and local taxation. Except for the Boulder Canyon project and the Tennessee Valley Authority, none of the Federal power projects pays any amount in lieu of State and local taxes. The task force indicated its belief that there is no economic or social reason, or reason in equity, why the customers of Federal power should not pay in their rates their fair share of costs of the Federal, State, and local governments as do the users of non-Federal power. It said "The conducts by the Government of tax exempt power operations, and the sale of the power at prices that do not count the taxes thus foregone as a cost, result in unfair competition on the part of the Government with private enterprise, because the Government compels private enterprise to pay the taxes and thus makes it impossible for it to compete with Government prices."

Another reason the Federal Government can charge such low rates, the task force attributes to the fact that the Federal Government has designated 2½ to 3 percent on the investment as a satisfactory return. Generally, in the electric utility business, State regulatory agencies and the Federal Power Commission conceive of about 5½ percent as a minimum fair return on investment.

The task force summarizes its position by saying:

"To the extent that users of federally generated power fail to pay their proportionate share of the cost of the various governmental

units—the equivalent of local, State, and Federal taxes—that deficiency must be made up by other Federal, State, and local taxpayers. To the extent that net revenues from Federal power operations do not at least cover the interest paid out by the Federal Government to holders of its debt, that deficiency must be made up by Federal taxpayers. To the extent that revenues from Federal power operations do not also cover operating, maintanance, amortization or replacement costs, that deficiency must be made up by the Federal taxpayer. Any such deficiencies amount to subsidies to the users of federally generated power."

The deficiencies in Federal power revenues below minimum financial requirements after providing for all operating expenses and computed Federal, State, and local taxes, and interest at 3 percent, but without allowing the additional return to make up the 5½ percent that private utilities generally receive, are given in the following table for the major Federal projects from their beginning to June 30, 1953.[1]

	Deficiency, year ended June 30, 1953	Deficiency, cumulative to June 30, 1953
Tennessee Valley Authority	$29,979,158	$99,574,167
Columbia River Basin projects	19,982,767	96,626,893
Hoover Dam	7,941,830	101,186,839
Parker-Davis Dams	3,480,633	21,200,338
Southwestern Power Administration	4,470,582	10,692,305
Southeastern Power Administration	7,056,395	10,906,696
Central Valley project	2,718,625	[1](8,596,193)
Total	75,629,990	331,591,045

[1] Surplus.

The dissent and separate statement of Commissioner Chet Holifield in the Report of the full Hoover Commission[2] presented the opposite point of view. He presented an analysis which attempted to demonstrate that the task force's deficiencies in revenues were the result of "misleading computations of hypothetical taxes."

Commissioner Holifield presented the figures compiled by the task force, itself, giving estimated financial requirements including taxes and interests at 3 percent ($1,577,688,711 in the 20 years from 1933–53). The total computed tax item for those years was also presented ($527,326,666). Deducting the computed taxes from the total, there remains $1,050,362,045 as the task force computation of the financial requirements of the programs exclusive of taxes. Now, also according to the report, total collected revenues totaled $1,246,098,366, which would leave a margin of revenues over requirements of $195,736,321.

Commissioner Holifield pointed out that in 1953 the privately owned electric utilities paid about 21.5 percent of the revenues in taxes of all kinds, which is considerably less than the 33.4 percent in taxes the task force computed the Federal power program should pay. Moreover, the 21.5 percent of revenues which the private power companies charged to taxes in 1953 is unquestionably higher than they will actually be found to have paid out of that year's revenue because they regularly overaccrue taxes and then return the balance to their surplus profit accounts after final settlements are reached with the tax authorities.

Commissioner Holifield credited Senator AIKEN with pointing out another misleading comparison—the fact that the Federal program is composed of wholesale power supply systems whereas private utilities are mainly retailers. If taxes, including Federal income taxes, are to be assessed against the Federal program, the basis of comparison should be private companies engaged only in the production and transmission of wholesale power supply to other distributing utilities. The average 1953 tax accruals covering all the tax obligations of privately owned companies supplying wholesale power was 13.5 percent of operating revenues.

Commissioner Holifield added: "As I have already pointed out, the consolidated revenues of the Federal power program for the 20 years 1933 to 1953 were ample to cover all operating and financial requirements, as estimated by the task force, plus 16 percent of such revenues in lieu of taxes. Clearly, there is no showing that the program was subsidized."

He said that TVA surplus revenues represented 15.5 percent of revenues; that of Bonneville system 17.8 percent; and that of the combined Boulder, Parker, and Davis projects only 9.4 percent—those which have been most under attack as subsidized are actually the ones which have produced the surplus revenues to make the whole Federal program completely self-supporting, even by the task force standards.

As for the rate of interest, Commissioner Holifield could see no reason for charging the program interest at 3 percent when the Government borrowed the money with which they were constructed at 2½ percent.

He also believed that there is no reason for requiring the Federal program to both replace all its facilities during their estimated life and, at the same time, to amortize all the investment in them. "Private companies don't do that. With these modifications in the fixed charges used by the task force, the margin earned by the Federal power program over the 20-year period would constitute a higher percentage of revenue than the 16 percent shown in the table."

Commissioner Holifield also called attention to the fact that the calculations of the task force assume that the same large quantities of power from Federal projects would have been sold even if the higher rates of private power companies were applied. It did not draw any conclusions about the direct inverse relationship between rates of power and amounts consumed.

4. Do hydroelectric facilities make any financial contribution to irrigation and reclamation?

Construction projects authorized under reclamation law provide benefits in the nature of land irrigation, hydroelectric power, flood control, navigation improvement, fish and wildlife conservation, and water supply. Financial feasibility of a project requires that revenues be sufficient to liquidate costs allocable to the reimbursable functions of irrigation, power, and water supply. Frequently, anticipated revenues from irrigation are not adequate to repay costs allocable to irrigation. In such instances the irrigation costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay must be repaid by revenues from the sale of hydroelectric power or of water supply. Up to the present time the water supply features of most projects have been very small in comparison to the power features.

Under reclamation law as it had been written, up to and including the act of 1939, the price of power sold from Federal multiple purpose projects was in theory, at least, to be fixed sufficiently high to include the following five components:

(a) Operation and maintenance of power facilities.

(b) An amount paid into a replacement fund for use when needed.

(c) An annual amortization item for the repayment to the Treasury of the Government's investment.

(d) Interest at 3 percent on the unamortized power investment.

(e) A sum to be used as a subsidy to pay for some of the irrigation investment.

The justification for the theoretical inclusion of (e) is found in precedents going back to early projects in which it was almost impossible to separate the respective costs of power and irrigation facilities. But since World War II with the rapid expansion of multiple purpose development the assignment of (e) as a component of the power price has been largely ignored.

In an opinion of the solicitor of the Interior Department rendered in 1944 it was declared that the interest component (d) could be applied to the repayment of irrigation costs. More recently under the present administration the so-called Colibran formula, or some modification thereof, has been favored over the interest component use. Under this formula, named after a small project at Colibran, Colo., to which it was first applied, the interest component is used as originally intended; i. e., to pay back to the Treasury interest on the unpaid portion of the power investment over a fixed number of years of repayment. After repayment of the power investment, the power revenues are used to pay off the unpaid part of the original irrigation investment which is beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

Mr. Charles D. Curran, Task Force Administrator, for the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power, in a special study of the subject[3] concludes "that neither formula has any economic advantage over the other, that essentially they come back to the same thing." A study of the record indicates that both the use of the interest component and the Colibran formula are devices to obviate the need for the higher power rates that would be required if both the power and irrigation features were amortized throughout the life of the project.

The Comptroller General in his audit report to the Congress on the Bureau of Reclamation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, provided the following repayment figures of tentative reimbursable allocations including irrigation and power:

[1] Task Force Report, p. 158, vol. I.

[2] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Water Resources and Power. Vol. II, (Separate Statements of the Commissioners), pp. 74–80.

[3] Task Force Report, p. 1213.

All Bureau of Reclamation projects constructed, under construction, or authorized (exclusive of Missouri Basin)

Reimbursable feature	Construction cost allocation, amount	Percent	Probable repayment, amount	Percent
Irrigation	$1,912,091,000	61	$1,153,663,000	37
Commercial power	998,344,000	32	1,722,407,000	56
Water supply	172,095,000	5	172,095,000	5
Other	58,418,000	2	40,123,000	2
Total	3,140,928,000	100	3,088,289,000	100

All Bureau of Reclamation projects constructed, under construction, or authorized (exclusive of Missouri Basin)—Continued

MISSOURI BASIN PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED, UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR AUTHORIZED [1]

Reimbursable feature	Construction cost allocation, amount	Percent	Probable repayment, amount	Percent
Irrigation	$2,713,152,000	74	$661,312,000	18
Commercial power	874,252,000	24	2,922,804,000	79
Municipal water supply	17,748,000		31,365,000	1
Fish and Wildlife, recreation	10,329,000			
Future additions to power system	58,176,000	2	58,176,000	2
Total	3,673,657,000	100	3,673,657,000	100

[1] Includes Corps of Engineers projects.

From the above tabulations it will be noted that for Bureau of Reclamation projects exclusive of the Missouri Basin, the allocation to commercial power of construction costs is 32 percent of the total reimbursable allocations but commercial power revenues repay 56 percent of the total costs allocated to reimbursable purposes. Allocations to irrigation and repayments by irrigators are 61 and 37 percent, respectively, of total reimbursable costs.

For the Missouri Basin projects, the allocation to commercial power is 24 percent of the total of reimburseable allocations, but commercial power revenues pay 79 percent of the total costs allocated to reimbursable purposes. Allocations to irrigation and repayments by irrigators are 74 percent and 18 percent, respectively, of total reimbursable costs.

5. Do Federal hydroelectric plants pay taxes or make payments in lieu of taxes? If so, how much?

In its power operations the Federal Government has utilized the constitutional immunity of Federal facilities from State and local taxation. Except for amounts provided in TVA and Hoover Dam Acts none of the Federal power projects pays any amount in lieu of State and local taxes. Neither does the Federal Government pay Federal taxes on its investment.

Section 13 of the TVA Act as amended provides for payments in lieu of taxes. The objective of the section was to maintain whole the local taxing bodies by replacing the taxes collected at the time of acquisition of privately owned property acquired by TVA. Payments are measured by a percentage of gross proceeds from TVA power sales and "are apportioned among the States by a formula which gives equal weight to power revenues and to power property. If the amount thus apportioned to any State for any year is less than former State and local property taxes on acquired power property, the difference is made up by a supplementary payment which becomes an additional charge against TVA power operations. Provision is made for payments equal to former county and district property taxes directly to counties affected, and the amounts so paid are deducted from amounts otherwise due the respective States. The percentage rate of payment is graduated downward from 10 percent of gross power proceeds of the preceding year paid in 1941 to 5 percent in 1949 and each year thereafter. It was anticipated that this decrease in percentage would be offset by an increase in power sales so as to maintain the financial position of State and local governments. The gross proceeds from the sale of power on which these percentages are computed exclude power used by the Authority or sold or delivered to any other department or agency of the Government of the United States for any purpose other than the resale thereof. Sales thus excluded amounted to about 52 percent of the total in fiscal year 1955.

"(b) Payments in lieu of taxes: The following table shows the payments in lieu of State and local taxes made by TVA for selected years. No payments in lieu of Federal taxes are made.

TVA's payments in lieu of taxes for selected fiscal years

Fiscal year	Payments	Percent of power revenues
1941	$1,499,394	7.0
1946	1,992,256	5.6
1951	2,444,796	3.5
1953	3,418,110	3.3
1955	3,878,466	4.7

Source: Task Force Report, Vol. II, pp. 436-437 with 1955 figures added.

"The table shows that the amount of payments in lieu of State and local taxes has steadily increased owing to the increase in power sales.

"In general, the municipal electric systems distributing TVA power pay tax equivalents approaching amounts that would be obtained by applying the prevailing local tax rates to the depreciated cost of their power properties. In several of the States in the area, rural electric cooperatives are exempt by State law from State and local taxes; in others, their properties are assessed by utility or tax commissions.

"In fiscal 1955 the total taxes or payments in lieu of taxes paid by all distributors amounted to $6,192,400."

The Boulder Canyon Project [4] Adjustment Act provided for payment during the amortization period of: (1) $300,000 per year to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada, and (2) $500,000 per year to the Colorado River development fund. The Congress considered the payments to Arizona and Nevada as payments in lieu of taxes. Such payments have been made each year since 1937 out of the power revenues from Hoover Dam.

6. Is the TVA paying its own way?

The Tennessee Valley Authority is an independent Government corporation created by act of Congress, May 18, 1933. The authority was established for the purposes of navigation, flood control, reforestation, agricultural and industrial development, the national defense and for other purposes including the production, distribution, and sale of electric energy.

The multiple-use dams built and operated by TVA serve three major purposes: navigation, flood control, and production of power. Power operations is the only TVA activity which provides income in the business sense of the term. None of TVA's other activities produce income directly to the Government but they yield returns in terms of public security and well-being and better cash return to private enterprise.

TVA power operations appear to fulfill the requirements of the TVA Act that they be self-supporting and self-liquidating. Figures given in answer to question 3 on payments to the Treasury and question 9 on repayment of Government investment in TVA indicate the extent to which TVA is paying its own way, particularly in regard to the power investment.

The discussion in question 3b is particularly germane because the question as to whether TVA is paying its own way depends on the extent that interest and taxes should properly be included. The majority and dissenting views of the Second Hoover Commission bring this subject in focus.

7. Does the TVA make a profit and if so, where does the profit go? Is it reinvested, or does it come back to the Treasury?

Whether or not TVA makes a profit depends upon the costs that should properly be included in this Federal operation. As previously indicated, only the power features of the TVA facilities produce revenues in a business sense.

TVA is empowered by section 26 of the act to utilize the proceeds derived from power sales and other sources in the conduct of its power business, in the operation of dams and reservoirs, and in the production and disposition of fertilizers. The net revenue after paying all costs and holding a continuing fund of $1 million for emergency purposes is paid into the general fund of the Treasury by the end of each calendar year. In the past, power projects have been financed both from congressional appropriations and from revenues, under title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1948, however, revenues may not now be expended for construction of new power-producing projects, except for replacement purposes, until such projects have been approved by Congress through the regular appropriations procedure.

From the beginning of TVA in 1933 through the fiscal year 1955, TVA power revenues amounted to $1,017,000,000 with net revenue from operations, or $311 million.

The following table summarizes the financial results of TVA power operations.[5]

[Millions of dollars, 1933 through 1955]

Revenue	1,017
Expenses:	
Operation and maintenance	479
Payments in lieu of taxes	37
Depreciation	190
Total expense	706
Net income before interest	[1] 311
Investment assignable to power (22-year average)	353
Annual return on investment (22-year average)—percent	4

[1] Of the $311 million net income before interest shown above, $10 million has been used to pay interest on bonds, $51 million has been used to retire bonds, and $100 million has been paid into the Federal Treasury as an offset to appropriations previously made. The remainder, $150 million, has been reinvested in power facilities.

8. Does TVA pay taxes—local, State, and Federal?

9. What is the total Government investment in TVA? Will that investment ever be paid off out of earnings?

TVA pays no taxes as such, but makes payments to States and local bodies in lieu of taxes. This subject is covered in some detail under paragraph 5 above.

It is believed pertinent to add the following figures and comparative data from the

[4] Source: Task Force Report, vol. II, p. 492.

[5] Information received from Tennessee Valley Authority, Washington, D. C.

1955 annual report of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

"In the fiscal year 1955, TVA paid a total of $3,878,466 in lieu of taxes, while the payments of the municipal and cooperative systems amounted to $6,192,400. The total of $10,070,866 was 200 percent greater than the total tax payments from electric systems in 1937, when the area was primarily served by private companies. Elsewhere in the Nation similar payments of State and local taxes by private utilities have increased about 185 percent over the same period.

"The total payments of $10,071,000 also amounted to 6.4 percent of the total revenues for power, excepting only that sold to the Federal Government by TVA. In comparison, the State and local taxes of a dozen private utility systems bordering the TVA area averaged 7.9 percent of operating revenues and ranged from 4.8 percent to 11.3 percent."

As of June 30, 1955, the fixed assets of TVA amounted to about $1,775 million, of which $1,721 million related to water control and power and the remainder $54 million to chemical plant and general plant. Approximately 80 percent of the total water control and power fixed assets relate to power, 9 percent to navigation, and 11 percent to flood control.

Power assets at June 30, 1955, totaled about $1,534 million exclusive of general assets not segregated by programs and exclusive of work in progress relating to multiple-use facilities at projects for which an allocation of costs to programs has not been made. Deducting accumulated net power income and certain revenues collected in advance and contributions of about $303 million leaves about $1,231 million which is considered as derived from United States Treasury funds.

The average net investment in completed powerplant during the fiscal year 1955, plus allowances for power inventories, general plant used in power program, and working capital, was approximately $1,130 million. Net revenue from operations for the fiscal year of $47.9 million represented a return of 4.2 percent on the average power investment. At this rate the power investment would be paid off out of earnings in the next 25 years. Inasmuch as the power investment represents the major portion of the total it is entirely possible that the total investment of TVA will be paid off out of power earnings. However, the law requires only that the congressional appropriations for the power facilities be repaid.

Source of figures: Annual Report of TVA, 1955.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, S. 4183, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2618, H. R. 3210.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should like to complete my request first.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, with the understanding that no amendment will be considered unless it be agreed to by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works; that is, other than committee amendments themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request—I did not want to let this occasion pass without expressing my appreciation for the work of the Committee on Government Operations and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who acted as chairman of the subcommittee, appointed by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I know of the hard work he and his associates did on the bill which is being laid aside.

It is a subject in which a great many Members of the Senate have had a great interest for a number of years. I first joined in introducing a bill on the subject of payments in lieu of taxes with the late Senator Taft of Ohio and other Senators. Many other such bills have been introduced.

As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has pointed out in his remarks, the bill, of course, does not go as far as he or his committee or many others of us had hoped it would. However, it seems to us that it goes as far as it is possible to go at this point with the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget and the executive agencies, because of the fact that this is a new field and they feel they need to gain some practical experience in it.

We thought that an arrangement could be worked out whereby some relief could be given and at the same time have a commission appointed which which go into the broader aspects of the problem.

I quite agree with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in his feelings about the whole question of public lands, in light of the situation that in many areas 60 and in some States as much as 80 percent of the land is off the tax rolls. We have the same problem in connection with school districts, and so forth. Those subjects need very urgent consideration by Congress. It appears quite evident that it will not be possible to consider the subject at this session of Congress because of the lateness of the hour.

I hope, however, that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has done so much work—and I am sure the work he has done will be highly beneficial to all of us who desire legislation of this type to be enacted—will get a running start at the beginning of the next session, and that very early in the next session he will hold some hearings on the subject. I say that because I am certain it will be only a short time before Congress and the country and the executive department will realize the necessity of facing and solving the problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank the minority leader for his comment. I am sure that in the next Congress, God willing, I will continue this work. I have indicated before that this is a very technical subject. It is not a subject that is a part of any particular political philosophy. It is something which needs to be done in terms of Federal and State and local government relationships.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not a Republican problem or a Democratic problem. I say to the Senator from South Dakota that it is a matter on which we should not be divided as between urban and rural areas, or metropolitan districts and suburban areas. The problem exists in all the States of the Union, in both rural and metropolitan areas and in both small cities and large cities, as well as in school districts. All have this problem. I feel certain that if we can get more people alerted to the problem and to the studies which have been conducted in connection with it, we will make some progress in solving the problem. It seemed to me that with the studies which had been made it was time to get something underway. However, because of the conditions which confront us at this late hour of the session, it is obvious that action will have to be posponed until next year.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I recognized the fact, when the bill was brought up this afternoon, that the likelihood of its being passed was very remote. I have said, if not publicly, certainly privately to the Senator from South Dakota, that I was very dubious about whether we could get any action on the bill in the House at this session of Congress.

I wish it to be perfectly clear that I am not at all disheartened by the failure to go ahead with the consideration of this proposed legislation. At the same time, I must say that it has been quite a burden over the past 7 years to hold hearings on it. However, I am a persistent fellow, and I can assure friend and foe alike that next year we will be at it again. I look forward to the same kind of help that we have had in the past from the distinguished minority leader and from Members on the other side of the aisle; and perhaps we can have even more help from the Republican side than from the Democratic side.

As the Senator from California has said, this is simply a plain problem of equity and economic justice. It does not have a thing to do with party politics. I shall look forward to getting together with my friend from South Dakota and seeing if we can build a bond of common unity on this particular measure. With his effectiveness directed in the right way, for the right cause, we should be able to pass a bill within 15 minutes after it is brought before the Senate next year.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if this is going to be a temporary burial of the bill, I should like to participate in wording the obituary at this time. I look forward to joining my friend from Minnesota at the next session and working out a more logical legislative approach, and a more equitable distribution of the

benefits if we accept this concept of Federal expenditures. While I think we are making a mistake in not adopting the Mundt-Martin amendment in the nature of a substitute, which we might have done if we had faced it earlier, we can, if this legislation is to be enacted at all, have correspondence with responsible executive officials and get from them something a little bit more definite and illuminating than we now have available.

I was interrupted so unexpectedly by this change in plans, that I left myself in a position where I must continue briefly the argument I was making about this idea of subsidization of socialism. There is an element of danger in it. It does not apply to all features of the bill but it is pertinent to the features of it dealing with federalized industries and commercial enterprises. I was leading up to the point where I expected to develop the argument that we needed to establish some criteria in Congress before this proposed legislation is enacted which would keep it from being a device for subsidizing socialism and which would set up some principles which are so good and so sound that they should be universally applied to the urban and rural areas and suburban areas in all sections of the country, if it is decided they should be adopted at all.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the majority report and our minority views. I urge careful study of this entire subject and of all arguments involved. If we act at all on it next year we should legislate knowingly, carefully and equitably.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, 20 years were spent on a study of this matter, and 7 years have been spent by Congress in trying to solve the problem.

Witnesses representing the American Municipal Association and the County Supervisors Association, appeared at hearings held by the 81st, 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses.

If the Senator from South Dakota has any ideas as to how to improve the measure, I should appreciate his sending them to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota has suggested that if anyone had any suggestions to make to improve the bill they might be sent to the Committee on Government Operations. I inquire, with reference to public lands and public property which the United States holds for public purposes, whether we should not try to find a way to put the lands into private ownership.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I would not want to deny the fact that that may be a very valuable and constructive suggestion. I only suggest that the Senator send his idea to the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States. I think the Senator has a pretty good point. The bill which was originally introduced covered some such suggestion.

Mr. MALONE. I wonder when it became the custom for the Congress of the United States to pass any legislation sent to it by the White House. I think it started 22 years ago. We are carrying on that custom, and I think it is time we stopped it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. This bill was introduced before the White House had a thought on the subject.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is a very arbitrary cutoff date provided in the bill which is before the Senate. I cannot see any justification for such an arbitrary cutoff date. I think attention should be given to the minority views signed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself, especially point 6, which outlines a practical approach. I believe it is vital to arrive at a fair solution of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared with reference to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

Today, in the closing moments of the 84th Congress, we are considering legislation that is vitally important to thousands of our communities. In the past years local governments have been squirming under increasing burdens of taxation. The costs of providing the services rendered by local governments have been increasing. It costs more to send our children to school, to provide for our citizens' safety, and even to dispose of the city's garbage.

Into this picture of increasing costs comes a most disturbing factor. In the face of this tax problem in many areas throughout the country the problem has become more involved because of the activities of the Federal Government.

The crux of the problem we are attacking today was stated in a report filed by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I quote a portion of that report:

"One aspect of the tax relations among governments requiring urgent attention is the immunity of the National Government from State and local taxation and the immunity of State and local governments from Federal taxation. In this area the problem of greatest concern to local governments is the tax status of Federal property. The immunity of federally owned property from State and local ad valorem taxation has reduced the tax base of many communities which rely on property taxes as their chief source of revenue. The impact of this immunity is uneven; it is particularly severe in areas where the value of Federal property is a large part of total property values."

This portion of the Intergovernmental Relations report states the problem briefly and clearly. In many areas the local governments suffer seriously because, although the Federal Government occupies a large part of the taxing base for that community, it benefits from tax immunity. At the same time, of course, the services provided by the local government must be expanded in order to meet the need created by the Federal employees who work on the specified Federal project.

It is unnecessary to cite specific instances proving the seriousness of this problem. It should be noted, however, that in one case at least, the problem became so severe that open conflict between the Federal Government and one local government was threatened. As reported in the County Officer magazine, July–August, 1953, in Cuyahoga Heights, Ohio, the Air Force secured a piece of land in order to build a large manufacturing plant. The removal of this property from the tax rolls of this community of 713 people resulted in a tax loss to this village of $90,000. At the some time it was apparent the services rendered by the community would have to be expanded greatly. For some time the city refused to issue a building permit and at one time the Air Force threatened to build the factory without a permit. Eventually a compromise was worked out, but the threatened incident demonstrates the seriousness of the problem.

Today, I would like to examine one portion of the bill now under debate. I've gone to some length to demonstrate the seriousness of the problem. I've also tried to demonstrate my conviction that the problem is serious and it does need legislative attention. At the same time, however, we must not do, simply for the sake of doing. When you're sick the doctor does not prescribe a pill. He prescribes the right pill. We should be careful today that we are not to overwhelmed by the illness that we operate without diagnosis.

A good bill should meet two tests. Is it necessary? Will it correct the need without harmful effects on any group? Certainly this bill meets the first criterion—it is needed. I have my serious doubts about the second criterion, however, if the bill is accepted as written.

That portion of the bill I want to examine carefully is the provision that establishes the cutoff date as June 30, 1950. In order to qualify for payments in lieu of taxes, the community involved must prove financial hardship occuring after June 30, 1950.

Several witnesses that appeared before the committee traced the historical development of this problem. During most of the history of our country this was not a problem. In our early days the national Government owned the overwhelming majority of our land. Very little of the Federally owned land was located in a community taxable area, however. Our local government developed in a historical setting where property was being added constantly to the tax rolls. As Mr. Claude E. Porter, the past president of the Michigan Municipal League pointed out in the hearings, the starting time for the tremendous expansion of Federal ownership came when our country started to enlarge and expand its national defense program. For that reason September 8, 1939, was set by the study committee as the fair and equitable cutoff date.

Why, then, was June 30, 1950, selected by the majority report as the cutoff date? The report uses this language:

"The June 30, 1950, cutoff date was chosen because this date would cover the increased Federal acquisition of real property of this type, incident to the Korean War. In addition, it will serve to keep the cost of this program within reasonable bounds."

Mr. President, no one in this chamber is more dedicated to sane spending than I. No one in this Chamber was more pleased with the recent news of a balanced budget than I. During the last few days a great share of my time has been occupied by another matter where I am doing my utmost to secure legislation that will eliminate a $500 million loss in revenue to the Post Office Department—$500 million that will have to be taken from our Treasury if we do not pass this legislation. I, too, want to keep the program we are discussing today

within reasonable bounds. But I also want to be fair.

For example, take the hypothetical case of community "X." Perhaps the Federal Government came into this community in 1940 when we were expanding tremendously our national defense program. Perhaps the Federal Government found it necessary to build a factory in community "X" to implement our war effort. Perhaps the tax problems of this community have been increased greatly because a substantial portion of the taxrolls of the community now belong to the Federal Government and the cloak of tax immunity has been drawn around the factory. For 16 years this community has lived with this problem.

The hypothetical situation we have created meets all the criteria. Community X can prove financial hardship and distress. The taxpayers of the community have suffered from an unreasonable tax burden. The property held by the Federal Government fits the limited designation of commercial or industrial property as described in the bill. This is the identical problem the bill is created to meet, except—and this is a big except for community X—except the acquisition of property by the Federal Government occurring before 1950.

Does this make the problem any less for community X? If we pass this bill as written today, will community X be able to look forward to easier times? Is it any easier to bear a burden created in 1939 than it is to bear a burden created in 1950? This is a philosophy I cannot accept. This is a philosophy that if a man has been blind for some time he is accustomed to his blindness and therefore shouldn't be helped to regain his sight.

There are hundreds and hundreds of community X's across the country. For example, look at San Diego County, California. 54 percent of the assessable area of that county is owned by the Federal Government. Yet Mr. Arthur Eddy, the county assessor of San Diego County, testified that if the 1950 cutoff date applies, not one piece of property would be helped by this act. Practically all of the expansion of the Federal Government into San Diego occurred before 1950. Here is a county where over half of the land is tax immune because of Federal ownership. Here is a county that is an ideal example of the situation we are trying to correct. Here also is a county that won't be helped in any way by the bill as written because the injury occurred before June 30, 1950.

Before long we will be closing the doors on this session of Congress. We will be going back home to report to the people we represent on the accomplishments of this Congress. Perhaps community X is in your State. Perhaps you represent the citizens of community X. How will you explain to them what we contemplate doing today? How will you explain to them that their neighboring community will be qualified to receive payment in lieu of taxes because that community has suffered since 1950, but in community X where the financial suffering has been extended over a longer period of years, Congress offered no relief? How will you justify this pick-and-choose approach of Congress? What will you say?

There are other portions of this bill that disturb me. I cannot justify in my own mind the arbitrary selection of industrial and commercial property as the only criterion to which these payments will apply. I cannot justify the absolute exclusion of rural land, of grazing land, of game refuges. This, too, seems an unfair exclusion.

I am not proposing we change the date from June 30, 1950, to September 8, 1939, or to any other date. It is my contention, however, that this time problem is indicative of the entire problem. The approach of this bill to a very complex problem is the quick step in the dark approach. I am firmly convinced that there is another alternative—a better choice. The amendment that is in the nature of a substitute to be offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and myself contemplates a careful study of this problem. It substitutes careful study for hasty and perhaps unwise action. It recognizes the disease, but it also recognizes that the right cure must be found, not just any cure. It offers a realistic approach to a complex problem.

I support with my full conviction this amendment.

AWARD OF MEDAL TO REPRESENTATIVE BARRATT O'HARA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 12396.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12396) to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill involves an award for valiant service in the Spanish-American War. The recipient fought with great courage and bravery on the side of Cuba, and this is an award given by the Cuban Republic.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to the statement made by the very eminent senior Senator from Georgia.

Private O'Hara enlisted in the United States Army at the age of 16. I think perhaps his statement concerning his age may not have been quite accurate, and that he was younger than he said. After many years the Cuban Government recognizes his services and is rewarding him for military service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to observe that I am very happy that the Senate has just passed a bill in behalf of Mr. O'HARA. I think the senior Senator from Illinois is deserving of an award, because I have never known a man to be more diligent than he has been in this particular situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3468) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2379) to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline Corbett.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6586) to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The consideration of House bill 3210.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Chair had recognized me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, H. R. 3210, was passed by the House last July by a vote of 316 to 74. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works held 2 days of hearings, and by a unanimous vote from both parties reported the bill favorably to the full committee. Similarly, the Committee on Public Works recommended the passage of the bill. So the bill comes to the Senate with the overwhelming vote of the House and with the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Works.

I observe on the floor the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who presided with great ability over the hearings. I hope that later he will take the floor and describe his attitude about the bill.

Mr. President, H. R. 3210 would provide authority for the State of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway at an additional annual average rate of 1,000 cubic feet per second. Since 1938 the diversion by the Chicago Sanitary District from Lake Michigan has been at a rate of an annual average of 1,500 cubic feet per second.

This was a sharp reduction from the figure of between 8,000 to 10,000 cubic feet per second which was diverted be-

fore the decision of Chief Justice Hughes. The present bill permits a rate providing a total annual average of not more than 2,500 cubic feet a second.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works and the full committee took action on the bill. There is no objection whatsoever to its passage.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

There is a real need for the benefits provided by this bill. The health and welfare of the equivalent of 5½ million people residing within the service area of the Chicago Sanitary District must be seriously considered. Population increases in this area are stated to be at a rate of 55,000 per year.

The functioning of the Chicago Sanitary District is one of the finest in sanitary engineering. The increased demands of an expanding population requires an equal expansion of facilities of this type including the expanded need for water.

The waterways of the Chicago, Des Plaines, Calumet, and Illinois Rivers extend in a northeast-southwest direction across the broad expanses of the State of Illinois. These waterways provide an ever-increasing volume of commercial water traffic from the Mississippi River through Chicago and the Great Lakes. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway will greatly increase the traffic on these Illinois water routes.

The present flow of water through the Chicago Sanitary District treatment facilities leaves the water with an inadequate supply of oxygen which is necessary for fish life and an excess of nitrogen, which causes rapid growth of algae and other micro-organisms harmful to navigation and the maintenance of a clear, unpolluted stream of water. More water is needed.

Adequate safeguards have been added to this bill which were not present in previous bills. They are, first, a limitation of not more than 5,000 cubic feet per second at any time, or twice the average; second, the Secretary of the Army shall at all times have direct control and supervision of the amount of water directly diverted from Lake Michigan; and, third, prohibition of the diversion of water into the Illinois Waterway during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers.

To demonstrate more specifically the change in the once-voiced opposition to water diversion from Lake Michigan by downstate communities I want to point out that I have recently received several letters from local businessmen, individuals, and from the Peoria Association of Commerce stating that their former objections to this legislation are withdrawn and that they now support the bill because of the safeguards incorporated in the bill and because of their desire for the benefits of increased water for better navigation, a cleaner river, and a possible enhancement of their underground water supply.

The bill provides for a study by the Secretary of the Army as soon as possible after the date of enactment to determine the effect on Lake Michigan water levels and on the Illinois Waterway of the increased diversion. This assures safeguards which will prevent excessive use of the waters of Lake Michigan. Downstate communities are assured of protection against flooding of their communities by the constant control and supervision required of the Secretary of the Army in the use of the additional water with maximum diversion rates established in the bill during normal and flood stages. This bill in my opinion deserves the favorable consideration of the Members of the Senate.

Testimony and documentary evidence produced before the House and Senate committees demonstrated there is no real basis for the expressed fear of lowered lake levels throughout the Great Lakes Basin with attendant lighter vessel loads. An interim report, dated June 14, 1955, prepared by the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers to the International Joint Commission has now been published. This report concludes that additional water diversion at Chicago would produce the following effects:

1. There would be a temporary reduction in lake levels with a maximum of five-eighths of 1 inch over a period of 15 years in Lakes Huron and Michigan and a reduction of three-eighths inch in the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.

2. This reduction would have no significant effect upon navigation.

The study prepared by the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers, June 14, 1955, includes the following:

The effect on navigation expressed as maximum lowering of levels in inches at critical points is shown in the following tabulation:

	Maximum reduction in levels in inches
Lower St. Marys River	5/8
Harbors on Lakes Michigan-Huron	5/8
St. Clair River	5/8
Detroit River	3/8
Harbors on Lake Erie	3/8
Upper end—Welland Canal	3/8
Lower end—Welland Canal	3/8
Harbors on Lake Ontario	3/8
St. Lawrence River above International Rapids Section	3/8
Lake St. Louis	1/4
Montreal Harbor	3/8

The above minor lowering of levels could have no effect on the loading of vessels.

In addition, and perhaps the major factor in the 1954 Presidential veto of H. R. 3300, a bill having similar provisions for water diversion from Lake Michigan, is the objection of our Canadian friends. Their original objection was predicated upon three points:

First. Potential reduction of power in the Niagara River at International Rapids.

Second. Adverse effect upon navigation through the Great Lakes, and

Third. A recommendation that congressional action should await the report of the International Joint Commission created under article IX of the Treaty of 1909. The report of the Lake Ontario Board of Engineers has been published. The report clearly answers the objections advanced by the Canadian Government.

I know it has been said that this is merely an interim report, and that we should wait for the final report of the International Joint Commission. My office communicated with the acting chairman of the International Joint Commission, Mr. McWhorter. I understand he has assured us that the interim report is as final a report as any which we will get on the effect of lake diversion.

Historically, the amounts of water diverted at Chicago have been determined by the United States unilaterally, through the Supreme Court or the Secretary of War, without regard for negotiations with Canada.

There is a very real reason for this, for under the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909, Lake Michigan is not considered as "boundary water," since it lies wholly within the United States, and is a considerable distance removed from the Canadian border.

The map at the back of the Chamber shows that Lake Michigan stops at the Straits of Mackinac. The Straits of Mackinac are quite a distance from the international boundary, which runs through Lake Huron. Thus, Lake Michigan lies completely within the United States, and is not a part of international boundary waters.

A legal opinion prepared by the Chicago Bar Association dated March 1, 1955, covering this problem, reaches four conclusions:

First. Congress has power under the commerce clause of the constitution to authorize the additional diversion.

Second. Authorization of additional diversion would not violate the constitutional barrier to giving a preference to the ports of any State.

Third. The power of Congress to authorize increased diversion is not affected by the fact that the Supreme Court has in the past considered the subject matter and has retained jurisdiction to modify its decree.

Fourth. Congressional action authorizing additional diversion at Chicago would not violate the mandatory provisions of the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 or the Niagara Treaty of 1950.

I might say in this connection, that when Elihu Root testified before the Foreign Relations Committee at the time the 1909 treaty was under consideration, he said that the definition of boundary waters was "carefully drawn in order to exclude Lake Michigan." I think that should make a great appeal to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], a distinguished graduate of Hamilton College, because Elihu Root was one of the most distinguished graduates of that college. I know the opinion of Secretary Root should therefore have a controlling influence upon the opinion of his fellow Hamiltonian and my good friend, the senior Senator from New York.

A significant fact which should be kept in mind in considering the use of the waters of the Great Lakes Basin for the development of hydroelectric power between Canada and the United States is the Long Lake-Ogoki water diversion into Lake Superior. This diversion has been at an average rate of 5,000 cubic

feet per second by the Canadian Government since 1940, with attendant hydroelectric power development.

The Canadians have changed the direction of the waterflow which formerly went into Hudson Bay from Ogoki River by dams that reverse the flow into Lake Superior. This flow from Long Lake means there is an authorized diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second, which creates additional hydroelectric power development, not only on the spot, but further downstream—an amount which is twice as much as we are asking for diversion into the Illinois River.

Upon inquiry, it developed that Canada is not merely diverting the 5,000 cubic feet a second to which she is entitled under the international agreement, but she is diverting an additional quantity as well.

I inquired of Mr. McWhorter, the Acting Chairman of the United States Section of the International Joint Commission, and I received a letter dated July 13, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION,
Washington D. C., July 13, 1956.

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Reference is made to the hearing this forenoon on your and Senator DIRKSEN'S bill, S. 2550, and to my answer to your question regarding the physical possibility of diverting more water than a yearly average of 5,000 cubic feet per second from the Albany River watershed into Lake Superior through the Ogoki and Long Lake works constructed by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

I stated my understanding that more than 5,000 cubic feet per second and possibly 6,000 cubic feet per second could be diverted into Lake Superior through those works. I am pleased to inform you that the record shows that during the calendar year 1946, the Long Lake diversion averaged 1,576 cubic feet per second, and the Ogoki diversion averaged 4,648 cubic feet per second, the combined average diversion during that year being 6,224 cubic feet per second.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER B. MCWHORTER,
Acting Chairman, United States Section.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in that letter he wrote:

The record shows that during the calendar year 1946 the Long Lakes diversion averaged 1,576 cubic feet a second, and the Ogoki diversion averaged 4,648 cubic feet a second—

Or 1,200 cubic feet more than Canada was entitled to under the international agreement.

We are asking for only an additional 1,000 cubic feet a second, which means that there would be no lowering whatsoever of lake levels from those which would be created if Canada held to its legal limit of 5,000 cubic feet a second. Their extra 1,200 feet would more than compensate for our extra 1,000.

Furthermore, although I am not fully acquainted with the topography of the north country, I think it is true that additional water could be diverted from the Ogoki River, and thus, from Hudson Bay, and sent into Lake Superior, so that the slight effect of this diversion would be more than neutralized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Illinois thinking in terms of navigation or power? Does he understand that our agreement with Canada provides that, if waters from the northern rivers are diverted into the Great Lakes system, all the power which might be developed from such diversion belongs to Canada, not the United States, whereas all the power which is diverted out of the lakes and goes down into rivers is taken away from the good people in the northeastern section of our country?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not take the position that the sole and exclusive function of the drainage area of the Great Lakes is to provide power for New York and New England. I helped get the St. Lawrence seaway project enacted into law. I voted for the development of the Niagara power project. I hope the Senator does not think that the sole function of the Great Lakes is to supply water in order that New York and Vermont may reap the benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. It certainly is a very important function. When 2,500 second-feet are permitted to be lost, it means that a lot of potential power is lost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That seems to be the typical eastern attitude, which is that the Midwest should be milked by the East—that we are simply to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the New York Power Authority.

Mr. AIKEN. The people in the area of the State of the Senator from Illinois are certainly trying to be drawers of water, all right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Vermont, since his State is getting 100,000 kilowatts out of the development of the St. Lawrence, says that nobody else should have any of this water; that the water must be pledged to Vermont and New York. That is also the argument of Robert Moses.

Mr. AIKEN. That is 100,000 kilowatts which the State of Illinois would draw from power which would go to the people of Vermont.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact, the amount of power which would be lost would be only about 1½ percent of the total amount of power at Niagara.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the flow of the Niagara River?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know that I can give the flow in cubic feet, but, as the Senator knows, about 2 million kilowatts are generated. I think the loss will be only about 1½ percent of that.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that during the 3-year period which would be authorized by the bill there would not be a single kilowatt of power lost to Niagara or St. Lawrence because, in the first place, there is not now being used half of the water that is flowing there, and, in the second place, the persons concerned would not be in a position to use more of it during the 3-year period which the bill provides as an experimental proposition for the city of Chicago and the Sanitary District of Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to thank my friend from Oklahoma for putting the case cogently indeed. If New York and Vermont object, they will be playing dog in the manger. They are not going to utilize the power for themselves and during the 3-year experimental period they will not permit Chicago to use it.

Mr. AIKEN. We intend to generate power at Niagara.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was at Niagara last fall. I spent 2 days there. I am a strong believer in that project, but——

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from Illinois give us assurance that if at the end of 3 years the diversion of water, during a low-water period, is proved to have a deleterious effect on the Great Lakes Basin, Illinois will gracefully and gladly surrender the 2,500 second-feet?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Board of Engineers finds that on the whole this diversion is having a bad effect upon the economy and upon the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin, they can so make that decision.

If such a decision is well backed up, I am sure we will not ask for the extension.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask another question. If the State of Illinois is asking for this 2,500 second-feet of water during a low-water period, would not the State of Illinois, in a spirit of compromise, be willing to take the 2,500 second-feet of water during a high-water period?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We want this water primarily for health purposes. We cannot limit ourselves to 1,500 second-feet of water during the low-water season.

Mr. AIKEN. I doubt that a great deal of extra water for sanitary purposes would be needed in New England and the Northeastern States; but we would like the water for the generation of power and possibly for navigation purposes, although power is what I am primarily interested in, because, as the Senator from Illinois knows, any water diverted from the Great Lakes by Canada, for instance, would simply be used there, and we would not be able to use any of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Water diverted by Canada from Hudson Bay to the Great Lakes has an effect on the level of the lakes. It raises the level more than the Chicago diversion would lower it.

The lake shippers oppose this bill—which is absurd, because it would merely result in a change of between three-eighths of an inch and five-eighths of an inch in the lake level. So, from the point of view of navigation, the Canadian diversion is not very important.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say regarding the bill. I hope it will be passed.

I will welcome any remarks on the bill by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who took the testimony on the bill, and understands it very well.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I think this bill should be passed by the Senate.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, the bill was passed by the House by a

majority of approximately 3 or 4 or 5 to 1.

The bill was approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Public Works, following extensive hearings. The bill is supported by both the Senators from Illinois.

Mr. President, this bill, if enacted, will harm no one. In Lake Michigan there is a variation in the water level of between 5 feet and 6 feet over what seems to be a regular cycle of different water levels, covering a period of years. In other words, at times there is a difference of from 5 feet to 6 feet in the water level of Lake Michigan.

If this bill were put into effect and if no additional water were diverted into Lake Superior by Canada, the effect of the bill would be to make a difference of about one-half inch in the water level of Lake Michigan. The water level of Lake Michigan already is affected to the extent of nearly 6 feet by the running of the cycle of different water levels.

So the enactment of this bill would harm no one.

Enactment of the bill is a necessity for the health of approximately 6 million to 8 million persons at the present time, and a population which probably will increase 10 million in the matter of a few years.

It has been said that Canada objects to the bill. Mr. President, Canada has no more say regarding the waters of Lake Michigan than she has regarding the waters of the Chattahoochee, the Suwannee, the Arkansas, or the Tennessee Rivers. No part of Lake Michigan is within miles of the Dominion of Canada; and in my judgment, it would be a voluntary surrender of sovereignty for the United States Government to ask the Government of Canada—much as we respect and admire the Canadians, and great as is our affection for them—whether Canada has a position regarding what the United States of America and the State of Illinois do with the waters of Lake Michigan. It would be similar to the following situation Mr. President: If you owned a home and a farm in the county in Kentucky in which you lived, and if you wished to sell that property, and if your wife was willing to sign the deed to it, and if then you were to say, "Well, now, let us wait and see whether we can find some citizen in Illinois or in Oklahoma who might object to this; we will not sell it until we address a letter 'To Whom It May Concern,' and request their reaction to our proposal to sell this land, which is exclusively ours, and no part of which is theirs."

Mr. President, 20 years ago Canada decided that she wished to divert some waters in the area north of Lake Superior, into the Great Lakes system, instead of permitting the water to continue to flow into Hudson Bay. Canada wished to develop a power project or two north of Lake Superior. Canada simply made the installation, and started diverting between 1,500 and 5,000 cubic feet of water a second into Lake Superior. So far as the record shows, Mr. President, I was unable to find from our State Department or from the representatives of the International Boundary Commission that Canada ever took up with anyone in the United States the matter of whether the United States had a position on that subject, although Lake Superior is recognized as being an international body of water, with reference to which the United States has as much interest, control, and jurisdiction as has Canada.

After Canada had begun to divert between 2,000 and 5,000 cubic feet of water a second, someone suggested to her that, since Lake Superior is an international body of water, she should talk to the United States about it. Canada did so; and there was reached an agreement by which Canada was to be permitted to divert approximately 5,000 cubic feet of water a second into Lake Superior. However, the record shows that Canada diverts an average of approximately 6,000 cubic feet of water a second into Lake Superior, under the terms of the agreement whereby Canada was to divert 5,000 cubic feet of water a second.

The record also shows that Canada would like to divert more water, because in doing so she would be able to generate electricity at some hydroelectric facilities. But no agreement for Canada to divert more water has been reached, because additional diversion would adversely affect the level of the Great Lakes, by withdrawing too much water from them.

The Senator from Vermont says his State has a power interest in this water. Perhaps Vermont has; I do not know. However, Mr. President, in the West, no man has a claim to water unless he has established it. One cannot dream or envision or speculate an interest in water, even though the water is adjacent to his own property, until he has begun to use it. That is the law of the river.

I would suppose that Vermont is approximately 500 miles or more from Lake Michigan. It is a fantasy, Mr. President, for Vermont to say she has a vested interest in the waters of Lake Michigan, which is wholly within the State of Illinois and one or two adjacent or boundary States.

There is a health problem in the sanitary district of Chicago. Three hundred million dollars has already been spent there on sewage-disposal facilities, which have been developed to the highest point of efficiency that modern science can devise. In the operation of those facilities it has become apparent that there is necessity for an additional amount of fresh water, because, although they can purify the effluent from the disposal plants to the point where there is no poisonous matter in it, in the process the nitrogen content becomes so high that the oxygen content is practically eliminated; and vegetation grows luxuriantly, but animal life dies. So an additional quantity of fresh water is required, and the source of it is immediately available and adjacent, and it can be taken without harming anyone, without dispossessing any community, State, or country, of a single vested interest. Therefore the Committee on Public Works unanimously approved the bill.

Let us assume, by some stretch of the imagination, or by the indulgence of a fiction, that Vermont had an interest in the waters of Lake Michigan. I would be afraid to have the Senate establish such a thing as a precedent. The western half of Oklahoma has about 20 inches average annual rainfall, and some of it eventually finds its way into the Atlantic Ocean. I would be disturbed and distressed if our great friends from Florida, Georgia, North and South Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland should say, "Throughout countless generations that water has flowed down the rivers of Oklahoma, then into the Arkansas and the Red, and into the Mississippi, thence into the Gulf of Mexico, where it is commingled with the Gulf Stream, which finds it way out of the Gulf of Mexico, travels north and then east, eventually bathing the shores of sunny France and the British Isles." If Vermont has a claim to water from Lake Michigan that she has never used, we might create an international incident, and our great friends in Ireland might come before the United Nations and say, "You cannot build reservoirs in southeastern Oklahoma or southwestern Arkansas, because, who knows—it might diminish the flow of the Gulf Stream, with its warmth and lifegiving properties which we have enjoyed and possessed throughout the centuries."

But even if we were to indulge in such a fiction, Vermont has not used that water and cannot use it in the 3-year experimental period provided for in this legislation.

Therefore I end where I started, with the proposition that this legislation harms no one. It serves a purpose on the part of the Sanitary District of Chicago, rightly conceived and worthily pursued, a purpose with respect to which, in my judgment, Chicago comes here on the basis of what she is entitled to.

I did not expect to consume so much of the time of the Senate. There have been times in my association with the distinguished Senator from Illinois when I could not, by as wild a flight of the imagination as that indulged by the Senator from Vermont, have pictured myself in the position of supporting his proposal with such vigor. Justice, and justice alone guides me in what I have said in support of this legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me remind my friend from Oklahoma that justice may be guiding him, but the struggle for justice deserves friendship and that I will accord.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened with amusement and some benefit of instruction to the remarkable statements I have heard in relation to the particular issue before us.

Let me phrase the issue as the President of the United States phrased it when he vetoed the last bill, because, to me, his statement simplifies and does not throw any fog into the issue we are discussing. The President said:

I am unable to approve the bill because—

1. Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois waterway and Mississippi River.

2. The methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion.

3. The diversions are authorized without reference to negotiation with Canada; and

4. The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No; let me continue. Then I shall be glad to open myself to questions.

This particular bill was introduced in the Senate in July 1955. A report on the bill was received from Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Morton said:

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report and that the enactment of this proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President since its considers the reasons for the President's memorandum of disapproval of H. R. 3300, 83d Congress, remain valid.

Let us see what the bill does. We have heard it said that it would grant certain power to the Secretary. The bill provides:

Authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army—

To do what? To divert a flow up to 5,000 cubic feet per second.

I have heard it estimated that 5,000 cubic feet would fill this Chamber. That amount of diversion is proposed, in addition to what is being taken. It would go into this particular channel.

As shown on the map, along Lake Michigan there are the States of Michigan and Wisconsin, and to the south a little of Indiana and a little of Illinois. That is the greatest watershed in the world. Engineers, of course, recognize what it would mean if we interfered with the level of the water.

There is pending now a bill which would authorize the expenditure of money for connecting channels of the Great Lakes. We know very well that the ships which come into the Great Lakes and go to the port of Chicago—and Chicago has spent millions of dollars to create what might be called a sea harbor in the middle of the Nation—would be faced with the situation that there would be taken from the waterway up to 5,000 cubic feet a second.

North of Chicago, on Lake Michigan, in my State, we have some beautiful harbors. There is Milwaukee and Green Bay and Port Washington, and others. We have made some appropriations lately, and Milwaukee last year had to spend some money to deepen its harbor. It was not only my personal objection to the bill in committee, but, in spite of the fact as the report shows, that the opponents had the testimony of experts, they insisted on going ahead with the bill.

I will read from the report:

Opponents of the diversion discussed the possible adverse effect on lake shipping, especially since the lakes are now entering a cycle of declining lake levels, and the relationship of such diversion with the Boundary Treaty with Canada and the decree of the United States Supreme Court.

In spite of what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has said, there is a boundary treaty in effect with Canada.

I read further from the report:

Officials of lake cities and legal advisers of the States of Wisconsin, Ohio, and New York filed their objections to the bill.

However, the persuasive and eloquent arguments of the distinguished Senators from Illinois, one a Democrat and one a Republican, apparently swayed the committee.

This unwarranted bill would sanction—I repeat, would sanction—increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan down the Chicago Sanitary Canal, to the detriment of the Nation. I have fought the bill in the past, and I oppose it now.

PREVIOUS BILL H. R. 3300

This bill has highly disturbing history.

Most recently, as we all know, a similar bill, H. R. 3300, passed in the closing hours of the 83d Congress. Fortunately it was vetoed by the President.

The President specified four vigorous objections to the bill. Not one of these objections has been successfully answered by proponents of this latest version of this dangerous bill.

To be sure, they have amended it somewhat. They have added some sugar coating. But it is still the same bitter pill underneath.

That is why I wrote to the Senate Public Works Committee to oppose the latest version.

SERIOUSLY AFFECTS WISCONSIN

My own State of Wisconsin knows full well what the lowering of lake levels can mean to us in serious losses. A loss of a single inch of draft for shipping means a loss of 72 millon tons in carrying capacity on the Great Lakes in 1 year. Over a 2-year period the port of Milwaukee alone has been compelled to spend $50,000 to dredge the channels in order to permit ships entering Milwaukee Harbor to unload their cargo at docks with the same ease as they unloaded during the higher waters of 1952.

The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character. The State of Illinois has no right to usurp a function which is the common interest of Wisconsin and other Lakes States. The well-being of the antipollution work of the Chicago Sanitary Canal is important, but certainly not to the exclusion of all other interests along the lakes.

BILL UNJUSTIFIABLE

I believe this is an unjustifiable attempt by one State to arbitrarily act so as to compromise the interests, not only of other States surrounding the Great Lakes, but the relationships with our good neighbor to the north, Canada.

Water levels on the lake are, of course, a critical affair—rising and falling. Therefore, the most expert cooperation—on a long-range basis—is essential among all 7 States and 2 nations adjoining the lakes, if work on the lake levels is to prove satisfactory to all concerned.

Arbitrary, one-sided action—in contrast to carefully planned, well-coordinated action—can prove exceedingly harmful to property owners, to shipping sources, and other interests all along the lakes.

Why penalize the people of Wisconsin or of other States to pay for increased dredging costs, and to suffer shipping losses, just to serve some special interests of Illinois?

Wisconsin, together with other Lake States, has consistently and vigorously opposed this legislation. It is completely repugnant to the best interests of the entire lake area.

This proposal is "special-interest" legislation at its worst. It is legislation which runs contrary to a historic and binding Supreme Court decision, contrary to the letter and spirit of our treaty agreement with Canada, and contrary to the needs of the peoples adjoining the lakes.

There is every reason for defeating this proposed legislation, and no good reason for passing it.

PRESIDENT VETOED SIMILAR BILL IN 83D CONGRESS

President Eisenhower's wise veto of a previous version of it is an indication that the executive branch clearly recognizes how important are the issues at stake in defeating this unsound proposal.

I hope the Senate will not send the bill down to the White House again—for still another veto—which would be well-merited.

HOUSE ACTION ON BILL

Regarding the background of the bill, I want to point out some unusual circumstances surrounding the progress of H. R. 3210 in the Congress.

For example, when this bill was considered by the House of Representatives, there were no committee hearings available for the Members of the House to read.

Furthermore, there was no report by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of State, or the Bureau of the Budget.

Unfortunately these reports and evaluations were not available at all when the bill came up.

Yet somehow it was smoothly engineered throughout the House.

ACTION IN SENATE

Now it has come up in the Senate. It is no small or trivial matter. If enacted, it may have serious effect on our Great Lakes and other interstate commerce. The resulting adverse effect on shipping, increase of cost of harbor dredging, and loss in power to the generating plants now operating in the Great Lakes area are significant factors to be considered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have order? The Senator from Wisconsin is delivering a very important speech. I am sitting very close to the Senator, but it is difficult for me to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILEY. On power alone, for example, there would be loss of energy at the following places:

First. At the United States Niagara River plant;

Second. At the Canadian Niagara River plants;

Third. At the United States units of Bernhart Island powerhouse in the St. Lawrence River;

Fourth. At the Canadian units of the Bernhart Island powerhouse in the St. Lawrence River; and

Fifth. At the International Rapids section.

AFFECT THE WHOLE NATION

Furthermore, an undesirable precedent would be established by which water may be diverted from any rivers and waterways.

In the great Northwest, for example, diversion of water would not only affect sources of power, but would have an adverse effect upon the salmon, and other fishing industries.

Moreover, every State on an interstate waterway may be subject to similar diversions of water—if this water steal is allowed to establish a precedent.

The proponents of this bill have indicated that they have soothed the concern of our Canadian neighbors over the amount of water to be stolen from the Great Lakes. They have indicated that they have entered into informal negotiations with Canada to alleviate her fears over the lowering of water levels in Lake Ontario and other Great Lakes.

I do not believe that the State of Illinois has authority to enter into such negotiations, when the interests are national and international in scope.

The history of this bill has shown that there was really no one for it, except some groups in the State of Illinois.

CONCLUSION

I should like to reiterate some of the factors which testify against the enactment of this kind of legislation:

First. It would be detrimental to the shipping commerce on the Great Lakes.

Second. It would result in increased cost of harbor development and maintenance throughout the lakes region.

Third. It would have an adverse effect on the lakes trading and greatly reduce the benefits which may be desired from our development of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

Fourth. It would result in a tremendous loss of power generated by our Great Lakes powerplants—both Canadian and American.

Fifth. It would endanger our international relations with our good neighbor, Canada, by adversely affecting the water level for lake transportation.

Sixth. It would set an undesirable precedent by which this kind of self-interest diversion might seriously interfere with, and impair, our Great Lakes and interstate commerce.

For these very sound reasons I am hopeful that the leaders of the Senate may refuse to bring up for final vote such an undesirable piece of self-interest legislation at all.

If passed by the Senate, I shall again urge the President—by every good means—to again veto this dangerous proposal in the national interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator inform this body of the date of the veto message by the President?

Mr. WILEY. I do not think I quite caught the Senator's question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Wisconsin inform this body of the date on which the President vetoed the measure?

Mr. WILEY. I am looking at the report of the committee, and I quoted from that report. I think it must have been September 3, 1954.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Is it not true that it was not until June of the following year that the interim report was made to the international joint commission which showed that the maximum reduction of lake levels on Lakes Michigan and Huron would be five-eighths of an inch, and on Lake Ontario three-eighths of an inch, after a period of years had passed? What the Senator is saying is that the project should be held up lest the level of Lake Michigan be reduced by five-eighths of an inch, whereas the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out that there is a cyclical fluctuation of 6 feet in the water level. For some curious reason, lake shippers think the loss of half an inch would diminish the amount of cargo they can carry. That is perfectly ridiculous. I remind my friend from Wisconsin that while Milwaukee is a splendid city, and we love it, Chicago has several times more water transportation than has Milwaukee. We do not want to hurt the port of Chicago or the port of Milwaukee, and this will not injure either. The people of Wisconsin are seeing bogies that do not exist.

Mr. WILEY. I think I know my people in Wisconsin pretty well. While we love the people of Illinois, we are kind of glad, sometimes, that a part of Wisconsin is now a part of Illinois. Chicago was once a part of Wisconsin Territory.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very happy that that is true.

Mr. WILEY. Then we are both happy. We are separated by a mere line.

The report of which the Senator speaks—what was the date of that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 14th of June, 1955, or 9 months after the President vetoed the bill, based upon completely erroneous information.

Mr. WILEY. After that, there was a letter, which is printed in the report, from Donald R. Belcher, dated June 24, 1955, in which he says, among other things:

> However, it is understood that the results of these studies will not be available before next year. The President stated in his memorandum of disapproval that reasonable opportunity to complete the surveys should be afforded before legislative action is undertaken.

So, this letter was written after the so-called report of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. President, I was unfortunate in not being able to appear before the committee, though I filed my objection and reported, also, the objections of my State. I understand that engineers have testified on several occasions; and on another occasion, when the port of Chicago attempted to take water from the lake, the Supreme Court of the United States spoke very clearly and definitely as to the rights of the citizens of my State and the other States in connection with the matter. That decision still stands. There is now an effort made to do that which I think would be detrimental to our good relationship, as well as to the rights of the people using the Great Lakes, and the people of my own State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the time Chief Justice Hughes rendered his decision we were diverting between eight and ten thousand cubic feet a second. I think that was a somewhat larger amount than we should have diverted at that time. As a result of the decision handed down by Chief Justice Hughes we have spent $312 million to install sanitary disposal works, and we have today the best sanitary disposal works of any large city in the Nation.

There is, however, a nitrogen residue which cannot be eliminated, which, if washed downstream, kills off fish life and breeds micro-organisms. The additional 1,000 feet will provide sufficient oxygen, so that it will purify the river. That is the real point. It will increase the oxygen content of the water so that the nitrogen will not kill fishlife, and so that the water will not be a breeding place for micro-organisms.

Mr. WILEY. Why does the Senator have in the bill a maximum diversion not exceeding a flow of 5,000 cubic feet?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The average is 1,500 cubic feet now.

Mr. WILEY. But it is sought to bring it up to 5,000 cubic feet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are asking for an additional average of 1,000 cubic feet per second, or an average of 2,500 feet. There are certain seasons in the year, particularly in the summertime, when the flow of water in the Illinois River is low. We wish to divert more, keeping within the yearly average of 2,500 cubic feet, but we provide that it shall never exceed twice the yearly average.

Mr. WILEY. When the Senator says they are taking 1,500 cubic feet now, that seems to be permissible; but in fact, it is 2,500 cubic feet. Then it is stated in the bill that there is a maximum of 5,000 cubic feet. That is kind of overreaching, and it is not "cricket." It means that at any time they can take up to 5,000 cubic feet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But that is within the yearly average of 2,500. Does the Senator from Wisconsin think we can always fall below our average and never exceed it?

Mr. WILEY. The average is 1,500 cubic feet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The average we want is 2,500 cubic feet.

Mr. WILEY. And also 5,000 cubic feet, in addition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only in the summer months when the flow of water in the Illinois River is low.

Mr. IVES. Is not that the time when the water in the Great Lakes is low?

Mr. WILEY. I suppose in the summertime the water is low even in Illinois, when it is low in the Great Lakes.

I realize that we are all fighting for our own personal interests. But I think something more is involved than merely the interest of Wisconsin or Illinois. As the President so succinctly and almost

dramatically stated in his veto message. We must not overlook this issue.

Second, while we have heard it said that the diversion will be 2,500 feet, and the bill provides for the maximum diversion, we know that people of Illinois will take the maximum every time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The diversion is to be under the supervision of the Army Engineers. If the average run is above 2,500 feet, they will give directions to shut off the flow of the water.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think that is what the bill provides, in substance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It certainly does say so. The diversion will be under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, who has jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that Milwaukee is growing faster than Chicago? This will be a permanent situation, as I view it. The larger Milwaukee grows, the more water it will need.

Mr. WILEY. I shall refer that question to my brother from Illinois. He is more versed in the subject of growth than I am.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Both cities are growing.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if there are no more questions, I yield the floor.

PAUL D. THOMPSON, SR., PHILOSOPHER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once in a generation a philosopher arises who makes an outstanding record. Such a philosopher is Paul D. Thompson, Sr., who lives in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated July 27, 1956, which he wrote to me, together with a letter which he wrote to the Secretary of the United Nations, and also a petition in the form of a letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 27, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since I discussed my work with you tragic annals have been recorded of sacrifice and courage and infant mortality in man's eternal struggle to be free. That we may memorialize the bravery and the death of these gentle people by considered action I wish to convey a message to the Polish people, and the people everywhere who are struggling for tangible forms that give dignity and surety of life under law and a future of freedom for the families and the children of the earth. Their sacrifice and deprivation is one with families torn asunder on the plains of Russia and China, the deprivations of the conquered and the minorities under Hitler, people whose only offenses were the worship of God, the joys of family life and the loving care and tenancy of a bit of soil. Can man be improved by being killed, despoiled, deprived? Is death the great improvement to be meted out to the children of the earth? The chief value in life is living, for unless one lives one cannot love, or have a soul, or be somewhat in God's image, or stoop to touch the soil or smell the air of spring. One cannot even die until one has lived. No philosophical program by which man can seek his improvement through government can assume any proposition by which children and human beings can be deprived of life by the acts of governments or individuals. The right to life is an equal right, a paramount right to every human being on this earth; not inferior to man's wish for power and wealth and the infliction of war and deadly instruments on the human race. To live and have their children live is a just and inviolable heritage of the people of the earth. The instruments of force and oppression must be gradually and surely abated to give the people their right to life—to give the national cultures their freedom and common partnership of dignity on the earth.

In this conversion to a world at peace death and force will not give the people the life they seek. Mankind must take common measures to assure growth of the peoples welfare, under God, by such measures as are in harmony with the moral order we seek.

In answer to the peoples' prayers a peaceful revolution is growing on the earth to build a great foundation as a common enterprise of work and conservation: A great council to serve as trustees of the great foundation, men who hold in their minds and hearts the constitution to keep earth's children safe and free. To this great undertaking I now invite the common participation of the people of the earth, to sign the conditional pledges, to counsel and call to service those men who stand for human dignity: men to whom the service of mankind has brought the great reward of love and spiritual growth.

In that representation the people even now are free. As there is increasing growth of the peoples welfare the national cultures will find increasing freedom and dignity. There will be a progression toward a common estate of well being and armaments and oppression will gradually decline everywhere.

I enclose to you certain documents which are now of a public nature. I wrote the Children's Constitution in a schoolroom long before the wire to Dag Hammarskjold and Letter to the Editor. We had seen the pictures of the children praying in the refugee camp in Vietnam. The Children's Constitution and this great movement are the gift of my wonderful wife and I to the children of the earth. I hope you can bring this letter, the wire, the pledge, the Letter to the Editor, and the Children's Constitution to public notice in any way you can.

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL D. THOMPSON, Sr.

APRIL 18, 1956.

The Honorable DAG HAMMARSKJOLD,
Secretary General of the United Nations,
The United Nations, New York, N. Y.

GREETINGS: I congratulate you on the signal success of your conciliatory efforts to create a more tolerable situation in the local area and in a world where our failure to build a public philosophy relative to the deepest needs of the people has made life a travail to the human race. I greatly honor also the United Nations, and their efforts at cooperation, which will be more easily furthered when all national cultures are free, and are thus in homage to a like philosophy of freedom and dignity, and the burden of armaments has been removed from the aching backs of the humble people of the earth.

I pray you to advance a request to the honored heads of states, and the people of Israel and the Arab States. In honor of the gift of inspiration of the children and the work and gifts of God-fearing people responsive to that gift. I request all fighting cease, all armed stances be forgone, and men return to work and prayer, to think not of conflict but of the work necessary to conserve the earth and strengthen the fabric of intercourse and understanding in common enterprises for human good. God is indeed working a leaven in America and the world. Relative to the churches, the synagogues, the mosques, and the peaceful aspirations and the love of gentle people pledges are now being signed or will be signed as earnest of man's wish to have a great foundation and a council, the gift of inspiration of the children of the earth, to represent the right of each child born to dignity and freedom, and the flowering of gifts under God as naturally as the plant lifts its leaves and flower to heaven to receive the beneficent rain and the sun's rays which spur its growth. In honor of this gift the children have given us to keep earth's children free and a safe place for me upon the children's graves a flower, and ask a prayer of forgiveness for our failure to advance human inspiration and the kingdom of God rapidly enough to keep the children we love safe. A child must never die in the conflict of states again. With peace of mind I will use the gift I have, as the gifts of all God's children must be used, and with the help of godly men from Israel and Islam and around the earth, I will act as a council while millions of pledges are signed around the earth by children, by young people and by gentle people, until such time as great men can be called to serve and form the great foundation and the council. God has indeed been merciful to His children.

And now for illustration I will advance four thoughts for the solution of problems and the growth of human welfare that concern the Middle East in a vital way that will surely be of immediate concern in research, work, and recommendation when the Council is formed and the Foundation is organized. The great Foundation and the Council will have a special care and guardianship of refugees, especially the children, who by reason of oppression of the spirit, or conflict, or great imponderable catastrophe find themselves displaced from home and country. An immediately related problem is an advancement of the free national cultures in conservation and natural resource use to make our science servant to the welfare of man, and immediately applicable to local situations such as that in Jordan, where children have undergone terrible suffering. In those children lies the future of the human race. Where there are people in jeopardy the processes of education and the application of technical scholarships around the earth, such as the great Foundation could sponsor, will tend to promote healthy growth of the people's welfare and the spirit of understanding and service would be immeasurably increased by the fact that children and young people would be learning to serve by doing by these pledges and would have a great motivation to prepare themselves for lives of service in promoting the conservation of the earth and the furtherance of human welfare, in such a manner as the great Dr. Schweitzer has illustrated in Africa.

The people of Jordan must receive allround help, in addition to present aid, immediately to advance a life of dignity for their children in line with the philosophy of the great Council. That this help was provided with a heart of love as children and young people signed pledges around the earth would dramatize the real and only road to world peace and understanding, which can only be achieved by a public philosophy relevant to these children's right to life and happiness.

The great Foundation and the Council would promote those processes of understanding and leadership and conservation by which the free national cultures of the earth could advance their own well-being in free and equal partnership in cooperation with other free peoples mutually dependent on the earth's resources, without the ruin which would inevitably follow for all from conflict to contend for these resources. With freedom and dignity achieved, and arms and

power subjugated to reason, England would have with Egypt and the Arab States a common bond of growth and progress in the welfare of their peoples. The children of the earth must not be crushed by the power hunger of the architect's of man's domination, who see in the people's poverty and confusion a way to extend a cult of slavery and suppression. Rather the slavery already imposed must be lifted as people see by illustration and dramatization the people's work grow under the benefits of freedom and inspiration. The common dignity of peoples can best be won through love and common work to build a world where children will be free and safe to develop their gifts for life. The greatest hazard for the welfare of the children of the earth is man, provident not of their well-being but of insatiable lusts for power and influence.

I wish to give a single illustration of how easily the problems of national cultures can be composed when once the field is freed from strife in a common effort to promote the dignity and well-being of all. It may not be feasible, but I believe it may be possible and desirable, in that climate, to recommend that the great foundation construct a road beneath the Negev strip, atomically ventilated and air conditioned, so that the commerce of Jordan and Egypt could fully operate, and Israel have free overland access to the sea. At a later date, when the usages of peace and conservation had produced a common abundance for the people's good, the tolls of gratitude to the children could well repay the great foundation. It might well be called the highway of peace, linking in part the associated states of Israel and Islam in a common bond of peace and mutual conservation, this in a region that has given man a heritage of faith that he now needs sorely to rely on.

I ask you, therefore, to convey this message to these rulers and peoples to inform them of this work for the good of man. I ask their help in its furtherance, and I will pray that the leaders of all religious faiths will call their people to prayer and a common task that the issues of our destiny may convey happiness to countless generations of children. With a firm faith I will proceed along the road, secure in the knowledge that here lies the way that Christ would have us travel on the earth.

PAUL D. THOMPSON, Sr.,
A Humble Philosopher.

CONDITIONAL PLEDGE FOR A GREAT FOUNDATION AND A COUNCIL TO REPRESENT COMMON WORK, FREEDOM AND DIGNITY FOR THE NATIONAL CULTURES AND THE CHILDREN OF THE EARTH: THE MOBILIZATION OF MAN FOR DIGNITY AND FREEDOM

Over all the earth, the discoveries in science and in government, and the development of man's artistic and spiritual resources give men in all cultures hope for a better life. From time to time, however, the birth of punitive philosophies relying on force and the natural ambitions of small groups who desire power and dominion over others have enforced upon the peoples of the earth great armaments and war and constant fear, so that the peoples' work is forgotten, their substance is wasted, and the whole earth is in danger of the desolation of destructions. Yet, the peoples of the earth want but to develop their cultures in freedom. They wish but to give their children a chance to develop their gifts for life, under God and to find for them the means of the pursuit of happiness.

It becomes necessary then in this period of confusion, that men over all the earth have a place of common work and leadership to symbolize for the peoples of the earth a philosophy of freedom and dignity based on the historic struggles of men for the free estate and the development of the human spirit in the passage of this life. In common work and great leadership, free of politics and power, the peoples' work can be dramatized by a great council and a great foundation.

I, therefore, pledge this action to help the peoples of the earth build the foundation and council. I understand that the philosopher of this foundation will, with the assistance of philosophers of human freedom in various sections of the earth, second the nomination of the peoples for a quorum of 14 trustees of the great foundation; men who hold in their minds and hearts the constitution to keep earth's children free and safe. When the President of the United States, conferring with the leaders of the free cultures of the earth, shall deem that organization has proceeded sufficiently far to warrant the payment of pledges, I agree, if living and under no misfortune, to pay the sum of $———, in semiannual payments of $——— each, to the official designated by the President, on the 1st day of July and the 1st day of January, after the date of such designation, until the sum of the pledge is paid in full or until my death or according to such arrangements as I shall enter into by the attached schedule or statement of will.

And so, God willing, I attach my signature to pledge my help to the building of these great institutions, trusting the great men who will serve to be mindful of but one thing in their work—the dignity and freedom of the children of the earth.

Date———
Signatures———
Address———
Church———

Please attach a letter stating your views on the directors and trustees. The latter will make up the council.

Mail to Paul D. Thompson, Sr.

SURVIVAL

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have decided that it is in the national interest and in the interest of the people of the earth that I raise the issue of our survival in respect to the only methods by which we can effectively work at it. This letter can be considered a message to the people from a democratic philosopher, and an answer to the fine letters of Mary Stuart Chamberlain, D. G. Mook, Frank W. Vander Hoof, James R. Newman and the many others who have advanced plans and suggestions for reasonable attempts at survival. I wish also to include the lawmakers and the columnists, especially Agronski, the Alsops, Pearson, Sokolsky, Dorothy Thompson, Brown and Fleeson. I am sure the parents of the earth all wish to have their children live in a world geared for life rather than death, if some workable method can be found for them to express themselves in some common enterprise to free themselves of the powermongers, the dictators and the armaments. I consider it to be a philosophical conflict, and the struggle is one for the allegiance of man. For this struggle we need a democratic philosopher to lead the way to some common enterprise and unity. From foreign aid to balloons over Europe, from H-bombs to Aswan dams, the headlines shriek of the gadgets, the contrivances, the devices which are supposed to lead man to a more tolerable situation. The ambitions and rivalries rampant on this earth lead but to a common grave. There is one common bond among the people of the earth. They want to live—they have one common wish—to be free of architects, of oppression, of Stalins, of H-bombs and all this silly business of armaments which enslave and destroy the people. The moral force of the people is a mighty force, and once the people are engaged in one common enterprise of dignity and freedom the people will take over everywhere on this earth. Only the people can clean these Aegean stables. Only great leadership can engage them at the task that must be done. Only when the people are in charge will our children be safe. The people must be led. The great forces of love must be arrayed for this mighty task as men under God build a world relevant to man's right to live in dignity and freedom. I am very sure that the horrors of war and disunion will not enforce peace any more than the distension of a balloon with combustible gases will guarantee a safe journey to the passengers. World order must result from a peaceful revolution engaging the loyalties, the sacrifices and the work of millions of people around the earth. It must result from positive work relevant to the right to life and happiness of the children of the earth.

There is no easy road, no other road that we can follow, yet the way is open to us along this path that we must travel, to reach, under God, a period of true historical peace and a world geared for life instead of the instrumentalities of force and destruction. The people of the earth cry for peace and there is no peace. They see themselves entwined in the spreading web of materialistic conspiracy, corruption, force, greed, and bureaucratic waste. Yet on this earth the immense forces for human good never had more moral power at their disposal. We must assume then that there is a lack of essential leadership to find a way for the great forces for human good to array themselves in the moral struggle—the philosophical struggle to keep our children safe and free.

In this century the forces of materialism have forgotten something. They have not only left out God. They have left out the basic God-given rights of the people—the simple essentials men need to have some comfort and joy in the passage of this life—a common mean by which men can live and enjoy their family, their earth, and their worship. The earth is the people's earth, to be conserved, to be made a place for children to laugh and play and develop their gifts to keep men free.

At a time like this, when men in various power combinations consider calmly the unloosing of those forces in this strange neurotic, imbecilic, suicidal exercise that war has become, and dwell on how many millions of children will be maimed and obliterated in these first exchanges after the initial attack by the architects of human welfare, a leader must rise from the people to lead the way. That this should happen in this age is not a miracle. Considering the complete dislocation of the power architects from life, the psychosis of madness apparent to common folks everywhere, it would be a miracle if a democratic philosopher did not emerge to unify the parents of the earth in a common struggle for dignity and life. (I honor the military who have been explicit about the H-bomb blasts.)

The need then is for a democratic philosopher working on problems of survival of the children of the earth. The leaders and rulers of men have lost contact with the earth, the people. There are many great democratic philosophers. I consider Dr. Albert Schwiezer, of Lambourine one of the world's greatest men. I have that vocation. Since God has given me this opportunity I need not dissemble in advancing this needed work. I am a teacher of children, a democratic philosopher who has been working for years on the survival of the human race. My vocation is as clear, as unmistakable, as that of the forester or the pastor. The circumstances of my life have hewed me for my task. I am on the path I must travel on this earth. With simple faith in God, I will proceed along the way, knowing my actions will spring from the needs of life and have a true bearing on the destiny of man. I am secure in the thought

that God favors my success since I am, without wealth or power or position, far along the way that I must go.

Let us examine the work of a democratic philosopher and see what that work is and its application to this tragic situation.

Let us consider an analogy. We can suppose that a forest fire unexpectedly threatens an isolated village that must depend for its very existence upon the resources of its people. Now this analogy is far from complete because the resources that the village pastor commands have not, in this situation, the great bearing that the great forces of love, the spiritual forces have in the world situation today. In this situation—in this incomplete analogy we find the gifts of a simple man, a philosopher, are vital to the safety of the village. Lars, a parishioner, was a man of simple dignity. From boyhood he had roamed the hills, and knew so well the ravines, the water courses, the cover and the life of the village that his responses were instinctive and sure. While the pastor brought the order of faith and prayer to the villagers, Lars sent the young men and the woodsmen to vantage points with orders to set the backfires and the things needed to stay the conflagration. Here there was faith, faith in God and faith in action and the order of prayer and sure action and the village was saved.

We have the great forces we need in the world to win the struggle to keep the earth's children safe and free. The democratic philosopher knows where those great forces are. From a lifetime of thought, often in solitude, he knows the crosscurrents, the eddies, the movements, the conceits, and the hypocrisies that endanger the children of the earth. He acts in response to instincts of survival and the love that God has placed in his heart. He does not try to teach a world by the method of the scholar. Like Lars he calls for simple actions in which individuals can take part. Because the action is true and right, more and more people take part around the earth. The forces of gentle faith move into the breach as the people's work for dignity and freedom grows on the earth, until men of great gifts forget their prejudices and conceits and add their skills and leadership to the people's work.

And so upon this earth great institutions grow, built by the people with their gifts of love. As the people build a positive structure based upon the people's need for life, something that God approves of, we have a proper public philosophy on the earth. The people will then put away their dictators and their guns and the national cultures will be free. God is not mocked. When the parents of the earth take over to protect the family and the hearth no bombs will be needed to protect the children, anymore than we need an H-bomb to protect the boy fishing on the farm pond. Let us forget these headlines, these boondoggles like jets for Tito. We have something growing on this earth, something that each child can have a part in. God must indeed love us or He would not have let us live so long, so foolishly. The parents of the earth are the natural guardians of the family and the children's right to life. Let us trust the people to know the thing we do is good. We have work to do. Let us give thanks to God that our brave soldiers have preserved this opportunity for us and go ahead with sacrifice and courage in building a proper public philosophy in the world which will give joy to every parent on the earth, and give our children such a measure of freedom and dignity as has never yet been seen.

PAUL D. THOMPSON, Sr.

CHILDREN'S CONSTITUTION

We, the children in the world, have seen a shadow fall upon the earth which we could not understand. Do not people in all lands love their children? We have heard of thousands of children with the ones they love creeping through the woods and through the barbed wire fences to get to a land of freedom where they could live in peace. We have heard of millions of poor farmers torn from their farms and the soil they loved and sent to the slave camps of the earth while their children were left fatherless and weeping on the earth. We have seen pictures of children fleeing along the roads while overheard the bombers roared so that one man might have a madman's dance of victory. We have heard of a dark forest where the brave officers of a nation were deliberately shot and buried in heaps never to see the children they had offered their life to save or the homes they had defended with their lives. Recently we have seen the pictures of half a million people with the children fleeing through the jungles and down the rivers on rafts, that they might have the chance of life and freedom and a chance to worship God in peace. And we have seen the men who caused these things cry that they want peace while using the very bread that their people hungered for to build guns, and tanks, and planes to threaten the freedom of their neighbors and spread fear across the world. We know these things are true because we live in countries where everyone is free to tell the truth and before us are the pictures that we see taken with the cameras where these things happened.

We know about the bomb and the threat of war upon the world. We have faith that freedom will live upon the earth. We know that we must sacrifice and face death in such a world to defend our right to life. We know, too, that soldiers love their own children and the children of the earth. We have faith that if mad leaders try to conquer the earth and bring war and destruction on the children a million soldiers who love their country and their children will turn their guns upon these men. They would not dare send a single ship out to sea and plan on it coming back, nor could they be sure that the bomber they sent into the air would not loose death on their own heads. There are men in the states of fear who love their children and the land they have lost and the right to life without fear. We know that our fathers and our brothers would fight to the death for us and our freedom and they would win.

We know that the free nations of the world do not want any of Russia or any of China. We have fought wars to defend freedom in the world. As soon as nations or great islands like the Philippines and Japan were ready we have given them their freedom and our friendship. We have no Polands or Czechoslovaks in our grasp. The free nations of the world want but to live in peace.

We therefore propose a new kind of war upon the earth—a race to see which nation can do the most to make the earth a better place for the children of the earth—a race to make the earth a garden and use the science and the gifts of man to help the nations fight their way up from poverty and have a good life upon the earth.

We therefore propose a constitution for the earth to be set up under God in the hearts and minds of men. We have sanctutaries for birds which have saved bird species from being lost forever. We believe we should have a sanctuary of the earth to save the children of the earth and all we love from destruction. There is but one thing that must be done. The nations of the earth must be free of bondage and never again must a nation march in war, for the nation that threatens with great arms and oppresses its neighbor is at war upon the earth and risking the destruction of all of us.

Let there be a covenant of peace. Let each nation draw back and drop all thoughts of war. Let each turn the mighty arms factories to making gifts for a better life on earth. Let the rulers turn their movements toward freedom and a better life for their people. The people of the earth will forever call them great, instead of trying to forget them like a Stalin or a Hitler who caused the death of millions of people on the earth and died beloved of none.

What do the children of the earth want in life? We would have these things for all the people of the earth.

1. The right to have a little land, our homes and our families in safety; to live life in joy and not in fear; to leave our homes and land to our children when we have had our passage of this life.

2. To be free and to have learning; to give our gifts and express ourselves in any work we choose, whether it is the farmer painting his pictures on the hills with his terraces and fields or the teacher teaching children in the schools to develop their gifts in freedom.

3. To use the great science of our times to make a better way of life in all the regions of the Earth like Dr. Albert Schweitzer did in Africa and Edison and Carver did in America.

4. To have our families without fear of separation—to have justice under law—to have equality under law regardless of race or color or religion.

5. To have a government of justice for all.

6. To have each nation free to develop its land in freedom.

7. To have war forever banished from the earth and disputes settled by a concordat of nations devoted to peace.

8. To freely worship the way we choose and to have Sunday free for worship without interference of the State.

9. To have governments and teachers that tell us the truth.

10. To have freedom of speech and freedom to print the truth or express opinions about the conduct of the government.

11. To have all share in the science of the earth that all may have food and clothing and the other benefits of science.

We believe that upon this earth there will be a new birth of freedom and happiness for all. We believe that man should serve others on the earth and live a life of usefulness to others. We therefore pledge to be honest and truthful—to be worthy of trust—to do everything we can to help all of the people of the earth.

We believe that every child born should have a chance to freely express himself in life and not die lonely and forsaken in some bleak barren land of human misery, his poem of life forever unwritten. We believe that freedom to express oneself in love of family is a part of life itself—that hope will never vanish and each new generation will fight to regain the freedom lost when evil and power hungry men captured the movement to make man free.

We believe that our gifts will help make a better word—that gifts cannot be fully developed except in freedom. We believe God gave us the gifts we need to make a better world if we but have the faith to work and use them.

We believe the gifts and wealth of man should be used to conserve the resources of the earth for children yet unborn. The forests should cover the mountain slopes; the waters should run pure and sparkling in our streams; the soil should be abundant and return good for every form of life.

I know when I sign this it is a pledge for life. So that men everywhere will understand we will use a little child with wings as a symbol—a little bird so that man everywhere can look into the sky and see a bird and have new hope and a thought of regaining the freedom he has lost.

We therefore solemnly pledge ourselves to a life of usefulness to make democracy live upon the earth: We pledge ourselves to do all we can to carry the message of love and hope to the other lands; that men everywhere can have a new urge to have a better life for their children; we pledge ourselves not to

forget the little children in every land and we will show by what we do that we wish them to share the great liberty which we have which has been saved for us by the sacrifices and death of those who have defended our right to happiness on the earth and our right to develop our gifts for life in freedom.

PAUL D. THOMPSON, Sr.,
Historian and Earths Volunteer Sponsor.

ESSENTIALITY OF THE WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning a finding by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report with respect to the essentiality of the watch industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

I am deeply concerned by the report submitted last week by the Joint Economic Committee. I refer, of course, to the report entitled "Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy: Case Study of the Watch Industry and Precision Skills." In part my concern stems from the fact that the Report, based on but 4 short days of hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, undertakes to make sweeping, authoritative pronouncements on such profound and difficult matters as the character of the future war in which we may be engaged, the type of mobilization base needed to prepare for such a conflict, the relative production priorities for defense needs, and the character, availability, and interchangeability of the labor force skilled in the turning out of microprecision products. In part, my concern is with the fact that the committee, on the basis of an exceedingly limited record, has made categorical findings in these difficult areas at the very time the Office of Defense Mobilization and its delegate agencies have underway an extensive investigation of the very same problems as they relate to the domestic jeweled watch industry. I have grave reservations as to the wisdom of such action.

The casual reader, however, may not realize the extent to which the report departs from the record on which it purports to be based. This is of particular concern to me because the two documents bear but little resemblance to each other, and the reader who is unfamiliar with the record could be seriously misled.

Fortunately, Congressman TALLE, a member of the subcommittee, and Congressman THOMAS CURTIS, a member of the full Joint Economic Committee have exposed these grave deficiencies in the report in very able discussions contained in their separate comments on the report. I may also say that one distinguished Member of this body, Senator GOLDWATER, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, concurs in the view prepared by Congressman CURTIS. Senator FLANDERS has also commented separately in disagreement with the report's unsupported observation that the domestic jeweled watch industry need not be protected as an essential defense industry. The report's astonishing conclusion that military and essential civilian needs for the products of the domestic industry be secured from Switzerland in wartime was too much for them to accept, as I am sure it will be repugnant to all other Americans who have faith in the national security measures which have been followed by both this and the preceding administration.

Why there should be any hesitation on the part of the United States to take adequate measures to preserve a domestic watch industry in deference to the sensibilities of the highly prosperous and extremely vocal Swiss escapes me. Should we fail to look to our own national security for the sake of the Swiss watch industry which operates from the privileged confines of a neutral nation who has refused to join any of the collective efforts of the free world to preserve peace, such as NATO or the United Nations? I am sure that the members of the Senate and the American people would do well to bear in mind that Switzerland's watch industry was a major part of the war production effort of our enemies in World War II. Nor does Switzerland hesitate to contribute today to the military strength of the Soviet Union. In the July 16, 1956, edition of the American Machinist the editor, Burnham Finney, reports that Switzerland in company with the Soviet satellite nations has been supplying strategic machine tools to the Soviet Union for several years. The exact quotation is as follows:

"Machine tools are being imported into the Soviet Union on an exchange basis from Czechoslovakia, which has a long-standing well-developed machine-tool industry; from East Germany, which has a fairly large machine-tool industry; from Switzerland, and other Western European nations. Russia has been securing machines from all of these countries for several years. However, its importation of machines from NATO countries has been limited to certain types of so-called nonstrategic machines. Machine tools on the critical list, especially 'elephant tool,' cannot be shipped to Eastern European countries or to China by any member of NATO."

REJECTION OF FUNDS FOR ISRAELI CULTURAL PROJECT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from Moses I. Feuerstein, president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEW GARDENS, N. Y.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of our 3,000 congregations and its 3 million worshippers throughout the United States I should like to thank you for the tireless and ceaseless efforts throughout the past 3 months on behalf of the independent elementary school system in Israel. The great personal interest and unusual efforts are highly appreciated by all of us. In spite of today's disappointment, we know that the battle isn't lost as yet.

MOSES I. FEUERSTEIN,
President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, for some inexplicable reason, the Committee on Appropriations' conferees have rejected funds requested by the State Department for the Israeli cultural project. This action jeopardizes Israel's independent elementary school system which assures for us an up-and-coming generation of Israelis who will uphold and create an atmosphere consistent with our point of view.

Although I did everything within my power in behalf of the requested appropriation, I am convinced that the conferees' action was due to a misunderstanding of the project.

In this light, I have urged Secretary of State Dulles to find some way to allocate the necessary money within the executive domain, either from the counterpart mutual security funds or some funds that are left to the discretion of the President.

I consider this a most worthy project, and I intend to follow it through with every means at my command.

FIFTY FACTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, throughout his administration, President Eisenhower has demonstrated a keen awareness of the agricultural situation and a sympathetic understanding of the problems confronting farmers during the period of conversion from a wartime economy to peacetime conditions.

As the President has said: "Farm policy is never a completed task. It must be dynamic, adapting to changing conditions. The Secretary and I agree that we should not go back to old policies that have failed to meet the problems of the past. I was greatly encouraged to learn from the Secretary the several new steps he is exploring for strengthening and broadening the present program. He and I agreed that such steps are necessary in order to speed the time when farm production and markets are in balance at prices that return to our farmers a fair share of the national income. We also agreed that we must, for the future welfare of our people, do still more to promote the proper use of our land so that its productivity may be better and more permanently preserved."

It is my firm conviction that the farmers of America are more interested in a factual presentation of the current farm situation than they are in political demagoguery. I believe further that we can achieve and maintain a free, prosperous, and expanding agriculture under the sound, workable programs inaugurated by this administration. A return to the programs which created the major agricultural problems of the day would only compound our troubles. The alternative to the Eisenhower farm program involves more Government controls and regimentation and less freedom for farmers to make their own management decisions.

In the interest of setting the record straight with respect to the current agricultural situation, I have prepared a statement in the form of an outline entitled "Fifty Facts for Farmers," based largely upon official reports from the United States Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

FIFTY FACTS FOR FARMERS

1. There is peace.

2. Unprecedented national prosperity provides the broadest domestic market ever for the food and fiber of our farms.

3. Our fast-growing population adds nearly 3 million more American customers for agricultural products each year.

4. Fiscal integrity has been restored. This fiscal year a balanced Federal budget was submitted and the Government operated in the black instead of in the red.

STRENGTH OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

5. Per capita income of farm people from all sources was $930 in 1953, $911 in 1954, and $881 in 1955, compared with $828 in 1950, the year the Korean war erupted. Let us remember that after the Democrat administration had been in power more than 5 years and during the last 3 peace-time years preceding our entry into World War II, namely, 1938, 1939, and 1940, the per capita net annual income of our farm population from all sources averaged $250. World War II quickly brought improvements in farm prices and farm income.

6. Farmers' realized net income in the first half of 1956 was running at an annual rate of $11.6 billion. This was about the same as in the first half of 1955 and a half billion dollars higher than the rate during the second half of 1955.

7. The total value of all farm assets—now $163 billion—approaches the alltime record level.

8. Farmland values moved upward by 4 percent in 1956, reaching an alltime high. This evidence points to a basic confidence in the future of American agriculture.

9. While farm real-estate valuations have been climbing, bonds, savings, deposits, and life-insurance policies held by farmers have not been shriveled by inflation. A dollar saved in 1953 is still worth a dollar. A dollar saved in 1940 was worth less than 53 cents by 1952.

10. Three-fourths of the Nation's farmers own their farms today—a record high.

11. The total debt of farmers amounts to only 11 percent of their assets.

12. About 7 out of 10 farmers have no mortgage debt. Of the mortgaged farms, four-fifths are mortgaged for less than 50 percent of the market value, and half for less than 30 percent.

13. Farm foreclosures are near the alltime record low point.

14. Mechanization of farms has made rapid progress.

Year	Tractors	Combines	Corn-pickers	Motor-trucks
1940	1,545,000	190,000	110,000	1,047,000
1950	3,394,000	714,000	456,000	2,207,000
1955	4,345,000	980,000	688,000	2,701,000
1956	4,450,000	1,000,000	700,000	2,800,000

15. Percent of farms:

1950	With electricity	77
1952	With electricity	88
1954	With electricity	92
1955	With electricity	93
1950	With telephones	38
1952	With telephones	40
1954	With telephones	44

16. Years of schooling for rural people have increased:

	Years
Grandparents	7.5
Parents	8.5
Today's young people	10.5

MARKETS ARE EXPANDING

17. Foreign markets for United States farm commodities are being expanded. During the year ended June 30, 1955, shipments of farm products to foreign countries were 7 percent higher than in 1953–54 and 11 percent higher than in 1952–53. For the first 10 months of the current fiscal year farm exports were up another 9 percent over the similar period a year earlier.

18. Per capita consumption of such high protein, protective foods as meat, milk, and eggs, is on the upswing.

Year	Beef and veal	Pork	Poultry	Total meats and poultry	Eggs	Milk fluid
	Lbs.	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*	*Number*	*Lbs.*
1930	55	66	17	144	327	337
1940	62	72	17	157	314	331
1950	70	68	24	167	383	349
1955	80	66	26	187	366	352
1956	83	65	28	190	367	354

This trend is of major significance because livestock and livestock products account for 55 percent of farm income.

PRICE AND INCOME

19. In the face of dwindling exports and declining farm prices, the Democrat administration in 1952 failed to invoke acreage controls on 1953 crops of wheat, cotton, and corn. This added heavily to the surpluses inherited by the Eisenhower administration and made it impossible to begin the work of bringing production under control until 1954.

20. The parity ratio, which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, dropped 19 points—from 113 to 94—from the Korean war peak in February 1951 to January of 1953 when the Eisenhower administration took office. In June 1956 it was 86, having recovered 6 points from low of 80. The average for 1955 was 84. Two-thirds of the decline of 27 points since 1951 occurred under the Democrats. Farm prices, on an average, were up 11 percent in the first 6 months of 1956. Let us remember that in the 3 peacetime years just preceding our entry in World War II, parity averaged 78.7 under the Democrat administration then in power. Furthermore, in those same 3 peacetime years the farmer's share of the food dollar averaged 39 cents, whereas for the 3 peacetime years of the Eisenhower administration it averaged 43 cents.

21. If rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity were the answer to the farm problem, there would be no problem today. Virtually all of the decline in agricultural prices and income since 1951 came about while rigid price supports at 90 percent of parity were in effect for the basic commodities.

22. The Eisenhower administration's program of flexible price supports started taking effect with the marketing of the 1955 crops. Levels of support under the flexible program are the highest ever made available to farmers under peacetime agricultural legislation.

23. Basic crops (cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts) bring farmers about 24 percent of their income from marketings. Present Government price support investment in basic crops is $7.7 billion. Total investment in inventories and support loans as of May 31, 1956, was $8.5 billion.

24. Basic crops bring farmers 40 percent or more of their income in 11 States. North Carolina, 67 percent; Mississippi, 57 percent; Arkansas, 54 percent; South Carolina, 53 percent; Kentucky, 49 percent; Montana, 48 percent; Louisiana, 44 percent; Arizona, 45 percent; Texas, 42 percent; Tennessee, 42 percent; and Kansas, 40 percent.

25. Basic crops bring farmers 10 percent or less of their income in 15 States and 15 percent or less of their income in 22 States: 0–1 percent, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island; 2–5 percent, New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, West Virginia, Nevada, Wisconsin; 6–10 percent, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Wyoming, Utah, Florida; 11–15 percent, California, Iowa, Michigan, Oregon, Colorado, Minnesota, Connecticut.

SURPLUS DISPOSAL

26. In a determined effort to reduce the price-depressing surpluses overhanging farmers' markets, the Eisenhower administration has disposed of recordbreaking amounts of Government-owned commodities:

1953	$520,000,000
1954	1,424,000,000
1955	2,115,000,000
1956	2,700,000,000

27. Virtually all of the surplus cottonseed oil stocks have been moved into use. The accumulation reached 1,186 million pounds at the peak in 1954. All Government-owned protein meals have been sold.

28. Government-owned stocks of dairy products have been sharply reduced since 1954.

Butter: From 466 million pounds to 6 million pounds on June 30, 1956.

Cheese: From 436 million pounds to 201 million pounds on June 30, 1956.

Nonfat milk solids: From 599 million pounds to 146 million pounds on June 30, 1956.

29. Varying the level of price support proved effective in the case of dairy products, bringing supplies into better balance with market demands. Since dairy support levels were adjusted in the spring of 1954, consumption of milk, butter, and cheese has gone up. Government purchases of these commodities are down sharply and prices to farmers showed substantial improvement from 1954 to 1956.

30. Overall production and consumption of most farm products are now more nearly in balance than at any time since the height of the Korean war. As surpluses, accumulated under price-support programs, are moved into consumption at home and abroad, market prices for farm commodities will strengthen. Farmers will be free again to produce for use rather than for Government storage.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

31. The Department of Agriculture in 1955–56 undertook an emergency pork-buying program to assist farmers in marketing an unusually heavy run of hogs. It vigorously supported the industry's nationwide promotional campaign to increase consumption of pork products. A starching and diversion payment program on potatoes through the marketing year brought a sharp upturn in prices.

32. To assist farmers in making the transition from wartime demands to peacetime markets and conditions, Federal expenditures for programs primarily to stabilize farm prices and income have been the largest ever.

1950	$487,000,000
1951	624,000,000
1952	306,000,000
1953	330,000,000
1954	963,000,000
1955	1,350,000,000

33. Grain storage owned or sponsored by Commodity Credit Corporation has been greatly expanded:

	Bushels
1952	750,000,000
1953	925,000,000
1954	1,350,000,000
1955	1,500,000,000

34. More farmers have been helped to acquire family-sized farms and to improve their farms and homes through loan programs. Farmers' Home Administration in fiscal 1955 assisted farmers in buying their farms to the extent of $50.9 million, compared with $29.7 million in the last fiscal year of the preceding administration. The Farmers' Home Administration advanced $147 million in production loans to small farmers in 1954 and $133.5 million in fiscal 1955, compared with $124 million in 1952 and $129 million in 1953. Emergency loans under the Eisenhower administration increased from $44 million in fiscal 1953 to $93.5 million in 1954 and $89.2 million in 1955.

35. Farmers' Home Administration loan service has been expedited through simplification of procedures, elimination of unnecessary forms, and delegation of more authority to the county level.

36. The Great Plains program was developed in 1955—and action is underway. Land classification in the more hazardous soil areas is being speeded up. Maps will be available to serve as a guide to proper land use. The agricultural conservation program now more strongly encourages proper land use and shares the cost of making needed adjustments.

37. The rural electrification program is moving forward vigorously. More power is being used by consumers serviced by REA borrowers than ever before and it is available at the lowest average cost in REA history. Processing of loans has been speeded up to a point where the backlog of applications is down to $90 million, the lowest since World War II.

38. The rural telephone program is being expanded at a record rate. In fiscal 1956 borrowers received loans totaling $81 million, the largest total for any year since this program started in 1949. There has been substantial progress in bringing down the cost of rural telephone facilities.

LEGISLATIVE ADVANCES

39. Farmers are sharing in the Eisenhower administration's tax reduction of 1954. The Republican 83d Congress approved legislation giving a general reduction in taxes on incomes and, especially for farmers, provided accelerated tax writeoffs on grain storage facilities and machinery, and also permitted income-tax deductions for the costs of certain soil-conservation practices.

40. The Republican 83d Congress extended social-security coverage to farm families in 1954. For years farmers had helped to pay the cost of this program but not until the Eisenhower administration have they been permitted to share in the benefits.

41. Budget for agricultural extension and education increased $1,350,000 in the 4 years prior to 1953 under the preceding administration. The increase has been $19,964,000—nearly 15 times as much—in the 4 years of the Eisenhower administration.

42. Agricultural research budget increased $1,984,000 in the 4 years prior to 1953. Research to aid farmers increased $45,795,000 in the past 4 years.

43. The Farm Credit Administration was returned to the management of farmers and again established as an independent system under the Eisenhower administration.

44. Soil-conservation assistance and promotion of soil building have been expanded. There is a closer cooperation between the Soil Conservation Service and the Agricultural Conservation Program Service, and the SCS is furnishing technical help to a record number of districts. The amount of soil conservation applied by farmers in 1955 was 10 percent above 1952.

45. New and expanded water-management programs have been put into effect. Under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act passed in 1954, and other legislation, 550 local watershed groups in 46 States have applied to the Department for assistance. The SCS has authorized planning in 172 of these watersheds in 45 States. Land treatment and construction operations have been authorized on 16 projects. From October 1, 1954, to November 4, 1955, $21 million in loans was made available under the new Farmers' Home Administration soil and water conservation loan program.

46. New highs in timber production from the national forests have been set with more protection to timber owned by farmers.

47. The number of complete meals served under the national school-lunch program during fiscal year 1956 was approximately 1.6 billion, an increase of 600 million meals over the 1 billion served in fiscal year 1951. Approximately 1.4 billion half pints of milk were served in 62,000 schools participating in the special milk program during fiscal year 1956. The average daily consumption of milk under the program reached a peak of 8.6 million half pints in February.

48. A 15-point program to aid low-income farm families was started in 1955—the rural-development program. Over 27 States have reported long-term rural development type work or plans for special programs. In some 20 States about 40 pilot counties have been officially designated. An additional 9 States are planning to identify areas for pilot programs. The original plan called for at least 50 pilot counties.

49. The Eisenhower administration ended 30 years of inaction on the St. Lawrence seaway. Construction is now going forward on this major project which will provide lower transportation costs for farm products.

50. The Eisenhower administration is vigorously attacking the farm surplus problem on two major fronts. The soil bank is being placed in operation as a means of bringing production into better balance with current needs, and at the same time building up land fertility against future requirements. This program could have been applied on a much broader basis this year had not the Democrat leadership delayed action until farmers had already planted spring crops. Surpluses accumulated under past programs are being moved as rapidly as possible into channels of consumption at home and abroad.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO FILE A REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to file its report of an investigation under the authority of Senate Resolution 153 during the period of the adjournment.

I wish it to be understood that the report will be filed only after the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I have considered the matter, or after consultation with the committee staff representative of the Senator from Kansas. I wish it to be plainly understood that I have such an agreement with the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit House Concurrent Resolution 275, which relates to H. R. 7619, which was passed by the Senate. The resolution provides only for the correction of certain grammatical errors in the bill. I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

In section 104 (a), strike out subsection (b) following section 104 (a) (4) and insert the said subsection (b) immediately preceding section 105.

In section 118, strike out "116" and insert "117."

In section 9 (d) of the amendment made by section 401, strike out "first or second" and insert in lieu thereof "second or third."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutiton (H. Con. Res. 275) was considered and agreed to.

COVERAGE OF EMPLOYEES OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE WITHIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the House has returned H. R. 3489 with the request that section 3 be stricken from the bill, thus leaving only sections 1 and 2. The bill which passed the Senate contained 3 sections, but since the House has stricken section 3, which was an amendment of the Senate, it was thought better to have sections 1 and 2 than to have no bill at all.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and that the amendment of the Senate be disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which H. R. 3489 was passed will be reconsidered.

Without objection, the amendment of the Senate will be disagreed to.

Without objection, the bill without the amendment is passed.

DISPOSAL OF REMAINING ASSETS SEIZED UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair), laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2226) to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941, which was on page 5, line 19, after "court.", to insert the following:

This subsection shall not apply in the case of any lien, attachment, garnishment, trustee process or execution, or any order or decree of any court, arising out of any action which was pending or had been decided on or before July 1, 1956.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the House has made a small amendment to S. 2226. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE TRIBAL LANDS TO THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of

the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wyoming if the report was unanimously agreed to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was agreed to by a majority of the committee of conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

JUAN JOSE MOYA RAMIREZ

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1012) for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez, which were after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, George Nakamura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Richard H. Johannes, a citizen of the United States; and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Nakamura may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on July 25, 1955, the Senate passed S. 1012 which cancelled the outstanding deportation proceeding in behalf of the beneficiary of the bill. On July 27, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1012 with an amendment to include the beneficiary of an individual bill (H. R. 11830) which would facilitate the admission into the United States of the minor adopted child of a United States citizen.

The amendment is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1012.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3227) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11123) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 11123) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NOMINATION OF POSTMASTER AT INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina.

I hold in my hand what I presume will be the last list of confirmations of nominations of postmasters. I fail to find approval of the confirmation of the nomination of the postmaster at Indianapolis, Ind., a Mr. Smith.

I simply wish to say that I am extremely disappointed. Mr. Smith is a career man who has been working for the Post Office Department for many, many years. I have received a large number of telephone calls, letters, and telegrams from employees of the post office urging the confirmation of his nomination.

His nomination has been before the committee for many weeks and months. Yet I fail to find that the confirmation of the nomination has been recommended by the committee.

I also have in mind the nominee at Mount Vernon, Ind., where lives a very outstanding Legionnaire, a man who served his country well in World War II, who has been on the list for weeks and weeks. I fail to find either of those two nominations on the list for confirmation.

I feel obliged to make a record in behalf of not only those two gentlemen but others equally important, whose nominations have not been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I want the RECORD to show, and I want Senators to know, I am very much disappointed about this. I do not understand why the confirmation of the nomination of a postmaster in the largest city of Indiana, Indianapolis, should be held up for weeks and months and months. He is a career man. He has worked for the post office for many years. In fact, if my recollection serves me correctly, he has worked for the post office 25 years. For some unknown reason the confirmation of the nomination of that gentleman has not been approved by the committee. I want the Senate to know that I do not understand it, and I am sure my colleague from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] does not understand it.

I do not want to go back to the people of Indiana and Indianapolis tomorrow, after the Congress adjourns, without having made the statement I am making here tonight. I do not understand it, and I hope the nominations of the postmaster at Indianapolis and of postmasters at two other places in Indiana will be confirmed in the early part of next year. I do not understand why they have not been confirmed up to now. Perhaps the chairman of the committee can enlighten me as to why they have not been confirmed.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from South Carolina should like to reply; and, with the understanding that I retain my right to the floor, I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Indiana, I hope, before we adjourn, to put in the RECORD the number of nominations for postmasters that have been before the committee of this Congress. The Senator will find that number is between 3,000 and 3,500. The Senator will find that this is more than twice as many as were confirmed in the 80th Congress. We make it a rule not to delay confirmations if both Senators from a State do not oppose the confirmation. We have tried to follow that rule.

Mr. CAPEHART. Both Senators from Indiana have approved the nomination of this gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, where the committee finds good and sufficient reason for objecting to a nomination, that is done.

Mr. CAPEHART. I just wanted the RECORD to show that I feel very deeply concerned over the failure to confirm the nomination of this gentleman from Indianapolis.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has questioned the committee in regard to the confirmation of postmaster nominations. Therefore, I believe I should explain the matter a little more fully.

In the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the system is as follows: When we receive a postmaster nomination from the President, we send cards to both of the Senators from the State concerned. Until those cards have been returned signed to the committee, the committee does not act on the nomination.

Furthermore, if there is placed in the record any opposition to confirmation

of the nomination, we investigate that matter. All that takes some time.

Let me report here on the disposition of nominations received by the committee during the 84th Congress:

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the committee received from the President 1,490 nominations. During the 1st session, 1,131 nominations were confirmed. In the last 2 days of the 1st session, the committee received 290 of these 1,490 nominations too late for the committee to act upon.

During the 2d session of the 84th Congress, we received 1,900. We confirmed 1,300. Three hundred of these were received during the last 2 days of this Congress, again too late to act upon.

Now, let us look at the Republican 80th Congress. In the Republican 80th Congress 1,340 nominations were received from President Truman. The 80th Congress confirmed only 520. That gives a clear picture of the situation. The same system was used in both Congresses, the 80th and the 84th.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was talking about the city of Indianapolis.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know.

Mr. CAPEHART. That particular nomination has been here for months. So far as I know, there is nothing against the gentleman who has been nominated. He is a career employee. He has worked for the Post Office Department for 25 years, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That may be true.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was unable to obtain from any member of the committee anything against the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That may be an isolated instance.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I should like to get back to the bill, but I yield to the Senator from Kentucky with the same understanding I previously had.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Kentucky seeks recognition for one purpose only, and that is for the purpose of considering a conference report which is at the clerk's desk. The chairman of the committee which handles the bill is present on the floor, and I ask that the Senator from New York yield so that the Senator from New Mexico may submit the conference report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President the conferees met this morning and disposed of the matter very satisfactorily. All the projects added to the bill by the Senate were agreed to, and not a single amount was changed.

There were some slight language changes made in the two Senate amendments. I think there is now before the Senate a very good bill.

I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, before I begin, I should like to ask if any other Senator wants the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wonder if we may have order. I shall not be very long. That is why I should like to have a little order, if I may, please.

Mr. President, we should be ever mindful of the danger that action by the Congress to benefit one State may have a harmful effect on other States. Certainly that is a possibility—I think a probability—if the pending bill becomes law.

There is no disputing the fact that an additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, as provided by this bill, would lower the water levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario—in fact, of all the other Great Lakes except Lake Superior. There is dispute over how much the levels would be lowered.

A representative of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, testifying before the House Committee on Public Works in 1953, said that every inch of reduction in the water levels of the Great Lakes could force each vessel plying the Lakes to reduce its load by approximately 100 tons. The effect of this on the total amount of shipping in the Great Lakes could be fantastic, particularly in view of the fact that the Federal Government and the State governments are spending millions of dollars to deepen Great Lakes channels in anticipation of oceangoing traffic resulting from the St. Lawrence seaway project.

It is indisputable that the proposed diversion would reduce the amount of water available for the generation of hydroelectric power at Niagara Falls and in the St. Lawrence River. I fear that the effect would be appreciable—and this at a time when the State of New York is spending $315 million, and Canada a similar amount, to develop the hydroelectric potential in the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg and Massena.

This bill is essentially the same as one vetoed by the President in 1954. The President made four points in his memorandum of disapproval. I should like to remind the Senate of three of them, which bear on the effects this legislation might have outside of Illinois.

First. "All methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion."

Second. "The diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada."

Third. "The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected."

In my opinion, the pending bill does not meet any of these objections.

The President pointed out that the International Joint Commission is presently studying the effect which the proposed diversion would have on the entire Great Lakes system. The Commission is expected to have a report ready this year—that is the final report, not the interim report. Even broader studies are being made by the Corps of Engineers, and the report on these studies is not expected before next year. The President, the Department of State, and the Bureau of the Budget have asked the Congress not to adopt the pending legislation until the results of these studies are known.

Mr. President, this legislation did not properly safeguard the interests of States other than Illinois in 1954. The pending bill does not properly safeguard those interests. I urge the defeat of the pending bill.

Mr. President, mention has been made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who spoke on this matter, of the interim report, dated June 14, 1955, as I recall; and it has also been stated that the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, on June 24, 1955, wrote a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works in opposition to the bill. But the Senator from Wisconsin did not mention the fact that even after that—on July 27, 1955—a letter was written by the State Department in opposition to the bill. In other words, both the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget are on record since the interim report came out.

I have examined the interim report. The distinguished Senator from Illinois very kindly loaned it to me so I could examine it. I cannot find in it anything at all of a final nature.

For the life of me I cannot understand why we should be doing anything of that sort until we have an agreement with Canada on it.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] seemed to indicate that

he thought Canada had nothing to do with this matter. Mr. President, I live in a State bordering two of the Great Lakes—Lake Erie and Lake Ontario—and Canada is on the other side of those two lakes. If the water level of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario is lowered to any appreciable extent—and at this time no one knows how much the level would be lowered by this bill—the bill, if enacted, would very definitely be injurious to the parts of both Canada and New York State and Ohio and the other adjoining States which would be affected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think we should be responsible for the fact that the Bureau of the Budget and the State Department do not keep up with the official reports. They should have been familiar with the interim report.

Mr. IVES. But it is an interim report, not a final report. I examined it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently the Senator from New York did not hear me say that we had been in telephonic communication with Mr. McWhorter, American Joint Chairman of the International Joint Commission and that he tells us that this is as final a report as we are likely to have. A few minutes ago we received word that he was sending a telegram to me, in care of the Democratic cloakroom, to confirm that.

We are now trying to get him on the telephone, to confirm it. I invite the Senator from New York to get on the telephone, when that call comes through, and talk to Mr. McWhorter personally.

Mr. IVES. However, unless that gentleman makes the statement officially his statement is not official. His report should not be made personally to either me or the Senator from Illinois or anyone esle. His official report should be made only to the official body to which the report is supposed to be made. I would not accept such a thing as being official at all.

Mr. President, somewhere along the line there must be a final report. Even if there is nothing in the report, it must be final. He has not made a final report. The report he has made very obviously is not a final one. It is on the basis of that report that objection has come from the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget. I am sure that both those agencies of the Government have very open minds on this subject. I can understand the attitude of the State Department, where Canada is concerned. I happen to be a neighbor of Canada, and I have quite a great deal of solicitude for that Dominion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is perfectly true that Canada is on the other side of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. But I hope the Senator from New York is sufficiently acquainted with the geography of the United States to know that Canada has nothing to do with Lake Michigan. I invite the Senator from New York to come to the map which is on display on this side of the Chamber, and I shall show him what that situation is.

Mr. IVES. I do not need to go nearer the map; I am farsighted, and can see it from where I stand. However, I am quite familiar with that part of the world.

I point out that the waters of Lake Michigan definitely affect the waters in the other lakes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New York quarrel with Elihu Root? I thought that at Hamilton College they swear by Elihu Root.

Mr. IVES. Of course, we swear by him; but we do not always agree with him. There is a big difference between swearing by a person and always agreeing with him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the pending bill, I believe there is a great deal of confusion in the minds of many persons.

Frankly, I do not claim to be an expert on matters of lake transportation or matters involving the flow of waters which will generate power.

However, reports which have come to me from various sources would indicate—although I am not quite as completely convinced—that there would be a loss both to navigation and to the power resources of the various States and communities which are served by the waters of the Great Lakes.

I have received many protests about the bill from the lakeside cities of my State, as well as from other communities which may be affected by the lessened height of the waters in Lake Michigan and the other lakes.

Mr. President, because of the protests I have received from responsible persons and from great communities, such as Buffalo, the second largest city in my State, I cannot support the bill.

I shall not take the time of the Senate at this late hour to discuss the bill in greater detail; but I wish to point out that in my opinion there are grave doubts as to the effect of the proposed diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a telegram from the executive vice president of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce; and a letter, addressed to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, by Mr. Robert Moses, chairman of the Power Authority of the State of New York.

Let me say that in addition to that telegram and letter and other letters, I have received a protest from the City Council of the city of Buffalo.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 6, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Lake Michigan Water Diversion bill being actively considered by Senate Public Works Committee contains elements that may adversely affect navigation in the port of Buffalo and hydroelectric power development at Niagara Falls. Channel depths at Buffalo are from 2 to 6 feet less than authorized connecting lake channels and because of rock bottoms would be extremely costly to deepen further. Ships carrying ore and stone would have to sacrifice up to 100 tons of cargo for each inch of lower water levels in Buffalo Harbor. Buffalo Chamber of Commerce is opposed to any diversion that will reduce navigating depths and the volume of water for hydro power purposes at Niagara. Bill should at least be amended to specifically direct Corps of Engineers to study impact of diversion upon harbors and the Niagara Power project in the 3-year test period.

CHARLES C. FICHTNER,
Executive Vice President, Buffalo Chamber of Commerce.

POWER AUTHORITY OF THE
STATE OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., July 29, 1955.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: It is with great concern, as to its effect on our St. Lawrence power project, that I notice H. R. 3210 has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now before your committee. The title of this bill is "An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway and for other purposes."

As you know, this bill would provide for a 3-year test on the effect of diverting an additional annual average flow of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway. It is said the study will provide information upon which to ascertain whether or not such increase, or possibly even more, should be made permanent.

I should like to point out one effect, which is of major concern to us, of such an increase in diversion should it be made permanent. This increase would result in a loss to us of 730,000 acre-feet of water per year which could be used for power generation in our St. Lawrence powerplant. Financially, this represents a minimum of $144,000 per year loss in revenue, or if capitalized at 3 percent per annum over the term of our Federal Power Commission license from the commencement of operation, would amount to approximately $13,360,000.

The St. Lawrence project has been successfully financed by a bond issue backed by the revenue to be derived from the sale of power and without the use of public credit. Construction is now well under way. The rates for the sale of power to cover costs of financing, operation, and maintenance have been fixed on the basis of anticipated power generation resulting from historical streamflows. Diversion to the Chicago Sanitary District and the State of Illinois of an annual flow of 1,500 cubic feet per second as validated by the Supreme Court in 1930 is now taking place. If we are deprived of the use of an additional annual average flow of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second, this sizable loss, translated into kilowatt-hours and dollars of revenue, will in the end have to be made up out of the pockets of the power users.

Furthermore, the effect this increased diversion might have on the capital cost of the St. Lawrence power and seaway project as a result of increased dredging costs for navigation and channel improvements has apparently not been given consideration in the discussion of this bill.

While we are not yet authorized to construct the Niagara project, the effect of the additional diversion on this development should not be overlooked. The quantity of flow at Niagara will have a power value of about four times that at the St. Lawrence project.

The bill before you has aptly been referred to as a "foot in the door" proposition which would lead to a permanent diversion of water affecting the entire Great Lakes area. We, therefore, respectfully urge that this bill be defeated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT MOSES,
Chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in case any Members of the Senate tuned in late on the pending bill, this is a proposal to increase, by a thousand cubic feet per second, the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, for a number of purposes, including navigation and sanitary purposes, under the direction and control of the Army engineers, with limits provided in the bill, so that there will be no abuses.

This problem has been with us for a long time. Exactly 3 years ago, on adjournment night at 11 o'clock, the Senate approved a similar bill; and I would be less than fair if I did not say that the President of the United States vetoed that bill. That distressed me somewhat. It disconcerted me, because President Eisenhower called me from Denver and said, "Everett, I am terribly disconcerted about having to veto this bill, but, of course, I must depend on the advice I receive from the Government agencies and Cabinet members." So he vetoed the bill.

This bill is substantially similar, except that it provides for a study for a limited period of 3 years. There can be no diversion beyond 5,000 cubic feet per second as a maximum, and the bill provides for an average annual diversion of 2,500 cubic feet per second. That is a thousand cubic feet over what the sanitary district is diverting at the present time.

The problem is very simple. The sanitary district is a quasimunicipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois. It must make provision for the treatment of sewage, and for sanitary purposes, for the equivalent of 7 million people.

The thing we quarrel about most is that a neighboring government has a veto over the health and navigation of our own people.

I share with my distinguished colleague from New York solicitude for and interest in our Dominion neighbors. However, I am not at all sure that they have been so sensitive and delicate about our interests, because if a report on the Columbia River Basin is finally made public it will be found that the Canadians made a determined effort to divert water on the Columbia River.

We are trying to accomplish our purpose by orderly processes. We think we need the water for sanitary purposes. We think we need it for navigation in the Illinois River, which is a link in the whole waterway system, embracing the St. Lawrence Seaway, tying it with the States, the Mississippi River, and the Gulf of Mexico. That is the reason we make this plea.

We believe that the Senate should approve the bill. There are some reasons for it; and I shall get around to the objections assigned in the veto message some 3 years ago.

First, let me say that after the decree of the Supreme Court, and the findings of Charles Evans Hughes as special master a generation ago, Chicago completed its treatment works. I fussed at the sanitary district years ago, when I was a Member of Congress and had a constituency on the Illinois River. I did not like the idea of Chicago sewage going down our river. I did not like the idea of the oxygen being taken out of the water, destroying the fish life.

The records of the Department of Commerce will show that at one time the Illinois River was second to the Columbia River in fish production. Sewage has destroyed it, largely because it took the oxygen out of the water. We are trying to repair that difficulty. Chicago completed its treatment works at a cost of $315 million. No raw sewage now goes through the sanitary canal or the Illinois River, but the water which is used in the treatment, what is called the effluent, obviously goes into the canal and into the river. The trouble is that that water, which is clear, is charged with a great deal of nitrogen, and is deficient in free oxygen.

There is only one way to repair the difficulty, and that is to take more fresh water from Lake Michigan to increase the quantity of free oxygen in the Illinois River. That is the first thing. The second thing is that we had a sanitary problem. We believe that under the direction of the Army engineers we are entitled to a 3-year study. That is all the bill provides for.

This Government, with the approval of the Congress, has built dams and structures in the Illinois River for purposes of navigation, and to maintain a 9-foot channel. When that was done the tonnage on the river was only about 200,000 tons a year. That tonnage has gone up to 21 million tons a year. We believe we are entitled to a 3-year study to see what the extra water would do so far as navigation is concerned.

We believe also that we are entitled to this study to see what damage is caused by low waters. The level goes up and down, on a cyclical basis, but the cost estimates before the Public Works Committee, as the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] can testify, run as high as $100 million.

All we ask for is a 3-year study under the direction, control, and supervision of the Army engineers.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Is not the Senator asking for something more? Is he not asking for an additional diversion of 1,000 average cubic feet per second, with a top level of 5,000 cubic feet per second, at a time when the Great Lakes are at their lowest point, and when the effect would be most disastrous, at least on Lake Erie and Lake Ontario?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I entirely disagree with my distinguished colleague from New York. I used to be a drainage contractor on the Illinois River. I know something about those waters. The reason why we established the 5,000-foot limit is that in the spring season, when the snows are melting and there are unprecedented spring rains, we get most of the water. That is the period of flood seasons on the middlewestern water courses. I recall the time when it was alleged that as much as 20,000 cubic feet was diverted at one time or another out of the lake.

We say, as a safeguard, that not more than 5,000 cubic feet per second at any one time can be taken out of Lake Michigan, no matter what the average is.

Mr. IVES. Am I to understand that the Senator from Illinois disagrees with his colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]? The Senator's colleague made the statement that the water is to be taken out when the lake is at its lowest level.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know what my colleague said, but I know what my experience was over a period of years as a drainage contractor. I know a little something about the water level. Regardless of what my colleague may have said, I think I know a little something about water level, based on experience; and I have a pretty fair idea of what this is all about.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who took the testimony on the bill.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that no part of Lake Michigan forms a part of the boundary between this country and Canada?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I was coming to that. The distinguished chairman has elicited the fact that the nearest place on Lake Michigan to the Dominion of Canada is 30 miles.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that Lake Michigan is as free from a veto power of our sovereignty, and our policy with reference to it, as it is with reference to any other inland lake, be it in South Dakota, Iowa, or Oklahoma?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is absolutely correct. Lake Michigan is entirely within the boundary of the United States of America. We are permitting another government to exercise a veto power on the navigation, health, and general well-being of millions of people in the sovereign State of Illinois.

Mr. KERR. Would we not, if we took that position as a national policy, be surrendering jurisdiction over an inland body of water with reference to which there is no possible basis for a claim of jurisdiction by any foreign government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly so. That matter was made emphatically clear under very skillful questioning by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Did I not ask the representative of the State Department to give us a brief for any basis in fact whereby Canada could possibly claim such jurisdiction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I was in the committee room when the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma undertook to get that information into the record.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator from Illinois that that information has not been furnished by the State Department.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That fact, I believe, speaks for itself, and it ought to be persuasive on the Members of the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the level of Lake Michigan, on the basis of the records of the Weather Bureau and meteorological authorities, varies as much as 5 to 6 feet?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the contemplated diversion would influence it only by one-half of 1 inch?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct, and very little more, if that. I was going to implement that by reading a portion of the interim report of the International Joint Commission and the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers, dated June 14, 1955. They say:

> The maximum temporary reduction in lake levels would be about five-eighths of an inch.

Some of the cities along the Great Lakes have been complaining that there would be a distressing effect upon navigation. Yet they cannot conclusively establish that such a modest reduction in lake levels, whether it is Erie or Huron, or whether it is Ontario or Michigan, would have any appreciable effect upon navigation. It seems to me that that case falls.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator know that in the case to which he referred a moment ago, under the commissionership of Justice Hughes, the engineers testified that the loss in the lake level of Ontario and Erie of that diversion would be between 3 and 4 acres.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but that is a fact of more than 25 or 20 years ago.

Mr. BRICKER. But the effect on the level is just the same.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the testimony indicated a rise and fall of lake levels; so that there is no appreciable effect on navigation.

Mr. BRICKER. The rise and fall of the lake level is due to a cyclical period which has been going on for as long a time as records have been kept. If the level of the lake is lowered by 3 inches at one time, commerce in my State is affected; and if the level of the lake is lowered 4 inches at another time, commerce in my State is likewise affected. Therefore it is not the average that counts, but the amount of the diversion which lowers the level at any given time. Whether it is high or low, it is bound to affect commerce in the lower lakes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I know is that the International Board appeared before the committee, and the interim report of the Ontario Board was before the committee, and with all the figures adduced there was no showing that it was going to have any appreciable effect upon navigation.

On the one side we have that factor. And of course there is the power generation at Niagara; but the amount of power which might be lost is almost infinitesimal when we compare it with the entire wattage that is generated. On the other side we have the health and well-being of literally millions of people. We have no other place to go, Mr. President.

Finally there was no quarreling, of course, when Canada, for instance, on some projects in her territory was either taking water out of the Great Lakes Basin or putting water into it. My colleagues from Illinois pursued that matter at considerable length. I am referring to the Ogoki project.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the Senator said a moment ago that the city of Chicago had complied with the mandate in regard to the construction of the sewage disposal program, which does present an injurious effect on the health of the people of Chicago by the effluent from the disposal plant.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but my distinguished friend forgets that the sanitary district, in area and in equivalent population it must serve, is growing year after year, and that it embraces suburban communities. Hence there is a growing need for water in order to meet that augmented problem.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senators mean to say, in other words, that the problem is growing so acute that the city of Chicago and the suburban areas are unable to keep up with it. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mean that we must have water to take care of it, in order to wash it out and get rid of the effluent and redissolve the effluent, and in that way get enough free oxygen so as not to destroy a fine stream like the Illinois River. That is one of the many facets in the picture I am now emphasizing.

Mr. BRICKER. If the Senator will read the record he will find that the problem is not serious at all since Chicago has complied with the mandate for the construction of the processing plants.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with that; but I remind my good friend from Ohio, who was assistant attorney general of Ohio when this question was brought before the courts, that Chicago had to reverse the course of the Chicago River, because previously the result had been that hundreds and hundreds of people had died from typhoid fever. Certainly we should not be expected to wait until there is a recurrence of another calamity or another disaster. We are being forehanded in the interest of the health of millions of people.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the Senator said that there is no imperiling of the health of the people at the present time, because the effluent is not dangerous to health.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously it is necessary to have water with which to wash the effluent out into the stream, and at the same time to be mindful of the interests of the people who live along the water course, and who also have an interest in this matter.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator suggest to the Senate that 1,000 extra cubic feet per second would be sufficient and adequate to take care of those things?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from Ohio puts his finger on it. The bill specifically provides for a 3-year study under the direction of the Corps of Army Engineers. Once the 3-year period has lapsed, that is the end of the effective time of the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois is familiar with the report of Donald R. Belcher, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in which he said:

> The President stated in his memorandum of disapproval that reasonable opportunity to complete these surveys should be afforded before legislative action is undertaken.

The Senator spoke about an interim report. Someone has said that in the course of a few months the final report would be made. Why would it not be well to wait until the final report has been made and then determine what action to take, instead of giving authority to the district, as the bill provides, to use no water during high water?

The bill provides that the "Secretary of the Army shall not allow any water to be directly diverted from Lake Michigan to flow into the Illinois waterway during times of flood"; but in low water may use up to 5,000 cubic feet in 1 second, which is the equivalent of this program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The reason for not waiting is that the final report cannot change the intermediate report so far as the finding of a figure is concerned as related to the lake level.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On that very point I may say that for the third time this evening I have been in telephonic communication with Mr. McWhorter, the American chairman of the joint commission. I asked the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] to come and listen to the conversation, but he did not feel that he ought to do so. Mr. McWhorter informed me that the final report, which is now under preparation, will show the same result as the interim report, namely, that the maximum effect on the lake level of Erie and Ontario will be three-eighths of 1 inch.

The maximum effect on Lake Michigan and Lake Huron will be five-eighths of an inch.

A telegram is coming here which I expect to have delivered at any moment, which will confirm my statement—and here it is. [Laughter.]

It is as follows:

> The report on the effect of diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of water at Chicago as shown in the interim report of the International Lake Ontario Engineering Board is expected to be exactly the same as will be shown in the final report of the Board. You will recall that I testified 2 years ago that the effect of the diversion would not lower Lake Ontario as much as half an inch.

That telegram is signed by Roger B. McWhorter, Acting Chairman, International Joint Commission.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator read that over again? It refers to 1,000 cubic feet. The Senator wants 5,000 cubic feet in times of low water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It will take many years for this average of 1,000 cubic feet to have the effect of three-eighths of an inch on Erie and Ontario.

Mr. WILEY. That is not what I mean. Please read the telegram again.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this bill in specific language provides that the average annual diversion will not be 5,000 cubic feet, but 2,500 cubic feet per second. The language is found on page 2 of the bill, and I read it for the edification of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin:

> In addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than 2,500 cubic feet of water per second.

Mr. WILEY. Let me make my point, and then I think the Senator will understand it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand it completely.

Mr. WILEY. When the Senator says we will not take any water at high water, it means that when there is low water we will take 5,000 cubic feet. The distinguished Senator from New York stated what that amount would be in terms of tonnage.

Mr. IVES. It would be 100 tons per inch.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have heard talk about the plimsol line which is marked on vessels to show how much cargo they should carry, but I have not found anyone who could come up with figures to show there is a line so far as cargoes on lake vessels are concerned. The chief of the port authority undertook to come before the committee, and, in my judgment, he made the case pretty clear. He is not only identified with the port authority, but he was a skipper in his own right, and he spoke from a wealth of experience.

Mr. President, I am not disposed to detain the Senate on this matter. I think we should get around to a vote. We have made our case, and I sincerely hope the Senate will have some regard for the rights of the people of Illinois and permit no neighboring country to veto our health needs, our navigation needs, and the amount of water we must take out of Lake Michigan.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. This matter came up suddenly this evening. I did not know the bill was coming up at all. Where is the record of testimony taken before the committee? Are there copies of it here?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Testimony was taken 3 years ago, and testimony was recently taken over a period of time.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it printed and available to the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know. I know that when the committee was in session I appeared before the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The official transcript of the testimony before the Senate Public Works Committee is available and I have a copy with me which I am happy to furnish to and do now deliver to the Senator from Ohio. These records have been available to all who were interested in following this legislation closely.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I should like to have a live quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McNamara
Allott	Green	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hennings	Morse
Beall	Hill	Mundt
Bender	Holland	Murray
Bennett	Hruska	Neely
Bible	Humphrey, Minn.	Neuberger
Bricker	Humphreys, Ky.	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Ives	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Payne
Butler	Jenner	Purtell
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Scott
Chavez	Knowland	Smathers
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Wofford
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright		
George		

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Before the Senator from Vermont begins his remarks, the Chair requests that the visitors in the galleries, those who are members of the Senate staff, and the Members of the Senate cooperate in the last few hours of the session so that several items of important business which still remain to be considered may be concluded.

The Chair does not wish to insist on order as the various Senators speak on the matters which are before the Senate, except when it becomes necessary. But it is important, if the conclusion of the Senate's business is to be reached tonight, that order be maintained.

The Chair will appreciate the cooperation of all who are in the Senate Chamber as we proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the beginning of the debate, when the Senator from Vermont undertook to point out how the diversion of the waters which ultimately flow to the St. Lawrence River over Niagara Falls, through the Massena power development, and thence to the Atlantic Ocean would be injurious to his State and possibly would jeopardize the 100,000 kilowatts of power which Vermont expects to receive from the power development on the St. Lawrence River, the Senator from Vermont was referred to as being greedy for undertaking to protect the 100,000 kilowatts of power to which his State is clearly entitled. I am simply wondering who is greedy.

I think we have before us an unparalleled example of greed in a great city, which has probably reached the limit of its growth and is undertaking to continue to grow uneconomically at the cost of all the rural areas of 10, 15, or possibly 20 States.

Only 2 years ago Congress authorized the development of navigation on the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. This navigational project will mean much to most of the great States of the Union, from Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa to all the States to the eastward.

We are now informed that if the water is diverted, so as to lower the level of the lakes even 1 inch, 2 inches, or 4 inches—we do not know how much it will be—the shipping on the Great Lakes and in the St. Lawrence River will be adversely affected. No one seems to know how much or to what extent; but we are told that the shipping will be adversely affected.

I do not know to what extent the power development in the power-short Northeast will be affected. But I do know that the bill permits the diversion of 5,000 second-feet of water during the low-water period. This amount of water would generate a tremendous amount of power as it went over Niagara Falls and over the 256-foot drop in the St. Lawrence River. It would not be as if that amount were diverted from high water. The diversion would come out of the firm power which is to be generated at Niagara Falls and in Massena Rapids.

This would be a terrible calamity for the States which need the power desperately. We do not have atomic energy plants in our region. Neither do we have natural gas from which to generate power at a price at which we can afford to use it. We must depend on hydropower.

Is there anyone who can say honestly that we who live in the northeastern section of the United States are greedy if we try to protect our right to have power?

I have noted one thing. I think the Senators from Illinois have given the finest argument for the decentralization of population and the decentralization of industry which I have heard for a long time. They freely admit in their arguments that the great city of Chicago has reached its maximum growth. They admit that the sewage of that city has

reached such great proportions that it would take the waters of the Great Lakes to purify it and to keep the city clean.

When a city has reached the limit of its growth, why should we then undertake to despoil Minnesota, to despoil upper New York, to despoil the rural areas of all the other States, so that that city may grow bigger and bigger and bigger, even though that growth may be uneconomical? That is no way to create a stronger country. There are plenty of other places in the world where people can live and business can be established besides Chicago.

It has been said that Canada can turn water south into the Great Lakes to make up for what Chicago takes out to carry the sewage away from that great city. But the water which Canada would turn into the Great Lakes, as I pointed out, cannot be used to generate power for Northeastern United States.

The Senator from Vermont has been called greedy tonight because he is attempting to protect his own State. My goodness. We are entitled to that little 100,000 kilowatts of electricity. But I maintain that the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois are not entitled to ravage the countryside to the north of them by taking waters from the Great Lakes to wash away their sewage. Let them make less sewage in Chicago. [Laughter.] Let them decentralize and get out of there. The city is big enough. Both Senators from Illinois have admitted by their arguments that the city of Chicago has reached the limit of its growth and has even gone beyond it.

So why not let Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, Ohio, and all the other areas in the Great Lakes Basin have that to which they are entitled, instead of attempting to rob them in this fashion so that one great city may become greater?

Mr. President, I said I would speak at length on this subject. I could speak at considerable length, but it would merely be a reiteration of what I have said. I hope the Senate will give me the courtesy of a record vote on the bill so that we may see how each of us stands.

SEVERAL SENATORS. No! No!

Mr. AIKEN. I hear several Senators say "No." Let us see in a record vote how the Senators stand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has asked for the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I think there are some facts which the Senator from Vermont and the Senate should note. He is saying that the proposed diversion will imperil the 100,000 kilowatts which Vermont will get from the St. Lawrence. I spent some days in the St. Lawrence area last November. The generating capacity on the American side of the St. Lawrence is approximately 1 million kilowatts. Is that not correct?

Mr. AIKEN. It is about 700,000 kilowatts at Massena.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Vermont is to get 100,000 of the 700,000 kilowatts.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That leaves quite a margin. Let us see what the International Joint Commission has said about the reduction of power which will be caused by the proposed additional diversion. I read from page 12:

> The maximum reduction in dependable capacity which could occur at Canadian and United States plants would be 2,600 and 2,750 kilowatts, respectively. These maximum reductions could occur only in conditions of critical low flow during December and October, 1961, for Canadian and United States plants, respectively.

In other words, the Senator from Vermont is objecting to a decrease of 2,600 kilowatts out of 800,000 kilowatts. Whether that is greed or plain misinformation, I shall let the Senate decide.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know where the information read by the Senator from Illinois comes from, but if anybody has said that 2,500 second-feet of water falling at Niagara and over the Massena Rapids do not generate over 2,600 kilowatts, he is greatly mistaken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said the diversion would reduce the capacity only by that amount.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, for the first time I have seen the typewritten record. There seems to have been presented to us no printed record at all. I did not know the bill was coming up, but it is interesting to go through the record. No reference has been made to certain interesting matters in it.

I see, first of all, that the attorney general of my State appeared before the committee. I see also that the mayor of Manitowoc also appeared. I see also that the city attorney of Green Bay appeared. I see that Curtis Lee Smith, president of the chamber of commerce, appeared.

HOUSING ACT OF 1956— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may yield the floor for the purpose of having the Senate consider the conference report on the housing bill, H. R. 11742.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield for that purpose.

HOUSING ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is a bill which has been of considerable interest to all of us. I wish to say that we have worked in the conference all day long, and I believe the Senate should feel pleased over the results.

I should like to explain rather briefly this rather long bill.

FHA's title I program of insured loans for home repairs and improvements was extended for 3 years. Authority was granted for the FHA Commissioner to waive the requirement that a new house be occupied for 6 months before the owner can obtain a title I loan. The maximum loan for single-family structures was increased from $2,500 to $3,500; and for multifamily structures from $10,000 to $15,000. The FHA Commissioner is authorized at his discretion to increase the repayment period for title I loans on single-family structures from 3 to 5 years. A new interest rate formula is provided for title I loans consisting of interest equivalent to 5 percent discount on amounts up to $2,500 and 4 percent discount on amounts over $2,500.

In order to meet the growing need for rental housing the Senate conferees agreed to a provision which increases the maximum loan-to-value ratio on FHA insured rental housing loans from 80 percent to 90 percent.

The bill reduces from 65 to 50 percent the proportion of veterans in a cooperative group required to make the cooperative eligible for the more liberal terms accorded a veteran cooperative. It would also permit World War I veterans to be counted in determining the percentage of veteran members of a cooperative group. The FHA Commissioner is authorized to increase the maximum loan amount available to FHA-insured cooperative projects by $1,000 per room in high-cost areas. A new provision was added to section 213 of the National Housing Act which would permit a mortgagor-sponsor approved by the Commissioner to obtain an FHA-insured mortgage upon certification to the Commissioner that the completed housing project will be sold to a cooperative group. Such a sponsor would be entitled to a mortgage not to exceed 85 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost of the property. When the property is completed, it may be sold to an eligible cooperative group which will, of course, be entitled to receive the insured mortgage under the terms and conditions available to cooperative groups. If a mortgagor-sponsor takes advantage of these new provisions and fails to sell the completed property or project to a cooperative group, as defined in the bill, he shall not thereafter be eligible for any additional FHA-insured loans under this section.

The bill also contains a provision to encourage the trade-in house program. This provision permits an existing house to have the same loan-to-value ratio for FHA mortgage insurance as the amount available for a new house, with a safeguard to prevent home builders from avoiding FHA inspections.

The bill contains a provision to increase from $7,000 to $12,000 the maximum loan amount under the FHA insurance program for disaster housing loans. This provision is identical to S. 2854 which passed the Senate in April.

In order to continue the normal FHA insurance programs, the bill provides $3 billion of insurance authorization beginning July 1, 1956. This amount includes any insurance authorization which was unused on that date.

The bill contains a number of new features designed to activate the FHA section 221 program to provide housing for families displaced from urban renewal areas. It is the purpose of these amendments to implement a much-needed program which to date has been largely ineffective. The maximum loan for section 221 mortgages is increased from $7,600 to $9,000, and from $8,600 to $10,000 in high-cost areas. The bill permits the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages amounting to 100 percent of the value on both sales and rental housing, except that with respect to sales housing the borrower must pay $200 cash which may include settlement costs, taxes, and other closing costs. The maximum maturity on section 221 loans is increased from 30 to 40 years on both sales and rental housing. If the mortgagor is a private nonprofit corporation not subject to State or local regulations, the mortgagor must be regulated by the FHA Commissioner.

The Senate bill contained a provision authorizing the FHA to permit up to 10 percent in profit for sponsors of housing to be built in urban renewal areas. The House bill contained a similar provision, except that it would require an allowance of 10 percent for profit unless the FHA Commissioner certifies by regulation that a lesser profit is warranted. After careful consideration of the necessity to replace housing demolished in slum areas, and considering the minor differences between the two bills, the Senate conferees agreed to the provision in the House bill. Except for certain minor additions, the conference bill contains the other provisions on cost certification from the original Senate bill.

The House bill would have extended the military housing program to September 30, 1959, and the Senate bill would have extended the program until December 31, 1957. The conference bill compromised these dates and extends the military housing program until June 30, 1958. The FHA insurance authorization for military housing was increased to $2.3 billion, which was the amount contained in the Senate bill. The House bill raised the average unit cost of military housing from $13,000 to $16,500. The Senate conferees agreed to this increase with a provision that the $16,500 ceiling must include the cost of equipment built into the houses. This provision has the practical effect of reducing the amount originally provided in the House bill.

The acquisition of military housing constructed under the so-called Wherry Act was an item of serious disagreement in conference. I believe that the provisions contained in the conference bill should satisfy the Senate. The bill provides that where a new military housing project is to be constructed, the Department of Defense must acquire any Wherry Act project at or near the same military installation. The formula for acquisition is exactly the same as that agreed upon by the Armed Services Committees in the military construction bill. This calls for negotiations between the Government and the owner, and for condemnation proceedings if negotiations fail. This should prevent overbuilding of military housing under title VIII of the National Housing Act, and should provide a fair means for the Government to purchase existing projects.

The bill would permit a third party to pay downpayments for a mortgagor 60 years of age or older who buys a house with an FHA-insured loan. The National Housing Act is amended to permit more liberal financing of rental housing designed specifically for elderly persons (90 percent of replacement cost) if the mortgagor is a nonprofit organization and if the entire property or project is specifically designed for the use of elderly persons. The bill also directs the HHFA to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for the elderly.

Although no public housing units are provided specifically for the elderly, the bill does contain some provisions designed to assist elderly persons in obtaining a fair share of the public housing units constructed or to be constructed under the regular program. Thus, a single person aged 65 or over would be permitted to occupy a public housing unit if he meets other requirements. Elderly persons may receive preference in public housing units and units may be designed for the occupancy of elderly persons. An elderly person is not required as are other persons to come from unsafe or insanitary dwellings in order to be eligible. The cost ceiling for public housing units designed for the elderly is established at $2,250 per room in contrast with the cost ceiling of $1,750 per room for regular units.

Most of the provisions regarding the Federal National Mortgage Association, which appeared in the original Senate bill, are retained in the conference bill. The most significant change concerns the purchase of mortgages under the special assistance programs of FNMA. The Senate bill required that such mortgages should be purchased at par. The House would not agree with this provision, and the conference bill provides that for 1 year these mortgages must be purchased at not less than 99 percent of par. This is the purchase price presently established under administrative discretion.

Most of the Senate provisions concerning the Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal program were retained. The Senate conferees accepted a provision to increase the ceiling on urban renewal funds which may be made available in any one State, in order to avoid the possibility that this program would not be curtailed in States having the greatest need for slum clearance and urban renewal. The conference bill also amends the provision providing assistance for families or businesses forced to give up their homes or buildings as a result of slum clearance. The Senate bill provided that this compensation could include an estimate of loss of goodwill in the case of businesses. The House conferees were adamant that this provision be deleted, and the conference bill does not permit allowances for the loss of goodwill.

In the field of public housing the bill authorizes 35,000 units for 1957 and 1958. The unused balances for 1956 may also be used in any succeeding year. These units are to be made available only to communities with a workable program. At the present time, only 10 percent of the funds available for public housing are permitted to be expended in any one State. This 10 percent limitation is increased to 15 percent. In addition, a provision of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953 restricting the number of public housing units which may be started in any one year is repealed.

The provisions of the Senate bill concerning the disposition of certain farm-labor camps were retained with several amendments including a provision that no camp in Florida may be sold unless the proceeds are used to provide additional units of housing for farm laborers.

The provisions in the original Senate bill concerning the transfer or sale of defense-housing projects were administration proposals. The conference bill retains these provisions with several amendments and additions to which there has been no objection.

The conference bill contains an increase of $250 million in the loan fund for college housing. The House insisted that college housing loans should not be extended to divinity schools, and this provision is not in the bill.

Title V of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to extend for 5 years the farm-housing program authorized by that title. This provision extends the program to June 30, 1961, authorizes $450 million for farm-housing loans, $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments of loans for potentially adequate farms, and $50 million in grants and loans for improvement and repair of farms.

The original Senate bill contained a provision to revive authority for hospital construction loans. This provision remains in the conference bill, except that the authority will be available through fiscal year 1958 instead of fiscal year 1957, as provided in the Senate bill.

The VA direct loan program which has been an extremely valuable portion of our housing program is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1957. The VA-guaranty home loan program has been extended for 1 year by a bill recently passed by both House and Senate, H. R. 9260. A provision in the bill would bring the direct loan program in line with the guaranty program by extending it for 1 year.

We worked out the very controversial Wherry housing program in a way which I believe will be thoroughly acceptable to the Senate. We adopted, to a great extent, what is provided in the military construction bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Oklahoma refused to sign the report on the ground that the Senate was placed in the position of being forced to accept the "take-out" provision for Wherry housing to be offered to the Government under conditions which we both feared would open dangerous possibilities of windfall profits from Wherry projects.

For that reason, neither the Senator from Illinois nor I felt we could sign the conference report. The Senate is placed in a peculiar position, in that the House was adamant in demanding that there be legislation enacted giving the owners of Wherry housing the right to negotiate the sale of such houses or to have them sold through condemnation, which, under a court test, the Senator from Illinois and I thought would cause great windfall profits, because there would be shown an appreciation of values which the builders did not have in the houses, but which would result only because of their proximity to large military installations. For that reason we were unable to sign the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Oklahoma has very well stated the position taken both by him and by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in conference. Of course, Senators will remember that two nights ago, when the provision was debated, the Senate as a whole was very much disturbed over the Wherry provisions of the House bill. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma will acknowledge that we did the very best we could.

Mr. MONRONEY. The report represents the very best possible compromise that could be made, but I personally feel that the matter should be given careful study and investigation by the Banking and Currency Committees of the two Houses next year, and not have the measure forced on us in the closing hours of this session.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In such event there would not have been a housing bill. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that, so far as sale by negotiation is concerned, we adopted the formula which the Senate had already adopted in a previous measure. I can only say with reference to condemnation, we have no control over condemnation awards. Such matters are settled under provisions of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that when private property is taken, just compensation shall be paid. Congress cannot write a formula to change that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Alabama will remember, I am sure, that last night, after the Senate reduced the number of public housing units from 135,000 to 35,000, it completely eliminated the provision respecting housing for elderly people. I refused to serve on the conference committee. I did so as a protest against the action of the Senate, in the first place, in reducing the number of units from 135,000 to 35,000, and, in the second place, for making it impossible for Members of the conference committee even to discuss the all-important question of public housing.

Now we have a bill—I do not know all the provisions of it—as a result of a conference which was held this afternoon. I do know that the bill contains a pitifully and pathetically small number of public housing units. The bill provides for only 35,000 units instead of 135,000 units, which number was adopted in a measure passed by the Senate only 2 or 3 months ago. The bill also contains no provision whatsoever for housing for elderly people. I think it is a record in which no Member of the Senate can take pride, and I deplore it and protest against it with all the vigor at my command.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York knows we did the best we could in respect to public housing, if we were to have a housing bill at all. The Senator is correct in stating his own position. But, Mr. President, after all, legislation, at best, must be a compromise; and we got the very best compromise we could.

I wish to correct one thing the Senator said; he said that in the bill there is no provision for housing for elderly persons. Mr. President, the conference report does not contain the fine program which was in the bill as it was passed by the Senate, or even the one which was in the bill as reported by the House committee. But we still include the FHA provisions to assist elderly persons. In the public housing which is provided—in other words, 35,000 a year for each of the next 2 years, plus the carryover, which will be approximately 20,000 units, making a total of approximately 90,000 units over the next 2 years—there is considerable relief for elderly persons. I hope the units provided will prove to be a test which will make it possible for us on the next go-around to take steps which will be of real help to the elderly persons of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator from Alabama will yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do the provisions of the conference report require that the Secretary of Defense purchase the Wherry housing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only in those cases in which title 8 housing—Capehart housing—has been authorized, where there are Wherry housing projects on or near the particular installation; and the requirement is that the Government shall first try to purchase by negotiation; and if that fails, then by condemnation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Secretary of Defense required to make a finding that there is a military necessity for the housing, before he buys it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true, because he cannot get Capehart housing without making such a finding, and he is required to purchase only where he proposes to build Capehart housing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I may say the members of the armed services subcommittee dealing with military housing the other night—with the provision of the bill requiring the Secretary to buy Wherry housing—felt that would be improper if it should be required, with the price formula which was in that bill, which would be the cost or replacement plus depreciation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator will recall that we were in general agreement with that viewpoint, and we took out the price formula, and coupled the compulsory purchase of Wherry projects with the attempt to build new housing at the post.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the requirement to purchase is only where a finding has been made of a military need for the housing; is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this morning we passed an immigration bill, a measure which would make some constructive changes in the McCarran-Walter Act and some essential modifications in the Refugee Relief Act.

It was not a radical bill, and the changes were not sweeping ones, although they were good for America and represent a constructive liberalization both of the McCarran-Walter Act and the Refugee Relief Act—amendments which would help make these two laws work in a more humane and flexible manner—more in keeping with the spirit and tradition of America.

Before the Senate passed that legislation, it considered and then turned down by a voice vote some very far-reaching proposals for the modification of the Immigration and Nationality Act, made by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who had associated with him on that proposal a number—I think it was 12—of other Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to the leadership which has been given to the forces fighting for immigration reform by the junior Senator from New York. He has been fighting that battle, and has been supported by other Members of this body—and I could name quite a few names: the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—and quite a few other Senators—ever since he has been a Member of the Senate. It has been one of his chief crusades, and he is, as we all know, an inveterate crusader for the causes in which he believes, whether all of us go along with him in all those causes or not.

In my judgment, the bill the Senate passed today was in some measure at least, if not in a major measure, a reflection of the tireless advocacy of immigration reform of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I do not want to overlook anybody who deserves credit in this field, and there are those on both sides of the aisle. But I do want to say that Senator LEHMAN has been a most tireless spokesman for immigration reform not only in the Senate, but in the

country at large. I know of his efforts to inform the American people on this issue, and both the supporters and opponents of changes in our immigration laws recognize his leadership in this field.

I want to say that those of us who agree with him, and those of us who disagree with him, honor his efforts and the sincerity of his position.

Although I do not believe that he felt the bill we passed today was a big enough step forward, he did say that he considered it a step forward and he supported and voted for it. I believe that no one will challenge my statement that his tireless activities on this front, as well as those of the other Members of the Senate to whom I have referred both by name and by blanket reference, helped make possible today's action.

ANNOTATED EXCERPTS FROM ARMY STAFF PAPER ASKING BASIC CHANGE IN MILITARY SETUP

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I addressed the Senate on the dangers that would accrue to this country in the event that control of our military establishments passed from civilian authority to a General Staff Corps.

At that time I asked unanimous consent that an article on this subject appearing in the June 24, 1956, issue of the New York Times be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. Through inadvertence, this did not occur and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOTATED EXCERPTS FROM ARMY STAFF PAPER ASKING BASIC CHANGE IN MILITARY SETUP

NOTE.—On June 24, 1956, the New York Times published "excerpts from an official United States Army staff paper criticizing the 'hydrogen bomb concept' of national defense and calling for a fundamental change in the command and organization of the armed services of the United States." In an accompanying story Mr. James Reston, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, stated that the "Army view was that since the problems its staff paper dealt with had not been settled but were still under active debate in the Pentagon, there was nothing wrong with making its views known to the public."

This official Army paper concerns a matter which is of vital importance to the welfare and security of this Nation.

" 'To separate them [the armed services] makes them rival services with the whole train of evils which such rivalry creates, evils which in times of peace mean contention before Congress for unbalanced appropriations, grievances, and fretfulness about relative rank and rapidity of promotion and in time of war the substitution of * * * service prides for a single emotion of pride in one service.' (Annual report of the Secretary of War [Newton D. Baker], 1919.)"

(Comment: It is fitting that Newton D. Baker should be quoted as an authority for a plan to pass the control of our military establishment from the civilians to a General Staff. While Mr. Baker was Secretary of War he relinquished effective civilian control over the War Department. In 1916, following a long struggle for control by the Army General Staff, Secretary of War Baker directed that from thenceforth the Chief of Staff of the Army would run all activities of the War Department "speaking in the name of the Secretary of War." This was a carte blanche for the Chief of Staff and a vital victory for the Army General Staff within the War Department. This latest plan vividly demonstrates the difficulties confronting the present Secretary of the Army, Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, in maintaining civilian control within the Department of the Army. Mr. Brucker has publicly and unequivocally expressed his opposition to the integrated single service concept. In spite of this clear expression of the views of the civilian head of the Department of the Army, his Army General Staff has prepared and published an official staff paper which is a master plan for the creation of a single service supreme general staff organization which would destroy effective civilian control of the military establishment. Ironically, a key point in this plan is the complete elimination of Secretary Brucker's job.)

1

"The objective of this study is to determine the most suitable organization for a thoroughly integrated military establishment. This objective is not a new one. Over a period of years many plans and much legislation have been advanced to 'unify' the armed services. Outwardly a measure of 'unification' has been achieved. Fundamentally the unification visualized by the Army planners who supported the National Security Act of 1947 has not been achieved.

2

"Dictionary definitions of 'unification' are of no value in studying the course of what is generally termed unification of the armed forces. Unification, in this latter context, means, and has meant different things to different persons or groups.

"These meanings extend all the way from the loosest encouragement to cooperate to a tightly knit, vertical structure of Federal military command over, and including, all three services.

"Almost traditionally, the Army has oriented its views toward the latter extreme, perhaps influenced by its doctrinal belief in unity of command. Today this unity of command exists in the person and office of Secretary of Defense and represents an accomplished objective of past Army policy. Beyond that objective, however, unification from the Army standpoint has been a failure."

(Comment: Army General Staff objective admitted to be single military commander, a monolithic command structure of an extreme nature. This can only be achieved by imposition of a Prussian-German-type single Chief of Staff and a Supreme General Staff over the Military Establishment. It could only be achieved by destroying civilian control of the Military Establishment.)

3

"There is a definite need for thorough integration of the Military Establishment. This approach to the problem of national defense is essentially an Army one. However, the desirability of this objective has been borne out by history.

"(a) The experiences of World War II with uniservice approaches to the problem of national defense had their effect upon the operations of the separate military establishments and the semiautonomous Army Air Corps. Significantly, World War II for this country began with a military disaster that has been traced directly to the fallacy of mutual cooperation.

"(1) Due to the gravity of the Japanese crisis in the autumn of 1941, the War and Navy Departments kept their commanders in Hawaii well informed on the progress of negotiations with Japan and of the measures they should take. Here, however, were two separate service commanders: Admiral Kimmel, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, and Lieutenant General Short, Commanding General of the Hawaiian Department. Both were under orders to conduct their relations under the principle of mutual cooperation.

"This applied not only to everyday business but to the approved war plan (Rainbow No. 5) for the area. Each commander relied upon his own service department for information and each tried to keep the other informed.

"Several Important Exceptions.

"Nonetheless, there were several important and noteworthy exceptions * * *

"The existing joint plan for the defense of the Hawaiian Coastal Frontier placed the responsibility for distant reconnaissance, air and surface, on the Navy. But for reasons not necessary to evaluate here, Admiral Kimmel decided not to institute long-range reconnaissance against air attack. This was not known to the Commanding General of the Hawaiian Department until after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Until then, General Short continued to assume that he could rely on the Navy to give him adequate warning of the approach of a hostile force.

"On the other hand, General Short failed to notify the admiral that the Army had instituted only a limited alert, which required the Interceptor Command (including the radar) to operate only from 4 a. m. to 7 a. m. Admiral Kimmel assumed that the Army was on an all-out alert and that the radar was in full operation. This was not a breakdown of personalities, for the two commanders were close friends. It was the failure of a doctrine, 'mutual cooperation,' that had never been tested in warfare. And it is a doctrine that continues, despite this lesson, to have its supporters today."

(Comment: This is, at best, a one-sided interpretation of the Pearl Harbor tragedy. Further, the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization and subordinate command structure which we now have is completely different from that existing at the beginning of World War II. Pearl Harbor is a "strawman." The attempted comparison is fallacious.)

"2. Following Pearl Harbor, the files of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were filled with records of attempts by the Army, generally successful after argument, to establish unity of command among the active Army and Navy forces conducting military operations both at home and abroad. Generally, frictions over unity of command decreased in direct ratio to the distance from Washington.

"However, it was almost a year and a half following the investigation of Pearl Harbor that a paper was approved establishing broad principles to govern the exercise of unity of command in joint operations and it did not provide for unity of command as the normal method of coordination.

"3. Despite these advances, and after the praises showered on operational unity in Europe, the Southwest Pacific and the Pacific Ocean areas, the United States incongruously approached the final defeat of Japan with the United States command structure in the western Pacific surprisingly uncoordinated.

"The offensive against Japan consisted of a two-pronged approach: [General of the Army Douglas] MacArthur's advance northwest across northern New Guinea and the Philippines; and [Fleet Adm. Chester W.] Nimitz' advance west through the Pacific islands to Okinawa. Command difficulties became greater when the 20th Air Force, later to become the United States Strategic Air Force, controlled directly from Washington, was added as a third independent force in the Pacific. Thus at one time there were five separate American air forces or components to be coordinated, and on occasions both Army and Navy air elements scheduled strikes simultaneously on the same targets, completely oblivious of the other's plan."

(Comment: This is, again, a one-sided interpretation stated as a categorical fact. Such statements are subject to authoritative

refutation. This is an example of trying to establish a premise by using the broad assertion and half-truth technique. Another gratuitous slur on the Air Force.)

4

"The National Security Act of 1947, passed by Congress with the intent of unifying both the administration and the strategic planning and operations of the armed services, was a compromise of traditional service roles and missions, or 'functions,' and of service concepts thereof."

(Comment: The law did intend, as stated in the Declaration of Policy of the National Security Act of 1947, amended, to provide "effective strategic direction of the Armed Forces and for their operation under unified control" * * * This has been achieved in accordance with law, by placing such authority in the Secretary of Defense, and by establishing under him unified commanders in the various theaters of operations. The law specifically states the military departments shall be 'separately administered.' Thus, the statement that the law was passed with the intent of unifying the administration of the armed services is false. On the contrary, Congress has repeatedly rejected this concept. The service roles and missions as prescribed by Congress were not a compromise. Congress specified, in accordance with its constitutional obligations, the basic functions for each service. Congress did not compromise with the requirements of national security. The roles and missions are as necessary, as sound, as applicable, and as responsive to defense needs and technological advancements today as they were when written into the National Security Act. The Army General Staff opposed roles and missions then because, in putting such provisions in law, Congress blocked the Army General Staff plans to take over the Marine Corps and encroach on the proper functions of the Navy and Air Force.)

"Only at the Department of Defense level of the national defense structure was true unification achieved. Further than this, unification in 1947 could not be legislated, for de facto integration of the three armed services has its basis in the assignment of roles and missions oriented toward accomplishing a specific national strategy. Therein lies the basic divergency which today divides rather than unifies the Military Establishment."

5

"A series of interservice divergencies, or differences of opinion, doctrine or 'policy,' today mitigate against effective integration of the armed services. Most of these divergencies stem from three fundamental differences in service doctrine which must be subordinated or settled by compromise before true integration of the Military Establishment can be accomplished. These fundamental divergencies will be discussed briefly:"

(Comment: If these divergencies are so vital and fundamental, isn't this the precise area in which civilian control should be exercised? These are matters which should be decided by the Secretary of Defense and the President rather than by a military chief of staff.)

"A. Although in apparent outward agreement to date, the Army and the Air Force are divided on the basic concept for fighting World War III. In brief, the Air Force believes in the so-called short war concept, primarily a strategic air war of massive atomic destruction in which a decision will be reached in from 30 to 60 days.

"In opposition to this concept is the fundamental Army belief that decision will not be reached, in a manner acceptable to our basic national objectives, until the effectiveness of enemy land, sea, and air forces as war-making potentials of enemy power have been neutralized. The Army believes that this should be accomplished by integrated Armed Forces, which patently will require a considerably longer time period than 60 days. Basically, this is a doctrinal split of some years' standing, the Air Force adhering to the 'decisiveness of airpower' * * * which the Army has never accepted as valid. Nonetheless, this divergency of honest opinion has influenced all subsidiary considerations of service roles and missions, force levels, appropriations, and the determination of basic national policy.

"Unity of command

"B. A fundamental belief of the Army is the doctrine of unity of command: the mission and the responsibility given to one commander, who has authority over, and control of, all means necessary to the accomplishment of the mission. In opposition to this belief is that advanced by the Air Force and, to a lesser extent, the Navy: the doctrine of 'cooperation.' "

(Comment: Again the Army General Staff argument that a single military commander is needed over all the Armed Forces, because one man has to command units in actual combat. This fails to distinguish between the requirements for command in combat and formulation of military policy at the seat of Government. This contention that both situations require a single commander was condemned as false and dangerous by both the late James Forrestal and the Hoover Commission task force on national security.)

"Essentially the cooporation theme states that unity of command is achieved at the theater commander level and that subordinate forces can participate in joint action on a coequal status of cooperation. This has been an old Army-Navy issue of many years' standing, although the Navy has modified its attitude considerably since World War II.

"The Air Force, however, which as the Army Air Corps touted unity of command, upon achieving independent status completely reversed its views on this issue. This divergence of views has been reflected in many subsidiary issues relating to air defense and air support of ground forces. Despite much historical evidence substantiating the validity of the unity-of-command concept, it remains an interservice issue.

"Arms development and use

"In many aspects of the respective service views on [weapons-system development and employment] there is a correlation to the basic service split on national strategy. However, the impact of weapons-system development on the roles and missions of the services is such that it stands alone as a fundamental issue of service divergency."

(Comment: It is an "interservice issue" only to the extent the Army General Staff makes it such by insisting on having its own way.)

"This divergency reaches primarily into two doctrinal fields of weapons-system development and application, although there are many related subsidiary issues.

"These two fields are (1) atomic energy and (2) guided missiles. In the first of these, military application of atomic energy, the heart of the divergency is closely related to service views on the decisiveness of airpower. Atomic weapons have given substance to the Air Force doctrine that a military decision can be obtained through air bombardment alone. However, this doctrine was propounded by the airpower enthusiasts long before the atomic bomb was conceived.

"This doctrine was not valid until the thermonuclear bomb was invented. Thus a valid weapon has been granted to an invalid doctrine to give the latter some substance. But to execute this air-atomic doctrine, to the extent that a 'decision' can be achieved, requires the total destruction of an enemy nation.

"Rather than concur with the 'decisiveness' of thermonuclear destruction as a desirable course of action, the Army takes the position that this type of decision is morally, politically, and practically unjustifiable when the application of graduated, selective politico-military force can achieve the desired national security objective without unduly risking enemy thermonuclear reaction."

(Comment: This is an open, overt attack on the Air Force and national defense policy. Again, the Army General Staff condemnation of everything that does not accord with its views.)

"An extreme eventuality visualized by the Air Force is the possibility that guided missiles will shortly replace the manned combat aircraft as an interceptor, close-ground-support and strategic-bombardment weapon. In stark projection of such a concept, the Air Force can see itself reduced to a troop-carrying and logistic support service to the Army, unless it obtains control of the guided missile function of the future. As an argument for its control of guided missiles, the Air Force has adopted the position that missiles are a supplement to and replacement of Air Force manned aircraft, that missiles will be used on targets now attacked by aircraft and that therefore missiles are primarily an Air Force weapon.

"On the other hand, the Army visualizes the guided missile as a logical extension of its military arm which, by increasing the range and lethality of fire-power, will enhance the tactical and strategic mobility of ground combat forces.

"Reconciliation is asked

"D. Thus the internal stresses within the Military Establishment, which tend to divert rather than integrate the armed services, have their root in uniservice doctrines considered essential to the prosecution of individual service roles and missions."

(Comment: Again the attack on roles and missions. This is a broad statement that is not a categorical fact. There is no source of conflict in statutory roles and missions except that which is generated by a refusal to accept and abide by the law.)

"It is where these functions overlap, bringing divergent doctrine onto the same battlefield, that interservice divergencies become most evident.

"It is doubtful if true integration of the Military Establishment can be accomplished unless these fundamental differences can be reconciled or otherwise eliminated.

6

"[Here followed (1) a description of the service attitudes toward unification prior to the National Security Act of 1947 and (2) a critique of that act from the Army's point of view.]

"Analysis of service experience with unification since 1947 reveals four basic causes for the lack of truly integrated operation of the Armed Forces to date:"

(Comment: "Truly integrated operation of the armed services" is a vague and meaningless term, and gives a false impression of effectiveness of actual war effort. After all, there was unity of command in Korea, and integration of forces and effort.)

"A. Divergent service doctrine on three specific fundamentals.

"B. The nature of 'command' over the armed services as promulgated by Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953."

(Comment: Reorganization Plan No. 6 emphasized civilian "command." This is repugnant to the Army General Staff. This assertion lays basis for eliminating civilian secretaries, as this document proposes below.)

"C. Adherence by the services to the 'Joint Chiefs of Staff concept.' "

(Comment: A generalized indictment of the war-proven JCS system; assumes that it is bad per se for the services to adhere to the JCS system as established by law. Such a slur on the JCS is a necessary step in moving to the plan, proposed below, for junking the JCS in favor of a supreme general staff.)

"D. Overlapping and undefined functions resulting from the trielemental, land-sea-air approach to the allocating of roles and missions to the separate armed services."

(Comment: This is factually wrong. Congress in writing roles and missions into the National Security Act rejected the Prussian-German trielemental theory and based roles and missions on the American "functional" or "balanced force" concept. This Army General Staff statement is the product of either deliberate misrepresentation or ignorance. At least until now Army General Staff cleverness has not been characterized by ignorance of essential facts and military terminology.)

"Courses of actions listed

"Having isolated the deterrents to integration of the Armed Forces, it is possible to deduce certain courses of action which singly, or in combination, might provide a concept for the most suitable organization for a thoroughly integrated Military Establishment. These are:

"A. Retain present organization, but develop a common doctrine for all services.

"B. Retain present organization, but redefine the functions for the separate services.

"C. Revise the National Security Act to reorganize the Department of Defense above the military services level.

"D. Revise the National Security Act to reorganize the military services, per se, into an integrated national armed force.

"[Here followed analyses of the four courses of action with the conclusion that course (C) offered the most chance of success in achieving traditional Army unification objectives.]

"[The Army's argument in favor of this course follows.]

"This concept visualizes a Military Establishment organized as follows:

"(1) An essentially military Department of Defense, organized as a joint military staff. This Department is directed by a civilian Secretary of Defense who is both a Cabinet officer and commander of the Armed Forces in the name of the President as Commander in Chief."

(Comment: To assure that the supreme general staff will be certain of controlling the Department of Defense, the entire Department is to be included in the supreme staff.)

"Directly responsive to the Secretary, as a staff affiliate, is a civilian controller and a civilian general counsel. Through these agencies the Secretary controls the legal and budgetary functions of the Department and the military services.

"(2) Directly subordinate to the Secretary of Defense is the chief of the joint staff. The joint staff is the operating element, which in fact comprises the Department of Defense."

(Comment: The joint (supreme) staff becomes the Department of Defense—manpower, research, troop information and education, draft requirements, industrial requirements, procurement, etc. This would be the greatest single grant of power to the military in all modern history. The magnitude of this grant of power to the military is readily apparent when it is considered that the Department of Defense is the greatest single spending agency in the world today. The power that would accrue to the joint (supreme) staff through its direct and indirect control of the national economy which would inevitably flow from the expenditure of the defense billions is appalling to any thinking American.)

"The Chief of the Joint Staff is appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. He may be from any of the three military services, however, the office will be rotated among the three services. His tenure will be limited by statute. He may be extended for additional 2-year periods upon nomination by the President with the consent of the Senate. Upon assuming office, he will be retired from his service and upon completing his assignment he may no longer return to duty with any component of the military service but will continue in retirement at the full statutory pay of his office. During his term in office, he will be, as a civilian, the military commander of the armed services, but will have no budgetary authority. He will be the military adviser to the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the National Security Council."

(Comment: Chief of the Joint Staff—

1. Will be retired before taking office. By overnight change of clothes he is supposed, apparently, to become a civilian.

2. Cannot be a civilian. Under law a retired officer remains an officer. Retired officers are in the military service of the Government. This was decided by the Supreme Court in the case of *U. S.* v. *Tyler* (1882) (105 U. S. 244). There are various statutes which confirm this status of retired officers. For example, section 1c, title 10, United States Code provides as follows:

"(a) The Regular Army is that component of the Army which consists of persons whose continuous service on active duty in both peace and war is contemplated by law, and of persons who are retired members of the Regular Army."

Further, article 2 (4) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice provides that:

"Retired personnel of a regular component of the Armed Forces who are entitled to receive pay" are subject to court-martial jurisdiction.

This is just another example of the ignorance or deliberate misrepresentations of preparing this paper.

3. Is commander of all military forces, and the joint (supreme) staff, which includes the entire Department of Defense.

4. "No budgetary authority." A meaningless restriction. The Chief of Staff, as herein proposed, will control the Department of Defense (the supreme staff), and his power to set military policy, strategy requirements, manpower requirements, weapons and industrial requirements will be so great as to exert indirect control over defense budgets. He will have all the planning agencies and can produce the facts to support his requirements. No other agency will have a source of military information; hence no way of checking on the Chief of Staff's decisions.

5. Will be sole military advisor to Secretary of Defense, President, and National Security Council. Thus the civilian "superiors" will have only one viewpoint, and recommendation, and will not have any way of knowing whether there were serious military objections to what has been decided by the Chief of Staff. Civilian superiors will have only one alternative to Chief of Staff's position and that would be to veto it. This they could not do as they would have no alternate plan to substitute for it. This is the manner in which the chiefs of the great German general staff boxed in and controlled their nominal constitutional superiors.)

"Two deputies provided

"3. The chief of the joint staff will be served by two deputies: a deputy chief of staff for plans and operations, and a deputy chief of staff for requirements. These officers will each be of a different armed service than the chief of the joint staff and each other. They may serve for no more than 4 years in the Department of Defense after assuming deputy status and upon completion of their assignment will be retired on full pay, with the exception that they may be reappointed immediately as chief of staff of the joint staff.

"(4) The deputy chief of staff for plans and operations will be served by three assistant chiefs of staff: an assistant chief of staff for operations, assistant chief of staff for plans, and an assistant cihef of staff for intelligence. Each of these assistant chiefs of staff will be of a different military service. They may serve for no more than 4 years in the Department of Defense after assuming assistant status and upon completion of their assignment will be retired on full pay, with the exception that they may be reappointed immediately as a deputy or as chief of the joint staff.

"(5) The deputy chief of staff for requirements will be served by three assistant chiefs of staff: an assistant chef of staff for personnel, assistant chief of staff for logistics and an assistant chief of staff for research and development. Each of these assistant chiefs of staff will be from a different service and will be subject to the same terms of tenure of office and retirement as the assistants for operations, plans, and intelligence.

"(6) This Department of Defense joint staff need not be wholly military but no fixed ratio of civilian appointments to military personnel should be established. The staff, however, should be predominantly military. Throughout subordinate staff organization, the principle of integrated assignment of officers from different services to personnel spaces should be adhered to, as should a policy of rotation of specific spaces among the different services. Officers below the assistant chief of staff level on duty with the Department of Defense joint staff should be limited to no more than 4 consecutive years of staff duty, with a minimum 2 years duty required outside the department before he can be reassigned for another tour. This restriction can be voided during time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress."

(Comment: All civilian deputy and assistant secretaries of defense would be replaced by military officials. A really clean sweep by the supreme general staff: eliminates all chance of Secretary of Defense having influence in or information from Department of Defense except as permitted by the Chief of Staff.

Also note how line of succession to higher power in the supreme staff is provided. Duty on the supreme staff becomes a new career, subject only to occasional interruptions for other duty. However, in war and national emergency there is no restriction on continuous duty. This closely parallels similar aspects of the great German general staff system, which led to a permanent corps of general staff officers whose careers centered almost exclusively on general staff duty. This in turn resulted in loss of realism and increased "ivory tower" thinking.)

"No separate departments

"(7) Below the Department of Defense, there will be no separate Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force per se. The directing functions of the present military departments will be absorbed into either the Department of Defense, the separate service staffs, or both."

(Comment: One big merger into one service, precisely what Congress has prohibited in the most unmistakable terms, complete centralization of control into the Department of Defense, which is, in fact, the supreme general staff.)

"(8) The chief of staff of the joint staff will hold direct command over the Army, Navy, and the Air Force through the commanding Generals of the Army and the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations. He will also designate and command directly the unified commanders. Forces for the unified commands will be allocated by the chief of staff and provided, on his order, by the service commanding generals and Chief of Naval Operations. The chief of staff of the joint staff will be responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the strategic planning and direction of the Armed Forces and for maintaining the efficiency of the Military Establishment, its state of preparation for military operations, and plans therefore."

(Comment: Chief of staff commands the Army, Navy, and Air Force through the military heads of those services. The Secre-

taries of Army, Navy, and Air Force are eliminated, replaced by the military. No longer will the Secretary of Defense control the military departments through their respective secretaries. Every vestige of civilian control is destroyed. Also destroyed is the Marine Corps. There is less chance of civilian control under this Army General Staff blueprint than there was in the German armed forces in the palmiest days of the great general staff.)

"From this analysis, course of action C offers the most chance of success in achieving traditional Army unification objectives. Therefore, the most suitable organization for a thoroughly integrated Military Establishment can be achieved by revision of the National Security Act of 1947 to reorganize the Department of Defense above the military services level within the concept outlined for course of action C."

(Comment: A correct statement. What is the traditional Army General Staff unification objective? James Forrestal knew what that objective was. He pointedly stated it was the isolation of civilian control of the military, and he further stated that General Marshall "quite frankly said so." This plan certainly would achieve that objective.)

ESSENTIALS OF THE ARMY GENERAL STAFF PLAN FOR ESTABLISHING A PRUSSIAN-TYPE HIGH COMMAND

1. Destruction of the war-proven Joint Chiefs of Staff.
2. Creation of a single chief of staff.
3. Creation of a supreme general staff.
4. Elimination of civilian Deputy and Assistant Secretaries of Defense.
5. Replaces civilian Deputy and Assistant Secretaries of Defense with deputy and assistant Chiefs of Staff.
6. Makes Department of Defense identical with the supreme general staff. Thus, the Chief of Staff and the supreme staff would control all the activities now performed by the Department of Defense. Its power would effect every home, school, and industry in the country.
7. Eliminates the civilian Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.
8. Replaces the civilian secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force with military officers.
9. Gives Chief of Staff actual command over all Armed Forces.
10. Chief of Staff to have power to settle all differences of opinion in Armed Forces as to proper national military policy. Does not even have to refer basic policy questions to Secretary of Defense or President.
11. Chief of Staff displaces Secretary of Defense as real authority over Department of Defense. Chief of Staff directs Department of Defense for the Secretary of Defense.
12. Chief of staff sole adviser on military matters to Secretary of Defense, President, and National Security Council. Can control the information his "superiors" receive.
13. Would be able likewise to decide what information Congress should receive on national defense matters. Would be the end of effective congressional action in defense matters.
14. Would eliminate the Marine Corps.
15. Establishes system for successive promotions through the supreme staff hierarchy, and continuing rotation of individual officers to duty in the supreme staff.
16. Creates "ivory tower" in which those who make plans are not responsible for carrying them out.
17. Substitutes the Prussian-German supreme general staff system for the United States-developed Joint Chiefs of Staff system.
18. Thus it would destroy civilian control of the military, prevent congressional "interference" in military matters, and destroy the war-proven JCS system, substituting in its place the high command system of the vanquished.

NOTE.—Every one of these proposed changes is contrary to the letter or spirit of the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on National Security.

FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report on the flood insurance bill is at the desk. I call this matter to the attention of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining the details of the conference action may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

I urge immediate adoption of the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Fortunately, the House made few changes in its action on this Senate bill. Therefore, there were only a few points to be adjusted in the conference between the two Houses.

The Senate found it necessary to recede to the House in the following three matters:

1. Under the conference bill a loan-contract program will be made available whereby a potential flood victim, upon payment of a fee to be fixed by the Administrator of this program, can assure himself of the right to a loan in the event he becomes a flood victim. It is expected that this program will operate in a manner similar to the procedures provided for the V-loans under the Defense Production Act of 1950. This loan-contract program will supplement the flood-insurance program provided in other portions of the bill. Potential flood victims may choose to purchase their flood protection in the form of insurance or loans or a combination of the two. For a fee less than it will cost to buy flood insurance, a potential flood victim may assure himself of the financial means to repair flood loss under the loan-contract provision. The bill as it passed the Senate contained no comparable provision.

2. Under the conference bill, the flood insurance and loan-contract program will be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in whom is vested operating and management policy. Under the conference bill, he may appoint a Commissioner to assist him in these duties. As it passed the Senate, the bill would have created a Federal Flood Insurance Administration as an agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and would have required a Commissioner to head that Administration to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate bill would also have vested operating and management control in the Commissioner.

3. The conference bill modifies the definition of "flood" to make it clear that the insurance and loan-contract program will cover, among other forms of water damage, surface landslides due to excess moisture, thus excluding underground cave-ins. As it passed the Senate, the bill defined "flood" to include, among other things, any landslide due to excess moisture.

This concludes a summation of the matters on which the Senate receded to the House. In two respects the House receded to the Senate in the conference bill.

First, the House receded to the Senate on the ratemaking provisions so that the maximum subsidy on the rate for insurance or loan contracts is 40 percent. As the bill passed the House it would have placed no limit on the amount of subsidy for flood insurance or loan contracts issued to owner-occupants of dwellings.

Second, the House also receded to the Senate on certain technical changes affecting the requirement for State participation in paying subsidies under the program after June 30, 1959.

While I personally am not pleased with all the provisions of this bill, I am happy that for the first time the Congress of the United States is placing the finishing touches on an experimental program of flood insurance that should go far toward relieving the anguish of those affected by floodwaters. Deficiencies in the program can be spotted as the provisions of the statute are placed in actual operation. These defects can be remedied by future legislation where it is advisable. The important thing is that the conference bill will accomplish a humanitarian and practical method of helping flood victims to help themselves through a program of insurance. I urge immediate adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the conference report on the mutual security appropriation bill is at the desk. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will call it up.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 26, 1956, pp. 14768–14769, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to

House bill 12130, which was read as follows:

In the House of Representatives, U. S.,
July 26, 1956.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18 and 27 to the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: ": *Provided,* That at least $50,000,000 on a grant basis shall be made available for Spain, exclusive of interregional expenses: *Provided further,* That not less than $18,500,000 of the amount available for Spain shall be used for agricultural commodities."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have a table which reflects the amount of the bill as passed by the House, the amount of the bill as passed by the Senate, and the amount carried by the conference report, in the case of each item. I ask that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement on mutual security appropriations bill, 1957

Items	Appropriations, 1956	Estimates, 1957	Recommended in House bill, 1957	Recommended by Senate, 1957	Conference agreement
MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
Appropriation	$1,022,200,000	$3,000,000,000	$1,735,000,000	$2,300,000,000	$2,017,500,000
Unobligated and unreserved balance	33,900,000	166,600,000	195,500,000	195,500,000	195,500,000
Total, military assistance	1,056,100,000	3,166,600,000	1,930,500,000	2,495,500,000	2,213,000,000
DEFENSE SUPPORT					
Europe	85,500,000	78,700,000	63,700,000	71,200,000	68,700,000
Near East and Africa	113,700,000	170,000,000	165,000,000	170,000,000	167,500,000
Asia:					
Appropriation	800,000,000	882,000,000	865,000,000	882,000,000	873,500,000
Unobligated balance	25,000,000				
Subtotal, Asia	825,000,000	882,000,000	865,000,000	882,000,000	873,500,000
Latin America			35,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
Total, defense support:					
Appropriation	999,200,000	1,130,700,000	1,128,700,000	1,175,200,000	1,161,700,000
Unobligated balance	25,000,000				
Total appropriation and unobligated balance	1,024,200,000	1,130,700,000	1,128,700,000	1,175,200,000	1,161,700,000
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE					
Near East and Africa	73,000,000	63,000,000	60,000,000	293,000,000	250,000,000
Asia	51,000,000	80,000,000	70,000,000		
Latin America	38,000,000	27,000,000			
Total, development assistance	162,000,000	170,000,000	130,000,000	293,000,000	250,000,00
TECHNICAL COOPERATION					
General authorization	127,500,000	140,500,000	135,000,000	140,500,000	135,000,000
United Nations program	24,000,000	15,500,000	10,000,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Organization of American States	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total, technical cooperation	153,000,000	157,500,000	146,500,000	157,500,000	152,000,000
OTHER PROGRAMS					
Special assistance, joint control areas	21,000,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000
Special Presidential fund	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
United Nations refugee fund	1,200,000	2,300,000	2,000,000	1,800,000	1,900,000
Escapee program	6,000,000	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
United Nations Children's Fund	14,500,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
United Nations Relief and Works Agency:					
Appropriation	58,366,750				
Unobligated balance	3,633,250	45,300,000	45,300,000	45,300,000	45,300,000
Total appropriation and unobligated balance	62,000,000	45,300,000	45,300,000	45,300,000	45,300,000
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	3,700,000				
Ocean freight, voluntary relief shipments	2,000,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	3,000,000	2,500,000
Ocean freight, surplus agricultural commodities	13,000,000	14,000,000			
Control Act expenses	1,175,000	1,175,000	1,175,000	1,175,000	1,175,000
Administrative expenses	33,500,000	35,250,000	34,145,000	33,045,000	33,595,000
President's fund for Asian development	100,000,000	100,000,000			
Special authorization for Middle East and Africa		100,000,000	100,000,000		
Foreign reactor projects		5,950,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
Total, other programs:					
Appropriation	366,941,750	401,775,000	284,920,000	185,220,000	185,370,000
Unobligated balance	3,633,250	45,300,000	45,300,000	45,300,000	45,300,000
Total appropriation and unobligated balance	370,575,000	447,075,000	330,220,000	230,520,000	230,670,000
Total, mutual security:					
Appropriation	2,703,341,750	4,859,975,000	3,425,120,000	4,110,920,000	3,766,570,000
Unobligated balance	62,533,250	211,900,000	240,800,000	240,800,000	240,800,000
Total appropriation and unobligated balance	2,765,875,000	5,071,875,000	3,665,920,000	4,351,720,000	4,007,370,000
Conference agreement under Senate bill					344,350,000
Conference agreement over House bill					341,450,000

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Congress has now completed action on all of the regular and supplemental appropriation bills for this year. I have a table which reflects the action of the House of Representatives and the action of the Senate on the budget estimates submitted to each body. The final amount approved for the regular and supplemental appropriation bills for 1957 is $59,729,807,628. This amount is a net decrease of $220,529,181 from the budget estimates of $59,950,336,809 submitted to the Senate. The table does not reflect permanent appropriations, estimated to total $7,564,859,833, which required no further action from Congress.

The table also shows action by the Congress on deficiencies and supplementals for 1956. The final amount approved for these was $918,109,962, which is a decrease of $24,531,766 below estimates of $942,641,728 submitted to the Senate.

The grand total of all appropriations approved by the 84th Congress, 2d session, amounts to $60,647,917,590, which is $245,060,947 below the budget estimates of $60,892,978,537 considered by the Senate during the session. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the details on the appropriation for each department for the session.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Department or establishment	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House		Passed House		Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	
		Date	Amount	Date	Amount		Date	Amount
Regular annual acts, 1957:								
Agriculture	$1,987,302,268	May 11	$1,983,512,568	May 14	$1,983,512,568	$1,989,841,668	May 18	$2,016,771,068
Commerce	1,552,673,000	Apr. 27	1,382,003,000	May 2	1,382,003,000	1,522,673,000	May 23	1,445,566,000
Defense	34,147,850,000	May 3	33,635,066,000	May 10	33,635,066,000	34,147,850,000	June 18	34,983,734,000
District of Columbia	(182,899,500)	Mar. 15	(179,797,800)	Mar. 19	(179,797,800)	(182,899,500)	June 1	(181,682,050)
Federal payment	22,358,650	do	22,358,650	do	22,358,650	22,358,650	do	22,708,650
General Government	15,014,475	Feb. 27	14,849,275	Mar. 1	14,849,275	15,014,475	May 24	14,969,975
Independent offices	5,783,704,000	Mar. 2	6,005,157,260	Mar. 7	6,010,543,290	5,783,704,000	do	5,916,997,258
Interior	426,748,200	Feb. 17	415,963,200	Feb. 21	415,963,200	435,142,300	Apr. 17	433,851,400
Labor—HEW	2,363,648,400	Mar. 2	2,296,810,781	Mar. 5	2,296,981,781	2,363,885,400	June 1	2,372,023,281
Legislative	93,664,903	May 24	89,376,450	May 29	89,376,450	122,496,933	June 14	117,804,058
Mutual security	4,859,975,000	July 6	3,425,120,000	July 11	3,425,120,000	4,859,975,000	July 14	4,105,420,000
Public Works	818,501,000	May 21	787,453,000	May 22	790,758,000	818,501,000	June 8	871,886,000
State—Justice—Judiciary	598,169,820	Apr. 20	541,367,372	Apr. 25	541,367,372	599,104,820	May 21	556,271,517
Treasury, Post Office	3,649,872,000	Feb. 3	3,618,699,000	Feb. 7	3,618,699,000	3,649,872,000	Mar. 6	3,639,579,000
Subtotal, regular annual acts	56,289,481,716		54,217,736,556		54,226,598,586	56,330,419,246		56,497,582,207
Supplemental acts, 1957:								
The supplemental, 1957	1,222,849,525	July 7	1,555,535,425	July 12	1,555,589,275	1,254,364,525	July 14	1,722,089,675
Second supplemental, 1957 [1]	1,912,095,000	July 20	2,341,895,000	July 24	1,941,895,000	2,365,553,038	July 24	2,311,391,438
Subtotal, regular and supplemental acts, 1957	59,424,426,241		58,115,166,981		57,724,082,861	59,950,336,809		60,531,063,320
Deficiencies and supplementals, 1956:								
Urgent deficiency, 1956	64,505,201	Feb. 3	61,504,201	Feb. 7	64,670,201	64,505,201	Feb. 8	70,195,066
Second supplemental, 1956	835,902,923	Mar. 15	795,743,823	Mar. 21	795,768,823	878,136,527	Apr. 11	858,864,176
Labor, 1956		do		Mar. 15			Mar. 15	
Subtotal, deficiencies and supplementals, 1956	900,408,124		[2] 857,248,024		860,439,024	942,641,728		929,059,242
Grand total, 84th Cong., 2d sess	60,324,834,365		58,972,415,005		58,584,521,885	60,892,978,537		61,460,122,562

Department or establishment	Passed Senate		Public law		Increase (+) or decrease (−) compared to budget estimates to Senate	Bill No.	Law No.
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount			
Regular annual acts, 1957:							
Agriculture	May 22	$2,018,331,068	June 4	$1,993,744,968	+$3,903,300	11777	554
Commerce	May 31	1,446,316,000	June 19	1,416,732,000	−105,941,000	10899	604
Defense	June 26	34,783,734,000	July 2	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000	10986	639
District of Columbia	June 5	(181,687,490)	June 29	(181,612,490)	(−1,287,010)	10003	637
Federal payment	do	22,708,650	do	22,558,650	+200,000		
General Government	June 6	14,969,975	June 13	14,969,975	−44,500	9536	578
Independent offices	do	5,925,187,646	June 27	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826	9739	623
Interior	Apr. 23	433,876,400	June 13	423,934,100	−11,208,200	9390	573
Labor—HEW	June 5	2,372,523,281	June 29	2,366,380,781	+2,495,381	9720	635
Legislative	June 18	117,804,058	June 27	117,804,058	−4,692,875	11473	624
Mutual security	July 24	4,110,920,000		3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000	12130	
Public Works	June 13	872,186,000	July 2	856,727,000	+38,226,000	11319	641
State—Justice—Judiciary	May 25	556,271,517	June 19	548,930,957	−50,173,863	10721	603
Treasury, Post Office	Mar. 7	3,639,579,000	Apr. 2	3,629,139,000	−20,733,000	9064	467
Subtotal, regular annual acts		56,314,407,595		55,780,736,315	−549,682,931		
Supplemental acts, 1957:							
The supplemental, 1957	July 16	1,724,639,675		1,691,341,875	+436,977,350	12138	
Second supplemental, 1957 [1]	July 25	2,316,142,438		2,257,729,438	−107,823,600	12350	
Subtotal, regular and supplemental acts, 1957		60,355,189,708		59,729,807,628	−220,529,181		
Deficiencies and supplementals, 1956:							
Urgent deficiency, 1956	Feb. 10	65,695,066	Feb. 14	65,695,066	+1,189,865	9063	406
Second supplemental, 1956	Apr. 12	838,864,176	May 19	852,414,896	−25,721,631	10004	533
Labor, 1956	Mar. 15					H. J. Res. 582	432
Subtotal, deficiencies and supplementals, 1956		904,559,242		918,109,962	−24,531,766		
Grand total, 84th Cong., 2d sess		61,259,748,950		[3] 60,647,917,590	−245,060,947		

[1] Amounts shown do not include budget estimates of $1,150,000,000 for Department of Commerce and $500,000 for Department of Labor to be derived by transfer from Highway Trust Fund: Conference totals do not include $800,000,000 for Department of Commerce and $300,000 for Department of Labor to be derived from Highway Trust Fund.

[2] Does not include $1,200,000,000 contained in H. R. 10654 for acreage reserve and soil conservation payments which the House did not act upon.

[3] Does not include permanent appropriations, estimated to total $7,564,859,833.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the conference report on the social security bill is at the desk. I ask our beloved and cherished friend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to submit it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 26, 1956, pp. 14815–14828, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the reports?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill was very thoroughly debated in the Senate. I think all Members of the Senate are familiar with its main provisions, all of which are retained in the conference report. Some of the other amendments—while meritorious, of course—are not retained in the report, because the House would not agree to them.

I therefore move the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have prepared a written address on the social security bill. While perhaps I covered the high points of this address in my speech before the Senate the other day, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel strongly that we have arrived at the time when we should improve our social security program by providing for the payment of insurance benefits to the men and women of our country who are unfortunate enough to become permanently and totally disabled.

INSURANCE VERSUS ASSISTANCE APPROACH

The hearings which the Finance Committee conducted in 1950, 1954, and this year have amply demonstrated that it is imperative to liberalize the social security program to help disabled persons. The burden of disability is a crushing load on many families. Not only does the disabled person have the worry, the discouragement, and the frustration due to the loss of his health, but he has the heavy weight of increased medical and hospital bills, nursing services and drugs, the loss of his regular income, and the continued financial responsibility for the support of his wife and the education and care of his children.

Every Senator knows individual cases where prolonged sickness and disability has reduced a proud and self-supporting person to a helpless, dependent individual who must look to his wife, or to his children or relatives, or to private or public charity to support him. The children may have to drop out of school to help maintain the family. The wife may have to work long hours at low-paying odd jobs to earn enough to keep the family together.

In my judgment, this is not a sound or wise policy. Every time we cut short the education of a promising young boy or girl we are not only making it difficult for that person to have a successful career but we are losing for our Nation productive or inventive skills which may have been developed through proper schooling. Every time we force a mother into the labor market against her will we are disrupting family life and sowing the seeds of further hardship, delinquency, and despair.

Today, there are over 400,000 permanently and totally disabled persons receiving public relief in the United States. Just think of that. I ask Senators to stop and reflect for a moment what it would mean if someone you knew, someone you held dear to you, some friend of yours, had to apply for public relief because he or she was permanently and totally disabled.

I wonder how many of us realize that the number of disabled on public relief is increasing every month. I recognize that we cannot organize our society so that we can prevent all disability or insure everyone against it. We must have a system of public assistance for those disabled who are in need. I am proud to have been a member of the conference committee in 1950 which authorized Federal grants to the States for aid to the needy disabled. This was a forward step at the time and has yielded us much in experience. It was a wise step, and many of the fears about the administration of such a proposal have proved to be groundless.

But, in my opinion, we cannot be content with the assistance program as one of our major approaches to meeting the economic needs of our disabled group.

I find it singularly distressing and very strange in the year 1956 to hear the arguments of those who say we can rely upon public assistance to meet the needs of our disabled. We have not followed this principle with respect to our aged, our widowed mothers and dependent children, or the unemployed. As a progressive and enlightened Nation we have adopted the policy that assistance is a second line of defense and that we want to rely on the tried and tested method of contributory social insurance to meet the major economic hazards of our industrial society. I believe we should, we can, and we must now apply the contributory social insurance principle to the risk of permanent total disability.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF DISABILTY PROPOSAL

Before discussing in more detail my reasons for wholeheartedly supporting the disability proposal, I want to outline the major provisions of the proposal. The disability-insurance provisions have been carefully drawn. They are the result of many years of consideration by those who have studied the problem. The provisions safeguard the financial soundness of the program and they assure that it can be administered economically, efficiently, and wisely.

To be eligible for disability benefits an individual must comply with all of the eight following requirements:

1. He must have worked and contributed to the social security program for a substantial period of time. In order for an individual to be insured for disability benefits he must meet not merely one test of attachment to the labor market, not merely two tests, but three separate, distinct requirements. An individual must have had 6 quarters of coverage, that is 1½ years, in the 13 quarter period ending with the quarter of his disablement and 20 quarters of coverage, that is 5 years, in the 40-quarter period ending with the quarter of his disablement. He must also be fully insured, which means that an individual who becomes disabled in the future may need as much as 10 years of coverage and contributions under the Social Security System. These eligibility conditions are adequate assurance that casual and intermittent workers will not be eligible for benefits. Only persons who have demonstrated that they can hold a job for a substantial period of time can gain insurance rights for disability. There is adequate protection in this way to the System. As I said, there are three separate eligibility tests—all of which must be met. This is a carefully designed program. I ask Senators to remember this because these provisions have been intentionally drawn with the idea in mind of preserving the sound insurance basis of the present program.

2. A second requirement which the individual must meet is that he must be so disabled that he is "unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity." I ask you Senators to note this requirement very carefully. It means that if the disabled individual can engage in any substantial gainful activities he is not eligible for disability insurance benefits. This is a very conservative requirement. It is the requirement recommended by the experts who were members of the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Finance Committee in 1948.

3. A third requirement is that the disability must be "a medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or be of long-continued and indefinite duration." Under this requirement the applicant for benefits must present sound and convincing medical evidence that he has a medically determinable impairment. The evidence must include medical reports giving the history of his condition, the diagnosis, and the clinical findings which must indicate not only the nature of the impairment but also its severity. Pertinent nonmedical information must be secured from the applicant and from other sources such as the employer in connection with the employment record of the individual. The guides for evaluating disability were developed in consultation with State agencies and with the advice and assistance of an outstanding medical advisory committee. The doctors on this committee were all members of the American Medical Association. I think I can fairly state that these standards are reasonable, practical, and represent the best medical thinking in the United States on the subject. Disability determinations are being made every day under this definition and these standards for the disability "freeze" provisions enacted by the Congress in 1954 as part of the social security amendments.

4. A fourth requirement which every disabled person must meet is that each disabled person must have been disabled for a 6 months waiting period. Throughout this 6-month period the individual must have been been disabled. During this period no benefits are paid under the provision. The requirement of a waiting period clears up the great preponderance of temporary ailments. It reduces the cost of the program and gives the administrative agency ample time to process the claim carefully and make all the necessary medical determinations.

5. The fifth requirement is that an individual must be age 50 or over in order to receive benefits. Over one-third of all disabled persons are under the age of 50 and would not immediately be benefited by the proposal. Personally, I am of the opinion that the age 50 requirement is arbitrary and unrealistic. I believe that there is just as much justification for the payment of benefits to the disabled person at age 48 or 49 as to the disabled person at age 50 or 51. As a matter of fact the younger person may have heavier financial and family responsibilities, less savings and resources, than a man of 50 or 60 who becomes disabled. From a social point of view I believe it would be more desirable to strike the age 50 requirement from the proposal. I introduced such an amendment and still believe it is the sounder policy. But I am willing to go along with the more conservative, the more restricted policy embodied in the House-passed bill because our colleagues in the Ways and Means Committee in the House have felt we should be careful and conservative in starting this program.

6. A sixth requirement in the proposal is that an individual is not to be considered disabled unless he furnishes such proof of the existence of the disability as the administrative agency may require. In other words, the disabled individual must prove his case. The social-insurance program is also protected by the fact that the bill specifies that if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare believes, on the basis of information obtained by or submitted to

him, that an individual ceased to be disabled, the Secretary may suspend the payment of benefits until it is determined. These provisions give the Secretary ample power to administer the program on a careful and economical basis.

7. A seventh requirement in the proposal is that disabled individuals are referred to the State agency administering vocational rehabilitation. Moreover, an individual must accept rehabilitation services available to him under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act unless he has good cause for refusal. In addition, the bill specifically states that after entering upon a program of rehabilitation, for a period of 1 year a disabled person shall not be regarded as being able to engage in substantial gainful employment solely on the basis of services rendered in connection with an approved rehabilitation program. These requirements in the bill encourage rehabilitation. They indicate that every reasonable effort is to be made to rehabilitate the disabled individual. Only when rehabilitation is not feasible, or is not available, or where the age of disablement of the individual does not respond to rehabilitation will the individual continue to draw his benefits.

8. An eighth requirement is that benefits are reduced under the plan by any amount an individual receives as a disability benefit from any other Federal law or any State workmen's compensation law. There is ample protection, therefore, against duplicate public payments.

SEPARATE DISABILITY FUND

Another feature of our proposal is that the funds for disability payments are earmarked in a wholly separate fund. These moneys will not be commingled in any way with the funds for old age insurance or for widows and orphans. The contribution income and the disbursements for disability payments will be kept completely distinct and separate. In this way the cost of disability benefits always will be definitely known and the costs always will be shown separately.

The disability program is limited to a total of one-quarter of 1 percent of payroll from employers, one-quarter of 1 percent from employees' and three-eighths of 1 percent from the self-employed and disbursements cannot exceed the amount available for this purpose. Thus, the argument that has been made against the original proposal as considered by the Finance Committee, namely, that the cost of the proposal cannot be determined, is met by our amendment. Moreover, another argument that was made against the original proposal that the program eventually may cost more than originally estimated and may thus divert some of the funds from old-age or survivors insurance is also met by our proposal. Senators who have had any doubts about the financial aspects of the proposal can vote for the amendment with complete assurance as to its financial soundness.

ADMINISTRATIVE FEASIBILITY

Mr. President, I have enumerated eight specific requirements that are necessary in order to qualify for the permanent-total-disability benefits in the bill. I have also pointed out that under our proposal the financing of the proposal would be separately earmarked. I have given these provisions careful study. I say to you now—in all earnestness—that these requirements safeguard the program. It is my considered judgment that Senators may confidently vote for this proposal with assurance that it will be soundly administered.

One of the arguments which sometimes is made against the disability insurance proposal is that it is administratively difficult to determine disability in certain types of cases. I am willing to admit the validity of the point that it is more difficult to determine disability in some cases than to determine age or the fact of death. But we do determine unemployment under the unemployment insurance program of the Social Security Act and I venture to state that it is also difficult to determine unemployment in some individual cases.

But, with the administrative skills we have in this country we have not shied away from determining unemployment or disability just because there are some difficult cases. If every time someone indicated that there were some problems in the administration of any program, we would give up that program, then we would not have any programs for anything. Wherever there are human beings there are problems. It is our duty to face these human problems and try to solve them to the best of our ability.

As a matter of fact we are now determining disability in the social-security program and have been doing so for many months. Under the amendments enacted in 1954, each individual who is determined to be disabled has his insurance rights frozen to protect his old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Under the proposal I am making, the same definition of disability would be used, the same medical information would be obtained, the same procedures and medical standards would be utilized, and the existing administrative machinery would serve both for the disability freeze and the payment of disability benefits.

The administration of the disability freeze is proceeding satisfactorily. The hearings before the Finance Committee have a full report on this matter at pages 39 to 48. Relationships with doctors, hospitals, and other medical groups are satisfactory. The House and Senate Appropriations Committees have reviewed the operation of the disability freeze in connection with this year's appropriations. No criticisms have been advanced by anyone during the hearings regarding the administration of disability under the existing definition or procedures.

Since we are going to use the same definition and procedures for the payment of disability benefits, I believe we have a good solid administrative basis on which to operate the disability insurance program. The Social Security Administration has operated the existing social-security laws economically, efficiently, and carefully. I have complete confidence in their ability to administer disability insurance benefits. The officials of the Social Security Administration worked out the technical details in the disability provisions as passed by the House and I am sure, therefore, that the provisions are workable in every respect.

In addition to the fact that disability determinations are being made every day in the social-security program, Congress has also authorized the determination of disability as well as the payment of disability benefits under a number of other Federal laws. The railroad retirement system is most comparable with the social-security system in that it is a contributory social-insurance plan for industrial and commercial employees. Disability determinations and payments are being made under that program to the complete satisfaction of the Railroad Retirement Board, railroad management, railroad labor, and the medical profession.

In the nine different retirement systems for Federal civilian employees, disability determinations and payments are being made. Disability beneficiaries under the civil service retirement system in 1953 represented only 3.1 percent of the number of covered employees. Members of Congress and legislative employees have the same disability protection as do employees of the executive branch. In my opinion, similar disability insurance protection should be available to all industrial, farm, commercial, business, and professional groups.

The Tennessee Valley Authority also includes disability in its retirement plan as does the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Disability insurance provisions were included in United States Government life insurance sold to men in military service in both World War I and II.

Moreover, State and local retirement plans for public employees, teachers, and policemen and firemen all include disability provisions.

The various States are determining disability under the disability assistance provisions of the Social Security Act (title XIV) as well as under their workmen's compensation programs.

All of these programs I have mentioned have been enacted by the Congress. They are sound and desirable. They have been proven to be administratively feasible and necessary. All we are asking today is that Congress now accept and extend the same principle to the rest of our working population covered by the social-security system. We ask only that the persons covered under the social-security system and their employers be allowed to contribute toward this protection. Not a single cent of the cost is to be borne out of general revenues.

We are not asking for authorization for appropriating funds from general revenues. We are asking that self-supporting Americans be allowed to contribute toward their own security so they will not need to rely on aid from general revenues.

Mr. President, I have studied this proposal from every angle. We have had the proposal before the Finance Committee since 1950. We have had it studied by several independent advisory groups. It is sound and practical. It is humanitarian and at the same time realistic and workable.

All of the experience in the administration of disability programs has been studied and evaluated by the Government agencies and by the Advisory Council of 1948 which reported on this subject. I would like to quote the conclusion of this Advisory Council on this matter of administration. They said: "We believe that there is enough administrative ability in our Government organization to provide effective machinery for meeting this pressing social need."

Some of the doctors who appeared before the Finance Committee pointed out some of the medical problems involved in determining disability as a basis for their opposition to the disability proposal. I have more faith and confidence in the doctors than they seem to have in themselves. I have confidence in their professional skill and abilities and in their integrity. They are making medical reports at the present time on disabled persons in all these other Federal and State retirement programs. I see no reason why they cannot do so for social security. The fact of the matter is they are making disability reports right now under the disability freeze and they are doing this job cooperatively and satisfactorily.

I have consulted with the two previous commissioners of social security and they tell me that they are convinced the disability insurance proposal is sound in its basic conception and administratively feasible. Arthur J. Altmeyer, who was in charge of the social-security program from its inception until 1953, has stated that this disability proposal can be administered satisfactorily. John W. Tramburg, who was the first commissioner of social security appointed in 1953 by the present administration, has wholeheartedly endorsed the proposal. Mr. Tramburg was responsible for initiating the administration of the disability freeze program in 1954 and he is convinced that the Social Security Administration can efficiency handle this matter based upon their successful handling of the disability freeze. The testimony

of State public welfare administrators indicated that they believed the disability insurance program was sound and feasible.

The disability insurance proposal has been studied for many years. Every aspect has been carefully investigated. We know more about the disability problem and how to administer the program than we did about old-age insurance in 1935 when we enacted the original program. Extensive public hearings have been held on the disability proposal. Expert groups have studied it very carefully.

I should like to point out that in 1938 the American Medical Association endorsed disability insurance. In 1944 the United States Chamber of Commerce endorsed disability insurance benefits beginning at age 55. Marion B. Folsom was the chairman of the chamber's committee. He supported the principle of disability insurance at that time. This recommendation was endorsed by 67 percent of the chamber's membership. In 1945 the various private insurance companies endorsed the chamber's proposal.

In 1948, the advisory council on social security to the Senate Finance Committee appointed by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, voted 15 to 2 in favor of disability insurance benefits without any age restriction. In 1950 and 1954 the Congress adopted every major recommendation of this council. Only the disability insurance recommendation remains to complete their splendid work which began nearly 10 years ago.

In addition to the views of these outstanding experts, I have just received a letter from eight outstanding citizens advocating disability insurance. They are:

Dr. Sarah Gibson Blanding, president of Vassar College;

Joseph W. Fichter, past master of the Ohio Grange;

Miss Elizabeth Magee, general secretary of the National Consumers League;

Mrs. Agnes Meyer, of the Washington Post;

Dr. Ellen Potter, M. D., of New Jersey;

Miss Ollie A. Randall, vice chairman of the national committee on aging, National Social Welfare Assembly;

Dr. Edward S. Rogers, M. D., at School of Public Health, University of California; and

Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, president, United Church Women.

In addition, both the AFL-CIO and numerous State public welfare administrators endorsed disability insurance in the hearings. So did the American Nurses Association, the American Association of University Women, and the American Public Welfare Association.

There is thus widespread support from the general public and from experts for disability insurance. The addition of disability insurance protection to the tens of millions of men and women now participating in the social-security program would give the same kind of protection against the catastrophes of crippling injury and disease as has long been provided for Government employees, and employees of certain large private organizations. The time for this addition to the basic individual protection program of the Nation is now—not 2 years from now, or 4 years from now, or at some distant time when the cost estimates may have been refined to the sixth decimal point and tons of papers, and analyses, and studies stacked. For no amount of figuring or estimating or assessing will detract a whit from the elemental fact that a cash disability payment is an essential and inevitable part of the old-age and survivors insurance program. Let us do the constructive thing, the sensible and needed and practical thing, and put it there without further delay.

REHABILITATION

Of course, we all recognize that the ideal help for the disabled is their complete rehabilitation into nondisabled status. But of what present use is that abstract principle, sounds as it is, to the multiplied thousands of unfortunate men and women in America who are incapacitated beyond real hope of recovery or of return to any kind of gainful activity? What of the unskilled worker who, after having worked and paid social security taxes for nearly 20 years, is blinded or crippled, and so must undergo a long period of convalescence, adjustment, and training before he can even hope to earn a living again?

For one, I would be humiliated to say to these disabled people that, because rehabilitation is the ideal answer to their problems, money to buy food, shelter and medicine would be less than ideal, and therefore we chose not to provide disability payments under the old-age and survivors insurance program. To add that those who lack means to purchase the necessities of life might apply to the public welfare offices for aid would be merely to beg another question. Why should one having contributed regularly for years to a Government program designed to make him independent of public welfare in retirement, be compelled to turn to public welfare when he is forced into retirement prematurely by disability? As many Senators present could verify from constituents' letters, the question has been a difficult one to answer. When we say to the disabled man of 50 or 60 that he has benefit rights but that he cannot collect upon them until he is 65, his reply is frequently that his condition is such that he cannot expect to live to 65. He may well point out with bitterness that in his state of disability retirement, his need for retirement benefits is much greater than it would have been in retirement in good health at age 65. He has had fewer years to accumulate savings and must bear the medical expenses that go with his condition. I must commend these facts to the earnest consideration of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, the disability benefits would certainly do no injury to the rehabilitation program with respect to a great number of people who are, for all practical purposes, beyond the reach of rehabilitation techniques we have today. As to those people who are capable of being rehabilitated, I find it difficult indeed to believe that, in any general sense, they would reject the hope and chance of resuming an active life simply because they can get a small monthly check by remaining disabled. The very highest benefit payable to a disabled person under the House bill would be $108.50 a month, and the average would be much lower, in the neighborhood of $70 to $80 a month.

The amount is simply not enough to put a premium on prolonged disability. Instead, is it not more reasonable that the regular monthly payments would enhance the prospects for rehabilitation? It seems clear to me that the better state of mind, the degree of relief from strain, that would often be provided by the checks would act to improve the disabled person's outlook and attitude, and thus make him a more likely subject for eventual rehabilitation. I cannot believe that any great proportion of the American people would be seduced into a life of unnecessary idleness and malingering by the disability benefit payable under this program.

COSTS AND FINANCING

At this point I want to comment on two important aspects of the proposal: The cost and the methods of financing the cost.

Detailed actuarial cost estimates will be found in the Finance Committee hearings at pages 57, 58, 59, and 60. The Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration has stated that the intermediate cost of the disability proposal is equivalent to about four-tenths of 1 percent of the payroll. That means that the cost can be completely financed by the employees paying two-tenths of 1 percent of payroll and the employer paying the remaining two-tenths of 1 percent. However, in the interest of sound financing in our amendment we have placed the contribution rate at one-quarter of 1 percent on employees and a similar rate on employers. Moreover, the estimates given by the actuary are the long-run costs assuming there is no further improvement in employment or earnings in the United States. Moreover, it assumes no improvement in the rehabilitation of the disabled. These are very pessimistic assumptions which I do not share. It is my opinion, therefore, that these estimates overstate the cost.

Nevertheless, I am willing to accept the estimates of the actuary for our present discussion because whatever the proposal costs I believe the people and the economy of the United States are willing and able to pay for the care of their disabled men and women. I do not think one-quarter of 1 percent of payroll is a tremendous burden on the employees of this country; nor is this amount a crushing burden for business to set aside each year for the care of the disabled.

According to the estimates of the actuary the proposal would cost substantially less than four-tenths of 1 percent of payroll for many, many years to ocme. In the first year, it would cost only about eleven-hundredths of 1 percent of payroll and by the fourth year would only be about one-quarter of 1 percent of payroll. This cost is so small that by itself it would not justify an increase in the payroll tax at this time.

The next increase in social-security taxes is scheduled for 1960. In the pending bill we have included provisions for the establishment of an Advisory Council to study the financing of the program and to report back to Congress prior to 1960 with any recommendations. The bill provides for the established of such an Advisory Council at the time of each scheduled increase. Thus, there is adequate protection in the bill to assure that the financing of the program will be retained on a sound basis.

One further word on costs and financing of disability: The people of the United States do not intend to allow their fellow citizens, their neighbors, their relatives and friends, to become disabled without some aid and protection. Already 400,000 disabled persons are receiving public assistance through State public welfare departments. This aid is financed, in part, from Federal funds. It is clear, therefore, that we are caring for the disabled and we will continue to care for the disabled. This cost is already being borne by the general taxpayer out of general revenues. By covering the risk of permanent total disability under the social-security program, we can reduce these costs to the general taxpayer and at the same time have a more dignified method of dealing with this human problem.

In addition to reducing the cost for the general taxpayer, there is another important effect of paying a disabled person under the social-security system rather than through public relief. Many of the States with per capita incomes lower than the national average, which includes many States in the South and the Midwest, cannot afford to pay as much as the States with per capita incomes over the national average. While the national average being paid to persons on permanent total disability assistance was $56.53 per month in March 1956, this average varied from $116.70 in Connecticut, to $24.54 in Mississippi. In my State of Georgia the average was $42.21. In Virginia the average was $39.91. In Oklahoma, $58.28 and Colorado, $57.80. No matter how hard you try these wide variations cannot be justified on grounds of differences of cost of living.

But if disability payments are made under the insurance provisions of the social-security program, they will be based on the

previous earnings of the disabled man. Consequently, the payment to disabled individuals will be in some reasonable relation to their previous standard of living and earnings. They will be somewhat more adequate in the South than present public assistance payments and will thus help to maintain income and purchasing power and raise the standards of living.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, the social security legislation to be enacted by this Congress is the last which I shall have the opportunity to influence as a Member of this body. For that and many other reasons, I have had an especially keen interest, and I think an understandable one, in the direction and development of the legislation before us. I have had the great honor and privilege to be a Member of the Senate throughout the life of this very important program. I sat here when it was first enacted into being over 20 years ago, and when controversy surrounded its very principle. It was new and different then, and we approached it with much more caution than confidence. But it worked, and it grew in favor, because it was soundly conceived and administered with understanding and skill.

Successive Congresses, realizing these things, increased its size and scope, until today the old-age and survivors insurance system pays monthly benefits to more than 8 million people, provides basic protection against want in old age or in orphanhood, or widowhood to 9 out of 10 American families and pays out more than 5 billion dollars a year. The Congress has not been loath to adapt and extend this program of protection as time and experience have pointed the way. There has developed through the years a feeling both in and out of Congress that the contributory social insurance principle fits our times—that it serves a vital need that cannot be as well served otherwise. It comports better than any substitute we have discovered with the American concept that free men want to earn their security and not ask for doles—that what is due as a matter of earned right is far better than a gratuity. And so the social security system—now tried and proved by nearly a generation of experience—is once more surveyed by the Congress. What we decide, how we dispose of the legislation before us, will not only affect the rights of participants generally, but will be of immediate and urgent interest to many thousands of our older citizens and disabled citizens in every State and every community in the Nation.

Mr. President, I regret to differ with the recommendation of my great friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, but I must in candor assert that the bill now before us has been shorn of its most valuable and needed provision. The removal from the bill of the provision for cash disability benefits is a backward step. I am convinced that the provision is timely, practicable, and workable, and that it ought to be restored by the Senate.

Many persons who become permanently disabled, whether from cancer, a heart attack, polio, blindness or other causes, use up all their savings and sooner or later become dependent on private charity or public relief. Under my proposal they will be able to remain self-supporting with the aid of a regular monthly social-security payment toward which they will have contributed during their working lifetime.

Social security is not a handout; it is not charity; it is not relief. It is an earned right based upon the contributions and earnings of the individual. As an earned right, the individual is eligible to receive his benefit in dignity and self-respect.

Mr. President, the proposal to include disability benefits in the social security program is part of the age-old struggle to improve conditions for our fellow men. It is part of the movement to prevent suffering and human misery.

We have come a long way in the past 20 years in the social security measures we have adopted to relieve human suffering and misery. We have not reached the goal of perfection. But we have made steady progress.

I am proud to have been intimately connected with every step in the evolution of the social security program since it was established in 1935. As a member of the Finance Committee, I believe we have over the years built slowly and surely on a solid foundation.

Now we come to what is a vital decision. Are we going to continue to ask our disabled to rely on relief or are we going to improve the insurance system to help meet this risk?

I am willing to stake my reputation on one prediction: the movement for the improvement of the disabled will not stop if disability insurance is defeated this year. It will only become more intensified. You cannot hold back a sound tested movement whose objective is to help the crippled, the blind, the disabled.

We have passed legislation to help build public roads and public housing, to improve our rivers, our agriculture, our crops and soil. We have passed legislation to provide foreign aid and technical assistance. Is the welfare of our disabled any less important?

We have adopted legislation providing insurance payments under the Social Security Act to the aged, to widows and orphans, and the unemployed. Are the disabled any less deserving?

Mr. President, my proposal to pay disability benefits would help everyone in the community. It would help the disabled person and his family. It would help the disabled person's children to continue their education. It would help the disabled man or woman to pay his rent, his grocery and doctor's bill, and his life insurance premiums.

These are practical reasons for supporting the proposal. They are good reasons. They are important reasons.

But I should also like to appeal to Members of the Senate for support of the proposal on the grounds of humanitarianism, on the grounds of Christian charity, on the grounds of building a better life for the men and women who have worked to make our country great and strong.

As I look back over my many years in the Senate, I recall many great issues and debates, many controversies and crucial votes. The vote on this issue may not seem as important to other Senators as it seems to me. I respect the convictions of other Senators and I know the sincerity and conscientious devotion they have to their responsibilities. I hope that other Senators will find it reasonable and timely to join with me in making another advance in humanitarian progress.

Mr. President, it is not pleasant to differ so markedly and so strongly with the majority of the able committee of which I have for so long been a member, but it is with a sense of rightness and conviction that I recommend the adoption of the amendment I have discussed. It represents an addition to social security protection that will be valued and appreciated not only by the thousands upon thousands of older women and disabled people who would derive early payments because of the amendment, but also by millions of other Americans to whom the amendments would bring an added sense of security. This Nation, blessed by an abundance beyond the dreams of others, cannot afford to be penurious, timid, and mean in the search for ways to make the life of its aged and infirm a better and easier and happier one. The provision I recommend to you would contribute materially to that high purpose. It has been carefully drawn and studied. While the amendment is somewhat long and complex, this is largely due to the necessity of repeating many provisions in existing law. The amendment has been carefully prepared by the Senate legislative counsel. As I have pointed out, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. I urge your support of the amendment that we may set it into operation to provide a measure of hope, and relief, and freedom from anxiety for American citizens in every State and section of this land.

THE PANAMA CONFERENCE—A NEW ERA IN INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as we all know, the chiefs of state of the American Republics met at a unique and highly publicized conference in Panama. The occasion was the anniversary of the Panama Congress, convoked by Bolívar in 1826. One hundred and thirty years ago Bolívar envisoned a vast league of the newly independent American nations, based on sovereign equality, and pledged to the peaceful settlement of their conflicts and to mutual defense. The present Organization of American States, the oldest continuous international body, owes its origin and inspiration to the ideas Bolívar outlined at Panama.

The assemblage of 19 chief executives, the largest of its kind in history, was certainly an impressive tribute to the pan-American ideals of Bolívar. And behind those men last week in Panama stood more than 300 million people, united in their determination to defend their freedom against any adversary. Moreover, the meeting had far-reaching implications beyond the narrow confines of the Western Hemisphere. The spectacle of many nations, small and large, of diverse languages, religions, cultures, and strengths, but working together as sovereign equals, was a vivid demonstration of the possibilities of mutual cooperation among free nations.

I was glad President Eisenhower could attend the historic conclave for it was fitting that the Chief Executive of the more than 160 million English-speaking members of the Organization of American States should take his place alongside his Latin American counterparts. From all reports, President Eisenhower was accorded a rousing reception by the people of Panama; so much so, in fact, that the security measures for his protection almost broke down under the pressure of the enthusiastic crowds.

But more developed at the weekend in Panama than the happy proof that the Panamanian people warmheartedly welcomed the President of the United States. The uncertainty which attended preparations for the meeting and its lack of formal agenda led many to believe that the American nations were going to indulge merely in some ceremonial handshakes and timeworn clichés. The handshakes were there, of course, and the eloquent declamations were there.

The President of the United States, in a moving speech, gave a positive emphasis to the inter-American system. He said:

The destiny of America is to create a civilization that will give tangible meaning to the concept of human liberty, to the princi-

ple that the state is the servant of man and not his master, to the faith that man will reach ever greater heights in his spiritual and material development and to the proposition that all nations can live together in peace and dignity.

The full realization of the destiny of America is inseparable from the economic and social development of its peoples and therefore makes necessary the intensification of national and inter-American cooperative efforts to seek the solution of economic problems and to raise the standards of living of the continent.

The President then concluded by saying:

Our organization can never be static. We are here to commemorate a dynamic concept initiated at the first inter-American conference in 1826 convoked by Simón Bolivar. We here pay tribute to the faith of our fathers, which was translated into new institutions and new works. But we cannot go on forever merely on the momentum of their faith. We, too, must have our faith and see that it is translated into works.

My own sentiments regarding close economic and social cooperation with our sister American Republics, I believe, are well known. On numerous occasions in the past I have risen to urge action in creating a positive program in Latin America, over and beyond the vital mutual defense system we now possess. It has long been my conviction that the Americas working together could and must demonstrate to the world how free nations can tackle problems that communism promises to relieve. We have in fact a unique opportunity to show once again the visionary idealism, the boldness, the originality that gave America its special attraction in epochs past. Latin America and the United States together could show the world a new dimension in international cooperation.

The Senate, I believe, shares my conviction. In the last few years each time the Department of State presented us with a meager program for Latin America, a token gesture, the Senate has augmented its request by adopting amendments offered by me. In 1954 Congress approved an amendment I introduced to hike our technical assistance program in the 20 Republics from $23.5 to $44.5 million—$10 million over the administration request. Likewise, in 1955, we managed to earmark $17 million more for Latin America out of a contingent fund where it would never have found its way south of the Rio Grande considering the cool attitude of the Department of State toward assisting the American Republics. Again this year, I introduced an amendment to the Mutual Security Act to increase aid to Latin America to promote health, education, and sanitation in the region. Congress responded with a $15 million increase over the State Department request.

The intent of the Congress has been apparent by its willingness to support a more substantial program in Latin America. This was evidenced by the fact that on several occasions it overwhelmingly voted appropriations for Latin American assistance over and above funds requested by the administration. Yet by inertia, inability, or unwillingness, the State Department continued its policy of relegating Latin American affairs to the bottom of the pile. In the past, every time I discussed our Latin American program with the Under Secretary of State, or his staff, I met with the same answer, "Our program is adequate and if additional funds are appropriated no plans are developed to give effect to the intent of Congress."

It is quite obvious that the thinking and desire of the President of the United States has at least in the past been at variance with those of his subordinates who carry out our foreign policy in Latin America, for his recent statements at the Conference in Panama clearly indicate a call for effective action in further promoting and implementing our "good neighbor" relations. I hopefully trust that the President will be able to instill in the minds of his subordinates the sincerity of his convictions so that their views will now coincide with his own. If he can convince the State Department of his sincere objectives, great strides can be made toward giving a meaningful effect to our good neighbor policy, for as we all know Latin America is extremely important to us from the standpoint of trade, strategy, and raw materials, and we, of course, on the other hand are equally important to that region. In helping this area in their economic difficulties, we unquestionably help ourselves.

I am, of course, delighted to find that the President has rediscovered America. But I was disappointed by his "concrete" suggestions that he brought forth at Panama to implement his plan. His recommendation to examine the hemisphere possibilities to utilize nuclear power for industry and to combat disease is indeed meritorious. However, the press has lauded his suggestion to form a new council of special representatives to, quoting the President, "join in preparing for us concrete recommendations for making our organization of American States a more effective instrument in those fields of cooperative effort that affect the individual." To these representatives he continues, "We could look for practical suggestions in the economic, financial, social, and technical fields which our organization might appropriately adopt."

Anyone who has followed the development of our Latin American policy knows that we already have a plethora of such studies and suggestions. Among the more notable is the report of Milton Eisenhower, himself, after his factfinding trip over the region; the report of the International Development Advisory Board entitled "An Economic Program for the Americas"; the report of the Joint Brazilian—United States Commission; studies by the Pan American Sanitary Bureau; numerous reports by the UN Economic Commission for Latin America; or if you prefer to keep the UN out of the regional undertaking, there is the Organization of American States' own Economic and Social Council, firmly established at Bogota in 1948 after its provisional establishment at Chapultepec in 1945. Ironically, the predecessor to the Economic and Social Council of the OAS, known as the Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, was created in 1939 by the First Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics in Panama.

Obviously, the idea of creating still another advisory group to study the problems of Latin America provides hardly a ray of hope in helping this area solve its economic difficulties. What is needed instead is a firm determination, coupled with effective and specific programs—many of which have already been suggested by some of the already established agencies now and for a long time operating in this field. There are already recommendations on combating malaria, leprosy, and many other tropical diseases, as well as specific programs for sanitation, for highways, for schools. But the State Department will not, and does not, approve of any of these programs, so that nothing of a practical nature is done.

I'm sure all people of Latin America and those interested in them hope that the President will instruct the State Department to present to the Congress next session some realistic, practical plans for Latin America.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO THE CHAIRMAN AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not wish this session to come to a close without paying a tribute to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Those two Senators not only organized the Appropriations Committee, but they have carried through the most orderly method of conducting the Appropriations Committee session I have witnessed during all my experience on the Appropriations Committee. I commend the distinguished chairman [Mr. HAYDEN] for an excellent job.

FLOOD INSURANCE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with the flood-insurance conference report, the housing report, and other events of the day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BUSH

The adjournment of the 84th Congress is a landmark in the period since President Eisenhower took office—a period of progress and unparalleled peacetime prosperity.

This session of Congress, like its predecessors, has taken actions which will have a profound effect upon the lives of the people of Connecticut and the future economic development of our State.

There have been improvements in the social-security system, and elsewhere in the field of health, education, and welfare. Legislation has been adopted for greater protection of our people against the hazards of hurricanes and floods. A highway program, largest in the history of America, has been

started which will bring a new era of safe and rapid travel and expansion of business opportunities in our State, as in others. Slum clearance and urban renewal have taken a new lease on life in our communities.

In all of these advances, I have been privileged to play a part.

While this Congress has made a good record in some respects, there have been distressing failures as well. It has failed to implement President Eisenhower's forward-looking recommendations in many fields, notably civil rights, aid for school construction, and reform of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

It has taken some actions, such as the geographical dispersal amendment to the Defense Production Act, which, if not carefully held in check by wise administrative judgment, could have detrimental effects upon the future economic well-being of our State. There is a desire on the part of some Members of Congress from the South and Southwest to use Federal tax funds and governmental machinery to stimulate the growth of their regions at the expense of the long-established industrial areas, such as New England. Connecticut must remain vigilant against such maneuvers, always pressed in a Democratic-controlled Congress because Southern Democrats hold the key positions of power.

A disturbing development in this session was evidence of a breakdown in the spirit of nonpartisanship in the field of foreign affairs—a spirit which has been symbolized by the close cooperation between President Eisenhower and the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia. Some Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisles have allowed their hatred and distrust of communism, feelings shared by all Americans worthy of the name, to lead them into expressing a lack of confidence in these two men whose experience in the intricacies of our foreign relations is unmatched and whose patriotism and devotion to the long-range interests of the United States is above question.

I am deeply appreciative for the cooperation I have received during these years from State and municipal officials, whether under Republican or Democratic administrations, in seeking solutions to the problems which have arisen. As a Senator, I have felt it my duty to give my fullest assistance to all elected officials in our State whenever matters are involved affecting the well-being of the people we represent. Without this mutual cooperation, our rapid recovery from the flood disasters of 1955 would not have been possible, nor could we have obtained the urban renewal programs in our cities and the beneficial provisions of the highway legislation directly affecting Connecticut's own roadbuilding program.

These past few years have been a deeply rewarding experience. I shall always be grateful to the people of Connecticut for having given me this opportunity to serve them. Within a few short weeks they will have the opportunity to review my record and the record of the Eisenhower administration, which I have supported and assisted fully. Should they approve, I shall count it an honor and privilege to have the opportunity to serve them again.

This has been a great day for the people of Connecticut and New England generally, and for the people of other areas exposed to the hazards of hurricanes and floods.

In the final day of the 84th Congress, we have enacted legislation which—

(1) provides a 5-year experimental program of Federal flood insurance;

(2) appropriates $2 million to expedite the construction of small, but urgently needed local flood protective works under the terms of the Bush-McCormack Act.

(3) makes possible additional flood protection for Connecticut by authorizing the construction of flood control dams and reservoirs at Torrington and Winsted, Conn., and Littleville, Mass.

(4) permits faster Federal urban renewal assistance to disaster areas;

(5) increases FHA insurance for disaster mortgages from $7,000 to $12,000;

(6) permits continuation of the work of protection and improvement of our harbors and coastal areas, stimulated by the Bush Hurricane Survey Act of last year and prior authorizations, by authorizing the construction of the Bridgeport Harbor project and Federal participation in beach erosion control in the New Haven-Guilford area.

Additional restoration of eroded beaches will be made possible in the future by our enactment earlier this year of legislation permitting Federal assistance in this work on privately owned beaches in circumstances when a public benefit is involved.

I am grateful to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator PURTELL, and to the Members of our House delegation who have given encouragement and support in these endeavors, introducing, in many cases, companion measures to bills I drafted. I express my appreciation also to my colleagues on the Committees on Public Works and Banking and Currency of the Senate, for their support of this legislation, to members of the Appropriations Committee, whose response to our requests for flood control funds has been most generous, and to the distinguished Senators from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for their assistance in scheduling the bills for prompt consideration.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

FAREWELL TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are reaching the point of adjournment sine die—the point of no return insofar as this session of the Senate is concerned.

As always, most of us have a sentimental lump in our throats as we think of our friends who we shall not see for many months. There are some who will leave at the end of this session and who will not be with us when we reconvene in January.

On that list are two of the greatest statesmen of our times—the senior Senator from Georgia and the senior Senator from Colorado. Both are retiring voluntarily after a lifetime of eminent service to our country.

I think the members of this Senate already know how I feel personally about those two great statesmen. Senator GEORGE and Senator MILLIKIN are to me an inspiration for all who love their country and who rest secure in the confident belief that there are men of great intellect and men of great patriotism to steer us through the troubled waters.

I merely at this point want to say not good-by, but farewell until we meet again.

There are others who are leaving us. There is the junior Senator from Kentucky, ROBERT HUMPHREYS. It has not been my good fortune to boast of a long acquaintance with him. But in the period that he has been here, I have formed for him an attachment that amounts to deep friendship.

He entered the Senate to take over the seat held by our late and dearly beloved colleague, Alben W. Barkley. Senator Barkley was a man of towering eminence and to follow him would be a difficult and exacting assignment for any man.

I think it is a measure of the junior Senator from Kentucky that he discharged his responsibility ably and in the finest traditions of his State.

Another one who is leaving us is the junior Senator from West Virginia, WILLIAM R. LAIRD III. Young, alert, and aggressive, he has been a splendid Senator, cooperating with the leadership and making a genuine contribution to the deliberations of this great body.

I predict that Senator LAIRD is a man destined to go far in the field of public service. We shall hear more from him.

Finally, there is the junior Senator from South Carolina, THOMAS A. WOFFORD.

He, too, came into the Senate on short notice during the hectic days when we were engaged in the heaviest volume of business in the session. The people of South Carolina can be very proud of Senator WOFFORD and the dignity and effectiveness with which he has conducted himself.

Here, now, before the session adjourns I want to say to all of these men farewell, good luck, and I hope we will all meet again. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

CLOSING REMARKS OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON TO THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the last hour of the 84th Congress is here.

All of us, I think, greet it with a variety of emotions.

There is, of course, a feeling of relief—relief that the days and the nights of hard work and hard decision have come to an end, at least for a while.

There is also a touch of sadness: sadness that we have not accomplished more, and sadness in different ways for each of us that things we wanted to do could not be done.

But in this final hour there is time to speak of one emotion which at such a time as this lies close to the hearts of all. It is fitting to speak of it now.

I speak of friendship—the warm friendship that has been forged through our days together here on the floor.

The Members of this body and the people who aid us have a sense of identity rarely equaled in any institution in the world. The existence of this identity transcends politics. It cuts across party and regional lines. Men from all sections of our country from coast to coast, from north to south, assemble here on this floor and under the impetus of a common work and a common goal become as one.

Those who watch our activities have often attempted to grasp at the essence of this sense of identity which they sense but cannot define. Usually they take refuge in a stereotyped phrase such as "the most exclusive club in the world." And in using such a phrase as that they lose entirely the meaning of this institution, which is truly the greatest deliberative body the world has ever known.

As the majority leader of the Senate I know now as I stand here how very, very much I personally owe to every Senator and to those who are associated with the Senate. In the days and the nights of work, in the long hours associated with the management problems of the leadership, I have not forgotten that. I do not forget it now. To all of you who I know have felt impatience at my impatience I can say only that I ask your forgiveness.

Most of the time I know—even though occasionally I have forgotten—that the leadership is an impossible task without your friendship and without your cooperation. I cannot say what is in my heart tonight about this friendship. I can express only in a more inadequate manner my knowledge of how much you all have done for me and how deeply grateful I am.

And now I turn, as every day and almost every hour I have turned, to my friend across the aisle. No majority leader can be effective without the friendship and, above all, the understanding of the minority leader.

Senator KNOWLAND, you have made me a fortunate man.

In selecting you to lead them, your colleagues have placed me in their debt, just as they owe that same debt to you. Words can be debased, just like coins, by overusage. One of the most abused words in the English language is the word "integrity" because it is so often applied by people who do not know its meaning to so many little men.

Yet there is no other single word which so describes Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND. [Applause.] And when I use it tonight I know full well that to those outside the Senate it is just another word. But every man on this floor tonight knows and understands its special meaning when I say that integrity in its simplest and purest meaning is the only fitting way to describe the character of the minority leader.

It is hardly unusual for BILL KNOWLAND and me to disagree on the issues of the day but it is impossible for me ever to take exception to his honor. In all the years I have known him never once has he gone back on his word. My relationship with him is not merely the friendly, formal relationship of men who by circumstance happen to occupy positions where they must deal with each other daily so that the business of this great parliament can be done.

I will be his friend at any time and under any set of circumstances. He is a man who makes us all proud that we are men and who fills us with hope for the future of men.

And now I come back to my own side of the aisle to speak of my good right hand, the senior Senator from Kentucky, EARLE CLEMENTS, the greatest of all the whips. [Applause.]

This able, this effective leader enjoys the confidence and has the admiration of all of us. He is quiet, he is gentle, and all of us can bear witness he is most persuasive. This gentle gentleman from a State of great gentlemen, great politicians, and great statesmen is deserving of all the praise all of us could heap upon his shoulders. And curiously enough, it would embarrass him more than anyone else I know. For here is a modest man, modest in his own evaluation of his great talents. I do not think my colleagues will take offense if I say that modesty is a rare quality.

The truth is that only EARLE CLEMENTS and I know how much he has done for his majority leader. I know it better than he. His comrades at arms will welcome him back to us next January.

My friends, I am tempted to call the roll and after each name tell you of my gratitude to every one of you. But the hour is late, we are tired in body and in mind, and I will spare you this last duty of listening to the majority leader once more.

Instead, I want to mention just briefly those who rarely receive the praise and never receive the rewards for their devotion to the Senate.

There is our distinguished and gracious Secretary of the Senate, Felton Johnston. "Skeeter" Johnston has been for so many years a part of this Chamber that he has become, in fact, even if not in title, "the 97th Senator." The State of Mississippi has sent many great men to the Nation's Capitol; it has in its time produced great Americans and the name of Felton Johnston is on Mississippi's roll of honor.

There is the Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick B. Harris, who serves our spiritual needs. To serve our corporeal needs there is Dr. George W. Calver and his staff, and here I want to send for all of us a special word of thanks after Dr. R. W. Gifford, who has recently left us.

And now—Bobby Baker. I know I should refer to him formally as secretary to the majority, but my tongue, even as my heart, says "Bobby" instead. His quick intelligence, his tremendous fund of knowledge about the Senate, which is almost appalling in one so young, has kept the machinery on this side of the aisle working with smooth precision. Always present, always alert, and, more than anything else, always understanding and persuasive with his wise counsel, I say to all of you here tonight that here, indeed, is a young man of rare and real promise.

He is ably assisted, too, by Jessop McDonnell, who has come a long way in a short time.

I hope you will indulge me if I say a special word of thanks to the counsel of the majority policy committee, Gerald Siegel. He knows that I will express my appreciation of gratitude in a more personal way and at a more private time but I cannot let this moment go by without a public expression of this somewhat private debt. But above and beyond his service to me he has served the Senate well. His encyclopedic knowledge of the legislation before us has made the difference, more times than any of us can count, between a good bill and a bad bill. This body owes him much.

Will my colleagues forgive me if I trespass for a moment on their side of the aisle? Every one who sits here can remark upon how ably they have been served by their own people. It is, however, not my function to tell you this and I speak only of the courtesies and the kindnesses and the help and cooperation which they have properly given to us of the majority. I speak of Mark Trice, secretary to the minority. I speak also of Bill Reed and of Don Pierre and of Bill Brownrigg.

I sometimes think that were the temper of this body to change and were open warfare to exist between us, the minority could reduce the majority to impotence almost overnight by telling this handful of four men "just don't cooperate." This I know would never happen and I am happy in expressing to them our heartfelt thanks.

Our thanks go to Sergeant at Arms Joseph C. Duke, the indispensable man from Arizona and his deputy, Robert G. Dumphy. They carry heavy responsibilities and all of us are safer and better cared for because they discharge those responsibilities so ably.

There is Charles L. Watkins, the Senate Parliamentarian, who frequently is the only man who knows where the Senate is and where it is going, and his assistant, Floyd M. Riddick. Without them, we would frequently be powerless to move.

There is Emery L. Frazier, our Chief Clerk, a storehouse of knowledge who probably knows more about the traditions of the Senate than any other living man.

All of us are deeply grateful to Edward J. Hickey, the Journal clerk, and Edward E. Mansur, the legislative clerk. Their duties are important; their rewards are few. But their service is always faithful.

These are the men with whom we are in daily contact on the floor. But off the floor there is a vast corps of hard workers. There is no way of thanking these

men adequately. It is difficult to do more than list their names.

I am referring to men like Lewis W. Bailey, executive clerk of the Senate; William H. Wannall, the printing clerk, and his assistant, Thomas N. Gay, the Senate Disbursing Officer, Robert A. Brenkworth, and his assistant, William A. Ridgley; the large corps of official reporters presided over by James W. Murphy, of whom we spoke yesterday; the superintendent of the document room, Theron W. Marshall; and the librarian, Richard D. Hupman.

In the press galleries are the very able staffs headed by Joe Wills, Bill Perry, and Harold McGrath. As we all know, Harold is retiring this session, and we will all miss him.

I would like to say one final word about the Metropolitan Police detail, headed by Capt. Mike Dowd. Mike is the witty, beguiling son of Erin who can rightfully claim every Member as a personal—and charmed—friend.

Mike and his detail are on the job whenever the Senate is in session. And they ably supplement the corps of Capitol police headed by the distinguished Robert C. Pearce.

I must cut the rollcall short. I cannot go down the long list of committee staffs and the many upstanding Americans who play such an important role in the legislative process.

At this hour it is hard to sum up what I have been trying to say. There are, I know, many ways of doing it. Many men have tried before me and most have been successful. There should be an easy way but I have none. At this moment—and for this moment only—I wish I were an admiral and not a Senator. Because then I would merely have to give the traditional order, which is the highest praise of the Navy—"Break out the signals and fly 'well done'."

But I am not an admiral; I am a Senator. All I can say is thanks—thanks to everyone for a job well done.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish this occasion to pass without rising and paying tribute to LYNDON JOHNSON who, I believe, will go down in the history as one of the great leaders of the Senate. I have had the opportunity of working with Senator JOHNSON as closely as any other man in the Senate, be he of his own party or of my party. I know the heavy burdens he has carried. I know of the illness that he suffered not long ago, and of the great recovery that he made from that illness. I know he has carried on his heavy and burdensome duties with courage and ability and integrity and friendship, and has carried on with a knowledge of operations of the Senate which have served well the traditions and the history of the Senate. It has been a great privilege for me as an individual to serve with him, to know him, and to count him as a friend.

I hope that we shall have Lyndon back in a position of leadership, be it on the majority side or the minority side, for many years to come. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I cannot help but express appreciation for his most generous personal remarks about the minority leader. I wish to join with him in paying joint tribute to the very fine staff we have on both the majority and minority sides, all those who day by day serve us in their various capacities and without whom we could not carry on the work of the United States Senate.

I wish at this time to express my word of appreciation to my good friend and colleague, STYLES BRIDGES, who has carried not only the burden of the chairmanship of the Republican Policy Committee, but who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations; to my associate and coworker, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the Republican whip; to EUGENE MILLIKIN, another very fine and outstanding Senator who, like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is voluntarily retiring from the Senate at the end of this session; to the members of our staff and others who have served us on this side of the aisle.

Mr. President, we who serve in the Senate come to realize that association means a great deal. It is true that we have a center aisle dividing us. The Democrats sit over there and we sit over here, but we consider the great problems of our country as Americans, without any partisan distinction.

I believe that in the history of our country our people can be proud of the fact that in meeting the great issues of the day, men go back and forth across party lines and try to make decisions which will best serve the cause of our common country. So long as we have men like LYNDON JOHNSON and WALTER GEORGE serving the country, the latter having given such great leadership to his party and to his country in foreign affairs, and who, we are all happy to know, is going to serve the Nation in new and high responsibility, we can know that our Nation is safe and that we shall play our full part as Americans in trying to preserve a free world of free men.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree completely with every word said by the majority leader and with every word said by the minority leader, but on the impulse of the moment we are likely to forget others who have also rendered to the Senate and to Senators individually a great service. I know of one boy in the Secretary's office who has been there at least 49 years and who is a veteran of the First World War.

I speak from personal knowledge when I say that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico, and, believe it or not, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, used to be clerks in the Senate, at the time we had such Members as Knox, of Pennsylvania, Penrose, of Pennsylvania, John Sharpe Williams, of Mississippi, and others.

I think it is only proper that those who have served Senators on both sides of the aisle, as has the Negro, Vernon Talbertt, in the Secretary's office, who has been here 49 years, should be paid a tribute on account of their services to the United States Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after the sine die adjournment.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED BY LAW

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; that Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky be and is hereby excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works and assigned to service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and that Mr. SCOTT be assigned to service on the Committee on Public Works.

NOMINATION OF A POSTMASTER

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, I send to the desk the nomination of a postmaster reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I should like to have the nomination confirmed immediately, because the man in question is from the home town of my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], who will not be here very long, and I wanted to give him something while he is here. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, and as in executive session, the nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Johnston Winston Chapman to be postmaster at Montgomery, W. Va.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 328) as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the 84th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to. [Applause.]

THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO SENATOR GEORGE, OF GEORGIA (S. RES. 329)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 329), as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the 84th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

MIKVEH ISRAEL CEMETERY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 7181.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7181) to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2835.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2835) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim all interest of the United States in and to certain lands located in Indiana to the State of Indiana and to the Board of Trustees for the Vincennes University, Vincennes, Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is a quitclaim title bill involving a university in the State of Indiana. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is very much interested in the measure. There is a favorable report on it. The bill was reported favorably by the committee, by poll.

Mr. MORSE. Who owns the land now?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Federal Government owns it.

Mr. MORSE. What compensation is the University of Indiana to pay for it?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. I shall object until I know what that is.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator withhold his objection? I think the information can be obtained.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I want to know whether this is simply a case of Federal property being transferred to the University of Indiana without compensation. If it is, then I shall object. If the transfer is to be made without compensation, it is a violation of the principle for which I have been fighting for 10 years.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, I have amendments which I propose to offer.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reference to the bill providing for transfer of land in Indiana, the Department of the Interior report itself, which the Senator brought over to me, shows that the Department recommended that the institution involved should pay the fair market value for the property, which is, of course in conformity with the Morse formula, for which I have fought for 10 years, and which, for the record, I should say, has resulted in saving the taxpayers $500 million, if all the savings in 10 years are added up. That is not a bad one-man economy drive, I submit.

The amendment prepared by the Senator himself adopts the recommendation of the Department of the Interior and provides for the payment. The only problem is that I do not know how, at this hour, we can get the amendment adopted by the House and have the bill passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will let the Senate proceed to adopt the amendment, we can get the bill over to the House.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Secretary of the Interior" and insert "Administrator of General Services."

On page 1, line 4, after the word "deed", to strike out "without consideration" and insert "upon the payment of the fair market value of the right, title, and interest to be conveyed thereby, less any value resulting from any development or improvement made by the grantee or its predecessors in interest."

On page 2, line 6, after the word "The", to strike out "Secretary" and insert "Administrator."

On page 2, strike out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall execute the conveyances described in the first section of this act only after he has been informed by the interested parties that the following conditions have been met:".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2835) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, (a) the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, upon the payment of the fair market value of the right, title, and interest to be conveyed thereby, less any value resulting from any development or improvement made by the grantee or its predecessors in interest, to the State of Indiana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that parcel of land located in the city of Vincennes, Ind., title to which was vested previously in the city of Vincennes, Ind., by the act of March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. 505), and which is more particularly described as follows: All that part of survey numbered 5 in Upper Prairie surveys, township 3 north, range 10 west, which lies between Second Street and Fourth Street in the city of Vincennes, all in Knox County, State of Indiana.

(b) The Administrator is further authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that parcel of land located in the city of Vincennes, Ind., title to which was vested in the city of Vincennes, Ind., by the act of March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. 505), and which was authorized to be conveyed with certain reservations to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University by the act of June 30, 1944 (58 Stat. 645), and which is more particularly described as follows: All that part of survey numbered 5 in Upper Prairie surveys, township 3 north, range 10 west, which lies between Second Street in the city of Vincennes and the Wabash River, all in Knox County, State of Indiana.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall execute the conveyances described in the first section of this act only after he has been informed by the interested parties that the following conditions have been met:

(1) That the city of Vincennes, Ind., has released and conveyed to the State of Indiana any right, title, and interest that such city may have in and to the lands described in subsection (a) of the first section of this act;

(2) That the city of Vincennes, Ind., has released and conveyed to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University any right, title, and interest that such city may have in and to the lands described in subsection (b) of the first section of this act; and

(3) That the board of trustees for the Vincennes University has released and conveyed to the State of Indiana any right, title, and interest that such board of trustees may have in and to the lands described in subsection (a) of the first section of this act.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to quitclaim all interest of the United States in and to certain lands located in Indiana to the State of Indiana and to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind."

PROPOSED MERGER LEGISLATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, while Senators who are interested in the bill are securing the information necessary for the Senate to act, I should like to say that I have never seen a session approach adjournment in a more felicitous mood. The splendid speech of the majority leader and the equally fine speech of the minority leader leave us all very deeply touched.

Yet, Mr. President, I feel an obligation to make a comment and to make a request which I hope will not in any way impair the felicitous atmosphere in the Senate.

Early in the evening, before the conference reports were being sent over by the House to be submitted to the Senate for agreement—one of which was presented by me—I gave notice to the Senate that it would be my intention to ask to separate a bill which came to the Senate from the House of Representatives last April and which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for action, and which, by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, was assigned to the subcommittee of which I have been the acting chairman, namely, the Committee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

The bill which came to our committee, and to which we gave lengthy and diligent attention, was a procedural bill approved by the Department of Justice to enable the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to be notified in due time by companies proposing to merge. It was an attempt by law to enable the Antitrust Division, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission to begin prosecutions before the mergers became like scrambled eggs.

The Committee on the Judiciary unfortunately was prevented by certain events which took place during the closing days of the session from sitting during the sessions of the Senate in order to complete consideration of the bill. A request was made by one of the Members of the Senate, in absentia, to postpone consideration for a week. That made it impossible for the committee to consider this simple—and I say simple advisedly—procedural bill until Thursday, July 26.

The committee met that morning, and at that session there was added to the bill by motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] another House bill which had been referred to the Senate in June. This was H. R. 1840.

It seems to me, in all the good feeling which is being shown tonight on both sides of the aisle, we ought to pay some courtesy to the House of Representatives and, if possible, return to the House the bills which they have sent to us for our consideration. The bill has become a sort of omnibus bill because of the addition, by amendment, of the bill which is sometimes called the Kefauver bill, sometimes called the Patman bill, and sometimes called the Rodgers bill, which was designed to amend the Clayton Act with respect to the good faith defenses provided in that act.

I felt frankly, as I told the Senator from Tennessee when he presented that amendment, that the only result would be that we would probably not have an opportunity to consider the measure in time before adjournment.

But there has occurred to me, as I said earlier this evening, an opportunity to bring the matter to a favorable conclusion. I think that in the splendid mood in which the Senate is now enjoying itself, wonders can be done by unanimous consent. [Laughter.]

So I should like to ask—I promised the Senator from Tennessee that I would ask—that the bill which he offered as an amendment to the procedural bill which we had studied in the committee for months be separated from the bill which has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary, the omnibus bill, bearing No. H. R. 9424. I should like to ask, if it is possible to do so, by unanimous consent, to separate that measure from the other with the understanding that no amendment may be added to it, and with the further understanding that there shall be no debate except 20 minutes, 10 minutes to each side.

If the Senate would give unanimous consent to that request, then the Senate could proceed to the consideration of section 3 of this bill.

If the Senate should deny that request, then I would ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9424 minus section 3.

Having fully explained the request, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it is very difficult to oppose a request by such a genial and fine friend and Senator as the junior Senator from Wyoming. I agree with him that much good will and brotherly kindliness are being shown tonight. I do not wish to destroy it. Therefore, I shall have to object. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not understand the part of the unanimous-consent request to which the Senator from Ohio objected.

Mr. BRICKER. To the only request which was made.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the bill, H. R. 1840, which, because there was only one last meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, was added as an amendment to the major bill, which is H. R. 9424, is one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation for small business that has been before Congress in a long, long time. It is made important because of the fact that small business failures have been increasing greatly in the past few years. Small-business profits in the past 4 years are down from 8.6 percent to 2.2 percent. Small business is being crushed under the increasing concentration of economic monopoly.

The bill is intended simply to amend the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act so as to carry out what Congress intended to do when the bills were enacted in 1936. In other words, the intent is to make it impossible or unlawful for a seller to discriminate in the matter of prices to purchasers, retailers, or wholesalers, unless the discrimination is based upon the size of the order or the cost, where the result would be to create a monopoly or lessen competition.

The majority of the Federal Trade Commission are in favor of it. Full hearings have been held on the bill. It is important for small business. As a representative of the wholesale grocers said in testimony, "A lot of good people we have today will not be here next year, when Congress can straighten out the situation we have facing us today."

Full hearings have been held in the Senate and the House. An amendment has been offered to take care of any question of freight rate absorption.

I certainly hope, even at this late hour, that the Senator from Ohio will reconsider his objection and let us at least discuss the bill and vote on it, so there can be a determination by the Senate as to whether there should be given this greatly needed protection to small business and the small merchants of the United States.

I do not believe a discussion of the bill would take very long, probably 10 minutes to a side. I think there is great interest in the bill. The bill is sponsored by some 30 Members of the Senate. The Senate should be able to vote on it tonight.

I hope the Senator from Ohio will reconsider his objection to the bill.

In conclusion, I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that the bill has been sponsored by 30 Senators, and it passed the House by an overwhelming vote. I think we are entitled to vote on the merits of the bill. It is a simple bill. Ten minutes to each side should be sufficient to explain it. I think it is important for small business and industry.

I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will withdraw his objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I will not withdraw my objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not understand the Senator from Ohio. Did he say he would or would not?

Mr. BRICKER. I will not withdraw my objection to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 277.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 277,

which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION—NOMINATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider and confirm the nomination which I now send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry L. Bolen, of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nomination today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3210) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending business is the Lake Michigan water diversion bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished Senator from Ohio if he would yield to me briefly. He graciously did so, and I now yield to him, with the hope that he may make a brief statement, so the Senate may proceed to vote the bill up or down.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I had intended to read excerpts from the testimony, which I had not seen before. Much of the opposition comes from States in the lower Great Lakes region.

I read a statement in the testimony to the effect that Chicago is the healthiest city in the United States. As a result of that testimony, I am not alarmed by the statement of Illinois that the health of Chicago would be imperiled.

In the second place, the bill is opposed by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the administration. The President vetoed a similar bill 2 years ago. We are asked to pass a bill without having received a final report from the Commission which was appointed to investigate the matter, not knowing whether water can be diverted without doing damage to the lower lakes or doing damage to shipping.

I am therefore compelled to oppose the bill.

My mind goes back to the case to which the Senator from Illinois referred a moment ago, wherein a distinguished former Chief Justice of the United States made a finding against the city of Chicago, requiring it to comply with an order—an ex parte order, I grant, but an order—that there be built a disposal plant for the city of Chicago to take care of its sewage. A few years later it was necessary—I happened to be one of many counsel in that case—for me, representing the great State of Ohio, to bring a citation contempt in the Supreme Court of the United States to compel the city of Chicago to comply with that order.

I do not know for sure whether the order was completely complied with or not, but at least the results are apparent that improvement has taken place in sewage disposal at Chicago. I have no question in my mind that Chicago could meet its needs, if it wanted to put up the money, without having to be a detriment to shipping on the lower lakes.

This problem becomes more magnified because of the fact that we have passed the St. Lawrence Waterway improvement bill. The channels for the cities on the south shore of Lake Erie will have to be deepened. The same thing is true of Pennsylvania and New York. The same thing is true in Michigan. It costs millions upon hundreds of millions of dollars, both Federal money, State money, and local money, to deepen the channels. Every inch makes many thousands of dollars of difference in the cost, as well as lessening the amount of tonnage which can be carried per ship into the Great Lakes ports.

So I think the Senate should defeat the bill at this late hour. We have not had an opportunity thoroughly to investigate the bill, thoroughly to argue it, and completely to understand it. The testimony is not given in the committee report. The only adverse statement in the committee report is that from the administration, which, of course, was responsible for the veto 2 years ago.

So, Mr. President, in my judgment, the bill should be defeated at this time, and should be taken up after the report of the Commission has been made, so that we may have all the facts upon which to predicate a proper judgment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Ohio think that possibly the fear of an unfavorable report may be responsible for the unseemly haste in trying to achieve this diversion before a report can be made? Is it likely that if the proponents of the bill anticipated a favorable report, they would be undertaking in the last 3 hours of this session to push through a bill which would divert up to 5,000 feet of water at the low-water period from the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River into the Illinois Canal?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly would not want to attribute to the proponents of the bill any such motive, although exactly the same thing happened 2 years ago, and in the same way, at the last hour of that session.

Mr. AIKEN. And the President who vetoed the bill then is the President today.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the urge comes from the city of Chicago, which up to this time has been unwilling to meet its own obligations. I say that in view of the fact that it was necessary to bring a citation of contempt against the city in 1932, in order to force it to comply with the master's order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Ohio and likewise the Senator from Vermont take both sides, by saying there was not adequate time in which to consider this matter, whereas it was considered by the Senate 3 years ago. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives passed an almost identical bill at that time.

This bill was passed by the House of Representatives nearly a year ago.

So, Mr. President, over a period of 3 years, there has been ample time for Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate to fortify themselves on the issues involved in this matter. Certainly that would be enough time to enable the busiest Member of the Senate to familiarize himself with the provisions of a simple, two-page bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Then, in the light of the statement made by the Senator from Illinois, I plead guilty to neglect; but this is the first time I have seen the typewritten copy of the record, and there is no printed copy; and this is the first time I knew the bill was to be brought up tonight.

So I plead guilty to what the Senator from Illinois states. However, we have been rather busy; and I think every Senator can understand that situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Ohio that I would be the last one on earth to attempt to cast the slightest reflection or aspersion upon one whose friendship I value so very highly.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I did not consider the Senator's remarks in that light at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT],

the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are detained on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—43

Bible	Hayden	Magnuson
Bridges	Hennings	Mansfield
Capehart	Hill	McClellan
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Monroney
Chavez	Hruska	Morse
Clements	Humphrey, Minn.	Mundt
Dirksen	Humphreys, Ky.	Neuberger
Douglas	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Ervin	Kefauver	Smathers
Frear	Kerr	Sparkman
George	Laird	Stennis
Gore	Lehman	Symington
Green	Malone	Wofford

NAYS—33

Aiken	Duff	McNamara
Anderson	Dworshak	Payne
Barrett	Ives	Purtell
Beall	Knowland	Schoeppel
Bender	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Bennett	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Bricker	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Carlson	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Case, N. J.	McCarthy	Wiley
Cotton	Morse	Williams
Curtis	Mundt	Young

NOT VOTING—20

Allott	Goldwater	Neely
Bush	Hickenlooper	Potter
Butler	Jenner	Robertson
Byrd	Kennedy	Russell
Daniel	Long	Saltonstall
Flanders	Millikin	Welker
Fulbright	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 3210) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen; and

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 938) to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 276) providing for the sine die adjournment of Congress on July 27, 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 277) providing that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions found to be truly enrolled, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DIMINUTION, CONTROL, AND TREATMENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2813, Senate bill 4267.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 4267) to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4267.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize programs which the Federal Government can usefully undertake to combat the growing problem of juvenile delinquency.

The programs set forth in the proposed bill would operate for the most part through the States, by grants-in-aid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Delinquent Children's Act of 1956."

FINDINGS AND POLICIES

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) juvenile delinquency, since it is a social disability that impedes the development of children into responsible citizens, thereby diminishes the strength and vitality of the Nation;

(2) juvenile delinquency is a steadily mounting problem of nationwide proportions in both our urban and rural communities, the problem overreaches local and even State boundaries in some of its aspects; State and local resources, especially in regard to the availability of specialized facilities and professional personnel trained to handle the problems of delinquency, are, in most cases, inadequate; and

(3) although major factors in juvenile delinquency are basically related to conditions in the home, the neighborhood, the community, and the State, requiring concerted and coordinated action on those fronts, the Federal Government can and should provide such leadership as is possible in stimulating home, neighborhood, community, and State efforts, and should undertake such measures as the neighborhoods, communities, local institutions, and States cannot initiate or support by themselves.

(b) It shall, therefore, be the national policy to provide such Federal leadership and such funds as may be required: to stimulate and promote the training of specialized personnel, and to supplement State and local resources for this and other purposes, and to encourage coordination and planning among public and voluntary nonprofit agencies whose programs relate to the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, especially those agencies concerned with the welfare, health (including mental health), spiritual development, education, and recreation of children and youth, and to assist the States in strengthening, improving, and encouraging State and community programs to diminish, control, and treat juvenile delinquency, both as specialized programs and as part of general State, community, and neighborhood programs related to the problem of juvenile delinquency.

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

SEC. 101. In order to provide the Secretary with advice concerning programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, and to help carry out the purposes of this act, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council shall consist of the Secretary or his designee, representing the Secretary, and 21 members appointed by the Secretary without regard to civil-service laws. The 21 members so appointed, none of whom shall be officers or full-time employees of the Federal Government, shall be eminent in fields related to juvenile delinquency such as education, law, child psychology, criminology, penology, sociology, psychiatry, social work, juvenile court work, probation and parole services, spiritual guidance, recreation work, police work, and community organization work and representatives of the public well known for leadership in programs concerned with juvenile delinquency. In making such appointments, the Secretary shall give due consideration to recommendations for such appointments submitted to him by private voluntary organizations and professional associations interested in and associated with the above fields, including, but not limited to, such organizations as the National Association of Social Workers, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Public Health Association, the Industrial Areas Foundation, the National Association of Training Schools and Juvenile Agencies, the Child Welfare League of America, the Family Service Association of America, the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Probation and Parole Association, the American Bar Association, the National Education Association, the

American Association of School Administrators, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the American Medical Association.

SEC. 102. The terms of each of the 21 appointed members of the Council shall be for 4 years, except that the first Council shall be appointed as follows: 7 members shall be appointed for 16 months, 7 members shall be appointed for 32 months, and 7 members shall be appointed for 4 years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

SEC. 103. The Council shall, among other duties and functions, submit an annual report to the Secretary. The Council shall make such additional reports, from time to time, to the Secretary, as the Council shall deem necessary and appropriate, which reports, in the discretion of the Council, shall be of public record. Such reports shall deal with the status of the problem of juvenile delinquency, the progress being made with the problem, and shall contain such recommendations as the Council may deem appropriate with regard to any matter covered under this act: *Provided*, That the Council's annual reports shall be submitted by the Secretary to the Congress, and the Secretary, in transmitting such reports, shall append such comments, especially with respect to recommendations contained therein, as he may deem appropriate: *Provided further*, That such of the Council's reports to the Secretary which the Council decides shall be of public record shall be made public by the Secretary, together with such comment by the Secretary as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 104. The Council is authorized to comment upon applications for special projects submitted to the Secretary under title IV of this act and to recommend to the Secretary for grants under such title any such projects or any projects proposed by the Council which show promise of making valuable contributions to the diminution, control, or treatment of juvenile delinquency. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters relating to this act, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

SEC. 105. Decisions by the Council in regard to reports or in regard to any other matters within its jurisdiction shall be by majority vote of all the members of the Council, except that the Secretary or his designee may not vote except in the case of a tie.

SEC. 106. Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

SEC. 107. The Council shall elect a chairman and a secretary who shall serve without additional compensation and the Council shall be provided by the Secretary with such technical, consultative, clerical, and other assistance as the Council shall require, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

TITLE II—GRANTS TO STATES TO STRENGTHEN AND IMPROVE PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. For the purpose of assisting the States to strengthen and improve State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $5 million, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the sum of $7,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the sum of $10 million, and for each of the following 4 fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine.

SEC. 202. The sums appropriated under section 201 shall be available for making grants to States to assist them to establish, strengthen, and improve, under approved State plans, programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency by—

(A) determining the most urgent needs of the State and localities for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(B) developing a plan of priorities for meeting such needs in a coordinated and balanced manner;

(C) coordinating, on a continuing basis, the execution of such plans;

(D) providing either directly or through entering into contracts with private voluntary organizations demonstrations of improved services for the location, treatment, and aftercare of delinquent youth; and

(E) conducting either directly or through entering into contracts with private voluntary organizations research and investigations for assessing the causes and extent of juvenile delinquency and the effectiveness of existing programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, and for developing improved methods for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall approve any State plan for carrying out the purposes set forth in section 202 if he finds that such plan—

(A) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local agencies, carry out such purposes;

(B) shows that in developing such plan there has been consultation with and among representatives of State agencies concerned with juvenile delinquency, including to the extent feasible the State welfare, education, health, and labor departments, mental health and vocational rehabilitation authorities, the employment service, State and local agencies responsible for services to, or care of, delinquent youth, and private voluntary organizations engaged in or responsible for such services and persons representative of juvenile courts and probation and police services; and provides for the participation of such agencies, representatives, organizations and persons in carrying out the purposes of section 202 and for coordination of public and voluntary services within the State dealing with juvenile delinquency in furtherance of the national policy as set forth in section 2 of this act;

(C) provides for financial participation by the State;

(D) provides for the establishment of a State advisory council to advise the designated State agency on the administration of the program under this act; such council to be representative of private voluntary organizations, professional associations and civic groups interested in the problems of children and youth, especially juvenile delinquency;

(E) provides for a determination of the most urgent needs of the State for strengthening and improving its programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, for developing plans for strengthening and improving such programs, and for planning and initiating a program or training of specialized personnel for such programs;

(F) provides that the State agency designated to carry out such plan shall make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and shall comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(G) provides for such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis except that (A) the Secretary may, if he determines that this requirement is not feasible or would unduly delay the maximum effectiveness of a State plan, exempt portions of a State plan from this requirement and (B) the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; and

(H) makes a substantial contribution toward the fulfillment of the purposes set forth in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 204. (a) From the sums made available in any fiscal year for grants to States under section 202, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the child population of such State bears to the child population of all States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for a fiscal year which is less than $50,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $50,000.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Secretary shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as defined in section 507 (B)) of the cost of carrying out the purposes set forth in section 202 in accordance with its State plan approved under section 203: *Provided*, That, from each State's allotment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, and June 30, 1958, the Secretary shall pay to such State an amount equal to 100 percent of so much of the cost of carrying out the purposes set forth in section 202 as does not exceed $30,000 for the 2 years combined, and an amount equal to the Federal share (as defined in section 507 (B)) of the cost of carrying out the purposes set forth in section 202 as exceeds $30,000.

(c) At such time or times of each fiscal year as the Secretary determines, after receiving advice from the States with respect thereto, that the amounts (if any) to be paid to any State from its initial allotment for such year will total less than such allotment, the Secretary shall reallot the portion of such initial allotment which he determines will not be so paid to such State. Such portion shall be available to other States which the Secretary determines have need in carrying out their State plans for amounts in excess of their initial allotment; such reallotment to be made on the basis of such State plans after taking into consideration the child population of each such State as compared with such population of all such States. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under section 204 (b).

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR TRAINING PERSONNEL

SEC. 301. For the purpose of training personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $5,000,000 and for each of the following 7 fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine.

SEC. 302. The sums appropriated under this title shall be available for grants to States and to approved nonprofit institutions of higher learning for paying the cost of training personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, or for the development of courses

for such training, including the establishment and maintenance of such fellowships and traineeships, with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as the Secretary may determine to be necessary.

SEC. 303. Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement for services performed and purchases made as may be determined by the Secretary and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS

SEC. 401. For the purpose of demonstrating or developing improved techniques and practices for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $1 million, and for each of the following 6 fiscal years such sums as the Congress may determine.

SEC. 402. The sums appropriated under this title shall be available for grants to States and to public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning or research for paying the costs of special projects carried out directly or through contracts with private voluntary organizations which, in the judgment of the Secretary, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the strengthening or improvement of programs for the diminution, control, or treatment of juvenile delinquency. States may expend such sums as are made available under this title either directly or through the political subdivisions of the State. Any grant of funds under this title which will be used for direct services to delinquent children must have prior approval of the State agency supervising the administration of the State plan pursuant to title II of this act.

SEC. 403. Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement for services performed and purchases made as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. In carrying out his duties under this act, the Secretary shall—

(A) make such studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports as will promote the strengthening of programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

(B) cooperate with and render technical assistance to States in matters relating to such programs;

(C) disseminate information as to the studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports referred to in paragraph (A) hereof and as to other matters relating to such programs; and

(D) until June 30, 1958, provide short-term courses of training and instruction in technical matters relating to the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency, including the establishment and maintenance of such fellowships and traineeships, with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses), as he may deem necessary, except that no such training or instruction (or fellowship or scholarship) shall be provided any individual for any one course of study for a period in excess of one year.

SEC. 502. The Secretary is authorized to make regulations governing the administration of this act.

SEC. 503. The Secretary shall include in his annual report a full report of the administration of this act.

SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer this act.

SEC. 505. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to section 204 shall be as follows:

(A) The Secretary shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of such section for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State body and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Secretary may find necessary.

(B) The Secretary shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period under such section was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under such section. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 506. (a) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opoprtunity for hearings to the State body supervising the administration of the State plan pursuant to title II finds (1) that the State plan or a specified portion of the State plan submitted and approved under section 203 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a provision required by section 203 to be included in the plan, or (2) that in the administration of the plan or a specified portion of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with such a provision, the Secretary shall notify the State body that no further payments will be made to the State under section 204 (b) (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for portions of the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will not longer be such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments to such State under section 204 (b) (or shall limit payments to portions of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

(b) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's action under subsection (a), such State may appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact by the Secretary, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

SEC. 507. For the purposes of this act—

(A) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

(B) (1) The "Federal share" for any State shall be 100 percent less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent, and (B) the Federal share for Hawaii and Alaska shall be 50 percent, and for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ percent.

(2) The "Federal shares" shall be promulgated by the Secretary between July 1 and September 30 of each odd-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation.

(C) The term "child population" means the population under the age of 21 years, and the "population" and "child population" of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce.

(D) The term "programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency" shall include programs for the control and treatment of delinquent youth up to the age of 21 years.

SEC. 508. Not later than January 1, 1962, the Secretary shall transmit to the President for transmission to the Congress a report of the experience had by Federal, State, and local agencies in the administration of this act, together with his recommendations and the recommendations of the Council as to the expiration, continuance, or revision of the act.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the bill just passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am gratefully pleased that the Senate has an opportunity to act on S. 4267, the Delinquent Children's Act of 1956.

I am also proud that, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I directed the drafting of this bill. I wish to pay tribute at this time to my colleagues on that subcommittee, the distinguished Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL]. Considerable credit should also be paid to the able members of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency—a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary—for the findings and recommendations they have made as a result of many hearings throughout the country. Many of their findings and recommendations are embodied in the Delinquent Children's Act of 1956.

This legislation is vitally important to the future well-being of our Nation. It deals with a subject which should be of urgent and overriding concern to each and every one of us here in this Chamber and to each and every American in our Nation. This bill deals with a precious commodity—our Nation's children. It is to them that we must look to carry on what we here so earnestly strive to accomplish. It is to them that we shall one day entrust our cares and duties. Our Nation will be only as strong as the strength of our children. As we strive earnestly to provide for them a clean and wholesome upbringing, so do we strive simultaneously for the strength and worth of our Nation.

We read daily in the papers of horrendous crimes committed by our youth. Banner headlines proclaim this robbery or that burglary, this car theft or that mugging.

What are the facts? Has the situation been overstated? Is the problem of juvenile delinquency not as serious as it has been made out to be? Is it all a matter of newspaper headlines?

Unfortunately, the case has not been overstated. It is not a matter of newspaper headlines. Juvenile delinquency is a serious problem gnawing at the very vitals of our Nation. It must be checked and brought under control.

I appreciate that our children and youth cannot be presented in the form of cold statistics. I know only too well that they are living, breathing human beings with a life before them which we have the power to enrich and make fruitful and useful to themselves and to the Nation.

But figures can tell a story. And the story they tell about juvenile delinquency is not a pretty story. It is a very disturbing and in many ways a frightening story. Delinquency court cases have been rising for the past 7 years. Percentagewise, it has been rising far faster than our juvenile population. In 1955, delinquent children coming to the attention of juvenile courts rose 9 percent, while the child population rose only 3 percent. For the corresponding year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation figures show an 11.4 percent rise in police arrests of young persons under 18 as compared to the preceding year.

Here is another cold, hard fact, Mr. President. In 1954, 1 out of every 13 children in the United States between the ages of 10 and 17 was in trouble with the law.

Think of it, Mr. President, 1 out of every 13 children.

Here is another fact, Mr. President. One and one-third million children were picked up by the police; 335,000 were sent by the police to juvenile court; 40,000 of these children were committed to training schools for delinquent children.

And that is not the worst of it, Mr. President. It has been estimated that unless this upward trend can be brought to a halt, and brought to a halt quickly, by 1960 the number of children between the ages of 10 and 17 getting into trouble with the police will increase to 2 million.

I am looking at this in perspective. I am not overlooking the fact that the vast majority of our boys and girls will grow up to become decent, upright, law-abiding men and women who will do this Nation proud. I am not gainsaying the worth and the integrity of the vast majority of our children.

But to say that the vast majority of our children will not be stricken with polio is not the same as saying that this Nation is not concerned with those who may be so stricken.

The same is true about juvenile delinquency.

What is there to do?

Juvenile delinquency has many causes and contributing factors. It cannot be attacked on a single front. It must be attacked on many fronts.

Juvenile delinquency is not a problem for the experts alone. Juvenile delinquency is everybody's problem. It must be attacked and brought under control by everyone.

Too long have we allowed this problem of juvenile delinquency to be shuttled aside—to be handled as though it were of concern only to a limited number of people. It must be made the concern of all of us.

That is what this bill attempts to do.

It seeks to provide Federal leadership in an all-out attack on the problem. It seeks to achieve coordination of all forces at the State and local levels to bring about the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

I shall not burden the Senate with a recitation of the details of this bill. It establishes a Federal advisory council on juvenile delinquency, advisory to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as a system of grants to assist States in extending and improving their programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency and grants for training of much needed personnel to work in this program. It also provides grants for special projects to demonstrate new techniques of fighting juvenile delinquency. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at the end of my remarks a brief analysis of this bill.

I earnestly—I sincerely—urge with all the persuasion at my command, the favorable consideration of this bill.

S. 4267, DELINQUENT CHILDREN'S ACT OF 1956: ANALYSIS OF MAJOR PROVISIONS

1. Establishes a 21-member Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with members being chosen from among knowledgeable persons in the various fields concerned with the problems of juvenile delinquency. The Council would be advisory to the Secretary of the Department with respect to juvenile delinquency programs, would comment upon applications for grants for special projects in this field and would recommend to the Secretary such of these projects as show promise of making a valuable contribution to the diminution, control or treatment of juvenile delinquency.

2. Authorizes, for a period of 7 years, Federal grants-in-aid to the States to assist them in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control or treatment of juvenile delinquency. Appropriations authorized would be $5 million for 1957, $7,500,000 for 1958, $10 million for 1959, and such sums as the Congress determines for the next 4 years. Allotments of the funds appropriated are to be made on the basis of child population. The amount of State matching funds required would vary inversely with per capita income within a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of 66⅔ percent. The Federal grants are to be used by the States to determine the most urgent needs of the State and localities for the diminution, control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, to develop a plan to meet those needs to coordinate the execution of such plan, to provide demonstrations of improved services for the location, treatment and aftercare of delinquent youth, and to conduct research and investigations with respect to the causes and extent of juvenile delinquency, the effectiveness of programs, and improved methods for the diminution, control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Funds would be made available to States submitting State plans approved as meeting the requirements set forth in the bill. A provision for the reallotment of unused funds is also contained in the bill.

3. Authorizes the appropriation annually for 8 years of funds for grants to the States and to approved nonprofit institutions of higher learning for training personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The amount authorized is $5 million for 1957 and, for the next 7 years, such sums as Congress determines.

4. Authorizes the appropriation annually for 7 years of funds for grants to States and to public and private nonprofit institutions of higher learning for research for special projects which hold promise of strengthening or improving programs for the diminution, control or treatment of juvenile delinquency. The amount authorized is $1 million for 1957 and, for the next 6 years, such sums as Congress determines.

5. Authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make and disseminate information relative to studies, investigations, demonstrations and reports promoting the strengthening of programs for the diminution, control or treatment of juvenile delinquency, to render technical assistance to States and for 2 years, to provide short-term technical training programs. The Secretary is to transmit a report to the Congress by January 1, 1962.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have prepared relating to the bill just passed by the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The investigations of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee have pointed up sharply the urgent need for more national leadership in the field of juvenile delinquency. It has also highlighted: (1) The striking gaps in existing programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; (2) the need for better coordination of services; and (3) the great need for more training programs for personnel serving delinquent youth.

In view of the above situation, I sincerely feel that the enactment of the legislation under consideration into law would result in the following beneficial effect:

1. Better State and local planning for improving programs in behalf of juvenile delinquents. It would, we feel, make the same kind of contribution in this area that the planning grants under the hospital-construction program have made.

2. A greater degree of coordination within each State of the programs of the various State and local agencies concerned with the control of juvenile delinquency.

3. Increased cooperation between voluntary and governmental organizations in this field.

4. Development of training programs for a wide variety of kinds of personnel in many agencies and institutions concerned with juvenile delinquency.

5. Stimulation of new and creatively conceived projects and programs that would contribute to methodology and to individual treatment.

6. Encouragement of research activities so that we may learn new ways of helping delinquent youth and evaluating the effectiveness of present treatment programs, and certainly of programs for the prevention of delinquency.

Such a deliberate refocusing of attention can be encouraged if the National Government were to make it possible for local communities to be effective in dealing with problems in local situations. I do not mean by this that the National Government can afford to become a police agency with reference to juvenile delinquency; I do not mean by this that the National Government can afford to give direction to these local programs or should be permitted to give direction to these local programs; but I do think the Government is equipped, in this extremely well-advised Senate bill 4267, to provide a permanent agency and immediate resources in an effort to make communities out of localities that are not communities, and can give, for example, to police departments and various agencies in those communities, for wherewithal, the training, the understanding, and the skills in terms in which the problem can be effectively handled at that point. I urge that we face up to the fact that what we need, and what this legislation in fact is, is not a proposal for the National Government to become the caretaker of the delinquents of the country, but is a proposal to offer resources to local communities to deal with the problem at the only point where it can be effectively dealt with, at the family level, at the local community level, and through the organization of these local communities, by the agencies of the States.

The appropriation of moneys in this bill falls into three categories felt to be vital in the fight against delinquency. These are (1) grants-in-aid; (2) grants for training; and (3) provision of risk capital.

GRANTS-IN-AID

The object in this area is to provide increased consultation or technical aid, give assistance in attracting and training personnel, and temporarily provide the risk capital needed for local organizations and agencies to launch and demonstrate the value of new services and programs.

The activities of the present Children's Bureau staff in the field of juvenile delinquency will lay the groundwork for development of the programs in the States which are contemplated under S. 4267. Important as the technical aid and research activities of the Bureau are in helping States, their experience over the past 3 years shows that the States cannot make the most effective improvement in their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency unless Federal grants are available to assist them in this undertaking.

The treatment and control of juvenile delinquency requires the cooperation of a wide variety of services and agencies. These include the police, detention care, courts, probation services, foster-family care, health services, including psychiatric consultation, vocational counseling and education, training schools and other types of group-care facilities, and aftercare, which refers to placement and supervision usually after release from a training school.

Some of these services and facilities have been traditionally looked upon as responsibilities of local communities, while others have been generally accepted as responsibilities of the State. Whether State or local, public or voluntary, these activities are interrelated. Again, our experience shows that often a major reason why prolonged and costly treatment is not successful is that continuity in treatment and followup care are lacking, at both the State and local levels.

Coordination of effort, then, is a key factor in effective planning and development of programs for the treatment and control of juvenile delinquency. Yet, because of the variety of services and agencies involved, most States and local communities have not yet developed a mechanism for effectuating this coordination. It is necessary, therefore, that plans must be made for this as well as for the detailed technical and training activities.

S. 4267 authorizes a major grant for strengthening and improving State programs. This grant would be available on an annual basis for a period of 7 years. The purpose is to assist the States to establish, strengthen, and improve their plans and programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. This will be done by assisting them: (1) To estimate their needs for services to strengthen and improve their existing programs for the control of juvenile delinquency; (2) to develop plans for State and local action to strengthen and improve these services, including their effective coordination; (3) to coordinate services on a continuing basis, at State and local levels; (4) to demonstrate or develop improved techniques and practices; and (5) to conduct research and investigations for assessing the causes and extent of juvenile delinquency and the effectiveness of existing control programs, and for developing improved methods for the control of juvenile delinquency.

The grant-in-aid formula provided for in this bill making financial assistance available to the States is a sound one. This was first demonstrated in the twenties under the Sheppard-Towner Act, under which the Federal Government gave grants to the States to help them build up health programs for mothers and infants.

It has been demonstrated for the past 20 years in the grant-in-aid programs for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare, under the Social Security Act. Under this formula, the States are given complete freedom to draw up their own plans, tailored to their own needs, subject only to broad requirements of the act.

In providing States and communities both with the leadership of the Children's Bureau and with financial grants to initiate and strengthen programs, the Congress is recognizing that the people of the Nation have a right to use their Federal, as well as their State and local governments, to work on a problem of national proportions that, to put it in constitutional terms, provides for both the general welfare and the national defense.

The American Parents Committee, in a statement advocating the legislation under consideration, stated that "treatment and prevention must both take place in the cities and towns and counties where the children live and play and go to school. The problem is so big, however, that most communities are overwhelmed by it. We believe a grant-in-aid program set up in S. 4267 will bring the communities some of the help they need."

GRANTS FOR TRAINING

S. 4267 has provision for grants for training. The objective is to get money out to the States so that people can be trained to fight juvenile delinquency with the utilization of all available knowledge at their disposal.

The primary purpose of all the various types of assistance to be provided under this bill is to improve the quality of the care and treatment given to delinquent children and youth and thus to inject throughout the treatment process elements that are preventive in nature and that will reduce repetition of delinquent acts.

And so in the bill there is emphasis on training personnel who come in day-by-day contact with boys and girls who are in trouble with the law, emphasis on special projects that will provide opportunity to try out new and improved methods of locating and working with delinquents, emphasis on finding ways and means for public and voluntary agencies to work together and pool their planning and experience, emphasis on research to gain new knowledge about causes and treatment.

Thomas J. S. Waxter, director, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, spoke to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and stated, "Services which are to deal effectively with the deep complexities of human problems must be given with skill and understanding by persons who have a professional level of training and experience. One handicap faced by Maryland and other States is a lack of such personnel. In our opinion any Federal legislation must make provision for obtaining and training the staff necessary to do the job. We strongly advocate that funds for the training of the various types of necessary personnel be provided for in Federal legislation. Because of the urgency of this need, we recommend that funds be made available on a nonmatching basis."

The encouragement this bill gives to the employment of trained personnel in treatment services is highly desirable. We have seen the damage that is done, and the wastage of human lives that follows, when youngsters in trouble with the law are handed on from one untrained worker to another. The stimulus this bill would give to experimentation and demonstration will get many communities out of the mood of discouragement. It would get them off the dead center of inertia about their delinquency problems.

PROVISION OF RISK CAPITAL

Here the objective is to make funds available to States for utilization as risk capital to be used solely to launch and temporarily support new services only.

We must expect the Federal Government to share the leadership role in an attack on this problem by assuming the financial responsibility for the provision of such programs which are designed to strengthen local and State programs. Such grants can and should be made through the Children's Bureau which has already accomplished a great deal in this field and is universally recognized as the agency through which these grants should be made.

It would devolve upon the Children's Bureau to coordinate all national efforts by public and private agencies toward the accomplishment of the following objectives:

1. It would provide technical aid to States and local communities.

2. It would help in devising programs for training of personnel which would deal with prevention and rehabilitation; it would use existing formulas of their grants-in-aid program to make certain that proper and adequate funds would go to those areas which are most in need in the attack upon this problem.

Congressional action is essential to authorize and appropriate the necessary funds to aid the States and localities in promoting decent housing, welfare, health, education, and recreational facilities which will make it possible to rear our children under conditions which will give them a fighting chance to avoid the pitfalls of juvenile delinquency.

Title I provides for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency. This advisory council would consist of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or his designee, and 21 members appointed by the Secretary.

Objective: The council would review applications for special projects submitted to the Secretary under title IV of this act and to recommend to the Secretary for grants under such title. The purpose in creating this council is to get the expert knowledge of the leaders in the many fields concerned with juvenile delinquency, education, and related areas, who will be in a position to give valuable assistance to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in matters necessary to properly administer said act,

Section 101 provides for an advisory council to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The members of various associations who would be on the advisory council should be persons who have had experience in rehabilitative work, medicine, juvenile court work; in fact, a variety of people who have had different types of experience in the delinquency field. It is felt that this council would greatly strengthen the position of the Division in the Federal Government.

It is clear that S. 4267 provides for the inclusion of agencies, both governmental and voluntary, whose concern is not merely with a specialized approach to delinquency, but also with a broad community approach as a part of the program. This offers a real hope for the development of a broader approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency in our country. It gives the voluntary organizations their proper place in the picture, but, even more important, it provides a hope that in this program a beginning may be made in a true community approach which is the only sound approach in dealing with problems of juvenile delinquency.

Recognition of the fact tht the control of juvenile delinquency can best be achieved through close working relations between public and private agencies concerned with the well-being of children is sound. We hold firmly to the principle that public funds should and must be expended by public agencies, but we also believe that private or voluntary agencies have a great deal of value to contribute to public agencies and the work of all should be meshed together.

It was the hope of people in the delinquency field that whatever final act was passed by the Congress it would contain ample encouragement to the Children's Bu-

reau and to the State public agencies receiving Federal funds to draw on the advice and counsel of all other public and private organizations, both in designing plans for action and in carrying out such plans.

Title II provides for grants to the States to strengthen and improve programs.

Purpose: To provide to the States funds to strengthen and improve statewide programs to combat juvenile delinquency.

Within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Children's Bureau would have primary responsibility for the planning and administration of the grants provided under this bill, and for giving technical assistance as requested by the States. In addition, an interdepartmental mechanism would be established so that the Office of Education, the Public Health Service, and other constituents would contribute toward developing an overall plan for the administration of the program under this act. The Secretary would expect to appoint the advisory committee contemplated in the bill as soon as possible.

For the administration of strengthening and improving grants, we find that title 2 of S. 4267 places administration in a State agency in concert with representatives of voluntary agencies, and public agencies. This will have the good effect of bringing new ideas into the program.

Coordination among State and local public and voluntary agencies and organizations working in behalf of delinquent children is generally inadequate. State services for the control of juvenile delinquency are often scattered among many State departments—such as State departments of welfare, health, education, or correction; State youth authorities; and employment agencies. In most States, certain functions are entirely local and are not represented by a State department. This is particularly true of courts, probation departments, police, and often recreational agencies.

In most States provisions are lacking for assuring continuity in planning and providing care for individual delinquent youth. Responsibility for an individual child often shifts back and forth from the courts, to public or voluntary child-caring agencies, clinics, local and State institutions for delinquent youth, and other State departments or institutions. In many States and communities, there is little continuity in treatment during this movement. While certain avenues of cooperation between agencies and departments have been established, the procedure is often cumbersome and slow. As a result, many delinquent children do not receive the proper care and treatment at the time when it would be most effective.

In order to eliminate such practices, S. 4267 provides planning and program grants for strengthening and improvement of State and local programs. One of the major purposes of the planning grants is to enable official State agencies and local agencies with responsibility for services in the control of juvenile delinquency, to have time and funds to develop a coordinating mechanism and a coordinated plan for strengthening and improvement of their programs. Each State will determine the mechanism best adapted to the needs, resources, and organizational pattern within the particular State. Then, through the strengthening and improvement grants, the States will be helped to effectuate the plan developed for coordination of services.

Should this legislation be enacted, I believe that it would stimulate the States and local communities to greater accomplishments than ever before in strengthening and improving programs for the control of juvenile delinquency.

Title III provides for grants for the training of personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, or for the development of courses for such training, including the establishment and maintenance of such fellowships and traineeships.

Objective: To provide the trained personnel in all categories in both the preventive and correctional aspects of the delinquency problem.

We feel that there are many things which are currently known in terms of the handling of troublesome and delinquent children which a national training service, made available to State training schools, could get over to them in terms of inservice training, and do an excellent job in a relatively short space of time. This should not be imposed from above and no one would suggest that. But if the service were available on request, I am confident that State after State and agency after agency would seek that service.

Alfred J. Kahn, professor at Columbia University, who represents the American Association of Social Workers and the Citizens' Committee on Children, said that New York State recently passed legislation which provides a sound structure for State aid to probation training, State aid to curriculum building, State aid to inservice training, but the appropriations are very small despite the soundness of the total act. And the passage of Federal grant-in-aid legislation would certainly permit the expansion of training of this kind in a manner similar to that now projected in the field of vocational rehabilitation and the manner similar to that which has proven to be so effective in the field of child welfare and mental health.

Therefore, in reacting to this piece of legislation, Professor Kahn stressed the importance of those items in the proposed bill dealing with demonstration, research, pioneering efforts, expansion of services, inservice training, and particularly the importance of enabling institutions of higher education to expand training facilities and to offer scholarships and fellowships to people on the job who want to qualify themselves by leaves of absence and also people who want to enter into this field as a career after leaving their undergraduate training.

Services which are to deal effectively with the complexities of human problems must be given with skill and understanding by persons who have a professional level of training and experience. One of the primary obstacles to the development of the total range of social-welfare services is the shortage of people who have these qualifications. If it is agreed that these services are necessary, and that they call for personnel with special qualifications, it then follows that any broad measure to improve services must provide, among other things, for increasing the number of persons having the requisite qualifications. Among the ways for achieving this are training stipends for individuals and support for schools in providing specialized kinds of training that is otherwise not readily available.

As matters stand today, it is futile to expand services to deal with the delinquency problem without also doing something about acquiring personnel—and in this field, acquiring them means training them. It should also be borne in mind that a critical shortage of qualified personnel exists in all social-welfare fields. Moreover, people who do have the necessary qualifications move from one job to another. It is, therefore, not likely that concentrating on improving the personnel shortage in one specialized field alone, such as delinquency, will raise that one specialty to a position of distinct advantage. All parts of the pool rise together. But at least it is reasonable to expect that a specialized field should contribute as much to the personnel pool as it expects to take out.

Title IV provides for special projects for the purpose of demonstrating improved techniques and practices for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Objective: To encourage special projects which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the strengthening of programs for the control or treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Despite our inadequate understanding of juvenile delinquency, we are not making effective use of the knowledge and techniques we presently possess. The attacks on the problem which are represented by existing programs are too often halfhearted and uncoordinated and overwhelmed by the vastness of the task and the imperfections of the available equipment. Moreover, communities frequently find that the various agencies and services are working at cross purposes as a result of conflicting concepts and objectives.

There must be a willingness to face up to the true proportions of the problem of juvenile delinquency, and to develop programs and services which represent the best available information and methods; which provide consistent coverage without major gaps; and which all work in harmony and coordination toward a common purpose.

Much has been learned about the nature of juvenile delinquency and how to prevent and treat it, but there is also much more that we need to know. We need more scientific information about the social, psychological, and physical aspects of delinquency and the ways of applying this knowledge. We need to know more about the ways in which to organize and administer programs for making our services more effective in the communities throughout the country. For this reason it is of particular importance to experiment and try new ways of doing things. Any Federal legislation should make possible special projects carried out at a Federal and State level to help discover new methods of approach and to test the old.

Title V: Provides for certain activities in the DHEW which would serve the purpose for which the bill was introduced.

Objective: The above includes the following:

1. To make such studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports as will promote the strengthening of programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

2. to cooperate with and render technical assistance to States in matters relating to programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

3. to disseminate information as to studies, investigations, demonstrations and reports;

4. to provide short-term courses of training and instruction in technical matters relating to the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency.

It is felt by some that the most important feature of this bill is that which has to do with grants for planning and coordination at a State level. This sounds pretty dry when you read it in the legislative language, but in the course of the past 3 years the subcommittee has traveled in many States and talked with the public officials and voluntary officials, and the programs that have impressed the subcommittee members most are those in a few states such as California, Wisconsin, Minnesota, where, at a State level, an agency has employed a small number of persons, usually called community organizers, community service consultants, with training who are available not to give service to any individual youngster but to go into a local county or a city where there is a group of persons; it might be the Rotary, it might be the Legion, it might be a religious group, but to go into a local community and help citizens that have an interest in this problem in assessing what happens to youngsters in that local community, what they can do about it, what are the obstacles to doing it and how can they overcome those obstacles.

These programs which are planning and coordination in action seem to me to have

great significance insofar as they use a small amount of tax money, of public money, to help people do for themselves and they create thereby, by giving people an avenue of action, the spirit of caring, which we seem to agree in the testimony is the essential for licking this problem.

There is much that remains to be learned of the nature of juvenile delinquency, and of the techniques that will be effective in its prevention and treatment. Therefore, there must be increased attention to studies and research that will yield more knowledge in these areas. At the same time there is such a wide range of firmly held yet conflicting opinions as to how to deal with this problem that the more serious and less spectacular efforts are too often lost in the confusion.

It is true that more knowledge of delinquency is needed. Nevertheless, there is enough well-established information now available to demonstrate that a great many of the opinions and recommendations which are advanced on the subject are too narrowly conceived. Juvenile delinquency seems to be a prime example of a subject upon which quickly formed opinions and theories are held with great firmness and assurance while those arrived at after years of thoughtful study and objective deliberation are modestly advanced as tentative and incomplete.

Research—even the best research—is not going to be of much help if the information developed is not put to constructive use. Therefore, there must also be increased understanding on the part of the Federal Government and a willingness to support measures such as S. 4267 which are positive, well-balanced, and comprehensive.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the bill which the Senate has just passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I support the juvenile delinquency bill (S. 4267) just reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which my distinguished colleague, Mr. LEHMAN, is chairman.

This bill is a thorough and effective approach to the long-range solution of the problems of juvenile delinquency which our modern machine civilization is creating and having difficulty in allaying.

I am glad to say, also, that the distinguished members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare thought well enough of the bill, which I introduced early in this Congress (S. 894), to incorporate some of the provisions and ideas of that bill into the one which is now before you. I welcome a cooperative approach to this problem and believe that many heads are better than one when a difficult matter needs deep and creative thought. I believe the pending bill will go far toward aiding our young people and their seniors to help the unfortunate ones who have chosen, we hope only temporarily, the path of antisocial behavior, rowdyism, and often crime.

RAPID RISE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The serious spread of juvenile delinquency is a comparatively recent phenomenon in America. But, it has been growing by leaps and bounds during the last 7 years.

Since 1948, when juvenile delinquency first began to rise, it has increased by 70 percent. This figure is based upon the number of children involved in court delinquency cases. And in 1955, of 20 million American children between 10 and 17 years of age, about one-half million of them became involved in delinquency charges before a court.

Of course, the number of children in the United States during this 7-year period has increased. But the number of children has increased only 16 percent; whereas, as I just said, the number of child delinquents rose 70 percent.

During the last calendar year, children brought to juvenile court as delinquents rose 9 percent. During 1955, the number of children in the United States rose only 3 percent. So that the number of delinquents rose 3 times faster last year than did the number of children in the United States.

Unless we can stop the increasing rate of juvenile delinquency, it has been estimated that we may have, by 1960, 2 million children annually getting in trouble with the police.

That is a state of affairs which we cannot, in justice to future generations and to our American heritage, allow to happen.

THE PROBLEM OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

It is often thought that juvenile delinquents are only to be found in the slums of our big cities. But, although the most serious problems do seem to arise in the big cities, the number of delinquency cases in cities of less than 100,000 population have increased since 1948 at a higher rate than the national increase.

The students of the problem have also concluded that it is not confined to the poorer cities; but also exists in cities which are well off financially.

It has been well said that "no child is born delinquent". His or her environment creates problems which help to lead our girls and boys astray, into paths which bring them into conflict with constituted authority.

Children in good happy homes seldom get into trouble with the police. It has been pointed out that broken homes are a frequent cause of maladjustment which make it easier for the child to get into trouble. The homes may be broken by desertion or death or by lack of kindly faith among the parents. The resulting damage to sound parent-child relationships helps to cause the emotional conflicts in the child's mind which tempt him to resist authority and to break the law in order to get what he wants and feels he has been unjustly denied.

Besides the home, our churches, our schools, our athletic organizations, our welfare agencies and the boys and girls movements like the Boy Scouts, the Boys' Clubs, and the Boys' Nation, are all doing their part to keep our youth happily adjusted. And so, most of our young people grow up strong mentally, morally, and physically, and well able to behave themselves in the modern world.

However, there are not enough people trained in the problems of youth to counsel with the families, to initiate their organized youth programs, and to study the causes and suggest the cures for our rapidly growing juvenile delinquency.

Of course, legislation cannot direct an end to juvenile delinquency. But it can help to find a way to buttress the fine work which our homes, churches, schools, and other organizations are doing.

THE DELINQUENT CHILDREN'S ACT

The pending bill would authorize programs to operate through the States, by grants-in-aid. They will be administered through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They would be designed to strengthen and expand State and local programs against juvenile delinquency. They would also stimulate the increased training of people who wish to dedicate themselves to helping our youth avoid juvenile delinquency. They would also stimulate research, so that we would have more reliable information as to the causes and prevalence of this social difficulty among our youth.

The bill would authorize a 7-year program. Appropriations would be authorized for the first year of $5 million, for the second year of $7,500,000, for the third year of $10 million, and for the subsequent 4 years of such sums as the Congress might determine.

The States would submit their programs and receive allotments on the basis of their child population.

However, the matching appropriations by the States would be computed on the basis of an inverse ratio to their per capita income.

That would mean that the poorer States would contribute proportionately less than the more well-to-do States. But, the minimum State contribution would be one-third and the maximum State contribution would be two-thirds.

CONCLUSION

In the light of the seriousness of the problem to America and because increasing juvenile delinquency will undermine the moral and physical strength of our country, at a time when we need all our power to face a threatening world, these appropriations are not too much to add to private efforts to help our children succeed and be happy.

There is nothing about our young people which is essentially wrong. They are the best this country has ever had. Some of them, in this uncertain world, have run into difficulties which have never faced youth before. We are, to some extent, perhaps responsible for the condition of the world today. And we are, certainly, responsible for the state of the Nation. We must do our utmost, not only to improve and stabilize our national life, but also to help the States to help wayward youngsters toward a better adjustment to their surrounding circumstances.

I urge immediate enactment of this bill in order that the program may start right away.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, your committee appointed to wait upon the President and inform him that the Congress is ready to adjourn sine die, has informed him of that fact, and has inquired whether he has any further communication to make to the Congress; and the President has advised us that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

EMPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN VESSELS IN THE COASTWISE TRANSPORTATION OF COAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2824, House bill 9874.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R 9874) to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ore-

gon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I had arranged earlier in the day with two Senators who wished to make brief speeches. I ask that I may yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to detail for the Senate the reasons why I voted against adjournment on the night of July 24.

Basically, my decision was premised on two major facts.

First, I realized that it was impossible to enact civil rights legislation at this late hour during the session of Congress, because of the prolonged debate which would be demanded by the opponents of even as mild a bill as that passed by the other House.

Second, I did not care to risk the possibility of interminable debate of this bill resulting in the fatal delay or defeat of the social-security conference report, because I believe that the social-security bill contains more benefits for average families in this Nation—families of any race, white or colored—than any other legislation of the 84th Congress or of recent years.

Mr. President, even though I have been a Member of the Senate for only a year and a half, I am proud of my record in the field of civil rights—much of it at the State government level.

In 1949, it was my privilege, as a State senator, to sponsor the first fair employment practices bill ever introduced in the Oregon State Legislature. That bill led directly to what was, I believe, only the third FEPC act passed by any State legislature in the Nation. Oregon pioneered in this respect, and I was honored to be among those active in its pioneering effort.

Several years later, my wife, Maurine, and I were both cosponsors of a strong and effective civil-rights bill passed by our legislature. Mrs. Neuberger was a member of the Oregon House of Representatives. This bill outlawed discrimination in public places based on race, creed, religion, or color. It was passed against some bitter and vehement opposition, I might add. In addition, my wife was a sponsor of legislation prohibiting discrimination against religious or racial minorities in various trade schools. I helped to pass this measure through our State senate, after it had passed in the Oregon House of Representatives. We are proud of this record of successful effort in our legislature toward assuring persons of any race, at the State level, of freedom from discrimination in their jobs, in education, and in all kinds of public accommodations such as theaters, hotels, restaurants, barber shops, beauty parlors, and motor courts. I believe this record demonstrates, beyond doubt, my long-standing and continuing ambition to help with any step which may really accomplish something toward ending legal race discrimination and official bigotry in our great democracy.

I favor Federal civil rights legislation. I am a cosponsor of several civil rights bills, and I would gladly vote for the very limited but worthwhile program sent to the Senate by the House of Representatives. I concur in the lofty aspirations voiced so eloquently by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] in his moving talk on the Senate floor July 24.

II

Why, then, Mr. President, did I not support the motion offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for adjournment, so that he might file a motion to bring the civil rights bill to the floor?

Congress is on the eve of final adjournment of this session. Everyone knows that. The press has reported it, the leadership has announced it. Civil rights legislation on the Senate floor, at this late juncture, will inevitably provoke a debate that will continue until the fall of the gavel, be it this week or several weeks hence. I regret that fact, but a fact it is—a fact of life. I deplore the Senate rules which make it possible to prevent a vote in the Senate almost forever, but those rules exist and I cannot change them—at least not now. To deny these things is to deny what is, and to shut one's eyes and ears and mind to reality.

Mr. President, there have been civil rights bills before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary ever since the early days of the last session, since January of 1955. Several of these bills were reported out by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Missouri, in February and March of this year. I know of no effort which has been made, whether by supporters of the administration or from this side of the aisle, to discharge the committee from further consideration of those bills.

Although the chances for completing debate and acting on the bills would have been slight even then, the move would have had a good deal more plausibility than it can have today. Now it must be recognized as little more than a gesture, in the light of Senate Rule 22—a gesture which carries with it more danger for other important and humanitarian legislation than hope of gain for the individual rights, in which both its sponsors and I believe.

Mr. President, I think the chronicles of this important episode in the Senate should show that, at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon of January 5, 1955, a meeting of 14 or 15 liberal members of this body was held in the office of the illustrious junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I well remember that occasion, because I had been sworn in as a Senator only 2 or 3 hours earlier. I also recollect that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and I stood in the corner, as befitted our junior status, because of a shortage of chairs. When our opinion was sought, we passed, because we pointed out that our tenure as Senators was barely of several hours duration, and we had no experience to contribute to the question.

The issue was what should be done about civil-rights legislation in the coming session. I recollect that discussion turned to whether or not an effort should be made to revise rule 22, which is the rule that so aids and reinforces a minority seeking to prevent action on a bill. Mr. President, I believe I can state categorically that only one person at that meeting urged an immediate effort in the 84th Congress to assault rule 22, so that civil-rights legislation might eventually have some favorable chance of passage. That person was the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. To my memory, nobody else urged this course of action. The RECORD should show this, to the credit of that great man, the Senator from New York, who alone urged action then which might make reasonable and consistent an effort to bring up the civil-rights bill passed by the other House this late in the session. Looking back upon that situation, I believe the Senator from New York was right in his opinion.

III

Mr. President, I think it is quite possible that an effort may be made to amend Rule 22 of the Standing Rules of the Senate in a future session. If so, I am confident it will be made so early in the session that there will be ample time to debate at great length all the issues of the Senate Rules, of the proper function of debate in the Senate, and even of civil rights legislation itself, without destroying the Senate's ability to carry out and complete the rest of its legislative program during the remainder of the session. But the present session, Mr. President, no longer offers that opportunity.

For what could have been the result of literally interminable debate at this time, when we face the imminent end of the second session of the 84th Congress?

The result might be to foreclose the final enactment of various conference reports and other legislation, now in the concluding stages of processing but still not quite ready for approval by the President of the United States.

What was some of this legislation? Let us look at just a few examples.

First, there was the farm credit bill, and never in recent times have the farmers of our country been in such dire need of a relaxation of their credit market. Their plight is apparent to all of us.

Second, there was the conference report on housing, and we all realize that many of the people most concerned about civil rights also are most in need of slum clearance and a relief from shabby tenements.

Third, there was the omnibus public works bill, authorizing projects for improved navigation, for preventing tragic and catastrophic floods in many parts of the country, for generating low-cost hydroelectric power and for aiding in work for purifying drinking waters and reclaiming lowlands and plateaus.

Finally, above all, there was the social security conference report, which includes a reduction in the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 and also social-security benefits, commencing at the age of 50, for all permanently or totally disabled American workers.

It is exclusively the social security conference report to which I want to address myself today.

Is any person on this floor of liberal and humanitarian views right to risk any legislative or parliamentary maneuver which would cost the working people of the United States the far-flung benefits in that conference report? What if an interminable and heated filibuster over civil rights should result in the loss of social security? Who would be the victims of such a catastrophe?

The victims, Mr. President, would be the average men and women, who would benefit so greatly from the far-reaching improvements which the social security conference report provides. Fortunately, there is no color line in the Social Security System. The benefits are paid without regard to race, creed, or color. That is as it should be. I emphasize this to show that among the foremost suffers from a loss of these new social security advances would be millions of the very colored people, for whom the late effort in behalf of civil rights was purported to be undertaken.

IV

Mr. President, civil rights means not only the human liberties which we stress so properly, but also a decent and respectable standard of living. A man who has liberty but no economic security is in peril of losing his liberty, too. Effective civil rights are tied up intimately with such tangibles as good housing, healthful food, adequate medical care, and the assurance of comfort and respectability in old age. The ability to claim ones' legal rights is, in practice, dependent on the freedom of action and the confidence which come only with security against poverty.

Mr. President, I feel a sort of proprietary interest in the social security conference report. On January 18, 1955, I introduced, as my first bill as a United States Senator, for myself and 10 cosponsors, the original Senate bill in this Congress proposing a reduction from age 65 to 60 in the social security retirement age for women. I testified in some detail before the Senate Finance Committee in support of this proposal. I consider the even partial achievement of this goal, in the reduction to age 62 made by the bill we have passed, to be the greatest accomplishment of the Congress in the past 2 years—accompanied by the other major improvements in the social security bill, particularly the disability provisions.

I would deeply regret to see these great gains lost—perhaps for years to come, Mr. President—because the Senate is plunged into a bitter, endless, and hopeless debate over civil rights at this final stage in the life of the 84th Congress.

This does not mean that I believe no effort should be made to pass civil-rights legislation. On the contrary, I shall always welcome an opportunity to participate in an effort actually to enact necessary civil-rights laws. But such an effort should be made when it has a reasonable chance of success.

When the next Congress convenes in January, I shall be glad to join in a determined and ethical fight to amend the standing rules of the Senate so as to make it possible for the Senate to bring civil-rights legislation to a vote after full and adequate debate. I hope that Members from the other side of the aisle who profess support of the President's civil-rights program will join in such an effort, for it may require that the Senate stay in session around the clock, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for a month, maybe 2 or 3 months, to settle whether our rules should make it possible for a small minority to prevent forever a vote by the whole Senate on the merits of legislation.

But, Mr. President, why start the civil-rights effort at a time when there is no opportunity whatsoever to bring the debate to a successful end? Why start it when the only casualty might be social security, rather than the foes of civil rights?

There is a right time and a wrong time, Mr. President, to undertake any great cause. Security in old age and in sickness and injury is as great a cause as even that of civil rights. Let us never risk a situation in which one might bring about the delaying or retarding of the other.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to express the utmost admiration for the courage and humanitarianism of the Senators from New York, Illinois, and Missouri, who have undertaken their brave efforts during these past few days. I especially desire to salute the foresight and vision with which the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] prophesied the current developments over a year and a half ago.

I want the RECORD to show that sincere and conscientious individuals, all equally interested in civil-rights legislation, can disagree honestly over methods and time for action which can be successful and effective.

Mr. President, I say this with all the emphasis at my command. The time must come, and in the 85th Congress, when the Senate can vote on the great question of civil rights for all Americans. It is too late in this session to conduct the prolonged debate which may be necessary to change the rules of the Senate, so that such a vote can occur.

But come it must, Mr. President. The onward march of mankind cannot be retarded by anachronistic rules which have no place in a great democracy. There must be an hour for decision, when a legislative body like the United States Senate is ready to act. Full debate must be possible, but interminable debate—never.

How can we parade our democracy before the world, when Members of the Senate are denied, by a series of intricate rules, the privilege of expressing their viewpoint on, of all issues, the challenging question of human liberty.

Speaking for myself alone, I am willing to come back here in January, if I am permitted by the Almighty to do so, and to participate for as long as my strength will permit in an effort to change the rules of the Senate, so as to allow a vote on any legitimate issue. Of course, it must be a fair and honorable effort. If the Senate defeats civil-rights legislation in a fair and bona fide test, that is quite one thing. But for civil-rights legislation to be kept off the floor by parliamentary maneuvers and undemocratic procedures, is quite a totally different thing, indeed.

The year 1957 may well be the year of decision for the United States Senate—the year when Members of this body decide, once and for all, whether this is to be a Chamber in which democracy truly prevails. To deny a majority the right to vote is to thwart democracy. Democracy and the suffocation of the will of the majority are not consistent with each other.

DATE OF MEETING OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I introduce a joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 85th Congress shall assemble at noon on Monday, January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATOMIC ENERGY LIABILITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter, dated July 27, 1956, written by the President of the United States to the Vice President, relative to S. 4112, the atomic energy insurance bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 27, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
The Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The bill, S. 4112, now awaiting Senate action is important to accelerate our country's efforts to devote atomic energy to peaceful purposes. The bill was reported over a month ago by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I understand there was only one dissenting vote.

The bill would fix the extent of liability of owners and operators of atomic reactors. It would also protect the public by providing governmental indemnification in the extremely unlikely event of accident. Its effect would be to speed the adaptation of atomic energy to peaceful purposes, in keeping with the spirit and letter of the atomic energy law.

If this bill fails of passage in this session, our Nation's efforts to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be needlessly delayed. I earnestly urge, therefore, that every possible step be taken to enact this legislation before the Congress adjourns.

Although I am much aware that other programs of national importance which I have urged be passed are also still pending before the Senate, I call this bill to your attention now because I have not previously mentioned it to the Congress on the premise—obviously a mistaken one—that, it having bipartisan

support, there would be no question as to its enactment.

I am also writing the Speaker of the House urging that the House approve the companion bill, H. R. 12050, before the House adjourns.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

SERVING AND CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON AIRPLANES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement by me on H. R. 8000.

There being no objection, the statement was was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

I regret that H. R. 8000, as passed by the House of Representatives, has not been enacted by the Senate before its adjournment tonight. This is the bill which would have prohibited the serving or the consumption of alcoholic beverages on airplanes.

I was the sponsor of a similar bill in the Senate. This legislation had the support of the personnel—pilots and stewardesses—who fly on the Nation's airlines, who are responsible for the safety and the comfort of passengers on our commercial airplanes, and who have had first-hand experience with the dangerous and disturbing element which is, quite unnecessarily, introduced in air travel by the consumption of intoxicating drinks on airplanes.

I cannot understand how enactment of this legislation could not be in the public interest. Therefore I regret, I repeat, Mr. President, that it has not been adopted by the Senate after having passed in the other House.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, this has been an unusually cordial and friendly evening, and I wish to join in the many expressions of friendship and good will which have been so characteristic of this session.

At this moment, however, I rise with a rather heavy heart to speak on a subject which is very meaningful to me, the subject of civil rights.

The last few days have been troublesome for me, for I have found myself for the first time in my Senate career separated from three of my closest and most beloved colleagues whose respect and friendship I value deeply.

There is no subject with which I am more intimately identified than the subject of civil rights. There is no subject more meaningful to me than the subject of human rights.

As mayor of the city of Minneapolis, under the general powers of the executive office, I established and appointed the mayor's council on human relations. This civic body has just commenorated its 10th anniversary. It is an established institution. It has done great good. It has served to mobilize the community's resources for the advancement of human rights and the improvement of human relations.

As a result of the work of the mayor's council on human relations cooperating with other civic groups, the city of Minneapolis was awarded the brotherhood award of the National Council of Christians and Jews in 1948, the final year of my service as mayor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is entitled to order in the Senate, and the Chair will appreciate the cooperation of all Senators in extending to him the courtesy to which he is entitled. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the second accomplishment in the field of civil rights was the adoption in the city of Minneapolis, during my service as mayor, of the first municipal fair employment practice commission ordinance with enforcement powers. That legislation has proved effective. It set the pattern for other municipalities. From that limited beginning other cities in my State of Minnesota have adopted other similar legislation. In the most recent session of the Minnesota State Legislature, a State fair employment practice commission was authorized. I have worked steadfastly along with others for the fulfillment of that objective.

My colleagues will remember, some with satisfaction and others with regret, my participation in a debate on a civil-rights plank at the 1948 Democratic Convention.

From the first days of my service in the United States Senate, I have been the legislative author and leading sponsor of what we know to be the civil-rights program. The very bills, today and indeed lately embraced by the administration, are the embodiments of the bills which I have been preparing at every session since 1949. It is these very bills which are now the subject of controversy on this floor.

Yet, within recent days I found myself separated from the efforts of three of my associates and coleaders in the move for civil rights. I wish to make it clear why I felt compelled to take such action.

Tuesday night I joined all but three of our Democratic colleagues in voting against a motion to adjourn made by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. The motion was made and joined in by the senior Senator from Missouri and the junior Senator from New York out of the deep conviction on their part that this parliamentary move was essential as a means of achieving some expression by the Senate before final adjournment on civil-rights legislation. My vote could have been misinterpreted, by those who are unsympathetic to or unaware of my motives, as a vote to prevent a final expression by the Senate on civil rights. My friends and my conscience know that the contrary is true.

Civil rights to me has always been a broad vision of greater opportunity, greater happiness for ever-growing numbers of Americans regardless of their race, color or creed. Civil rights and human rights are one and the same. They are the expression of the American dream and of the religious spirit which guides this Nation.

The picture of America which I believe should be our goal is the picture of a Nation wherein our people are permitted to participate in full citizenship, free in spirit, unrestrained by the artificial barriers of race, religion, creed or color. Yes, an American people who are contributing to the greatness of America in the full measure of their talents and abilities. An America where we all stand with shoulders high, with dignity and with the expression of joy and happiness which comes in a society based upon principles of freedom, equality and justice. It is the picture of children in good schools with capable and dedicated teachers. It is a picture of our older citizens reaching the closing days of their lives gracefully and with dignified composure. It is the picture of our disabled enjoying the gifts of life and security.

This goal is to me the goal of human rights. It encompasses within it the essence of social security legislation which we seek to constantly improve. It includes within it humane, democratic immigration legislation. It includes within its definition a foreign policy which highlights aid to underprivileged nations and peoples. It includes minimum wages, health, education, housing legislation. It includes encouragement to an agricultural economy which emphasizes the humane social values of maintaining the family farm and, yes, Mr. President, it includes a civil rights program, with protection of the right to vote, the right to be secure against violence—a permanent commission on civil rights, equality of opportunity for employment, and the organization of all branches of government so as to secure those rights of human equality.

This broad picture of human rights must constantly advance on all fronts if our Nation is to live up to its dream. Mr. President, I am proud to be an American because this program of human rights has indeed advanced on all fronts, throughout the history of our Nation, and in particular since 1933 when a great President arose to a great challenge and set a course for a national program from which we have still not deviated. The progress we have made has been the result of dedicated effort by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government, supported by an informed citizenry aware of their responsibilities and ready to pay the price for social progress.

We must never allow ourselves to lose sight of our goal.

The goal and the dreams, however, Mr. President, are by themselves incomplete. It is also our responsibility to discover and achieve reality for them. We must search for the method of achieving them. Those of us who are members of this body cannot afford the luxury of merely talking about our objective. We also have the responsibility as legislators to answer the question: how do we achieve that objective?

It is in the area of how to achieve our objective that I felt compelled, respectfully and regretfully, to differ with my friends. I could not be a party to a parliamentary effort, the effect of which I believed was to endanger the most advanced social security bill that the Congress has passed in 20 years. For social security is to me an essential part of the human rights program. It is designed

for and its benefits go to the people in the low- and middle-income groups.

We must not forget that the social-security measure, in aiding the working people and the needy, cuts across racial and religious lines.

I could not in good conscience be part of a parliamentary tactic, the effect of which would be to hold the legislative process locked in its tracks at this crucial period before we had enacted a much-needed housing program designed to provide authority and funds for slum clearance, housing for our elderly and for urban redevelopment, before we enacted mutual security appropriations, farm credit extension and expansion, customs simplification, and the scores of other legislative proposals which are so essential to the functioning of our democratic government.

These are the facts, whether we like them or whether we do not. I regret that these are the facts, but I refuse to attempt to delude myself into believing that these real facts do not exist.

My plea to the United States Senate has been and still is that we mobilize our resources to complete the unfinished work of the Congress expeditiously and with the common purpose that dedicates all of us to the public good as we see it. This could best be done by following the leadership of the Senate in its determination of a schedule for the completion of our work.

It is important, however, that I make one thing clear. The uncompleted work of the Congress includes the necessity of acting favorably on civil-rights legislation. We cannot be blind to the honest, rightful, and eager aspirations of millions of Americans for some kind of positive expression by the United States Senate in the area of civil rights. The Senate will not be true to its responsibilities and not true to its proud heritage if this body is not given an opportunity to express itself on this most vital issue. I differed with my three colleagues from Illinois, New York, and Missouri on the tactics that they pursued. But I commend and encourage and join with them in the goal they pursue.

I have never wavered from the goal of civil rights and cannot in good conscience waver from it. I will work unceasingly with perseverence and determination for constructive action until we succeed.

In good faith, and fully cognizant of the obstacles of emotionalism on both sides that, unfortunately, sometimes prevent even reasonable men from coming to reasonable solutions on the gravest of problems, I have endeavored to act responsibly and realistically toward achieving some progress toward that goal.

In January 1955, during the first week of this 84th Congress, I urged my colleagues who joined with me in sponsoring civil-rights legislation not to stimulate a procedural fight regarding the rules of the Senate because I believed that this body, under its effective and responsible leadership, should be given an opportunity to proceed in an orderly, rational manner. That was not a popular move for me to make among my friends and associates. But I was motivated by my own conscience and judgment as to what was best for this country.

Since that date, I again introduced the complete series of civil-rights bills. I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee urging favorable action on those bills. I ask unanimous consent that materials relative to those bills be printed in the RECORD following these remarks. I made it clear to all who would listen that I established no priority, but would welcome favorable action on any one bill, even the most noncontroversial one, so long as it could be said that some forward movement had taken place.

I had hoped that the Senate would recognize and encourage such an honorable course. My colleagues from the North and Midwest and Far West have patiently awaited the results of what might develop from those efforts. It appears, however, that the climate and temper of the Senate have made those efforts untimely—and today we stand nearing the closing hours of the Congress and there is still no action.

My plea has been and is a twofold one. It has been and is a plea for responsibility and calmness, but also for intelligent, democratic decision making. To be sure, those of us who are eager for civil-rights legislation did allow the leadership to proceed with its schedule so that the work of the Congress could be expedited.

I have asked and shall continue to ask that the leadership of this body, and those in this body who out of regional considerations and different experiences oppose our efforts for civil rights, allow the Senate to express itself on at least one bill designed to move forward in the area of greater opportunity for all Americans. I plead with my colleagues once again, as I have done in the past, to put party politics aside and work together in achieving that objective.

The civil rights legislative program is still before the Senate Judiciary Committee. On April 9, I called upon my Republican colleagues to supply us four votes in that committee out of the seven members that they have on that committee, to join with four of our Democratic colleagues and together make a majority of eight—which would insure favorable committee action on our program. This plea went unheeded. There has been no action. The constructive work of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, under the able chairmanship of Senator HENNINGS, has been blocked. The subcommittee recommendation on civil rights bills have been smothered by committee rules, procedures, and inaction.

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary has refused to act on even one of the bills. Yet, these bills are fair, constructive, and long overdue.

No amount of parliamentary maneuvering will change the conviction of the vast majority of the American people that the program of civil rights bills, reported favorably by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, should not have been adopted by this Congress. Three of these are bills that I have sponsored, and that several other Senators have cosponsored.

Mr. President, let me in conclusion reiterate my conviction that full civil rights, for all Americans, are becoming a reality in the United States—and will eventually become an accomplished fact in American history regardless of what we have done in this session. We have failed in our efforts to gain legislation in this Congress. It will, however, be only a temporary failure. Our behavior this week will be only a footnote in history.

Within a few months, a new Senate will convene. This grave issue will still be with us.

I make a plea to my colleagues—North and South—Democrat and Republican, to join in a serious and sincere effort to find a formula for a legislative program which will end the bitterness and emotionalism which today surrounds the civil rights issue, and, instead, allow the intelligence and responsibility of the Senate to make its full and rightful contribution to the forward march of American democracy. I stand ready to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle—with the able and sincere minority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, and with our effective, honorable, and hard-working majority leader in designing a legislative program that will achieve progress and constructive action.

We can do no less. We cannot, again, permit basic human rights to be the victim of Senate rules and congressional stalemate. We owe it to ourselves, and to this great Nation, to face up to the issue of civil rights. Further delay can produce only further frustration, which, if continued, leads to irrational response. In the words of the Prophet Isaiah: "Come, let us reason together."

It will be in that spirit that the junior Senator from Minnesota, in the next session of the 85th Congress, will appeal to his colleagues on the basis of reason and fairness for constructive action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will say to my friend from Minnesota that he will find the Senator from Texas available every day to reason with him on any subject of importance to the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I always have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend.

PAYMENT FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN DAMS AND RESERVOIRS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2093) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, to undertake certain public works and grant compensation for certain property damages as a result of the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects, Missouri River, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements situated on a railroad right-of-way or on Indian tribal land the fair value, as determined by the Secretary, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, of any such improvements which will be rendered inoperative or be otherwise adversely affected by the con-

struction of the Gavins Point, Fort Randall, and Oahe Dams and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to pay to the Pollock Independent School District No. 3, Pollock, S. Dak., an amount equal to the difference between the sum paid for the taking of school facilities of said school district in the condemnation proceeding entitled "United States of America, plaintiff, against 10.00 Acres of Land, and so forth, defendants", civil No. 682ND, filed in the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota, northern division, on May 7, 1956, and the actual cost of replacing the school facilities so acquired as the Secretary shall find to be reasonable: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall the additional amount paid pursuant to this authorization exceed $200,000.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall the amount so expended exceed $550,000.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. D., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PAYMENT AND COLLECTION OF WAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 938) to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia, which was on page 3, line 14, after "discharge" insert:

: *Provided, however,* That in the instance of an employee who is responsible for monies belonging to the employer, the employer shall be allowed a period of 4 days from the date of discharge or resignation for the determination of the accuracy of the employee's accounts, at the end of which time all wages earned by the employees shall be paid.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment of the House is acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF THE FISHING INDUSTRY, RELATING TO THE TRAINING OF PERSONNEL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2379) to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry, which were on page 1, line 7, strike out ", including the establishment of scholarships,"; on page 2, line 1, to strike out "fisheries" and insert "fishing"; on page 2, strike out lines 11, 12, and 13; on page 2, strike out lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, and on page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out "$550,000 for vocational education and extension service" and insert "$375,000 for vocational education."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

VINCENT P. SVELNIS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 10006.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10006) for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN VESSELS IN COASTWISE TRANSPORTATION OF COAL TO OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar 2824, House bill 9874.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9874) to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 276, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on July 27, 1956, and that when they adjourn on that day, they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the resolution of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the statement he made tonight in defense of the small-business people who, in my judgment, are being done a shocking injustice by the Congress in not passing S. 11. As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I think it is most unfortunate that Congress failed to pass that bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a speech which I intended to make on the subject, and some communications which I have received from small-business men in Oregon urging the passage of S. 11.

To those businessmen of my State I wish to say that the bill would have passed tonight if we could have gotten it to the floor, but objection was made on the other side of the aisle.

There being no objection, the speech and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD MAKING SMALL BUSINESS SMALLER

At the beginning of this session of Congress, I had high hopes that much would be accomplished to improve the position of small business in America. I had hoped for administration support for our efforts to maintain our free economy by bolstering the economic climate for small concerns. But, what did we get from this Republican administration? Another committee—composed of, and note this list, Charles Wilson, Secretary of Defense; Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; James Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization; Dr. Burns of the Council of Economic Advisers; Albert Cole, Housing and Home Finance Administrator; and, out of the kindness of their hearts, Mr. Wendell Barnes, Small Business Administrator.

In lieu of concrete recommendations for assistance to small business, in the absence of positive support for the small-business measures already before Congress, the administration proposed a grand substitute: A committee designed to study small-business problems until the election period is past. I am reminded of Congressman CELLER'S recent remarks that a "commission is a group of the uninformed, appointed by the unwilling, to do the unnecessary." And this committee is unnecessary. If this administration had wanted to do something to assist small business it would have lent its support to some of the constructive measures before this Congress. Let's examine the administration record on three major and specific bills of importance to the small enterprises of this Nation.

First, consider the proposals before this Congress to provide tax relief to the small corporations of America. As all Members of this body know well, changes in our tax laws benefiting small business are very difficult to pass particularly in the face of opposition from the executive branch. Permit me to digress a moment, Mr. President, to explain why tax relief for our smallest corporations is of such vital importance. A lack of capital is doubtless the overriding problem facing all small business today. Small concerns do not have adequate cash to cover operations and to finance expansion. They do not have the needed cash because: (a) High tax rates on small corporations prohibit the plowing back of earnings into the business, (b) rising interest rates make borrowing not only more expensive but in some areas, exceedingly difficult to obtain at any price, and (c) the heavy cost of small stock issues makes capital financing worthless for most small firms.

I had hoped that in this session we would move to alleviate the inequitable tax burden

on small corporations. I have, therefore, supported measures to grant needed tax relief to our small corporations. Now, Mr. President, let us explore the administration's contribution to these efforts. Mr. Wendell Barnes, testifying before the Senate Small Business Committee last April, declined to support measures to grant tax relief to the Nation's small corporations because George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, had already gone on record in opposition to relief for small corporations.

Mr. Barnes frankly stated that he, "would have to follow the administration's position." He further admitted that he was precluded from making recommendations on "administration policy that is the primary responsibility" of another agency even though the subject at issue is of vital concern to small business. This is the support we get from the Republican Small Business Administration, the agency established by Congress to "aid, counsel, assist, and protect insofar as is possible the interests of small-business concerns."

For my second illustration, let's consider the bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act by limiting the "good faith" clause where the effect of a discriminatory pricing practice may substantially lessen competition or tend towards monopoly. This measure is S. 11, the "equality of opportunity" bill, which I cosponsored. The same Mr. Wendell Barnes appeared before the antitrust subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the bill. Mr. Barnes appeared in his role of spokesman for small business. His testimony, however, made clear that he was not speaking for small business. Let me read you two brief excerpts from the hearing record:

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you get any correspondence or were any views presented to you from the small retail organizations which indicate a disposition to oppose S. 11?

"Mr. BARNES. I do not think so.

"Mr. CHAIRMAN. Have you received any complaints from any small manufacturers to the effect that this proposed legislation is detrimental?

"Mr. BARNES. We have not * * * We have not solicited their views."

It was clear that the SBA Administrator was taking his cue from the Federal Trade Commission and from the Department of Justice, or as Mr. Barnes put it: "As a part of the executive branch, we would, of course, be guided by the opinions of the agencies that have the operating responsibility of enforcing the law in this field." This is the assistance we got from the Small Business Administrator despite the declaration of the Congress vesting the Small Business Administration with the responsibility for strengthening the overall economy by assisting our small-business enterprises. This is the Republican record despite the fact that this bill is fully consistent with the spirit of the antitrust laws designed to encourage free and unrestricted competition.

Finally, let's look at the antimerger bill requiring advance notification to interested governmental agencies of pending mergers. Corporate and banking merger rates are now at alarming levels. So common have mergers become that early this year a large New York bank advertised in a financial journal offering advice on mergers under a headline reading: "Would your company benefit by a corporate merger?" Quoting the magazine Business Week to the effect that "corporate mergers in business and industry tripled in the last 4 years," this "merger, anyone?" approach offered a finders' service with the hint that "your bank * * * may even know where preliminary investigations would prove fruitful."

The administration record on this bill was particularly revealing. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission strongly supported the measure. The Secretary of Commerce, however, just as vigorously opposed the bill. Apparently, Secretary Weeks and the big-business interests are not bound by the administration line. Apparently, Secretary Weeks is not under wraps in opposing measures favorable to small business. Can we assume that the team concept operates only to gag the small-business arm of this administration?

This is the Republican record on three specific measures of interest to small business. The administration did nothing to improve the climate for small business by strengthening the antitrust laws. It was ineffective and divided in efforts to limit unwholesome mergers. It did nothing to improve the capital position of small business by easing the inequitable-tax structure.

After 3½ years of inaction, this administration seeks to hide its big-business bias behind a smokescreen of a Cabinet-level study committee—good until the election is over. Will the American small-business men be fooled? I think not. Many of us from this body will be with the voters this fall to point up the truth and to place the responsibility for failure to assist small business on the Republican administration where it belongs.

MIDLAND REALTY CO.,
Chicago, July 16, 1956.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senator from Alabama,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Having been in business for the last 44 years, my personal observation and belief is that if the Eisenhower administration remains in power another 4 years, the small-business man will become extinct. The million-dollar corporations will become billion-dollar corporations and the small-business man will go to the poorhouse.

Investigate 50 corporations or more and you will find that they are controlling half a dozen other lines in addition to their own. That is not a healthy situation.

A month or so ago I saw something that I believe is worth mentioning. Some of the chain food stores now have drug and cosmetic counters. (However, they do not fill prescriptions as yet.) That of course denies the corner drugstore business which is rightfully theirs, and they surely have a struggle as it is.

As the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, Senator SPARKMAN, I hope you will do something about it, for conditions are ripe enough for a thorough investigation now. I believe that small-business men are the backbone of the Nation's industry. Therefore, I hope the Congress will see to it that the giant corporations will not eliminate the small-business man. The prosperity we have today is sectional and not uniform.

Sincerely yours,
G. K. PAPAZOGLIDIS, *President.*

ALBANY, OREG., *July 20, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your cooperation to secure passage of S. 11 bill will be highly appreciated. Small busines as ours will tend to survive if S. 11 is passed in its present form.

ERVINS DRUG STORE.
HURLEYS DRUG STORE.
MASONS DRUG STORE.
PAYLESS DRUG STORE.
SARFFS DRUG STORE.
LAMMERS DRUG STORE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 23, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Please wire us collect present status of H. R. 1840 which was referred to Senate Judiciary Committee. We understand that administration is making every effort to delay Senate vote on this bill and thereby kill it for this session. Oregon Independent grocers will appreciate your valued and influential support and bringing this messaage to Senate vote. Standard Oil Company and National chains are opposed to this measure and are using their big business influence to defeat this measure. House passed bill with only three dissenting votes.

HAROLD E. CARLSON,
Secretary, Oregon Independents.

ASTORIA, OREG., *July 5, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your suport and favorable vote to assure passage of S. 11.

HARRY STEINBOCK PHARMACY.

ASTORIA, OREG., *July 5, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support and favorable vote to assure passage of S. 11.

RICHARD PAULSON,
OWL DRUG STORE.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., *July 5, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

We urge your favorable vote on bill S. 11 for protection small business.

KLAMATH DRUG ASSOCIATION,
WILL W. WOOD, *President.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 2, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As one of many small businesses in the food industry, we sincerely urge your cooperation in supporting the passage of H. R. 1840 without amendment which we feel will help assure the future of small business on a basis of equal opportunity.

Yours very truly,
A. P. JOHNSON.

EUGENE, OREG., *July 5, 1956.*

WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

The future of the independent food merchant is at stake unless bill H. R. 1840 is passed without amendment. Your consideration appreciated.

BEVERLY PARK MARKET,
J. R. TIMMONS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 3, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senate bill No. 11 will preserve all business. Please vote for this bill.

GENE E. WATSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 3, 1596.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington D. C.:

Please support Senate bill No. 11. It is the backbone of United States business.

Y. INAHARA.

PORTLAND, OREG, *July 3, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request your favorable consideration of S. 11 to strengthen Robinson-Patman Act. This is an equality of opportunity bill which is favorable to small business.

CHRIS HALESTON.

FRESNO, CALIF., *June 26, 1956.*

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We ask you help and leadership to make sure, as you were a cosponsor of S. 11 which is identical with H. R. 1840, that this bill is

passed by the Senate at this session of Congress. You know and realize this bill will plug loopholes in the Robinson-Patman Act. Price discrimination destroys small business and additional thousands of small businesses will be forced out of business if we cannot secure passage of this bill at this session. We are depending on your help to make effective protection against this persistent evil a reality.

GENNUSO'S TEXACO SERVICE,
LOUIE GENNUSO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 25, 1956.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The 300 members of our association ask your help and leadership to insure H. R. 1840, the equality of opportunity bill, to plug loopholes in Robinson-Patman Act, is passed by the Senate at this session. Price discrimination destroys small business and additional thousands of small-business men will be forced out of business if we cannot secure passage of this bill at this session.

JOHN B. SPALDING,
Manager, Portland Automotive Trades Association.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1956.*
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The 365 Oregon (and southwestern Washington) grocery retailers who comprise United Grocers Inc., are much interested in the passage of H. R. 1840 without amendments. Most of them remember the days of rank discrimination before the passage of the original Robinson-Patman Act and are interested in preventing similar discriminatory tactics in a business that most vitally affects the pocketbook of every person in the country. May we urge your support on behalf of H. R. 1840.

HARRY THYE,
Secretary-Treasurer, United Grocers, Inc.

OREGON STATE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., June 18, 1956.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The equality of opportunity bill will be before the Senate for consideration and we would certainly appreciate your favorable consideration of this legislation.

The principal purpose of S. 11 is to plug a loophole that developed in the Robinson-Patman Act when the United States Supreme Court ruled that good faith was a complete defense for discriminatory sales to large outfits.

As you are probably aware, this bill passed the House by a large vote with, I believe, only 3 Members voting against it and 393 voting in favor of it. We are most anxious for this bill to be considered at this session of the Congress and would certainly appreciate your favorable consideration of this measure when it is before the Senate.

If there is any further information desired by you, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully,

H. A. SPECKMAN.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SERVICE STATION ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 9, 1956.
Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HON. SENATOR MORSE: We wish to thank you for the support you have given small business by signing the equality-of-opportunity bill, S. 11, that was introduced in the United States Senate on January 6, 1955, by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

Price discrimination, as you well know, is extremely detrimental to small businessmen and especially to the gasoline retailer.

We understand that the S. 11 bill will probably reach the floor of the United States Senate during the latter part of June or early July 1956 and we sincerely hope that you will continue to favor the passage of this important legislation.

Our association is comprised of 1,200 gasoline retailer members in the southern California area who have been forced into gasoline price wars many times during the past 20 years by the major suppliers who use a subsidy, rebate, or special allowance program discriminately. We believe that the Kefauver-Patman bill will eliminate the majority of our troubles and allow us to compete on a basis of service and efficiency.

Your continued support is urgently needed by small business and we feel certain that you will want to give us the legislation that will restore us to a competitive basis without discrimination.

Thank you for your kind consideration to this letter and if we can possibly ever be of service to you please feel free to use the services of our trade association.

Yours very truly,

EUGENE PITTALUGA,
President.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 14, 1956.*
The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You undoubtedly know that the House passed H. R. 1840, known as the equality-of-opportunity bill, by a vote of 393 to 3, and that it has been sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee for action.

Also, unquestionably you are familiar with the necessity for passage of this bill in order to give the small-business man an equal break with the "bigs." Particularly since the recent decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, has it become necessary to make clear the intent of Congress with respect to the Robinson-Patman Act.

From your past record, I feel sure you are in favor of this bill. The thing we, as small-business men, are up against now is getting this bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee and onto the Senate floor for action prior to the adjournment of Congress.

Anything you can do to expedite the clearing of this bill through the Senate Judiciary Committee will be greatly appreciated.

You are aware, I am sure, that this bill does not offer protective legislation to the smaller-business man, other than that he must be given an equal break in price and sales conditions, on like quantity and quality, with the "bigs" within his own competitive area.

Your good attention will be most appreciated.

Cordially yours,

OLIVER HURTIG.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PETROLEUM RETAILERS,
Detroit, Mich., June 19, 1956.
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Nation's service station operators earnestly request your support and help in securing Senate adoption at this session of H. R. 1840 (the equality of opportunity bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act) passed by the House 393 to 3—which is identical with S. 11 of which you were a cosponsor.

You are familiar with the reasons why the Nation's small-business men need this bill:

1. Price discrimination weakens and destroys small business.

2. The protection against price discrimination which Congress intended to provide in adopting the Robinson-Patman Act has been largely taken away by the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Detroit case (1951), making the "good faith" defense absolute rather than procedural so that it excuses price discrimination even where there is lessening of competition and tendency toward creation of a monopoly as a result.

3. Following the Supreme Court decision, new waves of destructive price discrimination have struck our industry and other industries as well with an alarming increase in small-business failures and destruction of small-business opportunity.

4. H. R. 1840 restores the intention of Congress as shown by the record in adopting the Robinson-Patman Act, by providing that the "good faith" defense shall not apply where there is a lessening of competition or tendency to create monopoly.

5. H. R. 1840 will undo the damage done by the Supreme Court decision and give small business the protection which it needs and deserves against this destructive practice.

We ask you to tell your colleagues why it is so necessary that H. R. 1840 be passed by the Senate at this session—that there will be new thousands of business failures and tragic loss of faith as well as economic loss if small business must wait another 2 years for this needed protection.

We sincerely believe that the American economic system should be made to work for small business as well as big business. If those who profit from crushing small business through price discrimination practices cannot be curbed, there will be a loss of economic freedom and opportunity for all Americans, and our economic system itself will be in danger.

H. R. 1840, which is identical with S. 11 and H. R. 11 as introduced by Representative PATMAN, had extensive hearings by the House Judiciary Committee and there is already an exhaustive record, eliminating the necessity for additional hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Members of the committee are already familiar with the evidence and the arguments, and we sincerely hope it may be possible that they will be encouraged to act in plenty of time for Senate adoption at this session.

As the national trade association of service station operators, we are deeply and desperately concerned. Until this bill is passed, the Nation's nearly 200,000 service station operators are at the mercy of ruthless, cruel price discrimination practices which have and are destroying their businesses, their earnings, and savings, and taking the very food from their families. Sixty thousand service station operators fail in business, quit business or are forced out of business by adverse conditions every year, and price discrimination practices are a primary cause. We earnestly and sincerely beseech your assistance in solving this problem through adoption of H. R. 1840 by the Senate as quickly as possible.

We will appreciate hearing from you as to measures which are being taken and progress being made.

Very truly yours,

CASH B. HAWLEY,
President.

SENATOR MORSE: As one who has consistently advanced the cause of the small-business man we are especially counting on you in this crisis.—C. B. H.

GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF PETROLEUM RETAILERS, INC.,
Decatur, Ga., June 22, 1956.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The 3,500 members of the Georgia Association of Petroleum Retailers want to thank you for cosponsoring

S. 11 which is identical with H. R. 1840 and earnestly request that you work and talk for passage without amendments in the Senate and Congress.

Sincerely,

MILTON F. ALLEN,
Executive Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 20, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I do not know whether you recall me or not; but we have had several conversations in the past on the perpetuation of the famous Robinson-Patman bill for the benefit of small business.

I am again writing to you, very sincerely and earnestly soliciting your cooperation in using your customary fine influence by talking to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on H. R. 1840, the Equality of Opportunity bill.

All indications would tend to prove to anyone that with the unanimous action of Congress in approving this H. R. 1840 indicates the feeling of the people throughout the country generally. Their great desire to have this bill approved by the Senate. I know you are a very definite champion of small business and sincerely trust that you will lend your support to the passing of same.

I know that the Congress is going to adjourn some time in July and it is my most sincere hope that this bill can now go through the House prior to the vacation time, because I understand if it does not; the thing has to start all over again during the next session.

Any assistance you can lend at this time to this most important bill will be greatly appreciated by the rank and file of the people of this country.

Again, thank you for your usual fine cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

MAILLIARD & SCHMIEDELL,
L. K. GREER.

HUFSTADER & WALLAN SHELL SERVICE,
Bend, Oreg., June 26, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We desperately need your help in combating price discrimination practices which weaken and destroy small business. Congress intended to prevent such destructive price discrimination when it adopted the Robinson-Patman Act, but the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Detroit case in 1951, which opened up the "good faith" loophole, has destroyed the effectiveness of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In the retail petroleum industry, 60,000 service station operators fail in business, quit business, or are forced out of business by hardship conditions every year—and price discrimination of the type permitted by the Supreme Court decision is probably the most important single cause of these human catastrophes.

The injury to small business caused by the Supreme Court decision will undoubtedly deepen and worsen until Congress acts to remedy the situation, and now for the first time since 1951 we are hopeful of getting such protection. A bill has just passed the House of Representatives which will remedy the damage done by the Court's decision, restore the intention of Congress in adopting the Robinson-Patman Act, and give small business the protection which it needs and deserves. This is H. R. 1840, the Equality of Opportunity bill (identical with S. 11 and H. R. 11 as introduced by Representative PATMAN) which will limit the "good faith-meeting competition" defense to cases where competition is not injured or destroyed by the discrimination.

In the House this bill received very extended hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, at which a score of small-business trade associations, farm, and labor organizations appeared in its support. It was approved by the committee, and adopted by the House 393 to 3.

This bill was unfortunately delayed in the House, however, and the promonopolists and lobbyists for big business which profit from price discrimination are probably hoping for sufficient delay in the Senate to prevent adoption at this session. In view of how desperately small business needs this bill, we ask your help to see that these delays do not occur and that this bill comes to a vote and is approved in this session.

Since the House has given this bill such extended hearings and the record is so complete, we are hopeful that the Senate Judiciary Committee can act on this measure without further hearings so that it may come to a Senate vote in plenty of time.

We will sincerely appreciate your help in getting this bill to a vote as early as possible and your support for it. Our members will also appreciate hearing from you as to progress which is being made.

Very truly yours,

L. C. WALLAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Future of small business depends on passage of H. R. 1840 or S. 11 without amendment solicit your full support.

L. A. SMITH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference H. R. 1840 or S. 11. We strongly urge your support of measure. We believe passage this bill without amendment vitally important to future of small and medium business in all fields. Thank you.

GOEBEL PRATT CO.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 26, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned gasoline dealers ask your help and leadership to make sure H. R. 1840, the equality of opportunity bill, to plug loopholes in the Robinson-Patman Act is passed by the Senate at this session. Price discrimination destroys small business and additional thousands of small-business men will be forced out of business if we cannot secure passage of this bill at this session.

George Bruce, Ben Hallyburton, Ed Chappel, Roy M. Johnson, R. D. Bowe, James Keep, Sam Gholson, Otto Davis, C. C. Fisher, George Foster, A. Geuder, Loring Stocks, Wally Youngson, Sheldon Baker, Virgil W. Rukke.

LYLE-PRATT CO., INC.,
Portland, Oreg., June 27, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As there are no Senators from Oregon serving on the Judiciary Committee, I certainly hope you will use your persuasive abilities among your friends on this committee to report favorably for passage of the House bill H. R. 1840 before Congress adjourns.

H. R. 1840 is nothing more than putting teeth in our present Robinson-Patman Act, which will ensure the life of small business, the backbone of our country. It accomplishes this by preventing price discrimination.

If this bill is not enacted, many small businesses will soon be disabled, thus crippling the economy of the Nation. The much increased activity on the part of the opposition (big business) for the defeat of this bill, since it passed the House, should be a clear indication that H. R. 1840 is vital to small business.

The Constitution was not written with the intent that monopoly should thrive, but to the contrary; the equality of opportunity for all.

Sincerely yours,

WM. P. LYLE.

BUFFALO AND SUBURBAN
GASOLINE RETAILERS ASSOCIATION,
Williamsville, N. Y., June 27, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are informed that H. R. 1840 (same at H. R. 11) the equality of opportunity bill, was passed by the House by overwhelming vote of 393 to 3—on June 11, and is now in the Senate Judiciary Committee. With such support by the House, after the extensive hearings by the House Judiciary Committee and the testimony before the House and Senate Small Business Committees—the need for this bill should now be adequately established. Economic murder through price discrimination is an issue which transcends any question of any suppliers' need to meet "lawful competition" by firing buckshot into a crowd of his customer's competitors. The answer to "lawful competition" is more "lawful competition" not "special privilege" to maintain a special customer's trade.

In view of how desperately small business needs this bill, and the need of this country to safeguard the survival of small business in a free enterprise system—even one more year of cut-throat competition may be crucial—not only for the thousands of small businesses which may be destroyed but for the morale of the remaining small business to continue the fight. When small business and its organizations have been defeated, demoralized or destroyed, who would remain to carry on the crusade for its protection?

The record is already adequate. Therefore further extensive hearings could add nothing but delay and thus prevent the report of this measure in time for action at this session. We ask your help in bringing this bill to a Senate vote in time for action and urge your personal support to aid its enactment. The overwhelming vote in the House is a tribute to the integrity of that body. May the Senate prove equally immune to the lobbies of those who would perpetuate the rule of economic murder.

Very sincerely,

WALTER F. FAXLANGER,
Executive Secretary.

RULES FOR SPORT ARE RULES FOR LIVING

(By Walter Faxlanger)

Sport in school (and out of school) teaches fair play, not only for the athletic field but for every part of living. It surely should include our business. All sport is played according to rules of fair play which apply equally to all players. To produce the keenest competition, contestants are graded according to age, weight, or skill. To match a flyweight against a heavyweight in boxnig or wrestling would be no competition at all. No one would buy a ticket to see such a match; and if anyone were forced to witness it, their sense of fairness (which they acquired through sport) would impel them to yell for a law to end such slaughter. Yet in business some persons think it is O. K. for a multi-billion-dollar refining corporation to knock out thousands of defenseless little retailers by competing at the retail level and cutting their price below the retailers' costs (but only until the independents are run out). Recently, to avoid criticism, they give stooge price cutters a special discount on condition that they will start

price wars to freeze the other dealers out. Such price wars are plain economic murder.

Paying players for throwing games recently created a national scandal in basketball, although it affected only the betting fraternity and the fame of a team or a school. (The effect on student and public moral values might as well be ignored unless it is our intent to apply these moral values of sport into our business relations with our fellow men.) For instance, the recent price wars among gasoline retailers were started by refiners offering special wholesale prices only to dealers who would agree to start price wars and thus betray their fellow dealers for the financial benefit of the major oil companies. The economic and moral damage resulting was far greater than that from the basketball sellouts, but no one harped on that betrayal as a public scandal. No; instead, such throatcutting is praised during Oil Progress Week and is hailed as proof that the oil industry is not a monopoly. No one bothers to point out to the public that such competition is only at the retailer level and is provoked by refiners to force retailers to handle the refiners' products for less.

MISSED MORAL POINT

The Supreme Court of the United States recently ignored the moral lessons of sport when it ruled that the right of a major oil company (Standard of Indiana) to discriminate in price between "Neds" and its other dealers in Detroit, "to meet the competition of another refiner (unnamed) in good faith" was a complete defense even though Neds used the advantage to cut the throats of a thousand other dealers, many of them Standard's own outlets. The Robinson-Patman Act ban on price discrimination (the third legislative attempt by Congress to prevent it) could not forbid discrimination unless it could be proved that there was an "intent" to establish a monopoly. How could anyone prove "intent"? That it did tend to create a monopoly and did injure competition was ruled irrelevant.

"Meeting the price of a competitor in good faith" might be compared to "shooting in self-defense." The Federal Trade Commission claimed that such facts should be admitted to the evidence for whatever weight they might hold, but that greater rights of third parties and of the public were involved and that those public rights were paramount above all private feuds. The Supreme Court ruled in effect that if one feudist was shooting at a shadow of another feudist across Main Street and thousands of third parties were being killed and a whole city was forced to detour from its normal places of trade that the Government still had no power to tell the feudists to "cease and desist" in accordance with a Government order. That is exactly the status of our State and National antitrust laws today.

We believe that the present session of Congress should write into law those moral values of sport which would outlaw price discrimination in words so clear that no court could dare misinterpret their meaning.

"Neds" was not an isolated case in Detroit. The practices complained against are part of a diabolical scheme, used nationwide by all major refiners to force all independent retailers out of business. But for a few exceptions that part of the program is already an accomplished fact. They wish, however, to retain the right to discriminate as a weapon for control and for further conquest of many related lines. For example, the writer is still an independent retailer. I own my own building and sell four different brands of gasoline. Yet, when I signed with Firestone to sell Firestone tires I was told to sign a form which directed Firestone to pay to Texaco a 1-percent commission on all of my sales. By their control over so many retail outlets they have gained power to levy tribute on other business and even to control who may or may not manufacture.

The oil industry's drive for supreme economic power began in the early 1930's when the major refiners started invading the retail field by building strings of palatial stations. The selling appeal of these swank emporiums was an "unfair trade practice" because they did not amortize the cost or pay the operational expense of "free service" out of the fixed margin allowed to their independent dealers. By entering the retail field they controlled both the wholesale and the retail price. Dealers could not adjust their margin to pay for equal swank. The new and shiny company stations were paid for out of refining profits by a subsidy reported to average more than 5 cents per gallon more than dealer margin.

BETWEEN MILLSTONES

Despite the lure of free service and swank, enough customers stayed with the regular "garage" to enable them to hang on doggedly. The major refiners then devised a quicker-acting system of freeze-out in which their own identity was more obscure. For customers wary of swank and monopoly they baited the trap with "independence," "little dealers" and "price" from 2 to 4 cents under the prevailing price. This discount to the retail buyer was made possible by a corresponding discount which was available only to dealers with a "tank car rating." The previous existence of a few tank car stations which actually had sidings and storage facilities and had sold unsteady job lots retail, lent background and credibility to a wholly bogus crop who had neither sidings nor facilities and got their supply from the major companies. These bogus tank car stations were served by truck and bought less than carload (just like any other dealer). By some strange coincidence the dealer who got the special price was always one whose nature or previous business example might indicate that he would use that advantage to undercut his fellow dealers. His large signs and flamboyant advertising would bust open the market for 20 miles around.

Such price wars, phony as they were, put the regular dealers right in the middle—between an upper millstone (the company station) pressing down with 5 cents more in swank and service—which the independent must try to match on a 3-cent margin—and a lower millstone grinding at that 3-cent margin with a price competition of from 2 to 4 cents per gallon. Before the dealers or anyone else could figure out what had happened or where the attack had really come from, independent retail gasoline dealers were almost extinct.

FEUDALISM REVIVED

As each dealer faced economic murder he was offered one chance for escape. He must pledge a fief to one company in the new feudalism of oil—by signing a lease and agency contract with one company. This automatically made his a one-brand station. He was then allowed to lease his place back from the company on a supervised day-to-day basis, under which he could be thrown out of his own building. This choice was thrust upon, not one dealer, but thousands of dealers all over the United States. But, because their stations were remodeled and in many cases completely rebuilt with oil-company loans, many dealers thought their vassal state was a good bargain. Each attended his new station with enthusiasm.

But the companies held mortgages which had to be paid whether the margin was much or small and they controlled the margin. The companies had demanded long-term leases, but dealer subleases were for only 1 year and required the dealer to pay ½ cent or 1 cent per gallon rent. Each time the short-term lease was renewed it demanded a higher rent, 1½ cents, 2 cents, 2½ cents. Dealers were told to get their profit from the grease and oil business, which they did. The next lease charged $30 per month for the lubrication room or $60 if it had two stalls. The dealers were told to sell more tires, batteries, and accessories, and some renewals demanded 6 percent on these. Like a squirrel running faster and faster in his revolving cage merely to stay on the same spot, the lease and agency dealers found that no amount of further effort would put them any further ahead. They could never earn any more than their oil-refiner landlord chose to allow them to keep. Some were getting troublesome and a few "tank-car dealers" who had built large volume with the aid of their special discount were refusing to stay in line. They considered themselves "better merchandisers" rather than "agents provacateur" or leadersheep in a slaughterhouse.

COMPANIES MAKE NEW DOUBLE PLAY

To break them all, one company offered a 2-cent discount for cash under the posted price at company stations. The other dealers had to follow.

A new price war was on. Pet retailers got rebates or paid no rent. Grumblers were forced to quit after sitting in on the cut-throat game long enough to run deeply into debt. Many signed their new stations over to the oil companies. Stations had no value during a price war. Thus the companies gained full possession before the loans could be repaid, and the leadersheep, who had led the flock to slaughter again, this time got their own throats cut. A special few were again rewarded with a chance to sell out at a real juicy price, which enabled them to start in again and to build the swankiest stations in the town. Now these favored few still play their old role in a new game—the Iowa plan.

THE IOWA PLAN

The Iowa plan claims to establish each lease-bound operator as an independent retailer. As such the company cannot dictate the retail price as it once did. Therefore the agent provacateur is used to undersell the regular dealers to keep the dealer mark-up at a minimum, while the wholesale price is pushed upward to all the traffic will bear. This assures the refiners of a maximum portion of whatever amount consumers can be forced to pay. The Iowa plan saddles on the dealer all of the liabilities, all the responsibilities of independence, but he has none of its prerogatives. He is deprived of all the prerogatives of an employee, such as a regular salary, pay for overtime, social security, compensation, etc.

Despite the swank of the modern stations compared to those of the past, we might still ask—

IS THAT PROGRESS?

The Iowa plan station operators know that they are expected to handle the particular brand of tires, batteries, and accessories tied up with their brand of gasoline. They cannot shop for value or price. Through such control of retail outlets the refiners are in position to levy tribute on manufacturers of other lines of merchandise, and by control of the normal outlets they are in a position to dictate who may, or may not, manufacture for general sale, and at what price.

SUCH HAS BEEN "OIL'S PROGRESS" TOWARD MONOPOLY

All of this concentration of their economic power was made possible by the little clause in the antitrust laws which allows a seller—to discriminate in price between customers—"to meet the equally low price of a competitor," * * * to sell below cost, in spots, while charging high prices elsewhere. In such a game the small merchant without stores elsewhere is doomed. That is why, to encourage free enterprise as the answer to communism, we need to assure those who venture capital to start a business that so long as they are efficient they can survive next to giants; that no group which merely has more money can force them into a give-away contest sure to end in bankruptcy for

the smallest. Economic murder by below-cost selling should be outlawed.

Records of the Federal Trade Commission bulge with data which supports the charges and information contained herein. Indeed, they were proved to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of the *Detroit Dealers* v. *Standard Oil of Indiana*. If the circuit court decision had been upheld, price discrimination would be outlawed and small business could survive; but now feudalism is enthroned, economic freedom has been murdered, and democracy will perish with it—while our attention is focused abroad.

This article is published to illustrate why dealers need legislation to ban price discrimination and sales below cost. It is the dealers' intention to seek such a law in the 1952 session of the legislature.

Might we count on your vote and help to attain it?

BUFFALO PHONE BOOK TELLS TRAGIC STORY

Comparing the classified list in the Buffalo directory with the directory distributed in October of last year, we find that 228 gasoline stations (approximately one-third of those listed) changed hands within that year. Those changes were not due to the current price war because listings closed in July which was too early to include the even greater price war losses. The 228 dropped from the 1950 book exceeded by only 22 the 206 dropped from the 1940 book a year before. In the new book (distributed in October 1951), another 100 phones of dealers have already been answered by a new proprietor or have been disconnected, as of November 1. These and the 22 might be labeled victims of the price war and even more will succumb in November—1952 equals 50 percent.

The price war is not a new epidemic. It is only a more violent form of the same problems which have cursed the retail gasoline business for many years. The cause of most of these business failures can be stated in 2 words—"unfair competition" or more dramatically "economic murder."

The name of the weapon is "subsidy." By it an oil company contrives to beat down the price of hundreds of dealers below their operating costs by subsidizing a few dealers with an extra discount, knowing that the subsidized dealer will use that advantage to undersell those who have no subsidy. In the present price war they pretend to even it up by offering a ½-cent subsidy to every dealer who will meet the price of the original cutter who gets upwards of 1½ cents—but only on condition that he will post a certain price (currently 19 cents plus tax, which equals 25.2 cents). This puts the dealer on a starvation 4-cent margin in spite of the fact that one-third of all dealers were going broke each year on a margin 2 cents greater.

Another form of subsidy is to reduce the rent (temporarily) to the man whom they can dominate, and raise the rent to the man who takes seriously their advertising blah that the dealers are "independent merchants." By such subsidies they can keep the dealers they want and drive out all others.

It is impossible to amortize the cost of a modern station with modern equipment out of the above-board retail margin. During the years when all other levels and segments of the petroleum industry were expanding and modernizing out of earnings, the retail dealers (most of whom once owned their own buildings) failed to earn enough to pay their expenses or modernize their stations and were forced to sell out to the companies who would do it for them.

Although the tactics of subsidy and price fixing (temporarily below the independent dealers' costs) is as old as the industry and was outlawed over 50 years ago by the Sherman Act, and was further condemned by the Clayton Act (1914) and by the Robinson-Patman Act (1936), the subsidy, discrimination, and price-fixing (below cost) still are condoned. The three acts are nullified by failure of the Department of Justice to investigate present violators and by the decision of the Supreme Court which ruled out of order the real issue, "the effect of subsidies" upon other dealers who have no subsidy.

Behind the one-third who contribute and lose their capital each year there always waits another sucker who, as the propaganda puts it, "would like to be his own boss—an independent merchant." Their "supervisor" advises them to invest $1,600 for advertising and giveaways for the opening day. The free goods clientele love him and leave him for the next station that wants big gallonage for a day. He operates longer hours on the advice of the "supervisor" and overhead eats up his capital. It is all sucked in to the costs of retailing gas. When he goes broke another sucker is always ready to become "independent."

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 29, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Judiciary Committee of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Would appreciate your favorable support of H. R. 1840 or S. 11 without amendment which is up for consideration. Certainly feel the future of small business is at stake if bill fails in passage.

Sincerely,

DONALD G. KAUFFMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1956.*

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Small business needs your support now of H. R. 1840, or S. 11, without amendment. Please help passage of this bill.

Yours very truly,

DAVID ROBINSON.

TILLAMOOK, OREG., *June 29, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of bill H. R. 1840 now before the Senate. We, as members of United Growers, Inc., would feel the full impact if this bill did not pass.

LEACH'S FOOD MARKET,
JERRY LEACH, *Owner.*

JOHN DAY, OREG., *June 29, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your consideration in passage bill H. R. 1840 without amendment.

CHESTER'S MARKET,
BILL SMITH, *Manager.*

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 3, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate bill No. 11 is vital for the preservation of small business. Please cast your vote for Senate bill No. 11.

L. L. SEATON.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 2, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your favorable support of S. 11 or H. R. 1840, without amendment, respectfully requested. Understand S. 11 now before you for consideration. This bill most important to future welfare small business.

ROY G. JOHNSON.

BEND, OREG., *July 2, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I am very interested in the passage of bill, H. R. 1840, without amendments.

CONGRESS MARKET,
JAMES MAYNE.

TILLAMOOK, OREG., *July 2, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your support S. 11. No amendments. Vital to survival of independent small business.

C. W. FOLKSTEAD,
President, Oregon State Farmers Pharmaceutical Association.

ASTORIA, OREG., *July 2, 1956.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Independent buisnessmen throughout United States need your support of H. R. 1840 without amendments. I personally urge you to vote for H. R. 1840.

EUGENE LOWE,
President, Astoria Public Market.

TEXAS SERVICE STATIONS, ASSOCIATED,
June 26, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In behalf of thousands of Texas service station operators TSSA wishes to express to you its appreciation for your leadership in introducing S. 11, the equality-of-opportunity bill designed to tighten the loopholes in the Robinson-Patman Act.

Now that H. R. 1840 has passed the House and is in Senate Judiciary Committee, we wish it were somehow possible to get our message to all Members of the Senate that we desperately needs adoption of this bill if small business is to survive. Price discrimination destroys small business and causes thousands of business failures among service station operators alone.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in small business, and ask your help in urging members of the Judiciary Committee to favorably report H. R. 1840, identical to S. 11.

Those who profit by crushing small business through price discrimination will probably seek to use every method of defeating this bill, and we are deeply grateful that you have supported our cause and will continue to do so.

Cordially,

BEN OGDEN, *President.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to recur to the remarks I was making concerning S. 11, because I now see the Senator from Tennessee on the floor. I do not know of anyone who has fought more persistently for the small-business men than has the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in connection with S. 11. I do not think any one of us has a better record than has the Senator from Tennessee for fighting for the best interests of the small-business men.

Mr. President, the valiant attempt of the Senator from Tennessee at the 11th hour so to speak, to have S. 11 passed deserves high commendation by the people of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I was one, together with the Senator from Oregon, who worked with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in urg-

ing the passage of S. 11. His work in behalf of small business is to be highly commended. I am very, very unhappy because the bill was never brought up for consideration. As I recall, the House passed a similar bill by a vote of 393 to 3.

Every small business firm in America which is fighting against tremendous economic odds was looking forward to the passage of this very important piece of proposed legislation.

The Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] have done great work in this Chamber on behalf of small business.

It is my privilege to serve with the senior Senator from Oregon on the Senate Small Business Committee.

The members of that committee felt that the proposed legislation was of paramount importance. I hope that at the opening of the next Congress a similar bill will be introduced and that it may be placed on the statute books before it is too late.

Anyone who has been engaged in a small-business enterprise knows the uphill fight which he must make against the monopolistic tendencies of our economic system.

Mr. MORSE. One only has to read such communications as I have placed in the RECORD from small-business men in Oregon to recognize how serious their plight is and how much they needed S. 11. They point out in communication after communication that they will have to go out of business unless they get relief such as was provided by S. 11.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. He has been of invaluable help to us in attempting to assist the small-business men of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, serving as I do under the leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Retail Distribution, I wish to underscore everything the Senator from Oregon has said. I repeat that this bill, which has died, so to speak, never had a chance to be born, much less die. Such legislation was long overdue.

If Senators will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of about 2 weeks ago, in the speech on credit which the junior Senator from Minnesota delivered as the result of a nationwide survey as to what is happening to small business under this administration, they will find evidence to indicate that the economic policies of the administration are strangling the lifeline of credit. They will find what is really happening to independent business enterprise.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota for what they have said about the effort to pass S. 11 and to thank them for their cosponsorship of the bill which was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope the small-business people, who have worked so hard and efficiently for its enactment, will not become disheartened, because I am certain it will be one of the first bills to be introduced in the next session. I hope there will then be time for full debate. I hope then when the bill is brought to a vote, there will be very few Senators who will oppose it on the floor of the Senate.

I regret exceedingly that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] objected to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a word with reference to the bill which the able Senator from Oregon was discussing, namely, S. 11. It had a companion bill, H. R. 1840.

I think this Congress has much of which to be proud. But the one piece of legislation which small business all across this country wanted was this particular bill. I think it is most regrettable that tonight we did not have a chance to vote on it because of the objection of one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another matter on which I wish to comment. Then I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech which I had intended to deliver today, but which I postponed in order to accommodate the schedule of the majority leader. It involves the serious matter of psittacosis, or parrot fever.

My proposal seeks to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry. The health of the American people is being greatly jeopardized because of the inadequate inspection of poultry.

Only a few days ago we read that several persons in Ypsilanti, Mich., became ill after eating diseased poultry.

Mr. President, a poultry inspection bill should have been passed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech I intended to give today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMERS, INDUSTRY, AND WORKERS NEED COMPULSORY POULTRY INSPECTION

The adjournment of Congress will leave unresolved one of the most vital problems of consumer protection to come before us in recent years. I am referring to legislation for the compulsory inspection of poultry.

It is highly unfortunate that neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives has acted on this most pressing legislation during the current session. Extremely dangerous problems to the health of consumers and poultry workers and to the economic welfare of the poultry industry are posed by the marketing of filthy and diseased poultry.

We, in Oregon, know through bitter experience how great are these health hazards and the need for compulsory poultry inspection. As I have reported to the Senate in detail previously, the Portland area of Oregon suffered a serious tragedy last spring because of the unhindered flow of diseased poultry. Two persons died and 62 men and women were made extremely ill—some were hospitalized for months—by an epidemic of turkey-caused psittacosis or parrot fever.

A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Oregon is by no means the only area plagued by outbreaks of illness due to diseased poultry. For example, only on Wednesday, the Washington Daily News reported that dozens of Michigan college students had been hospitalized after eating poultry. The news account stated, and I quote: "Health officials in Ypsilanti, Mich., said that the sudden fever and nausea that hospitalized 40 eastern Michigan college students was 'salmonella nurium' caused by infected poultry, and is 'very distressing, but almost never fatal.' "

These are just two of many outbreaks in recent years of illness, and sometimes death, caused by some of the 26 diseases transmissible from poultry to man. In Oregon, Texas, Michigan, Georgia, Nebraska, New Jersey, Virginia, Iowa, and other States unfit poultry has stricken consumers and poultry workers.

Despite the cries of apologists, diseased and adulterated poultry is definitely a health hazard. The very fact that poultry is in the unenviable position of the top category of causes for food poisoning demonstrates that point. The United States Public Health Service blames poultry and poultry products for an average of one-third of the food-poisoning cases reported each year. That percentage is far above those attributed to any other food groups, including all other perishables.

But even if death and illness were not involved here, even if consumers and poultry workers were not endangered, we would still have the responsibility to stem the flow of filthy and diseased poultry to market. The consumer does not want to buy garbage. And she has the right to be protected from buying it unwittingly. We must provide legislation which will assure her of good, clean, healthful birds.

INSPECTION NEED PROVEN

This great need for compulsory inspection legislation has been thoroughly documented in hearings before three different committees of Congress this year. But, unfortunately, this extensive consideration of the problem has not led to legislation.

The Senate Agriculture Committee last week reported what it called a compulsory poultry inspection bill. But the effectiveness of this measure is very doubtful. For example, it does not require ante mortem, or before slaughter, inspection, which alone probably would have prevented upward from 50 of the 64 Oregon cases of psittacosis. In fact, the Agriculture Committee's bill is a weak measure, loaded with loopholes.

Such legislation is as harmful to the poultry industry as to consumers. For poultry-inspection legislation without teeth cannot prevent epidemics. And future outbreaks will severely hurt the industry, in addition to causing human suffering.

OREGON HAS A DIRECT INTEREST

We, in Oregon, know that if there is a repetition of the spring disaster in our State, or if another poultry-caused disease were to strike there, our turkey industry would be severely harmed—and probably permanently so. Only the combined quick action of public-health authorities, labor, and industry saved the situation from becoming chaotic after the spring psittacosis outbreak. In the future, even this effective joint activity may not be enough against the resultant drop in consumer confidence and the embargoes of other States.

PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS PIONEER

Mr. President, we simply must have truly health-protective poultry-inspection legislation. I know that the fight for it will continue and that it will be successful. Powerful public-health groups, women's organizations, consumer groups, farm organizations and labor unions will increasingly press their joint effort to secure adequate and effective poultry inspection.

I want to thank and congratulate these groups for their fortitude and sense of public service.

Special credit must go to organized labor for the activities of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO) in spearheading the campaign. This union

called the attention of Congress and the Nation to the scandalous conditions existing in some sections of the poultry processing industry and to the problems these conditions posed to consumer and poultry workers.

For this public service I want to commend the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen and their great president and secretary-treasurer, Earl W. Jimerson and Patrick E. Gorman. I believe the Nation is indebted to them for their immense efforts to put this legislation on the books. The Meat Cutters Union's campaign is, indeed, a wonderful example of a powerful organization using its strength to benefit all the people of the Nation.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, Young Women's Christian Association, American Association of University Women, and Housewives United also deserve great praise for their public-spirited campaign on behalf of this legislation. These women's groups have ably represented the views of homemakers and consumers.

The National Farmers' Union has made many valuable contributions during the consideration of the poultry inspection bills. It realizes the great benefits to farmers of legislation which will assure consumer confidence in an agricultural product.

And important health groups, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States, Association of State Public Health Veterinarians Conference of Public Health Veterinarians, American Veterinary Medical Association, and American Nurses Association, have aided Congress with their expert knowledge and support. Some members of these groups are really the pioneers in the campaign, for some have called for this legislation as far back as a decade ago.

USDA DRAGS FEET

I regret, Mr. President, that among the groups which deserve great praise for their work on behalf of poultry consumers I cannot name the Department of Agriculture. This is the agency which should have called the need for compulsory inspection of poultry to the attention of the Nation and the public. Yet it did not. In fact, for a time it actually denied the need.

Worse yet, the Department of Agriculture sought to defend the malpractices committed under its voluntary inspection program. In the words of a Senate subcommittee, spokesmen for the Department sought to defend the lack of consumer protection with—and I quote—"contradictory, misleading, inaccurate, and exaggerated statements."

I assume this lack of concern about consumers is another part of the "be conservative with money but liberal with people" policy which this administration has so often enunciated.

LEGISLATION SHOULD RECEIVE PRIORITY NEXT YEAR

I am proud, Mr. President, to have played a part in the campaign to drive diseased and adulterated poultry from the market place. I was one of the sponsors of the first bill introduced in the Senate to provide compulsory inspection of the poultry for wholesomeness and sanitation. And I have supported the subsequent bill, S. 3983, introduced by Senators MURRAY, MCNAMARA, and BENDER, following their subcommittee hearings.

I will continue to do all in my power to secure the enactment of an effective and adequate bill. And when I say, "effective," I mean a bill which will actually protect consumers and poultry workers—not one that is a jumble of many fine phrases, and few safeguards.

This legislation is needed by all the American people. It is legislation which will save human suffering and which will assure the American consumer of always getting a square deal when she buys poultry. Therefore, Congress must correct its 1956 sin of omission by enacting a compulsory poultry inspection law early in its next session.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain editorials relating to the Hells Canyon Dam.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Coos Bay Times of June 28, 1956]

HELLS CANYON: STUDY IN POWER

At long last, thanks to the doggedness of Senators WAYNE L. MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and Representative EDITH GREEN, the Senate and the House are going to discuss Hells Canyon bills calling for a high Federal dam. Both S. 1333, introduced by Senator MORSE and cosponsored by Senator NEUBERGER, and H. R. 4719, cosponsored by Mrs. GREEN, have passed their respective Interior Committees and are expected on the floor next week.

It has been a long struggle against opposition which has consistently ignored or rearranged the facts in order to follow an ideal which has no bearing on the question—an ideal of laissez faire as opposed to what the opposition has emotionally termed "creeping socialism."

The opposition, so well aided by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, has attemped to make the issue one of "good old American free enterprise" against what McKay likes to call "Federal monopolies opposed to construction of water resources projects by anyone except the Federal Government." McKay, and others like him, have chosen to ignore the fact that private utilities control 80 percent of this country's power output and that even the most stanch advocate of a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, Senator MORSE, has publicly said that he favors private construction of dams when the situation warrants it.

The factor the opposition has ignored, and the one which sets Hells Canyon apart from any ideological or political consideration, is simply the question: How can its full potential be most nearly realized?

Because of the wide diversity in figures quoted by what should be reliable sources (estimated on cost of construction of Idaho Power Co.'s three low dams range from $132.6 million to $311.2 million and on the Federal high dam from $311 million to $388.6 million), it is difficult to choose between the Federal and private projects. It is difficult, that is, if the contrast in benefits is not considered.

But let's look at this contrast. Consider that the high dam plus downstream dams which would use the high dam's water would have an output of 1,124,000 kilowatts compared with three low dams' output of 680,000. The difference in output is higher than the whole constant capacity of Bonneville Dam.

But more important, the high dam's output would go into the Northwest power pool envisioned in the U. S. Army Engineer's main control plan for the Columbia River basin, to provide power we must have to keep and attract industry here. The Idaho Power output would go into that company's marketing area, southeast Idaho, and never would see the power pool.

One of the reasons why Idaho Power would not sell outside its bailiwick is that it could not compete ratewise. Its estimated rate would be 6.69 mills per kilowatt hour, compared with 2.34 wholesale offered by Bonneville Power Administration. The high dam rate would be an estimated 2.70 mills.

Another reason why Idaho Power would keep its power to itself, to sell on the basis of what the traffic would bear, is that there is a strong likelihood that it would not have much more than enough power for its own customers. The estimate of Idaho Power's three-dam output is an optimistic one. Chances are that the company would build only the most profitable Oxbow dam, and possibly the Brownlee Dam, but probably not the little Hells Canyon dam.

Now comes the question: But what if Congress doesn't pass the Hells Canyon bill for the big dam? Then we'll have nothing. Granted, but there is more leeway in time than usually thought, and a failure in this Congress would not be the end of hope. Although 8 years is the time estimated for construction of the high dam, experts say it could be done in 5. And before that time, storage water from the dam could be released to the benefit of downstream dams.

This time factor compares favorably with the estimate of 4 years for Brownlee, 6 for Oxbow, and 9 for little Hells Canyon. And those times are dependent on Idaho Power not only getting enough financing but also wanting to build all three dams as quickly as possible.

We have listed the power output as the big factor in favor of a high dam. There are others. New industries would open up in the Northwest, because of the low-cost power, that would affect the whole country. About 60 percent of the nation's reserves of phosphate rock are in southeastern Idaho, but they are undeveloped because of power rates. The Nation's farmers are worrying about a shortage of phosphates for fertilizers and the high dam would bring them out. Other resources or industries dependent upon cheap power, such as aluminum and low grade copper, would open up. And just plain availability of power in larger quantity would attract many industries.

Arid sections of the Northwest could be brought to productiveness by irrigation, 192,000 acres of them, through a separate project financed by revenues from the high dam. No irrigation provision is made in Idaho Power's plans.

Recreation facilities, for which Idaho Power plans to spend $95,000, would be vastly outdistanced by the $1 million project planned for the Federal dam. It has been estimated by a national parks official that 650,000 tourists, more than Idaho's whole population, would visit the big dam annually.

Water storage for flood control would be greater at the high dam and would be infinitely so if only 1 or 2 of the small dams were used for comparison. This also would preclude any necessity of building dams on the Clearwater or Salmon Rivers, tributaries of the Snake, which would not only be a saving in construction costs but also would save the huge salmon runs on those rivers and the forest land and winter range for numerous elk and deer on the Clearwater.

Not the least of the consideration is that of revenue. The Federal Bonneville Power system had, through the last fiscal year, returned to the Treasury almost $402 million and was $68 million ahead of its repayment schedule.

We hope the Congress can look at these facts squarely, without having to consider party lines, and can vote for the public welfare.

[From the Portland Oregonian of July 20, 1956]

HELLS CANYON HIGH DAM OUT, BUT STORAGE ISSUE REMAINS

The 51 to 41 vote in the United States Senate defeating the Morse bill to authorize a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon leaves that Democratic campaign issue as dead as a dodo.

Bills to authorize Hells Canyon were introduced in the 81st, 82d, and 84th Congresses and the Republican 83d Congress. Only in this 84th Congress has the bill come out of committees in House and Senate. In its first and last Senate test, Hells Canyon was beaten. Eight Democrats, seven from the South, voted with Republicans against it. Only two Republicans, ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, voted for it. There is no point in pressing for a vote in the House.

The last lingering hope of the National Hells Canyon Association to prevent Idaho Power Co. from proceeding with construction of the three dams licensed by the Federal Power Commission in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River is in the courts. That is a slim hope. The courts have repeatedly upheld the administrative judgment of FPC in licensing such projects. And since Congress refuses to authorize a Federal dam, there is no competitor for the sites.

Although the public might reasonably expect to be spared the political thunder of candidates on Hells Canyon itself, in the coming campaign, and henceforth, the Senate vote does leave some related issues still open for discussion.

In an editorial on this page Sunday, the Oregonian pointed out that if Idaho Power Co.'s program should be sustained, and a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon eliminated from consideration, it would still be possible to obtain flood control and power benefits comparable to those of a Federal Hells Canyon Dam through cooperation of private utilities and the Federal Power Commission.

The suggestion was that Pacific Northwest Power Co.—a grouping of four utilities—and Idaho Power Co. get together with FPC to study advisability of increasing usable flood-control storage of the Middle Snake from 1,500,000 acre-feet to 2 million acre-feet.

Pacific Northwest Power Co. seeks FPC permits to build Mountain Sheep Dam, a river-run project, and Pleasant Valley Dam, with total storage of 928,000 acre-feet and usable flood-control storage of 500,000 acre-feet. The FPC permit for Idaho Power's Brownlee Dam requires availability of 1 million acre-feet for flood control. Its two other projects, Oxbow and low Hells Canyon, would have no usable storage.

The Federal Power Act requires FPC to give due consideration to comprehensive and multiple use of water in granting licenses. Since an estimated 2,300,000 acre-feet of usable flood-control storage has been replaced in Hells Canyon with the 1 million usable acre-feet of Brownlee Dam, storage elsewhere in the basin for flood control and downstream power benefits must be found.

Our suggestion is that thorough study be made of the potential benefits of eliminating Idaho Power Co.'s low, river-run Hells Canyon Dam, the third on the downstream ladder, and that Pacific Northwest Power Co.'s Pleasant Valley Dam, 40 miles below, be built high enough to back the river up to the Oxbow damsite or thereabouts. The estimated gain in usable storage would be around 500,000 acre-feet. We believe the power benefits would equal or exceed those of the presently proposed projects, and that power benefits in lower Snake and Columbia dams would be increased measurably.

The private utilities have fought their hardest to kill the Federal Hells Canyon Dam legislation. They say then can do a better job, at less cost, than the Government. But if they are to be permitted to consider power revenues and output only, they will not be doing the comprehensive job that needs to be done. The Senate vote on Hells Canyon makes it imperative, we believe, for the private utilities to reexamine their plans for the Middle Snake.

STATE OF THE NATION UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as has been customary for a number of years, both the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, at the close of a Congress, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have printed as Senate documents their respective statements on the record of Congress.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed such a statement for the minority side in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with a review of the achievements of the Republican Administration since 1953. I also request that, with the consent of the Senate, this statement and the review of achievements be printed with any necessary revisions and corrections after the adjournment of the Congress as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

INTRODUCTION

At the close of the 84th Congress, consider these achievements of the Republican administration after only 3½ years in office:

We have successfully gained and held the peace in a world of danger and uncertainties. No American boy today is fighting on a foreign battlefield.

By a strong defense, mutual aid to the free world, and a firm foreign policy, we contributed heavily to the reduced fear of war in the world. Today, there is a great rift in the Communist system. Regardless of their motives, the Communist leaders have been compelled to try to ease the tensions within the "Iron Curtain" by repudiating Stalin.

At home, the Republican administration has brought the Nation to the highest state of prosperity and well-being in our history—without basing it on war or leaf raking. We have topped at $400 billion economy. Moreover, the promise of the future is exceptionally bright.

Over 66 million people are now full-time job holders, with wages and personal incomes at peak levels. The number of strikes and man-days lost is the lowest in 8 years.

Government spending has been reduced $8 billion from Mr. Truman's last budget year and Government finances have been put in order. Today, the totals are written in black ink, with income and outgo balanced, and something left over to reduce Government debt.

Inflation, which between 1939 and 1952 had cut the spending power of the dollar in half, has been halted.

Taxes have been cut by $7.4 billion. The savings to each family come to about $100.

We have checked, and in some cases reversed, the 20-year trend to centralization of power in Washington, ending wage, price, rent, and production controls which shackled our economic system.

We have extended and increased social security, railroad retirement, unemployment compensation benefits, and have greatly expanded hospital building, rehabilitation, and other health, education, and social benefits for our people.

The decline in farm prices and income has been ended. We have launched a new soil bank program designed to reduce price-depressing surpluses and preserve the fertility of the Nation's croplands.

In 3½ years of Republican administration, more significant advances were made by executive and court action in civil rights of Negroes and other minorities than in all the years since the Civil War.

Under this administration there has been undertaken the greatest public works program in the history of the Nation including the St. Lawrence Seaway, a $32.9 billion Federal highway program, and the upper Colorado River Basin project covering five States and to cost eventually more than a billion dollars.

Over all is an honest, economical Republican government—respectful of State and local rights; mindful of the people's welfare; responsive to the needs of businessmen, farmers, workers, military personnel, and our young people for the freedom and opportunity to build, produce, and prosper, and which does not treat Communist infiltration as a "red herring."

A large part of these accomplishments came about through a Republican President working in harmony with a Republican-controlled 83d Congress in the first half of the President's term of office.

In 1954, however, the Democratic Party regained control of Congress. Individual Democratic leaders pledged coooperation with the President and on numerous occasions gave their support, especially in the field of foreign affairs. President Eisenhower, for his part, followed his well-known policy of respect and cooperation with Congress.

While the President's batting average in the 84th Congress is good, much of his success is due to the popularity and public approval of his recommendations and to the strong support given his program by Republican Members in Congress. On the program as a whole, the Republican leadership and party members gave the President strong support.

MISFORTUNES OF DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

It is no reflection on the sincerity and patriotism of members of either party to say that the public interest suffers when Congress is controlled by one political party and the executive branch by the other party. If our people realized this more fully, there is good reason to believe they would vote for a Congress controlled by the same party as the President's. In this way responsibility for success or failure of a program could be made clear.

Although the 84th Congress enacted a considerable quantity of bills and a fair share of the President's program, the unfortunate results of divided government can be seen in the failure of this Democratic-controlled Congress to enact many bills recommended by the President in the public interest. It can be seen also in bills which delayed action or distorted the President's recommendations.

FAILURE TO ENACT MEASURES URGENTLY NEEDED IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

For example, the Democratic 84th Congress failed to pass the President's recommendations for Federal aid for additional school construction so urgently needed in many areas of the country. The same Democratic Party split which helped to defeat the school construction bill made impossible the enactment of civil rights legislation recommended by the President. Although highly critical of immigration restrictions, a Democratic Congress did not act on the President's recommendations for revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The Democratic 84th Congress again rejected the President's recommendation asking statehood for Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia. The Congress also failed to enact the postal rate increase requested by the President to end the deficits in the operations of the Post Office.

PARTISAN POLITICS AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The Democratic 84th Congress unfortunately yielded to partisan politics detrimental to the public interest. The House Democratic leadership last year pressed for a $20 personal income-tax cut, although

they knew that such a cut would deprive the Government of over $2½ billion in much-needed revenue and force the Government to borrow money and go deeper into debt.

IMPORTANT LEGISLATION DELAYED AND DISTORTED

Far too many bills important to the public interest were unduly delayed or distorted so completely that the President was compelled to veto them. The great Federal highway program and more than a dozen other major bills, for example, were not enacted by the 1st session of the 84th Congress as urged by the President, and thus were delayed more than a year. The farm soil-bank program was delayed for months until it was too late to apply it to the 1956 spring planting. When the bill finally passed it contained such major contradictions that it was plainly unworkable and the President was compelled to veto it. Similar delays affected other legislation urgently needed to aid the Nation's farmers. The huge military public works bill contained provisions violating the fundamental principle of separation of powers and here again, the President was forced to veto it. Democratic insistence on a postal pay bill stripped of proper job reclassification as recommended by the President forced another veto.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The one outstanding fact of paramount importance to all our people is that under this Republican administration the United States is at peace with the world.

Our strong defense, our steady pursuit of goals toward peace and toward the independence and free development of nations, large and small, have had beneficial results. Regardless of its motives, the Soviet Union for the present appears to have shifted from its policy of fomenting violence and aggression, and now emphasizes peaceful and economic competition. International tensions have relaxed to some extent; there is less fear of war; the economic state of the world is good; and the outlook for peaceful progress looks brighter.

Although the President and the Secretary of State are charged with the conduct of foreign affairs, the Congress played a strong supporting role. Bipartisan unity reached high levels because the President worked in close harmony with Republican and Democratic leaders in both Houses.

When the Chinese Communists threatened an attack on Formosa, the Congress passed, at the President's request, House Joint Resolution 159, giving him authority to use armed force, if necessary, for the protection of Formosa and the Pescadores. This clear policy dissolved the threat. In section 12 of the Mutual Security Act of 1955, Congress affirmed American policy against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. This was reaffirmed by a unanimously adopted concurrent resolution and in the mutual security bill of 1956.

The Senate broadened the defense of the free world in Asia by consenting to the Southeast Asia Treaty and the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China. It approved the Austrian State Treaty by which, at long last, Austria became a free and independent member of the international community. The occupation of Germany was also brought to an end, and the Federal German Republic became a member of NATO.

The 84th Congress took several occasions to reaffirm American policy in support of the freedom of all nations. A Senate resolution expressed the hope that self-government would be restored to the enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia. Both Houses approved a joint resolution urging the administration of American foreign policies in ways that will support the efforts of other people to achieve freedom and independence. These resolutions strengthened the President's hand in 1955 at the Geneva summit conference. More recently, Senate Resolution 302 expressed sympathy for the Polish people of Poznan in their courageous fight for bread and independence.

The Senate also approved several Geneva conventions for the more humane treatment of war prisoners, extension of the Trade Agreements Act, and a number of other treaties affecting the American interests abroad. The Congress also authorized American participation in the International Finance Corporation.

Late in the second session, some opposition developed among members of both parties to amounts requested by the President for mutual security. Upon the President's appeal, Republicans and Democrats joined to restore some of the cut in funds.

Notwithstanding the strong bipartisan support given the President, Democratic control of Congress resulted in some failures in legislation. Among these were the President's proposal for an atoms-for-peace ship, a bill introduced by Senate Republicans to require executive agreements to be deposited with Congress within 60 days after ratification, rejection of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act, and failure to act on the President's request for participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Under Republican leadership the Nation's defense strength is the greatest in our history, short of wartime mobilization.

Peace with honor remains the keystone of our national policy. In case of attack, however, our total land, sea, and air forces could inflict devastation on any aggressor.

Our Armed Forces are prepared to deal with any eventuality in the foreseeable future—with big or little wars and with nuclear or conventional weapons.

Nothing in the proceedings of the 84th Congress disputes this strong posture of American national defense, despite searching investigation and often acrimonious debate.

President Eisenhower's defense proposals to the 84th Congress looked to continued improvement in our combat readiness, without straining the Nation's economy. For defense in the year ending June 30, 1957, the President requested $34.1 billion in new funds. Congress approved a total of $34.6 billion, for the most part following the President's recommendations.

For military construction (housing, missile testing, and other research facilities, airbases, and other defense installations) Congress approved $1.398 billion, compared with $1.148 billion asked by Mr. Eisenhower.

Controversy developed in Congress over two aspects of the defense program: Air Force appropriations and the strength of United States airpower.

Congress cut the President's Air Force Budget for "Maintenance and operation" and "Military personnel," but increased by $100 million funds for "Research and development" and by $800 million funds for "Aircraft and related procurement." This latter increase revolved around demands of some Democrats for more B–52 bombers. The net increase in the Air Force budget was $792.6 million.

Senate Democrats originated and pushed to adoption the Air Force increases, voting down a Republican-sponsored compromise of $500 million, which included $350 million for aircraft procurement. The House, which earlier by voice vote had rejected $1 billion extra for B–52 bombers, agreed to the higher Senate figure after conference.

The $800 million were not earmarked solely for B–52's. Instead, conferees agreed, "the added funds should be utilized to expedite production of heavy bombers, tankers, and other essential Air Force weapons to the optimum limit of existing facilities."

In further explanation, the top House conferee declared the funds were also made available for the intercontinental ballistic missile, for jet tankers, and for fighter planes, although B–52's would have priority.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson denied he would impound the extra funds. He said he and his military advisers would restudy the whole situation so as to get the most defense for every dollar.

The airpower controversy led to hearings of a five-member Senate subcommittee, which was originally limited to study of the Air Force, but later was extended to guided missiles of all three military services; and still later to the Navy air arm by request of Republican members of the subcommittee.

More than 100 witnesses freely gave their personal views and judgments. Without exception, each military officer, when asked, testified that, as of today, the United States is ahead of Russia in overall airpower.

Reflecting today's revolutionary technological changes, differing views were expressed on how the United States can maintain a strong deterrent position.

Summarizing the situation, Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Nation's top military adviser, declared:

"It is my professional opinion that the forces which we are maintaining constitute a visible deterrent, are adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and constitute an ample base for a rapid and orderly buildup should such an eventuality become necessary."

Testimony before the Air Force Subcommittee showed that, without adding to our present military equipment, our readiness could be greatly improved if more skilled people were attracted to, and remained in, the military service.

To this end, President Eisenhower submitted career incentive proposals to the 84th Congress. Enacted were the following: Military pay and short-term reenlistment bonus; medical care for servicemen's dependents; increase in number of Regular officers allowed in Army and Air Force; benefits for survivors of servicemen and veterans; incentives for medical and dental officers; and retirement of Army and Air Force officers at temporary higher grades, in line with Navy and Marine Corps officers.

The Congress failed to enact legislation providing for an Assistant Secretary for research and development for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The foundation of today's unprecedented prosperity was laid by the close cooperation between the President and the Republican 83d Congress.

Controls were removed, the whole tax structure overhauled, a $7.4 billion tax cut put through, the budget brought into healthy balance, and a start made at getting the Government out of trade and industrial enterprises competing with private citizens.

The result was to free the economy, open up new areas of opportunity, and encourage the productive energies of all our people. Except for some unemployment trouble in spots and grievous trouble with farm surpluses, this great forward surge of activity has continued with extraordinary vitality down to the present.

The state of the economy as of July 1956 is truly remarkable.

The Nation's gross national income topped $400 billion and the annual rate of personal income reached $317 billion. Prices and the purchasing power of the dollar have been kept stable within a small range of 3½ years. Inflation no longer robs our people of their earnings and savings, and deflation causes us no distress.

In the month of June, 66.5 million persons were at work, an alltime high for employment in the United States. The average hourly wage reached $1.96, and the average

weekly pay was $79.40. In no other place on the surface of the globe has the working force of any nation ever received wages on this scale.

Acting upon the President's recommendations, the 84th Congress extended the life of the Defense Production Act until June 30, 1958, and directed Government agencies to promote the dispersal of industry in the interest of national defense. Except for the abortive attempt of some Democrats to pass a $20 individual income tax reduction, the Congress did nothing to disturb the President's view that general tax reductions could not be made while defense costs remained unusually high and Government finances needed to be brought into sound balance with some reduction of the public debt. Following through, the 84th Congress continued corporation and excise taxes at their present levels.

Congress increased the lending authority of the Small Business Administration, providing $150 million for ordinary business loans and $125 million for disaster loans. At the President's urging it enacted a Federal flood insurance program, a pioneering effort to provide financial protection for citizens suffering damages in flood disaster areas. Congress also simplified and improved customs regulations and changed the basis of customs charges on values of imported articles.

Congress also stiffened the administration of antitrust laws and raised the fines for violations of the monopoly laws from $5,000 (unchanged since 1890) to $50,000. It provided for the control and regulation of bank holding companies. The provision of these new laws was supplemented by vigorous prosecution of the antitrust laws by appropriate executive agencies. In 1954, some 35 antitrust cases were brought by the Justice Department; 54 cases in 1955. In the 62 years since the passage of the Sherman Act, 26 contempt proceedings have been brought for violation of existing decrees. Of this number, a third—9 in all—was brought during the last 3½ years. The Federal Trade Commission has been equally active in curbing monopoly. Some 42 antimonopoly complaints were issued during fiscal 1956 compared with 36 complaints in fiscal 1955. This compares with a yearly average of 28 from 1944 to 1953.

The Congress passed many other laws affecting the state of the national economy, notably in agriculture, natural resources and public works, national defense, and in the field of labor relations. This legislation is reported in more detail in those sections of this report.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE AND TAXATION

An administration achievement of which President Eisenhower is particularly proud, and which is a source of satisfaction to his fellow Republicans in Congress, is the balancing of the budget for fiscal year 1956, with a surplus of $1,754,000,000. A balanced budget also is indicated for fiscal year 1957.

Thus an essential element of sound governmental administration—fiscal integrity—has been restored with this fulfillment of an important Republican Party platform pledge. As Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey and Budget Bureau Director Percival F. Brundage stated July 19 this year in announcing this achievement, "With such financial stability and sound fiscal conditions, the American people can go forward with their constructive individual plans looking toward better living and more and better jobs."

Only three times in the whole 20-year period of the previous Democratic administrations was the budget balanced. It was done in fiscal years 1947 and 1948, as a result of appropriation cuts made by the Republican 80th Congress, and in fiscal year 1951. The New York Times commented July 6 this year that the balanced budget of 1951 "was brought about largely by a huge, unexpected and unanticipated rise in revenues of that year, a 'windfall' produced by the Korea boom." The Times added: "What makes the balancing of the budget in 1955–56 a solid achievement is the fact that it has been done the hard way, and the only way that is consonant with wise and courageous fiscal policy."

Budget expenditures for fiscal 1956 were $66.4 billion compared with budget receipts of $68.1 billion. The expenditure total represented a decrease of nearly $8 billion from the amount actually spent by the Federal Government in the last Truman year (1952–53). It was a cut of $11.5 billion from the amount proposed in the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1953, which President Truman submitted to the Congress in January of 1953 before the Republican administration took office. The last year of Truman accounting (1953) showed a deficit of $9.4 billion. In 1956, the Eisenhower administration produced a $1.7 billion surplus.

An outstanding fact of importance is that a balanced budget with money left over to apply on the public debt has been accomplished with lowered tax rates. In 1954, President Eisenhower's second year in office, he and the Republican 83d Congress cooperated to reduce taxes by a total of $7.4 billion, the largest tax reduction dollarwise in the Nation's history.

In the 84th Congress, legislation in the field of finance and taxation has included:

1. A decrease in the temporary legal debt limit for fiscal year 1957 from $281 billion to $278 billion. The permanent limit is $275 billion.

2. Extension for 1 year, until April 1, 1957, of special excise and corporation income taxes.

3. Instead of accepting the President's bond program which would not involve an increase in present taxes, the 84th Congress chose a 16-year tax program, effective July 1 this year, to raise $14.8 billion in additional highway-user taxes to help pay for new and improved highways. Highway users will pay as they ride by increased taxes on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels, tires and tread rubber, and on the sales of trucks, buses, and truck trailers.

4. A refund to farmers of the Federal excise tax on all gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes bought after December 31, 1955.

5. Removal of the excise tax on theater and other admissions which are 90 cents or less.

6. Authorization of United States membership in the International Finance Corporation, to which this Government would subscribe about one-third of the authorized capital of $100 million. Affiliated with the International Bank, the IFC is designed to stimulate private venture capital investment in productive enterprises in member nations.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

Through reorganization of the executive departments and agencies, substantial reduction of Federal personnel, and large-scale paring of appropriations and expenditures, this Republican administration has made the Government more efficient and economical, cut down its size, and checked the New Deal-Fair Deal trend toward an all-powerful central Government. Republican leadership has put an end to corruption, ousted the grafters and crooks, and restored honest government to the people.

During the 84th Congress 12 reorganization measures incorporating recommendations of the second Hoover Commission were approved by the Senate. Six of them became law. They dealt with extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949, the establishment of a 12-member bipartisan Commission on Government Security, the relief of Government officers of financial liability in certain instances, the relief of armed services disbursing officers of accountable liability in certain instances, the authorization for the donation of surplus property for civil defense purposes, and simplification of budgeting, accounting, and appropriations processes. Two others—one extending authority to dispose of surplus property by negotiation to July 31, 1958, and the other to expedite payments of certified claims where appropriations have lapsed—are awaiting the President's signature. The Defense Department reported March 22, 1956, that of the Hoover Commission's 322 recommendations for administrative reforms in that Department, 85 percent have been put into effect.

A much more efficient handling of the Post Office Department was reflected in the fiscal 1955 report of that Department, which showed that the postal deficit has dropped despite heavier mail and the higher wages for postal employees, which the administration recommended and the Congress approved. The greatly needed $430 million a year increase in postal rates failed of enactment.

Through legislation enacted by the 84th Congress, the civil service and other Government employment were improved and strengthened. Legislation was enacted to improve conditions in the Foreign Service so as to make this important branch of the Government more attractive to men and women of exceptional talent and competence. Other steps taken in the personnel field include the extension of group life insurance, unemployment compensation, and other benefits to Federal workers to bring Government working conditions abreast of comparable practices in private industry. Congress passed legislation increasing the salaries of about 600 top-level Federal employees. This bill also authorizes about 150 new technical and scientific jobs at salaries of $15,000 a year.

COMMUNISM

With the advent of a Republican administration, an era of cooperation between the legislative and executive branches was inaugurated in the effort to guard the Government against Communist subversion.

While the executive branch has been pressing action under existing law, congressional committees have been continuing investigations and subversive aliens are being deported. The Justice Department officially declared July 17, 1956, that until there is concrete evidence that the Communist Party leadership in this country has abandoned its criminal purpose of violent overthrow of the Government, the Smith Act and all other legal weapons will be utilized to combat the very real threat that domestic communism still poses to our Nation's national security.

As of July 1, 1956, 145 Communist Party leaders had been indicted on Smith Act charges and 102 convicted in Federal court. Others are awaiting trial. During fiscal year 1956 alone, 11 Communist Party leaders were arrested; the trials of Communist Party leaders charged with violating the Smith Act resulted in 14 verdicts of guilty. On July 24 the President signed into law a Republican-sponsored bill providing for stiffer penalties for persons convicted of seditious conspiracy.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Eisenhower administration has instituted a new public-works and natural-resource development program of unprecedented scope and unequaled in the expectations for future benefits to the Nation and protection of the public's property.

These programs differ markedly from public-works programs of previous administrations in this respect: In the case of a large majority of projects, the administration has also planned for revenues which will eventually pay the cost instead of increasing public debt. This is responsible Government and financial policy.

The administration set out to develop the Nation's resources under policies of (1) wise

conservation, (2) encouragement of local and private organizations capable of building public works and meeting the public's needs without tax money, (3) the recommending of Federal construction of projects restricted to those of such complexity and size that their success could only be achieved by use of public funds, and (4) encouragement of partnership projects in which the participation of private citizens and State and local government was as necessary and as beneficial to the public as Federal participation.

Republican Members of Congress strongly supported legislation based on these sound, feasible policies. The program captured the imagination of Americans from coast to coast, with this result: support for many of the proposals became mandatory regardless of political party.

Two of the foremost Republican recommendations approved by the 84th Congress involved highways and a giant water resource project.

The highway construction and roadbuilding program represents the biggest peacetime public works project of any type in the country's history. It involves the construction or improvement of 440,000 miles of roadways, including a 41,000-mile interstate highway system of 4 to 8 lanes to link every city of 50,000 population or more. The 13-year program will cost $32.9 billion. It was authorized at this concluding session of Congress after being delayed 1 year.

The administration's five-State, multiple-use upper Colorado River water storage project is strictly a Federal program of the type which no privately financed organization could undertake. The legislation will bring benefit to a 110,000 square-mile area through a system eventually designed to have a score of power and storage dams and 35 reclamation projects. The ultimate cost is estimated at $1 billion.

The administration reached another milestone in water pollution control when it submitted, and obtained passage, of legislation permitting a 10-year, $500 million program to aid States and cities to purify streams and other water sources which otherwise might endanger the health of the public.

The administration proceeded with its program of opening the Midwest to direct ocean-going trade and transportation by recommending, and having approved by the 84th Congress, a $110 million program to deepen the Great Lakes channels by the time the Republican-sponsored St. Lawrence Seaway is finished.

During the 84th Congress, the administration reversed the 15-year trend of neglect of our national parks so that today the national park system is larger and more adequately staffed than ever before. The park system obtained congressional approval to operate on a budget that is almost twice the amount available at the beginning of 1953.

More than 400,000 acres of land were added to the system and for the first time in history, the administration submitted to Congress on February 2, 1956, a comprehensive, 10-year $785 million program designed to equip the parks to accommodate 80 million visitors by 1960.

Scores of other programs and projects were submitted to the 84th Congress by the Republican administration. Among those approved were:

Authorization for a survey of the Passamaquoddy Bay power project; expansion of the Federal Aid Airport Act; flood-control bills to aid disaster areas; a minerals purchase act to aid small mining operations; authorization and appropriations for scores of reclamation, irrigation, and public-power projects; authorization and appropriations for navigation, beach erosion, and other river and harbor projects for nearly every State in the Nation; conservation measures for fish, grazing lands, and wildlife refuges, authorizations and appropriations for a vast military public-works program.

However, in certain notable instances the Democrats resisted, and, in fact, either killed, changed in part, or tried to pigeonhole by their majority power in Congress, important legislation in the field of natural resources and public works.

Five administration proposals in the 2d session of the 84th Congress for partnership development of water resources projects never saw the light of day because of Democratic opposition.

Even a proposal of a private-power company to help develop a river's hydroelectric resources without expense to taxpayers met opposition from Democrats. This was Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. The private-power company's application to build the project was unanimously approved by the Federal Power Commission after long hearings. Although proposals for Federal construction had been rejected by congressional committees twice during the Truman administration, Democrats finally succeeded in bringing the issue to the Senate floor for a final vote where they held majority power. The result was a rejection of Federal construction by a rollcall vote of 51 to 41. Smarting over defeat on this issue, Democrats permitted the big Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project to die in the closing days of the 84th Congress, although it was strongly endorsed by Republicans and had passed the Senate.

ATOMIC ENERGY

It was under the Republican administration that peacetime development of atomic energy by private and local municipal enterprise was first given its start, ending Government monopoly which limited work to war purposes. The 84th Congress provided joint Government-industry financing of civilian reactors; appropriated funds for continued research into atomic-energy uses; and authorized construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship. Republicans in the 84th Congress fought successfully to resist Democratic proposals which would have put the Federal Government into the business of building atomic reactors.

FARM PROGRAM

The Democratic 84th Congress made the flexible price support farm program, enacted by the Republican 83d Congress, one of its chief targets. The President fought hard to retain this program, eventually employing a veto, before Congress finally enacted this legislation of great importance to our farmers.

From the start of the session in 1955 the Democratic Congress persisted in disregarding the President's urgent plea to maintain the flexible price support embodied in the Agricultural Act of 1954. This first took effect (on a limited scale) with the 1955 harvest, and its value can be measured by the 11 percent rise in farm prices this year.

The House in May 1955, joined by the Senate a year later, enacted a measure to restore rigid 90-percent price supports for basic crops—a discredited program which had piled up nearly $9 billion in price-depressing crop surpluses, harmful to farmers and consumers alike as well as costing $1 million per day for storage.

The President courageously vetoed this bill enacted after much harmful delay and succeeded in getting an acceptable bill containing his soil bank proposal and other delayed features of his nine-point farm program, offered at the start of the second session.

The President's 15-point rural development program suffered even more delay. Offered in April 1955, it aimed at aiding about 1.5 million farm families with cash incomes of less than $1,000 annually whose production is too low to benefit from price supports. This program was all but ignored in the first session.

In his special farm message to the second session, the President repeated his recommendation for the rural development program as part of a nine-point program and requested Congress to enact it. Key legislation was cleared in the session-end jam.

Congressional action on the President's program was spotty. It enacted the soil bank proposal—a two-part program to pay farmers to take land out of production, both to reduce crop surpluses and conserve worn-out land for future needs.

Also cleared at the end of the session was one of the main parts of the President's 9-point program—legislation to implement the Great Plains program by authorizing $150 million for a 10-year cost-sharing plan to combat wind erosion by shifting land uses in 10 States.

Congress also voted increased funds for research, refunds to farmers of Federal taxes on gasoline and fuels used on the farm, and merged production credit corporations and intermediate credit banks as a step toward better coverage of farm credit needs.

Congress enacted only some of the recommendations dealing with commodity programs. It also rejected the President's request for a dollar ceiling on price supports to any one producer and refused to permit the disposal of surpluses on the domestic market at lower prices.

With flexible price supports and the soil bank as a basis, supplemented by the Rural Development and Great Plains programs, the administration provided American agriculture with its first real chance to make the fundamental adjustment needed to solve the farm problem.

LABOR

Of the many proposals for labor legislation initiated or supported by the administration, only one of prime national importance—a minimum wage bill—was passed in this Congress, and in a form differing from the President's recommendations. Except for a few items affecting special groups, the record of the Democratic 84th Congress is pretty barren of legislation responsive to the interests of the working man.

The Eisenhower recommendation for an increase in the legal minimum wage rate from 75 cents to 90 cents per hour was a carefully considered effort to balance higher wages with living costs, without increasing the danger of inflation. Congress, however, passed a bill providing for a $1 minimum.

Legislative proposals not enacted by the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress include: (1) Tart-Hartley Act revisions (even those favored by organized labor); (2) extension of coverage under the minimum wage law; (3) equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex; (4) public disclosure regarding employees' pension, health, and welfare programs; (5) Federal assistance to areas suffering chronic unemployment (area development program); (6) grants to the States for industrial safety programs; (7) revision of labor standards on work contracted or financed by the Federal Government to provide for time and one-half pay for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day or in excess of 40 hours a week as the work standard.

Most of these recommendations were originally made in 1955, and renewed by President Eisenhower in 1956, with several new ones.

In addition to the minimum wage, the 84th Congress enacted into law measures which regulated employment of Mexican farm laborers; increased unemployment compensation benefits in the District of Columbia; increased workmen's compensation benefits to longshoremen and harbor workers (as well as District of Columbia employees in private industry); and increased railroad retirement benefits.

VETERANS

Legislation affecting veterans enacted by the 84th Congress included the extension of veterans' education benefits until January 1965; the authorization of loans for farm homes as well as residential housing; the provision of social-security wage credits and lump-sum death benefits for military service before January 1, 1956; an extension for 2 years of the time in which eligible disabled veterans may apply for payment on an automobile; an arrangement whereby—within a time limit—a veteran may be granted an amount of term insurance equal to that which he had in service; a program for on-farm training for Korean veterans; an extension of the Dependents' Assistance Act; extension of World War II veterans' home-loan guaranty program; a provision for educational assistance for the children of certain veterans who died in Korea or World War II; and a revision of the laws providing benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Among the pressing concerns of the Republican administration, during the 84th Congress, in the fields of health, education, and welfare, were the necessity of strengthening the various agencies of Government which must deal with ever-increasing responsibilities in public health, medical aid, research and hospital construction, and the problem of the nationwide school classroom shortage, becoming more acute because of the accelerated birth rate since World War II.

Much had been accomplished during the preceding 83d Republican Congress. A Cabinet Department of Health, Education, and Welfare had been created. Social-security coverage had been extended to 10 million more persons, an increase which brought the total covered to 9 out of 10 persons gainfully employed. In addition, health programs were expanded all along the line and the plans were made for the White House Conference on Education.

In the 84th Congress some of the President's requests in the health, education, and welfare field were approved; others fell victim to partisan political tactics and were scuttled. Here is the record in brief:

Health: Health measures enacted during the past 2 years include: The Polio Vaccination Assistance Act, making grants to States for administering the Salk vaccine to eligibles without a means test; the Air Pollution Control Act and the Water Pollution Control Act; a bill to establish a hospital for the mentally ill in Alaska; an expanded program for vocational rehabilitation; the Narcotics Control Act; a bill providing for comprehensive research in methods for the treatment and rehabilitation of the mentally ill; and an omnibus health bill which establishes a 3-year program of graduate study for physicians and others in the public-health field; a 3-year program of advanced training for professional nurses; a 5-year training program for practical nurses; authority for the Surgeon General to make grants to improve the operation of State institutions for the mentally ill; and an extension until 1959 of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act. The President's efforts to secure reinsurance of voluntary prepayment health plans, however, did not succeed.

Education: Although Federal aid to schools in areas affected by Federal activities was continued, along with extension of veterans' educational benefits, the Democratic-controlled Congress frustrated all the administration's efforts to provide help for nationwide school construction. The President sought to provide this help on the sound basis of need and with an incentive to the States to augment rather than curtail school construction with some of their own funds. Under Democratic control the Senate committee took no action whatever to pass a school-construction bill.

In the House, Democrats insisted upon population rather than need as a basis and brought in a large Federal subsidy bill carrying out this idea. Moreover, the Powell amendment was offered to the bill. The measure was further complicated by House legislative actions. There was strong Republican support for the Powell amendment. Republicans next made every effort to substitute the President's measure for the Democratic bill. When this failed for lack of Democratic support, Republicans voted to reject the Democratic-sponsored bill which was wholly contrary to the sound principles on which the President's measure was based. The net result was that, although the White House Conference confirmed the urgent need for Federal school aid, the measure was defeated in the House.

Welfare: After the increase in benefits and the great expansion of social security coverage made by the Republican 83d Congress, the administration desired simply to complete coverage as far as possible and, for the present, devote itself to improvement of the operation of the system. The administration's requests were enlarged by the 84th Congress to include payments of OASI benefits to totally disabled workers at age 50 (instead of 65) and lowered the age of eligibility for widows, wives, and working women to draw retirement benefits. The Federal share of public assistance payments was also increased. A further amendment cut off the payment of benefits to anyone convicted of espionage, treason, or subversive activities. The school-milk program was expanded. (One billion half-pints of milk will be distributed in the schools this year.)

Appropriations, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, touching various phases of health, education, and welfare included more than $180 million for the National Institutes of Health; $100 million to continue the school-lunch program; $39 million for services for crippled children, maternal and child health services, and child welfare activities; money to enable the Children's Bureau to initiate services in the field of juvenile delinquency; $1.1 million for Federal and State study of education beyond high school; and $4 million to continue the work in venereal disease control.

HOUSING

The 84th Congress continued to provide American families with more opportunities than at any time in history to own their own homes. The Congress also continued housing loan programs for farmers and veterans and authorized additional public housing units.

CIVIL RIGHTS—ENDING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Following through on the President's 1956 state of the Union message, the administration requested of Congress a 6-point program to broaden and strengthen the present civil rights remedies. The program called for the creation of a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights to investigate alleged civil rights abuses; appointment of an Assistant Attorney General to head a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice; and broader authority of the Department of Justice to use civil remedies in the enforcement of "right to vote" laws and other civil rights.

In the closing days of the session, the House passed a civil rights bill, but when it came to the Senate the Judiciary Committee buried it.

Although Democratic Party platforms have for years decried the fact that people of the District of Columbia did not have the right to vote, another bill to accomplish this purpose failed in the Democratic 84th Congress. Home rule, which was urged by the President in his State of the Union passed the Senate but no action was taken by the House.

The administration strongly recommended and the Congress passed legislation to forbid eavesdropping by recording and other devices on Federal grand and petit jury deliberations. The move for the bill developed after disclosure that a university research team, under grant from the Ford Foundation, had made tape recordings of actual deliberations in a Federal jury room. The administration considered the legislation necessary to assure the free discussion of jurors, and to preserve the basic elements of trial by jury.

One other administration request in the civil rights field to become law was a measure to protect the right to vote in Federal elections of members of the Armed Forces stationed abroad and certain others serving overseas. The law provides for a simplified, uniform absentee ballot in peacetime as well as during war. Due to Democratic opposition a provision for waiving payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting in Federal elections was stricken.

Statehood for Hawaii was also urged by the President in his message to Congress. However, it, too, was blocked by Democratic action in the House by tying statehood for Hawaii and Alaska together and then recommiting the bill to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In the executive branch, a 5-member President's Committee on Government Employment Policy has been created to prevent discrimination in Government jobs. The Committee on Government Contracts, established by the Republican administration in 1953, is surveying employment practices of transportation companies doing business with the Federal Government, with a view to eliminating employment discrimination. Surveys are also to be conducted in the general field of Government contracts by the CGC and the contracting Government agencies to ascertain whether such contracts are providing expanded employment opportunities for all individuals.

REPUBLICAN ACHIEVEMENTS, JANUARY 1953 TO JULY 1956

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: THE CONFERENCE TABLE REPLACED THE BATTLEFIELD

Ended the stalemated war in Korea and reversed the previous foreign policy that had contributed to the loss of 600 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain in the decade 1943 to 1953.

Avoided involvement in the hot war in Indochina; took steps to aid Vietnam and build up its army.

Held meeting at Geneva, Switzerland with the heads of Russia, Britain, and France at Geneva to pave the way for concrete actions to relieve world tension. President Eisenhower took the initiative by his impressive offer to exchange full armament information under adequate safeguards. Although Geneva fell short of specific agreements, it served definitely to relax world tension and contributed to the shift in Russian policy.

Ratified mutual defense treaties with the Republic of China (Formosa) the Republic of Korea (South Korea), and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO), grouping together Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Great Britain, France, and the United States.

Ended the military occupation of Western Germany and provided for the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Negotiated the Austrian State Treaty (signed by Austria, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States) by which Austria was reestablished as an independent state and the military forces of the allied powers and the Soviet Union were withdrawn.

Endorsed the President's authority to use the Nation's Armed Forces for the protection

of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, as a move to preserve peace in the Far East.

Continued economic and military aid to the nations of the free world, with increasing attention to Asia.

Extended the foreign trade agreements program, permitting tariff reductions under regulations designed to protect American jobs and business. Also, provided for American participation in the international Finance Corporation designed to help nations to develop their resources.

Assisted the new free government of Guatemala which removed the Communist regime.

Took the initiative against communism in all parts of the world.

Reaffirmed official policy against Red China's admission to the United Nations.

Supported a United Germany (resolution of 83d Cong.).

Condemned Soviet mistreatment of minorities and callous disregard of human rights (resolution of 83d Cong.).

Moved for adoption by Western Hemisphere nations of the Caracas resolution declaring communism a threat to freedom and pledging full consultation in the event of aggression.

Negotiated arms pacts to strengthen Central American countries against Communist subversion.

Acted to oust Americans in the United Nations who have served the Communist cause.

Brought about a settlement of the oil controversy in Iran, preventing the threatened Communist subversion of that country.

Proposed an international pool of atomic energy resources for peaceful uses. Without waiting for its formal organization, the United States signed atoms-for-peace agreements with over 25 nations under which the United States furnishes enriched uranium for civilian uses. Further, the United States offered to furnish research reactors and to make available power reactors.

Passed the Refugee Relief Act to admit, over a 3-year period, up to 214,000 persons to the United States in excess of the quota limit.

Settled by negotiation the Italian-Yugoslav quarrel over Trieste which for years had threatened to cause war between the two countries.

Reiterated the traditional position of the Senate in favor of self-government and self-determination for all peoples in a move designed to give hope to the enslaved peoples of the satellite countries.

NATIONAL DEFENSE: INSTANT READINESS REPLACED UNPREPAREDNESS

Developed the greatest military strength the Nation has ever had, short of wartime, with emphasis on continuous combat readiness for any contingency.

Applied almost two-thirds of the national budget to national security (military defense, atomic-energy development, stockpiling of strategic materials, military aid abroad), compared with only 32 percent in 1950 and two-thirds in the peak years of the Korean war; and by building up military muscle and cutting out waste fat, saved billions in defense spending.

Put atomic and other new weapons into the Regular military arsenal for strategic and tactical use.

Built to a 131-wing Air Force as of June 30, 1956; continued buildup to 137-wing goal by a year later.

Announced plans to add 50 percent to long-range heavy-bomber striking power by increasing number of planes in heavy-bomber wings to 45 each (formerly 30).

Equipped all Air Force fighter wings with jet aircraft; all medium-bomber wings with B–47's, which have intercontinental capabilities; heavy-bomber wings (B–36's) are being replaced by eight-engine, all-jet B–52's.

Began building toward a completely supersonic fighter inventory in the Air Force; awarded the initial contract for production of the first Air Force supersonic bomber.

Conducted research toward nuclear-powered aircraft.

Air Force missiles include GAR–1 Falcon, an air-to-air guided air defense rocket, in production; the TM–61 Matador, a tactical surface-to-surface missile with nuclear capabilities, in operation; the IM–99 Bomarc, a long-range surface-to-air pilotless interceptor, under development for air defense; and long-range missiles Snark and Navaho, under development.

Gave top priority to ballistic-missiles research. The Air Force is pursuing two approaches to the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) in the Atlas and Titan. The 1,500-mile intermediate-range ballistic missile (IRBM), Jupiter, is a joint project of the Army (for ground launching) and the Navy (for surface ship or submarine use). The Air Force also has an IRBM project, Thor.

Gave high priorities to other missile research.

Obtained consent of Great Britain to extend the missile-firing range from Florida out over British possessions for 5,000 miles into the South Atlantic.

Built a powerful Navy, which consists of 2,753 ships, of which 1,000 are in active duty. These latter include 15 attack carriers, 15 cruisers, 250 destroyers, and 110 submarines. Ships in reserve include 58 cruisers, 109 destroyers, and 89 submarines. The Navy has some 16,000 planes, of which over 10,000 are in active service. Many of these are bombers which can carry high-yield nuclear and thermo-nuclear payloads.

Added two modern aircraft carriers, *Forrestal* and *Saratoga*, to the fleet; three are under construction; one is in the 1957 program; and more mobile air bases of this type are planned.

Launched the first nuclear-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, which is already in operation with the fleet and has steamed more than 40,000 miles, almost 24,000 of this submerged, without refueling. Launched a second such submarine, *Seawolf*, in July 1955; six more are in process; and six more were included in the fiscal year 1957 shipbuilding program.

Converted a cruiser, *Boston*, into the world's first guided missile ship; a second, *Canberra*, has just been launched; six surface ships in the 1956 program are guided missile ships and all cruisers and destroyers in the 1957 will be guided missile craft. The 1957 shipbuilding program includes a nuclear-powered guided missile cruiser, the first surface ship in the world to be nuclear-powered. Also includes funds for long-lead procurement of a nuclear reactor for a carrier.

Produced test models of the Seamaster, a water-borne, jet aircraft in the 600-mile-per-hour range, which can carry megaton weapons.

Began phasing into the Navy new high-skill, high-performance aircraft, including a supersonic fighter, F8U, and attack planes such as the A3D and A4D. The A3D has unrefueled combat radius of 1,500 statute miles—that is, 1,500 miles out and 1,500 miles back.

Developed missiles for shipboard use: surface-to-air Terrier, air-to-air Sparrow, and surface-to-surface Regulus I. The Regulus I can deliver an atomic warhead at transonic speeds over a 500-mile range and can be launched from submarines, surface vessels, and shore bases. An improved version is under way.

Put Talos, a surface-to-air missile, in production for test firing; the missile is designed for launching from ship or shore.

Brought the Marine Corps, consisting of three divisions and three air wings, to a high level of combat readiness; increased number of combat planes on hand and added to Marine firepower with atomic weapons.

Added the 280 milimeter atomic cannon to Army weapons inventory and supplied it to Army units in Europe.

Added Corporal surface-to-surface guided missile battalions and Honest John rocket batteries to Army combat strength; deployed some to Europe. Both missiles have atomic capabilities.

Installed Nike missile batteries for defense of key American cities; developed the missile master, the country's first electronic system specifically for controlling and coordinating Nike batteries.

Reorganized two Army divisions following maneuvers which tested organizational and tactical problems of atomic warfare; study is continuing to devise the most effective modern Army.

Built up the level of readiness of Reserve forces, aided by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. By June 30, 1957, Reserve components are expected to have about 1.1 million men in drill-pay status—better organized, trained, and equipped than ever before.

Greatly strengthened our continental defenses: coordinated Army, Navy, and air units under Air Force control in the Continental Air Defense Command and improved fighter-interceptor forces and antiaircraft weapons; Air National Guard units aid active Air Force in standing 24-hour alert throughout continental United States.

Rushed construction on the distant early warning (DEW) line and on a radar screen in the Arctic; extended warning system to include Alaska; extended such protection along Atlantic and Pacific approaches by constructing Texas Towers (manmade radar islands on the edge of the Atlantic Continental Shelf) and by Air Force and Navy airborne patrols.

Announced streamlining of the Nation's worldwide military command structure, effective July 1, 1957.

Continued military aid to our allies to help equip and train the equivalent of about 200 divisions, 551 combat ships, 250 air squadrons, and supporting units.

Maintained a strong and expanding peacetime industrial structure, readily convertible to tasks of defense and war.

Acquired new airbases in Spain, the Netherlands, and elsewhere.

Tightened the security-risk program; acted to deny commissions to doctors and dentists who turn out to be security risks.

Made changes to improve the morale of service personnel, including a pay raise, medical care for servicemen's dependents, short-term reenlistment bonus, and liberalized benefits for survivors of servicemen and veterans.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE: BALANCED BUDGET REPLACED DEFICITS

Stimulated record-breaking national prosperity; maintained the value of the dollar; clamped the lid on inflation; counteracted recession.

Kept Republican Party pledge to balance the budget; ended fiscal year 1956 with a surplus of $1 billion, 754 million out of which a substantial payment can be made to reduce the public debt.

Reduced Government spending each year well below the $74.3 billion spent in fiscal 1953, Truman's last budget year; wound up fiscal 1956 with a spending total of $66.4 billion, almost $8 billion under Truman's fiscal 1953 total, and $11.5 billion under Truman's proposed fiscal 1954 budget which he submitted to Congress before leaving office in January 1953.

Extended the maturity of the Federal debt; moved more of the debt away from banks, where it can contribute to inflation, and into the hands of long-term investors.

Tied in debt management actions with Federal Reserve System moves to keep the supply of money and credit in line with the needs of the country.

New records set in Savings Bond sales, reflecting public's confidence in country's economic future and in Government's fiscal policies.

TAXATION: TAX CUTS REPLACED CRUSHING TAXES

Gave the American people a whopping $7.4 billion in tax cuts in 1954—the first tax cuts since the Republican 80th Congress in 1948—including:

Three-billion-dollar cut in individual income taxes (an average of 10 percent).

One-billion-dollar cut in excise taxes on household appliances, cosmetics, and other items of everyday use.

Two-billion-dollar cut by abolishing the excess-profits tax which was restricting the expansion of businesses and jobs.

One - billion - four-hundred-million-dollar cut by liberalized deductions and fairer tax treatment of millions of persons and thousands of businesses under the 1954 tax code.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION: CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENTAL REPLACED DICTATORIAL ACTION

Replaced extremist New Deal-Fair Deal administration which tried to draft striking workers into the Army and seized private property illegally.

Checked the 20-year trend toward centralization of power in Washington.

Sold to private enterprise 25 federally owned synthetic rubber plants and the Inland Waterways Corporation; and disposed of many business-type commercial enterprises conducted by the Defense Department and civilian agencies in competition with private enterprise. This returned property to local and State tax rolls.

Approved and put into effect 12 reorganization plans to improve the operations and efficiency of Government departments and agencies, and to lower the cost of Government.

Established the Hoover Commission to study Government functions and operations.

Established the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to study Federal-State-local functions and fiscal resources and recommended proper allocation thereof.

All Government departments and agencies cooperated with these Commissions and wherever possible without legislation adopted many of their recommendations to improve the executive branch. Where legislation was required, Republican Members of Congress sponsored appropriate measures.

Substantially reduced the number of Government employees and removed security risks from Federal employment.

Brought about a budget surplus for the first time since 1951.

Reduced the deficit of the Post Office Department.

Brought about long-needed improvements and pay raises in civil service and various other Government agencies.

PARTNERSHIP POLICY IN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT REPLACED PATERNALISM

Authorized the $300 million joint United States-Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway project to open the Great Lakes and the Midwest to oceangoing freight and passenger traffic. United States share of cost to be $105 million, financed by toll bonds.

Authorized a comprehensive $110 million program for deepening and improving the connecting channels between the Great Lakes in order to accommodate the oceangoing ships which will travel through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Approved construction of the St. Lawrence River power project by the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, expected to generate the second largest amount of power of any similar project in the country.

Approved a 13-year, $32.9 billion highway construction and improvement program involving 440,000 miles of United States highways and roads, including a 41,000-mile interstate system of 4 to 8 lanes to connect every city of 50,000 population or more. Rural roads, park roads, and forest roads also to be improved and constructed. Total program is largest public-works project ever authorized in United States history.

Increased Federal emergency relief highway funds to help States in which roads and bridges have been damaged or washed out by hurricanes and floods.

Authorized a 10-year, $500 million water pollution control program providing grants-in-aid to States and municipalities to construct plants to purify polluted streams and other water sources. The program is the biggest of its kind in history and gives direct aid to cities and towns for the first time.

Authorized a nationwide lease-purchase program to build new post offices, customhouses, and other similar-type Federal buildings in every State.

Authorized Federal construction of the upper Colorado River water storage project covering 110,000 square miles in a 5-State area for eventual building of a score of multiple-purpose dams and some 35 reclamation projects. The project is the second largest of its type ever authorized.

Authorized what may be the third largest public power dam in the Nation—Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River; authorized hundreds of navigation, flood-control, beach-erosion, and other river and harbor projects of varying sizes throughout the Nation.

Authorized a $90 million Mississippi-gulf-sea-level canal.

Approved survey to determine whether hydroelectric power can be economically developed from the tides at Passamaquoddy Bay, Maine.

Authorized military public-works program of between $1 billion and $2 billion in each session of the 83d and 84th Congresses and approved appropriations for construction of numerous Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force facilities.

Authorized the Secretary of Army to allocate money for construction of small flood-control projects.

Approved flood and hurricane disaster measures designed to help house the homeless and to reestablish communications and transportation facilities.

Authorized scores of new reclamation, irrigation, and power projects; appropriations made for new starts and continuance of operations for others.

Ended antagonism to local and private power development; permitted the Federal Power Commission to license local public-utility districts and private power companies to pay for and construct their own power projects with the results of many offers to build power projects without Federal funds.

Rejected, by majority vote of the Senate, an attempt to prevent a private utility from constructing Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River as approved by the Federal Power Commission.

Extended the Water Facilities Act from 17 States to all 48 States in a move to conserve the Nation's water and soil resources.

Provided for upstream watershed protection and flood prevention under local control—reversing a 20-year trend toward Federal decisions on need for, and location of, such projects.

Permitted Federal loans to local irrigation districts for construction, on Federal reclamation projects, of water-distribution systems to be locally owned and operated.

Permitted—for the first time—multiple mineral development of the same tracts of public lands to encourage domestic sources of vital materials.

Extended a minerals purchase program to include incentives for small mine operations.

Inaugurated long-range programs for mining and metallurgical research; intensified study of radioactive metals; continued synthetic-fuels research; gave Federal Government more authority on surface resources in the granting of mining deeds.

Passed measures for additional conservation and propagation of fish and for the protection of grazing lands and wildlife refuges.

Approved extension of Federal Aid Airport Act to authorize a 4-year, $252 million program for annual matching funds to provide adequate and safe airports.

Approved conservation programs of many types, including improvement of western grazing lands through reseeding programs, water-spreading systems, and encouragement of soil- and moisture-conservation practices by range users.

Returned to the States their rights to submerged lands and resources off their coasts out to their historical boundaries—an area comprising about one-tenth of the area of the Continental Shelf and about 17 percent of the mineral resources.

Kept for the Federal Government submerged lands and resources beyond State boundaries—an area comprising about nine-tenths of the area of the Continental Shelf and about 83 percent of the mineral resources. Private industry already has signed leases nearing the half-billion-dollar mark; in all, an estimated $6 billion to $8 billion is expected for the United States Treasury from leases in these areas.

AGRICULTURE—ELIMINATING WAR DISLOCATIONS AND BUILDING PEACETIME PROSPERITY

The Republican administration, having inherited a rapidly deteriorating agricultural economy from the previous administration, has made solid progress in returning to farmers their share of the general prosperity, as follows:

Halted the decline in farmers' buying power which had fallen 19 points in the last 23 months of the Truman administration, but only 12 points in the 42 months of the Eisenhower administration, and is currently on the rise—up 6 points in the last 6 months.

Enacted a long-range farm program in 1954 to provide an effective floor under farm prices while reducing accumulation of price-depressing surpluses. Program provided flexible price supports effective with the 1955 harvests and farm prices rose on the average of 11 percent from December 1955 to June 1956.

Enacted a soil bank designed to reduce surpluses and increase the fertility of soil to meet future needs. The $1.2 billion program will pay farmers to take surplus crops out of production and plant grass cover and trees on marginal land. The latter is regarded as one of the greatest conservation and reforestation measures of our times.

Started a rural development program to provide better opportunities for the 1.5 million farm families with cash incomes under $1,000 annually. The full program was delayed by failure of the 1st session of the 84th Congress to act on legislation and the failure of the 2d session to pass the legislation until the final few days.

Developed a Great Plains program to provide a stable, profitable agriculture for the farm families in these 10 States. Passage of legislation providing the means for the Government to help farmers combat wind erosion in this area was delayed until the final days of the session.

Included farmers in the 1954 tax reduction through special provisions affecting farm operations. Gave farmers a refund on Federal tax on fuels used on the farm.

Extended social-security benefits to more than 5 million self-employed farm operators and farm workers.

Provided larger loan authorizations for rural electrification loans and for rural telephone loans. Reduced backlog of REA loan applications to $89.7 million, lowest level since World War II, and made loans of $189.8 million for rural electrification and

$81 million for rural telephones in fiscal 1956—the highest level for any year since the program began. Modified the State allotment formula for REA funds to provide funds where they were most needed.

Returned the Farm Credit Administration to the control of farmers and merged production credit corporations with Federal intermediate credit banks, making easier credit available to all farmers.

Farm lands and buildings increased in market value by nearly $4 billion in the past year.

Farm markets abroad expanded for the third consecutive year for an increase of 20 percent in 3 years. Domestic markets increased, too, both in terms of quantity and quality of farm products demanded.

Whole agricultural industries improved. For example, dairy farming, in the doldrums when Democrats left office, is enjoying increased consumption, decreased surpluses, and improved prices. Government holdings of surplus butter were eliminated at one point during this year. Prices of hogs and beef cattle have improved substantially this year. Livestock and dairying account for about one-half of farmers' total cash receipts.

Worked vigorously with industry to market beef, dairy products, vegetables, pork, and other plentiful foods. In the past 3 years, the American people have been eating more per person than ever before. Instituted and carried out a vast beef and pork purchase program to help stop decline in prices.

Raised flexible price supports for the 1956 crops of wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, and dairy products to increase income for farmers who might otherwise have suffered from the Democratic delay in enacting the soil bank in time to take full effect this year.

Extended school milk program to nonprofit institutions which care for children and included Hawaii in the program. School lunch programs have been expanded to serve 11 million children.

Worked vigorously to eliminate burdensome surpluses of farm commodities resulting from rigid price support system put into effect by Democrats. Disposed of more than $5.5 billion worth of farm surpluses at home and abroad in the past 3 years through barter arrangements, sales for foreign currencies, expansion of the school lunch program, and distribution to the needy.

Enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act in 1954 under which nearly $3 billion in surplus commodities have been bartered abroad for strategic materials or sold for foreign currencies.

Increased to $3 billion the ceiling on funds authorized to finance the sale of surplus goods for foreign currencies.

Extended the Sugar Act through 1960 and increased the sales quotas of domestic beet and cane producers.

Accomplished the biggest expansion of grain storage facilities in history from 750 million bushels in 1952 to nearly 2 billion bushels capacity in 1956.

Enacted legislation permitting the Agriculture Department for the first time to work in partnership with small local watershed groups, with initiative and leadership remaining with the local organization.

Moved swiftly to give aid to farmers hit by floods, drought, and other disasters.

Enacted a Federal flood-insurance program.

Reorganized the Agriculture Department to effect better supervision, coordination, and review of farm problems. Placed all foreign agriculture attaches under the Agriculture Department which helped strengthen efforts to expand foreign markets.

Expanded research activities to develop new crops, new uses for crops, new markets, and reduced production costs. Increased appropriations for research nearly $27 million in 3 years and achieved another 25 percent increase for 1957 to a total of $103 million.

Extended and expanded the brucellosis-control program.

Raised the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to $14.5 billion to further the price-support programs and to finance the Soil Bank Act.

LABOR: FAIRNESS REPLACED MISGUIDED FAVORITISM

Brought to the Nation's workers the highest standard of living in history.

An all-time record of 66½ million Americans have jobs.

Wages climbed to new highs.

Workers had a net gain because, while wages rose, the cost of living remained stable, within a remarkably small range.

Gave tax cuts which were the equivalent to a wage increase for every taxpayer; workers now keep more of what they earn.

Promoted harmonious labor-management relations, resulting in less time and wages lost on account of strikes; since Republicans took office there has been greater worker-industry peace than in any comparable post-World War II period.

Extended unemployment compensation insurance coverage to 4 million more people—the first major extension since the program began.

Urged and assisted State and local action on the growing migratory labor problem and developed draft legislation to regulate its interstate transportation.

Established a program of unemployment compensation for approximately 2½ million Federal workers.

Urged States to modernize their unemployment compensation; 23 States increased jobless pay benefits and 7 lengthened the payment period.

Recommended and supported legislation raising the minimum wage.

Blacklisted minimum wage violators and recovered bak wages for underpaid employees—in the most vigorous enforcement program since passage of the Davis-Bacon Act of 1935.

Recovered for workers in 1955 alone, more than $6 million due them from employers who violated either the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Walsh-Healey Act.

Extended railroad retirement benefits for 1½ million workers.

Speeded procedures of National Labor Relations Board for handling elections, settling disputes, and disposing of unfair labor practice cases.

Provided more effective attention to problems of women workers through newly created post of an Assistant to the Secretary for Women's Affairs.

Expanded vocational rehabilitation program; strongly enforced child-labor laws and health and safety standards; pushed apprentice-training and on-the-job training programs; helped veterans return to preservice employment.

Expanded its occupational safety training program and assisted the States in promoting programs to provide safe working conditions.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Established Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

Sponsored successful White House Conference on Education.

Authorized $1,100,000 for Federal and State study of education beyond high school.

Voted funds for school construction and operation to full extent allowed by law where schools are crowded because of Federal activities.

Voted full amounts authorized for school lunch program.

Authorized Federal Office of Education to contract with universities, colleges, and other educational agencies for research, surveys, and demonstrations on educational problems.

Approved—for the first time—payment of Federal funds to States for diagnostic or treatment centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, rehabilitation facilities, and nonprofit nursing homes.

Increased grants for research on cancer, heart, mental health, and arthritis.

Broadened vocational rehabilitation program to include training of doctors, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and other specialists.

Extended social security coverage to 10 million more people in the first major increase since 1935. For the first time, 9 out of 10 gainfully employed workers are covered.

Extended Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction Act to 1959.

Increased social security benefits to those already on social security rolls, with proportionate increases for dependents and survivors. Liberalized many other social security features.

Authorized a broad, nationwide, 10-year, $500 million water pollution control plan.

Increased authorization for construction of new buildings and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research.

Extended school-milk program to summer camps and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to care and training of children.

Approved new narcotics-control law providing death penalty for adults in the sale of heroin to juveniles, and giving broad new powers to Federal agents in the general narcotic field.

Authorized funds to develop library services to rural areas.

Authorized establishment of an educational assistance program for orphans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict.

Extended Poliomyelitis Vaccination Act to June 30, 1957.

Authorized funds for Alaska mental-health program.

Set up a National Library of Medicine.

Approved a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States.

VETERANS

Gave 5-percent increase in pensions and pay for veterans of all wars and their widows and dependents.

Gave Korean veterans the same benefits and preferences as World War II veterans in war housing, civil service appointments, and GI training; extended period for initiating training under the GI bill.

Raised funds for building veterans' hospitals to record amount; speeded construction.

Continued direct home and farmhouse loan programs for veterans; supported legislation liberalizing direct farmhouse loans and permitting Government-guaranteed loans to veterans for farmhouse purchase, construction, and repair; increased revolving funds so more direct loans could be made.

Continued Federal contributions to dependency allotments for more than 1 million enlisted personnel.

Continued paychecks and family allotments under the Missing Persons Act for Korean war prisoners and soldiers missing in action.

Provided automatic renewal of term insurance policies and simplified handling of veterans' life insurance policies.

Increased Federal payments for veterans cared for in State soldiers' homes.

Extended period during which veterans suffering loss of one or more limbs or permanent impairment of vision may apply for $1,600 payment on an automobile.

Increased benefits to survivors of servicement and veterans, and placed military personnel under the social-security system on a permanent basis.

Equalized pay received by reservists with that of members of the National Guard undergoing similar training.

Extended until July 25, 1958, the World War II veterans' home loan guaranty program.

AMERICAN FAMILIES PROVIDED MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR OWNING HOMES

Under 4 years of the Republican administration private housing construction boomed, providing employment for an estimated five million persons and adding to the national prosperity and contentment of the American people. Fifty-five percent of the 47 million American families now own their own homes.

Home ownership was brought within the reach of additional thousands of families by enactment of Republican-sponsored guaranteed home mortgage programs providing lower down payments, lower monthly payments, longer repayment periods, and increased mortgage limits.

Laws were tightened to prevent windfall profiteering and to protect homeowners from abuses under home-repair and improvement programs; vigorous prosecution stopped windfall profits and recovered millions of dollars.

Direct home and farmhouse loan programs were continued and improved, and laws were enacted to carry out the administration's proposals for FHA insurance of private construction of rental housing at AEC sites and permanent military installations.

Thousands of additional federally aided public-housing units also were authorized.

ATOMIC DEVELOPMENT: SHARING REPLACED MONOPOLY

Inaugurated peacetime development of atomic energy by private enterprise, ending Federal monopoly which limited work to war purposes.

Revised the Atomic Energy Act to permit (1) sale for public use of electricity developed by AEC—the first such power was delivered in July 1955; (2) joint Government-industry financing of civilian power reactors—the country's first nuclear powerplant is now under construction and other projects are either in the first stages of construction or are being considered; and (3) privately financed nuclear powerplants—several utility groups have already applied for licenses to built atomic plants without Government funds.

Continued spending for nuclear research on general reactors and civilian power reactors.

Launched the Atoms-for-Peace program to demonstrate America's sincere desire to harness nuclear energy to benefit—not destroy—mankind.

Authorized construction and appropriated funds for an atomic-powered merchant ship.

CIVIL RIGHTS—ENDING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Ended all segregation in the Armed Forces, veterans' hospitals, schools on military posts, and Government contracts.

Ended segregation in restaurants, theaters, hotels, schools, and places of amusement in the Nation's Capital.

Ended segregation in employment contracts to which District of Columbia is a party.

Prohibition by Interstate Commerce Commission of discrimination in interstate bus and train transportation.

Protection of jury-trial procedures by prohibiting recordings in Federal grand and petit jury deliberations.

Establishment of a President's Committee on Government Employment Policy to assure nondiscrimination in Federal jobs.

Establishment of a Committee on Government Contracts (headed by Vice President NIXON) to prevent discrimination in Government contract jobs; with the result that for the first time white-collar jobs are available to Negroes in public utilities, the chemical and aircraft industry, and the Federal Reserve System.

Proposal by President that Congress create bipartisan Commission to broaden and strengthen present civil-rights remedies and investigate alleged violations of civil-rights laws.

Announcement by Housing Administrator of refusal of Federal aid to cities defaulting in obligations to minority citizens.

For the first time in history, appointment of a Negro as Under Secretary of Labor; also more appointments of Negroes in policy-making governmental positions than in any other administration.

COMMUNISM IN UNITED STATES COMBATED

Inaugurated an era of cooperation between Congress and the Executive in combating domestic communism.

Enacted long-needed Communist-control laws which (1) outlaw the Communist Party; (2) grant immunity to witnesses before congressional committees; (3) impose heavier penalties for concealing persons from arrest; (4) impose heavier penalties on bail jumpers; (5) deny a Government pension to any Federal employee convicted of a felony; (6) revoke the citizenship of persons convicted under the Smith Act of advocating overthrow of the Government by force or violence; (7) make peacetime spying a capital offense; and (8) require registration of all printing presses owned or used by Communists.

Set up Internal Security Division in the Justice Department to give exclusive attention to vigorous prosecution of antisubversive laws.

Obtained convictions of over 70 persons under the Smith Act.

Ordered Communist Party to register under the Internal Security Act.

Deported more subversive aliens in 3½ years than during entire 20 years of Democratic control.

Weeded out security risks from Federal jobs.

Vigorously pushed congressional investigation of of various Communist activities.

Reaffirmed determination to pursue congressional probes by joining Democrats in January 1955 in passing Senate Resolution 18 which declared committees should vigorously investigate the Communist international conspiracy.

Revoked loyalty order of Truman; revised and improved security system in Government. The entire problem is being surveyed by a new bipartisan commission which is to make recommendations for improvements.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAWS OF GENERAL INTEREST (S. DOC. NO. 154)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed separately as a Senate document, after Congress adjourns, a digest of public laws of general interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE SENATE IN THE 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after the adjournment of Congress, an analysis which I am having prepared of yea and nay votes in the Senate in the 84th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the material which the Senator from California seeks to include contain anything with respect to the accomplishments of the Democratic Party? [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assume the Senator from Texas will have an equal right to place his own digest in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 4309. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Transehe;

S. 4310. A bill for the relief of Fanny Lee Lou Tak Yung;

S. 4311. A bill for the relief of Peter Von Neurath-Neudenegg;

S. 4312. A bill for the relief of Silvio Rafael Cebellos y Pardo; and

S. 4313. A bill for the relief of Max Warman and his wife, Rachel Warman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 4314. A bill to provide for a national labor-management policy, to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 4315. A bill for the relief of Johann Kalatschan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 27, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.;

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes;

S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 2060. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices;

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3391. An act to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district court of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchises or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers;

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes;

S. 3903. An act to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes;

S. 4221. An act to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS ORDERED PRINTED IN THE RECORD

By Mr. KERR:

Article entitled "This Is The Real America," written by Senator HUMPHREY and published in the Family Weekly magazine for July 1, 1956, dealing with the factors which make America strong.

By Mr. GORE:

Public statements and communications of the President of the United States with reference to the Dixon-Yates contract, as reported by the press.

Correspondence and statement concerning the TVA power system.

PROPOSED POTOMAC RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, first, I wish to ask the majority leader why he has not called up the conference report on S. 2568. Second, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada why he has not called it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think I can answer the Senator publicly, as I have answered him several times privately. The conference report is quite controversial. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said he did not propose to have the conference report adopted, if he could prevent it.

If the conference report in question had been called up tonight, I was fearful that we might be here all night. I did not think Senators would want to spend all night debating the proposed bridge.

I am well aware of the diligent efforts of the Senator from Maryland to have consideration of the bill. I should like to be in a position to request the consideration of every bill every Senator wanted to have brought up, but it happens that we must cut off somewhere.

The majority leader assumes the responsibility of saying to the Senator from Nevada that he did not think this was a propitious time to consider the bill.

Mr. BEALL. I have never worked under a more efficient majority leader than the Senator from Texas. I appreciate what he is thinking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend. That statement is worth my yielding to him.

Mr. BEALL. At this time, when we are thinking about the necessity of building a bridge over the Potomac River, whatever the merits of it may be, and we do not consider the conference report, and we adjourn without agreeing to the conference report, we have something to explain to the people of the District of Columbia and Virginia. The bridge would not extend into Maryland.

This is something all of us should think about.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to my friend from Ohio, because it is almost the hour of adjournment.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, are we limited in any way?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To 1 minute.

Mr. BENDER. That is not enough. [Laughter.]

I have much to say about some of the political uproar on civil rights. The responsibility with respect to civil rights is on the majority side. We on this side of the aisle had nothing to do with it. We do not control the committees. If civil rights legislation has gone by the board——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Ohio tell me what he did about it when his party had control of the committees?

Mr. BENDER. I did everything I could. I have been in Congress since 1939. I have done everything I could. But I do not control the committee of which I am a member, and I do not like this demagogery [laughter] at the last minute on the part of the majority membership, trying to create the impression that somehow or other the Republican side is responsible for the civil rights program not becoming effective——

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The hour of adjournment sine die has arrived.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken.

The hour of 12 o'clock midnight having arrived, the Senate, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 276, stands adjourned sine die.

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock midnight, Friday, July 27, 1956, the Senate adjourned sine die.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 27, 1956.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Lewis Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Tunisia.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Henry L. Boden of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., O16420, United States Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army, as major general, Regular Army, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States.

The following-named officer under the provisions of sec. 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, O15970, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Col. Charles H. Schilling, O23707, for appointment as professor of military art and engineering, United States Military Academy, effective August 1, 1956.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Joseph Howard Harper, O15083.
Maj. Gen. Peter Sonover Hains 3d, O15657.
Maj. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575.
Maj. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15698.
Maj. Gen. Robert Milchrist Cannon, O16163.
Maj. Gen. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777.
Maj. Gen. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897.
Maj. Gen. John Murphy Wellems, O16176.
Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Paul Alfred Disney, O17004.
Brig. Gen. Robert Highman Booth, O18093.
Brig. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, O18755.

To be brigadier general

Col. Bruce Douglas Rindlaub, O17513.
Col. Paul Goodrick Hollister, O29547.
Col. Irvin Louis Allen, O29810.
Col. George Waite Coolidge, O17599.
Col. Richard Allen Risden, O19278.
Col. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256.

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, Public Law 773, 83d Congress:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harold Arthur Doherty, O2270961.
Brig. Gen. Frank Edwin Fraser, O222901.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Ward Henry, O1293051.
Brig. Gen. John Jacobson, Jr., O102326.
Brig. Gen. Fred William Makinney, O998010.
Brig. Gen. Daniel Joseph Manning, O307848.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Murray Mayfield, O168962.
Brig. Gen. John Martin McGreevy, O278060.
Brig. Gen. Edward Josephus McGrew, Jr., O265015.
Brig. Gen. Richard King Mellon, O902002.
Brig. Gen. Joe Nickell, O246192.
Brig. Gen. Maxwell Evans Rich, O323746.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frederick Henry Garber, O385526.
Col. Frank Smith Hummel, O225597.
Col. Clark Hungerford, O171068.
Col. Franklin Martin Kreml, O909816.
Col. Everette Herbert Qualls, O216229.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.), as amended:

To be major generals

Col. Albert Dermont Sheppard, O190904.
Col J. J. Bethurum Williams, O5202.

The nominations of Roland S. Aronson and 146 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on July 20, 1956, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Roland S. Aronson, which appears on page 13720, and ending with the name of Cole B. Whaley, Jr., which appears on page 13720.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Chester C. Ward, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

The nominations of William A. Simunich and 217 other officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty, for temporary promotion to the grades indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law, which were confirmed by the Senate today, were received on July 18, 1956, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William A. Simunich, which appears on page 13372, and ending with the name of Neil C. Demaree, which is shown on page 13373.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Nell P. Roquemore, Lakeland.

ILLINOIS

Roland Horney, Beason.
William R. Wesley, Des Plaines.

IOWA

Ella V. Jones, Hawkeye.

KANSAS

Merle B. Hayes, Agra.
Carroll V. Houlton, Dodge City.
Neil Curtis Wieland, Morrowville.
Louis E. Shaw, Overland Park.

KENTUCKY

Basil G. Jackson, Gamaliel.

MASSACHUSETTS

George D. Fisher, Jr., Hampden.

MISSOURI

Harland T. Stroud, O'Fallon.

NEBRASKA

Irene I. Bopp, Spalding.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Allan D. Towers, Lincoln.

NEW JERSEY

William H. Miles, Colts Neck.
Stephen R. Lazar, Port Reading.
Josiah E. Spalding, Rockaway.
Anthony T. Pipitone, Rosenhayn.
Ella Venita Crandall, Stanton.

OHIO

Sam Verlenich, Jr., Warren.

OKLAHOMA

Reuben Bailey Strong, Clinton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Wilbert C. Shafer, Barnesville.
Evart L. Ervin, Beaver.
Max L. Saylor, Beavertown.
Walter L. Stuart, Brownsville.
Louis Hertzog, Delmont.
Eugene Elgin, East Berlin.
Maurice D. Greenawalt, Fayetteville
Margaret H. Heiney, Jeddo.
Charles S. Glisan, Markleysburg.
Elmer L. Zerphey, Mount Joy.
Elsie C. Summers, Zionsville.

TENNESSEE

Thomas L. Duncan, Kingsport.

TEXAS

Hal N. Anderson, Gatesville.

UTAH

Glen Vern Blonquist, Coalville.

WEST VIRGINIA

Johnston Winston Chapman, Montgomery.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 27, 1956:

POSTMASTER

Samuel P. Zangari to be postmaster at Wrightsville, in the State of Pennsylvania.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 7, 1956,

The following enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed by the Vice President on July 30, 1956, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3101. An act to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill;

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 3941. An act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming;

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

for the construction of a dam on the north branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard";

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, Puerto Rico, to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Barks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission, and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An Act concerning gifts of securities in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations struction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954;

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget;

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States on July 31, 1956, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3101. An act to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and for other purposes;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an advisory committee on soil and water conservation;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill;

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 3941. An act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming;

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954;

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

On July 27, 1956:

S. 1777. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person; and

S. 4256. An act to authorize the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from the State of California, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece.

On July 28, 1956:

S. 2216. An act to amend the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497); and

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

On July 30, 1956:

S. 849. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, so as to provide for grants-in-aid to non-Federal public and nonprofit institutions for the constructing and equipping of facilities for research in the sciences related to health;

S. 3458. An act to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes;

S. 3592. An act to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service;

S. 3926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands.

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; and

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

On July 31, 1956:

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robison; and

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes, of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes.

On August 1, 1956:

S. 497. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and

maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act;

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal-savings deposit, and for other purposes;

S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State;

S. 2634. An act relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3658. An act to amend the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), so as to authorize, by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted;

S. 3820. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes;

S. 3970. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3998. An act to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery known as the Holden Trout Hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt.;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4060. An act to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, to include employees in the Motor Vehicle Service;

S. 4215. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1954, authorizing the sale of certain vessels to Brazil;

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishments of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco; and

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget.

On August 2, 1956:

S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made;

S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions;

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting;

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes;

S. 3556. An act to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, 2d session;

S. 3779. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes;

S. 3968. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week.

On August 3, 1956:

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes";

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1243. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1324. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 2060. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3391. An act to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3650. An act for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

S. 3875. An act to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

S. 3903. An act to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes;

S. 3969. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4221. An act to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

On August 6, 1956:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954.

On August 7, 1956:

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3616. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; and

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund.

On August 8, 1956:

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes;

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in compiying with the terms of franchise or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; and

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had disapproved bills of the Senate of the following titles, together with his reasons for such actions:

RECONVEYANCE OF MINERAL INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS TO THE FORMER OWNERS THEREOF

S. 1384. I am withholding my approval of S. 1384, a bill to provide for the reconveyance of all mineral interests in lands acquired by the United States for certain reservoir projects to former owners thereof, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this measure is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army, when he determines that the exploration for or exploitation of mineral interests underlying lands within the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoir projects in Mississippi will not be incompatible with the development, maintenance, and operation of these projects, and that the reconveyance of such mineral interests to former owners thereof will be in the public interest, to convey such interests to the former owners thereof or to their legal heirs upon application made within 3 years and upon payment to the United States of an amount equal to but not in excess of the purchase price for which said interests were acquired by the United States.

The Department of the Army is nearing the completion of the acquisition of approximately 283,000 acres of land for these 4 reservoir projects in northwestern Mississippi which are an integral part of the Yazoo River Basin headwater project authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936. Approximately 62,000 acres have been acquired subject to retention of oil and gas and minerals of like character by the owners thereof and approximately 106,000 acres of the 218,000 acres acquired in fee simple for 3 of the reservoirs are available for leasing pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands approved August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913). Therefore, there is no objection to the enactment of legislation which would provide for the conveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests of like character underlying some of the lands within these reservoirs to the former owners thereof under conditions provided for in section 2 of the bill.

On March 29, 1956, I approved H. R. 7097, 84th Congress, which provides for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in lands within the Demopolis lock and dam project, Alabama, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey oil and gas and mineral interests to former owners thereof at the current fair market value of such oil and gas and mineral interests and subject to such reservations and restrictions as in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army are necessary. However, S. 1384 differs significantly from this legislation in that it provides for "payment to the United States of an amount equal to but not in excess of the purchase price for which said interests were acquired by the United States." This provision constitutes a departure from the principle established in other legislation requiring payment of fair market value for minerals disposed of by sale or lease. Furthermore, it is predicated on the fallacious assumption that there was a determination of the "purchase price" of the minerals separate and apart from surface and other interests at the time fee title to the land was acquired by the United States. While the known presence of minerals and any trading in oil and gas leasehold interests were considered in arriving at the appraised fair market value of lands acquired in fee simple for these projects, no separate valuation was assigned to minerals except in those few instances in which a separate estate in minerals had been previously created. Therefore it would be impossible at this time to determine, in most instances, the "purchase price" paid for the minerals. Under these circumstances, I believe that the job of administering this legislation would be confusing and unsatisfactory to all concerned. However, in withholding my approval, I am hopeful that the Congress may yet enact legislation relating to the mineral interests in these lands similar to H. R. 7097, 84th Congress (Public Law 459, 84th Cong.), referred to above.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1956.*

JEAN PFEIFER

S. 277. I am withholding my approval of S. 277, for the relief of Jean Pfeifer.

The bill would permit the payment of a lump-sum death payment under section 202 (i) of the Social Security Act to Mrs. Jean Pfeifer in connection with the death of her son, John S. Inches, without regard to the statutory limitation on the period within which an application for such payment may be filed.

The facts in the case are as follows:

Mr. Inches died on August 7, 1951. His mother, Mrs. Pfeifer, paid burial costs in connection with her son's death. She did not, however, file an application for the lump-sum death payment until September 21, 1953, more than 2 years after the death of her son. Mrs. Pfeifer states that she or another surviving son had telephoned to the local office of the Social Security Administration on different occasions before the period had elapsed asking for application forms, but there are no records of such calls in the Social Security Administration files. In view of her failure to file application for the lump-sum death payment within the time fixed by law, the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Administration held that Mrs. Pfeifer was ineligible for the payment. This action of the Bureau was affirmed, after a hearing, by a referee of the Appeals Council in the Social Security Administration.

I am reluctant to deny relief in a case of this kind, but there are at least two persuasive considerations which compel me to withhold my approval: (1) A much more desirable remedy is provided for in the revision of the Social Security Act that I approved today, and (2) enactment of S. 277 would establish for the social security program an undesirable precedent which until now has been avoided.

Since 1939 the Social Security Act has required that an application for the lump-sum death payment be filed within 2 years of the death of the individual involved. The courts have held that failure to file application within this period may not be waived or excused, even though it arises from misunderstanding or unawareness.

This bill would provide special relief permitting one individual to receive a social insurance benefit under conditions identical with those under which, under the basic law, the same benefit must be denied to others similarly situated. Such special legislation, as I stated in vetoing H. R. 1334, 83d Congress, is undesirable and contrary to sound principles of equity and justice.

This is not to say that there may not in some cases be equities which warrant extending the statutory time limit. But any modification in the provisions of the Social Security Act that might be desirable to allow for such cases should, I believe, be made in the basic law and stated in general terms so as to be applicable to all persons similarly circumstanced, rather than requiring claimants who believe that they have such equities to seek individual relief through the process of private legislation, which is both burdensome and hazardous to the claimant and costly to the public. The revision of the Social Security Act approved today contains an amendment to the basic law which would afford an opportunity, not only to Mrs. Pfeifer but to all claimants similarly circumstanced, to become entitled to a lump-sum death payment under the Social Security Act upon showing good cause for the belated filing of an application.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1956.*

CITY OF ELKINS, W. VA.

S. 2182. I have withheld my approval from S. 2182, a bill for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va. This bill would relieve the city of Elkins of all liability to repay a $75,000 loan (and all unpaid accrued interest) which it received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The facts on this bill are clear. Under the World War II defense area landing program, the Federal Government undertook, under certain circumstances, to build airports for communities which would provide appropriate land. In July 1943 the city of Elkins agreed with the Civil Aeronautics Administration to furnish land for an airport. The United States Government agreed to pay the cost of constructing the airport. Elkins then applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and was granted a loan of $75,000 to purchase the land. The loan was evidenced by $75,000 of 4 percent airport revenue bonds issued by the city. The city has made no payment on principal and is now in default on bonds aggregating $24,000. Some interest payments have been made but the accrued and unpaid interest as of May 1, 1956, amounts to $22,400. Through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Government has expended over $1 million on the airport.

The issues involved in the bill are likewise clear:

1. The original agreement was and Elkins has received and will continue to receive benefits at least proportionate to its relatively small share of the airport's total cost.

2. The bill would give special treatment to a single community and thereby discriminate against other communities which built airports during World War II with Federal assistance. Of over 500 municipalities, representing every one of the 48 States, which entered into similar contracts with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the city of Elkins is the only one which applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan to finance the purchase. The proposed legislation would relieve the city from any obligation to repay the loan. Thus, in effect, the Federal Government would have both constructed the airport and provided the land. No other municipality has received such special treatment.

3. The bill would set a precedent which could be used by many other communities to urge cancellation of their obligations held by the Federal Government. In all, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made loans to over 6,000 municipalities and other public bodies. Of these, there are still outstanding 75 issues of municipal obligations totaling approximately $7 million. To relieve Elkins as provided in this bill would be to give that city a preference which was not given to any other city granted loans by the Corporation. Undoubtedly, special circumstances exist in many of the communities whose obligations remain unpaid. Testimony presented to the House Committee on the Judiciary suggests that the case for relief from their obligations might be as persuasive as in the case of Elkins. The precedent set by this bill could, moreover, adversely affect collections on loans to local governments under several other continuing Federal programs.

This bill involves one community and a relatively small amount of money; but it would establish undesirable principles and precedents affecting many other communities and many millions of dollars. I have, therefore, withheld my approval of S. 2182.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1956.*

DATE OF MEETING OF 85TH CONGRESS

S. J. Res. 203. On recommendation of the majority and minority leadership of both the Senate and House of Representatives, I am withholding my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 203, fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress. January 7, 1957, the date fixed in the resolution, is the date prescribed by law for the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President. I am informed that the Congress cannot conveniently count those votes on the same day that it assembles.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 8, 1956.*

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER BY SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

S. 3338. I have withheld my approval of S. 3338, an act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes.

The only purpose which this legislation could accomplish would be to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from fulfilling the obligations imposed upon him by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, to establish rate schedules which will return sufficient revenue to amortize the investment in Federal multiple-purpose projects allocated to power, and to pay the necessary costs incurred in operating and maintaining power projects. By its terms, S. 3338 grants a legislative moratorium which prevents any rate increases for power sold by the Southwestern Power Administration to any public body or cooperative until June 30, 1957. This would result in a loss of $2,167,000 revenue during the present fiscal year.

Sound management requires that the Federal Government fix rates for electric energy and power from Federal projects which will return the taxpayers' investment, with interest, within a reasonable period of time. Revenues from power sales by the Southwestern Power Administration in 1955 were not sufficient to pay even the interest on the portion of construction costs allocated to power. Furthermore, these revenues have been insufficient to provide any return of the capital investment in power facilities since 1953. Enactment of the bill will prevent the establishment of compensatory rates until July 1, 1957.

Fears have been expressed that the increased rates, which I am informed amount to approximately 40 cents per month for the average rural customer, proposed by the Department of the Interior will force upon preference customers—public agencies and cooperatives—the burden of absorbing the deficit in power revenues brought about by the delivery of power to a nonpreference customer under a 1952, 30-year contract at unrealistically low unit rates. However, the fact is that under the proposed schedule of rates, these preference customers will pay for power at rates determined upon the assumption that all power users must pay the rate necessary to retire the capital investment allocated to power on these multiple-purpose projects. The preference customers will not pay any of the deficit resulting, during the repayment period, from the 30-year contract.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1956.*

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS, WYOMING

S. 3941. I am withholding my approval of S. 3941, an act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the

State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming.

S. 3941 provides an additional period of time for the validation of mining claims held by certain specified persons in New Mexico and Wyoming, which could have been validated under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated thereunder solely because of the failure of the holders of the claims to take the necessary steps.

This bill was originally introduced as a general measure, but, after the Department of the Interior recommended that it not be enacted, it was amended so as to be a private relief bill. This was done because the Department of the Interior pointed out that S. 3941 was really of the nature of a private bill, and that, if the bill were amended along such lines, reasons justifying the special treatment of the specific claimants might, perhaps, be produced. Justification for such unusual treatment has not been shown. The 12 persons named in the bill as having claims in Wyoming justify their failure to validate their claims under the act of August 12, 1953, on the grounds that a search of the records at a land office failed to show the existence of an oil and gas lease at the time of the location of their claims. However, a more diligent search of those records subsequently revealed the existence of an oil and gas lease. One of the persons named in the bill as having a claim in New Mexico based his right upon the fact that a search of the records at a land office failed to show the existence of an oil and gas lease because there had been a delay in making entries in the land office records. There was no evidence that the claimant had taken all possible steps to ascertain the existence of an oil and gas lease. The information on the other three claims is limited.

Under the circumstances, I have no recourse but to withhold my approval of S. 3941. To approve S. 3941 would, I believe, establish an undesirable precedent, encouraging others to seek relief from laws of general applicability on expired mining claims.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1956.*

REPORT ENTITLED "SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF NICKEL" (S. REPT. NO. 2826)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1956,

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on August 1, 1956, submitted a report entitled "Supply and Distribution of Nickel," relating to the impact of the nickel shortage on small electroplaters, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT—1956" (S. REPT. NO. 2827)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1956,

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on August 1, 1956, submitted a report entitled "Government Procurement—1956," relating to small business participation in Government procurement, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES", BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2828)

Under authority of the order of July 27, 1956,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, on August 14, 1956, submitted a report of that committee entitled "Summary of Activities", which was ordered to be printed.

INTERIM REPORT ON CONTROL AND REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 2829)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 23, 1956,

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on September 7, 1956, pursuant to Senate resolution 93, 84th Congress, 1st session, as extended, submitted an interim report on Control and Reduction of Armaments, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "SELECTED MATERIALS ON THE ECONOMY OF THE SOUTH" (S. REPT. NO. 2830)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1956,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, on October 5, 1956, submitted a report entitled "Selected Materials on the Economy of the South", which was ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENTS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 27, 1956,

The Vice President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment, made appointments to the following commissions and joint and special committees authorized by law or resolution of the Senate:

To the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space: Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HRUSKA.

To the Senate Office Building Commission: Mr. JOHNSON OF TEXAS and Mr. KERR.

To the Joint Committee to represent Congress at the ceremonies in connection with the unveiling of the statute of Commodore John Barry at Wexford, Ireland, on September 16, 1956: Mr. MALONE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. FREAR, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. LAIRD.

To the United States Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. THYE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. CURTIS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1956

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that on this closing day of the 84th Congress, our President, our Speaker, and every Member of this legislative body and all of us as officers, clerks, reporters, secretaries, pages, and employees, in whatever capacity, may be grateful for having had the privilege of walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

May we have within our minds and hearts the testimony that we have sought to discharge our duties with a pure and steadfast devotion and have aspired to be worthy of receiving the benediction of Thy peace and the diadem of Thy praise, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

We are commending and committing one another to Thy love and care, beseeching Thee that daily we may go forth in the joy and strength of doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with the Lord, our God.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 19, 1956:

H. R. 10075. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the town of Bald Knob, Ark.;

H. R. 10204. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain land to Richard M. Tinney and John T. O'Connor, Jr.;

H. R. 11873. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate delay in the start of projects; and

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 20, 1956:

H. R. 6501. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserve mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States;

H. R. 8817. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the city of Corbin, Ky.;

H. R. 9106. An act for the relief of Saul Lehman;

H. R. 9137. An act to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.;

H. R. 9339. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Union County, Ga., for lands within the Chattahoochee National Forest, Ga., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9451. An act to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Seminole Indians and to provide that certain lands shall be designated as a reservation for Seminole Indians;

H. R. 9500. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended, until July 1, 1957;

H. R. 9578. An act to provide for the conveyance of an interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Colorado;

H. R. 9774. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.;

H. R. 10479. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the county of Galveston, Tex.;

H. R. 11163. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 58), authorizing the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11375. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to further extend the special school milk program to certain institutions for the care and training of children;

H. R. 11402. An act to extend the existing application of the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941, as amended, to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11520. An act to provide for the transfer of certain property situated in the State of Maine to the town of Castine, Maine;

H. R. 11611. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pea Ridge National Military Park, in the State of Arkansas; and

H. R. 11683. An act to authorize permanent appointments in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

On July 23, 1956:

H. R. 9801. An act to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.

On July 24, 1956:

H. R. 483. An act to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy;

H. R. 842. An act granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1403. An act for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.;

H. R. 2111. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to cause to be published official registers for their respective services;

H. R. 2854. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties, applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government;

H. R. 3733. An act for the relief of Charles A. Barron;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Onie Hack;

H. R. 5566. An act to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5838. An act to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range;

H. R. 5868. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude I. Keep;

H. R. 6729. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint certain former members of the Navy and Marine Corps to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, as may be appropriate, and thereafter transfer such members to the appropriate retired list;

H. R. 7190. An act restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7380. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities;

H. R. 7611. An act to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander;

H. R. 7646. An act to authorize the secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation;

H. R. 7943. An act to change the name of the Government locks at Ballard, Wash., to the "Hiram M. Chittenden locks";

H. R. 8005. An act to provide for the conveyance to the Mathew American Horse American Legion Post No. 259, Cannon Ball, N. Dak., of certain lands upon the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., for use as a site for the erection of a memorial monument in honor of members of the Armed Forces killed in battle;

H. R. 8290. An act to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8407. An act to require enlisted members of the Armed Forces to make up time lost during enlistments;

H. R. 8898. An act to provide an additional authorization of appropriations for the purchase by the Secretary of Agriculture under the act of May 11, 1938, of lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah;

H. R. 9246. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by authorizing payments to survivors of former members for unused leave credit;

H. R. 9333. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide for hedging anticipated requirements of processors and manufacturers;

H. R. 9892. An act to amend the provisions of the Revised Statutes, relating to physical examinations preliminary to promotion of officers of the naval service;

H. R. 10010. An act for the relief of Roy Click;

H. R. 10011. An act for the relief of Jess Gary;

H. R. 10199. An act for the relief of A. O. Nissen and Don Nissen;

H. R. 10375. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide recognition for meritorious service by members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1929;

H. R. 10683. An act to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder;

H. R. 10964, An act to provide for municipal use of storage water in Benbrook Dam, Tex.;

H. R. 11320. An act to effect the control of narcotics and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11346. An act for the relief of Camillus Bothwell Jeter;

H. R. 11488. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

H. R. 11530. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Harold LeRoy Allen;

H. R. 11995. An act to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1956;

H. J. Res. 626. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 638. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain fiances of United States citizens.

On July 25, 1956:

H. R. 2603. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside;

H. R. 4456. An act for the relief of Corp. Oscar H. Mash, Jr.;

H. R. 5265. An act to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons;

H. R. 5853. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1957;

H. R. 9593. An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10368. An act to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10670. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia;

H .R. 11077. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11766. An act to provide for the establishment of the Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, in the State of Alabama; and

H. J. Res. 621. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

On July 26, 1956:

H. R. 7723. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.;

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the act of April 1, 1942, so as to permit the transfer of an action from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the municipal court for the District of Columbia, at any time prior to trial thereof, if it appears that such action will not justify a judgment in excess of $3,000;

H. R. 9038. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be treated as a State for purposes of district court jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship;

H. R. 9742. An act to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refugee, Ga., against damage from fire and drought;

H. R. 10285. An act to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11010. An act creating the Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Missippi River at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill.; and

H. R. 12237. An act to encourage and assist the States in the establishment of State committees on education beyond the high school, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton; and

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 6856. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 9083. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2663. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3517. An act to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

S. 3957. An act to amend the act authorizing the exchange and amendment of certain farm units in order to limit the time during which applications may be made under such act;

S. 4284. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation; and

S. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alberta Bernard;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration; and

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3467) entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. BARRETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments in disagreement to the above-entitled bill and requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4164) to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I announce to the House, in view of the fact that there are two very important bills on the atomic energy program which are scheduled for action by the House and have not been considered by the House, that until those bills are considered by the House I shall object to any unanimous-consent requests for legislative action. Therefore I object, Mr. Speaker.

THE LATE HONORABLE W. RANDOLPH CARPENTER

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret I announce to the House the death of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Randolph Carpenter, of Topeka, Kans.

Randolph Carpenter was my predecessor in the House. He served during a 4-year period, having been elected in 1932 and 1934. He did not seek reelection at the end of his second term.

Randolph Carpenter was born and reared in Marion, Kans., where he resided until 2 years ago when he moved to Topeka and became associated with the Columbian Title and Trust Co. of that place.

Mr. Carpenter served for a term as United States district attorney for Kansas. He also served as a member of important Federal commissions and boards.

Mr. Carpenter was a lawyer by profession. He was widely known. He was highly respected. He was regarded as being outstanding in the ethics of his profession.

During his term in Congress, Mr. Carpenter won the friendship and confidence of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. He was one of the hard-working, earnest Members of this body. Party lines made no difference to Randolph Carpenter when the decision was with respect to the best interests of his country. He served with honor as a member of the Armed Forces. He likewise served with honor as a Member of the Congress.

Mr. Carpenter had those qualities that go to make up a real statesman. He had a deep sense of justice. He was a Christian gentleman.

To Mrs. Carpenter and the children, we extend our deepest sympathy.

Death is only an old door
Set in a garden wall.
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk,
When the thrushes call.

Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still.
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.

There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door
In an old wall.

CUMULATIVE VOTING

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill this morning amending the National Banking Act on the subject of cumulative voting, proxy solicitation, and removal of directors.

My main purpose in doing so is to focus attention upon these very important matters which should receive the attention of the next Congress.

In the meantime, there should be full and complete discussion of these subjects, pro and con. Requests by interested parties to be heard should be addressed to the Banking and Currency Commitees of both Houses.

I have incorporated in my bill some of the amendments that had been sought to be offered to S. 256. I have no pride of authorship, nor do I insist that my bill is perfect.

I am hopeful that the best thinking of the country can be brought to bear on the various parts of the bill, so as to bring forth a really satisfactory piece of legislation that will give the utmost protection to all concerned.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, to include his remarks in the Appendix, to include a report to his constituents and extraneous matter and tabulations.

ELECTION OF HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON AS JUDGE

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to wish further success to our most distinguished colleague, the Honorable IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, who represents the 20th Congressional District of the State of New York.

I know that the entire membership of this great body is fully aware of the great legislative contributions he has made to the citizens of this country.

Congressman DAVIDSON has again been called upon by the people of the State of New York to continue his distinguished public service.

Upon the conclusion of his present term, he shall stand for election as a judge of the New York Court of General Sessions. I have no doubt of the successful outcome of his campaign, for the people of New York for many years have been fully cognizant of his sterling and unmatched qualities and will elect him to that high office by an overwhelming vote.

The citizens of New York are to be congratulated for their good fortune and wisdom in choosing Congressman DAVIDSON to be a judge of one of their most important tribunals. He will bring to that court his fine character, his wide experience, his profound knowledge of the law, and his unflagging desire to help his fellow man. These qualities were evidenced for many years during his service in the Legislature of the State of New York and as a judge in its courts.

It has been a distinct privilege for me to serve with Congressman DAVIDSON. I join with you in wishing Godspeed and good health to him and his wonderful family.

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the 84th Congress I want to pay tribute to the American Indians of the United States and Alaska and to the churches of America for their intensive mission studies and their interest in legislation for American Indians. I also want to speak of a great organization, the National Congress of American Indians.

In a deeply sincere gesture of appreciation last week, American Indians invited the Members of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Indian Affairs to a breakfast to express their great thanks to the United States Congress for passing H. R. 5566, the bill to extend the life of the Indian Claims Commission for 5 years without any crippling amendments. Indians from all over the United States and Alaska made this gesture through their organization—the National Congress of American Indians. Also, this weekend, the Otoe and Missouri Tribes, in my State of Oklahoma, are conducting a special ceremonial to thank and honor all the officials who have had a part in making possible their day in court and the final determination of their claim against the United States Government. I know that the Indian people want every member of the Congress to know of their appreciation.

In the many opportunities I have to work and eat with Indian tribes—and indeed it is a genuine Indian custom to eat together on joyous and important occasions—I have felt humbled by their qualities of generosity, reason, and patience. At our breakfast, a few days ago, though, I also felt guilty for myself and for the Congress in which I am privileged to be a Member, that we had not accomplished more in behalf of these generous and patient citizens of ours. I had tried hard on general education and sanitation bills in addition to supporting smaller measures—but surely I could have done more. I thought then of the many hours we have all spent to enact technical assistance programs for underdeveloped countries in other parts of the world, while our American Indians ask and wait patiently for this Nation to get around to a similar program for them.

But at that breakfast meeting, I also felt new hope for the American Indians not only because the life of the Indian Claims Commission had been extended but because the occasion invited one who has lived close to the Indians to notice the progress of the Indians in building an effective national organization. And I think in the closing hours of the Congress many of my colleagues in the Indian subcommittees will want to join me in paying tribute to the impressive growth in effectiveness and responsibility in the National Congress of American Indians. From the founding convention in Denver, Colo., in 1944, with only about a hundred Indians coming from 34 tribes but speaking only as individuals, the organization has grown to represent officially about 150,000, almost half of the American Indians in the United States and Alaska as represented in its tribal membership voted by the official governing bodies of the Indian tribes. Most of the Indian tribes with significant landholdings have officially voted tribal membership or financial support to the national Congress of American Indians. It was a rare privilege for me to address and observe the 1954 convention of this organization and I was then impressed and humbled by the patience of the delegates to this meeting. The seriousness with which they discussed issues, the courtesy with whch they heard all their delegates out, the patience with which they continued their discussions until understanding and agreement came about gave me deep respect for their official actions and resolutions.

A distinguished leader in this effort by the Indian people to forge a responsible national organization, to give voice to Indian concerns, has been the chief justice of my own State, the Honorable N. B. Johnson of Claremore, who served as the NCAI's first president and was reelected 8 successive years. Another distinguished Oklahoman, W. W. Short, served as the second president, preceding the current president, Joseph R. Garry, great-great-grandson of the great Chief Spokane-Garry. It was 20 tribes of Oklahoma under the leadership of Robert Goombi, chairman of the Kiowa-Comanche-Kiowa Apaches, who joined in designating NCAI's executive director, Mrs. Helen L. Peterson, Oglala Sioux, as "Outstanding Indian Citizen of 1955" last summer at the Anadarko, Okla., Indian Exposition. Other distinguished Oklahomans who are helping to make NCAI a unique contribution and a credit to the Nation as well as to the Indian people are numerous Indian attorneys, tribal officials, and Will Rogers, Jr.; Allie Reynolds; Maria Tallchief; and

W. W. Keeler. It is the hope of many of us that this all-Indian national organization will bring its annual convention to Oklahoma in 1957 to help us observe our 50th anniversary as a State. I cannot help but point with pride to the fine contributions of Oklahoma Indians in building a needed national Indian organization, just as they have contributed so richly to other areas of our national life.

By means of the recent breakfast, the Otoe-Missouri celebration to be held tomorrow, and in many other ways, American Indians have thanked us in the United States Congress for doing what we must acknowledge was no more than our duty. I believe many of my colleagues will want to join me in returning thanks to the American Indian people for their patience with our slowness, in extending them our congratulations for effective, responsible and impressive work done by their national organization in the 84th Congress just ending, and a pledge that we shall increase our efforts in their behalf in the years to come and that we welcome their ideas and participation in an accelerated Federal program to improve the conditions of the American Indian people.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Abbitt	Eberharter	Patman
Allen, Ill.	Evins	Phillips
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Pilcher
Anfuso	Gamble	Powell
Bailey	Gordon	Preston
Barden	Gray	Priest
Bass, N. H.	Healey	Prouty
Bass, Tenn.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Hillings	Richards
Blatnik	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Riley
Boggs	Holt	Rivers
Bolton, Frances P.	Hosmer	Robeson, Va.
Bowler	Jackson	Rutherford
Boykin	James	Scudder
Brooks, La.	Jennings	Sheehan
Brooks, Tex.	Jensen	Shelley
Burleson	Johansen, Kelley, Pa.	Short
Carnahan	Kilburn	Siler
Celler	Lane	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Latham	Smith, Va.
Christopher	Long	Taylor
Clevenger	McCormack	Thompson, La.
Coudert	McDonough	Thornberry
Davis, Ga.	McDowell	Tuck
Dies	Mollohan	Vinson
Diggs	Morrison	Vursell
Dowdy	Nelson	Wainwright
Doyle	O'Hara, Minn.	Wickersham
	Passman	Wilson, Calif.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the quorum call which terminated a few minutes ago, may I make a statement because I was not personally present before the time to answer "present" expired. I was on the floor actually during the second rollcall, but I was called to the long-distance phone off the floor to answer a matter of serious illness in California and that conversation on the long-distance phone had not terminated in time for me to get back and actually answer "present."

THE GENTLEMAN FROM NORTH CAROLINA, MR. BONNER

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I read in the Washington Post a long letter on the editorial page over the signature of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, our good colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. This letter outlined the circumstances under which the so-called tanker bill passed the House, and I thought in fairness to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] I would like to insert it in the RECORD so that all Members could read this statement of facts. However, I found that the letter had already been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and accordingly I take this means of urging all Members to be sure to read it.

At this time I would like to express my admiration for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. He has been a very fair chairman of the committee on which I have had the privilege of serving. I have noted a previous statement by him to the effect that all legislation having to do with helping the merchant marine must of necessity help some individual steamship operator. At the same time, the chairman has never pushed legislation which benefits his own district, but has always given equal opportunity to all of us on the committee to have full consideration and hearings on our own bills.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly mindful that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] was receptive to an amendment proposed by me, and which has been incorporated in all recent bills reported from the committee having to do with the sale of ships. This is an amendment requiring competitive bidding with a minimum price.

I further wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that he has never permitted partisanship to play any part in the activities of this great committee which has been so active and which has done so much for the merchant marine during the 84th Congress. It seems to me that it would be particularly unfortunate if a Member of Congress who has done so much for an industry which is vital to the defense of our Nation were unfairly criticized, as in the case of the so-called tanker bill. I think most unjustly our colleague was criticized in the editorial columns of a local newspaper. I for one as a member of his committee and representing a different political party have come to admire and respect our colleague, as do all the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who have had such a good opportunity to observe our chairman during the past 2 years.

The American people and Members of this Congress have every reason to be indebted to a great committee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we have a very unusual procedure here this morning. For the first time in many years, the Senate has recommitted a conference report and sent it back to the House. After an extended conference between the managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate in which the bill was examined in detail, item by item, and a complete agreement reached and approved by the conferees, the conference report was taken up and agreed to in the House and sent across to the other body. Thereupon the other body soundly spanked its conferees, repudiated their agreement, threw the conference report in the ashcan and came over here and wanted their chips back. In the future, when invited to a conference, we should make preliminary inquiries as to whether this is a game for keeps or merely a preseason game.

We took for granted this was a Rose Bowl game. They sent in their top team including a couple of presidential possibilities, and we sent over a second-string lineup. It was a full, free, fair conference held under the Queensbury rules and when it was over they shook hands with us and every Senate conferee signed on the dotted line.

Now this morning they come back and say, "You fellows outmaneuvered our boys and we are going to play the game over again."

It must be conceded that while it was our scrub team we did have 1 or 2 good men with us. For example, there was JOHN TABER, one of the best fullbacks that ever stopped an end run for the United States Treasury. And there was MIKE KIRWAN. MIKE KIRWAN is all-American on any man's team.

The astonishing feature of the fracas is that all the turmoil and the repudiation of a complete agreement and a signed conference report was occasioned by two minor items in the bill—the strategic minerals item and the Coast Guard patrol item. The first was to compel the United States to buy and stockpile tungsten and other minerals for which "there is no market." Strangely enough it was advocated by some of the boys who bitterly criticized the stockpiling of butter, cotton, and corn for which "there is no market."

The other item, which was the real bug under the rug, was a proposition to send gunboats down to start a war with Mexican fishermen. The fishing grounds

are outside the 3-mile limit in extraterritorial waters and if there is any problem there it is for the attention of the State Department and not the Treasury Department. We took up this matter with the departmental staff and the Coast Guard command last night and they assure us there has been no request for additional boats, no estimate by the Bureau of the Budget and that they are neither needed nor wanted. But the managers from the other House insist on appropriating $9 million for them.

That is what this tempest in a teapot is all about.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It might be interesting to the House to know that it would take a year and a half for those boats to be built.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. We were told it would take 18 months to build them.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman knows that the Coast Guard itself did not look with favor on this proposition. They were not behind this proposition in any way.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to have the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey comment on the item. He has been on that subcommittee for many years and he and Mr. GARY know more about the Coast Guard and its needs than anyone else in Washington. I talked to the Secretary last night, and he quoted the Admiral as saying they did not need them and did not want them.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the situation brought about by the rejection of the conference report, in the other body, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] objects.

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 625 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes, and at the conclusion of my remarks I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

House Resolution 625 makes in order the consideration of S. 3338. The resolution provides for an open rule, 1 hour of debate, and waives points of order against the committee amendments now in the bill.

The bill as passed by the Senate would have been applicable to all areas of the country and not just to the Southwest Power Administration area. The bill as amended by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee provides that the rates for power and energy marketed by the Southwest Power Administration shall not be revised before July 1, 1957; it would require that the incremental method of cost allocation be used as the basis in arriving at the schedule of rates for the sale of electric power and energy marketed by the Southwest Power Administration, and further authorizes and directs that the Secretary of the Interior renegotiate existing contracts between nonpreference customers and the Southwest Power Administration so as to provide that the rates of electric power and energy to these customers would be charged uniformly with any change of rates to preference customers.

I urge prompt action by the House on the resolution so we may proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when the bill which this resolution will make in order was presented to the Committee on Rules, there appeared to be many areas of reasonable doubt about the wisdom of passing the Senate bill S. 3338 this late in the session. There was considerable opposition voiced in the hearing which the Committee on Rules held on the bill. I think if I could have my own way about it, which, of course, I do not, I would suggest that this bill be put over until the next session so that a longer and more complete study could be made and action could be taken on it in a calmer atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, I have several requests for time on this side, and at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this bill places Congress in the position of the father of an erring son who, when the son announces his intention to abandon a life of crime, urges the boy to continue in his evil ways.

For years the Southwestern Power Administration has been the most extreme example of bureaucratic disregard of the congressional mandate on electric power ratemaking.

Now the Department of the Interior proposes to correct this long-standing abuse, and the Congress is asked to prevent the reform.

The most specific statement of Federal power policy is found in the Flood Control Act of 1944 which provides, with respect to rates, that—

> Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required for the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rate to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission.

The heart of that provision of law is the requirement that rates be consistent with sound business principles.

The record shows that sound business principles are not and have never been a consideration in the rate proposals of the Southwestern Power Administration until, as I have indicated, the Department of the Interior recently announced its intention to seek a revision in the rate schedules.

The present rate schedules, approved in 1946 as a temporary measure, are based upon the value of power in the area as estimated by the Federal Power Commission in 1946.

The time has long since passed when this temporary schedule should have been replaced with a regular schedule recognizing the various elements of sound business principles which are basic to electric power rates.

It has not been done earlier, as the FPC directed, because the Southwestern Power Administration until 1953 fought against the application of sound business principles and the controversy prevented the submission of an acceptable rate schedule to the FPC.

The SPA attitude toward ratemaking has ignored sound business principles in at least the following categories, and perhaps others:

First. Cost allocation.

Second. Amortization.

Third. Charge for the use of money.

Fourth. Value of power and actual project income as compared with preconstruction representations.

With regard to cost allocation, the Jones subcommitee in 1952 found that the SPA consistently attempted to allocate costs so that the least possible share of project cost would be attributed to power features.

Legislation with regard to two of the projects concerned—Denison and Norfolk—required the use of the incremental method of cost allocation. Legislative history on the remaining projects did not specify the method of cost allocation. The Jones subcommittee found that SPA varied the method of cost allocation from project to project, not in regard to the actual physical circumstances of the project, but solely with

the view of producing the lowest possible figure.

The report of the Jones subcommittee contains tables showing both the SPA's manipulated cost allocations and the cost allocations figured by the Corps of Engineers, which were generally acceptable to the Federal Power Commission. SPA figures show only about 54 percent of the cost that the Corps allocated to power purposes. The intention and the result, if SPA figures were accepted, would be lower power rates and a greater subsidy to power users in this favored area.

The Department of the Interior has now entered into agreement with other agencies concerned to adopt a uniform method of cost allocation, referred to as the separable costs, remaining benefits method. This method comes as near as possible to conforming to sound business principles.

The Department of the Interior proposes to incorporate this system of cost allocation in the new rate schedule for SPA. It would mean an increase of one-third mill in the present rate. This is part of the increase—part of the sound business—that the pending measure seeks to set aside.

Costs which actually belong to power should not be allocated to functions presently treated as nonreimbursable. Anything else constitutes a giveaway of the tax dollars of all of the people of the United States as a subsidy in the power bills of the people in a favored area.

The Senate measure was bad insofar as it would have postponed indefinitely the application of a sound cost allocation to the projects of the SPA.

The House measure is infinitely worse in that it has amendments which would require that the allocation be based on the incremental method, thus making it impossible to conform to the sound business principle represented by the separable costs remaining benefits formula.

Computations of the Corps of Engineers published in the Jones subcommittee report to which I have referred show that the incremental cost method recommended in this bill would result in charges to power of $328,688,180, while the use of the separable costs remaining benefit formula show charges for power of $436,663,720.

I do not believe there is any justification in the legislative history, other than on Denison and Norfolk, for the Committee's airy assumption that the dams would have been built for flood control in any case and that power is only a secondary consideration. Use of the incremental method can be justified only when it is clearly indicated throughout the history of the project that the function concerned is indeed only an incident to the main purpose, or when the function, such as power features, are added subsequent to original authorization.

Going further, we are concerned with amortization of project costs as they relate to sound business principles. It seems to me that amortization under the sinking-fund method now used by Federal agencies is not in accord with sound business principles. This method of amortization results in equal annual payments for the sum of amortization and interest on unamortized balances on the assumption that the income from the power project will continue at the same estimated annual rate throughout the entire period of amortization.

This procedure is faulty for several reasons.

First, the assumption that any Federal hydroelectric power project will be able to enjoy the same annual income over a period of 50 years is hardly justified in view of the developments in nuclear energy with which all of us are familiar.

Second, the sinking-fund method results in only a minor repayment during the lifetime of that generation of taxpayers which had advanced the funds for the project.

A procedure more in accord with sound business principles would be that method of amortization which requires equal annual repayments of the Federal investment—not equal annual payment of the sum or amortization and interest on balances. This would result in a more rapid payoff during the early years of the project when income is most certain, a fair return to the taxpayers who actually advanced the funds, and a diminishing burden on the project and hence on its customers in the later years of the payout period.

This is not the primary consideration, however, with respect to the amortization problem in the bill. Here we have a project that is not paying out. For the past 3 years it has failed to pay even the full amount of interest due, and we are told that it is falling some $2,500,000 short of paying the interest each year.

This means that under the present rate schedule, even when additional facilities overcome the present deficit, the project cannot pay out in 50 years. Adoption of the new rate schedules, which this bill seeks to prevent, would provide a 50-year payout period. Thus the bill presents the issue very clearly: should we hold to the long-established practice of requiring a 50-year repayment on projects of this nature?

SPA has long envisioned evasion of the law requiring a 50-year payout. The figures it made available to the Jones subcommittee in 1952 were based on a payout of 100 years' duration. This prolonged period, plus the manipulated cost allocations I have already mentioned, permitted SPA to recommend a charge for power less than one-half of the charge considered reasonable by the Corps of Engineers. Sound business principles never entered into the SPA calculations. The sole consideration was a low power rate.

This kind of thinking is still dear to the hearts of southwestern power beneficiaries, and the hearings developed that a payout period of at least 78 years is now contemplated by the proponents of this measure.

The 78-year period is based on a study that takes into account the effect of new power facilities to be added in the year 2010.

To me it is highly dangerous to assume, as I have said, that hydroelectric power will yield reliable revenues, in competition with the probable development of nuclear energy, even for the next 50 years. In fact, I would not want to bet on hydroelectric power in competition with the present methods of steam generation using low-cost coal resources. To expect that we can depend upon repayment from hydro projects over a period of 78 years is reckless. To base a decision today upon the possible installation of new hydro plants in the year 2010 is visionary.

Entirely aside from the violation of sound business principles, let me add that I consider it immoral to require that future generations of power users, 78 years from now, should be required to pay for electric power that is operating farms, factories, and the household conveniences of today.

A third consideration is the proper charge for the use of money advanced for the project, and this means money that comes either from Federal borrowing or from taxes, either of which is a responsibility of all Americans.

A fundamental sound business principle is that money is not loaned for less than the cost of money to the lender. Any other practice would lead to bankruptcy. Further, I think it is a sound business principle that the charge for the use of the money should begin on the day the first advance is made. By this I mean, as the Corps of Engineers has agreed, that interest should be paid during the period of construction. SPA calculations have not included interest during the period of construction. This is another device by which SPA has sought to justify a lower power rate than the facts and sound business principles would permit.

Finally, as I have pointed out heretofore, no sound business would tolerate a condition under which preauthorization or preconstruction estimates are forgotten as soon as they have served their purpose of helping to bring the project into being. This, unfortunately, is a common practice of Federal development agencies.

In the case at hand, actual construction costs have been 79 percent greater than the preconstruction estimates of the SPA.

This increase in construction costs, plus the use of the new cost allocation formula I have mentioned, brings the cost of the power facilities to something like 83 percent greater than SPA's original estimates.

It is apparent that rates based on these original estimates are entirely unrelated to the actual cost of the power, as they must be also to the value of the power.

These actual costs should be reflected in the rate at which the power is sold. At present they are not so reflected. The proposed revised rate schedule, which this legislation proposes to postpone or set aside, would be based on the actual costs, and would account for about 2.2 mills of the 2.5-mill increase proposed.

Summing up, we have a situation where the clear mandate of Congress has been ignored for the past decade. During all of this time the Southwestern Power Administration has operated as a

subsidized utility serving a limited number of customers in a favored area at the expense of all of the other taxpayers of the United States. Sound business principles have not been considered.

The Department of the Interior now proposes a new rate schedule, some 4 years overdue, in which recognition is given at least to sound principles of cost allocation, period of amortization, and actual construction cost. This is a trend that should be encouraged. It is a good beginning toward cleaning up a bad situation in the Southwest. Yet we are asked to freeze the present unrealistic rate and continue the burden on the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should mention that this is actually of small moment to the customers of Southwestern Power Administration. The effect of the new rate schedule would mean an increase of only about 40 cents per month to the average farm user of SPA energy.

It is of great importance, however, not only in dollars and cents but in principle as well, to all the taxpayers of the country who, until this time, have realized almost no return on their investment in this complex of dams and transmission lines and who will be forced to continue to pay a part of the electric power bill of every SPA consumer if a freeze is instituted.

This is a giveaway if ever I saw one. The tax dollars of every American are being given away to benefit a favored few.

I find no justification whatever for passage of this bill.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a considerable amount of interest to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. These are the same arguments which were made against this bill both in the hearings which were held over in the other body and also in the House committee and those arguments were rejected by committees which have studied this particular legislation for several good and sufficient reasons.

There are three clear and compelling reasons why this legislation, which would defer a suggested increase in rates for the preference customers of the Southwestern Power Administration for about 11 months, should be granted by the Congress.

In the first place, this legislation seeks to prevent an unfair rate increase proposal which raises the rates of Southwestern Power only in regard to the preference customers. Under examination before the committee, Assistant Secretary Aandahl was asked the direct question as to whether or not he had also proposed to increase the rates of the private power companies who, incidentally, receive a very large percentage of the power supplied by the Southwestern Power Administration. He stated that he had no intention of seeking a rate increase for the power companies, even though under the figures supplied by the Department of the Interior these rates also are below the rate necessary to secure an actual return on the investment at the present time. He was asked whether he had any intention to secure an increase in the rate of the power being supplied through the Arkansas Light & Power Co. to the Reynolds Aluminum Co. in Arkansas, which receives the entire production of electricity of one of the dams in the Southwestern Power Administration area. He stated before the committees that he was bound by a contract which, in all fairness, was entered into back before this administration, and he felt he was unable to raise the power supplied to the Reynolds Aluminum Co. Now the rates which the Reynolds Aluminum Co. enjoys and is going to enjoy, under the contract with SPA and Arkansas Light & Power for some time, are substantially below in the average cost of power now being charged to the preference customers which is proposed to be raised under the Department of the Interior proposal. So we say, first of all, it is unfair to come out of the Department of the Interior with an increase of rates to the REA's and the small communities without also seeking, through negotiation or otherwise, an increase in rates to the private power companies and to the nonpreference users of this power.

In the second place, we say it is also unfair to invoke arbitrarily a new method of allocating costs, when the only congressional direction that has been supplied on this matter in the Southwestern Power area is a direction that the incremental cost method be used. The gentleman from Ohio was fair enough in his remarks to say that there are two instances in the legislative history of this power where the Congress has said that the incremental method shall be used. There are no instances with regard to any other dam constructed where Congress said that any method but the incremental method should be used.

The importance of that is this: If we switch over to this new cost allocation method, there will be an increase in the rates. We say if they do not propose to increase those rates for Reynolds and the private companies, then manifestly it is unfair to switch over to a new allocation method and raise the rates for the REA and the consumers in that area.

Now, there is a final reason and a most compelling, important reason, and that is that in this 7-State area the States have been suffering for a period of 3 or 4 years from an acute drought that has been recognized by the White House in the declaration that it is an economically distressed area. We have had great losses of crops, forced liquidation of our cattle herds throughout that area, and we have had a great loss in farm prosperity, and the burden of this proposed rate increase is going to fall upon the consumers and the farmers and the customers of the REA in that disaster area. The rate increase described to you by the gentleman from Ohio as only one-third of a mill is actually an increase from 5.6 mills to an average rate of 7.7 mills, which is almost a 40-percent increase in the rates, and an increase of more than 2 mills that is being proposed actually in this proposal.

Now, in all fairness, we have here a history of acute drought, of great economic distress that is recognized by the White House as an area of economic distress, and I think in fairness to the Secretary of the Interior it should be pointed out that when our committee chairmen from both bodies asked that he withhold sending this request over to the Federal Power Commission for a period of time to permit this study, he readily agreed withholding sending over the rate increase.

I believe he did that because he also recognizes the emergency character of the situation in those States. Let me dwell on one further point.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] said that this places the Congress in the position of a father to an erring son, and he says that Southwestern Power Administration for many years has been operating without regard to sound business principles. The fact of the matter is that the figures show that from the year 1945 until the year 1953 there was a retirement on investment in Southwest Power Administration operations in each of those 9 years. Only in the last 3 years—1954, 1955, and 1956—when we had this terrible drought strike that area do the actual figures show that there is a deficit operation.

It would be unconscionable if this Congress refused to give the relief that is being sought by these farmers and these REA customers. I think it would be unconscionable if this Congress permitted a rate increase for these REA's and for these farmers when no rate increase is even being considered for the private power companies and for Reynolds Aluminum on the very fine rates that they enjoy.

We do not ask a preferential or a special position for the REA's or for the municipalities who enjoy this status of preference customers. But we do say that they are entitled to fair and equal treatment and that they should not be penalized in a time of economic distress.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I hope the bill S. 3338 will be supported by my colleagues on this side. I hope the rule will be adopted so we can support the bill.

I will say this in all frankness to my colleagues, that when the bill first came before the committee of which I am a member I opposed it vigorously for two reasons. First, the bill as it came from the other body proposed to freeze rates in all of these power areas—Pacific Northwest, TVA, all of the areas—for an indefinite period of time. It affected all the areas. I opposed it then because I said it would affect the feasibility of every irrigation project in the 17 Western States. Some committee amendments will be presented here this morning which were agreed to on both sides of the aisle.

Second. I opposed the bill because it froze rates for an indefinite period.

This bill now will be limited only to Southwest Power and for a period until June 30, 1957. So with those amendments in the bill I can support it.

The reason Southwest Power is in difficulty—and I am referring to that part of the report of the committee which

covers that—is this: First, the estimated total cost has risen 79 percent above the original estimate. So you are operating Southwest Power under some temporary rates, and with costs going up 79 percent it is true that Southwest Power failed this last year by $2,700,000 of even paying the interest. But that was due to the fact that these costs are so much higher than we had expected them to go.

So the bill that will be presented to you ought to be adopted so we may have a further study of all rates. I hope that our committee or some committee of Congress can make a further study of some of these electric light rates in these power areas.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] spoke about the power rates to the aluminum companies. In my opinion, one reason they lack enough money to pay interest is because these aluminum companies are getting large blocks of secondary power for 1¼ mills; yes, I said 1¼ mills. They call it secondary power or dump power, but I will tell you that they use it as firm power; while the REA's and the preference customers must pay about 5.4 mills for this power.

Some of these contracts with the private power companies were entered into for a period of 30 years, and, if I read the contract correctly, it is not subject to review. So you can understand that large blocks of power sold at 1.2 mills per kilowatt just cannot help but add to the deficit. The private companies have a contract, running for 30 years, of electric energy at less than the cost of production. The REA's are penalized because of the preference treatment given private industry. It does not make sense to me that we let a long-term contract made under a previous administration continue under these circumstances. There is a group investigating power rates. Here is a very fertile field.

More than half of the power produced at Bonneville in the Northwest is sold at less than 2 mills, yet the preference customers, the REA's pay between 5 and 6 mills for that same power. So there ought to be a review.

I hope we can support this bill and go forward. If the rates are to be raised, there ought to be some way found to raise the aluminum company rate, not 1¼ mills for secondary power, but to a point where we will have a decent return for this power and not load all of it onto the REA's.

Then, as has been said before, this is a drought area. I think there is some reason to extend it because of the economic distress that is going on in this area. When farmers have no income they cannot meet their bills. Therefore, I hope that the House will support the bill. I hope the amendment will be adopted, because it ought not to refer to any other area than the Southwestern Power Administration. If it is going to refer permanently to all districts, then it would be bad legislation and I could not support it, because I am sure it would make unfeasible irrigation power projects and cause additional trouble for the Federal Power Commission and those charged with seeing that these projects pay back the money they borrow at a reasonable rate of interest. I think they are behind $8 million in this area. Most of that is due to the fact that long-term contracts have been let to the power companies at very cheap rates, less than the cost of production. We are absolutely subsidizing the large aluminum companies and private industry with the money of taxpayers all over the country, then trying to load the rest of it onto the REA's. Let us adopt this bill and take another look at it when the next Congress comes in session. In my humble judgment the power contracts with the private companies violate the Flood Control Act of 1944 because they violate the preference clause which allocates Federal power to preference customers such as the REA's and municipalities.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I speak to you on this rule asking not for charity, not for sympathy, but for plain, simple justice. I have enough faith in the good judgment of this House to believe that they are going to do the just thing.

We are in an area in the Southwest where there is a drought situation. Ninety percent of the power of the hydroelectric projects in our area is sold to the power companies at an average rate something like 2.8. It is then resold by them to the rural electric cooperatives at 5.6.

The Southwestern Power Administration has paid its way. Every cooperative in my district, and I have five, was meeting its payments and interest and everything in good shape, until the drought came and made a different situation. Let me tell you something about that.

As I said, there are five rural electric co-ops in the district which I am honored to represent. The average customer usage is less than three users per mile. There is no power company, whether it is public or private, that could pay its way and make a profit with only three users to the mile. The cost of running those lines out to those farms is about $1 per foot.

When the drought hits, people have to leave the farm. They go to California, to Michigan, to Kansas, to Missouri, and to other places to seek employment. The rural electrical co-op that serves our home near Berryville, my hometown, has in the neighborhood of 10,000 meters. Right now there are 2,000 idle meters. There is not a dime coming in, but the expense is there just the same. Another co-op in my district has 11,000 users and they have 3,000 idle meters. The other co-ops are in a similar situation. All this bill proposes to do—and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and I introduced bills in the House identical to S. 3338. All this bill proposes is to give us time to get together and work this thing out; and study the situation without increasing the already overburdened farmers in my section of the country and all 7 States of the Southwest with a 40-percent increase. All we want is just to treat everybody alike. I have implicit faith in your fine sense of justice.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table and a memorandum from the Federal Power Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me ever to find fault with anything my friend from Arkansas says. He has stated that he is pleading for simple justice and, of course, I have always believed in fair and equal justice to all people. But there are certain things about this situation in the Southwest that need to be clarified. If my comments seem in opposition to the position taken by the gentleman from Arkansas, I hope it will not be charged that I am less interested than he in justice and fair play.

I consider myself a good friend of REA. I have consistently supported appropriations for the rural electrification and rural telephone programs ever since I have been in Congress and I do not think anyone can honestly contend that the appropriations I have supported have ever been less than required to carry forward these programs with all reasonable speed. I have three REA cooperatives in my congressional district. I have close business, personal, and political friends who are managers, directors, and customers of REA. They entertained me at a dinner held in my district not too many weeks ago and we talked over their problems in a friendly and open way. Just a week or so ago, 2 representatives of that group called on me in Washington to discuss 3 pending bills, and this is one of them. Hells Canyon was another and the Niagara power bill was the third. In our discussion of this particular bill, S. 3338, an argument was advanced to me by these gentlemen which is similar to the one advanced here this morning by the gentleman from Oklahoma and touched also by the gentleman from Arkansas. They all contended that it would be unfair and unreasonable to raise rates against rural cooperatives and not raise them against the private companies who acquire some of the SPA power. I assured the REA representatives who called upon me and advanced this argument that if they could show me—and I say today to the proponents of this measure—if they can show that the Department of the Interior has authority or right to advance the rates in the existing 30-year Reynolds Metals Co. contract, I will support this bill unless the rates in the contracts with the private companies are raised.

It should be pointed out that the Reynolds Metals Co. contract, which is a long-term 30-year contract under which approximately one-third of all of the power produced by the Southwestern Power Administration is acquired by that one company, was signed by Mr. Oscar Chapman when he was Secretary of the

Interior in President Truman's administration. That contract not only disposes of one-third of all of the power produced by the Southwestern Power Administration to this one nonpreference customer, but it does so for a period of 30 years and the contract does not contain any rate redetermination clause. The contract does contain a provision for step increases in rates at 10-year intervals but does not contain any provision giving the Secretary of the Interior any right to redetermine or increase the rates as specified in the contract.

Mr. WILLIS. I want to take up the gentleman's invitation to show it.

Mr. JONAS. I cannot yield at this time. I only have 5 minutes. Please do it in your own time.

As I was saying, if anyone can show that the Secretary of the Interior has the right, under the contract to which I have referred which was signed by Mr. Oscar Chapman as Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States of America with the Arkansas Power & Light Co., and Reynolds Metals Co. in 1952, to raise the rates for power which Reynolds Metals Co. is getting from the Southwestern Power Administration, I will vote against any increase in rates to the REA's until the rates to the private companies can be raised.

I am placing in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, under unanimous consent obtained before I began to speak, a memorandum of the Federal Power Commission dated April 4, 1952, in Docket No. E-6407. This memorandum appears in full beginning on page 1362 of the "hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session." This memorandum analyzes the Reynolds Metals Co. contract and the contents of the memorandum will be very revealing to those who are interested in determining what has caused many of the difficulties with respect to power in the Southwest.

This memorandum indicates that there was built into the contract a subsidy which amounts to approximately a million dollars a year—a subsidy for the benefit of the private utility and the private aluminum company. I hope someone can find a way by which this contract can be changed or the rate increased so as to eliminate the subsidy. I do not think this one company, which is not a preference customer, should have been placed in a preferred position of receiving these great benefits which directly affect the low revenues received by Southwestern Power Administration and thereby contributes, at least indirectly, to the accumulating deficits which the Southwestern Power Administration has been sustaining for a number of years.

I would like to read a paragraph from the Federal Power Commission memorandum concerning this contract. It will be argued that the contract was negotiated when we were engaged in the Korean war and that it can be justified as an emergency measure. One obvious answer to that is that surely it was not expected by the administration then in power that the Korean war would last 30 years. Certainly prudence, and a desire to follow the letter and spirit of the Flood Control Act of 1944, would have indicated the desirability of putting a withdrawal clause in the contract or at least a clause which would have permitted a redetermination of rates if circumstances arising in the future made such a course of action necessary or wise. And with respect to the argument that this contract was dictated by a war emergency, here is what the memorandum of the Federal Power Commission said:

> The Flood Control Act of 1944 requires preference be given to public bodies and cooperatives in the sale of power. Reynolds, to which the deliveries to Arkansas Power are largely dedicated, is neither. SPA defends the diversion of such a large block of power (150,000 kilowatts) to a nonpreference customer on the Nation's current need for aluminum. A letter has been received from the Defense Production Administration verifying this need. The question still remains, however, whether such a large block of power can be so diverted legally without a modification of the Flood Control Act. There is also question whether it is in the public interest to divert this large block of public power for use by one private corporation for private gain. Further, SPA has made no showing that the low rate it proposes to charge Arkansas Power will result in a saving to the Government in its purchases of aluminum from Reynolds.

So I would say to the people in the Southwest Power area, who are vitally concerned with this subject, that if the power rates are going to have to be raised—and it seems to be agreed by everyone that they will have to be raised if you are not to continue to fall farther and farther behind in the payments you have obligated yourselves for—if its rates have to be raised, the responsibility or blame does not rest with the present Secretary of the Interior. He was certainly not responsible for the 79-percent increase in the cost of constructing the dams and power installations over original estimates. Nor did he have anything whatsoever to do with the execution of the contract with the Reynolds Metals Co.—a contract which allots one-third of the entire power available from the Southwest Power Administration to one private company, which is not a preference customer, at a rate which amounts to a subsidy of nearly $1 million a year.

And may I say to the chairman of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, which has been engaged during the last 2 years in trying to discredit the present administration of the Interior Department, that here is a field for investigation. Last year that subcommittee conducted extensive hearings, which filled a 3-inch volume containing 1,686 pages, ostensibly studying whether acts and policies of the Interior Department had adversely affected the rights of preference customers. The subcommittee knew about this Reynolds Metals Co. contract, because it was called specifically to the attention of the subcommittee on several different occasions, but it was not scheduled for study or investigation. Yet it appears that under this contract a nonpreference customer gets one-third of the entire power available for sale by the Southwest Power Administration.

I would suggest that this subcommittee look into the background of that contract and determine if in its negotiation there was, as would appear from the Federal Power Commission memorandum cited above, a violation of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Certainly enough has come to light concerning that contract to indicate that it was highly favorable to one private company, which is not a preference customer, and was highly detrimental to the REA cooperatives and other preference customers in the Southwest Power area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat the statement I made at the beginning. If it can be shown that the Secretary of the Interior has any legal right to raise the rates in that contract I will vote for this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have two of these companies in Michigan. I am informed we are paying 10 to 12 mills at the bus bar while these gentlemen are getting it for 7 mills. Did I get the gentleman right that the Reynolds Metal Co. is getting $900 million?

Mr. JONAS. The Reynolds Metals Co. gets one-third of all the power that is produced.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But the gentleman mentioned dollars.

Mr. JONAS. I said the Federal Power Commission memorandum, which I am putting in the RECORD, says that there is a subsidy in that contract to the utility and the private company of nearly a million dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then they get a subsidy because those gentlemen over there gave it to them. We did not.

Mr. JONAS. That contract was negotiated in 1952. I have not heard anybody on this floor complain about this great giveaway of a third of the power in the Southwest Power area to nonpreference customer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thought maybe they had not heard about that.

Mr. JONAS. That is the reason I am putting the memorandum from the Federal Power Commission dealing with this contract in the RECORD.

(The memorandum follows:)

DOCKET NO. E-6407, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION, APRIL 4, 1952

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMISSION

(Reference: Department of the Interior (Southwestern Power Administration). Contract between United States of America, Arkansas Power & Light Co., and Reynolds Metals Co.[1])

Presented herein for the Commission's consideration is the 30-year contract between the United States of America, Arkansas Power & Light Co., and Reynolds Metals Co. for the sale of 150,000 kilowatts of low-load-factor peaking power and of secondary energy by the Government (SPA) to Arkansas Power, and the sale by that company of 110,000 kilowatts of high-load-factor power to Reynolds Metals.

[1] The Bureau of Power has prepared a memorandum for the Commission on the subject of allocation of project costs, power values, etc. Material contained in such memorandum has been utilized herein.

The contract was filed on January 30, 1952, by the Secretary of the Interior for confirmation and approval by the Commission under the Flood Control Act of 1944 of the rates and charges for the power to be sold by the Government to Arkansas Power. Because Reynolds is a customer of Arkansas Power and not of the Government, the rates to be charged Reynolds by Arkansas Power are not before the Commission for approval.

The contract provides for automatic termination if the rates to Arkansas Power are not approved by the Commission by March 29, 1952. A supplement dated March 14, 1952, filed March 27, provides for a 15-day extension of this termination date to (Sunday) April 13, 1952.

The staff recommends disapproval for the reasons outlined below.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The principal points bearing on the staff's recommendation are briefly as follows:

(a) SPA's overall payout studies, adjusted to reflect Bureau of Power's project cost allocations between power and other uses, adjusted to a 50 (instead of 100) year amortization period, show its total proposed revenues will not meet total costs. Involved in this matter are questions concerning SPA's methods of allocating project costs to power.

(b) The contract revenues are below full allocated cost. SPA has submitted several studies, most of which show that revenues from the contract exceed costs allocated thereto. However, the staff believes SPA's approach is unrealistic. (Further, the staff's allocated cost of service studies indicates rate A may have to be increased substantially.)

(c) The contract is for a term of 30 years with no provision for review of rates at any time. However, while the rates charged by the Government would be frozen (except for fixed periodic increases), Arkansas Power has the protection of the State regulatory commission. The staff does not believe the Government should commit itself to specific rates for such a long term without some recourse for adjustment in price should it become necessary, particularly since only a minor portion of all costs are definitely known at this time.

(d) The contract rates are substantially below SPA's other rates, and therefore are discriminatory.

(e) Reynolds is not a preference customer, and there may be question whether SPA can legally divert such a large block of power to such a customer. Further, it may not be in the public interest to tie up such a large block of public power by one industrial customer.

(f) Arkansas Power has first refusal on secondary energy (after SPA's present commitment to Texas Power & Light Co. and SPA's own needs) with no corresponding obligation to take it. This is believed to discriminate against other purchasers of SPA's secondary power.

(g) The margin of profit to Arkansas Power may be excessive.

(h) The contract price is substantially below the value of power in the area.

RATES

The rates to be charged Arkansas Power by the Government result in a payment of $1,872,000 per year for the 150,000 kilowatts and 360 million kilowatt-hours of firm power which is equivalent to an average rate of 5.2 mills per kilowatt-hour. Expressed on a kilowatt-year basis, it is $12.48 per kilowatt-year (including 2,400 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt, 27 percent load factor). The rate for the secondary energy sold the Arkansas company is 1.25 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The charges for the firm power increase 5 percent every 10 years during the term of the contract. The charges for the secondary energy increase to 1.50 mills per kilowatt-hour at the end of 5 years, to 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour at the end of 15 years, and to 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the end of 20 years.

Reynolds will pay to Arkansas Power $2,232,000 per year for 110,000 kilowatts and 360 million kilowatt-hours of firm power (37 percent load factor). Additional energy is charged for at 2.25 mills per kilowatt-hour for the first year with upward adjustments thereafter.

A more detailed description of the contract is attached as appendix A.

DISCUSSION

Costs and revenues

Allocation of project cost to power: At the time the subject contract was filed, SPA submitted an overall payout study comparing total system revenues with total costs through 1958. This study used questionable methods of allocating the costs of the reservoir projects to power, which SPA claimed was the best it could do on the information available to it at the time. At the conference of March 14, 1952, among representatives of SPA, the Corps of Engineers, and the staff, SPA stated that in the light of new data then available to it, it was willing to use the incremental method of allocating project costs to power in all cases (except possibly one), but that the allocation of any larger amount to power will price it out of the market. The Bureau of Power, on the other hand, believes the separable costs-remaining benefits method of allocating project cost to power to be proper for all projects except Denison and Norfork where the incremental method is deemed proper due to the special circumstances in those cases.[2] These matters are fully discussed in a separate memorandum for the Commission being submitted by the Bureau of Power.

Amortization period: SPA used 100 years in its overall payout study for the amortization of the project investments allocated to power. This matter was discussed at the conference of March 10 and 14, 1952. Although SPA did not agree at the time that 50 years was proper, later studies submitted by SPA used a 50-year amortization period.

Overall payout study: The following tabulation compares the results of SPA's overall payout study for the year 1958: (1) As submitted by SPA; (2) as adjusted to reflect the incremental method of allocating project costs to power and using a 50-year amortization period; and (3) as adjusted to reflect the allocating of project costs to power proposed by the Bureau of Power, which also includes a 50-year amortization period.

	As submitted by SPA	Incremental project allocation	Bureau of power project allocation
Total annual revenues (1958)	$21,461,200	$21,461,200	$21,461,200
Total annual costs	20,326,500	26,357,400	29,887,500
Excess (deficiency) in revenues	1,134,700	(4,896,200)	(8,426,300)
Percent	6	(19)	(28)

In addition to revenues from the sale of hydro-peaking power to be made under the subject contract and other sales of such peaking power, the above overall payout studies include revenues and related costs for sales to be made under rate schedule A to (preference) customers. These customers will be served largely from the systems of power companies with which SPA has or is negotiating wheeling and firming-up contracts, and from the transmission systems of the generation and transmission (G. and T.) cooperatives to be leased by SPA. (Appendix B attached gives a detailed description of SPA's proposed system and operations.)

Contract revenues versus cost of service: SPA has now submitted 6 studies comparing the contract revenues, averaged over the 30-year contract term, of $2,207,160 with the allocated cost of the service to be rendered under the subject contract, computed on different bases. These studies show annual costs allocated to this load ranging from $1,817,000 to $2,283,000, depending on the allocation method used and the assumptions made. SPA employed two methods of allocating system costs to the subject load: (1) Using average system cost per total kilowatt-hour sold, firm and secondary, and (2) assigning costs to capacity as well as energy. The first method is believed to be unrealistic and not defensible on any grounds because the same costs are imputed to secondary energy as to firm. SPA's second method (demand and energy) shows the following results:

	Cost	Amount revenues exceed costs
Revenues: 30-year average, firm and secondary energy	$2,207,160	
Costs:		
(*a*) 5 interconnected projects constructed or under construction, initial generating units only [1]	2,154,000	$53,160
(*b*) 8 interconnected projects expected by 1958, initial generating units only [2]	2,283,000	(75,840)
(*c*) Same as (*b*) except includes added generating units deemed necessary by 1958	[3] 2,100,000	107,160

[1] Denison, Norfork, Bull Shoals, Fort Gibson, and Tenkiller Ferry.

[2] Same as (*a*) above plus Table Rock, Dardanelle, and Short Mountain. SPA expects 4 additional projects by 1958 but they will be isolated and the power disposed of separately.

[3] This figure is lower than that of (*b*) because the allocated cost of the dam and reservoir is distributed over a greater number of kilowatts.

The above comparisons also are not believed to be valid because current costs are compared with the average revenues expected over the 30-year contract term. These average revenues include the effect of the periodic rate increases provided by the contract. The average revenues for the initial 5-year period will be only $2,052,000. This is less than any of SPA's allocated costs shown above. The comparison with initial revenues is believed to be the proper comparison (instead of with average revenues) because there is no assurance that the contract will continue for the full 30-year term. Furthermore, SPA claims that the periodic increases in the rates to Arkansas Power are to cover future increases in costs. Presently estimated costs, therefore, should be compared only with the initial rates. Thus, by SPA's own figures, the contract revenues will be less than cost.

The above studies are based on SPA's revised allocations of project costs to power and on the amortization of such costs in 50 years. SPA has allocated to power, however, only the incremental costs of adding power to flood control (and navigation) projects.

A staff study, using the allocations of project costs to power considered appropriate by the Bureau of Power and making certain other adjustments to SPA's studies, shows the allocated cost of the service to be rendered under the subject contract to be $2,857,500 per year or $805,500 (39 percent) in excess of the initial contract revenues.

[2] The Bureau of Power, in its memorandum for the Commission, points out that the instrumental method might also be appropriate for Tenkiller Ferry, but that the differences are relatively small.

Cost of service under rate A: Staff computations, using the data contained in SPA's overall payout study, but reflecting SPA's incremental allocations of project costs to power, show the allocated cost of service to purchasers served under SPA's rate schedule A (sales to preference customers) to be approximately 7.03 mills per kilowatt-hour at the load factor of the rate A customers assumed by SPA. This compares with the average revenue of 5.46 mills per kilowatt-hour under rate A at the same load factor. Allocating the project costs in the manner deemed proper by the Bureau of Power results in a cost of service to rate A customers of approximately 7.92 mills per kilowatt-hour.

SPA claims that if rate A is increased as much as a mill or more it will be priced out of the market. Considerable difficulties are, therefore, anticipated when rate A comes up for review in the near future. (Rate A approval expires February 13, 1953.) It would, therefore, appear to be imperative at this time to insure that any long-term rates, such as those contained in the subject contract, are not below cost, because any deficiency therein may require a further increase to the rate A (preference) customers.

SPA's position that increasing the portion of the project costs allocated to power will price it out of the market is a very vital question, and it must be settled in the near future before the review date of all of SPA's other rates. It certainly is too important to attempt to settle in the limited time available for the study of the subject contract. There is reason to believe there may be factors which contribute to SPA's unfavorable position other than the allocation of project costs, and it is believed that it would be inadvisable to use SPA's proposed allocations of project costs at this time as a basis for the long-term approval of the subject rates at least until the matter can be thoroughly studied.

Thirty-year contract term with no provision for review of rates

The contract is for 30 years with no provision for the review of rates at any time. The firm rate is increased 5 percent every 10 years. (The secondary rate is increased at 5, 15, and 20 years.) SPA claims these increases will take care of possible future increases in cost. It is understood that Reynolds insisted that the rates not be subject to review due to its financing requirements.

The bulk of the project and transmission investments remain for the future. Only 3 projects costing $100 million are now producing power, out of 12 projects forecast for 1958 costing over $775 million. Further, whereas the rates to Arkansas Power are not reviewable under the contract, that company is protected since its rates, including those it charges Reynolds, are subject to State regulation. Also, if SPA's costs do increase, the rates to other customers receiving the same class of service would necessarily increase, with resulting discrimination, and any deficiencies of the contract rates would undoubtedly increase the burden on preference customers.

At the conference of March 10, Mr. Wright, Administrator for SPA, stated that he was not surprised at the staff's concern over this matter, and agreed that a tentative rate was as suitable here as it had been in other cases but he was unable to obtain such a concession—that "maybe you are just staying with it longer than I."

Lower than other SPA rates

SPA charges other utilities $1.15 per month ($13.80 per year) per kilowatt of demand and 1.25 mills per kilowatt-hour for similar firm service, and is negotiating other contracts with these same rates. This is an average price of 7 mills per kilowatt-hour at the load factor of the deliveries of firm power to Arkansas Power, which compares with the average firm rate of 5.2 mills per kilowatt-hour (first 10 years) to Arkansas Power under the subject contract. Rate schedule A for service at the same load factor averages 6.75 mills per kilowatt-hour. The subject rate would, therefore, appear to be unduly discriminatory in favor of Arkansas Power (and Reynolds).

Reynolds not a preference customer

The Flood Control Act of 1944 requires preference be given to public bodies and cooperatives in the sale of power. Reynolds, to which the deliveries to Arkansas Power are largely dedicated, is neither. SPA defends the diversion of such a large block of power (150,000 kilowatt) to a nonpreference customer on the Nation's current need for aluminum. A letter has been received from the Defense Production Administration verifying this need. The question still remains however whether such a large block of power can be so diverted legally without a modification of the Flood Control Act. There is also question whether it is in the public interest to divert this large block of public power for use by one private corporation for private gain. Further, SPA has made no showing that the low rate it proposes to charge Arkansas Power will result in a saving to the Government in its purchases of aluminum from Reynolds.

First refusal of secondary energy

Arkansas Power is given first refusal on SPA's secondary energy next to SPA's present commitment to Texas Power & Light Co. and after SPA's own uses in its interconnected system, yet there is no reciprocal obligation on Arkansas Power to take the energy when offered. It is believed Arkansas Power should be so obligated, or that the rate should be made higher to avoid discriminating against other customers also purchasing secondary energy.

SPA claims it is not concerned with whether Arkansas Power takes secondary energy or not because it is negotiating a contract with 12 power companies similar to the Oklahoma companies' contract wherein they are obligated to take all power and energy for which SPA has no other market. This contract, however, is still not a fact and may never be consummated.

Apparent subsidy to Reynolds

When Reynolds is not taking power, or if Reynolds cancels, the firm rate to Arkansas Power will be increased 1 mill per kilowatt-hour on the number of kilowatt-hours Reynolds' take is below 360 million kilowatt-hours per year (but not to exceed $180,000 per year on the 360 million kilowatt-hours of firm energy sold Arkansas Power). If the higher rate is proper, then the lower rate applicable when Reynolds is taking power would appear to be a subsidy to Reynolds. SPA views the difference as the cost to Arkansas Power of transmitting the power to Reynolds, which it does not bear when Reynolds is shut down. Reynolds however is a customer of Arkansas Power and not of SPA, and whether or not Reynolds operates has no effect on SPA costs.

Margin to Arkansas Power

The 150,000 kilowatts and 360 million kilowatt-hours per year of firm power Arkansas Power will purchase from SPA will cost $1,872,000 per year (first 10 years). Arkansas Power will charge Reynolds from $2,232,000 to $2,247,000 per year for 110,000 kilowatts and the same 360 million kilowatt-hours during the first 10 years. The 40,000 kilowatts it retains has a value, at SPA's rate of $1.15 per kilowatt per month, of $552,000 per year. This results in a total average marking to Arkansas Power of approximately $919,500 yer year to be realized on the firm power. SPA estimates it will sell Arkansas Power an average of 144 million kilowatt-hours per year of secondary energy for which it will charge 1.25 mills per kilowatt-hour (first 5 years) and 1.50 mills per kilowatt-hour (second 5 years). Arkansas Power will receive an average of 2.526 mills per kilowatt-hour from Reynolds for this same energy, which is a further margin to Arkansas Power of $165,700 per year, or a total margin of $1,085,200 per year (71.5 percent) to cover losses and the cost of transmitting the power to Reynolds, which would appear to be quite substantial considering the services to be rendered. In addition it must be presumed Arkansas Power will make a profit on the additional (off-peak) energy it will sell to Reynolds.

It is understood the Bureau of Power is making a study of the overall value of the contract to Arkansas Power which will be included in a memorandum for the Commission on the subject contract.

Comparison of contract revenues with power values

The subject contract is premised on the belief that Reynolds cannot pay more than approximately 4 mills per kilowat-hour (for 99 percent load factor power)—that if the rate were any higher it would locate on the Texas gulf coast. Thus, SPA is competing in effect, with power values where cheap natural gas is available and not with the power values of its own area which were used in determining the feasibility of the various projects involved.

The Bureau of Power, in its memorandum for the Commission on these matters, estimates the present power values to Arkansas Power as $15.52 per kilowatt per year and 1.34 mills per kilowatt-hour (using present gas costs of about 11 cents per million B. t. u. Fuel costs at new plants may be substantially higher). These applied to the 150,000 kilowatts and 360 million kilowatt-hours per year of firm power and to the 144 million kilowatt-hours of secondary energy SPA estimates it will sell to Arkansas Power result in a power value of $3,003,000 per year. This compares with the contract revenues of $2,052,000. This further emphasizes the question of whether the sale of such a large block of public power by SPA for private use, at the low rate proposed, is in the public interest, particularly in view of the fact that SPA shows in its overall payout study an estimated potential market by 1958 of 158,400 kilowatts in additional preference customers over and above those included in its study.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing the staff can see no proper basis for recommending approval of the rates and charges to Arkansas Power contained in the subject contract, and recommends that they be disapproved.

APPENDIX A—DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT

TERM

The contract is for 30 years from the commencement of service with Reynolds being permitted to cancel after 15 years on 1 year's notice. If Reynolds cancels after 15 years, or the contract is terminated at any time by reason of default, service to Arkansas Power will terminate as soon as it can procure an additional 40,000 kilowatts of capacity, but not sooner than 2 years nor later than 5.

SALES BY SPA TO ARKANSAS POWER

Under article I of the contract, SPA will sell to Arkansas Power 150,000 kilowatts and 30 million kilowatt-hours per month (360 million kilowatt-hours per year) of firm peaking power and energy and up to 25 million kilowatt-hours per month (300 million kilowatt-hours per year) of secondary energy. Arkansas Power has first priority on SPA's secondary energy (up to 25 million kilowatt-hours per month) in excess of SPA's present commitment to Texas Power & Light Co. (which takes half the output of Denison)

and SPA's own uses on its interconnected system, but with no corresponding obligation to take the energy.

Arkansas Power must pay for the full 30 million kilowatt-hours per month (firm) regardless of its actual take, which is permitted to vary from 22,500,000 to 37,500,000 kilowatts per month, if agreeable to SPA, with the total excess or deficit not to exceed 60 million kilowatt-hours at any one time. (If water is spilled while Arkansas Power has energy in storage, it will be charged to Arkansas.)

The rates provided for the sale of power to Arkansas Power are briefly as follows:

	Contract years				
	1–5	6–10	11–15	16–20	21–30
	Mills per kilowatt-hour				
Firm power, per month:					
1st 22,000,000 kilowatt-hours	6.00	6.00	6.30	6.30	6.6150
Next 8,000,000 kilowatt-hours	3.00	3.00	3.15	3.15	3.3075
Average of above	5.20	5.20	5.46	5.46	5.7330
Secondary energy	1.25	1.50	1.50	1.75	2.00

The above rate for firm power results in a fixed charge of $156,000 per month ($1,872,000 per year) for the first 10 years and averages $163,930 per month ($1,967,160 per year) over the 30-year period of 5.46 mills per kilowatt-hour. Expressed on a kilowatt-year basis, the firm-power rate is $12.48 per kilowatt-year (including 2,400 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt) for the first 10 years, and averages $13.11 per kilowatt-year over the 30-year period.

If Reynolds takes less than 360 million kilowatt-hours per year of firm energy from Arkansas Power, the firm rate to Arkansas Power will be increased 1 mill per kilowatt-hour for a number of kilowatt-hours equal to the amount Reynolds' take is below 360 million kilowatt-hours, but not to exceed $180,000 per year.

ARKANSAS POWER'S SALE TO REYNOLDS

Under article II of the contract, Arkansas Power will sell 110,000 kilowatts of high-load factor firm power to Reynolds (the contract indicates 80 million kilowatt-hours per month will be sold to Reynolds, or a load factor of 99.6 percent) for use in a proposed new aluminum plant, reported as to be located near Arkadelphia, Ark.

The rate to be paid by Reynolds to Arkansas Power is very complex. When Reynolds is producing aluminum, the rate is $2,232,000 per year for the 100,000 kilowatts and 360 million kilowatt-hours per year with certain increases after the 5th year. Additional energy is charged for at 2.25 mills for the first year with upward adjustments each year through the 15th (when it reaches 3.112 mills per kilowatt-hour). After the 15th year, Arkansas Power must purchase secondary energy from the Government when available at Reynolds' request, for which Arkansas Power will charge Reynolds 2.50 mills per kilowatt-hour for the 15th to 20th year and 2.625 mills for the 21st to 30th year. The rate for all additional energy is 2.25 mills per kilowatt-hour for the 16th to 30th year plus a fuel adjustment.

When Reynolds is not producing aluminum, the rate for all energy is 5.2 mills per kilowatt-hour.

During the first 5 years, Reynolds must take or pay for not less than 3.36 billion kilowatt-hours (70 percent load factor), and not less than 4.8 billion kilowatt-hours during any subsequent consecutive 10 years (50 percent load factor). Further, when Reynolds is producing aluminum, Reynolds shall take or pay for at least 30 million kilowatt-hours per month (37 percent load factor), the same number of kilowatt-hours Arkansas Power is obligated to take from SPA. Reynolds may shut down at any time but may not restart within 1 year without being rebilled for an amount equal to the total amounts Arkansas Power paid the Government for power under this contract during such period of shutdown.

Also Reynolds may procure fuel for Arkansas Power in the amounts required for the delivery of steam-produced energy under the contract, with certain restrictions, and Arkansas Power will charge Reynolds only 0.63 mill per kilowatt-hour for conversion to electric energy and transmission to Reynolds. After the 15th year, if the total average rate to Reynolds exceeds 4 mills per kilowatt-hour for 3 months, Reynolds may construct a plant of its own to generate that portion of its energy not furnished Arkansas Power by the Government and Arkansas Power must transmit the energy for Reynolds at an agreed upon price not to exceed 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour per 50 miles.

APPENDIX B—SPA'S PROPOSED SYSTEM AND OPERATIONS

SPA anticipates 12 projects will be in operation by 1958 for which it will be the marketing agent. (The Corps of Engineers is the construction agency.) The Denison, Norfork, and Narrows projects are now producing power. Bull Shoals, Whitney, Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, and Blakely Mountain are in advanced stages of construction. The balance, Table Rock, Keystone, Dardanelle, and Short Mountain, have been authorized but no funds have been appropriated for their construction. A description of the circumstances of studies and authorizations of the projects is included in the Bureau of Power's memorandum on these matters.

SPA anticipates that eight of the projects will be interconnected through its back bone transmission line (nearly completed) extending from the Denison project on the Texas-Oklahoma border to the Norfork project in north central Arkansas. The remaining four, Narrows, Whitney, Blakely Mountain, and Keystone, are expected to remain isolated and their output disposed of separately under individual special contracts. (Initially, in its overall payout study, SPA had included Keystone in the interconnected projects, but included no transmission facilities to connect it to the backbone line.)

In this connection it was pointed out at the conference of March 10, 1952, by the corps that the cost estimates on the Keystone, Dardanelle, and Short Mountain projects are very questionable, and that these projects are integrally related to other projects in the plan of improvement of the Arkansas River for navigation and other purposes and can be justified only if the entire plan is carried out. The corps further pointed out that because of the very low ratio of total benefits to total cost (1.05:1) for the overall development, they question whether it will be initiated in the near future if at all.

In response to a question by the corps at this conference as to why the last three projects were selected, Mr. Wright, SPA Administrator, stated they were selected as the result of studies made by SPA and after discussions with SPA's customers (but not with the corps, the constructing agency).

SPA has entered into contracts with six generation and transmission (G. and T.) cooperatives to lease all or a portion of extensive transmission networks to be constructed by these cooperatives from REA funds, estimated by SPA to cost some $34,500,000, and to purchase the entire output of four steam-electric plants totaling 115,000 kilowatts to firm up a portion of its hydropower, also to be constructed by the G. and T. cooperatives from REA funds. Except in one case, SPA will sell firmed-up power from these networks to the member cooperatives and other SPA customers at SPA's standard rate schedule A. The exception is the Northwestern Electric Cooperative which will build a 252-mile 154-kilovolt line from the Bull Shoals project in north central Arkansas to its proposed 40,000-kilowatt steam plant to be located at Missouri City, northwest of Kansas City, Mo. SPA will sell to the cooperative 40,000 kilowatts at the steam plant site and the cooperative will in this case distribute the power to its member cooperatives at its own expense.

SPA has a contract with a seventh G. and T. cooperative (the M. & A. Electric Cooperative). This cooperative will also construct a transmission grid and a 20,000-kilowatt steam plant but SPA will neither lease the lines nor purchase the output of the plant, but will sell a 5,000-kilowatt block of power (2,000 kilowatts initially) to the cooperative at rate A and pay the cooperative 1.25 mills per kilowatt-hour to wheel the power to the member cooperatives. (SPA will buy surplus steam-generated energy from the cooperative if needed by SPA however.)

The balance of SPA's (hydro) power will be disposed of as peaking power to the power companies in the area under the subject contract, under contracts approved as to rates by the Commission to February 13, 1953, and under a contract still under negotiation. Under the latter two contracts, the companies will retain a portion of the power and wheel the balance, firm it up, and deliver the firmed-up power to SPA customers for the account of SPA.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I came over here this morning to listen to the debate. I had not expected to participate in it and I hope I will not take too much of your time.

Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to blame anybody for this situation we ought to be honest with ourselves and try to work this thing out so that nobody will get hurt. It is true that the gentleman from North Carolina and myself have gone into this aluminum company contract numerous times over the past year and a half. I believe we agree there is nothing that we can do about decreasing or increasing the rates to the Reynolds Metals Co. However, the RECORD should show at the time this contract was entered into by the previous administration, aluminum was in very short supply in the Nation. We had a great defense problem and just like many other subdivisions of Government that wished to make it attractive to companies to come into a particular area to build manufacturing plants, this contract was entered into with Reynolds.

One of the reasons why the Reynolds Metals Co. came into the area of the Southwest Power Administration was because they could get power at a lower rate and we in turn could have our aluminum produced that we needed very badly, and, in addition, it put a lot of people to work. Just because we cannot review that contract, I cannot see why we have to penalize the farmers and little people in the southwest area.

I have nothing to gain by this bill. I am from Philadelphia where we do not have a power problem. In all sincerity, in all honesty to the people of Arkansas and Oklahoma, we ought to agree on this matter. This is not the first subsidy that the Government ever gave. We had a

big fight about subsidizing airlines yesterday. We subsidize many things. This power is absolutely necessary to the economy of the Southwest and I think we ought to go along with this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, the ranking minority member the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], in urging that this rule be adopted. This, as has already been demonstrated, is, of course, a very complicated matter. When the bill was voted out, some members on the minority side of the Public Works Committee expressed some concern about it, and we worked out some amendments which will be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to which those primarily interested in this legislation have no objection and which I will not oppose. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] authorized me to say, in his absence from the floor, that with the adoption of those amendments he would have no objection to this legislation. That statement is also true with regard to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], the next ranking member of the minority of the Committee on Public Works. So, we are coming along here late in this session, and I will not take any more time on the rule. I hope the rule is adopted and that we will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MILLER of New York. I was just going to ask the gentleman this: As I understood the debate so far this morning, this is for a freezing of the REA and preferential rates for a period of 11 months; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Yet the assertion has been made here that the real evil in the situation and the real cause of the present predicament is that this power allocated to Arkansas Light & Power and Reynolds Aluminum is for a period of 30 years. Now, if that is the real cause of the difficulty, we certainly are not going to be in any different shape 11 months from today than we are today. In other words, with a power freeze for 30 years for Reynolds Aluminum and this freeze for 11 months, we will be back every year with this situation or meet it now.

Mr. ENGLE. I did not make that statement.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I carry no brief for the Reynolds Metals & Aluminum Co., but I have been told—and I hope the gentleman will correct me if I need correction—that this contract was negotiated with Reynolds Metals on the recommendation and on the suggestion of the Office of Defense Mobilization at a time when we were in the Korean war and when there was a critical shortage of aluminum and all other metals. Is that true? Because we ought to be fair about this matter. I want the RECORD straight. I do not want politics in this debate.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, I think it is, and, of course, the fact that Reynolds Aluminum gets a large piece of this power has some significant effect on the whole problem. We expect, and what we are asking to do is to freeze the situation until June 30 next year. In the interim we will try to work the thing out with the Department of the Interior in order to come to a fair conclusion on it.

Mr. CHELF. It is my understanding that these rates will be increased 40 percent.

Mr. ENGLE. The proposal is to increase the rates on preference customers from 5.5 mills to about 7.7 mills.

Mr. CHELF. If this has been declared a disaster area, the people are unemployed and the farmers are not able to pay operating expenses, or making anything, if they cannot pay the regular rates now, how can they pay a 40-percent increase? Down home we have a heart. If a man owes a debt and through no fault of his own, he is in financial difficulty, we give him a break. We try to get him up on his feet so that he can make it. From what I have heard here the proponents have made a case.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman makes a very fine argument.

Mr. CHELF. Thank you, my colleague. I am going to vote for it.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman mentioned a couple of minutes ago that two members of the Committee on Public Works had agreed to some amendments to this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. No; I did not mean to say that they agreed in behalf of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BECKER. The amendments the gentleman was going to offer.

Mr. ENGLE. What I said was that they say they will not oppose the bill if these amendments are adopted.

Mr. BECKER. I just wanted to make the RECORD clear that this bill was not in the Public Works Committee.

Mr. ENGLE. Maybe I should clear that up.

Mr. BECKER. I just wanted to make that clear, that is all.

Mr. ENGLE. The House Public Works Committee has an interest in this matter because these projects were built by the Army engineers. They were not built by the Bureau of Reclamation. The bill got into our committee because the bill, as it came over from the Senate, froze the power rates of all Federal power throughout the whole Nation. Now, these specific projects were built under the Army engineers authorization, which came out of the gentleman's committee, explaining, of course, the interest of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO, and some others. They did not presume to act for the Public Works Committee. I want to make that clear.

Mr. BECKER. And I wanted to make that clear, too.

Mr. ENGLE. What they said was, with those amendments, they personally would not oppose this legislation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are all, friends of the REA, but as I understand this issue, from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] who knows the facts and speaks with authority, the trouble now is that the Southwestern Power Administration, is not making enough money so they can continue to supply the needs of the REA customers. That is unfortunate. We should in some way assist them. There is no one who wants to see them lose money or be deprived of power.

But it appears that the contract which was entered into some years ago and which gives the Reynolds company a subsidy of $900,000 a year—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] might make note of that figure, even if he does come from Philadelphia, because it is quite a sum out in the country—that contract was made by a previous administration, by Mr. Chapman.

The answer for the making of that contract and which he gives in substance is, "I do not see any reason why REA customers should be deprived of power and made to suffer." I do not either, except that Chapman got them into that hole. Then the gentleman in effect said, "Well, the contract was made during the war," and another gentleman says, "During the Korean War, and those had to be the terms." Who shoved us into the Korean War? Was it not Truman? Republicans did not have anything to do with that. Nor can you lay that to the private power companies. That charge will not wash out. One reason for the plight of the REA customers may be that costs have gone up. Another might be lack of good management.

Another reason for the contract he gives is—and I do not get the hook-up between the two, because if it was during the war then there was no unemployment—but he said it was to give jobs. Well, that doesn't make sense, and that is all there is to his argument.

The whole situation gets back to the fact that the Truman administration or Mr. Chapman stuck us with the contract and it resulted in a whale of a big subsidy every year to the Reynolds private industry which some would like to liquidate.

Along the same line, as mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], for months the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations—not all of them, oh, no; but one or two—have been going under the direction of or being directed by Socialists, or former employees in the Department of the Interior, who either resigned because they could not stand the return to sound business methods or were kicked out. They have been directing the activities of this subcommittee. The parent committee, that is the Committee on Government Operations, has had $995,000 for investigations. They asked for $100,000 more, but that went out on a point of order. But they

had within $5,000 of a million dollars, a large part of which, in my opinion, as shown by their investigations and hearings they have been using deliberately and with skill, and without regard to the facts, to create and disseminate at the taxpayers' expense propaganda against private enterprise. That is the picture, and, like it or not, that is the way it is. They have been shoving along these reports at this late date, in the last week or two, when there is no sufficient opportunity for us to answer.

Not more than 2 hours ago I had a call from the Department of the Interior—and I was not on that particular committee as a regular member—when they said, in substance, "We just received a a copy of a report which reflects upon our integrity and we would like to answer. Will you make an effort to get time for us to answer?"

I said, "Bless your soul, the hearings, the time for putting in the report, were closed yesterday noon." They gave us all of 24 hours, this generous committee did, to file answers to reports which are based upon the stenographer's minutes where there was no printed record. How do you like it? And what do you think of that kind of treatment?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 84, noes 72.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 126, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—219

Abernethy	Cooley	Fountain
Addonizio	Cooper	Frazier
Albert	Cunningham	Friedel
Alexander	Davidson	Fulton
Andersen, H. Carl	Davis, Tenn.	Garmatz
Andrews	Dawson, Ill.	Gary
Aspinall	Deane	Gathings
Bailey	Delaney	Gentry
Baldwin	Dempsey	George
Barrett	Denton	Grant
Bass, N. H.	Devereux	Gray
Belcher	Dingell	Green, Oreg.
Bennett, Fla.	Dodd	Green, Pa.
Bennett, Mich.	Dollinger	Gregory
Blatnik	Dolliver	Griffiths
Boland	Dondero	Gross
Bolling	Donohue	Gubser
Bonner	Donovan	Hagen
Boyle	Dorn, S. C.	Hardy
Bray	Doyle	Harris
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Harrison, Va.
Burdick	Edmondson	Hays, Ark.
Burnside	Elliott	Hays, Ohio
Byrd	Engle	Hayworth
Byrne, Pa.	Evins	Herlong
Cannon	Fascell	Hoeven
Carlyle	Feighan	Holifield
Celler	Fernandez	Holland
Chelf	Fisher	Holmes
Chenoweth	Fjare	Holtzman
Chudoff	Flood	Huddleston
Clark	Flynt	Hull
Colmer	Fogarty	Ikard
	Forand	Jarman
Johnson, Calif.	Moss	Shuford
Johnson, Wis.	Moulder	Sieminski
Jones, Ala.	Multer	Sikes
Jones, Mo.	Murray, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Karsten	Murray, Tenn.	Sisk
Kilday	Natcher	Smith, Miss.
Kilgore	Norrell	Spence
King, Calif.	O'Brien, Ill.	Springer
Kirwan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Staggers
Klein	O'Hara, Ill.	Steed
Kluczynski	O'Konski	Sullivan
Knutson	O'Neill	Talle
Landrum	Pelly	Teague, Tex.
Lanham	Perkins	Thomas
Lankford	Pfost	Thompson, N. J.
LeCompte	Philbin	Thompson, Tex.
Lesinski	Poage	Thomson, Wyo.
Lovre	Polk	Tollefson
McCarthy	Price	Trimble
McCormack	Prouty	Tumulty
McGregor	Quigley	Udall
McMillan	Rabaut	Vanik
Macdonald	Radwan	Van Zandt
Machrowicz	Rains	Walter
Mack, Ill.	Ray	Watts
Madden	Reece, Tenn.	Weaver
Magnuson	Reuss	Whitten
Mahon	Rhodes, Pa.	Wier
Mailliard	Roberts	Williams, Miss.
Marshall	Rodino	Williams, N. J.
Martin	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Matthews	Rogers, Fla.	Winstead
Merrow	Rogers, Tex.	Wolverton
Metcalf	Rooney	Wright
Miller, Calif.	Roosevelt	Yates
Miller, Md.	Scrivner	Younger
Miller, Nebr.	Seely-Brown	Zablocki
Mills	Selden	Zelenko
Morano	Sheppard	
Morgan	Short	

NAYS—126

Adair	Dixon	Mason
Alger	Dorn, N. Y.	Meader
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Miller, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Fallon	Minshall
Arends	Fenton	Mumma
Auchincloss	Fino	Nicholson
Avery	Ford	Norblad
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Osmers
Bates	Gamble	Ostertag
Beamer	Gavin	Patterson
Becker	Gwinn	Phillips
Berry	Hale	Pillion
Betts	Haley	Poff
Bolton, Frances P.	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hand	Rees, Kans.
Bosch	Harden	Robsion, Ky.
Bow	Harrison, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Harvey	Sadlak
Brownson	Henderson	St. George
Broyhill	Heselton	Saylor
Budge	Hiestand	Schenck
Bush	Hill	Scherer
Byrnes, Wis.	Hillings	Schwengel
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott
Carrigg	Holt	Simpson, Pa.
Cederberg	Hyde	Smith, Wis.
Chase	Jenkins	Taber
Chiperfield	Jonas	Teague, Calif.
Church	Jones, N. C.	Thompson, Mich.
Cole	Judd	Utt
Coon	Kean	Van Pelt
Corbett	Kearns	Velde
Cramer	Keating	Vorys
Cretella	King, Pa.	Westland
Crumpacker	Knox	Wharton
Curtis, Mass.	Krueger	Widnall
Curtis, Mo.	Laird	Wigglesworth
Dague	Lipscomb	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Withrow
Dawson, Utah	McCulloch	Wolcott
Derounian	McDonough	Young
	McIntire	
	McVey	
	Mack, Wash.	

NOT VOTING—87

Abbitt	Buckley	Hinshaw
Allen, Ill.	Burleson	Hoffman, Ill.
Anfuso	Carnahan	Hope
Ashley	Chatham	Horan
Ashmore	Christopher	Hosmer
Baker	Clevenger	Jackson
Barden	Coudert	James
Bass, Tenn.	Davis, Wis.	Jennings
Baumhart	Dies	Jensen
Bell	Diggs	Johansen
Bentley	Dowdy	Kearney
Blitch	Eberharter	Kee
Boggs	Forrester	Kelley, Pa.
Bowler	Gordon	Kelly, N. Y.
Boykin	Healey	Keogh
Brooks, La.	Hébert	Kilburn
Brooks, Tex.	Hess	Lane
Latham	Priest	Smith, Kans.
Long	Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Va.
McDowell	Richards	Taylor
Mollohan	Riehlman	Thompson, La.
Morrison	Riley	Thornberry
Nelson	Rivers	Tuck
O'Hara, Minn.	Robeson, Va.	Vinson
Passman	Rutherford	Vursell
Patman	Scudder	Wainwright
Pilcher	Sheehan	Wickersham
Powell	Shelley	Wilson, Calif.
Preston	Siler	Wilson, Ind.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burleson for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Thornberry for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Brooks of Texas for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Dowdy for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Rutherford for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hope against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Preston with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Tuck with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Horan.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. MORANO, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SEELY-BROWN, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. FEIGHAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. McVEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTATION OF SHOE LATHES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the leader of the Republican delegation in the House and former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is the author of the bill (H. R. 10177) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty.

I ask unanimous consent that that bill be taken from the Speaker's desk,

with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 12, after "act", insert "and prior to the expiration of 2 years after such date."

After line 12, insert:

"Section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'linseed oil,' wherever it appears the following: 'or printing papers, coated or uncoated'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is a very important bill to industry and to labor. It means a great deal to this country. I worked very hard on this bill. The committee has been very considerate, and I want to congratulate the committee and express my appreciation of their efforts in getting the bill to the point where it is now.

I regret that this objection has been made. The parliamentary inquiry which I wish to direct to the Chair is this: Is there any device by which I can get this bill up and give the House a chance to vote on it for the benefit of industry in many States and for labor in many States?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is compelled to say to the gentleman that we would have to explore other avenues a little further.

RATES CHARGED PUBLIC BODIES AND COOPERATIVES FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3338, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this legislation, simply stated, is to put into effect a moratorium on a proposed rate increase in the Southwestern Power Administration until June 30, 1957, or something in the neighborhood of 11 months.

I should like to deal briefly with the background of this legislation and then discuss the bill itself. The southwestern power market area, in which the Southwestern Power Administration is located, includes parts of six States—Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. The waterpower projects to which this legislation relates are seven integrated projects in the system—Denison, Norfork, Bull Shoals, Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, Blakely Mountain, and Table Rock. The first of these projects was initiated in 1945. I mean by that the first of these projects was put into operation in 1945 and from time to time other of the projects have been completed and added to the system.

When the first project was put into operation it became necessary, of course, for the Interior Department to establish the power rates, because under the 1944 Flood Control Act, power generated at all public projects, whether built by the Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation, is turned over to the Department of the Interior as the marketing agency. So in 1946 certain rates were established with reference to the sale of power in the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Federal Power Commission approved those rates for a period of 6 years, and since that time has given short extensions from time to time.

After the project was fairly well on its way the Interior Department made a study of the sufficiency of the rates to meet the repayment costs of the project. It was discovered that the Army engineers had underestimated the cost of these projects some 80 percent. We hear a great deal around here about the Bureau of Reclamation in many instances underestimating the cost of projects.

These projects were underestimated by 80 percent by the construction agency which was the Corps of Engineers. They estimated the total cost at $199.8 million with $109.2 million allocated to power, when, as a matter of fact, the project will finally cost $357.6 million with $200.2 million allocated to power. In other words, instead of $109 million allocated to power, which has to be repaid, the amount of actual cost is just a fraction over $200 million. Of course, that made a significant difference with reference to whether or not the rates were entirely adequate, and in the light of those facts, the Department of the Interior started to look the situation over.

There are three groups of power customers in that area—the rural electric cooperatives, the Reynolds Aluminum Co. and the private power companies. The rate established on the aluminum company's contract will result in a deficit so far as that contract repaying its actual cost over a period of 30 years that the contract runs, plus the additional 20 years under which all these programs pay out, of something like $27 million. The deficit on the private power contracts will run something like $8½ million. The payments the rural electric co-ops were able to make, as pointed out by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMUNDSON] up to 1954 were sufficient to pay the interest and a substantial sum on the capital cost. Some $4 million was paid up until that time. But, in 1955, there was a deficit, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] pointed out, of something like $2 million. That resulted from two things. In the first place, they completed some other projects which added to the capital cost and, of course, increased the amount of interest due the Federal Government. The interest went up from something less than $1 million to $2½ million. And there was in 1953 an additional capital cost of about $63 million. When that hit them plus this water shortage and the drought, they simply have fallen behind in these recent years. When you do not get any water, you do not have any water to fill a reservoir. When there is no water to fill a reservoir, there is no water to run through the powerhouse. When there is no water to run through the powerhouse, there is no power to sell, and if the droughts are bad enough, the farmers cannot buy what power there is. These people are in a distressed area as declared by the President of the United States.

In the light of all that, what did the Department of the Interior propose? They came up here with a proposal that the power rates charged against the rural electrical co-ops should be increased by 40 percent from 5.5 mills to 7.7 mills. It must be remembered that the Reynolds Electric Co. gets its power in various categories. As you know, this power business is very complicated—from a low rate of 1¼ mills to a higher rate of 7.6 mills and it can be argued their average rate and the average rate of the private utilities is about 2.8 mills. The Department of the Interior came up here with the recommendation that the rates be increased on the rural electric co-ops. A bill was immediately introduced in the other body to not only freeze the rates of the Southwest Power Administration, but to prevent the increase of any rates of power disposed of by the Federal agencies throughout the United States. Very complete hearings were held on that subject matter in the other body, by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works joined by a subcommittee from the Senate Committee on the Interior, a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, and a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works.

The Senate bill was voted out by the Senate and was passed, and when the bill came over to our side we held hearings on it and we changed it. We adopted three amendments to the Senate bill, substantive amendments.

The first amendment we adopted limited the operation of the bill so far as the rate moratorium was concerned to the Southwestern Power Administration area itself, the only one really in trouble with respect to this power rate problem.

Then we added a second amendment which said that the Federal Government in fixing the rates in the Southwestern Power area should use the incremental method of establishing the cost of the power facilities. This simply means that nothing is charged for the building of the dam, the only charge being made for the improvements necessary to produce power. The dam had to be built anyway;

in other words, the incremental or additional cost added to the flood feature of the dam. We felt that was a fair base inasmuch as it was the method used in fixing the rate for the power contract with the private utility company and the Reynolds Aluminum Co., and by Congress itself in two of these projects in the Southwestern Power area.

The third amendment which the committee added was that the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and directed to renegotiate these other contracts for the purpose of increasing their rates and in order that future rate revisions shall be spread equitably among all of the customers of the Southwestern Power Administration. In other words, our bill presupposes that there is going to have to be some kind of power rate increase in this area. We did not dispute that, and those of us in the Far West who believe in these greater water and power projects believe that it is necessary for these projects to pay the costs allocated to power and repay interest on the power investment to the Federal Treasury. So we expect that these rates are going to go up.

We wanted the moratorium until the first of July of this coming year in order that the Interior Department could implement these instructions that we gave in the two new added sections, that is, sections 2 and 3.

Sections 2 and 3 caused some discussion. I did not suppose that anybody would object to applying the same rule to the rural electric cooperatives with reference to the method of determining costs attributable to power as were applied to the Reynolds Metals contract and the private power contracts; I did not suppose there would be any objection to that; if the incremental method was a good idea, and it has been applied by Congress in two projects in that area, it ought to be justified here. This was a theory that could be applied to the whole area on the ground that the dams were going to be built anyway. Therefore we thought the incremental method was a fair method to authorize them to use in this particular section.

But the Interior Department has come up with a different system and one on which there is general agency agreement. So when it was suggested that we take the section out I consulted with gentlemen on my side of the aisle as well as on the other side of the aisle who were interested in this particular legislation, and since they saw no reason for forcing this matter now, provided that section 1 of the bill is retained giving the moratorium, that we drop section 2 and go ahead and study the matters in that section later.

The same thing is true with reference to section 3, which is the matter of contract renegotiation. Some question was raised about the Reynolds contract. I know, as any lawyer knows, that you cannot abridge the terms of an existing contract; the Constitution of the United States stops that, and the Constitution is a pretty sturdy document. On the other hand, there was some concern that the direction in the bill could be regarded as a direction to the Interior Department to search out methods of finding some way of rejecting these contracts and subjecting them to renegotiation; so it was suggested that the third section be dropped out. Again I talked with those primarily interested in the bill on the subject of the proposed moratorium, and we are perfectly willing to have section 3 go over until the next session.

So the bill which will come before you, if these two amendments are adopted, or to put the case the other way, since they are amendments adopted by the committee, if the amendments are turned down, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania will urge when this matter comes up, the bill on which you will be asked to vote finally will be a bill creating a moratorium on an increase of these power rates in the Southwestern Power area until June 30 of next year, and that is all.

In the interim we propose to study these other matters, both with reference to what is the proper method of allocating cost in this area in connection with the Interior Department and the people primarily concerned, and as a matter of national policy, and, in addition, to explore the matter the gentleman from North Carolina mentioned in his discussion on the rule; and also what is the actual situation with reference to the renegotiation of some of these contracts held by private concerns that are now getting a good low-cost ride in a couple of instances, 2 of them to the extent of about $8½ million a year.

What is the justification, then, for this moratorium? The justification is the drought condition. This is a case of extreme hardship. Farmers that have no water cannot create any power to sell in order to get revenue and farmers whose lands are dry will not be able to buy power. And adding to the rates would only be adding to the deficits. That deficit is going to be added at the end of this contract period anyway. Secondly, the REA should not be picked out for preferential consideration with reference to the raising of rates. Others should be considered in that connection, too, and time will permit that to be done. The basis of cost allocation should be given some study in order that when the actual rate increase is arrived at, whether it is 2.2 mills or 1.9 mills or less than that, it will be arrived at on the basis of an appropriate allocation of cost, determined in this instance by the Congress of the United States. These other consumers should be brought in as early as can legally be done in order that there may be a fair sharing of this increased cost of 80 percent, which is the basic reason for the difficulty in which the Southwestern Power Administration now finds itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 648).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 12350, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby taken from the Speaker's table; that the House further insists on disagreement to the Senate amendments and agrees to the further conference requested by the Senate, and the Speaker shall immediately appoint the conferees without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no request for a second.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON, KIRWAN, GARY, TABER, and PHILLIPS.

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 3338, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], chairman of our committee, has referred to this bill as a moratorium. I think it could be more properly referred to as a coroner's inquest. The body is being examined to try to determine whether or not the corpse that is being viewed was killed by an injection given by a former administration; and, with all due deference to the gentleman from California, everything that he said leads me to the conclusion that try as you will to bring up any other issue, the embalming fluid that is found in the veins of this corpse was placed there by Oscar Chapman in 1952.

In 1952 Mr. Chapman entered into a contract, which the Department of Justice has stated cannot be broken, for 30 years, and instead of providing that in case there was an increase in cost the contract could be opened and renegotiated to reflect the cost, this contract contained no such provision whatsoever.

Now, I was interested in the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] when he spoke on the rule. He said that the pressing need for this contract in January 1952 was the fact that we were engaged in the Korean war and that aluminum was in short supply, and that it was necessary to encourage aluminum companies to open up. Well, apparently Mr. Chapman and the prior administration must have expected a 30-year war, because there was no provision in this contract that at the end of hostilities there should be a reexamination.

Now, I listened very closely to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and he said that you should not blame the prior administration; you should not take them to task for this very unfair contract that they entered into in giving preference and giveaway of the Federal money to the Reynolds Aluminum Co. and to a private utility because the Army engineers had missed out on their estimate and that they had underestimated the cost of this project by 80 percent. Yet the prior administration, and particularly Mr. Chapman, did not take those figures into consideration when he entered into a power contract in 1952, that these dams would cost over 80 percent more than the original estimate. No; you cannot saddle this on the present Department of the Interior. This is the first time on the floor of this House that the public-power advocates have had to come in here and admit that their whole project fails.

This is what was done in the early stages of this bill. The Senate bill wanted to freeze all rates. Then when they ran into a buzz saw and found they could not get that, and could not get that out of our committee, they said. "We will try and take one little group; we will take the Southwest Power and plead for the little people down there; we will try and get them to be the guinea pig that will set a precedent for this House to follow in all of these matters that come up hereafter."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is the gentleman suggesting that he has some information that other projects are in trouble or will be in some serious trouble in the days and years to come?

Mr. SAYLOR. I certainly am. And if the gentleman had read some of these hearings he would have come to the conclusion that it is not just the Southwest Power Administration, but the Bonneville Power Administration and a number of these other public power units that are in trouble and that are going to be in trouble and will be in here on the same basis.

Mr. DONOVAN. They will be in here asking the taxpayers all over the land to make up what they are losing.

Mr. SAYLOR. They will be in here asking the taxpayers all over the land to make it up, yes. I was interested in the fact that my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] gave three stirring reasons why we should pass this bill. First, the rate is unfair. It is unfair. I concede it is unfair. But it is not unfair to the people who live in this area. It is unfair to the taxpayers of America because they are being asked to pick up the tab, to pay the bill, to underwrite this loss.

Sure, it is unfair. It is unfair not to the people in that area; it is unfair not to the people who live in these 6 States but to the people in the other 42 States of the Union who have to pay their own electric bill. It is unfair to people who are yet unborn to ask them to assume to pay for the lights that are being burned by the people down in that area today. Certainly the people in that area ought to pay their own light bills.

So the Department of the Interior is now coming in and asking the Congress to put into effect the provisions of the Flood Control Act and say that the prices charged for power that is sold are sufficient to return the Government's investment with interest.

The gentleman points out a third reason why we should allow this bill to pass. There is a severe drought in this area and the farmers are in dire circumstances. For the first time we now find that the trouble in that section of the Farm Belt is not because of Mr. Benson. This is the first time I have heard these people get up and say that the trouble in that farm area is not with Mr. Benson. Now we have been told that their trouble for 7 years has been a drought. Maybe Mr. Benson is not the man principally responsible for all of the shortages in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of this House to defeat this bill and to defeat it because if they do not, let me predict that in the days to come, in the next session and the sessions following, there will be other projects in trouble coming in here and they will be pointing to what this House did in connection with Southwest Power to help them out, and that therefore we ought to help out the others.

These people who advocate public power should expect their own people to pay their own bills. Everyone knows they have taken enough of the taxpayers' money, without asking other people who do not live in those areas to pay their bill for burning their electric lights and operating their refrigerators.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Douglas Wright, who since the Southwestern Power Administration has been in existence has been its administrator, and who was carried over from the other administration into this one by Secretary McKay, testified before a House committee last year that the average farm use of electricity in the Southwest area was 200 hours of electricity. He figures that an increase in the rate of 1 mill would amount to 20 cents per month on that basis. Did the committee take any testimony on that indicating what the cost of this increase would be for the average user?

Mr. SAYLOR. As I understand from the hearings we had on this bill, the average increase for a farm user in this area would be 40 cents a month if this bill is not put into effect.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I noticed the chairman of the committee referred to the hearings and the gentleman has referred to them. I tried to get a copy of the hearings and was told that there are no copies available. I should like to know why the rest of the membership cannot get hearings on an important issue like this. I wonder if the chairman can answer that question.

Mr. SAYLOR. I can say that the matters before our committee were not printed. The only hearings I have referred to as printed hearings are the hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Why is the membership of the House not given the privilege of having what hearings there are available so we can follow this debate?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can answer?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The reason is that the testimony before the House committee was largely repetitious of what is already in the printed document.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But that is not available to us. I am talking about the House, not the Senate.

Mr. ENGLE. I know, but does the gentleman say he cannot get a printed document from the Senate?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no record, however, of these hearings. That is not fair to the House.

Mr. ENGLE. I cannot agree with the gentleman that the hearings are not available. They are. Every hearing that was printed there was participated in by members of 2 committees of this body, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, and 2 committees of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I understand the gentleman, the Senate hearings covered the whole area and are not confined, as this bill is, to the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. ENGLE. The primary testimony in the Senate hearings related to the Southwestern Power Administration. We did not see any sense in duplicating the printing job by printing cumulative statements. For instance, Mr. Aandahl appeared, and his statement before us was just about what it was in there. Those hearings are very complete.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I may say to the gentleman, for his information, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works appropriations, that there are extensive hearings on this subject before the Committee on Appropriations, which are available, and where Mr. Aandahl and Mr. Wright both testified.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The rest of the Members of the House, in trying to follow debate, go to the desk here, and

when we are told hearings are not available it makes it very difficult to follow the debate.

Mr. EVINS. The Appropriations Committee hearings are available if the gentleman wishes to examine them.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, for several reasons. One is that if the enactment of this legislation is completed the Secretary of the Interior will not be able to negotiate and set rates in the Southwestern Power Administration so that the project can become feasible. The Flood Control Act of 1944 provides that rates must be set so that these projects are feasible so that they will pay interest and amortization on the investment. Here we have a proposition where this great investment is running behind not only in its amortization but some $2¾ million a year in interest. There are provisions in this legislation that suggest, at least, a renegotiation of these contracts. It has already been stated that it is unconstitutional to impair the validity of a contract and the rights of a contract. Therefore, we are just putting words into a bill that actually have no effect. I will say to you the only ones left where the rates can be raised are the rural electric co-ops because they are not under contract. That rate increase would only amount to 40 cents per month per farm family. And if they cannot pay that now, they surely cannot pay it a year from now. Reference has been made to the incremental method of arriving at a rate base. I have no fault to find with the incremental method so far as the Southwest Power is concerned, but I suggest to you if the incremental method were used whereby some private utility were going to make use of the falling water, the right side of this aisle would be up in arms against a giveaway program of giving falling water provided by the taxpayers of America to some private utility. But here they say, "No allocation or no assessment of cost of the reservoir where the storage of water is made available shall be used in the base for determining a rate to be charged to Southwest Power." I will say to you if we use the incremental methods, there is only a difference of three-tenths of 1 mill. So it has very little effect if we use the incremental method. It would mean that the rate would have to be increased by 1.9 mills rather than at 2.1 mills which is a very little difference.

I suggest to you on the renegotiation of this Reynolds contract—and as I said, it cannot be done—that we are subsidizing the Reynolds Aluminum Co. to the extent of some $900,000 a year, which over a 30-year period amounts to $27 million being paid by the taxpayers of the United States to the Reynolds Aluminum Co.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Suppose, for example, it is discovered, as has been broadly hinted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], that a project, say in northern California like that one up near Shasta Dam finds it is in the same position as this Southwest Power Administration is now in and there are contracts with big power companies on the west coast which cover a long period of time, and it is found that the people who presented these projects to the House had underestimated the costs to get them by this floor, and they find themselves in the same position that the Southwest Power Administration finds itself in—they will be in here asking for the same kind of relief, I presume; is that not correct?

Mr. UTT. Unquestionably, in my mind, they will be.

Mr. DONOVAN. They will be in here hollering and complaining and charging this House with making fish of one and fowl of the other. They did it for Texas so you have to do it for northern California or for Oregon or for anyplace in the United States where there is a public power project; is that not correct?

Mr. UTT. The gentleman from New York is correct.

But, I do want to say to you that this 30-year contract which was signed by Oscar Chapman just prior to the expiration of his term as Secretary of Interior there was a 6-year temporary rate, that the then Secretary of the Interior knew a rate increase was necessary and inevitable in order to meet the interest and amortization of the project. It was also known by this former Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, that all co-ops would not be made to pay the necessary increase so long as the Reynolds Aluminum Co. had a 30-year contract at a lesser figure because Congress would come to the rescue of the coops and, therefore, by signing the 30-year contract at a loss rate froze the rates of the Southwest Power Administration for at least 30 years. With the annual loss of $2,500,000 the result of the recommendation of the committee, the total is going to be some $75 million in the next 30 years that the taxpayers of every State of the country will have to pay.

I say to you that if this legislation is passed you are not only giving a moratorium for 1 year but for every year as long as the Reynolds Aluminum contract is in effect, which is 27 more years. There is no use kidding ourselves that this is a 12-month moratorium; it is a 27-year moratorium, and the taxpayers of the country are going to have to pick up the check for $75 million to meet the interest alone, without making any payment upon the amortization of this contract.

I will say further that if this legislation is passed it will jeopardize every reclamation and flood control and power project in the United States brought before this Congress for consideration, because they will come up and say: "If it costs more do not bother, we will lower the rate and let the taxpayers pay the difference."

I urge the defeat of this measure.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us share a great sense of shock on hearing of the catastrophic collision the night before last off Nantucket Island of the Italian liner *Andrea Doria* and the large Swedish passenger vessel, the steamship *Stockholm*. These 2 great and popular passenger ships, carrying nearly 2,400 passengers, collided in the fog with a severely crippling effect on the *Stockholm* and resulting in the abandonment and sinking of the *Andrea Doria* some 10 or 11 hours later. Miraculously, loss of life appears to have been small. I commend the United States Coast Guard for its immediate and efficient response, and the magnificent feats of rescue performed during the tragic hours.

Fortunately, calm seas and instant and heroic response of rescue vessels saved nearly all of the passengers and crew of the doomed Italian liner.

I know that I express the sense of the House when I offer sincerest and deepest sympathy to the Italian people on the loss of the great and beautiful pride of the Italian merchant marine. It was only 3 years ago that she made her maiden voyage from Genoa to New York and was hailed as one of the true queens of the Atlantic.

The *Andrea Doria* and the *Stockholm*, both modern vessels, were equipped with radar and designed with supposedly adequate compartmentation and other up-to-date features of construction and equipment which should have made such a catastrophe impossible. The impossible happened and there must have been a reason.

These two ships and many others of the forty-odd foreign passenger ships plying the Atlantic between the United States and Europe are extremely popular and heavily patronized by American tourists and businessmen. Therefore I feel that the Congress and the appropriate committees must be immediately concerned when such a tragedy occurs to endanger the lives of American citizens.

Yesterday I asked the Commandant of the Coast Guard to make an investigation of the matter and report his findings to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as soon as possible. I plan to have the committee's staff get such facts as it can concerning the disaster and attend any hearings or boards of inquiry which may be held. I am also giving consideration to the appointment of a special subcommittee to look into the circumstances surrounding this matter and give particular attention to the adequacy of equipment and safety features on American vessels. At this time I cannot say the exact course we may have to take. But I definitely feel that we have an obligation to do whatever is necessary to assure the safety of the lives of our people traveling the high seas, whether they are traveling on

foreign flagships or American flagships. I cannot imagine an American flagship in a similar circumstance being unable to lower a large portion of its lifeboats.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to commend the chairman for the statement he has made and for the interest he has shown in this tragedy. It seems to me that our committee should obtain all the information we possibly can in connection with this collision for the purpose of safeguarding the lives of American travelers on whatever ship they may travel of whatever Nation. Furthermore, it seems to me that we should look into the international rules for safety at sea with a view to ascertaining whether or not they are adequate. Also we should inquire whether or not our own safety regulations are adequate. It seems to me our committee could very profitably look into the matter.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want the House to know that the prime interest here is in the American citizen. Of course, we are interested in the citizens of all nations, but we are responsible, in a way, to see that proper safety is accorded the American citizen who travels on a foreign-flag ship as well as those who travel on American ships.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I think we should know exactly what we are doing by this bill. I spoke against the rule and tried to point out some of the facts we are faced with. We should consider the practical aspects of what will be done by this bill.

The Southwest Power Administration has borrowed money from the United States Government to operate this project at a rate of interest of 2½ percent. If any of you will check the cost of money to the United States, you will find that money costs us a great deal more than 2½ percent. On short-term loans today we are paying 3 percent plus for the money; yet this money is loaned at 2½ percent; in other words, at less than the cost of that money to the Government. The actual cost of Government money is somewhere around 4 percent. We have this money loaned at 2½ percent, less than it is costing the Government. Still they are not able to pay out. The interest is lagging at the rate of about $2,500,000 a year. I repeat, that is not according to sound business principles as required under the act.

There are Members here who represent areas with REA's. I do, too. But I do not want to go back to my REA district and tell the people served by the REA in my district that they are not only paying their light bill to the local REA but they are also paying the light bill for people served by the Southwestern Power Administration. There is no great benevolent Uncle Sam who puts this money up; there is no great fund in the pockets of old Uncle Sam. It is you and your constituents and mine who are paying the income taxes that take care of these favored few. You and your constituents want tax reduction. You will never have a reduction so long as you vote for this kind of legislation.

This project is going to be extended to something like a 70-year payoff. We had a bill in here the other day where they were talking about what is going to happen with atomic power, and that some time in the near future atomic power is going to be competitive with other power. Oh, some of them said it may be 20 years until that time comes. But when that time comes, and if atomic power becomes competitive, you will have some 50 years still left to pay out this project, and it will not pay out. Our generation will pay the bill; our generation should be paid back.

So we better be careful when we go back to our people. When we have constituents who are paying light bills to private power companies, about 24 percent of that light bill is in taxes paid to the Federal Government to carry on these non-interest-paying projects. You better look this thing over carefully before you go back to your people.

We have all talked about economy, we have talked about stability and sound financial policies in this Nation; yet here we are today under the whiplash, in this particular case, because of reasons known to many of us. I fear we will go ahead and we will pass a law that will involve a loss of $2,500,000 a year in interest alone to all the taxpayers of the Nation in order to benefit a small segment of the country. This bill may pass, but not with my vote. I am not going back and tell my people that I was any part of this kind of sound fiscal irresponsibility in this House. I am going back and say that I endeavored under adverse circumstances to try to get some fiscal responsibility on this question so that my REA subscribers are not only paying their bills but the bills of somebody thousands of miles away from them. If we are ever going to bring about sound fiscal policies, we cannot pass these laws which impair the obligation of a contract, where people have agreed to pay back to us, and, if they cannot, we will pass a law so that they do not have to meet their responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I may not again address this House during this Congress. I hope in the next session we will bring back some semblance of legislative responsibility.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the attention of the committee to the consideration of one aspect of this problem that has not received any attention from those who have spoken here today.

We are all interested in the REA movement. I have already demonstrated my friendship for the REA's in my section of the country. I raise the question now, however, as to whether or not the action here proposed will not be a tremendous disservice to the REA movement. If we can accept the testimony of Mr. Douglas Wright, who has been the administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration ever since it was created back in the forties, and who was retained in that position by the new administration that come into power in 1953—and I mention that to show that he is not an appointee of the Eisenhower administration—the average cost per farm family, of an increase in retail rates of 1 mill, would be 20 cents per month. Now, the proposed increase is a little over 2 mills, and it seems to be admitted, in the debate here today that the average cost would be 40 cents per month per family. Now, I ask you, is that too much to pay to prevent giving the opponents—and we have opponents in this country of the REA movement—a club to beat the REA people over the head with? Are you not, if you adopt this legislation, giving ammunition to the people who oppose REA; are you not admitting what they have been arguing all the time—that many of these projects were not economically feasible; that the rate structure has not been realistic; and that ultimately the taxpayers of the United States will have to pick up the check? I invite the chairman of the committee to respond to this. Is this not the first time since the REA movement began that an effort has been made to have Congress fix rates by legislation and prevent a normal increase in rates when required? Is this not unique? Is this not the first time this has ever happened?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not know of any in my experience. This is the first time it has come to my attention.

Mr. JONAS. My understanding is that this is the first time since the REA movement began that proponents of legislation of this sort have ever come to Congress and sought to keep rates from being raised when required in order to meet the terms of amortization and interest.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say this to the gentleman, that we believe it is necessary to raise these rates. There is no dispute about that; there is no argument about that. Of course, the fact that these people are in difficulty now hurts rural electrification; we know that. But that is no answer to the problem. They are behind now because of drought conditions and these new, heavy capital obligations that have occurred in the last year or two.

What we are trying to do is to find a way out, that will give an equitable increase of rates to all consumers of that power. You say, yes, we are going to have to increase those rates. We know that. This is a simple moratorium until June 30 of next year to try to work out some of these complicated problems so that the administration does not knock out the rural electrification cooperatives in order to get them further rate increases while these other people are not getting any.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is fair to point the finger at this administration and say that it is seeking

to raise the rates only on the REA's. It is seeking to raise the rates on those customers who do not have firm contracts that cannot be touched.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman know that we have been paying from $2 million to $5 million to make up this loss for years?

Mr. JONAS. I am sure that is correct. May I call the Committee's attention to the testimony of Mr. Douglas Wright, on page 19 of the hearings on the Public Works Appropriations for 1956. He was talking about the knowledge in the Southwest that these rates were not realistic and would have to be raised, and that this had been known and accepted as inevitable for several years.

He said:

In addition to that, before submitting formal recommendations, as I said, they have an Advisory Committee on Power in the Southwest composed of the consumers. And in many meetings with those people the reasons for the rate changes were discussed at great length, and I think those consumers realized that a change in rates was going to be necessary, and the reasons for it.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Wright recommended that the rate be raised 1 mill. The proposal which came up here is 2.2 mills.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Wright testified before the House Appropriations Committee in 1955 that he knew the rates would have to be raised and he thought they would have to be raised to the neighborhood of 7 mills. I recall that the REA's in my State pay 7 mills for their power and have not found the rate unduly burdensome. Of course everyone who uses electricity would like to have as low a rate as possible.

The proposal in this instance is to increase the rate to 7.71 mills which is less than 1 mill more than my REA's have been paying and will have to continue to pay.

I am just raising the question, in all seriousness and sincerity, whether we will not be doing a great disservice to the REA's, if we today confess that a situation actually exists, which the enemies of REA have always contended did exist or would eventually arise. I think we ought to struggle along and try to keep from freezing these rates if it is at all possible; I do not know whether 40 cents per month is worth the danger of destroying, or greatly damaging, REA by playing directly into the hands of those who will be able to say, I told you so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I want to dispel any notion anybody might have that a vote against this bill would be a vote for the REA's, which was suggested by the gentleman who just spoke. You can search the 750 pages of the hearings on this bill, from cover to cover, and not find a single REA representative who is opposed to this bill. When I refer to REA, I refer to the REA cooperatives. Every REA representative, in the national office and all over the country who gave testimony on this, favored this bill and held that it was essential, necessary. So a vote against this bill is a vote against the REA's official position that was taken before the committee.

There is a second point that I think needs to be straightened out. There has been a great deal of talk about the aluminum company contract and how undesirable it is. If my information is correct, the approval that has been given to that contract by the Federal Power Commission is only a 5-year approval, and if the opponents of this bill wish to do something about their contract in 1957 they can go before the Federal Power Commission and take it up at that time. They will have that opportunity. But that has nothing to do with the merits of this particular proposal insofar as the need for alleviation of the rate increase proposed for the REA's is concerned at this time.

As to the final point, someone has said we ran into a buzz saw when we cut the bill from the entire country to one group. It was no buzz saw that led to this, it was the testimony of Assistant Secretary Aandahl that they were proposing only one increase and thinking about and studying about only one increase, and that was in the Southwestern Power Administration area. We regard this as unfair discrimination against our region of the country, and seek to prevent it by this measure. I urge the approval of this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations of the House held extensive hearings on this matter. Mr. Douglas Wright, Administrator, Southwest Power Administration, and Mr. Fred G. Aandahl, the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, both testified in detail concerning the controversy of the contracts here under consideration. It appeared to me from the testimony that an effort was being made to raise the power rates of rural cooperatives generally and especially three cooperatives in the State of Missouri. Such a raise in rates of the three Missouri cooperatives would put their rates on a level with a fourth cooperative in that area. It further appeared to me, Mr. Speaker, that the one cooperative with the higher rate should have had their contract reconsidered by SPA to reduce its rates and bring their rate cost structure in line with the three other cooperatives in Missouri—which are furnished power by SPA.

The private power companies purchasing Government power seemed to be in most instances receiving the benefit of low rates, whereas the farmers are paying a higher rate. The farmers of the area should not be saddled with the 40 percent rate increase proposed by SPA in the rate increase deal.

Certainly this matter is of such importance that we should not try to act on it too hastily. I believe this moratorium legislation should be enacted, to give the Department time to evaluate all the merits of the matter and not saddle farmer REA-Co-op users with increased rates throughout the area of the Southwest Power Territory. Rather, why should the rates of the Aluminum Company of America purchasing power in the area not be increased? That, in my opinion, would be more equitable in the present situation.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take this minute to tell the House that the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina would mean that the time is going to come when all REA's are going to be in the red and we are going to have to pick up the check. I think the record will show there are many REA's that are not only meeting their interest obligations but paying off the capital investment long before the time necessary.

May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that if both of us are back in the next Congress, if he will go along with these rates and keep these rates until next June, the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations will start in January to make a study of the rate structure and try to work this problem out.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania made that point. It is one I intended to make when I was on my feet.

I think this is the first time a failure to meet existing obligations has occurred. One of the things we have all been proud of throughout these years, and one of the things the REA people have always pointed to with pride—and I have agreed with them that we can all be proud of it—is that they have met their obligations and have not defaulted.

I am just raising the question, and suggesting serious consideration, whether or not we may not ourselves in the action we take here today in approving this legislation do a great disservice to the REA, because for the first time we are helping prove that an REA situation did not work out as planned.

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman will yield, you cannot get blood out of a turnip. They are not paying the rate they have now. How could they pay a higher rate? What we are saying is, Let us put this matter over until June 30, next year, while we study the proposition of making an equitable increase in rates across the line, especially in the light of the hardships these people are under. There is a drought down there. They have no water. They do not have any power and what there is, they do not have any money to buy it. The gentleman from Arkansas made a statement here on the floor that where there were 10,000 connections, 3,000 of them were not taking any of the product of those lines. So we just have to face up to the proposition, not of increasing the rates—that will not do any good—but let us go

down to the Department of the Interior and work the matter out. There are at least three of these private power contracts which can, in our opinion, be renegotiated, and in all probability the Reynolds Aluminum contract can be renegotiated too, after 1957.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask the gentleman to read for the RECORD any reference in the contract under which you think that can happen because it is a subject in which I am very much interested. I repeat what I said before that if it can be shown that the rates can be raised under the private contracts, I will vote for the bill. I would never favor raising the rates to the REA's and not take similar action under the contracts with the private companies. My fear is that those who negotiated the private contracts for the Government in 1952 and prior thereto failed, for some strange and unknown reason, to provide for rate increases in those contracts.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the principal purpose of the bill now before us is to require that the rates for power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration not be revised before July 1, 1957. This legislation is necessary because the Department of the Interior has served notice of its intention to file a new rate schedule with the Federal Power Commission which would have the effect of increasing the rates to cooperatives and other preference customers of the Southwestern Power Administration. The increase would result in an average wholesale rate of 7.71 mills at load center delivery points, as compared with 5.5 mills at the present time.

This proposed increase would upset the rate schedules of the cooperatives to such an extent that many of them undoubtedly would be put out of business. Most of the cooperatives in my congressional district are direct purchasers from the Southwestern Power Administration, and their rates would be directly and adversely affected if this rate increase were put into effect. Many of the cooperatives are having a hard time now meeting their debt obligations to the Government of the United States, and some of them are not quite making it.

The cooperatives made their agreements on the basis of certain costs of power and certain interest rates. Unless these costs are allowed to prevail throughout the life of the contracts, then the cooperatives are threatened with failure. The effect of the bill before you is to freeze the rates for 1 year at the levels existing on last February 27. During the year the opportunity would be available for a complete study of the rate structure of the Southwestern Power Administration so that the Congress would have more information on which to act.

We have had a severe drought in my part of the country for several years. Farm income in many cases has been reduced to the vanishing point. The cooperatives which deliver electricity to the farmers already are having trouble meeting their obligations because the farmers have been so hard hit by adverse weather conditions and low prices for farm commodities. The customer service of the REA's already is decreasing, even under present power rates. If the Department of Interior goes through with its plan to increase power rates, it will be placing an extra burden on farmers who already are suffering. As I see it, either we leave the rates alone for the present, or we reverse the longstanding Government policy of trying to make it possible for all farm families to enjoy the advantages of electricity.

I do not believe this House wants the Government to go back on the contracts which the REA's made in good faith with the Southwestern Power Administration. I do not believe we want to make it harder for farmers to enjoy the advantages of electricity. I do not believe we are going to take a backward step in our longstanding REA policy.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this legislation will be approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I regret the situation that has developed with respect to the Southwestern Power Administration. It is a situation that cannot be condoned and must be rectified before it throws the entire REA program in jeopardy.

I shall vote for the bill before us today because there is no alternative pending another session of Congress which must enact legislation compelling corrective action. It is obvious that farmer-consumers of electric energy in this area are in no position at this time to meet the obligations that would be necessary to put the SPA on a sound footing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-six Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 18 months after January 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Interior shall not, in the disposition of electric power and energy generated at projects under the control of the Federal Government (or any department or agency thereof) to any public body or cooperative, charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956, for electric power and energy furnished by him to such public body or cooperative.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 5 to 7, strike the words "generated at projects under the control of the Federal Government (or any department or agency thereof)" and insert the words "marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Add a new section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. From and after the effective date of this act, the basis for determining the allocation of project costs used in arriving at the schedule of rates for the sale of electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the incremental method of allocation, whereby the costs allocated to power shall be limited to the costs of adding power as a purpose in the projects."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which we agreed to delete from the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will rise, I take it, in opposition and I have no objection, and I announce the author of the bill and those primarily interested in this have no objection to voting down this amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, that is in accord with the agreement between the gentleman from California and myself that section 2 of the bill should be deleted and the amendment should be deleted.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, insert:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to renegotiate existing contracts between nonpreference customers and the Southwestern Power Administration so as to provide that the price charged for electric power and energy to such customers shall uniformly increase or decrease concurrently with any increase or decrease resulting from future revisions of the rate schedules presently governing the sale of electric power and energy to preference customers of the Southwestern Power Administration."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. ENGLE] to explain what this amendment does.

Mr. ENGLE. This is the amendment that permits renegotiation. It has also been agreed to drop it in accordance with our understanding and under a similar arrangement which we discussed with reference to the preceding amendment.

For reasons I have previously stated I request that the committee not agree to the amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. I may say to the gentleman from California that since he made the statement on the floor that these contracts could be renegotiated it is a position which I did not believe was possible, and therefore I think this amendment should be kept in the bill. I say that because I want to get everyone down there to pay more money, and if these contracts can be renegotiated I do not want to give the Reynolds Metal Co. or any private utility down there a handout. We have been informed up to now that they cannot be renegotiated.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. It is my opinion that three of those contracts can. I can be in error about that, and as the gentleman knows, 50 percent of the lawyers in every

situation are wrong. So rather than have any argument about it the reason we agreed to take that section out was so that this matter as well as the matter in the preceding section, namely, the adoption of the incrementation method of computing cost, could go over for further study on the assumption that the House will then adopt a one-section bill providing for a moratorium to June 30. I am not prepared to talk on the legal aspects of that, and I do not want to argue it with some of the gentlemen who are concerned in the matter, but I took it up with the author of the bill and the other sponsors of this legislation and with the Southwestern Power Administration. They are willing to leave the matter for further study and that is why I made the statement I did and suggest that the House not approve the amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, after that statement by the gentleman from California I am perfectly willing to see that the amendment is dropped out.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take more than 30 seconds, but I do so in order to complete the record.

I would like the record to show that I am in favor of renegotiating all of those private contracts that can be renegotiated.

I am in favor of increasing the rates in the Reynolds Metals Co. contract to a realistic figure and I am opposed to raising the rates on the cooperatives if at the same time the rates to the private utilities can be raised and are not raised. I just wanted the record to show my position on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I will not delay the House, but I think this is an opportune time to speak a word of warning which I hope will be noticed by the REA cooperatives in America.

Some people are raising false hopes in the minds of cooperative electric utilities for political reasons, and some people, I am convinced, are proposing that cooperatives start experimental atomic reactors for malicious reasons. There may be some who are gullible and believe the misleading information which fills our press and technical magazines with predictions of almost immediate economic power from atomic fission. Whatever the motives of these promoters may be, I wish to warn them with a warning that comes from a lifelong friend of cooperative projects. Six or seven of these cooperatives have been tentatively negotiating for the installation of experimental atomic reactors as part of the experimental reactor development program. Knowing that rural cooperatives do not have reserves of money for investment and knowing that they must borrow this money if they are to enter this highly problematical field, I just want to sound a word of warning to these cooperatives. If they undertake to enter this field, which will involve from 40 to 50, maybe a 100, million dollars to build full-scale experimental power reactors that will have any chance at all of demonstrating economic power, they are falling into a trap, whether it be by borrowing of this money or by increasing the assessment on the users of the electricity.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a field for the cooperatives to enter at this time. They had better stay out of it and let those people that have access to greater funds, or the Federal Government preferably, enter into the field of research and development of atomic reactors. They should not fall into this trap into which some people who have not been in favor of cooperatives are all too willing to push them. That is, the trap of assuming additional financial obligations that will either cause them to go into bankruptcy or be absorbed by some of the adjoining utilities, or will cause them to have to raise the rates to their cooperative customers to the point where there will be a rebellion among those cooperative customers.

The REA cooperatives or any other type of electric cooperatives should conserve their funds or credit, if they have such resources, in order to build economic reactors when and if atomic reactors are proven to be economic.

I take this time, therefore, to state this solemn warning and hope it will be brought to the attention of the cooperatives and that they will tread lightly and sail slowly on this dangerous sea.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects pursuant to House Resolution 625, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 140, answered "present" 1, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—201

Abernethy	Andrews	Barrett
Addonizio	Ashley	Belcher
Albert	Ashmore	Bennett, Fla.
Andersen, H. Carl	Aspinall	Bennett, Mich.
	Avery	Berry
Blatnik	Harris	O'Hara, Ill.
Boggs	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Konski
Boland	Harrison, Va.	O'Neill
Bolling	Hays, Ark.	Pelly
Bonner	Hays, Ohio	Perkins
Boyle	Hayworth	Pfost
Brown, Ga.	Herlong	Philbin
Burdick	Hoeven	Poage
Byrd	Holifield	Polk
Byrne, Pa.	Holland	Price
Cannon	Holmes	Prouty
Carlyle	Holtzman	Quigley
Celler	Horan	Rabaut
Chelf	Huddleston	Rains
Chudoff	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Ikard	Reuss
Colmer	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Cooley	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Cooper	Johnson, Wis.	Rodino
Cunningham	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Davidson	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten	Rogers, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Rooney
Delaney	Kilgore	Roosevelt
Dempsey	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Denton	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Dingell	Klein	Selden
Dodd	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Dollinger	Knutson	Short
Dolliver	Landrum	Shuford
Donohue	Lanham	Sieminski
Dorn, S. C.	Lankford	Sikes
Doyle	LeCompte	Sisk
Durham	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Edmondson	Lovre	Spence
Elliott	McCarthy	Staggers
Ellsworth	McCormack	Steed
Engle	McGregor	Sullivan
Evins	McMillan	Talle
Fascell	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Thompson, N. J.
Fisher	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Fjare	Madden	Tollefson
Flood	Magnuson	Trimble
Flynt	Mahon	Tumulty
Fogarty	Marshall	Udall
Forand	Matthews	Vanik
Fountain	Merrow	Walter
Frazier	Metcalf	Watts
Friedel	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Whitten
Garmatz	Mills	Wier
Gary	Morano	Williams, Miss.
Gathings	Morgan	Williams, N. J.
Grant	Moss	Willis
Gray	Moulder	Winstead
Green, Oreg.	Multer	Wolverton
Green, Pa.	Murray, Ill.	Wright
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	Yates
Griffiths	Natcher	Zablocki
Gross	Norrell	Zelenko
Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.	
Hardy	O'Brien, N. Y.	

NAYS—140

Adair	Dague	King, Pa.
Alger	Davis, Ga.	Knox
Allen, Calif.	Dawson, Utah	Krueger
Andresen, August H.	Derounian	Laird
	Devereux	Lipscomb
Arends	Dixon	McConnell
Ayers	Donovan	McCulloch
Baldwin	Dorn, N. Y.	McDonough
Bass, N. H.	Feighan	McIntire
Bates	Fenton	McVey
Beamer	Fino	Mack, Wash.
Becker	Ford	Mailliard
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Mason
Bolton, Frances P.	Gamble	Meader
	Gavin	Miller, Md.
Bolton, Oliver P.	George	Miller, N. Y.
	Gubser	Minshall
Bosch	Gwinn	Mumma
Bow	Hale	Nicholson
Bray	Haley	Norblad
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Osmers
Brownson	Hand	Ostertag
Broyhill	Harden	Patterson
Budge	Harvey	Phillips
Burnside	Henderson	Pillion
Bush	Heselton	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Hiestand	Radwan
Canfield	Hill	Ray
Carrigg	Hillings	Rees, Kans.
Cederberg	Hoffman, Mich.	Robsion, Ky.
Chase	Holt	Rogers, Mass.
Chiperfield	Hyde	Sadlak
Church	Jackson	St. George
Cole	Jenkins	Saylor
Coon	Jonas	Schenck
Corbett	Jones, N. C.	Scherer
Cramer	Judd	Scott
Cretella	Kean	Scrivner
Crumpacker	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis, Mass.	Kearns	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Keating	Smith, Wis.

Springer	Van Pelt	Wigglesworth
Taber	Van Zandt	Williams, N. Y.
Teague, Calif.	Velde	Wilson, Ind.
Thompson, Mich.	Vorys	Withrow
	Westland	Wolcott
Thomson, Wyo.	Wharton	Young
Utt	Widnall	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Auchincloss

NOT VOTING—90

Abbitt	Eberharter	Passman
Alexander	Fallon	Patman
Allen, Ill.	Forrester	Pilcher
Anfuso	Gentry	Powell
Bailey	Gordon	Preston
Baker	Healey	Priest
Barden	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Bass, Tenn.	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baumhart	Hinshaw	Richards
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Bentley	Hope	Riley
Blitch	Hosmer	Rivers
Bowler	James	Robeson, Va.
Boykin	Jennings	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Scudder
Brooks, Tex.	Johansen	Sheehan
Buckley	Kee	Shelley
Burleson	Kelley, Pa.	Siler
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Kilburn	Taylor
Christopher	Lane	Thomas
Clevenger	Latham	Thompson, La.
Coudert	Long	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	McDowell	Tuck
Deane	Martin	Vinson
Dies	Mollohan	Vursell
Diggs	Morrison	Wainwright
Dondero	Nelson	Wickersham
Dowdy	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Calif.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burleson for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Hope against.

Mr. Rutherford for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Brooks of Texas with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Gentry with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Johansen.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Priest with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Jansen.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. HENDERSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORK OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DURING 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting a statement giving in detail the activities of the House District Committee during the 84th Congress including the 1st and 2d sessions. I realize that some of the bills are at the White House awaiting the President's signature and it is possible that the Senate may pass some additional House bills before we adjourn. However, I wanted to submit the enclosed statement so the House Members would have an opportunity to review the activities of my committee.

The members of my committee have spent a great deal of time in an effort to solve the problems of our Nation's Capital and keep it one of the most beautiful cities in the world. Congress appropriated approximately $200 million for additional Federal buildings in the metropolitan area which is, in my opinion, a great deal more than all the States combined have received for new post office buildings during the past 2 years.

During the past 18 years I have attended practically every District Committee meeting. When I first became a member of the House District Committee, the chairman had regular scheduled meetings every Monday during the session of Congress. However, in order to conserve time, during the past 2 years, we have scheduled regular meetings once each month with the understanding that additional meetings could be called at the request of the chairman. I take great pride in being able to be of some assistance to my Nation's Capital. However, I do not always receive the cooperation that a committee chairman should receive when he is performing a duty placed upon him which has no bearing on the district he represents.

STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE, HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress 147 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Of this number 127 were House bills and 20 were Senate bills. A total of 15 House bills and 12 Senate bills were reported favorably to the House. Of these bills 17 have become public law, 1 is private law, and 4 bills passed the House and are pending in the Senate. Five bills were reported from the committee but action was taken on the Senate companion bills on the floor of the House.

During the 2d session of the 84th Congress 89 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Of this number, 73 were House bills and 16 were Senate bills. A total of 39 House bills and 10 Senate bills were reported favorably to the House. Of these bills 18 have become public law, 5 are private laws, and there are 8 bills that have passed the House and are pending in the Senate. One of these bills was reported by the Senate District Committee but failed to pass the Senate. There are 14 bills awaiting Presidential signature, 1 bill in conference, 1 bill pending on House Calendar, 1 bill that was reported by the House District Committee but was recommitted, and 1 bill that passed the House, passed by the Senate, with amendments, and sent back to the House.

During the 84th Congress a total of 55 House bills and 22 Senate bills were reported from the committee favorably. Of this number 35 have become public law, 6 are private laws, 12 House bills are pending in the Senate and there are 14 bills awaiting Presidential signature. One bill is in conference, 1 bill pending on House Calendar, 1 bill that was recommitted and 1 bill that passed the House, passed the Senate amended, and returned to the House.

The most important piece of legislation to come out of the committee was the revenue bill, H. R. 9770, Public Law 460. Extensive hearings were held on the bill, H. R. 8168, to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was introduced on January 5, 1956. These hearings were held on January 11, 16 and 17. After the completion of these public hearings many executive meetings of the committees and their staff members were held, and a new bill, H. R. 9770, was introduced on March 6, 1956. The bill was approved on March 31, 1956, Public Law 460. It is expected that the District of Columbia will derive additional revenue for the fiscal year 1957 in the amount of $9,812,000 and for the fiscal year 1958, and thereafter, additional revenue in the amount of $11,812,000.

PUBLIC LAWS, FIRST SESSION

Public Law 376, H. R. 191: The purpose of this bill is to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions.

Public Law 128, H. R. 1825: The purpose of this bill is to provide for the establishment of a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center.

Public Law 198, H. R. 2406: The purpose of this bill is to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601, of the District of Columbia Code, so as to exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, all estate gifts made for public or municipal purposes to the United States or the District of Columbia, or made to, exclusively, charitable, educational, and religious organizations.

Public Law 320, H. R. 3908: The purpose of this bill is to increase the fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia. The Public Utilities Commission has authority to fix the rate of fare at not more than one-half the cash fare established by the Public Utilities Commission for regular-route transportation.

Public Law 240, H. R. 6259: The purpose of this bill is to provide that the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the Armory Board, upon requisitions previously approved by the Accounting Officer of the District of Columbia, sums of money not to exceed $11,000 at any one time to be used for office and sundry expenses of the Armory Board, including use for change-making purposes. The bill also provides that a fund, not to exceed $3,000 in any fiscal year, shall be set up to be used for promotional expenses.

Public Law 313, H. R. 6585: The purpose of this bill is to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia so as to prohibit the use of mental irresponsibility as a defense for the commission of a crime. Public Law 134, S. 391.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the bonding of certain officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia and for the payment of the premiums on such bonds by the District of Columbia.

Public Law 249, S. 665: The purpose of this bill is to revive section 3 of the act establishing a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia and to repeal section 3 of the act increasing the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. This legislation would permit persons who became employees of the Department of Food Services in the public schools to have such prior service treated as Government service for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act. Each such person would be required to make deposits covering such service to the same extent he would have made deposits had be been an employee of the Government.

Public Law 113, S. 666: The purpose of this bill is to extend from June 30, 1955, to June 30, 1957, the time during which appropriations may be made to carry out the provisions of the act establishing a hospital center in the District of Columbia.

Public Law 222, S. 667: The purpose of this bill is to exempt from the provisions of existing law the practice of cosmetology in connection with any bona fide regularly scheduled national annual convention of any national association of professional hairdressers or cosmetologists, for the purpose of permitting the presentation of educational programs at such meetings.

Public Law 139, S. 727: The purpose of this bill is to increase the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and the salary of the judge of the tax court for the District of Columbia, and the judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia. The salary of the chief judge of the municipal court of appeals would be increased from $14,500 to $17,500, the associate judges would be increased from $14,000 to $17,000. The salary of the chief judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia would be increased from $13,500 to $16,500. The salaries of the associate judges would be increased from $13,000 to $16,000. The judge of the tax court for the District of Columbia would be increased from $13,000 to $16,000, and the judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia would be increased from $11,800 to $14,800.

Public Law 243, S. 1093: The purpose of this bill is to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Public Law 225, S. 2176: The purpose of this bill is to repeal existing law that requires any public utilities company, association, or corporation engaged in the manufacture and sale of electricity for illuminating or heating or power purposes, or either, in the District of Columbia to submit annual reports to Congress.

Public Law 223, S. 2177: The purpose of this bill is to repeal paragraph 75 of the act creating the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, approved March 4, 1913. This paragraph provides that "no public utility shall declare any stock, bond, or scrip dividend or divide the proceeds of the sale of any stock, bond, or scrip among its stockholders."

Public Law 227, S. 2427: The purpose of this bill is to provide for the payment of compensation to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, for duty performed on their days off, when such days off are suspended during an emergency.

Public Law 244, S. 2428: The purpose of this bill is to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police.

Public Law 389, S. 2576: The purpose of this bill is to (1) repeal the franchise of the Capital Transit Co.; (2) grant the Commissioners of the District of Columbia power to take possession of and operate the properties of the Capital Transit Co. as may be necessary until the repeal of the franchise legally becomes effective; (3) grant the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as an alternative, authority to provide public transportation by contract or otherwise; (4) permit the Commissioners, with the approval of the Public Service Commission of Maryland, to provide public transportation within the State of Maryland as formerly provided by the Capital Transit Co.; and (5) provide for continuity and eliminate duplication of accounting for the operation of the company during the period of operation by the Commissioners.

PRIVATE LAWS, FIRST SESSION

Private Law 323, S. 1741: The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A. National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC LAWS, SECOND SESSION

Public Law 445, H. R. 1806: The purpose of this bill is to permit the Roosevelt Memorial Association to consolidate with the Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.

Public Law 645, H. R. 3693: The purpose of this bill is to increase the term of the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court from 4 years to 10 years and to provide retirement for the judge of such court.

Public Law 479, H. R. 6574: The purpose of this bill is to amend section 2 of title IV of the Revenue Act of 1937, so as to permit the transfer of license plates for a fee of $1.

Public Law 653, H. R. 6782: The purpose of this bill is to bring up-to-date the act of July 1, 1902, relating to the licensing of secondhand dealers, by empowering the Commissioners to classify and regulate secondhand dealers in the light of modern merchandising methods.

Public Law 534, H. R. 7228: The purpose of this bill is to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River in the vicinity of Jones Point. This bill would transfer the responsibility for the construction of this bridge from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce.

Public Law 535, H. R. 8130: The purpose of this bill is to provide that the bridge to be constructed in the vicinity of Jones Point shall be named the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge.

Public Law 491, H. R. 8957: The purpose of this bill is to provide for an extension of time for the Civic Auditorium Commission to file its report.

Public Law 514, H. R. 9078: The purpose of this bill is to provide that the Metropolitan Police shall not have less than 2,500 men.

Public Law 649, H. R. 9582: The purpose of this bill is to provide for the delayed reporting of births in the District of Columbia.

Public Law 460, H. R. 9770: The purpose of this bill is to increase the income tax law, provide for the withholding of income tax, increase the tax on beer, wines, etc., in order to raise additional revenue in the District of Columbia.

Public Law 627, H. R. 10060: The purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, to enable the Police Department to eliminate certain administrative difficulties insofar as the pay and work periods are concerned.

Public Law 648, H. R. 10768: The purpose of this bill is to amend the Teachers' Retirement Act.

Public Law 650, S. 1275: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to designate employees of the District to protect life and property in and on the buildings and grounds of any institution located upon property outside of the District of Columbia acquired by the United States for District sanatoriums, hospitals, training schools, and other institutions.

Public Law 486, S. 1289: The purpose of this bill is to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia. The bill also provides for the appointment of three additional judges.

Public Law 704, S. 1739: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions.

Public Law 731, S. 2704: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia.

Public Law 708, S. 2896: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without regard to the provisions of section 27–114, of the District of Columbia Code, to license for cemetery purposes any parcel of land in the District of Columbia which does not exceed 1 acre in size, and which except for a one-side frontage of less than 100 feet on a public street or highway, is otherwise completely bounded by land dedicated to cemetery purposes.

Public Law 642, S. 3295: The purpose of this bill is to extend daylight-saving time for 1 month, from the last Sunday in September to the last Sunday in October.

PRIVATE LAWS, SECOND SESSION

Private Law 609, H. R. 4909: The purpose of this bill is to permit the consolidation of the National Tax Association with the Tax Institute Inc.

Private Law 737, H. R. 8493: The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc. in the District of Columbia.

Private Law 738, H. R. 10374: The purpose of this bill is to amend the act approved March 3, 1849, which incorporated the Oak Hill Cemetery in the District of Columbia, so as to permit the board of managers of the Oak Hill Cemetery, to dispose of certain real property now usable only for cemetery purposes.

Private Law 774, S. 2705: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co., to construct, maintain and operate a branch track or siding over Second Street SE., in the District of Columbia.

Private Law 731, S. 3663: The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia.

BILLS AWAITING PRESIDENTIAL SIGNATURE

H. H. 2603: The purpose of this bill is to increase the radius within which the members of the Metropolitan Police and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside.

H. R. 4993: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two gasoline stations in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 5853: The purpose of this bill is to amend the act regulating the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of

Columbia, so as to remove the requirement that each member of the Board of Examiners in Veterinary Medicine be a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia. It increases the course of study required to four 9-month college sessions from the present requirement of two 6-month college sessions. It also provides that applicants for examination shall have completed the required amount of study of veterinary medicine at a college which has a curiculum equivalent to that required by the American Veterinary Medical Association's Council on Education for schools approved by the association. It deletes the provision in existing law relative to the licensing of graduates of 2-year colleges who have had 5 years' practice. Provides for holding examinations at least once a year.

H. R. 7380: The purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities that now exist in the Fire Department.

H. R. 8149: The purpose of this bill is to transfer jurisdiction of cases of $3,000 to the Municipal Court from the United States District Court.

H. R. 10375: The purpose of this bill is to amend the act providing recognition for meritorious service by members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia.

H. R. 10670: The purpose of this bill is to extend unemployment compensation coverage to District of Columbia employees who are employed in Maryland and Virginia.

H. R. 11320: The purpose of this bill is to strengthen the laws controlling the sale of narcotics and dangerous drugs in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11488: The purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act so as to furnish relief from the excise tax on the replacement of a defective motor vehicle. The bill also provides that the holder of a learner's permit may operate a motor vehicle when accompanied by a holder of a valid license.

S. 2895: The purpose of this bill is to amend the acts of February 28, 1903, and March 3, 1927, relating to the payment of the cost and expense of constructing railway-highway grade elimination structures in the District of Columbia.

S. 2568: The purpose of this bill is to amend title I of the act authorizing the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, relating to the Constitution Avenue Bridge. This bridge would provide construction of a six-lane bascule draw bridge.

H. R. 11489: The purpose of this bill is to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11090: The purpose of this bill is to provide that gifts of securities to minors may be made in the same manner as United States savings bonds or a savings account.

House Joint Resolution 667: The purpose of this resolution is to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies.

HOUSE BILLS PENDING IN THE SENATE

H. R. 5892: The purpose of this bill is to authorize officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia voluntarily to perform certain services on their time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty and to receive compensation therefor.

H. R. 6063: The purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925 to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State.

H. R 6775: The purpose of this bill is to provide for the regulation of the business of making loans of $600 or less in the District of Columbia and to regulate the pawnbroking business.

H. R. 7061: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to borrow motor vehicles for use in a motor vehicle driver education and training course in the public schools of the District of Columbia, to excuse the owners of vehicles loaned to public, private, or parochial schools for driver-training purposes from the payment of certain fees and taxes during the period of such loan.

H. R. 4922: The purpose of this bill is to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House.

H. R. 7538: The purpose of this bill is to provide 5 longevity increases for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force who have completed 28 years of service, without regard to the grade in which such service was rendered.

H. R. 7804: The purpose of this bill is to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 9312. The purpose of this bill is to provide that members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia may be removed for cause.

H. R. 11967: The purpose of this bill is to amend Public Law 523 of the 78th Congress concerning a Commission to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 11968: The purpose of this bill is to provide that all States, or political subdivisions of such States, may purchase historic gun mountings and carriages from the Reformatory at Lorton.

H. R. 12327: The purpose of this bill is to increase the salary of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to $17,000.

H. R. 11002: The purpose of this bill is to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia.

INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith House Joint Resolution 511, joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 27, 1956.*

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF TRIBAL LANDS FROM THE SHOSHONE INDIAN TRIBE AND THE ARAPAHOE INDIAN TRIBE OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION IN WYOMING TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speakers' desk the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, HALEY, and MILLER of Nebraska.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the bill S. 3338 just passed and to include pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may have until midnight tomorrow night to file additional views in connection with the legislative oversight functions of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and that the additional views be printed with the committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 610 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7435) to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minue rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 610 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 7435, a bill to reauthorize the construction of the Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

The Farwell project was originally authorized by the act of December 22, 1944. Investigations subsequent to the original authorization have resulted in a major change of planning, making it desirable that reauthorization be obtained.

The project will provide water for the irrigation of 52,530 acres of land in central Nebraska. The estimated cost is $30,534,000, of which $29,348,100 is allocated to irrigation and is fully reimbursable. One million one hundred eighty-five thousand and nine hundred dollars is allocated to flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation. It is estimated that the water users can repay $11,860,000 over a 40-year period and the remainder of the construction costs would be derived from other revenues of the Missouri River Basin project.

I urge the adoption of this resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 7435.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that many Members have left the floor since the last rollcall and that there is not a quorum present at this time.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 129]

Abbitt	Fountain	Pilcher
Anfuso	Gordon	Powell
Baker	Gubser	Preston
Barden	Healey	Priest
Bass, Tenn.	Hébert	Prouty
Baumhart	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Hillings	Richards
Bentley	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Riley
Bowler	Hosmer	Rivers
Boykin	James	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, La.	Jennings	Rutherford
Brooks, Tex.	Jensen	Scrivner
Burleson	Johansen,	Scudder
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Sheehan
Chase	Kelly, N. Y.	Shelley
Chatham	Kilburn	Siler
Chenoweth	Kluczynski	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Krueger	Smith, Va.
Christopher	Lane	Steed
Clevenger	Latham	Taylor
Coudert	Long	Thompson, La.
Davis, Wis.	McDowell	Thornberry
Deane	Mollohan	Tuck
Dies	Morrison	Vinson
Diggs	Nelson	Vursell
Dowdy	O'Hara, Minn.	Wainwright
Eberharter	O'Neill	Wickersham
Fascell	Passman	Wilson, Calif.
Forrester	Patman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RIGHT TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be allowed until midnight Saturday to file minority views from the Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight Functions of the Committee on Government Operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] as he desires.

AMENDING THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933 TO PROTECT THE SMALL INVESTOR

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss a subject which is very close to your heart and concerns every investor in the United States.

Over 20 years ago, you were the author of the Securities Act of 1933. The principal objective of this act was to protect investors by requiring adequate and accurate disclosure regarding securities publicly offered for sale in interstate commerce or through the use of the mails. A second important aim was to create a mechanism for compelling such disclosure. A third cardinal principle upon which the act is erected is that all those responsible for statements, upon the basis of which the public is solicited to invest its money, shall be held to certain minimum standards of care and diligence. To implement this principle, the act imposes certain liabilities for failure to exercise such care and diligence upon issuers, their directors, principal officers, and upon underwriters of securities publicly offered. The fourth was to outlaw fraud in the sale of all securities.

SMALL INVESTORS ARE NOT GETTING ADEQUATE PROTECTION

I have been greatly concerned with one provision of the Securities Act which, in the light of present conditions, needs to be greatly strengthened. I refer to the securities issued under the exemption provided in section 3 (b) of this act. The language of section 3 (b) is as follows:

> The Commission may from time to time by its rules and regulations, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed therein, add any class of securities to the securities exempted as provided in this section, if it finds that the enforcement of this title with respect to such securities is not necessary in the public interest and for the protection of investors by reason of the small amount involved or the limited character of the public offering; but no issue of securities shall be exempted under this subsection where the aggregate amount at which such issue is offered to the public exceeds $300,000.

Up until 1945, the exemption under section 3 (b) was available to issues where the aggregate amount did not exceed $100,000. In 1945, the amount was raised to $300,000. In 1954 a proposal was made to increase further the exemption to $500,000. I objected to this proposal in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was defeated. Another attempt was made to increase this exemption on the floor of the House, and you objected to it. This proposal was defeated by the House of Representatives.

The number of filings under section 3 (b) exemption are at the rate of 1,200 to 1,300 a year, and represent offerings of approximately $250 million a year. During the 10-year period from July 1, 1945 through June 30, 1955, the aggregate amount of the proposed offerings was $2,052,181,000. Surely, you can see that this is no small matter. I have given very careful consideration to the administration of section 3 (b) by the Securities and Exchange Commission. My study has led me to believe that the administration of this provision of the law has been very inadequate for the protection of investors in small issues. Such investors are being imposed upon by many unscrupulous promoters who take advantage of the loopholes in the Commission's regulations with respect to small issues to defraud small investors.

Who are these investors in exempted securities? Chiefly, they are the average rank and file citizens—the store clerk, the factory worker, the railroad man. They are the ones who need the greatest protection for their investments. Yet, strange to say, the law provides for them lesser protection than is afforded to investors in registered securities. These individuals do not have thousands of dollars to purchase General Motors stock, or A. T. & T. At most, they have a few hundred dollars to invest, and so they are attracted to the low-priced, highly speculative issues, such as uranium stock, which sells for five or ten cents per share. Little do they realize that in buying such speculative securities they get inferior protection under the law as compared to investors in registered securities.

Wherein do investors in securities exempted under section 3 (b) get less protection under the Securities Act than investors in securities which are registered under this act?

As I stated earlier, section 3 (b) gives the SEC authority to issue rules and regulations prescribing terms and conditions under which an exemption from the registration requirements of the act may be granted. For many years prior to 1953, the rules and regulations issued by the Commission with respect to these offerings, known as regulation A, were very simple and required very little information. All the issuer of such securities had to do was to file a letter with the SEC's regional office, and answer a few simple questions. All this information could be supplied in 5 or 10 minutes, at most. Five days after the filing of this letter, the issuer was permitted to offer his securities to the public up to $100,000 prior to May 15, 1945, and up to $300,000 since that date. No selling literature of any kind was required to be offered to the prospective investor.

What happened to the investors in exempted securities as a result of the lax regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission? As the hearings

before the Heller Subcommittee in the 82d Congress will show—and I was a member of that subcommittee—the Securities and Exchange Commission found that most frauds in the sale of securities took place in the promotional issues made pursuant to the section 3 (b) exemption. The subcommittee questioned Mr. Baldwin B. Bane, then the Director of the Division of Corporation Finance of the SEC with respect to these fraud cases, and this is what Mr. Bane told the subcommittee:

I think that the possibility of perpetrating fraud upon the investor is much greater under regulation A filings than it is under full registration, and the extent to which you broaden that exemptions field, you natually broaden the possibility of the investor not obtaining the protection that Congress felt he should obtain with which I agree, in the form of adequate and accurate information about the thing he is asked to buy. He certainly does not obtain that in connection with an offering under regulation A.

To that extent, he is offered much less protection. Therefore, there is much more opportunity for fraud, except as you follow it up through enforcement. There is more opportunity for him to act without this protection and there is much less opportunity for the investor to obtain the information under regulation A that he should have as provided for registered securities. * * * That is a result of what I have seen of these filings, coming up through the years; it is not guesswork, no sir. (Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 2d sess., on Powers, Duties, and Functions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, pt. I, p. 444.)

In the face of this serious situation, what did the Securities and Exchange Commission do? On April 6, 1953, it amended regulation A to require the filing of more information and to require the use of an offering circular to prospective investors. Did the SEC impose any penalties to insure that this additional information would be accurate and not misleading? No, it did not. And even today, under its rules, there is no civil liability for false and misleading statements attached to the issuer, its officers, and directors, its accountants, its attorneys, and other experts.

Now, I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what is the use of placing in the offering circular the statements of experts, and others who lend weight to an offering when there is no liability attached to these individuals in case they should make false and misleading statements?

The imposition of civil penalties for false and misleading statements is a cardinal principle in registered issues which the Congress wrote into the law, and it is known as section 11 of the Securities Act of 1933. Section 11 provides a civil remedy to all purchasers of registered securities against the issuer, every person who signed the registration statement, the directors, underwriters, and experts named in the registration statement, if such statement contained any false or misleading statements or omissions.

The importance of section 11 was recognized by the SEC many, many times. In its Tenth Annual Report to the Congress, the Commission stated with respect to section 11, as follows:

This latter sanction against practically all persons concerned in the distribution of a security is one of the most important of implements in carrying out the policy of the act, since it results in a concerted effort on the part of all concerned to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of the securities offered. (Tenth Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 1945, p. 20.)

More recently, I questioned Mr. Byron D. Woodside, Director of the Division of Corporation Finance of the SEC, on the importance of section 11. Here is what Mr. Woodside told the committee:

We have always contended and argued that section 11 was an important prophylactic in connection with the sale of securities to the public. I think you can find testimony in the past to the effect the Commission has considered that has been a very important aspect of the statutory pattern in securing a fair disclosure and holding people responsible for the sale of an issue to account for fair and accurate information. There is no argument there. * * *

The man who is likely to be liable personally under section 11 is perhaps going to be a little more careful than if he is not liable. (Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 5701, p. 83.)

In spite of this strong endorsement of the principle involved in section 11 of the act, which is designed to protect investors, the present members of the Securities and Exchange Commission, strange to say, have strenuously fought the application of this same principle to securities which are exempted under section 3 (b) of the act.

MY BILLS WOULD GIVE MORE PROTECTION TO SMALL INVESTORS

In the light of these conditions, early last year I introduced a bill, H. R. 5701, the purpose of which is to abolish completely the exemption under section 3 (b). The effect of this bill would be to require all issuers of securities to register their public offerings, whether the aggregate amount is under or over $300,000. In other words, all offerings of securities would be placed or the same footing and the investor in such securities would get equal protection of the law.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on my bill H. R. 5701 in Washington, D. C., Denver, Colo., Salt Lake City, Utah, and New York City. Many of the witnesses who testified before the subcommittee stated that they could see no reason why an investor in securities issued under section 3 (b) should get lesser protection than investors in registered issues. Included among those who favored an amendment to the Securities Act to provide additional protection to investors in exemption securities are representatives of the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations; the attorney general of the State of New York, the securities commissioner of the State of Utah, and many attorneys and securities dealers.

Mr. Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange, who was a distinguished member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, spoke out very strongly in favor of this legislation. Here is what Mr. McCormick said in response to my questions:

My understanding of the historical development of section 3 (b) was that it was in fact to be an exemption. There were certain companies that could take their first step with some small sum, it was originally $100,000 in the law, and the SEC under its rulemaking power did exempt offerings of $30,000 and under.

In other words, you did not have to do anything with the SEC. You just sold the $30,000, and you had an exemption. Now, that, I think, was following what the Congress had in mind when it adopted 3 (b). However, gradually there has evolved a regulation which is basically a prospectus requirement today, very similar to that required of an issue of $400,000, so that to my mind they now have merely used 3 (b) as a basis for classifying securities. The fact of the matter is, I think, that 3 (b) is a dead letter so far as the original intent of Congress is concerned. * * *

I think as a matter of fact, as I say, the requirements (of filing under regulation A) now are so great that in effect you have merely classified the type of prospectus that is wanted for small business. The only basic difference, of course, is the one that you have alluded to so often, that is that they automatically get the exemption from section 11, which liabilities apply only to material contained in a registration statement.

Frankly, as I said earlier, the way I understand the original concept of 3 (b), they did not think they were going to have accountants and geologists and things of that sort, and that in a small proposition the seller would be subject to all of the civil liabilities of section 12 and the criminal liabilities of section 17. They thought this provided adequate protection.

Now, if the requirements of the SEC have come to the point where issuers are actually employing experts, there is absolutely no logic in saying, 'if he sells under $300,000, the buyer does not have the right to sue those experts, but if he sells $400,000 he does.' That is just sheer nonsense. * * *

I think one of the mot important legal steps taken at the time of the enactment of the 1933 act was the creation of section 11 to cover such individuals, and I certainly think that if those individuals are involved in the selling of securities under regulation A they should be equally liable. (Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on Promotional Securities, November 2, 1955, p. 501.)

During the hearings last year before the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee, a number of witnesses expressed the opinion that the outright repeal of Section 3 (b) would impose greater expense upon the issuer of small securities by requiring full registration. It may be true that full registration in some instances would entail greater expense to the issuer, although the records of the Securities and Exchange Commission show that in the case of promotional securities the cost of flotation is approximately the same. I still feel that the possibility of some additional expense to the issuer is offset by the greater protection afforded the investor of securities. It is also offset by the fact that registered securities are admittedly more saleable and acceptable by the public. Nevertheless, in order to get an alternative bill before Congress, I introduced H. R. 9319, the purpose of which is to amend section

3 (d) to provide that responsible officers, or other persons shall be liable in damages on account of untrue statements or material omissions in statements or documents filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a condition of this exemption. In essence, this bill would afford to investors in securities exempted under section 3 (b) the same degree of protecton with respect to false and misleading statements that investors in registered securities now enjoy under section 11 of the act. I believe that if the exemption provided for in section 3 (b) is to remain, the investor in such securities ought to be entitled to the same protection against fraud that is accorded purchasers of registered securities.

USE OF EXEMPT PROCEDURE BY URANIUM AND OTHER PROMOTIONAL COMPANIES

One of the principal concerns I have with respect to securities issued pursuant to the section 3 (b) exemption is the large use which is being made of it by uranium mining companies. Beginning with May 1954, a large increase took place in filings under regulation A by uranium companies. In the 12 months preceding this month, fewer than 10 issues were filed during any 1 month, and the aggregate amount during the month was less than $2 million. In May of 1954, 16 issues were filed with an aggregate dollar amount of $3,510,000. In subsequent months, the number of filings fluctuated, but were in excess of the May total. In October 1954, 43 issues were filed having an aggregate dollar value of $8,179,000. These uranium stocks, selling at 5 cents or 10 cents a share, have been foisted upon the public without disclosing to them fully and adequately what they were buying and without giving them the full protection of the Securities Act. The overwhelming majority of these issues have proved to be a total loss to the investing public. The people who got hurt mostly are the small investors who are unable to purchase the high-priced stocks.

A startling feature of these uranium stock promotions is the high cost of floating these securities and the large stock options taken by the promoters of such deals. I have examined a good number of uranium offering circulars and find that the underwriting commissions and discounts go as high as 33⅓ percent of the gross proceeds, with the large proportion of such offerings providing underwriting commissions and discounts of 20 percent or more. In addition, most of these offerings allow the underwriters cash expenses up to $25,000, and liberal stock options. In the case of 27 out of 33 uranium stock issues which I examined, the public would contribute between 90 and 100 percent of the cash but get only between 37½ percent and 95.2 percent of the total stock of the companies. In the case of 10 of these companies, the public would get less than 60 percent of the stockholdings of the corporation. In four of these companies, the public would get only two-thirds of the total outstanding stock in return for supplying practically all the cash.

A highly important question is: What happens to the proceeds of the sale of stock of these companies when the flotation is unsuccessful, that is, when not enough funds are raised to carry out the program for which the securities are being sold? And, as I have already indicated, most of these offerings have been unsuccessful flotations. Practically all of the uranimum promotions make no provisions for the return of any of the public's money under any circumstances. That is a shocking disclosure to me. I cannot understand why in these instances, the underwriter, and officers of the corporation should be entitled to receive all the proceeds of the sale and the investor should get nothing. It does not appear to me that the Securities and Exchange Commission has been exercising the duties delegated to it by the Congress, namely, to protect investors. The Commission can, under its rule-making powers, provide for appropriate safeguards for the protection of investors, but thus far has not seen fit to do so.

These uranium offering circulars are elegant looking brochures containing colored maps showing the locations of the mining properties on which the companies have options, and include statements of geologists, attorneys, accountants, and so forth. Little does the prospective investor realize that no liability attaches to these experts under the Securities Act for false or misleading statements. Of what value, then, are these expert opinions? What reliance can the prospective investor place on them when deciding whether or not to purchase the security?

Prof. William L. Stokes, an outstanding geologist and professor of geology at the University of Utah, told the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance at its hearing in Salt Lake City, Utah, last fall that uranium companies can obtain practically any kind of geological report as to the value of their mining property if they will pay for it. Professor Stokes' statement is so significant that I should like to quote from part of his testimony:

> Unfortunately in the uranium boom we have many persons posing as geologists and mining engineers who are poorly qualified to do professional work. I have had students who have flunked out in their attempts to obtain bachelor's or higher degrees ask me if they were qualified to sign themselves as geologists on professional reports.
>
> Such poorly trained geologists have found a temporary market for their services in the uranium boom. Many companies do not desire an honest, well-done report as much as they do one which extolls the virtues of their holdings in an exaggerated manner. I have heard company officials remark that everything would be fine "if they could find a geologist who would write the kind of a report they want." Unfortunately a geologist can usually be found who will write the kind of a report needed.* * *
>
> Unfortunately some of the uranium companies are not seeking the best qualified technical services; they want a cheap job and a rosy report. I can say from personal experience that bribery is regarded by some as a justified means of getting the kind of report needed. I want to make it clear that the majority of companies are apparently willing to let the chips fall where they may in confidential reports but those reports that are to appear for public consumption are as far as possible free of all negative and unfavorable items. (Hearings before the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, September 13, 1955, p. 327.)

One may properly ask: Why does the Securities and Exchange Commission permit the use of geological reports of this character in offering circulars? Surely, they are misleading and are contrary to the interest of prospective investors.

A recent stock offering of a small loan company, the Coastal Finance Corp. of Silver Spring, Md., is another illustration of the inadequacy of the present SEC regulations to cope with false and misleading statements in offering circulars. Two of the SEC's principal officers, the Executive Director, and the Administrator of the Washington regional office, were members of the board of Coastal while in the employ of the SEC.

In the summer of 1955, Coastal Finance offered and sold, pursuant to the section 3 (b) exemption over $161,000 in common stock. Shortly thereafter, it was found that the offering circular contained false and misleading statements of material facts. In particular, it was discovered that the financial statements contained in Coastal's offering circular were false and misleading in a material way.

Yet, the offering circular contained an accountant's certificate to the effect that an examination of Coastal's accounts was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Subsequent investigation by the SEC showed, in fact, that the accounting firm had not made a field audit or examination of Coastal's branch offices. And while the accountant stated in his certification that he was an "independent accountant," the fact of the matter is that he was not at all "independent" as that term is used by the SEC.

The tragic thing about this case is that because the offering was made pursuant to the section 3 (b) exemption of the Securities Act, no civil liability attaches to the accounting firm. Investors who were misled by the rosy financial statements certified to by the accounting firm cannot sue this firm under the provisions of section 11 of this act. Not only are the accountants immune to suit for their negligence, but also the directors and officers of Coastal, under whose direction and supervision these fraudulent practices were taking place are also immune to suit under section 11. That this sort of situation should be permitted to exist is inconceivable to me. I propose to change it by my bill, H. R. 9319.

COST OF FLOTATION OF SMALL ISSUES

It has been charged by some that to enact either one of my bills, H. R. 5701, which would cancel the section 3 (b) exemption outright, or H. R. 9319, which would make section 11 applicable to offerings under section 3 (b), would increase the cost of financing and therefore be a hindrance to small business. Yet, the records of the Securities and Exchange Commission show that the cost of small flotations of issues are attributable predominantly to compensation to underwriters and distributors, and only a relatively small part is represented by other expenses, including those affected

by registration requirements. All evidence that I have been able to gather indicates that the registration requirements of the Securities Act have very little to do with the high cost of floating small issues. In this connection, I should like to quote from the Tenth Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which so far as I know, contains the most recent information on this subject. The Securities and Exchange Commission stated:

Statistics showing the flotation costs of equity security issues of small companies during the period from January 1, 1938 to June 30, 1944 are presented in appendix table 2. There are included all common and preferred issues filed separately for primary distribution by companies having less than $5 million of assets, other than issues of investment trusts and extractive industry companies. The analysis shows that the total flotation costs of equity issues of companies reporting less than $1 million of assets amounted to 21.6 percent of the expected gross proceeds, which included 19.7 percent as compensation to underwriters and dealers and 1.9 percent for other expenses. Comparable figures for the companies reporting assets of between $1 and $5 million were 15.8 percent total flotation costs, which included 14 percent as compensation and 1.8 percent for other expenses.

Of course only a part of the "other expense" category is attributable to registration. Such expense items as issuance taxes, registrar's fees, trustee's fees, the cost of complying with State securities laws, and the cost of printing certificates and the preparation of underlying documents such as charter amendments and mortgages must be paid even though securities proposed to be offered are exempt from registration. Furthermore, even though registration were not required, there would be in most cases certain fees for legal and accounting services and expenses for the preparation of selling literature. It seems clear, therefore, that any measure designed to diminish that portion of the 1.8 or 1.9 percent "other expense" figure attributable to registration costs alone may not afford very substantial relief to enterprises that must pay in addition from 15 to 20 cents out of every dollar as commission to underwriters for selling their securities. (Tenth Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission to the Congress, 1945, pp. 20, 21.)

In particular, so far as the cost of floating uranium issues is concerned, the Securities and Exchange Commission has admitted that the cost of registering such issues and the cost of floating them under the section 3 (b) exempt procedure is approximately the same—hearings before the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, July 21, 1955, page 95.

SUMMARY

A large segment of American investors today, principally small investors, are being solicited to invest their savings in securities which are exempted from registration under the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933. The public offerings pursuant to this exemption have been substantial, and presently amount to approximately $250 million annually. Investors in these securities are not receiving adequate protection against false and misleading statements made in the selling literature on the basis of which the public is being solicited to invest its savings.

It is for the purpose of providing the investors in exempted securities with additional protection that I introduced H. R. 5701 and H. R. 9319. H. R. 5701 would repeal the section 3 (b) exemption outright, and require all issuers to register their public offerings. H. R. 9319 would not go so far but it would impose certain liabilities on those who are responsible for making the false and misleading statements with respect to the securities being offered. The imposition of such liabilities would result in the exercise of greater care and diligence by those who prepare these statements. It would result in more accurate disclosure of information regarding the securities being offered publicly.

I believe that the prospective investor has a right to adequate and accurate information concerning the securities which he is asked to buy. I believe that Congress owes a duty to the public to see that the prospective investor gets this additional protection, which he does not now have.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say that the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, after giving very careful consideration to my bill, H. R. 9319, reported it favorably to this House. The Rules Committee also approved it and scheduled it for debate. It was due to come up today. I realize, however, that we are now in the closing hours of the session and there is not sufficient time for it to be considered by the Senate if it were passed by the House today. If I am returned to Congress, I shall reintroduce this bill and feel confident it will be enacted early in the next session.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us makes in order the consideration of a bill having to do with a reclamation project, the reauthorization of the Farwell project in Nebraska.

This project was authorized under the 1944 Flood Control Act for the Missouri River Basin; however, as the years go by the feasibility of a project changes and it has been the policy of our committee to take a new look at these projects to determine their feasibility.

The Farwell unit project will cost about $30,500,000 and it will irrigate about 58,000 acres. There is no power in the project, and it is all reimbursable with the exception of $1,185,900 allocated to flood control and wildlife and recreation.

The report says:

The economic and financial studies of the Farwell unit indicate that it is one of the more favorable and justifiable units of the Missouri River Basin project. Economic justification for the unit is demonstrated by the fact that the overall benefits exceed the costs by a ratio of 1.88 to 1.

The bill was considered fully by the committee, it has the approval of the Department of the Interior, as well as Budget Bureau approval. A similar bill has passed the other body.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to join with the gentleman from Nebraska in stating that this is one of the best reclamation bills reported out of our committee this year and it should receive the support of this body.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill in reference to which a rule has just been adopted, H. R. 7435, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object except to ask the gentleman to explain the procedure.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this procedure, I will explain to the gentleman, is to make unnecessary the use of 1 hour's time as provided in the rule by going into the Whole House on the State of the Union. We read the bill under the 5-minute rule, just as we would if we were in the Whole House on the State of the Union. The bill will be subject to consideration under the 5-minute rule and everybody will have a chance to talk. I propose to speak for 5 minutes, I assume the gentleman will, on pro forma amendments and other types of amendment. It is an expediting procedure. The only difference is that it will require 218 Members to be present for a quorum rather than 100.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3594) to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project, an identical bill to the House bill, be considered in lieu of H. R. 7435.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authorization for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Farwell unit of the Missouri River Basin project contained in section 9 (c) of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended and supplemented, is hereby amended to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of works to furnish irrigation water for approximately 52,500 acres of land in Howard, Sherman, and Valley Counties, Nebraska. The principal works of said unit shall consist of a reservoir at or near the Sherman site, works for the diversion of water from the Middle Loup River and its delivery to said reservoir, and necessary pumping facilities, canals, drains, and related works. There shall also be included as a part of the Farwell unit such watershed management and channel works as are necessary to provide channel stability in the light of the anticipated application of irrigation water to the lands involved and appropriate portions of the costs of con-

structing, operating, and maintaining such works shall be allocated to irrigation and returned in the same manner and under the same conditions as other irrigation costs of the Missouri River Basin project: *Provided*, That any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193, 43 U. S. C., sec. 485 (h)) for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Farwell unit which are allocated to irrigation and assigned to be repaid by the contracting organization may provide for the repayment of the portion of the construction cost assigned to any project contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into two or more irrigation blocks, to any such block over the period specified in said section 9 (d) or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within the period stated under normal conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the organization to pay. The Farwell unit shall be integrated, physically and financially, with the other Federal works in the Missouri River Basin constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary is authorized to transfer to the Department of Agriculture from funds available for construction of the Farwell unit such sums as are reasonably required to construct necessary water management and channel works as hereinbefore provided.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 7435 was laid on the table.

CROOKED RIVER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 605 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7726) to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 7726 authorizing the construction of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported this bill with amendments. The bill proposes the construction of a dam and storage reservoir at Prineville, Oreg., a diversion dam and canal, related pumping plants, conduits and other facilities to furnish water to irrigate approximately 20,000 acres of land in Crook County, Oreg., and, in addition, furnish flood protection, make available an estimated 51,200 acre-feet of water annually for other lands in the area, benefit fish and wildlife and enhance recreational opportunities.

The estimated construction cost of the project is $6,598,000. It is estimated that the water users to be served by the project can repay $2,299,000 over a 50-year period and the bill provides that the remainder of the irrigation allocation of $5,903,000 be repaid from surplus revenues derived from the power operations of the Dalles Dam powerplant.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution No. 605 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 7726, which provides for the authorization of a very small but sorely needed reclamation project in Oregon. By "small" I mean the total cost is in the neighborhood of $6 million, all but $600,000 of which, I believe, will be repaid.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON], to further explain the bill.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on behalf of my Crooked River reclamation bill. It proposes to furnish irrigation water to approximately 20,000 acres of land in Crook County, Oreg. It would also provide needed flood-control protection, plus recreation and fish and wildlife benefits.

This worthwhile project is greatly desired by residents of the locality. A dozen of them flew here from Oregon to testify before House and Senate subcommittees in favor of Crooked River legislation. Their well presented testimony made a fine impression. They pointed out that development of the project will fill an economic gap which otherwise may occur in the area. This may result from a decrease in sawmill activity as the timber cut in the area diminishes.

Resolutions favoring the project have been adopted by the Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce, by similar organizations in Bend, Redmond, and Madras, and by the Prineville Chamber of Commerce. The area seems united in support of it. It is vital to its economic future.

Approximately half of the acreage which would receive water from the project is now nonirrigated. The balance receives an inadequate supply of irrigation water. This is cattle-raising country. A high percentage of well-irrigated land is seeded to alfalfa and other grasses for hay and forage. Wheat and other small grain plantings are concentrated on dry land, and on land which receives inadequate amounts of irrigation water. Besides the water for the 20,000 acres, an additional 51,200 acre-feet would be available for future use elsewhere in the area.

The principal structure proposed is the Prineville Dam. This would be a rock-fill structure with an impervious earth core. It would be 170 feet high and 700 feet in length at its crest. The reservoir behind it would have a capacity of more than 150,000 acre-feet. There would be a diversion dam and a diversion canal, plus necessary pumping and distribution works. The project would utilize the existing Ochoco Dam and Reservoir and an existing distribution system based on it.

Flood-control protection would be provided for Prineville, the county seat of Crook County, and for the agricultural bottom lands along the Crooked River. These are now subject to floods. Only a quick freeze saved Prineville from a real flood last winter, when heavy rains came on top of rapidly melting snow. The normal rainfall in the area is not enough for sustained crop production without irrigation.

Public-spirited citizens in Crook County have been waiting for this project and working for it for a long time. An identical bill has already passed the Senate at this session. I sincerely hope for a favorable vote here on this measure which will be of so much benefit.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. The benefit-to-cost ratio in this project is 2 to 1; is it not?

Mr. COON. It is approximately 2 to 1.

Mr. ENGLE. And the bill is cosponsored on the other side by the two United States Senators from the State of Oregon; is that correct?

Mr. COON. That is correct. It passed the Senate some time ago.

Mr. ENGLE. And presently before the House is the bill offered by the gentleman who now has the time?

Mr. COON. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says that there will be 20,000 acres coming into production by reason of this expenditure for irrigation facilities. Does the gentleman know of anything that is grown in Oregon that we are not already growing enough of in this country?

Mr. COON. We are not growing enough hay and pasture for the cattle that we have out there. This would permit them to raise more hay and pasture for the cattle which they are trying to raise.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman mean there are not enough cattle in this country?

Mr. COON. I did not say that, but when you do have cattle, you want to take care of them properly, and this will help to do that.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I should like to comment, as the last word I utter in the Congress, that such projects as this and the last one we just passed are just silly.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I do not happen to agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this project has been approved by the conservation groups of that area of the country and whether it will have any effect on wildlife and the preservation of forest areas?

Mr. COON. We have had information from the wildlife people in Oregon, and they say that this is approved by the national Izaak Walton League of America.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider the bill (H. R. 7726) on which the rule has just been granted in the House as in Committee of the Whole, as we did the preceding bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7726) to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7726, with Mr. SISK in the chair.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of the smaller reclamation projects which have been studied this year and presented to the committee for its consideration. This is one of the better projects, although it is small, it having a benefit-cost ratio of 2 to 1. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation visited the area to be served by this project last November. The area is in need of the water which will be provided by this project. It will help firm up the agriculture and livestock economy. It will not produce any appreciable amount of farm products which are in surplus at the present time. Most of the livestock and agricultural products produced at the present time on the lands to be embraced in the project and those to be produced on this project area in the future when the project is constructed will be used right in the area where they are produced. The area is largely a livestock area.

The project will cost $6,598,000, of which there are allocations to irrigation of $5,903,000, of $653,000 to flood control, of $29,000 to fish and wildlife, and of $13,000 to recreation. The last three items, of course, will be nonreimbursable, but that allocated to irrigation, $5,903,000, is entirely repayable under the reclamation law. Of that amount an appreciable sum will be paid out of the net revenues from the power project at the dam. This project will pay out within a 50-year period. The net revenues from the power dam which are to be used for repayment of irrigation allocations, beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay, could be paid in full, within a period of 123 days, from the power revenues produced by the power facilities of the Dalles project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the land in its present state is practically worthless?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would not say it is practically worthless but it does not support the agricultural and livestock economy that is presently there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In other words, in order to make the land at least self-sustaining, you have to have more water? Is that a fact?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right. Approximately one-half of this water is for supplemental water uses, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman from California what this land is worth?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know what it is worth. I have been there and looked at the land, but I do not know what it is worth. It is very, very poor land. It raises few if any crops.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman must have something to go on if he even suggests it is practically worthless.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that the gentleman meant that in the present condition it was not supporting the economy of the people who are presently residing in that area.

Mr. GROSS. We have land in the State of Iowa that with $9 and $10 hogs you cannot live on, either.

Mr. ASPINALL. I admit that. If the gentleman will come in with a reclamation project, I will help him out.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will today approve the Crooked River reclamation project and bring to a successful conclusion the years of effort the people of this area have spent to achieve this goal. There are over 9,000 people in Crook County; by 1975 population will probably rise as high as 15,000. Starting in 1916, these people have labored to provide, through their own efforts, adequate water for their arid farmland. Many of these farms represent the labors of several generations; through flood and drought, against all the difficulties their irrigation district has faced, they have worked to preserve and build up their farms. The Crooked River project means, to these people, assurance that their labors will not be lost, that for the future they can hope for adequate water and protection from the flood waters of the Crooked River.

The Crooked River valley depends on agriculture and lumbering for its livelihood. But the lumbering industry is contracting as the timber is cut off which means the valley must increasingly depend on agriculture. Without water, they must necessarily turn to wheat, for a cash crop, even though wheat is a surplus commodity. With water they can raise cattle and the necessary feed for cattle, as well as truck products. With adequate water, they can expand their operations to meet the anticipated pressure of population and the economy of the area can progress in stability.

The Crooked River project will supply water to 9,900 acres which are not now irrigated and to 10,220 acres which now have an inadequate supply. It will provide an additional 51,000 acre-feet against future irrigation needs. Annual benefits will exceed costs by more than 2 to 1. This is a modest investment to make in the welfare of the Crooked River Valley. It is a small investment to make in the future of this area. This bill has already been passed by the Senate, with the able sponsorship of Senator MORSE and Senator NEUBERGER. The words of the leading citizens of Crook County, who told the Interior Committee in eloquent and solid testimony what this project means to their community are a convincing proof of its importance. I hope this House will approve the Crooked River project and make possible its early construction.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands (including approximately 20,000 acres of land in Crook County, Oreg.), and for other beneficial purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Crooked River Federal reclamation project. The principal new works of the said project shall include a dam and storage reservoir at or near the Prineville site, a diversion dam and canal below said reservoir, and related pumping plants, canals, conduits, drains, and other facilities. The operation of said works shall be integrated with the operation of the existing Ochoco Dam and Reservoir and of the Government-owned generator in the Cove powerplant of the Pacific Power & Light Co., which works shall, for the purpose of this act, be considered as works of the Crooked River project.

SEC. 2. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the Crooked River project, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except that (1) any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193; 43 U. S. C., sec.

485h) for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the project which are allocated to irrigation and assigned to be paid by the contracting organization shall provide for the repayment of the portion of the construction cost of the project assigned to any contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into two or more blocks, to any such block over a period of not more than 50 years (exclusive of any permissible development period) or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within the said period under average conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the organization to pay; (2) upon inclusion in the repayment contract of the Ochoco Irrigation District of an obligation to repay, in accordance with the terms of the contract and in addition to that portion of the cost of constructing the new works of the project which is otherwise assigned to be paid by the district and to its present construction charge obligation as set out in its contract with the United States dated April 24, 1950 (which obligation may, if the district so elects, be merged with and paid under the same conditions as other obligations undertaken by it under this act), an amount equal to the face value of its outstanding bonds held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and accrued interest, if any, the obligation of the district to the Corporation shall be deemed fully discharged, the bonds shall be returned to the debtor for cancellation, and the Secretary of the Interior shall thereafter request that there be transferred, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be transferred, on the books of the Treasury to the account of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from moneys appropriated for carrying on the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation and available for constructing the Crooked River project a sum equal to the face value of the bonds and accrued interest, as aforesaid; (3) that portion of the cost of constructing the new works of the project which is allocated to irrigation but is beyond the ability of the water users to pay shall be charged to and returnable to the reclamation fund from net revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from his sale of power from the Dalles project, Oregon, which are over and beyond the amounts required to amortize the power investment therein, as provided in section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 890; 16 U. S. C., sec. 825s), and to return interest on the unamortized balance of said investment; and (4) construction of any of the new works herein authorized shall not be commenced until the Secretary shall have certified to the Congress, in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (57 Stat. 261, 266), that an adequate soil survey and land classification of not less than 20,000 acres of land to be served by the project has been made and that those lands are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation or that their susceptibility to the sustained production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation has been demonstrated in practice. Those costs of constructing the project which are properly allocable to flood control and to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife as provided in existing law, and the like costs of operating and maintaining the same shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the reclamation laws.

Committee amendment:

On page 3, line 2, after the semicolon, strike out all down to and including line 24 and insert:

"(2) the construction charge obligation of the Ochoco Irrigation District set out in its contract with the United States dated April 24, 1950, may, if the district so elects, be merged with and paid under the same conditions as other obligations undertaken by it under this act."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the 5 minutes but I would like to ask a question or two. What is the total cost of this project, if I may ask?

Mr. ASPINALL. The estimated cost of construction of the project is $6,598,000.

Mr. GROSS. And I understood someone to say that is just one of these small projects?

Mr. ASPINALL. All that the gentleman from Colorado wishes to say is that taking into comparison the project which this House was good enough to give support to, and in which the gentleman himself was interested, it is very small.

Mr. GROSS. I have to say to the gentleman that $6½ million is still quite a little bit of money in the part of the country I come from. We do not often see that much money for a dam or some other project or free bridge or something of that kind. You are bringing 20,000 acres into production?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is not exactly right. If I remember, 20,000 acres will be immediately served by the project comprised of 9,980 acres of dry land and 10,220 acres of land now inadequately served.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but you are going to make good producing land out of 20,000 acres, that is approximately correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct—and it is needed in the area.

Mr. GROSS. And there will be products grown which will come into competition with our surpluses produced in the Middle West?

Mr. ASPINALL. Not in any appreciable amount.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you are going to raise cattle out there and corn and I know back home we raise plenty of both in the Middle West and you will be producing competing crops?

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. COON. We raise mostly feeder cattle out there and send them back to Iowa to be finished on your good corn in that area.

Mr. GROSS. That is just feeder cattle?

Mr. COON. Mostly feeder cattle; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Oregon that I expect a lot of those cattle will never see the State of Iowa, but they will probably hit a packinghouse long before they get to the State of Iowa.

Mr. COON. Many of our good, fine cattle go to the State of Iowa to be finished on corn there.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many more of these bills providing for the construction of dams and bringing more land into production we are going to get in this session?

Mr. COON. I cannot answer that. I am sorry, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 19, strike out "(57 Stat. 261, 266)," and insert "(67 Stat. 261, 266)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the Chair advise us what bills are coming over from the Senate for further consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is sorry not to be able to advise the gentleman.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the Crooked River project, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by an appropriate State or local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, insert:

SEC. 4. In order to promote the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife in accordance with section 2 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U. S. C., sec. 661a), an appropriate screen and fish ladder shall be provided at the diversion canal headworks of the Crooked River project below Prineville Reservoir and a minimum release of 10 cubic feet per second shall be maintained from said reservoir for the benefit of downstream fish-life during those months when there is no other discharge therefrom, but this release may be reduced for brief temporary periods by the Secretary whenever he may find that release of the full 10 cubic feet per second is harmful to the primary purpose of the project."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $6,339,000 for construction of the new works of the Crooked River project, plus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering indices and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 4, strike out "4" and insert "5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SISK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7726) to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the

Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, pursuant to House Resolution 625, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3101) to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, an identical Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of furnishing water for the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands (including approximately 20,000 acres of land in Crook County, Oreg.) and for other beneficial purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Crooked River Federal reclamation project. The principal new works of the said project shall include a dam and storage reservoir at or near the Prineville site, a diversion dam and canal below said reservoir, and related pumping plants, canals, conduits, drains, and other facilities. The operation of said works shall be integrated with the operation of the existing Ochoco Dam and Reservoir and of the Government-owned generator in the Cove powerplant of the Pacific Power & Light Co., which works shall, for the purpose of this act, be considered as works of the Crooked River project.

SEC. 2. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the Crooked River project, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except that (1) any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193; 43 U. S. C., sec. 485h) for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the project which are allocated to irrigation and assigned to be paid by the contracting organization shall provide for the repayment of the portion of the construction cost of the project assigned to any contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into two or more blocks, to any such block over a period of not more than 50 years (exclusive of any permissible development period) or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within the said period under average conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the organization to pay; (2) the construction charge obligation of the Ochoco Irrigation District set out in its contract with the United States dated April 24, 1950, may, if the district so elects, be merged with and paid under the same conditions as other obligations undertaken by it under this act; (3) that portion of the cost of constructing the new works of the project which is allocated to irrigation but is beyond the ability of the water users to pay shall be charged to and returnable to the reclamation fund from net revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from his sale of power from the Dalles project, Oregon, which are over and beyond the amounts required to amortize the power investment therein, as provided in section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 890; 16 U. S. C., sec. 825s), and to return interest on the unamortized balance of said investment; and (4) construction of any of the new works herein authorized shall not be commenced until the Secretary shall have certified to the Congress, in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 261, 266), that ah adequate soil survey and land classification of not less than 20,000 acres of land to be served by the project has been made and that those lands are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation or that their susceptibility to the sustained production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation has been demonstrated in practice. Those costs of constructing the project which are properly allocable to flood control and to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife as provided in existing law, and the like costs of operating and maintaining the same shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the reclamation laws.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized, in connection with the Crooked River project, to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities and to arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same by an appropriate State or local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreturnable and nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

SEC. 4. In order to promote the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife in accordance with section 2 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U. S. C., sec. 661a), an appropriate screen and fish ladder shall be provided at the diversion canal headworks of the Crooked River project below Prineville Reservoir and a minimum release of 10 cubic feet per second shall be maintained from said reservoir for the benefit of downtown fish life during those months when there is no other discharge therefrom, but this release may be reduced for brief temporary periods by the Secretary whenever he may find that release of the full 10 cubic feet per second is harmful to the primary purpose of the project.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $6,339,000 for construction of the new works of the Crooked River project, plus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering indices and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and similar House bill (H. R. 7726) were laid on the table.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 10177) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain lathes used for the shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 12, after "act", insert "and prior to the expiration of 2 years after such date."

After line 12, insert:

"Section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'linseed oil,' wherever it appears the following: 'or printing papers, coated or uncoated,'."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers."

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, one Senate amendment provides a 2-year limit with respect to the free entry of these lathes. The House bill did not contain any time limitation.

Another Senate amendment relates to substitution of printing papers for drawback purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 10177 was a bill introduced by myself which simply provides that certain lathes used for shoe-last roughing or for shoe-last finishing may be imported into the United States free of duty. It will be recalled that my bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and was passed unanimously by the House. The bill has now been amended by the other body to limit its applicability for 2 years. There is no objection to this amendment.

Another amendment was also added by the other body which contains the substance of a bill introduced on this side by my distinguished friend and colleague, Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The bill to which I refer is H. R. 12240. The Senate amendment, like his bill, amends section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to allow substitution of printing papers for drawback purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I join the chairman of my committee in urging the House to concur in these amendments.

AMENDING TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 9396) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 5, insert:

"The amendment made by this section shall apply only in the case of articles entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the expiration of 2 years after such date."

After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1201, par. 1774), is amended to read as follows:

"'PAR. 1774. Altars, pulpits, communion tables, baptismal fonts, shrines, mosaics, or parts of any of the foregoing, and statuary (except casts of plaster of paris, or of compositions of paper or papier mache), imported in good faith for the use of, either by order of or for presentation (without charge) to, any corporation or association organized and operated exclusively for religious purposes.'

"(b) This section shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of enactment of this section, and to mosaics covered by entries or withdrawals which have not been liquidated or the liquidation of which has not become final on such date of enactment."

After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to admit free of duty any stained glass or any prefabricated panels consisting of stained glass set in reinforced concrete with fastening devices which may be imported within the 12-month period commencing on the date of enactment of this act for use in the construction of a new sanctuary and auxiliary buildings for the First Presbyterian Church of Stamford, Conn."

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments are as follows:

First, the Senate placed a 2-year limitation on the exemption for guar seed.

Second, an amendment provides for the free entry of certain mosaics designed for use of religious institutions. Our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] introduced H. R. 11035 on this same subject. That bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed the House. This Senate amendment merely embodies the provisions of that House bill.

Third, an amendment provides for the free entry of certain stained glass or panels for the use in construction of the First Presbyterian Church of Stamford, Conn. Our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] introduced H. R. 10957 on this same subject. That bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed the House. This Senate amendment merely embodies the provisions of that House bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9396 is a bill which simply transfers guar seed to the free list under the Tariff Act of 1930. It will be recalled that this bill passed the House unanimously. The bill has been amended in the other body to limit its applicability to a 2-year period. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill was amended in the other body to add the provisions of two other small tariff bills which recently passed the House unanimously, namely a bill to permit the free entry of certain mosaics and a bill to permit the free entry of certain stained glass for use in a specific church.

I urge that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

EMPLOYMENT FOR CERTAIN ADULT INDIANS ON OR NEAR INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3416) relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to help adult Indians who reside on or near Indian reservations to obtain reasonable and satisfactory employment, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake a program of vocational training that provides for vocational counseling or guidance, institutional training in any recognized vocation or trade, apprenticeship, and on-the-job training, for periods that do not exceed 24 months, transportation to the place of training, and subsistence during the course of training. The program shall be available primarily to Indians who are not less than 18 and not more than 35 years of age and who reside on or near an Indian reservation, and the program shall be conducted under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. For the purposes of this program the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, or with any private school which has a recognized reputation in the field of vocational education and has successfully obtained employment for its graduates in their respective fields of training, or with any corporation or association which has an existing apprenticeship or on-the-job training program which is recognized by industry and labor as leading to skilled employment.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act the sum of $3,500,000 for each fiscal year, and not to exceed $500,000 of such sum shall be available for administrative purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no request for a second.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma and the leadership on both sides of the aisle for bringing this bill, S. 3416, to the House floor under suspension of rules. I firmly believe this is the most important piece of legislation that has been passed in many years, so far as being of service to the American Indian is concerned.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a program of vocational training, vocational counseling, and guidance for enrolled Indian people who reside in areas of substantial Indian land allotments. It also provides for institutional training in any recognized vocation or trade apprenticeship, and it provides for the contracting with industry for on-the-job training for Indian people.

Under the bill, training periods do not exceed 24 months, but it does provide that the Secretary may, in addition to contracting for the training, provide the transportation and subsistence during the training period.

The bill authorizes that such a training program shall be available primarily to Indians who are between the ages of 18 and 35 and who reside on or near an Indian reservation, and it authorizes the Secretary to establish such rules and regulations for the development of this program as are necessary. It authorizes the Secretary to enter into contracts and agreements with industry, with schools and institutions as are necessary to carry on the provisions of this act, and it authorizes an appropriation of $3,500,000 per year to cover the cost thereof.

It is, of course, the purpose of this act not only to train the Indians, but to give them reasonable assurance that they will be employed at the end of the training period. It fits in "hand in glove" with the relocation program that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has developed with a certain degree of success during the past few years. It was, however, learned that the largest area of failure in the relocation program has resulted from the previous lack of training and the lack of knowledge on the part of the relocatee in industrial work. Most of those who are being relocated have been born and raised in Indian country and have never seen industrial plants. Their transition has been rapid and successful, but experience has proven that if these people could have some intensive training in the work in which they are about to engage, that the percentage of failures would be materially minimized. This program should be of great value in preparing and orientating participants in the Indian relocation program for this new work and this new life. The program will be of great benefit not only to the individual Indians, but to the Nation, since practically all reservations are so vastly overcrowded the economy of these reservation areas will

not sustain the large number of people who have been forced to leave there.

Under this program individual Indians will have an opportunity to begin supporting themselves, living as they would like to live, raising their families as they would like to raise them, and fitting into society as they themselves would like to do. If, on the other hand, these Indian people are required to remain on reservations as they are at present, the Government will be required to not only provide special services for them, but to provide relief for their subsistence, special policing because of forced idleness, and we can only look forward to another generation of people who are dependent upon relief rather than opportunity.

There is another great possibility in this legislation. On every Indian reservation in America, there is a vast pool of potential labor supply. This bill should stimulate industries to locate on or near Indian reservations to take advantage of the supply of Indian labor. Under the on-the-job training provisions of the act, the Government will contract for payment of a portion of the wages of the employee while he is learning the trade or business. This will be carried on similar to the GI on-the-job training program which was so very successful following World War II and the Korean war, and with this type of a program available, industry will be looking to these areas of labor supply for their branch industrial plants.

I would call your attention to the committee report, which sets up the following six advantages of the bill:

1. Reservation resources are generally inadequate to support the present population in residence. This program would channel the excess manpower into skilled trades, which would enable the individual and his family to attain a higher standard of living.

2. Indian reservations are usually so remote that the individual does not have the opportunity of obtaining vocational instruction at present subsidized by the Federal and State Governments. S. 3416 would merely extend this service now being offered to non-Indians.

3. An Indian trained as a skilled worker will earn more money, pay more taxes, need fewer special services from the Federal Government, thereby creating a saving to the Government in services, and his income tax might be considered as an offset to the expenditures for training other Indians.

4. This program will supply skilled workers now needed by our industry and thereby utilize one of our most dormant manpower resources.

5. This type of program has been recommended in the past and at present by congressional committees, Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, Interior Department, and Indian organizations; it seems to have the backing of all interested parties.

6. S. 3416, in assisting Indians to attain a higher standard of living, would help solve the problem of juvenile delinquency on reservations, one of the major contributing factors to delinquency among Indian children being "poverty and poor living conditions."

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is urged by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, it is urged by the Secretary of the Interior, it is urged by the Indian Affairs Subcommittee and the full Interior Committee of both the House and the Senate, it is urged by practically every group who are interested in the improvement of the living conditions and standards of the Indian people. It has received favorable approval of the other body, and I am certain that it will have the unanimous support of this House. Thank you.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill, S. 3416, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INDIAN EDUCATION ADVANCES

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, another great educational advance for our Indian people is signaled by this bill. It is surely grounds for congratulations to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Honorable Glen Emmons, and his able Assistant Commissioner, the Honorable Rex Lee.

I was pleased to introduce in the House an almost identical bill, H. R. 9904, which was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Interior Committee.

H. R. 9904 contained a phrase supplemental to the phrase, "on or near Indian reservations," which appears in the Senate bill. My additional phrase, approved by the House committee, was "or in areas of substantial Indian land allotments." Its purpose was to assure application of this new program in Oklahoma, where we have thousands of potential Indian trainees under this program.

Yesterday I was informed by Assistant Commissioner Lee that this question had been discussed fully in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and it was firmly agreed there that Oklahoma Indians would be covered by the phrase, "on or near Indian reservations."

Although most Indian land in Oklahoma has been individually allotted, there are still many small reservation areas owned by the several tribes, and other reservation programs have always been employed in Oklahoma.

Certainly, we have great need for this program in our State, where many Indian families have taken advantage of the relocation program, but have suffered from the lack of a parallel vocational education and training program.

This bill supplies this missing link in the relocation program, and is sure to produce great benefits. In the final analysis, there is no substitute for education in any rehabilitation undertaking.

May I add that we have at Okmulgee, Okla., in Oklahoma A. and M. Tech, one of the Nation's pioneering schools in the field of vocational education. I earnestly hope that many American Indians will take advantage of this program, and use the fine facilities of Okmulgee A. and M. to do it.

EXTENDING OPERATION OF THE EMERGENCY SHIP REPAIR ACT OF 1954

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 187, to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 4 of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954 (Public Law 608, 83d Congress) is amended by striking out the words "within 24 months after date of enactment of this act," and inserting in place thereof "before July 1, 1958."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, only for the purpose of finding out what this is all about.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend for an additional period of 2 years the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954. This act was originally passed for the purpose of placing in good operating condition a number of naval auxiliary type merchant ships in the reserve fleet. An appropriation was made for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. How much was the appropriation?

Mr. BONNER. The authorization was $12 million. There are funds yet in previously appropriated money.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and yield back my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate joint resolution was passed.

AMENDING SECTION 650 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD," RELATING TO THE COAST GUARD SUPPLY FUND.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4011) to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard Supply Fund.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 650 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 650. Coast Guard Supply Fund

"A Coast Guard Supply Fund is authorized. The Secretary may prescribe regulations for designating the classification of materials to be stocked. In such regulations, whenever the fund is extended to include items not previously stocked, the Secretary may authorize an increase in the existing capital of the fund by the value of such usable materials transferred thereto from Coast Guard inventories carried in other accounts. Except for the materials so transferred, the fund shall be charged with the cost of materials purchased or otherwise acquired. The fund shall be credited with the value of materials consumed, issued for use, sold, or otherwise disposed of, such values to be determined on a basis that will approximately cover the cost thereof."

(b) The analysis of chapter 17, title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"650. Coast Guard supply fund and supply account."

and inserting in place thereof the following item:

"650. Coast Guard Supply Fund."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, there is no money involved in this bill.

Mr. MARTIN. What does the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this merely provides different authority for the Coast Guard to operate the General Store Commission provision and uniform code.

The bill would amend the section to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations designating the classification of materials to be stocked. It would also provide for increasing the existing capital of unusable materials transferred from the Coast Guard inventory carried in other accounts. It is merely an accounting matter.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AMENDING SECTION 9 (C) (2) OF THE MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3113) to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 is hereby amended by inserting before "; and" at the end thereof the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection (c) (2) shall not apply to any such charter party executed on or after the date of enactment of this amendatory proviso; and the Secretary of Commerce is directed to modify any adjustment agreement to the extent necessary to conform to the provisions of this amendatory proviso."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want to ask, Has this bill been on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. It was objected to on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not passed over; it was objected to and stricken?

Mr. BONNER. Yes. It is a Senate bill, and I understand there was a little matter that was objected to on that ground. If the gentleman desires, I will tell him what it is.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. It merely provides that ships sold before the Ship Sales Act was passed be put in the same category as ships sold under the Ships Sales Act. At the time the ships were sold, it was understood that if there should be a general Ship Sales Act, these ships would come under it. That is about all there is to it.

Mr. GROSS. And there are no tankers involved in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. BONNER. No tankers.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question? I understand that the tanker bill is dead for this session of the Congress.

Mr. BONNER. So far as I am concerned, I imagine it is.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. 11554) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "balance", insert "of the principal amount."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Abbitt	Eberharter	Passman
Andersen, H. Carl	Forrester	Patman
Anfuso	Gordon	Powell
Ayers	Gubser	Preston
Bailey	Healey	Priest
Baker	Hébert	Prouty
Barden	Hess	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass, Tenn.	Hillings	Richards
Baumhart	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Riley
Bentley	Hosmer	Rivers
Blitch	James	Rutherford
Bowler	Jennings	Scrivner
Boykin	Jensen	Scudder
Brooks, La.	Johansen,	Sheehan
Brooks, Tex.	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Buckley	Kelly, N. Y.	Siler
Burleson	Keogh	Smith, Kans.
Cannon	Kilburn	Taylor
Carnahan	Kirwan	Thompson, La.
Chatham	Klein	Thornberry
Chenoweth	Kluczynski	Tuck
Christopher	Krueger	Vinson
Clevenger	Lane	Vursell
Coudert	Latham	Wainwright
Davis, Wis.	Long	Whitten
Denton	Mollohan	Wickersham
Dies	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Dowdy	Nelson	Young
	O'Hara, Minn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2950)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 38, 48, 60, 61, 84 and 90.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 34, 36, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50, 55, 63, 66, 68, 69, 71, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94, and 95, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"Sanitary engineering activities: For an additional amount for 'Sanitary engineering activities', for carrying out the purposes of the act of July 9, 1956 (Public Law 660), not otherwise provided for, $3,000,000, including $1,800,000 for grants to States and $200,000 for grants to interstate agencies."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $200,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 30, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, 86, and 96.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $150,000 for the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Foreign Operations

Amendment No. 15: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

Independent Offices

Amendments Nos. 16 and 17: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $2,500,000 for operating expenses, Public Buildings Service, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, and 23: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Interior and related agencies

Amendments Nos. 24, 25, and 26: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 28: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $250,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Amendment No. 31: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $1,060,000 for construction instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee has denied the sum of $190,000 for employee housing at the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 34: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Reported in disagreement.

Related Agencies

Amendment No. 36: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38: Deletes Senate language appropriating $10,000 for the National Memorial Stadium Commission.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Labor

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $300,000 to the Office of the Solicitor to be derived from the highway trust fund as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes Senate language appropriating $350,000 for grants for education of the mentally retarded.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $2,050,000 for grants for library services instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $34,050,000 for payments to school districts as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 54: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 55: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $3 million for sanitary engineering activities instead of $4,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference committee agrees that $250,000 of the amount appropriated shall be available for enforcement activities.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 60 and 61: Delete heading and Senate language appropriating $150,000 for the Foreign Quarantine Service.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $200,000 for construction of dental research building as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 64 and 65: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates $300,000 for general office building, National Institutes of Health, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Public Works

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $1,740,400,000 for operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,780,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 72, 73, and 74: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 75: Deletes title number as proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $12,750,000 for construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conference committee is in agreement that available unobligated balances may be used for implementing loan contracts for the construction of irrigation facilities with the Terra Bella and Madera irrigation districts.

Amendments Nos. 77 and 78: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Defense—Civil Functions

Amendment No. 79: Appropriates $2,520,000 for construction, general, rivers and harbors and flood control as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VIII

Department of State

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $30,000 for missions to international organizations as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Deletes Senate language making not to exceed $3,500,000 of foreign currencies available for educational, scientific, and cultural purposes.

Amendment No. 85: Reported in disagreement.

Related Agencies

Amendment No. 86: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IX

Treasury Department

Amendments Nos. 87 and 88: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 89: Appropriates $200,000 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Narcotics, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90: Deletes Senate language appropriating $6 million for the construction of 3 patrol vessels for the Coast Guard.

The conferees believe that there is a grave danger to personnel and equipment in the shrimp industry in Gulf of Mexico waters as a result of recent aggravations in that area. Therefore, the conferees direct that the Coast Guard increase the vigilance of its surveillance by maintaining two active patrols in the area insofar as practicable so long as the condition exists. If this is done, and the State Department will make vigorous efforts toward settlement, the conferees believe operations will again be possible on a calm and safe basis.

CHAPTER X

District of Columbia

Amendments Nos. 91 and 92: Insert headings as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 93: Appropriates $10,000 for settlement of claims and suits as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 94: Provides that the sum appropriated in amendment No. 93 shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

Legislative branch

House of Representatives

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates $50,000 for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XII

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendment No. 96: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
J. VAUGHN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 12350, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we take up the conference report on the last appropriation bill of the session and the Congress, the second supplemental, H. R. 12350. Both the bill and the conference report have already been discussed in detail. In the closing hours of the session I shall merely tabulate the summaries.

House estimates	$1,912,095,000
Bill reported to House	2,341,895,000
Bill passed House	1,941,895,000
Senate estimate	[1] 2,616,053,038
Bill reported to Senate	[1] 2,586,691,438
Bill passed Senate	[1] 2,591,442,438
Conference report	[1] 2,183,029,438
Conference over House	241,134,438
Conference under Senate	408,413,000

[1] Includes highway trust funds as direct appropriations less previous regular highway appropriations rescinded.

With the final figures of the last supplemental bill available we can now report on the appropriation record for the session. The estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for the 2d session of the 84th Congress aggregate $61,143,478,537. The total appropriations aggregate $60,551,817,590, amounting to a cut of $591,660,947 below the budget estimates for the session. I shall summarize the comparative history of the money bills for the 84th Congress in today's RECORD.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in coming back from the conference, the total figure has been raised by about $21½ million. That is the way it always is when we go to conference. You always have to give up more than you should.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything more I can say.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are 42 amendments in disagreement. I ask that the Clerk read the first amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 3, insert:

"Farmers' Home Administration

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $1,400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11544, 84th Congress, or similar legislation amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 2, line 10, insert:

"Office of the General Counsel

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the General Counsel', $85,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11544, 84th Congress, or similar legislation amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$45,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, line 6, insert:

"Operation and regulation: For an additional amount for 'Operation and regulation,' $13,968,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for hire of aircraft is increased from '$370,000' to '$570,000'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$13,968,000" named in said amendment, insert "$10,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 12, insert:

"Establishment of air navigation facilities: For an additional amount for 'Establishment of air navigation facilities' $54,075,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$35,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 3, line 15, insert:

"Maritime Activities

"Ship construction: For an additional amount for 'Ship construction' for design, construction, outfitting, and preparation for operation of a nuclear-powered merchant ship, $22,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount which may be transferred to 'salaries and expenses' for administrative and warehouse expenses for the current fiscal year, is increased from '$1,115,000' to '$1,315,000': *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6243, 84th Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$22,000,000" named in said amendment insert "$18,000,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$1,315,000" named in said amendment insert "$1,215,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 6, insert:

"Reimbursement to District of Columbia

"For reimbursement to the Highway Fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, $665,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu

of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"Reimbursement to District of Columbia

"For reimbursement to the Highway Fund, District of Columbia, for part cost of construction of highway-railroad grade separation underpass at a point in the southeast section of the District of Columbia in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, $200,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 4, line 12, insert:

"Bureau of Public Roads

"Federal-aid highways (Trust Fund): For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $1,150,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund; which sum is composed of $186,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, $875 million, the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, $85,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1957 and $30,401, $14,097, $1,034,766, and $985,204, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 8, 1938, section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943, and section 9 of the act approved September 7, 1950, as amended (23 U. S. C. 13a, and 13b), and section 7 of the act approved June 25, 1952, and $935,532 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across dams in accordance with the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709): *Provided*, That at such time, but no later than June 30, 1957, as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the amounts available and estimated to become available in the Highway Trust Fund during the fiscal year 1957 are sufficient for carrying out, on a current basis, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, this appropriation shall reimburse the appropriations for 'Federal-aid highways' for all expenditures subsequent to June 30, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Federal-aid highways (Trust Fund): For carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $800 million, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund; which sum is composed of $186,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1955, $610,500,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956, and $30,401, $14,097, $1,034,766, and $985,204, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the act approved June 8, 1938, section 7 of the act approved July 13, 1943, and section 9 of the act approved September 7, 1950, as amended (23 U. S. C. 13a, and 13b), and section 7 of the act approved June 25, 1952, and $935,532 for reimbursement of the sums expended for the design and construction of highway bridges upon and across dams in accordance with the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709): *Provided*, That at such time, but no later than June 30, 1957, as the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Secretary of Commerce, determines that the amounts available and estimated to become available in the Highway Trust Fund during the fiscal year 1957 are sufficient for carrying out, on a current basis, the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, this appropriation shall reimburse the appropriations for "Federal-aid highways" for all expenditures subsequent to June 30, 1956."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc those amendments which are in technical disagreement, and on which the House managers will offer a motion to recede and concur, as follows: Nos. 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 6, line 1, insert:

"Federal-aid highways

"Reduction in appropriations: The appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1957, and the unexpended balances as of June 30, 1956, of appropriations granted under this head for prior fiscal years are rescinded effective June 30, 1957, or such earlier date as all expenditures from such appropriations made after June 30, 1956, have been reimbursed by appropriations from the highway trust fund: *Provided*, That the sums rescinded shall revert to the general fund."

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"Payment to Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians

"For payments, as authorized by law, to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians, in settlement of their claims for damages resulting from the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, $437,500, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 10, line 11, insert:

"Fisheries Loan Fund

"For initial capital for the fisheries loan fund, for financing and refinancing of operations, maintenance, replacement, repair, and equipment of fishing gear and vessels; and for research into the basic problems of fisheries, as authorized by law, $10,000,000, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3275, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 10, line 21, insert:

"Forest service

"Acquisition of Lands for Cache National Forest

"For the acquisition of lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest, Utah, $50,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 11, line 21, insert:

"Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission

"For an additional amount for 'Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission', $163,400, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3386, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 12, line 3, insert:

"Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission

"For necessary expenses of the Booker T. Washington Centennial Commission to carry out the year-long celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Booker T. Washington and to promote the spirit of interracial goodwill, and revive interest in the practical policies, programs, principles, and philosophies of Booker T. Washington, $225,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 12, line 18, insert:

"Bureau of employees' compensation

"Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed $47,000 may be derived from the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U. S. C. 906), for the purposes of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of Labor Apppropriation Act, 1957."

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 13, line 4, insert:

"Promotion and further development of vocational education: For an additional amount for 'Promotion and further development of vocational education' for grants to States for extension and improvement of practical nurse training, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 13, line 24, insert:

"Assistance for school construction: For an additional amount for providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title III and title IV of the act of September 23, 1950, as amended, including payments upon applications filed on or before June 30, 1956, and not to exceed $500,000 for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies and not to exceed $15,000,000 for title IV, $108,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for salaries or other direct expenses of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 15, line 3, insert:

"Office of vocational rehabilitation

"For an additional amount for 'Grants to States and other agencies,' $1,000,000, for grants for special projects under section 4 (a) (2): *Provided*, That not more than $2 of these funds shall be expended for any project for each $1 that the grantee, or the grantee and the State, expends for the same purpose: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 3875, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 15, line 13, insert:

"Assistance to States, general: For an additional amount for 'Assistance to States, general,' including $1,000,000 for grants for graduate training of professional public health personnel, pursuant to the provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, $1,040,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 16, line 5, insert:

"Hospitals and medical care: For an additional amount for 'Hospitals and medical care,' including $2,000,000 for grants for advanced training of professional nurses, pursuant to the provisions of the Health Amendments Act of 1956, $2,050,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 3958, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 16, line 15, insert:

"Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health: For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses, National Institutes of Health,' $200,000, for administration of the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of S. 849, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 17, line 4, insert:

"Grants for construction of health research facilities: For grants pursuant to the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956, $30,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 849, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 17, line 9, insert:

"Construction of animal quarters: For construction of facilities for housing animals for the National Institutes of Health, including preparation of plans, equipment, and the temporary diversion of such facilities for office space, $1,371,000."

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 17, line 17, insert:

"Construction of library facilities: For the preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings for the National Library of Medicine, $350,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3430, 84th Congress."

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 18, line 7, insert "including the employment of aliens;".

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 18, line 23, insert "together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1956, of prior year appropriations made available under this head to the Atomic Energy Commission, and, in addition, any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U. S. C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 484): *Provided*, That of such amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum."

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 20, line 8, insert ", to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1956, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for 'Plant and equipment,' for the activity 'Equipment not included in construction projects,' shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for 'Operating expenses,' and the remaining balance of such appropriations shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That, in the event additional feed materials capacity is constructed by private industry with its own funds, the amounts included in this appropriation for such construction may be transferred to the appropriation for 'operating expenses.' "

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 20, line 21, insert:

"General provisions

"Any appropriation available under this or any other act of the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this act during the fiscal year 1957 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

"Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation herein made to the Atomic Energy Commission may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

"No part of any appropriation herein made to the Atomic Energy Commission shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 22, line 23, insert ", of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Alamogordo Dam, Carlsbad Project, New Mexico; and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Dickinson Unit, North Dakota, Missouri River Basin project."

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 23, line 7, insert:

"Administrative Provisions

"The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to participate in the construction of the bridge required in the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, Arizona, Colorado River storage project; and may transfer for this purpose to the Secretary of the Interior funds available for the construction of public lands highways: *Provided*, That the amount transferred shall not exceed the cost of placing such bridge upon and across the dam under the provisions of the act of July 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 709; 21 U. S. C. 64–70)."

Senate amendment No. 82: Page 24, line 3, insert:

"Contributions to International Organizations

"Appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1957 shall be available for contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, as authorized by the act of July 11, 1956 (Public Law 689), in an amount not to exceed $6,000."

Senate amendment No. 85: Page 24, line 21, insert:

"Cleveland Pan American Games

"For necessary expenses of the III Pan American Games, 1959, $100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the III Pan American Games Act of 1956 (S. J. Res. 186, 84th Cong.) or similar legislation."

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 26, line 20, insert:

"CHAPTER XII

"Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 143, 84th Congress, $1,312,538, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 30, 33, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47, 51, 54, 56, 59, 62, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 78, 82, 85, and 96, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 6, line 12, insert:

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Export-Import Bank of Washington

Not to exceed $4,000 of the funds previously made available for Administrative Expenses of the Bank shall be available for the purchase of one motor vehicle for replacement only.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 6, line 21, insert:

"President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, $50,000: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 4228, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$20,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 7, line 9, insert the following:

"Federal Flood Insurance Administration

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Federal Flood Insurance Administration, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration; $500,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (S. 3732, 84th Cong.) or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FLOOD INSURANCE

"For expenses necessary to carry out the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work under this appropriation; $500,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 (S. 3732, 84th Cong.)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 7, line 20, insert the following:

"Public Housing Administration

"Administration expenses: For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses', $750,000 and the limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration is increased from '$12,475,000' to '$13,225,000' and the limitation thereunder on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from '$950,000' to '$1,010,000': *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of legislation authorizing the Administration to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$750,000" named in said amendment insert "$200,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$13,225,000" named in said amendment insert "$12,675,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$1,010,000" named in said amendment insert "$980,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 8, line 10, insert the following:

"Federal National Mortgage Association

"The limitation under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on administrative expenses of the Association is increased from '$3,775,000' to '$4,275,000', and the limitation thereunder on expenses of travel is increased from '$150,000' to '$200,000': *Provided,* That $200,000 of the foregoing increase in administrative expenses shall be available only upon the enactment into law of the amendments to subsection 303 (b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, contained in S. 3855, 84th Congress, with respect to nonrefundable capital contributions by mortgage sellers, or legislation of similar effect."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$4,275,000" named in said amendment insert "$4,025,000"; and in lieu of the first sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment insert "$175,000"; and in lieu of the second sum of "$200,000" named in said amendment insert "$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 9, line 5, insert the following:

"Office of the Secretary

"Acquisition of Strategic Minerals

"For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the 'Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956' (Public Law 733, approved July 19, 1956), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $35 million, to remain available until December 31, 1958: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for expenses incurred in connection with materials procured under said act after their transfer to the strategic or supplemental stockpile."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$21,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 11, line 2, insert the following:

"Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission

"For an additional amount for 'Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission', $55,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton', approved August 20, 1954, is amended as follows:

" 'SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $25,000, in addition to the sum of $175,000 heretofore authorized to be appropriated, as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.' "

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$55,000" named in said amendment insert "$40,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 14, line 14, insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $290,000: *Provided,* That of this amount (a) $85,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, (b) $45,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 11549 or S. 3958, 84th Congress, and (c) $20,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11253 or S. 3620, 84th Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $270,000: *Provided,* That of this amount (a) $85,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 11695, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, and (b) $45,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 11549 or S. 3958, 84th Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 14, line 23, insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses for the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and expenses of attendance at meetings, $300,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$150,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 15, line 20, insert the following:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction: For payments under section 6 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, $50,000,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1958."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 25, line 4, insert the following:

"RELATED AGENCIES

"Funds appropriated to the President

"President's Special International Program

"For an additional amount for the 'President's Special International Program', for United States participation in the Universal and International Exhibition of Brussels, 1958, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3116, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$4,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COUNTY OF PIERCE, STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. 10184) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the county of Pierce, State of Washington, for public use through the Brown's Point Improvement Club, incorporated and organized under the laws of the State of Washington as a nonprofit organization, the following strip of land, being a portion of the Brown's Point Coast Guard L'ght Station Reservation, Pierce County, State of Washington.

"Beginning at Government meander corner at the southwest corner of lot 1, section 17, township 21 north, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, Pierce County, Washington, located 5309 feet north of the centerline of Tonowanda Avenue and 580 feet due west from the one-sixteenth corner between sections 16 and 17, township 21 north, range 3 east, Willamette meridian, thence north 29 degrees 13 minutes 09 seconds west 56 feet to a point of beginning on the south boundary line of Coast Guard property, thence north 29 degrees 13 minutes 09 seconds west 120 feet to a point on the Government meander line lot 1, thence east 364 feet to a point on the Coast Guard east boundary line, thence south 105 feet along the east boundary line to a point which is 3 feet east of a concrete monument located on the Coast Guard south property line, thence west along the south property line 306 feet to the point of beginning, including any rights to contiguous tidelands not acquired by the State of Washington.

"SEC. 2. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall contain a condition that, in the event the property so conveyed to such county ceases to be used for public purposes, title therein shall revert to the United States.

"SEC. 3. The conveyance shall contain the express conditions that the Brown's Point Improvement Club shall move and reestablish the fence on the relocated south line of the said Coast Guard reservation, and shall provide an access gate, and provide and maintain a suitable access road therefrom through that portion of the strip of land conveyed, and property owned by said club, in order to provide access from the Government property to Tonawanda Avenue, Brown's Point, and upon failure to do so in that portion of the strip of land conveyed shall revert to the United States."

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4164) to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, order, or regulation, the head of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce shall be a Federal Highway Administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe or as may be required by law.

SEC. 2. The term "Commissioner of Public Roads", as used in all laws, orders, and regulations, shall be deemed to mean "Federal Highway Administrator" on and after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 hereof, there shall be a Commissioner of Public Roads in the Bureau of Public Roads who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Federal Highway Administrator. The basic compensation of the Commissioner of Public Roads shall be $17,500 per annum.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITTLE WOOD RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the House, I call up House Resolution 604 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7850) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the other body. It was also reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House. I understand it

provides for an expenditure on the Little Wood River reclamation project of $1,800,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois stated, this bill was passed by the other body and reported unanimously by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. A rule was granted on July 17. There has been no objection by the Bureau of the Budget. It has been approved by the Department of the Interior. The project has to do with a dam on the Little Wood River where there were very serious floods during this last year. There is an existing dam on the Little Wood River, but it is not large enough to store the amount of water which comes down the canyon. Consequently, in the spring of the year the valley below is flooded and the dam runs out of water and the reservoir runs dry about the middle of July. The irrigation works are all in existence. The land is presently under cultivation to grow hay and is used for pasture purposes. It does not grow any crops which are in surplus. This project would bring new land into cultivation, but would use the existing irrigation works which are there now. As far as I know there is no opposition to the project either in the area or in any department of the Government. I hope that the bill can be enacted into law this session because the situation this last year was so serious that for periods of 4 and 5 days at a time, the community up there was completely isolated by floodwaters and they did not know whether the existing structures could hold the water which was coming down the canyon. For quite some period of time, there was a serious threat not only to all the property down the river but a very serious threat to the lives of the people living below the existing dam. I hope the House will see fit to act favorably on this legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes or more or less, as he desires, to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to understand what the situation is. Our Republican friends are trying to take over control of the House by this motion. I want my Democratic friends to understand just what this means. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] under the rules called up the resolution, which he is entitled to do when a rule is reported out for 7 days and he is within his rights in doing so. But, I want the House to know just what has happened. It is the first time in all my years of service in the House of Representatives, no matter what party was in control of the House, that a motion of this kind has been made to call up a rule which has a preferential status under the rules of the House. The bill is on the program and it might have been reached.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. It was on the program three weeks ago. A great many rules have been reported out since then which have passed and there are no indications that you were going to give any consideration to this bill which means so much to the people of Idaho.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is not going to affect me by waving his hands.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not think I would.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Not on this occasion. The gentleman might on some other occasions.

The fact is that this is a challenge to the Democratic leadership in the House.

Now, these matters are called up in the ordinary way. There has never been any time that I know of on the Rules Committee when the Republican leadership was in control that we rose to call up a rule under these conditions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Of course, now, in regard to the leadership, that is why they have the rule.

Mr. MCCORMACK. We understand.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is why we have the rule. Why should there be such a rule unless the situation could arise which has arisen in this case? Otherwise we might as well take the rule out of the books, but to meet a situation like this is why we have the rule.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am not criticizing you, but I am calling to the attention of the House the significance of what has taken place.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I must yield first to the former—to my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, and former majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes, and I say that with every respect.

Mr. HALLECK. And I occupied the position that you now hold for a period of 4 years at separated intervals.

I am sure the gentleman will recall that on numerous occasions over on his side that when you came to me and said: "Now, look, this rule has been out more than 7 days and if you do not program it we are going to call it up," all I ever asked was——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Nobody has said that to me yet.

Mr. HALLECK. How is that?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Nobody has said that to me yet on this bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, not over 15 minutes ago——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, you came just a few minutes ago, but this goes to the matter of programing ahead, asking for it to be programed, the leadership coming over and asking for action.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I have yielded to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me just say to the gentleman——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Let me make this further observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sit down.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Just a minute now. The gentleman from Indiana and I are capable of handling our own affairs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He would if you would let him talk.

Mr. MCCORMACK. If the Republican leadership had wanted this bill brought up they would have consulted me.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Wait a minute, just a minute, now. It is not necessarily certain that even when a rule is adopted that the bill is passed. This proceeding, as I understand, is only to the rule.

But I want my Democratic friends to know just what is taking place, that they are trying by this maneuver to take away the control and management of bringing up particular legislation from the Democratic leadership.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Since the gentleman said we just brought this question up 15 minutes ago on this Little Wood River bill, let me set the record straight. The other day, days ago, when you were announcing the program and you had a whole list of 17 bills for suspension——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Idaho asked about the Hood River project.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes, that is true.

Mr. HALLECK. And wanted to know if you were going to call it up. Subsequently your remarks indicated that it was programed.

Mr. MCCORMACK. It would be programed.

Mr. HALLECK. And it was programed.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That it would be programed.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand what the word "programed" means, it means that we are going to consider the bill or call it up in some way.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; that does not necessarily follow.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman understands that this matter is an urgent matter and that there was an insistent desire to have it considered.

Now, may I say to my friends on the Democratic side, we are now in the closing days of the session and we have handled a lot of matters here of interest to Members on both sides of the aisle and I think it has been done with great good sportsmanship and good feeling on both sides. It must be apparent to you on the Democratic side that in this situation we are only exercising a prerogative that is given to us under the rules and that everything that has been done has been done in accordance with the rules.

Now, if you want to kill this bill you have the votes to do it, but I think we

might as well stand up and be counted and learn whether or not this is a one-way street, whether the rule works one way or whether it works both ways.

We are calling this rule up to get something done that ought to be done, and we are acting in accordance with the rules to get consideration of a matter that is of great interest to the gentleman from Idaho and the people he represents.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Idaho had used different judgment, if the gentleman from Idaho had recognized that there is leadership on the Democratic side and if he had done what other Members have done, whether or not the bill could be brought up despite the fact it is programed is something I am unable to state. But the fact is I have never seen this method used by any member of the Rules Committee in the 28 years I have been a Member of Congress. It is an attempt to take over from the Democratic leadership control of the program. I have never said that this bill would not come up.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the gentleman said it would come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I never said it would not come up. There is other legislation ahead of this. We have other legislation to consider.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman ever done this before?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Like this?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes, on a bill just recently considered in regard to increase in postal rates.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be true on that bill. Outside of that? And that was after I incited you to do it. I engaged in a pretty good campaign of incitement on that occasion.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. My memory is very good. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The majority leader in talking to the gentleman from Idaho stated this, and if this is not a promise I do not know what it means. I quote the gentleman:

> In relation to the bill, H. R. 7850, I have looked into the matter and since a rule has been granted on this bill I am including it in the program for next week.

Does that mean that you are going to do something about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, not necessarily. Oh, no. There have been programs made on your side. It is still on the program.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I would like to refresh the gentleman's memory.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am opposed to this irregular way, this irregular method of trying to get this bill up for consideration. It is a challenge to the Democratic leadership and I want my Democratic friends to understand they are trying to take over control of the House as far as this bill is concerned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I know my good friend, the majority leader, has been harassed in the last 2 weeks by this deluge of legislation that is pouring in upon us. I think he wants to do the right thing. I know he wants to do what he thinks is the right thing. If he will recall correctly, I spoke to him on several occasions about this bill and on one occasion here are the words the gentleman said to me, and if that is not a commitment, of course, I do not know the definition of commitment. The gentleman said he would take care of the young man from the West.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that we would take care of Doc MILLER's bill. I say my friend's recollection is incorrect because I never referred to the young fellow from the West.

No, my friend is seriously mistaken about that. So far as I am concerned, the bill is still on the program. Whether it will be brought up or not depends on circumstances. To me this means to disrupt an orderly program and I hope that will not be done.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is an honorable man; a fine, Christian gentleman of this House, and his word to me has been just as good as his bond. We have talked to each other about this and other bills. He has been very fine to me about bringing my bill up and others that we have talked about. We talked about it with the leadership on our subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and we had a hearing on this bill and the committee reported it out. And, he was asked to use all means possible to get the bill up for consideration, and we have been trying to follow orderly procedure. When you and I go home tonight and look in the mirror, we have to look at JOHN McCORMACK and A. L. MILLER. We have to look at ourselves. We have to decide whether we made some commitments which we are going to keep or whether we made some commitments we are not going to keep. The bill has been programed, and if we stay here, before we quit tonight—this is the last day—I know the gentleman from Massachusetts will program the bill and it will be before the House, because he has told me it would.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman spoke to me outside.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He said that it would be programed, and I am sure that word means it will come up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman spoke to me outside for a moment earlier in the afternoon, did he not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That was confidential.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I said "Doc, I kept my word with you."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That was confidential.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I kept my word with you, anyhow, did I not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You said it was programed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wait a minute. I went further with you. I said I will use every effort to get your bill up, did I not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it was called up.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, and I appreciate it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As to the business of a bill being programed, you said it would be programed, and I believe you, as an honorable gentleman, will bring it up before the House adjourns.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the thing that impresses me about this discussion is that not one word has been said that would indicate that it was not a good bill. Now, that means that it is an admission that it is a good bill. Is the House going to pass on a question on the merits of the bill or on something else? I think we ought to do our duty.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring whether the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], is here ready to be recognized when this rule is adopted. He is the one that came over to me.

The SPEAKER. That matter is entirely in the hands of the chairman.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am inquiring whether Mr. ENGLE is here. I think this is proper. Is Mr. ENGLE, the chairman of the committee, here?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is it true that you came over here and asked me to bring this rule up this way?

Mr. ENGLE. No; it is not. I did not ask you to make this preferential motion. I said that I had gone to Mr. McCORMACK——

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Why did the gentleman come over here and talk to me? I could not put it on the program. This is the only way I could get it up.

Mr. ENGLE. Because I wanted my friend from Idaho to know that I was doing what I could to bring this bill on the program, and I went to Mr. McCORMACK and asked him if he was going to bring the rule up. Dr. MILLER and I both talked to him. I did not say anything about a preferential motion; no, sir.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 168, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—173

Adair	Fjare	Morano
Alger	Ford	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Fulton	Norblad
Anderson, H. Carl	Gamble	O'Konski
	Gavin	Osmers
Andresen, August H.	George	Ostertag
	Gross	Patterson
Arends	Gubser	Pelly
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Pfost
Avery	Hale	Phillips
Ayers	Halleck	Pillion
Baldwin	Hand	Poff
Bass, N. H.	Harden	Prouty
Bates	Harrison, Nebr.	Radwan
Beamer	Harvey	Ray
Becker	Henderson	Reece, Tenn.
Belcher	Heselton	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Robsion, Ky.
Berry	Hill	Rogers, Mass.
Betts	Hillings	Sadlak
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoeven	St. George
	Hoffman, Mich.	Saylor
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holmes	Schenck
	Holt	Scherer
Bosch	Hope	Schwengel
Bow	Horan	Scott
Bray	Hyde	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	Jackson	Seeley-Brown
Brownson	Jenkins	Short
Broyhill	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Budge	Jonas	Simpson, Pa.
Burdick	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Bush	Kean	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Kearns	Taber
Canfield	Keating	Talle
Carrigg	King, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Cederberg	Knox	Thompson, Mich.
Chase	Krueger	
Chiperfield	Laird	Thomson, Wyo.
Church	Landrum	Tollefson
Cole	LeCompte	Utt
Coon	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Corbett	Lovre	Van Zandt
Cramer	McConnell	Velde
Cretella	McCulloch	Vorys
Crumpacker	McDonough	Weaver
Cunningham	McGregor	Westland
Curtis, Mass.	McIntire	Wharton
Curtis, Mo.	McMillan	Widnall
Dague	McVey	Wigglesworth
Derounian	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
Devereux	Mailliard	Wilson, Ind.
Dixon	Martin	Withrow
Dolliver	Meader	Wolcott
Dondero	Merrow	Wolverton
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, Md.	Young
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Younger
Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	
Fino	Minshall	

NAYS—168

Abernethy	Dingell	Hayworth
Addonizio	Dollinger	Herlong
Albert	Donohue	Holifield
Alexander	Dorn, S. C.	Holland
Andrews	Doyle	Holtzman
Ashley	Durham	Huddleston
Ashmore	Edmondson	Hull
Aspinall	Elliott	Ikard
Barrett	Engle	Jarman
Bennett, Fla.	Fallon	Johnson, Wis.
Blatnik	Fascell	Jones, Ala.
Boggs	Feighan	Jones, Mo.
Boland	Fernandez	Jones, N. C.
Bolling	Flood	Karsten
Bonner	Flynt	Kee
Boyle	Fogarty	Kilday
Brown, Ga.	Forand	Kilgore
Burnside	Fountain	King, Calif.
Byrd	Frazier	Knutson
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Lanham
Cannon	Garmatz	Lankford
Carlyle	Gary	Lesinski
Celler	Gathings	McCarthy
Chelf	Gentry	McCormack
Chudoff	Grant	Macdonald
Clark	Gray	Machrowicz
Cooley	Green, Oreg.	Mack, Ill.
Cooper	Green, Pa.	Madden
Davidson	Gregory	Magnuson
Davis, Ga.	Griffiths	Mahon
Davis, Tenn.	Hagen	Marshall
Dawson, Ill.	Haley	Matthews
Deane	Hardy	Metcalf
Delaney	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Dempsey	Harrison, Va.	Mills
Denton	Hays, Ark.	Morgan
Diggs	Hays, Ohio	Moss
Moulder	Roberts	Thomas
Multer	Robeson, Va.	Thompson, N. J.
Murray, Ill.	Rodino	Thompson, Tex.
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, Colo.	Trimble
Natcher	Rogers, Fla.	Tumulty
Norrell	Rogers, Tex.	Udall
O'Brien, Ill.	Rooney	Vanik
O'Hara, Ill.	Roosevelt	Walter
Perkins	Selden	Watts
Philbin	Shelley	Whitten
Pilcher	Shuford	Wier
Poage	Sieminski	Williams, Miss.
Polk	Sikes	Williams, N. J.
Price	Sisk	Willis
Quigley	Smith, Miss.	Winstead
Rabaut	Spence	Wright
Rains	Staggers	Yates
Reuss	Steed	Zablocki
Rhodes, Pa.	Sullivan	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—91

Abbitt	Fisher	O'Neill
Anfuso	Forrester	Passman
Bailey	Gordon	Patman
Baker	Healey	Powell
Barden	Hebert	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Hess	Priest
Baumhart	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bentley	Hosmer	Richards
Blitch	James	Riehlman
Bowler	Jennings	Riley
Boykin	Jensen	Rivers
Brooks, La.	Johansen	Rutherford
Brooks, Tex.	Kearney	Scudder
Buckley	Kelley, Pa.	Sheehan
Burleson	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheppard
Carnahan	Keogh	Siler
Chatham	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Christopher	Klein	Taylor
Clevenger	Kluczynski	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	Lane	Thompson, La.
Coudert	Latham	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	Long	Tuck
Dawson, Utah	McDowell	Vinson
Dies	Mason	Vursell
Dodd	Mollohan	Wainwright
Donovan	Morrison	Wickersham
Dowdy	Nelson	Wilson, Calif.
Eberharter	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Evins	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Dawson of Utah for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Latham for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Forrester against.

Mr. Scudder for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Jennings against.

Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Johansen for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Preston against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Burleson with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Rutherford with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this resolution reads that it shall be in order for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole and so forth. Is it in order for me to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman gets recognition. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing the Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing the Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6888. An act to amend the act of September 3, 1954; and

H. R. 10092. An act for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) entitled "An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fisheries; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior a Fisheries Division; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 267. An act for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of Helen Mar Stanger;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of Amin Habib Nabhan; and

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the engrossed bill (H. R. 3489) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage," together with the Senate engrossed amendment.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO. FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DAM ON THE NORTH BRANCH OF THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4099) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is granted to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River near North Branch, Md., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation approximately 5 miles south of Cumberland, Md.

SEC. 2. Work shall not be commenced on such dam until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works, are submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is not commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. COLE. I demand a second.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the session today, when the House met at 10 o'clock, I announced to the House that because of my feeling of the urgency with respect to two bills which are of vital importance to the atomic energy program and which had been reported practically unanimously by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the urgency that those bills should be considered by the House before we adjourned, and I stated that until those bills were considered by the House, I would feel obliged to object to any unanimous-consent requests with respect to legislative procedures.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 6½ hours later. I have pursued that policy as best I can. These are two bills which the President has expressed his strong endorsement and urged their enactment. They are bills that will do more to expedite the peacetime development of atomic energy than anything the Congress can do.

Now, at this late hour it appears quite evident that the leadership does not intend to give the House an opportunity to pass on those bills. Being something of a realist, I acknowledge the futility of further efforts on my part and therefore wish to say that I shall no longer object to these unanimous-consent requests, but must again remind the House that the responsibility for failure to consider these vital bills in the atomic energy program must rest squarely on the leadership of the House.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, it was but a few days ago that there was much talk here in the Chamber of the alleged extreme necessity for an acceleration of the development of atomic energy for power purposes. It is true there were differences of opinion as to how best to bring about the most progress in that field. Many of us believed that the partnership agreements that have been entered into between Government and private capital under the act which the Congress itself brought into being showed the best promise for success in the near future. Now, it ought to be understood by everybody that the passage of this atomic energy bill, H. R. 12050, is absolutely essential for the continuation of those progams that have gone along very well up to this point. And, I say it comes with poor grace from those who lost in the other fight to erect this roadblock in the way of the progress of the programs that promise so much for the future. I just want to say, with my friend from New York, that you shall have to take the responsibility, and if you do not bring the legislation up and pass it here—and it could be passed in 10 minutes if you move to suspend the rules, because everybody is for it except one man, so far as I know, on both sides of the aisle; and you could do much to further its program—but, if you will not do it in this Congress, then some of us will see to it that it is the first order of business in the next one.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I rose to ask the gentleman from New York a question. I assume he feels no less strongly that it is not only a matter of great urgency with the Atoms for Peace program but may even have a direct or indirect benefit relationship to the security of the United States.

Mr. COLE. In response to the gentleman, I could not demonstrate more vividly my conviction of the importance of these bills to our national welfare, our national security, and our world leadership in peacetime uses of atomic energy than to have devoted, as I have, the last 6½ hours in an effort to have the bills brought up, and in that effort making myself extremely unpopular by having to object to some of the unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further observation?

Mr. COLE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. In case anyone desires to challenge the sincerity of the gentleman from New York—and I am sure none of us would—no man stands any higher in the respect of his colleagues than STUB COLE, of New York. But, he voted for the bill that the rest of you over there wanted a few days ago and some of us did not want. But, he voted for your bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we were faced with the problem of deciding whether the atomic-energy program should go forward in the field of developing atomic-power reactors. This House in its judgment by 12 votes turned down a program which would have provided $400 million for the development of peacetime atomic-power reactors. The Republican Members, almost to a man, voted against the bill.

The 1954 Atomic Energy Act which the Republicans passed in the 83d Congress has been in existence for over 2 years. Invitations have been extended to private industry to build reactors. For 2 years they have failed to come up with a practical program. Although there has been a lot of talk and a lot of discussion, there has not been one design of private-industry reactors approved by the Safety Reactor Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission for instituting this program, although many private-industry people have talked about it. The reason they have not started a program of this kind is because, in the first place, it takes from $50 million to $100 million to build one of these large-scale experimental reactors. All the scientific evidence at this time is that these reactors would not be economical. Therefore, no private industry, unless it had a gimmick of some kind, could build these reactors with the funds that are given to these corporations for investment for profit-making purposes.

Now they have come forward and asked for insurance, public-liability

insurance, on these reactors. Remember that these reactors contain fissionable material in volume as much as an atomic bomb and in some instances greater than an atomic bomb. There have been accidental incidents in connection with these reactors. There have been minor meltdowns, and there could be major melt-downs of fuel rods, emission of radioactive gas, and leakage of certain radioactive liquid materials. Fortunately, none of these accidents so far has imperiled human life. But no scientist can tell you that tomorrow one of these reactors may not run wild and break down, with tragic effect on nearby population.

The fact that no scientist or engineer can tell that to the insurance companies has impelled the insurance companies of America up to this moment to say, "We are afraid of this." A group of them have said, "We will give up to $65 million insurance." But the need is for $500 million of liability insurance for each of these reactors.

But let me stop here and say that no insurance company has as yet set a premium on the $65 million worth of liability insurance which they as a group have offered to give to the reactor builders. Therefore, private industry does not know how much they will have to pay for $65 million or any part thereof. If the price is high, they will take possibly $1 million at a high price of liability insurance and get the other $499 million at Government expense and for a nominal charge of $3,000 for a 100,000-kilowatt power reactor.

In other words, it is like selling accident insurance to an automobile owner on the basis of how many spark plugs he has in his automobile, or how many wheels he has on the automobile rather than the incidence of accidents per thousand cars. This is the position they are in. And so, as an excuse for not picking up this program they have said we must have $500 million worth of liability insurance before we can build. The Government does not have the right to give $500 million worth of liability insurance on human lives in these great cities close to where these reactors would be located, unless the insurance companies of America can establish the rate of risk to human life that is involved.

Dollars cannot take the place of human life. Nor can we as Representatives of the people discharge our responsibility for protecting our people from an unknown and unpredictable hazard, just because a few selfish utility companies want to take for their future benefit a great new source of energy. A source of energy which has been brought into being through the expenditure of approximately $15 billion supplied by the taxpayers—not the electric utility corporations. Just because we have the United States Treasury behind us is no sign that we have a right to gamble with a million human lives in one of these great cities. I for one do not want a reactor near my city of Los Angeles until we have a record of reactor operations so that we can say that we know that the risk is a bearable risk and not an unknown or unbearable risk.

May I say further that this is just the first gimmick the private industry people will want. When they get the insurance there will be further delay. They have applications down at the Treasury Department for rapid tax amortization, and if they get that, and they may get it, I do not know, they also will want to be excluded from the Utility Holding Company Act. If they get that, and I do not know but what they will, they will come to you and want long-range contracts at high prices for the plutonium that is created in these reactors. So it is one gimmick after the other.

The truth of the business is we are not ready to locate these great reactors, these potential death-dealing reactors, near our cities. That is why this committee, and I join with them, is proposing that we have a full-scale reactor program on the isolated sites of our atomic energy installations away from these great centers of population, because we knew they would be safer there than anywhere else, and we knew if they were built there with Government money we would proceed to catch up with the power reactor building program of England and the Soviet Union. I tell you that they are getting ahead of us in this art, and they are the ones that are making contracts to sell reactors. England made a contract to sell a reactor to Japan the other day because she was ahead in the art. Our people are not ready to deliver reactors and the British are. The gentlemen on my left here, the Republicans who voted down the only practical program for the building of reactors, can carry the blame regardless of how they try to blame it on the Democratic Party. Remember this, the Republican Members by their votes Tuesday stood in the way of the only practical program. They are the ones who have to take the blame. Let them carry it into this election, and we will take the platform and prove it to the American people.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of Thursday, July 26, on page 16, the editorial page, the Washington Post sunk to a new low. Under the heading "Atomic Power Deferred," the Post printed an editorial on the defeat of the so-called Gore-Holifield bill and called this defeat "A tribute to the obstructionism of Lewis Strauss." Setting aside the fact that Mr. Strauss does not have a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives, and that the bill referred to was recommitted to the Joint Committee by a vote of 203 to 191, and that it had survived an even more definite threat of defeat a few moments earlier—when a motion by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to strike out the enacting clause, and thus defeat the bill, was carried in the committee of the Whole House by a vote of 155 to 135, and lost, when it was reported to the Congress, by a narrow margin of 199 to 195—the editorial is not only inaccurate but unquestionably libelous.

The editorial says that the House Appropriations subcommittee accused Chairman Strauss of fraud. The House Appropriations subcommittee did no such thing; neither did the full Committee on Appropriations, when it met to pass upon H. R. 12350, as reported to it by the subcommittee on Public Works. To begin with, a subcommittee does not issue a report.

The report is written, after the "mark-up" by a subcommittee, and submitted, to accompany the bill, properly completed as to money figures and wording, to the full committee. Not until then does a report appear, and it is a report of the full committee and not of a subcommittee.

So much for technicalities; the fact of this matter is that the word "fraud" is not used in the committee report to which the editorial referred.

What the editorial also omits is that sufficient members of the majority side of the Appropriations Committee considered the report so offensive, and so far from the truth, that they insisted on its being cleaned up before it was accepted as the report of the Appropriations Committee on H. R. 12350. I repeat, the word "fraud" did not appear in either edition.

The bill referred to, which the report was later written to accompany, was passed out of the subcommittee by a straight party line vote, and again, out of the full committee by a straight party line vote; the only deviation was that, in the full committee, the Democratic Members themselves refused to accept the report in its original wording.

Libel is still libel, even in Washington. The Post editorial was not only inaccurate but also libelous.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT. My inquiry is, How does it happen that we are debating a bill which we are not allowed to consider?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot figure a parliamentary inquiry out of what the gentleman said.

Mr. SCOTT. I was not able to figure what was happening, and I thought I would inquire.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 461)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 193, 83d Congress, as amended, I

hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States a report of the activities of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission for the period ending June 30, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 27, 1956.*

RECESSES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time during the remainder of the day it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I think that is the thing to do. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the probability of the sine die adjournment? Many Members are asking about it. I understand progress is being made in respect to the housing bill and, if that is carried through, I cannot see any reason why we cannot adjourn early.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the public works conference report will be ready very shortly. I wish I could give some definite information, but the purpose of the unanimous-consent request I made is in the hope that we might be able to complete our business tonight, but I cannot give any definite assurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

OAHE, GAVINS POINT, AND FORT RANDALL DAMS AND RESERVOIR PROJECTS, MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2093) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Corps of Engineers, to undertake certain public works and grant compensation for certain property damages as a result of the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and reservoir projects, Missouri River, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to pay to any bona fide lessee or permittee owning improvements situated on a railroad right-of-way or on Indian tribal land the fair value, as determined by the Secretary, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, of any such improvements which will be rendered operative or be otherwise adversely affected by the construction of the Gavins Point, Fort Randall, and Oahe Dams and Reservoir projects on the Missouri River.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to pay to the Pollock Independent School District No. 3, Pollock, S. Dak., an amount equal to the difference between the sum paid for the taking of school facilities of said school district in the condemnation proceedings entitled "United States of America, plaintiff, against 10.00 Acres of Land, and so forth, defendants", civil No. 682ND, filed in the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota, Northern Division on May 7, 1956, and the actual cost of replacing the school facilities so acquired as the Secretary shall find to be reasonable: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall the additional amount paid pursuant to this authorization exceed $200,000.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to provide the funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act from any moneys appropriated for the construction of the Oahe, Gavins Point, and Fort Randall Dams and Reservoir projects: *Provided, however,* That in no event shall the amount so expended exceed $550,000.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

MINING CLAIMS UNDER ACT OF AUGUST 12, 1953

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3941) relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subject to any valid intervening rights acquired under the laws of the United States, any mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyde A. Bailey and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, located within section 20, township 13 north, range 9 west, New Mexico Principal Meridian, McKinley County, N. Mex., which would have been validated under the act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 539), except for the fact that the owners thereof failed to post notice of their claims and to file amended notices of location within the period prescribed by that act, shall be effective to the same extent as if they had been given full force and effect under the provisions of the said act of August 12, 1953: *Provided,* That no mining claim shall be validated hereunder unless the owner thereof shall, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, post on the mining claim validated hereunder in the manner required for posting notice of location of mining claims and file for record in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such claim is of record an amended notice of location of such claim, stating that such notice is filed pursuant to the provisions of this act and for the purpose of obtaining the benefits hereof.

(b) Subject to any valid intervening rights acquired under the laws of the United States, any mining claims owned by Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming, located within sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, or 15, township 43 north, or section 33 or 34, township 44 north, range 82 west, Sixth Principal Meridian, Johnson County, Wyo., which would have been validated under the act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 539), except for the fact that the owners thereof failed to post notice of their claims and to file amended notices of location within the period prescribed by that act, shall be effective to the same extent as if they had been given full force and effect under the provisions of the said act of August 12, 1953: *Provided,* That no mining claim shall be validated hereunder unless the owner thereof shall, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, post on the mining claim validated hereunder in the manner required for posting notice of location of mining claims and file for record in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such claim is of record an amended notice of location of such claim, stating that such notice is filed pursuant to the provisions of this act and for the purpose of obtaining the benefits hereof.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyde A. Bailey and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L. Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

By unanimous consent, a second was considered as ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this merely takes care of claims which were not filed within the proper time?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, since the committee hearings were held I have received an affidavit from Burton S. Hill, attorney at law, Buffalo, Wyo., who represents the parties interested in the Wyoming lands. This, I believe, clarifies this situation as applied to those lands. The affidavit reads as follows:

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES—IN THE MATTER OF A BILL TO PROVIDE THE VALIDATION OF CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS OWNED BY THELMA ARNDT, WALLACE (OR WALLY) LAWSON, RICHARD L. (OR R. L.) GREENE, ELDEN F. KEITH, ZOLA KEITH, LEON KEITH, LEE E. KEITH, ROBERT ARNDT, ROSE GREENE, FERNE CRESSY, MARJORIE LAWSON, AND FRANK CRESSY, ALL OF THE STATE OF WYOMING, LOCATED WITHIN SECTIONS 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, AND 15, TOWNSHIP 43 NORTH, AND SECTIONS 33 AND 34, TOWNSHIP 44 NORTH, RANGE 82 WEST OF THE 6TH P. M. THE MINING CLAIMS IN QUESTION ARE FOR BENTONITE—PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 3941

STATE OF WYOMING,
County of Johnson, ss:

AFFIDAVIT

Burton S. Hill, of lawful age and being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

That he is attorney for Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.

Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, who reside in Johnson and Natrona Counties, Wyo., pertaining to certain mining claims in sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, and 15, township 43 north, and sections 33 and 34, township 44 north, range 82 west of the sixth p. m.

That the mining claims in question were filed in Buffalo, Wyo., during the year of 1948. That affiant was not attorney for the said locators at the time of the filing of said mining claims but knows of his own knowledge that a thorough search was made of the records at the land office, then in Buffalo, Wyo., for any prior claims or leases; but there appeared to be more whatever.

That patent proceedings were commenced covering said claims on or about the 8th day of June 1955, and that before said application was filed another search of the Land Office records at the Bureau of Land Management in Cheyenne, Wyo., was made to determine whether or not there were any prior claims or leases. This search was not made by affiant, but to his personal knowledge the search was made.

That on or about March 16, 1956, affiant did make a check at the Cheyenne, Wyo., Land Office as to the priority of the mining claims in question for the reason that the patenting proceedings were not moving as rapidly as they should have been. After a very minute search he found that said claims were filed over certain oil and gas leases made in March of 1944 and relinquished in February of 1950. The oil and gas leases in question are Nos. LB 038426 and LB 038369.

It is very obvious to affiant why these leases might have been overlooked. There have been so many entries on the Land Office records that the record of these old oil and gas leases is virtually obliterated. Only one skilled in the search of Land Office records would be able to locate these leases. As a matter of fact, because the record was so obliterated affiant asked the assistance of the Land Office personnel to determine the true facts. After some further search it was determined that the above-mentioned oil and gas leases were actually in operation at the time the mining claims in question were filed.

Affiant further says that the mining claims in question would have been relocated under the act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 539) or under the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708) if there had been any knowledge of the prior oil and gas leases above mentioned. That there is not now and never has been any design on the part of the above-mentioned locators to gain any advantage by not refiling said mining claims under one of said acts.

That the said locators relocated their claims under the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708), on March 20, 1956, in order that they might have priority as mining locators; but each of said claims was relocated by the same identical locators on the same identical lands. However, it is to be understood that all of the validation work on the claims in question had been completed for the purpose of patenting said claims, and before there had been any knowledge of the prior oil and gas leases. It is to be understood, of course, that the said locators do not want to do all of the validation work over again when it would be done on the same lands by the same locators. This would be done at a great expense, which would be to the benefit of no one, but to the the detriment of the mineral premises in question.

Wherefore affiant prays that proposed substitute for S. 3941 does pass.

Dated this July 23, 1956.

BURTON S. HILL, *Affiant.*

Subscribed and sworn to before me this July 23, 1956.

My commission expires January 21, 1960.

[SEAL] ROBERT A. HILL,
Notary Public.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

DISPOSING OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before October 1, 1956.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives and Record Service, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 30 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interest of the Government, and he shall submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4116) to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission, created by the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 481), as amended by Public Law 178, 83d Congress, approved August 3, 1953, is hereby increased from 7 to 9 members, such additional members to be appointed by the President of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

By unanimous consent, a second was considered as ordered.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask one question. This involves the Senate Office Building; does it not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thought the work has all been done and I cannot quite understand why they should now, when the work is over, enlarge the commission.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. My understanding is that the work has not been completed and that the work is of a continuing nature. The Senate has requested the increase in membership of the commission and for that reason there was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. When the other body makes a request of this kind, usually the House agrees; is that not correct?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The House always agrees, yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN GREENHOUSES AT THE BOTANIC GARDEN NURSERY

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3881) authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, District of Columbia, and the construction of other facilities in

place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, is hereby authorized and directed to demolish and remove all existing greenhouses and other structures from square 576 west in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, bounded by Maryland Avenue, Second Street, Independence Avenue, and Third Street SW., and to develop such square as a park area.

SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library and in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Architect of the Capitol and to be approved by the Joint Committee on the Library, is hereby authorized and directed to construct eight new greenhouses, a boilerhouse, and other necessary structures and facilities at the United States Botanic Garden Nursery on land heretofore acquired by the United States Botanic Garden under authority of the act of June 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 774), in place of the greenhouses and other structures authorized to be demolished under section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts and to make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of $587,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that the costly property now operated by the Botanic Gardens at the foot of Capitol Hill will be removed and transferred to other property owned by the Government in Anacostia.

The Senate committee reported the bill unanimously. It was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GROSS. What will this cost?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Approximately $580,000. It has the approval of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can the gentleman give us some reason for this sudden desire to move the Botanical Gardens, which have been down here at the foot of the Hill for over a lifetime and very convenient to the Members?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman from California that this is no sudden desire on the part of the Architect of the Capitol to remove these facilities, because they are expensive to operate due to being obsolete. The maintenance cost has come to be a considerable factor.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How much is the annual deficit?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman means how much will be the annual saving?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. What has been our annual deficit from year to year?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am sorry I do not have those figures available for the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I suggest that $580,000 would probably cover a fairly large deficit.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman from California that this is merely an authorization. The question the gentleman raises I am sure will be considered by the Committee on Appropriations when the matter comes before them for appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think it might be possible for this House if given time to discuss it to be willing to do something like this, but I have an inherent resistance to bringing in bills of this nature in the very last hours of the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This bill was on the Consent Calendar yesterday, but was objected to because we substituted the Senate bill.

There was no opposition to the measure either in committee or on the floor on yesterday, and I am somewhat surprised to find that there should be opposition at this late date.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman should not be surprised if somebody makes an inquiry on a bill of this character brought up in the last 2 hours of the session.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad of the gentleman's interest in the matter.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. This bill was presented to the Committee on Public Works and reported out unanimously. It was requested by the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman from California that this does not mean the entire removal of the property. For instance, the large auditorium that is used for display will be continued, and the flowers and the ornaments that are used in the garden will be on display annually as they have been in the past.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, is not this statement correct, that under the present condition of what we call the old greenhouses, where the wooden framework that holds the panes of glass is in such state that a complete remodeling job needs to be done, that it has been found that if we have to go to that expense it would be more desirable to move this to some other more suitable property owned by the Government and remove it from this very valuable area?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That was the sentiment of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I can get this straight. You will move this facility from the Botanic Gardens. Are you going to have to construct a new place somewhere out here on the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Only the greenhouses are to be reconstructed, or else we would have to construct them on the present site. The Federal Government already owns the property and it is suitable for the use of the Botanic Gardens in the Anacostia area. It will result in the removal of an unsightly structure from the avenue.

Mr. GROSS. Is $500,000 going to be sufficient to build a new structure?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, that is the amount required.

Mr. GROSS. This is confined strictly to this purpose?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. There is not anything else with respect to this building program?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is nothing else in this bill, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. J. Res. 615) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "Yolanda)", insert "Kreis Krzyszto."

Page 3, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Georgina Mercedes Llera."

Page 3, line 4, after "Smith", insert "and."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "and Kreis Krzysztof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 649) for the relief of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5.

Page 1, strike out line 6 and insert "That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A)."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 3, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Graziella Valencic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Anna Maria Winskoski, a citizen of the United States."

Page 3, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 5. For the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act Emmanuel, Kleanthi, and Gianoula Manos, shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien children of John Manos, a citizen of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5274) extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUAN JOSE MOYA RAMIREZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1012) for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Juan Jose Moya Ramirez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 1, line 13, add a new section:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, George Nakamura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Richard H. Johannes, a citizen of the United States; and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Nakamura may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls as the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY M. CAUDILL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6709) for the relief of Harry M. Caudill, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$335" and insert "$330.90."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DARRELL C. WILLIAMS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2567) to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to advance Darrell C. Williams, now a lieutenant, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant commander, United States Navy, on the retired list of the United States Navy, with the retired pay and allowances of that grade; but no back pay of allowances shall be held to have accrued by reason of this act, prior to its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7536) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "any passenger or" and insert "more than six."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "Company." and insert "Company, and."

Page 2, after line 15, insert "'(3) vessels navigating on the Great Lakes'."

Page 4, line 16, strike out "June 1, 1956" and insert "March 1, 1957."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman for an explanation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House some time ago. It is a bill which would amend the Communications Act regarding a provision for telephones from ship to shore. It was offered by a member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD]. It went to the Senate, and the Senate limited the number of passengers that it would apply to in connection with any vessel. That is all the amendment does.

Mr. SCHENCK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2226) to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941, with a committee amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman to explain the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill which was passed by the other body was requested by the Attorney General. It amends the Trading With the Enemy Act and permits the Attorney General to wind up old World War I claims. It is a bill that was requested by the Attorney General as being necessary in order to permit him to clear his books and to complete the disposition of the claims of World War I. There is about $800,000 in the account from World War I, and the Attorney General has gone as far as he can go with reference to the disposal of the property, and this bill permits him to transfer it to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is there not a surplus in this account as compared to some of the claims? What is going to be done with the money remaining or the property in the custodian's hands?

Mr. HARRIS. It transfers the property and what cash is left to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury then continues to carry out the provisions of the act in order to finally dispose of it.

Mr. SCHENCK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General, notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, or the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, as amended, is authorized and directed as soon as practicable after the date of enactment hereof—

(a) to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury all cash credited, or which may hereafter be credited, on the books of the Attorney General in the following accounts maintained with respect to property or interests acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended:

(1) Trust No. 47667, Consolidated Unclaimed Balances Account;

(2) Trust No. 47669, Unpayable Balances Account;

(3) Government Earnings—Interest Account; and

(4) Undistributed Income—Interest Reserve;

(b) to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury the assets, other than cash, credited on the books of the Attorney General in Trust No. 47863, German claimants, maintained with respect to property or interests acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, if possible, liquidate such assets and deposit the net proceeds of their liquidation in the German Special Deposit Account created under section 4 of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized in his sole discretion at any time to abandon or destroy any asset transferred to him pursuant to this subsection upon his determination that such asset has no value or a value less than the cost of its liquidation;

(c) to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury the cash credited on the books of the Attorney General in Trust No. 6179, Osterreichisch Ungarische Bank, Vienna, maintained with respect to property or interests acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. So much of such cash as shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Attorney General to be the property of Czechoslovakia and Poland shall be carried with the Treasury in accounts in the names of Czechoslovakia and Poland blocked in accordance with Executive Order 8389 of April 10, 1940, as amended. So much of such cash as shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Attorney General to be the property of Rumania shall be covered by the Secretary of the Treasury into the Rumanian Claims Fund created by section 302 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and shall be subject to disbursement under section 309 of that act;

(d) to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts all cash credited on the books of the Attorney General in the following accounts maintained with respect to property or interest acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended:

(1) Trust No. 47675, Polish claimants;

(2) Trust No. 47677, Czech claimants; and

(3) Trust No. 47687, Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian claimants.

Upon such transfer, the Attorney General shall publish notice thereof in the Federal Register, together with notice of the rights conferred by this subsection upon any person having any claim with respect to any cash so transferred. Within 2 years after the publication of such notice, any person having any claim to any cash so transferred may file in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia an action against the United States for the recovery of the cash so claimed. Upon the filing of any such action, such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such claim, and to enter judgment against the United States for such sum, if any, as the court may determine to be the amount to which such claimant would have been entitled to receive from any such account if the transfer authorized by this subsection had not been made, except that the amounts so determined to be payable shall be subject to the provisions of any applicable blocking regulations issued under Executive Order No. 8389, dated April 10, 1940, as amended, which remain in force at the time of the entry of such judgment; and

(e) to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury, pending the ultimate disposition thereof, the participating certificates issued to the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General pursuant to section 25 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

SEC. 2. (a) No person shall have any claim to any cash or other assets transferred by the Attorney General to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 1 except persons claiming cash transferred pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) thereof.

(b) The cash or other assets transferred by the Attorney General to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 1 shall not be liable to lien, attachment, garnishment, trustee process or execution, or subject to any order or decree of any court.

SEC. 3. The Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by striking paragraph 15 of subsection (b) of section 9.

SEC. 4. The word "person," as used herein, shall be deemed to mean an individual, partnership, association, or other unincorporated body of individuals, or corporation or body politic.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, after the period at the end of line 19, insert: "This subsection shall not apply in the case of any lien, attachment, garnishment, trustee process or execution, or any order or decree of any court, arising out of any action which was pending or had been decided on or before July 1, 1956."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIPMENTS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11969) to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out "ninety days" and insert "one year."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANAGEMENT OF RED LAKE INDIAN FOREST AND SAWMILL

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3787) relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the 17th paragraph of section 9 of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 123, 137) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Red Lake Indian Forest shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with principles of scientific forestry that will encourage the production of successive timber crops for the benefit of the Indians of the Red Lake Band, and he is hereby authorized (a) to harvest, sell, and manufacture such marketable timber from any tribal lands within the Red Lake Indian Reservation as he may deem to be advisable and, if the timber is the growth of Red Lake Indian Forest, in keeping with the foregoing principles, (b) to establish nurseries and otherwise provide for the reforestation of said lands, (c) to construct and operate sawmills and other facilities for the manufacture into marketable products of the timber harvested from said lands, (d) to purchase, harvest, and manufacture such additional timber standing on or severed from any other lands, including lands outside the reservation, as in his opinion may contribute to the profitable operation of such sawmills and other facilities as a tribal enterprise, subject to such limitations on expenditures as may be prescribed in annual appropriations acts, and (e) to employ, with the consent of the tribal council, such persons and use such means as he may find necessary to carry out the purposes of the foregoing provisions. Any proceeds derived from sales of timber or timber products under this paragraph may be expended in payment of the expenses of any of the activities authorized by this paragraph, including construction expenses."

SEC. 2. The fourth paragraph of section 8 of the act of June 30, 1915 (41 Stat. 3, 14) is hereby amended by striking out the proviso.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to say how happy I am that the bill which I introduced in May of this year, relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill, passed the House today. This bill—H. R. 11033—has been under advisement for the past several years and it just could not seem to be brought up at the right time.

I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives for being so helpful during the year and for helping me to get this bill to the floor.

The Indian people do not expect much, they only want someone to help them to help themselves. This bill will enable them to proceed in a technical and scientific way in the running of their sawmill, which will make the business more profitable and thus give them more income.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate:

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the engrossed bill (H. R. 3489) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage," together with the Senate engrossed amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is granted.

There was no objection.

TRAINING OF FISHING INDUSTRY PERSONNEL

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10433) to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10433, with Mr. HAYS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 10433 was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine. It is sponsored by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to it.

This bill proposes to do for the fishing industry similar things that we have done for agriculture. At many of the hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine it was apparent that scientists, men versed in scientific explorations for the discovery of fish supply, were scarce in this country. I might say as a compliment to the great States on the Pacific coast, there are only 2 States that conduct a course that students take for the promotion and advancement in the fishing industry. In addition, the bill will provide an extension course, something like the 4–H, or that type of course, in the high schools of the Nation to instruct young men in the art of fishing and in the manner in which it should be gone about. There was no opposition to the bill when it was being considered in the committee.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee has said, this measure seeks to establish a program of training scientists and technicians for the fishing industry. The bill came before the House several days ago under suspension and failed under suspension although the votes were almost 2 to 1. I believe the vote was about 250 in favor of the bill and 130 against it. The bill was approved unanimously by the committee after testimony from representatives of the industry who felt that they needed this legislation badly. I have had personal requests from several segments of the industry favoring the legislation. I think it is a good bill, although it does call for the expenditure of approximately $925,000 per year.

I may say that there are only two schools in the country which feature programs in their curricula having to do with the training of fishing personnel. One is at the University of Washington and the other at the University of California. I know of no other school which has in its curriculum this type of study.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is setting the Federal Government up in the school business in the different States, is it not? That is just what it is. You are going right down to the local level and setting the Government up in the school business.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. This program certainly is no different than the program in connection with our agricultural schools. Of course, we could not pretend to go into a program on such an extensive scale as that in connection with agriculture.

May I add one other thought. The thing we are considering here is more than just an industry. I think I have on other occasions called the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there are only two sources of food in the country, one is the land and the other the sea. It seems to me that the people of the United States and this Congress should be tremendously concerned with food of this sort which is available to us in the sea. It will become more and more important as time passes on and our population increases.

In connection with what the gentleman from New York has said about this matter, may I say that at the present time the Federal Government spends just under $6 per ton to produce agricultural food products. In connection with fisheries we spend about 80 cents per ton to produce fish food products. It certainly is not any unusual or overreaching request that we are making.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understood this would cost something like $900,000 a year. Will this cost be met by the industry or by the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It will be met by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We may have a shortage of well-trained fishermen in this country, but we also have a shortage of doctors and scientists. We refuse to subsidize schools for the education of medical practitioners, scientists, and others of that type. Why should we do something for the fishing industry that we refuse to do for the benefit of the doctors and scientists?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I should like to comment on that. If the gentleman from Ohio will consider that not only are we trying to protect an industry but we are also trying to protect a food resource. In that regard we are in no different position, it seems to me than we are in connection with the educational programs for the farmers. It is not entirely that we want to support the farmer himself. It is the fact that we are concerned about a land and food resource.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has always been said, and I think most people agree that the liberties of this country depend to a great extent on a free press and freedom of the press. I happen to make the largest part of my living out of the newspaper business. I wonder if the gentleman would be willing to vote Federal money at the expense of all the American taxpayers to set up linotype schools to educate printers because there is a great shortage in our industry, which actually affects the freedom of the press.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Of course, I would not because, as I said, I am concerned not about an industry here so much as I am concerned about our food resources. This Congress has, on a number of occasions, done things to protect the resources of the United States whether they be water, mineral, forests, or what have you. In that sense, this is a little different than offering Government assistance to an industry.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, some people in our part of the country where we are dependent on pork and beef cattle feel that the more we help the fishing industry, the less we sell of our beef and pork. What about that situation?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I say to the gentleman the day will come when our population in this country will increase to a point where we will be tickled to death to have fishery resources that we can depend upon.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I was just discussing this proposed legislation with my very good and able friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. She inquired of me whether or not there is any program contemplated for cooking the fish? The gentlewoman seems to think

since we are trying to carry on an educational program to catch the fish, there ought to be a program to cook the fish and I quite agree with her. I think that ought to be a part of the program, too.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I think the gentleman misses the point of the program envisaged in this bill. Coming back to what I already said, one of the things we are endeavoring to do here is to train fishery people to recognize, as we on the committee do, that we have at stake an interest in preserving our fishery resources in our waters.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It has been suggested here by some Members who do not have commercial fishing in their respective districts, but who do have trappers and hunters, whether the gentleman would be willing to include trappers and hunters and have a program for training young men coming out of college how to trap and hunt. Would the gentleman be willing to do that?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. No, I would not. I think that falls into a different category, too. I know the gentleman is being facetious in what he said.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to ask two questions. With reference to the schools that do exist, are they State financed?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, they are.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Why cannot these other States, if they are sufficiently interested in this particular industry, do like California has done?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I may say to the gentleman that I do not know why they do not have the same kind of curriculums in their schools.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. May I suggest that the reason is they are not interested enough?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete what I started to say, the fact remains that the States have not instituted this program in their colleges. This bill seeks to encourage them to do so. We, in the Congress, should be very interested in protecting the national interest in these food resources.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think we do have an interest but I would suggest that those States that have a sufficient interest do what we expect them to do and set up schools. And those States that are not interested have not done so.

The other question is this. Talking about a resource, actually you are going to train people to deplete the resources because already we have a situation in the Great Lakes and also with reference to your salmon out in the Northwest where I understand it is not a question of teaching them how to catch more, but rather how to preserve what we have.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is exactly what is envisaged in this program. Of course, the technicians who would be developed under this program would instruct fishermen to catch fish more efficiently and at less cost. But they would also teach them fishery conservation and development practices. Out in the Northwest such knowledge and practices have restored and increased certain species of fish. Naturally, the fishermen caught more fish after restoration and increase of species.

The gentleman, I believe, has a mistaken concept of what the bill is intended to do. The bill is not designed to teach fishermen how to catch more fish, but to teach them how to catch fish more efficiently and conserve the fish resources.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is a conservation program?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It has conservation features.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has just referred to the Great Lakes problem. In the Great Lakes there is a problem of the lamprey eel which has wiped out great fish resources. This is not the problem of any one State. We are dealing with a great national resource and it should be treated as a national problem. For instance our problem on the Pacific coast is an international problem and is handled by an international commission.

It is true that some States have established schools of fisheries, but as the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] has pointed out, the problem which this legislation seeks to get at is not the problem of the individual fisherman. We are dealing with a great natural resource, and I hope the Members will not look at this as being the project of any State.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me that the gentleman from Ohio who spoke of its interfering with pork, that we have done a great deal of legislating for pork, and I do not mean that in the facetious slang sense of the word, but we have passed a great deal of legislation for farmers and for the pork industry. It seems only just to help the fishing industry which is so important to us in many sections of the country, and, indeed, to the entire country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. PELLY] that this is a very important bill to the fishing industry of the entire country. It is one bill that the industry of all sections of the country have agreed upon. We all know that the fishing industry is the first industry of the western hemisphere. It is still an important industry in all sections of the country.

This bill is considered by members of the industry, and I agree with them, to be a matter of importance and significance; certainly, the industry has taken it so seriously that at their convention they unanimously agreed to request legislation along this line, and that is why I introduced the bill at the request of the industry.

This bill will do a tremendous amount of good, and it seems to me that the great contributions made by our fishing industry through the decades that we should help them with the difficulties they are laboring under at the present time. The very fact that they are in unanimous agreement upon this particular bill warrants its passage.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is really one of the great authorities in this country on fishing, and I hope he will tell us how these people should be trained if we are going to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As so often happens, I regret very much that the gentleman is completely mistaken. Wish I had the ability he attributes to me.

I am not only not an authority on fishing but I have difficulty in catching fish. If I knew more about it I would go into consultation with myself and use what knowledge I have, if any.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I must yield to the gentleman. He is the creator of the Hoover Commission. It was his bill which brought it into existence. He served long and faithfully on that Commission and is familiar with the reports of the Task Force, but I have no doubt but what he will give me a ribbing of some kind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I inquire whether or not, if this legislation is enacted, this fish school legislation, the gentleman expects to enter college and study fishing? He said he was not an expert.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I never went to college to study fishing, nor do I expect to do so, although some of my first money came from fish, spearing suckers through the ice, pulling them from out of the snowbanks where I stored them and selling them to the farmers when they came to town on Saturday. I became a fisherman later on.

I want to refer to the situation the gentlemen have been trying to keep me from talking about. A little while ago a report was filed by the Committee on Government Operations. It is on the employment and utilization of experts and consultants, one of the reports put out by the very industrious and active Committee on Government Operations.

I did not have time to go over that report and write minority views. It is 122 pages long. I simply said I did not have

time on account of other duties. I just wrote:

MINORITY REPORT

Because of the almost continuous sessions of the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations and the daily meeting of the House, when Members' presence on the floor is necessary if they are to perform their duties, the minority have been without any opportunity to examine the hearings, read the reports filed by the majority, prepare dissenting or additional views.

This situation is protested as being unauthorized under our system of legislation, as being unfair, and depriving the individual Members of Congress, who are members of the committees making the reports, of their opportunity to perform their duties.

The action of the committee in delaying the putting out of these reports until the closing days of the Congress—action which automatically deprives the Members of their civil rights—is in sharp contrast with the action of the House in adopting the civil rights bill.

It is proof, indeed, that actions speak louder than words; that verbal adherence to a principle is no indication that it will be followed or supported when an actual situation arises.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Along came the chairman of the committee, the very capable gentleman from Chicago [Mr. DAWSON], and he filed additional views. Here they are, and they are worthy of consideration and study. The gentleman states:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

The minority members and the majority members of the Committee on Government Operations have the same amount of time in which to work.

There is not the slightest doubt about that.

Maybe the majority members of the committee are more industrious and perhaps apply themselves more earnestly to their duties and responsibilities.

That may be so. I am not contradicting anything the gentleman says. On one of these subcommittees at least I was the only Republican who attended the hearings in three States. There were Senators there, there was a Democratic Member from the House present, but I was the lone Republican because the Republicans on that committee, or at least some of them, had been assured it was just a study that was to be made. It was a beautiful trip out west, I thought, but actually it was not. It was nothing but work day in and day out with nothing worthwhile accomplished.

This is the point: I have as much time and the minority Members have as much time as do majority Members, but there are not as many of us. One man in 1 hour just cannot do as much work as can 10 men. Do you get the point? The Committee on Government Operations has under the Reorganization Act 10 staff members, half of them anyway getting $10,000 or $11,000 a year. I am not complaining about that, please do not misunderstand me. That is the regular setup of the committee under the Reorganization Act. In addition to that, the chairman of the committee, and the House in its wisdom granted the authority, has some $995,000 more for investigations and expenses. Then he employed a staff of experts, and they are experts. There are 60 employees on that committee and its subcommittees. So, do you see how absurd it is to have the chairman say that the minority has as much time as they did?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment. You and I are in accord about something, are we not?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman wanted to know why I objected to some of the bills on the unanimous consent calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have 5 minutes more? There will be a recess, anyway, so what is the difference?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BONNER and Mr. TOLLEFSON each yielded 2 minutes to Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.)

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I just wanted to ask: I think you mentioned the House Administration Committee having all this money. Did the gentleman from Michigan appear against the money, or was he in favor of it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, I did, and on the point of order they struck out $100,000 that they did not get, otherwise it would have been $600,000 the last trip instead of five. Yes, I was there. I do not know whether you were there or not.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I was there, but I cannot recall seeing you there.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is the point. Just think of it. All these reports coming in, and being one of the most vocal and consistent supporters of the Eisenhower administration, at least on quorum calls and matters of that kind, I get requests from friends of the administration who are not in office to file answers to some of these reports, and I just cannot do it for lack of time. So, weigh this statement of the chairman that we have just as much time as does the majority, and then if I plead guilty for myself—not for the other members of the committee that I do not work as hard as majority members—I hope you will forgive me if I am not as industrious, if I do not apply myself as earnestly to my duties and responsibilities as do the majority members.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman would not like to put in the RECORD the amount of staff that the minority does have to help them with their reports.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, they have between 50 and 60.

Mrs. CHURCH. The minority side.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, the minority. Oh, well, let me see. The committee very generously recently gave us an addition to our staff, so we have now one stenographer, and we have one lawyer, and then under the reorganization law we have a minority member of the full committee. So, to offset the work of the 60 staff members of the majority, we have three. It seems hardly fair to ask or expect the three to do as much as the 60 even if they have just as many hours to work. Yet that is the chairman's reasoning. Do you wonder sometimes why I give up and just come over here and kill time instead of remaining in the slave galley over there in the office building?

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will, to my very distinguished, lovable friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHUDOFF. I would just like to get it in the RECORD so that the Members do not misunderstand. When you were chairman of the full committee and I think the gentlewoman from Illinois knows it also, you cut the staff to two and you wanted to pay them about $1,200 a year, and as the result of that, we had a subcommittee appointed, of which Mrs. CHURCH was a member, and we insisted at least on paying our two employees a living wage. You have twice as many as we had. You have four.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your own subcommittee has four. Your full committee has 60 all told. Now, you know, there is an illustration of the extreme wisdom of my colleague. Well, the Reorganization Act fixed it so that on the committee there were ten and two of the ten are assigned to the minority, and that is exactly what happened then. It is exactly what happened this time under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Chicago [Mr. DAWSON]. And, I am not complaining about that. What I am talking about in this statement that we have just as much time, and the only inference I can draw from his additional views, is that our failure to get out reports is due to our lethargy and our indolence. What I am calling attention to is that we have three people altogether while they have 60. Now, I am just trying to defend myself from that charge of indolence. That is all I am doing, and I hope the House will not criticize me too greatly or too severely for that even though it appears the four of us cannot turn out as much as the 60 employees plus the efforts of the 17 majority members.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I rise in support of the bill. I want to point out, in answer to one of the questions asked, that a great many people eat fish. During World War II, the Government spent a great deal of money encouraging more people to eat fish in place of meat. It is not a special school program. We are already in special school programs in certain subjects. We are helping to support four State

marine schools; we are helping to support State agricultural schools; and when we consider a commodity like fish, this is important.

The subject I wish to speak on out of order is this: I wrote a letter yesterday to the Secretary of Commerce protesting a situation which I think this House should be made acquainted with.

In 1950 the House by an overwhelming vote voted $350 million to build 50 fast mariner vessels for the use of the American merchant marine. They were extremely valuable; in fact, invaluable during the Korean war. The last eight of those vessels are now laid up. There are two American companies seeking to purchase them. Overnight the Federal Maritime Administrator and the Under Secretary of Commerce made an offer to the Navy to turn them over to the Navy. The Navy said they could use some of these vessels. But what is the Navy going to do with these vessels, costing from $8 million to $10 million to build? The Navy is going to spend $15 million per vessel to reconvert them to the kind of vessel they want and then put them in their lay-up fleet.

Here are two American companies—and one in particular on the Pacific Coast, which was the first one to buy these mariners—who want to buy them and spend an additional couple of million dollars to make them adequate for Far East and oriental service. They now find themselves boxed out.

I say that this is completely in contravention of the law enacted by Congress, that the matter is being delayed and dragged out until Congress is out of session so that the Department of Commerce can then do what they want.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. BONNER. This situation came to pass because in an appropriation bill there was authority given to the Navy to reach into the reserve fleet and take such ships as they might desire without coming to Maritime or without consulting the Committee on the Merchant Marine. It is just another case where blanket authority was given in an appropriation bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted the gentleman from California has raised this question on the floor of the House. As a minority member of the subcommittee that appropriates for these ships, I want to say that I, too, have protested to the Navy and to the Secretary of Commerce transfers of these ships to the Navy.

The money was appropriated to build up our merchant fleet, which the gentleman and I think should be done. The subsidy money was appropriated for that purpose. If the Navy comes in and takes these ships actually what they are doing is relieving themselves of a $10 million appropriation on each ship so that the record will show that that money was not appropriated to them.

The fact is that the figures which I have checked will show that in the end it would cost the taxpayers of the United States about $23 million more if these ships are transfered instead of the Navy building ships for themselves. In other words, the Mariners cost about $9 million and the Navy is going to put about $15 million into each ship in order to put it into service when they could build these ships for $20 million.

I will say to the gentleman that I have protested to the Navy and only today talked about it to the Secretary of Commerce. I hope the transfer will not be made, because then it will be for the benefit of the American taxpayers and in the interest of building a better and greater merchant fleet for our people.

Mr. SHELLEY. I want to agree with my fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations and thank him for his comments.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Following the protest expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], I think it should be pointed out that if these ships are taken into operation by the privately operated merchant marine they will still be available for the use of the Navy and the country in time of war in just as much readiness as if the Navy takes them now.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think it is time we got back to the simple and ancient art of fishing. I think there is a great deal that has been misunderstood about this bill and what it seeks to do. I am certain those people who have tried to drag a little levity into the debate did so unintentionally.

Fishing is important to this country, and fish is an important source of food. It represents a source of protein that cannot be very well gotten in other forms and in other places.

Who are the fishermen? They are the people on the Atlantic coast, up in the New England States, who are the descendants of fishermen. The fishermen on the Pacific coast and in other parts of the country have come to this country for the most part from those countries where fishing was traditional, such as Italy, Portugal, Yugoslavia, Spain, Norway, Sweden, and parts of England. On the west coast we add to that the Japanese, who are perhaps the greatest fishermen of all. We have cut off immigration and the source of fishermen naturally has dried up as we cut off that immigration.

I notice that Senator PURTELL in his statement on this bill in the Senate calls attention to the fact that the average age of the fishermen in New England now is around 59. When these men originally went to sea they did so in sail, or the boats were propelled by oars. Today the fishing practices have completely changed. Fishing is mechanized like everything else, but when we mechanized it we broadened it and increased the ability of people to take more and more fish. We have actually depleted some of the species as a result of that. What we have to do is bring those fish back. We have to study, intensify our study of fishing, just as, starting about the turn of the century, we started to intensively study agriculture. That is all we seek here.

Members are concerned about free education under this bill. You have vocational training under the George-Barden Act. Nearly every rural high school of any size in the country has courses that teach young boys, particularly in the field of agriculture, how to handle equipment and how to handle the mechanized tools of agriculture. That is all we are asking in this case. So that there is a need for fishing.

Let me tell you now something of my own experience in this field. At the outbreak of the war those in charge of defense threw nets across the entrance of every great harbor in this country. Two days after war was declared the Quartermaster Purchasing Agent in San Francisco sent to the Division of Fish and Game of California and asked for a conference. He said, "You have to intensify the fishing for sardines, because we need the fatty oil." We needed it for explosives. We were short on fatty oils. The oil of the country, the copra and the tung oil that was imported into this country, was cut off. We needed the canned fish products, too. And yet the Navy and the Army said, "You cannot fish. You cannot send boats to sea to fish." We had a series of conferences. I came on to Washington with some members of our Commission, and before we got through the Navy put special gates in these anti submarine nets. It opened the ports to fishing just as in England during the war. They had to fish. There they sent boats to sea in convoys under naval escort, to fish because fish was essential as a food. We are getting a rather late start in the fishing industry. But, think of its popularity in the restaurants throughout the country. I think some of the people, perhaps, who have been a little critical of it here today are the first ones who will go down to a restaurant and want to get a nice lobster or some shad or who will want some good Chesapeake Bay oysters. Yet, we do not know too much about how they breed or what we can do to preserve these fish and these species for the future. All we are doing is asking you to establish a program for a great historic industry just as you have established one for the agricultural industry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true, for instance, in the case of oysters, that they contain a great deal of iron?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, and iodine too.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And that they are good for people with anemia?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A great many people are not allowed to eat meat and have to eat fish and it is a very valuable food, almost a medicine in some cases.

Mr. MILLER of California. Not only is fish valuable food, but in the impact of civilization the fishing industry is hit very badly because pollution destroys more fish than anything that has been mentioned. We talk about the lamprey eel. Perhaps we have unbalanced Nature and have taken out one of the enemies of the lamprey eel that has held it in check heretofore. We stand to lose, for instance, our oyster fishery industry. Are we taking too many oysters and have we introduced some enemy in the form of pollution that is destroying them? Everyone is concerned about this. We have seen the sardine industry practically disappear from the Pacific coast although it is on its way back again.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. HALE. We are suffering a very serious depletion of our valuable clam resources in New England and we are quite concerned about that.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is going on right now. All we want to do is to find out why and we want to train people who will be skillful in conserving those resources and we want to have trained people who will go into the fishing industry to help.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I come from the Great Lakes area of our country. In the Great Lakes white fish have almost disappeared. Lake trout are also disappearing. If this program is for the purpose of helping to propagate and again seed the waters of our country with fish, the program is worthwhile because we are losing that industry in the Great Lakes.

Mr. MILLER of California. What we are seeking to do is to train men who can have the know-how and to make them available for the fishing industry just as you have economists and other people throughout the country in agriculture doing what they do for agriculture.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. In connection with the Fish and Wildlife Service appearing before our committee on the subject of the lamprey eel in the Great Lakes, they stated they were unable to get scientists and sufficiently prepared men to carry on the studies for which the Congress has already made appropriations. In the rivers and in the interior waters, we are getting pollution and we do not have the proper men with the knowhow to handle the situation. That exists all over the country. So, this bill looks to the future to prepare men who will be qualified to carry on these studies and encourage the qualification of those men for this very work. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman from California that pollution is killing the fishing industry and is driving the fish out of the waters.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman has heard these statements before his committee in favor of pollution legislation or antipollution legislation which is something we need too.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. This discussion has been tremendously illuminating. Letters that I have received particularly from those engaged in fishing in the Great Lakes have been critical of it because it has been misunderstood that it would train scientists who would teach us how to catch more fish as contrasted to training scientists who would work on the preservation and building up of our fish population.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up, because perhaps I failed to stress it, but that is just what we think, we have got to conserve our fish resources and learn how to do it and teach others how to do it.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. It would be my hope that the studies would include the results of radioactivity that cannot help but be taking place when we launch a bomb over water. That water flows through all the oceans of the world before it gets through, and I trust very sincerely that there may be a study made much more extensive than has been made by the Atomic Energy Commission. The results of such a study would do much to give our people a sense of security.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would say to the gentlewoman from Ohio that that belongs in another field. What we are doing is tackling the biological problem and you do not solve any biological problem quickly. It takes long labor of patient trained people. We are trying to encourage such research.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I want to thank the gentleman for his work in the matter.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, last week when the House was considering H. R. 11708, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, I offered an amendment to that bill which the House adopted.

The bill, as it read before the adoption of my amendment, would have permitted barter of our surplus agricultural commodities with the Soviet satellite nations.

My amendment prohibited such barter and all commerce with all Communist- or Communist-dominated nations. In speaking in favor of this amendment, I said that in my opinion trade or barter with any of the satellite nations would essentially be benefiting the Soviet Union.

The House passed my amendment to prohibit any barter of our surplus agricultural commodities with all Communist nations.

The conference report—House Report No. 2903—did not include the proposal sponsored by Secretary of State Dulles to authorize the barter of our surplus agricultural commodities with the Communist captive nations. The report did not include my amendment to prohibit such barter. The net result is that barter of our surplus agricultural commodities with any Communist or Communist-dominated countries is prohibited.

I talked with the conferees who represented the House and since the time is short before the end of this session and because I accomplished the objective which I intended, to forbid barter of our surplus agricultural commodities with the satellite nations, I made no objection to the conference report.

I think the Members of the House who supported my amendment are to be congratulated for we have defeated the effort to open barter relationships with the Communist-dominated countries.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, this bill is urgently needed for the Nation and the industry. This bill is urgently required by the fishing industry which is presently experiencing so many difficult problems. Those who are familiar with this industry recognize that the solutions to these problems must be approached on a broad front. This measure will make a contribution to that end.

Under this bill the Secretary of the Interior will be authorized to make grants to certain States in order to promote the education and training of professionally trained personnel in the varied aspects of the industry. If the provisions of this bill had been in operation many years ago, many of our problems would not now be with us. I strongly recommend that it be enacted.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in this legislation. Maine has 2,400 miles of coastline. We invite you to share our scenery, but let me say also there are many of our people who engage in fishing for their livelihood. They are very much interested in this bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this proposition of making a study of the depletion of shellfish and other kinds of fish is something that we are probably making too late. For instance, herring come into our streams down where I live every spring and spawn. No one ever sees those herring after they leave in October when they catch them as sardines. No one ever sees them again for 3 years. No one knows from where they come or where they go.

Take the eel. Some people say the eel comes from the Sargasso Sea, but we do not know; no one has been able to find out.

There are many other problems of the fishing industry about which we should have more scientific knowledge. Could

we know more about their life and habits we could manage and conserve this resource much more effectively.

The gentleman from Maine said that the clam situation in Maine was bad. It is worse in Massachusetts. I can remember when we used to get thousands of bushels a month and ship them all over the eastern seaboard, yet for the last 8 years there has been hardly a clam or a soft-shell crab on the Massachusetts shores. They are coming back, however, but no one knows why, either why they are coming back or why they left. We used to catch a lot of bluefish but now we do not get any bluefish at all—maybe once in a while one. We would like to know why. Some say it is because they do not get the bait, the old porgies, that used to come in from the Atlantic Ocean.

What the cause is we do not know, but we do know we have not the fish but need them.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, if you will look at this bill and read it through carefully, you will realize it has tremendous possibilities and will not cost the taxpayers any money in the long run. Actually, in the State of Washington we have I believe the only school of fisheries that gives a degree to its graduates. Our graduates are greatly sought after by the Department of the Interior and by the various State fisheries departments. But there are not enough of these trained graduates. When these men get to working for the States they do a great work in clearing the lakes and streams of various kinds of undesirable fish and replanting with sports fish. The sportsmen are very much interested in this legislation.

It is late in the afternoon, but let me address myself to those who are interested in economy. Let me give you some examples of how this legislation will actually make money. I can cite to you from our part of the country, the Pacific Northwest, one particular example, where the scientists who are trained by such schools of fisheries studied and recommended a program to eliminate an impediment to a run of salmon. The United States, I believe, contributed $5 million with Canada toward a British Columbia Canadian project. As a result of the work that was done on the Frazier River, 4 years later when the salmon run was restored by science to that stream the fishermen in my State of Washington alone in 1 year took $16 million worth of sockeye salmon. Likewise, with reference to the Great Lakes where the sea lamprey has eliminated trout and other fish, that fishery was worth $5 million a year and trained men in time will restore it.

What we need are scientists and trained personnel to get out and find the sources of the problem for the disappearance of fish and I think those of you who voted before for this bill when it passed the House recently under suspension of the rules, 250 to 130, but not enough under the two-thirds rule, should gather around now and support this as a piece of good legislation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Inasmuch as the gentleman has mentioned the sea lamprey situation of the Great Lakes it should be understood that the House just recently in a supplemental appropriation bill appropriated funds for the purpose of eradication of the lamprey eel. I do want the gentleman to understand that I am supporting this bill and I concur in his statements.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] realizes this problem. What we seek to do is to get more scientists and technicians to utilize a little in the way of appropriations both Federal and State and return a great deal on the investment we would put in.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in this legislation. As a matter of fact, I introduced one of these bills. People from the Bureau of Fisheries have testified in hearings before the other body in favor of this proposal. Nobody doubts the value of research when it comes to medical science and the prevention and cure of disease, and so forth. I do not know why anybody would be skeptical about the value of research in connection with our food supply.

When I was a child anybody in Maine could go down to the beach with a little clam hoe and bring home a mess of clams for supper. Now they are almost gone.

One of the best things that has happened in the State of Maine was that we did get some appropriations awhile ago for a little research on that situation. As the gentleman from Masachusetts has said, there is some promise of ameliorating that situation.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is a very important piece of legislation. The cost is trivial compared to the results that may be obtained. I hope this bill will pass the House by an overwhelming vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman spoke of clams. I know that lobsters are not nearly so plentiful as they were when I was a child, and they are having difficulty getting a plentiful supply off the Maine coast.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants, out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section, to public and nonprofit private universities and colleges in the several States and Territories of the United States for such purposes, including the establishment of scholarships, as may be necessary to promote the education and training of professionally trained personnel (including technicians and teachers) needed in the field of commercial fishing. Any amount appropriated for the purposes of this section shall be apportioned on an equitable basis, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, among the several States and Territories for the purpose of making grants within each such State and Territory. In making such apportionment the Secretary of the Interior shall take into account the extent of the fishing industry within each State and Territory as compared with the total fishing industry of the United States (including Territories), and such other factors as may be relevant in view of the purposes of this section. The Secretary of the Interior may establish such guides and curricula for educational courses as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1956, and for each fiscal year thereafter for the purposes of this section.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior may establish such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, following the word "purposes", delete ", including the establishment of scholarships,".

Page 1, line 9, following the word "including", insert "scientists,".

Page 2, line 10, delete the words, "The Secretary of."

Page 2, lines 11, 12, and 13, delete in entirety.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few questions I should like to ask concerning this legislation, which calls for the spending of $1 million a year in perpetuity to teach people about fish and how to catch them. We have had numerous explanations, but what do you propose to do; train people how to catch fish, train technicians, or what? What is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. The bill speaks for itself. It is to prepare men for scientific studies in the propagation and study of fish and fish life, just as you prepare men in other vocations. In addition to other things, the bill carries an extension of the program in high-school work, for young men who may be interested in this subject.

Mr. GROSS. I want to get at that, too. What is going to be the educational requirement? There are no basic requirements or standards in this bill.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman knows what was done in the agricultural colleges, to prepare the county agents and people of that kind, to know more about

agriculture. This bill has the same purpose, to teach young men something about fish and fish life, just as in the extension course in the agricultural college.

Mr. GROSS. One of the gentlemen who preceded me, and spoke in behalf of the measure, said that with immigration having reduced, fishermen were not coming from foreign countries to this country. To the contrary, immigration has been increased, but is the purpose of this bill to teach people how to catch fish or to do just what?

Mr. BONNER. It would imply all of those things, yes; to study the movement of fish in deep water, exploration of places where fish go, and how to go about getting more fish.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the House just the other day pass a bill providing for a brand new Assistant Secretary in the Department of the Interior to head up the Fish and Wildlife Service; and was there not a Division of Fishing Industry created there for the first time? And is there not going to be a Director appointed over there and a number of technical and scientific employees?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted the chairman asked that question. It is difficult to get the right kind of people, people properly qualified in the Fish and Wildlife Service, to carry out the authorizations and appropriations that we have made. The purpose here is to bring up young men who will be qualified in this field. In one State they had a large river that became very much polluted, or something happened to it, and the fish were dying by the thousands.

Mr. GROSS. Is this a stream-pollution bill or a bill to teach people how to catch fish?

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman would wait a minute, I should be glad to tell him. We had one man, an ichthyologist, to go there and make a study. It would take 3 or 4 years to make that kind of a study. We finally got this man to that place, and he is in great demand all over the country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not very much impressed by that argument.

Mr. BONNER. I am sorry.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not yet answered my question as to whether you are going to try to train people to catch fish or whether you are going to train technicians, scientific people, and so forth. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Where is this money going to be expended?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. As far as specific institutions are concerned, I do not know where it will go any more than we knew when we established the agricultural program in this country. Let me say in all sincerity to the gentleman who has raised some very interesting questions that I did say that immigration had been cut off and that that took away from us people who used to come to this country, who were fishermen. We have to train men from the ground up in the business, just as we had to train people in agriculture.

The gentleman has a great agricultural school at Ames, Iowa. We have a great one in California. There is not a State that does not have a great agricultural school. They are pouring people continuously into the field of agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Then we have schools in vocational training which we can use in this program, to teach people, for instance, how to make nets; for instance, there is the field of refrigeration in the fishing industry, where we lack trained people. I am just trying to think of a few practical examples. The same type of problems existed in agriculture when we had to train people to go out and do scientific work in that field.

Mr. GROSS. If this bill is for the purpose of teaching people how to make fish nets, we are getting far afield and mighty reckless with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me again?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. If the gentleman will read the bill he will see on page 1, line 3—and this is in answer to the gentleman's question—

That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants, out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section, to public and nonprofit private universities and colleges in the several States and Territories of the United States—

For the following purposes. Now that is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Are you going to establish a course in fishing at the Iowa State College?

Mr. BONNER. Is the gentleman's college interested in getting a grant or a scholarship for this purpose?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows the answer is that there would not be a course in fishing established there because there is not money enough in this bill to begin to go around, if courses in fishing were dished out to all the State colleges and universities in the United States.

As to vocational training, the State of Iowa carries its full share of the cost but the States benefited by this bill would make no contribution whatever.

Mr. BONNER. I agree with the gentleman there is not enough money to spread around to all the States.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not the fishing industry take an interest in this training and defray part or all of the cost?

This is a strange committee report. The report on page 1 deals with this bill, and then from page 2 on it deals with tariffs and the distress of the New England textile industry.

I sympathize with the New England textile industry. It is having a hard time there days, but to the people of New England who are having this trouble I would say, "If most of your Representatives were not voting to spend so much money on the foreign WPA extravaganza, teaching people in foreign countries and providing them with the machinery to make and export textiles, you would not be in the trouble you are in now." Join me next year in cutting the foreign handout bill, and you will not be in so much trouble with your industries.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman was told this was a bill to teach people how to catch fish. I understood it was to teach them how and where and when not to catch fish, so that the fish could grow larger and happy families to be caught later. Will the gentleman follow that up with these experts? I thought it was to teach people how and where and when not to get the fish.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but I still cannot tell the gentleman just what this bill proposes to do.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not there has been any request from the various conservation departments of the 48 States for this money?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly have had no request from the Department of Conservation of Iowa for this legislation.

Mr. PILLION. Can anyone tell us how many research scientists we will need in the next 10 years in the various State conservation departments, and whether or not this $1 million per year is enough or too much to fill the needs of the 48 States and the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina or the gentleman from Washington can tell the gentleman. I certainly cannot answer the question.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that a valid case for this legislation has not been made. It wraps around the necks of all the taxpayers a bill of $1 million a year for all time, plus the millions that will be spent through the new Division of Fisheries in the Department of the Interior. This is ridiculous and reckless legislation of which we already have too much in this session of Congress.

If there is not to be a rollcall vote, let the record show my vote against this bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) $375,000 for vocational education in the fishery trades and industry and distributive occupations therein, to be apportioned for expenditure in the several States and Territories on an equitable basis, as determined by the United States Commissioner of Education after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, taking into account the extent of the fishing industry of each State and Territory as compared with the total fishing industry of the United States (including Territories)."

(b) Section 3 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "paragraphs (1) to (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (1) to (5)."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10433) to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry, pursuant to House Resolution No. 612, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING AND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

CORRECTIONS IN H. R. 7619

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7619), to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

In section 104 (a), strike out subsection (b) following section 104 (a) (4) and insert the said subsection (b) immediately preceding section 105.

In section 118, strike out "116" and insert "117."

In section 9 (d) of the amendment made by section 401, strike out "first or second" and insert in lieu thereof "second or third."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING TRAINING OF NEEDED PERSONNEL FOR FISHING INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill H. R. 10433. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has asked for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—yeas 82, nays 37.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2379) to promote the fishing industry in the Uinted States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry, which is a similar bill to the bill just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants, out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section, to public and nonprofit private universities and colleges in the several States and Territories of the United States for such purposes, including the establishment of scholarships, as may be necessary to promote the education and training of professionally trained personnel (including scientists, technicians, and teachers) needed in the field of commercial fisheries. Any amount appropriated for the purposes of this section shall be apportioned on an equitable basis, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, among the several States and Territories for the purpose of making grants within each such State and Territory. In making such apportionment the Secretary of the Interior shall take into account the extent of the fishing industry within each State and Territory as compared with the total fishing industry of the United States (including Territories), and such other factors as may be relevant in view of the purposes of this section. The Secretary of the Interior may establish such guides and curricula for educational courses as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $550,000 for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1955, and for each fiscal year thereafter for the purposes of this section.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior may establish such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(d) The several States and Territories, in order to receive the benefits of this section, shall be required to match by State or local funds or both 100 percent of the appropriations made under authority of this section.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) $550,000 for vocational education and extensive service in the fishery trades and industry and distributive occupations therein, to be apportioned for expenditure in the several States and Territories on an equitable basis, as determined by the United States Commissioner of Education after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, taking into account the extent of the fishing industry of each State and Territory as compared with the total fishing industry of the United States (including Territories)."

(b) Section 3 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "paragraphs (1) to (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (1) to (5)."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2379 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H. R. 10433, as passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

At the request of Mr. BONNER, and by unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 10433, was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

WATER CONTRACT WITH THE CITY OF RAPID CITY, S. DAK.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3468) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to amend contracts numbered IIr-1413 and 14-06-W-51, dated respectively July 27, 1943, and October 20, 1952, and entered into with the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for the furnishing of water by the Government for municipal purposes, to such extent as he may deem necessary to secure to the holders of revenue bonds, hereafter issued by said city to finance certain essential improvements to its water system, a first priority to revenues derived from the sale of water supplied to said city pursuant to such contracts. The priority authorized in this act shall be limited to revenue bonds the face value of which does not exceed $2,500,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULINE H. CORBETT

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2943)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3957) entitled "An Act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and the Senate agree to the same.

E. L. FORRESTER,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
WILLIAM LANGER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3957) entitled "An Act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The bill as passed by the House would authorize an appropriation of $18,716.97 to Pauline H. Corbett, Charleston, W. Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of severe personal injuries and disabilities sustained by her as a result of an overdosage of streptomycin which she received while a patient at the Tokyo Army Hospital, Tokyo, Japan, from November 2 to 28, 1950, as a civilian employee of the General Headquarters, Far East Command, United States Army, engaged in a nonappropriated fund activity.

The Senate increased the sum to $38,317.19, and at the conference this sum was agreed upon.

E. L. FORRESTER,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 7 OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk a bill (H. R. 6586) to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "section", insert "7."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL FOR MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in these closing moments of the 84th Congress, I would like to summarize the activities of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation Committee on Flood Prevention and Relief, on which I was honored and privileged to serve as chairman. This brief report cannot enumerate the many activities of the committee, nor can it record all of the results stemming from our sustained, intensive, cooperative effort waged for our State and area regardless of party affiliations or partisan considerations. The chief motivation of our work was the welfare of our State and area and Nation.

In all modesty and humility, our committee merely wishes to state that a check of the objectives outlined by the committee at the outset, and during the course, of our work, will disclose the virtual 100 percent completion of our legislative and administrative program.

In the Congress, as a result of our joint efforts and the generous assistance of our colleagues, we were able to secure favorable action for practically our entire announced program. Only in a few nonemergency or detail matters did our obectives fall short. This was more than offset by the fact that our objectives were actually exceeded in other instances. We can all be proud of this accomplishment, but without the help of many other people, it would not have been possible.

In the committee's name, and in the name of the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress, I desire to express our deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks to the President, the very many Members of Congress, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader of the House, the leaders and Members of the Senate, the agencies, private and public, and to the very many individuals who rendered us such splendid, effective assistance. We are eternally grateful to all.

To my own colleagues on the committee, I tender deep thanks for their invaluable help without which the results achieved would never have been possible. I am proud of and thankful indeed to our entire Massachusetts delegation. It is indeed a great one, and representative of the best traditions of our historic Commonwealth, the Congress and the Nation.

I cannot stress too strongly the splendid assistance and great public service regarding our flood relief and rehabilitation measures of the distinguished majority leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and the distinguished minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

FLOOD RELIEF

The disaster relief operations undertaken by the Army engineers immediately after the August floods are now nearly completed. All eligible work has been finished or will be under contract by the end of this month.

The total amount channeled into Massachusetts by the Army engineers for disaster relief operations is $7,253,000.

The engineers assisted Massachusetts in three different ways under the Operation Noah disaster program: (a) reimbursement for expenditures made by the Commonwealth or local communities in their initial relief operations; (b) contributions toward the permanent repair or reconstruction of public facilities; and (c) emergency repairs and debris cleanup performed by the engineers through the employment of private contractors throughout the damaged areas.

The engineers have paid, or are in the final process of paying, a total of $2,700,000 to the Commonwealth and to the local communities for reimbursements—item (a) above.

For contributions, the engineers are paying, or are in the process of making final payment, a total of $553,000—item (b) above.

For direct work by the engineers performed by local contractors, the engineers will have paid by the time the last contract is completed a total of $4 million—item (c) above.

The committee and the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress desire to commend that sterling military leader, Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., the New England Division Engineer, and his entire staff, for the outstanding work performed throughout the flood devastated areas of the Commonwealth under the Operation Noah program. This work was most difficult. The engineers did a tremendous job and this committee unanimously expresses its sincere gratitude—a sentiment profoundly shared I am sure by our entire Massachusetts congressional delegation as well as delegations of other flood-stricken States, by our beloved Commonwealth and by all our people. This effective operation is another instance of the brilliant leadership, smooth-functioning efficiency, readiness, and humanitarian spirit of our great Corps of Engineers.

CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN

As a result of action by the 84th Congress, an expedited flood-prevention program will be undertaken in the Connecticut River Basin, the most ambitious since the Federal Government moved into the flood-control picture in 1936.

Congress has provided $6,120,000 for flood works in the Connecticut Basin. These funds will make it possible to begin construction of five new projects and start the planning of another. In addition, the Congress has granted authori-

zation for the badly needed Littleville Dam and Reservoir on the middle branch of the Westfield in Massachusetts.

The new construction and the amount appropriated by Congress in the 1956–57 Civil Works appropriation bill are as follows:

Ball Mountain, Vt., $2,300,000; Otter Brook, N. H., $1,250,000; Barre Falls, Mass., $1,150,000 Townshend, Vt., $620,000, and North Springfield, Vt., $500,000.

Planning funds in the amount of $300,000 have been appropriated for the North Hartland, Vt., Dam and Reservoir.

These Vermont projects will do much, in the estimation of the Army engineers, in reducing floods on downsteam points of the Connecticut in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

Congressional authorization for the Littleville Dam in this session of the Congress will advance by many months the planning and construction of this project. The Army engineers have prepared a preliminary plan for Littleville, which calls for the construction of a dam on the middle branch of the Westfield River in Huntington and Chester, Mass. The reservoir would extend upstream a distance of 3 miles and lie in Huntington and Chester. The project would be solely in the interests of flood control.

The engineers estimate that the project would reduce flood heights at downstream locations, including Westfield and West Springfield, Mass., and Hartford, Conn.

The estimated cost of the project is $5,090,000.

The committee and the delegation will press for the inclusion of planning funds in the 1957–58 Civil Works appropriation bill when the 85th Congress convenes next January.

Construction on one of these projects, Barre Falls in Massachusetts, has already begun. Groundbreaking ceremonies were held in Barre on June 15.

BLACKSTONE BASIN

The Congress appropriated $1,940,000 for flood-control work in the Blackstone Basin. Of this amount, $1 million is for the Woonsocket channel improvement project.

Work will be started on the Worcester diversion tunnel project, for which $840,000 has been appropriated.

The delegation was successful in obtaining $100,000 in planning funds for the West Hill Dam and Reservoir in Upton, a project which will have considerable flood-reducing effect on downstream points of the Blackstone. The House voted this amount in the Civil Works appropriation bill, but the item was deleted by the Senate because of the lack of State concurrence.

Governor Herter notified the delegation and the Army engineers of State approval of West Hill in June and it was possible for us to have the $100,000 reinstated in the bill by the conferees.

In addition, the Congress has appropriated $30,000 for needed survey of the Blackstone Basin as part of the Army engineers' Northeast flood studies, a continuing survey to cost about $2 million for the whole Northeast before completion.

General Fleming has stated that recommendations will be submitted to Congress calling for permanent flood-control improvements in the Blackstone Basin upon completion of these surveys.

THAMES BASIN

The greatest damage in Massachusetts occurred in the Thames Basin last August.

Three of four authorized flood-control projects in Massachusetts will be started this year with funds made available by the Congress.

A total of $2,400,000 has been appropriated for these Massachusetts projects: Buffumville, $1,200,000; East Brimfield, $840,000, and Hodges Village, $360,000, all construction funds.

The Massachusetts delegation sought planning funds for Westville, a companion project to East Brimfield to protect Southbridge. According to the Army engineers, however, it is more feasible from an engineering standpoint to defer the planning and construction of the Westville dam and reservoir until such time as the East Brimfield project is in the advanced construction stages. The engineers state that deferred action on Westville will do away with the need for a coffer dam, which would be required if both projects were constructed at the same time.

The invitation for bids for the construction of the Buffumville Dam were issued this month by the Army engineers. The bids will be opened on or about August 17. Construction will get under way soon thereafter.

MERRIMACK BASIN

Through the energetic efforts of our beloved colleague Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, in which the entire Massachusetts delegation joined, $50,000 was appropriated for the planning of the Hopkinton-Everett Dam and Reservoir in New Hampshire, which, when constructed, will have considerable flood-reducing effect on downstream points of the Merrimack in Massachusetts.

In addition, $11,000 has been made available by the Congress this year for surveys of the Merrimack and its tributaries as part of the northeast flood study.

NAVIGATION AND BEACH EROSION

The entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress actively supported and worked for needed navigation and beach erosion projects with the result that the Commonwealth this year will see the beginning of a $4½ million program.

Eight new projects will be undertaken under the supervision of the Army engineers: Boston Harbor extension to 40-foot anchorage, $1 million; Cape Cod Canal, $157,000; Chatham Stage Harbor, $167,000; Fall River Harbor, $500,000; Nantucket Harbor, $162,000; Newburyport Harbor, $143,000; Revere Beach, $75,000, and Weymouth Fore River, $500,000.

In addition, the Congress appropriated $1,500,000 for the Mystic River 35-foot channel project and $302,000 for the Town River navigation project, continuing projects from previous years.

FLOOD SURVEYS

In its initial report last November, the committee recommended emergency funds to complete engineering studies on key flood control projects in the whole Northeast.

Congress supported the delegation in these efforts by providing $330,000 in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill in February and $381,000 in the regular flood control appropriation bill in June for the so-called Northeast flood study, a continuing flood survey of all devastated Northeast flood areas which will cost about $2 million before completion.

Of the $330,000 appropriated in February, $130,000 is being used for New England flood studies. The following is the breakdown, by basin, of this amount:

Connecticut, $50,000; Merrimack, $1,000; Thames, $20,000; Housatonic, $39,000, and Blackstone, $20,000.

New England will be apportioned $120,000 of the $381,000 made available in the regular appropriation bill for the Northeast flood study. Following are the basins and amount allocated for each:

Connecticut, $20,000; Merrimack, $10,000; Thames, $20,000; Housatonic, $30,000; Blackstone, $10,000; coastal streams, including the Charles and Neponset in Massachusetts, $10,000, and rivers in Maine, $20,000.

BUSH-M'CORMACK BILL

The 84th Congress enacted most desirable legislation in the passage of the Bush-McCormack bill which was originated by the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK. This law will now make it possible for the Army engineers to go ahead with small flood prevention projects, up to $400,000, without specific congressional authorization.

Prior to passage of the Bush-McCormack bill, the Army engineers were limited to expenditures of $150,000 on individual small projects authorized by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950. Up to $400,000 may now be spent on any one project so long as it meets the basic requirements of the 1950 act—the project must be complete within itself, be economically justified and not be in an area intended to be protected by a larger flood control project.

Congress appropriated $2 million in the supplemental appropriation bill to carry out provisions of the Bush-McCormack bill. In addition, $2½ million was appropriated in the regular 1956–57 fiscal year flood control works appropriation bill for small authorized projects.

General Fleming has stated that as work progresses on the Northeast flood study, locations will be found on New England streams where Bush-McCormack flood projects may be authorized. Before he can recommend expenditures of Federal funds at these locations, it will be necessary to accomplish considerable detailed field and office work. In all cases, a brief report will be required showing the cost and economic justification for the work.

The committee has recommended that surveys of the following basins be made for permanent flood prevention works under provisions of the Bush-McCormack bill: Connecticut, Thames,

Blackstone, Merrimac, Charles, Neponset, Housatonic, Hoosic, Ipswich, Mystic and other streams in the State.

WATERSHED PROTECTION

In its inital report to the delegation, the committee cited the newly enacted Watershed Protection Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress—as a possible source of flood relief for smaller areas in the Commonwealth where large engineer flood control projects are not contemplated.

While the program is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, such projects need not be confined to agricultural regions alone because some watershed protection projects in residential and industrial communities can be included so long as there is a relationship to soil conservation, land utilization and flood prevention.

The committee again brings to the attention of our Massachusetts communities, troubled with periodic floods, the potential value of the USDA Watershed Protection program in helping to solve local flood problems.

The 84th Congress has made substantial changes in the original law, which called for matching funds from local beneficiaries of watershed protection projects. These changes now require the Federal Government to bear all the cost of construction for flood protection. The soil conservation and land utilization aspects of the program will continue on a matching basis with the Federal Government bearing up to about one-half of the cost.

The objective of the watershed protection program is to reduce the peak flow of floods through small dams, cut down on the flow of silt, debris and rubbish, halt soil erosion, build up moisture in the subsoil of farms and keep wells from going dry.

Two watershed projects in Massachusetts are progressing under the provisions of Public Law 566. One is in the Town River Basin and the other, sponsored by the Suasco Watershed Association, is located in the Sudbury, Assabet and Concord River Basins.

WEATHER RESEARCH

The committee successfully worked for additional funds for the United States Weather Bureau to improve forecasting and storm warnings. In addition, the committee pressed for the inclusion of funds for special hurricane studies to be undertaken by the Army engineers in cooperation with other Federal agencies. The Congress appropriated $1,400,000 for those engineer hurricane studies.

FLOOD INSURANCE

One of the final actions taken by this Congress to assist flood disaster areas was the adoption of a flood-insurance program backed by the Federal Government, which was urged by the delegation after the August floods. We had envisaged a much broader disaster insurance bill, but the bill enacted is a good start in the field and will permit future necessary experimentation and subsequent sound expansion of the program consistent with our free private enterprise system.

The supplemental appropriation bill contains $500,000 to get this $5 billion flood insurance program underway. The experimental 5-year program includes direct Federal insurance policies when private corporations fail to provide the needed insurance. The Federal Government otherwise would reinsure policies issued by private insurance companies.

The program at this time sets a $10,000 limit for insurance on private homes and a $250,000 limitation on policies held by an individual or company. Authority is provided to issue or insure $3 billion in flood insurance policies with discretionary authorization to the President to increase this amount by $2 billion more if necessary.

In addition, Congress authorized, as part of the flood insurance program, a $2 billion loan program, which can be increased by $500 million by the President. The loans carry a 4 percent interest rate and would be available to those who sign flood loan contracts in advance with the Government.

PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

One of the problems facing the Army engineers in connection with an expedited flood-control program for New England is the shortage of engineering personnel. In his testimony to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee, General Fleming stated a substantial number of vacancies in his engineering staff could be filled immediately. However, with the intensive recruiting being carried on by private industry for engineering help, the problem is most difficult and complex.

The volume of work for the New England Division is such that it has been necessary for the Army engineers to allocate the design work for several New England flood-control projects to Division offices of the engineers in other parts of the country.

For instance, design work on the North Hartland Dam in Vermont is being done by the Army engineers in Portland, Oreg. The Townshend, Vt., dam design is being prepared by the Garrison, N. Dak., Division engineer staff. The design of the Hodges Village Dam and Reservoir in Massachusetts is now being prepared by the staff of the Division engineer in Seattle, Wash. The East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir project in Massachusetts has its design work being done by the Buffalo, N. Y., Division engineer. The work for the North Springfield, Vt., dam is being prepared by the Division engineer at Omaha, Nebr.

The committee recommends that every effort be made to bring wage schedules for engineers and other technical specialists more in keeping with the salaries being paid in private industry. If this is not done, the shortage of qualified engineers in the field of public works will become more acute, thus negating the efforts of the New England delegation in Congress to obtain an accelerated flood-control program for the region.

The following is a tabulation of Massachusetts flood-control projects, showing congressional appropriations for the 1955–56 fiscal year before the August floods and appropriations made by Congress after the floods in the Urgent Deficiency and 1956–57 fiscal year appropriation bills:

Massachusetts flood control projects

	1955–56 fiscal year appropriations	Urgent deficiency supplemental 1955–56 fiscal year appropriation	Massachusetts delegation recommendation	1956–57 fiscal year appropriation
Adams	[1] $1,900,000	None	$1,976,000	[1] $1,576,000
Barre Falls	None	[1] $300,000	1,150,000	[1] 1,150,000
Buffumville	[2] 55,000	[1] 100,000	1,200,000	[1] 1,200,000
East Brimfield	None	[2] 140,000	840,000	[2] 840,000
Hodges Village	None	[2] 140,000	360,000	[2] 360,000
North Adams	[1] 750,000	None	2,000,000	[1] 2,000,000
Worcester Diversion	None	[2] 140,000	840,000	[2] 840,000
West Hill [3]	None	None	[2] 100,000	[2] 100,000
Westville [4]	None	None	100,000	None
Littleville [5]	None	None	100,000	None

[1] Construction.
[2] Planning.
[3] State concurrence granted in time for inclusion in 1956–57 appropriation bill.
[4] The Army engineers state Westville will be more feasible to plan upon completion of East Brimfield. The committee felt it necessary to acquiesce in this engineering judgment.
[5] Now authorized by Congress. The committee will press for planning funds in the 1957–58 fiscal year appropriation bill.

EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1956, I introduced H. R. 10620 which would implement and continue our assistance to the large number of mentally retarded in this country who cannot presently realize their potential as useful adjusted citizens. When passed, it will represent a very vital act of recognition that mentally retarded children in America have the same rights as other children to grow and develop to the fullest of their abilities. Only in the past 10 years has this principle obtained general acceptance.

I had hoped that this bill would pass this session of Congress. However, after checking with members of the Committee on Education and Labor and the chairman, the gentleman from North Caro-

lina [Mr. BARDEN], I am sorry to inform the Members of the House that no action will be taken this year. I have been assured by the chairman of the committee that hearings would be granted early next year and I am confident that the committee will report out this bill and pass it in the early days of the next session of Congress.

It was almost exactly 2 years ago that the House Subcommittee on Appropriations called your attention to the tragic nature of mental retardation and proposed that the Federal Government join the States and various organizations and individuals in an effort to prevent or mitigate this problem. Congress rapidly responded to this proposal and approved an increase of $750,000 in appropriations for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the National Institute of Mental Health which would be specifically devoted to initiation of a program of research leading to the eventual elimination of mental retardation. I might mention in passing that actual research undertaken by these Institutes in this area now considerably exceeds that original sum and the research attack on mental retardation has assumed major proportions.

It may be remembered that the Congress assumed this responsibility in the face of exceedingly tragic facts. There are now four and a half million retarded children and adults in the United States. Mental retardation is 10 times more common than poliomyelitis or cerebral palsy, and this handicapped population is growing at a rate of 130,000 new additions yearly. Only a small percentage of these children will obtain an education, be able to undertake more than unskilled labor for their support, or be capable of taking part in the normal activities of the average person. As our birth rate accelerates and as medical skills further reduce infant mortality, it is probable that the numbers of retarded born each year will increase further.

In making funds available 2 years ago for the research attack on mental retardation, the Congress was guided by a philosophy which has been basic to our support of research on all disorders during the past decade. We have realized that an attempt to render complete medical, educational, and rehabilitative services throughout our future to all the afflicted and disabled in this country on a permanent basis would involve sums far beyond our ability to bear them. Such services, however, are necessary and must be provided insofar as we are able, for they mitigate the problems of disease, though they do not eliminate them entirely. Through research, however, we are taking the most realistic steps toward the final prevention of premature death and disability.

Investment in research has, in fact, served us well. During the past decade we have seen the virtual control of the infectious diseases and the beginnings of control of some of the chronic disorders. Science, of course, can make no predictions concerning the ultimate conquest of mental retardation, but progress thus far has been heartening. Science has begun to understand some of the causes of infant brain damage, and prevention of mental retardation thereby has become an actuality in some instances. Thus, physicians no longer X-ray mothers in the first three months of gestation, and during the same period of the brain's most active development both physician and mother are particularly on guard against German measles. Science has also found that complete recirculation of blood in the newborn Rh incompatible child has been found to virtually eliminate kernicterus, a disease previously leading to cerebral palsy and mental retardation in approximately 1,000 newborn infants every year.

The present research attack on mental retardation promises even greater gains. This research primarily focuses on determining a large number of unknown factors governing the fate of embryonic brain during pregnancy. Scientists are studying the entire history of human pregnancy in order to elucidate those environmental influences such as abnormal metabolism and nutrition in the mother which may lead to mental retardation in the child. Direct investigations of the developing embryo can be made on experimental animals, and a variety of techniques have already been developed to induce intellectual deficits in animals and to measure the extent of those deficits.

Promising as such research is, however, there is no question that the conquest of mental retardation, like the conquest of other disorders, will be achieved only after considerable effort. We should remember that the research attack on mental retardation has barely begun. Morever, since it is likely that mental retardation is due to many causes, it is probable that progress to our ultimate goal will only come through slow, step-by-step progress.

This prospect, of course, does not hold out great hope to those who are mentally retarded now and to those who are responsible for their care. It is our evident responsibility, therefore, to do whatever is humanly possible to provide care, training, and rehabilitation to the mentally retarded at the present time. We know that mental retardation is not a hopeless condition and that, in fact, only a small number suffer such loss of intellectual capability as to be helpless. Out of every 100 exceptional individuals, only 5 percent show a severe loss in intellectual capacity; but the 20 percent moderately retarded and the 75 percent mildly retarded can and must receive those services which will grant them the maximum economic and social adjustment to society.

They must receive them, for otherwise large numbers of them will become public charges, and their lives wasted in institutions. And it is well to remember that each institutionalized retarded child costs society $50,000 during his lifetime.

Traditionally, direct services to the disabled have been the responsibility of State and local communities and of those remarkable associations and individuals who dedicate themselves to humane works. During the past decade we have seen them assume these responsibilities more and more on behalf of the retarded child. Diagnostic and treatment clinics have sprung up throughout the United States; special nursery schools and special educational classes within city school systems have been established, and sheltered workshops and vocational rehabilitation programs have been organized. Many children who would otherwise have been helpless cripples are now capable of undertaking some of the activities of daily living and of achieving some degree of economic independence.

The fact remains, however, that while rapid advances have been made in the general and special education of retarded children, the need is still much greater than the achievement. Approximately 950,000 of the 1 million retarded children of school age can profitably be educated, but less than 200,000 of them are either enrolled in special public school classes or in those special schools established to meet their particular educational needs. You will be interested to know that even this small total represents a 30-percent increase over the total school enrollment of mentally retarded just a decade ago.

What is the core of this problem? It has a number of facets, of course, but it is the profound shortage of specialized instructors which is of the most serious import. There are approximately 8,000 teachers of the mentally retarded in the United States today. While this represents a 40-percent increase over the number of teachers available 10 years ago, we still need 5 times this number to meet the total need. In short, in a majority of this country's communities, the retarded child receives no education, no vocational training, and in some instances may not be able to take care of the most rudimentary needs of personal hygiene.

It is evident that we must meet this situation with all possible means. This present bill, H. R. 10620, would enable the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a program which would financially assist individuals to obtain the complex training necessary for the teaching of retarded children and which would assist State institutions to either expand or initiate their mental retardation teacher programs.

Clearly, we cannot expect the total educational needs of retarded children to be met immediately. The need is great and the numbers of those who can undertake the teaching of the mentally retarded are relatively limited, for such teachers must have special enthusiasm and zeal, exceeding patience and gentleness, and exhaustive inventiveness—plus a willingness to accept remuneration that is not really commensurate with their education or their devotion. We are fortunate, however, that there are such selfless people, and that given the training opportunity they will devote themselves to a job which must have many disappointments as well as rewards. This bill will pave the way for making that opportunity possible and for at least partially realizing those goals stated in the Bill of Rights for the Handicapped Child, which was prepared more than 15 years ago by the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. This document states that

the handicaped child has a right "to a life in which his handicap casts no shadow, but which is full, day by day, with those things which make it worth while, with comradeship, love, work, play, laughter and tears—a life in which these things bring continually increasing growth, richness, relase of energies, joy in achievement."

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION—GILES COUNTY, VA.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today of bringing to the attention of my colleagues an important and most appropriate celebration that is taking place within a few weeks in the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia, and to extend an invitation to every Member to visit and take part in this celebration.

Giles County, formed in 1806 under an act of the Virginia General Assembly, is celebrating its 150th anniversary. The week of August 26 through September 1 has been designated as the official sesquicentennial celebration week. An impressive list of events, including a historical pageant, parades, beauty contest, and a homecoming Sunday in the county's many churches, has been planned.

Giles County was named for a former Member of the House, the late Honorable William Branch Giles, who was elected to the First Congress, reelected to the Second and three succeeding Congresses, and later to the Seventh Congress. He was also a Member of the United States Senate and served as Governor of Virginia. It is appropriate, then, that we should be reminded of the 150th anniversary of Giles County, and that the director of the celebration, Raymond E. Hogan, should issue an invitation to all Members here to visit in Giles during the celebration.

Although Giles is officially 150 years old this year, the county's history dates back nearly 300 years. Historical material collected by Robert Friend, Narrows, Va., is being published in the Giles-Virginian Leader by the editor, Eaton K. Goldwaithe. The historical sketch provided me by the director, taken from Mr. Friend's collection, indicates that the advent of the first white man into the Giles area was in the year 1671. From this beginning, the history of the development of the area is traced through the formation of Augusta County and West Augusta, and eventually the formation of the county of Giles, 1806.

The history of Giles traces the development of transportation from buffalo hide boats to the modern railroads and highways that criss-cross the county today; tells of the progress of education from the earliest efforts to the complex and outstanding public-school system of today; recounts the Civil War skirmishes that occurred in the county, including the record of 2 former United States Presidents, Col. Rutherford B. Hayes, and Maj. William McKinley, being in the county seat during the period; and includes all of the interesting and fascinating events that make up the history of a rapidly growing and progressive county.

I am particularly interested in the industrial growth of Giles, because of the work that is being done today by an active area development corporation. Only this past week, a leader of this organization came to see me, advising of the work that is underway to continue the industrial development today.

Of course, the railroads of Giles—the Norfolk & Western and the Virginian—have played a great role in this industrial growth. The Norfolk & Western acquired the rights of the old New River Co. in 1881 and constructed a standard gage road. The Virginian Railway—the last class I railroad built in this country—began its construction early in the 20th century.

Industrial development began in the county in 1897 with the establishment of the New River Tannery. The Appalachian Electric Power Co. built its Glen Lyn plant in 1919, and a $26 million addition is now being constructed. The Virginian Railway's powerplant at Narrows was built around 1924–25; and in 1939 the establishment of the huge plant of the Celanese Corporation of America between Narrows and Pearisburg capped the industrial expansion.

I wish to commend the citizens of Giles County for planning this outstanding observance of their 150th anniversary as a Virginia county. It is indeed desirable that the historic founding and resulting development be commemorated during sesquicentennial week. This celebration can touch every facet of community life, giving pause for reflection on the significant events of the past 150 years and, at the same time provide reemphasis to the plans for another 150 years of progress and growth.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Giles County in the House. And it gives me considerable pleasure to invite you and our colleagues to visit in Giles in southwest Virginia and participate in this celebration.

The local newspaper carried an editorial recently in regard to this celebration. The editor wrote:

> Giles County's history is precious, individual, and important. And in this day of changing values it is vital that the new generations have roots. We can help to accomplish this by instilling in them a pride in the county's past and a hope for the county's future; no better way can be devised than through a 150th anniversary pageant and celebration.

I must say that I agree with this writer, and that I herewith extend my best wishes for the success of the celebration and the continued growth of Giles County.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, last year, during the first session of this Congress, more than a year ago now, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 was passed by Congress and later signed by the President thereby becoming the law of the land. Before passing this legislation the Congress included a provision as section 7 of that law which authorizes and directs the President to take action with respect to defense-vital commodities to assure that imports of those commodities will not endanger the national security. This provision has become known as the defense amendment.

There was widespread concern within Congress with respect to many items that increasing imports of those commodities threatened the domestic economy of the industries concerned and more important in many cases the national security was involved. One of the principal commodities which was before the Congress at that time, one which is essential to our peacetime economy and vital in war, was petroleum. Many in Congress felt that increasing imports of petroleum threaten the domestic industry and thereby threaten the national security. Petroleum was, therefore, one of the principal commodities that the Congress had in mind when it adopted section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

The problem of excessive oil imports is one of long standing. Congress has been concerned with this matter almost continuously since World War II. This concern beginning back more than 10 years ago has been fully justified by the record. This record shows that it is unfortunate that this concern was not given more recognition at that time because the domestic industry has been weakened in its ability to meet national-defense requirements and foreign oil has taken a greater and greater share of the domestic market.

Prior to World War II oil imports amounted to less than 5 percent of domestic production. Immediately following World War II the rate of imports was increased rapidly and sharply and during the period 1946 to 1951 imports had about doubled the prewar position in the home market, amounting to about 10 percent of domestic production. As imports take over a larger and larger share of the domestic market the domestic industry is thereby forced to cut back its base of operation. That means that the domestic industry's defense base is weakened.

During the past 5 years since 1951 oil imports have continued to increase at even higher rates and there is no indication that the trend will stop unless some positive action is taken.

The concern about this problem has not been confined to Congress. In 1954 the President of the United States created the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, which was given the assignment of determining a proper policy to be taken by the Government with respect to oil imports. The report of that Committee was issued early in 1955. This Committee, made up of

members of the Cabinet, concluded that oil imports in excess of the 1954 relationship to domestic production would endanger the national security. During 1954 imports, which had increased continuously during the postwar period, amounted to 16.6 percent of the domestic production. It was felt by many of us concerned with this problem that the Cabinet committee recommendation represented real progress toward a solution of the oil import problem. Many Members of Congress and many members of the petroleum industry felt that the 1954 relationship of 16.6 percent was too high. There was widespread support for limiting imports to 10 percent of the domestic market. I was among those who felt that 10 percent was a more realistic standard than the 1954 relationship. But there was widespread support, including my own, for establishment of the 1954 relationship for at least a trial period. It was realized that it was important to stabilize imports at some level even though there may be disagreement as to the precise level most desirable.

With this background in mind the Congress considered the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1955. At that time there was a strong movement to incorporate in that legislation a provision that would establish a legislative quota which would have limited oil imports to 10 percent of domestic demand. It was only after strong appeals from the executive branch of the Government that the defense amendment was adopted in lieu of the 10-percent quota. The Congress was informed that the administration, if given the authority to restrict oil imports, would take action to do so. The plea was made that such authority should be broad and general in nature so that the administration would have the greatest flexibility possible in seeking out a solution which would have the least adverse effect upon our foreign trade program and foreign policy in general. The Congress was persuaded to rely upon these pleas and reassurances, and based thereon, adopted the defense amendment.

The defense amendment gives the President ample authority to act so as to limit oil imports. It gives the President authority to take any action, in the form of increased tariffs, quotas, or any combination thereof, if such action is necessary in order to limit imports so as not to threaten to impair the national security.

The defense amendment, as applied to oil, was made clear during the congressional debate. The legislative history clearly shows that it was the intent of Congress that oil imports should be limited to the 1954 relationship. The legislative history is clear that with respect to oil imports, the Congress determined that imports in excess of the 1954 relationship would threaten to impair the national security.

Despite this clear intent of the law, no effective action has been taken under the defense amendment. Despite this clear intent of the law, imports have been permitted to continuously increase.

In 1955, imports averaged more than 18 percent of domestic production, despite the fact that the law provides that imports in excess of the 1954 relationship of 16.6 percent endangers the national security and should be curtailed.

This situation has grown even worse during 1956. For example during the first 6 months of this year imports amounted to almost 20 percent of domestic production. The future outlook offers no encouragement. In fact, according to the programs of the importing companies themselves, submitted to the Texas Railroad Commission periodically, imports during the last 6 months of this year will well exceed the ever-increasing levels of the past. These schedules of future imports indicate that during the next 6 months foreign oil will be equivalent to about 22 percent of domestic production.

This is the record of the administration's assurance to Congress if given the authority that was granted to the defense amendment. This is the record that faces those of us in Congress who have watched oil imports increase year after year, taking over a greater and greater share of the domestic market and thereby threatening to a greater and greater degree the national security of the Nation.

What action has the administration taken since Congress granted the authority embodied in the defense amendment? The initial responsibility under the defense amendment rests upon the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming. Shortly after the passage of the defense amendment last year, Dr. Flemming called upon the importing companies to voluntarily reduce oil imports. In response to his request, imports, instead of being reduced, were increased. Since that time Dr. Flemming has made repeated appeals to the importing companies to curtail imports. The result each and every time has been the same, namely, increased imports of foreign oil.

The lastest appeal of Dr. Flemming was a letter of June 26, addressed to the oil importers calling for a reduction in only a portion of total imports. In fact, this appeal was limited substantially to Middle East oil into the eastern coastal area of the United States. It was a mild request. It called for a reduction in these imports, during the third quarter of this year, of 4 percent below such imports during the first 6 months of 1956. It should be borne in mind that this request did not call for any reduction in imports from Canada and Venezuela; that it did not call for any reduction in imports of residual fuel oil; that it did not call for any reduction of imports into the five Western States. Yet, what was the response to this mild request? The importing companies have just recently filed with the Texas Railroad Commission their plans covering the next few months. It shows that instead of curtailing imports for a 4 percent as requested by Dr. Flemming, that they expect to increase these imports by about 20 percent. In other words, the importing companies have ignored the pleas of Dr. Flemming for voluntary curtailment of imports.

Although during the past year, Dr. Flemming has repeatedly appealed to the importing companies to voluntarily limit imports the record shows that no results have been realized. It would appear on this record that it is now time to abandon the voluntary action route and to impose the force of law that has been authorized under the defense amendment. For some strange reason the administration appears reluctant to carry out the intent and purpose of the defense amendment.

I am hopeful that between now and the time Congress reconvenes next January that the administration will see fit to carry out the intent of Congress and exercise the authority granted under the defense amendment so as to bring oil imports within the 1954 relationship. That is the law and should be enforced. If such action is not taken between now and January, I fully expect to introduce legislation to establish definite restriction on oil imports. And I believe that, unless imports are curtailed as contemplated and intended by Congress in adopting the defense amendment, that there will be widespread support for a legislative restriction on imports.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY GEORGE M. HUMPHREY

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey has made public his determination to continue in the chairmanship of an Ohio Senator's campaign, he has elected to tarnish the high office of Secretary of the Treasury with the dual roll of chairman of a Senator's campaign committee. In my judgment, either office is a full-time job, and the highest kind of motives will not be able to erase or dispell the full-time blind partisanship which will now engage the Secretary of the Treasury.

Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey has now chosen to be an issue in the coming campaign, and his activity will focus attention on the interest of big business in the outcome.

If the Ohio Republican campaign spending proceeds in accord with current plans, the Secretary of the Treasury may well find himself spending the next several years telling congressional committees how his campaign committee raised and spent the biggest campaign chest in history.

Fiscal matters of the Nation demand the highest kind of integrity; fiscal matters of political campaigns also should. The American people will not tolerate commingling the assets of the Nation with those of the Republican Party.

GRAY REPORTS HIS RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the gavel will fall tonight, signaling the end of the 84th Congress. I want to take this time to thank you and all of my colleagues for your great assistance and kindness to me in the 20 months I have been a Member of this great body. Without your help and the help of my colleagues, it would not have been possible for me to make this report of my achievements in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in making my report I want to express my heartfelt thanks to the good people in southern Illinois for giving me the opportunity to stand up in the Halls of Congress and speak out in behalf of their wants and needs. It has truly been the busiest 20 months of my life, experiencing both heartaches and joys. I have tried with every ounce of energy to sell southern Illinois to the Congress and the rest of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have notified every Member of Congress and the national administration that southern Illinois has wonderful people, good schools, churches, and fine communities in which to live. I have made it clear that we were tired of the lack of recognition of our problems by past administrations.

In an effort to focus attention on our needs, I have appeared before every committee in Congress having under consideration legislation which I felt would benefit the people of my congressional district. I introduced a score of my own bills designed to help our people and made numerous speeches on the floor in an effort to have the legislation passed.

Mr. Speaker, during my 20 months in office, I have made over 200 speeches in southern Illinois; had several television appearances; and called a mass "sink or swim" rally at West Frankfort on December 31, 1955, to which I invited everyone, including President Eisenhower. The meeting was a huge success and has helped focus national attention on our problems. In addition, I paid for ads in southern Illinois newspapers, asking my folks to write letters to Members of Congress in support of certain pieces of legislation under consideration at the time, and sent out over 100,000 letters to organizations and individuals, asking them to write letters supporting certain legislation. With all the valuable support from you, my colleagues, and the good people back home, I was able to get through Congress in my first term a program I believe will be of great assistance to the social and economic welfare of our people in southern Illinois. I shall not attempt to list all the bills I supported, nor mention my full 20 months work in this report; however, I do take pride in listing some of my accomplishments, which were made possible through your cooperation and the cooperation of the people of my congressional district:

First. Helped pass the gigantic highway construction program: As a member of the House Committee on Public Works, helped write the Federal Highway Construction Act of 1956 and worked for its passage. The bill provides 41,000 miles of new superhighways throughout the United States and specifically a new 4-lane expressway through my congressional district in southern Illinois. This will be the largest public works program in the history of this country. In addition to a wonderful road system, it will provide many jobs for our unemployed people in southern Illinois. I was featured in the May 14 issue of Newsweek for my work on this bill.

Second. Helped liberalize social security benefits: Introduced a companion measure to H. R. 7225, and worked for its final passage. This bill liberalizes social security benefits by lowering the retirement age to 62 for women, 50 for totally disabled persons, and extends coverage to thousands of people who were heretofore not covered. I still favor lowering age to 60.

Third. Helped pass veterans' benefits bill in House: Introduced H. R. 6153, granting all World War I veterans $100 per month pension. A companion measure passed the House, allowing a pension for World War I veterans and increasing by 10 percent the amount of compensation being paid to service-connected disability veterans. Due to lack of support by the Senate, and the rush for adjournment, the House-passed measure did not reach the floor of the Senate for vote. We are hopeful it can be taken up early in January. We were successful in getting enacted into law a bill allowing increased benefits to widows of deceased veterans and other fringe benefits.

Fourth. Secured approval of $4,300,000 for Devil's Kitchen Dam project: This includes the construction of the dam, public beach, boat dock, a complete network of access roads, picnic areas, parking facilities, and the long-sought leasing of cabin sites. Obtained $2 million in cash with which to start the project with the announcement for competitive bids on September 1. This is the first action on this project in 16 years.

Fifth. Secured $50,000 for flood control survey of the Cache River and tributaries: Thousands of acres of farmland is being inundated during each rainfall. (The people residing in the Cache River Basin had been trying for years to obtain funds with which to make this study.)

Sixth. Secured $75,000 for a full-scale study of the canalization of the Big Muddy and tributaries: If a study proves feasible, this project would open up new prospects for future industrialization of southern Illinois by providing cheap transportation rates for our coal deposits and raw materials for prospective industries that might locate on the banks of the canal. I would not support a plan to hurt the railroads.

Seventh. Secured through Congress $3 million for flood control work in the 25th District for fiscal year 1956–57. (Construction work will provide many jobs.)

Eighth. Secured $25,000 for a flood-control study in the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing and Drainage District No. 2, Monroe County, Ill. (Several thousand acres of land have been inundated by water up and down the Illinois side of the Mississippi River levee due to internal drainage during floods. This survey is a test case to find out what measures are needed in order to stop large loss in crops and land damages.)

Ninth. Secured approval of Congress authorizing an expenditure of $5,970,000 for flood control improvements on the Saline River and tributaries: United States Army Corps of Engineers requested $930,000 local contribution. I was successful in having eliminated 75 percent of this amount, saving the local taxpayers $697,500.

Tenth. Secured purchase order for 100,000 tons of Illinois coal last year for overseas shipment by the Foreign Operations Administration.

Eleventh. Secured congressional approval of $1,100,000 for a Federal building at Benton, Ill: In 1937, Congress designated Benton, Ill., as a place to hold Federal court, and since that time efforts have been made to have this much needed facility built. This is the first concrete action since that date.

Twelfth. Secured a civil-defense warehouse at Ordill on Crab Orchard Lake where $4,500,000 worth of medical supplies are authorized to be stored for use in a national emergency with an authorized employee strength of 13.

Thirteenth. Helped pass the antipollution bill: As a member of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, I worked for the passage of H. R. 9540, a bill designed to assist in clearing up our streams and rivers by aiding municipalities to build adequate sewage-disposal plants. Also worked to help secure $50 million in appropriations with which to carry out the program for the first year. Illinois cities will receive $1,734,200 for the first year with the program to run for a 10-year period.

Fourteenth. Secured passage of the fluorspar bill: Introduced H. R. 11622, a companion measure to S. 3982, which provides for the stockpiling of 250,000 tons of acid-grade fluorspar at $53 per ton. Also spurred action from the Office of Defense Mobilization to stockpile metallurgical grade fluorspar at a premium price. Helped to obtain $21 million appropriation with which to carry out the provisions of the bill. These two programs should stabilize and revitalize the entire fluorspar industry in southern Illinois, providing more jobs.

Fifteenth. Secured thousands of dollars' worth of Government surplus property for municipalities, hospitals, and schools throughout southern Illinois, including nine fire trucks.

Sixteenth. Secured tentative approval for new armory at Marion: If a suitable site can be located, an armory to house a 200-man Army Reserve training center will be built costing approximately $184,000.

Seventeenth. Supported farm program: Voted for soil-bank plan and worked for an increase in both corn and wheat acreage allotments. Since agriculture is one of the vital segments of our American economy, I have voted for all legislation I felt would be beneficial to the farmer, particularly the family-size farmer.

Eighteenth. Supported passage of bill giving flour and cornmeal to recipients of Government surplus food: Cosponsored H. R. 2851, a bill directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to grind up wheat and corn into wheat and cornmeal for distribution to needy persons

receiving Government surplus food. In addition to providing food for thousands of jobless people, it is helping the farmer by getting rid of surplus wheat and corn which has been depressing the market.

Nineteenth. Voted and worked for additional funds for school-lunch program: $3,153,000 for Illinois schools was allowed for fiscal year 1957. Many southern Illinois schools had run out of school-lunch funds before the end of the school year, forcing a hardship on schoolchildren. An increase of $625,000 over last year was allowed.

Twentieth. Fought successfully against proposed sale of land at Marion Veterans' Administration Hospital by the Administration in Washington.

Twenty-first. Helped secure $250,000 appropriation with which to select a site for a new $9,500,000 Federal penitentiary: As soon as a site committee is selected, I intend to see that southern Illinois is considered, and if we meet all the necessary requirements, I am hopeful the prison can be located somewhere in my district.

Twenty-second. Conferred with President Eisenhower and every Government agency and bureau in Washington, telling them of the wants and needs of the people of southern Illinois, and soliciting assistance for various projects.

Twenty-third. Contacted over 300 individuals and concerns in an effort to locate industry in southern Illinois.

Twenty-fourth. Secured Government loans for three industries in southern Illinois.

Twenty-fifth. Requested an investigation of the accidental drownings on Crab Orchard Lake, in an effort to attempt to better safety regulations and obtain rescue equipment.

Twenty-sixth. Supported passage of a bill to aid retired railroad pension recipients.

Twenty-seventh. Worked for the passage of a bill granting postal employees an increase in salary: Was featured in National Postal magazine for 100 percent voting record for postal employees.

Twenty-eighth. Worked for passage of bill granting civil-service employees an increase in retirement benefits and liberalizing eligibility for retirement.

Twenty-ninth. Am supporting Rend Lake in Franklin County, and have urged Governor Stratton to speed up survey report by Illinois Division of Waterways in order that some proposal can be made to the Federal Government from the information derived from the survey.

Thirtieth. Secured additional appropriations for Shawnee National Forest and the forest-research center at Carbondale: Urged United States Forest Service to adopt Comte proposal, which offers a forest-development program to provide many jobs and improve our natural timber resources.

Thirty-first. Helped obtain Federal funds for hospital construction in my district.

Thirty-second. Helped secure approval of loans to various rural-electrification cooperatives in my district, amounting to several hundred thousands of dollars to extend lines to rural areas in need of electricity.

Thirty-third. Helped secure Federal loans under Federal Housing Authority in order to ease the critical housing shortage for students at the fast-growing Southern Illinois University.

Thirty-fourth. Worked for passage of bill establishing minimum wage of $1 per hour.

Thirty-fifth. Have worked diligently for legislation affecting the coal industry: Introduced legislation, made numerous speeches, and held several conferences with the administration in an effort to curb the foreign importation of residual oil which has drastically curtailed coal production and resulted in the loss of jobs in the coal mines. United Mine Workers Journal has written articles concerning my work in behalf of the coal industry.

Thirty-seventh. Helped secure approval of Federal grants for five airports in my district totaling several hundred thousand dollars.

Thirty-eighth. Supported successfully the passage of S. 3879, a bill enabling automobile dealers to bring suit in Federal district courts against manufacturers not acting in good faith in complying with terms of franchises.

Thirty-ninth. Supported successfully the passage of H. R. 8780, a bill exempting farmers from paying 2 cents per gallon Federal tax on farm used gasoline.

Fortieth. Served on three important committees—the full Public Works Committee, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, and the Subcommittee on Flood Control. By serving on these important committees, I was able to work for legislation not only beneficial to southern Illinois, but was able to vote for projects beneficial to citizens throughout the United States, and particularly those who have suffered loss of life and property through floods.

Forty-first. Maintained a full-time district office: For the first time in the history of southern Illinois, we have maintained a full-time, fully staffed office where the citizens may come with their problems. We have received several thousand visitors in the office during the 20 months it has been open.

Forty-second. Have received and personally answered over 75,000 letters, telegrams, telephone calls during my 20 months in office: These included all types of requests too numerous and varied to mention. I read all incoming mail and give each one my prompt and personal attention.

In addition to supporting the above measures, I have worked just as diligently in opposing certain measures. Many bills were introduced which I felt were not in the best interest of the people whom I have the honor of representing. They are too numerous to mention. I will give the foreign-aid bill as an example. There has been $60 billion given out to foreign countries since the start of the program and only $2 out of every $100 has been repaid. I do not feel that we can buy friendship, and I think this feeling is borne out by the fact that over 700 million people have come under Communist domination in the last 4 years. The money we now send to foreign countries may some day come back in bullets. I am in favor of giving hungry people our surplus food, but I am opposed to sending dollars that can very easily get into Communist hands and be used against us. I am in favor of keeping these billions at home and allowing an income tax reduction after a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I again say how delighted I am to have served in this great body and express my warm personal regards and heartfelt thanks to you and my colleagues for the assistance you have rendered in my efforts to help southern Illinois. It is my hope and prayer that we can continue to progress by working together. Thank you.

THE AD HOC COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make a statement concerning the ad hoc committee appointed by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

This committee was established for the purpose of investigating the mistreatment and imprisonment of American citizens by the Chinese Reds.

The committee has delayed holding its hearings after consultation with high officials of the State Department.

The members of the committee recognize that sensitive negotiations are under way with respect to many American prisoners, and the committee wishes to avoid any activity which might in any sense interfere with these negotiations.

Consequently, the committee at this time has decided to postpone the opening of these hearings.

The ad hoc committee, however, will continue in its work of obtaining information on this subject, and will review the recent hearings of Senator MCCLELLAN'S Senate investigation committee to avoid any unnecessary duplication of effort.

STASSEN POLITICAL SURVEYS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days there has been a great deal of discussion about the intention of Mr. Stassen to conduct an opinion poll to determine public confidence in our distinguished Vice President, RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Stassen has alleged that an Eisenhower-Herter ticket would run 6 percent stronger than an Eisenhower-Nixon ticket. This statement astonished most Republicans in the United States, and particularly astounded the Republican Members of the House. It astounded us because we are aware that polls conducted by the leading research organizations in the country, including Dr. George Gallup, Opinion Research,

and sectional and regional polls of the leading newspapers in the country, all showed Vice President RICHARD NIXON as the preferred candidate for nomination by the Republican convention as the vice presidential candidate.

As recently as July 25, only 2 days ago, the Gallup poll reported Mr. NIXON as the overwhelming choice of Republican voters over six other outstanding Republicans. Mr. NIXON's lead over his nearest rival was, in fact, more than 2 to 1. As a consequence, Mr. Stassen's statement amazed the Republican Members of the House, and we were even more greatly disturbed by the total absence of any further information from Mr. Stassen regarding the source of the figures which he quoted. He has provided no information whatever regarding where, when or how his purported survey was conducted!

Now, Mr. Speaker, he tells us that he is going to conduct a new poll next week dealing with the same subject matter. Why he needs a second poll is certainly not clear, and why he needs any poll at all, in view of the many very competent and reputable polls which have already been conducted, is a very serious question in our minds. If his initial poll had any validity, it should be unnecessary for him to scour the Nation for financial support with which to finance another; he has only to reveal the circumstances under which the first was conducted.

Mr. Stassen, when pressed to reveal his associates in this new adventure, announced to the press that the new poll would be conducted under the supervision of one Adolph Toigo. I believe the American people are entitled to know something about this man who is to supervise what apparently is, in Mr. Stassen's judgment, to be such a vital sampling of American opinion. This is particularly true in view of the fact that this survey has been given so much publicity in the past few days.

Upon inquiry, I find that Mr. Toigo is not a recognized public opinion researcher but is, instead, an advertising executive and president of a New York City advertising agency, Lennen and Newell, of Madison Avenue.

I do not know who the clients of Lennen and Newell may be nor what interest they may have in such a poll. I am distressed to find, however, that Mr. Toigo, far from being an impartial, objective, neutral participant in this matter, actually is one of Mr. Stassen's long-time friends and an associate in Mr. Stassen's political endeavors. As a matter of fact, Mr. Toigo was one of the principal brain trusters behind Mr. Stassen's ambitious campaign to become President of the United States.

I find that Mr. Toigo played an active role in the Wisconsin presidential preference primary campaign in 1952. He assisted in the Stassen campaign headquarters in the city of Milwaukee as an adviser to the Wisconsin managers of that campaign.

You will recall that this was the election in which Mr. Stassen placed great reliance on public opinion surveys which were likewise very widely publicized. I recall his claim that his public opinion survey indicated he would receive the entire Wisconsin delegation of 30 delegates. Later, presumably based on a second survey, his estimate was revised to show that he would win 20 delegates to the national convention. You all know the results of the election in Wisconsin in the spring of 1952. Despite the findings of his scientific surveys he failed to win a single delegate. I think this experience should cause the American people to become most cautious about placing any reliance on any polls that Mr. Stassen has conducted recently or which he proposes to conduct in the future.

Mr. Stassen has recently advised many of the Members of the House concerning a proposed survey which he intends having conducted in the very near future. This information, of course, has led to considerable discussion and speculation. Many grave questions have been raised with respect to this highly irregular procedure. We would like to know from Mr. Toigo exactly how this survey or poll is to be conducted.

Is it going to be conducted by a professional and accredited opinion research organization? If so, we would like to know the name of the organization and something about its background and reputation. We would like to know what area this poll will cover, and how many interviews will be made. We would like to know whether the interviews will be made by the same organization that makes the tabulation and analysis of the survey. We would like to know who will make the report and draw the conclusions from the samplings made. If any weighting is done we would like to know on what basis the various weights are applied.

It would be helpful if Mr. Toigo would tell us the specific conditions under which his poll will be made. In this way it would be possible for some other organization to make a comparable poll to serve as a further contribution to what conclusions may be drawn from Mr. Toigo's survey. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there has also been considerable speculation concerning the cost of a reliable survey of this kind on a nationwide scale.

In view of the repeated and conclusive polls which have been made by responsible public opinion research organizations, demonstrating the overwhelming preference of the American people for a continuation of Mr. NIXON's tenure as Vice President, it is inconceivable to most of us that any further polls should be necessary. Certainly, however, if any polls are to be conducted by Mr. Stassen, or Mr. Toigo, the people of the United States are entitled to have full information with respect to the methods by which they are conducted, and who conducts them, in order that they may adequately appraise their reliability. I believe they are entitled, as well, to a full and complete disclosure by Mr. Stassen with respect to the poll which he alleges has already been made.

OUR PROSPERITY IS BASED ON LAWS PASSED IN DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Republican campaign slogan of "Peace and Prosperity" will not carry with it the weight and effectiveness that our Republican friends with their Madison Avenue high-powered public relations specialists are hoping for. Such a slogan reminds us of the old one of years ago, "The Full Dinner Pail" which has long since fallen into disuse.

In those days with the tremendous use of money—and practically all of the press controlled by the Republican Party, when radio and television did not exist, they were better able to mentally condition—a polite term for political brainwashing—the American people than today. While close to 90 percent of the newspapers of America are still Republican, due to the radio and television they are not able to wield the influence they did, not so many years ago.

And the part of the slogan "Prosperity" which the Republicans rely upon, the people know that the basis for the same was brought about by our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by former President Harry S. Truman and the Democratic Party.

The people know that in 1953 the Republican administration inherited a sound and progressive economic system from the Democratic Party.

The economists of our country and the Republican administration have repeatedly stated that we will not have another depression "due to the cushions" that exist in the laws.

That is true.

But what are those "cushions."

First. Social-security law, which includes unemployment compensation, earned annuities, old-age assistance, aid to the blind and other groups.

Second. Protection of deposits in banks as a result of the guarantee of bank deposits, resulting in a strengthening of an economic system.

Third. Securities and Exchange Commission, protecting our people against fraud in the issuance and sale of phony stock.

Fourth. The right of labor to organize and to collectively bargain.

Fifth. The protection of homes and farms during the depression, and later, through proper and effective legislation, enabling the widespread building and owning of homes by hundreds of thousands of American families.

Sixth. The justifiable consideration given to the farmers of our country extending to them by law compensatory considerations for the tariff advantage given to business and industry.

Seventh. Legislation prior to 1953 to protect small and independent businesses.

Eighth. Minimum wage legislation and so many other bills that I could mention that have been enacted into law.

But what political party was in control of our Government when those and other beneficial laws were enacted and put upon our statute books?

As Alfred E. Smith repeatedly said, "Let us look at the record."

The undeniable record is that all of these progressive laws, now "cushions" against a future depression, were put on the statute books by the Democratic Party.

This fact is indelibly impressed on the minds of the great majority of our people.

Now that the emotionalism of the 1952 campaign is over, when the Republican Party must go to the people on its record of the last 4 years, the Democratic candidates can show that it was under the leadership of the Democratic Party that "prosperity" was given to our people.

And I might say, that during the past 4 years, with a Republican administration, that progressive legislation strengthening our economic system was enacted into law because of Democratic leadership and support.

For the great majority of the Democratic Party are sound progressives. A clear majority of the Republican Party are ultraconservative, looking backward, not forward.

On the other aspect of the slogan "Peace," that the Republicans are going to campaign on—let us again examine the record.

Today, and I say this most regretfully, our country is on the defensive throughout the world. The condition we are in is not a pleasant one to picture. Uncertainty, and even confusion, exists in our foreign policy. In Europe, in Asia, in the Middle East, in the Mediterranean we are on the defensive, due to the lack of firm leadership.

Just because shooting on a wide area is not going on does not mean we have peace.

The cold war is going on actively, and Communist Russia is waging it in a manner that should be disturbing to our people. What should disturb our people is the lack of policy, as well as uncertainty, on the part of President Eisenhower, and his administration.

Let me quote only a few illustrations.

We have seen the varying statements only recently made by President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and Secretary Dulles on the question of "Neutralism" on the part of some nations, we see the weakening of NATO.

We see the confused situation in the Middle East, with a forgetful policy in relation to our friend in that area, the new nation of Israel.

We witness Premier Nasser of Egypt buying arms from Communist sources, showing lack of respect and understanding for our great country.

We witness a lack of policy to contribute to the solutions of the Cyprus question, whose people and the people of Greece have been our close and valued friends.

It is only recently when the workers of Poznan, Poland, with great heroism, showed their strong desire for liberty by facing death, many of them preferring death to being denied liberty. The same thing happened in East Germany only a few years ago.

President Eisenhower and the Republicans promised the people of Poland and other Communist subjected countries liberation a little over 3 years ago.

And what have they received?

Fraternization—with the people of Poland and other satellite countries for independence, liberty, and liberation, no—but with the Communist dictators.

As we have seen the promise to unleash Chiang Kai-shek result in the opposite—to the tying of his hands—we have also seen the repudiation of the promise of "liberation" change to the opposite, "fraternization with the Kremlin," bringing to the millions behind the Iron Curtain who hate communism, and who believed in the promise of "liberation" disappointment and disillusionment. One of the greatest assets we have is likely to be lost as a result of such confused leadership.

And as a further illustration, it is only a short time ago, when the uprising at Poznan was taking place, when we read our newspapers stating in one column the number of workers killed at Poznan, and in the next column a news story about President Eisenhower urging extensive fraternization with Communist Russia.

What poor timing.

What a message to send to those in Poznan who participated in the uprising, and to the countless millions in Poland and in other satellite countries who hate their Communist oppressors.

Under former President Truman we had firmness in our foreign policy.

Everyone whether behind or outside of the Iron Curtain knew he made his own decisions and he meant what he said. There was firmness in our foreign policy under President Truman, and under the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. We did not have a day-to-day or week-to-week foreign policy.

The Communist leaders not only respected, but they feared him. We had firmness and strength in our foreign policy. Our country was respected throughout the world. They knew Truman's policy of "Peace Through Strength" meant what it said.

Under former President Truman we were not on the defensive throughout the entire world. Our allies and other friendly nations did not doubt our sincerity.

The quicker we get back to the policy of "Peace Through Strength" the better it will be for our country.

The way to get back to that is through Democratic leadership again in control of our Government and of our foreign policy.

So as we approach the coming campaign, with the Republicans intending to try and mentally condition, sloganize our people with the slogan of "Peace and Prosperity," we Democrats can effectively meet and destroy such a campaign by showing on the established record that it was through the Democratic Party that prosperity was brought to our people. And that it is through the Democratic Party that the best assurances of real peace can be brought to our people and to a troubled world.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, Ohio; Mr. CLARK, Pennsylvania; Mr. ANFUSO, New York; Mr. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; Mr. SMITH, Mississippi; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. ELLSWORTH, Oregon; Mr. BECKER, New York; Mr. MORANO, Connecticut.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.; and

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12006. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain lands in the Benbrook Reservoir project, Texas, to former owners of such lands where such lands are not required for public purposes, including public recreational use.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of assistant director in the Bureau of the Budget.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12350) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 23, 27, 37, 52, 53, 57, and 86 to the above-entitled bill.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee submitted the following conference report and

statement on the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2955)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 4, lines 19 and 20, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated November 16, 1953" and insert "Senate Document Numbered 144, Eighty-fourth Congress".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 8, beginning in line 17, of the House engrossed bill, strike out ", published as House Document Numbered —, Eighty-fourth Congress" and insert "dated June 1, 1956".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 3, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "256" and insert "188".

On page 3, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "thereto" and insert "therefor".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 5, line 6, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "York B." and insert "York Beach,".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 6, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "The".

On page 9, line 3, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "Engineers." and insert "Engineers; and the".

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 9, line 12, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "seven upstream".

On page 9, lines 19 and 20, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "either prior to or".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 10, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "Saylorsville" and insert "Saylorville".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 11, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "of Interior" and insert "of the Interior."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 206. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the States and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with States and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, or multiple purpose projects.

"(b) In carrying out this policy and that set forth in section 205 above, it is hereby provided that storage may also be included in any reservoir project surveyed, planned, constructed or to be planned, surveyed and/or constructed by the Corps of Engineers to impound water for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial water and the reasonable value thereof may be taken into account in estimating the economic value of the entire project: *Provided*, That when contract for the use of such impounded waters is made it shall be on the basis that will provide equitable reimbursement to the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That the entire amount of the construction costs, including interest during construction, allocated to water supply shall be repaid within the economic life of the project, but in no event to exceed fifty years after the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose. The interest rate used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

On page 21, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "including public recreational use,".

On page 22, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Act" and insert "section".

On page 22, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Act" and insert "section".

On page 22, line 22, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Act" and insert "section".

On page 24, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Act" and insert "section".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 34, line 16, of the House engrossed bill strike out "San Felipi" and insert "San Felipe".

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
RUSSELL V. MACK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ROBERT S. KERR,
ALBERT GORE,
FRANCIS CASE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes in the House bill: 1, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, 26, 30, 31, 36, 46, 56, 57, and 58.

The House recedes with respect to each of these amendments.

Amendment No. 2: The Senate amendment provided for the adoption of the project for the improvement of Bridgeport Harbor, Connecticut, at an estimated cost of $2,300,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate amendment provided for the adoption of the project for the improvement of the Barataria Bay Waterway, Louisiana, at an estimated cost of $1,700,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: The Senate amendment provided for the adoption of the project for the modification of the existing project in the Mississippi River at St. Anthony Falls, Minneapolis, Minn., at an estimated cost of $19,893,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: The House bill provided for the adoption of the project for the Minnesota River, Minnesota, at an estimated cost of $2,539,000. The Senate amendment modifies the project included in the House bill by providing for the extension of the channel .5 mile upstream at an estimated additional cost of $5,000. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 6: The Senate amendment provided for the adoption of the project for the improvement of Port Washington Harbor, Wisconsin, at an estimated Federal cost of $2,936,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: The Senate amendment provided for the adoption of the project for the improvement of the Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon, at an estimated cost of $19,800,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 8: The Senate amendment provided for the adoption of the project for the improvement of the Waimea Beach and Hanapepe Bay, Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, at an estimated cost of $20,000. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 9: The Senate amendment provides for the modification of the project for the improvement of the Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cutoff, Mississippi, to permit local interests to be reimbursed for work which they have done on the project, within the limits of the Federal portion of

the project, over and above that required as a part of the local cooperation for the project. The amendment provides that such reimbursement will be made only if such work has been approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project modification provided in the amendment. The amendment provides that the payment (1) cannot exceed $44,000, (2) will be subject to appropriations thereto, and will not have priority over authorized Federal improvements of higher priority, and (3) cannot be made until the local interests have met all the requirements of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 188, 81st Congress. The House recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 13: The Senate amendment provides that the Chief of Engineers may enter into contracts for the protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement of structures or facilities owned by an agency of government where such structures or facilities are adversely affected or threatened by a navigation, flood control, or related water development project. Payments under such contracts could be made from appropriations made for the construction or maintenance of the project. The contracts can provide for the payment of the reasonable actual cost of the work, or for the payment of a lump sum representing the estimated reasonable cost. However, the new provision will not modify any existing or future requirement of local cooperation, and it does not indicate a policy that local interests shall not hereafter be required to assume costs of modifying such facilities. The new provision will apply to projects hereafter authorized and to those which have heretofore been authorized but have not been completed on the date of this Act. It will apply to structures and facilities occupying the beds of navigable waters. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22: These Senate amendments added certain localities to those to be surveyed, subject to section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950. The localities are as follows:

Short Sands Section of York Beach, York County, Maine.

Sachem's Head Harbor, Guilford, Conn.

Indian River Bay to Assawoman Canal known as White's Creek, and up White's Creek, Del.

Indian River Bay via Pepper's Creek to Dagsboro, Del.

Chesapeake Bay and tributaries, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia (water chestnut elimination).

Savannah River, with a view to providing nine-foot navigation to Augusta, Ga.

Camp Pendleton Harbor and Oceanside, Calif. (beach erosion).

Anaheim Bay, Calif. (beach erosion).

With respect to these amendments, the House recedes, or recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 24: This amendment would increase the appropriation authorization for the Connecticut River Basin by $6,000,000, in order to cover the cost of the project which would be added to the House bill by the Senate amendment No. 25. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 25: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for the Mad River Dam and Reservoir on the Mad River above Winsted, Conn., in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $5,820,000. The authorization for the Connecticut River Basin would be increased under amendment No. 24 by $6,000,000, to cover the cost of this project. The House recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 27: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on Hall Meadow Brook in Torrington, and Goshen, Conn., in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $2,420,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 28: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for the flood-control dam and reservoir on the east branch of the Naugatuck River in Torrington, Conn., in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $2,670,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 29: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection on the north branch of the Susquehanna River, New York and Pennsylvania, and authorizes the appropriation of $30,000,000 for partial accomplishment of such project substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 394, 84th Congress. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 32: This amendment would increase by $512,000 the appropriation authorized for the project for flood control and related purposes on the Tombigbee River and tributaries, Mississippi and Alabama, substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 167, 84th Congress. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 33: This amendment would reduce by $512,000 the contribution which local interests may contribute in cash or equivalent work in lieu of the cash contribution contained in item (f) of the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report published as House Document No. 167, 84th Congress. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 34: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection on the Alabama River at Montgomery, Ala., substantially in accordance with the report of the division engineer, dated June 11, 1956, at an estimated cost of $1,300,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 35: The Senate amendment provided that the general plan for flood control on Red River, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, is modified and expanded (at an estimated additional cost of $53,235,000) as recommended in the Chief of Engineers' report on Millwood Reservoir and alternate reservoirs, Little River, Oklahoma and Arkansas, with the following exceptions:

(1) The Sherwood Reservoir on Mountain Fork River is authorized in addition to the reservoir recommended in such report.

(2) The basis for determining the cost allocated to hydroelectric power and water supply purposes in the case of the Sherwood Reservoir and the six other reservoirs upstream from Millwood Reservoir (recommended by the Chief of Engineers in such report) shall be the incremental method of allocation. Under the incremental method of allocation, the cost allocated to power and water supply is limited to the cost of adding power and water as purposes in the project. Under the amendment flood control and land-enhancement benefits are not reimbursable.

(3) The seven reservoirs in question would be constructed either prior to or concurrently with the Millwood Reservoir.

The amendment also provided that the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma will have priority of use, consistent with the laws of such States, or any water supplies originating within their respective boundaries and developed, conserved, or improved by any project now or hereafter authorized as part of the general plan for flood control on the Red River.

The substitute agreed upon in conference is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the provision that the reservoirs could be constructed either prior to or concurrently with the Millwood Reservoir is amended to require that they be constructed concurrently with such reservoir, and the incremental method of cost allocation for water supply and power is made applicable to Millwood Reservoir as well as to the seven upstream reservoirs.

Amendment No. 37: This amendment would permit provision of additional flood-control storage or changing pool elevations in connection with the Markham Ferry Reservoir, on Grand River in Oklahoma, authorized to be constructed by the Grand River Dam Authority by Public Law 476, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 450). Any change in pool elevations would require approval of the Chief of Engineers. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 38: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for the Saylorville Reservoir on the Des Moines River, Iowa, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 6, 1956, at an estimated cost of $44,500,000. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 39: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection on the Grand River, Michigan, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 132, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,825,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 40: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection on Owasco Outlet, tributary of the Oswego River, at Auburn, N. Y., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 133, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $305,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 41: This amendment of the Senate contains a number of separate matters.

First, it provides that with respect to any power attributable to any dam in the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin, to be constructed by the Chief of Engineers, the construction of which has not been started, an equitable proportion of such power, as may be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, or such portions thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contract made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the State where such dam is constructed.

Second, it provides for the modification of general comprehensive plans for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin, heretofore adopted, to include the payment to Williston, North Dakota, from funds appropriated for the Garrison Reservoir project, the sum of $1,200,000, to compensate for the replacement of that city's water supply and water treatment facilities.

Third, it amends Public Law 641, 84th Congress, to provide the following:

(1) In lieu of protecting the Lewis and Clark Irrigation District, $1,935,000 of the funds appropriated for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir will be available for the purchase of lands and improvements in such district, and $1,196,000 shall be available for the relocation of highways and utilities in such district.

(2) The substitution of land acquisition for the protection will be made if all the landowners (except the State or its political subdivisions or agencies) have, by the end of June 1957, offered to sell their property on terms agreeable to the landowners and within the amount provided for the land acquisition.

(3) The Secretary of the Army can acquire lands of the State of North Dakota or its political subdivisions and agencies pursuant to the provisions of this or any other Act, except that no limitation of time shall apply within which such property must be offered for sale if it is to be acquired pursuant to this Act.

(4) If all the landowners other than the State and its political subdivisions and agencies have, by the end of June 1957, offered to sell their property as described above, and the Secretary of the Army determines that the acquisition of the land of the State and its political subdivisions and agencies is necessary, he is authorized to condemn it.

Fourth, it provides that the Secretary of the Army may construct and provide—

(1) facilities to treat the sewage of the St. Joseph's Indian School (or to connect with the city system) at a cost of not to exceed $35,000.

(2) sewer facilities for Fort Pierre, S. Dak., at a cost of not to exceed $120,000, and water facilities at not to exceed $25,000.

(3) sewer facilities for Pierre, S. Dak., at a cost of not to exceed $210,000. The amendment also authorizes the Chief of Engineers to pay the Ridgeview School District, Ridgeview, S. Dak., the sum of $10,000 as reimbursement for a certain school building. The amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army may provide the sums necessary to carry out these provisions out of sums appropriated for the construction of the Oahe Dam and Reservoir project, Missouri River.

Lastly, the amendment authorizes the project for the enlargement and improvement of the existing dam and reservoir on Elm River, a tributary of the James River, South Dakota, at an estimated cost of $1,750,000.

The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 42: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection in the Gering and Mitchell Valleys, Nebraska, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 136, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,214,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 43: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection on Ruffy Brook and Lost River, Minnesota, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 141, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $632,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 44: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for the upper Wabash River and tributaries, Indiana, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 435, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,500,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 45: This amendment would add to the House bill the project for flood protection on Meadow River at East Rainelle, W. Va., substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers contained in Senate Document No. 137, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $708,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 47: The Senate amendment authorizes the project for Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir on the north fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho (in the Columbia River Basin), for flood control, navigation, and other purposes substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as set forth in Senate Document No. 51, of the 84th Congress. In addition the Senate amendment authorizes the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of this project and increases the appropriation authorized for the Columbia River Basin accordingly. The Senate amendment further provides that there shall be made available for use in the State of Idaho such power attributable to this project as the Secretary of the Interior determines to be an equitable proportion of firm power, or such portion thereof as may be required from time to time to meet loads under contracts made pursuant to this reservation. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 48: The Senate amendment would add a new section 206 to the House bill providing that all Federal navigation, flood-control, and multiple-purpose projects may include provisions for development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, if State and local interests agree to pay the costs allocated to the development of water supplies for such purposes. This amendment also includes provisions to permit modifications of such projects for future water supply when directed by resolution adopted by the Public Works Committee of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, or when approved by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, if the cost of such provisions for future water supply does not exceed 30 percent of the total estimated cost of the project to be modified for such purpose. This amendment further provides that State or local interests shall be responsible for complying with any applicable State law relating to water supply or water use.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the conference agreement, the declaration of policy contained in subsection (a) of section 206 of the bill (as amended by the Senate amendment) is retained. In lieu of the remainder of section 206 (as contained in the Senate amendment) a new subsection (b) is added, which provides that storage capacity may be included in any reservoir project now constructed, now being constructed, planned, or surveyed or to be planned, surveyed or constructed in the future, to provide water for present or anticipated future municipal or industrial demands or needs. The reasonable value of such storage capacity may be taken into account in determining the economic value of the entire project of which such storage capacity is a part. Provisions for low-flow augmentation contained in section 205 of the bill are also within the scope of section 206 (b).

The use of storage provided for domestic, municipal, or industrial water supply pursuant to the authority granted by the proposed subsection (b) may be contracted for on a basis that will provide equitable reimbursement to the United States, as determined by the Secretary of the Army, and the amount or amounts of such reimbursement shall be fixed so as to pay for the portion of construction costs allocated to water supply over a 50-year period, beginning with the time when the project is first available for the storage of water for any purpose, with interest computed on the basis of the long-term interest rate on Federal obligations.

Amendment No. 49: The Senate amendment provides that for 3 years from the date of enactment of the bill the Secretary of the Army may reconvey lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the Grapevine and Garza-Little-Elm Reservoir projects in Texas to the former owners thereof whenever (1) he determines that such land is not required for public purposes, including public recreational use, and (2) he shall receive an application for reconveyance of such land or interests from a former owner of such land within 90 days after he has given notice to such former owner. Such reconveyances are to conform the acquisition of lands or interests in land heretofore acquired for the projects to the lesser estate in lands now being acquired to complete the real-estate requirements of the projects. However, no lands heretofore acquired for the Grapevine Reservoir project lying below elevation of 557 feet are to be reconveyed under the Senate amendment or revested under the act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797), prior to January 1, 1958.

The Secretary of the Army may make such exceptions, restrictions, and reservations in the land reconveyed under the Senate amendment as he determines to be in the public interest, but no mineral rights may be reserved, unless he finds that they are needed for the efficient operation of the reservoir projects designated in the bill.

Any land reconveyed under the Senate amendment shall be sold for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the amount paid for such land by the United States adjusted to reflect (1) any increase in the value thereof resulting from improvements made thereon by the United States, but not any enhancement in value resulting from the construction of the Grapevine and Garza-Little-Elm Reservoir projects, or (2) any decrease in the value thereof resulting from (A) any reservation, exception, restrictions, and condition to which such reconveyance is made subject, and (B) any damage to the land caused by the United States. Under the Senate amendment, the grantee shall bear the cost of any survey or boundary markings necessary as an incident of such reconveyance.

The proceeds from reconveyances under the Senate amendment are to be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The House recedes with an amendment which strikes out the words "including public recreational use," after the words "public purposes", so that the meaning of the term "public purposes" will not be modified or restricted.

Amendment No. 50: This amendment is a clerical amendment. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 51: The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers with respect to Stump Creek, tributary of North Fork of Mahoning Creek, at Skyesville, Pa. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 52: The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause surveys as to flood control and major drainage problems to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers with respect to watersheds of the Illinois River, at and in the vicinity of Chicago, Ill., the Chicago River, Ill., the Calumet River, Ill. and Ind., and their tributaries, and any areas in northeast Illinois and northwest Indiana which drain directly into Lake Michigan. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 53: The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers with respect to Soquel Creek, Calif. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 54: The Senate amendment provides that the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers with respect to streams at and in the vicinity of San Mateo, Calif. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 55: The Senate amendment provides that Kihei District, Island of Maui, T. H., is to be an area where the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by

or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers. The House recedes.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
RUSSELL V. MACK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12080) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 132]

Anfuso	Gordon	Passman
Bailey	Gubser	Patman
Baker	Healey	Powell
Barden	Hébert	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Herlong	Priest
Baumhart	Hess	Prouty
Bell	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Bentley	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Bowler	Holifield	Rhodes, Ariz.
Boykin	Hope	Richards
Brooks, La.	Hosmer	Riehlman
Brooks, Tex.	James	Riley
Buckley	Jensen	Rivers
Burleson	Johansen,	Rutherford
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Chatham	Keogh	Siler
Chenoweth	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Kluczynski	Taylor
Christopher	Lane	Thomas
Clevenger	Lanham	Thompson, La.
Coudert	Latham	Thornberry
Davis, Wis.	Long	Tumulty
Dawson, Utah	Machrowicz	Udall
Dies	Mason	Vinson
Dowdy	Morrison	Vursell
Eberharter	Nelson	Wainwright
Edmondson	Norrell	Whitten
Fino	O'Brien, Ill.	Wickersham
Forrester	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Calif.
Gathings	O'Neill	Withrow
George	Osmers	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have been having a lot of trouble about the suggested dams on the upper Susquehanna River, and they have been uniformly of a very low benefit-to-cost ratio. The way they work out on 5 dams that are already authorized is that they have a benefit-to-cost ratio of .27 to 1; that is, they could not possibly produce more benefit than 25 percent of what the cost would be.

Now we have had two different ones chucked at us in attempts on appropriations this spring, and now we have another one for a dam on the north branch of the Susquehanna River referred to in House Document 394 and which appears as amendment No. 29 on page 23 of the bill in the Senate. Now, that proposition is just so good that the document is not yet printed and available. So, you cannot tell what it is or where it is or anything about it.

Now, I am sorry that our conferees yielded to the Senate on this proposition. I know it is absolutely worthless and it is a dangerous thing to get into building dams where the benefit-to-cost ratio runs so poor.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman has served as a conferee more often than the Member from Ohio, and I am certain he recognizes what we were up against in this conference. In addition to what the distinguished gentleman from New York so ably said, may I quote from one section of the conference report:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the primary responsibilities of the State and local interests in developing water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes, and that the Federal Government should participate and cooperate with the State and local interests in developing such water supplies in connection with the construction, maintenance, and operation of Federal navigation, flood control, multiple-purpose projects.

In addition to the very project that the gentleman from New York has so ably called to our attention, this legislation enters into a new program where we certainly are infringing upon States rights. We have not recognized the old philosophy that we should have a recommendation from the Corps of Engineers of the Army, as well as from the Bureau of the Budget. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is to be congratulated for calling our attention to the statement relative to the Susquehanna River.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, about two-thirds of this bill has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and a great deal of it has not been approved by the Army engineers—about 50 percent of it, anyway.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I think we should say as to a written report, as set out in the rules and regulations or the law, they have not furnished us a written report.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me that we ought not to approve any conference report which goes along in this way. It is too much of a good thing. It is loading up the country terribly.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Is it not a fact that the House voted overwhelmingly against these projects when they were brought in in proper order heretofore?

Now this thing comes back to us so disguised that it is impossible to make out what is in the bill. A document is referred to of which we cannot even obtain a copy. There is no recommendation from the Army engineers. We are simply asked to swallow the whole thing. I have my own suspicions and I think the gentleman has his, too, as to why this was placed here by the Senate. Certainly it never had the approval of this House, and in my humble opinion should never have that approval.

I thank the gentleman for his very fine dissertation on this whole matter with which he is so eminently familiar.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As the gentleman from New York knows, I am one of the members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on Public Works. Twice this year, as I recall, we had before us a recommended project which seemed to be for this purpose. We twice rejected it because of the low-benefit ratio and high cost. Is this related to the same project which we have twice rejected?

Mr. TABER. It is in the same territory, but you cannot even tell in what State it is or exactly what it is.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman is in error in stating that the Bureau of the Budget has not approved this item, nor the Army engineers.

Mr. TABER. I do not know about its being approved by the Bureau of the Budget; I could not tell you about that.

Mr. DONDERO. Or that the Army engineers have not approved it. There may not be a written report on file, but it is my understanding from the Senate conferees that they both have approved this project. It is in southern New York and northeastern Pennsylvania and is described in full in the report on this bill.

Mr. TABER. Where?

Mr. DONDERO. On page 22.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. While the gentleman from New York is checking this particular item I want to call to the attention of the membership page 14067 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which the Member from Ohio had something to say on this matter.

In this the Member from Ohio stated there was $572,505,500 worth of projects that had not been approved by a written order of the Army engineers nor the Bureau of the Budget. This always has

been adhered to. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the other body has recommended an increase of $271,651,000 on flood control and $46,649,700 worth of navigation projects.

Mr. TABER. There is a funny thing about that. The authorized cost is $30 million. On page 22 of the report of the Senate the project report of 1954 showed reservoirs $82 million; current, January 1956, reservoirs, $90 million. This way of doing business, of having a bill based upon a report of the Army engineers which you cannot find and cannot reach and cannot tell anything about, goes way beyond me. I cannot go along with it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. On page 39 of the bill there is a very good example of what the gentleman is speaking about, the complete lack of justification for a specific project. This is an item for so-called flood protection on the west branch of the Mahoning River in Ohio. It is said in the bill to be authorized substantially in accordance with plans to be prepared by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $14 million.

First, this project has never been approved by the Bureau of the Budget; second, there has never been adequate engineering research or investigation on it nor a report by the Army engineers which specifically violates the present statutory law now in force. Third, it is in an area where the engineers themselves admit it will take a flood greater than a 600-year recurrence, and almost a Noah's flood, once every 3,000 years, to cause substantial flood damage. If that is a flood-control proposal, I would like to know it. Here is a project that has been pushed in to this bill suddenly and without any investigation whatever.

It admits on the face of the bill this project is only to be approved according to plans to be prepared substantially in accordance with what the Chief of Engineers says. The opposition was not given an opportunity to be heard by the subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the House which had jurisdiction, although specific request for opportunity to be heard was made by the objectors. This should be recalled when any request is made to this House for appropriation of funds under this questionable and rushed authorization legislation on this west Mahoning Branch, Ohio, so-called flood project.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate what the gentleman has said.

Last night we had an appropriation bill come back because of one item. If you throw back this item it could be fixed up in 20 minutes and we could get the thing straightened out and get rid of things that ought not to be in here.

I hope the House when they come to vote on this conference report will vote it down and send it back.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, something has occurred in this legislation which I humbly submit is not in accordance with proper procedure. Certainly it may be legal, but I have a feeling that what I have to tell you may make you think further on this conference report. This item is on page 50, amendment No. 49.

I have in my hand the Consent Calendar, in which is listed No. 808, in which I am concerned. It refers to the lake from which Dallas draws its drinking water, and in which we have a substantial financial investment. While it is not in my district, naturally we are greatly concerned with it under the State water laws of Texas.

I have here also the bill and the report that was to come before this body but for some reason did not. I want to tell you this. I have several amendments to amend this bill. I was asked by my colleagues not to do this in the subcommittee, but rather to carry it over to the full committee. In the full committee, a matter of several days ago, I was asked by my Texas colleagues, who have a vital interest in this, "Do not propose the amendments here, Bruce, but carry it over to the floor." This I necessarily had to do, though protesting that it should be done in committee. I have waited patiently—11 hours here yesterday for this bill either on Consent Calendar or under suspension of rules waiting to be heard. I waited all day today. What do you think I learned about midmorning? By rather slick legislative procedure, this land revestment bill has been placed in the Senate version of the omnibus public works, rivers and harbors, flood control work. H. R. 12093, revesting the land, has not come before this body at all for you to hear anything about the facts. I have one or two things to say about that. There are a few facts I would like to bring to your attention although I think you can see already that the facts will make no difference. There have been no public hearings on this measure. I do want to call your attention to several things that are of interest to me and possibly you will think further and ask that section 49 be stricken from the bill.

I am interested in the provision that says the land that this bill requests to be returned to the former owners not be returned until we know whether it will be necessary to have to buy the land right back again. Further than that, I am interested solely in the maximum utilization of the yield of the watershed of the Trinity River which drains into this lake from which we of Dallas get our water. Dallas engineers had a plan to submit to this body through a committee at the proper time concerning how to get an additional yield of 35 million gallons per day from the Grapewine and Garza-Little Elm Lakes. But, we were a little ahead of ourselves so I simply brought in an amendment to the Wright and Ikard bills. Of course, on the revestment of land, according to the policy of the Corps of Engineers, Dallas invested $3,700,000 under the plan of the Corps of Engineers to buy land to the spillway crests level plus 10 feet. Subsequently the Corps of Engineers changed that policy to acquiring land to the conservation pool level plus a 5-year flood frequency, which was substantially lower. This was done without consulting with the city of Dallas which had entered into this contract under other terms.

Immediately after that, my colleagues from Texas introduced bills to revest this land to the former owners—the same land in which we have a financial investment which possibly may be needed, if, as I said, the Texas Water Board agrees to raise the level of the Garza-Little Elm Lake.

Now an appeal was made to me by the city of Dallas who said this bill is forcing the revestment of land which we may have to buy back. Of course, I said I would look into the facts. I have looked into it and know you should have the facts placed before you in a more sensible way than this last-minute haste. The chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], did all he could to give me a fair chance but there were no public hearings.

Now, I suspect questionable political moves lie behind this bill. I also know the wishes of the constituents of my colleague's district who want their land back for grazing. I am all for land revestment generally, but not the land that may have to be bought back. I submit to you there should have been public hearings. This will only take a short period of time.

Surely, it is our right to have hearings so that we can find out the merit of revestment of the land right at the water's edge at the lakes in question. The water in Garza-Little Elm is far below the spillway and can be raised to get more water for several communities, including my colleague's district.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Insofar as the gentleman has alluded to the suggestion which some of us made in committee when this separate bill was being considered by the committee that he might offer certain amendments when the matter came on the floor of the House, I should like to say that I was among those who did suggest that course of action and that I did it in good faith believing that we would have an opportunity, and that I told the gentleman I would offer certain amendments when it came upon the floor, but that I had no way of knowing, in so suggesting, that it was going to come before the body in this manner and that is the reason that the suggestion was made.

Mr. ALGER. I thank my colleague. Of course, I would remind him that I joined him as I joined another Congressman from Texas in seeking the revestment of land around other lakes. I was only interested in Garza-Little Elm Lake because Dallas has such a large financial investment and it is the source of our water. I ask you to consider striking out section 49 from this bill. Send it back and have it stricken and bring a bill back that we can vote for and protect the people of Dallas, whose interest is concerned.

To supplement these remarks, I want to add the observations of Forrest and Cotton, our able Dallas engineers, addressed to Mr. Vollmer and the Dallas

Water Survey Committee, a fine group of dedicated citizens.

Early in our engineering investigations, it was apparent that the present conservation storage capacity in the Lewisville and Grapevine Reservoirs was not sufficient to fully develop the water resources of the Elm Fork and Denton Creek, and it would be necessary for the city of Dallas to provide additional conservation space on these streams. Engineering studies developed that suitable reservoir sites existed on the Elm Fork above Lewisville Reservoir and on Denton Creek above Grapevine Reservoir. These sites, known as the Aubrey and Roanoke sites, respectively, are shown on the small map attached hereto.

The engineering studies on Elm Fork and Denton Creek, show that water conservation would be greatly benefited by an exchange of storage between the existing and proposed new projects. In the case of the Lewisville and Aubrey Reservoirs, the exchange would provide for an additional 218,000 acre-feet of the present flood-control storage in Lewisville to be used for water conservation, and an equivalent amount of flood storage, approximately 238,000 acre-feet, would be provided in the Aubrey Reservoir. Such an exchange, resulting in a better distribution in the conservation storage, would increase the total yield of the two projects by 26 million gallons per day. In the case of the Grapevine and proposed Roanoke projects, the conservation storage in Grapevine would be increased by 200,000 acre-feet, which would be replaced by a like amount of flood control storage in the Roanoke Reservoir. No conservation storage space would be provided in the Roanoke Reservoir. This arrangement, drastically reducing evaporation losses, would increase the yield of the two projects by 9 million gallons per day. Thus, the exchange of storage between the existing and proposed projects would make an additional 35 million gallons of water per day available for municipal supply and would not, in any way, detract from the flood control value of the projects. In fact, the new projects as proposed would materially increase the flood protection of Dallas and the Trinity River Valley. It is desired to emphasize that the city of Dallas would propose nothing that would decrease the flood protection provided by the present reservoirs and would strongly oppose any plan that would decrease the flood protection now enjoyed. In order to make the exchange of storage, it would be necessary in the future to raise the elevation of the Lewisville Reservoir 7 feet, and the Grapevine Reservoir 22 feet.

When construction was initiated on these two projects by the Corps of Engineers, the policy of the Government was to acquire the reservoir lands in fee simple to the maximum probable reservoir elevation, which would be some 10 feet above the spillway crests. It was on this basis that the city of Dallas agreed to participate in the cost of these projects, for which the city would receive conservation storage space. About 2 years ago, the Corps of Engineers changed its policy without consulting with the city of Dallas. Under the new policy, the Corps of Engineers started acquiring land in fee only to the conservation pool level, plus a height equal to a flood of 5-year frequency. In effect, the land was acquired in fee only a few feet above the conservation pool level. In addition to this change in acquisition policy, the Congressmen from Fort Worth and Denton have introduced bills reinvesting fee title in former owners of lands above this new "take line" which had been acquired prior to the change in policy. The effect of the new policy and the proposed legislation would be to reinvest fee title to a band of land around each reservoir that would later be needed in connection with the exchange of storage between these reservoirs and the proposed new reservoirs at Aubrey and Roanoke. This would involve 3,584 acres in the Lewisville Reservoir and 4,044 acres in the Grapevine Reservoir.

As soon as it was apparent that this new policy of land acquisition would handicap future development on the Elm Fork the city manager of the city of Dallas contacted the Corps of Engineers office in Fort Worth requesting that the land acquisition program take into consideration the future development program and advised that any additional cost resulting would be borne by the city of Dallas. These negotiations were carried on by representatives of the city for about a year without results. Appeal was then made for assistance to Congressman ALGER. After considerable negotiation, Congressman ALGER about 2 months ago secured a commitment from the Chief of Engineers whereby the small amount of remaining land would be purchased to the height desired by the city of Dallas. Congressman ALGER attempted to insert a section in the authorization bill for public works authorizing the proposed exchange of storage between the existing and future reservoirs. His proposal was defeated by opposition of Congressman FRANK IKARD, of Denton, and Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth. At the present time Congressman ALGER is fighting bills by these two Congressmen which would return these lands to the former owners. It is possible that Congressmen FRANK IKARD and JIM WRIGHT may not fully understand the significance of this proposed plan. If they are made aware of the fact that the plan will increase the yield of these reservoirs by 35 million gallons of water per day over what would otherwise prevail, and if they become aware of what might constitute a breach of faith between the Government and the city of Dallas, it is believed that their attitudes might change.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the very worthwhile provisions of this bill except that I merely regret that the Conference Committee has chosen to include Bruces Eddy project. I have as many good reasons for having the Bruces Eddy project struck out as some other Members have for their pet projects. When you read my reasons in the morning you will find that they are not enough to defeat the whole bill.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House refused to vote for a rule to consider the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, a reclamation project that had been voted out of the House committee after lengthy hearings. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project was a transmountain diversion to provide supplemental water and would cost about $150 million.

Today we are asked to vote for a project that has never been able to clear a legislative committee of the House, that is to cost almost as much, more than $120 million, and one whose almost 600-foot dam will flood 48 miles of the canyon of the North Fork of the Clearwater River. Yet we have but a few minutes of debate and this Bruces Eddy project is going to go sailing through without adequate consideration and against the opposition of many Members of this House who have previously voted for all such projects.

In recent testimony before the Rules Committee the question was asked, "Where is the giveaway at Hells Canyon?" One of the giveaways at Hells Canyon is the loss of almost 3 million acre-feet of storage. And right here is an attempt to get some of that storage back.

Bruces Eddy Dam is to be 570 feet high, creating a reservoir of 1,433,000 acre-feet of usable storage which will replace about half of the storage lost by the giveaway at Hells Canyon. Instead of utilizing the rugged canyon that forms a huge natural reservoir at Hells Canyon, we are going to inundate one of the last upland wildernesses in America and destroy a unique scenic and recreational area and lose important fish and wildlife resources.

The report on the project doesn't say anything about a partnership at Bruces Eddy. But everyone in America who has followed the development of the power resources in this region knows that the five northwestern power companies who have combined as the Pacific Northwest Power Co. have designs on Bruces Eddy and Penny Cliffs. In January of this year the northwest power combine succeeded in renewing its preliminary FPC permit for investigation and study of the Bruces Eddy project.

It is significant that the very individuals who have succeeded in tailoring down the Hells Canyon project so that the Idaho Power Co. could build it are the ones who are most enthusiastic about Bruces Eddy. And after the defeat of a Federal Hells Canyon Dam in the other body, up comes the Bruces Eddy project.

In the final decision of the Federal Power Commission the opinion touched upon this question of loss of storage on the Snake and Columbia Rivers by the licensing of the Idaho Power Co. dams. The Commission said:

> If applicant [Idaho Power Co.] is to be permitted to construct its developments, an additional amount of flood control would have to be provided elsewhere. We have previously pointed out some possibilities of providing this storage, although its relative cost is not shown. However, we are convinced from the record that the provision of such storage should not be a problem from the standpoint of availability of other sites.

The other possibilities mentioned by the Commission for upstream storage were 4,250,000 acre-feet at Libby which is currently stymied in the International Joint Commission, and Glacier View's 3,160,000 acre-feet which could be obtained by invading Glacier Park for a storage reservoir.

So the authorization of Bruces Eddy is carrying out the present pattern of inadequate development of the resources of the Columbia Basin for the benefit of the private power company. The next step is plain and obvious. The Corps of Engineers will build the 570-foot Bruces Eddy Dam largely for flood control with nonreimbursable charges and the 5 private power companies comprising the Northwest Power combine will be around insisting upon congressional approval of a partnership whereby the 5-company combine will install the generating facilities and sell the power.

During the discussion of Hells Canyon in committee and in the debate, great fears were expressed about the

protection of water rights if the Hells Canyon Dam were built. Special protective provisions were written into the Hells Canyon bill to insure that water rights, both agricultural and domestic, would be protected. But here there is no protection for water rights except the general law of the Flood Control Act and the Federal Power Act.

This demonstrates two things: That the furor about protection of water rights in the Hells Canyon discussion was a smokescreen to hide the real issue of inadequate development of the river resources and that there is ample protection in the general law and the precedents of the last 50 years to prevent any invasion of water rights.

This House, which has refused to consider Hells Canyon and Fryingpan-Arkansas projects even though favorably reported by House committees, would even more decisively veto the Bruces Eddy project which failed to secure the support of the House committee. But the House is not given a chance to debate and discuss this project and is placed in a position of taking it or leaving it in an important and far-reaching conference report.

But the House will have another chance at this project when the appropriation for construction of the dam here authorized is submitted. And it is not too early to start to consider the price that we are already beginning to pay for the loss of Hells Canyon, a price that is going to get greater and greater through the years if such projects as this Bruces Eddy project continue to receive authorization.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] 2 minutes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I am sure, is laboring under a misunderstanding on what is contained in this conference report with respect to the flood control items for the Susquehanna River. I desire to clarify the record, and to make certain about these items I wish to ask certain questions of the chairman of the committee handling this bill.

I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the item for the upper Susquehanna River carried in this conference report was recommended by the Army engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Was not this item approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. COLE. Is it a fact that none of the dams authorized in this item are located in New York State?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. They are in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. COLE. Is it not a fact that the cost-benefit ratio of this item in the upper Susquehanna is an unusually high cost ratio?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Very good—53 to 1.

Mr. COLE. On the basis of that I can see no reason for rejecting this conference report because of that item for the upper Susquehanna.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Why does it say in the report, No. 29, "New York and Pennsylvania," if it is located solely in Pennsylvania?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is part of the comprehensive basic plan.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO, 5 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DONDERO. Not at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to say that this bill is a comprehensive bill. It contains 85 projects put in by the Committee on Public Works and 23 projects added by the Senate. They are situated in more than 36 States, and while there might be some technical complaint that the actual report of the Army engineers may not have been filed in every project, nevertheless the Army engineers came before us and approved and recommended that these projects be adopted, and they were adopted by the committee.

This particular item in dispute in New York and Pennsylvania was put in by the Senate.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Might I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], on the project for the West Mahoning in the bill at page 39—actually it was never scheduled for an open hearing and that those who were interested in it had requested to be notified by the clerk of the committee but did not have a chance to come in and make their objections.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. We heard the Army engineers and had a rather full statement on the matter.

Mr. FULTON. But the people who wanted to oppose were not giving a chance to be heard, those who were interested in the Ohio River development.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. If they asked for it it was after we had closed the hearings.

Mr. FULTON. No, it was before, but they did not have a chance to be heard. As a matter of fact on this particular development there is no plan yet because the plans are to be prepared by the Chief of the Army Engineers. Is that not a fact?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The plans are substantially complete as of the moment. This project is well understood by the people in that area, it is very much needed and we feel it was entirely justified.

Mr. FULTON. There is no intention that by the development of this particularly dam on the West Mahoning Branch to use it as an excuse for the development of the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Absolutely not. We made certain of that.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman will make sure this is not a subterfuge to develop the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, a project that will throw 11,000 or 12,000 workers out of work in the Pennsylvania-Ohio area?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The gentleman can rely on that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not see why we should be so much agitated by this report that has come back from the committee. No one is seeking to appropriate any money. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and his very efficient committee will have all that to do later. Here is a committee, of which these gentlemen are members, that has done a fine job. They have surveyed probably two or three hundred projects. They had not only the Army engineers' figures but they come to us with their recommendation. That is what they are doing. They are recommending that these projects be considered and that is what will be done. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and his committee will have a chance to pass on them. Just because the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], great man that he is, finds a few bad items in here is no reason why the House should turn them all down. We are not asking here for a penny.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman give us the number of projects included in the House bill, the total amount of money, and the number included by the Senate and the total amount of money involved?

Mr. DONDERO. There were included in the House bill 85 projects, the amount of money involved $1,343 million. The Senate added 23, amounting to about $300 million, including navigation and flood control.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so many extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, while I am a member of the Public Works Committee which reported out the rivers and harbors bill I opposed the bill and must oppose the conference report.

This legislation while it provides for some worthwhile projects is topheavy with pork. It is a typical election year pork barrel bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 130, noes 31.

So the conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the State wildlife agencies in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington have each urged postponement of consideration of this project on the basis that studies of its effects on fish and wildlife are incomplete. They indicate that the results from their field investigations will be available in a period of 2 or 3 years. At the end of this time they will be able to more accurately assess the losses from this project and offer recommendations for offsetting them if these can be developed.

I fail to see the justification for authorization of Bruces Eddy in the absence of this basic biological information—particularly in view of the extremely rich fish and wildlife resources of this Clearwater region. Nowhere in the country can one find a more bountiful variety of game animals living under wilderness conditions.

The 49-mile reservoir created on the North Fork of the Clearwater by Bruces Eddy Dam would flood out winter ranges of what is believed to be the country's largest elk herd. These low areas are of vital importance to thousands of deer and elk during severe winters and the wildlife agencies point out that any reduction in them may have devastating effects upon these herds. No wonder that sportsmen and leading conservation groups are opposing the desecration of the North Fork in the absence of concrete recommendations for offsetting these probable losses to wildlife.

The sport and commercial fisheries of the Clearwater are of great economic importance to this area as well as the downstream sections of the Columbia. These fisheries have been restored through management programs to the point where they now support thousands of sport fishermen visits annually. Last year, anglers spent 5,200 days on the North Fork where Bruces Eddy Dam would be built. These people enjoyed stream fishing at its best in some of the West's finest mountain water while taking over 42,000 trout.

We should carefully consider any course of action that would endanger the productivity of these waters, particularly in view of the findings of the wildlife agencies that show the catch of steelhead trout, which makes up 60 percent of the total take of trout, would be destroyed as a result of the 570-foot Bruces Eddy Dam. There is no known way to get these sea-run fish back and forth over obstructions of this height.

At a time when the need for outdoor recreation is becoming more and more apparent and the pressures of our hectic modern-day pace are taking an ever-increasing toll of our bodies and minds, we must look carefully at the recreational potential of an area like the Clearwater before writing it off to river development. We see in our people many unhealthy signs of these pressures. They serve to point up the need for considering recreational values, as well as the benefits that might be derived from hydroelectric power and flood-control facilities, in determining the most desirable use for our rich lands.

In place of the magnificent beauty of the North Fork Gorge, Bruces Eddy Dam with its fluctuating water levels would leave unsightly scars along steep-walled mountainous canyons. Should not we stop to weigh these losses along with the many benefits that would accrue from the wise use of the fish, wildlife and scenic resources of this wilderness country?

It would seem that these are the things that conservationists in Idaho and throughout the Nation are thinking of when they ask for further studies to determine effects of this dam. Is it not fair for them to ask that this information be made available before we undertake any consideration of legislation to authorize this dam? These people have a stake in this country and feel an obligation to protect it for their children and the future generations of Americans that stand to gain even more from the outdoor living that this region is capable of providing.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country have a right to request careful study of the proposals for authorization of Bruces Eddy Dam. We should postpone this action until an assessment of fish, wildlife and recreational resources has been completed.

I predict that the Congress will rue the day that this back door method of authorizing the construction of a dam was allowed to pass.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 653) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee authorized by the chairman, in addition to the authority contained in any other resolution, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to all matters involving safety of life at sea, including but not limited to—

(1) adequacy of existing construction standards of passenger vessels;

(2) adequacy of navigation and warning devices presently in use, including radar;

(3) the facts and circumstances surrounding the collision between the SS. *Stockholm* and the SS. *Andrea Doria*.

For such purpose the said committee or any subcommittee authorized by the chairman is hereby authorized to sit and act within the United States during the present Congress whether the House is in session, has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence and all other papers as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 654) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 653 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $10,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHOE INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. HALEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2956)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation are authorized to convey to the United States the tribes' interests in the 388.23 acres of land that are described in section 2 of the Act, subject to a reservation to the tribes of all minerals, including oil and gas, and mineral rights, which may be exercised only in a manner that does not interfere with the construction and operation of the dam site and reservoir of Anchor Dam, a part of the Owl Creek unit, Missouri River

Basin project in Hot Springs County, near Thermopolis, Wyoming. The conveyance shall be for a price that is mutually agreeable to the tribes and to the Secretary of the Interior as representing fair and just compensation for the land taken. If the tribes and the Secretary fail to agree on a price to be paid for said land, the Secretary shall report that fact to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the first day of the Eighty-fifth Congress, and the Secretary is authorized, effective thirty days after said report is filed, to proceed to acquire such land by eminent domain. The consideration payable to the tribes pursuant to this Act shall be paid out of funds appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit and for the use of the respective tribes in accordance with the provisions of the Act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 208).

"SEC. 2. The lands that are referred to in section 1 of this Act are: Lots 1 and 2, section 13, northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, west half, northeast quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter, section 24, township 8 north, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, Wyoming, containing 388.23 acres.

"SEC. 3. In the event of the failure or abandonment of the Anchor Dam feature of the Owl Creek unit the interest in the land acquired pursuant to this Act shall be reconveyed by the Secretary of the Interior to the tribes and the title shall be held in the same manner it was held before such acquisition: *Provided*, That the purchase price paid by the United States shall be returned by the tribes.

"SEC. 4. The portion of the construction costs of the Owl Creek unit that is allocable to the irrigable lands of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation shall be a lien against such lands, but the assessment and collection of such costs shall be deferred in accordance with the provisions of the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564). The irrigable lands of the tribes shall be entitled to their pro rata share of the water storage and regulation benefits accruing from the construction and operation of the Owl Creek unit upon payment by the tribes, under appropriate contract, of their pro rata share of the annual operation and maintenance costs of the Owl Creek unit.

"SEC. 5. The members of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes shall have the right to fish on the lake created by Anchor Dam, without a State license, but the Indians shall be subject to all other provisions of applicable conservation laws and regulations."

And the House agree to the same.

JAMES A. HALEY,
CLAIR ENGLE,
A. L. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
FRANK A. BARRETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The two areas of disagreement concerned the fair and just compensation to be paid for the conveyance and the wording in the respective sections 5.

The House-approved bill provided that the conveyance would be for a price that is mutually agreeable to the tribes and the Secretary of the Interior and would be based upon the fair market value of the land. The Senate-passed bill provided for no compensation but, in lieu thereof, relief to the tribes from payment of construction charges of the Owl Creek unit. The Senate-approved bill also provided that the Secretary of the Interior would acquire the land by eminent domain if, after 30 days following enactment of this legislation, the tribes failed to agree to the conveyance. The amendment agreed upon by the conferees provides that if the tribes and the Secretary fail to agree on fair and just compensation for the conveyance, the Secretary shall report such fact to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the first day of the 85th Congress. In this event the Secretary is authorized, 30 days after filing said report, to institute eminent-domain proceedings.

The conferees agreed to substitute section 5 of the Senate-approved bill for section 5 of the House-approved bill. The Senate-approved section provides that the Indians shall be permitted to fish on the lake created by Anchor Dam, without a State license, whereas the House version permitted the Indians to fish on the lake without a license, as if the lake were within the exterior boundaries of the Wind River Reservation. The conferees thought that the words "as if the lake were within the exterior boundaries of the Wind River Reservation" might someday be used to contend that the Indians had the right to keep others from fishing on the waters outside the reservation as they do have within the reservation itself. In both instances the Indian fishermen will be subject to all other provisions of applicable conservation laws and regulations.

In all other respects the conferees agreed on the House-approved H. R. 10183.

JAMES A. HALEY,
CLAIR ENGLE,
A. L. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3467) to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITTLE WOOD RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3227) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the principal purposes of improving the irrigation water supply of approximately 10,000 acres of land in Blaine County, Idaho, and assisting in the control of floods, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to undertake an enlargement of the Little Wood River Reservoir and to operate and maintain the same in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). Any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193; 43 U. S. C. 485h) for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Little Wood River project which are properly allocable to irrigation and which are assigned to be paid by the contracting organization shall provide for the repayment of the construction cost over a period of not more than 40 years or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within the period stated under average conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the organization to pay.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to construct minimum basic public recreational facilities in connection with the Little Wood River project and to enter into appropriate arrangements for the operation and maintenance of the same by a State or local agency or organization. The cost of such facilities shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in the works of the Little Wood River project as, upon further study in accordance with section 2 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U. S. C. 661a), he finds to be required for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife. An appropriate portion of the construction cost of the project shall be allocated as provided in said act and it, together with the portion of the construction cost allocated to flood control and the portions of the operation and maintenance costs allocated to these functions or the capitalized value of the equivalent thereof, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

(b) So far the Secretary finds the same to be consistent with safety and with efficient operation or the primary purpose of the Little Wood River project, the project waters in the project area shall be open to free public use for lawful hunting and fishing purposes, and free access to the waters for those purposes shall be assured.

(c) Little Wood River Reservoir shall be operated in accord with water rights, under decree or permit, which are valid under the laws of the State of Idaho, but the Congress, taking cognizance of the need for clarification of certain of these rights in some formal manner effective under Idaho law, particularly as between the Fish and Game Department of said State and the water users under the Little Wood River project or their organizations, does not by this declaration accept for or impose upon the United States, its officers or employees any responsibility for determining the correctness of such claims of right and does not, either by the enactment of this act or by any action taken pursuant thereto, intend to and or prejudice the claims of any party to a dispute with respect thereto or to impose upon any party to a contract entered into under this act any obligation with respect to such rights

that does not exist under the laws of the State of Idaho or to require that water, other than that which is available under established rights, shall be used primarily either for irrigation or for the preservation of fish and wildlife resources.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Little Wood River project $1,880,000 plus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein and, in addition, such amounts as may be required to operate and maintain said project.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is the bill that was programed and that we had some discussion on earlier in the day. It was the intention to bring the bill up if possible, and the minority leadership and the Democratic leadership spontaneously agreed on bringing up the bill at this time. It makes for a happy ending to a very pleasant day and a very pleasant association.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 7850 was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will it be in order after the House has adjourned for all Members to insert their remarks in the RECORD and have that permission for a period of 10 or 15 days?

The SPEAKER. The majority leader usually asks unanimous consent for that permission, and I am sure it will be provided.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11123) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1948 (16 U. S. C., sec. 407m and the following), is amended by inserting immediately after the first section thereof the following new section:

"1A. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation or with donated funds, or to acquire by purchase, all of the land and buildings immediately adjacent to Old St. Joseph's Church, situated on the east side of Fourth Street between Walnut Street and Willings Alley excepting the land and building known as 211–227 South Fourth Street, and all of the land and buildings on the south side of Walnut Street, east of Fourth Street, up to and including number 324 Walnut Street, to be included within the Independence National Historical Park. The Secretary shall first enter into an agreement with the proprietor or proprietors of Old St. Joseph's Church property, such agreement to contain the usual and customary provisions for the protection of the property, assuring its physical maintenance, without expense to the United States, as a part of the Independence National Historical Park, and without any limitation or control over its use for customary church purposes."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of such act is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not exceeding $900,000, as may be necessary to acquire the property referred to in section 1A of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman give me an explanation of the bill, and tell us where this area is in Philadelphia?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. The church that is the subject of this bill is surrounded by buildings. The old St. Joseph's Church, which survived the first test of religious freedom in the English-speaking world in 1753, is surrounded by buildings. To reach that church one has to go up an alley off Walnut Street. My bill will permit taking of the buildings which surround the alley to Walnut Street, and down Fourth Street, excluding the New Amsterdam Insurance Building to be demolished.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. The property we talked about is excluded?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Yes. The amendment will do that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the amendment that excludes the New Amsterdam Insurance Co. makes this bill quite proper, and I urge its passage.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What is the cost of this project?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Nine hundred thousand dollars. The committee reduced it from $1,500,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What will the Government do with the land? Will it make use of the land?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. It will be part of the Independence Mall, which is 100 feet away from this church.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does it connect up with the Independence Mall?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Yes, it will be part of the Independence Mall, but the church will take care of its own property.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is going to cost the Federal taxpayers of all the country $900,000?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Yes. This is one of the greatest historical places, in the country, I might say.

Mr. GROSS. Whom will this benefit?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. It will benefit the whole Nation.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I think this is a most important bill. The Independence Hall in Philadelphia does not belong to the citizens of Philadelphia, it belongs to the world. The Declaration of Independence of our great country was signed there. People come to Philadelphia from all over the world to see it. There is a wonderful project up there of improving the mall. This would be an eyesore. If we do not pass this bill and make this improvement I think it would be a shame. It is a very good bill and I urge its passage.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. This has bipartisan support. Senator EDWARD MARTIN is the one who came up with the idea. He is a Republican from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the church there is the oldest church in the English-speaking world?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. No, I did not say that. I said that it stood the first test of religious freedom and freedom of religious worship in the English-speaking world—in 1753.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Is not this one of the most important and most famous units of the National Parks Service?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I would say it is.

Mr. BOLAND. Does not the United States Government take the responsibility now for Independence Hall?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Yes, it does.

Mr. BOLAND. This will just make it a better place and a greater shrine; is that not correct?

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, BUNCOMBE COUNTY, N. C.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10238) to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept certain land in Buncombe County, N. C., for cemetery purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to accept for and in the name of the United States from the city of Asheville, N. C., by deed satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, title to two tracts of land in Buncombe County, N. C., being a portion of the property owned by the city of Asheville, known as the Riverside Cemetery, and to maintain such tracts for the burial of veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who die in the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Oteen, N. C.

SEC. 2. The tracts of land referred to in the first section are a portion of that property conveyed to the city of Asheville by the Asheville Cemetery Co., July 2, 1955, by deed recorded in book 760 at page 407 in the office of the register of deeds for Buncombe County, N. C., which said property is known as the Riverside Cemetery and is shown on a plat recorded in plat book 26 at page 106 of the Buncombe County register, and more particularly described as follows:

Tract I: Beginning at a concrete monument (formerly iron pin) (formerly an old poplar tree) in a corner of the southern boundary of the property deeded to the city of Asheville by the Asheville Cemetery Co. dated July 2, 1955, and recorded in deed book 760 at page 407 of the Buncombe County registry; said beginning point and concrete monument is located by measuring from a 2-inch iron fence post in concrete in the easternmost corner of said property described in said deed book 760 at page 407, the following courses and distances: North 83 degrees 50 minutes west 166.6 feet to a white oak; south 60 degrees 00 minutes west 142.2 feet to an iron pin; south 43 degrees 45 minutes west 194.5 feet to the beginning concrete monument of this tract I herein described; runs thence from said beginning point with the southern boundary line of the property described in said deed book 760 at page 407, the following courses and distances: South 36 degrees 12 minutes west 107.2 feet to a Spanish oak; south 70 degrees 41 minutes west 194.5 feet to an iron pin; south 59 degrees 37 minutes west 66 feet to a concrete monument; north 85 degrees 30 minutes west 576.5 feet to a stake; thence leaving said southern boundary line of said property described in said deed book 760 at page 407 and runs north 17 degrees 15 minutes east 38.2 feet to a stake; thence north 58 degrees 33 minutes east 110.4 feet to a stake; thence north 24 degrees 43 minutes east 107 feet to a stake in the southern margin of a cemetery road, known as Parker Road; thence with the southern margin of said Parker Road the following courses and distances: South 65 degrees 17 minutes east 64.1 feet to a stake; south 87 degrees 47 minutes east 157.3 feet to a stake; north 84 degrees 58 minutes east 161.6 feet to a stake; south 86 degrees 32 minutes east 188.4 feet to a stake; north 68 degrees 28 minutes east 35 feet to a stake; north 49 degrees 58 minutes east 77.2 feet to a stake; thence leaving said southern margin of said Parker Road and running south 48 degrees 39 minutes east 117.5 feet to the place of beginning.

Tract II: Beginning at a stake in the northern margin of a cemetery road, known as Parker Road, which said road has been hereinbefore referred to in tract I above, which said beginning stake is located by measuring from the beginning concrete monument hereinbefore referred to in tract I above, the following courses and distances: North 48 degrees 39 minutes west 117.5 feet to a stake in the southern margin of said Parker Road; thence with the southern margin of said Parker Road, south 49 degrees 58 minutes west 77.2 feet to a stake; south 68 degrees 28 minutes west 35 feet to a stake; north 86 degrees 32 minutes west 61.2 feet to a stake; thence crossing said Parker Road, north 37 degrees 10 minutes west 26.35 feet to the beginning stake of this description of tract II; thence running from this beginning stake of tract II, north 37 degrees 10 minutes west 68.9 feet to a stake; north 47 degrees 52 minutes east 49.5 feet to a stake; south 46 degrees 48 minutes east 29 feet to a stake; north 44 degrees 58 minutes east 28.3 feet to a stake; north 35 degrees 22 minutes west 165.3 feet to a stake in the eastern margin of a cemetery road, known as Shuford Road, thence runs with the eastern margin of said Shuford Road, north 00 degrees 02 minutes west 23.1 feet to a stake; thence leaving said Shuford Road south 45 degrees 10 minutes east 179.8 feet to a stake; thence north 69 degrees 06 minutes east 73.3 feet to a stake; thence south 43 degrees 31 minutes east 83.9 feet to a stake in the northern margin of said Parker Road; thence runs with the northern margin of said Parker Road south 49 degrees 58 minutes west 123.4 feet to a stake; south 68 degrees 28 minutes west 27.5 feet to a stake; north 86 degrees 32 minutes west 74 feet to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, line 6, add the following:

"SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the transfer of land authorized by section 1, evidence of title and a land survey, if required by the Government, shall be furnished by and at the expense of the city of Asheville, N. C."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now recognize Members who have special orders for today. But, at any time that there is business to be transacted, the Chair hopes that Members will yield so that the House may proceed with its business.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Speaker recognize me for the purpose of moving that the House accept the Senate amendments to the bill, H. R. 6888.

The SPEAKER. Has the committee authorized the gentleman to make that request?

Mr. KEATING. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman.

FINAL REPORT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, when the 1st session of the 84th Congress adjourned just one year ago on August 2, I addressed my colleagues with a final report on the record of that session. The encouraging and spontaneous response to that summation of our work in 1955 has prompted me to again report on the accomplishments of this, the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

Within a short time, we will again adjourn after 7 months in session during which time over 5,200 bills have been introduced and over 800 enacted into law.

We have spent many hours each day in committee and on the floor preparing and debating the legislation comprising this record, and each of us has been diligent in our desire to do what we believe is best for our district and country.

I am proud to report that of nearly 300 roll and quorum calls during the past 2 years I have missed only 2 rollcall votes and 3 quorum calls.

The record of the 84th Congress is now complete. We await the decision of the American people.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The largest political storm to brew during the 2d session was over the Nation's defense program.

Because each of our citizens is acutely aware of the Communist menace and the threat of enemy aggression, everyone has paid considerable attention to the development and maintenance of our defense establishment. Thus, it could only be expected that President Eisenhower's opposition should make our Pentagon an arena for political demagoguery.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

In his budget request, the President asked the Congress to appropriate $34,147,850,000 for the Department of Defense. This amount, according to the testimony of high military and civilian officials, would "insure a well-rounded military establishment in fiscal year 1957."

The House Committee on Appropriations agreed with this basic premise, although they reduced the request by approximately one-half billion dollars. The House agreed to this amount and appropriated $33,635,066,000.

After much partisan maneuvering in the Senate, which included the proposing of fantastic and preposterous sums not in accord with any fiscal responsibility, the final figure for our defense budget was $34,656,727,000. This amount was appropriated and subsequently approved by the White House.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS

One feature of the Defense Department appropriation bill which was added last year was the requirement which forced the Department to obtain approval from the Appropriations Committees before they could halt Government competition with private enterprise. This was a deliberate roadblock to administration attempts to get the Government out of business, and the Congress finally removed this restrictive proposal from the 1957 appropriation legislation.

The opposition, however, inserted this provision in a new bill, and the administration attempts to reduce Government competition with private enterprise might have again been wrapped in procedural redtape if the new bill had not died in the Senate.

OTHER DEFENSE LEGISLATION

The Congress approved a $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion for 1957, including a nuclear-

powered cruiser and 60,000-ton aircraft carrier. The Eisenhower proposal for an atomic-powered peace ship was amended along partisan lines, and the proposal he finally signed resembled only vaguely his original proposal.

Measures providing for additional top-level scientific, professional, and administrative positions in defense agencies, and for the installation of $15.4 million worth of equipment to be used by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics were also approved.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The field of foreign policy provided one area of relative bipartisan agreement and accomplishment. This spirit of cooperation has prevailed throughout the 84th Congress and provides a striking testimonial to the President's leadership and his desire to keep all of the legislative leaders informed on the status of our relations with other nations.

RED CHINA

Indicative of this bipartisan approach to the accomplishment of a firm foreign policy was the unanimous approval by both the House and Senate of a resolution expressing the sense of Congress against the admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations.

CLEVELAND PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

Congress also passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of $5 million in Federal funds for the purpose of promoting and insuring the success of the pan-American Games to be held at Cleveland in 1959, and then approved an initial appropriation of $100,000 to be expended in planning the games.

This congressional action, as well as the action and enthusiasm on the part of State and local officials in Ohio, will prove to be an invaluable asset toward the improvement of our relations with our American neighbors.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Despite a general feeling in the Congress to drastically reduce or terminate Federal expenditures for foreign aid, both Houses agreed to an appropriation of $3.7 billion for the mutual-security program.

Senate conferees agreed to a reduction from the $4.1 billion the Senate voted, and the House conferees agreed to the increase from the $3.4 billion the House had voted. The compromise total is about $1.1 billion less than the administration originally sought. Congress had previously authorized a $3.9 billion program.

POLICY OF LIBERATION

The House of Representatives also passed two resolutions to further our program of liberating the enslaved people of the world.

The first reaffirmed the policy of the United States to work for the reunification of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam; to work for the admission of those nations and Japan to the United Nations; and to work for the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence of peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist bondage.

The second expressed the sympathy and encouragement of the House of Representatives for the people of Poland in their revolt at Poznan, against Communist dictatorship.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

A marked accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration was the balancing of the 1956 Federal budget. On June 30, 1956, when the total receipts and expenditures during the previous 12 months had been tabulated, the American people found they had a surplus of $1.754 billion in their Treasury which could be utilized to reduce the Federal debt.

Anticipating another year of unprecedented prosperity, the administration has set its sights on a balanced budget for 1957, and it is most probable that the national debt can be further reduced.

For these reasons, Congress was asked to provide a temporary increase in the debt ceiling of only $2 billion as contrasted to the previous requests of twice that amount. Congress approved this lower request.

1957 APPROPRIATIONS

Including the enormous Department of Defense appropriation and other expenditures for national security, which account for 61.3 percent of the total 1957 budget, Congress was asked to appropriate $59,950,336,809 for the 1957 fiscal year.

Upon review of this request, Congress appropriated a total of $59,729,807,628 which was $220,529,181 less than the President recommended. This amount, coupled with unobligated balances and compared to estimated tax receipts of over $66 billion, should provide a surplus on June 30, 1957, of about $2 billion.

TAXES

Corporate and excise tax rates were extended for another year although certain excise taxes, including those on theater admissions, radio and television parts, and foreign air travel, were either repealed or reduced in separate bills.

Realizing that our internal revenue laws have become discriminatory in many ways and oppressive in others, but mindful of the fact that the present level of Federal receipts can only be lowered gradually, a complete study for the revision of these laws has been ordered which, it is hoped, will lead to legislation improving the tax laws and reducing the tax burden of our individual citizens. With proper planning, it may soon be possible to enact another tax cut similar to the $7.4 billion reduction in taxes enacted in 1954 during the 83d Congress.

BUSINESS

Congress enacted two bills to strengthen the antitrust laws. One increased the fines under the Sherman Antitrust Act, and the other defined suits for damages under the antitrust code.

A third bill defining "good faith" in the defense against price discrimination charges under the Robinson-Patman Act was approved by the House of Representatives but died in the Senate. This bill was designed to aid small business and received strong support from small business establishments throughout the Nation.

Congress also enacted a bill to enable automobile dealers to bring suit against automobile manufacturers on the termination of franchises under the antitrust laws, but a bill prescribing Federal policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by the executive agencies failed of passage in the House.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

After more than a year of partisan bickering, the Congress junked President Eisenhower's program for a bond-financed Federal highway system and enacted an acceptable $24.8 billion interstate highway program to be paid for by increased user's taxes. This is the first long-term Federal road-building program in the Nation's history.

Although a year late in starting, the American driving public can now look forward to improved and safer highways. Ohio's share of this Federal interstate program is expected to exceed $201 million in just the next 3 years. An additional $74 million in Federal funds will be made available to Ohio for the building and improvement of primary, secondary, and urban roads.

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

The House-approved project to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels between Lakes Erie and Huron and between Lakes Huron and Superior was passed by the Senate during the second session and signed by the President. This is an important step in the preparation for increased ocean shipping in the Great Lakes via the St. Lawrence Seaway.

A bill to encourage the construction and maintenance of modern Great Lakes bulk-cargo vessels in the interest of peacetime commerce and the national defense which was sponsored by several Great Lakes Congressmen failed to gain House approval.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

After much debate, the Congress approved a housing bill extending and liberalizing the FHA and military housing programs and authorizing 35,000 more public-housing units annually for 2 years.

The FHA home-improvement loan authority was extended for 3 years with an increase to $3,500 from $2,500 in loan maximums for a single-family dwelling and an increase in the repayment time to 5 years from 3. A cosigner may now endorse an FHA-insured mortgage of a mortgagee aged 60 or older and allows FHA to insure up to 90 percent of a mortgage on housing built especially for elderly persons by nonprofit organizations.

LABOR

The 84th Congress has taken little action on President Eisenhower's labor program. Benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act have been increased, as have the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. But no action has been taken on the proposal to protect beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension plans by requiring registration and full disclosure of the financial operations of the plans; no action has been taken on

the proposal to promote occupational safety by providing grants-in-aid to improve State programs; no action has been taken on the proposal to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in the payment of wages; and no action was taken on the President's proposed amendments to improve the Taft-Hartley Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY

After exhaustive hearings the Senate, during this second session, approved with amendments a House social security bill which extends social-security coverage. Benefiting under the new law are self-employed professional groups; additional farm operators, share farmers, and agricultural workers; certain ministers; employees of nonprofit organizations; and State and local government employees.

The new act reduces from 65 to 62 the age at which all women may become eligible for benefits, provides for the payment of disability-insurance benefits to permanently and totally disabled workers, continues monthly benefits to disabled children over 18 years of age, and increases the tax rate by one-fourth of 1 percent on the employer and the employee.

POWER DEVELOPMENT

In a move to allow the development of power by private industry rather than by the Federal Government, the Congress rejected legislation providing for Federal development of power on the Niagara River in New York and on the Snake River in Idaho. The latter proposal, popularly known as the Hells Canyon bill, was defeated on the House floor, and the Niagara project was not reported from the Committee on Rules before Congress adjourned. Similarly the House killed the Federal development of the Frying Pan-Arkansas reclamation project.

Of major importance, however, was congressional approval for the Federal development of the upper Colorado River project. This item was high on the administration's list of legislative proposals.

VETERANS

Several important bills assisting our veterans were approved by the Congress, but the veterans' pension bill failed of passage.

GI HOME-LOAN PROGRAM

The fact that approximately 11 million veterans have not been able to take advantage of their entitlement under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act for a guaranteed home loan encouraged Congress to extend this particular provision an additional year to July 25, 1958. Further, the new law provides that if a loan report or an application for a loan guaranty has been received by the Veterans' Administration on or before July 25, 1958, such loan may be guaranteed or insured up to July 25, 1959.

TAX CREDIT FOR RETIRED PAY

Another law enacted during the second session permits members of the Armed Forces to take income-tax credit for retirement income under the provisions of the Revenue Code and the Social Security Act.

KOREAN GI BILL

Veterans of the Korean war attending school under the GI bill were assisted when Congress passed a bill exempting courses leading to standard college degrees offered by nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning from the provisions of the act prohibiting the enrollment of eligible veterans under that act when such courses have been in operation for less than 2 years.

SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

The enactment of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act was an integral part of President Eisenhower's legislative program. This act provides a general revision and liberalization of benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans and puts military personnel under social security.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

The House of Representatives passed two veterans' pension bills. The first would provide for increased pensions for disabled veterans whose annual incomes did not exceed $1,400 if single or $2,700 if with dependents regardless of whether or not the disablement was service-connected. The second bill provided an increase in the rates of compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disabilities and in the rates of additional allowances for dependents which are payable to veterans whose disabilities are rated 50 percent or more.

Neither bill was acted upon by the Senate.

AGRICULTURE

Partisan debate continued during the second session in the consideration of farm legislation.

RIGID VERSUS FLEXIBLE PRICE SUPPORTS

As explained last year in my first session report, a new era in politics was born when the various labor union leaders deserted their consumer ranks and aided the partisan Democrats in pushing a bill through Congress which would restore high rigid price supports and scuttle the flexible price-support program.

This bill had passed the House before we adjourned one year ago, and shortly after Congress reconvened in January the Senate added their approval to this politically-inspired legislation.

President Eisenhower vetoed this bill in what was called the most courageous act performed by a Chief Executive in recent years and asked Congress to enact a soil-bank program. No effort was made to override the veto.

SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

Following the President's veto of the rigid price support bill, the Congress agreed to the Eisenhower soil-bank program which then became law.

This measure authorizes $1.2 billion for a voluntary soil-bank program to reduce the production acreage of crops in surplus supply, encourages the disposal of surpluses at home and abroad, and fixed feed-grain supports at 76 percent of parity.

Farm leaders lauded the President for this program.

GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

Foremost in the administration's endeavors to improve the operation of our Federal Government has been the implementation of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The administration has made a creditable record in adopting some 75 of these recommendations. But where legislative action will be necessary before 140 of the total 314 recommendations can be adopted, the Democrat-controlled Congress has enacted legislation to implement only 30 of these proposals.

Late this spring, President Eisenhower's special assistant for the Hoover report listed 16 measures pending before the Congress to implement Hoover recommendations which deserved high priority. Only half of these 16 measures have been enacted as we adjourn this 84th Congress. The remainder were either shelved in committee or defeated on the floor.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

One of the most important reorganization measures adopted by the Congress during the second session was the bill to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures. This new act places the entire governmental financial structure on an annual accrued expenditure basis and permits a much closer supervision by the Congress over the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

A House-approved bill designed to alleviate the postal deficit by increasing the rates on first, second, and third class mail died in Senate committee. This, too, was an important part of the President's program, and received overwhelming support in two Minshall polls conducted among the residents of Ohio's 23d District.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

There were several important bills of a general nature considered during the second session.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A key proposal in President Eisenhower's legislative program was the enactment of a comprehensive Civil Rights program.

The House of Representatives, in the last days of the session now ending, approved a bill which would have established a Commission on Civil Rights, created a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General, and given the United States district courts concurrent jurisdiction with State courts to enforce civil actions against offenders, but the Senate had insufficient time before adjournment to press for action. The bill thus died in Senate committee.

ALASKA-HAWAII STATEHOOD

In another field of inactivity, Congress failed to grant statehood to either Alaska or Hawaii. The bills were rejected in the first session and not considered during 1956.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Congress failed also to enact a school construction bill which was another important part of the President's program. There can be little doubt that there is a critical shortage of classrooms in the Nation's schools, but the question was how should the Federal Government participate in this construction, and a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives refused to approve the

proposal which was presented on the House floor.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

In the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation, Congress enacted the Water Pollution Control Act to assist States and local governments in the prevention and control of water pollution.

Comprehensive programs for water-pollution control are established, the Surgeon General of the United States is instructed to support and aid technical research through investigation, training and information programs, and enforcement measures against the pollution of interstate waters are clearly spelled out.

The act also authorized the appropriation of $3 million a year for the next 5 years for grants to States' water pollution control programs, and authorized a 10-year $500 million program of grants to the States for construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into any waters.

NARCOTICS CONTROL ACT

Congress also amended present narcotics laws to strengthen the penalties for unlawful acquisition, transportation, and sales of narcotics, and provides a death penalty for the sale of heroin to juveniles. The new act undoubtedly will be of invaluable assistance to law enforcement officers in curtailing the traffic of narcotics.

OLIVER P. BOLTON

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will suffer a great and serious loss in the retirement of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON. Few men ever seated in this august body have earned for themselves in 4 short years the respect and honor of fellow Members as has the gentleman from Ohio. Without contradiction I can say that each of us has received great benefit from the wisdom and knowledge he has displayed as one of the outstanding legislators in American history.

I have had the privilege of knowing the gentleman from Ohio perhaps longer than any other Member of this great body with the one notable exception, his good and wonderful mother, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, who, as you all know, succeeded the late, distinguished Chester Bolton, her husband, in this House. I knew OLLIE BOLTON in schooldays before he graduated from Harvard University in 1939. At the outset of World War II we served in the Army together. He later served with distinction in the Pacific theater and was honorably discharged after more than 5 years of service. I remember well his successful career as an attorney after his graduation from Western Reserve University Law School in 1947, how we campaigned together for the Ohio Legislature, and his brilliance as president and later national committeeman of the Ohio Young Republicans.

OLIVER BOLTON will leave the Congress at the conclusion of this term through personal choice. In doing so, he is forsaking a brilliant future as a legislative leader solely out of consideration for his personal health and the security of his family—a decision based upon the single criterion with which he has approached each major decision in his life: "Regardless of my personal desires, what is best for those around me."

Thus, it was a distinct honor for me when I was elected to the House of Representatives to serve with my good friend. During these past 2 years, I have found his energy to be a challenge, I have found his advice to be excellent and unimpeachable, and I have found his sincerity and devotion to his friends and to duty unsurpassed.

While it is with deep regret that I watch OLLIE BOLTON retire from the Congress, I know that it is not "goodby"; for if his past record is any indication, Ollie's future in his private life will find him as a great civic leader, a wonderful father, and a devoted friend to each of us.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks that the gentleman has just made. Let me say first that he has made a very splendid statement.

I have known OLIVER BOLTON for something over 2 years. The first time I met him he came down to my home town. He spoke in behalf of the party he loved at a Lincoln Day dinner. I was impressed with his remarks, so were all who know of his work in behalf of his party, in behalf of his community, and in behalf of his State and in behalf of his Nation, well known to the people of Ohio and beyond the borders of Ohio.

I have also been impressed with the tremendous record he made as a freshman Congressman. When I came down to Washington myself and became associated with OLLIE BOLTON I was more deeply impressed as I saw him work. The fervor with which he threw himself into his legislative activity was indeed a challenge for all of us who came here to the Halls of Congress for the first time, and it is with extreme regret personally to me that I see OLLIE BOLTON leave the Halls of Congress.

He has not been content to be just a Congressman; he has not been content just to hold office, but because of the intense desire he has had to serve his people and the country his own health has failed and it is necessary for him to leave us here.

We wish him well in the work that he will do in the future and we trust that he will find that his physical strength will return. I wish him many, many fruitful years of faithful service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] in the tribute that is being paid to one of our retiring colleagues, the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON, who, when the final gavel falls this evening will wind up at least his present career in the Congress of the United States.

It has been my pleasure and my privilege to know OLIVER BOLTON, or OLLIE, as we call him, since childhood; and, of course, to know very well his wonderful father and his wonderful mother.

It is unusual for a young man to take up public service as a career, yet OLIVER BOLTON, coming as he does from a distinguished family, has devoted himself and his life to public service. He has served well within the State of Ohio, and he has served with great and unusual ability as a national legislator.

It is with great regret that we see him leave the Halls of Congress, but I think we know that in the future we will hear from him again, because he is a man with a future, and his contributions to the welfare of his country and his Nation have not only been great in the past, but I am certain will be even greater in the future.

All of us from Ohio give him our best wishes and our highest regards as he leaves us here tonight and we hope we may see much of him in the future.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with his other friends in expressing deep regret that OLIVER BOLTON is retiring from congressional service. I have been here for 32 years; I have seen many brilliant men, but I know of none who gave more promise than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON]. He is a young man of ability, character, and integrity. When he came here I am sure he was actuated by the sincere purpose of serving his State and his country well. We need more men like OLIVER BOLTON in our national life and it is with regret when one of his stature is separated from it with such a short service. I hope and trust that in the next few years he will regain his health and will enter a wider field of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, I am sorry to see OLIVER BOLTON leave. We all wish him the best and we hope the blessings of God will be with him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with the other Members who have spoken with reference to this very fine man. It was my good fortune to have served with his father in the State Senate of Ohio. Chester Bolton distinguished himself there in such a way that he had no trouble being elected to the Congress.

While a Member of the House, those of us who were here remember Chester Bolton as having been a fine, high-class man with great capacity. We have also known Mrs. BOLTON and last year the fine work she did when she traveled all over the world, distinguishing herself as no other woman has ever done. She did this wonderful job all by herself. This boy of hers has a right to consider his mother as everybody considers his

mother, and he can look back with great satisfaction and note what a fine legislator his mother has been.

Ollie, I hope everythings works out well for you.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, while OLLIE BOLTON comes from the other end of the State, the people of southwestern Ohio recognize the fine job he has done during the 4 years of his service as a Member of this House. They regret that a man of his ability, character, and integrity must leave the service of his country. It is just too bad that men like him must retire from the Congress because we need in public service men like OLIVER BOLTON.

Ollie, the people of southwestern Ohio wish you well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to join in this tribute being paid to our colleague from Ohio, OLLIE BOLTON. He has not been a Member of this body very long, but those of us who have had occasion to come in contact with him either on a personal or business basis have always found him of friendly disposition, we have always found him to be a wonderful fellow to do business with. In addition to that, he has been extremely capable and diligent in the conduct of the business of his office.

I trust that his health will continue to improve over the years. I look forward to great success in the business venture on which he is embarking and I look forward with hope that in years to come OLLIE BOLTON will return to public life because our country needs men of that stamp and character in the national service.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been a Member of this House long enough to have served with OLIVER BOLTON'S father more than 22 years ago, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to OLIVER BOLTON as he bids us farewell tonight and wish him in the days to come life's richest blessings, the first of which is good health.

May you have good luck, Ollie, and God bless you.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, although I am from Pennsylvania, OLIVER BOLTON is well known in my district, as he represents a district next to mine. Everyone who knows Oliver admires and respects him. We will miss him in Congress; however, the people in his congressional district will never forget he served his Nation and he served his people in Ohio well. We will all miss him.

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying a very well-deserved tribute here to a young man whom I consider to be probably my best friend in the Congress. We came together in the 83d Congress and have been associated rather closely since then. I have learned to appreciate tremendously this young man's ability, and I know that it is a loss not only to the Congress itself but to the country that OLLIE BOLTON has seen fit to leave us. In my opinion, he is the type of man that this country needs; a man of character and responsibility and integrity; a man who has been devoted to his job, and a man who stuck to his guns through thick and thin, I might say. Certainly, I want to join with the others, Ollie, in wishing that you would regain your full health, and at some future date to return to the Congress. I know that the people of your district will welcome that, and so will your colleagues in Congress. Good luck, Ollie.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I reemphasize and reiterate what has been said about you, Ollie. I think we are losing an invaluable Member of this House. It is my hope and trust that you can and will return here or elsewhere so that we and the people of Ohio will benefit from your experience, your integrity, and your ability.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, there are many thoughts that come to my mind, expressions from the heart, that I would like to give voice to in paying respects to this distinguished young man who is leaving us. Because of the circumstances and the lateness of the hour, I will refrain from giving expression to those feelings of sentiment. However, I do want to say what a treasure it has been to me, one of the outstanding experiences of my life. To have served in this great body with the distinguished father of this young man and then with his illustrious mother and now to have served with him is a great experience and treasure of my lifetime. I regret deeply that he is leaving us and I wish him Godspeed.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my regret at OLIVER BOLTON'S leaving this body. One of the greatest pleasures I have had during the last 2 years has been my acquaintance and association with him. I know that the Congress of the United States and the people generally will suffer a great loss by his failure to continue to serve in this body. We all wish him the best of luck in everything.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I join in the tributes being paid to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON]. It is unusual to be permitted to serve with the father, the mother, and then the son, especially when all have been so constructive. It is fortunate for the country to have given a father, a mother, and a son who are not only enjoyable but educational, I will say, to the rest of us, and I sincerely hope that when next we see him in public life it will be over in the other body, the Senate of the United States, where he should be now.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to add my thoughts to those already expressed. OLIVER BOLTON served on the Committee on Banking and Currency. He proved to be an able Congressman, a straight thinker, and a fearless speaker of his opinions. We respect him. We hate to lose him.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join in these tributes to our colleague, OLIVER BOLTON. I served with his father, Chester Bolton, in the Congress of the United States. He was a wonderfully fine man to him and to his mother and Oliver is a worthy successor. I remember the dean of the cathedral in Cleveland told me that there was no finer man anywhere than Chester Bolton or any man who did more for his church than Oliver's illustrious father. Those of you who are now in the Congress know of the great work of his mother, FRANCES BOLTON; her great patriotism, her great philanthropy. We also know of what OLIVER BOLTON himself has done. His fine war record and his independence here. I am not going to say "Farewell," Oliver, to you, because you will be back and give us advice, I know. You have not spared yourself since you were ill; you have never thought of yourself. Good luck to you, Oliver, and your family.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it has been my privilege to serve with OLIVER BOLTON'S father, a very distinguished and very useful legislator and a very lovable character. All of us know of the distinguished service of his very charming, gracious, and capable mother.

OLIVER BOLTON, to me, is one of the very distinguished and very useful young Members of Congress. I think I have not seen a man of his age so devoted to duty as he has been in his 4 years in Congress. He is going to be missed. I hope, and I believe, that his retirement from Congress will be the opening of a career of even greater usefulness.

We will miss you, Ollie.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion go by without adding my words to those that have been uttered here this evening as a farewell tribute to OLLIE BOLTON. He and I came to Congress at the same time. We have been rather closely associated since that time

in January of 1953. And the longer I have known him, the greater has my admiration become for him. And tonight I say, as he bids us farewell, that I could not love him more if he were my brother.

Throughout all the days and the years that are ahead, Ollie, I sincerely wish for you not only good health but all of the happiness and joy that you deserve.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join all those who have paid tribute to OLIVER BOLTON and endorse everything that has been said. I well recall when he first came to Congress and I met him, I knew at once he was a likable, lovable individual; but it was not long thereafter that I discovered he was a young man of tremendous ability, courage and patriotism. It has been a real joy and a pleasure to have served with him. I wish him well in all that he does and regret that he is leaving us.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with Oliver's very many friends in saying that having known you, Ollie, has made my own service in the Congress more worth while and certainly much more pleasant. I wish you Godspeed and know that as you have greater opportunities, you will measure up to them. Your State and our Nation will be a far better place in which to live because of you.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the entire Ohio delegation is sorry, indeed, that OLLIE BOLTON has decided to retire to private life. Of course, we from Ohio know the great service that the Bolton family, father, mother, and son, and brothers, has given to the State of Ohio and to their Nation. We know that even though Ollie is leaving the House of Representatives he will carry on the fine tradition of that fine family, that he will be serving his county, his State, and his Nation, wherever he may be, whatever he may be doing so long as he lieves.

We want him to come back, often.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the friends of OLLIE BOLTON and wish him Godspeed in his new endeavors. As a committee colleague, I have had the opoprtunity to be closely associated with him and to observe his ability. I regret that he decided to retire from Congress, because I think he had a promising career here. He has always exhibited intelligence and an alert devotion to duty to all matters that came before the committee. I am sure that he will be a success in whatever he attempts to do after he leaves the Congress.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my friends and the friends of OLIVER BOLTON in saying to him that we wish him Godspeed. I am sure God will be good to him and give him good health, success, and prosperity in whatever endeavors he engages in in his life.

Tonight we are reminded a bit of an adage in the Bible that says:

Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou hast been faithful in the few things. I shall see that you will be master of many.

We predict many good things of OLIVER BOLTON in the days to come.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the fine service that has been rendered to this House by OLIVER BOLTON. It is nothing new for the State of Ohio to have fine representation from the Bolton family. OLIVER'S father, Chester Bolton, was one of the great Congressmen from the State of Ohio. History will write the service that Chester Bolton has rendered to our State. The mother, FRANCES BOLTON, is outstanding in her service in this House. It has been grand to have the son of those two great servants of the public serve here with us during the last two terms. I am delighted to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in a great tribute to a fine statesman, a fine friend, and a great Ohioan, OLIVER BOLTON.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join in these remarks about OLIVER BOLTON. In my district, the 6th District of Florida, the Boltons hold a very full spot in our affection, for their family has lived there many years during the winter months. In the short time I have served here in the House I have come to know and respect OLIVER BOLTON as I had already known and my father had known before me his wonderful mother. I want to wish Oliver the best in all the years to come. We are going to expect to see a great deal of him in Florida.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with the friends of OLLIE BOLTON in this tribute to him in recognition of his outstanding service in this Congress. We in Maine are proud that in his heritage there are some of the traditions of Maine. At this time, Ollie, may I bring you the warmest wishes of the Maine delegation that your future years will be rich in reward and in the health and happiness which you so well deserve.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to serve one's country. It is even a greater privilege to serve one's country in the Congress of the United States. To leave it is exceedingly difficult, but in leaving may I say to each of my colleagues, my thanks to you for your friendliness, your cooperation, your help, and above all, as a citizen as well as your colleague, for your patriotism. May God be on your side in the work in this House in the future. Thank you again.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD with regard to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am sure that the House will understand when I say that I hesitated to agree to speak during these moments when a few Members expect to say a few words about the retiring Congressman from the 11th District of Ohio. As I thought it over and realized that this is a very unique moment in the entire history of the House of Representatives, I felt impelled to do so.

The first chapter began in Cleveland when my youngest stopped at my house on his way home one evening, whistled a family whistle which brought me to the door and with a broad smile said—"I just thought you would want to know I am running for Congress." With the same independence he wrote me—in November—I was in Africa—that he had decided to resign from the Congress.

It has been an interesting experience for us both. Few, if any, mothers have had the opportunity to become colleagues of their sons. Perhaps no mother in our Western World has had such an experience. Few if any sons have had the fun of finding in "Mother" an objective, constructive, hard-working colleague.

These have been fascinating years to us both—our lives will always be enriched by them—I am exceedingly happy to join with others in saying to my distinguished colleague from the 11th Ohio District that it has been a joy to serve with him, to share the stimulating challenge of his consecrated service here, and with the rest of you, I wish him well in the many years that lie ahead. That he will use his intelligence, his energy and his intense desire to see this great country of ours true to her traditions of freedom wherever he may serve, no one who knows him could doubt. I trust that he takes with him a deep sense of satisfaction in the work he has been able to do. He knows that he has won his spurs in perhaps the hardest school there is. He has been tried and not found wanting. Mr. Speaker, it is a great joy to me to share in these moments and to add my congratulations to the Congressman from Ohio's 11th District for the work he has done here and to wish him Godspeed in all he will do in the future.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I join my colleagues in paying warm and deserved tribute to Congressman OLIVER BOLTON, whom I am proud to call one of my closest friends.

Regrettably, this is the last House session in which Oliver will participate, and we will sorely miss him both as a devoted friend and as an able legislator. Yet at the same time we can rejoice with

him in the knowledge that he leaves the House by his own choice—for out of consideration for his personal health and for the security of his family, he has chosen to restrict his energies and talents to managing his varied personal business interests.

I have long known of the high regard in which Oliver has been held not only by his constituency in the 11th Ohio District, but also by the people of the entire State of Ohio, regardless of their political affiliations.

Having served at his side in Congress these past 2 years, I have observed, too, the respect he has earned for himself from both sides of the aisle, by virtue of his dedicated and unselfish service to the Nation. He has indeed brought added luster to his family name, which has for so long been associated with the finest in public service.

OLIVER BOLTON leaves the Congress with an established record of concrete achievement, at an age when many men are just beginning to aspire to a House seat. The Nation has profited immeasurably from his participation in this great legislative body these past 4 years, and can justifiably subscribe to our sentiments today as we, his colleagues and sternest judges, say to him in all sincerity, "Well done, Ollie."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of another session of this great Congress of the United States I rise to express my regrets that for so many of our colleagues this year marks the end of their service in this body.

It is a matter of particular regret to me that one of our finest young Members, OLLIE BOLTON, is among those voluntarily retiring from the House.

Let me hasten to add, however, that I appreciate his reasons and respect his decision.

I well remember the first meetings I had with the group of freshmen Congressmen on this side of the aisle shortly after the 83d Congress convened.

They were an enthusiastic group, eager to get on with a Republican program so that the 83d Congress, working with President Eisenhower, could fashion needed legislation for the well-being of the country.

No Member of that freshman group took his responsibilities more seriously than OLLIE BOLTON.

No Member proved himself more worthy of the trust that the people of his district had placed in him.

And I say these things as one who knows, having served as the majority leader in that Congress.

In his departure we are losing a fine young colleague and his constituents are losing an excellent public servant.

I understand that Ollie plans to resume his career in journalism and I know that as a newspaper publisher he will continue to serve the public ably and conscientiously.

For my part I am most sorry to see him go, but I wish him Godspeed, success, and a full measure of happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute to my good friend, OLLIE BOLTON.

He comes of good stock. I served with his father, Hon. Chester Bolton, in the Ohio senate and here in Congress. He was one of the finest men I ever knew. I have served with his mother, our colleague, on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for 17 years. She is a great woman. He has two fine brothers whom I know well, Charlie and Ken.

OLLIE BOLTON has added luster to the family name. After a fine record in World War II, and a career in business, he has made an outstanding record in his too few years here in Congress. His service has been characterized by industry, courage, and commensense. His retirement at this time in his career is a great loss to his district, our State, the Nation.

But he is still a young man.

Sometimes in a football game a star back goes out early in the game, only to return later to carry the ball in the last half.

I wish our colleague well in his retirement. I am comforted by the feeling that he will be back in the game later.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of the session one is especially aware of the value of friends—and the importance of friends. In the case of those retiring from Congress, as is OLIVER BOLTON, we realize all the more how much their friendship has meant to us all.

In the two terms in which he has served his district and his country with distinction, Ollie has been a devoted public servant—and a real friend. He has been blessed with many talents. We have all benefited from his unfailing good judgment, his understanding of the many problems which we all face, and from his ever-present—and invaluable—sense of humor. He has always been conscientious in discharging his responsibilities and yet he has never let his tireless energy interfere with his real interest in his friends and associates. Although he is retiring, I am confident he will continue to be actively engaged in worthwhile activities. On both sides of the aisle, I am sure, we wish him all kinds of happiness and good fortune.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, on this closing day of the 84th Congress, I am moved to extend my remarks in tribute to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON, who for reasons of his own has decided not to seek reelection to Congress.

Even though I am a freshman in Congress and have only known OLLIE BOLTON 1½ years, I have developed a friendship with him which I shall value, and a high regard and respect for him. The Congress is losing a good man, a fine legislator who has an excellent record, and I hope since he is still young and has a great future before him that he may some time return to Congress.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON, is voluntarily retiring from Congress. We need young men such as OLLIE BOLTON in our legislative halls. He is a hard worker, honest and has most capably represented his district during the period he has been in Washington. Although he has only been with us a short time, he has made an excellent record and has many accomplishments.

Mrs. McGregor joins me in extending to him and his family best wishes in whatever their endeavors might be.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with my colleagues in all the nice things they have said about OLIVER BOLTON. I had the privilege of serving with him on the Banking and Currency Committee, where he made a distinct contribution. He was always alert to the many problems which we considered in that committee.

Ollie was an able Congressman. He always seemed to be keenly interested in everything about him and exhibited his interest with a personality that made him a host of friends.

I sincerely regret that he is leaving Congress and wish him the best of luck.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a Clevelander and as a longtime friend of the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON, of the 11th District of Ohio, I regret his decision to retire from the Congress of the United States. As fellow members of the Banking and Currency Committee, we had a splendid opportunity to work with one another on the complexing legislative problems which have come before our committee. OLLIE was always on the job with clear, incisive questions relating to pending legislation. He was always cheerful and pleasant, never indicating the great problems which he faced as Congressman from the 11th District of Ohio. Although I am of a different political faith and philosophy, there were always great areas of agreement in our thinking.

OLLIE BOLTON has made a great contribution in his work as a Representative of his people. It is my hope that his withdrawal from public life is only temporary. Government will always need people like the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with my other colleagues in paying high tribute to OLIVER P. BOLTON, who does not seek reelection to the Congress. He has been an aggressive, fine legislator, and has served his constituents faithfully and well.

When the 19th District of Ohio was redistricted OLIVER BOLTON took over part of Trumbull and all of Ashtabula County, which I had formerly represented. He fully demonstrated his willingness to lend assistance in every possible manner.

It is my fervent prayer that his health will continue to improve and that he will find relaxation, success, and happiness in whatever field of endeavor he might choose.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that my good friend and colleague, OLLIE BOLTON, is not seeking reelection. We all hope the best of everything for him and look forward to the day when he will return to public life.

Speaking as one whose district adjoins his, I am confident I express the feeling of his constituents when I say, "You did a good job, OLLIE; we appreciate your efforts in our behalf."

We can all be thankful, however, that the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON is still with us. Congress without a Bolton

would be like a carriage without a horse. The contributions this family has made to America will never be forgotten.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I speak of the retirement of my good friend, Congressman OLIVER BOLTON, of Ohio, from Congress at the close of the current session.

OLLIE and I have been close personal acquaintances since we both came to Washington as freshman Congressmen in January of 1953. Our contacts were both on and off Capitol Hill and were uniformly pleasant and interesting. They were strengthened by the fact that we were both members of the same group of young Republican Congressmen who met weekly to consider and discuss problems of mutual legislative interest.

Congressman BOLTON was one of the most conscientious workers on Capitol Hill. His close attention to the many problems of his district and the long hours he cheerfully contributed to their solution undoubtedly helped to bring about his untimely illness last year from which we are all so grateful that he has recovered so splendidly. I should also say that, in addition to the duties of his constituency, his obligations arising from membership on two of the most important House committees were also fully complied with.

It is the hope of many of us that OLLIE BOLTON will be able, in the near future, to reenter public service. I know of no one in Congress of our age group that is more fully qualified for such a career. I join with his many friends on Capitol Hill in sorrow at his departure but in confidence that our good wishes go with him and that he will have a long and successful life, no matter in what direction he turns his talents.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, OLIVER P. BOLTON, is retiring from Congress, but he will never lose the warm friendships which he has made during the two terms he has served the people of the 11th District of Ohio. OLLIE is my personal friend, and it has been a pleasure to serve with him.

Mr. BOLTON comes from a distinguished family of public-spirited citizens. His father served in the House before him. His mother has ably represented the people of the 22d District of Ohio for the past 16 years. OLIVER P. BOLTON has made his mark in the Halls of Congress, and in every sense he measures up to the standards of performance set for him by a famous mother and father.

Few men who have served in the House of Representatives the brief period of 4 years have enjoyed the great popularity, and have won in such a short period of time the profound respect of their colleagues. Mr. BOLTON is a man of irreproachable integrity. By his keen and sympathetic understanding of the many problems which come to a Representative he has diligently and zealously served his constituency.

Nature endowed OLLIE BOLTON with a warm personality which has won him countless friends, and he has kept those friends by being steadfast. I wish him good health and good fortune in the future.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague, Hon. OLIVER BOLTON. OLLIE and I came to Congress at the same time and during the past 4 years, I have enjoyed his friendship and association. He has won for himself not only the respect of his colleagues, but a splendid reputation for intellectual capacity and courage. He will always be an inspiration and challenge to those of us who have known him and worked with him and we will remember him for the example of devotion to his constituency and his country which he has set.

I concur in the opinions expressed here tonight, that although OLLIE BOLTON is leaving the Halls of Congress, we will be hearing from him in the future. He has my sincere good wishes for future happiness and all of life's blessings.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends and colleagues has voluntarily decided to withdraw from public life. This would be tragic if I did not believe that the withdrawal is temporary. OLLIE BOLTON has too much dynamic energy, too much to offer, to place himself out of political circulation. It is all too rare on the American scene that someone like Ollie devotes this energy to service in behalf of the people.

His work in Washington will long be remembered. He has followed in the footsteps of already illustrious predecessors bearing the Bolton name. What more can be said than "Godspeed and hurry back."

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by OLLIE BOLTON that he will not seek reelection and that he plans to retire at the end of this term removes from the Ohio delegation a very able and conscientious Member of Congress.

It was my privilege to know his distinguished father, Hon. Chester Bolton, who served in Congress for five terms more than 20 years ago. OLLIE is a worthy son of a great father and has brought additional fame and luster to an outstanding Ohio Republican family. His mother, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, has been a Member of Congress since 1940.

As OLLIE BOLTON returns to his business interest in Ohio, I wish him abounding good health and much happiness.

FAREWELL TO RETIRING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to yield to two of my colleagues. I yield at this time to the gentleman from New York, a man that we on this side of the aisle have had the pleasure of serving with a long time. We admire his zeal, his industry, and the way he fights for the things he believes in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the gentleman from California and I appreciate what he said about me. However, I do not intend to talk about myself or my own interests at this time, or politics.

I want to say a word of appreciation of the service for over 20 years of RALPH GAMBLE of New York in the Congress. He has been one of my closest friends here. He has been on the Committee on Banking and Currency almost all that time and has done a remarkable job there. He is leaving and I hope in his retirement he will be able to enjoy life for a long time to come. I certainly wish him my best and the best of everything.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express genuine regret in bidding farewell to our distinguished friend from New York who has served with us in the House for so many years. His service here has been approximately the same length of time as mine. During that time I have come to recognize his fine qualities, his great patriotism, his loyalty and his conscientious efforts for the good of his people and for the good of his country. I am extremely sorry to know that he will no longer be with us. But in giving expression to that regret, I can also express the hope for him that there will be many years of good health and happiness for him to enjoy.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I also regret to see RALPH GAMBLE leave the Congress. I have served with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency all the time that I have been there and I am sure he has made a great contribution to the economy of this country in the service that he has rendered over the years on that great committee. We hope he will enjoy many, many years of health and happiness, and we regret to see him leave the halls of Congress, after having served with us so many years.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to concur with my great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to say that RALPH GAMBLE was one of the greatest members of the New York State Legislature, and because of the record he made up there, he was sent down here to Washington. Those of us who have been his close friends here and in Albany regret that he is leaving the Capitol and leaving this House. We all say to him we have not only appreciated his friendship and our association with him, but the record he leaves behind he can keep in his mind for many, many years to come. I join with all of you in hoping that Ralph has many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues, and the delegation from the State of New York, especially to pay tribute to the senior Congressman from Westchester County. That is one-half of Westchester County he represents, the other I represent. When I came here he did his best to see that I voted right, which meant voting with him so that the newspapers back home would think that we were two statesmen who saw alike. All through this time I have had the joy of that companionship.

I would like to tell the Members that RALPH GAMBLE comes from a line of distinguished public servants. His father was a Member of this House for two terms and a member of the Senate for two terms from South Dakota. His uncle was also a Member of this House before his father. So he has lived up to the tradition and I hope and expect that the Gambles coming after him will carry on. I know that we can all look forward to the association with Ralph back in Westchester where he came from, and we look forward to his long and useful service there. May he have a long life and God bless his efforts.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. I would like very much to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to RALPH GAMBLE. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I found him to be a man high in principles, high in ideals, outspoken in his convictions. He was a tower of strength.

I wish for him the very very best from here on. I regret that he is leaving the Congress.

Mr. TABER. I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for his graciousness in yielding to me.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to yield 10 minutes to a man on the Government Operations Committee with whom I have served for 10 years. This man is in my opinion one of the most remarkable men in the United States Congress. The zeal with which he tackles the problem at hand is remarkable.

He is 4 or 5 years older than I, but I can say that he is as hard a fighter as any man in the House, and although we have been on this committee for 10 years our personal relationship has been very friendly.

I follow him on the rollcall. My name is called after his. I can say that politically this is about the only place that I follow him.

But at this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the tribute paid by the good friend from California certainly is welcome, because in the years gone by I have heard sentiments of another kind—not all the time, but very frequently.

This seems to be the day to bid farewell to our comrades—I guess I better strike that—colleagues who are not being "liquidated" at the polls, but who are retiring voluntarily.

It is no more than right that something should be said about the service which has been rendered by two men from Michigan: I refer to our colleague, JESSE WOLCOTT, and our colleague, GEORGE DONDERO. Jesse has served here for some 26 years, George for 24. It is not necessary for Members on either side of the House to pay tribute to either of these gentlemen.

Jesse served in World War I. George has been fighting the battle for his people and home I think from the day he was born—at least from the day he was weaned; I will not go back farther than that, and they both rendered distinguished service in Michigan before they came here. Each one of them has a mind of his own.

George especially is an authority on Lincoln, and I have noticed that whenever Members of the House had an opportunity to speak to some large group, some great celebration where Lincoln was the topic, more than once instead of saying something of their own have called upon GEORGE DONDERO. And George has several very remarkable, instructive, very entertaining talks on the subject. So I bespeak for you any time you have occasion to make a talk on Lincoln, get George to do it for you rather than do it yourself.

We will miss these colleagues.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say that the second year I came here, 1944, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] took the well of the House and gave a lecture on the deportment of Members while in the Chamber. I have never forgotten the speech he made, because he told us many of the little things we were inclined to do unthinkingly: Glancing at newspapers, putting our feet on the back of the seat ahead of us, and other little things about which we sometimes become careless and do, not realizing that American citizens in the gallery are looking down upon us—I am speaking now from the standpoint of height—looking down on us and judging us by our actions and our postures and our speech. I have always been grateful for that speech the gentleman made, and while I probably violated some of the principles which he enunciated, I usually found myself thinking about it and tried to correct myself on the floor of the House.

In leaving the House of Representatives I wish for both gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. DONDERO] that the remainder of their lives will be spent in the happiest fashion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt but what many of us have learned a great deal from the lecture to which the gentleman from California referred to, and things that we needed to learn. I have not been able to religiously follow the advice, however, that he gave me. Sometimes it took us back to our schoolboy days. When we saw George coming we took our foot off the desk, or if we were slouching or talking, we just quit, because we knew what was coming. In that respect he has rendered a wonderful service to the House in presenting the House to the people as a dignified body, or something along that line.

As I stated before, we in Michigan and we of the Michigan delegation do not deem it necessary to eulogize each one of these gentlemen. Both have served as chairman of regular House committees, both have been faithful, loyal, and industrious. Michigan is going to lose two valuable members. They will be missed in the State, and they will be missed here, and no matter what the ability or the industry of their successes may be.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize it is not necessary for us to pay any personal tribute to men as prominent in this House of Representatives as are Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. DONDERO, but I would not want to let this moment pass without paying my own personal tribute to these two men.

I have served on the Committee on Banking and Currency with Mr. WOLCOTT for the last 4 years. During that time I have learned to respect very highly his intellectual capacity, his forthrightness, and his desire to do things in the right way.

I, too, have every respect for Mr. DONDERO.

I am sure we are going to lose two very able Members in their retirement.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. It has always been my feeling that second only to the personal satisfaction an individual has, the opportunity of rendering service to the public by membership in this body or the main reward or gift that a Member has, is the opportunity of serving with and being associated with persons of great character, great talent, great integrity and great patriotism. I can think of no two other persons who are greater, in my estimation, during my years of service than JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO. Both of them are gentlemen of the first order, both of them great legislators and effective legislators, both of them intensely patriotic citizens and both of them true servants of the public and genuine personal friends.

I deeply regret their leaving.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the services of these gentlemen.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we had a doctor in my district one time who made a speech and he said "Fishing is my platform." I have gone fishing with our dear colleague, Mr. WOLCOTT, several times. He started out calling me a sissy fisherman, but after we caught a lot of fish, he had the little ones and I had the big ones, he stopped calling me a sissy

fisherman. I think JESSE WOLCOTT is one of the ablest men that I have served with in the House of Representatives, and I have served with more than 3,000 men and women. I regret very much to see him go. And then along comes GEORGE DONDERO and others, and I am just wondering how the Republican side is going to look in the 85th Congress with their ability gone, or most of it. But, I do regret the leaving of JESSE WOLCOTT, who is my dear and devoted friend, and I am his. GEORGE DONDERO is a gentleman who knows as much about the rules as anybody that I know of in the House of Representatives, because very few people know much about the rules except the Parliamentarian of the House. Uncle Joe Cannon sat up there one time and somebody asked him a parliamentary inquiry. Asher Hinds was then the great Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, and Uncle Joe says "Asher says so and so," and that was it. There are very few good parliamentarians in the world, and I know of only one great one in the House of Representatives, and that is Lew Deschler. But, I could not let this moment pass without paying my respects and my affectionate regards to GEORGE DONDERO and JESSE WOLCOTT.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to like to join in this tribute to these two fine Congressmen who are retiring this year. It has been my privilege to be associated with JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO for over a quarter of a century. I know the tremendous loss that this means not only to the Republican Party but to the Congress and to the country. It is going to be a big loss as they are splendid men, men of great knowledge and served with distinction and ability. Their service to the country could never be calculated. JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO were two great chairmen when I was Speaker and we never had to worry about the legislation that came out of their committees. In their leaving I have lost two stout and loyal friends.

May I also say a farewell word to CLIFF HOPE, a great authority on agriculture. He was without a doubt the best informed man I have ever known here on agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to say a word of regret at the departure of RALPH GAMBLE. He is another old-time Member of this House who served with fidelity and patriotism, and it is a great regret to see him go, as well as the young gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON]. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], is another great loss, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING], who is retiring. He was a fine, patriotic Congressman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to Mr. RAYBURN.

Mr. RAYBURN. While I was on my feet I did not know that they had talked about that fine gentleman from New York [Mr. RALPH GAMBLE]. I never knew a finer man or a greater gentleman or an abler legislator than RALPH GAMBLE. I regret that he will not be here with us any more. I wish him Godspeed, and God bless him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to sit beside JESSE WOLCOTT on the Committee on Banking and Currency for a good many years, and anyone who has been closely associated with him could not help but have great admiration for him as a man and for his intellect. He has been an able, a conscientious and a great statesman.

Of course, I can look with indifference on the great loss which I know the Republican Party has sustained, but I do feel a sense of great loss at his going. I look upon him as a friend. There is no doubt that he has rendered a great service to his Nation and to the people of his State. Wherever he goes, I hope good luck will attend him and that honors await him which he greatly deserves.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I speak not as a partisan when I say that I have never heard Democrats praise Republicans so much in my life as they are being praised here today. I want to say that all of the great men who have been praised on the left side of the aisle are friends of mine, and I have enjoyed their friendship through the years.

JESSE WOLCOTT is a big man in every sense of the word. He is one man who I am sure is worth his weight in gold to the people of this Nation. I am sure that all of us value his friendship.

I can say the same for my friend, GEORGE DONDERO, whose friendship I have enjoyed and whose friendliness is known to all of us. We sustain a great loss when they leave this House. I know that at this hour of the day you do not want to hear a speech and I am not attempting to make a speech. But when I even think of making a speech I am reminded of the time when they were having a hanging down in Tennessee. The platform had been erected, the scaffold was there, the rope was ready, and the sheriff of the county turned to the man and said to him, "Under the laws of the great State of Tennessee it now becomes my duty to advise you that you have the right to make a speech for 10 minutes and say anything you want to say." A great multitude had assembled for the execution. The condemned man told the sheriff that he did not desire to make a speech. Out in the audience there happened to be a candidate for Congress. He said, "Sheriff, if the gentleman does not care to use his time, I will be glad to make a speech myself." Whereupon the sheriff asked the condemned man if he had any objection. He said, "No, I don't have any objection, but I have one request." And the sheriff said, "What is that?" and the man said, "Hang me before the man starts talking."

I know you do not want to hear a speech, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying that I do regret that these able and distinguished statesmen and parliamentarians on my left are leaving this Chamber. Likewise I regret to see two of my beloved friends from North Carolina leaving the service of their country, Mr. WOODROW WILSON JONES and Mr. ERTEL CARLYLE. Both are brilliant lawyers. They have served in this House magnificently. I do not know anyone who has more diligently applied himself and more faithfully discharged the duties of his office than WOODROW WILSON JONES and ERTEL CARLYLE.

WOODROW WILSON JONES is voluntarily leaving the service to go back to the practice of his profession. I am sure he will be even more successful in the years ahead than he was before he came here. Mr. ERTEL CARLYLE is a close personal friend and a college fraternity mate of mine.

He, too, is going back to the practice of law, and he, too, is a brilliant lawyer.

I think that our Nation can ill afford to lose the really true statesmanship that we are now losing, because in the days ahead I believe our Nation should have the best and the most brilliant representation from every district in this great country that can possibly be provided. I know that North Carolina is sustaining a loss when ERTEL CARLYLE and WOODROW JONES walk out of this Chamber tonight. I wish them Godspeed and assure them of my friendship and high esteem. I shall look forward to seeing them frequently in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to sincerely associate myself with the dean of my delegation, Mr. COOLEY, in expressing my admiration and respect for ERTEL CARLYLE and WOODROW JONES, who are this evening answering their last rollcalls. They will take with them not only my best wishes but I bespeak for them both and their families every choice blessing.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see our friends and colleagues take leave of the Congress. They are able men, warm friends, and great Americans.

Their departure brings out to me for the first time in my 6 years in this House an interesting point on the way we work. Perhaps it is because of the design of the Chamber.

The shape of this Chamber underscores the sentiment of Benjamin Franklin. He held that it is for us here to consult and not to contend. We contend at the polls. The people judge the issues and the men and vote their convictions.

The shape of this Chamber is a semicircle. We sit in rows that follow from one end of the Chamber to the other. We face the man who addresses us. We do not face each other as do members in the House of Commons in England. We are indeed different.

Our semicircle forms 180°. This means that on any vote, the people of the United States who sit, symbolically, in the other 180° of the circle, hold, by their vote, the final say on what we do here every 2, 4, and 6 years. Every 2 years the

people vote their sentiments on the Members of the House. Every 4 years they vote their sentiments on the President. Every 6 years, a Senator stands for approval or disapproval by his State.

This makes our people sovereign. By their right to vote they hold the power over the Congress and the Executive, who in turn appoints members to the Supreme Court for life.

Thus, we in this House are on a stage. The citizens of the United States are in the audience. We, by our votes, indicate. The audience, by returning us or rejecting us, adjudicate. The word of the people is final every 2, 4, and 6 years. Americans are great sports. They are great referees. They call them as they see them every 2, 4, and 6 years.

That is why they want the issues rolled out full and fair; and the men behind the issues do that, as our colleagues who take leave today, have done that with all their hearts. We shall miss them.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think that the above observations disclose why it would be so very, very difficult, almost impossible, would it not, to overthrow our Government by force and violence?

For to overthrow our form of government by force and violence would mean that our people, each voter, would, in effect, have to be destroyed.

Each of us in the Congress is replaceable. If one of us falls, hundreds stand ready, nay thousands stand ready to take our place. Recent shooting in the House Chamber brought that out. We could, each of us, have been wiped out. We would have been replaced in short order had we been killed.

Ingrained in the American tradition is the admonition of our forefathers, those 56 gallant giants who signed the Declaration of Independence; in effect, this great American tradition says: "Speak for yourself. Stand on your own feet. Vote your convictions. Fight for your life and your country if you must; but fight."

Our departing colleagues have fought the good fight. Godspeed to them and their families, gallant Americans. Goodby all.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to several of our colleagues and friends of several years' service together in the House. Those of our colleagues who are retiring from and leaving the Congress.

I especially want to mention my friend CHARLIE DEANE, whom we have all grown to admire and respect for his true Christian character and genuine worth. He will be missed but we all, I know, wish for him much happiness and every future success.

My high regard and admiration and affection is also extended to our colleagues F. E. CARLYLE, WOODROW W. JONES, and THURMOND CHATHAM, of North Carolina, and also our friend, Congressman BRADY GENTRY, a genteel Texan.

On the other side of the isle, I extend my best wishes to my friend, Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS, of California. It has been my fine privilege to be able to serve JOHN PHILLIPS on the Independent Offices Appropriation subcommittee. There is no more persuasive and able legislator than JOHN PHILLIPS. He will be missed and I know we all wish for him good health and happiness in his retirement.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend best wishes to Michigan's distinguished senior Congressman, GEORGE DONDERO, who is also retiring. Mr. DONDERO is known as "Mr. Gentleman" of the House, in deportment, but in battle he is a relentless foe—in any battle. He is a champion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project for which he fought diligently and contributed much in a legislative way to make it a reality.

We shall miss our friend Congressman DONDERO as we shall miss all of our other departing colleagues. Their services shall be missed by the Nation. I wish them all good fortune, good health, and unalloyed happiness.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is no other word in the English language more difficult for me to say than "farewell" to a departing friend. But divine providence in infinite wisdom has rightly decreed that all things must come to pass and so it is that the day often arrives when close and intimate friends must bid each other adieu. That day has now come upon us in this House and it is therefore with a feeling of genuine sadness that I turn to bid my dear friend, ERTEL CARLYLE, goodby. I have known many men in my lifetime and I have observed them under difficult and trying situations. But without doubt I have never known a man who could face sunshine and shadow like ERTEL CARLYLE and yet remain constant.

Mr. Speaker, ERTEL CARLYLE is one of those rare persons we meet in life's journey who by sheer force of character and goodness of soul endears himself to all men. I have never heard anyone say an unkind word about his character or ability. What greater tribute can we say about any man? Regardless of the time, the place, or the circumstance, Ertel has always carried a smile upon his lips and a word of encouragement for his friends. During his tenure in the Congress, Ertel has been faithful to duty and friend alike and I know I voice the sentiments of all who have been privileged to know and serve with him when I say that he will be sorely missed in this body. He has labored long and hard for the welfare of his constituents and he has ever been faithful to the responsibilities of his high office.

My life has been enriched and blessed by knowing ERTEL CARLYLE. I shall miss him in the days to come but I shall never forget him. In future days our paths will surely cross and I will indeed rejoice in greeting my friend.

God be with you until we meet again.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, when the gavel falls to indicate sine die adjournment of the 84th Congress, it will bring to a close the distinguished congressional career of my friend, ERTEL CARLYLE. Ertel will take back with him to Lumberton, N. C., all of the satisfactions that flow from outstanding public service.

It has been a great privilege to have had the opportunity to serve here with ERTEL CARLYLE during the last 4 years. I have been greatly impressed by his conscientious devotion to duty and by the able manner in which he has discharged the responsibilities of his high office. He has earned the confidence, respect, and esteem of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Ertel served with distinction on one of the most important committees of the House, the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and much important legislation came out of that committee. Due to the tremendous growth of Government in the last quarter century, Members of Congress cannot possibly keep abreast of all of the activities of the various committees and we must of necessity rely upon those who serve on committees other than our own. Frequently I have gone to Ertel for advice on matters pending before his committee and on legislation cleared by his committee for House action. He always responded freely and generously and I could count on any advice from him being sound and sincere.

In the retirement of ERTEL CARLYLE, the country is losing the service of a dedicated public servant, a man of outstanding ability, and one who has demonstrated by his service in the House a profound devotion to country, State, and district. As he ends his distinguished career in this body, he will take with him the affectionate regard of all of his colleagues and our best wishes for a long life filled with health and a full measure of joy and happiness.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the other Members of the House of Representatives in congratulating my good friend, ERTEL CARLYLE, on the fine service he has rendered the people of North Carolina and the United States during his 10 years as a Member of this body.

Congressman CARLYLE'S district joins mine for approximately 100 miles and we have worked on numerous mutual problems with complete unity during the past 10 years. I can remember very distinctly the tremendous efforts Congressman CARLYLE made in behalf of the people of North Carolina in having the United States engineers approve the Waccamaw River drainage project which traverses the lower part of his district and completely crosses my district. I feel that Congressman CARLYLE'S services in this instance were worth more to the people of North Carolina than the entire salary he received for the 10 years he has been a Member of this House.

Congressman CARLYLE is a hard-working, Christian gentleman, and is one of the finest lawyers in the Congress. I will greatly miss him as a friend and a coworker during the next Congress. His services will be greatly missed by every Member of the House as he joined in on numerous occasions in solving problems not only for the Nation but the entire world.

I certainly hope Congressman CARLYLE will completely regain his health and enjoy a lucrative and pleasant law practice during the future years. I am certainly happy to consider Congressman CARLYLE as one of my closest personal friends.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure and privilege to have had the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with ERTEL CARLYLE, and it is with a sincere feeling of regret that I realize he will leave the House of Representatives at the close of this session of Congress.

ERTEL CARLYLE has been an able and faithful member of the committee. His ability, experience, and sound advice has been unusually helpful in the work of the committee. He will be greatly missed as his assistance has always been most worth while.

At all times, during his membership in the House, he has been most anxious to represent the constituency of his congressional district in a manner that would bring to each of them the greatest possible good. He has always been zealous in promoting their welfare and all that pertained to their well-being.

Not only has the service of ERTEL CARLYLE been of an outstanding and challenging character, but he has shown at all times a spirit of friendliness to his fellow Members that has endeared him to all, both Democrats and Republicans. It is our hope that the days and years ahead will be filled with health, happiness, and success for him.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has lost a most able legislator and lawyer from their congressional delegation in the person of the Honorable F. ERTEL CARLYLE.

It was my pleasure to serve with this gentleman in this legislative body for the past 10 years during which time he more than once demonstrated his ability in legislative matters. The service which he has rendered to not only the people of the Seventh District of North Carolina, but to the people of the United States, is a matter of record.

I sincerely wish that he will enjoy a most lucrative law practice during his coming years and hope that some day he will once again serve with us here in the Congress.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO have inspired me during my 10 years of service to constantly seek to improve my craftsmanship as a Member of this House. I am grateful for their long and faithful service. They know of my personal interest in their great State. I do not know when we will meet again. It comes to me to suggest that perhaps it might be on Mackinac Island. Best wishes Jesse and so long, George.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying a just tribute to GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan, who is retiring after 29 years of faithful and patriotic service in this House.

George served as a member of the special congressional committee which investigated the Katyn Forest massacre. As the Members know we held hearings in this country, in England and Europe. I, as chairman of this committee, had a close association with him and observed firsthand his great ability as a legislator. He was the mainspring and balance wheel on this important committee. His services and ability contributed more than I can review here tonight to the great success of the work of the Katyn Massacre Committee.

I wish to him many years of happiness, good health, and long life.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that with the adjournment of this session of Congress the service of many distinguished Members of this House will close.

I would like to make individual reference to each of them. However, the time afforded permits me to only make reference to a few, those with whom I have been more closely associated with—I refer to the following:

CLIFFORD HOPE

CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, came to membership in the Congress at the same session of the 70th as I did. During these approximately 30 years of service it has been a privilege and a pleasure to have been in close and understanding friendship with him. During all these years he has been uniformly courteous and modest. He has shown a knowledge of agriculture and its needs that has made him an outstanding source of knowledge and wisdom in dealing with the difficult problems that have confronted us throughout all the years he has served in the House. His counsel and advice have been most helpful at all times. We shall miss him and as he leaves us he carries with him our high regard and best wishes for health, happiness, and success.

JESSE WOLCOTT

JESSE WOLCOTT came to the Congress at almost the same time that I did. No Member has ever served in this House who has shown a greater knowledge of the subject of banking, finance, and sound economy and the kindred subjects within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee than JESSE WOLCOTT.

His careful and close study of the problems that came before the committee on which he served and the sound recommendations and views he expressed on the floor of the House in debate, commanded the attention of his colleagues at all times. No one was given closer attention when addressing the House than JESSE WOLCOTT. He was a tower of strength and has made a contribution to sound financial stability that has enabled our county to progress upon a safe and sure basis. He goes from this House at the peak of usefulness. Consequently, he will be greatly missed. We have needed men of his character and ability, and will always need such. It will be difficult to fill the place he leaves vacant. Our best wishes follow him wherever his path may lead.

RALPH GAMBLE

RALPH GAMBLE has stood beside JESSE WOLCOTT on the Committee on Banking and Currency and worked hand in glove with him in solving the intricate questions of banking and finance. Quiet and modest at all times, he has served with fidelity and ability. He was always zealous in advocating and supporting principles that make a sound basis for progress in our great country. He never wavered in his adherence to such principles, and, at all times he showed a zealous interest in the work of the important committee on which he served, and attended the sessions of the House with great regularity. We shall miss him as he goes forth from our midst. We wish him well in whatever may claim his interest in the days of retirement. May health, happiness and success be his in large measure.

GEORGE DONDERO

GEORGE DONDERO has in no unmistakable way shown himself to be a gentleman of the old school in every sense of the word—always courteous and polite. Never has he ever said one word that would hurt the feelings of any Member. Always ready and willing to help each and every Member of the House in whatever way he could.

Aside from the ability that GEORGE DONDERO has always shown in the committee on which he served, and on the floor of the House, he has always been a stickler for adherence to the rules of the House and for a decorum that made for dignity in the conduct of the business of the House.

It has also been a rare privilege to have had the opportunity of hearing his stories and interesting incidents in the life of Abraham Lincoln. This was a subject that claimed his constant study and attention, and he was ever ready and willing to give of his knowledge in this respect to his fellow Members.

GEORGE DONDERO will be missed, as he leaves this House, by everyone who has known and been associated with him during the many years he has served as a Member of Congress. In the days ahead it is our wish that his cup of happiness will be brimful and running over.

OLIVER BOLTON

I have not known OLIVER BOLTON as long as I have the others to whom I have referred, but it has been sufficiently long for me to recognize that he is a young man of strong character, sound judgment and great ability and sincerity.

I knew and served in this House with his distinguished father, Chester Bolton, and I have had the pleasure and privilege of serving with his distinguished mother in the work of the Congress, and she is still a Member.

It has been a great distinction for father, mother, and son to serve in the House of Representatives, and particularly for mother and son to serve at the same time.

I regret that OLIVER BOLTON has decided to leave this House at the close of this session. It is my opinion that he would have been one of the leaders of great usefulness in the work of his Nation in this House had he found it possible to continue his service. We wish him well in the days and years ahead. I trust that he may enjoy health, happiness, and success.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with many other colleagues to express regret that JESSE WOLCOTT is leaving Congress. He has been an outstanding personality in the years that I have been a Member of this distinguished body. Rarely have I disagreed with his position on matters that came within the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. WOLCOTT

had the unusual ability to analyze a legislative problem and then to set forth his views in clearly understandable language. There was never any doubt when he completed an argument that the membership of the House understood his position.

His leadership will be missed. The people of the State of Michigan will perhaps miss him more than we do because he was an outstanding legislator. On the other hand, he has today established himself as a national personality by virtue of his grasp of banking and currency problems as they affect the welfare of the Nation. So his departure from this body creates a void not only in the Michigan delegation but truly it is a national loss. Men of his ability and stature are not numerous in public life. He has given of the best years of his life to public service and he has earned a very deserved respite from legislative responsibilities.

JESSE WOLCOTT, Mr. Speaker, also served with honor and valor as a soldier in World War I. It was my privilege to have been a member, along with him, of the first officers training camp at Fort Sheridan, Ill., established in 1917. For 90 days we trained intensively to become second lieutenants in Uncle Sam's Army in a war that was to save the world for democracy. Here, also, JESSE WOLCOTT made an outstanding record as a soldier. So we have in this man a personification of soldier and statesman.

We shall miss you, Jesse, but our prayers and good wishes go with you for continued health and happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have come to know GEORGE DONDERO quite intimately. For the past 4 years it has been my privilege along with other Members of this body to meet in the House Cafeteria at 8 o'clock each morning for breakfast. There we settled many problems of the day. There it was that we contended for certain points of view on certain issues that were about to be considered. There it was in friendly fashion we needled each other about votes cast the previous day on a certain bill.

Mr. Speaker, right now I can see GEORGE DONDERO approaching the breakfast table with his tray of food. His first question to us always was "Well, gentlemen, who is abusing us today?" George was expressing a question that Abraham Lincoln always addressed to his cabinet whenever they met. So I shall always remember that question and the pleasant association with this man, not only at the breakfast table, or around the round table in the House Restaurant but as an outstanding legislator on the floor of this House.

As chairman during the 83d Congress of that great Committee on Public Works, he assumed tremendous responsibilities but he met them without flinching. Many times he was compelled to vote his convictions rather than vote for specific legislation. He was always in the forefront to consider the effects of every bill upon the welfare of our Nation. His has never been a narrow provincial attitude but rather one of broad outline.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget him as he would go down into the well of the House at least once a year and admonish us regarding the rules of the House, especially as they related to our conduct while on the floor. No man, in my opinion, knew and understood the rules of the House in this regard as well as my dear friend from Michigan. No Member of this House ever took offense at the manner of his "preaching" to us on the rules. He was always dignified, kindly, yet deadly earnest as he pled with us to obey so that the visitors in the gallery would go away with a good impression of the House of Representatives. We confess today, Mr. Speaker, that many of us have failed to follow George but we admit the wisdom of his advice.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE DONDERO is also an intense patriot. I dare say that no man in this body is more devoted to the ideals which undergirded our great Nation than he. Certainly, no one is better informed about the causes for the great Civil War between the States and the war itself than Mr. DONDERO. He is a national authority on Abraham Lincoln and is greatly sought after as a speaker from many points throughout the Nation.

Shortly after coming to Congress, in 1941, my very good friend drove Mrs. Smith and myself to Gettysburg, where, on a personally conducted tour, he pointed out the interesting historic spots in the great battle of the Civil War, a battle which perhaps turned the tide of victory for the Union forces. Mr. DONDERO is recognized by the guides in Gettysburg as being better informed than they, and they all know him and speak affectionately of his very great knowledge concerning the Gettysburg battlefield. It was a rare opportunity for us to have accompanied him on that trip.

We will miss GEORGE DONDERO in this body. His departure means a personal loss to me, but, more important than that, the great State of Michigan will miss him also, as will the Nation.

I can only wish him Godspeed and a pleasant respite from the arduous duties of a congressional Representative. May God be with him always.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I was assigned to the Subcommittee on Roads. On that subcommittee was a member who is voluntarily retiring from Congress. It did not take us long to recognize the ability, the patience, and the willingness to be of service of JESSE WOLCOTT, the gentleman from Michigan.

Since that time I have really become acquainted with JESSE WOLCOTT and his very fine wife. They are great Americans and certainly their records will go down in history for their many friends to look at with admiration. As Speaker RAYBURN has said, Congressman WOLCOTT, affectionately known as Jesse, has been one of the outstanding lawmakers of this period. His ability has not only been recognized in this Congress but throughout the country.

We will miss JESSE WOLCOTT, Mr. Speaker, but certainly our blessings and good wishes go with him wherever he goes.

Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress adjourns, we realize that many ties will be broken. For many years, Mr. Speaker, I have been closely associated with the Honorable GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan, who is voluntarily retiring from public office. He has been chairman of the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member. He has been the guiding hand, always being courteous and giving consideration to his fellow men.

Congressman DONDERO is a great American, a gentleman, and a scholar of the highest order. He has completed 50 years of public service. He will be missed in these legislative halls, but I am certain that many will continue to seek his guidance and help in ironing out the difficult problems. To you, GEORGE DONDERO, and your family, we wish the very best of everything.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there have been few men in the Congress who have had a broader grasp of American economics than JESSE WOLCOTT. His service on the Banking and Currency Committee has been brilliant. Not only that, Jesse has a keen sense of humor that has endeared him to everyone who knows him.

We wish Jesse and his wife every success in the years to come. He richly deserves every good to come his way.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress I became a member of the old Rivers and Harbors Committee, and it was there that my friendship for the gentleman from Michigan, GEORGE DONDERO, first started. I soon learned to respect his sound judgment, his spirit of fair play, and his devotion to this country. He aided me in many ways and gave me much help in the work we were both engaged in.

GEORGE DONDERO'S service in the House has been outstanding and he has always enjoyed the respect and admiration of his colleagues. He is a real gentleman, and, in his courteous way, has tried to teach us all good manners and respect for the traditions of the House of Representatives.

GEORGE DONDERO'S retirement is a loss for us all and the Nation is losing an experienced legislator who is free from bigotry, intense in patriotism, and devoted to the highest standards of statesmanship. May his days to come be filled with God's rich blessings, and I trust that he will find time to return to the Capital from time to time and keep fresh the bonds of affection which his colleagues have for him.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us are proud to have had the privilege of working with GEORGE DONDERO.

Human, kind, thoughtful of others, courteous—George's attributes, coupled with his intelligent approach to the multitude of legislative responsibilities that have come his way, make his service in the Congress one in which we all rejoice.

We wish George and Mrs. Dondero every good in the years to come.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express one's self about the loss of JESSE WOLCOTT to the House of Representatives. His devotion to the principles of free government and the promotion of the free enterprise system in our economy are outstanding and always command the sincere respect of all

who know him. Never a demagog, he approached each problem with a keen mind and real vision, and in simple, sincere language presented his arguments with clarity and persuasion. No one ever had any doubt about the gentleman's views and his position on any subject under discussion.

With it all, JESSE WOLCOTT has a warmth of character tinged with a sublety of humor which wins him many friends who cherish deep affection and admiration for him and the principles for which he stands. His loss to the House as well as to the Nation will be great, and if the good wishes of his friends have any effect, his days to come will be filled with the best things of life.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute that is being paid to GEORGE DONDERO in his retirement from Congress. As both the chairman and ranking member of the Public Works Committee, Mr. DONDERO has always been friendly and helpful to me on the committee during our 6 years of service together. He is an able legislator who will be missed greatly in the House of Representatives.

GEORGE DONDERO will also be missed greatly in Washington by his friends and fellow members of the Washington Civil War Round Table. He has been a leader in this organization and has done a great deal to promote proper research and scholarship about the war for southern independence.

Representative DONDERO is without a doubt one of the outstanding present-day authorities on Lincoln. One of the highlights of the past year's program of the Civil War Round Table was his entertaining address on sidelights in the life of Lincoln.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, GEORGE A. DONDERO, has decided to retire from Congress after a distinguished career of 24 years of devoted, unselfish, and constructive public service. He will be missed by all of his many friends in Congress.

It was my pleasure to serve as one of an investigating group of which Mr. DONDERO was cochairman. He proved himself to be a most congenial and considerate traveling companion, who was always most solicitous of his colleagues' comfort and well-being. It was this same spirit which endeared him to all the Members of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO is a man of vision and foresight, who took seriously the trust his constituents placed in him. He served them ably and worked diligently for their best interests. He has high political principles, and it is to his everlasting credit that he stood by them. His record in Congress is a consistent one, and he can look back over the past 24 years of public service with great satisfaction.

I join with other Members in wishing GEORGE DONDERO many years of health, happiness, and contentment as he retires from the active political arena to enjoy a richly deserved retirement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 10 minutes, because my time is about to expire, and I have promised to yield to certain gentlemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasant thing to rise to say we have certainly enjoyed the fine friendship and the working together with people of ability as well as friendliness such as JESSE WOLCOTT, GEORGE DONDERO, RALPH GAMBLE, JIM RICHARDS, CLIFF HOPE, KARL KING, THURMOND CHATHAM, and a host of our fellow Members. We are sorry that a good man from Pennsylvania, also a good friend of mine, is leaving us, KARL KING, who stands up squarely and says what he thinks; DICK RICHARDS, chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, is certainly competent and friendly. You who have worked with these men know they are not only friendly but have been helpful to the young Members coming on. There will be a real spot missing when they leave. We are sorry to see these fine friends leave the House, but not from our recollection, friendship, and memories.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year, as usual, we have the same thing happen. I have had the privilege of serving here with many Members who have decided they can conserve and enjoy life back home. I certainly hope they can.

There is my good friend from Michigan, GEORGE DONDERO, whom I usually refer to as "Doctor," because he has always impressed me as being a doctor and not a Congressman. Also I think you all regret the leaving of JESSE WOLCOTT, who, in my opinion, has been one of the most valuable men ever to serve since I have been here in the House.

Also RALPH GAMBLE, from New York, whom we, of course, hate to see leave the House because of his valuable service here.

As to OLIVER BOLTON, let me say this. In 1938 I came back on a military plane and his father came back on a private plane. Of course we all know of the accident in which he was killed. I have always felt a very close relation to the family because of that fact.

We have in the State of North Carolina two very distinguished men who are leaving these halls and for whom we certainly wish joy in their lives. We hate to lose their services here—F. ERTEL CARLYLE, whose service here has been distinguished, a man who has shown ability and statesmanship and integrity while he has served in Congress. We also hate to see our good friend, WOODROW WILSON JONES, leave here. WOODROW WILSON JONES carries a distinguished name. He is young. He has ability, and he has distinguished himself here in the Halls of Congress. We regret to lose his services. North Carolina, of course, will lose their services here in the Congress, as well as their great ability. I wish them Godspeed and wish them a useful life back home—all of them—Members on the left and Members on the right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO, and, of course, my associates from North Carolina, F. ERTEL CARLYLE and WOODROW JONES.

I remember on a fishing trip, where there were eight or nine or ten Members of Congress. JESSE WOLCOTT was there. We all put up a small amount of money for whomever got the first and the largest fish. JESSE WOLCOTT got one little fish. The game warden said he ought to put it back in the water. He said, "No, hold it." That turned out to be the only fish caught on the trip.

Mr. Speaker, they are all delightful men. I could stand up here for an hour and extol and enumerate their many virtues and the value of their service to our Nation and this House of Representatives and the Congress as a whole. But it would be a repetition of all the fine things that have been said about them. I shall miss them all. I shall miss each one of them. And, naturally, you know that I shall especially miss my two colleagues from North Carolina, Mr. CARLYLE and Mr. JONES. To all of them I wish the best the world offers. I wish they live long and happy lives and have rich happiness throughout their remaining years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, if you are from Michigan you realize that when GEORGE DONDERO and JESSE WOLCOTT leave this Congress it is a great loss to the State of Michigan and a great loss to the Nation. We are sorry to see them go. I am happy to have had the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency with Mr. WOLCOTT, and I hope that I can always represent the district which I represent now, which was once represented by Mr. DONDERO, as well as he represented it.

Mr. Speaker, we wish them well.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] may extend his remarks at this point, as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER], to pay their tribute to the gentlemen who have been so highly eulogized here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable personal regret that I feel compelled to comment on the fact that this Congress and particularly the North Carolina delegation is losing four fine Members from its rolls at the close of this term: the Honorable THURMOND

CHATHAM, the Honorable ERTEL CARLYLE, the Honorable CHARLES DEANE, and the Honorable WOODROW JONES. I have known all of these fine gentlemen many years. Two of them, the Honorable ERTEL CARLYLE and the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, were college mates of mine.

Their distinguished service in the Halls of this Congress is a matter of record and something that their constituency, as well as the American people, can well be proud. No question of integrity, loyalty, or devotion to service has ever been raised by anyone either on this floor or in political campaigns.

The Honorable WOODROW JONES is retiring from Congress of his own free will and accord. The other three distinguished gentlemen were defeated; but in defeat as in victory they were gentlemen, good sports, appreciative of the many fine things their constituency had done for them. Best of all they were men enough even though defeated not to have bitterness but had hearts full of appreciation for the many fine friends they had made and still possess after many years of public service.

Many fine complimentary things have been said on the floor of this House in the behalf of the Honorable CHARLES DEANE and the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, in all of which I concur. In the rush of the closing hours neither the North Carolina delegation nor many of the Members of the House who would like to pay tribute to the Honorable WOODROW W. JONES and the Honorable ERTEL CARLYLE have had the opportunity to express themselves. This I would like to do at this moment, for I have a very genuine regard and affection for ERTEL CARLYLE and WOODROW JONES.

Both are fine gentlemen, both sturdy and dependable, both conscientious, effective and honorable legislators, who never for one moment have ever permitted selfish gain, desire for continuation in office or political prominence permitted their clear vision of their duty, their loyalty to their country or their duty to the people whom they represented to be dimmed. They are great Americans. They will continue to contribute much to this great Nation.

May God grant them long and happy lives and the continued love and respect to their host of admirers throughout the United States.

The 4 gentlemen referred to are my friends. I am sure the 4 gentlemen who will succeed them, all of whom I know, are not only fine but able gentlemen, for the people in the districts heretofore represented by their predecessors are loyal Americans, who love good government and intended to send as good Representatives as they have heretofore enjoyed.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, we regret that our friend, WOODROW W. JONES, is voluntarily withdrawing from the Congress. I have known WOODROW JONES for a number of years and welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to his fine work here.

WOODROW JONES was born and reared in Rutherford County, N. C., where he early learned the true value of things. He acquired his education in the public schools of the county of his birth and he secured his law degree at Wake Forest College. Following service in the United States armed services during World War II he returned to his hometown of Rutherfordton to engage in the practice of law. In that field he was unusually successful.

I served in the North Carolina General Assembly with WOODROW JONES. In that legislative body he made an enviable name for himself. Because of his steadfast adherence to his high ideals and principles, and his conscientious efforts on behalf of his constituents, he endeared himself to the people of North Carolina.

Here in the Congress WOODROW JONES has an outstanding and distinguished record. He has represented well the American people in his courageous discharge of his duties and thereby has brought honor to his State and the district he represents.

The Congress of the United States will suffer a great loss when Congressman JONES retires. I do not know that he will ever be interested in a public office again, but I do know that he will always be vitally interested and active in public affairs. By this interest I am sure that he will continue to render valuable service to the people of this Nation.

WOODROW JONES is a warm personal friend of mine. I admire him and will miss him tremendously here in Washington. I wish for him and his lovely family a very happy life.

Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 84th Congress several of the members of the North Carolina delegation will complete their congressional service. Among the members of our delegation who will not return to the 85th Congress is the Honorable ERTEL CARLYLE.

Ertel has rendered distinguished service in this body and has brought honor to his State and district. I hold Ertel in affectionate regard. He is a man endowed with sound judgment which for the past several years he has used for the benefit of all of the American people. His integrity and honesty of purpose in his life and legislative work here has been admired by all. Truly he is a great American. I will miss ERTEL CARLYLE. He is a good friend of mine. I wish for him continued success and happiness as he returns to private life.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound sadness that I rise to say farewell to my good friend, WOODROW JONES, who is voluntarily retiring from the Congress at the end of this session. I have known WOODROW JONES for many years and we have always been close personal friends. We have served together in the North Carolina General Assembly and have been active together in the affairs of the Democratic Party in North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I know, probably better than any other Member of this House, the character and personal worth of WOODROW JONES. And knowing him as I do, I realize the great loss we will sustain in the Congress by his departure. At this critical stage in American history, when our country demands the very best that is in our national character, we can ill afford to lose in public service men of the caliber of WOODROW JONES. His devotion to the basic principles upon which this Government functions, is as strong with him today as it was with his early American forebears in their struggle for liberty. He has demonstrated in this House and before the country the courage to do the right as he has seen the right. He has voted his convictions on every occasion and has never violated his conscience. I have often sought his advice and never has he counseled political expediency. In these days of stress and change, WOODROW JONES has stood as a bulwark of courage and personal integrity. We may have had doubts where others stood but there has never been a question as to the position WOODROW JONES would take. Invariably we have found him standing where the best interest of his country reposed.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to select two words to best describe WOODROW JONES, I would choose the words courage and integrity. Of such is the character of great Americans.

As Woodrow returns to his beloved North Carolina, I wish for him with all the sincerity at my command my very best wishes for his future health, happiness, and prosperity. We shall meet again many times on life's broad highway and we shall remain friends until the last long sunset.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying a deserving tribute to my good friend, ERTEL CARLYLE.

I regret very much that he is going to leave us at the end of this session. I am proud to call ERTEL CARLYLE my friend because he is not only an outstanding Member of this body, but also because of his sterling character and devotion to public duty. It has been my great privilege to know him very intimately. Everywhere you see him he is the same friendly, courteous, and lovable person. His dry wit and keen sense of humor make him a delightful conversationalist and companion.

Ertel has never sought the plaudits of the crowd or played for the headlines. Nevertheless, he has always worked hard for the public good and has made an outstanding record here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, ERTEL CARLYLE is a man of courage and conviction. I have never known him to hesitate in telling you exactly how he stood on any issue, irrespective of its controversial aspects. I know that he is held in the very highest esteem by all of his colleagues here in the House. He is a devoted public servant, an untiring worker and a great American.

I wish him well in whatever endeavor he may undertake in the future.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I really am glad that circumstances prevented my being present in the Chamber when some of our colleagues paid their tributes to WOODROW JONES. Otherwise I would not have had the opportunity of reading what he himself had to say in a farewell address before expressing my own sentiments. I have since read his speech and wish to say that it is one of the most impressive I have ever read. It is marked by the sincerity and steadfastness to principle that characterizes all of WOODROW JONES' utterances.

Woodrow's successor has already been selected. He is a young man of outstanding ability and one with whom I have been personally acquainted for many years. I am sure he will measure up in every way to the responsibilities of the high office to which he has been elected and that he will render outstanding service to the people of his district. However, I think we will all agree that an unusually high standard has been set by his predecessor and that his shoes will be hard to fill.

No Member of this House has impressed me more than WOODROW JONES. Time after time I have witnessed him vote his convictions in spite of tremendous pressures to do otherwise. I think of him as one Congressman of whom it can truly be said that he put principles and love of country above every other consideration. It takes courage to do that. Woodrow has consistently sought, throughout his congressional career, to protect our heritage of individual liberty, to safeguard our unique system of free enterprise, to maintain and promote sound fiscal policies, and to resist the trends toward concentration of more and more power in the Central Government. I can say these things in all sincerity because, while I consider him a warm personal friend, he and I are affiliated with different political parties. It is a great loss to the Nation for him to leave this body. This country needs men like WOODROW JONES in its service:

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking.

In my book, WOODROW JONES is such a man. As he goes back home in order that he may have more time to spend with his family—those fine sons really need him now as they are in the period when character is molded and when principles are ingrained—their gain is our country's loss.

In conclusion may I also say to my friend from Rutherfordton that I have greatly enjoyed my association with him in this body; that I deeply appreciate the many courtesies he so freely extended to me; that I respect and admire him for the outstanding record he has made here; and that I sincerely wish for him all of the joys and happiness he deserves.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to associate myself with my distinguished fellow colleagues from North Carolina and others in the House in their tributes to four very able colleagues of ours from my home State who will not be with us in January.

With the departure from our midst of CHARLIE DEANE, ERTEL CARLYLE, THURMOND CHATHAM, and WOODROW JONES, the House will sustain a great loss. The Congress and the Nation are losing the very valuable services of four very able and distinguished Americans.

First, as one of the younger Members of this body from North Carolina, I want to express my deep gratitude to these colleagues and fellow North Carolinians of mine for the very generous and friendly manner in which they received me when I came to Congress. They have been thoughtful, cooperative, and most helpful. I will always be thankful for my associations with them. All of them are men of stalwart character, high integrity, and strong convictions. They have had the respect and love of every one of us on both sides of the aisle. All of them have been very valuable Members of this House. They have contributed significantly to the legislative enactments of the Congress. They have been loyal and faithful to the people of their respective districts, to the great State of North Carolina, and to our Nation which we all love so deeply.

With the passage of time, the committees on which they have served, more than anyone else, will appreciate the loss of their services.

I did not know all of them well before I came to the Congress, but I have learned to admire and respect each of them.

CHARLIE DEANE has been one of the hardest working Members of this House. He is well known here as a fine Christian gentleman, interested in the welfare of the people of America, especially "little people." He is a kindly man. He has been an unsurpassed combination of unswerving devotion to duty, courageous loyalty to his deeply held convictions, and unfailingly sweet spirit. He has been a faithful and able public servant. I appreciate his friendship and I will miss his presence in this body, as I know you will.

I feel rather close to ERTEL CARLYLE because, upon my arrival here, I learned that he participated in the marriage of a member of my family to a distinguished constituent of his. ERTEL CARLYLE is one of the most conscientious and likable Members of this House. He has a friendly and hospitable mind and heart which attract you to him. He is always pleasant. He has an excellent sense of humor. Out of nowhere he has the ability to come forward with a short humorous observation, particularly in private conversations, which enables one to at least momentarily lift the weight of congressional responsibilities from his shoulders and relax in the atmosphere of good humor and laughter. Also I have appreciated the quality in him that looks upon every vote in this House as a serious matter. ERTEL CARLYLE will be greatly missed by all of us.

I have also been extremely impressed by the congenial personality and the stalwart character and integrity of our colleague, THURMOND CHATHAM. He is one Member who has his own convictions. At the same time I have noticed his extreme respect and admiration for the convictions of those who may disagree with him. I am told by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee that he has been a very valuable member of that committee, thinking always in terms of what is for the best interests of America and contributing significantly to legislation which that committee has reported to this House for our consideration. He has been deeply interested in the security of this Nation and the free world. To that end he has aggressively supplied his splendid talents. We will also remember THURMOND CHATHAM as one of the finest hosts in Washington. He and his good wife, Pat, have, on many occasions, been hosts to the Members of this House and other friends of theirs. In this extracurricular activity they have contributed much to our own health, happiness, joy, and contentment here in Washington. THURMOND CHATHAM will not only be missed by the Foreign Affairs Committee but he will be missed by his many friends who have learned to love and respect him for his fine qualities and for his great ability.

I first met our distinguished colleague, WOODROW JONES, when he was serving as a member of the House of Representatives in the North Carolina State Legislature. Though I was across the hall in the other body, representing my own district in North Carolina, I had the opportunity to observe and work with him in action. He was an extremely valuable member of the State legislature, and then, as now, he had those deep-seated convictions which would not yield to trivial, petty, or political arguments or expediencies. I am quite sure that every Member of this House who has come to know WOODROW JONES well is mindful of his strong convictions, particularly when it comes to expenditures. While on some occasions many of us may not have seen things as he did, I am sure that I bespeak the feelings of every one of us when I say that if all of us had voted on all matters involving appropriations, increases in appropriations, or amendments reducing appropriations as he has voted, our national budget would have been balanced long ago. WOODROW JONES has served a very necessary and essential place in this House by being one of its most economy-minded Members. He has been one of the most able and conscientious Members of this House, devoted to the service of his district, his State, and his Nation. The better you know him, the more you love him. His district and State have every reason to be proud of the statesmanlike service he has rendered during his tenure in this House. He will be missed by all of us in more ways than one. I regret very much that he has made the decision to return to the private practice of his profession—law. And yet, I can thoroughly understand and appreciate his wishes to return to his beautiful wife, Rachel, and his two fine sons who have preferred to remain at home during most of Woodrow's service here.

The memory of our association with these four distinguished and very capable Members of this House, who are returning to their homes and other avenues of life, is something which I am sure all of us, on both sides of the aisle, will always cherish and hold near and dear to our hearts. May the tie of friendship and understanding which binds them to this House and to us and us to them ever remain stanch and true.

Individually and collectively they have wrought good works upon us, upon their constituency, and upon their country and the world. Yes, they have wrought good works which will be remembered.

What builds the Nation's pillars high
And its foundation strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?
Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong—
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long—
Freemen who work while others sleep
Who dare while others fly
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

Mr. Speaker, truly, we are losing four coworkers of indomitable spirit, leaders whose memory we shall ever hold in the highest esteem. They will be hard to replace. While their individual qualities and interests naturally vary, as do all of ours, I think it can be truthfully said that the seriousness with which they have accepted their obligations, the efficient and dignified manner in which they have executed their duties, and the patient understanding they have always exhibited to their colleagues have contributed substantially to the improvement of this body and its accomplishments.

And so, my fellow colleagues, may I conclude my tribute to these distinguished fellow North Carolinians of mine by wishing for them and their fine families in the days, months, and years ahead the very best of everything and, above all, an abundance of good health, success, and happiness in whatever they undertake.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this Congress to adjourn without telling my colleague, Congressman Woodrow W. Jones, of North Carolina, and the Members of the House how much we Members who know him will miss his services here in the House of Representatives during the next Congress. We all sincerely regret that Congressman Jones decided not to be a candidate for reelection after this year. He is one of the most valuable men serving here in Congress as he votes his own convictions at all times and party lines mean nothing to him when a principle is involved.

We should have men of Congressman Jones' ability, character, and experience serving on our Federal benches throughout the United States and on the Supreme Court. I am certain that he has a bright future ahead of him as, I understand, he is one of the most brilliant lawyers in my neighbor State of North Carolina. I have certainly enjoyed having Congressman Jones serve on the House District Committee, as I always knew that he would vote on every proposed piece of legislation for the best interests of the people of the entire Nation.

The Congress of the United States is losing the services of some of its most valuable Members this year and some of them are among my closest personal friends. I do not know of any Member who is retiring from Congress who will be missed more than my good friend, Congressman Jones of North Carolina. I hope that I will continue to have his friendship when he returns to the private practice of law, and wish for him and his family all the success possible during the future years.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our two very good friends, Jesse Wolcott and George Dondero. Jesse is rounding out 26 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives and George is concluding 24 years of equally fine representation of his congressional district. Between the two there is a total of 50 years as Members of this body. Michigan, or any other State, never sent to the Nation's Capital any better Representatives.

Eight years ago when I was first elected, both Jesse and George could not have been more kind and helpful to a freshman. Their counseling was invaluable. My first 2 years were on the same committee with George Dondero, the Committee on Public Works. It was an enlightening and stimulating experience to work with him and see the universal respect for him by his fellow members. No newcomer in the Congress could have had a better example of how to be a constructive committee member. I only hope and trust that my future efforts and conduct on whatever committee will approximate his high standards.

Jesse Wolcott has deservedly been the leader of our Michigan delegation and all of us have profited immeasurably by the leadership which he gave us. His great accomplishments for the State and Nation have made all Michiganders rightfully proud. We wish he would stay here with us for many more years for the country needs his wisdom, experience, and integrity, but he has decided to retire for more pleasant and less arduous pursuits.

May I say in closing that I have lost through their voluntary retirement two of my closest friends and advisers. Michigan, in their retirement, is losing two statesmen whose contributions to the public good are beyond comparison. The Congress and the Nation are being deprived of their wisdom, competence, and experience. Their departure is our loss but each of us wishes them the very best in health, happiness, and success.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words concerning a fine colleague, Congressman Woodrow Jones, of North Carolina, though I regret the occasion that prompts my saying them, for his voluntary withdrawal from this body has saddened us all. He is a loyal American who loves good government and who has served his district and his Nation well. I feel that our country can ill afford to lose such Members of Congress. He has by his outstanding and distinguished record in the Congress brought honor to his great State of North Carolina.

I join with his many friends and colleagues in paying tribute to him for his unselfish devotion to duty in rendering valuable service to our Nation. I wish for him continued success and happiness in the future as he returns to his beloved State. I consider it an honor to have served with Woodrow Jones in this Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to rise and join in these tributes to our colleagues in the Congress whom we are losing at the end of this session. I would particularly join in the remarks made by our distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. Dondero], and our very dear friend from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott]. I have known both of these men since I was a very small boy, since my father served in this body for such a long time, and very happily with them in the House of Representatives. I would like to say that we in Michigan feel that our gain in the State of Michigan is the loss of the Congress because we will have them home again.

I know you as well as I will miss them next January when we meet again. Thank you.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hayworth].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the two brief sessions in which I have served in this body I have come to realize more than I ever thought I would realize the great fact that above party is character. The two gentlemen from Michigan whom we are honoring are representative of the finest American character. You cannot be with Mr. Wolcott or Mr. Dondero 5 minutes without knowing you are speaking with persons of real substance.

Michigan is proud to have been represented so long by these two great men. They have enriched the life of the Nation and the life of Michigan as well.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I promised next to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] 1 minute.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, throughout their service in this great deliberative body I have been impressed by the conscientious work, great ability, and fine characteristics of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, our good friend, Woodrow Wilson Jones, and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, an equally good friend, Ertel Carlyle. Both have distinguished themselves by their service to the Congress and to their Nation. They are the type of men we need in Government.

It has been a great privilege for me to be associated with them and to knew them. I shall certainly prize the memories of my work with them in the Congress. We shall miss them and the Nation will miss their valuable services.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 84th Congress draws to a close, I desire to make a few observations relative to my service in this distinguished body. I am voluntarily leaving the Congress at the end of this session. My decision to leave public life at this time is based on personal reasons consisting of my desire to return to my private law practice and to spend more time with my family. I came to Washington to represent the 11th Congressional District of North Carolina during the 2d session of the 81st Congress and have served consecutively in the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses. This has not only been a great

honor and privilege but also a great personal experience. It is, indeed, a high honor and personal experience which I shall never forget.

During my service in the Congress, I have tried at all times to represent what I considered to be the best interest of my country and the best interest of the people of my congressional district. I am a member of the great Democratic Party which has so rich a history of service to the American people. I am an ardent disciple of the great Thomas Jefferson and a firm believer in the principles of government enunciated by him. I have at times disagreed with some of the leaders of the Democratic Party, but generally these disagreements have been motivated by my belief that these leaders were straying far afield from the principles laid down by Jefferson. I have at all times felt that the interest of my country must come first and, therefore, the interest of my party of necessity must be relegated to a secondary position.

Under the principles of government laid down by Thomas Jefferson and through the blessings of Almighty God, we have developed a great Republic. Never in the history of civilized mankind has the individual achieved such freedom as we enjoy today. Under this freedom and our republican form of government, we have developed the greatest civilization the world has ever known. I am dedicated to our system of government and shall continue to be ever zealous in preserving it. It is my humble opinion that if we are to safeguard our way of life and enrich our Republic, we must adhere to the fundamental principles upon which it is founded. In the experience of mankind and particularly in this modern world many emergencies arise and problems exist. Those who are impatient in meeting these conditions sometime propose remedies which would strike at the fundamental principles of our way of life. In many of these instances the cure is worse than the ill. I firmly believe that these emergencies and problems must be met and solved within the framework of our Constitution and the basic principles of our Government as bequeathed to us by our forefathers.

During my tenure of office, I have voted against many proposals because I firmly believed that they were not in harmony with our basic principles of government. I have at all times been a strong advocate of the free-enterprise system, and I firmly believe that the great progress we have made in this country has been wrought by adherence to that system. There are those who contend that the Government can do many worthwhile things for the American people and do them better than free enterprise. I do not adhere to this belief, and I am convinced that the history of our country proves the truth of my contention. Those who advance the theory that the Government should invade every phase of American activity should review the history of other efforts at free government and learn anew the reasons for their decline and eventual destruction.

All of my adult life, I have been a strong advocate of economy and a firm believer in a sound fiscal policy for our local, State, and Federal Governments. I have contended that deficit spending and financing was a most dangerous practice for a free government and should not be tolerated except in dire emergencies involving the security of our Nation. I have watched with apprehension our Federal Government spend year after year more than it takes in and have seen the Federal debt rise to alarming proportions. My devotion to this belief has led me on many occasions to vote against appropriations which I deemed to be good but which I felt the Nation could not afford. Most every individual in our great country has faced the problem many times of desiring things in life which he could not afford at the time and had to refrain from their enjoyment until his budget was balanced. It is difficult for a man in public office to tell his constituents that he cannot vote for many of the things which they deem to be good but it is absolutely necessary to reach such decisions if we are to retain any semblance of financial responsibility. The American people should know that if all requests made for money are granted that eventually the tax rates will become prohibitory.

I have been alarmed at the tremendous growth of our Federal Government. For the past quarter of a century, there has been a strong trend toward the concentration of power in Washington. I view this as a great danger to the individual liberties of every American as well as our system of government. It is without doubt a serious departure from the fundamental principles taught and practiced by Thomas Jefferson. To many Americans, the doctrine of States rights appears to be old fashioned and has no place in modern government. This is a fallacy which if not corrected will contribute to the destruction of our form of government. Jefferson said, "The government which governs least is the government that governs best." He was pointing out to us that government should not attempt to control the daily lives of its citizens and that government itself could be controlled best at the local level. Americans should remember that all tyranny in the past has been practiced in the name of government. When our forefathers threw off the yoke of English despotism they strove to establish a government here which would never become tyrannical and oppressive of individual liberties. If we are to retain those liberties bequeathed to us by our forefathers, we must be ever vigilant against the growth of government and the concentration of power in one central federal government. Too many Americans, including many of our State officials, look to Washington for the solution of every problem which arises. Somehow our people have been imbued with the philosophy that all wisdom, all power and an unlimited supply of money reside in the Federal Government in Washington. In my humble opinion, the continued growth of this philosophy will engulf us and within a very few years, if not halted; we will wind up with one strong central government and the States will be relegated to the position of mere provinces. If this happens, then our citizens will not be able to go to the city hall, the county courthouse, or the State capital for redress of their grievances, but will have to journey to Washington to present each complaint. Let us all as good Americans strive with all of our might to prevent this from occurring.

We have developed a great country and the finest system of government ever known to man. It is the duty of all Americans to help preserve our way of life. As Thomas Jefferson said:

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

If we are to save our Republic all Americans must be eternally vigilant.

In closing let me say again that it has been a great privilege and high honor to serve in the Congress of the United States. I express my deep appreciation to the people of my congressional district for this great distinction. I have been honored to serve with what I consider to be the finest delegation in the Congress—the North Carolina delegation. To each of them, I express my thanks for all of the courtesies which they have extended to me. I have made many fine friendships here in this body—friendships which I shall cherish so long as I shall live.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to briefly pay my respects to my fellow colleague in the House, the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, JACKSON B. CHASE, who is voluntarily retiring from Congress to return to his home in Nebraska.

Judge CHASE, as he is affectionately and best known to all of us, has given an excellent account of himself during his service as a Member of the 84th Congress. He is one of Nebraska's esteemed citizens, an able lawyer, a former State legislator and district judge, and perhaps is best known in our State because of his legal and judicial background.

Judge CHASE reluctantly left his place on the judicial bench in Nebraska to become a candidate for Congress. It was his high sense of responsibility for public service and the urge of many, many citizens when this vacancy occurred that prompted him to stand as a candidate for this office. Now, he is returning to Nebraska to again seek his first and only love—serving the citizens of our State in a judicial capacity.

It has been a distinct honor for me to be associated with JACKSON B. CHASE, and I can say with assurance that for the short time I have served with him here, my sentiments voice the feeling and impression of his many colleagues, not only from Nebraska, but from other States throughout our country.

I would like to extend my very best to Judge CHASE and Mrs. Chase upon their return home. I wish them Godspeed. They will be sorely missed.

Nebraska is again losing the services of an honest, capable, conscientious, and talented Representative in the Congress.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of loss that we realize the service of the Honorable SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER in the House of Representatives is drawing to a close. Months ago he announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection from the Third District of Indiana, but would return to the private practice of law. This is a field in

which he and other members of his family have made notable records in Indiana through the years.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] brought to the House of Representatives extensive training both in the fields of law and engineering. This, coupled with his wartime service in the Air Force and his actual experience as the operator of an Indiana farm, provided an ideal background for service in this body.

He is by nature quiet, studious, and objective and has a keen sense of right and wrong. Those who knew him were always impressed with the knowledge he had of pending legislation.

His service on the Judiciary Committee was distinguished. He was a hard-working, diligent member of that group and one whose views were respected because they were objective and fair.

Of his patriotism and love of country, there can never be the slightest doubt. He has demonstrated those characteristics in too many ways, both as a member of the armed services and as a civilian. A great advocate of adequate airpower, he never failed to express his views in that respect when proper opportunity offered. The Members of the House of Representatives will miss his steady, inquiring mind and the counsel which he gave, but certainly those of us who count ourselves among his closest friends wish him every success and happiness as he returns to the practice of law in South Bend, Ind.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending a tribute to SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER. Shep, as he is known to those of us who have been associated most intimately with him, entered the Congress at the same time that I did. As always is the case, Members become much better acquainted and more closely associated with their own class.

SHEPARD CRUMPACKER comes from a long line of legal talent. His family has made its name known throughout the State of Indiana for keen understanding of law and the principles of justice, equality, and freedom. All of these principles were exemplified in SHEPARD CRUMPACKER during his three terms in the House of Representatives.

I feel confident that the Third Indiana District will miss his excellent services. All Members who will be privileged to return likewise will miss him because of his friendliness, his understanding, and studious application to the work to which he was assigned.

I join his many friends in wishing all good things to him and his family. My prayer is that he will be able to continue to serve his community and his fellow man in the same able and capable manner that he served his Nation during the years that he represented the Third Indiana District in the Congress.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during my years in the Congress, it has been my privilege to note the coming and going of various Congressmen. I remember so well when SHEPARD CRUMPACKER entered the 82d Congress along with a number of other new Members in January 1951.

I knew some of his family background and from my experience in the Indiana State Legislature had learned that the name Crumpacker in Indiana represents the best elements that are to be found in individuals. SHEPARD CRUMPACKER was no exception to this rule.

In my various associations with SHEPARD CRUMPACKER, I found him to be one of the most studious and attentive Members on the floor. He entered into debate and discussion of legislative proposals with a display of understanding and appreciation of the problems involved.

The third district can well be proud of the services that he rendered. His community of South Bend where he was reared will be fortunate indeed if he continues to make it his home in the future. I join my many colleagues in wishing him God's richest blessings in all his endeavors.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Indiana sent five new Republican Congressmen, including myself, to the 82d Congress. Now the first of that group, the Honorable SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR., is retiring from congressional service and will not seek reelection.

It has been a great pleasure and privilege for me to serve with my good friend and fellow Hoosier during the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses. He has earned the respect of all of us, and the deep affection of those of us who have had an opportunity to know him well. However long I may serve in this body I am sure I will know few who will equal his earnest attention to congressional business, his fervent desire to do the right thing, and his energetic and faithful service to his constituents.

Although we are both Hoosiers and Republicans, we have frequently found ourselves on different sides of a legislative issue. In such cases I have always reexamined my own position, for I know that he does not form an opinion lightly and that he strives as earnestly as any of us to make the right decision.

With the retirement of SHEPARD CRUMPACKER the Nation has lost a superior legislator. However, we know that Shep's interest and activities for the best in local, State, and National Government will continue. We also know that the legal profession will be enriched by his return to his chosen profession.

I want to join with his many other friends on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Hill in wishing him the very best of luck in the years to come.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult at the close of a Congress to say goodby to the many colleagues whose leaving breaks up both a pleasant professional association and the prospects of enjoying fully the close relationships which have developed. The people of the United States will miss many of the men who are leaving Congress tonight. I wish I could pay individual tribute to each of them.

I am particularly interested in pointing out the effective congressional service and the outstanding personal qualities of SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER who has so ably represented the Third District of Indiana for three terms in the House of Representatives. In 1950, Indiana sent five new Republican Members to the House: SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, 3d District; E. ROSS ADAIR, 4th District; JOHN V. BEAMER, 5th District; WILLIAM G. BRAY, 7th District; and me, CHARLES B. BROWNSON, 11th District. The companionship between Congressmen of a given class is always a close one but the relationship between five of us who came at the same time, serving the same party, from the same State, has been a particular bond. We all regret it must be broken, at least to a degree, as Mr. CRUMPACKER resumes the private practice of law.

Shep, as we know him, has been a quiet Congressman, whose advice has been eagerly sought by those of us who respect his ability to cut through superficialities and arrive at a penetrating analysis of any given problem. I am sure the great Committee on the Judiciary will miss his skills as a lawyer. I know the people of his district will miss the high quality of service which he has rendered to his constituents over and above his legislative responsibilities.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to a distinguished colleague, the Honorable SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana's Third Congressional District, who is retiring at the close of this Congress.

It has been a real pleasure serving with Congressman CRUMPACKER during the past 6 years, and I have greatly appreciated the many courtesies he has extended to me, especially his helpfulness when I had legislation before the House Judiciary Committee, of which he is an honored and valued member.

We shall miss Mr. CRUMPACKER here in Congress but I know God will continue to bless and direct him in all his future endeavors, and I join with his many friends in wishing him well as he returns to the practice of law in South Bend.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, and the Chair right now is going to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The bells will be rung 10 minutes before the expiration of the recess.

RECESS

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazer, one of its clerks announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished

Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Major General Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar; and

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution correcting enrollment of H. R. 7619.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel, and the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended; and

S. 3941. An act relating to certain mining claims which were eligible for validation under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated solely because of the failure of the owners to take certain action to protect their claims within the prescribed period.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill S. 3467 entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 12080 entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

PROVISION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HOUSING AND THE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN COMMUNITIES

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2958)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Housing Act of 1956'.

"TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

"Property improvement loans

"SEC. 101. (a) (1) Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out 'September 30, 1956' and inserting in lieu thereof 'September 30, 1959'.

"(2) The proviso in the second paragraph of section 2 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: ': *Provided*, That this clause (iii) may in the discretion of the Commissioner be waived with respect to the period of occupancy or completion of any such new residential structures'.

"(b) Section 2 (b) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, or improvement of existing structures exceeds $2,500, or for the purpose of financing the construction of new structures exceeds $3,000' and inserting in lieu thereof 'exceeds $3,500';

"(2) by striking out 'except that' in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof 'except that the Commissioner may increase such maximum limitation to five years and thirty-two days if he determines such increase to be in the public interest after giving consideration to the general effect of such increase upon borrowers, the building industry, and the general economy, and'; and

"(3) by striking out '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15,000 nor an average amount of $2,500 per family unit'.

"(c) Section 2 (b) of such Act is further amended by striking out '*Provided*, That' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*Provided*, That any such obligation with respect to which insurance is granted under this section on or after sixty days from the date of the enactment of this proviso shall bear interest, and insurance premium charges, not exceeding (A) an amount, with respect to so much of the net proceeds thereof as does not exceed $2,500, equivalent to $5 discount per $100 of original face amount of a one-year note payable in equal monthly installments, plus (B) an amount, with respect to any portion of the net proceeds thereof in excess of $2,500, equivalent to $4 discount per $100 of original face amount of such a note: *Provided further*, That the amounts referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of the preceding proviso, when correctly based on tables of calculations issued by the Commissioner or adjusted to eliminate minor errors in computation in accordance with requirements of the Commissioner, shall be deemed to comply with such proviso: *Provided further*, That'.

"Sales housing insurance

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '(but, in any case where the dwelling is not approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, 90 per centum)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(but, in any case where the dwelling is not approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, unless the construction of the dwelling was completed more than one year prior to the application for mortgage insurance, 90 per centum)'.

"(b) Section 203 (h) of such Act is amended by striking out '$7,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,000'.

"Rental housing insurance

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 207 (c) (2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out '80 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '90 per centum.'

"(b) Section 207 (c) (3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) not to exceed, for such part of such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, $2,250 per room (or $8,100 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project is less than four per family unit) or not to exceed $1,000 per space or $300,000 per mortgage for trailer courts or parks: *Provided*, That as to projects to consist of elevator type structures, the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of $2,250 per room to not to exceed $2,700 per room and the dollar amount limitation of $8,100 per family unit to not to exceed $8,400 per family unit, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator type structures of sound standards of construction and design; except that the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations per room contained in this paragraph by not to exceed $1,000 per room in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require.'

"Housing for the elderly

"SEC. 104. (a) Section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'except that with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor who is sixty years of age or older as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance, the mortgagor's payment required by this proviso may be paid by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor under such terms and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe.'

"(b) Section 207 (b) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(except provisions relating to housing for elderly persons)' before 'to take' in the unnumbered paragraph immediately following paragraph (2); and

"(2) by inserting '(except with respect to housing designed for elderly persons, with occupancy preference therefor, as provided in the paragraph following paragraph (3) of subsection (c))' after 'hereunder' in the second unnumbered paragraph following paragraph (2).

"(c) Section 207 (c) of such Act is amended by striking out the unnumbered paragraph immediately following paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraph:

"'Notwithstanding any of the limitations contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, if the entire property or project is specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons in accordance with standards established by the Commissioner and the mortgagor is a financially qualified nonprofit organization acceptable to the Commissioner, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation not in excess of $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property as may be attributable to dwelling use and not in excess of 90 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of such property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall prescribe such procedures as in his judgment are necessary to secure to elderly persons priorities in occupancy of the units designed for their use.'

"(d) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall establish, in accordance with the provisions of section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for elderly persons.

"Cooperative housing insurance

"SEC. 105. (a) Section 213 (a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or' at the end of paragraph (1);

"(2) by inserting 'or' at the end of paragraph (2);

"(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"'(3) a mortgagor, approved by the Commissioner, which (A) has certified to the Commissioner, as a condition of obtaining the insurance of a mortgage under this section, that upon completion of the property or project covered by such mortgage it intends to sell such property or project to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit trust of the character described in paragraph (1) of this subjection at the actual cost of such property or project as certified pursuant to section 227 of this Act and will faithfully

and diligently make and carry out all reasonable efforts to consummate such sale, and (B) shall be regulated or restricted by the Commissioner as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation during any period while it holds the mortgaged property or project; and for such purpose the Commissioner may make such contracts with, and acquire for not to exceed $100 such stock or interest in, any such mortgagor as the Commissioner may deem necessary to render effective such restriction or regulation, such stock or interest to be paid for out of the Housing Fund and to be redeemed by such mortgagor at par upon the sale of such property or project to such nonprofit corporation or nonprofit trust;'; and

"(4) by adding 'referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection' after 'which corporations or trusts'.

"(b) Section 213 (b) (2) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '65 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '50 per centum';

"(2) by amending the last proviso to read as follows: ': *And provided further,* That for the purposes of this section the word "veteran" shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, or on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955'; and

"(3) by inserting immediately after '$8,900' a semicolon and the following: 'except that the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations per room contained in this paragraph by not to exceed $1,000 per room in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require: *Provided further,* That in the case of a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) the mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 85 per centum of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed physical improvements are completed: *Provided further,* That upon the sale of a property or project by a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation or trust within two years after the completion of such property or project, the mortgage given to finance such sale shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed the maximum amount computed in accordance with this subsection without regard to the preceding proviso'.

"(c) Section 213 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"'(h) In the event that a mortgagor of the character described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) obtains an insured mortgage loan pursuant to this section and fails to sell the property or project covered by such mortgage to a nonprofit housing corporation or nonprofit housing trust of the character described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) hereof, such mortgagor shall not thereafter be eligible by reason of such paragraph (3) for insurance of any additional mortgage loans pursuant to this section.'"

"(d) Paragraph (a) of section 227 of such Act is amended by inserting after 'subsection (a) thereof' the following: 'or with respect to any property or project of a mortgagor of the character described in paragaph (3) of subsection (a) thereof'.

"General mortgage insurance authorization

"SEC. 106. Section 217 of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'July 1, 1955' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1956';

"(2) by striking out '$4,000,000,000' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,000,000,000'; and

"(3) by striking out 'section 2' in the first and second sentences and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 2 and section 803'.

"Housing in urban renewal areas

"SEC. 107. (a) Section 220 (d) (3) (B) (ii) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after 'Commissioner' in the parenthetical phrase a comma and the following: 'and shall include an allowance for builder's and sponsor's profit and risk of 10 per centum of all of the foregoing items except the land unless the Commissioner, after certification that such allowance is unreasonable, shall by regulation prescribe a lesser percentage'.

"(b) Section 220 (d) (3) (B) (iii) of such Act is amended by striking out in the first proviso thereof all that follows 'construction and design' and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided further,* That the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations by not to exceed $1,000 per room or per family unit, as the case may be, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require'.

"Low-cost housing for displaced families

"SEC. 108. Section 221 (d) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$7,600' in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '$9,000';

"(2) by striking out '$8,600' in paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000';

"(3) by striking out '95 per centum of the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence: *Provided,* That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 5 per centum of the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of acquisition in cash or its equivalent' in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the appraised value (as of the date of the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence, less such amount as may be necessary to comply with the succeeding proviso: *Provided,* That the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least $200 in cash or its equivalent (which amount may include amounts to cover settlement costs and initial payments for taxes, hazard insurance, mortgage insurance premium, and other prepaid expenses)';

"(4) by striking out '95 per centum of' in paragraph (3);

"(5) by striking out 'agencies thereof' in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'agencies thereof or the Federal Housing Commissioner'; and

"(6) by striking out 'thirty' in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty'.

"Approval of cost certifications

"SEC. 109. Section 227 of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'Upon the Commissioner's approval of the mortgagor's certification as required hereunder, such certification shall be final and incontestable, except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor.';

"(2) by inserting after 'legal expenses,' each place it appears in paragraph (c) the following: 'such allocations of general overhead items as are acceptable to the Commissioner,';

"(3) by inserting after 'maximum insurable mortgage amount' in paragraph (b) a semicolon and the following: 'except that if the mortgage is to assist the financing of repair or rehabilitation and no part of the proceeds will be used to finance the purchase of the land or structure involved, the approved percentage shall be 100 per centum'; and by striking out '(without reduction by reason of the application of the approved percentage requirements of this section)' in clause (ii) (B) of paragraph (c);

"(4) by amending the proviso in paragraph (c) to read as follows: ': *Provided,* That such additional amount under (A) of this clause (ii) shall in no event exceed the Commissioner's estimate of the fair market value of such land and improvements prior to such repair or rehabilitation, and such additional amount under (B) of this clause (ii) shall in no event exceed the approved percentage of the Commissioner's estimate of the fair market value of such land and improvements prior to such repair or rehabilitation'; and

"(5) by adding at the end of paragraph (c) the following: 'In the case of a mortgage insured under section 220 where the mortgagor is also the builder as defined by the Commissioner, there shall be included in the actual cost, in lieu of the allowance for builder's profit under clause (i) or (ii) of the preceding sentence, an allowance for builder's and sponsor's profit and risk of 10 per centum (unless the Commissioner, after finding that such allowance is unreasonable, shall by regulation prescribe a lesser percentage) of all other items entering into the term "actual cost" except land or amounts paid for a leasehold and amounts included under either (A) or (B) of clause (ii) of the preceding sentence. In the case of a mortgage insured under section 220 where the mortgagor is not also the builder as defined by the Commissioner, there shall be included in the actual cost an allowance for sponsor's profit and risk of the said 10 per centum or lesser percentage of all other items entering into the term "actual cost" except land or amounts paid for a leasehold, amounts included under either (A) or (B) of the said clause (ii), and amounts paid by the mortgagor under a general construction contract.'

"TITLE II—SECONDARY MORTGAGE MARKET

"SEC. 201. Section 302 (b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(2)';

"(2) by striking out 'if (i)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'if'; and

"(3) by striking out 'or (ii) the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage' and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and (3) the Association may not purchase any mortgage, except a mortgage insured under section 803 or a mortgage covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii, if the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded $15,000 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage'.

"SEC. 202. Section 303 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting: 'The Association shall accumulate funds for its capital surplus account from private sources by requiring each mortgage seller to make payments of nonrefundable capital contributions equal to 2 per centum of the unpaid principal amounts of mortgages purchased or to be purchased by the Association from such seller or equal to such other greater or lesser percentage, but not less than 1 per centum thereof, as the Association may determine from time to time, taking into consideration conditions in the mortgage market and the general economy.'

"SEC. 203. Section 304 (a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'at the market price' in the second sentence and inserting 'within the range of market prices'.

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 304 (a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, advance commitments to purchase mortgages in secondary market operations under this section shall be issued only at prices which are sufficient to facilitate advance planning of home construction, but which are sufficiently below the price then offered by the Association for immediate purchase to prevent excessive sales to the Association pursuant to such commitments.'

"(b) Section 304 (d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The Association may not purchase participations in its operations under this section.'

"SEC. 205. Section 305 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the price to be paid by the Association for mortgages purchased in its operations under this section, during a period of one year from the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1956, shall be not less than 99 per centum of the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items.'

"SEC. 206. Section 305 (f) of such Act is amended by striking out 'by the Housing Amendments of 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on or after August 11, 1955'.

"SEC. 207. Section 305 (e) of such Act is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'and purchase transactions' after the words 'advance commitment contracts';

"(2) inserting 'or transactions' after the words 'if such commitments'; and

"(3) by striking out 'but not more than $5,000,000 of such authorization shall be available for such commitments in any one State' and inserting in lieu thereof 'but such commitments in any one State shall not exceed $5,000,000 outstanding at any one time'.

"SEC. 208. So much of section 305 (c) of such Act as precedes the proviso is amended by striking out 'purchasers' and inserting in lieu thereof 'purchases'.

"SEC. 209. (a) The last sentence of section 306 (c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and subsection (e) of this section'.

"(b) Section 306 (e) of such Act is repealed.

"TITLE III—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

"SEC. 301. Section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding section 110 (h) or the use in any other provision of this title of the term "local public agency" or "local public agencies" the Administrator may make advances of funds under this subsection for surveys and plans for an urban renewal project (including General Neighborhood Renewal Plans as hereinafter defined) to a single local public body which has the authority to undertake and carry out a substantial portion, as determined by the Administrator, of the surveys and plans or the project respecting which such surveys and plans are to be made: *Provided,* That the application for such advances shows, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, that the filing thereof has been approved by the public body or bodies authorized to undertake the other portions of the surveys and plans or of the project which the applicant is not authorized to undertake.'

"SEC. 302. (a) (1) Section 105 (a) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out '(including any redevelopment plan constituting a part thereof)'.

"(2) Section 110 (b) of such Act is amended by inserting 'and' after the semicolon at the end of clause (1), and by striking out '; and (3)' and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"(b) (1) Section 110 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) "Urban renewal project" or "project" may include undertakings and activities of a local public agency in an urban renewal area for the elimination and for the prevention of the development or spread of slums and blight, and may involve slum clearance and redevelopment in an urban renewal area, or rehabilitation or conservation in an urban renewal area, or any combination or part thereof, in accordance with such urban renewal plan. Such undertakings and activities may include—

"'(1) acquisition of (i) a slum area or a deteriorated or deteriorating area, or (ii) land which is predominantly open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or of site improvements, or otherwise, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, or (ii) open land necessary for sound community growth which is to be developed for predominantly residential uses: *Provided,* That the requirement in paragraph (a) of this section that the area be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating area shall not be applicable in the case of an open land project;

"'(2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements;

"'(3) installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds, and other improvements necessary for carrying out in the urban renewal area the urban renewal objectives of this title in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"'(4) disposition of any property acquired in the urban renewal area (including sale, initial leasing or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan;

"'(5) carrying out plans for a program of voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with the urban renewal plan; and

"'(6) acquisition of any other real property in the urban renewal area where necessary to eliminate unhealthful, insanitary or unsafe conditions, lessen density, eliminate obsolete or other uses detrimental to the public welfare, or otherwise to remove or prevent the spread of blight or deterioration, or to provide land for needed public facilities.

"'For the purposes of this title, the term "project" shall not include the construction or improvement of any building, and the term "redevelopment" and derivatives thereof shall mean development as well as redevelopment. For any of the purposes of section 109 hereof, the term "project" shall not include any donations or provisions made as local grants-in-aid and eligible as such pursuant to clauses (2) and (3) of section 110 (d) hereof.

"'Financial assistance shall not be extended under this title with respect to any urban renewal area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character unless such area will be a predominantly residential area under the urban renewal plan therefor: *Provided,* That, where such an area which is not clearly predominantly residential in character contains a substantial number of slum, blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating dwellings or other living accommodations, the elimination of which would tend to promote the public health, safety, and welfare in the locality involved and such area is not apropriate for predominantly residential uses, the Administrator may extend financial assistance for such a project, but the aggregate of the capital grants made pursuant to this title with respect to such propects shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total amount of capital grants authorized by this title.

"'In addition to all other powers hereunder vested, where land within the purview of clause (1) (ii) or (1) (iii) of the first paragraph of this subsection (whether it be predominantly residential or nonresidential in character) is to be redeveloped for predominantly nonresidential uses, loans and advances under this title may be extended therefor if the governing body of the local public agency determines that such redevelopment for predominantly nonresidential uses is necessary and appropriate to facilitate the proper growth and development of the community in accordance with sound planning standards and local community objectives and to afford maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of the project area by private enterprise: *Provided,* That loans and outstanding advances to any local public agency pursuant to the authorization of this sentence shall not exceed 2½ per centum of the estimated gross project costs of the projects undertaken under other contracts with such local public agency pursuant to this title.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'either the second or third sentence' in clause (2) and inserting 'the second sentence.'

"(c) The first sentence of section 110 (d) of such Act is amended by striking out the phrase ', public facilities financed by special assessments against land in the project area,' in clause (3) and adding the following proviso before the period at the end of the sentence: ': *And provided further,* That in any case where a public facility furnished as a local grant-in-aid is financed in whole or in part by special assessments against real property in the project area acquired by the local public agency as part of the project, an amount equal to the total special assessments against such real property (or, in the case of a computation pursuant to the proviso immediately preceding, the estimated amount of such total special assessments) shall be deducted from the cost of such facility for the purpose of computing the amount of the local grants-in-aid for the project.'

"(d) Section 110 (e) of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: 'Where real property in the project area is acquired and is owned as part of the project by the local public agency and such property is not subject to ad valorem taxes by reason of its ownership by the local public agency and payments in lieu of taxes are not made on account of such property, there may (with respect to any project for which a contract of Federal assistance under this title is in force or is hereafter executed) be included, at the discretion of the Administrator, in gross project cost an amount equal to the ad valorem taxes which would have been levied upon such property if it had been subject to ad valorem taxes, but in all cases prorated for the period during which such property is owned by the local public agency as part of the project, and such amount shall also be considered a cash local grant-in-aid within the purview of section 110 (d) hereof. Such amount, and the amount of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes included in gross project cost, shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator and such rules, regulations, limitations, and conditions as he may prescribe.'

"SEC. 303. (a) Section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"'In order to facilitate proper preliminary planning for the attainment of the urban renewal objectives of this title, the Administrator may also make advances of funds (in addition to those authorized above) to local public agencies for the preparation of General Neighborhood Renewal Plans (as herein

defined) for urban renewal areas of such scope that the urban renewal activities therein may have to be carried out in stages, consistent with the capacity and resources of the respective local public agency, over an estimated period of not more than 10 years. No contract for advances for the preparation of a General Neighborhood Renewal Plan may be made unless the Administrator has determined that:

"'(1) in the interest of sound community planning, it is desirable that the urban renewal area be planned for urban renewal purposes in its entirety;

"'(2) the local public agency proposes to undertake promptly an urban renewal project embracing at least 10 per centum of such area, upon completion of the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan and the preparation of an urban renewal plan for such project; and

"'(3) the governing body of the locality has by resolution or ordinance (i) approved the undertaking of the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan and the submission of an application for such advance and (ii) represented that such plan will be used to the fullest extent feasible as a guide for the provision of public improvements in such area and that the plan will be considered in formulating codes and other regulatory measures affecting property in the area and in undertaking other local governmental activities pertaining to the development, redevelopment, rehabilitation, and conservation of the area.

The contract for any such advance of funds for a General Neighborhood Renewal Plan shall be made upon the condition that such advance shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to the local public agency for the undertaking of the first urban renewal project in such area: *Provided,* That in the event of the undertaking of any other project or projects in such area an appropriate allocation of the amount of the advance, with interest, may be effected to the end that each such project may bear its proper allocable part, as determined by the Administrator, of the cost of the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan. As used herein, a General Neighborhood Renewal Plan means a preliminary plan (conforming, in the determination of the governing body of the locality, to the general plan of the locality as a whole and to the workable program of the community meeting the requirements of section 101) which outlines the urban renewal activities proposed for the area involved, provides a framework for the preparation of urban renewal plans and indicates generally, to the extent feasible in preliminary planning, the land uses, population density, building coverage, prospective requirements for rehabilitation and improvement of property, and any portions of the area contemplated for clearance and redevelopment.'

"(b) Section 102 (d) of such Act is further amended by striking out 'The Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The Administrator may make advances of funds to local public agencies for surveys of urban areas to determine whether the undertaking of urban renewal projects therein may be feasible and for'.

"SEC. 304. Section 106 (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out '$70,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$100,000,000'.

"SEC. 305. Section 106 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, an urban renewal project respecting which a contract for a capital grant is executed under this title may include the making of relocation payments (as defined in paragraph (2); and such contract shall provide that the capital grant otherwise payable under this title shall be increased by an amount equal to such relocation payments and that no part of the amount of such relocation payments shall be required to be contributed as part of the local grant-in-aid.

"'(2) As used in this subsection, the term "relocation payments" means payments by a local public agency, in connection with a project, to individuals, families, and business concerns for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit (which are incurred on and after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1956, and for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made) resulting from their displacement by an urban renewal project included in an urban renewal area respecting which a contract for capital grant has been executed under this title. Such payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator as are in effect on the date of execution of the contract for capital grant (or the date on which the contract is amended pursuant to paragraph (3)), and shall not exceed $100 in the case of an individual or family, or $2,000 in the case of a business concern.

"'(3) Any contract with a local public agency which was executed under this title before the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1956 may be amended to provide for payments under this subsection for expenses and losses incurred on or after such date.'

"SEC. 306. Section 104 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'*Requirements for local grants-in-aid*

"'SEC. 104. Every contract for capital grants under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved. Such local grants-in-aid, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have theretofore been made, shall not be required in excess of one-third of the aggregate net project costs of all projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have been made.'

"SEC. 307. (a) Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'*Disaster areas*

"'SEC. 111. Where the local governing body certifies, and the Administrator finds, that an urban area is in need of redevelopment or rehabilitation as a result of a flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes" (Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance under this title for an urban renewal project with respect to such area without regard to the following:

"'(1) the "workable program" requirement in section 101 (c), except that any contract for temporary loan or capital grant pursuant to this section shall obligate the local public agency to comply with the "workable program" requirement in section 101 (c) by a future date determined to be reasonable by the Administrator and specified in such contract;

"'(2) the requirements in section 105 (a) (iii) and section 110 (b) (1) that the urban renewal plan conform to a general plan of the locality as a whole and to the workable program referred to in section 101 (c);

"'(3) the "relocation" requirements in section 105 (c): *Provided,* That the Administrator finds that the local public agency has presented a plan for the encouragement, to the maximum extent feasible, of the provision of dwellings suitable for the needs of families displaced by the catastrophe or by redevelopment or rehabilitation activities;

"'(4) the "public hearing" requirement in section 105 (d);

"'(5) the requirements in sections 102 and 110 that the urban renewal area be a slum area or a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area; and

"'(6) the requirements in section 110 with respect to the predominantly residential character or predominantly residential reuse of urban renewal areas.

In the preparation of the urban renewal plan with respect to a project aided under this section, the local public agency shall give due regard to the removal or relocation of dwellings from the site of recurring floods or other recurring catastrophes in the project area.'

"(b) Subparagraph (A) of section 220 (d) (1) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(A) be located in (i) the area of a slum clearance and urban redevelopment project covered by a Federal-aid contract executed or a prior approval granted, pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949 before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954, or (ii) an urban renewal area (as defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended) in a community respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the certification to the Commissioner provided for by section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or (iii) the area of an urban renewal project assisted under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided,* That, in the case of an area within the purview of clause (i) or (ii) of this subparagraph, a redevelopment plan or an urban renewal plan (as defined in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended), as the case may be, has been approved for such area by the governing body of the locality involved and by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Administrator has certified to the Commissioner that such plan conforms to a general plan for the locality as a whole and that there exist the necessary authority and financial capacity to assure the completion of such redevelopment or urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That, in the case of an area within the purview of clause (iii) of this subparagraph, an urban renewal plan (as required for projects assisted under such section 111) has been approved for such area by such governing body and by the Administrator, and the Administrator has certified to the Commissioner that such plan conforms to definite local objectives respecting appropriate land uses, improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and that there exist the necessary authority and financial capacity to assure the completion of such urban renewal plan, and'.

"(c) Section 221 (a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

"(1) by adding immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence a comma and the following: 'or (3) there is being carried out an urban renewal project assisted under section 111 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended'; and

"(2) by striking out 'clause (2)' each place it appears in the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof 'clause (2) or (3)'.

"(d) The second sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows: 'The Administrator is further authorized to make planning grants for similar planning work (1) in metropolitan and regional areas to official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agencies empowered under State or local laws to perform such planning; (2) to cities, other municipalities, and counties having a population of twenty-five thousand or more according to the latest decennial census which have suffered substantial damage as a result of a

flood, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2 (a) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters, and for other purposes" (Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 30, 1950), as amended, has determined to be a major disaster; and (3) to State planning agencies, to be used for the provision of planning assistance to the cities, other municipalities, and counties referred to in clause (2) hereof.'

"SEC. 308. The last sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out '$5,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000'.

"TITLE IV—PUBLIC HOUSING

"Low-rent public housing

"SEC. 401. (a) Subsection (i) of section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended effective August 1, 1956, to read as follows:

"'(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Authority may enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than thirty-five thousand additional dwelling units which amount shall be increased by thirty-five thousand additional dwelling units on July 1, 1957, and may enter into only such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for annual contributions with respect to each such thirty-five thousand additional dwelling units shall terminate two years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That any balance of the authorization provided by this subsection, as amended by section 108 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955, not utilized by July 31, 1956, shall be available in any succeeding year: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further*, That no new contracts for loans and annual contributions for additional dwelling units in excess of the number authorized in this sentence shall be entered into unless authorized by the Congress.'

"(b) Clause (2) of the third proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned 'Annual contributions:' under the heading 'Public Housing Administration' is repealed.

"SEC. 402. Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting the following after the first comma therein: 'or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956,'.

"SEC. 403. Subsection (d) of section 21 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out the figure '10' in both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '15'.

"Housing for the elderly

"SEC. 404. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The term "families" means families consisting of two or more persons, a single person sixty-five years of age or over, or the remaining member of a tenant family. The term "elderly families" means families the head of which (or his spouse) is sixty-five years of age or over.'

"(b) Section 10 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(m) For the purpose of increasing the supply of low-rent housing for elderly families, the Authority may assist the construction of new housing or the remodeling of existing housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for such families. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection 10 (g), any public housing agency, in respect to dwelling units suitable to the needs of elderly families, may extend a prior preference to such families and may waive the provisions of clause (ii) of section 15 (8) (b) with respect to such units: *Provided*, That, as among such families, the "First" preference in subsection 10 (g) shall apply.'

"(c) Section 15 (5) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word 'Alaska' the following: 'or $2,250 in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families'.

"Farm-labor camps

"SEC. 405. Section 12 (f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon the filing of a request therefor within eighteen months after the date of the enactment of this sentence, the Authority shall relinquish, transfer, and convey, without monetary consideration all of its rights, title, and interest in and with respect to any such project or any part thereof (including such land as is determined by the Authority to be reasonably necessary to the operation of such project, and including contractual rights to revenues, reserves, and other proceeds therefrom), (1) in the case of any State other than Florida, to any public housing agency whose area of operation includes the project, upon a finding and certification by the public housing agency (which shall be conclusive upon the Authority) that the project is needed to house persons and families of low income and that preference for occupancy in the project will be given first to low-income agricultural workers and their families and second to other low-income persons and their families; and (2) in the case of Florida, to any public housing agency in the State whenever, under the laws of the State, such agency (A) is authorized to acquire and operate such project, (B) is required to give preference for occupancy in such project, first, to low-income agricultural workers and their families, and, second, to other low-income persons and their families, (C) is required, in the event of the disposition of such project by sale or otherwise, to use the proceeds thereof and any available accumulated earnings to construct facilities (which shall be subject to the same preferences as those specified in clause (B)) for occupancy by low-income agricultural workers and their families in the same area, and (D) is required, so long as it continues to own or operate such project, to have on its managing board one or more members whose principal occupation is farming. Upon the relinquishment and transfer of any such project it shall cease to be a low-rent project within the meaning of this Act, and the Authority shall have no further jurisdiction over it, except that in any conveyance under the preceding sentence the Authority may reserve to the United States any mineral rights of whatsoever nature upon, in, or under the property, including such rights of access to and the use of such parts of the surface of the property as may be necessary for mining and saving the minerals. Any project, or part thereof not relinquished and conveyed pursuant to this subsection or under a contract for disposal pursuant to this subsection within eighteen months after the date of the enactment of this sentence shall be disposed of by the Authority pursuant to subsection (e) of section 13 of this Act, notwithstanding the parenthetical clause in such subsection.'.

"Disposition of defense housing

"SEC. 406. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, effective on the first day of the month following enactment of the Housing Act of 1956, all right, title, and interest, including contractual rights and obligations and any reversionary interest, held by the Federal Government in and with respect to all real and personal property comprising the following housing projects:

"Project Numbered	Location
"ALA–1D1___	Ozark, Alabama.
"ALA–1D2___	Ozark, Alabama.
"ALA–2D1___	Foley, Alabama.
"ALA–2D2___	Foley, Alabama.
"ARIZ–1D1__	Yuma, Arizona.
"ARIZ–1D2__	Yuma, Arizona.
"ARIZ–3D1__	Flagstaff, Arizona.
"CAL–3D1___	Oceanside, California.
"CAL–3D2___	Oceanside, California.
"CAL–4D1___	Miramar, California.
"CAL–6D1___	San Ysidro, California.
"CAL–7D2___	Barstow, California.
"CAL–9D1___	Barstow, California.
"CAL–9D2___	Barstow, California.
"CAL–10D1__	Twentynine Palms, California.
"COLO–1D1__	Colorado Springs, Colorado.
"FLA–2D1___	Green Cove Springs, Florida.
"FLA–4D1___	Milton, Florida.
"FLA–8082___	Pensacola, Florida.
"FLA–8084___	Pensacola, Florida.
"GA–1D1____	Hinesville, Georgia.
"KAN–3D1___	Hutchinson, Kansas.
"ME–4D1____	Brunswick, Maine.
"MD–1D1____	Bainbridge, Maryland.
"MO–1D1____	Waynesville, Missouri.
"MO–2D1____	Waynesville, Missouri.
"MO–4D1____	Waynesville, Missouri.
"MO–5D1____	Waynesville, Missouri.
"NEV–2D1___	Fallon, Nevada.
"NC–1D1____	Camp LeJune, North Carolina.
"NC–3D1____	Camp LeJune, North Carolina.
"NC–4D1____	Elizabeth City, North Carolina.
"RI–1D1____	Portsmouth, Rhode Island.
"RI–2D1____	Portsmouth, Rhode Island.
"TEX–2D1___	Kingsville, Texas.
"TEX–3D1___	Hondo, Texas.
"TEX–5D1___	Beeville, Texas.
"TEX–5D2___	Beeville, Texas.
"TEX–6D1___	Mission, Texas.
"VA–6D1____	Quantico, Virginia.
"VA–10D1___	Yorktown, Virginia.
"VA–12D1___	Yorktown, Virginia.
"VA–13D1___	Williamsburg, Virginia.

The provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, and of the Act entitled 'An Act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes', approved October 14, 1940, as amended, shall not apply to any property transferred hereunder and, except as otherwise provided herein, the laws relating to similar property of the Department of Defense shall be applicable to the property transferred. The Department of Defense is authorized to utilize any revenues derived from the property transferred hereunder, after its transfer, for the maintenance, operation, improvement, and liquidation of such property and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. There is hereby transferred to the Department of the Navy out of the fund entitled 'Office of the Administrator revolving fund (liquidating programs)' established in the Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, under title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955 (68 Stat. 272, 295), as amended, $375,000 to be available until expended for repair and rehabilitation of such property by the Navy.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, which is not transferred under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof shall, as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957, be disposed of on a competitive bid basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation: *Provided*, That the third proviso in section 302 (b) of such Act shall be applicable to housing disposed of under this subsection, except that project numbered IDA–2D1 at Cobalt, Idaho, shall be sold only for use on the site.

"(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is hereby directed to convey (pursuant to the provisions of section 606 of the Act entitled 'An Act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended): (1) Housing project numbered RI–37013 to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, Rhode Island: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of that section or of any other law, the agreement required by that section shall permit the use of the project in whole or in part for the housing of military personnel without regard to their income, and shall require the Authority, in selecting tenants, to give a first preference in respect of three hundred and sixty dwelling units to such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes for three years after the date of conveyance and to give thirty days' advance notice of available vacancies to such designee, and (2) housing projects numbered PA–36011 and PA–36012 to the Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of that section or of any other law, the agreement required by that section shall permit the use of the projects in whole or in part for the housing of military personnel without regard to their income, and shall require the Authority, in selecting tenants, to give a first preference in respect of seven hundred dwelling units to such military personnel as the Secretary of Defense or his designee prescribes for three years after the date of conveyance and to give thirty days' advance notice of available vacancies to such designee.

"SEC. 407. (a) The Act entitled 'An Act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes', approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 614:

"'SEC. 614. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, (1) any housing to be sold on-site determined by the Administrator to be permanent, located on lands owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold, or otherwise disposed of by the Administrator under other provisions of this Act or under the provisions of other law by January 1, 1957, except housing which is determined by the Administrator by that date to be suitable for sale in accordance with section 607 (b) of this Act; and (2) any permanent housing to be sold off-site which is not relinquished, transferred, under contract of sale, sold, or otherwise disposed of prior to the effective date of this section shall be disposed of, as expeditiously as possible, on a competitive basis to the highest responsible bidder upon such terms and after such public advertisement as the Administrator may deem in the public interest; except that the Administrator may reject any bid which he deems less than the fair market value of the property and may thereafter dispose of the property by negotiation.

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other law, all contracts entered into after the enactment of this section for the sale, transfer, or other disposal of housing (other than housing subject to the provisions of section 607 (b) of this Act) determined by the Administrator to be permanent, except contracts entered into pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall require that if title does not pass to the purchaser by April 1, 1957 (or within sixty days thereafter if such time is necessary to cure defects in title in accordance with the provision of the contract), the rights of the purchaser shall terminate and thereafter the housing shall be sold under the provisions of subsection (a) hereof. For the purposes of this subsection, title shall be considered to have passed upon the execution of a conditional sales contract.

"'(c) The dates set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not be subject to change by virtue of the provisions of section 611 of this Act.'

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell and convey, at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert, to the city of Alexandria, Virginia, or to the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority, or to any agency or corporation established or sponsored in the public interest by such city, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Chinquapin Village housing project, VA–44131, located in Alexandria, Virginia. Any sale pursuant to this authorization shall be made within six months after the date of the enactment of this subsection and shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to sell and convey to the city of Euclid, Ohio, for a total price of $6,125,000, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the housing projects known as Euclid Homes (OH–33074) and Lakeshore Village (OH–33071) located in Euclid, Ohio. The purchase price shall be secured by a mortgage which need not be a general obligation of such city, and shall be paid in equal annual installments within twenty years from the date of sale with the right of prepayment of all or any part thereof. No downpayment shall be required, and the unpaid balances shall bear interest at the rate of 4½ per centum per annum. The Administrator may impose such other terms and conditions as he may deem necessary or desirable, including a requirement that any net revenues be applied by such city as advance payment on the last maturing installments of the purchase price.

"(d) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Public Housing Commissioner is authorized and directed to sell and convey by quitclaim deed to the Georgia Institute of Technology, upon full payment in cash of the purchase price determined under paragraph (2), all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that real property (including furniture, fixtures, and equipment located on the property on the date of the execution of the contract of sale under this subsection), situated in Atlanta, Georgia, known as the Techwood Dormitory and more particularly described as follows:

"Commencing at the intersection of the south line of North Avenue with the east line of Techwood Drive; thence running north 89 degrees 45 minutes east 94.47 feet along the south line of North Avenue to the east line of property formerly owned by Mrs. Emma L. Ellis; thence south 00 degrees 12.5 minutes east 155.0 feet more or less to the south line of an alley formerly known as Linden Alley and the north line of property formerly owned by Mildred W. Seydel; thence north 89 degrees 45 minutes east along the south line of said alley 170.0 feet more or less to a point in the south side of said alley which is distant 100.0 feet westerly from the west line of Williams Street; thence south 00 degrees 12.5 minutes east 290.0 feet more or less to a point on the south side of the former location of Linden Avenue, which point is 100.0 feet more or less west of the west line of Williams Street; thence running south 89 degrees 45 minutes west 281.57 feet more or less along the south side of the former location of Linden Avenue to its intersection with the east line of Techwood Drive; thence north 00 degrees 02 minutes east 293.88 feet more or less along the east line of Techwood Drive; thence north 6 degrees 06 minutes east 151.98 feet more or less along the east line of Techwood Drive to its intersection with the south line of North Avenue and the point of beginning.

"(2) The purchase price of the property referred to in paragraph (1) shall be the fair market value of the land described in such paragraph on the date of the execution of the contract of sale under this subsection, as determined by the Public Housing Commissioner, excluding for purposes of such determination the value of any buildings, furniture, fixtures, and equipment located on such land.

"(3) If the property referred to in paragraph (1) is not sold and conveyed to the Georgia Institute of Technology within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Public Housing Commissioner shall dispose of such property at public sale to the highest competitive bidder.

"(e) The last proviso of subsection (c) of section 108 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out '12' and inserting in lieu thereof '24'.

"Payments in lieu of taxes

"SEC. 408. Notwithstanding the provision of any other law or any contract or rule of law, the Public Housing Commissioner shall approve payments in lieu of taxes for project fiscal years ending prior to April 1, 1956, by each of the following local public agencies in the following amounts:

"Housing Authority of the City of Houston (Texas), $200,324.82.

"Quincy Housing Authority (Illinois), $12,549.75.

"Housing Authority of the City of Fresno (California), $6,874.13.

"Reading Housing Authority (Pennsylvania), $11,106.59.

"Huntington, West Virginia, Housing Authority (West Virginia), $13,049.38.

"Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (California), $104,765.05.

"Housing Authority of the City of Monroe (Louisiana), $1,560.76.

"Housing Authority of the City of Dothan (Alabama), $1,238.46.

"Housing Authority of the City of Sacramento (California), $26,628.29.

"Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (Ohio), $59,576.64.

"Housing Authority of the City of Tampa (Florida), $22,959.85.

"TITLE V—MILITARY HOUSING

"Armed services housing mortgage insurance

"SEC. 501. Section 801 (g) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) The term "State" includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and Midway Island.'

"SEC. 502. Section 803 (a) of such Act is amended by striking out 'September 30,

1956' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1958'.

"SEC. 503. Section 803 (a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title (except mortgages insured pursuant to the provisions of this title in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955) shall not exceed $2,300,000,000'.

"SEC. 504. Section 803 (b) (2) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ', and (ii) with the approval of the Commissioner, shall have determined that adequate housing is not available for such personnel at reasonable rentals within reasonable commuting distance of the installation and that the mortgaged property will not, so far as can reasonably be foreseen, substantially curtail occupancy in existing housing covered by mortgages insured under this act. The housing accommodations shall comply with such standards and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe to establish the acceptability of such property for mortgage insurance, except that the certification of the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall (for purposes of mortgage insurance under this title) be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the existence of the need for such housing. However, if the Commissioner does not concur in the housing needs as certified by the Secretary, the Commissioner may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund against loss with respect to the mortgage covering such housing. The Commissioner shall report to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he has required the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund, with reasons therefor. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.'

"SEC. 505. Section 803 (b) (3) (B) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(B) not to exceed an average of $16,500 per family unit for such part of such property or project (including ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and fixtures) as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That the replacement cost of the property or project as determined by the Commissioner, including the estimated value of any usable utilities within the boundaries of the property or project where owned by the United States and not provided for out of the proceeds of the mortgage, shall not exceed an average of $16,500 per family unit; and'."

"SEC. 506. (a) Section 803 (b) (3) (C) of such Act is amended by striking out 'eligible builder or' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eligible bidder with respect to'.

"(b) Sections 403 (a) and 403 (b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 are amended by striking out 'eligible builder' wherever the term appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'eligible bidder'.

"(c) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out 'the builder' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'the mortgagor'.

"(d) Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out 'with any builder'.

"SEC. 507. Section 403 (a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is further amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence the following: 'Any such contract shall provide for the furnishing by the contractor of a performance bond and a payment bond with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, and the furnishing of such bonds shall be deemed a sufficient compliance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793), and no additional bonds shall be required under such section.'

"SEC. 508. Section 405 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out '$9,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$21,000,000'.

"SEC. 509. The second sentence of section 406 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting after the colon immediately following the first proviso the following: *'Provided further*, That such plans, drawings, and specifications, when developed pursuant to arrangements made under this section after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1956, shall follow the principle of modular measure, in order that the housing may be built by conventional construction, on-site fabrication, factory precutting, factory fabrication, or any combination of these construction methods:'.

"SEC. 510. Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 410. In the construction of housing under the authority of this title and title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, the maximum limitations on net floor area for each unit shall be the same as the net floor area permanent limitations prescribed in the second, third, and fourth provisos of section 3 of the Act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 375), or in section 3 of the Act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), other than the first, second, and third provisos thereof.'

"SEC. 511. Section 408 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Nothing contained in the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act in effect prior to August 11, 1955, or any related provision of law, shall be construed to exempt from State or local taxes or assessments the interest of a lessee from the Federal Government in or with respect to any property covered by a mortgage insured under such provisions of title VIII: *Provided*, That, no such taxes or assessments (not paid or encumbering such property or interest prior to June 15, 1956) on the interest of such lessee shall exceed the amount of taxes or assessments on other similar property of similar value, less such amount as the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines to be equal to (1) any payments made by the Federal Government to the local taxing or other public agencies involved with respect to such property, plus (2) such amount as may be appropriate for any expenditures made by the Federal Government or the lessee for the provision or maintenance of streets, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, sewers, lighting, snow removal or any other services or facilities which are customarily provided by the State, county, city, or other local taxing authority with respect to such other similar property: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to properties leased pursuant to the provisions of section 805 of the National Housing Act as amended on or after August 11, 1955, which properties shall be exempt from State or local taxes or assessments.'

"Acquisition of Wherry Act housing

"SEC. 512. Section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 404. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Defense or his designee deems it necessary for the purpose of this title, he may acquire by purchase, donation, condemnation, or other means of transfer, any land or (with the approval of the Federal Housing Commissioner) any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The purchase price of any such housing shall not exceed the Federal Housing Commissioner's estimate of the replacement cost of such housing and related property (not including the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds) as of the date of final endorsement for mortgage insurance reduced by an appropriate allowance for physical depreciation, as determined by the Secretary of Defense or his designee upon the advice of the Commissioner: *Provided*, That in any case where the Secretary or his designee acquires a project held by the Commissioner, the price paid shall not exceed the face value of the debentures (plus accrued interest thereon) which the Commissioner issued in acquiring such project.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any provision of subsection (a) to the contrary, the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall, in the manner provided in subsection (a), acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer or, if the parties cannot agree upon terms for acquisition by such means, by condemnation, any housing constructed under the mortgage insurance provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act (as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955) which is located at or near a military installation where the construction of housing under the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Program has been approved by the Secretary.

"'(c) Condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C., sec. 257) as amended, or any other applicable Federal statute. Before any such condemnation proceedings are instituted, an effort shall be made to acquire the property involved by negotiation. In any condemnation proceedings instituted pursuant to this section, the court shall not order the party in possession to surrender possession in advance of final judgment unless a declaration of taking has been filed, and a deposit of the amount estimated to be just compensation has been made, under the first section of the Act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), providing for such declarations. Unless title is in dispute the court, upon application, shall promptly pay to the owner at least 75 per centum of the amount so deposited, but such payment shall be made without prejudice to any party to the proceeding. In the event that condemnation proceedings are instituted in accordance with procedures under such Act of February 26, 1931, the court shall order that the amount deposited shall be paid in a lump sum or over a period not exceeding five years in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties in the proceedings. In connection with condemnation proceedings which do not utilize the procedures under such Act, the Secretary or his designee, after final judgment of the court, may pay or agree to pay in a lump sum or, in accordance with stipulations executed by the parties to the proceedings, over a period not exceeding five years the difference between the outstanding principal obligation, plus accrued interest, and the price for the property fixed by the court. Unless such payment is made in a lump sum, the unpaid balance thereof shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centum per annum.

"'(d) Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

"'(e) The Secretary or his designee may, in the case of any housing acquired or to be acquired under this section, make arrangements with the mortgagee whereby such mortgagee will agree to release and waive all requirements of accruals for reserves for replacement, taxes, and hazard insurance provided for under the corporate charter and indenture agreement with respect to such housing, upon the execution of a written agreement by the Secretary or his designee

that the purposes for which such reserves and other funds were accrued will be carried out.

"'(f) Any housing acquired under this section may be (1) assigned as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents; or (2) leased to military and civilian personnel for occupancy by them and their dependents, upon such terms and conditions as will in the judgment of the Secretary of Defense or his designee be in the best interest of the United States, without loss to military personnel of their basic allowance for quarters or appropriate allotments. Amounts equal to the quarters allowances or appropriate allotments of military personnel to whom such housing is assigned as public quarters under clause (1), and the rental charges realized under clause (2), shall be deposited in the revolving fund created by subsection (g).

"'(g) There is hereby created a fund which shall be used by the Secretary of Defense or his designee as a revolving fund for the purpose of paying for housing and related property acquired under this section, paying interest, principal, mortgage insurance premiums, and other obligations (except those for maintenance and operation) with respect to such housing, and paying expenses incurred in the alteration, improvement, rehabilitation, and repair of such housing. The amounts and charges referred to in the last sentence of subsection (f) of this section, and any savings realized in the operation of section 405, shall be deposited in such fund. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "savings realized in the operation of section 405" means the difference between the amount made available for payments under section 405 and the amount actually used in making such payments.

"'(h) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to establish on the books of the Treasury Department the revolving fund created pursuant to the authority of this section. To provide capital for such fund, there is authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $50,000,000 and the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, is authorized to transfer from unexpended balances of any appropriations of the military departments not carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury such sums as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary to provide adequate capital for the revolving fund.'

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

"College housing

"SEC. 601. Section 401 (d) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out '$500,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$750,000,000'.

"Research

"SEC. 602. (a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to undertake such programs of investigation, analysis, and research as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in the exercise of his responsibilities, including the formulation and carrying out of national housing policies and programs. Without limiting such authority, such programs shall develop and supply data and information on—

"(1) the housing inventory of the Nation and the production, use, and demolition and conversion of residential structures, and such other factors as affect the total supply of housing;

"(2) mortgage market problems;

"(3) the extent to which adequate housing is available to the low-income and middle-income families of the Nation through public and private means;

"(4) housing for elderly persons;

"(5) residential design, assembly methods, and materials use in relation to cost, utility, and comfort; and

"(6) characteristics of current and prospective housing market demand.

"(b) (1) In order to permit the Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by subsection (a) of this section, he is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with agencies of State and local governments and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations and into working agreements with departments and independent establishments and agencies of the Federal Government in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection: *Provided*, That the total amount of such contracts and working agreements shall not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of $1,000,000 on July 1, 1957, and July 1, 1958, respectively.

"(2) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including administrative expenses which are hereby authorized, and amounts necessary to make payments pursuant to contracts or working agreements authorized under subsection (b) (1) of this section.

"(3) The provisions of the third and fourth sentences of subsection (a) of section 301 of the Housing Act of 1948 and of subsection (c) of section 502 of such Act shall apply to contracts and appropriations pursuant to this section.

"(c) The Administrator may disseminate (without regard to the provisions of section 306 of the Penalty Mail Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C. 321n)) any data or information acquired or held under this section, including related data and information otherwise available to the Administrator through the operation of the programs and activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in such form as he shall determine to be most useful to departments, establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments, to industry and to the general public.

"(d) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator hereby authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from private individuals, organizations, and other public agencies. Any such information or data shall be used only for the purposes for which it is supplied, and no publication shall be made by the Administrator whereby the information or data furnished by any particular person or establishment can be identified, except with the consent of such person or establishment.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, or any other provision of law.

"Public facility loans

"SEC. 603. Title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 206. As used in this title, the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.'

"Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933

"SEC. 604. (a) Section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 is amended by striking out '$2,500' in the proviso at the end of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof '$3,500'.

"(b) Section 5 (c) of such Act is further amended by striking out '15 per centum' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof '20 per centum'.

"Hospital construction

"SEC. 605. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, the authority under section 304 of such act to make loans or grants, or other payments to public and nonprofit agencies for the construction of hospitals is hereby revived and extended with respect to public and nonprofit agencies which have, prior to June 30, 1953, applied under such section 304 for such loans or grants, or other payments for the construction of hospitals, and have been denied such loans or grants, or other payments solely because of the unavailability of funds for such purpose.

"(b) The authority granted by this section shall expire June 30, 1958.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 for the purposes of this section for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, and June 30, 1958.

"Farm housing

"SEC. 606. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making loans under this title (other than loans under section 504 (b)). The total principal amount of such notes and obligations issued pursuant to this section during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, shall not exceed $450,000,000.'

"(b) Section 512 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"*'Contributions*

"'SEC. 512. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 503, the Secretary is authorized to make commitments for contributions aggregating not to exceed $10,000,000 during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961.'

"(c) Clause (b) of section 513 of such act is amended to read as follows: '(b) not to exceed $50,000,000 for grants pursuant to section 504 (a) and loans pursuant to section 504 (b) during the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961; and'.

"(d) This section shall take effect as of July 1, 1956."

"Servicemen's readjustment act of 1944

"SEC. 607. Paragraph (C) of subsection (b) of section 512 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is amended by striking out '1957' and inserting in lieu thereof '1958'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The

essential differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below.

FHA TITLE I—HOME REPAIR LOANS

The House bill contained a provision increasing the maximum term of title I single-family home-improvement loans from 3 to 5 years. The Senate amendment contained a provision placing discretionary authority in the FHA Commissioner to raise the term of such loans from 3 to 5 years. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate amendment.

FHA TITLE II—HOME MORTGAGE INSURANCE

The House bill contained a provision increasing the permissible loan-to-value ratio for builder-mortgagors from 85 to 90 percent of the amount permitted for owner-occupant mortgagor. The Senate amendment did not contain this provision and neither does the conference substitute.

FHA cooperative housing

The House bill contained a provision permitting a regular FHA housing project, insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act, to be converted to a cooperative housing project, if the intention to convert such project to a cooperative project was stated by the applicant at the beginning of the project. No such provision was included in the Senate amendment. The conference substitute includes a provision in lieu of that contained in the House bill under which a sponsor of a cooperative could obtain a commitment for a loan up to 85 percent of the replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. The sponsor would certify intent to sell to a cooperative upon completion. Until he sells the project, he would be regulated by FHA, as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. To prevent possible abuse of this financing device, the substitute would deny further use of this special commitment feature in the event the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative. In all cases the sponsor would be subject to the cost certification requirement of section 227 of the National Housing Act.

FHA TITLE VIII—MILITARY HOUSING

The House bill provided for extension of the military housing program for a period of 3 years to September 30, 1959. The Senate amendment only provided for an extension of this program to December 31, 1957. The conference substitute provides for extension to June 30, 1958.

The House bill provided for an increase in the FHA insurance authorization for military housing projects from the present authorized amount of $1,363,500,000 to $2,475,000,000. The Senate amendment provided for an increase in this authorization to $2,300,000,000, and this amount is retained in the conference substitute.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions requiring the FHA Commissioner to approve Defense Department determinations that new military housing needed would not substantially curtail occupancy of certain existing housing accommodations. The House bill provision, however, was more limited in its application in that if the project was to house personnel who are required to reside in public quarters then the approval of the FHA Commissioner regarding curtailment of occupancy in other projects was not required. The conference substitute includes the provision of the Senate amendment.

Under the House bill, the cost of housing under the FHA military housing program was limited to an average of $16,500 per unit for each project. The Senate bill provided that such average could not exceed $15,000 per project and set a servicewide per unit average of $14,250, including equipment. The conference substitute retains the House provision of a $16,500 average unit cost per project but includes the language of the Senate substitute making clear that equipment such as ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens and fixtures, are items of cost which must be included in the maximum average cost of $16,500 per unit.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained provisions requiring that military housing plans follow the principle of modular measure. In order that prefabricated as well as conventional construction might be employed. The conference substitute retains the language of the House bill, with an amendment to make it clear that the provision applies on a prospective rather than a retroactive basis.

Acquisition of "Wherry Act" housing

The House bill contained a provision directing the Secretary of Defense to acquire, operate, and improve the housing included in the so-called Wherry Act projects. These are projects which were constructed under the FHA title VIII military mortgage insurance program as it existed prior to the revision made by the housing amendments of 1955. The House provision included a purchase-price formula under which the value would not exceed the FHA estimate of replacement cost at time of insurance, adjusted to current cost levels, minus allowance for depreciation. Provision was made, however, that if the project actually cost less than the original mortgage amount or if the buyer or seller could not agree on price, then condemnation proceedings had to be started for acquisition of the project. A $50 million revolving fund was authorized for such purchases and could also be used for meeting debt service, alterations, and improvements. The Senate amendment did not include a similar provision.

The conference substitute includes a Wherry Act acquisition provision which coordinates it with an acquisition provision included in legislation just enacted by the Congress relating to construction at military installations (H. R. 12270). Under that bill there is permissive authority for the Secretary of Defense to acquire the existing Wherry Act projects by purchase, donation, condemnation, or other means of transfer. In negotiating for such projects, the purchase price of any such housing shall not exceed the Federal Housing Commissioner's estimate of the replacement cost of such housing and related property (not including the value of any improvements installed or constructed with appropriated funds) as of the date of final endorsement for mortgage insurance reduced by an appropriate allowance for physical depreciation, as determined by the Secretary of Defense or his designee upon the advice of the Commissioner. The conference substitute does not disturb this provision of the military construction bill except with respect to Wherry Act projects located at or near an installation where new FHA title VIII military housing projects are programed. In such cases the Secretary of Defense is required to proceed to negotiate for acquisition of such Wherry Act projects and, in the event of failure to acquire through negotiation, to institute proceedings for acquisition of the projects through condemnation. It is the intention of the conferees that where FHA title VIII projects are programed under the authority provided by the Housing Amendments of 1955 the Department of Defense shall acquire existing Wherry Act projects.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ELDERLY HOUSING

The Senate amendment contained a provision requiring the Housing and Home Finance Agency to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for the elderly. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute retains this provision of the Senate amendment.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

The Senate amendment contained a provision which was not included in the House bill under which the Federal National Mortgage Association would be required to pay par for all mortgages purchased under its special assistance mortgage-purchase program. The conference substitute includes a provision under which special assistance mortgages purchased by the Association must be purchased at a price of not less than 99 for a period of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

The Senate amendment contained a provision rewriting the section of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to requirements of local grants-in-aid in connection with slum clearance projects. It was provided "such local grants-in-aid, together with local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have heretofore been made, shall not be required in excess of one-third of the aggregate net project costs of all projects of the local public agency on which contracts for capital grants have been made." It is the understanding of the committee of conference that under the language of this provision the agency may continue its present pooling arrangement with respect to such local grants-in-aid. In this connection the committee of conference expresses agreement on the discussion of this subject appearing on pages 31 and 32 of House Report No. 2363, 84th Congress, 2d session.

SALARY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY GENERAL COUNSEL

The House bill contained a provision increasing the salary of the General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the level of the heads of constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. No comparable provision was included in the Senate amendment and none is contained in the conference substitute.

Veterans' Administration direct-loan program

The Senate amendment contained a provision which was not included in the House bill extending both the Veterans' Administration home-loan-guaranty program and the Veterans' Administration direct home-loan program for 1 additional year. Other legislation passed by the Congress has provided for a 1-year extension in the Veterans' Administration home-loan-guaranty program but does not include extension of the Veterans' Administration direct home-loan program. Accordingly the conference substitute retains only that portion of the Senate amendment providing for a 1-year extension in the Veterans' Administration direct home-loan program.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
HENRY O. TALLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. SPENCE (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I

ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC HOUSING IS A VITAL INVESTMENT

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, the amount of money for any purpose is always limited, even Federal funds. In our dynamic economy, Federal investment and expenditure has assumed a major role. We are certainly called upon to weigh every program involving investment with great care and to ask what are the long run as well as the immediate results.

I know of few programs that more directly now and for a long time to come, will repay our investment as well as the relatively small sums loaned, guaranteed or paid out of the Federal Treasury for the well-built homes built as part of the public low-rent housing program. We are all concerned about the present problems and future conditions of our cities and metropolitan areas. As the majority of our population is urbanized, and increasingly so, these living conditions are at the core of our future as a democracy and a nation.

The renewal of our cities is a great frontier of today. The health or disease of our metropolitan areas, of each neighborhood and each home will drastically affect what heritage which we have received and will pass on.

It is my feeling that a greater part of our Federal budget and the budgets of cities and States will have to be devoted to strengthening and improving our urban environment. This is hardly debatable. It is not a luxury or a vague idea but an immediate necessity.

Private enterprise through investment institutions of all sorts, the home-building industry and our excellent supply of labor and materials is doing a big and valuable job, yet it has been clear time and again to the majority in both Houses of the Congress that the blighted cancerous sections of our urban centers need treatment. This treatment includes many programs and various kinds of timing. It also seems clear to me that the construction of homes at a low or moderate rental is an essential part of these programs and this broad stream of investment which is necessary.

Public housing has been an excellent investment in several ways. It is first an investment in people, hundreds of thousands of families living in the presently built dwellings and those who will take their place as they move out. It is an investment in hope, morale, and health.

Beyond this, it is a sound investment in the tax base of cities. A group of public housing developments in Philadelphia, for instance, have more than tripled the actual sums collected on their sites during prior years. While $98,000 was assessed for tax payments but only $77,000 actually collected, there was a total of more than $300,000 actually paid or accrued by 13 low-rent housing developments during the last 12 months. Some of these sites were slum areas in the last stages of decay, a couple were cemeteries which, of course, did not pay taxes, and several others were on vacant, often waste, land. I do not mean to say that public housing should be built on land that is unusable for any other purpose but the facts in this instance, and in many other cities, will show that even the partial payments in lieu of taxes by local housing authorities on their properties have increased incomes to their cities and certainly decreased the negative expenses for fires, disease, and crime.

Private enterprise makes possible most of the investment in public housing by purchasing the bonds in local housing authority. These have a favorable rate of interest, of course, due to the Federal guarantee and the exemption of the interest from Federal income taxes. The bonds have sold quickly and favorably.

Each thousand homes built by public housing with the present Federal aids make possible an investment of $10 million to $15 million depending upon local construction costs and the cost of site acquisition including the demolition of slums. We are actually talking about some hundreds of millions of dollars of private investment which will follow from approval of this public-housing program. In relation to the total housing industry and the total renewal effort, this is a relatively small part, but like the primer charge which sets off a large piece of artillery, the initial impact may be decisive.

In many city renewal efforts, public housing has been the only substantial program for clearance and rebuilding. In neighborhoods of some cities, public housing has been the first concrete evidence and its construction has been followed by other kinds of new investment. The housing construction, in some instances, clearly appears to have encouraged the additional investment. Whether a clear chain of cause and effect can be proven is a matter for debate but the fact exists that other investment took place after the construction of public housing.

We need to make steady progress all along the line of more homes, better homes, and neighborhood improvement. No section of our people should feel cut off, trapped, or hopeless in the effort to have decent homes in a decent neighborhood. Public housing is one bridge over what we hope is a narrowing canyon between slum conditions and at least decent minimum homes. But the canyon is a deep one and the bridges we have already built must be widened.

Public housing is clearly one form of investment with many and continuing returns—for which we are all richer.

FLOOD DAMAGE INSURANCE

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following report and statement on the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2959)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that in the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources. With specific reference to insurance against flood loss, the Congress finds that insurance against certain losses resulting from this peril is not so available. Since preventive and protective means and structures against the effects of these disasters can never wholly anticipate the geographic incidence and infinite variety of the destructive aspects of these forces, the Congress finds that the safeguards of insurance are a necessary adjunct of preventive and protective means and structures.

"Inasmuch as these disasters impede interstate and foreign commerce, hamper national defense, and cause widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare, without regard to State boundary lines, and in the absence of insurance protection from private or public sources, the Congress ought to provide for such protection in the case of flood, and study the feasibility and need for similar programs in the case of other forms of natural disaster against which insurance protection is not generally and practically available in all geographical areas.

"(b) (1) It is the purpose of this Act to authorize the establishment of a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risks of loss resulting from flood as hereinafter defined, and to require a study and report on insurance and reinsurance against still other natural disaster perils to the extent that such insurance or reinsurance is not available on reasonable terms and conditions from other public or private sources; and

"(2) It is the further purpose of this Act to encourage private insurance companies to write insurance covering the extent of the risks above the limits prescribed in section 10 (a) and to provide Federal reinsurance to the extent desirable and necessary to carry out this purpose.

"(3) It is the further purpose of this Act to authorize the establishment of a program of loans, and a program combining insurance and loans, to assist flood victims who have entered into contracts with the Administrator under this Act.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. (a) To assist in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Administrator may appoint a Commissioner, and the basic rate of compensation of such position shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the Commissioners of the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

"(b) The provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, shall apply to the functions vested in the Administrator by this Act, to the same extent as applicable to wholly owned Government corporations.

"(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the issuing of insurance policies, the making of reinsurance agreements, and the making and guaranteeing of loans, and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE AND REINSURE

"SEC. 4. To aid in carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to provide, upon such terms and conditions (including coinsurance requirements) as he may establish, insurance and reinsurance against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property (including property owned by any State or local government) due to flood, as hereinafter defined, occurring within the United States: *Provided*, That insurance policies issued under this Act after June 30, 1959, shall be issued only with respect to property in those States which participate as provided in section 7 (a) of this Act.

"LOAN CONTRACTS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with any persons (not including State and local governments and agencies thereof) to the effect that, in the event of any subsequent loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real and personal property due to flood, as hereinafter defined, occurring within the United States—

"(1) the Administrator will guarantee any public or private financing institution against loss of principal and interest with respect to any loan in an amount not to exceed such subsequent flood loss (as modified by subsection (f) of this section, relating to deductibility), which may be made by such institution to any such person in connection with such flood loss; and

"(2) to the extent that a loan to finance such flood loss is not available from any such institution on reasonable terms, the Administrator will make a loan directly to such person in an amount covering all or part (as provided for in the loan contract between the Administrator and such person) of the difference between the amount of such flood loss (as modified by such subsection (f), relating to deductibility) and the amount of the loan available from such institution.

Each such contract shall contain such terms and conditions and require from any such person such monetary consideration, as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation. In issuing such regulations the Administrator shall fix such monetary consideration at the lowest practicable amount, following generally the same principles as apply under section 7 (a) with respect to the establishment of fees for insurance.

"(b) Any loan made or guaranteed under this section shall bear interest at the rate, as determined by the Administrator, which is prevailing in the area where the money loaned is to be used but such rate shall not exceed 4 per centum per annum on the unpaid principal balance.

"(c) Any Federal Reserve bank, when designated by the Administrator, is hereby authorized to act, on behalf of the Administrator, as fiscal agent of the United States in guaranteeing loans under this section and in otherwise taking action in connection with such guarantees. Such funds as may be necessary to enable such bank to carry out any such guarantee shall be supplied and disbursed by or under authority of the Administrator from the Disaster Loan Fund. Such bank shall not have any responsibility or accountability except as agent in taking any action in connection with such guarantees. Each such bank shall be reimbursed by the Administrator, from funds appropriated by the Federal Government, for all expenses incurred by the bank in acting as agent on behalf of the Administrator, including among such expenses, notwithstanding any other provision of law, attorneys' fees and expenses of litigation.

"(d) Action and operations of such banks under authority of subsection (c) of this section shall be subject to the supervision of the Administrator and subject to such regulations as he may prescribe. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe the term and incidental charges for loans guaranteed under subsection (c) of this section. The Administrator is further authorized to prescribe regulations with respect to the forms and procedures (which shall be uniform to the maximum extent practicable) to be utilized in connection with such guarantees.

"(e) To the maximum extent practicable, loans under this section shall be on a long-term basis in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, if so requested by the person obtaining the loan.

"(f) Loans under this section shall be made only with respect to amounts exceeding the first $500 of the amount of the loss.

"(g) The face amount of all loan contracts outstanding under this section at any one time shall not exceed $2,000,000,000; but such amount may be increased, with the approval of the President, by not to exceed $500,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

"(h) The provisions of sections 8, 9, 10 (a), 10 (b), 12 (b), 12 (c), 13, 14, 15 (e), 15 (g), 17 (a), 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23 of this Act shall be applicable with respect to the loan contract program under this section.

"COMBINATION OF INSURANCE AND LOANS

"SEC. 6. The Administrator is authorized to establish, under such regulations as he may prescribe, a program combining insurance and loans in order to provide the greatest variety and amount of protection against loss to the greatest number of affected parties in accordance with individual needs.

"ESTIMATED RATES AND FEES

"SEC. 7. (a) The Administrator shall from time to time establish a schedule of 'estimated rates' for insurance offered under the provisions of this Act, which would be adequate, in his judgment, to produce sufficient proceeds to pay all claims for probable losses over a reasonable period of years. Such 'estimated rates' shall be used as a basis for determining the fees to be paid by the persons insured. They shall be based on consideration of the risks involved and shall be uniform for similar risks within a given classification of property. They shall not include any loading for administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this Act. The Administrator shall establish a schedule of fees to provide insurance protection at reasonable costs designed to achieve marketability: *Provided*, That no insurance policy shall be issued for a fee less than 60 per centum of such 'estimated rate'. The Administrator is authorized to establish such classifications of fees as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act based on the use of the property to be insured, the availability of insurance from private sources covering such property, and the ability of the insured to self-insure or reinsure and may establish differentials in levels of fees for such classifications: *Provided*, That all such fees shall be uniform for similar risks within a given classification of property. Prior to July 1, 1959, the Administrator shall pay into the Disaster Insurance Fund, hereinafter created, from time to time, an amount equal to the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued and the amount which would have been charged if the 'estimated rates' were applied: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1959, each State shall pay from time to time into the Disaster Insurance Fund, an amount equal to one-half the difference between the fees charged for insurance policies issued after such date on property in such State, and the amount which would have been charged if the 'estimated rates' were applied, and the Administrator shall pay into such Fund, from time to time, an amount equal to the State's contribution for each policy issued.

"(b) The Administrator from time to time shall also negotiate with insurance companies seeking reinsurance for the purpose of establishing fees for reinsurance offered under the provisions of this Act. Such fees shall be based on consideration of the risks involved and shall be adequate, in the judgment of the Administrator, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses. The fees shall not include any loading for administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this Act.

"PROPERTY AND LOSS LIMITS

"SEC. 8. The Administrator is authorized to provide for the determination of types and location of property with respect to which insurance or reinsurance shall be made available under this Act, the nature and limits of loss or damage in any area (including subdivisions thereof) which may be covered by such insurance or reinsurance, and such other matters as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"RISK CLASSIFICATION

"SEC. 9. The Administrator may from time to time issue appropriate regulations regarding the classification, limitation, and rejection of risks assumed by him under authority of this Act.

"POLICY AND PROGRAM LIMITS

"SEC. 10. (a) The outstanding face amount of insurance issued by the Administrator under this Act shall not exceed $250,000 per person: *Provided*, That the face amount of such insurance on any dwelling unit (including any structures and personal property connected therewith) shall not exceed $10,000.

"(b) The Administrator may from time to time issue appropriate regulations regarding insurance coverage available to joint owners and subsidiary and affiliated corporations as he shall deem advisable to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"(c) Each insurance policy issued by the Administrator shall contain a loss-deductible clause relieving him from any liability for paying the first $100 of a proved and approved claim for loss, plus 5 per centum of the remainder, or such larger amount or percentage as may be specified by the Administrator upon issuance of the insurance policy, taking into consideration the class of risk involved.

"(d) The face amount of insurance policies and reinsurance agreements outstanding at any one time under this Act shall not exceed $3,000,000,000 (which limit may be increased with the approval of the President by further amounts not to exceed $2,000,000,000 in the aggregate if such increase is deemed advisable to effectuate the purposes of this Act) minus the aggregate amount of claims proved and approved under insurance policies and reinsurance agreements issued under this Act, but plus fees collected hereunder. For the purpose of applying this limitation, the face amount of any policy or agreement shall be deemed to be the original amount minus claims proved and approved thereunder.

"REINSURANCE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

"SEC. 11. (a) The Administrator is authorized to issue such regulations regarding reinsurance under this Act as he deems advisable in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"(b) The premium rate and terms and conditions of any policy reinsured under the provisons of this Act shall be subject to approval by the Administrator.

"(c) The Administrator shall use his best efforts to encourage private insurance companies to undertake the issuance of insurance policies covering that portion of the loss in excess of the limits specified in section 10 (a) of this Act resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property due to flood as defined in this Act. The Administrator may seek to achieve this end by offering a program of appropriate reinsurance within the authority granted him by this Act.

"(d) Wherever practicable, the Administrator may encourage, by offering suitable reinsurance subject to the provisions of this Act, the issuance by private insurance companies of policies insuring against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property due to flood.

"NONDUPLICATION OF AVAILABLE INSURANCE

"SEC. 12. (a) No insurance or reinsurance, or loan contract, shall be issued under the provisions of this Act covering risks against which insurance is available on reasonable terms from other public or private sources.

"(b) No insurance or reinsurance shall be issued under the provisions of this Act on any property declared by a duly constituted State or local zoning authority, or other authorized public body, to be in violation of State or local flood zoning laws.

"(c) After June 30, 1958, no insurance or reinsurance shall be issued under the provisions of this Act in any geographical location unless an appropriate public body shall have adopted and shall keep in effect such flood zoning restrictions, if any, as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator to reduce, within practicable limits, damages from flood in such location.

"USE OF OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FACILITIES

"SEC. 13. (a) In providing insurance or reinsurance under this Act, the Administrator shall use to the maximum practicable extent the facilities and services of private organizations and persons authorized to engage in the insurance business under the laws of any State (including insurance companies, agents, brokers, and adjustment organizations); and the Administrator may arrange for payment of reasonable compensation therefor.

"(b) In providing insurance or reinsurance under this Act, the Administrator may use the services of other public agencies, and pay reasonable compensation therefor.

"(c) The Administrator may supply, receive from and exchange with other agencies of the Federal Government, State, local, and interstate commissions or agencies, and private organizations experienced in the fields of insurance or reinsurance, such information as may be useful in the administration of the programs authorized by this Act.

"(d) In carrying out the functions authorized in this Act, the Administrator may consult with other agencies of the Federal Government and interstate, State, and local public agencies having responsibilities for land use and flood control and for flood zoning and flood-damage prevention in order to assure that the insurance and reinsurance programs are consistent with the programs of such agencies. Where the program of the Administrator may affect existing or proposed flood-control works under the jurisdiction of agencies of the Federal Government these agencies shall cooperate with the Administrator in coordinating their respective programs. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator shall coordinate the administration of their respective programs relating to flood insurance and reinsurance for agricultural commodities.

"(e) The Administrator may from time to time consult with representatives of the various States to the extent deemed necessary by him to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"CLAIMS PAYMENT AND JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 14. (a) Under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, he shall arrange for prompt adjustment and payment of valid claims for losses covered by insurance or reinsurance under this Act.

"(b) Upon disallowance of any claim against the Administrator under color of any insurance or reinsurance made available under this Act, or upon refusal of the claimant to accept the amount allowed upon any such claim, the claimant may institute an action against the Administrator on such claim in the United States district court in which a major portion (in terms of value) of the insured property is located. Any such action must be begun within one year after the date upon which the claimant receives from the Administrator written notice of disallowance or partial disallowance of the claim. For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may be sued and he shall appoint one or more agents within the jurisdiction of each United States district court upon whom service of process can be made in any action instituted under this section. Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon all United States district courts to hear and determine such actions without regard to the amount in controversy.

"FUNDS AND TREASURY BORROWINGS

"SEC. 15. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to establish three funds to be known as the (1) Disaster Insurance Fund, (2) Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and (3) Disaster Loan Fund.

"(b) Into the Disaster Insurance Fund shall be deposited all insurance fees collected by the Administrator for insurance policies issued by him under this Act, and the contributions made by the Administrator and the respective States in accordance with section 7 (a) of this Act. Into the Disaster Reinsurance Fund shall be deposited all fees collected by the Administrator in connection with reinsurance made available by him under this Act. Into the Disaster Loan Fund shall be deposited amounts accruing to the United States in connection with loan contract transactions.

"(c) Moneys in each of the funds may be invested in obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. Such obligations may be sold and the proceeds derived therefrom may be reinvested as above provided if deemed advisable by the Administrator. Income from such investment or reinvestment shall be deposited in the respective fund from which the investment was made.

"(d) All salvage proceeds realized by the Administrator in connection with insurance made available under this Act shall be deposited in the Disaster Insurance Fund; and all salvage proceeds realized by the Administrator in connection with reinsurance made available under this act shall be deposited in the Disaster Reinsurance Fund.

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time and have outstanding at any one time, in an amount not exceeding $500 million (or such greater amount as may be approved by the President) notes or other obligations in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations to be issued hereunder and for such purpose he is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and obligations.

"The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchase, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Funds borrowed under this section shall be deposited, in such proportions as the Administrator deems advisable, in the Disaster Insurance Fund, the Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and the Disaster Loan Fund.

"(f) Moneys in the Disaster Insurance Fund, the Disaster Reinsurance Fund, and the Disaster Loan Fund may be used for the following purposes as deemed necessary by the Administrator:

"(1) To pay from the Disaster Insurance Fund proved and approved claims for loss under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, insurance policies issued by the Administrator under this act;

"(2) To pay from the Disaster Reinsurance Fund proved and approved claims under, and other nonadministrative expenses arising in connection with, reinsurance agreements entered into by the Administrator under this Act;

"(3) To pay from the Disaster Loan Fund the amounts of loans made by the Administrator, amounts in payment of guarantees, and other nonadministrative expenses in connection with direct and guaranteed loans under this Act; and

"(4) To repay to the Secretary of the Treasury sums borrowed from him in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

"(g) All administrative expenses of the Federal Government under this Act shall be paid from funds appropriated by the Federal Government.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 16. In carrying out his functions under this Act, the Administrator shall appoint an advisory committee as authorized by section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 590, 645). Such committee shall consist of not less than three nor more than fifteen persons familiar with the problems of insurance or reinsurance, to advise the Administrator with respect to the formulation of policies and the execution of functions under this Act.

"STUDIES

"SEC. 17. (a) The Administrator shall undertake a continuing study of the practicability of extending the coverage of insurance programs similar to those authorized under this Act to any one or more natural disaster perils, other than flood, against which, and for the period during which, insurance protection is not generally and practically available in all geographical locations from other public or private sources.

"(b) The Administrator shall also undertake a continuing study of participation by private insurance companies in the programs authorized by this Act, in order that the protection it authorizes can be provided, whenever practicable, through insurance policies issued by private insurance companies and reinsured with the Administra-

tor, in lieu of providing such protection through insurance policies issued in the name of the Administrator.

"(c) The Administrator shall undertake a continuing study of the feasibility of having private insurance companies take over, with or without some form of Federal financial support, the insurance programs authorized by this Act.

"ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 18. For the purpose of carrying out functions under this Act the Administrator may—

"(a) sue or be sued;

"(b) without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529 and 41 U. S. C. 5), and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), enter into and perform contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions, on such terms as he may deem appropriate, with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or with any State or agency or political subdivision thereof, or with any person, firm, association, or corporation and consent to modification thereof, and make advance or progress payments in connection therewith;

"(c) without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 529 and 41 U. S. C. 5), and section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), by purchase, lease, or donation acquire such real and personal property and any interest therein, make advance or progress payments in connection therewith, and hold, use, maintain, insure against loss, sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real and personal property as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act;

"(d) appoint, pursuant to civil-service laws and regulations, such officers, attorneys, and employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; define their authority and duties; provide bonds for such of them as he may deem necessary; and delegate to them, and authorize successive redelegations by them, of such of the powers vested in him by this Act as he may determine;

"(e) conduct researches, surveys, and investigations relating to flood insurance and reinsurance and assembled data for the purpose of establishing estimated rates, fees, and premiums for flood insurance and reinsurance under this Act;

"(f) issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

"(g) exercise all powers specifically granted by the provisions of this Act and such incidental powers as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"RESERVATION OF RIGHTS IN REAL ESTATE ACQUIRED

"SEC. 19. The acquisition by the Administrator of any real property pursuant to this Act shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property.

"TAXATION

"SEC. 20. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to exempt any real property, acquired and held by the Administrator in connection with the payment of any claim under this Act, from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 21. The annual report made by the Administrator to the President for submission to the Congress under existing law on all programs provided for under this Act shall contain a comprehensive report concerning (1) the operation of insurance, reinsurance, and loan programs authorized under this Act, and (2) the status and result of studies authorized under section 17 of this Act, together with such recommendations, if any, for legislative changes deemed by the Administrator desirable to improve the operation of programs authorized under this Act. The annual report for the calendar year ending December 31, 1958, shall contain a list of the States which can be expected to participate in the insurance program authorized by this Act after June 30, 1959. The annual report for the calendar year ending December 31, 1961, shall contain an express opinion of the Administrator, supported by pertinent findings, concerning the advisability of withdrawing in whole or in part Federal financial support for insurance policies to be issued at any time after June 30, 1962, offering protection as authorized in this Act, taking into consideration the desirability of offering such protection. Such opinion shall be accompanied by recommendations for legislative changes deemed desirable by the Administrator in the event the opinion is to the effect that any such withdrawal of financial support is advisable.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 22. As used in this Act the term—

"(a) 'Flood' includes any flood, tidal wave, wave wash, or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landslide due to excess moisture, and shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed by regulation of the Administrator.

"(b) 'Person' means an individual or group of individuals, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, including State and local governments and agencies thereof;

"(c) 'United States', when used in a geographic sense, means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

"(d) 'State' includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

"(e) 'Administrator' means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

"SEPARABILITY PROVISION

"SEC. 23. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to any person or circumstance other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
MIKE MONRONEY,
WAYNE MORSE,
PRESCOTT BUSH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a subsitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The conference substitute is identical with the House amendment, except in two respects.

The House amendment contained a provision authorizing the Administrator to issue insurance policies on owner-occupied homes at reduced fees if he found that the owners of these homes, as a class, could not afford to pay the fees otherwise chargeable for such insurance under the bill. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The House recedes, and this provision is not included in the conference substitute.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided that after June 30, 1959, each State would be required to pay into the disaster insurance fund one-half the difference between the fees charged for policies issued after that date on property in that State and the estimated rates needed to cover losses on such properties. The provisions of the Senate bill on this point were more complete, providing for such matters as consultation between the State and Federal Governments and a statement in the Administrator's 1958 report of the number of States which could be expected to participate in the program after this requirement takes effect. The conference substitute follows the language of the Senate bill, with a technical amendment making it clear that when the States begin to contribute to the insurance fund, the Federal contributions will be reduced by a corresponding amount.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 655

Resolved, That a committee of two Members to be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The chair appoints as members of the Committee to notify the President the gentleman from Massachusttet [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 199) to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved etc., That there is hereby established one additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget, for which the compensation shall be the same as is now or may hereafter be provided for the two such positions heretofore authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 16a).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM LUKE PHALEN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1355) for the relief of William Luke Phalen.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a private bill?

Mr. MORANO. This just permits a postal employee to file a claim. There is no expense involved.

The SPEAKER. It is a private bill.

Mr. MORANO. It does not cost a cent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of William Luke Phalen, of Bridgeport, Conn., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from pulmonary tuberculosis alleged to have been contracted while in the performance of his duties as a clerk with the Post Office Department, Postal Transportation Service, Boston, Mass., shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL RATE LEGISLATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, accomplishments of a Congress are twofold in nature: One, in the passage of constructive legislation; and two, in preventing the passage of unwise and unfair legislation.

The increase in postal rates recommended for the past 3 years by the Republican administration imposed an unfair burden on the users of first-class mail. It constituted a 33⅓-percent users tax. It was also burdensome upon newspapers and magazines. While an increase for newspapers and magazines was justified the rates proposed were too high and too sudden.

The credit for the failure of this bill to pass is due to Democratic leadership.

In 1952, at least 90 percent of the press of the country supported General Eisenhower and the Republican candidates, and the thanks they received was increased burdens that would have adversely affected all of the newspapers of the country, except a few large metropolitan papers, who make most of their delivery by truck, and would have compelled many to stop their publication and go out of business.

It will be interesting to see in the coming campaign, if they will continue to support President Eisenhower and Republican candidates, or support or treat fairly Democratic candidates who fought for fair treatment for the press of America.

In this fight, and it was a hard one—with every effort made by the Republican administration to drive and force the bill through—the Democratic Members fought for fair treatment.

It will be interesting to see in the months ahead if the press of the country gives the Democrats fair treatment.

PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT AND COLLECTION OF WAGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

Whenever used in this act, (a) "employer" includes every individual, partnership, firm, association, corporation, the legal representative of a deceased individual, or the receiver, trustee, or successor of an individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation, employing any person in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the word "employer" shall not include the Government of the United States, the government of the District of Columbia, or any agency of either of said governments, or any employer subject to the Railway Labor Act.

(b) "Employee" shall include any person suffered or permitted to work by an employer except any person employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations promulgated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia).

(c) "Wages" means monetary compensation after lawful deductions, owed by an employer for labor or services rendered, whether the amount is determined on a time, task, piece, commission, or other basis of calculation.

(d) "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents.

(e) "Working day" means any day exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays.

SEMIMONTHLY PAYDAY

SEC. 2. Every employer shall pay all wages earned to his employees at least twice during each calendar month, on regular paydays designated in advance by the employer: *Provided, however*, That an interval of not more than 10 working days may elapse between the end of the pay period covered and the regular payday designated by the employer, except where a different period is specified in a collective agreement between an employer and a bona fide labor organization: *Provided further*, That where, by contract or custom, an employer has paid wages at least once each calendar month, he may lawfully continue to do so. Wages shall be paid on designated paydays in lawful money of the United States, or checks on banks payable upon demand by the bank upon which drawn.

EMPLOYEES WHO ARE SEPARATED FROM THE PAYROLL BEFORE A REGULAR PAYDAY

SEC. 3. Unless otherwise specified in a collective agreement between an employer and a bona fide union representing his employees—

(a) Whenever an employer discharges an employee, the employer shall pay the employee's wages earned not later than the working day following such discharge.

(b) Whenever an employee (not having a written contract of employment for a period in excess of 30 days) quits or resigns, the employer shall pay the employee's wages due upon the next regular payday or within 7 days from the date of quitting or resigning, whichever is earlier.

(c) When work of an employee is suspended as a result of a labor dispute, the employer shall pay to such employee not later than the next regular payday, designated under section 2 of this act, wages earned at the time of suspension.

(d) If an employer fails to pay an employee wages earned as required under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, such employer shall pay, or be additionally liable to, the employee, as liquidated damages, 10 percent of the unpaid wages for each working day during which such failure shall continue after the day upon which payment is hereunder required; or an amount equal to the unpaid wages, whichever is smaller: *Provided, however*, That for the purpose of such liquidated damages such failure shall not be deemed to continue after the date of the filing of a petition in bankruptcy with respect to the employer if he thereafter shall have been adjudicated bankrupt upon such petition.

UNCONDITIONAL PAYMENT OF WAGES CONCEDED TO BE DUE

SEC. 4. In case of a bona fide dispute concerning the amount of wages due, the employer shall give written notice to the employee of the amount of wages which he concedes to be due, and shall pay such amount, without condition, within the time required by sections 2 and 4 of this act: *Provided, however*, That acceptance by the employee of any payment made hereunder shall not constitute a release as to the balance of his claim. Payment in accordance with this section shall constitute payment

for the purposes of complying with sections 2 and 4 of this act, only if there exists a bona fide dispute concerning the amount of wages due.

PROVISIONS OF LAW MAY NOT BE WAIVED BY AGREEMENT

SEC. 5. Except as herein provided, no provision of this act shall in any way be contravened or set aside by private agreement.

ENFORCEMENT, RECORDS, AND SUBPENAS

SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioners shall enforce and administer the provisions of this act and may hold hearings and otherwise investigate any violations of this act and institute actions for penalties provided hereunder. Any and all prosecutions of violations of this act shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia and by the Corporation Counsel or his assistants.

(b) The Commissioner shall have power to administer oaths and examine witnesses under oath, issue subpenas, compel the attendance of witnesses, and the production of papers, books, accounts, records, payrolls, documents, and testimony and to take depositions and affidavits in any proceedings before them.

(c) In case of failure of any person to comply with any subpena lawfully issued, or on the refusal of any witness to testify to any matter regarding which he may be lawfully interrogated, it shall be the duty of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or any judge thereof, on application by the Commissioners, to compel obedience by attachment procedings for contempt, as in the case of disobedience of the requirements of a subpena issued from such court or a refusal to testify therein.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any employer who, having the ability to pay, willfully violates any provisions of section 2 or section 4 of this act or who fails to comply with any other provisions of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall for the first offense be punished by a fine of not more than $300, or by imprisonment of not more than 30 days, or in the discretion of the court, by both such fine and imprisonment; and for any subsequent offense shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or more than 90 days, or in the discretion of the court, by both such fine and imprisonment.

EMPLOYEES' REMEDIES

SEC. 8. (a) Action by an employee to recover unpaid wages and liquidated damages may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employes similarly situated, or such employee or employees may designate an agent or representative to maintain such action for and on behalf of all employees similarly situated. Any employee, or his representative, shall have the power to settle and adjust his claim for unpaid wages. Whenever the Commissioners determine that wages have not been paid, as herein provided and that such unpaid wages constitute an enforceable claim, the Commissioners may, upon the request of the employee, take an assignment in trust for the assigning employee of such wages, and of any claim for liquidated damages, without being bound by any of the technical rules respecting the validity of any such assignments, may bring any appropriate legal action necessary to collect such claim and may join in one proceeding or action such claims against the same employer as the Commissioners deem appropriate. Upon any such assignment the Commissioners shall have power to settle and adjust any such claim or claims on such terms as they may deem just.

(b) The court in any action brought under this section shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, allow costs of the action, including costs or fees of any nature, and reasonable attorney's fees, to be paid by the defendant. Such attorney's fees in the case of actions brought under this subsection by the Commissioners shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia. The Commissioners shall not be required to pay the filing fee or other costs or fees of any nature or to file bond or other security of any nature in connection with any action or proceeding under this act.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 9. The Commissioners are authorized to delegate to any agency of the government of the District of Columbia any function, power, or duty vested in or imposed upon them by this act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect 60 days after its approval.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: On page 3, line 14, after the word "discharge" and before the period, insert the following language: *"Provided, however,* That in the instance of an employee who is responsible for moneys belonging to the employer, the employer shall be allowed a period of 4 days from the date of discharge or resignation for the determination of the accuracy of the employee's accounts, at the end of which time all wages earned by the employee shall be paid."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress, and that as a personal note and as a last observation he conveys his best wishes to Sam.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a House Concurrent Resolution (H. Con. Res. 276) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on July 27, 1956, and that when they adjourn on that day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 277) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolution duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, nothwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 656) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Reolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-fifth Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could the distinguished majority leader tell us approximately the last date for the inclusion of these remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It is usually 10 days after the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. SHORT. That was my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 657) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841 et seq.), shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING REPORTS FILED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 84th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FACTFINDING TRIP TO THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Timothy J. Murphy, who is a valued friend of mine and a great leader of his splendid organization, recently took a trip to the Middle East.

Upon his return Commander in Chief Murphy made a report of a factfinding trip to the Middle East. It is a report worthy of widespread publicity and consideration.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to include his report in my remarks.

I shall now read the report of Commander in Chief Timothy J. Murphy, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

REPORT OF A FACTFINDING TRIP TO THE MIDDLE EAST BY COMMANDER IN CHIEF TIMOTHY J. MURPHY, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

Because of the ferment in the Middle East, the Congressional debate on Military and Economic Aid for foreign countries, the precarious status of NATO, and the long term trends that are fraught with danger for the West, I deemed it advisable as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also as a Reserver officer in the Navy to visit some critical areas where I could learn something of the grave problems that should be of interest to all informed Americans. Much was learned; and I came away with enhanced respect for the zeal and devotion to duty of most of our Government officials in the areas visited.

I took off on May 8 from the Norfolk Air Station and arrived at the large, well equipped airfield at Argentia, Newfoundland in 6½ hours. There we dined, the plane was fueled, and at 1930 took off in direct flight for the Azores. The green fields, volcanic mountains, and red roofed Moorish type dwellings of these old Portuguese islands surrounded by the blue Atlantic is an enchanting sight particularly when viewed at daybreak and early morning. We should all highly value our NATO ally, Portugal, and be thankful for the opportunity of having United States Air Forces on these important strategic links in the first line defense of the United States. But only a few hours in the Azores and then on with a new crew and some passengers for British Gibraltar and the continent of Europe, via Fort Lyautey in French Morocco, which is a United States Navy installation about 60 miles north of Casablanca. There the Navy maintains an efficient, well-laid-out airbase with modern barracks and an up-to-date commissary and ship's store. Here again another link of our defense against aggression by Soviet Russia, a part of the high price that must be paid to contain a great military power that has the goal of world conquest.

Off to Gibraltar, arriving in an hour. The historic "Rock" looked much like the insurance advertisement we have all known since childhood. Although time was short, opportunity was taken to visit the old rock fortress; see the tunnels hewn from solid rock and hear a few stories of its many sieges and thrilling history. In the atomic age its strategic value is debatable other than importance as a unit of the old British Empire chain for fueling naval vessels, and providing repair facilities, and a landing field. On May 10 we left Gibraltar for the 7-hour flight to Malta, another British base that was of tremendous strategic value in World War II. Much of the day we flew over Algiers and Tunisia, far reaching oceans of sand, flat and desolate, only a few oases here and there. My thoughts went first to the old days of the early American Navy when we fought the Barbary pirates of these Moslem States, and over Tunisia I recalled the first great battles of our troops in this part of the world with remembrance of the sacrifices made by our men in campaigns such as the Kasserine Pass in Tunisia and the all-out assault on Sicily.

In flying into Malta one is impressed by the fact that it comprises the principal British military and naval base in the Mediterranean and one of great strategic value from earliest times; proof of which is it has belonged successively to the Phoenicians, the Greeks, the Carthaginians, the Romans and the Saracens. In 1530, it was given by Charles V to the Knights Hospitalers (therefore sometimes called the Knights of Malta). It should be of historic interest to the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that the insignia of our organization, the Cross of Malta, was the distinctive symbol of this ancient band of crusaders and knights.

Malta can take it. We should never forget that in World War II, between 1940 and 1943, Malta was subjected to well over 2,000 heavy air raids by Italian and German planes, but the solid fortifications and air-raid shelters built into the rock and an intensive anti-aircraft concentration kept the Axis from bombing Malta into subjection. In 1942 the entire Maltese population was awarded a decoration for bravery by George VI. It was in 1943 at Valetta, the capital, that the entire Italian Fleet surrendered to the British. And while speaking of things nautical, St. Paul was shipwrecked on this island of Malta, a land of classical antiquity.

Still May 10 and flying over Sicily en route to Naples. Here in 1943 with heavy losses and against stubborn defense an Allied landing was effected with troops from the North African bases. It was in the general sea area of these landings that the Romans defeated the Carthaginian fleet 256 B. C. But if one wants to delve in early history one is reminded that the leading Greek city of ancient Sicily was founded 734 B. C. Since peace has come to this part of the world it seems long ago that General Patton and his Americans stormed the beachheads of this rugged Italian island at the toe of the Italian "boot." However, history will ever record how our men of the New World fought and died on historic seas and ancient battlefields in lands that once knew the grandeur of Greece and the glories of Rome.

Soon we were flying over beautiful Capri and got our first thrilling view of old Vesuvius and the hauntingly beautiful harbor of Naples. Although the inhabitants appear to be packed like sardines in the city of Naples, they are a gay, carefree people loving their music and their wine, and particularly friendly to the Americans stationed there. For those not informed it is well to know that Naples serves as NATO southern European headquarters and the main base of all of our naval activities in the Mediterranean. It was my good fortune to meet shortly after my arrival Capt. Harry Cross, United States Navy, attached to NATO in a public relations capacity. He made clear the definite policies of doing all possible to effect in the peoples of free Europe good will for our Armed Forces, wherever stationed or billeted. It was heartening to learn how the senior officers of all our services pay special attention to this important factor in our foreign representation with particular emphasis on furthering the good name and prestige of the United States as a country.

Also I had the opportunity while in Naples, at a reception, to meet some senior representatives of the Department of State and a good number of the officers of other NATO nations. One is much impressed by the all for one and one for all spirit of these officers who until recently served under the supreme command of Gen. Alfred Gruenther and now under the command of the able General Norstadt. Their problems are many but as Americans we should be eternally grateful for the achievement of NATO in the way of providing a common defense in these perilous years of the cold war.

On May 13 took off for Rome to make connections for my flight to the Middle East. Because of the low altitude it was a most interesting flight because one could observe closely and distinctly the villages perched on crags and hills, the little farms, the olive orchards, and the vineyards of this ancient land. And as for Rome, I thought of the millions of pilgrims and sightseers who have been thrilled through the centuries by the recall of its many classical, historical, and sacred associations. But I did not have much time to reflect on such things because of my disappointment on learning that the flight to Athens had been canceled. Because of my haste to get on to the Near East,

the lands I came to visit, arrangements were made for a commercial flight to Athens, leaving Rome early morning and arriving in 3 hours at Athens. So after 5 days from the United States I was in the land of Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle; Greece, the country with the longest history of any country in Europe.

Before taking a look at the problems of modern Greece, it is well to recall that Greece has had many lives and died many deaths. Think of it, invaded in whole or in part by Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Gauls, Goths, Slavs, Franks, Norman, Sicilians, Genoese, Florentines, Navaresse, Venetians, Catalans, Turks, and Germans. From all she has taken something but invariably, as it has been written, she has "led captivity captive." However, many qualities of the conqueror have molded the modern Greek character yet love of liberty and life, a certain perennial youth, and strong religious solidarity are marked characteristics of the Greeks, our ally in the Atlantic Pact.

We must remember that the Truman Doctrine contributed to a major degree in bringing domestic stability to Greece and preventing the country from becoming a Soviet satellite. Since 1944, UNRRA assistance, British financial aid, then American aid through the Truman Doctrine, Marshall plan, and MSA has amounted to over $2½ billion. About one-third of this huge sum was used in a bitter war to defend the 52,220 square miles of Greek territory from Communist aggression; and the rest of the money restored the economy of a country that suffered an estimated $7 billion damage in World War II.

The American Embassy had been apprised of my visit and an automobile came to take me to the Chancery. I had the opportunity at this time to see a most colorful ceremonial of Royal Guards in honor of President Heuss, of West Germany. These striking soldiers of the Royal Guard, members of the Evzones, a select infantry unit, wear the traditional kilt of the mountain warriors. Some of the short pleated skirts contain 40 yards of material and with tasseled cap, braided jacket, leggings, and red shoes with black pompons, comprise one of the most colorful elite corps in the world. After this royal ceremonial I met Admiral Cooper, United States Navy, who gave me a thorough briefing on the past performance and the duties of the joint United States Military Assistance Team. I learned of the functions of this group in the distribution of the military weapons and supplies, something distinct from the planning and liaison duties of NATO. Because it is a command and supply question, it would seem that to combine these functions would be extremely difficult. It is as if in the Navy the admiral or the captain took on the functions of supply officer in addition to other well-defined and important duties. There is the question of whether NATO should take over these duties.

I had talks with the representatives of the United States Information Service and NATO as well as an excellent briefing by Mr. Thurston, the Consul General, on the explosive question of Cyprus. The United States Ambassador to Greece, the Honorable Cavidis Cannon, was most courteous and helpful. Our senior representative in Greece gave me a clear and factual picture of the problems that face both the United States and the Greek Government in this bitter dispute. The Ambassador gave unstintedly of his time to make clear the unique aspects of the Cyprus controversy with its threat to peace in that part of the world with emphasis on the fissure that already exists in Greek-Turkish relations. For this education in international relations, I am indeed grateful. It is a huge problem and cannot be oversimplified.

I was most fortunate to meet a well informed Greek gentleman, Elias P. Demetracopoulous who had been a prisoner of both the Germans and the Communists. Because of his long experience as a newspaperman and writer treating of world affairs, he had met most of the political and military leaders of the Middle East and the European world and was in a position to make clear many questions of history and policy pertinent to the general area of the Near East. When I paid my respects on the next day to the American Embassy, Mr. Demetracopoulous was there and accompanied me in my call on the Minister of Foreign Affairs, His Excellency, Mr. Spyros Theotokis. In explaining the more serious problems that occupy him and confront his government, I was particularly impressed by two points that he made.

First: That when other countries were occupied with rehabilitation after the ravages of World War II, it was the fate of his country to fight another long and bitter war with Greek Communists; a struggle that although called by the outside world, a civil war, was in reality a war that had aid and direction from Moscow. He emphasized that the war had been won by loyal Greeks with military assistance from the United States but that no foreign troops took part and that only the lives and blood of Greeks were lost. It was a costly war both in lives and wealth and one that had to be won before rehabilitation could be commenced. After victory Greece as all the world knows made great strides to build a sound peacetime economy. Second: The Minister made the point that under no condition can the United States ignore the Cypriot national struggle. He compared the United States, the leader of the Free World to that of the captain of a football team with the players as our allies and colleagues and stated that a good captain works for harmony among all his players in order to achieve the mission and win the game.

I was fortunate to have an interview with Lt. Gen. Constantine Dovos, the Chief of the Greek National Defense Staff. The distinguished general who was severely wounded in the Greek civil or Communist war was also a veteran of brilliant military record in both World Wars. He strongly emphasized that from a military viewpoint NATO is essential to Greece and that Greece is important to NATO. He expressed the hope that under no circumstances would NATO disintegrate or lose its vitality. He made the observation that in the event of aggression by the Communist world that Greece was the back door to Yugoslavia and a base for the Free World in the Near East.

As for NATO, General Dovos hoped that major differences would be resolved because it was difficult to explain to people that NATO will save and protect them from their enemies when it permits them to be abused by their friends. In fact, he advocated a much stronger NATO; one that would function and meet problems under a constitution positive charter or more authoritative direction at the top, in contradistinction to the present loose and flexible organization. He reasoned that this positive order giving authority should be in and a part of NATO; that because after all NATO is an organization of 15 allied nations forming a common front against Communist aggression and Dovos was of the opinion that because of the aims, objectives and ideals inherent in NATO's mission is in a much better position to decide major defense issues than the United Nations with its 87 countries, many of which are not familiar with or have no connection with NATO.

From this very direct and thought-provoking conference, I was taken to call on the Minister to the Prime Minister, Constantine Tsatsos, a gentleman, small in stature but dynamic and engaging in personality who informed me immediately that his government was pro-Western and always would be—however, it was still a government that depended upon the votes of the people. He added that the Greeks are extremely political, fond of disputes, and most sentimental on national issues. He remarked that although the American Ambassador had stated the people were too stable to abandon a pro-Western government of Greece that at times he was not so sure because of the way the Communists were exploiting and with all the acumen of genius the problems of Greece. For example: On Cyprus the Communists are against liberation, while on the mainland they urge liberation; and to disrupt the Atlantic Pact, the Communists are agitating for a Tito, Athens, and Cairo Axis. I learned while in Greece of the subtle nets of interest that Greece has with her neighbors, therefore, the problem is—how to repair, strengthen, and preserve them without weakening the Atlantic Pact and Greek membership in that far-flung peaceful alliance.

As for Cyprus, he believed that the Greek position was very moderate. Annexation was not sought but rather local autonomy under the Crown first and after a constitutional form of government had been firmly established and functioning then the matter of self-determination could be brought to a vote by the people of Cyprus. The minister maintained that the status quo of military installations would not be affected and that any description of agreement relative to the preservation of the right of the military to maintain bases was acceptable. He felt the type of government he advocated could set up constitutional guaranties that would give adequate protection to the "Turks" living on that unhappy and terror stricken island. He maintained that all the equities were on the side of the Greek position and that the issues should be met before the situation worsens in the present highly charged political atmosphere.

When making my final visit to the Embassy to bid farewell and express my heartfelt thanks for the courtesies extended, I noted the elaborate ceremonies and gala decorations in Athens to honor the Shah of Iran who was making a state visit. The Royal Palace and state buildings were draped with Greek and Iran flags, full dress uniforms of the military and civil were to be seen in the vicinity of government buildings—all of which was most colorful and impressive.

On May 17 with a last look from the air at the Parthenon, the masterpiece of harmonious perfection that has inspired poets and architects of every age since Phidias built it about 500 B. C., we were on our way to Ankara, Turkey. On May 18, I was met at the American Embassy at Ankara by the senior military attachés who conducted me to senior officers in the Consulate General and there I received an excellent briefing on the Near East problems and particularly the Turkish views on the contentions and arguments of the Turks. One is impressed by the cumulative venom of age-old feuds, wars, and bloodshed. It is most difficult, too, for the average American to understand from afar the mental conditioning of peoples of divergent stocks and religions who have been in bitter disputes for centuries and who now, in an age of self-discrimination, are prone to permit their sentiments and prejudices to overlook hard facts and present Communist threats, to the end that local, national views obscure the larger picture of world affairs. These are some of the things that American voters should understand before glib remarks as to what Greece, Turkey, and other countries should do. However, we have some of that attitude in the United States. As in this country, the electorate must be considered, and over there sometimes the intelligent but more often the illiterate and uninformed are influenced largely by ancient grudges. And also, it must ever be kept in mind that there, as here, a sound foreign policy must rest on a sound basis of domestic

stability. In the Near East that usually means something to eat, and lodging.

On the evening of May 18, I had the opportunity of meeting many officials at the United States Armed Forces Day reception. Not only were the United States representatives and our allies present but many military and diplomatic officials of countries behind the Iron Curtain were in attendance. It was a friendly and beautifully arranged social event that cast credit on the Armed Forces of our country and enhanced our prestige as a Nation.

I was much impressed by the blend of old and new in the capital, Ankara. The seat of government was transferred there in 1923 by Kemal Attaturk, the dynamic revolutionary leader and modernizer of Turkey. Ankara was a commercial city in the ancient days of the Hittites, 1300 B. C., and in the first century A. D. was the capital of a Roman province. The old part of Ankara that I visited is still most primitive comparable to a large section of Seoul in Korea—without running water, sewage, or any so-called modern conveniences. The houses were ancient, crowded, and packed with people. I thought while there of how necessary it was to keep striving to improve the lot of the poor and underprivileged—of redoubling the effort to raise the standard of living throughout the world in order to combat successfully communism's appeal to those who have nothing to lose or so they think when they embrace its ideology.

I was surprised to learn that about two thousand Americans live in Ankara, the greater number of the male adults are attached to the various Government missions, commissions of military and technical assistance, and the Department of State. There did not seem to me that there was much fraternization or integration, probably because of the language barrier and customs. The Americans have their own post exchanges, clubs, schools and places of entertainment and while there is not much mixing there is no doubt that there is mutual respect of each nation for the other.

In talking with General Riley, of the United States, about the aid for Turkey, he made it clear that Turkey needed and should receive aid, particularly in the light of the fact that Turkey had always been in our corner. He added that she had never exacted a promise or condition from us for the aid. As to how long this aid program should continue, he was not sure. Mr. Hirshberg, an American economist, joined us and gave an interesting account of the rise in Turkish industry and agriculture that had been stimulated by United States aid, but at my visit production was down because of the lack of foreign exchange.

While in Ankara, Mr. John Goodyear arranged an appointment for me to call on Orham Eralp, Director General of the Second Department of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a department that covers much of the troubled, critical, and strategic areas in the world. He escorted us to meet His Excellency, Nuri Birgi, Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who was in charge of the office in the absence of the Minister. Mr. Birgi has the reputation of being a very scholarly, erudite, and brilliant man, and certainly leaves that impression in an interview. I frankly told him that I was on a factfinding mission and desired to report to policymakers in the VFW exactly what I learned in order that they would get a more precise picture of the problems of the Near East, and particularly as to United States aid to the countries of this general area. I told him what the officials of the Greek Government had told me as to their position on Cyprus. He then, in a logical, incisive, and scholarly way, met all the arguments of the Greeks and expressed his own and the views of the Turkish Government. I felt that I had heard in Greece and Turkey, as does a judge in court, both sides of a most controversial and complex question presented by about the most able and senior representatives of the two respective nations. It was an education, a rare experience that I shall never forget. And on the question of Cyprus, Mr. Birgi said that he had lectured at the NATO War College at Istanbul. The matter of self-determination of the Cypriots arose, and Mr. Birgi asserted that it was his observation that no United States State Department official or military man there would unconditionally favor the right of self-determination to be the conclusive and deciding factor of area status.

As a preliminary of a discussion on United States aid, I told the distinguished statesman that a good number of people at home thought that many foreign countries not only accept but expect aid and that when the time comes to stop or curtail it, we will no longer have friends but on the contrary have tried to cultivate countries that are basically unfriendly. To that Mr. Birgi replied in substance: Turkey has been advised and conditioned that United States aid is not permanent, will be diminished and will eventually be curtailed. However, because the aid is authorized by yearly congressional appropriations no precise planning can be made for its distribution. He made the point emphatically that United States aid had had a tremendous impact in raising the economy of the free countries and most certainly had bolstered United States national security as well as theirs. But he did feel strongly that the matter of aid could have been developed and given in a far more effective way. He was fair and also qualified his remarks with the observation that it was relatively simple to sit on the sidelines and point out defects. He stressed the fact that the Turks had an abiding love for Americans and had never put any conditions or limitations on their allegiance to NATO and the cause of our country. This, he added, is not the case in some countries.

He believed that originally aid should have been given under the following three categories:

1. Those who unequivocably support, are loyal to, and attach no strings or conditions to their commitment to the major international policies of the United States.

2. Those who have sincere and valid reasons to modify or condition their commitment to the United States.

3. Those who accept the aid with thanks but who are neither anxious nor willing to commit themselves to the general international policies of the United States or the cause of the free world.

Mr. Birgi advanced his informed opinion that the United States in its bountiful generosity had left the impression in some countries that if the Soviets made a conciliatory gesture or promised some aid to a country, the United States ran after the country with a "basket of fruit," asking that they accept some. This had left an impression that United States aid had in some places not been unselfish but rather a counter to Soviet gestures and promises that might never have been realized. He believed the Soviets used this tactic to keep the United States on tenterhooks and at the same time insure that we expend more than was necessary in foreign aid for some countries.

I have no doubts about the friendship of the Turks for the United States. We shall never forget their fierce fighting in Korea. Think of it—soldiers that get 17 cents a month in pay. Yes, it is 17 cents a month—and most from poor families.

On May 23 in preparation for my visit to Israel I had a most interesting conversation with Colonel Gaon, the Israeli military attaché to Turkey. He pointed out the great strides that his poor and small country were making with emphasis on the hostile borders and the adverse criticism and bad public opinion relative to the Gaza strip. He was proud of how his countrymen and government has brought arid land into production and commenced the first industrialization of its kind in that part of the world. The Colonel said that the inhabitants of Israel reflect all shades of political philosophy and beliefs with a small percentage of Communists. I looked forward eagerly to my trip to Israel and the Holy Land for although tension would be high between Jew and Mohammedan, I know of no clear-cut solution to the many differences dividing these troubled lands and I at least would have the opportunity to visit the places where our Judeo-Christian civilization was born and visit shrines that are the symbols of my religion.

It was on the drive to the splendid, modern airport at Ankara that I was forcibly impressed with the age of these historic lands, the links with the past and of man's eternal struggle to survive in a land of scarcity. I saw a living picture that made one think of nomads, Old Testament characters, and ancient history. There on the crest of a hill, silhouetted in the setting sun, outlined in golden light, was an old Turk riding a sturdy little ass and shepherding his precious caravan of a cow, a goat, a sheep, and a dog. He was pointed toward a rugged, primitive baked-brick hut on the crest of the hill, a son of Allah who was going home to rest, an ageless picture for this part of the ancient world—the life of his fathers.

However, farming methods are slowly changing. In 1948 Turkey had no more than 2,000 tractors, but today, partly as a result of $500 million in United States aid, there are 20 times that many. The old and new can often be seen side by side. Turkey, only 10 years ago, raised barely enough wheat for its own people, has now become a large world exporter. A country of the type of Turkey will not forget this aid from the United States, and as Mr. Birgi told me, although the United States is the benefactor now, the time may come when she will be glad to have all possible aid from those she once befriended. That could be.

On the flight to Beirut, in Lebanon, I sat beside Mr. Robert E. Lee, who was connected with OCA, and told me of the various projects in that part of the world that were receiving the attention of our Government. Had I time, I should have enjoyed some sightseeing off the beaten track; for example, Damascus, which is said to be the oldest city in the world, but I was conforming closely to my original mission of learning all the modern history I could absorb. Comdr. Frank Kelly, the American naval attaché, met me, but in the short time I was unable to get an embassy briefing on the Arab-Israel controversy, and left on May 24 for Jerusalem. I was fortunate on my arrival to join a small pilgrimage that was visiting Christianity's holy places. One has an indescribable feeling when, after visiting the remains of Herod's Fortress, where Christ was condemned, walking the approximate route that Jesus walked to his triumph and death over 1,923 years ago. And never shall I forget standing on the ancient hill of Calvary and there entering the venerated shrine of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, that covers the site where Christ arose from the tomb after His Crucifixion, for it was there in the words of St. Luke, "They found the stone rolled away from the sepulcher." The original church was built by Constantine the Great in the fourth century and is decorated with ornate lamps and candelabra given by kings and emperors of the eastern and western Christian empires. All that I had ever learned of the Blessed Mary and her first born came to mind when I visited the Church of the Nativity in the village, the holy town of Bethlehem of ancient Judea. The Christian world owes a great debt to the eight-hundred-odd Christian monks, priests,

ministers, and missionaries who care for these holy places in the old city of Jerusalem.

On May 25, Mr. Eugene H. Bird of the United State consulate gave me an up-to-the-minute exposition of the Arab-Israel situation, its many ramifications and knotty problems. Colonel Hodman, of the United States Marine Corps, escorted me into "No Man's Land," the international zone, where the United Nations Headquarters is located. Here in a beautiful modern building that permits a striking view of Jerusalem, I was presented to General Burns of the Canadian Army, head of the United Nations Delegation, who talked of the various aspects of the tense situation. He made it clear that the United Nations was a factfinding body and had no immediate jurisdiction in the matter of the sales of arms or authority as to whether or not there should be an arms embargo. He indicated that he hoped neither side would be further armed and that an international agreement could be negotiated with mutual agreement that the signers would not furnish arms to either side. He was relieved that the situation was much better than in April.

In conversation with two political attachés of the United Nations, I was told that the situation remained tense and highly charged with emotion on the part of both sides with the added comment that even though the shooting had died down, it was preferable to have a cooling-off period before positive steps be taken in the attempt of negotiation. Informed officials give the impression of hoping for the best but fearing the worst.

On May 26, after receiving an exit visa, Mr. Bind, of the American consulate general, took me through the well-defended Mandelbaum Gate. After clearing the officials of the Jordan side, I was then cleared after inspection to the Israel side and driven to our consulate. My first impressions of Israel and her people were excellent. One is struck by the modernity of the streets and buildings, the well-dressed and cheerful people. It is as if one went from an old world to a prosperous new one although I am told there are Jewish refugees living presently in shoddy camps and in abject poverty. However, it is doubted whether any country in history has ever made so much progress in such a short time.

Mr. Teddy Kolluch, an influential gentleman in the Ben-Gurion government, stressed what his country had done in the way of soil reclamation and the establishment of industry. He discussed the huge and pressing problems of placing refugees as they arrived, getting them in communities and making them self-sustaining and productive. We then drove into Tel Aviv, where we saw striking evidence of the things Mr. Kolluch had talked of, good streets, water conservation, electric power lines, villages of modern construction, and a general air of order and purpose seemed the rule. There is no argument, it presents a decided contrast with the Arab countries, where in most areas sanitation, ordinary cleanliness, and personal hygiene are almost unknown. I hope that the cease-fire truce will be maintained between the two distinct civilizations and that Mr. Dag Hammarskjold and the United Nations will in time effect a workable modus vivendi. Feelings are now high, and the conflicting forces in the Middle East, all exacerbated by Communist connivance and conspiracy, do not augur well for the future. The Crown Prince of Yemen and the Shah of Persia have been to Moscow, and the new dictator of the Near East, President Gamal Abdel Nasser, is planning his visit. Some informed observers believe that when Israel's Premier David Ben-Gurion dropped his Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett last month, June, that he is paving the way for a tougher policy toward his Arab neighbors.

On May 27 left Tel Aviv by commercial plane, crossing the fabled island of Rhodes, where once existed one of the wonders of the world, the famous Colossus—and it was not built by Hollywood. With a stop at Athens, we went soon on our way to the heel of Italy. And thence up the beautiful east coast of Italy, with its green farms and fertile, well-kept fields, on to Rome, the Appenines, and out over the snowcapped Alps to Paris. Here, after a short meeting with our VFW officials of the Benjamin Franklin post in Paris, off again for Brussels and home.

For the period of time much territory was covered and very much learned in the way of unsolved problems, dilemmas, and a peculiar awareness of the nature of the threat of long-term communism in the Middle East. I believe that many of our officials, although not talking for publication or attribution by observers traveling in my capacity, are genuinely worried. There is no doubt that the Communists are working night and day to win the good will of the seething, unpredictable Arab world.

For example in Libya, the pressure, extent, and tenor of Soviet propaganda reached such a pitch that most propaganda activities of foreign governments have been prohibited, while Somaliland has filed formal complaint with the United Nations on the same activity. It is reported that in Jordan the pro-Egyptian Army group that ejected British Lt. Gen. Sir John Glubb is becoming more influential in politics and power. While all report that Nasser is doubling his efforts to weld a Moslem bloc with, of course, himself as dictator at the helm. Nasser is also behind the steady penetration of Islam into pagan Africa. We must remember that Soviet technical missions are also making hay in the countries of the Near East which brings us to an important point—how much technical aid should go to the countries in this area. Note, I said in the area of the Near and Middle East?

First, I believe that there should be an unbiased, nonpartisan evaluation and reappraisal of the whole question of technical and military aid. Times are changing and changing fast. This time last year we could call the Mediterranean a Western Powers' lake; all that has happened within a year in the way of Soviet gains in the area has greatly changed that situation although the West still has a preponderance of air and sea power in the area. But I believe that the Western Powers should make every effort to resolve the Cyprus situation and bring about better feeling between Greece and Turkey. They are both on our team; they can fight; and we need their bases for operations in that part of the world. Therefore, we should go slow in curtailing economic or military aid in that area but a study should be made of the balance or proportion between that purely technical and that classified as military. Both categories of aid should be regarded as a means of increasing our own national security in its global considerations, and certainly not as some people facetiously refer to it as a "giveaway program."

After this interesting and eye-opening trip I am more convinced than ever that Russia is still hell bent for achievement of her mission of world domination. It is true that the Kremlin got to smelling so badly that the old ax men of Stalin had to do some fumigation and blame their once dear leader for some of the murders, conspiracies, and diabolical crimes. But have they the willing servants of the late monster of Red terror taken any blame for the crimes they carried out at this direction and in the hope of their personal rise to power? Emphatically, no. Rather have they taken another tack, a wiser one diplomatically, and one that could lull us into a false sense of security: it is that of peaceful competitive coexistence with much publicity about manpower cuts and disarmament. For all who believe this twaddle, I request that he give some thought to a quotation from a speech made in 1931 by a brilliant Russian Communist to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow.

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. The bourgeoise will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtones and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we will smash them with our clenched fist."

The Soviets are now on one phase of their peace offensive making neutrals of those who cannot be enveigled as allies, stirring the Moslem world against the Christian and Jewish world, retaining the basic features of a political philosophy that permitted a Stalin to rise to unbridled power, building nuclear weapons at a heavy pace, and putting out the hand of peace and friendship at every opportunity. In short, the only hope of preventing a third world war is predominant strength, readiness for massive and instant retaliation, and a dedicated people with the fortitude to make great sacrifices even in a cold war.

In history's greatest contest for survival we must keep strong or we shall fall.

THE HONORABLE JOHN PHILLIPS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to pay tribute to our colleague from California, Mr. JOHN PHILLIPS, who has served here many, many years. I had the privilege of serving in the State legislature with JOHN PHILLIPS, starting in 1933, at which time he represented the county of Riverside, Calif. Later he became Congressman from my district and still later that district was divided and I took a portion of JOHN PHILLIPS' district.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no man in this House who has rendered a greater service to his country, to his State, and to his district than has JOHN PHILLIPS and I take this opportunity to wish JOHN PHILLIPS all of the success in the world in his retirement and to congratulate him for the marvelous service he has rendered, the unselfish, dedicated service he has rendered.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from California in paying tribute to JOHN PHILLIPS. Mr. PHILLIPS and I came to this House at the same time almost 14 years ago. One always feels a special kinship for the people of one's own class, so to speak.

JOHN PHILLIPS is an extraordinarily industrious person, with a capacity for infinite pain in analyzing facts and figures. He is a hard-headed and a level-headed man who looks at the fine print as well as the big print. He has worked steadily and courageously in the best interest of our country as a whole in the complicated field of appropriations. At the same time, he is always kindly, courteous, and considerate.

All of us who have known and worked with JOHN PHILLIPS have experienced ever-increasing regard, respect, and admiration for him. We are sorry to see him retiring, voluntarily, because I am sure he could have stayed here as long as he wanted to, if he had been willing to run.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to Mrs. Phillips and John my warm good wishes and trust that in their retirement they will have the best of all goods things.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay a brief tribute to my friend, JOHN PHILLIPS. JOHN PHILLIPS came to Congress the same day I did. He had had a very fine legislative experience in the California Legislature, in the assembly and in the senate.

JOHN PHILLIPS is a man of great courage, he is a diligent, hard worker. He wants to know what are the facts and he wants to know what is behind the discussion concerning a bill. In every way I think he is an ideal legislator.

John and Mrs. Phillips, and their children, are great friends of ours. I hope John will have a pleasant time when he retires, if that is what he is going to do. Nobody knows what he is going to do. My guess is that John is going to write a book, and if he does, I am sure it will be worth reading. I hope he sells thousands of copies through the country and makes a fortune out of it.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity to add a small word concerning my colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS. We in Cleveland feel as though we own him a little bit, because he was out there. We are particularly happy over the work that he did in the matter of securing what we had been promised, a Veterans' Hospital in Cleveland.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleague [Mr. UTT] in paying tribute to our colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS. I know of no one in the delegation or in the House that has been as helpful to the new congressmen as has JOHN PHILLIPS. We will miss him. California loses one of its great Representatives.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN PHILLIPS came on the Appropriations Committee soon after he came here. During all the time that he has been on it, and that covers almost all of his service, he has been a wonderful man on the committee. He knew what he was doing all the time. He was able by virtue of his ability as an economic analyst to tell just exactly what a situation was. He did a wonderful job for the committee and for the country all the way through for many years. I want to add my appreciation of that wonderful service. I wish we had more like him. The country needs that kind of service.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I take the floor to pay tribute to two Republican Congressmen, my two Republican colleagues from Michigan, JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO, who are retiring from Congress. We all know of their sterling qualities. They have been told here many times today. But if I were really to tell the truth, I would say I am hoping they will be succeeded by two first-class Democrats.

The Democrats of Michigan had a party for them some time ago. We figured up that the people at the head table had had Government service for over 100 years. We hate to lose all this great thought that is associated so closely with Government. Nevertheless, we want to start fresh with two young Democrats from Michigan, and I hope we will do the best we can in that regard.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to pay my respects to a great man, a great American, a great legislator, JOHN PHILLIPS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks following the remarks I am about to make.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a great many able Members of the House of Representatives are retiring. The reasons for that I do not quite know about, but each one makes his decision for himself.

We, in Indiana, are losing from our delegation and the House of Representatives is losing, SHEPARD CRUMPACKER, of the Third District, one of the most able, outstanding Members of the Congress of the United States. We regret to see him leave, but since he has made that decision to leave this body, we wish him well because we know that those great attributes of ability, integrity, decency and honesty that have characterized his service here will follow him in the years to come. In whatever he chooses to do, he will find himself in good company.

Mr. UTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the many other Members of this House who have so ably paid their tribute to one of the finest men with whom it has ever been my privilege to be acquainted, the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS, of California—a man of tolerance and understanding, a man of judgment and ability, a man whose counsel and advice has through the years been sought by all Members, and who constantly gave freely of his talents and judgment based upon many years of experience to his fellow Members.

The Congress of the United States is losing one of its most valued Members and the Members of Congress are losing one of their most valued friends in the retirement of JOHN PHILLIPS.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN PHILLIPS and I came to Congress together in January 1943. Mr. PHILLIPS was a member of the 78th Club, made up of Republican Members of Congress, and he served as one of its early presidents. We became closely associated in the affairs of the club and in our work as Members of the House of Representatives. A rich friendship developed between us.

I deeply regret that JOHN PHILLIPS is leaving the House of Representatives. He is the kind of an individual who is sorely needed in our legislative halls. JOHN PHILLIPS is a man of honor and integrity and his word is as good as his bond. He is a student of government, and whenever JOHN PHILLIPS spoke on the floor of the House he was given close attention because Members had great confidence in his opinion on legislative matters.

John was admired and respected by his colleagues and we shall all miss him in the days that lie ahead. He is indeed a Christian gentleman, and my best wishes go with him in all of his future endeavors. He deserves life's richest blessings.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, 14 eventful years have passed since JOHN PHILLIPS and I came to Congress. It has been a real privilege to serve with this alert and constructive man.

For many years my offices were across the hall from those of JOHN PHILLIPS. I observed that John was always busy serving the Nation, California, his district, and his myriad of friends. His retirement is a loss, of course, but his 14 years of diligent service is a true gain.

We wish for John and his wife, Dorothy, everything good in the future.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress in 1943 with JOHN PHILLIPS, and that in itself is an association which long endures; it is a certain something we have in common which breeds affection.

His service has been brilliant. With his charm of manner, his inquiring mind, his ability to express himself, and his devastating logic, he has contributed much to the cause of orderly government, and the country is better for his service.

JOHN PHILLIPS will be sorely missed by the host of friends he has made, and he will never be forgotten by those who knew him. I join with his colleagues in best wishes for the days to come, and I hope he and his gracious wife will enjoy years of happiness in the knowledge of a lifetime of fruitful service.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in January 1953, I was given the high honor of assignment to the Appropriations Committee. I think every Member should serve on that important committee. The people have the habit of blaming the Chief Executive or the administration for unnecessary and wasteful spending, but the truth is that no administration can spend a dime unless Congress authorizes it and appropriates the money. Therefore the importance of service on the Appropriations Committee cannot be overemphasized because it is that committee which scrutinizes the requests for funds and makes the recommendations that precede appropriations.

And, Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to be assigned to serve on the Inde-

pendent Officers Subcommittee, a subcommittee that had the responsibility of handling appropriations for some forty-odd independent agencies and offices of the Government. The chairman of that subcommittee was the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS, and he presided over and directed its work with impressive dignity and ability. He knew that I had never had legislative experience and that appropriations work was brand new to me. He went out of his way to give me the benefit of his experience and knowledge. I soon came to admire him as one of the outstanding Members of Congress.

In my judgment the country is losing the benefit of the services of one of its wisest and most devoted servants. I truly regret that he saw fit to retire from that service although I must confess that I do not blame him in the least for doing so. He has given his people the benefit of 14 of the best years of his life. If any man ever deserved to retire from the tremendous pressures and responsibilities under which we have to work here in Congress, on the basis of having already contributed more than one man's fair share to the preservation of our precious liberties and fundamental principles, that man is JOHN PHILLIPS.

I could not allow this occasion to pass and our paths separate, although I hope not permanently, without expressing my profound thanks to him for his leadership, for the high example he has set for those who may follow him, for his uniform courtesy to all Members, and for the friendship which he has given me. In my book, JOHN PHILLIPS is one of the truly great Americans. I shall never forget him.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my word of praise to fine service rendered by JOHN PHILLIPS during his service in this House.

He has been diligent in his inquiry of what was needed and, what was not needed, in making appropriations for the conduct of the affairs of this great Nation. In the performance of his duty he has given much time and effort. He has always had the courage of his convictions and the membership of the House has always recognized his sincerity. We honor him for the fine qualities he has shown. We will miss him. We wish him and his good wife a pleasant and happy retirement.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as a comparatively young man I naturally look to those older than I for guidance. There are several things which appeal to a young man—personality, achievement, and all-around ability. JOHN PHILLIPS has all of these, but the thing that has attracted me to him most is his strong, moral fiber and his great character. I can think of no greater tribute to pay him than to say when I retire from this House I hope I will do so with the respect of my colleagues that JOHN PHILLIPS possesses.

Mr. UTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in tribute to JOHN PHILLIPS. I was standing in back of the Chamber this afternoon when another Member commented that in losing JOHN PHILLIPS, we lose one of the ablest Members of this House, one of the finest parliamentarians, one of the best informed Members with whom we have had the privilege of serving. I would like at this time to pay tribute to my colleague from Pennsylvania, KARL KING, who is also retiring from the Chamber by his own wish. We wish him the best of happiness and a full life in his home and in his district. We hope, of course, to see a worthy successor from the same side of the aisle come here to join us in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay further tribute to our colleague, Mr. CRUMPACKER, from Indiana, with whom I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary. The House will miss him very much and as one who comes from what might be called one of the more "vicissitudinous" districts, I think we are all indebted to Mr. CRUMPACKER for his candor in saying he is retiring in order to earn a more secure living.

Mr. UTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the gentleman from California in paying tribute to a truly great American and outstanding citizen. It was my privilege to have served on the Committee on Appropriations for the past 2 years on two subcommittees on which Mr. PHILLIPS served, the Public Works Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. He truly has been an outstanding Congressman and he has been a great credit to his section of the country and to the Nation at large. As a young man who came to that committee with his great experience and his kindness and his courtesy, he took me by the hand and together with Mr. THOMAS, of Texas, led me through the labyrinths of congressional appropriations where I obtained some knowledge of Government. We wish for him and his family many years of health, happiness, and prosperity.

Mr. UTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California yielding so that I may pay tribute to my good friend from California, JOHN PHILLIPS. I have served on the Committee on Appropriations with him. He has been a great statesman and a great friend of America. I know that my country is far better because of JOHN PHILLIPS and that my sons and my grandchildren will live in a better America because of his great fight for the liberties and freedoms that we all have enjoyed.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join our colleague in paying tribute to Congressman PHILLIPS. I served with him on the Appropriations Committee.

My experience in Congress has been greatly enriched as a result of my association with such a fine legislator and wonderful gentleman as JOHN PHILLIPS.

I wish John and his family every possible success.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with all the others who have paid tribute to JOHN PHILLIPS. I know of no man who has served more ably than has JOHN PHILLIPS, and I am sorry that he is leaving. I believe every Member of this body likewise is sorry that he is leaving.

While I am here I want to say just a few words about JESSE WOLCOTT on whose committee I served for many years. He was a great chairman, and I believe it is the sense of this body that we are sorry he is leaving. The same applies to GEORGE DONDERO.

And, Mr. Speaker, in just 1 minute may I say I think we have had a very successful session of Congress. This has been one of the most constructive sessions of Congress it has been my privilege to serve in.

And while I am on my feet I want to have the honor of paying tribute to the wonderful gentleman presiding behind me. He has sat patiently in that chair from 8 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night for the last 2 weeks doing a wonderful job.

And I want to pay like tribute to the minority leader, JOE MARTIN.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. IKARD. I would like to join with all the others in the tributes that have been paid to our colleague from California, Mr. PHILLIPS, to our colleagues from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO and Mr. WOLCOTT, also to call to the attention of the House the fact that one member of our Texas delegation is likewise leaving us, a man who has rendered a great service here, a man of ability and of great integrity, a man whom we are proud to have had as a member of our delegation. I refer to BRADY GENTRY. He has rendered a great service to his country in different positions in public life both on the State level and on the national level. I regret that he has seen fit to leave his service here. We will miss him.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARSHALL. How am I to obtain a minute's time in which to inform the House that our colleague, JOE O'HARA, of Minnesota, is recovering his health and is able now to be home?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman from Washington does not want to take the time of the House, but I feel that I simply must mention one of the Members who is leaving and who we are sorry to see go. I mean JOHN PHILLIPS. In the days when I came here, in the first part of the Eisenhower administration, economy steps began to be taken and I saw the

great military installations in my district fading away, but the military installations in California were being built up.

At the next election they said the gentleman from Washington was the best Congressman California ever had. JOHN PHILLIPS is a man of great ability and certainly one of the greatest Congressmen California ever had; and as we look over the years that have gone by and the years through which we have passed we can pay our respects to JOHN PHILLIPS as one of the greatest Representatives the House has ever had, and I see him go with great regret.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects to those Members of the House who are leaving, one in particular, JOHN PHILLIPS. It was my privilege to be associated with him in the Breakfast Club for many years, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

In my book he is one of the ablest and finest Congressmen this House has ever had. We shall miss him, and I know we all say, "John, God speed thee."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, my time has expired.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point on the public service of the Members who are leaving us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our fellow Members who are leaving the House of Representatives at the end of this session. I am in accord with all that has been said about each and all of them on this occasion.

I realize the time allocated for paying these tributes is limited. I do want to pay my respects, and the respects of my fellow colleagues from Kansas, to the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, who has joined the ranks of those who are retiring from this great body of Representatives of our country.

CLIFF HOPE served in the legislature of the great State of Kansas, where he was speaker of the house, before he came to Congress 30 years ago.

The number of years of service does not tell the whole story. Years of service is great. The kind of service he rendered is so much greater. CLIFF HOPE has been a great leader in our State. He has been one of the great men in Congress. His work in the House has been largely in the field of agriculture. Many of his proposals have been enacted into law. He has been truly the farmer's friend of this country.

CLIFF HOPE has the esteem and the confidence of the Members of the House. He knows no party lines in his efforts to serve his country.

The other members of the Kansas delegation will miss his kindly advice and his willingness to share his experience with them.

Members of this House will long remember the courteous manner with which he treated each and all of them. He differed in opinion with other Members on many occasions, but never failed to respect the other fellow's views.

CLIFF HOPE has a certain poise and fineness of character that make him outstanding among his fellow men. He is patient, but firm. He has a rare sense of justice.

We wish for CLIFF HOPE and his family the best that the future can hold. Cliff deserves it.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the tribute being paid to our retiring colleagues.

It is with much sadness that we face the realization that many familiar, friendly faces will not be seen in the Hall of the House of Representatives next year.

We from California shall miss particularly our colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS, who has represented the 29th District since 1942. John has been a friend and adviser to so many of us who became Members of this body subsequent to him. His incisive power of analysis and his pleasant wit will be difficult to replace. His service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations helped save taxpayers billions of dollars. The Eisenhower administration can credit him for much of the work which made a balanced budget possible.

My best wishes to John and Mrs. Phillips as they begin a well-earned retirement.

To all others who are leaving us, good luck and Godspeed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored indeed to have the opportunity to express my feelings and to associate myself with my colleagues who have so sincerely expressed their high regard for Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, who is leaving the Congress after 30 years of service.

It is with sadness and regret that we say goodby to this great man who has so influenced agricultural legislation in the United States for more than a quarter of a century.

Congressman HOPE came into the House when we were first discussing a phase of agricultural legislation concerning price supports. This was during the days of the McNary-Haugen bill.

During my service in the House and for the past 14 years, I have served on the Committee on Agriculture, of which Mr. HOPE has either been chairman or ranking member. In this position he has had an opportunity to direct and carefully guide agricultural legislation through the committee, hearings, reports, and on the floor of the House. In every one of these positions he has discharged his obligations to his district, the State, and the country in a way that has endeared him to the hearts of all farm organizations, as well as a multitude of farm families and city consumers. Words are poor vehicles to express what this Nation, his neighbors, and his district, as well as the Members of this Congress, think of this great agricultural leader.

In the parlance of the day, he is "tops" and we shall sorely miss his counsel, his advice, and his application of his every energy to the work of agriculture to which he has directed a lifetime.

May the blessings of a kind providence guide and protect not only Congressman HOPE, but his wife and family in the days to come.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime I have met a great number of different men under varying conditions and circumstances, but I have never known anyone more modest and retiring than the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE. Quiet in his disposition, always of an even temper, sincere and simple in his attitude, and consecrated in his service to our country, he will never be forgotten by those who know him.

CLIFF HOPE is recognized in Government as an authority on agriculture, and his views are much sought after and highly respected. Never a demagog, he won people to him by his friendly attitude, his quiet persuasion, and his logical argument. His loss to the cause of good government is very great but we can appreciate his desire for rest after the many years he has devoted to the best interests of our country. Congress is better for having had him as a Member, and I feel sure we all agree to that fact.

It is hard to think of CLIFF HOPE in retirement, and I venture the thought that he will be called on from time to time for his advice and counsel. Can anyone imagine a man better equipped to be the Secretary of Agriculture in any administration?

Whatever the future may have in store for CLIFF HOPE, I join with his host of friends in wishing him good health, happiness, and contentment.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of CLIFF HOPE, of Kansas, from Congress brings to a close a tenure of congressional service to the Nation which I believe can best be described as one devoted to the preservation of the American system. He has performed his duties as Congressman with great integrity and energy. Without fear of contradiction it can be stated that all Kansas is proud of Cliff, they regret his leaving the Halls of Congress, but they are glad he is coming back to Kansas to stay for awhile.

One could discuss at great length the outstanding accomplishments of CLIFF HOPE. For nearly 30 years he has played a major role in the formulation of all agricultural legislation. He introduced the original domestic allotment bill, most of which is now embodied in the present farm program. He sponsored the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This legislation is recognized as one of the greatest advancements in agricultural research since the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. He was the author of the Extension Service consolidation bill, which is an outstanding contribution to Extension Service legislation. He is an authority in the field of conservation. Another milestone in his career on the Agriculture Committee came with the passage of the act establishing the upstream watershed program. He again exhibited his outstanding ability with the passage of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, which increased the farmer

ownership and control of the Federal farm credit system.

These are only a few of his many accomplishments in the field of agricultural legislation. Senator FRANK CARLSON has made an excellent presentation of CLIFF HOPE'S devotion to duty and his outstanding accomplishments. This was done in a speech given on May 3, 1956, at the testimonial dinner in honor of CLIFF HOPE given by officials and employees of the Department of Agriculture. Senator CARLSON'S speech follows:

When my close and trustworthy friend, CLIFF HOPE, told me several months ago he was retiring from public service, my reaction was one later shared by the people of his home district and farm families everywhere, one of dismay and deep regret. I still feel the hard-pressed farmers of the Nation are losing a great champion, but in all fairness I must say retirement was never more richly deserved.

Congressman HOPE has served the Fifth Congressional District of our home State through 30 of this country's most turbulent, trying and revolutionary years. He has served it in a way to win the respect and affection of his constituents and colleagues alike. He has won his place and held it because he has kept mental pace with the fast-changing times. We all recognize that many of his sound views on agriculture are of such far-sighted nature they will not be officially accepted until some future date, after his retirement. It is a sad fact that true progress is slow to evolve and that many times deserved credit is not given to men like CLIFF HOPE who tediously pioneer the way to better living.

There are many high points in his enviable 30-year career, but the ones to which CLIFF HOPE himself points with quiet pride are those concerning soil and water conservation legislation, and laws to promote agricultural research—particularly in the area of marketing research. His first major effort in this field came in 1935, when he was responsible in large measure for the original Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the forerunner of much of the Nation's farm program today.

Another milestone came just a little more than 2 years ago with the passage of the Hope-Aiken Act to establish the small watershed program.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the 83d Congress, he also established the insured-loan program for soil and water conservation, a program which is developing slowly but which has great long-range possibilities. He is still working on better means for marketing farm products, a job which had its first major impetus with passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, which he coauthored.

A newspaper in Congressman HOPE'S home district summed up his career in these words: "The most amazing facet to his career is that not since his first election has his vote-getting power been seriously challenged, nor his reputation as the friend of the farmer been seriously questioned." Truer words were never written, and I think they are a fitting testimonial to Mr. HOPE'S abilities.

Congressman HOPE entered the political arena as a representative in the Kansas Legislature in 1920. He was reelected to that post in 1922 and 1924, serving as speaker pro tempore in the 1923 session and speaker of the house in 1925–26. He has been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture continuously since entering Congress in 1927, and was chairman of this committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses. He has been the ranking Republican Member since 1932. It is truly a distinguished record of service.

Although agriculture has been his principal field, Congressman HOPE has had numerous other chores in Washington. He has served as a member of the Labor Committee and was appointed to several special committees, including the vital Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the 78th Congress. He visited and made economic surveys of Russia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, Italy, and most of Western Europe in 1945 in connection with this latter work.

And now the CLIFF HOPE public-service story, which had its start with a small-town plains lawyer battling his way through a tough Republican primary to become the Representative of his neighbors, is drawing to a close. The last political chapter reveals Cliff at the height of his popularity and respect, with a reputation for legislative action—particularly farm legislation—that has been consistently astute, farsighted, and fair. Even now, when he could easily taper off his heavy schedule of congressional activities in view of his announced retirement, CLIFF HOPE remains one of the most conscientious, responsible, and hard-working men on Capitol Hill. He is still keeping trust with the remarkable faith his constituents and the American farmer have shown him.

I, for one, will sorely miss his wise counsel and personal friendship here on Capitol Hill. And I am convinced that in the years ahead we all will realize more fully what major contributions he has made to the economic welfare of the Nation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, CLIFF HOPE, more than any other living American, has been a true champion of the farmers of our great land.

During my 14 years of service in the Congress, it has been my privilege to have had counsel with CLIFF HOPE many times. Always he was patient, courteous, and constructive. We have worked together on many projects and, under his leadership—and with his ability to work with everyone, regardless of partisan or sectional conviction, numerous successes have come to the good of American agriculture. It is a proud record that CLIFFORD HOPE leaves through 30 years of conscientious work.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, agriculture and farmers throughout our great country lost a trusted and true friend when the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE announced his retirement from the Congress.

While I am on the opposite side of the political fence I have always found Mr. HOPE to be most sympathetic to the problems of agriculture irrespective of any political implications. He was always kind, courteous, and patient and on a number of occasions I have counseled with him when he was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I found his advice most constructive and his friendship I have valued.

Mr. HOPE has compiled an enviable record in the Congress, and he more than any living American has been a true champion of the farmer.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, that he will not seek reelection to Congress and that he is retiring at the end of this session to enter the private practice of law prompts me to make a brief statement concerning his service in Congress.

Mr. HOPE has served with honor and distinction for a period of 30 years. During all of this time he has been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. Since 1932 he has been the ranking Republican on that committee, and in 1947–48 and 1953–54 he served as chairman.

For 18 of the 30 years that Mr. HOPE has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture it has been my privilege to be associated with him in the work of that committee. In all of the history of the Committee on Agriculture I doubt if anyone has ever equaled CLIFF HOPE'S contributions to the welfare of American agriculture.

His decision to retire is a great loss to farmers in every State in the Union. He represented a great wheat producing district and always fought for the interests of the people who elected him, but his interests in agriculture were not limited to his district and he worked unceasingly to improve the farmer's economic position in all areas of agricultural production. His wise counsel and sound reasoning on agricultural questions will be sorely missed in the Committee on Agriculture.

As he returns to the active practice of law in Garden City, Kans., I wish for him abounding success and complete happiness.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, my State of Michigan is suffering a serious loss in the retirement from Congress, after this session of two of her most respected and ablest public servants, Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT, of Port Huron, representing the 7th Congressional District, and Congressman GEORGE DONDERO, of Royal Oak, representing the 18th district.

JESSE WOLCOTT, the dean of our congressional delegation, is known as one of the most brilliant men in the House of Representatives. In the field of his specialty, the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency, his reputation was outstanding. Jesse rarely spoke on the House floor except in connection with his own committee's legislation and when he did, he was recognized as an expert on his own pet subject. To the newer Members of the House, especially those of us from Michigan, he freely gave of his time, his wise counsel, and patient assistance. He will leave a very large and very real gap here on Capitol Hill.

GEORGE DONDERO is one of the kindliest and most warm-hearted persons it has ever been my good fortune to know. His qualities as a gentleman were only rivaled by those as a patriot. His love for and knowledge of history and traditions of our great country were always a constant source of inspiration. In his own Public Works Committee, his years of tireless work were finally capped by the approval of the St. Lawrence Seaway which promises to mean much to Michigan and which reflects so much deserved credit upon him. George was regarded by many of us with real affection and his retirement will also mean the loss of a devoted public servant.

It is a very real blow to the National Government and to the State of Michigan to lose at the same time two men of the caliber of Congressmen WOLCOTT and DONDERO. I join my colleagues in wishing for them both a long and well-deserved retirement and a hope that all

the good and rich things of life may be theirs for many years.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, will be missed by his many friends in Congress. I came to know him very well in the days immediately following World War II. We were members of a special committee which visited a great many of the war-torn countries in order to see first-hand the magnitude of the task of rebuilding a world so gravely wounded by all-out war. The able gentleman from Oklahoma is a confirmed enthusiast, optimist, and a believer that all things turn out for the best in the end. VICTOR WICKERSHAM well represented the people of the Sixth District of Oklahoma during the years he served them in Congress. He is sure to succeed in whatever he chooses to take up as his work in the future. He carries the good wishes of his colleagues, and I shall miss his pleasant smile and the warmth of his friendship.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words for my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts, who serves with me on the Appropriations Committee.

For 2 years I have had occasion to watch his work. During that time I have learned to admire and respect him for his enormous capacity for work and for his keen, alert mind. He grasps the problems which we work with in committee with an understanding that oftentimes amazes all of us.

The people of the great State of Massachusetts and the people of his district are very fortunate to have representing them a man of Congressman BOLAND'S fine moral character, general alertness, and ability to get a job done well.

He is one of the outstanding members of our committee and of the Congress. As the years go on we shall hear of Congressman BOLAND'S ever-increasing achievements.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will lose one of its most able Members in the next session because THOMAS J. DODD has decided to seek election to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. DODD is respected by every Member of this House and everyone who came to know him intimately as I did. He is held in highest esteem because of his unusual qualities of leadership, together with his sense of fairness and justice. During the 83d Congress it was my pleasure to serve on the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. Mr. DODD was also a member of that well known select committee. This gave me an opportunity to work very closely with Mr. DODD and to observe firsthand his keen grasp and understanding of the worldwide struggle between the forces of human freedom and those totalitarian forces which seek to enslave all mankind. His experience as chief trial lawyer during the trial of the Nazi leaders gave him an unusual comprehension of the terrible crimes against humanity committed by the Russian Communists. He has long advocated the establishment of an International Juridical Commission so that the crimes against humanity committed by the real tyrants of Moscow may be recorded, and so that all free men may accordingly be warned that so long as any segment of humanity is exploited and enslaved, the liberty and dignity of all mankind stands in mortal danger.

We will all miss our colleague, THOMAS J. DODD, and we wish him continued success in the great work he has been doing as I am certain he will take it up with equal vigor and determination when he begins to serve his term in the Senate.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a close friend and colleague of mine during my two terms in the House is leaving this body. I refer to the distinguished Representative from the First District of Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD.

Representing, as I do, the neighboring Second District of Massachusetts, I am particularly aware of the service that TOM DODD has rendered to the people of the great State of Connecticut and to the Nation as a whole.

I have known him to be a man who thinks out problems long and well and then forms determined convictions. I have known him as a man who has shown a rare courage and a rare talent in fighting for his convictions. I have known him as a man whose sincerity and eloquence on the floor of the House has caused many of us to readily follow his leadership on many of the vital issues of our day.

On July 7 in Hartford, Conn., at the Democratic State convention, TOM DODD was nominated to the office of United States Senator from Connecticut. His name was placed in nomination by a distinguished former Member of the House, and now Governor of Connecticut, Abraham A. Ribicoff.

The political philosophy of these two men, who have been so singularly honored by the people of Connecticut, is reflected in their remarks to the convention delegates. The principles for which they stand and the creed in which they believe are part and parcel of the great political party that numbers both Governor Ribicoff and Congressman DODD among its most outstanding leaders.

Mr. Speaker, it is upon this philosophy, this creed, and these principles that our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], has offered himself as a candidate for United States Senator from Connecticut.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD Governor Ribicoff's nominating address and Congressman DODD'S acceptance speech:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION PLACING THE NAME OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. DODD IN NOMINATION FOR THE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR

Politicians are a superstitious lot. I remember during the last campaign for the governorship, many of you gave me good-luck charms.

Before the campaign was over, my pockets were weighted down with four-leaf clovers and good-luck medals and a rabbit foot or two. And frankly, I carried them with me through the entire campaign. Two years ago on this platform, when I was nominated for the office of governor by this convention, I wore a gray suit and a gray and black tie, and I felt that that was sort of a lucky suit for the Democratic Party 2 years ago. I went up to the attic and got that same gray suit and that same gray and black tie and I am wearing it on the platform today. I hope it brings the same luck to our nominee.

We are assembled here today to nominate the next United States Senator from the State of Connecticut.

There are few offices in this land, or as a matter of fact, there are few offices anywhere in the world that can compare with the importance of the office of the United States Senate.

When our Constitution was first adopted and when our Republic was in its infancy, the United States Senate had a different meaning than it has today.

The House of Representatives was of the people. The House of Representatives was an elective office.

The concept of the United States Senate was a group of dignified men of great honor, who were chosen by legislatures. It was many years, many, many years before you had direct elections by the people to the United States Senate. And for some 30 years, in the infancy of our Nation, the United States Senate was a more or less honorary, but meaningless body.

Then the United States Senate, due to the impact and the growth of America, because of the type of men that it was attracting, became a very important body.

And I dare say, if you recall the history of the United States, there are many United States Senators whose names and deeds are in your minds when you find it difficult to name and think of many men who served in the Presidency of the United States.

The United States Senate has become and is a powerful position. The United States Senate now not only has significance to the people of this State and the people of the Nation, but the United States Senate has significance today for the entire free world.

We in Connecticut have sent great Democratic Senators to the United States Senate. In recent years we have had distinguished men like Gus Lonergan, Francis Maloney, Bill Benton, and that great man, Brien McMahon.

As a matter of fact, this would have been the time for that nomination to have come back. I recall, when I was in Washington, the great influence that Senator McMahon wielded in the affairs of our Nation and the affairs of the entire world, because in the matter of international relations, in the matter of appropriations, the United States Senate is a very, very important body. And, therefore, it behooves us today to send a man to the United States Senate who can carry on in those great traditions and play his role, not only on the floor of the United States Senate, but, indeed, to be spokesman for the free world in the United States Senate to the entire world.

The United States Senate is a peculiar position, too. My concept of a man to go to the United States Senate is this: Technically, a Senator, while he represents the State of Connecticut in Washington, is also a Senator for the entire United States. And I would be very disappointed if this convention nominated a man who is narrow in outlook, whose concepts are restricted and confined, and who failed to exercise leadership that went beyond the borders of his own State and only the interests of the State and failed to encompass the interests of our entire Nation.

A United States Senator must be a man of courage, and this may be a strange thing to say, but a United States Senator must be a man who can be lonely, a man who can withstand pressures, a man who may often have to say no to the leadership of his own party, and a man who on occasion may have to go into the face of temporary public opinion as it may be mobilized on an emotional basis.

A United States Senator must have a historical perspective. A United States Senator must have breadth. A United States Senator must have a philosophy. And a United States Senator must have the courage to face an issue and a great deal of loneliness, and often, as I say, against fleeting public opinion as he may find it on any special occasion.

A United States Senator not only must represent the State of Connecticut, in the Halls of the United States Senate, but a United States Senator must from time to time come back to the State of Connecticut and explain to the people of this State what the basic problems are that face the Nation and face the world.

He must be in a position to mold public opinion. He must be in a position to mobilize public opinion. And he must interpret the world and the United States to his own people.

Now I am satisfied that the man that I am going to nominate today fulfills those qualifications.

All of us realize that today one of the great struggles in this world is that between freedom and slavery, between democracy and tyranny. This great struggle is not one of short duration. This struggle now has been going on since 1917 and this struggle will continue on for many, many more years. It is long; it is difficult; and it is arduous.

It is important that the man that we nominate understands the perspective of freedom and a perspective of tyranny.

The man we are to nominate knows tyranny; he knows dictatorship. He has played the prime role in the Nazi tyranny that preceded in power on a worldwide basis the one we are struggling with today. He met this situation face to face on the Nuremburg trials. This man understands the present tyranny of worldwide godless communism.

As an FBI agent, as a special assistant United States attorney, as Assistant Attorney General, and in Congress and out of Congress he has been the leader in the understanding of the position of the free world and what must be done and what has to be done if democracy and freedom should be preserved, not only for the United States of America, but for the entire world. I am satisfied that the man we are going to nominate today fulfills that qualification to the utmost limits.

But not all the problems that a United States Senator deals with are in the international field.

You heard an outstanding speech last night, and you heard an outstanding Senator mention the programs and great policies of Woodrow Wilson, of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman.

You understood that here was founded a party with principles that had brought to fruition and success great economic and social reforms for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

So solid and so accepted have these social and economic reforms become that when the Republicans came to power in 1952 they dared not, nor did they advocate, nor did they try to eliminate any of them, because the American people know, respect, and live by these great economic and social reforms that have done so much for the benefit of our entire Nation.

TOM DODD understands these things. TOM DODD is a liberal and progressive in the true sense of the word. He understands the position of America on the domestic scene. His voice was raised against the tideland oil grab. He understands the State's problem on flood insurance and flood control where he has been a strong and ardent advocate in the Halls of the House.

He understands the problems of the aged. He understands the problems of housing. He understands the problems of labor. And he understands the problems of old age and social security.

We have here a man whose domestic record has been one of success. We have here a man who has been successful in understanding the great international problems.

What else do we have? We have a man whom all of us know. Born and bred in the State of Connecticut, his years, both formative and mature, have been spent in this State.

He was born in Norwich, educated in their local schools, a graduate of Yale University, a practicing member of the bar, and twice United States Representative from the First Congressional District; a lovely wife, understanding, intelligent, charming, a true mother, and a great helpmate; six bright children with shining Connecticut faces, who are indeed a credit to our candidate and a great asset. And, indeed, I think that I would underestimate his political astuteness were he not to show this wonderful wife and family of his to the electorate during the next couple of months.

The Democratic Party is going to win in November.

The Democratic Party is going to elect a United States Senator.

The candidate we are going to nominate has a lot of work to do. Believe me, no one is going to win an election in the State of Connecticut just by using the mechanical means. The candidate whom the Democratic Party nominates has the obligation to go up and down the highways and byways of this State to make his views known and the views of the Democratic Party, and I am confident that our candidate is that type of campaigner. And I am confident that each and every one of us will be in there fighting for him, working for him, and helping him to victory.

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow delegates, I give you the Democratic nominee and the next Senator to the United States Senate from the State of Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of West Hartford.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. DODD OF THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT, JULY 7, 1956

Fellow Democrats and friends, I accept humbly and gratefully the honor you have given to me.

I am well aware of the challenge that we face. I am a Democrat who was born and raised in Connecticut. My father and my grandfather were Democrats in Connecticut so I know something about the task which confronts our party in every election year. There was a time when the odds were almost always overwhelmingly against us. But in recent years our State has shown a disposition to select Democrats with considerable frequency. As I stand on this platform today I think of some of the great Democrats from Connecticut who have served in the United States Senate during my lifetime.

I can see the honest and generous face of Augustine Lonergan.

I can hear the wise and eloquent words of Francis T. Maloney.

I can feel the strong personality and brilliant intellect of Brien McMahon and happily, in our midst I see the friendly and courageous Senator Bill Benton.

These are great Democrats who in recent years have represented Connecticut in the United States Senate.

The opportunity to follow and carry on in the tradition which they have established fills me with a sense of grave responsibility.

The campaign which we start today will result in a victory for us in November. The signs of this victory are all around us, although obscured somewhat by political propaganda.

During the last 2 years the voters of Connecticut have given ample evidence of their interest in the Democratic Party. Our great Governor, a Democrat, directs the policy of this State. Every major city is headed by a Democratic mayor. Town after town, some of which had never been Democratic before, have joined the growing list of Democratic strongholds.

These are reasons for encouragement. But to insure victory we will work together until every vote has been counted. Today our party is united and strong. The first and greatest credit for this unity and strength is due to the great leadership of our State chairman, John M. Bailey, and to his associates on the State Central Committee.

All that remains to be done is for us to talk facts in this campaign and to tell the people the truth about the issues which confront us.

For it is my deep conviction that a Democratic victory this fall is essential to the welfare of our Nation and to the security of the world at large.

For nearly 4 years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress and I have watched with growing apprehension as our national administration falls more and more under the control of big money and big business.

Big oil has won its tidelands fight.

Big gas has only temporarily been delayed in fulfilling its avaricious ambition to reap high profits from the gas-consuming public. I say only temporarily delayed for the President vetoed the gas bill because of shameful lobbying tactics, but significantly, in his veto he said nothing about the evil of the legislation itself.

The corporate profits of big business go and and up every day. Special privileges are given away every day. Many of our natural resources are just handed over to private profit seekers. The hard-money boys still have the controlling voice in Washington and through all of this the small-business man, the salaried individual, the wage earner and the professional people have been completely forgotten.

The only tax relief has been given to a special and privileged group in our society while the rest of us carry a tax burden that is heavier than it has ever been in the history of our country during peacetime and there is no interest in the administration to reduce it.

Here close at hand in New England we see our textile industries languishing in the face of Government indifference. We see enticements in the form of tax exemptions being used to lure industries from our State and region and the tragedy is that nothing is being done by the Federal Government to help us keep them here. Very recently an administration sponsored proposal to geographically disburse industries was pushed through Congress. There are strange and sinister shadows on this measure which may take on harmful form and substance for us in Connecticut.

The voice of labor has been without influence in the halls of the Federal Government, for the hopes and aspirations of working men and women have been drowned out by the more powerful and politically persuasive voice of big business.

We live in an uneasy prosperity. Our people sense that all is not as well as it appears to be on the surface. For most of the blessing of this prosperity have been reserved for a favored few. Our economic structure is topheavy.

We have a barrage of words on the ever acute problem of civil rights—but no action. The Department of Justice has the means and the power to move right now on civil rights. I know whereof I speak because I was privileged to serve as assistant chief of the first civil rights section established by the then Attorney General during a Democratic administration almost 20 years ago. We pioneered in this field in fighting intolerance and bigotry in the Deep South and in

the Far West. It is a fact of history that under a Democratic administration, we tried more civil rights cases in the United States than at any other comparable time in the history of the United States.

That fight which we undertook has for all practical purposes been abandoned. No longer do we hear of civil rights prosecutions against those who violate the constitutional privileges of Negroes. No more do we hear of litigation to protect the rights of organized labor. It is a long time since we have heard of Government activities to protect minority groups. But the great and good work which we started must be carried on and expanded if we are to fulfill the promises of our own democracy and set an example of freedom, of liberty and of justice for the people of the world. For we cannot sell democracy abroad, we cannot preach fairness or equality of opportunity in distant places if we do not enforce justice at home.

While talking big about civil rights this same administration tried to force legislation through Congress which would allow the Federal police to tap your telephone wires and listen to your private conversations. I am proud of the fact that I fought that vicious grasp for power and helped to defeat that proposal in Congress.

Two days ago in Congress, legislation which would have provided necessary Federal assistance in the field of public education was defeated. The significance of the vote by which that necessary legislation was lost lies in the fact that 119 Democrats voted for the bill while only 75 Republicans supported it and 119 Republicans, almost exclusively from Northern States, joined 105 southern Democrats in voting against the bill. This cynical performance on a matter as essential to our national welfare in and of itself is enough to indicate the necessity of a Democratic victory in November. The truth of the matter is that the national administration has given only lip service to assistance for public education. So, as well in the field of public housing, in social security, in public health, this administration has not advanced an original idea but rather has dragged its feet and grudgingly continued, because it feared to do otherwise, the great social and economic programs given to this Nation by the Democratic Party.

Thus in domestic affairs after nearly 4 years the pattern is clear. That pattern is one of extraordinary and inordinate concern about big money and big business and a poor-cousin approach to the problems of the average American citizen.

The opportunity to reverse this trend and to put this Nation back on the high road of social conscience moving toward the improved welfare of people awaits us.

This is an historic opportunity which we Democrats have in this decisive election year.

This is the opportunity to elect candidates who believe that people are entitled to decent homes in which to live, to a fair chance to earn a living with reasonable security against the disasters of illness, injury, and the infirmities and insecurities of old age.

These are the first interests of the Democratic Party because we believe that human beings are more important than anything else.

These social programs are the handwork of those who have a passion for social justice and they must not be entrusted to those who do not really believe them to be of first importance.

What of our foreign policy? What has happened to our former position of leadership and influence throughout the world?

The great battle of our age is that of freedom against tyranny.

The great evil of our times is that of communism.

The frightening facts are that communism has continued to spread across the world and it has more influence now than it had 4 years ago. As we look out on the world we see a divided and restless Korea. In the northern half the Communists continue to build up power and strength for aggressive purposes.

We see Asia, whose people are slowly but certainly deserting us for the soft blandishments of the Communists.

We see a divided Indochina where in the north again the Communists build up mightily for purposes of attack and conquest.

We see Germany still divided.

We see a major crisis developing in the Middle East.

Soviet and Iron Curtain arms are pouring into Egypt. Egypt has recognized Red China. Nasser flouts the United States while he embraces the Bulganin-Khrushchev-Chou En-lai axis. Nasser has announced that he will soon visit Communist China, accompanied by a military mission to Peiping.

Syria is flirting with the Communist world and has recognized Red China. Moreover, she is negotiating an agreement for the purchase of arms from the Communist bloc.

And in the face of this growing danger in the Middle East we have no policy but one of wait and see.

The enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe have been told to hope, to trust in the free world, and in the leadership of the United States. These nations in bondage, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, have been told to keep faith in us and our democratic creed. But they are beginning to despair of our sincerity and steadfastness. They find that the benefits they have received from the wily, ingratiating policies of the Kremlin have been more valuable than our words. The Kremlin knows how to move for purely propaganda reasons to confuse and divide, and—unless we stop it—ultimately to conquer.

Within a matter of the last few days the Polish people of Poznan gave a lesson in freedom for all the world. That lesson is that there is no price too great to pay for liberty.

Many of the people of Connecticut have living ties with the captive peoples of Europe. They know full well the price that has been paid, and is being paid, because of our State Department and its lack of policies. Time has not been on our side, as some administration leaders try to tell us. Time has robbed us of prestige and power. Time has weakened our friendships abroad. It has spread suspicion and dissatisfaction.

Only a change of administration can correct this faltering, inept policy. Only a return to a strong bipartisan foreign policy can restore us to our former position in the eyes of the world.

I propose to discuss these issues in every part of the State of Connecticut during this campaign. I promise you that I will work tirelessly from now until election day and that I will tell the truth to the people of our State.

I expect to run on my record, on my record as a Member of Congress, and on my lifetime record in resisting tyranny, in fighting for civil rights, the battle for social justice and for peace.

I invite my opponent to discuss my record as I expect to discuss his.

The people of Connecticut are entitled to a discussion of our respective records and to know where we stand on every issue which confronts this Nation.

I now suggest to my Republican opponent that he and I publicly debate these issues before the people of Connecticut. I am sure that we can mutually arrange for radio and television coverage and that we can work out a schedule which will bring these debates to every section of this State. If my opponent is willing to do this the campaign will be more clear, more effective, and less expensive.

In former years it was an accepted practice for competing candidates to appear in public on the same platform and to discuss the same issues. There is no reason why this good practice should not be revived and I hope and expect that my opponent will accept this invitation.

Finally, I thank all of you for the work that you have done throughout the years in the interest of the Democratic Party and in the United States of America. As your candidate for the United States Senate this year I can look you in the eye and say that as a United States Senator I will wear no man's collar.

I am beholden to no special interests nor to any pressure group.

I have made no promises, no commitments of any kind.

However, I made one promise to you and to the voters of Connecticut and that is that as a Member of the United States Senate I shall at all times honestly and energetically do my best to improve the lot of people and to raise the standard of living at home and to work for peace in the world. God willing, the opportunity to fulfill this promise will be given on election day.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to say a few words about my very good friend, the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM. While we in Texas are always accused of not being able to speak of anything but Texas, it is not unlike speaking of Texans when you speak of THURMOND CHATHAM. His characteristics of warmheartedness and congeniality made him one of the most popular Members of this body.

It was my good fortune to have been closely associated with him during my tenure of office in this legislative body and I know of the great service he rendered as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee which legislated not only for the people of North Carolina, but our whole Nation.

I am sure that he will be sadly missed in the forthcoming Congress by all that knew him and I hope that the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina see fit to return him to us sometime in the future.

THE HONORABLE BRADY GENTRY

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that I wish I had the time to pay tribute to all of the Members who are leaving at the expiration of this session. I am going to confine my remarks to BRADY GENTRY and I want you to know that my remarks apply to all of you who are leaving.

There is much I could say about Brady at this time, so much that it would take many, many minutes to do so. But if there ever was a man who did full justice to a term, it is BRADY GENTRY. We are sorry to lose him and we will all miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay just and due tribute to a member of the Texas delegation who is retiring this year. He is our good friend and able colleague, the

Honorable BRADY GENTRY, of Tyler, Tex. Brady has spent many years in public service and enjoys the deepest and most profound respect of all with whom he has dealt during his fine service. It was his honor and privilege to serve as county judge of Smith County, Tex., for a number of years. During this tenure of office he so deeply impressed the people with his sincerity of purpose, his fine character, his unswerving honesty, and his keen ability that he was subsequently named as a member of the Highway Commission of the State of Texas. At the time Brady was serving in this capacity, many decisions of great import had to be made. Decisions that could have shaken the very foundations of the State government had the wrong course been pursued. Decisions that affected the lives and interests of people throughout the entire Southwest. But let it be said that BRADY GENTRY, without fear or favor, walked a straight line down the middle of the road, yielding neither to influence on the one side nor emotions on the other. It was during a time that tried the souls of men, but the fine character of BRADY GENTRY stood out like a beacon in the night, and by reason thereof, Texans and their children in the years to come were the benefactors. Brady continued this course of conduct when he was honored by election to the House of Representatives of the United States. And the record that is now written of his activities in the Congress is full evidence of his independent thinking and his desire to preserve and perpetuate the fundamental principles upon which this great country was founded and upon which it must survive.

Brady chose voluntarily to retire from further Government service. We all hope that his departure from these ranks will not take him away so that his fine counsel and advice will be lost to those of us who valued it so highly.

There are so many compliments that could be paid Brady that time and space will not permit, so let me say in conclusion that I hope he and his many friends will understand how I feel when I say that, if there was ever a man whose life and work do justice to the term, "a gentleman and a scholar," it is BRADY GENTRY, of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in RECORD on the service of BRADY GENTRY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a popular article which appears from time to time in a national magazine is entitled "The Most Interesting Person I Have Ever Met." I think if I had to name a Member of Congress whom I have known during the 14 years I have served here who more nearly fits into that description I would name BRADY GENTRY, of Texas.

It is my desire to pay a brief tribute to him. After serving here for only 4 years he is retiring voluntarily this year. Indeed an unusually large number of the most able and outstanding Members of this body are retiring, and that certainly constitutes a great loss to the Nation.

BRADY GENTRY is one of those. He has become recognized as one of the very best informed and one of the hardest working Members of the House. Being a prolific reader and a lifelong student of government, his intimate knowledge of historic events and their true significance is almost uncanny. And that is true not only in regard to government. It is true of a wide variety of subjects that deal with practically every phase of life.

Brady is a native of Van Zandt County, Tex. As a Texan, he is endowed with many of the fine qualities which characterized the great patriots who preceded him in the Lone Star State. He graduated from Cumberland University Law School, Tennessee. His yen for politics and public service was shown early in life. At the age of 19 he was serving as city secretary-treasurer of his hometown of Tyler. He was a prosecutor for 4 years, county judge for 8 years, and then by appointment from the Governor was chairman of the State highway commission for 6 years.

It is said that during those 6 years he traveled, mostly at his own expense, into every one of the 254 counties of Texas and over practically every mile of its vast highway network. In that background of intimate knowledge of roads and the transportation needs, he put to use his vast storehouse of knowledge gained from his studies and travels and became a guiding factor in triggering the expansion of a vast interstate roadbuilding program which has become one of the very best highway systems in America.

During his tenure on the State highway commission, GENTRY was elected president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. In that capacity he traveled into nearly every State in the Union, met and counseled with local, State, and regional groups everywhere—people interested in better roads and better planning. In that manner he qualified himself for transcontinental road planning and became widely recognized as an authority on that subject.

In a recent conversation with Mr. C. D. Curtiss, Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Commissioner reminded me of the great contribution which GENTRY made to the cause of good roads in America. It was pointed out to me that then, in 1944, GENTRY plugged hard for the initiation of a comprehensive interstate system which, if begun then, would have been a very timely and proper forerunner of the more recent action by Congress in approving a huge construction program. GENTRY foresaw the vast development of transportation needs in the march of our Nation's economy, with more and more of it geared to trucks and automobiles.

That serves as a tribute to GENTRY'S vision and wisdom. If his advice had been followed then the Nation would have had a more orderly and gradual development, and at a much lower cost. Many billions of dollars would have been saved and perhaps with better roads thousands of lives would have been spared by reduced highway accidents. Moreover, the earlier initiation of the highway-construction program, on a scale envisioned by GENTRY, would have stimulated the Nation's industrial progress and economic well-being.

I believe it fair to say that while serving in Congress Brady has made more personal friends, both Democrats and Republicans, than most any other single Member. As a member of the Public Works Committee he was a principal architect of the better features of the highway construction bill, recently enacted. He fought hard for certain improvements, some of which were adopted, some defeated. What is certain is that whatever he advocated was the result of careful study and was based upon a sincere desire to better serve the Nation's welfare.

BRADY GENTRY has not been a party hack or a narrow party-liner. He has always put the country first and political considerations have always been secondary with him. What greater tribute can be paid to any man? As a true patriot, a brilliant student of government and of public affairs, an uncompromising defender of the philosophy of free enterprise, Brady has, with becoming modesty and humility, performed his job in the Congress well.

May his future be blessed with good health, happiness, and the realization of those things in life and in government which are so dear to his heart.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to one of the members of our own Texas delegation who is retiring from the Congress this year, the Honorable BRADY GENTRY. Mr. GENTRY has had a lifetime of public service, holding various offices within the State of Texas prior to his being elected to the House of Representatives.

It was my pleasure to have served with him during his first term of office on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. His sincerity of purpose, his honesty, and integrity made him a most valued member of that committee, and I regretted very much that he resigned from the committee at the outset of the 84th Congress at which time I was elevated to the post of chairman. It would have been a pleasure to have had him serve with me.

His work with the Public Works Committee on the recently enacted Federal Aid Highway Act was most valuable as his prior public service covered a number of years on the Texas Highway Commission which gave him a keen insight to the problems of the State in highway construction and maintenance.

I wish for him the best of everything in his future life and I for one am sorry to see him leave this legislative body.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to frame all of one's feelings toward another in words. Insofar as I am able, however, I want to pay my tribute to a true statesman, BRADY GENTRY. The accolade of statesman is richly deserved in this instance, and though I wish this occasion had not arisen, I relish the opportunity to pay this highest compliment of all to a fellow Congressman.

It is difficult, as we all know, not to bow at times to political expediency. BRADY GENTRY has never given way at any time, to my knowledge, to political

expediency. I know this as a fact because I have been fortunate enough to work with him on two subcommittees of the Public Works Committee. Our efforts there plus work in the House, where our attendance records parallel each other, has permitted such frequent association that I know Brady's voting record and the principles underlying this record. He is a gentleman, scholar, and statesman of the old school. Old-fashioned in the sense that he epitomizes the abiding principles that do not change, being honest, sincere, straightforward, conscientious, and hard-working beyond question.

BRADY GENTRY's departure from Congress is a great loss to our country. His voluntary withdrawal, while in keeping with his ideology, is very disappointing to his friends, including myself.

I recognize in Brady a kinship of belief that goes far beyond and transcends party politics, and for this reason I admire and esteem him, and value his friendship. Only in Congress can such a relationship exist between men, I suppose. The politics, conflicting pressures, demanding decisions, and ceaseless round of work—all create a way of life in which each man is tested and tests his fellow Congressmen in a way that builds a different relationship than I have ever previously experienced. In this congressional world, my association with BRADY GENTRY has been a rewarding experience, for I have seen reflected in him and in his conduct the principles in which I believe. Brady, you will be missed in Congress.

While I might attempt to say much more, probably little could be added where words somehow seem inadequate. I simply wish Brady Godspeed and happiness in the days ahead and that his continued success reflect the rewards he so richly deserves. When I leave this Congress, I would like others to feel about me the respect which I feel for BRADY GENTRY.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, many kind and impressive remarks have been made here today about one of our valued Members from Texas who is not seeking reelection and will not be with us when Congress reconvenes next January. I refer to the Congressman from the Third District of Texas, BRADY GENTRY.

BRADY GENTRY's office is directly across the hall from mine in the Old House Office Building, and by reason of that fortunate circumstance, I came to know him well. During the early months of this, my first term, I had many occasions to seek the advice and assistance of other Members of Congress. BRADY GENTRY was always willing to be of assistance to a freshman Member. I was immediately impressed with his ability, integrity, and dedication to the principles in which he believes.

Brady is, above all, a sincere and deeply modest and humble man. Despite an illustrious career in the public service in his State and to his Nation in this Chamber, his biography in the Congressional Directory states simply "BRADY GENTRY, Democrat, of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of the session, I shall not follow the lead of others who have spoken here in detailed praise of Brady's accomplishments. I do want to say, in all sincerity, that I shall miss him in Congress, and I am sure that his colleagues from the State of Texas and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle are going to miss his presence here.

I am confident that the people of the Third District of Texas are also going to miss the helpfulness and the devotion to duty of BRADY GENTRY, who, through these years he has served them, has followed without equivocation or compromise the deep-seated convictions which he believes are in the best interests of our Nation, and of his district.

BRADY GENTRY is a fighter for his principles. His choice not to seek reelection will not change these convictions. I am confident, therefore, that he will continue in whatever position he may attain to advocate and practice a line of thinking and action which will keep America strong and American. He will persist in his devotion to the principles of our Constitution and our Nation's great past and bright future. I know that the entire Congress joins me when I say, "Good luck, BRADY GENTRY. Thanks for your fine work and thanks for your friendship."

THE HONORABLE IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, while the country will no doubt be rejoicing that this Congress has now completed, successfully completed, its work, many of us must voice a word of sorrow that many of our friends who will be leaving us as this day closes will not be back again with us in the next session.

Among those who will not return, out of his own willingness, is our very good friend from New York [IRWIN D. DAVIDSON]. He came here after a distinguished career in the New York State Legislature. He served as a judge of one of our local courts and has served brilliantly in this session of the Congress. Beginning next January he will commence service on one of the highest courts of New York State. We all know he will serve with distinction.

When he came here to the Congress he brought with him a tremendous sense of humor, a keen intellect and great ability and capacity for work.

We will miss him as we will miss all of the others who will not return to the next session.

We wish him and them and their families God's greatest gift, happiness in the work of their choice.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to express my keen regret at the leaving of IRWIN D. DAVIDSON from this Chamber. He came to us after an enviable career as a judge of the Court of Special Sessions in the city of New York. He is returning to the courts to assume an even higher station in our judicial system in New York. He will wear the ermine of judicial office as a judge of the Court of General Sessions, which is the equivalent to our highest court of general jurisdiction in New York.

He earned our esteem during his short term here by dint of his personality and character. I shall personally miss him as colleague and friend. I shall miss his kindliness, his rich and rare humor, his trenchant remarks that often lit up an otherwise dark situation, his keenness of perception, his felicitous turn of expression.

Irwin wears well. The more one knows him the greater respect one has for him.

May good healh and happiness ever attend him.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the service of the Honorable IRWIN D. DAVIDSON.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, our good friend and colleague, will not be with us next year, as he has received the nomination for judge of the court of general sessions of the county of New York. We are certain of his victory in the election, and although we are unhappy about his leaving us, we are pleased that this new honor has come to him.

Before coming to Congress in 1955, Judge DAVIDSON had rendered outstanding service in numerous official capacities in the State of New York. He served in the State legislature with distinction; in 1948 he became a justice of the court of special sessions in New York City where he served most ably until he left the bench to come to the House of Representatives. He is much loved and highly respected; he has always given unselfishly of his time and talents to many civic and communal affairs.

In Congress, he has proved himself to be a fine statesman and he has discharged his duties here with great ability and conscientiousness. The people of the 20th District of New York have been fortunate in having him serve as their Representative.

Representative DAVIDSON has made many friends among us and he has earned the respect of all who know him. We shall miss him very much, for we have found him to be a man of fine character, a good companion, and true friend. It is with deep regret that we see him leave these Halls; we wish him many years of enjoyment of his new judicial duties as well as continued good health and success.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve in the New York State Assembly with IRWIN D. DAVIDSON and to have appeared before him when he was a judge in the courts of our State. I was delighted 2 years ago when our friendship was renewed upon his election to this body, and his

assignment to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on which I also have the honor to serve.

Representative DAVIDSON's fine capabilities were recognized both in the New York State Assembly and by the attorneys who have appeared before him when he served on the bench. They have also been recognized by his colleagues here in Congress, and most especially by the members of our committee.

I regret the decision that has been made to return to the judiciary of the State of New York. Though it is a distinct loss to the country as a whole it is a very real gain to the legal profession in the State of New York. I look forward to appearing before him again in his judicial capacity, and renewing his friendship whenever we meet in our hometown of New York City.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, there is always a note of sadness at the conclusion of any Congress when we must say goodby to colleagues who have been good and close friends and who will not be returning to these halls again. We from New York will greatly miss our distinguished colleague, IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, who leaves us to return again to the courts of New York State. Prior to coming to Congress, Judge DAVIDSON served in the New York State Legislature and as a justice in the court of special sessions in New York City. Now he has been called to higher judicial office as a judge of the court of general sessions in New York City. We shall miss his kindliness, his brilliant wit, and his friendship, but we wish him well as he continues his career of public service and know that he will bring to one of the highest courts in our State his deep and profound knowledge of the law and the sincere dedication to his work which he has always demonstrated in whatever high office he has been called upon to fill. Our loss is a great gain for the judiciary.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished public service of our fellow Congressman, the Honorable IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, Representative of the 20th Congressional District of New York. Congressman DAVIDSON is not running for reelection for Congress. He has been nominated by both the Democratic and Liberal Parties of his State for the office of judge of the court of general sessions in New York County. This is tantamount to his election. The city of New York is to be congratulated on its new judicial ornament. The court's gain is a loss to Congress. And a gain to his lovely wife, Bernice, and his two fine sons.

It has been particularly gratifying to note and be inspired by the career of Congressman DAVIDSON. He is a native-born New Yorker who received his education in the city's schools and at the great New York University where he won the highest scholarship award. He went through law school on a scholarship and later engaged in active practice. In these respects he was another example of an aspiring and able young man who followed in the traditional pattern of growth and achievement on the ladder of success.

However, Congressman DAVIDSON was not satisfied with the routine of a successful practice. He yearned for public service. He felt deeply moved by all that the city, State, and Nation meant to him and he was resolved to devote his life to public affairs. From that time of decision his record is a most impressive one.

In 1935 he was appointed counsel to the legislative bill drafting commission in the New York State Legislature. Shortly after that he acted as special counsel to the New York State Mortgage Commission. In 1936 he was elected to the State legislature where he served for 12 years, and for a time was acting Democratic leader of the house.

The record of legislation sponsored by our colleague is outstanding. In 1937 he introduced the first constitutional amendment providing for slum clearance. In 1939 he spearheaded a constitutional amendment providing for five-sixths jury verdicts in civil cases. Juries up to that time had to be unanimous in their verdicts. He introduced measures for liberalization of the workmen's compensation law, for rent control and for the now famous fair lease law which prevented small type catch-phrases in leases which the average tenant never read.

In all, approximately 100 liberal, progressive, and constructive pieces of legislation were introduced and passed during this tenure as an Assemblyman.

In 1938, he attended the New York State Constitutional Convention where he acted as secretary to the Democratic leader, United States Senator Robert F. Wagner, and during this year conducted a radio program explaining to the public, week by week, the procedures and deliberations of the constitutional convention.

Irwin resigned from the State legislature in 1948 to become a justice in the court of special sessions of New York City where he performed his judicial duties for the next 6½ years.

Judge DAVIDSON resigned from the court to run for Congress. He was elected to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954 and is a member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

During his first year in Congress, DAVIDSON was quite active in important pieces of legislation, most noted of which was a bill signed by the President to grant a gold congressional medal to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, the scientist who discovered the antipolio vaccine.

He is well known for his many communal activities which include acting as trustee for Rodeph Sholom Temple, the Jewish Consumptive Relief Society, Holy Name Centre, the New York Philanthropic League for Crippled Children and the Grand Street Boys' Foundation. He was chairman of the speakers' bureau for United Jewish Appeal and is permanent chairman of Manhattan for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. He is a member of the New York City Bar Association, New York County Lawyers Association, Tau Delta Phi fraternity, the Army-Navy Union and of the board of visitors for the Washington Square College of Arts and Sciences.

I am grateful for this opportunity to salute a man who has given much to his countrymen and who is well on the way to years of still greater service.

We will miss him sorely—his great fund of stories, his wonderful sense of humor and his all-around good fellowship.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is going to lose the services of a most capable hard-working Member when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON] leaves this body to become a judge of the court of general sessions of the county of New York. IRWIN DAVIDSON came to us from the bench of the court of special sessions of New York City after a brilliant 6 years of judicial service. Previously, he had been a member of Assembly of the State of New York for 12 years. While in Albany he justly earned a reputation for great legislative ability, serving as acting Democratic leader of that body.

Not only does our friend IRWIN DAVIDSON possess great legislative and judicial ability, he is above all a sterling gentleman of high and affable character, possessing a keen sense of humor along with kindness, uniform courtesy, and a humane heart.

While IRWIN DAVIDSON has been with us for but one Congress, he will long be remembered by the many friends he has made here. His record and his service on the Committee on the Judiciary, the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will long be remembered.

It has been my great personal privilege to have made a good and close friend during these past 2 years. Irwin has been a delightful companion and will certainly be missed at the future meetings of the New York delegation in Congress. I am confident I bespeak the thoughts of all of us in wishing him Godspeed, good health, and success upon his return to the bench. We know that he will grace the court of general sessions of the county of New York with dignity, great ability, courtesy, and humaneness.

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE AND HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the entire membership of the House joins the Illinois delegation in expressing regrets at the retirement of HAROLD VELDE and RICHARD HOFFMAN, both of Illinois. These two gentlemen are outstanding Americans and they were great legislators.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished member of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable HAROLD H. VELDE.

Congressman VELDE not only served his constituents well, but the Nation as

a whole, and his activities and investigations as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee in the 83d Congress will be forever remembered.

Mr. VELDE also made an outstanding contribution to good Government through his activities on the Education and Labor Committee, and having sat next to him in committee in the 83d and 84th Congresses, I will certainly miss him very, very much.

I, like all others, wish for Harold great success as he returns to the practice of law and the many other endeavors that will be open to a man of his exceptional ability.

His voluntary retirement from the United States Congress is a great loss to the Congress and to the Nation, and our best wishes go with him and his family.

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, as a California Democrat, I would like to join in paying tribute to JOHN PHILLIPS, who is a man of the highest integrity, a man of scholarship. He has the demeanor of the scholarly individual he is. He rendered a valuable service in the State legislature before coming here. He developed a reputation for being a man interested in economical government, and when I first came here I was greatly pleased by the vast expressions of respect and admiration for Mr. PHILLIPS.

ACTING SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] to please take the chair.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader of the House [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, we are ending a most difficult and trying session of Congress. We have had many difficult battles. We have had our differences of opinion, but we always respect each other because we know, whatever were conflicting views, we knew each one was conscientious and worked for what we believed was the good of the country. We leave tonight proud of our friendship and proud of our membership in this national assembly. In these months ahead we will also have a great national debate, a debate that will largely determine what is to be the future of our country. This contest will be bitterly fought, but we hope it will be in harmony with our past traditions. All during this great session of the Congress there was one man who had the universal respect and esteem of all, and that was the man who presided over this House, our great Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. SAM RAYBURN is one of the greatest parliamentarians that this House has ever produced, and I am happy to say, there is one trait that stood above all else, he was eminently fair, fair to both Republicans and Democrats. We hail him for upholding the finest traditions of the great office.

In appreciation of that service, Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask the Members to adopt.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 658

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). This resolution was unanimously agreed to; and let me say it is one of the best resolutions this Congress ever passed.

The SPEAKER. My colleagues of the House of Representatives, I have been here at the closing of many sessions of the Congress. This is the twenty-second. I never enjoyed the service more than I have with you ladies and you gentlemen. You have been kind and fine to me, and from the bottom of my heart I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], my predecessor, and twice my successor, for his kind remarks about me.

It is a great thing to be a Representative in the Congress of the United States even for one term, because you must have the faith and the confidence of a great many people to get here once, to be elected. And to be reelected is a greater and higher honor.

The House of Representatives, in my opinion, is the bulwark of the American people, their liberties and their common good, because the Representatives come fresh from the people every 2 years.

There was a time when many people thought that the Members of the House of Representatives should be elected for 4 years. At one time, when I was having a little trouble down in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, I wished that were the case. But long since I have come to the conclusion that it is better for the American people to give the people an opportunity to elect someone nearest to them every 2 years. I hope it is never changed.

You have done me great honor on many occasions. When I wind up this term as Speaker—of course, I do not mean to wind up on the 3d of next January—I will have served as Speaker of the House of Representatives 4 years longer than any other man in the history of the American Government. [Applause.] To be honored once by your colleagues with this distinguished office is something that you can carry with you all of your life as a grand tribute to yourself and you will always be thankful to the Representatives of the American people for having called you to this high station.

So, to each and every one of you on both sides of the aisle, for your kindness, for your consideration in a most difficult situation even under the best circumstances, from a grateful heart I thank you and trust that God will bless you.

I wish you a happy and successful holiday. [Applause, the Members rising.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

A BREACH IN THE FREE WORLD SECURITY IS STILL OPEN AND MUST BE CLOSED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House are acquainted with the efforts I have made during this session to put a stop to what I consider to be the illegal use of the American taxpayers' money now being expended for the benefit of so-called White Russian refugees living in Red China, who are flowing freely through the crown colony of Hong Kong into some 30 countries of the free world. In my judgment, many of these so-called White Russians are in fact espionage and propaganda agents of the Russian conspiracy of communism. My belief is supported by the startling fact that in Brazil a top Russian espionage agent, who was posing as a White Russian refugee from Red China in order to gain entrance into Brazil under that false cover, was uncovered by the police authorities of that nation. It is also significant that the Brazilian Government then put a stop to the entry of any more of these so-called White Russians from Red China into their country. That stop order is still in effect and I understand that the Brazilian authorities are wisely looking into the character, the purpose, and the activities of all so-called White Russians who have been infiltrated into Brazil.

I believe the chronology of what I have done in order to bring to light the true facts concerning the so-called White Russians will be of interest to Members of Congress.

Upon my return from a 6 weeks inspection tour of the Far East, I made a report which I submitted to the full Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives which underscored these startling facts:

First. That a very large number of people claiming to be so-called White Russians have emigrated from Communist-occupied China into some 30 countries of the free world without having any field security investigation whatever made on them.

Second. That the majority of these so-called White Russians had in their pos-

session valid passports issued by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a fact which in itself attests to their loyalty for the Government of the U. S. S. R. and the conspiracy of communism.

Third. All of these so-called White Russians had in their possession exit permits issued by the Communist Government of Red China, exit permits which the Americans held by the Chinese Communists have been unable to obtain even after many years of pleading and begging for such exit permits and including the intercession by the United States Government to secure such exit permits for United States citizens held prisoner by the Chinese Communists. It is important to note that Mr. Charles Snyder Miner, a former newspaperman and a businessman in China, attempted for 5 years to get an exit permit, without success, and only a few weeks ago was able to get such an exit permit.

Fourth. That governments of the free world were issuing "sight unseen" visas to these so-called White Russians by the process of granting a "blank check" for the issuance of visas by a representative of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and the International High Commissioner for Refugees in Hong Kong. This representative would issue such visas, supposedly on behalf of a country of the free world, to these so-called White Russians as they entered the crown colony of Hong Kong. This "blank check" visa system was necessary in order to get these so-called White Russians into Hong Kong because the British authorities very wisely would not permit any of these people to enter the crown colony unless one of the unsuspecting governments of the free world had promised an entry visa to them. The officials of the crown colony of Hong Kong obviously put the security of the crown colony first because they felt these characters were unwelcome in the crown colony and so long as they passed on to some other part of the world, that no security risk was imposed upon them, and therefore no responsibility was theirs.

Fifth. The representative of the United States escapee program in Hong Kong, the program that uses American dollars to make this breach of the free world security possible, releases the American taxpayers' money and makes possible the movement of these so-called refugees out of Red China, without any field security investigation made on them, into some 30-odd unsuspecting countries of the free world. When I questioned the United States escapee program representative in Hong Kong on this matter he was very evasive, attempted to shift the responsibility to the British representative of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Hong Kong. The function of the United States escapee program representative is supposedly to pass upon the adequacy and completeness of the field security investigation made upon these people because that is a specific requirement of the law authorizing public funds to pay the ocean transportation of such refugees, but the facts are that this representative of the United States escapee program could not pass upon the adequacy of the security investigation because no such security investigation was possible on these so-called White Russians. It is obvious therefore that both the letter of the law and the spirit of the law are violated through the use of any of the American taxpayers' money on these so-called White Russian refugees.

All these pertinent facts were made known by me in a report to the full Committee on the Judiciary on December 21, 1955. Since submission of that report I have sought a full-scale public hearing on the issues raised in my report in order that all the facts pertaining thereto might be put before the judgment of the American people.

The full text of the report made by me to the Committee on the Judiciary has not been made public by the process of an official committee print. For this reason, I am, at this point, inserting in the RECORD a copy of that report in order that it may be made known to all Members of Congress and so that its validity may be judged by future events.

REPORT OF INSPECTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953, AS AMENDED, AND RELATED PROBLEMS IN THE COUNTRIES OF SOUTHEAST ASIA AND NORTH ASIA

(By MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress, 20th Ohio District)

BASIC FINDINGS

1. That the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, includes beneficial provisions which are capable of materially advancing United States foreign policy objectives in the Far East.

2. That certain provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, hinder its successful administration in many key areas of the Far East.

3. That the prospects of accomplishing the purposes of the act in the Far East within the terminal date prescribed by law are good and these prospects would be improved by two amendments to the act.

4. That the tremendous population upsets in the Far East caused by acts of Communist aggression have caused widespread human suffering and displacement.

5. That the concerned free governments of the Far East were quick to respond to the human needs of these victims of Communist aggression and their accomplishments in this respect merit the highest commendation.

6. That United States participation in and contribution to a wide range of projects to assist victims of Communist aggression has proven to be one of the soundest investments made by the American people.

7. That the American voluntary agencies working in the Far East are carrying out a wide range of self-help projects for the victims of communism and are providing real leadership in resolving those human problems which accompany war and aggression.

8. That a serious violation of the security of the free world has been permitted to fester in the Far East due in large measure to negligence on the part of some United States Government officials.

CONCLUSIONS

1. That no security investigation whatsoever is made on the so-called White Russian refugees residing in Red China who are emigrating to some 30 countries and territories of the free world.

2. That governments of the free world admitting such individuals from Red China into their countries appear to be laboring under the false impression that such individuals are subjected to a security investigation and that United States Government security clearance is provided in such cases.

3. That gross negligence in protecting the security of the free world is apparent in the failure to require any security investigation of such individuals residing in Red China who are emigrating to countries of the free world.

4. That United States Government officials concerned with this program cannot escape responsibility for this serious breach of free world security because United States public funds are used to make this security violation possible, through the United States escapee program and indirectly through the United States contribution to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

5. That the American voluntary agencies operating programs of assistance to victims of communism in the Far East are making a substantial contribution to the spiritual and material strength of the free world and to the cause of a just and lasting peace.

6. That the projects of the American voluntary agencies for victims of communism in the Far East are deserving of continued and expanded support by the United States Government and the American public in general.

7. That while the extension of the benefits of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to refugees in the Far East was unduly delayed there are now good prospects that in 1956 its application will substantially advance United States foreign policy objectives in that area.

8. That Congress should provide a remedy for those provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, which have proven to be senseless obstacles to the successful administration of the act.

9. That the United States International Cooperation Administration is deserving of commendation for sponsoring and advancing self-help projects for refugees in the Far East such as low-cost housing and for the child-feeding program in Hong Kong.

10. That there is an abundance of opportunity in the Far East for the productive use of United States surplus agricultural commodities which would in no way disturb normal commercial markets.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. That the United States Government take immediate steps to:

(a) Warn all free governments that it takes no responsibility whatsoever for the security clearance of individuals residing in Red China and who are flowing through Hong Kong to many countries of the free world.

(b) Prevent the further use of United States public funds for payment in whole or in part of transportation of such individuals from Hong Kong to countries of the free world.

II. That the House Committee on the Judiciary launch a full-scale investigation of the serious breach in free world security created by the flow of individuals from Red China into the free world in order to fix responsibility upon those who have allowed this gross negligence to go unnoticed until this late date.

III. That the balance of the fund of $500,000 earmarked by the United States escapee program for the transportation of individuals from Red China to countries of the free world be made available to the American voluntary agencies conducting programs to assist the Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese victims of Red tyranny.

IV. That the International Cooperation Administration continue to advance its program of self-help projects among refugees from communism, particularly those for the construction of low-cost housing, placement of individuals with leadership qualities, local integration and child feeding.

V. That the United States Government explore the possibility of using surplus agricultural commodities for launching additional projects in the Far East similar to the child-feeding program in Hong Kong.

VI. That Congress give early and favorable consideration to amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, that would—

(a) Eliminate the requirement that governments agree to issue a certificate of readmission for persons issued visas under the act;

(b) Waive the requirement of assurances in instances where an accredited American voluntary agency signifies its interest in a case or where the consular officer is reasonably satisfied that the applicant is not likely to become a public charge.

INTRODUCTION

By appointment of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives a study was made of the Far East, including all the nations of Southeast Asia and North Asia, from the point of view of the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1950 as amended, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 as amended, and other problems having a possible future bearing upon United States immigration policy. This overall study of Far Eastern immigration and population problems was the first carried out by a member of the House Judiciary Committee since the termination of World War II.

The inspection period involved covered a period from October 2 to November 18, 1955. The countries visited for the purposes of this inquiry were as follows: The Philippines, the British crown colony of Hong Kong, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, Singapore, and the Malay Federation, Portuguese colony of Macao, Republic of China (Formosa), Korea, and Japan. For purposes of brevity and ready reference this report is divided into three major sections.

Section I. Population displacements caused by intrigue of the Russian Communists and armed aggression carried out by their proconsuls in Asia

Experience in the past has clearly demonstrated that population displacements caused by war or other catastrophes have a direct bearing upon our immigration policy and its implementation. Immediately in the wake of World War II the problem of population upsets in Europe, those caused by the Nazis and the Russian Communist tyrannies and the expulsion from their homelands of some 12 million Germans of ethnic origin brought about a situation in which Congress established emergency immigration programs to help relieve the social and economic and political pressures caused by these upsets. The effects of World War II in Asia resulted in tremendous population upsets particularly on the mainland of China; however, more serious and potentially dangerous population upsets in the Far East have occurred since the end of general hostilities. Those displacements are the direct result of either Russian intrigue, including internal subversion, or armed aggression carried out under the leadership of Russian Communist proconsuls in key nations of Asia.

A. The British Crown Colony of Hong Kong

It is estimated that over 800,000 Chinese refugees have received asylum in Hong Kong since the Communist takeover and occupation of their homeland in 1948. This tremendous influx of refugees fleeing their Communist occupied homeland created a great number of economic and social problems for the colony of Hong Kong. Principal problems have been housing, employment, and schools along with those growing out of broken families. Considering the enormity of the refugee problem which confronted the Hong Kong government, a most remarkable job has been done. A resettlement commission was established by the government and with limited resources it has reduced human suffering and want to a minimum.

Perhaps the outstanding accomplishment in Hong Kong is the construction of housing for the refugees. In this connection the American voluntary agencies with the assistance of the United States Government International Cooperation Administration and the full cooperation of the Hong Kong government have given the leadership to self-help housing projects which will stand as a monument to American concern for homeless victims of aggression. The Catholic Relief Services (NCWC), Lutheran World Federation, Church World Services, are especially to be commended both for their accomplishments to date as well as their determination to complete the job.

The tremendous economic pressure caused by the heavy influx of refugees has created many problems which require continued United States interest and assistance. Perhaps outstanding among these problems is the fact that well over 25,000 refugee children in Hong Kong are entirely dependent upon a feeding program carried out under the auspices of the American voluntary agencies and the welfare department of the Hong Kong government. These children come from either the families of the unemployed or families whose income is so small as to provide insufficient food for the requirements of all the family members. This children-feeding program in Hong Kong provides an excellent example of what intelligent leadership in the utilization of our surplus agricultural commodities can do, both in alleviating suffering and striking a blow for the cause of human freedom. This is particularly evident in parts of the world where the cause of human freedom is now being put to an acid test.

A number of essential welfare services are provided the refugees by American and international voluntary agencies. These services include assistance in small business establishments, medical and dental services, resettlement services, local integration of farmers, and vocational training. These voluntary agencies have contractual arrangements with the International Cooperation Administration, through which public funds are made available to them in order to carry out these services. The agencies offering one or several of the above-noted services are (1) Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc., (2) National Catholic Welfare Conference of America, (3) Church World Services (American Protestant organizations), (4) Lutheran World Federation, (5) Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America (Maryknoll Fathers), (6) World Council of Churches, (7) the Free China Relief Association.

B. The Republic of Vietnam

Communist armed aggression directed from Moscow, assisted by Red China and led by a longtime Russian Comintern agent, Ho Chi Minh, has placed roughly one-half of Vietnam under Communist occupation. A conference at Geneva, Switzerland, brought an end to active hostilities in Vietnam, but also had the effect of splitting the country in half, with one part free and the other part under Communist occupation. As a consequence of Communist occupation of part of this country, well over 700,000 refugees have moved south into the territory of free Vietnam. It is estimated that many hundred thousands more would leave the Communist-occupied territory if they were free to do so.

The arrival of over 700,000 refugees in free Vietnam created a wide range of economic, social, and health problems. It was necessary for the Government to start from scratch in meeting these many problems. With assistance from both the United States Government and the enterprise of voluntary agencies, the Government has accomplished an almost insurmountable task in providing housing, schools, churches, public health facilities, and some type of employment for all those who chose freedom as their way of life. There are refugee villages spread throughout free Vietnam in areas which were once nothing but open farmlands. These villages have their schools, medical clinics, small businesses, and churches. Nearby farmland is tilled by the people. Many of the refugees have found employment outside the villages and in the surrounding areas.

It can now be said that the first task of providing emergency care for these refugees has been accomplished, and to the credit of all those who participated in the work. The major task ahead is to assist these refugees in becoming an integrated part of the Republic of Vietnam, which includes their further dispersion both to the farms and the existing industrial and business life of the country.

It was my privilege to attend the first national conference of refugee leaders which took place in Saigon, Republic of Vietnam, under Government auspices during the time of the inspection visit. These refugee leaders gathered together to work out plans for the future to complete local integration of all victims of Communist aggression. It was a stimulating experience, and one that will long be remembered, to speak with these people who gave up their homes and their material possessions rather than lose their freedom.

The International Cooperation Administration is to be complimented for a job well done in assisting the Government of Vietnam to successfully meet the challenge posed 1 year ago by the arrival of over 700,000 refugees. The National Catholic Welfare Conference is also deserving of commendation for the leadership role it has taken in assisting these refugees with their day-to-day problems and in helping them to plan programs for the future. This assistance has done much to sustain their faith in the cause of human freedom.

C. Cambodia

Cambodia was spared the ravages of Communist military aggression. Nevertheless it has received a number of refugees as a consequence of Red aggression in Vietnam. The exact number of Vietnam refugees in Cambodia is not known but an estimate places the number at upward of 5,000. They are residing in that part of Cambodia which borders on Vietnam. These refugees have created no serious problems for the Cambodian Government, which in turn has assisted them wherever possible to make their livelihood.

D. Laos

Laos has also been spared the ravages of a full-scale Communist aggression. The military action carried out by the Communist guerrilla forces in North Laos has caused some population upsets but nothing of a major character. There are also a considerable number of Vietnam refugees now living in Laos. The Government has demonstrated a competence to resolve problems in connection with refugee victims of communism.

E. Thailand

It is estimated there are as many as 25,000 refugees who escaped the Communist-occupied part of Vietnam. These refugees crossed the Laotian territory where they are now settled in concentrated areas. These refugees are stanch opponents of colonialism and erroneously regard the Communist leader, Ho Chi Minh, as a leader of the nationalist's liberation movement. This problem is complicated by the fact that these refugees regarded the Republic of Vietnam as under the control of Emperor Bao Dai and therefore still under French colonial rule. A real effort is now being made to point out to these Vietnam refugees that President

Diem is the true leader of the nationalist liberation movement and that he is also a stanch opponent of colonialism. It is expected that the recent overwhelming victory registered by President Diem over former Emperor Bao Dai in the October referendum will help these people to understand it is in their interest to take up residence in the Republic of free Vietnam. It should be noted that while these refugees erroneously regard Ho Chi Minh as a national hero, nevertheless, they are unalterably opposed to communism and would not return to the Communist occupied part of Vietnam. Communist agents are active throughout the area where these refugees are settled and their activities cause unrest and dissatisfaction which could cause trouble in the future.

F. Burma

Burma has had some population upsets as a consequence of Communist guerrilla action in its northern provinces. However, these upsets to date have not caused problems beyond the capabilities of the Burmese Government. Some of the Burmese Government officials are population conscious because of the geographical location of their nation to areas affected by great internal population pressures. India to the west with a population in excess of 400 million people has always had a tendency to have many of its people spill over into Burma. Communist occupied China to the north with a population claimed to be in excess of 450 million has long encouraged its people to migrate southward into Burma and the other countries of Southeast Asia. It is understandable that leaders of Burma with its population of some 180 million should be concerned with the possibility of being overrun and absorbed by either one or both of her giant neighbors.

G. Macao

Macao, a Portuguese colony, located on a small peninsula extending out of the mainland of China, has a relatively serious refugee problem. The colony with a population of approximately 300,000 has had to take in a refugee population of some 35,000 people. All of these refugees are Chinese except a few nationals of Portugal who had lived in China.

Within the limits of its resources, including the sparse land which makes up the colony, the government has done what it could to assist these refugees. With assistance of the United States Government a considerable number of refugee housing units have been constructed in Macao. In addition, supplemental food programs have been established utilizing United States agricultural surpluses. An American voluntary agency, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has taken the responsibility for initiating and overseeing both of these projects.

The future facing the refugees in Macao is a dismal one. There is no employment opportunity for them in Macao and little or no opportunity for them to emigrate elsewhere. They are always faced with the prospect that Red China will suddenly decide to overrun the Portguese colony of Macao which would certainly be the end of everything for them. Despite these handicaps the refugees interviewed made it clear that they did not want charity, but what they wanted was the opportunity to earn their own way in an atmosphere of freedom. The voluntary agency officials in Macao have been studying for some time the possibility of establishing several small business enterprises in the colony to provide employment for the refugees. It is hoped that these authorities will find some feasible plan to provide employment for these good people and that such plans will be given quick United States Government support.

H. Formosa

It is estimated that there are approximately 2 million refugees from Communist occupied China now residing on Formosa. The Government of the Republic of China has done a noteworthy job in integrating these refugees into the social, economic, and political life of free China. Emphasis has been placed on getting these refugees into occupations either identical or similar to those in which they were formerly engaged. There is a great deal of evidence of this activity in Taipei where there are hundreds of small business establishments. The Government has also taken practical steps to provide opportunities for higher education, including the training of teachers, provision for medical and dental schools and colleges, engineering, and government administration.

It is estimated that there are over 2,500 Chinese refugees now residing in Formosa who are graduates of American colleges and universities. This fact, in some measure, accounts for very strong ties between the Republic of China and the American people.

One project established in Formosa supported in part by United States Government funds worthy of special commendation is "Juddville," a welfare center established for the care and training of Chinese refugees. This project was named after a distinguished Member of Congress, the Honorable WALTER JUDD, who spent many years in China as a medical missionary and who is also chairman of Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc., an American voluntary agency. "Juddville" is a model village located about 10 miles from the city of Taipei. It is equipped with a medical center, school, handicraft shop, low-cost but attractive housing, and a small rice and vegetable farm. In addition to providing temporary assistance as well as medical care for a great number of refugees, the workers in this center concentrate on assisting Chinese intellectuals in finding their proper place in and contributing to the progress of Formosa.

The Government of the Republic of China is competent to take care of any future refugee problems which it might face as a consequence of Communist oppression in the homeland.

I. Korea

The Republic of Korea has been subjected to one of the biggest internal population upsets since the end of World War II. These population upsets have been caused by the tyranny of the Communist occupation north of the 38th parallel, the Moscow-directed and Red Chinese-supported war of aggression against the Korean people and the ravages of that aggressive war. As a consequence of these acts of violence it is estimated that at one time or another over one-half of the Korean people were displaced, dispossessed or forced to flee their native villages and homes. During the most active stages of the Korean war millions of refugees fled from the north to the south in the hope that they could escape from the tyranny of communism and at the same time place themselves under the protection of the United Nations forces which were then seeking to turn back Red aggression in Korea. Consequently, when the shaky and highly dubious armed truce was reached in 1953, there were millions of refugees in free Korea. These refugees needed immediate housing, medical care, clothing and food. Considering the magnitude of the problem the Republic of Korea faced at that time it can be reported that a remarkable job has been done in bringing order out of chaos and providing all these refugees with the essentials of life. While the refugee problem is by no means completely resolved it is certainly reduced to manageable proportions and gives every promise of being resolved completely in the immediate years ahead.

The investment the United States has made toward alleviating the problem of refugees in Korea has been a good one. The returns in human values and political stability far outweigh the cost in dollars and cents. The American voluntary agencies whose services have been one of the bright beacons of hope for the people since the end of World War II have done and are continuing to do a great work. Without the leadership and inspiration which these agencies have provided the tremendous job of salvaging the human resources of Korea could not have been done. Principal among these American voluntary agencies are Church World Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the American Korean Relief Foundation.

Section II. The administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (Public Law 203, 83d Cong.)

The following provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, have specific and special application in each of the nations visited during the inspection trip.

Section 4 (a) (11): "Not to exceed 2,000 visas to refugees residing within the district of an American consular office in the Far East: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in said consular office district and only to refugees who are not indigenous to the area described in this paragraph."

Section 4 (a) (12): "Not to exceed 3,000 visas to refugees, residing within the district of an American consular office in the Far East: *Provided*, That such visas shall be issued only in said consular office district and only to refugees who are indigenous to the area described in this paragraph."

Section 4 (a) (13): "Not to exceed 2,000 visas to refugees of Chinese ethnic origin whose passports for travel to the United States are endorsed by the Chinese National Government or its authorized representatives."

In addition, section 5 A has special application to Korea. Section 5 A reads as follows:

"Not to exceed 4,000 special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans as defined in this Act who are under 10 years of age at the time the visa is issued: *Provided*, That not more than two such special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans adopted, or to be adopted by any one United States citizen and spouse, unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers or sisters."

The general opinion was expressed by responsible American officials in the countries visited that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, was potentially valuable in advancing United States foreign policy objectives in Asia and in creating a better understanding of United States policies by the people of Asia. The application of the benefits of this legislation were unduly delayed in practically every one of the countries visited. A variety of reasons were advanced for that delay. Primary, among those reasons, were that all of these nations were reluctant to commit themselves on the certificate of readmission required under section 7 (d) (2) for each and every person issued a visa. The second major reason advanced for the delay was the requirement of assurances provided for in section 7 (a).

It was the opinion of all those interviewed that the requirement of the certificate of readmission placed an unnecessary obstacle in the way of a successful administration of the act. Generally speaking, governments concerned were resentful of this requirement because it represents an infringement upon their sovereign powers. In addition, many responsible individuals felt that this requirement neutralized the strategic value of the positive provisions of the act, including our recognition by enactment of law that those who were willing to fight for freedom in Asia would be accorded the same recognition by the United States as that accorded those in Europe who take a similar stand.

In general the assurance provisions were also found to be a hindrance in bringing about the best possible application of the act. In many cases the lack of required

assurances made it impossible for the field administrators to assist worthy cases whose emigration to the United States would stand as a concrete demonstration of our basic national motivation to try to help all those in need. One bright spot in this respect was found in Japan where the number of assurances put forward by Californians and other west-coast farmers exceed the number of internally displaced Japanese desiring emigration to the United States. It is difficult accurately to estimate the possibilities of a successful implementation of the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act, in the countries of Asia. If, however, the requirements of the certificate of readmission were revised and a practical interpretation of the assurance requirement were applied there are good reasons to believe that the program will be successful before December 31, 1956, the date when the act expires.

A. Philippines

The actual application of the provisions of Public Law 203 were delayed until April 1955. The reason for this delay was that the Philippine Government was unwilling to agree to the certificate of readmission as required by section 7 (d) (2). In April of this year a workable agreement in this respect was arrived at with the Government of the Philippines. Since that date there have been applications made under Public Law 203 to cover in excess of 1,600 persons. With but few exceptions these applicants are Chinese. The few exceptions are represented by so-called White Russians, former residents of China who were provided temporary haven in the Philippines before Communist occupation of the mainland of China. There are few among these exceptions who have not already been rejected by United States immigration authorities for reasons involving very questionable backgrounds or for excludable reasons of health.

In order equitably to apply the benefits of Public Law 203 to these applicants in the Philippines an answer must be found to an acute shortage of certified assurances as required by section 7 (a) of the act.

B. Hong Kong

The administration of the Refugee Relief Act assigned a special consular officer to Hong Kong in July 1954 to complete negotiations leading to the implementation of the provisions of the act. Final arrangements with respect to the certificate of readmission as required by section 7 (d) (2) were completed in December 1954. The following statistics, with respect to the application of the provisions of the law, will be of interest:

(a) Up to October 1, 1955:

Applications: 11,400 individuals.

Certified assurances: 3,731 individuals.

Investigations completed: 990 individuals.

Visas issued: 680 individuals.

(b) Applications under section 4 (a) (11) (persons who are not indigenous to the area):

Applications: 380 individuals.

Certified assurances: 170 individuals.

Investigations completed: 50 individuals.

Visas issued: 38 individuals.

With reference to the above it is noted that the vast majority of the applicants and individuals who obtained visas are so-called "White Russians." Included are some few Poles and Portuguese nationals. Upon inquiry it was revealed that practically all of these applicants determined to be nonindigenous to the area spoke Russian and English and few of them spoke Chinese although they have alleged to have lived in China over a period of many years.

Section 4 (a) (13): Up to October 1, 1955, a total of 38 visas had been issued in Hong Kong under the provisions of this section of the act. Inquiry was made as to why there had not been more applicants under this provision. It was learned that a precedent had been established by the consular officer requiring that the applicant be in actual possession of a passport endorsed by the Government of the Republic of China as prerequisite of such application. Consequently, this precedent has tended to slow down applications under this section. A more detailed examination of this problem is presented under the section pertaining to the Republic of China (Formosa).

With respect to security, a number of conferences were held with the officers directly responsible for this phase of work. It was their opinion that the present staff of field investigators assigned to Hong Kong was able to handle the volume of work involved. In addition it was reported that excellent cooperation and assistance in this respect had been provided by the government authorities in Hong Kong. However, concern was expressed over the security problem created by so-called White Russian refugees in China who were seeking admission into the United States under section 4 (a) (11). The Hong Kong government will not allow them to enter its territory unless they have in their possession a valid visa for some country of the free world. It is impossible for any United States agency to conduct a field investigation, as required by law, on any of these applicants because they are still residing in Communist China. Even the usual "name check" which is but a part of any security investigation is futile because the source records are completely out-dated and therefore unreliable. In these circumstances, the security officers connected with the administration of the Refugee Relief Act in Hong Kong have refused to give a security clearance to such cases. These officers were assured that their judgment in this respect was most correct and that Congress would be heartened to learn of the stand they have taken in this matter.

A complete investigation was made of the security problem presented by so-called White Russian refugees now residing in Communist China, the results of which are set forth in section III of this report.

C. Other Countries in Southeast Asia

The administrator of the refugee relief program has established a regional office in Singapore to service applications coming from the following countries and areas of Southeast Asia: Borneo, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaya, Netherlands New Guinea, New Caledonia, North Borneo, Portuguese Timor, Sarawak, Singapore, Thailand, Timor, Vietnam.

In discussing the administration program with the regional officer, it was learned that agreements with respect to the certificate of readmission had been reached with the following: Singapore, Sarawak, British North Borneo, Federation of Malaya, Thailand, Vietnam.

It is obvious therefore that the requirements of section 7 (d) (2) are a hindrance to the program in a great many countries in Southeast Asia.

The following statistics concerning the number of applications and their source are of interest (place of application and number):

Singapore Consular District (includes Federation of Malaya, and three territories of British North Borneo), 100.

Indonesia (with verified assurances), 11.

Thailand, 8.

Vietnam (with verified assurances), 5.

Place of issue and number:

Singapore consular district, 34.

Saigon, 2.

It was learned that the requirement of assurances had seriously reduced the number of applications accepted in each of the field offices noted above. A practice has been established of accepting applications only from those who have in their possession certified assurances. This accounts for what appears to be a relatively small workload for the regional office at Singapore. There are a considerable number of persons who would become applicants under the law if they could arrange for sponsorship in the United States or if the requirements on assurances were modified. This is particularly true in Vietnam.

D. Formosa

A number of extended conferences were held with the Chairman of the Ministry for Overseas Chinese and members of his staff with respect to the application of section 4 (a) (13) as well as the problems of Chinese refugees in general. These officials were most interested and cooperative and expressed a keen interest in bringing about the best possible results from the refugee relief program.

With respect to section 4 (a) (13), which requires applicants applying under it to have in their possession a passport endorsed by the Republic of China, a number of practical problems were encountered. To begin with, the Government had, up to October 1955, been reluctant to endorse passports unless the applicant was able to give proof of assurances from a sponsor in the United States. This position was taken so as not to encumber the offices of the Refugee Relief Program in the Far East with a large number of applicants who would not be able to qualify because they lacked sponsors in the United States. The Government, however, has recently taken the position of granting endorsed passports to applicants who do not have a sponsor in the United States but who appear to be otherwise eligible under the act. This action has been taken in the hope that an adequate number of sponsors will be found in the United States for these worthy people.

Up to November 7, 1955, the Ministry for Overseas Chinese had received a total of 622 applications for endorsed passports. As of the same date the Ministry had approved 440 of those applications. It was noted that approximately 300 applications for endorsed passports have been made by residents of Hong Kong.

This phase of the program would be facilitated if interested applicants in Hong Kong would make early application to the Republic of China for an endorsed passport. This procedure will be particularly urgent during 1956 when it is expected that visas authorized under section 4 (a) (12) will be exhausted somewhat before the terminal date of the act itself.

The Government of the Republic of China has extended its full cooperation to United States officials administering the Refugee Relief Act. It has established a Government committee made up of representatives of the Ministries for Overseas Chinese, Foreign Affairs, Interior and Security to work with representatives of the United States Government.

Up to November 11, 1955, a total of 170 people had emigrated from Formosa to the United States under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

E. Korea

Up to November 14, 1955, a total of 296 applications for visas under the Refugee Relief Act have been made. This does not take into account applicants under or interest shown in the orphan provisions of the law. As of this same date 114 visas had been issued and there were 182 cases under active investigation.

The Government of the Republic of Korea readily agreed to issue certificates of readmission to all Koreans who might qualify under the Refugee Relief Act. However, they have not agreed to issue such certificates to non-Koreans. It was learned that few non-Koreans applying under the act were Russians from Red China and few Chinese refugees.

The major problem in the administration of the refugee program in Korea is a dearth of sponsors to provide assurances for the many worthy applicants. Special efforts have been made to secure such assurances with but little success. One of the reasons

for this is that relatively few persons of Korean origin live in the United States and they have not been able to stimulate others to sponsor the applicants. Unless assurances are provided or revision is made on the requirement of assurances most of these applicants in Korea will not receive a visa to the United States.

A number of problems have been encountered in administering the orphan provisions of the act. While the orphan problem is pretty much restricted to what are called "GI babies" there is an enormous amount of redtape required in order to process a case. For example, merely to initiate a case requires an exchange of three letters between Korea and the United States. It was learned that a considerable number of orphans would be adopted by United States military personnel stationed in Korea and Japan except that the visas issued would expire before the tour of duty would end which in turn would mean they would not be able to get the child into the United States before the expiration of the act. This prospect was further complicated by the fact that no visas can be revalidated after December 31, 1956, the date when the act expires.

The administrator of the Refugee Relief Act in Korea was satisfied with arrangements made for security investigations of all applicants under the act. The appropriate officials of the Republic of Korea have extended their full cooperation in this matter. In particular, the commanding officer of the counterintelligence corps of the army of the Republic of Korea was commended for his valuable contribution to the successful operation of the program.

F. Japan

The administration of the refugee relief program in Japan did not get underway until 1955. Up to May 1955, a total of 100 applications had been received and 4 cases were completed and visas issued. There was a large spurt of activity between May 1955, and October 31, 1955. As of that date a total of 795 applications had been received, 293 investigations had been completed, and 100 visas had been issued.

The Government of Japan has agreed to the certificate of readmission with respect to Japanese nationals. However, no agreement has as yet been reached on this requirement with respect to non-Japanese who have made application in Japan. This, however, must be considered as a very minor problem since only six non-Japanese individuals have applied.

The administrator of the program was optimistic concerning results that he expected to attain under section 4 (a) (12) of the act. For example, he has received slightly over 500 assurances from sponsors in California and other States on the west coast to cover Japanese farmer applicants. It was his estimate that as many as 1,000 Japanese might qualify for visas to the United States under this section. They were broken down into the following three main categories:

A. Typhoon victims.

B. Repatriates from Manchuria.

C. Victims of military operations (including residents of Nagasaki and Hiroshima who may have been victims of World War II operations).

The administrator of the program was satisfied with arrangements made for security investigations and clearance of individuals applying under the act. In this connection, the appropriate officials of the Government of Japan have been most cooperative and helpful.

Section III. The security problem created by so-called "White Russian" immigrants flowing into the free world from Red China through the crown colony of Hong Kong

During the course of the inspection carried out in the countries of southeast Asia and north Asia, a very serious security problem was uncovered. Gross negligence on the part of United States Government officials in laying countries of the free world open to wholesale infiltration by Russian Communist agents impels the writing of this special section. A full exposé is made of this negligence with the hope that immediate corrective action will be taken by the proper authorities in the United States Government and that Congress immediately after it reconvenes, will undertake a complete and thorough investigation in order to fix responsibility on those individuals responsible for this wholesale breach of security of the free world.

According to official estimates, a total of some 5,900 individuals, the vast majority of whom are so-called White Russians who are alleged to have lived in Red China for many years, have moved into the free world through the crown colony of Hong Kong since 1952. These people have emigrated to practically every country and territory of the free world as well as to Communist-occupied countries, including Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Their movement has been arranged for and initiated by either the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, or by joint action on the part of both these international agencies.

Inquiry was made on each and every step undertaken in the movement of these people from Red China into the free world by either United States Government officials, representatives of American voluntary agencies, or representatives of intergovernmental agencies. The steps taken in their chronological order are as follows:

1. The individual living in Red China initiates his application for a visa to one of the countries of the free world by writing a letter of application to (a) the Shanghai office shared jointly by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, or (b) to any voluntary agency located in Hong Kong, or (c) to the Resident Representative in Hong Kong of the Joint Office of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (hereafter referred to as Resident Representative ICEM/UNHCR).

Pointed inquiry was made concerning the Shanghai office shared by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This seemed a strange arrangement since Red China has not been admitted to the United Nations, that an organ of the United Nations would be operating within its borders. Moreover the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which was created by the initiative of Congress was launched under the specific understanding that Communist or Communist-dominated nations would not be admitted to membership and that dealings with such governments would be excluded. It was not possible to get more specific information on this Shanghai office because no one really knew how it existed or how it was actually run.

2. All applications, regardless of initial source, are channeled to the voluntary agencies for their handling. This procedure is followed because the voluntary agencies have been responsible for securing the visas—a factor which will be explained in more detail in the following paragraph. The voluntary agencies then send back to the applicant a 4-page questionnaire which they request the applicant to fill out and return to them.

3. When the voluntary agencies receive these filled-out forms from the applicants in Red China, they then forward such applications to one of their representatives in the countries of the free world. These representatives in turn, use the data contained in this 4-page questionnaire, the validity and accuracy of which has in no way been security checked by any responsible government or intergovernmental official, to negotiate with a particular government of the free world in order to secure a visa to that country for the applicant and such dependents as he might have.

4. If the voluntary agency representative is successful in negotiating a visa from one of the countries of the free world, a "visa authority" is then forwarded to the Resident Representative of ICEM/UNHCR in Hong Kong. This visa authority is an official notice that a particular government of the free world has agreed to grant a visa to the person whose application was submitted to them by a voluntary agency.

5. The Resident Representative of ICEM/UNHCR in Hong Kong then notifies the Shanghai office of ICEM/UNHCR to put them under notice that the applicant has a valid visa to one of the countries of the free world.

6. Thereafter the Shanghai office sends notice to the resident representative in Hong Kong covering the following three basic points:

(a) That the applicant is medically sound;

(b) That the applicant is likely to get his exit permit from the Red Chinese authorities;

(c) That if stateless, the applicant will be supplied with identity documents.

7. The Resident Representative of ICEM/UNHCR in Hong Kong then applies to the government of Hong Kong for a transit visa for the applicant. At this point, assurance must be given the government of Hong Kong that the applicant for a transit visa has a valid visa for another country of the free world and that arrangements have been made to transport such applicant to that country. After a transit visa is granted, notice of same is then telegraphed to the Shanghai office with the request that the applicant then be moved to Hong Kong.

8. When the applicant arrives in Hong Kong, he goes to the office of the Resident Representative of ICEM/UNHCR where a series of interviews and a medical examination takes place. The applicant then receives a visa which is issued by the resident representative, acting for the receiving country.

The only exception to this last step is required by one of the Latin American Republics. Applicants for admission into that country do not actually receive their visas until they arrive in Genoa, Italy, where such visa is issued by a consular officer of that Government.

While the above procedural steps are being taken, a name check of each individual applicant is made. The name check consists of a check against records held by the government of Hong Kong, by the Republic of China (Formosa), and the United States. Specific inquiry was made to each of these sources where it was learned that their records are both incomplete and so out-dated as to be of no real value in a proper security investigation.

At one point during this inquiry, it was inferred by the Hong Kong representative of the United States Escapee Program that the American voluntary agencies assist in the security investigation of the applicants residing in Red China. Since this appeared to be a highly irregular arrangement, inquiry was made as to whether these American voluntary agencies have representatives in Red China and it was learned that without exception none of them had such representatives. It developed that when voluntary agencies receive derogatory information through refugees who themselves either reside in or formerly resided in Red China, this information is passed on to the representatives of the United States Escapee program in Hong Kong who in turn makes this information available to the resident representative of ICEM/UNHCR in Hong Kong. Such unchecked information may in no sense

be considered as a reliable security aid. This evaluation is not to be regarded as a reflection on the work of any American voluntary agency, but rather upon any government or intergovernmental official who attempts to use such voluntary agencies in connection with security problems.

The obvious conclusion reached after this careful study was that no field security investigation whatsoever is conducted on persons residing in Red China who are applicants for emigration to countries of the free world. The so-called "visa authority" is a blank check signed by governments to admit immigrants concerning whose background they have no reliable or verified information. There is reason to believe that the governments issuing such blank check visas are laboring under the false impression that a thorough-going security investigation and clearance is done on each of these applicants before they arrive in their country of destination. It is also believed that this false assumption is further advanced by the role United States Government officials play in this movement of people from Red China, particularly the fact that funds provided by United States Escapee Program are used to cover the transportation cost of most of these people from Hong Kong to the country of their destination. For example, a grant of $500,000 has been made by the United States Escapee Program to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration to make possible the movement of such applicants residing in Red China to countries in the free world.

United States Government security officials who were interviewed concerning this obvious breach of free world security were quick to point out that they were in no sense responsible for security clearances of those individuals moved from Red China through Hong Kong into the free world. Moreover, these same officials expressed their concern for the absence of reasonable security provisions in connection with this program. It was made clear during the course of several conferences with these security officers that the name check they were requested to make of United States Government files in no way constituted reliable security check.

During the course of this special inquiry the resident representative of ICEM/UNHCR was most helpful and cooperative. He was candid and open in the discussion of the problem outlined above, recognizing that a field security check of these applicants was impossible and that the element of risk in moving any individuals from Red China to countries of the free world was both great and ever-present. The resident representative in Hong Kong has done nothing more than carry out the orders and instructions of higher authorities.

In connection with this problem, one may ask what right a congressional subcommittee may have to inquire into the immigration policies or practices of another country. It was not the purpose of this inquiry to become involved in the immigration policy or practice of other nations. It was the intent, however, of this committee to determine whether United States public funds were in any way being used to make this movement of individuals from Red China to countries of the free world possible. It was also the intent of this inquiry to determine whether United States officials were in any way involved in passing upon the security fitness of any of these applicants from Red China or whether the likelihood existed that the governments of the free world receiving these immigrants labored under the false impression that a security clearance was provided by the United States Government.

It is of special interest to note that during the period from March 1, 1952 through October 1, 1955, a total of 5,901 residents of Red China received visas under the procedures outlined above and migrated to a country of the free world. During 1952, 759 individuals were so moved; during 1953, 3,266; during 1954, 1,463; during 1955 (up to October 31), 413. By far the greatest number of these individuals went to Brazil, a total of 2,627.

Approximately 85 percent of the individuals involved in this movement from Red China to countries of the free world were so-called "White Russians." In the official record they are classified as either citizens of the U. S. S. R., Russians or stateless. When one takes into account the extreme measures undertaken by the Russian Communists to prevent anyone escaping from territory they occupy into the free world and the constant demand of Moscow upon free governments to hand over to them Russian citizens who have escaped, brings into sharp focus the unusual if not peculiar status apparently enjoyed by the so-called "White Russian" refugees in China. There is little doubt that the Communist regime in Red China is completely responsive to the demands of Moscow and there is good reason to doubt that the Red Chinese would allow the exit of these so-called "White Russians" over the objections of Moscow.

A great deal of publicity has in the past years been given to White Russians, and they have usually been portrayed as enemies of Red Russia. Little or no publicity has been given to the fact that these so-called White Russians living in Harbin, China, flocked to renew their allegiance to Moscow following World War II. Nor has the fact that a very large number of these people still carry valid passports issued by the U. S. S. R. been given the public notice it warrants. The Kremlin never allows an enemy to make use of a U. S. S. R. passport. It is flirting with disaster naively to equate White Russians as enemies of Russian communism or advocates of democracy.

Due consideration was given to the records which indicate a total of several hundred individuals of various other nationalities, such as Polish, Armenian, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and German, had been moved from Red China under this program. Recognition was also accorded the movement of a small number of hardship cases—the blind, tubercular, etc.—from Red China to countries of the free world. However desirable may be the continued assistance to such people, the conclusion must be faced that the grave risks involved in any program of this type override all other considerations.

Inquiry was made concerning the ages of these individuals who were moved from Red China to the free world. This point of inquiry has special meaning when it is recalled that the Russian-Communists take special care to prevent the escape of persons in the most productive years of their life. It is fundamental to communism that manpower is the only value that man has to the State. It is interesting to note, therefore, that analysis of an average month of activity on this program reveals that of a total of 351 persons moved, 153 were between the ages of 21 and 50. This same analysis revealed that approximately 66 percent of these individuals were under 50 years of age.

Responsible officials in the United States Government can take immediate steps to plug this grave security breach. This can be done immediately by undertaking these two simple steps:

1. By prohibiting the use of any United States public funds, either directly or indirectly, for the movement of immigrants from Red China through Hong Kong to countries of the free world. This includes the use of direct funds by the United States escapee program, as well as the use of public funds appropriated for the use of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

2. To inform all of the governments who to date have been providing blank check visa authority that the United States Government takes no responsibility whatsoever for the security clearances of persons residing in Red China who make application to them, through the intermediary of voluntary agencies, for a visa of permanent residence.

The urgency for immediate action on the part of responsible United States Government officials is underscored by the following:

1. There are over 5,000 active applicants now residing in Red China under consideration in Hong Kong.

2. The resident representative of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the United States High Commissioner for Refugees in Hong Kong has a blank check to issue over 100 valid visas for countries of the free world to such applicants.

3. The United States escapee program has authorized the use of $500,000 of United States public funds to cover the cost of transportation of such applicants who emigrate from Red China through Hong Kong to any country or territory of the free world.

THE 84TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the closing hours of the 84th Congress, it is well that we look back upon the work of this Congress and analyze the result of the blending of the legislative effort of the Members of Congress. This Congress put more statutes on the legislative books than any other Congress in the preceding 5 years. A fair appraisal of the record of the 84th Congress will indicate a wide area of cooperation with the present administration, embracing for the most part the President's proposals, but expanding and liberalizing his program in an effective degree. For the greater part, the President had to rely on the liberal coalition of members of both political parties for the realization of his proposals. The 84th Congress did not challenge the President of opposite political faith—it worked toward a united front to an extent rare in American history. Congress probed, Congress investigated, and Congress acted in many new areas.

On the domestic front, one of the bitterest fights in Congress, which was of great importance to the people of the Greater Cleveland area, was the fight against the bill to exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. This legislation if enacted into law would have resulted in a tremendous increase in the natural gas rates in the Greater Cleveland area. Cleveland consumers of natural gas were as vitally concerned as perhaps any other group in America. Our city enjoys a very reasonable gas rate which results from the widespread use of gas for space heating and from the great industrial use of gas. This legislation was passed by the House in the spring of 1955, and early in 1956 passed the Senate.

The President's veto prevented this legislation from becoming law. While I was happy about the decision of the President in vetoing this dangerous legislation, my reasons were upon different grounds. His veto was as a result of the so-called Case incident and the political implications that resulted there-

from. My opposition to the legislation was based upon my belief that the natural gas of the Southwest and other parts of America which reaches the Midwest and the Northeastern States by way of interstate pipelines is a public utility within the full purview of the law and therefore subject to public regulation. To do otherwise would place the gas consumers of our community at the mercy of the gas producers who would use their unregulated power to charge the helpless gas-consuming public as much as they would be willing to pay for this important public service.

In the course of the debate on the natural-gas bill, I had my baptismal in the fire of congressional debate. It was an experience that I will never forget.

The 1955 session of the 84th Congress saw the increase in the national minimum wage from 75 cents to $1. It was my privilege to be among that group of legislators who felt that the national minimum wage should be $1.25, and in this effort we had to struggle against the influence of many people in Congress and the Chief Executive who felt that the minimum wage should not be increased or that its increase should be limited to 90 cents. In my judgment, it is doubtful that the administration would have recommended any increase at all if it had not been for the great pressure and sentiment for this legislation in the 84th Congress. The increase in the minimum wage, while limited to interstate businesses and industries, had the effect of increasing wage standards throughout the entire country. For us in the greater Cleveland area it served to raise the level of wages in the low-income Southern States and thereby helped to stay the movement of industry from the Northern States to the Southern States where the labor market was cheaper. It has always been my judgment that regions in America should have the full right to compete for business and industry but that competition should be based on markets, accessibility of facilities, availability of power and water and industrial sites and skilled labor, but never on the basis of cheaper wage standards. On the minimum-wage bill I argued before the congressional committees that the last increase of minimum wage took place in 1949 and that if 75 cents per hour was determined as a proper minimum wage in 1949, certainly $1.25 would be necessary today. I further pointed out that the Nation should follow a fair and reasonable formula for determining a minimum wage based upon an hourly wage which would produce an income sufficient to provide for a normal family under the minimum conditions of decency in which we can permit Americans to live.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I was among those Members of Congress who supported an unsuccessful effort to reduce the income tax. Although this bill took the form of a $20 per person tax credit, I gave it support because I felt there was a tremendous need for increasing the take-home pay of the great majority of working citizens. A bill to increase dependency exemptions would have been founded on stronger principles. The present dependency exemption of $600 bears little relationship to the cost of supporting a dependent. A dependency exemption should be what it purports to be—an effort to allow a taxpayer a fair tax credit for the cost to him of a dependent's support. The purpose of the dependency exemption is to place the taxpayer with dependents in a more equal position with the taxpayer lacking dependents. Today's dependents are tomorrow's workers, creators of goods, services, enterprises, and defenders of the national security.

The family is the keystone of our society of government and social life. The family must have realistic tax allowances for the cost of supporting dependents, for the cost of educating them and providing them with medical care. During the course of the legislative session, I introduced legislation to accomplish these purposes but committee action was not forthcoming.

In the 1st legislative session of the 84th Congress, I supported appropriation funds to construct new railroad bridges over the Cuyahoga River and thereby facilitate the movement of ore and limestone and coal from Lake Erie to the plants in the industrial Cuyahoga River Valley. In addition, I supported legislation for the extension of the Great Lakes Seaway and for the widening and deepening of the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes to facilitate the shipment of heavy freight cargoes to Cleveland from both the upper lakes and the St. Lawrence River. This legislation is indeed important to preserve for Cleveland its position as a great steel and machine tool producing center. To our community this means jobs and homes and growth.

In the spring of 1955 I was the very first person to raise the issue of the lack of control of the Public Health Administration in the development of the Salk antipolio vaccine. It was shocking to learn that large quantities of this new drug were released without adequate Government supervision. In the course of hearings before my Banking and Currency Committee, I pointed out the derelictions of public responsibility on this important issue, and at the conclusion of long and extensive hearings the Surgeon General of the United States admitted this dereliction.

The highway bill of 1956 was one of the important enactments of the 84th Congress. For the first time the Government of the United States was responding to the need to modernize and improve the 40,000 mile Interstate Highway System. Congestion and the increasing number of automobiles had rendered the existing highway system obsolete and conditions were progressing so badly that the automobile itself was in danger of becoming obsolete. With my background experience as legal adviser to the State department of highways, I vowed with all of my strength to oppose legislation which provided that the Government would pay for the relocation of public and private utilities made necessary for the improvement of the highway system. It seemed to me that the utilities were using highway rights-of-way without charge and certainly deserve to at least contribute to the cost of relocating their own facilities. This law has raised the Federal gasoline tax 1 cent but the effect will be highways which are safer and more equipped to assume modern-day traffic.

In the first session of Congress the House of Representatives passed out legislation to increase social-security benefits by reducing the retirement age for women from age 65 to age 62 and to provide for disability benefits for workers who are totally disabled at age 50. Although this is not a tremendous increase in retirement benefits, it represented as much as could be done in this session of Congress in view of the tremendous opposition to this legislation by the President and his administration.

Although this is a moderate adjustment of our social-security laws, it will have a far-reaching effect upon our entire economy. The lowered retirement age for women will undoubtedly become a tremendous incentive for the retirement of women as well as for men who have continued their employment simply because the woman of the household was not able to enjoy her social-security benefits. The increase in the numbers of our retired and their consequent displacement from employment or from the lists of those seeking employment will create innumerable job opportunities for those below retirement age. As a matter of fact, this may create job opportunities for a large segment of our unemployed working forces of middle age who will be the most eligible candidates for positions in industry which will be vacated by the increasing number of our retiring citizens.

Nothing is more important than to permit our senior citizens to retire in dignity. The retirement income should be sufficient to permit them to live at a level which is in some measure commensurate with the level they enjoyed throughout the employable years. Retirement should not force them to move from a home to a hovel. Nor should it force them to substitute no medical care for the inadequate medical care which they received during their employment years. Our retirement program should permit our retired families to live in comfort, to buy the medical and hospital care which they need and to enjoy the benefits and the conveniences of our times in good measure.

The need for providing for the disabled worker over 50 years of age should need no further justification. Such a worker, whose employable years are cut short by accident, should not be faced with a lifetime of destitution and despair. The misfortune which afflicted his life is one which by chance we may have missed. Certainly the workers of America who will all be entitled to the privilege of this benefit, if a disability should strike them, should have no objection to assuming in some way the cost of providing for the less fortunate members of our working society.

Early in the second session of the 84th Congress I made plans to bring the Housing Subcommittee to Cleveland to

conduct hearings on the housing problems which afflict our area. These problems stem from the high cost of housing in Cleveland, resulting from high housing construction costs and from the low FHA appraisals on both new and older properties. This condition has forced many purchasers of homes in Cleveland into high second, third, and fourth mortgages and into the purchase of dwelling places on land contracts. The costs of this kind of housing were so great that the owners of such property were forced to violate zoning laws by unlawfully dividing housing into multiple units and by overcrowding them. Up to the time of the Housing Subcommittee hearing in Cleveland no progress was seemingly made on the effort to get Garden Valley and the Cleveland urban renewal work underway. After these hearings, Washington was prompt with action and the first work was undertaken. As a result of the Cleveland housing hearing, evidence was accumulated to make improvements in the Housing Act and to make home ownership easier.

Numerous times throughout the session, in committee and on the floor, I opposed the unwarranted granting of quick tax amortization write-offs which were being made by the Office of Defense Mobilization to numerous industries throughout the Nation. I attacked the write-offs on the basis that they transferred a greater portion of the tax burden on to the taxpayers who were certainly less able to pay. While quick tax write-offs are still authorized by law, I believe that they will be terminated by the next Congress and that the result will be the development of a more equitable tax system.

During this spring, I also fought for restrictions on the exportation of scrap to foreign nations. In my judgment the Administration had been authorizing the shipment to foreign nations of unwarranted supplies of our scrap at a rate which increased by almost 500 percent in the past year. This has caused the current supply of scrap to shrink and has caused the prices to rise in the domestic steel markets. The result showed up in the increased cost of finished steel products. The real danger existed in the tremendous supplies of our scrap which were going to foreign countries, some of whom could transship the scrap to nations unfriendly to us. The experience of World War II might be repeated when American sailors and soldiers were killed with steel made from American scrap.

In the course of the session I made every effort to call to the attention of the public the unwarranted attack on our income tax laws by former Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews who was more interested in his legal client than in any loyalty to the United States Government. It was my belief that his attack was part of a national scheme to destroy the income tax to the advantage of the large income group rather than any other peoples in our economy.

In the course of this session there were numerous other tasks, such as the support for authorization of the Pan American Games to be held in Cleveland in 1959, the clearing up of the Brancato immigration fiasco, and for numerous important immigration cases which had to be resolved.

I exercised every effort to oppose the Administration's desire to increase the cost of first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents. From all of the evidence which was submitted, I was convinced that the first-class mail was operating at a profit and that the postal deficit was brought about by the high cost of 2d-, 3d-, and 4th-class mail—otherwise known as the junk mail. It appeared to me that the magazine publishers of the country were attempting to push the burden of the mail cost on to the user of ordinary first-class mail. Until the high cost 2d-, 3d-, and 4th-class mail assumed a greater portion of their mail charges, it was my belief that first-class mail should remain unchanged.

With respect to veterans legislation, I supported the legislation which increased disabled veterans' pensions by approximately 10 percent. The last increase of 5 percent made by the past Congress was inadequate and unrealistically out of line with the rising cost of living. I also supported the increase in the pension plan for the veterans of World War I. It seemed to me that this legislation would have filled a great need in our economy and would have been very important to thousands of residents of my district. I regret that these measures did not become law.

It was my privilege to participate extensively in the civil rights debate of 1956. Although this legislation left untouched a large area of civil rights, I felt that it was the minimum step in the right direction that should be made by this Congress. On four occasions I took the floor of the House of Representatives to urge the adoption of this important legislation.

It is unfortunate that the education privileges of the GI bill of rights was not extended by this session of Congress. This Nation is stronger and more productive because of the tremendous educational program which was made possible for World War II and Korea veterans. With the struggle between communism and democracy now shifting to the educational front, it is more important than ever that we provide for a comprehensive program of educating our people of all ages for greater productivity, for the development of better family life, for the national security, and for increasing duties of citizenship.

In the closing days of the session, the RECORD is filled with my activity as a more seasoned Member of the House of Representatives. I enjoyed the privilege of debate and heartily participated in all activities which make up the legislative process. To the Members of the 84th Congress my time as a "new man" was not very long.

In the next several months I will have a greater opportunity to take care of the many personal inquiries which have been made to me by the citizens of the 21st District of Ohio. It will be my intention to be in my Federal building office almost daily between now and the end of the year. The office is in room 506 of the Federal Building on Cleveland's Public Square. The telephone number is CHerry 1-7900. My staff and I will make every effort to carefully study any problem or question which is submitted, and I will personally endeavor to see every person who calls. This is difficult work, but it is the essence of democracy, and it is one of the functions of the Congressman to translate the tremendous affairs of the Federal Government in the most courteous and understanding way to every citizen. It is the citizen who counts because from him all power and responsibility in Government flows.

After the conclusion of regular office hours, it will be my desire to personally visit and call upon as many families as I possibly can. In this effort I will at least endeavor to visit every street in my community. I will talk to workers and housewives, the senior citizens and young people. If it is my destiny to continue to legislate, it is my obligation to know my community, to learn its problems and to be dedicated to their solution. Some of the best ideas which were given to me on my work were supplied by persons who least suspected they were setting in motion and stimulating a force in legislative life. Give me your problems and your ideas for their solution, for from these things laws are made.

CIVILIZATION'S GREATEST DANGER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of the second session of the 84th Congress, I want to once again reiterate my stand against communism.

The greatest menace to our country and to freemen everywhere is this deadly poisonous attitude of the Communists. Communism is the most demoralizing and debasing influence that the world has known since the crucifixion of Christ on Calvary's Cross.

I want to warn the administration against the "new look" of the Soviet Union. Their pretended friendship is really a subterfuge. To me this is a real attack to lull us to sleep and to try to catch us napping at the switch. The Russians' relentless drive in the Near East and in Egypt is proof that this "new look" is far more deadly than has ever been the menace of war. Announcement this morning of the seizure of the Suez Canal by Egypt is merely another step to world power by the Communists through its satellite countries. All America should be on guard. Especially should the administration be on the alert while Congress is in adjournment. Now is the time for good Christian people to be militant and watchful. Communism is anti-Christian and anti-religious.

Because Communists want to rule the world, they start with the individual, work up through communities, states and nations. If they can control our Nation, the world is theirs. They have proved this by gradually taking over the satellite countries in Eastern Europe and now they are taking over the Middle East by working through native Communist Parties in the countries they seize.

Nevertheless, the power of control is centered in Moscow.

The American people reject wholeheartedly the Communist Party and its leaders. But we must never cease our efforts to eliminate and destroy its influence. The hostilities of our people have driven the Communist Party underground. Yet it continues its menace through organizations and individuals.

The seeds of communism are planted in our schools, the entertainment world, political organizations, labor unions or any organization in which they think they can get a foothold.

The Communist Party is trying to get the loyal citizens of the Nation to do their work for them. They are intent in exercising power behind the scenes to influence policy, to initiate "peace" petitions and to protest against national defense measures. Its insidious campaign to infiltrate every segment of our people is its main weapon. Every American citizen must be on the alert against this relentless foe. Communism completely lacks morals and ethics. Peace to the Communists means the destruction of all opposition.

And may Almighty God in His infinite wisdom and glory give us the strength and unity and foresight to work as a united people against this relentless foe which if, by any chance (may God forbid) they should become victorious, freedom and liberty as we know it would be abolished a thousand years. Therefore, let each of us consider it our sacred duty as a loyal citizen and a Christian to be on guard at all times in every community throughout this land.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

To all Americans as well as those here in Congress, I direct this request to pause a few minutes to review and reflect upon the past and present major pieces of legislation affecting the welfare of American veterans.

For the first time, a program of readjustment benefits was established by the 78th Congress and approved by President Roosevelt to aid returning veterans of World War II in readjustment to civilian life. This masterpiece, commonly referred to as the "GI bill," established a program of educational assistance, vocational training for the service disabled, unemployment compensation, mustering out pay, and home and business loans. The 82d Congress, with approval of President Truman, extended these benefits to veterans of Korean service—medical, hospital and domiciliary care, burial benefits and compensation or pension for disabled veterans and dependents of the deceased.

More than 7,800,000 veterans received education and training under the World War II program, and nearly one and one-half million veterans have entered the educational and training program under provisions of the act established for veterans of Korean service. This program has enabled millions of veterans to obtain a college education who otherwise would not have been able to do so and has helped countless others to overcome their physical handicaps and thereby become self-sustaining. Most national leaders agree that the readjustment programs, in spite of their high costs, have been economically sound and have materially increased the earning capacity of the veteran population.

The Veterans' Administration in a recent release to United Press sets the cost of the training program at $14.5 billion and is being repaid rapidly in the form of larger income tax payments. A VA survey shows that the average income of veterans who trained under the bill is up 51 percent above that of the past 6 years while that of nonveterans in the same age group has increased only 19 percent. The VA estimates these veterans are paying $1 billion a year more in income taxes as a result of greater earning ability. "At this rate," the Agency said, "the Government's investment will be returned in about 15 years."

An additional and more intangible benefit which cannot be measured in terms of dollar value results from the creation of an educated citizenry that is better qualified to cope with our numerous social and political problems.

In 1940 Congress enacted the National Service Life Insurance Act, thereby enabling every person who served in World War II to purchase low-cost life insurance in the maximum amount of $10,000. More than 22 million policies of life insurance were issued under this act and nearly 6 million of them are now in force. In 1951 Congress enacted the Servicemen's Indemnity Act, under which every person in the Armed Forces during the period of the Korean conflict was given $10,000 of the gratuitous indemnity insurance without cost. Congress also supplemented this protection to the dependents of those who died in service or from service connected causes by materially increasing the rates of death compensation payable to widows, orphans, and dependent parents. A service pension for widows of World War I veterans where the death was not connected with service was first established by Congress in 1944. Widows became entitled to pensions without the necessity of showing the veteran had a service-connected disability at the time of death. More than 320,000 World War I widows are now drawing pension under this act.

When Congress provided benefits for Korean veterans the service period established was from June 27, 1950 to such date as might be determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or Presidential proclamation.

On January 1, 1955, President Eisenhower issued an Executive order terminating the Korean service period as of January 31, 1955. Many in service prior to the issuance of the Executive order had enlisted in reliance upon the promise of a 4-year college education under the Korean GI bill for 2 full years of service. This benefit would have been denied thousands who entered the service because of the assurance of a college education had it not been for the prompt action of the 84th Congress, which enacted Public Law 7, which became effective on February 15, 1955, and permitted the accrual of educational benefits by all who were in the service prior to the January 31, 1955, termination date.

The hospital and medical program of the Veterans' Administration has been improved and expanded. Medical services are now provided through 173 VA hospitals and 70 outpatient clinics. As of January 31, 1956, there were 121,163 hospital beds in operation which represents an increase of 4,131 beds since July 1, 1954. The 84th Congress has also been responsible for a replacement, modernization, and improvement program which will assure the continuance of high-quality medical care through the Veterans' Administration. This program has scheduled the large-scale modernization of 58 existing hospitals, with minor improvements in 16 others.

In addition, the House of Representatives, of this 84th Congress, has passed a bill materially increasing existing benefits for the survivors of those who died in the Armed Forces or from service-connected causes and has approved legislation to provide a college education for children of those who died from a disability incured in combat or by an instrumentality of war. These measures have now both become law.

But the job of this—the 84th Congress—is not done.

There is still unfinished veterans legislation; the bill for increased compensation for our disabled veterans and the pension bill for the older veterans of World War I.

When Old Glory called her soldiers to serve, they were there in full force, on land, on sea, in the air, and beneath the waves, prepared to face the onslaught of the enemy from any direction. They gave their sweat, their blood, their all. Many never came back, leaving behind them widows and fatherless children who look to America, to this Congress, for help and encouragement. There were those who came back, injured and maimed, disillusioned and without hope. There were those who came back with renewed hope and eager to pick up the reins where they had dropped them. All of these, sick, or well, discouraged or inspired, look to us, the Members of this Congress, for courage and assistance. We cannot let them down.

Yes, we have done well by our veterans. But there is more to be done. Before this 84th Congress adjourns we must act—here and now—upon the bill for increased compensation for our disabled and the World War I pension bill.

I agree wholeheartedly with my honorable colleague, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts, who, like a true soldier, recently said on this floor:

> During the war our soldiers were expendable. We must not let the veterans become expendable today.

Let us complete the job today—and tomorrow Old Glory will wave a little higher and a little brighter.

RELIEF OF DISTRESSED ECONOMIC AREAS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the

House, to the more than 100 Members of the House, who represent areas classified as distressed economic areas in 15 States in the Nation, and at the same time to bring this matter to the attention of the people in my district, as well as the people in other congressional districts suffering acute unemployment, and to all the people in the country the tragedy of this session.

I regret that in these closing hours of this session of Congress, I must strike this note of disharmony. But strike it I must, because the failure of the administration and the Republican leadership of the House to agree by unanimous consent to permit the aid to distressed areas bill to be called up under suspension of the rules, prevented the passage in this session of that bill.

The Douglas-Flood bill introduced last year in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, and by myself in the House and with many bills for the same purpose introduced by dozens of Members from both sides of the aisle. I say, Mr. Speaker, such a bill passed the Senate 2 days ago with a 60–30 vote. I immediately moved and obtained the consent of the majority leadership of the House, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to have this bill called up in the House under the suspension of the rules. Mr. RAYBURN and Mr. MCCORMACK advised me they would do so, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, would agree. I immediately contacted the two gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON] and enlisted their aid in view of the fact that both Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON represent such distressed economic areas, and each had introduced similar bills this year. The bills introduced by Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON were the administration bills to meet this problem, and were introduced immediately after President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress, urged the passage of this legislation. I was advised by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, that an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Corwin, stated the administration would not accept the Douglas-Flood bill. I talked to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, on the telephone immediately, acquainted him with the situation as I have outlined herein above, and he said he would dispatch his assistant, Mr. Mueller, to the Capitol at once, to discuss the matter at my suggestion with Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON. This was done.

Two hours later, Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON advised me that the administration was adamant and against any bill whatsoever. They advised the administration leadership at the Department of Commerce and in the House that the important thing for millions of people who would benefit by this bill was to get any bill on the floor of the House under the suspension of the rules so that it could be sent to conference with the Senate for the vital purpose of bringing aid to the distressed economic areas in the Nation and to pass the Congress before adjournment. The Democratic leadership was advised by me of each one of these steps hour by hour during the last 2 days of this session.

The Democratic leadership even agreed to call up on the floor for final passage, under suspension of the rules, the administration bill, the very bill the President asked the Congress to pass on this problem. The Department of Commerce spokesman and the Republican leadership of the House refused even to agree to consider the administration bill as proposed by the President.

I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, because as you know, many times during this session I supported important legislation requests by the President, and fought for it in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of this House, when those bills were frequently opposed by the Republican leadership and by many Republican Members.

Again, for the past 48 hours, I have been working day and night pleading with the administration leaders here to agree to report out their own bill for aid to distressed areas. This they have consistently refused to do, and therefore upon them must rest the responsibility for our utter, complete, and total failure in this session to pass a bill to bring aid to distressed economic areas of the Nation.

I have been in this Congress for a number of years, but never in my experience could I believe that this would happen. It was a bitter disappointment to my Republican friends in the House from distressed areas who know the need and wanted this bill as much as I did, and it is a crying shame that the administration leadership who were 100 percent against this bill, once more rejected a direct request from their own President, refused to cooperate and join with the Democratic leadership after the Senate had passed such a bill, in permitting a bill, not just the Senate bill, but any bill, including their own administration bill, to be voted on.

I challenge the Republican leadership and any member of the administration, and any Member of Congress, Republican or Democrat, to deny these statements. But they cannot be denied, for these are the facts.

I pledge to the people of my district, to the people of all districts where there is acute unemployment, to my colleagues representing those districts, Republican and Democrat, that the first thing I shall do when the 85th Congress convenes in January, is to reintroduce this same legislation with confidence that then it will become law.

I want to emphasize that this was a completely bipartisan operation between a handful of Republican Members in affected districts, and with myself and my Democratic colleagues from similar areas and the Democratic leadership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I indict the administration and the Republican leadership of the House for the adamant refusal to permit this legislation to be called for a vote under suspension of the rules today.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Masachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the closing hour of the 84th Congress is drawing near, and to this minute the House and the Senate have not agreed to iron out differences on legislation that would give relief to minority groups now handicapped from bringing their relatives and friends to the United States.

Early in the first session of this Congress I joined with Senator SALTONSTALL in filing identical bills, H. R. 2558 and S. 519, which would correct many of the inequities in the so-called McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. Our bill provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding year to those waiting lists of quotas 7,000 and under, including the Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, Polish, Lithuanian, and other Eastern European quotas. Our bills would make the immigration laws more fair and workable. The McCarran Act established immigration quotas on the basis of the 1920 rather than the 1950 census. H. R. 2558 and S. 519 would eliminate discrimination against cultural and racial groups, which have become increasingly important parts of our community in the last 36 years, by establishing quotas on the basis of the 1950 census. The bills would bar Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from this country without the necessity of proving, as is now necessary, that they have advocated the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. In addition, the bill establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in the State Department to review denials of visas and the regulations applying to immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that amendments such as these have not been made to the McCarran Act. However, the immigration and nationality laws have been modified in various respects by H. R. 6888 which passed the Senate today with amendments. Section 5 of the Dirksen amendment is particularly desirable, for it deals with redistribution of the unused quota numbers at the end of a fiscal year. This is substantially the same provision that we had written into our bills.

It is so late in the session now that it would appear that this is the best bill amending the immigration and nationality laws that we can get through Congress. I urge the House to accept the Senate amendments so that this year, at least, we can start admitting more men, women, and children to our shores from Eastern and Southern Europe.

BUILDING THE PATH TO PEACE AND A RICHER WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the hour for our adjournment draws

near. The 84th Congress soon will become a part of the history of these United States of America. I am proud to have shared in its deliberations and I am humbly grateful to the men and women of the Second District of Illinois for the opportunity they gave me of using the authority of their vote in helping to build the path to the tomorrow of peace, of good will and of broadened horizons of life for everyone.

We have come a long way in the 84th Congress in the building of that path to a richer tomorrow. To every nation, as to every person, is given by divine providence a mission. Always mankind looks upward, and the climb is toward the heights. It is the mission of our country, now charged with world responsibility, to open new and loftier heights and to ease the climb.

Ahead is a world without poverty, a world without hatreds, a world in which man can live at peace with his fellow man and in the dignity intended for all the children of God. The 84th Congress has made its contribution to that end.

ATTENDED EVERY SESSION

Mr. Speaker, I have attended every session of the 84th Congress. As in the 83d Congress, I have answered all rollcalls. Each day as I have approached the Capitol, my eyes fixed untiringly and strengtheningly on the beautiful and inspiring dome, I have voiced a quiet prayer that in the deliberations and votes of the day I should represent to the full extent of my ability the thinking and the aspirations of all the quarter of a million men and women and children in the district that three times has honored me with the delegation of casting its vote in the greatest deliberative body in the world. I have felt that any day would be a lost day unless it marked some progress, small or large, toward the heights for which we are reaching.

FIGHT AGAINST DISEASE

The Democratic 84th Congress will be remembered long after we are gone as the Congress that prepared the way for the final conquering of dread diseases, those of cancer and of heart included. We have authorized the greatest program of medical research ever undertaken by any nation in any age of the world's history. From this will result, as sure as day follows the night, the ultimate lifting from the homes of America, and of the world, of the tormenting fear of illnesses, for which there now is no remedy, striking down the loved ones in our family circles. We have prolonged the span of human life, not only for our own people but for those of all other lands.

This is the true way to peace on earth. When from the study and the research, resulting from the program we have mapped, the cures are found for ailments, now incurable and we share our knowledge with other peoples then indeed will the name of the United States be blessed.

In my active support of this frontal attack on the physical ills that plague our people I am confident that I have truly represented, as they would have wished it, the people of the Second District of Illinois. I shall report to them, equally confident of their approval, my support of an extension and enlargement of the school milk program, of medical and dental care of our school children, and of the free distribution of polio vaccine.

SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING

The physical well-being of our people is the proper concern of the Congress. The spiritual well-being also is of concern. The Congress has recognized that we are a nation under God by placing that affirmation in our pledge to the flag, by setting aside a room for meditation and prayer for Members of the Congress, and one of the laws of the 84th Congress commands that all coins and currency of our country there shall appear the words "In God We Trust."

BUILDING NATIONAL FAMILY

The 84th Congress will be remembered long after we are gone as the Congress that prepared the way for the elimination of sectionalism and the uniting at long last of all our people into one national family. When people meet and know one another differences not of character dissolve. In enacting the largest public works program in history, that providing for a $33 billion highway construction, the 84th Congress did more than any other Congress in our history to unite into one family the American people. With the completion of this program, making easily and quickly accessible one section of the country to all others, one State of the Union will be to the family of the Nation not as a separate and removed residence but as one room in a family home of 48 rooms.

REAL HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY

The 84th Congress also provided for the quick completion of the Pan-American Highway, so that soon from Alaska to the Panama Canal, and later I vision to the tip of South America, there will flow unendingly a stream of travelers, coming and going, getting really to know peoples in sections and lands visited, and thus cementing in understanding the bonds that unite.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the way to peace. It is this that will keep the peoples of this hemisphere in a unity as strong and enduring as the Rock of Gibraltar. This is one of the proud accomplishments of the Democratic 84th Congress.

OPPOSED SADDLING WITH DEBT

Mr. Speaker, I think at this point I should make some comment on why I could not and did not support the administration's original highway construction bill. I do not believe that one generation has for its own advantage the moral right to mortgage generations as yet unborn. The progress made by each generation should be paid for by the toil and the sacrifices of that generation. It is only when war comes, and national survival requires the departure from rules of prudence, that debts morally may be acquired that carry over into succeeding generations.

The administration bill provided for the $33 billion construction with money raised from the sale of bonds. That meant an interest charge of over $1 billion a year continuing indefinitely. Recently in my own State of Illinois a bond issue was sold to finance a new turnpike. The bonds have been sold, and the people of Illinois are now paying $50,000 a day in interest even though work on the turnpike construction is still far from the starting stage. Had the administration's bill been accepted this would have resulted on the national level to a devastating extent.

In prudence and in honor I felt we should pay for our highway construction as we went along, and thus avoid its financing becoming a weight around our necks to strangle our future. Happily, the Democratic bill was adopted. It provides for paying as we go and on a fair basis of use and abuse.

CONGRESS WITH A HEART

Mr. Speaker, my time is almost gone, and I must hurry along. There is not time remaining to mention the many other achievements of the 84th Congress, including the increase of the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour and the liberalizing of the social security provisions. I do wish before closing to mention some matters especially of interest and concern to my own constituents.

CAL-SAG A DREAM COME TRUE

In the campaign of 1954 I presented to my constituents what I termed a positive program for Chicago. The items included the Calumet-Sag Channel, water diversion, and Federal aid against beach erosion. The 84th Congress both in its 1st and 2d sessions made appropriations assuring the early completion of the great and important inland waterway so vital to Chicago's future. In the three Congresses of which I have been a Member, Cal-Sag has commanded my unceasing effort. I am very, very happy that the 84th Congress has made the dream come true.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

The 84th Congress passed in both the 1st and 2d sessions the Lake Michigan water diversion bill; and I am very glad to have a part in cooperation with my colleagues from the Cook County area, both Democratic and Republicans working as a perfect team under the leadership and inspiration of the beloved Congressman O'BRIEN. The bill we passed in the 1st session the President vetoed. The bill we passed in the 2d session is now on the President's desk. Whatever action he shall take is of course within his determination. We in the Congress have done our part, and all the members of our delegation on both sides of the aisle share in the credit. There are no politics in serving Chicago.

I am happy too that the 84th Congress made substantial progress in the matter of controlling beach erosion and water pollution.

CLASSICS OF DEMOCRACY

To the leadership and my colleagues I extend my deep thanks for the support so generously given me, and for which I always shall be grateful, in two matters in which mine was the responsibility of initiation and advocacy. I refer to the program for making available to all peoples the classics of American democracy, translated into all languages and printed in inexpensive editions, and to the provision in the Housing Act of 1956 reimbursing small-business tenants, displaced by urban redevelopment plans, for moving

expenses up to $2,000 and displaced individuals and families up to $100.

It is good, Mr. Speaker, to contemplate that at this moment, when the gavel is soon to fall on the deliberations of the 84th Congress that adopted the classics of democracy program, that the works that inspired our forefathers are actually reaching in translated editions the peoples of the world and we are on our way to winning the war for the minds and hearts of people everywhere. This is the true road to peace.

AID TO DISPLACED TENANTS

It is good to know, Mr. Speaker, that small-business tenants and families that are thrown out of old locations and homes by the march of progress in the rebuilding of our cities can find in the Federal Government an understanding of their problems and at least some relief in meeting the expenses of moving to new locations.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbly grateful to the Providence that guides our course for the opportunity of participating in the good works of a good Congress and with the diligence made possible by desire and by good health, of serving to the utmost of my ability the constituents who three times have voted me the priceless honor of their confidence.

With God's help, wherever we serve may we continue to follow the path to a true peace and a richer world for all.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2835. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to quitclaim all interest of the United States in and to certain lands located in Indiana to the State of Indiana and to the board of trustees for the Vincennes University, Vincennes, Ind.; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez; and

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) entitled "An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11742) entitled "An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12130) entitled "An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3722) entitled "An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes."

DAY OF MEETING OF 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution (S. J. Res. 203) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 85th Congress shall assemble at noon on Monday, January 7, 1957.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert in the first RECORD appearing after today a table and my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I think we should make it clear and unmistakable that we should have 10 days after today in which to extend remarks, but only remarks made before and articles that appeared before this moment of adjournment; and I would like to ask the very distinguished and able majority leader if that is correct?

The SPEAKER. That has always been done, the Chair will advise the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will assure the gentleman from Missouri that that matter had already been taken care of.

Mr. SHORT. I thought it had, but I wanted to make it clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. My request had been agreed to by the House, and it will govern the insertion of remarks in the RECORD after the House adjourns.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 276. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die of the 84th Congress, 2d session.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 7643. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America' to increase the value of real and personal property that such Institute may hold";

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Florida and Georgia, being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress;

H. J. Res. 662. House joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; and

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.;

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes";

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 2060. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Funs, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Lin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955;

S. 3391. An act to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes;

S. 3903. An act to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes;

S. 4221. An act to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois for 30 minutes today to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT in five instances and to include extraneous matter; notwithstanding that in one case it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $558.25.

Mr. ZELENKO and to include a report to his constituents.

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSMERS (at the request of Mr. ELLSWORTH).

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. Arends).

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. UTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLSWORTH.

Mr. PHILBIN in four instances.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances and to include a tabulation.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TUCK and to include a Democratic speech made by Mr. WATKINS M. ABBITT of Virginia.

Mr. GARMATZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD in 3 instances; in 1 to extend the résumé of the activities of the Committee on Government Operations for the 84th Congress in the permanent RECORD; second, to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter; third, to have his special order for today, with extraneous matter, extended in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRIS in two instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND and to include a speech by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. COLE in three instances.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DINGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. ADDONIZIO.
Mr. RABAUT in five instances.
Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. WESTLAND in three instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. FORD.
Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include newspaper articles.
Mr. PATTERSON in five instances.
Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).
Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. HENDERSON in two instances.
Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. HILL in two instances.
Mr. TABER in two instances and to include a table showing appropriations.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3911. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4090. An act to provide for a study by the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration with respect to the need for automatic radiotelegraph call selectors and other such safety devices on certain cargo ships of the United States;

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5738. An act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6040. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws;

H. R. 7855. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until July 31, 1958, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell public lands located at Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9699. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10432. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11613. An act to extend the time limit within which naval vessels may be loaned to friendly Far Eastern nations and to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly European nations;

H. R. 11677. An act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Army of the United States (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list;

H. R. 11695. An act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions;

H. R. 12138. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the House Concurrent Resolution 276, the Chair declares the House adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2082. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 16th Semiannal Report of the International Educational Exchange Program of the Department of State for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2083. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to implement the convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2084. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the abaca-fiber program, as administered by the General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 462); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-fourth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations on Civil Defense for National Survival; without amendment (Rept. No. 2946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-fifth intermediate report on availability of information from Federal departments and agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 2947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-sixth intermediate report on improper use of Government equipment and Government personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-seventh report on Federal role in aviation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 12350. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2950). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-eighth intermediate report on Post Office Department procurement of motor vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 2951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-ninth intermediate report on purchase-resale transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirtieth intermediate report on operations of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads; without amendment (Rept. No. 2953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 114 pertaining to small business and the aluminum industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennesee: Committee of conference. H. R. 12080. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2955). Order to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee of conference. S. 3467. A bill to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States (Rept. No. 2956). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 3042. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U. S. C., sec. 184), in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; without amendment (Rept. No. 2957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of Conference. H. R. 11742. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2958). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPENCE. Committee of Conference. S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2959). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirty-first intermediate report on Federal Timber Sales Policies; without amendment (Rept. No. 2960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on study of manpower utilization and personnel management in the Federal Government pursuant to House Resolution 304 (84th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 2961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 12450. A bill to allow any person retired from the Armed Forces as an enlisted person or warrant officer and then or subsequently advanced to commissioned grade to cancel such advancement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 12451. A bill to preserve rates of compensation of wage board employees whose positions are reduced in grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 12452. A bill to amend section 5144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended (12 U. S. C., sec. 61) as to the voting rights of shareholders of national banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 12453. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to prevent loss of annual leave by employees in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 12454. A bill to provide for the establishmment of a fish hatchery in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 12455. A bill to amend section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to provide a new and more liberal housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 12456. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of marsh and other injurious mosquitoes in the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 701. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22d amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. J. Res. 702. Joint resolution to urge the admission into Communist-occupied Poland of official observers for the purpose of reporting to the entire world the circumstances surrounding the forthcoming trials of the patriots of the Poznan uprising, the validity of the charges, the trial proceedings, and the justice of the verdicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 649. Resolution to amend the rules of the House, to restrict the reporting of business to the calendars during the closing days of a session; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. Res. 650. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of national civilian air policy and its enforcement; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 651. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of national civilian air policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 652. Resolution to create a select committee on pornographic materials; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 12457. A bill for the relief of Maurilio Gonzales Flores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12458. A bill for the relief of Jose Ochoa Jiminez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 12459. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Jack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 12460. A bill for the relief of John or Giovanni B. Massaria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 12461. A bill for the relief of Victoria Medina-Vasillas vda de Viramontes also known as Estella Medina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 12462. A bill for the relief of Don Ralph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 12463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lotte Gertrude Augusta Phelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Illinois:

H. R. 12464. A bill for the relief of Vladislaus Velkme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 12465. A bill for the relief of Cipriano F. Romero Outeiral; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12466. A bill for the relief of Manuel DaCosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 12467—A bill for the relief of Emil Friedman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1205. Mr. HOLTZMAN presented a petition of Frederick J. Cutting, Josephine B. Larsen, and Maybelle R. Maloney, all residents of New York, and employees of the Veterans' Administration, who were affected by a reduction in force and subsequently reassigned to lower grade positions in that agency, and who request that Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, be directed to restore them to their proper grades and positions, as of the date of removal, together with all rights, benefits, and privileges that might have accrued from that date, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on the following dates that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance as deductions of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to

authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard";

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attainage age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the city of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the city of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and habors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 277, 84th Congress, he did on the following dates, sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United State Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954

to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard";

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 277, 84th Congress, he did on the following dates sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3101. An act to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 3941. An act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming;

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954;

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress.

On July 30, 1956:

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; and

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, reported that, on the following dates, that committee had presented to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 7643. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America"; to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold;

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in District of Columbia;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Nuezler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules.

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relie of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

On July 31, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Sveinis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for

shoe-last roughing or for shoe-last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On August 1, 1956:

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 27, 1956:

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Sam H. Ray;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2325. An act for the relief of Joseph Santo;

H. R. 7121. An act to validate payments of mileage made to the United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8047. An act granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in Saint Marys Falls Canal project;

H. R. 8617. An act to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service.

H. R. 8971. An act for the relief of Hamazasp Psakian, Mrs. Varsenick Psakian, and Nune Nona Psakian;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of John L. Hughes;

H. R. 9081. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a 3-acre tract of land situated about 6 miles south of the city of San Antonio, in Bexar County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

H. R. 9842. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases;

H. R. 10679. An act granting the consent of Congress to the establishment by the States of Mississippi and Arkansas of a bi-State commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 10983. An act for the relief of P. R. Cox;

H. R. 12138. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 549. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Government of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada;

H. J. Res. 604. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from April 14 to April 27, 1957, and in the Oklahoma semicentennial celebration to be held in various communities in the State of Oklahoma from January 1 to December 31, 1957; and

H. J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 1952. An act for the relief of Clarence Christensen;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 6376. An act to confer upon Alaska autonomy in the field of mental health, transfer from the Federal Government to the Territory the fiscal and functional responsibility for the hospitalization of committed mental patients, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10088. An act for the relief of Rupert Waitl;

H. R. 10111. An act to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions; and

H. R. 11861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 256. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts

owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen;

H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of William J. Bohner;

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of Emanuel Mathes;

H. R. 4127. An act to exempt courses leading to standard college degrees offered by nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning from the provisions of section 227 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 prohibiting the enrollment of eligible veterans under that act when such courses have been in operation for less than 2 years;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Maria Pintos and her daughter, Eugenia Pintos;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 5256. An act to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps;

H. R. 5337. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities;

H. R. 6081. An act for the relief of Patricia May Stevens;

H. R. 6243. An act to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate;

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchange and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 8265. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply;

H. R. 8940. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Hulah Reservoir to provide water for the city of Bartlesville, Okla.;

H. R. 9918. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and execute a contract with the Riverside Irrigation District, Ltd., of Idaho, relating to the rehabilitation of the district's works' and other matters;

H. R. 11706. An act for the relief of Kim Chung Hi;

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week; and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States.

On July 31, 1956:

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

On August 1, 1956:

H. R. 3882. An act to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4899. An act for the relief of Helmut Klestadt;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5488. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska.

H. R. 5738. An act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6247. An act to amend subdivision a of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 6403. An act to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations;

H. R. 6595. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the estate tax;

H. R. 7089. An act to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaeohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 7893. An act to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8474. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9260. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9265. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the audit of Government (Territorial and county) accounts;

H. R. 9547. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 (e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9699. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 9947. An act for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10946. An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958;

H. R. 11024. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80) as amended by the act of July 12, 1952 (66 Stat. 592, 48 U. S. C. 116a);

H. R. 11254. An act to amend section 104, title 4, United States Code;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11636. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish;

H. R. 11653. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11947. An act to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951;

H. R. 12034. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract with the Tule Lake Irrigation District, California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce;

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.;

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

On August 2, 1956:

H. R. 604. An act to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska highway at the Alaska-Canadian border in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5519. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain

lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government;

H. R. 5712. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto;

H. R. 6040. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws;

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth;

H. R. 8226. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision (e) of section 58, notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 10432. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11696. An act to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On August 3, 1956:

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4090. An act to provide for a study by the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration with respect to the need for automatic radio-telegraph call selectors and other such safety devices on certain cargo ships of the United States;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 6794. An act to authorize certain members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept and wear decorations, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines;

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 7855. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until July 31, 1958, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation;

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Ampitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11613. An act to extend the time limit within which naval vessels may be loaned to friendly Far Eastern nations and to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly European nations;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11695. An act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fulgencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

On August 6, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 5881. An act to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America" to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Florida,

and Georgia, being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies; and

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

On August 7, 1956:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11677. An act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Army of the United States (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; and

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations.

On August 8, 1956:

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations.

On August 9, 1956:

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.

On August 10, 1956:

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following bills of the House; his reasons for such actions are as follows:

IMPROVEMENT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

H. R. 4993. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 4993, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

The two properties involved, owned by private corporations, are occupied as gasoline filling stations in a residential use district. Under the zoning regulations promulgated pursuant to the act of March 1, 1920, as amended by the act of June 20, 1938, the two stations may be continued as such in the category of nonconforming uses because they were in existence prior to the enactment of the zoning statute. However, except under certain conditions, these nonconforming uses cannot be physically extended, enlarged, or improved. At present there are approximately 5,000 nonconforming uses in the District of Columbia.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the National Capital Planning Commission have had underway for the past 3 years a study looking to a complete revision of the zoning regulations for the District of Columbia. That study is almost completed, and when completed will doubtless include provisions dealing with the problem of nonconforming uses. We should not single out two of these now by special legislation and provide benefits for them which cannot be enjoyed by any of the other many nonconforming uses. To do so would constitute an invitation for other special legislative exceptions which, if enacted, could frustrate comprehensive planning and make impossible the orderly development of the Federal City.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1956.*

LAKE MICHIGAN, DIVERSION OF WATER

H. R. 3210. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3210, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

This bill is substantially the same in purpose and effect as H. R. 3300 of the 83d Congress from which I also withheld my approval in that it would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to increase from 1,500 to 2,500 cubic feet per second the diversion of water from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years. H. R. 3210 would also direct the Secretary of the Army to make a study with respect to the effect of the diversion and to make recommendations regarding its continuance. While certain conditions and limitations are imposed that were not in the earlier bill these do not deal with the fundamental reasons for my withholding approval of that measure.

In my memorandum of disapproval of H. R. 3300 I stated, among other things:

> I am unable to approve the bill because * * * (2) all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion, (3) the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada, and (4) the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

A comprehensive report by the Corps of Engineers which will include consideration of the best methods of obtaining improved control of the levels of the Great Lakes and of preventing recurrence of damage along the shores is nearing completion. I am asking the Secretary of Defense to expedite completion of this report. This report is in addition to the technical report on the effects of an increased diversion into the Illinois Waterway which has been made by the Joint Lake Ontario Engineering Board to the International Joint Commission. I think it would be unwise to proceed with the diversion in the manner proposed in H. R. 3210 until all relevant information has been obtained, particularly since objections to the proposed diversion have been registered by the Canadian Government in its note dated February 13, 1956, and additional objections filed by legal advisers of the States of Wisconsin, Ohio, and New York.

Although I am fully aware of the seriousness of some of the problems confronting the Chicago area and the State of Illinois, the record on H. R. 3210 affords no basis for me to change my position in this matter. Accordingly, under the circumstances, I am convinced that the bill should not be approved.

I am asking the State Department to engage in discussions with the Canadian Government in an attempt to work out a solution to these problems as soon as all pertinent facts are available.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1956.*

TAXES, REAL-ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUSTS

H. R. 4392. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4392, entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts."

Under existing law, real-estate trusts and associations with transferable shares are generally taxed as ordinary corporations on their entire taxable income. The enrolled bill would extend to such organizations, under certain conditions, the conduit or pass-through

method of taxation which present law provides for regulated investment companies. The effect would be to exclude from the corporate tax all but a small margin of retained earnings of real-estate trusts.

While the bill assumes a similarity between real-estate trusts and regulated investment companies, there are important differences between the two situations. The income of regulated investment companies is generally derived from the securities of corporations which are fully subject to the corporate income tax. In the case of regulated investment companies, therefore, the conduit treatment merely avoids an additional level of corporate taxation, which for dividend income consists of the tax on the portion of dividends remaining after the 85 percent intercorporate dividends deduction. By contrast, the conduit treatment proposed for real-estate trusts would entirely remove the corporate income tax from much of the income originating in their real-estate operations.

It is by no means clear how far a new provision of this sort might be applied. Though intended to be applicable only to a small number of trusts, it could, and might well become, available to many real-estate companies which were originally organized and have always carried on their activities as fully taxable corporations.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

TAXES, ROYALTIES ON PATENTS AND COPYRIGHTS

H. R. 7643. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 7643, "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts." This bill would extend to firms with a permanent establishment in the United Kingdom that receive royalties there a credit for taxes imposed by the United Kingdom on the payer of the royalties. This provision would be retroactive to 1950.

Under the income tax convention with the United Kingdom royalties received by a United States licensor are not subject to tax in the United Kingdom if the recipient has no permanent establishment there. If it does have a permanent establishment, the royalty is subject to British taxation. The American recipient reports the net amount of royalties from British sources and receives no United States tax credit for the British tax paid. This treatment under United States law arises from two court decisions (*Trico Products Corp.* (46 BTA 346, affirmed 137 F. (2d) 424, cert. den. 320 U. S. 799, reh. den. 321 U. S 801); *Irving Air Chute Co. Inc.* (1 T. C. 880, affirmed 143 F. (2d) 256, cert. den. 323 U. S. 773)).

The combined effect of the United States income tax law and the income tax convention with the United Kingdom is to produce a different combination of British and United States taxes on the royalties paid some American recipients than on others. However, the United States tax law is not the cause of this difference in treatment. It is caused by the provisions in the convention itself. The appropriate way to correct the situation would be modification of the convention. The Treasury Department currently is conducting discussions on the convention with the British and will add this problem to the agenda.

The present status of royalty payments from the United Kingdom to the United States has been well known to interested parties at least since the convention was adopted in 1945. Many arrangements between licensees and licensors have reflected existing law and the burden of British tax may not rest on United States licensors in such cases. Consequently, to allow the British tax as a credit against the United States tax on a retroactive basis would give a windfall gain to some American licensors.

The proposed change would single out for special relief a small group of taxpayers whose need for relief has not been demonstrated. Tax relief should not be given in this way.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

PUBLIC WORKS, RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

H. R. 12080. I have withheld my approval of H. R. 12080, which would authorize appropriations totaling about $1.6 billion for 99 projects or project modifications and 14 river-basin authorizations involving improvements for navigation, shore protection, flood control, and related purposes. I regret that this action is necessary, because I believe that the periodic enactment of river and harbor and flood-control legislation is an important step in the formulation of a sound Federal program for the wise development of the Nation's water resources.

This bill does not appropriate funds. It only authorizes certain projects or project modifications, so that the next Congress can consider them for appropriation. So my action on the bill need cause no delay in starting the many worthwhile projects in the bill.

While the majority of the projects which this bill would authorize have been given adequate study and review within the executive branch and by the affected States, there are still a large number which have not been reviewed in accordance with the orderly procedures set forth in the applicable laws. Therefore, it is not possible at this time for me to determine whether their authorization would be in the public interest. Still others have, after review, been found not to be in the public interest.

Existing law requires that before a report of the Chief of Engineers recommending authorization of a project is submitted to the Congress the affected States be afforded an opportunity to comment on the proposal. In addition, procedures for review consistent with other statutory requirements have been established under Executive Order 9384. These procedures provide for review of project reports within the executive branch before they are submitted to the Congress. For 32 of the projects which the bill would authorize, involving financial commitments of over $530 million, all of these requirements have not been met. Without such review, the Congress must necessarily have acted on the basis of incomplete information. Some of these projects have not even been studied and reported on by the Chief of Engineers, and in a few cases field studies have not yet been completed.

Section 202 of the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1954 declares it to be the policy of Congress that:

> No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

I regard this as being a wise policy, and I believe that it is very unfortunate that this traditional statement was not followed in H. R. 12080.

In various messages to the Congress I have clearly stated my view that our vital water resources can best be conserved and utilized in the public interest if the Federal Government cooperates with State and local governments and with private interests in the development of those resources, and does not undertake such development as though it were a matter of exclusive Federal interest. In order to carry out such a policy properly and effectively, it is necessary that the views of affected States be given adequate consideration in formulating proposals for water resources projects. This has not been accomplished for a number of projects included in this bill.

In addition, other projects in this bill would be authorized on a basis which would result in a lesser degree of local participation than was agreed to by the local interests and recommended by the executive branch. I believe that authorization of water resources projects on such terms would represent a serious backward step in the desirable development of the Nation's water resources, and would result in the loss of the best test yet devised for insuring that a project is sound—the willingness of local people to invest their own money in a joint enterprise with the Federal Government.

In the weeks before the Congress convenes a careful, orderly review will be undertaken of those projects and other provisions of the bill which have not been fully studied or reviewed at the present time. This should enable the Congress to base its action on a full knowledge of all the facts involved. I believe that the people of the United States are entitled to expect that these procedures will be followed before new water resources projects, invôlving large future financial commitments, are authorized in law.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

BRIDGE COMMISSIONS, LAWRENCEBURG AND CANNELTON

H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662, bills creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission and the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, respectively. The City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission would be authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., and to purchase and operate a ferry at this location. The City of Cannelton Bridge Commission would be granted comparable authority with respect to a bridge and a ferry at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky.

On July 26, 1956, I approved H. R. 11010, creating a Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing it to perform functions similar to those contemplated by H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662. At that time I indicated that I would not be inclined to approve the creation of bridge commissions of the type contemplated by that bill in the absence of special emergency circumstances. Because the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., were confronted with a serious disruption of traffic as a result of the collapse of the center span of an existing bridge, and because it appeared that a bridge commission could most quickly undertake the construction of a new bridge, I signed the bill.

I am unaware of any circumstances which would make the provision of bridges at Lawrenceburg and Cannelton so urgent as to justify special Federal legislation creating additional bridge commissions. The construction and operation of interstate bridges, as I stated on July 26, has traditionally been a State rather than a Federal responsibility. The General Bridge Act of 1946 facilitated State action by granting blanket authority for the construction of bridges over navigable streams without the enactment of special authorizing legislation. In those cases in which the States choose to create special interstate agencies to build, maintain, and operate toll bridges, they may do so at any time through the negotiation of suitable interstate compacts. I am, therefore, unwilling, under ordinary circumstances, to have the Federal Government take away from the States and their highway agencies the responsibility for providing bridges of concern primarily to the residents of the immediate area to be served.

Bridge commissions of the type provided for by these bills also give rise to serious legal and administrative problems. Because they owe their creation and all of their powers to acts of Congress they cannot be State or local agencies. Yet they are not considered to be instrumentalities of the Federal Government. One result of this uncertainty is the lack of adequate provisions for supervising the activities of bridge commissions in the public interest. No State or Federal official or agency is empowered to see to it that the commissions proposed by H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662 carry out their responsibilities in a faithful and efficient manner.

This lack of supervision can lead to serious mismanagement and injury to the public interest, as was recently disclosed by a congressional investigation of the affairs of the White County Bridge Commission. That investigation documented questionable expenditures of many thousands of dollars and led a select committee of the House of Representatives to propose drastic measures to prevent future abuses.

I, therefore, suggest that if the States of Indiana and Kentucky determine that these two bridges are needed, they enter into appropriate agreements to proceed with construction under the authority conferred by the General Bridge Act.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 954, 84th Congress, and the order of the House of July 27, 1956, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on August 7, 1956, appoint as members of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space the following members on the part of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. McGREGOR of Ohio.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 17, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	$7,358.87
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	6,808.86
Mabel C. Downey	Clerk	7,399.98
Geo. L. Reid, Jr	Assistant clerk	7,399.98
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	3,843.54
Pauline E. Graves	do	3,483.90
Betty M. Prezioso	do	3,124.26
Gladys Ondarcho	do	2,824.50
Diane Johnston	do	302.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,870.30
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	13,081.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	28,951.98
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	21,048.02

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 9, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	Clerk and staff director	$6,166.65
Corhal D. Orescan	do	7,399.98
Kenneth Sprankle	do	7,399.98
Paul M. Wilson	do	7,399.98
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	6,808.86
Ross P. Pope	do	6,808.86
Robert M. Moyer	do	6,808.86
Carson W. Culp	do	6,808.86
Samuel W. Crosby	do	6,808.86
Harris H. Huston	do	6,808.86
Frank Sanders	do	6,288.66
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	6,288.66
George S. Green	Clerk to minority	6,282.46
Robert P. Williams	Editor	5,917.14
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to majority	5,824.20
Robert L. Michaels	Staff assistant	5,322.60
G. Homer Skarin	do	4,727.94
Earl C. Silsby	do	4,564.44
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	3,723.66
Francis G. Merrill	Staff assistant	3,552.42
Samuel R. Preston	Junior staff assistant	3,124.26
Donald R. Bridges	Clerical assistant	2,353.50
Donald F. Berens	do	1,889.90
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,461.00
Randolph Thomas	Janitor-messenger	1,601.52
Delores Cropper	Clerk-stenographer to the chairman.	2,610.42
Julia M. Elliott	Clerk-stenographer	2,610.42
Rose Ann Nimitz	do	2,175.35
Mary A. Vaughn	do	2,610.42
Phyllis N. Troy	do	2,610.42
William J. Neary	do	2,610.42
Ann R. Davis	do	2,175.35
Shirley Rae Colley	do	2,610.42
Catherine D. Norrell	do	2,610.42
Mildred Burnham	do	2,610.42
Barbara Grey	do	2,610.42
Molly O'Day Saguto	do	2,353.50
Donald L. Bernard	do	2,610.42
David P. Doyle	do	1,740.28
Edwin A. Sheehan	do	1,479.24
Margie H. Trew	do	2,610.42
James W. Dudley	do	2,610.42
John G. Clevenger	do	2,610.42
Charles C. Andersen	do	2,610.42
Gladys Kofmehl	do	2,610.42
Frank B. Melchior	do	2,507.64
Monica Smith	Clerk-stenographer to the ranking minority member.	2,524.80
Frank Mentillo	Clerk-stenographer	2,353.50
Elaine M. Hopkins	do	1,961.25
Barbara J. Groves	do	2,353.50
Baert Devos Brand	do	1,939.63
Roma E. Jaques	do	1,396.68
Wilburn L. McClure	Clerical assistant	296.40
Glenna L. Taylor	Clerk-stenographer	435.07
Helen B. Rogers	do	392.25
Agnes Norton	do	870.14
Ruth M. Young	do	435.07
Luman H. Long	do	435.07

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$405,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	187,992.90
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	199,123.13
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	387,116.03
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	17,883.97

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 9, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Haynes	Director of surveys and investigations.	$5,991.42
Richard F. McIlwain	Assistant director of surveys and investigations.	5,991.42
Ralph W. Horton	Investigator	5,805.66
Rose Marie Borda	Stenographer	2,567.64
Ethel P. Powers	do	2,216.52
John J. Donnelly	Consultant	1,500.00
Marion N. Hardesty	do	1,050.00
Charles W. Hart	do	4,275.00
Frank R. Joslyn	do	700.00
Alvin C. Loewer, Jr.	do	487.50
Joseph M. O'Connor	do	640.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Agriculture, Department of:		
Jerome P. Anthony	Editorial assistant	$448.35
Melvin N. Culp	Investigator	1,933.29
Central Intelligence Agency:		
Edward C. Gauvreau.	do	2,285.69
Defense, Department of:		
Hickey, Edward J.	do	1,052.16
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Carl L. Bennett	do	1,563.52
Harold H. Hair	do	1,339.20
Richard A. Miller	do	4,315.22
Robert W. Murphy	do	4,291.23
James E. Nugent	do	3,297.65
Robert E. Reiser	do	578.13
Robert E. Rightmyer.	do	611.20
John A. Ruhl	do	236.21
Andrew John Shannon.	do	1,194.80
Glenn Arthur Trofast.	do	770.84
General Services Administration:		
George E. Desjardine.	do	1,330.00
J. W. Flatley	do	2,050.76
John J. Holmead, Jr.	do	1,515.40
W. Trigg Miller	do	1,992.71
Billie Jean Powell	Stenographer	282.11
Mary Winifred Poynton.	do	923.36
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Lois P. Flower	do	44.55
Mary Lou Hesko	do	216.71
Violet E. Haislip	do	26.34
Kathryn F. Jylka	do	27.62
Elisabeth J. Miller	do	25.89
Interstate Commerce Commission:		
Alexis P. Bukovsky	Investigator	2,819.54
Navy, Department of:		
Wilkenloh, Charles E.	do	2,461.52
Post Office Department:		
Janet Baden	Stenographer	138.76
Aletha Bonnette	do	89.76
Robert W. Morris	Editorial assistant	1,815.52
Adeline Schubert	Stenographer	36.64
State, Department of:		
Donald F. Berens	Clerical assistant	1,423.66
Franklin W. Reinhold.	Editorial assistant	214.56
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		16,644.16

EXPENDITURES IN PREVIOUS PERIOD NOT REPORTED AGAINST 1955 APPROPRIATION

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Reimbursements to Government agencies:		
Atomic Energy Commission:		
James Rorer	Editorial assistant	$508.08
Department of State:		
Franklin W. Reinhold.	do	1,248.80
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		29.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	209,825.06
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	89,222.22
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	299,047.28
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	200,952.72

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JULY 5, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$7,400.00
John R. Blandford	Counsel	7,366.00
Charles F. Ducander	do	7,310.45
Philip W. Kelleher	do	7,310.45
Janice G. Angell	Clerical staff	3,209.88
Berniece Kalinowski	do	3,209.88
Oneta L. Stockstill	do	2,811.67
L. Louise Ellis	do	2,811.67
Mary M. Abbott	do	2,262.89
James A. Deakins	do	2,610.43
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	7,399.98
Edward T. Fogo	Investigator	5,050.14
Lloyd R. Kuhn	do	4,014.84
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	2,781.72
Dorothea Clore	do	231.81
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	2,610.42
Ethel L. Mott	do	2,610.42
James Woolls	Staff assistant	306.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	59,208.65
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1956	32,096.52
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955, to June 30, 1956	91,305.17
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	58,694.83

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JUNE 30, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon	Clerk and counsel	$7,399.98
Orman S. Fink	Professional staff	7,399.98
John E. Barriere	do	7,399.98
Elsie G. Whitney	Deputy clerk	4,951.08
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	3,723.66
Mary W. Layton	Secretary	3,723.66
Employees pursuant to H. Res. 203, Subcommittee on Housing:		
William Costello	Clerk-messenger	1,661.55
Eleanor Hamilton	Research assistant	3,939.18
Alberta Masumian	Secretary	2,534.68
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Housing economist	6,182.16
Robert R. Poston	Chief counsel	6,952.76
Betty B. Ridgell	Clerk	3,227.00
Allen H. Dropkin	Assistant counsel (Jan. 1, 1956, through April 30, 1956).	2,865.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	24,316.42
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	38,931.99
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	63,248.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	86,751.59

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JULY 15, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$7,399.98
Wendell E. Cable	Minority clerk	6,258.96
George R. Stewart	Attorney	6,808.86
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	4,031.94
Margaret S. Rogers	do	2,473.44
Dixon D. Davis	do	1,851.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	52.33
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	21.75
Total amount expended from Feb. 24, 1955, to June 30, 1956	74.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	1,925.92

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JULY 13, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	7,399.98
James M. Brewbaker	General counsel	4,933.32
John O. Graham	Minority clerk	7,399.98
Kennedy W. Ward	Assistant general counsel.	6,166.65
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,226.98
Jeanne Thomson	Assistant clerk, minority.	3,226.98
Gloria Ann Baysden	Assistant clerk	3,226.98
Marion O. Riddiford	do	3,226.98
Mary Lynn Venuto	do	3,226.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,897.23
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	25,127.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	36,025.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	88,974.87

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JULY 7, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk.	$7,399.98
Roy J. Bullock	Staff consultant	7,106.10
Albert C. F. Westphal.	do	7,106.10
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	do	7,106.10
June Nigh	Staff assistant	3,723.66
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,638.04
Helen C. Mattas	do	3,638.04
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	3,638.04
Helen L. Hashagen	do	3,638.04
Mary L. O'Brien	do	[1] 1,000.72
Roosevelt Taylor	Messenger	1,678.02

[1] For period Apr. 30, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	4,573.76
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	6,009.53
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	10,583.29
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	64,416.71

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JULY 9, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:	
Orville S. Poland, general counsel	$6,853.98
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	7,399.98
William Pincus, associate general counsel	6,932.70
Martha C. Roland, staff member	5,694.18
J. Robert Brown, staff member	5,322.60
Dolores Fel'Dotto, clerk-stenographer	3,937.80
Earle J. Wade, staff member	3,496.74
Mona Keating, clerk-stenographer, Feb. 1-June 30, 1956	1,840.20
Catherine Hartke, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1-9, 1956	131.62
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer, Feb. 1-29, 1956	417.94
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff member	6,189.60
John P. Carlson, minority counsel, Mar. 19-June 30, 1956	3,226.70
Esther Breeze, minority clerical staff, Jan. 1-18, 1956	569.41
Cecil Ray Broy, minority clerical staff, Jan. 19-Feb. 27, 1956	1,153.23
Expenses, full committee	3,733.10
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, associate counsel	5,359.76
William A. Young, professional staff member	5,694.18
David Glick, investigator, Mar. 21-June 30, 1956	2,363.23
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	3,226.98
Clara K. Armstrong, minority staff-clerical, Mar. 1-June 30, 1956	1,797.36
Expenses	342.90
Total	18,784.41
Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:	
Michael P. Balwan, staff director	6,808.86
Herbert Roback, director of investigations	6,808.86
James Eckhart, assistant counsel	4,355.56
Earl J. Morgan, investigator	4,355.56
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	3,509.58
Sylvia Swartzel, clerk-stenographer	3,231.24
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	3,231.24
Expenses	11,907.97
Total	44,208.87
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, professional staff member	4,795.23
Francis . XMcLaughlin, investigator	3,295.50
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member, Apr. 1-June 30, 1956	2,382.66
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	3,010.04
Expenses	536.48
Total	14,019.91
Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Earl Chudoff, chairman:	
Arthur Perlman, staff director	6,808.86
James A. Lanigan, counsel	6,511.62
John B. O'Brien, Jr., investigator	4,951.08
Miles Q. Romney, professional staff member, Apr. 16-June 30, 1956	1,874.62
Inge Kaiser, consultant, Jan. 1-Feb. 10, 1956	837.00
Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer	2,917.29
Joan D. Heinly, clerk-stenographer	2,235.79
Melba Lou Cook, stenographer, Jan. 5-9, 1956	69.66
Expenses	2,571.27
Total	28,777.19
International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman:	
Maurice J. Mountain, professional staff member	$6,511.62
Walton Woods, investigator	4,876.74
Charles Rothenberg, special counsel, Feb. 15-June 30, 1956	3,991.95
Phyllis Seymour, clerk-stenographer	3,231.24
Mary E. Davis, clerk-stenographer, May 28-June 30, 1956	431.47
Expenses	915.66
Total	19,958.68
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Robert H. Mollohan, chairman:	
Curtis E. Johnson, staff director	6,808.86
Jerome S. Plapinger, counsel	6,808.86
Stanley T. Fisher, accountant-investigator	4,660.50
Hal M. Christensen, associate counsel	4,009.47
John L. Anderson, investigator	3,987.67
A. Carl Carey, Jr., assistant counsel, May 29-June 30, 1956	802.74
Elizabeth D. Heater, clerk-stenographer	2,961.54
Barbara L. Tork, stenographer	2,096.64
Expenses	1,630.91
Total	33,767.19
Special Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman:	
Vernon McDaniel, staff director	6,808.86
William Huskey, investigator	4,194.66
John E. Moore, investigator, Mar. 17-June 30, 1956	2,099.51
Irma Reel, clerk-stenographer	2,559.03
William Townsley, counsel	5,055.12
Chesley Prioleau, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1-Feb. 29, 1956	898.68
Expenses	1,155.00
Total	22,770.86
Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, Hon. John W. McCormack, chairman:	
Ray Ward, staff director	6,737.02
Margaret O'Connor, clerk-stenographer, Mar. 1-June 30, 1956	1,754.56
Expenses	39.15
Total	8,530.73
Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff director	6,140.04
John J. Mitchell, chief counsel, Feb. 9-June 30, 1956	4,929.26
J. Lacey Reynolds, senior consultant	5,471.25
Helen K. Beasley, clerk-stenographer	2,856.63
Catherine Hartke, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 10-June 30, 1956	2,829.92
William Fairfield, investigator, Apr. 19-June 30, 1956	2,099.33
Wallace Parks, associate counsel, Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1956	2,698.47
Bernard Schwartz, consultant, June 4-9, 1956	200.00
Jacob Scher, consultant, Feb. 8-Mar. 19, 1956	1,040.15
Juanita V. Haddock, secretary, Feb. 11, 1956	293.93
Expenses	2,897.63
Total	31,456.61
Special Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power, Hon. Robert E. Jones, chairman:	
William C. Wise, staff director	6,344.41
William L. Sturdevant, Jr., professional staff member, Jan. 1-Apr. 30, 1956	4,038.88
Roy F. Bessey, consultant	4,750.00
Ann A. Dominek, clerk-stenographer	2,550.46
Margaret McFerren, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1-Feb. 23, 1956	738.36
Expenses	3,692.58
Total	22,114.69
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	995,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	373,643.94
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	248,122.24
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955, to June 30, 1956	621,766.18
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	373,233.82

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JULY 2, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Clerk and staff director.	$6,808.86
Marjorie Savage	Clerk in charge of accounts.	6,437.28
Jack W. Watson	Assistant clerk	5,322.60
Lura Cannon	do	4,564.44
Staff employed to conduct an investigation and study of the operations of federally operated printing services, pursuant to H. Res. 262 and H. Res. 306, 84th Cong.:		
Philip B. Billings	Legal counsel	5,606.84
Susan Agnes Fodor	Research analyst	2,867.34
John F. Haley	Staff director	6,065.76
Julian H. McWhorter.	Technical advisor	5,219.66
Asselia S. Poore	Research analyst	3,295.50
Marjorie A. Prout	do	406.53

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 306	$65,000.00
H. Res. 359	10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,525.35
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	25,302.46
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	33,827.81
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	41,172.19

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JULY 11, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentio ed committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Engineering consultant.	$6,262.68
George W. Abbott	Counsel	6,262.68
John L. Taylor	Territories consultant.	6,262.68
George H. Soule, Jr.	Minerals and lands consultant.	6,262.68
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	5,545.56
Gertrude S. Harris	Clerk	3,552.42
Nelda Boding	do	3,552.42
Laura Ann Moran	do	3,209.88
Eve Fatzinick	do	3,209.88
Linda Glavey (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, inclusive).	Clerk	$1,433.67
Geraldine W. Eaker (Apr. 1 to June 30, inclusive).	do	1,433.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	31,296.34
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	[1] 6,981.77
Total amount expended from Feb. 24, 1955, to June 30, 1956	38,278.11
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	11,721.89

[1] Includes $3,131.34 paid to Eugene D. Eaton, research consultant, in salary for period Feb. 1 to Apr. 30, 1956, inclusive.

CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JULY 2, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$7,400.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	5,396.94
Herman C. Beasley	Assistant clerk	4,597.15
Georgia G. Glasmann.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	3,295.50
Helen A. Grickis	do	3,295.50
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,781.70
Margaret J. Beach	Clerk-typist (H. Res. 105, H. Res. 117).	2,610.43
Pauline Chaternuck	Assistant clerk-stenographer (from June 1, 1956; H. Res. 105, H. Res. 117).	472.18
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	7,400.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	7,400.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	7,400.00
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant	7,005.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,852.85
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	9,142.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1955, to June 30, 1956	19,995.36
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956 (approximate)	40,004.64

J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 13, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$7,399.98
Bessie M. Orcutt	Administrative assistant.	6,808.86
William R. Foley	General counsel	7,399.98
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant.	7,399.98
Thomas F. Broden	Counsel	6,065.76
Walter R. Lee	Legislative assistant.	7,399.98
Velma Smedley	Clerical staff	4,564.44
Violet Benn	do	4,237.50
Anne J. Berger	do	4,237.50
Lola Bikul	do	3,723.66
Frances Christy	do	4,151.88
Helen Goldsmith	do	3,980.58
Mary D. Weil	do	3,295.50

SALARIES PAID FROM JANUARY 1, 1956, TO JUNE 30, 1956, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 98 AND H. RES. 355

Herbert N. Maletz	Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	$6,437.28
Kenneth R. Harkins	Cocounsel Antitrust Subcommittee.	6,065.76
Samuel R. Pierce, Jr.	Associate counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	909.86
Leonard Appel	Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	4,819.91
Thomas H. McGrail	do	4,564.44
Julian H. Singman	do	1,521.48
William M. Milligan	do	1,775.06
Lucille Brooks	Clerical staff	3,980.58
Gertrude C. Burak	do	3,381.12
Roberta Eisenberg	do	2,867.34
Elizabeth Meekins	do	2,867.34
Mike Kelemonick	do	2,696.04
Marianne Higgs	do	110.91
Robert E. Bauman	Messenger	1,472.92

Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):		
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1955		$107,232.50
Expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1956		23,953.48
Balance, June 30, 1956		83,279.02
B. Revision of the laws:		
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1955		6,398.54
Supplemental appropriation		2,800.00
Total		9,198.54
Expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1956		8,899.98
Balance, June 30, 1956		298.56
C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):		
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1955		2,764.01
Expended		0.00
Balance, June 30, 1956		2,764.01

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY 26, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ralph E. Casey	Chief counsel	$4,933.32
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	6,808.86
John M. Drewry	do	6,808.86
Frances Still	Chief clerk	5,471.22
Charles F. Warren	Assistant counsel	4,564.44
William B. Winfield	Assistant clerk	4,066.20
Ruth Brookshire	do	3,266.98
Vera Barker	Secretary	3,167.04
Edith Gordon	do	2,742.93
Shirley Schwartz	Minority clerk	4,066.20
		45,856.05

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	31,013.05
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	9,141.34
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1955 to June 30, 1956	40,154.39
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1956	9,845.61

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JULY 17, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$7,399.98
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	7,143.24
Henry C. Cassell	Clerk	6,455.88
Weldon T. Ellis, Jr.	Professional staff member (Feb. 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956).	5,379.90
John B. Price	Assistant clerk	3,809.34
Lillian Hopkins	do	3,723.66
Lucy K. Daley	do	3,552.42
Elsie Thornton	Stenographer	2,824.50
Blanche Simons	do	2,824.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,604.35
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	8,984.25
Total amount expended from Aug. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	16,588.60
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	58,411.40

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JULY 15, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Tierney	Chief counsel	$7,400.00
Robert F. McConnell	Counsel	7,400.00
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Consultant	6,808.86
Margaret R. Beiter	Assistant chief clerk	5,322.60
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	4,564.44
S. Philip Cohen	do	3,809.34
Helen A. Thompson	do	3,766.50
Louise B. Cullen	do	3,766.50
Herman J. Sloves	do	3,723.66
Estes Saunders	Clerk-messenger	1,839.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,865.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	16,511.27
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	24,377.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	25,623.00

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 7, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas M. Carruthers.	Clerk	$4,817.16
Jane W. Snader	Minority clerk	3,866.40
Barbara M. Thornton	Assistant clerk	2,771.11
Agnes R. Hanford	Assistant clerk (January).	543.54

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JULY 10, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator (transferred to investigating committee Apr. 30).	$4,093.36
Standing committee—Continued		
Richard Arens	Director (appointed May 1).	$2,466.66
Thomas W. Beale, Sr.	Chief clerk (resigned Mar. 31).	3,699.99
Isabel B. Nagel	Clerk-stenographer (transferred from investigating committee May 31).	549.25
Courtney E. Owens	Investigator	5,694.18
Juliette P. Joray	Clerk	4,724.34
Rosella Purdy	Secretary to counsel	3,963.48
Carolyn Roberts	Assistant chief of reference section.	3,723.66
Thelma I. Scearce	Secretary to investigators.	3,963.48
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Counsel	7,399.98
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	5,991.42
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section.	4,727.94
Investigating committee:		
Alice W. Anderson	Information analyst	3,124.26
Donald T. Appell	Investigator (transferred Apr. 30).	2,046.68
Kar. Baarslag	Consultant (appointed Jan. 3).	5,341.08
Kay Baird	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Apr. 1).	1,497.90
Margaret Bentz	Information specialist.	2,467.72
Suanne Blair	Clerk-typist (appointed June 18).	132.87
Frank Bonora	Investigator	3,894.96
John W. Carrington	Assistant to the clerk (resigned May 31).	3,245.80
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator	3,723.66
Patricia Crovato	Clerk-typist (appointed June 19).	122.65
Anniel Cunningham	Information analyst	3,038.58
John G. Davies	Clerk-typist (appointed June 20).	112.43
Barbara H. Edelschein.	Editor	2,696.04
Elizabeth L. Edinger.	Clerk-stenographer	3,124.26
Ann C. Goldsmith	Clerk-typist (appointed June 18).	119.50
Kathleen Hagenbuch.	Clerk-typist (resigned May 31).	1,818.55
Joan Haletsky	Clerk-typist (appointed June 25).	61.32
Lillian Howard	Research analyst	3,552.42
W. Jackson Jones	Investigator	4,951.08
Olive M. King	Editor	3,226.98
Stephen V. Kopunek.	Clerk-typist	2,096.64
Kathleen M. Lucious.	Clerk-typist (resigned Jan. 31).	282.91
Helen I. Mattson	Research analyst	3,702.97
Isabel B. Nagel	Clerk-stenographer (transferred to standing committee June 1).	2,746.25
Kay Phillips	Switchboard-operator.	2,053.80
Maureen Roselle	Clerk-stenographer	2,439.18
Dolores F. Scotti	Investigator	3,723.66
Josephine Sheetz	Clerk-typist	2,439.18
Lela Stiles	do	2,439.18
Cele Sweeney	do	2,267.88
Ruth K. Tansill	Information analyst	3,124.26
Pauline Umberson	Clerk-typist (appointed June 18).	132.87
Max O. Truitt, Jr.	Assistant to the clerk (appointed June 8).	278.84
Lorraine M. Veley	Clerk-stenographer	3,124.26
Richard S. Weil	Research analyst	3,852.12
George C. Williams	Investigator	4,951.08
Billie Wheeler	Clerk-stenographer (Apr. 1-30; reappointed June 18).	725.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	222,870.13
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	120,511.47
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955 to June 30, 1956	343,381.60
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1956	156,618.40

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JUNE 30, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	$6,808.86
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	6,808.86
Harold A. L. Lawrence.	Professional aid, minority.	6,808.86
J. Buford Jenkins	Professional aid	6,511.62
George Fisher	Clerk	6,808.86
Ida Rowan	Administrative aid, minority.	6,808.86
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	5,322.60
Helen A. Biondi	do	4,151.88
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	3,546.70
George Turner	Assistant clerk	3,509.58
Investigating staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	4,187.80
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	2,182.26
Jean Johnson	do	561.07
Sam Hardy	Investigator	787.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	27,894.88
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	12,304.65
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	40,199.53
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	9,800.47

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JULY 31, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Clerk (C)	$7,399.98
Russell E. Train	Minority adviser (P).	7,399.98
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P).	7,106.10
James W. Riddell	do	5,684.28
John M. Martin, Jr.	do.[1]	2,086.32

[1] From May 1, 1956.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frances C. Russell	Staff assistant (C)	$4,515.42
Susan Alice Taylor	do	4,066.20
Anne Gorden	do	3,338.34
Virginia M. Butler	do	3,338.34
Grace G. Kagan	do	3,338.34
Irene Wade	do	3,279.82
Virginia Brannock	do.[2]	990.37
Frances Donovan	do.[3]	553.94
June A. Kendall	do.[4]	313.87
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	2,247.91
Walter B. Little	do	2,247.91

[2] From May 2, 1956.
[3] From May 28, 1956.
[4] From Jan. 15, 1956.

JERE COOPER,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SURVIVOR BENEFITS

JULY 6, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carnes & Co.	Consultants	$1,200.00

NOTE.—The firm of Carnes & Co. is retained by the committee under contract to provide all staff personnel required for the committee's study. Those serving with the committee are on the payroll of Carnes & Co.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	32,836.50
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	1,531.54
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	34,368.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	631.96

PORTER HARDY, Jr.,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

JULY 6, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

NOTE.—No funds have been expended by the select committee for staff salaries.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,106.85
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	2,228.06
Total amount expended from July 21, 1955, to June 30, 1956	4,334.91
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	5,665.09

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JULY 12, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Everette MacIntyre	Staff director and general counsel.	$7,399.98
Wm. Summers Johnson.	Chief economist and assistant staff director.	6,808.86
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	3,552.42
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant-clerk.	3,552.42
George L. Arnold	Assistant counsel and investigator.	4,492.07
Harry S. Weidberg	do	1,322.24
Irving Maness	do	5,173.98
Justinus Gould	do	5,173.98
Warren Biscailuz	do	1,819.02
Lois E. Allison	Economist	2,833.02
Eunice V. Hutton	Research analyst-secretary.	3,552.42
Katherine C. Blackburn.	Research analyst	3,423.96
Clarence D. Everett	Investigator	3,552.42
Milton S. Fairfax	Secretary	2,914.89
Ila D. Coe	Stenographer	2,632.30
Clara G. Romero	do	2,504.82
Alice Fay Ebert	do	1,942.50
William F. Vail	Stenographer-typist	2,167.26
Margaret Fallon Palmer.	Research analyst	3,295.50
Pauline Chaternuck	Stenographer	2,080.42
Samuel Moment	Consulting economits.	1,062.97
Victor P. Dalmas	Assistant to minority.	4,534.32
Mildred C. Darrow	Secretary-stenographer to minority.	2,653.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$330,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	129,256.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	81,655.83
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955 to June 30, 1956	210,912.56
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	119,087.44

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the first calendar quarter of 1956 were received after April 20, 1956, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $1,086. E. (9) $479.77.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,308.19. E. (9) $8,825.42.

A. Joseph Amann, 343 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 343 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $6,777.97.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,540.68. E. (9) $1,540.68.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $19,937.82. E. (9) $19,937.82.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,821.24. E. (9) $12,521.24.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $990. E. (9) $264.02.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $35,907.14.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,220.06.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. N. W. Barber, 5358 Chillum Place NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Household Finance Corp., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,804.25.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma 2, Wash.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,498. E. (9) $363.13.

A. Warren B. Bledsoe, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $26.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,950. E. (9) $198.95.

A. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $268.38. E. (9) $340.50.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen e. v. Contrescarpe 46 Bremen, Germany.
D. (6) $17,366.07. E. (9) $694.50.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Board of Trade, Inc., International Trade Section, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $415.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frankie Childers, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,365. E. (9) $910.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,600. E. (9) $2,028.41.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Herman Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $125.67.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 20 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $955. E. (9) $533.40.

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., 104 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,103.43.

A. Committee for Hometown Television, Inc., Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.
D. (6) $1,997.33. E. (9) $432.95.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $345.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $519.23.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N. Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $24,467.50. E. (9) $18,816.46.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 173 West Madison Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $763.09.

A. Arnold H. Dadian, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved U. S.-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $90.

A. William L. Daley, 912 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $166.50.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $126.21.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.
E. (9) $67.50.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,874. E. (9) $3,328.94.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $64.23.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Alfred J. Elliott, P. O. Box 134, Tulare, Calif.
B. County of Tulare, Calif.
E. (9) $1,468.85.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $18.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $419.84.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $71.65.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $82.40.

A. Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Box 77, Bushland, Tex.
D. (6) $3,850. E. (9) $1,351.53.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $400.

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,462.85.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $807.67.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $326.94.

A. Robert B. Harper, 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, Box 228, Waverly, Va.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph B. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Laurence G. Henderson, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,350.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,687.12.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,235. E. (9) $1,235.

A. Housewives, Ltd., 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $86. E. (9) $65.75.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,647.15.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $816.55. E. (9) $1,813.11.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $2,150.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,225.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.
E. (9) $15.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $2,865. E. (9) $1,850.02.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $49.79.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $27.39.

A. J. M. DeW. (Jack) Kyle 2d, Post Office Box 1520, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $712.24. E. (9) $580.81.

A. D. B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $94.74.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $183.48.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,760. E. (9) $1,517.29.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dr. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

A. U. G. Lewellen, 628 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Bus & Truck Association, 628 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Mo.
D. (6) $301.44. E. (9) $851.06.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $200.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado, Window Rock, Ariz.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $10.

A. Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio.
B. Pennsylvania-Ohio-New York Committee on Low-Cost Niagara-St. Lawrence Power, Box 117, North Baltimore, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,716.65. E. (9) $556.56.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $154.35.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 North Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $143.32.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $1,982.52.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $1,349.26.

A. Harry B. Madsen, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,822.80. E. (9) $1,162.31.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,059.81.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Philip Merryman, Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.
B. Committee for Hometown Television, Inc., Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $142.05.

A. Mica Fabricators Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. James E. Milano, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $268.38. E. (9) $340.50.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,325. E. (9) $148.03.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Northern Textile Association, Boston, Mass.; Abitibi Power & Paper Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ontario; and Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association, Southbridge, Mass.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $574.22.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok, Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $174.20.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $1,284.45. E. (9) $300.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17 Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,466.40. E. (9) $1,689.69.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,852.16. E. (9) $15,284.72.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $311,889.60. E. (9) $4,896.39.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,257.29. E. (9) $1,555.85.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,456.56. E. (9) $5,715.64.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,594.75. E. (9) $14,329.50.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $37,797.27. E. (9) $26,551.35.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,500.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council Against Conscription, 513 West 166th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,082.35. E. (9) $1,693.76.

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,791. E. (9) $420.51.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $205.56. E. (9) $1,130.57.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,803.53. E. (9) $6,803.53.

A. National Institute of Social Welfare, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $747.37. E. (9) $9,938.57.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $813.37.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $34.10.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,044.13. E. (9) $7,781.62.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,177.60. E. (9) $5,503.41.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,224.45.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinist Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,775.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Rutherford T. Phillips, executive director, the American Humane Association, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $990. E. (9) $264.02.

A. John O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $35.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $768.94. E. (9) $528.74.

A. L. M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Town House, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $2,100.

A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,025.80. E. (9) $1,348.78.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,999.99. E. (9) $506.02.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,552.25.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) $2,192.28. E. (9) $1,809.45.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $44.37.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, United Cerebral Palsy Association, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.
D. (6) $10,999.97. E. (9) $5,898.97.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $896.60.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George L. Rodgers, 1504 Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., the Montana Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., and the Washington Water Power Co.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $450.

A. Rowe-Doherty Associates, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and 612 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $748.37. E. (9) $748.37.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $323.50.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $66.44.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $163.40.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $76.60.

A. M. Q. Sharpe, Kennebec, S. Dak.
B. Tribal Council, Lower Brule Tribe, Sioux Indians, Lower Brule, S. Dak.; Tribal Council, Crow Creek Tribe, Sioux Indians, Fort Thompson, S. Dak.; Tribal Council, Standing Rock Tribe, Sioux Indians, Fort Yates, N. Dak.
E. (9) $592.50.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $36.05.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $30,492. E. (9) $11,003.75.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $183.79.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,550.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $64.37.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 715 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $260.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. (6) $4,284.59. E. (9) $4,125.32.

A. Sterck, Richards & Roots, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $280.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,674.97. E. (9) $13,954.34.

A. Mrs. Joseph Mills Stoll, 4001 61st Street, Brookmont, Washington, D. C.
B. Volunteer Worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $111.56.

A. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $146.14.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, Nebr.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Effron, Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $38,612. E. (9) $38,612.

A. John D. Swygert, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors.
D. (6) $2,562.50. E. (9) $200.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $32. E. (9) $32.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc.; and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugh C. Tuttle, Dover, N. H.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,355.57.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 North Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Marion G. Ward, Post Office Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Arkansas Bus & Truck Association, Inc., Post Office Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,078.67.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,425.

A. Richard H. Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $5.71.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $78,388.08. E. (9) $65.95.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $173.18.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,440.36. E. (9) $2,440.36.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 120 Danbury Street SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $974.28.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $15.

A. Howard Zahniser, 6222 43d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $329.22.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $356.03.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1956:

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the third calendar quarter 1955:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description; (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution; (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during the Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6"), and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Bank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $261.60. E. (9) $261.60.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $85.45.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,367.28. E. (9) $89.75.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,676.59. E. (9) $6,064.49.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,396.92. E. (9) $5,396.92.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,854.84. E. (9) $9,854.84.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $363.45.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $235.50.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $5,508.06. E. (9) $5,508.06.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $30,814. E. (9) $31,311.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $35,275.57.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $275.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,094.47. E. (9) $11,794.47.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y.
D. (6) $157,751.11.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $5,612.69. E. (9) $15,593.07.

A. American Life Convention, 250 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $376.62. E. (9) $376.62.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $11,956.99.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $24,757.76. E. (9) $6,392.27.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $334,271.67. E. (9) $3,093.40.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., development fund (legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8501 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,818.30.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $832.67. E. (9) $832.67.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,167.41. E. (9) $1,700.49.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,378. E. (9) $14,767.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $67,236.26. E. (9) $14,336.45.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,283.19. E. (9) $2,283.19.

A. American Social Hygiene Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,800.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $43.40.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $17,648.90. E. (9) $6,088.89.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $29,838.54.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,268.72.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,821.01. E. (9) $2,752.77.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,660. E. (9) $2,696.63.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $41.40.

A. John R. Arent, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $78.25.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,495. E. (9) $93.26.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,160.26.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Simon & Schuster, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $23.43.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. George E. Ashley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $812.50.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,010. E. (9) $8,838.04.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $48,125.10. E. (9) $48,125.10.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,878.93. E. (9) $1,878.93.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,536.72. E. (9) $4,536.72.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, route 4, box 186, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $12.90.

A. George P. Baker, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $160.28.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,028.27. E. (9) $644.24.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $948.74. E. (9) $86.81.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $312.86.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc. and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $496.71.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $225.13.

A. Burton M. Behling, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $1.

A. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,307.69. E. (9) $120.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,958.59.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The G. B. Macke Corp., 212 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Automatic Canteen Co. of America, Merchandising Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and National Automatic Merchandising Association, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $528.11.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and its subsidiaries.
E. (9) $13.50.

A. J. Raymond Berry, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $596.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $426.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $60.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $642.39.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) $200.70.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road, Washington, D. C.
B. United States-Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $4.65.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $669.20. E. (9) $447.34.

A. Henry W. Blalock, Sr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo.; N. W. Electric Power Cooperative, Cameron, Mo., and Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anadarko, Okla.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles J. Bloch, First National Bank Building, Macon, Ga.
B. Pacific National Fire Insurance Co., San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $409.61.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,710. E. (9) $363.07.

A. Leo V. Bodine, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $396.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle N. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,953. E. (9) $184.63.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $294.50.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $10.

A. Roland Boyd, McKinney, Tex.
B. Hub Hill, 2121 North Field Street, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $6,825. E. (9) $2,289.35.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $293.80.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $907.10.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.96. E. (9) $318.15.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $415.38. E. (9) $16.88.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $350.

A. Brookhart, Becker and Dorsey, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Agencia Industrial, C. por A., P. O. Box 199, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $413.64.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,091.32. E. (9) $7,091.32.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $83.20.

A. C. R. Brown, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,374.15.

A. Brown, Land & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American and Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $8.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $4,131.65.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Power Reactor Development Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. $133.50.

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $12.87.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Toby E. G. Brunner, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Robert R. Bryant, 203 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Carl S. Buchanan, 404 Hollister Building, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Motor Bus Association.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $168.75.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $31.80.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beckman Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22. E. (9) $12.60.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., and 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $995.67. E. (9) $624.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $6,495.40. E. (9) $5,969.58.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $407.96.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Clint Bush, 105 East 70th Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $120.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $2.87.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa.
E. (9) $105.87.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $32.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,692.34. E. (9) $269.23.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Daniel W. Cannon, 303 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bituminous Coal Operators' Association, 303 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $115.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $696.88. E. (9) $365.85.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,578.94.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,670.90.

A. Chauncey P. Carter, Jr., 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $103.63. E. (9) $5.30.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak., and Crow Creek Reservation, S. Dak.; also Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak. and S. Dak.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayen, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,757.02.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,558. E. (9) $236.65.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,252.30. E. (9) $4,144.61.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $506. E. (9) $3,716.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.36.

A. Clark and Lanahan, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert W. Groves, John Morel, F. D. M. Strachan, Jr., and Thomas H. Adams, Savannah Bank & Trust Co. Building, Savannah, Ga.
E. (9) $59.23.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $3,230.78.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 531 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $120.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Cuban Sugar Mill Owners Association, and The Cuban Sugar Cane Growers Association, Habana, Cuba.
E. (9) $140.96.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.
D. (6) $30.18. E. (9) $66.44.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $140.63.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $281.56.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Browning Lines, Inc., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $150.69.

A. Don C. Collins, Kit Carson, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $781.19.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $34,800. E. (9) $6,165.84.

A. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,050. E. (9) $9,160.89.

A. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,594. E. (9) $3,221.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $75.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $20,098.91.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Citizens Group, Anne Arundel County and Prince Georges County, Md.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, c/o Ames, Hill & Ames, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $63.75.

A. J. Robert Conroy, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $42.25.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,442.30. E. (9) $333.40.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $310.47.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,000. E. (9) $8,967.38.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,695. E. (9) $11,158.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 173 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $238.85.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $28.29.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers Association of America, 408 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $8.63.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $101.63.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd., et al.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $16,200. E. (9) $88.59.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $360.72.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $236,708.88. E. (9) $561.90.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $78.57. E. (9) $78.57.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 613 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $781.19. E. (9) $781.19.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,277.94. E. (9) $1,810.74.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $525.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Arnold H. Dadian, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D (6) $750. E. (9) $90.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $50.51.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $932.81. E. (9) $320.62.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 West Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,635.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trustees under the will of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, in care of The Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.
E. (9) $693.64.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $230.85.

A. Sherlock Davis, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $202.75. E. (9) $202.75.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $213.78.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $831.81.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,300.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $883.75. E. (9) $8.08.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,736.40. E. (9) $111.40.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, 1234 Wishon Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $2,668.20. E. (9) $68.20.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $7,500.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,767.50.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Petroleum Industry Trade Association.
D. (6) $362.05. E. (9) $362.05.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,093.18. E. (9) $15,759.75.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15,284.45.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,399.60.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.51. E. (9) $6.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $425.80.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,356.50. E. (9) $342.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $47.50.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipelines.

A. W. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $2,033.33. E. (9) $225.

A. Ben Du Bois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Build'ng, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harold R. Duffie, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald H. Dunham, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $175.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $232.50. E. (9) $8.49.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $268.74.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $692.04.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $27.20.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,276. E. (9) $496.14.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, Homer Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,040.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,552.12.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $22.47.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $29.61.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,102.50. E. (9) $69.85.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $38.25. E. (9) $192.63.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $310.91.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
E. (9) $425.72.

A. Edward Falck & Co., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Gas distribution companies.
E. (9) $529.36.

A. Hugh F. Fall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $8.27.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $41,142.75. E. (9) $22,263.34.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Asso-

ciation, Fellsmere, Fla.; Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $13.55.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Financial General Corporation, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $92.73.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $337.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $225.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,557.22. E. (9) $37.58.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $151.80.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,702.66.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,381.80.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $2,503.51.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $16.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $75.80.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) $535. E. (9) $535.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,095. E. (9) $926.12.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Committee for Books, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,825. E. (9) $1,751.85.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. James G. Frechette, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp., 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $22.58.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $266. E. (9) $50.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,165.35. E. (9) $16,157.33.

A. George Milan Fuller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $1,087.59. E. (9) $1,087.59.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $537.64.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gordon H. Garland, Post Office Box 507, Woodlake, Calif.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.
E. (9) $983.13.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $4.40.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,758.53. E. (9) $2,001.96.

A. Gaston, Snow, Rice & Boyd, 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $115.91.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $183.15.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,868. E. (9) $108.50.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $541.59.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $293.49.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $14.70.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,009.25. E. (9) $5,175.02.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $75.20.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $19,155.50. E. (9) $8,546.32.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $325.72.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $21.42.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Francis T. Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $729.17.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $6.75.

A. I. J. Gronfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Carroll A. Gunderson, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $490. E. (9) $55.

A. James S. Gunn, 2110 Davenport Avenue, Richmond, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $105.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $285.25.

A. Mrs. Violet N. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $165.95.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $803.08. E. (9) $596.01.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $210.65.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $362.21.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,112.35. E. (9) $41.96.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $8.27.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,500.01. E. (9) $393.82.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.12. E. (9) $236.19.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,591.31. E. (9) $466.31.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $454.49.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $39.90.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. Wade Harrison, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $17.50.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $270.17.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $46.50.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $16.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $365.50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $341.20.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $800.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $95.75. E. (9) $95.75.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, National Wool Trade Association, 283 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $44.10.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $333.32.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $107.07.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $196.88.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,333.76. E. (9) $83.76.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. Charles Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $610.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,540. E. (9) $790.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $230.85.

A. Donald B. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $467.49.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,280.10.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,580. E. (9) $285.

A. Raymond E. Hughes, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $1,205.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $275.

A. W. C. Hushing, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,302. E. (9) $402.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,381.77.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $13,497.50. E. (9) $10,315.69.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,020.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $29.30.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $25.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $1,968.75. E. (9) $260.14.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Japanese American Citizens League.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $300.

A. Daniel Jaspan, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,010.43. E. (9) $110.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participatione Industrielles et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Kerianstr 19, Switzerland.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $215. E. (9) $2,157.66.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr., 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,884.96. E. (9) $75.04.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $13.87.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $735.41.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $294.90.

A. Wallace M. Jopling, People's Hardware Building, Lake City, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $450.

A. Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers International Union.
E. (9) $2,540.

A. Orrin G. Judd, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsai, 21 Park Place, Great Neck, N. Y.
E. (9) $5.17.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $950.96.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $62.05.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph Duff Kelly.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,500.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $66.67. E. (9) $88.25.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $641.67. E. (9) $123.85.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $228.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $190.30.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1148 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $286.95.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,308.78. E. (9) $1,008.34.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, De Blois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $20.57.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375.

A. King, Noble & Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas R. Kingsley, corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Bill Kirchner, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,475.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, postoffice box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $40.04.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,461.52. E. (9) $198.55.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2649 North Hackett Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $40.

A. Robert M. Koch, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $16.40.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.

A. Georgia Koonce, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $173. E. (9) $170.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,128.50. E. (9) $6,145.71.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $109.35.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,140. E. (9) $4,708.19.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, 718 Insurance Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. William C. Lantaff, 916 DuPont Building, Miami, Fla.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $276.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $2,973.40.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,476.29.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $134.64.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,749.98. E. (9) $147.07.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $75.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $5,754.68.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $62.54.

A. James R. Lee, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $395.36.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $541. E. (9) $963.40.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Artemas C. Leslie, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Cross Commission of the American Hospital Association, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,998.98. E. (9) $7,126.29.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,937.35. E. (9) $8,937.35.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $55.57.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Leon Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert W. Lishman, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $536.25. E. (9) $117.02.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $10.

A. Walter J. Little, 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,324.68. E. (9) $1,800.96.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipelines, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $75.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,450. E. (9) $1,205.44.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,749.93. E. (9) $15.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Panama, Panama, Panama.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Loan and Finance Corp., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,718.75. E. (9) $50.59.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $750.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,541.70. E. (9) $454.39.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,937.50.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,997.66. E. (9) $43.10.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $143.37.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,550. E. (9) $189.30.

A. Angus McDonald, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,809.47. E. (9) $296.35.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, Esq., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., 425 Crocker Building, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $28.07.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportes Maritimos Mexicanos, S. A. Avenue, Insurgentes No. 432, Mexico, D. F.
E. (9) $15.25.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.25. E. (9) $1,315.32.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $200.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $2,230.91.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,623.75. E. (9) $406.81.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $850.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $55.38.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $161.60.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $383.23.

A. James Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $470.21.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $214.40.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, Post Office Box 1170, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $375.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $58.34.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,319.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $1,272.58.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $821.80. E. (9) $6.46.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $3.25.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $199.56.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $75.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $426.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,617.50. E. (9) $1,796.96.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $13.30.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $123.85.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $20,377.50. E. (9) $2,258.33.

A. The Merchants National Bank & Trust Co. of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $120.70.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $361.92.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $228.94.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,218.85.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles C. Miller, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $25.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $207.77.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $249.03.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,226.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Northern Textile Association, Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association, and Abitibi Power and Paper Co.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $742.30.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John H. Davis, Harriett O. Davis, Harry Handley Cloutier, Elinor S. Cloutier, estate of Henri H. Cloutier, deceased, Marry M. Cloutier, executor, Margaret S. Cloutier, Seattle, Wash.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $311.02.

A. H. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $27.34.

A. F. E. Mollin, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $231.42. E. (9) $231.42.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $188.65.

A. Donald Montgomery, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $1,503.44.

A. Walter M. Moorman, 4650 East West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Maryland Railroad Association, c/o E. H. Burgess, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $68.32.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Group Health Dental Insurance, Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.
E. (9) $81.16.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $90.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $99.91.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $609.05.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Movers Conference of America, Corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,008.12. E. (9) $2,008.12.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Howard E. Munro, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,797.31.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,173.93. E. (9) $2,173.93.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,592.15. E. (9) $1,552.41.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $14,356.25. E. (9) $100.87.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,607.97. E. (9) $16,364.09.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,148.25. E. (9) $6,036.75.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $275.88.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,931.58. E. (9) $1,378.90.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $940.97. E. (9) $1,789.26.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $38,523.76. E. (9) $5,368.07.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,763.76. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $26,817.29.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $415,643.05. E. (9) $2,304.62.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,232.32.

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $1,938.81.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, care of D. G. Ward, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $6,168.52. E. (9) $6,168.52.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,443. E. (9) $2,267.68.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $245.02.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $631.93. E. (9) $631.93.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,480.79. E. (9) $1,883.32.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $141.59. E. (9) $141.59.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $146,652.38. E. (9) $29,115.20.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,267.89. E. (9) $2,267.89.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $17,246.20. E. (9) $17,983.72.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,433.50.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,790.36. E. (9) $2,535.17.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,453.58. E. (9) $4,453.58.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $40,728.01. E. (9) $3,000.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,932.50. E. (9) $11,383.30.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,519.56.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $345.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,588.84. E. (9) $8,011.66.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $16,581.52. E (9) $16,581.52.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,446.11. E. (9) $2,503.48.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $5,227.87.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100,545.10. E. (9) $1,468.82.

A. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1661.79. E. (9) $1661.79.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Grandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $9,018. E. (9) $4,634.70.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $8,082.61.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,083.36. E. (9) $2,598.59.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $48.05.

A. George S. Newcomer, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Blake T. Newton, Jr., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,041.67.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $3,934.81.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,056.25.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $260.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Humane Association, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,980. E. (9) $304.99.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $727.50. E. (9) $57.34.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $338.25.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $583.87.

A. Francis A. O'Connell, 625 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Division, Transport Workers Union, 80–07 Broadway, Elmhurst, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,885. E. (9) $933.45.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,108.25.

A. Robert E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $15.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theatre Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,213.89.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Mira Quesada 376, Of. 504, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) $57.03.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $97.85.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $14.90.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $15.20.

A. Graeme O'Geran, 131 Orvilton Drive, Dewitt, N. Y.
B. The Merchants National Bank & Trust Company of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,141.59.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $28.85. E. (9) $4.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,345.46. E. (9) $426.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,370. E. (9) $18.25.

A. Samuel Omasta, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Inst., Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $17.50.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,916.07.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
E. (9) $375.53.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $429.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $89.80.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Co., College Park, Md.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $48.63.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,225. E. (9) $2,559.05.

A. James G. Patton, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver 3, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $635.88.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Allstate Insurance Co., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
E. (9) $56.07.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clerk de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.08.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. N. R. Caine & Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $28.80.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty and Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $69.44.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.,

---

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $64.34.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,916.66. E. (9) $228.71.

A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $945. E. (9) $500.

A. Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $22.65.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $202.66.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $26.42.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $167.79.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $40.81.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $750.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $213.66. E. (9) $232.55.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $114.45.

A. Piper & Marbury, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $11.84.

A. B. J. Pittman, Jr., Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) $408.28.

A. Walter C. Ploeser, 50 South Bemiston Avenue, Clayton, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Portland, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $54.53. E. (9) $7.10.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $5.25.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $7.40.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,939.84.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Oliver & Donnally, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $21.60.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $3,900.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Devalin Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $19.74.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Little & Christman, 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $199.89.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $35.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $561.02.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,925.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $130.80. E. (9) $134.73.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Reasoner & Davis, 505 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Joint Committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,711.11.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,989.58. E. (9) $7,989.58.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 10th and E Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $175.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $32,952.85.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,369.85. E. (9) 7,311.41.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. P. F. Claveau, Post Office Box 1958, Anchorage, Alaska.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $858.75.

A. Harry Ricek, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Siert Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $511.16.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $438.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,080. E. (9) $940.61.

A. E. W. Rising, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $417.36.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $90.75.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $761.21.

A. George L. Rodgers, 1504 Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., the Montana Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., the Washington Water Power Co.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $450.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Watson Rogers, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. James F. Rowan, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $93.75.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5.60.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $126.19.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $180.05.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $240.55.

A. William H. Ryan, 303 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $833.34. E. (9) $91.14.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $528.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $63.03.

A. Benjamin H. Saunders and Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunray Mid-Continent Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $120.56.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. James J. Saxon, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $344.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N. J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,360.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.54.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $50.

A. W. J. Sears, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $9.35.

A. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $167.79.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,094. E. (9) $134.37.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,582.49.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $148.54.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $131.25.

A. Manly Sheppard, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission, 24 Branford Place, Newark, N. J.
E. (9) $12.

A. W. Lee Shield, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9.45. E. (9) $9.45.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Paul Sifton, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $2,030. E. (9) $1,128.58.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $5,172.35.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $46.85.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, P. O. Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
D. (6) $1,258. E. (9) $1,545.21.

A. R. S. Smethurst, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. W. Smiley, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,210.62.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $3,897.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $67.40.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Mutual Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislative, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,326.92. E. (9) $159.17.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $346.15.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,027.83.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $17,798.28. E. (9) $26,003.53.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $99. E. (9) $355.83.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,385.67.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $27.50.

A. Preble Staver, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $32.45.

A. Samuel Elliot Stavisky, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $7,289.58.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Utility Trailer Rental Association, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Rental Trailer Association, Chicago, Ill.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 519 South Broadway, Wichita, Kans.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,364.80. E. (9) $14,197.79.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $3.50.

A. Erskine Stewart, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $120.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958.34.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $592.59.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $125.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,538.46.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.

A. Eugene C. Struckhoff, 95 North Main Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $1,706.95.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $8.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,078.53.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Fruit and Steamship Co., 964 St. Charles Avenue at Lee Circle, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $129.31.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $212.50.

A. Glenn J. Talbott, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence Talley, Route 1, Box 86, McLean, Va.
B. American Oil Co., 555 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $900.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $625.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $7.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $341.18.

A. Ruth E. Tegtmeyer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $8,525. E. (9) $5,716.01.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $445.09.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $2,938.16.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,723.05.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $34.01.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $17.50.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $540.87. E. (9) $13.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $231.56.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,418.75. E. (9) $75.81.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. Touche, Niven, Bailey & Smart, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $243.12.

A. Harry L. Towe, 241 Main Street, Hackensack, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $292.66.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $90.34.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,156.25. E. (9) $42.39.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $467.24.

A. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Citizens Association, Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $3,917.15. E. (9) $5,525.11.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $39,174.04.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $20,446.15.

A. R. G. Van Buskirk, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $96.99.

A. Weston Vernon, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $56.25.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $27. E. (9) $27.

A. Addie W. Viars, 2818 Kenmore Road, Richmond, Va.
B. Ladies' Society of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 202 Rector Building, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $70.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley W. Vogt, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,534.96. E. (9) $224.57.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 1453 Harvard Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 2800 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $490.24. E. (9) $374.16.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $119.50. E. (9) $6.89.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $45.

A. William C. Warren, 116th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $339.16.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Committee, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,750. E. (9) $6,750.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,956.30. E. (9) $3,760.63.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,420. E. (9) $1,080.81.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $598.16.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hilary Waukau, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,069.67. E. (9) $1,555.33.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,699.60. E. (9) $600.87.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $3.53.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $326.57.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) 247.18.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.09.

A. Monroe Weso, Zoar, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $640.81.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. A. L. Wheeler, 911 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marvin Small, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., and J. George Spitzer, 923 Old Nepheran Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Montana Power Co., Electric Building, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power and Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $87.81.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,160.69. E. (9) $2,160.69.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $584.37.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $18.81.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $17.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
E. (9) $20.93.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $50.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 120 Danbury Street SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $1.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ute Indian Tribe et al.
E. (9) $422.89.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $5.18.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $500.65.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $367.07.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $95.02. E. (9) $95.02.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $198.91.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $17.24.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $824.39.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $6,024.48.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $6,740.55. E. (9) $2,141.39.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $916.08. E. (9) $1,080.56.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,196.20.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,437.50. E. (9) $89.05.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $114.29.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric, Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, et al.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter of 1956:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of the pages should be "4," "4," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.
2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Charles J. Alexander, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navajo Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado; address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz., and Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Monument Association, Inc., 282 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.

A. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Anti Tax Association of New York, 141 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.

A. George E. Ashley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert F. Beitel, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircoach Transport Association, Inc., 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Adm. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Power Reactor Development Co., care of the Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harold J. Buoy, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.

A. William J. Burns, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edward T. Butler, 1191 Clay Avenue, Bronx 56, New York, N. Y.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Chesapeake Gardens, Inc., 2406 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

A. Clark & Lanahan, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert W. Groves, John Morel, F. D. M. Strachan, Jr., and Thomas H. Adams, Savannah Bank & Trust Co. Building, Savannah, Ga.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 531 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Browning Lines, Inc., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. John W. Cross, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Deutsche Amerikakohlen-Transportgesellschaft m. b. H. (American-German Coal Transport Co.), 17 Grabenstrasse, Dusseldorf, Germany.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans American Airlines, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, 1234 Wishon, Fresno, Calif.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.

A. Harold R. Duffie, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John W. English, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Russell J. Fisher, Gordonsville, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. O. J. Fox, Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Welfare Federation Act Committee of 1,000, Inc., Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. Gaston, Snow, Rice & Boyd, 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.

A. C. O. Griffis, 435 North Walnut Street, Slater, Mo.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James S. Gunn, 2110 Davenport Avenue, Richmond, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Moultrie Hitt, 718 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Kendall K. Hoyt, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircoach Transport Association, Inc., 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

. A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad, 15th and Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.

A. Joe Jenness, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John G. Johnson, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. A. Key, 401 North Hays Avenue, Jackson, Tenn.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Chevy Chase Club, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Patent Office Society, Post Office Box 685, Washington, D. C.

A. League of New York Theatres, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John E. McClure, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Reading Co., Reading Terminal, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Harry B. Madsen, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Marr, 1098 Chapel Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Joseph Meagher, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Michigan Railroads Association, 601 Prudden Building, Lansing, Mich.

A. Aubrey C. Mills, foot of Washington Avenue Bridge, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, foot of Washington Avenue Bridge, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A. The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexingston Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang (wife), 157–16 20th Road, Whitestone, N. Y.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D. C.

A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin & Krim, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Bulova Watch Co., New York, N. Y.

A. B. J. Pittman, Jr., care of Texas Employers Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Employers Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.

A. Kenneth Michael Plaisted, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

A. Thomas L. Preston, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas J. Quinlivan, 927 Olney Street, Rocky Mount, N. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 9807 South Oakley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Reasoner & Davis, 505 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John A. (Jack) Smith, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. William L. Breese, Longview, Accokeek, Md.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Josefa Kusiak, 4814 Dexter Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Preble Staver, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local One, GCEOC, 1007 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence Talley, Route 1, Box 86, McLean, Va.
B. American Oil Co., 555 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. William P. Tidwell, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Addie W. Viars, 2813 Kenmore Road, Richmond, Va.
B. Ladies' Society of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 202 Rector Building, Little Rock, Ark.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang (wife), 157–16 20th Road, Whitestone, N. Y.

A. Lloyd W. Weaver, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Wilmer & Broun, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Bullard Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph M. Wyatt, 501 Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Chesapeake Gardens, Inc., 2406 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that this is the 30th anniversary of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which was organized in 1926. This event certainly should not be permitted to pass unremarked. In the opinion of many students of government, the Joint Committee and its remarkable staff, headed by Mr. Colin F. Stam, is the outstanding example of the legislative process at its best.

I had the honor to be chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in the 83d Congress. In addition, of course, as Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the same Congress, I had a unique opportunity to recognize and appreciate the extraordinary contribution to good legislation which that staff traditionally has made. Mr. Stam has been its chief since 1938 and during this period of almost unparalleled service to the Congress he has always performed his duties with tireless conscientiousness, with impartial fairness, and with unquestioned integrity.

The joint committee staff generally has furnished the entire technical assistance to both the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on every item of tax legislation,

large and small, irrespective of which party happened to be in control of the Congress at any particular time. Thus, the staff has been a truly nonpartisan one, providing an extraordinary reservoir of professional talent available to all Members of the Congress regardless of party.

I know that many, many Members of both the House and the Senate are thoroughly familiar through personal experience with the extent and the caliber of the contribution which has been and is being made by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. There are others, perhaps, who have not had a similar opportunity to know the work of this staff and its chief, Mr. Stam. The staff is made up of some 26 individuals, professional and clerical. It has lawyers thoroughly experienced in the intricacies of the tax law. It has economists who are versed in the economic effects of tax policy and who study continuously the level of the Nation's economic activity in order that tax policy can be developed on a sound basis. It has expert accountants who are able to furnish invaluable information as to the practical application of tax rules in relation to actual business practice. It has statisticians able to provide information as to the revenue implications of tax proposals.

I would like to describe briefly the manner in which this remarkable staff assisted in developing the monumental new Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Throughout 1953, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was busy receiving suggestions for changes in the tax laws from individuals and groups throughout the country. It established staff subcommittees, made up jointly of personnel from the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service. These staff groups specialized in a large number of the more important aspects of taxation. They met with trade associations, business representatives, and professional and other groups for many months, and engaged with them in lengthy discussion of tax problems. In addition, of course, many suggestions for improvement in the tax laws were developed from within the Government itself. These many months of work by the staff were followed in January of 1954 by the submission of staff proposals to the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee had already held in the previous session some 6 weeks of public hearings at which literally hundreds of witnesses had testified. That great volume of public testimony had also been available to the joint committee staff in its labors. For about 6 weeks, starting in January of 1954, the committee met in executive session with the staff of the joint committee. Finally, a bill was prepared representing thousands of changes in the tax law. I have no hesitancy in saying that without the work of the staff of the joint committee and Mr. Stam, this extraordinary accomplishment would never have been possible.

Following consideration of the new Internal Revenue Code by the House of Representatives, the bill was referred in the Senate to its Committee on Finance. There the staff of the joint committee, again, became the technical advisory group. As a result, the tremendous experience which the staff had developed with this bill during its many months of work in the House was completely available to the other body. Finally, when the bill went to conference with a large number of Senate amendments, the joint committee staff assisted the conferees in working out the agreement which is represented today by that truly remarkable document, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This procedure which I have outlined above is one which is followed with respect to all tax legislation. I need hardly emphasize the great contribution to the legislative process which this procedure furnishes. The continuity of staff work between the House and the Senate makes possible, I am convinced, a better type of legislation than could otherwise be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into some length with regard to the work of the joint committee staff, not only because it is singularly appropriate on this, the 30th anniversary of its organization, but also because there has been a recent tendency in some quarters to criticize its work. I can think of no greater disservice to the legislative branch than any effort to undermine the effectiveness of the joint committee staff. True, it is not a partisan staff. Therefore, I can understand the dissatisfaction of those who would prefer to conduct tax policy on a partisan basis. True, Mr. Speaker, the basic approach of this staff could be called middle of the road. As a result, I can again understand the dissatisfaction of those whose economic thinking is either far to the right or far to the left.

I believe that the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation under its chief, Mr. Colin Stam, is an institution of which this Congress should be proud, and one which it should maintain and strengthen.

Hon. Irwin D. Davidson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, leaving Congress to go to the court of general sessions in New York as does IRWIN DAVIDSON is like going from one room into another. The closing is the opening door.

Irwin does not change—but the scene of his activities does. He would do well anywhere.

He returns to his old love—the courts from whence he came here. He made an enviable reputation in judicial circles; now he goes back once more to the milieu of the courts.

Although in Congress but one term, he has made his mark here. His uniform courtesy, his captivating humor, his keenness of perception, his clearness of expression, his high integrity of purpose, his kindness, his loyalty to his friends and colleagues are the facets of the jewel we call character.

I shall miss his quiet demeanor but pronounced wisdom which he brought with him to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Irwin, during his altogether too brief spell here, played the game. He quickly caught on to the deportment and carriage necessary to the makeup of a good Member. He never marred his record—only heightened it.

Before he voted on a measure, he studied and gave careful scrutiny to it. He always did his homework. He voted as his mind and heart dictated.

He had his eye, not on the next election, but on future generations.

He knows that the art of government is not easy to master. There are no scales to measure. Yet Irwin has mastered, measurably well, its perplexities and difficulties.

I am sure that in the congressional hurly-burly of debate he has learned much that will stand him in good stead as a judge. He has seen how on the anvil of discourse and discussion and debate we come a step closer to the truth. I am sure that his experience here will make him even more conscious of the dignity of the individual and his need to have a place in the sun. He will be better enabled to judge men, one from the other. He will have developed greater discernment and be better enabled to separate the wool from shoddy. He will have realized that talk sometimes is cheap; that the voluble one is not always wise; that the silent one may hold great learning. He will have realized that certain laws are immutable and cannot be breached with impunity.

We wish him well, albeit we shall miss him sorely.

Budget Estimates and Appropriations, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith certain tabulations dealing with work of the 84th Congress on appropriation bills as compared with budget estimates submitted by the President, and pertinent related facts.

The first tabulation is for the second session and is in usual form by bills, segregated as between fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The second table is similar, but in condensed form, for the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Permanent appropriations—those which recur automatically under substantive law without annual action in the appropriation bills—are included for sake of completeness but necessarily on an estimated basis at this time.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Title	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1957 bills:								
Treasury-Post Office:								
Treasury	$648,507,000	$643,434,000	$643,434,000	$648,507,000	$643,434,000	$643,434,000	$643,434,000	−$5,073,000
Post Office	3,000,000,000	2,973,900,000	2,973,900,000	3,000,000,000	2,994,780,000	2,994,780,000	2,984,340,000	−15,660,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	
Total	3,649,872,000	3,618,699,000	3,618,699,000	3,649,872,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,629,139,000	−20,733,000
Interior and related agencies:								
Interior	287,682,600	277,172,600	277,172,600	295,993,200	285,126,800	285,151,800	280,857,250	−15,135,950
Forest Service	96,773,000	96,773,000	96,773,000	96,773,000	106,348,500	106,348,500	100,970,750	+4,197,750
Related agencies	42,292,600	42,017,600	42,017,600	42,376,100	42,376,100	42,376,100	42,106,100	−270,000
Total	426,748,200	415,963,200	415,963,200	435,142,300	433,851,400	433,876,400	423,934,100	−11,208,200
General Government matters	15,014,475	14,849,275	14,849,275	15,014,475	14,969,975	14,969,975	14,969,975	−44,500
Independent offices	5,783,704,000	6,005,157,260	6,010,543,290	5,783,704,000	5,916,997,258	5,925,187,646	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826
Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:								
Labor	421,084,000	380,348,500	380,348,500	421,321,000	380,963,000	380,963,000	380,785,500	−40,535,500
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,925,898,400	1,903,184,781	1,903,184,781	1,925,988,400	1,977,341,781	1,977,841,781	1,972,121,781	+46,133,381
Related agencies	16,576,000	13,277,500	13,448,500	16,576,000	13,718,500	13,718,500	13,473,500	−3,102,500
Total	2,363,648,400	2,296,810,781	2,296,981,781	2,363,885,400	2,372,023,281	2,372,523,281	2,366,380,781	+2,495,381
District of Columbia	(182,899,500)	(179,797,800)	(179,797,800)	(182,899,500)	(181,682,050)	(181,687,490)	(181,612,490)	(−1,287,010)
Federal payment	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,708,650	22,708,650	22,558,650	+200,000
State, Justice, and Judiciary:								
State	181,207,285	171,506,737	171,506,737	182,142,285	176,125,872	176,125,872	175,065,872	−7,076,413
Justice	235,880,000	215,965,000	215,965,000	235,880,000	219,451,910	219,451,910	216,043,650	−19,836,350
Judiciary	37,582,535	35,395,635	35,395,635	37,582,535	37,193,735	37,193,735	36,321,435	−1,261,100
U. S. Information Agency	135,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	135,000,000	115,000,000	115,000,000	113,000,000	−22,000,000
Refugee relief	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	
Total	598,169,820	541,367,372	541,367,372	599,104,820	556,271,517	556,271,517	548,930,957	−50,173,863
Commerce and related agencies:								
Commerce	1,453,568,000	1,313,153,000	1,313,153,000	1,453,568,000	1,376,706,000	1,377,456,000	1,347,872,000	−105,696,000
Panama Canal	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	−250,000
Related agencies	53,445,000	53,440,000	53,440,000	53,445,000	53,450,000	53,450,000	53,450,000	+5,000
Total	1,522,637,000	1,382,003,000	1,382,003,000	1,522,673,000	1,445,566,000	1,446,316,000	1,416,732,000	−105,941,000
Defense:								
Office of the Secretary	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	
Interservice activities	657,375,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	657,375,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	−13,500,000
Army	7,761,425,000	7,497,582,000	7,497,582,000	7,761,425,000	7,545,787,000	7,545,787,000	7,539,280,000	−222,145,000
Navy	10,047,600,000	9,999,534,000	9,999,534,000	10,047,600,000	9,999,997,000	9,999,997,000	9,999,497,000	−48,103,000
Air Force	15,666,500,000	15,479,125,000	15,479,125,000	15,666,500,000	16,779,125,000	16,579,125,000	16,459,125,000	+792,625,000
Total	34,147,850,000	33,635,066,000	33,635,066,000	34,147,850,000	34,983,734,000	34,783,734,000	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	1,987,302,268	1,983,512,568	1,983,512,568	1,989,841,668	2,016,771,068	2,018,331,068	[1] 1,993,744,968	+3,903,300
Public works:								
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	
Department of Interior:								
Power Administrations	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	
Bureau of Reclamation	195,789,000	164,767,000	167,612,000	195,789,000	188,850,000	188,850,000	181,114,500	−14,674,500
Army civil functions	588,877,000	588,851,000	589,311,000	588,877,000	649,201,000	649,501,000	641,777,500	+52,900,500
Total	818,501,000	787,453,000	790,758,000	818,501,000	871,886,000	872,186,000	856,727,000	+38,226,000
Legislative branch	93,664,903	89,376,450	89,376,450	122,496,933	117,804,058	117,804,058	[2] 117,804,058	−4,692,875
Mutual Security	[4] 859,975,000	3,425,120,000	3,425,120,000	4,859,975,000	4,105,420,000	4,110,920,000	3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000
The supplemental, 1957	1,222,849,525	1,555,535,425	1,555,589,275	1,254,364,525	1,722,089,675	1,724,639,675	1,691,341,875	+436,977,350
Second supplemental, 1957	1,912,095,000	2,341,895,000	1,941,895,000	[5] 3,516,053,038	[5] 3,461,691,438	[5] 3,466,442,438	[5] 3,058,029,438	−458,023,600
Rescission of "Federal-aid highway" funds contained in other bills above				−900,000,000	−875,000,000	−875,000,000	−875,000,000	−25,000,000
Net, second supplemental, 1957	1,912,095,000	2,341,895,000	1,941,895,000	2,616,053,038	2,586,691,438	2,591,442,438	2,183,029,438	−433,023,600
Subtotal, fiscal year 1957	59,424,426,241	58,115,166,981	57,724,082,861	60,200,836,809	60,806,363,320	60,630,489,708	[3] 59,655,107,628	−545,729,181
II. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1956:								
Urgent Deficiency, 1956	64,505,201	61,504,201	64,670,201	64,505,201	70,195,066	65,695,066	65,695,066	+1,189,865
Labor (Bureau of Employment Security)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	
Second Supplemental, 1956	835,902,923	795,743,823	795,768,823	878,136,527	858,864,176	838,864,176	852,414,896	−25,721,631
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956 and prior	900,408,124	[4] 857,248,024	860,439,024	942,641,728	929,059,242	904,559,242	918,109,962	−24,531,766
III. Grand total, session	60,324,834,365	58,972,415,005	58,584,521,885	61,143,478,537	61,735,422,562	61,535,048,950	60,573,217,590	−570,260,947
Permanent appropriations estimate							7,564,859,833	
Grand total, regular annual, supplemental, deficiency and permanent							68,138,077,423	

[1] Includes $1,250,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[2] Includes $400,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[3] Includes $1,650,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[4] Does not include $1,200,000,000 contained in H. R. 10654, which the House did not act upon.
[5] Includes estimates of $1,150,500,000 and appropriations of $1,150,300,000 out of permanent highway trust fund, to reimburse general fund appropriation accounts for expenditures made subsequent to June 30, 1956, and such reimbursed appropriation accounts to be rescinded not later than June 30, 1957; Public law column includes only $800,300,000 for such purpose.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong.

	Estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
1. Fiscal year 1956 bills:			
Treasury-Post Office	$3,360,385,000	$3,322,488,500	−$37,896,500
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	2,432,148,861	2,373,516,500	−58,632,361
Interior and related agencies	314,523,056	317,573,627	+3,050,571
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	898,384,574	883,051,623	−15,332,951
Independent offices	5,640,155,000	5,842,458,500	+202,303,500
State, Justice, and Judiciary and related agencies	483,531,912	466,302,415	−17,229,497
Defense	32,232,815,000	31,882,815,726	−349,999,274
District of Columbia	(175,462,020)	(168,843,440)	(−6,618,580)
Federal payment	21,892,700	19,892,700	−2,000,000
Commerce and related agencies	1,366,393,000	1,245,360,000	−121,033,000
General government matters	28,777,700	27,166,300	−1,611,400
Public works	1,801,465,000	1,365,613,500	−435,851,500
Legislative	92,692,911	92,808,972	+116,061
Mutual security	3,266,641,750	2,703,341,750	−563,300,000
The supplemental, 1956	2,123,351,072	1,656,625,802	−466,725,270
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956	54,063,157,536	52,199,015,915	−1,864,141,621
2. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1955 and prior	981,176,193	925,805,300	−55,370,893
3. Estimates not considered	156,500,000		−156,500,000
Grand total, session	55,200,833,729	53,124,821,215	−2,076,012,514
4. Permanent appropriations (estimate)		7,303,736,276	
Total appropriations		60,428,197,491	

SUMMARY FOR THE SECOND SESSION

Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House during the second session totaled $60,324,834,365. Against these requests, the Committee on Appropriations submitted total recommendations of $58,972,415,005, a net reduction of $1,352,419,360. Bills as passed by the House totaled $58,584,521,885. Estimates considered by the Senate aggregated $61,143,478,537 and bills passed by that body totaled $61,535,048,950. Final amounts enacted total $60,573,217,590, a net of $570,260,947 below estimates of appropriations submitted by the President. In addition, rescissions of prior appropriations included in the several bills aggregate approximately $900 million bringing the total reduction of spending authority to about $1,470,260,947.

As to the net appropriation decrease of $570,260,947 below corresponding budget requests, several items need especially to be mentioned. In the Department of Defense bill, the Congress added $900 million not budgeted by the administration to accelerate B–52 and fighter plane production as vital to the readiness of our defense forces and to assure that we do not fall behind in missile and aircraft research and development. It will be recalled that the Government's expenditure reductions in the past 4 years have been largely in national security programs.

In the independent offices bill, the appropriation of the Government's share to the civil retirement fund is $230 million above the budget. The administration failed to include provision to meet the Government's share. By this increase, the Congress sought forthrightly to move the annual contribution toward the currently accruing level.

The budget for military public works construction, in the supplemental bill for 1957, included an item of transfer of $357 million from revolving funds in lieu of requesting direct appropriation. The effect was to hold down new requests and thus show apparent lower totals though in fact the spending requests were higher. The Congress decided the cleanest way was to rescind outright the idle funds and appropriate directly. Thus the increase on this account is apparent only.

BUDGET DEFICITS

Mr. Speaker, the administration is taking credit for a budget surplus for the fiscal year 1956 just closed. It is claiming that the 1952 campaign pledge of a balanced budget has been redeemed. The official administration announcement stated:

This means a great deal to the people of this country.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does mean a great deal. It means that the surplus was achieved through burdensome taxes on individual taxpayers. It is only the ever-increasing national income which has spared the administration another year of fiscal embarrassment. It means, also, that it was not achieved by economy in Government as I shall conclusively show in a few moments. No credit is due for the achievement—in fact, it is not an achievement. It just happened. We have the largest national income in peacetime history. Practically every segment of the economy except the farmers are prospering—but paying heavily for it in high taxes and inflated dollars. That is why the budget was balanced. Real Government economy contributed nothing to the result; in fact, if we had real economy we could have a balanced budget and tax relief at the same time.

Here are the statistics to support these statements, taking from a tabulation released July 19 by the administration:

Budget receipts, expenditures, deficits, and surplus

[In billions]

	Actual, 1954	Actual, 1955	Actual, 1956
1. Receipts (net)	$64.7	$60.4	$68.1
2. Expenditures (net):			
National security	48.2	42.6	42.1
All other items	19.6	22.0	24.3
Total	67.8	64.6	66.4
3. Deficit or surplus	−3.1	−4.2	+1.7

NOTE.—In fiscal 1951, under the previous administration, there was a surplus of $3.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, these figures summarize the real record of expenditures in the first 3 years of the present administration, and show how claimed savings have been brought about. National security programs account for the savings—cut from $48.2 billion in 1954 to $42.1 billion in 1956. Much of that was to be expected once fighting stopped in Korea as President Truman so accurately prophesied in his last budget message submitted in January 1953. So no claim should be made that this decline constituted real savings of the kind the people were promised and had every right to expect. As a matter of fact, the Congress had found it necessary to restore some of these cuts as regards the vital airpower buildup.

What about the nondefense programs and agencies of Government? The figures speak for themselves—from $19.6 billion in 1954 to $24.3 in 1956, a whopping 24-percent increase. Where is the promised retrenchment? And what is even more disappointing, the administration proposes to keep on increasing expenditures. Up-to-date estimates for fiscal 1957 are not yet available, but last January's budget guess of $65.9 billion—at the time itself a shocking $1.6 billion above the prior year—is far below the mark if judged by what happened in fiscal 1956 and the unending stream of new spending proposals coming to the Capitol these past months and weeks. Fiscal 1957 spending might go up several billion more. Actual spending in 1956 turned out to be exactly $4 billion more than estimated by the President when he first submitted his budget for that year. And this is on top of the $1.8 billion increase in 1956 over 1955. This, and the almost certain further increases in fiscal 1957, constitutes a deplorable reversal, a running start in the other direction—upward.

The first session of the 84th Congress cut appropriation requests by $2 billion, thereby preventing that much of a drain on the Treasury. Further cuts in appropriations during the present session, though not of the same magnitude for reasons given, will aid further in this respect.

As noted, there is another side to budget results—taxes. Individual income tax collections rose from $32.4 billion in fiscal 1954 to $35.3 billion in fiscal 1956. In contrast corporation income taxes, during the same period, dropped from $21.5 billion down to $21.3. The individual taxpayer is carrying the burden of these increased expenditures and he is the very one who so badly needs tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, these facts demonstrate beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the last 3 years have been anything but economy years. Objective appraisal of the record shows that the economy pledge of 1952 has not been kept and will not be kept.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, the size of the national debt is appalling. It is so huge as to defy comprehension. We are paying $7 billion a year just to carry it. But what is worse, it has consistently increased under the present administration despite

repeated, categorial promises to the contrary in the campaign of 1952. These administration pledges have been broken. And they cannot possibly be redeeemed in the few remaining months of the administration. In a speech at Providence, R. I., in October 1952, President Eisenhower said:

Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

The following facts conclusively show that bigger debts have been piled upon the American people during the present administration.

The public debt during 3 fiscal years of this administration

[In billions]

	Beginning of year
Fiscal 1954 (July 1953)	$266.1
Fiscal 1955 (July 1954)	271.3
Fiscal 1956 (July 1955)	274.4
Fiscal 1957 (July 1956)	272.7
Increase during 3 full fiscal years	+6.6

CONTRAST WITH PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, the $6.6 billion increase is in sharp contrast to the record of the previous administration under similar peacetime conditions. During 4 full peace years—that is, fiscal years in which there was no war operation—under the previous administration, the debt was reduced by $12 billions, as follows:

	Billions
June 1946	$269.4
June 1950	257.4
4-year decrease under previous administration	−12.0

Mr. Speaker, there is no real tangible hope for improvement—tax relief and debt reduction—under present administration policies because Government expenditures are increasing, not decreasing, as I shall point out in more particulars in a few moments.

The administration, 2 years running, asked that the old debt ceiling of $275 billion be raised to $281 billion. Again this year, the request was renewed, this time for $278 billion. I wonder how many people realize that in December 1955, the debt reached its highest point in history—the stupendous sum of $280.8 billions—and that this, in a year of peace, was $1.6 billion above the peak reached during World War II, the greatest war in all history?

Mr. Speaker, present expenditure trends of the administration arrestingly indicate that this limit may have to go on indefinitely. Certainly under those circumstances it would have to if long-needed tax relief is ever granted.

APPROPRIATION RECORD OF THE LAST 4 YEARS

Mr. Speaker, when the present administration took office President Truman had just submitted his budget for fiscal 1954. The war in Korea was still on and no one knew when it would be concluded. The present administration immediately began to revise that budget and send new recommendations to the 83d Congress. And they really revised it—downward, that is, to the tune of $12,029,351,862 during the first session. That was the dramatic big splash—the new broom sweeping clean. It amounted to almost a 20 percent cut below the budget of President Truman which was a wartime budget, not a peacetime budget. This is the budget the present administration delights in looking back to and continually deprecating. I want to come back to that in a moment, but first on the big first year cut of $12 billion plus. What items were cut? Over $8 billion was in the Department of Defense and about $5 billion of that was against the Air Force. Fiscal salvation was on the way, so it may have seemed. A $12 billion cut is truly an impressive sum—but of course two-thirds of it was against national security items.

The 2d session of the 83d Congress received estimates of $50,253,323,985, about $4.3 billion less than appropriations in the 1st session. Appropriations enacted by the 2d session of the 83d Congress totaled $47,642,131,205, a further reduction of $2,611,192,780 of which $1.4 billion was against Defense. Meanwhile, expenditures for nondefense items continued to increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, comes the reversal—another big splash, but this time in the other direction. Estimates submitted to the 1st session of the 84th Congress totaled $55,200,833,729—that's $7.5 billion above prior year appropriations. The Congress cut these requests by $2,076,012,514. What about the present or 2d session of the 84th Congress? Appropriation estimates received from the President come to a net figure of $61,143,478,538, or $8 billion above 1st session appropriations. And, Mr. Speaker, this does not reveal the whole story. When the final tabulations are made some weeks hence, I am certain they will show total obligation authorizations in all forms such as to fully justify the conclusion that no real administration economy-program exists.

The following tabulation substantiates the foregoing statements:

Estimates, appropriations, and reductions—last 4 years

[NOTE.—Grand totals except permanent appropriations and miscellaneous private acts]

Congress and session	Estimates	Law	Decrease (−)
83d Cong., 1st sess (calendar 1953)	$66, 568, 694, 353	$54, 539, 342, 491	−$12, 029, 351, 862
83d Cong., 2d sess. (calendar 1954)	50, 253, 323, 985	47, 642, 131, 205	−2, 611, 192, 780
84th Cong., 1st sess. (calendar 1955)	55, 200, 833, 729	53, 124, 821, 215	−2, 076, 012, 514
84th Cong., 2d sess. (calendar 1956)	61, 143, 478, 537	60, 573, 217, 590	−570, 260, 947

Mr. Speaker, as mentioned, the administration takes great delight in comparing present budgets with the last budget submitted by President Truman. Admittedly, that budget could have been cut just as any budget can be cut. But they never overlook an opportunity to make comparisons with it—favorable to themselves and of course unfavorable to the previous administration. The import of these comparisons is that succeding budgets have deleted from the 1954 budget the expenditures and items so severely called into question during the 1952 campaign—meaning, of course, the several nondefense departments and agencies. So I recently compared the new obligation authority—authority to contract and spend—requested by President Truman in the last budget to which such frequent comparison is made and President Eisenhower's budget of this past January on which we have now concluded action. The statistics follow, taken from table V, page A9, Budget for 1954, and table on page M–20, Budget for 1957:

New obligation authority requested for other than defense military functions and foreign aid—budgets for fiscal years 1954 and 1957

[In millions of dollars]

	President Truman's budget, 1954	President Eisenhower's budget, 1957	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Legislative branch	85	87	+2
The Judiciary	29	41	+12
Other Executive Office of the President, funds appropriated to President	8	20	+12
Independent offices (including GSA and HHFA)	[1] 8, 271	8, 495	+224
Department of Agriculture	1, 659	3, 150	+1, 491

[1] Excludes $404 million, AEC reappropriation, and $706 million RRB taxes, for comparability; includes $135 million for USIA.

New obligation authority requested for other than defense military functions and foreign aid—budgets for fiscal years 1954 and 1957—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	President Truman's budget, 1954	President Eisenhower's budget, 1957	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of Commerce	1, 078	1, 635	+557
Department of Defense, civil functions	688	665	−23
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1, 773	2, 654	+881
Department of the Interior	664	582	−82
Department of Justice	187	236	+49
Department of Labor	332	502	+170
Department of the Post Office	669	[2] 120	[3]−549
Department of State	[3] 197	239	+42
Department of Treasury	7, 101	7, 813	+712
District of Columbia	12	35	+23
Contingency reserve	50	250	+200
Total	22, 804	26, 524	+3, 720

[2] Reflects estimate of $350 million in revenue resultant from pending postal rate increase bill.

[3] Excludes $135 million for USIA transferred to independent offices.

One thing stands out. Of the 16 departments or groups on this table, all but 3 show that President Eisenhower requested more spending authority for 1957 than President Truman did for 1954. And in total, the 1957 request exceeded—I repeat, exceeded—the 1954 request by $3,720,000,000. When final tabulations are available, the difference will doubtless be much greater.

In the face of these facts—and every figure cited is documented—who, Mr. Speaker, can demonstrate that the present administration has kept, or shown any signs of trying to keep, its economy pledges?

Thirtieth Anniversary of Network Broadcasting by National Broadcasting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, we are approaching the 30th anniversary of network broadcasting by the National Broadcasting Co. The existence of network broadcasting has had a profound impact on our national culture. I should like to mark this occasion by having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement so printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Monday, November 15, 1926, the National Broadcasting Co. had its inaugural network program, linking, for the first time, 21 charter affiliated radio stations and 4 specially added outlets in cities all over the United States in a presentation of music, singing, and addresses. In that initial program there was set a standard which was designed to, and consistently has adhered to, the principle that only the finest is good enough for the American family. Among the well-remembered names of that first broadcast are those of the beloved Will Rogers, Walter Damrosch, the New York Symphony Orchestra, Mary Garden, the New York Oratorio Society, Edwin Franko Goldman, and many more.

Most important of all, it is well to remember that just 24 hours before this highly significant date, and within the life span of every one present in this Chamber, our great cities still were, in a manner of speaking, island communities. We were, in effect as far removed from each other as our inclination to travel the miles between.

Overnight, the inventive and organizational genius of men like Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff and the men who served with him, made the entire Nation next-door neighbors. In the simple flick of a switch, the amazing world of electronic science was to change the lives of an entire Nation. Mass communication, a notion we dreamed of with Jules Verne and H. G. Wells, was now a bewildering fact.

To comprehend the grandeur of a way of life which we accept without emotion, let us be reminded that it was a far different means of mass communiction which gave birth to America, one night 180 years ago when three citizens of our sister commonwealth, Massachusetts, rode through the night on horseback, to warn a few farmers in a few villages, that freedom was in danger.

Today, in microscopic segments of a second, 160 million Americans in 10,000 cities, towns and villages can be told what horse is winning the Kentucky Derby; can see and hear an atomic bomb bursting and can listen to pauper, prince or president at the very moment the events take place.

None of this was possible a comparatively few years ago.

Before and during World War I, the United States was almost entirely dependent upon foreign-owned cables and wireless facilities for contact with the rest of the world. Great Britain was the communication center of the world.

Suggestions from our own Navy Department inspired the formation of an American institution, which in December of 1919 became the Radio Corporation of America—parent of the National Broadcasting Company.

The early development stages of what was to come brought about the exciting occasions when individual radio stations transmitted spoken words and music—instead of the heretofore mystical dots and dashes of the telegraphic era.

Having once achieved reproduction of human sound, the engineering geniuses who brought the National Broadcasting Co. into being were not content until they could bring their achievements to the greater number for the greater good.

There were timorous tests and trials by which cities like New York, Boston, and Schenectady were joined in common communication.

Finally the momentous November night when music was for the millions.

As we look back even so short a span as 30 years, it is difficult to try to conceive life when there was no radio or television.

Eighty-fourth Congress Record in Behalf of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 821 bills were referred to our Committee on Agriculture in the 84th Congress, to set a new record. In fact, the number of bills dealing with Agriculture was almost twice the previous record of 423 introduced in the previous Congress.

Our committee, with its 19 subcommittees, held 289 hearings.

We reported 113 bills.

We disposed of virtually all of the 821 bills referred to us, approving the best, consolidating the good points of others, and rejecting or passing over others. Among those not reported were a number of good bills that require further study before the Congress can act upon them.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture of the 84th Congress has handled the greatest legislative workload ever undertaken in any Congress, in a dedicated and devoted effort to bring to our farm people a fair share of the Nation's prosperity that rightly should be theirs. Although a Presidential veto defeated our major efforts to raise farm prices, the accomplishments of this Congress are such that each Member who has joined in the battles for our farmers may justly feel proud.

This Congress has made a magnificent record, but the welfare and prosperity of our farm families are a constant challenge. Much yet must be done. I hope in the months ahead, in direct association with farmers in their own fields, in their homes, in the country stores, at the county fairs, all of us may receive a new guidance and inspiration from them, to continue their battles in the 85th Congress when it convenes in January.

Mr. Speaker, while for each of the 11 years—1942–52 inclusive—our farmers had received average prices at 100 percent of parity or better, by the beginning of 1955, when this Congress convened, these prices had fallen far below a full parity relationship with the rest of the economy and farm income continued in a downward and devastating spiral. The average of farm prices had dropped 22 percent below the level of February 1951. Net farm income in 1954 had dipped about 30 percent under the income of 1947. The parity ratio was at the lowest level since 1941. Farm operating costs remained near record highs, and farm debt was increasing. Farmers' purchasing power had declined to the lowest level since 1940.

Our Committee on Agriculture, which it is my honor and privilege to serve as chairman, immediately set to work, in January 1955, to stem this new recession in agriculture, with the firm and resolute purpose of putting our farmers and their families again on the road toward income parity with our nonfarm population.

The most apparent and the most effective action open to this Congress, for quick relief of the farm distress, was to undo the damage of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which required that flexible—lower—price supports should be applied to the major crops.

This Congress approved H. R. 12, calling for an end to the downward flexing of prices; but we were thwarted and defeated by a Presidential veto. The will of the Congress did not prevail, as the President exercised his constitutional powers to reject H. R. 12. This will mean a loss of many millions of dollars to our farm families this year and it is my judgment that the veto has delayed a recovery of the farm economy.

Mr. Speaker, our fight was not in vain. Notwithstanding the veto, the Members should feel great pride in the record of this Congress in its accomplishments for agriculture. Our fight for 90 percent of parity forced Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, to raise the low prices he had set for the 1956 crops. As example, the Secretary had announced the support for wheat at $1.81 a bushel—76 percent of parity. This price was raised to $2 a bushel, or 84 percent of parity. The corn support was increased from $1.40 a bushel to $1.50, rice from $4.04 per hundredweight, to $4.50. The dairy supports were increased. Supports for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum were lifted from 70 to 76 percent of parity. I believe our effort also brought about better supports for cotton and peanuts than Mr. Benson otherwise would have proclaimed.

This record of the 84th Congress bespeaks a deep interest in the people who till the soil.

The Congress established a $1,200,000,000 soil bank.

It enacted various legislation to protect the interests of small farmers and the rights of tenants and sharecroppers.

It improved the agricultural credit system, with special emphasis on the well-being of family-operated farms.

It improved the machinery for disposal of our farm products abroad.

It opened wider the doors of our warehouses to provide food for needy people in our own country.

It advanced research in agriculture.

It enacted legislation and appropriations to expand and improve rural electrical and telephone service.

It expanded the program to provide milk for millions of schoolchildren.

It improved and extended the Sugar Act, in a way to give our own cane and beet producers a larger share of the American sugar market.

It made great advances for the improvement and conservation of our soil and water resources.

It authorized the greatest appropriation of funds of any Congress in our history for agriculture.

It repealed the Federal tax on gasoline used in farming.

Mr. Speaker, through all our efforts you will find one purpose overshadowing all others—that is: To perpetuate and strengthen the family farm and the rural community economic and social order that is indispensable as a source of spiritual, social, and political vitality in our growing Nation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues here, and the farmers and, indeed, all the American people, that the fight for fair treatment of our farm families will go on. Of necessity, it must go on. The interests of all our citizens requires that this fight continue.

Following is a review of some of the important enactments of the 84th Congress relating to agriculture:

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—PUBLIC LAW 540

1. SOIL BANK

This act sets up a $1,200,000,000-a-year soil bank, in two parts:

(a) Acreage reserve: This program is designed to reduce acreages of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Payments to farmers are made to reduce their acreages of these crops below their acreage allotments, and these payments may be made as soon as the acreage is measured. Under this authority, the Department of Agriculture has set up 1956 rates of payment per acre, on a national average, as follows: Corn, $40.05; cotton, $45; wheat, $19.80; rice, $59.22; peanuts, $27; flue-cured tobacco, $255.42; and burley tobacco, $295.74. A maximum of $750 million a year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 years.

(b) Conservation reserve: This program is designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual national limit of $450 million.

Compulsory features, proposed in other soil-bank legislation, were not included in H. R. 12—vetoed—or in H. R. 10875 which became Public Law 540. Limit is placed on the amounts that can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds. Provision is made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers. Procedures are provided for appeal by producers whose soil-bank contracts have been canceled because of alleged violations.

The act directs that the soil bank be commenced with 1956 crops, with a clear congressional intent that the fact that some crops had been planted at the time of enactment is not to stand in the way of starting the program this year.

Many Members of Congress are disappointed with the manner in which this program is being administered. The Secretary has discriminated against those farmers who need the benefits of this program most: namely, those farmers whose crops have been ruined or damaged by drought or flood. It was the clear intent of the Congress to pay farmers who plowed up their crops on a basis of the average yield of the land, but the Secretary has adopted an "appraised" yield payment plan, knocking down the level of payment to take into account any weather or other natural damage to the crops on the land put into the acreage reserve. Thus, where the average yield base might mean a payment of $45 an acre in cotton the Secretary actually is paying as low as $6 under his improvised "appraised" yield. Similar trimming down of payments has occurred in wheat, corn, and other crops.

The major objective of the soil bank and other provisions of the act, relating to surplus disposal and to marketing quotas and acreage allotments, is the adjustment of production to market needs, reduction of the surpluses, conservation of soil and water, and the general improvement in farm income.

2. CORN

The act authorizes four different programs under which corn farmers may receive price supports in 1956, as follows:

(a) Producers in the commercial area who elect to comply with the acreage allotments previously announced by the Secretary—at the rate of approximately 43 million acres—are eligible for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—under that program, without putting land into the soil bank.

(b) For the operation of the soil bank the bill increases the corn acreage allotment for 1956 by 9 million acres to a total of 51 million acres. Corn producers in the commercial producing area may qualify for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—by planting within their allotment from the 51 million-acre base acreage, provided they put into the soil bank an amount of cropland equal to 15 percent of their base acreage of corn.

(c) Producers in the commercial corn area who do not comply with the regular acreage allotments previously announced nor with the base acreage setup for soil bank purposes will still be eligible for price supports, under the noncompliance program newly announced by the Secretary, at the rate of $1.25 per bushel—about 83 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area.

(d) Producers outside the commercial area will receive a support at 82½ percent of the level of the support for compliance corn in the commercial area—or about $1.24 a bushel.

(e) The Secretary is directed, not later than December 15, 1956, to conduct a referendum of producers in the commercial corn area to determine whether they favor the present acreage allotment and price support program or would prefer to do away with acreage allotments completely and then let the Secretary fix the corn price support at such a level as he determines "will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn." If two-thirds or more of producers voting approved the change, corn then would be removed from the list of basic crops for price support purposes, and the support level thenceforward would be at the discretion of the Secretary, as has been the case in the small feed grains and in other crops.

3. FEED GRAINS

The act sets the price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at 76 percent of the parity price for each commodity as of May 1, 1956. Thus, the 1956 supports are: Barley, $1.02 per bushel; oats, 65 cents per bushel; rye, $1.27 per bushel, and grain sorghums, $1.97 per hundredweight. These higher level supports thus supersede the 70 percent supports announced by the Secretary, which were 93 cents for barley, 59 cents for oats, $1.16 for rye, and $1.80 for grain sorghums.

4. COTTON

(a) A freeze of 1957 and 1958 national acreage allotments at no less than the 1956 allotment; (b) a provision that no State acreage allotment can be cut in 1957 and 1958 by more than 1 percent; (c) a special 100,000-acre national reserve is created to add to the allotments of small farmers; and (d) the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to sell Government cotton for export at the price necessary to regain America's traditional world market at around 5 million bales annually.

A program has been put into effect to make cash payments on the export of cotton textiles and cotton waste, to equalize the competitive position of our own cotton textile mills with foreign mills in the use of American cotton.

The act requires that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause them to compete on equal terms in the market.

Solution of our market problems, particularly in cotton textiles, will be substantially assisted by authority clearly given the President in this act to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

5. RICE

The act provides that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 shall not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955; and that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than the final national allotment for 1956, and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment. The act provides a certificate program for rice, at the discretion of the Secretary. The certificate program will not be substituted for the present program unless the Secretary determines and proclaims that the initiation of the problem is "administratively feasible and in the

best interests of rice producers in the United States."

6. TRANSITIONAL PARITY

The act freezes transitional parity for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts—the only 3 basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula—will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they otherwise would have been. The bill also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, and to include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out this recommendation.

7. GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

The President is directed to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

8. SECTION 32 EXPANSION

Appropriation of an additional $500 million annually is authorized for section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities. The section 32 program previously has operated on funds derived from an allocation of 30 percent of duties collected under the customs laws, amounting to approximately $200 million annually. The authorization of a $500-million appropriation, in addition to the amount available from a share of the customs collections, will bring to about $700 million annually the funds available for this program which acts as a substantial price stabilization mechanism for various crops, as well as serving the needs of the school lunch program, making food available for low-income persons and generally aiding in the disposal of surpluses.

9. FORESTRY

The act authorizes broad expansion of cooperative activity between the Federal Government and the States in reforestation. Upon presentation by the proper State official the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to approve a plan for tree planting within the State and thereafter to cooperate technically and financially in such program. With respect to parts of the program carried out on non-Federal lands, the Federal financial contribution cannot exceed that of the State toward the same program. The secretary is directed to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the appropriate State forester in approving and carrying out such plans.

10. OTHER IMPORTANT PROVISIONS

The act embraces various improvements in the disposal of surplus commodities and other significant provisions.

To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to process food commodities, such as grain, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the State and the Federal Government to devote food commodities to certain penal institutions.

To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and to step up disposal under title II of Public Law 480 from $300 million to $500 million.

The act authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

Provision is made for the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem, the Secretary is directed to make a study of proposals for disposing food domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan; he is directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter; he is directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency; he is directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long-staple cotton specifically.

An attack is made upon the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by again placing extra long staple cotton, now exempt from quotas, within the quota set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

In order to encourage further the underplanting of acreage allotments, the act authorizes a producer, for the first time, to plant only a part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This could eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

To make present production adjustment laws more effective, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

GREAT PLAINS

H. R. 11833—on President's desk—the Great Plains Conservation bill—proposes a broad program, in cooperation with farmers, to restore and conserve cultivated and grazing lands of a wide area in the 10 Great Plains States that often are ravaged by high winds and dry weather. A $150 million program, over a 10-year period, is provided in the legislation. The bill rounds out and makes available a sounder and more workable approach to Federal cost-sharing in meeting the conservation problems on individual farms and ranches of the Great Plains. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce a conservation program for that area and to enter into 10-year contracts with farm and ranch operators to terminate not later than December 31, 1971. The program differs from the soil bank program in that it is aimed at obtaining a shift in land use rather than a reduction in production. It is designed to encourage a permanent shift in land use in the Great Plains, taking into consideration the conditions which are peculiar to that area.

CONSERVATION

The Great Plains program was one of a series of major enactments for the conservation of soil and water resources, in addition to the soil bank law.

Public Law 756 extends for 2 years the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP).

H. R. 8750—on President's desk—broadens the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to include all aspects of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water—not just the "agricultural phases" of these activities as provided in the present act. This means that such things as municipal and industrial water supplies may be included as part of a watershed program. The bill permits the building of dams with a capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet, up to 25,000 feet, if the capacity in excess of that figure is for purposes other than flood prevention and the construction cost of such excess capacity is borne entirely by the local cooperating organizations. It provides that the local organizations shall not be required to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention. Local organizations and individuals will continue to be required to provide rights-of-way, easements, etc., for such structural measures and to carry out necessary land-treatment measures. It eliminates delay in the handling of small projects by providing that only projects involving a Federal contribution of more than $250,000, or a structure of more than 2,500 acre-feet need be submitted separately to Congress through the President, but requires all projects submitted to Congress to be approved by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate. It provides for long-term loans at the Government rate of interest to local organizations for the purpose of financing their share of the cost of programs, and it extends the provisions of the act to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The 45 day "waiting time" had already been reduced to 15 days in Public Law 734, and is eliminated altogether in H. R. 8750.

Public Law 483 provides that in establishing the national standards for the Agricultural Conservation Program, the Secretary of Agriculture will have the authority, if he chooses to exercise it, of applying water conservation measures as ACP practices in any State. This act struck out the words "in arid or semiarid sections" which previously had limited the area of operation of this program as it relates to water conservation measures.

Public Law 473 enacted into permanent legislation authority which has been contained in the most recent several appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture and which has been exercised, pursuant to those acts, by the Forest Service. The act consists essentially of authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to advance Federal funds in the furtherance of cooperative research projects.

IMPROVED CREDIT

Congress took special note of the need for improved and expanded credit services, especially for family unit farms, in view of the current hard-pressed situation in agriculture.

H. R. 11544—on President's desk—(a) authorizes the refinancing of existing indebtedness of eligible farmers if the borrowers are "presently unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance such debts with commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible credit sources at rates and terms which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill"; the bill authorizes the Farmers Home Administration to accept a second mortgage for either direct or indirect loans for this purpose; (b) authorizes FHA to make loans, for the first time, to part-time farmers; loans authorized include those for real estate improvement and development and loans for operating expenses; to be eligible a borrower would have to be a bona fide farmer who historically depended on agriculture for his livelihood and who is conducting a substantial farming operation; such loans may also be made for refinancing of such a farm unit; (c) the bill extends from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the authority to make economic emergency loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress, and increases from $15 million to $65 million the amount from the loan revolving fund which may be used for such loans; (d) increases from $7,000 to $10,000 the maximum amount of a loan for operating purposes, with the special provision that not more than 10 percent of the funds available in any 1 year may be used for loans up to $20,000; (e) authorizes the Secretary to extend up to 10 years the repayment period of regular operative loans to farmers in cases of special hardship; (f) a special provision for real estate loans up to $15,000 for the improvement or replacement of tenant houses on farms having not more than three families. Not included in the bill, because existing law contains the general authority, but in the House committee report is a statement of policy favoring the making of emergency replanting loans to orchardists whose orchards have been destroyed by natural disasters with a deferred repayment schedule geared to the time required to obtain a crop from the replanted trees.

H. R. 10285—On President's desk—increases farmer ownership and control of the farm credit system and promotes its efficiency and growth. The bill embraces a congressional policy to (a) provide agriculture with a sound, dependable source of credit; (b) combine the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations in order to increase the efficiency of operation and facilitate the retirement of Government capital; (c) encourage and promote the continued growth and development of the production credit associations as self-supporting cooperative lending institutions operating on a sound credit basis with maximum local authority to determine credit needs and loan policies consistent with the maintenance of a national production credit system; and (d) continue to provide other financing institutions making loans to farmers and ranchers with the right to borrow from and rediscount with the combined entity on a basis comparable with the production credit associations.

SUGAR

Public Law 545 (H. R. 7030) reenacts and extends for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with further amendments to, first, give domestic cane and sugar-beet producers a fair share of the growth of the United States sugar market; second, bring about a more equitable participation by foreign suppliers in this market; and third, maintain stability of sugar supplies and prices in the United States.

The Sugar Act is one of the most successful of our farm programs, in terms of benefits to producers and dependable supplies at stabilized prices for consumers. Sugar consumption continues to soar under this program. The United States now consumes over 8,500,000 tons of the approximately 40 million tons annual world production, and the consumption is increasing by more than 135,000 tons a year.

This is because the Sugar Act maintains a fair price to housewives, while giving a fair return to producers.

Public Law 545 provides that domestic producers may supply 55 percent of the growth in the American market, in addition to the approximately 4,500,000 tons annually already allotted to them.

This participation by the United States sugar producers in the future market growth restores to them the status they had under sugar-quota legislation prior to World War II. In the Sugar Act of 1948, quotas for the domestic areas were limited to fixed quantities, with all the growth of our market going to foreign suppliers, 96 percent to Cuba. This was done to assist Cuba in making the transition from wartime to peacetime conditions, since Cuba's production has been greatly expanded to meet America's wartime needs. However, it was recognized at the time that the change was of temporary nature and that at the appropriate time the domestic areas should resume participation in market growth.

Cuba, under Public Law 545, retains its status as our largest foreign supplier. The actual tonnage which Cuba will market in the United States is expected to increase from year to year because of her participation in our market growth. Additional quotas granted to other foreign suppliers, as provided in this act, are in line with our national policy of broadening our trade relations.

It should be emphasized here that the sugar program, supported by a small excise on sugar, actually has shown a profit of about $312 million since it became effective in 1937, and American housewives, under this program, pay less for sugar than is the case in many other areas of the world.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Public Law 465: This act, first, extended the special school milk program 2 years to June 30, 1958, increased the amount authorized for it from $50 million annually to $60 million annually for the current fiscal year and to $75 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, and made certain nonprofit institutions devoted to the care of underprivileged children eligible for the benefits of the program; second, extended the accelerated brucellosis program 2 years to June 30, 1958, and increased the amount authorized for it from $15 million annually to $17 million for the current fiscal year and to $20 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years; and third, extended the veterans and Armed Forces milk program 2 years to December 31, 1958.

Public Law 752 makes the benefits of the school-milk program available to most summer camps, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and similar institutions which are operated on a nonprofit basis, removing the previous qualification that limited this phase of the milk program to those nonprofit institutions serving underprivileged children on a special welfare or charitable basis.

PERISHABLE COMMODITIES

H. R. 5337—on President's desk—would, without broadening the scope or original intent of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, as amended, correct certain deficiencies which have become apparent in the administration of the act, thereby lending greater strength and more effectiveness to the basic legislation. The bill would accomplish this end by (a) strengthening the provisions relating to misbranding or misrepresentation of grade and origin of fresh fruits and vegetables; (b) increasing the maximum annual license fee from the present $15 per year to $25; (c) permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to deny issuance of a license to any person convicted of a felony in any State or Federal court; (d) authorizing the Secretary to deny a license to any applicant who has been involved in bankruptcy proceedings within 3 years unless the applicant furnishes a bond or other assurance satisfactory to the Secretary; (e) empowering the Secretary to suspend the license of a person who employs in any responsible position an individual whose license is under suspension; and (f) providing authority for the inspection of any perishable commodity covered by the act.

TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

H. R. 11708 amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480. This is the law which authorizes the sale of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies, where such sales are in addition to the usual purchases of such commodity by the foreign country. H. R. 11708 increases from $1,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 the total amount of the foreign currency transactions which may be carried out under the law. It also authorizes broadening of the use of the foreign currencies in Public Law 480 operations to include assistance to American schools in countries where such currencies are available. The bill exempts sales of fruit and the products thereof under

title I of Public Law 480 from the requirements of the cargo preference laws. It also broadens the provisions of title II of the act to permit donations of food to refugees and similar cases of extraordinary need.

TOBACCO

Public Law 425 adjusted the burley tobacco allotment for 1956 upward, to conform with acreage justified by accurate data on 1955 production which was not available when the original allotment for 1956 was determined. The effect of Public Law 425 was to make most farm allotments the same as they were in 1955.

Public Law 427, House Joint Resolution 521, readjusts the acreage allotment of Maryland tobacco to conform with acreage justified by data on production of the previous year not available when the original allotment for 1956 was determined. The effect of this act was to eliminate an acreage reduction of approximately 15 percent for 1956.

Public Law 426, House Joint Resolution 518, adjusts upward the acreage allotments of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco to conform with acreage justified by data on production of the previous year which was not available when the original allotments for 1956 were determined.

Public Law 609, H. R. 9475: This act changed the statutory deadline from December 1 to the following February 1, for the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture of tobacco marketing quotas with respect to all kinds of tobacco except flue-cured. The law had required that the Secretary make the announcement of tobacco marketing quotas not later than December 1 of the year preceding the year for which such quotas are established. On December 1 most kinds of tobacco have not yet been marketed. Therefore, instead of the accurate measurement of the quantity of tobacco produced during the current year which the Secretary possesses as soon as the current crop has passed through the markets, he has on December 1 only the estimates made as of November 1. In a number of recent years these estimates have varied sufficiently from actual outturn of crops to have created a situation where the marketing quota announced by the Secretary was substantially different from the quota he would have determined had the actual weight of the crop been known to him. Under Public Law 609, the Secretary now may make the quota announcements at any time prior to February 1 and it is presumed that he will do so with respect to the various types of tobacco at such time as sufficient production and other data are available.

Prior to this enactment, this Congress had approved separate bills to adjust allotments to conform to data that was not available when the allotments were announced—a condition that may be avoided in the future by the use of the authority in Public Law 609.

The Congress, by unanimous votes of the House and Senate, approved House Joint Resolution 317 designating November 16–22 this year as National Farm-City Week, with the purpose of promoting better understanding between farm and city people. The resolution requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the Department of Agriculture, the Land-Grant Colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service and all other appropriate agencies and officials of Government, to cooperate with farm organizations and other groups in programs observing this Farm-City Week, including plans for public meetings, discussion, exhibits, pageants and press, radio and television features.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress, in its two sessions, has approved appropriations and loan authorizations aggregating $3,908,818,000 for the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the actions restoring the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The previous Congress authorized $2,778,400,000 for the Department.

Liberal appropriations and authorizations were approved for conservation, education, research, school lunch, and all the various action programs.

A compilation of the House Committee on Appropriations figures shows specific appropriations and authorizations of the 84th Congress and the comparative figures for the previous Congress as follows: Research, 84th, $179,044,000; 83d, $129,600,000. REA electric and telephone facilities, 84th, $549 million; 83d, $420 million. Farmers Home Administration loan authorizations, 84th, $367,500,000; 83d, $330 million. Extension Service, 84th, $101,175,000; 83d, $78,800,000. Soil Conservation Service and watershed and flood prevention, 84th, $182,268,000; 83d, $145,011,000. School lunch, 84th, $183,235,000; 83d, $166,601,000.

OTHER ENACTMENTS

Public Law 431: This act made possible the planting in 1956 of an expanded acreage of durum wheat in counties known to be capable of producing this wheat, in order to alleviate the serious shortage of this particular type of wheat, which is preferred in the manufacture of macaroni.

Public Law 607 first, increased by 15,000 acres the lands within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest which may be acquired under the act of June 22, 1948; second, increased to $2,500,000 (from $500,000) the amount authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of lands under such act; and third, made section 5 of such act applicable to the additional lands described by the bill of June 30. Section 5 provides for payment to the State of Minnesota of amounts based on the appraised value of national-forest lands in the roadless area rather than forest receipts, as provided by title 16, United States Code, section 500.

Bills approved by the Congress and awaiting the action of the President include:

S. 1400, to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act.

S. 1915, to provide for the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions.

S. 2216, relating to occupancy of national forest lands.

S. 3032, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

H. R. 11682, Department of Agriculture Organic Act, providing primarily for permanent authorizing legislation for many activities heretofore authorized by appropriation acts.

Several other measures of local interest were handled by our committee which have become law or which are awaiting action by the President.

Mr. Speaker, the recession in agriculture is reflected particularly in the volume of inquiries coming to Members of Congress and the House Committee on Agriculture, concerning farm legislation. I hope the foregoing summary of important actions in the 2d session of the 84th Congress will assist in furnishing factual information about our work. Those who may be interested in reviewing all the farm major legislation passed during this Congress should refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 10, part 10, pages 13267–13270, of August 25, 1955, where I presented a summary of enactments relating to agriculture during the first session of this Congress.

Swiss Watch Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1956, I introduced H. R. 11437, a bill to impose a tax on the processing of certain watch movements. This bill was introduced at the urgent request of the Department of the Treasury because of a rapidly developing problem with regard to the importation of Swiss watches. It has become apparent that, under the provisions of the existing tariff law, there are opportunities by which foreign producers can avoid the clear intent of Congress with regard to the protection of the domestic watch industry.

The Committee on Ways and Means considered this problem in the last session of this Congress and, after full public hearings, reported a bill favorably to the House designed to close this loophole in the tariff structure. No action was taken by the House last session on this bill. As I have indicated, the matter was again brought to our attention in this session, and I responded by the introduction of the bill in question. I believe that it is highly regrettable that the Committee on Ways and Means has failed completely to consider this pressing problem. It is now obvious that no action will be taken prior to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it absolutely clear that in the next session of the Congress I shall press for early consideration of this matter by the Committee on Ways and Means. Our na-

tional security requires that the matter be no longer delayed.

I include at this point a letter, dated July 27, 1956, from the Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and another letter, under the same date, from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to myself.

JULY 27, 1956.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in reference to H. R. 11436 and H. R. 11437, identical bills imposing a processing tax on certain watch movements which were introduced by Mr. MILLS and Mr. REED, respectively, at the second session of the 84th Congress, and referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The purpose of this legislation, which is supported by the Treasury Department and other interested agencies in the executive branch, is to correct a recently developed deficiency in the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relating to watch movements.

We understand that you and a number of other members of your committee felt that adequate consideration of the bills would require public hearings and extensive consideration by the committee.

As you know, the Treasury Department and other interested executive agencies believe this deficiency which presently exists in the tariff law is a quite serious one and can be satisfactorily corrected only through legislation.

Now that Congress is about to adjourn, it will, of course, not be possible for this matter to be rectified before next year. However, we plan to propose legislation early in the next session of Congress when there will be ample time to give it thorough consideration. I hope that this can take place as shortly after the Congress convenes as you find it practicable.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

JULY 27, 1956.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: Because of your very real interest and help in the introduction of the bills imposing a processing tax on certain watch movements and designed to avoid and correct a recently developed deficiency in the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relating to watch movements, I am sending you a copy of a letter which the Secretary of the Treasury has sent today to Chairman COOPER.

There is no question but what in the tremendous press of business in the closing weeks of this session it is apparently not feasible for public hearings which have been thought by the Ways and Means Committee to be necessary to be held.

At the same time, as Secretary Humphrey points out to Chairman COOPER, the Treasury feels very deeply about the innate fairness and necessity of this legislation and thinks it only fair to give public notice that we will renew our request for consideration of the legislation at the earliest possible moment after the new Congress convenes in January.

Again, the very real thanks of the Treasury Department for your help and consideration in this entire matter.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID W. KENDALL,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

This Is the Real America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "This Is the Real America," written by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and published in the Family Weekly magazine for July 1, 1956. It deals with the elements which make America great.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE REAL AMERICA

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota)

What is America? Ask a hundred Americans, and you will receive a hundred answers. Admittedly, we live in a land of vast resources and mass-production skills. Yet, they who think we are just a combination of skyscrapers, shiny automobiles, television sets, and mechanized kitchens miss the real America.

America is not just efficiency and bigness. America is people—people of many walks of life, prizing varied achievements, but sharing a common regard for the dignity of each other and inspired by infinite hope.

America is a people at work, producing coal and steel, building houses and highways, selling goods and services.

America is more an array of small-town Main Streets than it is glittering Broadways.

America, deep underneath, is the stability and character and willingness to work exemplified by the men and women on hundreds of thousands of American family farms. It is the tradition of family living, church on Sunday, the family picnic, the respect for hard work. It is this that runs through the whole fabric of American life, whether small town or big city.

America is people working together in a thousand voluntary organizations—planning parks, building clean playgrounds and beaches, organizing scouting groups, improving neighborhoods and towns and cities, raising funds for medical research. It is men and women in laboratories and in sickrooms and hospital operating rooms, fighting the daily struggle against pain and fear and death.

America is opportunity, where a man's station in life is what he makes it and not what his birth might indicate. America is where men and women can openly join in organized labor to protect their livelihood and their health and their families; it is where other men and women risk their fortunes and devote their energies and dedication to keeping American industry progressive and dynamic, so that our economy may continue to expand.

America is the excitement of youth, heedless of the cynic and the pessimist, an impatience for fulfillment of even greater promise for each generation.

America is the exemplification of mass acceptance of each individual's human dignity as an inherent right; America is the conscience that pushes us and those with whom we associate in the world toward greater justice for all men, no matter what their creed or color. It is the compassion that sends our hand out to the aged and the sick, to the homeless and the starving, at home and around the world.

America is abhorrence of war and violence and oppression in any form—yet a zeal to uphold moral rights and human freedoms so strong we are willing to fight to preserve them, whatever the personal sacrifice.

America is strength and power from spiritual and moral principles upon which our Nation was founded, with our strength ebbing and flowing as we cling to or neglect those spiritual and moral principles.

It is this indomitable spirit of America that I believe in—the real America. It is to maintain this kind of an America, based upon justice for all, compassion for all, tolerance for all, and respect for all, whether we agree or disagree with their views; it is to this vision of America which I hold dear in my heart that I have dedicated my life and whatever talents God may have given me.

My 1956 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have made it a practice to distribute widely among my constituents a questionnaire on the topics of the day. The replies to my 1956 questionnaire have now been tallied and I ask unanimous consent to insert the results in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Do you favor:

1. Continued foreign aid for non-Communist nations? Yes, 59 percent; no, 30 percent; undecided, 11 percent.
2. Enforcing Supreme Court antisegregation decision? Yes, 42 percent; no, 21 percent; undecided, 37 percent.
3. Raising postal rates to cover deficits? Yes, 67 percent; no, 24 percent; undecided, 9 percent.
4. Federal aid for local school construction? Yes, 71 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 10 percent.
5. United States veto of Red China admission to the U. N.? Yes, 93 percent; no, 4 percent; undecided, 3 percent.
6. Making political campaign contributions tax-deductible? Yes, 41 percent; no, 30 percent; undecided, 29 percent.
7. Pensions for all World War I veterans? Yes, 36 percent; no, 34 percent; undecided, 30 percent.
8. A ceiling of 35 percent on income taxes? Yes, 56 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 25 percent.
9. Defending the independence of Israel? Yes, 36 percent; no, 38 percent; undecided, 26 percent.
10. An international organization to handle tariffs? Yes, 29 percent; no, 31 percent, undecided, 40 percent.
11. My efforts to:
    - Reclaim the Jersey meadows? Yes, 94 percent; no, 2 percent; undecided, 4 percent.
    - End Government competition with private enterprise? Yes, 78 percent; no, 12 percent; undecided, 10 percent.
    - Provide Federal scientific scholarships? Yes, 67 percent; no, 21 percent; undecided, 12 percent.
    - Stop employment discrimination due to age? Yes, 88 percent; no, 6 percent; undecided, 6 percent.
12. The overall record of the Eisenhower administration? Yes, 79 percent; no, 13 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

TVA Power System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters and a statement concerning the TVA power system, the latter being an analysis of Senate bill 3964 and its effects on the TVA power system, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 20, 1956.

The Honorable ALBERT GORE,
The United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: Your letter of July 11, 1956, refers to the fact that TVA has not yet submitted a report to the Senate Public Works Committee on S. 3964, a bill introduced by Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and requests that I advise you of the views of the TVA Board of Directors or of a majority of the Board.

We regret the delay in submitting a formal report on S. 3964 to the Senate Public Works Committee which has resulted from efforts to reconcile differences of opinion within the Board. We expect within the next few days, however, to transmit a report to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance.

In the meantime, responding to your request, there is enclosed a statement which summarizes my views on S. 3964. I have discussed this statement with the other members of the Board and am authorized by Dr. Curtis to say that he agrees with it. General Vogel wishes me to advise you that it does not reflect his position.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND R. PATY,
Director.

JULY 26, 1956.

Dr. RAYMOND R. PATY,
Director, Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR DR. PATY: I thank you for your letter of July 20 and for your analysis of Senate bill 3964, which analysis, I understand from your letter, is concurred in by your fellow Board member, Dr. Harry A. Curtis.

This analysis of S. 3964 by a majority of the TVA Board of Directors confirms my own prior analysis of the bill as being unworkable and antagonistic to the TVA.

It is my view that the Senate Public Works Committee will not favorably report this bill or report one even similar in objective and effect. Enactment of Senate bill 3964 would be very damaging to TVA.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

ANALYSIS OF S. 3964 AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE TVA POWER SYSTEM

S. 3964 would authorize TVA to issue bonds for the purpose of financing additions to its power system. However, the authorization would be subject to such limitations and surrounded by such restrictions that the bill could not provide a basis for successful financing and operation of the system.

The principal features of the bill and resultant problems which it would raise are as follows:

1. The bill provides for issuance of bonds up to a total of $200 million outstanding at any one time. This amount is sufficient to finance only about a million kilowatts of generation and transmission capacity. The normal load growth on the TVA system, exclusive of the growth in Federal loads, will be on the order of 150,000 kilowatts a year. The authorization for $200 million of bonds would thus take care of less than 2 years' load growth, and would provide no assurance to the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley area that their long-term requirements for additional power capacity could be met.

2. The authorization for the limited amount of bonds provided under the bill would be accompanied by imposition of extraordinary and unwarranted financial burdens. Specifically, S. 3964 would require that TVA pay a return on the appropriation investment in TVA's power facilities equal to the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its outstanding marketable public obligations, while at the same time leaving in effect the existing requirement contained in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act 1948, that TVA repay this appropriation investment over a 40-year period. The double requirement of a return on the Treasury's investment and a repayment of that investment would have a number of effects:

(a) It would drain off so much of TVA's net power revenues and leave so little coverage for debt service on revenue bonds as to make infeasible the issuance of such bonds on a reasonable basis. As a result, unduly high interest costs would be incurred and the net income to the Government as owner of the business would be reduced.

(b) It would render impossible the use of any substantial portion of TVA's earnings to supplement bond proceeds as a means of financing additions to the system.

(c) This in turn would insure that the $200-million bond ceiling provided under the bill would be reached very quickly.

(d) The Government, as owner of the system, would be withdrawing its equity investment in the business during periods when it was necessary to sell bonds to private investors to finance system expansion. This would represent basically unsound financing, which in the case of a private utility would not be permitted.

3. Under the bill, bonds and revenues, even in the limited amounts authorized or available, could not be used until after affirmative approval by Congress in acting on a budget request. The bill specifically provides in this regard that no bonds shall be sold nor bond proceeds used except for purposes "approved by the Congress in connection with its consideration of the Corporation's budget programs transmitted by the President pursuant to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended." The bill would leave in effect the third paragraph of title II of the 1948 Appropriation Act, which prohibits TVA's use of power revenues for construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress. And it would extend this prohibition to include power-producing units and installations, as well as projects, thus making it applicable to additional units at existing plants.

Congress has recognized from the beginning that TVA was engaged in business-type operations which could not be conducted successfully without confiding to management the responsibility for decisions on business matters. Congressional control has been exercised by prescribing the policies which TVA shall follow and by holding the management of TVA responsible for the results of the decisions made in carrying out those policies. In accordance with this pattern, TVA has been accorded a wide discretion to use the proceeds of its power business in carrying on that business under the policies laid down by Congress. Under the provisions of S. 3964, however, issuance of any of the $200 million of bonds permitted under the bill to finance a proposed addition to the TVA power system would be dependent on the same budgetary and congressional approval process which would apply in the case of an appropriation; and the same process would also become applicable with respect to a proposed use of revenues to initiate construction of additional generating units at existing plants. The requirement of express congressional approval would place the initial point of decision on TVA bond issues and the use of TVA revenues for new construction in the Bureau of the Budget, through which the TVA budget is submitted to the Congress. If TVA's recommendations were disapproved by the Bureau, they would not come to the attention of Congress unless Congress should ask for them.

The result of adoption of the proposal in S. 3964 to require express congressional approval of the use of bond and revenue proceeds for new construction would be to deprive TVA, when it was obtaining funds for construction primarily from such sources, of even the measure of financial flexibility which Congress has considered desirable for TVA while it was obtaining such funds primarily from appropriations. The region TVA serves could have no assurance that its power needs would be met under such a situation.

4. S. 3964 does not authorize use of bond proceeds in connection with the lease, lease-purchase or contracts for the power output of a power facility financed by State or local interests. The cost of a lease would be an operating expense payable solely out of revenues received from electric consumers in the valley. In the case of lease-purchase, the costs would not only be paid by the consumers of the valley, but the title would eventually rest in the Federal Government. It would seem to be sound policy to provide for the possible participation of State and local interests in raising the capital required for TVA power expansion if they are ready and able to do so and if the circumstances make it necessary or advisable to raise capital in this way.

5. S. 3964 makes issuance of bonds by TVA subject to sections 302 and 303 of the Government Corporation Control Act. These sections would give the Secretary of the Treasury complete authority over issuance of TVA bonds, and over deposit and investment of TVA bond proceeds and other funds. The Secretary would become, in effect, the final judge as to all details of TVA financing. While his advice might be helpful, control should not rest with him since he carries no responsibility for the success or failure of TVA operations. Moreover, revenue bonds such as TVA would issue, unlike obligations of the Treasury, are issued pursuant to and incorporate by reference long and complicated bond contracts, which contain many covenants affecting the business operations of the borrower. Power in the Secretary of the Treasury to approve or veto the contents of TVA bonds would thus deprive the TVA Board of control over decisions affecting TVA's actual administration. Such Treasury control is inappropriate in the case of revenue bonds because they are not issued on the credit of the United States and would have no impact on Treasury operations. The Treasury does not now exercise such control with respect to bonds issued solely on the basis of the revenues of the issuing agency.

6. S. 3964 contains a provision prohibiting extension of the TVA power service area beyond the boundaries existing on May 1, 1956, or supplying of power by TVA to purchasers outside such area except pursuant to authority hereafter granted by law. The TVA power service area has undergone only a few minor changes since 1945. TVA has no desire to expand this area and has on numerous occasions declined applications for service outside the area. However, the question of fringe adjustments along the border

of existing areas will almost inevitably arise from time to time. For example, cases have occurred, and are likely to occur in the future, where an electric cooperative to which TVA supplies power wishes to adjust its service area by exchanging facilities and customers with an adjoining distribution agency, public or private. Again, TVA may be asked to serve a cooperative or small community located outside the limits of TVA's present service area but in the shadow of one of TVA's dams or of a Corps of Engineers dam on the Cumberland River, the output of which is marketed through the TVA system. Under S. 3964, TVA would be prohibited from supplying such a cooperative or community until legislative approval was first obtained.

7. Under S. 3964, TVA bond and power proceeds would be subject to apportionment under the provisions of R. S. 3679. Under the apportionment procedure the Bureau of the Budget could schedule TVA expenditures by months, quarters, operating periods, or other time periods as it saw fit. The primary purpose of the apportionment procedure is to prevent anticipation of appropriations. As applied to funds derived from revenues or the sale of revenue bonds it does not serve this purpose at all, but only transfers to another agency final authority over the amounts and rates of expenditure of funds which have already been raised by borrowing or are derived from revenues.

8. Under S. 3964, the proceeds of bonds issued by TVA would be included in the computations of budget receipts, expenditures, surpluses, or deficits, except for amounts budgeted for payment by TVA to the Treasury. The result would be to treat the borrowings on revenue bonds as though they added to budget deficits or diminished budget surpluses, although this would not be the case since the Treasury would have no obligation to pay the principal of or interest on the bonds.

Man of the Year in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each year the editors of Dixie Business Magazine conduct a poll to elect the "Man of the Year" in the South. This was begun in 1946 and has continued since that time. Recipients of this award represent a cross section of the highest type leadership in the South from many varied fields including industry, business, law and the clergy.

It is fitting and proper that the official ballot for 1956 should include the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, Senator GEORGE.

Senator GEORGE was elected to the United States Senate in 1922. During the course of the 34 years in which he has served in that great deliberative body he has received many honors both in and out of the Senate. He has served as chairman of 2 of the most responsible committees in the Senate, the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Now in the twilight of his long and distinguished senatorial career he has been named to the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" by the editors of Dixie Business Magazine. Limited to 200 living men and women, the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" is an institution which recognizes eminent southerners for achievement in their chosen field. It gives well-deserved recognition to those men and women whose outstanding contributions to their profession, to their community and to the South has left its indelible mark.

Senator GEORGE is a worthy addition to this group. He succeeds the late Honorable Alben Barkley to this honored position and joins that group of men whose deeds posterity will measure to determine the success or failure of this generation. His demonstrated ability and his recognized professional and personal integrity merits this recognition.

Need for Support of the Partridge Schools for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions, most recently on May 7, I have pointed out the vital challenge facing our country in meeting the needs of the mentally retarded. The group numbers some 4¾ million Americans.

There is no group among them more deservant of our interest than the 1½ million youngsters who are mentally retarded.

Each of these children is precious to us.

Each child's whole life stretches before it. It is a life which can be an agony of despair and futility and neglect or a life in which the child can achieve as much of his or her birthright as is humanly possible.

Here, then, is a vast group of children with a problem—or whole series of problems—which challenge the science, the humanity, the devotion of all of the rest of our Nation.

Here is a group of children whom we can, by apathy, simply leave on the "scrap heap" of society—neglected, forgotten, untended, or whom by constructive work, we can help develop to the limit of their potentialities as fine, useful citizens.

MIRACLES IN PIONEERING

Fortunately, a number of outstanding individuals and groups in our country have achieved what almost seem to be miracles in pioneering in new methods, in helping mentally retarded children.

I am pleased to say that my own State of Wisconsin is in the forefront of this activity, as indicated by remarks which I have previously made in the Senate.

A LIVING MEMORIAL TO A GREAT MAN

It is a source of gratification to those of us in our Nation's Capital who are interested in this subject that nearby—just 35 miles away—in Gainesville, Va., is another outstanding pioneering project—the Partridge Schools.

The schools are run by the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, a splendid nonprofit, nonendowed organization. It was and is designed to meet the growing nationwide need for residential centers for mentally and emotionally handicapped children.

The Partridge Schools are a living memorial to a great American who devoted a half century of effective endeavor to the study and treatment of mental and personality disorders.

FINE WORK OF MRS. SPECK

It is the good fortune of the foundation to have as its director, his daughter, Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, a clinical psychologist. Mrs. Speck was educated at Boston, Yale and Johns Hopkins Universities. She is a former fellow in research at Training School at Vineland, N. J., research assistant at Yale Psychological Clinic—now the Gesell Institute. She has had broad experience in mental hygiene clinics, as consultant for juvenile courts, and organizer of special classes for retarded children in public and private schools.

BROAD SERVICE AT LOW COST

The Partridge Schools help the disabled child. They help the parent. They help the community.

For the child, the schools mean the blessings of test and treatment tailored to meet individual needs, clinical services at leading medical centers in and near the Nation's Capital, self-reliance and group training for citizenship, speech, occupational and play therapy, academic classes daily except weekends, vocational training-homemaking, handicraft, sheltered workshop projects in furniture restoration, carpentry, and so forth; dairy, poultry, truck gardening, and other farm work; recreation games, music, dancing, TV, parties, field trips.

All these and other services are provided in what are regarded as some of the finest individualized services in the Nation at the lowest possible cost. Tuition costs have been kept at the minimum, while achieving top caliber professional standards.

CONTRIBUTIONS NEEDED

More money—more financial support—is, of course, the key to the future increased success of the schools.

Modest amounts—very, very limited, I understand—have already been raised.

A recent benefit was, for example, held, based on the sale of tickets to a performance by the famous entertainer, Danny Kaye, at the Carter Barron Amphitheater. Mr. Kaye has himself visited the school with friends, and was deeply impressed by the fine work that is being done there.

Washington's newspapers have devoted a good deal of well-merited attention to the schools, and more coverage may be expected.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS NEEDED

But vastly expanded financial aid is urgently needed. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars must be raised to purchase the schools' 560-acre dairy farm near the Blue Ridge Mountains which is now only leased.

Friends' and founders' contributions have therefore been warmly invited from individuals and groups. Contributions—which are, of course, tax deductible—should be addressed to: The George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc., Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, Secretary-Treasurer, Post Office Box 67, Springfield, Va.

I wish the foundation every success. May it serve as an inspiration and a guide for similar fine work all over our Nation.

May it and similar projects receive the support from Federal, State, and local governments which they so eminently deserve.

WE NEED FEDERAL BILL

May I say, incidentally, in this connection, that it is my earnest hope that S. 3620, a bill which I am proud to cosponsor, will not die in the House. We in the Senate have already passed this bill for expanded research in teaching mentally retarded children. The bill has been championed by that tireless friend of the health needs of our Nation, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Finally, with reference to the Partridge Schools, themselves, I ask unanimous consent that a supplementary statement, giving the background of the memorial foundation's noble work be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS

WHAT ARE THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS?

The Partridge Schools are residential, nonprofit rehabilitation centers for mentally disabled children and youths. The first center was established in Herndon, Va., October 1954 for older boys with moderate mental retardation resulting from brain damage. The second unit opened in Springfield, Va., 6 months later. This was to accommodate young boys and girls, also with brain damage and mental and emotional problems. Because of the need to expand, these 2 centers were consolidated on a 550-acre dairy farm, Route 211, near Gainesville, Va. The schools are licensed under the Virginia Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals.

Although there is now but one center, the term "Partridge Schools" is still used because additional units to include other types of mental and emotional problems are planned at the present location.

WHAT TYPES OF CHILDREN ARE NOW BEING ACCEPTED?

At present 34 pupils ranging in age from 3 to 23 years are enrolled from Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Brazil. Twenty of these have suffered some form of brain injury, either at birth or in early childhood. Four of these have some form of epilepsy, with seizures now practically under control. Four have cerebral palsy. Twelve have what is called a diffuse damage, in which no one spot in the brain has had any special injury, but where there has been a fine scattering of damage to the nerve endings. In these cases the children appear perfectly normal. They usually express themselves well, and are often mistaken as being normal. However, they usually have some moderate mental retardation. They have difficulty learning academically in spite of enough mental capacity. They are restless, sometimes destructive, and constantly in trouble at school and home. They may become very aggressive, and begin to get involved with the law; or they may withdraw unto themselves and develop serious emotional illness. In addition to these 18 children there are 9 children with mental retardation and emotional disturbances in whose cases diagnosis of brain injury is being considered. There also are four children diagnosed as being mongoloid. The majority of these children, with proper treatment and training in a happy, relaxed atmosphere, can become useful citizens. Those who cannot manage in open society can learn to be productive in the sheltered workshop program being developed at the Partridge Schools. All can be spared a life in a State institution if given help early enough.

HOW DO THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS HELP THESE CHILDREN?

For each child the school emphasizes from the beginning the importance of developing self-control; consideration for others; the building of work habits.

No child is accepted for less than 1 year. Custodial cases are not accepted. As most of the children have had numerous examinations by various specialists, an effort is made to secure all available findings. A conference is held with the child's parents and physicians before any new studies are made. If it seems indicated, a complete medical and psychological study is made. Readjustment of medication or new medication may be decided upon. Various laboratory tests may be found necessary. Facilities in one of the nearby medical centers will be used. A staff conference is held and a plan mapped out for the child's treatment. If delicate, the child is built up physically with special diet, rest, and fresh air.

WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL PROGRAM?

In a dormitory with five other children his age, under the motherly supervision of a nurse, the child learns independence in his personal-social habits.

Five days a week he attends small classes with trained teachers where special materials and teaching methods are used to help him overcome his handicaps. Speech and occupational therapy are included in his program. For the older children and youths, vocational training in household skills, loom weaving, making of hooked rugs, pottery, furniture refinishing, simple carpentry, farm and dairy projects is given. Physical education and recreational programs are emphasized. Religious education plays a prominent part in the child's life. A nearby small chapel, loaned to the school, called the Children's Chapel, is used for nonsectarian services, as well as for recreational activities. Music and dancing are considered important in the child's training. Field trips, visits to restaurants, theaters, are encouraged and arranged as part of the child's regular program. Every opportunity to help the child learn to conduct himself acceptably in society is given to him.

The school staff consists of: A certified clinical psychologist, who serves as director; a registered nurse and 3 practical nurses; 3 academic teachers; 2 part-time occupational therapists; a workshop instructor and supervisor of older boys' activity program; housemother and housefather; chaperon; cook; laundress; general maid; and chauffeur. A local physician is on call at all times. A pediatrician and psychiatrist serve in consultant capacity. Physiotherapy, speech therapy, and additional special services are available through local clinic facilities.

WHAT ARE THE BROADER ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM?

Because of the Partridge Schools' location within 35 miles of the Nation's Capital on a four-lane highway easily accessible to the various leading medical centers and universities of the greater metropolitan area, the schools offer an unequaled opportunity to serve as a national demonstration program of rehabilitation for the mentally disabled. Medical and psychological research projects are already underway. Treatment with one of the new drugs is being conducted under the supervision of the school's medical staff. Development of diagnostic testing techniques, special materials and teaching methods for brain-injured children play an important part in the overall program. An in-field-service-training program for graduate students in clinical psychology has been established in collaboration with one of the local universities. Professional workers in the fields of mental hygiene and special education are welcome as volunteers to work under supervision of the school staff for practical experience.

At the Partridge Schools there is an opportunity to develop a rehabilitation center for the mentally and emotionally handicapped which can stand as an example to the rest of the Nation.

WHO SPONSORS THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS AND HOW ARE THEY FINANCED?

The Partridge Schools are sponsored by the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, incorporated in Maryland in the fall of 1954. The George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc., is a nonprofit, nonendowed, tax-exempt organization. Its purpose is to promote treatment centers for mentally and emotionally disabled children and youth. Dr. Partridge, a noted author, psychologist, and educator, died at the age of 83. He had devoted more than 50 years to the study and treatment of delinquency, mental, and personality problems. A semi-invalid, he overcame his own handicaps to the extent that he was able to lead a highly productive life, and to help others overcome theirs. His family and friends decided that an appropriate memorial would be the development of a program to promote treatment centers for the mentally disabled child, often called the forgotten child.

Few schools have programs to include the child with mental problems. Those which have, tend to exclude the child who is nonconforming or in need of individual attention. Funds are available from State and private organizations for the physically handicapped, but resources for the mentally handicapped are almost nonexistent. Because of the great need of these children, the foundation was set up to solicit funds for the establishment of treatment centers to salvage, whenever possible, lives which can become useful to society, rather than a financial drain. With small gifts from Dr. Partridge's family and friends, and from contributions from parents and agencies sponsoring children enrolled in the schools, the program sustained itself during the first difficult year.

With the expanded program and need for more building space and equipment, additional help is sought for the purchase of the present location—the 550-acre dairy farm and buildings—the center can then help more children.

Fifteen percent of our total child population can be expected to be in need of special treatment and training, because of some mental or emotional problem. The majority of these children can be spared a life in a State institution and can become useful citizens, if given the opportunity for the highly specialized kind of help they require during their formative years.

The Shriners sponsor the physically crippled child; Lions Clubs are concerned with the visually handicapped. No civic organization has yet become interested in the mentally handicapped children. Will not some public-spirited organization come forward to lend a helping hand to the forgotten child?

Please send all communications to: Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, secretary-treasurer, the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc., Post Office Box 67, Springfield, Va. Telephone Fleetwood 4-8655.

The advisory board includes professional and lay citizens interested in the field of mental hygiene.

Trustees of the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc.: President, Mr. Wilton C. Dinges, Baltimore, Md.; vice president, Judge Hugh Reid, Arlington, Va.; secretary-treasurer, Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, director, the Partridge Schools; Hon. J. Ridley Mitchell, Washington, D. C.; and M. Philip N. Partridge, Las Vegas, Nev.

Tax on Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy with the action the conference committee has taken with regard to H. R. 9875, which provides a tax exemption for the theaters of the Nation. My only regret is that it was necessary for the House conferees to recede and accept the Senate amendment reducing the amount from $1 to 90 cents.

The bill is designed to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It will provide that the tax on admissions will apply only with respect to the portion of the amount paid in excess of $1.

It will be recalled that under the present law general admissions are free of Federal excise tax if the charge is 50 cents or less. Under the law as now amended, general admissions will be free of tax up to 90 cents. The bill will not affect admissions for which the charge exceeds the exemption figure. In other words, the tax on an admission charge of, say, $1.50 would be 16 cents. The 10 percent tax would be based upon the entire $1.50 and not merely upon the portion of the charge—60 cents—in excess of the 90 cents.

I know from my correspondence and from the many friends I have in the theater industry in my district that there is a serious need for even a greater exemption than this bill now provides. I am hopeful that another session of Congress can increase this exemption.

We owe much to the theater industry in the way of entertainment and relaxation, for long before television and even before radio was perfected, the movies provided a fine entertainment and recreation channel. In addition, there is no better documentation of history than the films of yesterday.

The industry made a fine contribution to the war effort and to our national defense during the war years and the postwar years. Our young men in the service found wholesome and educational entertainment in the movie houses throughout the Nation as well as in foreign service.

The small business people who operate the theaters in our towns and cities are having a struggle to survive, and I believe the elimination of this tax will enable them to keep in business. The relief which we formerly gave in lifting the admission limitation to 50 cents or less has been inadequate for the survival and successful operation of our movie theaters. While the increase to 90 cents is still inadequate, I am sure it will be some help until such time as a subsequent Congress can increase this exemption to where it will be more beneficial to a sagging industry.

Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD public statements and communications of the President of the United States with reference to the Dixon-Yates contract, as reported by the press.

There being no objection, the statements and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 1, 1954]

From the President's news conference, July 1, 1954:

Question. "Mr. President, could you tell us your reasons for ordering the AEC to make a private-power agreement for getting some additional power put in through the TVA?"

Answer. "Well, it was a rather long and complicated story. We had told you people long ago that the TVA was a historical fact, that it was going to be supported and, particularly supported in the purposes written into the law for which it was established. Now, as time went on, we found that TVA had gone far beyond the establishment of steam plants to firm up maximum water power developed in the waters of that region.

"Now, we found projects for installing, building TVA power plants way out on the periphery of this area, which would mean finally that they could best deliver their power on beyond that, and there was no, he knew of no, way in which this thing would be limited.

"The only thing that he wanted with respect to that was a very good look from every angle, and tell them what was the best future for that region, how far they could continue to build up this area at the expense of others. Maybe they should be building the Missouri River or the Susquehanna or the Penobscot or some other.

"Now, one of the contentions made was that they were under an immediate shortage, something had to be done because of this great portion of the power taken by the AEC. The AEC said that they had the authority to buy their power for a given number of years under private purchase. The comparisons of cost, as based on original layout and the annual cost of this power, were long and involved.

"But it looked like a good thing to buy this power privately so that they could get a really good look as to where they are going into the future in terms of expansion because, you see, he had States, representatives of Massachusetts, New York, Indiana, coming to him and saying: 'You are taking our taxes and building up cheap power some place and taking our industries out.'

"He didn't know exactly where all of the truth lay in this thing, and he was trying to find out—this was just a way to give us a chance to study the thing thoroughly."

[From the New York Times of July 8, 1954]

From unofficial transcript of the President's press conference, July 8, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, Gov. Frank Clement, of Tennessee, has sent you a telegram saying that your remarks here last week regarding TVA were deeply disturbing to him and asking a chance to meet with you and state his case regarding this new proposal for private utilities to come into TVA territory. Have you decided to give him that conference?"

Answer: "As a matter of fact, he hadn't actually seen the telegram yet, but Governor Clements, like any other governor in the United States, could come to see him at any time that a convenient time could be arranged."

[From the New York Times of July 22, 1954]

From the President's news conference, July 21, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, the Democrats have used some pretty strong language on the Hill this week in attacking the administration proposal to grant a private power contract in the Tennessee Valley area. Republican Senator Cooper, of Tennessee, has also joined critics of the proposal. Is there any chance, any possibility, of the administration changing its position on this issue?"

Answer: "Well, he constantly had stated in front of them that there were always details of anything he proposed where, if he was shown there was a better way of doing it, why, he was perfectly ready to do it.

"Now, he thought he had explained this situation here a couple of weeks ago. This area said it needed power because industries wanted to come into that region. Long ago, the project of harnessing the streams in the area had been completed, and the Federal Government also had built the steam plants to firm up the waterpower potential.

"Now, in these recent years it had been merely a question of producing steam plants. Well, now the problem in his mind, and he would think in everybody's, was if the Federal Government went into the constant production of steam plants, why didn't we go now to the Missouri Valley or to the Ohio or to the Connecticut or the Sacramento or the Pecos or anywhere else, and produce steam plants in that region before we went putting more here?

"He was trying to find out the facts of this whole situation, what it meant. He was, as he had told them before, he was prepared to support TVA as it now stood, with all the strength he had, and anyone who said this was any attempt to destroy the TVA was, to say it in the mildest way he knew, was in error. There was no such thought at all. There was the thought of providing the power while a new and further look was taken at this whole business because the whole United States was concerned and not simply one little area, and he was working for the United States."

Question: "Mr. President, one of the major points in the debate on the Atomic Energy Commission–TVA contract today arose out of testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that three Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission opposed signing the contract. Therefore, the Senators are arguing the question of whether the President has the power to order independent agencies to take action that their Administrators or a Commission majority oppose. Would you discuss your attitude toward that problem?"

Answer: "Well, he was not going to discuss it very greatly, very obviously. He had an Attorney General and, when there was a matter of legality arose, why, he had to be governed by what the legal staff of that office decided was correct because they would remember this: It wasn't always a matter of taking authority in these cases, it was a matter of somebody exercising responsibility,

and someone had to do it. And, frequently, he supposed lots of people would like to get out of exercising responsibility, but you had to do it when the chips were down.

"Now, in this one, she was telling him things and she was giving him a premise that he didn't know existed. But he would say this: The Atomic Energy Commission he did not believe was an independent Commission in the sense that the ICC or FCC was. It was something that he was compelled to take action on and over which to exercise supervision."

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1954]

From the President's news conference of July 28, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, you told Mr. Brandt that you wouldn't want to support someone who had opposed you on a major issue. In the last week Senator Cooper, of Kentucky, has voted twice against the administration—once against the TVA contract, and yesterday or last night, rather, against the entire atomic-energy bill. Would you consider that major opposition, sir?"

Answer: "Well, he thought Senator Cooper was mistaken, but he thought that Senator Cooper's record in the Senate was one that he couldn't possibly criticize in any serious way. Now, he has been perfectly honest, he (Senator Cooper) has come to him every time he had had a difference and he (the President) knew that it did not make either of us happy. He believed there was a legality, a point of legal responsibility and legal authority involved, and he thought he (Senator Cooper) had been perfectly honest in that, and he respects a man's honest opinions. So he—don't try to get him to say he was against Senator Cooper; he was not."

Question: "I am not trying to."

[From the New York Times of July 18, 1954]

From the President's press conference of August 17, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, Stephen Mitchell, the Democratic National chairman, said yesterday you personally ordered the Dixon-Yates power contract awarded to a firm in which one of your closest friends has an interest, and at $90 million more than a competitor syndicate. His office later identified the friend as Bobby Jones. Do you care to comment on that matter?"

Answer: "Well, ladies and gentlemen, he knew when he once went into political life that he would be subjected by many types of strange characters to many kinds of innuendo and allegations. In this case, he must say, and he was a little astonished, that any kind of such innuendo should include a private citizen of the character and standing of Bob Jones.

"He thought there was no gentleman that he knew whose integrity and probity he was more certain of than he was of his.

"Now, as to his (the President's) actions, his own actions, he was no going to defend himself, as he had told the reporters time and again he should not. He merely said this: Of course, he approved the recommendations for this action, and every single official action he took involving the contractual relationships of the United States with anybody and except only when the question of national security was directly involved, was open to the public.

"Any one of you here present might singly or in an investigation group go to the Bureau of the Budget, to the chief of the Atomic Energy Commission, and get the complete record from the inception of the idea to this very minute, and it was all yours. Now that was all he had to say about it."

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1954]

From the President's news conference of October 27, 1954:

Question: "On this secrecy of documents, and so forth——"

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "Why can't we get the Dixon-Yates contract? We got a copy but other people didn't."

Answer: "Well, as a matter of fact, he probably, if he had anything to do with it, would discipline the person that had given them the copy, if he knew them. He didn't know. Here were the facts. He had promised all the documents in the negotiations leading to the making of this contract and, as far as he knew, everybody had been able to see them.

"Next there was a contract made, and the law provided that that contract, when made, was placed before the Congress, and was to remain there until—he believed it was the Joint Committee—the Joint Committee of the Atomic Energy Committee, had the full opportunity to investigate it and go through its details. And when that was done, then it would undoubtedly be made public. But until it had finished its tour in front of the Atomic Energy Commission, he doubted that it would be proper to release it."

Question: "On that point, sir, do you wish the Joint Committee to waive that 30-day period for inspection and have the contract——"

Answer: "No one had asked him to ask them to waive any period. Now, this was what he did know: The Federal Power Commission said this was a proper contract and fair to the Government and all concerned. The TVA authorities had gone over it and said, after incorporation of certain changes they wanted, that it was perfectly satisfactory. The Congress had the last word in the situation, and could go after it if they wanted to, so he felt that the Government was perfectly and splendidly protected."

Question: "The Senate committee has raised some question about the ethics of the actions of some subsidiaries of the Dixon-Yates group. I wonder if that would have any effect upon your thinking on the Dixon-Yates people, and the fact that the contract was let without bid?"

Answer: "Well, he couldn't think of any man in Government whom he trusts more as to his integrity, his commonsense and his business acumen than Lewis Strauss (Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission). Now, he was the one that was at the focal point of making this contract. The Congress—after he (the President) had quoted the Federal Power Commission, he had quoted the TVA—the congressional committee had its right to go over it in detail.

"If they found anything wrong, he was sure there would be someone that would make it public. Now, up until that moment, he had nothing further to do with it; he hadn't seen the contract in its detail, and he hadn't any more comments to make about it."

[From the New York Times of November 11, 1954]

From the President's press conference of November 11, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, Mr. Thomas Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, testified before the Joint Committee this week that the top level management of the Atomic Energy Commission was being diverted from its primary mission by what he described as a political controversy over the Dixon-Yates contract. Would you agree with this conclusion and discuss with us, sir, your views on whether the Atomic Energy Commission should be a nonpolitical or a political body?"

Answer: "Well, he thought, of course, that any business organization working for the Government should be nonpolitical, and he deplored any thought that there had been an effort to make this matter political. On the contrary, this contract, to which had been raised some objection, there had been no effort to keep that under cover until after the elections or to keep these—it had been laid out and spread out on the record as fast as it could be, first, the negotiations and, after the contract was once in the hands of Congress, then the country.

"Now, possibly, he had better straighten once again his attitude toward this whole business. It had been represented to him that there was going to be an acute power shortage in the TVA area by 1957.

"Now, there was an area in which the Federal Government had not fully developed the water power, had then built the steam plants to firm up that water power, then had built additional steam plants and was still enlarging some of them. Now, the question became how long did this go along at Federal expense unless it was done in the Smoky Hill Valley, and in the Penobscot Valley, and in the Hudson Valley, and all the rest of the world. It would look ike it was time to take a look at this. So, consequently, he said, 'How can we supply that need without putting the Government in position that in perpetuity it is going to continue to build steam plants anywhere anyone wants them?' Now, one way to do it was to take the needs of the AEC and to see whether they could be supplied and, therefore, provide this extra 600,000 watts it then had been predicted they were going to need in 1957; then it wouldn't damage the people of the area and one would go ahead and give everybody time to take a good look at this and study it out. There was nothing in this contract that could raise by a single cent the prices for—that TVA charged its customers for power, and the contract had been gone over, as he had told the reporters before, by the Federal Power Commission, by TVA, and he believed, the General Accounting Office, all of whom had found it a satisfactory contract. So if there was anything political in it, someone was making it that way, it was nothing political from his viewpoint."

Question: "Mr. President, this week, one of your strong supporters journalistically, one of your strong supporters, the Scripps-Howard papers, called on you to let go of the Dixon-Yates contract. They said it was a dangerous thing politically and would hurt you. Have you changed your mind any on supporting the Dixon-Yates contract from what we understand you said a minute ago, or do we understand that it is going to go through?"

Answer: "Well, he hadn't changed his mind for this simple reason: No better contract had been offered. If the people were going to get power in that region, and if they were going to get it in this amount, he knew of no better way to get it, and no better way had been offered. So, until some better way was offered, he had to stick to this one."

Question: "Mr. President, on that point, why were not the specifications laid down for this, and competitive bids asked?"

Answer: "Well, as far as he knew—now, he didn't want to be quoted here too exactly that he couldn't change his mind—but, as he remembered it, he had been informed that they had put this matter up before a number of utilities, and there had been only two offers received, and one had been, they thought, completely unacceptable, because there had been no risk whatsoever. They remembered, in contracts of the past, where the AEC had made contracts, they had been strictly cost-plus. He rejected those; he thought they weren't good for the Government. He thought it ought to have a contract where there was some risk shared by the building companies, so he had insisted on that. Now, the other one, the other plan, as he understood it, that had been submit-

ted, was again one which the building companies took no risk on."

Question: "As I understand, the specifications were very general and there was only one other company made a bid."

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "And I also understand that TVA was not consulted in the initial steps."

Answer: "Well, that would have to be checked up with AEC and with the Bureau of the Budget. He couldn't be expected to recall every detail."

Question: "No."

Answer: "But he did know they had come and sat in front of him often enough and he assumed TVA knew about it."

Question: "The previous Chairman of TVA testified that he was not called in on the initial proceedings to give the expert advice."

Answer. "Well, he did believe this: He believed that the prior Chairman's whole attitude toward the matter, toward this particular matter had been well known, but he was not—he didn't recall, and he thought that he (the questioner) had got places to find out that detail."

Question: "May I ask one more question, please?"

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "Are you adamant against TVA expanding further?"

Answer: "Well, he said 'adamant.' He hoped that he was old enough that he didn't think there was anything particularly sacrosanct about his decisions and conclusions. But he did believe that if the Government continued to expand there, what was it going to do about the other sections of this country? And he thought there had to be a policy deliberately adopted by the United States before it made these things so lopsided. Because, let him tell those present, for every argument he had had for TVA, he had many, many people, political leaders, come to his office and say: 'Why do you continue to give them cheap power and take away our industries, and then we pay taxes to support them?' Now, he didn't know that there was any justice to that argument and, as he had said again and again, he had put a man down there from whom he believed they could all expect absolutely objective and complete reporting on the thing, and he hoped they got it, because he would like to know what the answer was."

Question: "There are two kinds of expansions, sir; one is geographical and the other one is expanding power production."

Answer: "That is right."

Question: "Inside TVA's area. Now, do you oppose expansion both ways?"

Answer: "Well, again he said, he didn't know too much about it. But if they—look, if they, if the Federal Government was committed just to building power in the TVA and giving them 100 percent of all they would ever want in their estimates for the next 5 years, why didn't he do it in the Mississippi Valley; that was what he wanted to know and no one answered for him. He asked them—the TVA people came in his office and stood around and argued and he said, 'Well, now are you ready to support this kind of development for the Upper Mississippi?' And they just looked at him and said, 'That is outside the question.' But it wasn't to him. He believed that the United States should be treated fairly all the way through."

Question: "Their argument down there was that the Federal Government was their power monopoly in that area. Any expansion they got in that region must come from the Federal Government."

Answer: "Well, to his mind, he would hate to be admitting that he was completely and absolutely dependent upon the vagaries of the Federal Government that might do anything at any moment, and didn't believe any section of this country had to be completely dependent upon the Federal Government unless it was in the District here."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 11, 1954]

TEXT OF LETTER BY EISENHOWER ON DIXON-YATES

WASHINGTON, November 11.—The text of a letter from President Eisenhower to Representative W. STERLING COLE, Republican, of New York, chairman of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee, on the controversial Dixon-Yates contract follows:

"DEAR STUB: On several occasions you and I have discussed the administration plan to relieve TVA of part of its obligation to furnish electric power to AEC in order that TVA, without additional steam plants built at taxpayers' expense, may have an adequate supply of electric power for its customers through 1957.

"My general thinking on the subject is this: It seems to me that all arguments for the construction by the Federal Government of the additional steam plants ignore this one and very important truth: If the Federal Government assumes responsibility in perpetuity for providing the TVA area with all the power it can accept, generated by any means whatsoever, it has a similar responsibility with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States of America.

"Logically, every section of the United States should have the same opportunities, and the Federal Government should not discriminate between the several regions in helping to provide this type of facility. My own conviction is that we have not been alert enough in making certain of this equality of treatment. If this is the case, then it is high time that other regions were getting the same opportunities.

"I cannot believe that Americans, in general, disapprove of attempting to place all regions on a basis of equality in this regard. Consequently, there must either be some reexamination of any plans which would call for the Federal Government to supply all the additional power capacity that might be needed in the future in the Tennessee Valley, or logically we would have to begin plans for a gigantic power delevopment to cover the entire Nation equitably.

"DESIGNED TO GAIN TIME

"The directive to the AEC to make arrangements for the purchase of private power—either directly or by finding a new private source to replace available TVA power—was designed to allow time for a thorough examination of this whole vast field, without hurting the citizens of the valley.

"As a consequence of these facts, I believe that the project for building new plants at Federal expense—implying a purpose of continuing this process indefinitely in the future—is therefore wholly indefensible unless it should become part of a vast national plan. If this is to be national policy, it is most certainly a project that demands earnest and prayerful study. In the meantime, the citizens of that region will not be deprived of the additional power they need for the next several years.

"It seems to me that there has been a very great deal of talk and argument—much of it partisan—about issues that are really clear and simple.

"NO INTENT TO HURT TVA

"No one in this administration has any intention of destroying or damaging TVA or of diminishing its effectiveness in any way. But this is not the same thing as fastening on the Federal Government a continuing and never-ending responsibility which I frankly do not believe is logical nor, in the long run, in the best interests of the country.

"The administration plan, and all facts concerning its development, have been before the public for months. I hope that the Joint Atomic Energy Committee will give the plan, and the proposed contract to carry it into effect, the fullest consideration that the committee deems necessary. If, however, after such consideration, the committee is of the opinion that the final contract terms are completely satisfactory, it would be clearly desirable and in the best interests of the people of the TVA area that any additional waiting periods be waived, so that construction may begin as soon as possible and people in the TVA area may make their plans for the future.

"With warm personal regard,

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1955]

From the President's press conference of March 17, 1955:

Question: "Mr. President, I have two questions about an oldie. The Dixon-Yates contract is apparently tied up in the courts, and a majority of the TVA Board has lately asked you again for appropriations for the Fulton steam plant. I wonder whether that would prompt you, sir, to reconsider the problem of power in west Tennessee; and, the second question, would the construction of a plant, generating plant, by Memphis itself not fit into your philosophy, sir?"

Answer: "Well, I know of no reason, to take your second question first, I know of no reason whatsoever that Memphis has not a complete right to manufacture or set up any producing plant it wants to. And certainly I would favor it. I have nothing at all against local ownership of power. I think in many cases it is not only a good thing; in some cases it has been proved to be very effective. But there is one thing I always want to point out to you people when I talk about governmental authority, responsibility, and operation. Don't forget this: When the Federal Government does this, they can print money to do the job. Nobody else can, and there is a very great difference; because the second that the Federal Government starts to print money to do these things, they are taking 1 cent, or at least their proportion, out of every dollar that any of you might happen to have in your pockets. Now that has the effect of cheapening money, and I don't think we ought to go into that.

"Now, as to the review of the case, it has not come up to me in any way in that form, and I don't know whether there is any reason for review or not. But I do say what the local governments or anything else that falls within the State or city authorities, I have no objection to it, to their doing it whatsoever."

[From the New York Times of June 30, 1955]

From the President's press conference of June 30, 1955:

Question: "Mr. President, one of the justifications for the Dixon-Yates contract was that the Memphis area needed the power, needed the 600,000 kilowatts. Last week, as you probably know, the Memphis City Council voted to build a steam plant of their own of about 600,000 kilowatts. I wonder if, in your opinion, the Government should now proceed with the Dixon-Yates contract or cancel it at the cheapest possible terms."

Answer: "I haven't had this matter brought to my attention by any of my responsible associates since I saw that suggestion in the paper. But I do know this: that when I was first visited by a delegation from Tennessee and I suggested that the city of Memphis go ahead and build their own plant, they said it was an impossibility under the whole TVA system, and the TVA contract was an impossibility; that's all I know about it."

Question: "Senator KEFAUVER charged on the Senate floor yesterday that the Budget Bureau was trying to conceal what he called a scandal in the Dixon-Yates contract negotiations regarding the employment of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell of the First Boston Corp. Senator KNOWLAND says there is no corruption in it, and that he thinks you were just trying to help the Tennessee Valley get some power. I wondered if Mr. Hughes of the Budget Bureau had cleared with you his refusal to give Mr. KEFAUVER the information he was asking down there?"

Answer: "Mr. Hughes came to see me, went over the situation, and I repeated to him the general instructions, I think, that I expressed once publicly in front of this body, that every single pertinent paper on the Dixon-Yates contract, from its inception until the final writing of the contract, would be made available, I think I said at that time, to the press, much less to any committee.

"Now, I do stand on this: Nobody has a right to go in and wreck any processes of Government by taking every single file—and some of you have seen our file rooms and know their size—and wreck the entire filing system and paralyze the processes of Government while they are going through them.

"There are—these files are filled with every kind of personal note—I guess my own files are filled with personal notes from my own staff all through, they are honeycombed with them. Well, now, to drag those things out where a man says to me, 'I think so-and-so is a bad person to appoint to so-and-so, and you shouldn't have him,' all he had was his own opinion. You can't drag those things out and put them before the public with justice to anybody and we are not going to do it. But at the time that I gave those instructions, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Strauss, whoever else was involved, got together every single document that was pertinent to this thing and put it out.

"Now, as far as the Wenzell report, Mr. Wenzell was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract. He was brought in to—as a technical adviser in the very early days when none of us here knew nothing about the bookkeeping methods of TVA or anything else. He was brought in as a technical adviser and nothing else, and before this contract was ever even proposed."

Question. "Mr. President, a little while ago you stated that Mr. Wenzell was never called in about the Dixon-Yates contract, and there seemed to be some testimony before the SEC and before a committee that he had served as a consultant, I wondered if you were—"

Answer. "He did serve as a consultant at one time."

Question. "Of the Dixon-Yates?"

Answer. "No; I think—now, I will check this up. My understanding is that quickly as the Dixon-Yates thing came up he resigned and we got as our consultant a man named Adams from the Power Commission here itself to come over and be the consultant so as to have him because he (Wenzell) was connected with a great Boston financial company."

Question. "Mr. President, had you been informed that he had no connection at all with the Dixon-Yates?"

Answer. "My understanding of it, and it may have been, that part of it there may have been, an overlap of a week or two, there I am not sure of."

Question. "Would there be any change in your position on that if there was material that he had served as a consultant on that?"

Answer. "If he had served as a consultant on that and brought in a definite recommendation to us I would be very delighted to make that public. But I just don't believe there is a thing in it about it. However, I will have it checked again."

[From the New York Times of July 7, 1955]

From the President's press conference of July 6, 1955:

Question. "Mr. President, many Democrats on Capitol Hill are now claiming that your decision to reopen or to restudy the Dixon-Yates matter is a political victory for their side, and claim that it represents a backing down on your part on this whole matter. Could you discuss that with us, sir?"

Answer. "Well, I hadn't heard this particular point. The first group that ever came to my office to urge upon me the building with Federal funds of a new steam plant in the TVA were very insistent that this be done. It's the only way they could get a plant; and they said the city of Memphis is going to be without power in that whole region; and I recommended to them that the ctiy of Memphis build its plant just like New York City or Abilene, Kans., would if they had to have a plant. And they showed to me or attempted to show to me this was impossible in their area because of the type of contract that TVA had made with all its customers. It is an exclusive sort of contract. If you take any power from TVA then you may not, under your contract, get any power anywhere else.

"Now, that was the situation at that moment. Actually, I am delighted that the city of Memphis or any other local community, when it comes to the simple building of a power station through steam-plants methods and with no flood control or navigation or other factors in it, do it themselves.

"I believe we should do it ourselves. So I am not really concerned as to who is claiming political victories. This is in accordance with the philosophy in which I believe."

Question. "Mr. President, returning to the Dixon-Yates question, have you had a report from Mr. Hughes as yet so that you could tell us whether you will or will not cancel that private agreement?"

Answer. "Well, I had a report just a few minutes ago from Mr. Hughes. But the investigation by the Attorney General and by the Budget Bureau is still going on, because there must be determined the complete feasibility of the city building its own powerplant. Otherwise we might proceed quite a ways on that proposition, and find that it was an impossible thing, due to some kind of legal or other limitations. The TVA has reported to me that there will be no need for this power in TVA and, of course, in that event, if that is substantiated, then there would be no need for building this plant."

Question. "Then you would cancel under such circumstances?"

Answer. "Under—if all of these circumstances meet the standards that we have set up, yes."

Question. "You spoke, sir, of the continuing investigation of the feasibility of the city of Memphis"——

Answer. "Yes; and that will be"——

Question. "Is that likely to take some time, a week or 10 days?"

Answer. "Well, I didn't ask them, but my impression of this was that it might be finished up in a couple of weeks."

Question. "Mr. President, there has arisen between Budget Director Hughes and Senator KEFAUVER relative to the questioning of the five witnesses from the Budget Bureau in the Dixon-Yates controversy, and I wondered if you would care to discuss for us"——

Answer. "Five witnesses, you say?"

Question. "Five witnesses in the Dixon-Yates controversy relative to the part that Mr. Wenzell played in the Dixon-Yates case."

Answer. "Well, Mr. Wenzell was the only one I heard about."

Question. "The thing I wanted to find out was where you thought how much discretion Mr. Hughes had?"

Answer. "I think Mr. Wenzell is entitled to tell the court—I mean to tell the investigating committee exactly what he did. You will remember he was called in to investigate certain accounting and financing systems of power establishments and their tax situation, and that was early in this administration. And he, I believe, submitted on that a fairly formal written report. I have no doubt he will show that written report to the committee if they want to see it, although it has no bearing on the thing they are now talking about. Later he was for a period, I believe of 60 days, in early 1954; he was here as a technical adviser, as they were trying to devise some form of contract that would befit the situation. He, I have no doubt in all matters of fact, will testify freely before this investigating committee."

Question. "Mr. President, I had in mind more the discretion that you felt your agency had had, not necessarily Mr. Wenzell but with regard to other witnesses. There were five other witnesses before in the Budget Bureau that the committee had asked to come down; and Mr. Hughes had informed the committee that they should not—"

Answer. "Mr. Hughes has not talked to me, as I recall it. Now, maybe Mr. Hughes talked to me about it and it slipped my mind. I have explained my attitude here time and again. If anybody in an official position of this Government does anything which is an official act, and submits it either in the form of recommendation or anything else that is properly a matter for investigation if Congress so chooses, provided that national security is not involved.

"But when it comes to the conversations that take place between any responsible official and his advisers or exchange of little, mere little slips, or this or that, expressing personal opinions on the most confidential basis, those are not subject to investigation by anybody, and if they are, will wreck the Government. There is no business that could be run if it—if there would be exposed every angle thought that an adviser might have because in the process of reaching an agreed position there is many, many conflicting opinions to be brought together. And if any commander is going to get the free, unprejudiced opinions of his subordinates he had better protect what they have to say to him on a confidential basis. It is exactly, as I see it, like a lawyer and his client or any other confidential thing of that character."

Question. "Mr. President, on the basis of what you have been told about the role of Adolphe Wenzell in this Dixon-Yates contract, do you regard that role as proper?"

Answer. "Indeed, yes."

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 12, 1955]

July 11, 1955: "On leaving the White House, Mayor Tobey said the cancellation of the contract 'is unquestionably a victory for public power.' Asked what President Eisenhower's reaction was, the mayor smiled and said, 'the President is very happy about it.' The White House issued a statement saying President Eisenhower was 'delighted' to see Mayor Tobey and to learn of Memphis' decision to build its own plant. The President told the mayor, the statement said, that the President long has favored such a plan as an alternative to building another TVA steam plant. The President said he saw no more reason to spend Federal funds on a steam plant to provide power for the Tennessee Valley than one to provide power from the valley of the Kansas River, the statement said. It added that only after the President was informed that Memphis could not build its own plant was the Dixon-Yates plan developed. 'The Dixon-

Yates plan was developed as a means of assuring the Memphis area it would not suffer a power shortage as a result of the siphoning off of additional power by the Atomic Energy Commission,' the statement said."

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1955]

From the President's press conference of July 27, 1955:

Question: "Mr. President, there has been testimony of the SEC Chairman that Sherman Adams intervened before the SEC which was a quasi-judicial body. Testimony was given by the Chairman on that score. The Democrats are contending that there was something improper in intervening with any quasi-judicial body. I wondered if you looked into that and you have any comment you would like to make about it."

Answer: "I looked into it only to this extent: I am sure that Mr.—head of the Commission—has given the entire story. I understand he is back before the committee. And certainly if he had omitted any details, he should give them now. And I believe that Governor Adams has informed the Senate committee that he hasn't a single detail to add; that the story has been told and that is all there is to it."

Question: "In connection with the Dixon-Yates matter, and in view of the fact that the Senate investigation subcommittee recently brought out for the first time the part played in initiating the Dixon-Yates contract by Adolphe Wenzell of the First Boston Corp., which corporation later became the financing agent for Dixon-Yates, in view of all of that, do you believe your directions last summer for disclosure of the complete record in the case were carried out by the agencies concerned?"

Answer: "Well, I didn't know that anyone had alleged that he was the initiator, because no such statement has ever been made to me. But what I have done is this: I have gotten back Mr. Dodge who was Director of the Budget when all this was done, when the 1954, I believe, policy on this statement, on this whole proposition was made, and he is going now before one of the committees. Isn't that correct?"

The President's press secretary: "Yes, sir."

Answer: "He is going down before one of the committees with instructions to do this: to tell every possible item that has anything whatsoever to bear on Dixon-Yates and see whether we can get the whole list of information properly coordinated and placed before the people that are investigating it."

Question: "I hate to go back to Dixon-Yates again, but there was one thing I don't think was completely clear. There were some AEC officials, Mr. Fields and Mr. Cook, who testified that Mr. Wenzell's name was knowingly eliminated from the Dixon-Yates chronology; and, of course, they stated this was on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. I wondered if you knew anything about this, and if you did know of it, if you would like to comment on whether you thought it was important."

Answer: "I don't intend to comment on it any more at all. Now, I think I have given to this conference, time and again, the basic elements of this whole development and everything that I could possibly be expected to know about it. I said Mr. Dodge, who initiated this whole thing, is going down before the committee to again begin the process of taking this thing from its inception and following it through until he turned over to Mr. Hughes, and I believe that Mr. Hughes is to be there if they want him again. Now, they can tell the entire story and I don't know exactly such details as that. How could I be expected to know? I never heard of it."

America's Vital Engineering Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the past several years I have delivered a number of major addresses on the subject of expanding America's vital engineering resource.

I have done so because of the obviously critical need for such expansion, in view of Soviet Russia's enormous strides in technological advance.

Almost everyone in our country is aware that the Soviets are reportedly graduating twice as many engineers and technicians as we are.

In view of my deep interest in this subject, I was pleased to receive an invitation from the National Society of Professional Engineers to prepare an article for the August issue of the excellent magazine, American Engineer.

I am happy to have contributed this article which has become the lead piece of the August issue.

I send to the desk now the text of this article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S ENGINEERING RESOURCES

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

"Danger—we are falling behind in the race for engineering manpower."

This and a hundred other terse warning signals have been hoisted all over America.

From every forum of public opinion, the press, radio, and television, from the world of science and the world of politics and government, from private industry, labor and agriculture, has come the urgent message: "America must expand its engineering resources!"

Responding to this problem, the great engineering profession itself has applied its enormous talents and abilities toward helping to meet the challenge. Of course, too, in Washington, in the executive branch of our Government, significant steps have been taken to take a comprehensive new look at why the Soviets are surging ahead of us in the quantity of engineers and technicians.

In the legislative branch, as well, as the pages of the American Engineer have reflected, our Senators and Representatives in great numbers have focused their attention on this problem.

However, many serious observers are surprised not so much at the engineering shortage, which is, of course, deeply disturbing; they are surprised that it took us so long to wake up to it. They are surprised that only at this late stage have we become aware of the fact that we are falling behind in this stiffly competitive race.

The danger signs were present for us to see, for a long, long time. Even a layman such as myself, who is not especially familiar with the engineering profession pointed out years ago that America was entering into a dramatic new engineering age in which the engineer would play a more important role than ever before in man's history. I pointed out, too, that in this new age, an ambitious totalitarian system such as that of the Soviet Union could set a top-priority target of scientific and technical progress; and it could reach that target by sacrificing all other so-called nonessential activities.

Unfortunately, many complacent Americans tended to downgrade the Kremlin's ruthless determination to build up its horse-and-buggy economy, as well as its military prowess. Today, we Americans belatedly face up to the acute threefold challenge of Soviet science and technology:

1. In direct military strength, with the world's largest ground force and air force, and second largest navy.

2. In industrial surges on the home front, in vast Russia, itself, 7.8 million square miles with 200 million people, and in the sprawling slave empire of 700 million more.

3. From outside the Iron Curtain, in the so-called cold war, economic penetration of underdeveloped countries.

Our most serious problem arises, of course, from the crucial Soviet military challenge. A day hardly passes without some new warnings that the Russians are making enormous strides in the fields of supersonic jet fighters and long-range bombers; atomic and hydrogen bombs, with an increased punch of more and more megatons; longer and longer range guided missiles, with even deadlier accuracy. The rate for the so-called "ultimate weapon"—the intercontinental ballistic missile—looms by far as the most crucial of all the phases of this many-sided military competition.

But the military race while paramount, is hardly the only competition we face. From my vantage point as senior Republican on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I can note in civilian fields, the worldwide signs of the forward surge of Soviet engineering. This is evidenced: Inside Russia, in its magnificent buildup of heavy industry, which the Kremlin seeks, as a byproduct to display as showpieces to visiting delegations from underdeveloped nations; outside Russia, in its Khrushchev-Bulganin-type peaceful economic penetration. This latter phase is best illustrated by the numerous Soviet offers of "loans with no strings attached" for everything from new hydro-electric projects to sewerage systems and road paving in the neutralist, uncommitted bloc of the world.

Consider now, both of these civilian phases—internal and external. Within Russia itself, all observers have agreed that the Reds have made enormous strides in industrialization but, of course, at a staggering price of slavery, mass human misery, and deprivation. According to "The National Economy of the U. S. S. R." (if you can believe it) between 1940 and 1955:

Red steel production rose 142 percent—from 18.3 to 45.3 million tons. (In the same period, free enterprise—American steel output—already at mammoth levels—rose 67 percent—to 117 million tons.)

Coal output increased 136 percent, from 165.9 to 391 million tons. (Comparable United States output decreased 3.5 percent.)

Soviet oil gushed up 128 percent to 482.9 million barrels. (United States comparison—a rise of 82 percent to 2.5 billion barrels.)

Soviet electric power—up 252 percent to 170.1 kilowatt-hours annually. (United States kilowatt-hours rose 275 percent.)

The same Red report incidentally quotes Soviet educational enrollment of 50 million students, including 1.9 million in technical schools, 1.8 million in colleges, and 30 million in high schools. It also boasts a jump in the number of civilian engineers from 289,000 in 1941 to 585,000 in 1955—a 102 percent increase. In the United States our total rose 100 percent, from 300,000 to 600,000.

The key fact which must be borne in mind is that all this Red growth was over the base

of an exceedingly primitive economy, including an economy devastated in World War II. Obviously, the Kremlin has been absolutely determined to shatter all its previous economic targets—no matter what the price in other sacrifice.

Meanwhile, throughout Asia, the Middle East and Africa, newly sovereign nations with primitive economies of their own, tend to gape in awe at the rise of Communist Russia and China from primitive underdevelopment. What Asia, the Mideast, and Africa may tend to forget is the blood-price exacted in the growth of these Communist countries. That blood price was revealed in all its hideous dimensions in Khrushchev's denunciation of the murderous tyrant, Stalin.

Asia, the Mideast, and Africa may not, however, remember. "If Russia and China could stride forward so rapidly, so can we," say the underdeveloped peoples. "Let us therefore, welcome Soviet and Polish and Czech and Peiping Government help," the neutralists continue.

And so, throughout the world the Soviet engineers and technicians are swarming. So, too, Soviet salesmen, representing Iron Curtain publicly owned enterprises, are offering the widest variety of products in exchange for the products of underdeveloped lands. The Soviets and satellites are particularly willing to take in exchange products which are in surplus and which the free world may not be able to absorb.

Thus, we see the battle for men's minds, as well as the battle for men's pocketbooks and stomachs. Of course, we Americans have been diligent in many respects in combating the Soviet challenge, militarywise, industrialwise, and aidwise throughout the world.

Our own private enterprise system has been our basic bulwark of strength on exporting both capital and know-how to underdeveloped areas. Private banks and the World Bank, have helped vitally to initiate development projects to supplement the efforts of an agency like the International Cooperation Administration, as well as the efforts of the Export-Import Bank. Look at a descriptive worldwide summary and at a globe or a map and you can pinpoint hundreds of farflung major engineering projects, representing uplifting work on a governmental, semigovernmental, and private level.

We have literally "transformed the earth" in country after country. We have helped to bring the industrial age to places which were not very long out of the bare beginnings of the iron age. American engineers, representing the great corporations of the United States, have built every conceivable type of installations in foreign parts.

As a matter of fact, one particular fact has always been somewhat disturbing to me, concerning our governmental aid agencies for economic and technical assistance, with their huge budgets, representing taxpayers' hard-earned savings. It is the fact that the agencies have not utilized to the fullest degree that they should, the services of private engineer consulting firms, or for that matter, of top-notch private economic consultants.

There has, frankly speaking, been too much of a tendency for governmental aid agencies to build up their own bureaucratic empires, huge and unwieldy official staffs. Their concern, in turn, has not always been with an actual private enterprise solution of an underdeveloped nation's problem, but rather, often with merely the filing of a sufficient number of papers, forms, and reports for artificial palliatives during a particular fiscal year. My readers may well be familiar with this distinction which I draw and which definitely occurs at times between the work of some Government employees in aid agencies and the work of high-grade private engineering firms. I don't want to be unfair to the former or to overstate the case for the latter, but I have seen a great many instances where private business know-how could have accomplished far more than a Government payroller's relatively amateurish performance.

I first drew attention to this frequent distinction a good many years ago. My readers may be interested in looking up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 5, pages 6597–6598, for a discussion of what I believe to have been the serious deficiencies of the then Truman administration's high-aspiring, but at times low-achieving point-4 program. "Get more private engineering know-how," I urged.

My interest then and now was in getting the most effective job done for Uncle Sam at the least possible cost. Private engineering firms these days are hardly lacking in a sufficient amount of business from purely private sources. So, my interest is not in more Government business for them, as such, but in more constructive results and yes, more economic results for Uncle Sam. I feel that we of the legislative branch in fulfilling our function of checks and balances with the executive branch, have a responsibility to point out facts of this nature.

Private business sources which other members on the Foreign Relations Committee have cited a large amount of impressive private engineering or economic work overseas in true free enterprise fashion which our executive branch might well seek to emulate. Consider the very successful (Daniel) Bell Mission, the current programing of industrial development in the Philippines and in Peru, and the development of sulfur reserves in Mexico. If you want specific instances, I cite these without attempting to judge a larger number of worthy counterparts in other areas. But these particular projects involving engineers of international reputation like Michael J. Deutch of Washington, D. C., and economists like Klein and Sachs of New York, indicate what an objective—I emphasize—objective, professional viewpoint can accomplish, in solving a problem, and not just supplying bureaucratic palliatives.

Meanwhile in our own country, the engineer is coming into his own. One can hardly open the business pages of a magazine or newspaper without reading that an engineer has become president or chairman of the board of some great American corporation. But where is the engineering leadership of tomorrow? And how are we going to get a sufficient number of engineers in the first place? In other words, what are we going to do to lick the engineering shortage?

Let me suggest just a few of what should be our minimum approaches. Let me later spell out background reasons behind a few of these approaches.

1. We must take comprehensive steps to bring effectively and continually to the attention of the youngsters in our grade schools and high schools—particularly our still untapped womanpower—the opportunities available in an engineering career.

2. Basically, in counseling both boys and girls in their early years in school, we must seek the fullest possible emphasis on science and mechanics for those who show aptitude in these fields.

3. We must help improve the overall quality of the great American teaching profession. It is the teacher—math, physics and others—who will help fan the spark of engineering talent which a youngster may show at an early age. Such a teacher must, in turn, be properly paid, must have appropriate recognition from society, must be properly trained in his or her own right in order to be able to bring out the best in talent.

4. We must increase our understanding of the reasons for dropouts from the grade schools, as well as from the high schools, colleges, and universities of our land. We must take remedial steps to minimize those dropouts, both within school and between the various steps up the ladder of education. Such efforts against dropouts must include: a. Making more generally available accurate, directly useful information on sources of scholarships, tuition grants, loan funds, and the like. b. Considering the expansion of our own Federal programs for scholarships for talented individuals.

5. Through the tax laws and any other means, we must encourage the great private enterprise system of America to help strengthen our engineering resource. We must give encouragement and inducements to industry to broaden the base of our engineering talent and to sharpen its proficiency.

6. We must take whatever steps are necessary to help strengthen the great private and public university system in America, so as to increase its ability to help meet this problem in all fields of engineering.

7. We must strengthen Uncle Sam's own program for recruitment and maintenance of engineering talent. The Federal Government must be able to get, and keep, for as long as necessary, the top talent which it needs in all fields of endeavor, particularly in military application.

8. Simultaneously, the Federal Government must consider still further expansion of its existing university and private contract work for research and development.

These, then, are but a few of the facets of our meeting this shortage problem. I have not attempted to specify all the possible remedies, because I do not presume that any single layman, myself or anyone else, can come up with all or even most of the answers. But I feel certain that by diligent teamwork among all interested sources, we can begin to make a dent in the critical manpower situation.

Now, let me spell out just a few of the background reasons for my suggestions. And let me touch upon a few areas which much of our public may tend to underestimate.

In the first instance, we are not simply seeking a vastly expanded quantity of engineers; naturally, we want an ever-improved quantity of engineers. We have good reason to be proud that our American engineers rank so high from the standpoint of quality. And we are interested in maintaining and increasing that qualitative superiority. I welcome, therefore, the spendid efforts being made by much of American industry in encouraging its existing engineers to sharpen their talent through post-graduate work.

Unfortunately, the percentage of engineers taking postgraduate studies has been dropping instead of increasing. So, many private companies' foresight in now encouraging more of their engineering talent to study for their doctorates, comes at a most opportune time. Moreover, companies have set up programs to send at least a few of their top engineers to graduate schools full time. Others are planning to send their personnel to special graduate courses for a few hours a week on company time. Some are trying to persuade graduate school facilities to set up off-campus schools for their engineers. They are offering to help these schools build facilities and they are even helping to pay instructors.

A second point which many Americans tend to lose sight of is the fact that almost invariably when we talk of the engineering profession, we think of male engineers. Here in the United States, despite the magnificent opportunities which we offer to our womenfolk and despite their usual splendid capitalization on such opportunities, they surely have not made full contribution in this particular field. Since 1953, when bachelor degrees in engineering were granted to 33 women, the number rose to 62 for each of the following years. But of all the students enrolled in engineering in 1955, less

than one-half of 1 percent, or only 1,074 were women.

Contrast this with the situation in Soviet Russia. In 1940, the Soviets credited women with constituting 19.4 percent of their engineering force. An analysis in our own country of the 1950 census, reported by the Scientific Manpower Commission, showed that only 0.7 percent of all the employed engineers were women. That certainly indicates the present need of more American lady engineers.

A third point which we tend to overlook is that an enormous number of talented youngsters who could probably make excellent engineers, cease all educational efforts after they graduate from high school. Thus, the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training indicated that scarcely more than half of the top graduates from high school go to college, and of those who enter college more than half drop out before graduation. When we apply these figures to the boys and girls in high school who have potential qualities necessary for service as engineers and scientists, we note that 8 out of 10 drop out and never graduate. They probably become good citizens, but they could make an infinitely larger contribution to the technical demands of our age if they were to continue.

Just why do they drop out of school? Lack of finances certainly is an important reason, but there are undoubtedly a good many other reasons as well which we had better examine quickly, and then take remedial action.

Still another phase of the problem is that we don't pay enough attention to preventing drop-outs from schools of engineering. I would like to cite just a few figures from the schools of my own State.

My readers are aware that I have the honor to represent a State with as proud an engineering background as virtually any other in the country. Four of her schools of engineering and technology are so outstanding as to be listed by the United States Office of Education among 216 American schools which granteed first degrees in engineering to 22,589 graduates last year. Unofficial figures for this June's graduations step that figure up to 30,000.

Nearly 60 percent of Wisconsin's engineers are graduated from our great University of Wisconsin at Madison. About 30 percent come from our privately-endowed and world-renowned Marquette University at Milwaukee. Two other schools with graduates listed by the United States Office of Education are the fine Milwaukee School of Engineering and the Wisconsin Institute of Technology at Platteville.

Our Badger graduates may be found in top spots throughout our country and the world. Their contributions in all phases of engineering are impressive, and it doesn't take an admitted Wisconsin booster to hail that fact. But here are the enrollment facts to consider. In 1955, the total enrollment of the four Wisconsin engineering schools to which I have referred was 5,712. That represented an encouraging gain over their enrollment of 4,431 in the fall of 1953. Each year's enrollment was around 2.6 percent of that of all engineering schools in the country, which, in 1955, had advanced to 22,488.

In 1953 Wisconsin schools graduated 569 engineers, or nearly 2.4 percent of the Nation's graduate class of that year. In 1955, the new engineers from Wisconin's four colleges numbered 430. Somehow, during four years of college about 150 students dropped out. What happened to cause the drop in potential graduates? Obviously, this is not simply a Wisconsin problem; the factors responsible for the drop-outs undoubtedly prevail throughout our Nation.

Still another phase is the fact that our United States distribution of engineers is not proportionate to the needs in all of your profession's major and growing categories. Again, let me cite the facts in my own State: Nearly 60 percent of Wisconsin's talent is enrolled in electrical and mechanical engineering phases. As important as these specialties are, there results to some degree an apparent and relative underemphasis of such vital fields as aeronautical engineering, architectural engineering, agricultural, geophysical engineering, and engineering physics.

But in the light of recent dramatic developments in, say, aeronautics and the uses of nuclear energy (many of which are reflected in the growing industries of my own State), it would appear to a layman that some of these latter, rather understressed phases of engineering might well be given increased attention in our able engineering schools. Of course, ours is and must remain a free system—with universal, individual free choice and initiative, but we dare not ignore national, yes, international needs, as well. Observing the engineering profession, I have been pleased to note the increasing amount of civic participation by your members in all phases of American life. We truly need the type of cool, factual, objective thinking which our engineers can bring to bear upon local, State, and national problems—on everything from local commercial rezoning to the awesome problems of the shrunken world of the jet age.

It is a fact, however, that our engineers are still under-represented in many high councils of our Government. Look at the membership of the United States Congress, or of your own State legislature, or of your city council, and ask yourself how large a proportion of the members are engineers, as compared, say, with lawyers or members of the other professions. The answer is, of course, very few, too few. That is why the engineer's greater role is essential in all segments of American life. An increasing role on the part of engineers in their own technical and professional societies is likewise necessary. Through these organizations, engineers throughout the 48 States of the Union gain nationwide recognition and renown they could not possibly attain individually, for their profession and for their Nation.

Similarly, the sound registration of engineers throughout the 48 States of the Union is a most welcome step in the engineering profession's history in our country.

We may expect ever higher standards to be established in this profession. And naturally, to the extent that engineers strengthen their own role in America, they strengthen America itself.

In conclusion, as I wrote at the start, danger signals are to be found everywhere—at home and abroad. But so are signals of opportunity, of promise, of hope—if we but use our God-given intelligence and energy. We as a Nation will not fail in this historic hour. With God's help, we will help usher mankind into a new era of fulfillment—of peace and prosperity and freedom.

Work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress comes to a close it is well to take stock of its accomplishments. In the field of foreign affairs much has been done by the Congress to enable the United States to give those charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs the money, the authority, the flexibility, and the tools with which to make progress in the complicated field of international relations. In this legislative process the House Foreign Affairs Committee has played an important part.

I want to pay tribute to the hard-working, conscientious, and able members of the committee who worked tirelessly together in a true spirit of bipartisanship to enable the committee to complete one of the heaviest workloads in its long history. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as one who is about to depart from this body into private life, I can only look back at my work on the committee with profound satisfaction. Above all, I can say without hesitation that without the hard work and wholehearted cooperation of each and every member of the committee, both on the majority and minority side, the great accomplishments of the committee would never have been achieved. I can truly say that the legislation which emerges from the House Foreign Affairs Committee is legislation which has been very carefully considered and very carefully drafted by the committee, with only one goal in mind, the security and the welfare of our Nation and of our people at a minimum cost to the taxpayer.

I also want to pay tribute to Boyd Crawford, the head of our committee staff, and to the others who have worked so well and faithfully under him—our staff consultants, Roy Bullock, Albert Westphal, and Sheldon Kaplan, and our staff assistants, June Nigh, Winifred Osborne, Helen Mattas, Myrtie Melvin, Helen Hashagen, and Louise O'Brien. They have earned and evoked my admiration and appreciation, as well as my personal friendship, by their consistent and sustained efforts on behalf of the committee. I do not believe there is another committee on Capitol Hill which has a better qualified staff. It has been the constant aim of the committee only to employ people who can deliver the goods. The long tenure of the staff is evidence that our high standards and care in selection have paid off in terms of efficiency and dependable service.

The work of the committee has grown by leaps and bounds. This is apparent from the comparison of funds involved in legislation considered. For example, during the 73d Congress the amount of money involved in public bills before the committee was $102,000, whereas the approximate total authorization considered by the committee, passed by the House, and enacted into law during the 84th Congress alone was $7,222,975,174.

The tremendous workload in the committee is readily obvious from a review of the following statistical record of committee activities during the 84th Congress:

Statistical record, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 84th Cong.

Number of consultative subcommittees	8
Number of special legislative subcommittees	7
Number of conference committees	4
Number of meetings of conference committees	5
Number of bills and joint resolutions referred to the committee	166

Statistical record, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 84th Cong.—Continued

Number of simple and concurrent resolutions referred to committee	157
Number of bills and joint resolutions considered by the committee	58
Number of bills and joint resolutions reported favorably	39
Number of bills and joint resolutions favorably reported by committee and passed by House	37
Number of bills and joint resolutions enacted into law	32
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions considered by committee	23
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions reported and acted upon by the House	10
Number of hearings (open and executive)	229
Number of pages of printed hearings	2,282
Number of pages of reports	982
Number of witnesses	348
Number of witness appearances before committee	482
Number of meetings with Rules Committee	13
Number of committee reports:	
Reports on legislation 48	
Minority reports on legislation 3	
Conference reports 4	
Special reports 7	
Total	62
Number of messages from the President and executive communications referred to the committee	40
Number of House documents referred to the committee	29
Number of memorials and petitions referred to the committee	104
Number of reports requested from Government departments and agencies on legislation referred to the committee	87
Approximate number of pages in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of House consideration on bills and resolutions reported by committee	480
Number of Members sponsoring measures referred to the committee	169

Time spent in sessions:

By committee: Executive 193 hours, 25 minutes; open 92 hours, 5 minutes.

By subcommittees: Executive, 51 hours, 14 minutes; open, 41 hours, 50 minutes.

Total: 376 hours, 6 minutes.

One point I wish to emphasize is that the committee has been very much aware of the fact that foreign affairs legislation is a matter of deep concern to the American people and that the public is entitled to as much information as can be made available without impairing the security of our country. In this connection, the committee has made a special point of publishing transcripts of executive session meetings after deletion of testimony involving matters relating to national security. It has also been the chairman's practice after executive session meetings to give the press a digest of information received or action taken during the meeting, carefully omitting references involving matters affecting the national security.

Within the next few weeks a detailed survey of the committee's accomplishments and activities during the 84th Congress will be made available to the public in printed form. The idea of compiling a documented survey of the activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was conceived during the 1st session of the 81st Congress. At the close of each Congress since that time the committee has published a survey of its activities.

For the benefit of the Members of the House who may wish to have a ready reference at this time to the committee's activities, there follows a summary of the legislative measures on which the committee completed its action during this Congress:

MEASURES ENACTED INTO LAW

FORMOSA

This act authorizes the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related possessions and territories of that area; approved January 29, 1955, Public Law 4.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mutual Security Act of 1955: This act authorized not to exceed $3,280,800,000 for the mutual security program through fiscal year 1955; approved July 8, 1955, Public Law 138.

Mutual Security Act of 1956: This act extended the mutual security program through fiscal year 1956 and authorized not to exceed $3,927,575,000 for carrying out the program; approved July 18, 1956, Public Law 726.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

This act provides for distribution to American claimants of $41 million available in the United States for payment of claims against Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and Italy. Utilizes existing claims adjudication organization at no cost to American taxpayer. Administrative expenses are to be met from funds available for distribution; approved August 9, 1955, Public Law 285.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Strengthening the State Department: This act increases the number of top-level statutory positions in the Department of State by three officers at the level of Deputy Under Secretary of State; provides for the rank of career ambassador as the highest class of Foreign Service officer; and permits computations for retirement purposes upon the actual salary received by an officer; approved August 5, 1955, Public Law 250.

Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1955: This act enables the Department of State to continue the integration of its personnel into the Foreign Service Officer Corps, as has been recommended by several independent committees appointed to study the State Department personnel and organization.

Establishes a home transfer allowance; permits the Department to defray part of the cost of education of children of Foreign Service officers when living abroad; provides for medical examinations, inoculations, and vaccinations for dependents of Foreign Service officers; makes Foreign Service and Reserve officers eligible to receive hardship post differentials like those paid staff officers and employees and civilian personnel of other Government agencies stationed abroad; approved April 5, 1955, Public Law 22.

Foreign Service Act amendments of 1956: This act, like Public Law 22 and Public Law 250 of the first session, continues the program started in 1954 by the Department of State to strengthen the Foreign Service and to improve its overall administration so that qualified individuals will find career incentives in the Foreign Service; approved July 28, 1956, Public Law 828.

Providing certain basic authority for the Department of State: By this act the Department of State was given basic authority for certain housekeeping activities which, in the main, have heretofore been contained in annual State Department appropriation acts. Waiting signature by the President.

Foreign Service annuities: This law provides for a $324 increase for about 250 retired Foreign Service officers and widows. It also makes an adjustment in some annuities similar to the cost-of-living increase already provided for a comparable group of retired civil service employees. The bill also provides relief through grants, not exceeding $100 a month, to widows living in impoverished circumstances who are not eligible for annuities; approved May 1, 1956, Public Law 503.

Repeal of consular fee stamp requirement: This act repeals the requirement for adhesive official stamps to be affixed by consular officers abroad when any consular or notarial act is performed. Elimination of this stamp dispenses with an obsolete and costly procedure and permits the Department of State to conduct certain of its functions in a more efficient and businesslike manner; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 101.

Service charge: This law repeals service charge for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State. Permits the Department to charge for such services at a rate commensurate with cost; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 102.

Protection of United States officials and distinguished foreign visitors: This act authorizes certain security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms for the protection of United States officials at international conferences and distinguished foreign visitors to the United States; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 104.

AMENDING THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

The purpose of this act is to prevent exchange visitors from using the exchange visitors program as an avenue to immigration to the United States. It is designed to prevent these exchange visitors in American institutions and organizations from regarding training experience provided under exchange regulations as preparation for permanent employment in the United States; approved June 4, 1956, Public Law 555.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

This law amends an act of August 5, 1953, to give more flexibility to the Commission in its plans for a suitable memorial in the Philippines to the Filipinos and Americans who fought there during World War II. It permits the Commission to accept public and private gifts and carries an authorization of not more than $100,000 for the expenses of the Commission. Also it permits the Commission to contract for work, supplies,

materials, and equipment inside and outside the United States and to engage the services of architects and other personnel; approved August 9, 1955, Public Law 298.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

This act amends the American Battle Monuments Commission's basic legislation by repealing outmoded provisions, and streamlining and improving the Commission's functions and responsibilities with respect to military cemeteries in which our American war dead are interred in foreign countries; approved July 25, 1956, Public Law 792.

RELINQUISHMENT OF UNITED STATES CONSULAR JURISDICTION IN MOROCCO

This law authorizes the President, at such time as he considers appropriate, to relinquish the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco. It also repeals various statutes implementing the treaties which have permitted the United States to exercise extraterritorial jurisdiction in Morocco. Waiting signature by the President.

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN LOSSES AND DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II (VATICAN CLAIMS)

This act authorizes the payment of $964,199.35 for damages sustained by the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo, which was accidentally damaged by bombs dropped from United States planes during attacks upon military targets in close proximity thereto during hostilities against German armed forces in World War II; approved July 3, 1956, Public Law 656.

PASSAMAQUODDY INTERNATIONAL TIDAL POWER PROJECT

This law authorizes not to exceed $3 million for the purpose of making a final survey to determine the feasibility of construction of a tidal power project in Passamaquoddy Bay for the generation of hydroelectric power, its cost, and whether the project is in the interest of national economy and national defense; approved January 31, 1956, Public Law 401.

PASSPORT FEES

This act authorizes an increase from $1 to $3 in the passport fee collected by clerks of State courts when executing passport applications; approved February 10, 1956, Public Law 403.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES ACROSS CANADIAN AND MEXICAN BOUNDARIES

Bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn.; approved June 16, 1955, Public Law 79.

Bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 98.

Bridge across the Rio Grande at Rio Grande City, Tex.; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 100.

Bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada; approved July 28, 1955, Public Law 184.

Bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; approved May 18, 1956, Public Law 529.

Bridge across the St. Marys River in or near city of Sault St. Marie, Mich.; approved May 18, 1956, Public Law 530.

Bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; approved July 11, 1956, Public Law 687.

Bridge over Niagara River between Buffalo, N. Y., and Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada; approved July 27, 1956, Public Law 824.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

United States participation in Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs: This measure authorizes an increase in the United States contribution for the support of the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs from $2,333 to $8,658 per year. It also authorizes an appropriation of $44,975 to pay the increased contribution for fiscal year 1957 and the increased amount for the period since April 1, 1950; approved July 11, 1956, Public Law 680.

Participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: This act authorizes the continued participation by the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference as well as a continuing appropriation to finance such participation; approved July 11, 1956, Public Law 689.

Participation in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: This act increases from $10,000 to $25,000 the authorization of the amount which may be appropriated to meet annual contributions of the United States to the regular budget of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, a specialized agency of the Organization of American States; approved July 27, 1956, Public Law 816.

Invitation to World Health Organization to hold 11th World Health Assembly in the United States: This measure authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $400,000 in order to defray the expenses incident to organizing and holding the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; approved July 30, 1956, Public Law 832.

INTERNATIONAL GAMES AND FAIRS

Cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals: This act authorizes the United States to continue the program which it has carried on for the past 2 years of participating in foreign trade fairs in various parts of the world and of underwriting certain expenses of sending United States musicians, theatrical performers, and athletes to other countries. The program has been financed for 2 years by the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. This measure recognizes the importance and demonstrated success of this program and provides formal authorization for its continuation. Waiting signature by the President.

Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif., 1960: Gives official United States sanction to the extension of an invitation by the United States Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif. No expense to the United States Government is involved. The last games were held in the United States in 1943; approved June 13, 1955, Public Law 69.

Pan-American games, Cleveland, Ohio: Authorizes an appropriation of $5 million to be available for the purposes of promoting and insuring the success of the pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959; approved July 30, 1956, Public Law 833.

United States World Trade Fair and the Oklahoma Semicentennial Celebration: Authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, 1957, and in the Oklahoma Semicentennial Celebration to be held in various communities of Oklahoma, 1957. No expense to the United States Government is involved; approved July 27, 1956, Public Law 815.

AUTHORIZING HON. BARRATT O'HARA, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO ACCEPT AWARD TENDERED BY PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA

Authorizes the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, Representative from the State of Illinois, to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fulgencio Batistá y Zaldivar. Waiting signature by the President.

CONCURRENT AND HOUSE RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE AND ADOPTED

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109

Authorized appointment of seven delegates by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and by the President of the Senate to meet jointly with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members at a conference in Paris in July 1955.

Passed House under suspension of rules June 20, 1955; passed Senate July 1, 1955.

OPPOSITION TO COLONIALISM AND COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 149

Expresses the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, June 23, 1955; passed Senate July 14, 1955.

STRENGTHENING THE PEACE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 157

Congress hereby expresses the fundamental desire and hopes of the American people for peace and calls upon other nations to renew efforts to strengthen the peace.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, June 14, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO PAKISTAN, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 223

Extends the greetings of the United States Congress to the National Assembly and to the people of Pakistan upon the occasion of Pakistan's inauguration as a republic on March 23, 1956.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, March 20, 1956; passed Senate, unanimous-consent proceedings, March 21, 1956.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS ON OCCASION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 232

Extends the greetings and expresses the appreciation of the United States Congress to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

Passed House, consent calendar proceedings, May 7, 1956; passed Senate June 6, 1956.

OPPOSING ADMISSION OF THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 265

Reiterates the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to prevent such representation.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1956; passed Senate July 23, 1956.

CONTINUING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL INJUSTICES IN THE WORLD, HOUSE RESOLUTION 370

Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of our Government to bring about the reunification of the peoples of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam; declares the sense of the House that it shall be the policy of our Government to bring about the entrance of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam into the United Nations; and declares that the policy of the United States Government shall continue to be in support of the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by the peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist bondage.

Passed House under suspension of rules, April 16, 1956.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE SUDAN, SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 70

Conveys the greetings of Congress to the Parliament of Sudan on the occasion of the independence of Sudan and the approval of its application by the Security Council for membership in the United Nations. The resolution also reaffirms the friendship of the United States for the people of the Sudan.

Passed Senate March 19, 1956, passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, May 7, 1956.

MEASURES REPORTED AND PASSED BY HOUSE BUT NOT FINALLY ACTED UPON IN SENATE

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCEPT AWARD TENDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF GREECE, H. R. 12358

Authorizes the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, Representative from the State of Ohio, the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, Representative from the State of Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY, Representative from the State of New York, and the Honorable JOHN TABER, Representative from the State of New York, to accept the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece.

Passed House July 23, 1956, unanimous-consent proceedings, without committee action.

AUTHORIZING AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE AND CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCEPT AWARD TENDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY, H. R. 12408

Authorizes Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable William A. Barrett, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable James K. Fulton, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, to accept and wear the award of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica Itáliana tendered by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

Passed House July 25, 1956, unanimous-consent proceedings, without committee action.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 386

Calls upon the people of the world to join in protecting their continued right to worship and to practice their own spiritual beliefs.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1955.

URGING CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL JURIDICAL COMMISSION WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 668

Urges the President and the Secretary of State to take immediate steps to bring about the establishment of an International Juridical Commission within the framework of NATO. The Commission would fulfill four functions: First, document all available evidence on the crimes against humanity committed by the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy; second, prevent those individuals implicated in such crimes from purging themselves of guilt by passing all responsibility to former leaders of the conspiracy now deceased; third, prevent the conspiracy of communism from cloaking itself with unwarranted respectability; and fourth, reduce the dangers of a third world war.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1956.

MEMBERSHIP OF SPAIN IN NATO, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 127

Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 14, 1955.

MEASURES REPORTED BUT NOT FAVORABLY ACTED UPON IN THE HOUSE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST AGGRESSION, HOUSE RESOLUTION 183

Requests the Secretary of State to take action to carry out certain recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, contained in its report made at the close of the 83d Congress.

Reported to House, June 9, 1955.

UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO, H. R. 5894

Amends Public Law 565, 79th Congress, to permit acceptance by the United States National Commission of gifts or bequests of money, such gifts or bequests to be exempt from District of Columbia as well as Federal income, estate, and gift taxes.

Reported to House July 14, 1955; considered in House July 23, 1956, under suspension of the rules. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill defeated by voice vote.

UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 186

Membership in the United Nations for Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, and Vietnam has been blocked by Soviet veto in the Security Council. It is the sense of this resolution that the United States should "exercise all possible influence in the United Nations to support these free and independent countries for membership in the United Nations."

Reported to House July 12, 1955; considered in House February 6, 1956, consent calendar proceedings. Motion adopted to have resolution laid on the table.

Haiti Celebrates 153d Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to send sincere greetings and best wishes to the Haitian people, President Paul E. Magloire, and His Excellency, Mauclair Zepherin, Ambassador of Haiti, on the occasion of the celebration of the 153d anniversary of the independence of Haiti, January 1, 1957.

Haiti, first of the Latin American nations to proclaim its freedom from colonial rule is the only Negro republic in the New World. Dissatisfaction with colonialism grew apace in America during the last years of the 18th and early years of the 19th centuries. St. Domingue was no exception, and on July 1, 1801, the great Haitian patriot Toussaint L'Ouverture declared the independence of the island from France. This independence was reaffirmed by Jean Jacques Dessalines on January 1, 1804, when the new republic was given the island's aboriginal name—Haiti—meaning land of mountains.

For a long time after separation from France, Haiti, like other countries of Latin America, suffered from political chaos. It is to the country's everlasting credit that, having so many obstacles to overcome, it has gone far on the road of self-development. Fundamentally, that road has been one of agricultural progress.

Agriculture is the basis of the nation's economy. There has been no lack of

awareness of the problems of Haitian agriculture or of devotion to the cause of improving it. President Paul E. Magloire upon the assumption of office embarked upon a plan of economic development for Haiti the scope of which has never before been undertaken in the history of the country. The aim of the Magliore program is to ameliorate all economic life, but in Haiti this means basically agricultural development. Haiti envisages a series of economic measures of which the most important, actually in execution, is the development of irrigation and hydroelectric power in the Artibonite Valley. In addition, the program of economic development embraces measures for the promotion of increased production of the chief exportation crops, intensified production and cultivation of foodstuffs, irrigation, drainage and river control, conservation and reforestation, development of animal husbandry, and the establishment of demonstration and experiment farms. The government of President Magloire has seriously adapted itself to the fulfillment and implementation of this program, which if successful will accrue many benefits for Haiti.

The government has dedicated itself to resort to all available means to improve the health, security, and standard of living among the people at large without undue delay. The entire education system of the Republic reflects this objective.

There exists a close rapprochement between our country and Haiti. The Haitian Government has repeatedly declared its solidarity with the United States and the other republics of the Western Hemisphere. Haiti is no newcomer to the practice of genuine inter-American cooperation. Haitian soldiers fought at the battle of Savannah in the American Revolution. Haiti sent help to Simon Bolivar in his struggle for independence in South America. Haiti's valuable contributions to World War II and western hemispheric defense efforts are well known. Hence, in contributing her efforts to the common cause of democracy, Haiti is carrying out a well-established historical tradition for which other American nations are deeply grateful.

Haiti is made up of a great and proud people; it is an important democracy toward which we feel friendly and we believe its people feel friendly toward us. I trust that throughout the years this good feeling, this friendship, and this cooperation may abide.

Grain Prices in Retrospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like the farmer and businessman to look back over the grain prices for the past 17-year period. The truth of the saying "Hindsight is better than foresight" is borne out. It is interesting to observe when and where the fluctuations occur. Of course, we all realize that available supply plays a part in the price level, as well as the market demand. Other factors enter in beyond the farmer's control; it may be the wind, the rain or the sun—too much or too little; insect or rust infestation. Here is where the Government's role comes in; that of a stabilizing factor.

Farm prosperity reflects on the other segments of our economy by a seven-times ratio. The Republican administration has realized its importance in relation to the general prosperity of our country, and to protect the farm economy in peacetime has devised and utilized various remedial measures; increased import restrictions; increased price supports; eased farm credit restrictions, including refinancing existing indebtedness on long-term real-estate loans through FHA; made available to farmers immediate soil-bank benefits—total number of acres presently enrolled is climbing past the 5 million-acre figure and still mounting—liberalized wheat subsidy exports. It is not resting here. It is also working out feasible means of developing new industrial uses for farm products.

With these stabilizing measures, and the $2 support price for wheat extended to the 1957 crop, I believe that farm prices will continue to rise. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago reported that farm prices have risen steadily from the downward drift by 11 percent since last December. During this same period, farmers' operating costs rose only 3 percent. I was glad to see this price squeeze eased, and farm prices maintained at a 96 percent average in mid-June of this year, as compared to 80 percent of parity in December. Farm income right now is running about half a billion dollars higher than during the last half of 1955, and it is still on the upgrade. Prospects for a continuance of this steady rise look favorable.

After analyzing the following table of yearly average grain prices per bushel at Minneapolis from 1940 to 1956 inclusive, I believe you will come to the conclusion that your party, the Republican Party of peace, progress and prosperity is working toward achieving a genuine prosperity for the farmer and the Nation as a whole. It does not intend to let the farmer down. You can bank on it.

[Average yearly price]

Year	Wheat, No. 1 Dark Northern Spring (ordinary protein)	Wheat, No. 1 Dark Northern Spring (15 percent protein)	Barley, No. 2 Malting	Barley, feed type	Oats, No. 2 White	Flaxseed, No. 1	Rye, No. 2
1939–40	$0.92	$0.95	$0.56	$0.45	$0.35	$1.65	$0.56
1940–41	.86	.89	.53	.43	.32	1.64	.50
1941–42	1.12	1.17	.79	.56	.47	2.10	.68
1942–43	1.27	1.34	.96	.64	.53	2.58	.68
1943–44	1.56	1.61	1.33	1.12	.77	3.04	1.15
1944–45	1.62	1.73	1.31	1.05	.69	3.10	1.23
1945–46	1.73	1.81	1.34	1.15	.72	3.14	1.91
1946–47	2.30	2.42	1.83	1.36	.84	4.81	2.76
1947–48	2.70	3.03	2.47	1.76	1.16	6.37	2.63
1948–49	2.26	2.38	1.49	1.09	.72	5.98	1.52
1949–50	2.24	2.38	1.57	1.08	.72	3.92	1.41
1950–51	2.34	2.56	1.63	1.21	.84	3.88	1.65
1951–52	2.42	2.53	1.57	1.22	.84	4.10	1.87
1952–53	2.39	2.51	1.64	1.18	.78	4.07	1.78
1953–54	2.33	2.68	1.54	.99	.74	3.86	1.19
1954–55	2.49	2.83	1.48	1.02	.71	[1] 3.39	1.30
1955–56	2.35	2.47	1.30	.87	.60	[2] 3.38	1.13

[1] Average of 6 months, August of 1954 through January of 1955.
[2] Average of 11 months, August of 1955 through June of 1956.

Let Us Stick to Facts—There Is No Spoils System in the Fish and Wildlife Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has had quite a bit to say about the spoils system ruining the Fish and Wildlife Service. Let us examine that closely.

In the first instance he says the top six jobs in the Service are all political appointments. Actually, there are only four class C—exempt—positions: the Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director for Wildlife, and Assistant Director for Field Operations. The two Assistants to the Director, GS–15, are not class C; they are both career appointments.

During the discussions on the floor of the House on July 24, the implication was left that the people who have been appointed to these jobs are "political hacks" with no experience in conservation and without qualifications for the jobs they hold. Nothing could be more inaccurate. Here are the facts.

John L. Farley, the Director, was for 6 years executive officer of the California Fish and Game Commission.

Associate Director Arnie J. Suomela, a graduate of the University of Washington in fisheries, joined the old Bureau of Fisheries back in 1931 and worked in it for 4 years until he went to the State of Oregon Fish Commission, of which he was executive secretary when he came to the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1953.

Incidentally, Milton James, who retired voluntarily in 1952 as Assistant Director

for Fisheries, the position to which Mr. Suomela was appointed in 1953, recently was named to Mr. Suomela's old job in Oregon.

Robert H. Johnson, who holds the position of Assistant Director for Wildlife, was director of the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Game, when he was appointed, a post he had held 8 years.

Lester H. Bagley, Assistant Director for Field Operations in the Service, came to Washington from Wyoming where he had been director of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission for 16 years.

Dr. O. Lloyd Meehean, who is Assistant to the Director for Technical Staff Services, one of the jobs implied to be occupied by a "political hack", has been a member of the staff of the Fish and Wildlife Service for 26 years and was Chief of the Branch of Game Fish and Hatcheries when he was promoted to his present position.

The other Assistant to the Director job in the list discussed by the gentleman from Wisconsin is occupied by Robert A. Wells who, before coming to Washington, had been for 9 years secretary of the New York State Conservation Department, which had an excellent reputation for a progressive conservation program in the administration of Perry B. Duryea. Mr. Duryea was the conservation commissioner who was succeeded by Governor Harriman's appointee, Louis A. Wehle, who resigned recently under fire after making ridiculous charges against civil-service wildlife employees in that department. Incidentally, Governor Harriman is a member of the party of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I might add that Mr. Wells received the Charles Banks Belt award in 1955 for the outstanding contribution to waterfowl restoration in the Atlantic Flyway as a result of the program which he developed in New York. That award was made by a committee of judges which included S. Dillon Ripley, curator of the Peabody Museum of Natural History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., and Robert Cushman Murphy, formerly curator of the American Museum of Natural History.

Along these same lines, Assistant Director Johnson received the Springfield Daily News Trophy this year for outstanding achievement in New England conservation. The selection was made by the New England Outdoor Writers Association.

Every single one of these men have long professional records in the conservation field. They are anything but "political hacks."

Apparently, if you came into the Service with a Democratic chairman's approval, you are a conscientious public servant; and if you came in at the time of a Republican administration, you are a "political hack."

Now let us turn to the subject of oil leases. We get the impression from the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin and some of his associates that oil leases were never issued before 1953 and that the present administration of the Department of the Interior is responsible for opening all wildlife lands to oil and gas operations. From the way the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin read, you are given the impression that only six oil leases were issued in the 20-year period prior to 1953. This, too, is completely inaccurate.

The wildlife lands involved are in three categories—wildlife refuges, game ranges, and cooperative lands. For all 3 groups there have been issued since 1920 to date a total of 612 leases. It may be of interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin to learn that prior to January 20, 1953, there were 277 of those leases issued. The bulk of all the leases were issued on the game ranges, principally Fort Peck. For wildlife refuges alone there have been 37 leases from 1920 to date. Of those 37 leases, 20 were issued prior to January 20, 1953. That certainly does not indicate that the Fish and Wildlife Service has taken a 180° turn, as the gentleman from Wisconsin stated.

The charge also has been made that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been winking at duck-baiting regulations. That, too, is completely untrue, as the facts on prosecutions clearly indicate. An examination of the record leaves you with the inescapable conclusion that, if the present Fish and Wildlife Service administration is winking at duck-baiting regulations, the previous one shut its eyes completely to them. The tabulations submitted to the gentleman from Wisconsin by the Fish and Wildlife Service for a 5-year period through 1953 showed an increasing number of cases in the past 3 years and none in 1951 and 1952 in the States involved.

When these facts were brought to his attention, the gentleman from Wisconsin then tried to emphasize that there were no prosecutions involving shooting of ducks more than 200 yards away from bait. In that respect I note that in his July 24 comments he said that—

> California duck-hunting clubs were given the green light and have been merrily shooting ducks from over bait from 200 yards to half a mile from the guns ever since.

I should like to know what kind of firearms they use in California to have a range like that. My duck-hunting friends boast forever when they reach out to get a bird 70 yards away.

This talk about 200 yards is just a smokescreen. Duck baiters actually shoot directly over or at least within shotgun range of the corn when they are taking ducks by this illicit method. That is where the birds are really vulnerable and where the baiters can get the most ducks. That's the real reason why baiting cases involve ranges of less than 200 yards.

I do not intend to discuss charges and countercharges involving Mr. Day which came up on the floor on July 24. I should like to suggest, however, that some of the gentlemen who have been so industriously engaged in whitewashing everything which happened in the Fish and Wildlife Service before 1953 and smearing everything which has happened since should check with the State fish and game administrators and learn what they privately think about previous Fish and Wildlife Service Administration's attitude and actions with respect to cooperative Federal-State effort to improve waterfowl management. Ask them if that administration willingly and freely cooperated in the States' efforts to get coordinators to make possible more efficient State and Federal action in flyway management programs and in developing improved regulations realistically based on waterfowl behavior patterns.

Practically all of these discussions, charges, and countercharges have involved waterfowl. For that reason and not as an intentional disregard of the other important phases of the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service I limit my next observation mostly to the waterfowl program alone. The present administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service is dedicated unequivocably to a cooperative Federal-State fish and game agency approach to the solution of the waterfowl problem. It believes that only by joint consultation and effort through flyway council organizations can the waterfowl management programs which are necessary be developed. This determination to work closely and continuously with the State conservation agencies is in sharp contrast with the record of the past. With respect to fisheries, I should like to add just this: Great advances in the fisheries conservation program have been made these past 3 years in both management and research. Everywhere you hear commendation for the Service's activities in this field.

Social Security Still Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the social-security conference report which was approved by the Congress on yesterday. I noted for this bill when it passed the House of Representatives last year because it is a step in the right direction and does bring about some very badly needed improvements in this law—particularly in reference to the age reduction for women and the disability protection for workers aged 50 or over.

My own bill to amend the social-security law is still pending before the House Ways and Means Committee and would make the following improvements:

First, reduce the eligibility age for retirement benefits—now age 65 for everyone—to age 62 for men and age 60 for women.

Second, provide that widows who have been entitled to mother's benefits because there were young children in the home when the father died may become eligible for benefits in their own right at age 55, regardless of whether there are still children under 18 in the home. Under existing law, the benefits to such a widowed mother cease when the youngest child reaches age 18, and she must wait until she is 65 years of age before she is again entitled to a benefit.

Third, provide that workers aged 50 and over who are retired prematurely from their jobs by a disability which is so severe that they cannot work at any job shall be entitled to benefits on proof of such disability.

Fourth, provide substantial increases in benefits ranging from 33⅓ percent in the lower and middle brackets to 10 percent in the highest.

The greatest need under our social-security program today is a substantial increase in benefits. Present rates are completely inadequate and unrealistic in the light of living costs and economic conditions generally. It is deplorable that our retired people should be expected to live on a pension as low as $45 per month for man and wife.

I hope the House Ways and Means Committee will renew its study and commence hearings on this important subject immediately upon the adjournment of Congress so that the matter can be given further consideration next January.

Report to the People of Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin—My Record and Votes on Major Issues in the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a policy which I have followed since first elected to the 81st Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives, I submit to the people of the Fourth District a report on the major legislative actions of the 84th Congress.

There is no doubt in my mind that my record will not please each and every individual in the Fourth District. Nevertheless, I want my constituency to know that I have followed the dictates of my conscience, and tried to represent our people to the best of my ability. The rest is a matter for their judgment.

THE 84TH CONGRESS

The Democrat-controlled 84th Congress—as the record shows—was a hard-working Congress. During the first session, which began on January 5, 1955, and ended August 2, 1955, the 84th Congress put more laws on the statute books than any other Congress in 5 years, and it had done so in less working days than any recent Congress.

During the second session, which lasted from January 3, 1956, to July 27, 1956, the record was equally imposing. The overall accomplishments of our national legislature during the last 2 years show a keen sense of responsibility and concern for the public welfare.

Even more important than the record 2,878 bills approved by this Congress is the quality of its conduct—and here, the 84th Congress ranks very high. We must note that President Eisenhower's prediction about a cold war of partisan politics—which he said would develop if the Democrats would win the control of the 84th Congress—never materialized. As a matter of fact, the President repeatedly received more support from the Democrats in Congress on issues affecting the security and well-being of our Nation than he did from the members of his own political party.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is a matter of record that the Democratic majorities in the 84th Congress have shown a consistent determination to keep our country militarily strong. They opposed the administration's moves to cut back our airpower, to reduce the strength of the Marine Corps, and to curtail our military buildup. The administration claimed that these economy moves would not hamper our military aircraft procurement, but the opposite happened. Aircraft purchases were cut back, a 2-year delay occurred in the Air Force buildup, and the production of B–52 jet bombers fell to alarming levels.

In the meantime, Communist displays in Moscow revealed that the Reds made unsuspected progress in the development and production of jet bombers and fighters, and in other military equipment. In comparison, our airpower and military development were falling behind.

Bearing these facts in mind, the 84th Congress increased the administration's request for Air Force funds by $1.1 billion, expanded research facilities in aeronautics, enlarged atomic energy projects, and increased funds for aircraft control and warning system. It also reorganized our military Reserves, forestalled Marine Corps manpower cuts, raised the officer strength of the Armed Forces by 60,000, and enacted a $1.4 billion naval construction program which included an atom-powered cruiser and a supercarrier.

INTERNAL SECURITY

While the Democrat-controlled 84th Congress was deeply aware of its responsibility for the safety of our Nation, it could not condone the many politically motivated frauds perpetrated by the administration in the name of internal security.

A thorough, 14-month study led a congressional committee to conclude that the administration "deliberately compiles figures which are basically dishonest" about its security programs.

The committee showed, for instance, that the list of persons allegedly fired as security risks was replete with duplications, dead people, employees who transferred to other Government agencies, workers who resigned because of illness or to take private jobs, and with other gross errors. As a case in point, the committee reported that 750 alleged security risks could not be identified at all by the Federal agencies which supposedly employed and fired them, and another 646 were actually rehired by the Government.

Through its security program "numbers game," the administration rendered serious injustice to thousands of loyal Government workers whose reputations have been besmirched for the sake of political expediency.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Great changes took place in the world during the last 2 years. Under the impact of the "spirit of Geneva," the trend toward neutralism became apparent in many countries located on the fringe of the Communist empire. Collective security arrangements, embodied in NATO, SEATO, the Balkan Alliance, the Baghdad Pact, and in other defense treaties, began to lose cohesion and strength. At the same time, dissension and conflict flared in North Africa and in the Near East.

The 84th Congress followed the President's recommendations by approving the continuation of the mutual-security program in 1955; by extending for 3 years the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; by simplifying our customs laws; by approving various treaties, and in other ways. In this field, the Democratic support of President Eisenhower's recommendations consistently exceeded that which he received from his own party.

Unfortunately, these measures were insufficient to stem the apathy toward the Communist danger which was slowly spreading through the free world. New, dynamic programs are needed to meet the challenge of revised Communist tactics. The administration failed to provide this kind of leadership. Instead, it further confused our allies by contradictory positions on the subjects of neutrality, on colonialism, on trading with the Communists, and on other grave issues.

Disturbed by these developments, Congress sharply cut the 1956 mutual-security program funds, initiated a thorough review of our foreign policy, prohibited the administration from sending further military aid to Yugoslavia, and adopted a series of resolutions reaffirming its opposition to colonialism and to the admission of Red China to U. N.; supporting the right to self-determination of other peoples; urging that Spain be admitted to NATO; and stressing our determination to work for reunification of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and for the freedom and independence of the Communist-dominated nations.

GOOD GOVERNMENT

The 84th Congress adhered to the principle that good government requires fair treatment of Government employees. It increased the salaries of postal and other Federal employees to bring them more closely to the levels prevailing in the private sector of our economy, and liberalized retirement and various fringe benefits. Judicial, legislative, and executive salaries were also adjusted.

The administrative machinery of the Federal Government came under careful congressional scrutiny, and many improvements were put into effect. The authority of the President to submit reorganization plans was extended, and various recommendations of the Hoover Commission were implemented.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The long-range, dynamic highway program approved by the 84th Congress will provide our growing Nation with a network of safe, modern highways. In the next 13 years, the Federal Government will finance 90 percent of the cost of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System, at the same time continuing the policy of aiding local and State authorities in the construction of Federal-aid highways outside of that system.

In the field of taxation, the 84th Congress repealed the so-called Humphrey

blooper—a provision of the Republican tax law which meant at least a billion dollar windfall profit for corporations; revised the formula for taxing the incomes of insurance companies to yield higher revenues; and extended existing excise tax schedules and the 52 percent corporate income tax.

An earnest attempt was made to lessen the burden of the individual taxpayer by granting a $20 tax credit. Unfortunately, opposed strenuously by the administration which only 2 years earlier pressed for and received tax cuts totaling $7.2 billion, and primarily benefitting large corporations, high-income people, and special cases, the average man's tax bill failed to clear the Senate.

In furthering balanced economic growth of our Nation, the 84th Congress overrode the administration's opposition and raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour; approved a 4-year program to stimulate airport construction; extended the life of the Small Business Administration and increased the revolving fund for loans to small business; strengthened our antimonopoly law and passed a law to curb the influence of large bank-holding companies.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

One of the most dramatic achievements of the 84th Congress was the enactment of new social-security amendments. These amendments contain the principles which I introduced and sponsored as early as 1953. They reduce the retirement age for women to age 62, and provide benefits to totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50. In addition, coverage was extended to 250,000 self-employed, professional people, and substantial improvements were made in programs aiding dependent children, the blind, the old, and the infirm.

The 84th Congress also enacted improved housing laws, providing special aid in this respect to our elderly citizens; approved dynamic, farsighted programs for medical and dental research, for the training of public health personnel, and for hospital construction; and passed several laws which are specifically designed to benefit our youth.

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

In an effort to make our Military Establishment as effective as possible, and to remove certain inequities, Congress enacted a law to give our Nation a reserve manpower pool of 2.9 million by 1959; provided incentive pay increases for members of our Armed Forces; liberalized retirement benefits and social-security credits; overhauled the entire structure of survivors' benefits; extended medical care to military dependents, and granted educational assistance to children of World War II and Korean war veterans whose deaths were service-connected.

The veterans in the Milwaukee area should be particularly pleased that steps were taken this year to provide a new Veterans' Administration hospital at Wood, Wis., a project which I sponsored and for which I have been working for 4 years. The preparation of plans for the 1,250-bed, $35 million hospital will begin in the near future.

The space limitations of this report will not permit me to describe in detail the several other measures which will benefit our veterans and servicemen. A summary of veterans legislation which was acted upon by the 84th Congress is available upon request.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Under the Eisenhower administration, farm operators' net income declined about 30 percent. The depressed conditions in the agricultural segment of our economy began to affect our cities: sales of agricultural implements and of other industrial goods dropped sharply, and employment decreased in those industries.

The Agricultural Act of 1956 and other measures approved by Congress are intended to put our agriculture back on its feet, and to correct the sharp disparity in incomes which prevailed during the last few years.

The 84th Congress also took steps to prevent further raids on our natural resources—such as the Al Sarena Mine case, the sellout at Hells Canyon and at Niagara, the tidelands oil grab, and the raids on our timber resources and on the national grazing lands. It strengthened older statutes and provided new laws aimed at the preservation of our national heritage for future generations.

Voting record, 84th Congress

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	Extension of the selective service program	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization and strengthening of our military Reserves	Became law.
Voted for	Stepped-up production of B–52 jet bombers and fighter planes	Became law.
Voted for	Special funds to prevent 22,000-man cut in the U. S. Marine Corps	Became law.
Voted for	Increased funds for aircraft control and warning system	Became law.
Voted for	$1.4 billion for naval construction, including atom-powered ships	Became law.
Voted for	Measures to strengthen our internal security laws	Became law.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen the free world defense	Became law.
Favored	Study and revision of United States foreign policy programs	Initiated.
Voted for	3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements program	Became law.
Voted for	Simplification of burdensome United States customs procedures	Became law.
Favored	Extension and revision of Refugee Relief Act, more visas for orphans	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Resolution opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations	Approved.
Favored	Aid to workers and industries harmed by foreign competition	Pending.
	GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Government Reorganization Act of 1955	Became law.
Voted for	Code of fair practices for congressional committees	Approved.
Voted for	Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska	Pending.
Favored	Home rule for the District of Columbia	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Salary revision for Federal employees, officials, judges, legislators	Became law.
Voted for	Improved benefits under Civil Service Retirement Act	Became law.
Voted for	Improved benefits under Railroad Retirement Act	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization and improvement of U. S. Foreign Service	Became law.
Voted for	Elimination of undue restrictions on reduction of unnecessary Government competition with private business	Became law.
Voted for	More effective civil rights program	Passed House.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Income tax reduction for the average taxpayer	Passed House.
Voted for	Plugging up of loopholes in the 1954 GOP tax law	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	$33.4 billion, long-range highway program	Became law.
Sponsored	Equality of opportunity bill to aid small business	Passed House.
Opposed	Exemption of natural-gas producers from Federal regulation	Vetoed.
Opposed	Postal rate increases on first-class mail which produces a surplus	Passed House.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Incentive pay increases and allowances for Armed Forces personnel	Became law.
Voted for	Continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen	Became law.
Voted for	Medical care, improved housing for military dependents	Became law.
Voted for	Revision and improvement of military survivors' benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Improved compensation and pensions for veterans	Passed House.
Proposed	New $35 million, 1,250-bed VA hospital for Wood, Wis	Programed.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Voted for	Agricultural Act of 1956 and the soil bank program	Became law.
Voted for	Increased sales of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies	Became law.
Voted for	Liberalization of farm loan programs, relief for economic disaster	Became law.
Voted for	Improved conservation, research, brucellosis-eradication programs	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded reclamation and irrigation project programs	Became law.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Social Security Act Amendments of 1956	Became law.
Voted for	Federal assistance to States for construction of needed schools	Defeated.
Voted for	Federal aid for the Salk vaccine program	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded programs of medical-dental research, hospital construction	Became law.
Voted for	4-year program of aid to States for airport construction	Became law.
Voted for	Strengthened bans on use of mails to transport indecent literature	Became law.
Voted for	Increased penalties for peddling of narcotics, particularly to youth	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of school milk program to child-care centers and camps	Became law.
Voted for	Improved housing program with special aids for elderly citizens	Became law.

Rollcall record	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting [1]	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum calls [2]
1st session	147	76	1	71	2
2d session	132	73	4	59	2

[1] Pairs generally arranged.
[2] Absence on quorum calls does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

Saudi Arabia Celebrates King Saud's 24th Anniversary of Accession to the Throne, November 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to extend felicitations to the people of Saudi Arabia, His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman al Faisal al Saud, and His Excellency Sheikh Abdullah Al-Khayyal, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, upon the occasion of the celebration of the 24th anniversary of His Majesty King Saud's accession to the throne of Saudi Arabia, November 12, 1956.

The herculean efforts of King Ibn Saud to weld his country into an independent entity and break the bonds of the post-World War I mandate system are too well known to warrant detailed recounting here. Perhaps nowhere else in the annals of modern history could be found a state which owed more of its existence to the efforts of a single man. It suffices to say that King Saud's valiant struggles to regain for his family its lost authority and past glory began many years before he acceded to the throne of his country. Despite numerous obstacles created by man and nature which confronted him, nullifying his initial successes, King Saud forged ahead, achieving remarkable victories over the enemies of his people. Personal courage, faith, and determination undergirded the young prince for his tasks. Indeed the determination of King Saud to carry on many of his early encounters singlehanded in the face of numerous odds was the source of grave concern to his family and faithful friends.

With the advent of the First World War King Saud's plans for independence of his country suffered a setback. Upon the termination of the war, the Arab countries which revolted against colonialism, and which were promised their independence by the Allies, were placed instead under the mandate system of the League of Nations.

In 1924 the forces of King Ibn Saud captured Taif and Mecca followed the next year by similar victories over Medina and Jedda. In January 1926, King Saud was proclaimed King of the Hejaz. When Nejd was proclaimed a Kingdom in 1927, His Majesty's title became King of the Hejaz and of Nejd and its dependencies. In September 1932, King Ibn Saud proclaimed the union of the Hejaz and Nejd into the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with himself as monarch.

During the early years of World War II Saudi Arabia remained neutral. Its contribution to the war effort is described in the citation of the Legion of Merit, Degree of Chief Commander, presented in 1947 to King Ibn Saud by President Truman. The citation reads in part:

> His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman al Faisal al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia, rendered exceptionally meritorious service to the war effort of the United Nations. He led his country in an unwavering course of support and encouragement to the cause of the Allies * * * As Commander in Chief of Saudi Arabia he kept the land, sea and air routes under his control open for use, and by his attitude of wholehearted cooperation, he enable American forces to accomplish a program of construction and resource development in the country that derived benefits of major proportions for the prosecution of the war. Through his unswerving loyalty, and his dynamic leadership at the head of his nation in the support of the cause, King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud made a notable contribution to the successful war effort of the United Nations.

Saudi Arabia is a member of the United Nations, having sent a delegation to the San Francisco Conference in 1945 when it was a signatory of the United Nations Charter. It is also a member of many specialized agencies of the United Nations.

In describing King Ibn Saud, H. C. Armstrong wrote in his Lord of Arabia:

> Ibn Saud is Lord of Arabia ruling by force of his personality and the strength of his own right arm. An immense man, tremendous, vital, dominant. A giant thrown up out of the chaos and agony of the desert—to rule.

The success which King Ibn Saud has achieved through his efforts and with the minimum of external support have gained for him universal esteem and affection of Arabs. No more outstanding figure has appeared in the Arab world for many years. We trust that his bigness in his own country will be expanded; that his conscience and regard for the prestige of Saudi Arabia in the free world will lead to an expression of that same greatness in all relations with all people; that nothing be permitted to cast a shadow over a shiny career.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, May 1 is a day customarily set aside by the Communists to celebrate and glorify the expansion of the Communist ideology. It is a day to sing praises to its depraved principles and to pay tribute to its barbaric aim of world conquest.

On the eve of this infamous spectacle, the Veterans of Foreign Wars in my home State of Georgia observed Loyalty Day. Annually the Veterans of Foreign Wars stage these patriotic ceremonies as a brief reminder of the matchless blessings enjoyed by everyone in our land of freedom and liberty.

There are many fine patriotic celebrations each year in our country, but only VFW Loyalty Day is dedicated specifically to the reaffirmation of faith and belief in our Flag and to the Constitution.

VFW Loyalty Day was conceived in a fighting spirit. It was originated as a weapon to combat the sinister effects of Communist-celebrated May Day and to arm our citizens against the penetration of Communist propaganda.

In Georgia, VFW Loyalty Day was directed by State Commander Randolph Medlock of Stone Mountain and State Loyalty Day Chairman Charles A. Moran of Atlanta. Under the inspirational leadership of these two patriotic Americans, many fine programs were sponsored by VFW posts throughout the State.

At the VFW Georgia Department encampment last month, Chairman Moran summed up Loyalty Day with these words: "Loyalty Day contributes to a great campaign of truth by informing our people and urging them to rekindle that flame of love for God and country which awakens them from apathy and indifference."

The world was slow to recognize the menace of communism. Freedom-loving people of every nation for many years were unprepared to believe the horrors which communism held for the millions living under its scorn. With the high sense of morality associated with Christianity, we could not conceive of the criminal character and the pagan conscience of this heathen philosophy.

At last the world has come to recognize the evils inherent in this ungodly ideology which enslaves the mind and molds the body as serfs of the all-powerful state.

The observance of Loyalty Day stands like a sentry over our freedom and reminds us that our heritage, like all things precious, must be eternally defended.

It was an honor for me to serve as honorary vice chairman of the Georgia Loyalty Day Committee. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have made, and are continuing to make, real and significant contributions to the vital cause of loyalty through the annual observance of Loyalty Day.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Activity Report for 2d Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 105, 84th Congress, I should like to submit a statement of the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 84th Congress, 2d session.

The activity report for the first session of this Congress was inserted in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1955, at page 13178. A more detailed report, combining both sessions, will be filed later.

Among the important measures cleared by the committee during the second session were the following items of legislation:

On the subject of health, the committee promptly reported a bill to extend the Polio Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955 through June 30, 1957, which became law. The committee also took action on bills authorizing mental health study grants, a national health survey, increasing authorization for construction at National Institute of Dental Research, health research facilities, increasing the number of specially trained professional nurses and of practical nurses and professional public-health personnel, extension for 2 years of the hospital and medical facilities survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act, and establishing a national library of medicine.

In connection with its study of the Salk polio vaccine, the committee visited the Eli Lilly & Co. laboratories and acquired much valuable information about the problems involved in the production of the vaccine.

Legislation was enacted, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, to provide, generally, for a 10-percent increase in benefits to a large number of beneficiaries under that act.

On the subject of aviation, the committee reported legislation making it possible for airlines operating in Hawaii and Alaska to obtain permanent certificates; to prohibit serving alcoholic beverages on airlines; to permit reduced-rate air transportation to ministers of religion; extension of aviation war risk insurance; extension for 5 years of Prototype Aircraft Act; to punish sabotage of aircraft; and to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 relating to capital gains of air carriers.

Following the tragic airplane accident over the Grand Canyon, a special subcommittee was appointed to investigate immediately the problems of airspace use, including air traffic regulations and control, in an effort to find ways to avoid recurrence of such air disasters. The subcommittee immediately held hearings in Las Vegas and visited the scene of the accident.

In the field of transportation, the committee held extensive hearings on the legislative recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization. It reported out a bill to improve the transportation system in the District of Columbia and its environs, which became law. The so-called trip leasing bill was enacted. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to prohibit common carriers by railroad, motor vehicle, water, or freight forwarders from granting reduced rates—that is, less than published tariff rates—for the transportation of Government property or personnel, except in certain minor respects, was reported to the House. Also reported, was a bill designed to change requirements for obtaining freight forwarder permits. Bills to grant reduced fares for disabled persons requiring an attendant and to regulate transportation of migrant farm workers were reported favorably.

Under authority of House Resolution 357, a special subcommittee was appointed to study traffic safety, which has already made plans for an extensive study of this problem.

The committee reported legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act with regard to attorney fees and disposal of World War I assets; and to amend the War Claims Act relative to claims of certain religious organizations in the Philippines, and determination of date of death of certain prisoners of war.

In the field of securities, extensive hearings were held on promotional securities, and legislation was reported to establish liability of officers and other persons making false statements under subsection 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933.

A report was filed on newsprint, reflecting the newsprint outlook for 1956, House Report 1953.

The detailed activity report follows:

ACTIVITY REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

BILLS REPORTED

The committee has considered and reported favorably the following bills:

H. R. 8704: Extension of Polio Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955. Report 1697, by Mr. PRIEST, January 30, 1956. S. 2990 passed House, in lieu, February 6, 1956. Approved February 15, 1956, Public Law 411.

H. R. 7732: Artificial coloring of oranges. Report 1982, by Mr. DIES, March 29, 1956. Approved July 9, 1956, Public Law 672.

S. 2587: Commissioned Corps of Public Health Service. Report 1987, by Mr. ROBERTS, April 9, 1956. Approved April 27, 1956, Public Law 492.

S. 2972: Antisabotage of aircraft. Report 1979, by Mr. HARRIS, March 29, 1956. Approved July 14, 1956, Public Law 709.

H. R. 8901: District of Columbia transit bill. Report 2034, by Mr. HARRIS, April 24, 1956. S. 3093 passed House, amended, in lieu, May 17, 1956. Approved July 24, 1956, Public Law 757.

H. R. 9048: Mental health study grants. Report 2086, by Mr. PRIEST, May 2, 1956. Provisions of this bill contained in S. 3958. S. 3958 passed House, amended, in lieu, July 23, 1956.

S. 3958: Health Amendments Acts of 1956. Report 2569, by Mr. PRIEST, July 2, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 24, 1956.

S. 3076: National Health Survey Act. Report 2108, by Mr. DIES, May 3, 1956. Approved July 3, 1956, Public Law 652.

S. 3246: Increasing authorization for construction at National Institute of Dental Research. Report 2144, by Mr. PRIEST, May 10, 1956. Approved July 19, 1956, Public Law 732.

S. 849: Health Research Facilities Act of 1956. Report 2184, by Mr. PRIEST, May 21, 1956. Passed House, as amended, July 13, 1956. House adopts conference report, July 19, 1956. Senate adopts conference report, July 20, 1956.

H. R. 9592: To permit reduced air rates for ministers of religion. Report 2183, by Mr. CARLYLE, May 21, 1956. S. 3149 passed House in lieu, June 18, 1956 (text of H. R. 9592 substituted). House adopts conference report on S. 3149, July 19, 1956. Senate adopts conference report on S. 3149, July 23, 1956.

H. R. 5257: Definition of dry-milk solids. Report 2176, by Mr. ROBERTS, May 17, 1956. S 1614 passed House in lieu, June 18, 1956 (text of H. R. 5257 substituted). Approved July 2, 1956, Public Law 646.

H. R. 8000: Prohibit serving alcoholic beverages on airlines. Report 2399, by Mr. WILLIAMS, June 20, 1956. Passed House, July 25, 1956.

S. 1146: Amend Trading With Enemy Act re attorney fees. Report 2332, by Mr. KLEIN, June 12, 1956. Approved June 25, 1956, Public Law 611.

S. 898: Trip leasing. Report 2425, by Mr. HARRIS, June 25, 1956. Passed House, as amended, July 13, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

H. R. 9065: Amend Railroad Retirement Act to provide increased benefits. Report 2418, by Mr. HARRIS, June 25, 1956. S. 3616 passed House in lieu, July 23, 1956.

H. R. 7536: Require radiotelephones on certain vessels. Report 2387, by Mr. MACDONALD, June 19, 1956. Passed House, July 2, 1956. Passed Senate, amended, July 26, 1956.

H. R. 8902: Determination of airline revenue. Report 2530, by Mr. MACK, June 29, 1956 (pt. 2, minority views, by Mr. HESELTON). Recommitted, July 26, 1956.

H. R. 9319: Liability of officers making false statements in securities. Report 2513, by Mr. PRIEST, June 28, 1956.

H. R. 10624: General Public Utilities Corp. in Philippines. Report 2477, by Mr. KLEIN, June 26, 1956.

S. 2913: Extend for 2 years Advisory Committee on Weather Control. Report 2424, by Mr. ROGERS, June 25, 1956. Approved July 9, 1956, Public Law 664.

S. 3163: Permanent certification for airlines in Hawaii and Alaska. Report 2462, by Mr. PRIEST, June 26, 1956. Approved July 20, 1956, Public Law 741.

H. R. 525: Amend section 22 of Interstate Commerce Act re Government traffic. Report 2633, by Mr. HARRIS, July 6, 1956. Rules Committee deferred action, July 12, 1956.

S. 1456: Amend Communications Act re interlocking directorates. Report 2540, by Mr. HARRIS, June 29, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 16, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

S. 3412: Extend war-risk insurance (aviation) for 5 years. Report 2510, by Mr. PRIEST, June 28, 1956. Approved July 20, 1956, Public Law 746.

H. R. 11969: Require safety devices on household refrigerators. Report 2634, by Mr. ROBERTS, July 6, 1956. Passed House, July 19, 1956. Passed Senate, amended, July 26, 1956.

H. R. 9547: Amend Food and Drug Act to simplify procedures. Report 2623, by Mr. PRIEST, July 5, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 16, 1956. Passed Senate, July 23, 1956.

S. 3365: Change requirements for obtaining freight-forwarder permit. Report 2778, by Mr. HARRIS, July 18, 1956.

S. 1777: Reduced or free fares for disabled persons requiring attendant. Report 2745, by Mr. WILLIAMS, July 17, 1956. Passed House, July 19, 1956.

S. 3363: Private bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak (pilot's radio license). Report 2783, by Mr. HARRIS, July 18, 1956. Passed House, July 26, 1956.

S. 2060.: Working capital fund for Bureau of Standards. Report 2809, by Mr. ROBERTS, July 19, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

S. 3391: Regulation of transportation of migrant farm workers. Report 2810, by Mr. HARRIS, July 19, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

H. R. 12144: Amend War Claims Act (determination of death date of POW's). Report 2824, by Mr. KLEIN, July 19, 1956. Passed House, July 23, 1956.

S. 2226: Disposal of World War I assets. Report 2777, by Mr. KLEIN, July 18, 1956.

S. 3430: Establish medical library. Report 2826, by Mr. DIES, July 19, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 24, 1956.

S. 2074: Extend for 5 years Prototype Aircraft Act. Report 2816, by Mr. HINSHAW, July 19, 1956.

H. R. 6586: War claims of religious organizations in the Philippines. Report 2825, by Mr. KLEIN, July 19, 1956. Passed House, July 23, 1956.

NUMBER OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

The committee held public hearings as follows: Entire committee, 5; subcommittees, 146.

Hours of sitting (public and executive), entire committee, 44; subcommittees, 328.

Printed pages of public hearings, 6,230.

Unprinted pages of public hearings, 140.

Pharmacists in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months past I have served as a member of the Subcommittee on Manpower of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This subcommittee has continued the work of a predecessor subcommittee in the 83d Congress to assist in the prevention of duplicated effort and to work toward the most effective and economical utilization of manpower in the Federal Government. I believe the subcommittee has rendered an excellent service to the Nation.

My comments at this time, however, are directed to use of manpower in the Armed Forces rather than toward civilian personnel.

The armed services must constantly guard against the shortsighted practices in the assignment of personnel. We all know that the use of manpower in our military services is of vital importance to their operating efficiency in the defense of our Nation. I am concerned that the classification of personnel for military duties often leaves much to be desired.

For the past year, I have been particularly concerned with the policies relating to the assignment of servicemen who are registered civilian pharmacists and have made some initial investigation of this question. It is learned that in many cases men who are registered pharmacists serve in other capacities while untrained men are given special training at Government expense upon their entry into the service to assume duties in military pharmacies. I have received letters from constituents bringing this to my attention.

Last year, when I took up this question with the Army, I received the following reply which read in part concerning first, the commissioning of pharmacists and secondly, of the assignment of registered pharmacists as enlisted men:

Recent reductions in the overall strength of the Army have necessitated the suspension of our program of appointing and calling to active duty pharmacists and other individuals who meet the criteria for appointment in the Pharmacy, Supply and Administration Section, of the Medical Service Corps, for fiscal year 1956. In view of the fact that the Medical Service Corps is at the present time approximately 16 percent overstrength, it is not anticipated that vacancies will occur in the very near future.

The enlisted military occupational specialty job description for pharmacy specialists (932) is below the level of the registered pharmacist, and during periods when personnel are not being inducted into the Army, positions classified in this specialty would be filled primarily by service school-trained enlisted personnel with no professional training and experience prior to entry into military service. Because of the large numbers of registered pharmacists who have been inducted, no service school training has been conducted in this enlisted specialty since May 1953. Vacancies through attrition have been filled to the maximum extent possible by inducted registered pharmacists. No attempt was made, however, to eliminate career enlisted specialists already trained and being utilized in the field. It is estimated that 25 percent of the present enlisted strength in military occupational speciality 932 falls in this category. Many enlisted registered pharmacists for whom pharmacy vacancies did not exist have been effectively utilized, during their period of obligated service, after short periods of on-the-job training, in allied enlisted specialists such as medical laboratory and medical aid man.

I have now received the following letter from the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association informing me of a practice within the Air Force which seems very questionable indeed. The letter is as follows:

OHIO STATE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Columbus, Ohio.

Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The past few weeks, Congressman HENDERSON, there have been news stories concerning the need for increased appropriations for the Air Force, and lots of debate back and forth about the justification for the additional appropriations.

At the present time, only a fraction of the pharmacists entering our Armed Forces are given the opportunity to practice pharmacy while serving the term for which they were either drafted or enlisted. Most of them, from reports which regularly come to my desk end up as first-aid men, ambulance drivers, lab assistants, or any one of the myriad of duties related to one degree or another to the medical field.

In our appearances before the various student bodies of Ohio's four colleges of pharmacy we have been rather successful in convincing these pharmacists and pharmacists to be there will be enough pharmacy vacancies to permit each pharmacist to serve in his profession while in the Armed Services.

However, I'm through trying to defend the Armed Forces against the treatment about which these young pharmacists complain. Here's the reason why.

This past week I received a copy of the apprentice pharmacy specialist curriculum prepared for and being used by the United States Air Force School of Aviation Medicine, Gunter Air Force Base, Ala. On page 1, the text outline says, "This course is 18 weeks * * *and 702 curriculum hours. Two of these weeks are devoted to basic medical subjects such as first aid, anatomy, physiology, and preventive medicine."

It goes on to outline the apprentice pharmacist specialist course objectives as follows: "To train students to operate an Air Force pharmacy; to perform the administrative duties necessary for the operation of an Air Force pharmacy; to compound and dispense drugs; to utilize the drugs, chemicals, and biologicals in the Federal Catalog of Medical Material."

Students at Ohio's four colleges of pharmacy spend many times the 702 hours required to complete this course in qualifying for their pharmacy degrees. In addition, they spend 1 year's apprenticeship in a retail or hospital pharmacy, against several times the number of hours necessary to pass the Gunter course.

The young men entering our Armed Forces, Congressman HENDERSON, are entitled to the same high grade of health care they can obtain as civilians. Their lives should not be risked at the hands of untrained apprentice pharmacist specialists whose training does not deserve to be mentioned in the same breath as university graduate registered pharmacist.

The Air Force, if top brass so desires, can eliminate this waste of already-learned skills and money by simply abolishing the Gunter apprentice pharmacist school and utilizing the training of pharmacists who already know their profession and who are eager to practice it while required to serve in the Armed Forces. This whole situation appears to be a gross mismanagement of the use of available manpower by the United States Air Force.

What actions can you take, Congressman HENDERSON, to see that young men and women in our Armed Forces, and the Air Force in particular, get the same high standards of pharmacy treatment as they get as civilians?

Cordially yours,

JAMES H. MERRITT,
Executive Secretary.

JULY 6, 1956.

World Communism and Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, recent months have seen farflung and well-publicized efforts of the part of the U. S. S. R. to extend her influence throughout the world on the diplomatic and economic fronts. These efforts have not overlooked Latin America.

The Communists have added fuel to the Middle Eastern caldron by supplying important military assistance to Egypt, hoping to undermine the Anglo-American position in key Arab countries and to bring those countries under their own sphere of influence. Increasing emphasis in Asia on the part of the Soviets has been highlighted by the wandering tourists—Khrushchev and Bulganin—in India and Burma, well documented in the world press. New attention to Africa is notable in, among other things, economic overtures to Liberia and propaganda support of the Mau Mau terrorists in Kenya.

Meanwhile, as Russian armaments reach new heights, the peace offensive in the Western World is renewed by Premier Bulganin, seeking to recapture the shattered Geneva spirit. Although Bulganin's letter to President Eisenhower requesting an American-Soviet treaty of friendship has been firmly turned down by the President in a note of reasonable

moderation, the Soviet Premier's overtures, renewed in a second letter to the President, remain a kingpin in Communist peace propaganda.

I

Soviet desires to give this peace offensive the appearance of universality have naturally led to the inclusion of the Latin American Republics in its scope, although this phase of the overall effort seems to have been somewhat overlooked by Western commentators. The public kickoff for the Latin American offensive took place on January 16 in a Moscow press conference conveying the written answers of Premier Bulganin to a series of questions put by the New York-published Spanish-language magazine, Vision. Premier Bulganin extended the prospect of full diplomatic relations with all the Latin American Republics and dangled the bait of extensive foreign-trade possibilities between the Soviet Union and Latin America.

In offering diplomatic relations to those Latin American countries with which such relations do not presently exist, Premier Bulganin promised certain benefits which he said had been obtained from uninterrupted diplomatic relations with Argentia, Mexico, and Uruguay. These benefits were alleged to include cooperation between those three states and the U. S. S. R. for maintaining and strengthening peace, and the stimulation of economic, cultural, and other relations. As an attraction to Latin American States not maintaining diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R., Premier Bulganin ascribed to the existence of such relations between the U. S. S. R. and Argentina "the reason for the substantial increase in trade" between those two states.

In the economic sphere, the Premier assured Latin America that "the U. S. S. R. would be able to export to the Latin American countries various types of industrial equipment and machinery, including equipment for the petroleum industry, complete production equipment, complete sets, and all types of machine tools, automobiles, and agricultural machinery." The offer of technical personnel was extended, with the U. S. S. R. eager to share her experience in the field of industry, electrical energy, construction, transportation, and agriculture. Other items were offered by the U. S. S. R.: wood products, cellulose, and paper goods; petroleum and petroleum derivatives; sheet metal; cement; asbestos; dyes; chemical, and other products.

In exchange, the U. S. S. R. would "be able to import from Latin America agricultural products, livestock, and mining products."

These Kremlin overtures to the Central and South American Republics suggest the need for an appraisal of the major roles of the Soviet Union and her satellites among those Republics at the present time. Only from such an examination can there be projected a sober evaluation of potentialities inherent in that phase of the "peace offensive" aimed at Latin America.

II

Any effort to measure the degree and kind of Communist activity in a given area runs immediately into the fact that the tactics of international communism make it extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, totally to dissect "direct" operations of the Soviet Union or her satellites in the official sense from those operations which are carried on by local Communist parties or front organizations. The efforts of each type are commonly the product of a centrally defined and directed "line," dedicated to the single purpose of the fulfillment of the designs of the Soviet Union.

Thus, wherever international communism functions, its operations in propaganda, in economic and cultural fields, as well as in more sinisterly subversive areas, are all a part of a common scheme. These operations are carried on by a variety of organizations, official and unofficial, which may give the appearance of separateness. But official agencies of Communist bloc governments and unofficial local Communist parties and "front" organizations are meshing parts of a machine functioning for the same purpose.

A general demonstration of this theme is provided by the attached chart of major types of Communist activity in the Latin American Republics. By and large, where one kind of activity exists, other types likewise exist. Note, for example, that in Argentina, there are virtually complete Communist bloc diplomatic representation, an active local Communist Party, trade agreements with six Communist states, a large number of "friendship societies," and front organization activity. With respect to the other Republics, it is generally true that if one form of Communist activity exists, there is at the same time one or more other sort of operation.

Latin American Republics	Communist bloc diplomatic missions						Communist bloc trade agreements (N=negotiating)						Number of Communist bloc supported "friendship societies"	Local Communist Party legal	Abstained from or repudiated Caracas anti-Communist resolution	Local Communist Party numbers (where available); total party membership for Latin American estimated 250,000
	U. S. S. R.	Czechoslovakia	Poland	Hungary	Rumania	Bulgaria	U. S. S. R.	Czechoslovakia	Poland	Hungary	Rumania	East Germany				
Argentina	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13	X	X	39,000 (Communist Party claim).
Bolivia		X											1			
Brazil		X	X					X	X	X		X	1			100,000 (Communist Party claim).
Chile								N	N			N	7		X	
Colombia												X	0	X		Activities banned though party "legal," 5,000.
Costa Rica													0		X	
Cuba													0			
Dominican Republic													0			
Ecuador		X											0	X		
El Salvador													0			
Guatemala													0			
Haiti													0			
Honduras													0			
Mexico	X	X	X					X					6	X	X	
Nicaragua													0			
Panama													0			
Paraguay								X	X	X			0			
Peru													0			
Uruguay	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	2	X	X	
Venezuela													0			

What is being suggested here is not that any one Latin American Republic is about to become Communist dominated but that there is a clear pattern for the mode of Communist penetration. Further, that pattern is the result of a combination of activities on the part of official representatives of Communist states and at the same time of local parties and front organizations.

However, it should not be assumed that an easy response to the Communist threat lies in the simple denial, for example, of diplomatic relations, or in the banning of a local Communist Party. The whole apparatus of penetration is geared to the exploitation of national problems in the Latin American Republics and seeks to manipulate those problems in such a fashion as to gain local support for some phase of Russian policy. The very real economic problems of the underdeveloped Latin American states, with their domestic and international implications, offer a fertile field for Soviet-directed activity. Historical fears of the "Colossus of the North" can be reawakened, and new feelings of national consciousness on the part of the

Latin American states can be turned to the benefit of the Soviet Union.

A sensible appraisal, then, of Communist activities in Latin America must include an understanding of the tactics of penetration, but must never lose sight of the underlying problems which supply opportunity to the Communists. Efforts to combat such Communist works simply by countering or blocking them on the tactical level offer no permanent solutions.

III

The ground which the U. S. S. R. must cover to make any headway in the diplomatic field is sharply delineated by the limited number of Latin American countries in which the U. S. S. R. and Communist bloc states now maintain diplomatic missions. The U. S. S. R. itself now maintains such missions in only three Latin American countries: Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay. Five other Communist bloc nations are represented by 12 diplomatic missions in 6 Latin American Republics: Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay, plus Bolivia, Brazil, and Ecuador. Czechoslovakia is responsible for 6 of these 12 satellite missions, Poland for 3 of them, with Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria supplying 1 each. In short, neither the Soviet Union nor her satellite states are represented in 14 Latin American Republics by diplomatic missions.

Further in the way of obstacles to a successful diplomatic offensive, the 20 Latin American Republics are associated with the United States in the Organization of American States, a regional grouping for the betterment and the security of the Western Hemisphere. Within this organization, mutual understanding and respect among the 21 American Republics develops as the representatives of each of the republics work jointly in economic affairs, defense questions, health problems, and other activities of common concern. Backstopping hemisphere security is the Rio pact which clearly warns that any attack on an American state will be considered an attack on all the Americas. Beyond that, 16 of the 21 American Republics have given positive support to the Caracas resolution of March 1954, which puts domination by international communism of the political institution of any American state in the same category as military attack upon any state as "a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America." The pattern, then, for a strong bulwark against the blandishments of communism exists; the degree to which this pattern is filled with actions based on mutual decision and common needs will determine its continuous effectiveness.

Similarly, it is impossible to ignore, in considering the impact of the new Soviet overtures, that the U. S. S. R. and international communism received a major setback in the Western Hemisphere when the openly pro-Communist Arbenz regime in Guatemala was overthrown by the present anti-Communist Castillo Armas government in early summer, 1954.

The limited degree of Soviet and satellite diplomatic relations in Latin America has been noted. It should further be noted that local Communist Parties are outlawed in 15 of the Latin American Republics. The widespread degree of the outlawry of the Communist Party poses, of course, an additional difficulty in any efforts of the Communist bloc to gain diplomatic representation or recognition.

However, although the Communist Party of Brazil has been illegal since 1947, it remains in existence as the presumed largest Communist Party in South America. In other republics, driving the Communist Party as such underground has resulted in Communist efforts to infiltrate existing legal political parties or to form new parties under new labels. For example, Communist Party support was probably accorded the winning Kubitschek-Goulart ticket in the recent Brazilian presidential election. Local Communist Party desires for respectability and legality in their respective states leads them, among other things, to press for Soviet and satellite diplomatic representation and recognition. Local pressures for recognition of the U. S. S. R. seem strongest in Brazil and Chile.

Currently it is reported that no directly specific Soviet efforts to expand diplomatic representation in countries beyond the three republics wherein such missions are maintained are observable. Some overtures to Ecuador may have been made during a recent tourist visit to that country of the U. S. S. R. Ambassador to Mexico. Most analyses, however, of the Bulganin diplomatic overtures seem to suggest that the U. S. S. R. was seeking to inspire initiative for recognition from the Latin American States themselves. Note Bulganin's strong emphasis that Argentina had profited heavily from increased economic relations with the Soviet Union as one of the results of Argentine-Soviet diplomatic intercourse. The effort to inspire Latin American requests for diplomatic relations is hardly a subtle one.

IV

Beyond the normal diplomatic and commercial activities of recognized embassies, Soviet and satellite missions are the centers of other types of activity—a rule to which Latin America is no exception. The totalitarian Soviet Union does not hesitate to use all its instrumentalities for the pursuit of a total foreign policy, regardless of the inhibitions of regular diplomatic usage. Revelations made, for random examples, from the Canadian spy inquiry and the more recent ones in Australia have certainly made clear the fact that the Soviet Union considers direction of basic espionage a regular activity of their diplomatic missions. The degree to which such activities take place is not a matter, however, of thorough public documentation; and the degree of success of such activities varies with the level of security service scrutiny on the part of the nation wherein a given Soviet embassy lies. It should be noted that the numbers of personnel at Soviet and satellite missions in Latin America, particularly military attachés, are reported to have been increased in recent months.

In the pursuance of a total foreign policy, Soviet missions likewise may operate as communication links between local Communist parties and the Kremlin, from which new directives as to the currently correct party line may emerge. One of the sources of tactical as well as strategical coordination of local Communist Party and front activities with the overall purposes of the U. S. S. R. is frequently a Soviet or satellite embassy.

V

Currently the Communists have stepped up in Latin America all phases of their propaganda offensive. These propaganda efforts in Latin America are noteworthy in their strategy because they reflect the effort to apply a "new" line in an area where communism has been basically weak and in an area where at the same time a terrific economic potential remains essentially undeveloped. Indeed, the Communist strategy in Latin America is worth studying not only for its impact on Latin America but also as an example of how the Communists hope to woo the so-called underdeveloped areas. Much of this approach parallels the Communists' effort in China, for which reason alone its impact should not be underestimated.

The "line" in Latin America does not at the present time take the form of an outright bid for political power for Communist parties as the Latin American phase of world revolution and domination. Rather, the Communists present themselves in the South American Republics as truly concerned with the national interest of each Republic, as truly "patriots" interested in forming broad coalitions against "foreign" imperialistic domination. Thus the Communists' attempt to capitalize on two existing facts of political life in Latin America: Strongly awakened nationalism and the not so latent historical antipathy to the Colossus of the North. The United States is presented as aggressively dominating the Latin American area, economically, politically, culturally, militarily, to the detriment of the rightful aspirations and normal development of the Republics of that area. The Communists then hope for the creation in the politics of the Latin American States of broad coalitions of political power, nationalistic in nature, anti-United States, and sympathetic to the Soviet Union.

For the current period, then, communism is seeking to move closer to political domination in Latin America through a kind of "back door," wherein its naked desires for control are cloaked in the guise of nationalism and economic well-being. As a consequence of the effort to build up "National Democratic Front" governments, the Communists are willing to work through political groups and economic classes which they once publicly denounced. Current propaganda in Latin America does not avow the revolution of the proletariat and the overthrow of the existing economic order. Rather, the Communists emphasize the "common interests" of workers, of the middle class, of intellectuals, of those capitalists who have not "sold out to Yankee imperialism," of small farmers, and so forth. These "common interests"

which cross traditional class lines are portrayed as involving at root the combating of the American domination which is held to be the cause of economic illness and instability in Latin America.

The efforts to create this kind of "National Democratic Front" have involved some interesting switches in Communist tactics. In Brazil, the Communist Party supported a presidential candidate it had previously denounced. In Argentina, the Communists are avidly courting the support of those elements of organized labor which had been the main reliance of ex-dictator Perón. Indeed, the new line has seen quite a few groups and persons formerly called Fascist become favorites of Communist propaganda efforts.

VI

This strategy of capitalizing on nationalism, anti-Americanism, and economic instability is carried on tactically in a variety of ways. Front organizations carry on many of the overt activities of the Communists in Latin America. Various movements for peace are active in the Communist campaign in Latin America, particularly in Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. The themes stated above are angled in the peace movements to demonstrate the warlike intentions of the United States for world domination. The United States is portrayed as the aggressor in the pursuit of its own imperialistic economic interests, interests described of course, as directly contrary to the best development of the national economies of Latin America. Efforts are constantly under way to increase the degree of Communist penetration of labor unions and the amount of Communist support in organizations of farm workers and intellectuals.

Thirty binational centers, maintaining close ties with the Soviet and satellite diplomatic missions in the area, are focal points for general propaganda. These hyphenated national societies, Argentine-U. S. S. R. Cultural Relations Institute—IRCAU—for example, are maintained in six Latin American Republics, with their distribution indicated on the chart attached to this paper. The centers promote cultural exchange, display Communist films, translate and distribute Communist publications, and serve as the transmission point for speeches advancing the "National Democratic Front" idea. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five was a year of tremendous expansion of such activities in Argentina, with 500 representatives of Argentine official and cultural circles attending the inaugural ceremonies of new offices of the IRCAU in Buenos Aires. Then President Perón was represented by a personal telegram of good wishes for the success of the institute.

Various types of published material are used as vehicles for Communist propaganda. Spanish translations of Soviet books are available in large numbers in Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and other Latin American countries; it is reported that the U. S. S. R. Spanish translation program was up to 63 titles last year, compared to 28 in 1953. Various foreign published Communist journals circulate in Latin America, carrying over recent months far more material aimed at that area. In 1955 25 articles in the Cominform Journal were devoted to Brazil alone. Additional types of propaganda pamphlets and booklets in a variety of languages were distributed in great numbers, including some aimed at children. Soviet and satellite films are used as a major part of the propaganda effort.

Local Communist sources maintain around 80 newspapers and magazines in Latin America, with a particularly significant emphasis and success in Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Argentina.

Although little headway has been made in local radio and TV in Latin America by the Communist propagandists, Soviet and satellite radio aims over 50 hours per week of broadcasting to the area, an increase during the last year of around 167 percent. It should be noted, comparatively, that USIA beams around 12 hours of broadcasting to Latin America per week from the United States.

The exchange of cultural, sports, and economic delegations is another major area of Soviet propaganda activity. From such exchanges and sponsored visits, the Soviet hope to reap the reward of sympathetic travelogues and articles written by those returning from behind the Iron Curtain. A limited success has been achieved.

VII

The trade policy of the U. S. S. R. and her satellites springs from a rigidly planned and controlled economy. Soviet foreign trade does not result from the interdependence of the Soviet economy with the economies of the free world. The primary purpose of foreign trade for the Soviet Union may reasonably be assumed to be that of serving as a complementary and important phase of the overall world political purposes of the Soviet Union. Thus Soviet foreign trade policy may be specifically tailored to meet the demands of the immediate strategy and tactics of international communism. Russian and satellite efforts to increase trade with Latin America are properly viewed from that perspective.

Latin America as a nonindustrial area wherein a vast economic potential remains yet fully to be developed presents some very pressing economic problems. With the basic exportable items of Latin America agricultural commodities, petroleum, and metal ores, there is often a difficulty in marketing these products in those countries of the Western World which are able to supply Latin America with needed finished products in return. This problem is enhanced by the fact that individual Latin American republics are frequently heavy producers of one major commodity upon which their foreign trade relies. Thus, for Cuba, sugar; for Brazil and Colombia, coffee; for Chile, metal ores; and for Bolivia, metal ores are the dominant exportable items. When demand for these products is limited in the countries normally supplying Latin America with finished goods, large unexportable surpluses develop in specific Latin American states which immediately depress the economy of those states.

The trade of the United States with Latin America runs considerably over $3 billion per year in each direction. Balance of United States imports with United States exports is relatively even, but with discrepancies in the case of individual countries. Frequently, of course, exportable Latin American items run into surpluses in the American domestic market, or a particular price situation, as in the case of coffee, temporarily shrinks the American consumption market. When this happens, there is a tendency in the affected Latin American nation to blame the United States, the big customer, for the resulting weakening effects on the domestic economy of that Latin American nation.

It is in this sort of situation that the Soviet Union's trade policy can be manipulated to create an attractive appeal, and that we can best understand the nature of the current economic offensive in Latin America. Trade policy becomes the material partner of the propaganda offensive described above; indeed, it is reasonable to view the kind of trade policy the Soviet Union is pursuing in Latin America now as part and parcel of the overall propaganda strategy. To nations with unexportable surpluses creating domestic economic and political unrest, the Soviet Union appears in the guise of the savior, prepared to accept surpluses of an agricultural or mineral commodity in exchange for capital goods badly needed by the Latin American States, or in exchange for dollars. An alternative is offered to "Yankee domination"; this is the economic side of the appeal of the new line to nationalism and anti-United States feelings.

Efforts to use trade in this politically motivated fashion are on the increase on the part of the U. S. S. R. and her satellites since the Bulganin overtures of last January. Reference to the chart attached to this paper will indicate those countries maintaining formal trade agreements with the U. S. S. R. and her allied states. Note the heavy emphasis on Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In addition, however, the Communist-bloc states are capable of "single shot" trade arrangements, an example being the purchase last year of some 700,000 tons of Cuban sugar which helped alleviate the tremendous surplus of that commodity in Cuba.

Existing trade agreements between Soviet bloc countries and Latin American countries sought a trade level of $500 million for 1955, a goal double the 1954 trade level between the two areas, and nearly 3 times the level between the 2 areas in 1948. Trade by the Communist bloc with Argentina and Brazil has been responsible for the bulk of this increase.

Total Soviet-bloc trade with Latin America remains—even if the goal of $500 million is reached—less than 15 percent of the total United States-Latin American trade. It is difficult to conceive that the U. S. S. R. and its allies could materially increase the proportion of its share of Latin American trade on a permanent basis in the kinds of ma-

chinery and capital equipment suggested by Bulganin in his overtures. This is not, however, to say that significant inroads could not be made by the Communists or that future increases in trade of some size may not be expected.

In this respect, it should be remembered that the U. S. S. R. is under terrific pressure to supply heavy goods, machinery, equipment, and the like for the needs of its expanding domestic economy. The Soviet Union at the present stage of its development does not have the productive levels in capital goods to supply its own needs fully, much less to export large quantities of them. It must further be remembered, however, that the foreign trade of a controlled Communist economy is capable of being manipulated for purely political purposes along the lines suggested above. Thus the U. S. S. R. may judge that the gains for its international designs from a specifically tailored exchange of machinery for agricultural products in surplus in a given Latin American State may outweigh the momentary loss to the expansion of its domestic economy. Further, of course, is the fact that the U. S. S. R. is short in agricultural commodities for its own consumption; it could make likewise good use of imported consumer goods. But the decision to obtain these items in exchange for heavy equipment and the like remains one geared to the overall political purposes of the U. S. S. R.

The attractiveness with which dealing with the Soviet Union and its satellites may be viewed by given Latin American countries in economic straits should not obscure certain clear dangers in such trade.

First. As has been pointed out above, Soviet foreign trade is an integral part of the drive for respectability and acceptance in the recipient nations. Reliance on such trade might increase the acceptability of the national democratic front idea.

Second. Acceptance of key items of machinery and so forth from the U. S. S. R. creates the possibility of undue reliance on the Soviet Union for the maintenance and expansion of critical types of equipment.

Third. Since the Soviet Union is not forced to rely on the essentially politically motivated trade, it might exact from the recipient of such trade the price of support of the U. S. S. R.—or at least coolness toward the West—in international negotiations and organizations for the continuance of such trade.

Fourth. Acceptance of heavy machinery and equipment from the Communist-bloc nations entails frequently the importation of technicians from those nations for the maintenance of that equipment, with the possibility of an undue reliance on the technical know-how of the Communists. Communist technicians are not unknown to indulge in other kinds of activities.

Communist trade overtures to Latin America, then, can be seen to have a certain degree of attractiveness to individual Latin American Republics facing particular economic problems. At the same time, the nature of the Communist-bloc government and economy allows such trade to be carried on principally for its effects on the overall political strategy and goals of the Soviet Union. Acceptance of such trade by Latin American States involves dangers to the recipient state and to the Western World along the lines described in the previous paragraph.

VIII

The future of Latin America as an industrial world stronghold remains to be developed, but Latin America carries the full potential for such a future. Brazil alone has been described as comparable to the United States of the mid-19th century, capable of an expansion over the coming decades equal to that of the United States in the past century. The stake of the United States in the future of this great area is large, not only in the coldly material sense but in the best sense of the policy of the good neighbor concerned for the proper development of Latin America as an area wherein economic success takes place in a society devoted to the values of the Western World—freedom, liberty, dignity of the individual.

It is important to present to Latin America an image of the United States which accurately reflects the United States as a nation sharing so fully in the ideals present in current Latin American aspirations. Central to the ideology of the American democracy is the Declaration of Independence, which is a living documentation of abhorrence of imperialism and of developed nationalism based on the recognition of human values, not narrow materialistic chauvinism.

But there is far more for the United States to do in implementing the policy of the "good neighbor." The individual economic needs of each Latin American state ought carefully be appraised, and the wealth of the United States wisely used to aleviate economic distress. Out of the billions and billions of dollars of foreign-aid grants and credits of the past decade, Latin America has received around 2.4 percent; in the last fiscal year around 2 percent of all foreign grants of the United States went to Latin America.

It should not be argued that grants of economic aid represent the sole or final solution to the problems of non-industrial areas; it should not be argued that the bulk of the economic expansion of such areas is not the proper province of free enterprise. However, the underlying immediate needs of Latin America as an underdeveloped area do require large-scale development funds which cannot be found in private investment sources. Highways, railroads, communications, development of power resources, and the like, are all fundamental to the creation of a modern industrial economy. The lag in such areas in most of Latin America is tremendous, and the large-scale jump in these areas can only be made by provision of development funds from sources other than private enterprise. By substantial increases in its assistance to development projects carefully chosen in mutual cooperation with the affected Latin American state, the United States could do much to create the basis for broader economies of greater stability.

It may be argued that this represents the application once again of the philosophy of the foreign-aid program of the past decade, but one must remember that that program has barely touched Latin America. Further, the greatest opportunity for the effective use of such aid funds lies in the more underdeveloped areas; much of the criticism attached to aid programs for areas more economically mature does not apply in the case of Latin America.

Leading Latin American spokesmen put this argument most strongly at the Rio Economic Conference in November 1954. President Cafe Filho of Brazil underlined the necessity of putting greater emphasis on the economic aspect of the inter-American system, hoping that future generations would not be able to say that the statesmen of today met the crucial problem of cooperation for economic development with "too little and too late."

The current stress of the Eisenhower administration on the United States as the "good partner" seems to rely far too far, in the minds of many Latin American leaders, on private programs in economic development. Given the United States grants necessary to construct the bases for a modern economy, the possibilities for future free private enterprise investment are limitless. But the dominant current need is development capital not being supplied from private sources, and not, in its nature, likely to be supplied from private sources.

This suggestion for economic aid on an increased scale to Latin America should not be viewed as the single approach to our relationship with that area. Concurrently, programs of technical aid to Latin America ought to be expanded by the United States. The accurate presentation of the image of the United States to Latin America, the continued maintenance of the inter-American security system, the expansion of United States private enterprise capital, south of the border, the performance in all United States relations with Latin America as a "good partner" who remains a "good neighbor," are all vital to a proper relationship. New ways of exploring common interests should be steadily sought, such as, for example, Senator MANSFIELD's recent proposal for a university of the Americas.

IX

The current Communist offensive in Latin America has been examined, its strengths and weaknesses noted. Brief suggestions have been made for the United States response to this offensive. Such a response could be the most effective repulse of the Communist offensive in that area, and could open a new era of constantly expanding and mutually profitable relations between the cultures and the economies of the free Americas. If the Communist offensive may have the effect of reemphasizing to the United States its stake in the magnificent future of Latin America, it may be a blessing in disguise.

Building of Alternate Canal Route Is Answer to Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Dulles, Eden, and Pineau have reaped what they have sown. The dismay at Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal brings to mind a similar dismay when they learned of the Czech-Egypt arms agreement. They have pursued a consistent policy of appeasement subordinating national self-respect to the fog of fear. They were passive when Egypt closed the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping, failing to see that as a forerunner of Egyptian arrogance. Through United States Ambassadors Caffrey and Byroade, they fed this arrogance and helped to build this outsize picture of Nasser.

Military and economic reprisals would be the least satisfactory of policies. There is, however, the proposal of good sense, and that is the building of an alternate canal from Elath on the Gulf of Akaba—Red Sea—across Israel to Ascalon on the Mediterranean.

The cost would not be too great. The very preparation and original digging for such a canal would reduce Nasser to size. The cost could be kept down to $150 million; bonds therefor could be readily sold. Little government cost would be involved.

The United States, Great Britain, and France should give immediate and serious consideration to this proposal. It is noted that this very proposal is the subject of considerable talk among high government officials in Great Britain. The proposal, in and of itself, would have considerable merit had there been no seizure by Egypt of the Suez Canal. Its obvious worth is underscored now. The Western Powers need not be caught helpless in the face of the present international tangle.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

No attempt has been made to include votes on all of the numerous bills, motions, and amendments. The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 14,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. I believe this word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which unfortunately do not always completely reflect the nature or purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 10th report of my voting and attendance record. These 10 reports show how I voted on 1,430 questions in the House of Representatives during the last 10 years. Based on quorum calls—calls of the House—and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date, 1956	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 26	Call of the House	Present.
3	Jan. 31	H. R. 8780, relieving farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes: On passage. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
4	Jan. 31	H. Res. 352, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 385 to 1.)	Yea.
5	Feb. 1	H. R. 7993, authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 358 to 3.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 2	Call of the House	Absent.
7	Feb. 8	H. Res. 396, disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber plant, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission: On adoption. (Rejected 61 to 309.)	Nay.
8	Feb. 20	H. R. 8710, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947: On passage. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
9	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
10	Feb. 28	H. Res. 311, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On adoption. (Adopted 354 to 26.)	Yea.
11	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
12	Feb. 29	Call of the House	Present.
13	Mar. 1	Call of the House	Present.
14	Mar. 1	H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On passage. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Yea.
15	Mar. 7	H. R. 9739, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act: On amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the General Services Administration. (Rejected 150 to 231.)	Nay.
16	Mar. 13	H. R. 9166, extending to April 11, 1957, the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Adopted 366 to 4.)	Yea.
17	Mar. 20	Call of the House	Present.
18	Mar. 21	Call of the House	Present.
19	Mar. 21	H. R. 8320, extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for fiscal year 1956: On motion to agree to the conference report (thus rejecting Senate amendments to extend these programs for 2 years). (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 21	On motion to concur in Senate amendments extending programs for 2 years. (Agreed to 406 to 0.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 21	S. 1271, authorizing the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, U. S. Army, retired: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 80 to 310)	Nay.
22	Apr. 11	Call of the House	Present.
23	Apr. 11	H. R. 12, The Agriculture Act of 1956, providing rigid 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to recommit conference report to conference with instructions to provide 82½ percent support for basic crops and 80 percent support for milk under a more liberal parity equivalent formula and to delete dual parity provisions, mandatory support for feed grains and multiple price plans for wheat and rice. (Rejected 181 to 238.)	Yea.
24	Apr. 11	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 237 to 181.)	Nay.
25	Apr. 12	H. R. 9893, authorizing certain construction at military establishments: On passage. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
26	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
27	Apr. 18	H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, providing rigid 90-percent support for basic crops: On motion to pass bill notwithstanding the veto of the President. (Rejected 202 to 211.)	Nay.
		H. R. 7728, transferring responsibility for constructing and operating Jones Point, Va., bridge from Department of Interior to Department of Commerce:	

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1956	Measure, question, and result	Vote
28	Apr. 23	On passage. (Passed 284 to 8.)	Yea.
29	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
30	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
31	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
32	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
33	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
		H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill:	
34	Apr. 25	On amendment fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Rejected 179 to 184.)	Not voting (1).
35	Apr. 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956:	
36	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
37	May 2	Call of the House	Present.
38	May 3	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
39	May 3	On amendment to provide for an acreage reserve program for grazing lands. (Adopted 199 to 195.)	Nay.
40	May 3	On amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price for upland cotton. (Rejected 186 to 208.)	Nay.
41	May 3	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to incorporate provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Rejected 184 to 211.)	Yea.
42	May 3	On passage. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Yea.
43	May 9	Call of the House	Present.
44	May 9	Call of the House	Present.
45	May 10	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10986, the Defense Department Appropriation bill:	
46	May 10	On amendment to delete sec. 633, containing language requiring Appropriations Committee approval before Department of Defense could eliminate governmental activities in competition with private business. (Adopted 222 to 156.)	Yea.
47	May 10	On passage. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yea.
48	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
49	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 8901, providing for restoration of franchise to Capital Transit Co.:	
50	May 17	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 161 to 172.)	Nay.
51	May 21	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11124, providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges:	
52	May 21	On passage. (Passed 238 to 52.)	Yea.
		H. R. 11319, appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1957:	
53	May 22	On amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Adopted 179 to 170.)	Nay.
		H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
54	May 23	On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 304 to 59.)	Yea.
		S. J. Res. 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming:	
55	May 24	On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 176-126.)	Not voting (1).
		H. R. 10285, the Farm Credit Act of 1956:	
56	May 31	On passage. (Passed 246 to 4.)	Yea.
57	June 6	Call of the House	Present.
58	June 6	Call of the House	Present.
59	June 7	Call of the House	Present.
60	June 8	Call of the House	Present.
61	June 8	Call of the House	Present.
62	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act:	
63	June 11	On passage. (Passed, 275 to 122.)	Yea.
64	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 1804, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination:	
65	June 11	On passage. (Passed, 393 to 3.)	Yea.
66	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
67	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
68	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
69	June 13	On motion to recommit conference report to committee. (Rejected, 179 to 209.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4090, amending the Communications Act of 1934, to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators:	
70	June 13	On motion to recommit to committee for evaluation of reliability of device and other study. (Rejected, 151 to 228.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Act:	
71	June 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section providing Federal grants for construction of sewage plants. (Rejected, 165 to 213.)	Yea.
72	June 13	On passage. (Passed, 338 to 31.)	Yea.
73	June 20	Call of the House	Present.
74	June 25	Call of the House	Present.
		S. 3295, empowering the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October:	
75	June 25	On passage. (Passed, 199 to 120.)	Yea.
76	June 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7886, providing for presumptive disability at age 65, and increasing the monthly rates of nonservice-connected veterans pension awards:	
77	June 27	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 110 to 305.)	Yea.
78	June 27	On passage. (Passed 364 to 51.)	Nay.
79	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
80	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9852, extending until June 30, 1958, provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
81	June 28	On motion to agree to the conference report expressing approval of Defense Department Dispersal order: (Agreed to 200 to 197.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 554, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to the States for school construction:	
82	June 28	On adoption. (Adopted 327 to 67.)	Yea.
83	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
84	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9801, authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal Zone at Balboa, C. Z.:	
85	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 325 to 59.)	Yea.
		S. 2379, providing grants of $925,000 to train professional personnel in the field of commercial fishing:	
86	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 254 to 133.)	Nay.
87	July 3	Call of the House	Present.
88	July 5	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to States for school construction:	
89	July 5	On amendment providing for payment of 1 percent of Federal income taxes to the State where collected for school construction purposes. (Rejected 168 to 250.)	Nay.
90	July 5	On amendment requiring States to comply with the Supreme Court antisegregation decisions. (Adopted 225 to 192.)	Yea.
91	July 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate provisions allocating aid on basis of need and effort. (Rejected 158 to 262.)	Yea.
92	July 5	On passage. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	Nay.
93	July 6	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11380, raising postal rates and establishing a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:	
94	July 6	On passage. (Passed 217 to 165.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956:	
95	July 9	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to House managers to substitute Kalkaska, Mich., as a site for an air defense base, as recommended by the Air Force, instead of Manistee, Mich. (Rejected, 29 to 343.)	Yea.
		H. R. 11967, reactivating National Stadium Commission and setting aside site:	
96	July 9	On passage. (Passed, 287 to 80.)	Yea.

[1] Absent. Would have voted "nay" if present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1956	Measure, question, and result	Vote
97	July 11	Call of the House	Present.
98	July 11	H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957: On passage. (Passed, 284 to 120.)	Yea.
99	July 12	H. Res. 584, waiving points of order against provisions of H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: On adoption. (Adopted, 361 to 30.)	Nay.
100	July 12	H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authorization for Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac River. (Rejected, 24 to 370.)	Nay.
101	July 12	H. R. 12038, providing increases in veterans service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 391 to 0.)	Yea.
102	July 17	Call of the House	Present.
103	July 18	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations: On adoption. (Adopted 391 to 0.)	Yea.
104	July 18	H. R. 11708, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act: On passage. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
105	July 19	Call of the House	Present.
106	July 19	On motion to lay on table a motion that further proceedings under a call of the House be dispensed with. (Rejected 104 to 290.)	Nay.
107	July 20	Call of the House	Present.
108	July 21	Call of the House	Present.
109	July 23	Call of the House	Present.
110	July 23	H. R. 627, providing means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the United States jurisdiction: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 131 to 275.)	Nay.
111	July 23	On passage. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
112	July 23	S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 245 to 145.)	Yea.
113	July 23	H. R. 12227, providing a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool hair: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 216 to 123.)	Yea.
114	July 24	Call of the House	Present.
115	July 24	H. R. 7992, enacting into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Act: On the committee amendment giving Congress veto power over the elimination by the Defense Department of Government enterprises competing with private businesses. (Adopted 201 to 185.)	Nay.
116	July 24	H. R. 12061, directing Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate plants to produce electric energy with atomic reactors: On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 195 to 199.)	Yea.
117	July 24	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 203 to 191.)	Yea.
118	July 25	Call of the House	Present.
119	July 25	H. R. 11742, the Housing bill of 1956: On amendment to the rule making in order an amendment to strike out title V, authorizing public housing. (Rejected 92 to 299.)	Nay.
120	July 25	H. Res. 638, citing Arthur Miller for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 373 to 9.)	Yea.
121	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
122	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
123	July 26	H. Res. 641, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 412, authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado: On adoption. (Rejected 179 to 194.)	Yea.
124	July 26	H. Res. 602, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines: On adoption. (Adopted 184 to 178.)	Nay.
125	July 26	H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines: On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 196 to 153.)	Yea.
126	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
127	July 27	H. Res. 625, the rule providing for the consideration of S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration: On adoption. (Agreed to 219 to 126.)	Nay.
128	July 27	S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration: On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Nay.
129	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
130	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
131	July 27	H. Res. 604, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7850, authorizing construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho: On adoption. (Agreed to 173 to 168.)	Yea.
132	July 27	Call of the House	Present.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

First. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

Second. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

Third. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Fourth. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

D. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

E. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

F. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if

adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

G. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

First. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

Second. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

Third. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Fourth. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote is recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

The outcome of various votes are indicated in parentheses in the record above. In the case of rollcall votes, the actual vote is shown—the yeas first and the nays last.

Trip-Leasing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have expressed an interest in a brief explanation of the provisions contained in the trip-leasing bill, which has passed the Congress.

When the bill passed the House, I gave a full explanation of the bill. Even though it was thoroughly discussed, I fully realize the difficulty in readily comprehending the bill, because of its technical features.

In an effort to be helpful, I have prepared a memorandum as briefly as possible in explanation of the legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the memorandum in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF TRIP-LEASING LEGISLATION, S. 898, 84TH CONGRESS

The legislation would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to exercise certain regulatory control over the leasing of motor vehicles by motor common and contract carriers, when such vehicles are to be driven for the carriers by the owner, or an employee of the owner, of the vehicle. This legislation is not concerned with the leasing of a motor vehicle when such vehicle is leased without the services of a driver.

The Commission is granted authority by this legislation to prescribe regulations as to certain contents of the lease, and regulation which would assure that the motor carrier would have full direction and control of the leased vehicle and be fully responsible for its operation. The Commission is also given authority to establish requirements with respect to inspection and the safety of operation of such vehicles.

However, the Commission is denied authority to regulate the duration of a trip-lease of a motor vehicle, with driver, or the amount of compensation for the use of such vehicle, when the vehicle is that of (1) a farmer, (2) a farmer-cooperative organization or federation, or (3) a for-hire or private carrier when such vehicle has completed a movement of property specified in the agricultural exemptions specified in section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act. Under this section, motor vehicles used in carrying property consisting of ordinary livestock, fish (including shellfish), or agricultural (including horticultural) commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), are exempted from economic regulation by the Commission, but are subject to its safety regulations.

In other words, regulated motor common and contract carriers would be permitted to trip lease the motor vehicle, with driver, of a farmer, a farm cooperative association or federation, or the motor vehicle of a for-hire or private carrier which has completed a movement of property specified in section 203 (b) (6) of the act. Also, regulated motor carriers would be permitted to trip lease the motor vehicle of a private carrier when such vehicle is used regularly in the transportation of perishable products manufactured from property specified in section 203 (b) (6). Examples of such perishable products are frozen orange juice, or frozen vegetables.

The direction of movement of the trip-leased vehicle is limited generally to a single movement, or one or more of a series of movements, in the general direction of the general area in which the trip-leased vehicle is based.

A more detailed statement of this legislation is given in House Report No. 2425, 84th Congress.

Court Review for Veterans With Service-Connected Disabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 of this year I introduced a bill to provide court review from decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals which disallow in whole or in part any claim for a benefit or payment for disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service.

Under existing law the Board of Veterans' Appeals is the Supreme Court so far as disabled veterans are concerned. Its decisions are final both as to law and fact. If this Board make a mistake, there is no way to correct it unless the Board itself changes its viewpoint.

I have handled many cases for disabled veterans and their dependents during my service in Congress where the decision of the Board of Veterans' Appeals was clearly in error. In some instances I have been able to persuade the Board to reverse its previous decision, but in most instances the Board refuses to budge—right or wrong. I am sure many Members of this House have had experiences similar to my own, which is one of the reasons I am convinced that some method of providing further review of these decisions must be found.

During the last session of Congress I introduced a bill in behalf of a veteran who had lost the vision in one eye from an injury received in service. This bill was passed unanimously by both the House and Senate. The Board of Veterans' Appeals had repeatedly denied this veteran his pension. Thus we had a situation where 435 Members of Congress disagree with 3 members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals on the question of this man's entitlement to compensation.

It should not be the function of Congress to review the decisions of administrative agencies, and therefore the proper procedure in these cases is to permit a veteran with a service-connected claim to have his day in court. That is what my bill seeks to do.

The House Judiciary Committee held hearings on my bill last spring. Unfortunately that committee did not report the bill in order to give the House an opportunity to consider it. I am confident that, when the bill is considered, it will pass this House with an overwhelming majority.

The legislation has the approval and support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion of Michigan, and I am sure will ultimately have the support of the national departments of all veterans' organizations.

Other citizens are entitled to their day in court, and it is high time we provided the disabled veteran and his dependents with this same privilege.

Address of the Honorable W. M. Abbitt at the Virginia Democratic Convention in Richmond, Va., July 27, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WATKINS M. ABBITT delivered the keynote address at the State Democratic Convention in Richmond, Va., on July 27, 1956, and his remarks were received by the delegates therein assembled with great enthusiasm and favor.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Mr. ABBITT's sound and inspiring address:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE W. M. ABBITT AT THE VIRGINIA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION IN RICHMOND, VA., JULY 27, 1956

I count it a high honor and a great privilege, as well as a real pleasure, for me to be here today to talk briefly to the Democrats of Virginia. It is always a pleasure to meet with real Virginia Democrats. Here in Virginia the Democratic Party was bred and

nurtured. Virginia is the cradle of democracy. In my opinion, the Democrats of Virginia have kept the faith of our Founding Fathers. I am proud of the great heritage that we in Virginia have. Virginians can be proud of the record of our Democratic Party, its accomplishments as well as the aims and ideals that have been our guiding light down through the years. Our State government has been a model for other States. We have had clean, honest, efficient government, whose officials have been untarnished and unblemished by corruption or fraud.

In these trying times, and believe you me these are trying times, it is well that we think back and review the principles of democracy so that we might be guided in the future by the light of the experiences of the past. The Democratic Party was founded for the purpose of protecting the rights and privileges of the people as well as the sovereignty of the individual States. It was founded by that great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who realized the evils thereof and the danger of creating a strong centralized governmental monstrosity if the rights of the people were to be preserved. He realized that the best governed were the least governed. He knew, as we know today, that any centralized government is constantly grasping and seeking power, constantly trying to take from the individual citizens their rights and privileges in an endeavor to secure power for the government. He realized, as we realize, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. He knew, as we know, that there is no such thing as something for nothing; that no money is handed out from the Federal Treasury except and until it has been first extracted from the individuals who make up this great country of ours of some one hundred sixty-odd million souls.

The Democratic Party has been the party of the masses, the party of the common people and everyday citizens as opposed to the party of big business. I hope and trust that we can keep the Democratic Party on the right track and headed in the right direction maintaining the principles upon which it was founded.

In the past few years, we have seen many people, would-be political leaders, endeavoring to chart a new course for our Nation; endeavoring to build up a strong all-powerful centralized government; endeavoring to take away the rights, privileges, and liberties of our people and to strike down the sovereignty of the individual States. Yes, endeavoring to federalize and socialize whenever possible.

There are and have been political hacks who, in their desire and greed to obtain political preferment, are willing to change the entire philosophy of our Government, to make the people the vassals of the Government, the servant of the Government rather than the Government the servant of the people. In the very recent past, we have seen the judicial arm of the Federal Government attempt to strike down the customs, habits, mores, and traditions of our people by usurpation of authority that they never had, authority that was specifically retained by our Founding Fathers for the people themselves and the individual sovereign States.

According to the Vice President of these United States of America, the Court that rendered that decision was headed by a "great Republican Chief Justice." I am sure that no one in the sound of my voice would want to dispute the claim of the Vice President as to the political affiliation of the head of that Court. Only recently in Virginia, we have seen in the press where another Republican judge entered an order on the same subject which was equally as obnoxious.

My friends, we cannot afford to sit idly by and see the rights and privileges of our people gradually taken from them by an octopuslike arm of our Government which is attempting by judicial decree to amend the Constitution and thus strike down constitutional government. Now is the time for men and women to stand upon principles that we know are right and just. I call upon the Democrats of Virginia to stand steadfast upon the principles of the founding fathers of this great party of ours; to exert every effort possible in these perilous days to preserve for posterity and to hand down to oncoming generations this civilization of ours as it was wrought out for us by the Founding Fathers.

I think it is fitting that we review for a moment one of the great principles of our party and its patron saint, Thomas Jefferson. He believed in strong, local, self-government, and the dignity of the individual. That has been one of the main tenets of the Democratic Party. I want to see our people cling to this ideal and demand that this country of ours get back on the right track and continue to recognize constitutional government, the sovereignty of our States and the freedoms, the privileges and the dignity of the individual.

It is discouraging to observe that the spirit of self-reliance so dominant among our early leaders is becoming more difficult to find today. It is alarming to note that principle is being sacrificed too often for the sake of political expediency. The lure of a welfare state has caused many to surrender their liberties. When a sovereign State permits or invites the Federal Government to perform any of its functions, the moral fiber is weakened and we rapidly approach a state of dependency. Such a condition is foreign to our teachings and should be distasteful to every Virginian.

So many of our people forget the duties and obligations they owe as citizens of this great country of ours. It is so easy to look for security rather than to stand upon principles. I think we as Virginia Democrats must rededicate ourselves to the principles upon which our great party was founded and to let the world know we intend to stand on those principles and the things we know and believe to be right.

I say to you when there are principles involved, such as we face today, if we are to maintain our way of life, if we are to continue constitutional government, if we are to retain for our children and our children's children their liberties and freedoms then we must stand up like men and women and fight for those principles.

I realize it is very popular today to run with the crowd, to put up token resistance to things we don't believe in but to finally succumb to the majority and go along with the crowd. The continuance of this action could well mean the annihilation of our way of life as well as the wrecking of the Democratic Party as we know it and which we love so much.

The need of the time is for a leadership willing to face the facts. Complacency toward what is happening is a betrayal of the America we have inherited. The kind of leader that people are willing to stay with, and to sacrifice personally for, is the kind that says, "I'm going to fight it out on this line if it takes until eternity."

Wavering and self-interest through compromise where vital points are at stake never yet held a following. To win this struggle we have got to get on the right side of the road and keep it with resolution.

Here in Virginia, yes; and in all the Southland, we are facing today a great crisis. There are those who would have us to yield and to sacrifice the principles upon which this great country was founded because, as it appears now, we are faced with superior forces. There are those who would have us sublimely submit to the illegal, unauthorized, unwarranted and iniquitous decision of May 17, 1954, of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. This decision, as we all know, was based not upon legal precedent, the pole star of legal jurisprudence in Virginia and all English-speaking countries, but rather upon the sociological philosophy of a foreign-born sociologist whose name is mentioned prominently in the records of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives.

If we in Virginia sublimely submit then we have lost all hope of retaining constitutional government in this country of ours. To combat this decision will require sacrifice; it will mean hardship, yes; and more, but to me the privilege of being and remaining an American, the privilege of retaining for my children and my children's children the rights, privileges, and freedoms that have been carved out of this wilderness by our forefathers is worth all of the sacrifice necessary, all of the hardship that is forthcoming and all of the wealth we possess that men might continue to walk upon the face of this good earth with dignity and the retention of their self-respect.

I have faith in the people of Virginia. I believe they have the intestinal fortitude, the love for freedom, the burning desire to maintain our way of life to such an extent that they will do whatever is necessary to maintain our rights and freedoms. Yes; our very way of life.

I do not know what sacrifices will be necessary or what hardships we will have to overcome, but whatever is necessary that we will do or we will forever and a day lose our way of life as we know it together with all the freedoms and privileges that have meant so much to the people of this great country.

I hope, believe, and trust that the Democrats of Virginia will stand together on this great issue, it being the issue upon which our party was founded.

What can we do to maintain as well as preserve our way of life? I say to you in all candor, there is no hope in the National Republican Party or those who are running the present administration. In 1952, we were led to believe that the present administration, if they were elected, would stand firm for States rights. Apparently, since the election of 1952, not a thought has been given to that campaign promise. The present Attorney General, upon the bidding of the Chief Executive, has done more, in my opinion, than any one man to bring about the crisis we are now facing. He intervened in the famous school case, insisting and demanding that all of the past legal precedent be ignored and that the Supreme Court, in effect, amend the Constitution. It was he who appeared before the appropriate committees of the Congress urging those committees to report out legislation known as the so-called civil-rights bill. The name, of course, is a misnomer. It is anything but a civil-rights bill unless the depriving of individuals of their liberties and the States of their sovereignty is civil rights. This legislation, if enacted into law, strikes at the very heart of the liberties and freedoms of our people. The Republican leaders in the House who had charge of the civil-rights legislation boldly shouted at the tops of their voices that the legislation not only had the blessings of the Chief Executive but was introduced at his bidding and upon his urging. In my opinion, it is an effort on their part to influence certain minority segments of our society in utter disregard of the welfare of our people, regardless of the consequences to the liberties and freedoms that were wrought out for us by the sweat, blood, and tears of those great patriots who have gone on before. It is an attempt to strike down with one stroke of the legislative pen the theory of our very form of government itself. This legislation strikes down the right of trial by jury. It does away with the sovereignty of our States. It takes from our individuals their right to be tried in the

local courts. It sets up a small Gestapo under the direction of an Assistant Attorney General who will be the political hatchet man of the administration in power. It allows our people to be dragged from the four corners of our country and brought before an agent of the Federal Government without a charge being brought against them and without knowing who instigated the investigation. It is an iniquitous piece of legislation. It is one we would expect in a totalitarian government. It could well be the beginning of the end of our very way of life and of democracy itself in this great country of ours if it ever becomes the law of the land. I say to you its main sponsor as of this moment is the present administration that told us in 1952 that they were running on a great platform of States rights.

I say frankly to you Democratic men and women of Virginia, there is no hope for us in the Republican Party. They will never aid or assist us in retaining our way of life nor in preserving for us the precious heritage that is rightfully ours. They would sell our very birthright for a mess of political porridge. I tell you that the record of the Republican administration in Washington has been a disappointment to those Virginia Democrats who believed in 1952 that the cause of sound government demanded that they leave the ranks of the National Democratic Party. The discrepancy between Republican promise and performance in Federal finances, resistance to socialistic experimentation, and defense of the integrity of local governments makes it plain to us that the present administration has been one of broken promises and an attempt to outdeal the New Deal.

Those Democrats who supported the Republican Party in 1952 could not have foreseen the rapidity with which the promises that attracted them were to be shelved after Inauguration Day.

For instance, we can recall in the campaign speech in New York in October 1952 the Republican candidate for President promised, and I quote, "We are dedicated to better education without letting the Federal Government stick its long nose into local business." Almost one of the first acts of the present administration was to have the chief law-enforcement officer, the Attorney General of the United States, stick the long nose of the Federal Government into a lawsuit pending between the Commonwealth of Virginia and certain pupils in the public schools of Prince Edward County. Contrary to that solemn Republican promise to respect the right of the States to order and control domestic institutions, the Supreme Court was told by the mouthpiece of the Chief Executive that peace in the world required the decision of the case in Virginia.

Then, too, it was impossible for us to foresee in 1952 that a Republican Vice President would be able to brag that these domestic institutions were being uprooted under the leadership of a great Republican Chief Justice, nor that Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House, would join hands with Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York City's Harlem, in support of a law to tax the citizens of Virginia for Federal aid to education but deny them the financial benefits of this taxation.

The Republicans in 1952 promised debt reduction, and almost as soon as they took office the Chief Executive demanded that Congress increase the national debt limit. He promised fiscal sanity. Then he tried to win congressional approval of an irresponsible bond-selling scheme for highway construction with the added audacity of demanding that the bonds not be counted as a part of the debt of the United States of America. But for the valiant efforts of stalwart Democrats, the bond scheme would have been perpetrated upon the American people and the Eisenhower administration could still claim a balanced budget. The economy promises of the present administration have been followed by substantial increases in nondefense spending and their farm policies have aided neither farmer nor consumer.

In 1952, the national Democratic candidate advocated enactment of the Compulsory Fair Employment Practice Act while the Republican candidate opposed it; but, suffice it to say, it was impossible for us to see in 1952 that within 2 years the Republican Vice President would boast truthfully that the major civil-rights aims of the FEPC had been accomplished by the administration without even submitting FEPC to a vote of the people's elective representatives in the Congress.

In 1952 we were afraid of creeping socialism, and I say to you this day in 1956 the socialistic trend, if anything, has been accelerated by the present administration. The Democrats were not outvoted in 1952—they were outpromised. Today, however, fellow Democrats, we in Virginia and the Nation have the Eisenhower record of 3½ years in office on which to base our judgment next November.

In my opinion, it is a record of broken promises. Let's take the promise to the farmers, for an example. To a lot of farmers today, Benson is a fighting word, with the polls showing that the Secretary of Agriculture is about as popular with feed growers as an invasion of locusts, about as popular with cattlemen as Bang's disease, about as popular with the tobacco people as the blue mold, and as popular with the peanut producers as the lifting of import quotas; and discerning voters are not going to buy this Eisenhower farm program as a Benson program.

It was President Eisenhower, not Secretary Benson, who pledged 100 percent of parity, and officially broke that campaign promise to the farmers early in 1954. I am beginning to wonder if the Eisenhower farm program is what the President is talking about when he describes his program as one of "dynamic conservatism." To the Virginia farmers and to the Nation, it has meant a dynamic cut in prices that is doing little to conserve the farmer's income. I don't think Virginia's farmers are being sold on another term of Eisenhower government.

But what about the Eisenhower program of progressive moderation? This might well be used to describe small business under this Republican administration since small business is being progressively moderated right out of existence.

During the 1952 campaign, the candidate in a nationwide telecast expressed a deep concern for small business. "I must say," he told his television audience, "I think in the long run we should be even more concerned about small business than big business, because big businesses were all small businesses at one time, that is certain."

Now, today it is also certain that big business has taken over this administration and left small business out in the cold. Official statistics of the Department of Commerce reveal the fact that small-business profits are down to one-third of what they were under the Democrats, while the rate of business failures has doubled under the Eisenhower administration.

Earlier this year, we had the frank admission from the Department of Commerce that a man starting his own business today has only a 50–50 chance of lasting 2 years.

Of course, no one expected Secretary of Commerce Weeks to do anything about this, since he has clearly indicated that his role in the Cabinet post is to help big business, which put him there in the first place.

The Republican candidate in 1952 talked repeatedly about the high cost of living and how he would bring it down if elected. Yet, during the present administration's first year in office in 1953, the cost of living hit its record peak in our history and it stayed right up there too, until June of 1956. Then came the new record peak in our history, when the Eisenhower administration broke its own previous record high in the cost of living, setting a new alltime high.

We were promised a balanced budget and we hear the budget balancers boasting of a $2 billion surplus in the Treasury. At one and the same time, we see an alarmed group of Senators on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate listen to one Air Force general after another testify about the big cuts in the necessary fund for the proper protection and defense of our country. What they said, in effect, was that they had been denied the money which meant that the world's most powerful Nation would soon have the world's second best Air Force. This came as quite a shock to those of us who had been assured by the present administration that the drastic cuts in our Armed Forces personnel would more than be made up by our overwhelmingly superior Air Force.

I say to you that the budget has been balanced in spite of the administration. It was balanced because of (1) drastic cuts in defense appropriations; (2) the rapidly expanding economy of the country; and (3) a cut of over $2 billion made by the Democratic Congress in the budget request of Eisenhower. In other words, the present administration backed into a balanced budget for the time being, through no efforts of its own.

We come now to the question—Wherein lies the hope of the South? The South is and always has been the backbone of the Democratic Party. And in turn, the Democratic Party has always been the home, the hope, and the sanctuary of the South. It is true that not all Democrats agreed on all the issues within our party. In that respect, our political party differs from the British. In Britain, most issues are fought out between the 2 major parties but here in the United States, we debate issues within parties as well as between parties. I think that is helpful.

It is true there are wide areas of disagreement between Democrats in the North and South. Southern statesmen are leaders in the Congress and leaders of important committees in the House and Senate. Upon the record of the parties as of today, I say to you in all candor and frankness that I believe it best to fight in the party caucuses for the principles that we believe in and know to be right whenever possible.

In the coming months, we will hear a great deal about the necessity of a Republican Congress in order to carry out Ike's great program of progress.

In 1952, the people gave to Ike all that he asked in the shape of the Republican 83d Congress. Recently, we were given the benefit of the inside story as to how that worked. The palace guard that surrounds President Eisenhower and that makes the decisions during the prolonged interregnums of his illnesses, decided that there should be an official biography to present Ike to the American people during the fall election in the most favorable light possible. After careful deliberation, the biographer was selected. He was given access to all secret files, including top secret minutes of Cabinet meetings and those denied not only to the public but to committees of the Congress.

The book has recently been published. It tells from the inside how Ike liked the doings of the Republican 83d Congress. He was so disgusted with its performance, says his official biographer, that he gave serious consideration to the formation of a third party and even went so far as to select the name of that party.

But Republican orators will say that that won't happen anymore. The elephant has been made over into Ike's liberal image, and if Ike is again elected with a Republican Congress, we need not again fear that its conduct will cause a flare-up of ileitis.

Do I understand, therefore, that the good people of Southside should return big BILL TUCK to South Boston in order that they may send a Republican Congressman to Washington to help Ike integrate the schools and carry out his civil rights program?

Do I understand that the good people of the Richmond area should retire VAUGHAN GARY from his important position on the Committee on Appropriations in order that Ike might raise our contribution to Marshal Tito and put all such programs on a permanent basis?

Am I to understand that the people of Tidewater are to retire ED ROBESON to the shipping yards in order that we might carry out Ike's program to emasculate the Taft-Hartley law?

Is BURR HARRISON to be returned to the valley from his vital position on Ways and Means in order that we might carry out Ike's program of a permanent increase in the national debt by $15 billion, or applaud such new juggling acts with the Nation's finances as setting up Government corporations to issue bonds which would not be counted as part of the national debt, as was attempted in the $30 billion highway bond scheme?

Is PAT JENNINGS to be returned to southwest Virginia so Benson will be allowed to ride herd on the American farmer?

Are the people of Piedmont and the northern neck to retire to pasture that most beloved and most respected of Congressmen in the United States, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, in order that Ike may clear through the Rules Committee his program for socialized housing?

I read in the press of the nomination for Congress in the Norfolk area of a recent arrival of a new citizen whose total claim to fame seems to be that on some occasion he gave up his home to Ike for a weekend of golfing. Are the good people of Norfolk and the second district to be asked to retire Congressman HARDY who is doing such a great job in order that he may be succeeded by one who is so slavishly devoted to Ike that he will give up his home, our traditions and our principles to carry out his program?

The simple truth is, and the record proves it, that the hope of good government lies in the election of a Democratic administration with a Democratic Congress dominated by men from the Southern States, men like JOHNSON and RAYBURN as majority leaders; like BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the vital Committee on Finance; and RUSSELL and VINSON, of Georgia, and HARDY, of Virginia, on Armed Services; ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and PAT JENNINGS, of Virginia, on Agriculture; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and ROBERTSON, of Virginia, on Banking and Currency; GEORGE, of Georgia, and RICHARDS, of South Carolina, on Foreign Relations; MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, rather than MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations; EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and TUCK, of Virginia, on Judiciary; that great southern statesman, GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina, on Education and Labor, MURRAY, of Tennessee, and ROBESON, of Virginia, on Post Office and Civil Service.

These men will take what is good in any President's program. They have the capacity, the intelligence and the vision to enact it into law, but regardless of what President may recommend programs to destroy the solvency of the Nation or to bring its agriculture to its knees or to emasculate its constitution, these great southerners will stand as a stone wall as did Jackson and his men at Manassas and will again inspire the battle cry to "rally behind the Virginians."

Amalgamated Clothing Workers—Transcript of Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at the 20th Biennial Convention, Washington, D. C., May 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I append here a recent address by our Secretary of Labor to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, one of our finest labor unions:

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS—TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL AT THE 20TH BIENNIAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 23, 1956

Thank you, Mr. Potofsky. Officers, delegates, friends of this convention, I am very happy to be here. I am very sorry that, at your convention in 1954, I was unable to be present, because I look upon the Amalgamated Clothing Workers as friends of mine, and I want to assure you that I am a friend of yours. [Applause.]

Incidentally, I must say, I had the opportunity, together with Mrs. Mitchell, of having brunch with the members of your board and your president and their charming wives, at Arthur Goldberg's house on Sunday, and, in order to set the record straight, one of your board members, immediately upon my arrival, looked to see if I had an Amalgamated label in the pocket of my suit. [Laughter.] There was such a label in it. [Laughter.] Today, I have on my other suit and I can assure you that it has an Amalgamated label in it too. [Laughter and applause.]

This union is particularly to be held up by all of us who prize and treasure trade unionism in this country as a model of industrial democracy.

It has been an outstanding union in that you have translated the sweat shop—the sweat shop of not so many years ago, the sweat shop which I am sure still lives in the memory of some of those present—you have translated the sweat shop into a high standard of living for your members, and you have done it in an era of mutual trust and mutual aid, and you have built a model of labor-management relations upon which you are to be congratulated.

It seems to me that the present welfare of your members stands in sharp contrast to the period when sweat shops were common and workers, many of them immigrants, were exploited; and your union has been a moving force in that change in the American scene.

I was glad to note that your executive board reports that in the past 2 years you have gained 19,000 members and organized 300 shops, bringing your total membership to over 400,000, and that is a long way, a long, long way from the 70,000 members in 1932.

I am also glad to note that you have wage increases and that you have otained improved insurance benefits for over 150,000 clothing workers.

I understand that one of your objectives is so fittingly and appropriately called Bread and Roses, and I would say that your achievements in attaining the bread and roses in the last several years have been remarkable.

You have opened two new health centers, the Laundry Workers in New York and the Sidney Hillman Center in Chicago, and so you have doubled your service to your membership, and someday I hope that as an honorary, or, shall I say, an affiliated member, of Amalgamated, I might be invited to that workers' paradise as Cornwell, Pa., which you have just acquired.

I understand from those who know about it that it is well worth visiting.

I think that the history of this union will stand as a monument to the progress of American trade unionism, and I join with you in your efforts to achieve what Sidney Hillman well described as a future when men and women will be economically secure and politically free.

Now I would like to talk, if I may, about some facts because, as your President has said, my job in the Labor Department, is to promote and develop the welfare of the wage earners of this country, and I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that so long as I am in that job that will be my sole objective. [Applause.]

So let's take a look at the record, the record of the activities of the Labor Department and the record of the legislative problems and activities of the Labor Department because in that record lies a story. In that record lies a story that I think you and I have to be cognizant of. In that record lies a clear-cut story as to what the workers of this country have to do to make sure that the gains that they are entitled to are secure.

In April of this year, the average weekly wage of the worker in industry in this country was $78.39 a week, which was an all-time record for the month of April. But the really important question is income in terms of purchasing power.

If you have got a lot of money and you can't buy anything with it, it is just the same as though you had none. We compile a statistic in the Labor Department called The Average Net Spendable Weekly Earning. It is the expendable aspect that I think should be of interest. We arrive at the figure by taking the actual average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing. We subtract from that all of the deduction like taxes and social security that come out of the weekly wage, and then we adjust the figure for changes in the cost of living.

And the result gives us an indication of the real value of a worker's wage. Now, between 1944 and 1952, the workers of this country received wage increases amounting to $21.89 per week. The gain, however, was an illusion, because inflation and taxes not only cut the increase down; the real spendable earnings of a single man actually dropped by $1.88 a week. Between 1952 and 1955, however, the average worker had received a clear-cut gain in net spendable earnings of about $6 a week. It seems to me that in an attempt to achieve a higher and higher standard of living we must be continually conscious not only of the wage level but of the level of the cost of living, which in the last 2 years has remained virtually steady, making the money that you receive, money your members receive, of more value in terms of purchasing power.

Now, I note from this morning's paper, as another part of the record, that my good friend Louis Hollander, your vice president, says that the same people who are anti-Negro, anti-Jew, and anti-Catholic, are anti-labor and antisocial, and I want you to know that I agree with him 100 percent. [Applause.] And I want to tell you what we are trying to do in this field of minority discrimination.

In the last several years much has been done, and I am going to use as an example right here in the District of Columbia. Two years ago I recommended, and the President appointed, Mr. J. Ernest Wilkins as Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of international affairs. Mr. Wilkins is a Negro from Chicago, and he was asked at the

first press conference he held, "How is it, Mr. Wilkins, that you feel free to come to Washington when a man like Ralph Bunche not so many years ago said that he could not bring his family to Washington because of discriminatory practices?"

And Mr. Wilkins truthfully replied, "I can come to Washington now because things have changed."

Things have changed in this respect: There is no longer discrimination in the District of Columbia eating establishments. Segregation has been abolished in the District of Columbia recreational facilities, in swimming pools, in parks, and in other facilities. Segregation has been done away with in movie houses and in theaters in the District, and racial discrimination has been effectively banned on Federal contract jobs by the President's Committee on Government Contracts. I worked with the President's Committee, and through that Committee we have brought about not only these changes in the District of Columbia but also the abolition of certain discriminatory practices by employers in the District of Columbia.

We have not achieved our goal. We have a long way to go, not only here but throughout the country. But I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the objective of the President's Committee, the objective of the Labor Department, is to continually and effectively move ahead so that every single American, regardless of his race or his color or his creed, will have equal opportunity for jobs and will have equal opportunity for education and will have equal opportunity as a citizen of these United States. [Applause.]

Now, your president and officers and your membership have always supported the Department of Labor programs which are designed for the welfare of the wage earners of this country, and I would like to mention a few recent happenings which I am sure are of particular interest to you.

The effectiveness of the Walsh-Healey Act which, as you know, permits the Secretary of Labor to determine minimum wages for work performed on Government contracts, has been threatened by the Fulbright amendment which subjects such wage-finding decisions of the Secretary of Labor to judicial review. We are determined to make the law work and have therefore fought hard to establish sensible and practical administrative procedures to help us enforce this law. And the result has been that, within the last month, we have won in the Supreme Court the right to determine a nationwide minimum in the cotton-textile industry and in the woolen and worsted industry. As you know, these determinations have been enjoined by employers for some years. We have successfully defeated the efforts of the employers to make the act inoperative; and, as a result, we have brought $2½ million in back wages to nearly 100,000 workers in these industries. [Applause.]

Now, I'd like to talk also about some of the other problems of the Department of Labor. Each year since 1953, we have been successful, with your help, in increasing the budget of the Department of Labor so that we might be more effective in the doing of our job for the working people of this country. For example, in 1950 the grand total appropriation in the Department of Labor was $223 million. In 1956, it is $468 million. And with this money, the Department of Labor has increased effectively its enforcement operations in Walsh-Healey, in the Fair Labor, and in the Davis-Bacon Acts.

As an example of the tightness of our enforcement, when the minimum-wage law was passed and made effective in March of 1956, in the men's cotton-garment industry, we refused to go along with the precedent that had been established in 1950 for an extended learning period, and we cut the learning period by 160 hours, because we felt that was a fair thing to do. [Applause.]

You may recall that in 1950, learners' certificates were granted in many industries, and through June 30, 1950 (you may remember, the law became effective in January), in the men-boys suit-coat industry, the Department of Labor granted 205 learners' certificates.

So far this year, we have granted, in the Department of Labor, in the same industry, only 82 learners' certificates, and the reason that number is low, possibly, is because we insist that no learners' certificates be granted, unless there is definite proof that no skilled workers are available. [Applause.] And I hope that any of you who know of the existence of skilled workers in an area where learners' certificates have been granted will let me know.

Now, with relation to this law enforcement, and the additional funds that we have requested and secured from Congress, we propose to continue actively and strenuously our law enforcement in the interests of the workers of this country. We propose to see to it that any employer, who is violating the law, shall be punished, in accordance with the statute. And we propose to continue our enforcement of the laws, so that the fair employer is not subject to the chiseling competition of a law violator. [Applause.]

Just as an example of the difference in the tempo of the law enforcement of the Labor Department, I want to cite you just one figure:

Under the Davis-Bacon Act (an act which as you know, provides that the Secretary of Labor shall find the prevailing wages in Federal construction projects) from 1935 until 1952, four contractors were blacklisted by the Department of Labor, for violating the Davis-Bacon Act, this at a time, remember, when we had the largest construction program in the history of our country.

Since I have been in office, we have blacklisted 46, or nearly 10 times as many, because we propose that the workers of this country shall be protected and that the fair employer shall be protected. [Applause.]

Now, I want to tell you about some of our projects:

We have before Congress a number of legislative proposals, and I have brought them with me, because I thought you might be interested in my scanning them for you.

In November 1953, 1 month after I got this job, before the CIO convention in Cleveland, I said, and I think it was the first time that anyone had said it from a national platform, that I thought the minimum wage should be increased. I said that I thought the coverage of the minimum wage should be expanded. [Applause.]

And I want you to know, ladies and gentlemen, that I have not receded 1 inch from that position, and I am prepared, when the Senate Labor Committee calls hearings, to testify with specific recommendations, for the increase and the coverage of the minimum wage. [Applause.]

Now we have a number of other proposals in the Congress, and I won't recite them in detail. We have a proposal to revise the 8-hour laws which would provide for overtime after 40 hours on Federal construction projects because, do you know (while it may not be of particular news to your members), do you know that under the present law, archaic as it is, that in some sections of this country construction workers working on Federal programs are working 56 hours a week at straight time because the law provides only for overtime after 8 hours.

In these nonunion areas in the South and Southwest, construction workers are working 56 hours a week at straight time—8 hours a day, 7 days a week, and we proposed last year, on February 25, 1955, and on April 20, 1955, we introduced legislation in the Congress to correct this abominable situation, and we have had no action.

Last year in this country, 14,000 people were killed on their jobs, and over 2 million, or nearly 2 million injured—injured to the extent that they lost time. And we proposed legislation last year to promote occupational safety programs in the States by providing grants-in-aid to the States so that a better protection job could be done, more factory inspectors, better laws, better codes.

We introduced that legislation on February 18, 1955, in the Senate, and on April 20, 1955, in the House, and we have had no action.

We have legislation to amend the Workmen's Compensation laws that affect longshore and harbor workers and the private employees of the District of Columbia. This legislation was introduced in 1955. It affects some 650,000 workers in this country, and so far we have had hearings, just hearings, no action.

The President of the United States in his state of the Union message this year said that he would introduce legislation, and he has, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in the payment of wages, and we have had no action.

We have legislation to provide a nonoccupational disability benefit to the District of Columbia employees because that is the only area that Congress can legislate in this field. This legislation was introduced last year, and there is no action.

We have legislation to improve the unemployment compensation programs of the District of Columbia, and we have no action.

We have legislation which is designed to protect the migrant workers of this country from many bad practices that exist in transporting them from place to place of work. So far we have had no legislation.

We have many other bills which are somewhat technical in nature, and I am not going to talk about them. But when you add up the number of workers that these bills affect on our best estimate—just let me run them down:

One bill, at least 12 million. At least a million on another. The safety bill, 39 million. Six hundred and fifty thousand. Two hundred and fifty thousand. Six hundred and fifty thousand again. One and a half million. Two million. One million.

Those are the workers that would be affected by this legislation which we proposed.

Now why aren't we getting any action? I will tell you why: I see before me a sign which says: "Organizing Is Everybody's Job. Abolish Taft-Hartley and Right-To-Work Laws."

In 1954 the President of the United States suggested, recommended to Congress, presented a bill to Congress, to make certain changes in the Taft-Hartley law. That request was reiterated in 1955, in 1956, and nothing has happened.

My position on the right-to-work laws is well known. But I think to get this picture of why, why nothing is happening on this proper labor legislation which we have in the House and Senate, I think we ought to talk a little bit about the right to work.

Where do these right-to-work laws exist, and how do they affect—and how do they affect—congressional thinking on other types of labor legislation?

Let me run down—it won't take a minute—the list of the political composition of the legislatures in the States with the right-to-work laws in alphabetical order:

Alabama, Democrat; Arizona, Democrat; Arkansas, Democrat; Florida, Democrat; Georgia, Democrat; Iowa, Republican; Louisiana, Democrat; Mississippi, Democrat; Nebraska, Republican; Nevada, Democrat; North Carolina, Democrat; North Dakota, nonpartisan; South Carolina, Democrat; South Dakota, Republican; Tennessee, Democrat; Texas, Democrat; Utah, Republican; Virginia, Democrat.

Thirteen legislatures Democrat, four Republican, one nonpartisan.

Now let's take a look at the congressional composition, the present composition of the congressional delegation from these 18 States with right-to-work laws: The total Democratic Congressmen and Senators, 114. The total Republican Congressmen and Senators, 37.

Now, how can you and I expect reasonably sympathetic approach to legislation which benefits the workingmen and women of this country with that record? How can we expect it? I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that I say that your job and mine in terms of those elements in this country which are antilabor is to exercise what Sidney Hillman called our political freedom. [Applause.] So I ask with all of the force that I can: How can one say that this administration is not in favor of the workingman, with this record of accomplishment, this record of legislation which is blocked in the House and the Senate by the Democratic leadership? And all you have to do to document it is to look at the right-to-work States and where they are.

I want to thank you for listening to me. I appreciate very much the cordiality and the interest that you have shown. I want to say again that so long as I am in office—and I know I will have the opportunity of being in office for another 4 years [laughter]—so long as I am here, you will find me on your side. [Applause.] You will find me fighting for your legitimate rights, and you will find me working as closely as they will allow me—and they do—with your national officers. You will find me fighting every inch of the way for the thing that you and I are primarily interested in, which is the welfare of the workers of the United States. [Applause.]

Congressman Harley O. Staggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last spring, in answer to students' inquiries, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my idea of the average Congressman. I chose from among the Members of the House of Representatives my colleague, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. Since that time, several things have happened in the ordinary work-a-day life of Congressman STAGGERS that I think should be brought to your attention in order to complete the record of the achievements of this Congressman.

Culminating years of hard work, Congressman STAGGERS has been instrumental in having authorized a new Federal building in Martinsburg, W. Va., to house the post office and the Federal court. It is estimated that the cost of this building will be approximately $1,500,000.

Through the efforts of the second district Congressman, a bill has been put through Congress for the relief of the city of Elkins from an airport indebtedness.

Another project which adds to Congressman Staggers' credit is the establishment of a fish hatchery in his district. He has diligently pushed through the House of Representatives a bill which will provide a $600,000 Federal fish hatchery in the second district which will supply the streams throughout the national forests in West Virginia and some of the streams in adjoining States. This bill provides a maintenance fund of $100,000 yearly.

Your average Congressman has also had enacted by Congress a resolution authorizing $30,000 for planning and surveying of the Greenbrier River in Marlinton, W. Va.

A definite decision has now been made to locate the Radio Astronomy Center, to which I referred in my previous speech, in Pocahontas County, W. Va.; $3,500,000 has been earmarked to start this project. STAGGERS played a large part in seeing that the funds were appropriated and earmarked for this project.

In addition to major achievements, the Congressman is daily working for the best interest of America and the good of the people.

He has helped thousands of people and works on every problem just as if it were his own. He makes hundreds of speeches yearly and is always available when needed.

Information Fact Sheet on the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, any legislation which comes before the House must finally be decided on its own merits alone. To merit our approval a bill must be sound in purpose. Its results must be necessary as well as worth while.

Normally I would be content to address myself only to the provisions of a bill. I would rest my case solely on the merits of the proposed legislation.

In the recent debate on the veterans security bill it was necessary to consider the character and integrity and history of service of its sponsor and principal supporter—the American Legion.

The American Legion's proud record of service for God and country has been ignored by those who charge the Legion with being a "Treasury-raiding" organization.

There is room for honest differences of opinion as to the relative importance of the various provisions of this bill to liberalize existing veteran compensation and pension benefits. I, for one, believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that disabled and aging veterans who are unable to work because of their disabilities or unable to obtain a job because of their age, and who have little or no income, should not be left destitute. I believe, too, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that those who were disabled in the service of our Nation, their dependents and the survivors of deceased veterans are adequately cared for. Most important, I believe that our Nation and our economy will continue to grow and prosper so that this obligation can be met in the future as well as it is being met today.

This belief, which is shared by the American Legion, scarcely warrants the charge of "Treasury Raider." Yet, nearly three million American Legionnaires have been so branded by some opposed to this bill.

Such a charge is unjustified both in terms of the legislation now being considered and in terms of the American Legion's unequalled record of service for others.

I challenge anyone to show me an organization that has done more for the welfare of all of our people and of our entire Nation than the American Legion.

There is none.

In whatever field of service one may choose, the American Legion is in the forefront.

Consider for a moment the veterans' legislation enacted by the United States Congress since the American Legion was chartered by an act of Congress on September 16, 1919; the American Legion has been in the thick of every legislative battle for the improvement of conditions for disabled veterans and their dependents.

As recently as 37 years ago there was no Veterans' Administration. The American Legion led the fight for creation of this agency. It has been the watchdog of its operations. It has been its most constructive critic. There are few who do not recognize that the establishment and improvement of VA have resulted in a much more efficient and much more economical administration of veterans benefits enacted by Congress.

Is this Treasury-raiding?

After World War I there was no hospital and medical program for disabled veterans. The American Legion fought to make this program the finest of its kind in the world today. Is this Treasury-raiding?

I am confident that future historians will some day credit Congress with writing one of the most beneficial, constructive, far-sighted laws in the history of America or any other nation when it enacted the GI bill of rights in June 1944. The American Legion was the architect of this legislation. Was the American Legion raiding the Treasury when it helped write into law a program whose ultimate value to our Nation and to our people no one can now measure?

Going beyond the field of legislation into the area of direct service to the Nation and to our people, we come to the American Legion's programs of Veterans Rehabilitation, Child Welfare, National Security, and Americanism.

Veterans rehabilitation to the American Legion means more than sponsoring and supporting legislation of needed benefit for veterans. It means helping veterans obtain these available benefits which they need and to which they are entitled.

Each year the American Legion spends millions of dollars on the National, State, and local level processing veterans' claims, helping sick and disabled veterans obtain the hospital and medical

care they need, assisting veterans with insurance, disability, housing, education, and other matters, and doing the other things which must be done before a veteran can receive authorized benefits.

Nearly a million dollars are spent by the Legion each year to operate its national rehabilitation service alone. In addition, there are more than 1,100 accredited Legion representatives in VA regional offices, hospitals, clinics, and other installations throughout the country; a service officer in each of the American Legion's more than 17,000 posts is ready and willing to help any veteran with any problem he may have.

Let me emphasize that this service is available to any veteran, regardless of whether he is a member of the American Legion or even eligible for membership in the Legion.

The American Legion, through its veterans' rehabilitation program, has contributed $50,000 to the Heart Fund, an equal amount for NP research, and additional funds for other medical purposes. It has made available to the Government the advice and services of its expert medical, insurance, and claims advisory personnel.

These are but a few of the positive ways in which the American Legion is serving others without recourse to the Federal Government or any other agency, which means, of course, that this is being done with Legion dues and contributions, not Federal or State funds.

In the field of child welfare, the American Legion has during the past 31 years spent more than $125 million to provide direct aid for children in need. In 1955 the Legion's child-welfare program cost that organization more than $7,300,000.

The money spent by the Legion has bought everything from food, clothes, and shelter to iron lungs, prosthetic appliances, and miracle drugs. But the story of this child-welfare program cannot be told in terms of money alone. It must be told, too, in terms of the hundreds of thousands of hours devoted to the care of children each year by the more than 50,000 trained workers in this field in the American Legion and its auxiliary. And it must be told in terms of the children made healthy, the families kept together, and the constructive, farsighted child laws on the statute books today because of the determination and support of the American Legion.

The American Legion's record in the field of national security further refutes the baseless charge of "Treasury-Raider." It is only necessary to review the history of our Nation since World War I to realize that up until very recently, the American Legion was one of the few organizations in the country which steadfastly opposed our lack of military preparedness.

Is there anyone today who would question that the American Legion has been interested only in the welfare and security of our country in urging a strong program of military preparedness? Is there anyone who would question that such American Legion sponsored and supported laws as the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the Federal Civil Defense Act, the various National Security Acts, and other defense measures are in the best interests of our country?

Individual Legionnaires have given freely of their time and effort to serve on Selective Service boards, with civil defense units, and other defense agencies.

A few days ago on Flag Day, June 14, the American Legion demonstrated another facet of its positive, constructive programs for the good of America. In front of the east entrance to the United States Capitol, the American Legion conducted an inspiring Flag-Day program. Some of our colleagues in the Senate and House were privileged to represent the Congress on this program. They can tell you what this patriotic observance of the birthday of our flag meant to them and to the millions of our fellow citizens who watched it on a national television program that morning.

Americanism is one of the American Legion's most important and most comprehensive programs. If it is a Treasury-raiding program, it is only because the American Legion drains its own treasury to finance such magnificent activities as Boys State and Boys Nation, the annual, nationwide oratorical contest, the sponsorship of Boy Scout troops, and American Legion junior baseball.

Each year the American Legion spends approximately $1 million to teach young men of America about the functions of their State and Federal Governments through Boys State and Boys Nation. Some 20,000 boys participate in this program annually.

The oratorical contest gives more than 350,000 high school boys each year an opportunity to learn about our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Essays are written on these precious documents by the contestants. Many youngsters, who otherwise could not have gone to college, have had a college education because of the scholarships they won in the American Legion's oratorical contest. And every participant has gained a greater understanding and appreciation of those documents that are the foundation of our democratic form of government.

Is this the kind of activity which merits unthinking, caustic criticism?

Currently, more than 175,000 future leaders of our Nation are members of the 4,128 Boy Scout Troops sponsored by the American Legion. Since the Legion began sponsoring these troops, more than one million Boy Scouts have benefited from the wonderful moral and physical training which scouting gave them.

If baseball is America's national pastime, then the American Legion is one of the cornerstones of the country through its unequaled junior baseball program.

This largest, organized, teen-age activity in the Nation started in Milbank, S. Dak., in 1925. It became a national program in 1926. During the past 30 years, at least 20 million boys have played American Legion junior baseball.

Nearly 20,000 league teams take part annually in this program. More than one million boys play American Legion junior baseball each year. In addition to the 20,000 teams playing in league competition, other teams are sponsored by Legion Posts to give more boys a chance to play junior baseball. This accounts for the total of one million boys.

American Legion junior baseball has been the proving grounds for the major and minor leagues. Since World War II it has given the major leagues 60 percent of their players. Last year alone, 264 players on the 16 major league teams were graduates of American Legion junior baseball.

But this is an incidental benefit of the program. The real value of American Legion junior baseball and the reason the Legion spends upward of $1,200,000 each year on this activity is that it teaches young Americans the importance of teamwork and of sportsmanship as one of the cornerstones of good citizenship.

These are but some of the unpublicized, unselfish, day-to-day programs of the American Legion.

They do not rate headlines. But they do prove that the American Legion, far from being a Treasury-raiding organization, is one of the greatest forces for good our Nation has ever known.

The American Legion fights hard for what it believes in. But it fights fairly. And win, lose or draw, it continues to carry out its many programs of service for God and country.

So the next time somebody accuses the American Legion of being a Treasury-raiding organization because he disagrees with a Legion-sponsored bill for the benefit of veterans, remember what the Legion is doing for the welfare of others.

If every organization which comes before the Congress in support of or opposition to one bill or another were doing as much, you and I could rest easy about the future security and welfare of our Nation.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the position of small business in our country today and there are among us the conjurers of gloom who, in their frenzied search for political issues, have hit upon the idea that they can sell the American people the bill of goods that the present administration in Washington is not interested in the fate of the small businesses of our country. This is plain balderdash.

Today small-business concerns, in general, are much better off than they were in the early part of 1953 when President Eisenhower took office. This improvement has been accomplished despite the more highly competitive civilian markets of the past 2 years. In addition, much progress has been made in solving the problems encountered by small business in particular areas such as financing, Government procurement, protection

from monopolies and discriminatory practices in the market place.

OUR RECORD ECONOMY

Our economy is currently operating at record levels, far above anything contemplated by even the most optimistic persons 10 or even 5 years ago. The first 3 months of 1956 show total goods and services—the gross national product—produced in the United States as reaching an annual rate of $403.4 billion, an all-time high. A record number of business concerns participated in supplying this amount of goods and services—they now number more than 4,252,000. Our total labor force is at a new high of 67,846,000, while average weekly earnings for workers in manufacturing concerns reached $78.40 in May of this year. A new high in average weekly earnings of $79.52 was reached in November of last year.

Our economy, therefore, is in a period of prosperity with the people of the United States enjoying the highest standard of living ever experienced in our history or anywhere in the world. We Republicans are proud of this record, particularly when the goods and services produced by our economy may be enjoyed during a time of peace.

Small-business concerns have participated in and have contributed to this prosperous economy. While small firms suffered a decline in sales and profits during the Korean war period, the trend was reversed within a few months after the end of hostilities in 1953. Since that time there has been a steady increase in both the sales and profits of small business. The conversion from the Korean period to an essentially peacetime economy was accomplished with a minimum disturbance to our economy.

Small-business concerns depend upon a high level of economic activity and upon a large demand for civilian goods and services. It may be noted that from 1952 to the first quarter of 1956, Federal purchasing of goods and services was reduced from $54.3 billion to $45.7 billion. During this same period, personal consumption expenditures—the things we all buy in our daily living—increased from $218.3 billion to $258.8 billion. This means that small businesses are currently better able to participate and to prosper in the markets of today.

We recognize that while small business in general is better off today than it was in 1953, individual firms do still experience difficulties in their efforts to secure long-term credit, to compete against monopolistic or discriminatory practices in the civilian market and in some other areas. These are not new problems. They were certainly not created by the Republican administration. What is important is that under the direction of President Eisenhower, the several agencies of the Federal Government are making strong and conscientious efforts to remove these obstacles to effective competition by small-business concerns.

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MERGERS

Much has been said by our New Deal and Fair Deal critics about the high rate of business mergers with increased concentration in big business and about the high rate of business failures. Two things should be pointed out about the concentration of economic power and business mergers. The first is that big business normally benefits far more during periods of wartime or defense production than does the small business. We all remember the thousands of small businesses that have been casualties in our last two wars. We also remember the controls which brought on this economic strangulation during our recent war years. Big business received a tremendous impetus during World War II and the Korean period. The factors which brought this about may be an unavoidable adjunct of war, but I suggest that the other party remember its share in the responsibility for the administration of controls during this period.

For many years, New Dealers have vilified our larger business enterprises and wept crocodile tears for our small concerns. "Robber Barons," "Economic Royalists" are all part of the New Deal's colorful language contrived to get votes. I believe the American people are tired of such baseless foolishness. Bigness is not bad per se. It is bad if it causes unfair competition or is used to foster monopolies. In this event, we are protected by our antitrust enforcement agencies which under the Eisenhower administration have been vigorous in protecting our free enterprise system from monopolistic encroachment. From the number of actions by the antitrust enforcement agencies in this administration, we soon see that the Republican administration has been far more vigilant in policing our economy than were its predecessors.

I believe it is important that we understand the true picture of business failures. The New Dealers have looked long and hard for campaign issues—it appears that the best they can come up with is the fact that some small businesses fail to make the grade. I am as much concerned as the next man when the local tailor, hardware store or shoe store has to close its doors. We hope that every man can succeed in his endeavor. However, the business failure rate today is not high. Let us not forget that during 1955 there were 374,000 new businesses started, or over 1,000 a day. This tremendous incentive to compete in today's market resulted in a record number of business firms in our economy totaling 4,252,000.

I wish to state most emphatically that trying to compare what happens during a peacetime economy, such as we have at present, with the experience of an economy geared to war is sheer nonsense. As a matter of fact, since 1940 we cannot find any normal year for the purpose of comparison. From 1941 to 1945 we had World War II; from 1946 to 1948 we had a reconversion period with all sorts of economic shocks as a tremendous backlog of demand on the part of consumers developed. From 1950 to 1952 we had the Korean emergency and finally in 1953 we had a short period of relatively stable reconversion and the demand for new products to satisfy the wants of consumers. We find, therefore, that 1954 and 1955 are actually the only normal peacetime years in the last decade and a half.

In 1954 we find that there were slightly over 11,000 business failures or at the rate of 42 per 10,000 business enterprises. In 1955 there were slightly under 11,000 business failures or at the rate of 41.6 per 10,000 business enterprises. This rate is considerably less than three New Deal years, 1939–41, which were normal years and which experienced a failure rate of 63 per 10,000 firms. It is also much less than the long-run average of 70 per 10,000 firms for the period 1900 to 1955. This rate is more characteristic of our business experience during this century. On this basis I certainly do not feel that the current business failure rate is out of proportion with our historical experience.

While I am, of course, concerned over the failure of any business enterprise, I firmly believe that we may have confidence in our competitive system when so many thousands of new businesses are being started each year. Certainly, this best illustrates that the citizens of our country have not lost faith in the opportunities which exist today or in their ability to compete with firms which are not only large but which have had many years of successful operation.

PROFITS OF SMALL FIRMS

Using all of the figures available to us, we find that as far as small manufacturing corporations are concerned, there was a significant loss in their financial position during the period 1947–52. Earnings before taxes declined from $1,885 million to $1,347 million or 28.5 percent. Similarly, earnings after taxes declined from $1,096 million to $610 million or 44.3 percent.

During this same period, 1947–52, sales of the large corporations increased from $144,290 million to $219,758 million, or 52.3 percent. Earnings before taxes of this group increased from $14,589 million to $18,877 million or 29.4 percent. Their earnings after taxes decreased 9.5 percent. Compare this to the 44 percent decline of small corporations.

Now what has happened during the Republican administration? For nearly 2 years there has been an improvement in the financial position of small manufacturing corporations as well as the large.

In the years 1954 and 1955, earnings before taxes of the small corporations increased 31.8 percent compared with 36.7 percent for the large corporations, but the percentage of increase of earnings after taxes of the smaller corporations was greater, 39.8, compared with 34.2 percent for the large firms.

WHAT THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION HAS DONE

Now, what efforts has the Eisenhower administration put forth to help create a climate in which small business can prosper? Let us look briefly at the work of various Federal agencies whose programs have assisted the small-business concerns in our economy.

The Small Business Administration was established by the Republican 83d Congress, as the first independent, peacetime agency to render assistance to small

firms. This agency actually serves as the chief proponent of small business in the executive branch of the Government and has programs in operation which are designed to help small business. Each year since 1953 has seen increasing activity in these fields. Since the inception of the agency and through June of this year, the Small Business Administration had approved 3,560 loans to business concerns for a total of $165,691,000. These loans have gone to virtually every type of legitimate enterprise, local drug and hardware stores, feed and implement dealers, small machine shops, taxicab and bus companies, and others. The SBA also has approved some 4,552 disaster loans to businessmen and homeowners who suffered damage because of hurricanes, floods, and other catastrophes. As a matter of fact, the loans made during the past fiscal year more than doubled those of the previous fiscal year.

This was the Republican answer—legitimate credit for small business, replacing the scandal-ridden Reconstruction Finance Corporation which spread loans to huge corporations and was so subject to political influence in the previous administration. Let me also say here that the SBA does not seek to compete with private lending institutions. It is not a Government superbank. It does, however, provide sound loans, often in participation with private lenders, when banks cannot make the loan on sufficiently long terms or for other legitimate reasons which would deny credit to small businesses.

Not all the agency's efforts in rendering financial assistance, however, are resolved by the making of a loan. Frequently SBA financial specialists can advise an individual as to changes of operation so that a loan is no longer necessary or so the businessman can secure the credit he needs from his local bank.

The Small Business Administration has agreements with other Government agencies which buy goods and services such as the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Agriculture whereby all or certain portions of particular Government purchase contracts will be set aside for exclusive bidding by small firms. This means that on Government contracts suitable for performance by small business, small firms will be assured of an opportunity to compete. As of June 30, 1956, $1,112 million in set-asides for small business had been agreed to by procurement agencies. Here, again, the SBA has been increasing its efforts to assist small business. Each fiscal year finds many more millions of dollars in Government purchases reserved for exclusive award to small firms.

Other Small Business Administration programs in operation assist small firms to place their names on Government bidders' lists, to obtain specifications and bid sets; to learn of prime and subcontracting opportunities; and to acquire the latest information on managerial and technical subjects.

The administrator of SBA recently disclosed that Small Business Administration field office reports during fiscal year 1956 showed that prime contract opportunities referred to small firms resulted in contract awards totaling $332,567,000; counseling on selling to the Government and related problems was provided to 30,139 small companies; 88,857 prime and subcontract opportunity referrals were made to small firms; and Government contracting officers were furnished names and addresses of 7,265 small firms which could supply items for which additional small business competition for Government contracts was needed to obtain more suitable prices.

The Republican founders of the Small Business Administration envisioned it as a one-stop agency to which firms could turn, particularly in their dealings with the Government without encountering the redtape, brush-off, and run-around which had so long been associated with the attitude of the Federal Government from 1933 to 1953.

I believe that the several programs of the Small Business Administration have been of material assistance to the small business concerns of this Nation. Because I believe that such valuable assistance has been rendered, I have, during this Congress, supported all legislative proposals and requests for appropriations dealing with the Small Business Administration. I have also noted a tendency on the part of the other party to discredit and belittle this agency.

Other agencies in the Federal Government have during the past 3 years given increased recognition to the needs of small business in their own particular programs.

As I have said, the economic welfare of the small-business concern is, to a large extent, dependent upon the vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws—for with free, open, and fair competition the small firm may successfully compete against its large competitors. The record of antitrust enforcement under the Eisenhower administration is a commendable record. New vigor and insight on the part of the enforcement agencies have created a record of accomplishment superior to that of either of the two previous administrations.

The efforts of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have been directed toward the speedier handling of cases and the prosecution of hard-core violations. I am informed that during the 10 years from 1944 through 1953, the FTC brought an average of only 111 complaints each year. In fiscal 1954, this jumped to 123, in fiscal 1955 to 161, and at the present rate, fiscal 1956 will see more than 170 complaints issued. In final orders by the Commission, the same stepped-up action is revealed. From an average of 96 orders for companies to cease unfair trade practices each year between 1944–53, 104 were issued in 1954, and 1955 produced 112. Fiscal 1956, with 94 orders already issued, is certain to surpass last year's record.

The Eisenhower administration has a much better record of antitrust enforcement than its New Deal predecessors despite all of the lip service to the contrary. The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department under our administration has instituted well over 100 suits against antitrust violators; whereas, in 1952 under a Democrat administration, 30 new antitrust cases were filed; in 1953 under the Republican Administration, 33 new proceedings were brought; and in 1955, a total of 54 new cases were begun.

In the 62 years since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act by a Republican controlled Congress, 26 contempt proceedings have been brought for violation of outstanding decrees—one-third of these were brought in the 3 years since the present Republican administration took office. In all areas of antitrust law enforcement, strengthened and more expeditious treatment of cases has resulted. Every means is being used to assure small firms the full protection under the law.

Many small firms sell to the Federal Government and do so in direct competition with the largest business concerns in the country. When so many billions of dollars of goods and services are being purchased each year it is most important that small firms are accorded every opportunity to compete. It has long been the expressed intent of Congress that small business should receive a fair share of Government purchases and in the past 3 years every effort has been made by the procurement agencies to see that the will of Congress is carried out.

I have already mentioned the beneficial results derived from agreements between the Small Business Administration and Government procurement agencies. Additionally, these agencies themselves have small-business specialists and small-business programs. The figures show that small firms have received a larger share of military procurement in the past 2 years than under the so-called Fair Deal administration.

For fiscal years 1954 and 1955 small business received an average of almost 24 percent while in the 3 most recent Democrat fiscal years they received an average of 18 percent. Similarly, the percentage of contracts awarded through secret negotiation by the Government has decreased during the past 2 fiscal years. In other words, Government buying is being brought out in the open where all business firms can compete fairly.

I believe that the agencies responsible for procurement activities will increase their efforts to assure small business a larger share of Government purchases and will eliminate obstacles to providing small firms full information on proposed purchases, contract administration, and other areas in which small business has a vital interest.

For 20 years, the Federal Government proceeded unimpeded toward becoming a bureaucratic colossus. Empires were built within the Federal structure. The Government arrogantly embarked on all sorts of business-type ventures in competition with the legitimate pursuits of private enterprise. Thus, the Government became a high-cost producer of many items, insensitive to the competitive forces which operate in the American economy to keep prices low. The American taxpayer not only paid the difference, but also suffered increased taxes since the Government was denied the corporate tax revenues which the companies holding Government contracts for such work would pay. This is certainly a form of socialism which often

damaged small businesses because of the type of functions that would have been undertaken had this work been contracted for with private industry.

The Republican administration has been quick to disband these schemes. Scores of such activities have been abandoned since 1953, although the opposition Congress of the past 2 years has erected roadblocks in this Republican program.

I have mentioned Socialist tendencies, and I wish to add that a fully socialized economy is far easier to accomplish if production is concentrated in the hands of a relatively few large enterprises. As in Great Britain several years ago, a socialistic government can assume control of private industry more easily when the assumption of control results from taking over a few large industrial organizations. This is why anyone who opposes Socialist ideology must believe strongly that small business must be preserved and fostered in a free-enterprise system.

The Eisenhower administration knows that small business is the essential blood and nerve system of our economic body if free enterprise is to be a vital, dynamic force. It knows that avenues of opportunity for small business to grow are necessary to the functioning of free enterprise. It knows and has demonstrated through its intelligently conceived policies that both large and small business are required and must be balanced carefully in Government policies so that both can be stimulated.

In order to assure that the small-business segment of our economy receives the most assistance possible within the proper sphere of Federal Government activities, and as further evidence of his concern for small business, President Eisenhower recently established a Cabinet Committee on Small Business. This Committee will, in the words of the President:

> Make specific recommendations for administrative action, and, where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen economic position of small business and to foster their sound development.

Through vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws the Republican administration has endeavored to assure small firms an opportunity to compete with all businesses adhering to the rules of the game. In particular areas where small firms habitually encountered more difficulty than larger businesses, the Eisenhower administration has made every effort to strengthen its programs which can provide assistance to individual small-business concerns.

But, above all, I believe that the greatest service has been rendered small firms by respecting individual initiative and resourcefulness and by making every effort to maintain a flourishing and prosperous economy in which all businessmen may participate. I believe we can all have faith in the strength of the thousands of small-business concerns throughout the country. We also can be assured that President Eisenhower and his administration will continue to render all assistance necessary.

I personally pledge myself to continue to support in Congress every legislative measure which will honestly serve to benefit small business and assure that it continues to provide the vital and driving force in our economy. Then, I believe, all of our people will reap the benefits from a sound, flourishing free Nation.

Colgate Answers the Plight of the Private College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is not necessary for me to remind this body of the series of crises facing private higher education in our country today. A combination of rising costs and reduced purchasing power is each year placing our independent colleges in an increasingly difficult position.

I do, however, rise to tell you with great pride what one institution, Colgate University, in Hamilton, N. Y.—my own alma mater—is doing through the efforts of its alumni and friends to solve its problems. Perhaps the example of Colgate will prompt and assist others to do likewise.

Colgate University has always been seriously undercapitalized, both in endowment funds—income from which helps to defray the 40 percent more it costs to educate a student that he pays in tuition—and in available sources for important improvement and replacement of its physical plant. Never the recipient of State, National, or other public funds, or of large gifts from individual philanthropists, Colgate has had to make its own way financially. That it has built itself into a vital national institution while developing and maintaining the highest academic standards, is a tribute to those who have believed in the college, and have worked hard for it.

To meet today's problems, Colgate first took careful stock of all of its needs and resources, particularly in relation to the position it is determined to play in the future of American higher education. Then it listed those needs on a priority basis and made long-range plans to satisfy them.

For the most pressing of these, it planned a campaign among alumni, parents of students, and friends, to raise $3,300,000 in capital funds. This was to be used for the endowment of faculty salaries—in the light of all that has been written, I need hardly remind you of the desperate need that exists here if our colleges are to maintain their high standards of classroom teaching—for a new library to house its excellent collection of books and pamphlets, including the printed material issued by our own Government; and for the William A. Reid Athletic Center, honoring the great leader and a great friend of all Colgate men.

Colgate turns to alumni, parents, and friends, for these funds because the officers and trustees of Colgate University believe strongly that they cannot ask others for help unless they have done everything possible to help themselves. They also believe that every man has three great duties to be recognized when he apportions his philanthropic dollar—duty to church, duty to charity, and duty to education.

Furthermore, the university has enlisted the loyal support of its alumni in conducting the campaign. In each of the larger centers where Colgate men live, an alumni chairman has organized captains and workers—matched by a similar organization among parents, who have been most generous and faithful in supporting their adopted college—who are calling on other alumni to obtain gifts.

Today, the campaign has passed the halfway mark, with more than $1,800,000 subscribed; it is this fall entering its second phase. This is focused on the week of September 24—September 29, designated as Homecoming Week, and lying between Founders' Day, set aside annually to honor the 13 men who founded the university in 1819; and Homecoming, when Colgate meets its traditional rival, Cornell, in football on its homefield. This game, I might add, will be televised over NBC stations, and will be seen here in Washington as well as in New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

During this week, workers will call on every alumnus in their areas who has not subscribed to the fund and give them an opportunity to send in their pledges. This will also hold true for parents. Those who live in scattered areas where there can be no such organization will receive a mail appeal, enclosing a pledge card and asking them to make sure that their gifts are included in the total which will be announced during the Homecoming celebration. This total, I know, will be an impressive one.

This, as I said, is what one American college is doing to meet the serious situation which confronts higher education. Because of the nature of the campaign—its reliance on alumni, parents, and friends for gifts and for the organization conducting the appeal—it might well be termed "Operation Bootstrap."

Certainly it is most commendable for such an institution to insist on finding its own way out of its financial difficulties. I am sure you will agree with me that Colgate has set a fine example. She scorns to palm the public purse and true to her rich heritage remains proud, independent, self-reliant and, above all, reverent. I am proud of Colgate University.

A Fair Deal for the Small-Family Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a disappointment to me that this Con-

gress did not bring about a happier solution to the serious farm problem. It is tragic that politics entered into our deliberations.

It is too bad that the Senate delayed until a political year to approach the problem. The House approached it in 1955, a nonpolitical year. If the Senate had followed suit, I believe we could have accomplished more.

I want the record to show that politics never entered my mind in legislating for the farmer. If a bill was good for the small-family farmer, I did not care whether it was a Democratic or a Republican bill. If it was good for the small-family farmer, it got my support and vote.

If a bill was bad for the small-family farmer, I did not care whether it was a Republican or Democratic bill—I worked against it and voted against it. The farm problem is not a political problem with me. It is a serious national problem, and politics should be omitted.

In all my years here I am proud of the fact that I never played politics with the farmers' misery. Whether it was Democratic or Republican did not enter my thinking. What effect it would have on the farmers' welfare was my only consideration.

I know from what is going on that the farmers' problems are not going to be solved by politics. The Democratic South in control under Democrats never did give the dairy farmer much of a break. They gave as little as possible—and just enough to get their program through. Their concern is oleo—not dairying.

The Eastern Republicans believe in subsidies for everyone but the farmer. The combination of these two is responsible for the breakdown of dairy farm legislation. For any farmer to blindly follow party is defeating his own cause. The farmer should vote for men—not politics. It's the type of men you send to Congress, and not the party in control, that is going to solve the farm problem.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOOD PRODUCTS

I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill, away back in 1945, to set up a plan of disposition of surplus dairy and other food products. That was when the war ended. That was the time to solve the surplus problem. It was folly to wait until the surplus ran out of our ears.

This bill set up a plan for the school-lunch program, school-milk program, food for the aged, the disabled, the veterans, and needy countries of the world.

Progress on this bill has been slow, but little by little it is being adopted. For instance, last year Wisconsin got the following from the Federal Government:

School-lunch program: In 1,696 schools with 157,704 children participating (22 percent of 717,836 schoolchildren—Federal funds allocated to Wisconsin were $1,375,046). Most meals served were complete lunches; children pay part.

School-milk program: In 2,468 schools; Federal expenditure in Wisconsin was $968,000 last year.

Direct distribution program: Foods donated to schoolchildren and needy persons in institutions and family units totaled 3,760,000 pounds at a cost of $1,545,000 in Wisconsin last year.

Foreign nations: The amount of food the Federal Government disposed of to needy people in other nations amounted to over a billion dollars last year.

As a result of my efforts and the efforts of others like me, the school-lunch program, the school-milk program, the food to the needy in our Nation and the foreign-aid food program will be greatly increased in the coming year.

Slow but sure, the bill I introduced away back in 1945 is being adopted. If this bill had been adopted in 1945, the surplus-food problem would not be with us today.

SOCIAL SECURITY

When I addressed the farmers at hundreds of meetings 2 years ago, I told them that I introduced bills to reduce the social-security eligibility age for women to 62 years, and to pay social security to the disabled, regardless of age.

I am happy to report that progress has been made on these bills. The bill to reduce the eligibility age for women to 62 passed both Houses. The disabled will be able to draw social security at age 50, in a bill passed by both Houses.

It may interest you to know that I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill—in 1943—to make farmers eligible for coverage under the social-security program. What a break the farmers would have gotten if the bill had been adopted in 1943, when I first introduced it so that the farm income during war years could have been used as a basis for social-security payments.

WHY I SUPPORT 90 PERCENT OF PARITY FOR DAIRY FARMERS

I have always supported 90 percent of parity for dairy farmers because I believe that the way to reduce production is to guarantee a dairy farmer a good income. A dairy farmer's costs are fixed. He has expenses that are inescapable. If he cannot pay his bills with 20 milk cows he will milk 25 or 30.

If he wants to stay in business his income will determine how many cows he will milk. Lowering his income below 90 percent of parity will force him to milk more cows to get the needed income. That is the mistake in Benson's thinking.

This is why I felt it was a mistake to drop 90 percent of parity for dairying. This is why I introduced an amendment to keep 90 percent of parity for dairy products. But the Democrats of the South and Benson supporters licked my amendment. Notice it was a combination of southern Democrats and Benson supporters who defeated it.

WHY I SUPPORTED 90 PERCENT OF PARITY INSTEAD OF THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

The soil-bank program will not noticeably help the Wisconsin dairy farmer. It is a shame that this $1,200,000,000 expenditure will not noticeably help Wisconsin. Wisconsin dairy farmers cannot afford to take land out of production. To pasture and feed the increased number of cows they must milk to make ends meet, they cannot qualify for any real part of the $1,200,000,000 program.

The soil-bank program will enrich the large corporation farms that have thousands of acres. It will not help small Wisconsin dairy farmers. While Wisconsin farmers will get pennies, the large corporation farms will get thousands of dollars.

The 90-percent parity program would help all Wisconsin dairy farmers—and particularly the small-family farmers. And the 90-percent parity program would cost the taxpayers less than the $1,200,000,000 soil-bank program.

That is why I voted for the 90-percent parity program. A good soil conservation program with 90 percent of parity on limited production is the best answer to the problems of the small-family farmer. As it now stands, the small-family farmer is still in desperate circumstances. The farmer who needs help the most gets the least.

YOU HELP THE NATION WHEN YOU HELP THE DAIRY FARMER

Dairying accounts for more farm income than any other farm crop. In 1954, total dairy income was $5½ billion. In the same year, income from wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts altogether was only $7½ billion. Every crop is important, but only dairying is a crop in every State in the Union.

Since dairy farmers are everywhere, we help the whole Nation and every State in the Union when we help the dairy farmer. This cannot be said for any other farm crop. We would do the whole Nation a great service if we consider the welfare of dairying first above any other crop.

No farm crop deserves to be considered basic before dairying. What affects dairying affects the Nation. Yet the southern Democrats and eastern Republicans never permitted dairying to be classed as a basic industry. The most extensive farm industry is cast aside for peanuts and rice. It would be a great Congress except for southern Democrats and eastern Republicans.

MY ATTENDANCE RECORD

Largely because of the lack of balance between city and farm income, I saw to it that I was present each day Congress met in the past session. It is difficult to achieve, but the record shows I did not miss a single day that Congress was in session.

I was hopeful that more could be done to up farm income to balance it with city income. I am recorded as voting on every bill on which there was a rollcall. Every vote I cast was always on the side of the small-family farmer. Never did I vote against him.

To answer all the mail and other things a Congressman must do, it is difficult to have a perfect attendance record in Congress. Yet, I did accomplish just that. For the farmers' interests I did all humanly possible. There just weren't enough of us here. I repeat it is not party but men who will solve the farm problem.

Dr. Townsend and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the final approval this week by the Congress of amendments to the social-security law is a big step forward in social insurance for the people of our country.

It is another step toward the goal envisioned by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who pioneered for a plan to bring economic freedom, dignity, respect, and security to the old folks of this Nation. His proposal which became known as the Townsend plan gave inspiration and hope for the past score or more years to millions of senior citizens throughout the Nation.

Dr. Townsend was appalled at the sight of poverty in the midst of plenty. He saw how the Hoover depression brought dire hardship to millions of people. Old folks then were especially affected by privation and despair. Many of them rallied under the leadership of Dr. Townsend in a fight for social justice. The Townsend plan was proposed to abolish poverty and to bring lasting prosperity to all Americans as well as justice and security to elderly folks.

Much of the credit for the progress that has been made in social insurance is the result of Dr. Townsend's pioneering efforts for old-age pensions or for what he now refers to as a plan for national insurance.

Dr. Townsend's plan has been presented in many Congresses but has never reached the floor of Congress. It has been introduced again in this 84th Congress, 163 Members of the House have signed a discharge petition to bring the bill to the floor for debate and action.

This support gives evidence that many Members of Congress see the need for consideration and action on legislation which goes much further than the present social security law and beyond the amendments which were finally approved by Congress this week.

The Townsendites were not dismayed by the powerful opposition they faced. They continue to press for the Townsend plan—a program that will adequately meet the needs of all elderly folks. Even the modest improvements just made in the social-security law by this Congress were opposed by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, Marion B. Folsom, a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. If the administration opposes these very mild changes today, it can be understood why the Townsend plan faced bitter opposition from extreme conservative forces during the past 20 or more years.

These mild social-security improvements of 1956 were also bitterly opposed by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Medical Association, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and other big money groups who have been long-time foes of such humanitarian and liberal legislation. Despite such opposition, great advances have been made in the field of social insurance, thanks to Dr. Townsend and other men of vision who were not influenced by deceptive propaganda and scare labels used by opponents of such programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of attending meetings of Townsend Clubs in my district on a number of occasions. These meetings are attended by many senior citizens of Reading and Berks County. These elderly folks are making a great contribution to the understanding of the problem of the aged. They point to the need for organization and action, particularly by senior citizens, in seeking legislative action to obtain their worthy objective.

Growing numbers of citizens, as a result, now recognize the need for this humanitarian legislation. They believe that people who have contributed a life of service to the Nation have a right to enjoy their twilight years in dignity, self-respect and security.

The Townsendites have taken a keen interest in politics realizing the importance of their ballots in obtaining adequate security legislation that will bring justice to the old folks and prosperity to all.

It is quite proper that we give proper recognition to Dr. Townsend and to his faithful followers for their contribution to the progress that has been made in social insurance. Dr. Townsend is a man of great social vision. He is nearing his 90th birthday but has remarkable energy. He continues to carry on at a great sacrifice to himself for a cause which will eventually triumph.

Dr. Townsend may not live to see his plan, or another which meets the objective he seeks, adopted by the Congress. But he can take pride in knowing that he has played a leading role in easing the burden of millions of old folks and in making life for them more full and happy.

Independence Through Employment—Hire Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "Independence Through Employment—Hire Disabled Veterans" is the pointed message on an attractive Independence Hall 1956 calendar card recently distributed to some 300,000 employers, under the sponsorship of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. "Call your public employment office" is the notation above the calendar and below it appears the following words: "Printing costs paid by the Irving J. Phillipson Rehabilitation Fund of the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation."

Coincidentally, the Chairman of such President's Committee, Melvin J. Maas, major general, United States Marine Corps Reserve, retired—now blind—is the present national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

A veteran of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, Mel Maas, as he is known to his friends, has, in both these important positions, been successfully emphasizing the advantages to employers of employing handicapped employables, both civilians and veterans, by utilizing their remaining abilities in suitable jobs, which they can just as satisfactorily perform as able-bodied persons, with less time loss because of accidents, absenteeism, or indisposition. Mel believes that the Nation can make no better investment, both from a financial and a humanitarian standpoint, than the money expended in effectuating the physical and vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons—civilians and veterans—thus enabling them to live in the American way, for which America's disabled defenders have sacrificed much of their bodies and of their health. The DAV and its service foundation have taken an active part in publicizing the need for employment of the physically handicapped.

The DAV Service Foundation is an incorporated trusteeship. One of its principal functions is to see that certain charitable funds of the DAV are properly invested and expended, and also to assist in raising funds. It has been my privilege to serve for some years as a trustee of this foundation together with Gen. Melvin J. Maas, national commander of the DAV. Other trustees are: Gen. George C. Kenney, Lewis L. Clarke, Arthur W. Proctor, and Francis Buono, of New York City, Daniel W. Bell, president of the American Security & Trust Co., in Washington, D. C., Maple T. Harl, director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., Washington, D. C., Boniface R. Maile, lawyer, of Detroit, Mich., Floyd L. Ming, of Bakersfield, Calif., John L. Golob and James L. Monnahan from Minnesota, and Miles H. Draper, attorney, of Tampa, Fla., who is chairman. The trustees serve for staggered terms, thus assuring continuity of policy.

The foundation's executive secretary, and full-time executive director, is a DAV past national commander and former national service director, Millard W. Rice, with offices located at 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D. C.

The foundation has taken part in the raising of the funds which, under its charter, can be used only for the charitable purposes of the DAV. During the last 7 years it has conducted puzzle contests, which have enabled it to make appropriations to the DAV during that time in the aggregate sum of $2,490,000, in addition to smaller amounts to DAV State departments and units, by reason of localized fund-raising efforts.

Unfortunately, after the DAV Service Foundation established the formula for raising funds by conducting word values puzzle contests, many other organizations, one after another, decided to do likewise, which has thus resulted in

diminishing gross and net receipts for the DAV Service Foundation. Its trustees must therefore look for other effective methods of raising substantial funds, so much needed each year by the DAV, to enable it to continue, uninterruptedly, its nationwide setup of full-time experienced trained national service officers, to advise and to assist, each year, scores of thousands of distressed disabled veterans and their dependents, in proving their entitlement to the governmental benefits to which they believe themselves legally and equitably entitled.

Designations in trust agreements, wills, and insurance policies, assignments of stocks and bonds and other properties to the DAV Service Foundation, by disabled veterans, and by social-minded Americans, are greatly needed and highly justifiable, and will be reflected in the humanitarian helping-hand services extended by the DAV to so many disheartened disabled veterans and their dependents, who are thereby converted from community liabilities into community assets.

The future welfare and security of our country is inevitably linked up with the welfare of its disabled war veterans, because America's possible future war veterans will naturally be impressed by the fact that our country does not permit its disabled defenders to become mere forgotten heroes, but enables them to become self-sustaining taxpaying civilians.

Too many of my fellow Americans unfortunately assume, erroneously, that governmental benefits to disabled veterans are automatically awarded, not realizing that more claims are denied by the Veterans' Administration than are allowed.

It is more difficult, ordinarily, for a disabled veteran to prove factual and technical entitlement to the benefits to which he may be justifiably entitled than is the case as to an able-bodied World War II or Korean veteran who may thereby be entitled to some benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights.

When official records fail to substantiate a disabled veteran's claim that his disability originated during his military service, then the burden of proof rests upon him positively to prove his claim, by detailed specific fact-giving affidavit evidence, which, too frequently, becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible.

Expert advice is needed by the average disabled veteran claimant, from an experienced service officer—one who knows what is required by the Veterans' Administration under the some 1,000 laws administered by it—to justify favorable adjudication of the claim. Digging into the memory of such a disabled veteran, and of those who have observed the pertinent facts, DAV service officers can frequently persuade them to set forth such facts convincingly and in sufficient detail to establish such technical merit of the discouraged disabled veteran's claim.

It should be obvious that this task cannot be properly performed by an employee of the United States Veterans' Administration, because, in the final analysis, it must act as the judge and the jury and, if the claim is awarded, it must provide the awarded disability compensation, vocational training, medical treatment, etc.

The DAV maintains the largest staff of full-time national service officers, located in the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country, of any veteran organization—nearly 200 of them—in addition to about 2,000 part-time and volunteer service officers maintained by its State departments and local chapters.

This nationwide service officer setup is under the jurisdiction of the DAV national director of claims, Capt. Cicero F. Hogan, who has his offices at the DAV national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.

At such national service headquarters is also located the DAV's national legislative director, Maj. Omer W. Clark, former Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and, incidentally, chairman of the Disabled Veterans Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

A vitally important aspect of the DAV services comes under its national director of employment, John W. Burris, who is also its national civil service officer—also at the same address.

The administrative activities of the DAV come under the jurisdiction of its national adjutant—a wounded marine of World War I—Mr. Vivian D. Corbly, located at the DAV national headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati 13, Ohio.

Under Mr. Corbly also comes the DAV's chief fund-raising project—sending out miniature automobile license tags to automobile owners—as a result of which 125,000 sets of lost keys are each year returned to their owners—without regard as to whether the owners have previously made any contribution for such Idento Tag.

Very unfortunately, only about 20 percent of the recipients of such key insurance idento tags do send back donations to the DAV, but, fortunately, those who have done so have enabled the DAV to maintain its some 200 full-time national service officers.

Every Idento Tag recipient is the owner of an automobile and ought to attach such Idento Tag to his key ring, as a key insurance that his keys if lost would probably be deposited by the finder in some post-office box, whereupon the Post Office would deliver them to the DAV national headquarters, and the DAV would then return the set of keys to its owners—some 125,000 sets being so returned each year. Surely, this nationwide key insurance—which commercially used to cost at least $1 or more—ought to be worthy of a donation of at least $1. The manufacture of these tags is conducted by the DAV at its Idento Tag plant at national headquarters in Cincinnati and furnishes employment for hundreds of disabled veterans and other handicapped people.

A more liberal response by Idento Tag recipients would make the DAV financially able to employ additional very much-needed full-time national service officers in all of the some 166 hospitals maintained by the United States Veterans' Administration throughout the country. There is a great need for them at such hospitals, to advise, counsel, and assist the thousands of hospital patients, first, technically to establish their entitlement to such governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled; second, to guide them toward physical restoration and vocational rehabilitation; and third, to assist them to become useful, self-sustaining taxpaying civilians.

No charitable donation could bring greater dividend returns, both from a financial and a humanitarian standpoint, to the local communities of these hospitalized disabled veterans than by making it possible for the DAV to give them the helping-hand service that they so sorely need.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who are grateful for the sacrifices of America's disabled defenders, of parts of their bodies or of their health, will generously support the vitally important service program sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation and so effectively operated by the congressionally chartered 36-year-old Disabled American Veterans—DAV.

The Administration Program for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to represent a great agriculture district. Naturally, a foremost consideration of mine has been how best to advance the welfare of our farmers, how to solve the problem of accumulated surpluses which depress prices that the farmer may receive his fair share of our national income.

This, I am proud to say, has also been a foremost consideration of the entire Eisenhower Republican administration. The first special message which President Eisenhower submitted to the Congress, following his state-of-the-Union message, was on the farm problem. The Congress had been in session only a week when he urged early action on a nine-point farm program.

Under President Eisenhower's leadership a great deal has been accomplished for the benefit of the American farmer. It was his determined efforts to put into effect a workable program, and the cooperation of the Republicans in Congress, that enables us to review with some pride what has been accomplished during this Congress for the benefit of our farmers.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 was greatly strengthened along lines recommended by the President. The Congress built on an act which, as the President said, "permanently reinforced the foundations of all agriculture." It was apparent, however, early in this session that the unprecedented stocks of surplus food and fiber accumulated from previous farm programs were such a

market-disturbing factor that the more economically sound provisions of the 1954 act were prevented from functioning effectively. Therefore, additional legislation was needed to overcome the imbalance between production and consumption.

At the start of this year, farm income had been in an 8-year decline, with the single exception of the Korean war year of 1951, and the farm price parity ratio had been in a 5-year decline. It is true the parity decline had been substantially slowed down in recent months. For example, the parity ratio had declined from 113 in February 1951 to 94 in January 1953—a total decline of 19 points. This contrasted with a decline of only 14 points in the 3 years from January 1953 to January 1956. We were not satisfied with a mere slowing down of the decline which had been under way most rapidly when this administration assumed office. The trend had to be reversed. The President recognized this last January 9 in his message when he pointed out that "for 5 years, the farm economy has declined. Unless corrected, these economic reversals are a direct threat to the welfare of all of our people."

The President's recommendations were, practically point by point, enacted into law, but it was accomplished only by his courage to veto an impractical bill and his insistence that the program be sound. It is unfortunate that in many cases enactment came too late in this session of Congress for the full benefits of the program to be realized by farmers this year. This was because the Democrat-controlled Congress made the farm legislation a political football.

While the farm bill as passed by Congress was not in all respects what the President desired, there has been an economic quickening throughout the agricultural economy as a result of its adoption.

It is gratifying to all of us to note that prices received by American farmers have risen 11 percent since this session of Congress convened last January. The farm price parity ratio for last month stood at 86—a rise of 5 points in 6 months. It is now 1 point higher than a year earlier. This is the first time in over 5 years that the parity ratio was higher than it was a year earlier.

There is every indication that the farm economy has passed the turning point and is definitely headed upward. However, we cannot accomplish miracles overnight. It will take time to work out of the situation that we were a dozen years working into. The important thing is that we are faced in the right direction. Net farm income is currently running half a billion dollars above the level of late 1955. This is the first time in 8 years that net farm income has headed upward, with the single exception of the Korean war year of 1951.

This new strength in the farm economy stems in large part from adoption and implementation of the President's recommendations for constructive agricultural legislation.

This new strength in the farm economy stems in large part from the President's recommendations to tackle the surplus problem head on. This was a courageous effort to correct basic causes underlying the farm maladjustment, not merely to rub salve on symptoms.

Of the many difficulties that aggregate the farm problem—

The President said in his January message—

mountainous surpluses overshadow everything else.

It was on his recommendation that this Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to press surplus disposal programs even more vigorously than before. This year the Department moved $2.7 billion worth of Government-owned commodities into use at home and abroad—more than ever before and 5 times as much as in 1953. In the 3½ years of this administration, over $6 billion worth of surplus commodities have been moved by the Department of Agriculture.

But the farmer's hope does not lie in continued Government disposal of surplus. The farmer is interested in expanding markets and in effective balancing of production and consumption.

On the recommendation of President Eisenhower, the Congress enacted a soil bank. This legislation has far-reaching provisions to correct imbalance between production and consumption, and thus to attack the basic cause of the agricultural income recession. This will be done in such a way as to provide cooperating farmers with income assurance during the years the adjustment is being made. At the same time our great agricultural production resources will be strengthened against the day when this Nation will need increased production of food and fiber. Thus every American will benefit from this forward looking program, whether he be farmer or urban dweller.

That day last January when President Eisenhower first recommended this Congress enact a soil bank, there was agreement among Republicans and some Democrats alike that such legislation was needed. The leadership of both parties in Congress expressed desire for its prompt enactment.

However, it soon became apparent that the soil bank would be delayed substantially because of numerous attempts to load it with crippling amendments. One hundred amendments were offered when the bill was reported to the floor of the Senate. Over forty of them were adopted.

The net effect of these amendments was to produce such a legislative hodgepodge that the President in good conscience could not accept the bill. Some provisions of the first farm bill passed by this Congress would have perpetuated into the future the very arrangement that got agriculture into the mess it was in.

It took political courage for President Eisenhower to veto a farm bill which had been erroneously heralded by its proponents as "the answer to the farm problem."

The ink on the President's veto message was scarcely dry when the overwhelmingly favorable reaction from all parts of the country indicated his good judgment. Principle had dominated politics. Farm and nonfarm people alike rallied behind the Presidential veto. Tens of millions of Americans responded enthusiastically to this manifestation of integrity in Government. The effort to override the veto in Congress failed to achieve even a simple majority.

This Congress is to be congratulated for pitching in again promptly, after veto of the first unworkable farm bill, for hammering out a soil bank bill following the recommendations made by the President last January. It is unfortunate that nearly half a year's delay resulted from the political maneuverings on the first bill. This delay made it impossible to get the soil bank in full operation this year, and cost the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars. For this, the Democratic leadership in Congress alone must accept responsibility.

It is well for us now to review briefly the recommendations made by the President in his January message, and to take stock of what has been done about them.

He asked for—and Congress enacted—a soil-bank law.

He recommended strengthening of the commodity programs. This has been done on a broad front.

He asked for and received extension and enlargement of the special school-milk program.

The President's recommendations for improvement of the Agricultural credit system were approved.

The brucellosis eradication program was enlarged.

A start has been made toward a Great Plains program as recommended by the President in order to maintain a more stable agriculture in an area beset by drought and wind erosion.

Congress approved the President's recommendations for a great expansion of agricultural research to develop new uses for crops, new markets and new crops. Appropriations for research and extension have been increased $43 million since 1953.

Congress followed his recommendation to relieve farmers of the Federal tax on gasoline used on farms. This meant a saving of $60 million annually.

Though the Rural Development program to assist those farm families which benefit little if at all from price support and other programs is going forward, the Congress did not see fit to implement this on the scale recommended by the President.

In the main, thanks to our President's firm leadership, the Congress came fairly close to following the blueprint laid down by the President last January. Bipartisan effort was made to heed the criterion of the President when he said in the message:

Historically agricultural policy in this country has sought to foster family-sized owner-operated farms. This has been a sound and wise policy—not only in the development of an efficient agriculture which has become the envy of the world, but also in fostering a sturdy, resourceful, self-reliant citizenry.

The principle of flexible rather than rigid supports, carried over from the Agricultural Act of 1954, makes it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this historic policy. The Secretary demonstrated anew that under this principle, supports can be "flexed" upward as well as downward, depending upon circumstances.

Conditions were such that the Secretary announced that supports would be flexed upward in order to relieve a squeeze on wheat and corn growers and on producers of dairy products. Higher support levels were announced for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums.

It is pertinent to note a few additional facts about the farm economy.

More farmers own their farms than ever before in history.

Farm tenancy is at an all-time record low.

Farm foreclosures are near record low.

About 7 out of 10 farmers have no mortgage debt whatever.

Total farm indebtedness is only about 11 percent of the value of farm assets. This is near an all-time low ratio. Indeed, farmers own more cash and bonds than their total indebtedness.

Farms now have more and better machinery than ever before.

More farmers than ever before have electricity and telephones. The REA has aided markedly in this program during the past 3 years.

Farm families have a record high level of living.

New and expanded water management programs have been put into effect under legislation enacted by this administration.

Never before has there been so much soil and water conservation activity on so broad a front as now.

More disaster and drought aid has been extended to farmers during this administration than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, it is easily apparent that the 84th Congress was able to enact such a broad program of constructive legislation for American farmers because of the far-reaching recommendations for legislation made by President Eisenhower during the opening days of the Congress. If it had not been for determined leadership of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, combined with enlightened demands from our farm leaders in all 48 States, it is doubtful we would have this constructive record on the part of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this Congress has made a real contribution to the welfare of American farmers. I am glad that our program can take some share of responsibility for revising the 8-year downturn in farm income. I am happy that we have in President Eisenhower and in Secretary of Agriculture Benson two outstanding individuals who have the insight and the courage always to place principle before politics. I am proud that a sufficient number of Members of Congress followed their leadership and their recommendations to have enacted into law the constructive measures which they had recommended.

Government Budgeting and Accounting Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to comment on the passage of my bill to revise the governmental budgeting and accounting methods, since I feel that with its passage many progressive steps can be taken in our Government accounting system. As originally introduced, this measure implemented the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission to revise our governmental accounting methods, estimated by the Commission to save billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money when fully implemented. The bill as I introduced it in the House called for the executive departments and agencies to provide: Budget information on program costs and accomplishments; departmental budgeting on a cost basis; synchronization of organization structure, budget classifications and accounting systems; accounting on an accrual basis; simplification in the subdivision of appropriations of funds; it also contained the provision that Congress make annual appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, or that Congress could not vote more than the administration planned to spend in any fiscal year.

The bill received the unreserved endorsement of the Government's foremost financial authorities—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. It was widely supported by many organizations and individuals interested in fiscal reform, and in economy in Government.

While the House Committee on Government Operations deleted one of the major provisions of the bill providing that Congress make annual appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, it was felt that substantial progress in governmental accounting would be possible by the passage of the amended bill calling for the departments and agencies to start to put their budgets on a cost-based basis and set up their accounts on an accrual basis. The amended bill, as the original bill, received the support of Mr. Percival Brundage, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and in this connection I would like to quote from a letter from Mr. Brundage directed to Senator KENNEDY, who sponsored the bill on the Senate side: "While I favor putting appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, and believe that legislation to accomplish this should ultimately be enacted, I regard the other sections of your bill to be of such great importance that I would strongly favor the enactment of your bill, even without the section to place appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis." Also approving the passage of the amended bill were Mr. J. Harold Stewart, chairman, Hoover Commission Task Force on Budgeting and Accounting; Clarence Francis, chairman, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; John Coleman, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Meyer Kesnbaum, special assistant ot the President; and former President Hoover.

I would like at this time to quote a telegram to me from Mr. Clarence Francis, the national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report: "Thank you for your splendid work on behalf of the Hoover Commission's Budget and Accounting Report. The conference-approved bill will be a major stride in the history of Federal fiscal practice, and lead to important savings. The citizens committee hopes the conference version will be speedily enacted. Please accept our congratulations."

I am keenly interested in seeing all of the Hoover recommendations for budgeting and accounting reforms enacted, and I have already introduced a bill, H. R. 12410, to carry out the deleted provision of our accounting bill, calling for annual appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, which will give Congress the control it does not now have over the money it appropriates, and which will ultimately result in the savings of many dollars of the taxpayers. I introduced H. R. 12410 at this time in order to clearly set forth the provision which will bring about the annual accrued expenditure budget. It is my plan, if a Member of the 85th Congress, to reintroduce this measure on the first day of the session.

The Great Circle Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the sound economic development of our State requires that the restrictions on Pan American World Airways' transpacific route be not reimposed, so that it may operate between our Pacific ports and the Orient, over the great circle route.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following authorized statement by 23 members of the California delegation; a copy of statement by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, July 23, 1956; and a copy of telegram dated July 24, 1956, from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The people of California for a century have had a deep interest in commerce with the Orient. The only through one-carrier air service between our State and the Orient has been rendered by Pan American World Airways, which pioneered transpacific operations over 20 years ago.

California and our carrier, Pan American, are now confronted with a problem as to the

continuation of this service which is of serious concern to the people of our State. Recent resolutions which we have received from the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco and Los Angeles illustrate this problem.

Pan American still holds only a temporary authorization, expiring early in 1960, to serve Tokyo, the principal traffic center of the Orient. Northwest Airlines, the other American flag carrier, which provides through one-carrier service to the Middle West and Eastern States also holds only temporary authorization to serve Tokyo which now expires 2 years later in 1962. Both carriers must utilize jet aircraft costing many millions of dollars to provide efficient service beginning in 1960. President Eisenhower decided early in 1955 that neither carrier should have permanent authorization until such time as they had demonstrated they could operate without subsidy.

Our carrier, Pan American, operated without subsidy in 1955 and will again be subsidy free as soon as the archaic restrictions requiring it to fly from its four Pacific coast gateways to Tokyo via a mid-Pacific island are removed and it is permitted to provide our State with short, fast service over the direct route via Seattle.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we urge the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to now grant our carrier, Pan American World Airways, permanent authority to serve Tokyo. Unless this is done, this carrier cannot be expected to acquire the fleet of jet aircraft at a cost exceeding $50 million which are needed if California's historic position in trade with Japan and other Orient traffic centers served via Tokyo is to be preserved.

CARL HINSHAW, Chairman, the California Delegation; JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Member of Congress; JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr., Member of Congress; CLAIR ENGLE, Member of Congress; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Member of Congress; EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Member of Congress; CHET HOLIFIELD, Member of Congress; CRAIG HOSMER, Member of Congress; JOSEPH F. HOLT, Member of Congress; CHARLES TEAGUE, Member of Congress; JAMES B. UTT, Member of Congress; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Member of Congress; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Member of Congress; DONALD JACKSON, Member of Congress; LEROY JOHNSON, Member of Congress; CECIL KING, Member of Congress; GLENARD LIPSCOMB, Member of Congress; WILLIAM MAILLIARD, Member of Congress; GORDON MCDONOUGH, Member of Congress; JOHN PHILLIPS, Member of Congress; HUBERT SCUDDER, Member of Congress; JOHN SHELLEY, Member of Congress; ROBERT C. WILSON, Member of Congress.

STATEMENT, SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JULY 23, 1956

In 1935, more than 20 years ago, Pan American World Airways inaugurated air transportation across the Pacific to the Orient from California and has been serving the California gateways since that time. It was well aware that the great circle route was by far the shortest one to the Orient and as early as 1931 made aerial surveys of this route. However, because of obstacles of a political character then existing the route was not available to it. For that reason it established its route across the central Pacific via Honolulu, Wake, Guam, and Manila to Hong Kong. In 1946 it was authorized by the United States Civil Aeronautics Board to serve both Tokyo and Shanghai from California but was denied the right to use the great circle route which it then sought even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter from California to Tokyo. Instead it was confined to the central Pacific route and Northwest Airlines was authorized to use the great circle route for a competing service from the United States to Tokyo. Since that time Pan American has made repeated efforts to be released from the arbitrary Civil Aeronautics Board restriction which requires its Tokyo services from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island en route.

In the most recent proceding the transpacific certificate renewal case of 1953 Pan American's authorization to serve Tokyo was temporarily extended to April 10, 1960. At that time Northwest's authorization was temporarily extended until April 10, 1962. Again, however, Pan American was restricted to the longer central Pacific route.

The proceeding has been reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the direction of the President to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the great circle route to the Orient.

The question of permanency of the authorization was an issue in the proceeding. However, in a decision by the President only 18 months ago he took the position that the time was not yet appropriate for the issuance of permanent certificates either to Pan American or Northwest for service to and through Tokyo. Rather, it was pointed out that the temporary certificates should run their course and the situation be reviewed in the light of the operating results near the end of the temporary period. Nevertheless, the question has again been raised by a new application filed by Northwest for a permanent certificate and is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If a decision is now to be made as to the permanency of the certificates for service to Tokyo there is no question that Pan American, the carrier which pioneered the Pacific routes and which has been serving the United States-Orient traffic for over 21 years, should be given first consideration for permanency. The manifest fairness of this statement is pinpointed by the following facts:

1. Japan generates better than 50 percent of the total United States-Orient traffic.

2. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through the California gateways.

3. Despite the handicap of restrictions which force Pan American to serve Tokyo by a route more than 1,000 miles longer from California Pan American has been carrying nearly 70 percent of the United States-Tokyo traffic.

It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification must first apply to the primary gateways and the primary carrier. In this case California and Pan American.

The matter of subsidy is not involved since both Pan American and Northwest were free of subsidy in the Pacific operation during 1955. However, this will not remain a fact with respect to Pan American in the event it is denied the right to use the great circle route to the Orient for its west coast gateways including Portland and Seattle whether the certificates remain temporary or are made permanent.

Northwest alleges that they are faced with a "very real hardship" for lack of permanent operating rights to Tokyo and urges that "money is being invested to promote services on the strength of a temporary certificate. Changes in equipment and services required by the advent of jet aircraft are a very real and pressing possibility. Time delay will cause damage that may well be irreparable." These arguments apply even more forcefully to Pan American. Pan American did not hold back on ordering jet aircraft. It has anticipated the public need by placing orders for such equipment amounting to approximately $243 million including a fleet for its transpacific service at a time when the Tokyo certificates of both carriers were temporary and there was not the slightest indication that one would be extended on a permanent basis without the other. Failure to now grant Pan American a permanent Tokyo certificate while at the same time granting Northwest such permanency would cast such a cloud over Pan American's continuance on the Pacific that in Pan American's case the damage would "be irreparable."

In the postwar years Tokyo has come to occupy the dominating position as the gateway to the Orient. Plainly a carrier excluded from Tokyo or placed under a severe handicap in respect to serving Tokyo and other countries of the Orient through Tokyo would be in a hopelessly inferior position. At the same time, the California gateways which such carrier is serving would suffer from the inferior service to which they thus would be restricted. They could enjoy none of the advantages which true and effective competition can bring to them.

Failure to grant Pan American the great circle route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted Northwest would be manifestly unjust not only to Pan American but the west coast gateways which it serves.

COPY OF TELEGRAM RECEIVED FROM THE LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

JULY 23, 1956.

HON. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building:

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce recently actively participated in Civil Aeronautics Board docket No. 5031 known as the reopened Trans Pacific Certificate Renewal case. The proceeding was reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the direction of the President of the United States, to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the great circle route to the Orient. Pan American inaugurated air service across the Pacific to the Orient from California gateways in 1935 and has provided service since that time. However, Pan American was and has been denied the right to use the great circle to the Orient even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter to Tokyo via that route. Present route restrictions require Pan American's Tokyo service from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island enroute. These mandatory circuitous routings have caused many passengers who would logically be routed through California gateways to choose other more direct routes. Carriers not serving California gateways advertise this fact, and thereby attract additional traffic away from California gateways.

The California businessman is already at a considerable disadvantage with his competitors for the Japanese and Chinese markets because of great distances involved. Certification of Pan American to serve Tokyo via the great circle route will considerably offset these handicaps. In another docket, No. 7725, presently before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Northwest Airlines, who are presently certified to fly the great circle route to the Orient from Seattle, have applied for permanent authority to serve this route. We take no position as to whether this application should be granted or denied. We feel that is a decision now to be made as to the permanency of the certificate for service to Tokyo from the west coast. There is no question but that Pan American, who has been serving the west coast to Orient traffic for over 21 years, should be given at least equal consideration along with Northwest. Failure to grant Pan American the great circle route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted to any other carrier would be manifestly unjust to Pan American and the west coast gateways it serves. The matter of subsidy is not involved in either proceeding since both Pan American and Northwest Airlines have been free of subsidy in the Pacific operations during and since 1955. However, if present routing restrictions are not lifted and if Pan American is not permitted

to fly the shorter great circle route from California gateways via Portland and Seattle to the Orient, it does not appear that they will be able to remain in a competitive position and stay off subsidy.

Tokyo at present occupies the dominant position as the gateway to the Orient. Over 50 percent of the total United States Orient traffic is generated by Japan. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through California gateways. It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification should be given to the primary gateways and the carrier handling the traffic, in this instance Pan American. The Civil Aeronautics Board should give favorable consideration toward the permanent certification of this much needed more expeditious air route between California gateways and the Orient, which has already been established as convenient and necessary to the public.

A. O. BECKMAN,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Nelson Poynter and the Congressional Quarterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Congressional Quarterly has taken some exception to the remarks in my newsletter charging that their evaluation of Members' voting records have carried a noticeable bias.

I had not intended to go into any great detail in the matter—but in view of the Congressional Quarterly's rather strong attack against me of July 26, I believe the people of my district are entitled to know something about that publication and who is back of it.

First, the publication is owned and published by Nelson Poynter, of St. Petersburg, Fla., and it has no official connection with the Congress of the United States. Mr. Poynter is also the owner and publisher of the St. Petersburg Times, a publication which is undeniably New Deal in its sympathies, and certainly in its editorial slanting of the news.

Second, Mr. Poynter is not unknown to the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the official files of that body show that Mr. Poynter is listed as initiating sponsor of the organization known as Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The official files show that his name was carried on the letterhead of that committee, and his association with the committee was reported in the Communist Daily Worker of December 24, 1944.

In a separate report entitled "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace Arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions" the Committee on Un-American Activities stated:

The meeting was sponsored by a Communist-front organization known as the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is a descendant of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which was repudiated in 1946 by Harold L. Ickes, its chairman, because of its Communist character.

In August 1945, June Hoffman, representing the cultural section of the Communist Party at its New York State convention, declared proudly:

"We built the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and it is a great political weapon."

At that same meeting Lionel Berman, husband of Louise Bransten, a known contact of Soviet espionage agents, was praised by the cultural commission of the Communist Party for his role in setting up the ICCASP—Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

On August 2, 1948, Louis F. Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, testified before the Senate Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department as follows:

"The Independent (Citizens) Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was worked out originally in my office in the Daily Worker. It was worked out by the cultural commission of the Daily Worker, of which Lionel Berman, of the cultural section, organizer of the party, was a member, and he was entrusted not only by that meeting but by the political committee, as the result of these discussions with the task of forming the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

I am not implying that Mr. Poynter or his wife are necessarily Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers, but it must be admitted by even the most casual observer that they have been keeping "biased" company.

Mr. Poynter's pious protestations of political unbias are clouded seriously by the strong New Deal flavor of his St. Petersburg newspaper and by the fact that files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveal that Press Research, a publication also organized and published by Nelson Poynter, was an admittedly biased periodical.

To complete the picture, records indicate that Mr. Poynter served with the Office of War Information under a Democrat administration.

The files of the House Un-American Committee also show that Mr. Poynter was a member of the Political Action Committee and that he arranged with a Mr. C. B. Baldwin, assistant chairman of the PAC of CIO, to give PAC free copies of his publication even though they were prepared for other clients who were paying for the service.

The hearings also contained admissions that the Poynter publication, Press Research, contained the personal opinions of Mr. Poynter and his managing editor. If further evidence than the above is needed to determine Mr. Poynter's strong personal prejudices toward the New Deal philosophy, a look at some of these Press Research reports should satisfy even the most skeptical.

I would not be so concerned over Mr. Poynter's background if his research methods were more accurate and fair. The rollcall votes, however, which he chooses to designate as in support of President Eisenhower are picked by a peculiar formula which is completely arbitrary and open to bias since on some occasions measures proposed by members of the Eisenhower Cabinet are not included, even though they are undeniably a part of the overall Eisenhower program.

Under Poynter's methods, an anti-Eisenhower Democrat may vote for four amendments to a major bill and then vote to kill the bill. According to Mr. Poynter's system of counting, such a Democrat could come out with an 80-percent record in support of the Eisenhower administration, even though he voted to destroy the basic bill sought by the President.

I must also take exception to Congressional Quarterly's Thomas M. Schroth, executive editor of that periodical, when he says that he can predict whether Eisenhower would have voted "yea" or "nay" on each of the 41 rollcall votes he mentioned. Some, as Congressional Quarterly certainly knows, were parliamentary measures which depend for their interpretation on the overall strategy of the leadership for the passage of that particular bill.

In any event, if CQ is claiming to be a "predicting service," it is hard to correlate this with their claim "nothing but the facts." Crystal gazing and factual reports are widely separated journalistic arts.

I have no quarrel with Mr. Poynter nor with Congressional Quarterly so long as they stick to facts and to an accurate job of news reporting; but when they circulate in my district material which is incorrect and which is obviously slanted, I feel that it is my obligation to call to the attention of my constituents something of the background of the men behind this movement and of their methods.

Behavior of American Servicemen Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been increasing publicity given to the crimes being committed by American servicemen abroad. These stories are injuring American prestige abroad and are causing apprehension in the United States about the criminal tendencies apparently shown by some American youths and concern as to how it will affect the attitude of friendly nations toward us. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have been attempting to find out if these charges have been magnified and learn the true facts of this alarming situation. I have been collecting newspaper clippings and editorials for some time on this subject. These also show a growing apprehension on the part of the American people over the behavior of the American soldiers abroad and how it may affect our country.

At first I intended to get statistics on the number of American servicemen

abroad and the number of crimes supposedly committed by them to determine a percentage. I have, in a general way, done this; but since the number of American troops in any locality is classified as secret information, for obvious reasons it would be improper for me to make public these figures. However, I do want to assure you that the number of crimes committed by our American soldiers abroad is, in my opinion, less than crimes committed by the youth of the same age not in the service. If 20,000 American troops in 1 locality have committed no major crimes in a period of several months, it is not news; and naturally it does not make the headlines; but, as soon as 1 American soldier commits a felony, that immediately becomes headlines. It is my sincere belief that with reference to the crimes committed abroad the American people and the people abroad should give equal importance to the fine job being done and the good will displayed by the hundreds and thousands of our American boys abroad.

I do not mean to condone the crimes being committed by American servicemen abroad. It is true that the publicity given these crimes is being used as a pretext by Communist and Fascist factions abroad to force us to bring our American troops home. I am not attempting to discuss our foreign policy and the number of troops that we should have in foreign countries; but I do want to point out some possible actions which the United States can take to cut down the number of crimes committed by our American troops abroad. From investigations which I have made, I believe that the Army, Navy, and Air Force have not used sufficient care in the selection of servicemen for overseas assignments. This carelessness in handling personnel is not new. To my personal knowledge it existed during and after World War II and up until the present time. By proper study, observation, and tests we could eliminate from overseas duty 90 percent of the potential troublemakers that are going to become a part of any Army under the draft system.

As I stated above, I am not trying to comment upon the advisability of the number of American troops abroad; but I do believe that all America has the right to demand that the servicemen we send abroad well represent the best in our way of life. A merchant does not put his poorest and worst merchandise on display; neither should the United States send troublemakers as our emissaries abroad.

It has been my personal experience that a capable company commander can tell almost to a certainty the men in his command who cannot be trusted, and those who are potential troublemakers. We cannot afford to send second-rate servicemen abroad to represent America. To continue to do this is going to bring about a situation whereby public opinion abroad and in America will force the return of our forces abroad.

While many believe that we should bring American servicemen back to the United States, I do not believe any American wants us to do so because of the loss of prestige of our American youth abroad.

All I am asking—and I intend to continue to work toward that goal—is that the United States weed out from overseas duty that very, very small dangerous few that are giving the United States a bad reputation overseas.

The United States World Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has approved and thus signed into law my resolution, House Joint Resolution 604, to focus world attention on the United States World Trade Fair. Thus is completed the legislative process which began on April 18, 1956, when I introduced this measure. The bill was at that time referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the chairmanship of the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS. Because of the committee's work on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, my resolution could not be considered immediately, but I was assured from the start that as soon as the Mutual Security Act had been presented to the House, the way would be clear for the committee to take up and consider my bill.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, Chairman RICHARDS was true to his word and on June 21, 1956, the committee met and unanimously ordered that the resolution be favorably reported to the House. The report was filed on June 28, and on July 16, the House passed the resolution. The bill was then sent to the Senate where it was immediately placed on the Senate calendar, and on July 20 the Senate considered and passed the bill.

As a result of the introduction, passage, and Presidential approval of this bill, the President has been authorized to issue a proclamation inviting the States of the Union and the nations of the world to participate in the fair which is to be held at the New York Coliseum in the district that I represent. The fair will be held in April of 1957.

Mr. Speaker, the interest in this international exposition is great. The Governor of the State of New York has already issued an invitation to 71 nations that they participate. The mayor of the city of New York has issued an official greeting to those who might wish to participate. There will now be added the proclamation of the President of the United States.

This World Trade Fair presents our Nation with a great opportunity. The aim of our foreign-aid programs has always been to lend our friends in the world the economic assistance that they require to become economically self-reliant. By focusing attention on a world marketplace for all of these nations, and by encouraging their participation in it, we develop at the same time the means by which the nations of the world can exhibit and offer for sale their goods and services. The fair will include nine different categories of products, covering some 60 different types of goods.

This method of sustaining our friends and aiding their economies will add to their independence and self-reliance and may eventually lead to the replacement of foreign aid with foreign trade. The nations of the world realize this. Already, the following have agreed to participate in the fair: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Greece, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and West Berlin, which though not a nation will be accorded equal status with the other participants.

The interest of these nations is for me a strong indication of the fact that we have done a great service in passing House Joint Resolution 604. I am very grateful to all who aided in its passage in the Congress.

Encourage Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, great corporations are getting larger all the time through natural growth, corporate mergers and monopolies, the buying up of small enterprises and reaping the giant's share of the Federal procurement dollar. Small business, the heart of our free-enterprise system, is battling with its back to the wall in many instances for its fair share of profits and growth under an expending American economy.

Small business is presently being squeezed in innumerable ways. Raw materials are hard to get in many fields. A constant rise in labor and material costs is not so easy for small business to absorb as it is for the large corporations; labor problems not so easy to solve. Competition from cheap imports is impossible for small business to meet. Prime defense contracts are the exception for small business. There is a definite lack of subcontracting opportunities for the small-business man. Small business is unable to compete with the large corporations for skilled technical people. Engineers and other skilled professional help are leaving small-business enterprises every day for the attractive wages, working conditions and other inducements offered by big business. Small business is fighting for its very existence.

In the face of these problems, small business is not sharing, in proportion to its productive capacity, in the general prosperity which prevails in most of the country. At this very time when the expanding national economy creates greater demands upon the production facilities of this country, we are faced

with an alarming trend of small business failures in an expanding number of fields—automobile dealers are not moving a heavy backlog of cars, some are closing their doors; small retailers have large inventories of alliances and other goods, many are closing up shop; suppliers reflect general conditions in many retail enterprises, and on the whole small business is being pushed to the wall by its larger competitors and by certain governmental policies, or the lack of them.

Mr. Speaker, this is decidedly an unhealthy and threatening atmosphere for small business, especially when the financial pages of our newspapers record almost daily the huge profits of giant corporations while the level of earnings of small corporations is in steady decline.

In the light of present conditions facing small business, the Federal Government should and must take affirmative action to assist this vitally important part of the Nation's economy. There are many areas in which the Government could move effectively to narrow the gap and dissipate the ruthless economic forces that are crushing small business.

One such area is the Government's procurement business. More of it should and can be channeled to small business. That is why I introduced in this Congress H. R. 4380 to require the Department of Defense to set aside up to 20 percent of the total defense procurement solely for small business. In addition, my bill seeks the award of competitive contracts to small business on other than a price basis so as to insure that the full capabilities of small business are utilized to the greatest possible extent in the defense procurement program.

The text of H. R. 4380 is as follows:

A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section, if the agency head determines that such action is advisable in the interest of the national defense in order to make or keep suppliers available for furnishing supplies in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense through maintenance of active research and development, will be served by such action, supplies may be procured on the basis of, and in accordance with, an invitation for bids containing provisions which specify—

"(1) that a part, not exceeding 20 percent, of the total procurement involved when practicable may be withheld from the successful bidder or bidders for distribution among the small-business concerns, not exceeding five, which submit, as to all or such part of the procurement involved as may be specified in the invitation, the lowest bids submitted by small-business concerns; and

"(2) that the part of the total procurement so withheld when practicable may be distributed among such small-business concerns (either by acceptance of the bids made by them or by negotiated purchase or contract) on a basis involving payment to each of a price not in excess of 15 percent above the lowest price paid to a successful bidder."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by inserting after "2 (c)", wherever appearing therein, the following: "or 3 (c)."

SEC. 3. Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions necessary under section 3 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement."

A second bill I have introduced dealing with Government procurement is H. R. 4386, which gives priority to small business for Government contracts when a substantial proportion of the work is done in a labor surplus area. H. R. 4386 reads as follows:

A bill to provide that preference will be given in the awarding of Government procurement contracts to firms which will perform a substantial proportion of the production on such contracts in areas having a surplus of labor

Be it enacted, etc., That before any procurement agency awards a contract to any firm on the basis of its bid or proposal when a substantial proportion of the production on such contract will not be performed in areas classified under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 (18 F. R. 6995) or any similar rule, regulation, order, or policy, as areas having a current or imminent surplus of labor, such agency shall give an opportunity to match such bid or proposal to firms which submitted bids or proposals on the contract not in excess of 120 percent of the bid or proposal made by the lowest responsible bidder, and which will perform a substantial proportion of the production on such contract in areas so classified. Such opportunity shall be given among such firms first to the small business firm which submitted the lowest bid or proposal, next to the small business firm which submitted the next lowest bid or proposal, and so on until the contract is awarded or until all small business firms among such firms have been given an opportunity to match such bid or proposal. If the contract is not awarded to a small business firm, such opportunity shall be given among such firms to the firm (other than a small business firm) which submitted the lowest bid or proposal; next to the firm (other than a small business firm) which submitted the next lowest bid or proposal; and so on until the contract is awarded or until all such firms have been given an opportunity to match such bid or proposal. If a firm which is given an opportunity to match such bid or proposal matches such bid or proposal, the contract shall be awarded to such firm, unless such firm is not entitled to be awarded the contract for reasons other than the amount of its bid or proposal.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "firm" means an individual, partnership, corporation, company, association, or joint-stock company.

H. R. 4386 would make it possible for small industries in labor surplus areas, which are unsuccessful in obtaining Government contracts because of high bids, to match the successful bid when made by companies outside labor surplus areas. Preference would be given to small-business firms who came closest to the low bid when the original bids were submitted. The net effect would be to reinstate the match bid regulations in effect for a short time prior to the Korean war in favor of distressed areas which spread a substantial part of this huge business among smaller units.

Under the present regulations to help labor surplus areas, the Federal Government has this to offer: "There is plenty of Government business; all you have to do is go out and get it." That advice might help the unemployment problem of large cities with many diversified industries. But in the case of small communities, dependent upon one or a few major industries for annual payrolls, the assistance of the Federal Government leaves much to be desired. Small business does not seek special favors and special privileges. But it protests against a situation which permits special favors and special privileges to huge corporations.

Another area in which the Federal Government could provide definite help to small business is through tax incentives. In cooperation with the Smaller Business Association of New England, I have sponsored several tax bills in the 84th Congress to assist small business.

One of these measures is H. R. 4381, which provides that the allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered that is deductible as a trade or business expense shall not be considered unreasonable if not in excess of amounts paid in similar enterprises even though in excess of sums paid or salaries and compensation by the taxpayer in previous years.

This legislation would make it possible for small business to meet the big corporations on more even ground in holding on to key professional and technical corporation officers and employees. The text of H. R. 4381 follows:

A bill to clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (a) (1) (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions allowed for income taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end of said subsection the following: "An allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered shall not be considered unreasonable if it is not in excess of salaries or other compensation paid by others engaged in similar enterprises or businesses similar to the taxpayer's in the same taxable year for similar services rendered, even though it is in excess of the sums paid for salaries and other compensation by the taxpayer in earlier years."

Another bill is H. R. 4382, which allows a deduction up to $25,000 from the gross income of corporations for amounts actually expended during the taxable year for capital expenditures or other corporation purposes.

Testimony presented to the House and Senate Small Business committees confirms the need for this desirable legislation to help small business. Under the present tax structure, it is almost impossible for small business to accumulate additional working capital to permit even a minimum expectancy of expansion.

No matter how much small business tries to lay aside enough earnings to make the investments and take the gambles that must be taken in research and development work, the tax load beats the small enterprise at every turn.

H. R. 4382, by exempting the first $25,000 spent on capital improvements, represents a step in the right direction in helping small business taxwise. It would help correct some of the evils

which are strangling small business enterprise and initiative.

The heavy tax load on small business is a definite handicap to normal development and growth, so much so that it represents a real threat to the American economy. H. R. 4382, the text of which follows, would ease the tax burden of small business:

A bill to allow an exemption of $25,000 corporate income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following to be known as subsection (bb).

"(bb) Increase of capital assets by corporations: In the case of a corporation and notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code, and after all other allowances permitted under this section such sum, not exceeding $25,000, as has actually been expended during the taxable year for its own capital expenditures or for other corporate purposes."

Another bill, H. R. 4388, which I introduced in the House in cooperation with the Smaller Business Association of New England, is similar to H. R. 4382 with regard to the $25,000 exemption. It has an added provision making the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000. The text of H. R. 4388 is as follows:

A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to normal tax on corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the normal-tax net income of every corporation (except a corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 14 or section 231 (a), supplement G, or supplement Q) a tax of 24 percent of the amount of the normal-tax net income in excess of $25,000."

SEC. 2. Section 14 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to tax on corporations with normal-tax net incomes of not more than $25,000) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 14 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to tax of foreign corporations engaged in trade or business within the United States) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) In the case of a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business within the United States, the tax shall be an amount equal to 24 percent of the normal-tax net income."

SEC. 4. Section 15 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to surtax on corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), supplement G or supplement Q) a surtax of 14 percent of the amount of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949.

Early in the second session of the 84th Congress, I introduced, in legislative form, another tax proposal of the Smaller Business Association of New England. This bill is H. R. 8850, which increases from the present $25,000 to $50,000 the amount exempted from the surtax on corporate taxable income. This bill would also permit corporations with income tax liability for a taxable year of less than $100,000 to pay its tax in four equal installments. The text of H. R. 8850 is as follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount exempted from the surtax on corporate taxable income from $25,000 to $50,000, and to permit a corporation with income tax liability for a taxable year of less than $100,000 to elect to pay its tax in four equal installments.

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 11 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to surtax on corporations) is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

(b) Paragraph (7) of section 12 of such code (relating to cross references to the tax on corporations) is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

(c) Section 821 (a) (1) (B) of such code (relating to surtax on certain mutual insurance companies) is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

(d) Section 821 (b) (2) of such code (relating to surtax on certain interinsurers) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Surtax: A surtax of 22 percent of the mutual insurance company taxable income (computed as provided in subsection (a) (1)) in excess of $50,000."

(e) The first sentence of section 1551 of such code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption and accumulated earnings credit) is hereby amended by striking out $25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

SEC. 2. Section 6152 (a) (1) of such code (relating to election by corporations to pay income taxes in installments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Corporations: A corporation subject to the taxes imposed by chapter 1 may elect to pay the unpaid amount of such taxes—

"(A) in two equal installments, if the amount of the taxes imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year (reduced by the credits against tax provided by pt. IV of subch. A of ch. 1) is $100,000 or more; or

"(B) in four equal installments, if the amount of taxes imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year (reduced by the credits against tax provided by pt. IV of subch. A of ch. 1) is less than $100,000."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955. The amendment made by section 2 of this act shall apply with respect to payments of tax for taxable years ending after the day on which this act is enacted.

The Federal Government should offer every measure of protection and encouragement to small business. The bills which I have enumerated represent a few of the corrective remedies which are required to help small-business units throughout the country. There are many others, which would do much to restore a more wholesome and healthy climate than that surrounding small business at the present time.

The growth, vitality, and vigor of small business are the strength and prosperity of our great Nation. Let us promote better opportunities and more equitable conditions for this vital segment of our American economy. If we do not, the system of free private enterprise will be endangered, weakened, and damaged to the extent that our country will be left open to the machinations of those who would destroy American business, big and small.

Let us be just and fair to all American business when it is legitimate and lawful and socially aware of its responsibilities to the Nation and the American people. But let us be vigilant and willing to act in order to insure for small business its opportunity to live and to enjoy its rightful share in the national prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article appearing in the Boston Herald written by William F. Homer, Jr., on small business.

The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS FALLS BEHIND BIG COMPETITORS IN PROFITS

(By William F. Homer, Jr.)

The record-breaking profits of big business are not being enjoyed on the same scale by the 4,200,000 small-business firms of the Nation, about 60,000 of which are in New England.

These little fellows, or many of them, are experiencing acute profit problems. They are confronted with static or lower sales, and more and more mergers in the profit squeeze.

There is the highest failure rate for industry in 15 years of 46 for each 10,000 firms. The average liability in bankruptcies for 1955 was down around $40,000.

Of course there are more companies now than ever, and some of them are bound to stumble. But New England industry leaders find five principal small business headaches which curdle the milk and honey of profit. They are: (1) management; (2) taxes; (3) financing; (4) labor; (5) costs.

What is small business, since we're talking about it? The cynics used to have a word for it.

"Business is small if it can't afford a lobbyist in Washington."

The serious rule of thumb was a firm with less than 500 workers independently owned and operated.

Currently, the popular version holds that small business is the firm that says yes in a merger. And on a statistical basis, the 1,100 members of the Smaller Business Association of New England adopt a more flexible approach.

They look at the industry itself. A 150-man diamond tool shop could be big. An 800-worker tire plant, by Akron standards, can be small.

SUBCONTRACTING DIPS

But big or small, the volume of subcontracting that came to postwar New England, when consumer goods and materials were scarce, has vanished. Industry giants now do the farmed-out work themselves to help meet overhead.

In Government contracts, industrialists say, the line of least resistance leads to the big company. Small company ingenuity bows to large company assets in atoning for promises not performed. The national Small Business Association now carries the fight to get defense contract set-asides for small firms, after it rules on their competency.

This is one object of SBA, explains Edward J. Stewart, regional director. The others are to advise on technical and management problems and to give financial aid when other sources refuse.

Since its founding in 1953 to April 1956, the New England SBA office has made about 75 of these loans in a total of more than $3 million Stewart declares.

On a State basis, Massachusetts Business Development Corp., concentrating on financial not development aid to small business, has made 62 loans for $9,157,000 in approximately the same period.

These are all to the good, businessmen agree. The trouble is that they are not enough to make up for the tax drain on working capital and the high cost of replacing equipment.

NO COLOR LINE

Don't think that all small business writes in red ink, and all big business in black. There is no clear color line. But little business, profitwise, has not kept pace with big. In 1955, the profit margin before taxes for the giants of $100 million or more assets, was 13.4 percent. For manufacturing firms with less than $250,000 resources, it was 2.6 percent of sales.

Stewart agrees with S. Abbot Smith, member of the board of advisers of SBA and former president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, that rising money rates put the clamp on the small business borrower who can't meet the higher loans cost or finds his bank "lines" cut off.

They concur that the upsurge of fringe benefits and wage-guaranty plans puts an added burden on starting new small enterprise or continuing the old.

"Lack of management ability is the biggest single cause of small business folding," Stewart insists.

"Good management is essential, but it's no good if companies do not get the financing for reserves, replacement or growth," Smith adds. "This financial middle ground is a big cause of failures. Companies have grown beyond the point where they can finance themselves. They're not big enough, too risky, to go on the stock exchanges. It's hard to attract money to them. A wealthy man would be better off buying tax-exempts.

"If the company makes any money, the Government takes 52 percent of it in corporation taxes," Smith continues. This makes the Government what Joseph D. Noonan, executive secretary of the New England association, calls a "majority partner." This is the basis for the graduated business tax provisions of the current Patman act.

SCANT RESERVES

This tax bite means scant reserves set aside in good times for harsher weather. It means a squeeze to replace a machine that cost $7,000 originally with an improved model that costs $18,000 some 15 years later.

"The small company cannct carry a big inventory," Smith explains. "It has to buy materials at a higher price than large firms and sell goods competitively at the same price. When materials become scarce, suppliers cut off the least important companies first. Then they're up against a scarcity squeeze and a price squeeze as big companies continue to hold the price line, with a typical 5 months inventory to work on."

"It's harder for the small company to hold skilled labor," Smith, a wallpaper manufacturer, adds. He calls "unbelievable" the salaries paid technical men, figuratively "stolen right out of their previous plants."

"Don't forget," he concludes, "that small business still has advantages. It can move fast. It offers quick opportunity for ingenuity—the New England machine shop. It gives a well-rounded business training. Good management on good products can pay off rapidly. Finally, a man can be his own boss and build an equity for himself and his family.

"Yet under present tax and financing inequities, some big industries run three shifts. Well managed small competitors run not at all."

Keynote Speech of Congressman William L. Springer Before the Indiana State Republican Convention, June 27, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1956, our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] made the keynote speech before the Indiana State Republican Convention.

In view of this fact, I felt sure the Members of the House would be interested in what he said on that occasion. Under unanimous consent, I append herewith the speech made on that occasion in full:

Mr. Chairman, fellow candidates in 1956, delegates to this convention, and my Republican friends, this convention convenes again in the spirit of this great Republic, to declare your principles in a party platform, to nominate the candidates to high office who shall serve you both at home and in Washington, and to reassert your confidence in the administration of the greatest President within our lifetime.

From him, and all of his administration in Washington, I bring you personal greetings and best wishes for a successful convention and for the election of all of your State and National candidates this fall.

I cannot think of Indiana without this personal note of fond recollection. Here I was born and grew to manhood. Some of my first boyhood friends and college classmates are among you here today. My father and mother are hallowed in your ground—as are their parents before them. And dear ones of my family still reside among you. I could not look out upon this audience without thoughts of long ago.

I now live among the finest people in the world, but I can look back upon my former association with friends in Indiana with long and abundant affection.

The Indiana Republican State convention is a time when old friends return to Indianapolis to renew ties with the party. There are among you many old delegates who have seen service in the party wars of yesteryear. I see also those who are probably coming to this convention for the first time and will be here years hence when many of you have handed over the reins of party leadership.

Just 24 years ago, I walked through the portals of this building for the last time as a delegate to this convention from Sullivan County. The keynote speaker on that occasion was the late Will Hays. I can remember his words as if it were only yesterday when he said:

"Hoosiers are friendly people. No matter where you may roam, when a Hoosier meets a fellow Hoosier, it is time to sit and have a friendly chat."

In the past few years, I have travelled over much of the globe, and it seems that regardless of where I am, I always manage to meet a transplanted Hoosier. In connection with this gregarious and friendly trait among your people, I am reminded of thse lines of Rupert Brooke in speaking of his beloved England:

"If I should die, think only this of me:
That there's some corner of a foreign field
That is forever England.

* * * * *

Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given;
Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter learnt of friends, and gentleness."

You who have gathered here today are reflecting on the significance of the Republican Party in 1956 on the life of the State and the Nation. In any democracy, we must have a theory about the principles which make it up. One theory given us in the wisdom of our founding fathers was that every 4 years the President should return to the people with an accounting of his stewardship and ask for a vote of confidence in his actions and his policies. So, in 1956, the Eisenhower administration returns to the people for an approval of its actions during the last 4 years.

This is only fair—it is only just—it is only right—that we do so.

Not within my lifetime has a Republican administration been able to return to the people with such a record of accomplishment—either in the White House or in the Congress. We should be shouting from every street corner about this great record. Never has a party had a better record or a better program to stand on. All recent polls indicate that this Republican administration in Washington is approved by a solid majority of the American people.

If we are to give an accounting of this stewardship, what have we done during the past 4 years?

Let us look at the situation in Washington in 1953 when the Republicans were returned to power:

I. There was a shooting war in Korea: Between 1945 and 1953, in the short space of 7 years, 600 million people had disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.

There were hot spots all over the world, any one of which could have involved us in a war.

After just 3 years in the White House, this administration is in this situation:

We have finished the war in Korea and we are firmly at peace for the first time since 1940.

By wisely allying ourselves with friends in Europe and Asia, we have brought about an increased military strength to the entire free world and we are able to meet and defeat any aggressor, wherever he might appear.

In my estimation, this was the major issue before the American people when they went to the polls in 1952. I leave it to your best judgment as to whether or not this administration has performed on its promise to end the Korean war and to keep ourselves strong enough that no aggressor, nor combination of aggressors, can bring on world war III.

II. When the people of America went to the polls in 1952, they were conscious that during recent years there had been scandal and dishonesty which had run rampant through the Truman administration from 1948 on.

I would like to recall for just a moment some of the headlines of 1952. Here they are:

December 1951: New Scandals in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

January 1952: House Judiciary Votes Investigation of Department of Justice.

March 1952: Newbold Morris Called In To Clean Up Mess.

April 2, 1952: Morris, McGrath, and Truman Clash.

April 3, 1952: McGrath Fires Morris, Truman Fires McGrath.

April 4, 1952: McGrath Tells McGranery, "Bring a Pair of Asbestos Trousers With You."

I don't know what you people called it in Indiana, but in Washington we termed it the "Scandal-a-Day Administration."

In the past 3 years, what have we and the President in Washington done about this mess?

First of all, we got rid of the questionable people in high places who were making possible this corruption and we replaced crook-and-crony rule by able and honest administration.

I am not contending that all of the honest people are in the Republican Party. That is not the test of a successful and honest administration. The test is—when these crooks arise in high places, the President meets the person and the issue head on and removes them from Government. This is what I charge the Truman administration failed to do. This is what I assert the Eisenhower administration has done on every occasion where ethical standards have been tested.

On the issue of honesty in Government, I believe that the policies of the Eisenhower administration have received the substantial approval of people everywhere.

III. When the people of this country went to the polls in 1952, there was great uneasiness and serious lack of confidence in the ability of the previous administration to deal effectively with the question of the internal security of the United States. Some of this had been brought about by its record of negligence in the Hiss case, the White case, and many others which could be named. There had been a failure on the part of the previous administration to follow the reports and the findings of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to the danger of Communist infiltration into high places in Government.

What is the record of President Eisenhower on this point? First, he tightened the security standards not only for those who might be involved in a Communist conspiracy against the United States, but also set up standards which removed from Government those weaklings who might be subject to indecision when confronted with the question of making a choice between their Government and their own advancement.

The laws with reference to these matters have been more strictly enforced than ever before. This administration has deported 157 alien Communists in 3 years. In the previous 7 years of the Truman administration, only 95 alien Communists were deported.

The Congress has passed laws which more nearly fit the penalty for subversion and espionage, and has given our Justice Department the necessary weapons with which to deal with this entire matter.

But most important of all, we are making as sure as possible that none of these people will get back on the payroll again.

IV. When the people of the United States went to the polls in 1952, they had witnessed fiscal irresponsibility for 20 years. During that time they had seen only two balanced budgets—both by the Republican 80th Congress, in 1947 and 1948.

I am happy to report to you that on June 30, 1956, this administration will have balanced the budget and will have a modest surplus of between 1½ and 2½ billions of dollars.

Your Congress, with the support of the President, passed the Tax Revision Act of 1954. This was the first general overhaul of the tax structure of this country in 57 years. Under that act, we granted to the people of this country the greatest tax reduction in all history.

This tax cut amounted to $7½ billion.

Sixty-two percent of the entire amount went to individuals, including a 10-percent across-the-board decrease in income taxes. Thirty-two percent of this tax cut went to businesses of all kinds, including agriculture. A large portion of this tax reduction to business was responsible for the tremendous incentive to business to expand and has resulted in the unparalleled employment and prosperity in this country in the last 3 years.

V. When the people of this country went to the polls in 1952, they knew that for 20 years they had been watching a gradually decreasing dollar and that inflation was rampant.

In the last 3 years of the Truman administration the value of the dollar decreased 12 percent alone. From a 100-cent dollar in 1932 the previous administration had brought us in 1952 to a 54-cent dollar in purchasing power.

The factory mechanic, the white-collar worker, and the farmer were seeing whatever economic gains they made gradually disappear in the mirage of inflation.

During the past 3 years, this administration has halted the inflation spiral which threatened the economic gains of every group in America. The dollar today, in purchasing power, varies less than 1 percent from what it did in 1952.

VI. During the campaign in 1952, the opposing party went up and down the country saying, "Elect a Republican President, and you will see the greatest depression in history."

How many of you remember that?

Let us take a look first at the general business picture. In the past 3 years, retail sales, building construction, and personal income have set alltime records; 1955 was the greatest year in history for business and the worker.

The number of people employed in 1955 was the highest in history. This is in striking contrast with the administration during the previous 20 years. They were never able to produce maximum employment except from war or the after effects of war.

In 1940, which was the last peacetime year before World War II, after 7 years of boondoggling and leaf raking, there were four times as many people unemployed in America as there are today. In 1949, President Truman's last peacetime year before the Korean war, there were twice as many unemployed as there are today.

The proof of any pudding is in the eating. In my estimation, this proves that our policy of encouraging individuals to create jobs is better than the New Deal policy of relying primarily on Government to make jobs.

Your administration has not only given to the people the greatest prosperity ever known, but it has kept our economy on an even keel in all of its efforts.

The gross national product is $12½ billion more than 3 years ago.

We are currently employing between two and three million more people in America than was ever reached under a Democratic administration.

By wise labor policies, and more especially, due to incentive employment factors, strike losses are down 53 percent in 1955 from 1952.

VII. When the people of America went to the polls in 1952, our opposition said, "Elect the Republicans and you will get the most reactionary Government in our history."

I am convinced that a majority of Americans want their Government to be progressive and humanitarian—but they do not want it socialistic.

This has been a guiding beacon light in all that this administration has tried to do. Your Republican administration in Washington has these accomplishments to its credit:

1. Established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

2. Extended Social Security to 10 million more people and liberalized benefits for all of them;

3. Extended unemployment insurance to 4 million Government and small-business workers;

4. Increased railroad retirement and unemployment benefits;

5. Set up a Small Business Administration to assist small business;

6. This administration has advanced the civil rights of minorities everywhere. This administration has done more in 3 years to reduce discrimination than our predecessors did in 20 years;

7. Your President has proposed to Congress programs for highway expansion; medical and health research; and aid to depressed labor areas; all of which are now pending before your Congress in Washington.

I wish to emphasize that all of this has been done without regimentation or centralization. In whatever has been accomplished by your party in Washington, it has reversed the trend of the previous 20 years toward regimentation and centralization.

I am sure the people want an administration which does not look to the past, nor is satisfied with the present, but one which by deeds even more than by words shows the way to new and greater hope for the future. I believe that this program, designed in the very best of American tradition, will keep America on the road to progress. True conservatism has always been progressive * * * and for this we could point to the great record of Theodore Roosevelt.

May I emphasize to my good friends in this convention that the choice this fall is not between the Eisenhower program and something more conservative, but between the Eisenhower program and something far more radical.

So, in conclusion, may I say that the Republican Party can return to the people this fall with an excellent record of stewardship and accounting in the National Government.

Your Members of the House of Representatives have given a good account of themselves. CHARLES HALLECK did an able job as your majority floor leader in the 83d Congress. Other Members, CECIL HARDEN, RALPH HARVEY, EARL WILSON, CHUCK BROWNSON, BILL BRAY, JOHN BEAMER, ROSS ADAIR, and SHEP CRUMPACKER have all stood to be counted on the difficult issues which have faced all of us in Washington. These Members have never surrendered on principle.

They have given your President and your Republican administration all the backing which they conscientiously could and have acquitted themselves to their constituents in excellent fashion. I could not let this moment pass without commending them to your good graces.

May I close this speech with a personal word—you who are here this morning are those who will be the frontline troops in 1956. This is a worthy cause. You will be fighting to continue in office an administration which has ended war—thrown out corruption and waste—and brought great security to the people of America. You can glory in that fight and you can win.

Let us all join the battle so that this cause, so great in its promise and so magnificent in its performance, will not fail, but shall be victorious.

Address of Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the graduating class of the Page School on June 11, 1951, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building:

Mr. President, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it an

honor to have been invited by the members of this class to make the address on this occasion. It is a genuine pleasure to participate in these exercises on this memorable night in the lives of these young men.

Members of the graduating class, this is a serious hour in the history of America, and a critical period in your own lives. I would suggest to you, and to the youth throughout the land, that you set a goal in life—a goal toward which you must constantly strive. The earlier we set for ourselves a goal of accomplishment, the more likely will be our chances of success.

I remember hearing a story about a young boy who was employed as a carpenter in the new building which was to be the meeting place of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. This young lad was observed by his foreman to put forth special interest in the chair in which was to sit the chief justice of the supreme court. The foreman asked this young boy, still in his teens, why he spent so much time on this particular chair. The lad replied, "Someday I will sit in this chair as the chief justice of this State." Years later this young man did become the chief justice of the supreme court in the great State of Oklahoma. He set for himself, early in life, a high goal and worked toward that end. It is no small wonder that his ambition was crowned with ultimate success.

I hope the youth of America today, seeing the shortcomings of this generation, will set for themselves the goal of rectifying the chaos we find in the world today. I hope you young men, in facing the menace of foreign ideologies, and "isms" which would enslave the world, will be bold and aggressive, and that you will have no fear. The foreign policy of our great country tonight seems to be predicated on what Russia might or might not do. Fear hysteria is sweeping the country. Fear cannot solve the problems of this great Nation.

The Bible says the things which we greatly fear will come upon us. As you face the future, with its stupendous task of arriving at lasting peace, I know you will face those tasks with the same type of fortitude that our forefathers had when they founded the early American Republic. They were afraid of nothing, except to do wrong.

The motto of the late Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, is found on the monument at his resting place in Crawfordville, Ga. This motto reads: "I am afraid of nothing on the earth, under the earth, or above the earth, except to do wrong. In the path of duty I shall ever endeavor to walk, fearing no evil and dreading no consequences." And what a wonderful motto that would be for the youth of America today.

France and England, in the years preceding World War II, contributed to the outbreak of that war by being afraid to stand on principle and back up the little nations who desired freedom. They were, by their policy of fear and appeasement, just as guilty of starting the war as were the aggressor nations. A bold, determined stand by these two nations for righteousness and the sanctities of treaties in 1938 could have prevented World War II. Whenever any nation surrenders principle for a temporary respite or fleeting expedience that nation later will pay a terrible price in blood.

America has reached the coveted position it occupies in the world today because of its belief in God and in freedom of opportunity. Our forefathers were builders. They gave us, on a silver platter, this land as we know it today. We have the highest standard of living any people in world history have ever enjoyed. Our educational systems are comparable to those of any other nation. The masses in America have a far greater opportunity for an education than those of any other nation.

When I was in the Far East in April, I was told that 83 percent of the Chinese people are illiterate; that eighty-plus percent of the people of India are illiterate—they cannot read or write. Our literacy rate, in America, is higher than the illiteracy rate of these two countries.

I enjoy living in America. I am proud of my American citizenship. We should be grateful to God and the Founding Fathers of our Republic for the great America we see every day. No civilization has ever excelled ours in religious tolerance or freedom from class hatred. Minority races of people have advanced further here than in any other country. Strong moral and spiritual beliefs have always placed our Nation on the side of right and principle as opposed to tyranny and oppression. Our democratic form of government has created an American citizen who is tolerant, self-reliant, intelligent, and conscious of his rights and the rights of others.

The American system of free enterprise has given to the American people more automobiles, television sets, more telephones, more washing machines, more of the luxuries of life than all the rest of the peoples on this globe combined. Think of it—150 million people have more of these modern conveniences than all the other 2 billion people in the world. This is a tribute to our democratic way of life, to our free-enterprise system, and to the individualism of the American people. We cannot maintain this great era of accomplishments by tearing down or by socializing the system which has made this era possible. The youth of our Nation must work, in the years ahead, to guarantee the preservation of our system of government with its equal opportunities.

Booker T. Washington was born a slave in Virginia. Never knowing who his father was, he went from that humble beginning to establish Tuskogee Institute, one of America's greatest colleges today. I visited this college, in the "black belt" of Alabama, not long ago. It is a monument to the character and perseverance of Booker T. Washington. He could have accomplished this only in the United States.

Abraham Lincoln was born in a one-room log cabin in the backwoods of Kentucky. With little formal education, he gradually ascended the ladder of fame. He was defeated for Congress and for the United States Senate. He did not become disillusioned and embittered. Instead he continued onward and became the President of the United States.

Alfred E. Smith was born in the East Side of New York City. He worked in the fish markets and, as he grew up, saw little of the world except the slum sections of that great city. But Al Smith was four times elected Governor of New York State and was the Democratic standard bearer for the Presidency in 1928.

Immorality in government and among the American people is today posing as a great threat to true democracy. This threat is paralleled by complacency and indifference on the part of the American people. If we are to preserve democracy, we must use democracy. If freedom is to grow, we must use that freedom.

In 1948, 93 million Americans were eligible to vote in the Presidential election. Only approximately 47 million voted. Forty-six million did not vote at all. They did not evidence enough interest to exercise the sacred privilege of casting their ballot for whomever they pleased.

How many people today exercise the privilege of publicly stating their views on the state of the Nation? One-half of the American people are members of no church of any denomination whatsoever. Yet, America was founded and has prospered on Christian principles and a belief in God.

I do pay special tribute tonight to the press and radio for exercising the sacred privilege to write and discuss the things which they believe.

If any man, woman, or child in this audience tonight were to go home, get in bed, and lie flat on your back for a year without exercising the limbs, you would lose the use of arms and legs. We maintain the physical limbs of our body by constant use and exercise. So it is with the "four freedoms" and our democratic way of life. If we do not use them, we will surely lose these sacred privileges.

You members of this graduating class, as you face the many problems of today, are probably thinking of the obstacles of seniority. You are probably thinking that you will have to wait many years before you can serve your community, your State, or your Nation. You are probably thinking that youth and lack of experience will be a stumbling block.

Remember the words of Benjamin Franklin: "Fools learn by experience; wise men through the experience of others." In the 4th chapter of First Timothy, the 12th verse, we find these words: "Let no man despise thy youth." These words are taken from Paul's letter advising the young minister, Timothy, as he went out into the world of men. Youth is your greatest asset. You have all the history of the past centuries to draw from. If in this modern age, with its libraries and great teachers, we have to learn in the bitter school of experience, then we are indeed very foolish. If we must put our hand in the fire to learn, by experience, that we will be burned, then we are what Benjamin Franklin said of those who learn by experience—very foolish indeed. We can turn back through the pages of history, or we can look at our contemporaries in the various fields of endeavor and find that youth has played an important role.

I am thinking tonight of scientific advancements. The men who made the atomic bomb were but little older than you who sit in this graduating class tonight. The average age of the members of the American Association of Atomic Scientists is 29 years.

Let us turn to the field of literature. William Cullen Bryant began writing poetry at an early age and wrote until he was past 80. Yet the greatest poem he ever wrote was Thanatopsis, written at the early age of 17. Byron, Keats, and Shelley, of England, were all young men when they wrote their masterpieces.

In the realm of government and politics, William Pitt was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the age of 24. He is acclaimed by most historians as the greatest Prime Minister Britain ever had, greater even than Winston Churchill. William Pitt saved England in the great Napoleonic era of world conflagration.

In America, Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence when he was 33 years of age. Alexander Hamilton, the father of the American currency and one of the founders of the American Constitution, was adjutant to Gen. George Washington at the age of 20 and helped to plan the campaigns which made this country independent. Madison and Monroe were both young men when they fought for the American Constitution. John C. Calhoun, who once represented the district it is now my honor to represent in Congress, was elected to the House of Representatives at the age of 28 and in a few months was one of the outstanding leaders of the country. Henry Clay was United States Senator at the age of 29. A few years later on the same day he took his oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was elected Speaker of the House, at the age of 34.

In the field of music, Mozart was playing publicly at the age of 6 and composed his first symphony at the age of 9.

In military science and tactics, the greatest generals the world has ever produced

were young men, little older than you. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years old. Napoleon Bonaparte was a lieutenant general at the age of 27, and dominated Europe at the age of 31. Hannibal was commander of the Carthaginian Army in Spain when he was 25. Gustavus Adolphus was commander of the Norwegian Army at the age of 19. These four men are credited by most historians as being the greatest military generals of all times. They were at their best when they combined their great intellect with the vigor and imagination of youth.

The members of this graduating class are all young men—but we must not forget the ladies. Joan of Arc was a French leader while in her teens. Florence Nightingale also made great accomplishments early in life.

Jesus Christ hung on Calvary's cross at the age of 33, after He had started a movement which is still growing today and has hundreds of millions in its ranks. And today a young evangelist in America—Billy Graham at the age of 32—has won hundreds of thousands of Americans to the cause of Christianity.

We are never too old nor too young to serve our country. Let no man ridicule you for your youth.

I hope you will pardon this personal reference. I received no encouragement when I ran for the legislature of my State of South Carolina at the age of 22, but the people of my county elected me. Two years later, at the age of 24, I received no encouragement when I ran for the State senate, but I was elected over two opponents. I was advised by many not to run for Congress in 1946 because I was what they termed too young, but still the people elected me to the House of Representatives.

Let us not be discouraged by the cynics and those who would have us wait while America may be passing through its hour of greatest danger. Our country needs us today. Tomorrow may be too late. The past generation has failed to give us, the youth of today, the peace that they promised, the security that was to be ours. Let us not make the same mistake and pass on to the next generation a world of chaos, of war, of fear, and of apprehension. We must act now, before it is too late, to save our country in this hour of crisis.

A story is told of Napoleon Bonaparte when he was being defeated by the Austrians at the Battle of Austerlitz. He had done his best and defeat was staring him in the face. As his veterans fell back in disorder, he rode up to a little 14-year-old drummer boy, and the great general said, "Son, beat a retreat." The little boy looked up at his great commander and said, "Sir, I don't know how. You never taught me how to beat a retreat. But, sir, I can beat a charge on this drum that will wake the dead on this battlefield." Napoleon thought for a moment and then said, "Beat it, then." The old guard, seeing the courage of this little boy and hearing his stirring notes on the drum, rallied and won for Bonaparte the greatest victory in French history.

The great minds of America may fail to solve the present-day problems. Just remember the great General Bonaparte and all of his commanders had given up that day in the Battle of Austerlitz, only to see defeat turned into a great victory by a 14-year-old lad. The youth of America today, like the little drummer boy, might save this country after our leaders have done their utmost.

I wish you great success in the years ahead. May you serve your community, your State, and your Nation as well as yourselves and your families. God bless you, each of you.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the promises made by the President and his administration were fine—they followed the entire Democratic program of Roosevelt and Truman—but that is as far as they went; they remained idle promises. As soon as the administration's purposes and aims were announced, the Republicans started to chip away, bit by bit, every promise that had been made or to evade it entirely, whenever they could get away with it. The comparatively few bills, in the best interests of the people, which finally became law never would have seen the light of day if it had been necessary to rely on Republican support.

For 3 years the administration lagged in making recommendations on many vital issues and definitely opposed numerous liberal measures and programs. However, in this election year the President and the Republicans have done an about-face and now pretend to favor many programs they opposed in the past. Furthermore, they try to take full credit for helpful measures passed by the Democratic 84th Congress, although the record shows that not one of the major accomplishments during this administration would have been possible without the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate. The Democratic Congress has, as always, been the protector of the people's welfare.

REPUBLICANS' BROKEN PLEDGES

The administration's boast of prosperity is an empty one. We find that areas of chronic unemployment exist in 24 States and Puerto Rico; in some areas more than 12 percent of the working population is jobless. The administration broke it's pledge to deal with the unemployment problem in depressed areas and has shown no real concern for our millions of unemployed. The wage earner cannot meet increased living costs which have reached an alltime high, but the President and the Republicans opposed the Democratic fight for a decent minimum wage. The Democrats fought for a minimum wage of $1.25 but the administration was insistent upon 90 cents, so a compromise had to be accepted setting the minimum at $1. The fate of small business is tragic under the Republicans, for the administration favors big business and has remained heedless to the needs and problems of small business. Small-business failures are up 36 percent and many thousands have closed their doors. So, we ask, prosperity for whom?

Tax relief was promised, but we find that the Republican "trickle-down" tax philosophy still holds full sway. In the 83d Congress, tax relief amounting to millions was given to corporations and the rich but when the Democratic Congress attempted to give a $20 tax cut to the ordinary taxpayer, the action was termed "irresponsible" by the administration.

Civil rights has always been one of my major concerns. There was never any doubt that a good civil-rights bill would pass the House. Although the President promised a civil-rights program at the beginning of his administration, it took his Attorney General 3½ years to make his recommendations. The administration knew that by stalling on the issue so that it would come before the House in the closing days of the session, the Senate would never act on it. Had the President asserted his leadership and kept his promise, the bill would have come before us long ago; there would have been ample time to overcome the threatened filibuster in the Senate and the Senate would have ultimately acted on the bill. The debate in the House indicated clearly that Republican strategy was to capitalize politically on the issue; in my opinion the Republicans had no sincere intention to allow the measure to become law.

Although Candidate Eisenhower said: "We need to rewrite the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act" they are still law; the administration took no action for 3 years and then proposed several futile amendments, worthless when we consider the cruelty and inequities of our present immigration laws. Attempts by me, as well as by many of my colleagues, to correct this sad situation have been in vain because of strong opposition by the administration.

The President, in 1952 and 1953, stated that he was in favor of amending the Taft-Hartley Act. This pledge was also broken, and the administration's record shows it to be against labor and the American worker.

The Federal school-construction bill was killed in a shameful debacle because of the Republicans' failure to support the President. It is to the best interests of our country that we have a literate and trained citizenry; it is important that our children have adequate and safe school facilities. It is a tragedy that the children of this Nation must now suffer danger and inadequate school facilities because of the refusal of some of our lawmakers to meet their true responsibilities when the bill came before us.

It is appalling that in a country of our great wealth, tremendous numbers of our people should be poorly housed, forced to live in slums, or homeless. Many campaign promises were made by the Republicans that the need for low-income public housing would be met. The Democrats passed the Housing Act of 1949 which has been wrecked through the years by the Republicans. This year the Senate passed a bill authorizing 135,000 units, while a bill approved by the House committee would have provided for 50,000, annually for 3 years, but this was termed "unrealistic, excessive, and ill-conceived" by an administration spokesman. Because of strong Republican opposition, the housing bill as finally passed provided for only 35,000 units annually for 2 years.

Social security was bitterly opposed by the Republicans in the beginning but

they also give this Democratic program their approval now in order to save themselves politically. They point with pride to the social-security amendments passed this year, but it is well to remember that this beneficial legislation was not passed during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when Republicans were in control; the Democratic 84th Congress is entitled to full credit.

Space does not permit my covering all important legislation. The foregoing are only a few of the instances which show failure of the President and his administration to keep promises made to the people in an effort to win votes.

LEGISLATION

In my 1955 report to constituents, I discussed in detail the numerous bills I had introduced which would be beneficial to the people I represent and the Nation, so I shall not repeat that information now. I am continuing my efforts for civil rights, aid to consumers, aid to Israel, unification of Ireland, employment for older workers, as well as many other matters.

I feel that my neighbors in the 23d District of New York would like to know how I voted on major bills which came before us. I voted in favor of the Mutual Security Act; extension and liberalization of the Social Security Act; reduction of individual income tax and excise taxes; admission of 200,000 refugee immigrants; Housing Act, providing for additional public-housing units; Federal aid for highway construction; Federal aid for school construction; increased benefits for veterans; broadening of unemployment compensation program; pay increases for postal workers and other Federal employees; increase in minimum wage; statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; St. Lawrence Seaway development; reciprocal trade agreement extension; civil-rights bill; civil-service retirement bill; railroad retirement bill.

I opposed and voted against: The Tidelands Oil giveaway bill; the Dixon-Yates contract; the natural-gas bill; the shipment of arms to Arab States; the reduction of the Air Force budget; the curtailment in building veterans' hospitals; the increase in first-class mail rates; the disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber plants.

In addition to my legislative duties, I have had the opportunity to try to help many thousands of my neighbors with their individual problems, and I am pleased that they feel free to call upon me for assistance.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

I maintain a congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, which is open daily. My constituents are invited to call there and to take up any problems they may have. I also invite them to write me so that I may have the benefit of their views and suggestions regarding legislation.

It is a pleasure and honor to represent the people of the 23d District of New York. They have my pledge that I shall continue to extend my best efforts in their behalf.

Congressional Unit of Department of Agriculture Wins Well Earned Citation for Superior Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House an outstanding award recently made within the Department of Agriculture to one of its branches of which the Congressional Inquiry Unit is a part. The awards to individuals and units within the Department of Agriculture were a part of the William A. Jump Memorial Foundation citations.

Without doubt the outstanding service rendered by the Congressional Inquiry Unit to Members of Congress contributed materially to the record which caused the Inquiries and Distribution Service, headed by Richard A. Hollis, to be singled out for this citation.

The citation declared that the award was "for transmitting information about Department services and the results of its work to Members of Congress and the public with outstanding efficiency, marked initiative, and exemplary teamwork."

In connection with the awards, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, said:

> Service to our fellow men is a source of great satisfaction. This satisfaction compensates for long hours of work, patient waiting, and sometimes tedious effort. It is an earned satisfaction. And it explains, in part at least, the dedication to service which is so characteristic of so many Department employees.

The Congressional Inquiry Unit of the Inquiries and Distribution Service is headed by Miss Mary I. Parrett and is the unit with which congressional offices must frequently come in contact with the Department. This branch is the traffic manager for our congressional inquiries and I sometimes marvel at the expeditious manner in which requested material is dispatched to our offices for reference use, for use as speech material and for use in answering letters from our constitutents making specific and often complicated requests for agricultural information.

It was indeed appropriate that the Department of Agriculture should include in the unit citation program a place for an award to Mr. Francis J. P. Cleary, retired, and presently of Woodstock, Va., the organizer and first chief of the Inquiries and Distribution Office. The setting up of the Congressional Inquiries Unit within the Information Office assigned exclusively to handling congressional inquiries, was an idea originating with Mr. Cleary. At the unit award program he was given a gold 50-year service pin for his more than 50 years on active duty with the Department.

The staff members of the Inquiries and Distribution Service who worked together to make this superior service award possible for the unit deserves individual mention. I have previously mentioned that the branch is headed by Mr. Hollis. His assistant is Fred L. Zimmerman. The other units participating in the citation and their personnel follow:

Adminstrative Service Unit: Thomas L. Cullinan, chief; Edna B. Davis, A. Sidney Frye, Caroline M. Gray, Rudolph A. Stewart and Martha E. Ridgway.

Congressional Inquiries Unit: Mary I. Parrett, chief; Clara J. Irwin, Thelma H. Brown, Ann S. Steuer, Lois I. Bruce, Arthur R. Garner, Beatrice V. Carthorne and Harry W. Hart.

Government and Public Inquiries Unit: Vitura P. Sanders, chief; Martha J. Mount, Cleopatra S. Caras, Barbara A. Barnes, Mabel E. Heinecke, Lydia Bell Jones, Julia L. Johnson, Hilda B. Norris and Katherine A. Cook.

Mailing List Unit: Gretchen W. Costello, chief; Ann Rogers Hickey, Alice G. Cobert, George M. Brown, Ann B. Smith and Sarah L. Pruitt.

General Inquiries and Publications Unit: Eleanor W. Clay, chief; Harry L. Reed, Roby W. Stehr, Alice M. Shoemaker, and Ella J. Green.

Warehouse Unit: Edward Buck and Clarence O. Irby.

Lt. Gen. Samuel Dent Sturgis, a Great American Soldier and Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, I have had some opportunity to observe how the impact of the atomic age has affected the United States Military Establishment. I could say much about the changes that have occurred since World War II, and are still occurring, in planning, organization, and operations in all branches of the services.

At the very heart of military technology, at least insofar as the Army is concerned, is the Army's Corps of Engineers, which bears much of the brunt of modern-day changes in military concepts. The engineers must keep abreast of rapid changes in their own increasingly complex technical field. They must keep abreast of changes made in the Army of which they are a part. Finally, they bear much of the burden of helping all arms and services adapt themselves to technological change. For every new development in any branch is likely to bring about new requirements in the way of base construction, transportation, bridging, or dispersion, and it is largely up to the engineers to meet these requirements.

The Nation has been fortunate in having, at this critical stage, a chief of engineers whose capability and experience outstandingly fit him to direct the Corps of Engineers through its present crucial period. He is Lt. Gen. Samuel Dent Sturgis, Jr., the most distinguished scion of a family that has been famous in

American military history for more than a century. His grandfather attained the rank of major general in heroic fighting during the Civil War, and afterward helped pacify the West. An uncle was killed with Custer. His father also reached the rank of major general and commanded the 87th Division in World War I. The traditions of this outstanding family of military leaders reached a climax with the career of the present General Sturgis, who has achieved higher rank than even his illustrious forebears.

We of the Connecticut Valley were greatly impressed with the invigorating forcefulness with which General Sturgis helped to direct the rescue and rehabilitation effort during the dark days of the flood in 1955. The floods of that year in the New England and North Atlantic States were among the greatest natural disasters of American history. While the waters were still raging, General Sturgis appeared in person to help coordinate the efforts put forth under the overall direction of the Civil Defense Administration. Army engineer personnel and resources were mobilized and rushed to the spot from all over the eastern United States within a matter of not days, but hours. Bulldozers and emergency bridging appeared; roads, railways, and communications were reopened; relief and repaid supplies began to flow into the area; and basic utilities were restored. It was the Army engineers who made available the bulk of the emergency funds, and under their auspices contracts for reconstruction work were let in record time.

I am in a position to know that the forcefulness manifested by General Sturgis on that occasion is typical of his every effort. He has brought the same qualities to bear in helping the Nation's Armed Forces adapt themselves to the complex problems of modern technology, and in hammering his own corps into a well-trained combat arm and a technical service of unparalleled efficiency.

The man who holds the position of Chief of Engineers, United States Army, holds one of the biggest and most important executive jobs in the world. It is a job to test the mettle of a man like General Sturgis. I know of no better way to pay him tribute than to describe that job, and then examine the way in which he has measured up to it.

The Chief of Engineers must be, first and foremost, an outstanding soldier. It is his job to counsel the Army's high command on all matters in which engineering is concerned—and in these days, when it has been truly said that modern warfare is engineering warfare, that function alone makes him one of the key commanders of the Nation's Military Establishment.

He is the general in charge of the training of 10,000 engineer officers and 100,000 enlisted men who are deployed all over the globe—which means that he is responsible for providing the Nation with some of the world's most highly skilled soldiers and making them ready to face the toughest and most intricate tasks of modern warfare. Their mission spans the entire field of war from the munitions factories at home up to and beyond the front lines of battle action. He heads a redoubtable intelligence operation and the world's largest and most scientific mapping activity, which turned out 500 million vital military maps during World War II. He directs a far-flung research effort and a vast supply organization handling $2.5 billion worth of military stocks.

He is in charge of the biggest peacetime military engineering and construction program in history—a job which has reached its climax during the tenure of General Sturgis as Chief of Engineers. This program embraces the complex design and construction of the almost infinite range of facilities required by the Army and the Air Force, to the amount of about $1.5 billion a year, at some 700 different locations scattered from the Arabian desert to the frozen wastes near the North Pole.

But all this is only half of the job of the Chief of Engineers. Entirely apart from his military function, he has the job of directing the United States Government's rivers and harbors and flood-control programs; and in carrying out this job he is responsible not to his military chiefs but directly to the Secretary of the Army. The civil works part of his job alone would make him among the more important executives in the world. For the program calls for the expenditure of over a half billion dollars a year. It embraces the construction and maintenance of all the Nation's seacoast ports and harbors, all its Great Lakes ports, and all its inland waterways, which now total some 28,000 miles and carry an important and increasing proportion of the Nation's total tonnage of freight. It also involves responsibility for the national flood-control program, including the construction of hundreds of large and small dams, thousand of miles of levees and floodwalls, and a vast array of other engineering works. As an incidental part of the job, the Chief of Engineers is responsible for electric-power installations with a combined generating capacity of more than 4 million kilowatts—one of the greatest power-development programs in the world.

Taking his military and civil functions together, the Chief of Engineers directs the world's largest construction program and in addition to his 110,000 engineer soldiers, is boss of 55,000 civilian employees. As part of his job, he is required to conduct the world's largest real-estate operation. The acreage under his charge is the equivalent of the combined areas of New Jersey, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, and Delaware, and with improvements has a value of more than $25 billion. The variety of this real estate is astounding. It includes almost every kind of property one can think of—military bases, reservoir sites, experimental areas, farms, forests, towns, factories, utilities, highways, railroads, bridges, and even cemeteries.

Such is the job. Now what of the man who holds this job?

General Sturgis' long career has covered a truly remarkable range. He has held every kind of assignment that can normally be held by an engineer officer. This personal acquaintance of all aspects of the works of his command—combat, construction, staff, and civil works—has been one of the main assets contributing to his outstanding record as Chief of Engineers.

Born in St. Paul, Minn., in 1897, Samuel D. Sturgis was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1918 and was promoted through the ranks of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain all in 1 day. Though he trained with troops, World War I ended before he could be shipped overseas. He then served as company commander and received further training in military and engineering subjects, after which he taught for a time at West Point.

In 1926, young Sturgis went to the Philippines, where for a time he commanded the 14th Engineers. During the period he carried out strategic studies which were invaluable to him 18 years later, when, as Chief Engineer for the Sixth Army, he participated in the reconquest of the Philippines. As a part of these studies, he participated in the mapping of the island of Luzon and initiated work on the defenses of Bataan.

Next he was assigned to Company A, Ninth Engineers, Mounted, at Fort Riley, Kans. It was here that he outstandingly displayed the qualities of enterprise and imagination that was later to manifest on larger and more important fields. Far ahead of his time, and ahead of many of his fellow officers, Sturgis comprehended the revolution that motorization would bring about in military operations, and conceived the necessity of the modern engineer mechanical equipment that would be needed to keep military engineering abreast of mechanized warfare. He applied for and received the first such equipment made available to any engineer troop unit of the United States Army. Under his direction, this became the pilot test which resulted in the provision of bulldozers, diesel shovels, air compressors, and other modern construction equipment which played such a vital role in opening the jungles and beachheads of World War II.

It was the first, but by no means the last, time that Samuel Sturgis was to play a leading part in helping keep the Military Establishment abreast of technological change.

During the mid-1930's, Sturgis was assistant to the district engineer in charge of the Passamaquoddy tidal power development. After the disastrous, record-breaking Ohio River flood of 1937, he was sent to Huntington, W. Va., to serve as executive officer in the intensive flood-control and navigation construction effort which followed. Later, after a period in the Army War College, he became district engineer at Vicksburg, Miss., where he not only initiated work on the revised flood-control program for the lower Mississippi Valley but directed a $200 million construction program to build essential installations as part of the pre-World War II preparedness effort—installations which later contributed to rapid mobilization and the successful conduct of the war.

World War II saw him in the South Pacific as chief engineer of the Sixth Army. He directed engineer operations in a theater where his commander, Gen. Walter Kruger, said that warfare was "one-third engineers, one-third Air Force, and one-third everything else."

Under the all but impossible conditions that prevailed in the area, Sturgis manifested the qualities of initiative and resourcefulness that were to lead him to the highest command in his corps. The problems he overcame during the New Guinea, New Britain, Admiralty, and Philippines campaigns might well have overwhelmed a man of less force. Operating at the end of an immensely long supply line, helping plan operations in mud and jungles and across vast stretches of sea, fighting on little-known islands, he and his engineers had to lead the way across beaches, build all-important airstrips under fire, cut roads through jungles for the troops to follow, then build depots, hospitals, harbors, and facilities for the staging of other invasions to follow.

After the war he was the chief engineer of the Air Force until that service was separated from the Army. Then there followed other important commands. For a time he was division engineer in charge of work on the great program of dams and reservoirs for controlling and developing the Missouri River. Later, he was commanding general of the Sixth Armored Division at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. In 1952 he was appointed commander of the communications zone, United States Army, Europe, with headquarters in France, and commander of all Army Forces in France. In this post, it was his duty to prepare the entire fighting and supply line from French ports and across France to meet any threat of attack from the East. He was recalled from Europe to take his present position of Chief of Engineers.

This was the period when the Korean war had alerted our Nation to the need for worldwide defenses against the aggressive power that had come within a hairsbreadth of unleashing world war III. America had taken the initiative in building a ring of strategically located bases around the free world. The construction job—a job totaling about $10 billion—was given to the Army's Corps of Engineers. This program was still developing when General Sturgis was appointed by the President to head the Corps. Fresh from the arduous emergency construction job in France, he brought his experience and skill to bear on the problems of the worldwide effort.

As the Nation knows, he has carried it through triumphantly. At the same time, he has carried out some of the largest annual civil-works construction programs in the 132-year-old history of the Federal rivers and harbors enterprise. He coped with great floods not only in the North Atlantic area but on the west coast.

While carrying out the responsibilities of his position, he has also provided the armed services with outstanding inspiration and leadership in discerning and grappling with the problems of this age.

He has been among the foremost of the Nation's leaders in focusing attention upon the need for survival power in case of future national emergency, whether it be a natural disaster like another great flood, or the terrible disaster of war. It has been part of his doctrine that it is not enough to be able to strike heavy blows at an attacker; that America must be organized to get back on its feet after taking the heaviest blow that the enemy can strike, and go on to outslug him. General Sturgis has not only preached this doctrine, but taken a leading part, insofar as his authority and responsibility permitted, in setting up emergency procedures to be followed in case of need.

Similarly, he has hammered away at the importance of technology in warfare. Sometimes at the risk of antagonizing his superiors, he has insisted on subjecting every theory and doctrine to the test of its technical practicality. He has pointed out the ever-increasing construction requirements imposed by new weapons, new plans, and new military concepts, and demanded that the engineer and technician be given a voice in all decisions from the highest strategic level on down. Having seen and experienced in actual warfare both the disastrous cost of failure to heed engineering principles and the remarkable achievements made possible by taking full advantage of engineering resources, he has applied his experience to the problems of the present and the future.

To help make the Army engineers into a crack force ready for any test, he has strengthened the combat effectiveness of the engineer soldier both by insistence on thorough training and by constantly seeking to improve combat engineer equipment. Under his direction, light, stripped-down bulldozers, shovels, and other heavy engineer machinery have been developed that can be dropped by parachute, and thus enable engineer assault units to carry out complex missions if necessary behind enemy lines. The search for quicker and stronger methods of bridging, of transport, of fuel supply, and of storage and supply, has been initiated and stepped up to keep pace with the modern concept of widely dispersed, highly mobile military operations.

General Sturgis has been as effective in the civil-works side of his job as in the military side. He has provided outstanding leadership in maintaining and strengthening the Nation's water-resources development programs in a troubled period, when, under the pressure of economy and the stresses of necessary reorganization and reorientation, all Federal programs were being subjected to the strictest scrutiny. He took the lead in the movement to better coordinate the many old and sometimes conflicting Federal conservation policies and agencies—the movement which led the President to appoint his Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. And he has been one of the first to point out growing problem of water supply—a problem which some authorities consider the Nation's No. 1 natural resources problem of the future—and to suggest means of meeting it.

Finally, few men have been as effective as General Sturgis in calling attention to the vital problem the Nation faces in its shortage of engineering and technical manpower. Not content with discussing this problem before congressional committees and high-level bodies of engineers, he has gone before young people themselves in schools and colleges to urge them to develop their talents, to explain the rewards of hard work and patriotism, and to point out what the Nation needs and expects from its youth.

It goes without saying that a man who has accomplished so much both as a commander and an administrator is no ordinary personality. Not only his Army chiefs and the Nation's leaders, but the many ordinary citizens who have worked with him, know Gen. Sam Sturgis to be not only a man of great virility and ability but a man of great integrity and sincerity. One of his proudest boasts on behalf of his corps, along with its record of construction and achievement, is that it has had the courage and integrity to reject 55 percent of the project proposals brought before it, on ground that they did not represent good investments for the American taxpayers.

When he was appointed Chief of Engineers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch spoke for most of the people who knew him when it headlined the story: "General Sturgis Man of Action, No Stuffed Shirt." When he spoke his mind in opposition to a bill favored by many Congressmen and some of his superiors, the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, on the other side of the fence on that particular issue, praised him for his ability and sincerity. In an editorial headed "This Man Sturgis," it said:

> Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis * * * is no table thumper. A man of great competence, outstanding ability, real understanding, and high purposes, it has been our own personal experience with General Sturgis that when he thinks a thing is right, he says so. And he speaks softly and persuasively.

Another newspaper reporter said of him:

> Like many dedicated soldiers, Sturgis eats, sleeps, and talks the Army. A rugged 6-footer, he drives himself and others hard, and on his many inspection trips (1 year he flew 125,000 miles) often stops to go deeply in the details of a construction project or to make a careful spot check of some engineer troop unit.
>
> He likes to move fast when walking, driving, or flying, and nearly all his efficiency reports refer to Sturgis' "boundless energy and enthusiasm." A bit of a Spartan, he takes a social drink and smokes occasionally. Once he startled the bartenders at a reception in Michigan by asking for a chocolate soda.
>
> Sturgis' hobbies are golf, reading military history (his "escape" reading) and doing math problems (he taught mathematics at West Point).

But perhaps the most fitting tribute and accurate summing up was made by President Eisenhower 2 years ago at the dedication of McNary Dam, the great structure built by the Army engineers on the Columbia River. The President of the United States told his audience:

> When I first met Sam Sturgis I was detailed as a young officer to coach a football team and a young hopeful lieutenant showed up. I made him an end and he worked pretty hard under me for some weeks and months. Today I think that all of you would like me to speak for you in commending him as the brilliant head of a great organization which not only here but throughout our land has built up these great works in flood control, in drainage, in water conservation, and power development, an organization of which not only the United States Army but which America is proud.

Congressman Young Supports Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, as one of those Members of Congress who voted in favor of President Eisenhower's civil rights proposal, I would like at this time to outline it briefly for the people of Nevada.

In recommending the creation of a bipartisan civil rights commission, President Eisenhower said in his State of the Union message:

"It is disturbing that in some localities allegations persist that Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and are likewise being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures. I recommend that the substance of these charges be thoroughly examined by a bipartisan commission created by the Congress."

The six-point program advocated by President Eisenhower contained these provisions:

First. Establishing a six-man bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights with subpena power to investigate voting rights abuses and unwarranted pressures aimed at denying basic rights.

Second. Providing new post of Assistant Attorney General to head a special Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department.

Third. Allowing Federal prosecution of individuals—as well as officials—who try to intimidate voters in any election for a Federal office.

Fourth. Allowing Justice Department to seek Federal injunctions on behalf of United States or persons deprived of civil rights.

Fifth. Permitting private citizens access to Federal courts in civil rights cases without exhausting State steps.

Sixth. Permitting Justice Department to bring civil suits against civil rights conspiracies like hooded gangs and so forth.

Although we were successful in passing this proposal through the House, it was defeated in the Senate by the southern chairmen of the key committees.

These same gentlemen will continue to control Congress and to bottle up civil-rights reforms unless Republicans are elected in November.

President Eisenhower has taken the lead in making democracy apply to everyone. The greatest civil rights gains since the Civil War have occurred under the Eisenhower administration. Equality of treatment is being achieved by deeds and action, not empty talk. President Eisenhower has carried out his campaign pledge to use all the power of the Chief Executive to work toward elimination of segregation and discrimination.

Here are some specific points of antidiscriminatory action taken under President Eisenhower and his team:

First. Elimination by ICC of "Jim Crow" in bus and interstate travel.

Second. Abolition of segregation in schools on military posts by executive action.

Third. Elimination of discrimination among civilian employees at naval bases.

Fourth. Completion of end to segregation in the Armed Forces, VA hospitals, and so forth.

Fifth. Establishment of a Committee on Government Contracts—headed by the Vice President—to help prevent discrimination in Government contract jobs and a President's Committee on Government Employment Policy to assure nondiscrimination in Government jobs.

Sixth. Requirement that new contracts for services to the District of Columbia must include pledges of no discrimination in employment.

Seventh. Elimination of segregation in the Nation's Capital by executive action.

Eighth. A new era of equality has begun through Supreme Court decisions outlawing segregated schools and providing equal access to other public areas.

Agriculture in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today the most important single fact is that this Nation is at peace. Peace has been achieved and maintained under the courageous leadership of President Eisenhower.

Peace, prosperity and progress under his administration are spelled out by the fact that more Americans are at work today, earning more, producing more, building more and investing more than at any other time in history.

Inflation has been halted. The savings, the insurance policies, the pension rights of our people are no longer being whittled away by advancing living costs. A dollar saved in 1953 is still worth as much as it was then. A dollar saved in 1940 was worth only 52 cents by 1952.

Under the Eisenhower administration, the Nation as a whole is enjoying higher earnings, lower taxes and stable living costs—all at the same time.

The saving, rather than the spending, of a dollar has again become a respectable objective in Washington. Reductions in Government expenditures have made possible the greatest dollar tax cut in history—$7.4 billion annually. That is the equivalent of $180 a year for every family in America. Along with this record tax cut, the Federal budget has been balanced.

Stifling bureaucratic controls over the national economy have been eased.

The Nation has the strongest and most efficient Armed Forces in all its peacetime history. A tax dollar is buying a dollar's worth of defense.

This administration is determined that farmers shall share fairly in this unprecedented national prosperity. A concentrated attack upon price-depressing surpluses is underway.

There has been a sharp upturn in the general level of farm prices during recent months. Since January farm prices, as an average, have increased by about 11 percent. During the first 6 months of 1956, net farm income was running at a rate of half a billion dollars higher than for the last 6 months of 1955.

The parity ratio, which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, moved from 80 in January to 86 in June. This is in marked contrast with farm price trends during the last 7 months of the Truman administration when the parity ratio dropped 7 points. In fact, during the final 23 months of that administration, the parity ratio tumbled 19 points in one of the sharpest farm price declines of record. This happened despite the fact that the country was at war throughout the entire period.

A substantial part of the general improvement in farm prices has come in hogs and beef cattle. These two items account for approximately 30 percent of farmers' total cash receipts nationally—more than all of the six basic commodities.

In recent months top quality hogs have been bringing $17 to $18 in the principal markets. The 8 percent reduction in spring pig farrowings would indicate strong prices in the year ahead.

Beef cattle prices have strengthened about 10 percent since January.

The current political controversy over Government farm policies involves a clash of two basic philosophies. The 1956 elections will determine whether American agriculture is to remain free or be driven down the road of regimentation and State control.

The position of the President and the Republican Party on this fundamental issue is clear-cut. We believe that the role of Government in agriculture should be that of a helpful partner, never a master. We believe that Government can and should assist agriculture in such important fields as research and education, grading and inspection services, market expansion and development and credit. We believe that Government should—as it is doing—carry forward commodity loan programs and direct purchase operations which protect farmers against undue price declines but at the same time permit our abundant production to move into consumption rather than into storage.

We believe, too, that while Government should help farmers to do the things that they cannot do individually, the hand of Government must never replace the hand of the farmer in the operation of his own farm. Farmers must remain free to make their own management decisions. They must be permitted to be competitive in both the domestic and foreign market places. They must not be shackled by burdensome controls and regulations which deny them the opportunity to make the most efficient use of their production facilities. Not only farmers but all Americans have a stake in a free agriculture.

Farmers realize that the primary cause of their present problems is surpluses—surpluses of food and fiber piled up under wartime programs continued

too long after the need for vastly expanded production had passed.

This administration is vigorously attacking the surplus problem on two major fronts. The soil bank is being ance with demand and at the same time placed in operation as a means of bringing current production into better balbuilding up the fertility of the land against future needs. This program could have been applied on a much broader basis this year had not the Democrat leadership dawdled and delayed action until farmers had planted their spring crops.

The surplus problem is also being met through a program of greatly expanded farm exports.

The Republican administration got to work at once to regain and expand our shrinking export markets. In fiscal year 1954, the dollar value of farm exports went up 7 percent; in fiscal 1955, they went up another 4 percent; and for the fiscal year 1956, they will be up still another 9 percent.

The Republican 83d Congress enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to help dispose of farm surpluses without unduly disturbing markets. Since July 1953 we have moved into use more than $5.5 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities. Gains in exports are apparent this past year in all major crops except cotton. Excluding cotton, exports this year are expected to be the highest of any year for the past 30 years.

Here are some of the commodity highlights:

Wheat up 20 percent from last year.

Feed grains up 84 percent from a year ago.

Soybeans up 37 percent from last year and a new record.

Soybean and cottonseed oil up 52 percent and another record.

Lard up 31 percent and the largest of the last 4 years.

I would list these other accomplishments of the past 3½ years:

When this administration came to Washington in 1953, it found prices controlled, grading of beef compulsory, and prices going down. Government restrictions were removed. A vast beef purchase program was undertaken to help stop the decline in prices.

Government worked with industry to market beef vigorously—and not only beef but dairy products, vegetables, pork, and other plentiful foods. In the past 3 years, the American people have been eating more per person—more beef, chickens, and turkeys than ever before.

Under this administration we have had the biggest expansion of grain storage facilities in all history.

We have moved swiftly to give aid to farmers hit by floods, drought and other disasters.

We have developed a program for upstream protection of watersheds, to conserve soil and water, to help prevent floods and to preserve our precious national heritage for future generations.

School lunch programs have been expanded to serve 11 million children.

We have sought to use every appropriate and effective means to enlarge markets so that farmers can produce and sell their output, increase their incomes and enjoy an improving level of living.

A Great Plains program was developed to provide a stable, profitable agriculture for the farm families of this vast region.

A prosperous, expanding and free agriculture is important not only to farmers but to all of us.

We have measured our farm policies on the basis of what is good for the farmer and the Nation. Farmers know they have in the White House a friend who is concerned with their problems and is determined that they shall share fairly in our unprecedented national prosperity.

Congress Fails To Do Its Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a case has recently been brought to my attention which is an example of rank injustices inflicted upon Federal employees because of the failure of the Congress to do its duty. Instead of writing out and setting its own rules and regulations governing the dismissal of employees working for the Government, Congress has allowed the Civil Service Commission to make its own.

In this case a young woman who has 18 years of creditable work behind her was involuntarily retired because of disability. She has been denied access to the personnel files, records, reports, and statements made by her supervisor, and was not given a chance to refute or explain them. She was sent to a psychiatrist, with the lasting stigma which that act implies, and was not able to obtain the files and reports sent to the Public Health Service, nor copies of them.

In the rules and regulations set forth in chapter Z1 of the Federal Personnel Manual, section 29.11, Disclosure of Information (a) (1), there is this provision:

> Files, records, reports, and other papers and documents pertaining to any claim filed with the Civil Service Commission, whether pending or adjudicated, will be deemed privileged and made in confidence, and no disclosure thereof will be made except as provided herein (p. 342).

I have been told that this regulation continues:

> Except to a claimant or to his duly authorized representative in matters concerning himself alone when such disclosure would not be injurious to the physical or mental health of the claimant or be regarded as a breach of confidence. Determination as to when disclosure of information would be injurious to the physical or mental welfare of a claimant will be made by the Medical Division.

Under the same section—11—it is stated:

> Copies of papers, records, etc., the furnishing of which would be prejudicial to the interest of the Government; copies of reports of examining surgeons; or copies of records of departments and other confidential matters, will not be furnished.

Why should not a person dismissed for disability be informed as to what is allegedly the basis for his dismissal?

If there is anything in Russia that can beat this for absolute denial of the rights of our citizens to be heard in their own defense. I do not know about it. As reported in the Evening Star of July 12, 1956, in another similar case, the United States Court of Appeals for the District held that—

> Federal employees retired for disability are not entitled to see civil-service medical files on their cases, nor are they entitled to hearings.

For over a year this woman has been beating her head against the stone wall of bureaucratic secrecy and unconstitutional withholdings of information, and there are undoubtedly numerous similar cases which have so far not been brought to public attention.

If we are to retain any semblance of our Bill of Rights, it is high time that Congress passed a law taking away from the various bureaus and agencies in Government the right to make their own rules and regulations without the right of hearings or appeal and see to it that the rights of our citizens are protected.

These regulations refer to physical and mental health of employees. That gives the Civil Service Commission ample leeway to hold back information on the ground of mental health. There may be nothing wrong with an employee as to mental health, and how does it come that the Commission is the sole arbitrator of this delicate question?

This woman has lost her job, and she does not know what the reasons are. While the stigma of being sent to a psychiatrist remains, she cannot get a job anywhere. This Commission has taken away from this employee a thing of the highest value. Shakespeare said:

> He who steals my purse steals trash, but he who robs me of my good name steals that which does not enrich him, but makes me poor, indeed.

Are we in the United States carrying on a gestapo in the question of mental health? Are we to make the Commission the supreme ruler over the very lives of Federal employees? In this case the employees cannot get work while this resort to mental health, secretly applied, with no chance for the victim to vindicate himself, remains, and, finally, the victim will be robbed of life. Is that the authority Congress has given to bureaucrats? I would like to know.

A Report to the People of the Second District of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like

to take this opportunity to look back over the 84th Congress, evaluate and reiterate some of the legislative progress that has been made, and to point up some of the benefits the Second Congressional District has received during this period.

As the House lights dim and the spotlight of campaign activities picks up each Member of the House of Representatives, I feel it a fitting time to pause briefly to sum up just what we have done in this, the 84th Congress, and to point up some of the problems, and solutions to them, I have had while representing the second district in this Congress.

A Congressman has three broad fields of work in representing his district. One is on the national scene where overall programs and policies are enacted by the Congress. Another is in the operation of Federal agencies which affect his district. And the third is the personal problems of constituents which can be solved by action of governmental offices or by remedial legislation.

I would like to outline a few of the highlights of the past Congress, and developments, which I think are of significance to the Second District in each of these fields.

As we return to the cool climate and warm friendship of our home districts, we Republican Members of the 84th Congress carry with us a mixed sense of satisfaction and frustration. Satisfaction over the solid progress we have been able to make in some fields, and frustration over the political bickering and shameful flaunting of the Nation's welfare by the opposition party in the closing days.

Nationally, we are enjoying a day-to-day standard of living unequaled in all history. President Eisenhower's program for the people of this Nation has provided us with burgeoning economic development, a secure outlook for the future, and a calm sense of trust in our National Government.

The 84th Congress passed a monumental piece of legislation in the highway bill. This measure will link our 48 States together with thousands of miles of broad, smooth highways—which will facilitate movement of goods from region to region and provide fast arterials for passenger-car travel.

We have passed social-security legislation which will provide benefits at age 50 for those who are disabled, and will lower the retirement age for women to 62.

For the first time in many years we are ending the fiscal year with a surplus in the Treasury and with prospects for a balanced budget for the year ahead. This money will be applied to reduce the national debt—a sum which requires that every family in the Nation pay $14 per month just for interest payments each year.

We have appropriated $66 billion this year. The Department of Defense will receive around $35 billion. The interest payment on the national debt will take $7 billion. Benefits to veterans will take $5 billion. Foreign aid will take about $3.7 billion. Agricultural programs will get nearly $2 billion. The operation of governmental agencies will take the rest.

It is a sobering thought that what might be called the price of peace is $50 billion of our tax money annually. I am sure that we in the second district feel we can well pay the price for the guaranty of continued peace and the security of knowing we are discouraging aggression by being strong and ready.

The 84th Congress passed the soil-bank plan, which will not have a major effect in the second district, but which will benefit the Nation's agricultural picture. Administrative changes in farm policies have bolstered the dairy scene in recent months and the road ahead looks brighter for our milk producers. The tax on gasoline used in farm implements was removed. We have extended the brucellosis eradication program, and the school milk and lunch programs which will consume more farm products.

In the field of governmental operations, we have continued under the Eisenhower administration to combat waste. We have required that the Defense Department call for bids on all contracts over $2,500 to secure the best price.

We have launched a general program of efficiency. By passing constructive legislation establishing benefits for career Armed Forces personnel, we have cut the new recruit training needs and kept experienced military men in the service. The Army alone has upped reenlistment rate from 47 to 67 percent. At a cost of $5,000 to train each recruit, the 30,000 men who came back for another hitch represent a saving of $150 million for the taxpayer.

Our shipping has benefited from the launching of the largest peacetime building program in history, which should stimulate and enforce our shipyard economy. The Bellingham yard has been successful in participating in the Navy's minesweeper construction program—a part of our defense expenditures, of $2.7 billion for modernization of the naval fleet.

Increased funds for health and medical programs will mean more research on disease prevention such as the Salk polio vaccine. This Congress has appropriated more money for health and welfare than any other in our history. This is an integral part of President Eisenhower's program and we took great satisfaction in earmarking $184 million for research.

Last year we acted on pay increases for postal workers and other governmental employees, to bring salaries more in line with those offered by private industry. We have improved the civil-service retirement programs and have added incentives to keep talented people on the job in agencies where efficiency can save money for the taxpayers.

We have appropriated $3.7 billion in foreign aid. I supported this bill after it had been trimmed from its original $4.9 billion request. I feel this program, since it is mainly military aid, is in reality a part of our defense budget. It has only about a billion for economic aid. I believe the entire program should be reevaluated and some thought given to tapering off and eventually ending this wartime emergency program.

Where have we failed? I regret deeply the demise of the school construction bill. Any honest evaluation of the sinking of this bill leads to the inevitable conclusion that sectionalism and stubborn refusal by the Democratic majority to make the program workable led to its death. President Eisenhower's incentive plan would have made it a fair program to the taxpayer. States would have received maximum Federal aid in return for maximum State effort. The sorry Southern tactics of endless amendment, brick-wall resistance to civil rights, and the failure of Northern Democrats to support the incentive plan doomed this needed legislation from the start.

We however, did pass a school-aid bill which will mean thousands of dollars to our district. The Federal-impact area school construction and operation program affects a great number of our districts. We appropriated $378 million for this program.

The President's overall program suffered from studious neglect by the leaders of the majority party. Obstructions to Government economy were voted, such as the crippling bill to halt closure of Government installations without specific permission from Congress. The atomic peace ship, atomic electric power development, civil rights, Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Alaska-Hawaiian statehood, putting the Post Office on a sound fiscal basis—all these were blocked by one means or another.

The Second District has fared well under the Republican administration during the past 2 years. I have received a minimum of complaints about conduct of Federal offices, and many agencies are proving to be of more assistance than ever before to residents of the district.

The economy of the district is flourishing. We have been able to get more appropriations for roads and trails in the national forests. More timber sales personnel will mean smaller units and more opportunity for small bidders. Our Mission 66 program will mean millions of dollars worth of roads and campgrounds for Olympic National Park during the next 10 years. Eight major oil companies are interested in establishing refineries in our district. It has been my pleasant privilege to talk with the leaders of these firms, and to assist them with information and introductions to governmental procedures relevant to preliminary arrangements for these plants.

Our farmers have been hard hit by the weather. We have been able to secure disaster loans at low rates of interest and an emergency feed program. The weather has been more cooperative in recent months and the outlook now is for alleviation of a threatened feed shortage throughout our farming area. I am in hopes that my dairymen's self-help plan will be adopted eventually by the Congress, as I believe it will stabilize the dairy industry at a high income level.

Our marine industries are off on a development program unparalleled in our history. The seven harbor projects for which I was able to get authorization in the 83d Congress, have received much attention during the past 2 years. Funds to start construction on Everett,

Bellingham, Blaine, Anacortes, Neah Bay and Quillayute Harbors have been approved, and promises extended for action on Port Angeles next year.

In addition, we authorized the Port Townsend Harbor project this year and the Sammamish River flood control plan. I plan, if reelected, to push for funds for these projects next year.

Navigational surveys will be undertaken on three of our major rivers due to action I was able to secure this year. The Skagit, Stilliguamish and Snohomish Rivers will be studied by the United States Army engineers to determine the feasibility of navigational improvements.

My mailbag has brought a host of letters outlining individual problems requiring consultation and negotiation with governmental agencies. Many of these were settled to the satisfaction of the party which sought the help of my office. I am grateful that so many residents of the district have written to express opinions on legislation, in answer to the questionnaire I sent out this year, and in requesting help for specific problems.

As we leave Washington for the political battlefield, I would like to extend to my colleagues in the House my appreciation for the cooperation and fellowship I have enjoyed. I'm sure it is the hope of all of us that we are saying, in the words of the old song "Au Revoir," but not "Good Bye."

House Proves Friend Indeed to Veterans of War With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the minutes run out on the 84th Congress and I glance over this historic Chamber, gladdened by seeing dear faces on both sides of the aisle, saddened by the thought that all will not be returning, I feel that I should speak what deeply is in my heart.

Close to six decades have passed since the 55th Congress in its second session decreed that Cuba should be free and that Spanish rule on this hemisphere should cease. Since then there have been 29 Congresses. In these a total of 98 veterans of the war with Spain have served as Members of this body. As the last of this number I have sought, as best my opportunity and diligence would permit, to represent the spirit and the interest of the survivors and the widows of survivors of the faraway war that started our United States of America on the road to world responsibility.

From the bottom of my heart I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the understanding and the help they have given. I could not let the 84th Congress slip into history without saying what is in my heart. The leadership on both sides, the membership of the House without a single exception, have shown a friendship for the Spanish War veterans and their widows that I shall never forget, that will not be forgotten as long as life and memory remain with any in that group.

HOUSE PASSED MORO BILL

By unanimous vote in the first session you passed the so-called Moro bill, intended at long last to give recognition to the few who remain of that valiant army that carried on in hostile Philippine provinces with great sacrifice and loss after the arbitrary cutoff date of the Spanish-American War.

HOUSE PASSED LAMBERT BILL

By unanimous vote in the second session you passed the measure placing the name of Gustaf Lambert, soldier of the war with Spain and hero of the yellow-fever experiments in Cuba, on the honor roll where it should have been many, many years ago. Also you adopted, by unanimous vote, an amendment to an appropriation bill providing money for the gold for a medal for Gustaf Lambert.

HOUSE SAVED THE "OLYMPIA"

You were not deaf to my expression of the sentiment among my comrades of the war with Spain for the preservation as a historic shrine of the warship *Olympia*, Dewey's flagship in the naval battle in Manila Bay and that bore to our shores the Unknown Soldier of World War I for burial in Arlington National Cemetery. As a result I am assured the *Olympia*, instead of being junked, is on the list of the historic battleships of our country to be preserved.

HOUSE PASSED WIDOWS BILL

By unanimous vote you passed a bill for an increase in the pension for our Spanish War widows. God's blessing will reward you for this action. There are not many widows of Spanish War veterans. There are fewer every month. They are too old to work. For the most part they receive no social-security assistance. They are in dire need. Trying to stretch out a piteously meager pension, many of them are unable to buy the medicines they so badly need. The Spanish War veterans asked nothing for themselves, only that these widows be provided with minimum pensions of $75 a month. To its everlasting glory, the House responded.

THANKS TO YOUNGER VETERANS

To all my colleagues in this body again and again the thanks of the gentleman from Illinois and all his comrades. You have been magnificent. Most of you are veterans of World War I or World War II or both. You have given a helping hand to the lone Spanish War veteran remaining among you in this Chamber in the finest expression of comradeship. When the time shall come that among the many veterans of World War I and of World War II but one remains a member of this body, it is my prayer that from his younger colleagues this last surviving veteran will receive in full measure of richness the understanding and the help you have given the last of the Spanish War veterans in this body.

CREDIT TO GREAT LEADERS

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans was the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, who came to Congress as a Representative from the State of Iowa the year our beloved minority leader, JOE MARTIN, was a freshman. He served for many years with great distinction, being a member at different times of the Rules, Appropriations, and Ways and Means Committees.

Commander in Chief James H. Johnson, serving as head of the United Spanish War Veterans during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, is a veteran of the war with Spain, of World War I, and World War II. He is a great soldier and a great American. His military record is outstanding.

Past Commander in Chief William J. Otjen as chairman of the legislative committee of the USWV, working side by side with Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld as cochairman, has done a prodigious job in the promotion of worthy and patriotic legislative causes. He has been as tireless as time itself, and even at this moment when adjournment is near and hope is fading he is at the post of duty and of honor on the other side of the Capitol striving to get action on our widows' bill by the other body.

OTJEN'S TESTIMONY IN FULL

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the testimony of Past Commander in Chief Otjen before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as follows:

Mr. OTJEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am William J. Otjen, of Enid, Okla., past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans and chairman of the national committee on legislation and its administration of that organization.

I have with me Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, a past national president of our auxiliary and cochairman of the auxiliary legislative committee.

Of course, we have given due study to the proposals incorporated in the measure before this committee. We do not question the major portion of H. R. 7089, which is apparently designed principally for the relief of dependents of career personnel. We are in complete accord, especially with the objective of increasing death compensation rates for service-connected dependents of the honored dead.

With that thought in mind I wish to confine my remarks in considering the objectives of H. R. 7089 to a proposed amendment which has been introduced by Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, and which is before you, and I understand that an amendment is to be introduced by Senator COTTON, of New Hampshire, for the same purpose. They are both similar in character and the efforts of both meet the same objective.

These objectives are that for reasons which I hope to be able to describe in full, intended to request that surviving widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer uprising be included within the terms of the Hardy bill as service-connected and at the proposed rates defined under that bill.

As we are advised, at this time the rolls of the Veterans' Administration will show 334 Spanish War veterans as service-connected; they show 1,193 dependents as service-connected. They show as of December 31, 1955, 56,019 non-service-connected veterans nd 80,903 such dependents. We do not dispute

the rolls of the Veterans' Administration, but we certainly know that this tabulation of figures does not do justice to the veterans of the Spanish War. Let me emphasize that embraced in the Spanish War veterans are the veterans who served during the official period of the Spanish War in 1898. Also embraced are those who served until July 1, 1902, either in the Boxer Rebellion or in the Philippine Insurrection. Our tabulation shows that 61 percent of the Spanish War veterans—covering this period—served overseas.

There are Members of this honorable body, Senator Martin, of Pennsylvania, Senator Green, of Rhode Island, Senator Neely, of West Virginia, and of those who have recently retired, Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, and Senator Gillette, of Iowa, all of whom were Spanish War veterans, and who have vivid recollections of what was faced by that volnuteer army of 1898.

They were all volunteers; they enlisted for the meager pay of $13 per month. They drilled in heavy blue uniforms, ate hardtack, and food which was supposed to be left from the Civil War. The food was such, the facilities of the camps were such—lack of sanitation, lack of medical supplies, lack of proper food—that sickness became abnormal. It could not be coped with. These men drilled in their blue uniforms with sticks instead of muskets. Disease was rife and the death rate very high. Scarcely any hospital records were kept. The senior Members of the Senate will remember the tales of Montauk Point where sickness became almost unbelievable. It was appalling.

Of that terrible period of the Spanish War, no adequate records were kept, no hospital records available. When the regiments were mustered out, the men were simply glanced at with no physical examination, and they returned to their homes. They had no benefits of the present GI training which we think that Congress can be greatly commended for putting into effect. None of the Spanish War veterans had the advantage of college training—it would have meant much to them. They had no benefit from loans for business purposes; they had no bonuses except in a few States, but in their declining years, the thing which is worse for them is that there is no record of hospitalization, no record of service-connected disability. That is the reason why so few are shown as service connected.

In my own experience in the Philippines my company lost one-half of its men, but men of that company shot and wounded grievously were—and are—carried on the Veterans' Administration rolls as nonservice connected.

The Veterans' Administration—and I say this without criticism—just does not have a tabulation of the living Spanish War veterans who were service connected, nor does it have a complete tabulation of the deceased Spanish War veterans who were service connected. If it had such records, those records would doubtless show that many of the veterans of 1898–1902 would have disabilities directly resulting from armed service. However, the absence of such records is the reason why the vast majority of the Spanish War veterans are receiving the pension rates, and that is why I am appearing before this committee.

We feel that considering the advanced age of Spanish War veterans, their increased death rate—1,367 of our veterans passed away during the 3 months ending December 31 by VA computation—that something must be done immediately about the widows of these veterans. As for the widows, the maximum number has been reached. The rolls fluctuate just a little from month to month now, but the roll will decrease steadily. We think it only just and fair, and we advocate strongly that the dependents of the Spanish War veterans be included in H. R. 7089 as presumptively service connected.

I would like to call attention at this point to a brief colloquy that took place on the floor of the House last July 13, when the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, was being considered.

The reference is to a question asked by the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA of Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas. Congressman O'HARA is the last surviving veteran of the Spanish-American War serving in the House of Representatives, and, as this committee well knows, Mr. TEAGUE is the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and was a most important member of the select committee which drafted and approved the Hardy bill.

The colloquy follows:

"Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes. I am not accustomed to criticizing committees. I think this committee has worked hard and has come before us with a bill that has much merit. The members of the committee are outstanding in ability and in knowledge of veteran problems. I doubt, however, that we have had sufficient time to read the bill and to study its provisions. I regret that the bill comes to the floor under a closed rule. It would have been more quieting to our concern in guarding against inadvertencies if the rule had been open. I am speaking especially for the Spanish-American War group. My colleagues will appreciate my position as the last remaining veteran of that war of the 96 or 97 who have served in this body. Among our Spanish-American War veterans, there is some concern. We feel that the House could have quieted that concern if there had been an open rule, and it had been permissible to present an amendment that in substance would have recognized that in the Spanish-American War there were no records kept. Now, I know how difficult it is for younger veterans to appreciate conditions at that time. So that it may be made clear in the record, I have requested this time to ask one who knows, the great chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas—Mr. TEAGUE—to make comment on that phase.

"Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would certainly agree with the gentleman that the records kept during the Spanish-American War and during World War I and World War II are altogether different. The records are very poor, when we find any record at all, so far as the Spanish-American War veterans are concerned.

"Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. So that it would be impossible for a Spanish-American War veteran or his widow to prove that the veteran had service-connected injuries?

"Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is so in practically every case."

This status has been recognized officially by our Government on two occasions. You Members of the Senate will recall the Economy Act that was passed during 1933. Two years later, the Congress restored the pension payments to Spanish War veterans and their dependents, and when President Roosevelt approved the restoration bill, he issued a statement which called attention to what could be termed a great difference between the services rendered by Spanish War veterans and those rendered in subsequent wars.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the text of the White House statement explaining the reasons which actuated the President in signing the bill restoring these pension rights. It follows exactly:

"The President, in signing today (August 13) H. R. 6895, a bill reenacting laws dealing with pensions granted to veterans and the dependents of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, made clear the definite distinction between legislation relating to veterans of early wars and the veterans of the World War.

"The Congress on many occasions has recognized that because of the complete absence of any system or policy initiated during or immediately following the Civil War, the Indian Wars, and the Spanish-American War, and because of lack of adequate medical care from the point of view of modern standards, the veterans of these earlier wars could be compensated and taken care of only through some form of pension system.

"In the case of the World War, however, the Congress at the very beginning of the war adopted an entirely new system of care and benefits. This new system applied to all who fought in the World War, extended to them additional compensation if they had dependents, as well as insurance, hospitalization, vocational rehabilitation, and the adjusted service certificate (the bonus).

"The veterans of the Spanish-American War now approaching an average age of 62 years, had none of these advantages except hospitalization in recent years. Their case therefore, cannot be compared to the case of World War veterans. For the same reason the approval of this bill establishes no ground or precedent for pensions for the World War group; theirs is an entirely different case.

"There are some inequalities involved in this legislation but the President recognizes the fact that the Spanish-American veterans were once on the rolls, under prior legislation, that they are approaching advanced age, that their disabilities are increasing.

"The President's action is taken appropriately on the anniversary date of the occupation of Manila by the American forces."

Later, in 1951, the Congress passed the bill known as our outpatient treatment bill, which was vetoed by the Chief Executive. It was passed by both Houses of Congress by an overwhelming vote over the veto. That bill provided that because of lack of hospital records and service-connected records, Spanish War veterans should be presumed and considered as service connected for outpatient treatment purposes. So, we think this is a just measure which will not cost the Government of the United States much for the reason that our ranks are so rapidly thinning.

The veterans of the Spanish War are asking no increase in pension for themselves in this Congress, but the pension of $54.18 which is paid the elderly widows of the Spanish War does not provide a decent living expense. We feel that this amendment would be a just recognition of the incomparable service of these aging veterans and aging widows. Every elderly man and woman realizes the high cost of living and the high cost of medical treatment for the aged. Our people are no exception.

We veterans of the Spanish-American War are inclined to boast that ours was the last war this country has won in which the peace treaty did not give away the benefits obtained. The achievements of the Spanish War veteran added to this great country of ours Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. They made us a world power. Ours was the only war in which this country has been engaged in which returns to this country were far greater than the cost. The Spanish War opened up the markets of Asia and the Far East to the United States, and increased the trade of the Nation enormously. You gentlemen know that the period following our war was commonly referred to as "The golden era."

We feel that it would be but just compensation to that volunteer army of 1898–1902 to adopt our requested amendment to H. R. 7089, which would provide that the death of a veteran shall be conclusively presumed to have resulted from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while so serving.

I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a member of the Hardy committee suggested that we present this amendment.

Mrs. TRAZENFELD. As cochairman of the legislative committee for the United Spanish

War Veterans, may I say that our organization—and I speak for the 80,000 widows that this amendment would affect—concurs completely in the statement rendered by our chairman, Mr. Otjen, and we feel that should this committee in their deliberations find it within their hearts to grant this request, a great injustice of long standing could be corrected, and that much happiness and much good and at very little cost would be accomplished.

Appropriations Made in the 2d Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me, I am submitting a table showing the appropriations made in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

It will be seen that, without the cuts in the mutual security setup, the Congress on direct appropriations appropriated more money than the budget asked for by $523 million. In addition to the direct appropriations, there were reappropriations involving very large sums of money, probably at the very least $500 million.

One of the worst things that we have to contend with is that so many of the expenditures are provided for in different acts which permit expenditures from public debt receipts. That authority is outstanding as of July 1 last, according to the estimates that have been furnished us, in the amount of $19,772,000,000. This is almost one-third of the direct appropriations made by the Congress, so that the availability of funds is in the neighborhood of $19,772,000,000, plus obligated and unobligated balances that are carried forward, plus the authority to spend from public debt receipts, and the management and revolving funds which run to a total of about $74 billion carried over from the 30th of June 1956. You add to that the $68 billion of new money available on July 1, and you have $142 billions.

We have been fortunate in that, notwithstanding about $72 billion withdrawals from the Treasury, we had net deposits of $77 billion; and, although the actual surplus is only about $1.8 billion, the cash balance picture is quite a lot more. With these $19 billion of authority to spend from public debt receipts, there is no possible way for the Congress to keep a tight control upon funds.

With the advent of the new highway bill and the trust fund proposal, the gasoline tax receipts and that sort of thing will not appear as Treasury revenue, but will go into a trust fund. The withdrawals will not be labeled a charge against the Treasury. For the fiscal year 1957 the charge for this trust fund is $800 million. The story of the appropriations no longer means the control over appropriations that we had 30 years ago.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Title	Estimates considered by House	Public Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1957 bills:			
Treasury-Post Office:			
Treasury	$648,507,000	$643,434,000	−$5,073,000
Post Office	3,000,000,000	2,984,340,000	−15,660,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,365,000	1,365,000	
Total	3,649,872,000	3,629,139,000	−20,733,000
Interior and related agencies:			
Interior	287,682,600	280,857,250	−15,135,950
Forest Service	96,773,000	100,970,750	+4,197,750
Related agencies	42,292,600	42,106,100	−270,000
Total	426,748,200	423,934,100	−11,208,200
General Government matters	15,014,475	14,969,975	−44,500
Independent offices	5,783,704,000	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826
Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Labor	421,084,000	380,785,500	−40,535,500
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,925,988,400	1,972,121,781	+46,133,381
Related agencies	16,576,000	13,473,500	−3,102,500
Total	2,363,648,400	2,366,380,781	+2,495,381
District of Columbia	(182,899,500)	(181,612,490)	(−1,287,010)
Federal payment	22,358,650	22,558,650	+200,000
State, Justice, and Judiciary:			
State	181,207,285	175,065,872	−7,076,413
Justice	235,880,000	216,043,650	−19,836,350
Judiciary	37,582,535	36,321,435	−1,261,100
U. S. Information Agency	135,000,000	113,000,000	−22,000,000
Refugee relief	8,500,000	8,500,000	
Total	598,169,820	548,930,957	−50,173,863
Commerce and related agencies:			
Commerce	1,453,568,000	1,347,872,000	−105,096,000
Panama Canal	15,660,000	15,410,000	−250,000
Related agencies	53,445,000	53,450,000	+5,000
Total	1,522,673,000	1,416,732,000	−105,941,000
Defense:			
Office of the Secretary	14,950,000	14,950,000	
Interservice activities	657,375,000	643,875,000	−13,500,000
I. Fiscal year 1957 bills—Con.			
Defense—Con.			
Army	$7,761,425,000	$7,539,280,000	−$222,145,000
Navy	10,047,600,000	9,999,497,000	−48,103,000
Air Force	15,666,500,000	16,459,125,000	+792,625,000
Total	34,147,850,000	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	1,987,302,268	[1] 1,993,744,968	+3,903,300
Public works:			
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,357,000	5,357,000	
Department of Interior:			
Power Administrations	28,478,000	28,478,000	
Bureau of Reclamation	195,789,000	181,114,400	−14,674,500
Army civil functions	588,877,000	641,777,500	+52,900,500
Total	818,501,000	856,727,000	+38,226,000
Legislative branch	93,664,903	[2] 117,804,058	−4,692,875
Mutual Security	4,859,975,000	3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000
The supplemental, 1957	1,222,849,525	1,691,341,875	+436,977,350
Second supplemental, 1957	1,912,095,000	[3] 3,036,029,438	−458,023,600
Rescission of "Federal-aid highway" funds contained in other bills above		−875,000,000	−25,000,000
Net, second supplemental 1957	1,912,095,000	2,183,029,438	−433,023,600
Subtotal, fiscal year 1957	59,424,426,241	[3] 59,655,107,628	−545,729,181
II. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1956:			
Urgent deficiency, 1956	64,505,201	65,695,066	+1,189,865
Labor (Bureau of Employment Security)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	
Second supplemental, 1956	835,902,923	852,414,896	−25,721,631
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956 and prior	900,408,124	918,109,962	−24,531,766
III. Grand total, session	60,324,834,365	[4] 60,573,217,590	−570,260,947
Permanent appropriations (estimate)		7,564,859,833	
Grand total, regular annual supplemental, deficiency, and permanent		68,138,077,423	

[1] Includes $1,250,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[2] Includes $400,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[3] Includes $1,650,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[4] Does not include $1,200,000,000 contained in H. R. 10654, which the House did not act upon.
[5] Includes estimates of $1,150,500,000 and appropriations of $1,150,300,000 out of permanent highway trust fund, to reimburse general fund appropriation accounts for expenditures made subsequent to June 30, 1956, and such reimbursed appropriation accounts to be rescinded not later than June 30, 1957; public law column includes only $800,300,000 for such purpose.

Report to the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered it one of the duties of a Representative in Congress to keep the people of the district he represents informed about his activities and about the work of Congress. While Congress is in session, I send a letter from Washington to the newspapers of the district which is printed in most of them. During this Congress I have also made frequent radio and television reports. This year, as I have done before at the conclusion of a term of Congress, I have prepared a summary or report on this, the 84th Congress, and have included in it a summary of my own activities. In addition to presenting this report to the House now, I shall have reprints of it made which will be circulated as widely as possible in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, which I represent.

A DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

During the 2 years of this Congress the authority and responsibility for the operation of the Federal Government is divided. The executive branch of the Government which must administer the laws passed by Congress and operate the numerous executive agencies is headed by a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, with a Republican Cabinet. The Congress is controlled by the Democratic Party. Although the margin of control is only 1 vote in the Senate and 29 votes in the House, these majorities mean that all committees are not only headed by Democrats, but the committees are dominated by Democratic majorities. For example, the Rules Committee, of which I am a member, has 8 Democratic members and 4 Republicans. Although this is the largest majority control of any committee, the others have majorities sufficient to insure majority control.

As a practical matter then, with Congress controlled by one party and the administration by the other party, the element of politics inevitably becomes a part of most of the important actions of the Congress.

At the beginning of each Congress the President presents it with a statement of his ideas as to what legislation should be enacted. These suggestions are known as the President's program. When the President's party controls Congress, as it did in the first 2 years of this administration, the Republican Congress could and did go ahead and enact into law most of the President's program.

This Congress apparently could not, as a matter of practical politics, give such wholehearted support to an opposition administration. The record shows that it did not do so.

PARTS OF PROGRAM PASSED

On the other hand, in spite of the sharp party and political battles over legislation to carry out the President's program, the record of this Congress is fairly good. As I look over the record of the accomplishments of this 84th Congress, it is pleasing to note that many of the important items in the President's program were enacted into law. It is true that practically none of the recommendations of the President were followed exactly. In many instances the legislation which was passed, although dealing with the same subject, represents quite a different approach to the problem from that suggested by President Eisenhower.

For example, the President suggested a big, long-range highway improvement and construction program. The big program was approved by Congress, but in a completely different form which involves heavier taxes which will pay for the construction program as it is completed. The political battle over the highway bill, which failed of passage in the first session, caused a delay of more than a year in the beginning of the program.

The President suggested a farm program designed to reduce the enormous surplus of farm products which the Government owns and to withhold from production land which had been forced to produce food for war. It was necessary for the President to veto the first bill passed by this Congress. The final version which he accepted did not fully represent the program he recommended. The political struggle over the farm bill caused delay which was costly to the farmers.

Most of the President's program having to do with foreign policy was given bipartisan approval except the request for foreign aid.

The President recommended $4.9 billion, which was reduced by a billion in both the authorization and the appropriation bills.

A few of the President's recommendations were passed without material change. The Housing Act revision was quite similar to the President's request. The upper Colorado River reclamation project was authorized. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended. The minimum-wage law was amended to increase the hourly rate. Disaster assistance legislation which he recommended was enacted, including a flood-damage insurance program. The 10-year improvement and expansion program for the national parks, known now as Mission 66, was immediately approved, both with additional legislation and with appropriations.

Several recommendations made by President Eisenhower were not approved. He urged Federal assistance to help local school districts construct classrooms, to be in the form of credit support and grants-in-aid on a limited basis in distressed areas. After struggling with this recommendation for most of both sessions, a bill, which did not represent the President's recommendation but provided a large program of outright grants to all States irrespective of need, was rejected by the House.

Although the much discussed aid-to-education bill failed to pass, this Congress voted to continue two school assistance programs which have been very helpful in our congressional district. One provides money assistance for operation and maintenance to those districts where the school population has been swollen because of some Federal activity such as a large construction project, a military camp or logging in the national forest. The other program provides construction money for such districts. The Congress authorized a total of $368 million for the two programs during the present and next fiscal years.

His proposed health-insurance plan, which would make available to more people a prepayment plan for medical care, was not even taken up for consideration in this Congress.

OTHER LEGISLATION REJECTED

The administration recommended that Congress increase postage rates as a means of decreasing the huge deficit from operating the Post Office Department. The annual loss is about $500 million. The House passed a bill which, among other rate increases, would have boosted the charge for mailing a first-class letter from 3 cents to 4 cents. Although the Senate committee held hearings and had the bill prepared for action, it was not taken up by the Senate before adjournment. There will be no postage increase this year.

A large irrigation and reclamation project in Colorado known as the Frying-pan-Arkansas project, which had the approval of the administration, was killed by the House in a close rollcall vote.

The much discussed Hells Canyon high-dam proposal was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 51 to 41. It was not taken up for consideration by the House. A careful reading of the extensive Senate debate on the Hells Canyon bill reveals that many of the facts claimed as compelling virtues for the high-dam project were not facts at all. The waterpower resource of that stretch of the Snake River is being developed under a license issued to a power company by the Federal Power Commission. Most hydropower in the United States has been developed on that same basis. Such development has never before been referred to as a "giveaway" which is the political cry against the Hells Canyon decision.

In the closing days of Congress an attempt was made to pressure through the House a bill directing the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed at once on a program involving the expenditure of $400 million to build large atomic reactor plants for the purpose of producing electricity on a full-scale commercial basis. This scheme was opposed by the administration, by our military people, by the Atomic Energy Commission, and by several atomic scientists. It was urged only by one outstanding scientist and the Joint House-Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. On a rollcall vote the House sent the bill back to committee—in other words, killed it.

MY LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

Much of my own legislative activity was in the general field of conservation. The destruction of the fish runs in the Rogue River because of the lack of proper screens for the turbines and ditch outlets at Savage Rapids Dam has been a

serious and costly problem for several years. The project was too big to be undertaken under State law and since the dam is not strictly a Federal dam has not been eligible for the appropriation of Federal funds. To solve this problem I worked out proper authorization language and an appropriation item of $208,000 and was able to get both the authorization and the appropriation made in the 1957 public-works appropriations bill when it passed the House. Construction of the fish screens will begin soon.

For several years, since the value of standing timber on Government-owned land has increased so sharply, I have been endeavoring to secure the passage of legislation which would separate surface and subsurface rights on mining claims. In other words, the timber on a mining claim should remain the property of the Government when a mining claim is filed. My first success in this endeavor was with a bill of mine approved in 1948, when Congress enacted such a law protecting the timber on Oregon and California railroad grant lands in Oregon. In succeeding Congresses I worked in cooperation with other Members of the House in an effort to enact similar legislation for the protection of national forests and other public-domain lands. Until last year, when conflicting interests were brought together and an acceptable bill was passed, our efforts were plagued by conflicting committee jurisdictions and by a very sharp conflict between the mining industry and conservationists. The 1955 act is the first important change in the Federal mining claim laws to be made since 1872. It is one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation passed by Congress in many years.

Other conservation legislation included increased appropriations for forest recreation areas; authorizing legislation and appropriations for the Nation Park Service Mission 66 program; the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries and Wildlife; and a bill to authorize a research program on forest range and watershed management. Another piece of conservation legislation which I was glad to support was the bill which became Public Law 660, to increase Federal research grants to States and an expanded program for water-pollution control.

Legislation which I sponsored and which was passed by the House included the transfer of surplus land at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Roseburg to the city of Roseburg for use as a park. A bill for a comprehensive survey of the Rogue River Basin which I introduced in the House was incorporated in the omnibus flood-control bill but with slightly different language from that contained in my bill. A bill to convey a historical old house and its contents in Roseburg to the city of Roseburg for the Douglas County Historical Society was passed by the Congress.

PUBLIC-WORKS PROJECTS

We have numerous flood control, navigation, and irrigation projects in our Fourth Congressional District which must be constructed with Federal funds. During this Congress, as in previous years, I have worked diligently toward securing appropriations for these needed public works. Some of these projects are discussed in the following paragraphs:

Talent irrigation project: For 10 years or more the previous administrations worked on a survey of an irrigation plan for the Rogue River Basin. When the Eisenhower administration took over, the Department of the Interior Reclamation Bureau was directed by Secretary Douglas McKay to prepare and send to Congress a project report for the Talent division of the Rogue River reclamation survey. I immediately introduced a bill to authorize this $22 million project and in 1954 fought it through to final passage in the House, winning on a rollcall vote by the narrow margin of 19 votes. An appropriation for completion of the planning of the project was passed in 1955. The first big appropriation for construction of the project, $2,400,000, was budgeted by the President and approved by the Congress this year.

Coos Bay Harbor: Soon after the end of World War II, I sponsored the legislation necessary to deepen the inner harbor at Coos Bay and increase the depth over the bar to 40 feet. This legislation was passed promptly. Subsequently, the necessary appropriations were made by Congress and the project is now completed with the exception of the Charleston Small Boat Harbor, for the completion of which funds have been appropriated this year.

Harbor at Gold Beach: My bill to authorize the construction of a harbor at the mouth of Rogue River was passed by Congress in 1954. That project is needed badly as a water shipping outlet for the products of the Curry County area. It is now eligible for appropriations. I am making every possible effort to get planning and construction money for the Gold Beach Harbor included in the next budget.

Green Peter Dam: One of the three urgently needed dams for the Willamette Basin flood-control project, the Green Peter Dam on the South Santiam, is an alternate site for a main stem dam authorized in 1938. That authorization was for flood-control construction only. A better benefit-to-cost ratio could be obtained by redesigning the dam and including power, so in 1954 my bill to authorize the dam as a multiple-purpose project including power was passed. Planning of this dam under the new authorization is partially completed. In the public works appropriation bill this year $200,000 was included for that purpose.

Cougar Dam: The Cougar Dam on the McKenzie has substantially the same status as the Green Peter Dam. It, too, is an alternate dam for one authorized in 1938. Cougar Dam was also authorized for power in 1954 in legislation which I introduced and passed through the House. Planning for this dam has been completed. It is now under construction with $1,650,000 in the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

Partnership plan for Cougar and Green Peter: Three major units of the Willamette project are either under construction or in the advance planning stage—Cougar, Hills Creek, and Green Peter. The total estimated cost of these 3 projects is:

Cougar	$37,400,000
Hills Creek	32,300,000
Green Peter	58,365,000
Total	128,065,000

Since these dams are to be constructed almost simultaneously, it means that very large amounts must be appropriated annually for the next several years. In fact, the amounts necessary to complete construction of these projects at a maximum rate would be so large that they would tend to unbalance the annual public works appropriation bill in favor of the one river basin in Oregon, as compared with appropriations for projects in the other 47 States. It is evident, therefore, that if non-Federal money can be used on these projects along with appropriated funds, we stand a far better chance of having the projects completed at the earliest possible moment than if we are compelled to depend entirely upon annual appropriations made by Congress. For this reason, as well as because of the soundness of the partnership plan, I introduced in 1954 bills which would authorize the Federal Government to contract with local utilities in the Cougar and Green Peter areas for the construction of power facilities and the necessary reregulating dams for the Cougar and Green Peter projects.

In 1954 the partnership bill for Cougar passed the House without a dissenting voice, but was blocked in the Senate. The Green Peter partnership bill, which came up late in that year, did not reach House action in 1954. In 1955 I again introduced the partnership legislation, this time incorporating both Green Peter and Cougar Dams in one bill. The Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Commitete on Public Works favorably reported my partnership bill to the full committee. It was stopped there by political pressure.

The opposition is endeavoring to make of this partnership proposal a public power versus private power issue. They evidently think they can brainwash the people with the emotional appeal of the magic phrase "low-cost Federal power" in order to make votes in this election. The truth is that there is no public versus private power aspect to the Green Peter-Cougar partnership proposal. Regardless of how the dams are built, people will purchase their power from the same utility that they do now and at the same rates. All power produced in the Pacific Northwest goes through the Northwest power pool so that there can be no question of harming or disturbing the overall Northwest power program by the adoption of the partnership plan. Facts in both House and Senate committee hearings show that the publicly owned power system at Eugene, through partnership, would get power cheaper than it can be purchased from Bonneville.

Chetco Small-Boat Harbor: Several years ago I succeeded in getting a bill passed to authorize the construction of a small-boat harbor at the mouth of the Chetco River at Brookings. This year

$225,000 was appropriated for its construction.

Amazon project in Eugene: The growth of the city of Eugene has made necessary the control of Amazon Creek which runs through the city in order to prevent great annual damage from the flooding of this stream. I have been working on this project for several years. A substantial part of it is now completed. A new unit of it is under construction for which $100,000 was included in the public works appropriation bill this year.

Willamette Valley flood control project: The gigantic flood control project for the Willamette Basin which was first authorized in 1938 was somewhat delayed by World War II. Since I have been a Member of Congress, Dorena, Detroit, Fern Ridge, and Lookout Point dams have been constructed. As stated above, Hills Creek and Cougar are now under construction and Green Peter is in the planning stage. A total of $180 million has been appropriated for this project since I have been in Congress. I have worked each year for appropriations to keep the rate of construction on these projects at a high level.

Coos flood-control survey: My bill, H. R. 8074, in the 83d Congress, was passed, providing for a water use and flood control survey in the Coos County area. Protective works are needed but their nature and extent can only be determined by a proper survey. This year I have worked toward increasing the appropriation for such surveys.

APPROPRIATIONS THIS SESSION

This year the final appropriation figures for projects in our Fourth Congressional District are as follows:

Amazon Creek (Eugene)	$100,000
Chetco River Harbor	225,000
Coos Bay	300,000
Couger flood-control dam	1,650,000
Green Peter flood-control dam	200,000
Hills Creek flood-control dam	2,125,000
Holley Dam	100,000
Savage Rapids Dam fish screens	208,000
Talent irrigation project	2,400,000
Willamette River bank protection	300,000

In addition to the above appropriations for specific projects by name, the bill carries funds for flood-control surveys, rehabilitation money for two of the older irrigation districts in the Talent project, harbor maintenance money, and funds for small projects to be allocated by the Army engineers.

POWER DISTRIBUTION

Allocated for expenditure in the Fourth District for the current fiscal year by the Bonneville Administration for additions and improvement of transmission facilities is $4,158,000. This is the largest share of the Bonneville funds for any of Oregon's congressional districts. As I have consistently done in the past, I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee requesting these funds and others to improve power availability in Oregon.

To further distribution of power through rural electric cooperatives and for telephone cooperatives, the past Congress authorized appropriations for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 in the amount of $665,735,000. This makes a total of more than $2 billion in loan funds for REA that I have voted for since coming to Congress.

Allocations of funds to electric and telephone cooperatives serving the Fourth District from January 1955 to July 1956 were as follows:

Douglas Electric Cooperative (2 loans)	$150,000
Douglas Electric Cooperative	184,000
Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative	2,000,000
Lane County Electric Cooperative	339,000
Benton-Lincoln Cooperative	1,830,000
Pioneer Rural Telephone Cooperative	90,000
Pioneer Rural Telephone Cooperative (2 loans)	432,000
Total	5,025,000

THE POWER ISSUE

Briefly stated, my policy, which is also administration and Republican policy, regarding Northwest power development is that far more generating capacity is needed in the Northwest than can or will be built entirely at Federal expense. Approximately $100 million annually, or 20 to 30 percent of the entire Federal appropriations for multiple-purpose power development has been approved by Congress for the Pacific Northwest States. At least three times this amount must be spent annually to provide additional power. We favor the construction of power generators with capital from all sources—Federal-State, local REA's public-utility districts or individuals. Unless the economic development of the Northwest is to come to a halt, we must have more electrical energy at the rate of 500,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity each year.

I, and Republicans generally, have supported appropriations for the Bonneville system, for the Big Columbia River Dams, for the Hills Creek, Lookout Point, Detroit, and other Federal project dams which include power. The partnership proposal for Green Peter and Cougar is merely designed to provide $40 million in supplemental local funds available to speed completion of these projects and relieve the people of the average annual $2 million in flood losses.

ACCESS ROADS

An expanded program of timber access road construction is sorely needed for the proper management of the national forests in our district. I have been battling on this subject every year. The first favorable break came in the passage of the Highway Construction Act of 1954 by the 83d Congress. That law not only increased the authorization for access roads—Forest Service roads and trails—to $22,500,000 but permitted funds to be obligated over a 3-year period, thus permitting fairly long-range planning.

When the Public Works Committee had the highway bill under consideration last year and again this year, I urged that the authorization be increased to $25 million with that sum earmarked for construction, plus another $10 million for annual maintenance. The previous authorizations have not separated construction and maintenance. The House committee did not go all the way, but it did increase the total figure to $27 million. It passed the House in that form.

The Senate committee struck out the House increase and sent the bill to the Senate floor with the 1954 figure unchanged. Fortunately, Republican Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, supported by other Senate Republicans, was able to secure the passage by the Senate of an amendment which restored the House access road figure and added to the amount for forest highways. The Barrett amendment increases were approved in conference and the higher figures are in the law.

MINING DEVELOPMENT

With the establishment of the Bureau of Mines Electrometallurgical Laboratory which former Senator McNary and I were able to have located at Albany, there has been an expanded interest in the development of mining and smelting in our district. The Albany laboratory developed the first commercially successful method of production of zirconium metal, essential in atomic industry. Private production of zirconium for the Government continues to provide employment for people in Albany. Two new industries now employing hundreds of men are in operation: The Hanna Co., at Riddle, mining and smelting nickel from the low-grade ore of Nickel Mountain; and the Apex Manufacturing Co., at Springfield, which is reducing aluminum from native clay.

Had it not been for congressional interference almost to the point of persecution under the guise of a committee investigation, I believe the old Buzzard Mine, in Jackson County, now known as the Al Sarena Mine, might be in production on up to a 10,000-ton-a-day basis and providing considerable employment.

For more than 50 years the area in which the Al Sarena property is located has been known as a mineralized area yielding gold, silver, lead, and zinc. Reliable estimates place the ore body of the Al Sarena Mine at 150 million tons or more. Some $200,000 has been spent on development of the property in tunnels, buildings, and mining equipment. A 100-ton mill was installed to make experimental runs to determine the ore values. I am informed that the owners had intended, when the patents were granted and financing could be arranged, to spend several hundred thousand dollars in core drillings and "blocking out" the ore body, whereupon, according to usual mining procedure, the financing of some $5 million for the major development could be done. The mineowners were made the victims of a vicious political attack, aimed at the administration, which slandered and maligned them. They were compelled to temporarily abandon their plans for commercial development, thus delaying into the future a needed payroll industry for Oregon. The congressional investigation served only to prove the falsity and fiction of so-called "charges" and their political origins.

It is possible that the attack on the Al Sarena people may have created a climate in Oregon which might make other potential development in doubt.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The House of Representatives passed a number of bills to provide adjustment

in payments to veterans to make such payments more in line with the present value of the dollar. These bills would have increased payments for non-service-connected veterans who are unable to support themselves and would have likewise increased payments for veterans who suffered service-connected disabilities. Spanish-American War veterans' widows' pensions were also increased in legislation passed by the House.

The Senate failed to act on any of these veterans' bills before the adjournment of Congress, thus none of them became law.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As finally passed by both Houses and sent to the President, amendments to the Social Security Act added compulsory coverage for osteopaths but left doctors and Government employees as the only major groups not covered under the social-security law. The new law would also permit women to draw reduced benefits at the age of 62. Widows at that age would receive full benefits. Provision is also made for payments for total disability at age 50 and after.

The payroll tax levied on the first $4,200 of annual income, now 2 percent for employer and employee, will be increased January 1 to 2¼ percent. The tax on self-employed will be increased from 3 percent to 3⅜ percent.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In all, a total of 16,782 bills were introduced in this 84th Congress. Of this number about 1,900 were passed by both Houses and sent to the President. In this report it is not possible to discuss dozens of other items of beneficial legislation, but I shall be glad to answer inquiries concerning any of these bills.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

During this session of Congress the roll has been called 132 times in the House of Representatives. Fifty-nine of these rollcalls were simple quorum calls and 73 were record votes on legislation. My attendance record is one of the best of any Member of the House. I missed only one vote and it was on a bill having to do with the District of Columbia. I missed only 3 of the 59 quorum calls.

I had first thought to include the details of my voting record in this report, but space will not permit. However, I shall be glad to furnish such information to anyone who desires it.

TO NATO CONFERENCE

Your Congressman received a nice honor which was announced just a few hours before Congress adjourned. Speaker SAM RAYBURN named me as one of nine House members who, with nine Senators, will represent the United States Congress in the parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations. The conference will be held in Paris beginning November 19. Our delegation is being sent to this conference pursuant to a joint resolution passed by Congress a few weeks ago. The future course of NATO is a matter of very serious consideration in all of the member governments. The Paris Conference promises to be one of considerable importance.

YEAR-ROUND SERVICE

The Washington office of your Congressman is kept open year round whether Congress is in session or not. Our office is a busy place. Mail will average about 50 letters a day. Many people from Oregon visit my office every year. We are always glad to see them because they bring news from home. I have been called upon many times for assistance by our State, county, and local officials and by veterans and others in connection with their problems with the Federal Government.

I am always glad to be of help in any way that I can. I welcome letters commenting upon legislation and expressing opinions. I hope the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon feel free to call upon me at any time if they think I can be of help to them. While I shall have an office at 217 Pacific Building in Roseburg during adjournment, letters will always reach me if addressed: Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Seizure of Suez Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the action of dictator Nasser in seizing the Suez Canal is another example of our ridiculous policy of buying friends with money. If any nation should be grateful to America, that nation is Egypt. When Rommel was knocking at the gates of Cairo with his Nazi and fascist legions, it was America and Britain who came to her rescue. Since the war, the United States has poured millions into Egypt in the form of economic and military aid. Now, because we did not advance the money to build the Aswan Dam on her terms, Dictator Nasser is ready to join up with Russia and possibly start another world war. If the United States had not sent her a single dollar, I believe she would be much more friendly to us today. The same will eventually be true of the whole free world. One by one they will kick us in the teeth when they find out that our money is running out.

Korea should be an example to our policymakers. How many friends came to our aid in Korea? The whole effort was negligible outside of the United States and South Korea. Mr. Speaker, with our billions and billions, we have only bought hatred, distrust, envy, and jealousy. We have helped others at the expense of our own solvency and national security.

There are many ill fed and ill clothed people throughout the world. We as a nation of surplus commodities can and should help these people but this should be done through the Salvation Army, Red Cross, church groups, and international relief organizations. These organizations are free of politics and are trained and equipped to administer aid directly. The people receiving this aid would know that it was not politically inspired and was not sent as a selfish means of helping America but sent through brotherly love and from the heart of our people.

In opposing foreign aid, I have always urged that we adopt an alternative plan, spend our money on a giant air force, guided missile program, research and development. If we had done this the last 10 years, we would have friends in every section of the world. We would be strong and powerful and nations throughout the world would be anxious to be our allies. Yet we have followed this policy of buying friends and we have failed. We have failed at the expense of our own security. The Russians are turning out more technicians than we are, which is the key to the cold war. It is not too late yet to divert our money to science, engineering, training for technicians, guided missiles, and overwhelming airpower. If we lose the battle of research and development, we will lose the war. By pouring out our money to other nations, we are contributing to their eventual downfall by contributing to our own weakness. The only protection the free world has is a strong America developing annually superior weapons and superior technicians to any other nation. If we scatter these resources all over the world, we will weaken ourselves and weaken the free world.

Mr. Speaker, let us at the next session of the Congress abandon this policy of spending and appeasement, and initiate a strong offensive policy that will win the respect and admiration of the whole world.

Mackinac Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn the Congress and return to our respective homes many will be seeking a rendezvous where complete rest and relaxation may be found before entering the fall campaign.

Foremost among the historic shrines of the world and equally as outstanding as a vacation spot is Mackinac Island in the straits of Mackinac just off the tip of Michigan's lower peninsula. Wonders of nature, scenic splendor, historic sights everywhere, and an alluring quaintness provide interests for all.

The island is a State park in which historic places and scenic beauty have been retained. Cars are prohibited, and in their place are horse-drawn carriages of various types and a variety of self-propelled cycles, all of which provide a rare atmosphere of carefree enjoyment.

Fort Mackinac, built in 1780 by the British and used as a stronghold in their battle to retain America in the Revolution and again in the War of 1812, stands in its original state, high above the waters of the straits, but visitors have replaced the warriors that paraded across

its grounds more than 160 years ago. Over the years the island has been held by Britain, France, and America.

Here on Mackinac Island you will find the new rearmament assembly center, which has just been completed. Also, you will find the nationally known Grand Hotel, claiming the longest porch in the world, offering elegant accommodations.

In behalf of Mackinac Island I extend an invitation to each and every Member of Congress to seek this beautiful island as their rendezvous.

Detroit Airport Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Government Operations Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia, held 17 days of hearings and issued a report on the Government's handling of aviation problems.

Included in those hearings was an examination of administration of Federal airport aid funds in the Detroit metropolitan area.

At my request the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics prepared a table showing allocation of funds to various airports in the State of Michigan for a 10-year period, 1947 to 1957. For those interested in aviation matters and particularly for my colleagues from Michigan, I incorporate that tabulation at this point in my remarks, together with the cover letter from C. J. Lowen, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, dated July 20, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that one airport in the State of Michigan received in that 10-year period $6,011,472, or 49.4 percent of the total of $12,146,227, which the whole State of Michigan received in that period. This is more remarkable when it is realized that only one scheduled air carrier has been using the Detroit-Wayne major airport, the recipient of this Federal bounty, namely, Pan American World Airways, which within the last 3 years has commenced scheduled flights, never exceeding one a day, into the Wayne County landing field.

Meanwhile Willow Run Airport, which has served for the past 10 years as the air passenger terminal for Detroit, has received $150,031—1.2 percent—of the Michigan total for that decade.

Mr. Speaker, the question naturally arises, under what philosophy of Federal aid has the bulk of Michigan's allocations of airport aid funds gone to an airport which has practically no scheduled airline traffic?

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, July 20, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: In accordance with a telephone request from your office to Mr. Merle W. Hemphill, Deputy Director, Office of Airports, there is enclosed a summary by years and locations of the Federal-aid airport program in the State of Michigan for fiscal years 1947 through 1957.

If we may be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. LOWEN,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Federal-aid airport program, State of Michigan, fiscal years 1947–53 and 1955–57

City	1947		1948		1949		1950		1951	
	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost
Adrian	$19,500	$18,133								
Alma									[1] $9,500	$8,990
Ann Arbor	91,469	[2] 0								
Bad Axe	30,000	23,111								
Battle Creek					$40,000	$19,805				
Bay City	82,750	50,000								
Benton Harbor-St. Joseph	75,000	42,000								
Boyne City	4,775	[2] 0	$225	[2] 0						
Cadillac	22,000	32,474								
Coldwater	25,000	16,180								
Crystal Falls										
Detroit City					150,000	149,728			[1] 17,500	[2] 0
Detroit-Wayne-Major			240,000	$528,617	1,061,600	1,030,641	$1,000,000	[3] $1,407,810	500,000	488,820
Detroit-Willow Run										
Dowagiac										
East Tawas-Tawas City										
Escanaba	20,000	20,000	15,000	13,991			22,000	39,898		
Flint			55,000	57,448					100,000	215,233
Fremont					10,000	5,923				
Grand Haven	44,250	47,350								
Grand Marais	116,500	[2] 0								
Grand Rapids			100,000	110,931					102,000	85,354
Greenville										
Hart	10,375	11,041								
Holland			15,000	[2] 0						
Houghton	312,680	290,524	28,320	2,461						
Howell	19,000	[2] 0								
Indian River	6,250	[2] 0								
Iron Mountain	45,000	45,000					45,000	26,896		
Ironwood	32,500	51,438			25,000	14,850	32,500	2,351		
Jackson					4,000	2,982	77,000	47,697		
Kalamazoo	51,375	12,785								
Lakeview	10,100	[2] 0							[1] 9,400	7,321
Lansing			75,000	123,731	20,000	20,000	75,000	[3] 106,900	75,000	52,261
Ludington	14,500	14,500	7,000	4,750						
Manistee										
Marquette	43,000	50,000							8,500	5,969
Menominee			65,000	65,000					9,000	4,824
Midland	47,972	60,000	12,028	14,960			[1] 7,100	9,030		
Monroe	20,500	30,572								
Montague	7,400	[2] 0								
Mount Pleasant										
Muskegon			70,000	70,000	70,000	[3] 120,128				
Niles	27,450	59,632	[1] 72,550	39,151						
Northport					7,100	[2] 0				
Owosso			40,000	75,430						
Pellston							20,000	28,191		
Pontiac					40,000	27,861				
Port Huron	65,000	89,143			20,000	24,365				
Saginaw Bay City									7,150	11,974
St. Ignace	11,500	(2)								
Sault Ste. Marie	75,000	(2)								
Sebewaing							[1] 10,100	6,905		
South Haven					15,000	15,116				
Sturgis					10,000	18,487				
Three Rivers	10,500	10,500	7,000	6,088						
Traverse City							10,000	7,897		
Watervliet	12,881	13,893								
Total	1,354,227	988,276	802,123	1,112,558	1,472,700	1,449,886	1,298,700	1,683,375	838,050	880,746

See footnotes at end of table.

Federal-aid airport program, State of Michigan, fiscal years 1947–53 and 1955–57—Continued

City	1952		1953		1955		1956		1957 allocation	Total Federal funds obligated or allocated	Percent State total
	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost			
Adrain									$19,000	$37,133	0.3
Alma										8,990	.1
Ann Arbor							$55,000	(3)	9,000	[4] 64,000	.5
Bad Axe							28,000	(3)	7,250	[4] 58,361	.5
Battle Creek							100,000	(3)		[4] 119,805	1.0
Bay City										50,000	.4
Benton Harbor-St. Joseph					[1] $50,000	(3)	51,589	(3)	90,000	[4] 233,589	1.9
Boyne City										0	
Cadillac										32,474	.3
Coldwater							40,000	(3)		[4] 56,180	.5
Crystal Falls							50,000	(3)		[3] 50,000	.4
Detroit City										149,728	1.2
Detroit-Wayne-Major	$250,000	$345,306	$170,000	$154,664	80,000	$80,000	975,614	(3)	1,000,000	[4] 6,011,472	49.4
Detroit-Willow Run			74,000	70,031	100,000	80,000				150,031	1.2
Dowagiac									24,000	24,000	.2
East Tawas-Tawas City									23,000	23,000	.2
Escanaba							40,000	(3)	87,500	[4] 201,389	1.7
Flint			30,000	33,000	60,000	(3)	25,000	(3)	40,000	[4] 430,681	3.5
Fremont										5,923	.1
Grand Haven							10,000	(3)	10,000	[4] 67,350	.6
Grand Marais										0	
Grand Rapids	210,000	222,796	75,000	[3] 88,000	190,000	[3] 165,000	150,000	(3)		[4] 822,081	6.8
Greenville							21,000	(3)		[3] 21,000	.2
Hart										11,041	.1
Holland										0	
Houghton									25,000	317,985	2.6
Howell										0	
Indian River										0	
Iron Mountain			5,000	4,905			40,000	(3)	29,000	[4] 145,801	1.2
Ironwood							25,000	(3)	5,000	[4] 98,639	.8
Jackson									94,000	144,679	1.2
Kalamazoo							89,500	(3)	80,000	[4] 182,285	1.5
Lakeview										7,321	.1
Lansing	70,000	[3] 70,000	70,000	[3] 62,400	100,000	[3] 66,000	375,000	(3)	153,000	1,029,292	8.3
Ludington										19,250	.2
Manistee							10,000	(3)		10,000	.1
Marquette									45,000	100,969	.8
Menominee							7,200	(3)		[4] 77,024	.6
Midland										83,990	.7
Monroe							6,000	(3)		[4] 36,572	.3
Montague										0	
Mount Pleasant									50,000	50,000	.4
Muskegon			20,000	[3] 20,000	21,530	[3] 65,530	50,000	(3)	80,000	405,658	3.4
Niles									50,000	148,783	1.2
Northport										0	
Owosso										75,430	.6
Pellston										28,191	.2
Pontiac					[1] 5,901	[3] 5,901	138,000	(3)	31,500	[4] 203,262	1.7
Port Huron							10,000	(3)		[4] 123,508	1.0
Saginaw Bay City							55,000	(3)		[4] 66,974	.6
St. Ignace							37,000	(3)		37,000	.3
Sault Ste. Marie										0	
Sebewaing										6,905	.1
South Haven										15,116	.1
Sturgis									29,500	47,987	.4
Three Rivers									17,000	33,588	.3
Traverse City										7,897	.1
Watervliet										13,893	.1
Total	530,000	638,102	444,000	433,000	607,431	462,431	2,388,903		1,998,750	12,146,227	100.0

[1] Added during year.
[2] Canceled.
[3] Active project.
[4] Some projects still active.

Senator Tom Wofford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I cannot leave for South Carolina without paying tribute to South Carolina's junior Senator, the Honorable TOM WOFFORD. Gov. George Bell Timmerman made a wise choice in his selection of TOM WOFFORD to represent South Carolina since the resignation of Senator Thurmond in April. Senator WOFFORD in these short months made many friends and admirers on both sides of the Capitol and in both political parties.

Senator WOFFORD ably upheld the principles, ideals, and traditions of the Founding Fathers of this Republic and the great leaders of South Carolina history. He was most cooperative and worked with the other members of the delegation as a team. Senator WOFFORD in his service here was modest, did not seek the headlines, but worked quietly and efficiently for his State and his country.

I hope Senator WOFFORD will not retire from public life but will again someday offer his service to our people. I wish him, his splendid wife, and lovely family the best always.

Need for Thorough Study of the National Banking Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has the slightest familiarity with the Federal statutes regulating national banks must agree that it is high time that all of those statutes were reviewed, clarified, and brought up to date.

Since January 1953, under the aegis of the big banking interests of the country, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, there has been a constant whittling away at the Federal statutes so as to strike down many of the safeguards written into the law after the bank holiday of 1933.

All of the bad practices that were disclosed as a result of the depression and the bankruptcies which came in and after that period are again being encouraged. In the last few years, under the sponsorship of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, laws were enacted affecting the qualifications of national bank directors; lessening the number of required bank examinations; lifting the requirement for the filing of stockholders lists with the Comptroller of the Currency; and extending and broadening the lending authority of national banks.

A review of the testimony and reports of these Government officials in connection with those bills, together with that which came from them with reference to the bank holding company bill and the attempt to enact S. 256 to eliminate cumulative voting, plus their resistance to regulation of bank stock proxy solicitation, supports the conclusion that this is all part of a pattern to weaken our national banking system and to vest complete control thereof in the hands of the big moneyed interests of the country.

On July 7, 1955, I introduced House Resolution 303, calling for a study of all of these matters. It has received no attention. On July 20, 1956, I offered a motion in executive session of the House Banking and Currency Committee for the appointment of a subcommittee to study all of these problems. The motion was pending at the time the executive session was recessed and there has been no executive session of the committee held since.

Today I wrote to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee as follows:

JULY 27, 1956.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Several of the members of our committee are very much concerned, as I am, that we have failed to investigate the activities of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is managed by a bipartisan Board of Directors of three members. By law, the Comptroller of the Currency is one of those Board members. Since 1953, the Comptroller of the Currency, Ray M. Gidney, and the Chairman of the Board, H. Earl Cook, have been members of the Republican Party, and the third member, Maple T. Harl, has been a Democrat.

It appears to us that the FDIC has been dominated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chairman of the Board. On several occasions, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Board have made statements on behalf of the FDIC without consulting the third member of the Board.

This matter needs thorough investigation to determine to what extent this has occurred. Our attention has been directed to other very serious violations of the law concurred in, or acquiesced in, by Comptroller Gidney and Chairman Cook. To mention but a few—

1. The discharge of an attorney who had tenure resulting in a lawsuit brought by that attorney which has been settled by the payment of $22,500.

2. The employment of not 1, but 2, outside firms of attorneys to defend that suit while at the same time using counsel and attorneys of FDIC to do the same thing.

3. Waste of FDIC funds in that connection.

4. Continuance of an employee, to wit, the chief examiner, on annual leave beyond the time permitted by law.

5. Authorizing, if not instigating, the collection of a substantial fund from employees, for a gift presented to the chief examiner, in violation of law.

6. The waste of funds by giving of cocktail parties and dinners to bankers at the expense of FDIC. We are told that there has been at least one such function in each of the years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

7. The reorganization of a national bank in Chicago by forcing the sale of the stock to the Illinois State auditor who in turn placed his dummy in charge of the organization as the president, as a result of which he was able to cash State checks, improperly drawn to fictitious payees, converting the funds to his own use.

8. Operating the offices of Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the benefit of big bankers and big banks, forcing smaller banks out of business by sale of assets or merger into the largest banks, and preventing the merger of smaller banks which seek to compete with the larger banks.

9. Violating the law by permitting corporations to organize banks, using dummies as individual stockholders.

10. The Comptroller of the Currency, ever since his appointment as comptroller, has been drawing his full salary of $17,500 per year while at the same time time drawing a pension from the Federal Reserve System in excess of $12,800 a year.

We have every reason to believe that the foregoing charges hardly begin to scratch the surface.

We ask that you immediately designate a subcommittee to investigate all of these problems.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

These matters are all of extreme importance and they should be inquired into without further delay.

Voting Record of Hon. Charles A. Boyle, of Illinois, in the 2d Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record in the 2d session of the 84th Congress:

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE of Illinois in the 2d sess. of the 84th Cong.

Date	Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote of CHARLES A. BOYLE	Vote on issue
Jan. 3, 1956	1	Quorum call	Present	376 Members present.
Jan. 26, 1956	2	do	do	332 Members present.
Jan. 31, 1956	3	Rollcall, gas tax on farms	Yea	387 yeas, 0 nays.
Do	4	Rollcall, funds for Committee on Un-American Activities	do	385 yeas, 1 nay.
Feb. 1, 1956	5	H. R. 7993, to authorize construction of certain naval vessels	do	358 yeas, 3 nays.
Feb. 2, 1956	6	Quorum	Present	367 Members present.
Feb. 8, 1956	7	Rollcall, H. Res. 396, re sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant (rubber) (resolution condemned sale).	Yea	61 yeas, 309 nays.
Feb. 20, 1956	8	Rollcall, H. R. 8710, to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947	do	372 yeas, 2 nays.
Feb. 28, 1956	9	Quorum call	Present	347 Members present.
Do	10	H. Res. 311, for rule on H. R. 3383 (Colorado River project)	Yea	354 yeas, 26 nays, 53 not voting.
Do	11	Quorum call	Present	376 present.
Feb. 29, 1956	12	do	do	400 present.
Mar. 1, 1956	13	do	do	392 present.
Do	14	H. R. 3383, Colorado River project (on passage)	Nay	256 yeas, 136 nays.
Mar. 7, 1956	15	H. R. 9739, request for a separate vote on the Dowdy amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the GSA.	Yea	150 yeas, 231 nays, 52 not voting.
Mar. 13, 1956	16	H. R. 9166, extends for 1 year the present corporate income tax rate and the present tax on liquor and certain other excises.	do	366 yeas, 4 nays, 63 not voting.
Mar. 20, 1956	17	Quorum	Present	384 Members present.
Mar. 21, 1956	18	do	do	408 Members present.
Do	19	Conference report on H. R. 8320, to amend agricultural act with respect to the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.	Nay	195 yeas, 215 nays.
Do	20	To concur with Senate amendments to H. R. 8320	Yea	406 yeas, 0 nays.
Do	21	Motion to recommit H. Res. 432, to authorize appointment of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge to civilian position in Department of Justice (Immigration).	Nay	80 yeas, 310 nays.
Apr. 11, 1956	22	Quorum	Present	410 present.
Do	23	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 12 (farm bill)	Nay	181 yeas, 238 nays.
Do	24	Conference report on H. R. 12 (farm bill)	Yea	237 yeas, 181 nays.
Apr. 12, 1956	25	H. R. 9893, to authorize certain construction at military installations	do	377 yeas, 3 nays.
Apr. 18, 1956	26	Quorum	Present	406 Members present.
Do	27	H. R. 12 on President's veto of the farm bill	Nay	202 yea, 211 nays.
Apr. 23, 1956	28	H. R. 7228 for bridge over Potomac River at Jones Point	Yea	284 yeas, 8 nays.
Apr. 24, 1956	29	Quorum	Present	309 Members present.
Do	30	do	do	299 Members present.
Do	31	do	do	292 Members present.
Do	32	do	do	298 Members present.
Apr. 25, 1956	33	do	do	375 Members present.
Do	34	H. R. 10721, State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations on amendment fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of Department of Immigration.	Nay	179 yeas, 184 nays.
Apr. 27, 1956	35	Quorum	Present	384 Members present.
Do	36	H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956	Yea	388 yeas, 19 nays.

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE of Illinois in the 2d sess. of the 84th Cong.—Continued

Date	Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote of CHARLES A. BOYLE	Vote on issue
May 2, 1956	37	Quorum	Present	
May 3, 1956	38	do	do	393 Members present.
Do	39	H. R. 10875, agriculture bill, Albert's amendment to include $50,000,000 for grazing lands	Nay	199 yeas, 195 nays.
Do	40	H. R. 10875, amendment to maintain price support for 1956 crop of upland cotton at 84 percent of parity	do	186 yeas, 208 nays.
Do	41	H. R. 10875, amendment to make 50 percent prepayment on 1957 crop in 1956	do	184 yeas, 211 nays.
Do	42	H. R. 10875, on the passage of the bill	Yea	314 yeas, 78 nays.
May 9, 1956	43	Quorum	Present	
Do	44	do	do	
May 10, 1956	45	do	do	
Do	46	H. R. 10986, defense appropriation bill for 1957. Amendment on sec. 633 (question of striking out).	Yea	222 yeas, 156 nays.
Do	47	H. R. 10986, on passage of the bill	do	377 yeas, 0 nays.
May 16, 1956	48	Quorum	Present	359 Members present.
Do	49	do	do	341 Members present.
May 17, 1956	50	H. R. 8901, mass transportation in the District of Columbia, motion to recommit	Yea	161 yeas, 172 nays.
May 21, 1956	51	Quorum	Present	291 Members present.
Do	52	H. R. 11124, annuities for widows and dependent children of Federal judges	Yea	238 yeas, 52 nays.
May 22, 1956	53	H. R. 11319, public works appropriation bill, 1957 on Abernethy amendment to provide $160,000 for resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.	do	179 yeas, 140 nays.
May 23, 1956	54	H. R. 10875, conference report on farm bill	do	304 yeas, 59 nays.
May 24, 1956	55	S. J. Res. 135, conference report for providing payment to Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project.	do	176 yeas, 126 nays.
May 31, 1956	56	H. R. 10285, Farm Credit Act of 1956	do	246 yeas, 4 nays.
June 6, 1956	57	Quorum call	Present	359 Members present.
Do	58	do	do	311 Members present.
June 7, 1956	59	do	do	379 Members present.
June 8, 1956	60	do	do	345 Members present.
Do	61	do	do	299 Members present.
June 11, 1956	62	do	do	388 Members present.
Do	63	H. R. 11356, Mutual Security Act of 1956, on passage	Yea	275 yeas, 122 nays, 2 present.
Do	64	Quorum call	Present	391 Members present.
Do	65	H. R. 1840, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination on passage of the bill.	Yea	393 yeas, 3 nays.
June 12, 1956	66	Quorum call	Present	358 Members present.
Do	67	do	do	350 Members present.
Do	68	do	do	351 Members present.
June 13, 1956	69	H. R. 5881, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. On motion to recommit the conference report.	Nay	179 yeas, 209 nays.
Do	70	H. R. 4090, amending Communications Act of 1934. On motion to recommit the bill	do	151 yeas, 228 nays.
Do	71	H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, on motion to recommit.	do	165 yeas, 213 nays.
Do	72	H. R. 9540, on passage of bill	Yea	338 yeas, 31 nays.
June 20, 1956	73	Quorum call	Present	382 Members present.
June 25, 1956	74	do	do	328 Members present.
Do	75	S. 3295, extend to last Sunday in October daylight savings time in the District of Columbia	Yea	199 yeas, 120 nays, 1 present.
June 27, 1956	76	Quorum call	Present	411 Members present.
Do	77	H. R. 7886, veterans bill on motion to recommit	Nay	110 yeas, 305 nays.
Do	78	H. R. 7886, veterans bill on passage	Yea	364 yeas, 51 nays, 1 present.
June 28, 1956	79	Quorum call	Present	394 Members present.
Do	80	do	do	394 Members present.
Do	81	H. R. 9852, extension of Defense Production Act of 1950, on adoption of conference report	Nay	200 yeas, 197 nays.
Do	82	H. Res. 554, on H. R. 7535, school construction bill, on passage of resolution for consideration of bill.	Yea	327 yeas, 67 nays.
June 29, 1956	83	Quorum call	Present	343 Members present.
Do	84	do	do	
July 2, 1956	85	H. R. 9801, authorizing construction of bridge over Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.	Yea	325 yeas, 59 nays.
Do	86	S. 2379, training of fishing industry personnel, passage of bill	do	254 yeas, 133 nays.
July 3, 1956	87	Quorum call	Present	363 Members present.
July 5, 1956	88	do	do	385 Members present.
Do	89	H. R. 7535, school construction bill, on Gwinn amendment of allowing States to retain 1 percent of Federal income taxes for school construction.	Nay	168 yeas, 250 nays.
Do	90	H. R. 7535, on Powell amendment to allow no funds to any State which fails to comply with decisions of Supreme Court.	Yea	225 yeas, 192 nays.
Do	91	H. R. 7535, on motion to recommit	Nay	158 yeas, 262 nays.
Do	92	H. R. 7535, on passage of bill	Yea	194 yeas, 224 nays.
July 6, 1956	93	Quorum call	Present	394 Members present.
Do	94	H. R. 11830, to increase postal rates, on passage of bill	Nay	217 yeas, 165 nays.
July 9, 1956	95	H. R. 9893, Military Construction Act of 1956, on conference report, on motion to recommit	do	29 yeas, 343 nays.
Do	96	H. R. 11967, on National Memorial Stadium, on passage of bill	do	287 yeas. 80 nays.
July 11, 1956	97	Quorum call	Present	377 Members present.
Do	98	H. R. 12130, mutual security appropriation bill for 1957, on passage of conference report	Yea	284 yeas, 120 nays.
July 12, 1956	99	H. Res. 584, on H. R. 12138, supplemental appropriation, 1957	do	361 yeas, 30 nays.
Do	100	H. R. 12138, supplemental appropriation, 1957, on motion to recommit	Nay	24 yeas, 370 nays.
Do	101	H. R. 12038, to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances on passage of bill.	Yea	391 yeas, 0 nays.
July 17, 1956	102	Quorum call	Present	379 Members present.
July 18, 1956	103	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of Communist China into United Nations.	Yea	391 yeas, 0 nays.
Do	104	H. R. 11708, to increase from $1,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000, the total amount of the foreign currency transactions for distribution of surplus commodities.	do	389 yeas, 6 nays.
July 19, 1956	105	Quorum	Present	398 Members present.
Do	106	Motion to lay on table move that further proceedings be dispensed with	Nay	104 yeas, 290 nays.
July 20, 1956	107	Quorum	Present	400 Members present.
July 21, 1956	108	do	Absent	261 Members present.
July 23, 1956	109	do	Present	399 Members present.
Do	110	H. R. 627, Civil Rights Act of 1956, on a motion to recommit	Nay	131 yeas, 275 nays.
Do	111	H. R. 627, Civil Rights Act of 1956, on passage	Yea	279 yeas, 126 nays.
Do	112	S. 1644, the Federal Construction Contract Act, on suspending the rules and passing the bill (⅔ majority needed).	do	245 yeas, 145 nays.
Do	113	H. R. 12227, amending certain wool import duties to suspend the rules and pass the bill	do	216 yeas, 123 nays.
July 24, 1956	114	Quorum	Present	379 Members present.
Do	115	H. R. 7992, enacting certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act on passage.	Yea	201 yeas, 185 nays.
Do	116	H. R. 12061, providing for a civilian atomic-power-acceleration program on striking out the enacting clause.	Nay	195 yeas, 199 nays.
Do	117	H. R. 12061, atomic-power-acceleration program, on motion to recommit	do	203 yeas, 191 nays.
July 25, 1956	118	Quorum	Present	382 Members present.
Do	119	H. R. 11742, housing bill, on amendment to strike out title V authorizing public housing	Nay	92 yeas, 299 nays.
Do	120	H. Res. 638, to cite for contempt of Congress Arthur Miller	Yea	373 yeas, 9 nays.
July 26, 1956	121	Quorum	Present	380 Members present.
Do	122	do	do	374 Members present.
Do	123	H. R. 412, Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, on H. Res. 641	Nay	179 yeas, 194 nays.
Do	124	H. Res. 602, to consider H. R. 8902, relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from the sale or other disposition of certain property.	Yea	184 yeas, 178 nays.
Do	125	H. R. 8902, relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from the sale or other disposition of certain property, on motion to recomment.	do	196 yeas, 153 nays.

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE of Illinois in the 2d sess. of the 84th Cong.—Continued

Date	Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote of CHARLES A. BOYLE	Vote on issue
July 27, 1956	126	Quorum	Present	336 Members present.
Do	127	H. Res. 625, for consideration of S. 3338, relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.	Yea	219 yeas, 126 nays.
Do	128	S. 3338, relating to rates charged for electric power, on passage	do	201 yeas, 140 nays.
Do	129	Quorum	Present	337 Members present.
Do	130	do	do	339 Members present.
Do	131	H. Res. 604, to bring up H. R. 7850, Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho	Nay	173 yeas, 168 nays.
Do	132	Quorum	Present	327 Members present.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK. T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as the elected Representative of Ohio's 16th Congressional District, it is my duty once again to report to the people of Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne Counties on my activities in their behalf and in behalf of good government. With the close of another session of Congress, I want to thank the thousands of citizens who have sent me their views on the many important issues Congress has considered. Government is everybody's business and our system of government works best when every citizen takes an active interest in its operations, voting in each election and expressing his opinions to his representatives for their guidance and the guidance of the Republic. Sixteenth District citizens have demonstrated that they appreciate these facts.

This report calls attention to the complexity of our district as it is reflected in the work of the Congressman. We have the richest agricultural county in Ohio, the largest concentration of clay industries in America, one of the Nation's most important centers of diversified industry, splendid coal resources, one of the world's outstanding watershed conservation projects, and many other interests that bring us into daily contact with the operations of the Federal Government. Almost every Federal activity has an effect on our progress and prosperity and must be of interest to the 16th District Representative.

AGRICULTURE

Dairying is a primary factor in our farm income and therefore in the income of all 16th District residents. During the past 2 years I have worked with dairymen, their organizations and the Department of Agriculture to make adjustments in price formulas that have added some $3,500,000 to the income of area farmers. The latest such adjustment eliminated the seasonal reduction in the marketing order on a statewide basis, meaning $10 million to $14 million additional income this year for Ohio dairymen.

These accomplishments were of importance to city people, too. They helped to secure an ample supply of wholesome milk without the interruptions and violence experienced in some other regions. The increased farm income is reflected in the sales and salaries of the city people with whom the farmers do business.

My dairy self-help bill would permit dairy farmers to take over from the Government the entire milk-marketing program and operate it themselves. I also introduced legislation to permit the sale of Government feed grains to farmers, and fought for an amendment to remove controls on grain grown solely for use on the farm.

In late spring I introduced the President's soil-bank bill. Though delayed by partisan squabbles and finally enacted in modified form, this program has had a good effect in our district and Wayne County has an especially high record of participation. Farm prices have strengthened and farm income is on the upgrade.

SMALL BUSINESS

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee providing funds for the Small Business Administration, I have taken an active part in its work to strengthen the competitive position and financial stability of small business. In our district where diversified industry predominates, worthwhile and necessary loans have been made, considerable advice and counsel has been offered, and a number of Government contracts have been secured through the assistance of this new agency. Established at the request of President Eisenhower, it is the first permanent independent agency devoted solely to the interests of small business, the backbone of our free-enterprise system.

Under this program small business has enjoyed an increasing share of Government contracts and its competitive position relative to larger enterprises has steadily improved. This is reflected in a better profit outlook, a high rate of new business firms, and a relatively low rate of business failure.

Ohio is enjoying a remarkable expansion of business and industry, reflected in more jobs and better wages in our district as well as others.

POSTAL SERVICE

No Government agency is closer to the people than the post office, and I have made every effort to improve postal service in the 16th District. In addition to improvements in a great many post-office quarters, new buildings are completed or under way at Apple Creek, Doylestown, East Canton, and Navarre. Rittman is soon to have our first post office constructed under the 83d Congress lease-purchase law. Other places are under consideration.

Progress is being made also to provide city delivery wherever local conditions meet minimum requirements. City delivery has been established in Orrville and Navarre and is expected soon in East Canton. Doylestown is under consideration, and others are making preparations for this improvement.

Rural routes have been extended in a number of areas and many individuals have benefited.

AKRON-CANTON AIRPORT

Expansion and improvement of Akron-Canton airport has been a special concern. This spring we secured CAA approval of the first $400,000 Federal matching grant toward a $2,020,000 3-year program that will include a new terminal building and improvements to existing facilities. The Federal airport program authorizes CAA to provide about one-half the funds.

Military construction at Akron-Canton also was authorized this spring and will amount to almost $3 million in the next 2 fiscal years. A new hangar for Air National Guard use will be constructed, with supporting facilities. Other military contributions toward making Akron-Canton a first-rate air terminal are under consideration.

Efforts also are being made to improve service into Akron-Canton and New Philadelphia-Dover, both by the major scheduled airlines and by Lake Central, our local service carrier, the only employee-owned airline in the world. Lake Central is now seeking extension of its routes to connect our area with Buffalo, Erie, and Detroit.

My appropriations group also handles CAA and CAB funds, and I take a personal interest in these activities. I am working now to establish a Commission on Air Safety to provide a coordinated and comprehensive attack on this problem, and have introduced the necessary legislation. President Eisenhower has recognized the need for such work and has appointed a special consultant on aviation.

MUSKINGUM CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

The Muskingum Conservancy District, with headquarters in New Philadelphia, is receiving this year the final payment on the debt of the United States for properties acquired by the Corps of Engineers many years ago. I was able to overcome opposition to the appropriation of $425,000 for this purpose, thereby making it unnecessary to levy special assessments against the thousands of property owners against whom benefits assessments have not been made for many years. We are proud of the conservation accomplishments of the district, and it is a privilege as your Representative to be able to help so many who are affected by this appropriation.

BALANCED BUDGET

Three years of diligent effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee, cooperating with the administration, brought us this year a balanced budget. As a member of the committee, this has been my objective through the years and it is an accomplishment that holds promise of further reductions in taxes as well as continued stability in the cost of living. I think the achievement particularly noteworthy when we consider that it has been done despite a tax-reduction program in the 83d Congress that saved the Nation's taxpayers $7.4 billion. It shows what thrift and good management can do.

My own Subcommittees on Commerce, State, and Justice made total savings of $227 million this year, more than enough to pay all of the expenses of the Congress for over 18 months.

INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS

Many hundreds of 16th District citizens have brought me their individual problems arising out of dealings with the Federal Government. Veterans, servicemen, and those on pensions make up the largest number. There are many immigration and passport problems with which I have been able to help. I have made it a point to give immediate attention to every such request, and have a staff of experts in such matters in my Washington office. My Canton office is open every weekday to receive such calls. Your Congressman is as close to you as your telephone whenever problems arise.

During the past Congress I have been able to help several individuals with personal problems that required legislation. Because she was more than 10 years old, little Mary Mancuso had to be left behind in Italy when Mr. and Mrs. Paul Torcasio, of Canton, adopted her two little brothers. She was able to rejoin the family in Canton by virtue of a special act of Congress which I introduced. The same 10-year-old age limit in the Refugee Relief Act made it impossible for Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lemmo, of Canton, and Mr. and Mrs. Bernardino Nasci, of Alliance, to bring their adopted daughters to this country. By virtue of special acts of Congress this spring, both little girls should be with their new families in Ohio soon. These humanitarian measures make a Congressman's work doubly rewarding.

Other bills have been sponsored to help groups of individuals who are in difficulty, such as farmers who are opposed to compulsory social security. I am pressing for action on my bill to make this insurance optional for farmers.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Designation of the week of September 17 to 23 as Constitution Week was an act of Congress in which I had a part. For the past several years I have urged designation of September 17 as a national holiday in honor of the Constitution. Opposition to additional national holidays made this effort very difficult, but designation of the period as Constitution Week will serve to call attention to the document that makes our Republic the most successful association of free men in the history of the world.

I also sponsored the House resolution on treaty law which in its Senate version is known as the Bricker amendment.

During the past session I have made the status of forces agreement, giving jurisdiction over our servicemen to the nations where they are stationed, my principal interest in foreign affairs. My resolution to modify or denounce this treaty is winning support in every State in the Union, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, and many other fine organizations.

VOTING RECORD

Any man who seeks office as a Representative in Congress is duty bound to remain on the job at all times to cast his vote in behalf of the people whom he represents. Occasionally official business in his district may cause him to miss a vote. I am glad to report that your Congressman missed only 4 votes this year for that reason, and that I have a record of voting on 96 percent of the rollcalls during my entire service here. Few can equal that record.

As a guide in legislative work, I have sent a congressional questionnaire to the residents of the district each year. The response is helpful, and I was glad to observe that on most issues the views of the majority who respond are the same as my own.

Following is my voting record on some of the major rollcall votes of the 84th Congress:

Subject	Bow's vote	House action
1ST SESSION		
Continue GI education program	Yes	Approved.
Protect domestic industry against tariff cutting.	Yes	Failed.
Extend reciprocal trade program	No	Approved.
Increased pay for Federal employees.	Yes	Do.
Use surplus agricultural commodities for relief.	Yes	Do.
Reaffirm opposition to colonialism and communism.	Yes	Do.
Extend the foreign aid program	No	Do.
Broaden social security benefits	Yes	Do.
Raise Federal minimum wage to $1.	Yes	Do.
Extend Federal Housing Act	Yes	Do.
2D SESSION		
Refund tax on farm-use gasoline	Yes	Do.
Construct upper Colorado River storage project.	No	Do.
Agricultural Act of 1956 including soil bank.	Yes	Do.
Extend foreign aid program	No	Do.
Provide pensions for World War I veterans.	Yes	Do.
Increase service-connected disability payments.	Yes	Do.
Federal Highway Act of 1956	Yes	Do.
Provide Federal grants for school construction.	No	Failed.
Eisenhower civil rights program	Yes	Approved.

Alaska Tuberculosis Deaths Drop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a dramatic chapter in American medical history has been written in Alaska in the last 10 years. Great strides have been made in conquering tuberculosis. It is still a dread disease in Alaska, a veritable plague and a killer; but the degree and rapidity with which it is being brought under control are almost miraculous.

Only the other day Dr. Charles R. Hayman, Acting Alaska Commissioner of Health, announced that deaths in Alaska from tuberculosis in 1955 dropped to a new low of 50.

On the other hand, new cases of the disease continue to be discovered at a high rate. The average was 80 a month with a total of 955 for the calendar year. In making this report Dr. Hayman emphasized that there may be many undiscovered cases.

The splendid progress which has been made is emphasized by the fact that in 1950 with a total population just over half what it was in 1955, total deaths from tuberculosis numbered 234. The death rate 6 years ago per 100,000 population was 181.9. Five years later it had been reduced to 43.3 per 100,000. Despite all the good work that has been done much remains to be accomplished because the death rate for Alaska is almost four times that in continental United States.

For the first time in history, a concerted effort to gain control over this devastating disease, which has made such terrible inroads in Alaska, was begun about 10 years ago. Then the Federal Government began to make appropriations for hospitals dedicated to the care of the tubercular. Then it was that the women of the Methodist Church took over some abandoned Army buildings at Seward and opened a sanatorium there which has had an instrumental role in the fight against tuberculosis. A fine, new hospital was constructed at Anchorage with 300 beds for the care of those ill with tuberculosis. Navy facilities on Japonski Island adjacent to Sitka were taken over by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including a hospital building. There are other hospitals where beds are available for the care of those ill with this disease. Eleven years ago there was not a single hospital bed designed or used specifically for the treatment of Alaska's tuberculosis patients. Now there are close to a thousand available in Alaska and the States for Alaska patients.

The most dreadful ravages of tuberculosis are among the native population, the American citizens living in Alaska of Indian, Aleut, and Eskimo blood. They have been the hardest hit and they cannot be made healthy in a day. Indeed, it will be difficult if not impossible to effect complete control until their economic conditions and housing are improved.

However, the gains made have been so significant as to cause rejoicing among all concerned with the problem. The Federal Government through Congress and through the executive department has provided funds and personnel so sorely needed. The people of Alaska have played their part too through their legislature which has appropriated ever-increasing amounts to the Alaska department of health in the fight against

tuberculosis. And the people of Alaska in their individual capacities, too, have worked hard and successfully.

The battle, for such it is, has included case finding, hospitalization and what is known as the ambulatory-chemotherapy program. This program, which is under the general control of the Arctic Research Health Center, is said to be remarkably effective and holds out great promise for the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the work which has been done by a devoted little group of women at the small Kuskokwim town of Aniak. Not too long ago I came into possession of the first annual report of the Aniak health council. Normally one would not expect a community as small as Aniak to create a health council which has functioned so splendidly as has this one. Mrs. Ernest Begin was president, Mrs. Norman Potoski was secretary, and Mrs. David Leach was secretary-treasurer for the period for which the report was made. As Mrs. Begin stated in opening the report:

You may wonder why a small group like the Aniak health center presumes to publish its activities and why this report is being mailed to you.

First, it gives us the opportunity of expressing our appreciation to the various official and lay organizations and individuals who have helped us during the past year. It records the council's activities, it accounts for the moneys raised and spent; it outlines plans for the coming year, and by the practical examples given throughout the report we hope that other Alaskan communities, similar to ours, will be encouraged to organize health councils.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the Kuskokwim area and for whom Aniak may be merely a pinpoint on the map, I would like to explain that our village is typical of hundreds of native villages throughout the Territory.

Our predominantly Eskimo population fluctuates between 300 and 400 during the year. Transportation of people is by dog team or plane since there are no roads. Supplies travel from Seattle by ocean freighter and river barge, making manufactured goods costly.

Aniak's economy and health level are roughly the same as those of scores of villages in the Kuskokwim and Yukon Deltas and in Bristol Bay, which is to say, it is poor.

We believe if Aniak can support a health council, other Alaska villages can do the same.

Aniak has no doctor or nurse. As the report states:

In the case of illness about the only thing that could be offered was aspirin and the hopeful assurance that the patient would be all right in a few days.

Then at the suggestion of Mrs. Wayne House, wife of the United States commissioner, a money collection was made. Two Eskimo children carried an old cigar box about the village asking for donations to buy medicines for the village people. Seventy-six dollars was thus raised. With that money a community medicine kit was purchased.

That was the inspiration for the Aniak Health Council. Seventeen people gathered at the first organized meeting. Sometimes in the meetings it was necessary to use an interpreter because some Aniak people are not skilled in English.

During the first 10 months of work 22 patients received emergency first-aid treatment for serious accidents or injuries. In serious cases the nearest physician, at Bethel, Alaska, gave advice by radio.

The report of the Aniak Health Council states in simple but eloquent words the situation regarding tuberculosis there:

TUBERCULOSIS IN ANIAK

Until recent years, there has been a hopelessness about tuberculosis in our village. Nobody knew for sure how many active cases existed, relatively few stood a chance of being hospitalized and TB attacked at will. TB was a scourge; born in poverty, bred in crowded, unsanitary homes and maturing right in the village.

In truth, many people never knew they had tuberculosis. There were vague symptoms, a lassitude often mistaken for laziness, occasionally chest pain, sometimes hemorrhage, but a lot of tuberculosis was lived with, and died from, without the formality of a diagnosis. The tragic consequence was that tuberculosis spread.

BACKGROUND NOTES

As near as we can determine, the first X-raying for tuberculosis in Aniak dates back to 1948. After that, there was a period of 6 years with no case-finding by X-ray until the winter of 1954, when Dr. Wendell Matthews, medical officer for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, made a field trip to Aniak for the purpose of checking and X-raying CAA families stationed here.

Dr. Matthews offered to X-ray people from the village, and despite the short notice and severe temperatures, 106 people were X-rayed in 1 day. Unfortunately, many people were out trapping and therefore were missed, but in July of the same year (1954), Dr Ferger and a technician made a 1-day field trip to Aniak and 135 X-rays were made. There still was no baseline survey for the whole village but the tuberculosis picture was beginning to fill in.

CHEMOTHERAPY

Earlier in this report, reference has been made to the daily radio schedules held by ANS hospital physicians and it was a chance interception of such a radio hour that brought information to the council that a new tuberculosis program was to be inaugurated.

Over a period of about a week, Dr. Ferger made the same announcement daily to all who might be listening to the effect that two new tuberculosis drugs were to be given to all known and suspected tuberculosis cases in the Kuskokwim villages. (Later the program was extended to other parts of the Territory.) ANS teachers and lay people in villages where no ANS personnel were stationed were requested to send in names of such cases to augment lists that were being compiled from hospital records.

It was explained that drug treatment at home was not intended to replace hospitalization but that chemotherapy, as it was called, was considered to be the best possible treatment for those who were forced to wait many months before hospital beds became available. The most important result of taking the drugs was said to be that there would be a decline in the TB bacilli produced by active cases. The byproduct of this would be that there would be less TB spread to members of patient's immediate family and close associates.

THE COUNCIL PARTICIPATES

The Aniak Health Council offered to participate in this program so that our village could receive the obvious benefits. Names of all known and suspected cases were submitted on preliminary forms and soon we received dosage sheets and a shipment of two different TB drugs. We agreed to be responsible for dispensing the medicines, for weighing the patients at certain intervals. We also supervised the mailing in of sputum specimens, watched the patients for adverse drug reactions and kept accurate, confidential records.

Later the program became more formalized, and today the ambulant chemotherapy program functions as a tri-agency program with the Alaska Department of Health, United States Public Health Service and the Alaska Native Service as participants. Each agency plays a certain part and at the end of the chain is the chemotherapy aid. In Aniak, this person is Mrs. Wayne House, who devotes many volunteer hours to this important work.

In January 1955, Aniak was visited by a full chemotherapy team composed of Dr. Kenneth Momeyer (USPHS), and Miss Marilyn Porter, supervising nurse. On loan from the Bethel ANS Hospital were Miss Jacqualine Firebaugh, staff nurse, and Mr. S. Crump, X-ray technician. Another X-ray survey was run, standard chemotherapy forms replaced the old, preliminary sheets, files were set up for each patient, home calls were made and several more cases added to the roster. Shortly thereafter free vitamins were supplied regularly to all those on chemotherapy.

One more X-ray survey was to follow when Dr. Matthews returned on his yearly field trip. By this time, the Aniak TB picture was complete. We have been told by workers from the chemotherapy program that Aniak is far from a hot-bed of tuberculosis, yet at this writing, 23 of our people are on chemotherapy, 9 Aniak people are in TB hospitals, and more are waiting for a bed to become available for them.

CONCLUSIONS

It is perhaps too early to evaluate the effectiveness of the chemotherapy program, and this is a matter for the professionals. On the local level, we who have worked with the TB picture, have seen great improvements in many cases. After being on drugs for a while, the people look better and they feel better. They are hopeful of shorter hospital stays and complete cures eventually.

We believe the chemotherapy program is coping with our village's most dangerous health problem, that of the tubercular person. After many years of stagnation as far as case-finding is concerned, this part of the TB program is receiving adequate attention in Aniak. We still have tubercular children of tubercular parents, but at least there is hope for their future.

With about 1,000 beds accommodating the most seriously ill, with Federal and Territorial agencies cooperating and with individual citizens such as the women of Aniak doing their part, there can be no doubt that tuberculosis, which once was a virtual death sentence for thousands of Alaskans, will in time be subdued and conquered.

Report to My Constituents on the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice for the 14 years that I have been a Member of Congress to make a report near the end of each session to the people I represent. I want them to know how I voted and how

I view all public questions. This is their right and my responsibility.

NEWSPAPER AND RADIO REPORTS EACH WEEK

It is the duty of every Member of Congress to keep in close touch with the people he represents, to know their wishes, and to keep them informed. I have tried to do so this year, just as I have done in years past. I write a weekly news letter that goes to approximately 90 newspapers, 14 radio stations, and many individuals in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. I tape a weekly radio program entitled "What's Happening in the Nation's Capital" that has been carried regularly over the years by all of the radio stations in the district, and I have made several television films which were carried by the stations that reach into western Nebraska during the past year. The newspapers and the radio and television stations have been kind enough to use these efforts as a public service. I deeply appreciate their help in bringing these reports to the people.

VISITS ALL 100 TOWNS

When the Congress is not in session I am out in the 38 counties of the district, talking with as many people as I can at county fairs, service clubs, church groups, farm meetings, and other gatherings of all kinds. Last year, just as I do in each off-election year, I held a government clinic in each of the 38 courthouses for the purpose of discussing problems of government with my constituents. The first hour of these 2-hour meetings is devoted to a Youth Wants To Know forum with high-school students. The second hour is given to the public at large. These meetings have been extremely helpful in discovering the problems that are bothering the people at home, and they enable me to better represent my district.

FIRM LEADERSHIP—THREE YEARS' PEACE

We are entering the fourth year of a world at peace, an era that began with the end of the Korean war in 1953 and that progresses day by day toward a more permanent, enduring, and solid structure for world conduct. The Communist world, Russia and nations under its domination or in its camp, has grown since 1939 from a population of 170,467,000 to 928,488,000, while the free-world population has declined from 2.23 billion in 1939 to 1.7 billion at present. In recent months we have seen substantial evidence that Russia is losing control over its subject nations; that resistance is developing just as it always has when the inherently free nature of the individual is made to yield to the will of a tyrannical master. Poland has signified that its resistance has progressed to an active stage. Russia's hold on the people of East Germany has become uneasy. More nations and more individuals are ready to seek means of lifting the Iron Curtain.

Our leadership has been firm. We have not jumped from crisis to crisis; instead, we have consistently demonstrated to the nations of the world our sincere desire for peace by positive and constructive acts and needs, insisting on the same course of conduct on the part of the Soviet Union. We have not accepted the new behavior in Russia as evidence of any significant change in attitude so long as the inspection program and disarmament proposals submitted by President Eisenhower go unheeded by the Kremlin.

This era of world peace, tense though it might be, has given us a prayerfully welcome respite from the slaughter and destruction of two major wars.

ADVOCATES FOR "GLOOM AND DOOM" WRONG—EMPLOYMENT HIGHEST; UNEMPLOYMENT LOW

The transition from war to peace has not brought about the depression predicted several years ago by some of the advocates of "gloom and doom." On the contrary, the Nation, industry, and labor enjoy the highest and best level of prosperity in our history.

There are more than 66 million Americans gainfully employed, and the number of people without jobs is reassuringly low. Individual income soared to more than $320 billion in the past year, with an average income per family of $5,520. Twenty-three million American families had incomes above $5,000, and because the Republican 83d Congress gave them a $7.4-billion income-tax cut, and because sound fiscal policies have stabilized the dollar, the average family is able to save and invest more than ever before.

The Government is also prosperous. The administration has successfully carried out one of its most important promises—to balance the budget. The Federal Government closed its books on June 30, 1956, with a credit balance of $1.74 billion. This is the second time in nearly 20 years the Treasury has been able to show a surplus on hand at the close of the fiscal year and for the first time in many years a payment on the national debt will be made.

GOOD FARM PROGRAM

There have been several notable changes in the law and governmental policies that relate to agriculture. Farmers, caught in the squeeze between falling commodity prices and rising costs, did not share in the general booming prosperity of other industry and labor. A number of factors contributed to this hardship. Tremendous stores of supported commodities, continued overproduction of surplus crops, and centralized drought conditions tended to reduce the farmer's gross income, while at the same time his net income has been shrunk by high operating costs.

Recognizing that the major ills of agriculture have been caused by an unwise and shortsighted program that induced market-depressing surplus crops, the Congress and the administration have developed legislation and policies that strike directly at these problems. The first part of this new program is the soil bank law, establishing an acreage reserve and a conservation reserve. Many hundreds of farmers, within a matter of days after the law went into effect, are now participating in the program and benefiting from it. To assist stock growers in drought areas, the administration is permitting the use of reserve acres for grazing purposes.

Realizing that the Government itself was contributing to the surplus crops by long established policies which permitted their production on millions of acres of public lands, President Eisenhower on May 21, 1956, issued an order putting an end to this practice. This order implements legislation which I introduced during this session of Congress.

The soil-bank law and the order restricting public land use effectively attack crop surpluses from the production end. Other legislation and other administrative actions deal with disposal and marketing problems. The administration is selling more and more agricultural commodities to foreign countries in exchange for their currency, under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, introduced by Congressman HARRISON, of Nebraska. More farm products are being consumed through an expanded school-lunch program, and still more are being channeled into a relief program for the needy of our country.

One of the most important provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is the section establishing a Commission to prepare legislation dealing with further industrial use of grains and other farm crops. More than 1.5 billion bushels of grain that now goes into Government warehouses could be converted into industrial alcohol to be blended with gasoline or used in the production of butadiene, one of the components of synthetic rubber. We know that ingenious American scientists will discover other potentialties out of a wedding of industrial and agricultural processes. I was privileged to join with Nebraska's Senator CARL T. CURTIS in sponsoring this legislation.

These and other measures will in due time cure the problems that have been created by the Government's regulation of a normally free agriculture.

To help in bringing farm price back in line with operating costs, the President increased the support levels on most of the basic crops and Congress raised the parity prices on feed grains and dairy products. In recent months, hog prices have shown a strong recovery from last year's slump, and the cattle market has been firm, even though it has never recovered from the rollback ordered in 1952 by former President Truman.

When all of the political thunder that accompanied the veto of the first farm bill died away, the President and the American farmer emerged victorious with a constructive and forward-looking agricultural program. Farm prosperity is sure to follow.

NEBRASKA SHARES IN 41,000 MILES OF HIGHWAY

In one of the largest public works measures ever presented, Congress passed and the President signed a law authorizing a 13-year road-construction program. A 41,000-mile Federal interstate highway, to be constructed on a revenue basis from increased gas, fuel, rubber, and other related taxes, is the most significant part of this new legislation. Additional grants will be made to States and local subdivisions to construct and improve non-Federal primary and secondary highways. Total Federal cost of the program is pegged somewhere in the neighborhood of $35 billion.

SOCIAL SECURITY BROADENED AND MORE LIBERAL

Both Houses of the 84th Congress adopted extended and liberal social-security legislation. Following the example set by the House last year, the Senate recently passed the bill bringing practically all vocations and professions under social security, lowering the retirement age of women to 62, and making totally disabled persons eligible for benefits at age 50.

FARWELL-AINSWORTH IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Legislation I introduced in this Congress has cleared many of the necessary hurdles. Some of these bills have become law. For example, the Ainsworth irrigation unit was authorized for construction by the Department of the Interior when the bill I introduced was signed by President Eisenhower on May 18, 1956.

The bill authorizing construction of the Farwell project on the Middle Loup River has been passed by both Houses and will undoubtedly be signed by the President.

The Gering Valley flood-control project became a part of the Flood Control Act of 1956, with the splendid assistance of Senators ROMAN L. HRUSKA and CARL T. CURTIS.

Two bills I introduced for extending farm loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act were included with other provisions of the farm-credit bill passed by the House.

The bill I introduced to prohibit the production of surplus crops on Government-held lands was made a part of the President's order of May 21, 1956, and will take effect on or about August 18, 1956; while the bill establishing a Commission to draft legislation for industrial use of agricultural commodities became a part of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Some progress has been made toward establishing a partnership between the Federal Government and the Nebraska Mid-State reclamation district, although it is still incumbent upon representatives of both groups to resolve important differences in the engineering and financial concept of this irrigation, reclamation, and power project.

Other legislation I introduced would have been passed, I am sure, if my political party were in control of the Congress. But with the opposition in charge, conscious of the approaching elections, a high priority has been given to Democrat-sponsored bills almost to the exclusion of all others.

SOUR NOTES ON POLITICAL CONGRESS

The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress has distinguished itself in two ways, neither of which is commendable. First, it has the distinction of being the most obstructionist Congress in recent history. Second, it has been the most political Congress in my memory.

These obstructionists tactics have been manifest in two major ways: First, Congress has refused to act on many bills that were a fundamental part of the President's legislative program; second, the administration bills that were acted upon were either amended so as to be unpalatable or rewritten beyond recognition. Many bad bills were prevented from becoming law only because the President had the courage to use his constitutional veto power.

This Congress has spent hundreds of hours and millions of tax dollars to prove that the Eisenhower administration and its top-level officials have been guilty of giving away the natural resources of America. Investigating committees have probed into mineral and timber transactions, atomic energy ventures, electrical power contracts and policies, reporting volubly that these investigations established the giveaway charge. However, no responsible or constructive action has resulted from these inquisitions, which many times have taken the form of ancient star-chamber proceedings.

Congress has the unquestioned right to investigate, and it is dutybound in many instances to do so. But this power is restricted to a legitimate legislative purpose, and the proceedings must at all times be governed by additional considerations of candor and fair play. I am afraid the committees have not kept these fundamental principles in mind. Instead, they have been driven by the desire to unearth, if possible, or manufacture if necessary, political issues upon which to base a political campaign that will elect or reelect members of their party.

Vote trading, back scratching, and logrolling have been all too prevalent in the Congress during the past year. This has been especially true in the field of reclamation and power legislation, where many worthwhile projects have failed to go forward because their sponsors did not yield to the pressure for other less meritorious projects. In one of the most shabby melodramas of congressional history, I was made the villain of a plot to kill the Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line appropriation. Although I have supported 98 percent of the public power, reclamation and flood-control projects that have come before Congress in my 14 years—some 371 all told—I was branded as an enemy of public power, ostensibly because I had voted 5 years ago, when the Korean war was going badly and our budget was running some $14 billion behind, to trim all appropriations 5 percent. On that vindictive basis a public power project recommended by the Eisenhower administration was killed by members of the political party that holds itself out as the public power champion. I later learn, however, that I can redeem myself by supporting a package deal of 5 or 6 Federal power projects, which would cost more than $1 billion, and in return the proponents of this billion-dollar blackjack would support the $8 million Grand Island transmission line. Many other Congressmen have been given the same alternative, with their projects assuming form as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Politics has been inherent in the conduct of most functions of Government during election years, but the party in control of the Congress this year has surpassed in flagrance and disregard for orderly process any performance I have previously witnessed.

I plan to return to Nebraska just as soon as the Congress adjourns, and I am looking forward to meeting and talking with as many old and new friends in the Fourth District as time permits. I will attend many county fairs and group meetings. A report giving unbiased election facts shows only 5 Republicans who received over 70 percent of the vote in the general election of 1954. Thanks to many friends I was 1 of the 5. Believe me I will continue to do the best job I can.

Background Information on United States Citizens Released From UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following statement containing background information on the seven cases of United States citizens released from UNESCO:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE SEVEN CASES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS RELEASED FROM THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

During the course of 1954 and first half of 1955, seven United States nationals employed by UNESCO were separated from the Organization. In all seven instances the employees had failed to appear for a hearing by the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board of the United States Civil Service Commission. The Board subsequently advised UNESCO that on the record before it, there was reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of these people to the United States. Four of the employees had fixed-term contracts expiring at the end of 1954 or the beginning of 1955. The Director General allowed these contracts to expire. Three of the employees had indeterminate appointments. In these latter cases the Director General found that on the basis of all the facts, they did not possess the degree of integrity required of an international civil servant. Their appointments were therefore terminated.

Owing to the immunity of international organizations from suit, international employees cannot appeal to national courts when they consider that their contracts of employment have been breached. As a consequence, special tribunals have been set up to hear their cases. The specialized agencies of the U. N. located in Europe, as a matter of economy and convenience, use the long-established Administrative Tribunal of the International Labor Organization.

Exercising the rights under their terms of appointment, all seven United States nationals separated from UNESCO employment appealed their cases to the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labor Organization and asked to be reinstated or awarded damages. In all seven cases, the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labor Organization held that the Director General had acted illegally in separating the employees. If reinstatement was not possible, damages amounting to approximately $74,000 were ordered to be paid.

The Director General refused to reinstate any of the employees. In addition, he urged the Executive Board of UNESCO to challenge the ruling of the International Labor Organization tribunal in the four fixed-term contract cases. (In order to gain more support for this course of action, he did agree, how-

ever, on the grounds of hardship, to advance these four persons one-third of the amount allowed by the ILO Court, pending the final outcome of the challenge, provided they undertook to make full refund should the challenge prove successful.) The Executive Board of UNESCO, with strong United States support, agreed with the Director General that there were grounds warranting a challenge of the ruling of the tribunal by asking the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion in accordance with the provisions of the tribunal statute. The final outcome in these four cases will not be known until the issues involved have been reviewed by the International Court of Justice. The past few months have been devoted by UNESCO to a careful and thorough preparation of briefs, which, along with those of the former employees, are being submitted for the actual oral hearings scheduled to take place in the near future.

In the three cases involving termination of indeterminate contracts, however, the Director General considered that on the record made before the tribunal, the grounds provided in the tribunal statute for an appeal to the International Court of Justice did not make it possible to challenge the tribunal ruling. While the United States member of the UNESCO Executive Board disagreed, the remainder of the Board considered that there were not adequate grounds on which to take the tribunal ruling to the International Court. Therefore, awards amounting to approximately $23,000 were authorized to be paid out of past savings of the Organization, since the Director General did not intend to reemploy the individuals.

Statement on the Area Vocational Technical School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on the area vocational technical school bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My desire to cosponsor this bill stems from the experience and firsthand information about the need for an adequate supply of skilled workers when I was governor of Minnesota. The permissive legislation for area vocational technical schools in Minnesota was passed and approved while I was governor.

A study by the State commission on vocational and higher education, published in 1953, shows very clearly that we are falling short of trained workers for just the normal replacement of retiring personnel.

Although we have eight area vocational schools in Minnesota, we have waiting lists for enrollment in many of our trade classes, both in public and private vocational schools.

For example, Dunwoody Industrial School in Minneapolis has received applications for enrollment from 1,200 persons for the school year 1956–57. The facilities will accommodate only 400. This same situation is occurring in public area vocational schools. We are unable to supply the demand for skilled technicians needed for the new plant of Remington Rand and International Business Machines, who are now constructing new plants in Minnesota.

This bill, I am sure, would give needed impetus to the specialized training that is needed not only in Minnesota but throughout the country, and in turn would be a step forward in training technicians needed in this age of atomic energy and automation.

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, August 1, 1956, represents the 665th anniversary of the founding of the modern Swiss Republic; more than 6½ centuries ago the Swiss people struck off the shackles of despotism and tyranny and began the long ascent toward governments in which the rule of people is supreme. The Swiss philosophy of democracy fired the revolutions against despotism in France, Italy, and elsewhere. It set the framework for constitutional democracy in the United States.

Today Switzerland's people, of German, French, and Italian ancestry, live, work, and prosper together, solving their problems in the open, democratic tradition.

Many of the world's modern humanitarian projects—such as the Red Cross and the World Health Organization—have originated and make their home in that country. Similarly, other agencies in the service of mankind have located there. For example, the League of Nations, the first world peace organization founded on the plans and ideals of Woodrow Wilson, made its headquarters in Switzerland.

Throughout America today we find the descendants of the hardy Swiss immigrants. One of their sons was Albert Gallatin who served as Secretary of the Treasury and represented the United States abroad on many diplomatic missions. He was an early and vigorous proponent of increased foreign trade for the United States.

Modern-day Switzerland is one of the most constructive forces in the promotion of world trade. Because she is poor in land resources, ores, metals, and other raw materials, Switzerland has concentrated on science, skill, and industry upon which to found one of the most vigorous trade economies in the world today. In this manner, Switzerland has become the world-acclaimed source for the highest quality watches, textiles, precision instruments, and other commodities. Relying totally on free competition in a free market, they have won an excellent market in the United States for their products. By so doing they have also enriched American export economy because the Swiss have invariably permitted the United States to acquire a surplus in our trade with that country. Today, after 20 years of Swiss-American reciprocal trade, a concept fathered by Cordell Hull, the United States has accumulated a trade profit in form of a surplus of more than one-half billion dollars.

Among those who benefit from trade with the Swiss are the tobacco farmers of southern Maryland whom I have the honor of representing in Congress. In fact the Swiss are the largest and the very best cash customer for high-grade Maryland export tobacco. That is why we are disturbed by the Republican administration's series of decisions which harassed Swiss-American trade by increasing tariffs on Swiss products, including watches and watch movements which constitute the lifeblood of Switzerland. I am pleased to note that the recent report by the Joint Economic Committee of the 84th Congress stated that these Republican trade restrictions represent an undue burden on consumers, on other industries, and on the trade of the free world. I hope every Member of Congress, as well as the President and the members of his administration, have an opportunity to read this report.

Letter to Chairman of the Platform Committee of Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks I wish to include a copy of a letter I wrote today to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman of the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention:

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Chairman, Platform Committee,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: The Democratic Party since the time of Thomas Jefferson has consistently fought for the welfare of the laboring people. Today many thousands of workers are being laid off and the working week of others curtailed because of an influx of Japanese textiles. Employees in the chemical, glassware, bicycle, tunafish, coal, and other industries are likewise threatened by excessively low tariffs and unfair trade practices.

The Democratic Party has traditionally been the party of free trade and low tariffs. We still are staunch advocates of world trade, but the Democratic Party has never advocated tariffs so low or trade practices that placed the American worker at an unfair advantage. The Democratic Party has taken the lead in improved working conditions and raising our standard of living.

I urge you with all the sincerity at my command to prevail upon the platform committee to adopt a plank against tariffs so low as to cause unemployment among American workers. I also urge your serious consideration of import quotas in those industries seriously affected. You represent in the Congress a great textile State. You are familiar with the disaster facing many American workers due to competition with low-wage countries. You have fought long and hard for many years to improve the lot of American labor. I have great confidence that you will make every effort in the platform committee to offer some hope to the

American textile worker and other industries so affected.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

We Should Settle Native Land Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, contrary to an impression that seems to be rather widely held, the decision of the Supreme Court made on February 7, 1955, in the so-called Tee-Hit-Ton case did not bring a judicial and final conclusion to the important matter of Alaska native land claims.

It is true that the majority of the Supreme Court in that decision narrowed the issues. Justice will not be served and there will not be full knowledge of land ownership in Alaska until another and concluding step is taken. This must be by congressional action. In an effort to achieve this, I introduced H. R. 11986 in the House of Representatives on June 27, 1956. It is my hope that the executive branch of Government and particularly those Departments chiefly concerned—Justice and Interior and Agriculture—will examine this proposed legislation carefully during the period of congressional adjournment so the bill may be considered should it be reintroduced, as I hope will be the case, early in the 85th Congress. It was not offered with the thought that it represented legislative perfection. Rather it was intended to serve as a guideline, as a point of departure.

As Mr. James Craig Peacock, Washington attorney who represented the Tee-Hit-Ton group before the Court of Claims and before the Supreme Court, said in explanatory notes prepared in connection with H. R. 11986, this bill may be considered as a modernized version, giving effect to the Tee-Hit-Ton decision, of the latest committee print on this bill which was before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the 83d Congress. There is a dual need, as Mr. Peacock has pointed out. There is a need for the sake of the Indians and Eskimos and Aleuts and their white brethren in Alaska to settle those land claims. At the same time, there is a need to accord to the natives what the Supreme Court has called their moral deserts. It is correct to note that the Supreme Court found that native possessory rights cannot be maintained under the act of May 17, 1884, or the act of June 6, 1900. But, as the majority opinion went on to say:

> No case in this Court has ever held that taking of Indian title or use by Congress required compensation. The American people have compassion for the descendants of those Indians who were deprived of their homes and hunting grounds by the drive of civilization. They seek to have the Indians share the benefits of our society as citizens of this Nation. Generous provision has been willingly made to allow tribes to recover for wrongs, as a matter of grace, not because of legal liability.

And again:

> Every American schoolboy knows that the savage tribes of this continent were deprived of their ancestral ranges by force and that even when the Indians ceded millions of acres by treaty in return for blankets, food, and trinkets it was not a sale but the conquerors' will that deprived them of their land. The duty that rests on this Nation was adequately phrased by Mr. Justice Jackson in his concurrence, Mr. Justice Black joining, in *Shoshone Indians* v. *United States*, a case that differentiated "recognized" from "unrecognized" Indian title, and held the former only compensable.

Certainly the concluding paragraph of the Supreme Court's decision in the Tee-Hit-Ton case provides ample evidence that the conclusions of the Court are not to be interpreted as meaning that the native people of Alaska are to be foreclosed from seeking justice at other places:

> In the light of the history of Indian relations in this Nation, no other course would meet the problem of the growth of the United States except to make congressional contributions for Indian lands rather than to subject the Government to an obligation to pay the value when taken with interest to the date of payment. Our conclusion does not uphold harshness as against tenderness toward the Indians, but it leaves with Congress, where it belongs, the policy of Indian gratuities for the termination of Indian occupancy of Government-owned land rather than making compensation for its value a rigid constitutional principle.

Mr .Speaker, we have delayed too long in settlement of this issue. Our tardiness should weigh heavily upon our collective conscience. I sincerely hope that the 85th Congress will act.

President Eisenhower Should Have a Republican Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of Congress it has become more and more apparent that if President Eishenhower is to accomplish all that he expects, and is expected to do, he should have a Congress that is in full accord with his aims and purposes and willing to help.

There have been times when the President has had the help of the Democrats in Congress in some matters. However, more often he has not had their help and cooperation. In consequence of this, much that the President has desired to do has not been done at all, or, in such a manner that the compromise bore little resemblance to what the President had asked for. Thus, although the President had prescribed a worthwhile program to promote the welfare of all our people, he was unable to accomplish it in its entirety because his party—Republican—was not in the majority and consequently could not direct congressional action.

There are many who do not understand the necessity of a President having a Congress in control of his own party. Too often it is thought that the election of a President is all that is necessary. It would seem that many such people overlook the fact that the President has no power to put into effect the program upon which he conducted his candidacy. His program even though most worth while and desirable remains nothing more than a group of suggestions for legislation unless and until the Congress enacts them into law. It is only when this has been done that the proposed law comes before the President for his approval or disapproval. Thus, it can be readily seen that whether any such legislation is passed or not, or whether in satisfactory form to the President, depends upon whether the Congress is one that is willing to carry out the President's wishes. Hence the necessity for the President to have a Congress wherein his own party has control.

I have gone into this detailed explanation to show that President Eisenhower, if he is to accomplish all that is expected of him, should have a Congress that is in full accord with his viewpoint. To deny him such leaves him handicapped and makes highly uncertain his ability to fulfill in entirety his promises and the program he has advocated.

I am well aware that the people of this Nation have a high degree of confidence in President Eisenhower. They are certain of his high purpose and desire to be helpful to our people in every walk of life. They like what he has done. They are in favor of what he seeks to do, and they expect him to do it. But too often they overlook the fact that in the final analysis it is the Congress that must enact the legislation that will make effective the program of the President.

Why do I emphasize so strongly the importance of President Eisenhower having a Congress with a majority of his own party? First, because it is necessary if he is to accomplish all that is expected of him. And, second, because so many people who have confidence in him and desire his program of welfare think that all that is necessary is to elect him. This, of course, and as I have already pointed out, will not be sufficient. Anyone who believes in President Eisenhower and intends to support him should give him a Congress that will help him. It is not fair nor reasonable to elect him and then withhold from him a friendly Congress. To do so is only to handicap and prevent him from doing the very things for which he was elected.

Furthermore, in these uncertain times, when questions of great international importance are continually arising, there should be an assured unity of action between the President and the Congress. With such unity our position is strengthened in world affairs and without such, it can be greatly weakened. Thus, it is to our welfare, both from a domestic as

well as a foreign standpoint, to have a President in full accord with the Congress and a Congress in full accord with the President. Our national welfare can best be promoted at this time by reelecting President Eisenhower and giving him a Republican Congress.

S. 4301, a Bill To Extend the Scope of Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me on S. 4301, a bill to extend the scope of vocational education.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EARLE C. CLEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH S. 4301, A BILL TO EXTEND THE SCOPE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

On April 26 of this year I introduced a bill, S. 3748, proposing that the Federal Government annually award college scholarships to 5,000 of our most deserving high-school students. The scholarships would be for the pursuit of courses at accredited institutions of higher education, leading to recognized degrees in science and engineering.

At the time of introduction of the scholarship bill, I stated some of the urgent reasons for enactment of it. I drew attention to our national shortage of engineers and scientists, and the gravity of Soviet competition in the production of scientific manpower. I set forth the need for Federal scholarships to be provided in the interest of our physical safety and economic security as a nation. I pointed out that establishment of such scholarships would be a measure to protect our national freedoms, and that these awards would be a sound investment in the future of our youth and in the welfare of our people.

Today I am pleased to associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama and others in introducing a bill (S. 4301) which might be considered a complement to the Federal scholarship proposal. The bill which we introduced today proposes that the Federal Government promote the further development of vocational-technical education programs of less than college grade. While the development of legislation in this field at this late hour in this Congress will not enable action to be taken on it at this session its introduction will serve to illustrate the great need and will generate interest and support in order that when similar legislation is introduced at the convening of the Congress in January it will be favorably acted upon.

ORIGIN OF THE NEW BILL

This bill emanates from more than a year's study on the part of a number of persons associated with vocational training in the United States, among whom was James L. Patton, director, vocational education in Kentucky. These leaders in vocational education below college grade are aware of its present limitations and the need for its further development. They are competent to advise the Congress with respect to the Nation's needs and interests in this field. This bill is based upon an understanding of our national problems in vocational education and a desire to find the best answer to them.

PRESENT WEAKNESS IN OUR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Full study of our Federal-State system of vocational education below college grade has highlighted its most outstanding weakness, namely, that it does not reach enough of our people. In many rural areas, particularly, adequate vocational-technical training programs are not available.

Furthermore, the limitations of available funds do not allow the establishment of special training and retraining programs needed by older workers for their adjustment to new scientific and technological processes.

This bill is designed to remedy these weaknesses in vocational education in the United States.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

The bill would encourage the States to establish area vocational schools and programs for the training and retraining of technicians and skilled workers in industry and agriculture. Through such schools and programs, the bill would also promote training in other occupations essential to the Nation's security and economy.

As defined in the bill, the term "area vocational schools and programs" means those "for youths not less than 16 years of age, and for adults," which are "operated by State or local authorities, or both, for a State or an area of a State designated and approved by the State board" for vocational education.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

To assist the States in developing area vocational schools and programs the bill would authorize appropriations by the Congress as follows: $5 million for fiscal 1957, $7.5 million for fiscal 1958, and $10 million for fiscal 1959, and such amounts thereafter as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. The funds would be apportioned to the States on the basis of the composite formula in the George-Barden Act (Vocational Education Act of 1946).

POLICY AND PRECEDENT

Enactment of this measure would be thoroughly consistent with established Federal policy and precedent.

Federal participation in vocational education in this country might be said to date from establishment of the Military Academy at West Point in 1802. This was established as a school for engineers. Federal-State cooperation in financing vocational education began with the Morrill Act of 1862, which led to establishment of our tremendously important land-grant colleges. Enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 initiated Federal cooperation with the States in financing vocational education of less than college grade. This highly satisfactory system now operates under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act of 1946.

The new program to promote area vocational schools would be administered by the same authorities as the present program. These authorities are the United States Office of Education at the national level and the State boards for vocational education at the State level. The State in each case would have full authority to designate and approve the area schools and programs.

There would be no opportunity for any Federal control over the schools and programs other than fiscal controls, to assure usage of the funds for the purpose intended by Congress.

MANY STATES ALREADY MAKING EFFORTS

In 30 of our States and Territories, State and/or local educational authorities are already operating area vocational schools. In at least 8 additional States, area vocational programs are in operation as units of State colleges or junior colleges. According to data compiled by the American Vocational Association, my own State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, is one of those in which area vocational programs are most developed. There are 12 area vocational schools operating in Kentucky. These schools are very popular, but many of them are limited in their offerings. In Kentucky there are long waiting lists for admission to the area vocational schools and programs. Being relatively new in the educational system, these are handicapped in the competition for the educational dollar. The demands of the elementary and regular high schools usually receive priority.

By giving recognition to the national need for area vocational education, Federal promotion of such education would stimulate the States and localities to even greater efforts in this field so important to the national welfare.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Under the Constitution the Federal Government is responsible for the national defense and has a duty to promote the general welfare. Both the national defense and the general welfare are absolutely dependent upon the maintenance of adequate programs of vocational education throughout the country. The Federal Government therefore shares with the States and localities the responsibility for providing vocational training at all levels.

Throughout the history of the United States, many of our national leaders have emphasized the importance of education to the very maintenance of our form of government. Thomas Jefferson, for example, warned that: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

Alexander Hamilton expressed the view that the Constitution assigned the Federal Government responsibility for promoting education. George Washington advocated the fostering of education as an obligation of the Federal Government. John Quincy Adams urged Congress to promote education.

In reference to education, Abraham Lincoln said, "I view it as the most important subject we as a people can be engaged in."

The Congress has repeatedly recognized the Federal responsibility, particularly in the field of vocational education, by enacting specific legislation for its support and development. However, the Federal concern in this field has grown far greater because of the tense international situation.

This has been emphasized very recently by the Soviet Union's open challenge to a technological race with the West.

Our ultimate victory will depend upon the capacities of our whole people. Their abilities will in turn depend upon the amount and quality of their vocational training.

If the Federal Government neglects its share of the responsibility and fails to provide the States and localities sufficient support for vocational education we may not win the new kind of cold war with the Communist world to which I have just referred.

WHAT THE SOVIETS ARE DOING

Let us take a look at what the Soviets are already accomplishing in the educational field and consider how their activities may affect us. According to a study made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in March 1956 entitled "Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia," in 1951, Soviet universities and other institutions graduated 30,000 engineers with 5½ years of training including 3 years of close specialization. By 1954 they had increased this number to the startling total of 53,000 while at the same

time our universities and colleges turned out only 22,329 engineering students. The following table carried in the report graphically illustrates the rate we may be falling behind the Soviet Union in providing our Nation with persons trained in technical fields:

Structure of graduating classes in the U. S. S. R. and in the United States

Field	U. S. S. R., 1954, graduations by field of study		United States, 1954, bachelors and 1st professional degrees by field of study	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	173,000	100.0	358,699	100.0
Engineering of all types	53,000	30.6	22,329	6.3
Agriculture, including agronomy, forestry, animal husbandry, veterinary medicine	18,000	10.4	[1] 7,832	2.2
Health and medical sciences	24,000	13.9	[2] 23,616	6.6
All other fields (of which university, physical and biological sciences, mathematics are included)	78,000	45.1	304,922	84.9
Additional: Extension training (predominantly in other fields)	57,000			

[1] Does not include veterinary medicine.
[2] Includes veterinary medicine.

Sources: Russian Research Center, Harvard University, and U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, earned degrees, 1953–54, Circular No. 418, pp. 4–5.

Dr. J. H. Hildebrand, president, American Chemical Society, described the Russians as taking more seriously than we here in the United States are taking the maxim that "knowledge is power." Dr. Hildebrand further warned "if we let them get ahead of us in education, the national disaster for us and our way of life is inevitable. Our hope lies in an enlightened people from whom we can obtain the essential leadership necessary to build the kind of world in which we want to live."

With respect to vocational and technical training of less than college grade, it is difficult to make comparisons between the Soviet Union and the United States because of the difference in the categories for reporting training programs. However, there has evidently been a tremendous expansion at the secondary- and post-high-school levels of vocational and technical training in the Soviet Union.

The March 1956 issue of Life magazine said that the Soviet Union is producing an elite generation of young scientists and engineers "enormously dangerous to the West, but so far little noticed by it." The article stated further that—

"At the recent Communist Party Congress in Moscow Premier Bulganin boasted that Russia already has an army of 5.5 million specialists, adding that it would have another 4 million by 1960. Then they will far outnumber those of the United States, which already suffers from a shortage of scientists" (p. 31).

The article stated that there are 3,796 "technicums" in Russia that graduate 70,000 technicians per year. These serve in positions between professional workers and skilled or semiskilled workers.

In the United States there is a great shortage of technicians, and there are very few institutions or programs to train them.

The Honorable William Benton, a former Member of this House, now editor of the Encyclopedia Britannica, visited Russia in 1955 to study the Soviet system. He has reported that:

"The Soviets are now challenging us frontally on what have historically been two of our strongest points—technology and mass education. The present rate of Russian education advance is faster than our own. Just as their growth-rate in industrial production surpasses ours. The gap in total performance is closing. It is closing rapidly."

In the May issue of the NEA Journal there is another illuminating article by Mr. Benton, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"A recent trip to the U. S. S. R. has convinced me that education has become a main theater of the cold war; that Russia's classrooms and libraries, her laboratories and teaching methods may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs—the Communists from the earliest days gave up butter for guns, but they gave up meat for education."

The alarming revelations and the other facts I have set before you demand early enactment of a bill such as my colleagues and I are introducing today. It is an essential measure for the security and progress of the people of the United States.

Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in Town and Village, a weekly newspaper which is published and distributed in the 19th Congressional District of New York which it has been my honor to represent:

(By Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN)

These are a Congressman's busiest weeks, the weeks before adjournment when legislative proposals that have been studied in committee and debated back and forth, come up for vote. All a busy legislator can do at this time for his scheduled column for Town and Village is to put down random notes and observations having a bearing on the political life of our country.

One of the more ugly revelations at this session was the attitude of detachment manifested in Government circles about the discrimination against American citizens of Jewish faith in international trade with the Arab countries and in the American personnel admitted to those countries. There is a long and glorious history of United States official condemnation of such practice in instances where other countries undertook to lay down the law to the American Government about distinctions between one citizen and another. In all previous cases, United States policy was clearly and unmistakenly one of indignation at such attempts to dominate American attitudes. It remained for this administration to accept the existence of such practices and to do so with the air of stiff detachment and aloofness. Fortunately this is by no means a closed issue. The American people will have an occasion to learn the facts increasingly from in and outside Congress and pass judgment on this yielding of American sovereign rights.

One of the more gratifying public developments recently was the formation of a group of American scholars known as the American Committee for the Study of War Documents. This concerns a subject which perhaps I was the first Congressman to take note of in the House.

Some time ago I learned that a vast amount of historic documentation which had been found and acquired by the United States occupying forces in Nazi Germany had been kept in Washington, had been made available only in small part for research, and—this is most important—was now in the process of being returned to the Federal German Republic. It was not clear just where the responsibility rested for the decision to return this material. At that time I brought the subject up in Congress in a statement in which I said:

"The German archives contain, no doubt, material that can shed a powerful light on the goals, methods, and processes of the Nazi conquest of one country, Germany; material about the unutterable plans for the destruction of what they called inferior people, first in their own land and then in neighboring countries. It no doubt sheds light on their Machiavellian propaganda techniques, including those by which they contemplated the division of our own country and the weakening of our material and moral strength to resist totalitarianism. Such material is of incalculable historical importance. It must not be jeopardized or lost to us by its casual return to a country where its nationalist forces may be disposed to destroy the full record or to conceal it forever from the scrutiny of the civilized world.

"This record must be kept and, in due course, be made available to American scholarship as the all-important source material by which we can learn from the dread recent past and be strengthened by that knowledge to deal with problems that we may well have to meet in the imminent or far future."

Fortunately, the officials seem to have recognized the stake that the American people have in this material and the value of conserving it by microfilm so that American and world scholarship could have full access to it.

The committee of historians is to be congratulated on its organization. They deserve every aid and encouragement to make it possible for them to carry out this important historical task.

With the political campaign well under way, it is interesting to note the sly action of the Republican national committee in putting forth the notion of Communist preference for a Democratic victory, while, at the same time, giving itself freedom to disown such a smear. A campaign very often gets into ugly impasses. This is one of the ugliest, and it is high time the American people rose up in its wrath to reject these shocking innuendoes against America's oldest political party and against the millions of Americans, probably the majority, who vote for its candidates.

There was a news items just recently reporting how gratified the Soviet leaders were at Eisenhower's decision to run, despite his health condition, because, according to the report, they felt that they could "do business with Eisenhower." I am sure that the

Republican National Committee will not include this report in its documentation for the smear and poison that it is trying to inject into our political discussions.

One of the more wholesome things that followed the great Hoover Republican depression was the deflation of public figures so that their pontifications were not all taken as gospel truth. I remember back in the twenties when every successful industrialist was automatically endowed with wisdom in every aspect of life. The big tycoons spoke on American history, or on medicine, or on psychoanalysis—subjects utterly unknown to them—and received an awesome hearing. The depression deflated this, and it was realized that a man may be qualified to speak authoritatively on one subject and be a darn fool on others.

Now we have a recurrence of this situation: the emergence of "political doctors"—men who are qualified in the field of medicine and surgery and who set themselves up to judge as to the exacting demands of high political office. They are expected to know about the condition of an injured heart or an occluded intestine. That's understandable, but now they have gone further. They issue authoritative statements, as to the strain or lack of strain of political office. With the experience that America has had with such so-called experts, it will know how to take this new development with the big chunk of salt that is called for.

Whatever happened to the teamwork that was so highly touted in the last presidential campaign? The promise that there would be no confusion or misunderstanding and that all the members of the new administration would work as a team conscious of each other's actions, consistent with one another's policies? I raise this question whenever I read of a statement by the President, for instance, on the situation of the neutrals; and an opposite view expressed by his wandering Secretary of State. Is it possible that neither reads what the other says? And what happened to the famous pledge to maintain the highest ethical standards when we run across the Chotiner case; and when the head of the Department of Justice plays "footsy" with a commercial organization for whose television broadcast he reserves the announcement of a major bit of Federal action? What happened?

The campaign I gather is going to hear a great deal of gloating about the fact that the present administration has somehow maintained the high prosperity level that was developed by the policies of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Question: Prosperity for whom? For the farmers? They need only to be asked to reveal how great has been the drop in the farm income, on which so much of our national prosperity depends. The workers? You need only read the news items of the shortened working week, the layoffs, the drop in employment in the basic manufacturing industries. Small businesses? Here are some figures between 1952 and 1955: big business profits after taxes were up 45 percent, and big business return on investment were up 18 percent. Small business profits after taxes were down from 13 percent to 15 percent and investment return down from 16 percent to 41 percent. Dun & Bradstreet index on business failures since 1900 shows that, on the average, the failure rate has been nearly twice as high under the Republicans as under the Democrats.

Small business is becoming smaller and smaller and drastically affecting the general picture of the United States economy.

And so I ask, prosperity for whom?

When the Congress ends its session, I hope to prepare for the readers of T. & V. an extensive series of reports as to the legislation passed and the meaning of what has occurred in our Nation's Capital.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my letter dated July 26, 1956, to Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, and Mr. Burger's reply, dated July 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business,
Washington Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: As you are aware, I have always shown a deep interest in the problems of small business. I first met you, I believe, about 10 years ago in my capacity as a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which was considering a bill to prohibit tire manufacturers from owning and operating retail stores. The bill had been pending before Congress for several years.

I supported this bill and it was I who made the motion that it be reported out of the committee favorably. This was not done at that time though it was subsequently reported.

I cosponsored legislation, sought by the independent bankers of the Nation, commonly known as the Bank Holding Act which is now law. It was largely the result of my activity that the Senate, on July 1, 1955, made a continuing committee of the Senate Small Business Committee which is ready at all times to consider small-business problems. Also, I was active in the establishment of an independent agency in the Government known as the Small Business Administration to give aid to small businesses.

In view of this, I would appreciate your letting me know what further action Congress should take. You may rest assured that I will give close attention to whatever recommendations you may have.

Sincerely,

HOMER E. CAPEHART.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of the 26th expressing your desire to get our opinion on further actions that can be taken by the Congress as an aid to small business of this Nation, in addition to those which you mentioned specifically in your letter to me.

Senator, we value this request very highly as being of considerable importance because of your seniority in the Senate, and because of our previous knowledge of your interest in the problems of small business. I am glad to have the opportunity to give you our overall opinions, which I know are the opinions of the membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, all independent business and professional men, and all voting members.

I believe the total membership will disclose the federation to be the largest business organization of its kind in the Nation, numbering approximately 102,000 members.

Any position we take is on direct nationwide instruction of our members, and no officer or group of officers can speak or act officially for the federation until they receive the instructions from the membership.

We were vitally interested in the action of the President in setting up a special Cabinet Committee to study the problems of small business. This gave me a splendid opportunity to confer with the Chairman of that Committee, Dr. Arthur Burns, and some of his staff at the White House Annex on July 5, 1956.

I think it's necessary, Senator, to give you the substance of the views we expressed at that important conference, and I believe the subject matters discussed at that time with Chairman Burns and his staff, as outlined below, will give you the answer to your request on what further action can be taken by the Congress as a help to small business.

ANTITRUST

We know from practical experience of owning and operating an independent business establishment that the key to success or failure of a small-business enterprise, whether at the production or distribution level, rests largely in the enforcement of these major laws to protect the free-enterprise system.

We believe there is need for strengthening amendments to these laws, such as is proposed in the present Congress, which will curb deliberate and continual violations of antitrust laws. We find that fines are no deterrent.

It doesn't make much difference how efficient small business may be, or how well financed they may be. If these laws are ignored, or there is weakness in the enforcement, it then means certain destruction to small business of this Nation.

As a help, also, in this direction, the local United States Government attorneys should be utilized in detecting violations at the local level.

To bring about impartial, sincere, and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, it is our belief that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should receive increased appropriations, earmarked for antitrust enforcement. Through this competent personnel would be attracted, which would result in the Department continuously being staffed with well-informed personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

The procedure in the Federal Trade Commission should be reviewed, and the agency should confine itself to major economic cases or questions before the Commission so that relief could be secured at the local level for small business through the free-enterprise system. This agency, too, should receive increased appropriations which would attract competent personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

CONGRESSIONAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEES

During their existence these past 15 years, they have proved invaluable to the future welfare of small business. It can be said without fear of contradiction that through the creation of these committees by the Congress many of the Government agencies, for the first time, took the proper steps in creating departments within the agencies on small-business problems.

We believe these committees should be strengthened by giving them full standing committee status, with full legislative authority.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

We have closely observed the operation of this agency. It has made progress in aiding small business. It can make greater progress providing the agency is made a permanent agency of the Government, and the full

control rests in the hands of the Administrator, subject to review by the Congress.

It is our belief that the agency should exercise its right in going in and taking prime contracts and subletting them to small-business institutions. We make this recommendation in view of the fact the following report appeared in the Senate Small Business Committee newsletter of June 30, 1956:

"Small business' share of defense contracts dropped to new low point in 9-month period ending March 30. Report released by Department of Defense shows small business has received only 19.7 percent of the dollars spent by Defense thus far in fiscal 1956. In fiscal 1955 small business got 21.5 percent of the dollar value of all prime contracts awarded to business firms for work in the United States. In fiscal 1954 the small business share was 25.3 percent."

TAXES

Some definite recommendation should be made by the committee that immediate steps be taken by the Congress in enacting legislation which will permit small business to set up necessary reserves so that they may be able to have funds available to take care of their business requirements during normal or lull periods in our economy.

Such legislation has already been introduced in the present Congress and this could be used as a pattern in bringing about this due recognition for tax relief for small business.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

It is our belief that proper steps should be taken for the Government to cease its operations in those fields where it works a tremendous disadvantage to small business.

We believe that the armed services should carefully scrutinize the operations of the Government ships stores and post exchanges, and determine whether under present mass distribution of products such branches of the Government during peacetime are a necessary adjunct of the Government.

TARIFFS

It is well to realize that reciprocal trade with other nations must continue, but this should be carefully scrutinized as to each and every arrangement so that it doesn't work a hardship on our domestic economy.

Many large corporations in the Nation are operated on an international basis so they gain no matter which way the regulation is put into effect, but, on the other hand, reciprocal trade might result in destruction, or an unfair competitive condition for all types of businesses in our Nation's economy, other than the international corporations.

GOVERNMENT FORMS

We realize that, in some instances, the numerous forms now required by Government law for businesses of all descriptions to complete sometimes give invaluable information to the Government, but at the same time recognition must be given to the fact that, in many instances, small business establishments are unable to fulfill the requirements of completing such a maze of forms. It requires outside help, which adds greater expense to the small business operation, or places an undue hardship on the owner of a small business establishment should he attempt to complete the forms himself.

LABOR

On behalf of our members we have repeatedly urged, in our appearances before the platform committees of both political parties, in 1948 and 1952, that labor be brought in under the full provisions of the antitrust laws. This must not be misunderstood as being antagonistic to organized labor because such is not the case, but we do believe, with the increasing concentration in labor leadership, it is necessary today that they be brought in under the antitrust laws, which, in itself, could even be a help to the constructively organized labor movement.

On this subject matter, we also think that the Wage and Hour Law Division of the Department of Labor could stand some reviewing in its enforcement of the wage-and-hour law as it applies to small business.

We live with this situation daily in our contacts with our nationwide membership. Small business is not asking for any preferential treatment, but we do believe there is necessity for fair and equal administration of the labor laws.

At the conclusion of my conference with the President's Cabinet Committee Chairman and his staff, I advised them that these were the major subjects for consideration during the conference, and that we trust appropriate action will be taken by that committee in reporting out recommendations along the lines of the above outlined subjects.

Because of the importance of this communication, Senator, it is my hope that you will make the contents of this letter a matter of public information through insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Such action will be invaluable to the overall future interests of small business of this Nation.

With very high regards,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Peace, Prosperity, and Progress Do Not Change Horses in the Middle of the Stream—Let Good Enough Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, if asked to describe in a few words the achievements of the present Republican administration it could be done in three words—peace, prosperity, and progress.

These words without any further elaboration clearly set forth the present-day conditions that are acknowledged by our people and accepted with general satisfaction and approval.

To fully understand the real reason that exists for this general satisfaction upon the part of our people, we need only compare conditions of today with those that existed when the present administration, under President Eisenhower, took over.

At that time we were still at war in Korea, our boys were being killed, wounded, and maimed on the battlefield. The prosperity, so called, that we had at that time was based upon war conditions. It was therefore neither sound prosperity nor the kind of prosperity that our people could enjoy, as it was founded upon the blood of our boys being shed on the battlefield. Thus, there was no peace, no real prosperity, and progress in promoting the real welfare of our people was at a standstill.

Today the scene is changed. The war is over. No longer are our boys being killed and wounded on Korean battlefields. No longer is our prosperity founded upon war. Instead we have prosperity and progress based upon peace. What could be finer? What could provide more genuine satisfaction to the fathers and mothers of our land? It is not strange that our people, regardless of political affiliation, express approval of the results attained under the present Republican administration.

It is accomplishments such as these that rise above and beyond partisan politics. The heart and soul of America is for peace. The desire for peace dwells deep in the heart of every one of our people whether they be Republican or Democrat. Thus, as peace is the basic desire of all our people, regardless of political affiliation, and prosperity and progress the desirable end of all our national efforts, it is not difficult to understand why there is such general satisfaction upon the part of our people with present conditions wherein peace, prosperity, and progress stand out with such preeminence.

What do we desire for the future? Could there be any better objective than "Let well enough alone" or "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream"?

We have peace. Notwithstanding the troubled state of the world, arising from numerous and varied questions, creating problems that are new each day and causing deep concern, yet the fact remains we are at peace and our boys are not being called upon to die on foreign battlefields.

We have prosperity. Today, as a people, we enjoy a degree of prosperity that exceeds that of the people of any other country in all the world. Our employment exceeds the fabulous figures of 65 million workers. Our national production in value reaches toward $400 billion. All of this has enabled us to enjoy a standard of living that exceeds any other period in our Nation's history.

Is it any wonder that thoughtful citizens should be more favorably impressed with these conditions that are the result of policies tried and not found wanting, and more willing to continue them, than to embark upon a sea of untried, uncertain, and questionable policies that could or would, in whole or in part, hamper or curtail the satisfactory conditions that now exist? It is fortunate that here in America, above and beyond the shouting and the turmoil of designing individuals who seek personal advantage by the advocacy of uncertain policies of government, there is a deep-rooted and well-founded commonsense inherent in our people that finds expression in that well-known adage, "Let well enough alone"?

Peace, prosperity, and progress are the important issues that confront our people today. Politicians can raise their voices to the highest pitch in advocating other issues, but the people will undoubtedly, and as they should in their own best interest, continue to give favorable consideration to these fundamental issues: Peace, prosperity, and progress. Of course, there are varying problems that must be met and solved as we deal with these larger issues. Agriculture and labor have problems to be solved. Our people yearn for additional tax reduction, aid for schools, increased health

facilities, and so forth, and so on. Much has already been done with reference to these, but there is more to be done with respect to them and otherwise. These are important and must have consideration, but careful consideration leaves no doubt that what we can do with these other problems depends in large measure upon whether peace and prosperity shall continue. We have these now, and the progress that follows. Therefore, is it not wise to "let well enough alone"?

President Eisenhower is entitled to have the support of our people in his desire to continue the fulfillment of these basic principles: Peace, prosperity, and progress, and a Congress pledged to support and assist him in his great endeavor.

May God's blessing continue to be and remain with us as a people, that not only peace, prosperity, and progress shall be our portion, but that righteousness, truth, and morality shall ever be present, and a dominating influence in our land.

Justice Department's Withholding of Information on A. T. & T. Settlement Scored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I wish to state that the Attorney General's office has refused to supply the Antitrust Subcommittee with any information from the Department of Justice files concerning the circumstances surrounding the settlement of the Government's antitrust case against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidary, the Western Electric Co.

The Attorney General's refusal to supply the Antitrust Subcommittee with any information from the Department files concerning settlement of this case is predicated on an asserted need to withhold information concerning A. T. & T. and Western Electric operations obtained in the course of consent decree negotiations, and secondly, on a claim of alleged Presidential privilege to deny to the Congress communications passing between employees of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

At the outset, and by way of contrast, I note that the alleged Presidential privilege which is sought to be invoked did not deter members of the administration from making available apparently without restriction, to a friendly newspaper correspondent, numerous highly confidential minutes of Cabinet meetings, as well as other documents of a confidential nature.

It is strange indeed that the Attorney General would cavalierly deny a request of an appropriate committee of the Congress, seeking access to records necessary to make a determination as to the propriety of the A. T. & T. decree, while at the same time the White House freely supplies confidential information to a journalist who is neither elected nor appointed to any office.

On the one hand, the Attorney General invokes the principle of executive privilege to deny the legitimate requests of a duly constituted committee of the Congress; while on the other hand, there is an unprecedented dumping of confidential files by the administration for the whole world to read. This mocks the efforts of the Congress to keep itself informed of the processes of government.

Beyond that, I note that the Attorney General is seeking to withhold not only documents obtained in the course of consent-decree negotiations and memorandums passing between employees of the Antitrust Division, but documents in other categories as well. No reason is even assigned for refusal to make available for committee examination correspondence between the Attorney General and heads of other executive agencies relating to the settlement of this case.

Careful analysis of the A. T. & T. decree indicates its deficiency in many major respects. The only effective relief in this case against the allegedly unlawful monopoly of A. T. & T. would be a separation of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Yet under the decree, the corporate structure of A. T. & T. and Western Electric was not disturbed. In fact, it is fused even closer together and the manufacturing and telephone monopoly is still concentrated in the same hands. This is in direct contrast to the Attorney General's assertions that the A. T. & T.-Western Electric monopoly has been dissipated by the decree.

The settlement, in short, fails to accomplish the principal objective of the Goverment when it filed suit 7 years ago, namely, the separation of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Furthermore, Department consent to the settlement undoubtedly will prejudice future administrations in any subsequent efforts to mitigate the effects of the A. T. & T. monopoly.

Against this background and in light of the circumstances surrounding the settlement and the terms of the consent degree, congressional examination is essential to determine, among other things, whether A. T. & T. and its subsidiary, Western Electric, were given preferential treatment in this case by the Department of Justice.

The text of the letter I wrote to the Attorney General and the answer received from the Department of Justice in reply follow:

MAY 29, 1956.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee has examined and analyzed the consent decree entered into on January 24, 1956, in the antitrust case of *United States* v. *American Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al.* The subcommittee's study indicates that further and more detailed inquiry into all the circumstances surrounding the settlement of this case is appropriate.

Accordingly, it is requested that you make available for examination by the subcommittee all files in the Department of Justice relating to the negotiations for, and signing of, a consent decree in this case.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1956.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Antitrust Subcommittee,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I have your letter to the Attorney General, dated May 29, 1956, requesting that we "make available for examination by the subcommittee all files in the Department of Justice relating to the negotiations for, and signing of, a consent degree in, *United States* v. *American Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al.*"

The staff of the Antitrust Division has examined in detail this Department's files relating to the negotiations and formulation of that decree. The bulk of these documents fall in two categories: first, material submitted by defendants regarding their operations; and, second, memoranda by various members of the Antitrust Division concerning negotiation conferences as well as decree provisions.

Documents relating to defendants' operations, I emphasize, were produced, not pursuant to interrogatories or court order, but rather in the course of good-faith negotiation of a consent settlement. Some touched on confidential aspects of the defendants' operations. Were they made available to your subcommittee, this Department would violate the confidential nature of settlement negotiations and, in the process, discourage defendants, present and future, from entering into such negotiations.

In any event, as I wrote you over a year ago, on May 6, 1955, Department policy does not permit disclosure of staff memoranda or recommendations. As I indicated, the decision whether or not to settle, and if so on what terms, may involve difficult judgments. Reaching these judgments, I am sure you appreciate that men equally devoted to vigorous antitrust enforcement may well differ. To enable intelligent final decision, therefore, full and open discussion is required frequently, not only by all members of the staff but also by the staff with the Assistant Attorney General. This process of interchange may endure over some time. And, as a result of discussion, any participant must feel free to alter his views as the merits of argument dictate. This essential process of full and flexible exchange might be seriously endangered were staff members hampered by the knowledge they might at some later date be forced to explain before Congress intermediate positions taken. The responsibility for explaining such decisions thus rests upon the Assistant Attorney General and ultimately upon the Attorney General.

As the President of the United States directed in a like instance:

"Because it is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising with each other on official matters, and because it is not in the public interest that any of their conversations or communications, or any documents or reproductions, concerning such advice be disclosed, you will instruct employees of your Department that in all of their appearances before [congressional committees] * * * not to testify to any such conversations or communications or to produce any such documents or reproductions. This principle must be maintained

regardless of who would be benefited by such disclosures."

The danger of abandoning that policy in the case of a law enforcement agency seems clear. Revealing staff disagreement on issues might well cramp effective enforcement.

With this in mind, this Department cannot grant your request to examine our files relating to the decree in *United States* v. *American Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al.*

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

Reports Which Should Not Be Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on July 20 last the distinguished minority leader of the United States Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, of California, expressed to the Senate his amazement and concern that the United States under the United Nations Charter is required to furnish regular reports to the United Nations concerning Alaska and Hawaii. Under article 73, chapter XI, of the charter, it is held that Alaska and Hawaii are nonself-governing Territories. That is certainly true. But it is likewise true that they are incorporated, organized Territories of the United States and as such are constitutionally part of the Union.

I was delighted to learn that Senator KNOWLAND took such an emphatic position in seeking to bring to an end the furnishing of these reports. I trust his efforts will be successful. It must be sadly admitted, however, that earlier attempts in this same direction failed completely. To the best of my knowledge, it was Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, who in the early winter of 1953 first called upon the Secretary of State to discontinue without delay such reporting. For my part, I followed in the next few days with a letter to the Secretary of State endorsing Senator WATKINS' recommendation. The letter which was directed to Senator WATKINS by Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton and copy of which was furnished me by the Department of State was about as unresponsive a communication as I have ever had come to my attention. The State Department wrote to Senator WATKINS in these words:

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: The Department has noted with great interest the points which you raise in your letter of February 10, 1953, concerning reporting by the United States to the United Nations on Territories under the administration of this Government.

The Department was glad to learn that you favor the decision recently communicated to the United Nations that, in view of the self-governing status within the Federal Union attained by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under the constitution of July 25, 1952, it is no longer appropriate or necessary to provide information on Puerto Rico under the provisions of chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations.

With regard to Alaska and Hawaii, the ultimate status to be attained within the American Federal system is evidently statehood. The Department of State has always considered that, with the attainment of statehood for these Territories, a full measure of self-government in the language of chapter XI of the United Nations Charter will have been obviously achieved and there will be no question of further reporting to the United Nations. In this connection, it is noted that statehood for Hawaii is among the measures urged by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message and ranks high on the legislative program of the current session of the Congress. It is also noted that bills have again been introduced proposing statehood for Alaska.

There is no question, as you point out in your letter, that Hawaii and Alaska, as incorporated Territories, are integral parts of the United States. The charter, however, makes no distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories and calls for the transmission of economic, social, and educational information for territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

In 1946, on purely pragmatic grounds, the United States considered that a broad interpretation of this charter obligation would not only cause no disadvantage but would encourage other members of the United Nations to transmit information on their territories on a similarly broad basis, and thus assist in rendering the charter effective in this important sphere. The decision to report to the United Nations on Hawaii and Alaska has remained unchanged in the absence of any modification since 1946 in the constitutional position and status of these Territories which would lead the United States to cease reporting. The United States, it may be added, has actually received much favorable comment for the excellent administration of its Territories.

The Department is constantly reexamining the question of reporting to the United Nations on United States Territories, and your suggestion regarding Hawaii and Alaska will be given further study in connection with this periodic review. A change in status in either case would, of course, bring your suggestion into immediate effect.

I replied on February 21 as follows:

Thank you for your letter of February 20 with which you were good enough to send me a copy of the letter addressed to Senator WATKINS under date of February 19. Both these communications have to do with reporting by the United States to the United Nations in respect to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Since you have been in office such a short time that naturally you have not had opportunity to look into matters such as this and also because as a former Member of Congress you must have had your hackles rise upon receiving departmental letters whose weight is based only on wordage and not logic, please allow me to record a personal belief that the letter sent Senator WATKINS is gobbledygook in its most elevated form.

I was particularly taken by the phrase that the United States in 1946 "on purely pragmatic grounds" decided to report to the United Nations on these Territories which are integral parts of the United States. Purely pragmatic grounds is wonderful. Perhaps it would be just as well, though, for the United States to look at this realistically and become unpragmatic. Whoever was the actual author of the letter sent to Senator WATKINS inserted by way of added dividend "The United States, it may be added, has actually received much favorable comment for the excellent administration of its Territories." May I call upon you to supply by chapter and verse the notation of such favorable comment. This would be most interesting. Actually, I would be much more content if the Department of State under the new administration were to cease furnishing to the United Nations precise statistical information which might be useful to Soviet Russia, a nation which naturally is most interested in everything that goes on in the Territory so close to its own Siberia. Better yet, grant us statehood and there would be no question about any of this.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only improper that Territories which, as Senator WATKINS pointed out, have been brought into the Union should be reported on to the United Nations but there are certain inherent dangers in doing so. There is always the possibility that information might be furnished in connection with these highly strategic areas that would be useful to a potential enemy. Alaska is one of the principal bastions of the United States. We do not tell our own people much about what is going on there regarding defense. Why, then, do we report to the United Nations? This practice should be stopped without delay. I am grateful to Senators WATKINS and KNOWLAND for their help.

The Legislative Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress has been one of the most constructive Congresses in the history of our country. It has enacted into law more public and private measures than has been done by any Congress for many, many years. Among the public laws have been many of great importance to the people of our country.

I desire to compliment Members of both sides of the aisle for their industrious and devoted attention to duty, both in committee and in the House during this Congress. For Speaker RAYBURN and myself, I wish to express our thanks for the courtesies and the understanding cooperativeness shown us, and without excluding others, in particular, the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The 84th Congress has been a responsible Congress during which very constructive legislation has been enacted. A Republican Congress, not long past, may have raised fears in the American minds that our system does not work well when the executive and legislative branches are not controlled by the same political party. The 84th Congress, under Democratic leadership, has dispelled such fears so far as Democratic control of the Congress is concerned. This Democratic Congress accepted the responsibility decreed it by the American voters in 1954, and has not broken faith with the voters. In the 1954 election, President Eisenhower, during the campaign,

tried to throw fear into the minds of the American people that the election of a Democratic Congress with a President who is Republican would result in a cold war. The deeds of the 84th Congress have shown very clearly that President Eisenhower was in error when he made that statement.

This Congress has received the recommendations of the President of the United States in good faith. It has given thorough and careful consideration to such recommendations and, in so doing, has put national interest above partisan concern. In many cases the recommendations were passed substantially as recommended; in others they were improved upon prior to passage; in still others they were not acted upon because they were not for the best interest of the people. The guidepost of the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress was always, How do these recommendations fit the need of this great country of ours?

The record clearly shows the Democratic Party's selfless indifference to partisan advantage in our dedicated efforts to achieve major objectives. Once again we have substantiated our claim that we are the party of the people. While some members of the minority party have worked just as industriously and diligently as we Democrats to achieve the great record made by this Congress, the major credit lies with the Democratic Members.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very simple reason for this unusual situation which finds the President of the United States largely dependent upon support from the opposite political party than his own in order to obtain the progress and development of his program. In connection with this, it must be borne in mind that the President has embraced many of the basic policies and much of the philosophy of the Democratic Party.

We stood with the President in all matters which we felt were in the public interest. We fought him on issues which were designed to channel ever more of the common man's purchasing power into the coffers of special interest groups. The accomplishments of the 84th Congress clearly show that the Democratic Party was not a party of blind opposition but assumed its role under constitutional government of constructively supporting, of constructively proposing, of constructively criticizing, and of constructively opposing. When we compare this affirmative attitude of the Democratic Party with the blind opposition of the Republican Party under Democratic Presidents, the Democratic Party gains greater stature in the minds of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our record of taking specific and tangible action when the welfare of any segment of our people, large or small, is threatened. We do not condition our policy upon whether or not it is good for General Motors. Nor do we proclaim to the people in distressed areas that the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy. The record clearly shows that the Democratic Party is primarily concerned with the interest and welfare of our people. Under Democratic leadership, people will not, because of economic conditions, be expected to scrounge for survival.

From a statistical standpoint the 84th Congress has been extremely active in comparison with other recent Congresses. In fact, the number of measures enacted into law exceeds that of any Congress for the past 20 years. While the final returns are not yet in on the number of measures enacted, the figure is certain to rank high in comparison with other recent Congresses. These comparisons, standing alone, are an inadequate picture of the real accomplishments but they do give some indication of the workload of the 84th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline some of the major achievements of this Congress because I think it represents an era of enlightenment in the field of bipartisan politics that is unsurpassed in the history of our Nation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

At the outset, I want to emphasize the fact that in the 2d session of the 84th Congress just completed, it is the first time in years that all regular appropriations bills were through both branches of the Congress by June 30. This is an unusual record.

One of the most critical problems to face in the 84th Congress in its earliest days was Formosa and what to do about her defense. Under Democratic leadership the problem was quickly brought before Congress and action was taken to give the President authority to use the Armed Forces, if necessary, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. This demonstration of American strength and unity aided considerably at that time and for some months to come in the lessening of the tension in the Far East. Unfortunately, that tension has increased from other factors during the past year. I might state that the Formosa resolution was supported almost unanimously by members of both major political parties.

The President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements and to reduce tariff rates was extended to June 30, 1958.

Economic and military aid amounting to over $7 billion was authorized.

The President's authority to control exports was extended until 1958.

Authority was granted for the United States participation in the International Finance Corporation for the purpose of encouraging private investment in foreign trade.

Congress provided for the settlement of World War II claims against Hungary, Rumania, and other countries.

An appropriation of $57.7 million was authorized to complete the Inter-American Highway.

Numerous important treaties in which the House had no voice were ratified by the Senate.

Last year I had the pleasure of submitting a concurrent resolution designed to place Congress on record as opposing Communist imperialism and calling for administration of our foreign policy and use of our influence to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-determination or independence. This resolution passed both branches of the Congress unanimously.

Congress extended to July 1, 1959, the authority to draft men into the Armed Forces. The act relating to doctors, dentists, and allied specialists was extended to July 1, 1957. These actions were necessary in the national interest of our country.

Legislation was enacted into law to establish a trained reserve manpower pool of 2,900,000 by 1959. Unfortunately, this program has not progressed very rapidly due to the confused leadership of the present administration.

An excellent program of construction of armories for training reserves in the sum of $250 million and covering a 3-year period was authorized.

On two occasions Congress extended the President's authority to allocate and fix priorities of critical and strategic materials, and to grant loans and subsidies under the Defense Production Act. That authority now will not expire until June 30, 1958.

Officer strength of the armed services was increased by 60,000 men.

Laws were enacted to authorize the President to make the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service a part of the military in times of emergency; and to organize State defense forces to replace the National Guard when that organization is called into the Federal service.

A $532.2 million program of atomic energy projects was authorized.

Legislation was enacted providing for a large construction program in connection with the domestic and foreign bases of the Armed Forces, which legislation included provision for housing military families.

Additional funds were provided for the expansion of research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, as well as for the construction of an aircraft control and warning system.

Legislation was enacted authorizing $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion, including a nuclear-powered cruiser and a 60,000-ton aircraft carrier.

I might also say that considerable other legislation too numerous to mention on this occasion in the field of foreign affairs and national defense were enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I will now review some of the major activities of this Congress in a field in which the Democrats have always taken the leadership:

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Under the inspired leadership of a great Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of the most important and humane pieces of legislation ever proposed was placed before Congress and enacted into law. This was accomplished against the opposition of a great majority of the opposite party. I refer to the Social Security Act. That act has subsequently been broadened and liberalized in many respects under the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and under former President Harry S. Truman. The 84th Congress accomplished a major revision of the act. It extended benefits to women beginning at the age of 62 instead of at age 65, and to disabled persons at age 50 instead of at age 65; coverage for lawyers, dentists,

and other professionals was included; benefits were extended to some farmers; grants to States for aid to the needy, blind, and to dependent children were increased.

Another extremely important measure enacted by this Congress was the extension until July 1, 1957, of the Salk polio-vaccination program. Despite the poor administration of this program for a long period of time, it should be a comfort now to all Americans to know that this battle against crippling disease is now running smoothly, and this was mainly brought about through the justifiable criticism of Democratic Members.

In the field of medical research, of such vital importance to the people of our country both from a legislative and appropriation angle, this Congress has made the greatest step forward ever made in the history of our country. The results of the action of the Congress will inure to the benefit of our people and of mankind. As a result of the legislation passed and appropriations made, medical science will be able to enter into partially explored and unexplored fields bringing about results that will bring hope and confidence and improved care and treatment to millions of sick, afflicted, and disabled persons.

This Congress increased and extended the authorization for milk for schoolchildren; legislation was enacted authorizing a 5-year $7.5 million a year program of Federal aid for State library services in isolated rural areas; the Public Health Service has been directed by statute to survey the extent of chronic illnesses; and appropriations for medical research have been greatly increased.

Following the disastrous floods of the fall of 1955, the present Congress has made an outstanding record in meeting this serious situation. Adequate appropriations have been made for construction of dams and other work during the remainder of fiscal year 1956 and fiscal year 1957.

The Congress has also passed a law giving the Army engineers authority to construct projects, without authority from Congress, up to $400,000 per year in each project instead of the limited $150,000 which was the law heretofore. In connection with the latter, an additional appropriation of $2 million has been made to carry out this law during the coming fiscal year. In addition, Congress took many steps to extend FHA loan privileges to those who suffered during the flood period.

A very important bill of vital concern to the people of our country is the passage of flood disaster insurance legislation. After the disastrous floods of 1950 and 1951 in various sections of the country, particularly in and around the Middle West, former President Truman recommended such legislation. It was bitterly opposed as socialistic. After the floods of last year a public demand developed for the passage of such legislation. As hearings took place in both branches of the Congress, secret and powerful opposition developed against the passage of such legislation. Fortunately, such opposition was overcome with the resultant passage of the bill through both branches of the Congress. The concept of this type of legislation originated in the recommendation in 1951 of former President Truman; its passage was as a result of bipartisan support, but strictly under Democratic leadership.

This Congress has passed a housing program that represents a compromise but still represents progress.

Legislation was enacted to extend the program for the construction of school facilities in federally impacted areas.

Mortgage insurance provisions were extended and liberalized.

Legislation was enacted to meet the sinister activity of illicit drug peddlers who sell to children, and other provisions effective stricter control of narcotics were enacted into law.

AGRICULTURE

As is well known, the 84th Congress passed and sent to the President legislation providing price supports of 90 percent for basic commodities, increasing price supports on dairy products from 75 percent to a scale of 80 to 90 percent, and providing for a soil-bank program and a two-price plan for wheat and rice. As is also well known, President Eisenhower vetoed that bill, which veto was sustained. Recognizing the plight of the farmers of our country, the Democratic-controlled Congress passed a bill in an attempt to alleviate the same. This bill was necessary as a result of the veto of President Eisenhower. It was not as effective as the Democratic measure.

A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress in 1957 will mean more effective legislation for the agricultural communities of our country.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing power was increased by several billions of dollars; the Sugar Act was extended until 1960 and foreign and domestic quotas were adjusted; farmers were relieved of paying excise tax on gasoline and oil used in farm machinery; the brucellosis eradication program was increased by $20 million and extended until 1958; a 10-year $25 million program of soil and water conservation was authorized for farmers of the Great Plains States; the limit on sales of surplus commodities for foreign currency under the Foreign Agricultural and Trade Development and Assistance Act was increased by over $2 billion; recruitment of Mexican farm labor was extended to 1959; acreage allotments for durum wheat were raised to meet shortages; onions were brought under the provisions of the Commodity Act; rice acreage allotments were reapportioned; tobacco quotas have been redetermined; emergency loan provisions for farmers and stockmen were extended for 2 years; a 2-year extension was granted for agricultural loans in disaster areas; a $15 million program for distribution of surplus wheat flour and corn meal to needy families was authorized; additional insurance of loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act was authorized; additional appropriations were authorized to the Agricultural Extension Service for special programs to aid farmers in low-income areas; and an important measure to the farmers of our country was that interest rates on farm disaster loans were reduced from 5 percent to 3 percent.

NATURAL RESOURCES

This Congress passed a number of fine projects of importance to different sections of the country in connection with flood control, conservation, and to prevent our natural resources from going to waste. One of the most important of these bills in this respect is the passage of the upper Colorado River bill authorizing a $760 million project for flood control and land reclamation in this great section of our country.

Another important bill passed was one increasing by $1 million a year Federal research grants to States and expanding the water-pollution program to $50 million a year for 5 years. Section 6 of this bill was opposed by the Republican administration.

Funds were authorized for the Washita River Basin project in Oklahoma; the Missouri River Basin project; the Mississippi-Gulf outlet; the Russian River, Calif., development; dam construction in Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri; the Ventura River reclamation project; construction and operation of the Washoe reclamation project in Nevada and California; Trinity River; and Central Valley project.

Several important interstate compacts for apportioning and allocating water—fire protection and other matters—were approved by Congress; Federal aid for wildlife projects was authorized; an 8-year program of research in the development and use of saline waters was enacted; legislation was enacted to permit development of mineral resources on public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development; a bill authorizing $8.5 million Federal matching-fund program to aid States in drainage and flood-control measures for anthracite mines; $15 million was authorized as an emergency fund for protection and repair of flood-control work, flood fighting, and rescue operations.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

This Congress enacted provisions to grant educational benefits to children of veterans who lost their lives in World War II and Korea; social security wage credits were granted for certain periods of military service; pay of trainees under the Reserve program was increased; legislation was enacted to provide medical care for the dependents of members of the Armed Forces; the Veterans' Administration program of guaranteed loans for home purchase or construction was extended to July 1958; pay of medical and dental officers in the armed services and Public Health Service was increased; loans were authorized for the purchase of farm homes by veterans under the same terms as for residential housing; the unemployment program for veterans of the Korean war was extended to 1960; and mustering-out pay provisions for Korean veterans were also extended.

And also of great importance, legislation was enacted to increase the pay of all members of the armed services by amounts ranging from 6 percent to 25 percent.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Congress, after many months of careful and deliberate consideration, enacted a broad highway construction program. This is distinctively a Democratic measure. If the measure recommended by President Eisenhower had become law, it would have cost the taxpayers of America in a period of 30 years over $11 billion more than the Democratic measure. President Eisenhower and the entire administration at the outset bitterly fought this vital measure. This law authorizes a $33.4 billion program involving 41,000 miles of interstate highways to be spread over a 13-year period. The Federal share of the cost will be 90 percent. The Democratic measure was a "pay as you go" one. The Republican measure was a deferred-payment one, properly known as the big bankers' dream.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was amended to increase the minimum wage rate from 75 cents to $1 per hour. President Eisenhower recommended an increase to 90 cents per hour. The Democractic Congress put through the increase to $1 per hour.

The Small Business Administration's loan authority was increased by $100 million to take care of disasters.

A very important bill, distinctively Democratic in origin, that passed both branches of the Congress under Democratic leadership is the bill to increase exemptions of the amusement tax from 50 cents to 90 cents. In particular, this is a matter of great importance to the moving-picture houses of our country that are operating under severe competition, and more particularly to the smaller moving-picture houses of our country.

Legislation was enacted authorizing a 4-year program of airport construction, and providing $63 million a year for grants-in-aid to States. When we realize the air disasters that have taken place, the importance of this legislation will be recognized and appreciated.

War-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act were extended to 1960; renegotiation provisions for recovery of excess profits from defense contracts were extended to 1958; criminal penalties under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act were increased.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Congress enacted legislation to improve budgeting and accounting procedures and methods; civil-service retirement provisions were liberalized; annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system were increased; salary increases were provided for postal employees and other Federal employees, as well as members of the Cabinet, Federal judges, and Members of the Congress; per diem and travel allowances for Federal employees were increased; legislation was enacted to facilitate integration of State Department employees into the Foreign Service, and standards were raised to improve the quality of personnel.

The retirement bill for at least 2,100,000 employees and their 6 million dependents is a very important piece of legislation. It is probably the most important single Federal employee act of this session of Congress. Under Democratic leadership, the bill as it passed both branches is a much better one than that recommended by President Eisenhower. This bill is another illustration of the considerate and humane leadership of the Democratic Party.

The several pay-increase bills in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, also enacted under Democratic leadership, resulted in higher pay increases for Federal employees than those recommended by President Eisenhower.

Both of these bills were passed over the resistance and opposition of the administration to the higher salaries and higher retirement benefits.

INTERNAL SECURITY

In this field laws were enacted to—

Fix criminal penalties for persons assisting in attempted escape of Federal prisoners; prohibit Government employment of disloyal persons or those who believe in the right to strike against the Government; create a Commission on Government Security to review the present program and make recommendations thereon; provide penalties for threats against the President-elect or the Vice President; provide rewards for information on the illegal importation, manufacture, or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons; and provide penalties for the willful damage or destruction of aircraft.

The record of Congress is not only legislation passed for the best interest of the people but also in exposing or preventing actions that are not for our best interests.

The 83d Republican-controlled Congress was noted for its giveaways of certain natural resources of our people. The 84th Congress stopped such giveaways.

The use of the contract device without advising or consulting with the Congress until after contracts were actually entered into, thereby attempting to commit our Government and compelling Congress to appropriate the necessary money, even if Congress did not agree, upon the theory that Congress had to approve otherwise it would constitute impairing the obligations of a contract, for which large compensation could be received from the Government by the private contracting party has been definitely exposed by this Congress.

An illustration of this is where the Department of the Air Force made contracts involving several billions of dollars over a period of 10 years in connection with the project known as Sage.

This is a case where contracts were made where no authority in law existed for the making of the same. The private companies were innocent. In this case there was no stretched interpretation of law involved. It was the making of contracts without authority in law.

Democratic Members were not opposed to project Sage, but insisted that the constitutional powers of Congress be preserved. It is interesting to note that the Comptroller General ruled that no authority in law existed for the making of such contracts.

As a result, the Defense Department, through the Department of the Air Force, had to come to Congress to get the authority in law to make such contracts, and which authority was granted by the recent session of the Congress.

It is also interesting to note, however, that as a result of the attempt to ignore and bypass Congress that first, $830 million over a period of 10 years has been saved the taxpayers of our country; and, second, the rights of small and independent telephone and electric companies, ignored by the Department of the Air Force, have been protected by congressional action.

This large saving of money and the protection of small and independent telephone and electric companies was brought about by the Members of the present Democratic-controlled Congress.

The number of cases of "conflict of interest" involving at least several high officials of the present administration resulting in their resignation is another illustration of nonlegislative action by Congress, but constructive in nature and protective of the people's interest.

A further illustration of this is the nefarious Dixon-Yates contract which, first, was made in secrecy; and, second, by the very man who represented the Government, and at the same time was an official of the company entering into contractual obligations with the Government.

This hidden deal, contrary to the best interest of our people, was exposed by Democratic Members of Congress against the strong resistance of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration.

Another attempt by this administration is the stretched interpretation of the laws for the purpose of bypassing Congress. An excellent illustration of this was the action of the Defense Department in practically destroying the Donable Property Act, which meant so much to the several States and political subdivisions and to the hospitals, colleges, and schools of our country. This action of the Defense Department was stopped by the present Democratic-controlled Congress.

Another illustration of the constructive work done by the 84th Democratic Congress is the exposing of secrecy in Government where the executive branch withholds information from our people which they should receive. Quite frequently it is through releases by the Foreign Ministry of Great Britain and of France that the American people are made acquainted with valuable information which should be made public by our Government. Also involved is the deliberate withholding of information from the Congress and its committees which makes this a dangerous policy—justifiably subject to severe criticism.

We have seen develop under President Eisenhower during the past 3½ years a strange doctrine known as the doctrine of nonresponsibility, subtly established

by President Eisenhower and the executive branch of the Government. The effect of this doctrine means that when bad errors are made by appointees of the President, and when they do things that are wrong, the President is not held responsible. This has created a political vacuum in Washington which is inconsistent with our theory of government.

The continuance of this doctrine of nonresponsibility of the President, with the resultant political vacuum, is not for the best interest of our country and our people. The doctrine of nonresponsibility for the conduct of public office by virtue of being uninformed or not desiring to be informed is dangerous.

The election of the Democratic candidate for President in November will effectively stop the continuance of such doctrine and the conditions that follow therefrom.

The Democratic Party has always been strong for a firm foreign policy and for a powerful national defense. Unfortunately, our country is upon the defensive throughout the world. The quicker that those who are entrusted with the responsibility of conducting our foreign policy get back to the Democratic policy of peace through strength the better it will be for our country and the free world.

Mr. Speaker, this presentation shows that the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress was not only an active one but a constructive one. My presentation does not by any means portray a complete picture of the fine work which has been done by this Congress. Based upon the work performed and the record made, I am proud to include the 84th Congress within my span of my service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

President Eisenhower an Influence for World Peace Who Should Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today with its uncertainties in world affairs there is great need for the strength that comes from unity of action as well as of purpose.

From the very beginning President Eisenhower has shown not only a desire for peace, but, also a determination to maintain peace.

The President in all his efforts to effect these purposes has had the loyal and fullhearted help and support of Secretary of State Dulles, who is equally dedicated to the cause of peace. The physical and mental energy that has been displayed by Secretary Dulles is almost unbelievable. Aside from the mental strain that he has been under in meeting the many problems that confront our Nation, and, that he has been called upon to consider and find appropriate solution for, which in itself has been tremendous, there has been also the physical strain incident to the thousands of miles he has traveled by airplane to all parts of the world to meet those in other nations whose agreement and cooperation has been necessary if the best possible results were to be attained.

It is a high tribute to Secretary Dulles that he is honored and respected by congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle, Democrats as well as Republicans, for the wisdom and sincerity with which he has approached world problems. As a result of this, he and President Eisenhower have built up a nonpartisan support for American policies in our own Nation that has enabled us to present a united front to the nations of the world, and thereby gain that cooperation that has been so helpful and necessary to secure the blessings of world peace.

It has been no easy task that the President and his Secretary of State have been called upon to cope with in the effort to maintain our peace, and peace and good will throughout the world.

In this connection, it has been most difficult because of the unusual conditions created by Russia; first, under Stalin and, second, under Bulganin and his associates. The policies pursued by the latter were distinctly different than those under Stalin. But, was there a real difference in objective? This was the fundamental question. It has not been easy of discernment. Consequently, it has been no easy task to avoid pitfalls that might have led to disaster.

For instance, there was the incident of Premier Bulganin sending to President Eisenhower a communication on behalf of the Soviet Union, in which the latter proposed a treaty of peace solely between Russia and the United States. It was a gesture that could easily have led a peace-loving nation, such as ours, to a quick acceptance. It could have been assumed that President Eisenhower would jump quickly to accept the suggestion as a way to peace, but fortunately our President was not so naive as to accept at full value what on the surface looked like a peace offer from Russia. However, he looked beneath the surface and there he saw a hidden danger and evidence of an ulterior motive. What he saw revealed to him the truth of two old sayings, namely, "All that glitters is not gold," and equally true, "Things are not always what they seem." However, the answer given by President Eisenhower to the Russian note left no doubt that he had looked well beneath the surface and had not been fooled by deceptive words, gilded though they were with the beauty and splendor that surrounds the thought of peace. Had President Eisenhower not been so discerning, and, had he accepted the Russian suggestion for a treaty solely between the Soviets and ourselves, it could have easily wrecked the unity that has existed between the free nations of the world and thereby eventually imperiled the united security for peace that now exists.

Never have I been more proud of our President than I was after reading the answer he made to the Russian Premier. His answer was so dignified, so searching, so simple and clear in expression, and so plain and convincing as to our national desire for peace, that even though the President refused to accept the Russian proposal as offered, and asserted in plain strong language that the failure of Russia to live up to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and its conduct in violating the principles of the Charter in recent years, made it mandatory that Russia first show a desire for peace by deeds rather than words, nevertheless, a spirit of friendliness pervaded the whole document to such an extent that it must have been apparent to even the Russian Premier, and, I hope, to the people of Russia, that our Nation seeks peace and not war.

The answer of President Eisenhower, in my opinion, constitutes one of the most outstanding chapters in the long history of mankind in its effort to create a world of peace and good will.

The friendly language of the President's reply, devoid of any harshness, and yet unmistakably strong and to the point, did not destroy in the slightest degree the eloquence of the answer, nor its effectiveness in promoting a better understanding of the sincerity of America in its desire for world peace. The acclaim of approval with which the President's reply was received throughout the world by all people who seek honestly to follow the ways of peace, and the praise that greeted it by all, regardless of party affiliation, including leading Democrats, such as former President Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Senators Byrd and Russell, as well as all the leaders within the President's own political party, leaves no doubt as to its approval and confidence in its effectiveness as a means of promoting world peace.

There are many equally significant and important incidents that might be set forth. All of such would tend to prove the valuable asset we have in the person of our President to deal with the intricate problems of foreign affairs. President Eisenhower, by his long and intimate association with foreign leaders, when he was commander in chief of the Allied armies, gained for him a reservoir of information that is of the utmost value in times such as these. He is helped immeasurably thereby as he meets with foreign leaders with reference to problems identified with our peace aims, and, also in making his decisions in reference thereto. Furthermore, his influence in all these matters is enhanced by his personal acquaintanceship with foreign leaders whereby he has been in a peculiarly strong position to demonstrate the high purpose that actuates him in all he says and does in the cause of peace.

President Eisenhower's character, ability, influence, and sincerity are so well known abroad, as well as here in his homeland, that it behooves us to retain him in the office of President and give to him a Congress pledged to support him in all his efforts for world peace.

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to make part of the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a listing of my votes on the important rollcall issues of the 84th Congress. I feel it is a duty to the electorate which has sent me back here to represent them in Congress, and a willing desire of mine to compile and publish this record so that they know how my vote was cast on the important issues of the day.

Since the House of Representatives had some 22,000 bills introduced during the 2 years of the 84th Congress, it is apparent that only a relatively small percentage of them ever got to a vote before the House. Many smaller bills, having to do with private legislation, were not brought to a rollcall vote. For practical purposes, since these are the votes officially recorded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, I have confined this record to those votes requiring a yea-or-nay answer—a rollcall. These, of course, include the topmost issues before the Congress during the past 2 years.

For simplification I have divided these measures into categories according to the general fields they encompass. Some are difficult to classify as they are considerably broad in scope and I request the reader's pardon if the categories overlap on some bills.

BILLS RELATING TO DEFENSE AND ARMED SERVICES

Voted for H. R. 6042 in 1955 and H. R. 10986 in 1956. Both bills provided for appropriations to operate all the armed services through the Defense Department.

Voted for H. R. 4393 in 1955 and H. R. 7993 in 1956. These bills provided $1.3 and $1.4 billion for Navy shipbuilding and modernization of fleet programs.

Voted for House Joint Resolution 159, which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Voted for H. R. 3005, to increase benefits under dependents' assistance program and provide for a continuing Armed Forces personnel program.

Voted for H. R. 7000, to strengthen the Armed Forces Reserve program which offers youths choice of several ways to fulfill their military obligations.

Voted for H. R. 6829 in 1955 and H. R. 9893 in 1956, which provided nearly $4 billion for military construction projects.

BILLS AFFECTING BUSINESS AND TRADE

Voted against Resolutions 170 and 171, which would have kept the Government in rubber plants operated at loss to taxpayers.

Voted for H. R. 1, which authorized the President to enter into beneficial trade negotiations with various nations of the world.

Voted for H. R. 8710, which removed authority of Defense Department to negotiate big contracts. Bids must now be called on contracts over $2,500.

Voted for H. R. 6227, which provides regulation by the Government of bank holding companies.

Voted for H. R. 11380, which would have provided sufficient revenue to operate the Post Office Department on a sound fiscal basis.

Voted for H. R. 1840, which strengthened antitrust laws and prohibits price discrimination.

BILLS AFFECTING VETERANS, SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION, AND HOUSING

Voted for S. 2126, to provide Federal housing, reconstruction and slum clearance projects, and H. R. 11742, the 1956 version of the same bill, which included my amendment to provide authority for single elderly people to occupy public housing projects.

Voted for H. R. 7535, to authorize a Federal-aid program for school construction.

Voted for H. R. 7886, to provide increased pensions for World War I veterans.

Voted for H. R. 587, to extend the GI education bill.

Voted for H. R. 4721, to increase pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces.

Voted for H. R. 7225, to lower the retirement age for women to 62 and start disability payments at age 50 under the social-security program.

Voted for H. R. 12038, for increased payments for service-connected disabilities.

Voted for H. R. 7089, to provide increased survivors benefits for servicemen.

BILLS ON GENERAL OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT

Voted for H. R. 10660, which sets up a 13-year, $38 billion program to develop interstate, primary, and secondary highways in the Nation.

Voted for H. R. 4259 and H. R. 9166, for extension of corporation taxes.

Voted for H. R. 5924, to authorize Inter-American Highway completion within 3 years.

Voted for H. R. 7224 and H. R. 12130, which provided foreign aid funds. Voted for all reductions.

Voted for H. R. 6766, which set up increased funds for the United States Army engineers, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 265, which expressed Congress' opposition to admittance of Red China into the United Nations.

Voted for H. R. 627, for furtherance of civil rights.

Voted against H. R. 7992, which would impede Defense Department getting out of competition with business and require Defense Department to submit proposal to Congress before getting out of business.

Voted for H. R. 12061, which would speed up governmental development of atomic electrical power by establishing reactor plants at Hanford and other locations.

BILLS AFFECTING LABOR

Voted for H. R. 7214 to increase the minimum wage to $1 per hour.

Voted against H. R. 9852 which would require dispersal of defense industries, such as Boeing from coastal areas.

Voted for H. R. 567 to increase pay for certain types of civil-service employees.

Voted for H. R. 4644 to increase postal workers' pay, eliminate inequities in service.

Voted for Bacon-Davis amendment to highway bill that requires prevailing rates of pay for all labor on highway construction projects.

BILLS AFFECTING FARMERS AND FARMING

Voted for H. R. 10875, President Eisenhower's farm program with soil-bank provisions, and other programs designed to bolster farm income. Voted to sustain veto of hodgepodge, unworkable farm bill originally proposed.

Voted for H. R. 8780 to eliminate gasoline taxes on fuel used in operation of farm machinery.

Voted for H. R. 8320 which extended school milk program and set up $75 million fund for program; also extended the brucellosis eradication program.

Voted for H. R. 3383, the upper Colorado River project, which provides for conservation and beneficial use of water resources of the great water basin.

Voted against H. R. 12 which provided high rigid price supports with no production controls, the cause of surpluses which cost taxpayers $8 billion.

Voted for H. R. 2851 to make Commodity Credit Corporation—farm surplus—commodities available for distribution to distressed areas.

Voted for H. R. 11708 to increase appropriations for disposal of agricultural products.

Voted for House Resolution 641 to take action on Fryingpan-Arkansas project for development of agriculture and beneficial usage of Fryingpan River.

Accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the benefit of the businessmen of my district, a brief summary of the accomplishments during the 4 years of the Eisenhower administration.

As of the close of this session, marking the fourth year of the Eisenhower administration, as businessmen I thought you might be interested in a brief summary of its accomplishments.

Successful businessmen generally make plans or policies. Because of the bigness of Government, I find that policies in Government are of the greatest importance.

The first act of this administration was to agree upon a blueprint of sound policies, as follows:

First. To stop the war in Korea.

Second. To achieve efficiency and economy in Government, and put an end to waste.

Third. To reduce taxes.

Fourth. To encourage free enterprise.

Fifth. To stabilize the dollar, and balance the budget.

Sixth. To get the Government out of business.

Seventh. To work toward the goal of world peace.

I believe the facts will prove we have gone a long way in 4 short years in accomplishing the above objectives.

The first policy—stopping the war in Korea—can be checked as accomplished.

The second policy of efficiency, economy, and the stopping of waste has been accomplished by reducing the unnecessary cost of Government during the past 4 years by over $20 billion.

That policy made it possible to reduce Federal taxes by $7½ billion—our third objective.

By reducing taxes and revising the tax code, we gave business and the free enterprise system the green light of confidence, which encouraged business to expand, employing additional millions of our people, increasing our production, and increasing the wealth of our Nation.

This fourth policy had such a dynamic effect on the expansion of the business of the Nation that the threatened peacetime depression was beaten off, and even with a tax reduction of $7½ billion given to the people, we were able to balance the budget for the first time since 1951, and the second time in a quarter of a century.

With a surplus in the Treasury of over $2 billion, we have stablized the dollar, brought inflation under control, and are getting the Government out of competitive business as rapidly as possible. The Defense Department alone has closed down 195 business-type activities. We have sold 24 synthetic rubber plants, getting back 97 percent of the taxpayers' investment—a record never before equaled.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The power for peace which has been built up in this Nation through the experience and leadership of President Eisenhower has stopped the Russian Bear in his tracks. Our massive retaliatory military power which has deterred Russia and has preserved the peace has been accomplished at a minimum cost to the taxpayer—yet it offers a maximum striking power for defense.

In the fact of our most powerful military force in the history of the Nation, Russia has paused in her plan of aggression, she has started no new wars, she has enslaved no new peoples. Today, as we stand on the threshold of world peace, we have every reason to have continued confidence in our Nation's foreign policy, in her defense program, and in her leadership. But we must not relax our vigilance. We must not be disarmed by Russian smiles, we must keep the line taut.

THE RESULT OF SOUND POLICIES

In adopting sound policies and keeping the avenues of opportunity open, the expansion of business, resulting in millions of jobs, with the new wealth created in the past 3½ years almost staggers the imagination.

This economic strength snuffed out the threatened depression, and prosperity, with the exception of the farmer for a time, has been rolling forward on the broad highway, nationwide, reaching one peak after another; in fact, the strength of our economy has been so powerful that the Federal Reserve Board working in close cooperation with the Treasury has kept putting on the brakes for the past 2 years to keep the business boom from getting out of hand.

The underlying strength of the boom continues to confound the pessimists and amaze most of the optimists. Not even a 1 month's industrial steel strike on top of the major slowdown in automobiles is likely to make much of a dent in our economy.

It is expected that the year 1956 in business spending will top the record-high 1955 total spending of $322.3 billion. While our gross national product, or yearly production, for the fiscal year 1952 was $346 billion, 1956 has finally broken through the $400 billion yearly rate of total production. In other words, the Nation's wealth has increased $54 billion since 1952, and is expected to gain momentum in 1957.

Personal income rose to a new high annual level of $317.5 billion the first quarter of this year, which is $3 billion above the last quarter of 1955.

NEW CONSTRUCTION HEADED FOR RECORD

Outlays for new construction are expected to total $44.5 billion in 1956, a 4-percent increase over last year's record level, according to revised estimates prepared by the Commerce and Labor Departments. Further gains were forecast for utilities, private industrial buildings, and highways.

RETAIL SALES

A check of store managers across the country, including department stores, indicates that total retail sales in 1956 will top the record year of 1955—finishing up with a record-high Christmas business.

HIGH EMPLOYMENT

American employment has reached an alltime peak with over 66 million persons holding jobs. A record backlog of savings and purchasing power by accumulation of E and H bonds, which are now held by the people, has reached the alltime high of $40,929,000,000, an increase of bond holding by the people of $5,605,000,000 during the past 3½ years of the Eisenhower administration.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN 1952

Confidence in the Government's leadership plus sound policies are absolutely essential. Because of the lack of confidence of the people in their Government in 1952, they cashed in $523 million more of their bonds than the Government was able to sell back to the people. With confidence in the new administration in the first year, 1953, the trend changed, and the people bought and held $211 million more in bonds than were cashed in.

In 1955, the sales of E and H bonds exceeded redemptions by $717 million, and the figures indicate to date that in 1956 the people will buy and hold again this year about $700 million worth of bonds in excess of cash-ins, or redemptions.

On June 30, 1956, $14.9 billion matured Series E bonds were being retained by their owners under the optional automatic extension program voted by Congress; in other words, approximately 70 percent of the bonds that had come due are being held by their owners as part of their backlog of savings—another evidence of confidence.

AGRICULTURE

One of the outstanding achievements has been the courageous stand of President Eisenhower and us in the Congress who have backed him. We attacked the cause that was depressing farm prices rather than yield to political expediency and continue high-price supports that were responsible for the mountain of surpluses which depressed farm prices and cost the taxpayers over a billion dollars last year.

By treating the cause, we will ultimately save the taxpayers billions of dollars a year, and at the same time bring real prosperity to the farmers.

HIGHLIGHTS OF FARM EXPORTS

Our farm exports are up 20 percent from last year. Corn and other feedgrain exports are up 84 percent—an alltime high record; soybean exports are up 30 percent; lard exports are up 31 percent. If you exclude cotton, our farm exports this year are expected to be the highest in the past 30 years.

These exports of surplus farm commodities should result in higher prices, increase the farmers' spendable income which should reflect in local business.

Farm prices have turned upward with a gain of 9 percent over the low reached last December. During the last several months there has been an increase of 40 percent in the price of hogs.

THE WASHINGTON SCENE

As businessmen, I believe you want the facts. Notwithstanding the general optimism of the people, and this favorable report of the Nation's prosperity, in frankness we must admit a lot of sour notes have been blown in Washington which could have been avoided had the people, after electing the President and a new administration, given the President a majority of his own party to help him complete the job he had so well begun.

May I say to you in all seriousness, it appears the Democrat majority in the House and Senate has constantly voted to increase appropriations, in an apparent effort to prevent the President and his administration from balancing the budget. I feel sure careful analysis of such excess spending, which the people will have to pay back in taxes, will total over $2 billion for the last 2 years.

While we balanced the budget with a $2 billion surplus, it could have been $4 or $5 billion had the President had the cooperation of a friendly Congress.

HOOVER REPORTS

The Hoover Commission has just issued a report as follows:

Of 314 recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, more than 80 reports have been put into effect by the President through Executive action, while only about 20 of the recommendations have been implemented to any degree, by the action of Congress. The report further states it appears that the adoption of its reports, which would reduce the cost of government by $10,000 a minute is of little interest to many leading Democrats in Congress. This statement is made by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

The Eisenhower administration during its first 2 years passed a law empowering the Secretary of Defense to get the Government out of business where private enterprise could do a better job, and much progress was made during the first 2 years.

When the Democrat Congress came in 2 years ago, they threw up a roadblock which has greatly slowed down the program by enacting legislation which the Eisenhower administration opposed, which compels the Secretary of Defense to get the consent of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate before the Secretary can act. We tried to repeal that provision in the present session, but were voted down, with the Democrat Members almost solidly opposing us.

WORLD PEACE

Our greatest hope for the future is that under the leadership of President Eisenhower we may ultimately achieve the goal of world peace. May I say to you, in all sincerity, the facts show we have made great progress in that direction.

Value of Federal Health Program—Polio Vaccine an Illustration of What Can Be Done by Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member and have been chairman, has jurisdiction over many important subjects, such as transportation of all kinds; communications, radio, television, telephone, and telegraph; aviation; stock exchanges; investment legislation; scientific programs; Federal trade; pure food and drugs; railroad retirement; and many other subjects of a regulatory character. However, the jurisdiction within our committee that gives me the greatest pleasure, in study and accomplishment, is that which relates to the health of our people.

The work in connection with the subject of health has brought many satisfying results. I take great pride in the several research activities we have set up. These include all that relate to the major diseases that take such a terrific annual toll of our people. By way of illustration, I refer to cancer, arthritis, nervous diseases in all their different forms, including mental diseases, muscular dystrophy, and so forth.

In addition to the numerous and varied programs of a research character, there have also been accomplishments, of which I am proud, in providing for additional hospital facilities, both general and mental, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, and centers for clinical purposes. Such as I have mentioned constitute only a small part of the many programs that have engaged our attention in an effort to improve the health of the Nation.

POLIO

I would feel remiss if I did not make special mention of the achievements in the field of polio, particularly as a result of the splendid work of Dr. Jonas Salk in producing a serum that is helpful in preventing certain types of polio.

There has been no happening in recent years that has brought so much happiness and relief to parents and others than the announcement that the polio vaccine discovered by Dr. Salk can be helpful in preventing paralytic polio. Dr. Salk is entitled to the high honors that have been paid to him. His modesty, and particularly his refusal to patent his important discovery for his own financial gain, is one of the most outstanding and unselfish acts recorded in the history of medicine.

The history of medicine is replete with instances where doctors and scientists have made contributions of scientific discoveries to promote the welfare of people without any thought of financial reward. I wish that time and space permitted me to enumerate them all. It would be a list of which we all might well be proud. All of this, including Dr. Salk's recent contribution, should be sufficient to impress us that after all there are men and women who think in terms of service to their fellow man as being above and beyond the mere accumulation of wealth.

It is my hope that Dr. Salk may live long to experience the joy and happiness he has brought into the lives of those who otherwise might have experienced the crippling results of infantile paralysis.

The important discovery of a polio vaccine is an illustration of what can be accomplished by continued and intelligent research. Sufficient funds as a means of carrying on and expanding research activities pays off in greater returns by improving the health of our people than any other activity of our Government. Consequently I feel that the time and effort I have put forth in committee hearings and the drafting, introduction, and passage of legislation to maintain, increase, and improve health research facilities has given to me a real sense of compensation and great satisfaction to have had a part in the promotion of ways and means of improving health conditions for our people.

The following letter which I have received from Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States, means much to me because it brings to mind the memory of the work we have done in the cause of health. It reads:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLVERTON: In departing from Washington and my Government career, I want you to know how much I have enjoyed and have appreciated my association with you. I shall always cherish the experiences during my years in Government service, and I want you to know that among the most pleasant has been my relationship with you. Your understanding and your sympathy with the aims of the Public Health Service have been an inspiration to all of us. Much of our accomplishment—and I like to think of it as substantial—would not have been possible without your counsel, your friendly and constructive criticism, and your support.

I will be located in New Jersey, as you know, but I hope to come back to Washington from time to time and hope that I may be privileged to appear before the Congress in the future in behalf of health legislation. I am sure that our paths will continue to cross.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

It is my hope that I may be privileged to continue to engage in the noble and rewarding work of promoting the welfare of our people, by improving and expanding the facilities that can do so much for the future health of our people.

A Decade of the Japanese American Citizens League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me on the Japanese American Citizens League.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, when the Japanese American Citizens League meets at San Francisco during the coming Labor Day weekend for its 14th biennial convention, it can look back upon a series of accomplishments on behalf of harmony in our land which, I feel sure, will give its membership and officers a deep sense of pride.

This is perhaps especially true of its work of the past decade. Meeting at Denver in the spring of 1946 for their first postwar convention, League delegates undertook a 10-year program to attain first-class citizenship for themselves and their parents, and to gain full acceptance as worthy Americans. They incorporated the antidiscrimination committee to serve as their legislative-legal arm and chose Mr. Mike Masaoka, a veteran of the famed 442d all-Nisei Regimental Combat Team, as national legislative director of the committee.

Utilizing the instruments of democracy within the framework of our American system of government, the League obtained the passage of remedial legislation, won court decisions outlawing racial discrimination against those of Japanese descent, and gained the acceptance of their fellow Americans. It is a shining record.

By 1952, the major legislative objectives adopted at the Denver convention had been realized. The privilege of naturalization was extended to resident alien Japanese, who since 1790 by Federal law had been denied citizenship in the land of their adoption and of their children's birth. The Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 was repealed, and immigration quotas were extended to Japan and other Asian countries. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the orphans' bill, and the so-called soldier brides' laws enabled additional Japanese to come to America as nonquota immigrants to join their families here.

An Evacuation Claims Act was approved in 1948. It authorized the payment of losses suffered by Japanese-Americans during the 1942 wartime evacuation. This act was amended by the 84th Congress, 2d session, to provide a similar measure of justice with respect to claims which have not yet been processed.

Another law in which the Japanese American Citizens League interested itself authorized the Attorney General of the United States to adjust the status of deserving Japanese aliens who had come here as treaty merchants, students, and temporary visitors but were stranded by the war. Many of them assisted the United States against the country of their nativity. The law has had the humanitarian result of averting the forced separation of some 2,500 alien Japanese from American citizen families comprising approximately 10,000 persons.

Other statutes included naturalization for alien Japanese who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, restoration of citizenship to those who had lost it solely because they voted in the postwar elections in Japan during the occupation period, reimbursement for those who lost contraband articles deposited with State and local police officials when the war broke out, and recovery of improperly vested property by dual nationals.

And, of course, there was the treaty of peace with Japan which inaugurated a new era of friendship and cooperation in the Pacific.

One of the last bills passed by the 84th Congress eliminated the prohibition against using Mongolian labor on Federal reclamation projects. Perhaps this was an accomplishment of greater significance than the public realized. For the first time since this prohibition was written into law, in 1902, there is no statute which discriminates against Asians. Our Japanese-American citizens have reason, I believe, to be proud of the progress in fair and equal treatment which this enactment represents. So, too, have Americans of every other ancestry good cause herein to feel that our Nation continues to advance along the highway of understanding and tolerance.

A remarkable degree of the credit for these accomplishments can be given to the national legislative director. As a Nisei, Mr. Masaoka had misgivings when he registered as a lobbyist for the first time. But because he represented in his person the problems of the Japanese-American and spoke of them with the genuine concern of his constituency, he was accepted without question. His war record attested to his loyalty to the land of his birth. He holds the Combat Infantryman's Badge, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and Italian War Medal.

This leadership in the cause of solving the problems of the Japanese-American has been acknowledged in a feature article published by Reader's Digest entitled "Washington's Most Successful Lobbyist." In that account, published in 1949, Masaoka was described as one "who practices personal lobbying by appealing to the conscience of America." His simple, and completely American, creed is "Anyone can sell fair play and justice."

The Japanese American Citizens' League Decade, which will be commemorated at San Francisco from August 30 to September 3, is an inspiring documentary to the efficacy of democracy. The theme of the convention is "Changing Perspectives." Secure now in their future, and cognizant of the great and many opportunities which are rightfully theirs, our fellow citizens of Japanese blood will take stock of the changing perspectives of our times and will look forward to a new decade which all of us hope and believe will be as constructive as the one now coming to a close.

The United States and Japan, on different sides of the great Pacific Ocean, are united in their determination to continue as free nations. I am sure that in the years ahead the Japanese American Citizens' League will use its organization and facilities and membership to enrich the friendship which exists between America, their native land, and Japan, land of their ancestry. The league has demonstrated that it is peculiarly well qualified for this challenging task.

Statement of Hon. Frederick G. Payne, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, as this session draws to a close I should like to pay a few words of tribute to the two great legislative leaders of this body in the 84th Congress—my distinguished colleagues, Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM KNOWLAND. Much of the credit for what we have accomplished here since January 1953 should go to these two outstanding Americans.

When LYNDON JOHNSON became minority leader in 1953 he set forth a philosophy which he has maintained right down to the closing hours of this session. "There are two courses open to a minority party," Senator JOHNSON said, "it can indulge in the politics of partisanship or it can remain true to the politics of responsibility."

I believe that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle will agree that after the majority shifted, Senator JOHNSON, through his own personal skill, maintained his pledge to a policy of moderation and responsibility, and this has also been true of BILL KNOWLAND.

Senator KNOWLAND has lived up to the confidence placed in him by his party, by the administration, and by his fellow Republican colleagues here in the Senate. His able and courteous leadership on this side, at all times, has been a great moving force behind the enactment of the President's legislative program.

These two great leaders, who have walked among us, have not always seen eye to eye on major issues. But under their leadership I would venture to say that the traditions of fair play, of honest debate, and of congressional integrity have been maintained at a level unequaled in Senate history.

No two men could ever display greater patience many times under trying conditions and circumstances.

Now, as the days of the 84th Congress have diminished into hours, and these hours are rapidly diminishing into minutes, we come to realize more fully the leadership which these men have provided. While political experts and the press of the Nation set out to evaluate what the 84th Congress has done or has failed to do, we can turn these issues aside temporarily and say a word of personal thanks to LYNDON JOHNSON and BILL KNOWLAND for their leadership, for their inspiration, and for their friendship, which all of us, regardless of party or policy, have come to value so highly.

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the text of a letter I sent to the New York Times on June 14, 1956, and which subsequently appeared therein:

JUNE 14, 1956.

EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Exhibiting more courage and understanding of the fundamental issues facing the country today than do the other two coordinate branches of Federal Government, the Supreme Court has stood firm in its protection of the constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties and rights of our people. We have reason to be grateful. However, this good guardianship has given rise to much unbridled animosity and has resulted in unwarranted attacks on the integrity of the Court. These thrusts go far. They strike at the very nature of our Government by seeking to make the Court subservient to the political passions of the day.

The extent to which the hostility against the Court has gone is evidenced by bills introduced into the Congress which would damage the independence and authority of the Court. I cite among these the following:

Legislation to limit the term of a Justice of the Supreme Court to 12 years, deleting the lifetime provision;

Legislation to limit appointment to the Supreme Court to a person who (1) is a natural-born citizen of the United States, (2) has attained the age of 35 years, (3) has been 14 years a resident within the United States, (4) has been graduated from a law school approved by the American Bar Association, or has been admitted to the bar of a court of general jurisdiction of any State, Territory, possession of the United States or the District of Columbia, and (5) has practiced law for a total of not less than 5 years after having been admitted to the bar of any court of general jurisdiction or has had a total of not less than 5 years' judicial service;

Legislation to limit appointment to the Supreme Court to persons who have had at least 5 years prior judicial service. Obviously this last piece of legislation was aimed directly at Chief Justice Warren. Had such provisions prevailed in the past, monumental figures such as Chief Justice John Marshall, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, Justice Louis Brandeis, as well as the present Chief

Justice, would have been disqualified from serving.

Paramount among the decisions which have aroused the ire of powerful forces are the school desegregation cases, the decision in *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, announced April 2, 1956, and the decision in *Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor, International Association of Machinists* v. *Robert L. Hanson, Horace A. Cameron, Harold J. Grau, et al.*, announced May 21, 1956. In the Nelson case the Court held that the extensive nature of Federal legislation in the area of subversion indicates an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the entire field of sedition against the Government of the United States. In the last cited case the Court held that a provision in the Railway Labor Act expressly permitting the union shop takes precedence over a provision in the Nebraska constitution prohibiting union-shop agreements.

In the light of article IV, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, no other result in this case is possible. The Supreme Court detractors had better review article IV, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, * * * shall be the supreme law of the land, * * * anything in the Constitution or law of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The Railway Labor Act by amendment in 1951 removed the previous bar against the union shop in the railway field. Under the basic Railway Labor Act, any agreement between the railway union and employer shall be binding, "notwithstanding any statute or law of any State." What does this mean? It means that any State law that forbids a union shop is inapplicable to any collective bargaining agreements controlled by the Railway Labor Act. But when the Supreme Court, on May 21, last, did just what Congress said it must do—consider the Federal statute as paramount to State law—there was occasion for cries of anguish and alarm from States Righters in and out of Washington about the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court.

Protests against these decisions have been loud, vigorous, and sustained. Powerful forces, under the banner of States rights, have moved forward to upset these decisions. Together with the bills already mentioned above, legislative proposals are now before the Congress to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court cases affecting schools and education. We have proposals to grant the States and the Federal Government concurrent jurisdiction in all areas unless Federal statutes expressly preempt the field. Such proposals would completely Balkanize the Government, leaving in complete confusion all interpretations of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. National problems would be dealt with by a welter of laws of 48 States. They would contradict and cancel each other out, leaving the Federal Government helpless to resolve the confusion. No one can foresee the effect of such far-reaching proposals.

We have further the proposal stemming directly from the Nelson case to give the States concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal Government in crimes involving subversion against the United States. If we examine the Nelson case we find that the Supreme Court has not challenged the authority of Pennsylvania to act in matters involving the State of Pennsylvania itself. It is most appropriate for the State of Pennsylvania to seek protection against threats directed against the State itself, but where Congress has provided an extensive program to protect the United States Government, it is absurd for the various States to have isolated, separate, and often conflicting programs against threats directed at the United States Government. I consider proposals authorizing State legislation in this area unwise and unwarranted. Protection against national subversion is part of the national defense. Forty-eight State laws on subversion aimed at the advocacy or conspiracy to overthrow the National Government can only lead to "different criteria of substantive offenses and a multiplicity of tribunals and a diversity of procedures" that in the final analysis can only benefit the subversive in our midst. The prevention of subversive activities is so clearly an integral part of national defense that it behooves us to ask those who so strenuously oppose Federal preemption of the field whether they favor an Army, Navy, or Air Force for each of the 48 States.

I am pleased to note that your editorials have urged caution on all these proposals. The problem of balancing Federal and States rights is not an easy one. In other recent cases the Supreme Court has upheld State action. In the case of *Auto Workers* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, decided June 4, 1956, the Court upheld a State ban against mass picketing. In *Black* v. *Cutter Laboratories*, decided June 4, 1956, the Court let stand a decision of the California Supreme Court which resulted in an alleged Communist losing her job. In both cases it was strenuously argued that paramount Federal law required contrary decision. These decisions reflect how unfounded are the charges that the Supreme Court opposes States rights.

It is fervently to be hoped that the Congress will not yield to the pressures of those who under the guise of States rights seek to weaken the balanced structure of our Government both by direct attack on the composition of the Court and indirectly by consistent attack upon its decisions.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Musical Recording: Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1956, the Congress approved House Concurrent Resolution 258, accepting without cost to the United States copies of the musical recording Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and providing for the distribution of such records, first to radio and TV stations and then to schools and other organizations. Each Member of the House will receive an allotment of 50 records and each Member of the Senate will receive 25 copies. ASCAP has donated these records to the Congress and they should become available within about 2 months. Each record will be packaged for mailing. One side of the record carries the instrumental and vocal arrangement of the United States Air Force Band, conducted by Capt. Robert L. Landers, with the Singing Sergeants participating, which was heard originally in the House of Representatives on June 14, 1955, when Flag Day ceremonies were conducted for the first time. The other side of the record carries the instrumental and vocal arrangement of the United States Marine Band, conducted by Capt. Albert Schoepper, with an Interservice Choral Group accompanying, which was heard in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1956.

In order that the Members of the House might fully appreciate the musical arrangement of the song Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag that was presented so well in this Chamber on Flag Day this year, I am submitting a description of the composition as arranged by S. Sgt. Donald R. Hunsberger, United States Marine Band. Also included are the names of the members of the Marine Band and the Interservice Choral Group, who cannot be praised enough for their rendition of this composition in the House. This arrangement is a reflection of the various conceptions of the flag as held by the American public. It embodies strong patriotic fervor as demonstrated by the rich full sound of the American military band, long an important part of the American way of life along with a feeling of reverence as introduced in the middle of a cappella section. Of special interest to the listener will be the addition of the words "under God" which are heard in the repeated chorus of the Pledge. The extensive use of the military bugle call To the Colors, as used in part as well as in its entirety, further ties in another accepted tribute to the flag.

This bugle call is first introduced in the opening bars in a single trumpet and later is completed by use of a three-part trumpet canon. A fragmentary a cappella choral statement closes the introduction and sets the mood for the baritone soloist. Throughout the verse and chorus, distant trumpet fanfares are heard to sustain the patriotic feeling further. Following the choral version—of the chorus—the full band reenters, alternating with the bugle calls in a modulatory passage. At this point a reverend mood is introduced by the chorus singing a cappella in a much slower tempo. The music was arranged in this section to bring out some of the fine qualities of the Interservice Chorus. At the end of this extended section, chimes bring the listener back from the sacred to a flowing melodious playing of the verse by the trombones. This is then worked up in volume until the full band breaks forth with a strict rhythmical and harmonic bridge, modulating into a strong key for the chorus and band to present the final version of the chorus in a very grandiose style. A powerful and dramatic coda closes the arrangement in a triumphal manner, deserving of all the impact revealed in the words—a patriotic symbolic interpretation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Following are the list of names of those who participated in the presentation of the Pledge song in the House of Representatives on June 14, 1956:

UNITED STATES MARINE BAND

Leader: Capt. Albert F. Schoepper.
Arranger: S. Sgt. Donald R. Hunsberger.
Recording technician: T. Sgt. Harry H. Ritchie, Jr.
S. Sgt. Leslie E. Sheary, flute.
S. Sgt. Michael A. Hamilton, flute.
M. Sgt. Eugene H. Graham, oboe.

S. Sgt. Theodore C. Heger, oboe.
S. Sgt. Robert Barclay, Jr., E-flat clarinet.
M. Sgt. Harold E. Malsh, Jr., B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Joseph Leo, Jr., B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Thomas M. Dykton, B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Pasquale Pulvirenti, B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Jack T. Kline, B-flat clarinet.
S. Sgt. William Lubis, B-flat clarinet.
S. Sgt. Ronald H. Baltazar, B-flat clarinet.
S. Sgt. Marlan E. Manwiller, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Stanley J. Gaulke, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Raoul P. Querze, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Donald G. Carodiskey, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Donald A. Puluse, B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Paul H. Hines, alto clarinet.
S. Sgt. Charles H. Wallis, bass clarinet.
M. Sgt. Felix A. EauClaire, alto saxophone.
S. Sgt. Jack C. Carey, alto saxophone.
T. Sgt. Stephen J. Rammer, tenor saxophone.
T. Sgt. Ralph A. Moeller, baritone saxophone.
S. Sgt. Robert P. Koper, bassoon.
M. Sgt. Charles W. Thompson, Jr., bassoon.
M. Sgt. Dougla A. Stevens, French horn.
T. Sgt. George F. Parker, French horn.
T. Sgt. Joseph C. Stoll, French horn.
Sgt. Robert W. Ricks, French horn.
M. Sgt. Robert R. De Hart, cornet.
T. Sgt. Charles P. Erwin, cornet.
S. Sgt. Daniel J. Patrylak, cornet.
S. Sgt. Fredric J. Erdman, Jr., cornet.
T. Sgt. John A. Gosling, trumpet.
T. Sgt. Guy M. McIntosh, trumpet.
T. Sgt. Chester A. Shields, trumpet.
S. Sgt. Glenn A. Dodson, trombone.
S. Sgt. Donald W. Bechtold, trombone.
S. Sgt. William Gray, trombone.
S. Sgt. William A. Scheneman, baritone.
T. Sgt. Angelo L. Saverino, bass.
S. Sgt. Vernon L. Brown, bass.
T. Sgt. Boyd Conway, drum.
M. Sgt. Frank J. Janata, drum.
S. Sgt. John H. Beck, chimes.
S. Sgt. Robert B. Stuart, tympani.

INTERSERVICE CHORAL GROUP

Chorusmaster: William D. Jones, United States Marine Band.
Virginia A. Pickel, publicist, United States Marine Band.

UNITED STATES ARMY BAND

Pfc. Charles R. Cassey, second tenor.
Pfc. George G. Fortune, baritone.
Pfc. John A. Gillaspy, second tenor.
Pfc. James R. Mulvaney, first tenor.
Sp2 Harley E. Rex, baritone.
Sp2 Arnold M. Voketaitis, bass.
Pfc. Donald A. White, first tenor.
Pvt. Donald S. Woods, bass.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Cpl. Richard C. Anderson, baritone, barracks detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Pfc. Leroy Clayton, baritone, barracks detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Sgt. Kenneth B. Forrey, first tenor, barracks detachment, Marine Base, Washington, D. C.
Cpl. Henri, D. Kahn, Jr., second tenor, MCI detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Sgt. Robert C. Knepp, second tenor, barracks detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Cpl. Raymond O. Koch, first tenor, MCI detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Pfc. Martin H. Rogers, bass, MCI detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
M. Sgt. Otis R. Strong, bass, A Company, headquarters, Marine Corps.
Cpl. C. L. Tate, second tenor, H. and S. Company, headquarters, Marine Corps.

UNITED STATES NAVY SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Musn. Robert P. Hope, second tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. James R. Humbert, first tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. Roger E. Kirkbride, first tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. Bob G. Johnson, bass, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musa. Charles L. Munds, baritone, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musa. Robert A. Schutt, bass, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musa. Richard A. Weilenmann, second tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. Samuel E. Wood, baritone, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

SR. William L. Baker, bass, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. Harry C. Forbes, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. Alan W. Gingher, baritone, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SA. Ralph E. Knorr, baritone, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. Fred Marsh, baritone, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. George D. McDaniel, second tenor, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
JO2. Jack D. Richardson, first tenor, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. James R. Smith, second tenor, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

S. Sgt. Richard W. Carlson, baritone, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. Raymond J. Fisher, Jr., second tenor, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
T. Sgt. David M. Ingalls, first tenor, headquarters command bank, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A1c. Richard M. Rawson, second tenor, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. Richard T. Sanders, bass, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. Norman O. Scott, first tenor, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A1c. John L. Steinecker, bass, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. William J. Zajkowski, bass, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.

The Issue Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, camouflaged as it may be, the real issue confronting the 84th Congress and—if we stay out of war—the one which will be predominant in the 85th, is private enterprise versus socialism.

Oh, I know you have heard that story before. But make no mistake. It was over that issue that the real battle in Congress was carried on this last session. Unless correctly resolved, it may destroy us.

The issue is not being fought by Republicans on one side, Democrats on the other. The battle is carried on on each side of the aisle between the two factions in each party.

Roosevelt was elected on a platform and on his individual promise that he could and would reduce national spending and Federal jobs 25 percent. That the country would remain on the gold standard. That constitutional government would be his goal. No real worthwhile effort was made to adhere to any of those promises.

On the contrary, Federal spending increased. We went off the gold standard within 6 months after he was inaugurated. All pretense of constitutional government went out the window.

The advocates of paternalism took over and, from that day until this, there has been a vigorous, persistent effort on the part of a financially and politically powerful group in both parties to establish the doctrine that "Papa knows best." That is to say that some of the representatives you send to Congress, your hired men, and the bureaucrats who are thoroughly entrenched in the executive departments, know more about how you should live, carry on your own businesses and affairs, than do you.

The only thing they concede is that you may work at least 3 of the 12 months of the year to earn the tax dollars on which the Federal Government operates.

During the 84th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations on which I am the ranking minority member, and the 11 special subcommittees, on which I serve, had a special appropriation of $995,000—no, I am not mistaken; that was only $5,000 less than a million dollars; the committee asked for another $125,000 but the $125,000 was abandoned when a point of order was raised—but the committee had another $200,000 out of legislative appropriations to carry on investigations and hold hearings. The committee had at least $1,200,000.

In my judgment, the overall purpose of some of the investigations of its subcommittees has been to establish the doctrine that the Government should take over and operate from Washington practically every business in which businessmen or business organizations are engaged.

The slaphappy bureaucrats and their adherents would, if they could have their way, take over.

You may think I misjudge the situation. But read this quotation from David Lawrence, who, referring to this group, writes:

> They will not be happy until all food stores, all department stores, all retail stores, all steel plants, all factories are owned by the Government.

And remember former Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of Agriculture Rexford Guy Tugwell's statement that "Business will logically be required to disappear" and "Perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without violent resistance."

Some, your representative included, have long fought this trend. With the administration's aid, we have stopped some of it.

Do not be discouraged—I am not. The quicker the results of this drive take

shape and bear fruit, the sooner we will get back to constitutional government, respect for the rights of individuals and of the States.

Opposition to socialism is one of the tasks which keeps me from growing old in spirit and activity, if not in years.

Experience will point the right road and certainly we have sense enough to follow it.

The people themselves will have an opportunity in November to once more point the way they wish the Nation to travel.

What Second District People Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following summary of a questionnaire which I sent to the people of my district, in order that they may know the results.

I was most pleased with the returns on the questionnaire which I sent to residents of all sections of the Second Congressional District. The 11,000 answers convey the opinions of a representative cross-section of occupations and geographical sections of the district. I am deeply appreciative of the promptness of the returns and for the many people who took time to write additional comments on issues not covered specifically by the questionnaire.

Analysis of the results reveals an interest in good, sound governmental management on the part of those replying, and increasing interest in fiscal policies, our relationships with other nations, and our own defense efforts. Here is what the answers revealed and actions taken on the subjects:

First. The first part of this questionnaire was divided into 11 categories, which represented 11 important aspects of government. Answers given were ratings of the top six issues in the opinion of the answerers. Here is how these issues ranked in importance to Second District residents: First, defense; second, balancing the budget; third, foreign policy; fourth, farm policies; fifth, taxation; sixth, Government spending; seventh, highways; eighth, labor policies; ninth, schools; tenth, civil rights; eleventh, power policies.

Second. Should the United States continue foreign military aid? For, 56 percent; against, 44 percent. Economic aid? For, 63 percent; against, 37 percent.

Action taken: Congress passed $3.7 billion military- and economic-aid bill, cut from original $4.9 billion request. I voted for cuts and for bill in its final form.

Third. Should the Government pay farmers for taking acreage out of production? Against, 92 percent; for, 8 percent.

Should we return to high rigid price supports? Against, 84 percent; for, 16 percent.

Action taken: Congress voted hodgepodge farm bill with high supports. President vetoed. Congress passed second farm bill with soil bank, flexibles. I voted against high rigid supports. Voted to sustain President's veto. Voted for second farm bill.

Fourth. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction? For, 70 percent; against, 30 percent.

Action taken: House killed school bill after lengthy debate. I voted for the bill, which would have appropriated $400 million annually for 5 years.

Fifth. Do you favor a highway-construction program supported by increased gas and tire taxes? For, 68 percent; against, 32 percent.

Action taken: Congress passed 15-year program to build $38 billion worth of roads. Interstate, primary, and secondary roads to benefit. I supported this bill.

Sixth. Do you favor unbalancing the budget to get an income-tax cut? Against, 82 percent; for, 18 percent.

Do you favor a cut in taxes before reduction of the national debt? Against, 76 percent; for, 24 percent.

Action taken: No income-tax legislation considered. Administration's balanced budget means $1.7 billion can be applied toward cutting national debt.

Seventh. Do you favor the partnership program for power development? For, 73 percent; against, 27 percent.

Action taken: No House votes on specific projects. Progress made on Priest Rapids and Rocky Reach partnership dams.

Eighth. Do you favor increasing postal rates to meet the post-office deficit? For, 71 percent; against, 29 percent.

Action taken: House passed postal-rate-increase bill. Senate ignored it. I voted for bill, which would have erased $500 million annual postal deficit.

Ninth. Do you think the Taft-Hartley Act should be:

(a) Repealed? For, 9 percent; against, 16 percent.

(b) Strengthened? For, 18 percent; against, 6 percent.

(c) Left as is? For, 10 percent; against, 10 percent.

(d) Amended as recommended by the President? For, 26 percent; against, 5 percent.

Action taken: No action in either House of Congress this session.

Tenth. Do you believe we are spending enough for defense? Yes, 72 percent; no, 28 percent.

Action taken: Congress passed $35 billion defense appropriation bill. I voted for this measure when it passed the House.

This questionnaire was of great value to me in considering legislation presented to the Congress. I intend to continue, if reelected, this procedure in order to get the views of the people I represent.

Leasing of Lands in Superior National Forest to Inco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. METCALF, in the May 24 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] called our attention to Warren Unna's excellent summary of Republican giveaways in the May issue of Harper's magazine.

In particular, I noted the section dealing with a mineral lease now being developed by the Department of the Interior with the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd.—Inco—for lands in the Superior National Forest. I have always taken an interest in the protection of the public domain.

When I looked into this matter, I found that it also raised many other important questions, among them national defense, monopoly versus small business, and a critical shortage of an indispensable metal. All these made it imperative that this proposed lease be carefully scrutinized.

On page 9581 of the June 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I called attention to this lease.

As part of my remarks I included a letter in which I addressed several questions on this lease to the Secretary of the Interior. I also included the introduction of Senate Document No. 4, 82d Congress, "Investigation of the Preparedness Program." In that report the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee said Inco is "one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found."

Later additional information on the Inco monopoly came to my attention. In the June 22 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted two letters which indicate that even a South African concern may not sell nickel to an American businessman without the transaction going through Inco in New York.

To complete the record, at least for now, I am making available Interior Secretary Seaton's reply to my inquiry and the answer I have sent him. These letters follow:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1956.

HON. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. METCALF: This will reply to your letter of June 5 in which you raise a number of questions concerning the International Nickel Co.'s application to this Department for mineral leases on lands located within the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

In your letter you list eight questions to which you request answers from the Department of the Interior. These questions, you state, involve "national defense, conservation, monopoly, a critical shortage of an indispensable metal, and the attendant injury to small business." You further request a

copy of the proposed lease form. We are happy to comply with both requests.

I shall attempt to answer your questions in the order in which they were raised.

1. When will the lease become effective? The lease, if granted, would become effective on the first day of the month following its execution, unless the applicants were to request that the lease be dated the first day of the month of execution.

2. What provisions are made in the proposed lease for the stimulation of production during a period of emergency * * *? This provision is covered in detail in section 7 (e) of the enclosed proposed lease form under heading of "National Emergency."

3. Has your Department had access to a copy of the Office of Defense Mobilization letter to the Forest Service on the desirability of stimulating production in the national interest? While I am not certain as to the letter to which you refer, it is my understanding that there is a classified document of this nature in the confidential files of the Forest Service. The Department of the Interior has not seen such a document.

4. Has your Department examined the assays of samples from the diamond drillings by Inco in the Superior National Forest? If so, what did they show: Were minerals in addition to nickel and copper found in commercial quality? What were these minerals? What royalty provisions for all minerals involved are contained in the contemplated lease? The Geological Survey of this Department which has examined the assays submitted by the company has reported thereon. That report is now receiving departmental consideration. The details in such geological reports and findings of this Department are not considered to be public information. They are a matter between the Department and the lease applicant. To betray the confidential nature of these reports would not only compromise the position of the applicant but would also be contrary to established procedures for considering mineral-leasing applications. The royalty provisions are dealt with at length in section 2 (b, c, and d) in the proposed lease form.

5. In view of the current emergency, has ODM been consulted with respect to the terms of the proposed lease? Representatives of the Office of Defense Mobilization were active participants, along with representatives of this Department, the Forest Service, and other interested parties, in the preliminary meeting when the proposed lease form was discussed and formulated.

6. Is Inco to have an undivided interest in the lease? If not, what other companies will have an interest and how much? If executed, the lease would be between the Department of the Interior, as the appropriate agency of the Federal Government, and the International Nickel Co. Any overriding royalties or other possible arrangements would be between the lessee and other parties with whom the Department would have no connection.

7. In view of the Senate subcommittee's finding that Inco is "one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found," has the proposed lease been referred to the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice for determination as to whether Inco's monopoly would be enhanced by this lease? I have been advised informally that the Anti-Trust Division has no interest in reviewing the proposed lease. Explicit monopoly and fair price provisions are contained in section 6 (b) of the proposed lease form. Interior has, however, submitted the proposed lease form to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the congressional committee most concerned with the overall aspects of the proposed lease. On May 11, 1956 Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of this committee, wrote to the Department of the Interior that his committee has no objection to issuance of the proposed lease. Senator MURRAY's letter said, in part: "I hereby rescind the request that execution (of the lease) by the Department of the Interior be held in abeyance."

8. Is there a requirement in the proposed lease that the plant, which will process this ore from public lands, be located in the United States? We believe that location of a processing plant is always dictated by the economics of the prevailing situation; by availability of transportation facilities, electrical energy, employee housing, etc. It would be highly unusual to include as a provision of a lease the stipulation that this Department would have the right to dictate the location of a processing plant even before the company actually got into production. However, there are special stipulations listed in section 3 (f) of the proposed lease form that guarantee the preservation of the forest character of the area. It should also be noted that none of the area embraced by the lease application lies within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest.

As you point out in your letter, there is widespread interest in the potential development of a significant source of nickel in this country. As you no doubt know the present production of this strategic material in the United States is insignificant in comparison with consumption. The exploration and study in the Superior National Forest mineralized area have taken a number of years. Most of the prospecting permits embraced in the present lease application were issued in 1951 and 1952. The law provides that after a prospecting permit has been granted a lease must issue if minerals are found to be in commercial quantity.

During the 5 years since the first prospecting permits were issued the question of lease issuance has been given thorough and continuous study. The proposed lease form has been cleared by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

If there is any additional information with which we can furnish you please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of July 19 concerning the International Nickel Co.'s application for mineral leases on lands in the Superior National Forest.

As I have indicated previously, this is a matter of real concern to me, involving as it does questions of national defense, protection of the public domain, monopoly versus small business, and a critical shortage of an indispensable metal.

You will recall that my second question was contained in this paragraph:

"(2) What provisions are made in the proposed lease for the stimulation of production during a period of emergency such as we are experiencing now? I consider this a most important question in view of the allegations of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in Document No. 4, 82d Congress, with respect to Inco's monopoly position in nickel production and distribution."

Now I, too, want to see a lease go into effect. But I want it to be a lease which will assure production, not permit one of the most formidable monopolies the Senate subcommittee found to tie up, thus foreclosing development by anyone else if Inco chooses to sit on the lease, the public's minerals for 50 years. I believe section 7 (e) of the lease form could well be reexamined with this in mind.

If the Department of the Interior has not seen the document referred to in my third question, the Department should. And if, as you say in answering my fifth question, representatives of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Forest Service, attended the preliminary meeting when the proposed lease form was discussed and formulated, it is strange that Interior has not seen the ODM letter to the Forest Service.

You write that the assay report is now receiving departmental consideration. I would think that one of the first things the Department would have done would have been to study the assays—to find out what it has to lease before a lease form is drawn up. If these assays reveal the presence of rare minerals, they would certainly affect the royalty provisions of the lease.

In answering my sixth question, you indicate the Department is not concerned with any other company which might get a piece of the lease from Inco. I have been informed that another American nickel producer is interested in this lease. If this is the case, then substantially all the known nickel deposits in this country may be tied up by two companies.

I am happy to learn that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has approved the lease, and that the lease form has been cleared by the Forest Service. However, I would point out that a determination of whether Inco's monopoly would be enhanced by this lease is not within the jurisdiction of either the committee or of the Forest Service. I assume that each approved the lease within the scope of its jurisdiction. Neither has anything whatsoever to do with monopoly. I cannot understand why the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has no interest in reviewing the proposed lease. According to my recollection, the Department of Justice previously considered action against Inco and entered into a consent decree several years ago.

One purpose of this lease is to develop our domestic nickel supply. At the same time, however, you oppose inclusion in this lease of a requirement that the processing plant be located in the United States. I believe the development of our supply would be enhanced by the location of the processing plant in the United States.

I know that present United States production of this strategic material is insignificant in comparison with consumption. That is one of the reasons I am concerned.

I know, too, that Interior cannot be in the position of holding up the development of this source of the indispensable metal. But it is your responsibility to see that every contract you make in the Government's name is in the public interest.

You will recall that Public Law 632 of the 84th Congress provides for a special study of the entire nickel situation by the Department of Commerce. I presume that the study will cover all possible sources of supply, including this proposed lease. I will be very much interested in this study. I also will continue to watch the development of this lease very closely.

As I promised I would, I shall place your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the importance and widespread public interest in this matter. Once the lease has been executed I also plan to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For that reason, I will appreciate your advising me of any changes in the lease form.

Accomplishments of 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 84th Congress has ended. I would not want the occasion to pass, however, without expressing my views

about the accomplishments of this Congress.

This was a very hard-working, constructive Congress. I am extremely proud of the record we have made. There has been no cold war of partisan politics, as the President once predicted there would be if the Democrats gained control of the 84th Congress. Quite the contrary. The Democratic leadership has cooperated with the President at every turn, and the President has the Democrats to thank for putting across many of the vital parts of his legislative program.

Our sole objective in every case was to do what we thought best for the American people. Party considerations were secondary, as they always are with the Democrats in power.

In legislating in the field of foreign affairs, the Democrats were as nonpartisan as it was possible to be. I recall that the first major act in the 1st session of the 84th Congress was to pass a resolution, at the President's request, authorizing him to use American Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. Many of us felt the President needed no new legislation from Congress to exercise the authority given him by the Constitution, but we, nevertheless, complied with his request.

Subsequently, and over vigorous opposition from many Republicans, we passed legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years. The Republican-controlled 83d Congress refused to approve this measure despite the recommendation of President Eisenhower. The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress carried out the President's request.

The 84th Congress also gave the President substantially what he asked to continue the foreign-aid program. There were differences over details, but not partisan differences.

In the field of national defense, Congress went even further than the President had requested in making money available for our Armed Forces. We voted $900 million more than the administration asked for airpower. The Democrats are determined that America shall remain ahead of the Russians in the development of speedy long-range airplanes and ocean-spanning missiles.

The Democratic record in the field of domestic legislation was outstanding in the interests of the American people. We set in motion the greatest road-building program in history, a program providing for 41,000 miles of interstate highways to crisscross the Nation. We increased Federal contributions for all forms of roads, primary, secondary, and urban. The American motorist is now assured of having better, safer highways on which to satisfy his urge to go places and see things.

We extended and liberalized the social-security program by reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 and providing for the payment of social insurance benefits to the disabled at age 50. We provided for an increase in old-age assistance payments of at least $5 per month where the States take advantage of the increase in Federal funds available.

I was sorely disappointed when the President vetoed the original farm bill passed by the Democratic Congress. We Democrats felt that by returning to 90-percent price supports on basic commodities, we would be guaranteeing the farmer an immediate increase in his purchasing power. The need for boosting farm income was so apparent that there seemed no justification for the attitude taken by the President and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson.

However, we finally worked out a soil-bank program which will be beneficial to farmers in the long run, but we had a hard time selling even this program to the administration at the outset. Secretary Benson first rejected it, but he ultimately changed his mind when he saw the seriousness of the farmer revolt against the policies of the Republican administration. While the soil bank alone falls short of the well-rounded program the farmers have a right to expect, and while I am not satisfied with the way it has been administered with respect to the 1956 crop, it will be of some help. I believe it can and will be improved by a later Congress.

We raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour despite administration pressure to hold the line at 90 cents an hour. We provided the Federal authority necessary to aid private enterprise to meet the demand for new homes, and we made the money available to finance distribution of the marvelous new vaccine to combat infantile paralysis.

In the development of the Nation's natural resources, this Congress took many important steps forward. I was proud that we voted the money to get started on the big Arkansas Basin development program, a tremendous undertaking that will mean much in the industrial growth of eastern Oklahoma. Although the administration dragged its feet every inch of the way, we were able to get Congress to vote $1.5 million for getting construction underway on Eufaula Dam on the Canadian River.

As a matter of fact, a record number of public-works projects was approved by Congress for my congressional district in southeastern Oklahoma. I am delighted at the prospects for business activity which are bound to result from approval of these various projects.

The complete record of accomplishments by this Congress is much too long for me to attempt to cover in these remarks. Hundreds of beneficial measures were passed, and I note that even our Republican colleagues have conceded that we accomplished a great deal. I cannot conceive of anyone accusing the 84th Congress of being a do-nothing Congress, or of sustaining the charge that the Democratic Congress did not cooperate with the Republican President.

I personally am extremely disappointed that we failed to get through the 84th Congress the bill providing Federal aid for the construction of schools. I strongly favored this bill, and I regret very much that it became involved in the conflict of views over segregation. I regarded this as a completely extraneous issue, and it proved to be the vehicle through which Republican opponents of Federal aid to schools were able to kill the bill. Without the so-called Powell amendment attached to it, this bill would have been approved by the House and probably enacted into law. Republicans by a large majority voted for the Powell amendment, and then against the bill. They achieved a temporary victory, but I am confident that they will not be able to stymie this constructive legislation for very long.

In spite of what happened on these individual issues, I maintain that the overall record of this Congress is excellent. I think history will so show. I have no hesitation whatever in predicting that on the basis of the very fine record made by this Congress, Democrats will win control not only of Congress, but the White House, in the election next fall.

Fourth Anniversary of the Puerto Rican Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, July 25 was the fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution and as such it was observed in Puerto Rico and in many parts of the country as Puerto Rican Constitution Day. I composed some remarks on that day which I broadcast to Puerto Rico.

I ask unanimous consent that this comment on the significance of Puerto Rican Constitution Day be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION

It is with genuine pleasure that I join with the many other friends of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in extending greetings on this, the fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution.

As we look back over the years since July 25, 1952, we can feel a justifiable sense of pride in the way in which the people of this new commonwealth have assumed the responsibilities of self-government with maturity, confidence, and wisdom. Its actions during this period justify in full the faith reposed in the people of Puerto Rico by the Congress of the United States in 1950 when the legislation which brought about this changed status was enacted. As we watch the course charted by the Puerto Rican Commonwealth, those of us who supported the enabling legislation in Congress—and I am proud to have been one of them—get the same feeling that comes to a person who finds a friend in whom he has reposed trust and confidence has justified that trust.

So it is with Puerto Rico. The Commonwealth has been blessed with able, vigorous and imaginative leadership, a leadership which has helped to steer the ship of state past the many difficulties which have confronted it. But the greatest credit is due, I believe, to the people of Puerto Rico who have been responsive to their leadership and who have above all shown a native stability,

a fundamental good sense, and an inherent understanding of both the dangers and the possibilities of their new status.

As the people of Puerto Rico well know, their status as a Commonwealth is a novel one in American history. The relationship which was worked out is unprecedented. It was an experiment. It is a continuing experiment. Thus far the experiment has been a grand success.

For the most part the Commonwealth has wisely refrained from putting too great a strain on the new ties which bind Puerto Rico to and separate it from the mainland. A distinctiveness has been achieved without endangering the intimacy of the connection and association with the rest of the United States. It is a delicate relationship and has been delicately handled.

There are many hurdles yet to be overcome and many problems to be resolved. In my judgment, one of the goals of first importance is the elimination of the inequities and inequalities which still exist in the treatment accorded Puerto Rico by the Federal Government. I belive that the goal should be the treatment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on a par with the States in every respect. We are all American citizens and as such are equal before the law. The Federal law should make no distinction in the manner it treats American citizens, whether they live in Pennsylvania or Puerto Rico.

We must work to remove these inequities and discriminations. I am aware that this involves the solution of some very profound problems which will take time. It surely will require patience, good will, and cooperation among all of us.

I believe that we recently took a very significant step forward in this direction in our social-security legislation. The Congress is at the point of completing consideration of amendments to the Social Security Act. These amendments will, among other things, raise the limit of Federal contributions for public-assistance payments to Puerto Rico. This increase is in the neighborhood of a million dollars. The principle is as important as the amount of money. It represents progress toward the goal of equality.

This goal of equality must beckon us onward on this anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution. Nor may we forget the broader goal—the advancement of the happiness and well-being of the people of Puerto Rico along with the similar advancement of their fellow American citizens on the mainland, and the dedication of all our common efforts to the achievement of a world order based on justice, security, and peace.

Aviation Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House should be called to what I regard as an outstanding investigation recently conducted by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. That subcommittee is under the chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, West Virginia, and is composed of the following members: JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, Minnesota; JOE M. KILGORE, Democrat, Texas; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, Michigan; EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania; GEORGE MEADER, Republican, Michigan; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, California; and WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Republican, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, at my request, on February 22, 1956, the subcommittee voted to undertake an inquiry into the expenditure of Federal funds for the promotion and development of aviation facilities, including both the air navigational system and airports.

The staff of the committee, under the able leadership of our chief counsel, Jerome S. Plapinger, immediately began a preliminary study, including on-the-spot visits to traffic-control centers and extensive discussions with experts in all phases of aviation operations.

Hearings opened June 25, 1956, and were concluded July 20, 1956. We compiled 2,030 pages of stenographic transcript of testimony and received numerous exhibits. The committee heard experts, both in Government and in private industry, on various aspects of aviation problems. Witnesses included:

W. Barclay Harding, chairman, Aviation Facilities Safety Group.

N. E. Halaby, vice chairman, Aviation Facilities Safety Group.

Adm. Chase Rosendahl, retired, executive director, National Air Transport Coordinating Committee.

Clarence Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association.

Max Karant, vice president, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

Warren Dickenson, executive engineer, Douglas Aircraft Co.

Matha Miller, supervisor, acoustics group, Douglas Aircraft Co.

M. L. Pennell, chief engineer, transport division, Boeing Aircraft Co.

Don Buck, engineering sales department, Boeing Aircraft Co.

Harry Howell, chief acoustics electrical unit, transport technical staff, Boeing Aircraft Co.

H. M. Conner, Washington representative, Lockheed Aircraft Co.

Carl Schmidt, airline operations engineer, Lockheed Aircraft Co.

J. F. Woodall, engineering department, acoustics, Convair division, General Dynamics.

Milton Arnold, vice president, operations, Air Transport Association.

Col. A. B. McMullen, secretary, National Association of State Aviation Officials.

Charles Parker, executive secretary, National Aviation Transport Association.

Charles J. Lowen, Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

James Pyle, Deputy Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Herbert Howell, Director, Office of Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Joseph Blatt, director, program planning, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Joseph Tippetts, Director, Office of Federal Airways, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

David Thomas, Director, Office of Air Traffic Control, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Fred Davis, Director, Office of Aviation Safety, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Robert Gale, Deputy Director, Office of Air Traffic Control, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Air Force, assisted by Colonels Conklin, Frizen, Dougherty, Kelly, and Lightner, and Elmo Ceconi, and Donald Mack.

Hon. Louis Rothschild, Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Edward P. Curtis, Special Assistant to the President for Aviation Facilities Planning.

Robert J. Wilson, vice president, Capital Airlines.

William M. Joy, commissioner of aviation, Detroit, Mich.

Cass Hough, former chairman, Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

C. V. Burnett, director, Detroit Aviation Commission.

John P. McElroy, member, Michigan Aeronautics Commission; director of personnel, Wayne County Road Commission.

John Witherspoon, city comptroller, Detroit, Mich.

Robert Miller, president, Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc.

Edmund A. Cummiskey, attorney, University of Michigan.

Floyd Wakefield, airport supervisor, University of Michigan.

Karl Cousino, representing Warren Township.

Arthur Miller, representing Warren Township.

Henry Baker, airport consultant, Wayne County Road Commission, Detroit.

Brig. Gen. Lester J. Maitland, counsel, Michigan Aviation Commission.

Paul Morris, Civil Aeronautics Administration member, Airport Use Panel.

Joseph Johnson, secretary, Airport Use Panel.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan.

Cole Morrow, National Business Aircraft Association.

James Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Joseph P. Adams, member, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Joseph Minetti, member, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Franklin Stone, General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Oscar Bakke, Deputy Director, Bureau of Safety Regulation.

Ben Ashmead, Chief of Analysis Division, Bureau of Safety Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some familiarity with the conduct of congressional investigations, not alone through my service on the Government Operations Committee in three terms in the House of Representatives, but prior to that time as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, from 1943 to 1947, and as counsel for the Fulbright Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1950. It is my considered opinion that the conduct of the hearings of the Mollohan committee on aviation problems and the report which was expeditiously drafted, not only reflect credit on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives but that

the evidence accumulated and the opinions the committee expressed will for some time to come constitute a landmark in aviation history.

Mr. Speaker, my opinion of the quality of those hearings was fortified by the comment of a member of the press who attended every session of the committee's hearings. In noting that he had been following aviation hearings for 23 years, he observed that the hearings of the Mollohan committee were more complete and more impartial and conducted on a higher level than any he had witnessed before.

I want to commend especially my chairman, Mr. MOLLOHAN, who is terminating his service in the House of Representatives, and our counsel, Jerome S. Plapinger, for a job well done. The report of the Mollohan subcommittee on its aviation hearings was unanimously approved by the subcommittee on July 23, 1956, and unanimously adopted as the report of the House Government Operations Committee on July 25, 1956.

Based upon an excellent and complete record of fact and expert opinion, the report of the Mollohan committee expresses a judicious and informed concern over the failure of the Government to provide the leadership and support which our important aviation industry, both military and civilian flying, requires under modern conditions. At this point in my remarks, I insert the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee and the subcommittee's conclusions:

[From the Washington Office of Representative ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, House Government Operations Committee, Friday, July 27, 1956]

A House Government operations subcommittee today called for drastic reorganization of Federal aviation agencies as part of an eight-point program to meet the soaring growth of United States aviation.

Subcommittee Chairman ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, said the recommendations climaxed 4 weeks of hearings, including testimony covering the mid-air collision of 2 airliners over Grand Canyon, June 30, which killed 128 persons.

Other subcommittee recommendations:

A speedup of studies underway by Presidential Aviation Adviser Edward P. Curtis, himself looking into reorganization of Government aviation agencies.

An end to Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Communications Commission membership on the Air Coordinating Committee, a body composed of Federal agencies, boards, and commissions created by Presidential order to resolve aviation disputes within the executive branch of Government.

The subcommittee said that "the continued membership in the Air Coordinating Committee by these regulatory bodies represents an undermining by the executive branch of the careful standards and safeguards of administrative law procedures prescribed by the Congress in creating both the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board."

Clarification of the Air Coordinating Committee's role in aviation policy determination.

An end to military predominance on the ACC.

Acceleration of the so-called 5-year Federal airways plan of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to modernize United States air navigational facilities.

An end to the VOR/DME-TACAN impasse, a dispute between civil and military agencies over two types of navigational aids.

An automatic review of air traffic-control problems before approval of site locations for new airports.

MOLLOHAN said the hearings, held by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, indicated confusion among Federal agencies administering United States air programs and added: "Direction must be substituted for coordination."

The West Virginia lawmaker said his subcommittee declined at this time to report to the full committee a bill calling for a commission study of United States aviation introduced by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan.

The subcommittee indicated approval of congressional and industry participation in such a study and promised to follow closely the progress of the Curtis study. It was MEADER, MOLLOHAN said, who first asked hearings before his subcommittee.

The report expressed concern over what it called the limited budget of $150,000 granted the Curtis study group and urged that the study be accelerated.

Curtis, with a staff of 3 and grants from the Defense and Commerce Departments of $300,000 to pay for study contracts by outside firms and organizations, was appointed as a result of the Harding report to the Budget Bureau which last year counted 75 agencies, boards, bureaus, and committees attempting to administer and control American aviation.

It likened Curtis' limited budget and staff as driving a spike with a tack hammer.

The report pictured growth of American aviation as miraculous and almost beyond human comprehension, and noted that passenger use alone of commercial airlines nearly tripled in the 7-year period between 1947 and 1955.

The subcommittee also took to task membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission on the Air Coordinating Committee, created merely by Executive order in 1946. Its report described their continued membership on the Air Coordinating Committee as representing "an undermining by the executive branch [of the Government] of the careful standards and safeguards of administrative law procedures prescribed by the Congress in creating both the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board."

Both agencies were established by law as quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative regulatory bodies. Yet a CAB member testified the Board is bound through its membership on the ACC to its decisions and recommendations.

The report noted specifically that the ACC has no statutory authority to make decisions and added:

"Coordination by means of Executive order must not be used to nullify congressional enactment."

Also attacked was apparent predominance of military membership on the Air Coordinating Committee. Noted were appearances on working panels of the ACC of separate representatives of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force as well as the Department of Defense. In the case of the Airport Use Panel of the ACC, said the report, membership was divided 4 for military and 2 for civilian representatives.

But the report noted also that the CAA is not a member of the parent Air Coordinating Committee in its own right.

The subcommittee also commended the President's recent request for appropriation of an additional $68 million to speed up the CAA's 5-year airways plan. It noted CAA officials' testimony that with additional money the 5-year plan could be completed in 3 years.

The VOR/DME-TACAN controversy between two types of navigational aids also was a target of committee fire. Testimony indicated military preference for the TACAN type of aid while the CAA offered continued prefence for the VOR/DME type.

Added the report:

"Valuable time already lost can never be recaptured and little excuse exists for further procrastination in this matter."

The report also recommended automatic review of air-traffic-control problems within the Civil Aeronautics Administration before allocating funds for airports.

A specific example, said the report, was the proposed Northeast Airport at Detroit where, testimony indicated, Detroiters were permitted to continue spending their money on the Northeast site without a determination by the CAA whether traffic-control complications would preclude its maintaining a traffic pattern independent of air traffic of airports in the Detroit metropolitan area.

Detroit officials said they first learned of CAA views on traffic complications during hearings held by the subcommittee.

A Stronger America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me on the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONGER AMERICA

Mr. President, as the 84th Congress moves into history, the people of our Nation may now assess its progress, measure its failures, and—come November—prepare their own decision on American government for the years ahead.

We are a nation of free peoples, unfailingly determined to maintain our freedom and to advance the cause of a just peace in the world. In exercising that determination, our Federal Government will be judged by our people in varying ways and differing opinions, brought about, I suppose, by different interpretation of facts, by differing capacities to judge, by sectional background, and, sometimes, by narrow partisanship.

But we are all in the same boat together. The problems which face us and our children affect all of us, and will affect all of us, in precisely the same manner, no matter whether or how they may be solved. The gravest menace to free peoples, here and elsewhere, is international communism, and its constant threat of aggression. That threat falls equally on all of us whether we are Republicans or Democrats, and whether we live in New York, Illinois, Florida, or California. That threat remains, despite the change in the Soviet approach which has tended to play down the danger of the Communist menace to freedom and which, alas, has been a narcotic to some Americans.

Earlier this year, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, warning against the continuing menace of communism, said, "We should not now be lulled into complacency." There, indeed, is the lurking danger to the spirit of our people. The President has referred to the Soviet policy of "zig and zag." So it is. This Nation and all our people must be awake to the dark menace of slave government which frankly

confesses that world domination continues to be its goal.

History will give great credit to the 84th Congress for working in almost complete unison with the executive branch of our Government in facilitating a more dynamic approach to our problems in this all-important field.

To be sure, there have been areas of disagreement. Congress and the Executive share this high responsibility. But it is fair to say they have not been partisan in nature. Foreign policy decisions in this body have been registered by bipartisan majorities on the basis of what is best for all the people of the United States.

In the closely related field of American defense, I have approved, with my vote, President Eisenhower's overall program. Carefully continued, it represents the considered opinions of our military leaders, concurred in by the Chief Executive, himself preeminently skilled in this field.

Here is the judgment of Admiral Radford on the 1956 recommendations, who told me, a short while ago, it is precisely his view now:

"I feel as of today that we are better prepared to meet an emergency than we ever have been during my service in the Armed Forces. We have a flexible combination of land, sea, and air forces with a wide variety of weapons and capabilities, including nuclear, which in my opinion is fully adequate for the security of the United States. We have strategic air forces and carrier task forces which are unmatched by any other nation. We have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending on what the target requires. We have Army and Marine Corps ground forces consisting of well over a million men.

"In fact, the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. These forces are fully adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and they constitute an ample base which will permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary."

Our country enjoys a great prosperity. More people are gainfully employed today than ever before. The total income of American families reached a record high of $288 billion last year. The increase in the number of business concerns last year was larger than any year since 1948. Farm prices have recovered from last winter's low levels. Our Government this past year has lived within its revenues for the first time in several years, despite two tax reductions.

I do not want to paint too rosy a picture. But I can truthfully observe that we're in pretty good shape here at home, and we intend to keep it that way.

OUR NATION STRENGTHENED

Looking at the domestic scene closer, the roots of our American economy have been fertilized and fed by several significant actions of this Congress. The session just ended brightened the prospects for happiness, security, health, and opportunity for the future of generations now alive and others yet to be born.

Although our record of legislative achievement could have been better and more substantial in several respects, the United States is in a stronger position, as a consequence of measures enacted in 1956, to contribute the leadership for which the free world looks to our Nation.

Among the more progressive and constructive pieces of legislation enacted by the 84th Congress in its 2d session are:

The soil-bank program, which will conserve irreplaceable resources while supplying a solid floor under our agriculture.

Generous appropriations for the utilization and protection of other natural resources, including water, timber, minerals, and campgrounds.

The most ambitious and worthwhile highway program ever conceived.

Liberal support for the Armed Forces and their personnel, including new and expanded installations for greater security of America.

More realistic benefits for veterans and the aged, disabled, and needy Americans who must look to the social-security system for much of their sustenance.

Continuation of Federal financial aid to school districts plagued by phenomenal population growth directly due to Federal activities.

Through all of these measures, broad in scope and effect, the constantly growing State of California will be aided and benefited.

In a number of other instances, this administration and this Congress have been of further specific assistance to the State of which I am a Native Son. Our California people readily and willingly assume their obligations, as a member of our Union, to work in partnership with the National Government and will perform their duties so that a wholesome atmosphere of democracy and opportunity will be waiting for our children and our children's children.

For the very definite advantage of my home State, the Congress voted substantial sums of money and took other actions to rehabilitate both the areas and the unfortunate individuals heavily damaged by last winter's unseasonal and uncontrollable storms. I am grateful, and I assure my colleagues that the people of California feel warm appreciation, that the administration, in response to appeals which I submitted to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of the Budget, realistically increased appropriation requests so that work on authorized projects can be accelerated, long-planned but unstarted projects can be initiated, and surveys and examinations, vital for the safety of mushrooming communities, can be undertaken.

WATER PROBLEMS RECOGNIZED

The recognition by this Congress of the duty to cooperate with State and local agencies in solving water problems—from both excesses and deficits of water—is a major development which will strengthen America. All of the legislation of particular aid to California accords entirely with Federal policy and precedents. In virtually every instance our people will be carrying a considerable burden in the form of cash contributions to eventual realization of long-standing plans. Without hesitation I declare the appropriations made this year will yield hearty dividends through conservation and better use of often-scarce water as well as through averting future tragedy and economic loss from excessive rainfall and snowmelt.

A prime example of the benefits for the Nation, as well as for my State, is given by the Ventura project, now being built under terms of Public Law 423, which I had the opportunity to introduce. Besides authorizing this $26,750,000 undertaking, almost every cent of which will be repaid to the Federal Treasury, the Congress saw the need for speedy construction and provided $6,400,000 to get work going without delay. The schedule, thanks to the very material amount of money now available, will make possible impounding of water beginning in 1959. The project will firm up supplies for a thriving industrial, chemical-producing, and oil-refining city, and will facilitate production in the surrounding area of widely desired specialty crops of fruits, nuts, and vegetables.

The new water pollution law, of which I was a cosponsor, gives valuable added weapons for Federal and other agencies endeavoring to clean up our streams, counter the mounting demand for waste disposal facilities, and offset the occasional deficiencies of nature. I was happy to have this Congress vote promptly money to carry out the program contemplated by the legislation which I participated in framing as a member of the Public Works Committee.

Continuance of the dramatic program of investigating possibilities of influencing weather by chemical and mechanical means is another commendable achievement which can enrich the lives of people across our land. Further potential relief for critical areas of the Nation seems likely from continuing research into methods of converting saline water into fresh. Because I thoroughly appreciate the precious worth of water for farms, for industries, and for homes, I cosponsored the legislation relating to both projects in the confidence that our expenditures will produce a return of real value to agriculture, industry, and many other groups in our society.

The happiness, and I feel sure, the health of Americans in scores of sections will be promoted through the recent appropriation of the largest sum ever provided by Congress to track down and eventually, I trust, extinguish a relatively new menace, smog.

To carry on the research and experimental work being done under the law which I had the honor to author last year, the present Congress has voted an unprecedented $2,740,000 for the current fiscal year. With these funds, chemists, biologists, engineers, and meteorologists, among other scientists, will pursue lines of inquiry which may enable bedeviled communities to cleanse the air our people, their animals, and plants must have for existence.

SMOG MENACE ATTACKED

As a result of the enactment of the Kuchel Air Pollution Act by the first session of this Congress, the United States Public Health Service has initiated a far-reaching program of research, technical assistance, and training in the field of community air pollution. This is the first nationwide attack on the serious and spreading problem of smog, fumes, and irritants. With the $1,785,000 provided for the last fiscal year, inquiry into engineering, physical science, and health aspects of air pollution was started within laboratories of the Health Service, Weather Bureau, Bureau of Mines, and Bureau of Standards. Supplementing these agencies, an increasing number of investigators, supported financially by research grants at universities and scientific institutions throughout the country, are attacking the mysteries and troubles on the local scene.

More than 250 requests for field assistance have been received from State and local air pollution control agencies and the Public Health Service is endeavoring to meet as many of these requests as possible. Technical training courses are now being developed at the Taft Center in Cincinnati for operating personnel of these agencies and a field station is due for Los Angeles in the near future. With the $955,000 increase in appropriations for the current year, expansion of these promising activities is planned, together with the launching of grants-in-aid to States and communities for training and demonstration projects.

With some of the most varied terrain and climatic conditions which can be found on our continent, California lamentably suffers from time to time from excesses of rainfall and snowfall just as some parched regions unceasingly struggle to obtain sufficient water supplies. Therefore, I point out gratefully that this Congress not only moved speedily and promptly to relieve and repair damage inflicted last winter but imaginatively acted to afford long-range protection for our people against floods.

FORCES OF NATURE CHALLENGED

The 1956 omnibus flood-control, rivers and harbors, beach erosion bill is a case in point, a cheering illustration of the way forces of Federal, State, and local governments can be marshalled for a concerted at-

tack on a problem too large for the residents of any affected area to solve on their own. I note particularly the authorization for investigations into and reports on the flood danger and means of counteracting it in the Sacramento River basin and on assorted streams such as Pescadero Creek, San Gregorio Creek, Redwood Creek, in South San Francisco, near Burlingame, and in Contra Costa County.

Additional flood-prevention works, safeguarding areas not yet protected by the many structures and controls in existence or under construction, would be authorized for some hard-pressed sections of California. Among worthwhile undertakings included for future building with Federal funds are Buchanan and Hidden Reservoirs in the San Joaquin Basin, on the Sacramento River between Chico Landing and Red Bluff, on the Eel, Kaweah, Tule, and Feather Rivers. A conspicuous instance of Federal willingness to be partners with the States and local agencies is the projected multipurpose Oroville Dam to be built on the last-named stream. The principle that the National Government should aid with cash contributions measured by the degree of flood protection provided by such structures is sound and should be carried further in succeeding sessions of Congress.

PROTECTION FOR THE FUTURE

I was especially happy to have opportunities to speak and vote for the measure setting up a system of disaster insurance. By this legislation finally approved just before adjournment, Congress took a definite step forward in safeguarding our people against painful losses from forces mankind cannot control. I anticipate this statute will be considered a milestone when the Federal Government joins hands with forward-looking private enterprise and with the States in affording all endangered Americans a chance to indemnify themselves against possible catastrophic losses of homes and other possessions through rampages of nature.

The new law, of which I was a cosponsor, allowing the Army engineers discretionary funds to construct small flood-prevention works, is an undeniable contribution toward a stronger America. We provided a flexible tool with which this alert and determined branch of the Army can supplement the major projects which rightly must be specifically and individually authorized by statute. Certainly an expenditure of up to $10 million annually for debris basins, retarding dams, and channels on tributary streams and in isolated canyons costing up to $400,000 apiece will be a prudent use of the people's money for the people's welfare. The tremendous benefits from this type of undertaking already have been demonstrated in Los Angeles County, where funds I asked the Senate to approve have financed a number of such developments.

The provision of money to replenish the disaster loan fund and the emergency highway repair fund was another related and necessary move by this Congress. Californians in more than a dozen counties will be aided in rebuilding after the violence wreaked on the northern and central sections of our State only a few months ago.

The philosophy that the National Government must aid the people in tasks which are too heavy for single communities or loosely knit groups has been demonstrated significantly in the increased appropriations for forest-fire suppression and prevention, for which the Senate was notably generous in responding to an appeal I helped present. I cannot even hazard a guess at the number of our citizens who also will be grateful for the increased funds to carry out programs providing more campgrounds, highways, museums, public utilities, and other urgent facilities in our remarkable national parks and national forests.

By voting nearly $10 million over prior year levels, this Congress gave real impetus to the Mission 66 program in the park system, which embraces such a large amount of land in my State. And boosting by nearly $1 million the allotment for national forest facilities, we have started chopping away at the backlog of demands from millions of persons who derive pleasure and inspiration from these spectacular reservations, many of which are in California.

From a materialistic point of view, Californians also feel a debt to this Congress for substantial appropriations for this fiscal year, including more than $8 million to improve rivers and harbors and beaches, well over $55 million to further our irrigation and reclamation projects, and for nearly $32,500,000 to prosecute essential flood-control construction. An item of nearly $800,000 to conduct water surveys in our bountiful central valleys will lay a foundation for planning that in time will mean the most beneficial and fruitful utilization of land and water, the averting of shortages that could seriously retard our growth, and industrial expansion that invigorates the national, as well as the State, economy.

FARMERS, WORKERS, AND INDUSTRIES HELPED

California farmers, like the men and women elsewhere whose livelihood comes from agriculture, agree that the new farm law is a sound move toward a solution of the problem which has perplexed and burdened many segments of our Nation during recent years. The reassurance already is being noted, as witness the reports of tremendous numbers of farmers signing up to participate in this forward-looking program. When the normal influences of supply and demand have maximum latitude to operate and when the soil bank is functioning as intended, we should be able to glimpse an end of price-depressing surpluses that have been such a painful financial drain and deterrent to individual initiative.

One branch of our unique California agriculture will profit in particular from constructive efforts of the Congress to assist our people. By exempting fruits and specialty crops from requirements of the Cargo Preference Act, we have thrown open new doors to potential markets abroad. Although a confirmed believer in the so-called 50–50 law designed to bolster America's indispensable merchant marine, I believe this waiver on behalf of growers of citrus, grapes, and other fruits was a warranted exception from that fundamentally wise requirement that half of our Government-financed surpluses going abroad should move in American-flag vessels.

The farm problem in several respects highlights the importance and effect of our trade policies. I maintain that our trade-relations legislation should not be employed to damage any segment of our economy. That is why I was so determined to have this Congress enact comprehensive fisheries legislation. That is why I have been pressing upon our executive branch the fact that administrative action is imperative to assure our fruitgrowers, particularly those raising figs and dates, a fair share of their home markets.

The fisheries legislation will be regarded in the future as a distinct advance in the way of assuring sound and coordinated policies affecting both a vital industry and millions of Americans who turn to our streams and lakes, our shorelines, and coastal waters for recreation and relaxation. In a commendable spirit of compromise, the Congress recognized the seriousness of the problem affecting our offshore commercial fisheries and composed differences between those who fish for sport and pleasure and those whose sustenance comes from the sea.

The record of this Congress for labor and for education is not too gratifying. I was glad to have a hand in obtaining more funds for railway safety, which will benefit workers and travelers alike on our railroad system and to vote for extension of the law that enables the Federal Government to share the burden of maintaining and building schools in communities where the school population has jumped astoundingly because of Federal activities. The latter assistance is of particular importance to my State, because California has 501 Federal properties officially classified as causing impact on local governments and 326 districts last year obtained aid for operations while 147 were assured funds for new buildings.

The past session saw marked and encouraging progress in launching a coast-to-coast program of urgent Federal construction under the Lease-Purchase Act which I had the opportunity of helping to write and manage in the 83d Congress. Besides assuring California of 3 desperately needed multipurpose structures in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sacramento and 2 much-wanted post offices in National City and Bellflower, this novel means of providing quarters for Federal agencies will provide a great amount of employment and put tremendous sums of money in circulation in communities all over the Nation. Plans are in preparation for other cities in California and across the country.

The scope of this effort is difficult to conjecture but is hinted by the fact that the Senate Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, approved 120 separate projects costing in excess of $638 million in the session just finished. The 5 California projects will entail an expenditure of nearly $87 million.

The sympathetic understanding of Congress for the troubles and ordeals of a unique American industry which has its roots in California resulted in agreement that the war-inspired admissions tax is punitive to motion-picture exhibitors, producers, and patrons. With owners of approximately 5,000 theaters just keeping heads above water and a shocking number still operating at a loss, it was just and fitting that Congress should waive the 10-percent levy on tickets costing under 90 cents. This relief, as pointed out to the Finance Committee, will mean also greater amusement and entertainment opportunities to immense numbers of families who must figure closely where their dollars are spent.

Another important and distressed California industry—ship building and repair—received encouragement from two actions in this last session; extension for 2 more years of the Emergency Ship Repair Act, which I cosponsored, and enactment of the measures requiring periodic inspection of shipyards to determine their defense capabilities will strengthen an indispensable feature of our fourth line of national defense.

California shipyards were invaluable in creating the bridge of vessels which contributed spectacularly to victory in World War II. They must not be allowed to wither away and expire.

By authorizing further modernization of ships in our mothball fleet, the Congress assured that a nucleus of trained labor can be kept employed at some California establishments. The new statute relating to industrial capability provides for allocation of work in a fashion which will make certain of an adequate mobilization base at strategic points in the country for national defense purposes or in event of a national emergency. Thus, I feel confident, responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government will follow a course designed to maintain the skills and facilities that are essential to the operation of the American merchant marine and the United States Navy.

There was one very distressing action by this Congress, the adoption of the loosely worded and ill-conceived dispersal amendment to the measure extending our Defense Production Act. I resisted this hastily presented declaration to the best of my ability, although I do not have—nor can any patriotic, thinking American—any objection to a sound policy that makes sure all our defense eggs are not in one vulnerable basket.

I intend to see that California is treated equitably and with understanding, because the industry in existence will be indispensable in event this Nation is assaulted by a hostile power. Authorities in the executive branch have stated this unfortunate legislation will not be interpreted in a manner inimical to our industry and that the application of the policy will not preclude establishment in our State of new enterprises such as the $40 million guided missile plant recently authorized to be erected on the outskirts of San Diego.

The time-tested social-security system has been expanded and improved, as have the laws affecting Federal employees. By raising the floor under old-age assistance, through increased Federal contributions, this Congress assured immediate benefits to elderly citizens grappling with the cost of living, and I was proud to join in pushing the amendment which finally was enacted. I am glad to say that Congress overwhelmingly adopted new proposals providing assistance to the disabled, and enabling women to begin receiving at the age of 62 the pensions toward which they have contributed. The Federal employees retirement benefits law, along with the measure protecting persons in the classified service against salary cuts in cases where jobs are realined through no fault of their own, will make public service more attractive and protect the 230,000 loyal Government workers who reside in California. These benefits bring our Government personnel system closer to what private industry provides for its employees.

BETTER HIGHWAYS IN VIEW

While recognition of the importance and complexity of water problems is a conspicuous achievement, the past session of Congress enacted another salutary and notable measure in launching the 13-year highway construction and modernization program.

On previous occasions I expressed grave concern about costly delay in tackling the pressing problem of inadequate highways. Because I have shuddered repeatedly at the toll of deaths and injuries and because I cannot tolerate the shameful wastes of time and money due to congestion and outmoded roads, enactment of the 1956 highway law gives me much satisfaction.

The significance of highway modernization is obvious when one considers that California's area is virtually equivalent to the stretch of Atlantic seaboard between Massachusetts and South Carolina. Our farflung communities, divided into distinct basins by mountains and other topographical features, are linked in hosts of cases only by the paved road and the motor vehicle.

A Federal contribution of $268 million over the next 3 years for our interstate routes will go far toward setting in motion the men and machines which will straighten and widen and otherwise improve essential arteries of communication and transportation. With the increased Federal aid toward the cost of the Interstate System, California will be enabled to channel more of its revenues to other categories of highways that cannot longer be neglected and ignored.

I am convinced the only effective and prudent way to distribute Federal financial aid to the States is on the basis of measured and weighed need. That is why I originally supported President Eisenhower's proposal and why I voted against the Gore bill which, happily, the Congress rejected almost in entirety. The stopgap scheme for apportioning these moneys for the first 3 years can be tolerated because many States will require that much time to complete preliminaries, such as land acquisition and blueprinting. When a subsequent Congress gets this pay-as-you-ride program on the sound principle of demonstrated need, we can expect fast progress toward the kind of highway system our Nation must have for its security, prosperity, and happiness.

The requirement that the States adhere to the prevailing wage for workers on federally assisted projects is a wise precaution. Although some in our population condemn this principle, I enthusiastically joined in pushing the idea of applying the Bacon-Davis Act because I want labor and contractors alike protected against sweatshop working conditions and cutthroat competitors. Just as a laborer is worthy of his hire, so a conscientious contractor is entitled to equality of opportunity and knowledge that his rival must use the same yardstick in estimating costs.

A FEW DISAPPOINTMENTS

While I see much in the record of 1956 legislative achievement to cite with pride and satisfaction, the Congress just concluded must acknowledge it let down the American people in several disheartening instances.

I must and do earnestly deplore the refusal to enact a code of fair procedure for committee investigations and hearings. The resolution which I had the honor of cosponsoring to safeguard witnesses and innocent third parties regrettably died without even a cursory hearing by the Committee on Rules and Administration, despite promises and pledges that such a reform as a set of fair and realistic rules would be one of the first accomplishments of the 84th Congress. I beseech those who have the responsibility of leadership in the 85th Congress to discharge the obligation to provide guaranties against character assassination, destruction of reputations, browbeating, and unjust accusation.

The bottling up of civil-rights legislation, the bald refusal to even take testimony on measures which I and others put forward to promote the interests and maintain the dignity of minority groups of our population, is a great disappointment. Who can deny that the unrestricted right to vote, the privilege of invoking laws which are intended to protect each and every citizen, the sanctity of our democratic traditions should not be bulwarked by measures such as President Eisenhower advocated and numerous of us have introduced?

The continued degrading of Hawaii and Alaska, held forcibly in second-class citizenship because of partisan jealousy, is a cause for shame in looking back over the record of 1955 and 1956. With both parties committed to recognize these Territories as equals with the established States of our Union, there can be no convincing apology for the failure to enact statehood legislation for the loyal, hard-working residents of our mid-Pacific and Arctic possessions.

Realistic appreciation of the dire shortage of educational facilities is an undischarged debt and at the same time an inescapable duty awaiting the next Congress. Refusal to equip heavily burdened communities to supply the opportunity for the finest schooling to which every American child is entitled hardly can be a source of gratification to the membership of the 84th Congress. I sincerely trust that a year hence bipartisanship and true devotion to America and our future citizens will enable the 85th Congress to rise above the pettiness and jealousy that prevented enactment of a worthwhile program for Federal assistance in school construction and instruction.

GOING FORWARD RESOLUTELY

The unprecedented prosperity and the feeling of faith in the future which are America's fortunate lot have been bolstered and sustained by the labors of the 84th Congress. Despite occasional dark spots in our domestic economy and some ominous clouds on the foreign horizon, the conclusion of the 1956 session finds the United States proceeding boldly and confidently toward the objective of stable peace, pursuing the goal of unconquerable democracy, and maintaining a genuine appreciation of man's individuality and innate dignity.

The Hoover Commission Recommendations and the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the Hoover Commission recommendations and the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has now been over a year since the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, the Second Hoover Commission, held its last meeting. After 2 years of intensive examination of the Federal Government, the Hoover Commission reported to the Congress on 20 different areas of governmental activity and made some 314 recommendations for increasing efficiency, economy and rational operation of the Government. Of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, some 167 individual recommendations required action by the Congress before they could be put into effect.

As one who undertook to introduce various bills to implement the Hoover Commission recommendations, I feel it is timely upon the close of the 84th Congress to consider the progress, or lack of it, which Congress has made toward implementing these recommendations. It should be remembered that the scope of the Second Commission's inquiry far exceeded that of the First Hoover Commission and delved into the realm of policy matters by considering whether certain functions should be continued to be performed by the Federal Government at all, rather than just the most efficient manner in which such services could be rendered. As a result many of the Second Commission's recommendations were highly controversial.

Nevertheless, there has been substantial consideration of some of the Commission's recommendations, particularly by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Elsewhere in the RECORD, Senator KENNEDY has outlined the endeavors of that subcommittee with the Hoover Commission recommendations, and the following summary of the positive enactments of the 84th Congress in implementing the Hoover Commission recommendations includes those bills considered by his subcommittee, as well as those of other committees:

ACTION OF 84TH CONGRESS IMPLEMENTING SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

I. General

A. Extension of President's authority under the Reorganization Act to present reorganization plans to Congress to June 1, 1957. Public Law 16, March 25, 1955.

II. Personnel and civil service

A. Pay increases for heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and independent agencies (recommendation 4). Public Law 854, July 31, 1956.

B. Classification of Postal Employees (recommendation 8B). Public Law 68, June 10, 1955.

III. Paperwork management

A. Simplified computation of charges imposed on departments and agencies for the

use of the United States mail (task force recommendation 16). Public Law 705, July 14, 1956.

IV. Federal medical services

A. Establishment of a National Library of Medicine (recommendation 23), S. 3430. Sent to President July 24, 1956.

B. Increased pay and retirement benefits for doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces, reducing need to draft doctors (recommendation 4). Public Law 497, April 30, 1956.

C. Clarification of veterans' privileges for dental care, limiting it to service-connected conditions (recommendation 7). Public Law 83, June 16, 1955.

D. Provision of medical and hospital care for Armed Forces dependents through insurance (recommendation 21). Public Law 569, June 7, 1956.

E. Authorization for Surgeon General to make grants for a program of research on mental illness (recommendation 27, in part). Public Law 182, July 28, 1955.

F. Development of improved methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of mentally ill (recommendation 27, in part), S. 3958. Sent to President July 24, 1956.

V. Lending agencies

A. Separation of Home Loan Bank System from the Housing and Home Finance Agency (recommendation 9). Public Law 345, August 11, 1955.

B. Extension of direct loans to veterans for housing until July 25, 1957. Public Law 88, June 21, 1955.

C. Increased rate of retirement of Government capital in certain institutions (including banks for cooperatives) operating under supervision of the Federal Farm Credit System (recommendation 22). Public Law 347, August 11, 1955.

D. Encouragement of liquidation of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (recommendation 28, in part). Public Law 55, June 1, 1955.

E. Extension of Small Business Administration for 2 years (recommendation 39b). Public Law 268, August 9, 1955.

F. Merger of Production Credit Corporation in Federal intermediate credit banks and provision for return of the Government's investment in such banks (recommendations 24, 25), H. R. 10285. Sent to President July 16, 1956.

VI. Transportation

A. Authorized the armed services to use private ships wherever possible in transporting people and cargoes (recommendations 7 and 10). Public Law 538, May 28, 1956.

B. Revision of storage provisions for household goods of members of the Armed Forces (recommendation 2). Public Law 245, August 5, 1955.

VII. Surplus property

A. Revision of program of donation or surplus property for educational and public health purposes (recommendations 8a, 8d, and 9). Public Law 61, June 3, 1955.

B. Authorization of donation of surplus property for civil defense purposes (recommendation 9). Public Law 655, July 3, 1956.

C. Extension of authorization to dispose of surplus property by negotiation to July 31, 1958 (recommendation 17), H. R. 7855. Sent to President, July 25, 1956.

VIII. Business enterprises

A. Authorization for leasing of Alaska Railroad (recommendation 13b). Public Law 232, August 4, 1955.

IX. Depot utilization

A. Revision of nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects (recommendation 2a, in part). Public Law 245, August 5, 1955.

X. Research and development

A. Increased compensation for top research personnel in certain Federal agencies (recommendation 1). Incorporated in Public Law 854, July 31, 1956.

XI. Budget and accounting

A. Establishment of cost-based accounting and budgeting in the executive departments (recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 13, and 14), S. 3897. Sent to President July 25, 1956.

B. Simplification of accounting and procedures for the settlement of claims against lapsed appropriations. Public Law 793, July 25, 1956.

C. Relief of certain officers of financial liability, not due to fraud or gross negligence, to reduce the volume of claims to the General Accounting Office (recommendation 19, in part). Public Law 365, August 11, 1955; Public Law 334, August 9, 1955.

D. Establishment of a Staff Office of Accounting in the Bureau of the Budget, headed by an Assistant Director of Accounting (recommendation 10). Senate Joint Resolution 199 sent to President July 27, 1956.

XII. Water resources and power

A. Vest primary responsibility for water pollution projects in the States, with Federal effort directed to research, consultation, and control, over interstate problems (recommendations 1c and 1e). Public Law 660, July 9, 1956.

In addition to those measures enacted by the Congress, the Department of Defense, which is so intimately affected by the Hoover recommendations, has announced its concurrence with 85 percent of the Commission's recommendations. Most of these recommendations can be impleted through administrative action. The Department has indicated that it is putting these recommended changes into effect.

Yet there is no justification for complacency in viewing the record of implementing the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission. Much remains to be done before there can be any real satisfaction. Although the Congress approved certain very important budget and accounting revisions, the House of Representatives stood firm against the inclusion in that legislation of the fundamental revision placing appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis. Approval of that reform in the financial structure of the Government must be obtained during the next Congress. In addition, the establishment of an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development in each of the military departments must be pursued next year. Although the President proposed this change in a reorganization plan, the Congress disapproved of it considering that such an organizational change should be accomplished by positive legislation. The Congress thereby obligated itself to undertake passage of the necessary legislation at the earliest opportunity.

In the field of civil service reform, there has been little accomplished toward implementing the fundamental changes that the Hoover Commission recommended. Establishment of the senior civil service, revision of veterans' preference provisions, and other important matters must be given priority in the next Congress. The Civil Service Commission has, admittedly, had a prodigious task in evaluating the effect and advisability of all the recommendations throughout the divisions of the Federal service, but the Commission should definitely come forth during the early days of the 85th Congress and preesnt its findings and recommendations so that action, already long delayed, can be taken.

I have received a letter from Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, dated June 21, 1956. In this letter, Mr. Young held forth considerable promise for recommendations from the Civil Service Commission, concerning the Hoover proposals, to be ready for the 85th Congress. I hope that such Civil Service Commission proposals will be forthcoming early in the next session.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1956.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am glad to reply to your letter of April 26, 1956, concerning the Hoover Commission recommendations, in which I share your great interest. You inquire specifically about S. 2331, S. 2332, S. 2333, S. 2334, S. 2335, S. 2336, and S. 2337, bills to implement some of the more important proposals of the Commission in the area of personnel and civil service.

As you know, the executive branch is giving intensive consideration to the Hoover Commission recommendations not already in effect. There is enclosed a letter from the President expressing his interest in the Hoover Commission proposals on personnel and civil service.

Much has been accomplished already through legislation and administrative action. Public Law 68, establishing a pay and classification system for the postal field service, substantially accomplished recommendation 8 (b). Excellent progress has been made in the improvements in recruiting, examining, and appointment practices proposed by recommendations 9 and 10. Our new Federal service entrance examination program is a great stride forward in this area. The extension of the competitive service overseas (recommendation 14 (a)) has been largely accomplished. Recommendation 14 (c), concerning the transfer of persons between merit systems, has been provided for by Executive Order No. 10577 and is being implemented by the Commission. A directive of January 11, 1955, instructed agencies to carry out the substance with respect to in-service training of recommendation 7.

The bills you inquire about embody some of the most fundamental changes suggested by the Commission. In order to realize the full benefits of these Hoover Commission recommendations, there must be not only general agreement as to the overall aims but also general aceptance of methods on the part of Congress, heads of agencies, and other affected groups. I believe it is of the utmost importance to the ultimate attainment of these objectives that we lay a firm groundwork of acceptance. Following is a brief statement of our progress in considering the bills you mention:

S. 2331 would put into effect recommendation No. 6 of the Report on Personnel and Civil Service. This bill provides for a senior civil service. To be effective, this proposal must have the full support of the Congress, the heads of departments and agencies, and employees. We believe that a far-reaching educational program will be necessary in order to gain the support needed. The executive branch is now exploring ways of accomplishing the objectives of the senior civil service, including a study of those parts of the proposal that could be put into practice immediately by administrative action. We do not believe that a legislative proposal will be ready for submission to the Congress before the next session, however.

S. 2332 would carry out recommendation No. 8 (a), to simplify the grade structure of the Classification Act. Under this bill, grades GS–1 through GS–6 would be regrouped into 3 grades, and grades GS–7 through GS–11 would be regrouped into 3 grades. About 92 percent of the employees covered by the General Schedule are in grades GS–1 through GS–11 and their present pay is in excess of $3 billion a year. A major revision of the grade structure of the Classification Act, as proposed in S. 2332, could result in very substantial changes in payroll costs and could affect the interests of hundreds of thousands of employees, as well as the internal organization of the departments and agencies. Since this bill

would have such far-reaching effects, it is extremely controversial. It contains some technical provisions which involve complex administrative problems. Solutions should be determined for all such problems before we submit our comments on this bill. We do not want to report adversely because the bill provisions certainly merit consideration. This specific proposal relates to only one part of a larger set of problems in classification and pay. A plan is now under consideration through which these problems can be attacked. We will report to you within a few months on the progress in carrying out this plan.

S. 2333 would carry out recommendation No. 10 (c) by substituting a "rule of 5" for the present "rule of 3" required by the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. The Commission has made a careful study of this proposal and our report on S. 2333 was transmitted to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON on May 29, 1956. We recommended enactment with amendment to provide that the Commission may apply a rule of five in certifying to those categories of positions for which it determines such action to be in the interest of the Government. A copy of our report is enclosed.

S. 2334 would put into effect recommendation No. 11, to simplify the performance rating system. We have carefully studied this proposal and hope to have ready early in the next session of the Congress a legislative proposal which would carry out the objectives of this recommendation, although the content of the proposed legislation may differ from that of S. 2334.

S. 2335 would carry out recommendation No. 12 (a), to limit a veteran's right of appeal to the first 5 years after appointment to the service. The Commission staff has just completed a study and reevaluation of the whole appeals program. It will be ready within a few weeks for Commission consideration and for discussion with agencies, employee and veterans' groups, and staffs of congressional committees. These steps will obviously take considerable time. They will be pursued diligently, and a report will be made to you at the earliest possible date.

S. 2336 would put into effect recommendation No. 13, relating to reductions in force. We are presently making an intensive study, not only of the specific recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on this subject, but of the other aspects of the reduction-in-force problem. We have solicited the views of representative agencies and have secured extensive information from them concerning reduction-in-force problems. Because of the far-reaching nature of this proposal, we feel that it is unlikely that a report on S. 2336 can be made during this session.

S. 2337 would carry out recommendation No. 14 (c), providing for the transfer of Federal employees between merit systems. Our report on this bill was submitted to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on April 17, 1956. As stated in that report, the Commission has adequate authority under the civil-service rules to carry out this proposal and has developed criteria by which we can identify established merit systems. We are now conducting negotiations with agencies maintaining such systems in order to arrive at agreements for the reciprocal transfer of personnel.

I believe that the Hoover Commission recommendations on personnel and civil service are highly constructive and have already led to significant improvement in personnel management. As indicated above, some of these recommendations have already been put into effect. In the case of some others, work by the executive branch has been completed and is awaiting action by the Congress.

The executive branch has completed work on recommendation No. 4, proposing increased salaries for the Government's top managers. S. 2628 and H. R. 7619 are now pending before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. General authority for all agencies for training at nongovernment facilities (recommendation No. 7) is contained in H. R. 9510 and S. 3287, resulting from a legislative proposal submitted to the Congress by the Commission. Funds for carrying out recommendations 17 and 18 have been requested of the Congress in our budget request.

We assure you of our deep interest in the remaining proposals and our desire to complete action on them as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

The people of the United States have every right to expect that the public business, the business of government, will be conducted as economically and as efficiently as possible, within the objectives laid out for the Government. Although attending to the details of governmental organization, staffing, and financing may not be as exciting or as enthralling as some other matters of policy which require consideration by the Congress, nevertheless, every Member of Congress has a heavy obligation to concern himself with these details. I know that most Members of the Congress realize this fact, and I am hopeful that further substantial progress will be made on the Hoover Commission recommendations during the next Congress.

Federal Role in Aviation—Report of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee on the Federal Role in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere I have reported to the House the hearings on aviation conducted by the Mollohan subcommittee. I believe the conclusions of the committee's report should be of interest to every Member of Congress and to the American public generally. They are as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

1. Reorganization of executive agencies required

The hearings of the subcommittee have convinced it that drastic reorganization of agencies in the executive branch of the Government having responsibilities in the field of aviation is urgently required.

The present Federal organization structure in civil aviation is tragic proof that it is not enough to have a forum or bargaining table where conflicts and disagreements can be settled and compromised. There must exist a capacity for leadership and planning in addition to the prompt resolution of differences. Direction must be substituted for coordination. To continue the present Federal organizational structure in aviation matters and thereby perpetuate current interagency conflicts and the lack of planning and leadership would mark Mr. Curtis' study as a futile effort, no matter how outstanding his projections for long-range aviation facilities.

Aviation activities must be administered through organizational machinery capable of dynamic action.

2. Expedition of Mr. Curtis' study required

The subcommittee believes that the responsibilities and functions of aviation agencies are so important, and the organizational relationships between them are so complex and confused, that piecemeal, casual changes might be dangerous. Changes should be made only after careful study. We cannot run the risk of disrupting current aviation operations and creating even more confusion than exists now.

The subcommittee is concerned over the limited budget given Mr. Curtis to achieve his goal. It is difficult to conceive how with a budget of $150,000 (plus $300,000 contributed by the Departments of Defense and Commerce for contracts made in connection with the first phase of his study) and a permanent professional staff of three (to be supplemented by a team of scientists and engineers), no matter how capable, Mr. Curtis can attain his goal with expedition. In this respect, it would seem the tools given Mr. Curtis in his monumental task may be likened to driving a spike with a tack hammer.

The subcommittee questions the timetable of between 1 year and a year and a half (from March 1, 1956) furnished by Mr. Curtis as the period in which his study will be completed. We are not suggesting that speed be substituted for thoroughness—only that with additional money and staff, the pace of the study can and should be quickened. Time is valuable and the Nation can ill afford to continue the current aviation organizational muddle.

3. Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Communications Commission membership in Air Coordinating Committee must be terminated

The presence of the Civil Aeronautics Board, an independent, quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, regulatory body on the Air Coordinating Committee should be terminated at once. This is equally applicable to the membership of the Federal Communications Commission.

This is especially significant in view of testimony before the subcommittee by a Civil Aeronautics Board member in which he stated the Board would be bound by air coordinating committee decisions in which the Civil Aeronautics Board member, after consultation with the Board, acquiesced.

The subcommittee believes that the continued membership in the air coordinating committee by these regulatory bodies represents an undermining by the executive branch of the careful standards and safeguards of administrative law procedures prescribed by the Congress in creating both the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. Whatever benefits may accrue as a result of their present Air Coordinating Committee membership can be obtained through being kept apprised of developments pertinent to their respective operations.

It is an illegal and unwarranted invasion by the executive branch by means of an Executive order to assume, without consent of the Congress, powers the Congress specifically conferred on these independent tribunals.

Participation by regulatory bodies in Air Coordinating Committee matters and according Air Coordinating Committee decisions binding effect, without adherence to procedures prescribed by the Congress represents a flagrant flouting of the will of the Congress.

That participation should be discontinued at once. The reservation contained in the Executive order with respect to regulatory agencies is meaningless—testimony before the subcommittee is ample and disturbing proof of that fact.

The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission are placed in the awkward position of being forced to disregard either an Executive order or the statutes which created them. We believe it is clear they should obey the statutes as superior to an Executive order.

4. Clarification of Air Coordinating Committee authority required

In a statement prepared at the request of the subcommittee, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics noted that "under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, Congress has vested in the civil agencies of Government, the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board, authority to require all aircraft, military as well as civil, operating anywhere in the airspace of the United States, to conform with our air traffic rules. It would be difficult to enlarge this grant of authority.

"Secondly, in the same law, Congress not only authorized, but directed, the Civil Aeronautics Administration to provide an airways system for the Nation's air traffic and to regulate and protect that air traffic.

"This combination of authority to make rules and to control traffic makes it possible for the civil agencies of Government to control the use made of the airspace of the United States by all types of aircraft, military as well as civil. We believe these controls are adequate and do not need to be enlarged."

The Congress has not delegated this authority to the Air Coordinating Committee nor to any other agency of Government.

Such delegation of authority cannot be accomplished except through legislation or possibly through a reorganization plan subject to congressional approval.

Most certainly a congressional delegation of authority cannot be contravened or otherwise affected by an Executive order.

The authority of the Air Coordinating Committee should be clarified without delay to make abundantly clear that the Air Coordinating Committee has no decision-making authority with respect to any matter in which Congress has vested authority elsewhere.

Coordination by means of an Executive order must not be used to nullify congressional enactment.

5. Predominance of the military on the Air Coordinating Committee and the Air Navigational Development Board must be avoided

Pending completion of the organizational aspects of Mr. Curtis' study, the subcommittee does not make any additional recommendations concerning organizational structure. However, it cannot ignore the predominance of the military services on the Air Coordinating Committee and the Air Navigational Development Board (and their various panels and committees). The subcommittee is impressed by the sheer weight of numbers and is concerned, for instance, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is not a member in its own right of either body, while the Department of Defense [1] and the three military services are specifically designated.

In addition to the statutory conflict pointed out in 4 above, the subcommittee believes that such military predominance conflicts with our tradition of vesting final authority in civilian rather than in military officials.

6. The 5-year Federal airway plan must be accelerated

The subcommittee is heartened by the recent request of the President for appropriation of an additional $68 million to accelerate the 5-year Federal airway plan for navigational aids. That request is in accord with the subcommittee's belief that the 5-year plan must be accelerated.

If acceleration is "just a matter of dollars and cents," as the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics told the subcommittee, then we believe the plan should be further accelerated so that with introduction of commercial jet transport planes in 1959, the Federal airways system will be better able to accept them, and cope with the many problems of air-traffic control that commercial jets will undoubtedly present.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration must obtain grade differentials for controllers. With the added air-traffic-control facilities to be provided under the 5-year plan, the Civil Aeronautics Administration cannot risk loss of any supervisory or other experienced controller personnel. It is, therefore, incumbent upon them to obtain grade differentials for controller personnel based on responsibility. That matter should be actively pursued by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

7. TACAN–VOR/DME controversy must be resolved without further delay

The vacillation that has marked the above problem is symptomatic of the lack of planning and direction in aviation matters within the Federal Government.

The controversy should be resolved no later than October 1, 1956, the date (30 to 40 days after August 20) promised by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation in his appearance before the subcommittee. Valuable time already lost can never be recaptured and little excuse exists for further procrastination in this matter.

8. Automatic review of air traffic control requirements within the Civil Aeronautics Administration is required before airport aid projects are finally approved

Internal procedures within the Civil Aeronautics Administration according to testimony before the subcommittee do not provide for automatic review by the Office of Air Traffic Control before final approval of project applications for Federal-aid airport funds to ascertain whether air traffic control difficulties will be experienced.

While the subcommittee was told that such applications are coordinated with the Office of Air Traffic Control, it is believed that procedures providing for automatic review would avoid any possibility of slipup.

Local bodies concerned with plans for construction of airports should thoroughly and constantly explore with the Civil Aeronautics Administration all facets of airport operations, particularly with reference to air traffic control problems. The proposed Detroit Northeast Airport situation is a most unfortunate example of the need for close and continuing liaison between local and Civil Aeronautics Administration officials.

[1] Although not a member of the Air Coordinating Committee, strangely, the Department of Defense is a voting member of the Airport Use Panel in addition to the Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Letter From Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to High School Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in my 32 years of service on Capitol Hill I have never known a Secretary of Labor who had the confidence and respect of management and labor and all segments of our people exceeding that of Secretary James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey. Everyone who knows Jim takes his hat off to him on his dedication and good works. Recently, the Secretary addressed the following public letter to high-school graduates defining the employment opportunities of our day:

DEAR GRADUATE, EMPHASIS IS ON SKILL, DEMAND IS HIGH

(By James P. Mitchell)

I am writing this letter to acquaint you with the employment opportunities you can expect and to let you know the kind of economy you are entering as a young worker.

There are two factors in your favor. First, the economy is at high levels. Employment this spring is at high marks for almost all sectors of enterprise. Job opportunities, therefore, are excellent. Secondly, there are fewer youths coming of working age now than there will be in the future when the high birth rate of the 1940's begins to be felt in the late teen brackets.

If I had to single out the most important fact concerning your status as workers, I would say it was this: whatever occupational field you enter, you will find that the premium in our modern economy is on skill. The day of the unskilled worker is passing; the day of the highly skilled, flexible, and well-educated worker is already here.

You will find, then, that your education in this sense is just beginning. You will find that training courses will precede many vocations, and that they involve as great an intellectual challenge as many of your school courses. How successfully you meet that challenge is a critical factor in the future success of our economy, and of our country.

Workers who have mastered one of the skilled crafts or who have acquired the skills of a technician generally earn more than the less skilled workers. They possess greater flexibility in making job changes, have more promotional opportunities and job security. It would be extremely unwise to pass up any opportunity for additional training that could very well make the difference between good wages and security and lower wages in your future years.

There are a number of skilled fields in which training opportunities and long-run employment prospects are good. Among these are machine-shop occupations, particularly tool and die makers and machinists. The construction trades, including occupations such as carpenters, electricians, plumbers and pipefitters, and bricklayers make up the largest field of employment for skilled workers. These trades will provide many apprentice openings this year. Another large field of employment for skilled craftsmen is the printing trades, which offer relatively high earnings and steady employment.

Numerous jobs will be open to girls with training in the traditional fields in which they excel. Stenographers and typists, operators of various office machines, such as computers, key-punch machines, and bookkeeping machines are in demand.

The trend in occupations for women workers has been, since World War II, toward greater diversification and latitude. Many kinds of employment now are open to young women workers. In the 1950 census, women workers appeared in 466 occupational groups. The majority of them, however, demand more training than you now have. Nurses, teachers, women scientists, and mathematicians will find good jobs for a long time to come, but more education and more training are needed to qualify for these positions.

Jobs in the clerical field, in selling, in assembly work in many factories are available for the high-school graduate. I would, however, give a great deal of thought to continuing your education toward a higher occupational group where women are now not only accepted but needed.

The wide trend toward mechanization within the factory should continue the rapid growth in employment opportunity for maintenance and repair personnel. Among the most important of these are electronic technicians and maintenance mechanics. The entire electronics field from home television receivers and military and civilian electronic equipment, requires a large staff of maintenance and repairmen.

Those of you about to enter a branch of the military service should investigate the opportunities for specialized training in some of the skilled crafts and technical occupations. The time spent in uniform may afford you a chance to learn a basic trade and gain valuable experience. It can mean greater job opportunity and higher wages when you return to civilian life.

In choosing industries in which to seek employment, the young graduate should consider not only the industries which are currently expanding, such as electronics manufacturing and chemicals, but also the large well-established industries where replacement needs provide thousands of new job opportunities each year. Your school or public library, or your vocational counselor, have copies of Labor Department reports which will show up-to-date information on how many workers are employed in each of the Nation's industries.

The employment picture in your town may be somewhat different from that of the Nation as a whole. I urge you to take the path of wisdom and pay a visit to your local employment service office. There you will find invaluable information on occupational outlook both on a national and local scale. United States Department of Labor publications like The Job Guide for Young Workers, the Occupational Outlook Handbook and the Employment Outlook Bulletins will describe long-range employment prospects for the major industries as well as many important occupations. Many valuable services are also available at your Employment Service. Aptitude tests, guidance and counseling facilities, and occupational directories can help steer you in the right vocational course. Your school counselor may also be able to help you.

As you begin your work career, you will be offered many kinds of advice. The decisions you make, however, will be your own. Now is the time to take stock, decide what kind of job you would like to have, and what kind of training and education you need to obtain it.

Your country needs you. Upon the skills and abilities you possess and will develop depends the American future. I am sure you will meet this challenge and responsibility with the same success that has characterized the generations before you. Best of luck.

Holifield Bill for Peacetime Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the more than 10 years that I have been a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have studied with great care the possibilities for peacetime development of atomic energy.

As part of my official duties on this committee I have become acquainted with the technical aspects of atomic-hydrogen weapons development. It is my deep conviction that this tremendous force of nature, if harnessed for peaceful work instead of mass killing, can bring new wonders to the world.

DESTRUCTIVE POWER OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Ever since I served as a member of President Truman's Special Committee on the Atomic Bomb Test at the Bikini atoll in 1946, and saw with my own eyes the enormous destructive power of the atomic bomb, this conviction has become part of my daily thought and action.

In the following years I saw the destructive power of the atomic bomb multiply a thousand times so that a single explosion of a hydrogen bomb could wipe out a whole city and spread lethal radiation over thousands of square miles.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY APPROACH

In 1954, during the 83d Congress which had a Republican majority, the basic legislation governing the atomic energy program was rewritten in an attempt to encourage peacetime development. The main interest of the Republican sponsors of the new legislation was to encourage private industry to get into the atomic-energy field.

As a close observer of atomic energy reactor development, I knew that this development program had a long way to go before private industry could afford to participate on a commercial basis. Reactor designs were experimental. Costs of atomic power production would be exorbitant compared to conventional power production from coal, falling water, or other sources.

In many respects this change in atomic energy legislation was merely a holding operation for private utility companies. They wanted to control the industry's future, but they were not ready to invest in present development. Also they feared atomic power competition from public agencies made possible by Government investment.

I warned the Congress in 1954 that the efforts to turn the peacetime atomic energy program over to private industry were premature, that the legislation had sinister possibilities of monopoly control because only a few giant corporations had atomic know-how as contractors to the Government, and that if the Government slackened its atomic program before industry was ready to step in, a dangerous void would be created.

SLACKENING OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

The developments of the past 2 years have affirmed my prediction about the slackening of Government effort in atomic energy development. Today we are losing the race for peacetime atomic power to other nations. Great Britain is about to produce electricity from atomic reactors, and Soviet Russia has made rapid strides in this field, as I know from personal observation at the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held at Geneva, Switzerland, last year.

HOLIFIELD BILL TO SPEED ATOMIC POWER

In an effort to overcome this gap in our national atomic energy program I sponsored legislation in this Congress for the Federal Government to build a number of large reactors to produce power at present atomic energy sites. Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, sponsored similar legislation in the Senate.

The Holifield-Gore bill proposes a $400 million atomic-power program for the next 5 years. The Atomic Energy Commission would be authorized and directed to build large-scale prototypes of atomic-power reactors. The purpose of this program is to advance the art and technology of atomic power by actual operation of large reactors that can convert the enormous energy of splitting atoms into kilowatts of electricity. All discoveries and advancements which are made at Government expense are immediately made available to privately and publicly owned utilities for the benefit of all people.

PROGRAM BLOCKED BY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the Holifield-Gore legislation failed of passage in this Congress. The failure was due in large part to the vehement opposition of the Republican administration at the behest of private utilities. These companies put their own business affairs ahead of the national interest in maintaining American leadership in the peaceful uses of atomic power.

The defeat of this bill by administration efforts, in which Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis L. Strauss played a conspicuous part, signifies to me that the so-called atoms-for-peace program which the administration professes to support, is little more than an empty gesture, a windy exercise in rhetoric.

HOLIFIELD BILL TO BE ON AGENDA

If the peacetime potentials of atomic energy are to be realized, the Federal Government must proceed boldly and constructively to build reactors and to promote research and development. Therefore, I believe that the Holifield-Gore bill will be a crucial item on the agenda of the next Congress.

Fund for the Republic's Report on Blacklisting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has arisen over the investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee of the report on blacklisting by the Fund for the Republic.

As a member of the committee, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, dealing with this subject.

The letter follows:

SCHERER DEFENDS ENQUIRER EDITORIAL

To the EDITOR OF THE ENQUIRER:

As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, I have listened to the testimony so far adduced before the committee with reference to the Fund for the Republic's report on blacklisting. I thought your editorial in the July 1 Enquirer on this sub-

ject was excellent and remarkably consistent with the sworn testimony.

I see in your readers' column a letter from Michael Harrington severely criticizing and condemning the editorial. Now I feel that I must comment so that people will not be misled by Mr. Harrington.

Of course, Michael Harrington is a professional employee of the Fund for the Republic. He is one of those who helped prepare the report. It can be expected, therefore, that he will rise to defend it.

First, let's see whom Robert Hutchins, president of the fund—the man who said before a congressional committee that he would not hesitate to employ a Communist—selected to make the investigation and prepare this report of the fund on blacklisting.

Let's start with Mr. Harrington himself. In the spring of 1956 Mr. Harrington contributed an article entitled "A Marxist Approach to Art" to the magazine known as the New International which lists itself as "the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, nationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world." Harrington has also written a number of articles for the publication of the youth organization of the Independent Socialist League, which was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as an organization which seeks "to alter the form of the Government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

Harrington was one of the group which called upon President Truman to commute the death sentences of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, the atomic spy traitors. As we all know, the attack on the President and the Department of Justice was spearheaded by the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. The Un-American Activities Committee has overwhelming evidence that this committee was completely controlled and dominated by the Communist conspiracy. By the way, Harrington was also a member of the War Resisters League.

Now I am not saying that Harrington is a Communist. Mr. John Cogley of the executive staff of the Fund for the Republic, whom Mr. Harrington helped in writing the report, testified before our committee that Harrington was a Socialist.

Before we go any further, let's see who some of Mr. Harrington's associates were in the investigation, preparation, and writing of the fund's report.

There was Dr. Marie Jahoda, who come to this country as late as 1945 from Austria, where she was an active member of the Socialist Democratic Party. She was one of the persons who helped prepare this so-called impartial report for the Fund for the Republic. At the time she was hired, it was known by the Fund for the Republic that she had already issued reports and made studies which attacked loyalty programs of this Government.

And finally there was Elizabeth Poe, a researcher for the fund's staff. Frederick Woltman, writer for the New York World Telegram and Pulitzer prize winner for his articles exposing Communist infiltration, testified before the committee in the blacklisting hearings 2 weeks ago. He said: "Elizabeth Poe was a member of the Communist faction of the Newspaper Guild at Time Magazine for some years and was very active in the Communist group." Woltman then vehemently denounced the report before the committee and in one of his articles he said that the report is a fraud perpetrated against the public with tax-free money and that taxpayers of the United States who do not approve of what is advocated by the report are financing it.

A series of witnesses before the committee, including James F. O'Neil, publisher of the American Legion magazine, Godfrey P. Schmidt, president of AWARE, Inc., and lecturer on constitutional and labor law at Fordham University Law school, Francis J. McNamara, director of the American Sovereignty Campaign of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jack Wren, account executive of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., public relations firm of New York City, vehemently denounced the report as biased, slanted and in some instances as not being in accordance with the facts.

Just last week the AFL-CIO News had this to say about the Fund for the Republic's blacklisting report:

"Many feel that what should have been a factual, objective study became in its final writing and editing a document seemingly colored by one viewpoint * * *.

"A fund employee who helped draft the document has verbally acknowledged several important errors of fact on one page of volume 1 and has offered to correct them in an affidavit. This makes one wonder if there could be so many factual errors on just one page, how many other such errors are there in the rest of the 312-page report?"

Jack Gould, radio and TV editor of the New York Times, which newspaper has been a supporter of the Fund for the Republic and its objectives, said in substance that the authors of the blacklisting report take recourse to much undocumented and unsubstantiated material. The report makes damning indictments against people without having gotten their versions.

Time magazine in a recent issue dealing with the committee's hearings on the Fund for the Republic's blacklisting report said that it was poorly cataloged, highly opinionated, and in some instances incomplete. Time says that the hearings of the committee revealed glaring weaknesses in the report. Time further says that the hearings suggested that the report was inept journalism at best. Time supported Woltman's position when he said: "If any newspaper proceeded the way the author did, it would be subject to grave criticism."

From the testimony already adduced, it is obvious to us on the Un-American Activities Committee that one of the basic reasons for the fund's report was to indirectly and subtly discredit the investigating committees of the Congress and the anti-Communist organizations of this country. The report attempts to show that there is a widespread blacklisting of persons in the radio and television industry as a result of the activities of the investigating committees of Congress and the anti-Communist groups in the Nation.

To accomplish this objective, the report takes cases of individuals who the report says were deprived of employment by reason of their political beliefs. In almost every case, however, the report deliberately and apparently by design conceals the fact that these individuals had been identified under oath as members of the Communist conspiracy or had long records of membership in Communist-front organizations.

The fund and its followers have been highly critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and congressional investigating committees for the use of what this group calls faceless informers. It is significant that the fund's report on blacklisting uses faceless informers in many instances in an attempt to sustain its findings in the report. It cites case after case of individuals who supplied information merely by referring to these individual's in the report as Mr. X, Mr. M, and Mr. N.

When Mr. John Cogley, the man who with Harrington directed the preparation of this report, was asked by the Un-American Activities Committee to identify these faceless informers on whom he allegedly relied to sustain the findings of the report, he refused to identify them.

It can readily be seen, therefore, from what I have shown herein from the record that, when the Enquirer in its editorial of July 1 called the Fund for the Republic report on blacklisting a whitewash of communism, it was absolutely correct and perhaps was understating rather than ovestating its charge.

Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER.

CINCINNATI.

Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the current headlines have produced a new crisis for the free world in the Middle East.

President Nasser, of Egypt, has seized the Suez Canal in an ominous breach of international agreement. This sets an example for every other Middle East ruler who may also be tempted by the desire for power and plunder.

This is Colonel Nasser's answer to our refusal to help finance the Aswan Dam. It is an answer which vindicates our position for it confirms the view that the Nasser regime cannot be relied upon to keep its commitments. Apparently stunned by our more realistic attitude, Nasser has now taken a desperate measure to retrieve prestige and influence in the Arab world. But this coup should not be dismissed as a capricious act by an immature dictator. It is part of a calculated plan to undermine the influence of the West and to expropriate its assets in the region. Unless Nasser is effectively challenged, he will be emulated by other Arab rulers. Oil wells, mines, refineries, pipelines, air bases, landing fields—none of these will be immune from the grasp of political adventurers seeking to expand domination and wealth.

One may be certain that there will be many on hand to apologize for Nasser and to explain that he was provoked into doing this because our Government and the United Kingdom withdrew the offer to build the Aswan Dam. Those who preach appeasement will argue that we should have continued to coddle Nasser, that we should have closed our eyes to his insults and anti-Western intrigue, that we should have ignored his wasteful and reckless arms purchases. But, I cannot believe that this is wise counsel or that it is widely advocated. To those who still believe that Nasser can be held for the West, I call attention to the speech he made Tuesday in which he cried:

> I look at Americans and I say, may you choke to death on your fury.

In addition, the Egyptian press has been printing scandalous and shocking libels against our point 4 mission in Egypt, claiming that we have used the program for espionage and that we had supplied Egypt with diseased poultry and cattle and poisonous methods of espionage intrigue.

Mr. Speaker, this debacle has been long in the making. I have, on a number of occasions, taken the floor in the House to warn against a Middle East policy which does not measure up to reality. Most recently, on June 19, I called attention to the fact that it was the Communists who came to Cairo that week to celebrate the evacuation of British forces from the Suez Canal. Despite our long and hard pursuit of Nasser, it was Shepilov, the Communist Foreign Minister, who was first at the finish line. That celebration marked the end of a Western base, devoted to the support of Western freedom. Thanks to Nasser, Communist power is being steadily consolidated in the Mediterranean. I concluded that brief statement with these words:

> How many more diplomatic defeats shall we suffer in the Near East until we come to appreciate the fundamental principle that democracy will not be able to organize the defense of freedom in the Near East if it continues to capitulate to the pressures and intrigue of rulers who have no interest in democracy and who are concerned primarily with the search for power?

Since that statement was made, there has been evidence that our policy has begun to harden into realism. Ambassador Henry A. Byroade, chief proponent of our pro-Egypt mood, is being sent off to the Union of South Africa where he will cease to exercise influence over our Arab-Israel relations. The withdrawal of the offer to build the dam was sharp and unmistakable. These two steps made it clear that the administration's courtship of Nasser had come to an end. Disenchantment with Nasser is now a manifest diplomatic fact.

If there are some who still think we should have let Nasser have the money for the dam, let them look at the contemptuous way in which Nasser tore up the Suez agreement. Under that agreement, private operation of the canal was to continue for another dozen years. Just 2 years ago, when the British yielded to the pleas of our own American diplomats and agreed to withdraw from the Suez base, Nasser reaffirmed Egypt's respect for the international agreement which governs the administration of the canal. But now this agreement is a scrap of paper. Can the international community invest faith and confidence in a government which repudiates its word? Should the World Bank lend Nasser $200 million? Should we pour out grants from the United States Treasury as gifts to a man who demagogically whips up hatred against Americans and who rabblerouses the Arab world in a venomous and vindictive cry for the death of Americans.

Let us no longer have illusions about Nasser. Let us understand fully that this man, in the name of neutralism, is organizing opposition to democracy and the West, that he has thrown the Mediterranean open to the Communists, and that he is attempting to undermine and destroy the position of the West in the Mediterranean, in the Middle East, and throughout Africa.

The history of this century should have taught us something about the ways of dictators. It has also taught us, to our great misfortune, how democracies have yielded and retreated before bluff and blackmail. Hitler was able to achieve power for death and destruction, partly because democracy built him up, partly because democracy bowed down before him. Resistance came only when it was very late and at devastating cost.

Once a democratic people yield to pressure and threat, once they surrender or abandon a right in compromise with principle, their defenses begin to crumble and each succeeding concession, each succeeding retreat comes more easily. Five years ago the Western World was confronted by the hard fact that the Egyptian Government was blocking the Suez Canal to Israel-bound shipping on the untenable ground that it was at war with Israel—untenable because no United Nation member may be at war with another. The United Nations Security Council publicly condemned this action as a violation of the United Nations Armistice Agreements. It called on Egypt to stop its blockade, but Egypt defied the United Nations and managed to get away with it. It is still getting away with it. Moreover, it has extended the blockade to include Israel's southern port at Aqaba.

Now if the Egyptians can stop Israel-bound ships one day, they can stop American ships bound for other countries tomorrow, and if Egypt can ignore its international obligation by impeding the free flow of shipping for one nation, there is nothing to prevent Egypt from repudiating its obligations to all other nations.

When the West failed to stand up and to insist upon Israel's rights, it beclouded and endangered its own rights.

I trust that our own Department of State now recognizes the full gravity of the Nasser menace, and if it has finally awakened to the reality of that menace, I pray that we are now taking the measures to strengthen those who are directly in its path. In the light of all that has happened in the last few weeks, it is strange that the State Department should have been turning a deaf ear to Israel's urgent pleas for arms to defend herself. It is tragic that we should have told Israel to go shop elsewhere, because we didn't want to get into an arms race, because we were going to be the impartial peacemaker in the region, because we thought we might hold Egypt on our side.

The Department of State stubbornly refused to make a choice. On the one hand it was confronted by a little Fascist dictator rising to power on the shoulders of a military junta, mortgaging his country's substance on arms purchases from the Communists, deriding and baiting the West, because of the incitement and encouragement of Moscow. On the other side, there was an isolated little democracy, completely identified with the West in spirit, history, and tradition, and the first target of the Cairo-Kremlin threat, pleading vainly for arms.

As between these two, Mr. Dulles continued in a state of immobility, paralyzed by the fear that he might provoke the Arabs into some kind of indignant reprisal. Well, we have now had the reprisal, and, as it finally developed, it had nothing to do with Israel, and it came despite the fact that we did not respond to Israel's plea for arms. If we had met Israel's request for arms last fall when it was first made, we would have suffered no greater disaster than that which has occurred. Indeed, a firm policy at that time might have discouraged and deterred Nasser from the steps he has been emboldened to take by the spectacle of Western weakness.

What will Nasser do next? Will he be carried, by the momentum of his own adventurism, into new and bolder assaults against the West? Will his allies now be encouraged to seize oil wells and refineries? Will Nasser step up his campaign to get the French out of Algeria, the British out of Cyprus, the Israelis out of Israel?

Will the Egyptians now launch an offensive into Israel, using their new jet bombers to rain death on Haifa, Tel Aviv, and Jerusalem? Will the Egyptians now roll their Stalin and Centurion tanks across the Sinai Desert and into Israel?

Who can say that they will not? Bear in mind that it was the Egyptians—not the Israelis—who launched the 1948 war when the Arab States tried to put aside the 1947 U. N. resolution by force. Is there any hope that the agreements negotiated by U. N. Secretary General Hammarskjold last spring will preserve the cease fire in the region? If those agreements were so sound and so durable, why was it necessary for the Secretary General to go back for more talks within the last few days?

This is not the time for complacency. If there are some who refuse to believe what Nasser is saying, if there are some who think that his threats against Israel are simply bluffs for domestic consumption, let these complacent prophets ask themselves whether they believed, as late as yesterday and the day before, that Nasser would seize the Suez Canal.

Mr. Speaker, there are some firm conclusions to be drawn from the present crisis.

The administration's policy to propitiate the Arab States has not worked. The Arabs are not impressed by weakness and by appeasement.

The administration has done nothing this year to make it clear that we will not permit a renewal of war in the Near East, that we will stand up against aggression, that we will strengthen those who are threatened. It rejected Israel's request to purchase arms; it made no provision for arms for Israel in the mutual-security program, it did not offer Israel a security treaty, it did not strengthen the Tripartite Declaration, it did not ask Congress for power to intervene if war broke out. In short, it did nothing, but hope that the illusion of peace could be preserved by a U. N. mission. There is nothing in the record of the administration and Congress to refresh and renew the strength and confidence of those who look to America for leadership in the struggle for freedom.

The time has come for a reappraisal of our Near East policy.

We must draw a line between democracy and dictatorship. We must stand

firmly with those who are joined with us in the preservation of freedom and democratic institutions. That is the only way to peace.

My Record in the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to include a summary report of my legislative activities during the 84th Congress to the people of the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District whom I have the honor to particularly represent in this House.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

Mr. Speaker, throughout my public life I have consistently respected and complied with the moral obligation imposed upon every officeholder by the Biblical mandate to "render an account of thy stewardship." I have made it a rule to submit at the end of each term of office a summary report of my activities to the people I represent.

It is, of course, obviously impossible to report my every word and action in detail during the brief period allowed. I am prevented from full comment on each and every one of the more than 1,200 varied pieces of legislation which came before the House. I do, however, wish to reveal and make clear my personal stand and judgment upon some of the major legislative issues of 1955 and 1956.

TRUTH FROM THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, there has probably never been a time in our national history when it was more vitally important for the American voters to know the truth about the actions and philosophy of those to whom they entrust the guidance of their Government for domestic security and progress, as well as leadership in a troubled world. The foundation sources of fact on the deeds and words of those serving in this United States House of Representatives are the official Journal, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, required by law to publish the proceedings of each legislative day in the Congress, and the official reports of committee hearings.

The main body of this report, with some accompanying comments, will reveal the exact words I spoke and actions initiated during particular legislative discussions and debates.

DISTRICT AND REGIONAL—FLOOD TRAGEDY

Mr. Speaker, on August 19 and 20 of 1955 the whole Northeast area, including my own State and district, was visited by overwhelming floods in the wake of a torrential downpour of continuous rainfall through the 3 preceding days and nights. Just 2 short years previous, on June 9, 1953, my city of Worcester, Mass., and surrounding communities were suddenly struck by the most vicious tornado in our history, leaving more than 100 dead in our area and tremendous property damage.

On the afternoon of August 19 when these floods began to dangerously threaten, I was in my home office meeting with constituents on congressional business. Local public officials contacted me, and I immediately telephoned the Civil Defense Administrator in Washington requesting the cooperation of all Federal agencies in lending the vitally needed assistance to our stricken area. The President very soon declared the region a major disaster area within the provisions of Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress, which I am happy to say I had a voice in enacting.

Under this law and by Presidential direction, the resources of our National Government are authorized for use in assisting people and communities upon whom any serious natural disaster has fallen. The help of all Federal agencies, in cooperation with local and State government units, and that splendid organization, the American Red Cross, was soon at hand. The personnel of every Government agency at every level performed in the most heroic and expedient manner, first, to prevent any continuing flood damage, and, second, to assist in the rehabilitation and recovery from the great and widespread flood damage. The United States Army Corps of Engineers distinguished themselves and the military by their heroic and untiring efforts to save lives and property. Our people themselves exhibited the highest courage and capacity for sacrifice in Christian neighborliness and humaneness. The wildness of the uncontrolled flood elements made it a sad day, but the heroism of our people in time of tragedy also made it a proud one for Massachusetts and New England.

In spite of all efforts, several lives were lost in our immediate area and the amount of property damage staggered the imagination to assess.

Precise figures have not even yet been accurately established, but the financial losses from unemployment, damaged personal property, and disintegrated places of business reached into the hundreds of millions. The memory of the family tragedies through the loss of loved members will never be erased from our minds.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Personally observing and realizing the terrible danger from recurring floods to the lives and property of my people, it was only natural that I, and a great many other national legislators, resolved to concentrate our minds and devote our energies to the enactment of Federal legislation to prevent further floods and provide insurance against property damage from floods.

Toward that objective, in the national and regional welfare, I introduced four different bills in the 84th Congress: H. R. 8342, to authorize the construction of protection measures against damage from extraordinary floods; H. R. 8343, to authorize the construction of protection measures against damage from extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms; H. R. 10744, to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance; and House Joint Resolution 468, to establish a Northeastern United States watershed development and flood protection commission.

Below is a chronological listing of my actions to encourage the enactment of flood-protection measures for our district and a national flood-insurance program:

GENERAL FLOOD PROTECTION

(Excerpts from testimony before special congressional committee at Springfield, Mass., October 24, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you are here, of course, primarily in recognition of and sympathy with the tragic results of the double disaster of floods that have been visited upon this area within the space of 3 months.

In my opinion, the modern history of congressional action in relation to the water resources and power of this country clearly reveals the continuing congressional conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent, the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water-control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation or initiative is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import where projects, because of size or complexity or potential multiple purposes or benefits, are beyond the means or the needs of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England floodwater-control problem lies, and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem. It will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs of this flood-ravaged region are not provided for with full Federal assistance before disaster may strike again.

WORCESTER DIVERSIONARY TUNNEL

(Excerpts from testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, January 19, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very grateful for the opportunity to appear even briefly before you today. I shall confine my remarks at the moment to the particular project commonly described as the Worcester diversionary tunnel, so vitally necessary to the life, safety, and property protection of the citizens of my native city, and for which, as you all know, there has been included a sum of $60,000 in this bill to enable the Army engineers to complete a resurvey of the area and planning involved.

The essentiality of this project to the continuing welfare of Worcester is undoubted by anyone. Prayerfully remembering the personal sorrow and human tragedy which cannot be materially valued, it has been reliably but conservatively estimated that the presence of this tunnel during our most recent flood disaster would have prevented approximately $15 million of the property damage that was done. The Army Corps of Engineers has repeatedly and authoritatively stated that the tunnel is a vitally needed protection and it will do the job within reason. They have also testified that the project is well justified economically, inasmuch as the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and that the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is exceedingly good. The President has included and requested the funds for this flood-control work, and in order to initiate the resurvey that must be accomplished before actual construction is started, which is planned for 1957, there

remains only the approval of this committee; without your approval, the whole project could encounter tragic disruption. I most sincerely urge that you give this item your very sympathetic consideration.

TUNNEL APPROPRIATION APPROVED

(Excerpts from House speech, May 22, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, flood control and protection has, indeed, these past several years, become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the various States and municipalities of the Nation in solving that problem is great.

In my particular city, the most efficient Corps of Engineers had long recognized the vital necessity of a flood-protection tunnel and they recommended the participation of the Federal Government in the achievement of such a project for local protection. Last January 18 I appeared before the committee to present a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this particular project for the safety of the people of my city and area, and there was then approved in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill a sum of $60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of this Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project.

It was a matter of modest personal gratification to me that the committee approved the initial resurvey sum and further recommended in this present bill the additional sum of $840,000 to begin construction of the tunnel in this next fiscal year.

I earnestly urge the unanimous approval of the bill by this House so that projects of imperative importance, such as the Worcester diversionary tunnel in my area, and similar projects throughout the country, may soon have a beginning, primarily in protection of the lives of American citizens.

FLOOD INSURANCE APPROVED

(Excerpts from House speech, July 21, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in realization of the practically unanimous sentiment of the House concerning the vital necessity of enacting an adequate program of Federal flood insurance, and in consideration of this late Saturday hour, I have no intention of prolonging my remarks.

Flood damage, as we all know, hits with paralyzing effect, first, those ordinary homeowners who lose their homes by flood but still owe the mortgage debt on their homes; and, secondly, diligent businessmen, whose credit is so impaired by flood loss as to make it practically impossible for them to recover and resume business operations. We all realize further that Federal disaster grants are not now generally available for individuals as such, and private insurance companies cannot handle the situation.

I earnestly hope that every Member will grant this flood insurance legislative proposal his most conscientious consideration and that it will be approved without further delay.

TAX REDUCTION

(Excerpts from House speech, February 25, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this measure providing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption because it is directly in line with the sentiments expounded by the President himself in his recent budget message.

It is my very deep belief that this tax credit for individual income taxpayers in general, and very particularly for our low-income taxpayers, is urgently needed now to sustain an expanding economy. I supported the tax legislation enacted in the last Congress mainly because it contained the first major revision in over 50 years for improving our antiquated tax system. However, I felt then, as now, the specific provisions of that legislation did not extend fair and just tax consideration to those working people and their families within our lowest income brackets. This present measure before us contains provision for the correction of that past deficiency because it benefits all taxpayers and is distributed to every taxpayer evenly on a dollar basis with respect to each personal exemption.

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA—SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, in my firm conviction, adequate social-security legislation is one of the soundest barriers we can erect against the advancing scourge of Communist propaganda and philosophy which is today forcing us to fight for the survival of our democratic system.

How much stronger, how much more resistant to Communist entreatment and intrigue this Nation will be when its citizens are assured that our great business system and our Government, working harmoniously together, establish a dignified, humane financial operation making them eligible to receive what every worthy working American and family deserve; namely, reasonable security in time of old age, adversity, and dire need.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1955

(Excerpts from House speech, July 18, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, the changes offered in this bill, while not by any means completely sufficient to the needs, represent a progressive measure of improvement in the current social-security structure. Briefly and substantially, this bill provides (a) monthly benefit payments, under qualifying conditions, to workers who are totally and permanently disabled at or after the age of 50; (b) payment of monthly benefits at the age of 62 to women who are insured workers, wives of insured workers, and widows and dependent mothers of deceased insured workers; (c) continuation of monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before the age of 18; (d) coverage extension to the self-employed professional groups now excluded—except physicians—to certain farm owners, and others; and (e) increases in the present schedule of contributions of one-half percent each on employers and employees and three-fourths percent on the self-employed.

No one can reasonably doubt that these liberalizing advancements in our present social-security pattern are in accord with the fundamental Christian principles and philosophy of American political and economic life, as opposed to the atheistic concept of a Communist slave state. I urge you all, therefore, to approve the amendments embodied in this bill without further delay, while we look forward to the enactment of even more equitable and liberalizing provisions of our Social Security System in the near future.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1956

(Excerpts from House Speech, July 26, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, these current improvements in our Social Security System, as spelled out in this legislation, are in entire accord with our Christian principles and traditions. They are within the capacity of this blessed and bountiful Nation to assume. We have been extremely anxious these last 10 years and extremely generous in providing billions of dollars to aid and assist friendly peoples, and even some enemies, all over the world. Some of those expenditures were and are undoubtedly wise in our self-interest, but the wisdom and practicality of certain others becomes even more and more doubtful.

To those who question our own ability to reasonably participate in a sound social-security system at the Federal level, I suggest they take a look at the staggering and astounding amounts of money that we have spent abroad. I ask them, in all sincerity, what will it profit us to spend abroad if we neglect to the point of discouragement and demoralization the welfare of our own people? I would remind them that the primary duty of this National Legislature is concern for the people of the United States.

This social-security measure is truly in accord with the exhortation of the President to legislate for the good of all Americans, and I now urge its unanimous adoption without further delay.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege from 1947 to 1951 to be a member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which acted upon the Hoover Commission recommendations. More than half of the first Hoover Commission recommendations have been adopted, with tremendous Government savings resulting, and I am proud to say I voted for them all.

In this Congress, then, it was a pleasant duty for me to urge the adoption of and vote for the enactment of a further recommendation of the second Hoover Commission to modernize our antiquated Government accounting and budgeting methods, which, as reliably estimated, will result in an additional savings to the American taxpayer of approximately $4 billion.

GOVERNMENT BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING IMPROVEMENTS

(Excerpts from House remarks, July 11, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, by enactment of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, took a significant step forward in providing for the use of program or performance budgets by the executive agencies of the Government. The objective of that law, which I was most happy to support at the time, was to have the Government departments show how they intended to spend their money on the basis of the major programs that the agencies carry out.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress is to exercise any constitutional degree of effective control over Federal Government spending, it must have clear and concise information on which to exercise an intelligent control action. Effective control over the Government purse is one of the most important devices available to the Congress for protecting the American taxpayer from waste, extravagance, and bankruptcy.

I sincerely hope that we will soon be permitted to enact into law this most important Hoover Commission recommendation to improve the budgeting and accounting methods of the Federal Government. It is reliably estimated that the adoption of these modern accounting methods will result in a saving to the American taxpayer of approximately $4 billion.

MUTUAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently been in favor of the basic principle involved in mutual security defense aid, and that is to prevent the necessity for American fathers, sons, and daughters to fight again all over the world. Nevertheless, I stated, at the beginning of this Congress, my firm opinion that we could retain the basic principle of this program

but we should also effect sensible retrenchment, in consideration of the American taxpayer, because many friendly allies had already achieved a substantial measure of recovery and rehabilitation, because attempted financial bribery of doubtful allies was proving more and more to be a fruitless and unwise investment, and because our whole foreign-aid and mutual-security program was in dire need of resurvey and revision in accord with changing world conditions.

My legislative actions on this important subject during this Congress have been consistent with my best judgment as outlined above.

MUTUAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS

(Excerpts from House speech, June 8, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, preliminary to our continuing action, it might be well to reflect upon the fact that well over a hundred billion dollars of our people's money in principal and interest has been spent on foreign aid since 1940.

It is true that in the beginning of this program to rehabilitate war shattered and torn countries abroad, the American people were willing to reasonably share of their own wealth and resources in Christian generosity and practical wisdom. However, the time has come for the American taxpayer to sensibly ask if the astronomical sums we have been granting to many of these countries is still actually needed. From authoritative statistics here, it is obvious that some of these nations have long reached a point of economic productivity beyond their capacity previous to the war, and therefore substantial reductions, if not total elimination, are in order. Let us be patriotically mindful that this blessed Nation and its generous people are not possessed of inexhaustible resources, and let us remember our primary duty is to them.

In consistent pursuit of such sensible self-interest, the problem confronts us of continuing the laudable aims of our foreign aid and foreign policy in reasonable appropriation retrenchment in accord with what the already overburdened American taxpayer can afford. Mind you, this current authorization is proposed pending the resurvey of the whole program and its policy.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, let us reemphasize that there are appropriations outstanding sufficient to carry on our foreign-aid program for 3 years. There is overwhelming evidence from the highest authorities that the program has been overexpanded by overoptimistic and unrealistic planning. There is, unfortunately, overwhelming, startling evidence that changes in attitudes and reactions are taking place in too many countries all over the world which we have unhappily failed to properly appraise. There is nothing in this measure before us that will in any way disrupt the continuation of a reasonable mutual-security program. Nations that have been and still are friendly to us are being adequately assisted. Those strategic areas where some of our own boys are in danger, such as Korea, are being well equipped militarily. The most desirable point 4 operation is going and will go on. The substantial objectives of our whole foreign-aid program are not being denied.

We can meet our two obligations of reasonably protecting the American taxpayer and providing security from the Communist threat by adopting this measure containing sensible reductions in foreign aid while the whole program is being reevaluated. Let us remember that the Congress can always act promptly in any sudden emergency. I urge your approval of this bill without further delay.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

(Excerpts from House speech, July 11, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I stated here a few weeks ago during the course of debate on the authorization bill for foreign aid, the fundamental purposes of this legislation were, and still are, Christian to our character and practical to our own self-interest.

The only fundamental question presented to us in this appropriation bill is whether or not it provides sufficient money to keep the program in reasonable operation while a thorough resurvey of our whole foreign aid policy and financial commitments to support it is conducted.

The reductions in this bill before us will in no way disrupt the continuation of a reasonable mutual-security program. The most desirable point 4 operation, allies who have demonstrated friendliness, and areas of strategic military importance to us are all adequately provided for.

While we then accept our obligation to provide for this security against communism for ourselves and the free world, let us also accept and concentrate upon our primary obligation to the American people, whom we represent, to take the greatest care of their money and exercise the highest vigilance over the manner in which it is spent. The resources of this great Nation are not limitless and the burdens now being patriotically assumed by each American taxpayer are truly staggering. It will profit us little to extravagantly attempt to buy uncertain friendships if the exorbitant price is the deteriorating morale of the American people and the grave danger of our own economic instability. Let us beware of both of these catastrophes which are more threatening than may appear on the surface. The American taxpayer has put both his faith and his money into our legislative hands. In legislative conscience let us neither betray the one nor dissipate the other.

UNITED STATES LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Speaker, I have continuously, during my tenure here, emphasized my convictum that outside of moral and spiritual strength, no attributes are more vital to national progress and security than the promotion of good health, the advancement of sound education, and the encouragement of peaceful labor-management relations in this Nation.

I reiterated my convictions on these subjects during the discussion of departmental appropriations in this current Congress.

GENERAL WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS

(Excerpts from House speech, March 5, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I have said over the past several years when this annual appropriation bill for the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments has come before us, there is perhaps, no measure upon which we act here that more vitally affects the lives of so many of our American citizens.

The appropriation we grant under this measure and the regulatory provisions governing the spending of the appropriation are designed to improve continuously the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriation bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us has the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

In our consideration here, it might be well to emphasize the identification of some of the unit agencies affected by this appropriation bill and almost by their very names, which unfortunately are not as widely publicized for general appreciation as they should be, we realize their beneficial impact upon the country's welfare. First, let me mention just a few that come under the Department of Labor. There are the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Bureau of Employment Security, Bureau of Labor Standards, Bureau of Veterans' Employment Rights, the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, and the Women's Bureau. The value of these bureaus and their divisions to the country in maintaining and encouraging constant improvement in labor conditions and relations in the most productive country in the world is incalculable, both for domestic prosperity and tranquillity, as well as in providing adequate defense against any possible aggressor.

Some of the more vitally important units of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are, the Social Security Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the United States Public Health Service, the Bureau of Medical Services, and the National Institutes of Health. In their various functions these agencies regulate and inspect the distribution and sale of food and drug products to protect the American public from unscrupulous dealers; vocational rehabilitation, a national necessity, is promoted by the Office of Education; the Children's Bureau insures better child and maternal health examination. Under the Institutes of Health, we have the various research programs for continuing work toward the cures for such devastating diseases as heart, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, as well as mental and dental. These research institutes have been doing and are doing most encouraging work in the fight against the ravages of these terrible afflictions causing, annually, tremendous losses in our economic productivity, not to mention the suffering and unhappiness they visit upon individual lives and families. Progressive discoveries have been made in these recent years prompting us to reasonably feel that a great part of this human misery and economic loss will continue to be greatly alleviated by the wise use of these appropriation funds for persevering research into the health problems of the Nation and that is the chief reason why I am solidly in favor of increasing these particular appropriations by as much, or even more, than $10 million.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, while appearing before the United States Committee for Reciprocity Information in Washington, I testified that I was not personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory lying at the basis of our trade-agreements program.

However, I also expressed and emphasized my understanding that the fulfillment of such a program was not intended, either by the Congress or by the President, to promote disintegration of our own essential domestic industries and

to generate great segments of sectional unemployment.

Consistent with his legislative activities to advance the overall national welfare, I conceive it to be a real part of the duties of a United States Representative to exercise every legitimate and conscientious effort to protect and preserve the essential industries, with their associated employment opportunities, within his own district and area. These are the substantial thoughts and convictions that governed my action on the subject of extending trade agreements when it came before this Congress.

I first voted to recommit the bill for the purpose of including additional provisions for preserving essential domestic industries and employment, and then voted for final passage upon the promise of the President himself that Executive action would be taken whenever required to preserve essential domestic industries.

PROTECTING DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES AND EMPLOYMENT

(Excerpts from House speech, February 18, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I have never been, nor am I now, opposed to the basic principles underlying our trade-agreements program. However, there appear to be very serious grounds upon which this bill in its present form should be patriotically questioned.

Certainly it does not completely conform with the sentiment expressed in the President's own statement on trade policy contained in his state of the Union message February 2, 1953, when he declared:

"This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture and labor standards." Nor does it conform with the statement contained in the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy that "American labor should not be subjected to unfair competition as a part of any program to expand our foreign trade."

Even the advocates of this bill admit it will inevitably visit great hardships upon great numbers of employees and many industries in certain sections of the country, such as New England, where textile manufacturing and innumerable other products will be hardest hit. Yet there are no provisions or proposals, nor are we permitted to offer any for adoption, in this measure to prevent the imposition of serious economic suffering upon such American workers and industries.

Therefore a great many of us here, trying to conscientiously represent our people, very deeply feel that the tariff cutting features of this bill should be wisely held in abeyance until, with Government assistance, new industries are encouraged and developed for areas that would be so disastrously affected and proper precautions are taken to safeguard the employment opportunities rightfully belonging to so many patriotic American working people. Toward that objective labor, industry, and all levels of government should sincerely cooperate.

It is truly not a simple or easy problem to solve but it is just as truly our representative responsibility to work out a fair trade program that will be fair to Americans as well as our foreign friends. I earnestly hope the House will vote to recommit this bill for the sole purpose of writing in new provisions designed to prevent great hardships from falling upon many regional industries and workers, not to mention other provisions to retain and preserve essential defense resources that we can ill afford to dissipate in the face of threatening Communist aggression.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, the foremost authorities in the Nation have testified and emphasized to the absolute need of improving the roads and highways of this country, and they have unanimously urged immediate Federal legislative action.

In response to the truth of this overwhelming evidence from the highest sources, if such were needed beyond personal observation and knowledge, I felt it my duty to speak and vote in favor of the Federal highway aid program in the national interest.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

(Excerpts from House speech, April 27, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, there are three fundamentally important factors involved in this overall highway problem—the safety factor, the defense factor, and the economic factor.

With respect to the safety factor, we have already killed more than a million people in 50 years with automobiles. Thirty million more have been injured. Automobile accidents have taken twice as many American lives as we have lost in all our wars. The number injured in traffic accidents is 25 times the number of men wounded in wars since the first Minutemen fell at Lexington, 179 years ago. It would, therefore, be unChristian, uncivilized, and inhuman to continue to disregard the appalling loss of life and limb to American citizens by any further delay in taking steps to prevent this mounting holocaust on the Nation's highways.

With respect to the defense factor, let us dwell for a moment on what would happen if war suddenly broke out. In this age of the H-bomb there is no longer safety in digging in. It would be necessary to evacuate the great industrial cities within range of the Communist air force. How could they possibly be evacuated when even on a normal peacetime day our roadways and highways are jammed?

With respect to the economic factor, a huge and sensibly planned increase in roadbuilding is necessary if the national economy is to continue expansion and if the Nation's living standards are to continue upward.

Future highway construction must be planned to serve an economy which the President has estimated will rise to $500 billion worth of goods and services annually within 10 years. At present it is conservatively estimated by the authorities that the lag in highway construction is costing the Nation about $5 billion a year.

In consideration of our progressing economy and this tremendous financial loss, the obvious answer is that we cannot continue to afford to throw away $5 billion annually by failing to provide safeguarded highways for the more than 70 million motor vehicles that most probably will be on our United States highways by 1965. It is time for action.

MINIMUM WAGE

(Excerpts from House speech, July 19, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and to urge approval of this bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing the present minimum wage to $1 per hour.

In our consideration of this problem, let us never forget the warning lesson of the great depression in the early 1930's that lack of increasing purchasing power in the hands of our lowest income families, who spend the most, brings about terrible unemployment, hardships, and economic stagnation. It profits us nothing to possess the greatest industrial production potential in the world if low wages and low consumer income prevent millions of Americans from buying these products.

I am also intensely concerned about another aspect of this minimum-wage problem affecting so disastrously the textile workers and industries, and other groups, in my own home area of Massachusetts and New England. An increase in the minimum wage would tend to revitalize the textile industry, discriminated against as it is in our so-called reciprocal trade agreements, not only in the establishment of a decent wage structure, but also in market stability, as well as being a just and necessary rebuke to unfair competition. It would discourage the seducement of industry to cheap-labor localities by subsidies. It would compensate the workers for increased productivity, thereby providing more purchasing power which would, of necessity, create a wider demand for textiles.

We are here obligated to enact laws designed to assist, not hinder, all those who are conscientious and trying to be honestly fair and decent. We are here obligated to enact laws primarily designed to advance the general welfare. In compliance with and in the spirit of that high obligation, I urge you to approve now this minimum wage of $1 per hour, while we at the same time pledge ourselves to be continuously and conscientiously concerned with the advancement of American living standards and national prosperity.

PROTECTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, the ideal of equality under law has always been a great and distinctive American goal. The so-called Civil Rights Act of 1956 was designed to assist in the accomplishment of this great goal by strengthening the law-enforcement functions of the Federal Government in the entire area of civil rights.

I was, therefore, very happy to fulfill my legislative obligation in speaking and voting for this measure.

PROTECTING OUR LIBERTIES

(Excerpts from House speech, July 23, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is clear. It is to make more certain that rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States will be enjoyed by all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

It is directed at no particular section of America. Certainly no area of the country can claim achievement of full equality under law. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives recognizes its distinct duty to enact wise legislation which will guarantee that the words of promise spoken by the Constitution will be fulfilled in every corner of the Nation. It is also realized that American leadership of the free world is aided greatly by practical demonstrations of our historic commitment to the ideal of equality under law.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that any temporary passions, prejudices, or partisanship will be put aside today in order that we may render a historical legislative accomplishment in our own national interest and also provide a legislative inspiration to all peoples everywhere on this blessed earth.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND DECENT HOUSING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, since being privileged to enter this House in 1947, the advancement of a sensible public housing slum clearance and urban redevelopment program has been of primary legislative concern to me. My concern has been ever based upon the conscientious conviction that the family is the basic unit of our national life, and the greatest encouragement for good family life and good citizenship is living in a decent home with healthful surroundings.

Although the only housing legislation that came before us was extremely limited and fell far short of acknowledged needs, I considered it a clear duty to vote and speak in favor of it in order to keep alive this most beneficial program in the interest of all Americans.

HOUSING BILL OF 1956

(Excerpts from House speech, July 25, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I very deeply regret that the manner in which this legislation is being presented to us today leaves no choice to those conscientious legislators who are vitally interested in trying to help enact a sound and adequate program to enable the multitudinous members of our low-and middle-income groups and the elderly to live in decent homes in accord with our Christian traditions. We have here unfortunately to choose between the most meager housing program that opponents of this objective can devise or no housing program at all.

We all realize that the basic problem of providing public housing cannot be severed from the problems of slum clearance and urban renewal programs. The 1950 census showed there were 15 million substandard dwellings now in use in this Nation. Only a full public housing program coupled with a less restricted slum clearance and urban renewal program can eliminate this situation.

If we do not act on this measure before us, the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for veterans and home repair will die next September. If we do not accept this bill, the very modest authorized construction of 35,000 public housing units for the next 2 years will perish, along with the slum clearance and urban renewal program that goes hand in hand with it. The college housing program that has been advocated by our leading educators and that has proved so valuable is continued in this watered-down housing bill, as well as authorization for hospital construction that is in urgent need.

The token housing extension provisions of this bill will at least serve to keep the fundamental program alive. I urge you, then, to vote for it for that reason alone, while at the same time we dedicate ourselves to the expansion and improvement of it at the first opportunity in the future.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT

Mr. Speaker, the majority of our people sensibly realize that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and reasonably extend to them equitable salary, retirement, and annuity treatment.

In that spirit, I urged the adoption of and spoke in favor of the revision of the postal and Federal employees retirement system that was finally approved by the Congress.

(Excerpts from House remarks, July 20, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is only ordinary practical commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our faithful postal workers and Government employees are encouraged, by a reasonable salary and retirement system, to meet their family obligations and face the future with a certain confidence, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist propaganda temptation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of importance to remind this House that the last major revision of the Federal employees' retirement and annuity system was made in 1948. I do not believe it is necessary to remind the House that the cost of living and major changes in the pension and retirement systems of our commercial and industrial businesses have changed considerably since that date. The comparable systems within Federal Government employment have fallen far behind and are now completely outmoded.

Legislation to sensibly liberalize the retirement benefits and annuities of our postal and Federal employees while at the same time improving the overall financial soundness of the civil-service retirement fund is ready to be acted upon. The present setup is antiquated and far behind similar systems in the competing employment field of private enterprise. Our loyal and faithful Government employees are at the mercy of the Congress, unlike the employees of private business. It is the duty of the Congress to encourage Federal employment of persons of competence and character.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming array of authoritative testimony of factual record, including Presidential recommendation, could leave no question in the mind of a conscientious legislator that this Nation is faced with a dismaying shortage of classrooms and teachers for our schoolchildren. Legislation to grant reasonable Federal assistance to correct this catastrophic situation, which included provisions to prevent any possibility of Federal control of our schools, was presented to the Congress, and I executed my duty in speaking and voting for it.

THE NATION'S CHILDREN AND TEACHERS

(Excerpts from House speech, July 5, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the astonishing and astounding facts now are that 18 percent of our schools are fire hazards, a third are health and safety hazards, and thousands of school buildings are more than 50 years old. Coupled with these distressing figures is the cold fact that the school enrollment figure in 1955–56 was 1,675,000 over that of the previous year. By 1959 it is reliably reported that the total school enrollment will be more than 38½ million children.

This admitted classroom shortage problem goes beyond and is much deeper than the restriction of facilities and materials. Obviously the root of the problem and the real cause for national concern is that a shortage of classrooms and classroom facilities deprives the Nation's youth of adequate educational opportunities. Limited classroom space and old, unsafe, and unhealthy buildings are not conducive to learning nor are they by any means an inspiration to the faithful teacher. If we ignore this critical problem our greatest asset and investment for the future—the Nation's youth—are continuing to be improperly trained for the tremendous responsibilities of leadership which someday will be theirs.

Associated with this classroom shortage is perhaps even the more important problem of the shortage of teachers. Enactment of a sound Federal aid to school construction bill will at least result, indirectly, in helping to make the teaching profession more attractive. Taking advantage of Federal aid for construction will permit State and communities to allocate more of their education budgets to the increase of teachers' salaries.

I would be the first to protest any unwarranted intrusion, or danger of intrusion, by the Federal Government into the supervision and direction of the schools of this country. I am extremely happy that the committee has seen to it that this legislation carries provisions that preclude any possibility of Federal control of our schools.

I earnestly hope and pray that the majority of this membership can find it in their minds and hearts to support the Constitution while they are supporting the Nation's children and that we can in conscience and in patriotism preserve the Nation and provide for our youth by adopting this Federal school construction measure which is essentially good for all of America.

OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, I have listed above a recitation of my words and actions with respect to the legislation which perhaps achieved the most prominence and publicity in this current Congress. There were other legislative subjects that may have been less publicized but were as equally or more important to the great numbers of American citizens whom they would directly affect.

I feel it is my duty, therefore, to present a résumé of the convictions I expressed on some of these more outstanding issues:

(Excerpts from House remarks, June 28, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the last few weeks of this Congress, it is most distressing to me that some very vital and important legislative proposals affecting large segments of our American people remain unacted upon.

ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

For instance, there is legislation pending to provide assistance to communities, enterprises, and industries in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate substantial unemployment by providing new employment opportunities for developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, up in my area where inroads are constantly being made because of cheap foreign importations and sectional competition upon the textile, machinery, and armament manufacturing industries, among others, and their associated employment opportunities, there is vital need of sensible legislation of this type.

I sincerely trust that this Congress will not close without corrective legislative attention being devoted to the solution of this problem affecting my own region, and so many other regions of the country.

Because of the hardships continuously being visited upon the textile industry, I earnestly hope that the Congress will go on record with an expression of concern over the disintegration of this most essential industry because of increasing foreign cheap importations and also urge the President to use his emergency powers to control the excess of these damaging imports.

IMMIGRATION REVISION

Mr. Speaker, I very earnestly also hope that this Congress will not adjourn without enacting revision and correction of some of the injustices that are contained in our present immigration laws.

I urge the adoption of sensible amendments which will permit the pooling of unused immigration quotas and their use by those countries such as Greece, Italy, Poland, and others, whose quotas are vastly oversubscribed and impose abnormal waiting periods of several years' duration upon otherwise qualified and desirable applicants.

It would be an added injustice not to renew the provisions of our outstanding Refugee Relief Act and permit the many qualified thousands of refugee-relief applicants from the Iron Curtain countries to come to the United States who otherwise will have little hope of ever entering America.

Among other injustices that should be corrected are the present exclusion of certain tubercular immigrant applicants who are members of American families and a great many who are barred because of conviction of a felony in another country when the same offense would not be considered a felony in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget that this Nation itself was founded almost altogether

by refugees and displaced persons. In advancing our position of world leadership in these perilous days, we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our Christian utmost to give real freedom to those now faced with Communist extinction. Security-screened and qualified refugees are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earliest days right up to this hour.

I hope and trust that we will be granted an opportunity to enact sensible legislative amendments to expand and correct our present immigration laws before this Congress terminates.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. Speaker, I and a great many other Members of this House have become deeply disturbed by the increasing publicity and propaganda questioning the continuation and cost-of-living adjustments and other benefits being reasonably accorded our veterans.

It is strikingly noticeable that the sources of these doubts about our obligation to war veterans have no hesitancy or question at all about the wisdom of continuing to provide billions of dollars in subsidies to carry on our faltering foreign-aid program. Some of these people even seem to prefer the vacillating actions of Tito to the loyalty of the American veteran and his family. They seem to think that an astronomical gambling investment in Tito is more valuable than a reasonable investment to fulfill our duty to these American patriots who have been disabled in war and whose families have been visited with extreme material hardship because of military service sacrifices.

I do not believe that the people of this country now wish to turn their backs in forgetfulness of the substantial sacrifices made by our war veterans and their dependents in protecting this Nation from armed enemies. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of the American people realize there is only one safeguard for this Nation in time of emergency, and that is the willingness of American men and women to fight and die to preserve our national security. I am sure they further understand that the efficiency of our fighting men is governed by the morale of their families and dependents. In these tense days of international turmoil, it is not only just but patriotically wise to inspire the veteran of the future with the example of our real concern for the veteran of the past.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending to extend farm, home, and business loan guaranties for our veterans, to continue vocational rehabilitation adjustment assistance, to raise the ratings and pensions of the disabled war veterans and dependent allowances, as well as income limitations, in accord with our increased basic living costs. There is pending legislation to extend simple justice to Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, who are trying to eke out a bare existence on some $54 per month.

These, and other beneficial measures, such as the so-called War Orphans Education Act, should be enacted without delay. Most of the pending bills are substantially sound and beneficial and are intended to discharge our just obligation to the war veteran and his family. I shall continue to work in support of their enactment as the best investment we can make to insure our national security.

SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. Speaker, it has always been an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

It is perhaps not surprising that the various department heads in the executive branch have not been overwhelmingly zealous in presenting a program to us to aid the small business of the Nation. That, nevertheless, does not discharge the Congress from its own legislative responsibility.

There are a great many sound measures to grant vitally needed help to small business pending in the Congress, and I sincerely trust that they will not be passed over in the adjournment rush.

It is true that we extended the life of the Small Business Administration last year, and I am proud of the part I had in the original enactment of that beneficial legislation, but thus far that is about all that has been done for small business.

There remain many additional conditions affecting the vitality of small business that can be at least partially removed by applicable legislation.

One of the substantial helps we could give to small business would be to adopt a measure amending the Robinson-Patman Act to correct the weakening of that act which has resulted from several court decisions beginning with the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana against Federal Trade Commission. It appears the Supreme Court misinterpreted the original intention of Congress, and the objective, therefore, is to reemphasize and make clear that intention. The original purpose, and the purpose of current legislation, is simply to grant small business equality of opportunity and remove present discrimination that is allowed against him. It is designed to prohibit the larger concerns from getting preferential discounts, secret rebates, and under-the-counter deals which are discriminatory against the average merchant. The legislation is meant to apply only where there is interstate commerce, and its end objective is to guarantee to the man who buys his goods for resale that he will get the same price from the supplier that this supplier grants to his competitors under the same terms and conditions. It permits differences in prices in accord with the normal rules of good business practice, but it prevents the good-faith defense where the effect of the discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This is sound legislation in the American tradition and it should be passed by the Congress.

There are other bills pending which recognize problems associated with the suffocation visited upon small business when a few giant corporations control raw materials, processing, and manufacturing segments of industry and a large number of very small business firms serve as retail distributors for these corporations. Retail gasoline dealers and automobile dealers are two prime examples. It appears clear from the evidence that legislation is urgently needed to restrict these giant suppliers' freedom to unjustly and summarily cancel dealers' franchises without good cause, and we particularly need to restrict suppliers' freedom to coerce dealers to follow certain policies or to deal only in the brands of merchandise dictated by these corporations.

There is a further need for legislation to strengthen our antimerger laws in these days of increasing tendency of great corporate mergers with resultant harmful limitations upon our traditional competitive enterprise system. These laws should be made more strengthened by helpful amendments, and the penalties for criminal violation should be greatly increased.

The Congress should also do all in its power to encourage and request the executive branch to permit small business to participate in defense contracts. It has been authoritatively revealed that in the last 3 years the Department of Defense has been awarding 95 percent of the value of all contracts on the basis of negotiations. Therefore, it is certainly in order for this Congress to enact legislation of stronger intent and requirement for the award of Government contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids so that small business will have a better opportunity. The Department of Defense in all fairness should itself initiate a program of negotiating contracts with small business whenever such contracts are suitable.

Another field in which remedial action could be taken is in the tax setup affecting small business. Action should be taken to make the corporate form of business more attractive taxwise to small firms now existing as partnerships so that these units could accumulate retained business earnings at corporate rates and taxes on smaller corporations should be investigated in order to work out a system of graduated or progressive rates similar to that applying to individual income. There is much that can be done to help small business in this tax field and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give the subject their prompt and earnest attention.

If we neglect the health of small business in this Nation we are betraying our duty of preserving the economic integrity of the Nation; let us then assume our rightful obligation to grant reasonable assistance to small business by the prompt enactment of suitable legislation.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE ADJOURNED WHILE VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to express my opposition to any early sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives while vitally important legislation remains pending.

Just a few of the problems that still challenge our legislative conscience are the enactment of a civil-rights program, school-construction aid, adequate housing and slum clearance, and flood-disaster insurance. These problems, as well as many others, very deeply affect the general welfare and progress of the country. It is my judgment that we are morally bound to remain in session until these vitally important problems are legislatively solved for the good of all Americans.

BILLS INTRODUCED IN 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, limitations of space and time prevent me from further dwelling on multitudinous other bills that were discussed, but I shall personally report to my people on them at length and in detail, during the next several months.

However, this summary would be highly inadequate if I did not list, in part, some of the bills I introduced in the 84th Congress: They follow:

House Concurrent Resolution 5, a concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament.

House Concurrent Resolution 208, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the loss of the famous Wayside Inn.

House Joint Resolution 468, a joint resolution to establish a Northeastern United States Watershed Development and Flood Protection Commission.

H. R. 355. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education.

H. R. 356, a bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor.

H. R. 357, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy.

H. R. 358, a bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year.

H. R. 359, a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H. R. 360, a bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags.

H. R. 361, a bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs.

H. R. 2385, a bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties.

H. R. 2970, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder.

H. R. 5110, a bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday.

H. R. 6094, a bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.

H. R. 7184, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

H. R. 7753, a bill to provide that no fee shall be charged by any branch of the Defense Department for furnishing copies of official documents related to a veteran's or a serviceman's military record.

H. R. 8342, a bill to authorize the construction of flood protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extraordinary floods.

H. R. 8343, a bill to authorize the construction of flood protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms.

H. R. 10744, a bill to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance.

H. R. 10950, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits.

H. R. 10995, a bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy.

H. R. 11281, a bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

A NECESSARY PERSONAL NOTE

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, following my release from active military service, I presented my qualifications to the voters of the Fourth Congressional District in Massachusetts for the honor and privilege of representing them in the United States Congress. They accepted me in November of 1946 and reelected me to each succeeding Congress.

Since the day of assuming the responsibilities of Congressman, I have conscientiously worked to justify that confidence and trust. The full facilities of my office have been energetically and courteously extended, at all times, for personal service to my constituents. I have cooperated, on every occasion, with the community agencies, social, fraternal, and racial organizations of my district in the promotion of their various objectives.

The expressed wishes of the majority of the people I represent, and a thorough study of the issues involved, have been the foundation for my judgment and action on legislation to advance the best interests of my district and the Nation.

In return for the trust and confidence expressed in me, I consider it a major part of my duty to present this summary of my voting record on domestic and foreign legislative issues to the people of my district.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless.

Congressional Quarterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the Congressional Quarterly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the closing days of the 84th Congress my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, made certain comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16 and 27 relative to the useful publication known as Congressional Quarterly. While recognizing that "the Congressional Quarterly has accurately reported the votes on specific rollcalls," the Senator from Kansas charged that "there is an editorial bias in interpreting the figures," and that "it slants the explanation of its statistics." The Senator from Kansas, himself a subscriber to Congressional Quarterly, makes it clear that he has not "questioned its value as a ready source of information on the activities of Congress," but he does question "how it presents its facts."

While I realize that no method of listing, compiling, organizing, analyzing, or commenting upon the votes of Members of Congress could ever meet the impossible task imposed by the intense desire of all Members that every comment concerning their votes on all projects should be completely sympathetic with their respective points of view, I am unwilling to have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD close this year without inserting these observations regarding Congressional Quarterly.

I have followed this unique and valuable service since it was founded in 1945. I have known its founders, Henrietta and Nelson Poynter, of St. Petersburg, since before I was Governor of Florida. I knew Nelson Poynter's father as a constructive, crusading newspaperman from my earliest days in Florida politics.

Congressional Quarterly has provided a fast, accurate factual service for more than 200 newspapers and other publications with many and varied political viewpoints. It seems to me that the client-editors of these publications, of all conceivable points of view, are able watchdogs against bias or slanting of Congressional Quarterly reports.

This service has made Congress more comprehensible to more people by logging all votes and all bills and presenting them in a form that laymen can understand. In compiling the records of support of Congressmen for President Eisenhower Congressional Quarterly has followed the same methods that it used during the Truman administration.

I believe that many of my colleagues in both Houses are a little more conscious of their records as a result of the nationwide use of Congressional Quarterly material. A box score cannot be devised that will suit every Congressman for every occasion. But Congress is better served and the institution of self-government is better served if more voters have an interest in and working knowledge of what goes on in Congress.

A year ago Congressional Quarterly took pains to show its client-editors how the box-score was compiled on the support each Congressman has given to the Eisenhower program. At the time it forecast that these records would be the heart of 1956 elections. The fact that many Republicans "like Ike" in an election year, but vote against his program is an embarrassment of their own making and does not justify attacking the integrity of the newspaper service that supplies the data on an impersonal basis.

Since I doubt that many people know how difficult and expensive a job it is to analyze and cover the actions and votes of Congress I would like to quote from Congressional Quarterly's explanation of the process, which it gave to its subscribing newspapers:

"Congressional Quarterly's job of making the record available, so that America's editors could 'take it and give it vitality,' has been the most massive, and probably the most costly, single assignment in the history of American journalism.

"It has required, in a decade of effort, the development of a highly trained staff, the use

of complex and expensive electronic equipment, the invention and steady improvement of a whole series of special techniques essential to the task.

"As a research project alone the assignment was so formidable that it had never been attempted, even by the big foundations for the purposes of historians and scholars. In any case American editors knew that this was a job that should be paid for by American newspapers for their own use, not left to government or to charity.

"They also knew that, while it was a newspaper responsibility, the assignment was one that no newspaper or wire service, geared to the fast reporting of spot news, could undertake successfully. * * *

"The job had to be done by a new, separate, specialized organization devoted to the task of collecting and organizing congressional and political information for newspaper use.

"It had to be an organization especially trained to gather, correlate, index, and prepare for the easiest and fastest use of reporters, editors, and editorial writers, all of the essential factual record and background on Congress, and to build a system to keep it always up to date.

"It also had to be capable of anticipating the needs of newspapers and, by planning years ahead, to build a solid factual basis for newspaper coverage of elections 2, 4, 10 years in the future.

"When Congressional Quarterly undertook this task, the full dimensions of the problem were hardly imagined.

"The raw materials consisted of tons of documents, millions of words, yard after yard of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, stacks of committee and floor calendars, bushels of reports, amendments, speeches, records of junkets, Budget Bureau and White House recommendations by the pound, executive agency and department reports and proposals from floor to ceiling. And the supply kept coming every day.

"All this had to be sifted, sorted, and analyzed, while a system and staff were developed simultaneously to keep the job up to date * * *.

"Here's a case history of two interlocking Congressional Quarterly stories, Eisenhower Support and Eisenhower Boxscore, published during the 84th Congress.

"1. Every Eisenhower message, speech, press conference, and other public statement was examined minutely by a trained Congressional Quarterly staff. Every specific Presidential request or recommendation for legislation, every clear-cut declaration of stands on public issues, was recorded and cataloged. This process required the equivalent of half time for one experienced staff member the year round.

"2. During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955, the President's legislative program consisted of 207 items. Each was followed painstakingly through the legislative process. Congressional Quarterly recorded exactly what happened to every point of Mr. Eisenhower's program. The boxscore showed which items Congress approved, which were rejected, which sustained setbacks, which progressed part way.

"3. Rollcall votes place Members of Congress on record. During 1955, Congress took 93 rollcalls that tested support of the President's program. On each, his public stands made clear which way he would have voted if he had been Congressman Eisenhower. Most of the 93 votes decided Congress' stand on points of the President's proposals. The balance tested congressional support for his viewpoint on other issues.

"Working from its meticulous record of the President's stands, Congressional Quarterly analyzed each rollcall, pinned down the facts on who was for, who against Mr. Eisenhower.

"The job of logging and analysis for these two stories—Eisenhower Boxscore and Eisenhower Support—took the equivalent of one highly trained staff member's full time, all year.

"4. All information on the 93 Eisenhower-issue rollcalls was entered on IBM punchcards. The final compilations of Eisenhower Support, by parties and by individual Congressmen, were made electronically.

"Operation of the IBM machine for the Eisenhower Support story took the equivalent of about one-third time for one man all year.

"5. Then—and only then—came the writing. Each of the two stories took the time of a topflight writer for approximately 5 days, plus repeated, regular consultation with the research staff throughout the year.

"The result: A smash exclusive story for Congressional Quarterly newspapers; vital information the voter never before could get; a noticeable increase in caution and responsibility on the part of politicians and parties.

"This kind of thorough, exclusive reporting is standard Congressional Quarterly practice."

Henrietta and Nelson Poynter live in Pinellas County, Fla., where he is owner and editor of the St. Petersburg Times. I read his newspaper regularly and frequently disagree with its editorial position. The Republicans are in his debt because his newspaper stanchly supported the two-party system when they were weak in his area in numbers and funds. I mention this because more recently Pinellas County's Republican vote gave that party its first seat in Congress since reconstruction days—which seat we Democrats have high hopes of recapturing this year.

In my years of careful reading of Congressional Quarterly reports, I have found no bias carried over to it from the editorial attitudes of the St. Petersburg Times. In my years of public life I have met many newspaper editors and writers. I place the Poynters among the top of those who have a high and continuing sense of responsibility toward making journalism strengthen our democratic institutions.

Civil Defense for National Survival—Report of the Holifield Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Military Operations Subcommittee, under my chairmanship, recently completed an investigation of the civil defense program. This was the most searching and comprehensive inquiry into civil defense ever made by a congressional committee.

Hearings were held in selected major target areas, including New York City and Syracuse, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital. Our subcommittee heard more than 200 witnesses prominent in science, engineering, and medicine, and other professions.

The governors of 36 States and mayors of 33 large cities submitted their written statements to the subcommitte and a number of them also appeared in person. The highest military authorities and the chiefs of the Federal agencies responsible for civil defense planning were heard.

The outcome of our work is a report on civil defense, known as House Report No. 2946, which was presented to the Congress this session.

EVACUATION POLICY "DANGEROUSLY SHORTSIGHTED"

The subcommittee report was sternly critical of the existing civil defense program. It said that this program, which relies on evacuation, is weak and ineffective, and, indeed, dangerously shortsighted.

The official testimony of Mayor Poulson and the Civil Defense Director of the city of Los Angeles reflected the common sense knowledge of our people that evacuation, under conditions of limited warning time which we must expect as weapon technology advances, is impossible. As a civil defense policy for the Los Angeles area, evacuation is absurd.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD FACE UP TO RESPONSIBILITIES

The subcommittee recommendations, which were endorsed by the full committee with 1 or 2 qualifications, add up to this: The Federal Government should squarely face up to its responsibilities to provide for the common defense by developing a civil defense program as a vital component of our overall national defense.

We took the position that civil defense must not be neglected any more than our Army, Navy, and Air Force. America is always peace-minded but it dare not let down its defenses against possible aggression. Civil defense is an essential part of these defenses in the nuclear age.

GROUP SHELTER PROTECTION ESSENTIAL

The key measure in this civil defense program, our report pointed out, was a program of group shelter construction to protect people from the direct blast and heat effects of atomic-hydrogen bombs and the lethal fallout radiation which persists after the explosion.

We did not try to gloss over the difficulties or the costs of building adequate shelters, or the demands which must be made upon the public for supporting an effective civil defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE LEGISLATION MUST BE OVERHAULED

We found that Federal agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission were not giving the full facts on nuclear weapons effects to the public, and that the Federal Civil Defense Administration was built on a faulty legislative structure that made for a diffusion of responsibility and a lack of strong Federal leadership.

Our report proposed that the 1950 civil defense legislation be rewritten to face the realities and meet the needs of the nuclear age. Moreover, it stressed the importance of maintaining civilian control over civil defense rather than let the military "take over."

HOLIFIELD REPORT RECOGNIZED BY PRESS AND PRESIDENT

Many leading newspaper editorial writers and columnists have praised our report highly. I believe that in the days to come it will be the basis for a complete reorganization of the civil defense program.

President Eisenhower, in fact, recently released a letter to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in which he took due note of the work of my subcommittee and promised that in his next budget message to the Congress, he would make recommendations to modernize the civil defense program based upon our recommendations and others.

I am confident that in 1957 the President who is elected to office must and will take account of our constructive recommendations for the security and continued strength of America against the threat of nuclear attack.

Congressman Hagen Reports to the People—The Work of the 1956 Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in reporting on the work of the Congress I will deal principally with those subjects which are of most immediate interest to Kern, Kings, and Tulare Counties, and my people. I feel that such a report is a necessary aspect of my job. Almost everyone has decisions important to his or her welfare which depend on additions to, or changes of, some Federal statute or the action of some administrator. In the space of time allowed to me I will touch upon the most important of these matters and hold myself available for information to my constituents with respect to matters which are not touched on in this speech.

I will deal with those projects and actions which have a purely local impact. They are:

1. Success and Terminus Dams.
2. Lemoore Naval Air Station.
3. Terra Bella irrigation district.
4. Desert area FHA housing.
5. Federal aid to local school districts.
6. Recreation at Isabella Lake.
7. The so-called barley bill.
8. San Luis project.
9. Agriculture program.

SUCCESS AND TERMINUS DAMS

For the first time in their legislative history Success Dam on the Tule River and Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River received an appropriation for commencement of construction. As quickly as the work demands additional sums will be secured to build a structure on the Kaweah—Terminus, near McKays Point, which will store up 145,000 acre-feet of water—and a structure on the Tule, Success, just above Worth Bridge, which will store 75,000 acre-feet of water. In each case flood control is the principal benefit but there will be some reregulation of irrigation water. In addition, in some years, additional irrigation water will be available by reason of the capture and storage of floodwater which would normally go into Tulare Lake. Discounting the loss of storage capacity attributable to water already owned the amount of new water made available on Kaweah would be 34,000 acre-feet and 10,000 acre-feet on the Tule and, of necessity, this is not a year-in and year-out supply. The Corps of Engineers will control the flood-control aspects of the dams but the local people will direct the use for irrigation to the end that the best use is made of water and no person's water rights adversely affected.

I have acted on behalf of each of these projects each year during my 4 years in Congress, and I am proud that final success was achieved during my tenure in office.

These projects have a history antedating 1944 but were not authorized until that date by Congress and, with the exception of periodic appropriations of planning money, no money was provided for them until 1956. Such delay is attributable to the fact that Federal authorizations and appropriations are difficult to secure, with the decision often being made by the President and the Budget Bureau. In addition, in the case of Success and Terminus, added factors were involved. From time to time they were clouded with local controversies. Changes in plans occurred which delayed action. In some years they lacked the approval of State water agencies. Fortunately these delays are behind us.

I cite these facts to clear the atmosphere of political charges made regarding them. It should be noted that during the long history of slow progress since 1944 and prior thereto the district has been represented by Congressmen Alfred Elliott and Thomas Werdel and myself in that order and by Senators Sheridan Downey, Hiram Johnson, William Knowland, Richard Nixon, and Thomas Kuchel, respectively. The record of accomplishment speaks for itself. In this connection it should be noted that the people of Tulare County have, over the years, almost unanimously supported these projects. Whatever opposition has existed has been understandable and forgiveable if not acceptable to the great mass of the people.

Upstream areas have an acute interest in development of flood control and water-conservation problems which are not reached by the major storage structures. I have pledged myself to help them and have received assurances from their neighbors downstream that they will support the development of additional plans. The Army engineers can be put to work developing upstream flood-control plans by a resolution of the Public Works Committee of either the House or the Senate. I intend to seek such approval and anticipate no difficulty with it.

Finally, Tulare and Kings County people should investigate plans for provision of recreational bodies of water back of each dam site. This action was taken in Kern County on Isabella Lake by the action of the board of supervisors in purchasing surplus Central Valley project water which could be exchanged for water to be stored the year-round at Isabella. I secured the consent of the Army engineers to such storage right.

LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION

The establishment of an $80 million air station at Lemoore is a reality. It will bring a tremendous payroll into Kings and Tulare Counties. Over $10 million for it was appropriated this year and the dirt should fly in 1957. I worked closely with the Navy and the local community on this and was commended by the Navy for my help before the committees of Congress.

There will be problems arising from the project but they can be solved and the overall value is so great that the problems become minor. The Government is not unaware of problems arising from such a major Federal activity. Federal aid is available for schools, planning, and other activities complicated by the Federal impact. The ultimate size of the station is a matter of speculation until the Navy submits its final land-acquisition plans to the House and Senate military committees in January 1957.

TERRA BELLA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Responding to telegrams from the Terra Bella area I acted to secure inclusion of funds for the irrigation district distribution system loan in this year's appropriations. I succeeded in securing language in an appropriation bill, in the face of opposition from the Budget Bureau, which makes money available for such loan. Similar efforts by me on behalf of the Porterville irrigation district were not successful because of opposition from both the Budget Bureau and the Bureau of Reclamation on the basis that negotiations were not far enough advanced to indicate an immediate appropriation. In any event the Porterville district can go ahead with its proposed contract and dispose of all preliminary actions with the assurance that in January or February of 1957 the money will be provided.

DESERT AREA FHA HOUSING

The communities of Ridgecrest, Mojave, Rosamond, and Boron have had difficulty securing the usual FHA loan guarantees for private housing. Part of their difficulties were resolved through a conference I arranged with top-level FHA and Veterans' Administration officials.

The Congress provided added relief in legislation I worked on with Senator SPARKMAN and Congressman RAINS, of Alabama. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six legislation establishes a new category of guaranties of building loans and purchase loans for essential employees of military research or development facilities which would be used when the usual FHA programs were denied. The communities mentioned will have a new avenue of private housing loans open to them.

FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For several years the Federal Government has been furnishing construction funds under Public Law 815 and operation funds under Public Law 874 to school districts which have increased pupil loads arising from military and related installations. A defect of the program has been that operation payments matched the previous year's attendance

to the disadvantage of districts with steadily increasing enrollments—a category into which fall the schools on and about the Naval Ordnance Test Station, the Mojave Marine Air Station, and Edwards Air Force Base. I have worked with Jesse Stockton, Dr. Earl Murray, Theron McCuen, and Robert Ulrich, and others concerned with this problem. I can report that the 1956 version of Public Law 874 conforms to our requests.

I was also pleased to be of assistance to these educators in opening a new door to solution of the Burroughs High School problem. The present facility is inadequate to serve both off-station and on-station students. Without a change in the law the Federal construction entitlement attributable to these two categories of students could not be combined in the expansion of the existing facility or the erection of a new one. With the help of the named educators and others I secured the necessary change which would permit the combination of both entitlements in a single location. It is proposed that the present high-school site be devoted to elementary-school purposes and a new high-school plant be erected on a more central location to be donated by the Navy. This site would be open to students and parents without the necessity of going through a security gate. Under the amendment of law secured, over $800,000 of Federal money would be available. It should be emphasized that all decisions in this matter rest with the local people. The change in the law merely opens a new avenue of approach.

ISABELLA LAKE

A minimum recreational lake has been established at Isabella. This is the result of the cooperative efforts of local groups and myself and other officials. The Board of Supervisors of Kern County are to be congratulated for their many actions, including the provision of the necessary water supply.

The same fine cooperation resulted in the establishment of an office of the Federal-State Market News Service at Visalia. This office has proved a boon to local dairy, cattle, sheep, and hog farmers in getting the best sale prices for their livestock.

BARLEY BILL

I successfully opposed H. R. 9650, the barley bill introduced by HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. In this effort I had the reported unanimous support of the Republican side of the committee and majority support from the Democratic side. I was joined in opposition by the Department of Agriculture, the California Supervisors Association, the Kings and Fresno County Boards of Supervisors, local Grange and Farm Bureau officials, and other groups and individuals.

This proposal deserves comment because some people do not understand it and it may come up again at the Federal level. The commonest method of supporting the prices of selected farm commodities, including barley, is the nonrecourse CCC loan at an established parity level. Under this method, the grower of the supported crop places it in Government-approved storage and borrows its parity value from the Government under a contract which includes delivery of a warehouse receipt to the Government as a deposit of security. The loan establishes an extended time of repayment, as do all loans. During this time the grower can recover his commodity and sell it at a profit. In addition, if its value at the time the Government takes title—arrival of loan maturity date without redemption—is greater than the loan value he receives an equity payment. This loan procedure is not only designed to keep the farmer in the open market for his own benefit but also to lessen the possibility of commodities going into Government hands at a loss to the taxpayers.

The Cooley bill would have permitted a barley grower to pass his ownership to the Government at any time at his option thereby evading local property taxes and shifting storage costs to the Government. I am convinced that this legislation stems in part from the efforts of certain large barley growers in Kings and Tulare Counties to evade local personal-property taxation. In fact, I was asked by one of their representatives to sponsor such legislation. I refused.

Creation of a favored class of farm taxpayers merely results in a shifting of taxes to other farmers and to town people—a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. In Kings County the barley growers, by and large, are corporation farms which are best able to pay taxes and the victims would be the other taxpayers least able to pay. The growers of fruits and nuts and dairy operators have borne, in terms of ability to pay in recent years, an undue burden of taxes and any shifting of barley taxes to them would only aggravate a present injustice. In any event it is not the proper function of the Federal Government to assist avoidance of local taxes. This is a matter of major consequence in Corcoran, for example, where the local schools and the city have a limited tax base greatly affected by any exemptions.

If the growers of price-supported crops in storage have a valid argument for exemption their proper forum is with the local and State tax authorities who can fairly evaluate the local situation case by case. Discussion, such as was had about 3 years ago, of a proper method of taxing farm commodities should be renewed.

SAN LUIS PROJECT

The conflict over the San Luis versus the Feather River project as the best method of increasing San Joaquin Valley water supplies spotlights the need for intense thought and activity on the part not only of those water deficient areas which will receive water from one or the other or both but also those water-deficient areas which will receive no benefits from either as presently proposed.

If it is a reasonable assumption that there is need for more water in almost every area of Kings, Kern, and Tulare Counties there has been a serious lack of organized expression from areas lying east of the valley floor.

The initial features of the San Luis project, which have the best chance of Federal authorization, would make water deliveries only about as far south as the Blakeley Canal in Kings County. It would not be very difficult to extend those deliveries into the lower reaches of the Kings River service area to permit an exchange of Kings River waters farther upstream. It should be recalled also that there have been proposals to use the Delta-Mendota pool and canal as a source of supplemental supply for the Kings and San Joaquin Rivers service areas. It should be noted that the San Luis project will preempt the last low-cost power in the Central Valley project as well as some or all of the remaining unused capacity of the Tracy pumps and the Delta-Mendota Canal without contribution to the capital cost of those facilities.

It seems unlikely to me that the Secretary of the Interior will accept State proposals for dedication of Federal power and CVP facilities to, and the initial expenditure of Federal money for construction of, a project to be turned over to the State of California.

The feasibility of the Feather River project is an economic question which must be decided by majority opinion. I am hopeful that all water-deficient areas will organize and hire the best expert opinion on possible water developments in order that the widest possible participation in Federal or State project benefits can be secured.

Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to add my voice to those of my fellow Members and friends in Government who are applauding the significant and pioneering report on Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy which has been produced by the House-Senate Committee on Foreign Economic Policy, and ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this report constitutes the first realistic congressional study of the intimate relationship between healthy American competition and our defense mobilization base. This subcommittee has ably demonstrated that it would be a self-defeating policy to impose restrictions on foreign trade in an attempt to protect domestic industries considered essential to our defense. Instead of providing an expanding arsenal of recision tools and skills, the committee showed that the stifling of foreign competition tends to foster industrial complacency, technological stagnation, higher prices, diminishing consumption, and, consequently, a smaller reserve of essential equipment and skills.

The watchmaking industry, which happened to be the subject of this case study, proved an excellent example of the weakness of protectionist arguments that high tariffs

necessarily contribute to the welfare of defense-essential industries. The committee warned that, in the first place, "Every industry feels itself essential to defense because it knows that its facilities would be employed in an all-out emergency." While respecting the possibility that there may be industries for which defense essentiality can be argued, the committee demonstrated that artificially created monopolies could only further weaken those domestic industries, as well as the total national security.

As the committee stated, "Freezing neither industrial capacity nor skilled manpower in set patterns is a wise approach to insuring national security even in the narrow sense of continental defense in an age of accelerated technological change."

The committee rightly suggests that if there are products for which it is possible to forecast long-range defense essentiality they should be aided through devices which do not disrupt international trade and thereby weaken our friends abroad. Stockpiling or direct subsidies, for example, have the virtue of placing the cost in the defense budget, where it belongs, instead of on the backs of American consumers in the form of prohibitive prices for the goods we require.

This unanimous report, Mr. President, marks a significant forward step in solving the complex problems involved in creating a realistic mobilization base. The findings of this committee should, hereafter, be considered a basic document for the executive branch whenever it is called upon to consider pleas for tariff protection on grounds of defense essentiality.

Results of Harden Poll Show Wide Interest in Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the House to the results of my 1956 legislative questionnaires.

During the months of February through May I conducted a series of four opinion polls among residents of the Sixth Indiana District on legislative issues before the Congress. I have made it a practice to take such polls ever since coming to Congress in 1949, but this year's effort was the most extensive, since it involved four individual polls mailed out at 1-month intervals.

Needless to say, I find surveys of this type interesting, informative, and helpful to me in my efforts to represent the 300,000 residents of the Sixth Indiana District. While poll taking cannot substitute for personal contact, it is impossible while Congress is in session for Members of this body representing districts hundreds of miles away from Washington to maintain sufficient personal contact with residents of their districts. Thus the poll helps to bridge the gap by keeping me in touch with the thinking of my constituents on the important legislative problems which we face here in Washington.

Approximately 50,000 ballots were mailed over a 4-month period to persons listed in the telephone directories of most of the communities in the 10 counties which make up the Sixth Indiana District. Slightly more than 8,000 ballots were returned, for a percentage of roughly 16 percent. I am grateful for this response, which I am told is considered exceptionally good for surveys of this type. It indicates that the people of west-central Indiana are interested in legislative affairs, and the results, I am sure you will agree, indicate a broad understanding by the poll participants of these affairs.

Some of the questions were used in more than one poll, but new issues were raised each month so that most of the major matters before the Congress were covered during the 4 months of polling. Here is a summary of the results; with combined totals being used on questions asked on more than one occasion:

AGRICULTURE

Five agricultural questions were asked:

First. Greater aid to agriculture to help farmers gain a larger share of the national prosperity? Yes, 1,728; no, 993; not voting, 157. [Congress approved new soil-bank plan and President Eisenhower announced higher price-support levels.]

Second. Sale of United States surplus farm goods to unfriendly Communist nations? Yes, 1,554; no, 1,969; not voting, 179. [No action by Congress.]

Third. Food-stamp plan, utilizing surplus farm goods to feed needy people? Yes, 1,851; no, 360; not voting, 91. [No action by Congress.]

Fourth. Large-scale research program aimed at finding new industrial uses for farm products? Yes, 1,757; no, 420; not voting, 125. [My bill, H. R. 10123, would establish such a program. Hearings have been held but no final action taken.]

Fifth. Soil-bank plan urged by President Eisenhower. Yes, 952; no, 364; not voting, 84. [Congress approved soil bank.]

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

This question was asked twice. The combined vote was 1,920 for, and 2,220 against. [The House defeated a school-construction bill.]

TAXES—BUDGET

Four questions were used, one on each of the polls. Voters were asked whether they agreed with President Eisenhower that Federal income taxes should not be reduced until the budget could be balanced and a reduction made on the national debt. Here are the month-by-month results:

February: Agree, 2,599; do not agree, 220; not voting, 59.

March: Agree, 1,252; do not agree, 166; not voting, 18.

April: Agree, 1,798; do not agree, 418; not voting, 86.

May: Agree, 1,064; do not agree, 280; not voting, 56.

[Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey announced in mid-July that the Federal budget has been balanced and that the Government wound up its fiscal year July 1 with a surplus of $1¾ billion. Congress did not approve a tax cut, so the budget surplus has been applied to reduction of the national debt.]

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Voters in the February and March polls approved the new highway construction program by a combined vote of 3,113 to 1,095, with 106 not answering the question. [Congress passed the highway bill and it was signed into law by the President.]

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Two questions assessing confidence of Sixth District voters in President Eisenhower were asked.

February: Do you, in general, approve of the 3-year record of the Eisenhower administration? Yes, 2,475; no, 269; not voting, 134.

March, April: Do you, in general, approve of President Eisenhower's direction of United States foreign policy? Question asked twice. Yes, 2,983; no, 454; not voting, 265.

VETERANS' PENSION

Because of widespread interest in bills granting a pension to World War I veterans, the following question was asked in the February poll: "Should Congress approve a $100-a-month pension to World War I veterans at age 65?" (a) Regardless of need, 553; (b) only on proof of need, 1,570; (c) opposed to either, 684; not answering, 71. [The House passed a bill which would grant pensions to World War I veterans at age 65 on an income limitation basis. The bill did not come to a vote in the Senate.]

POSTAGE RATES

Voters showed consistent support of the administration bill to increase postage rates as a means of easing the annual deficit in United States postal operations. Here are the combined answers from the March, April, and May polls:

Question: The Postmaster General thinks postage rates should be increased to meet the $500 million annual deficit incurred in handling the mail. Opponents maintain these losses should be made up from general tax revenues and that rates should not be increased. Do you favor a rate increase? Yes, 3,197; no, 1,754; not voting, 187. [The House passed a postage rate increase bill but it was not taken up by the Senate, so failed of enactment.]

FOREIGN AID

One of the most controversial issues before the Congress, the foreign-aid questions proved controversial among residents of the Sixth Indiana District. Here are the three questions used in my polls, along with the answers:

March poll: The President has asked Congress to appropriate more than $4 billion for foreign military and economic aid this year. Should Congress (a) approve the amount requested? 438; (b) reduce the amount? 565; (c) discontinue all foreign aid? 390; not answering question, 43.

April poll: Should Congress reduce the amount of our foreign economic and military aid spending this year? Yes, 1,158; no, 879; not voting, 109.

May poll: Should Congress reduce the amount of our foreign economic and military aid spending this year? Yes, 658; no, 630; not voting, 112.

Summary: The preponderance of opinion seemed favorable to a moderate decrease in foreign aid spending. Congress, after spending many months arriving at a decision, finally came to the same conclusion by reducing the President's requests approximately $1 billion.

ARABS-ISRAELI

The Eisenhower administration has been following a cautious policy in regard to the dispute between the Arabs and Israel. In my May poll I found strong support among the Sixth District voters for this policy of caution. Here is the question, with the results:

Question: Would you favor the granting of United States arms aid to Israel in the present Arab-Israeli dispute? Yes, 329; no, 924; not voting, 147.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree after studying the results of the polls I have taken that I am fortunate in having an extremely intelligent constituency. I can assure you it is a privilege and a pleasure to represent the Sixth Indiana District.

Statement on the Report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I had hoped to deliver on the Senate floor during the last days of the session. The statement concerns a constructive report recently released by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I do not want this session to end without briefly paying tribute to our distinguished colleagues, serving as members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee under the chairmanship of the most able Representative from Missouri, Mr. BOLLING, who have recently turned out such a brilliant and stimulating report on the relationships between our foreign economic policy and the national security.

It seems to me that the report of this five-man subcommittee, which included Senators DOUGLAS, FULBRIGHT, and FLANDERS, has paved the way for a clarification of congressional and executive approaches to the vital question of industrial preparedness, and that the members and staff of this subcommittee deserve sincere congratulations.

I might say, Mr. President, that I have been disturbed to see the reaction to this report which was voiced in recent days by a few of my colleagues on the Senate floor. These comments were addressed specifically to those aspects of the subcommittee's report pertaining to the watch industry, and no doubt they reflected a sincere attempt to defend the position that the four domestic jeweled watch manufacturers are so essential to national defense as to justify the abandonment of our policy for the expansion of foreign trade.

I submit, however, that these efforts to perpetuate the impression that we must curtail watch imports in order to preserve our national security will not prove of genuine benefit to the domestic watch manufacturers, and will certainly lead to a weakening of our national security.

History clearly demonstrates, Mr. President, that whenever old concepts have outlived their usefulness, many of those who have committed themselves to those propositions have found it difficult to adjust to the new realities. Instead, they have reacted by increasing their efforts to defend these old concepts.

This is only human nature, and it has been reflected in the attacks which the domestic watch manufacturers have inspired against the subcommittee's findings. Despite these efforts to minimize the value of the committee's work, however, the undeniable logic of the report is certain to shine through. It seems to me, Mr. President, that any impartial, unprejudiced study of this report is certain to penetrate the smoke-screen which has been put forth by those who oppose it.

It should be understood, Mr. President, that the report did not deny that the domestic watch manufacturers can produce items which are useful to defense, although it pointed out that many other industries are capable of producing the same types of defense products. More important, however, was the very convincing presentation by the subcommittee that, even if it is decided that the watch manufacturers are important to defense, it would be most harmful public policy to attempt to aid them through techniques which are merely aimed at curtailing and suppressing their competitors. The heart of the report lies in the finding that our total national security is impaired, rather than helped, when we impose barriers to international trade in an attempt to protect isolated industries under the guise of national defense.

I might add, Mr. President, that the members of this subcommittee were undoubtedly fully aware of all of the allegations that have recently been raised on the Senate floor. As a matter of fact, the report discusses each of them in detail, and, indeed, points out the error of these arguments. It should be clearly understood that the domestic watch manufacturers had a full opportunity to present their views before the subcommittee, as did other segments of the watch industry and many distinguished, qualified witnesses who had no self-interest in the watch dispute.

In my opinion, the report of this subcommittee is, in every respect, a thorough, objective, and masterful job. It is one of the truly outstanding achievements of the current Congress, and I sincerely believe that those few people who are criticizing the document have not thought through the full implications of their narrow attacks.

In my opinion, the members of this subcommittee and its staff are to be sincerely commended for providing guidelines to the executive branch concerning methods of maintaining maximum national security without disrupting our friends and allies overseas and without penalizing the American consumer by forcing him to pay higher prices because of unwarranted trade restrictions. It is my fervent hope, Mr. President, that the President and the Office of Defense Mobilization will give this report the consideration which it so richly deserves, as they consider appeals from various industries for tariff relief on grounds of alleged defense essentiality.

The Giveaway of Federal Power by Past Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have just a few remarks to make about Federal electric power and this bill (S. 3338) which was considered originally by the Senate Committee on Public Works. The bill passed the Senate and then was referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs where it was given a brief hearing and then, subsequently, reported to the House with some amendments. I will support the bill as amended.

The effect of this bill in the form passed by the Senate would be to freeze all of the rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for the electric power generated at all Federal projects throughout the United States for a period of 18 months. The reason behind this bill was to head off an application that has been made by the Interior Department to the Federal Power Commission to increase by approximately 2.2 mills the rates charged these consumers for public power in the Southwest Power Administration. The Interior Department has made no application and contemplates no such action in any project at the present time with the exception of this project under the jurisdiction of the Southwest Power Administration. For that reason then, the House Interior Committee saw fit to amend S. 3338 so that it would apply only to the Southwest Power Administration where this rate increase is threatened. It is limited in time to June 30, 1957.

Now, why should the Interior Department be concerned about power rates in the SPA? Why should they try to increase these rates without making a similar application for the other great power projects in America? The existing SPA rate schedule was developed by the Department of the Interior in 1946. It was submitted, according to law, to the Federal Power Commission and approved in February 1947. The Federal Power Commission recognized at the time of this approval that some of the projects were not completed and the exact costs of these projects were not known. For that reason the Federal Power Commission wisely inserted in its order fixing SPA rates a provision that they should apply for a period of not more than 6 years, and after this 6-year period the Interior Department should review the projects, the costs, and the other factors that should go into determining power rates so that an adjustment could be made if it was found necessary.

It developed subsequently that the estimates for the cost of the seven integrated projects of the Southwest Power Administration were grossly understated by around $158 million, as determined by the Department of the Army as late

as 1954. Clearly an adjustment and a reexamination of this rate schedule should have been made. In all of the multiple-purpose projects throughout the country, electric power is the one factor that is relied on to repay its own costs, including interest, and this should be kept in mind in all cases. In the original estimates of costs of the Southwest Power Administration projects, the amount allocated to power was $109,200,000. A few years later, in 1946, the costs allocated to power were established at $111,200,000 and this is the cost allocation that was used by the Interior Department and the Federal Power Commission in arriving at the rates that were made applicable; and now, nearly 10 years later, we find that the total construction costs that should be allocated to power are nearly twice that much or $200,200,000.

It should be kept in mind that this SPA area, which covers several States, is a part of a large drought section at this time. Since it is a drought area and there has been some bungling in past years of their contracts for electricity, there seems to be some reason to freeze the rates until June 30, 1957. I want to repeat, however, that the continued freezing of the rates, which at the present time build up a $2.5 million a year deficit, cannot go on indefinitely. This area, like others, should either stand on its own feet or the rates should be adjusted to reflect sound business principles. The Department of the Interior is not able under their present contracts to meet a sound payout schedule. Part of this is due to additional cost. To recover this additional cost the Department has proposed to increase the rates charged the REA's, co-ops, and other public bodies in the Southwest Power Administration areas by an additional 2.2 mills.

There are some things in this bill and in the power situation in SPA that bother me. First, I believe that the principle of selling power at a rate sufficient to recover the cost of that portion of a multiple-purpose project is sound. Under this principle, it is apparent and obvious that a rate increase is not only justified but it should be demanded by the Congress. However, which power rates should be raised? Should we raise only the REA's, co-ops, and the public bodies, or should we look at the whole picture? A great block of SPA power is being sold to private groups at approximately 2 mills, which is less than the cost of production.

The thing that disturbs me greatly is the fact that under the Truman-Strauss-Chapman period a private industry, the Aluminum Co., was able to enter into a contract for 30 million kilowatt-hours of electricity per month at less than cost. Some of it is secondary power that sells for 1.25 mills per kilowatt. I realize that this may be considered dump power, but it certainly is not used in that manner by the Aluminum Co. They get a large block of power at less than 2 mills under the same circumstances. I would point out at this time that the REA's must pay about 5.5 mills per kilowatt and they are in need of more power. The proposed increase would boost them to approximately 7.5 mills per kilowatt. It would not disturb the contract of the Aluminum Co. The REA's and the cooperatives need this power. They are being treated differently than the private aluminum company. I would point out further that the selling of Federal power to private industries at around 2 mills, and less than the cost of production, goes on in all of the valley authorities.

Now, to my friends on the other side of the aisle, who have a special group to investigate and attempt to prove that our administration is guilty of giving away the Nation's resources, I would say that some of these contracts for power in the SPA would be a good place for you to start. I know, however, that you would not dig up these contracts. Do you know why? Because they were entered into in 1947 to 1952 when Mr. Truman was in the White House and Mr. Strauss and Mr. Chapman were running the affairs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior. But, in all fairness, my friends, while you are on the subject of giveaway, here is one of the best examples you can get. If some people do not know what a giveaway is, you might hold some of these contracts up so they can see and make the comparison.

There are also some splendid giveaways for you in the Bonneville Power Administration and for some reason or other most of these involve aluminum companies. Now, we are all aware of the importance and the tremendous value of the contributions that the aluminum industry has made to the defense and the progress of our country, and we know that the aluminum companies must have a ready and reasonable supply of electrical power or they could not operate. The great Northwest has developed tremendously in recent years primarily because there was an available source of power to attract many aluminum and other metals companies.

On May 21, 1956, the manager of the Bonneville Power Administration's Washington office, in reply to a letter directed to him from the senior Senator from Utah, analyzed the power sales made by the Bonneville Power Administration. This analysis appears at page 13456 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1956. This is the same Bonneville Power Administration which would have handled the sale of power to be generated from the late Federal Hells Canyon Dam. If you are interested in giveaway, you would be interested in this analysis because it shows that approximately one-half of the total power sales made by Bonneville Power Administration were made to industry, private industry, that has been attracted to the Pacific Northwest by the 2-mill electric power from the Columbia River power dams. The defenders of this situation will argue that this rate is made because the companies are paying for dump power. Yes, they may be paying a dump-power rate, but they are getting firm power. These aluminum companies do not know the difference between dump and firm power, except in the cost. They use dump power, just as well as they can use firm power, to operate all of their electrical facilities. Last year I inserted some remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the amount of power that was being sold to one of the private aluminum companies in the Pacific Northwest from the Bonneville Power Administration. This company was receiving millions of kilowatt-hours at less than a 2-mill rate which is, as I said before, considerably under the cost of production. After these remarks appeared in the RECORD, I received a letter from an official of this company in reply. He did not deny the truth of this article but he said in effect, "Why pick on us? Here is a list of 12 or 13 more companies who are in the same boat, who are getting the same treatment we are."

If you will look a little further into the operations of the Bonneville Power Administration, you will find that approximately one-fifth of the Bonneville power is being sold to private utilities in the Pacific Northwest; so when you add together the power that is being sold to the private utilities for resale to their customers, you discover that more than two-thirds of the power generated by these Government projects, public power projects, built by the Nation's taxpayers, is being sold to nonpublic sources and about one-half is being sold to private companies for less than it costs the Government to produce it. You don't have to be very smart to figure out that someone is paying the bill. Maybe the REA's, co-ops, the State agencies, the municipalities and the other public bodies who buy the balance of the power are paying all they should. But if the rates being charged the private utilities and the private industries were raised so as to pay their share of the costs, it would follow that the other customers would have to bear a proportionately smaller share of the burden. As things stand now, the biggest contribution that must be made to make up this deficit comes from the taxpayers all over the country. The taxpayers in every State in the Union are being asked all the time to pay the money it takes to subsidize private metals companies. The REA's pay about 5.5 mills per kilowatt.

Southwest Power is not paying its way. Last year, I am informed, the revenues from the sale of power fell $2.5 million short of paying the interest charges on the facilities. This has to be made up by the taxpayers. No, it is not the cooperatives or the REA's or the municipalities who are getting the big benefits out of the Southwest Power Administration. These groups have been paying about 5.5 mills for their power. It is the aluminum company sitting there with a 30-year contract for millions of kilowatt-hours of electricity that is getting the big bite out of the taxpayer. They get it at less than the cost of production. This contract with the aluminum company probably cannot be changed and it may not include any provision for review by the Interior Department and the Federal Power Commission, as the other contracts do. It may be that the contracts

that were let under the Truman-Strauss-Chapman administration to the aluminum companies of the Pacific Northwest are not subject to review. But if they are, the Government should undertake the review immediately. These are subjects that ought to be carefully reviewed by the proper committees of Congress. There seems to be a big "giveaway" of public power to private groups. This cheap power cannot be had by the REA's. It helps produce a big deficit in the SPA.

So, I would say again to my friends on the other side of the aisle that while you are going about your business of trying to brand this administration as a giveaway administration you will not know what a giveaway is until you have looked carefully at some of the contracts for power made during the heyday of the Truman-Strauss-Chapman team. I shall support S. 3338, as amended, with the hope that the sharp spotlight of public opinion will be focused on some of these power contracts. I do feel the time is here when all Federal projects should pay their own way. There would be no deficit of $2.5 million in interest alone if these private groups paid a better share of the cost of electric power in the SPA. All of these power contracts should be reviewed. It should not be necessary for the taxpayers of the country to subsidize the power in the great Pacific Northwest. The record will show that nearly half of the power marketed by the Bonneville Administration is sold at less than the cost of production. I just hope the next Congress will take hold of this situation in a firm manner and try to correct this great "giveaway" of Federal power to private companies.

The Great Pretense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1956, it was my privilege to participate in the Georgetown University Television Forum of the Air. The question discussed on that forum was The Great Pretense. Also participating in this forum were the Honorable Edward M. O'Connor, former Commissioner of Displaced Persons, and now consultant to the Director of the United States Information Agency, and Mr. James J. McTigue, consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who was substituting for our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.

The Great Pretense refers to the present efforts of the masters of the Kremlin to cloak themselves with respectability in order to deceive the unsuspecting into believing that the Communists have abandoned their goal of world conquest by subversion, infiltration and force when necessary. Because of the great interest so many people have in getting all the facts about the latest tactical maneuver of the Russian Communists, under leave granted I insert in the RECORD the transcript of that forum meeting The Great Pretense:

THE GREAT PRETENSE, JUNE 17, 1956

(Participants: Mr. James J. McTigue, consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, substituting for the Honorable Thomas J. Dodd; Hon. Michael A. Feighan, Member of Congress from Ohio; Mr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the Director of the United States Information Agency. Moderator: Mr. Matthew Warren.)

Mr. WARREN. The Great Pretense is the topic for the 500th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown University Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be The Great Pretense. The participants are James J. McTigue, consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, substituting for the Honorable Thomas J. Dodd, who is ill (Mr. Dodd is a Member of Congress from Connecticut); the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, Member of Congress from Ohio; Mr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the Director, United States Information Agency. All three of our speakers were members of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress.

Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Send 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing, with your name and address to the Georgetown University Forum, Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

Today's Forum takes its title from a significant document issued on May 19. The document was published by the House Un-American Committee and is a symposium on the anti-Stalinism now current in the Soviet Union. We of the Forum feel obligated to alert Americans to the current changes in Soviet strategy and at the same time to remind all of us of basic objectives of the world of communism. So we of the Georgetown University have asked three most competent analysts of Soviet behavior to give you their evaluation of recent Soviet changes. Mr. O'Connor, what is the great pretense?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Matthew, as you have described it, in one sense it is a publication of a symposium on anti-Stalinism in the 20th Congress of the Communist Party which was held in February of this year.

I thought I might, as a beginner, give my impression of the main points established in this printed symposium. I think the first thing would be that the anti-Stalin campaign is an effort of the present Communist leaders to remove from themselves all guilt for the long list of crimes against humanity committed in the name of communism. The second thing is that the anti-Stalin campaign is but a part of the larger Russian offensive to get the free world to accept peaceful coexistence, that is, the creation of the illusion that human freedom and tyranny can live side by side in safety and at peace with one another. The third point is that this anti-Stalin campaign in no way signifies a change in any of the basic policy of the Communist conspiracy but merely heralds a significant change in tactics. Therefore, the word of caution. We ought to remember that this symposium is a contribution indeed to the thinking and to the alerting of the American people to the dangers in this change in tactics. But we ought not to consider this symposium as the end all, because the tactics of the Russians, the Communists, are very changing and there will be many more in the months and years ahead.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. O'Connor, this is a very vital publication, The Great Pretense, a symposium on anti-Stalinism and the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Many of our Americans across the Nation are familiar with the publications of our Congress; and the United States Government Printing Office has added this to their long list, and very many do not read these articles as much as they should. Can you tell us how they can get hold of this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. They can get this publication by writing to the Government Printing Office and for the payment of 25 cents, I believe anyone can secure this publication.

Mr. FEIGHAN. You mentioned, Mr. O'Connor, that this new approach heralded no change in Communist tactics. I think in that connection it would be informative to refer to The Great Pretense for a moment in an article by Whittaker Chambers. The article is entitled "Is Stalin's Russia Weakening?" In that article, Whittaker Chambers says on the subject of tactics, among other things, as follows: "In brief, communism's great change dating from the 20th Congress is a change of tactics not of intentions. Communism is cleaning house in order to make its personnel, its formations, its tactics more acceptable, efficient, up to date, and thus to hasten its project of dividing, wooing, and of winning the West preparatory to overrunning the West. That Communist purpose never changes."

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree completely in that statement by Whittaker Chambers. I believe he is an eminent authority and one who has lived close to the conspiracy for years. I think he is a real student of its twists and turns.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I might add, Mr. Warren, Mr. William Henry Chamberlain also in his analysis showed very clearly that this Russian Communist change is one of tactics only. He said that there has been no change in Russia in such basic Stalinite methods as the forced regimentation of the peasants in collective farms, the denial of such basic human rights as freedom of speech, press, voting, and trade union organization. Nor is there any apparent willingness on the part of the new Soviet leaders to relinquish their grip on the vast territories in Eastern and Central Europe which Stalin took by force and held in violation of sound pledges to respect the self-determination of peoples. It is quite obvious that if the Russians were sincere they would do away with the slave labor camps throughout their vast empire. They would give freedom to the people, such as freedom of religion, press and speech, and the right to vote, the right of self-determination. They would give enough for these enslaved nations to be free. But in their enunciations they only talk about freedom, but they will not give the people an opportunity to have an expression of freedom by a ballot or in any other manner.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Congressman FEIGHAN, that theme runs through this report by the House Un-American Activities. I would like to cite another such quotation as the Congressman has given us, by the professor of international relations at Syracuse University, contributed to this symposium under the title of, "Risks of Anti-Stalinism." Here is what he says on this subject, speaking, of course, of the effort of the Russian leaders to wash their hands of these crimes: "Can they successfully wash off their hands the responsibility for the Socialist purges and the forced labor camps which they have not abolished after his death? Can they claim his succession while degrading their former master who they publicly extolled at the previous 19th Congress." That is a fundamental question which runs as a central theme throughout this report. How can these people from Khrushchev on down possibly

purge themselves of these tremendous crimes when the very offenses and crimes against humanity which were committed by Stalin and at his direction are continued within the vast empire of the Communists. This, it seems to me, is a very basic question.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I might add there that Khrushchev, the present Secretary of the Communist Party, was known in the Ukraine as the hangman of the Ukraine, because he was the one who perpetrated and carried out the manmade famine and many of the massacres, not only in the Ukraine but in many other nations in the U. S. S. R.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Right along those lines, Congressman FEIGHAN, and in line with what Mr. O'Connor has just discussed, I would like to make reference to Mr. William C. Bullitt's article in The Great Pretense. Mr. Bullitt is our former Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1936. The article by Mr. Bullitt is entitled, "A Talk With Voroshilov." Voroshilov is at present the chairman of the Communist Party Presidium. In this article, in a conversation with Voroshilov, Mr. Bullitt reports as follows. He is talking about the murders of the Czarist officers and their wives and children in Kiev. He says, "What did you do then after the men were shot?" "Oh," said Voroshilov, "after we shot the men and boys we put all women and girls into brothels for our Army." "Do you think," asked Mr. Bullitt, "that was a very decent thing to do?" "My army needed women," said Voroshilov, "and I was concerned with my army's health and not with the health of those women, and it didn't make any difference anyhow because they were all dead within 3 months." So, this is the type of leadership, Mr. O'Connor, which is trying now to disassociate itself with Stalin's crime; is that correct?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, indeed it is. I don't think, Mr. McTigue, that this description which has been given by Bill Bullitt, a great patriot and a great American statesman, is limited only to Voroshilov. I think, as Congressman FEIGHAN has pointed out, Khrushchev gained the title of hangman of the Ukraine. He got that title only because he was the major domo in the forced famine and thereby the starvation of over 5 million people, plus the liquidations in the Ukraine and in Byelorussia, following World War II. I heard he also had a hand in the death of over 2 million Moslems in Turkistan between 1925 and 1927, and a whole lot of other crimes have been attributed to him. Let's take Zhukov, as another example. These days we hear him being extolled as the possible guardian of the peace. We must remember that Zhukov is fundamentally, by his own admission, a hard-rock Communist. The story is going around that while he was supposed to have been in exile in Odessa he was masterminding the takeover of China. There is also some reason to believe that Zhukov was the master mind behind the Communist aggression in China. We could go on down the list of these people who are the major characters in the Communist central authority, and I think every one of the records would be very similar, if not identical, to those which we have described.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McTigue, as a consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, you will recall perhaps there was some difficulty in interpreting this term "ad hoc" at a recent congressional hearing. Would you explain that to me?

Mr. MCTIGUE. I recall that, Mr. Warren. "Ad hoc," if I recall my Latin as I learned it from the good Jesuits of Georgetown University, means, "for this purpose." Consequently, an ad hoc committee is a committee for a particular purpose, let us say, a special temporary committee.

The ad hoc committee of the Foreign Affairs Committee is presided over by Chairman THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut. The committee's jurisdiction, which was voted by motion of the full House Foreign Affairs Committee, directs the ad hoc committee to investigate the treatment of American civilians and American military personnel who were detained or who were imprisoned in Red China. Mr. DODD, I am sure, has no intention in pursuance of this investigation of taking an account, a dreary reaccount, if you will, of the experiences, the terrifying experiences undergone by these prisoners and civilians in the forms of beatings, and so forth, and so on; rather, Mr. DODD has in mind that this investigation will bring home forcibly to the American people the psychological warfare that the Red Chinese are now conducting. Among other questions we will seek to determine is whether these international bandits are holding these 11 civilian prisoners of war as ransom for their eventual, that is, Red China's eventual admission into the U. N. I could go on at some length about this, Mr. Warren, but I know our time is short. I do, however, want to make this observation, if I may: It is a great honor and privilege to substitute for Congressman DODD on this program. It occurs to me that a substitute for Mr. DODD on a subject like this is somewhat like sending in a substitute to hit for Mickey Mantle. However, let me say this: The world knows of Congressman DODD's record at Nuremberg. He knew the enemy then; he knows the enemy now.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman FEIGHAN, you have a long and outstanding record in Congress alerting the people of America to the facts of communism. Are you now convinced that this new look in Communist Russia is really a great pretense?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I really think it could better be described as the master fakery of the ages. There is absolutely no air of sincerity in their new tactical maneuvers whatever. They are fully devoted to the idea of world conquest, the destruction of nations, and nationhood. Any idea that we could coexist with them is, in my opinion, utter foolishness. In fact, I have been opposed even to the meetings at the so-called summit, because, in my opinion, the greatest accomplishment, if you could call it such, of the so-called meetings at the summit was to humanize the evil little despots of the Kremlin and to wipe off the blood, the guilty blood of many millions of martyrs and nations from the hands of Khrushchev and Bulganin. I think it is about time that we recognize that there is no sincerity, no change of policy of world conquest by the Russians, and consequently we should endeavor to engage in a political offensive in which we will eventually bring about the destruction of this ogre of world communism which deprives people of their freedom and keeps so many people and nations under the yoke of Communist bondage and slavery.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Warren, I concur with Mr. FEIGHAN in the belief that the Russians attended the Geneva summit conferences strictly for the purpose of furthering their campaign of peaceful coexistence. Whatever the purposes of the leaders of the West may have been, there is no denying that central fact. The Russians went to Geneva with the clear purpose of laying the foundation for the worldwide offensive in which they are now engaged. It is significant, in my considered judgment, to note that when the foreign ministers met several months after the meeting at the summit to bring into specific point and action the rather generalized thinking that took place at the summit conference, it is noted that they fell into complete disagreement and indeed Mr. Molotov broke up the meeting by issuing ultimatum after ultimatum, which, of course, the leaders of the West could not accept. Then this was followed by a visit to South Asia by Khrushchev and Bulganin where they did nothing but belabor the West. They belabored the British and the French and accused the United States as being the biggest imperialist power in the world.

This brings me to the point of a quotation from The Great Pretense. Harry Schwartz, a very able newspaperman who writes for the New York Times, had this to say on the subject: "The Soviet Union of the 20th Congress had posed before it the great enemy of colonialism. Here is our opportunity to expose the Soviet Union as the major colonial power on earth today. The riots in Georgia in March testified more to the continuing strength of Georgia national feeling than to love of Stalinist dictatorship. If freedom is good for India and Burma, why is it not good for Uzbekistan, for Armenia, for the Ukraine and Latvia, and for all the people whose freedom has been taken from them by the czars or their Communist successors." Here they are, the biggest colonial imperial power in all of history, calling us, the lovers of independence and the ones who have fought for the rights of nations, the imperial power. I think we could do something about that.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. O'Connor, I notice from the newspapers yesterday Shepilov, the new Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, was over in Cairo condemning the United States and the West as a great colonial power. I think it is essential that truth be brought to the world. I think one of the mediums by which this can be done is through the United Nations. Mr. DODD and four other Congressmen and myself introduced a House concurrent resolution last year calling up on the Secretary of State to send to each member nation of the U. N. a copy of the committee report of the Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, in which we had eye-witness testimony of over 300 witnesses which exposed the imperialism and colonialism and the terrible tyranny of the Russians.

We also requested that the Secretary of State draw up a resolution to be introduced by our Ambassador to the U. N., setting forth that the Russians were a threat to the peace and that they have been guilty of aggression. Unfortunately, that bill which passed the Foreign Affairs Committee, 17 to 5, was stalled in the House Rules Committee. It was certainly my hope that that will be acted on now, because I think truth is one of the biggest factors that will be effective in the cause of true peace.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman, as reported in this symposium on anti-Stalinism, as reported in The Great Pretense, Khrushchev, speaking at the opening of the 20th Congress of the party in Moscow gave the free world an ultimatum: Choose between coexistence and war. He offered no other choice in the relationship between the free and the regimented world. What do we do about this? What is the alternative? Congressman FEIGHAN, must we accept this ultimatum?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely not. Constantine Brown in the article in The Great Pretense brings up this subject of coexistence. Our committee 2 years ago in its report recognized that the Kremlin was engaged in an all-out propaganda offensive as the advocates of peaceful coexistence between the Communist empire and the free world in order to gain time, to delude the free world as to its real intentions, to divide and destroy the free-world alliances, and to prepare the way for world war III. It seems there has been a dangerous oversimplification of the courses of action open to us in this present world crisis, either preventive war or a peaceful coexistence. Our committee very flatly rejected both of these courses of action as alien to the national interest. Instead, we recommended that we undertake——

Mr. MCTIGUE. May I interrupt, Congressman FEIGHAN?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes.

Mr. MCTIGUE. To ask you, I think that the committee that we were all associated with

rejected after hearing the eye-witness testimony of the victims of this system, and very much the symposium that we have, The Great Pretense, merely extends the proof, the more current proof of the judgments that were made at the time. Would you agree with that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, a reaffirmation of our findings.

Mr. MCTIGUE. And hopefully this will continue, the good judgment of people in authoritative positions like this recognizing the threat. As I recall it, some other recommendations were made by the committee, were they not, Congressman, to defeat this coexistence?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, indeed. We recommended that the President get all the free countries of the world together and set forth their determination that all nations should have the right of national self-determination and be free. We also recommended that there be a severance by the free nations of both diplomatic and trade relations with the Communist-controlled countries.

Mr. MCTIGUE. At this juncture, is it an illusion to think that we can do business with the Soviets, the Communists?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think it is because history shows very conclusively that whenever any nation has done business with the Russians they have always come out on the short end.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I concur completely in that. I would like at this point, Mr. Warren —you have asked me what we can do about this. I would like to make a couple of suggestions. The first is that Mr. FEIGHAN last year, as I recollect it, Congressman, correct me if I am wrong, introduced in the Congress a resolution to create a joint committee of the Congress on overseas information programs, conducted by the United States Government in order to carry on a real campaign of truth, to tell the people of the world where we stand and expose the Russians for what they really are. I think that is a practical step in a political offensive against communism.

The second one is this, recommended by TOM DODD, that an international juridical commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so as to record the crimes against humanity of communism; in other words, to establish a permanent record. If such a record were established, as he recommended, there would be no ducking on the part of the leaders in the Kremlin because they would be strictly on the hook. Therefore, it seems to me that we ought in these days continue to record these crimes by the eyewitnesses because the masters in the Kremlin will continue to try and get off the hook and escape guilt for these terrible crimes.

Mr. MCTIGUE. When there comes a final accounting, Mr. O'Connor, there will be no evading the charges or the terrible atrocities which were committed by these Communists during the period of occupation and conquests, and so forth. That was on the basis of Mr. Dodd's experience at Nuremberg.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly. I think in addition to that, Mr. McTigue, such a record would stand as a warning to all free peoples to be on guard against anyone who attempts to impose a totalitarian rule and to be determined to free those who are held in bondage of such rule.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Serving notice, in other words.

Mr. WARREN. Gentlemen, can we accept this as a fact, that first the Communist Party has changed its strategy radically; secondly, that the Soviet Union has launched a new type aggression; and in the third place, that we must be aware of this and fight back to the best of our ability?

Mr. MCTIGUE. If we don't, we are going to lose, Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I am sorry, our time is up for further discussion of the The Great Pretense. The participants in today's program, Mr. James J. McTigue, consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, substituting today for the Honorable Thomas J. Dodd, who is ill; the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, Member of Congress from Ohio; Mr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the Director, United States Information Agency.

Questions and Answers on the Dividend Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provide a modest amount of relief from the double taxation of dividends have been the subject of much misunderstanding and, I am afraid, deliberate misrepresentation. Inasmuch as I sponsored the new tax law, I feel a personal responsibility for setting the record straight.

I have collected some typical questions which I have received concerning the dividend provisions, and have prepared answers which I believe will help in achieving a true understanding of these meritorious amendments:

Question. What is meant by the "double taxation" of dividends?

Answer. The double taxation of dividends exists because dividends are subject to income tax twice—once in the hands of the corporation which earns them and then in the hands of the stockholders to whom they are paid. Of course, a dividend is simply an amount which a corporation pays out of its earnings to its owners—that is, its stockholders—as a return on their investment.

The double tax effect is illustrated clearly if for the moment we ignore the modest relief now accorded by the revised tax law. Since corporations pay a 52-percent income tax, the earnings available for distribution to their owners are more than cut in half before they can be distributed as dividends. Then, when the stockholders receive what is left—and, of course, the company must keep some of its earnings itself in order to finance its operations—those stockholders themselves must pay an income tax of from 20 to 91 percent, depending on their individual incomes, on these same earnings which have already been more than cut in half by taxes. As a result of this double taxation, the combined tax burden on the distributed earnings of a corporation ranges from a little over 61 percent for persons in the lowest income-tax bracket (such as a widow living on a $2,000 income) to a little over 95 percent for persons in the highest bracket. Of course, this double burden hits the person of small means the hardest. The combined corporate and individual income-tax load borne by the dividends received by such a person from his savings is over 3 times the 20-percent rate which he pays on any other type of income, including wages.

I should also point out that it is only corporation earnings which are subject to this discriminatory double taxation. Individuals who operate their business as a partnership rather than as a corporation pay only one tax, their individual income tax. The partnership is not taxed first on its earnings before they are distributed to its partners. Furthermore, if a person operates a business, such as a grocery store, as an individual proprietor, he too is taxed only once.

Question. Aren't wages subject to the same double taxation?

Answer. Absolutely not. When a business figures its income for tax purposes, it first deducts any wages it pays its employees. Therefore, it pays no income tax at all on this amount. The only income tax paid on wages is the tax paid by the employees themselves.

Just suppose that wages were subject to the same unfair tax treatment as dividends have been today—here's what would happen: A corporation would have to pay a 52-percent tax on its employees' wages before they were even paid. Such a tax would reduce by more than half the amount which the corporation could pay out in wages. In other words, payrolls in this country would be cut by more than half. I think that you would agree that such a tax system would be indefensible and disastrous. Yet that is exactly what was happening to dividends. All the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 did was to remove a small portion of this unjust discrimination.

Question. Does the new tax law give the same type of relief to interest on bank deposits, savings bonds, and other forms of interest?

Answer. No, it does not—for a very simple reason. Interest is not subject to double taxation. Just like wages, a bank can deduct the interest it pays before figuring its income tax. In fact, any taxpayer is entitled to deduct his interest payments. Of course, the Government pays no income tax so the interest on its bonds is also free from double taxation.

Question. Do you think it right that dividends pay a lower income tax than wages?

Answer. Of course not. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 does not result in dividends getting a better tax break than wages. I have already pointed out that in the absence of the new provision the lowest combined corporation and individual income-tax burden on dividends would be 61 percent, while that on wages is only 20 percent. Therefore, the average taxpayer, the man with a small income, would bear over three times the tax burden on dividends that he does on wages. Thus, dividends already have been bearing a much higher tax load than wages. All the new tax law does is cut down this extra burden by a very small amount. The 4-percent dividend tax credit which it provides merely cuts from 61 percent to 57 percent the combined tax burden on dividends. Even so, these dividends are still taxed almost three times as much as wages. Moreover, the first $50 of dividend receipts, which the new law excludes from individual income tax, continues to be taxed at the corporate level at 52 percent as compared to the 20-percent tax which applies to wages in the first individual income tax bracket.

Question. How does the new law relieve double taxation of dividends?

Answer. Very simply. First, every taxpayer can completely exclude from his income up to $50 of dividends. This does not mean that he can exclude any dividend payment which is $50 or less, but merely that out of his total dividend receipts he can exclude a total of up to $50. Therefore, a taxpayer whose total dividends from all sources do not exceed $50 pays no tax whatever on his dividends. This will be a tremendous benefit to small stockholders, to individuals who have invested a small portion of their savings in stocks.

Second, in addition to the $50 exclusion, a taxpayer is given a tax credit equal to 4 percent of any dividends in excess of the exclusion. Here's how it works: Take as an

example a widow with a total income of $2,000, of which $150 consists of dividends. First, she completely excludes $50, as I have already explained. Then she figures her income tax on the remaining $1,950 just as usual, including the $100 of her dividends still subject to tax. Let's say that her tax on this whole amount comes to $120. Then she figures 4 percent of her taxable dividends of $100. That comes to $4. She simply deducts that $4 from the $120 tax she has computed. Her final tax will be $116. This reflects a total tax reduction of $14 in this case as a result of the new provisions, $4 due to the tax credit and $10 on account of the exclusion; that is, 20 percent of $50.

Question. Why does the new law provide a credit which comes off the tax rather than a simple deduction to be taken in computing taxable income? Doesn't this method favor well-to-do taxpayers?

Answer. Just the contrary is true. The deduction method would favor wealthy taxpayers. For example, a $100 deduction would mean a tax saving of only $20 to a person in the first bracket but it would mean a saving of up to $91 for individuals in the upper brackets.

The tax-credit method adopted in the new law means that every taxpayer, no matter what his income, receives exactly the same amount of tax relief with respect to the same amount of dividends. For example, the 4-percent tax credit gives a person in the first bracket a $4 tax cut on $100 in dividends. A person in the top bracket receives exactly the same $4 tax cut, and no more.

As a matter of fact, the method contained in the new law gives proportionately much more relief to lower-bracket individuals than to upper-bracket taxpayers. Without the credit an individual in the first bracket would pay a $20 tax on $100 in dividends. The 4-percent tax credit cuts that $20 tax to $16—a 20-percent reduction in his tax on those dividends. On the other hand, a top-bracket taxpayer without the credit would pay a $91 tax on the same $100 in dividends. The 4-percent tax credit reduces that $91 tax to $87—only about a 4-percent reduction in his tax on those dividends, instead of 20 percent.

Question. Why doesn't the new law reduce double taxation by allowing a corporation to deduct all or part of its dividends in figuring its tax, just as it can wages?

Answer. This is undoubtedly one method by which double taxation of dividends could be reduced or even eliminated, and it was given careful study. The trouble is that, if you give a corporation a deduction for dividends, you create a tremendous pressure on management to distribute earnings. Therefore, it was felt that such a tax system would interfere with sound business judgment as to how much of a corporation's earnings can safely be distributed and how much should be retained in the business. It was also felt that such a system would discriminate particularly against small, new companies who are most dependent upon retained earnings to finance their growth.

These reasons, plus our previous unfortunate experience with an undistributed profits tax, led to the decision to give relief at the individual shareholder level.

Question. Do any other countries in the world give relief from double taxation of dividends?

Answer. They certainly do. England has given such relief for well over 100 years. Under the British system, a taxpayer can claim a credit for the amount of tax actually paid by the corporation on his dividends. The fact that England has given such relief for over a century is significant in view of the fact that we usually think of the British income tax as especially heavy.

Canada already gives a 20-percent tax credit for dividends. This is exactly the same method contained in our new tax law except that our credit is only 4 percent. Thus, Canada already gives five times the dividend tax relief that we provide. Of course, our new law also gives a complete exclusion of up to $50 of dividends in order to help small stockholders. Canada does not do this.

Sweden, which is usually considered to be one of the most progressive countries in Europe, also gives relief from double taxation of dividends.

In fact, not only is the new dividend provision not something revolutionary, but it is actually simple equity which other countries have recognized years ago. The truth is that the United States has been extremely backward in this regard.

Question. Even assuming that other countries have given relief from the double taxation of dividends, isn't such a proposal still pretty revolutionary in the United States?

Answer. Just the contrary. Our income tax was first adopted in 1913. It was provided then that dividends should not be subject to higher tax than other sources of income. To accomplish this, dividends were exempt from the normal tax in the hands of individuals. Since initially the corporate tax and the individual normal tax were at the same rate, this meant in effect that dividends did not bear the burden of double taxation. While these rate relationships were not maintained, dividends were consistently exempt from the individual normal tax, and in 1918 the exemption was as high as 12 percent on some income. The exemption from normal tax continued for 23 years, right up to 1936. It is interesting to note that the exemption in 1936 was 4 percent—exactly the same amount of relief which the new tax-revision law provides.

In 1936, President Roosevelt recommended the complete elimination of double taxation by exempting from the corporate income tax any earnings which were distributed in dividends. In his message accompanying this recommendation that the corporate income tax only be imposed on undistributed income, the President stated that his proposal "would constitute distinct progress in tax reform."

Since that time, prominent individuals from all parts of the country, both Democrats and Republicans alike, have recommended immediate steps to remove double taxation of dividends.

In 1944, for example, a special committee of the then Democratic Congress made the following recommendation:

"Consideration should be given to the elimination of the present double taxation of dividend income, either by treating the tax on corporate income as a withholding tax and exempting dividends from the personal normal tax, or by some equivalent provision."

The chairman of that group was Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, now ranking Democratic member and chairman of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee.

In 1947, all 10 Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee strongly criticized the Republican majority for not taking up the question of double taxation of dividends.

Therefore, you can see that not only is this type of provision not unusual in other countries, it represents a concept which is far from new in our own country.

Question. Is it true that most of the tax relief contained in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 went to stockholders?

Answer. This is absolutely not true. The 1954 tax law gave $827 million tax relief in 1954 to individual taxpayers and $536 million tax relief to business. Of this total tax relief of $1,363 million, stockholders received $204 million—or only about one-seventh of the total—because of the partial relief from double taxation. Moreover, more liberal deductions for dependents, deductions allowed working mothers for the expense of child care, bigger allowances for medical expenses, and tax reduction for retired people—these alone added up to well over $400 million relief for individual taxpayers, more than twice the relief given from double taxation of dividends.

One other fact is frequently overlooked and that is that the new law extended for 1 year the 52 percent corporate income tax which would otherwise have gone down to 47 percent April 1, 1954. This meant an additional $1.2 billion tax burden which had to be borne indirectly by corporation stockholders—a tax load which was approximately six times the relief these same individuals received from the double taxation of dividends.

Question. Who are the stockholders who will benefit from the new provision? Aren't stockholders the wealthiest group in the country?

Answer. There are some 6,500,000 stockholders in publicly held corporations. Certainly, some of them are wealthy, and some of them are poor. However, on the whole, they represent a pretty fair cross section of our people.

Let's take a look at some figures which show who the stockholders of this country are:

Four and three-tenths percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

Almost 10 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

Almost 20 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $4,000 a year.

Over 30 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

Finally, over 75 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $10,000 a year.

Thus, the great majority of the stockholders of this country are in the low- and middle-income groups.

One of the biggest companies in the country is the United States Steel Corp. I think it safe to assume that its stockholders are fairly typical. Here are some facts about United States Steel's stockholders which a recent survey brought out:

Only 10 percent of its stockholders had incomes over $25,000.

Nearly three-fifths of them—56 percent—had incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

It had as many stockholders with incomes below $4,300 as there were with incomes above that amount.

Finally—and this is the most interesting figure of all—53 percent of United States Steel's stockholders had incomes below the average wage paid to the company's steelworkers.

Now, let's take a look at the number of tax returns which show dividend income. For 1952, the latest year for which the figures are available, 4,219,000 returns were filed which showed dividends as part of the taxpayer's income; 1,896,000 of those returns—about 45 percent of the total—report adjusted gross income from all sources of less than $5,000.

Therefore, those who try to tell you that the dividend provision helps only the rich either do not know the facts, or they are trying deliberately to mislead you.

Hundreds of thousands of housewives are stockholders. Many thousands of elderly retired people depend upon their small stockholdings for their livelihood. Most important of all, let us not overlook the many thousands of thrifty workers who every day, more and more, are purchasing small amounts of stock in their employer's business through payroll deductions. This wholesome trend means that a growing proportion of our country's wage earners are

acquiring a direct stake in our free-enterprise system through stock ownership.

Question. Why should we encourage people to buy stocks?

Answer. The answer is simple—in order to create jobs for the American people. To put a man to work, there must be a plant for him to work in. There must be tools and machinery for him to work with. It takes money to provide those things. It is estimated that it takes between ten and fifteen thousand dollars of new capital to create one new job. When you realize that upward of 700,000 young people come into the labor market and seek employment for the first time every year, you get an idea of the tremendous amount of new capital investment that we need every year if we are to provide the job opportunities these young Americans deserve. There is only one fundamental source of this new capital and that is the earnings of our people. The savings from those earnings must provide the capital out of which new jobs and a higher standard of living can be created. When a thrifty individual saves a part of his earnings and invests those savings, he is not only providing for his own security but he is helping to build a strong future for America.

Question. Why can't corporations raise new capital by borrowing instead of by selling stock?

Answer. They can—at least large, well-established businesses can.

Of course, small businesses, especially those just being started, frequently are not in a position to borrow. Just because their businesses are new and not yet established, they are usually considered too risky for bank loans. Therefore, new business must depend to a very large extent upon capital raised through the sale of stocks. This is of great significance, because it is these new and relatively small concerns of today which will provide the strength of our economy tomorrow.

Big business usually can borrow to meet its capital requirements. In fact, it is advantageous for it to borrow because the interest is deductible for tax purposes, while if it raises capital through the sale of stock it gets no deduction for any dividends it pays. This present discriminatory treatment of equity (stock) financing is one reason why business generally has become more and more dependent on debt financing. For every dollar raised since the last war by new stock issues, industry has raised almost $3 by bond issues, mortgages, and bank loans and supplied $9 from retained earnings and depreciation reserves. To provide capital funds, industry found it necessary to double its debt and to reduce the percentage of earnings paid out in dividends. The result has been that total corporate debt at the end of 1953 was $211 billion, more than double what it was at the end of World War II.

This is a very unhealthy situation. Borrowed money has to be used in relatively safe undertakings. It cannot be used ordinarily for experimentation, for carrying out new methods and processes, for developing new products. These things take "risk" capital, capital which is willing to take a chance. If we were perfectly satisfied to let this country stand still, then it might be all right to have business depend on borrowed money in this manner. But if we want our American economy to expand and to provide a steadily rising standard of living for our people, then we must encourage the raising of capital through the sale of stock rather than through borrowing.

These therefore are the two major objectives of the dividend provision contained in the new tax law:

First, to give some relief from discriminatory double taxation; and

Second, to encourage the development of risk capital—capital which is willing to take a chance on the future of America.

The Defeat of H. R. 12061 Was a Victory for Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

A STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the House considered at length and refused to pass H. R. 12061, known as the Gore-Holifield bill, to put the Federal Government into the atomic-power business. This bill, had it been passed, would have had far-reaching and adverse effects on the survival of our country, and on the American freedom as we have known it. It would have been a long step toward complete socialization of American industry. The history of the embracement of socialism has been a history of the downfall of nations and the loss of personal freedoms. Surely we in America, where the private-enterprise system has given us the highest standard of living in the world today, will not tolerate turning to a system which has been a failure throughout history, and which has destroyed other nations.

THE DANGER TO OUR COUNTRY

The passage of H. R. 12061 would have authorized and directed actions that honorable, competent, and patriotic witnesses testified would adversely affect military and defense activities of the United States.

The testimony of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Admiral Strauss, and of his scientist associate, Dr. Libby, as well as that of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, was that the shortage of competent scientific personnel is the most serious problem today.

The bill provided for construction, by the Federal Government, of an unspecified number of large-scale atomic powerplants, and of an unknown number of smaller scale atomic powerplants. These plants would have been uneconomic. They would have been obsolete almost as soon as they were constructed. Their operation would have required large Federal subsidies, possibly in excess of $100 million annually.

It would be unthinkable and the height of folly to jeopardize our defense position, even our Nation's existence, by spreading the layer of competent scientific and technical personnel thinner, as we would have done, by embarking on this "crash" program.

WHY?

In view of the potential threat to the security of our Nation, a logical question is, Why were we being asked to take this step down the road toward socialism? What were the purported reasons given by the proponents?

A look at the record discloses quite clearly that the reasons advanced were without foundation in fact. It is the same old, old story of trying to use a somewhat plausible basis of action to hide the thinly disguised, real purpose of the bill.

The proponents of this "crash" program of Federal construction at atomic powerplants claimed this program was necessary because no one is building the various designs of nuclear reactors. The record does not bear this out. On page 49, of part I, of the hearings on the second supplemental bill for 1957, Mr. Strauss, AEC Chairman, was asked whether the Federal Government should build more plants. The answer was:

I think the Federal Government should only build plants in the event we have a design for a reactor that we think should be built and where private industry won't build it. Then I think we should.

Mr. Strauss then said:

We have no reactor as of the moment which we feel is ready to go into large-scale construction that has not been contracted for or negotiated for by private industry.

To which Mr. W. K. Davis, Director of the Division of Reactor Development, added:

That is absolutely correct.

Again on page 40 of part I of the hearings, Mr. Strauss said:

Every type that is promising in the opinion of the Commission is either today building or projected as a prototype or full-scale plant or is in active investigation in one of the laboratories of the Commission.

Various spokesmen for private industry have testified or issued statements to the effect that they propose to continue to take a leading part in the research and development of nuclear power reactors with the ultimate aim of economic power production. It has been estimated that their present expenditures are at a rate of $30 million a year and plans are now outstanding for expending several hundred millions of dollars for nuclear powerplants.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was passed less than 2 years ago. It was not until the passage of this act that private industry, and public bodies and cooperatives, were permitted to take an active interest in the development of nuclear powerplants. Any reasonable person, without a preconceived desire to ignore the facts in order to make a case for the crash Federal program, will be astounded at the progress that has been made in a little over a year after the first round of proposals were received, in the spring of 1955.

Table II on page 98 of part II of the House hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, indicates the magnitude of the program, now under way or contemplated.

In view of the progress that has been made in a little over a year since AEC opened the gate for private, cooperative, and publicly owned groups to participate in atomic power development, one must wonder why this urgency to get the Federal Government involved in constructing and operating full-scale atomic powerplants.

The proposal for the crash Federal program was introduced in the other body on July 30, 1955, just 11 months after the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was signed and only a few months after the

last date of filing proposals with the Atomic Energy Commission for the first round of non-Federal participation in reactor development. Can anyone doubt or deny that initially the Gore bill was a public power proposal pure and simple?

Even though H. R. 12061 represented some changes from the original Gore bill, the basic design was still there, and to confirm this, the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, July 18, 1956, quoted the author of the bill, in the other body, as saying with respect to the present bill:

> He regards its provisions for governmental construction of atomic-power plants as one of the keystones of a four-point public-power program he expects the Democrats to spell out in their platform at the party's Chicago convention.

Can anything be clearer?

With all the ballyhoo about getting something started, there was no definite information in the bill, nor the accompanying report, as to the number, size, type, or location of the nuclear reactors to be constructed. The basis for the estimated cost was, and still is, a mystery.

The Nation should be thankful for the House's refusal to commit the taxpayers to spending $400 million—it is admitted that this is a general overall estimate—or maybe several times that amount, for uneconomic nuclear-power plants of unknown types, size, and safety characteristics. There can be little question, had H. R. 12061 passed, that it would have received a deserved veto.

Government Must Be Limited to Its Legitimate Constitutional Functions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by Mr. Willis Stone delivered before the Congress of Freedom at Dallas, Tex., last April 7.

This speech contained figures which may seem incredible. But a check has been made and I find that included in the principal statistical sources drawn upon for facts were such authentic publications as our own United States Government Manual, the Federal budgets for recent years, the audit reports of the Comptroller General on Government-owned corporations, the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the reports and task force reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the statistical abstracts of the United States, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Stone has developed the thesis that the misuse of the taxing power is making us captives of the Federal bureaucracy. I cannot resist, therefore, supporting Mr. Stone's thesis by again pointing out the legitimate functions of Government to which its activities should be limited. Moral wrongs, whether by Government or by individuals, cannot long be tolerated.

We do have legitimate areas laid down in the Constitution within which Government can function. All others are illegitimate. These illegitimate functions I hate as much as anyone.

There is just one legitimate area, and only one, where the Central Government is honorable and, indeed, admirable, and, on the whole, honest. That area has to do with the defense of the people's rights and property, the maintenance of law and order, and the sacrifice having to do with national defense.

These are legitimate functions of Government not merely because the Constitution or the contract with Government says so. They are proper functions because the moral and natural law made them so, long before the Constitution. They are in the nature of things. The individual has the same rights and powers with the same limitations imposed on him by the moral and natural law. He can use force to defend himself and his property. And that is the only time he can use force on another person without his consent. He can transfer that right and power to Government as his agent. And since all rights and powers come from the Creator to the individual, he can convey no different or higher right or power to Government than he himself possesses.

Even if people should vote by a majority to give more power to Government than they themselves possess as individuals, the transfer would be no good. When Satan offered to Jesus, in the hour of His greatest temptation, the powers and privileges of the kingdoms of the world, Jesus rejected them utterly. Satan had no such power as he pretended to have to transfer to Jesus. He had simply assumed to have an immoral and illegal power over the people which he had no right to convey.

When the Government goes beyond that restricted area which is the only natural and moral area possible for Government to occupy, then without exception it becomes dishonorable, full of misrepresentation and corruption. It exploits the people to do special favors for special groups in return for their votes. It pretends to be able to manage people and their property better than they can manage for themselves. It attempts to play God in the lives of the people.

GOVERNMENT IS MORALLY WRONG

It is beginning to dawn upon us that using the force of Government to take other people's property to do good according to Government's notion of what is good is all dead wrong. The fact that the whole world is morally wrong by taking people's private property and making it government-owned emphasizes the extent of the world collapse of morals. And, of course, what is morally wrong is contrary to the laws of God. The world violates them with contempt. When Government violates the laws of God by doing what no individual can morally do, then it is just as guilty of wrong as the individual would be guilty. What we have been doing has always been regarded economically wrong. It is indeed both economically and morally wrong.

For example, a lot of our old neighbors, some of our children, fell in love with the mountains and deserts of the great West. They knew before they went west that there was no water in the deserts. They went anyway. They never dreamed of tapping every eastern family $25 for every billion dollars needed for water. Yet when they organized themselves into political groups they said to their Congressmen, "You go back there and take $25 on the average from every family in the East, or we will not reelect you to Congress." So, the Congressmen have done very well. They have already collected about $150 from each family, or about $6 billion altogether for that purpose.

ANOTHER MORAL WRONG

As another example of the immoral and ridiculous, take a look at TVA in Tennessee. That was our first planting of a Socialist rose in a patch of weeds, otherwise called the free economy. All competition was killed off for its benefit. The rose has had to be artificially fed ever since 1922. And the feeding has cost us in recent years $190 million per year, a total of over $2 billion. That is another $50 per family Government has outrageously presumed to have the power to take from us. It sells power below cost so that 110,000 families heat their houses with electricity at your expense. TVA never can earn a surplus at such rates to build new facilities for a growing population. And Government can never raise the rates and keep the votes of the people. There will always be a shortage of power so long as TVA has to depend on Congress for its life. Industry will not move into Tennessee because they cannot depend on Congress to continue to carry such a weakling. Congress cannot depend on itself either in that regard. TVA does not pay a dime toward the national defense—it is exempt from all taxes. It has been a blight on the State of Tennessee. It has constantly fallen behind all the other 11 southeastern private power-producing States in agricultural products, in manufacturing, in retail sales, in growth of new business, in postal receipts. All this is in accordance to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States survey in 1953.

On all of our Socialist projects above described, the Government spends $10 billion annually, and loses most of it. That is $250 annually per family. And it is growing much worse. There is no restraint or reversal of the trend in sight.

WHO CAN STOP ALL THIS?—THE PRESIDENT CAN'T

Clearly the President cannot stop it. When he runs for reelection this fall, he will be met by a committee at nearly every State line asking, one after the other, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from others to give to us for more power this year?"

CONGRESS CAN'T STOP IT

Congress certainly cannot stop it. Congress has tried and failed.

THE REMEDY IS CONSTITUTIONAL, NOT LEGISLATIVE

We are now in somewhat the same position as that of our ancestors just prior to 1789. We, the people, must, as they did then, reassert and redefine, so

that even the Supreme Court cannot misinterpret, the constitutional limitations on the functions of the Government. The taxing and spending powers of Congress must be limited again. We must first of all correct the dreadful mistake made in 1913, called the 16th amendment, which gave unlimited power to Congress to tax and spend. We must chain the politicians, as Jefferson said, to the limitations of the Constitution so they cannot break away from them.

We should make of ourselves a true example of freedom again in the world. It does not exist today. Thus we might hope to repeat the contribution which we made in the past against the police states of the world. Thus we could hope to reestablish peace at home and in the world.

Alaska Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the application of Federal income taxes to individuals living in Alaska and to businesses operating there has been a matter of increasing concern as the cost of living has gone up and as the cost of doing business has gone up. Attention has been even more closely focused on this subject since there has been a determination that the cost-of-living allowance paid to Federal employees there—and elsewhere outside the continental limits of the United States—is not subject to income taxes. Comparisons are made between Alaska and Hawaii, where all Federal taxes and all other Federal laws apply, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to which the United States Federal income tax has never been extended. It has been urged by some that Federal taxes should be abolished insofar as Alaska is concerned. Others have argued that there ought to be treatment for non-Federal workers—and businesses—comparable to that accorded Federal employees. Still others, including Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman, have advocated a Federal tax holiday. To the best of my knowledge, it has never been exactly spelled out how this would operate.

It is understood, of course, that Alaskans are not alone in having to hand over to the tax collector so much of the income they derive from wages or salaries, or profits they make from business. Everyone in the 48 States and in our sister Territory of Hawaii is required to pay to the Federal Government much, much more than before World War II. The difference is one of degree. That is to say, the Alaska wage earner is required to earn much more than he would in the States for living based upon minimum standards; yet to attain this living he is projected into an income-tax bracket the effect of which is to take from him much more than would be the case if he were living in an area of lower cost.

I am writing this report to give my fellow Alaskans the benefit of the knowledge I have been able to acquire on the subject. It is one which may be made to lend itself, and very easily, to an emotional approach. This is an election year. In the heat of a campaign it is easy enough for a candidate to promise the voters that if he is elected he will do away with taxes and provide at the same time more services; it is just as easy to promise the moon and the stars. It has not been my habit to make empty promises, and I do not intend to start now. I only intend to report.

It has been said in Alaska that there should not be taxation without representation. I believe there should not be. There should not be taxation without representation anywhere under the American flag. It is contrary to the very concepts upon which this Government was founded. Too long continued, it becomes not only offensive but in my opinion downright immoral. But here again I must warn myself that emotionalism must not be substituted for the factual. It was over 6 years ago that I requested from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress an opinion on the constitutionality of Federal taxes as applied to Alaska. That opinion, written in the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service, had this to say upon the proposition of taxation without representation:

> The further contention that lack of representation invalidates a tax was laid at rest in *Heald* v. *District of Columbia* ((1922) 259 U. S. 114), when the Supreme Court stated:
>
> "Finally it is earnestly contended that the act is void, because it subjects the residents of the District to taxation without representation. Residents of the District lack the suffrage and have politically no voice in the expenditure of the money raised by taxation. Money so raised is paid into the Treasury of the United States, where it is held, not as a separate fund for the District, but subject to the disposal of Congress, like other revenues raised by Federal taxation. The objection that the tax is void because of these facts is fundamental and comprehensive. It is not limited in application to the tax on intangibles, but goes to the validity of all taxation of residents of the District. If sound, it would seem to apply not only to taxes levied upon residents of the District for the support of the government of the District; but also to those taxes which are levied upon them for the support generally of the Government of the United States. It is sufficient to say that the objection is not sound. There is no constitutional provision which so limits the power of Congress that taxes can be imposed only upon those who have political representation."

Mr. Speaker, it was in the spring of 1954 that the late Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, of Hawaii, and I joined in a proposal made to the Treasury Department that the same treatment given Federal employees in respect to cost-of-living allowances be granted to those in private employment in Hawaii and Alaska. Hon. M. B. Folsom, then Under Secretary of the Treasury and now Secretary of the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, rejected our proposal on behalf of the Treasury Department.

In the autumn of 1954 Mayor Cyril A. Coyne, of Skagway, Alaska, came to Washington to renew the effort to convince Treasury officials that they should support tax exemption for Alaska. This was after the Central Labor Council of Skagway had decided to seek action. Mayor Coyne, a group of interested men in Washington, D. C., and I met with Under Secretary Folsom and one of his principal advisers. Early in 1955 the Treasury Department, through Mr. Folsom, again declined to take affirmative action. In writing Mayor Coyne, the Treasury Under Secretary said:

> I appreciate the point which your group raised with reference to your higher cost of living but there are, of course, also great differences in the cost of living within the 48 States. A differential tax treatment based on cost of living would appear to open the way to really immense complications and new and different sorts of discriminations between different sections and regions.

In writing to me on the same subject, Under Secretary Folsom said in part:

> The tax exemption of certain Government cost-of-living allowances does perhaps create an awkward precedent and I can understand your feeling and that of Mayor Coyne and his associates. However, I believe that the tax exemption of the Government allowances was adopted as an alternative to higher gross allowances. For most people it seems likely that pay scales over the years have come to reflect the living cost. Special tax exemptions under such circumstances would thus not seem to be called for.

In the fall of 1955 Governor Heintzleman, of Alaska, in a speech made in Portland, Oreg., proposed that Alaska be given a 20-year moratorium on Federal income taxation. Later it was reported from Washington that this idea had not been cleared with the Eisenhower administration.

Indeed, then Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay dismissed the Governor's proposal with the comment:

> I think that was just Frank's idea.

The Secretary was reported to have also definitely stated the suggestion had not even been discussed with him, much less cleared with the Eisenhower administration. The newspaper article to which I refer added:

> McKay went on to indicate that while it might be a fine thing for Alaska, a tax moratorium for Alaska has about as much chance of passing by Congress as a bill to replace the stars and stripes on the American flag with the hammer and sickle.

In a special dispatch to the Anchorage Daily News, Washington Correspondent David Fernsler reported:

> Involved also in doubts over the Heintzleman proposal is the well-recognized fact that one Congress cannot bind another. Legislation by this Congress to grant a tax holiday would not be binding upon the next Congress. Any succeeding Congress could change the order of things.
>
> In the case of Alaska where investments in business would be sought, this would be most important. Investors might hesitate to embark on a long-range program without more binding assurance than this that they would escape United States taxes.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I called attention to all this in a letter written to

Acting Secretary of the Interior Davis on May 17 of this year, and stated in part:

It would be most helpful to me if I could learn from you first if Governor Heintzleman has ever taken up with the Department of the Interior this proposal for a Federal tax incentive or holiday relating to Alaska. If he has, can you inform me if the Department proposes to seek legislative action in harmony with Governor Heintzleman's suggestion? Likewise, I should be most appreciative if you will let me know if generally the Department of the Interior is sympathetic with Governor Heintzleman's plan to take industry to Alaska by decreasing or abolishing the Federal taxes and if the Department believes that such a proposition is sound legally in view of the fact that Alaska is an incorporated Territory.

The reply, dated June 11, came to me from Assistant Secretary of the Interior D'Ewart, which said in part:

Governor Heintzleman on several occasions has discussed with officials of the Department his views with respect to encouraging the industrial development of the Territory. We are in complete and wholehearted agreement with the Governor that mining and other industries in Alaska should be expanded. However, we have requested Governor Heintzleman to submit to us a more detailed and specific proposal embodying his views on the subject so that this Department may give it formal consideration. For this reason we have not looked into the legal aspects of the matter. Without question incentives of the type apparently contemplated by the Governor could be put into effect only as a result of congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, even then I did not stop. My next letter was addressed to Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey on June 22 in which I reviewed the history of the subject and then said:

There are wide differences, of course, between living costs in New York City or Washington, D. C., for example, and a small town in Mississippi. Nevertheless, this argument fails to satisfy. The "wide difference" to which Mr. Folsom alluded is not sufficient to require the Federal Government to grant a cost-of-living allowance to the Federal employees in Washington, D. C., or New York City. Yet the Federal Government must grant the allowance in Alaska not only as a matter of simple justice but to keep personnel there. An accurate cost-of-living survey has not been made for several years but since the cost of living has not decreased notably anywhere, the latest available figures will not, I am confident, be too far out of line. When the last survey was conducted the cost of living in Anchorage, Alaska, was something on the order of 41 percent more than in Washington, D. C., and in Fairbanks, Alaska, it was something like 48 percent more. That is the essential factor, I suggest, which ought to permit the Treasury Department to give sympathetic consideration to a tax adjustment for Alaska without being accused of favoring one section of the country.

Governor Heintzleman, of Alaska, has proposed repeatedly in public statements and in speeches that tax exemptions (whether total or partial is not clear) be allowed by the Federal Government for a period of 20 years. This, he has stated, would, more than anything else, attract capital to Alaska and permit constructive development of the Territory's wealth of natural resources. I must assume that in some measure or other Governor Heintzleman speaks for the administration in this, since as the chief executive official of the Territory and an appointee of the President he is the administration's spokesman in matters relating to Alaska.

After receiving Mr. Folsom's letter I judged it would be a mere gesture and a fruitless effort if I were to introduce legislation in the Congress bearing on this subject. And it is not my intention to do so at this time. Rather, it occurred to me that it would be far preferable to write this letter to you explaining the situation and the need in the hope that instead of receiving the formal views of the Treasury Department by way of report on any bill which might be introduced, I might have a prior expression from you. Therefore, I respectfully request that Federal taxation policies, as they relate to the welfare of individual Alaskans and the development of that great Territory, be carefully examined with a view to determining if we could not jointly correct that which certainly has the surface appearance of being discriminatory and of being hurtful to the best interests of the United States in that it hinders growth of business and industry and employment of labor.

Secretary Humphrey was kind in replying to me without delay. But he held out no hope for tax relief in his letter of July 3 when he said:

I regret that I cannot give you any encouragement for Treasury Department support for such legislation. Under Secretary Folsom's letter of February 3 to you indicated the problem which the Treasury has in dealing with the numerous requests for special tax treatment and allowances for different purposes. You recognize in your letter that substantial differences in the cost of living also exist within the 48 States. The fact that certain cost-of-living allowances to Federal employees were made nontaxable by the Congress was presumably an alternative to a higher direct adjustment in pay. As Mr. Folsom pointed out, the practice regarding Federal compensation cannot be presumed to reflect a general practice, since in most cases it seems likely that regular compensation will have come to reflect the living cost. A general increase in exemptions or a cost-of-living deduction would give a special tax benefit even to those whose compensation has already been adjusted to reflect any cost-of-living differences on the normal taxable basis.

Not yet persuaded, Mr. Speaker, I wrote Secretary Humphrey once more, elaborating on the point previously made and making specific reference to the possibility of a tax holiday for business, to which the Treasury Secretary replied on July 12:

I am afraid that I would have about the same reaction to a proposal for a tax holiday for business income in Alaska. There are so many proposals for special relief of one sort and another. They would all add up to a really tremendous revenue loss that would prevent any reduction in general tax rates for many years to come. It is so important for the whole country to get all the rates down as soon as we can that I could not agree to starting on a series of special exemptions that would prevent general tax relief.

I do appreciate very much the spirit in which you have written me and I wish that I might be more encouraging to you. I have had to disagree with so many other similar suggestions for other good purposes that I do not see how I could make an exception in the special situation which you describe in Alaska, important though it is.

Next I thought it would be appropriate to consult with our esteemed colleague, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas. I took this matter up with Mr. MILLS because he had recently been appointed chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee to study income-tax matters. In a letter which he wrote me Mr. MILLS held out no more hope for special consideration for Alaska than had Secretary Humphrey. I present his letter here:

I have read your letters to the Honorable George M. Humphrey of June 22 and July 6, 1956, with considerable interest. As an attorney, I must confess that I am somewhat startled by your suggestions that some tax preference should be provided for resident individuals and businesses of the Territory of Alaska.

As I recall, the organic act governing Alaska provides that the Constitution of the United States and all of the laws thereof shall have the same force and effect within the Territory of Alaska as elsewhere in the United States. In other words, it would appear that the uniformity clause of the Constitution requires that all Federal tax laws apply uniformly to Alaska, just as to any other part of the United States.

In saying this, I am not unaware of the doubts expressed by some as to whether the Federal income tax qualifies as a duty, impost or excise within the meaning of the uniformity clause. However, I remember the case of *Stratton's Independence* v. *Howbert* held a Federal corporate income tax to be an excise tax, measured by income, on the privilege of doing business as a corporation.

It has also been argued that Congress' power to enact legislation governing the Territories is derived from article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution, and that this power is independent of the prohibition contained in the uniformity clause. This question has never been decided by the courts. However, I am inclined to think that if and when it arises, the courts will decide that the mandate of the uniformity clause must prevail.

Aside from the constitutional doubts that I have about your suggestion that Alaska be accorded some tax preference, I am also concerned about the economic basis and justification for such a preference. Both of us are aware that the cost of living is not uniform throughout the United States. Granting a tax preference for Alaska would set a precedent which would compel like treatment for other high-cost areas within the United States and eventually lead to unbearable complexity in the Internal Revenue Code.

In closing, let me suggest that it is possible that a tax preference for resident individuals or businesses of Alaska could do irreparable harm to the Territory's chances of becoming a State of the Union. Severe though the economic problems of the Territory may be, nevertheless, I do not believe that the answer to them lies in a tax holiday for the Territory.

I then talked with the ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED. Mr. REED told me, "I can readily appreciate the reasons you have set forth with regard to the application of a lower Federal income tax in Alaska. On the other hand, I should think that Alaskans generally would wish to avoid being treated differently from the residents of the States. Moreover, I believe that you will agree that practically all of the reasons for a differential tax treatment with regard to Alaska also apply, although perhaps with lesser force, in many of the States. The difference is really largely one of degree. I really think that adoption of such a plan might start us along a very dangerous road."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that administration support for the elimination or reduction of Federal income taxes in Alaska cannot be expected. Secretary Humphrey has made that clear. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic member of the

House Ways and Means Committee, junior in service only to Chairman COOPER, has indicated the substantial doubt of relief which he entertained. Mr. Speaker, the esteemed ranking minority member, Mr. REED, has not been persuaded that Alaskans should enjoy a special tax treatment.

In the face of all this, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to delude or betray my fellow Alaskans by telling them that tax relief can be arranged simply and without too much effort. All the evidence—and it is massive—points to the contrary. Constitutional considerations, a seeming fear that special benefits for Alaskans might create a chain reaction, and considerations of practical application—these are the high barriers to tax relief in the Territory.

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, During the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the 84th Congress the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives had one of its busiest and most productive two sessions. During this Congress 655 House bills and resolutions and 30 Senate bills were referred to the House Post Office and Civil Sevice Committee. The committee recommended favorably 26 House bills and 18 Senate bills. Thirty-five bills acted on by the committee became law. Six bills recommended by the committee and passed by the House are pending in the Senate.

The committee approved the following reports:

House Report No. 434: The General Accounting Office's Report on Leave Practices in Post Offices, April 21, 1955.

House Report No. 435: The General Accounting Office's Report on Financial Management of the Post Office Department, April 21, 1955.

House Report No. 1740: Study of Manpower Management in the Federal Government, February 2, 1956.

House Report No. 1741: General and Financial Management, Decentralization and Reorganization of the Post Office Department, February 2, 1956.

House Report No. 1744: Leave Administration in the Departments and Agencies, February 6, 1956.

House Report No. 1844: United States Civil Service Commission, March 1, 1956.

House Report No. 2109: Personnel Programs and Policies of the Federal Government in Overseas Operations, May 3, 1956.

House Report No. 2961: Study of Manpower Utilization and Personnel Management in the Federal Government—Interim Report—August 6, 1956.

MAJOR LEGISLATION NOW PUBLIC LAW—SALARY INCREASES FOR 1,573,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The committee held extensive hearings on legislation to increase the salaries and classify the positions of officers and employees of the postal field service. Deliberations of the committee on this extremely complex and difficult subject resulted in approval of a committee bill which was passed by the House. Virtually all of the principles of this bill are included in Public Law 68, 84th Congress, which provides salary increases averaging 8.1 percent for all postal field service employees and establishing a modern, realistic system for the classification of their positions on the basis of the relationships of the various positions and the levels of the duties and responsibilities thereof.

The committee also held complete hearings and recommended legislation with respect to salary increases for classified Federal employees, resulting in enactment of Public Law 94, which gave each employee a 7½-percent increase.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR 328,000 RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The third of a series of increases for Federal employees already retired was approved in the first session of this Congress. Under this legislation, Public Law 369, 84th Congress, the annuities of those on the retirement rolls June 30, 1955, were increased by 12 percent on the first $1,500 and 8 percent on all over $1,500. Annuities of those who retired after that date but before January 1, 1958, will be increased but lesser percentages on a gradually declining scale.

IMPROVED FEDERAL CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT 2,400,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Title IV of Public Law 854, 84th Congress, completely rewrites the Civil Service Retirement Act. Under its provisions the average annuity benefit for Federal employees is increased by 25 percent and this increase affects the annuities of the surviving spouses. The average increase in annuities of surviving children is 150 percent. Other important features of the law are: First, an annuity is provided in case of involuntary separation after 50 years of age with 20 years of service; second, there is a minimum annuity of 40 percent assured for those retiring for disability; third, there is a cut of 50 percent in the amount an individual's annuity is reduced in cases where an employee retires when less than 60 years of age; fourth, an employee may provide an annuity for his widow by taking a reduction in his annuity of only 2½ percent for the first $2,400 and 10 percent for the remainder. This compares to the present reduction of 5 percent for the first $1,500 and 10 percent for the remainder.

This law also provides for a more realistic approach to handling the civil service retirement fund. It establishes as a goal the normal cost plus interest representing the Government's contribution to the fund and provides that each department and agency will contribute to the fund at a payroll cost of 6½ percent an amount equivalent to that contributed by the employees.

MERIT SYSTEM EXTENDED TO 60,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Public Law 380, 84th Congress, authorized the granting of career-type appointments for indefinite Federal employees who were in positions in the competitive civil service on January 23, 1955, who had passed competitive qualifying examinations or who would pass such examinations within 1 year and who had 3 years of satisfactory service in the competitive civil service.

Public Law 836, 84th Congress, provided the same benefits for postal employees.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The merit system of Federal employment is improved and strengthened through the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission. This reorganization was recommended in House Report No. 1844 and is provided in title II of Public Law 854, 84th Congress, which establishes 6-year staggered terms of office for United States Civil Service Commissioners.

The President will designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission and the line of succession to the chairmanship is established through the Commissioners rather than through the executive director, who is not a Presidential appointee.

REVISION OF SALARIES IN EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

The pay in executive positions—primarily Presidential appointees—had lagged behind that of Federal employees generally. Title I of Public Law 854, 84th Congress, provides top salaries of $25,000 for Cabinet officers and salaries of $22,500, $22,000, $21,000, $20,500, $20,000, $19,000, $18,000, $17,500, and $17,000 for other executive officers and heads of independent departments, agencies, commissions, and boards. It spells out the individual positions and sets specific salaries. It also authorizes and fixes the compensation of certain secretarial, executive, and administrative staff assistants to the President.

This title also adjusts certain salaries of specialized professional and technical personnel so as to bring them in conformity with the executive salaries established under the bill. The top two grades of the general schedule and the three top grades of the postal field service schedule are also adjusted with the top salary limitation being established at $16,000.

SALARIES PROTECTED WHEN POSITIONS ARE DOWNGRADED

Public Law 594, 84th Congress, protects the salary of an officer or employee subject to the Classification Act of 1949 who, on and after the effective date, is in a position paid under the general service schedule and whose position has been placed in a lower grade due to reclassification subsequent to July 1, 1954, provided that such officer or employee has held this position continuously and that the duties and responsibilities of such position have not been materially changed.

It also provides that when such position becomes vacant the rate of com-

pensation of any individual subsequently appointed to fill the vacancy shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949. The provisions of this act do not apply to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule.

OVER ONE-HALF MILLION FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BONDED WITHOUT CHARGE

Public Law 323 of the 84th Congress authorized the procurement by the Government of blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds, suitable for the numbers and types of employees involved, for Federal and military personnel required to be bonded.

For many years Federal employees have complained that they were required to purchase their bonds because they happened to be in a position that required that they be bonded. This was particularly true of postal employees. Postmasters and supervisors in large post offices were required to carry heavy bonds at a substantial personal cost to them.

ENFORCEMENT OF POSTAL LAWS STRENGTHENED

Public Law 821, 84th Congress, which permits the impounding of mail matter for a 20-day period will greatly strengthen the arm of the Postmaster General in enforcement of the postal laws prohibiting the perpetrating of fraud and the sending of obscene matter through the mails. This has become an increasing problem with the Post Office Department. The sending of obscene matter has been listed as one of the major causes for the increase in juvenile delinquency.

Under Public Law 821 the Postmaster General will be able to act promptly in preventing law breakers from harvesting thousands of dollars in ill-gotten gains.

HIGHWAY POSTAL SERVICE

Public Law 862, 84th Congress, establishes a basic act governing the Highway Postal Service. Up to this time the Highway Postal Service has been operating under the laws relating to star routes. The growth of this service as the result of the discontinuance of branch railway lines and the need for more substantial and modern equipment made it necessary to provide legislation which would be designed specifiaclly for the Highway Postal Service. This legislation is contained in Public Law 862, 84th Congress.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR 200,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Public Law 37 extended the benefits of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act to all Government employees required to wear uniforms.

POSTAL-RATE REVISION

While legislation revising postal rates recommended by the committee did not become law, it is of such importance that it should not go without mention. Failure to increase postal rates leaves the postal service facing one of the largest rates of deficit in its history.

In the first place the committee held extensive hearings and recommended legislation which would have increased postal revenues by $430 million annually. This legislation passed the House by a substantial margin. Hearings were begun in the Senate but were not completed by the end of the Congress. It is expected that action will be taken early next year on this very important problem.

In recommending this legislation the committee pointed out that the real reason for the postal deficit was increased costs over which the Department had no control. The most important of these increased costs were increased employee benefits. These benefits since 1945 and counting the recent retirement legislation amount to $1,500,000,000 a year.

In recommending the legislation to the House, the committee emphasized that first-class letter mail was still being carried at the 1933 rate—3 cents an ounce—and the users of first-class letter mail had not had a single increase to meet the increased cost of these benefits.

The main provisions of postal-rate increase bill were: First, increasing the first-class letter rate from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce and the domestic airmail rate from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce; and, second, increasing the newspapers and magazines on the portion sent outside the county of publication by 30 percent on the reading portion and 120 percent on the advertising portion.

The principal increases in third-class mail were from 2 cents to 3 cents for individual mailings and a minimum rate per piece of from 1½ cents to 2 cents.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Subcommittee hearings held under the authority of House Resolution 304 were as follows: Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management, November 2, 3, 4, 1955; June 25, 27, July 2, 1956; Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations held hearings on the subject of the sending of unordered merchandise and obscene matter through the mail on February 28, 29, March 2, 5, 1956.

The Subcommittee on Civil Service Commission and Personnel Programs held hearings at overseas installations during the fall of 1955 under the authority of the Legislative Reorganization Act—Public Law 601, 79th Congress.

SPECIAL REPORT

The Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which was appointed pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 555, 82d Congress, submitted the fiifth and final part of its report to Congress on June 29, 1954. This 1,155-page report contains detailed analyses of all retirement and pension systems applicable to Federal civilian and military personnel, certain recommendations with respect thereto, and other pertinent data.

Because of the volume and exceptionally broad scope of this report, a brief summary thereof was prepared and printed as a committee print for ready reference by the Members. The summary sets forth the principal recommendations of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel and related comments.

COMMITTEE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Under the authority of House Resolution 304, the committee has conducted extensive investigations and studies into three general categories and problems coming under the committee jurisdiction as follows: First, the Federal civil service; second, postal operations; and third, the utilization of manpower throughout the Federal Government.

THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

The committee issued House Report No. 1844, covering the Federal civil service. This is generally considered to be one of the most far-reaching reports on the Federal civil-service system, recommending a completely new and modern approach to personnel management. Among other things, the report recommended completely rewriting the old Civil Service Act of 1883. Many of the recommendations of this report have already been placed into effect.

Among some of the major recommendations which have been approved are a reorganization of the Civil Service Commission whereby the Commissioners are placed on a 6-year-term basis. The Commission will continue to be bipartisan, one term expiring every 2 years. At the same time, it was recommended that the operations of the Civil Service Commission, as well as policy matters, be directed by the Civil Service Commissioners and that a regular succession to the acting chairmanship be established. These provisions were written into Public Law 854.

The report also recommended that the civil-service retirement fund be placed on a sounder basis by requiring that the employee contributions be matched by a like contribution from each Government agency. Thus, a major part of the retirement cost would become a payroll cost and the retirement fund would be assured of a more constant Government contribution. Also, the general principle of the normal plus interest basis of funding was recommended. Public Law 854 provides for the normal plus interest basis for the retirement fund and for the payroll contribution as recommended by the committee.

The report suggested that the Civil Service Commission should take a more aggressive attitude in conducting its audits to determine whether or not job levels are being inflated by many devious administrative processes, primarily reorganizations. The Civil Service Commisson has agreed between now and January to conduct such inquiries and legislation has been introduced which will provide it on a permanent basis.

Nearly 50 percent of the recommendations made by this report have already been placed into effect, including most of the major recommendations.

Under authority of the Legislative Reorganization Act—Public Law 601, 79th Congress—a subcommittee of the committee held extensive hearings in the European area covering problems of Federal employees overseas. A report was issued, House Report No. 2109. Legislation was drafted and introduced—H. R. 12193 and H. R. 12194—which will improve and provide uniformity in the leave, home leave, health and medical services, educational benefits, and other related benefits for Federal employees serving outside the United States.

POSTAL OPERATIONS

A discerning report covering the reorganization of the postal service was filed as House Report No. 1741. This report analyzes the effect of the reorganization and decentralization of the Post Office Department and made the following recommendations:

(a) That the Postmaster General consider the proposal to organize the 15 regional headquarters under the general direction of the regional operations manager;

(b) That more authority be delegated to the postmasters who should report directly to the regional office;

(c) That the plan of describing the district manager as the supervisor of postmasters would lead to empire building and place 23,000 postmasters in rather unimportant positions and should be reviewed;

(d) That consideration be given to a reduction in the staff assigned to the regional personnel units;

(e) That the industrial engineer organization be centralized in the headquarters at Washington, D. C.;

(f) That the appointment of postmasters of all classes and the authority to establish and discontinue post offices be centralized in the Post Office Department in Washington.

The Subcommittee on Postal Operations also examined into the closing of fourth-class post offices and, by an interim agreement, this program has been substantially slowed down, based upon this investigation. The Postmaster General has reported to the committee he is adopting the following program:

(a) When a vacancy occurs in the position of postmaster in a small office, a specific survey will be made to determine whether the office should be continued and a new appointment made.

(b) As part of the regular annual inspection of post offices, consideration will continue to be given to the question of the need for each office, and such information will be recorded. However, pending the receipt of the report and recommendations of our committee, such offices recommended for closing will be closed only if opposition is not significant or if the closing is accompanied by the contracting of a rural station in the same community.

Hearings were held covering complaints concerning the receipt of unordered merchandise and obscene matter going through the mail. Legislation was introduced and is now Public Law 821 which strengthens the arm of the Postmaster General in enforcing laws prohibiting the sending of obscene material through the mail.

The subcommittee also suggested to the Postmaster General that both second- and third-class mailers should be required to separate their mail by zones in the 110 cities where postal zones are in effect. Some second-class mailers are presently doing this—third-class mailers perform this service in the city where mailed only. This will result in a substantial manpower savings for the postal service and, at the same time, the mailers will need to zone their mail only one time.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

An extensive study was made of manpower utilization throughout the Federal Government. The program, initiated in the 83d Congress, has been continued and expanded. As a result of this program there are today 35,000 less positions in the Federal Government than were planned by the departments and agencies.

Detailed reports have been filed—House Report No. 1740, February 2, 1956, and House Report No. 2961, August 6, 1956—demonstrating how a better manpower-utilization program has been established throughout the Federal Government and the groundwork laid for a permanent program of this type.

Legislation was drafted and introduced and is now Public Law 801 which will assist in the control of manpower on new projects. It does this by requiring that where any new projects are recommended by the executive branch estimates will include an estimate of the total number of personnel required to carry it out.

The Vice Presidential Situation in the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have long felt that I should publicly express regret for having supported Harold Stassen in the 1948 presidential campaign. Stassen's unsavory attempt to dump Vice President NIXON is only the last in a long series of actions that, in my opinion, qualify Stassen as one of the most contemptible politicians of our era. His recent career has been such that I have had to oppose Stassen at nearly every turn since 1952, but the NIXON episode is final proof that anyone who ever thought well of Stassen was sadly deluded.

I call Stassen's attack on NIXON unsavory, not because he is opposing a man who I happen to think has done a good job; but because the attack obviously has the single purpose of promoting Harold Stassen's personal political fortunes—whatever may be the cost to the Republican Party and to the Nation. Harold Stassen is obsessed by an overpowering ambition to become President. As for his methods—anything goes that promises to place Stassen's name in the limelight.

STASSEN'S SECRET POLL

Take, for example, the so-called secret poll that, according to Stassen, showed that the Republican ticket would run 6 percent stronger with Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, as the vice presidential candidate than with NIXON. It is impossible to believe that Stassen was telling the truth about this poll. Whether the poll was never taken, or Stassen lied about the results of it, I do not know. But it is inconceivable that Governor Herter, whom a vast majority of Americans had never heard of, would have run ahead of a man who is known by all Americans and well-liked by most of them. Other polls bear out this conclusion. For example, a Roper poll, taken about the time of Stassen's alleged poll, asked the question: "If Eisenhower decides not to run, whom would you like to see as the Republican presidential candidate?" NIXON was selected by 12 percent of those who indicated a choice; Herter by barely 1 percent.

A REPUTATION FOR UNTRUTHFULNESS

There were other reasons that prompted Washington observers to conclude that Stassen's poll was a phony. Stassen had been known to falsify the facts before. He falsified the facts, both in his official reports to Congress and in his testimony before a Senate committee, in an effort to cover up the fact that the United States was permitting its allies to ship strategic war materials to Communist nations. I quote from the Senate investigations committee's official report on East-West trade (p. 46):

"The Battle Act Administrator, Mr. Stassen, in 1954 misstated the facts in his Fifth Battle Act Report, when he reported: 'Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power, such as aluminum, copper, nickel, molybdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the embargo list.' In this and other portions of the Fifth Battle Act Report, Mr. Stassen misrepresented facts, which thus misled the Congress and the American people. Moreover, when he testified before this subcommittee, Mr. Stassen appeared to be an arrogant, evasive, and uncandid witness. The subcommittee feels that Mr. Stassen is to be severely criticized for his conduct in this matter."

It is no wonder, in the light of his record, that the motives for Stassen's attack on NIXON have been suspect. Moreover, Stassen's pose of martyrdom, in the face of almost universal criticism of his actions, fools no one. Those who know Harold Stassen know that he has never been a martyr to any "cause" except his own.

STASSEN'S REAL MOTIVATIONS

What, then, does Stassen hope to gain for himself? For one thing, Stassen believes that if he should succeed in dumping NIXON, there is a good possibility that the vice presidential nomination will be his. He knows that the leftwing of the Republican Party wants desperately to get rid of NIXON, and he believes that if NIXON is dumped, the triumphant leftwingers will be in a mood to reward the man who led the dumping campaign. The fact that the Herter-for-Vice-President campaign is, in reality, a Stassen-for-Vice-President campaign is amply demonstrated in the following news item. Referring to the Herter headquarters set up by Stassen, a Washington newspaper reported: "Heading up the volunteer crew at the Ike and Chris headquarters is H. Brooks Baker * * * who also serves as chairman of Young Americans for Eisenhower First, and Stassen Second."

(I should add, in case there are any doubts about it, that this organization was set up several months ago, under Stassen's auspices, to drum up support for making Stassen the vice presidential candidate.)

Actually, however, Stassen is not placing all of his bets on getting the vice presidential nomination this year. He is probably playing for much higher stakes. Stassen knows that at the present time there is no heir apparent to President Eisenhower as the leader of the leftwing of the GOP. There are many who aspire to that title besides Stassen—Sherman Adams, Milton Eisenhower, Tom Dewey, Paul Hoffman, to name a few. But none has yet definitely emerged as the man who will be the leftwing's leader when President Eisenhower leaves office. Stassen believes that his attack on NIXON will give him a large head start over his

rivals. Stassen believes, moreover, that the leftwingers will control the Republican Party in the future, and that in 1960 or in 1964, they will be disposed to make the hero of the anti-NIXON campaign the GOP presidential candidate. Stassen figures there is no better way to ingratiate himself with the leftwingers than to lead a fight against NIXON, a man whom the leftwingers fear and dislike. His chances will be especially good, Stassen believes, if an Eisenhower-NIXON ticket should be defeated in November. In that event, the leftwingers will place the blame for a Republican defeat on NIXON, and Stassen will be hailed as the man who called the turn, and thus the man who should be nominated for President in 1960.

These, I firmly believe, are Harold Stassen's real motivations. It is likely, however, that Stassen will fall victim to his own overpowering ambition. I think that the Republican Party and the American people will reward his dump NIXON efforts by dumping Stassen himself into political oblivion, which is where he has belonged for some time.

A Report to the People by Hon. Chet Holifield, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is customary at the close of a Congress for Members to report to the people back home. I have one of the largest constituencies in the country and, I may say, one of the most informed.

Among the people of my district—the 19th District of the great State of California—there is a broad base of liberalism and understanding and good will. These qualities are strong foundations of our democracy, which most of us recognize whether we are Democrats or Republicans.

In the seven Congresses, from 1943 to date, in which I have served continuously as Representative of the 19th District of California, I have learned a great deal about the intricacies of the legislative process.

As a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of its Legislative Authorization Subcommittee, as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, and chairman of its Military Operations Subcommittee, and as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it has been my privilege and opportunity to sponsor important legislation and to become intimately acquainted with a wide range of Government affairs.

To this I may add the additional honor conferred on me by you, Mr. Speaker, of serving as a member of the Hoover Commission. In this capacity, as you may know, I supported constructive measures for economy and efficiency in government, but I opposed with all the power at my command any efforts to cut down essential services or to jeopardize governmental programs for the welfare of homeowners, consumers, small business, veterans, working people, small farmers, and other groups important to the Nation's economy.

In each Congress many thousands of bills are introduced. The hard-working committees of the Congress can consider only a few hundred of them. Among those that finally survive to get consideration on the floor of the House, some may be voted down, others may die in the Senate. Those that pass both Houses may be vetoed by the President.

Our system of government is one of checks and balances against unwise legislation. Sometimes, however, good legislation gets blocked along with the bad. Therefore, it is difficult, in the final analysis, to measure congressional achievement simply by the number of bills passed or the legislative votes cast under parliamentary procedures.

This I can say sincerely. I vote my convictions based on the broad and enduring principles of our democracy. The great majority of people in my district understand and endorse these principles.

Now for a brief summary of the successes and failures of the 84th Congress, which has just come to a close.

In many ways this has been one of the most hard-working and constructive Congresses. In other ways it failed to pass important legislation, either because of party differences that could not be overcome, or because the President has been too far removed from the daily scene to give sure and vigorous direction to his own legislative program.

While it is not my purpose here to dwell on the party positions on each individual measure, I believe the record will show that the Democratic Party has been a responsible and constructive party. In fact, it has been more responsive to the President's legislative program in many instances than has the President's own party, the Republicans.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social security now is an accepted feature of American life. Hardly more than 20 years ago, under the guiding hand of Franklin D. Roosevelt, social security became part of the law of the land. In the following years the legislation has been improved by various amendments.

It has been my constant endeavor in the years I have served in this House, to improve the social-security program by working for expanded coverage, increased benefit payments, and other valuable measures.

In this Congress I was happy to vote for an amendment to the Social Security Act which provides that benefits for women will begin at age 62 and to disabled persons at age 50. Previously benefits for both could not begin until age 65. Under this new law, 30,700 disabled persons in California will be eligible immediately for benefits. Reduction of the retirement age for women will enable 15,000 additional women to be eligible immediately for retirement benefits and an additional 64,000 women for the reduced benefits available for those who retire earlier.

The law also extends coverage to lawyers, dentists and other professionals except doctors, and to certain farmers. Aid grants to the States are increased for the needy, blind, and dependent children.

VETERAN' AND SERVICEMEN'S LEGISLATION

Of the 22 million veterans in civilian life, almost 5 million served during the Korean conflict. The Veterans' Administration which serves the veterans' needs, is one of the largest and most important agencies of the Federal Government. A great deal of legislation concerns the activities of this agency.

During the 84th Congress I voted for bills to provide educational assistance to children of servicemen who died in the line of duty during the Korean and past wars; extending educational benefits to veterans, extending the veterans' home-loan program and various other measures which were enacted into law. I voted also to increase benefits and disability payments to veterans.

Legislation which I introduced was accepted in an omnibus amendment bill which restored to a veteran his original housing privileges, where his property was condemned for public use, such as freeway rights-of-way or was destroyed by flood or other natural causes. My legislation also extended the GI home financing privilege from July 1957 to January 1965, to World War II veterans.

Various laws were passed to help servicemen, including the placing of military personnel under social security and increasing benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans; provision for medical care of dependents of members of the Armed Forces; and increased pay of 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act from $50 to $78 a month.

INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

Apart from assistance to Federal employees including those in the postal service, the most important labor legislation passed by the present Congress was a bill to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents an hour to $1 an hour.

The Eisenhower administration tried to limit the amount to 90 cents an hour. The Democratic Congress, however, passed a bill at the $1 level and it became law.

This wage applies to low-paid workers who produce goods which are shipped in interstate commerce.

Our relatively high wage levels in California make such legislation of great interest to our State; the economic advantage it brings generally is obvious. The light manufacturing industry of our State must compete with the low wages of the States in the South. We prefer such competition to take place on a level which guarantees that every American worker will at least have the minimum necessities.

WATER AND FLOOD CONTROL

The Eisenhower administration does not favor large Federal power projects unless the private utilities can control the revenue-producing features, mainly the output of electricity from the water falling over large dams.

Two projects sponsored by the Republican administration, namely, the Upper Colorado River Basin storage project and the so-called Fryingpan-Arkansas project, would threaten the southern California water supply from the Colorado

River. Consequently, I opposed those projects.

Federal flood-control appropriations, which I supported in the Congress, will bring several million dollars' worth of assistance to Los Angeles basin flood-control projects.

SMALL BUSINESS

Many small businesses are closing their doors. Since 1953 small-business failures have increased 21 percent. Tight money and difficulties in getting Government loans are primary causes. A Small Business Administration was established ostensibly to grant such loans and its revolving fund was increased to a total of $175 million.

However, I am advised that since 1953 some 300,000 individuals and companies have applied for small-business loans, and of this number, only 7,000 have received favorable action.

The Small Business Administration is only a shadow agency because it does not have any real support by the Eisenhower administration.

CLASSROOM NEEDS

Our achievements in social security and highway improvement were not matched in the case of legislation to aid education. A bill authorizing $1.6 billion in Federal aid to States to build more classrooms over a 4-year program failed to pass the House by a small margin of votes.

The State of California, which has about 3 million children aged 5 to 17, would have received an annual allotment of more than $32 million, or about $130 million from this program.

If approved, this legislation would have helped greatly to relieve serious shortages of classrooms. The funds were to be allocated to the States on the basis of school-age population. The States would have been assured, however, that there would be no Federal Government interference with local school systems.

In this case, I am convinced the President could have obtained passage of the legislation, if the White House had taken a firm stand and had exercised positive leadership over the Republicans in Congress. Many of these Republicans, after maneuvering hamstrung the legislation by supporting the Powell amendment, which would have insured the defeat of the bill by raising national issues, turned around and voted against the bill when the Powell amendment was attached to the bill.

The Congress did succeed however in passing a law which authorized $378 million in Federal aid for school construction, maintenance, and operating costs in areas where Federal activities have caused the school-age population to be expanded. This legislation dates back to 1939, when defense and—later—war industries threw heavy additional burdens on many communities in educating children. Last year California received about $15 million under this program and will receive slightly more under the new rate of Federal assistance.

BETTER HIGHWAYS

One of the outstanding achievements of this Congress was the enactment of the $33.4 billion highway-construction program for a 13-year period. This law includes a Federal 90-percent share of the cost of completing a 41,000-mile interstate highway system and increased regular aid for State highways through 1959. This will furnish $367,500,000 of Federal moneys for California roads.

The financing for this huge highway program which will help to modernize America's highways and add greatly to the safety and convenience of motoring, is to be financed by increased excise taxes on motor fuels, trucks, trailers, and tires to yield $14.8 billion in the next 16 years. The Republican administration originally had proposed a different financing scheme which would have involved bond issues and extra profit to bankers and bondholders without any discernible advantage to the average motorist. The Democratic majority took a different, and, in my opinion, a more equitable approach raising the necessary revenues through taxes on major commercial and other users of the highways. The congressional majority prevailed and the President accepted our views in the matter.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I voted for appropriations for our national defense and aid to other nations of the free world in order to keep us strong against the threat of communistic aggression. We should not fall into the trap of allowing our military defenses to be weakened, because of the new smile approach of the Soviet leaders. Deeds, which prove their real attitude, should be our standard of judgment, not deceitful smiles and hypocritical words.

The foreign-aid bill that passed the Congress was increased some over last year. Many Members of Congress are concerned that there has been too much emphasis on strictly military appropriations and not enough on economic and technical aid to help underdeveloped countries that seek to improve their standard of living and who, in the absence of such help, are a natural prey for Soviet aims. We should take every wise and prudent step that is possible to establish world peace.

TAXES

No tax legislation was passed to help the average family of moderate income. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey succeeded in forcing through the Congress the so-called rich man's tax bill which gives 73 percent of long run tax relief to corporations and only 9 percent to people with incomes of $5,000. I voted against this bill. The facts concerning this unfair tax legislation revealed that 80 percent of the American taxpayers received only 9 percent of the reductions in this Republican tax bill.

The Democratic Members of Congress, including myself, voted to enact a tax bill giving an across-the-board $20 tax reduction credit to each and every taxpayer. Republican opposition defeated this legislation. Today our national debt is at an alltime high, and interest rates on this debt have been increased for the benefit of the money lenders.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil rights legislation was not enacted by the Congress, although action was taken in the House of Representatives, which I supported. The purpose of this legislation was to afford greater protection to personal liberties and voting rights of all citizens regardless of race, color, or creed.

Civil rights, unfortunately, represent a neglected field. The administration has made only perfunctory supporting gestures, sectional differences in the Congress make it an extremely difficult area of legislation.

As always, I shall continue to fight for the constitutional rights of every American citizen and for full opportunity to develop and use their talents according to the American heritage of freedom.

NATURAL GAS PRICE RAISE BILL

There was considerable debate in the Congress concerning the natural gas bill and the influence of lobbyists in attempting to get this legislation enacted. I voted against the bill because it would have removed Federal regulation of the price of gas at the wellhead which is shipped in interstate commerce, and would have raised the price of gas to consumers.

Notwithstanding a strong vote against the bill, it was passed by the House and Senate, but later vetoed by the President on the grounds that improper lobbying influence had been used. The President indicated that he favored the legislation otherwise.

Had this bill become law, it would have cost every user of natural gas in California $1 more per month.

POST OFFICE LEGISLATION

As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I assisted in the enactment of legislation which brought better pay to post-office employees, both in office and supervisory positions and in the postal field service. Increased pay and opportunities for advancement were provided, and also payment of time and a half for overtime and holiday work for some grades, and compensatory time for other grades. A 10-percent bonus is allowed for night work.

However, I voted against Republican-sponsored legislation to increase the cost of sending first-class letters from 3 cents to 4 cents and airmail letters from 6 cents to 7 cents. A majority of the Republican Members and a few Democratic Members passed this bill in the House; it failed in the Senate.

The proposed increase was intended to fasten on the ordinary sender of first-class letters, the burden of the present subsidy which the Government gives to magazines, books, catalogs, and newspapers. I shall continue to oppose such unfair legislation.

BETTER HOUSING

Homeowners, homeseekers, and people who now live in slum areas, will benefit from the housing legislation of the 84th Congress. Needless to say, as a long-time supporter of improved Federal housing legislation, I voted for the housing bill, although some of its desirable amendments were defeated.

The housing bill will provide another $3 billion of mortgage insurance authority and will extend the VA home-loan program for another year.

Loans to finance repairs can be made over 5-year periods instead of the present 3-year maximum. This will allow smaller monthly payments. It has been estimated that 1 million more American families will improve their homes because of this legislation. The program extended to September 30, 1959, would allow the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner to waive requirement of 6 months occupancy before an owner can qualify for a loan. The housing legislation also would allow the Federal Housing Administration to insure new long-term mortgage loans for persons whose property is damaged by floods, hurricanes or other disaster; authorizes construction of 70,000 units of federally subsidized low-rent housing for low-income groups in 2 years; authorizes Federal loans and capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal projects to improve blighted areas, makes added provision for housing for military personnel, college students, farmers, and farm labor camps.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Among the important legislation passed by the 84th Congress in the health and welfare fields are the authorization of $30 million in Federal funds to assist States in providing Salk polio vaccine for needy children and expectant mothers; more effective control of narcotics, including drastic penalties for illicit drug peddlers who sell to children; authorization of $30 million of Federal aid each year for 3 years for the construction of non-Federal research facilities related to various crippling and killing diseases, such as cancer and heart afflictions. I voted for these bills.

BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

One of the disturbing features of our national economy is the fact that the cost of living is at an all-time high. The pay raises granted by Congress last year, amounting to 7.15 percent increases for regular civil-service workers and 8.6 percent for postal workers, certainly were justified.

This year the 84th Congress enacted several laws to improve civil-service employment and liberalized the retirement benefits of Federal workers. Increased benefits upon retirement will amount to 20 to 25 percent under the new legislation. Family survivorship benefits have been increased by as much as 150 percent and all other phases of retirement and survivorship benefits have been made more liberal.

ILO Convention on Forced Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I have prepared a short statement concerning the position taken by the United States Government at the recent International Labor Conference in Geneva on the issue of an international convention on forced labor. Senators will remember that I have been concerned with this issue throughout the 2d session of the 84th Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON AN ILO CONVENTION ON FORCED LABOR

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the position of the United States Government on the question of an ILO convention on forced labor.

The Senate will remember that I have been somewhat critical of the timid position the United States Government appeared to be taking on this important issue. As a consequence, I introduced Senate Resolution 248, Senate Joint Resolution 117, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 75. The effect of these resolutions would be for the Senate to express its view that the Government of the United States should exercise leadership in the ILO to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

The United States delegation recently returned from the International Labor Conference which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from June 6 to June 28. I am pleased to state that the delegation voted in favor of placing on the agenda of the next International Labor Conference in June 1957, the question of forced labor for a second discussion, with a view to a final decision on a convention on the subject. To the extent that a change in policy has been reflected in these actions, I have been considerably encouraged.

The United States delegation at the International Labor Conference introduced an amendment to the text suggested by the International Labor Office, which governments had studied for many months. This amendment would provide that international trade and commerce in goods produced by any forced or compulsory labor should be prohibited.

While many of the delegations at the conference agreed in principle with or expressed sympathetic interest in the United States proposal, they considered that they had not had sufficient opportunity to study the proposal in all of its implications, the governments having been advised of it only a week or two before the opening of the conference. It was, therefore, agreed by the conference committee on forced labor that the United States proposal would be given consideration next year.

I quote the following from the report of that committee:

"In view of the fact that the United States proposal was submitted only at this session of the conference, and not earlier, a number of governments felt that more time for study was needed before a decision could be taken on this proposal. The employers' and workers' members indicated that they were not at this stage expressing any views either for or against the United States amendment. The committee decided that the amendment proposed by the United States would be appropriate for consideration by the governments during the ensuing year, along with the conclusions directed toward a convention. The committee, therefore, adopted a proposal that governments should be afforded time for further study of the amendment in connection with the final draft of the convention to be prepared during the year and that the International Labor Office be requested to send the United States amendment to the governments along with the conclusions, on the understanding that governments would consider it and that it would be taken up in connection with the final draft of the convention at the next session of the conference. It was pointed out that since at this session it was at the first discussion stage, no delay need be caused by the action taken by the committee."

This report was approved unanimously by the conference.

As a consequence of the action taken by the 39th International Labor Conference, the United States proposal will be contained in the further documentation prepared by the International Labor Office and distributed to governments prior to the 1956 conference, and will be considered by governments in connection with their preparations for that conference. It will be taken up again in June 1957.

There is, of course, no way of telling at this time what attitudes governments will take toward the numerous amendments which were introduced, including that of the United States Government and the text of a convention which will finally emerge. Governments will wish to study all these amendments with great care during the ensuing year. I am encouraged, however, by this more constructive approach of the United States Government on the matter of an ILO Convention relating to forced labor, and I wish to commend it for its position.

A New Look in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 84th Congress, I believe it is time to take stock of the many changes and improvements that have been made during the past few years in our Federal civil service. The unanimous approval by Congress, in the closing days of this session, of greatly liberalized retirement benefits, is a fitting climax to a long series of legislative actions granting employee benefits and strengthening the merit system in the Government.

As often is the case, the full value of these changes and improvements may not be realized and appreciated because of the many legislative and administrative actions that have brought them about over a period of time. The true picture is presented only by noting the sum total of the advances made in recent years. Never in our history has so short a span of time marked such great strides for Federal employees as those taken in the past half decade.

Now, this did not just happen. It has taken long, hard, and constant work by the Congress and its committees that are charged with civil-service responsibility. I believe it is now time to spread on the record the major changes and improvements that have brought us to a firm and effective basis for personnel management in the Government and an immeasurably more attractive career service for Federal employees.

POSTWAR ADJUSTMENT

As a ready gage to our progress, we need only recall the years after World

War II. The aftermath of that war, the innumerable problems of Government seeking a return to normalcy after tremendous expansion, had not yet been cleared up when the Korean conflict brought further disruption. Government payrolls were topheavy with emergency workers. Countless temporary and indefinite employees had no protection against sudden dismissal, regardless of efficiency and loyal service. There was no strong career system of Government employment. Morale of workers was at a low ebb, and its state was matched by the public regard for its servants.

The severe dislocations of those war emergencies had an equally adverse effect on efficiency and economy throughout the Government. Under the pressures and demands of critical emergencies and readjustments that followed, officials were unable to devote adequate time and attention to maintaining a strong civil service, must less to improvements needed to keep pace with modern practices and the growing complexity of the Government. The results were almost chaotic. Frankly, after World War II we faced a seemingly hopeless task. It is with some sense of gratification, therefore, that this record is presented as a review of the steps which have brought order out of chaos.

INCREASED SALARIES

High on the list of employee interests, of course, is the matter of salaries. The proper levels of salaries and the relationships of positions in our mammoth Government has no counterpart in private industry. The problem is not only of size, but of limitless complexity. It is a real task to keep abreast of the needs of the Government and its employees, let alone make up ground lost in periods of national emergency.

Consideration of the Government's salary and position classification structure occupied a major share of the time of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the first session of the 84th Congress. This Congress brought the salaries of our half million postal employees and of all other Federal employees into line with those in private industry and with increased costs of living due to the great expansion in the national economy.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASES

The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 is a great milestone in postal activities. This law gave postal field service employees an average salary increase in excess of 8 percent. More important, it established for the first time a salary structure with the proper relationship between the various positions in the postal service based on the actual level of duties and responsibilities. It replaced an archaic jumble of laws and special provisions that was incomprehensible to any but experts—an uncoordinated hodgepodge that gave only dissatisfaction to employees and management alike.

Other Federal employees also were given generous salary increases and the laws relating to their compensation and position classification were clarified and brought up to date by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955. Unnecessary and unrealistic variances in treatment of groups and classes of employees were eliminated. These employees now are in a position to know what they can count on in the way of salaries, working conditions, retention rights, and other benefits.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Retirement benefits are one of the key factors in building and maintaining a strong and efficient personnel program, whether in Government or private industry. Our civil service retirement plan, established in 1920, had had no major revision since 1948 until the present Congress. Piecemeal legislation over the years had had a number of benefits without making provision for adequate financing. Moreover, retirement benefits had become far out of balance as between retired employees and present employees. Three liberal increases were granted retired employees in the past 8 years, while no major change had been made in the basic retirement law as it affected active employees.

IMPROVED CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

This situation was corrected by Public Law 854, 84th Congress, giving $340 million in added retirement benefits to Federal employees. The Government will bear $295 million of the cost.

The average annuity benefit is increased by 25 percent, and this increase extends to annuities of the surviving spouses. The average increase in annuities of surviving children is 150 percent. A retiring employee may elect to provide survivor benefits after only 5 years of service, instead of 15 years under the previous law.

An annuity is provided in case of involuntary separation after age 50 with 20 years of service. The rights to an annuity on involuntary separation at any age with 25 years' service, and to optional retirement at age 55 after 30 years of service, are continued.

When an employee retires before reaching 60, the reduction in his annuity will be about one-half of the reduction he previously had to take. If he dies, his widow will receive an immediate annuity regardless of whether there are surviving children, and there will no longer be any reduction in the widow's annuity if she is under age 60.

An employee retired for disability will have a guaranteed minimum annuity of 40 percent of his average salary or the annuity he would have earned had he worked until age 60, whichever is the lesser.

An annuitant reemployed because of special skill or ability, who works one full year before final separation, will have his original annuity plus an annuity based on the reemployed service.

These are just the major new benefits of this legislation, which completely rewrites the civil-service retirement law in clear and readily understood terms. A great deal of surplus language and almost incomprehensible provisions of past piecemeal legislation are eliminated.

BETTER FINANCING OF RETIREMENT FUND

Although this legislation greatly liberalizes retirement benefits, in the judgment of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee one of its most important results is the establishment, for the first time, of a sound method of financing the civil-service retirement fund. Beginning in 1952, with the creation of a Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel under Public Law 555, 82d Congress, our committee has made an exhaustive study of the financing of the fund. This has become an increasingly serious problem—so much so that failure to take immediate action to strengthen the financing might have threatened the entire retirement structure. The deficit in the fund had grown to astronomical proportions, reaching $13.5 billion a year ago. Potential obligations of the fund so far exceeded its assets as to cast grave doubt on any guaranty that present and future employees could be assured of the retirement benefits for which they pay and which, in effect, the Government has underwritten as at least a moral obligation.

The committee recommendations for the financing of our retirement system to insure its soundness were printed in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress. The three essential principles are written into Public Law 854. First of all, employees' contributions to the fund must be on a par with the benefits they receive. Second, the Government must contribute equally with the employees as a part of its payroll cost, to be paid into the fund by each department and agency. Third, the Congress should appropriate to the fund each year an additional amount, over and above payroll contributions by the departments and agencies, to cover interest on the past deficit and any further cost of the fund not met by employee contributions and matching contributions by the departments and agencies. This method of financing, known as the normal cost plus interest method, is approved by retirement and actuarial authorities. It will maintain the retirement system on a sound financial basis and prevent further increase in the deficit.

IMPROVED CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

The current shortage of qualified scientific, professional, and technical personnel highlights the unsatisfactory conditions of Federal employment that stem from the war periods and the readjustments that followed. There is little doubt that past lack of career opportunity laid the foundation for loss of potentially valuable workers today.

Just a few years ago, for example, only 65 percent of all Federal employees could regard their positions as permanent in nature. Now, more than 90 percent are in career-type appointments. The true career civil service benefits both employees and the Government. Uncertainty of tenure is removed, and each individual can devote his best efforts to the service.

The establishment of a strong career system of employment was worked out in cooperation between the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. The basic principles of the program are set forth in the statement of managers on

the part of the House on the conference agreement that became Public Law 763, 83d Congress. This legislation also places a necessary ceiling on the total number of permanent Federal employees and provides guidance for maintaining a proper level of permanent Federal employment in case of emergency expansion in the future and return to normal operations thereafter.

EXTENSION OF MERIT SYSTEM

Some 200,000 employees were made eligible for career appointments by Public Law 380, 84th Congress, and an additional large number of temporary but long-time postal employees were given similar opportunity by Public Law 836, 84th Congress.

INCREASED NUMBER OF SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS

In a further step to relieve the present shortage of scientific, professional, and administrative personnel, your committee reported, and the House in its wisdom approved H. R. 11040 in the present Congress, to create a total of 685 such positions. The other body did not act on this bill, but included a lesser number of these positions in legislation (H. R. 7619) to provide needed salary adjustments for Cabinet members and other top executives of the Government along with an increase from $14,800 to $16,000 in the maximum Classification Act salary, which passed the House last year. It is believed that the Congress will want to review the requirements for additional scientific, professional, and high administrative positions early in the next Congress. Such additional positions were urgently requested in the presentations made to our committee by officials charged with the responsibility for maintaining a national defense capable of meeting the threat of any potential enemy.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has conducted a penetrating study of the Civil Service Commission in the present Congress. Its findings and recommendations are printed in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress. This study was directed at methods of strengthening the Commission and thereby enabling it to assume and exercise effective leadership in the field of personnel management in the Government.

As noted previously, the committee's recommendations in this report with respect to retirement financing are now part of Public Law 854. Likewise, its recommendation in the same report for top-level reorganization of the Civil Service Commission is part of Public Law 854. This law provides for 6-year, staggered terms for the Civil Service Commissioners, for the appointment of a Vice Chairman as well as a Chairman of the Commission, and for a line of succession to the duties and responsibilities of the Chairman through the Vice Chairman and the third member of the Commission. This will greatly strengthen the Commission, in both internal operations and dealings with other parts of the Government. It gives assurance of continuity of top-level leadership for the Commission—a must if this central personnel agency of the Government is to pull its weight and carry out the responsibility vested in it by Congress.

EMPLOYEE GROUP INSURANCE

Another weakness that had developed over the years with respect to the Federal civil service was the lack of a Government-sponsored insurance program for its employees. Private industry for many years has taken the lead in such programs, often contributing a major part or all of the cost, and it has become a desirable and accepted part of the fringe benefits of employees throughout the United States. The Congress, working in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, established a new low-cost group life insurance program for civilian employees of the Government on a voluntary participation basis, providing coverage for term life in amounts equal to each employee's salary raised to the next higher $1,000 level and double indemnity and dismemberment insurance. The cost to each employee is not to exceed 25 cents biweekly for each $1,000 and the Government contributes 12½ cents. Certain inequities and gaps in this legislation were corrected in the present Congress, extending the coverage to well over 130,000 employees not previously covered and allowing continued coverage in case of an employee who is disabled and receives disability benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. These provisions bring the Government up to date and place its employees on a par with those in private industry in the matter of insurance benefits.

SALARIES SAVED IF JOB DOWNGRADED

The repeated fluctuations in employment levels and requirements of the Government for many years have created severe hardship and inequities because of backlogs in the classification of positions. The Classification Act of 1949 makes the level of every classified position subject to review by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission fell far behind in its tremendous classification audit workload. Then, as positions were reviewed many were placed at lower levels with consequent reduction in salaries of incumbents through no fault of their own. This condition became an extremely serious morale problem, since the employees quite justifiably felt that they had no protection whatever from downgradings and loss of salary which might prevent them from taking care of obligations they had assumed on the basis of the salaries of their positions before downgrading. The committee study of this situation demonstrated the need for legislative action to correct it, which was confirmed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Corrective action is authorized by Public Law 594, 84th Congress. This law provides that an employee will suffer no loss in salary if his position is placed at a lower grade level. It does not, of course, save an employee's salary if he is demoted for cause.

During the past two Congresses a large number of bills have been introduced to provide various fringe benefits for Federal employees, that is, specific types of benefits which do not fall within the ambit of major legislation previously discussed. The committee made a thorough study of all of these proposals, and those found desirable were incorporated in a single general Fringe Benefits Act. This act for the first time provided for an employees' uniform allowance of $100 a year. This allowance was extended by the 84th Congress to apply on an equitable basis to all employees required to wear uniforms in the performance of official duties. In addition, it established a greatly broadened and far more attractive incentive-awards program for Federal employees which already has proved its worth through tremendous increases in employee participation in suggestion programs and millions of dollars of savings to the Government.

BETTER OVERTIME PAY

The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and the Fringe Benefits Act of 1954 also provided new and liberalized systems of premium compensation for overtime, night, and holiday work for Federal employees so that all such employees now are on a generally uniform basis for such work.

FREE BONDS

Each Federal employee in a position requiring bonding was required, until the present Congress, to pay the premium of his own bond, even though it was primarily for the protection of the Government. The same was true of any employee who must obtain a notary-public commission for use in his official duties. In effect, therefore, the salary of such an employee was reduced by the amount of his bond premium or the cost of the notary commission, as the case might be, in comparison to the salaries of other employees performing work at the same level of responsibility. The discriminatory effect of this situation long has been recognized, but previous efforts to obtain corrective legislation have been unsuccessful. The 84th Congress approved Public Law 323, authorizing the Government to purchase these bonds at no expense to the employees, and Public Law 681, authorizing an allowance to cover the cost of a notarial commission obtained for official purposes. The first report of the Secretary of the Treasury on operations under the bonding law was received on the last day of this session, and shows that the new system not only has given a definite boost to the morale of the employees concerned but, also, will accomplish real savings for the Government.

THE NEW LOOK IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, I can probably best summarize this statement by saying that the condition of Federal employment today is entirely different from that of a decade ago. Today's employee has security in his job. He has had salary increases amounting to over 60 percent. His retirement annuity has been directly increased by over 25 percent with new and much more liberal provisions for his surviving widow and children. The actual increases are much more than this when considered in connection with the salary increases. If he dies his beneficiaries receive a year's salary as a result of the

low cost life insurance which has been provided. He has opportunity for both honorary and monetary awards up to $25,000 for outstanding service or improvements in Government operations. He has protection against reduction in his salary in cases where his position has been downgraded as a result of reclassification. He has better opportunity for recognition of his qualifications and effort through improved classification systems and promotion programs. He has reemployment and priority placement rights in cases where he is separated due to reduction in force in his agency. He has greatly improved appeals rights through betterments in the appeals procedure and system. Compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work has been greatly increased and standardized. His annual and sick leave privileges have been extended and improved. If he is required to wear a uniform this uniform is now furnished by way of an allowance. If his duty requires that he be bonded he no longer is required to furnish his own bond. In cases where a notary's commission is required authority has been granted to the department and agency to defray the expenses formerly paid by the employee.

In my judgment, in no other employment, whether it be private or governmental, does the employee have as many benefits as he does in the Federal Government. These benefits are in the main the result of recommendations made to the executive branch and legislation approved by this committee over the past few years.

Harold McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the retirement of Harold McGrath, Superintendent of the Radio-Television Gallery in the Capitol.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within a few days Mr. Harold McGrath, Superintendent of the Radio-Television Gallery, will retire and return to his home in Walla Walla, Wash. Mr. McGrath has served in his present position since February 1940. Prior to that time he was Secretary to Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington State.

During the incumbency of Mr. McGrath as Superintendent of the Radio-Television Gallery the service has been tremendously expanded and the number of accredited members has increased more than tenfold.

I am sure that I reflect the sentiments of all my colleagues in the Senate when I say that Mr. McGrath will be greatly missed.

During the 7 years that I have served in the Senate I have frequently come into contact with Mr. McGrath. I found him not only uniformly conscientious and courteous but invariably friendly and cooperative. Mrs. Lehman has always shared my regard and affection for Mr. McGrath. I also had the pleasure of knowing Mrs. McGrath. I have rarely seen devotion equal to that shown by Mr. McGrath toward his wife, who passed away after a long illness less than a year ago.

I will always remember Mr. McGrath for his friendliness, his patience, and his understanding of the needs of the Members of the Senate. I wish Mr. McGrath many more years of good health, contentment, and service, and I hope that he will frequently visit his many friends in Congress.

The Congressional Session in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has adjourned, and its achievements and shortcomings now are being appraised. The record of the Congress is being evaluated by its Members, and by nonmembers, of all shades of political coloration.

I shall not presume to "rate" the Congress but shall restrict myself to brief mentions of the principal legislative actions.

How much will the activities of the session just concluded cost the taxpayers? A summary placed in the RECORD by Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee shows that the Congress sent to the White House appropriation bills providing a total of approximately $60,573,000,000 as against about $61,143,000,000 requested by President Eisenhower in his original budget and supplemental estimates. This indicates that Congress shaved $570,000,000 from Mr. Eisenhower's figures on an overall basis.

According to Mr. CANNON'S accompanying statement, "rescissions of prior appropriations included in the several bills aggregate approximately $900 million, bringing the total reduction in spending authority to about $1,470,000,000."

This refers, of course, to the overall total of appropriations. In some of the appropriation bills, Congress voted more money than requested. In the Department of Defense bill, for example, the tabulation shows that the President wanted $34,147,000,000 to run the Armed Forces in the year which began July 1. Congress voted $509,000,000 more than that. This does not mean that the Congress approved every defense expense item and then some. It cut down in some places but increased by $900 million the appropriation for bomber and fighter aircraft and related weapons of the Air Force.

Although Secretary of Defense Wilson insisted he did not want this extra money, and would not use it if he got it, the testimony of high Air Force officers that Russia had been catching up with us rapidly in air developments weighed heavily with members of congressional committees handling the defense appropriations.

It is clear that we shall continue to spend huge amounts for our national safety as the tension and uncertainty in world affairs persist.

Among the costly new items related to defense are expansion of the early-warning radar system which it is hoped would give us a chance of avoiding being crushed by a sneak air attack. This calls for at least $72 million.

The Navy is ready to spend upward of $1,400,000,000 building and modernizing warships. Another supersized aircraft carrier and a cruiser to be powered by atomic energy are scheduled. Many ships are to be adapted to carry atomic weapons.

Expansion of base facilities of the Armed Forces, both at home and overseas, is figured to cost about $2,100,000,000.

It is a grim and depressing thing to contemplate—this tremendous expenditure of our wealth on weapons, countermeasures, and the training and maintenance of personnel to operate the equipment of warfare—but few citizens would contend that we should reduce our defenses sharply and take a chance on the sincerity of occasional Russian smiles.

Our national debt, meanwhile, stands approximately $6,600,000,000 higher than 3 years ago. In 3 successive years, the President has asked and received from Congress temporary increases in the legal limit of the national debt. For 2 years, the request was to raise it from $275 billion to $281 billion. This year, in the light of an apparent budget surplus of approximately $1,700,000,000 as of June 30, Mr. Eisenhower asked for authority to exceed the legal limit by only $3 billion. The discouraging aspect of the debt-reduction problem is that, even if the $1,700,000,000 apparent surplus were credited against the debt, the Federal Government still would be mortgaged to an appreciably higher extent than 3 years ago.

In fiscal year 1956, which ended June 30, we spent approximately $42,100,000,000 on national security, as against about $48,200,000,000 for national defense in fiscal year 1954, when we still were paying big bills attributable to the Korean war.

Sad to relate, economy in nondefense Federal spending has not made progress. The costs of Government, apart from national security, totaled about $19,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1954. In fiscal year 1956, just ended, they amounted to an estimated $24,300,000,000—an increase of about 24 percent.

Although Congress did not give Mr. Eisenhower all the money he asked for foreign aid, it nevertheless made available, including unexpended balances from prior appropriations, more than $4 billion for military, economic and technical aid to foreign countries which we consider friendly, or hope are friendly. That means 4,000 millions of American tax dollars may be sent abroad this fiscal year in the continuing effort to bolster the free world in the contest with international Communist aggression.

As other defense-related items, we might note authorization of substantial additional expenditures on research projects of the Atomic Energy Commission

and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; renewal, for 2 years, of the President's authority to allocate and fix priorities, and the strengthening of penalties against seditious conspiracy and advocacy of overthrow of the Government.

In the field of international relations, congressional actions included extension for 2 years of Presidential authority to impose export controls; simplification of the customs laws; reemphasis of the position of Congress that Communist China should not be admitted to the United Nations; authorization of loan of naval vessels to West Germany, Brazil, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations, and ratification by the Senate of the International Wheat Agreement.

In veterans' and servicemen's legislation, the Congress authorized a special program of educational assistance for the sons and daughters of those who died in service in World War II and the Korean war. Following a study by a special committee headed by Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia, a new schedule of benefits for survivors of servicemen was approved, and all military personnel were provided social-security coverage.

A new plan of medical care for dependents of servicemen was voted.

The GI home loan guaranty program for World War II veterans was extended to July 25, 1958, and other actions included an increase from $50 to $78 a month in the pay of the 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act; provision of a lump-sum readjustment payment for reservists released from active duty involuntarily; extension to July 15, 1957, of the payment of pay of servicemen missing or captured in Korea; provision for burial in Arlington National Cemetery of an unknown soldier of the Korean war; and setting up an income-tax credit for retirement income of members of the armed services.

The House voted increases in the service-connected disability pensions of all veterans; the pensions of Spanish-American War widows, and the non-service-connected pensions of World War I veterans, but further congressional action was not had on these bills.

Legislation affecting natural resources included approval, at the request of the President, of a huge dam-and-reservoir project in the West, known as the upper Colorado River storage project, with an estimated initial cost of $760 million and the expectation that the ultimate bill will be much higher.

If the actual appropriations, as needed, follow the authorizations voted, numerous other big dam projects in the West will be built at a cost of many millions. The cost of just one of these many projects could give us a complete program of flood control and soil conservation in this section of Virginia if we concentrated on the smaller, upstream measures instead of the big dams. A total of $1,300,000,000 was authorized for river and harbor improvements and flood and beach-erosion projects of the Army engineers.

One of the most controversial pieces of legislation was a measure to exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. It was vetoed by the President.

Although opposed by many, including the State Water Control Board of Virginia, as an unjustified extension of Federal influence over State and community problems, use of Federal funds to assist in construction of sewage-treatment plants was approved—$50 million a year for 5 years.

Congress directed a new survey to determine whether it is practical to harness for power the tremendous tides of the Passamaquoddy region of the Maine-Canada border as a joint project of the United States and Canada.

Probably the most far-reaching pieces of domestic legislation were the Soil Bank Act, the Highway Act, and the social-security amendments.

The first, representing the major farm legislation of the session, is a $1,200,000,000 experiment in reducing the domestic surplus of farm commodities by payments intended to encourage farmers to take a portion of their lands out of production.

The soil bank has two parts—the acreage reserve, in which farmers are paid to underplant their acreage allotments of certain basic crops, leaving part of the land idle, and the conservation reserve, in which the Federal Government will "rent" a portion of the farmer's land, provided he agrees to plant it in trees or other soil-conserving cover and refrain from grazing it or harvesting the growth.

In somewhat varying forms, the soil bank idea was urged by the President, the congressional leaderships of both political parties, and all major farm organizations. The bill which authorized it followed one vetoed by the President, in which high rigid price supports on certain basic farm commodities had been included. The measure eventually signed by Mr. Eisenhower did include fixed feed-grain price supports at 76 percent of parity, and provisions intended to encourage disposal of our agricultural surpluses abroad.

The Highway Act authorizes $33,400,000,000 over a 13-year period for an expanded program of road-building with emphasis on the so-called 40,000-mile National Interstate System of through highways. The present Federal-State cost-sharing programs for other highways also will be continued.

Control of projects in the National Interstate System will be left to the State highway authorities, subject to Federal approval of route layouts, width of right-of-way, steepness of grade, materials to be used, and so forth. This differs from the original proposal of Mr. Eisenhower, which would have set up a special Federal corporation, with authority to condemn land and sell bonds to pay for the work, which bonds were not to be counted as part of the public debt, although sold by an agency of Uncle Sam.

To help pay for the road-building, it was deemed necessary to raise the Federal excise taxes on motor fuels, tires, trucks and trailers.

The social security changes provide for starting benefits to women at 62—although at a somewhat reduced rate than if they wait until 65—and to totally and permanently disabled persons at 50. Social security coverage is extended to lawyers, dentists, and virtually all other self-employed persons except physicians and osteopaths.

The Congress continued FHA housing loan insurance, authorized some more Government-built housing in the cities for subsidized rental; provided FHA loans for repair of homes damaged by floods and other major disasters; set up a flood insurance program; extended the Salk polio vaccine distribution to needy families for a year; extended and broadened the school lunch program; voted use of $7,500,000 a year for 5 years to help provide library services for rural areas; set up a training program to relieve the nurse shortage; authorized expanded research in crippling and killing diseases and chronic illnesses; tightened penalties, including provision of a discretionary death penalty, for narcotics peddlers, and extended the vocational rehabilitation program.

It also authorized the FBI to enter kidnaping cases when the victim has not been recovered in 24 hours; liberalized civil service retirement benefits; adopted certain Hoover Commission recommendations on budget and accounting procedures; established "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States; authorized research in atomic-powered merchant vessels; exempted farmers from the Federal gas and oil taxes on fuel and lubricants used off the highways; liberalized certain farm loan programs; again increased borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation and expanded the watershed protection program.

Many of the legislative enactments carried out recommendations of President Eisenhower. Others originated within the Congress. Some of the proposals of President Eisenhower failed of approval, among them the so-called civil rights bill, relaxation of immigration restrictions, statehood for Hawaii, and federally supervised school construction program.

The Record of the 84th Congress on the Administration's Program in the Fields of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the record of the 84th Congress on the administration's program in the fields of labor, health, education, and welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I should like to review the accomplishments of this Congress in the field of labor and public welfare legislation referred to the

Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Unfortunately, the accomplishments are few, in comparison with the program proposed by the President over the past 2 years.

This report clearly indicates to what extent this Congress has supported the Eisenhower program and to what extent it has not.

Before presenting this analysis, I wish to emphasize an important development in the committee itself during the 84th Congress, and especially the 2d session. Senator HILL and I as the respective ranking members of the committee have directed the Democratic and Republican staff members of the committee to work together as much as possible on legislation which both parties were supporting. Partially as a result of this cooperation such legislation that has been agreed upon has been reported by practically unanimous votes of the committee and has in nearly all cases received prompt action on the floor of the Senate. It is to be regretted that we could not handle the full program of the administration by this procedure. I refer especially to the committee's failure to consider and act upon the school-construction bill.

At the outset I want to make it clear that the order in which I discuss particular items does not necessarily reflect the importance of each one.

I. IN THE FIELD OF LABOR

The President, in his state of the Union messages of 1955 and 1956, recommended a number of labor measures which he deemed vital to the welfare of the American people and especially to the workers. Three of the most important items recommended were: Improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act; legislation to improve the safety of workers on their jobs; and a proposal to protect the beneficiaries of union health and welfare plans. In addition, there is the continuing problem of improving the Taft-Hartley Act.

The President's 1956 state of the Union message said "legislation to improve the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act is still needed." This is one area of labor legislation in which Congress has acted. S. 2280, cosponsored by 23 Senators from both sides of the aisle was enacted after hearings on a number of bills sponsored separately by leading Senators from both parties. This enactment substantially raised the far too low benefit level and improved other features of the workmen's compensation law applicable to longshoremen and harbor workers throughout the country and to all types of workers located in the District of Columbia. This is a substantial accomplishment which has been long overdue.

Occupational safety

I regret that two very important occupational safety measures which the administration has urged have not been enacted. One measure is designed to improve occupational safety in the Federal Government. The Federal Government as the largest single employer in the United States has a special responsibility in protecting the safety of its own employees. In recognition of this obligation, the President, in his 1956 budget message, stated: "To encourage precautionary safety measures, the administration will propose legislation which will provide, in conformity with the best business practices, that employing agencies shall bear the cost of [workmen's compensation] benefits paid for their employees."

At present, all costs of workmen's compensation for all Federal agencies are charged against one central fund administered by the Department of Labor. It is believed that each agency will become more safety conscious if workmen's compensation costs are charged to each agency rather than to one central fund.

S. 1309 and S. 3582 were introduced in 1955 and 1956, respectively, by myself and the distinguished senior Senators from New Hampshire and Massachusetts, in an effort to accomplish this purpose. No action has been reported on these bills, but hearings have been held on a measure, S. 3517, introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota and 12 of his colleagues from the other side of the aisle, which would reorganize the safety functions of the Federal Government. The purpose of this bill, to improve the job safety of Federal employees, is the same as that of the administration bills. It does not, however, include the administration's charge-back provision. In his comments on S. 3517, the Secretary of Labor has urged that favorable consideration be given to such a provision as embodied in S. 3582 and to other improvements in the proposal which would make it more effective in accomplishing its purpose. As an example, the bill should be amended to place in the Secretary of Labor, who now is charged with safety responsibilities for Federal employment, rather than in some subordinate official of his Department, the added powers and functions in the area of Federal safety which the bill would provide.

The President called attention to another occupational safety measure this year in both his state of the Union and budget messages. This is a program for grants to the States to aid them in establishing more vigorous and effective occupational safety programs. Such a measure, he stated, is a matter of great importance demanding immediate attention. To carry out this recommendation, S. 1091 has been introduced by the senior Senators from New York, Massachussets, Connecticut, and Minnesota, the junior Senators from Pennsylvania and Ohio, and myself. We consider this measure to be of the greatest importance. More than 2 million industrial accidents occur each year with untold hours of wasted manpower, needless human suffering, and financial loss running into billions of dollars. Over 85 percent of these injuries can be prevented if effective programs are instituted. Yet the present Congress has taken no action on this vital item.

It is tragic, indeed, that such safety measures, designed to protect the workers of the Nation, are passed over.

Temporary insurance benefits to certain workers in the District of Columbia

The wage loss workers suffer during periods of idleness forced upon them through no fault of their own can cause great hardship. This country has recognized this in such income-insurance programs as workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and old-age and survivors insurance. Little has been provided, however, to protect the worker against wage losses due to illness and injury that is not work connected. Recognizing the responsibility of the Federal Government for legislation in the District of Columbia, the President's 1956 state of the Union message recommended appropriate legislation, and S. 2753 was introduced, cosponsored by my esteemed colleagues, the senior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from New Jersey. This bill would provide insurance benefits, for a temporary period, to workers in the District of Columbia who suffer loss of income due to nonoccupational disabilities. Several States have adopted laws of this type and it was hoped that the Congress would meet its responsibility for legislation for the District of Columbia and provide this much-needed protection. To date, it has failed to do so, however.

Labor relations legislation

The President has reiterated in his 1955 and 1956 state of the Union messages the recommendation he made in his special labor message in 1954 for amending the Taft-Hartley Act. He stressed particularly amendments dealing with the rights of economic strikers to vote and the need for equalizing the obligation under the act to file disclaimers of Communist affiliation. To date no action has been taken on any such amendments.

A new proposal in the field of labor relations which the President considers of great importance is legislation to protect the beneficiaries of union welfare and benefit plans by adequate disclosure of the financial affairs of such plans. S. 3051, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Colorado at the request of the administration, is designed to accomplish this purpose. The registration and full disclosure required by this bill should act as a strong deterrent to malpractice, mismanagement, and waste of these funds. Another bill, S. 3872, to accomplish much the same purpose has been introduced by the senior Senators from Illinois and Montana, who were joined by the distinguished senior Senator from New York. This latter bill, however, places handling of registration of the plans in the Securities and Exchange Commission whereas the administration believes the Department of Labor is the appropriate agency for this function. Again, the Congress has not acted on this important legislation.

There were two major administration proposals regarding the Federal minimum-wage law. In his 1955 and 1956 state of the Union messages, the President recommended both an increased minimum wage and extended coverage of the law. The first of his recommendations has been enacted into law. The recommendation for extended coverage, however, has not been acted upon, although Secretary Mitchell is prepared to testify and give specific recommendations to Congress on this item. The many millions of workers who are in need of such legislation are thus still without its benefits, and this Congress has again failed to be responsible to the needs of workers of this country.

The President has also requested in his past two state of the Union messages that "legislation be passed to clarify and strengthen the 8-hour laws for the benefit of workers who are subject to Federal wage standards on Federal and federally assisted construction and other public work." To accomplish this purpose, S. 1204 was introduced by the senior Senator from New York, myself, and the junior Senators from New Jersey, Ohio, Colorado, and Connecticut. This bill was intended to revise the three separate 8-hour laws into a single law. It would simplify the provisions, include a 40-hour week—a provision long needed in this particular field—and would extend coverage of this act to comply more fully with the original intention of these various 8-hour laws. Again, as with so many of these proposals, there has been no action taken upon this measure.

Area development

We all know that there are some sectors of our essentially productive and healthy economy in which substantial and persistent unemployment prevail and that these areas need help to revitalize themselves. The President recognized this when he said in his 1956 state of the Union message, "We must help deal with the pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar the Nation's general industrial prosperity. Economic changes in recent years have been often so rapid and far-reaching that areas committed to a single local resource or industrial activity have found themselves temporarily deprived of their markets and their livelihood. Such conditions mean severe hardship for thousands of people as the slow process of adaptation to new circumstances goes on. This process can be speeded up * * * improving such communities must,

of course, remain the primary responsibility of the people living there and their States. But a soundly conceived Federal partnership program can be of real assistance to them in their efforts."

Early in this session I introduced a bill, S. 2892, embodying what are believed to be essential principles for such legislation. Twenty-two of my distinguished colleagues from this side of the aisle joined me in sponsoring this measure. The principles we have embodied in this legislation were set down by President Eisenhower in his 1956 Economic Report, as follows:

1. Emphasis on lasting improvement rather than temporary relief, in aid of distressed areas but not at the expense of others.

2. Recognition of primary responsibility in the States and local communities.

3. Federal assistance only through appropriate State and local channels, and only as a participant with State and local organizations.

There has been no action in the Senate on this important bill. Hearings have not even been held. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported out another bill, S. 2663, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois and 7 of his colleagues from the other side of the aisle. A similar bill has been reported in the House.

Minority members of the committee worked closely with the majority members on S. 2663 in an effort to improve its provisions. When S. 2663 was reported from committee, it was with two exceptions a fairly reasonable bill and, while it went further than the administration bill, it did embody most of the provisions and protections of that administration measure.

However, sweeping amendments from the Democratic side to S. 2663 were offered and approved on the floor. These amendments removed from the bill the "runaway shop" protections, thereby encouraging the creation of new depressed areas and endangering the livelihood of many numbers in highly industrialized areas.

In its amended form S. 2663 passed the Senate, but was not acted upon by the House.

Equal pay for equal work

Another area of labor legislation to which President Eisenhower referred in his recent state of the Union message is that of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex. This is a matter of simple justice. With the large number of women in the labor force, in many cases engaged in work done previously by men or working alongside men, it is only reasonable that these women be paid according to their work and not according to their sex. And yet, S. 3352, introduced by the senior Senator from New York, the junior Senators from Colorado, Ohio, and Maine, and the two Senators from Connecticut, has been ignored since its introduction in March of this year.

Other important legislation

There is an important measure which would extend the protection of our laws relating to assaults and homicides against officers and employees of the United States to those persons enforcing the Federal labor statutes which has not been acted upon. Most Federal employees who perform law enforcement duties are covered by provisions of the Federal Criminal Code relating to the protection of Federal officers and employees. This protection does not extend, however, to Labor Department employees. To cover these employees, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah has introduced S. 1150. H. R. 6997, a comparable measure, has been passed by the House, but action is still pending in the Senate. This proposal should be acted upon.

The Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly by concurrent resolution of February 18, 1955, expressed its desire for the extension of the provisions of title III of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This would enable the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, which does not presently extend to Puerto Rico, to be put into effect there. There is a high rate of unemployment persistent in Puerto Rico and the need for this application of the unemployment insurance system is great. My esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from New York, introduced S. 2183 on June 10, 1955, to accomplish this purpose. But, this bill, too, has been shelved.

Another unemployment-insurance measure has failed of enactment. The President in his state of the Union and economic messages of 1955 recommended improvement of the District of Columbia unemployment-insurance law to provide a uniform maximum duration of 26 weeks for benefits and improvement of the disqualification provisions. S. 1163 was introduced by the junior Senators from Maryland, Maine, and Montana, and the senior Senator from West Virginia to carry out this recommendation. The sponsors of this bill were joined by the junior Senators from New Jersey and Michigan and the senior Senator from Oregon in sponsoring a substitute measure, S. 1835. This bill has passed the Senate and been referred to the House District Committee. No further action has taken place.

In all jurisdictions, except the District of Columbia, the State or Territory handles both the public employment services and the unemployment-insurance functions, thus being enabled to operate them as a coordinated system. This insures a maximum offer of jobs to unemployed claimants as well as an efficient and economical administration of the two programs. At the present time, the public employment service for the District is operated by the Federal Government while the unemployment-insurance law is administered by the District government. To remedy this situation, my esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, introduced S. 3642, a bill to transfer the District of Columbia public employment service from the United States Department of Labor to the Government of the District of Columbia. This legislation had the backing of the administration. Yet it, too, has not been acted upon by this Congress.

I wish to call attention to one final measure which, I am happy to note, has been passed by both the Senate and the House and has been signed by the President. I refer to S. 3391, a bill designed to protect migrant workers by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate their interstate transportation by motor vehicle. Over the past 50 years the migration of large numbers of workers for temporary farm employment has presented problems regarding their safe transportation from place to place about the country. This legislation is designed to do something constructive to help alleviate this problem.

II. IN THE FIELD OF HEALTH

Although many important parts of President Eisenhower's health program were not given consideration, a fair amount of progress in this field was made.

The President, in his health message of January 31, 1955, stated that "the Congress should take steps to strengthen the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps by improving its status." S. 2587 was introduced to reach this objective. The bill, which is now public law, amended the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to declare the Commissioned Corps to be a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense as well as in time of war.

The committee also considered and favorably reported two other vitally important administration health bills. One, S. 1948, provided grants to States for carrying out the purposes of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955. The second bill, S. 2940, extends the time limit on availability of funds through June 30, 1957.

S. 886, the omnibus health bill, which embodied health recommendations made in the President's health messages of 1955 and 1956, and in his state of the Union message of 1955, received brief hearings, but no action was taken on the bill as a whole.

Of the six titled in the bill, Title I, Reinsurance; Title II, Mortgage Loan Insurance for Construction of Health Facilities; and Title V, Public Health Grants, which would replace the present separate authorizations with an authorization for grants for support of public-health services generally and for extension and improvement of such services and grants for special projects, received no action in the 1956 session.

However, Title III, Practical Nurse Training; Title IV, Graduate Training of Professional Nurses and Public Health Personnel; and Title VI, Mental Health Grants, were considered and in modified form included in the Health Amendments Act of 1956, S. 3958, which has been passed by both House and Senate.

Also embodied in S. 3958 was the principal objective of S. 3075, an administration bill which had been recommended by the President in his 1956 health message. While S. 3075, which provided for the extension of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, received no action as such, it was essentially the same as S. 3958 which has passed both the House and Senate.

Another phase of the President's program favorably reported by the committee and enacted into law during this Congress was S. 3076. This bill provided for a continuing national survey on disease and illness and other special supplementary studies. This program will provide statistical estimates on the extent of the major diseases, injuries, and impairments, on the nature and duration of the resulting disability, and on the amount and type of medical and related services received.

Although the committee was successful in enacting into law part of the President's health proposals, it has failed in some very important areas of the administration's program. S. 3252 was introduced to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a 5-year program of Federal construction grants to assist medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and to assist other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical and dental research to expand their research facilities.

The President, in his health message of January 26, 1956, said: "I recommend that Congress enact legislation authorizing $250 million for a 5-year program to assist in construction of research and teaching facilities for schools of medicine, osteopathy, public health, and dentistry, and other research institutions. These institutions would be required to supply at least equal amounts in matching funds."

S. 849, which the Congress approved, is a modified version of S. 3252, but it does not contain one of the most significant provisions of S. 3252. There is no provision for construction of medical and dental training facilities. The information we received at the hearings indicates the vital need for these facilities. We have only to read the figures of the large number of potential doctors and dentists turned away from our schools for lack of training facilities, to know that the need for this legislation is acute. If our ever-growing population is to have a well-trained and sufficiently large medical and dental profession, this legislation must be passed.

Another vital piece of health legislation which received no action by the committee was S. 4172. This bill would authorize approval of voluntary agreements between private insurance organizations for pooling their

resources in developing plans or policies designated to meet current needs for adequate health prepayment protection.

The list of health bills proposed by the administration, which will die for want of action by the committee, grows as we add S. 4132. This bill, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, Senator PURTELL, to implement the recommendation of the President in his 1956 budget message, provides for the transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University. The bill was designed to carry out the recommendations of the Freedmen's Hospital Study Commission. This proposed legislation is based on recognition of (1) continuing and increasing needs for medical, nursing, and allied professional personnel; (2) the need for new substantive law which would establish the long-term mission of Freedmen's Hospital; (3) Howard University's expanding medical training program; and (4) hospital service needs of the greater Washington community.

III. IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Although the President has succeeded in getting action on part of his health program, his recommendations in the field of education did not fare so well. The greatest single failure of this committee has been its failure to take action on the President's school construction proposal. At the beginning of the 84th Congress extensive hearings were held by the committee on several school construction bills. Members of the committee heard from witnesses who reemphasized the seriousness of the problem. The shortage of schools for the children of America has created a critical and ever-growing problem in our educational system. Certainly every member of the committee is aware of this crisis.

Yet as quickly as the interest of the majority members of the committee in school construction had arisen, so did it die. Hearings were held on the first administration bill, S. 968, on February 16, 17, 18, and 21, 1955. Hearings were also held on the Democratic-sponsored bill on January 27, 28, and 31, 1955. The first administration bill was revised and introduced as S. 2905 in the second session, but no hearings were held on the revised bill or on any other school construction bill throughout the second session. S. 2905 contained the following substantive titles (there is a fifth title with definitions and miscellaneous provisions): Title I, authorized Federal purchases of obligations of local educational agencies where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest; title II, authorized Federal advances of funds to reserves established by States; title III, authorized grants to States to assist them in helping local educational agencies; title IV, authorized grants to States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing State programs.

Action on school construction was one of the first orders of business and in the first session appeared to be of paramount importance to the members of the committee. However, in the second session, while the interest of the Republican members remained great, all action and the previous interest displayed by the Democratic membership seemed to lessen considerably. No amount of urging on the part of members of the minority could rekindle the interest displayed by the Democrats at the beginning of the 84th Congress. The efforts of the ranking Republican on the committee to reach an agreeable compromise with the majority members were to no avail. Today we are without a school construction bill and without a cure for the cancer that is eating away at our educational system.

One of the few bills in the area of education to escape this inactivity was the extension of Public Law 815. Although the bill, H. R. 11695, which passed both Houses was not the exact administration version, it was an acceptable one. Among other things, it extends Public Law 815, 81st Congress, which provides for school construction assistance to local educational agencies in areas that had been burdened with substantial increases in school attendance as a result of defense and related Federal activities.

Because of the need to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action by the States and localities in the field of higher education, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School recommended the appropriation of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State in establishing a State Committee on Education Beyond the High School. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but also to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee.

Legislation introduced to implement this recommendation would have provided $800,000 to the States. An additional $300,000 was asked for to support the President's committee.

Unfortunately no funds were appropriated by the Congress for the State committees, and only $150,000 was appropriated for the President's committee.

One important education measure urged by the President in his 1956 state of the Union message which recently passed the Senate but failed to get House action is S. 3620. This bill provides for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded. Enactment of this legislation would insure substantial progress toward achieving the following objectives: (a) Reducing the number of the mentally retarded who need and require institutional care; (b) reducing the degree of dependency of the mentally retarded who live at home; (c) making the mentally retarded more nearly self-supporting; (d) reducing, by grouping the mentally retarded into special classes for special instruction, the disproportionate amount of time and attention which the mentally retarded inevitably require in the average classroom; (e) increasing the significance of life for mentally retarded children; (f) bringing added satisfaction to those families of which mentally retarded children are a part.

IV. IN THE FIELD OF WELFARE

The President recognized a long-sought objective of persons associated with the arts when, in his 1955 state of the Union message, he recommended establishing a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. The purpose of the Commission as set forth in S. 3054 is to undertake studies of, and make recommendations related to, appropriate methods for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Hearings were held on S. 3054 and similar bills, and the committee then favorably reported S. 3419. While the bill which finally passed the Senate was not identical to S. 3054, it contained many of the principal proposals of the administration and was considered an acceptable compromise. Unfortunately this bill was not acted upon by the House.

In the closing days of the second session the committee acted upon a juvenile delinquency bill. The administration bill, S. 894, authorized a 5-year program of Federal grants to assist States and localities in strengthening and improving their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency. Particular emphasis was given to effectuating coordination of programs of various States and local agencies concerned with the control of juvenile delinquency. The bill which finally emerged from the committee, S. 4267, did contain some of the provisions of the administration bill. Certain provisions of the bill reported out of the committee were based on studies and investigations made by a committee headed by Senator Hendrickson in the 83d Congress.

I have briefly here attempted to review the course of many of the administration's labor, health, education, and welfare proposals referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during this 84th Congress. The list is by no means complete. Yet it can be seen that little has been done by this Congress with all too many of the proposals of the administration in these fields. I feel that this is a serious failure to meet our obligations in these important areas.

Investigation of the Rehabilitation of Narcotic Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement commenting on a resolution which I have introduced proposing an investigation into ways and means of rehabilitating narcotic addicts who are some of the most pitiable and unfortunate people in the world.

I do not expect that any action will be taken on this resolution at this session but I hope to see that it is introduced as soon as Congress convenes next year. This is a most appealing problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared in support of Senate Resolution 322 and certain attachments thereto, consisting of letters from some of my constituents, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON SENATE RESOLUTION 322 PROPOSING AN INVESTIGATION OF THE REHABILITATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS

Mr. President, during this session of the Congress, we have enacted legislation drastically increasing the penalties for the violation of the Federal narcotics laws. However, this legislation was of the police type and dealt only with the detection, apprehension and sentencing of those engaged in the illicit drug traffic. We have enacted no legislation specifically dealing with the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and the preventive measures needed to prevent their recidivism.

The Senate will recall that when the Narcotics Control Act was being debated on the Senate floor, I pointed out at length that if we wanted to get at the roots of this problem of narcotic addiction, we should focus our attention on the rehabilitative phases of the problem.

The Narcotics Control Act was a result of extensive hearings on the illicit narcotics traffic conducted by the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. This subcommittee conducted its investigations under the able leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas. That subcommittee quite properly oriented its investigation in the direction of ascertaining those areas of the Federal judicial system and machinery as well as of the enforce-

ment agencies of the executive branch that needed strengthening. It heard some witnesses who discussed some of the problems attendant upon the rehabilitation of drug addicts, but its central focus was upon the detection, apprehension, prosecution and sentencing of persons dealing in illicit narcotic drugs. It did issue a report dealing with some aspects of the treatment of rehabilitation and the role of the United States Public Health Service in treatment. The report did not deal with the role of the United States Office of Education and the various State and local educational agencies in educating our youth to the dangers of narcotic drugs—and how such educational processes might be safely carried on. The report did not deal with the role of the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the State vocational rehabilitation agencies, of which there is one in each State, in the aftercare of narcotic addicts who no longer need hospitalization. The report did not deal with the possibilities of setting up some sort of regional hospital system for the care of narcotic addicts. These are all important areas. If we are to make a start toward the rehabilitation of these addicts, we must give them our earnest and thorough attention.

Now I hasten to assure the junior Senator from Texas that I mention these areas not covered in his report without the slightest intention of criticising the fine work which he and the other members of that subcommittee have done in their investigations. For I know—as the Senate knows full well also—that the subcommittee deliberately limited its areas of activity because it did not want to impinge in any way upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. For his zeal in so doing, I heartily commend the junior Senator from Texas and his colleagues. And to make certain that the rehabilitative features of the problem of narcotic addiction were not overlooked, the chairman of that subcommittee directed copies of the testimony received to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. In commenting on the floor of the Senate upon his action in doing so, the junior Senator from Texas stated it to be his belief that both the law enforcement and the rehabilitative aspects of the problem were equally important, but should be handled in separate bills after consideration by separate committees.

And so, the mandate to act is clearly upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As a member of that committee, I am most anxious that it act—that it act in an intelligent way by making legislative proposals only after a thorough exploration not only of what is being done, but also what it is possible to do to bring about the successful rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. To achieve such an exploration, I introduced a few days ago Senate Resolution 322 calling upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to conduct such an investigation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, from my own experience here in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as my experience as Governor of the State of New York, I have been made well aware of and have become increasingly concerned with the problems attendant upon the growing problem of drug addiction, especially among our young persons.

The answer, Mr. President, to this problem is not bigger and bigger prisons, jails, and reformatories. The answer lies in prevention and treatment at the earliest possible moment, while there is still time to save these unfortunate addicts. The answer lies in finding out what facilities and services are needed for their successful rehabilitation and making certain that those facilities are there when needed.

Now, Mr. President, disregarding for a moment the social values involved—and I do not concede that we can ever lose sight of them even for a moment—consider the proposal simply from a dollar-and-cents point of view. It is far cheaper to provide the services a young narcotic addict needs for his rehabilitation than to confine him in a Federal penal institution at an annual cost—a recurring cost, I remind you—of almost $2,000.

What good does it do to lock this young addict up in prison without making the attempt—the real, sincere, fortified attempt to achieve his rehabilitation? Rather than contenting ourselves with his confinement, we should dedicate whatever is needed for our resources to apply every bit of skill and knowledge we have to transforming this young narcotic offender from a taxpayer into a tax consumer.

I realize that it is late in the session and that there is little chance for action on my resolution. I introduced it as an indication of the direction and the manner in which I think this problem can be attacked. In doing so, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I do not foreclose, but, rather, expect action in certain areas in the meantime. There are doubtless certain things which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare could recommend immediately. I am hopeful it will do so. There are other areas in which certain additional investigations must be made, certain additional data gathered, certain additional testimony adduced before the exact direction in which we should move can be formulated.

Mr. President, I have received numerous communications from agencies, organizations, and individuals supporting the stand I have taken that the approach we should take to the drug-addiction problem should be rehabilitative rather than punitive. I ask unanimous consent that some of these letters be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I hope, Mr. President, that early in the next session of the Congress favorable action will be taken along the lines of Senate Resolution 322 and that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will proceed as expeditiously as possible in its investigation so that it can with all possible dispatch recommend to the Congress legislative measures which will deal with the problems of the rehabilitation of drug addicts in a sound and constructive manner.

Senate Resolution 322

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation, special attention shall be given to (1) determining the nature and extent of the facilities and services available and needed for the successful rehabilitation of narcotic addicts; (2) the adequacy of existing laws providing for the treatment of youthful and juvenile addicts; (3) the extent and effectiveness of the cooperation and coordination of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government both among themselves and with the various State and local agencies concerned with the rehabilitation of drug addicts; and (4) the efficacy of the Nation's present approach to the rehabilitation of drug addicts with special emphasis upon youthful and juvenile addicts.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

JULY 13, 1956.

Dr. DANIEL BLAIN,
Medical Director, American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BLAIN: Thank you for your letter enclosing a statement critical of legislative proposals concerning narcotic drug addiction.

I am, of course, in general agreement with the approach you take to this problem—the treatment rather than the punitive one. I also am in accord with your position that what is needed is more treatment, more rehabilitation, more research, and the personnel and facilities to make these all possible. As you know, when the Narcotics Control Act was being considered in the Senate, I took the floor to speak out against the approach being taken.

Thank you for writing as you did and sending me the views of your organization. I appreciate greatly receiving them.

Yours very sincerely.

AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I am enclosing a statement critical of legislative proposals concerning drug addiction now pending before the Congress. We shall certainly appreciate any attention you may give to it.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL BLAIN, M. D.,
Medical Director.

The enclosed statement critical of current legislative proposals in Congress regarding drug addiction has been prepared by the American Psychiatric Association for public release. The statement makes the following major points with reference to the effects of S. 3760, S. 3901, and H. R. 11106:

1. From a medical point of view, the bills represent backward, rather than constructive, approaches to a national attack on drug addiction.

2. They are based on misconceptions of the nature of drug addiction as a psychiatric illness, and appear to proceed mistakenly on the assumption that drug addicts are especially responsible for a substantial number of crimes of violence.

3. The bills discourage or abolish previous flexible provision for parole, probation, and assignment of drug addicts to Federal hospitals, and thus will impede medical progress. that has been initiated under existing legislation.

The statement contends that further progress against drug addiction lies in the direction of expanding the medical attack on the problem. It is possible to envisage the gradual development of a medical program that would not only reduce drug addiction but would, at the same time, take the profits

out of the illicit drug trade. New legislation should proceed in this general direction.

A STATEMENT CRITICAL OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS DEALING WITH THE NATIONAL PROBLEM OF DRUG ADDICTION

(Prepared by the American Psychiatric Association for public release, June 12, 1956)

In the opinion of psychiatrists, several legislative proposals now before Congress to tighten control of illicit traffic in drugs, chiefly by increasing penalties for possessing and selling them, represent backward steps in attacking this national problem. It is noted that public hearings on these particular bills (S. 3901, S. 3760 and H. R. 11106) have not been held, thereby giving professional opinion an opportunity to take exception to them. Although these bills differ in many details, considered as a composite they have the following effects:

They drastically increase penalties attached to possessing and selling the drugs, in one case providing the death penalty for a third conviction.

They provide for mandatory jail sentences, and in doing so substantially discourage or abolish previous flexible provisions for parole, probation, and assignment of offenders to Federal hospitals for treatment and rehabilitation.

They discourage the seeking of voluntary treatment by addicts by making it mandatory for a physician in a Federal hospital, including VA hospitals, to report such patients to public authorities, thus violating medical confidence. This would apply even to those who become addicted accidentally in connection with a prolonged physical illness.

The bills in establishing punitive measures do not distinguish between pushers, peddlers, and high-level operators in the illicit drug trade.

The bills tend to substitute extreme punishment and police power for a constructive medical program for treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts that has slowly developed over the years in the Federal hospitals at Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky., and also in State and city hospitals.

Such legislative proposals apparently arise out of widespread public misconceptions about the nature of drug addiction, drug addicts, and what constitutes a long term constructive approach to the problem from a medical point of view.

The main point to be made is that drug addiction is due to a psychiatric illness, in the nature of a personality and character disorder. The drug addict has approximately the same mental characteristics as the alcoholic and the barbiturate addict.

There are some 60,000 drug addicts in the United States. This is an alarming figure, but from a psychiatric point of view, it suffers by comparison with an estimated 3 million confirmed alcoholics, not to mention some 750,000 mentally ill people found in our mental hospitals on any day of the week.

The notion that a drug addict is in fact a criminal is false. He is made a criminal by law, rather than because of the effects of the drug. Opium and its derivatives, heroin and morphine, do not as such have the effect of motivating a person to commit crimes. On the contrary, they have a sedative effect and give the addict a sense of being at peace with the world.

It is during the withdrawal phase, when the drug wears off, that the addict is impelled to criminal behavior. His motivation is simple and direct: to get money to purchase more of the drug, without which he suffers extreme pain and discomfort. His crimes are not generally crimes of violence such as rape and murder. Rather, they are crimes of stealth, petty thievery, picking pockets, breaking and entering, and the like.

Alcohol, on the other hand, does have some crime-producing qualities, notably by way of stimulating people to socially irresponsible action. It is estimated that 7 out of 100 fatal automobile accidents, for example, are due to the influence of alcohol. It is commonly believed that criminals become "hopped up" on the drugs to commit crimes. This is not so. They are far more apt to take alcohol to work up courage and confidence to commit the crime.

Marihuana, taken in sufficient quantity, may have certain crime-producing qualities. Studies, however, indicate that crimes committed as a result of taking marihuana are relatively rare, and usually occur when the drug is used in conjunction with alcohol.

There is also wide misunderstanding about terms used in connection with drug addiction and the traffic in drugs, notably the terms "peddlers" and "pushers." The peddler is himself usually a drug addict. He obtains and sells the drug to other addicts as a means of obtaining his own supply. Most peddlers are not concerned with selling drugs to nonaddicts or with promoting drug addiction.

The pushers, however, for the most part are nonaddicts who are key agents in the network of criminals who seek to promote drug addiction among the population for the profits that are in it. Some drug addicts, it is true, become pushers, but the bulk of them do not.

It is also common knowledge that there is a select group of big-time operators at the top of the drug-trade hierarchy who make huge profits yearly out of supplying the drugs to sick addicts and in promoting drug addiction generally. They are the arch criminals of the trade, and Federal legislation to date has been notably unsuccessful in putting them out of business.

By not distinguishing among peddlers, pushers, and big-time operators in prescribing punishment, these legislative bills make it impossible to provide treatment and rehabilitation for the peddler addict.

It seems clear the root of the evil lies in the profits that are available in the illicit-drug trade. The situation is somewhat similar to the kind of profiteering and gangsterism that characterized the illicit-liquor trade in the 1920's. In the long run a method must be found to remove the profits. There is no reason to believe that extreme punishment for peddler addicts will help. Indeed, to the extent that such legislation discourages further treatment and rehabilitation for them, it may be expected to worsen the situation.

A sound medical program designed to make substantial inroads against drug addiction calls for the same essential ingredients as any other medical program; more treatment, more rehabilitation, more research, and the personnel and facilities to make these possible. Considerable progress has been made in recent years in Federal, State, and city hospitals in treating and rehabilitating addicts. The incidence of drug addiction has decreased over the past 30 years. This progress has been made under rigorous existing legislation and procedures (the Harrison Act). The medical assumption may be made, therefore, that further headway can be made by elaborating the treatment and rehabilitation programs that have already been started.

Much more, of course, remains to be done; but progress lies in the direction of expanding the medical attack on the problem. It is possible to envisage the gradual development of a medical approach that would not only become increasingly effective in reducing drug addiction, but would at the same time take the profits out of the illicit-drug traffic. Many proposals for making possible the prescribing of drugs for addicts under medically controlled conditions have been considered and recommended in medical circles. These proposals should be subjected to careful investigation and experiment.

Additional legislation concerning drug addiction should be directed to making further medical progress possible, rather than discouraging it. The legislative proposals now under consideration would undermine the progress that has been made and impede further progress. Thus, they are not in the public interest.

JULY 14, 1956.

MR. GEORGE STRAUSS,
Chairman, American Civil Liberties Union, Buffalo, N. Y.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Thank you for your letter urging my opposition to the inclusion of the death penalty and wiretapping provisions in the Narcotics Control Act.

As you know, when this bill was being debated in the Senate, I took the floor to speak out against the approach being taken and to urge greater facilities and services for the rehabilitation of drug addicts. I also cosponsored two amendments to delete the death penalty and wiretapping provisions. While we were successful in obtaining the adoption of the latter amendment, the former amendment was rejected.

Thank you for writing as you did and bringing to my attention the views of your organization.

Yours very sincerely.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
NIAGARA FRONTIER BRANCH,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 13, 1956.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: On behalf of the Niagara Frontier Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, I would like to call your attention to certain provisions of the so-called narcotics control bill which are objectionable from a civil-liberties point of view.

It is our feeling that the extension of the death penalty to narcotic peddling is primitive, retributive, and highly inappropriate at a time when the rest of the civilized world, for instance England, is abandoning it. We feel that if this penalty is used at all it should be reserved only for the areas in which it has been traditionally used, such as murder and rape.

We also object to the wiretapping provisions which were wisely deleted from the bill when it passed the Senate. We feel that wiretapping in any form is an unjustified invasion of the individual's right to privacy.

Although we realize that the bill has already passed the Senate, we urge you to remain vigilant that these sections do not pass if the bill is returned to your body.

Sincerely,

GEORGE STRAUSS,
Chairman.

JULY 13, 1956.

MR. ERNEST F. WITTE,
Executive Director,
Council on Social Work Education, Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WITTE: Thank you for the kind remarks contained in your letter with respect to my comments concerning the letter from George Washington to the Newport Hebrew Congregation, and on the narcotics control bill.

It was considerate of you to write me as you did and to take the time and effort to comment on my remarks. I appreciate your thoughtfulness.

Yours very sincerely.

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 13, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with great interest the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you so kindly sent me, in which were quoted your remarks concerning the letter

from George Washington to the Hebrew congregation in Newport, R. I. I found this a most inspiring document and, as you say, one that the Nation could profitably review at frequent intervals.

I have also read your remarks on the pending narcotics bill, S. 3760, and confess that in my judgment it is one of the few rational speeches made on this bill which I have been privileged to read. I hope that your views will prevail and that something constructive can be added to this measure in line with modern knowledge, which will be more effective in removing the causes for the sale and use of narcotics and in the rehabilitation of those victims who have become addicted.

Would that we had more Senator LEHMANS in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST F. WITTE.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 26, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Your office was good enough to send me a copy of the floor remarks which you made on the narcotics bill, S. 3760, on May 25.

I write to congratulate you on this forthright and incisive statement which seems to me entirely sound.

I hope your hand can be strengthened in taking the emphasis away from punitive control measures and placing them on prevention and rehabilitation.

Faithfully yours,

REGINALD M. ATWATER, M. D.,
Executive Secretary.

MAY 31, 1956.

DR. HERBERT BERGER, M. D.,
The Berger Clinic,
Tottenville, Staten Island, N. Y.

DEAR DR. BERGER: Thank you for your letter enclosing a reprint of your article on narcotic addiction, and for your telephone call to Mr. Edelstein explaining the academy's position on the Daniel bill.

I am enclosing a copy of the remarks I made on the floor of the Senate when this bill was taken up for consideration. You will note that I relied heavily upon your views and those of the academy.

I do appreciate your making your views known to me.

Yours very sincerely.

THE BERGER CLINIC,
Tottenville, Staten Island, N. Y.,
April 7, 1956.

Senator H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Enclosed please find a reprint of an article on narcotic addiction which appeared in our State medical journal.

I hope that when the Daniels committee recommendtion reaches the floor of the Senate that you may feel yourself in a position to support the medical rather than the punitive management of these sick people.

These principles have been adopted by the State medical society. I should be happy to have the opportunity to discuss this matter with you in person.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT BERGER, M. D.

THE RICHMOND COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY'S PLAN FOR THE CONTROL OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

(By Herbert Berger, M. D., F. A. C. P., Staten Island, N. Y.)

In January 1953 the Medical Society of the County of Richmond in New York after considerable study passed the following resolution:

"1. Whereas the medical profession in its traditional role as guardian of the public health has been distressed by the narcotic problem and its apparent increase; and

"2. Whereas the average user of narcotics must spend from $15 to $100 per day to keep himself supplied with drugs; and

"3. Whereas the crime in drug addiction stems from the inability of persons of moderate means to purchase drugs at present illegal prices; and

"4. Whereas the most serious of these crimes is the conversion of each addict into a salesman with consequent formation of new addicts; and

"5. Whereas the use of morphine and heroin in themselves do not incite these unfortunate people to crime, as both drugs are depressants; and

"6. Whereas the narcotic trade exists only because of the huge profits involved (for example, 2 pounds of heroin can be bought for $10 in China and sold after cutting and packaging for $80,000 or more): Then therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Medical Society of the County of Richmond favors the legalizing of the distribution of narcotics free of charge with proper safeguards, hereinafter to wit:

"1. Establish narcotics clinics in all cities as the need appears under the aegis of the United States Public Health Service.

"2. Register and fingerprint all who apply to prevent reregistering in other clinics.

"3. Do not demand that they be enforcibly confined, as they are now.

"4. Determine the smallest amount of pure drug that will relieve the patient of his symptoms.

"5. Administer this uncut material by the doctor or under his supervision and under sterile precautions.

"6. Keep accurate records of dosages.

"7. No supply ever to be given to the addict, dosage to be given only at the clinic.

"8. Nominal charge for the actual cost of the drug, possibly 15 to 30 cents.

"9. Make an effort to effect a cure, where possible, using hospitalization if the patient acquiesces."

The passage of this resolution excited the enthusiasm of the public press and has been followed in turn by a not inconsiderable degree of interest among social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, the clergy, and addicts themselves. Those who are seeking a solution to the problem of juvenile delinquency, as well as a number of organizations devoted to the study of criminology, have seen fit to comment favorably on these suggestions. After appropriate action by the coordinating council of the five counties comprising the city of New York, this resolution was presented to the house of delegates of the Medical Society of the State of New York. It was referred to the council committee on public health and education and studied for an entire year. In May 1954 the house of delegates of our State society passed this resolution and referred it to the American Medical Association. The problem is now before a committee of the American Medical Association. Therefore, it seems proper that the resolution be called to the attention of physicians throughout the United States who may now have an opportunity to understand the background and the thinking that went into the preparation of these thoughts. Similar joint resolutions have been introduced into Congress. If some of the material that follows seems elementary, it is written so only because by Federal fiat the medical profession has been separated from the care of these sick people, the narcotic addicts. It is quite possible that many physicians have neither seen, recognized, nor treated a person afflicted with addiction.

THE NARCOTIC ADDICT AS A PERSON

There are few people in this enlightened country of our who are so badly misunderstood and maligned as these unfortunates. Our novelists and some of our less well-informed sources of general information have pictured him as a fiend, and a devil, subhuman, and possessed of none of the gentler civilized attributes. Since most physicians are inexperienced with the votaries of opium, even we, who of all people should be aware of this faulty characterization, know little about these individuals. I was utterly amazed to meet a veritable Casper Milquetoast, my first experience with a long-addicted person. Perhaps as this story unfolds, the reasons for our lack of authoritative information in this important medical area may become apparent.

There are no individuals who do not at times experience periods of depression or elation. A mature personality recognizes these alterations in his mood as normal. Most of us have learned that blue days are temporary and will ultimately be followed by better ones. We overcome our despair with patience or sometimes by the finding of a new hobby, a vacation, a new job or home, or perhaps a new interest. The narcotic addict, however, cannot tolerate these depressions and valleys in his daily living. He is incapable of using his own native talents for overcoming these unpleasant episodes. He wants to reach and stay at the heights of elation and happiness constantly. This is a perfectly normal, human desire shared by all of us. Our narcotic patient, however, differs in that he seeks to attain this plateau of joy chemically rather than from the use of his own inner strength and convictions. Even this small introduction to a large and involved subject should make it apparent that drug addiction isn't even a disease. It is merely a symptom of one.

What then is wrong with the euphoria that these people seek to achieve endlessly? The fault lies not with the pleasant state of mind which they hope to perpetuate, but rather with their lack of insight into themselves and their lack of understanding of reality. A problem deferred with narcotics remains unsolved. It persists tomorrow or the next day so that these individuals, like so many of the rest of us, are procrastinators of the worst sort. Whatever strength of character they may once have possessed is lost as they everlastingly retreat from life and the making of decisions. Without going into this subject to a length interesting only to the serious student of psychiatry, it becomes apparent that these are sick individuals, suffering not from narcotic addiction but from lack of will power and strength of personality. They differ little from those of us who eat too much and hardly at all from the alcoholic who seeks as well to solve life's problems chemically.

THE NATURE OF ADDICTING DRUGS

We physicians have been using narcotics for thousands of years, and we know full well the effect of these medicaments on our patients. They are sedatives, inducing sleep or relieving anxiety. With them our patients may achieve surcease from pain or worry. Their larger problems may become smaller or even insignificant to them. Can the lurid articles in the daily press make us, who have a grounding in pharmacology, believe that narcotics do anything else for an addict? Under the influence of opiates the addict like our other patients becomes relaxed and at ease. He is incapable of violent crime while under the influence of these drugs and cares nothing for sex. He is incapable of sex. Many of them tell me that their entire interest in this subject disappears when they are so sedated. In fact, many of these individuals are better citizens with narcotics than they are without. Please do not interpret this as a suggestion that they be used

in the treatment of certain psychogenic states. An observation that those of us who are interested in this subject make, time and time again, is that the individual who has been using these materials as self-treatment for anxiety demonstrates all of his symptoms as he is removed ever further and further from the addicting material. Many calm and quiet individuals who are able to work steadily while using narcotics find themselves becoming antisocial, belligerent, and endlessly difficult without these substances.

This, then should introduce us to a new concept of these patients because actually every reader of this paper probably has met, and knows now, a narcotic addict who may hold a position of responsibility in his own community extending from bank presidents to doctors to locomotive engineers. These people perform their work perfectly without detection until for some reason they run afoul of the law in their efforts to gratify their habit. Compare our addict, if you will, with a diabetic. The latter is able to lead a normal life as long as he gets all of life's necessities and insulin. The drug addict, similarly, is able to function adequately as long as he receives the same necessities of life that our diabetic needs, but he, in addition, needs not insulin but narcotics.

There are two features which are ascribed to narcotics as though they exhibited these pharmacologic characteristics alone. These drugs produce both tolerance and dependence. By the former we mean that it takes ever-increasing doses to produce the same effect. Your self-treated constipated patient tends to use ever larger and larger doses of his favorite laxative in order to produce the same effect on his bowels. Dependence is some characteristic of the nerve cell which demands these materials in order to function properly. Such dependence appears in many other diseases, for example, the use of vitamin B_{12} in the treatment of pernicious anemia.

Let us picture for a moment a potential narcotic addict who has never met a peddler. He might be the antisocial person who throws a stone through the stained glass window of the church to which he does not belong or who sets fire to his school when he has been disciplined therein. Perhaps he is a member of one of our numerous lunatic fringe societies, or he may be found in our jails or in our underworld because some of his antisocial behavior has made him a criminal. Not too long ago such a person came to my attention who, after experiencing many difficulties in adolescence, became a moderate user of narcotics. For the past 45 years he has operated a railroad switch tower at a busy junction. He has been praised by his supervisor as a diligent, conscientious worker who "never misses a day" and on whom he "can depend utterly." This individual unfortunately acquired tuberculosis and came to my attention only when he was admitted to a sanitorium, thereby being separated from his usual sources of supply. In summary, then, these materials are used as self-treatment by certain mentally sick individuals. They do not incite the user to violence. In fact, the very opposite is true.

CRIME AND DRUG ADDICTION

If these drugs do not promulgate criminal tendencies, why are crime and narcotic addiction so closely allied in our minds? In the United States the addict is not recognized officially as a psychopath but rather as a criminal. Now this is an entirely man-made situation. We could make our diabetics criminals just as quickly were we to forbid them insulin. Similarly, our experience with prohibition proved to us that we could make criminals out of devotees of alcohol. We recognized this error in our thinking when the 18th amendment was repealed. Now, by the ukase of the Bureau of Narcotics, we have divorced the addict from a legitimate source of drugs. He may not obtain these materials from his physician, nor can he obtain them through his pharmacist. To him they have become a way of life. They are, in his warped reasoning, necessary for his very existence. Therefore, he obtains them through the underworld or by stealth. The peddler, like the bootlegger of the 1920's, was happy to have this artificial opportunity created for him by our legislative efforts.

Narcotics are not very expensive, costing little more than aspirin to produce. There is a rather large tax on these materials, but even so, 20 or 30 cents would supply the daily needs of most addicts. Actually, however, since the price of these materials has been artificially heightened by the nature of their source. many of these people spend from $15 to $100 a day to gratify their addiction. This, then, is the source of crime. How many individuals do any of us know who can spend $100 per day on drugs in addition to all the other expenses of living. It becomes apparent that few could hope to do this by legitimate means. Actually the situation is compounded even further by additional factors. The narcotic addict must keep his illness secret to avoid the censure of his neighbors, so that he can stay out of the clutches of the law. As we have pointed out before, the materials are sedatives so that every capacity which he may have once had for earning large sums has been lost by this action of narcotics. Therefore, as one addict described the situation, each day is spent in a frequently futile effort to acquire sufficient money to gratify the habit.

The type of crime to which these individuals turn is interesting. Since many of these people are rather meek, their methods of acquiring money are rarely violent. They are shoplifters, policy slip runners, bookies, pilferers, and the like. Murder is a rare crime among them. Females practice prostitution. Married women have been known to sell the furnishings from their homes to obtain moneys which should have been spent for food and other necessities. Many prostitutes have never seen the money their efforts have earned. Instead their procurer or madam pays them in narcotics. This tends to keep them from leaving the house. In some cities of the United States as many as 86 percent of all apprehended prostitutes were narcotic addicts.

Actually these are the least of their crimes. The most serious is the introduction of neophytes to addiction. The narcotic peddler is usually an addict. In New York City he is given 25 percent of all the narcotics he can sell. Therefore, the addict is the largest single cause of the spread of this symptom complex. Who are these initiates? In most instances they are children of high school age who are easily induced to take narcotics as a new adventure. They want desperately to be one of the crowd and intensely fear criticism of being "chicken."

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

Because the sale and distribution of narcotics is illegal in the United States, we have no accurate figures as to the number of addicts in this country. Actually we know only of those individuals who run afoul of the law. This amount seems to be increasing. An estimate made in 1918 by a commission appointed by the then Secretary of the Treasury estimated that we had a million addicts. This was about four or five times the number of sufferers prior to the passage of our first law of control, the Harrison Act. None of the figures from any course, whether it be the Commissioner of Narcotics, our courts of law, the Federal hospitals for the care of narcotic addicts, our prison population, or the Bureau of Customs who seize a certain amount of narcotics each year, are accurate. The United Nations estimates that no more than 10 percent of all of the material smuggled into the United States is ever seized. In 1952, 4,000 ounces were so acquired by the Government, and if this were 10 percent of the total, then 40,000 ounces were smuggled into the country, which should be sufficient to supply 180,000 addicts. The number of individuals who have been apprehended for narcotic violations has increased 1,200 percent in the last 7 years. The adoption of our resolution will lead to the acquisition of some accurate information as to the nature of this problem and its magnitude.

THE CAUSE OF OUR PRESENT SITUATION

Most of the narcotics introduced into the United States in the latter part of the 19th century and the first 14 years of the 20th reached this country through Chinese tongs. A good deal of the material so introduced was powdered crude opium which was smoked in parlors, very much as liquor is consumed in saloons. An occasional non-Chinese member of our community used this substance. Perhaps even larger numbers of individuals had become accustomed to various proprietary medications, which were sold across drugstore counters without prescriptions, which contained more or less narcotics. Querulous children were treated with nostrums containing paregoric. This was a well-recognized remedy for teething. Women used such substances for the relief of menstrual cramps and discomfort. A great number of apprehensive people used patent medicines containing opiates rather regularly to reduce their nervous tension.

In an effort to cope with this situation which had become a matter for concern in the press of the early 20th century, there was passed the Harrison Stamp Act. The purpose of this piece of legislation was to control the sale of these materials and to tax them. Since that time each vial of narcotics carries a stamp very much like that found on bottles of liquor. It is obvious that the Congress expected that this would be a tax measure because its enforcement was placed in the Treasury Department. The term "narcotic addict" does not even appear in the act. As a result of rulings by the Chief of the Bureau of Narcotics and by subsequent interpretations of these decrees by the Supreme Court, it has become illegal for practicing physicians to administer narcotics to addicts. The legal machinations by which we in medicine were separated from these unfortunates is a story in itself. It has been told very well by Mr. Rufus King (1) recently in the Yale Law Review. Remember, the regulations were made by the Bureau and not by Congress.

All of the legislation, Federal, State, and municipal, is punitive in nature. The net result of this type of control has been to make the acquisition of narcotics ever more difficult and consequently ever more expensive. It follows then that each new measure actually incites new crime. In every instance this observation has been borne out. I am sure that those who have profited enormously from the sale of these substances welcome every new legal effort at control. There is no need to question why there are so many who are interested in "pushing" narcotics. The profits are beyond all realization. Five or $10 spent for narcotics in the Orient easily secreted under the shirt of a seaman can be smuggled into this country and sold for over $100,000 after being properly cut, diluted, and peddled. When one considers how impossible it was to prevent the smuggling of alcohol, which is thousands of times more bulky and with a considerably smaller profit involved, one can readily sense the futility of legally controlling narcotic addiction by such means.

Senator Royal S. Copeland, a physician from New York, recognized that many addicts would be left without any legitimate source of supply after the enactment of the Harrison Act. He suggested, therefore, that clinics be made available for these individuals so that they might be able to gratify their needs at small prices without recourse to the underworld. These clinics followed none of the regulatory devices which are suggested in our resolution. Nonetheless, they were attended by thousands of patients throughout the

country. They were not well conceived, but they were an attempt in the right direction. They might ultimately have been made to work properly, had they been given the opportunity to correct their own errors. They were closed by a decree from the Bureau following a report by a committee of the American Medical Association in 1919 which suggested that narcotic addiction could best be cured within an institution. While the Bureau of Narcotics acted rapidly on the AMA suggestion, closing the clinics at once, it was not until 1935 before proper Government-controlled institutions were inaugurated, first at Lexington, Ky., and later in Fort Worth, Tex., in an effort to handle this problem.

At the present time the United States has become a vast game preserve stocked with hundreds of thousands of narcotic addicts, a few of whom can be apprehended at will by our enforcement officers. The apprehension of an occasional smuggler or of some user or peddler (and the latter two terms are frequently synonymous) receives newspaper headlines, and we, who may not be interested in the subject, might then feel that the problem is being solved.

PRESENT METHODS OF TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

Narcotic addicts who are not convicted of a crime and, therefore, incarcerated in jails may either by their own volition or on recommendation of appropriate penal, social, or medical authorities be recommended for admission to either of the Federal hospitals. Only one of these accepts females. Treatment in these institutions is excellent, there being brought to bear on the problem not only medical but religious, social, and vocational guidance. The treatment is long, from 4 to 12 months, and costs on an average $4,000 per patient.

The relapse rate of these patients is unknown. It is probably extremely high. Authorities in the institutions speak of 69 or 75 percent in various articles. Addicts give us the impression that the relapse rate is practically 100 percent. One addict that I interviewed received his first dose of heroin, after leaving the hospital at Lexington, in Pittsburgh as he changed trains to New York City. It would seem that only 5 percent of these patients stay completely well. If this figure is true, and it is probably quite accurate, then each cure costs the taxpayers of the United States $100,000. We in medicine would never accept so poor a record in the treatment of any disease. It becomes very difficult to say much in favor of a program of therapy with so enormous a rate of failure.

Yet our Government is committed to this utterly untenable policy. Perhaps the degree of ineptitude of our methods can best be exemplified by studying the situation in England where addicts may be treated by their own physicians and where there are reported for the year 1953 311 addicts, and there may be, according to the British authorities 50 or 75 more in the entire British Isles, an area with a population of 40 million.

There is some light to be found in this picture in that in Detroit, Chicago, and New York City some followup methods are now being utilized. The report of the Provident Hospital under Dr. Walter Adams (2) in Chicago makes excellent reading, and I commend it to those of you who are interested. In New York City where the problem is most acute, particularly in our underprivileged areas, we have some facilities for the hospitalization and followup to juvenile patients, but nothing for adults.

In the therapy of so complex an individual as a narcotic addict, embracing as it does every class of human being, it becomes apparent that some, perhaps many, patients are incurably addicted. For such an individual there remains only three possibilities: (1) Incarcerate him for life, (2) put him to death, or (3) grant him some narcotics legally under proper regulation.

The first of these is too costly and would take many valuable citizens out of circulation. In addition, the addicts themselves would not voluntarily enter hospitals. They rarely go to Lexington or Fort Worth now of their own volition and then it is not to break the habit but to "kick it down" to a price they can afford.

The second has been tried at various times in dictatorships in the Orient. It hasn't worked there, and it is not likely to be enacted in any civilized country like the United States.

The third represents to us the only likely approach.

THE RICHMOND COUNTY PLAN A PRACTICAL REMEDY

The plan which has been described in the original resolution is as simple as it is direct. It embraces really only two steps:

1. Recognize the addict for what he is, a mentally sick person whose prime symptom of illness is addiction.

2. Let us bring to bear on this unfortunate psychopath the whole weight of our great knowledge in medicine, sociology, psychiatry, religion, and humanity so that this sick individual may again be made well and to rehabilitate him so that he can live without narcotics if this can possibly be done. If this is not possible with our present state of knowledge, then let us carry him on narcotics under our control until we learn enough about this subject to effect eventually a permanent cure.

What can we expect from this program?

1. To learn the magnitude of the problem.

2. To stop crimes committed by addicts in order to obtain the price of drugs.

3. To stop the introduction of addiction to new people by the present users who are trying to guarantee their own sources of supply.

4. To prevent death and disaster to those addicted individuals who inject impure, dirty, infected materials into themselves. Many lose their lives from overdosage or from "hot shots" which contain poison. This is the way the underworld disposes of a dangerous addict who has no money to purchase drugs or who informs on the higher ups.

5. To empty our jails of these noncriminals or those people who have become criminals only through our own inept legislation.

6. To give us the opportunity to study addiction so that we may eventually discover a real cure for this disease.

Naturally such a program will require careful safeguards:

1. It will demand the establishment of clinics in our larger cities and individual physicians (3) in smaller localities.

2. Narcotics should be administered only at the clinic. The addict will never be given a supply of medications.

3. He must be fingerprinted and properly identified, registered, and photographed. Only those who are actually addicts can be treated. These can be readily recognized either by incarcerating them and withdrawing them from the narcotics after strict seclusion or by the administration of narcotic antagonists such as nalline.

4. Hospitalize those patients who the medical personnel at the clinics feel can best be served by inpatient techniques. These should be individuals who request hospitalization after being so advised by the clinic physicians. They should not be forcibly incarcerated unless their physical or mental condition is so critical as to make them a menace to society.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PLAN

This plan is opposed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. I believe these gentlemen to be entirely sincere in their concept of narcotic addiction as a wholly criminal matter. I can only cite in rebuttal the existence of the problem after 40 years of such methods and its apparent growth under this technique. They feel that pride would keep addicts from registering in such clinics, and it is quite true that some might not, but 1,500 registered in the early clinics of 1918 on the first day. At the present time all addicts are cheats since they will do practically anything to secure the drugs they so urgently need. Under our plan some may continue to be dishonest, but that number ought to be a great deal smaller than it is now.

We hear a great deal about the contagious nature of addiction and that clinics, by bringing addicts together, will increase their numbers. Actually the necessity to sell drugs on the part of one addict to another in an effort to guarantee his own sources of supply is the most common cause of the spread of this condition. The disease itself is not contagious. There seems little reason to believe that an individual would continue to steal and commit crimes in order to obtain drugs when they can be obtained free.

Since some individuals use drugs frequently during the course of a day, we hear the objection that it will be inconvenient for them to return to the clinics as often as necessary. Pharmaceutical chemists [1] tell me that any time that the need arises they can prepare a repository narcotic that will have a 24-hour or longer effect.

CONCLUSION

It seems that narctoic addicts, like the rest of us, by normal attrition tend to reach the termination of their span on this earth. By such natural means many of our present incurable addicts will in time disappear. Should the pusher no longer find it necessary to induce our youth to become addicts to gratify his own narcotic needs, then it would seem that time alone under our technic will solve this problem even if we acquire no new information from our experience with these people when we have the opportunity to treat them. In view of the medical professions' extraordinary record of accomplishment in the past with the management of so-called incurable diseases, it seems probable, God willing, that we might find the answer to this one as well.

Rereferences:

1. King, R.: Yale Law Rev. 62: 736 (Apr.) 1953.

2. Adams, W.: Narcotic Drug Addiction and Outpatient Treatment, privately published by the Provident Hospital, 426 East 51st Street, Chicago, Ill.

3. Howe, H. S.: New York State J. Med. 55: 341 (Feb. 1) 1955.

JUNE 15, 1956.

Miss MARY FLEMING,
Flushing, N. Y.

DEAR MISS FLEMING: Thank you for your communication with respect to the drug addiction problem.

I have for some time now been concerned with the growing amount of drug addiction in this country, particularly among our young people. The very factor of their youth makes the chances for their successful rehabilitation so much better that I feel we should do all we can to increase available facilities and services to attain that end.

I think you might be interested in reading the remarks on this topic that I made on the floor of the Senate recently. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Thank you for writing me as you did, setting forth your views on this problem.

Yours very sincerely,

FLUSHING, N. Y., *May 15, 1956.*

Hon. Senator HERBERT F. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I was glad to read today of the approval of the bill cracking

---

[1] Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N. J.

down on the drug traffic and heroin selling especially. Several months ago I read an excellent proposal to wipe out illegal narcotics traffic. This suggestion was originally made by a group of doctors in New York State. They recommended, I believe, that any drug addict be supplied with the drug he craves free of charge by his physician. The drugs could be paid for by the Government. This would wipe out the profits of the drug racketeer and make it worthless to smuggle drugs into the United States. It would encourage addicts to seek legal treatment and encourage them to try to be cured. I believe it would make addiction easier to cure because the addict would never be forced to steal to procure the drug, and would know he could be given it as medicine. This should lessen the desperation of many addicts.

I think this would be an excellent provision to add to this narcotics bill.

Sincerely yours,

MARY FLEMING.

JUNE 15, 1956.

Mr. MICHAEL ALEXANDER,
New Hyde Park, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you for your communication with respect to the drug-addiction problem.

I have for some time now been concerned with the growing amount of drug addiction in this country, particularly among our young people. The very factor of their youth makes the chances for their successful rehabilitation so much better that I feel we should do all we can to increase available facilities and services to attain that end.

I think you might be interested in reading the remarks on this topic that I made on the floor of the Senate recently. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Thank you for writing me as you did, setting forth your views on this problem.

Yours very sincerely.

NEW HYDE PARK, N. Y., *May 13, 1956.*

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After hearing today's Town Meeting debate between Congressman BAKER and Dr. Berger on the drug-addiction problem, I am greatly moved to urge you to support the so-called clinic plan for the treatment of drug addiction.

I am convinced that the spread of addiction among our young people is largely due to the necessity of drug addicts to themselves become sellers of narcotics in order to get the money to satisfy their needs.

The clinic plan would remove the economic basis for the spread of addiction, and would substitute treatment for punitive methods. Experience has shown that neither legal nor any other kind of punishment will solve the problem.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL ALEXANDER.

My Record on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I had intended on the evening of Friday, July 27, when I addressed the Senate on the subject of civil rights, to include in my remarks a brief review of my own record in this field during the past session. I have assembled specific items which delineate my activity in the field of civil-rights legislation in the 84th Congress. They include:

First. A summary of the civil-rights bills introduced at the beginning of the 84th Congress by myself and several cosponsors, and contained in a press release which I issued on February 1, 1955.

Second. My appeal to all of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee for action on S. 900, S. 902, and S. 903, civil-rights bills of mine which were favorably reported from the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. The text of letters which I sent to members of the Senate Judiciary Committee is contained in a release from my office dated April 9, 1956.

Third. When it became clear that 4 Democratic Senators on the Judiciary Committee were prepared to support the civil-rights proposals and that if they were joined by 4 Republican colleagues, a sufficient number would be present to report these bills to the Senate floor, I asked the Republican members on the committee to join in this endeavor. On April 19, 1956, I issued a press release summarizing the situation facing the Judiciary Committee in the effort to line up bipartisan support.

Fourth. On Tuesday, April 24, 1956, I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee summarizing my own position on civil-rights legislation and urging bipartisan support in the committee.

Fifth. On May 24, 1956, I made public my response to a civil-rights questionnaire sent to me from the Pittsburgh Courier. My answers contain an up-to-date statement of my own position on each of these positions raised.

I ask unanimous consent that each of these 5 items—the 4 press releases, and testimony before the Judiciary Committee—be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[News release of February 1, 1955]

SENATOR HUMPHREY LEADS RENEWED FIGHT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS BILLS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, appealed for "an end to discrimination against our Americans because of their race, religion, color or national origin" today in renewing his continuing fight for an improved legislative program on human rights.

Together with a group of his colleagues, Senator HUMPHREY introduced in the Senate a package program of 11 civil rights bills and declared enactment of any part of the package at this session would be striking a blow for freedom all over the world.

Calling attention to conflict and bitterness over civil rights legislation in the past, he said he and his colleagues were presenting the proposals again "with a prayer that the 84th Congress will crystallize and symbolize instead a feeling of good will and brotherhood and consensus in consideration of this vital legislative program."

The series of bills and cosponsors include:

1. A bill to establish equal opportunity in employment. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, IVES, LEHMAN, CASE, DOUGLAS, DUFF, KENNEDY, LANGER, MAGNUSON, MARTIN, MCNAMARA, PURTELL, MORSE, SALTONSTALL, MURRAY, SMITH of New Jersey, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

2. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

3. A bill to protect persons within the United States against lynching. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

4. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

5. A bill to provide relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation. Sponsors: Senators MAGNUSON, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

6. A bill to strengthen existing civil rights statutes. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

7. A bill to protect the right to political participation and make it a crime to intimidate or coerce or otherwise interfere with a right to vote. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

8. A bill to create a joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

9. A bill to reorganize in the Department of Justice by establishing a civil rights division in the Department under an Assistant Attorney General. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

10. A bill to strengthen the current laws with regard to peonage, convict labor, slavery, and involuntary servitude, Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

11. The omnibus civil rights bill to strengthen existing civil rights statutes. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

[News release of April 9, 1956]

SENATOR HUMPHREY OPENS NEW DRIVE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, announced today new steps in his continuing fight for civil rights action by the current Congress, seeking organized support behind a determined effort to gain action on "a minimum basic package of civil-rights legislation."

Calling attention to action of the Senate's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights on reporting three of his civil rights bills favorably to the full Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HUMPHREY wrote all members of the Senate Judiciary Committee Friday saying, in part:

"I am confident that most Americans would agree that these three bills constitute a minimum basic package of civil-rights legislation for the current session of Congress. May I respectfully invite your early and earnest consideration of this matter?"

The three bills are:

1. S. 900, which he said "would guarantee certain basic rights to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and would involve a special protection against lynching";

2. S. 902, which he said "would reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights by providing for an additional Assistant Attorney General to be in charge of a new Civil Rights Division"; and

3. S. 903, which he said "would protect the right to political participation by all American citizens in Federal elections, would establish the right to qualify to vote and to vote, and would set criminal penalties against interference with these rights."

At the same time, Senator HUMPHREY also wrote to Senators DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, LANGER, and NEELY, who cosponsored the bills with him when they were introduced along with other civil rights legislation on February 1, 1955, urging their help in gaining the earliest possible attention of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Senators LANGER and NEELY are both members of that committee.

In his letter to the cosponsors, Senator HUMPHREY commented: "I have reason to believe that a major stumbling block may be the lack of a quorum of eight at Judiciary Committee sessions. I am convinced that there are at least 4 Democrats and 4 Republican members of the Judiciary Committee who would support this legislation if present." He urged his colleague to help expedite action by the Judiciary Committee by seeking bipartisan cooperation in getting a favorable majority to attend committee sessions.

In a third and related step, Senator HUMPHREY also wrote to Senator HENNINGS, chairman of the subcommittee which had reported favorably on the three civil-rights bills, commending him for that action in the interest of democracy.

In his letter to Senator HENNINGS, Senator HUMPHREY also called attention to another of his pending measures, S. 906, calling for establishment of a Commission on Civil Rights.

"In view of administration announcements calling for such a Commission, I would like to suggest that your subcommittee may wish to give further consideration to this legislation already before you to accomplish the very purpose the President now seeks," Senator HUMPHREY wrote.

In commenting on the new drive for action, Senator HUMPHREY declared he would welcome bipartisan support.

"If the Republicans are sincere in wanting to do something about civil rights, they should now give their wholehearted support to these long-pending measures which have already been cleared to the full committee with subcommittee approval.

"There is no need to talk about proposing new legislation, when legislation to accomplish the same purposes has long been pending and has already completed important steps in the legislative process toward final enactment," Senator HUMPHREY said.

[News release of April 19, 1956]

SENATOR HUMPHREY CHALLENGES REPUBLICANS TO SUPPORT CIVIL-RIGHTS ACTION

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, today termed Attorney General Brownell's request for new civil-rights legislation "more evidence of lipservice by leap-year liberals" and challenged the administration to prove its sincerity by supporting Democratic legislation to achieve the same objectives and more already pending before the Senate.

"What is the use of making a grandstand play about proposing new legislation, when such legislation is already pending and part way through the legislative process?" Senator HUMPHREY asked.

"If Attorney General Brownell and the President are sincere about wanting civil-rights action, instead of just building a political record of lipservice, why don't they support the legislation that has been before the Senate since February of 1955?"

Senator HUMPHREY said such pending legislation could be brought before the Senate for action any time as many Republicans as Democrats will stand up and be counted in favor of action in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Commenting further on Brownell's recommendations, Senator HUMPHREY said:

"The Republican platform calls for Federal action on antilynching, antipoll tax, and fair-employment-practices legislation. I notice a complete absence of any reference to these topics in the administration's recommendations.

"All they do propose is a bipartisan commission, a new Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department, tightening of protection against interference with the right to vote, and improving laws designed to prevent conspiracy to interfere with the right to vote.

"If they really want a commission, why have they not supported the pending bill for such a commission introduced a year ago by myself and a group of my colleagues?

"If they really want a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice why don't they support the Humphrey bill for that purpose already favorably reported by the Hennings Subcommitteee on Constitutional Rights?

"If they really want to protect the right to vote, why don't they support the Humphrey bill for that purpose—a bill with more teeth, providing criminal prosecution instead of civil action for violations—already favorably reported by the Hennings Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights?

"If they want to live up to their own party's platform, why don't they also now join us in support of the Humphrey antilynching bill also reported favorably by the Hennings subcommittee?"

Senator HUMPHREY emphasized he would welcome bipartisan support for such objectives, but added that lack of support heretofore has blocked progress that could have been made earlier and indicates the new administration move may just be more gestures of leap-year liberals.

He reiterated his challenge to the administration first voiced when he launched a renewed drive for civil-rights action last weekend prior to the Brownell recommendations, saying:

"If the Republican administration will assure us matching our votes in the Judiciary Committee—if they will get us 4 votes out of the 7 members they have on that committee—we can get action, instead of talk. If they don't the responsibility for this shameful failure to act rests squarely upon the shoulders of the Republican Party and the Republican administration," Senator HUMPHREY said.

[News release of May 24, 1956]

REPLIES BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY TO CIVIL RIGHTS QUESTIONS FROM THE PITTSBURGH COURIER

On May 3, 1956, the editor of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Courier addressed a letter to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, excerpts of which follow:

"DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Inasmuch as you are being mentioned more and more, by your many friends and supporters, as a prospective candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for the Presidency, readers of the Pittsburgh Courier, the largest nationally circulated Negro newspaper, would like to have directly from you a frank expression of your views on certain matters which are of direct interest to them as Americans. * * * Your answers will be published exactly as you send them. * * * Thank you for your time and consideration.

"Your very truly,

"P. L. PRATTIS,
"Executive Editor,
"The Pittsburgh Courier."

Senator HUMPHREY in reply answered the questions of the Courier in the order listed. The complete text of Senator HUMPHREY'S reply is as follows:

"On July 14, 1948, before the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, I said:

" 'There are those who say to you—we are rushing the issue of civil rights. I say we are 172 years late.

" 'There are those who say—this issue of civil rights is an infringement on States rights. The time has arrived for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights.'

"Nothing that has happened during the ensuing 8 years has caused me to retreat or equivocate on the position I held then. Much that has happened during these 8 years renders action on civil rights inescapably urgent now. While I am not a candidate this year for any office, most emphatically including the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, I welcome this opportunity to state my views for the hundreds of thousands of persons who read the Pittsburgh Courier.

"Here are my answers to your question:

"1. Question: Do you believe that leadership in all our States should take action to comply with the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, on segregation, as soon as practical (taking into account local conditions), and give some affirmative indication of intention to work for compliance?

"Answer: I believe that no State or civic leader is exempt anywhere in our country from taking action in compliance with the Supreme Court's desegregation decision of May 17, 1954. Admittedly local conditions in some parts of the country will require that this compliance be more gradual than elsewhere. Nevertheless, no State, subdivision, or school district in the United States is legally absolved from its obligation under the Court decision to comply with all 'deliberate speed.'

"2. Question: If elected President, would you use the power of that great office, positively and firmly, to induce the leadership in so-called recalcitrant States to support a steady and progressive program of compliance, rather than defiance?

"Answer: The power of the Presidency should be used positively and firmly to supplant defiance with compliance throughout America. Within his constitutional limitations, the President is in a unique position to influence public behavior favorably on the issue of desegregation. I regret to say that President Eisenhower, however well-meaning, has not exhibited the kind of leadership which the situation requires.

"3. Question: Would you, if elected President, favor the creation by Congress of a permanent bipartisan, interracial Commission on Civil Rights with power to subpena witnesses and conduct necessary investigations?

"Answer: The creation by Congress of a permanent bipartisan interracial Commission on Civil Rights, equipped with the essential subpena and investigatory powers, would be an important instrument of further progress. I have continually advocated such a commission ever since 1948 when I came to the Senate. During the current session, I am the sponsor of S. 906 and S. 907, either of which bills would provide for the establishment of such a commission.

"4. Question: Would you, if elected President, be in favor of the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights?

"Answer: Likewise, ever since 1948 I have sponsored legislation to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. In the present Congress I have sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 and S. 907, measures which would create a Joint Congressional Committee which would consist of 14 members, 7 from each House. The committee would be given broad investigatory, consultative, and advisory jurisdiction.

"5. Question: Would you, if elected President, be in favor of the creation of a Division of Civil Rights in the Department of Justice?

"Answer: The creation of a Division on Civil Rights in the Department of Justice would also, I believe, spur the executive branch of the Government to greater action in the civil-rights field. I am currently the sponsor of S. 902 and S. 907, either of which would elevate the existing civil-rights unit

in the Department of Justice to the status of a division under an assistant attorney general, and would strengthen the FBI's capacity to investigate civil-rights violations.

"6. Question: Would you, if elected President, be in favor of strengthening existing civil-rights statutes to the extent that a citizen, denied a civil right (to vote, for example) might seek remedy through the Federal courts whether the offender was the State (or its representative), or a citizen, or citizens, who, by threats or intimidation, denied or abridged the right of another citizen to vote?

"Answer: It is essential that we strengthen existing civil-rights statutes. S. 905 is a bill which I have sponsored for the specific purpose of amending and supplementing existing civil-rights statutes. It was designed to carry out recommendations made by the Department of Justice as long ago as 1952. I am also the sponsor of S. 901, a bill to outlaw the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other elections for national offices; of S. 903, a bill to protect the right to political participation, including the right to vote, by providing for criminal penalties against infringement of this right; and of S. 904, a bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

"I favor legislation to allow an aggrieved citizen to seek a remedy through the Federal courts against the denial or abridgment of his right to vote from any source. I would also include specific authority for the Attorney General to seek an injunction against any person who denies or interferes with the right of another citizen to exercise his voting privileges. The right to vote must be free and unfettered. It must be zealously guarded. It is the duty of the Federal Government to safeguard it.

"7. Question: Would you, if elected President, other measures having failed, favor invoking the provisions of the second section of the 14th amendment which expressly require that the representation of a State in Congress should be cut down in proportion as the right to vote of citizens 21 years of age and over is denied or abridged?

"Answer: I have always felt that it was more consonant with our democratic processes to work for the extension of suffrage rather than the restriction of representation. Hence, I would prefer an affirmative increase in suffrage to an invocation of the neglected 2d section of the 14th amendment which would reduce a State's congressional delegation in Congress proportionate to that State's denial of the right to vote. Practical and legal difficulties would inevitably handicap the enforcement of this provision, and I would rely upon it only as a last resort.

"8. Question: Would you, if elected President, be willing to use the powers of your great office to encourage, positively and firmly, fair employment practices throughout the Nation and would you create such devices as might be necessary to help secure to every American the right to work at the calling for which he is best fitted?

"Answer: The President's discretionary powers to promote fair-employment practices should be used by him to their fullest extent. As mayor of Minneapolis I organized the Mayor's Council on Human Relations and proposed a municipal fair employment practices ordinance with powers of enforcement, a proposal which was adopted and is now a working law administered by a municipal fair employment practices commission. Following these successful achievements, I have been convinced of the importance of governmental action toward obtaining equal opportunity for employment regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. Fair-employment practices are more important today than ever before. We need all available talents and skills if we are to maintain a dynamic economy and to meet the challange of Soviet competition in the field of scientific research, technology, and engineering. In S. 899, the Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act, I have again proposed legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"9. Question: Would you, if elected President, favor Federal aid to education to all school districts which indicated, affirmatively, that they intended to work toward compliance with the Supreme Court decision on segregation? Would you favor denying Federal aid to school districts which indicated, by evasion or indirection, that they intended to defy the Supreme Court decision?

"Answer: The desperate need for new school construction, the clear guidelines which the Supreme Court has set down for judicial policing of the segregation decision, and the possibility of fruitless jurisdictional tangles if those guidelines are not maintained, have inclined me to take the following position on Federal aid to education. Funds under any Federal school construction bill should be made available to all States unless an appropriate Federal court following due process of law has found such State, school district, or political subdivision to be in contempt of the Supreme Court's decision and implementation order, or unless the State legislature or a school board has by official action refused to comply and openly defies the court order. Prior to the court ruling or official action on the part of a State legislature, school board, or State political subdivision, there would be a presumption of compliance. In other words, it is to be presumed that the States are observing the law unless there is court or legislative action that demonstrates to the contrary. Following an adverse court ruling or action of a legislature or political subdivision defying the court order, I would propose that funds otherwise allocable to the contemptuous State, school district, or political subdivision be held in escrow until such time as the State, school district, or political subdivision has purged itself of contempt.

"10. Question: Would you, if elected President, use the powers of that great office, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, to see that all men and women in our armed services had the same chance to fight and work for our country in nonsegregated units and the same opportunities for advancement?

"Answer: I have long favored the complete desegregation in all units of our Armed Forces. It has been my privilege to work with the Department of Defense, in close cooperation with the former Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army General Collins, and other military officials, during the years 1950 through 1952, to promote speedy desegregation in the the Armed Forces. I have continued to urge the President to persevere in his duty to insure equal opportunity and advancement to all of the men and women in our armed services without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

"Discrimination has been a lingering and stubborn infection sapping the strength of our democratic system. We convict ourselves of hypocrisy to the extent that we refuse to eradicate this infection. There is no aspect of my life as a public servant which I consider to be of greater importance than my efforts in and outside the Senate to hasten the day when discrimination is dead and democracy is fully alive."

CIVIL RIGHTS TESTIMONY BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend you for your fairness in calling this hearing on an issue of vital concern to all America, knowing of its deep emotional impact in your own home State.

All of us in the Congress must find a reasoned balance between the interests of our own States which we are privileged to represent, and the entire United States which we represent together.

All of us in the Congress share common responsibilities that go beyond the needs, the desires, and yes, even the views of our own States.

The question of human rights is one of those common responsibilities.

It goes beyond any partisanship. It involves fundamental concepts of our democracy that must be of grave concern to all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, whether our geographical background happens to be from the North or the South. It involves problems we must squarely face with reason rather than emotion, with a spirit of tolerance rather than a spirit of recrimination.

Perhaps this occasion can be a historical milestone, of responsible men reasoning together as Americans all, not as hostile blocs arrayed in bitterness against each other.

My views on "human rights"—and that is the term I prefer, for it is the rights of fellow human beings we are talking about when we discuss civil rights—are well-known to this committee.

They are nothing new, and they are not politically inspired.

They are the result of deeply held convictions, spiritual convictions, that it is a blemish on our democracy to permit in our midst any discrimination against fellow Americans because of their race, religion, color, or national origin.

The struggle for civil rights has been a continual one since the beginning of our Nation, paralleling our country's growth as an expanding democracy.

Our Nation stands today as the freest and most democratic power in the world.

We are justly proud of the progress that we have made as a country in expanding opportunity, security, and human welfare of our citizens.

There is no area of our life which has not developed toward greater democracy.

To be proud of our Nation and its progress, however, is not to be blind to the imperfections that still remain within our society.

The most evident of those imperfections, and the one which cries loudest for immediate remedy, is in the area of civil rights.

Discrimination based upon bias and prejudice still exists, and so long as it is alive, we must be vigilant to eliminate the cancer from our body politic.

Democracy is more than achievement, more than material progress, more than elections and government.

Democracy is essentially a faith of freedom, of equality, of human dignity and brotherhood.

This is the beacon of hope we now have to offer a troubled world. This is the lesson which we must now strive to get accepted in the world, if our Nation is to avoid war and preserve its liberty.

The struggle against the totalitarian forces of communism is not merely of a military character, as recent events have made even more clear than ever before.

It is political and ideological in nature as well.

We stand opposed to the doctrines which enslave men and reduce men to mere automatons.

We believe in the inherent dignity and worth of man; that man is an end in himself; that only in a genuinely free society can man attain his true nature.

We believe that, given equality of opportunity, each individual, irrespective of color, religion, national origin, or race, can realize his true self.

These are the great values for which we are currently engaged in the struggle against communism, values which we must preserve

from within our society as well as safeguard against attack from without.

Those of us who strive for the enactment of civil-rights legislation by the Congress do so because we are convinced that the enactment of such legislation will help us as a nation in the world struggle against communism.

We do so also, however, because we must constantly strive to strengthen the spirit and fabric of democracy itself. We do so because we believe that, even if there were no Communists in the world, the discrimination which exists within our country must be eliminated if our democracy is to survive and be true to itself.

With democracy now on trial in the world, it ill behooves us to leave any chinks in our armor.

We must never forget that the image we as a nation cast abroad is mightily affected by what we do at home. One of the best criteria for predicting how a nation will behave in its international relations is its record of achievement among its own people. We judge the Soviets in this manner and part of our skepticism about their sincerity on world issues is grounded in our awareness of how brutally the Kremlin has conducted its domestic policies, how little regard it has had for human rights.

We should consider our own behavior from the same perspective.

At times we have forgotten that we shall not enhance freedom by aping the enemies of freedom.

Democratic institutions are not safeguarded by totalitarian techniques.

The central principles on which America was founded are now being considered by others in their evaluation of us.

Brotherhood and equality of opportunity have now become central aspects of America's national image as it is seen abroad. Just as Lincoln decided upon emancipation of the Negro slaves not only as an act of justice but also as a military necessity, so the achievement in America of racial equality is now urgently needed on both these grounds.

Gandhi asked of the whole Anglo-Saxon world, "What can conquer your unpardonable pride of race?"

We must answer him. We must answer him soon. We should answer him now that the true spirit of democracy is bigger than racial pride—and prove we mean it.

Our responsibilities and the requirements of our national security no longer permit us the luxury of temporizing and evasion on civil rights here in the United States.

Communist propaganda has recognized that issue clearly, and has effectively gone to work against us with it.

You can rest assured that the Kremlin will not permit even these hearings to go unnoticed, and will gleefully exploit any failure on our part to truly exemplify the democracy we preach to the rest of the world.

You can rest assured the eyes of millions of uncommitted peoples throughout the world—people who may sway the balance between a world of freedom and a world of totalitarian oppression—are upon this issue in the United States and upon what we do about it; upon what we do about it at this very hearing and in this very Congress.

Our proper response, both to the Kremlin waiting for us to falter and to the other vast areas of the world looking desperately to us as mankind's greatest beacon of hope for universal recognition of the dignity of man, is to do what we should have done anyway, to do what is right and just; to do what we eventually must do, regardless of external threats, to fulfill the vision of our Founding Fathers for creating a nation fully respecting the individual dignity of man as an inalienable, inherent right under God.

Communism and the atom have only heightened our age-old dilemma of good and evil and raised the stakes of moral choice.

Ever since I have been in the Senate, I have consistently and continually sought greater fulfillment of human rights by legislative action aimed at eliminating discrimination.

Three years ago, at the start of a new Republican administration, I again introduced a series of bills aimed at my continuing objective. At that time, in the hope of bipartisan action for a cause that should be above partisanship, I declared:

"We have just completed a national election. Both political parties came to the American people and said that they were champions of civil rights. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusions of these remarks excerpts from the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The President-elect came to the American people and on many occasions stated his opposition to discrimination and his convictions in favor of equal opportunity. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of these remarks, excerpts from some of his statements.

It remains for the Congress to act in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the American people.

In addition to reintroducing, for the third time, the Humphrey-Ives bill for a Fair Employment Practices Commission to guarantee equal opportunity of employment, I introduced at that time nine other measures covering legislative improvements needed for adequate civil-rights protection.

Unfortunately, despite the campaign pledges of the Republican Party, no action was taken on any of these measures by the Republican 83d Congress.

Included among my measures introduced on January 16, 1953, was a new and more moderate approach that I hoped would at least be accepted as a minimum step in the right direction.

It was a bill to create a Federal Commission on Civil Rights, providing for a commission to study continuously the problem of civil rights and discrimination and measures being taken to deal with the problem.

At that time I declared:

"I have never believed in an all-or-nothing approach to any of the major social, economic, or political problems which face our Nation.

"I, therefore, urge the Senate to find a middle approach, and take some steps to spell progress. * * * It is my belief that a Commission on Civil Rights would provide a constructive and factual approach to a problem which is torn with emotionalism. It is not a substitute for other legislative proposals, but it may in fact turn out to be a preliminary step which must be taken to bridge the gap between divergent opinions and establish a foundation for a more constructive, positive legislative program. I shall, in fact, continue to devote my efforts to the enactment of a full program which I have presented to the Senate."

That was 3 years ago, but I stand by those words today. They are even more meaningful today.

Regrettably, no attempt was made by the Republican administration and Republican Congress to act on even such a minimum approach to a crucial national problem.

When the Democrats regained control of the Congress in 1955, I again introduced a civil-rights package program of 11 basic bills, including the same commission proposal.

For a year, I am told, this committee has been awaiting administration views on such a program.

Now, at long last, the administration has recommended enactment of such a commission, along with some other minimum steps all covered in long-pending legislation.

As belated as it has been, I welcome this administration support. I hope sincerely it is offered in good faith, in sincere intent that will be backed by concerted efforts for Republicans to vote side by side with Democrats for enactment of such legislation. If they do, we can make progress of which all of us can be proud. If they do not, America's conscience will have a continued burden upon it.

When I introduced this group of legislative measures a year ago, I declared enactment of any part of them would be striking a blow for freedom all over the world.

I reiterate that statement today.

Instead of conflict and bitterness, my hope and prayer is that the 84th Congress can earn a place in history by symbolizing instead a feeling of good will and brotherhood in consideration of this vital program, with mutual respect and mutual tolerance for deeply held convictions however opposite they may be.

Already favorably reported to this committee by your Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights are measures I have sponsored with some of my colleagues to protect the right to political participation and make it a crime to intimidate or coerce or otherwise interfere with the right to vote; to create a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General; and to protect persons in the United States against lynching.

These, together with the proposed commission which the President has now joined in supporting after 3 years, should provide a basic minimum of positive action, going a long way toward eliminating the injustices of discrimination.

I appeal for this committee's favorable action in the name of democracy, in the name of humanity, in the name of morality.

If the Republicans will match the Democrats vote for vote on this committee, this legislation can be approved by the committee and readied for floor action.

Surely, if the administration is really behind its civil-rights program, it can muster four Republican votes favorable to such action on this committee.

In their 1952 platform, the Republicans promised that they would not "mislead, exploit, or attempt to confuse minority groups for political purposes." The Republican Party now has an opportunity to live up to that promise. The Democratic Party will welcome their support.

Together we can build a stronger America, and brighten the beacon of hope for the rest of the world.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the bill (S. 2167), to clarify and reaffirm congressional intent in the last major revision of the Canal Zone Code of 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a great deal of disappointment that I take note at this time of the inaction by the Senate on the legislation having to do with a number of necessary changes in the operation of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone Government.

This legislation (S. 2167) has been 3 years in the making and represents studied views

of the steamship industry, and to a substantial degree of the General Accounting Office and employee groups as how best to clarify and reaffirm congressional intent expressed in the last major revision of the Canal Zone Code in 1950 (Public Law 841).

But while the proponents of this legislation have spent a long time working out a fair solution to an obvious inequity in the present management of the Canal and Zone Government, the Senate itself has only received the bill for consideration within the past 3 weeks. Unfortunately, there has not been sufficient time to properly bring the bill before the Members of the Senate in order that certain misunderstandings can be clarified concerning its purpose.

While I am disappointed at the inaction by the Senate this year, it shall not deter me in the future in pursuing this matter. My interest is, of course, primarily in seeing that all forms of transportation receive equity before the law, and S. 2167 concerns itself with accounting reforms, judicial review of tolls rates and other aspects of canal management, which bear upon the users of the canal facilities, both tolls payers and employees. At the same time, I am equally concerned with the defense considerations which are involved and there is no intent in my legislation, nor does it so provide, that the control by the Military Establishment over the canal in time of emergency is in the slightest degree changed from its present status.

S. 2167, of course, has my support and was favorably reported unanimously by my committee. This affirmation by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the principles that I have so long urged convinces me that in the long run the full membership of this Senate will realize the logic and equity underlined in this legislation.

I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Pacific Shipper:

"YOU CAN'T SUE THE SOVEREIGN

"A United States district court has agreed with a Justice Department attorney that the old axiom 'The King Can Do No Wrong!' still is true—at least legally.

"This oldest legal sidestep in the lawbooks was used to get the wheezing Panama Canal Company off the hook on a $38,350,000 legal suit brought against it by 37 steamship companies for alleged excess toll charges since 1951.

"Nobody has really disputed the basic truth of the steamship operators' complaints, and recent action by the powerful Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee heavily underscored their probable righteousness.

"This committee, under the chairmanship of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, unanimously recommended that the Senate pass legislation transferring management of the Panama Canal from the Army to the Department of Commerce.

"In addition, the committee urged that the Government agencies in the Canal Zone reimburse the zone government for providing certain functions such as immigration, customs, prisons, etc., and that the canal income be arranged so that steamship lines do not subsidize, through the tolls they pay, many of the activities attendant upon maintenance of the Canal Zone, Panama Canal Company, and the Army in that area, but having nothing whatever to do with the actual operation of the canal.

"The Magnuson committee also asked that procedure be established for toll hearings to be held so that users' complaints might be heard, and also that allowances be made for court review of the tolls when the occasion required.

"Senator MAGNUSON commented that it seemed the Canal Company was a commercial enterprise which ought to be run as such, and not as a military operation. In this opinion he followed the lead of the General Accounting Office which came to the same conclusion some time ago.

"So it looks very much as though the days of the Colonel Blimps are nearing an end so far as the Panama Canal Company is concerned. Doubtless the $38,350,000 suit of the 37 steamship companies, while it may have been technically lost, like the Battle of Bunker Hill, will prove to have been a factor of some weight in getting the Army out of the canal business (if one may count such chickens before they are hatched).

"The defeat of the steamship companies reminds us very much of a French monarch of dubious distinction who said, 'L'etat, c'est moi!' That was the gentleman whose royal neck shortly thereafter was given to the mercies of Madame Guillotine.

"Apparently, something of this nature is now in the works in Washington for the brass-bound leaders of the Panama Canal Company, and when they go, as some day they must, we can only hope that the Department of Commerce will not be infected with the same germs of kingly pretensions but will strive to remember that the Panama Canal was dug to link the east and west coasts of the United States and aid commercial shipping—not to increase the empires of bureaucrats, be they military or civilian."

Taft-Hartley Law Amended by Administrative Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following address which I recently delivered before the New England Convention of the Carpenters Brotherhood Union on the occasion of their 75th anniversary:

It is a pleasure for me to meet with the New England representatives of the carpenters union. We have a double reason for celebration today. This is your first regional meeting as part of the united AFL–CIO, and it is also the 75th anniversary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners. Few organizations that are now active in the Nation can point to as rich a tradition and as dynamic a program for the future as does your brotherhood.

It was your first president, Peter J. McGuire, who gave us Labor Day which has become virtually a national holiday.

The direct accomplishments of your union are a matter of record. A union carpenter earns today in 1 hour as much as Pete McGuire earned in a whole day, and McGuire had to work 12 hours or more to get his day's pay. Your union was in the vanguard to make the 8-hour day a reality.

Membership in the carpenters union as in all other unions has paid off. This is true not only in terms of the human dignity and security that the union provides, but in terms of day-to-day experience here in Boston and all over the United States. I was very much interested to read in last month's issue of your publication, the Carpenter, that official Government statistics support the fact that union dues pay off. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data prove that the average hourly union-wage rate is from 10 to 20 cents higher than the pay received by nonunion members.

But a union program is not purely a selfish one. Your organization could not have flourished over three-quarters of a century, if its program were not identified with the common good. The fact clearly is: What is good for America is good for the carpenters.

You favor an expanded housing program. This might appear to be a selfish interest, since you are in the business of building, but again your interests coincide with the needs of the country. Despite the great prosperity and the rising standard of living over the past few decades, millions in our Nation are still ill housed; and many hundreds of thousands of children are living in dilapidated dwellings which should be torn down or which require major overhaul to make them fit places in which Americans may live.

I believe that the Government has a very real role to play in this area, and I wholeheartedly support the bill recently introduced in the Congress which offers a realistic housing program for our Federal Government.

In brief, this program provides for:

First. The building of 200,000 public-housing units for low-income families. This program is to last for 3 years, during which 600,000 units would be built.

Second. The setting aside of 10 percent of these housing units for elderly persons.

Third. The establishment of a national mortgage corporation with lending authority of $1 billion to stimulate the construction of housing for the middle-income man, the forgotten man of this era, in my opinion.

I believe that the provision to help finance housing for middle-income groups is just as important as the construction of public-housing units. There is no present effective Federal program for the building of middle-income housing, for which there is a crying need, and I am fully confident that the Federal sponsorship of middle-income housing is not going to be any burden to the taxpayer. Given conditions of prosperity and high wages, there will be sufficient potential customers to take advantage of the federally sponsored program, and these customers will have the ability to repay the loans on their houses.

It is important, however, that the federally sponsored construction program should be based on a fair wage system. The extension of coverage of the Davis-Bacon Act to include all construction programs which are sponsored with Federal funds is clearly necessary. As you know, the Davis-Bacon Act has helped construction workers by assuring that the prevailing rates which they have been receiving in their communities would be paid on jobs to which the Federal Government is a party. I believe that these provisions should be extended to all programs which are sponsored by the Federal Government. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that these provisions help only workers in the building trades. They also help the contractors by providing a means by which they can ascertain the approximate labor costs on Government contracts prior to submission of their bids. This helps in the stabilization of the construction industry and the achieving of better labor-management relations in the construction industry.

The application of Davis-Bacon provisions has helped all segments of the community. Unscrupulous contractors who bring in low-cost labor where higher wage rates prevail tend to deteriorate the wage standards in the community. Furthermore, workers who are imported to new areas by these contractors frequently become drags on the community when the temporary construction jobs are completed.

The Federal Government must not become a party to undermining wage standards.

The Government also, in my opinion, has a duty not to be a party to creating strife and undermining labor-management relations. Along this line, as a former member of the NLRB, I find the application of the act to the construction industry particularly unrealistic in many instances. The construction industry has its own special problems and a tradition of good labor-management relations. Many practices listed in the Taft-Hartley Act as unfair are not easily applied to the building industry.

In this field I draw particular attention to the secondary boycott section of the act. Provision should be made to permit an employer to sign a union agreement on a construction job without going through the present cumbersome obstacles which, in many cases, result in the construction job being finished before an agreement can be signed.

Further, the section of the Taft-Hartley Act which places restrictive State law above Federal law in the miscalled right-to-work laws should be removed.

For that matter, I feel that due to the unique nature of your industry it would not be at all unusual if an exception were made of the industry as a whole—as was done when our Federal Government recognized your unique problems in the days of wage controls and a separate construction industry board was set up to deal with your problems.

While on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, I have heard many people say that the act should be repealed or changed. Well, I have news for these people, the act has been so changed that you might say it has been repealed—

By whom, you ask? Well, not by the Members of Congress.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been changed, and changed drastically. It has been changed by the recent appointees to the National Labor Relations Board. Even though sworn to uphold the law which Congress enacted, it would seem that these members have searched it from stem to stern with the purpose of making it a more antilabor statute, and of reversing wherever possible each rule of interpretation and application established in the administration of the act from 1947 through 1952.

Those who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act said that it was two-sided legislation, that it equalized the rights of management and labor, without submerging the rights of either side. Whatever the merits of that position—I think that there can be little doubt that the changes in the administration of the act since 1953 have been almost exclusively against labor.

First, it is clear that almost all of the innumerable changes in doctrine and interpretation have been changes which reduced the protections of labor. With respect to each charge it could perhaps be argued that the old Board was wrong and the new Board is right. But when all of these changes are looked at together it is discovered that the total result is injury to labor.

Those who would justify their decisions say that the Board is fair and has moved in an antilabor direction only because the earlier Board was excessively prolabor, and that the present Board is simply correcting the prolabor mistakes of the Truman board.

Fortunately, we have a yardstick against which to measure these arguments.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947, its sponsors were afraid that it would not be fairly administered. The statute was complex and many of its provisions were so unclear that maladministration could easily defeat the intent of Congress. To guard against such maladministration, Congress provided, in title 5 of the act, the creation of a joint committee of both Houses to conduct an investigation in the 2d session of the 80th Congress, of the Board's administration of the act. That committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Ball, concluded in its report that the act was being administered in accordance with its terms and with the intention of the Congress as revealed by the legislative history of the provisions.

So we start with the established premise that the Taft-Hartley Act was, on the whole, fairly administered in its early years with neither a prolabor nor a promanagement bias in the Labor Board's decision.

But the past 2 years have seen a rising chorus of protest, objection, and complaint, that the National Labor Relations Board is biased and prejudiced against labor organizations, that it is utilizing its powers to thwart self-organization among employees. It is thwarting unionization both by withholding the act's remedies against violations by employers and by distorting the terms of the act so as to exclude illegal conduct by employers from the prohibitions of the act. At the same time, it is charged, the Board is narrowing the area of lawful protection which Congress extended to employee activity in the field of self-organization and that it is imposing upon the right to strike, restrictions which Congress rejected under our present system of collective bargaining.

We all know how important it is, in a field as delicate as labor-management relations, where the very lives and livelihood of many citizens are at stake, that the agency which we Members of the Congress have entrusted with the duty of administering the law of the land, should be unbiased and unprejudiced.

Surely, it is clearly important to the Board, that it should avoid the appearance of any unfairness in any individual case, and it is of much greater importance to the Congress and the Nation that this agency not act in a fashion which might produce a deep-seated feeling, that by deliberate design it is unfair to an entire class of litigants.

These charges of bias, prejudice, maladministration, and distortion of the statute does not come from defeated litigants alone. These charges have been confirmed by informed students and competent lawyers who specialize in this field of labor-management relations. Prof. Willard Wirtz, of Northwestern University, in a carefully documented study of the new Board's free-speech decisions, concluded that the Board has recently emasculated the protection which Congress guaranteed to employees against employer coercion in the exercise of rights to form and join labor organizations by placing upon section 8 (c), the free-speech provision of the amended act, a construction far broader than Congress intended. How does the Board operate to change the law? Well, we all know of the appointments to the Board itself of Beeson, the labor management consultant, etc., who have made it apparent that they are using the powers of their office to substitute for the labor relations policy which Congress enacted in 1947 a policy of their own. The sweeping character of the policy changes which the Board has made during the past year, taken together, amount, in my opinion, to amendment of the statute in a manner far more drastic than anything this administration has proposed to Congress. The antilabor amendments which the new Board has accomplished by interpretation exceed, in some respects, even the antilabor proposals of the Hartley wing of the Republican Party, which were rejected by the Congress in 1947.

Equally as important, however, in my opinion, but not as noticeable to the public or perhaps even to labor officials, is the Office of General Counsel, which is charged with the duty of determining whether a complaint of unfair labor practices shall issue on all charges filed with the agency. This office was recently filled with a lawyer whose private practice background was exclusively as a representative of employers in the labor-management relation field. Soon after taking office this General Counsel removed his Associate General Counsel in charge of field operations. In his place was appointed a young man who first came to the Board in 1954, a man who had less than 4 months' experience with the Board's field operations and whose only experience in the labor-relations field prior to 1954 was in the capacity of attorney for a division of the United States Steel Co. in San Francisco. The field operations boss is the man who determines, more than any other, the impact of the Board's policies on actual labor relations day to day. In this office lodges power and responsibility for the supervision of the operation of all of the Board's field offices with their many regional directors, dozens of field examiners, and attorneys who, in their dealings with both labor and management, are to all intents and purposes the Board itself.

Under the Office of Associate General Counsel in charge of field operations are several Assistant General Counsels whose responsibility it is to directly supervise the operations of the National Labor Relations Board regional offices. The General Counsel, as you know, has the power to decide which cases shall and which shall not reach the Board for decision. He determines whether the evidence presented in support of a charge is adequate to warrant prosecution.

By fragmenting the evidence instead of viewing it as a whole, the clearest case of unfair labor practice can sometimes be reduced to a series of meaningless and trivial incidents. Of course, no fair or rational administration of the act can result. In one case which illustrates the whole picture, which is identified by the present General Counsel as case No. K–42, he refused to issue a complaint on charges alleging that the company violated section 8 (a) (1), (3), and (5) of the act, although five employees who had gone on strike testified, independently of each other, that the company had offered each of them benefits to abandon the strike and return to work, on the ground that there was no corroboration of their testimony.

How could there be corroboration of separate conversations at which only two parties—the employer and the employee—were present? It is not the business of the general counsel, but of the trial examiner and the Board, to weigh the evidence and decide whether, if the employer denies making the statements attributed to him, he or the employees are telling the truth. But there is something even more shocking in this case.

The employer did not deny making the statements to the employees. Their testimony stood uncontradicted by any witness to the conversation. On what basis then did the General Counsel act? He accepted an affidavit of the employer's attorney, who, although not present, denied that the statements were made, as proof that the employer had not actually made them. Even if the burden of proof in these unfair labor practice cases was as heavy as in a criminal case, which certainly is not, I have no hesitancy in saying, that in my time at the NLRB the General Counsel would have proceeded in this case forthwith and that statement includes the action of the General Counsel who hired me, who was a strong Robert A. Taft Republican and who, before his death, practiced labor law on management's side, the late Mr. Robert Denham.

Maybe these gentlemen who form the hard core of the NLRB are neutral but, from where I sit—and from the decisions I read, they appear to me to be about as neutral as a loyal and enthusiastic Yale man refereeing a Harvard-Yale football game.

In closing, may I say that few organizations can claim the vigor and dynamic program that you are displaying on your diamond jubilee. May your next 75 years be as helpful to the American carpenters, as well as to the community at large, as your program has been during the previous three-quarters of a century.

Montana-Canadian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on Montana-Canadian relations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Mr. President, in this world of cold wars, border patrols, uprisings, and international tensions, there is one place where peace is real and lasting. That is the border between the United States and Canada.

The frontier stretches from Puget Sound along the 49th parallel, the Great Lakes, and Maine—without a soldier, warship, or fence to be found. People visit back and forth like neighbors. In brief, it is one of the few places in the world where disarmament between two countries has actually worked.

The State of Montana is an important part of this 4,000-mile frontier, and, following true to form, people and goods from Montana and the neighboring Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan are flowing back and forth across the boundary in ever-increasing numbers. In fact, Canada is proving to be one of Montana's best customers.

Canadians spent an estimated $16 million in Montana during 1955. They are expected to spend even more this year, according to Department of Commerce figures. The Departmental studies show that more than 23 million Canadians visited the United States in 1954.

About 14 million came by automobile alone. While the stay was short for many, 3 million Canadians stayed for 3 days or longer. The traffic to and from Canada is beginning to have more and more significance.

Vast distances, poor roads, forests and mountain ranges all tend to isolate Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta from the more populated and industrialized areas on the eastern and western coasts of Canada.

People in the Prairie Provinces, as a result, find themselves drawn more and more toward north central United States. This friendly relationship is a two-way street and Montanans are becoming concerned that they are not living up to their part.

With this view in mind the Montana Chamber of Commerce has planned an all-Montana-Canadian relations tour for a week during August. All major communities in Montana are participating in the large caravan of Montana cars which will tour Alberta and Saskatchewan.

A. W. Johnson, president of the Montana Chamber of Commerce, estimates that the tour will be the biggest mass good will Canadian visit any State has attempted.

Montana Day events are being planned in every city along the tour route. The meeting of Montanans and Canadians will be strictly informal. The purpose of the tour is multipurpose, but generally designed to show our Canadian neighbors an expression of our good will and desire to further cement the growing Montana-Canadian relations.

The need for greater Montana-Canadian relations has expanded in recent years. And it is the feeling of Montanans that they should be organized in an all-out effort to thank our Canadian neighbors for the trade they have given in the past and to open the door even further for the future.

The small Montana towns along the boundary are fine examples of how two nations and two peoples have learned to live together in peace. There is completely free interchange and cooperation in civic matters extending from emergencies to civic entertainment. In some instances farmers till land on both sides of the border.

Though the 4,000-mile frontier stands as a monument to peace, there are still occasional differences of opinion and even sharp disputes, over investment, tariffs, international water rights, and the fact that the Canadians at times feel they are being taken too much for granted.

However, whatever the dispute, people on both sides of the border are assured that it will be settled at the conference table and not on the battlefield.

Montana has a great deal at stake in its relations with its neighboring Canadian Provinces—as much, if not more than any State along the frontier. It is quite important that the current relationship be preserved and improved upon in the future.

The strengthening of this two-way street between Canada and Montana can be exemplified by increased trade, expanded north-south transportation with new highways and airlines, agricultural and livestock cooperation, and expanded tourist travel.

Will Strict Laws Solve the Narcotic Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter I sent to Mr. Jess Stearn of the New York Daily News, and the text of an article he wrote called "Addict's Story: You Can Always Find a Pusher." This subject is of particular interest in view of the recent passage of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956.

The letter and article follow:

Mr. JESS STEARN,
New York Daily News, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. STEARN: I read your article in today's issue of the Daily News, Addict's Story: You Can Always Find a Pusher, and am much impressed with your series on the general subject, Will Tough Laws Curb Dope?

In view of your concern for this distressing problem I thought you might be interested in my views on one facet of the problem.

The Narcotics Control Act of 1956 has just become law. It makes the death penalty applicable to persons convicted of selling heroin to minors and increases jail sentences to a maximum of 40 years in other cases.

Admittedly, the sale and use of narcotics leading to addiction is a tragedy of horrible proportion, resulting in irreparable damage to the individual and to society. We cannot look upon the corruption of minors to drug addiction without horror. I maintain that it is our responsibility to summon all our forces to understand the cause and to effect the cure of the narcotic habit. It is a problem that, to date, has baffled us, and we are frightened. In the panic we have seized upon the death penalty as an answer to this problem.

The imposition of a death penalty brings us no closer to a solution. This is not a problem for the penologists; it is a problem for the medical men, for the psychiatrists, and for the social workers.

Advocates of the extreme penalty seem to believe that the cure of the narcotics scourge rose in proportion to the severity of punishment. This is nonsense. Incarceration is no cure, much less life imprisonment and the death penalty.

Dr. Herbert Berger, chairman of the committee on alcoholism and narcotics of the New York State Medical Society and president of the New York City Medical Society, has this to say on drug addiction:

"For more than 40 years our lawmakers and administrators have been trying to cure an illness by treating it as a crime. That illness—steadily on the increase in this country—is addiction to narcotic drugs.

"Our legalistic approach * * * has wrought its own reward. We have created a new criminal class. We have a flourishing narcotics racket. We have ever more drug addicts. Yet, in spite of the peculiar lack of success that the punitive principle has had in the narcotics field during four decades, Congress is now seeking to extend this principle. * * *"

The drug addict is mentally and emotionally ill. He requires medical attention and rehabilitation more than penal punishment. What we need desperately is to find a way to remove profit from the drug traffic. This is the heart of the matter.

I turn again to a statement by Dr. Berger:

"Since society shuns and abhors him (the drug addict), he must turn to the underworld to satisfy his demands. Its members are more than happy to comply. The profits are fabulous. Five dollars in Red China purchases an ounce of heroin. It has been sold for as much as $8,000 in New York City. Small wonder that punitive legislation has failed to remove the importer. We have created a criminal market that is both lucrative and safe. When, occasionally, one of these purveyors is caught there are always others willing to step into his place."

The seller or pusher is generally an addict himself. He sells to get money for the drug he must have. He sells to anyone, including the minor, so that he can insure himself a steady flow of customers. The death penalty will not deter him. Medical men will tell you that the compulsion of the addict is so strong that nothing deters, since the misery of doing without the drug is so intense that any risk, even death, is preferable.

It is prevention that we want, not vengeance. It is reduction of crime we seek, not retribution.

Moreover, criminologists admit that the death penalty does not reduce crime. Juries are less willing to convict and judges loathe to sentence when the possible penalty is death. The commission of first-degree murders in States barring capital punishment is no greater than in States imposing the death penalty.

Gov. Walter J. Kohler, of Wisconsin, has written:

"I have never favored capital punishment and 6 years as Governor of a State which does not impose the death penalty has merely served to reinforce that conviction. I have yet to see any evidence which indicates that the death penalty is effective as a deterrent to major crimes. * * * Here in Wisconsin all murderers who are sentenced to life terms are eventually paroled, and experience has shown that they generally establish outstanding records while on parole, ultimately are pardoned and continue to live as useful and productive citizens."

Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, of California, has stated:

"I have now been in law enforcement for some 12 years. I have grave doubts as to the efficacy of capital punishment. As a matter

of fact, I think that it could well promote violence rather than deter it."

Attorney General Don Eastvold, of Washington, says:

"Those who advocate the imposition of the supreme penalty insist that it is justified as a deterrent to similar crimes. The evidence available to support this view is not convincing."

The attorney general of Utah, E. R. Callister, states:

"My opposition to capital punishment is based on the fact that this type of punishment is not fulfilling its purpose. In other words, it does not seem to be a deterrent to crimes of violence, and in many instances relegates the convicted murderer to the position of a martyr."

The evidence mounts. The death penalty solves nothing.

In the United Kingdom the criminal addict is not recognized. Addicts are treated by physicians and given prescriptions by reputable pharmacists. As a result there are only 279 known addicts and probably very few unknown. The problem has thus been effectively removed from the realm of the underworld.

I repeat, prevention and rehabilitation are the only practical approaches. Rehabilitate the addict without drugs if you can, or with them if you must. Kill one and a dozen others spring up to take his place.

We may be gripped by the horror of the whole subject, but we must not lose sight in our outrage of what procedures would be most effective and realistic. It is too easy to sink into the clouds of emotion.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

[From the New York Daily News]

ADDICT'S STORY: YOU CAN ALWAYS FIND A PUSHER

(By Jess Stearn)

Living in the suburbs was a great inconvenience for Frankie, since he had to journey into New York every day for his shot of heroin.

"It got so that I finally had to get myself a commutation ticket," said the 23-year-old addict. "I needed every dollar I could for the drugs."

Frankie, who comes of good old-line stock, frequently varied his itinerary. Sometimes he stalked Eighth Avenue, from 14th to 59th, sometimes Broadway, and sometimes Harlem, Spanish Harlem and the old Harlem.

"It was expensive traveling," said Frankie, "but I had no choice—the stuff you got in my town was cut so much that it didn't give me a boost anymore."

Frankie never returned home without his fix. "If you look hard enough you can always find a pusher," he said. "I don't know how they do it, but they always seem able to spot me.

"The other night I thought I'd try Broadway. I was standing outside this place, minding my business, when a guy walks up to me and says:

" 'What's happening?' "

Frankie gave him a searching look.

"Nothing's shaking," he replied.

The guy was satisfied.

COMPLETES SALE IN OLD ASHCAN

"He told me to meet him in a hall around the corner, asked me for $15, and then told me I'd find what I was looking for up forward in an old ashcan."

The word dope, or heroin, was not once mentioned.

Frankie has already been in jail twice for addiction, and is not keen on taking risks, particularly since the recent congressional and State stiffening of penalties for pushers and addicts alike.

"I'd rather get all I needed every week," he said, "but I have no place to bring it but home, and my mother is always turning the house upside down looking for needles, syringes, and the stuff itself—she doesn't trust me when I say I'm off.

"I'd rather live in New York, so I wouldn't have to make that trip every day, but living home I don't pay room and board and that money goes for the stuff. As it is, my job doesn't carry it all. I make $90 a week as an electrician's helper and I need another $25 or so to buy what I need."

DAD'S ALWAYS GOOD FOR EXTRA DOUGH

"My father," he said, "is the only one in the family who has not given up on me. I can nearly always go to him and get an extra $10 or $20, saying I need it for a date.

"I don't think he believes me, but he's afraid that if he doesn't give it to me, I'll go out and get it some other way. He just says to me, 'Frankie, I hope you're telling me the truth.'

"Sometimes I feel ashamed to think I'm deceiving the only person who has any faith in me, but I've never felt so much shame that I haven't felt the need for the stuff more.

"The rest of my family are fed up with me and I don't blame them. I'm the only one that ever got into trouble or went to jail, and sometimes I wonder if I really belong in the family, since my brothers and sisters are all respectable and doing well.

"Nobody could be more patient with me than my father. If he ever gives up on me, I don't know what I'll do. Maybe it's because he was an alcoholic once, and knows what I'm going through. My mother is pleasant, but she doesn't seem much interested. I guess having a husband an alcoholic for years, and then a son an addict, sort of tires a person out after a while.

"Once I thought about trying to get into that New York hospital (Riverside) for teenage addicts, but it didn't seem to help any of my buddies in New York. They were always swimming the river to get away from there or else shooting themselves up again. It was all right for rest, good food, and girls, I heard, but, hell, I could get all that at home."

SOMETIMES SORRY, TRIES TO QUIT IT

At regular intervals, since becoming an addict 8 years ago, Frankie is overcome by remorse and tries to quit.

"I had gone to this place because they cut the stuff right in front of you and you know you're not getting cheated. And that night I felt the need of a real stiff shot."

He grimaced as his mind went back to that night. "You never saw anything like that room before. The pusher who was an addict, had passed out and was lying on the bed. He had thrown up and he was lying in his own vomit. The stench was terrible.

"There were 3 or 4 little kids, crawling and toddling around the room, dirty and without any clothes on. You could have scraped the filth off them with a knife, and they obviously weren't housebroken.

"The mother—I guess she was the mother—was busy mixing the stuff. She had a mask over her face, so none of it would get in her nose and throat. That struck me kind of funny, a surgical mask with all that filth.

AFTER YOU GET FIX YOU JUST DON'T CARE

"I kept asking myself, as I sat there, what had ever happened to me. I came from a clean home, with clean parents, and here I was sitting in a place where things were crawling out of the walls, waiting for a fix.

"I almost got up and ran out, but all the time I was thinking of it I knew I wouldn't. As the woman was diluting the stuff, I could almost taste it. And once I got the fix, I knew I wouldn't care where I was."

Frankie shows few outward signs of addiction as yet. Except for the needle marks on his arms and his shifty eyes, I saw nothing unusual. He found it impossible to look me in the eye as he talked and he prefaced each remark with an apologetic, "I suppose you'll think I'm feeling sorry for myself, but——."

Although tall and muscular, in striking contrast to the usual frail type, he was beginning to find it increasingly difficult to handle his job.

"If I lose the job," he said, "I'm sunk, because I just have to have that money every week."

He dates occasionally, but isn't interested in women. Blushing, he acknowledged that he had never done more than casually neck with a girl, but hastened to add:

"Not that I'm funny or anything like that. But whenever I'm with girls I'm thinking of my next fix."

He has no marriage plans.

"No," he said, "I haven't thought about it in terms of making some woman unhappy. It would make me unhappy, though. I just don't see how I can support a wife—and the habit—at the same time."

And like so many of the new and growing crop of addicts he was barely in his teens when he started—just past 14.

HE'S HOOKED AND BECOMES A CROOK

He has searched for an answer himself, but hasn't found it. "It wasn't anything in my home, or like that," he said. "My mother and dad were both good to me and I had nearly anything I wanted.

"Maybe it was bad company, but they were just kids like myself. There were about a dozen guys in our crowd and we used to see each other around every night.

"When I took my first shot I didn't think I'd get hooked. Hell, I didn't see how anything like that could hook me. I got it from one of the kids in the crowd. He asked me if I wanted a thrill and I said yes. It cost me $3 for that first shot.

"I've heard a lot of stuff about pushers giving the kids the dope at first to get them hooked and then making them pay for it through the nose. But I haven't seen it work that way myself.

"I think the smart pushers don't try giving it to the kids now; most kids today would get suspicious of something they got for nothing, and pushers know that kids that get hooked will hook other kids. It makes their work easy for them."

Three months after that introductory offering, Frankie was thoroughly hooked. He had dropped out of school unknown to his parents and was engaged in a 2-man crime wave with another teen-age addict.

IN SEPARATE CELLS AND NO EXERCISE

"We did pretty good for a while," he said, "but one day without realizing it we took some stuff out of the police chief's house and there was hell to pay. They really went after us. You would have thought it was the biggest crime that ever happened. About every cop in town was on the case.

"They finally caught up to us through the pawnbroker we had peddled the stuff off to. And then they gave us a going-over until we admitted taking the stuff. By that time I would have admitted anything."

Frankie was 16 when he went to jail for the first time, charged, among other things, with addiction.

"Hell," he said, "you would have thought we were the most dangerous criminals in captivity. There were 2 or 3 of us and they put us in separate cells by ourselves and wouldn't let us out. The other prisoners exercised every day, but not us."

DO ANYTHING TO GET OFF, HE SAYS

"About every 2 or 3 weeks, they'd break down and take us out for air, and you should have seen how they guarded us. Guards stood by with sawed-off shotguns, and they had machineguns up on the walls in case we got violent.

"If it hadn't been so ridiculous it would have been comical. It shows how much they

know about addicts. I've known lots of addicts and I've never known one that did anything violent—unless, of course, he was interrupted while he was stealing, or something like that.

"It's funny how they can deal with addicts all the time and know so little about them. Maybe they don't want to know. The last time I was arrested, I'd just been picked up on suspicion. I told the judge I had been off drugs for a while, but he said he'd take the narcotics agents' word for it.

" 'They're the best judge,' he said, 'of whether an addict's on drugs or not.'

"What a joke that was. They don't know any more about it than you or I do. Nobody knows anything about it. But I got sent away again, anyway. I suppose that made up for the times that nobody caught me. You get to be philosophical after a while."

Frankie suddenly paused and looked up, directing his gaze to the level of my shoulder. "Do you think," he asked, "a psychiatrist could help me?" He grimaced, "But I don't have the money."

"I don't know," I told him, "but I know a few who work with addicts and I could ask them."

I suggested he call the following afternoon.

That was 2 weeks ago and I haven't heard from Frankie. "It's lots easier," the psychiatrist said, "to talk about kicking drugs than do anything about it."

Private Enterprise Can Provide Best Form of Aid for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the statement by me in aiding underdeveloped areas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps the strongest single current running throughout the world today is the deeply rooted desire of hundreds of millions of people in undeveloped countries for improved standards of living. It underlies the revolutionary tides which have swept over large parts of the globe, and it poses a major problem for the so-called have nations with respect to their relations with the have-nots. Every consideration of our western tradition based upon the brotherhood of man urges us to lend our assistance to the efforts of those less fortunate than ourselves to improve their lot.

Mr. Harvey S. Firestone recently proposed in Hamburg, Germany, a constructive and relatively little used approach to the solution of this problem. His attitude is in direct keeping with the basic American view that private capital should be encouraged to initiate and to develop enterprises designed to lift the economic, social, and cultural life of underdeveloped nations. I am inserting into the RECORD this report of his talk as printed in the Journal of Commerce of June 18, 1956:

"BUSINESS URGED TO TAKE LEAD IN AIDING UNDEVELOPED AREAS

"HAMBURG.—'Private business and private capital should shoulder the task of providing financial and technical aid for development projects—especially in the less developed areas of the world.'

"This clarion call for the free enterprise system on the international plane was sounded here recently by 2 top businessmen, 1 American and 1 German. Before an impressive gathering of the German business community, come together in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Phoenix Gummiwerke AG of Hamburg-Harburg, Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. of Akron, Ohio, and Herman J. Abs, chief executive of the Sueddeutsche Bank of Frankfurt, warned against entrusting governments and government agencies with development plans.

"Eschew special privilege

"Both speakers agreed that private capital is willing, as it has been in the past, to assume the risks inherent in such projects, provided adequate guaranties exist for its protection in foreign countries, and it is not discriminated against. Stating that private capital does not seek special privilege, Mr. Firestone said that it will not go where it is uncertain of fair and friendly treatment.

"He urged that the treatymaking power of individual nations be used to create a climate beneficial to foreign investments, but that such treaties should be limited to establishing protection for foreign investments and should not interfere with foreign investments themselves.

"Mr. Abs, who recently became the first president of the newly formed Society To Promote the Protection of Foreign Investments, noted that German business must henceforth take a more active part in developing foreign national economies, particularly overseas, even though available funds are much smaller than those of the United States and the United Kingdom. So far German firms have rather hesitated to undertake such risks, mindful of considerable losses suffered in the past by confiscation and expropriation.

"As Mr. Firestone pointed out, there are strong incentives for both West German and American business to invest money in other nations, as both countries must rely on imports of countless vital raw materials, and many of these necessities come from the same nations now anxious to obtain aid.

The Firestone Corp. itself showed its willingness to assume risks when 6 years ago it concluded a comprehensive agreement with the Phoenix Co. of Hamburg, the first American tire company to do so. The Hamburg firm was headed then as it still is, by Otto A. Friedrich, one of West Germany's outstanding businessmen and a frequent adviser of his government in raw material and related matters.

"Urged magna carta

"Mr. Abs proposed that the Western nations conclude a multilateral treaty under which the signatory nations would provide equal treatment and protection to foreign investors. Such a magna carta of foreign investments would help stop the trend toward government planning and pave the way for economic development by private capital.

"Praising American economic aid and German-American economic cooperation he expressed particular satisfaction over a recent amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, introduced by Congressman THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and passed unanimously by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which stresses the need for 'equitable treatment and protection of private investments of nations participating in the program under this act.' "

Increase of Price Supports on Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a table on the increase of price supports on farm products as a result of the President's determination to give the farmer a break. Farm prices have reacted to this program and are increasing steadily, which will result in a much larger income for the farmer for 1956 over 1955.

The table follows:

Increase in price-support rate

Commodity	Previous announced program		Present program		Increase	
	Support rate	Percent parity	Support rate	Percent parity	Support rate	Percent parity
Corn, bushel	$1.40	81	$1.50	86.2	$0.10	5.2
Wheat, do	1.81	76	2.00	83.7	.19	7.7
Grain sorghum, hundredweight	1.80	70	1.97	76.0	.17	6.0
Oats, bushel	.59	70	.65	76.0	.06	6.0
Barley, do	.93	70	1.02	76.0	.09	6.0
Rye, do	1.16	70	1.27	76.0	.11	6.0
Flax, do	3.09	70	3.09	70.0	0	0
Rice, hundredweight	4.04	75	4.50	82.7	.46	7.7
Milk, pound	3.15	82	3.25	84.4	.10	2.4
Butterfat, do	.562	78	.586	81.2	.024	3.2

Beef Broth on the Rocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, beef broth on the rocks seemed to be a popular drink around the Capitol during the adjournment days of this 84th Congress.

The House of Representatives restaurant served the drink, courtesy of Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas; and Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY had a beef-broth fountain in his office, which was enjoyed by many of my thirsty colleagues, including myself and Mrs. Hagen.

This is illustrative of still another way the great American cattle industry can serve the Nation.

I can truthfully say that both my wife and I attest to the fact that iced beef broth is a gourmet's delight and should receive wide public acceptance.

The Republican Party on Its Record Is the Economy Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take this time to point out that Government reports covering appropriations for the past 12 fiscal years establish beyond question that the Republican Party by its record is entitled to be known as the economy party. I make this statement because of the records established by the Republican-controlled 80th and 83d Congresses.

According to Senate Document No. 158 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, the 80th Congress reduced the appropriations for fiscal 1948 and 1949 approximately $28 billion below the appropriations by the 79th Congress.

The 83d Congress reduced the appropriations more than $63 billion below the totals appropriated by the 82d Congress.

In the past 25 fiscal years our Federal budget has been balanced but three times, twice during the 80th Congress and again this year under the administration of President Eisenhower.

The table which follows show the amounts appropriated in each of the past 12 fiscal years, and was compiled by Mr. Paul O. Peters, of my office staff:

Appropriations, excluding payments from trust funds

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
79th Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1946	$69,780,137,109
2d sess., fiscal 1947	35,734,209,165
Total	105,514,346,275
REPUBLICAN CONGRESS	
80th Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1948	35,982,837,708
2d sess., fiscal 1949	41,675,480,957
Total	77,658,368,665
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
81st Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1950	46,497,456,897
2d sess., fiscal 1951	81,045,040,411
Total	127,542,497,308
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
82d Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1952	101,117,768,897
2d sess., fiscal 1953	85,999,646,411
Total	187,117,415,308
REPUBLICAN CONGRESS	
83d Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1954	65,156,254,797
2d sess., fiscal 1955	58,160,445,563
Total	123,316,700,360
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
84th Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1956	60,428,197,491
2d sess., fiscal 1957	68,138,077,423
Total	128,566,274,914
Grand total of appropriations	749,715,602,829

The appropriations during the 12 years exclude approximately $83,325,000,000 payable from trust fund receipts.

Appropriations by the 82d Congress were the greatest in history except for the $204,863,924,329 appropriated by the wartime 77th Congress.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, Which I Shall Reintroduce in the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I worked out a legislative measure designed to take care of certain emergent situations which had arisen in the field of immigration and nationality under both the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. My proposals constituted a comprehensive immigration bill, the effect of which, if enacted into law, would be to alleviate certain hardships affecting immigrants and citizens of this country without destroying the basis of our immigration laws.

Briefly, my proposals would—

First. Liberalize the restrictions applicable to immigrants who have committed petty offenses, although such offenses could be classified as felonies under foreign law;

Second. Wipe out the "mortgages" imposed on certain small immigration quotas by the Displaced Persons Acts of 1948 and of 1950, under which this country has admitted over 400,000 immigrants;

Third. Forgive the refugees the misrepresentations made while applying for immigration visas if such misrepresentations were prompted by their fear to be forcibly repatriated to countries under Communist domination;

Fourth. Permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive in their discretion and on a basis of reciprocity the fingerprinting requirements of our immigration laws in the interest of facilitating foreign travel and exchange of visitors, students, artists, and so forth;

Fifth. Admit under proper safeguards up to 1,200 immigrants afflicted with tuberculosis in order to prevent separation of families;

Sixth. Permit expeditious naturalization of alien children adopted by citizens of the United States who are stationed abroad either in the service or in the employment of the Government of the United States or an American institution, firm, corporation, religious organization, and so forth;

Seventh. Permit the entry of an additional 5,000 war orphans adopted by citizens of this country, and to raise the maximum age of those orphans from 10 years to 14 years;

Eighth. Give the illegitimate child the same status under immigration laws—relating to the mother of such child—as the legitimate child has under existing law;

Ninth. Enable the immigrant's family to come to the United States in the same preferential status regardless of whether the family is accompanying the breadwinner or following to join him at some later time;

Tenth. Permit the issuance of around 40,000 nonquota visas to refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain without additional restrictions provided in the 1953 law and without "cutting off" the visas at any particular time, thus opening the doors to the United States to those refugees who might even in the future dare their Communist oppressors and cross the Iron Curtain; and

Eleventh. Help the American wool growing industry by admitting an additional 350 skilled sheepherders from Spain.

To this carefully worked out program, the Senate added a provision which, in permitting the redistribution of immigration quotas, represents a most drastic departure from the principles of our immigration laws. The House of Representatives was faced with this wholly unexpected basic change of the foundation upon which our immigration policy has stood for over 30 years just 5 hours before the adjournment of the 84th Congress. No hearings were held on this provision. The House was totally unprepared to vote for it in the last minute rush, the Committee on the Judiciary never had this proposal before them, and the hard-working 5-member subcommittee in charge of legislation affecting immigration and nationality had similarly no opportunity to even read the Senate amendment available to the membership of the House in but 1 mimeographed copy.

This hastily conceived Senate amendment was attached to my 11-point immigration and refugee relief program, thus dooming this urgently needed and carefully worked out—with the full participation of the leadership of both parties—proposal.

Under the circumstances, it is my intention to reintroduce in the 85th Congress, on the day it convenes, my emergency proposal and shortly after the Committee on the Judiciary is organized to commence hearings at which every interested party will have an opportunity to bring before us the accusations, the grievances, the alleged inequities, and the proposed amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

In my opinion, that law has worked very well and to the benefit of the United States in the 4 years that passed since it was placed on our statute books. I am familiar with the need of certain technical changes but before I submit my own proposals, I want the Congress and the public opinion at large to be given an opportunity to acquaint themselves fully with the problem and to ascertain how much of the propaganda leveled against the Immigration and Nationality Act is prompted by purely political consideration, how much of it stems from those

who would sacrifice the security, the welfare, and the economy of this country on the altar of foreign interests, and how much of it is based on humanitarian and justifiable legal grounds.

I believe that extensive public hearings will permit us to write a set of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act if the case for such amendments is made.

Benefits for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, much constructive action was taken by the 84th Congress in behalf of Alaska. Some of the legislation passed and signed into law certainly ranks as equal in importance to any adopted since the Organic Act of 1912.

Of course, the order of importance is a matter of subjective judgment. To the man seeking a homestead title which he could obtain only by action of Congress, certainly the legislation of most particular consequence would be the bill concerning him personally. However, in the broader field affecting the general public interest, there were four legislative gains long needed by the Territory, the effects of which will be beneficial and lasting.

Without attempting to assign any order of priority in respect to these four, I immediately think of the Alaska Mental Health Act. That law, long sought and achieved after almost incredible difficulty, places legislative responsibility for the care of Alaska's mentally ill where it properly should be—with the Territorial government. It provides that the ultimate taking over by the Territory of the financial costs with temporary grants-in-aid and help in building institutions coming from the Federal Government. It also permits commitment procedures to be established by the Territory.

Then, of course, Alaska's inclusion in the Federal-Aid Highway System through adoption of an amendment to the National Highway Act of 1956 is really monumental. Before this time Alaska only among the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico was denied the benefits of the national law. Now we can go forward and build the roads which are so necessary to the opening up for settlement of that vast country.

Next, the 84th Congress gave the Territorial government authority for the first time to issue bonds for needed public improvements. The people of Alaska in a referendum vote previously taken had sought the right to issue bonds for school buildings. The law was enlarged in scope to include other public improvements and will, I am confident, serve a most useful purpose.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress a bill was enacted into law abolishing the 80-rod shore-space reservation. This had been a barrier to settlement and its repeal had long been sought. The old law provided that homesteads, for example, on shore space of whatever kind it might have been, must be separated by at least a quarter of a mile. It is not necessary to point out how crippling this was in a country with such vast expanses of shorelands. True enough, the old law provided that the Secretary of the Interior had the right to waive the requirement, but Alaskans are mindful that for a long period no such waiver was granted and that circumstance might rise again, so the law repealing the 80-rod provision was a desired and a welcome one.

In the 2 sessions of the last Congress appropriations amounting to $304,025,774 were made for operations of the Federal Government in Alaska.

Of especial significance was the fact that a breakthrough came in respect to appropriations for desperately needed river and harbor projects in Alaska. In the first session, the President's budget message had asked for funds for the Seward Harbor of Refuge and for planning flood-control work on Gold Creek, in Juneau. But the Congress made additional appropriations and as a consequence small boat harbors are being built in Petersburg, Metlakatla, and Wrangell. This year the President's budget message asked for money for the Bar Point river and harbor project at Ketchikan, for the Gold Creek flood-control work and the Valdez breakwaters. Again Congress, on its own motion, made additional projects possible. This means that the small-boat basin and breakwater at Pelican will be constructed soon; that Craig will have a mooring basin; that the Elfin Cove channel will be deepened; that the Kodiak small-boat basin will be started with an initial appropriation of $500,000; and that further planning will be done with respect to the needed small-boat basin at Sitka. I am also delighted to report that the House Public Works Committee approved my resolution to make possible a flood survey of the Matanuska River. Also, and in this same field, the omnibus navigation and flood-control legislation of the 84th Congress authorized navigation and flood-control projects for Juneau, Douglas, Naknek River, Dillingham, and the Chena River.

A new Alaska native health service 50-bed hospital at Kotzebue will be constructed, thanks to appropriations made by the 84th Congress.

The Housing Act of 1956 will be of real benefit to Alaska because it lifts the ceiling of $15,000 on Federal National Mortgage Association mortgages for Alaska and extends to the Territory loans under the public facilities program.

These are only a few of the legislative aids given to Alaska by this Congress.

I am proud to say that there were enacted in the 84th Congress 26 public laws which either bore my name or were introduced in the Senate at my request. The same two sessions witnessed the enactment of 19 private bills introduced by me. Especially heart-warming so far as I was personally concerned was the legislation which permitted a young Filipino resident of Ketchikan to become a citizen of the United States and another private bill which will make it possible for Miss Sue Kennedy of Juneau to bring two Greek children she has adopted to Alaska. These do not fall, naturally enough, in the list of accomplishments affecting broad groups of people, but I assure you that they bring a glow to one such as myself who is able to make a contribution in bringing happiness to individual human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about how many bills I sponsored in the 84th Congress which have become law. It might be of interest to record that since I came here in the 79th Congress and including the 84th, 109 bills of mine or their companions in the Senate have become public laws and 55 private bills introduced by me were enacted, making a grand total of 164.

Mr. Speaker, I am sensible of the fact that all these bills for Alaska were translated from mere words into the law books of the United States through splendid cooperation which has been given me. I appreciate it very deeply. This cooperation has come from both sides of the political aisle. For my own personal part during the almost 12 years I have been in Washington seeking to serve the people of Alaska I have come to hold in ever-increasing respect and affection those Members, both Democratic and Republican, who have given so freely of their time and assistance in bringing about legislative gains for a Territory and people so distant from so many of them. Their friendship has been not only a continuous pleasure to me but has been vitally important to the welfare of the Territory of Alaska.

Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has completed its 2d session and, unless it should unexpectedly be called back for a special session, has completed its record for the period since its election in November 1954. The record is one of substantial achievement, I think.

The great highway construction program has been correctly called the largest public works project of all recorded history. We made major improvements in the social-security system despite the intense opposition of the Eisenhower administration. We raised the minimum wage for workers engaged in production for interstate commerce from 75 cents to $1 an hour—again, against the administration's opposition.

There were things we did not do. We failed to pass a desperately needed school-aid bill, and it was a serious failure. The House passed but the Senate failed to pass a minimum civil-rights bill. These are subjects that must

be urgently considered by the 85th Congress meeting next January.

We are going into a new presidential and congressional campaign, and the nominating conventions will meet shortly in Chicago and San Francisco.

It is appropriate to emphasize again, as I did last year, how wrong President Eisenhower was in 1954 in predicting a political cold war unless the people followed his desires and elected a Republican-controlled Congress.

The people elected a Democratic Congress instead—and there has been no political cold war.

On foreign policy, Democrats in Congress this year as last gave the President essential support at critical moments when he could not depend upon his own Republicans. Bipartisanship in foreign policy—initiated as a modern approach under President Roosevelt and successfully maintained under President Truman's leadership—has remained the keynote of our Democratic program.

When leading Republican Congressmen were trying to force the President into rash actions in Indochina, along the China coast and in other areas, we Democrats filed no ugly charges of "appeasement" when he refused. We gave him the essential legislative backing he needed. It was a Democrat, the retiring veteran Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, who took the lead in building a climate of opinion that made it possible for the President to meet the Russians in Geneva.

The GOP campaign orators will talk a lot in the next 3 months about "peace" as their party's issue. But without Senator GEORGE and the remainder of congressional Democrats, General Eisenhower would never have dared go to Geneva. The attitude of many Republicans toward their own President is indicated by a Senate vote almost on the eve of adjournment. Mr. Eisenhower nominated Paul G. Hoffman as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and his own Republicans violently attacked him. Senate Democrats voted 39 to 6 to express their confidence in the President's judgment and confirm the nomination. But the minority Republicans, with their bitter-end massive right-wing, threw 16 votes against Hoffman.

It was the right-wing Republicans, all through the sessions, who waged "political cold war" on the President. On foreign policy, when we Democrats believed on principle that he was right, we upheld and sustained him without a thought of partisanship.

We believe that American foreign policy has been bungled and mangled by the almost incredible contradictions on "neutralism" and "neutrals," for example, by the President, Vice President NIXON, and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. These contradictions and this bungling will be part of the forthcoming political campaign. But not a single responsible Democratic leader has waged "political cold war."

In the field of domestic policy, Democrats changed, corrected, revised, and sometimes defeated Eisenhower proposals—and for that we have no apologies.

We heard a lot, from time to time, about how the President wanted to be "conservative in economic affairs, liberal toward people." Let us see how this slogan has been dishonored in practice, and how Democrats have had to force through "liberalism toward people" against administrative opposition. There are notable examples.

When legislation to increase the minimum wage was pending in 1955, the administration fought to hold the higher rate to 90 cents an hour. Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell testified formally that an increase to $1 an hour would throw industry into bankruptcy, create unemployment, and do more harm than good.

We Democrats refused to accept this advice, because the facts based on the Government's own statistical data did not support it. We insisted that a minimum of $1 an hour was equitable and we did not believe it would cause bankruptcies and joblessness. Well, a few months after the $1 minimum became effective last March 1, Mitchell acknowledged that business had absorbed it, that it had not caused bankruptcy, that it had not thrown people out of jobs.

Who was liberal toward people and sensible in the economic field—the Eisenhower administration or the Democrats?

Look at social security. The House passed a bill in 1955 to provide disability benefits for the totally and permanently disabled at age 50, to lower the pension-eligibility age of women, to grant assistance for disabled children beyond the age of 18. The Senate this year revised the program somewhat and added higher Federal grants to the States for old-age assistance. The bill on this compromise basis was accepted by both Houses and sent to the White House.

This was liberalism toward people in a practical sense. Disability insurance has long been needed; higher old-age grants have been needed; a lower retirement age for women is justified on the basis of the age differential between most husbands and wives.

Yet the administration fought these proposals. It was understandable that the departed Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby—the Cabinet member who bungled the Salk polio vaccine program—should have opposed them. But so did her successor this year, Secretary Marion B. Folsom. He actually opposed programs as an Eisenhower official that he had advocated, years earlier, as a private citizen and member of the chamber of commerce. We Democrats had to pass the social security bill in the teeth of administration hostility and in the face of the President's power to veto.

Liberalism toward people? How about the tax bill? Democrats in the House last year passed a bill, against Republican opposition, to raise exemptions for Federal income-tax purposes from $600 to $700 per person. The effect would have been to reduce the income-tax bill of the average family of 5 by $100. But the administration fought it, and even a modified bill was beaten in the Senate. The administration gave corporations and wealthy taxpayers a $7 billion tax cut in the Republican 83d Congress when the Government had a deficit. It opposed tax relief for low-income and middle-income families in the 84th Congress even though our budget surplus was nearly $2 billion in the last fiscal year.

Democratic pressure in the 84th Congress sometimes produced impressive results, even though the administration did not truly feel liberal toward people.

The President vetoed our first bill to restore the income of farmers. But his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, was compelled to raise support prices for this year far above what he desired. He was compelled to adopt the soil-bank plan that we Democrats pushed through even though as late as September of last year the Agriculture Department attacked it as worthless. The second farm bill, though it falls short, is vastly superior to the Benson plan to drive marginal farm families off their land.

The story of pay raises for Federal employees is instructive. Federal Government salaries had slipped badly in relation to those of other workers and because of inflation. The President vetoed a bill to raise salaries by an average of 3.5 percent. Yet the 84th Congress, under Democrats, was able to apply enough pressure to force him progressively to announce willingness to accept ever larger percentages—and finally to sign a bill for 7.1 percent.

The exceedingly narrow majorities by which Democrats controlled Congress sometimes made it impossible for us to achieve desirable things.

The Hells Canyon bill fell through, and because of this failure other great and important Federal projects to make full use of our water resources and develop river valleys were beaten.

On the other hand, we were able to check the intense efforts of the administration to destroy our 50-year-old Federal power policies which aid reclamation and give preference in Federal power to rural co-ops and publicly owned electric-distributing systems. A large group of Georgia co-ops, for example, finally got their rights to power from the Clark Hill Dam after resisting for 3 years Interior Department attempts to compel them to surrender their rights.

On the Dixon-Yates issue, I am especially pleased at the later trend of events. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, and I raised the first warning flags, in 1954, that the administration was attempting to cripple the TVA by having the Atomic Energy Commission sign a contract with the Dixon-Yates combine to furnish power to the city of Memphis, a TVA community.

President Eisenhower finally canceled the contract, after investigations showed that his subordinates had falsified records and otherwise been guilty of inconsistencies, improprieties, and lack of candor. But it took him nearly a year to cancel, and the record shows that if the President had listened to Democrats he would have got out of the "mess" more quickly.

Now the Dixon-Yates combine is suing the Government for damages of $3.5 million, and Mr. Eisenhower's own Justice Department in fighting the claim has

made damaging admissions. The Department has told a Federal court that the whole contract was illegal to begin with—and this contradicts an official opinion by Attorney General Brownell in 1954.

The Department has told the court that in 1954, when the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy approved a waiver of the right of Congress to study the contract, the Republican majority of that year had acted illegally. It has admitted, in effect, that when we Democrats regained control of the committee in 1955 and repudiated the waiver we acted correctly and legally.

The Justice Department has adopted all our arguments about the conflict-of-interest activities of the investment banker brought into the Government as an adviser to cook up the scheme to destroy the TVA. The activities of this banker alone, now says the Department, were enough to void the purported contract.

It is a sad episode. I am, however, a member of the joint congressional committee, and the episode at least gave me a clear firsthand look at the domination of the Eisenhower administration by a single economic group—the big-business men and big-business bankers and lawyers—who try to work their desires behind the protective shield offered them by the President's reputation.

Where we failed in this Congress, it was because Democratic majorities were not big enough and because the Republicans, while paying lip service to their President, support him really only when he does what they please.

The collapse of the school-aid bill is a key example. Mr. Eisenhower, after 3 bewildering years of delay, finally recommended an almost adequate program. Our own program was better—the bill sponsored by Representative KELLEY of Pennsylvania proposed more money more quickly.

Almost any bill would have been better than none. But Republican Members of the House ignored the President's request for action. They voted against the bill on final passage.

The great majority of Democrats voted for passage of the bill. But the President had no observable influence on members of his own party.

In housing, the usual pattern was observable. The President asked an inadequate program; the Senate voted a much bigger program—and then Republicans on the House Rules Committee bottled up the bill until the closing days of the session. Democrats voted 4 to 2 to report out a better bill than the President's, although one less liberal than the Senate's. All four Republicans voted against reporting it, and the logjam could not be broken until Democrats agreed to compromise for the sake of getting something.

On the highway bill, however, we were able to salvage a great deal. The Democratic majority flatly turned down the President's proposal to finance new roads by long-term bonds offering $11.5 billion in interest charges to bankers. We insisted on financing roads on a pay-as-we-go system, and we will get the roads without unnecessary payments in interest from the people's taxes.

It has been instructive to us to see where the administration stands and fights and where it merely pays lip service to programs.

It did not stand and fight on the school-aid bill. GOP Floor Leader MARTIN of Massachusetts could not possibly have led his drive to defeat it, had the full power of the White House been used with him.

But the Republican White House used all its power to kill tax relief, to kill the big Federal Hells Canyon Dam and to try to kill the social-security bill. Telephone calls went from the White House to important Members, the President's emissaries were on Capitol Hill working hard against the bills. Within an hour or two of the key Senate vote on disability insurance, four Republican Senators who had previously promised to vote for the measure felt compelled to change their minds, and the proposal barely passed. A comparable amount of pressure was applied to beating 90 percent farm-price supports.

Mr. Eisenhower was a part-time President long before his two illnesses. But the White House staff is always present—and the things the staff demands and opposes, and how it makes its desires known, how hard it fights, are the key to this administration.

Under the excellent Democratic leadership of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Floor Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, with Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate, the ordinary business of Government has been handled skillfully and speedily. The necessary appropriations bills went through this year earlier than in any year in recent history. The congressional machinery was kept in excellent condition.

My own special legislative interests have been in relation to my work as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, I arranged for an authoritative House document warning that the Soviet Union is gaining a tremendous jump in the training of engineers, scientists, and technicians.

The United States cannot afford to let the Soviets train twice as many engineers and scientists as we do—but that is what we are seeing happen.

We must have a great breakthrough in our concepts: we must spend Government money, if necessary, to encourage bright young students and to expand the scientific and engineering schools of our universities. This is a field in which budget-balancing concepts cannot be allowed to dominate.

As chairman of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, I traveled to Okinawa to study the problems involved in the desire of our military forces there for more land and the need of the Okinawan people to grow crops for food. It is my hope that our report laid the basis for compromises that will let the people of the trusted island use their arable land for food without limiting our forces to the point of weakness.

I traveled to Geneva, also, for the first United Nations conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We learned there much to disturb us about Russian success in developing nuclear power reactors larger than any we yet have in this country.

I was deeply disappointed, therefore, that the Gore-Holifield bill to direct our AEC to build nuclear power reactors was beaten by the combined opposition of President Eisenhower, his Republicans in Congress, and his AEC Chairman, Admiral Lewis Strauss.

Our private utilities are not yet ready to underwrite the expense and risks involved in experimental power reactors, and the Government therefore should do the job. Eisenhower-Strauss opposition to AEC-built reactors seems grossly shortsighted in relation to Soviet advances in the nuclear power field.

Also, from the Armed Services Committee, I played some part in persuading the administration—once again—to stop cutting airpower dangerously in order to balance the budget. The administration itself asked for $1 billion more than it originally proposed this year for the services, and in Congress we added $900 million more.

The country is rich and we can afford what we must spend for defense. President Eisenhower is a military man, but when he lets budget-minded businessmen control his decisions on defense he is not acting properly in exercising the functions in the civilian high command.

We in the Congress, in any case, have our own responsibility to provide for the common defense. We cannot abdicate this responsibility—and we have not done so—to anyone else.

Senate Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the Senate leadership.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

During the last hours of the 2d session of the 84th Congress I had hoped to be able to take the floor for a few minutes to express my high regard and great respect for the legislative leaders of our two great political parties. The press of adjournment, however, made this impossible.

The majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, has once again demonstrated his great and all-embracing grasp in matters affecting legislative procedure. He has been uniformly considerate and courteous to all members in his own party and I am certain to the membership of the Republican Party as well. His magnetism, his skill, his understanding have been in large part responsible for the responsible attitude that the Democratic Party has taken during the 83d and

the 84th Congresses. He has tried to understand our individual problems and he has cooperated to the fullest extent possible in seeing to it that every Member was given every possible consideration. He has proved to the country that, despite his severe heart attack of over a year ago, he is once again his old self and that he is able to carry on his duties as effectively and expeditiously as before. We are thankful for his complete recovery and we look forward to serving with him and under him when the 85th Congress convenes.

The minority leader, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, has, as always, displayed his outstanding integrity, honesty, and consideration of his fellow Members. He, too, has been uniformly courteous and has worked hand in hand with Senator JOHNSON in carrying through the legislation which has been before the Senate and he, along with the majority leader, has kept alive the traditions of decency, fair play, and honest debate throughout the two Congresses. The patience of the majority and minority leaders has been tried at times, I know, but they have always been able to overcome difficulties, to explain to the membership what the situation was, and to emerge with greater stature than before.

As we look back on the 84th Congress, we realize more than ever the greatness of the leadership of these two men and we are thankful to them that in time of crisis the Nation is blessed with a partnership of this kind which has maintained congressional integrity and kept the standards of the Senate at a high level.

To LYNDON JOHNSON and BILL KNOWLAND I want to express my thanks for their fine leadership and friendship, their courtesy and consideration. They are real assets and a great credit to our country, their respective parties, and to the Senate of the United States.

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Swiss Independence Day will be celebrated on August 1, and I would like to take this opportunity to extend my greetings to the Swiss Republic. This anniversary will represent the 665th of the founding of the modern Swiss Republic. More than 6½ centuries ago, the Swiss people struck off the shackles of despotism and tyranny and began the long ascent toward governments in which the rule of people is supreme. The Swiss philosophy of democracy fired the revolutions against despotism in France, Italy, and elsewhere. It set the framework for constitutional democracy in the United States.

Today, Switzerland's people, of German, French, and Italian ancestry, live, work, and prosper together, solving their problems in the open, democratic tradition.

Many of the world's modern humanitarian projects—such as the Red Cross and the World Health Organization—have originated and make their home in that country. Similarly, other agencies in the service of mankind have located there. For example, the League of Nations, the first world peace organization founded on the plans and ideals of Woodrow Wilson, made its headquarters in Switzerland.

Throughout America today we find the descendants of the hardy Swiss immigrants. One of their sons was Albert Gallatin, who served as Secretary of the Treasury and represented the United States abroad on many diplomatic missions. He was an early and vigorous proponent of increased foreign trade for the United States.

Modern-day Switzerland is one of the most constructive forces in the promotion of world trade. Because she is poor in land resources, ores, metals, and other raw materials, Switzerland has concentrated on science, skill, and industry upon which to found one of the most vigorous trade economies in the world today. In this manner, Switzerland has become the world-acclaimed source for the highest quality watches, textiles, precision instruments, and other commodities. Relying totally on free competition in a free market, they have won an excellent market in the United States for their products. By so doing they have also enriched American export economy because the Swiss have invariably permitted the United States to acquire a surplus in our trade with that country. Today, after 20 years of Swiss-American reciprocal trade, a concept fathered by Cordell Hull, the United States has accumulated a trade profit in the form of a surplus of more than one-half billion dollars.

Americans of Swiss descent greatly resent the Republican administration's series of decisions which harass Swiss-American trade by increasing tariff on Swiss products, including their watches, which constitute the lifeblood of Switzerland. And they are happy that the recent report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Democratic Congress stated that these Republican trade restrictions represent an undue burden on consumers, on other industries, and on the trade of the free world.

Tolerance in Public Life Exemplified in Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a recent event in one of our sister democracies, a land with which I claim some ties of descent, is, I believe, worthy of note here in the Congress of the United States. I refer to the election of the Honorable Robert Briscoe as lord mayor of Dublin.

Mr. Briscoe is one of the outstanding Irish patriots of today; he is also an orthodox Jew. At a time when countless persons throughout the world are being persecuted for their beliefs—religious, racial, and political—the election of Mr. Briscoe as lord mayor of the Irish capital is a refreshing and encouraging example of true democracy. If one were to label the Irish according to their religious faiths—which is not the Irish way, nor the American way—the Jewish group would surely be designated a "minority," since it is unofficially reported that only one-half of 1 percent of the population of Ireland is of the Jewish faith.

HIS ELECTION "MAGNIFICENT GESTURE" OF TOLERANCE, SAYS NEW LORD MAYOR

When he was invested with the great chain of office in the city hall the new lord mayor said:

It is a magnificent gesture that in Catholic Ireland it is possible to elect to this important office a man of a different faith, particularly my own, which proves that in this Catholic Ireland tolerance exists. I hope it will go forth from this chamber to the world that in a free Catholic Ireland there would be no intolerance. * * *

My participation as a soldier in the Republican army during the fight for freedom of Ireland from British control has justified the views I always held that the Irish people could be an example to the world in the spiritual sphere of life.

HE HAS LONG RECORD OF PATRIOTIC SERVICE

Mr. Briscoe, who is said to speak fluently and often on the subject of bringing about the union of the six northern counties of Ireland, has served with distinction in the Irish Parliament, the Dail Eireann, for 31 years, and as a member of the Dublin City Council during the same period. A long-time friend of that great Irish patriot, Eamon de Valera, Robert Briscoe, after the split in 1921, alined himself with that section of the Irish Republican Army which refused to accept the treaty. He later became a member of the Fianna Fail Party of which Mr. de Valera is the leader, and is now a member of the opposition headed by the former Prime Minister.

Active politically in Irish Government affairs, Mr. Briscoe is also active as an exponent of the Zionist movement. He is a friend of Chief Rabbi Herzog, of Jerusalem, who was formerly chief rabbi in Dublin, and has raised funds not only in Ireland but in other countries to further the cause of Zionism.

I am interested in Israel and pleased it is there—

He said recently:

I hope that in a time not too far distant, amicable relations will be resumed between old friends, the Jews and the Arabs.

The new lord mayor was born in Dublin 61 years ago. He started work as an electrical engineer and in later years has been instrumental in bringing capital into Ireland and in helping establish industry in the country. He has been associated, as director, with a number of the younger Irish industries, including the pharmaceutical industry. For many years chairman of the city corporation finance committee, in this capacity he worked hard to rid Dublin of its worst slums and to provide homes for the laboring people.

Mr. Briscoe married early in life Lillian Isaacs, also of a Dublin Jewish family, whom he had known from childhood. They have 7 children, 4 boys and 3 girls.

The lord mayor is known as a family man. He loves reading and good music and is a collector of pictures, particularly of still life and early Italians. For recreation he likes to go to Graystones on the east coast and go out in a boat sea fishing.

INVITATIONS TO VISIT UNITED STATES POUR IN TO LORD MAYOR

As soon as Mr. Briscoe's election as lord mayor of Dublin was announced, various groups of Irish-Americans in the United States began urging him to visit this country. John J. Sheehan, chairman of the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York, cabled him an invitation to review the 1957 parade, and many other invitations have poured from this country across the sea to the popular Irishman, who has many friends on this side of the Atlantic. One New Yorker is reported to have remarked that if Mr. Briscoe accepted all the invitations to speak here, he could embark on a lecture tour that would keep him out of Dublin for the rest of his term.

His Honor lived in the United States for a time when he was a young man and has been a visitor to the United States on various occasions, beginning in the early days of his country's struggle for independence, when he made several secret missions to this country to raise funds and arms for the rebels. He has also visited here in the interests of the Zionist cause.

I add my voice to the many that are extending invitations to Mayor Briscoe to come to these shores. I hope that the Capital City of the United States may soon welcome for a visit the lord mayor of the capital of Ireland.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Leader, of Dublin, Ireland, dated July 7, 1956, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLERANCE IN PUBLIC LIFE

The election of Alderman Robert Briscoe, T. D., to the lord mayoralty of Dublin, has evoked far more interest overseas than it has in the new chief citizen's own native city and country. This is a healthy symptom.

We take it for granted that the Fianna Fail nominee should have as good a chance as the votes give him to be elected to his present high office. Outside the country the whole interest is in the fact of Catholic Dublin having a Jewish lord mayor. It can fairly be said that Alderman Briscoe's religion was at no stage a factor in the contest. He was opposed and supported by men of varying faiths. The very fact the election was so conducted is proof that our Constitution is not a bouquet of pious hopes but a series of practical directives for the rational conduct of the Nation's affairs. Robert Briscoe's tenure of office in the Mansion House is and will be a standing challenge to those who, in their ignorance and prejudice, accuse us here in free Ireland of running a clerical-fascist state. It will be more. It will be a standing reproach to those in the north-east corner of Ireland who have so rigged the machinery of government that it is not alone impossible for a member of the large Catholic majority of the city of Belfast to attain to the mayoralty but even for representatives of the overwhelming Catholic majority of the city of Derry or of the substantial Catholic majorities of Armagh and other centers in the six counties to attain to the highest civic office. This point was well and forcefully brought out by Mr. Hugh McAteer, Member of Parliament for Derry City, in a telegram of congratulation to Alderman Briscoe—and one quoted by the lord mayor in an interview with a representative of a great American newspaper.

Alderman Briscoe took the same opportunity of reminding people at home and abroad that Irish Catholics have had an unblemished record for their treatment of religious minorities. Incidents such as that recently quoted where agents of the sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses were forcibly expelled from the village of Clonlara near Killaloe do not materially affect his thesis. Such people are not content to make their doctrines known in a normal way. They have been in trouble in their country of origin, the United States, for their grossly insulting criticisms not alone of the Catholic religion but of the faith and practice of Protestants of many different shades of belief and for the methods—amounting to invasion of the fortress of the home—which they employ to put their "message" over. If their organization has at the same time been declared illegal in Canada and in countries beyond the Iron Curtain that is no proof that Canada is Communist or intolerant.

It is important for us in Ireland to guard against any and every tendency—even when the situation calls as it were for measures of self-defense—to use our numerical power as Catholics or Protestants to the detriment of minority groups. It is apparent, for instance, that inside the Protestant body generally in the six counties a split is developing mainly on the schools question and the appointment of teachers to the so-called transferred schools. Church of Ireland spokesmen are citing cases where the Presbyterians are squeezing out church members from posts even where parents and children in the area are in the large part of non-Presbyterian affiliation. That sort of thing is destructive of that internal peace in the community which should be a prime mark of Christian life. It can give no pleasure to the Catholics of the north, already suffering under other forms of discrimination or to those in the south whose memories of near-persecution, economic and political, are all too fresh.

Ireland, north and south, is in a position to be an example to the world. With a population overwhelmingly composed of practicing Christians, with constitutional guaranties, even in the north, of fair play for all men of whatever creed, our people should consciously set out to create a tenor of life in which religious discrimination would be so little known as to be hardly worth mentioning in any discussion of our affairs, when the election of a Catholic lord mayor of Belfast would be of as little internal interest as the election of a Jewish or Protestant lord mayor of Dublin.

Work of the Agriculture Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, finally I make brief comment on the work of the Agriculture Committee of which I am the only California member. We enacted these laws of particular interest to California: Put a floor under 1957 and 1958 national cotton acreages with the result of about 33,000 additional cotton acres in California in 1957 alone; extended the Sugar Act with a formula expanding domestic quotas including an estimated added 25,000 of beet acres in 1957; streamlined the PCA lending program; liberalized Farmers' Home Administration lending programs for the benefit of small farms; and expanded the school milk program.

S. 4046, Amending Certain Provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement concerning S. 4046.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENNINGS

On June 13 the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] introduced S. 4046. That bill proposes an amendment to the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act and is designed to eliminate certain difficulties which have arisen in the administration of Public Law 626, 83d Congress, 2d session. Public Law 626 arose out of a bill which I introduced in the Senate on my own behalf, and on behalf of Senators DIRKSEN and LANGER. I am therefore greatly interested in S. 4046, which would assist materially in carrying out the purposes of existing legislation. Senator LANGER has authorized me to state that he joins in these remarks.

Public Law 626 was addressed to the problem of so-called heirless property in the United States. It established a procedure under which the President of the United States could designate a successor organization which could lay claim to this property. The property in question was that which had been vested by the custodial authorities of the United States, but which, in fact, belonged not to enemies of the United States but to persons who had been persecuted by the Nazis for political, racial, or religious reasons. Such persons, if alive, would have been eligible, under long-standing provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, to claim and obtain the return of their property; and this right was transferable to legal successors in interest. In many situations, however, the extermination policies of the Nazis were such that there were no survivors, and a substantial amount of unclaimed or heirless property remained.

Public Law 626 thus permitted the return of such property to a successor organization which could obtain return only upon certifying to the proper authorities that the property would be used for the relief of needy surviving persecutees. In addition, the successor organization was required to certify other conditions prohibiting the payment of any part of these funds for legal fees, requiring regular accounting, and so forth. The Jewish Restitution Successor Organization was duly authorized and designated by President Eisenhower as the successor organization under this legislation in January of 1955.

The administrative task involved in the filing of claims by the successor organization was an enormous one, particularly in view of the wholesale destruction of records and of the complexity inherent in the heirless property situation. Nevertheless, the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization did file numerous claims. These have been examined and discussed with the Office of Alien Property, and have now been boiled down to a relatively small number of claims. With respect to these claims which remain, however, the problems of proof—of finding documents which have been destroyed or which are located beyond the reach of the United States authorities, etc.—are almost insuperable.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is, therefore, to provide a method of expediting consideration and disposition of these meritorious claims. I am informed that, although Public Law 626 provided a ceiling amount of $3 million, the amount which would be involved under the proposed legislation would not be in excess of $865,000. The proposed bill would authorize and direct the proper executive agencies to settle by payment to the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization claims in cases in which the claim had been properly and timely filed, had been examined by the custodian, and information adverse to the claim had not been produced. Proper custodial charges would, of course, be levied against this property, as against other property which is returned by the custodian.

The proposed legislation will eliminate an administrative burden which will be costly both to the private charitable organizations concerned and to the Government of the United States. It is, I believe, essential if the intent of the Congress as already expressed in law is to be carried out. The legislation in question is necessary if the humanitarian purposes of Public Law 626 are to be accomplished; and it is hoped that this meritorious legislation can receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Congressman Wolverton's Policy in Representing Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this session of Congress it seems to me appropriate that I express to my constituents in the First Congressional District the privilege, as well as the pleasure, it has been to have had the opportunity of serving them in the Congress of the United States.

There has been no period in the history of the United States that has presented more difficult and fundamental questions to solve, other than at the foundation of our Government and later in its maintenance. Commencing with the depression with its numerous and varied problems, the recovery period, World War II, and the Korean conflict, it seems that the questions have not only been unique but extremely vital to the welfare of our Nation and its people.

The solution of these problems at times has required the adoption of new and untried policies. Because of this fact, serious divisions between political parties and within each of the political parties have been created. In all such instances it has been my policy to make my decisions and give support to proposed legislation on the basis of what seemed best for our people. Thus, I have never permitted mere partisan reasons to control my thought and action. The fundamental factor has been, as it should be, what is best for the people.

In the fulfillment of the same policy, I have always assumed and maintained, after the election was over and I had been elected, that thereby I was the representative of all the people in the First Congressional District, regardless of political affiliation, Democrat or Republican. By reason of the fact that there could be only one Representative for the district, I felt that it was incumbent upon me to represent all within the district to the best of my ability. This has been, and will continue to be my policy as long as I have the privilege and honor to represent the First Congressional District.

I have been encouraged in the fulfillment of this policy, during my entire service in Congress, by having been elected each time I have been a candidate by majorities that left no doubt that my attitude in this respect had the approval of the voters, regardless of party. I have been deeply appreciative of this manifest approval, and I have continually endeavored to merit the confidence that has been shown, and give assurance that it will be my constant endeavor to merit such confidence in the future as in the past.

It has been highly gratifying to me to realize that in so many instances it has been my privilege to advocate and support legislation, the subject of which has proved so helpful in promoting the welfare of our people.

As a people, we have much to be thankful for. Peace. Our boys are no longer dying on Korean battlefields, nor anywhere else in the world. We are enjoying the highest peak of employment with the highest average rate of wages at any time in the history of our country, and surpassing in production of goods for our people that of any other nation in the world. Less days of cessation of work than ever before in our history. There have been tax reductions, and more are planned as a result of a balanced budget that has been brought about by reducing expenditures of Government and the high degree of employment that exists. Additional health facilities have been provided, including construction of hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers, and numerous and varied research programs, all of which have proved highly beneficial to our people. Increased benefits and extended coverage under social security with reduction of the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 years of age, and reduction of eligibility age for all who are totally disabled from 65 to 50 years of age. Increased benefits under Railroad Retirement Act, including widows and survivors of railroad workers. Increased benefits for veterans, their widows, survivors, and dependents. Improved facilities for medical care for veterans. Improved housing for low-income groups, easier financing for all, and slum clearance. Legislation helpful to farmers and small-business men.

It has been particularly pleasing to have had a part in bringing a substantial program of work to the New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J. I know what it means to the families of the workers. I confess that there is nothing more pleasing to me than when I can be helpful to the people I represent.

What I have already mentioned does not begin to cover all the numerous and varied ways in which the welfare of our people have been promoted. It would be impossible to enumerate them all without extending these remarks unduly. Suffice it to say that in all the matters I have enumerated, and many more, including the help I have had the privilege to give to thousands of individuals in solving their problems and answering their inquiries, has given me a pleasure beyond words to express, and I assure my constituency of a continuing desire to be helpful at all times to the fullest extent of my opportunity and ability.

Surplus Property for Education and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the Members of this body and to the public a report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which shows that educational and health institutions were allocated personal property at cost value of $49,990,174 during the months of April, May, and June 1956. Real property in value of $5,314,668 was also allocated for these meritorious purposes, making a total of $55,304,842 in allocations for both personal and real property.

A summary for the entire fiscal year 1956 shows total allocations of $218,872,568 with personal property accounting for $204,497,417 and real property $14,375,151.

The summary follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
July 27, 1956.

Mr. RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: In accordance with section 5, Public Law 61, 84th Congress, enclosed is a report covering personal property made available for distribution to educational and public health institutions under section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and all real property disposed of to such institutions under section 203 (k) of that act.

This report covers the calendar quarter, April 1 through June 30, 1956.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Surplus property for which the Federal Government has paid $55,304,842 was made available to the States for educational and public health purposes during April, May, and June by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Real property accounted for $5,314,668 and personal property $49,990,174.

Secretary Marion B. Folsom announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion-picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

Personal property made available for distribution to and real property disposed of to educational and public health institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1956 (acquisition cost) (In accordance with sec. 5, Public Law 61, 84th Cong.)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$49,990,174	$5,314,668	$55,304,842
Alabama	1,279,295		1,279,295
Arizona	427,604	9,277	436,881
Arkansas	545,751	25,000	570,751
California	4,545,091	290,517	4,835,608
Colorado	697,236	1,450	698,686
Connecticut	560,296		560,296
Delaware	217,901		217,901
District of Columbia	310,664		310,664
Florida	1,656,300		1,656,300
Georgia	981,360	7,275	988,635
Idaho			
Illinois	2,444,258		2,444,258
Indiana	831,384	5,000	836,384
Iowa	802,994		802,994
Kansas	563,685	253,607	817,292
Kentucky	1,150,987	70,075	1,221,072
Louisiana	828,647		828,647
Maine	300,956		300,956
Maryland	1,325,109	107,510	1,432,618
Massachusetts	1,311,469		1,311,469
Michigan	949,932		949,932
Minnesota	935,674		935,674
Mississippi	815,138		815,138
Missouri	1,497,906	14,838	1,512,744
Montana	157,647		157,647
Nebraska	701,046	54,628	755,674
Nevada	107,600		107,600
New Hampshire	291,345		291,345
New Jersey	543,395	4,399	547,794
New Mexico	462,552	979,999	1,442,551
New York	2,280,623	441,270	2,721,893
North Carolina	1,337,190		1,337,190
North Dakota	48,069	43,100	91,169
Ohio	1,778,459	93,900	1,872,359
Oklahoma	1,237,514		1,237,514
Oregon	519,940		519,940
Pennsylvania	2,646,799	420,062	3,066,861
Rhode Island	664,329		664,329
South Carolina	741,191		741,191
South Dakota	392,596	4,500	397,096
Tennessee	1,388,435	19,710	1,408,145
Texas	3,454,255	1,020,478	4,474,733
Utah	354,238	3,200	357,438
Vermont	162,187		162,187
Virginia	1,654,810	14,690	1,669,500
Washington	1,081,509	329,795	1,411,304
West Virginia	909,079		909,079
Wisconsin	1,116,131		1,116,131
Wyoming	202,155		202,155
Alaska	44,719	18,000	62,719
Hawaii	348,645	1,072,378	1,421,023
Puerto Rico	377,178	10,000	387,178
Virgin Islands	6,901		6,901

Saudi Arabia Celebrates King Saud's Anniversary of Accession to the Throne, November 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of 1 of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to extend felicitations to the people of Saudi Arabia, His Majesty Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz al Saud and His Excellency Sheikh Abdullah Al-Khayyal, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, upon the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of His Majesty King Saud's accession to the throne of Saudi Arabia, November 12, 1956.

The herculean efforts of the late King Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman al Faisal al Saud to weld his country into an independent entity and break the bonds of the post-World War I mandate system are too well known to warrant detailed recounting here. Perhaps nowhere else in the annals of modern history could be found a state which owed more of its existence to the efforts of a single man. It suffices to say that King Saud's valiant struggles to regain for his family its lost authority and past glory began many years before he acceded to the throne of his country. Despite numerous obstacles created by man and nature which confronted him, nullifying his initial successes, King Saud forged ahead, achieving remarkable victories over the enemies of his people. Personal courage, faith, and determination undergirded him for his tasks.

With the advent of the First World War, King Saud's plans for independence of his country suffered a setback. Upon the termination of the war, the Arab countries which revolted against colonialism, and which were promised their independence by the Allies, were placed instead under the mandate system of the League of Nations.

In 1924 the forces of King Ibn Saud captured Taif and Mecca followed the next year by similar victories over Medina and Jedda. In January 1926, King Saud was proclaimed King of the Hejaz. When Nejd was proclaimed a kingdom in 1927, His Majesty's title became king of the Hejaz and of Nejd and its Dependencies. In September 1932, King Ibn Saud proclaimed the union of the Hejaz and Nejd into the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with himself as monarch.

During the early years of World War II Saudi Arabia remained neutral. Its contribution to the war effort is described in the citation of the Legion of Merit, Degree of Chief Commander, presented in 1947 to the late King Ibn Saud by President Truman. The citation reads in part:

His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman Al Faisal Al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia, rendered exceptionally meritorious service to the war effort of the United Nations. He led his country in an unwavering course of support and encouragement to the cause of the Allies. * * * As commander in chief of Saudi Arabia he kept the land, sea, and air routes under his control open for use, and by his attitude of wholehearted cooperation, he enabled American forces to accomplish a program of construction and resource development in the country that derived benefits of major proportions for the prosecution of the war. Through his unswerving loyalty, and his dynamic leadership at the head of his nation in the support of the cause, King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud made a notable contribution to the successful war effort of the United Nations.

The success which the late King Ibn Saud achieved through his efforts and with the minimum of external support gained for him universal esteem and affection. No more outstanding figure has appeared in the Arab world for many years.

Upon the demise of his illustrious father, His Majesty Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz al Saud ascended the throne of Saudi Arabia on November 12, 1953. King Saud had had years of training in practical administration of his country as prince, under the guidance of his father. During his brief years as chief of state King Saud has vigorously interested himself in maintaining the unity of his country and in the continued progress and development of Saudi Arabia.

We trust that his bigness in his country will be expanded; that his conscience and regard for the prestige of Saudi Arabia in the free world will lead to an expression of that same greatness in all relations with all people; that nothing will be permitted to cast a shadow over an otherwise shiny career.

Dangerous Pitfalls in Price Support Limitation Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during this session of the Congress considerable publicity was given to various proposals which would provide some type of limitation, usually in terms of dollars, on the participation of individual farm operators in the farm price support program.

Limitations were first suggested in the so-called Brannon plan, but they were later withdrawn from that proposal when the inequity and unworkability of the idea became clear. The idea was reviewed again in President Eisenhower's message to the Congress on the farm problem, which was submitted earlier this year.

With this impetus, a price support limitation was adopted in the form of an amendment to H. R. 12 when that bill was being considered on the Senate floor. The conferees on the bill, the most experienced and knowledgeable men in the Congress on agricultural problems, deleted the provision by unanimous vote. Senator ELLENDER, in reporting on the conference, said:

> These provisions did not seem to be effective * * * or to the extent effective (would be) destructive of the purpose.

The idea of limiting price supports has its greatest appeal to those who think of our entire price support program as nothing more than a dole or handout. Naturally, if the farm program is to be nothing more than that, we should limit individual participation as much as possible.

The purpose of the price support program, whether it be flexible, rigid, or otherwise, is not to provide a dole or handout. It is designed first of all to provide a system of orderly marketing of farm commodities. Before price supports were offered, the average farmer had to market his crop as soon as it was harvested, thereby leaving himself at the mercy of the buyer in a buyer's market. The price support system makes it possible for the farmer to place all, or a portion, of his crop in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan if the price offered at harvesttime is not acceptable. The placing of portions of the crop in the loan prevents the flooding of the market and preserves a stabilized price in a free market. If and when the market rises, the farmer can pay back his loan plus interest and carrying charges, redeem his crop and sell it on the higher market.

The use of the loan is a tool in the hands of every farmer, large or small, that brings benefits to all agriculture. Naturally, the greatest benefits come to the small farmer, for he has no other means of waiting out the market or withholding his crop for more favorable prices.

The operation of the loan program usually means that commodity markets are influenced primarily by the loan level. There is almost always a free market price approximating that of the loan because no commodities on the market are barred from participation. Small farmers desiring immediate cash returns, with a minimum of redtape involved in loan operations, quite often sell their crops as soon as harvested. They do not actually participate in the loan program, but they secure all the benefits of the free market price sustained by the loan level.

Suppose, through a limitation on participation in the price supports, the large producers were denied the use of the loan for their commodities. The loss to the big farmer would be nothing by comparison with the hardship brought upon the small or family-size farmer. He would be faced with the choice of placing his crop in the loan or selling immediately in competition with the unsupported crops of the big producers in the open market. Naturally the large quantities of unsupported crops from big producers would keep the free market well below the loan level.

It is obvious that a limitation on support would tend to draw the entire crops of small producers into Government stocks, leaving the market to the large producers that would be barred from participation in the program. This would result in the free market never rising above the price-support level. The end result would be the destruction of every type of price-support program. Large operators would, of course, suffer hardships as a result of this, but by far the greatest losers would be the small farmers.

The contribution of the family-size farm to our great American economy and culture has always been recognized, and no one belittles it today. Those who propose price-support limitations like to call themselves defenders of the family farm. I hope that the true friends of family-farm operators will see the danger to the entire commodity-loan program which would develop from these limitation proposals.

The limitation plan would also deny the benefits of the loan program to a large group of farmers who are entitled to just as much consideration as any others—the tenants and day laborers who secure their income as a part of the operation of these large producers who would be barred from participation in the loan. Tenants on cotton farms, for instance, work under a contract which provides that they shall have a certain share of the proceeds from each bale of cotton which they produce. There is no way in which that bale can be divided to be placed in the loan. Price-support limitations would effectively bar tenants from obtaining any benefits from the basic Government farm program.

The same result would apply to farm laborers who work for wages. As is true with any business enterprise, the wage scale is to an important degree related to the income of the operation. Denial of the loan program to the employers of these laborers would be denying them an opportunity to earn the highest possible wages. Rank discrimination would be involved, of which we can find no parallel in industry.

One of the prize exhibits which supporters of loan limitations have presented is a list of large farming operations over the country with a tabulation of the commodities which these farmers placed in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan during a certain period. The inference has been made that these farmers received a handout amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in individual cases. Actually there were no handouts in any case, and the figures shown merely represented the value of crops placed in the loan.

Two of the farms listed were in my own district, and I have taken the trouble to secure a detailed report of the loan operation involved. In one case the interest amounted to a profit of $4,828.67 for the Government. In another case the vast majority of the cotton placed in the loan was withdrawn and sold. The interest paid the Government exceeded the value of the cotton left in the loan, and, in addition, the Government now has full title to this cotton. In both cases the Government actually made a profit on the operation.

I hope that the entire country, and the Congress and our agricultural leadership in particular, will study this issue carefully in the coming months. I am confident that any impartial analysis will result in the entire idea of limitation being rejected by those who want to see a sound price-support program retained to benefit not only our farmers but our entire economy.

The Current Plight of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, of the estimated 4,225,000 businesses in the United States on June 30, 1955, 4 million, or 95 percent, were classified as small business by the Small Business Administration. These small businesses account for somewhere between one-third and one-half of the total nonagricultural business done in the United States

Thus we see that small business contributes a significant share of our national product in addition to providing the broad competitive base which we look to as the economic bulwark of our American system of free enterprise. Such an important segment of our economy should quite naturally warrant the continued concern of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

THE PRESENT STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS

One cannot avoid considerable alarm, therefore, upon learning that the net profits after taxes of manufacturing firms with assets under $250,000 have fallen more than 50 percent since the present administration took office, from $308 million in 1952 to $149 million in 1955. Such a significant decline in the fortunes of small business becomes even more noteworthy when contrasted with the earnings of manufacturing corporations having assets in excess of $100 million. Net profits after taxes of these corporations rose from just over $6 billion in 1952 to nearly $10 billion in 1955, an increase of 61 percent.

Business failures are especially indicative of the welfare of small business since over 90 percent of all business failures occur in firms having total liabilities of less than $100,000. The average number of business failures under the present administration from 1953 through 1955 was up 25 percent over the average number under the previous administration from 1949 through 1952. Business failures during 1956, which totaled 7,879 on August 2, are continuing at an even faster pace. If they proceed at their present rate, business failures in 1956 will be 55 percent more than the average number of failures for the years 1949 through 1952.

The failure of small business, starting in 1953, to share in the general prosperity of our economy behooves a careful examination of governmental policies which affect small business. Consequently, I would like to review the activities of this administration and of the 83d and 84th Congresses in the fields of antitrust policy, taxation, monetary policy, and small-business assistance.

THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND MERGERS

Primary responsibility for the administration of our antitrust laws rests with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and with the Federal Trade Commission. The basic intent of the antitrust laws is to prevent the growth of monopolies and economic concentration which substantially lessen competition.

While not all mergers lessen competition, that is frequently the intent or result of a merger. A loophole in the antimerger section of the Clayton Act prevented the Government from taking any action against mergers consummated through the acquisition of assets, in contrast to mergers effected through stock acquisition, until the Celler-Kefauver amendment was passed in 1950. The hope that this amendment would provide a future safeguard against large-scale merger movements such as the one which occurred in the late 1920's appears thus far to have been a false hope. The year 1955, in which the Federal Trade Commission reported 846 corporate mergers, was estimated by Commission economists to have been the greatest year for corporate mergers since 1930. Moreover, the Trade Commission reports that mergers are taking place at an even faster rate this year. The total number for 1956 is likely to exceed 1,000.

Not only are mergers now taking place at a rate equaled only during the boom-and-bust years of 1928–32, but, as the following table indicates, the incidence of these mergers among the larger firms is becoming greater and greater:

Relative distribution of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired by size of acquiring concern, 1940–47, 1948–54, 1955

[Percent]

	1940–47	1948–54	1955
$50,000,000 and over	29.3	29.4	33.2
$10,000,000 to $49,999,999	28.6	36.1	36.8
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	12.8	13.9	9.8
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	17.7	13.3	12.9
Under $1,000,000	11.6	3.2	1.5
Assets unknown		4.1	5.8

Source: Federal Trade Commission, Economics Division.

Paralleling the continued increase in mergers has been the growing number of complaints received by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. The great majority of these complaints are from small-business men protesting against the allegedly unfair-trade practices of their larger competitors. In 1952 the Antitrust Division received 692 complaints; in 1955, 1,261.

Is it merely a coincidence that in the first 3 years of this administration small-business profits have been cut in half, small-business failures have gone up 25 percent, mergers have reached their highest peak since 1930, and complaints of antitrust law violations have nearly doubled? A clue to the answer lies in a review of administrative efforts prior to, and in view of, these developments.

FTC AND ANTITRUST DIVISION APPROPRIATIONS

In its drive to economize, the administration trimmed the already meager budget of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division by $400,000, or more than 11 percent, in fiscal 1955 and left the appropriation at the same level for fiscal 1956. Meanwhile, the budget appropriations for the antimonopoly work of the Federal Trade Commission were nearly 10 percent lower in fiscal 1954 and 1955 than they had been during the last fiscal year of the previous administration, 1953.

The alarming increase in the number of mergers which followed these budgetary cuts was brought to light by the House Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in its interim report on corporate and bank mergers published in late 1955. The studies and investigations conducted by the subcommittee were undoubtedly influential in restoring the 1957 fiscal budget of the Antitrust Division to its 1953–54 level, and in obtaining an increase over the previous year of $1,001,500 in the appropriations of the Federal Trade Commission. Furthermore, the increased funds of the Commission were specifically "requested for an expanded enforcement program of the Antimerger Act"—the budget for fiscal year 1957, page 139.

ANTIMERGER ACT

The administration is just beginning to exhibit concern over the merger problem in this election year. During its first 2 years in office, on the other hand, the administration showed no apparent concern over the fact that the Justice Department had not issued a single complaint under the new Antimerger Act.

As of July 1956, the Federal Trade Commission had issued 10 complaints under the Antimerger Act, one of which had been settled by a consent decree, and one of which was pending before the Commission. The other eight cases had not yet reached an initial decision. Also, as of July 1956 the Department of Justice had issued 6 complaints under the Antimerger Act, 3 of which had been settled by consent decree and 3 of which were still pending.

Since the adoption of the antimerger amendment, not a single cease and desist order has been issued in a contested case by either the Commission or the Justice Department. The combined total of 4 consent decrees thus far entered by both agencies under the Antimerger Act covers less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the more than 4,000 mergers which have taken place since the beginning of 1951 in the mining, manufacturing, and trade industries.

THE CONSENT DECREE

As it has done in so many other areas, and particularly in the field of defense, the administration has sought to convey the impression that it is producing more results for less money in the conduct of its antitrust program. One aspect of this policy has been an increasing reliance upon consent decrees and other voluntary agreements with businesses accused of violating the antitrust laws. The contention has been that such agreements accomplish the intended purposes of our antitrust laws while avoiding the expense and delay of formal proceedings.

The consent decree has for many years been a necessary and important instrument of antitrust law enforcement. Its expanded use should not lessen the Government's responsibility, however, in prosecuting violations of antitrust laws where no satisfactory agreement can be reached voluntarily.

The effectiveness of a consent decree in discouraging future violations of the antitrust laws is limited. The corporation against whom proceedings are brought is not even referred to as a defendant but is merely a respondent. In agreeing to a consent decree the respondent neither admits nor denies the allegations made. Subsequent violation of a consent decree by the respondent cannot successfully be prosecuted unless the courts rule that the alleged violations spelled out in the consent decree were in violation of the antitrust laws. In such a case it can well be argued that more positive action should have been taken against the respondent at the time the consent decree was issued.

The proceedings leading up to a consent decree are at present completely unpublicized. This makes it difficult for people outside the administration to know how effectively the antitrust laws are being administered.

In view of the present emphasis on the consent decree and the corresponding rise in mergers and antitrust law complaints, I feel that the Congress should give careful consideration to proposals for greater safeguards on the present consent decree procedure. One proposal which merits particular attention would require the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission to publish an opinion accompanying each consent decree stating the Government's case, the respondent's proposition, and the reason for the Government's acceptance of the particular compromise.

BANK MERGERS

When the Antimerger Act was passed, it provided a special exemption for bank mergers. Yet the problem of mergers in the banking industry is at least as serious as it is in other fields. During the 4 years of the previous administration the average yearly number of bank mergers and acquisitions was 88. In 1953 this figure rose to 116; in 1954 it soared to 207; and in 1955 it reached an estimated 250. During the first 6 months of 1956 bank mergers continued at an estimated yearly rate of over 200.

The rate of bank mergers from 1954 to the present has been far greater than at any time since 1934 when the effects of the depression were still forcing banks to merge as a matter of survival. The present trend of bank mergers is all too reminiscent of the earlier period when bank mergers rose steadily, from 363 in 1925 to 798 in 1931.

As they eliminate more and more small businesses from the banking field, these bank mergers dry up a primary source of capital for small business in all other fields. The small banker has most often been willing to grant financial

assistance to the small-business man, but the larger banks seldom find that such small loans are worth their while.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO MERGERS

Growing protests over the increasing number of mergers in the fields of banking, mining, manufacturing, and trade led the President this year to recommend four revisions in antitrust legislation relating to mergers. None of his recommendations had strong party support, however, and none managed to pass both Houses of Congress.

Probably the most important bill relating to mergers, H. R. 9424, was introduced by Mr. CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of this year. Among other things, it would have required companies planning to merge to notify the Attorney General 90 days prior to any merger in which the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the merged companies would be in excess of $10 million. The bill passed the House in April, but was not considered by the Senate. H. R. 9424 was effectively killed when Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, insisted upon an amendment giving companies which might be subject to antitrust suits the right to go to court as plaintiffs and seek a declaratory judgment against Government action.

A bill to bring bank mergers under the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act, H. R. 5918, was introduced by Mr. CELLER and passed the House in February 1956. No action was taken on this bill by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Another bill relating to bank mergers was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, on May 23, 1956. It passed the Senate on July 25, 1956, but has not yet been considered by the House.

Legislative action to stem the growing wave of mergers should certainly be given careful consideration during the next session of Congress. Some measure to provide for Federal control of bank mergers should merit particular attention.

But we cannot attain an effective antitrust program merely by passing further laws. A 1956 House of Representatives document entitled "Antitrust Laws With Amendments" contains 107 pages of antitrust laws. The Sherman Act of 1890 covers the first 1½ pages of this document. A strong argument can be made that our antitrust policy would be more successful if we devoted all our antitrust efforts toward a rigorous enforcement of this basic law. The important point is that effective antitrust policy depends primarily upon its administration.

FTC AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Realizing the need for a consistent policy and impartial attitude in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, Congress established the Federal Trade Commission as an independent agency in 1914. The reorganization plan of the Hoover Commission adopted in 1950 has tended to place the Commission more and more under administrative control. Since 1950 the Chairman of the Commission has been a political appointee of the President, responsible to him and serving at his pleasure. The Chairman had previously been elected once each year by a vote of the 5 Commissioners. The reorganization plan has also given the Chairman considerably more control over personnel administration.

Since 1952 the policies of the Federal Trade Commission have changed considerably, apparently to coincide to a high degree with the "philosophy" of the administration. Moreover, Commission reports have recently tended to build up the accomplishments of our present antitrust program in a manner which indicates a certain lack of impartiality and objectivity.

As Mr. PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, pointed out in January, recent Commission reports have placed a good deal of emphasis upon the number of complaints which were issued under the chairmanship of Mr. Howrey. The reports failed to mention, though, that these complaints were being directed more and more toward the small rather than the large business enterprise. Under the chairmanship of President Eisenhower's appointee, Mr. Howrey, from April 1, 1953, through December 31, 1955, average assets of the 60 companies charged with antitrust law violations were $32,500,000. Under the chairmanship of James Mead, formerly Democratic Senator from New York, during the 33-month period immediately preceding April 1, 1953, the average assets of the 66 companies charged with antitrust-law violations were $256,200,000, or nearly eight times as great.

Last year the House Small Business Committee announced its intention to look into the frequently made allegation that the Federal Trade Commission and other independent regulatory agencies have lost their independence through reorganization and have in practical effect become a part of the executive branch of the Government. Hearings on this subject were held in July 1955 and are to be published in the near future. They should shed considerable light upon the extent to which the Commission has come under the domination of the present administration.

FINES UNDER THE SHERMAN ACT

One antitrust law of interest to small business was the result of a bill introduced by Mr. CELLER, of the House Judiciary Committee, on February 7, 1955, and signed by the President on July 7, 1955. The law increased from $5,000 to $50,000 the maximum penalty which could be imposed by the courts in cases of violation of the Sherman Act. It remains to be seen to what extent the courts will take advantage of this law to impose stiffer penalties upon antitrust law violators. During fiscal 1956 the total amount of fines imposed in antitrust cases was $460,800 as compared with $260,580 in 1955. Although the amount of fines imposed in 1956 was the highest total since 1951, it was still less than half the total amount of fines imposed in 1948.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Price discrimination is another aspect of antitrust law which is of particular interest to small business. The original law banning discriminatory pricing was contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act enacted in 1914. Certain weaknesses in this section prevented it from stemming a widespread growth of harmful discriminatory practices by large distributors, notably chainstores. These practices were often intended to and frequently did result in the elimination of small businesses which could not command price discounts similar to those of their larger competitors.

Congressional investigations of discriminatory pricing practices in the early thirties led to the Robinson-Patman amendment to section 2 of the Clayton Act in 1936. According to the Senate Judiciary Committee report on the amendment, a principal weakness of the original section 2 lay in the fact that "it permits discriminations to meet competition, and thus tends to substitute the remedies of retaliation for those of law, with destructive consequences to the central object of the bill"—Senate Report No. 1502, 74th Congress, 2d session, 1936, page 4.

Until 1951 it was generally thought that the Robinson-Patman Act had remedied the weakness cited in the Senate report. In that year, however, the 5 to 3 Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case interpreted the "good faith" provision of the act in a manner which indicated that the old weakness in the price-discrimination law was still present. The "good faith" defense of a price cutter was a complete defense according to the Court even though the price cuts were not cost-justified and regardless of their competitive effect.

Legislative proposals to clarify the "good faith" clause of the Robinson-Patman Act have been forthcoming ever since 1951, but none has yet passed both Houses of Congress. Certain of these proposals have sought to write the Supreme Court decision into law. Others, such as H. R. 1840 directly paralleled by my bill, H. R. 2690, which passed the House during this session of Congress, have sought to clarify the original intent of the act by making it plain that section 2 (b) should not be a defense where the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

Unfortunately, administration policy as expressed by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission was for some time opposed to H. R. 1840 and other similar bills introduced in this Congress. The majority of the Commission reversed itself to favor passage of H. R. 1840 after a decision handed down by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in May of this year. This was in the same Standard Oil case which the Supreme Court had remanded to the Commission in 1951 for reconsideration of the "good faith" clause. The Commission found that Standard Oil had not shown good faith and in its brief before the circuit court stated that any other finding would make the Robinson-Patman Act meaningless. Nevertheless, the court overruled the Commission by finding good faith on the part of Standard Oil.

If, as the Commission has said, the Robinson-Patman Act has now been made meaningless as a result of judicial interpretation, the next Congress should give early consideration to further legislation to protect small business from unfair price discriminations.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE

The most significant step taken in the antitrust field by the present administration was probably the Attorney General's creation of a National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. On March 31, 1955, the Committee issued a lengthy report which included 85 recommendations.

The need for such a comprehensive study of our complex antitrust system has seldom if ever been questioned. The membership of the Committee and the tenor of its recommendations have, nevertheless, come in for sharp criticism. The Committee was made up almost exclusively of lawyers specializing in defending business clients in antitrust suits. Approximately half the lawyers on the Committee were representing defendants in antitrust suits while at the same time serving on the Committee. Without questioning the motives or qualifications of any of these practicing antitrust lawyers, it might have been expected that the Committee's report would reflect their interests in simplifying the antitrust laws so as to benefit their clients.

The sixth annual report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business contained the following comments on the National Committee's report on the antitrust laws—pages 78, 79:

The scant attention which was paid to legislative history by the National Committee becomes the more disturbing when it is noted that the group made a total of 85 recommendations respecting the antitrust laws. Instead of concentrating upon discovery of what was the intent and purpose of Congress in enacting the antitrust statutes, the National Committee's majority appears to have been more concerned with how the laws could be modified to conform to their personal preferences. * * *

In the National Committee's report, not a single formal recommendation is to be found which can be construed as being favorable or even sympathetic to the victims of antitrust law violations. Your committee's interest in this point was prompted by the personal knowledge that antitrust victims are generally the small-business men of our Nation. On the other hand, the report is replete with recommendations reflecting concern for violators. * * *

Here it seems that the National Committee digressed from the issue of soft versus hard competition to tackle the question of soft versus hard antitrust enforcement, and the National Committee resolved the issue squarely in favor of the soft or lenient variety.

CORPORATE INCOME TAX

Another area of major concern to the small business man is our Federal revenue structure. In answer to a questionnaire circulated last year by the National Association of Manufacturers, a revision of the tax laws was considered the most important step which the Government could take to help small business.

The present corporate-tax structure fails to give proper consideration to the relatively greater need of small business to finance its corporate growth through retained earnings. Financing through the issuance of stocks and bonds is often impractical for the small firm and is in any case considerably more expensive than it would be for the larger firm. Bank loans also tend to be much more expensive when made to the small firm. At the same time the small business is much more likely than the large firm to find it economically desirable to undertake a rapid expansion of its existing facilities.

The need for a more moderate corporate tax on small business was recognized to some degree in the Internal Revenue Act of 1938 when the $25,000 exemption from the surtax was enacted. The rapid devaluation of the dollar since 1938 has, however, made this exemption wholly inadequate today. If the exemption were raised to $50,000, as some have proposed, we would be doing no more than adjusting the 1938 law in accordance with the changing value of the dollar.

In addition to proposals to increase the present surtax exemption to somewhere between $50,000 and $100,000, there have been suggestions for replacing the present corporate income tax with a graduated corporate tax. Companion bills were introduced in the House and Senate during this session of Congress which would have adopted a new corporation tax graduated from 5 percent on the first $5,000 of taxable income to 55 percent on all taxable income over $100,000. No action was taken on either of these bills.

In view of the difficulties which small business is now encountering in its search for necessary capital, some revision in the present corporate income tax law would be a vital step in reversing the downward trend of small business during the last 3½ years.

TAXES AS AN INFLUENCE ON MERGERS

The next Congress should also consider the extent to which our tax laws have stimulated the current merger movement. The ability of large firms to carry forward past losses against current and future profits so as to reduce their corporate tax liability has encouraged them to seek firms with a history of losses. Under present conditions, firms with losses are generally the small firms and it is exceedingly difficult for a firm in such condition to resist the temptation to merge.

Other tax incentives which have encouraged small firms to merge have been, first, lessening the impact of the estate tax; and, second, in the case of a successful closely held business, the ability to take profits out of the firm by the capital-gains route as an alternative to having the profits distributed as dividends subject to high individual income-tax rates or left in the company to have the retained earnings taxed under section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

On July 30, 1953, the Small Business Administration—SBA—was established as the first peacetime agency charged solely with the responsibility for fostering the welfare of small business. The SBA took over many of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Small Defense Plants Administration which had provided valuable assistance to small business in preceding years.

The Small Business Act of 1955 extended the life of the SBA for another 2 years, raised the maximum amount permitted on any individual loan from $150,000 to $250,000, and required the Secretary of Defense to submit monthly reports to the President and the Congress on the amount of military expenditures going to small business.

Early this year Congress increased the disaster loan fund of the SBA from $25 million to $125 million. This action resulted largely from the floods which swept the New England States in the fall of 1955.

The programs of the SBA—to provide sound loans to small business where other sources of credit are not available, to assist small business in obtaining Government contracts, and to provide production and management assistance to small business men—are all highly commendable. They should continue to receive the full support of Congress and the administration.

INCREASED LOANS OF THE SBA AND THE TIGHTENING OF CREDIT

The $126 million in loans approved by the SBA in fiscal 1956 was double the amount approved in fiscal 1955 and was considerably more than the total amount of loans approved in the 22 months from September 1953 to July 1955. It is encouraging to note that substantial funds from this much needed source of credit are finally being made available to small business.

The principal reason for this sudden increase in loan approvals, nevertheless, appeared to be a severe tightening of the availability of private credit to small concerns over the past several months. A survey by Standard Factors Corp. showed that between March 1955 and March 1956 firms enjoying lines of bank credit declined from 53 to 18 percent among companies having a net worth of $5,000 to $25,000, and from 82 to 44 percent among companies having a net worth of $25,000 to $100,000. There was almost no change in the percent of large firms maintaining credit lines.

As credit has become more difficult to obtain it has also become more expensive, particularly for small businesses. Interest rates on short-term loans are now 4 percent, the highest they have been since 1929. In the past 18 months interest rates have risen from 3.3 to more than 4 percent on new issues of medium-grade corporate bonds; from 1.3 to 3.38 percent on prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months; from 1.1 to 2.55 percent on 91-day Treasury bills; and from 2 to 2.91 percent on 3- to 5-year Government securities.

Although commendable as far as it went, the increased amount of loans approved by the SBA in fiscal 1956 met only a small fraction of the credit needs of small business. Of much greater benefit to small business would be some relaxation in the tight money policy being followed by this administration.

CABINET-LEVEL COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

On June 1, 1956, President Eisenhower established a 7-man committee including 3 Cabinet Secretaries to deal with the

problems of small business. The President called for a review of existing programs to aid small business and assigned the committee the continuing task of "making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and when necessary for additional legislation to strengthen the economic position of small businesses."

For 3½ years the present administration has followed policies which have brought about a swift and steady deterioration in the welfare of small business and in its future prospects. Now the President establishes a committee to look into the problem and make recommendations. Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, issued a significant warning when he said that this Cabinet-level committee "may be taking the approach of giving Government aid to small business" through loans and contract awards "instead of helping to make it free to stand on its own feet."

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

No matter how benevolent the Government may wish to be, it cannot personally assist every one of the 4 million small businesses in the country. What the Government can and should do, however, is to seek to preserve equality of opportunity for all business enterprises, whether large or small.

If small business is to remain a significant and dynamic force in our economy, it must be given greater opportunity to come into existence, to grow, to survive, and to compete on an equal basis with larger and better established firms in its field. These goals can best be achieved by a more vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws which will reverse the rising trend of corporate mergers and which will prevent large buyers from obtaining unfair price discriminations. There is also a great need to adjust our tax laws and particularly the corporate income tax so that small business will be able to grow and will not be tempted to sell out in order to realize tax savings. Finally, there should be some relaxation of our present tight money policy so that small business will again be able to find credit sources which will enable it to finance future growth.

Although there are a great many other areas in which the Government could take more positive action to assist small business, it is particularly in these areas of antitrust enforcement, taxation, and monetary policy that the current administration has been neglectful of the needs of small business over the past 3½ years.

Reorganization of the Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the reorganization of the Passport Office.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the recess following the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations was directed, at my suggestion, to initiate a survey of the operations of the Passport Office of the Department of State with a view toward reorganizing and modernizing the Office to meet the increasing demands for passport service.

As a result of this directive, and at the request of the committee, a survey team, composed of representatives of the General Services Administration, the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission, was assigned to assist Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, to determine what action was necessary to increase the efficiency of the Office, to prevent the recurrence of backlogs and delays, and to meet current demands for passport services.

A detailed report was submitted to the Senate following this reorganization survey. The committee approved the staff report (S. Rept. No. 1604, 84th Cong.) and initiated legislative action designed to correct reported deficiencies and to modernize the operations of the Passport Office (S. 3340). Officials of the Department of State requested an opportunity to appear before the committee in order to present their views relative to certain provisions of the proposed legislation to which they were opposed, and the bill was thereupon recommitted to the Committee on Government Operations. I have since been informed by the staff of the committee that, although there have been marked improvements in the operations of the Office following the reorganization, there are a number of tasks which still remain to be undertaken before the Office will be prepared to serve the public in its fullest potential, such as the providing of adequate telephone facilities and increased personnel during peak periods, the training of personnel to conform to the new mechanization program installed at the direction of the reorganization survey team, the initiation of a program for advance planning to handle the continuing increase in the workload of the Office and the determination of the need for decentralization.

Accordingly, with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I have requested the staff of the committee to continue these studies and to prepare a further report for committee consideration before the convening of the 85th Congress.

I include at this point in my remarks copies of correspondence directed by me to the chief clerk of the Committee on Government Operations and to the Director of the Passport Office, in which I have set forth suggestions relative to the specific data which should be compiled by the staff of the committee in cooperation with the Passport Office and the reorganization survey team, to insure that all aspects of the operation may be given further study and appropriate action initiated to correct any continuing deficiencies, as well as replies from the chief clerk of the committee and the Director of the Passport Office setting forth the present status and the projected study program.

JULY 18, 1956.

Mr. WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have just written to Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, in which I have requested certain information relative to the operations of the Passport Office.

My thinking is that our committee ought to keep abreast of developments in light of the hearings that were held on the proposed legislation earlier in the year. I would appreciate you and the staff following up with the State Department in line with these suggestions:

That the Passport Office be assigned a liaison office on Capitol Hill;

That the Passport Office provide the requisite agents and clerks;

That the Passport Office keep alert to the needs of the traveling public and be encouraged to render whatever services are necessary in this respect; and

That the Passport Office continue to supply Members of Congress with passport statistics on a quarterly basis.

Perhaps, upon receipt of replies from the State Department and from Miss Knight a staff report could be issued.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
July 20, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 18, 1956, with reference to certain additional information you desire in connection with the operation of the Passport Office.

As I informed you personally, I have already been in contact with Miss Frances Knight and have further conferences tentatively scheduled for a full discussion of the various problems encountered by the Passport Office, including the points you raise in your communication to Miss Knight.

Following the development of the essential facts through consultation with officials of the Passport Office, the GSA, and the GAO, I shall have a further conference with officials of the Department of State with a view to initiating appropriate action necessary to correct any deficiencies in the organization of the office that still may exist and will, as you suggest, prepare an additional progress report as soon as all of the facts are available.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk.

JULY 18, 1956.

Miss FRANCES G. KNIGHT,
Director, Passport Office, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS KNIGHT: I have seen your report of July 13 giving a breakdown on the number of applications for the issuance or renewal of passports during the first 6 months of 1956. As you know, I am extremely interested in the operations of the Passport Office. In light of the hearings earlier this year before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I feel our committee members would desire additional and more specific data on the operations and plans of the Passport Office along the following lines:

1. We have been informed that a Passport Agency has been proposed for location in Los Angeles. What progress is being made toward the opening of this office? What will this provide in terms of lightening the workload of the Washington office and furnishing speedier service for west coast travelers?

2. What are the plans for providing more adequate telephone service to the public and to Members of Congress? You will recall my recent letter to you on this aspect of the passport office functions.

3. What is the present status of the mechanization program, and what consideration is being given to additional machinery and automation?

4. During the hearings it was recommended that the Passport Office be provided with

more flexibile budgetary authority to meet changing personnel and supply requirements. Has such budgetary flexibility been provided, and what changes in budget handling have been effected in this regard?

5. Are plans for more adequate staff and facilities being activated now in preparation for the 1957 travel season?

6. In addition to the information contained in the July 13 report of statistics on issuance of passports, I feel our committee would be greatly interested in statistics showing the number of telephone calls, incoming and outgoing, including congressional inquiries, relating to the status of passport applications and their issuance. Other data representing the workload, such as employee overtime, for the past 6 months will be also of interest.

I know that during the peak travel period Members of Congress are called upon by their constituents for assistance in expediting action on their passport applications and that a goodsized portion of the workload is concerned with providing this service. It has occurred to me that there may be a way to facilitate this service through the establishment of a passport liaison office on Capitol Hill, in the Capitol itself or in the Senate or House Office Buildings, from January to, perhaps, September 1. This would be for the purpose of servicing emergency calls and requirements concerning passports which arise in congressional offices. One or more agents and clerks could be provided by the Passport Office for this liaison office during these peak months.

Your comments and reaction to the above suggestion, and your furnishing me with the information requested in the foregoing at your earliest convenience will indeed be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of July 18, 1956, inquiring into the operations of the Passport Office. I want you to know that we greatly appreciate your personal interest in our welfare and your help and suggestions in solving some of our problems.

I will answer your specific questions in the order you asked them:

1. Question: "We have been informed that a Passport Agency has been proposed for location in Los Angeles. What progress is being made toward the opening of this office? What will this provide in terms of lightening the workload of the Washington office and furnishing speedier service for west coast travelers?"

Answer: We are planning to establish a Passport Agency in Los Angeles to be open for business October 1, 1956. The Department was advised this week that the General Services Administration received three bids which could be considered as meeting our requirements for office space. A decision was made this week to locate the Passport Agency in the Architect's Building at Fifth and Figueroa Streets. This is the downtown area, located near transportation companies and travel agents.

The space measures approximately 4,500 square feet and is located on street level. I am planning to fly out to Los Angeles on Sunday to see it and arrange with GSA for renovations, modernization, and to select and purchase the necessary furnishings and equipment. In accordance with my request, the Department's representative on office space will be with me.

Our recent statistics indicate that in the first 6 months of 1956, we received 44,575 applications for passports from California. A substantial proportion of this number originated in the Los Angeles area. I believe 20,000 is a conservative estimate of the number of passports which may be issued annually by the Los Angeles agency. This, of course, would relieve the Washington office of that many issuances and, at the same time, would provide faster service to citizens on the west coast.

I am presently working out the staffing pattern of the Los Angeles agency and hope to have it at least 75 percent staffed by the proposed opening date of October 1, 1956.

2. Question: "What are your plans for providing more adequate telephone service to the public and Members of Congress? You will recall my recent letter to you on this aspect of the Passport Office functions."

Answer: The telephone service which we should but have not been able to provide remains one of our major problems. We have had experts from GSA, the telephone company, as well as the Department study our system, and presently the only answer appears to be additional equipment and more operators.

It is generally agreed that the additional lines assigned to the Passport Office last April, while helpful, did not meet the need. Lines were added, but we still had insufficient instruments with which to answer incoming calls, or to make outgoing calls. We should have at least four lines and phones, as well as four additional operators. This additional equipment and staff has been recommended and is under consideration by the Department. As soon as the pressure lessens to the point where we can devote adequate time to a training program for new operators, we will do so.

The idea of a switchboard has been discouraged because of the expense of initial installation, which would hardly be justified if the Passport Office is to move into the proposed new building for the Department of State within the next 2 years.

The Department has looked into the possibility of securing two off-premise lines from the Capitol direct to the Passport Office. I have been informed that contact was made with Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, the Clerk of the House, and that he reported the present inadequacy of the Capitol switchboard. He also reported that due to this congestion Members of Congress have been requested, whenever possible, to place their long-distance calls through commercial facilities.

I know for a fact that my staff and I personally have had long waits to reach the Capitol switchboard through the code number of 190 and through outside lines. As of the present time, the request for two direct lines from the Capitol board to the Passport Office has been denied. If this arrangement could be reconsidered, I believe it would do much to relieve congressional offices of their problems in reaching the Passport Office. With such a system, the Capitol operator could connect a congressional call directly to the Passport Office, and, if the lines are busy, she could watch them and plug in the call as soon as they are free.

3. Question: "What is the present status of the mechanization program, and what consideration is being given to additional machinery and automation?

Answer: We have fulfilled our requirements insofar as electric typewriters are concerned. The specially built pin-feed machines on which we type the control card, the file record, and the address insert are installed and operating satisfactorily.

We have just ordered a new combination seal-and-legend machine which will emboss the seal of the Department of State on the passport picture and the red wafer, and at the same time punch in the legend reading "photograph attached Department of State Washington."

Delivery on this combination machine will be made on or about December 1, 1956.

We are presently looking into a new process for applying the photograph onto the passport. This is going to take some time to develop, but we are making some progress.

4. Question: "During the hearings it was recommended that the Passport Office be provided with more flexible budgetary authority to meet changing personnel and supply requirements. Has such budgetary flexibility been provided, and what changes in budget handling have been effected in this regard?"

Answer: There has been no change in budgetary control which would give the Passport Office flexibility in the sense the committee had in mind. However, Mr. I. W. Carpenter, Jr., Assistant Secretary-Controller, has held two meetings since your hearings, at which the affairs of the Passport Office were discussed. At these meetings I was permitted to present my requirements, and I pointed out that reappraisals and adjustments of the Passport Office budget were in order, due to the increased workload from applications received as well as unforeseen additional services required of the Passport Office. Mr. Carpenter's deputies in charge of budget, personnel, and operations, who also attend these meetings, are making sincere efforts to be of assistance to the Passport Office. They have been briefed on our workload and requirements. A revised Passport Office financial plan for 1957 which would permit us to staff adequately for the next travel season, has been submitted, and I hope to receive favorable and expeditious action.

5. Question: "Are plans for more adequate staff and facilities being activated now in preparation for the 1957 travel season?"

Answer: In connection with the revised financial plan for 1957 mentioned in the preceding paragraph, I have requested additional staff and funds for the immediate future in order to permit the training and staffing of the Washington headquarters as well as the field agencies. I stress the need for prompt action, because what is not completed in the way of organization and planning during the months of September, October, and November becomes delayed or sidetracked when our travel season begins.

6. Question: "In addition to the information contained in the July 13 report of statistics on issuance of passports, I feel our committee would be greatly interested in statistics showing the number of telephone calls, incoming and outgoing, including congressional inquiries, relating to the status of passport applications and their issuance. Other data representing the workload, such as employee overtime, for the past 6 months will also be of interest."

Answer: The following statistics give a partial picture of workload we have carried in the past 6 months:

Applications for passports received by the Passport Office indicate the following increases in 1956 over 1955:

	Percent Increase
January 1956 over January 1955	19.5
February 1956 over February 1955	22.9
March 1956 over March 1955	3.5
April 1956 over April 1955	9.5
May 1956 over May 1955	8.0

Applications for passports received by the Passport Office field agencies indicate the following increases over a 10-month period:

	Percent Increase
New York	9.7
San Francisco	10.5
Chicago	15.0
Boston	11.2
New Orleans	10.0
Washington, D. C	15.8

Analysis of incoming telephone calls to Passport Office inquiry section, January 2 through January 6, 1956, 1,022 calls.

Analysis of incoming telephone calls to Passport Office inquiry section, June 1 through June 7, 1956, 4,592 calls.

Increase of 100 percent.

Analysis of incoming congressional telephone calls to the Passport Office inquiry section February 3 through February 9, 1956, 394 calls.

Analysis of incoming congressional telephone calls to the Passport Office inquiry section June 1 through June 7, 1956, 1,266 calls.

Increase of 237 percent.

Between January 1 and June 30, 1956, the Passport Office was called upon to render "special service" on 31 percent of the applications received. This special handling involving 115,000 applications includes expediting individual cases involving matters of life and death, sickness and other emergencies. Included also are special searches and stop orders due to last-minute changes in departure dates, changes in mailing address, and amendments to passports due to changed travel plans. The Passport Office has absorbed this additional and greatly increased workload through considerable overtime on the part of its employees.

In the first 6 months of calendar year 1956, the Passport Office worked a total of 16,235 hours of recorded overtime. Supervisory personnel do not record their overtime since it is voluntary. However, it is conservative to state that there are at least several thousand hours of voluntary overtime unrecorded. I, personally, put in 620 hours overtime from January 1 through June 30, when I gave up keeping even a fragmentary record of the nights, weekends, and holidays spent at the office.

With reference to your suggestion that a Passport Liaison Office be established on Capitol Hill during the peak travel season, for the purpose of serving the Members of Congress—I think it is an excellent idea. I know that space is very tight in both the Senate and House Office Buildings, and as far as I can determine, it is equally tight in the Capitol. I have been informed that various departments have been asked to remove their liaison officers from the Capitol because of the size of their contingents and large amount of space and facilities they absorbed. The Passport Office service would not present this problem since one of our agents could operate from any corner that would be made available to us. Furthermore, we would not have to tax the Capitol's switchboard facilities because I find we could install a teletype between the Hill and the Passport Office which would provide us with a two-way recorded communication system. In any event, if the space could be provided, we would be very glad to cooperate and provide such a service.

In the final analysis, the answer to our major problems of delays and overwork, is a realistic view of our personnel requirements, both in Washington and in the field agencies. I believe we are making progress in that respect, and I do hope we will have a much more effective office in operation by the time Congress convenes in January 1957.

Thank you again for your continuing interest in our welfare. With best wishes,

Sincerely,

FRANCES G. KNIGHT,
Director, Passport Office.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS.
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Pursuant to your letter of July 18, 1956, I have consulted briefly with Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, and with representatives of the General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office who originally served as members of the survey team appointed at the request of the committee in 1955 to effect necessary reorganization in that Office, with the objective of carrying out your suggestions for further improvements in its operations.

In a preliminary review of the present operations of the Office, it has been developed that there are several areas which will require further studies and administrative action in order to permit the Passport Office to render adequate service to passport applicants in accordance with the reorganization program. These surveys and studies are presently under way.

It develops that, although the new mechanized program initiated early this year has been effective in many respects, there are still certain problems that have to be resolved before the Office will be able to keep abreast of the increased demands for passport services. As you have indicated, there appears to be a need for closer liaison with the Congress, improved telephone facilities, increased seasonal personnel to meet the demands for passports during peak travel periods or to handle emergencies, and more flexibility in budgetary authority in order that changing personnel and supply requirements may be met promptly. The staff will direct its efforts, through the cooperation of the Director, the members of the original survey team, and officials of the Department of State, to effect appropriate administrative action to accomplish these objectives.

I have been in contact with officials of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, who have indicated a desire to cooperate with the staff in working out solutions to these problems, after full information has been developed through conferences with the Director of the Passport Office and the other Government officials.

Contact has also been made with officials of the International Travel Division, Department of Commerce, and the staff will give consideration to information and recommendations submitted to that Agency by the Travel Advisory Committee relative to further reorganizations of the Passport Office, the developments of the statistical information service by the Office and effecting appropriate adjustments in passport fees.

As previously indicated, a report will be prepared for submission to you and other members of the committee as soon as all the facts have been developed, with recommendations for further committee action.

With kinds regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

A New Horizon for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us concerned with the future of American agriculture are giving increasing attention to a proposal that a part of the press has dubbed the Indiana plan. This is the proposal that would seek to open up a new horizon for our farmers by marshaling the scientific resources of the country to concentrate on the development of new industrial uses for farm products through research.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Research and Extension, with Chairman THOMAS G. ABERNATHY presiding, took testimony on H. R. 10125. This is my bill, serving as the House counterpart to an identical measure introduced on the other side of the Hill by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART and 33 cosponsors. While action on the measure is hardly expected so late in the waning hours of the 84th Congress, I wish to assure all those interested, in and out of Washington, that the legislation will be reintroduced in the next Congress. It is my confident hope that in the foreseeable future the essence of this proposal will become basic law in the long-range program for a sound and expanding national farm economy.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I should like to reproduce here the statement I was privileged to place before members of the subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and many others, I wish to thank you for your courtesy and thoughtfulness in scheduling this hearing.

While it appears certain this session of Congress is about to conclude, surely the subject matter of the proposal before us deserves attention and consideration.

Although H. R. 10125 bears my name as author, its sponsorship can be widely credited. In its present form, it was first introduced as S. 3503, with 33 Senators joining the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART in its sponsorship. On this side of Capitol Hill, numerous House colleagues have advised me of their approval of the bill's aim, and four of them—Representatives ADAIR, BEAMER, BRAY, and HARDEN—have offered duplicate proposals.

The subject of H. R. 10125 is that of research, research of a type that will broaden the industrial and commercial uses of farm production, particularly farm commodities in surplus.

On this occasion, Mr. Chairman, I believe we sense the irony of the American farm problem. Mankind, since the dawn of recorded history, has known no greater problem than that of sustaining life by protecting food from the ravages of flood and famine. But today our farms and farmers are most seriously challenged by the constant production of more food and fiber than can be consumed. The problem is more incredible with the realization that millions throughout the world are in dire want of food and clothing.

It should be noted, I think, that the Congress has acted to ease the situation. Public Law 480, for example, is operating with more and more success to help distribute our agricultural largess among needy and friendly people of the world. Only last week the President reported that United States commodities valued at more than $1 billion had been disposed of by means of this legislative act.

But the surplus-disposal law, like earlier enactments limiting crop production and the more recent one creating a soil bank, must be recognized for what they are—temporary devices that promise no permanent solution of the basic problem. I am one of those, Mr. Chairman, who feel sure our farmers are no different than other productive Americans—deservedly most happy and prosperous when they are producing to the maximum of their ability, with due regard for enlightened practices of conservation in order to preserve the fertility of the soil for future generations.

The employment of scientific research as an aid to agriculture is not new in our history. Legislation creating our land-grant agricultural colleges was enacted 94 years

ago. And through nearly a century of research activities under Government direction, we have witnessed amazing advancement in the productivity of our farms. This progress has released millions of people from the cultivating of food and fiber to work in the factories and mills of industry, and thus accounts for today's high standard of living.

But is it not apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come to shift the emphasis of agricultural research? In the face of mountainous surpluses, we are spending this year about eight times as much money for still greater production than we are to find new and extended uses for the crops we have. H. R. 10125 is urged as a practical and realistic expression of faith in our ability to find new and enriching industrial uses for the output of modern-day farming. Surely in terms of our national well-being, we need not to produce more, but to realize more from all we produce.

At present we have four regional laboratories, each devoting limited funds and modest manpower to scientific research. Their work, much of it impressive, is divided between the search for better production and new utilization of existing production. I certainly am not complaining about the work that has been done. It is conceded that a great deal of good has accrued from both types of research, nor would I wish us to abandon research in methods to increase the productivity of our farms. What I am saying is that we need now to concentrate more of our resources upon research for new and broader utilization of farm production.

Research for use, some will say, is going on daily, thanks to the laboratories of private industry. But is this enough? I would not want to be in the position of saying that such research is not good, because I think it is. What I am saying is that this type of research is not dedicated to a solution of the overall problem, which is the lack of industrial use of the surplus products we have.

Perhaps I can illustrate my point by citing the several great industrial concerns who are currently seeking to devise substitutes for cotton. Now cotton is one of our surplus problems, and the economic welfare of millions of people is dependent on cotton. Surely research is a matter of future concern to them, because cottongrowers themselves cannot conduct a research program. We should at least try to help them hold their own in a fiercely competitive race by seeking new and better uses for cotton.

We have seen tremendous progress come about in the utilization of soybeans which is a newcomer in terms of the long-range agriculture picture. Our Midwest regional laboratory, located in Illinois, has made some very worthwhile contributions with regard to better uses for soybean byproducts, and this has meant millions of dollars to the agriculture of the Nation. I cite this as a good example of the potential of utilization research, but the program of research in my opinion has to have much more emphasis and much more money for its use.

I know that the Department of Agriculture has historically supervised all agricultural research even into commercial utilization and I believe they have given to this activity the very best support. My bill, however, provides that there shall be set up a separate administration for industrial-agricultural research and it is given certain powers, duties, and responsibilities. The members of this agency shall be subject to appointment by the President and the members shall serve at his pleasure. The administration which my bill would create is to conduct scientific research, maintain and expand pilot plants wherever necessary, operate manufacturing facilities to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and in every way promote the finding and development of commercial uses of agricultural products.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that such an agency for budgetary reasons alone can proceed more expeditiously if operated independently of the Department of Agriculture. But whether the Congress in its wisdom finally concludes to approve the provisions of my bill or amend it to make it a continuing but considerably expanded segment of the Department, the main thing I want to stress here today is the urgency for action.

Accomplishments of the 2d Session, 84th Congress, Directly Concerning Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a résumé of the accomplishments of the 2d session, 84th Congress, which directly concern the State of Montana as prepared by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Representative LEE METCALF, and myself, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 2D SESSION, 84TH CONGRESS, DIRECTLY CONCERNING MONTANA

(By Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and Representative LEE METCALF)

The 2d session of the 84th Congress approved a number of laws and appropriations beneficial to Montana. They include the following:

1. A $500,000 appropriation provides for construction, by the Army engineers, of the badly needed second powerplant at Fort Peck Dam. This plant, when completed, will add 80,000 kilowatts to the existing 85,000-kilowatt plant now in operation.

2. Construction of a new fish hatchery at Miles City was authorized and $359,000 appropriated for construction. This hatchery will produce approximately 10 million bass, blue gill, pike, and catfish annually.

3. The Helena Valley unit received an additional $1,750,000 appropriation for a total of $4 million. Construction of the dam and reservoir should begin shortly after an additional contract is signed with supplemental water users of the city of Helena.

4. An appropriation of $225,000 for the Bitterroot Irrigation District in western Montana will permit rehabilitation and repair work and thus reduce farmers' maintenance costs and assure them a reasonable uninterrupted delivery of irrigation water.

5. The Corps of Army Engineers received $200,000 with which to begin construction of the flood-control project at Billings.

6. An appropriation of $115,000 for the lower Marias unit will permit cleanup work on Tiber Dam and Reservoir, a Bureau of Reclamation project; Tiber Dam will be operated for the first full year in fiscal 1957.

7. Congress authorized $1,236,000 in additional funds for construction and operation of training facilities, maintenance, housing, and community facilities at Malmstrom Air Base, Great Falls. A total of $706,000 was appropriated for this installation.

8. The Glasgow Air Base, now under construction, received an additional authorization of $2,470,000 for operational training, maintenance, utility, and family-housing facilities and for ground improvements and land acquisition. A total of $3,677,000 was appropriated for this project, a portion of this amount having been authorized previously.

9. Congress authorized and appropriated $21 million to implement a strategic minerals-purchase program which will permit some 250 persons to stay on the payroll of fluorspar companies at Hamilton and Darby and the tungsten operation at Dillon.

10. Congress authorized the letting of contracts with water users organizations for drainage works and other completion items on small irrigation projects. This new law is particularly helpful to the Buffalo Rapids irrigation project near Terry and the Greenfields Irrigation District near Fairfield.

11. The Milk River mosquito-control program was bolstered by increased allocations by the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Service.

12. Congress approved appropriations to initiate a long-range program for the improvement of Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks. Funds were increased for the all-important State and private forestry-cooperative programs of the National Forest Service.

13. Montana libraries in communities with less than 10,000 population will share a grant of $40,000 to Montana for improvement of rural-library service. This appropriation followed passage of the Library Services Act this session.

14. Congress appropriated $50,000 for barley research this year and of that amount $11,600 will go to Montana, for research on two-row barley at Montana State College.

15. Montana was allocated $138,671 in Federal funds for airport development during fiscal 1957. These funds were divided as follows: Billings, $17,167; Great Falls, $29,854; Missoula, $25,000; Plentywood, $66,650.

Public Law 685 of the 84th Congress has amended the small projects authority of the 1950 Flood Control Act, by raising the limitation on Federal expenditure for small flood-control projects from $150,000 to $400,000. This new law will allow the Army engineers to proceed with the construction of the West Glendive flood-control project, waiving the requirement for local contribution of all construction costs over and above the former Federal cost limitation of $150,000. This will save local interests approximately $15,000 to $20,000.

This summary does not include passage of general legislation like the highway bill, which will mean hundreds of millions of dollars to Montana during the next 13 years. But one such major bill deserves mention here because of the part ordinary Montana citizens had in it.

A provision written into the military construction authorization assures telephone and electric cooperatives the right to serve SAGE air defense installations in their area. Previously some cooperatives were being bypassed even though they could do the job more cheaply than private utilities could. The construction of duplicating lines will be forbidden by this amendment. It has been estimated that this and other provisions of the new military construction law will result in savings to the taxpayers of $830 million. We are pleased to add that this economizing legislation was initiated by representatives of two Montana cooperatives, the Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative with headquarters at Circle, and the Sheridan County Electric Cooperative with headquarters at Medicine Lake.

One executive decision strongly urged by ourselves and some other Members of Congress from Western States is particularly helpful to Montana. We refer to the Secretary of the Army's decision to maintain the 96th Infantry Reserve Division in its present operating status instead of reducing it to a maneuver area command as once programed. An unfavorable decision would

have doomed the reserve armory construction and entire Army Reserve setup in Montana. Army has approved Army Reserve training center sites at Billings, Bozeman, Butte, Glasgow, Great Falls, Havre, Livingston, and Polson. We would emphasize that these designations are for planning purposes only and that final departmental approval of the projects and requests for construction funds for the necessary 100-man and 200-man armories cannot be initiated until the minimum strength of troop program units meets the departmental requirements.

Eastern Montana has been plagued by serious drought conditions this year and we have repeatedly appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture for assistance for these counties. We were disappointed and disturbed when the Secretary did not declare all 17 counties in eastern Montana as disaster areas as requested by the Governor of Montana. However, we were able to obtain an allowance for some of these counties to continue grazing on soil-bank acreage during the summer months.

During the past year considerable progress was made locally and nationally in bringing attention to the deplorable conditions which exist among some of the Indian reservations and settlements in the State such as Hill 57 in Great Falls. It was unfortunate that legislation providing for relief of depressed areas, including Indian tribes, did not pass before adjournment of Congress. However, Congress did enact legislation, Public Law 959, providing for a vocational training program for Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 to help them obtain employment. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been persistent in its denial of additional aid to the destitute Indians in Montana, but we shall continue our efforts in behalf of "America's first citizens," the Indians.

The most grievous defeat for the people of Montana during this session was the Presidential veto of the resolution which would have authorized payment of $5 million to the Crow Indians for Yellowtail Dam land and right-of-way, and thus cleared away the last obstacle to construction of this multipurpose project which will mean so much to the industry and growth of our State. We believe the record of the 84th Congress, as it affects Montana, is good. We plan to make the record of the 85th Congress even better by providing, at the earliest opportunity, for a $5 million settlement for the Crow Indians. We are hopeful that the President, whomever he may be, and his advisers will agree that this figure is just and reasonable, and approve the proposal so we can get on with the job of building Yellowtail Dam and thus a better life for Montanans.

Report to First Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as I again make my report to the First Congressional District, it is with a feeling of utmost appreciation for the opportunity that has been given to me to serve this fine congressional district in the House of Representatives. I trust that my service has been satisfactory. I have tried to the best of my ability to be zealous in doing what I have considered best, not only for the people I have the honor to represent, but, also to promote the welfare of all our people and make America strong and secure.

PEACE

It is particularly pleasing to realize that our Nation is at peace. Four years ago, when General Eisenhower was a candidate for President, he pledged, if elected, he would make a personal visit to the battlefields of Korea, and would endeavor, to the best of his ability, to bring the war to an end. We are all grateful that this has been accomplished and as a consequence our boys are no longer being killed or maimed on Korean battlefields.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Everyone is conscious of the fact that since World War II we have been living in a world of uncertainty. It has seemed that each day presented some new problem that required solution. It is also generally recognized that Russia in most instances, either working alone or through its satellite nations, has been the cause of this uncertainty. This at times has created situations of a most critical character. A single unwise act or word upon our part might or could have precipitated war. We should be thankful to Almighty God for guiding our course as a nation in such a manner that peace prevails among the nations of the world. There can be no doubt that this Nation, as it has assumed the moral leadership of the world, has been an instrument in God's hands in promoting a greater sense of understanding and good will among the nations of the world. Although at times it may have been but a flickering light, yet it has been sufficient at all times to light the way to a better and more peaceful world. It should be our fervent prayer that the light of morality among nations will continue to grow stronger that peace and good will may be established and made enduring.

GENEVA CONFERENCE

In considering what seems to be a new force working for a more peaceful existence in the world, we should not overlook the tremendous good that was created by the Conference at Geneva, nor the great influence of President Eisenhower in directing the course of the Conference and thereby creating a more friendly attitude among the great nations of the world and thus promoting the cause of peace and good will.

It has been acknowledged throughout the world, if we can judge by the favorable comments of the foreign press, as well as our own columnists and editors, that President Eisenhower by his magnetic personality, his words of wisdom, his evident sincerity, and his high and unselfish ideals, raised the Conference to the highest level of any meeting of world diplomats that has ever been held. Even Russia since the Conference has announced new policies that have astonished the world as a new approach to a more peaceful existence. It will be our hope that fulfillment of these policies by Russia will be as genuine as the words that were used in expressing them.

FOREIGN AID

Since World War II we have given many billions of dollars for foreign aid. This was necessary because of the impoverished condition of our allies. Their need was so great that if we had refused the aid so sorely needed they could have been taken over by communism very easily. However, the economic and military financial aid we extended have enabled them to retain their independence from Russian domination, and, in addition, we have built up an organization of military strength in each of these nations, the existence of which can be of real assistance to us in time of any emergency and a strong deterrent against war at this or any other time. Thus, while our expenditures for foreign aid have been great, yet, equally great have been the beneficial results attained by us. And, with lessening of world tensions we can look forward to a substantial curtailment in such expenditures in the near future.

FISCAL POLICIES

At the present time the high degree of prosperity that exists throughout the Nation is exceedingly gratifying. With 66½ million of our people gainfully employed, at the highest average rate of wages ever paid in the entire history of our Nation, and, with production at the highest peak of all time, we have reason to be truly thankful. In addition to all of this, we have a fiscal policy that has not only balanced our budget, as promised by President Eisenhower during his campaign for the Presidency, but, has provided a surplus of receipts over expenditures that has enabled us to utilize such surplus in reduction of the national debt and thereby cut down the tremendous interest charges incurred by previous administrations because of their failure to live within our means. These satisfactory results arising from a sound fiscal policy make for a strong Nation. Financial stability is of prime importance in maintaining our security in the present and in the future. A continuance of such is most necessary.

TAX REDUCTION

The tax reductions effected by the Republican Congress in the 83d Congress under the Eisenhower administration totaled $7,400,000,000. This reduction was made possible by the greatest economy drive in the history of our country. Through the elimination of wasteful duplication, and often ridiculous spending policies set up and carried on by the previous administrations, it has been possible for the present Eisenhower administration to cut the expenditures of Government and, in consequence thereof, cut taxes by $7,400,000,000. This spectacular Republican effort produced the largest tax reduction in the history of the world and ended the "tax and spend" policy of the previous administrations to the great relief of financially burdened taxpayers in every walk of life. And these reductions represented the first big step in a long-range program to rewrite our tax laws in the interest of fairness to all the taxpayers, and thereby permit them to retain as much of their hard-earned money as possible. President Eisenhower with a Republican Congress can continue to give this kind of tax relief if elected.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Notwithstanding the strong desire for peace in our Nation, yet, as long as the world continues in an uncertain state with some nations less peaceably inclined than our own, it is necessary for our own security to maintain a strong national defense. The amount to be spent is necessarily large. However, under the wise and informed leadership of President Eisenhower, the greatest military man of our time, and Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, who is undoubtedly the greatest production engineer of our time, we can rest assured that whatever may be the program decided upon by these two men, it will be the best that wisdom and experience can devise. There will be neither waste nor anything beyond what necessity would demand.

Already under this administration there has been a considerable reduction in the cost of our national defense. The two outstanding men at the head of our defense, President Eisenhower and Secretary Wilson, know better than anyone else what we need and how to get an adequate defense at the least possible cost. Their performance in the past is a guaranty of what we can expect from their continuance in office. A Congress that is in accord with them, and, willing to make effective the program they decide upon, can be most helpful in providing a strong and adequate defense at reasonable cost.

LABOR

There are more of our people at work, earning more, building more, saving more, and buying more than at any other time in our history as a nation. We are enjoying the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any nation in history. An increasing population, businessmen actively engaged in starting new enterprises and expanding old ones, and the discoveries of science and technology opening up new opportunities, give promise of providing even greater employment and an even higher standard of living.

President Eisenhower's administration, with the Honorable James P. Mitchell, as Secretary of Labor, presented to Congress a slate of labor legislative proposals which included more major items, benefiting more wage earners, than has been included in any labor legislative program in many years. Some of its more important recommendations were: First, amendment of the Taft-Hartley law; second, amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage and to bring additional workers within its coverage; third, to revise and improve the 8-hour laws relating to work on Federal contracts; fourth, to provide financial aid to the States for improving industrial safety; fifth, to increase benefits payable under workmen's compensation under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act; sixth, to further improve the District of Columbia Unemployment Insurance Act in line with other recommendations by President Eisenhower for improvement of the Federal-State unemployment compensation system; and seventh, a bill to require equal pay for women to eliminate discriminatory wage practices based on sex.

Some of the above, in part or in whole, have been adopted. Others, and in addition to the above, await action by Congress. Among the many things that were done to promote the welfare of the workers was the adoption of a $1 per hour minimum wage law, with an expanded coverage thereunder; increased pay for postal workers and other Federal employees, together with improved retirement benefits and civil-service provisions; retention of Walsh-Bacon Act for the benefit of workers on Government projects. There was other legislation that will be helpful to workers. This includes legislation increasing benefits for rail workers, their widows, and dependents. In this connection, I am pleased to include in my remarks a letter received by me from G. E. Leighty, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association. He wrote:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of all organized railroad employees both retired and active, I want to thank you for your help in obtaining relief for our retired people.

Your career has been marked with many manifestations of your concern for the welfare of our people. For this we are, as ever, grateful.

Sincerely,

G. E. LEIGHTY,
Chairman.

AGRICULTURE

Real prosperity in our Nation demands prosperity in each segment of our economy. There can be no real prosperity if it pertains only to labor, nor, equally true, if there is only agricultural prosperity but none for labor. There must be prosperity for both and every other activity within the Nation if there is to be full national prosperity. We all go up together, or, we all go down together. This describes the situation both fully and accurately.

In speaking of prosperity in agriculture, I am well aware that recently in some sections of the country it has not been as great as some might desire. But, when there is a tendency to criticize, it might be well to remember that when the Republicans took office in January 1953, farm prices had been declining for 2 years. Prices received by farmers had dropped 15 percent between February 1951 and January 1953. This sharp rate of decline has been in great measure stopped and prices have leveled off and show more stability.

The President, since assuming office, has endeavored to have policies adopted that would be helpful in halting any further dropping of prices, and, that would give real price protection to farmers. To accomplish this, he has sought to rebuild export markets, sale of agricultural surpluses, authorization to set aside surplus commodities to be used in constructive ways, such as in school-lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to stricken people in other countries, and stockpiled for use in a national emergency, drought programs, water conservation, tax credits for conservation, new laws improving and expanding farm credit, farm-housing program, expanded Federal crop insurance, more effective agricultural extension service, increased appropriations for Department of Agriculture, agricultural research programs and State experiment stations, agriculture extension service and agricultural conservation programs.

In addition and in order to keep politics from interfering with the administration of farm programs, as has occurred heretofore, he created by Executive order a bipartisan Agricultural Commission to review the policies and administration of farm programs. This new 18-member Commission is made up of 9 Republicans and 9 Democrats. A minimum of 12 members must be farmers.

All of this indicates that President Eisenhower is aware of the needs of the farmer. As time progresses it is becoming more and more evident that the policies inaugurated by the administration, together with the improved general economic condition of the country at large, is working toward a better economic condition for the farmer.

The Department of Agriculture has reported farm prices are on the upturn. While the increase is not yet as high as we want, nor expect it to be, yet, it is most gratifying to realize that the 5-year downturn that commenced under the previous administration has been arrested and farm income is now headed upward. It is clear we have passed the bottom and are definitely on the road to recovery with better prices.

VETERANS

The Republican attitude toward veterans was expressed by President Eisenhower in his first state of the Union message, immediately after he assumed the office of President. He said:

Proper care of our uniformed citizens, and appreciation of the past service of our veterans, are part of our accepted governmental responsibility.

Following this declaration of responsibility toward our ex-servicemen, the Republican Party has shown a desire and intention of fulfilling such obligation. And, such has always been the policy of the Republican Party from the time of the Civil War until the present.

Since the advent of the Eisenhower administration there have been many and varied improvements made in laws beneficial to veterans, their widows, survivors, and dependents. All of these have received increased benefits to which they are justly entitled, in addition to which provision has been made for greatly increased hospital facilities. In the 83d Congress, the first under President Eisenhower, the Republican veterans' program provided more hospital beds and medical care for a greater number of veterans than in any other year. This Republican Congress appropriated $33,032,875 more than the preceding administration and $55 million more than the year preceding that.

In addition to providing increased benefits and increased hospital beds and medical care, under the Eisenhower administration there have been laws to improve the status of veterans in many other ways. For instance, there has been a decided improvement in the law regulating housing loans, improved procedures relating to veterans' life-insurance policies that will give veterans better service, continuance of pay checks and family allotments for Korean war

prisoners or soldiers missing in action, extending to Korean veterans public-housing provisions enjoyed by other veterans, facilitating appointment of veterans who had lost civil-service opportunities due to service in the armed services, legislation providing an additional $75 million to pay World War II veterans for compulsory labor or inhuman treatment suffered as prisoners of war, granting preferential status of veterans in Federal employment, and, in addition to the above, many more designed to be beneficial to our veterans.

It has been a personal pleasure and privilege to have had a part in the enactment of these laws, and, assurance is given that the same considerate action may be expected in the future with the privilege of continued service in Congress being granted.

HEALTH AND HOSPITALS

There has been no activity of Government that has been of more interest to the Eisenhower administration and its supporters in Congress than that pertaining to the health and welfare of our people. This interest has been translated into action surpassing all that has been done in the past 20 years.

The intense interest displayed by Republicans in this important activity of Government was shown by the creation of a Cabinet post, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It was created for the purpose of expanding the Federal Government's interest and participation in promoting the health of our people. Under its jurisdiction has been created facilities to better care for the sick, the disabled, the handicapped in all categories, temporary and chronic. To accomplish this, provision has been made for greater Federal assistance in hospital construction, including nursing homes, rehabilitation centers, clinical and diagnostic centers. All of this has been done through a Federal-State building and maintenance program in which each participates in sharing the cost.

In addition to the hospital construction program, there has been a tremendous interest taken in providing the National Health Service with facilities to carry on the most extensive research as to the cause, prevention, and cure of our most outstanding, crippling, and killing diseases. This includes heart, cancer, all mental, nervous, and muscular diseases. The accomplishments of this increased and ever-expanding research program is producing results that have meant much to the individuals affected by such, as well as providing methods of care and cure that have greatly reduced the cost of maintaining public institutions devoted to their welfare, and also the cost of home and private treatment and care.

There is no Government activity in which the Eisenhower administration is more interested or more definitely committed to extending. Already appropriations for the accomplishment of these activities are being greatly increased each year. I confess it has given me a pleasure and privilege to have been a participant in this great undertaking as a member of the committee having jurisdiction and on two occasions its chairman. It was indeed gratifying to receive the following letter from Dr. Leonard Scheele, the retiring Surgeon General of the United States:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLVERTON: In departing from Washington and my Government career, I want you to know how much I have enjoyed, and have appreciated, my association with you. I shall always cherish the experiences during my years in Government service, and I want you to know that among the most pleasant has been my relationship with you. Your understanding and your sympathy with the aims of the Public Health Service have been an inspiration to all of us. Much of our accomplishment—and I like to think of it as substantial—would not have been possible without your counsel, your friendly and constructive criticism, and your support.

I will be located in New Jersey, as you know, but I hope to come back to Washington from time to time, and, hope that I may be privileged to appear before the Congress in the future in behalf of health legislation. I am sure that our paths will continue to cross.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

HIGHWAYS

President Eisenhower proposed and the Congress enacted a law that will provide the greatest road system in the world. It will cross the Nation from north to south and from east to west. Every one of the 48 States will benefit. It will be financed by Federal-State participation. It will be one of the greatest achievements that has ever been carried out in the entire history of the Nation. It will prove beneficial to all our people and carry the Nation on to greater heights of progress.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Much to the dismay of President Eisenhower the Congress failed to enact a program for school construction. The question of segregation played a big part in the failure to pass appropriate legislation. The Republicans in Congress proposed a measure that would have greatly relieved the present stringent need for additional schoolrooms. The South is adamant in its refusal to accept any legislation that will curtail or eliminate the right of the individual States to adopt a policy of segregation if they so desire. Of course, such a policy runs counter to the Supreme Court, which has declared that segregation, as applied to the public-school system is unconstitutional. It is hoped that legislation can be enacted in the next Congress that will supply the need that exists for additional schools.

HOUSING

Another agency of Government that reflects the interest that Government should take in promoting the welfare of our people is that of providing proper housing and means for individuals to own their own homes. This, taken together with the legislation that has made possible slum clearance and the substitution of up-to-date and sanitary living quarters for the low-income groups, has improved the morale of our people to a point that cannot be fully estimated. In accomplishing these most desirable results the home builders as well as homeowners have been greatly assisted in providing these better living conditions. Homeownership makes for a stronger nation and a more satisfied people.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As an agency of Government social security has proved that it is worth while. Every day there comes to my attention the advantages that arise as a result of its far-reaching provisions. Of course, we are all aware that payments under social security and old-age assistance do not produce a state of affluence by any means, but it does constitute some help to those who come within its provisions. As our experience in its operation increases we learn of deficiencies and the need for improvement.

Since the Eisenhower administration came into office, and under a Republican Congress that was in the majority for only the first 2 years of that administration, great and important changes took place; namely, there was added 10 million citizens to the eligibility rolls, and benefits were increased for more than 6 million of our citizens now entitled to and drawing benefits. The changes approved in social-security legislation were designed to provide coverage for an increased number of our older citizens as rapidly as possible. The changes provide that, by 1960, 75 percent of our citizens reaching 65 years of age will be eligible for benefits. When the Republican administration replaced the previous administration in Washington only 47 percent of our aged were eligible for social-security benefits. It is the basic thought of the Republican administration that the program should be designed for the full benefit of all who now, or in the future, will need to rely upon it. The most recent changes that will prove highly beneficial provide that women shall be entitled to benefits upon reaching the age of 62 years instead of 65, and all totally disabled persons shall be entitled to draw benefits at 50 years of age instead of 65. Thus, we are moving on and the future will see further necessary improvements in the Social Security Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The question of civil rights is not new. The same old contentions arise in each session of Congress. The result is that legislation to improve and firmly establish the civil rights guaranteed to all our citizens by the Constitution passes the House and dies in the Senate. Its death in the Senate is not the result of a vote that defeats it but by reason of the fact that under the rules of the Senate it can be talked to death. This is accomplished by a filibuster carried on by Senators from the Southern States who talk and talk. The effect of this waste of time without action is to lay the legislation aside so that other business can be conducted, or, in many instances, the bill is held in committee and not permitted

to be reported to the Senate floor for consideration.

This latter condition prevailed in the session just closing. A bill drawn by the Republican administration's Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, provided for the establishment of a bureau within the Justice Department, under an Assistant Attorney General, to investigate any denial of civil rights to any citizen on account of race, color, creed, or national origin, and giving authority to the Justice Department to go into court and protect the rights of any and all citizens. It can be readily seen that such a proposal was reasonable and entitled to favorable consideration by the Congress. And, of course, it would have had the signature of the President if the Congress had passed it.

But notwithstanding the fact the House passed the bill by an overwhelming majority, it was sent to a committee in the Senate on which Democrat Senators from the South prevailed, and the bill was not even permitted to go to the floor of the Senate for discussion or vote.

Such a disposition is wrong. It is hoped that the coming elections in November will correct the wrong by the election of a House and Senate that will see the justice of the legislation and enact it into law.

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

Many have said that the women elected President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress in 1952. There can be no higher tribute to our party than to know we have the support of the women of America. Our party will remain strong and effective in providing good government as long as we can claim the support of our women.

As might be expected, the present administration has recognized the ability and utilized the services of women in the Government service to a greater extent than has ever existed heretofore under any other administration. More than 40 top-level posts in the Eisenhower administration are occupied by Republican women, and an estimated 1,200 are holding positions classified by the administration as policymaking or of high administrative authority. They are in diplomatic positions, the United Nations, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, civil defense, social welfare, postal operations, fiscal positions, customs, legal jobs, and in employment and Federal parole offices. And this is only a brief summary of the positions held by women in important agencies of the Government. Altogether there are upward of nearly a half-million women engaged in the Federal Government service.

In the Federal diplomatic service, the Republican administration has called on the aid of women in 67 embassies and 9 legations abroad. Two ambassadorial posts are held by women, in Italy and Switzerland. More than 350 women hold important posts in the Forcign Service.

It is also interesting to note that at the State, county, and local municipal levels, innumerable women have been encouraged by the Republican Party to assume governmental duties. It is unnecessary to say, but pleasing to acknowledge, that in each instance these Republican women are doing an excellent and praiseworthy job. They are bringing credit to the women of America and the Republican Party of which they are a part.

COMMUNISM

The forces of communism are no longer in policymaking positions of our Government. They have been cleared out as soon as their subversive affiliations have become known, and none have been appointed to office by the Eisenhower administration, nor will they be. They are out and will stay out.

CONCLUSION

There is much more that could be said of which the present administration can feel proud and which the people of the Nation approve. In this connection it would seem that there has been nothing that has been more generally approved than the sincerity and dignity that has been displayed by President Eisenhower in his conduct of the affairs of our Nation. From the moment when at his inauguration he asked if he might offer a personal prayer, and in which he displayed a firm faith in the overruling providence of Almighty God and his personal dependence upon that divine source for guidance and help, there has been a feeling among our people that the Nation has as its head not only a just man but a religious man in whom they can trust and in whom they can have confidence. It is good for our Nation that this feeling exists throughout the United States regardless of political affiliation.

May I close by acknowledging the great honor and privilege it has been to represent the First Congressional District in the Congress of the United States. I hope that my service has been satisfactory and that if there have been differences of opinion at any time that at least I may be considered as having been sincere in my convictions and with no desire other than to serve our people well and thereby promote their welfare. The confidence that has been displayed in the past and which I sincerely appreciate I trust may also be justified as to the future.

Settle Cyprus Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I forwarded strong appeals and intercessions to the Department of State expressing my deep interest, and urging the good offices of this Government to try to settle this very disturbing issue. At the time the State Department stated in effect that the Cyprus issue involved the direct interests of close friends and allies of the United States and was, therefore, a matter which the United States views with attentive interest.

The Department declared that this Government is ready to assist its friends to work out a solution in the Cyprus question, and that it viewed present problems with sympathetic concern and confidence that a solution can be found which will strengthen overall Western interests.

I find that the State Department Bulletin of some time ago, which was formulated in response to numerous inquiries and protests, is not particularly responsive to the many urgent requests that this Nation use its good offices to bring about a settlement of this dangerous issue; nor does it adequately set forth an outline of American policy in this distressing matter.

Reading the Bulletin, I got the distinct impression that it was comprised of generalized statements that would be applicable to almost any pending diplomatic situation.

In that sense it was disappointing, because I had high hopes that the Department would take a much more active interest and play a much more affirmative and positive role in seeking to bring about a satisfactory solution.

It would appear that the Department is more concerned about the feelings of some of our allies than it is about the settlement of this great human question which affects the claims to freedom of an historic and honored people, and which day by day is causing the deterioration of the attitude toward the western democracies in the Middle East. Cyprus is the type of question that should be approached not on the basis of the interests of allies alone, but on the basis of great fundamental principles to which this Nation is historically and unalterably pledged.

I believe that under the circumstances this Government, which is frequently making pious and understandable professions concerning its interest in world peace, should recognize that the issue of Cyprus is not only measurably disturbing world peace but it is gravely and seriously affecting our own interests and prestige in the Middle and Near East and throughout the world.

As the leading world democracy we above all should recognize that this question of Cyprus involves the sacred principle of self-determination to which Americans have been committed since before the founding of this Nation and which has been reiterated so very strongly during and following two great world wars as well as at many other times.

There is another very serious question involved here and that is the rights of religious minorities—a question which is very dear to the hearts of all true believers in freedom. This question relates not alone to freedom of worship which should be respected everywhere but also as it bears upon this issue, full respect for religious personages.

The callous treatment accorded Archbishop Makarios by the British Government was shocking to the conscience and moral instincts of the Christian and non-Christian world. It was an affront to all followers of religion. I hope and urge that our Government may take vigorous, affirmative steps to acquaint the British

Government with the fact that oppression of the kind that is being practiced in Cyprus is offensive to the moral sense of enlightened mankind and will not be condoned by democratic, freedom-loving peoples.

Clearly Cyprus is having most unfortunate, adverse effects upon the cause of the free Western nations. Our Government should, therefore, use all means at its disposal to bring the issue of Cyprus to an early, just, and permanent solution. The free world as a whole will think the better of us for it.

The Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the general prosperity is dependent on the prosperity of each major segment of our population. This fact makes the drop in farm income of 28 percent in the last 3 years most disturbing. During this period profits of business and income of others were increasing to an alltime high. Since each depression has been led off by a break in farm income, it is time the causes of the present farm situation be searched out and corrected. The present administration now seems to see the problem, but would do little to correct the causes. From my experience it is my opinion that the President's farm plan, when considered in connection with what our Government is doing to destroy our farmers by foreign aid and other governmental policies, could well do more harm than good. It is a case of giving the average farmer aspirin while he has his production dried up to producing for domestic consumption only. Of course, the big landowner would get several aspirin.

If implemented by cash it will provide a few dollars to each farmer. However, unless great care is taken to see that it is not all distributed to big landowners, it is to be doubted that such payments to the average small farmer will equal what he has lost this year on one hog. After all, what the President asks for is for his Secretary of Agriculture to take action under the law enacted years ago by the Democrats. Having brought about reduced farm income by lowering prices, increasing costs, and cutting acreage, truly, this administration—to cure the problem—has labored and brought forth a mouse.

The point I wish to make, however, is not along the line of how little it amounts to, but actually in view of present policies of our Government I believe for the farmers to rely on such program is dangerous in that it will lull the American farmer into going along with present policies which are destroying American agriculture and the farmer.

Secretary Benson has had and now has unlimited authority to sell our commodities in world trade through normal channels. Until recent months he would not use it. While he has held United States commodities off world markets, our Government is furnishing 738 agricultural experts, at United States expense, to help promote increased foreign agricultural production.

Through various foreign-aid programs the United States is supplying fine seed, tractors and combines, and other farm machinery to nearly every country outside the Soviet bloc. The United States is helping provide irrigation, flood control, highways, and cotton gins to increase foreign production to the point of meeting all world needs in the years ahead.

Our Government was and is granting tax concessions to American financial interests to advance increases in foreign production. United States promoted foreign production has increased as fast as Secretary Benson cut acreage in the United States. All this is shown in the report of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Pending the day when the United States Government has increased foreign production to the point of there being no need for United States agricultural production, except for our domestic consumption, the Government—through Public Law 480—has been virtually giving away United States commodities to take up slack in world needs, though our Government refused to sell such commodities in world markets.

Many people have supported Public Law 480 and foreign aid without realizing that, through the faulty policy of using Public Law 480 in substitution for sales through normal channels, such programs were being used to put American farmers out of business.

THE REAL CAUSES OF PRICE-COST SQUEEZE

Mr. Speaker, there have been 13 freight-rate increases in the United States since World War II. Prices charged by manufacturers and wholesalers have given them the highest profits ever received. Whatever the merits of such increases and the benefits to these groups, the result has been to increase the costs of what the farmer must buy.

At the same time, the farmer's parity formula has been changed on the recommendation of the Eisenhower administration so that these increased costs are no longer fully reflected in the price supports. The supports are now largely based on the average price the farmer has received for the preceding 10 years.

Since farm income is the sum of volume times price less cost, is it any wonder, in view of reduced acreage and volume, lower prices, and increasing costs, that farm income is dropping rapidly to depression-day levels?

The United States Department of Agriculture has held United States commodities off world markets so as to give markets to foreign countries far beyond their prewar share.

UNITED STATES AID TO INCREASE FOREIGN PRODUCTION

Largely financed by the United States, 1 million new acres of fine farmland have been added in Mexico through irrigation. The same situation exists with regard to many other countries in South and Central America. And in recent weeks, through the Aswan Dam proposal, the United States has taken the first step to help finance the development of 2 million new acres in Egypt.

India, where the United States financed 2,600 deep irrigation wells, has increased cotton production 50 percent since 1950–51 and will have a 4-million-bale crop in 1955–56.

Foreign dairy production has been increased by 740 million pounds of cheese and 66 million pounds of dried milk in the years 1950–54. During that period, while the United States would not sell competitively, exports of cheese from the United States dropped from 47.5 million pounds in 1950 to 5.4 million pounds in 1954.

During the period July 1, 1947, to August 1, 1955, the United States Export-Import Bank of Washington made loans of $250 million to foreign countries for farm machinery and equipment. The International Bank of Reconstruction extended $500 million in loans for the same general purposes.

From April 3, 1948, to March 31, 1955, the United States foreign aid program provided $984,159,436 in United States dollars to promote agriculture in foreign countries and created $710 million of counterpart funds for furtherance of agriculture in those countries. During this period the International Cooperation Administration granted a total of $476,819,000 for agricultural machinery, tractors, and equipment for foreign countries.

On June 1 of last year, there were 738 United States agricultural technicians—paid by our Government—on duty in foreign countries, helping to increase agricultural production. Two hundred and forty of such agricultural technicians are located in Latin America.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower tried for the first 2 years of this administration to virtually eliminate the present soil-conservation program—in which the Federal Government pays for only about one-third of the soil-conservation work on land.

Making payments for the soil-bank acreage reserve, as recommended by the President, will put a little money into the hands of the farmer, but will cure none of the basic ills. How can these people who now espouse this solution believe in a soil-bank idea, where the Government pays substantially all costs and the farmer would take little affirmative action other than not to farm? May I say it is my belief that the suggested payment for conservation reserve could be much better used if added to funds available for present soil-conservation programs. However, even to receive the recommendation of his soil-bank program, is a belated recognition of the soundness of the action of the Congress in retaining the soil-conservation program in spite of administration attacks against the program back through the years.

Secretary Benson and the President led the fight for modern parity, which

reduced parity itself. They led the fight for flexible supports which reduced the percentage of parity, all because they said high-level supports led to farmers producing for sale to the Government.

Now, this election year, after they have reduced price, increased costs, and reduced acreage by holding United States commodities off world markets through refusing to sell for dollars at competitive prices, they claimed to be surprised to learn that farm income is down. The United States Government goes merrily on, supplying dollars to foreign countries for building dams, furnishing seeds, providing tractors and combines and other equipment and machinery, and—to cap it all—at United States taxpayers' expense it furnishes 738 American agricultural specialists to teach people in foreign lands how to increase their production of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, dairy products, and all the rest—much of it for export—all to add to world supplies in competition with American farmers.

With this state of affairs the situation of American farmers is bound to get worse before it gets better. Such a course leads to reducing the American farmer to producing for the domestic market only; and to remain solvent he must look to the Government for an annual dole, or Government handout, dependent on the whims of succeeding Congresses, and knowing full well only every fourth year is election year.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES OFFER AT COMPETITIVE PRICES

All foreign countries take what action they deem necessary to help move their agricultural commodities. I cite the following examples of subsidies provided by other countries. France pays $1.40 subsidy per bushel to export wheat: Uruguay pays a subsidy of 47 percent on beef exports; Australia pays an export subsidy on butter and cheese of 11 cents and 7 cents, respectively; and Colombia pays a 40-percent subsidy on tobacco exports. Brazil has met the export problem by juggling its rates of exchange. All these foreign countries move their commodities by one means or another. The United States seems to be one of the few countries which fails to take whatever steps may be necessary to keep its agricultural commodities moving into world markets.

If our Government wants its farmers to have any foreign market, it is basic and fundamental that it must offer what the farmers produce for sale through normal channels in world trade at competitive prices. Such action is not only authorized by law but is contemplated by the law and is essential to protect the American taxpayer as well as the farmer.

UNITED STATES POLICY ADDS TO WORLD SUPPLY

By refusing to sell, the United States has and is cutting its own farmers' production down and is putting many of them out of production entirely. Such United States Government policies constantly add to total world supplies and United States surpluses. Even more dangerous, perhaps, is the fact that the United States is deliberately promoting increased world production in foreign countries for export. In addition to creating competition for United States farm products, such a policy will eventually enable Russia to meet her agricultural needs from these other countries, despite anything the United States may do to prevent it.

ORIGINAL FARM PROGRAM

The farm program was originally written in the midst of the last depression, at a time when the farmers' purchasing power had fallen to an alltime low, leading to the break in prices which resulted in the depression. It was realized that if we were to restore a fair share of the purchasing power to farmers, in relation to other segments of our economy which are protected by various laws, agriculture would have to have protections written into the law.

It was then provided and has since remained, until changed on the recommendation of the Eisenhower administration through Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, that price supports should be a percentage of the comparative purchasing power which the farmer had in 1909–14, which was determined by the Congress to be a fair base. Under that formula, the price the farmer was guaranteed, which was less than 100 percent of parity, was based on a parity formula which rose with increasing costs the farmer paid and fell with decreasing costs.

The whole approach was to assure the farmer a fair share of the Nation's purchasing power.

SECRETARY BENSON'S FARM PROGRAM

Secretary Benson apparently has differed with that concept. It seems to be his view, and concurred in by President Eisenhower, that price supports should be limited, as he would describe it, to preventing the bottom from falling out of prices; and he considers price-support levels as a means of regulating production.

First he recommended, and has gotten through the Congress, a change in parity. The old formula was repealed, leaving a so-called modern parity wherein price supports are based not on maintaining the average purchasing power of the farmer, but largely on the average price the farmer has received for the past 10 years. The so-called flexible price-support program.

Thus, increasing costs because of such factors as wage increases, and the 13 freight rate increases mentioned are not fully reflected under the new formula in the price the farmer receives from price supports. Actually, should the farmer have to continue to sell at the price-support level under modern parity, the price he receives will gradually go down, though his cost of production will probably continue to rise.

Further evidence that the Secretary has a different concept of price supports is that he would assure the farmer a larger percentage of parity under his flexible support formula—the average price the farmer has been receiving for the past 10 years—if supplies are short. Of course, if supplies are short enough, there will be a demand and a market and less farmer need for supports. On the other hand, if supplies are large so that there is virtually no market, which means that the farmer is in more serious straits, Secretary Benson would give a smaller percentage of his modern parity. Thus the Secretary's law helps the farmer more when he needs less help and provides less help when he needs more. That is the principle of the law which the Eisenhower administration requested and got through the Congress.

Experience has shown that a lower price does not necessarily reduce production; for the farmer, in the absence of other controls, will increase production in an effort to retain his income, declining because of reduced prices.

NONBASIC COMMODITIES

With regard to the nonbasic commodities, Secretary Benson has given clear evidence that he either does not understand the approach contemplated under the law or is opposed to it. To support prices for nonbasics, section 32 funds are made available to him automatically each year. A courageous Secretary of Agriculture should move in promptly, having the money at his disposal, and announce a purchase program before a break in the price of nonbasic commodities occurs.

When we review the actual operations of the various farm programs each year, there have been numerous instances where a prompt announcement that the Government would purchase a commodity in distress has resulted in sustaining the market. Usually it has had to buy very little of the commodity.

PORK PURCHASE

The prime example of the Secretary's lack of understanding is the break in hog prices last fall. This break could easily be foreseen. However, instead of moving in promptly, the Department of Agriculture waited until prices broke, as I recall, from some 20 cents a pound to around 15 cents a pound. Even at that time, instead of moving in to support prices, Secretary Benson announced in the press that the prices had not yet broken sufficiently for the Department to justify moving in. He stated that if prices broke still further apparently meaning to around 13 cents the Department would buy millions of dollars' worth of pork.

While I grant that it was probably not so intended, if you analyze this announcement, it was obviously an open invitation to the meat packers to further reduce prices to the farmers, in which event they would have a ready sale to Mr. Benson's Department of Agriculture for $85 million worth of pork. Quite naturally, within a short time the meat packers met his requirement, reduced the price as he indicated, and are now selling pork to Mr. Benson. The Secretary forgot to require that any benefits be passed on to the farmer, and the packers are declaring the largest dividends in years.

UNITED STATES COMMODITIES MUST CONTINUE FOR SALE IN WORLD MARKETS

Whether you believe in the approach of Secretary Benson, which is that price supports should be a means of regulating production, or whether you agree with me and others that price support should be used to maintain the purchasing power of the farmer, one thing is essential to either approach: That is, the production of American farmers, which is

surplus to American need, must be kept on world markets for sale for dollars.

To finance these support programs, the Commodity Credit Corporation was created.

The Congress, in order to protect the domestic price, provided that the CCC could sell on the domestic market at its investment price, plus reasonable carrying charges, normally set at 105 percent of parity. However, when the Congress limited the price at which the commodities could be sold domestically, it also realized that in order to retain any of our share of world markets we must make our offering prices competitive with those of the same commodities produced in other parts of the world. Thus the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation also provided for sales in world markets on a truly competitive basis, or at any price necessary to move them.

Most of our present difficulties have resulted from the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has been buying commodities as provided by the law, but has refused to sell them in world markets as contemplated by that same law.

SALES POLICY, OR RATHER, LACK OF

For the past several years and until recent months, our Government has made the support price its offering price in world trade. In the words of Secretary Benson, this country became the residual supplier. By sticking to a position of offering our production in world trade either at the domestic sale price or at a fixed price close to that level, we have held an umbrella over expansion in world production. Foreign buyers have bought elsewhere until the world supply was exhausted, and then the United States has taken up the slack. These are the words of the Department of Agriculture, and yet that Department has at all times had authority to sell in world trade at truly competitive prices. Until recent months it has not exercised that authority, and is now doing so only on a very limited basis.

The course followed is an open invitation for foreign expansion in the very commodities in trouble in the United States. The records show such invitation has been accepted. As we have reduced acreage in the United States, under Mr. Benson's convenient umbrella over world prices, foreign production has increased at approximately the same rate that our farmers were reduced. This was not because of the high level of supports in the United States, but because of faulty governmental policy. I would point out again that whatever the level of supports, Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture have had, and now have, authority to sell in world trade at whatever price it takes to move the commodities.

WHAT WE MUST DO

It is my opinion that there are several things which must be done.

First. We must stop all foreign aid which increases production of agricultural commodities for export.

The present program whereby the United States is furnishing capital, machinery, improved seed, and technical assistance is doing United States agriculture great harm. And when this is coupled with tax concessions for United States investors abroad and a Government policy of holding United States commodities off world markets at competitive prices, despite authority to sell—thereby holding an umbrella over world prices—it can only have the effect of wrecking the present farm program or any which might be adopted.

Second. Whatever the percentage of purchasing power the farmer should have in the opinion of the Congress, and I personally believe 90 percent is low enough, we should immediately restore the original parity formula so that parity will be tied tightly to the cost of what the farmer has to buy and provide that whichever formula—modern or old—provides the highest support level should apply.

Third. Since reduction in acreage will not necessarily reduce production of the basic commodities, price supports should be placed on a given number of pounds, bushels, or bales with some attention to farmers instead of being tied to land entirely. It is bad enough for small farmers to be squeezed because of economics; certainly we must see they are not squeezed out of business by Federal law.

I know many farmers differ with this approach. They believe that under acreage controls, by the use of fertilizer and other chemicals, they can produce just as much on reduced acreage. In fact, they usually have; but what most farmers overlook is that each time they do this, under present law they get further reductions in acreage the next year—with more fertilizer and other overhead costs. Thus each year the situation becomes worse.

Fourth. In order that curtailment in United States production will have the effect of reducing world production, which is essential to any effective farm program in the United States, I believe the Congress should require the Secretary of Agriculture to use his authority under the CCC charter to offer our commodities in the markets of the world for sale for dollars through normal channels on a competitive basis. This should be done at least to the extent of recapturing our normal share of world markets.

Fifth. Since most of the CCC losses come from inferior quality commodities, we should greatly increase the spread of support levels for good and poor qualities. This should be done by increasing supports on the good grades to the extent supports are lowered on inferior qualities.

Sixth. We should see that United States farm production is allowed to move into every section of the United States free of local boycotts or other restrictions.

Seventh. We must insist that the Secretary of Agriculture move promptly in the purchase of perishables, diverting purchases to the school lunch or similar good uses; and we must require that the benefits be passed on to the producer.

The suggestions I make are "musts." If we act on them, doubtless experience will show other changes which may be needed later.

ACTION BY CONGRESS

In the last appropriation bill before the Congress we made separate provision for a sales organization, for which there was already authority and funds but no organized sales force. Over the opposition of Secretary Benson we earmarked money in the bill for that purpose only. This organization has now been set up.

The committee also provided separate funds to find out what foreign countries are doing to export their commodities, though here, too, authority and funds were already available.

We provided for a study by the Department as to the price spread between the farmer and consumer, because the Department was urging reduced farm price supports. This information is now being assimilated.

We demanded that United States commodities be sold in world trade on a competitive basis; and in recent months limited amounts of several commodities have been offered on a competitive-bid basis. But even here the announcement of the Department of Agriculture gives no assurance that our Government will issue an export permit to whomever buys commodities on a competitive-bid basis from the CCC for export.

CONCLUSION

We may argue as to the proper parity percentage; we may argue as to the mechanics of the program; but in order to be of lasting value to the farmer, the support price must be tied to the cost of what the farmer has to buy. That we did have. That has been taken away from the farmer by the Eisenhower administration.

Any farm program, to be workable, must provide for the sale of what we produce over and above our needs in world trade for what it will bring; that is authorized by existing law, but has not been done.

Any farm program, if it is to work, requires an absolute cessation of the use of United States taxpayers' money for foreign aid to put the farmer out of business by providing everything for foreign expansion, including an umbrella over the sale of their increased production. If this foreign aid, which increases foreign production for export, is not stopped soon there will be no foreign markets to reach and the United States farmer will be cut back to producing for the domestic market only. Under existing administration policies such a situation is drawing near.

Activities of the House Committee on Public Works, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 84th Congress the Committee on Public Works left behind it an outstanding record of legislative

enactments which, without doubt, is the most important program of public works that has ever come from this committee during any session of the Congress.

Six hundred and twenty bills were referred to the committee during the first and second sessions. Eighty-six of these measures were acted upon favorably by the committee, 72 of which were passed by both Houses.

In addition, the committee adopted 74 river and harbor resolutions and 65 flood-control resolutions. These resolutions authorized review survey studies by the Corps of Engineers that will ultimately result in project reports submitted to Congress if the projects are found worthy and are approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers.

The committee also approved 141 post office and Federal office buildings for construction under the Lease-Purchase Act—Public Law 519, 83d Congress—involving a total estimated cost of $753,040,994. Of this number 88, at a total estimated cost of $516,532,540, carried budget approval; 22 at a total estimated cost of $11,662,954 were revised projects with budget approval; and 31 at a total estimated cost of $224,845,500 were approved subject to budget approval.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956 (PUBLIC LAW 627)

Probably the most outstanding piece of legislation handled by this committee is the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, providing for a $25.5 billion construction program on the Interstate Highway System through fiscal year 1969, and $2.5 billion for Federal-aid highways through fiscal year 1959. The States will provide matching funds in the amount of 50 percent on the Federal-aid highway system and 10 percent on the Interstate System. As a result of this legislation, the 43 States of the Nation are about to embark upon the largest highway building program in the history of the world.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS ACT OF 1956 (H. R. 12080)

Equally important to the Nation is the Omnibus River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1956, H. R. 12080. The committee gave detailed consideration to the needs of every section of the country in formulating this bill, especially with respect to flood control remedial works necessary as a result of the disastrous floods in the Kansas River area in 1954, the northeast floods induced by hurricanes which occurred last fall, and the west coast floods of last December and January. The bill contains 108 project authorizations in 37 States.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1956 (PUBLIC LAW 660)

This legislation is designed to strengthen and extend the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. It authorizes funds for research, investigations, training, and information programs, and provides financial assistance to States and Territories to assist them in meeting the cost of establishing water pollution control measures. In addition, it provides, for the first time, financial assistance to States, cities, and municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works. Fifty million dollars annually is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, with a maximum of $500 million for 10 years. The Federal grant for any project will be 30 percent of total cost, or $250,000, whichever is the smaller. The measure provides that 50 percent of the funds must be used for communities with less than 125,000 population. The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1957 carries a $50 million appropriation for the start of this program.

Below is a brief summary of other general bills acted upon favorably by the committee and enacted into law during the 84th Congress:

Small flood-control projects—Public Law 685: Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to allot not to exceed $10 million in any one fiscal year for construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by law, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is warranted, with not more than $400,000 to be allotted for any single locality. Will permit immediate construction of flood-protective works in many areas which might otherwise be unduly delayed awaiting the usual detailed survey and authorization process.

Federal participation in protection of private as well as public shore property—Public Law 826: Extends the policy of Federal participation in the construction of shore-protection measures to shores of privately owned property under certain circumstances, as well as the shores of publicly owned property. Also clarifies existing policy with respect to periodic placement of sand fills, and eliminates the presently unnecessary seawall proviso.

Hurricane damage study—Public Law 71: Authorizes Chief of Engineers to make an examination and survey, together with the United States Weather Bureau and other agencies, along the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States to secure data on movement of hurricanes, forecasting their paths, and investigating possible structural improvements which may be provided to prevent loss of life and property damages during the occurrence of hurricanes.

Following is a list of lease-purchase public building projects approved by the committee in the 84th Congress:

Public buildings approved, lease purchase program

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Albuquerque, N. Mex	Federal office building	$6,227,300	Oklahoma City, Okla	Courthouse and Federal office building	$7,140,000
Atlanta, Ga	Communicable disease center	12,330,000	Los Angeles, Calif	Customhouse and Federal office building	30,800,000
Omaha, Nebr	Post office and courthouse	9,579,823	Houston, Tex	Courthouse and Federal office building	15,300,000
Brunswick, Ga	do	1,431,000	Washington, D. C	Federal Office Building No. 5	25,250,000
Carthage, Tenn	Post office, etc	272,000	Boston, Mass	Federal office building	28,150,000
Biloxi, Miss	Post office and courthouse	1,110,000	Guilford, Conn	Post office, etc	154,600
Durham, N. H	Post office, etc	433,600	Helena, Ark	do	1,020,000
Jefferson, Ohio	Post office	78,125	Camden, Ala	do	272,000
Houston, Tex	do	7,100,000	Ronceverte, W. Va	do	255,000
Richmond, Va	Federal office building	7,410,000	Marshfield, Mo	do	324,000
New York, N. Y	United States mission to U. N	3,300,000	Winnetka, Ill	Post Office	326,000
Burlington, Vt	Post office and courthouse	2,830,000	Gering, Nebr	do	136,915
New Orleans, La	Post office, etc	14,200,000	Phoenix, Ariz	Courthouse and Federal office building	8,600,000
Minneapolis, Minn	Courthouse and Federal office building	5,877,815	Little Rock, Ark	Federal office building	9,150,000
Burlington, Iowa	Post office, etc	1,328,987	Emporia, Kans	Post office, etc	600,000
Lafayette, La	do	1,095,000	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Homewood).	Post office	238,500
Washington, D. C	Federal office building and Civil Service Commission building.	9,850,000	Pittsford, N. Y	do	135,395
Gainesville, Tex	Post office, etc	645,036	Leavenworth, Kans	Post office and courthouse	968,000
Toronto, Ohio	Post office	53,125	Mount Hope, W. Va	Bureau of Mines	700,000
Fort Mill, S. C	do	49,800	Sisseton, S. Dak	Post office, etc	530,000
Wayland, N. Y	do	56,250	Greenwich, N. Y	Post office	112,890
Parkersburg, W. Va	Courthouse and Federal office building	3,045,000	Washington, D. C	Federal Office Building No. 8	12,190,000
San Francisco, Calif	do	45,300,000	Smithville, Tenn	Post office, etc	263,000
Minden, La	Post office, etc	412,000	Rittman, Ohio	Post office	136,775
Philadelphia, Pa	Post office garage	1,805,000	National City, Calif	do	376,800
Sioux City, Iowa (Morningside).	Post office station	85,500	Detroit, Mich. (North End Station).	do	525,877
Sheboygan Falls, Wis	Post office	105,000	Newark, N. J. (Roseville).	do	227,675
Washington, D. C	Federal Office Building No. 6	16,275,000	Jersey City, N. J. (Bergen).	do	268,009
Do	U. S. Geological Survey Building	22,260,000	Waukesha, Wis	do	408,000
Sparta, Mich	Post Office	103,400	Livingston, Ala	Post office and Federal office building	279,000
Hudson, Mass	do	198,789	Miami, Fla	Federal office building	8,875,000
Kingsport, Tenn	Federal office building	1,146,000	Breese, Ill	Post office and Federal office building	271,000
Sacramento, Calif	Courthouse and Federal office building	10,210,000	Jonesboro, La	do	365,000
Bellflower, Calif	Post office	297,500	Moorhead, Minn	do	555,000
Tupper Lake, N. Y	do	107,554	Laurel, Miss	do	829,000
Lansford, Pa	do	94,000	McKinney, Tex	do	480,000
Teaneck, N. J	do	385,500	Terrell, Tex	do	392,000
Greenville, Miss	Post office and courthouse	1,200,000			
Washington, D. C	Meteorological center	30,990,000			

Public buildings approved, lease purchase program—Continued

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 7	$27,450,000	Redwood Falls, Minn.	Post office and Federal office building	$440,000
Do.	Federal Office Building No. 10	40,900,000	New Orleans, La.	Post office and garage facilities	19,670,000
Do.	Federal Office Building No. 9	22,115,000	Beaver, Pa.	Post office and Federal office building	310,000
Martinsburg, W. Va.	Post office and courthouse	1,400,000	Manning, S. C.	do	364,000
Dallas, Tex.	Courthouse and Federal office building	24,490,000	Hot Springs, Ark.	Post office and courthouse	1,729,000
Sedan, Kans.	Post office and Federal office building	218,000	Victoria, Tex.	do	1,563,000

Public buildings approved, subject to budget approval

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Hartford, Conn.	Federal office building	$8,350,000	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Federal office building	$23,960,000
Denver, Colo.	Courthouse	6,420,000	Sharon, Pa.	Post office and Federal office building	898,000
Monticello, Fla.	Post office and Federal office building	310,000	Lafayette, Tenn.	do	275,000
Milledgeville, Ga.	do	502,000	Daingerfield, Tex.	do	216,000
Fort Dodge, Iowa	Post office and courthouse	1,980,000	Orange, Tex.	do	620,000
Baltimore, Md.	Federal office building	19,170,000	San Marcos, Tex.	do	576,000
Denton, Md.	Post office and Federal office building	415,000	Salt Lake City, Utah	Federal office building	7,600,000
Bemidji, Minn.	do	1,200,000	Portsmouth, Va.	Post office and Federal office building	3,575,000
Brainerd, Minn.	do	612,000	Waynesboro, Va.	do	380,000
Moberly, Mo.	do	487,000	Franconia, Va.	Warehouse building	7,500,000
St. Louis, Mo.	Federal office building	13,760,000	Charleston, W. Va.	Courthouse and Federal office building	3,820,000
Do.	Federal records office	6,740,000	Wailuku, T. H.	Post office and Federal office building	757,000
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Courthouse and Federal office building	15,200,000	Ocala, Fla.	Post office and courthouse	1,580,000
New York, N. Y.	Customhouse and Federal office building	65,100,000	Benton, Ill.	do	1,100,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	Federal office building	21,700,000	Toledo, Ohio	Federal office building	4,950,000
Portland, Oreg.	do	5,092,500			

Projects approved on which revised specifications have been submitted

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
St. Mary's, Ohio	Post office	$126,400	Grundy, Va.	Post office	$106,000
Point Pleasant, N. J.	do	536,500	Newkirk, Okla.	do	98,100
Oxford, Pa.	do	109,000	Refugio, Tex.	do	117,700
East New York Station (New York).	do	491,300	West Memphis, Ark.	do	138,045
			Cashmere, Wash.	do	97,200
Denver, Colo.	do	8,209,000	Madison, Tenn.	do	138,000
Atlanta, Ga.	Motor vehicle shop and garage	252,644	Camden, N. Y.	do	147,300
Scranton, Pa.	Post office	94,300	Maplewood, N. J.	do	357,600
Garland, Tex.	do	183,450	Skaneateles, N. Y.	do	103,500
Grand Prairie, Tex.	do	245,000	Newtown, Pa.	do	150,915
Two Harbors, Minn.	do	107,400	New Richmond, Wis.	do	147,600
Ontonagon, Mich.	do	106,000			

Statement in Support of Amendments to the Social Security Act Contained in H. R. 7225

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to present my views on the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act embodied in H. R. 7225, and to voice my support for the humanitarian measures contained in this vital legislation.

When this legislation was before the House just a little over a year ago, I was glad to join my colleagues from Connecticut on the other side of the aisle in supporting these measures to improve our social-security laws. The other body passed a bill with certain modifications, and still further changes were made by the conference committee of the House and Senate. The final result, in my opinion, is not a perfect bill, but certainly one that will add many vitally needed changes to the Nation's social-security program.

I am particularly pleased that the essential characteristics of a provision for the payment of disability benefits has been retained in this bill. The Senate bill as it went to conference provided that this program for protection to those permanently and totally disabled be set up with a separate system of financing.

No doubt a great many, and probably even a majority, would agree with me in the belief that this was not necessary in order to preserve the integrity of the old-age and survivors insurance fund or to prevent excessive drains upon that fund. However, no one can quarrel with the desire of those who designed this particular provision to set up special safeguards to make doubly sure that the equity of the 70 million wage earners and self-employed who have contributed to the present reserve fund is thoroughly protected.

Even those of us who felt that it was probably not necessary can likewise agree that no harm is done by this arrangement and that the interest of those who look to the fund for the basis of their security in retirement as well as those who look to the newly created fund for protection against the contingency of physical disability are both adequately provided for.

I was pleased that the House and the other body promptly approved this bill as it came from conference. Passage of this bill in my opinion marked a significant advance in protection afforded the working people of this country. It will go down in the history of the social program of this country along with the first passage of the Social Security Act 21 years ago, the addition of survivors' insurance in 1939, the notable advancement in benefits marked by the amendments of 1950, and the significant extension of coverage contained in the amendments of 1954.

The extension of our system of social insurance for the first time into the field of disability insurance well deserves a place among those historic landmarks.

This venture, while of deep and lasting significance, should not be thought by any to be hasty or without the most careful study and analysis. In fact, a great part of the significance of this venture arises from the fact that it culminates efforts reaching back for some 18 years. I am informed that in 1938 studies made by the then Social Security Board outlined the feasibility of providing protection against the contingency of permanent and total disability. The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Finance Committee studied this proposal in 1948 and 1949. They included the following statement in their report to the Senate:

> Income loss from permanent and total disability is a major economic hazard to which, like old age and death, all gainful workers are exposed. The advisory council believes that the time has come to extend the Nation's social-insurance system to afford protection against this loss.

There can be no question concerning the need for such protection. On an average day the number of persons kept from gainful work by disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months is about 2 million. The economic hardship resulting from permanent and total disability is frequently even greater than that created by old age or death. The family must not only face the loss of the breadwinner's earnings but must meet the costs of medical care. As a rule, savings and other personal resources are soon exhausted.

This was the finding of a distinguished group of 17 people drawn from the fields of industry, organized labor, and representatives of the general public, many of whom held posts of honor and distinction in our great universities.

Members of longer service in this House will recall that the House bill of 1950 incorporated the recommendations of this advisory council but it failed of passage in the other body. We are most happy now to observe that the Senate bill carried this provision for payment of benefits to the permanently and totally disabled after age 50.

In 1954 a start was made toward the problem of disability by including the provision to freeze the benefits of those covered by social security who suffered disablement. This was a worthwhile step and it laid the foundations by proving that the determinations of a disability can be made soundly and objectively by a Government agency. The provisions similar to the waiver of premium provisions of private life insurance companies preserve the retirement benefits of a worker whose earnings were cut off because of his disability.

However, as Mr. George Meany, now president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, said in his statement to the Senate Finance Committee in support of this measure on April 9, 1954:

It is not enough to say to the permanently and totally disabled worker, "If you contrive to hold body and soul together during your years of incapacity until you reach age 65, we assure you payment of full retirement benefits."

This measure will give much more assurance to the unfortunate disabled workers. We are giving them the assurance that their primary retirement benefit will be paid to them if they should be forced to retire as early as age 50 because of a physical disability.

Through this legislation we are recognizing that men and women, while still young in years, are inflicted with the impairments associated with old age that result from illness, disease, and accident.

Many of us were distressed in the course of the hearings to observe the effort that was made to place the provision for benefit payments in opposition to rehabilitation efforts. No greater disservice could be done the very worthwhile and highly successful rehabilitation programs carried on by our State vocational rehabilitation agencies with the assistance that has been made available to them through Federal grants.

We need, however, to recognize that there are some cases that are beyond rehabilitation either because the physical impairment is too severe or because it occurs too late in life. But for the vast majority of the totally disabled rehabilitation is possible and great encouragement to the restoration of these people to useful and gainful employment will come from this measure. Their morale will be lifted knowing that the economic needs of the family are being met, at least in part.

Assistance as well as encouragement will come from the provision to retain the benefit status for a maximum of a year for getting started in a new occupation or employment. I look for the greatest advancement in the field of rehabilitation that we have seen in many years.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt upon the disability benefits aspect of this legislation which is, of course, a most important aspect of the bill, and one often misunderstood. However, H. R. 7225 does much more than provide disability benefits.

The bill also provides for lowering the retirement age from 65 to 62 for widows and surviving dependent mothers. The bill provides that insurance benefits for children who were disabled before they reached the age of 18 may be continued so long as their disability remains, which I feel is perhaps the most humane and desperately needed amendment contained in the bill.

The bill provides for a more liberal coverage for migrant agricultural workers, and for Ministers working outside the limits of the United States. The bill has many other provisions worthy of merit, but the ones that I have listed should serve to show the great good that this legislation will do for so many Americans.

I feel confident that the provisions of H. R. 7225 will become part of our social security laws. I am also confident that the liberalization of our existing social security laws provided for in this humanitarian legislation will be welcomed by the American people as one of the outstanding achievements of the 84th Congress.

Beware of Republican Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we all remember how during the 1952 campaign, Republicans told us about how inflation was destroying the country and that their election would stop the runaway inflation and bring things back to normal. One of the things they prated most about was their ability to increase the value of the dollar.

The statistics made available to us during this last week of this session of Congress establish the emptiness of their promises and their inability to cope with the situation. Our Republican friends can hardly pretend that the figures were colored, certainly not colored against them, because the statistics have been made available to us by departments controlled by Republican-appointed Republican appointees.

There has been a softening of the talk about controlling credit as the inflationary influences continue at work. While the profits of the big corporations have continued to climb, the profits of the small-business man have continued to decline. While the earnings of the wage earner have declined, disappeared, or remained static, the cost of living has increased and the value of the dollar has again slipped.

Thus far in 1956, the rate of failures, according to Dun & Bradstreet, is higher than in any of the previous years in this administration. Obviously the failures are not in big business, but in small business.

The national public debt at the end of the year 1952 was just over $259 billion. At the end of 1953 it was $7 billion higher. It climbed another $5 billion in 1954, and more than $3 billion more in 1955. The 1956 estimate indicates that there will be no decrease.

Textile Enigma Under the Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, are we not shocked by recent figures indicating that from 1947 to 1955 textile jobs in New England declined from 301,000 to 172,000? Do we not realize that this means a loss of 43 percent in the largest manufacturing industry in our region? How long can this continue, I ask in all reasonableness, without completely wrecking this vital industry?

What is the remedy? Well, a large part of it lies in checking cutthroat foreign competition. Rapidly growing imports from Japan, added to the rest, now create a great additional threat.

Now we are selling surplus cotton to Japan 25 percent below domestic prices. If this continues, it will provide us with another fantastic, crazy-quilt economic pattern—American cotton purchased and stored with money of American taxpayers, sold at reduced prices to foreign nations, converted under sweatshop and coolie conditions into textile goods and shipped back into the United States under the terms of the Geneva agreement to compete with high-standard, high-cost American labor and goods. The conclusion is inescapable that the New England textile industry under this agreement is made to bear the brunt and become the goat of the help-Japan policy now being followed at Washington.

Is it wise for us to give ourselves a knockout, economic blow in order to help other nations? Yet that is just what is happening under the current policy. It is interesting to note that not a single European country granted comparable concessions to ours in the 1955

parleys. How long can this Nation pursue this policy without most serious impact upon our economy?

We can ill afford to overlook the importance of attacking the problems presented by cutthroat competition in textiles by Japan and other nations, and I hope that satisfactory agreements may be reached at an early date and, if not, that Congress will go forward with appropriate legislation to check these injurious imports.

By all means, let us be friendly and helpful in every practicable way to Japan and other free nations. But let us, in that process, in carrying out that aim of good will and cooperation, let us avoid measures that will inevitably destroy our own industries and seriously impair the overall strength of our own economy.

Fundamental Differences Between the Democratic and Republican Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following in the RECORD.

Before this 84th Congress fades into history, before we go home to account for our stewardships and begin our campaigns, I should like to say that never before have I felt so proud to be a Democrat.

For the accomplishments of this 84th Congress are Democratic—not Republican—accomplishments; and the failures of this 84th Congress are Republican—not Democratic—failures.

I am, of course, partisan. Yet all Democrats are partisan—consistently partisan—in their beliefs. For Democrats are consistently partisan to people, and to the things people need for richer, happier, healthier lives.

But the distinction between this Nation's two major parties is far greater than a simple matter of consistency.

The Republican Party is the party of property values.

The Democratic Party is the party of human values.

And no matter where you encounter the members of one party or the other—whether at the local, State, or National levels—you will find this same sharp cleavage, this same basic difference in approach to government.

I feel that I am in a particularly good position to make the comparison, for I not only served in the Senate of Pennsylvania under four Republican governors, but I just recently served in my State's senate under a Democratic governor.

The comparison is as stark as the difference between day and night.

If I ever had illlusions about the Republican Party—and it must have been long ago since I do not recall them—I have none now.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you this: Reaction is reaction wherever you find it. There is only a difference of degree between the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and the National Association of Manufacturers; there is only a difference of degree between reactionary government in Harrisburg and reactionary Government in Washington.

At long last Pennsylvania has a Democratic governor in George M. Leader. And in the short year and a half since his inauguration, our Commonwealth has taken giant strides into the 20th century.

Governor Leader took office with a positive, constructive, forward-looking program. He wanted to put unemployed men and women back to work; he wanted to ease the plight of the mentally ill, which was scandalous; he wanted to rebuild Pennsylvania's school system and, especially, to lend a hand to his State's crippled, retarded, and otherwise handicapped children.

He has done these things and more. But he had to do it the hard way, because a Republican-controlled senate booby-trapped every inch of the road toward humane accomplishment.

Among other things, Mr. Speaker, Governor Leader concerned himself and his administration with the problem of the totally disabled worker. Why, he wondered, should a totally disabled man be disqualified for workmen's compensation after a prescribed period of time? Should a disabled worker be forced to beg until 65, when he would be eligible for social security?

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania now has a revised workmen's compensation law. It is among the best in the Nation, and it provides—among other things—that a totally disabled worker will henceforth receive compensation as long as he lives.

Such legislation has been overdue since 1800. Certainly it poses no moral or ethical problem to anyone who believes in decency or fairness.

Yet in 1955 the Republican Senate in Pennsylvania fought tooth and nail to keep that law from passing. Big business opposed it, you see, and big business calls the shots for Pennsylvania's Republican Party just as big business calls the shots for the Republicans right here in Congress.

Governor Leader got the workmen's compensation law he wanted by going to the people. The people spoke—and in no uncertain terms, for human beings think in terms of humanity, and not in terms of profit and loss statements.

I mention this one law passed in Harrisburg because the Democratic Party in Washington has long fought to give the totally disabled worker his social security at the age of 50.

We have finally won that fight, but only by the hardest effort.

President Eisenhower opposed it, and expressed his administration's opposition through Marion Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Folsom, testifying against the amendment said:

> We should be careful not to take any step which might reduce the incentive for rehabilitation.

Now if a disabled worker has been certified by doctors as permanently disabled, what, in the name of all that is holy, are his chances for rehabilitation? Does medical opinion have no validity?

The point is timely, Mr. Speaker, for no administration in this country's history has ever set more store by medical opinion, has ever claimed for the physician the infallible powers of the oracle.

And while we are on the subject of social security, what of the amendment which reduced, from 65 to 62, the age at which a woman can retire? The Democratic Party passed that amendment, Mr. Speaker, and President Eisenhower's Republican stalwarts fought it all the way.

Mr. Folsom had something to say about that amendment too.

> Such a change—
>
> He pontificated—
>
> would actually be a disservice to many thousands of older women by reducing their opportunities for employment.

Does it take a degree in sociology to know that a woman's chance of getting a job at 62 is one in a million?

Ask the working women of America how easy it is to find work at 52, or even at 42. They know how to answer Mr. Folsom.

Yet, Mr. Folsom's pious nonsense is not surprising. Unless, of course, we are still capable of being surprised at Republican thought processes. For Mr. Folsom is simply expressing what his party believes, and what the President believes.

But let us continue our parallel between Harrisburg, Pa., and Washington, D. C. Let us discuss taxes.

When the Democrats took office, we Pennsylvanians inherited a financial mess that beggars description. We also inherited a tax dear to the Republican heart—a tax absolutely guaranteed to milk the many and spare the few. For the reverse-English Robin Hoods of the Republican Party had placed a sales tax on the people of Pennsylvania.

The Governor took it off, pointing out its unfairness, and asked for a tax based upon a person's ability to pay. Specifically, he requested a classified income tax.

The Republican Party would have none of it, and months dragged on. Governor Leader proposed a manufacturer's excise tax. The GOP, ever alert to the dictates of big business, killed it. Governor Leader offered a compromise proposal in desperation. The answer was still "No."

To make a long story short, Governor Leader—the Republican pistol at his back—was finally forced to swallow another sales tax. It was that or nothing, said the GOP, and either the Governor would or the Commonwealth could go broke.

I should like to remind the House, however, that Pennsylvania's Senators of the Republican Party were merely taking their cue from the Republicans of the 83d Congress, whose view of taxation was identical.

All of us, I think, remember that tax-relief bill.

What a bill it was. It filled every Republican heart with nostalgia for the good old days of Andrew Mellon.

Some $7.4 billion was slashed. And what happened to each tax-relief dollar? The corporation got 73 cents; families earning more than $5,000 a year got 18 cents; and families earning less than $5,000 got 9 cents.

Working mothers got less than a nickel. Families with heavy medical expenses got less than a dime. In other words, 80 percent of the people got only 9 percent of the tax relief.

Yet when the Democrats tried to correct the unfairness of the 1954 tax bill by giving every taxpayer a $20 tax cut, the Republican Party called them irresponsible.

How long can this Republican doubletalk go on? Does the GOP think the American people will mistake the word for the deed indefinitely? Does President Eisenhower's administration believe that the ever-widening gap between promise and performance will go unnoticed?

One last example, Mr. Speaker.

In Pennsylvania, a Democratic administration has just passed the most extraordinary school-construction program in Commonwealth history. It makes available $500 million for new building.

Here in Congress we have just seen a Federal school-construction bill go down the drain—thanks to the Republican Party.

No one will argue with the critical need for schools in every one of these 48 States.

Yet, despite the President's specific request for the school bill, his own party preferred to sabotage the future schooling of future citizens by voting against it.

Why, the Powell amendment, to deny aid to any State where segregation exists, was supported by 148 members of the Republican Party. Would it not be reasonable to expect that, having voted for the Powell amendment, all 148 would vote for the entire school-construction bill?

They did not, of course. Of those 148 Republicans, 96 voted against the bill in its final version, thus killing it for this session. Their reason is plain: They expect to tell their Negro constituents that they supported the Powell amendment in their campaigning this fall.

In all of my political experience, Mr. Speaker, I have never encountered a lower brand of politics nor a more sickening instance of hypocrisy.

Yet, this being an election year, every Republican who seeks reelection will declare that he likes Ike, will claim that he has followed him faithfully, will insist that he and Ike both think alike—and that both of them are rock-ribbed liberals.

It happened 4 years ago, and it will happen again.

From the drab, dreary cocoons of reaction will crawl the Republican butterflies of liberalism—to flutter briefly across the political landscape and die conveniently on November 6.

But I do not think they will dazzle the voters again.

Yet we must expect them to try. And make no mistake about it: They will try their best to fool the people once more.

Tambourines will rattle and bass drums will boom; radio, television, and the press—primed with advertising dollars—will sound the jamboree; and the techniques of revival tent and medicine show will once more be used to paddle the snake-oil liberalism of the Republican Party in an election year.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, is to becloud the issues. For if the issues are sufficiently smogbound, they think, all a candidate will have to do is say the magic works: "I like Ike."

But does the Republican Party really like Ike?

I say it does not—except in an election year. They will follow him merrily to the polls, but not one step further.

As a military man, General Eisenhower must realize that the possibilities of maneuver are limited when the awkward squad you command disobeys any order but "squads right."

And the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, turns to the right just as inexorably as a compass needle turns north.

So where is this vaunted Eisenhower leadership? It ended, I think with World War II. Nor is the President entirely to blame.

For you cannot lead Republicans unless you carry the Dun and Bradstreet seal of approval.

I think that the voters know that now.

I do not think that they will forget the lesson quickly despite all the ballyhoo the GOP will generate.

I think that this will be an election in which the issues will determine the results.

And speaking as a member of the Democratic Party, I think the issues tell the story.

I think the record speaks for itself.

It is a Democratic record of man's responsibility to man.

American Music at Home and Abroad—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we in America can be proud of our country for a great many reasons, reasons which have been stated often on the floor of the House during this session of the Congress. It does seem to me, however, that there is a tendency on the part of our fellow citizens to overlook one aspect of American life of which we have every right to be proud. I refer to our cultural attainments. In this area we sometimes tend to think that we are weak and must look to other countries for leadership. America is, of course, greatly indebted to Western Europe for a great deal of its cultural heritage and we should be thankful for it but, at the same time, we have contributed a great deal that is of outstanding and lasting value to Western culture in the field of the arts and crafts.

Of all these contributions none is more important than our jazz music. This musical form has been developed fully in the United States in recent years and it has been one of our most successful exports abroad. Of this export I should like to speak in a moment. At this point, I should like to discuss briefly the state of music in America in 1956.

For many years our musicians who played American music played to very small audiences, and, as a result, many a fine American musician was forced either to give up his music or starve. Of course, a few musicians whose names were widely known were extremely well paid from the beginning but those musicians who were less well known, while in many cases they were equally gifted as musicians, found it extremely difficult to make a living at all.

Today, we have begun to appreciate our music on a much wider scale and it is possible to hear it in many cities of our land. It is played by our symphony orchestras of which there are more than 900. It is played over the air by radio and television stations. We hear it on records, long playing and short, classical and jazz. We hear it in our night clubs and in our fine hotels. We hear it in our theaters, especially the living theater, and in our movies. In many, many places—but so much of it is recorded and played by only a few name bands, and our symphony orchestras devote less than 10 percent of their programs to our own music. So, while Americans in all walks of life are now beginning to appreciate our own music it is still very hard for a musician to earn a living, and if something is not done soon to correct the situation, it may soon reach a point where it is not possible for more than a few musicians to make a living at all.

One of the principal reasons for this unfortunate situation is very simply that the places where music is being played are finding it increasingly difficult to stay in business. Cabarets and night clubs, hotel dining salons, and so on are all existing on the slimmest of profit margins or going out of business. All too frequently they are being forced by high taxes, among other things, to drop live entertainment and living musicians in order to stay in business. Thus at place after place throughout our land music is being heard increasingly on records and the living musician is finding it increasingly difficult to make a livelihood—and this is in the wealthiest nation in the entire history of the world.

In a speech before the New Jersey Hotel Association I attempted to develop the background information supporting a bill I have introduced in the Congress to help keep music alive in our land. My measure would eliminate the entertainment or cabaret tax. I am confident that the elimination of this tax would help relieve a deplorable unemployment situation which is facing many thousands of good American musicians and I should like to see the Congress adopt this legislation during the next session.

I include here my speech before the New Jersey Hotel Association in which I set forth my concern for American music and American musicians:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, NEW JERSEY, AT THE 38TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERSEY HOTEL ASSOCIATION, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., APRIL 23, 1956

Many hotel people in New Jersey and particularly in my district have complimented me on my sponsorship of H. R. 8403 to repeal the so-called 20 percent cabaret tax. I am deeply appreciative of the support you and your national office in Washington are giving me and others who seek to abolish this uneconomic and wholly repressive tax, I am conscious that your industry has been one of the chief sufferers under this misguided Federal tax policy. In the last 6 years, I am informed, fully two-thirds of all of the hotel rooms throughout the country formerly devoted to dine-dance entertainment have either been darkened or converted to other uses. I am conscious, too, of the unemployment this tax policy has occasioned among service people, entertainers and particularly musicians.

Down in Washington where the administration continues to proclaim this as a "no-tax-cut-year," we are told that it would cost the Treasury $40 million a year to abolish this tax. I do not accept that kind of schoolboy mathematics or economics. Recently I have seen the findings of a national survey conducted by a responsible independent fact-finding agency, the Research Company of America. It was made at the instance of the American Federation of Musicians. During the course of this survey the researchers talked to many hotel people like yourselves and to hundreds of others in the entertainment business. They came up with a finding that if this prohibitive 20 percent tax is repealed the Treasury will actually benefit to the extent of some $12 million annually over and above the $40 million which this tax now turns in to the Treasury. These extra accruals would come, of course, from increased business taxes and largely increased personal taxes resulting from more business and more employment.

It would be pure political "bunkum" for me to tell you today that my sole motivation in sponsoring repeal of the 20-percent cabaret tax was to help the hotel industry. That would be only half the truth and half truths are half lies. There was an added motive that cuts much deeper than the economics of any industry. That motive concerns our future as society which can hold its head high as a leader of the free world.

I imagine that many of you know that, in addition to my sponsorship of legislation to repeal the cabaret tax, I am the author of several other proposals to safeguard music and the arts. It happens that the cabaret tax is probably responsible for fully half of the wide unemployment existing among musicians, a critical situation that now threatens the very existence of musical culture in our Nation. In a country which has done so much in the past to overcome its inferiority complex regarding its musical creativeness and appreciation, this is a tragic situation.

I am concerned, too, that the weakest link in our defense against communism, the puniest effort in our all-important contest to win the hearts and minds of free men, lies in the fields of our cultural relations with other nations. The administration in Washington confesses that the Russians are spending more than $3 billion annually on direct propaganda designed to communize the free world. Yet we have matched this mammoth effort with something like $5 million a year over the last 2 years to display our cultural attainments abroad.

Presently we have the advantage of great talents for export. The timid, parsimonious experiments our State Department have made have paid off handsomely. I refer to the tours of some of our great symphonies, the triumphal appearances abroad of the American folklore classic, Porgy and Bess, and yes, to the American jazz presentation of "Satchmo" Armstrong and his lusty hornblowers. I repeat that presently we have great talent for export. But the wells of great talent, particularly in the field of music, are fast drying up. Why? Because I am forced to admit reluctantly there is some merit to the Russian claim that we are a materialistic people bent on corraling a fast buck while we let our great heritage in the arts exist in a garret, and the garret, I fear, is about to be foreclosed by the United States Treasury unless the present tax policy is modified.

In spite of an outmoded, uneconomic Federal tax policy the hotel industry still is a large employer of musicians. If we are successful in abolishing or reducing substantially the 20 percent cabaret tax your industry will become a much larger employer of instrumentalists. It is from employment pools such as you create and maintain that great talents in music emerge, just as the sandlots of America supply the great stars of the baseball diamond.

Unless we can awaken the Federal Government to its responsibilities with respect to music and all of the cultural arts the vaunted "American way of life" will become a very dull and pallid export product indeed. Take the field of music alone:

While most occupational groups have enjoyed a great expansion of job opportunities since 1930, musicians have suffered a 40 percent job loss. There were enough jobs in 1930 to provide full-time work for 99,000 musicians. By 1954 there were full-time jobs for only 59,000. The instrumental musicians lost 20,000 man-years of work between 1930 and 1940 due to the advent of mechanical music. Since 1943 an additional 25,000 man-years of work has been lost in places subject to the 20 percent cabaret tax which you and I seek to abolish. Average earnings for instrumentalists in 1954 were $3,454. Little wonder the profession of music attracts fewer newcomers each succeeding year.

My concern for the shrinking field of music and musicians lies in the area of jazz and theater music as well as "longhair" or cultural instrumentation. I realize that we cannot continue to have great musicians in America unless we have great numbers of musicians gainfully employed. Nor can we continue to create a great American musical idiom of our own unless we encourage the dance and jazz musicians which you largely employ.

The one consoling aspect of this glum story of the decline of music in America is that the public is not to blame. Indeed, there are significant signs that public demand for good music is beginning to tax the dwindling supply of skilled instrumentalists. Between 1945 and 1954 this public demand created new part-time jobs for some 7,500 players of symphonic music. Unfortunately, our major symphonies operate for an average season of only 22 weeks per year and the secondary orchestras average no more than 8 weeks a year. Although the major symphonies require the finest in musical talent and training, the minimum scale for instrumentalists of many years' training averages only $89.02 per week. No fond father is going to willingly consent to son John perpetuating his horn-blowing career in college unless the economics of professional musicianship improve.

As people in the hotel business many of you are acutely conscious of the importance of our natural resources as an attraction for tourists. As a Congressman, I have frequent occasions to vote upon bills devoted to the conservation of natural resources. It reminds me that there are more natural resources for us to be concerned about than our forests and our minerals and water supply. None of us in Congress or here in this room would willfully destroy valuable timber lands by lighting a forest fire. I see no reason why we should be less concerned about our cultural resources. The depletion of our musical profession is more insidious than a great forest fire because it takes place slowly and it doesn't throw up a great light. For this reason it is more difficult to fight. The reduction of the present cabaret tax, however, is as clear a bit of fire prevention as I can think of in this area of conservation, and I urge your support of our efforts in Congress to reduce this destructive bit of taxation.

Activities of the House Committee on Government Operations During the 2d Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations continued its efforts to make itself a more effective instrumentality of the House of Representatives. No matter is more basic to the preservation of the checks and balances of our constitutional form of democracy than continuous and comprehensive review of executive and administrative actions by the Congress. The committee's activities, therefore, have been directed toward assuring responsible, efficient, and economical administration of the laws in addition to its role in the enactment of legislation.

OVERSIGHT OF AGENCY EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS—GENERAL OVERSIGHT OF EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS

Just 10 years ago the Congress enacted the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. By its terms the Committee on Government Operations was required among other things to evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

As an incident of such evaluation the committee has had a review made of the evolution of the powers and duties of the committee and summarizes such a review for this report.

As early as 1816 Congress recognized its inherent right and responsibility to follow the appropriated dollar by creating a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. At that time the only executive departments were State, Treasury, War, and Navy. As new departments were created corresponding new committees on expenditures in the executive departments were added until they became 11 in number.

These committees had no established means of getting information about expenditures. None of their data came to them automatically—everything had to be in the nature of a special investigation. The result was that their work was necessarily limited in effect.

This situation was in a large measure responsible for the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

The hearings and debates on that measure so clearly reveal the intent of Congress in respect to what is now the Committee on Government Operations as to merit quoting at length. Prof. W. F. Willoughby, a prominent political scientist was called upon to assist in this study. His testimony was voluminous and received by the legislative committee hearing the bill with every evidence of respect and agreement. After outlining a parallel in the British Parliament, Professor Willoughby went on to say:

Congress is a fund granting authority. No organ that grants funds has fulfilled its obligation until it follows up and sees that the orders it has given have been carried out * * * [It should be the duty of the Comptroller General to] give Congress as complete a report of the way its agent, the administration, has carried out the orders given to it as possible. * * * [I would have a public accounts committee created.] I think if you merely provide for this Comptroller and auditor general submitting a report, and stop there, you do not get very far. We know the end of most official reports. They are filed and dismissed. * * * Congress should make provision for a committee on accounts, whose duty it would be to receive this report, examine it, take up all the points that were mentioned for examination, and if the criticism was of the Bureau of Fisheries, for example, in respect to the exercise of its discretion in the establishment of a station where it was not needed, or what not, the committee could call the director of the bureau before it, or any other officials. It would have the comptroller and auditor general right at its elbow to act as its technical adviser, and they would track that right out and report the results to the House. That committee ought to be a very serious-minded and a very important committee. It would assume all the functions of [the numerous committees on expenditures] and perform them in a much more efficient way, because it will get the information automatically rather than as the result of a special investigation.

A month later these views were reflected in the debate in the House where Mr. Byrns said:

The control of expenditures should properly be vested in the fund-granting rather than the fund-spending department. No private business of any magnitude would permit its executive officers who are charged with the duty of handling its finances, to audit its own accounts. And yet that is exactly the course pursued in our Government under the present system. * * * Congress has no control over expenditure. It cannot have complete control of expenditures without some system whereby the expenditures may be subjected to an examination by independent officers for the purpose of seeing whether or not the wishes of Congress in making the appropriations and any conditions imposed in making the grants are carried out in good faith. * * * The pending bill seeks to [provide] an officer, responsible only to Congress, whose duty it shall be to audit and pass on the legality of all Government expenditures.

Mr. Madden recognized the necessity for a strong single committee of the Congress to receive reports from the Comptroller General and make recommendations based on them.

Mr. Madden said:

If I have my way, when this legislation is completed, I shall propose the creation of a great committee of the House, to be known as the Committee on Expenditures, consisting of the best men in the House—because it is to be a great committee if it is created—to whom this auditor and Comptroller General may report from day to day, and through this medium supply the House of Representatives and the Senate with such information as to what is being done with the money appropriated as to keep the Congress advised in connection with every step taken. In this way we will have a check against the executive branch of the Government not only as to the methods of appropriating, but as to the method of expenditure, and my judgment is that the foundation of the future financial system of economy could not be so well laid in any other way as by the adoption of the bill, which is now before you for consideration.

However, it was not until 1927 that action was taken to consolidate the 11 expenditure committees. The next year Congress clarified and made specific the power of the committee to obtain information from the executive department and independent establishments.

Every executive department and independent establishment of the Government shall, upon request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, or any 7 members thereof, or upon the request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate, or any 5 members thereof, furnish any information requested of it relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of said committee. (May 29, 1928, ch. 901, No. 2, 45 Stat. 996.)

But even then there was no clear delineation of function or jurisdiction directly reflecting the intent of the Budget and Accounting Act. This delineation awaited the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In the studies that accompany the report on that act the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is not even listed among the hitherto important committees of the House. Small wonder, since in the preceding Congress it had held 19 hearings.

For the 2d session of the 84th Congress, lasting some 230 days, the committee has held 206 days of investigative hearings in addition to its legislative hearings. This growth in committee activity, in large part, may well be due to the definition of its jurisdiction adopted as a House rule pursuant to the enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

REVIEW OF AUDITS BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

During the past year the General Accounting Office has stepped up the number of its audits. More important, it has now adopted a policy of making comprehensive audits as distinguished from a mere dollar-and-cents reconciliation. As stated by the Comptroller General:

A comprehensive audit includes consideration of the following:

1. That the agency is carrying out only those activities or programs authorized by the Congress and is conducting them efficiently and in the manner authorized by the Congress.

2. That expenditures are made only in the furtherance of authorized activities and in accordance with the requirements of applicable laws and regulations, including decisions of the Comptroller General.

3. That the agency collects and accounts properly for all revenues and receipts arising from its activities.

4. That the assets of the agency or in its custody are adequately safeguarded and controlled and utilized in an efficient manner.

5. That reports by the agencies to the Congress and to the central control agencies, such as the Bureau of the Budget, disclose fully the nature and scope of activities conducted and provide a proper basis for evaluating the agencies' operations.

The Committee on Government Operations is rearranging its work program so as to receive these comprehensive audits, and, in terms of the legislative intent, examine them, question the officials concerned, get the technical advice of the Comptroller General, and then make its recommendations available to subject-matter committees, the Appropriations Committee, and the Congress. To this end an analysis of the latest comprehensive audits is now being made.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

It is only within the adult life of most of the Members of Congress that the growth of recourse to administrative agencies has made the Federal agencies assume such great importance. This growth has been so phenomenally rapid that the attention of Congress to matters of administrative procedure has lagged behind the growth. Yet more and more our daily lives and economic activity are influenced or directly regulated by procedures within Federal agencies.

The Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the committee, recently made the following comment on this subject:

The calculated executive expropriation of direction and control in the administrative agencies tends to obscure the fact that these rulemaking functions are derived solely from the Congress in the exercise of which the administrative agencies are responsible to the Congress.

The remedy for the resultant administrative irresponsibility is a conspicuous and unequivocal precept that these agencies are conformably accountable to the Congress. As Elihu Root said, "these agencies of regulation must themselves be regulated."

And the application of this remedy is exclusively in the hands of Congress. Professor Schwartz has appositely pointed out, "the role of the courts is to grant relief against administrative action which is ultra vires—that is, which exceeds the limits of the powers delegated by law."

The question of the propriety and effectiveness of the utilization of the powers thus delegated is solely the concern of the Congress as is also the precision with which the agency to which the power is delegated exemplifies the legislative intent which prompted the delegation.

As a means of implementing these views a questionnaire is being sent to each administrative agency in the Government. This questionnaire is prepared by experts in the field and covers every aspect of the numerous questions that arise. The purpose is to examine whether the laws enacted by the Congress are being efficiently administered so as to serve the public purposes embodied in the statutes while incorporating the elements of fair play to our citizenry which the courts long ago characterized as the due process necessary

to the preservation of our system of government.

The answers to this questionnaire will be published this year. It is expected that they will serve to disclose places in the present law which need amendment, instances which require administrative remedial action and areas not covered by any law or regulation.

This may well be one of the most useful and far-reaching studies made by this Congress.

SAVINGS IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

By subjecting the activities of the various departments and agencies to a continuous review, the committee has laid the foundation for, and actually brought about considerable dollar savings in Federal expenditures. The greatest savings come when the agencies are made conscious of the fact that a committee of the House, such as the Committee on Government Operations, is always scrutinizing the expenditures authorized by the Congress and the operations conducted by the agencies in connection with such expenditures.

For example, the reports of the Commission on Organization on certain supply activities in the Department of Defense called attention to the fact that the congressional mandate for unification of supply activities largely was being ignored. The Commission's reports estimated that more than half a billion dollars annually could be saved if the congressional policy of unified supply services for the military departments was followed. As a result of the committee's studies and investigations the Department of Defense installed a single manager system for supply which may result in the savings in the near future.

The committee's activities have resulted in very specific and very tangible savings in a number of areas. More important, the fact that the committee caused the savings of specific sums will undoubtedly lead the departments and agencies concerned to save many times the amounts involved in the specific situations called to their attention by the committee's investigations. Some examples of these kinds of specific savings which should have salutary effects upon departmental operations leading to even greater savings are as follows:

Approximately $14 million had been earmarked for contracts for survival studies by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Only slightly in excess of $1 million had been obligated for these contract studies. Before the hearings of the committee were completed the FCDA began a critical review of these studies. There is good reason to believe that a review of these studies in the light of what the committee's report recommended will result in these contracts not being awarded as planned. If the FCDA suspends these contracts, the savings will approximate $13 million.

The committee's investigation of Commodity Credit Corporation transactions in butter and cheese have led to legal action by the Attorney General to recoup approximately $2½ million paid out to processors of such commodities. Similarly, the committee's investigation into the distribution costs connected with the school lunch program in the State of Illinois resulted in a new contract which saved taxpayers about $150,000 in a period of about 8 months.

The committee's investigation into the use of experts and consultants will result in a more judicious use of this authority. In the case of individual experts and consultants, if the committee's recommendations are followed, there should be an annual reduction of costs in the amount of approximately $25,000. Several million dollars a year will be saved as a result of a probable curtailment of the use of contracts with firms or organizations of such experts or consultants.

A good example of how the committee's investigation of one instance will result in the savings of millions to the Government can be found in connection with the disposal of surplus property by the General Services Administration. The committee found that General Services Administration was about to dispose of an alumina plant at Laramie Wyo., at a proposed sale price of $1.2 million. The committee's investigation of the matter resulted in a higher bid by the same high bidder yielding $173,000 more to the Government.

The committee's legislative actions were also directed to the savings of specific sums of money wherever possible. An example of this can be found in H. R. 9593, Public Law 798, which would set up an entirely new method of paying claims out of appropriations which have lapsed. It is estimated that once this system has been placed into operation there will be an annual saving of some $600,000.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

In order to carry out its responsibilities of regular oversight of agency activities as well as the study of special problems, the committee has functioned during the 2d session of the 84th Congress through a number of subcommittees as follows:

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman.

Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. EARL CHUDOFF, chairman.

International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman.

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman.

Special Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman.

Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman.

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.

Special Water Resources and Power Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, chairman.

LEGISLATION

The committee has had studies made of the several score bills referred to it in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. Hearings were held on many of the bills and a number of important pieces of legislation were reported favorably to the House.

First. Budget and accounting legislation:

Under rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee receives budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations. Legislation governing the budget and accounting system of the Government is basic both to congressional control over the purse and to efficient management in Federal administration.

A major change in the governmental accounting system is incorporated in H. R. 9593, which was reported by the committee. This legislation will permit each agency to consolidate obligated balances in merged appropriation accounts and pay obligations chargeable against such accounts without prior reference to the General Accounting Office. This simplified procedure will save Government service hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. It will also clarify expenditures by the various agencies inasmuch as the obligations will be paid by the individual agency rather than out of a central certified claims account maintained by the Treasury Department. H. R. 9593 became Public Law 798 of the 84th Congress.

A long step toward improving budgeting and accounting in the Federal Government was taken when the committee favorably reported H. R. 11526 to the House. This legislation will not only promote simplification in reporting the complex financial operations of the Government but will also lead to greater congressional control over appropriated funds. The legislation should also contribute to reducing the large carryover of funds from year to year which has reached tremendous proportions and over which the Congress has become increasingly concerned in connection with request for new appropriations. H. R. 11526 would accomplish these results by requiring that budget estimates be predicated on a cost basis and that Government accounts be maintained on an accrual basis. In the interest of expediting congressional action H. R. 11526 was substituted by the House as the text of S. 3897, and S. 3897 became Public Law 863 of the 84th Congress.

Second. Disposal of Federal property:

The committee has general legislative jurisdiction under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 over disposals of Federal surplus property. Under this statute, Congress has laid down certain general rules and created administrative machinery for disposals of Federal surplus property pursuant to article 4, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States.

From time to time legislative proposals are made for disposals of individual parcels of property as exceptions to the general laws enacted by the Congress. The committee has had a substantial legislative workload in considering and passing upon many bills for such disposals.

In each case the committee has had to consider the particular details and circumstances of the proposed disposal of real property belonging to the United States. The particular circumstances have to be weighed against considerations of national policy and national interest to see whether there is a justification for departure from the established general statutory procedure. In the 2d session of the 84th Congress the committee reported favorably to the House approximately a score of bills providing for disposals of real property. Eighteen of these bills passed the House and 17 bills became law.

Third. Amendment of Employment Act of 1946:

One of the most important pieces of legislation recommended by the committee in the past became the Employment Act of 1946. This legislation provided, among other things, for systematic and continuous attention by the Congress to economic indicators through the medium of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, established by the 1946 act. That act also required the President to transmit his economic report to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session. H. R. 9764, reported favorably by the committee in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, changes the name of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to the Joint Economic Committee and provides a more specific date for the submission of the President's Economic Report to the Congress following upon the transmission of the President's budget. The latter provisions will enable the Council of Economic Advisers to take budget proposals into consideration in the preparation of the economic report. This bill became Public Law 591 of the 84th Congress.

Fourth. Travel expenses of Federal employees:

In connection with its continuous interest in, and responsibility for, the efficiency of general administrative procedure in the Federal agencies, the committee reported favorably to the House, H. R. 11515. This bill would permit the payment of expenses of travel of persons selected for appointment in manpower shortage occupations and would authorize the payment of expenses of transportation of their immediate families and household effects. In addition the bill would authorize the payment of travel expenses of persons in manpower shortage categories who are invited to visit a Federal establishment for purposes connected with employment. This legislation was intended to enable the Government to recruit enough scientists, engineers, and other technically trained personnel in manpower shortage categories to provide for our military preparedness and efficient conduct of the Government. H. R. 11515 was passed by the House on July 26, 1956.

Fifth. Improvements in paperwork management:

In order to achieve economies in the field of paperwork management, the committee favorably reported S. 2364. This legislation would remove any doubt about the authority of the Administrator of General Services to promulgate policy and principle pertaining to records management which would be binding on the various Federal agencies. In addition it was expected that the legislation would promote a greater utilization by the agencies of the talents of the records management specialists now employed by the General Services Administration.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Under rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee receives all proposed legislation and other matters relating to "reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government." Pursuant to this rule the committee received and acted upon Reorganization Plans Nos. 1 and 2 of 1956, and their pertinent House resolutions.

First. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956:

On May 16, 1956, the President transmitted to the Congress of the United States Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956. The plan was referred to the committee for consideration and action. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956 would have created an additional position of assistant secretary for research and development in each of the three military departments within the Department of Defense. Chairman VINSON, of the House Committee on Armed Services, introduced House Resolution 534 to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956. This resolution was also referred to the committee and the committee held hearings, considered and acted upon the resolution, together with the reorganization plan.

On July 3, 1956, the committee reported favorably to the House, House Resolution 534, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956. The committee found that the reorganization plan was not a valid reorganization plan under the Reorganization Act of 1949 which limits the creation of new positions to those made necessary by a reorganization made in the plan. The committee found and so reported to the House that the plan merely created new positions without any accompanying reorganization. In addition, the committee found that the purpose of the plan was one that could and should be accomplished by the regular legislative process.

On July 5, 1956, the House, following the recommendation of the committee, adopted the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 by a majority of the authorized membership as required by the Reorganization Act of 1949. This action had the effect of preventing Reorganization Plan No. 1 from becoming effective.

Second. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956:

On May 17, 1956, the President transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956. The plan was referred to the committee. Also referred to the committee was House Resolution 541 introduced by Mr. FASCELL, of Florida, a member of the committee. House Resolution 541 disapproved Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 provided for separating the management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the management of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The plan would have created a new and separate Board of Trustees to manage the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation although the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would have been a member ex officio of the new three-man Board of Trustees.

The committee considered Reorganization Plan No. 2 and House Resolution 541 together. On July 3, 1956, the committee reported favorably to the House, House Resolution 541, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2. The committee found that Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 was deficient in a number of respects including the following:

First. Separation of the two institutions would not necessarily accomplish the results which the proponents of the plan assumed would be accomplished.

Second. There was no complete separation of the agencies as suggested since the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board would also be a member of the new Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Third. The new Board of Trustees was not created on a bipartison basis. At the same time the President was given specific direction and control over the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Fourth. No economies or savings were shown to be involved in the reorganization.

On July 5, 1956, the House adopted the recommendation of the committee by approving House Resolution 541 by a majority of the authorized membership as required by the Reorganization Act of 1949. This action had the effect of preventing Reorganization Plan No. 2 from becoming effective.

INVESTIGATIONS

The committee is the major overall instrument of the House of Representatives for legislative oversight of the operations of Federal departments and agencies. Pursuant to rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee has the duty of studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. The committee has organized its activities so as to follow and review the operations of all the major departments and agencies as well as activities which involve and cut across the jurisdiction of more than one department or agency. In the course of its review of Federal activities a number of major investigations have been made, the results of which have been reported to the Congress.

In connection with reports made by the committee at this session of the Congress, more than 200 days of hearings were held. The magnitude of the effort devoted by the committee members to these hearings can be appreciated by the fact that the second session of the Congress lasted some 230 days—only slightly more than the number of days hearings conducted under the aegis of the committee. In addition, during the 84th Congress the committee made a record number of intermediate reports to the House—31 in all.

First. Post Office Department—(a) Post Office Department procurement of motor vehicles:

The committee investigated the action of the Post Office Department in negotiating 3 contracts in 1954 with the Twin Coach Co., of Kent, Ohio, for the purchase of 250 trucks purportedly for experimentation and tests at a cost of nearly three-fourths of a million dollars. The payments under these contracts exceeded by almost $175,000 the Department's total expenditures for experimental purposes under 96 separate contracts with other companies during the 4-year period, 1951 through 1954.

As a result of its investigation of these matters the committee found that in departing from competitive procurement procedures and in negotiating contracts involving nearly three-fourths of a million dollars, the Department had failed to demonstrate that the procurement had been done for a bona fide experimental purpose. It was concluded that the role played in the so-called experiment by Robert Heller & Associates, management consultants, was highly questionable and that activities pertaining to Government procurement should be handled by responsible Government employees rather than by temporary special consultants. Moreover, in the opinion of the committee the weight of the evidence indicated an attempt to avoid competitive procurement by designating the vehicles as experimental.

In order to avoid a repetition of the evasion of procedures laid down by the Congress, the committee recommended stronger controls by the General Services Administration over the negotiation of contracts for experimental purposes and the enactment of legislation to prohibit the inclusion of purchase options in Post Office Department contracts for the lease of new vehicles unless an emergency of indefinite duration requiring the immediate acquisition of vehicles is shown to exist. The committee's report to the House on this matter is House Report No. 2951, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) Post Office Department's public opinion survey to influence postal rate legislation:

The committee investigated the circumstances surrounding the execution, conduct, and use of a public opinion survey made for the Post Office Department by the Wengel Service Corp. in December 1953. This investigation was one part of the committee's overall study of the use of experts and consultants by the Federal departments and agencies.

The committee found that the public opinion survey had been conducted with great haste in order to make the results available for the Post Office to use with Members of Congress when the new session of Congress convened in 1954. In view of the fact that the Post Office Department had unsuccessfully urged the adoption of higher postal rates by the Congress in 1953, all the circumstances indicated that the Post Office Department had entered into the contract for the public opinion survey with the definite purpose of influencing the Congress to act favorably on the Post Office Department's recommendations.

The committee found that the actions of the Post Office Department in having the public opinion survey conducted for the purpose of influencing the Congress were open to question under section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for lobbying. The committee also concluded that the Bureau of the Budget had discharged its duties under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 in a perfunctory manner and had not attempted to ascertain whether the collection of information through the survey was necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Post Office Department. A full report on these matters was made by the committee to the House in House Report No. 2914, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Second. Department of Justice—Immigration and Naturalization Service:

The committee investigated reports it had received on the improper use of Government equipment and Government personnel for hunting trips to Mexico by Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. The committee's investigation showed that General Swing's hunting trips were improper and contributed little if anything to the effectiveness of his agency's operation. The committee found that General Swing's use of appropriated funds was improper including particularly his movement of 3 trailers over 1,500 miles when adequate hotel facilities were available.

The committee recommended that the General Accounting Office conduct a survey of the expenditures of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and that the Attorney General examine the record developed by the investigation. The latter recommendation was made in view of the conclusion of the committee that the conduct of General Swing was not consistent with his office. These matters were covered in the committee's report, House Report No. 2948, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Third. Department of Commerce—Civil Aviation:

The committee conducted an investigation covering all facets of civil aviation. Hearings were held at which principals in the aviation industry as well as representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Commerce, and State and local aviation officials were heard. The hearings were perhaps the most extensive study of aviation ever undertaken by the Congress. In the course of the hearings the committee also considered H. R. 11065, to create a commission to study executive agencies handling problems in the field of aviation with a view to reorganization and greater efficiency.

As a result of the hearings and investigation the committee concluded that a drastic reorganization of agencies in the Federal Government having responsibilities in the field of aviation is urgently required. It was further concluded that the present Federal organizational structure in civil aviation is inadequate in that it merely attempts to provide a forum or bargaining table where conflicts can be settled and compromised. There is an obvious need for leadership and planning in addition to a means for a possible resolution of differences among agencies.

In order to achieve a better organizational structure for civil aviation the committee recommended:

(a) The prompt completion of the study being conducted under the aegis of the President's Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning, Mr. Edward P. Curtis.

(b) Termination of Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Communications Commission membership on the Air Coordination Committee.

(c) Clarification of the so-called authority of the Air Coordinating Committee.

(d) Avoidance of military domination of the Air Coordinating Committee and the Air Navigation Development Board.

(e) Acceleration of the 5-year Federal airways plan.

(f) Resolution of the TACAN-VOR/DME controversy.

(g) Review of air traffic control requirements within the Civil Aeronautics Administration before airport aid projects are finally approved.

A report on the Federal role in aviation was made to the House as House Report No. 2949, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Fourth. Department of the Interior—(a) Federal timber policies:

The committee investigated the administration of Federal timberlands in the Pacific Northwest, including timber sales policies. The investigation covered the timber operations of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. Recommendations were made for the coordination and consolidation of the administration of Federal timberlands under the Forest Service. The investigation also covered problems of equal access to Federal timber; the need for up-to-date timber inventories and revision of the allowable cuts; the need for more access roads and increased salvage operations; the underpricing of Indian timber; the acquiring of timber under the guise of mining claims; the stifling of competition through huge long-term sales and other alleged favoritism to large operators; and instances of alleged abuse of administrative powers. Recommendations were made to bring about improvements in these various aspects of Federal timber management.

The recommendations were contained in House Report 2960, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) Al Sarena case:

The committee investigated the matter known as the Al Sarena case. The investigation and hearings disclosed that the Secretary of the Interior had acquiesced in a giveaway of valuable national forest timber on certain mining claims located in the Rogue River National Forest in southern Oregon. The Al Sarena Mines, Inc., had acquired mining patents on these claims from the Department of the Interior in order to obtain title to the timber, and not for the bona fide purpose of conducting a mining operation. The

timber was valued at approximately $325,000.

The committee recommended that the record of the case be sent to the Attorney General with a formal request that he take appropriate steps, including action to cancel these patents and to investigate the truth or falsity of statements relating to the extent of improvement work that had been allegedly performed on five of the contested claims.

The committee also recommended that the Department of the Interior take appropriate steps to insure observance of the Administrative Procedure Act, including the adoption of regulations to assure that, in the case of a contested mining case located on land administered by an agency outside the Department of the Interior, such other agency be given notice and an opportunity to be heard. The committee report on Al Sarena case is contained in House Report No. 2408, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(c) Private electric utilities' organized effort to influence the Secretary of the Interior:

The committee held hearings on an alleged effort by five Rocky Mountain power companies to influence the Department of the Interior in the administration of the Federal power laws.

(d) Virgin Islands Corporation:

The committee has conducted a preliminary investigation into the Virgin Islands governmental operations and the Virgin Islands Corporation. The Virgin Islands have been faced with an acute and recurring water problem which had deeply affected the economy and general welfare of the area. Notwithstanding numerous surveys and recommendations made by various governmental agencies and private firms, no concrete action, looking to a permanent solution of this problem has been undertaken by the Department of the Interior. It is believed that as a result of informal hearings conducted in the Virgin Islands action will be taken leading to a permanent solution of the water problem.

The informal hearings also received testimony on the activities on the part of the recent Gov. Archie A. Alexander. The loan program of the Virgin Islands Corporation which was to provide credit facilities in that area for agriculture, livestock, commercial, and other purposes is open to severe criticism. It appears that, as of June 30, 1954, approximately $30,000 had been loaned to small borrowers. Two $100,000 loans have since been made—one to a distillery and the other for the building of a golf course on a private project, while at the same time an application for a $60,000 loan for a chicken farm which had the approval of the officials of the Virgin Islands Corporation was summarily turned down by the Board of Directors of VICORP, headed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(e) Changes in powerline regulations by Department of the Interior:

The committee investigated the circumstances surrounding, and the results of changes in, powerline regulations covering rights-of-way for electric powerlines across Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. As a result of the investigation, the committee concluded that the changes made on August 11, 1954, in these regulations, and the actions of the top officials in the Interior Department in connection with the changes, demonstrated that those officials willfully followed policies and practices at variance with Federal laws designed to give preference to rural electric cooperatives and public agencies in the marketing of power generated at Federal dams. It was also concluded that the changes in the regulations were adopted by the Interior Department verbatim from an anonymous document delivered personally without a covering letter or memorandum by a registered lobbyist of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the then Solicitor and now Under Secretary of the Interior.

The committee recommended, in part, as follows:

First. Congress should enact legislation to put into statutory form the basic principles of the eliminated wheeling provision.

Second. In view of the increasing importance of the natural resources owned or controlled by the Federal Government to the economy and well-being of the Nation and in view of the widespread interest in the administration of those resources, Congress should enact legislation requiring the Secretary of the Interior and other officials having jurisdiction over such resources to publish notice of proposed regulations in the Federal Register at least 30 days in advance of their adoption. This would give the public an opportunity to present arguments favoring or opposing the proposed regulations. The period of notice could be shortened or eliminated where the responsible official finds in writing that an emergency exists and states the reasons for such finding. The issuance of regulations relating to federally owned resources is not covered by the advance notice provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

The report of the committee on these matters is contained in House Report No. 1975, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(f) Effect of Department of Interior and REA policies and public power preference customers:

The committee investigated the effect of policies of the Department of Interior in the last 3 years on statutory preference customers in the Southeast, the Southwest, the Intermountain States, the Central Valley of California, and the Pacific Northwest. In the course of the investigation the committee demonstrated that the present administration of the Department of Interior has followed a policy of withdrawing from its responsibilities for comprehensive river-basin programs and of taking actions designed to minimize its duties under various statutes to insure the most widespread use of federally generated electric power by giving preference to cooperatives and public bodies. The effect of the present policies of the Department of the Interior was shown to be that of enabling private utilities to gain an advantage over the preferred customers designated by Congress in various statutes. Included in the Department's action were the suppression of an Attorney General's opinion which in effect warned the Department of Interior against pursuing a proposed policy in contravention of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The committee's findings and recommendations designed to reaffirm the intent of Congress as stated in existing law are filed in House Report No. 2279, 84th Congress 2d session.

(g) Contract for rental of automobiles by Bureau of Indian Affairs:

The committee investigated a series of actions by the Bureau of Indian Affairs designed to circumvent requirements for competitive bidding in the leasing of passenger-carrying vehicles. The committee found that open competition would have resulted in substantial savings to the Government and that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had not availed itself of the results obtainable from a competent inquiry as to possible sources of supply from automobile-rental concerns. There was also an apparent disregard of normal time elements in contract negotiations indicating that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was intent on avoiding competitive bidding in the leasing of vehicles.

It also appeared that under existing Government discounts on automobiles it is cheaper for the Government to own rather than to lease passenger-carrying vehicles. The committee's conclusions were affirmed by the action of the Comptroller General in prohibiting an award under certain contrived invitations to bid issued later by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Complete findings and recommendations of the committee designed to improve acquisition and utilization procedures in connection with motor vehicles are contained in House Report No. 1892, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Fifth. Department of Agriculture—(a) Purchase-resale transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

The committee investigated the simultaneous purchase-resale transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation involving cheese and butter in the early part of 1954. In carrying out price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the Department of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, is authorized to purchase butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids. The intent of Congress in enacting this legislation was solely to aid dairy farmers of the Nation.

In 1954, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid nearly $2,500,000 to cheese and butter dealers as a result of purchase-resale transactions involving their commodities. In the transactions, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased approximately 85 million pounds of cheese and 5 million pounds of butter which it simultaneously resold to the original owner. The cheese and butter was never moved from the warehouses in which it was stored but the Commodity Credit Corporation paid the difference between the purchase and resale price to the so-called owners.

The committee investigation discovered that this Commodity Credit Corporation program proved of little benefit to the dairy farmers, but resulted in substantial windfall payments to business firms. As a result of the committee

investigation, the General Accounting Office ruled that the transactions were unauthorized and improper. Also, as a result of the committee investigation the Attorney General has filed suit for recovery of a number of the illegal payments and has demanded return of the others. The committee also called attention to the use of industry advisory committees in programs of this type and recommended that the Department of Agriculture take immediate action to eliminate possible conflicts of interest in connection with the use of such industry advisory committees. The committee's report is House Report No. 2952, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) School-lunch program in Illinois:

The committee investigated the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities in connection with the school-lunch program in the State of Illinois. The committee investigation showed that the State superintendent of public instruction was a political associate of a member of the firm of Dunbar & Co., a firm which was selected by negotiation to distribute surplus agricultural commodities for the school-lunch program.

It was disclosed that the contract with Dunbar & Co. was made under circumstances which indicated an intent to favor this firm to the exclusion of others even though Dunbar & Co. had only a limited experience in handling commodities. Moreover, the investigation showed that under the contract Dunbar & Co. made inordinate profits which constituted the major portion of the excessive costs of distributing donated commodities in Illinois.

Dunbar & Co. used its company income for a large number of questionable expenditures, showing a return of money to the political group in Illinois which undoubtedly arranged for Dunbar & Co. to obtain the contract.

Finally, the investigation demonstrated that the Department of Agriculture did not perform its functions in such a manner as to encourage maximum economy, since the Department was aware of some of the circumstances involved and could have known most of the others had the Department shown any positive interest in the matter.

The committee report covering these matters is House Report No. 2893, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Sixth. Department of State—(a) Foreign Service promotions under the Wriston program:

The committee investigated the implementation of the report of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, known as the Wriston Committee. The Wriston Committee report recommended a series of measures to strengthen the United States Foreign Service. The report had been accepted by the Secretary of State, and the Congress enacted implementing legislation in the form of Public Law 759, 83d Congress, and Public Laws 22 and 250, 84th Congress.

The objective of the Wriston report and the ostensible policy of the State Department pursuant to the report have been to integrate some 1,200 former departmental officers together with some 1,200 former Foreign Service staff and reserve officer personnel into the Foreign Service Officer Corps without any discrimination or inequitable treatment with regard to assignments, frequency of transfers, or promotions.

The committee investigation showed that the State Department had been lagging far behind its ostensible acceptance of the Wriston report objectives and that the system being employed by the State Department gave a heavy advantage to former Foreign Service officers.

The committee recommended that the Department bring its actions into conformance with the basic premises of the Wriston report or else seek approval to revise it.

The results of the committee investigation are contained in House Report No. 1663, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) United States technical assistance in Latin America:

The committee studied the technical assistance program in Latin America. It found a lack of full coordination between the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration. The committee also found that many projects were being engendered in Washington rather than being requested by the recipient country. Furthermore, too little attention has been given to the objective of transfer of projects for continuation by the host countries. In addition, certain projects have been developed beyond the technical assistance phase to actual economic aid.

Finally, the committee found that the Congress was not being presented with the necessary information for evaluation and approval of projects proposed by the executive branch.

The committee report on this subject is House Report No. 1985, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(c) Administrative management of the Department of State:

The committee investigated the administrative structure of the State Department and disclosed substantial weaknesses. In effect, the committee concluded that in terms of administrative management there are now five departments of State rather than one, since administrative management operations have been decentralized from the Department to four powerful regional bureaus which tend to hold aloof from accepting policies and services from the administrative area of the Department.

The committee study also showed that the expenditure of more than $250,000 for a 10-month study of administrative management of the Department by Robert Heller & Associates brought about no significant results.

Finally, the committee investigation disclosed that the funds used for the survey were those appropriated by Congress for emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular services and that, therefore, the use of these funds for the study was of doubtful propriety.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 2172, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(d) Foreign aid operations in Iran:

The committee has been making an extensive investigation of foreign aid operations in Iran. The investigation has been directed toward establishing the economy and efficiency with which some $206 million of technical and economic assistance has been furnished Iran in the period through 1955.

This inquiry is intended to serve as a case study of the administration of foreign aid programs.

Seventh. Department of Defense—(a) Unification of supply systems within the Department of Defense:

Based on certain findings of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Hoover Commission—in its reports on food and clothing and depot utilization, the committee investigated the actions of the Department of Defense with regard to unification of the supply systems of the three military departments. It was disclosed that until the committee's investigation was started and for some time thereafter some of the highest officials in the Department of Defense had been engaged in an effort, starting in 1953, to reverse steps which had been taken to unify the supply systems of the three military departments as directed by the Congress.

As a result of the committee investigations, the Department of Defense seems to have dropped its policy of ignoring the congressional mandate for integration of supply services. Starting at the end of 1955, the Department began to evolve its single manager system for handling various commodities and supplies.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 2013, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) Merger of certain naval supply activities:

The committee investigated the disestablishment of the San Pedro Naval Supply Depot and its merger with the supply department of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard located at Terminal Island, Calif. The committee investigation showed that the merger was not based on an accurate determination of economies, but rather on a casual speculation sought to be fortified after the action had been taken.

While interested in economies through elimination of duplication of activities, the committee recommended that more accurate determinations of economies be made in justification of such mergers.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 1662, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(c) Navy jet aircraft procurement program:

The committee investigated the expenditure of more than $500 million for 280 aircraft in the Demon fighter program. It found that the first 60 aircraft costing at least $154 million will be limited with 4 exceptions to nonflying uses. The committee also found that the other 220 aircraft had not been tested in fleet use and might soon become obsolete.

The committee concluded that the expenditures were excessive when judged by the end results. While the committee found that there are no indications of dishonesty or improper influence in the awarding or termination of contracts, it was concluded that all three parties involved, the Navy Department, Westinghouse Corp., and McDonnell Aircraft

Corp., shared responsibility for errors in judgment and waste of public funds, although the Navy Department bore final responsibility as the Government procurement agency.

The committee made a series of recommendations designed to improve procedures and to avoid repetition of fiascos of this sort.

The committee report covering these matters is House Report No. 1891, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Eighth. General Services Administration—(a) Government nickel plant in Nicaro, Cuba:

An investigation was made by the committee of the expansion and operation by the General Services Administration of the Government nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba. The committee investigation found that political and private influence had played an active role in the award of a subcontract in the construction project and that similar influence caused an award of an insurance brokerage contract to an insurance agency in Chicago, Ill.

Political influence combined with a passive attitude on the part of General Services Administration officials caused a large unnecessary expenditure to the Federal Government as well as a loss of about 10 million pounds of critically needed nickel of a market value of about $6,500,000. The committee recommended certain actions designed to cut down on the loss to the Government and also called certain matters to the attention of the Department of Justice for possible legal action.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 2390, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Ninth. Government information:

The committee has conducted a study of one of the most basic problems in our society, that is, the availability of information from Federal Government agencies. In the course of the investigation the information policies of every major department and agency have been thoroughly scrutinized. In addition, the views of eminent lawyers and other authorities on the problem of availability of governmental information have been obtained.

The legal aspects have been thoroughly researched and the legal and constitutional problems involved in the right of Congress to obtain information from Federal agencies have been summarized and documented in a committee print, "The Right of Congress To Obtain Information From the Executive and From Other Agencies of the Federal Government"—dated May 3, 1956.

The committee investigation has progressed to the point where two things are obvious:

First. A custom and orientation has grown up in the agencies leading to a strong tendency to withhold information. So strong has this orientation become that the custom itself is viewed as so-called law by many agency officials.

Second. The courts have recognized that congressional enactments govern information function and policy in the agencies. Consequently it is up to the Congress to take action to bring up to date various statutory provisions governing withholding and release of governmental information.

The report of the committee on this subject is House Report No. 2947, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Tenth. Experts and consultants:

For the first time since the enactment of section 15 of Public Law 600 in 1946, the committee has made a study of the employment and utilization of experts and consultants by the Federal Government. The study has been concerned with three different aspects:

First. The use of individual experts and consultants.

Second. Contracts with firms or organizations of such experts or consultants.

Third. The use of advisory committees.

The committee found a number of abuses in the use of individual experts and consultants, particularly as regards public relations activitives, lobbying within the Government, the use of trade association officials, and political and private influence.

The committee recommended the repeal of the blanket exemptions from conflict of interest statutes for certain experts and consultants and also an aggressive and positive role by the Civil Service Commission in preauditing instead of postauditing such appointments. The committee investigation has progressed to the point where it is obvious that Congress also must exercise a closer control in the case of contracts with firms or organizations. These contracts enable agencies to pay out sums without any limitation for services whose utility and necessity is highly questionable in too many instances.

With reference to advisory committees, the committee investigation has resulted in the publication of a number of committee prints listing for the first time the membership of all of the advisory committees being utilized by the major Federal departments and agencies. The committee study has also disclosed that there are no uniform practices governing the use of such advisory committees and that such uniform practices are probably a matter for legislation centralizing control over use of such committees and defining standards governing their activities.

Less than one-half of the advisory committees subject to the standards recommended by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are complying with those standards. Consequently, the committee recommended as a starting point that the President take immediate steps to obtain Governmentwide compliance with these standards by advisory committees.

The report of the committee on these matters is House Report No. 2894, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Eleventh. Civil defense:

One of the most comprehensive and far-reaching studies and investigations undertaken by the committee has been its investigation of the problems of civil defense. After many months of hearings and studies which disclosed that our country is woefully unprepared, the committee has recently reported to the Congress its recommendations designed to provide a sound approach to civil defense.

In the course of its hearings, 211 witnesses were heard including the highest officials of the Federal Government and of various State and local governments as well as experts and scientists of national and international renown.

As a result of its investigation, including hearings extending over a period of 5 months, the committee recommended:

1. Federal civil defense legislation should be redrafted to vest the basic responsibility for civil defense in the Federal Government, with the States and local units of government having an important supporting role.

2. The new legislation should create a permanent Department of Civil Defense, combining the civil defense functions—broadly defined—of the Office of Defense Mobilization and those of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

3. The Department of Civil Defense should consult with the Department of Defense and be required to formulate a master plan for nationwide civil defense. Plans for each target area should be made and protective measures initiated after careful determination of their respective priority importance to national defense and survival.

4. The master plan for civil defense should be pointed toward the establishment of an integrated nationwide civil-defense system based on the key civil-defense measure of shelter protection against the blast, heat, and radiation effects of nuclear explosions.

5. Studies under the survival-planning contracts should be suspended, pending a reformulation of the criteria for the expenditure of the funds Congress authorized and appropriated for this purpose. A local or regional survival plan study should be concerned only with the adaptation and application of the national plan and of basic studies to a local situation.

6. The Department of Civil Defense should be authorized to finance the construction of shelters in all target areas, with the cooperation of State and local authorities.

7. The Department of Civil Defense should be authorized to institute all other measures necessary to establish an integrated nationwide civil-defense system, and to utilize toward this end such available resources and facilities.

8. The Department of Civil Defense should be authorized to strengthen State and local civil-defense organizations by contributing equipment, supplies, and funds for administration, training, stockpiles, and other necessary civil-defense uses, subject to the supervision, inspection, and approval by the Secretary of Civil Defense of the civil-defense programs of State and local authorities.

9. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Civil Defense, should establish and implement an effective program of training active and reserve military personnel in civil-defense duties as a defined part of regular military training.

10. The Secretary of Civil Defense, in behalf of the President, should have defined statutory powers to act in an emer-

gency and to mobilize all civilian resources for minimizing the effects of enemy-caused disaster upon the national economy and the people of the United States.

11. The Secretary of Civil Defense, in behalf of the President, should have greater statutory authority to carry out plans and operations in peacetime, under preattack situations, particularly before declarations of emergency have been made, in order to minimize the effects of enemy-caused disaster upon the national economy and the people of the United States.

12. The role of the military forces in civil defense should be clearly defined. The State governors should be fully informed as to the terms and conditions under which military assistance to civil-defense authorities will be rendered in the event of widespread disaster and the breakdown of civil government.

13. The studies of martial law conducted by the Attorney General, the Department of the Army, and other Federal agencies should be made public promptly upon completion to assist the Congress and the public in understanding the contemplated role of the military forces in civil defense.

The committee report on civil defense is House Report No. 2946, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Twelfth. Inventory of Federal real and personal property:

On March 21, 1956, the committee released, "Real and Personal Property Inventory Report (Civilian and Military) of the United States Government, Located in the Continental United States, in the Territories and Overseas as of June 30, 1955." This report represented an attempt, for the first time in the history of our Government, to record—in report form—an inventory of realty and personalty assets of the United States Government. Inventory figures were at acquisition cost and the finished product was a result of coordinated efforts on the part of all Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Defense, working closely with the committee.

Since March of this year, considerable effort and time has been spent with Government representatives outlining the scope of activities and additional data to be included in the 1956 property inventory report which the committee expects to release in December of this year. The next property inventory report, which will include real and personal assets of the United States Government, located in the United States, its Territories and possessions and overseas, as of June 30, 1956, will again list Federal real estate, excluding public domain properties, at acquisition cost and personalty inventories will be listed at acquisition cost. Public domain properties—with separate listings of land, buildings, facilities, and so forth—will be shown at current or estimated market value. This will be the first time an accurate up-to-date, or estimated, value has been published on public domain properties. As a result of revised and improved accounting control procedures, it is expected that the inventories of the Department of Defense for the current report will be substantially increased from those reported last year.

It is the desire of the committee, at an early date, to have all Federal real property listed in a comprehensive inventory report at an "in use" value. In this connection, assistance has been offered the committee by representatives of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers. However, until criteria is developed and put into effect—which will involve assistance from all departments and agencies having real estate under their control—acquisition-cost figures will be used. In the meantime, however, a step in the direction of meeting this goal is being taken in the forthcoming report by having public domain properties listed at current market, or estimated, value.

A need continues to exist for a comprehensive reporting and accounting of this country's assets so as to afford the Members of the Congress and the taxpayers of this country with up-to-date figures on what this country owns. Such data will be vital in the issuance, one day, of an annual report of the Government which will reflect a true balance sheet approach of assets and liabilities of the United States Government.

The report of the committee is House Report No. 1930, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Thirteenth. Surplus donable property:

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the committee reported H. R. 3322 to the House of Representatives and this bill subsequently became Public Law 61.

The objective of this legislation is to insure that surplus property which should be donated for the purposes directed by the Congress is not withheld by the agencies from such donation. The committee is able to report that Public Law 61 has been effective as follows: The total surplus personal property transfers from January through May 1956 according to reports received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare amounted to $87,370,-177.

Fourteenth. Study of reorganizations:

Under rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee has the duty of studying the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

A study of the effects of past reorganization plans has been in process based on reports received from the various agencies which have been affected by such plans. The committee has sought to follow the reorganization plans and their effects after they have been adopted so that it can be prepared to recommend continuation or abolition of the extraordinary authority given the President under the Reorganization Act of 1949 and also to determine if the plans have been carried out in the manner the Congress has approved.

REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH (HOOVER COMMISSION)

As reported at the close of the 1st session of this Congress, 13 of the 18 subject-matter reports made by the Commission on Organization were referred to the committee for study. Since that time a substantial number of bills designed to implement some of the Commission recommendations also have been referred to the committee. The committee has given the Commission reports serious consideration and has taken action on those recommendations and suggestions of the Commission which appeared to be meritorious. The budget and accounting legislation, which was reported favorably by the committee at this session, is based on recommendations of the Commission amended by the committee to accord with the needs of the Government after careful study. The committee's investigation and report on the unification of supply services in the Department of Defense are based on the findings of the Commission in its Reports on Food and Clothing and Depot Utilization.

In addition, the committee has had under study other Commission reports, including Transportation, Business Enterprises, and Paperwork Management, parts I and II. Hearings were held on a number of bills to eliminate certain commercial-type activities from the Government. This proposed legislation was based on certain recommendations of the Commission. After careful consideration, however, the committee decided not to report any of these measures for the elimination of certain commercial-type activities, since no case appears to have been made for the achievement of greater economy and efficiency.

A special and exceedingly comprehensive study and investigation has been made by the committee of the Commission on Organization's report on water resources and power. Hearings were held at 15 different cities in various parts of the United States, and the record made at these hearings consists of more than 5,500 pages. Nine volumes of these hearings already have been printed. These hearings covered every phase of the use of our water resources, including tolls on inland waterways, hydroelectric power, forestation, and flood control. A report is being prepared which will evaluate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on water-resource development in the light of the information gained in the extensive hearings and studies of the committee. This report should serve as a valuable permanent work of reference on matters relating to the multiple-purpose development and use of the Nation's water resources.

REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (KESTNBAUM COMMISSION)

At the first session of this Congress the reports of the Kestnbaum Commission were referred to the committee for study and consideration. These reports consist of 16 separate volumes including the overall report. They represent 2 years' work by the Kestnbaum Commission and its many subcommittees and study committees composed of Federal, State, and local officials and private citizens.

Since the receipt of the report the committee has been making an intensive study of this important aspect of Government. There is probably no other aspect of Government which is so complex, involving as it does the Federal

Government and all levels of State and local government.

Methods and coverage of study: In an effort to obtain a complete picture of the operation of Federal programs involving intergovernmental relations, two separate questionnaires were developed—one for Federal departments and agencies and the other for State and local governments. These were distributed in December 1955.

The questionnaire for Federal departments and agencies was designed to obtain, first, a detailed description of programs involving intergovernmental relations; second, departmental and agency judgments of program adequacy; and, third, the position and action of each agency with respect to recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which are applicable to its programs.

Replies to this questionnaire have now been received from all 62 of the Federal departments and agencies to which it was sent. These replies are being analyzed by the staff and a staff report is being prepared for the committee on this phase of the study.

The second questionnaire was sent to each of the State governors, to the District of Columbia, and to a representative sample of cities and counties. Special effort was made to obtain the participation of local governments representative of all sections of the country as well as of the communities of differing sizes. This questionnaire was designed to give State and local government considerable latitude for identifying and evaluating those intergovernmental programs regarded as most important to them.

Comparison of the number of questionnaires sent and replies received, by type of government unit, is presented in the following table:

Government unit	Number of—	
	Questionnaires sent	Completed replies received
Total	305	115
States	48	[1] 39
District of Columbia	1	1
Counties	146	[2] 34
Cities	108	[3] 47
City-county units	2	2

[1] Includes 3 States which provided no data and 3 States that have transmitted reports prepared by special State study groups in connection with the work of the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
[2] Includes 4 counties which provided no data.
[3] Includes 3 cities which provided no data.

NOTE.—In addition to the 39 States shown in the table, 2 States have advised that replies are being prepared. The remaining 7 States have indicated, in our most recent contact (June 15), a willingness to participate in our study but require more time.

It will be seen from the table, above, that replies have been received from four-fifths of the States, almost half of the cities, but less than a fourth of the counties to which the questionnaire was sent. The staff is continuing its efforts to secure the cooperation of those which have not yet replied.

Content of State and local replies to committee questionnaires: The intergovernmental programs identified as of primary importance by State government are welfare, highways, health, and employment security—in that order. Other programs frequently mentioned in the State replies are education, school lunch, fish and wildlife restoration, civil defense, and tax relationships.

The highway, health, and welfare programs are also regarded as of major importance by cities and counties. Other activities involving intergovernmental relations which were frequently mentioned by local governments include housing and urban renewal, Federal payments in lieu of taxes, air and water pollution control, law enforcement and narcotics control, and flood control and harbor development.

Related projects initiated: To supplement the data being provided by the questionnaire method, two related projects have been initiated.

First. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is preparing for the committee a comprehensive but selective bibliography of literature available in the field of intergovernmental relations. Since no similar bibliography is presently available this document should serve a very useful purpose and will likely be in great demand. It is expected that this bibliography will be printed.

Second. In response to a committee request addressed to the President's Special Assistant for the Hoover Commission and Commission on Intergovernmental Relations Reports, the Bureau of the Budget has prepared a compilation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Each recommendation is annotated to show the method of implementation and the Federal department or agency and program affected. It is anticipated that this document will also be printed.

Projected work program: Plans are being formulated for a series of hearings to be held in connection with the committee study of intergovernmental relations. The data obtained through the questionnaire surveys should provide valuable background for conduct of these hearings. It is expected that separate hearings will be arranged for the Federal departments and agencies and for representatives of State and local governments. Such hearings should serve to, first, provide a medium by which the views of Federal, State, and local officials might be focused on common problems with the objectives of finding solutions to existing difficulties and pointing the way toward more effective methods of cooperation; and, second, increase public awareness of the character of our Federal system and the problems inherent in the operation of programs involving intergovernmental cooperation.

The committee staff is making preliminary study of several areas where intensive studies may be valuable. An example of such a project is study of the feasibility of further delegation of responsibility for auditing and other administrative controls to the States in Federal-grant programs. It is contemplated that the General Accounting Office and other experts will be invited to participate in this project if undertaken.

Other activities under consideration include the establishment of closer and continuing liaison with quasi-official agencies and associations which serve State and local governments.

STUDY OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

In recognition of the importance of the General Accounting Office as an arm of the Congress, and particularly of the Committee on Government Operations, the committee has made a comprehensive study of the organization and functioning of the General Accounting Office. The report of the committee study traces the history and functions of the General Accounting Office. The report also recommends changes in organization and procedure designed to improve the usefulness of the General Accounting Office to the Congress and the committee as well as to achieve economy and efficiency in the operations of the General Accounting Office.

The committee report on the General Accounting Office is House Report No. 2264, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Congressman Young Supports Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 there were more new businesses incorporated than in any previous year in the Nation's history.

At the present time there are 4,225,000 business units, one-third more than in 1939. Of these, more than 98 per cent are small business units.

In 1939 there were 14,768 failures.

In 1955 there were 10,969 failures—more than 3,700 fewer than in 1939, although there were about a million more businesses in existence.

Since 1900 the average failures per 10,000 units of business number 70. The rate of failures in 1955 was 41.6 per 10,000 units of business—which is the lowest rate of failures during any normal year.

More important than the figures and percentages is the knowledge that the Nation's business community is healthy, that it is more prosperous than ever before, and that it is growing faster than ever before.

Wage earners have more to spend, inflation has been stopped, more people are working. There is a new confidence among the business community because the Eisenhower administration has demonstrated its confidence in the American system of rewarding enterprise.

As a member of the Eisenhower team, I am extremely pleased to see these results. Small business is the foundation of the American way of life. As long as a man with good ideas and hard work can create an enterprise and be proportionately rewarded for his effort, we can be sure of a dynamic and lasting democracy.

Critics of President Eisenhower's administration have called it a businessman's administration. It would be more accurate to say it is a businesslike administration and that is why more people than ever before are enjoying peace and prosperity.

Republicans have balanced the national budget. Inflation has been stopped. You can plan your business operations with more reliability.

Under President Eisenhower we have created the first peacetime agency exclusively devoted to small-business needs.

We have provided a larger share of defense contracts for small firms—25 per cent and 22 per cent of military prime contracts in fiscal 1954 and 1955, compared to 21 per cent, 17 per cent, and 16 per cent in 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Wage, price, and materials controls have been removed.

The excess profits tax was ended, new depreciation rules voted to foster expansion.

In the past 3 years under President Eisenhower, there has been a 27 per cent rise in gross private investment, reflecting the new climate of encouragement to personal incentive and enterprise.

We have systematically inventoried Government commercial activities; sold or terminated many of them; and are steadily withdrawing from others—until hampered by the present Democratic-controlled Congress.

In Nevada we have felt the impact of the expansion in residential building.

We will feel even more the new Federal highway program, which will create many new opportunities for business within our State.

As the Congressman from Nevada, I have worked to bring proper industry to our State. We are on the threshold of our greatest growth. The national climate will undoubtedly have its effect upon our efforts here in Nevada.

Continuation of the record prosperity we now enjoy throughout the Nation will mean more prosperous times in Nevada.

Voting Record of the Honorable Irwin D. Davidson, 20th Congressional District, New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the last vote of the 84th Congress has been cast and the record of the legislation which has either been enacted into law or defeated is now complete. When I campaigned for the office of Representative for the 20th Congressional District of New York, I made a pledge to the voters in my district that, if elected, I would make a full report to them at the end of each session on both my voting record and my legislative activities.

Reports of that nature were made at the end of the first session, and I wish at this time to place once again, in the public record, the stand which I have taken and the vote which I have cast on every major issue presented to the House, since we reconvened on January 3, 1956. I do so with pride, because I know that each vote was cast after earnest consideration and attention to the issues involved, and because I feel that I have reflected in my vote the sentiments of the over 350,000 persons whom I have had the privilege and honor to serve since taking office.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we passed many bills during this session without resorting to a rollcall vote. I should like to list the issues involved in those measures and the position which I supported and voted for on each of them.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS

This was perhaps the most humanitarian piece of legislation passed by this Congress, and a bill which I was happy to support and cast my vote for. It provided for a reduction in the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 years and provided further for pensions to all totally disabled workers at age 50. These provisions were objected to by the administration but were supported by enough Democrats, myself included, to pass the bill. In addition, the bill broadens the coverage of the Social Security Act.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT

This bill provided for a major revision in the pensions paid to civil-service employees. I not only voted for this measure, but made a statement in support of it, before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, in which I requested that the committee report the bill favorably to the House without amendment. The annuities of present employees and their widows will be increased by about 25 percent and those of children by about 150 percent. This is the first major revision of the civil-service retirement system since 1948, and the increases that have been provided for by it will help bring the pensions paid under the act more into line with today's cost of living.

HIGHWAYS

Another one of the bills passed in the second session without a rollcall vote was the multibillion-dollar road program for an intracontinental highway system. The Democratic leadership was able to include in this bill provisions calling for a pay-as-you-go financing system which I wholeheartedly supported. The administration's alternative was to finance the program by a bond issue which would have put millions of dollars of interest into the hands of the purchasers of the bonds rather than into the road system.

FLOOD INSURANCE

The Congress passed, in the closing hours of the session, a $7.5 billion program of Federal flood insurance and loans. I supported that bill with my vote when it was acted on in the House, just as I had earlier supported the principle of this legislation by my introduction of bills designed to bring the Federal Government into this field. The flood losses of a year ago and the reluctance or inability of private insurance companies to write this type of insurance made the passage of this bill mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, on the other major issues of this session, rollcall votes were requested. The following is a summary of the issues involved in each of those major votes, and the position which I took on each. I have arranged this summary under the appropriate headings.

TAXES

January 31, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 8780, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on farms for farming purposes. On passage: Yeas 387, nays 0.

March 13, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 9166, a bill providing for a 1-year extension of the corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. On passage: Yeas 366, nays 4.

RUBBER PLANT DISPOSAL

February 8, 1956: Voted "yea." House Resolution 396, a resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of the sale of a West Virginia rubber plant as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. On agreeing to the resolution: Yeas 61, nays 310. Here, again, as was the case on two occasions during the first session, a giveaway advocated by the Republican leadership was permitted to be approved.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

March 1, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 3383, legislation authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. On passage: Yeas 256, nays 136. This bill provided the basis for a vast irrigation and land reclamation project in the western and southwestern part of our Nation.

SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM

March 21, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 8320, a bill extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year 1956. There were two separate votes on this bill. The first was on agreeing to the report of the House-Senate conference on the bill. This was rejected by a vote of 195 to 215. A motion was then made to agree to the Senate amendments to the bill, and on that motion I again voted "yea"; this motion carried: Yeas 406, nays 0.

FARM LEGISLATION

April 11, 1956: Voted "nay." H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956. This vote was on a motion to recommit the House-Senate conference report on the bill and return it to committee with instructions to substitute an 82.5-percent parity figure for the 90-percent figure agreed to. This motion was defeated: Yeas 181, nays 238.

April 11, 1956: Voted "yea." This vote followed the motion to recommit and was on the question of passage of the conference report. The report of the conferees was agreed to: Yeas 237, nays 181. This bill was vetoed by the President.

April 18, 1956: Voted "yea." This vote was taken on the question of

whether or not to override the President's veto of the bill. The two-thirds majority vote could not be obtained and the veto was sustained: Yeas 202, nays 211.

May 3, 1956: Voted "nay." This vote was cast on the new farm bill which was prepared after the President's veto. It abandoned or watered down the high parity provisions that had caused the veto and established a $1.2-billion farm subsidy in the form of a soil bank. This vote was on a motion to recommit the bill to committee and thus prevent its enactment. The motion was defeated: Yeas 186, nays 208.

May 3, 1956: Voted "yea." This vote followed the motion to recommit and was on the question of passage of the bill. The measure was passed: Yeas 314, nays 78.

FOREIGN AID

June 11, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956. This bill provided the authorization for all of our foreign-aid programs. The authorization approved by this bill was $3.8 billion. On passage: Yeas 275, nays 122.

July 11, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 12130, the foreign-aid appropriation bill. This bill appropriated the funds to carry on our foreign-aid programs within the authorization permitted by the Mutual Security Act. The amount appropriated by the House in this bill was $3.4 billion. On passage: Yeas 284, nays 120. In the closing hours of the session, a conference report was agreed to in the House on a voice vote. I supported that report which appropriated almost $3.8 billion for our foreign-aid programs.

SMALL BUSINESS

June 11, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and to amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. On passage, yeas 393, nays 3.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

June 27, 1956: Voted "nay" on motion to recommit the bill and voted "yea" on passage. H. R. 7886, a bill, which, after a part was stricken on a technical point of order, amended part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, non-service-connected disability pension awards. The motion to recommit the bill to committee was defeated: Yeas 110, nays 305. On passage: Yeas 364, nays 51.

July 12, 1956: Voted "yea," H. R. 12038, a bill to increase service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances. On passage: Yeas 391, nays 0. The Senate allowed both of these bills to die in committee.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

July 5, 1956: Four separate rollcall votes were cast on H. R. 7535, a bill to provide Federal aid to education through grants to finance school construction. The first vote came on an amendment to alter the formula for allocating funds to the States. On that amendment, I voted "nay." The amendment was defeated: Yeas 168, nays 250. The next vote was on the Powell amendment to bar funds to those States which fail to comply with the Supreme Court decision declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional. I voted in favor of that amendment and it was adopted: Yeas 225, nays 192. A motion was then made to recommit the bill to committee with instructions that the bill be again reported to the House with amendments. On that motion, I voted "nay"; the motion was defeated: Yeas 158, nays 262. Finally, the question was put on passage of the bill. I voted "yea," but the bill was defeated: Yeas 194, nays 224.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

July 6, 1956: Voted "nay." H. R. 11380, a bill to readjust postal rates and establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates. On passage: Yeas 217, nays 166. This bill would have caused the average citizen to bear the cost of subsidizing the great deficit caused by second-class mailing privileges granted to large magazine publishers. This, it seemed to me, was patently unfair and not the proper way to cure the annual deficit of the Post Office Department. The bill died in the Senate Post Office Committee.

COMMUNIST CHINA

July 18, 1956: Voted "yea." House Concurrent Resolution 265, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress against the admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations. On agreeing to the resolution: Yeas 391, nays 0.

CIVIL RIGHTS

July 23, 1956: Voted "yea" on passage of the bill and voted "nay" on a motion to recommit the bill to committee. H. R. 627, the civil-rights bill, was a watered down version of a bill introduced by myself and several other Congressmen. The bill as presented to the House for consideration was the very least that the Congress could have approved and still be labeled "civil-rights legislation." Opponents of the bill moved to recommit it to committee in an effort to kill the measure. I voted against the motion and the motion was defeated: Yeas 131, nays 275. The question was then put on passage of the bill, I voted "yea" and the bill was passed: Yeas 279, nays 126. Unfortunately, parliamentary maneuvering in the Senate prevented this bill from being considered in the upper House.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

July 24, 1956: Voted "yea." S. 1644, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. The measure would provide orderly procedures to curb abuses which had arisen in connection with such contracts. The bill was presented to the House on a motion to suspend the rules of the House in order to consider and pass the bill. Such a motion requires a majority of two-thirds of those voting, and such a majority could not be obtained. On the motion, yeas 245, nays 145.

CIVILIAN ATOMIC POWER ACCELERATION PROGRAM

July 24, 1956: Voted "nay" on motions to strike the enacting clause and on the motion to recommit the bill to committee. H. R. 12061, a measure to provide a program to accelerate the construction of atomic reactors. The purpose of this bill was to help our country to increase or at the least to maintain our lead in the field of atomic energy. My negative votes on the two motions were voted in favor of the bill, since both the motion to strike the enacting clause and the motion to recommit the bill were designed to kill this legislation. The motion to strike the enacting clause was defeated: Yeas 195, nays 199; the motion to recommit was, unfortunately, adopted: Yeas 203, nays 191.

HOUSING

July 25, 1956: Voted "nay" on motion to amend the rule so as to strike out title V of the bill, the title which authorized public housing. H. R. 11742, a bill to amend and extend the laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities. The only rollcall on this bill was on the motion to prevent consideration of the public housing sections of the measure. On that vote, I opposed the motion and it was defeated: Yeas 92, nays 299. The House then passed on a division vote an amendment to provide only 35,000 units of public housing in each of the next 2 years. This provision I opposed, feeling that a minimum of 200,000 units for each of the next 3 years was essential to win the race to provide decent public housing before the blight of slums overtook many areas. The Senate, however, agreed to the 35,000 units figure, and just before final adjournment, a conference report was approved by both Houses, thus preventing the termination of many of the Federal housing programs. On the voice vote to agree to the conference report, I voted to pass and adopt the report, since it was better to have some housing rather than to vote in favor of the death of many housing programs.

FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT

July 26, 1956: Voted "nay." House Resolution 641, a resolution permitting limited debate on H. R. 412, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. On the resolution to grant the rule permitting consideration of the bill: Yeas 179, nays 194.

AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

July 26, 1956: Voted "nay" on a resolution to consider this measure and voted "yea" on a motion to recommit. H. R. 8902, a bill to amend the Aeronautics Act of 1938 to give valuable tax concessions to already subsidized airlines in the purchase of new equipment. My votes on this measure opposed the bill. I voted against the resolution to consider the bill, but the resolution was adopted: Yeas 184, nays 178. I then voted in favor of a motion to recommit the bill to committee, and that motion was adopted: Yeas 196, nays 153.

ELECTRIC POWER RATES AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

July 27, 1956: Voted "yea" on both the adoption of the resolution permitting consideration of this measure and on passage of the bill. S. 338, a bill providing that the rates charged for electric power and energy by the Southwest Power Administration shall not be revised before July 1, 1957. On adoption of the resolution permitting considera-

tion of the bill: Yeas 219, nays 126. On passage of the bill: Yeas 201, nays 140.

LITTLE WOOD RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT

July 27, 1956: Voted "nay" on resolution to consider the bill out of order. H. R. 7850, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho. My vote was cast against the resolution because it was an attempt to disrupt the orderly program set out by the majority leader who had already scheduled an identical bill, passed by the Senate, for consideration. On adoption of the resolution: Yeas 173, nays 168. The Senate-passed bill was actually the measure considered and passed by the House and I supported that bill on a voice vote.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the voting record that I leave behind as the session closes. So that the record of my activities is complete, I shall shortly present a record of my legislative activities, that is, a full report on the bills and resolutions that I have introduced in this session of the Congress as well as a summary of the other activities that have occupied my time as the Representative of the 20th Congressional District of New York. I hope that together with the record of my votes, that document will paint a complete picture of the Congressman that I have tried to be.

Congressman Young Active in Wildlife Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the State of Nevada—fastest growing in the Union—typifies the problem all of us interested in preserving the pleasures of hunting and fishing face. The westward population movement has meant increased demands on our present hunting and fishing areas and has pointed up the need for protection of our present wildlife and recreation resources and the development of new wildlife areas.

During the 84th Congress considerable progress was made along these lines.

WASHOE PROJECT

Foremost in this new appreciation of the aesthetic and economic benefits of protecting and improving our wildlife resources was the $2 million authorized for this purpose in the Washoe reclamation project to be constructed on the Truckee and Carson Rivers.

I am proud to have sponsored this bill in the House and to have first introduced the wildlife provisions which were subsequently sustained by both Houses of Congress and the President.

Not only will this provision do much to protect and enhance the portions of these river systems which have appealed to sportsmen from all over the world, but it serves to write a new page in the history of reclamation and wildlife development.

It was on this same river system that the first Federal reclamation project was built shortly after the turn of the century. The lack of planning at that time resulted in the faulty constructed Derby Dam, which aided substantially in destroying the fabulous fishing at world-famous Pyramid Lake. As the new dams are constructed under the authorized Washoe project, we can now be assured that proper attention will be paid to enhancing the fishing and wildlife resources in that area.

MILITARY LANDS

Considerable progress was made in the House this past year with regard to hunting and fishing on military reservations. The measure I co-authored requiring congressional approval of any proposed military land withdrawal or reservation from the public domain in excess of 5,000 acres passed the House in the closing days but did not get through the Senate. I am confident, however, that it will be reintroduced next year and in the meantime will greatly influence the Defense Department in its improving attitude on this important subject.

As it passed the House, the bill would require compliance with State fish and game laws on military areas and cooperation with state conservation officials in the management of wildlife resources.

Through continuing negotiations with the Department of the Navy, I have been assured of written agreements to allow hunting on the Navy aerial gunnery ranges in Nevada. With proper management, the wildlife resources of this area can be improved under the multiple-use arrangement I have proposed.

DESERT GAME RANGE

In the case of the Air Force versus the Desert Game Range in southern Nevada, I have asked that the Department of Defense study possible location of their proposed gunnery range expansion to the north of the Desert Game Range. This study is now in progress.

PREDATOR CONTROL

The wildlife resources of Nevada will be better protected by the increased funds for predator control we were able to obtain this year. A total of $96,710 in Federal funds for control of predatory animals and injurious rodents on Nevada rangeland was approved—a hundred per cent increase over last year.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service will spend $655,680 in Nevada during the next 12 months. Of this amount $275,000 will be in Federal aid payments to States for wildlife restoration projects.

DUCK STAMP

Although legislation I sponsored last year provided substantial funds for wetlands acquisition, much remains to be done in this important field. It is my feeling that a greater portion of duck-stamp revenues should be spent for wetlands acquisition, and perhaps the duck-stamp price should be increased to make sure we acquire enough breeding grounds to keep apace with our skyrocketing population.

If an increase in the duck-stamp cost occurs, it should be specifically earmarked for waterfowl habitat acquisition, and nothing else till the acreage so badly needed is acquired. As most sportsmen are so keenly aware, one of the serious defects of existing law is the fact that duck-stamp funds can be and are being used for other purposes than acquisition of land and water resources. If waterfowling is to remain a sport for the average American citizen who does not belong to a private club, it is important that we speed up the rate of obtaining waterfowl habitat. It has been gratifying to see the interest on the part of sportsmen in Nevada in this regard and the progress made. The Mason Valley Ranch in Lyon County, acquired last year by the Nevada State Fish and Game Commission, is an excellent example of what can be done with foresight and determination.

FISH HATCHERY

I have been in close touch with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, urging establishment of a fish hatchery in the vicinity of Glen Canyon Dam for the purpose of stocking the Colorado River.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

H. R. 9540, the water pollution control bill, passed both Houses and was signed into law. It should be of considerable aid in the nationwide effort to improve our fishing resources.

BONNER BILL

Although there was opposition from Nevada to the original proposal to this measure, it was reshaped in committee and has generally met with favor by conservationists. It would create an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries and Wildlife as a primary step in strengthening the whole program. Under the Assistant Secretary, it would establish the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, headed by a single administrator, thus preserving machinery for the necessary integration and coordination in the many places where fish and wildlife problems overlap.

COORDINATION ACT

I was disappointed to see that the efforts to revise this important law so as to insure a broader recognition of fish and wildlife values in reclamation projects met with no success. It was most gratifying, however, to see the enhanced awareness of recreational values reflected in the Washoe project, where $2 million was authorized for fish and wildlife purposes.

Aaron Riche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 10, 1956, the Los Angeles Jewish community honored Aaron Riche for his 50 years in B'nai B'rith in the Embassy Room of the Hotel Ambassador in Los Angeles, Calif.

Testimonial resolution plaques from both the city council and the county

board of supervisors were also presented to Riche at the banquet.

A native of Colorado, Riche joined B'nai B'rith Denver Lodge in 1906. He was a newspaper reporter and editor in Denver and in New York City, and did publicity and public relations work in both those cities and in Los Angeles. He came to Los Angeles in 1924.

In addition to the United States Treasury Medal, he holds citations from the Red Cross, Jewish Welfare Board, Zionist Organization, Mount Sinai Hospital, Bonds of Israel Government, Key Men of the Welfare Fund, California Safety Council, United Jewish Appeal, United States Savings Bond Campaign and the Jewish National Fund.

The city's citation, which was in the form of a framed plaque, was presented by Fifth District Councilwoman Rosalind Wiener Wyman.

Joe Herman, Jr., was chairman of sponsors for the testimonial.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

It will be noted that there were 132 rollcalls and my attendance record was 100 percent.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 26	Quorum call	Present.
3	Jan. 31	H. R. 8780. To amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt farmers from paying the Federal excise tax for gasoline used on their farms. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yes.
4	...do...	H. R. 8796. To provide $275,000 for expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 386 to 1.)	Yes.
5	Feb. 1	H. R. 7993. To authorize the construction of 23 new naval ships and the modernization of 23 vessels at an estimated cost of $1,414,662,000. (Passed 358 to 3.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
7	Feb. 8	H. Res. 396. To disapprove the sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant, Plancor 980 (rubber-producing facility). (Defeated 61 to 309.)	No.
8	Feb. 20	H. R. 8710. To amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947	Yes.
9	Feb. 28	Quorum call	Present.
10	...do...	H. Res. 311. To provide 4 hours of debate on H. R. 3383, to authorize construction of the Colorado River storage project. (Passed 354 to 26.)	Yes.
11	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
12	Feb. 29	Quorum call	Present.
13	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
14	...do...	H. R. 3383. To authorize the construction and operation of the Colorado River storage project. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Yes.
15	Mar. 7	H. R. 9739. An amendment to delete language authorizing 11 supergrade positions for the General Services Administration. (Defeated 150 to 229.)	No.
16	Mar. 13	H. R. 9166. To suspend rules and pass the bill to extend to Apr. 1, 1957, the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. (Passed 366 to 4.)	Yes.
17	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
19	...do...	H. R. 8320. To adopt the conference report on the bill extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for fiscal year 1956. (Defeated 195 to 215.)	No.
20	...do...	H. R. 8320. To increase by $10 million the funds available for a school-milk program this year, and to extend and expand this program for next 2 years, and to extend and expand the brucellosis-eradication program for 2 years. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yes.
21	...do...	S. 1271. To recommit to Committee on Armed Services the bill to authorize appointment of 2 retired military personnel to civilian positions in Department of Justice. (Defeated 80 to 310.)	No.
22	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
23	...do...	H. R. 12. To recommit the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1956 to the committee of conference with instruction to alter the bill. (Defeated 181 to 238.)	Yes.
24	...do...	H. R. 12. To adopt the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1956. (Passed 237 to 181.)	No.
25	Apr. 12	H. R. 9893. To authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yes.
26	Apr. 18	Quorum call	Present.
27	...do...	H. R. 12. To override the Presidential veto of the Agricultural Act of 1956. (Defeated 202 to 241, a ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
28	Apr. 23	H. R. 7228. To amend the act authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River near Jones Point, Va., by transferring responsibility from the Interior to the Commerce Department and altering the design of the bridge. (Passed 282 to 8.)	Yes.
29	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
30	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
31	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
32	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
34	...do...	H. R. 10721. An amendment to appropriation bill for Departments of State and Justice fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration Service. (Defeated 174 to 184.)	No.
35	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
36	...do...	H. R. 10660. To adopt the Federal Highway and Revenue Acts of 1956. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yes.
37	May 2	Quorum call	Present.
38	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
39	...do...	H. R. 10875. To adopt an amendment to earmark $50 million for payments for reduction of grazing land for 1956–59. (Passed 199 to 195.)	No.
40	...do...	H. R. 10875. To adopt an amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price of upland cotton. (Defeated 186 to 208.)	No.
41	...do...	H. R. 10875. To recommit the bill for incorporation of provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Defeated 184 to 211.)	Yes.
42	...do...	H. R. 10875. To enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). (Passed 314 to 78.)	Present.
43	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
44	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
46	...do...	H. R. 10986. To delete sec. 633 which would require congressional approval of disposal by the Department of Defense of business-type operations which can be handled by private enterprise. (Passed 222 to 156.)	Yes.
47	...do...	H. R. 10986. To approve the bill for Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal 1957 totaling $33.63 billion. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yes.
48	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
49	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 17	H. R. 8901. To recommit to committee the bill which would provide for restoration of a franchise to Capital Transit Co. with several charter revisions. (Defeated 161 to 172.)	Yes.
51	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
52	...do...	H. R. 11124. To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges. (Passed 237 to 52.)	Yes.
53	May 22	H. R. 11319. To amend the public works appropriation bill to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Passed 174 to 148.)	No.
54	May 23	H. R. 10875. To adopt the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). (Passed 304 to 59.)	Yes.
55	May 24	S. J. Res. 135. To adopt the conference report providing payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River Basin project. (Passed 176 to 126.)	No.
56	May 31	H. R. 10285. To enact the Farm Credit Act of 1956. (Passed 246 to 4.)	Yes.
57	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
58	...do...	Quorum call	Present.
59	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
60	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
61	...do...	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
62	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
63	...do	H. R. 11356. To extend the mutual security program for 1 year and authorize an appropriation of $3,563,475,000. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Yes.
64	...do	Quorum call	Present.
65	...do	H. R. 1804 (also H. R. 11). To strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. (Passed 393 to 3.)	Yes.
66	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
67	...do	Quorum call	Present.
68	...do	Quorum call	Present.
69	June 13	H. R. 5881. To recommit the conference report on the bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. (Defeated 179 to 209.)	Yes.
70	...do	H. R. 4090. To recommit to committee for certain alterations the bill which would require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector of United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators. (Defeated 151 to 228.)	Yes.
71	...do	H. R. 9540. To recommit to the committee in order to delete section 6, which provides Federa. grants for construction, from the Water Pollution Control Act. (Defeated 165 to 213.)	Yes.
72	...do	H. R. 9540. To pass the Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yes.
73	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
74	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
75	...do	S. 3295. To extend daylight saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yes.
76	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
77	...do	H. R. 7886. To recommit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the bill to liberalize the non-service-connected pension awards for certain World War I veterans. (Defeated 110 to 305.)	Yes.
78	...do	H. R. 7886. To pass the bill to liberalize the basis for and extend the monthly rates of non-service-connected pension awards for certain World War I veterans. (Passed 364 to 51.)	No.
79	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
80	...do	Quorum call	Present.
81	...do	H. R. 9852. To adopt the conference report extending provisions of the Defense Production Act and including a requirement that the procurement of goods and services be dispersed geographically. (Passed 200 to 197.)	No.
82	...do	H. Res. 554. To adopt a rule providing for 6 hours of debate on H. R. 7535 to provide for Federal aid for school construction. (Passed 327 to 7.)	Yes.
83	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
84	...do	Quorum call	Present.
85	July 2	H. R. 9801. To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa. (Passed 325 to 59.)	Yes.
86	...do	S. 2379. To suspend the rules and pass the bill to promote the fishing industry by providing for the training of needed personnel. (Defeated 133 to 254, a ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
87	July 3	Quorum call	Present.
88	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
89	...do	H. R 7535. To amend the bill for Federal aid to school construction by allowing States to retain 1 percent of their Federal income taxes for school construction. (Defeated 168 to 250.)	No.
90	...do	H. R. 7535. To amend the school bill to provide that no Federal funds should be allotted to any State which fails to comply with decisions of the Supreme Court. (Passed 225 to 192.)	Yes.
91	...do	H. R 7535. To recommit the school bill in order to change the formula for distribution of Federal funds so to consider need and demonstrated effort of the States. (Defeated 158 to 262.)	Yes.
92	...do	H. R. 7535. To pass the bill for Federal aid for school construction. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	No.
93	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
94	...do	H. R. 11380. To pass the bill readjusting postal rates. (Passed 217 to 165.)	Yes.
95	July 9	H. R. 9893. To recommit the conference report on the military construction bill in order to substitute Kalkaska for Manistee as the site for airbase in northern Michigan. (Defeated 29 to 343.)	Yes.
96	...do	H. R. 11967. To pass the bill reactivating the National Memorial Stadium Commission and designating a site for the stadium. (Passed 287 to 80.)	No.
97	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
98	...do	H. R. 12130. To pass the mutual security appropriation bill. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Yes.
99	July 12	H. Res. 584. To approve a rule providing for the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill and waiving all points of order. (Passed 361 to 30.)	Yes.
100	...do	H. R. 12138. To recommit to committee the supplemental appropriations bill to strike out $14,325,000 for the Jones Point Bridge. (Defeated 24 to 370.)	No.
101	...do	H. R. 12038. To pass the bill to provide for a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation for veterans. (Passed 391 to 0.)	Yes.
102	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
103	July 18	H. Con. Res. 265. To adopt the resolution expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the U. N. (Passed 391 to 0.)	Yes.
104	...do	H. R. 11708. To amend the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of title I of the act. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yes.
105	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
106	...do	On motion to lay on table motion to dispense with further proceedings under call (Yes vote would permit filibuster). (Defeated 104 to 290.)	No.
107	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
109	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
110	...do	H. R. 627. To recommit civil-rights bill to Committee on the Judiciary	No.
111	...do	H. R. 627. To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights within United States jurisdiction. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yes.
112	...do	S. 1644. To suspend rules and pass bill prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. (Defeated 245 to 145, ⅔ required for suspension passage.)	Yes.
113	...do	H. R. 12227. Motion to suspend rules and pass H. R. 12227 to provide a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool and hair. (Defeated 216 to 123, ⅔ required for suspension passage.)	Yes.
114	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
115	...do	H. R. 7902. A bill to enact into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Appropriations Act. (Passed 201 to 185.)	No.
116	...do	H. R. 12061. On motion to strike out enacting clause on bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program. (Defeated 195 to 199.)	Yes.
117	...do	H. R. 12061. On motion to recommit bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program. (Passed 203 to 191.)	Yes.
118	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
119	...do	H. Res. 618. An amendment to the rule providing for offering an amendment to H. R. 11742 (housing bill). (Defeated 92 to 299.)	No.
120	...do	To adopt 8 resolutions citing witnesses for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 373 to 9.)	Yes.
121	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
122	...do	Quorum call	Present.
123	...do	H. Res. 641. On rule to provide for consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H. R. 412, to authorize construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project. (Defeated 179 to 194.)	Yes.
124	...do	H. Res. 602. On agreeing to resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, a bill to amend Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. (Defeated 184 to 178.)	No.
125	...do	H. R. 8902. On motion to recommit relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from sale or other disposition of certain property (Civil Aeronautics Act). (Passed 196 to 153.)	Yes.
126	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
127	...do	H. Res. 625. To adopt resolution providing consideration of S. 3338 a bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. (Passed 219 to 126.)	No.
128	...do	S. 3338. On passage of bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. (Passed 201 to 140.)	No.
129	...do	Quorum call	Present.
130	...do	Quorum call	Present.
131	...do	H. Res. 604. On resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7850, a bill to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance of Little Wood River reclamation project. (Passed 173 to 168.)	Yes.
132	...do	Quorum call	Present.

Report and Review of the Major Activities of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report and a review of the major activities of the 84th Congress. It is felt that such a report is due the people of the Fifth Indiana Congressional District.

A review of the 84th Congress necessarily must be brief, even to touch upon the most important topics. The second session started very slowly, but finally, after being prodded as a do-nothing Congress, the Democratic majority in control of this Congress pushed nearly every conceivable type of legislation to the floor.

Due to early inactivity, some good measures were not considered and, due to the rush in the closing weeks, many good measures were lost. At the same time, some unnecessarily bad measures were passed by both the House and the Senate. As a nation, we can be grateful for the bicameral system which made it possible for one body to either defeat or improve certain undesirable legislation.

Two thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight bills and resolutions were passed by the 84th Congress. This is the largest number of any Congress since the 71st Congress—1929–30.

Nineteen thousand and thirty-nine bills and resolutions were submitted. There is a total of 531 Senators and Representatives, which would make an average of 36 such bills and resolutions for each Senator and Representative.

One of the outstanding accomplishments of this administration was the balancing of the budget, which also provided a surplus of nearly $2 billion. This surplus will be available to help reduce the national debt and is the accomplishment of which the administration can be justly proud. However, even if we are able to reduce the national debt $2 billion per year, it will require a long time to bring the debt down to a sum that would not be a deterrent, as it is at the present time, to the general economy.

The appropriations amounted to $52.2 billion in the first session and $59.8 billion in the second session. This was an increase over the Republican 83d Congress. Some people have said that this was one of the most extravagant Congresses of peacetime years.

Remember that the large balance of this year was made possible by the Republican 83d Congress that attempted to practice some economy in appropriations and efficiency in Government agencies. The huge sums appropriated during these two sessions will make it increasingly difficult to secure a balanced budget and a surplus next year.

A highway bill was passed which provides $33 billion to be spent over a 13-year period. This is on a pay-as-you-go basis which means that everybody helps to pay with increased Federal tax on gasoline and auto accessories. Some have referred to this as a huge public-works project, but it is not to be compared with the old WPA program because highways are needed for an expanding economy and for safety measures.

A postal-rate increase was passed by the House. Nearly four decades had passed since changes had been made in certain postage rates. All operating costs of the Post Office Department had increased and, consequently, that agency was operating at a terrific loss each year. However, the Senate failed to act on this bill and, therefore, an annual deficit of nearly half a billion dollars will continue in the Post Office Department.

Natural resources presented the recurring question of public versus private power. By a small margin the House passed the Hells Canyon public-power project, but the Senate defeated it. The Senate action reaffirmed the action of the 83d Congress which saves the taxpayers millions of dollars and, in addition, will produce nearly $10 million in tax revenue each year.

A proposal to spend $440 million for federally owned atomic reactors was passed by the Senate but defeated by the House. This action further confirmed the principles of private ownership instead of more creeping socialism.

The Arkansas-Fryingpan reclamation project in Colorado was defeated.

The Natural Gas Act was passed by both Houses but vetoed by the President. The purpose of this law was to establish State instead of Federal regulation of natural gas. The net result would have been more and cheaper natural gas for the consumers.

Increased rates were predicted if this bill failed. Already $923,000 boost has been requested for a portion of southern Indiana. In addition, it is predicted that rates will continue to increase if Federal control is pressed upon the producers of natural gas. Indiana, especially, was greatly benefited when it received an increased supply of natural gas several years ago. As a result of this increased supply of natural gas, the quality of the gas for the consumer was improved and the rates were lowered. Indiana consumers of natural gas would benefit very materially if the provisions of the Natural Gas Act had been permitted to become law. Of course, the President's veto was not based on the fact that the principle itself was in question, but rather that certain lobbying tactics were deplored by the President.

Federal aid to education was presented in the form of Federal aid for school construction. This proposal was defeated in the House of Representatives. Some observers credited the inclusion of the segregation issue as a cause of the defeat of this measure. Actually, most of the Congressmen were opposed to the principle of Federal aid to education, and it is felt that the bill would have been defeated even if the Powell segregation amendment had not been offered. The desire to retain public schools instead of Government schools remains predominant especially in view of the many letters that were received from the fifth district in opposition to Federal aid to education.

Civil rights was one of the big debates of both sessions. The bill that was proposed really was the recommendation of the administration and received bipartisan support. It would have set up a commission to review questions and problems of segregation. Actually, it was an implementation of the rights guaranteed in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. This bill passed the House of Representatives but no action was taken in the Senate.

Foreign aid was another issue that is a constantly recurring problem. There are many of us who have had the opportunity of witnessing the work of several of the foreign-aid programs with the result that many people begin to wonder whether or not the huge sums of money being spent for foreign aid really are producing the desired results. The foreign aid again was increased to a total of $3.8 billion. Many billions of dollars also remain unexpended for this purpose.

The foreign policy was implemented by certain types of legislation, but in general it still retains peace and a recognized leadership in international understanding and determination for national sovereignty.

Defense appropriations totaled $66½ billion, plus $5 billion more for atomic-energy development. This is the largest in peacetime.

In keeping with further expansion of the military services the number of Army officers will be increased from 30,600 to 49,500 and the Air Force officers from 27,500 to 69,425.

Farm bill—the first one was vetoed because the 90-percent high parity was included. This system was the one previously used that had brought only lower prices to farmers, higher costs to consumers and increased taxes to all.

The second farm bill, though delayed nearly 4 months, was a reasonable compromise. Its principal feature is a soil bank providing $1.2 billion for conservation purposes of removing certain crops presently in surplus from production.

Health bills: Reinsurance was defeated in the first session. A bill to provide funds for medical research was passed and the polio vaccine program was continued for 1 more year.

Social-security contributions were increased and benefits were broadened. Two new features—totally disabled may draw benefits at 50 years of age, and widows and working women now can get pensions at 62 instead of 65 years of age.

Minimum wage was increased to $1 per hour.

Veterans will be receiving increased pensions and, with limitations, will have age 50 considered for total disability, service connected.

I also wish to comment briefly on certain bills that I submitted. One bill that would have made the provisions of the Hatch Act—participation by Federal employees in political activities—inapplicable to State employees, passed the House unanimously but was not considered by the Senate committee. This is a very worthwhile measure for those who believe that all power should not be concentrated in the Federal Government. The provisions of the Hatch Act were to

apply only to Federal employees and my bill would have corrected some of the recent applications of this measure to State employees.

I also introduced a bill that would validate the sea duty pay which was promised to the men who served in the Navy on the Great Lakes and on the steamship *Sequoia* during World War II. This bill was passed by both Houses and has been signed into law by the President.

I also introduced another bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the interstate transportation of migratory farm labor. Senator MAGNUSON introduced a similar bill in the Senate. Each bill passed its respective House and also has been signed into law as one of the labor reform proposals of the administration.

I also introduced legislation that would not permit the Federal Communications Commission to discriminate against newspapers or other organizations engaged in the gathering and dissemination of news in the allocation of television channels and radio wavelengths. This bill had hearings in the House, but no action was taken. It is a field that should be explored and studied.

In the field of agriculture, I introduced one bill that would have set up a soil-bank program and another that would exempt the farmers from paying the tax on gasoline used for purely agricultural purposes. Similar bills were passed and enacted into law by this Congress.

I also introduced a bill to provide for agricultural research in the marketing and additional uses of agriculture products. This seems to be a very important requirement today, because agriculture is faced with an overproduction problem. It seems much wiser to increase the consumption of agricultural products than to reduce their production.

It has been my privilege to serve on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Our subcommittee made extensive studies in the field of operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and also in the field of war claims. These war claims present a very important problem that must be settled.

Recently I also was appointed to serve on the Traffic Safety Subcommittee. This committee is charged with the study of the many traffic accidents that are occurring on our Nation's highways. The Nation was shocked recently when 128 passengers were killed in an airplane crash over the Grand Canyon. However, 115 people are killed every day in automobile accidents. Thus it is felt that this committee is charged with a grave responsibility of making some studies in the hope that recommendations may be made to decrease this terrific toll of lives.

As mentioned in the first part of my comments, 2,878 bills and resolutions were passed by this 84th Congress. Thus it is hoped that individuals and groups who may be studying the voting records of any Congressmen will not select any small group of bills—20 or 30—as often is the case, to determine a voting record. Each Representative is charged with the obligation of representing all of the people in his district with a full understanding of the needs and requirements of the entire United States.

The many requests that came through the mail daily to our office were handled promptly by a very efficient staff. I wish to pay tribute to the staff members and all others who cooperated in making it possible to render a service to the people of the Fifth District.

Agreements Reached in Organizational Meetings of Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would like to report to the House membership that the subcommittee held a series of organizational meetings prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress and reached preliminary agreement with respect to subcommittee plans. For the information of my colleagues and others interested persons, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a press release announcing agreement reached in the subcommittee's organizational meetings:

HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CUSTOMS, TARIFFS, AND RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES AGREEMENT REACHED IN SUBCOMMITTEE'S ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS

The Honorable HALE BOGGS, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements, of the Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress the membership of the subcommittee had held a series of organizational meetings and had reached preliminary agreement with respect to subcommittee plans. The subcommittee has reached agreement on the subcommittee's activity during the period from the adjournment of the 2d session to the convening of the 85th Congress.

It is expected that staff study will occupy a substantial portion of the subcommittee's activity during the adjournment period. This study will include detailed consideration of specific aspects of foreign trade matters. In addition to the public hearings by the subcommittee described below, the views of interested organizations and individuals will be solicited in regard to various aspects of the subject matter coming within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has tentatively agreed to conduct 2 weeks of public hearings during the month of September in Washington, D. C., and 2 weeks of public hearings beginning in late November at selected locations abroad. The details of these hearings are yet to be developed and they will be announced as they are determined.

In the short-range study scheduled to take place during the present adjournment period, the subcommittee and its staff will endeavor to investigate and study various aspects of our customs, tariff, and trade agreement laws and the administration of the agreements entered into thereunder as they relate to particular industries. Special emphasis will be placed during the inquiry on the relationship and effect of these matters on the foreign economic policy of the United States and their effect upon domestic producers and employment.

The subcommittee will select for study and review typical cases involving efforts of domestic industries to secure relief from imports through administrative and statutory procedures available to a domestic industry. This study will cover all aspects of these relief provisions, including their operation, adequacy, and effectiveness, the factual situations existing in the selected industries as to employment, production, and the impact of imports, the foreign trade and foreign economic policy implications involved, the relationship of the particular industry to our overall national economy, including trends and consumption of the items produced, the role of domestic production, the role of imports, and the role of the items in world trade.

Chairman BOGGS stressed the fact that this review and study will be limited to typical cases which will result in the development of information by the subcommittee which would be of general applicability. In this connection the chairman announced that such staff studies will be directed to the development of objective and factual information for subcommittee consideration.

Staff studies along these lines will proceed immediately. The subcommittee will announce at a later date the specific areas of inquiry and its further agenda.

The subcommittee has directed that the annual report of the Tariff Commission be evaluated by the staff to determine its adequacy for the purpose of informing Congress and interested persons with respect to tariff matters. In announcing the subcommittee hearing schedule, Chairman BOGGS stated that if the time of the membership permits additional hearings may be scheduled in October.

Persons having suggestions for improving our customs and tariff laws and comments with respect to specific aspects of the operation of these laws are invited to submit their written views to the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Such expression of views will be given careful staff study and will be reviewed by the subcommittee.

Requests to be heard before the subcommittee in public hearings should be held in abeyance until a specific hearing announcement is made.

The members of the subcommittee are: HALE BOGGS, Louisiana, chairman; CECIL R. KING, California; BURR P. HARRISON, Virginia; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; DANIEL A. REED, New York; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Connecticut; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri; ex officio, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Tribute to Joseph F. O'Hern, Manager, Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Newark, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to pay tribute to a public servant who is

faithful, conscientious, capable, and personable. He is Joseph F. O'Hern, manager of the Veterans' Administration's regional office, Newark, N. J. Too often in life, we pause to complain rather than give praise where praise is due.

Since I have been elected to Congress, I have come to learn what a trying job it must be to be a Regional Manager of the Veterans' Administration. I know I have called on Joseph O'Hern an infinite number of times to help my constituents. I have called Mr. O'Hern morning, noon, and night, and have always found a courteous reply and ready response to be of assistance.

I felt it my duty to make these remarks so that his faithful service might be brought to the attention of the Congress and be recorded on the records of Congress. His superiors should be proud of Joseph O'Hern. I know I am grateful to him and so are the constituents of the 14th District, whom he has served so well.

I think he is typical of many faithful Veterans' Administration employees and so that they may not feel that their work goes unsung, these words of praise stand as a tribute to them and their excellent performance.

Congressman Young Aids Nevada Workingman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the American worker is better off in every way today than at any other time in history. His wages are at record levels; his purchasing power is at an alltime high.

The working men and women of Nevada have shared in this record prosperity which is made even more of a blessing because it is accompanied by peace.

As a strong supporter of the sound and forward-looking policies of President Eisenhower which have produced this peace and plenty, I am proud to have played a part in these achievements:

Record employment: The 62.9 million men and women at work in January of this year were the greatest number of Americans ever employed in that month and represented an increase of 2.7 million over January a year ago and 1.9 million more than the previous record January in 1953.

Unemployment: The past 3 years under President Eisenhower averaged less unemployment than in the last term of his predecessor, despite nearly a three million increase in civil labor force and despite the fact 2½ of the years 1948 to 1952 were war years.

Wages: Both hourly and weekly wages are at all-time record highs—averaging nearly 13 per cent higher in peacetime 1955 than in wartime 1952.

Prices: The 12-cent loss in buying power—nearly one-eighth of each wage dollar—from inflation in the years 1950, 1951, and 1952 has been cut to less than three-fourths of 1 cent in President Eisenhower's first 3 years.

I have supported the sound fiscal policies and the faith in basic American principles which made these achievements possible.

As Nevada's Congressman, I am also proud of the legislative achievements improving the lot of all of us who work for a living.

Social security: Because the Eisenhower administration has extended social security to 10 million additional workers and liberalized benefits for 8,100,000, 9 out of 10 workers and their families are now protected against loss of income due to old age or death. Benefits have been increased substantially. Retired persons may earn more income on their own and still draw social security benefits.

Unemployment insurance: Four million additional workers have been covered by unemployment insurance.

Minimum wage: The minimum wage was raised to $1, effective March 1, 1956, directly increasing the pay envelopes of over two million workers and indirectly benefiting millions more by raising the general wage level.

Vocational rehabilitation: This humanitarian program has been improved and expanded to benefit additional hundreds of thousands of handicapped workers.

Federal workers: Armed Forces and Federal civilian workers received pay raises and insurance benefits.

Railroad retirement: These benefits were increased and tax provisions changed to aid retired people.

Nevada working men and women have shared in this nationwide prosperity. However, as your Congressman, I have worked to see that our own State is properly developed so that we will continue to hold our high position in terms of per capita income and general well-being. Here are a few accomplishments:

Sponsored the Henderson bill and other efforts to bring industry to Nevada.

Supported the new highway bill, which will bring millions of dollars to our State, thousands of new jobs, improved tourist business, opportunities for new enterprise.

Authored the Washoe project bill, which will aid the development of western Nevada and bring many new jobs to that area.

Fought for the Nevada tungsten industry to protect the jobs of hundreds of Nevada working people.

Stopped the Keating bill, which would have closed down one of Nevada's biggest industries and left thousands unemployed.

Have seen to it that the Nevada workingman in southern Nevada has an opportunity to acquire a small tract.

Supported the tax-cut bill which reduced the taxes of wage earners by $4.7 billion—and which represented a savings of $200 a year for the average Nevada taxpaying family of four.

Reply by Hon. Wayne Morse to Report Presented by Hon. H. Alexander Smith Defending the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my reply to the report presented by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in defense of the National Labor Relations Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE TO REPORT PRESENTED BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY DEFENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On July 9, 1956, the senior Senator from New Jersey, ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. SMITH], presented to the Senate a report prepared at the direction of himself and the senior Senator from California, the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], purporting to defend the policies and conduct of the present administration of the National Labor Relations Act. The report embodies, among other exhibits, letters from Chairman Leedom and General Counsel Kammholz of the Board, addressed to the senior Senator from Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], likewise purporting to defend the present administration. That report and these letters purport to show that the documented charges which I made in my speech on the floor of the Senate on March 23, 1956, "are not supported by the facts." In so doing, they accuse me of bias and prejudice against management and in favor of labor unions, conveniently ignoring the fact that I supported many of the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions, including two of the most important changes which imposed restrictions on labor unions and created new rights for employers—the provisions prohibiting strikes for recognition at a time when the employer was bound to deal with a rival, certified union, and the provision outlawing jurisdictional strikes. They accuse me of misapprehending "the intent of Congress and the meaning of the statute." And they accuse me of inconsistency in calling for a congressional investigation of the Board today, while I opposed a congressional investigation of the Board in 1949.

In evaluating these personal attacks upon me, as in evaluating all of the material submitted, it is indispensable to recall the precise accusation that I made against the present administration. For only in the light of the exact charge, and the evidence which I adduced to support it, does it appear that the entire defense is compounded of innumerable fallacies, distortions, and outright misrepresentations skillfully jumbled to becloud the issue and hide the relevant facts. When the fog is pierced by analysis, the defenses themselves reveal admissions of the charge.

I. POLICY OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

In my speech on March 23, I said that the Eisenhower administration wanted the American public to believe that it was friendly to labor unions; that prior to his elec-

tion the President had admitted that the Taft-Hartley Act, as it then stood, went too far in the direction of permitting employers to throttle, destroy, and defeat labor organizations; and that it would be the policy of his administration to reduce rather than to multiply the shackles which the Taft-Hartley Act had placed on employee self-organization and effective collective bargaining.

Of course, the Eisenhower administration would not willingly relinquish the political advantage which it gains from such a public evaluation of its aims and objectives. It has, indeed, gone to some lengths to maintain the illusion. Secretary of Labor Mitchell, for example, was permitted to advocate publicly that section 14 (b) should be repealed. That is the notorious and illogical provision which gives precedence over the Taft-Hartley Act to State laws which contain antiunion security provisions more restrictive than those of the Federal Act, but, at the same time, outlaws State laws which contain less restrictive provisions. And, as the report proclaims, the President did, in 1954, submit a proposal to delete the prohibition against treating replaced economic strikers as employees eligible to vote in an election to determine the bargaining representative of the struck plant, and to eliminate the mandatory injunction provision.

At the same time, however, the administration took steps to assure that none of these developments, favorable to unions, would occur. The President immediately disassociated himself from Secretary Mitchell's views on section 14 (b). And the bill which the administration introduced for the avowed purpose of effectuating the President's recommendation to eliminate the union-busting provisions from the Taft-Hartley Act was loaded down with other provisions, the cumulative effect of which, if enacted, would have been to jeopardize and threaten the interests of organized working men and women to an even greater extent than those provisions in the present law. That tactic was designed to assure that just what did happen would happen, namely, that the bill would be recommitted by "a solid, defectionless, party-line vote of the Democratic Members of the Senate." The purpose of the maneuver was obvious then as it is obvious now. The Democrats in the Senate could be blamed, as the report now seeks to place blame upon them, for frustrating the President's recommendation to remove union-busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the administration could be praised for attempting to keep its promise to remove these provisions. The American people, it was hoped, could be misled into believing that the administration was not hostile to organized labor.

The report is correct in saying that the "question * * * concerns the attitude of the Eisenhower administration." But the record shows that the guise in which the administration would like to appear to the public is a disguise. The administration's real attitude is shown by its failure to have submitted a simple bill to eliminate the provisions which the Republicans, for public consumption, admit are union busting. Such a bill could have been enacted into law if the President would work for Republican votes to add to the majority of Democratic votes in favor of such a measure.

But the hypocrisy stands most clearly revealed, as I demonstrated in my speech, by what the Republicans have done to the National Labor Relations Act through administration. Taft-Hartley, as every Senator who was a Member of this body when it was debated and passed will recall, was enacted only after many retreats and compromises by the rightwing proponents of straitjacketing labor unions. As a result, the act did not go as far in an antilabor direction as the NAM and other reactionary employer groups wanted to go. Almost from the beginning, these groups clamored to accomplish through administration what they had been unable to accomplish in the 80th Congress through legislation. Robert N. Denham, the Republican General Counsel of the Board, constantly attacked the Board for failing to construe the act as if the Hartley bill, rather than the conference bill, had been enacted. To coerce the Board to amend the statute under the guise of construction was the object of the investigation of the Board proposed in 1949.

Of course, many Senators, I among them, opposed this blatant attempt to destroy the Board's integrity; to dictate to the Board the manner in which the Board should exercise its discretion in these areas in which the act vests it with discretion; to compel the Board members, for fear of incurring the displeasure of powerful congressional groups, to construe the statute not judicially, but so as to favor employer interests hostile to labor unions. Investigation of the Board in 1949 was not defeated because Senators deemed it beyond the realm of possibility that an administrative agency could deliberately subvert the legislative process by embarking on a large-scale program of amending the statute under the guise of interpretation. Nor was it defeated on the ground that if such a development occurred Congress should close its eyes and do nothing about it.

Investigation was defeated because a majority of the committee recognized that the charges of misconstruction of the statute which had been leveled at the Board had no more substance than the soup of which Lincoln spoke as having been concocted from the shadow of a chicken that had starved to death. Investigation was defeated because a majority realized that it was not the Board's interpretation, but the interpretations which the proponents of the investigation would have foisted upon the Board that would have perverted the statute and defeated Congress' purposes. It was defeated because a majority, including myself, saw that a congressional investigation under these circumstances, and for these purposes, could serve only to intimidate and destroy a sound administration, and could not possibly serve to protect the integrity of the legislative process from administrative abuse. I am proud of having played a part in safeguarding quasi-judicial administration from such a wholly unwarranted attack.

What happened then? The same powerful employer groups and their reactionary allies, among them Joseph C. Wells, Denham's former Associate General Counsel, who has represented employers exclusively in labor relations matters since leaving his office, and whom the report characterizes as a "highly qualified observer," kept up a constant drumfire of criticism of the Board for refusing to transform the statute into the more intensely antilabor weapon which they had tried so hard, but failed, to forge. But, I hastened to add, even they suggested no such sweeping, revolutionary, wholesale change in interpretation as the Eisenhower appointees later accomplished.

The crucial test came when the Republican administration took office early in 1953. At that time the Board was composed of members appointed by the Truman administration, and the General Counsel was a Truman appointee. The most significant rulings of the Board interpreting the provisions which had been added by the Taft-Hartley Act and the changes which Taft-Hartley made in the Wagner Act provisions had met and withstood the challenge of court review. They were firmly embedded in the law. The terms of most of the Board members and the General Counsel would not expire for a considerable period. There was little prospect that, on the merits, any of the rulings of which the reactionary employer groups complained would be altered or reversed by the Board.

What did the administration do? Did it publicly adopt the position of the NAM that Taft-Hartley had been misconstrued by the Board; that it should be interpreted without reference to its language, legislative history, and the objectives of Congress, but only with reference to the result which would bear most strongly against unions? Did it ask Congress to amend the statute to reverse the Board's interpretations which the courts had approved? It did not. And the reason is plain. To have done that, openly and forthrightly, would have sacrificed the political advantage which the administration hoped to retain by masquerading as a friend of labor organizations. Moreover, that plan would never have succeeded. Congress would not have enacted a proposal to amend the Taft-Hartley Act to make it even more antilabor.

The administration chose another course, a course which would give its reactionary employer groups what they wanted, but, at the same time, so obscure the development from the American people that the administration could continue to pose as pro, or at least not anti, labor.

The administration waited until vacancies occurred among the Board's membership and in the Office of the General Counsel and then appointed to these posts, one by one, handpicked exponents of the reactionary employer philosophy, men who could be trusted to write their antilabor prejudices into the law.

I charged that, as part of the administration's actual program to transform the Taft-Hartley Act into a more vicious antilabor instrument, the Eisenhower appointees embarked on a program of wholesale reversals of statutory interpretations which were well established and in many instances court approved; that in every instance in which these members had a real choice between following precedent or discarding it and chose to reverse, the reversal hurt labor and benefited antiunion employers; I proved that in many of these instances the antiunion decision of the Eisenhower Board was irreconcilable with the language and legislative history of the act and that, in so changing the law, these Board members had forsaken their proper quasi-judicial role and usurped the function of Congress. I charged that the Republican appointees had ruthlessly forced out from subordinate positions in Washington and in the field offices men who had devoted virtually their entire careers to the Board's service and who were uniquely qualified by their knowledge, background, and experience to administer the law effectively and impartially as Congress wrote it. I charged that the Republican appointees replaced these men with others whose sole qualification lay in their dedication to the reactionary employer antilabor philosophy of the NAM; that each and every appointee had a promanagement background, and that many did not even possess the requisite experience to qualify for the jobs to which they were appointed under civil-service standards. I charged that the purpose of these appointments was to assure that the law would be administered in the field, in the thousands of cases which never reach formal decision by the Board, not impartially, but with bias and prejudice in favor of employers and against labor unions.

I pointed out in my speech that the consequences of this usurpation of legislative power by the Board, the consequences of this biased and prejudiced administration of an already biased act, have done immense harm to organized and unorganized workers alike. Men and women who sought to improve their lives and living conditions by joining unions have been fired from their jobs and been denied redress. Strikes which would have been won if the law had been fairly applied have been lost. Peaceful picketing, the only effective weapon working-

men have to publicize their grievances, has been illegally enjoined, and the cause of the workers has been doomed. Everywhere, and particularly in the South, the Board has made it more difficult for employees to organize and for unions to help them do it. And the Board is assisting in the perpetuation of the discriminatory wage structure by which one section of the country lures away the industries of another.

These are the charges. What have we been offered in refutation?

II. PERSONNEL

The report states that I gave "the impression that the Labor Board has been under Republican control from the moment the present administration took office in January 1953." The learned Senators who directed that the report be prepared, to say nothing of those who prepared it, may have neglected to read my speech. For in it I said: "By March 1954 the present administration had succeeded in placing a majority of its political appointees on the Board. On March 29, 1955, General Counsel Kammholz took office."

The report alleges that many of my "charges concern events and proceedings which arose prior to the date when it could accurately be said that Republicans held an actual majority of the controlling positions on the Labor Board." The only basis for this assertion is the allegation that the first appointee of President Eisenhower, Mr. Guy Farmer, as Chairman of the Board, was not a Republican. Therefore, it is now argued, the administration may not be held responsible for decisions made by the Board while Farmer was one of the Republican-appointed majority. Under any circumstances it would be absurd for an administration to disclaim responsibility for the actions of its own appointee. In this instance, however, the absurdity is heightened by the fact that the attempt rests entirely on a flimsy technicality. If, as the report claims, Farmer was not a registered Republican at the time he was appointed, it may have been because he was a resident of the District of Columbia and therefore not registered at all. The entire country was aware that he was a strong Eisenhower supporter and in his public speeches Farmer made it plain that he was appointed to bring the Eisenhower philosophy to the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. See Business Week, July 25, 1953, page 53. The claim of the report that the Republicans did not actually control a majority of positions on the Board as long as Farmer held office is, in fact, refuted by Chairman Leedom's own letter. He says: "The Eisenhower majority dates from March 1954 when Mr. Albert Beeson * * * took office."

Of even greater significance, however, is the fact that except for this frivolous attempt to disclaim responsibility for Farmer, the report does not even challenge my basic assertion that every appointee of this administration to a Board membership and as General Counsel was marked at the time of his appointment as a faithful follower of the proemployer, antilabor line. That charge, proved by the record, now stands admitted.

When we turn to the subordinate positions, we find again an attempt to evade the basic issue by resort to misleading technicalities. The report states that "contrary to the contentions of the Senator from Oregon there were no discharges of career civil-service employees." That assertion contains two patent fallacies. The first is that employees who are threatened with demotion, transfer to lower ranking or undesirable positions, or invited to stay on only until they obtain jobs elsewhere, and who in consequence resign, have not been "discharged." The Board, at least, should know better. Long ago, the Board and the courts discovered that these were favorite tactics of employers who sought on the one hand to rid themselves of union adherents and on the other to escape retribution for doing so by pretending that the employees had not been discharged but had merely resigned. The Board and the courts were not fooled. Resignations so induced they held to be "constructive discharges." See, e. g., *East Texas Motor Freight Lines* (47 NLRB 1023, 1029, affirmed, 140 F. 2d 404 (CA5)); *Marathon Electric Mfg. Corp.* (106 NLRB 1171, 1173, 1175, 1199); *Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.* (107 NLRB 790, affirmed, 217 F. 2d 575 (CA2)). The report does not even purport to deny that these intimidating tactics—the slightly more subtle but otherwise precise equivalent of outright discharge—were used to get rid of able, highly trained employees who had devoted many years to the Board's service and whose only fault lay in their devotion to impartial administration of the statute.

Chairman Leedom's assertion that there have been only six "involuntary terminations in the entire agency" during the Eisenhower Board's administration is based on the same fallacy. The number of separations which are carried on the Board's personnel records as "involuntary terminations" proves nothing, of course, as to the number of professional career employees who resigned because they were faced with either involuntary termination, demotion or degrading transfer. As any experienced administrator knows, a long-time career employee who is told he is to be discharged, or demoted, will, if he possibly can, resign to protect his employment record.

The purpose of thus ignoring the constructive discharges is, of course, to evade the contrast between the record of the Board under prior administrations, in which employees were selected on the basis of merit and experience, without regard to political considerations, and the record of wholesale removal of competent, experienced, career people by the Eisenhower Board. I charged that the Eisenhower Board had removed many competent, qualified, efficient, and nonpolitical employees of the agency for the purpose of facilitating their distortion of the legislative scheme. Not a scintilla of evidence has been offered to rebut that charge. On the record it stands admitted.

The second fallacy is that considerations of experience, merit, and ability should control personnel policy with respect to the NLRB's professional staff only for career civil-service employees and that employees who obtained their positions on merit, who devoted a lifetime to Board service, and who performed their technical duties efficiently and well are not to be considered in that category unless they have competitive civil service or veteran's status. But, as I pointed out in my speech, the professional staff of the Board, whether it has technical civil-service status or not, cannot be treated as fair game even for the spoils system, for its function is to do impartial justice under the law. That they cannot do if their security hangs on political considerations rather than the merits of their performance. More shocking still is the decimation of that staff for the purpose of replacing it with partisans in a field where impartiality between the opposing forces is the sine qua non of fair administration. Not only is there no denial that this is just what the Eisenhower appointees have done; the report blatantly admits it. No contention is made that the removal of Murdock and Feldesman was even remotely related to any consideration of merit; the only defense is that both were permitted to stay on until they had succeeded in securing other desirable employment.

The report claims that "every personnel action taken by the present Board and General Council (sic) was in full compliance with the laws and civil-service regulations." But in the face of the chicanery involved in the shifting of job titles, which I documented in my speech, and the many constructive discharges, both of which the report ignores, the bare undocumented assertion is hardly convincing.

More important, even if civil-service rules and regulations had been followed to the letter, that would be no answer to the basic charge that the persons who were appointed to vacated positions on the professional staff were uniformly inexperienced men of management background, who could be trusted to bring to their jobs an antiunion bias. Neither the report, nor the Leedom, nor the Kammholz letter so much as refers to this charge, which I detailed in my speech, at all. Specifically, neither of the letters refers to the appointments of regional directors in Detroit and St. Louis, or the appointment, as associate general counsel in charge of field operations, of an attorney whose only experience in the labor relations field outside the Board was as an attorney for a division of the United States Steel Corp., and who had less than 4 months with the Board.

Chairman Leedom does say that only 27 new professional people have been hired during this period. It is unclear whether this includes all persons hired both for the Board's staff and for the staff of the General Counsel. If the figure does include both categories, it should be most interesting to obtain a list of the 27 and a statement of their professional backgrounds. If the professional background of each proved to be similar to the backgrounds of those whose appointments were heralded in Board press releases, there would be reason enough to explain the report's silence.

General Counsel Kammholz does say, and correctly, that the regional and subregional offices of the Board "represent the frontline operation of the agency in its contact with the public. In many important respects each regional director functions as an 'alter ego' of the General Counsel."

The importance of this statement is emphasized when the character of the appointments to these offices is examined. In addition to the instances referred to in my speech, there are now additional examples of the kind of qualifications which are apparently established by the Board and the General Counsel for appointments to regional and subregional offices.

A short time ago, the appointment of an officer in charge of the Indianapolis, Ind., field office was announced. The man appointed to this important office had a total of 1 month's experience with the Labor Board. Prior to this month's experience, he had served as Assistant Legislative Counsel in the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior for a few months and before that he had served a term as attorney general of South Dakota. I know nothing of the background of this man except for these facts. He may be an entirely acceptable individual. But it is clear that his appointment, like so many others, is the appointment of a man with little or no experience in the field of labor relations over the heads of employees of the Board of long standing who have the experience and qualifications necessary for these important offices.

Even more shocking is the recent appointment of a new regional director for the Board's regional office at Los Angeles, Calif. The man appointed to this important post as an alter ego of the General Counsel does have considerable experience in the labor relations field. He has served as industrial security officer for Consolidated Vultee at San Diego and for North American Aviation at Downey, Calif. He also has worked as assistant director of industrial relations for a large steel corporation and as director of industrial relations for the employers' section of the Printing Industries Association in Los Angeles.

How this experience qualifies a man to supervise the frontline operations of the agency in dealing, in an impartial way, with

both labor and management is hard to visualize. The enormity of this kind of appointment can be suggested by speculating as to what would happen if the Board announced that it was appointing as its regional director a man whose career, up to the time of his appointment, had consisted entirely of representation of unions in dealing with employers.

There are additional examples. On March 30, 1956, the General Counsel announced his appointment of Harold A. Boire as Assistant General Counsel in charge of the Washington branch of the Division of Operations, and John D. Stringer to be Chief of the Appeals Section. Their experience would qualify neither one of them for even a top rank and file position with the agency if the requirements stated in job descriptions remained the criteria for qualification.

In attempting to defend these personnel actions, Kammholz adopts the by now familiar device of misstating the charge. The offense charged is not "any changes were made at all." The offense is that the changes were made for political and antiunion reasons; that they were demonstrably not made to increase efficiency; and that the manner in which the changes were made and the lack of qualification of the appointees prove it. Obviously, that charge is not answered by Kammholz' bare assertion that in his "judgment" changes were necessary "to strengthen the agency and to improve performance." The word "judgment" is a convenient term under which to hide. But when it appears, as it does here, that the changes cannot strengthen but can only weaken the agency and that the common characteristic of the changes is that they replace experienced and capable men with management oriented novices, the conclusion that the changes were made for the reasons stated in my speech, and not for legitimate administrative reasons, is irresistible.

III. DISCRIMINATORY CASE HANDLING BY THE GENERAL COUNSEL

I charged in my speech that the new General Counsel had adopted a policy of issuing complaints against unions not merely in cases where the law was doubtful and unsettled, but in cases where there were Board and even court decisions, squarely in point, holding the union conduct at issue lawful. I charged also that the General Counsel's agents in the field were utilizing that policy, and the fact that once a complaint issued against a union in a section 8 (b) (4) case an injunction was immediately applied for by the General Counsel and often granted, to coerce unions to desist from peaceful picketing and other conduct which was lawful under the decided cases.

The report, again misstating the charge, attempts to make it appear that I criticized the General Counsel for adopting a policy of proceeding rather than dismissing in doubtful cases. But the validity of that policy, so abstractly stated, was never in issue. Although the report implies the contrary, the policy of proceeding in doubtful cases was not originated by Kammholz but by his predecessors. The difference lies not in the policy but in its application. And one difference is that formerly complaints were issued in doubtful cases against unions and employers alike; under Kammholz, as I proved in my speech, where charges regarded as doubtful are filed against employers, they are dismissed. When similar doubtful charges are filed against unions, a complaint will be issued.

Although Mr. Kammholz in his letter calls the charge "ridiculous and unfounded," nowhere does he deny that he has repeatedly, as a matter of policy, issued complaints against labor organizations when the only conduct alleged to be illegal was, at the time the complaint issued, lawful under controlling Board and court decisions. There was nothing whatever doubtful about the law in these cases. The law was clear. The only reason for so proceeding was the fact that the General Counsel did not like the law as it then stood; he wanted the Eisenhower Board to change it. Far from being a proper exercise of the General Counsel's powers, that is part of the very program of amending the act under the guise of reinterpretation of which the Republican administration stands accused.

What makes the bias and prejudice even more apparent is the fact that not one case is called to our attention, by the report or by Kammholz, in which a complaint was issued against an employer under similar circumstances, that is, where an applicable outstanding Board decision held the conduct with which the employer was charged legal.

That documented charge of disparate and discriminatory treatment of unions and employers in the issuance of complaints is obviously not met by the report's technique of creating a straw man—a fictitious accusation that a policy of issuing complaints in doubtful cases against both sides is bad—and then knocking it down. Resort to that technique is itself further evidence that the charge which I actually made is valid and irrefutable.

In my speech I also documented the charge that the General Counsel and his staff had engaged in gross discrimination against employees and labor organizations in case handling both in the field and in Washington. The report refers to Kammholz' letter for the "detailed answer to these charges." For complete understanding of these so-called answers, which I discuss below, they should be read in conjunction with the initial discussion of these cases in my speech.

A. Case No. K–42, administrative decision of the General Counsel

Kammholz devotes much of his letter to detailing issues in this case which have no relevance whatever to the charge made, namely, that the General Counsel refused to issue a complaint even though five employees testified without contradiction to conduct by the employer which, if it occurred, was unquestionably sufficient, in and of itself, to justify the issuance of a complaint. Kammholz does not deny that the only contradiction of the employees' testimony was contained in an affidavit from the employer's attorney who was not a witness to the events; nor does he deny that the General Counsel resolved the factual issue against the employees merely on the basis of the attorney's affidavit. He could not do so, for those facts are clearly stated in his own account of the administrative decision. Nothing in the remainder of the intricate situation presented in that case could possibly justify such an unfair and unwarranted resolution of that factual question. In this case Kammholz insists that it is the General Counsel's duty to weigh conflicting evidence in light of all the facts. Yet in the Banta Towing case, to which I next turn, the examiner's report clearly reveals that Mr. Kammholz's investigation must have concerned itself only with those facts which had been supplied to the regional office by the employer, and must have ignored completely all of the actual facts of the case, as witnessed by the employees involved, as well as by the union representatives who were assaulted and shot at.

B. Banta Towing Co.

General Counsel Kammholz says that the regional office's investigation of this case revealed that the captain was held a prisoner in his galley and was forced to barricade himself in the pilothouse by union representatives; that the captain was "intimidated and stripped of his authority." If that is in fact what the field investigation revealed, the investigation must have been even more one-sided and prejudiced than Regional Director Kennedy's decision to issue a complaint against the union and to dismiss the charge against the company. For the statements of the employees who were present, as well as of the union representatives, show that it was the captain involved who instigated the violence by assaulting one of the union representatives with a flashlight; that it was the captain who threatened to get a shotgun from the pilothouse and "shoot the whole shebang"; that the captain was acting like a "wildman" and going "berserk"; that the captain "had a propensity for the use of such dangerous weapons as flashlights, meat cleavers, 15-inch butcher knives, toothpicks, or in other words any weapon he could get his hands on" and that, as the trial examiner found, the only interference by union representatives with the captain's freedom of movement which occurred was dictated by the immediate necessity of protecting themselves against the threats of bodily harm which the captain not merely voiced but repeatedly attempted to and later did effectuate. The fourth paragraph in Mr. Kammholz' treatment of the Banta case warrants close comparison with the facts as set out in my speech and with the evidence as detailed in the trial examiner's report. It is significant that Kammholz does not even suggest that the field examination revealed that the company had transported, in violation of Federal law, armed strikebreakers for the express purpose of shooting the pickets off the barges and that the pickets had come armed with toothpicks because they had been warned that the company would use firearms and other weapons to crush them. Revealing of Mr. Kammholz' own state of mind is his innocuous description of the barrage ordered by Captain Burt: "Some shots were fired from the towboat, with the result that the young union representative was wounded in the arm." One would never know from reading that statement that Captain Burt had deliberately ordered a fusillade of shots fired; that he had deliberately selected this particular union representative as the target at whom fire was to be directed; and that the violence which ensued then and earlier was, as the trial examiner expressly found, the result of the company's plan and design, all motivated by Captain J. W.'s statement, made before any union representative ever came on board any boat, and not denied, that he did not want any "damn union on his boats."

Kammholz' attempt to explain away the regional office's failure to issue a complaint against the company in this case by referring to "limited and peculiar circumstances" answers nothing. The only thing peculiar and unusual about these circumstances is that not since 1938 has an equally flagrant case of the use of weapons of warfare by an employer to throttle and defeat self-organization been spread upon the records of the Board. The viciousness of the unfair labor practices committed here by the company demanded immediate and effective correction through the Board's processes, not excuses by the Regional Director.

Equally unconvincing is Kammholz' attempt to defend issuance of the complaint against the union on the theory that by using force against the property of the company and the person of the captain, it allegedly interfered with the self-organizational rights of the employees. As the trial examiner pointed out, the employees involved were all members of the union before any acts of violence occurred. It was totally and utterly unnecessary for the union to use any violence whatever to induce them to join or to remain members. The entire crew voluntarily went on strike in protest against the company's refusal to deal with their duly chosen bargaining representative. On what conceivable theory could any acts of aggression which the union directed to the company's property have been designed to coerce these employees into doing something which

the evidence shows they did entirely voluntarily? Moreover, the result of any investigation should have revealed even to Mr. Kennedy that the only violence which the union directed against the company or its property was designed entirely as a self-defense measure by the individuals involved who were under constant threat of bodily harm from the captain. On what conceivable theory can measures taken in self-defense be equated with unlawful aggression? And is it not startling that in a case where the complaint was issued ostensibly to protect the right of employees, not one single employee should be called by the General Counsel to support it? The reason is, as the trial examiner observed, that the Regional Director issued a complaint against the union in this case not to protect the rights of any employees, but entirely to serve the company's twofold purpose: (1) to deprive its employees of the rights guaranteed to them by section 7 of the act, and (2) "to protect its property in the pursuit of its business" against the economic consequences which the company feared would follow from unionization. The trial examiner observed that "Board process is available for neither of these purposes." Indeed, to use Board process as Kennedy did, for these purposes, is to subvert not only the processes of the Board but the act itself.

C. Coca-Cola

In his discussion of this case, as elsewhere, Kammholz seeks to evade the charge made by discussing different and unrelated matters. A large part of his discussion is devoted to the section 8 (b) (1) (A) and 8 (b) (4) (A) cases against the teamsters which are totally irrelevant to the 8 (b) (4) (C) case which I discussed in my speech. The attempt to drag in the other cases is only designed to create an aura of prejudice against local No. 688 and to prevent consideration on the merits of the Regional Director's malfeasance in issuing a complaint against local No. 688 under section 8 (b) (4) (C).

Kammholz devotes but a paragraph to his discussion of the facts of the section 8 (b) (4) (C) case. First he says that the association was not defunct or dissolved when the strike began on November 9. The only basis for this assertion, however, is the trial examiner's statement that the proceedings in which the association was actually dissolved "were highly irregular and, if the trial examiner were called upon to decide, illegal." But the question at issue is not whether the proceedings, attended by 185 out of 196 association members, all of whom voted to disband the association (R. 189), were irregular or illegal; the issue is whether their action left the association a functioning labor organization. The record shows that after the meeting not one employee claimed to be a member of the association or desired to participate in it (R. 227). Judge Moore held that it was not, and the trial examiner could not even infer to the contrary, since there is not a shred of evidence that the association did or could have functioned after the dissolution meeting. It had no members, no supporters, no flesh, no blood. Indeed, as the attorney for the association told the Board, the association did not even want to appear on the ballot in an election that might be ordered. It did not have even a potential future existence.

Moreover, Kammholz ignores entirely the fact that before local No. 688 struck the contract between Coca-Cola and the association had expired; that, admittedly, there was at that time an existing question concerning representation; and that the company was not in fact bargaining with the association and was under no legal obligation of any kind to do so.

These facts were plainly stated in my speech to be the reasons for my conclusion that the Regional Director acted arbitrarily, unlawfully, and contrary to the terms and policy of the act and of the legislative history in issuing an 8 (b) (4) (C) complaint in this case. Mr. Kammholz now answers that the Board in *Lewis Food Company* (115 NLRB No. 136), decided March 22, 1956, held that an outstanding certification may support a finding that a rival union's strike for recognition violates section 8 (b) (4) (C), even though the certification is more than 1 year old. But Mr. Kammholz neglects to state that the Board's decision in the Lewis case shows on its face that the only basis for the majority's conclusion was that the certified union had a contract with the employer which was still in effect at the time the rival union struck and that, according to the Board, the employer was under a legal obligation to continue to recognize the incumbent contracting union pursuant to that contract until it expired. That decision may be right or wrong, but certainly it has nothing to do with the *Coca-Cola* case, where the contract between the company and the association had expired a week before local 688 called its strike.

D. Missouri Transit Co.

Kammholz attempts to explain away the delay in issuance of a complaint against the employer in this case on the ground that during the first 4 months after the complaint was filed his predecessor was in office and that a 3-month period elapsed thereafter before he was appointed. He implies that the case was thereafter expeditiously handled, that additional investigation was required and that after that investigation was completed the complaint promptly issued. But no amount of explanation can justify the delay between March 29, 1955, and December 23, 1955, when the complaint was actually issued, a period of 9 months from the time General Counsel Kammholz took office. No matter how complex the legal and factual issues, it should not take 9 months to decide that there is sufficient evidence to warrant issuance of a complaint, particularly where the violations are as flagrant as they were in that case. Comparison of the speed with which complaints are issued against unions in cases where the legal and factual issues are equally complex would show that during General Counsel Kammholz' tenure the lapse between filing a charge and issuance of complaint against a union has generally been countable in weeks, not months.

E. Volney Felt Mills, division of Lloyd A. Fry Roofing Co.

I charged in my speech that a Board field examiner had induced the union to withdraw its lawful picket line by threatening to issue a complaint and to obtain an injunction against the union on the employer's charges. Kammholz replies that I received "jumbled and inaccurate report" and that the field examiner did not suggest that the union should withdraw its picket line. But Kammholz does not deny that the field examiner predicted that a complaint would issue and an injunction be applied for against the union on the employer's charges, even though the union's picketing was lawful under the Board precedents as they then stood. He does not deny that the field examiner pointed out that only if the employer withdrew his charges could the union avoid subjecting itself to the burdensome litigation and heavy costs which issuance of a complaint against it would entail. And he does not deny that the employer would withdraw the charge only if the union agreed to cease its lawful picketing. These are the facts as testified to by Mr. William Englander, counsel for the union, who personally participated in the case. His affidavit is attached hereto as exhibit A. Mr. Kammholz' vague generalities—the "conversation covered a wide range of discussion concerning various Board and court precedents"—cannot obscure the fact that by threatening to undertake proceedings against the union, the Board succeeded when the employer had failed in forcing the union to desist from a lawful course of conduct.

F. United Steel Workers of America, CIO (Metal Fabricators and Finishers, Inc.)

I charged in my speech that the handling of this case by the regional office was an example of sheer harassment and vindictiveness toward unions. Kammholz does not deny that the facts are as I stated them, except in one particular. He says that the union "had persistently declined to enter into a formal settlement agreement * * * and reiterated its refusal to do so before the trial examiner at the hearing." This is incorrect. The union was willing to agree to a Board order against it. Indeed, it did not defend in the formal proceeeding before the trial examiner and it did not file any objection to his intermediate report or to the proposed Board order which he recommended.

There is another inaccuracy in Mr. Kammholz' reply. He attempts to justify the Regional Director's filing of exceptions to the trial examiner's report as an effort to preclude the establishment of erroneous legal precedents. The filing of exceptions here cannot be explained on any such basis. The trial examiner did not hold in that case that any of the conduct of the union which had been charged to violate the act did not constitute a violation. He merely refused to pass on some of it on the ground that the evidence was cumulative. Certainly, as the Board later confirmed by adopting his report, that disposition could not conceivably have been thought to establish any erroneous legal precedent. The filing of exceptions by the regional office accomplished nothing but what I charged in my speech it accomplished, namely, harassment of the union.

But even if Mr. Kammholz were right instead of wrong on both counts, his replies would not touch the heart of the matter. The plain and uncontroverted fact is that the local organization in that case had ceased to exist. The strike was lost, all of the strikers had lost their jobs, and the union agreed not to attempt in any way to represent the employees during the rest of the certification year. The employer was satisfied. The employee who had filed the charges was satisfied. Everyone was satisfied except the Regional Director, who insisted on using the limited available Board personnel to beat a dead horse.

General Counsel Kammholz attempts to justify this by citing a case from the same regional office involving violence by an employer in which a formal settlement was insisted upon. But even if it is assumed that in that case the charging parties desired to withdraw their charges and the union was satisfied with an informal settlement, still the cases are not at all parallel. The essence of the complaint against the Regional Director in the Metal Fabricators case is that he insisted in going ahead with a proceeding which would lead only to a formal order directing the union not to coerce the employees of this particular company, when the union not only agreed that it would no longer engage in such illegal activities, but also had agreed that it would not represent the employees at all, and, hence, would have no relationships either with the employees or the employer which would give the Board's order any meaning. The General Counsel's action in insisting on proceeding against the union under those circumstances would be paralleled in a case in which he insisted on proceeding against the company even though the company had gone out of business. If General Counsel Kammholz can find a case in which an employer has ceased business entirely and agreed that he will not go back into business for at least a year and in which his Regional Director has nevertheless insisted on continuing a formal proceeding against the employer, even though the em-

ployer has also agreed to post notices or take any action requested, then he can say that the Metal Fabricators case does not show vindictiveness and harassment of unions.

The report criticizes me for suggesting that the many instances of unfairness in case handling which I documented in my speech are only illustrative and that there may be many, many others which only an investigation could uncover. The criticism implies that I have been able to review all of the cases which have been handled by the General Counsel administratively in Washington, and all of the cases which were handled in the regional offices, and that unfairness was found only in the cases which I discussed. That is not true, as I specifically stated in my speech. No single Senator, indeed, no one man, could conduct a complete investigation of the National Labor Relations Board. Indeed, it would be impossible to conduct an adequate investigation of the General Counsel's office at all without subpena powers which were not available to me, for, as I stated in my speech, the facts are buried in the secret files of the General Counsel and the regional offices. The cases I discussed were only those which were brought to my attention, fortunately, by parties who chose to seek redress in this manner. That there were enough instances to reveal a pattern of bias and prejudice in favor of management and against unions suffices alone to prove that they cannot be the only ones who have well-founded grievances. Obviously only an investigation can bring them all to light.

Before leaving the subject of the General Counsel's administration of his office mention should be made of Mr. Kammholz' denial of my charge that he has spent an excessive amount of time away from his desk. Mr. Kammholz says that the report that he spends less than 50 percent of his time at his desk is grossly exaggerated, but he does not make any effort to tell us just how much time he has spent at his desk since taking office. These are facts peculiarly within Mr. Kammholz' knowledge, and the facts, if he supplied them, would be far more persuasive, one way or the other, than his conclusionary assertion. We may infer, I think, from Mr. Kammholz' failure to supply this evidence, that the facts would support, not refute, my position. Second, Mr. Kammholz suggests that it is part of his business to visit each one of the Board's 21 regional offices and spend time there getting to know firsthand something about these offices and the people who run them. We need not quarrel with this as a legitimate view of one aspect of the General Counsel's functions, but the question remains whether one who is appointed to a job as important as General Counsel of the Board at a time when that position had been vacant for 3 months and when the backlog of decisions which only the General Counsel is authorized by law to make had inevitably grown to overwhelming proportions, could afford to indulge in the luxury of such field trips before disposing of the backlog.

Far from being disposed of, shortly after Mr. Kammholz' appointment, the backlog of cases in the Appeals Section—cases in which unions, principally, appealed from refusals by Regional Directors to issue complaints on charges which they filed against employers—grew progressively larger. I am advised that by April 1956, over 100 such cases were pending and awaiting adjudication by the General Counsel. One may well ask whether the General Counsel's gathering of first-hand knowledge of the personnel of the regional offices, information which is hardly indispensable to the proper performance of his statutory task, may be regarded as taking precedence over performance of his statutory duty to determine expeditiously whether or not complaints should issue on charges which have been filed with the Board.

But this entire defense, again, misses the point. I did not charge Mr. Kammholz with dereliction of duty because he visited some or many of the Board's field offices in an effort to acquaint himself with the personnel and operations. I charged that he was abusing his office by spending an inordinate amount of time in traveling for the purpose of speech making to employer groups. Ignoring the fact that his audiences have not been the public, for whose benefit the statute was enacted, but a small segment of that public, namely, some employers, Mr. Kammholz' only answer is that he considers it part of the General Counsel's job to spend "some time and effort in acquainting the public * * * with the general operation of the agency." I suggest that Kammholz would do well to read the statute again, and particularly section 3 (d), which establishes and defines the duties of the office of General Counsel of the Board. If Congress vested the General Counsel with the duty of acting as a public information officer, I have yet to discover the language in the act by which it did so. The Board has a division of information and it has been my impression that such information concerning the agency as the public requires could be and should be supplied by it.

IV. AMENDMENT OF THE STATUTE BY DECISIONS OF THE EISENHOWER BOARD

I charged in my speech that the Eisenhower Board, while ostensibly exercising quasi-judicial power, is actually legislating. The charge is that the Eisenhower appointees regard it as their mission to overhaul the interpretations of the act which had been made by the Board since 1947. I charged that the Eisenhower Board members are actuated in making these changes in law and policy by bias and prejudice against labor organizations and in favor of management. I documented my charges by showing that in 32 major[1] precedent-setting cases, the Eisenhower Board made major changes in statutory interpretation or administrative policy, which, I showed, could not be justified by the language, the legislative history, or the objectives of the statute. And I demonstrated that in each case the change operated to the disadvantage of labor unions and to the advantage of antilabor employers.

These charges have been further validated, since my speech was made, by decisions of the courts which have reviewed the Board's decisions in the cases I discussed. In my speech, I treated at length the Board's decision in the BVD case, pointing out the disastrous impact upon the statutory rights of employees which would result from the rule of law which the Eisenhower Board innovated in that case. On May 3, 1956, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed the Board, for reasons virtually identical with those which I cited. *Ladies Garment Workers Union* v. *NLRB* (38 LRRM 2061). In my speech, I attacked as unconscionable the Board's refusal in the Modern Linen case, by resorting to its restrictive jurisdictional policy standards, to protect against reprisal an employee who had been discharged for testifying under subpena at a prior Board proceeding. On June 7, 1956, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed the Board's decision, finding that the Board had acted "arbitrarily and capriciously" and that its result was "unjust and intolerable." *Pedersen* v. *NLRB* (30 CCH Labor Cases 70025).

Subsequent to my speech, the Supreme Court acted on the remaining cases in which the Board had asked the Court to review the decisions of the courts of appeals condemning the Board's attempt to expand the prohibitory sweep of the secondary boycott provisions of the act. As in the Board's earlier petitions which I cited, the Supreme Court denied review. *NLRB* v. *Sales Drivers* and *NLRB* v. *Business Machines, etc.* (certiorari denied, June 4, 1956).[2]

It is of the utmost significance that although the report was issued after these judicial developments, which so clearly confirm my charges, had occurred, the report is completely silent about them.

That silence is characteristic of all of the replies, in that none go to the meat of the issue.

My charges could be refuted only by demonstrating that the decisional and policy changes which I attacked are rooted in the language and policy of the statute, not merely in the personal prejudices and economic and political predilections of the new appointees. This the replies fail to do.

A. Evasion of the charge—the numbers game

The report says that Chairman Leedom's letter to Senator HILL contains the "detailed answer to these charges." But the plain fact is that the letter contains not the semblance of an answer in these terms. Instead of discussing the cases, Leedom attempts only to minimize their impact and importance. This he does by resorting to a peculiar kind of numbers game. This is the way the game is played.

First, Chairman Leedom counts the number of leading cases discussed in my speech. Then he excludes from them all cases in which one or more of the two remaining Truman appointees on the Board concurred. This leaves only nine cases. Then he says that the Board, in this period, decided almost 5,000 cases of all sorts. And then he concludes that the area of "purposeful distortion" (Leedom's words) covers only two-tenths of 1 percent of the whole area of Board decision.

The fallacies of this numbers game are apparent to every informed observer of this field. Indeed, they have already been exposed by at least one such observer. On April 17, 1956, Bernard Dunau, formerly an attorney on the litigation staff of the Board, and now in private practice in Washington, addressed a letter to the New York Times in which he revealed the Leedom reply as a complete sham. I quote his letter in full:

"In a speech before the Senate on March 23, 1956, Senator WAYNE MORSE accused the

[1] Chairman Leedom did discover one obvious mechanical error in my speech; but the use he made of it is characteristic of his entire reply. In discussing the Board's extension of its preexisting jurisdictional policies to reject cases involving industrial properties, I inadvertently included the citation of the *New York Stock Exchange* case (decided in 1944, 58 NLRB 911). Mr. Leedom says that I used this case to prove that the Eisenhower Board had distorted the law. My attack was based on the action of the Eisenhower Board in the East Newark Realty Corp. case and the McKinney Avenue Realty Co. case. The text of the speech does not refer to or discuss the New York Stock Exchange case but only the extension of the rule which was accomplished by the Eisenhower Board. Aside from the date of the New York Stock Exchange decision, any intelligent reading of my speech could not possibly have failed to reveal that I was not using that case to attack the new Board, because in the New York Stock Exchange case, the old Board asserted jurisdiction over the office building operator. In their dissenting opinions in the East Newark case, Members Murdock and Peterson refer to New York Stock Exchange as a case which provides a "graphic illustration of the absurdity" of the new majority's "office building standard." Leedom's reply is a facetious attempt to discredit the charge actually made by drawing from a mere mechanical error a patently false inference.

[2] In fairness it should be noted that the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has upheld the Board in one of the cases I criticized. *Amalgamated Meat Cutters* v. *NLRB and Swift & Co.* (decided June 22, 1956, 38 LRRM 2289); petition for rehearing has been filed and is now pending.

National Labor Relations Board, as reconstituted and dominated by a majority appointed by the Republican administration, of anti-union bias in its decisions. Three weeks later, in a letter to Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, NLRB Chairman Boyd Leedom sought to answer this charge by arguing in part that, of the cases criticized by Senator MORSE, 'only nine represent a strict division between Eisenhower and Truman appointees. These 9 comprise less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the whole body of 4,615 decisions in contested cases rendered during a period that approximates that of the Eisenhower majority, fiscal years 1954, 1955 and the first of 1956. Admittedly, two-tenths of 1 percent is a rather small area for purposeful distortion of congressional intent.'

"This attempt at statistical refutation echoes previous efforts of the Eisenhower appointees to the NLRB to find refuge in numbers. In the Georgetown Law Journal for March 1955, Guy Farmer, former NLRB Chairman, wrote that 'The Board has been unanimous in about 95 percent of its cases.' In a speech made on October 19, 1955, Philip Ray Rodgers, NLRB member and then its acting chairman, stated that of the total contested cases '94 percent * * * have been decided by a unanimous vote of the Board,' and in less than 1 percent 'has the vote of the Board been divided along so-called political or philosophical lines.'

"There is a surface plausibility in the argument but its fallacy is easily exposed. It ignores important quantitative and qualitative distinctions which, when taken into account, materially change the picture.

"1. First of all, the basis for comparison which the Eisenhower appointees take is all contested cases without differentiation as to type, difficulty, or problem. This is like attempting to show that the percentage of deaths from cancer despite surgery is small by including among the survivors those patients who were operated upon for appendicitis.

"For example, the cases decided by the Board may be divided into unfair labor practice cases and representation cases. Representation cases, which are by far the most numerous, present primarily two main questions: (1) whether the time is appropriate for conducting an election to determine whether or not a majority of employees desire to be represented by a union, and (2) what classes of employees should be grouped together in a single unit for the purpose of collective bargaining. The kind of specific issue which is likely to arise in a representation case is not unfairly illustrated by the earth-shaking question whether a receiving clerk is appropriately included in a unit of warehouse employees and truckdrivers. Yet the Eisenhower appointees include this sort of case as part of their showing that significant unanimity of opinion exists among all NLRB members.

"The distortion which results from this indiscriminate lumping together is patent. In the fiscal year 1954, the NLRB decided 1,837 contested representation cases and 258 contested unfair labor practice cases. To show unanimity of opinion the Eisenhower appointees would include all 2,095 cases in their basis of comparison. Yet in all likelihood 90 percent of the representation cases, about 1,653, presented no issues capable of provoking a significant difference of opinion. When these 1,653 cases are culled out, 184 contested representation cases are left which might conceivably be included in the basis of comparison, a very different thing.

"2. To arrive at a valid basis for comparison it is accordingly necessary to evaluate the cases and to eliminate those which do not present division-provoking questions. But that is not the whole story even quantitatively.

"The Board members ordinarily (and quite properly) follow the practice that, once a majority has decided an issue, those in dissent thereafter follow the ruling, at least until a new majority can be mustered to overturn it. For example, after an Eisenhower-appointed majority of three decided not to assert jurisdiction over a radio station with less than an annual gross income of $200,000, any subsequent case involving this issue would be decided unanimously. But the unanimity flows, not from agreement upon the jurisdictional policy, but from the practice of adhering to a previous determination of the issue. Yet the Eisenhower appointees include in their basis of comparison all such cases as among those in which there is no 3–2 division along political lines.

"3. The fundamental fallacy in the statistical justification advanced by the Eisenhower appointees is, however, not quantitative. It is qualitative. A half-dozen rulings on subjects of pivotal importance can change the character of the regulatory scheme even as a hundred others are left undisturbed. It takes only one bullet to kill or maim.

"Furthermore, the influence of pivotal rulings is not confined to the subjects to which immediately addressed. They set a tone which subtly, but inevitably and significantly, guides the host of NLRB employees, investigator, attorney and trail examiner, in the everyday performance of the agency's work. Investigative zeal is dulled, or its direction changed, as the mood of the agency heads is gauged. These consequences may not be capable of statistical demonstration, but they nonetheless exist, as everyone familiar with institutional activity knows.

"Even among the agency heads themselves a like influence exists. There is a limit to effective dissent. There is also the need to get along which not infrequently will silence a dissenter. These intangible pressures bring about concurrence in decisions which in a different climate of opinion would not command assent. And the climate of opinion is of course formed by the Eisenhower majority which dominates the NLRB.

"It is apparent, therefore, that the statistics vouchsafed us by the Eisenhower appointees cannot truly tell us what they have wrought. Guy Farmer, the first of the Eisenhower-appointed NLRB Chairmen, in an address to the Industrial Relations Institute of the University of Wisconsin on July 20, 1955, stated that: 'It is true, of course, that a host of matters that once troubled the Board have now become settled doctrine; the Board and the courts have put to rest many of the problems that formerly beset this field. But a surprisingly large number of areas remain in which the law has not jelled; or, having once appeared to be settled, has dissolved again into a sort of twilight zone.' We can best ascertain what the Eisenhower appointees are doing by looking qualitatively into their performance in settling what is still unsettled and in unsettling what had been settled.

"In his letter to Senator HILL, NLRB Chairman Leedom heavily discounts the charges leveled by Senator MORSE on the ground that they are based upon an analysis by an attorney representing unions (a species of name calling which perhaps itself discloses the bias it professes to deny). I hasten to add, therefore, that management no less than labor is not entirely happy with the statistics of the Eisenhower appointees. In a radio broadcast of the Georgetown University forum on September 4, 1955, Mr. Benjamin Miller, director, Industrial Relations, American Trucking Association, observed that, 'Farmer says 95 percent were unanimous. But my question is, What about that 5 percent? They seem to be the precedent cases at least vital to both' management and labor. Of course, since management as well as labor has its bias, NLRB Chairman Leedom may see fit to disregard the views of both as untrustworthy. This would leave the field to the academicians as presumably the only ones free of bias and hence free to criticize. It may therefore be appropriate to mention the views expressed by Prof. Willard Wirtz in his address on August 22, 1955, to the section of Labor Relations law of the American Bar Association: 'These 2 years have seen phenomenal changes wrought in the interpretation and application of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 by a new National Labor Relations Board majority appointed by a new administration. * * * Yet what has happened remains, by any fair appraisal, a veritable revolution in the interpretation of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and one in which the new members of the National Labor Relations Board have acted primarily on their own responsibility.'

"Phenomenal changes have been wrought; statistics do not belie their existence; the Eisenhower appointees ought at least to face up to them rather than to pretend that nothing has happened."

There we have it. The entire defense is a skillfully woven concoction of false premises, false accusations, false inferences, and false conclusions designed to prove that the revolution in Board policy which the Eisenhower appointees have accomplished did not occur at all. Congress and the American people, I am convinced, will not be fooled.

B. The myth of prounion charges by the Eisenhower Board

Chairman Leedom also alleges in his letter, and the report repeats his charge, that the basis of my attack is unsound because the cases I selected do not fairly reflect the trend of the Eisenhower Board's decisions. He says "there are many other important decisions issued during the past 3 years in which the Board decided important questions, either not previously considered or previously going the other way, aiding organizational activities by employees and protecting the right of unions." In support of this assertion, Leedom cites 11 cases. Leedom says that if these cases are viewed as a group in isolation from the vast number of other decisions made during the same period, "they might give rise to an inference of favoritism toward unions generally." If these cases sustained the claim made for them they would be significant. But when we examined them, we find that nothing could be further from the truth.

The first three cases cited by Chairman Leedom, Ranco, Seamprufe, and Babcock & Wilcox, all deal with the same factual situation and with the same proposition of law. In all three cases union organizers, who were not employees of the employer involved, attempted to distribute union literature to employees on parking lots adjacent to the plant. The parking lots were maintained by the companies as adjuncts of their business, for the use of their employees. In each case, the plants were located in rural areas, at a distance from any large community; in each, because of the geographical location of the plant, and proximity to a highway, distribution of union literature to the employees could be made effectively only on the parking lots. In each case the employer involved sought to prevent distribution of the union's literature on his parking lot. In *NLRB v. LeTourneau Company of Georgia* (324 U. S. 793) the Supreme Court had held that in circumstances such as these the right of the employees to receive union literature, which the act guarantees, outweighs the bare property right of the employer to exercise "absolute dominion" over activity which occurs on his property. The Court held that dissemination of the literature on the parking lots must be permitted to effectuate the statutory rights of the employees. The only difference between LeTourneau and the three cases cited by Leedom is that in LeTourneau employees were handing out the union literature whereas in these cases a nonemployee organizer was doing so. But the applicability of LeTourneau to nonemployees

was not challenged for the first time in the three cases cited.

In *Caldwell Furniture Co.* (97 NLRB 1501), decided February 5, 1952, the old Board held that the LeTourneau rule prevented an employer from barring distribution of union literature on parking lots under such geographic circumstances when distribution was attempted by nonemployee organizers just as when it was attempted by employes. The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit enforced the Board's order in that case (199 F. 2d 267). See also *Remington Rand* (103 NLRB 152), decided by the old Board.

Thus, when the three cases cited by Chairman Leedom came before the Board there was already well-established precedent, and, indeed, a judicial decision, dictating the result which was reached. What is interesting about it is that even under these circumstances, although the law seemed clearly settled on the basis of decisions of the Supreme Court and the fourth circuit, one of the Eisenhower appointees, Beeson, dissented and voted to hold that the employer was free to bar distribution of union literature by nonemployees on plant parking lots. (*Ranco, Inc.* (109 NLRB 998, 1001–1002).) The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on reviewing this case, sustained the majority's decision, holding that the Supreme Court's decision in LeTourneau was applicable and, of course, controlling.

It remains to add that 2 other circuits, reviewing the 2 other cases cited by Leedom, held that LeTourneau was not decisive where nonemployee organizers were involved. Certiorari was granted in all three cases to resolve the conflict. In the oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States on these cases, as reported in Law Week (24 L. W. 3201–3202), the Board's Assistant General Counsel told the Court that in view of the rationale of the Supreme Court's decision in the LeTourneau case—that parking lots under these circumstances were appropriate places for employees to receive union literature and that protection of their right to receive literature was necessary to effectuate the statutory guaranty of self-organization—the Board regarded these cases as in no material respect different from the LeTourneau case itself.

Having told the Supreme Court of the United States that its decisions in these cases marked no change in policy, and that the Board indeed regarded itself bound to decide them the way it did by the Supreme Court's own prior decision, there seems something less than candor in Chairman Leedom's attempt now to describe these cases as ones "in which the Board decided important questions either not previously considered or previously going the other way, aiding organizational activities by employers and protecting the rights of unions." The truth is, as we have seen, that the precise question involved in these cases had been previously considered and decided, not only by the Board but by at least one court of appeals, and that the Eisenhower Board made no change in policy at all in deciding the cases as it did.[3]

The next case cited by Leedom is *Richfield Oil Corp.* (110 NLRB 356), in which the Board held that the statutory obligation imposed on employers by section 8 (a) (5) of the act to bargain collectively about all matters affecting wages, hours, and working conditions comprehends the duty to bargain collectively upon request about employee participation in stock purchase plans established by the employer as an incident to the employment relation. Although the application of the duty to bargain to such stock purchase plans was challenged for the first time in this case, the scope of the duty to bargain and the legal principles which govern it had been so well settled in prior decisions of the Board and the courts, that, as the majority opinion showed, the employer's attempt to distinguish between stock purchase plans and other types of plans for employee remuneration, which were concededly covered, was little short of frivolous. Yet here again, although the controlling legal principles were absolutely clear, Eisenhower-appointee Beeson, asserting a broad power to legislate to achieve results which conform with his particular conception of the welfare of business, dissented (110 NLRB 356, at 370). Needless to say, the majority decision was enforced by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in an opinion by Judge Danaher (37 LRRM 2327). The company petitioned for certiorari in this case, and the Government filed a brief in opposition. In that brief the Solicitor General and the General Counsel of the Board told the Supreme Court that, because of the established precedents concerning the scope of the subject matter of collective bargaining, the decision of the Board and of the Court of Appeals in the Richfield case was so "clearly correct as to obviate any need for further review." Certainly such a decision cannot be used as evidence that the Eisenhower Board is exercising its discretionary authority to expand the rights of employees and labor organizations, or that it is without antilabor bias. It proves, at most, that some Eisenhower appointees, in some cases, recognize that judicial restraints prevent them from accomplishing a total and complete reversal of whatever benefits and advantages employees and unions continue to enjoy under the law.

It should be noted in passing, however, that other high officials of the Eisenhower administration, reflecting the reactionary Republicans' determination to emasculate labor's rights under the act, recognize no limit whatever. In this very Richfield case Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, as reported in the Labor Relations Reporter (37 LRR 455–456), wrote a letter to the Solicitor General requesting that the Justice Department consent to the petition for certiorari filed by the company, even though the Board admitted that no substantial issue warranting review of the decision against the company was presented. The Solicitor General did not accede to this unlawyerlike position. He did, however, note the Secretary's intervention in the Government's brief in opposition. This attempt by the Republican administration, through its Department of Commerce, to influence even Board litigation policy in the Supreme Court, shows the lengths to which the Eisenhower administration is prepared to go to serve the interests of management at the expense of the rights guaranteed to labor under the law as enacted by Congress.

Boston Herald-Travelers Corp. (110 NLRB 2097) and *Whitin Machine Works* (108 NLRB 1537) (misspelled in Leedom's letter) deal with a single issue, the duty of an employer to supply to a labor organization with which it is bargaining collectively information regarding wages and wage rates of employees which is in the employer's possession and which is necessary to enable the union to bargain intelligently on these subjects. The Whitin case was discussed in Ratner's article, which I reproduced as an appendix to my speech, in the following terms:

"It is true that in Whitin Machine Works the Board phrased the duty of the employer to supply to the union information pertinent to collective bargaining in somewhat broader terms than had earlier Board cases. And in so doing the Board reversed at least one decision in which the duty had been subjected to restrictive qualifications. But the duty itself had been held to flow from the statute in an unbroken line of court decisions handed down before Whitin. The rationale for enforcement of the Board order in those cases implied at least that the duty was as broad as Whitin's subsequent statement of it. The alacrity with which the courts of appeals have enforced Whitin, and subsequent decisions based upon the test therein enunciated, add weight to the view that, to the extent Whitin marked a change in Board policy, it was a change dictated not so much by the individual opinions of the Board members as by the dictates of judicial authority."

It remains to add that despite the overwhelming weight of judicial authority, precisely in point, which was deemed controlling by the majority in the Whitin case, Eisenhower-appointee Beeson dissented even from that decision (108 NLRB at 1542). And it should also be noted that in a subsequent decision, rendered after Beeson was no longer a member, Chairman Farmer and Eisenhower-appointee Rogers dissented in an opinion which, if joined in by but one more member, would have reversed completely the law on the employer's duty to supply pertinent wage data; law established by an enormous body of Board and court decisions to which the Board had only a short time earlier bowed. (*Taylor Forge & Pipe Works* (113 NLRB No. 65).)

Truitt Mfg. Co. (110 NLRB 856), also cited by Chairman Leedom, is another case dealing with the employers' duty to supply information. The issue was whether an employer who, in collective bargaining negotiations, claimed that he was financially unable to meet the union's wage demands was bound by the good-faith requirement in section 8 (a) (5) of the act to permit the union to examine the evidence from which the employer drew his conclusion as to inability to pay. To hold that the employer need not permit examination of the evidence would mean that he could stifle bargaining completely merely by asserting inability to pay; by precluding the union from determining whether he was taking that position in good faith, the employer could prevent the union from deciding intelligently what position to take in the light of the company's actual financial condition. But, again, this issue did not arise for the first time in Truitt. It actually arose and was decided by the old Board in 1951, in *Jacobs Mfg. Co.* (94 NLRB 1212, 1221–1222). That case was reviewed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and the Board's view of the employers' legal duty under the act to supply such information in such circumstances was sustained. (*NLRB* v. *Jacobs Mfg. Co.* (196 F. 2d 680).) Manifestly, contrary to Leedom's assertion, Truitt is not a case in which the Board decided an important question "either not previously considered or previously going the other way."

Nor is *Borg-Warner* (113 NLRB 120), also cited by Chairman Leedom, such a case. The issue there was whether the employer violated section 8 (a) (5) by refusing to sign a contract with the union unless the union agreed in the contract that it would not call a strike without taking a strike vote among the employees in the bargaining unit and securing majority approval. This very question had been decided unanimously by the old Board on August 26, 1953, in *Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.* (106 NLRB 939), in which it was held that the internal procedure pursuant to which the union determined whether or not to call a strike was not a matter affecting "wages, hours, or working conditions" but rather an internal union and employee affair which the employer could not insist upon controlling as a condition precedent to performance of his duty to bargain collectively. The Board's decision in Allis-Chalmers was set aside by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on the authority of *NLRB* v. *American National Ins. Co.* (343 U. S.

[3] It should be noted that the Supreme Court held that the employer was free to prohibit distribution of literature at his parking lot by outside organizers. This reversal is, of course, not relevant to the point I am discussing.

395), which, however, did not involve any attempt by the employer to control internal union affairs as a condition to bargaining, but related only to the employers' insistence on maintaining unilateral control over certain conditions of employment. It was in this posture that the issue decided in Allis-Chalmers was presented to the Eisenhower Board in Borg-Warner. Two of the Eisenhower appointees, Farmer and Leedom, voted to reverse the Board's decision in Allis-Chalmers and to accept the sweeping extension of the American National doctrine which had been suggested by the seventh circuit. Only one, Rogers, voted with Murdock and Peterson to follow the Board's prior decision. If the choice had been left to the Eisenhower appointees alone the case would have been decided differently by vote of 2 to 1. And yet a reading of the opinions in the Borg-Warner case clearly shows that to follow the seventh circuit's view would read the statutory requirement of collective bargaining about terms and conditions of employment out of the act completely. On that view employers would be free unilaterally to impose conditions upon the performance of their own duty to bargain so onerous and demeaning to unions as to preclude their acceptance, thereby frustrating union resort to the bargaining process. The stand of the Eisenhower members on this issue can hardly be said to reflect a proclivity to expand "the rights of unions."

Leedom's attempt to credit the Eisenhower Board with the decision in the *Regal Shoe* case (106 NLRB 1078) suggests that his three-page letter was prepared with far less care than my speech. The truth is that the decision was issued by the old Board, before the Eisenhower appointees became a majority, and that only one Eisenhower appointee, Farmer, even participated in it. Moreover, the decision itself was dictated, as the opinion of the Board points out, by the holding of the Supreme Court in the *Rockaway News* case (345 U. S. 71), decided shortly before, in which the Court made it clear that the Board may not deny all effect to a contract merely because a hypertechnical reading of one clause might disclose a flaw which could conceivably, in other circumstances, give rise to a charge that that provision of the contract was illegal.

Chairman Leedom's attempt to claim for the Eisenhower appointees credit for the decision in *Boeing Airplane Co.* (110 NLRB 147) is likewise at odds with the facts. In that case, 2 of the 3 Eisenhower appointees voted to hold the union activity there involved unprotected by section 7; only one, Farmer, joined Members Murdock and Peterson in holding it protected. The view expressed in dissent by the majority of the Eisenhower appointees involved, in the words of the majority opinion, "an unwarranted extension of the doctrine in the cases on which they rely, and an unwarranted intrusion on the rights of employees as guaranteed in section 7 of the act" (110 NLRB at 151). The issue in that case, in brief, was whether an employer could lawfully discharge an employee for participating in a union-sponsored plan to secure better paying jobs elsewhere for employees of the company who were dissatisfied with the wages which the company offered where there was in effect a "gentlemen's agreement" that no employer in the industry would offer a job to one employed by a competing employer without the prior consent of such employer. The two Eisenhower appointees who dissented thought that since the success of the union's plan might result in loss of employees by the company through resignations, the potential injury to the company should result in holding unprotected the union's efforts so to assist its members and to strengthen its hand in collective bargaining. The majority recognized that to adopt this approach would result in having "decisions concerning the rights of employers and employees under the act * * * controlled by subjective feelings, rather than objective facts." They felt compelled to reject this novel and dangerous approach and to rely instead on the vast body of precedent which established that where, as here, concerted activities are undertaken for the mutual aid and protection of employees, and in the interests of collective bargaining, the protection of section 7 is not to be denied merely because the activities are novel, or because they may result in injury to the employer's business (110 NLRB 149–150). The majority decision is thus no unprecedented extension of the rights of employees under section 7; it merely rejects an attempt to restrict the preexisting scope of the act's protection. Moreover, as we have seen, the Eisenhower appointees cannot claim credit even for that.

Last is *Peerless Plywood Co.* (107 NLRB 427) in which the Eisenhower Board adopted the artificial rule, of questionable efficacy, that neither an employer nor a labor organization may address massed assemblies of employees on company time and property within the 24 hours immediately preceding an election. On the face of it the rule is as restrictive of union preelection activity as of employer preelection activity, and indeed, it has been applied to set aside an election in which a union broadcast to employees during working hours from a sound truck on the street outside the plant gates within the 24-hour period (*Repeal Brass Manufacturing Co.* (110 NLRB)).

In explaining the reasons for the rule the Board said in Peerless that a campaign speech to employees made during working hours in the plant within the 24-hour period "tends to create a mass psychology which overrides arguments made through other campaign media and gives an unfair advantage to the party, whether employer or union, who in this manner obtains the last word." Whether this reasoning is right or wrong is debatable. But it shows too clearly for argument that the rule was not adopted, as Chairman Leedom now claims, for the purpose of "aiding organizational activities by employees" or "protecting the rights of unions." Its sole avowed purpose is to safeguard employees against last-minute influences, whether pro or antiunion, of one particular type, exerted by unions and employers alike. And when that policy is related to the Board's decision in the *Livingston Shirt* case (107 NLRB 400) and the *Nu Tone* case (112 NLRB No. 143), discussed at length in my speech, even Peerless may be considered part of a pattern of retrogression from previously well established union rights and privileges.

It has thus been demonstrated that not a single 1 of the 11 cases cited by Chairman Leedom as examples of important decisions which, if read alone, might give rise to an inference of favoritism towards unions by the Eisenhower Board can conceivably be thought to sustain any such claim. The fact that only these 11 decisions could even be cited as instances of prounionism by the Eisenhower Board is itself the most eloquent testimonial to the accuracy of my charge that each and every one of the many major policy changes accomplished by the Eisenhower appointees has restricted the rights of labor and increased the rights and immunities of management. Far from proving, as Leedom claims, that my selection of cases "creates a false impression," examination of Leedom's cases serves only to confirm that the conclusions which I drew are eminently sound.

C. The pretense that the Eisenhower Board did not really change the law

The report attempts to show that in two areas where I demonstrated that the Eisenhower Board had made flagrant changes—jurisdictional policy and secondary boycotts—they made no changes at all but merely followed precedents established by the old Board. Let's take a look.

1. Jurisdictional Policy

I charged that the reasons the Eisenhower Board sharply curtailed the area in which it would assert jurisdiction was to give effect to its view that there should be less Federal regulation of labor disputes. It sought to override the policy of Congress—to regulate labor disputes to the fullest reaches of the commerce power—by its own contrary policy—to return to the States the handling of disputes which the Board regards as local. It goes without saying that the Board has no power to displace Congress' policy with its own. It is, therefore, not strange that my charge that this is what the Eisenhower Board has done is met with complete silence. There is not even a denial that desire to pave the way for State rather than Federal regulation is at the root of the Eisenhower Board's jurisdictional policy; and that is the heart of my charge.

The report defends the Eisenhower Board's wholesale declination of jurisdiction by the policy of previous Boards not to assert jurisdiction in the building and construction industry and the hotel field. Declination of jurisdiction in the building and construction industry stopped when Taft-Hartley was enacted. It was abandoned by the old Board in obedience to the 80th Congress' obvious desire to have its regulation apply in that field. Continuing declination of jurisdiction in the hotel field conforms with the apparent intent of the 80th Congress, as revealed in the legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act. In each of these instances there has been obedience to Congress. My whole point is that the jurisdictional standards which the Eisenhower Board initiated in July 1954, and for which it alone is responsible, are based on rejection of Congress' policy. Where is the answer to that charge?

The report defends on the ground that there has been no judicial disapproval of the power of the Board to decline jurisdiction and only one instance of judicial disapproval of a particular exercise of that power. Passing the report's neglect to mention the second circuit's very recent condemnation of the "unjust and intolerable" application of its jurisdictional policy, the report is comparing apples and oranges. Of course, the Board has power to decline jurisdiction when the reason for it is to lighten the caseload to a volume that can be handled by the money and manpower available to the Board. It is on that basis only that the courts have approved the Board's declination of jurisdiction. But budgetary and manpower considerations are not at the basis of the Eisenhower Board's jurisdictional policy. Nevertheless, I anticipated in my charge that it may well be that "the Board can escape judicial condemnation of its conduct, for the scope of judicial review in this area of case handling is narrow indeed, and the courts are loath to interfere where declination of jurisdiction can, however dishonestly, be said to flow from budgetary considerations." That is the very reason I call for an investigation by Congress. Limitations inherent in judicial review are one of the important reasons for congressional intercession.

Lastly, the report defends against my criticism of the jurisdictional standards adopted by the Eisenhower Board in secondary boycott situations, as exemplified by the *McAllister Transfer* case (110 NLRB 1769), by arguing that the standards were compelled by the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in *Joliet Contractors Association* v. *NLRB* (193 F. 2d 833). I do not believe that it has previously occurred to anyone that there was a compelling connection between the two and a reading of the two cases fails to disclose any. What is significant is that the secondary boycott situation—where the prohibition is applied against unions—is the one area in which the Eisenhower Board, instead of curtailing, expanded its assertion of jurisdiction.

2. Secondary Boycotts

The heart of the report's defense against my charge that the Eisenhower Board has interpreted the secondary boycott prohibitions of the Taft-Hartley Act to impair lawful primary picketing is that the Eisenhower Board has applied the same legal standards as its predecessor, and that it has been upset by the courts only as to matters of judgment in the application of those standards. Precisely the opposite is true.

To make it appear that the Eisenhower Board merely followed precedent the report describes the old Board's decision in the Schultz case as holding that a union could lawfully follow a struck employer's truck to its destination and picket the truck there only if there was no other place at which the union could bring economic pressure to bear on the primary employer. That is an out and out misrepresentation. Schultz did not treat the unavailability of picketing elsewhere as a condition precedent to allowing the union to picket the primary employee's truck at its destination; it merely referred to the unavailability in that case as further support for its ruling that picketing the primary employer at a secondary employee's premises is not illegal. Moore Drydock, which followed Schultz, and which formalized its doctrine, did not even mention the availability of another situs for picketing as a fact or limiting the union's right to picket the primary employer at a secondary situs.

The fact is, as I stated in my speech, that that limitation was innovated by the Eisenhower Board in the Washington Coca-Cola case, in which, however, the decision was defended and sustained on other grounds. The first case in which the new limitation became critical was *Sales Drivers* v. *NLRB* (37 LRRM 2166), and in that case the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia specifically found that the new Board had changed the prior rule by imposing a new limitation and ruled that the limitation was illegal and beyond the Board's power to impose. Every other court of appeals which has passed on this issue has come to the same conclusion. District Judge Wyzanski recently observed in an injunction case that the Board's new position was a "Procrustean rule" reflecting "some development from a rather broad permission to permit picketing at places of business other than the primary employer's, to narrower views more characteristic of a later administration" (*Alpert* v. *Steel Workers* (38 LRRM 2193)). The Eisenhower Board's attribution of this rule to predecessor boards is but another instance of its disingenuous refusal to stand up in defense of its own creation.

Similarly disingenuous is the report's attempts to refute my charge that the Eisenhower Board has substituted "a conclusive presumption of union guilt for the necessity of proving by evidence that the union's object is one which section 8 (b) (4) (A) outlaws." The refutation takes the form of quoting from a predecessor Board's decision that "Plainly the object of all picketing at all times is to influence persons to withhold their business or services from the struck employer. In this respect there is no distinction between lawful primary picketing and unlawful secondary picketing proscribed by section 8 (b) (4) (A)." The report deliberately seeks to confuse the finding of the predecessor Board that all picketing has as its object to dissuade persons from continuing to do business with the picketed employer, with the establishment by the Eisenhower Board of a conclusive presumption that inducement of employees of neutral employers to withhold services from the struck employer is designed to compel the neutral employer to cease doing business with the primary employer by illegal strike action.

There seems to be no end to the capacity of the draftsmen of the report to turn things upside down in order to prove that the Eisenhower Board is not standing on its head. Recognition by the predecessor Board that all picketing was designed to effect a discontinuance of business dealing led it to the conclusion that other criteria had to be relied upon to differentiate primary from secondary picketing. Observance of the same phenomenon by the Eisenhower Board leads it to reject the relevance of those other criteria which the predecessor Board thought crucial. When the two Boards thus derive precisely opposite conclusions from the same datum, it is a little difficult to believe that, as the report would have it, they are acting in the same way.

The plain fact is that the courts have differed with the Board insofar as the Eisenhower Board has attempted to innovate new and more restrictive rules of law in secondary boycott cases; not in the mere application of the old standards. The attempt of the report to prove the contrary by claiming that the second circuit upset the Board in one case (*NLRB* v. *Electrical Workers* (37 LRRM 2219)) but upheld it in another "on substantially the same facts" (*NLRB* v. *Associated Musicians* (226 F. 2d 900)), reveals more audacity than accuracy. The cases were not the same but entirely different, as the second circuit explained in its opinions, and the Supreme Court denied review in both cases.

Finally, the attempt of the report to explain away the conflict between the two Swift decisions on the ground that they involved different categories of workers is about as persuasive as attempting to distinguish two cases on the ground that in one the plaintiff was rich and in the other he was poor. The point is that in one case, where the result hurt unions, the Board held that buying was a management function and that employees who perform it are acting as agents of the employer, not as employees within the meaning of the act. In the other case, when consistency would have required dismissal of a charge against the union, the Board treated the buying function not as an employer but as an employee duty. No amount of quibbling can hide the inconsistency.

3. The Eisenhower Board Goes Far Beyond Judicial Decisions

The report states that the Eisenhower Board is now applying the law in accordance with judicial decision, and this statement is supported by reference to administrative abandonment of the per se interrogation theory and the Bonwit-Teller rule. The report thus sets up a strawman with which I am presumably supposed to take issue. But the merest perusal of Mr. Ratner's article, which I appended as an exhibit to my speech, shows clearly that I did not criticize the Eisenhower Board for discontinuing the per se interrogation theory and the broad Bonwit-Teller rule. Instead I recognized that these actions were justified by the state of judicial precedent. My basic criticism of the Eisenhower Board's actions in the free-speech area remain unanswered. Judicial reversal of the per se interrogation rule did not require or even suggest that the Eisenhower Board embrace, as it did, a view of employer persuasion that permits all sorts of coercive and threatening statements so long as the employer is clever enough to veil his remarks in innuendo rather than to be blunt. Nor did judicial reversal of the broad Bonwit-Teller rule require or even suggest that the Eisenhower Board countenance, as it did, an employer's prohibition of the distribution of prounion literature in the plant while at the same time himself distributing antiunion literature on the same premises. Where is the answer to the charge I did make?

4. Personal Products Case

The report attaches as exhibit 3 a letter addressed to me by Mr. John T. Van Aken, attorney for the Personal Products Co., in which he claims that my treatment of that case was based on an "inadequate analysis of the facts and the law." In my speech I said that the Personal Products case was "another flagrant example of the Eisenhower Board's attempt to rewrite the law to impose on unions new legal duties." That is exactly what it is, as the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia confirmed when it reversed the Board's decision. Nothing in Mr. Van Aken's letter, or in his brief to the Supreme Court as amicus curiae, to which he refers, shows the contrary. The language of the statute, and the Supreme Court's decision in the Automobile Workers case which I quoted in my speech both show that the act does not treat slowdowns as a violation of any provision of the act and that it does not allow the Board to order a union to cease and desist from engaging in a slowdown. No Board decision, before Personal Products, held that it did. In Phelps-Dodge, on which Mr. Van Aken says the Board "based" its Personal Products decision, the slowdown was held merely nonprotected by section 7; the employer was relieved of his duty to bargain with a union while it engaged in a slowdown; the slowdown was not held illegal.

The other matters mentioned in Mr. Van Aken's letter warrant only brief comment. For example, attacking my treatment of the position which the company took in collective bargaining, he quotes me as saying that the company "refused to offer any wage increase at all." Although that purports to be a direct quotation, comparison with my speech will show that it omits a critical word, "general," which appeared immediately before the words "wage increase." What I actually said was that the company "refused to offer any general wage increase at all." Mr. Van Aken does not deny that the statement I actually made is true and he cannot do so, for the record in the case proves it. That the company offered to increase a few individual rates and grant a few fringe benefits does not change the basic picture.

Mr. Van Aken says that the location of the plant in a private industrial district could not have affected the union's right to picket and therefore could not have been influential in inducing the union not to call a full-fledged strike. To prove his point, he refers to a strike which the union called almost a year after the slowdown in the course of which the union did engage in picketing which the company did not seek to enjoin. The point is, however, that before the slowdown occurred the union did not know whether the company would attempt to invoke its property rights to interfere with peaceful picketing. The company, indeed, explicitly refused to assure the union that it would not use its ownership of the property as an excuse to enjoin peaceful picketing. The facts are not changed by Mr. Van Aken's post hoc argument.

D. The false accusation that I am biased and prejudiced

Both the report and Chairman Leedom's letter charge me with bias and prejudice in favor of labor unions and against antiunion employers. This prejudice, they say, invalidates my charges, even though I documented them in every case with cold, hard facts. The evidence which is offered, however, not only fails to support the allegation that I am biased; it provides additional proof that the Board and its defenders are guilty of the very bias and prejudice which they have demonstrated in their administration of the act.

Both Chairman Leedom and the report charge me with bias for failing to mention in my discussion of the Swift case, that the Board, at the union's request, asked the Federal court to issue an injunction to prevent enforcement of an illegal State court injunction which the company had obtained to prevent the union from peacefully picketing the plant. The report goes so far as to

assert that the Board's action in seeking this injunction "demonstrates the Board's fairness and impartiality." Let us see.

In the first place, Mr. Leedom admits that the Board's application for an injunction against Swift was a "collateral action," and not part of the Swift case which I discussed.

The Board's action in bringing that "collateral" injunction suit against Swift & Co. was held to be irrelevant in the Swift case by the Board itself. As a matter of fact, the Board insisted, over the respondent union's strong objection, that its application for injunctive relief against Swift & Co. should be treated by the Federal court as an entirely separate and distinct proceeding from the proceeding which the General Counsel had brought against local 88 under section 10 (1), even though the section 10 (1) proceeding was then being tried before the same district court, and even though the union action which the General Counsel alleged to violate section 8 (b) (4) (A) was admittedly the direct outgrowth of the company's action in illegally obtaining and keeping in effect a State court injunction which prohibited local 88 from peacefully picketing the Swift plant for organizational purposes. So unrelated did the Board regard these two proceedings to be that in its decision it held that Swift's action in illegally enjoining local 88 from lawful organizational picketing did not even affect the application of the "roving situs" doctrine pursuant to which even under the Eisenhower Board's decisions, the union would have been entitled to bring pressure to bear upon Swift at the retail markets because it was not free to picket at Swift's plant.

Second, when we turn to consideration of the injunction which the Board sought against Swift, it is evident that the Board did not seek that injunction "to relieve the union involved of an improperly burdensome State court injunction." It sought the injunction because, and only because, Swift had previously filed a charge with the Labor Board alleging that the peaceful picketing of its plant by local 88 was an unfair labor practice. The General Counsel of the Board had dismissed that charge on the ground that the legislative history of the act clearly established that Congress did not intend to outlaw peaceful picketing for organizational purposes, but rather intended that that conduct be left free of judicial restraint and interference. When, thereafter, Swift maintained, in effect, its illegal State court injunction the Board felt compelled to seek a Federal injunction against Swift to prevent Swift from thus continuing to flout, undermine, and destroy the authority which Congress vested in the General Counsel to determine whether conduct of this kind should or should not be subjected to restraint. Consistent Board policy and precedent, which the Supreme Court has sustained and approved (see *NLRB* v. *Capital Service, Inc.* (347 U. S. 501)), makes it clear that the Board seeks to enjoin enforcement of illegal State court injunctions only where the party who is maintaining the injunction has sought and been denied such relief by the General Counsel on the merits. There is thus nothing in the Board's application for injunctive relief against Swift in that case which can be taken even remotely to suggest that the Board was acting in behalf of the union. It acted, as it was compelled to act, in the interest of preserving its own prestige and authority.

That this is true is shown, moreover, by the Board's insistence during the trial of the two cases before the Federal court on keeping the injunction case and the section 10 (1) proceeding entirely separate and distinct. It opposed, and succeeded in defeating, the union's motion to consolidate the cases. The Board thereby managed to create a situation in which the court could consider the one single interrelated situation which arose out of the union's picketing of Swift, the company's illegal injunction against that picketing, and the union's subsequent inducement of its buyer-members to refrain from purchasing Swift products, as if they were entirely separate and distinct transactions.

The result was that the district court not only ignored the interrelationship between the facts; it ignored, as did the Board, the basic interrelationship between the rights guaranteed unions in sections 7 and 13 of the act and the limitations imposed upon the exercise of those rights by section 8 (b) (4) (A). By this process of compartmentalizing the facts and the law, the district court was able to conclude that the General Counsel should have injunctive relief against the union in the section 10 (1) case, but that the Board should have no relief against Swift & Co. in the collateral case even though it was patent that the State court was entirely without jurisdiction to issue or maintain in effect that injunction against peaceful picketing, and that the injunction unlawfully prevented the union from exercising its statutory rights.

Moreover, it is obvious that nothing in the Board's action in seeking injunctive relief against Swift in a collateral action, on the Board's own theory, affected the rationale of the Board's decision against local No. 88 in the Swift case which I criticized. Mention of the application for injunctive relief was and is wholly unnecessary to complete understanding of each of the issues decided by the Board against the union. Leedom's attempt to make it appear relevant is simply another attempt to becloud and distort the real issues.

Finally, although the report praises the Board for appealing from Judge Moore's adverse decision in the injunction case, it neglects to add that the Board refused to request the Supreme Court to review the eighth circuit's adverse ruling, even though that court's holding that the Board was not empowered to seek such relief was admittedly novel, unprecedented, and tremendously important, not only to the Board and to all labor organizations in the country, but to many agencies of the Federal Government as well. The eighth circuit's result, moreover, as the Board itself alleged, in its brief to that court, appears to be in conflict with the Supreme Court's decision in the Capital Service case. Yet, although the grounds for certiorari were overwhelming, the Board made no attempt to obtain Supreme Court review.

Chairman Leedom also claims that I "departed from the position of an impartial observer and critic" by relying in part upon Mr. Ratner's article. Leedom says that since Mr. Ratner represents unions it seems "a fair assumption that his inclination would be to take the partisan rather than the purely objective viewpoint and would tend to color the total factual picture to favor labor organizations in an issue between unions and management."

Chairman Leedom appears, however, not to have thought through the implications of this attack. If what he is saying is that any attorney who represents either labor or management in labor relations cases is necessarily biased and prejudiced, then he must admit that the appointment of General Counsel Kammholz, whose background, like that of virtually every other Eisenhower administration appointee, was exclusively that of a representative of employers, necessarily foreshadowed biased and prejudiced action and judgments by that token alone. When General Counsel Kammholz was appointed, Senators DOUGLAS and MCNAMARA opposed his appointment on the ground that he lacked the capacity to be fair and impartial in the light of his exclusively proemployer background. (Views of Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS and PAT MCNAMARA in opposition to the confirmation of Theophil C. Kammholz, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) Mr. Kammholz at the hearings declared that his background in no way impaired his ability to make fair and unbiased decisions respecting the interpretation and application of the law as between labor and management. One of the factors which apparently led the Senate to confirm the Kammholz appointment was the fact that to disqualify attorneys from serving on grounds of bias and prejudice because they represented either employers or unions would eliminate virtually all candidates qualified by experience and training to deal with the issues in this field. Leedom now appears to suggest an even broader attack, namely, that analysis of the Board's decisions is to be discounted as biased and prejudiced whenever it comes from an attorney who represents one side or the other in this field. The result of such an approach would be to insulate the Board from virtually any informed criticism whatever. I can well understand why, in the interest of expediency, Chairman Leedom would desire such a result, but I can hardly believe that anyone will be misled by his self-serving assumption.

If, on the other hand, Chairman Leedom is not making so broad an attack, but is restricting his attempt at disqualification to attorneys who represent unions, as distinguished from attorneys who represent management, then it would appear that his attack reflects a degree of bias and prejudice more patent even than appears from the decisions of the Eisenhower appointees. Thus, on either approach, Mr. Leedom's "assumption" is neither fair nor tenable.

Perhaps Chairman Leedom's misguided attack is attributable to his misconception that what is at stake here is an issue "between unions and management." That, as my speech made perfectly plain, is not the issue at all. The issue is whether the Board is performing the function which Congress vested in it—a quasi-judicial function—or is usurping legislative power under the guise of performing that function; and whether the Board is exercising its quasi-judicial and administrative powers fairly or in a manner actuated by bias, prejudice, personal views, and political considerations. This is no issue between labor and management. Any Board which usurped Congress' legislative functions, as my speech demonstrates the Eisenhower appointees are doing, would be subject to censure whether its results favored management or labor, and whether it was acting in the interest of the Democratic or the Republican Party. It happens that the Eisenhower appointees are abusing their powers in the interest of management and to the detriment of labor, because that happens to be the real policy and program of the administration which appointed them and whose interests they have undertaken to serve. But my criticism is directed primarily at the abuse of constitutional processes and misuse of official position and power whereby the Eisenhower appointees are accomplishing their antilabor purposes; not merely at the victimization of labor which results. In appraising the merits of my analysis, one need not be either prolabor or promanagement; the analysis necessarily stands or falls on its own merits. It is patent that Leedom's attack is a subterfuge designed to evade such analysis on the merits.

Finally the report claims to prove my bias and prejudice by asserting that I implied, falsely it is said, that the act confers "rights on unions." The report says that the act does not confer any rights on unions, but only on employees. That is plainly, and ludicrously, false. If the act confers no rights on unions what did Congress take away from unions which refused to comply with the non-Communist affidavit and financial reporting provisions in sections 9 (f), (g), and (h)? If the act confers no rights on unions how are we to account for the fact that the act prohibits an employer from dealing individually with employees after a majority have chosen a union to represent them, even though the employees themselves want to bargain individually?

Of course the act confers rights on unions. And it does so because Congress recognized, as the Eisenhower Board members and the draftsmen of the report do not, that unions are the very instrumentalities through which employees exercise the collective bargaining rights which the act protects. Unions and their membership are inseparable and must remain so, if the law is to have any vitality. The attempt of the report to separate them reveals where the bias and prejudice really lie.

The report claims that I misapprehended the statute and was guilty of inaccuracy, by failing to note that Taft-Hartley added to section 7 a right of employees to refrain from joining unions. That is wholly inaccurate. The fact is, as I said, that Congress did not change the terms of the affirmative guaranty one jot or tittle. I omitted the guaranty of the negative right because it was wholly irrelevant to the Board's mutilation of the affirmative guaranty, and its irrelevancy is proved by the fact that in not a single one of the section 7 cases which I cited did the Board even offer that amendment as justification for its result. To construe the amendment as the report construes it is to attribute to Congress the intention of granting a right with one breath and taking it away in the next. The truth is that the negative right is designed only to protect employees who do not choose to join unions against both union or employer reprisal. It was not designed to diminish the protection of employees who choose to join unions and engage in concerted activity.

The attempt to utilize this irrelevancy to justify the Board's denial of protection to employees who choose to exercise their right to join and support unions speaks volumes—volumes about the attitude of those who resort to it.

V. THE REPLY ADMITS MY CHARGE THAT THE EISENHOWER BOARD APPOINTEES HAVE WRITTEN THEIR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ANTIUNION SENTIMENTS INTO THE LAW

When we have stripped from the replies all of the inaccuracies, misstatements and distortions designed to prove that what has happened did not happen, what remains is an admission of my basic charge. At the close of his letter Chairman Leedom says: "Decisions by all courts and quasi-judicial agencies reflect to a degree the economic and political views of the members. Therefore, some change constantly takes place in the interpretations of the law, not inconsistent with the statutory scheme of continuous change in the personnel comprising the tribunal."

Implicit in this statement is the view that an administration is justified in using its power to appoint the members and General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board to install in those offices men whose political and economic views accord with those of the administration and who will use the powers of their office to effectuate those views rather than the policies of the statute which Congress enacted and which it is their duty faithfully, honestly and impartially to enforce. If this view were sound, of course, what this Board has done would be no offense. And the report appears to subscribe to this view, for it contrasts my sole charge that the Board has a strong antilabor bias with the absence of any accusation of corruption, venality, bribery or any form of criminal abuse of its office, as if bias and prejudice were not enough.

Perhaps Chairman Leedom and the draftsmen of the report do not realize it, but their view is subversive of the most basic and vital principles of our system of Government. I had supposed that everyone understood that ours is a government of laws and not of men; that in that form of government quasi-judicial officers, no less than judges, are bound to respect the law as Congress writes it, and are precluded from substituting their own for Congress' judgment as to what the law should be. I had supposed that at least everyone who made even a pretense of fitness to hold judicial or quasi-judicial office under our Constitution would realize that adherence to these principles required not only that the judge refrain from deliberately injecting his personal, economic, and political predilections into his decisions, but that he make a conscious and deliberate effort to recognize and set aside, in deciding cases, whatever economic and political biases he may have brought with him to office, and which he cannot entirely escape.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in a recent collection of papers, Of Law and Men, pages 40–42 (1956), made the point this way: "Judges are men, not disembodied spirits. Of course, a judge is not free from preferences or, if you will, biases." But that is no excuse for the "cynical belief in too many quarters * * * that it is at best a self-delusion for judges to pursue disinterestedness. * * * To assume that a lawyer who becomes a judge takes on the bench merely his views on social or economic questions leaves out of account his rooted notions regarding the scope and limits of a judge's authority. The outlook of a lawyer fit to be a justice regarding the role of a judge cuts across all his personal preferences for this or that social arrangement." It is the duty of a judge to recognize "that he is there not to impose his private views upon society, that he is not to enforce personalized justice * * *."

Chairman Leedom's approach shows that the Eisenhower appointees regard it as their duty not to eschew but to reflect their economic and political views. That is an admission, at minimum, that the Eisenhower appointees do not have that outlook as to the role of Board members which makes them fit to occupy those offices. Mr. Leedom's attempt to justify the writing of their political and economic prejudices into the law by reference to their temporary tenure of their office is nothing less than a cynical attempt by this administration to justify on the basis of 1952 election returns its perversion of Congress' policy by administration. The defense is that since the election gave the administration power to appoint members of the Board, and since Board members are empowered to decide cases, there can be nothing wrong in the usurpation of power by which they decide cases in accordance with their political convictions, not the law.

It is this crucial difference in attitude toward their role as judges, as I said in my initial speech, which differentiates the Eisenhower appointees from the appointees of prior administrations. Until the Eisenhower administration, Board members regarded it as their duty to effectuate Congress' policy, not their own. Those, appointed earlier, who still serve still regard that as their duty. And it is, therefore, not at all surprising that in some of the cases which I criticized, where, as I said, reasonable arguments could be made to sustain a contrary view, one or more of these men voted with the Eisenhower appointees. But these men never voted as a block, and they did not always vote on management's side in crucial policy cases, as they never uniformly voted on labor's side in crucial policy cases prior to 1953. I disassociated them from my attack on the Eisenhower Board because analysis of the critical, revolutionary changes which the Board has made shows that they are all attributable to the Eisenhower appointees; that they did vote uniformly on the critical issues to hurt labor and help antiunion employers; and that the changes taken together show that they were made because of the personal views of the Eisenhower appointees as to what the law should be, not because the law as Congress wrote it compelled these results.

This has nothing to do, as the report would have it, with whether the appointees regard the Taft-Hartley Act as a good law or a bad law. Expecting, and getting, true quasi-judicial performance, the Congress which enacted Taft-Hartley retained as Board members men who had opposed many of the provisions of that act. Congress properly regarded it as irrelevant to sound exercise of the judging function by men of judicial caliber whether they approved or disapproved of the law. Approval of Taft-Hartley, of itself, is no more a disqualication than disapproval. What does disqualify is departure from the judge's role to achieve not the objectives of the law, but the different objectives of its most reactionary sponsors, or for that matter, its opponents.

The Eisenhower appointees stand indicted by their own decisions and policies. Although they seek to evade responsibility under a multitude of guises, their reply carries an admission that they have used their powers of office to accomplish partisan and biased ends. The truly reactionary, antilabor philosophy and program of the administration stands revealed in the abuse of governmental processes to which it resorted to achieve its objectives. Let Congress and the American people judge whether this performance is compatible with the ethics and principles of American Government.

EXHIBIT A

STATE OF NEW YORK,
City of New York,
County of New York, ss:

William H. Englander, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am assistant general counsel of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO. I supervised the activities of Harry A. Dower, a Pennsylvania attorney the union retained in the court case described below and I represented the union in the Board proceeding described below. Accordingly I have personal knowledge of the events described in this affidavit.

In May of 1955 the Lloyd A. Fry Roofing Co. bought the plant site in Emmaus, Pa., formerly used by the International Felt Co. Prior to its closing, the International Felt Co. had been under contract with this union.

In June of 1955, Lloyd A. Fry hired seven employees, all of whom signed TWUA authorization cards. In June, Pete Umholtz, an international representative of the union, called upon the company to grant the union recognition; the request was denied. Picketing of the company began on June 22. On June 27 the company applied to the Court of Common Pleas of Lehigh County for a preliminary injunction against the union's picketing.

On July 18, 1955, the court, by Judge Henninger, denied the company's application for a preliminary injunction. The court held there was a labor dispute within the meaning of the Pennsylvania Anti-Injunction Act.

Following the court's decision, the company met with union officials on July 25, 1955. We imagined the meeting was for the purpose of negotiating a contract, but we soon learned that the company was solely interested in having a written record of our claim to represent the company's future employees, as well as those currently employed.

With the transcript of that meeting in hand, the company went into court on August 9 and moved again for a preliminary injunction. In addition to holding the phony bargaining session with us, the company also took pains before renewing its motion to advise our members that they were laid off.

By a decision dated November 14, 1955, the court, by Judge Henninger, again denied the company's motion for an injunction. It was held there was nothing illegal in our

demand to represent future as well as present employees, and that we had a free speech right to advertise the dispute through picketing.

After the company wrote to six of our strikers that they were on "indeterminate layoff," we filed charges in the fourth regional office of the National Labor Relations Board against the company. We claimed that the company had discriminated against the six employees because of their union activities; also, that the company had unlawfully refused to bargain with us. Our charges were assigned Case No. 4–CA–1319.

On December 5, 1955, the company filed unfair labor practice charges against the union. The charges alleged we demanded that the company hire only union employees; that we demanded an unlawful union-shop agreement; and that we were guilty of committing a secondary boycott in that we had induced the employees of secondary employers not to deal with the company.

On December 20, 1955, I received a call from Bernard Samoff, field examiner in the fourth regional office of the NLRB. He told me he expected that the charges we filed against the company would be dismissed.

On the other hand, he stated that he thought there was a great deal of merit to the charges the company had filed against us. He said he was satisfied that Pete Umholtz, our international representative, had requested business agents of various AFL metal trade unions to instruct their members not to cross our picket lines; that these members, employees of secondary employers hired to do various preparatory construction work at the plant, had respected our picket lines in accordance with instructions given them. He said he thought this set of facts could very well make out a secondary boycott. He added that the potential illegality is further compounded by our demand for an overall production and maintenance unit union-shop contract, at a time when we represented just a few maintenance men. He said that this demand, supported by picketing, is per se illegal.

He added that such a contract, if granted, would not be a bar to an election and also since such contract would be coercive of other employees, it would follow that the demand for such a contract is illegal.

I pointed out to him that even if it were assumed that the unit we requested was inappropriate, I was quite certain there was not a single decided case which held that a demand for an inappropriate unit supported by picketing was an unfair labor practice per se. I also stressed the fact that the type of contract we demanded was simply an initial proposal for bargaining, and that during the course of bargaining we might very well take some other type of contract for some other unit.

Moreover, I told him that I had found a decision which dealt precisely with the facts that he alleged in his assertion that Pete Umholtz requested the business agents of AFL metal trade unions to instruct their members not to cross our picket lines. This case dealt with the identical situation; namely, where the picketing union went to another union and requested the other union to respect the first union's picket lines at the primary premises of the primary employer. The rationale of that decision was that a union may lawfully request, away from the situs of the primary picket line, what it may lawfully request at the primary situs of the picket line: that employees of secondary employers respect the picket line. I was referring to the *Interborough News Company* (90 NLRB 2135 (1950)).

In reply to my insistence that we had a perfect legal right to continue picketing even if the facts he claimed had been true, he urged me to consider the practical aspects of this situation. He noted that we had our picket line in front of this plant for a long time without any success; he expressed his opinion that the company was not likely to succumb to our picket line; that it would be to our advantage to withdraw the pickets, allow the company to attempt to get the plant going, and when the plant had hired additional employees, a new organizational situation will have been created.

He stated his belief that if we withdrew our charges and our picket line, the company would withdraw its charges. On the other hand, should we fail to see the practicalities of the situation and persist in our picketing, then, apart from any merit in our legal position, we would be faced with legal difficulties far beyond any value that this organizational situation could have for us. He noted that under the act an injunction would issue first, and only later would we have an opportunity to persuade the Board that we had a legal right to picket. He reminded me that there have already been many cases in which the charged party had proved to the Board its innocence of a secondary boycott violation. But all during the period of litigation the injunction remained in effect. He emphasized that fighting a court and a Board case hardly seemed to be merited by the organizational possibilities of the situation.

He also stated that the new General Counsel of the Board has taken the position that in all cases of doubt relating to possible new unfair labor practices, charges were not to be dismissed by regional directors but instead were to be brought to his attention for possible decision in favor of issuing complaints in circumstances that had not theretofore been regarded as unfair labor practices.

I made it clear to him that I had no jurisdiction over any decision regarding the wisdom of withdrawing our picket line at this time; I would be consulted only as to the possible legal consequences in the event we chose to maintain our picket line. I told him Pete Umholtz would have to consult his superiors for a policy decision on withdrawing the picket line.

I learned that Samoff had gone to Pete Umholtz' office that day, along with Bernard X. Alsher, another field examiner from the fourth region of the NLRB.

The next day, December 21, 1955, I received a letter from Pete Umholtz, forwarding to me a copy of the affidavit he signed for Samoff and Alsher the day before. It states in part:

"At no time did any member of the Textile Workers Union, AFL–CIO, or I ever communicate with any officers of the Building Trades Council of Allentown, or any business agent of any of the building trades requesting that our picket line be honored at Volney Felt Mill in Emmaus, Pa."

It is difficult to resist accusing these Board agents of overreaching and attempting entrapment in their interview of Umholtz. Apparently they were not satisfied merely to swear that he did not communicate with any officer of the Building Trades Council; they also had him swear to what he could not possibly know of his own knowledge, namely, that "at no time did any member of the Textile Workers Union ever communicate with any officer of the Building Trades Council."

On December 22, Bernard X. Alsher called me; he stated that he had spoken to Brandschain, the company's attorney, who said that if we withdraw the picket line, the company will withdraw the charges. I asked him whether the company would withdraw the charges with prejudice. I pointed out that once we removed our picket line, the company could complete the repairs required to put the plant into full operation, hire a full complement of employees and get production started. If, after that had taken place, the company thereupon refiled its charges, we certainly would have played the role of fools. Of course, it might be possible at that juncture to put a picket line up again, although that could be very difficult. But by then the horse would have escaped from the barn. I urged that we had a right to insist that the company withdraw its charges with prejudice in the event we chose to enter into any such arrangement.

Alsher told me that he had not and will not tell Brandschain that the regional office either requests or recommends that he withdraw his charges with prejudice. He said that he had not felt it would be proper for a Board agent to make that recommendation.

I told him I was exceedingly surprised at this position. I pointed out that he and Samoff had done a very excellent job in pointing out to us the practicalities of the situation, even to the extent of considering with me the possibility that we had every legal right to picket, while yet urging that Court and Board action against us should deter us from continuing an unprofitable organizational situation. I noted that the same persuasive powers exerted upon the company could very likely result in similar cooperation on that side.

Alsher repeated that as a matter of Board policy he would not urge Brandschain to withdraw his charges with prejudice. I asked him whether the problem of Board policy could be avoided if he relayed to Brandschain our message that we request him to withdraw with prejudice. He said he would do that.

He called back and advised that Brandschain had stated that he would not withdraw with or without prejudice—he would just withdraw, if we withdrew our charges and withdrew our picket line. Alsher told me that he understood this reply of Brandschain's to be negative, i. e., he would not withdraw with prejudice. Alsher suggested the parties work the problem out at a meeting between them.

Responsible union officials conferred concerning the situation. Throughout our assumption was that we had a legal right to picket, even if the facts claimed by the Board agent were true. Nevertheless, the threat of prosecution by the Board, and the expense, time, and trouble it entailed, was considered by us dispositive of the situation. We withdrew our charges and our picket line. On January 9, 1956, we were advised that the company had withdrawn its charges without prejudice.

WILLIAM H. ENGLANDER.

Sworn to before me this 17th day of April 1956.

ANN WARSHAUER.

A Report to the People of Berks County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 84th Congress, I feel that it is appropriate to make this preliminary report to my constituents, the people of Berks County, the 14th District of Pennsylvania. I will also issue a final report, summarizing those activities not covered by this preliminary report.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

I have always felt strongly that an informed and alert citizenry is one of the most important foundations of our democratic form of government. For this reason I have attempted to report as widely as possible my activities and the

work of Congress as a whole. Through these reports, as well as through weekly radio reports, I have tried to keep Berks Countians fully informed on the deliberations of the 84th Congress and to express my own stand on important issues.

REPRESENTING ALL THE PEOPLE

In my years in the House of Representatives I have conscientiously endeavored to represent and serve the needs of all the people of Berks County. In the field of legislation I have always tried to support measures which would truly benefit the greatest number of our people and which would genuinely serve the public interest. Of course, reasonable individuals will differ because of various interpretations placed on some phases of legislation. For this reason, no legislative record could possibly please every one of my constituents in every respect. This is to be expected in a healthy democracy, with its complicated social, economic, and political patterns. I do feel, however, that an elected Representative has the duty to consider carefully all viewpoints presented to him by all constituents, regardless of their political affiliation, personal motivation, or any other consideration. This I have always attempted to do to the best of my ability. All the views and aspects of particular legislative proposals are studied, weighed, and thoroughly considered before my final decision is made on how my vote will be cast. I have consistently voted for what I thought was in the best interests of the people of Berks County and our Nation.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

It has been my privilege to serve personally the people of my district who have contacted me about particular problems involving some phase of Government. I have tried to give this service promptly, courteously, efficiently, and fairly to all who have sought my help. Of course, it is not always possible to bring about the type of action needed to resolve satisfactorily each problem. However, every possible effort which is legal and reasonable is made in behalf of those seeking my assistance. Such services range from routine requests for Government publications to complicated problems involving veterans benefits, tax problems, social security and railroad retirement cases, immigration problems, Government contracts, and many other types of services to citizens in their relationships with their Government.

ATTENDANCE

My attendance record during the years of service as your Representative in Congress has been near perfect. In this 84th Congress my record was again one of the highest. The few calls I missed were caused by conflicting duties.

READING OFFICE

My office in the Reading Post Office Building is open 6 days a week to receive visits of constituents who desire information, help, or advice. I try to arrange my schedule to spend a maximum number of weekends at my Reading office when I am available to discuss personally particular problems which constituents may have. Whenever humanly possible, I accept invitations to attend various gatherings of community organizations, social, labor, farm and business groups, and other types of organizations. I am always willing to discuss any issue, answer questions, debate, or otherwise explain my views on specific issues before any group.

WASHINGTON VISITS

Again during the 84th Congress, it has been my pleasure to welcome many individuals and groups from Berks County on their visits to the Nation's Capital. Numerous school groups, religious groups, women's organizations, and Boy and Girl Scout groups met with me in the Capitol Building. With the assistance of Mrs. Rhodes, I have tried to help make their visits interesting, educational, and enjoyable. A visit to Washington to see our Government in action is one of the best ways for people to understand and appreciate the priceless heritage of freedom and democracy which we enjoy.

COMMITTEE WORK

During the 84th Congress, I have served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Administration Committee. I also served on numerous subcommittees and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics in the Government Service. Near the end of the second session I was appointed to fill a vacancy on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I have also presented my views on pending legislation to other committees both in the House and the Senate on such subjects as railroad retirement, housing for the aged, distressed-area assistance, veterans' pensions, minimum wages, problems of low-income families, small-business defense contracts, textile-industry problems, postal rates, and arbitration procedures for Federal employees.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

Perhaps one of the best guides to the scope and interest of any Member of Congress is the type of legislation which he introduces. During the 84th Congress, I introduced bills designed to reduce the retirement age for social-security benefits, grant tax relief to disabled taxpayers, raise personal income-tax exemptions to $800, provide social-security disability benefits for totally and permanently disabled persons, to liberalize the Civil Service Retirement Act, to establish a Federal Agency for the Handicapped, to improve the Fair Labor Standards Act, to provide increased railroad retirement benefits, to reduce corporation taxes on small businesses, to exempt nonprofit swimming-pool associations from Federal excise tax, to assist aged persons obtain public housing, to limit postal subsidies, and to establish a Bureau of Older Persons.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE

I have taken part in important debates on the floor of the House and discussed such issues as social security, railroad retirement, housing for the aged, postal pay, vocational rehabilitation, farm legislation, foreign policy, trade policy, postal rates, and numerous other issues.

CONSERVATIVE COALITION

A coalition of extreme conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats was a dominant force in the 84th Congress. This coalition succeeded in blocking or weakening many important measures which liberal Members of Congress considered essential.

The 84th Congress did, however, enact some significant and important measures which will benefit the vast majority of our people. Other important legislation fell by the wayside after being partially acted upon. Still other meritorious bills received little attention. Over 12,500 separate bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and over 4,500 were offered in the Senate. Of this total, less than 900 were enacted into law. Some of the most important of these new laws enacted in the second session will be discussed briefly in this report.

DEMOCRATIC COOPERATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

Democrats in Congress have maintained a responsible, constructive opposition to the Eisenhower administration, supporting and strengthening administration proposals which we believed in the public interest and opposing those measures which benefit the privileged few at the expense of the welfare of all. I did not approve of resorting to blind and irresponsible opposition simply for political reasons. I voted with or against the administration solely on the merits of the question under consideration.

A summary of the administration's legislative record shows that Democrats supplied the margin of victory for the President on many House rollcalls where his program was successful. Democrats in both House and Senate supported the President's foreign policy legislation to a greater extent that did members of his own party.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

The 84th Congress took some important strides forward but the progress was not what should have been made to meet successfully the challenge of automation, abundance, and surpluses.

The average citizen did not properly share in the prosperity created by increased production, scientific and technical advances.

Those of us who wanted to channel some of this prosperity to aged, retired, disabled and handicapped citizens were in a minority. We wanted to aid these people through the enactment of legislation to expand and improve social security and retirement programs. We urged improved service in Federal regulatory and inspection activities to protect the consumers and the public. In part we were successful. But in numerous cases monopoly restrictions were weakened or removed and had the effect of aiding monopoly interests at the expense of the average citizen. Small business also suffered because of the advantages won by monopoly interests.

Listed below are some of the important proposals acted upon by the 84th Congress:

PENSION AND RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Social security: One of the most important measures enacted by the 84th Congress makes liberalizing amendments

in the social security law. This action was taken despite vigorous opposition of the administration. The new law lowers the retirement age for women to age 62, provides benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50, continues benefits for physically disabled and mentally retarded children over 18, increases grants for public assistance to the needy aged, blind and disabled, and extends social security coverage to many professional groups. While this measure does not go as far as I personally hoped for, it is a significant step forward in meeting the needs of our senior citizens.

The social security amendments were approved despite objections from President Eisenhower's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion B. Folsom. It was in the final days of the session that the bill was brought out of the Senate Finance Committee where it had been crippled and delayed by the conservative coalition. Over strong opposition by the Republican leadership and Senator BYRD the Senate restored two important provisions. One was the lowering of the retirement age for women; the other was the disability feature. This key provision was approved by the Senate 47 to 45. Only 6 Republicans voted with the Democratic majority for the amendment. Both Republican Senators from Pennsylvania supported the administration and voted against the amendment.

That was the important decision on this year's social security bill. By a margin of 2 votes this social security fight was won. Benefits will be paid to women retiring at age 62, starting in December. Disability benefits will start July 1, 1957.

I joined with the liberal Democrats in working, voting for, and passing improved social security legislation.

Railroad retirement: Railroad retirement pensions were increased by 10 percent. A bill I introduced and worked for proposed a more liberal increase. It was for a 15-percent raise, which I felt was meritorius and justified because of increased living costs since the last pension increase. However, administration opposition made it a choice between 10 percent or nothing.

Civil-service retirement: The Civil Service Retirement Act was liberalized and improved, thus benefiting the millions of postal and Federal employees. Unfortunately, another bill to increase the annuities of already retired Federal employees was killed in the House after being strongly opposed by the administration.

TAXES

I introduced legislation to increase personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $800, and voted for a compromise tax relief bill which passed the House in 1955. The bill was strongly opposed by the Eisenhower administration and passage was blocked in the Senate. I feel that the average citizen is entitled to tax relief which was denied him in the 1954 tax bill which gave 91 percent of the savings to corporations and upper-income groups.

PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

Highways: A long-range program to build 41,000 miles of modern, interstate highways was approved. This is one of the most far-reaching actions taken by the Congress, benefiting the motoring public and commercial users of our highways. The new roads will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through increased taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires. I gave my support to this legislation.

Water-pollution control: A program to assist States in research and water-pollution control was enacted. I voted for the proposal which I believe is important in guaranteeing future supplies of water to meet the growing needs of our people.

Economically depressed areas: The 84th Congress took a big step toward the enactment of legislation to provide long-range Federal assistance to sections of our country suffering from chronic unemployment and economic stagnation. Although the House did not act on a depressed areas bill passed by the Senate in the closing days of the Congress, this issue will be a major target in the next Congress. I strongly support this type of program to help people and industry in depressed areas to help themselves in developing new skills, attracting new industry, and diversifying the types of products manufactured.

Flood insurance: The 84th Congress enacted legislation to provide a Federal flood insurance program on an experimental basis. This program was prompted by the disastrous floods in the northeastern part of our country last year and should help to reduce personal property losses in the event of future flood disasters.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

The 84th Congress made a significant record in enacting programs to provide long-range health and research programs to conquer disease and alleviate suffering among those Americans already stricken by diseases.

Salk polio vaccination program: Originally authorized last year, the program was extended until July 1, 1957, offering protection against crippling polio for many millions of children, young people, and expectant mothers.

Hospital construction, health research: Federal grants were authorized for an expanded hospital construction program, for training programs for nurses and public health personnel, and research and training grants to State mental institutions. Congress also provided for expanded dental research and construction of facilities and research programs into the causes of cancer, heart disease, polio, cerebral palsy, mental illness, arthritis, and other crippling diseases.

School milk program: Increased funds were voted for the school milk program and the program was broadened to include camps, nurseries for underprivileged children, non-profit-child-care centers and agencies.

School construction: The conservative coalition in the House of Representatives blocked passage of the important bill to provide Federal aid in the construction of school classrooms to meet the growing shortages. The bill would have authorized $1.6 billion in Federal funds, to be matched by the States, in the 4-year construction program. Pennsylvania's share of the Federal grants would have been slightly more than $100 million. One main controversy was over an amendment to implement the Supreme Court antisegregation decision. Many of us who supported both the Supreme Court decision and the school construction bill sought to separate the two issues, but when this was not possible, voted for the antisegregation amendment and for the school construction bill itself. Ninety-six Republican Members voted for the antisegregation amendment and then voted to defeat the school construction bill after the amendment was added. This issue will be an important one in the new Congress, as the school shortage continues to grow.

Rural library service: Congress enacted legislation to provide grants to States to expand and develop library service in rural areas of our country. Almost 90 percent of the people in rural areas do not have access to public library facilities. This legislation will bring library service within the reach of most of our citizens.

NATIONAL DEBT

The national debt under the Eisenhower administration has increased by $7 billion during the past 4 years. Finally, in the final year of the administration a balanced budget was achieved. This was done by making sharp cuts in the Armed Forces and by economic curtailment policies of the administration. The cuts in the armed services caused heated debate and warnings that the Nation's security was being imperiled. The curtailment policies which adversely affected small business and employment opportunities also was the subject of bitter debate.

SMALL BUSINESS

The growing problem of small businesses in our country has caused much concern among many Members of Congress. Big defense contracts have gone to giant corporations and monopolies while small businesses are failing at the highest rate since the depression of the 1930's. Profits of big businesses are reaching record levels but many small businesses are operating in the red or making only skimpy profits, insufficient to finance expansion plans.

Small business is the keystone of our free competitive enterprise system. In many sections of our economy they are being squeezed out of existence by monopolistic big business. I supported legislation to aid small business by an "equal opportunity" bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and sponsored legislation to reduce corporate income tax rates on small businesses.

FARM LEGISLATION

An attempt was made to restore high, rigid price supports to basic farm commodities during the 84th Congress. I voted against rigid supports and in favor of the flexible program, which was favored by the overwhelming majority of the farmers of Berks County. I also favored the principle of "domestic parity" advanced by the Grange, in the hope that it might provide the best long-range solution to the problem of farm surpluses.

COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOLS

I introduced legislation to repeal the 20-percent Federal tax on fees and dues paid to private, nonprofit swimming pool associations. I feel that tax relief for these worthwhile community projects would encourage the organization of more such groups. Neighborhood swimming pools play an important role in curbing juvenile delinquency. They provide needed recreational facilities in the neighborhood to encourage clean, wholesome, and healthful family-type activities. My bill received favorable reaction from people in many parts of the country who are interested in the development of swimming pool projects. It was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and placed in an overall excise tax readjustment bill which will be considered next year.

MORALS AND ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics in Government. Our subcommittee considered legislation to establish a code of ethics for employees of the Federal Government and reported a bill favorably. While it is obvious that morals and ethics cannot be guaranteed through legislation, this bill outlines a code of conduct which, if used as a guide, would do much to raise the moral climate of government.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

In addition to my efforts to liberalize the social-security program, I sponsored legislation to permit single aged persons or couples to occupy public housing units and also worked for inclusion of special aged housing provisions in the overall housing legislation passed by the 84th Congress. The conservative coalition succeeded in blocking the type of aged housing program which many of us felt was necessary to meet the growing needs of our elderly citizens.

I also joined in sponsoring legislation to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Its duties would be to formulate and carry out broad new types of programs to give older citizens the opportunity to enjoy more productive and independent lives, with adequate income, medical care, housing, and the chance to participate more fully in community activities. This legislation would provide the logical first steps in providing for the necessary Federal-State and private organizational cooperation in the development of plans and projects to assist older persons toward the attainment of these humanitarian objectives.

SURPLUSES AND ABUNDANCE

The real challenge which Congress must face is the challenge of automation and abundance. I joined with liberal Members who sought to channel more of our productive genius in the fields of manufactured goods and farm commodities into the hands of the millions of Americans now existing on meager pensions, substandard diets and living in slum housing. Children are attending inadequate schools, growing up under shameful conditions in this great land of abundance. These conditions must be remedied.

The cost of living remains high and continues to be a hardship on unemployed workers, their families, small farmers, and the millions of our retired senior citizens who struggle to exist on inadequate pensions or social-security benefits.

We must initiate policies to establish a full employment, expanding economy to provide more jobs at decent wages. We must have increased purchasing power in the hands of our neglected, low-income families and our old folks so that they can afford to buy the manufactured goods and farm surpluses which bulge from our warehouses and storage bins.

I supported policies to establish a full employment, expanding economy to provide more jobs and high living levels to put increased purchasing power in the hands of our neglected, low-income families and our old folks so that they can afford to buy the manufactured goods and farm surpluses which bulge from our warehouses and storage bins.

In a brief report it is not possible to tell completely the story of this session of Congress. Another report, resuming this summary of the work of the 84th Congress, will be mailed to you at a later date. Meanwhile, I will make myself available, without expense, to any group in Berks County which desires me to speak, answer questions, or debate on issues of national importance.

Contact my Reading or Washington office with any such request or on any matter in which you may be interested.

Report to the People of Berks County—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity at this time to conclude my report to the people of Berks County on the record of the 84th Congress.

In the first section of my report I discussed social security, railroad retirement, civil service retirement, income-tax legislation, small-business problems, health legislation, school construction, farm legislation, and the challenge of surpluses and abundance.

Here are additional important issues which came before this Congress:

PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

Highways: A long-range program to build 41,000 miles of modern, interstate highways was approved. This is one of the most far-reaching actions taken by the Congress, benefiting the motoring public and commercial users of our highways. The new roads will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through increased taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires. I gave my support to this legislation.

Water-pollution control: A program to assist States in research and water-pollution control was enacted. I voted for the proposal which I believe is important in guaranteeing future supplies of water to meet the growing needs of our people.

Economically depressed areas: The 84th Congress took a big step toward the enactment of legislation to provide long-range Federal assistance to sections of our country suffering from chronic unemployment and economic distress. I strongly support this type of program to help people and industry in depressed areas to help themselves in developing new skills, attracting new industry, and diversifying the types of products manufactured.

The bill, because of administration opposition, was killed by delay in the House.

AUTOMATION

A Joint Economic Subcommittee conducted a study of the problems created by increased automation in our industrial society. Its report stressed the possible impact of automation on future employment opportunities and emphasized that a healthy, dynamic economy is needed to form a bulwark against increased unemployment caused by automation. Liberal Democrats approve the report. If Government policies promote an expanding economy, displaced workers can be retrained to fill new jobs at good wages and the impact of automation thus can be considerably alleviated. This Democratic view is opposed by those who support curtailment policies of the administration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The House passed a bill designed to protect the civil rights of all Americans by establishing a bipartisan commission to investigate alleged violations of civil rights. I supported this important legislation. The bill, however, died because the Senate failed to act.

PEACETIME ATOMIC POWER

Key members of the Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee warned of the lack of progress being made in this country toward the development of atomic energy power reactors. Other nations, including Soviet Russia, are making significant advances. Many experts feel that our country will fall behind in the atomic power field unless action is taken. Legislation to direct the Atomic Energy Commission to build power reactors at our atomic energy installations was passed by the Senate. Strong opposition from the administration and Chairman Strauss of the AEC was exerted on House members and, as a result, the atomic power reactor bill was killed by a narrow margin.

I favored and voted for this important legislation to stimulate the peacetime development of atomic power.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Many Members of Congress have been alarmed at recent figures which show that during the past year the Soviet Union graduated more than twice the number of scientists and engineers graduated in the United States. Our very survival in the critical years ahead may well depend on our ability to retain world superiority in technological and scientific developments. The Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee

conducted important hearings on this subject and made a number of recommendations to arouse increased interest in science and engineering as a career for our young people. Legislation to promote this interest through the awarding of Federal scholarships, teacher's fellowships, and other similar programs was introduced in the House. This program had my full support.

NATURAL-GAS REGULATION

The controversial bill to exempt natural-gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission was vetoed by the President after the revelation by Senator CASE of South Dakota, that he had been offered $2,500 by oil lobbyists for his support of the bill. I opposed the gas bill in the House because I was convinced that it was special-interest legislation which could cost the gas-consuming public hundreds of millions of dollars annually in higher natural-gas rates. Despite the veto, President Eisenhower stated that he supported the bill in principle. The bill is expected to be introduced again in the next Congress.

POSTAL RATES

The administration's attempt to increase first-class postal rates from 3 to 4 cents was blocked in the Senate after having passed the House. Democrats opposed the bill because it would place a disproportionate burden on users of first-class mail who already pay more than their share of the postal costs.

Last year profit in first-class mail was $63 million. The administration bill would have imposed an additional $296 million burden on first-class mail users. It would also have made more secure the subsidies to giant magazine publishers. Life magazine, as an example, got a subsidy of nearly $10 million last year.

I opposed the bill because I believe postal subsidies to Reader's Digest, Saturday Evening Post, Life, and others should be substantially cut before a first-class rate increase is adopted.

Postal subsidies are now costing the taxpayers far more than does the entire agricultural conservation program.

FISCAL POLICIES

The national debt: It has increased $6 billion during the last 4 years. Interest on the debt now amounts to $7 billion, or more than 10 percent of our total budget expenditures. Finally, this year, a balanced budget was achieved. This was done by making sharp cuts in the Armed Forces, by delaying payments into the civil service retirement trust fund, and by economic curtailment policies. The cuts in the armed services caused heated debate and brought warnings that the Nation's security was being imperiled. The curtailment policies which adversely affected small business and employment opportunities was also the subject of bitter debate. Some of these cuts merely shift until a later date payments that the Government is obligated to meet. It gives a false picture of the debt situation.

Economic policies: White House advisors who influence the President are responsible for policies which resulted in higher interest rates, increased living costs, and a serious business recession in 1954. Regulatory commissions and inspection services were weakened.

These policies have caused higher public and private debt, exploitation of our natural resources by special interests, an alarming number of small-business failures, and a reduction of essential Government services.

They also meant the blocking of public-works programs, more subsidies, tax loopholes, and writeoffs for big business, and other policies which discriminate against the average citizen and bring about dangerous curtailment of our national economy. Democrats strongly opposed these policies.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

In addition to my efforts to liberalize the social-security program, I sponsored legislation to permit single aged persons or couples to occupy public-housing units. I also worked for inclusion of special housing-for-the-aged provisions in the overall housing legislation passed by the 84th Congress.

I also joined in sponsoring legislation to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Its duties would be to formulate and carry out broad new types of programs to give older citizens the opportunity to enjoy more productive and independent lives, with adequate income, medical care, housing, and the chance to participate more fully in community activities.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Pensions: The House of Representatives passed a bill to grant a $90-a-month pension at age 65 to World War I veterans whose maximum income does not exceed specified levels. It would have also provided increases for totally disabled World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions. The bill was blocked in the Senate Finance Committee. It was strongly opposed in a personal letter from President Eisenhower prior to the House action on the compromise bill. The bill was a moderate approach toward meeting the problem pertaining to the economic well-being of our older veterans, many of whom are no longer able to find suitable work. I supported the World War I pension bill before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and voted for the bill which passed the House.

Service-connected benefits: I also supported a bill passed by the House providing a 10-percent increase in compensation for veterans suffering service-connected disabilities during World Wars I, II, and the Korean conflict. In addition, it would have increased by 10 percent the allowances paid to disabled veterans with dependents when such veterans are 50-percent or more disabled. This bill was also opposed by the administration and it failed to receive Senate approval.

GI loan extension: The 84th Congress enacted a bill to extend the World War II GI loan program to July 25, 1958. There are still more than 10 million such veterans who have not used their GI loan entitlement to purchase homes, farms, or businesses. About 4,400,000 veterans have already taken advantage of this provision of the original GI bill.

Veterans' widows compensation: An important provision of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act enacted by the 84th Congress increased the payment of VA benefits for widows of veterans who died as a result of service-connected injury. The new rates will be $112 a month, plus 12 percent of the adjusted basic pay of the deceased veteran.

Veterans' insurance: World War II and Korean War veterans who let their Government life insurance lapse get a chance to reinstate their policies under a law passed by the 84th Congress. The law applies only to 5-year term policies that have lapsed since July 23, 1953, because the holders failed to pay either or both of the final two premiums. Eligible veterans will be sent notices.

LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

A subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee conducted a study of the problems of low-income families in the United States. One out of every five families now has an income of less than $2,000 a year. Despite increases in our economic resources, surpluses, and material abundance, millions of American families are forced to live on income too low to provide for their everyday needs. Some sections of the country have been hard hit by unemployment and depressed economic conditions. I presented a statement to the subcommittee describing the economic problems of Reading and Berks County and stressed the need for implementing the Employment Act of 1946 to provide maximum employment opportunities and for adopting policies to provide for the economic rehabilitation of low-income families.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The problem of juvenile delinquency has received considerable attention in the 84th Congress. An exhaustive study by the Kefauver Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in the United States has produced a number of valuable reports discussing the causes, extent, and possible action necessary to alleviate this problem. Legislation to authorize joint Federal-State-local programs to combat the juvenile-delinquency menace was favorably reported to the Senate. While no action was taken on the bill in this Congress, it will undoubtedly be considered further next year. Other bills were enacted to tighten up the law against selling narcotics to minors and against the shipment of obscene materials through the mails.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING

The Senate passed legislation encouraging the use of humane methods in the slaughter of animals in our Nation's packinghouses. I supported this legislation. In a speech on the House floor I called attention to the shocking and unnecessary brutality in transporting of animals and in methods of slaughter. I urged the use of modern devices now available to guarantee humane slaughtering practices. The bill was not acted upon by the House in this Congress but

Senate action was an important step forward.

NEWS CENSORSHIP

Members of Congress as well as newspaper editors, writers, educators, and many other Americans have become aware of the recent trend in the suppression of legitimate news concerning vital subjects of interest to the American people. In some instances security reasons are cited, but more often, ways have been found to restrict the flow of nonclassified information which administration leaders feel might be politically embarrassing if made known to the public.

The Moss investigating subcommittee has made startling discoveries of abuses of this type in its study of news censorship by the executive branch. The committee insisted that the American people have a right to know all of the facts about public business. The "paper curtain" of news censorship, the committee asserted, has no place in our democratic form of government.

COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOLS

I introduced legislation to repeal the 20-percent Federal tax on fees and dues paid to private, nonprofit swimming pool associations. I feel that tax relief for these worthwhile community projects would encourage the organization of more such groups. Neighborhood swimming pools play an important role in curbing juvenile delinquency. They provide needed recreational facilities in the neighborhood to encourage clean, wholesome, and healthful family-type activities. My bill received favorable reaction from people in many parts of the country who are interested in the development of swimming pool projects. It was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and placed in an overall excise-tax readjustment bill which will be considered next year.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The 84th Congress approved a rivers and harbors and flood-control program costing an estimated $1.5 billion, authorized a research project on the use of saline water for human and commercial purposes, and voted a number of reclamation projects.

Conservation: The 84th Congress took action to protect national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges from further exploitation after House Democrats revealed that oil leases on these refuges had been granted to private drillers by the Interior Department. I joined the Members of Congress in protesting this invasion of wildlife refuges and other administration policies which I considered contrary to sound conservation practices.

A vigorous investigation was also conducted into the activities of the Interior Department in the granting of mining leases in a national forest. These leases were used instead to cut valuable timberland owned by all our citizens.

Violations of fish and game laws by high-ranking military personnel and Government officials also brought strong protests from conservationists and Members of Congress, but legislation to outlaw these practices failed to pass.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Legislation to provide reforms in the Government's accounting and budgeting practices, recommended by the Hoover Commission, was enacted by the 84th Congress. Numerous other recommendations did not require congressional action. Unlike recommendations of the earlier Hoover Commission, the second Commission proposed many sweeping cutbacks in many services of the Federal Government affecting veterans, small businesses, and farmers.

Legislation offered to put these drastic cutbacks into effect received little serious consideration by the 84th Congress. While I have supported many recommendations of both Hoover Commissions to eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government, I oppose such far-reaching efforts to curtail essential social and economic programs enacted over the past years to protect the average citizen and to promote the general welfare.

REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Presidential appointments to the various regulatory commissions have shown a shocking disregard of the public interest and have brought repeated congressional protests. These commissions are obligated to protect the public against exorbitant utility rates, fraudulent stocks, false advertising, monopolistic corporate mergers, antitrust violations, and perform other similar important functions. Commission members who were vigilant in protecting the public interest were replaced by individuals coming out of the ranks of the businesses being regulated. Congressional critics referred to one lawyer who, before his appointment as chairman of a commission, spent his life arguing cases before the very same commission in behalf of big businesses accused of monopolistic practices. I joined in protest against such appointments which are very costly to the consumers and against the public interest.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Administration foreign policies have been challenged in Congress because of indecision, rash slogans, pious declarations, meaningless conferences, and aimless drifting. Chinese Communists have entrenched themselves in North Korea and turned the force of their aggression to the south, gobbling up a part of Indochina.

Despite heroic revolts by workers in East Germany and Poland, the Russian grip on the Iron Curtain countries remains tight. The NATO alliance of free nations has been weakened. The Middle East, with its rich oil reserves, remains a trouble spot. The Israeli Republic is threatened by aggression by its Arab neighbors, armed by the Russians. Communist propagandists have capitalized on our lack of a positive program.

United States prestige has declined in the free world and among uncommitted nations. American soldiers still face the Communists in Korea. The Suez Canal situation is another danger spot. The world situation is far from good and ground has been lost by the United States in the cold war.

TRADE POLICY

The 84th Congress voted a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade program requested by the administration, authorizing the negotiation of trade agreements with other countries. Peril-point and escape-clause provisions to safeguard American industry from unfair foreign competition were included in the bill.

EUROPEAN TRIP

As a member of a Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee, I visited a number of Government installations in various cities of Europe. The report of our subcommittee recommended certain steps to improve the status of civil service personnel in Europe. The largest and most interesting installation was at Frankfort, Germany, headquarters of the United States Forces in Europe.

While in Europe, I had the honor of representing the Reading YMCA at the world conference in Paris. Here I came into contact with people from all lands, who were working together in the interest of humanity, world brotherhood, and peace. It was an inspiring event for those of us who see and recognize the need for high moral principles and spiritual values as the foundation for lasting peace in the world.

MORALS AND ETHICS

During the 82d and 84th Congresses, I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics. Our committee recommended a code of ethics for Federal employees and Members of Congress.

While it is obvious that morals and ethics cannot be guaranteed through legislation, this code of conduct was presented as a guide which the committee believed would do much to improve the moral climate in government.

I am indebted to Rabbi Norbert L. Rosenthal, of Tulsa, Okla., for the following set of principles to which I fully subscribe:

To thyself be true.
To thy family, be affectionate.
To thy neighbor, be generous.
To thy community, be serviceable.
To mankind, be just.
To every living creature, be compassionate.
To the world, be courageous.
To the past, be understanding.
To the future, be hopeful.
And to God, be humble.

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

In concluding this report, I renew my willingness to appear before any group of Berks County citizens to answer questions, debate public issues, or to speak on any subject in which you may be interested.

Congressman Young Aids Nevada Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years Nevada has had the greatest mining production record in its history—far outstripping the days of the fabulous Comstock Lode.

Although we have had weak spots with respect to certain metals, our over-all production has reached a new peak.

The Bureau of Mines reports that in 1955 we had a total production amounting to $105,400,000.

This is 164 per cent of the amount produced in the war year of 1952.

These are the Bureau of Mines figures on Nevada's total mineral production since 1945:

1945	$31,300,000
1946	35,400,000
1947	40,900,000
1948	42,500,000
1949	37,400,000
1950	48,500,000
1951	57,700,000
1952	64,200,000
1953	73,500,000
1954	88,800,000
1955	105,400,000

Just what is responsible for the great spurt since 1952?

There are good reasons why the minerals industry, by and large, is experiencing prosperity. The most important, I believe, is that this Administration has restored the vital element of confidence in business planning—confidence that there will be no unnecessary intervention by the Government in the everyday activities of our citizens, confidence that there will be no effort to impose more controls over industry, confidence that business will no longer be the whipping boy of Government. As our economy expands, the demand for raw materials, including our mineral resources, increases in proportion. A healthy, growing economy in the years ahead will mean a steady, increasing need for our Nation's minerals and a strong domestic mining industry.

These policies are, of course, directed toward the maintenance of peace. War inevitably brings about high prices, but the aftermath generally brings about chaotic conditions. This Administration's policy is clear. It will leave no stone unturned in its foreign and domestic policies in the search for peace.

TUNGSTEN

Nevada has experienced a particular boom in the tungsten industry. Let us look at the Bureau of Mines report on our tungsten production in recent years:

1951	$4,800,000
1952	8,800,000
1953	13,800,000
1954	19,800,000
1955	23,000,000

Nationwide, domestic production of tungsten since 1952 has been nearly six times what it was in the entire period 1944–52. In short, the domestic tungsten industry productionwise has grown 600 per cent in the past 3½ years.

After considerable difficulty we were able to obtain approval of an extension of the Domestic Minerals Purchase Program to assure continuation of the tungsten industry in Nevada.

As a result of these efforts, hundreds of Nevada mines have been saved the tragedy of shutting down completely.

I have been personally assured by the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, that the long-awaited long-range minerals program will be ready for Congress in January.

In the meantime, I am continuing my efforts to see that the Defense Department encourages use of tungsten in the aircraft and other defense industries and that a tungsten research program is inaugurated to insure the continuation of the tungsten industry in Nevada that has been developed in the past 3 years.

GOLD

In my opinion, the first step to further a return to the gold standard would be to make it possible for American citizens to buy and sell gold like any other commodity. We are working diligently, although without notable progress, to accomplish this end. I have introduced legislation to effect this in both the 83d and 84th Congresses, but no legislative action was taken.

BUREAU OF MINES

An estimated $918,700 is planned for expenditure by the Bureau of Mines in Nevada in fiscal year 1957. Activities will continue to center at the Bureau of Mines stations in Reno and Boulder City.

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION AGENCY

Nevada ranks sixth among the States in terms of funds received from the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration. As of June 30, 54 contracts had been entered into involving Nevada mining explorations. These contracts had a total estimated cost of $2,561,052 with maximum Federal participation of $1,563,221.

Public Hearings Scheduled by Subcommittee on Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes, Committee on Ways and Means, I recently issued a press release announcing that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on Federal excise-tax policy, rates, and technical and administrative problems to begin on November 26, 1956. For the information of the membership and other interested persons, I would like to insert that press release in the RECORD at this point:

HON. AIME J. FORAND, OF RHODE ISLAND, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAXES, ANNOUNCES THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S AGENDA FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

The Honorable AIME J. FORAND, chairman of the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on Federal excise tax policy, rates, and technical and administrative problems to begin on November 26, 1956.

It is expected that the subcommittee will conclude the hearings in not to exceed 2 weeks.

Representatives of the Department of the Treasury will be invited to open the hearings and to present to the subcommittee the Department's views on Federal excise tax policy, rates, and technical and administrative problems which have come to the attention of the Treasury Department, including those arising in the collection and administration of the various Federal excise taxes. Representatives of the Department of the Treasury will also be invited to comment on the provisions of H. R. 12298, the omnibus excise tax bill introduced by Chairman FORAND on July 18, 1956, which incorporates the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems as embodied in the subcommittee's report dated April 20, 1956, as modified by the Committee on Ways and Means in its review of these recommendations. Following the testimony by Treasury representatives, public witnesses will be scheduled and are invited to present their views on the subject matter falling within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee in the order of the following excise tax categories in which they may be interested:

1. Retail excise taxes;
2. Manufacturers' excise taxes;
3. Excise taxes on facilities and services (admissions, communications, transportation, etc.);
4. Documentary stamp taxes;
5. Excise taxes on wagering, coin-operated devices, bowling alleys, etc., and regulatory taxes (except those on narcotics);[1]
6. Import taxes;
7. Excise taxes on distilled spirits, beer, and wines;
8. Excise taxes on tobacco products; and
9. Other excise taxes.

Within each of these categories industry representatives and others desiring to testify on an entire category will be scheduled for first appearances. Other witnesses will be scheduled according to the numerical order of the section numbers in which the taxes and related provisions on which they wish to testify appear in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. In the interest of avoiding duplication of testimony, it is requested that to the maximum extent possible an industry group select one spokesman to present the views of that industry.

To facilitate orderly consideration by the subcommittee, witnesses are requested to divide their prepared testimony into four broad groupings to the maximum extent possible. These broad groupings are:

1. Rates and problems relating to the level of rates.
2. Technical and administrative problems relating to broad groups of excises such as, but not limited to, the treatment of leases in the case of the manufacturers' excise taxes and the publication of rulings.
3. The technical adequacy and substantive sufficiency of the provisions of H. R. 12298.
4. Questions of Federal excise tax policy such as, but not limited to, whether or not too large or too small a portion of the total revenues of the Federal Government are derived from excises.

Witnesses may testify on one or more of these groupings, but it is requested that each grouping be clearly separated and captioned in the prepared testimony of each witness.

Persons interested in appearing at these hearings may arrange to do so by writing to the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., by not later than November 10, 1956. It is requested that prospective witnesses indicate in their letters

[1] The subcommittee will not consider regulatory excises on narcotics in view of the existence of another subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means with jurisdiction over this subject.

to the clerk the categories on which they will testify and where pertinent the sections of the 1954 code on which they will address themselves. Witnesses should also indicate the minimum amount of time required for their testimony.

Statements may be submitted (in triplicate) for the record in lieu of an appearance. As an alternative to multiple appearances by a witness who is interested in one or more categories, testimony may be given on subjects of major importance to the witness and briefs submitted for the record concerning other topics of interest.

Witnesses will be notified of the scheduled date of their appearance. The hearings will be held in the hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means in the New House Office Building and will begin each day at 10 a. m.

It is requested that witnesses submit 40 copies of their prepared statements to the committee clerk at least 4 days in advance of their scheduled appearance. In the event that a witness desires to make copies of his testimony available to the press, it is suggested that an additional 40 copies be submitted to the clerk for that purpose.

Chairman FORAND also announced that the congressional staffs and the staff of the Treasury Department have been requested to begin studies designed to develop the necessary facts and statistics on which to base an appraisal of Federal excise-tax policy, the levels of rates, and the technical adequacy and the administration of the Federal excise-tax law. The staffs have also been instructed to prepare legislative drafts incorporating the recommendations of the staffs for the subcommittee's consideration.

The members of the subcommittee are Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island, chairman; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; FRANK M. KARSTEN, Missouri; A. S. HERLONG, JR., Florida; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois; HAL HOLMES, Washington; ex officio, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Report to My Constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I believe it is my duty to make a report of my voting record to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. An analysis of this report will show that I cast my vote on every bill that was brought to a vote except one. My voting record for the 1st session of the 84th Congress was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 16, 1955.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Date	Measure	Vote
Jan. 31	H. R. 8780. To exempt farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used for farming purposes. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 352. To authorize expenditures for expenses of Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed 385 to 1.)	Yea.
Feb. 1	H. R. 7993. To authorize construction and conversion of certain naval vessels. (Passed 359 to 3.)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H. Res. 396. Resolution disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant. (Failed 62 to 310.)	Nay.
Feb. 20	H. R. 8710. To amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
Feb. 28	H. Res. 311. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 3383, a bill to authorize Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain Colorado River storage project. (Approved 354 to 26.)	Yea.
Mar. 1	H. R. 3383. To authorize Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain Colorado River storage project. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Yea.
Mar. 7	H. R. 9739. To make appropriations for independent executive offices. On Dowdy amendment to delete language of bill authorizing 11 supergrade positions with GSA. (Failed 151 to 231.)	Nay.
Mar. 13	H. R. 9166. To provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise-tax rates. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 366 to 4, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
Mar. 21	H. R. 8320. To amend the Agricultural Acts of 1949 and 1954 with respect to special school-milk program and brucellosis program. On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 8320. On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendments to above bill. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	S. 1271. To authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard. On motion to recommit. (Failed 80 to 311.)	Nay.
Apr. 11	H. R. 12. To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to high rigid price supports for basic commodities and milk. On conference report, motion to recommit. (Failed 181 to 238.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12. To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to high rigid price supports for basic commodities and milk. On conference report, adoption. (Approved 237 to 181.) (Vetoed by President.)	Nay.
Apr. 18	H. R. 12. On question of passing the above bill, over the President's veto. (Failed 202 to 211, ⅔ vote required.)	Nay.
Apr. 12	H. R. 9893. To authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
July 9	H. R. 9893. To authorize certain construction at military installations. On motion to recommit conference report to substitute Manistee for Kalkaska as a jet base. (Failed 29 to 343.)	Nay.
Apr. 23	H. R. 7228. To authorize construction of bridge over Potomac River. (Passed 284 to 9.)	Yea.
Apr. 25	H. R. 10721. To make appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies. On Murray amendment fixing salaries of certain employees at Department of Immigration. (Failed 179 to 184.)	Nay.
Apr. 27	H. R. 10660. To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for construction of highways and to provide additional revenue from taxes. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
May 3	H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). On the Albert amendment to earmark funds for reduction of grazing land acreage. (Approved 199 to 195.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). On Abernethy amendment to fix at 84 percent the parity for upland cotton. (Failed 186 to 208.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 10875. On motion to recommit the above bill with instructions to incorporate provision to authorize prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Failed 184 to 211.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 10875. On passage of above bill. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Yea.
May 23	H. R. 10875. On adoption of conference report on above bill. (Adopted 305 to 59.)	Yea.
May 10	H. R. 10986. A bill making appropriations for Department of Defense. On Allen amendment to delete sec. 633 which requires congressional justification prior to disposal of work done by Department of Defense. (Passed 222 to 156.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 10986. On passage of above bill. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yea.
May 17	H. R. 8901. To restore franchise to the Capital Transit Co. On motion to recommit. (Failed 161 to 172.)	Yea.
May 21	H. R. 11124. To provide for payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 238 to 52, ⅔ vote required.)	Absent.
May 22	H. R. 11319. To make appropriations for public works. On Abernethy amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Passed 179 to 170.)	Nay.
May 23	S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer rights-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit. On adoption of conference report. (Approved 176 to 126.)	Nay.
May 31	H. R. 10285. To merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks and for other purposes. (Passed 247 to 4.)	Yea.
June 11	H. R. 11356. To amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954—1 year extension. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 1840. To amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. (Passed 394 to 3.)	Yea.
June 13	H. R. 5881. To provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. On motion to recommit conference report. (Failed 179 to 209.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 4090. To require installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators. On motion to recommit. (Failed 151 to 228.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9540. To extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. On motion to recommit with instructions to delete sec. 6 which provides Federal grants. (Failed 165 to 213.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 9540. On passage of above bill. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yea.
June 25	S. 3295. To allow the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time for 1 month. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 7886. To increase monthly rates of pension awards for veterans (point of order deleted disability provisions). On motion to recommit. (Failed 110 to 305.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 7886. On passage of above bill. (Passed 365 to 51.)	Yea.
June 28	H. R. 9852. To extend the Defense Production Act. On conference report which contained amendment authorizing Congressional approval of dispersal policies. (Approved 200 to 197.)	Nay.
Do	H. Res. 554. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7535, to authorize Federal assistance to States for financing school construction on the basis of population. (Approved 327 to 67.)	Yea.
July 5	H. R. 7535. To authorize Federal assistance to States for financing school construction on the basis of population. On amendment providing 1 percent of income taxes be turned back to States as method of financing. (Failed 168 to 250.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 7535. On Powell amendment to above bill which would prevent Federal funds from being allocated to States practicing segregation. (Passed 225 to 192.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 7535. On McConnell amendment to above bill which would allocate funds to States on basis of need rather than population. (Failed 158 to 262.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 7535. On final passage of above bill. (Failed 194 to 224.)	Nay.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Date	Measure	Vote
July 2	H. R. 9801. To authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 325 to 59, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
Do	S. 2379. To promote the fishing industry in the United States and Territories by providing needed training for personnel. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 256 to 133, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
July 6	H. R. 11380. To readjust postal rates and establish congressional policy for determination of rates. (Passed 217 to 166.)	Yea.
July 9	H. R. 11967. To provide for District of Columbia National Memorial Stadium. (Passed 288 to 80.)	Yea.
July 11	H. R. 12130. To provide appropriations for mutual security. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Yea.
July 12	H. Res. 584. Resolution waiving all points of order against H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 362 to 30.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12138. To provide supplemental appropriations. On motion to recommit. (Failed 25 to 370.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 12038. To provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and increase dependency allowances. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 391 to 0; ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
July 18	H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China to the United Nations. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 391 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 11708. To amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to increase amount authorized for appropriation under title I. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
July 19	On motion to lay on table. Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of roll No. 105. (Failed 104 to 290.)	Nay.
July 23	H. R. 627. To provide for protecting civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. On motion to recommit. (Failed 131 to 275.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 627. On passage of above bill. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
Do	S. 1644. To prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 264 to 145, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12227. To amend provision of Tariff Act relative to import duties on wool. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 216 to 123, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
July 24	H. R. 7992. To enact certain provisions now included in Department of Defense Appropriation Act. On committee amendment (point of order) on transfer of commercial operation by Department of Defense. (Passed 201 to 185.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 12061. To authorize and direct Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with construction of power reactors and give Government exclusive right to develop atomic power for peacetime use. On motion to strike out the enacting clause. (Failed 195 to 199.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12061. On motion to recommit above bill. (Approved 203 to 191.)	Yea.
July 25	H. Res. 618. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 11742, to extend and amend Housing Act. On Colmer amendment to the rule providing an additional amendment to public housing section (Failed 92 to 299.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 638. Resolution certifying report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to refusal of Arthur Miller to answer questions before subcommittee. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 373 to 9.)	Yea.
July 26	H. Res. 641. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 412 to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance by Secretary of the Interior of Fryingpan project. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed 179 to 194.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 602. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 8902, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. (Approved 184 to 178.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 8902. To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from sale or disposition of certain property. On motion to recommit. (Approved 196 to 153.)	Nay.
July 27	H. Res. 625. Resolution providing for consideration of S. 3383, relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 219 to 126.)	Nay.
Do	S. 3383. Relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Nay.
Do	H. Res. 604. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7850, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 173 to 168.)	Yea.

Statement on Reorganizational Meetings of Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means, I recently issued a press release following a series of organizational meetings of the subcommittee. For the information of the membership and other interested persons, I would like to insert that press release in the RECORD at this point:

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS, OF ARKANSAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES AGREEMENT REACHED IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that the subcommittee had completed a series of organizational meetings and has reached unanimous agreement with respect to the subcommittee's tentative program for the adjournment period of the 84th Congress.

In announcing the subcommittee plans, Chairman MILLS pointed out that due to the fact that the subcommittee has only a short time available for its work, it will be necessary for the subcommittee to concentrate its efforts on a limited study of the matters coming within its jurisdiction so that the study can be completed by the end of this Congress and a report made to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Accordingly, the subcommittee has agreed to concentrate its efforts on reviewing the new provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as well as those provisions carried over into the new code without substantive change to determine what technical and substantive corrections and changes may be necessary. This review will be primarily concerned with technical and clerical errors, with ambiguities, with instances in which unintended hardships are imposed on taxpayers, and with instances in which unintended advantages are given to taxpayers. A number of cases involving such situations have already been brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means by the Treasury Department, by the staffs of the congressional committees, and by the interested public.

The revisions of the Internal Revenue laws which were involved in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 necessitated the promulgation of new implementing regulations. In addition, the subcommittee has been advised that the Treasury Department reviewed regulations in those instances where no substantive changes were made in the Internal Revenue laws and attempted to coordinate the old regulations with the new regulations and to bring them into line with judicial precedents handed down subsequent to the initial promulgation of the regulations. The subcommittee will also study the correlation between the statute and the regulations promulgated thereunder to determine the extent of uniformity in substantive meaning and presence of clarity.

The subcommittee will inquire into the administration of the Internal Revenue laws under the Reorganization Act of 1951. Some work in this field has already been done by an advisory group at the direction of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It is expected that the subcommittee will review the report of this advisory committee to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation dated July 25, 1955, and make such other inquiries as may appear necessary to the subcommittee. With respect to the inquiry into the administration of the Internal Revenue laws, the subcommittee will place particular emphasis on assuring that the administration of our tax laws is being conducted in such a manner as to promote efficiency, to protect the revenues, and to provide equity and fairness to all taxpayers.

Chairman MILLS stated that the above program is not necessarily the complete program for the subcommittee for the remainder of this Congress. Other plans and agenda of the subcommittee will be announced if and when they are decided upon. This, of course, will depend upon the progress of the subcommittee in considering the agenda set forth above. The chairman stated that additional specific problems requiring study by the subcommittee which may come to the attention of the subcommittee membership would be added to the agenda if circumstances warrant.

It is the desire of the subcommittee that legislative recommendations which its studies indicate to be necessary be drafted and submitted to the full committee before the end of this Congress.

Chairman MILLS stated that it was the unanimous intent of the subcommittee to direct this study in such a way as to assure the American public that the subcommittee is interested in achieving tax laws and applicable regulations that are understandable and certain, that are fair in their impact on the American taxpayers, and that are properly administered. Chairman MILLS added that the nature of the subject matter to be reviewed by the subcommittee would require substantial staff study preliminary to formal subcommittee action and that in this connection the staffs of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Treasury would be utilized with such recourse to outside individuals and groups as the subcommittee may decide to be necessary.

Chairman MILLS expressed the hope that the subcommittee will be reestablished in the 85th Congress so as to conduct a broader inquiry into the technical adequacy, the

substantive policy, and the administration of the internal-revenue laws.

Formal announcement with regard to subcommittee hearings will be made at a subsequent date following the further development of staff activity.

The members of the subcommittee are: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Arkansas, chairman; NOBLE J. GREGORY, Kentucky; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; FRANK IKARD, Texas; RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; HOWARD H. BAKER, Tennessee; ex officio, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Antitrust Subcommittee Issues Staff Report Critical of Dixon-Yates Contract Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me as acting chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in releasing the staff report on the Dixon-Yates contract.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As acting chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I am releasing a staff report which characterizes the Dixon-Yates contract as violating every concept of decent government and fair and impartial administration of applicable law.

The report emphasizes the role of the administration in encouraging and cooperating with private power interests to finance projects for the Tennessee Valley Authority and for other new power developments.

The document covers hearings held between June 27 and December 5, 1955, by a special subcommittee panel consisting of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, as chairman; myself; and Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota.

The report tells the story of the collapse of the Dixon-Yates maneuver, which it describes as the effort of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to make a contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., a newly incorporated organization created as a subsidiary of two private utility holding companies, headed by Mr. Edgar H. Dixon and Mr. Eugene A. Yates. It was a contract to furnish electric energy, not primarily for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, but rather to prevent the Tennessee Valley Authority from increasing its capacity to meet normal growth in the Tennessee Valley, and to accomplish this objective by special concessions on the part of the Government without notice to Congress.

After summarizing in detail all the circumstances involved, the report reaches this conclusion:

"The Dixon-Yates contract provides a dramatic case study of the waste, disorder, and confusion which inevitably surround governmental action which is calculated to serve big business interests rather than the public generally. From its very inception, Dixon-Yates was destined to end in public disgrace and disrepute. Its purpose was unwholesome; the methods used devious, and in carrying out the scheme every concept of decent government and fair and impartial administration of applicable law was ignored. Even a partial listing of the wreckage left strewn in the path of Dixon-Yates will demonstrate the damage that has been done.

"(a) The independent character of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was brought into serious question.

"(b) Officials of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission were placed in the position of having been persuaded to take legal positions which ran counter to precedent of many years standing.

"(c) The administration of law by SEC was brought into disrepute because of SEC's flagrant departures from accepted interpretations of the Public Utility Holding Company Act and its succumbing to pressures from higher authority emanating from the White House.

"(d) AEC was forced to execute and sponsor a contract which the Department of Justice has since asserted violated the Holding Company Act, the Atomic Energy Act, and the conflict of interest statutes."

The report presents a detailed analysis of a number of documents submitted to the subcommittee, following the last public hearing on December 5, by Rowland R. Hughes, then Director of the Budget. These documents, made public for the first time, "make clear that the policy of the Dixon-Yates sponsors of substituting private power for any new installations needed by TVA was forcing the Dixon-Yates contract against the objections of the career men at both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget."

From a reading of the report, one is inevitably forced to conclude that Adolphe Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., was sent to the Bureau of the Budget in 1953 to assist it with respect to a plan for eventually turning over to private power companies the attractive investment the American people have in the TVA. Through the guise of a power contract, our Government would have guaranteed very substantial profits with a minimum of private investment.

The report charges that "the administration forced the approval of the Dixon-Yates contract. Pressure of this magnitude must have been directed by the White House." The report presents "persuasive evidence" to support this conclusion.

The report notes that "there is no way that we can ascertain the full facts" because "the subcommittee has been completely blocked from getting to the bottom of the Dixon-Yates contract by the very men in the White House who were involved in these negotiations."

The report cites information leading to the conclusion that private-power officials, with the coming of the Eisenhower administration, had their eyes on power projects such as TVA and were thinking about how they could be taken over by private enterprise.

The report analyzes the evidence produced by the subcommittee "as a result of which the project was abandoned by order of the President and the Dixon-Yates group brought suit against the Government, which the Department of Justice is now resisting upon the ground that the contract was illegal, a conclusion which was presented to the committee by its staff early in the proceedings."

The report contains a legal opinion by the staff concluding that "the Dixon-Yates contract is void under section 434 of title 18 of the United States Criminal Code because of the fact that Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, an officer and director of the First Boston Corp., of which his wife was a stockholder, participated in the negotiations for the contract, although he was at one and the same time a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget and an officer of the First Boston Corp., one of the beneficiaries of the proposed proceeding, inasmuch as it was a financial corporation dealing in corporate securities."

The report also includes a chronology of all the events throughout the Dixon-Yates contract indicating "how incomplete and inaccurate were the releases to the press by the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission."

The Suez Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me on the Suez situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUEZ SITUATION

Before the 24-nation conference on the Suez situation is a good time to assess and evaluate the Suez incident on the basis of the known facts. President Gamal Abdel Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal has posed a difficult question to which the whole world must find an answer. There is no doubt but that President Nasser had the right to nationalize the canal. There is no question but that since the seizure, with one exception, normal transit of vessels through the canal has been allowed to continue in the same old pattern, which is in accord with the Constantinople Convention of 1888. The one exception is the continuation of the 8-year-old Egyptian boycott of Israeli ships. There is a question as to the threats used by the Government of Egypt to keep the foreign technicians on the job in the Canal Zone, and there is a question of legality insofar as taking over the assets of the Suez Canal Co. are concerned. The Suez Canal Co. has a lease with the Egyptian Government which expires in 1968, at which time its holdings automatically revert to the Government of Egypt. President Nasser's reported contention that the receipts from the Suez Canal tolls will average $100 million a year, and that this $100 million could be used on a yearly basis, to build the Aswan Dam is incorrect on the face of it. The fact is that the yearly gross proceeds from the canal average somewhere in the vicinity of $100 million, while the net proceeds are approximately $30 million a year. There is, it must be remembered, a constant drain on the toll funds to dredge the waterway to keep it in operation, and with the building of bigger tankers it will have to be further widened and deepened in certain localities.

I believe that Secretary Dulles did the right thing in finally turning down the Aswan Dam proposal because it would have meant the creating, on a gratis basis, of a moral commitment to the tune of hundreds of millions of United States dollars to build this project. This project, if it is ever to be built with United States contributions, should be on a long-term loan low-interest rate basis and in accord with and in line with the objectives of American foreign policy. The mistakes leading up to the Suez crisis must, in part, at least, be credited to the United States. I say this not so much in criticism but on the basis of hindsight

which, while a convenient peg to hang on to, does not excuse anyone personally for not recognizing the possibility of a mistake at the time of the event. We know now that—

1. We should not have exerted the pressure we did to get the British out of the Canal Zone although at the time it was done, I considered it a good policy.

2. We should not have made the proposal last January to begin the financing, on a grant basis, of the Aswan Dam with this country contributing $56 million toward the start of this project and the British offering $14 million. However, that is water over the dam.

We are now faced with a reality which calls for cool and considered action on the part of the Western Big Three and by all other nations as well. Neither the West nor Nasser can afford a defeat on the question of the Suez Canal. The answer to this difficult question does not lie in the use of aggressive tactics or in war. The answer lies in the use of diplomacy and the development of new policies and ideas. The emphasis on rearming and the calling up to the colors of reserves by both Britain and France is understandable in view of their economic interest and dependence on and in the Middle East, as well as other factors, but their emotionalism in this situation is, in its own way, as bad and as dangerous as Nasser's.

To illustrate the importance of the Suez Canal and the questions related to it, it is well to keep in mind that Western Europe depends for 90 percent of its oil needs on the Middle East and that in the next 10 years those oil needs will be doubled. Seventy percent of the world's oil reserves are in the Middle East; the loss of Mid-East oil either through closure of the Suez Canal or by nationalization or expropriation of the Middle East wells and pipelines would bankrupt Western Europe, bring about its economic collapse and pave the way for Moscow to move in. We must remember that through the Marshall plan we have spent $15 billion to rehabilitate Western Europe; we have been responsible for and have to a large extent spent a great deal of our treasure in keeping NATO functioning; we have, through the use of Mutual Security Administration, Foreign Operations Administration and International Cooperation Administration—all successors to the Marshall plan—poured additional billions of dollars into Europe to keep it a going entity. Surely, we do not want to see what we have contributed to the welfare of Western Europe, in our own defense and in our own security, go down the drain because of the situation in the Middle East. We cannot afford it.

President Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal Company was not a move made on the spur of the moment. Nor was it made only because of the United States refusal to make a grant to Nasser to allow him to start on the Aswan Dam. It appears to be that Nasser's seizure was a carefully worked-out plan which was moved ahead of its scheduled timetable and used as a means of offsetting the United States refusal to grant funds for the Aswan Dam. In other words, in my opinion, even if the United States funds had been granted, it would have only been a question of time before the seizure of the Suez Canal Company would have taken place. We cannot afford to become hysterical or emotional over Nasser's action because we have to remember that out of his seizure may come events which might imperil the Middle East oil and pipelines. Therefore, what we should do is to go slow, tread water cautiously and plan now for the future. Serious consideration should be given to the following possibilities:

1. The London Conference called for August 16. Secretary Dulles is to be commended for pouring oil on the troubled waters of the Suez question when he visited London on August 1 to confer with Foreign Minister Pineau of France and Prime Minister Eden of Britain. He was able, at that time, to quench some of the fire which these and other leaders were fanning and to come up with a proposal for a 24 power conference to convene on August 16 in London to consider the question of the Suez. His success in this matter did much to calm the situation and to allow Messrs. Nasser, Eden, Mollet, and Pineau, as well as others, to take a second look at their hole cards; to reassess the situation and to revise their original views. The purpose of the conference beginning August 16, as I understand it, will be to try to modernize the Treaty of 1888 and to make sure that, if possible, internationalization of the Suez Canal is made secure. It is to be noted that both Indian and the U. S. S. R. have accepted invitations to attend the conference. Even though they have expressed reservations it is significant of their interest in this particular question and an awareness, on their part, of its ramifications and complications. It is significant to note that this is the first invitation, to my knowledge, to the U. S. S. R. to participate in a conference affecting this particular area and a recognition of the fact that the Soviet Union has penetrated the Middle East. In my opinion, it is there to stay. Incidentally, we must recognize that the U. S. S. R. is now an exporting oil nation entirely on the basis of its own oil production and exclusive of the Rumanian fields at Ploesti. We should recognize that the cold war has now developed into an economic struggle between the U. S. S. R. on the one end and the United States on the other. We should not try to outbid or outbuy the U. S. S. R. We should do only what is primarily in our own interest.

2. There is a question in my mind as to whether President Nasser or Egypt alone can be absolutely depended upon to keep the canal open from here on out. As an illustration, all Israeli ships for the past 8 years, as well as other nationalities carrying goods to Israel, have been refused transit through the Suez Canal.

3. The Western World, including ourselves, must begin to lay emergency plans now to export oil, if necessary, from the United States, Canada, and Venezuela to Western Europe:

(a) We should allow United States oil companies to expand and develop their oil production in the United States.

(b) We should encourage, through subsidies and otherwise, the building of 70,000- to 80,000-ton tankers. With their speed, tonnage, and reduced comparative costs, they could go around the Cape of Good Hope and nullify, in part, dependence on the Suez Canal. They could also be used to export oil from the Western Hemisphere.

(c) We should give consideration to the possibility of the construction and support of a new canal from the Mediterranean through Israel to the port of Aquaba off the Red Sea.

4. We should recognize Egypt's right to nationalize the Suez Canal; but if no solid international agreement can be worked out, we should begin work on the alternatives already suggested. Even if an agreement can be worked out, we must be prepared to have an alternative very possibly along the lines already suggested.

5. The stakes connected with the question of the Suez are of the greatest importance because they affect the economic welfare and security of a large part of the rest of the world. Some of the grave questions raised are:

(a) The canal itself and all it means to the economic lifeblood of the world.

(b) Mid-East oil and all its implications and complications.

(c) North Africa and its effect on France's future.

(d) Europe's economy and its dependence on the Suez Canal and Mid-East oil.

(e) The possibility that the Mid-East situation may, if it expands, either bring a final breakdown of NATO or at long last, a final recognition that if it is to survive it must pull itself together, reassess its condition and recognize its importance as a European defense alliance and its possible significance as an economic unit.

(f) The question of Israel.

(g) The question of Cyprus.

(h) South of the Sahara Africa is and will be affected more by events growing out of the Mid-East crisis.

War is not the answer to the Suez incident. While the exasperation and emotionalism of France and Britain are understandable, it should be recognized that gunboat diplomacy in this day and age would only exacerbate the situation and make it worse. What we have to do now is to work with the present, but think and plan for the future.

We should in addition to the conference to be held in London consider the possibilities, in the light of subsequent circumstances, of referring the Suez question to the International Court of Justice in the Hague and, if aggressive action is undertaken by either side on an unwarranted basis, taking the question immediately to the United Nations Security Council.

Aggression and force are not the answers. Reason, not passion—restraint, not fireworks—must prevail.

The American Character: Strength or Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very disturbing statement recently made by Maj. William E. Mayer, described as a top Army psychiatrist, relative to the brainwashing of American soldiers captured in Korea.

I may say very frankly that I am astonished by the results of Major Mayer's findings concerning the results of Communist brainwashing.

The major states that "the effectiveness of the Red program points up basic defects in the American character that should cause searching self-examination by all Americans." If the conditions found by Major Mayer are at all extensive among our armed services, we have great reason to be gravely concerned.

I have great faith in the young men and women of this generation. They are sound, ambitious, loyal Americans, able and willing to fulfill their duty, defend the Nation and carry the burden of future leadership.

The fact remains that, if we are to have members of our armed services as indicated by Major Mayer's report lacking that historic stamina, courage, and tenacity which American fighting men have always displayed, clearly the Congress should take action as soon as possible to ascertain the degree and the cause of these conditions and try to rectify them.

My concern regarding this problem which involves the possible lessening of the vitality, endurance, and capacity in Americans of this generation was first deeply aroused by the results in the field of international athletics. As I pointed out in a speech last year, the Soviet is making great headway in athletics and is developing well-trained athletes in practically every field of great skill and ability who have in many instances demonstrated superiority over the athletes of the Western World.

It is true that the Soviet approach to organized athletics is on a different basis than our own and our friends of the free world, and that the training and education athletes receive under communism amounts, in effect, to professionalism as we know it. Their athletes are unquestionably professionals.

Nevertheless, the Soviet and the Iron Curtain countries are steadily building up and increasing the number of trained athletes who are able to outscore those of the free world. The winter Olympics was another example of this newly developed prowess of Communist nations.

It is my studied opinion that this fact, coupled with observations like Major Mayer's and other developments we are all aware of, should put this Nation sternly on notice that all is not well in our current social and educational life.

In my opinion, it is not principally the youth who are responsible for these conditions. It is primarily those who are responsible for bringing them up, for training them, for making them useful, ambitious, courageous members of the American society. Juvenile delinquency, so called, is only part of the picture. It is merely the symptom of an underlying social plague which is spreading in America, which is breaking down moral, physical, ethical, and cultural standards and subjecting the young folks of the Nation to the paganism and materialism that obtain in some other countries of the world where people have turned away from fundamental precepts of God, nature, and freedom and hence have declined in physical and moral strength, in political stability, in prestige, and national vitality.

Can this trend be stopped? Can these tendencies be checked? Can these instances of disloyalty and softness in the armed services be ended? These are grave problems for America and their solution must be seriously sought not only by Congress alone but in the States, in the local communities, in the homes of the Nation.

How long can we continue to ignore these problems deriving from modern life? How long can we permit debilitating influences to spread in the Nation and still retain the basic values and strength of body and character we need in order to cope with current threats to our way of life?

Let me reiterate: Despite what social commentators may say, fundamentally our American youth is sound, ambitious, and patriotic. It is morally and spiritually sound on the whole, and I personally see little evidence that in many respects it differs basically from the youth of previous generations. The youth of today may have more material means, more opportunities, more comforts and conveniences than those of former years. But essentially human nature has not changed very much, and I seriously doubt that modern-day youth, taken as a whole, is very different from its predecessors.

There is great good, splendid morality, fine spirit, commendable zeal, and loyalty in the present generation. Our young people are living in a vastly changed world; consequently their approach—their habits, their outlook, their attitude toward many things are bound to be different.

It must be noted also that they are living in a world where the poison of godlessness, paganism, materialism, skepticism and doubt and all the destructive philosophies are spread everywhere by Communists and other radical cultists endeavoring to destroy our religious beliefs, our culture, and our free society.

For these reasons, it is all the more important and vital that the young people of today be given very special guidance and direction in the homes, the schools, and the churches of America, for it is primarily in these great institutions of our God-fearing Nation that the American character of which we are so proud, and which has contributed so significantly to our national life and national success, is molded and developed and comes to its finest flowering.

It is to these institutions that we must look with increasing faith now for the proper guidance, direction, and training of new generations. The Bolsheviks are trying to destroy the family which is the basic social unit of civilization. But they will never be able, try as they will, to destroy the American family or the universal idea and ideal of family life.

It is for the homes of America to make sure that they are assuming and discharging their full responsibility toward the youth. A college friend of mine, Mr. N. V. "Swede" Nelson, Harvard football great, nationally known wit, pundit, and patriot, who is, among other fine things, a great worker among young people, put it well in a recent talk before a parent-teachers group when he asked the question: "Where is your boy or girl tonight?" For that is the plainest responsibility of parenthood—to know the companions, the whereabouts, and activities of young people who live in our American homes. If all parents made it a point to know "where their son or daughter is tonight," there would certainly be less delinquency, less maladjustment.

The part the school plays is also most important and vital. Upon the educators and teachers a great responsibility rests, not merely to perform the routine tasks of teaching, but to guide, to inspire, and to infuse the youth with love of learning and culture, with ambition and the spirit of civic and patriotic devotion. The cultivation of high ideals is most essential.

Above all comes the church, and there will be few so bold as to doubt that in this field is found the greatest source of moral teaching and spiritual enlightenment. And it is for this reason, because the church is the foundation stone of religious morality and virtue upon which loyal citizenship depends, that the fanatical charlatans of the communistic world direct such blasphemous attacks against it. Though they fall as upon some great indestructible rock, constantly dripping water in time wears away the hardest stone. We must insulate our religious institutions against these wanton attacks. This can be done by an enlightened, militant public opinion.

The atomic age, in its social, economic, political, and moral aspects, requires a firm sense of responsibility, individual and collective. It must be accepted and shared by all. It must rest as before on fundamental principles and truth. If we but put our interests and our energies loyally behind the great trilogy—the home, the school, and the church, which has so notably and indispensably contributed to the national greatness, this Nation will grapple with and solve its problems and find the road to security and peace in a free world.

DOCTOR REPORTS MANY CAPTURED UNITED STATES TROOPS YIELDED TO BRAINWASHING

WASHINGTON.—A top Army psychiatrist said today that nearly one-third of all American soldiers captured in Korea yielded to Communist efforts to sway their loyalty by brainwashing.

Maj. William E. Mayer declared that the effectiveness of the Red program points up basic defects in the American character that should cause searching self-examination by all Americans.

He said: "The behavior of too many of our soldiers in prison fell far short of the historical American standards of honor, character, loyalty, courage, and personal integrity."

Mayer, a foremost authority on brainwashing, based his views on a 4-year study of the experiences of 1,000 POW returnees. His opinions were expressed in a copyrighted interview with the magazine U. S. News & World Report.

The psychiatrist said that of about 4,000 GI's who returned from Korean captivity, nearly 1,000 admitted becoming progressives.

He added: "By the Communists' own definition, this meant that a man was either a Communist sympathizer or a collaborator—or both—during his stay in a prison camp."

Mayer stressed that these soldiers, by their own admission, were not subject to any physical torture.

Many Americans magnificently resisted Red attempts to change their beliefs, Mayer said.

He added: "But even granting that two-thirds of the men remained stanchly loyal Americans, still the fact that so many yielded to the degree that they did presents a problem of fantastic proportions and should cause searching self-examination by all Americans, both in and out of uniform."

Mayer said the Red brainwashers exploited three basic defects in the captive GI's—faulty character development, ignorance of American democracy, and lack of military toughness.

Many POW's, Mayer asserted, "had not been taught a sense of personal responsibility for the welfare of others" and failed to take care of sick comrades. As a result of this "every man for himself behavior," he added, "some ailing Americans needlessly died."

The expert said the Chinese Communists had a pretty low estimate of the American soldier, which was borne out to a certain degree by the behavior of the soldiers who bowed to Red psychological pressure.

Mayer charged that American schools are failing miserably to prepare youths for survival in a tense and troubled international society.

The psychiatrist also decried a lack of toughness in military training and said that

the attitude of the parents of soldiers seems to be responsible.

UNITED STATES CRIME DROP CITED—WARNING SOUNDED BY FBI

(By Frank R. Kent, Jr.)

The Nation's crime rate has shown signs of a slight drop for the first time in 7 years, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has informed Congress.

Hoover, however, called the indicated decrease of 0.5 percent for 1955 "negligible when considering the country as a whole." If the present trend of reports continues, he said, the year 1955 will represent the fourth consecutive year in which the number of major crimes has exceeded the 2-million mark.

Figures based on reports for the first 6 months of 1955 show "that crime has taken on such proportions that 1 out of every 17 homes will be victimized this year," he asserted.

Hoover's statements were included in testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee on February 1 and released yesterday. The subcommittee was conducting hearings on the budgetary requests of the Department of Justice.

Hoover said there were an estimated 1,128,350 major crimes committed during the first 6 months of 1955. This was only 7,790 fewer than the number committed during the same period of 1954, he said.

He listed the following highlights:

A major crime was committed every 13.9 seconds.

Every 4.2 minutes there was a crime of murder, manslaughter, rape, or assault to kill.

Victims of killers totaled 6,240.

Other individuals feloniously assaulted by rapists and potential killers totaled 55,410.

The lives of 284,590 other persons were jeopardized by crimes of robbery or burglary.

In 1954, Hoover said, 9.7 percent of persons arrested were under 18 years of age. Yet this percentage, he told the committee, was responsible for: 57 percent of all auto theft arrests, 49 percent of all burglary arrests, 43.6 percent of all larceny arrests, 26 percent of all arrests for violations involving receipt of stolen property, and 18.7 percent of all robbery arrests.

Hoover said the fundamental principle was that "We have to look to the home to correct this problem." Too often, parents resent and reproach the police officer who brings their child home after he has engaged in wrongdoing, Hoover said.

"It is that kind of softheadedness which contributes to delinquency," he declared.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., in his general statement, disclosed that the Department was asking for two new institutions to cost an estimated total of $17 million. One would be an Alcatraz-type maximum security prison. The other would be an institution to enable the Department to carry out provisions of the Youth Corrections Act in judicial districts west of the Mississippi.

The act permits a youth correction board to study the cases of offenders under 21 and to put them on parole, or send them to a farm, camp hospital, training school or prison, rather than incarcerating them with hardened criminals.

George J. Reel, chairman of the Board of Parole's Youth Division, said during the past year the Youth Division granted parole under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act to 53.2 percent of the juveniles in that category. Of the juveniles from the District of Columbia sent to the National Training School under a District statute 78.9 percent were granted parole, and 14.6 percent of those committed under the Youth Act were paroled.

District juveniles averaged 17.2 months in the institution here, Richardson said, Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act cases averaged 14.7 months and youths under the Youth Corrections Act 10 months.

Richardson told the committee that under the first year of operation of the Youth Act, the number of juveniles committed under it and those committed under District law who violated parole decreased from 48.2 percent in 1954 to 42.9 percent last year. He remarked that the percentage of violations among the District juveniles at the school has been high, but it decreased by 5½ percent last year.

Flood Insurance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the flood-insurance bill which we have passed in the closing moments before adjournment, in my opinion, will be remembered as one of the great achievements of the 84th Congress.

I believe that Congress in passing this bill has provided the American people with a flood-insurance program which, if properly administered, should promptly offer a high degree of security to potential flood sufferers. It should eventually offer a program of insurance against flood damage as readily available and as inexpensive as fire insurance is today. I believe the time will come when private insurers will find it a profitable business.

Flood-insurance legislation has had a long and hard fight through the 84th Congress. The problem that had to be overcome in getting a flood-insurance bill through Congress was apathy rather than opposition.

I believe that there is one Member of the House who deserves to be singled out for destroying this apathy through his persistent efforts and persuasive speech in behalf of the flood-insurance bill. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to our able colleague from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I heard Mr. DODD testify on behalf of flood-insurance legislation. I read his earlier statement before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. In all of his statements he vividly portrayed the terrible destruction that he personally witnessed in Connecticut. He clearly depicted the economic chaos for individuals and communities that such destruction inevitably brings. His statements vigorously supported the need for and the merits of flood insurance.

This gentleman did more than just convincingly support this legislation. It was Mr. DODD who introduced the unique loan feature which was made a vital part of the flood-insurance bill by the House, and kept as an essential feature in sections 5 and 6 of the bill we have just passed.

The loan feature of this bill was original and imaginative. It demonstrates Mr. DODD's ability to produce a solution to a most complex problem, as well as his consistent concern for the people in Connecticut and elsewhere in the Nation who have suffered such terrible destruction from floods.

Without the efforts of this eloquent and able gentleman from Connecticut, I believe that we would not have passed a flood-insurance bill in this Congress. Most assuredly, without his courageous and persistent fight on behalf of the people of Connecticut and other potential flood victims throughout our Nation, the loan feature would not have been adopted; and, without the Dodd loan plan, I feel that the flood-insurance bill which we have passed would not be as effective.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the House is about to lose the services of TOM DODD, but I expect that his ability and integrity will not be lost to the Congress. I understand that his sights are now set on a seat in the other body. If his goal is reached, I know that this outstanding legislator will continue to serve the people of Connecticut and the entire Nation with great distinction, reflecting credit upon them as well as upon himself.

Summary of Eisenhower-Republican Administration Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower-Republican administration achievements is a record of surpassing importance to the welfare of all our people. A summary of it from 1953–56 is as follows:

REPUBLICANS WAGE PEACE

First. Ended Korean war in July 1953, as promised.

Second. Secured United States prisoner release from Reds.

Third. Strengthened American defenses with powerful new weapons; lowered costs.

Fourth. Bolstered European collective security through West German sovereignty—NATO membership, Austrian Peace Treaty.

Fifth. Closed gaps in collective defense ring around Communist countries through SEATO, free China and Korea treaties.

Sixth. Deterred Red seizure of Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa; helped end Communist control of Guatemala in this hemisphere.

Seventh. Helped settle Iranian oil disputes—aiding free world.

Eighth. Initiated atoms for peace development.

Ninth. Furthered disarmament prospects through air reconnaissance and blueprint exchange proposals accepted by U. N.

Tenth. Improved world trade relations, while safeguarding United States industry.

REPUBLICANS ADVANCE PROSPERITY

Eleventh. Achieved war-to-peace conversion of economy with greater than

ever prosperity, while freeing the Nation from wage, price, rent controls.

Twelfth. Stabilized cost of living. In 3 Republican years, held dollar to within 1 cent of its January 1953 value compared to 12-cent loss in last 3 years of previous administration.

Thirteenth. Halted spiral of inflation that was robbing people's savings.

Fourteenth. Attained highest employment in history—currently 2 to 3 million higher than ever reached.

Fifteenth. Encourage record-breaking building of homes and other construction.

Sixteenth. Reduced labor strife significantly. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five strike losses down 53 percent from 1952.

Seventeenth. Pushed wages and take-home pay to record heights. One thousand six hundred and sixty-four dollars annual per capita disposable income means each American now averages $127 more per year to spend than highest ever reached before.

REPUBLICANS ASSURE PROGRESS

Eighteenth. Restored honesty and prestige to Government.

Nineteenth. Ended Communist influence in Government policy; tightened security standards.

Twentieth. Reversed 20-year trend to centralization of power in Washington. Reduced Government competition with industry.

Twenty-first. Cut Government spending and waste by over $10 billion from Truman's budget. Cut payroll by 275,000 Federal jobs, thereby reducing cost of Government.

Twenty-second. Provided history's biggest tax cut—$7½ billion a year, 62 percent to individuals, only 38 percent to corporations. Saved each family about $100 a year.

Twenty-third. Achieving balanced budget for 1956 despite defense demands and $80 billion IOU's inherited from previous administration.

Twenty-fourth. Established Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Twenty-fifth. Extended social security to 10 million; liberalized benefits for all. Reduced eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 years of age.

Twenty-sixth. Increased railroad retirement and unemployment benefits. Extended unemployment insurance to 4 million Government and small-business workers.

Twenty-seventh. Improved postal, Government, military pay structures with generous raises; greater benefits and security.

Twenty-eighth. Set up Small Business Administration.

Twenty-ninth. Advanced civil rights of minorities.

Thirtieth. Provided record highway aid.

Thirty-first. Initiated and expanded conservation and wise development of natural resources. Added to national parks, wildlife refuges.

Thirty-second. Helped farmers expand markets. Disposed of $4.7 billion of surpluses. Established sounder support program. Proposed soil banks and aid to low-income farmers.

Thirty-third. Proposed to Congress new programs for school construction, highway expansion, medical research, aid to depressed labor areas, and so forth.

The Outlook in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, once in a while it is useful, in trying to understand the future, to take a look into the past. So many people in these troubled days seem to be so surprised at the acute difficulties that continually boil up in the long slumbering countries of Asia. But the developments there were clearly foreseeable. They are the result, first, of ideas let loose in the world by the American Revolution of 1776, and, second, of the perversion of those ideas by the concepts and methods of the Communist counterrevolution in Russia of October 1917.

The losses that the cause of freedom has sustained in Asia since the war are not so much the result of Communist activities, brilliant and tireless as they are; rather, they are due to ignorance, indifference, and default by the forces of freedom—including our own country.

During the last year of World War II and for 3 years thereafter, I gave one speech, with variations, scores of times all over the country and to anyone who would listen. I was trying my best to prevent just what we now have on our hands—and with no good way to deal with it now.

I remember giving it at a meeting of the Yale Club in Washington in May 1946—with Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson on one side of me and Senator Robert Taft and Ambassador Spruille Braden on the other. I was honored when Mr. Acheson said at the end, "I would not have you change a word of it." But, somehow or other, nothing much ever seemed to get done, with vigor and in time, along the lines urged.

Mr. Speaker, recently I ran across a copy of the speech, condensed to meet the time limitations of a Town Hall broadcast in Newark, N. J., on March 4, 1946—just 6 months after V–J Day. Already the dearly bought victory in Asia, and for that matter, in the world, was on the verge of being lost—while America and the West slumbered.

Some of us who had watched the revolution growing in Asia were dismissed as alleged Asia-firsters, partisans of Chiang Kai-shek, emotional about Asia, and so on. No, we were trying to save our own beloved America from the terrible travail through which, barring a miracle, we must now pass for long, hard years ahead.

But the joy of freedom and the blessings of liberty are worth the price, whatever it be. We look back momentarily, only in order to look ahead and to march steadfastly on.

The speech of 1944–48 follows:

THE OUTLOOK IN ASIA

(Address of Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, Member of Congress, Town Hall broadcast, March 4, 1946, Newark, N. J.)

Only the shooting part of World War II has ended. A world-shaking ideological and political war is raging—a war to determine who really won the shooting war. No matter who defeated the Germans and the Japanese, the real victor in World War II depends on whose ideas ultimately dominate in the reconstruction of Europe and in the development of the gigantic manpower, resources and potential markets of Asia.

I believe that eventually it will become generally recognized that World War II all along was a war, more than anything else, to determine who is going to control the development of Asia.

Hitler knew that. He understood clearly that conquering Europe was merely the first step necessary to enable him to get control of the undeveloped areas of the world, most of which are in Asia.

Japan knew it. Her militarists openly admitted more than a decade ago that they had to get control of the manpower, resources, harbors and bases of east Asia to provide the springboard of their program of world conquest.

England, France and Holland have known it. Witness their feverish efforts to reestablish their empires in Asia.

Russia has known it. Over a period of more than two decades she poured more money and effort into the Communist movement in China than into any other country in the world. Undoubtedly she has hoped and still hopes to win control of Asia by propaganda and political agitation. But the drastic steps she has taken in Manchuria, for example, make perfectly clear that she intends to get control by other means if propaganda fails.

Only we Americans, even though we live on the same ocean with Asia, and its problems are in our front yard, seem not to realize fully that our own future in a large degree depends on the kind of ideas which guide the development of Asia.

There are four major possible ways Asia could go.

The first is a return to colonialism. Sections of Asia can be forced back into the old colonial pattern under the empire-building nations of Europe. If that is done, Asia will explode. And it will explode as violently against the United States as against England, France, and Holland.

I suspect future historians may record that the single most significant battle of World War II was the fall of Singapore. A billion Asiatics saw the white man's empires go down like a house of cards before the onslaught of an oriental country, Japan. Actually, the empires had been doomed since July 4, 1776; but it did not become clearly apparent to the people of Asia until 1942. They now know full well the weaknesses of those empires and they know that if they are forced back into that pattern it can only be because of the tacit approval, or at least the acquiescence, of the United States.

Through two centuries the Asiatics learned what attitude to expect from the European empire builders. The people of Asia are realistic and have not expected any such miracle as a right-about-face in that attitude.

But on the other hand, they certainly have not expected that the United States, which got its own independence by fighting a war against that same imperialism and which established a totally different pattern in dealing with the Philippines, might now appear to reverse its historical attitude and allow its strength and influence to be on the side of the empires.

This puts a very difficult decision before us. Our interests are essentially identical

with, or at least parallel to, those of the British, French, and Dutch—in Europe. We need them as much as they need us, and it is imperative that we hang together—for reasons too plain to need mentioning here. But our interests are not identical with or even parallel to what many seem to regard as the legitimate interests of Britain, Holland, and France—in Asia.

I see no way out except for us to make unmistakably clear to all concerned that we will stand by the democracies in Europe; we will not support their empires in Asia.

That is the right position; it is also the expedient position. For if our choice is between having on our side in Asia the old decadent empires, or the hearts of the billion people who live there—then by all means let us have the hearts of the people.

The second possibility in Asia is racialism.

The basic thesis of the Japanese policymakers was that white men would never treat Asiatics decently and that, therefore, the Asiatics had no hope except to unite under Japan's leadership and expel the white men and all their interests from Asia. The thing that prevented the Japanese propaganda of "Asia for the Asiatics" from succeeding was the incredible folly of the Japanese militarists in treating the Asiatics even worse than the white man had. But let nobody think that because Japan's initial effort failed, her idea did not take root.

If attempts are made to reimpose the old colonial pattern in Asia, vigorous and magnetic leaders will arise in the Philippines, or Malaysia, or Indonesia, or Burma, or India, or China with a new totalitarianism of the racial pattern, urging the people of Asia to unite with all the colored peoples of the world in one solid bloc against the white man. Such a movement will not be good for anyone, but it is almost inevitable if we fail to provide adequate leadership in other directions.

The third possibility is the new imperialism of Russia. Let no one be so naive as to imagine that the unity pact between Chinese Communists and the Central Government of China means the Communists will not, just as soon as there is a chance of success, make a strong bid for complete control of China—a development which would tend to swing all of east Asia into the Communist column.

At San Francisco, at the meetings in London and Paris of the Security Council, at the Assembly of the UNO, and on a dozen other occasions, skillful Russian maneuvering coupled with our own diplomatic ineptness has managed to get us before the world on the side of imperialism in Asia, and Russia before the world in the apparent role of liberator. The fact that Russia is herself actually imposing a new and utterly ruthless imperialism on her neighbors is kept partly obscured by her effective attacks on the old European imperialisms.

Why did we get into World War II? Because we finally realized that we could not afford to let one totalitarian militaristic nation, Japan, get control of the manpower, materials, and potential markets of China and of Asia.

Yet a good many Americans have been trying for over a year to get us to abandon our ally, China, to the control of another totalitarian militaristic nation, Russia. It is an almost incredible performance.

They seem to assume that the only way we can have good relations with Russia is by always yielding to her; that we must either appease or go to war.

But surely we should have learned by now that appeasement does not prevent war. It always leads either to war or to abject surrender. And surely we know that when it comes to a showdown, we will not abjectly surrender.

We spent 10 years appeasing our enemies. It did not give us peace. It led straight to war.

Are we now to spend the next decade trying in vain to get peace by appeasing our allies?

I am utterly opposed to any such policy because it would lead only to Russia becoming incomparably the strongest power in Asia as well as in Europe. This would be as bad in the long run for Russia as it would be for Asia and for ourselves and for world peace. It would compel all the democracies to get together in an alliance against such an unprecedented concentration of power. It would divide the world into two great armed camps with constant tensions and suspicions. Some day an inevitable spark would set off world war III.

It is not because we want war with Russia but precisely because we don't want war with Russia that we must reject any fallacious notion that trying to appease her by giving her other people's territory will bring peace.

Shortly after Yalta, at a time when most Americans were profoundly disturbed by Russia's action in Eastern Europe in violation of that agreement, a Russian in Washington said, "You folks do not understand us Russians. We never take any seats that are not empty. When did we ever push anybody out of the seat he was firmly occupying? But, if you leave a seat empty, and we take it, then don't you come along and try to push us out."

As nearly as I can figure out Russia's foreign policy, that is the best description I have heard of it—taking empty seats.

We left a political vacuum in Eastern Europe. We had leaders who insisted political decisions must be postponed until all military questions were settled. But political decisions could not wait. And Russia could not and did not wait. When empty seats were left in Eastern Europe, Russia moved in, and I don't see how anyone could rightly blame her or have expected anything else. She was realistic while we daydreamed.

Manchuria has now become almost a second Poland—because once again we didn't exercise vigorous and steady leadership in time. We left the seat empty. The same will happen to all of north China and then to other parts of Asia, if we do not stand firmly now—not against Russia, but for the sovereignty, independence, territorial and administrative integrity of China—the same sound policy we have had in Asia since 1898, the objective for which we fought Japan, and which we reaffirmed in unequivocal terms in the Cairo Declaration to which Russia also gave her approval.

It is not a new policy, something hastily cooked up to checkmate Russia. It is merely continued adherence to our historic policy, the thing for which we fought Japan for 4 years—to maintain the open door in China—"equality of opportunity in China for all friendly nations; dominance by none."

Thus our alternatives are not just either appease Russia or go to war. There is another. We can stand firmly by our commitments in Asia and by the commitments of the Atlantic Charter everywhere. We can exercise positive, consistent, effective leadership for the pattern we ourselves established in the Philippines—the pattern which the overwhelming majority of the people of Asia wants.

That is the fourth possibility—not the old colonial imperialism of Europe; not racialism; not the new Communist imperialism of Russia; but genuine democracy and independence of the sort we helped establish in the Philippines.

All Asia observed that when we took the Philippine Islands we did not make them the first colony in a great new empire, but started immediately to help them build a republic and trained their people for the independence we promised and delivered. That is the pattern which the rest of Asia wants.

Why do we Americans sometimes seem to be the only people in the world who have so little idea of the strength of our own country? We are inclined to ask with fear and trembling, "What will this nation or that leader think or do?" I sometimes wonder why in the world we don't decide what we ourselves believe and stand for. Why do we so underestimate the soundness and the appeal to the oppressed peoples of the earth of the democratic system and ideology? Why do we hesitate to make our own position forthright and clear to all?

It is reckless irresponsibility as well as plain distortion of the truth for anyone to misrepresent such a foreign policy as one of "getting tough with Russia." On the contrary, it is a policy of standing firmly for the principles which have been the foundation of America's foreign policy for 50 years, while extending our hand in good neighborliness to all other powers, including Russia, and bending every effort to help iron out international differences.

How can anyone consider it unfriendly to Russia for the United States to continue supporting policies in Asia to which Russia herself has given written agreement? The United States must cling tenaciously to the principles and policies laid down in the Atlantic Charter.

The white man's prestige in Asia was at its all-time low after Pearl Harbor and Singapore. To regain respect he had to demonstrate power—and he did. But power alone will not restore confidence. That can come only as he demonstrates for what purpose he intends to use that power in the future.

The original relationship of the western nations to Asia was one of overlordship. It is now in various stages of transformation into one of trusteeship. But that is not enough. It must go on to independence; and then, if the new countries desire, to partnership.

The peoples of Asia and Europe are on the move. We cannot hold them back. We cannot drive them. What, then, can we do? We can lead them—if it be on a basis, not of superior and inferior, but of full partnership in working together for the good of all as the true way to promote the good of each. If the democracies fail to exert vigorous leadership in that direction, there are others able and eager to lead them in other directions.

There is no more important task in the world than that of making sure the western democracies and the peoples of Asia are on the same side, the side of freedom and democracy.

We defeated Japan's Army and Navy—but her ideas or those of Russia will have won the war in Asia unless all its people are assured, beyond any question, of their ultimate freedom as they work and struggle and grow to full nationhood and independence.

The Communists in China can start really serious civil war there only if they know Moscow is ready to back them. Thus what happens in China in the near future depends on what is decided in Moscow. But what is decided in Moscow depends on what happens in Washington. Fortunately, the United States of America is one of the few remaining places where what happens in its Capital City still can be determined by its citizens—just like ourselves—if we will.

Conservation Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 84th Congress

shows that it was one of the most conservation-minded assemblies ever to grace these halls. Natural resources management has been a legislative subject of major importance. And the record is one that we can take proudly to the American people. New and constructive conservation laws were written into the statute books. Beyond that, by its alertness, the 84th Congress was able to ferret out and to expose the giveaway policies of the Republican administration—an administration which believes natural resources should be granted, leased, reserved, and exploited for the profit of the privileged few rather than conserved and wisely used for the benefit of all the people. Mr. Speaker, we were able to stop some of the giveaways dead in their tracks. Some we slowed down, but some are still going on.

But back to the conservation record of the 84th Congress. Here are some of the positive achievements:

First. We adopted a soil-bank law which, if properly administered, will save and build up the Nation's soil, water, timber, and wildlife resources while cutting down the troublesome crop surpluses. I am proud to say that, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I had some part in the shaping and final passage of this important and far-reaching legislation.

Second. Amended the Small Watershed Act of 1954 in order to broaden its purposes, slash through the redtape and speed up the work. Now a watershed project can include municipal water supply, stream-flow regulation, wildlife conservation, recreation, and other benefits as well as flood prevention and agricultural purposes. A watershed is not merely an area of land and water, the drainage basin of a stream. It also is a community of human beings, and usually includes towns and cities as well as farmers. All of these people are dependent upon the resources of the watershed for their health, wealth, and security, and none of the opportunities for wise use of those resources must be overlooked or neglected.

Perhaps the major improvement written into the Watershed Act by the 84th Congress was that all the costs allocable to flood control shall be paid for by the Federal Government. This is in line with long-established policies laid down by the Congress in connection with flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers. It is recognized that flood-control benefits accrue to the economy of the whole Nation, and therefore the Federal Government has paid for them.

The local sponsoring watershed district or organization and the landowners will share the costs of land-treatment measures and of water storage and utilization for farming purposes, as before. For some of the other community benefits which may now be included in a watershed project, such as impoundment of municipal water supply, will be paid for by the local interests. This bill will be of great benefit to my district, the Ninth District of Wisconsin.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, to help formulate and support the amendments which have broadened and liberalized the watersheds conservation program.

Third. This Congress adopted a new water-pollution control law with teeth, and for the first time in history appropriated enough money to start a first-class pollution-abatement program. While I was not the first Member of this Congress to introduce pollution-control legislation, I was the first to sponsor a bill containing authorization of incentive loans and grants designed to speed up the construction of sewage-treatment plants. This was the key new feature of the improved Blatnik bill that finally became law. The legislation sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and by the Committee on Public Works, sets up a program of $50 million per year and a total of $500 million over a period of years for grants to municipalities that are hard-pressed to finance sewage-treatment works. It also authorizes $3 million annually in grants to State water agencies to help them build and strengthen the State pollution-control programs.

The new law also gives the United States Public Health Service a better tool with which to clean up stubborn cases of pollution in interstate waters. Now the Federal Government can instigate abatement proceedings without first securing the consent of the State where the pollution originates; this was a fatal weakness of the old law.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a pollution-control law on the Federal books since 1948, but Congress never before appropriated enough money to fulfill its authorizations. To the everlasting credit of the 84th Congress, we not only passed the law, we appropriated the necessary funds. We voted the full $50 million for the construction grants, $2 million for grants to State and interstate agencies, and $1 million for administration and enforcement. If I am privileged to be a Member of the 85th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I shall work to increase the State grants appropriation to the full $3 million, and I shall advocate more money for research and enforcement.

Fourth. We passed legislation to stop raids on, and despoilation of, the national forests and other public lands through abuses of the outmoded mining law of 1872. Public Law 167 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, probably will go down in history as our outstanding contribution to the management of the public lands. It does not go quite far enough, however. It is still possible for an administration devoted to special privilege to give away fabulous timber resources under pretext of granting a mining claim, as occurred in the notorious Al Sarena case in Oregon. I shall discuss this case later in more detail.

Fifth. We appropriated funds to start mission 66 for the national parks. This is a 10-year program of rehabilitation and improvement of our great national park system. If subsequent Congresses follow through, the parks will be safeguarded and equipped to accommodate the 80 million visitors annually which are anticipated by 1966.

Sixth. Of special interest to sportsmen, we passed legislation to release $13½ million of Federal-aid wildlife funds that had been tied up in the Federal Treasury for 10 years. This is money paid into the Treasury by sportsmen through an excise tax on their guns and ammunition. It was earmarked for Federal aid to the States in game-restoration projects. The $13½ million accumulated during the war years when the States could not use the full annual receipts under the Pittman-Robertson Act. But once accumulated in the Treasury, it took special legislation to release the unappropriated surplus for its intended purpose. It is a good thing this Congress acted, Mr. Speaker, because the administration budget balancers had their eye on that chunk of the sportsmen's money. They wanted to use it for other purposes so they could brag on an economy record.

Seventh. We enacted a bill to assist distressed segments of the commercial fishing industry and at the same time to elevate and strengthen the whole fish and wildlife program in the Department of the Interior. Key accomplishment here was the creation of an Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife. In the past, wildlife interests have often been overlooked in bureaucratic competition for the attention of an Assistant Secretary who handled all public land matters.

In amending and then passing S. 3275, Mr. Speaker, we also headed off an ill-advised drive by commercial fishing interests to dismember the Fish and Wildlife Service and to put recreational fishing under the domination of a commercial-minded commission. We insisted upon the sound principle that fish and wildlife are related resources that, for true conservation, must be administered and coordinated in a single agency.

Eighth. We authorized far-reaching reclamation power and flood-control programs, including such major developments as the upper Colorado storage project.

The foregoing were the major positive achievements in the field of natural resources management. There were other momentous, and some small, conservation victories. A grave threat to the national park system was eliminated when Congress rejected an adminstration proposal to build Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. This not only would have despoiled one of the grandest areas of wild canyon country in the national park system, it would have established a precedent that would have made it virtually impossible to resist similar invasions of other national parks.

Among other lesser, but by no means unimportant, conservation enactments was the bill implementing the Great Lakes Fisheries Treaty with Canada, the major objective of which is control of the destructive sea lamprey, and a measure authorizing acquisition of private holdings within the famous Quetico-Superior wilderness canoe country of the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

A great deal of time was spent investigating and exposing the giveaway policies of the Republican administration. The name Al Sarena became notorious as it was disclosed how lieutenants of "generous Doug McKay" resorted to highly unorthodox methods to overrule career

conservationists in the Forest Service and approved dubious mining claims in the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon. As a result of this giveaway, documented carefully by the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in House Report No. 2408, Al Sarena Mines, Inc., secured title to 475 acres of highly valuable timber. While Al Sarena company has taken practically no minerals from the area, it has been mining rich stands of timber estimated in value at more than $500,000.

Investigations by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries disclosed the machinations of another McKay-sanctioned giveaway, this one gravely endangering the national wildlife refuges.

On August 31, 1953, Secretary McKay announced a stop order suspending action on applications for oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuge lands while the Department worked out new regulations for such leasing. Some 27 months later, on December 2, 1955, Secretary McKay announced and published the new regulations and it was immediately apparent that, while pretending to protect the wildlife values, they amounted to little more than an outright invitation to the oil and gas operators. Conservationists both within and outside of Congress protested and the Commmittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries started an investigation of this peculiar situation. Among other startling facts it was disclosed that during the 27 months of the so-called stop order, more than 550 leases were granted on wildlife lands. While the general public assumed the door was closed to oil exploitation in the wildlife refuges, a favored group of operators and manipulators were sneaking in the back door of the Department of the Interior and sneaking out again with oil leases in their pockets. When is a stop order not a stop order?

During all the years since Congress passed the Mineral Leasing Act in 1920, only 11 oil leases had been granted on national wildlife refuges until Mr. McKay's stop order went into effect.

As for the new regulations promulgated by the McKay administration, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee issued a highly critical report which was approved unanimously by Republicans and Democrats alike—House Report No. 1941. The committee had this to say:

> The new regulations fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary. Superficially these regulations appear to give a veto power to the Fish and Wildlife Service. However, under applicable laws, oil and gas leasing in wildlife lands is a matter solely within the discretion of the Secretary of Interior. Consequently, the veto power exists only so long as, and to the extent that, the Secretary permits the regulations to control.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the danger of raids on the National Wildlife Refuges remains with us. The hearings and the forthright report of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee undoubtedly slowed down the oil exploiters, but they are not enough to stop them. The pressures for mining and grazing privileges, for homesteading on some of the western wildlife refuges, for transfer of lands to the military departments, and for other exploitive uses, continue to threaten our wildlife resources. In my opinion, it will be necessary for the Congress to enact some kind of protective legislation for the Wildlife Refuges, erecting the same kind of legal safeguards that now keep the raiders out of the National Parks.

Still another kind of giveaway has recently come to light, this one affecting and restricting the opportunities of the taxpaying public to enjoy recreation on Federal reservoirs that their money helps to build. It started with a new joint land acquisition policy agreed to by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Interior, and said to have originated in orders from the White House shortly after the Eisenhower administration took over. The new policy, approved January 13, 1954, and published in the Federal Register as Order No. 2744, provides that the Corps of Engineers or Bureau of Reclamation, in building flood control, power or irrigation reservoirs, shall acquire in fee title only the bare minimum of land needed for construction purposes. Much of the area may be only partially controlled through flowage easements, and most of the shorelines are to remain in private ownership. The effect of this policy is to sacrifice opportunities for fish and wildlife development, which requires the management of shoreline areas, and to restrict public access for recreational purposes. On the other hand, this policy favors the few—usually real estate speculators—who manage to get their hands on the shoreline areas and can cash in on commercial developments.

Now the joint land acquisition policy of January 13, 1954, is being applied retroactively to Federal reservoirs started before that date. Several bills have come before this Congress with administration backing, proposing to sell reservoir lands back to the former owners at a special low price that fails to take into consideration the greatly increased values resulting from the expenditure of public funds. Once again, in most cases, it will not be the former owner who benefits, but the real estate manipulator who had "inside information" and has managed to corner the options.

Mr. Speaker, the special-privilege land acquisition policy at Federal reservoirs has got to be changed in the public interests. This is another task left over for the 85th Congress.

In conclusion, I want to comment briefly on the biggest giveaway among all the giveaways of the Eisenhower administration. I refer to the gift to favored private power combines of the Nation's finest remaining public power sites. At the same time, the administration has tried to hamstring, if not destroy, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, and other agencies created by Congress in the past for the purpose of extending the blessings of electric power at reasonable rates to all of the people in all parts of the country. Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the fact that this Congress would not stand for it, TVA and REA would be in bad shape today.

Under the whiplash of the White House and the private power lobby, working together like a well-oiled team, the Senate voted down a bill to authorize a great Government dam on the Snake River in Oregon and Idaho. Hells Canyon is the finest public power site remaining in the land. The Republican administration has given it away to a private power combine which, under Federal Power Commission license, will build 2 or 3 little dams accomplishing only part of the tremendous power and water-storage potential of the Hells Canyon site. The balance of the Hells Canyon potential, unless this giveaway is reversed, will be lost to the public forever.

No, Mr. Speaker, we may have slowed down, but we have by no means stopped all of the giveaways of the Republican administration. It takes time to ferret them out, time to overcome and defeat the well-heeled lobbies of special privilege. But if the facts are made clear to the American people, if the conservation issues are widely debated and clearly defined, I have no doubt of the final outcome. The American people believe in the wise use of our natural resources for the greatest good of the largest number, in the long run.

Comments on Interstate Power Co. Report on TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, earlier this year, a mimeographed report on The Facts About TVA was presented by a local representative of the Interstate Power Co. to a Kiwanis Club in Minnesota. This report was so distorted and constituted such a misrepresentation of the facts that I sought the advice and counsel of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, Senator ALBERT GORE, in preparing a reply so the record may be set straight.

Senator GORE'S comments should be read by every American who has been inclined to take at face value the claims of certain groups who have fought TVA from its very inception.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks Senator GORE'S Comments on Interstate Power Co. Report on TVA.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON INTERSTATE POWER CO. REPORT ON TVA

The mimeographed report on The Facts About TVA presented by a local representative of the Interstate Power Co. to a Kiwanis Club in Minnesota follows the general pattern of misrepresentation of TVA which has been spread nationwide through almost every media available to the free-spending private utilities.

The origin of the TVA idea is misrepresented. The power provisions of the TVA Act are completely distorted. The report glaringly omits any mention of TVA's national defense contributions, although more than one-half its power output today goes to the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal defense agencies. The statements concerning TVA power finances bear hardly a remote resemblance to truth, depicting an enterprise earning a 4 percent annual return as subsidized. No reference whatever is made, of course, to the positive benefits to electricity consumers and taxpayers in the Nation resulting from TVA power operations.

These points are supported factually in the following analysis:

POWER IN THE TVA ACT

The development of power was one of the major purposes in the TVA Act, which set up TVA as an agency for unified development of natural resources along principles developed in the conservation movement under President Theodore Roosevelt 30 years earlier. In fact, Roosevelt set the stage for TVA when he vetoed a bill turning over the Muscle Shoals, Ala., site of what is now Wilson Dam to private interests. In the course of similar vetoes on other streams, he declared "I esteem it my duty to use every endeavor to prevent this growing (power) monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the people of this Nation."

The historical facts thus effectively dispose of the claim in the report that TVA was presented to the public in 1933 "as a noble experiment—a new idea in river development that would show how the Federal Government could be a real help to a large depressed region." The idea that TVA was a kind of charity for a depressed region, instead of an application of conservation principles long established, is further discounted by the fact that the first act aimed at the development of the Tennessee Valley was passed in the economic boom year of 1928, only to be pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge.

Similarly, the provisions of the TVA Act itself completely controvert the assertion that the Congress of 1933 intended that "TVA dams would also generate a little electricity for local consumption."

Rather, section 9 of the act provided that TVA was to generate electricity "so far as may be consistent" with the requirements of flood control and navigation in the operation of its multiple-purpose dams. Section 23 removed any possible misunderstanding on this score by declaring the objective to be "the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation."

The act transferred to TVA a Government-built steam plant and clearly contemplated the construction and operation of additional steam plants when needed.

The power provisions of the act were specific. They required that power operations be "self-supporting and self-liquidating," but emphasis was on maximum service rather than maximum profits. TVA was expected to seek the wide and abundant use of electricity for the "fuller and better balanced development of the resources of the region." The act gave preference in the sale of electricity to nonprofit municipal and cooperative organizations operating "primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity" to citizens or members. TVA was directed to keep accurate records to accumulate data on costs of power generation and distribution for the benefit of the Congress, Federal and State agencies, and the public. The act, in short, shows that power in the unified development was a major consideration.

Finally, the act made clear that TVA's power facilities, as well as the chemical plants at Muscle Shoal, were to be available always for national defense.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND TVA POWER GROWTH

The report is accurate in saying that the TVA power system has grown into the largest integrated power system in the country and similarly accurate in saying "TVA did not grow like Topsy. It grew by design." In the fiscal year 1956, the system generated more than 57 billion kilowatt-hours in a region where production in 1933 was only 1.5 billion kilowatt-hours.

Completely lacking in the report, however, is any reference to the major factors in development of the design—that during the life of TVA the Nation has engaged in the greatest war in history, that scientists have split the atom, that since 1951 the Nation has been engaged in a tremendous national defense effort based on atomic weapons, accompanied by atomic development for peacetime use, and requiring hitherto unheard of amounts of electricity.

During World War II, from 1939 to 1945, TVA raised power production from 2 billion kilowatt-hours to 12 billion kilowatt-hours by rapid construction of dams and hydro plants. During the war three-fourths of TVA's power was used for war purposes—to produce aluminum for airplanes, chemicals for munitions, fissionable materials for the atomic bomb, and other war materials. Beginning with the hostilities in Korea in 1951, an even vaster expansion of power has been demanded and met.

Since 1951, TVA's power output has been multiplied 3 times, from 18 billion kilowatt-hours to 57 billion kilowatt-hours. More than half TVA's power sales—56 percent in 1956—goes to the Atomic Energy Commission's huge plants and to other Federal defense installations. Between 1950 and 1956, these Federal agencies multiplied their demand for TVA power 15 times—from 2 billion kilowatt-hours to more than 30 billion kilowatt-hours.

At the same time, TVA has had to meet the normal growth in power demand in the region it serves in the same way that other power systems do. TVA power is distributed in an area of 80,000 square miles by 98 municipal, 51 cooperative, and 2 small private utilities. In this area, which has remained stable geographically since 1945, power use has continued to grow rapidly.

THE JOB OF ELECTRICAL DEVELOPMENT

The report falsely seeks to convey the impression that in 1945 the job of TVA, under the act, was finished, saying "TVA itself declared that the job of harnessing the Tennessee was complete." It is true that TVA in its 1945 report said rapid wartime construction had advanced its project so that "no other major stream was so completely controlled for the protection and benefit of man." About 11 million acre-feet of flood storage had been provided and a 630-mile channel substantially achieved.

But the same report also made clear that the TVA job was not complete, that with the end of the war "emphasis could again be directed toward the job of building a stronger and more fertile valley through the development of its basic resources of soil, forests, and minerals."

Power, one of the resources, was needed for that development, for farms, factories, and homes. The TVA report made clear that normal power use during the war had been retarded by lack of manpower, materials, and appliances.

That the electric-power job was not complete in 1945 is amply demonstrated by what has happened since, keeping in mind that the geographical area served has remained virtually unchanged. In this area, the municipal and coperative systems increased their total sales from 3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1945 to more than 14 billion kilowatt-hours in 1956. The number of customers more than doubled, from 600,000 to 1,425,000. Where a quarter of the farms had service, the proportion today is 93 percent. The average home in the region used 1,750 kilowatt-hours a year in 1945, today the average is nearing 5,800 kilowatt-hours. Industrial sales by the local distributors increased from 2 billion kilowatt-hours to 7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1956.

This growth has been the work of the people in the valley region since they elected, by municipal referenda and by formation of rural cooperatives in areas long ignored by the private utilities, to own and operate their own electric systems. In this they followed a long-established American tradition, for publicly owned systems have existed since 1882, the birth date of the electric industry.

The report claims TVA "seized and put out of business 20 electric companies." This is a curious way to describe a change in ownership in which municipalities and cooperatives joined with TVA in purchasing the privately owned electric facilities, paying their full value of $127 million (the local agencies paid nearly $69 million for distribution properties, TVA over $58 million for generating and transmission facilities). About 350,000 customers, one-fourth the present number, were involved in the transfers.

WHY TVA BUILDS STEAM PLANTS

The vast increase in the demand for power, and particularly the tremendous requirements of the AEC and other Federal defense agencies, answers the question raised in the report: "Why does TVA need steam plants when it has 30 major dams?" (TVA has constructed 20 dams, acquired 5 from a private company plus Wilson Dam taken over from the War Department, and directs the operation of 5 major privately owned dams as a part of the integrated system, with benefits to both TVA and the company.)

The fact is that the power requirements of the region, including requirements of Federal installations for the common defense of the Nation, have far outrun the hydroelectric resources of the region. Some sites remain that may be developed for flood control and other purposes, as well as power, but even with total development of all available hydro, steam plants will be required to meet the total power demand.

The fear expressed in the report that TVA could expand its steam generation in an unlimited manner without regard to the region it is in is entirely unjustified; while no precise boundaries are set, TVA is limited in its sales of power to the economical transmission distance from its hydroelectric projects. The location of steam plants does not affect that limitation.

Similarly, the charge that TVA has been buying its coal at nonunion rates is without foundation. TVA can set neither the price of coal nor miners' wages. It buys its coal—about 18 million tons a year—in the competitive, free-enterprise market. Obviously, it buys its coal just as cheaply as it can, as any other well-managed enterprise would do, letting contracts to the lowest bidders. Under the law, TVA cannot differentiate between mines which pay high or low wages, or which are union or nonunion, except to require bidders to pay the minimum wages required on production for Federal agencies. Such minimum wages are established for each coalfield by the United States Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act. Private utilities are subject to no such requirement and can buy coal where they will, regardless of the Walsh-Healey Act.

All TVA's coal contracts provide for escalation in price to compensate for general wage increases.

TVA POWER MORE THAN PAYS ITS WAY

The consumers of TVA power pay for it without subsidy from taxpayers anywhere. Power revenues cover all costs of operation—the cost of coal and materials, wages and

salaries, maintenance—and straight-line depreciation, together with payments in lieu of taxes to States and counties. In addition those revenues have provided a margin which amounts to an average annual return of 4 percent on the power investment over the entire 23 years of operation. An operation which earns a 4 percent annual return on the investment obviously is not subsidized.

Sometimes attempts are made as in this report to disparage the financial record of TVA power operations by declaring that TVA does not pay interest. Interest, of course, is paid on debt, and the interest payments of any private business vary with the size of its debts. TVA, like any utility, has paid interest on its outstanding bonds. Sixty-five million dollars in bonds were originally issued, but the last $14 million outstanding were retired in August 1955, and no interest has been paid since that date. What the report is contending in effect is that because TVA does pay interest not on debt, but on equity capital, that money made available for investment by the Government as owner of the system, its financial record is unsound. There is no basis for such a conclusion. It is, of course, entirely fair to examine the extent to which TVA power system earnings have been adequate to cover the cost of money to the owner (the Government), assuming that the Government borrowed the funds to invest in the power system. The answer to this fair question is clear. The 4 percent return which the TVA power system has earned on the investment, after paying all costs of operation including depreciation, is about double the cost of money to the Government during the period in which the system was built.

TVA PAYMENTS ON INVESTMENT AHEAD OF SCHEDULE

Under a provision of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, TVA is required to pay into the United States Treasury, including retirements of bonds, amounts which will equal the Treasury funds invested in the power system within 40 years from the time electric facilities so financed are placed in operation.

TVA is well ahead of schedule on these payments, which amount to an average annual requirement of 2½ percent, thus disposing of the claim in the report that "TVA has at no time repaid more than 1.4 percent of its total investment in any one year."

On the basis of paying 2½ percent, or one-fortieth, of the Treasury investment each year, TVA should have paid by the end of the fiscal year 1956 about $115.6 million. The actual payments to that date were $186.5 million, about 60 percent ahead of the requirement. Prior to the 1948 act, TVA had paid $23.6 million to the Treasury. This brings the total payments from power revenues to more than $210 million at the end of fiscal 1956. (An additional $34.8 million of non-power proceeds has also been paid, bringing the total to nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.)

It should be pointed out here that no shift in ownership is involved. After the Treasury has received the equivalent of the Federal investment in the facilities, the Government continues to own them and is entitled to the earnings from them.

TAX PAYMENTS ON TVA POWER

The report includes the standard misrepresentations of the payments in lieu of taxes made by the TVA and the taxes and tax equivalents paid by the local distributors, and adds a new one. In the first place, it attempts to compare the State and local tax payments on TVA power with the total taxes of electric utility companies, including income taxes. In addition, it gives the impression that the payments on TVA power simply replace the taxes formerly paid by the private utilities at the time their facilities were purchased.

This is not true. The fact is that the State and local taxes of about $11 million paid by TVA and the distributors in the fiscal year 1956 was about 225 percent greater than the total of State and local taxes paid in 1937, when the production and sale of electricity was substantially in private hands. In the rest of the country the State and local taxes of private utilities in 1955 were 203 percent above 1937, a differential in favor of the TVA area of 22 percentage points.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues in June 1955 recommended that the provision for payments in lieu of taxes by TVA remain undisturbed, since "the present system is working to the general satisfaction of the State and local governments in the TVA area."

"This payment arrangement," the task force report said, on page 62, "conceptually reimburses the recipient governments not merely of potential property tax receipts but of all potential taxes of those governments referable to the power property and its operation."

Under section 13 of the TVA Act, TVA pays 5 percent of its revenues from sale of power, excepting from sales to agencies of the Federal Government itself, to the States and counties in which it owns property or sells power. The electric cooperatives, on their operations, pay the applicable State taxes, and the municipal systems make tax equivalent payments generally based on the combined State, county, and local tax rate applied to the net value of their systems.

In the fiscal year 1955, the $10 million of tax payments by the TVA and the distributors amounted to 6.2 percent of the combined power revenues, save those from sales to the Federal Government which are exempt by law. In comparison, the State and local taxes of a dozen private utilities adjacent to the TVA area ranged from 4.8 percent to 11.3 percent, averaging 7.9 percent, according to data of the Federal Power Commission.

TVA's in-lieu payments make it the largest single taxpayer in the State of Tennessee, according to State records. In the four largest cities using TVA power, and probably in many smaller cities, the publicly owned electric systems are likewise the largest taxpayers.

With State and local taxes disposed of, Federal income taxes can be considered. TVA is not required to pay Federal income taxes, since it is a Federal agency and the income from the power system belongs to the Government. The important fact is that the return on the investment is sufficient to cover the cost of money by a substantial margin. Although there would be no advantage to designating a part or all of this margin as income taxes, perhaps a hypothetical illustration will be helpful. In the fiscal year 1955 the net income from power operations was $47.9 million, representing a return of 4.2 percent on the net average power investment of $1,130 million. An allowance for the cost of money at 2 percent on this investment, amounting to $22.6 million, would leave $25.3 million. On this profit a private company would have paid an income tax of a little over $13 million to the Government. In the case of TVA the total income belongs to the Government.

THE TVA YARDSTICK

The report displays the usual reluctance of TVA critics to discuss the real yardstick, the public demonstration of economical power production and distribution. "Where the average cost per kilowatt-hour for the Nation's residential customers in 1954 was 2.69 cents, TVA consumers pay only 1.24 cents," says the report. "This is what TVA and its public power advocates call the TVA yardstick—the low rates that are supposed to set an example to the rest of the private electric industry."

The yardstick has often been thus misinterpreted to indicate that TVA was intended to arrive at rates which would then become a precise measure for electric rates everywhere. On the contrary, TVA has always recognized that conditions of power generation and distribution vary from region to region. However, the careful records which the Congress directed TVA to keep can be a source of information for purposes of comparison to weigh likenesses and differences.

But the yardstick has other useful and more general applications, based on the congressional criteria for success of power operations geared primarily to maximum service rather than maximum profit. The report points this up when it mentions only the comparative costs per kilowatt-hour for residential service between the TVA area and the Nation at large. It leaves out the other side of the equation—the effect of low rates on electrical use.

In the TVA area, average annual use by homes in the 12 months ending with May 1956 reached 5,778 kilowatt-hours per customer, more than double the national average home use—a demonstration of the well-known American industrial principle of mass, low-cost production and distribution inducing mass consumption.

Again, the TVA experience, in which the TVA costs of generation and transmission are reported separately from the costs of local distribution, gave a new insight into one of the mysteries of electric service—the costs of distribution as distinguished from the costs of generation and transmission.

The practical effects of the rate demonstration were revealed in a recent study which showed that the closer private utilities were to the TVA area, and to the public power demonstrations in the Pacific Northwest, the lower their residential rates tended to be. Consumers served by private utilities neighboring TVA, for example, are saving millions of dollars annually because of the TVA demonstration. The more remote they are, the higher their rates. Similarly, rural electric cooperatives buying wholesale power from private utilities pay lower rates per kilowatt-hour the closer they are to the public power areas.

The TVA area, in another demonstration, led the Nation in rural electrification, which was virtually nonexistent in 1933; in the Nation, only 11 percent of the farms had service, and in the present TVA region the proportion was 3 percent. In 1934 and 1935, the first cooperatives to offer service on a broad area basis were formed in the Tennessee Valley region, demonstrating that widespread rural electrification was feasible. They became the model for the REA cooperatives which, beginning in 1936, have brought electric service to more than 2.5 million farms in the Nation and have spurred private utilities to provide service to an additional 1¼ million farms.

All the Nation's taxpayers are benefiting through lower national defense power bills, not only from the low-cost power supplied by the TVA to AEC and other national defense agencies, but also because the TVA demonstration provided a lever which enabled the AEC to contract for large supplies of power for its atomic plants from privately owned public utilities at rates well below the rates of ordinary industrial service, even in large amounts. AEC is buying more than 50 billion kilowatt hours a year from TVA and two private utilities; this means that for every mill per kilowatt hour of saving, compared with what AEC would have had to pay in the absence of TVA, the Nation's taxpayers are benefiting to the extent of more than $50 million a year in reduced defense power bills. Over the 25-year periods of the

contracts, every mill of annual saving per kilowatt hour will add up to $1¼ billion, a sum equal to the total TVA power investment, including construction in progress, at the end of the 1955 fiscal year.

These facts may suggest why the TVA yardstick or demonstration is attacked so bitterly, why the facts about it are consistently distorted, and why the private utility industry is determined to destroy it.

TENNESSEE VALLEY NOT A FAVORED REGION

Contrary to the impression sought to be conveyed in the last paragraph of the report, the Tennessee Valley region is not favored in Federal expenditures. The Federal Government spends money for a wide variety of purposes intended to advance the general welfare, and not primarily to benefit particular States, regions, or groups. However, since the report raises the point, it can be answered. The fact is that in the years 1934-54, total Federal expenditures amounted to $5,850 per capita in the country; in the Tennessee Valley region, where the TVA expenditures were only a small proportion of the total, Federal expenditures per capita were only $2,840, less than half the national figure.

Even so, the price is further distorted by the use of the figures purporting to show how much TVA has cost Minnesota and Iowa. Most of the appropriated funds of TVA have been invested in power facilities and, as has been shown, will be returned to the Treasury in 40 years. A large proportion of the power investment is devoted to the national defense, which is as important to these States as to the rest of the country. Some of the funds have been used for TVA's fertilizer and munitions development, with strong benefits to midwestern agriculture and to national security. The Tennessee navigation channel has expanded the opportunities for interregional commerce, as for example—expanding the southeastern market for midwest grain.

At the same time, the flow of taxes and Federal expenditures is not a one-way street, taxes from the Tennessee Valley region contribute to the expenditures in the rest of the country for various projects and activities in the general welfare. Moreover, the valley region is contributing a proportionally larger share; in 1933, when TVA was created, the seven Tennessee Valley States contributed 3.4 percent of all the individual income taxes collected in the Nation; in 1954, the proportion was more than 6 percent. In 1954 taxpayers from these States paid $986,069,000 more than they would have paid had the proportion remained constant.

Report to the People of the 22d Congressional District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the folks of the 22d Congressional District of California on my voting record for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Congress. The purpose of this report is to collect and put in one place some 25,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This information is not generally available to the people of my district, and I believe it should be made available to every citizen.

It has been my policy, and shall continue to be, through the media of weekly news columns, Reports from Washington, and Legislative Questionnaires to keep the folks I represent in Congress informed as to what I am doing as their Representative and to give them every opportunity to participate in their Government.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

I just add this word of explanation as sometimes the official descriptive titles do not always reflect the entire purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I, of course, will be pleased to furnish detailed information concerning particular legislation and the reasons for my vote.

An explanation of the terms used below will be found at the end of the report.

It is my suggestion that readers look this résumé over before continuing.

Voting record of Congressman JOE HOLT, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1955		
	H. J. Res. 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area:	
Jan. 25	On passage. (Passed 410 to 3.)	Yea.
	H. R. 587, providing that servicemen on duty on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952:	
Jan. 27	On passage. (Passed 366 to 0.)	Yea.
	H. R. 3005, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years:	
Feb. 8	On passage. (Passed 394 to 4.)	Not voting.[1]
	H. R. 3828, adjusting the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress:	
Feb. 16	On passage. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 142, providing for 2 days of debate and prohibiting amendments on H. R. 1, extending authority of the President to enter into trade agreements:	
Feb. 17	On motion to end debate and vote on resolution. (Rejected 178 to 207.)	Nay.
Feb. 17	On amendment making amendments to H. R. 1 in order and limiting debate to 5 hours. (Rejected 191 to 193.)	Yea.
Feb. 17	On passage. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Nay.
	H. R. 1, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements:	
Feb. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to report back with amendment requiring President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission except when national security is involved. (Rejected 199 to 206.)	Nay.
Feb. 18	On passage. (Passed 295 to 110.)	Yea.
	H. R. 4259, providing a 1-year extension of the existing normal corporate tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates, and providing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption:	
Feb. 25	On motion to recommit, deleting the provision for a $20 tax credit. (Rejected 205 to 210.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	On passage. (Passed 242 to 175.)	Nay.
	H. R. 3828, adjusting the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress:	
Mar. 1	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 223 to 113.)	Yea.
	H. R. 4720, providing incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pay and allowances:	
Mar. 10	On passage. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yea.
	H. R. 4903, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 (second supplemental appropriation):	
Mar. 18	On passage of amendment restoring a provision authorizing transfer of $4 million of unexpended funds to the United Nations technical assistance program. (Passed 175 to 107.)	Paired.
	H. R. 4644, increasing the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service by an average 7.5 percent and eliminating certain salary inequities:	
Mar. 21	On motion to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 4644. (Rejected 120 to 302.)	Nay.
	H. R. 4951, directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year:	
Mar. 21	On motion to suspend the rules and pass with committee amendments. (Rejected 260 to 152; a ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of the rules.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 170, declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to Congress on Jan. 24, 1955:	
Mar. 22	On passage. (Rejected 132 to 283, thereby approving sale.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 171, disapproving proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic-rubber-producing facilities as recommended by Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission:	
Mar. 23	On passage. (Rejected 137 to 276, thereby approving sale.)	Nay.
	H. R. 4259, providing a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates:	
Mar. 30	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 387 to 8.)	Yea.
	H. R. 5240, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1956:	
Mar. 30	On amendment limiting to $1 per month the fee to be paid to educational institutions for reports on veterans enrolled therein. (Rejected 154 to 227.)	Yea.
	H. R. 4644, the postal employees' pay increase and classification adjustment bill:	
Apr. 20	On amendment increasing postal salaries by an average of 8.2 percent in lieu of 7.5 percent as provided by the bill. (Passed 224 to 189.)	Paired against.
Apr. 20	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 125 to 287.)	Paired for.
Apr. 20	On passage (8.2 percent increase). (Passed 324 to 85.)	Not voting.[1]

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Congressman JOE HOLT, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1955		
Apr. 21	H. R. 4303, providing for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Not voting.[1]
	H. R. 12, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by restoring 90 percent mandatory price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts:	
May 5	On amendment eliminating peanuts from the list of basic commodities. (Rejected 193 to 215.)	Yea.
May 5	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 199 to 212.)	Yea.
May 5	On passage. (Passed 206 to 201.)	Nay.
	S. 1, the postal employees' pay and classification adjustment bill, providing an average 8.8 percent increase:	
May 9	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 118 to 275.)	Yea.
May 9	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 328 to 66.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 223, rule providing 7 hours of debate on, and the limiting of amendments to, H. R. 2535, admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union on an equal footing with the original States:	
May 9	On passage. (Passed 323 to 66.)	Yea.
	H. R. 2535, the Alaska-Hawaiian statehood bill:	
May 10	On motion to recommit. (Passed 218 to 170.)	Yea.
	H. R. 6042, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956:	
May 12	On amendment deleting language requiring approval of a congressional committee prior to disposal or transfer of work traditionally performed by civilian employees of Department of Defense. (Rejected 184 to 202.)	Yea.
May 12	On passage. (Passed 384 to 0.)	Yea.
	S. 727, adjusting the salaries of judges in the District of Columbia:	
May 23	On passage. (Passed 283 to 32.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 244, creating a select committee to investigate the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission in connection with operation of bridge and approaches near New Harmony, Ind.:	
May 25	On passage. (Passed 205 to 166.)	Nay.
	H. R. 2851, making agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress:	
May 25	On passage. (Passed 344 to 1.)	Yea.
	S. 727, adjusting the salaries of judges in the District of Columbia:	
May 26	On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House amendments providing for lower salary increases. (Passed 170 to 165.)	Yea.
	H. R. 5881, supplementing the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
May 26	On motion to recommit designed to limit the scope of the bill to the 17 western reclamation States. (Rejected 62 to 229.)	Nay.
	H. R. 3990, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska:	
June 1	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 79 to 278.)	Nay.
	S. 2061, increasing the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
June 7	On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed 410 to 1.)	Yea.
	H. R. 5923, authorizing the completion within the next 3 years of the construction of the Inter-American Highway:	
June 8	On passage. (Passed 353 to 13.)	Yea.
	H. R. 1, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements:	
June 14	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 347 to 54.)	Yea.
	H. R. 6227, providing for the control and regulation of bank holding companies:	
June 14	On passage. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 210, authorizing Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board:	
June 15	On passage. (Rejected 178 to 214.)	Nay.
	S. 67, adjusting the rates of basic compensation of Federal employees:	
June 20	On passage. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yea.
	H. Con. Res. 109, authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference:	
June 20	On passage. (Passed 337 to 31.)	Yea.
	H. R. 6295, amending the Travel Expense Act of 1949 to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses:	
June 20	On passage. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yea.
	H. R. 4663, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws:	
June 21	On passage. (Passed 231 to 153.)	Yea.
	H. R. 6040, amending certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and repealing obsolete provisions of the customs laws:	
June 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section making export value the primary basis for assessing duty. (Rejected 143 to 232.)	Not voting.[2]
	H. Con. Res. 149, expressing sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism:	
June 23	On passage. (Passed 367 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
	H. R. 6992, extending for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
June 27	On passage. (Passed 267 to 56.)	Not voting.[2]
	H. R. 6829, authorizing certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations:	
June 27	On passage. (Passed 316 to 2.)	Not voting.[1]
	H. R. 3005, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years and extending for 2 years the Doctors-Dentists Draft Act:	
June 28	On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 171 to 221.)	Not voting.[2]
June 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 389 to 5.)	Not voting.[1]
	S. 727, adjusting the salaries of the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia:	
June 29	On motion to recommit conference report and insist upon original House amendments. (Rejected 158 to 226.)	Yea.
	S. 2090, authorizing the mutual security program:	
June 30	On passage. (Passed 273 to 128.)	Yea.
	H. R. 3210, authorizing the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway:	
July 6	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 74 to 316.)	Yea.
	S. 2090, authorizing the mutual security program:	
July 7	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 262 to 120.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7224, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year 1956:	
July 11	On passage. (Passed 251 to 123.)	Yea.
	H. R. 6766, the public works appropriation bill, providing funds for rivers and harbors projects:	
July 13	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 316 to 92.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 295, providing for consideration of H. R. 7089, providing benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans:	
July 13	On passage. (Passed 376 to 24.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7225, amending the Social Security Act providing disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, reducing to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are paid to certain women, providing for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, extending coverage, and increasing social-security tax:	
July 18	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Passed 372 to 31.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7214, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956:	
July 20	On passage. (Passed 362 to 54.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7000, providing for strengthening of the Reserve Forces:	
July 25	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 315 to 78.)	Yea.
	H. R. 314, providing for 3 hours of debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill:	
July 26	On passage. (Passed 274 to 129.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill:	
July 27	On motion to recommit to incorporate bonding provisions of Dondero substitute (administration program) into bill. (Rejected 193 to 221.)	Yea.
July 27	On passage. (Rejected 123 to 292.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 317, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, removing natural gas producers from Federal regulation:	
July 28	On passage. (Passed 273 to 135.)	Yea.
	H. R. 6645, removing natural-gas producers from Federal regulation:	
July 28	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 203 to 210.)	Nay.
July 28	On passage. (Passed 209 to 203.)	Yea.
	S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955:	
July 29	On amendment removing public housing provisions and extending FHA mortgage insurance authority. (Passed 217 to 188.)	Yea.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Congressman JOE HOLT, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1955		
July 29	On passage. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 299, providing $35,000 for further expenses of the Select Committee on Small Business:	
Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 231 to 134.)	Nay.
	S. 2576, repealing the franchise of Capital Transit Co., operating in the District of Columbia:	
Aug. 1	On suspension of rules and passage. (Rejected 215 to 150; a ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension or rules.)	Not voting.[2]
	S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955:	
Aug. 2	On adoption of conference report providing for construction of 45,000 public housing units in 1 year. (Adopted 187 to 168.)	Paired against.
1956		
	H. R. 8780, relieving farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes:	
Jan. 31	On passage. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 352, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
Jan. 31	On adoption. (Adopted 385 to 1.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7993, authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels:	
Feb. 1	On passage. (Passed 359 to 3.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 396, disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber plant, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission:	
Feb. 8	On adoption. (Rejected 61 to 310.)	Not voting.[3]
	H. R. 8710, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947:	
Feb. 20	On passage. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 311, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project:	
Feb. 28	On adoption. (Adopted 354 to 26.)	Nay.
	H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project:	
Mar. 1	On passage. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Nay.
	H. R. 9739, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act:	
Mar. 7	On amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the General Services Administration. (Rejected 151 to 231.)	Nay.
	H. R. 9166, extending to Apr. 11, 1957, the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates:	
Mar. 13	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Adopted 366 to 4.)	Not voting.[1]
	H. R. 8320, extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for fiscal year 1956:	
Mar. 21	On motion to agree to the conference report (thus rejecting Senate amendments to extend these programs for 2 years). (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Paired against.
Mar. 21	On motion to concur in Senate amendments extending programs for 2 years. (Agreed to 406 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
	S. 1271, authorizing the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, U. S. Army, retired:	
Mar. 21	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 80 to 311.)	Not voting.[1]
Apr. 11	H. R. 12, the Agriculture Act of 1956, providing rigid 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to recommit conference report to conference with instructions to provide 82½ percent support for basic crops and 80 percent support for milk under a more liberal parity equivalent formula and to delete dual parity provisions, mandatory support for feed grains, and multiple price plans for wheat and rice. (Rejected 181 to 238.)	Yea.
Apr. 11	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 237 to 181.)	Nay.
	H. R. 9893, authorizing certain construction at military establishments:	
Apr. 12	On passage. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
	H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, providing rigid 90-percent support for basic crops:	
Apr. 18	On motion to pass bill notwithstanding the veto of the President. (Rejected 202 to 211.)	Nay.
	H. R. 7228, transferring responsibility for constructing and operating Jones Point, Va., bridge from Department of Interior to Department of Commerce:	
Apr. 23	On passage. (Passed 284 to 9)	Yea.
	H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill:	
Apr. 25	On amendment fixing at grade GS–16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Rejected 179 to 184.)	Yea.
	H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956:	
Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
	H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
May 3	On amendment to provide for an acreage reserve program for grazing lands. (Adopted 199 to 195)	Nay.
May 3	On amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price for upland cotton. (Rejected 186 to 208.)	Nay.
May 3	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to incorporate provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Rejected 184 to 211.)	Yea.
May 3	On passage. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Nay.
	H. R. 10986, the Defense Department Appropriation bill:	
May 10	On amendment to delete sec. 633, containing language requiring Appropriations Committee approval before Department of Defense could eliminate governmental activities in competition with private business. (Adopted 222 to 156.)	Yea.
May 10	On passage. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yea.
	H. R. 8901, providing for restoration of franchise to Capital Transit Co.:	
May 17	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 161 to 172.)	Paired.
	H. R. 11124, providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges:	
May 21	On passage. (Passed 238 to 52.)	Paired.
	H. R. 11319, appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1957:	
May 22	On amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Adopted 179 to 170)	Paired against.
	H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
May 23	On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 305 to 59.)	Paired.
	S. J. Res. 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming:	
May 24	On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 176 to 126.)	Paired against.
	H. R. 10285, the Farm Credit Act of 1956:	
May 31	On passage. (Passed 247 to 4.)	Paired.
	H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act:	
June 11	On passage. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Nay.
	H. R. 1840, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination:	
June 11	On passage. (Passed 394 to 3.)	Yea.
	H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
June 13	On motion to recommit conference report to committee. (Rejected 179 to 209.)	Nay.
	H. R. 4090, amending the Communications Act of 1934, to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators:	
June 13	On motion to recommit to committee for evaluation of reliability of device and other study. (Rejected 151 to 228.)	Yea.
	H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Act:	
June 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section providing Federal grants for construction of sewage plants. (Rejected 165 to 213.)	Yea.
June 13	On passage. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yea.
	S. 3295, empowering the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October:	
June 25	On passage. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yea.
	H. R. 7886, providing for presumptive disability at age 65, and increasing the monthly rates of non-service-connected veterans' pension awards:	
June 27	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 110 to 305.)	Yea.
June 27	On passage. (Passed 365 to 51.)	Yea.
	H. R. 9852, extending until June 30, 1958, provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
June 28	On motion to agree to the conference report expressing approval of Defense Department dispersal order. (Agreed to 200 to 197.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 554, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to the States for school construction:	
June 28	On adoption. (Adopted 327 to 67.)	Yea.
	H. R. 9801, authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal Zone at Balboa, C. Z.:	
July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 325 to 59.)	Paired.
	S. 2379, providing grants of $925,000 to train professional personnel in the field of commercial fishing:	
July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 256 to 133.)	Paired.
	H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to States for school construction:	
July 5	On amendment providing for payment of 1 percent of Federal income taxes to the State where collected for school construction purposes. (Rejected 168 to 250.)	Nay.
July 5	On amendment requiring States to comply with the Supreme Court antisegregation decisions. (Adopted 225 to 192.)	Yea.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Congressman JOE HOLT, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1956		
July 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate provisions allocating aid on basis of need and effort. (Rejected 158 to 262.)	Yea.
July 5	On passage. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	Nay.
	H. R. 11380, raising postal rates and establishing a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:	
July 6	On passage. (Passed 217 to 166.)	Yea.
	H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956:	
July 9	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to House managers to substitute Kalkaska, Mich., as a site for an air defense base, as recommended by the Air Force, instead of Manistee, Mich. (Rejected 29 to 343.)	Nay.
	H. R. 11967, reactivating National Stadium Commission and setting aside site:	
July 9	On passage. (Passed 288 to 80.)	Yea.
	H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957:	
July 11	On passage. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 584, waiving points of order against provisions of H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:	
July 12	On adoption. (Adopted 362 to 30.)	Yea.
	H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957:	
July 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authorization for Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac River. (Rejected 25 to 370.)	Nay.
	H. R. 12038, providing increases in veterans service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances:	
July 12	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 391 to 0.)	Yea.
	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations:	
July 18	On adoption. (Adopted 391 to 0.)	Yea.
	H. R. 11708, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act:	
July 18	On passage. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
July 19	On motion to lay on table a motion that further proceedings under a call of the House be dispensed with. (Rejected 104 to 290.)	Nay.
	H. R. 627, providing means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the United States jurisdiction:	
July 23	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 131 to 275.)	Nay.
July 23	On passage. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
	S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies:	
July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 246 to 145.)	Yea.
	H. R. 12227, providing a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool hair:	
July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 216 to 123.)	Nay.
	H. R. 7992, enacting into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Act:	
July 24	On the committee amendment giving Congress veto power over the elimination by the Defense Department of Government enterprises competing with private businesses. (Adopted 201 to 185.)	Nay.
	H. R. 12061, directing Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate plants to produce electric energy with atomic reactors:	
July 24	On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 195 to 199.)	Yea.
July 24	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 203 to 191.)	Yea.
	H. R. 11742, the Housing bill of 1956:	
July 25	On amendment to the rule making in order an amendment to strike out title V, authorizing public housing. (Rejected 92 to 299.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 638, citing Arthur Miller for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
July 25	On adoption. (Adopted 373 to 9.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 641, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 412, authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
July 26	On adoption. (Rejected 179 to 194.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 602, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
July 26	On adoption. (Adopted 184 to 178.)	Nay.
	H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
July 26	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 196 to 153.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 625, the rule providing for the consideration of S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 219 to 126.)	Nay.
	S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
July 27	On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 604, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7850, authorizing construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho:	
July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 173 to 168.)	Yea.

[1] Not voting. Would have voted "yea" if present.

[2] Not voting. Would have voted "nay" if present.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

First. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

1. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

2. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

3. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

4. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

Second. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

1. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which, when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

2. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

3. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

4. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

Third. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

Fourth. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

Fifth. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

Polish Courage Displayed at Poznan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, at Poznan the Polish people gave unmistakable evidence of a spirit that is willing to assert itself against oppression no matter how strong the adversary may be.

Time and again in the long history of Poland its people have shown a willingness to face death in its effort to be free. No people in all of Europe have fought more relentlessly nor shown greater courage in the cause of freedom. They have won the admiration of all free people.

When the people of Poznan cried out for bread, they were met by tanks that gave them death instead. This was the Communist answer to the cry of starvation. No matter how strong the language used by the present leaders in Moscow in denunciation of Stalin and his regime of cruelty, the fact remains that they are attached to and carry out the same kind of cruelty for which they have criticized him. All of this goes to show that at heart communism is the same no matter who the Soviet leaders are, and, that when the mask that covers their faces is removed we see the same hideous face of communism depicting the same cruelty that has always been the case.

The Communist government in Poland would like us to believe that their so-called workers' government in that country is all that its name implies. But the incident at Poznan clearly shows that it is in no true sense a workers' government. It is nothing other than a dictatorial government that is using the workers as slaves to strengthen the Moscow leadership and to strip Poland of its resources for the benefit of maintaining the Soviet rule in Russia. No matter how loud the claim of the Communist rulers that they have the situation well in hand, the true fact is that they do not have any such hold on the Polish people.

The Polish people are not the kind that will submit to despotic rule, and Soviet Russia will never be able to truthfully say that they have them in hand. Beneath the domination that now prevails in Poland there is a determination upon the part of the people to again enjoy freedom and liberty. That spirit will never die. Oppression will make it stronger and shorten the time when it will assert itself again. There is nothing more certain in the history of any nation than that love of freedom, both political and religious. In Poland it cannot be killed; it cannot be held down, nor for any great length of time be denied to its people. Freedom is the heart and soul of Poland.

This is no new element in the character of the people of that land. It has always been so, even in the darkest days of its history. There is no people of any nation who have fought longer, endured greater hardship, and surmounted more obstacles in the fight for freedom than Poland and its people. The spirit of Poland will never die.

It is my opinion, and I am strongly convinced, that the free nations of the world through the United Nations Organization should take a strong stand in support of Poland, reestablish its sovereignty as a free nation, and return to it the land that was so unjustly taken from it. It is time that acts of oppression such as were displayed at Poznan should be denounced in no uncertain terms and the rule of justice established.

Report to the People of the 15th Congressional District of Michigan by Congressman John D. Dingell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, now that the second session of the 84th Congress has become history, I am making a report to my people of the 15th Congressional District of Michigan on my stewardship and program in this 84th Congress.

I was first elected to Congress by a special election held December 13, 1955, to fill a vacancy left by the death of my father, Congressman John D. Dingell, who represented this district for 23 years from its founding until his death.

I have served my constituents on the Public Works Committee, where I helped frame the great Federal Highway Construction Act passed by this Congress. It was as a member of that committee that I joined other liberals in the successful fight for the so-called Bacon-Davis amendment which guarantees that the prevailing fair wage in the area be paid on any highway construction project in which Federal funds are used.

I am also a member of that committee's Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and have worked to help secure a number of important harbor improvement projects in the Great Lakes areas.

I maintain an office in the district, to serve my constituents, located at 7310 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, staffed by my able legislative assistant, Mr. Charles S. Brown, and Mrs. Theresa Tabin, my secretary in the district.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

SOCIAL SECURITY

I have worked on a number of legislative projects including the improvement of the social security program by reduction of age requirements for men and women, increase in benefit schedules, free hospitalization for all recipients of social security benefits, and by extending permanent disability benefits, at any age, to persons covered by social security. I supported the improvements in the social security amendments passed by this session of Congress, and authored a number of bills on these and other related subjects.

TAXATION

During this session I introduced bills which provided for tax relief for low-income groups and small business. Under my program these things could have been accomplished by a revision of existing laws to close tax loopholes and by increasing individual exemptions from $600 to $700. Tax relief of $80 to $120 per year to an average family of four with an income of $5,000 per year would have been possible, together with a balanced budget and reduction of the national debt.

I also introduced a bill to revise corporate tax rates to permit fairer treatment of small firms by revising taxes to benefit small business. This would be accomplished by raising taxes slightly on large firms on a graduated scale. This bill was aimed not only at helping small business, but also at preventing the mergers which are leading our country to economic rule by huge corporate giants.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Shortly after coming to Congress I introduced a series of bills aimed at guaranteeing to all Americans the full exercise of the rights given them by the Constitution and laws of the United States. The most comprehensive of these, H. R. 8989, outlawed discrimination in public facilities, transportation and housing, and provided for protection of citizens from violence and lynching. These bills would also protect citizens in their right to vote, create a Commission on Civil Rights, and establish a Civil Rights Division within the Department of Justice with broad enforcement powers.

I was among the sponsors of H. R. 627, the civil-rights bill of 1956, and was one of the leaders in the small group who filed the discharge petition that brought the matter to the floor of the House for debate and passage.

IMMIGRATION

I joined in the sponsorship of an omnibus immigration bill eliminating discriminatory immigration quotas, and removing inequities in the present McCarran-Walter Act. I also introduced bills to extend the Displaced Persons Act and permit 45,000 more displaced persons, including orphans, to enter this country. These bills also eliminate the mortgage imposed on quotas of immigrants and help persons in need of refuge to find haven in the United States.

EDUCATION AND HOUSING

I supported the Federal aid-to-education bill which would have provided for over $4 billion in Federal aid for construction of schools. I voted for the Federal housing bill which passed both the House and Senate and which will provide for liberalized home-improvement loans under title I and the continuation of the liberal FHA loan guaranty provisions for purchase and construction of homes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a part of my stewardship to the people of my district and my legislative action on their behalf during this 84th Congress.

It is my sincere hope that future sessions will see the completion of this program, and it is my prayer that my humble efforts will contribute to bring it about.

Views of Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, on Dixon-Yates Staff Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the Dixon-Yates staff report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the conclusion of the Dixon-Yates hearings conducted by a panel of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Senator O'MAHONEY instructed the subcommittee staff to prepare a draft report. We have reviewed the report and have approved its release.

In addition, there are certain aspects of the Dixon-Yates matter which I feel it is necessary to comment upon briefly.

This whole plan was crudely conceived in darkness for the base and ulterior motive of destroying the Tennessee Valley Authority. Then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Joseph M. Dodge, brought Adolphe H. Wenzell, vice president and director of the First Boston Corp., a private investment firm, into the Budget Bureau for the purpose of studying TVA in May 1953. He worked in secret. Employees of the Budget Bureau were warned not to mention Wenzell or reveal his presence in the Bureau or the task to which he was assigned.

In this case there exists substantial evidence indicating that Mr. Adams, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Strauss deliberately attempted to conceal the conflict of interest growing out of Mr. Wenzell's dual role in the Dixon-Yates deal—a conflict which the President's own Attorney General now labels so contrary to public policy as to render the agreement null and void.

WENZELL'S PLAN

At the conclusion of his initial period of work Mr. Wenzell produced a plan, one part of which was the Dixon-Yates proposal. This, too, was held in secret by the Bureau. A copy of the Wenzell plan was withheld from this committee, upon a plea of executive privilege by Rowland R. Hughes, then Director of the Bureau, despite the fact that it had been shown to Herbert Hoover and to Mr. Wenzell's superior in the private firm of the First Boston Corp., George D. Woods, who recognized in it a vast field for exploitation by his and similar firms.

Mr. Woods was frank to admit that he saw in it not only an opening wedge into the TVA, but also the opening of all public-power investments of the Federal Government for private exploitation. Mr. Woods testified before our committee:

"I was impelled to come down here (to see Dodge) because my business is the security business and I thought it would be fine if there were untold millions or billions of dollars of securities sold on the market at a profit to security dealers" (p. 512).

PLEAS OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Hughes was not alone among Government officials in pleading privilege and thus conspiring to conceal the facts. It will be recalled that our investigation was obstructed by numerous pleas of executive privilege. As a result we were impeded in developing the facts with respect to certain actions taken by White House representatives, by Mr. Hughes, and by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, and by the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, J. Sinclair Armstrong. I call attention to this aspect of our hearings at this time because there exists persuasive evidence that various high officials in the Eisenhower administration have violated the criminal code.

The Government's answer in the suit filed by Dixon-Yates in the Court of Claims now alleges that the contract was illegal because it violated the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Public Utility Holding Company Act. The Government has also taken the position that the contract was null and void and against public policy because of the conflict of interest growing out of the dual capacity in which Adolphe H. Wenzell served during the negotiations of the power contract.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

From the standpoint of legal propriety, the conduct of the Department of Justice is highly questionable. In October of 1954 Attorney General Brownell advised the Comptroller, Joseph Campbell, then an Atomic Energy Commissioner, that the Dixon-Yates contract was a legal one for the Commission to execute under the Atomic Energy Act.

In opposition to the State of Tennessee both before the SEC and in the United States court of appeals, the Department argued the Dixon-Yates contract was valid under both the Atomic Energy Act and the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Now the Department, in its present answer, takes precisely the opposite position.

The Justice Department's own answer to the Dixon-Yates suit in the United States Court of Claims also asserts:

"The alleged agreement set forth in the petition is in violation of the statutes and laws of the United States and is unlawful, null and void, and contrary to public policy, for the following reasons, among others:

"(A) * * * by reason of the activities of one Adolphe H. Wenzell. * * * The role played by Wenzell in consulting with and advising and representing the Government, the First Boston Corp., and plaintiff (Dixon-Yates) with respect to the same project and the same alleged agreement with contemplated benefits to the First Boston Corp., as well as to plaintiff, involved a conflict of interest so contrary to public policy as to render the alleged agreement null and void."

POSSIBLE CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS

The allegations in the Government's answer thus give a new meaning to the various pleas of executive privilege which were asserted by the Chairman of the SEC, by Mr. Strauss, and by Mr. Hughes. They also give new meaning to the refusal by Mr. Sherman Adams to testify when Chairman Armstrong disclosed that Mr. Adams had intervened in the hearings before the SEC at the very time Mr. Wenzell was scheduled to testify. And finally, the answer throws new light upon the concealment by Mr. Hughes of Mr. Wenzell's activities in the Bureau of the Budget and the elimination of his name from the published chronologies.

Indictments and convictions have been obtained under section 371 of title 18 of the United States Code, which provides:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The offense under this section of the criminal code is that of conspiring to defraud the United States Government or any agency thereof. The essential ingredient of the criminal offense is the failure of a Government official to discharge conscientiously the duties of his office or his failure to administer Federal law in an unbiased manner. The crime is one of exercising improper influence. I believe that even with the limited facts available to us it is clear that the Dixon-Yates deal involved actions on the part of public officials which should be presented to a grand jury without further delay.

Briefly, the facts are these:

Mr. Adams, assistant to the President, telephoned the Chairman of the SEC and asked him to postpone the appearance of Mr. Wenzell. The reason Mr. Adams gave, according to Mr. Armstrong, was that he wanted to consult counsel on whether the Government should object to Mr. Wenzell's being called as a witness. Mr. Adams also stated at the time he requested the postponement, according to Mr. Armstrong, that he had a problem in Congress that week—the problem was the appropriation for the TVA transmission line which was scheduled for a vote within a day or two after Wenzell was first scheduled to appear.

WHY?

Why did Mr. Adams want to consult counsel about Wenzell's scheduled appearance? What bearing did Mr. Wenzell's testimony have on the problem which Mr. Adams faced in the Congress that same week? Did Mr. Adams know at the time he telephoned Armstrong what Wenzell's testimony would disclose?

What reason could he possibly have had for intervening in the SEC proceeding if it was not to prevent the disclosure of Wenzell's role, which the administration's own lawyers now say rendered the contract illegal? And if this was his purpose, it is obvious that Mr. Adams—had he succeeded—would have concealed information concerning the legality of a contract to which the United States Government was a party.

If Mr. Adams had a simple and proper explanation for his actions and his conduct, why didn't he avail himself of the opportunity to advance it when the panel asked him to appear following Chairman Armstrong's testimony? Nor is it too late even now for Mr. Adams to explain his actions. But if he fails to give a satisfactory explanation, the Attorney General, it seems to me, has no alternative but to present the case to a grand jury.

POSITION OF INFLUENCE

Mr. Adams' position and influence is well known. He holds a position of great power and importance. The facts show that he first used his office to push through a deal which his own administration now says is against the public interest. He later used his high office to try to prevent public disclosure of wrongdoing, and he finally used his position as Assistant to the President to frustrate the efforts of a congressional committee to develop fully and completely all the facts surrounding this affair.

Mr. Adams was not alone in perpetrating and carrying out a deliberate plan of concealment to avoid public disclosure of wrongdoing in the Dixon-Yates case. Mr. Hughes, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, insisted when he first appeared before our panel that he knew nothing about the First Boston Corp.; he knew nothing about any question of conflict of interest having been raised; and knew nothing about Mr. Wenzell's activities in the Dixon-Yates affair.

Consider his testimony against the testimony of Mr. Dixon, Mr. Wenzell and Mr. James, Mr. Dixon's counsel. Before the hearings were concluded these individuals and others testified that the question of a conflict of interest was discussed with Mr.

Hughes as early as February 1954. Now Mr. Hughes is not a stupid man. How could he possibly forget, in a matter as important as Dixon-Yates, that on several occasions at least three different people discussed with him the seriousness of the situation created by Wenzell's dual position. Moreover, the two letters Hughes wrote Senator LISTER HILL were calculated to deceive. And his testimony that Wenzell was not a negotiator of the Dixon-Yates proposal is flatly contradicted not only by Wenzell and AEC but also by documents that it took us almost 6 months to get Hughes to produce from his own files.

Was President Eisenhower aware of these facts? Was he aware of Sherman Adams' activities and Mr. Hughes' concealment of Wenzell's name when the chronologies were issued by the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission? We must assume that the President knew nothing about these matters. Otherwise it is difficult to explain why the President would have stated at a press conference (July 6, 1955) that Mr. Wenzell's role in the Dixon-Yates affair was a proper one.

But now the facts are available to the President. Our investigation developed them for him. They have now been confirmed by his own Attorney General. But still there is no indication that the President will insist upon punishment for those who abused his trust and breached their oath of office. If he is still unconvinced that Mr. Adams betrayed him and the American people, the President can quickly resolve the question if he would direct his assistant to comply with our request that he testify under oath.

The American people are entitled to the full facts. The President is justified, under certain circumstances and the course of normal Government administration, particularly where the security of the Nation is involved, to protect the papers and persons of the executive branch from unwarranted disclosures. But it is well established—and the Teapot Dome case is an important precedent—that executive privilege cannot be sustained and should not be used for the purpose of concealing fraud, wrongdoing, or crime.

Résumé of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 84th Congress is now history. It has been a great personal experience for me to serve the people of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia and our country for 8 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. We have spent many hours each day in committee and on the House floor in preparing and debating legislation which comprises the record of the 84th Congress. We now await the decision of the American people. We each diligently tried to do what we believe is best for our district and country and our accomplishments, or what we failed to accomplish, await the judgment of our constituency. I feel we have presented a good record and that the 84th Congress will go down in history as one of the hardest working and one of the most productive.

This was a Congress that put the future of our Nation ahead of narrow partisan considerations. We enacted a vast program of health and medical research which means hope for the stricken and for those in need in the years to come. We enacted a great highway-building program that will clear the congested arteries of commerce. It was a Congress that looked to the future in our defense and foreign policies. We have set up the framework to safeguard the security and the interests of the American people. For the workers, we increased the minimum wage to $1 an hour. We approved the flood-insurance program to help those in the areas of natural disasters.

The Democratic Party, as usual, continued to work for the benefits of the majority of the people and stood behind legislation for the greatest good for the greatest number. We fought against special interests and supported a humanitarian program. It is my belief that the past Congress was one of the most fruitful in history because it has touched the lives of more American men and women than any Congress in the past. It was a responsible Congress which looked to the needs of all our people, as it is the people who count in the final showing.

The 84th Congress approved appropriations for more than $34 billion for the Department of Defense for the next year. Preservation of the defense strength of our country is the greatest guaranty of security for the free world against aggression. To help support our national-defense efforts and promote international security we have approved a total of $3.8 billion to be expended under provisions of the National Security Act. This program provides economic and military aid and assistance to our overseas allies which gives to us a better defense program and strengthens our network of defense throughout the world through the cooperation of other free nations.

For the farmers we passed the soil bank program. We enacted legislation which exempts farmers from paying the Federal excise tax on gasoline and other special fuels used on the farm. This legislation is expected to give farmers about $60 million in tax relief. In the vital field of soil conservation we extended for 2 years the authority of the Federal Government to regulate soil conservation payments to our farmers. One of the major items was the allocating of funds to establish research centers in various sections of the country for the purpose of studying the forestry program. We approved funds for the Extension Service, watershed protection and flood prevention, marketing service, Rural Electrification Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, and for other loan, credit, and assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

It is pleasing to know that Congress enacted legislation for public library service which is primarily designed to assist in bringing books and library services to rural families. It was disappointing to me, however, that this Congress did not pass legislation providing Federal assistance to our school systems. To me this is one of the most pressing problems confronting America today. There is a definite need in our country for better school buildings and other facilities to improve our overall school system. As our population continues to grow, more pupils are entering schools and many of our institutions are overcrowded and are in need of better schoolrooms. I am happy to report, however, that Congress passed a bill to increase the allocation for the school milk and lunch program. This is another important and significant measure approved by this Congress affecting the health and welfare of our schoolchildren.

In an effort to improve the veterans program of this grateful Nation the Congress this year granted an additional appropriation for all veterans benefits. Our Nation has the greatest veterans program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services, and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents. We failed, however, to increase pensions for disabled veterans and increase rates of compensation to veterans for service-connected disabilities.

The Water Pollution Control Act to assist States and local governments in the prevention and control of water pollution was a major step taken by this Congress. This will be helpful to the cities and communities in the construction of necessary draining works to prevent the discharge of undertreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into any waters.

I am also pleased to report that Congress amended the present narcotic laws to strengthen the penalty of unlawful acquisition, transportation, and sale of narcotics and provides a death penalty for the sale of heroin to juveniles.

One of the major accomplishments was the passage of a record $32.9 billion highway-construction program. This is the biggest roadbuilding program in our Nation's history and one long overdue.

Another major accomplishment during this Congress was approval of major innovations in the Social Security program giving additional benefits to the workers of this Nation. The two major changes in the Social Security Act would first allow physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; secondly, reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social security coverage in the past.

The record of the 84th Congress bespeaks a deep interest in the people who work for a living. This Congress has made a magnificent record, but much remains yet to be done for the welfare and prosperity of our farm families.

Additional strides must be taken in the area of housing for the lower income groups and the aged. Additional legislation is needed in the field of labor and management relations so that these two great segments of our society engaged in production might meet across the bargaining table on an equal basis. Additional legislation is needed in the field of

social security aid to our dependent children and the handicapped. Legislative progress must be made in the development of atomic energy for the conservation and development of our natural resources. In the field of foreign policy bolder steps must be taken to insure our own national security and peace in the world. It was sorely disappointing to me that the Senate did not act on the House-passed bill to increase pensions for disabled veterans and an increase in the rates of compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disabilities.

The record of the 84th Congress is something that I am proud to have had a part in since Congress more thoroughly reflects the thinking of the people than any other branch of the Government. There remain issues to be resolved before this country can be said to be directly at peace with prosperity. The rights of our individual citizens regardless of race, creed or national origin need additional legislative protection. Assistance is needed in our educational facilities. This assistance obviously must come from the Federal Government and should come in such a fashion that local control over such facilities may be retained.

Judge Harlan G. Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 27, 1956, I called the attention of my colleagues to the passing of Judge Harlan G. Palmer. His contribution to the community which I represent in Congress, the city of Los Angeles, entire State of California, and our country, earned him the respect and admiration of all citizens.

His contribution went far beyond that of being editor and publisher of the Citizen News. He personally participated actively, day and night, in making our community a better place to live. Most folks, when they talk of Hollywood, speak of movie stars and the entertainment world. Judge Palmer was a vital part of this entertainment world, but, even more important, he was vitally interested in good, honest government and a clean, healthy city. His strong moral fiber served as a guiding light for me on many occasions. We shall miss him.

Judge Palmer had been a resident of Los Angeles for the last 45 years, all of which were spent as a newspaper publisher and active participant in the civic life of the city.

A drafted candidate for district attorney to oppose underworld forces in 1936, he received 48½ percent of the total votes cast, although he had not actively sought election.

In 1929 Judge Palmer was appointed to the Los Angeles Board of Water and Power Commissioners. This was at a time when contracts were being drawn between the southland and the United States Government for water and power from Hoover Dam.

As the commission's delegate chosen to achieve peace with the citizens of Owens Valley, his services were hailed as invaluable.

He later served without compensation as special attorney for the city council in an investigation of the water and power department.

Again, without fee, he successfully represented Dr. John P. Buckley, foreman of the 1934 county grand jury, in a libel action brought because of a report the grand jury had prepared against the county purchasing department.

Hollywood's first practicing attorney, Judge Palmer was appointed in 1915 as one of the six judges of the Los Angeles justice court, forerunner of the present municipal court system.

He was born in Le Roy, Minn., March 19, 1885. He received his elementary and high school education in his hometown, later attending the University of Minnesota, College of Liberal Arts, and the University of Southern California, College of Law.

During his boyhood, he worked at such jobs as driving the neighbors' cows to pasture, pulling mustard out of oatfields, and picking up potatoes after the plow. Judge Palmer's father was a lumber and coal merchant, so his early duties also included shoveling coal out of flatcars and piling lumber.

At the age of 14, he went to work in a country general merchandise store in the afternoons after school, on Saturdays, and during the summer vacation months. During the summer, the hours were from 6:30 a. m. until 10 p. m. on the first 5 days of the week and on Saturday nights until the last farmer had left town some time between midnight and 1 a. m.

When he graduated from high school, he was offered the management of a similar store in another country town 8 miles distant.

But Mr. Palmer had decided to go to university and start a 6-year law course. He worked his way through 2 years of university by carrying a morning newspaper route, working as a janitor and printer's devil in a printshop, waiting table in a nearby restaurant, and working full time during summer vacations.

At the start of his third college year, he was given the opportunity to purchase his hometown newspaper, the Le Roy Independent. The idea appealed to him and he hoped to earn enough to insure the completion of his education at a later date.

Judge Palmer published the paper for a little better than 2 years when his father was ordered to California for his health. The young publisher sold his paper and went into his father's retail lumber and coal business. Three years later, in 1911, came the decision to sell out and join the rest of his family in California.

During his 5 years as a businessman in Le Roy, he was an unsuccessful candidate for representative, 1908, and State senator, 1910.

After his arrival in Pasadena, he looked for a business that he might operate while going to law school.

At the suggestion of Dr. E. O. Palmer, a second cousin in Hollywood, he bought a small weekly newspaper, the Hollywood Citizen. He took possession of the Citizen on April 1, 1911, starting operations with one printer and one half-time reporter.

During the fall of 1911, he entered law school at the University of Southern California, attending classes during the late afternoon and at night. In 1913, after a year and a half of schooling, Mr. Palmer passed the State bar examination and opened the first law office in Hollywood.

The next year he was named president of the Southern California Editorial Association, the forerunner of the present California Newspaper Publishers Association. He served as president of the SCEA for 3 years, later serving as legal adviser to the CNPA for many years.

In April of 1915, Mr. Palmer was married to Ethelyn Hunkins, formerly of Minneapolis. Later the same year, the supervisors appointed him judge of the Los Angeles justice court, the forerunner of the present municipal court. He was reelected to a 4-year term in 1918.

In the latter part of 1920, the Citizen started construction of a four-story concrete building at Hollywood Boulevard and Cosmo. This project, coupled with the conversion of the weekly to a daily, forced Judge Palmer to resign from the court and devote full time to his business.

The Citizen began daily publication on October 1, 1921. Ten years later the Citizen purchased the Hollywood News and became known as the Citizen News.

In recent years, Judge Palmer served as a director of the Audit Bureau of Circulations, representing as such all newspapers in the mountain and Pacific time zones.

At the time of his death, he also was serving as a director of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.

He had been a past president of the Hollywood Business Men's Club, and a member of the Hollywood Round Table, Hollywood Masonic Lodge, Los Angeles City Club, Los Angeles Municipal League, Los Angeles Advertising Club, Malibu Lake Mountain Club, Los Angeles and Hollywood athletic clubs, and Wilshire Country Club.

His membership in the Los Angeles City Club had been presented for life, in recognition of his management of the club's membership campaign in 1920, which increased membership from 300 to 2,000 and enabled the club to obtain its own permanent quarters.

Judge Palmer is survived by his wife, Ethelyn H.; his children, Harlan, Jr., Byron, Ralph, and Peggy; two brothers, Judge William J., and Orlando T., and his sister Zuma, and nine grandchildren.

The following first-person résumé of Judge Harlan G. Palmer's career was written in 1950 for inclusion in the Citizen-News' 50 years of progress edition, commemorating Hollywood's golden anniversary:

I wish that it might have been my privilege to have been connected with the entire history of the Hollywood Citizen and the

Hollywood Citizen-News. However, I am grateful for the nearly 40 years that I have been associated with these publications.

I came to California from Minnesota in January of 1911. For 5 years my college education had been interrupted. Two years had been spent as publisher, editor, reporter, and typesetter of a country weekly at Le Roy, Minn. Three years had been spent in the retail lumber and coal business that my father had been obliged to abandon when sickness overtook him and he moved from Le Roy to Pasadena.

I had started at the University of Minnesota with a course that offered a bachelor of arts degree and a bachelor of laws degree upon completion of 6 years of work, 3 in the liberal arts college and 3 in the law school.

I had returned several weeks late for the start of my third year at the university in 1905. I was grappling with the problems of making up for the lost period, working 3 hours a day in a restaurant, and playing basketball, when a letter came from my father with the information that the publisher of the hometown paper at Le Roy had come to him with the proposal that I buy the paper as he had bought a larger newspaper elsewhere.

COULD SWEEP FLOOR

The publisher had convinced my father that I could operate the business. I knew how to do janitor work in a printing office, having worked the previous year from 4 to 7 each morning in sweeping the floors, cleaning linotype machine space bands and melting linotype metal in a Minneapolis commercial printing plant located near the university.

I was not qualified as a writer. My father had promised me $10 for the first letter I should write home that was free from spelling and grammatical errors. Two years of higher education had not equipped me to earn the award which to both my father and me represented a magnificent sum. (At jobs I could get in those days my earnings were 15 cents an hour.)

But the country-editor idea appealed to me nonetheless. I thought that I might make enough from the undertaking in a couple of years to insure the comfortable completion of a college education at a later date.

The price of the newspaper business was $2,150. How the seller happened to put that extra $150 onto the price I know not, but $150 happened to be just the amount of money I had saved up from a summer's work on farms. My father went on my note at the bank for $2,000 and I was in business.

LEARNING TO SET TYPE

My first job was to learn how to set type since all the reading matter in the paper was handset. I had to learn fast in order to get out the paper. In a few weeks I was setting as much type as the best printers set. My one printer set the ads and took charge of the job printing. I learned quickly to feed the job press and the larger press which printed four pages of the newspaper at one time. My young brother, Bill (now a Los Angeles County Superior Court judge) helped in his spare time from high school.

I gathered most of the local news items by running to the two depots when I heard incoming passenger trains whistle for town. I seldom had to ask questions. I knew everyone in town and could safely guess where the most of them were going or whence they were coming. In those days, train travel was the means for going more than 10 miles. The horse and buggy or sleigh served on the short trips.

I seldom took time to write the local news. I just got up on the stool at the type case and put the story in type.

OUT OF DEBT

I got the paper paid for in 2 years and was considering its sale and my return to college with the money in my jeans when my father was stricken and the doctor ordered him to go to California. The only way we could get him to break from home ties, from all his friends, and from the source of a modest livelihood was for me to step into his shoes in the lumber and coal business.

There wasn't much activity in lumber during the winter months so I started the study of a correspondence course in law.

When my father was finally convinced that I might run a small business in California as well as one in the hometown, he consented to the sale of his partnership interest. Then I came to Pasadena and began a search for a business that I might run while going to law school.

Finding such a business began to look hopeless until one day I came across a classified advertisement for the sale of the Whittier newspaper. I believed that I could manage such a publication. The streetcar service was such, I figured, that I could commute daily between Whittier and the USC Law School, then located at First and Broadway. I was keen for buying it.

SEEKING ADVICE

My cautious father then said: "You have a second cousin over in Hollywood, Dr. E. O. Palmer, who has been in southern California for 10 years, is connected with a bank, and is posted on business matters. You better go over and ask him what he thinks of the Whittier proposition."

I went to over to see Dr. Palmer. In substance I got this comment: "You don't want Whittier. Hollywood has a bigger future than Whittier has. Though Whittier has a daily newspaper today and Hollywood has only a weekly newspaper, one of these days Hollywood will outdistance Whittier. I know that you can buy the Hollywood newspaper at a good price. The man who bought both the Hollywood Citizen and the Hollywood Sentinel 2 months ago is sick of his bargain and ready to sell."

Since Hollywood was closer to law school and the demands of a weekly less than the demands of a daily, and since I didn't know that Dr. Palmer had a mortgage on the Hollywood Citizen, I took his advice. For several years, I blamed myself for doing so but in the course of time reached the conclusion that the advice had been good.

ORIGIN IN 1900

I took possession of the consolidated Hollywood Citizen and Hollywood Sentinel on April 1, 1911. The name of the Sentinel had been dropped in the consolidation. The Citizen was exactly 6 years old on April 1, 1911. The Sentinel was 5 years older, having been started in January 1900.

Before the consolidation the Sentinel had been the champion of the Highland Avenue and end of Hollywood Boulevard. The Citizen had been the champion of the Cahuenga Boulevard end. Each of those two ends had considered itself a rival of the other.

It was my job to overlook the past and to see the two ends as growing together.

THE VISIONAIRES

During the first week of my activities as Hollywood publisher I attended a meeting of the Hollywood Board of Trade and heard a discussion of the future of the boulevard. One man was bold enough to predict that eventually there would be solid business between Highland and Cahuenga. Most of the members of the board differed from the optimist but they finally settled on the vision of solid business on the south side of the boulevard between Highland and Cahuenga and apartment houses on the north side. None visualized any development at Vine Street and Hollywood Boulevard, where the Jacob Sterns home was located at the center of a 4-acre orange grove.

At the time of my advent it seemed to me that there could be no finer residential area in the world than was Hollywood. As I think back upon those days, when beautiful homes and gardens lined the boulevard, I am convinced that this was a correct conclusion. To me, coming from a small country town, it was like a dream.

And the people were such wonderful folks. Most of the prominent residents had their businesses in downtown Los Angeles. When all got together in Hollywood they had the common interest of maintaining a beautiful residential district.

The post office was located alongside the Citizen office on Cahuenga just south of Hollywood Boulevard. The morning greetings as folks came for their mail were bright spots in the day.

I started off with one printer and one half-time reporter. That reporter was Mabelle Lewis, now Mrs. Ward Heinzman, who was recommended to me as the person who knew the history of every woman and man in Hollywood. She never let any local news escape her.

The front section of the building, in which we housed our printing equipment and editorial desk, was occupied by an ice-cream parlor.

It was that ice cream parlor that led to my falling into the notion that Ethelyn Hunkins was the most exciting girl I ever met. She migrated with her parents from Minneapolis a year after I had arrived. Her father, W. S. Hunkins, looked around for former Minnesotans and made my acquaintance. Thereafter, the daughter came to the ice-cream parlor as an excuse for looking me over. We've been married over 35 years now.

IN LAW SCHOOL

I started in law school in the fall of 1911. It was tough going. I went into school for an early morning class and then back for a late afternoon class, until pressure became so great I switched all classes to late afternoon and night.

In those early days there was no place in Hollywood where a person could buy a large envelope or a sheet of cardboard or blotting paper, except at the printing office. Every time a customer came in for such stationery supplies, a printer would have to leave his work, wash his hands, and deliver a few cents worth of merchandise while losing a greater amount of money in the value of the time taken from mechanical work.

I finally decided to take over the space occupied by the ice cream parlor, install some shelves for stocking the called for stationery supplies, employ a girl to keep the books and wait on newspaper and stationery trade. That's how the Citizen Stationery Store got its start.

LAWYER AND JUDGE

Our business grew slowly. I passed the State bar examination, after a year and a half of schooling and 6 weeks of special cramming of the bar examination, and opened the first law office to be opened in Hollywood. There were a number of successful lawyers living in Hollywood at the time but their offices were in downtown Los Angeles.

We moved to two storerooms on Hollywood Boulevard, between Wilcox and Cahuenga, used part of the space for a law office, part for the stationery store, rented a part for real-estate offices, and used the entire basement for printing machinery and stock.

I had always figured that when I got a law business established I would sell the newspaper. But in October of 1915, the supervisors made two appointments to fill two offices additional to four in the court then designated as the justice court of Los Angeles Township and since consolidated with the Los Angeles police courts into the Los Angeles municipal court. One of the appointments was given to me.

I had an idea, regardless of qualifications, I wouldn't have gotten the appointment if

most of the weekly newspapers of the county had not favored it. I was then president of the Southern California Editorial Association, the forerunner of the present California Newspaper Publishers Association. I decided that being both a lawyer and a newspaperman wasn't a bad idea.

GETTING IN DEEP

In the latter part of 1920 we undertook the construction at 6362 Hollywood Boulevard, of a four-story concrete store, office, and newspaper building. The site had formerly been occupied by the freight yard and depot of the Pacific Electric. The undertaking took on what to us were large responsibilities. I decided that I owed it to the folks who had loaned the money for the building to resign from the court job and devote my full time to business. I had enjoyed the 5 years on the bench but circumstances forced me to quit. The complimentary title of "Judge" clung long after the resignation.

WEEKLY TO DAILY

On October 1, 1921, 10½ years after acquiring the weekly newspaper, we changed it into the Hollywood Daily Citizen. We didn't care to do it at that time for the new building wasn't completed and we had no press capable of handling the daily. But the owner of the Los Angeles Express was setting up an extensive plant for the publication beginning November 1 of a new daily, the Hollywood News, to be circulated free with the Express.

For a period we had to have our presswork done at Glendale or in Santa Monica. The experience was trying when the type forms broke or other accidents happened en route to the presses. We got our own press installed in the new building before the building was completed but when the basement was covered. We slid the type forms into the basement on skids. Only the most loyal group of subscribers and advertisers in the world could have carried us over those trying days.

Ten years to a day after the start of the Hollywood News, November 1, 1931, in the midst of the depression, it was purchased by the Hollywood Citizen on an installment plan that held over our heads for a period of 12 years the possibility of our losing everything.

STILL ALIVE

When we launched the Daily Citizen, experienced newspapermen predicted failure. When we purchased the Hollywood News experienced newspapermen again predicted failure. They are still predicting failure. They say that a daily newspaper cannot be successfully operated in one section of a big city. They are doubtless right.

We merely believe that our job is to keep on going so long as conditions permit and be very thankful for the years we have been permitted to stay in business and to make our contributions to the cause of good journalism and to the cause of better government in the city, the county, and the State.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Will Bring a New Era of Prosperity to Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the dream of a deep-draft route from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean is on the way to becoming a reality. We in Michigan and the surrounding area have fought for many long years to achieve access to world ports.

It is most fitting and proper that the Great Lakes region, wherein is concentrated a tremendous agricultural and industrial capacity, have available the transportation necessary to market this vast production.

With the coming of the St. Lawrence Seaway, access to all of the seaports of the world by deep-draft ships is made possible. This low-cost water transportation route will be an important factor in the ability to sell and meet competition in the markets of the world where the products of the Great Lakes area must compete with those produced by low-priced labor in other countries.

The Middle West will be freed from the necessity of paying tribute to higher cost forms of transportation to the seaboard. It will be free from the pilferage so common to the seaboard ports, and their high-cost shipping services.

What is said of all of the Great Lakes ports is true, with added emphasis, of Detroit. The products of Detroit and the surrounding area are of a general type peculiarly adapted to water transportation. A larger proportion of its products are of the heavy, large bulk type which offers greater opportunity for savings in transportation costs by cutting down on the number of times it must be handled. Direct loading at shipside and unloading at destination from vessels which are able to make the entire trip and complete delivery will save Detroit's industries millions of dollars annually.

The Motor City is already the greatest single producing center for foreign cargo in the United States. It thus stands to gain much by use of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Not only will its competitive position be improved by savings in transportation costs but there is a possibility of further savings in lower costs for much of its raw materials, particularly those which must come from overseas.

Much of Detroit's industry is based on utilization of metals. The coming of the seaway has fortunately coincided with an increasing dependence upon foreign sources for iron ore and other minerals. The availability of the seaway will for all time put a stopper to the long-dreaded possibility of the steel industry having to migrate to the seacoast. This might have taken place as the direct-shipping high quality iron ores of the Mesabi range became depleted. The industry must, of course, have easy access and at lowest possible transportation cost, to the raw materials required. It would have had little choice other than to move closer to these sources. In that event, Detroit would have been placed in a precarious position. Its metal fabricating industries would then have to choose between following steel's example or paying the penalty of greatly increased transportation costs. Fortunately, that possibility will be banished forever when the St. Lawrence Seaway is open to traffic in 1959.

With the steady increase in recent years of availability of overseas shipping services via the present shallow canals, such commerce in Detroit has increased rapidly. In the last 10 years services offered by small freighters carrying general cargo have increased from a handful of vessels and a few hundred tons to nearly 400 vessel arrivals and over 97,000 tons of cargo in 1955. The Port Commission of Detroit estimates that this will increase tenfold in the first 10 years following the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Already in anticipation of increased offerings for shipping by water, several railroads and trucking firms are preparing special export-import rates to lake ports. Since Detroit is one of the best situated cities in the world so far as inland transport is concerned, the breadth and extent of such services will expand as time goes on.

The business of freight forwarders, freight agents, and other accessories of commerce such as banking, marine insurance, warehousing, and the other manifold servants of foreign commerce will all expand considerably—thereby creating thousands of new jobs.

All of these elements add up to more efficient handling of a trade that is certain to expand rapidly when the seaway makes it all possible.

Detroit, over the years, has built up a well-deserved reputation for fast and efficient cargo handling. When this is made available to shippers from overseas seeking to reach the rich midwestern market, it will be a great inducement to increased commerce which cannot help but have an almost immediate impact on the volume of general cargoes.

It is fortunate that Detroit has an alert port commission which is aware of the potential value of general cargo. I am sure that when the seaway is completed, Detroit will have available the public, general cargo facilities that will be needed. It is my understanding that $15 million is being spent to provide 10 new berths especially designed to handle up to 1 million tons of foreign commerce. So it now appears that Detroit will be prepared.

Another result of the seaway in Detroit undoubtedly will be the establishment of new industries. They will choose this location because their market is here, and their raw materials will reach them cheaply and directly by water. They will be able to take advantage of all the varied mercantile services available in such a highly industrialized area as Detroit.

An authority in the field envisages Detroit as an important export center for packaged food products moving to northern Europe from as far south as St. Louis and as far west as Davenport, Iowa. It is quite likely that cargoes like furniture from Grand Rapids, chemicals from Midland and Wyandotte and farm machinery from Battle Creek will reach points all over the world through the Detroit gateway and the St. Lawrence.

It has been estimated that 1 million tons of foreign trade through Detroit's port would save shippers up to $1½ million per year in transportation costs over present methods of shipping.

Present users of the shallow St. Lawrence canals are planning to expand their use of the route when the 27-foot channel becomes available.

All in all, it is a pleasant prospect to contemplate. Detroit and its citizens will be the major beneficiaries of the St. Lawrence Seaway. It will require some positive effort, some salesmanship, imagination, and cooperation to make the most of it. Fortunately, those are characteristics that have long been identified with Detroit and its dynamic producers of the past two generations. The new generation now has an opportunity to extend its horizons. If the past is any indication, then Detroit is all set for a new and even more prosperous era, spurred by the coming of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Record of Activity of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a review of the activities of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, reveals the major role the committee played in the legislative history of this Congress. Statistics tell only a part of the story.

Of the 14,104 bills introduced in the House in this Congress, 5,327 were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Thus, the Judiciary Committee handled 37.6 percent of the legislative work of the House of Representatives.

Major legislation of vital importance to the Nation kept public interest focused on the activities of the committee. Among such bills can be found those dealing with the vital issues of civil rights, the strengthening of antitrust laws, the "good faith" bills, the automotive dealers franchise bills, the Federal Construction Contract Act, and the subject of conflict between State and Federal jurisdiction.

In addition to the 5 standing subcommittees, there were appointed 3 special subcommittees of particular note and significance.

The Special Subcommittee on Presidential Inability, composed of Messrs. CELLER, chairman, WALTER, LANE, KEATING, and MCCULLOCH, made an exhaustive study of this subject which is deeply vested with public interest. In addition to the hearings, the subcommittee compiled a document setting forth the views of eminent political scientists and constitutional lawyers on how best to meet the situation that arises when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. In addition thereto, it prepared legislation, not as yet introduced, setting forth the alternate suggestions with a view toward direct action in the forthcoming session.

The Special Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure Act, composed of Messrs. ASHMORE, chairman, BOYLE, and CURTIS of Massachusetts, directed its attention to legislation concerning administrative procedure to insure that the integrity of the Administrative Procedure Act is preserved. The subcommittee completed a study concerning deviations from the Administrative Procedure Act. This study not only indicates instances where Congress has provided express exemptions from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act but also indicates instances in which Congress has provided procedural requirments which are more strict than those prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act.

The special subcommittee also assisted in the formulation of committee views on House Resolution 462, a resolution to create a new standing Committee on Administrative Procedure in the House of Representatives. In conjuction with its study of House Resolution 462, the special subcommittee analyzed and examined the work of the Judiciary Committee regarding administrative procedure, the staff study on the Hoover Commission Report on Legal Services and Procedure and the testimony before the Rules Committee concerning House Resolution 462. The fruits of this analysis and examination were made available to the full committee and served as a basis for the statement made by the Judiciary Committee and forwarded to the Rules Committee which was considering House Resolution 462.

The Committee on the Judiciary received complaints concerning a controversy between the press of the Boston area and the Shubert theatrical organization. It was alleged that actions taken by the Shubert organization in the course of a controversy with the Boston Post had infringed upon freedom of the press. A special subcommittee was appointed to hear and weigh the testimony of those who were involved in the controversy. Representative FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky, was designated as the chairman of the subcommittee, and Representatives HAROLD D. DONOHUE and LAURENCE CURTIS, both of Massachusetts, were appointed to serve as members. The subcommittee held public hearings on the matter in Washington on May 2, 1956, and June 27, 1956.

A series of editorials in the Boston Post had charged that the Shubert theatrical interests in Boston had infringed upon the freedom of the press when, after a dispute concerning the paper's reviews of its plays, the Shubert organization reduced its theatrical advertising in the Post and refused to accord the paper's drama critic the customary complimentary press tickets to its productions. On the other hand, the Shubert organization contended that it acted with sound business justification, and that there was no issue of civil liberties or other public policy involved.

The subcommittee found that there was no actual violation of the constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of the press, since those provisions insure that the press of the United States will be free to function without being limited by laws imposing previous restraints on publications. The subcommittee, therefore, found that there did not appear to be any immediate need for Federal legislation. However, the subcommittee concluded that the economic pressure exerted by the Shubert organization in this instance was subject to criticism in that it must be recognized that such measures do in fact operate to limit freedom of expression as it has traditionally been recognized in the United States, and it is this freedom of expression which is protected from governmental interference by the guaranties of the Constitution.

In addition to the bulk of public legislation, it is altogether proper that we direct attention to the number of private bills which were referred to this committee: 3,827 immigration bills and 1,059 claims bills, giving a total of 4,886 private bills. It must be emphasized that each one of these bills, though private, requires active consideration in the same measure as do many of the public bills before the committee. Reports are requested, hearings are held, subcommittee deliberation and full committee deliberation are in order for each individual bill, and the appropriate report is filed.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust held exhaustive hearings in a serious effort to preserve the principles of free enterprise. The record of that subcommittee is one of which the committee is justly proud. The subcommittee sat mornings and afternoons in 88 hearings, issuing 6 special reports, and coming to grips with the grave economic problems attendant upon monopolies and monopolistic practices.

The members of the committee and the staff worked together in maximum effort to discharge their responsibilities on the issues that were placed before them, and the record speaks for itself.

To understand more clearly the nature of the activities of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have set forth below the activities of each subcommittee so that the total picture may emerge in greater detail and with sharper clarity:

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Subcommittee No. 1 had 150 public bills referred to it for action.

A group of nine bills dealing with the transportation and distribution of obscene matter was considered by the subcommittee. H. R. 3333, amending chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the provisions barring the transportation of indecent and obscene matter, was reported by the subcommittee. A similar Senate bill, S. 600, was amended on the floor of the House by the substitution of the provisions of H. R. 3333. That bill, approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, became Public Law 95.

The subcommittee drafted and recommended for enactment a bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of wives and children of Spanish sheepherders who had been admitted under laws authorizing the admission of such sheepherders. The legislation also provided

for a more humane approach to the waiver of minor criminal offenses of persons seeking to enter the United States. The subcommittee incorporated into the bill an amendment to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, so as to apply that law to refugees in Spain. An additional committee amendment was designed to correct a situation involving a number of aliens admitted under the displaced persons laws, who misrepresented their nationality or country of birth to avoid forced repatriation to Communist-controlled countries. The bill, H. R. 6888, was reported to the House, and was passed on July 30, 1955. The Senate passed an amended version of the bill on July 27, 1956, the last day of the Congress, but the Senate amendments were not agreed to by the House prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee considered a group of three bills proposing an amendment to section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, dealing with confidence game swindles. The committee reported S. 997 which added an amendment making it unlawful to transport or induce a person to travel in interstate commerce in the execution or concealment of a confidence game swindle. The bill passed the House and became Public Law 661.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the subcommittee considered legislation proposing a commission to study problems in the field of international legal practice and procedures. After hearings at which representatives of the American Bar Association, and the Departments of State and Justice appeared, the subcommittee recommended an amended bill to provide for a commission to conduct a study of problems in the field of international legal procedure. A clean bill was introduced embodying the recommendations of the subcommittee, and that bill, H. R. 7500, was reported to the House by the committee. During the second session a rule was granted, and the bill passed the House. The bill was not acted upon by the Senate prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee held hearings on H. R. 3 and related bills dealing with the question of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws. The subcommittee recommended an amendment to H. R. 3 so as to limit the application of the bill to the field of sedition and subversion, and to provide for concurrent jurisdiction in the States and the Federal Government in that field. The committee reported to the House H. R. 3 amended to provide for such concurrent jurisdiction.

The bill H. R. 2854, increasing the penalties for seditious conspiracy and advocating the overthrow of the Government, was considered by the subcommittee, reported by the full committee, and passed the House, and then the Senate with an amendment during first session of the Congress. This bill was the subject of a conference during the second session at which the Senate receded from its amendment and the bill was subsequently approved as Public Law No. 212.

The subcommittee held hearings on problems being encountered in connection with the issuance of United States passports. After the consideration of the matters brought out in the hearings, the subcommittee favorably recommended to the full committee, H. R. 11582, a bill providing for passport review procedure. That bill was pending at that point at the conclusion of the Congress.

HOUSE BILLS, 84TH CONGRESS

Public bills referred to Subcommittee No. 1	150
Public bills subject to hearings	11
Public bills reported to the full committee	16
Public bills reported to the House	5
House bills pending in the Senate at close of session	1
House bills which became public laws	1

SENATE BILLS, 84TH CONGRESS

Public bills referred to Subcommittee No. 1	4
Public bills subject to hearings	3
Public bills reported to the full committee	2
Public bills reported to the House	1
Senate bills pending in the House at closing	0
Senate bills which became public law	2
Total referred	154
Total hearings held	14
Total reports to full committee	18
Total bills reported to House	6
Total bills pending in Senate	1
Total bills enacted into law	3

84TH CONGRESS, PRIVATE BILLS (IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY) SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Introduced in the House	3,243
Enacted into law	780
Passed by the House	67
Tabled by the committee	653
Senate bills referred	584
Enacted into law	420
Tabled by the committee	93
Total House and Senate bills	3,827
Total enacted into law	1,200
Total tabled by the committee	746

In addition, congressional action on individual cases referred to Congress by the Attorney General under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, is set forth as follows:

Disposition of immigration cases referred to Congress under the provisions of sec. 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended:	
Cases pending at the beginning of the 84th Congress	474
Cases referred during the 84th Congress	407
Cases approved on H. Con. Res. 99, 110, 168, 202, and 221	766
Not approved	54
Withdrawn by the Attorney General	3
Held for further information	10
Left in process at close of 84th Congress	48
Disposition of immigration cases referred to Congress under the provisions of sec. 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended:	
Cases pending at the beginning of the 84th Congress	41
Cases referred during the 84th Congress	4,767
Cases approved on H. Con. Res. 98, 167, 201, 228, and 246	2,740
Not approved	330
Withdrawn by the Attorney General	24
Held for further information	31
Left in process at close of 84th Congress	1,683
Disposition of suspension cases referred to the Congress under sec. 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917 and under sec. 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952:	
Cases pending at the beginning of the 84th Congress	537
Cases referred to the Congress	2,029
Total	2,566
Cases approved—S. Con. Res. 66, 67, 68, 76, and 84	1,550
Withdrawn by the Attorney General	12
Not approved	39
Total	1,601
Cases pending at close of 84th Congress	965
Disposition of six suspension cases referred to the Congress under sec. 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, in 1952: Cases approved—S. J. Res. 163	6

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS, AS ASSIGNED SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

During the Congress the subcommittee conducted hearings on 28 different days. These covered public as well as private claims measures.

The subcommittee processed S. 1077, a bill to recompense, to a limited extent, those persons or their survivors, who suffered death, personal injury, and property losses as a result of the explosions and fires at Texas City, Tex., in April 1947. This was a manmade disaster. Loaded bags of ammonium nitrate fertilizer forming a part of the United States Government's program of foreign aid to war-ravaged and famine-stricken foreign countries, blew up in the holds of 2 ships at Texas City killing over 750 persons and injuring 3,500 more. This bill became Public Law 378.

The subcommittee also processed H. R. 7763, a bill to expedite the final settlement of Japanese-American evacuation claims which resulted from the Army's evacuation of over 100,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast areas during World War II. The claims program has been underway for some 7 years, and implementing legislation was needed to help expedite the final settlement of the remaining claims—Public Law 673.

Another bill on general legislation which the subcommittee favorably considered was S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure for the letting of lump-sum Federal construction contracts. After extensive hearings, the subcommittee adopted this Senate bill which, among other things, was designed to conform Government procedures for the letting of construction contracts to those followed by many prudent organizations in private industry, and at the same time eliminate unfair trade practices of bid shopping.

One of the public claims bills favorably considered by the subcommittee and enacted into law was H. R. 3996. This amends the Military Personnel Claims Act, as amended, to remove the $2,500 limitation upon the amount to be recovered under the act, and to permit settlement of claims not in excess of $6,500. Several House-passed private bills and one Senate-passed private bill are being

settled administratively under the amended act—Public Law 571.

The following tabulation indicates the workload of this subcommittee in connection with claims against the Government:

Referred to subcommittee:		
Private, House bills	874	
Private, House resolutions	29	
Private, Senate bills	63	
		966
Public, House bills	87	
Public, House joint resolution	1	
Public, Senate bills	5	
		93
Total		1,059
Reported to committee:		
Private, House bills	345	
Private, House resolutions	22	
Private, Senate bills	38	
		405
Public, House bills, favorably	23	
Public, Senate bills, favorably	5	
		28
Total		433
Private, House bills, adversely	93	
Private, Senate bills, adversely	2	
		95
Public, House bills, adversely	5	
Public, Senate bills, adversely	1	
		6
Total		101
Reported to House:		
Private, House bills	348	
Private, House resolutions	22	
Private, Senate bills	44	
		414
Public, House bills	23	
Public, Senate bills	5	
		28
Total		442
Passed House:		
Private, House bills	345	
Private, House resolutions [1]	22	
Private, Senate bills	44	
		411
Public, House bills	22	
Public, Senate bills	5	
		27
Total		438
Pending in Senate:		
Private, House bills	132	
Public, House bills	6	
Total		138
Public laws enacted		19
Private laws enacted		228
Bills vetoed		9

[1] Sent 22 private claims bills of the House to the Court of Claims.

Two House-passed private claims bills sent to the Court of Claims by Senate resolutions.

Two public claims bills of the House settled administratively.

Three House-passed private claims bills were settled administratively under provisions of Public Law 365, 84th Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

In addition to claim bills, subcommittee No. 2 handled a significant number of pieces of general legislation. These included civil-rights bills, bills to establish a public-defender system in the courts of the United States, legislation concerning criminal laws, mileage allowance increases for marshals and their deputies, proposed modification of the Lucas Act—Public Law 657, 79th Congress—and bills to provide a remedy for persons who are slandered or libeled by Members of Congress.

H. R. 627, a civil-rights bill, passed by the House of Representatives on July 23, 1956. It included four main provisions, namely, establishment of a Civil Rights Commission in the executive branch of the Government, creation of an additional Assistant Attorney General to be in charge of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, provision for a civil remedy at the behest of the Attorney General to protect the right to vote and provision for a civil remedy on the part of the Attorney General to further strengthen civil rights presently protected by the Ku Klux Act—title 42, United States Code, section 1985.

H. R. 627 was one of 70 civil-rights bills considered by subcommittee No. 2. Others called for the following: The creation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission to eliminate racial and other discriminations in employment, prohibitions on racial and other discriminations in federally supported housing, federally supported education, interstate transportation and the armed services, prohibitions on interference with the right to vote, and other rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and antilynching, antipoll tax, and antipeonage legislation.

H. R. 5205, a bill extending the protection of certain Federal criminal laws to all members of the armed services also passed the House. It would provide Federal protection against murder, manslaughter, or assault for all servicemen if the attack took place while they were engaged in their duties.

Hearings were held on other legislation concerning the criminal law. H. R. 4930 and H. R. 4932 would provide the defendant with an appeal against an excessive criminal sentence. H. R. 799 and H. R. 5264 would establish the making of contradictory statements under oath as perjury.

Subcommittee No. 2 held hearings on two bills, H. R. 271 and H. R. 641 to provide remedies for persons who are slandered or libeled by Members of Congress. These two bills were adversely reported by the subcommittee and tabled by the full committee.

In view of the fact that all other Federal employees received increases in mileage allowances for travel on official business Subcommittee No. 2 favorably reported H. R. 4019, to authorize an identical mileage-allowance increase for United States marshals and their deputies. This bill passed the House on July 25, 1955, and an identical bill, S. 2592—Public Law 228—was then substituted for it.

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee No. 2	100
Number of bills on which hearings were held	88
Number of public bills reported to full committee	85
Number of reports filed	3
Number of public bills passed House	3
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	2
Number of Senate bills disposed of	1
Number of public bills approved by the President	1

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS—GENERAL STATEMENT

The principal functions of this subcommittee may be divided into three categories. It processes all general legislation bills which are assigned to it. It also handles all legislation relating to patent, trademark, and copyright laws. In addition, it has jurisdiction over the revision of the laws, classifying all laws of general and permanent nature as they are enacted into the 50 titles which comprise the United States Code.

During the 84th Congress the workload of Subcommittee No. 3 was substantially increased. In all, 98 bills were referred for processing. Forty-two bills were handled in the 1st session of the 84th Congress and are not discussed here since they are covered in an earlier report made at the end of the first session of this Congress. During the second session of the Congress the subcommittee processed 56 bills. These included such subjects as foreign agents registration, habeas corpus, juvenile delinquency, national Federal probation, wire fraud, aircraft destruction, and interstate compacts. A statement (a) pointing up the functions of the subcommittee and (b) highlighting some of the legislation processed by it follows.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Because of the many recent aircraft disasters the subcommittee favorably reported H. R. 319—provisions of H. R. 319 were incorporated into S. 2972, which became public law—making it a Federal offense to place explosive substances near or on an aircraft with the intent of disabling or destroying it or any of its passengers. The subcommittee also broadened the scope of this legislation to include buses and other motor vehicles which move in interstate commerce—see S. 2972. In connection with aircraft, H. R. 6805 was also processed, prohibiting in any lawsuit the use of evidence obtained in military aircraft investigations conducted in the interest of air safety.

Due to the expansion in oil and gas leases, timber sales, and other activities of Indian tribal organizations, it became necessary to consider Federal legislation setting up safeguards to protect the funds and other assets belonging to the tribes which are entrusted to the care of its officers and Federal officials. H. R. 6403 was favorably considered by the subcommittee, and, if enacted, will make theft or embezzlement of tribal funds a Federal criminal offense.

The subcommittee also took action on legislation making the Federal Probation Act applicable to the District of Columbia. The courts in the District of Columbia have a greater number of criminal prosecutions, perhaps, than any

other district since, by statute, the Attorney General is authorized to institute prosecutions in a wider range of criminal cases here in the District of Columbia. Favorable consideration was given to H. R. 6870 to bring the district courts in line with other Federal districts so that Federal probation laws will now be uniform throughout all district courts.

A bill designed to close the loophole in the present law which presently limits the prosecution of frauds involving wire, radio, and television communication to interstate transactions was approved by the subcommittee so as to cover foreign communications as well—S. 3674. Persons seeking to circumvent Federal criminal statutes have been crossing the border into Canada and Mexico and by telephone and other communications promoting false stock and other transactions to victims residing in the United States.

The subcommittee took favorable action on several pieces of legislation which grant the consent of Congress to the States concerned, to enter into interstate compacts. Some of these bills were H. R. 6623, permitting States sharing common boundaries with New York or New Jersey to enter into mutual military aid compacts, H. R. 9314, an education compact between Wisconsin and Illinois, H. R. 11911, boundary relocation compact between Arizona and California, House Joint Resolution 511, New York-New Jersey air pollution compact, H. R. 5274, extending the crime control compact to Federal territories and possessions.

In addition to the above legislation, the subcommittee held hearings on a number of other important bills on which further action is contemplated. For example, as a result of hearings, the subcommittee decided to publish a committee document on H. R. 6682, affecting the judicial review of administrative decisions, so that the views of interested persons and agencies may be obtained during the recess and further action taken next Congress. Similarly, hearings were held on juvenile delinquency—House Joint Resolution 290, House Joint Resolution 291—and it is hoped that during the recess the staff of the subcommittee will secure data on several of the problems brought out at the hearings so that it may be studied next Congress. Hearings were also held on the disclosure provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, H. R. 4105. This bill, among other things, would require foreign agents outside of the United States who use the United States mails to circulate propaganda to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Hearings on this legislation will be printed, and made available for public comment and suggestions.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

The subcommittee during this Congress devoted a substantial portion of its time to patents, trademark, and copyright bills. Probably the most significant piece of legislation regarding patents and trademarks was H. R. 7416, which would increase certain patent and trademark fees in the Patent Office. This bill was favorably reported to the House. The subcommittee also favorably considered H. R. 10263, a bill adjusting certain fees in the Copyright Office. Another bill of substantial interest was H. R. 6716, which would provide a remedy against the Government for its infringement of any work protected under the copyright laws.

Legislation which was also favorably considered by the subcommittee and which affects the copyright field generally was contained in H. R. 781, setting up a 3-year statute of limitations on civil copyright infringement actions.

The foregoing bills, together with such items as patent extension, H. R. 2128, inventive contribution awards, H. R. 2383, and several other bills which passed the House during the first session of this Congress, gave the subcommittee two very active work years on patent, trademark, and copyright legislation.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

The principal work of the subcommittee with regard to the revision of the laws is the classification and codification of the public laws, as they are enacted, to the appropriate titles of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. In this Congress over 1,050 bills will have been enacted into public law, and because of the great number of these bills which were passed during the last days of the present session the subcommittee staff will be required to continue diligently in this work of classifying and codifying the laws for the next several months. The laws of the second session of the 84th Congress, which has just ended, will be set forth in supplement IV of the United States Code and supplement V of the District of Columbia Code.

The law-revision functions of the subcommittee include the enactment into positive law of the various titles of the code. To date, 13 of the 50 titles have been so enacted, with several titles now in various stages of process for enactment into law.

With regard to this particular phase of the work, there was cleared for Presidential approval H. R. 7049, a bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code entitled "Armed Forces" and title 32 entitled "National Guard." The enactment of this bill is one of the major legislative accomplishments of this Congress. In size alone it ranks as one of the largest bills ever enacted by the Congress. It consists of more than 800 pages of type printed in smaller than normal style. If printed in the usual style it would undoubtedly comprise more than 2,000 pages. The work on this legislation commenced more than 8 years ago and in the intervening period there has been almost daily liaison between the officials in the Pentagon and the subcommittee staff with regard to the thousands of provisions in the bill. With its enactment it will be possible to find and keep up to date all of the laws relating to the Armed Forces and the National Guard. These laws are now scattered throughout some 70 volumes of the Statutes at Large and although they were classified into titles 10, Army; 32, National Guard; 34, Navy, of the United States Code, until enactment of this bill those titles were only prima facie evidence of the law. Now titles 10 and 32 constitute the law per se and may be amended directly. This legislation will be of tremendous help to the Congress, the Armed Forces, and the public generally.

In this Congress, H. R. 6991—title 21, United States Code—relating to food, drugs, and cosmetics, received the favorable action of the House of Representatives. In addition work has progressed steadily on the preparation of material for the enactment into law of Title 16: Conservation and Reclamation; Title 20: Education; Title 23: Highways; Title 43: Public Lands. During the last several months the subcommittee staff has been working with the members of the Solicitor's Office of the Post Office Department with a view to enacting Title 39: The Postal Service, into law. Preliminary work on this proposed legislation is now completed and a bill will be ready for introduction and early committee action when the Congress convenes next January.

In addition, progress has been made on a draft of a bill to enact Title 44: Public Printing, into law.

The subcommittee has continued its daily function of cooperating with other committees of the Congress with respect to the form and style of legislation affecting titles of the code. In addition, it has received and considered numerous suggestions from individuals, Government agencies, and other organizations relating to corrections, discrepancies, and conflicts in our Federal laws. Work to correct or reconcile these conflicts or discrepancies in the law is now, as always, being processed.

Subcommittee No. 3, Committee on the Judiciary

Bills referred	98
Bills on which hearings were held	59
Bills favorably reported to full committee	31
Bills reported to House	30
Bills tabled by full committee upon recommendation of subcommittee	22
Bills passed House	28
Senate bills processed	4
Bills pending in Senate	10
Bills which became public law	19

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPT AND REORGANIZATION

During the 84th Congress, subcommittee No. 4 handled a number of bills designed to improve the administration of the bankruptcy laws. H. R. 4791, Public Law 518, and H. R. 5047, Public Law 543, provide for increases in the compensation of referees and trustees in bankruptcy. These laws are designed to make highly qualified persons available as referees and trustees. Another bill, H. R. 9956, improves the administration of the bankruptcy laws by eliminating the mailing of certain unnecessary notices, while H. R. 6247 contributes to this goal by conforming the handling of unclaimed bankruptcy funds with the handling of other unclaimed funds of district courts. H. R. 256 clarifies the definition of "salesmen" in the priorities section of the bankruptcy law. H. R. 6681 is designed to improve chapter XI

proceedings dealing with arrangements. This bill, making a number of technical changes in chapter XI, passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate.

General legislation assigned to subcommittee No. 4 has covered a wide range of subjects. For example, there have been before the subcommittee more than 175 bills concerning holidays, celebrations, and the incorporation of patriotic and other organizations. In addition, action has been taken on general legislation dealing with the temporary extension of various emergency statutes, the amendment of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and the amendment of criminal laws.

The emergency legislation on which Subcommittee No. 4 took action concerns title II of the First War Powers Act and certain legislation dealing with benefits to employees for mishaps arising out of war-risk hazards. Public Law 58 extends to July 30, 1957, the effectiveness of title II of the First War Powers Act, which authorizes expeditious contracting procedures essential to national defense. Public Law 125 and Public Law 679 provide temporary extensions to July 1, 1957, of legislation providing benefits for civilian employees who are injured, killed, or captured by enemy or other military action. These war-risk hazard and detention benefits are essential for effective recruitment of qualified civilian personnel for overseas employment, such as construction work on military installations. Permanent legislation in this area was proposed to Congress by the Department of Defense late in the session. However, hearings on these proposals indicated that significant changes in the temporary legislation were contemplated which would require extensive and careful consideration by Congress. For this reason the temporary legislation was extended for 1 year.

Subcommittee No. 4 handled a number of bills amending the Federal criminal laws. The laws concerning threats against the President were amended by S. 734, Public Law 53, to include the President-elect and Vice President in their protections. Subsequently, the House passed H. R. 6621 to include the Vice President-elect in this protection but the Senate took no action on the bill.

H. R. 9257, Public Law 544, and H. R. 10111 close gaps in the criminal laws. H. R. 9257 provides punishment for one who instigates, aids, or assists an attempted but unsuccessful escape from custody. Prior to this, the law appeared to punish assistance in conjunction with completed escapes only. H. R. 10111 added federally insured, State-chartered savings and loan associations to the protections of the Federal criminal law as to theft, embezzlement, misapplication of funds, and the making of false entries.

Another bill amendatory of the Federal criminal law, H. R. 6997, would have added certain Federal officers and employees of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, the General Services Administration and Federal probation officers to the protection of Federal criminal laws relating to murder, manslaughter, and assault. This bill passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate.

Subcommittee No. 4 handled legislation in other areas also. H. R. 10417, Public Law 619, amended the Federal Register Act to provide emergency means for the publication of Executive proclamations, regulations, orders, and other documents in the event of attack or threatened attack on the United States. H. R. 9038, Public Law 808, expressly provided for the inclusion of Puerto Rico in section 1332 of title 28 of the United States Code conferring jurisdiction on district courts in diversity of citizenship cases.

Number of public bills referred to Subcommittee No. 4	269
Number of bills on which hearings were held	76
Number of bills reported to full committee	67
Number of reports filed	38
Number of public bills passed House	37
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	6
Number of Senate bills disposed of	5
Number of public bills approved by the President	31

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

This subcommittee exercised jurisdiction over a variety of subjects with special jurisdiction over antitrust matters. Under its general jurisdiction, the subcommittee considered legislation relating to the Federal judicial system in which it covered subject matters as additional circuit and district judges, additional places for holding terms of court and the creation of new judicial districts and divisions. It also considered such matters as an increase in the fees paid to witnesses in the Federal courts, the increase in court costs, and the fees charged by United States commissioners and marshals. The subcommittee devoted considerable time to the problem of wiretapping. It also considered legislation raising congressional and judicial salaries and creating a Commission on Government Security. It provided for a system of annuities for the widows and dependent children of Federal judges.

During the 84th Congress this subcommittee had referred to it 119 bills—114 being House measures, 5 being Senate measures. Hearings were conducted on 59 of these bills. It disposed of 96 bills of which 25 were favorably reported to the House of Representatives by the full committee. There were 15 bills enacted into public law during the 84th Congress. One of the first bills enacted into law in the 84th Congress was the bill which increased congressional and judicial salaries. Another was the bill which created a Commission on Security which is making a study of the Government's security program both within the Government itself and in private industry insofar as national defense and security are concerned.

Another bill enacted into law established a system whereby annuities will be paid to the widows and dependent children of the Federal judges.

Several bills relating to the Federal judicial system were also enacted into law.

The committee reported to the House a bill which would have created 21 new judgeships throughout the United States. However, the bill was never considered by the House since no rule was granted. The committee also had enacted into law a bill which established the United States Customs Court as a constitutional court and also a bill improving judicial administration in the court of claims.

The subcommittee made an extensive study and conducted lengthy hearings on the problem of wiretapping. Several bills were considered in this connection and the subcommittee finally reported a bill to the full committee. Under that bill, all wiretapping would have been made a Federal crime except when it was done in accordance with the law of the State wherein the act was committed. It would also ban the use of any evidence obtained by wiretapping except where wiretapping was done under a court order which cases were limited to specific Federal crimes dealing with national security. Possession of wiretap equipment under certain circumstances was also made a crime. The full committee considered the bill at several executive sessions but the bill was not reported at the close of the Congress.

ANTITRUST JURISDICTION—LEGISLATIVE

Early in the first session the subcommittee recommended two antitrust bills which were enacted into law. Public Law 135, approved July 7, 1955, increased the maximum fine for violations of the antitrust laws from $5,000 to $50,000. Public Law 137, approved July 7, 1955, provides a uniform statute of limitations in private antitrust litigation, and in addition, creates a right of action on the part of the Government to recover actual damages for injuries to the business or property of the United States by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws.

Another bill referred to the subcommittee, S. 3879, which is designed to supplement the antitrust laws, passed the Senate as amended by the House, on July 26, 1956. This bill permits a franchised automobile dealer to bring suit for damages against an automobile manufacturer in United States district courts for the failure of the manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling or not renewing the dealer's franchise. S. 3879 creates a cause of action where none previously existed in that, irrespective of contractual provisions, it grants a right of review in Federal courts of disputes between automobile manufacturers and franchised dealers which involves the good faith of the parties. The bill, in its definition of good faith, imposes the duty on each party to act in a fair and equitable manner so as to guarantee the one party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion, or intimidation, from the other party.

Three additional antitrust bills referred to the subcommittee and passed by the House were pending in the Senate when Congress adjourned. Two of these bills, H. R. 5948 and H. R. 9424, resulted from the subcommittee's investigations into the administration and enforcement of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950. The other bill, H. R.

1840, originated in complaints from representatives of the small business community that the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, has frustrated effective enforcement of the antiprice discrimination law.

The purpose of H. R. 5948 was to prevent bank mergers achieved by acquisition of assets where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, covers bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions, but fails to include bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisition.

H. R. 5948 was passed by the House on February 6, 1956, to close the gap in existing law and to provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same authority to move against asset acquisitions by banks as against stock acquisitions.

H. R. 9424, which passed the House on April 16, 1956, had two purposes. First, to require parties to a proposed merger, where the combined capital structure would exceed $10 million, to notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission—or the appropriate commission or board vested with jurisdiction—90 days in advance of the transaction. Together with the notice, the bill would require the acquiring corporation to supply specifically enumerated information which would enable the Attorney General and the appropriate agency to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. Willful failure to submit the notification or to furnish the required information would be subject to a civil penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000.

Second, H. R. 9424 amended the Clayton Act to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a district court order preventing and restraining a merger in violation of Clayton Act section 7 pending issuance of a complaint and the completion of the Commission's administrative proceeding. This amendment would give the Federal Trade Commission, which has concurrent jurisdiction with the Attorney General to enforce the merger provisions of the Clayton Act, authority similar to that now possessed by the Attorney General to seek a preliminary court injunction to restrain the consummation of a merger pending adjudication of its legality.

H. R. 1840 was one of an important series of bills referred to the subcommittee which were designed to modify the doctrine enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231 (1951)), which holds that, regardless of the injurious effect on competition, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for a seller to show that his differential was made in good faith to meet the lawful and equally low price of a competitor. The bill, which was passed by the House on June 11, 1956, would have amended section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act to provide that unless the effect of a discrimination prohibited by section 2 of the act may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or his furnishing of services or facilities was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

INVESTIGATIONS

Early in the first session, the Antitrust Subcommittee conducted a comprehensive series of hearings on current antitrust problems. In these hearings the subcommittee studied antitrust enforcement procedures, recommendations made by the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, the forces involved in the merger movement, the growing problem of an industry concentration, and secured up-to-date information from political, industrial, agricultural, and labor leaders concerning the antitrust problems posed by new forces active in the economy. Hearings on these matters extended over a period of 17 days in the course of which 55 Government officials and leaders in the fields of business, labor, farming, and banking, testified.

These exploratory hearings resulted in the introduction of bills to amend the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950 subsequently considered by the House, and the publication by the subcommittee of two reports on the current merger movement. The subcommittee's interim report, Corporate and Bank Mergers, issued September 27, 1955, criticized the record of the agencies responsible for enforcing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950, and reported on the forces active in the extensive merger movement now underway as well as the adequacy of existing legislation. The subcommittee's staff report, The Merger Movement in the Textile Industry, outlined the background of recent mergers in the textile industry and analyzed the scope of the current merger developments and their effect on the pattern of concentration in the textile industry. The report gave a comprehensive description of certain specific mergers, primarily those involving Textron American and Burlington Industries.

Extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee during the first session on the problems involved in the Government's use of businessmen serving in key positions without compensation as well as the problems involved in the organization and operation of advisory groups by Government officials to assist in the exercise of administrative responsibilities. Hearings on WOC's and Government advisory groups extended over a period of 15 days during which the subcommittee received testimony from officials of the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Civil Service Commission, and WOC's who formerly had served in the Government.

Testimony adduced at the hearings by the subcommittee in its investigation of WOC's and Government advisory groups demonstrated the dangers presented by conflicts of interest inherent in the use of WOC's by the Government. The subcommittee's investigation underscored the necessity for careful safeguards to avoid any possibility of Government abdication of policymaking functions to private bodies in its use of advisory groups. From the standpoint of public policy enunciated in the antitrust laws, and the enforcement of those laws, there is not only the danger that Government advisory groups may abuse the circumstances which cause the Government to authorize meetings of competitors and use such meetings to commence or continue overt antitrust violations, but there is also the effect the activities of such private groups may have on governmental decisions bearing directly on industrial growth and concentration of economic power.

Two interim reports resulted from the subcommittee's investigation. The first report, The Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, issued December 12, 1955, analyzed the operations and activities of a special advisory group created to assist the Secretary of Commerce. The second report, WOC's and Government Advisory Groups, issued April 24, 1956, examined in detail the practices and procedures of the Department of Commerce in the Business and Defense Services Administration, and its predecessor, the National Production Authority, in the utilization of WOC's and advisory groups.

In its investigation of conflicts of interest involving full-time Government employees, the subcommittee conducted a 3-day hearing concerning the activities of Peter A. Strobel, Commissioner of Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration. As a result of disclosures uncovered in this investigation, Mr. Strobel resigned his position. The subcommittee's report, Activities of Peter A. Strobel, published April 10, 1956, affords a detailed analysis of the relationship maintained by Mr. Strobel between his private business and his Government position.

During the second session of this Congress, the Antitrust Subcommittee has undertaken an investigation of monopoly problems in industries which are under the jurisdiction of Federal regulatory agencies. Testimony has been received by the subcommittee from representatives of the Department of Justice, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Communications Commission, various academic specialists in the antitrust problems of regulated industries, and representatives from the airlines and television industries, in a series of hearings extending over 31 days.

This investigation was instituted as a result of frequent allegations made in the subcommittee's hearings on current antitrust problems, that, in operation Federal regulatory bodies have become unduly industry-oriented and have sanctioned excessive economic concentration in the industries subject to their jurisdiction. The purpose of the investigation is to determine the validity of the contention that public regulation has

gradually shifted the objectives of regulation from protecting the public interest to protecting the monopolies created under its aegis.

The subcommittee's extensive hearings on the airline industry included testimony from the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, representatives from the Air Transport Association, a trade association representing the scheduled air carriers and representatives from nonscheduled air carriers. The subcommittee also heard the Director of the International Air Transport Association testify with respect to air carrier problems and operations in the foreign field as well as the Comptroller General, representatives from Pan American World Airways, North American Airlines, and National Airlines, travel agents, and representatives from travel agents' associations.

One result of the committee's study of the airlines industry has been the reinstitution by the Civil Aeronautics Board of its general passenger-fare investigation. The value of this investigation is demonstrated by the fact that in the 17-year history of the Civil Aeronautics Board there had never been a formal investigation of the level of airline rates and as a consequence, the CAB has lacked the detailed information necessary to determine whether or not the level of fares presently being charged the traveling public is unjust or unreasonable. At various times the CAB has started three such general passenger-fare investigations but for one reason or another none has ever been completed, notwithstanding the fact that passenger revenues account for 80 percent of all revenues received by domestic airlines.

Another result of the subcommittee's airlines investigation has been an overall reexaminaiton by the CAB of the procedures promulgated by the certificated airlines' trade association with respect to the qualifications and eligibility of travel agents to serve the airlines. The subcommittee found that although Congress has given no authority in the Civil Aeronautics Act to the CAB to regulate directly the travel agent business, in practice the airlines' trade association has inaugurated what amounts to a licensing system to control travel agents' business operations. At the present time, CAB is conducting an investigation into the necessity for, and propriety of, the trade association's activities in this area.

In its investigation of the television-broadcasting industry, the subcommittee has interrogated the Federal Communications Commission with respect to network pratcices which contribute to alleged domination by the networks in the production, distribution, and exhibition of television programs. The subcommittee has been particularly interested in the antitrust problems inherent in the network "must buy" arrangements with their affiliates which require advertisers to contract for a minimum television network of some 50 stations, as well as the so-called option time practice which secures to the network first refusal of the best hours of the affiliate's broadcasting day. In addition, the subcommittee has studied in detail the activities of the Federal Communicaitons Commission in discharging its responsibilities to maintain a competitive nationwide television industry in an effort to determine the extent to which the Commission pays heed to the antitrust considerations implicit in the Federal Communications Act.

As part of its investigation of regulated industries, a staff report has been issued which analyzes the general antitrust implications in railroad mergers and consolidations. This report, Merger in a Regulated Industry, is a case study of the proposed merger of the Louisville & Nashville and the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroads. This case study provides a brief survey of the concepts, standards, issues, and arguments which are involved in considering a merger transaction in the railroad industry, which, upon approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission is exempted from the antitrust laws.

In conjunction with its investigation of regulated industries, and the Government agencies responsible for activities in the industries, the chairman introduced H. R. 9762 which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act to have Congress declare it is the policy of the United States to maintain, to the maximum extent practicable, in regulated industries the American system of free competitive enterprise embodied in the antitrust laws. The purpose of this bill is to establish a guide for regulatory bodies and the courts in the exercise of their powers over business and arrangements involving exemption from the antitrust laws. In the investigation representatives from Government regulatory agencies and from the industries concerned have testified with respect to this bill.

During the recess the Antitrust Subcommittee will continue its study of the airlines and television industries. Representatives from certificated air carriers and varioius segments of the television broadcasting industry will be heard.

DOCUMENTS ISSUED BY ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE

Hearings: Current Antitrust Problems, serial No. 3, 3 volumes; WOC's and Government Advisory Groups, serial No. 12, 3 volumes; Conflict of Interest (Full-Time Government Employees), serial No. 14, 1 volume.

Reports: Merger Movement in the Textile Industry, August 1, 1955, staff report to Subcommittee No. 5; Interim Report of the Antitrust Subcommittee—Subcommittee No. 5—on the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, December 12, 1955; Interim Report of the Antitrust Subcommittee—Subcommittee No. 5—on Corporate and Bank Mergers, December 27, 1955; Merger in a Regulated Industry, March 30, 1956—a case study of proposed merger of Louisville & Nashville and Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroads; Activities of Peter A. Strobel, April 10, 1956; WOC's and Government Advisory Groups, April 24, 1956.

Subcommittee No. 5

Number of bills referred to the subcommittee:	
House bills	114
Senate bills	5
Total	119
Number of bills on which hearings were held:	
House bills	58
Senate bill	1
Total	59
Number of bills reported to the full committee:	
House bills	91
Senate bills	5
Total	93
Number of bills reported to the House:	
House bills	20
Senate bills	5
Total	25
Number of bills pending in the Senate	9
Number of bills enacted into public law	15

Summary of the Social Security Act as It Relates to Self-Employed Professional Groups Newly Covered by the Social Security Amendments of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert herewith the following summary of the Social Security Act as it relates to self-employed professional groups newly covered by the Social Security Amendments of 1956, which was prepared by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means:

SUMMARY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AS IT RELATES TO SELF-EMPLOYED PROFESSIONAL GROUPS NEWLY COVERED BY THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956

I. INTRODUCTION

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1956 (Public Law 880, 84th Cong.) extended coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System to substantially all self-employed professional groups except physicians. This part of the new law, which was merely one of many provisions contained in the 1956 Amendments which broaden and strengthen the Social Security program will be of particular interest to the estimated 200,000 additional people who during the course of a year are self-employed in the practice of certain professions. Because of the interest which this group will have in this part of the 1956 Amendments, this summary of what the Social Security coverage will mean to these individuals was prepared for use of Members of the Committee in responding to inquiries. It is not intended to be a complete statement in detail on this part of the new law, nor is it intended to cover other provisions of the law. It is merely a condensed outline applicable to these additional self-employed professional groups. Detailed information,

of course, may be obtained by the individuals newly covered from the Social Security Administration or from the nearest local Social Security office.

II. SELF-EMPLOYED PROFESSIONAL GROUPS NEWLY COVERED

The 1956 Amendments extended coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program to the following additional groups of self-employed persons:

1. Lawyers.
2. Dentists.
3. Doctors of Osteopathy.
4. Chiropractors.
5. Veterinarians.
6. Naturopaths.
7. Optometrists.

III. BENEFITS UNDER OASI

Benefits under OASI are related to prior earnings of an individual in covered, employment or self-employment and fall within four broad categories: (a) Retirement benefits; (b) Survivors' benefits; (c) Disability benefits; and (d) Lump-sum death benefits. A more detailed description of these benefits follows:

(a) Retirement benefits—These are payable to male workers at age 65, if they retire, and to female workers at age 62 (on an optional basis) or age 65, if they retire; to male workers between the ages of 65 and 72 when they do retire, and to female workers between ages 62 (or 65) and 72, when they do retire; and to male and female workers at age 72, whether they retire or not.

The following examples indicate the nature of these benefits: To one fully insured, whose annual average earnings have not been less than $4,200, there would be payable each month (at present benefit rates): $108.50, if the insured beneficiary is unmarried; $162.80, if he is married and his wife has reached the age of 65 (or slightly less if she is 62 and decides to accept a smaller benefit than she would receive at 65); and $200 if, in addition he has children still under 18 years of age. These retirement benefits continue until the death of the insured.

(b) Survivors' benefits—These are payable, on the death of the insured, to a person's widow (or dependent widower) or surviving parents or surviving children. As an example, where the person has enjoyed average annual earnings of not less than $4,200, a widow aged 62, or a widow of whatever age with a child under 18 years of age, would receive (at present rates) $81.40 a month; and a surviving family might be entitled to payments of as much as $200 a month.

(c) Disability benefits—The new law provides for the payment of benefits to fully insured, and otherwise qualified, workers at or after age 50 where the worker becomes permanently and totally disabled. This benefit is the same in amount, generally, as the retirement benefit, but is payable only to the disabled worker himself.

(d) Lump-sum death benefits—These are payable to the widow of an insured person or, generally, to anyone else who may pay the burial expenses. They are designed to defray such expenses, are limited to a maximum of $255, and are payable in addition to the survivor benefits.

IV. THE TAXES PAYABLE UNDER OASI

Self-employed individuals covered under OASI will pay annually, beginning with the taxable year 1956, 3⅜ percent of their first $4,200 net income from covered self-employment. This rate increases to 4⅛ percent in 1960, 4⅞ percent in 1965, 5⅝ percent in 1970, and 6⅜ percent in 1975 and after. There is no social security tax on any net income above the first $4,200.

The OASI taxes are payable at the same time as Federal income taxes are payable.

V. PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

Periods of total disability of at least 6 months' duration are excluded in determining insured status and average monthly wage, provided the disabled worker has at least 6 quarters of coverage in the 13 quarters ending with the quarter in which he is disabled and at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which he is disabled. Determinations of disability are, in general, made by State agencies in charge of vocational rehabilitation.

VI. EMPLOYMENT PERMITTED WITHOUT SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS (CALLED "WORK CLAUSE" OR "RETIREMENT TEST")

A beneficiary can earn $1,200 in a year in any employment, covered or noncovered, without loss of benefits. For each $80 (or fraction thereof) of covered or noncovered earnings in excess of $1,200, 1 month's benefits are lost. In no case, however, are benefits withheld for any month in which the beneficiary's remuneration as an employee was $80 or less and in which he rendered no substantial services in self-employment. For beneficiaries age 72 or over, there is no limitation. If a retired worker's benefit is suspended, so also are the benefits of his dependents.

VII. EFFECTIVE DATES AND MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR COVERAGE OF ELDERLY WORKERS AMONG NEWLY COVERED GROUPS

The coverage provided by the new law for self-employed professional groups will be effective beginning with taxable years after 1955 (the calendar year 1956 will, therefore, be the first effective year).

There is a special provision in the new law establishing special "starting and closing" dates intended primarily for persons first covered in 1956, whereby an individual who becomes entitled or dies in 1957, and has at least 6 "quarters of coverage" after 1955 can have a starting date of December 31, 1955, and a closing date of July 1, 1957, if that will yield a larger benefit amount.

Stated more simply, at least 6 quarters of coverage is required before those newly covered elderly persons now reaching retirement age, or who have reached retirement age, can qualify for benefits.

VIII. WHAT NEWLY COVERED PROFESSIONAL PERSONS SHOULD DO NOW

All newly covered professional persons should contact their nearest social security field office for details about the new law, to obtain full information and the steps which they should take. Included among these will be making an application for a social security card and account number. It is important for these persons to remember that the foregoing is merely a nontechnical, informative summary of some of the highlights of what the new law will mean to them.

New England Flood-Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 84th Congress comes to an end, I would like to just take a moment of your time to express my personal thanks and the deep appreciation of my constituents in the Second Massachusetts District, and of all of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the New England region, for your generosity during this session in appropriating large and urgently needed sums for New England flood-control projects.

My distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman PHILBIN, who was the chairman of the Massachusetts congressional delegation committee on flood prevention and relief, has already summarized for your information just what these flood-control appropriations will do for our region in preventing disasters that we experienced last August and October.

Those disasters underscored the need for adequate flood-control projects in New England, and this body responded to our urgent requests by appropriating the largest sum ever approved in any one calendar year for our region, $34,436,000, in President Eisenhower's urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and $22 million for flood-control and water resource development programs in the public works appropriation bill. Also, congressional authorization of the Littleville Dam in western Massachusetts will speed up the planning and construction of this vital project. We also appreciate your adoption of a flood-insurance program backed by the Federal Government.

Republicans in the Senate Supported Eisenhower Program 90 Percent of the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an analysis which I am having prepared of yea-and-nay votes in the Senate in the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS IN THE SENATE SUPPORTED EISENHOWER PROGRAM 90 PERCENT OF THE TIME

An analysis which I have had made of rollcall votes in the Senate during the whole of the 84th Congress provides irrefutable evidence that Republicans gave far greater support to President Eisenhower's legislative program than did the Democrats.

The findings confirm statistically what I have stated before, that much more of the President's program would have been enacted and more of it in accordance with his recommendations had Republicans been in control of the Congress and its committees.

This is what the analysis shows:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

In the two sessions of the Congress there were 203 Senate rollcall votes involving the President's program out of the total of 230 votes recorded.

Fifty percent or more of the Republicans in the Senate supported President Eisenhower 183 out of 203 times, for a support record of 90 percent.

Fifty percent or more of Senate Republicans voted against the President only 21 out of 203 times, for an opposition score of 10 percent. (NOTE.—Support and nonsupport exceed 203 because in 1956 Republicans were split 50–50 on 1 vote.)

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD

Fifty percent or more of Senate Democrats supported the President's program only 108 out of 203 times, a support record of 53 percent.

Fifty percent or more of Senate Democrats voted against President Eisenhower's program 100 out of 203 times, for an opposition score of 49 percent. (NOTE.—Support and nonsupport totaled 91 in 1955, and 117 in 1956 because 5 votes were evenly split 50–50.)

The above calculations are based on actual votes cast, exclusive of absences, nonvoting pairs, and announced but nonvoting positions.

The vote calculations for each session are as follows:

Out of 94 Senate record votes in the first session and 136 votes in the second session of the 84th Congress, 89 and 114, respectively, involved President Eisenhower's program.

Fifty percent or more of the Senate Republicans supported President Eisenhower 83 out of 89 times for a support record of 93 percent in 1955, and 100 out of 114 times in 1956 for a support record of 87 percent. Over half of the Senate Republicans supported the Republican program during both sessions of the 84th Congress 90 percent of the time.

Fifty percent or more of the Senate Republicans voted against the administration only 6 out of 89 times in 1955 and only 15 out of 114 times in 1956, for an opposition score of 10 percent for the 2 years. (NOTE.—Support and nonsupport total 115 in 1956 because on 1 vote the Republicans were split 50–50.)

Fifty percent or more Senate Democrats voted against President Eisenhower 29 out of 89 times for an opposition record of 32 percent in 1955, and 71 out of 114 times in 1956 for an opposition record of 62 percent. During the entire 84th Congress over half of the Senate Democrats opposed the Republican program 49 percent of the time.

Fifty percent or more of the Senate Democrats voted for the President's program only 62 out of 89 times for a support score of 69 percent in 1955, and only 46 out of 114 times in 1956 for a support score of 40 percent—a 53 percent support score for the 2 years. (NOTE.—In the case of Democrats, support and nonsupport total 91 in 1955 and 117 in 1956 because on 5 votes they were evenly split 50–50.)

Party positions on 89 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program [1] *(84th Cong., 1st sess.)*

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
2	Formosa resolution. Amendment barring use of U. S. Armed Forces on China mainland or islands within 12 miles of coast. Yea was against program. Rejected. 3 yeas, 83 nays	42	97.7	41	97.6	1	2.3	1	2.4
3	Formosa resolution. Kefauver substitute. Yea was against program. Rejected. 11 yeas, 75 nays	43	100.0	32	76.2	0	None	10	23.8
4	Formosa resolution. Amendment denying authority to use troops on related Formosa areas. Yea was against program. Rejected. 13 yeas, 74 nays	42	97.7	32	74.4	1	2.3	11	25.6
5	Formosa resolution authorizing use of U. S. Armed Forces to secure and protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and related territories. Yea was for program. Passed. 85 yeas, 3 nays	43	97.7	42	97.7	1	2.3	1	2.3
6	Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. Yea was for program. Ratified. 82 yeas, 1 nay	40	97.6	41	100.0	1	2.4	0	None
7	Mutual Defense Treaty With Nationalist China. Amendment that treaty did not affect legal status or sovereignty of territories to which applied. Yea was against program. Rejected. 11 yeas, 57 nays	27	96.4	30	76.9	1	3.6	9	23.1
8	Mutual Defense Treaty With Nationalist China. Amendment deleting sentence providing for extending treaty to other territories by mutual agreement. Yea was against program. Rejected. 10 yeas, 60 nays	27	96.4	33	80.5	1	3.6	8	19.5
9	Mutual Defense Treaty With Nationalist China. Ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 65 yeas, 6 nays	27	96.4	38	90.5	1	3.6	4	9.5
10	Congressional-judicial salaries. Amendment striking out all congressional salary increases. Yea was against program. Rejected. 3 yeas, 80 nays	42	97.7	38	95.0	1	2.3	2	5.0
11	Congressional-judicial salaries. Amendment deferring salary increases until Federal budget balanced. Yea was against program. Rejected. 15 yeas, 71 nays	34	79.1	37	86.0	9	20.9	6	14.0
12	Congressional-judicial salary increases. Yea was for program. Passed. 62 yeas. 24 nays	32	74.4	30	69.8	11	25.6	13	30.2
13	Convention with Japan on income taxes. Yea was for program. Ratified. 72 yeas, 0 nays	34	100.0	38	100.0	0	None	0	None
14	Convention with Japan on estate, inheritance, and gift taxes. Yea was for program. Ratified. 71 yeas, 0 nays	34	100.0	37	100.0	0	None	0	None
15	Convention with Belgium on estate and succession taxes. Yea was for program. Ratified. 74 yeas, 0 nays	36	100.0	38	100.0	0	None	0	None
17	Johnson $20–$10 income-tax credit proposal. Yea was against program. Rejected. 44 yeas. 50 nays	45	97.8	5	10.4	1	2.2	43	89.6
18	Finance Committee amendment to eliminate the House-approved $20 tax credit plan. Yea was for program. Adopted. 61 yeas, 32 nays	45	97.8	16	34.0	1	2.2	31	66.0
19	Confirmation of John Marshall Harlan as Supreme Court Justice. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 71 yeas, 11 nays	39	95.1	32	78.0	2	4.9	9	22.0
20	Resolution to disapprove sale of 3 Government synthetic rubber plants in California. Yea was against program. Rejected. 39 yeas, 48 nays	40	93.0	8	18.2	3	7.0	36	81.8
21	Resolution to disapprove sale of 24 Government synthetic rubber plants. Yea was against program. Rejected. 31 yeas, 56 nays	43	97.7	13	30.2	1	2.3	30	69.8
22	Cotton-marketing quotas. Amendment to increase acreage allotment. Yea was against program. Adopted. 51 yeas, 39 nays	13	28.3	26	59.1	33	71.7	18	40.9
23	Cotton-marketing quotas. Amendment to increase 1955 wheat allotments. Yea was against program. Adopted. 47 yeas, 43 nays	26	55.3	17	39.5	21	44.7	26	60.5
24	Cotton-marketing quotas. Passage. Yea was against program. Rejected. 39 yeas, 51 nays	38	80.9	13	30.2	9	19.1	30	69.8
25	Postal employees' pay increase. Motion to table substitute amendment for 7.6 percent raise plus reclassification. Yea was against program. Tabled. 52 yeas, 41 nays	38	80.9	3	6.5	9	19.1	43	93.5
26	Postal employees' pay increase. 10 percent raise. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 72 yeas, 21 nays	19	40.4	2	4.3	28	59.6	44	95.7
27	Protocol on ending occupation of West Germany. Yea was for program. Ratified. 76 yeas, 2 nays	33	94.3	43	100.0	2	5.7	0	None
28	Protocol to North Atlantic Treaty on accession of West Germany. Yea was for program. Ratified. 76 yeas, 2 nays	33	94.3	43	100.0	2	5.7	0	None
29	International Telecommunications Convention. Ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 74 yeas, 1 nay	33	97.1	41	100.0	1	2.9	0	None
30	Colorado River project. Amendment to strike Echo Park Dam. Yea was against program. Rejected. 30 yeas, 52 nays	29	78.4	23	51.1	8	21.6	22	48.9
31	Colorado River project. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 58 yeas, 23 nays	27	77.1	31	67.4	8	22.9	15	32.6
33	Trade agreements. Amendment to delete peril point provision. Yea against program. Rejected. 9 yeas, 82 nays	47	100.0	35	92.0	0	None	9	8.0

[1] There were 94 record votes in all. 5 votes were omitted from this analysis because they did not appear to be true tests of the Eisenhower program.

Party positions on 89 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
34	Trade agreements. Amendment requiring submission of agreements to Congress. Yea against program. Rejected. 13 yeas, 73 nays	40	90.9	33	52.1	4	9.1	9	7.9
35	Trade agreements. Amendment eliminating section for determining effect of imports on domestic industry. Yea was against program. Rejected. 21 yeas, 67 nays	46	100.0	21	50.0	0	None	21	50.0
36	Trade agreements extension. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 75 yeas, 13 nays	38	91.6	37	91.4	7	8.4	6	8.6
37	Postal employees' pay. Conference report. Yea was against program. Adopted. 66 yeas, 11 nays	11	27.5	0	None	29	72.5	37	100.0
39	Constitutional amendment permitting governors to fill in House whenever over half House seats are vacant. Yea was for program. Adopted. 76 yeas, 3 nays	40	100.0	36	92.3	0	None	3	7.7
40	Postal employees' pay. Vote on passage of bill over President's veto. Yea was against program. Failed to override (⅔ affirmative vote needed). 54 yeas, 39 nays	37	82.2	2	4.2	8	17.8	46	95.8
41	Highway bill. Administration substitute (10-year, $25 billion program for interstate highways). Yea was for program. Rejected. 31 yeas, 60 nays	30	69.8	1	2.1	13	30.2	47	97.9
42	Highway bill. Motion to recommit. Yea was for program. Failed to recommit. 39 yeas, 50 nays	39	90.7	0	None	4	9.3	46	100.0
43	Postal employees' pay. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 78 yeas, 0 nays	35	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
44	Great Lakes Fishery Convention. Yea was for program. Ratified. 79 yeas, 0 nays	36	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
45	Mutual security. Requirement that 50 percent of economic aid be on loan basis. Yea was against program. Rejected. 33 yeas, 50 nays	21	48.8	29	72.5	22	51.2	11	27.5
46	Mutual security. Requirement that 75 percent of economic aid be on loan basis. Yea was against program. Rejected. 29 yeas, 52 nays	21	51.2	31	77.5	20	48.8	9	22.5
47	Mutual security. Amendment cutting by half defense support funds. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 56 nays	27	64.3	29	70.7	15	35.7	12	29.3
48	Mutual security. Recommittal. Yea was against program. Rejected. 16 yeas, 62 nays	26	68.4	36	90.0	12	31.6	4	10.0
49	Mutual security. $318,000,000 cut in overall authorization. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 53 nays	26	66.7	27	65.9	13	33.3	14	34.1
50	Mutual security. Ban on aid to countries trading with Red China while Americans are imprisoned there. Yea was against program. Rejected. 18 yeas, 60 nays	26	66.7	34	87.2	13	33.3	5	12.8
51	Mutual security. $200,000,000 cut in President's special fund for Asian regional development. Yea was against program. Rejected. 17 yeas, 63 nays	31	77.5	32	80.0	9	22.5	8	20.0
52	Mutual security. Waiver of civil-service laws regarding firing of 200 FOA employees. Yea was for program. Rejected. 40 yeas, 40 nays	40	100.0	0	None	0	None	40	100.0
53	Mutual security. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 59 yeas, 18 nays	28	71.8	31	81.6	11	28.2	7	8.4
54	Housing bill. Amendment reducing public housing authorization to 70,000 over 2-year period. Yea was for program. Rejected. 38 yeas, 44 nays	32	78.0	6	14.6	9	22.0	35	85.4
55	Housing bill. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 60 yeas, 25 nays	27	62.8	33	78.6	16	37.2	9	21.4
56	Commerce appropriations, 1956. Increase in CAB funds to pay air carriers. Yea was for program. Adopted. 51 yeas, 24 nays	32	86.5	19	50.0	5	13.5	19	50.0
57	Commerce appropriations. $38,000,000 increase for maritime ship construction. Yea was for program. Adopted. 53 yeas, 20 nays	21	60.0	32	84.2	14	40.0	6	15.8
58	Austrian State Treaty. Ratified. Yea was for program. 63 yeas, 3 nays	28	90.3	35	100.0	3	9.7	0	None
59	Defense appropriations. Increased funds for Marine Corps. Yea was against program. Adopted. 40 yeas, 39 nays	37	92.5	2	5.1	3	7.5	37	94.9
60	Defense appropriations. Deletion of ban on disposing of activities competing with private enterprise. Yea was for program. Rejected. 33 yeas, 48 nays	32	78.0	1	2.5	9	22.0	39	97.5
61	Defense appropriations. Yea was for program. Passed. 80 yeas, 0 nays	40	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
62	Resolution of Congress' sentiment that Secretary of State should obtain prior consent to discuss Soviet satellites at meeting of heads of government. Yea was against program. Rejected. 4 yeas, 77 nays	35	89.7	42	100.0	4	10.3	0	None
63	Passage of bill eliminating compulsory cumulative voting of shares of stock in election of directors of national banking associations. Yea was for program. Passed. 53 yeas, 21 nays	35	97.2	18	47.4	1	2.8	20	52.6
64	AEC construction authority. $21,000,000 for atomic-powered merchant vessel. Yea was for program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 42 nays	40	100.0	1	2.3	0	None	42	97.7
65	District of Columbia home rule. Yea was for program. Passed. 59 yeas, 15 nays	31	91.2	28	70.0	3	8.8	12	30.0
66	Geneva Convention on Armed Forces Wounded in the Field. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
67	Geneva Convention for Armed Forces Wounded at Sea. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
68	Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
69	Geneva Convention on Treatment of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
70	Resolution of Senate that self-government should be restored to enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia. Yea was for program. Adopted. 89 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
72	Reserve Forces Act. Ban on stationing United States servicemen in any country which has agreement giving that country criminal jurisdiction over U. S. Armed Forces. Yea was against program. Rejected. 14 yeas, 70 nays	30	68.2	40	100.0	14	31.8	0	None
73	Reserve Forces Act. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 80 yeas, 1 nay	41	97.6	39	100.0	1	2.4	0	None
74	Defense production. Amendment to permit continued hiring of dollar-a-year men in peace. Yea was for program. Adopted. 46 yeas, 45 nays	44	97.8	2	4.3	1	2.2	44	95.7
75	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Amendment restoring $420,000,000 for military aid which was cut by the House. Yea was for program. Adopted. 50 yeas, 38 nays	29	65.9	21	47.7	15	34.1	23	52.3
76	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Reduction from $85,000,000 to $64,000,000 for European defense support. Yea was against program. Rejected. 22 yeas, 63 nays	33	79.6	30	69.8	9	21.4	13	30.2
77	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Amendment reducing by $206,800,000 funds for Asian defense support. Yea was against program. Rejected. 24 yeas, 60 nays	30	73.2	30	69.8	11	26.8	13	30.2

Party positions on 89 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
78	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. $10,000,000 reduction in funds for Asian development. Yea was against program. Adopted. 68 yeas, 16 nays	2	4.9	14	32.6	39	95.1	29	67.4
79	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. $50,000,000 increase in President's fund for Asian economic development. Yea was for program. Adopted. 46 yeas, 38 nays	30	73.2	16	37.2	11	26.8	27	62.8
80	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 62 yeas, 22 nays	30	73.2	32	74.4	11	26.8	11	25.6
81	Treaty of Commerce with Germany. Yea was for program. Ratified. 83 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	42	100.0	0	None	0	None
82	Railroad retirement. Amendment deleting sections requiring positions on Railroad Retirement Board to be under competitive civil service. Yea was for program. Rejected. 24 yeas, 66 nays	24	54.5	0	None	20	45.5	46	100.0
83	Railroad retirement benefits. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 91 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	47	100.0	0	None	0	None
84	Domestic minerals program extension. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 54 yeas, 34 nays	15	35.7	19	41.3	27	64.3	27	58.7
85	Treaty with Panama. Yea was for program. Ratified. 72 yeas, 14 nays	39	97.5	33	71.7	1	2.5	13	28.3
86	Income-tax convention with Netherlands. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
87	Income-tax protocol with Netherlands. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
88	Income-tax convention with Italy. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
89	Estate-tax convention with Italy. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
90	Confirmation of John A. Hall to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, ICC. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 43 yeas, 41 nays	35	85.4	8	18.6	6	14.6	35	81.4
91	Retirement of Government capital in certain institutions under supervision of Farm Credit Administration. Amendment re application of assets on liquidation or dissolution of any bank for cooperatives. Yea was against program. Rejected. 9 yeas, 80 nays	37	84.1	43	95.6	7	15.9	2	4.4
92	Motion to recommit soldier vote bill with instructions to retain ban against poll-tax requirements. Yea was against program. Failed to recommit. 22 yeas, 56 nays	32	82.1	24	61.5	7	17.9	15	38.5
93	Motion to recommit conference report on Defense Production Act with instructions to strike requirement that dollar-a-year men list assets, etc. Yea was for program. Recommitted. 36 yeas, 34 nays	36	97.3	0	None	1	2.7	33	100.0
94	Confirmation of Harold C. Patterson to be member of SEC. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 49 yeas, 29 nays	37	97.4	12	30.0	1	2.6	28	70.0

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.) [1]

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
95	Convention on slavery. Yea was for program. Ratified. 84 yeas, 0 nays	43	100.0	41	100.0	0	None	0	None
96	Protocol modifying customs tariffs publication. Yea was for program. Ratified. 84 yeas, 0 nays	43	100.0	41	100.0	0	None	0	None
104	Sugar Act extension. Amendment providing different sugar allotment and percentage formula for export quotas. Yea was for program. Rejected. 30 yeas, 56 nays	25	59.5	5	11.4	17	40.5	39	88.6
105	Convention to facilitate importation of commercial samples and advertising material. Yea was for program. Ratified. 76 yeas, 0 nays	35	100.0	41	100.0	0	None	0	None
107	Agricultural Act of 1956. Anderson amendment deleting 90 percent of parity provision on any basic commodities except wheat. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 54 yeas, 41 nays	41	87.2	13	27.1	6	12.8	35	72.9
108	Agricultural Act of 1956. Substitute amendment establishing 1956 minimum national acreage allotments for corn at 50,000,000 acres. Yea was against program. Rejected. 44 yeas, 46 nays	43	95.6	3	6.7	2	4.4	42	93.3
109	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 108). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 44 nays	44	95.7		6.7	2	4.3	42	93.3
110	Agricultural Act of 1956. Modified amendment to Kerr amendment providing annually incentive payments of not more than $1,200 to producers agreeing to market lightweight cattle and hogs. Yea was against program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 53 nays	41	87.2	12	25.5	6	12.8	35	74.5
111	Agricultural Act of 1956. Kerr amendment providing 75 percent price support on hogs and beef cattle. Yea was against program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 61 nays	46	97.9	15	32.6	1	2.1	31	67.4
112	Agricultural Act of 1956. Aiken amendment eliminating language providing 90 percent price support on millable quality wheat. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 45 yeas, 45 nays (Vice President voted yea breaking tie)	34	75.6	11	24.4	11	24.4	34	75.6
113	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 112). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 46 yeas, 41 nays	40	87.0	6	14.6	6	13.0	35	85.4
114	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment to Williams amendment providing 90 percent price support to producer to whom not more than $5,000 loan is made and limiting to $50,000 any price support loan to corporate producer. Yea was against program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 56 nays	41	91.1	15	31.9	4	8.9	32	68.1
115	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment to Williams amendment limiting to $25,000 any payment to any participating producer in soil bank plan. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 84 yeas, 9 nays	46	100.0	38	80.9	0	None	9	19.1

[1] There were 136 record votes in all. 22 votes were omitted from this analysis because they did not appear to be true tests of the Eisenhower program.

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
116	Agricultural Act of 1956. Modified Williams amendment limiting to $100,000 price-support loans that may be made to any producer, and prohibiting production of any surplus crop on leased Federal land. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 78 yeas, 11 nays	43	97.7	35	77.8	1	2.3	10	22.2
117	Confirmation of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones as Democratic members of U. S. Tariff Commission. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 92 yeas, 0 nays	46	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
118	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment establishing domestic parity plan for wheat (100 percent). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 54 yeas, 39 nays	29	63.0	10	21.3	17	37.0	37	78.7
119	Agricultural Act of 1956. Russell amendment establishing domestic parity plan for cotton (100 percent). Yea was against program. Rejected. 33 yeas, 57 nays	38	86.4	19	41.3	6	13.6	27	58.7
120	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment continuing definition of standard grade cotton as provided by existing law. Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 47 nays	37	86.0	10	21.7	6	14.0	36	78.3
121	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment authorizing brucellosis control and school milk programs for a 2-year period. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 89 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
122	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment providing that other than basic commodities be made eligible for acreage reserve program of soil bank. Yea was against program. Rejected. 29 yeas, 58 nays	25	56.8	33	76.7	19	43.2	10	23.3
123	Agricultural Act of 1956. Aiken amendment eliminating provision for dual parity formula. Yea was for program. Rejected. 44 yeas, 45 nays	35	77.8	9	20.5	10	22.2	35	79.5
124	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 123). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 42 nays	38	84.4	4	8.7	7	15.6	42	91.3
125	Brucellosis control and school milk programs. Motion to recommit conference report which extended these programs for 90 days, to June 30, 1956. Yea was for program. Rejected. 46 yeas, 48 nays	46	97.9	0	None	1	2.1	47	100.0
126	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment increasing conservation reserve funds to livestock producers by $75,000,000 (to $425,000,000). Yea was against program. Rejected. 24 yeas, 63 nays	45	97.8	18	43.9	1	2.2	23	56.1
127	Agricultural Act of 1956. Morse amendment eliminating language requiring 15 percent State contribution to cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief. Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 43 nays	43	93.5	0	None	3	6.5	39	100.0
128	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment eliminating language providing reallocation of 174,000 acres among cotton States based on number of small cotton farmers in each. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 46 yeas, 43 nays	34	75.6	12	27.3	11	24.4	32	72.7
129	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment limiting imports of surplus crops to annual average of preceding 3 years. Yea was against program. Rejected. 43 yeas, 47 nays	25	54.3	22	50.0	21	45.7	22	50.0
130	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment making surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed under irrigation and flood-control projects ineligible for soil-bank benefits. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 63 yeas, 28 nays	41	87.2	22	50.0	6	12.8	22	50.0
132	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment requiring certification from beef processors that price paid to producers is not less than support price or a fair price as determined by Agriculture Secretary. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 44 nays	36	81.8	8	16.3	8	18.2	41	83.7
133	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 132). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 52 yeas, 42 nays	39	86.7	3	6.1	6	13.3	46	93.9
134	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment requiring that producer allocate certain percentage of his acreage to soil bank as a condition of eligibility for price support on any crop except tung nuts. Yea was against program. Agreed to, 48 yeas, 46 nays	9	20.0	37	75.5	36	80.0	12	24.5
135	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to reconsider vote by which Morse amendment (vote No. 127) was rejected. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 45 nays	42	95.5	3	6.2	2	4.5	45	93.8
136	Agricultural Act of 1956. 2d vote on Morse amendment. (See vote No. 127.) Yea was against program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 45 nays	42	95.5	3	6.2	2	4.5	45	93.8
137	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment making mandatory the authority for set-aside of corn at 250,000,000 bushels, and providing maximum and minimum set-aside of upland cotton at 9,000,000 and 7,500,000 bales, and of wheat at 800,000,000 and 750,000,000 bushels, respectively. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 44 nays	39	86.7	5	10.2	6	13.3	44	89.8
138	Agricultural Act of 1956. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 93 yeas, 2 nays	44	95.7	49	100.0	2	4.3	0	None
143	Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. Passage of resolution establishing. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 59 nays	38	82.6	21	52.5	8	17.4	19	47.5
144	Agricultural Act of 1956. Agreeing to conference report. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 35 nays	31	67.4	4	10.3	15	32.6	35	89.7
145	Convention on International Civil Aviation. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 81 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	39	100.0	0	None	0	None
146	Convention on customs facilities for touring. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 81 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	39	100.0	0	None	0	None
147	Customs convention on temporary importation of private road vehicles. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 81 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	39	100.0	0	None	0	None
148	Increased contribution to ILO and FAO. Amendment limiting United States contribution to ILO to present ceiling ($1,750,000). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 43 yeas, 40 nays	8	18.6	32	80.0	35	81.4	8	20.0
149	Definition of "bank holding companies." Amendment prohibiting companies from acquiring assets of bank located in another State unless specifically authorized by statute of other State. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 58 yeas, 18 nays	13	37.1	5	12.2	22	62.9	36	87.8
150	Definition of "bank holding companies." Amendment allowing companies to retain their nonbanking assets. Yea was against program. Rejected. 13 yeas, 68 nays	31	75.6	37	92.5	10	24.4	3	7.5
151	Definition of "bank holding companies." Amendment revising definition of company from 25-percent control of 2 banks to 25-percent control of 1 bank. Yea was against program. Rejected. 28 yeas, 51 nays	30	78.9	21	51.2	8	21.1	20	48.8
154	Federal flood insurance. Amendments en bloc requiring State participation on a 50-50 basis after June 30, 1959. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 39 yeas, 31 nays	35	92.1	4	12.5	3	7.9	28	87.5

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
155	Federal flood insurance. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 61 yeas, 7 nays	35	94.6	26	83.9	2	5.4	5	16.1
158	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment permitting CCC not to sell more than 100,000,000 bushels of milling quality surplus wheat for feed annually. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 31 nays	33	76.7	16	43.2	10	23.3	21	56.8
159	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment eliminating provisions for mandatory support prices for feed grains. Yea was for program. Rejected. 39 yeas, 44 nays	31	70.5	8	20.5	13	29.5	31	79.5
162	Agricultural Act of 1956. Williams amendment limiting payments to any 1 producer under soil bank and price-support programs. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 44 yeas, 29 nays	34	87.2	10	29.4	5	12.8	24	70.6
163	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 162). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 22 nays	19	50.0	3	9.1	19	50.0	30	90.9
164	Agricultural Act of 1956. 2d vote on Williams amendment. (See vote No. 162.) Yea was for program. Rejected. 28 yeas, 43 nays	21	55.3	7	21.2	17	44.7	26	78.8
165	Civil Service Retirement Act revision. Amendment retaining present law permitting optional retirement at 55 after 30 years' service, with reduced annuity. Yea was for program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 46 nays	30	73.2	6	14.6	11	26.8	35	85.4
166	Civil Service Retirement Act revision. Amendment retaining present law providing 5 percent reduction of first $1,500 of annuity and 10 percent reduction in excess of $1,500 where employee provides survivor annuity for wife or husband. Yea was for program. Rejected. 16 yeas, 65 nays	15	37.5	1	2.4	25	62.5	40	97.6
167	Housing Act amendments. Amendment raising interest rates on college housing loans from 2¾ to 3¼ percent. Yea was for program. Rejected. 40 yeas, 41 nays	38	97.4	2	4.8	1	2.6	40	95.2
168	Housing Act Amendments. Motion to table motion to reconsider vote by which Senate rejected previous vote (No. 167). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 41 yeas, 39 nays	38	97.4	1	2.4	1	2.6	40	97.6
169	Housing Act Amendments. Amendment limiting public housing units to 35,000 a year for the next 2 years. Yea was for program. Rejected. 38 yeas, 41 nays	31	81.6	7	17.1	7	18.4	34	82.9
170	Housing Act Amendments. Amendment restricting new public housing to localities with a workable program for slum clearance. Yea was for program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 44 nays	30	88.2	2	4.8	4	11.8	40	95.2
171	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Substitute amendment for language in House-passed title I re prevailing wages under Davis-Bacon Act. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 39 yeas, 39 nays (Vice President voted "yea," breaking tie)	25	65.8	14	35.0	13	34.2	26	65.0
172	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 171). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 41 yeas, 39 nays	27	67.5	14	35.0	13	32.5	26	65.0
173	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Motion to table Chavez amendment. Yea was for program. Rejected. 37 yeas, 41 nays	25	64.1	12	30.8	14	35.9	27	69.2
174	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Chavez amendment providing for application of Davis-Bacon Act on Interstate Highway System in payment of prevailing wages. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 42 yeas, 37 nays	25	62.5	12	30.8	15	37.5	27	69.2
175	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Amendment setting up formula for apportioning authorized appropriations among the States. Yea was for program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 55 nays	16	39.0	11	26.8	25	61.0	30	73.2
176	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Motion to table motion to reconsider voice vote on Fulbright amendment re appeal of wage determinations under Davis-Bacon Act. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 36 yeas, 33 nays	21	67.7	15	39.5	10	32.3	23	60.5
177	Domestic tungsten production and purchase. Amendment limiting purchases of tungsten. Yea was for program. Rejected. 22 yeas, 32 nays	19	79.2	3	10.3	5	20.8	27	90.0
179	Defense Production Act extension. Motion to table committee amendment. (See vote No. 180.) Yea was against program. Rejected. 20 yeas, 50 nays	24	64.9	26	78.8	13	35.1	7	21.2
180	Defense Production Act extension. Committee amendment declaring congressional policy to be promotion of geographical dispersal of United States industrial facilities. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 48 yeas, 13 nays	22	66.7	26	92.9	11	33.3	2	7.1
181	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Agreeing to conference report. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 89 yeas, 1 nay	42	100.0	47	97.9	0	None	1	2.1
182	Defense Department appropriations, 1957. Bridges amendments en bloc providing total increase for Air Force of only $500,000,000 over House figure. Yea was for program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 47 nays	39	92.9	3	6.4	3	7.1	44	93.6
183	Defense Department appropriations, 1957. Committee amendment providing total increase for Air Force of only $800,000,000 over House figure. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 48 yeas, 40 nays	37	88.1	3	6.5	5	11.9	43	93.5
184	Defense Department appropriations, 1957. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 88 yeas, 0 nays	40	100.0	48	100.0	0	None	0	None
185	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment protecting producers of agricultural commodities that are in surplus from increased imports. Yea was against program. Rejected. 43 yeas, 45 nays	25	58.1	20	44.4	18	41.9	25	55.6
186	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment placing temporary limitation on imports of cotton and cotton textiles. Yea was against program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 52 nays	30	68.2	22	50.0	14	31.8	22	50.0
187	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment perfecting language proposed to be stricken from committee amendment by Bridges amendment. (See vote No. 188.) Yea was for program. Agreed to. 52 yeas, 36 nays	11	25.0	41	93.2	33	75.0	3	6.8
188	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Bridges amendment eliminating language of committee amendment—as modified by O'Mahoney amendment (see vote No. 187)—which gives President discretionary authority regarding continued aid to Yugoslavia. Yea was against program. Rejected. 38 yeas, 50 nays	21	47.7	29	65.9	23	52.3	15	34.1
189	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment limiting foreign aid appropriation. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 58 nays	30	71.4	28	65.1	12	28.6	15	34.9
190	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment providing establishment of Commission on Foreign Aid Programs. Yea was for program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 45 nays	41	97.6	0	None	1	2.4	44	100.0
191	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment cutting off all aid to any nation shipping strategic materials to Soviet bloc. Yea was against program. Rejected. 23 yeas, 60 nays	27	65.9	33	78.6	14	34.1	9	21.4

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
192	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment providing for furnishing congressional committees information, documents, etc., relating to administration of mutual security program. Yea was against program. Rejected. 23 yeas, 58 nays	36	87.8	22	55.0	5	12.2	18	45.0
193	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment reducing from $75,000,000 to $35,000,000 development assistance and from $10,000,000 to $5,000,000 technical assistance to India. Yea was against program. Rejected. 23 yeas, 56 nays	24	61.5	32	80.0	15	38.5	8	20.0
194	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 54 yeas, 25 nays	27	69.2	27	67.5	12	30.8	13	32.5
195	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Motion to recommit. Yea was for program. Rejected. 22 yeas, 62 nays	17	41.5	5	11.6	24	58.5	38	88.4
196	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Amendment preventing windfall benefits to any airline subtracting amount of capital gain from amount invested in new capital. Yea was for program. Rejected. 37 yeas, 46 nays	25	61.0	12	28.6	16	39.0	30	71.4
197	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Amendment denying benefits under bill to any airline receiving an annual gross income of more than $50,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 43 nays	29	78.4	14	36.8	8	21.6	24	63.2
198	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 53 yeas, 22 nays	8	21.6	14	36.8	29	78.4	24	63.2
199	International Wheat Agreement. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 85 yeas, 2 nays	41	97.6	44	97.8	1	2.4	1	2.2
200	Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights with Iran. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 88 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
201	Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with Republic of Nicaragua. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 88 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
202	Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with the Netherlands. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 88 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
203	Civilian atomic power acceleration program. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 49 yeas, 40 nays	40	93.0	0	None	3	7.0	46	100.0
204	Confirmation of Simon E. Sobeloff to be U. S. Circuit Judge. Motion to recommit. Yea was against program. Rejected. 20 yeas, 63 nays	34	87.2	29	65.9	5	12.8	15	34.1
205	Confirmation of Simon E. Sobeloff to be U. S. Circuit Judge. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 64 yeas, 19 nays	35	89.7	29	65.9	4	10.3	15	34.1
206	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment liberalizing matching formula for old-age assistance and providing temporary extension of 1952 matching formula for dependent children. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 62 yeas, 21 nays	18	46.2	3	6.8	21	53.8	41	93.2
207	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment providing payment of social-security benefits to persons disabled at age 50. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 45 nays	38	86.4	7	14.6	6	13.6	41	85.4
208	Social Security Act amendments. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 207). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 43 nays	41	93.2	2	4.2	3	6.8	46	95.8
209	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment lowering from 65 to 62 the age that all women can claim old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 86 yeas, 7 nays	5	11.1	2	4.2	40	88.9	46	95.8
210	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment allowing recipients of old-age assistance to earn up to $50 a month without deduction. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 56 yeas, 34 nays	26	59.1	8	17.4	18	40.9	38	82.6
211	Social Security Act amendments. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 90 yeas, 0 nays	45	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
212	Construction of Hells Canyon Dam. Passage. Yea was against program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 51 nays	43	95.6	8	17.0	2	4.4	39	83.0
213	United States-France Convention to Eliminate Double Taxation. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 87 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
214	United States-Honduras Convention for Avoidance of Double Taxation and Prevention of Income-Tax Evasion. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 87 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
215	Confirmation of Paul G. Hoffman to be a United States representative to United Nations General Assembly. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 64 yeas, 22 nays	27	62.8	37	86.0	16	37.2	6	14.0
216	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendment reducing military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $1,735,000,000 (plus $1). Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 46 nays	31	70.5	15	34.1	13	29.5	29	65.9
217	Mutual security appropriations, 1957. Amendment reducing military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 37 yeas, 44 nays	29	69.0	15	38.5	13	31.0	24	61.5
218	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendment reducing military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $2,100,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 44 nays	29	64.4	15	36.6	16	35.6	26	63.4
219	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Committee amendment increasing military aid from $1,735,000,000 (House figure) to $2,300,000,000. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 39 nays	32	71.1	18	40.9	13	28.9	26	59.1
221	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendments reducing defense support and development assistance funds $126,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 54 nays	30	69.8	24	51.1	13	30.2	23	48.9
222	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Committee amendments providing $1,175,200,000 for defense support and $293,000,000 for development assistance (increase over House figures). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 57 yeas, 33 nays	32	71.1	25	55.6	13	28.9	20	44.4
223	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Motion to suspend rules to permit vote on amendment barring use of funds for military aid to Yugoslavia under provisions of H. R. 12130 and any prior act. Yea was against program. Rejected (⅔ vote required). 59 yeas, 33 nays	14	31.1	19	40.4	31	68.9	28	59.6
224	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendment barring use of funds in bill for military aid or equipment to Yugoslavia. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 42 nays	19	42.2	23	48.9	26	57.8	24	51.1
225	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 60 yeas, 30 nays	30	66.7	30	66.7	15	33.3	15	33.3
227	Second supplemental appropriations, 1957. Amendment providing $15,000,000 for construction of 2d airport for Washington, D. C., at Burke, Va. Yea was for program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 56 nays	3	6.8	29	66.0	41	93.2	15	34.0

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
228	Unemployment areas. Amendment creating an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to be in charge of redevelopment in United States. Yea was for program. Rejected (majority vote needed). 43 yeas, 43 nays.	43	97.7	0	None	1	2.3	42	100.0
229	Unemployment areas. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 60 yeas, 30 nays	27	62.8	3	6.4	16	37.2	44	93.6
230	Lake Michigan water diversion. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 43 yeas. 33 nays	30	83.3	3	7.5	6	16.7	37	92.5

Social Security: The Most Beneficial and Humane Legislation in This Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress has just seen enacted into law one of the most beneficial and humane pieces of legislation in this century—the 1956 Social Security Amendments. This law is an example of the continuing efforts of the Democratic Party to advance the lot of the average American—to assure him that, despite the tides of adversity that sometimes are part of the free enterprise system, he will be able to provide for self and family in a respectable, independent fashion.

It gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of the American people who will be affected some of the more important and forward looking features of this vital legislation. While it is not as liberal as I think it should be, it is a very excellent foundation on which to build an expanded program.

An outstanding advance in the history of social legislation is the provision for insurance of the totally disabled at age 50. This is most appropriate and long overdue. In our land of plenty, it is a national disgrace to have helpless persons in desperate need. Heretofore, a working man or woman could pay into social security for years and then suffer a totally disabling injury and receive no compensation until age 65. The total disability payment was incorporated in the original House bill, but the Senate deleted it from their version. Fortunately, the House-Senate conference restored the disability clause to its rightful position in the new bill. It has been estimated by experts that 250,000 persons will benefit under the new law in the first year of its operation.

Another eminently just and necessary stipulation provides for retirement of widows and workingwomen at age 62. I have always felt that the age for both widows and wives should be lowered to 60. The average married woman is approximately 5 years younger than her husband, but cannot draw benefits until 5 years after the retirement of her husband. This is most unjust treatment of our senior citizens who are usually very much in need of the combined payments to keep abreast of modern-day living expenses. My Democratic colleagues and I voted in the House for uniform reduction of retirement age for women from age 65 to 62. As I previously stated, I have always favored retirement for widows and wives at age 60, but realized that age 62 would receive more favorable consideration at this time. The House approval of age 62 was altered in the Senate to read age 62 with full benefits for widows and an accrual reduction in retirement benefits for wives and workingwomen if they retire between 62 and 65. The maximum amount receivable by workingwomen at age 62 would be 80 percent of full benefits. Payments will not be increased at age 65 for those women who elect receipt of benefits prior to their 65th birthday.

The social-security bill of 1956 has pursued a most realistic course in widening its coverage to provide protection for an additional 250,000 workers. This number may be even further increased by local referendums. Many groups such as TVA employees, State and city employees, and practically all self-employed professional people except medical doctors are now included.

In a sharp departure from precedent, payments will now be made after age 18 to the dependent child of a retired or deceased worker if the child has been disabled since before the 18th birthday. The mother of the disabled dependent is also eligible for payment as long as she continues to care for said child. This provision took into consideration the mentally deficient children who must be cared for long after the normal son or daughter has ventured forth to make their own way in the world. A mentally incompetent child is an additional worry when the parents realize that financial reverses or death of one or both parents will create an even worse situation for a child who cannot protect himself from the normal dangers of everyday existence. I am sure this provision will remove a certain degree of concern from the shoulders of the affected parents.

In this connection, many improvements were made for grants-in-aid for public assistance. A new provision provides matching funds for medical care furnished those receiving old-age assistance from the States. Additional funds have been made available for use in aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled up to a maximum average of $6 per adult and $3 per child. In short, more national funds will be made available than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee which worked so long and diligently on the new social security retirement bill, I have always been most keenly aware of the problems inherent in advancing years. I supported the original Social Security Act in the thirties and have fought to keep the program realistic and in step with the times. The statement of that great patriot, Thomas Jefferson, that "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind" was never more true than in the modern application of social security.

In this day of improved diet and medical advances, our people are living many years longer than was ever thought possible. While this is good news, it has created certain problems that must be coped with in the immediate future. Our older people with more leisure time than ever before are in what we might call a state of transition, facing a host of new problems, including boredom and financial difficulties. They are naturally self-respecting people who do not desire to be a burden to anyone—especially their children who are now busily engaged in raising their own families. Many of our retired citizens face a life of loneliness as a result of a lack of national planning in their behalf. Some progress has been made in housing for the aged in community-like hotels where those of common interest might gather to enjoy their remaining years with a minimum of worry. Wherever such endeavors have been tried, they have been a huge success. However, these projects have been the unselfish labor of public-spirited individuals and do not come close to filling the needs of an ever-expanding group of retired people. It is indeed regrettable that the provision for the creation of a commission on the aging was stricken from the social security bill.

In connection with my desire to assist the older people of our country, I introduced on February 16, 1956, a bill to provide that in determining income of World War I veterans and their widows for the purpose of ascertaining eligibility for pensions, payments under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be taken into account. Under the present system, if the total return from a pension and

social security exceeds $1,400, the pension is discontinued. This bill did not fare well this session due to an unexpected legislative backlog. It is my hope that I will have the opportunity and privilege to reintroduce similar legislation in the 85th Congress.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I am confident that Congress will continue to adjust social security to meet the growing needs of an ever-expanding economy.

Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, it is time to take stock of how well the 84th Congress has met its responsibilities to the American people and to discuss briefly the problems confronting us in this challenging period of world history. In the words of a great American of revered memory, "Let us look at the record." That record discloses a gratifying lack of petty partisanship and obstructionism on the part of the Democratic majority in evaluating the administration's recommendations and the passage of a substantial amount of legislation for the public welfare. It is a matter of keen regret to me that certain vitally important measures of deep concern to me failed of enactment. If we are to build a better America, if we are to make American democracy more healthy, more effective, more genuine, we must have vigorous and forward-looking-Government dedicated to the public interest, not dominated by a single interest viewpoint.

The traditional concern of the Democratic Party for the ordinary men and women of the country, its championship of legislation for the greatest good for the greatest number, is reflected in its fight in the 84th Congress for legislation to help the consumer, the farmer, the working man and woman, and our elderly people. As a sponsor of legislation on the subject, I am proud that the Democrats in Congress were victorious, over the opposition of the administration and their Republican colleagues, in making another advance in humanitarian progress by the modernization of the Social Security Act. Social security represents one of the greatest single advances in the history of our Government—initiated and improved by the Democratic Party—and it serves a vital need that cannot be as well served otherwise. The extension of coverage, the lowering of the retirement age for women, the provision for disability benefits, and the liberalization of Federal grants for State programs will provide a greater measure of relief and freedom from anxiety for Americans throughout the land. We have not reached the goal of perfection—indeed, the newly approved amendments contain various inequities and defects—but we have made steady progress.

Another important achievement of the Democratic 84th Congress is the enactment of a vast program of health and medical research. I am pleased that Congress has extended the Hill-Burton Act for grants to hospitals, increased funds for research far above the administration proposals, and established a new system for Federal grants to private research institutes. While we spend billions of dollars each year for defense against the ravages of war, very little has been spent to find the defenses against the crippling and killing ravages of the body.

Our country's most priceless resource is our children. They are entitled to decent housing and to adequate education. As a member of the Special Subcommittee on Housing, it was my honor and duty over the past 12 months to participate in one of the most intensive studies and investigations of Government-assisted programs ever conducted. Our reports received general commendation for their thoroughness and objectivity and our recommendations were largely adopted by the full Banking and Currency Committee in the housing measure reported to the House. Republican opposition to the public housing program, including that for our elderly people, resulted in adoption of the pitifully inadequate administration proposals. I am pleased, however, that part of the fine program for elderly persons sponsored by me was saved, and I hope the relief provided them in the housing legislation will lead to further action in this important field in the next Congress. I shall continue my efforts to meet the many special housing needs of the American people, including rental housing at moderate rents in urban areas.

The housing problem of our elderly people and others on fixed income is complicated by the fact that living costs have climbed to a new peak within the past month with the end not in sight. The administration's boast of the increase in the profits of big business is small comfort to those faced with declining purchasing power. The cost of everything that goes into daily living has gone up, and this, of course, has particularly affected our low and middle income families. In this connection, more must be done to enlarge employment opportunities for older workers.

Even more regrettable than the housing outcome was the failure of the Republican Party to meet our educational needs, which is one of our greatest emergencies. How we raise our children will shape the future of our society, and yet the administration made no attempt to secure party support in final passage of this urgently needed school construction bill. As one who has been dedicated to the cause of civil rights, I resent the efforts made to place the blame for defeat of the school construction bill on this issue. The civil rights problem did not kill the bill; it was merely used by those who wanted to see the bill defeated. Ninety-five Republicans who voted for the Powell amendment then voted against the bill on final passage although the amendment had been adopted; a switch of 16 Republican votes would have cleared the measure.

Again, the Republicans attempted to make political capital out of the civil-rights legislation when it came to the floor after 3½ years of inaction by the administration. The fundamental problem of eliminating second-class citizenship and insuring equal rights to all Americans should be above politics.

I have sponsored legislation designed to establish an immigration program that is consonant with our democratic traditions and I have sought to secure the improvement of the Refugee Relief Act. I regret this humanitarian and long-overdue legislation has not been acted upon by the House. I have personal knowledge of many compassionate cases dependent upon this program, and I am confident the American people desire its continuation and liberalization.

Failure of the Congress, due to the administration and Republican leadership opposition, to enact legislation to help people and business in depressed industrial areas is most unfortunate. I cannot accept the Republican theory that the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy. The House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, reported a constructive measure to cope with this grave problem which requires decisive action. The same indifference and inaction have characterized the Republican attitude toward the problems of small business in the face of a drop in small-business profits of 66 percent between 1952 and 1955 and an annual rate of business failures almost twice as great as it was under the Truman administration. Small business needs a fairer share of defense and other Government contracts, tax relief, and fuller protection against monopoly. The backbone of our economic system is small business; we must preserve it.

The Republican philosophy that big business should be singled out for special benefits is exemplified in its tax legislation which gave 73 percent of relief to corporations. I supported the Democratic proposal in the first session to raise exemptions and thus aid the average taxpayer. I also voted for the Democratic bill to increase the amusement-tax exemption.

The bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee to create a Federal flood-insurance system was approved. Among other constructive measures adopted by the 84th Congress were an increase in the minimum wage, improvements in the civil service and railroad retirement systems, extension of the Salk vaccine program, initiation of a huge highway program, improvement in the budgeting and accounting procedures and methods, continuation of the World War II GI loan program, extension of reciprocal trade agreements and mutual security programs, simplification of customs procedures, various benefits to servicemen and their dependents, extension

and enlargement of school lunch and milk programs, and numerous other proposals pertaining to domestic and international policy. It has clearly not been a do-nothing Congress, this Democratic 84th Congress now about to adjourn.

I shall continue to seek the protection of our natural resources and the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Our public lands, national forests and wildlife refuges belong to all the people, and I deplore the administration's giveaway policies. I shall continue to support policies designed to overcome the weaknesses in our national defense and our foreign policy programs and to meet the Communist challenge throughout the world. I have complete confidence that with the kind of leadership under which we licked a depression and won a war we will devise adequate solutions to the pressing international problems confronting us.

One of the most gratifying aspects of public office is the opportunity to help others, both in the field of legislative proposals and in the area of human problems. It has been my good fortune to be able to assist numerous constituents, and for this purpose I maintain two district offices. I have followed the principle that the people I have the honor to represent are not interested in showmanship and ballyhoo, but in honest, sincere action.

I have been deeply conscious of the high honor that the people of the 11th District have paid me in selecting me as their Representative for the past four Congresses. I have conscientiously tried to discharge my duties to the best of my ability and to consider each legislative proposal on its independent merits and from the standpoint of the public welfare. It is gratifying to me that my name was included in the group of Members about whom Mr. Larston D. Farrar, in his recent Washington Lowdown, commented:

> There is a minority in the House of Representatives and, fortunately, it is a growing minority—of Members who understand their constitutional role in the scheme of things. They won their offices by getting out and debating the issues with the people. The names of these men, who are greatly to be admired, are a curious admixture, showing that second- and third-generation Americans are taking an increasing interest in political matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope and prayer that our Nation, blessed in so many ways, will realize its great destiny and that we will build a better America and a better world for our children.

President Eisenhower a Religious Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying conditions that has resulted since President Eisenhower assumed the Presidency has been the recognition that morality should have, and does have, an important place in determining the policies of Government.

In the earliest beginnings of our Government there was an unmistakable acknowledgment of dependence upon Almighty God. In fact, in the early days of the colonies there were statutes that required officials of Government to believe in God as a requisite to holding public office. This was no empty or merely formal requirement. It was based upon the deep religious convictions of the men and women of that time. They were putting into Government the same rules of conduct that governed their own individual lives. Thus, our Government was founded in a very real sense on religious principles and such fact found expression in every conceivable way.

To look back over the history of this Nation is to be impressed with the fact that a divine hand has constantly guided and directed our course as a nation. At times questions have arisen that were fundamental to our very existence as a nation. They have touched the very foundation stones of our Government. But in each such instance there has been evidence that the divine hand that guided us in founding this great Nation and supported us in its maintenance has also directed our course in successfully meeting and overcoming the numerous and varied difficulties which, at different times, have confronted us.

Our dependence upon Almighty God as the real source of strength of this Nation has been symbolized in the words—"In God We Trust"—stamped upon our coins. As a result of our dependence upon God we have been enabled to become the moral leader of the world. Today we stand preeminent among all the nations of the world. To maintain that position of preeminence it is necessary that we continue to recognize our dependence upon God and continue to follow His guidance and direction. Otherwise, we cannot hope to lead the world in the establishment of peace and good will.

The most encouraging sign in recent days that gives evidence of an intention to continue our recognition of God in the affairs of government was the incident that occurred at the inauguration of President Eisenhower. On that day when the President-elect was about to take the oath of office, an event occurred that astonished the whole assemblage present to see the inauguration, as well as the millions of people elsewhere who viewed the proceedings on television or listened to the radio. I refer to the request of President Eisenhower that he be permitted to offer his own little prayer to Almighty God before taking the oath of office. Never before in the history of our Government had such a request been made. The inauguration proceedings are always formal with outstanding religious leaders of differing denominational beliefs present to offer the invocations. But here, in addition to all the usual formalities in this respect, the President-elect in a spirit of humility and without previous notice to anyone made his unusual request. The request struck deep into the hearts of his listeners. It created a feeling that cannot be described. A pronounced quietness immediately took possession of all who were present. The people seemed to grasp the real significance and importance of the event and entered into it in the same spirit that dominated President Eisenhower.

The prayer that the President offered was one that left a lasting impression. It was so humble, so simple in expression, so lacking in ostentation, and so deeply sincere that it made an appeal and created an influence that cannot be adequately expressed nor estimated.

The offering of that prayer in public, in my opinion, had the immediate effect of recreating the religious atmosphere that was so important in establishing a religious foundation in the beginning of this Nation, and it left no doubt that the President was a deeply religious man who recognized his own deficiencies and the need of help from a divine source to fulfill the heavy duties incident to leadership in this great Nation.

Furthermore, it cannot be other than reassuring to realize that as the President was willing to pray in public for divine guidance at the very beginning of his term of office, so we can readily believe that he continues to pray in private as each new day brings new and difficult problems in these times of uncertainty. The example he has set in the matter of prayer together with his regular attendance on the means of worship each Sunday gives further and satisfying evidence that the words "in God we trust" as a national expression of faith is also the private and individual faith of President Eisenhower.

What could be more in accord with the high ideals and religious convictions of this Nation than to have a people, as well as a President, who by word and deed accept in its fullest significance the declaration, "In God we trust"?

Results of Annual Questionnaire Sent to Constituents by Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the results of my annual questionnaire. The office has been swamped with questionnaires ever since we distributed them about a month and a half ago and I have been quite overwhelmed with the excellent results. That you

were all willing to take the time to fill them out and return them has meant a lot to me. They have helped me in my job as your Representative and I am glad that so many people took the opportunity to express their opinions both in their answers and extra comments.

As of July 30, 1956, approximately 2,100 questionnaries have been returned. The results have been compiled and below you will find the statistics on how you "voted" on the various issues. By comparing with my voting record you can see how I voted on these issues that came before the House.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Many important issues are now before this session of Congress. This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express your views on these issues and your answers will assist me in my job as your Representative. Please mail the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-free envelope. Thank you.

	Total		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you approve of our foreign policy as directed by Secretary of State Dulles?	771	985	44	56
2. Do you approve the raising of interest rates on loans to farmers?	291	1,697	15	85
3. Do you favor a reduction in taxes for lower income groups?	1,692	331	84	16
4. Do you favor continuing the public housing program to provide decent homes for families of low income?	1,713	314	85	15
5. Do you favor continuing a foreign-aid program under present world conditions?	839	1,052	44	56
6. Do you favor Federal aid to States to help meet the critical school classroom shortage?	1,649	393	81	19
7. Do you favor lowering the retirement age for women under the social-security law from 65 to 62 and providing cash benefits to disabled workers at age 50?	1,663	367	82	18
8. Are you in favor of an increase in the postal rate on first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents?	887	1,141	44	56
9. Do you favor a food-stamp plan to enable low-income families to buy more food products than they now can?	1,118	792	59	41
10. Do you favor the Bricker amendment to the Constitution which would weaken the President's authority to conduct foreign affairs?	553	1,395	28	72
11. Do you approve of trying to balance the budget at the expense of a strong national defense?	490	1,397	26	74
12. Do you favor the President inviting the Russian Communist leaders Khrushchev and Bulganin to visit this country this year?	650	1,315	33	67

Report to the People of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has joined the yesterdays in American history. Only in the passage of time can its accomplishments—or lack of them—be evaluated on the credit or debit side of the ledger. The basis for judgment here should be whether or not Congress met the challenge of the important issues in this decisive era.

It must be borne in mind that most of the major legislation is recommended to the House and the Senate by the executive branch of our Government. In the 84th Congress the Republican Party has been charged with this responsibility under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower whose recommendations for legislation have been presented to Congress.

Programs, in the form of legislative bills, are introduced and then referred to the appropriate committees. The most important phase of congressional procedure is the action by these committees. Here is where the most intensive consideration is given to proposed legislation and where the people of our Nation have an opportunity to be heard. When a committee favorably reports a bill, it transmits to the House—or the Senate—a description of the purpose and scope of the bill and the reasons for its recommended approval. The final action—or lack of it—on the part of Congress is proof of the President's implementation of his own program.

In the Congress which has very recently completed its work, the Democrats were in the majority as a result of the elections in 1954. The Republican occupant of the White House predicted that because of this situation, "a cold war of partisan politics would develop." Events proved otherwise. As shown in the RECORD, on issues affecting the security and well-being of our Nation, the President received more support from the Democrats in Congress than he did from the members of his own political party.

The 84th Congress chalked up no great legislative experiments or major reforms. On the credit side of the ledger for the 84th Congress were a number of major achievements. These achievements will be discussed briefly in my report. On the debit side, were bills bottled up in committees, especially the Committee on Rules, and bills defeated on the floor. To a degree, this was due to the failure of the President to support his own recommendations, or to send at the last minute, supporting statements for legislation under consideration, thereby contributing to confusion and frustration. But—and this is even more important—this brought about a lessening of interest and vague support of legislation from members of the Republican Party and a lack of initiation of legislation by the Democrats due to the uncertainty of what the President really wanted, or would support.

I believe the foregoing will throw some light upon the report which I present to the people of the 10th Congressional District whom I am proud to represent in Congress. Although the record may not please every individual, I want my constituents to know that I have followed the dictates of my conscience and have tried to represent them to the best of my ability.

This is my sixth annual report to the enrolled voters of the 10th District. Any questions or problems within my jurisdiction will be taken care of through my Washington office which is open the entire year. A letter addressed to me at the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., will be given my immediate attention.

INTERNATIONAL

I am chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, having been elected to this post by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the fall of 1955, it was my duty, and I considered it also a privilege, to take my subcommittee to Europe in order to reevaluate the foreign policy of the United States in that area. The report of the findings of this committee is available to all who request it, either from my office or from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The adverse effect of the Geneva Conference upon the nations of Europe was shocking to me and I conveyed this to the Secretary of State at the time of his Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva. The Geneva Conference disunited the free world; it caused the rise of neutralism which now has Europe and Asia in its grip; it weakened NATO, SEATO, the Balkan Alliance, the Baghdad Pact, and other defense treaties. Under the guise of the friendly cooperation tendered the Soviet Union at this time, communism, in its Januslike character, slipped into the Middle East by giving advanced arms and war potential material to Egypt. The free world is now caught in the whirlwind as crisis after crisis continues to be the order of the day in this section. In my report to the Secretary of State, I had suggested that the United States withdraw from the conference and expose the dualism of the U. S. S. R. to the free nations of the world before it was too late.

Bearing in mind these facts concerning the European situation, the House Foreign Affairs Committee started its hearings on the mutual-security bill on March 20, 1956. The actual recommendations of the executive branch had not been sent to the committee until March 19. The recommendations carried the request for increased foreign aid to the amount of $4.7 billion, including $540 million for advanced weapons. We were told by the administration that this money represented the United States share of supporting the forces in being. The amount requested in the previous year, for the same purpose, was $3.5 billion. The original request contained a recommendation for the appointment of a commission to restudy the United States foreign policy. This provision was deleted from the bill because the power to appoint an executive commission is one of the prerogatives of the

President, and further, the committee felt that its inclusion in the bill would weaken the measure. Later, the Foreign Affairs Committee adopted a separate resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to examine and reappraise the objectives, methods, and results of our foreign policies and programs involving the Mutual Security Act and related legislation. The committee will prepare its findings and recommendations not later than February 1, 1957.

The administration, however, claimed that our foreign policy was in a state of change and not yet formed. It is understandable why the House cut the President's request from $4.7 billion to $3.8 billion. Few, if any, Congressmen would authorize the expenditure of billions of American dollars without knowing the specific plan for the use of such funds.

In cutting the mutual security funds, the Congress initiated a thorough review of our foreign policy; prohibited the administration from sending further military aid to Yugoslavia, but refused to cut off undelivered military materiel from previous appropriations; adopted a series of resolutions reaffirming its opposition to colonialism and to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, supporting the right to self-determination of other peoples; urging that Spain be admitted to NATO; and stressing our determination to work for the unification of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and for the freedom and independence of the Communist-dominated nations.

The work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was not confined to the foreign aid bill. A statistical record of the committee's operations is being compiled and it will be sent to those who request it. Of 39 bills and resolutions favorably reported by the committee and passed by the House, 37 were enacted. Among these was my resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 265—opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations. This resolution passed the House by the vote, 391–0 and the Senate, 86–0.

In this session of Congress, the stamp of approval was put on a new scale of salaries for more than 300 Cabinet members, White House assistants, and other officials in departments, agencies, boards, and commissions. Also the Congress provided for the disposal of alien property seized during World War I.

The House adopted House Resolution 574 expressing the sympathy and encouragement of the House of Representatives for the people of Poland in their revolt at Poznan against Communist dictatorship and urging efforts to ship food to them. The Senate passed a similar resolution.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the field of national defense, the Democratic majority is disturbed by the dependency put upon the H-bomb for national protection. What will happen if the Soviet continues to nibble away at the territory of the free world, knowing we will not use the bomb? Is this administration placing the United States in a position where we will fight only the big war? The so-called Radford plan must be openly discussed. Should we keep nuclear weapons at the peak of development, involving great costs, together with the reduction of men under arms? Should we have the United States quotient so low we could not defend ourselves in a small "brush fire"? With these facts in mind, and taking its inspiration from Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the 84th Congress increased the administration's request for Air Force funds by $900 million. At the same time, it expanded research facilities in aeronautics, enlarged atomic energy projects, and increased funds for our aircraft control and warning system. It also reorganized our military Reserves, forestalled Marine Corps manpower cuts, raised the officer strength of the Armed Forces by 60,000, and enacted a $1.4 billion naval construction program which included an atom-powered cruiser and supercarrier.

In addition, the Congress renewed to June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to allocate and fix priorities of critical and strategic materials and to grant defense loans and subsidies under the Defense Production Act; authorized a $2.1 billion construction program at installations and bases of Armed Forces, including new housing facilities abroad; provided for housing for essential civilian employees of the armed services; authorized $295.2 million for acquisition and construction of property and facilities by the Atomic Energy Commission; extended to July 1, 1957, the authority of the Department of Defense to expand productive capacity of industrial facilities in emergency and to stockpile machine tools; authorized construction of prototype modern cargo vessels for mass production in event of emergency; strengthened penalties for seditious conspiracy and for advocacy of the overthrow of the United States Government; and granted Federal consent to agreements among New York, New Jersey, and contiguous States for mutual military aid in emergency.

PUBLIC DEBT

In commenting on our national debt, I quote from the remarks of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and the outstanding authority on appropriations and the budget. Chairman CANNON states—and we all agree—that "the size of the national debt is appalling. It is so huge as to defy comprehension. We are paying $7 billion a year just to carry it. But what is worse, it has consistently increased under the present administration despite repeated, categorial promises to the contrary in the campaign of 1952. These administration pledges have been broken. And they cannot possibly be redeemed in the few remaining months of the administration. In a speech at Providence, R. I., in October 1952, President Eisenhower said:

"Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

"The following facts conclusively show that bigger debts have been piled upon the American people during the present administration.

"The public debt during 3 fiscal years of this administration

[In billions]

	Beginning of year
"Fiscal 1954 (July 1953)	$266.1
"Fiscal 1955 (July 1954)	271.3
"Fiscal 1956 (July 1955)	274.4
"Fiscal 1957 (July 1956)	272.7
"Increase during 3 full fiscal years	+6.6

"CONTRAST WITH PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

"Mr. Speaker, the $6.6 billion increase is in sharp contrast to the record of the previous administration under similar peacetime conditions. During 4 full peace years—that is, fiscal years in which there was no war operation—under the previous administration, the debt was reduced by $12 billions, as follows:

	Billions
"June 1946	$269.4
"June 1950	257.4
"4-year decrease under previous administration	−12.0

"The administration, 2 years running, asked that the old debt ceiling of $275 billion be raised to $281 billion. Again this year, the request was renewed, this time for $278 billion."

BUDGET

In the 2d session of the 84th Congress, enacted appropriations total $60,573,217,590, which is a net of $570,260,947 below the estimates of appropriations submitted by the President, and rescissions of prior appropriations bring the total reduction of spending authority to about $1,470,260,947. The Republican Party is, therefore, taking credit for a budget surplus but it makes no mention of the fact that the foregoing reduction in requested appropriations and the largest national income in peacetime history together with heavy taxation account for the budget surplus. Incidentally, in 1951, under the Democratic administration, there was a surplus of $3.5 billion.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

One of the most important measures enacted by the 84th Congress was the law to amend the Social Security Act. Despite vigorous opposition by the administration, the new law contains provisions lowering the retirement age for women to 62; providing benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers at the age of 50; continuing benefits for physically disabled and mentally retarded children over 18; increasing grants for public assistance to the needy aged, the blind, and disabled, and extending social-security coverage to many professional groups including lawyers and dentists. Space does not permit a detailed explanation of this law, but I will be glad to send it to those who request it.

In the important field of public works legislation, a long-range program to build 41,000 miles of modern, interstate highways was approved. This is one of the most far-reaching actions taken by the Congress, benefiting the motoring public and commercial users of our highways. The new roads, costing $33.4 billion for a 13-year highway construction

program, will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through increased taxation on motor fuels, trucks, trailers, and tires. The administration advocated a separate bond issue to meet this road construction cost, but the Congress dictated the pay-as-you-go plan for which it received the plaudits of the press and the public.

Other enactments affecting our national economy include the extension to April 1, 1957, of the existing excise-tax schedule and the 52-percent corporate income tax; the exemption from Federal admissions tax of tickets of 90 cents or less; the increase from $25 million to $125 million in the Small Business Administration authorization to make disaster loans and to liberalize terms; the extension of the Renegotiation Act to December 31, 1958, to provide for recovery of excessive profits from defense contracts; the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce; the ban against the operation in coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States; and the control and regulation of bank-holding companies with the requirement that they divest of nonbanking interests within 5 years.

HOUSING

Those of us who understand the housing needs of low income families are appalled at the inadequate housing program enacted in the final days of the 84th Congress. We who have supported the public housing programs of past years recognize in them their benefit to the Nation and we realize that a vast segment of our people are still inadequately housed. The housing bill presented to us in the few days before adjournment authorized a 2-year program of public housing construction at the rate of 35,000 units per year. The original bill proposed 50,000 units per year for a 3-year period but even this was nowhere adequate when we realize there are 15 million substandard dwellings now in use in this country. In voting for the 2-year program of 35,000 units per year, we did so rather than adjourn without a public housing program. While the need for public housing exists, I will continue my support of housing programs.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Space does not permit a detailed explanation of the enactments in respect to changes in civil service employees' retirement benefits, but I will send a copy of this law and an explanation of such benefits to those constituents who request it. Briefly, the new law liberalizes civil-service retirement benefits, increases the number of scientific positions in defense agencies, and increases salaries of certain executive positions. Another law of importance to our civil servants, is that which protects their salaries against the downgrading in their job classifications. This subject had long been of interest to me and early in this Congress I introduced a bill to protect the employees' salaries against such downgrading. Late this session I introduced a similar bill to protect the "blue collar" workers against downgrading and I shall reintroduce this measure when the Congress meets in January.

Other enactments in the field of Governmental Reorganization include those to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and to simplify Government accounting practices; to increase annuities under Foreign Service retirement and disability; to make the United States Customs Court a constitutional court; to provide annuities for widows and dependent children of Federal judges; to authorize the sale of the Government-owned tin smelter, and to extend the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Among the laws enacted in the 2d session of the 84th Congress under this title are the following:

Authorization of a training program to increase the number of public health specialists, aid to States for training nurses and practical nurses, grants for improved mental health administration, and the extension of the Hospital Construction Act to July 30, 1959;

Authorization of $378 million in Federal aid for school construction and maintenance and operating costs in districts affected by Government activities;

Authorization of $30 million annually for 3 years for construction of non-Federal facilities for research into various crippling and killing diseases;

Authorization permitting FHA loans for repair of homes damaged in floods and other major disasters;

Creation of a joint State-Federal flood insurance program under HHFA with the Federal Government paying 40 percent of the cost;

Fifteen million dollars for Army engineers to construct without further authorization small flood-control projects;

An extension to July 1, 1957, of the Salk vaccination program;

An increase in fund authorization and an extension of the school milk program and the inclusion of the program in camps and nurseries for underprivileged children and nonprofit child-care centers and agencies;

Authorization of a 5-year, $7.5 million a year program of Federal aid for State library services in isolated rural areas;

An increase in disability benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

An increase in benefit payments under the railroad retirement system.

Authorization of a survey by the Public Health Service of the extent and effects of chronic illnesses;

Imposition of discretionary death penalty or life imprisonment for illicit drug peddlers who sell to children, and a provision for more effective control of narcotics;

An extension to June 30, 1957, of grants to States to aid expansion of vocational rehabilitation programs;

Authorization of $4 million for new equipment and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research;

Requirement that river steamers carry life-preservers for all passengers and crew;

Authorization for FBI to enter kidnap investigations where victim has not been returned within 24 hours;

Requirement that safety devices be placed on inside doors of refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

Authorization of Federal assistance to States in establishing committees on education beyond high school;

Creation of a National Library of Medicine; and

Consent to New York-New Jersey-Connecticut compact for study of air pollution control.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The 2d session of the 84th Congress enacted provisions to grant educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II and Korea; gave military personnel social-security wage credits and increased benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans; increased the pay of trainees under the Reserve program; granted medical care for the dependents of members of the Armed Forces; extended the program of guaranteed loans for home purchase or construction to July 1958; authorized loans for the purchase of farm homes by veterans; extended to 1960 the unemployment program for veterans of the Korean war; increased the pay of medical and dental officers in the Armed Forces and in Public Health Service; and extended the mustering-out pay for Korean veterans.

AGRICULTURE

Although there is no agricultural production in my district, the subject is of very grave importance to consumers. Among the agricultural measures enacted in this session were:

The law which authorized $1.2 billion for the voluntary soil-bank program to reduce production acreage of crops in surplus supply; fixed feed-grain supports at 76 percent; encouraged disposal of surpluses at home and abroad;

Extension of the Sugar Act to December 31, 1960; fixing domestic producers' quota at 55 percent and foreign suppliers' at 45 percent of the market;

Repeal of the excise tax on gasoline and oil used only in farm machinery;

An increase to $20 million in the authorization for eradication of brucellosis and extension of the program through 1958;

An increase from $1.5 billion to $3 billion of the limit on sales of surplus commodities for foreign currency under the Foreign Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. I am proud to state that Congress prevented the administration from selling surpluses behind the Iron Curtain to Russia and the satellite nations. This Congress sustained my amendment which embodies within the law a clear definition of "friendly nations";

A liberalization of terms of farm loans, authorization of aid to part-time and low income farmers under Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; authorization of $50 million increase in the emergency-loan program and its extension to June 30, 1959;

A broadening of the watershed and flood prevention program; allocating a share of costs among Federal and local interests;

A broadening of the plan of payments to farmers for water conservation practices;

An increase in the borrowing capacity of Commodity Credit Corporation from $12 billion to $14 billion;

A broadening of the licensing power of Secretary of Agriculture under the Perishable Commodities Marketing Act; and

A provision for regulation of interstate transportation of migrant farm workers.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Among the laws affecting our natural resources, the Congress achieved the following:

An increase of $1 million a year of Federal research grants to States and an expansion of the water pollution control program to $50 million a year for 5 years.

An authorization of $87 million, 2½-year program of Government purchase of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum to assure continued production.

In the field of power development, Congress approved the Upper Colorado River storage project which was forcefully supported by the President and the administration. This project, developed by private companies at public expense, will cost the Government $760 million. Politically, this will benefit the Republicans in Congress. On the other hand, the Senate rejected the development of Hells Canyon on Snake River in Idaho which is of far greater importance to this area. This project carried plans for growth such as TVA, and would have benefited the Democrats in that area. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project was rejected in the House during the closing days for lack of time to give it proper consideration. It was fully supported by the administration and would have assisted Republican elections.

The Niagara power project, long discussed and badly needed in New York, passed the Senate under the able leadership of Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, but it was blocked in the House Rules Committee by the administration who, no doubt, had an eye on the senatorial race in New York in November.

From this, we can see there was much needed legislation rejected by Congress, blocked in committee or killed for the session. This can be attributed to many reasons. The President carefully avoided any suggestion of pressure on behalf of his program. As a result, there was entire loss of important legislation, or such watering down of an issue that its sponsor could no longer recognize it. Another reason, called by many the basic reason, was that of partisanship in which the administration and blocs in Congress were equally involved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

One of my major concerns has been the passage of a law to guarantee civil rights to all Americans. At the beginning of his term of office, President Eisenhower promised a civil-rights program. He delegated the Attorney General to make recommendations covering this important legislation. At the end of 3½ years, there is no evidence of a specific program in this field.

A joint group of Democrats and Republicans organized in an effort to obtain recommendations and Representative HUGH SCOTT, Republican, and I were appointed to urge the administration to fulfill its campaign promise. Our many attempts to meet with the Attorney General met with refusal. Finally, in June recommendations were sent to the Judiciary Committee where, through the great and good help of Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, a bill was reported to the floor. This bill, inadequate though it was, passed the House but it was too late in the session to obtain action in the Senate.

A similar fate met our efforts to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. I have introduced amendments to correct the inequities in this law. In my proposals, unused quotas must be redistributed to other nations in proportion to their quotas and in another amendment quotas would be based upon the 1950 census instead of the 1920 population figure, which is in current use.

The bill authorizing Federal aid for school construction was another important measure which failed of enactment in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. Although in his 1952 campaign speeches, the President pointed to the need for 340,000 new schoolrooms throughout the country, he did nothing to advance this legislation. The bill was defeated by the many crippling amendments which would have mad^ this legislation unwieldy. The Powell amendment to the bill is one which I supported.

Despite the campaign promises of the Republican Party, the administration failed to act on many other important issues involving the people of our Nation. The lack of action in amending the Taft-Hartley Labor Act is another excellent example.

It shall be my prime consideration in thc next session to force these important issues to the floor and to enactment. It it my duty to give undivided attention to each measure so that the common good will be served. In this way, I know I shall be protecting the best interests of my constituent and neighbors in the 10th Congressional District.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, following the policy of keeping the people of my congressional district informed of my activities as their Representative in Congress, I am submitting this brief review of some of the highlights of the 84th Congress. This brief report is a supplement to my weekly press, radio, and television reports presented during both sessions of the 84th Congress.

During the 2 years of the 84th Congress the authority and responsibility for the operation of the Federal Government were divided. The executive branch of the Government which administers the laws passed by Congress and operates the various governmental agencies was in the hands of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The legislative branch of the Government is the Congress of the United States which is composed of the Senate and House of Representatives. During the 84th Congress the Democratic Party controlled both the Senate and House of Representatives as well as all congressional committees. With such absolute control over the legislative activities of Congress, Democratic congressional leaders were in position to place a life or death sign on legislative measures.

Against such a background, it is little wonder that, while the 84th Congress can be given credit as being a hard-working Congress, yet vital legislation encountered political roadblocks that were inexcusable even in a presidential election year when a display of partisan politics is not wholly unexpected. During the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress, political hypocrisy was developed to a degree the like of which I cannot recall in my public career.

There were more than 19,000 bills and resolutions introduced during the 84th Congress, the largest number since the 71st Congress of 1929–30. Of this number more than 800 were approved by the 84th Congress and became public laws. In order to consider legislation and handle other congressional matters, the 84th Congress was in session a total of 224 days which is somewhat below the record established by the 76th Congress of 1939–40 which stayed on the job for 366 days.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

During the 84th Congress, despite the heavy demands on my time because of committee assignments and visiting various Government agencies on congressional business, as well as the illness and death of my mother, I maintained a commendable attendance record by answering better than 95 percent of the quorum and rollcall votes. According to the minority clerk of the House of Representatives, my overall attendance record since coming to Congress in 1939 is one of the best in the history of the Congress of the United States.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

I retained my membership of many years on two important congressional committees—the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services. Because of my length of service in Congress, my seniority on both of these important committees has classified me as a senior member of each. Both of my committee assignments, and especially my membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, consumed a major portion of my time and to such an extent that literally for days I found myself behind closed doors involved in discussing matters pertaining to atomic energy, national defenses, and domestic and international affairs.

LARGE VOLUME OF MAIL

Throughout the 84th Congress, my daily volume of mail continued to increase to such an extent that it was necessary to reorganize and expand the clerical staff in my Washington and Altoona offices. In Altoona, because of the desire to provide greater service, new office quarters were obtained in the Central Trust Building. Following my usual practice, I personally read every piece of mail received at my Washington office. In the majority of cases, I developed the information to answer inquiries. My files are full of letters of appreciation for services rendered to my constituents. These expressions of gratitude for my efforts to truly represent at all times the people of my congressional district are deeply appreciated.

TAX LEGISLATION

With the Eisenhower administration continuing its program of economy in government, for the first time in years the national budget was balanced for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the surplus amounting to $1.7 billion was applied in reducing the national debt which as of August 1 was $272.5 billion. The action taken in applying the surplus of $1.7 billion as a reduction in the national debt, in lieu of a reduction in taxes, had the approval of both Republicans and Democrats. As a result, it was unanimously agreed by Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress that it was not possible to reduce Federal income taxes this year. Tax relief however, was provided to farmers by granting an exemption of the excise taxes on gasoline and other fuels used in operating farm machinery. During the closing days of the 84th Congress, legislation was approved which repealed the Federal tax on amusement admission tickets under 90 cents.

APPROPRIATIONS

The 84th Congress, in considering the national budget, appropriated $52.2 billion during its 1st session and $59.8 billion during the 2d session. This was almost $2 billion less than requested by President Eisenhower for the 2-year period. The reluctance of Congress to approve the $2 billion was due to the growing opposition to foreign aid expenditures.

To give you some idea of how the Government dollar is spent and using the fiscal year of 1955 as an example, 62.9 cents of the dollar was spent on national security. The remaining 37 cents was expended in the following manner: 7 cents on veterans' services and benefits, 4 cents on labor and welfare, 6.7 cents on agriculture, 1.7 cents on national resources, 2.5 cents on commerce and housing, 1.8 cents on general government, 10 cents on interest on the public debt, and 3.4 cents on international affairs and finance. Although figures are not yet available to show the breakdown of the 1956 fiscal dollar, it is expected to be similar to that of the 1955 fiscal dollar.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

As a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, I joined civilian and military leaders of Government in placing our national defense and security on a sounder and firmer basis. This is evidenced by my active support and my vote for the appropriation of $66.5 billion for the Defense Department and an authorization of approximately $5 billion for military and atomic energy construction programs. In addition, I supported the authorization to use United States troops to defend Formosa and voted to extend the draft law for 4 years and the doctor-dentist draft for 2 years. Congress also approved a Reserve program which had my support and which is designed to provide 2.9 million trained reservists by 1959. I also supported legislation continuing the President's power to allocate and fix priorities for critical and strategic materials. The authorization of $1.4 billion for naval construction and conversion program with emphasis on nuclear power had my support, as did the extension of the Defense Production Act and bills providing penalties for damaging aircraft, as well as strengthening the laws against sedition and conspiracy.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Continuing my active interest in improving the Social Security Act, I voted for the new amendments which have become law and which provide additional benefits to 1,225,000 persons. The two major changes in the Social Security Act are, first, allowing physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; and, second, reducing the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The disability plan will take effect on July 1, 1957, and make about 250,000 persons eligible for benefits. The lowering of the age limit for women workers will provide benefits for about 325,000 workingwomen and 275,000 wives of workingmen. The bill also will provide benefits to about 175,000 widows at age 62. The measure further extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

The broadening and liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act approved by the 84th Congress were in accordance with similiar amendments I have advocated over a period of years. This is especially true because of my efforts to reduce the eligibility age for retirement. For years, I have sponsored legislation designed to reduce the eligibility age to 60 years. I also strongly advocated payment of benefits to those disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation. The reduction of the eligibility age of women to 62 years is in the form of a compromise since my amendment covered both men and women; nevertheless, it is a step in the direction of a more realistic social security program.

In regard to the need for an increase in old-age assistance benefits, the new amendments to the Social Security Act increased the Federal contribution to States by $5 monthly for beneficiaries of public assistance programs as administered in Pennsylvania by the department of public assistance. This increase of the Federal contribution will not become effective until the department of public assistance in Pennsylvania makes a similar increase of $5. In the field of old-age assistance, I continued my activities by cooperating with business, labor, and pension groups who are seeking a solution to what has become America's No. 1 problem—the adequate care and welfare of the Nation's senior citizens.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

I am greatly disappointed that the 84th Congress did not approve some of my proposals to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase benefits. There is no type of legislation in which I am more interested than amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. As a matter of fact, I pleaded, prodded, and begged for action in my efforts to comply with the wishes of my constituents regarding their ideas as to how the Railroad Retirement Act should be amended. My proposed amendments were contained in 14 separate bills that I had pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. These bills expressed in legal language the views of my constituents regarding the manner in which they felt the Railroad Retirement Act should be amended. I was permitted to testify before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on behalf of my proposed amendments at which time it became evident that any amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act would have to be approved on a pay-as-you-go basis.

One significant development in the effort to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act was revealed by the report of a board of actuarial experts which stated that the retirement fund was operating at an annual deficit of $86.4 million and any increase in retirement benefits would require an increase in payroll taxes to cover the cost. Confronted with this insurmountable obstacle, a bill was introduced which would increase benefits by 15 percent to about 65 percent of the present beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement Act. The cost of the increase was to be met by increasing the payroll tax on the earnings of active railroaders and then allowing them credit on their income tax for the amount of the increase in payroll tax. The Democratic-controlled House Committee on Ways and Means refused to act favorably on the bill because of the income tax proposal, with the result that in the closing hours of the 84th Congress, in a desperate effort to increase retirement benefits, a compromise bill was offered providing for a 10 percent increase without any increase in the payroll tax. This bill was approved by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower on August 7. It is estimated that it will cost an additional $83 million making a total annual deficit in the retirement fund of $169.4 million. When President Eisenhower signed the bill, he stressed the point that when Congress convenes next January some means must be found to finance the deficit of $169.4 million and any future amendments liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act that Congress may approve.

In reporting on my activities in the field of railroad-retirement legislation, I

worked in close harmony with the 21 standard railway-labor organizations that endorsed the legislation and, therefore, I yield to no one in the effort I put forth during the 84th Congress to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act and increase its benefits.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

During the 84th Congress, I continued my efforts in behalf of the veterans of all wars and their dependents, an activity that I began after my discharge from World War I in 1919. Not only have I personally assisted hundreds of veterans and their dependents in obtaining benefits to which they were entitled, but I played an active role in securing congressional approval of bills, now laws, which provide an increase in benefits to the veterans of all wars and their dependents. While the 84th Congress enacted the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivors Benefits Act and a bill providing educational assistance to children of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities, the Democratic-controlled Senate took no action on bills passed by the House which would have provided benefits to widows of World War II and Korea; granted a 10 percent increase to service-connected veterans; and provided a pension to the veterans of World War I. These bills, which we approved in the House, died in the Senate with the adjournment of the 84th Congress.

A SOUND NATIONAL FARM POLICY

During the 84th Congress, I joined with agricultural leaders in Congress in advocating a sound national farm policy for the country, the taxpayer and the farmer. The common objective was to relieve the Nation from the costly and wasteful burden of high rigid farm price supports and, at the same time, continue reasonable aid for American farmers. These rigid farm price supports were enacted in 1942 purely as a war measure at a time when the country was faced with a tremendous job of food production. The high prices were guaranteed as an incentive to the farmers to go all out in meeting the food needs of the Nation during World War II. From the very beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the Democrats persisted in disregarding President Eisenhower's urgent plea to not only maintain flexible price supports but also declined to adopt his 15-point rural development program. Following the courageous veto by President Eisenhower of the bill to restore rigid price controls and after weeks and weeks of stalling in the hope of making the farm issue a political football in an election year, Congress finally enacted the Eisenhower soil bank proposal—a two-part program to pay farmers to take land out of production. It approved other bills of benefit to the farmer, with the result that farm prices are increasing and the outlook for agriculture is more promising as the Eisenhower administration continues to make headway in its determined effort to curtail annual farm surpluses and, at the same time, dispose of the mountain of surplus commodities stored all over the country and which costs the American taxpayer $1 million daily for storage charges alone.

LABOR

My efforts during my congressional career to protect the welfare of American wage earners were continued during the 84th Congress as I actively supported the effort made to safeguard the jobs of American workmen by restricting the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods flooding the American market place. I also voted to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1 which legislation was enacted by the 84th Congress.

Except for the increase in the minimum hourly wage and a few other minor measures affecting special groups, the record of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress is sadly lacking in its concern for the interest of the workingman. Despite the oft-repeated claim that the Democratic Party is a true friend of the wage earner and although it controlled all congressional committees, legislative proposals not enacted by the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress include: First, Taft-Hartley Act revisions—even those favored by organized labor; second, extension of coverage under the minimum-wage law; third, equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex; fourth, public disclosure regarding employees' pension, health, and welfare programs; fifth, Federal assistance to areas suffering chronic unemployment—area development program; sixth, grants to the States for industrial safety programs; and, seventh, revision of labor standards on work contracted or financed by the Federal Government to provide for time and one-half pay for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day or in excess of 40 hours a week as the work standard. It is a significant fact that most of these recommendations were originally made in 1955, and renewed by President Eisenhower in 1956, with several new ones.

HOUSING

I supported the multi-million-dollar housing bill which has been signed by the President and which provides for the construction of 70,000 low-rental housing units for low-income groups during the next 2 years. The bill provides in general for the homeowner, the home seeker, the slum dweller, and others. The bill sent to the White House represented a last-minute compromise and, while it included rental housing for elderly citizens, it did not provide for the sale of houses to them. The overall housing program is designed to stimulate the building and repair of homes, and provides disaster relief, hospital construction, college, and farm housing, and so forth.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress failed to approve a $1.6 billion appropriation of Federal funds to help finance new school construction. It did approve a bill which is now a law to train more public-health specialists, and to help States train registered and practical nurses and build hospitals. In addition, Congress approved bills subsidizing insurance against flood losses, extended the polio-vaccination program and the school-milk program. It also approved a 3-year program costing $90 million for the building of non-Federal facilities for research in crippling diseases, and appropriated additional funds to help States expand vocational rehabilitation programs and to conduct research in cancer, heart disease, and other ailments. I was happy to vote for all these programs, including the new school construction bill which was defeated in the House of Representatives.

HIGHWAYS

One of the largest public works measures ever presented to Congress and which had my active support was embodied in the Eisenhower highway program providing for a 13-year road-construction project involving a network of 41,000 miles of Federal interstate highways. The bill, which is now a law, provides that the cost of the new highway program, which will be in the neighborhood of $35 billion, will be financed from increased gas, fuel, rubber, and other related taxes.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

To assist States and local governments in the prevention and control of water pollution, the 84th Congress enacted the Water Pollution Control Act. The law authorizes the appropriation of $3 million annually for the next 5 years to be expended in grants to the various States for their water pollution control programs. Similar grants are authorized over a 10-year period to aid States in the construction of necessary treatment plants to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into any waters. The act establishes comprehensive programs for water pollution control and directs the Surgeon General of the United States to support and aid technical research through investigation, training and information programs.

THE ECONOMY OF MY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

It is gratifying that the Nation as a whole is enjoying unrivaled peacetime prosperity and that recent figures released by the United States Department of Labor disclose that over 66 million are gainfully employed. There are, however, pockets of unemployment in the Nation that are of grave concern. These labor surplus areas are victims of the scourge of unemployment which brings distress and unhappiness to good American citizens who are jobless through no fault of their own.

My congressional district for the past several years has been classified as a labor surplus area because of the loss of coal business which adversely affected our two basic industries—coal and the railroads. The use of substitute fuels, especially hydropower and foreign residual oil, has destroyed our eastern seaboard coal market with the result that the decrease in the sale of coal is reflected in the loss of freight revenue to the railroads for hauling coal, which is a contributing cause for unemployment in the railroad, coal, and related industries. In a determined effort to bolster our sagging economy, I have been active for the past several years in assisting local communities with their industrial development programs designed to attract new industries and thus diversify our economy. It is pleasing to report that practically every community in my congressional

district has a live-wire industrial development committee and that thousands of dollars have been raised to finance the program of attracting new industries or expanding the facilities of existing plants. In this connection, I have worked in close harmony with these community groups, both individually and collectively, in the common effort to eradicate unemployment and rehabilitate the economy of the area.

In my efforts to be of assistance in building a strong economy in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, I have received the wholehearted cooperation of the United States Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Department of Defense, and other Federal agencies. As a result, it has been possible for me to assist in securing the approval of loans for business firms from the Small Business Administration; to expedite the issuance of tax-amortization certificates totaling over $91 million for expanding existing industries and attracting new industries; to aid in obtaining the awarding of defense contracts to firms in my congressional district; to secure assistance of the Federal Government in surveying the needs and rendering practical aid in processing applications for flood control projects in DuBois, Tyrone, and Hollidaysburg; to assist in providing employment by securing the approval of my request to the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration to make needed repairs to post offices and other Federal buildings; and, finally, to secure approval from the Department of Defense for the construction during the next few months of five new military armories at DuBois, Curwensville, Clearfield, Bellefonte, and Altoona. In short, my activities are constantly directed in a sincere effort to provide employment opportunities to counteract the unemployment that is a menace to our economy which is based primarily on the coal and railroad industries.

As a supplement to my determined efforts to aid our depressed economy, for several years unemployed persons and their families in my congressional district have been receiving surplus food commodities as a result of my activity several years ago in arranging for the County Commissioners of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties to qualify as sponsors in compliance with regulations of the Department of Agriculture regarding the distribution of Government-owned surplus commodities to the unemployed and their families.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to rendering service to my constituents, individually and collectively, my time was devoted to the study of legislation affecting my congressional district and the American people as a whole. When you consider the time required in attending daily sessions of Congress and committee meetings, as well as interviewing constituents and reading and answering mail, it is realized that the evening hours had to be used in studying legislation in preparation for hearings and debates on various measures. Frankly, I found myself constantly burning the midnight oil as I read volumes of the hearings on major bills pending before Congress. This action is mandatory if a Member of Congress has the best interests of his congressional district at heart and is conscientious in casting his vote in an intelligent manner.

PERSONAL SERVICES TO CONSTITUENTS

As Representative of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I have always regarded my constituents as being in the role of an employer and that, together, we enjoy an employer-employee relationship. In an effort to give an account of my stewardship, I have tried zealously to keep in close contact with the residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties by frequently informing them of happenings in Washington. As many know, when Congress is in session, I report to you weekly by radio and television in addition to writing a column for the daily and weekly newspapers. From time to time reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of statements made by me in Congress have been mailed to many of you. Although my congressional duties kept me close to Washington on weekdays, I made a determined effort to spend as many weekends as possible at my Altoona office and in visiting communities in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties. These weekend visits made it possible for me to be available for interviews with constituents interested in legislation pending in Congress, or who had problems affecting some agency of the Federal Government.

"THANK YOU, CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT"

Excerpts from letters of appreciation:

COAL CAR SHORTAGE

On behalf of the coal industry in central Pennsylvania, I want to thank you for your energetic interest in our welfare. The meeting with the executive officers of Government agencies, railroads, and others which you recently sponsored and organized in Washington, D. C., was very helpful and should contribute to a large degree to alleviate the serious railroad coal-car shortage which has caused considerable distress in our area. (Eastern Bituminous Coal Association, December 1955.)

EMPLOYMENT

In grateful appreciation for your untiring and devoted service in helping further the industrial development program which has already produced several thousand new jobs for our people. (Citation from the citizens of the Altoona area, May 1956.)

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT was employed with the Pennsylvania Railroad 22 years and understands our problems. He has never stopped fighting to get us the best retirement system in the world. He has introduced more bills to help rail employees than any other Congressman. (Rail Pension News, May 1956.)

LABOR

Permit me in behalf of the Railway Labor Executives Association and the millions of people affected by the Railroad Retirement Act to thank you for your assistance on our railroad retirement benefit program * * * undoubtedly by now you have been informed that your candidacy in the 20th District of Pennsylvania has been endorsed by our political league (comprising 20 standard railway labor organizations). (G. E. Leighty, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association, July 1956.)

Labor's Nonpartisan League in endorsing JIMMIE VAN ZANDT for the 78th Congress said:

You voted against the crippling Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. You voted against the amendments to the Wage and Hour Act, which would have excluded 2½ million workers from benefits of this act. You voted against the May-Connally antiunion amendments. You cooperated with the United Mine Workers to secure favorable House action on the mine safety bill.

HOUSING

The CIO News, in the July 19, 1948, issue on page 4 included JIMMIE VAN ZANDT on the CIO honor roll of Congressmen who fought for action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for housing, awarding him an "A" for his efforts in behalf of housing legislation.

INDUSTRY

I would like to express the appreciation of Veeder-Root, Inc., for all that you have done for making steel available for our new Altoona plant on schedule. (Leon J. Dunn, Vice President, Veeder-Root, Inc., 1956.)

QUEHANNA CURTISS-WRIGHT CORP.

Much of the benefits that the area will receive from Curtiss-Wright's installation at Quehanna can be credited to JIMMIE VAN ZANDT's unifying efforts and counsel to the corporation as the representative of this congressional district. (Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, October 1955.)

VETERANS

As service officers of the American Legion we realize perhaps more than anyone else the great need for increased benefits due disabled and impoverished veterans to which you are constantly striving as a Member of Congress. (American Legion District Service Officers, 1956.)

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

You have helped us to expedite important electronic contracts for delivery to our Navy. It is our belief that the efforts that you and Mr. Sheridan exerted in our behalf must be considered not only a contribution to national defense but also to the unemployment problem in Pennsylvania. (Edward V. Little, Executive Vice President, Dumont Airplane & Marine Instruments Co., Inc., Hyde plant, Clearfield, Pa.)

A COURAGEOUS LEGISLATOR

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT is known for his straightforwardness, no pussyfooting, determined stand on national problems. His congressional record matches his war record—outstanding. (Erie (Pa.) Daily Times, 1951.)

ONE OF THE TEN

Selected as 1 of the 10 outstanding Members of Congress. Sponsored much veteran, military, old-age pension and social-security legislation. (Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., 1949.)

MINUTEMAN OF CONGRESS

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT is the "Minuteman" of Congress—whether one agrees with his political philosophy it would be hard to deny that he is one of the hardest-working Congressmen in history. (Richard H. Sarge, columnist, Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, 1952.)

CONCLUSION

My seniority on the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, together with my legislative and administrative duties as a member of the 84th Congress, fully occupied my time during the 2-year period. My congressional

duties received my constant attention and wholehearted devotion as I sought to represent my constituents with fidelity, efficiency, and honesty. I have tried in a sincere manner to meet every issue fairly and squarely, and at no time did I permit narrow, partisan views to influence or hinder me in doing what I considered my duty. I gave my undivided attention to the needs of my congressional district and to rendering prompt and courteous service to all constituents regardless of their creed, political affiliation, or social position in life. To the many who over the years have written me letters of gratitude and encouragement, I gratefully acknowledge your kind expressions and thank you for your thoughtfulness. The residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties have my assurance that I feel highly honored to represent the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in Congress. The confidence you have manifested in me is accepted as a constant challenge to continue my efforts to justify your faith in my ability to represent you in Congress. I shall always strive to merit your prayers and best wishes.

President Eisenhower and Republican Congress Support Negro Citizens in Demand for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, no one can successfully deny that there is a great need at this time for Congress to establish in plain, strong, and positive language the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to every race, color, and creed.

It seems strange that there should be any necessity for such. But that such a necessity does exist is made plain whenever a civil-rights bill comes before Congress. It is always a signal for an intersectional controversy. And, while such legislation always obtains favorable consideration in the House, notwithstanding opposition from the South, yet it can never overcome such opposition in the Senate. This is not because the majority of the Senate on a record vote would be opposed to a civil-rights bill, but because the rules of the Senate permit the opposition to talk as long as desired and thereby kill the bill by filibustering tactics without ever bringing the bill to a final vote on its merits.

The conditions that create the necessity for such legislation arise chiefly in Southern States that are unwilling to give the Negro citizens the same rights of voting as are accorded to other citizens. By one means or another the rights of Negro citizens to vote are curtailed or effectually denied altogether. This is accomplished by restrictive laws or direct intimidation. Notwithstanding, the legislation that is enacted for the purpose has always, or practically so, been declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Yet the time that is consumed in fighting the issue though the several courts during which the restriction is enforced, or the continual enacting of new laws on the subject, thus creating new issues and new delays, has the effect of preventing the Negro voter in such States from exercising a free right of suffrage. This, in my opinion, is not only wrong from a legal standpoint, but it is un-American and subject to condemnation of the severest kind.

The need for legislation that will protect the rights of Negroes is not limited to voting rights. There is a Jim Crow attitude not only in the use of transportation facilities in certain Southern States, in fact it is almost general, but it finds expression in numerous and varied ways of discrimination against the Negro. It is shown in limitation of employment, use of hospital, school, parks, playgrounds, and many other civic facilities that should be on an equal and fair basis for all regardless of race, color, or creed.

During my service in the Congress I have never let an opportunity to improve the status of the Negro pass by without giving it to my full-hearted and sincere approval and unlimited support. I do not mention this with any thought that thereby I am entitled to great credit. I think that my Negro constituency is entitled to such. I would be derelict in my duty and obligations to them, as a Member of Congress, were I not in full accord with all such legislation. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to do so.

To me it has been most gratifying to see the progress being made each year by the Negro citizens of our country. Notwithstanding the obstacles they have had to encounter, they have been speedily progressing in matters of higher education, in the professions, in useful vocations, and in all that pertains to useful and influential citizenship. They have shown that when given the opportunity they can progress, achieve, and accomplish that which is worth while. It is our duty to assist in this endeavor by passing legislation of whatever kind is necessary to strike off the shackles that have too often bound them and restricted this upward movement, and to adopt such measures that will be most helpful.

The Eisenhower administration, and every Republican administration within my memory or reading, has been unqualifiedly friendly and helpful to the aims and aspirations of our Negro citizens. President Eisenhower, from the very beginning of his administration, has sought not only to establish all the civil rights of the Negro but has time and again shown his confidence in the ability and patriotism of the Negro race by appointing to high office recognized Negro leaders in the field of Government. In each instance the Negroes appointed to high office have justified the confidence placed in them by the President. There is no doubt in my mind that any future Negro appointments he may make will prove equally satisfactory. There are today innumerable Negro men and women qualified by training and character to serve with honor and distinction our Government in any position to which they may be appointed.

I consider it my continuing duty to be helpful whenever and in whatever way may be within my power. I will consider it a pleasure and a privilege to do so.

Voting Record of Congressman Wayne L. Hays, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my voting record on 18 most important bills to come before the House of Representatives. I have done this every 2 years since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record.

The matter follows:

How I voted	Issue	Status
Voted for	Agricultural Act of 1956 with soil bank	Became law.
Voted for	Refund tax on gasoline used on farms	Became law.
Voted for	Lower interest rates on loans to farmers for economic disasters	Became law
Voted for	Modernized REA loan allocation system	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	Increased railroad retirement benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Increased social-security benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Public housing and slum clearance bill	Became law.
Voted for	Interstate Federal-aid highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing veterans' pensions	Passed House only.
Voted for	Veterans' farm home loans	Became law.
Voted for	Bill strengthening and improving the Small Business Administration	Became law.
Voted against	Bill exempting from Federal regulation certain producers of natural gas	Vetoed.
Voted for	Income tax reduction for the average taxpayer	Passed House only.
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen free world	Became law.
Voted for	Federal aid for school construction	Defeated.
Voted against	Bill raising postal rates on letters from 3 cents to 4 cents	Passed House only.
Voted for	Civil-rights bill	Passed House only.

Legislative Record of the Honorable Irwin D. Davidson, 20th Congressional District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the legislative session of the 84th Congress has come to a close. Before the record is completed, however, and because I feel that an accounting of my activities is required, I wish to take this opportunity to place before my colleagues in the House and before the people of my district, the legislative activities and duties that have occupied my time, and the bills and resolutions that I have introduced during the second session.

Since the 3d of January, 1955, it has been my very great privilege to serve as the Representative of the over 350,000 persons who reside in the 20th Congressional District of New York. The honor which they bestowed on me almost 2 years ago has given me the opportunity to render a great variety of services to my constituents. Since my term of office does not expire until the 31st of December, I wish to make it plain that I shall continue, until that date, to render such services as I am able.

Since this is the last opportunity that I shall have to address my colleagues, I feel compelled to add one personal note. As you know, I am not a candidate for reelection to Congress. Instead, I have been honored with the nominations of the Democratic and Liberal Parties of New York State for judge of the court of general sessions for New York County. If elected to that office, I shall again have the opportunity to render service to the people of my State, and I am confident that my experiences here in Washington during the past 2 years will be of great help to me. I wish to thank all my good friends who have made my term of office so pleasant, and I hope that they will find this report enlightening.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the activities and duties of a Congressman are many. Each of us serves on committees of the House of Representatives. I have had the privilege during this Congress to serve on three of the standing committees: The Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Committee on Banking and Currency. In my work on those committees, I have attended hearings, questioned witnesses, written reports on legislation, and helped to decide whether legislation should be reported to the floor of the House. This is a side of our life of which few people are fully aware, and in which we spend a good number of hours each day. I mention it now as a part of the total picture of our lives as the representatives of our constituents, so that, when taken together with other phases of our activities, a complete picture of a Congressman's life may be painted.

Of course, the bills and resolutions which we introduce are a very meaningful part of our activity for they reflect the views which we hold and which we feel call for legislative action by the Congress. It is because of that picture which we draw of ourselves and of our interests that I reported to the House last August my legislative record for the 1st session. It is for the same reason that I desire to make this report for the 2d session. Again, as was the case last year, I make the report with some pride, for results have been accomplished. I will discuss first the public laws which I introduced, and for convenience I have listed them under their appropriate general headings.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—WORLD TRADE

House Joint Resolution 604, introduced April 18: This resolution was ordered favorably reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and was unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress. It was signed into law by the President on July 27, 1956. The resolution authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to join and participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in the Coliseum in my district of New York in April 1957. The States and nations will exhibit and offer for sale their respective goods and services. This fair will make a major contribution to our foreign-trade policies and will be the cornerstone and foundation of economic self-reliance for our friends throughout the world.

HOUSING

H. R. 7881, introduced January 3: This measure provided for an additional 45,000 units of public housing to be utilized by July 31 of this year and for 150,000 units during the fiscal year 1957. In addition, the bill provided for preferences to certain elderly persons in obtaining low-cost public housing.

H. R. 10295, introduced March 29: This bill would establish within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs to aid in and oversee the national programs for housing.

H. R. 10296, introduced March 29: This is an omnibus housing bill covering all phases of the national program. It provides for low-cost public housing, for the construction of middle-income housing and for slum clearance and urban renewal. This bill would have provided for 200,000 units of public housing in each of the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. Because of the administration's opposition to an adequate housing program, the Congress was forced to accept an entirely inadequate public-housing measure, one not even sufficient for the needs of the city of New York. The administration's bill called for only 35,000 units of public housing in each of the next 2 years, and this was the bill that Congress approved.

TAXATION

House Resolution 385, introduced January 19:

This resolution authorized an investigation and study of the desirability and feasibility of allowing taxpayers to deduct for income-tax purposes the expenses incurred in traveling to and from their places of employment. The provision in the Internal Revenue Code which bars this item as an expense and as a deduction is manifestly unfair. The cost of traveling to and from work is a real business expense for every wage earner.

H. R. 9329, introduced February 16: This measure would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit taxpayers with greatly fluctuating incomes to average their income for 2 or 3 years and thus avoid the harsh impact of a high tax bill in a low-income year. For thousands of persons who work on a commission basis, such as salesmen, this bill would provide much needed relief.

Though neither of these bills was acted on by the House, I have written to the chairman of the newly created Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation asking that the subject matter of these bills be among those considered this fall by his subcommittee.

HEALTH ANI EDUCATION

H. R. 9803, introduced March 7:

This bill provides for the conveyance of Ellis Island to the State of New York for use as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics and narcotic addicts.

House Joint Resolution 674, introduced July 6:

This resolution would set aside the 12th day of April of each year as National Health Day to focus the attention of our Nation on the great strides that are being made in the conquest of disease. The date, April 12, was chosen because it marks the date of the passing of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, perhaps more than any President in our history, recognized the significant part that the Federal Government could play in the conquest of disease and because it was on the 12th day of April that the wonderful results of the first field trial of the Salk antipolio vaccine were announced to the world.

House Joint Resolution 597, introduced March 29: This resolution would establish a joint congressional committee to study methods of improving and obtaining the greatest benefit from the international exchange-of-persons programs sponsored and conducted by the Federal Government.

DISASTER INSURANCE

H. R. 8664, introduced January 23: This bill would amend the War Risk Insurance Act to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from the forces of nature.

H. R. 9072, introduced February 6: This bill would create a Flood Insurance Administration, to provide for the writing of insurance against flood damage.

Both of these bills were drawn up in the hope that they would help in the discovery of a suitable formula for insuring individuals and firms against the losses caused by floods such as those that occurred in the northeastern part of the country last fall. A formula was found during this session of the Congress and a bill was passed to provide a $7.5 billion

dollar Federal flood insurance and loan program.

DEPRESSED AREAS

H. R. 8877, introduced January 30: This bill would have provided relief for conditions of excessive unemployment in areas which were economically depressed. This would be accomplished by loans to assist in financing the construction of industrial plants or other industrial or commercial facilities to provide employment to persons in such areas. A similar bill passed the Senate and was favorably reported in the House, but a rule was not granted for its consideration on the floor. Thus, the bill died.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

H. R. 10102, introduced March 21: This bill provided for an increase of 15 percent in the benefits paid to retired railroad workers under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. Such an increase would have brought the pensions paid to these persons more into line with reality in light of today's cost of living. The Congress passed a similar bill, except that the increase provided amounted to about 10 percent. While that is less of an increase than I felt was required, it is a step in the right direction.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA POWER

H. R. 11299, introduced May 17: I introduced this measure to reaffirm my support of the principle of public development of the Niagara electric power potential. As you know, in the first session I introduced H. R. 5878 as a companion bill to S. 1823 introduced by Senator Lehman. When the Senator's bill was passed by the Senate in an amended form, I reintroduced my bill in the identical language of the Senate-passed measure. The failure of the House Rules Committee to send this bill to the floor of the House for consideration was a great victory for the administration which had sought from the beginning to give this great power potential to the private utility monopoly in New York State.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the public laws which I have introduced during the second session. There are, however, other phases of my duties as a Congressman which have occupied a substantial part of my time since I took office, and which, in order to make this report complete, must be reported to you.

For example, in addition to the public laws which I introduced, there are measures of a private nature for which I am responsible. Since I took office, I have introduced over 40 private bills. The majority of them were for the relief of aliens faced with deportation under provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. Since bills of this type normally take at least 2 years or so to process, I am gratified to be able to report that 12 of these bills have become law, thus granting permanent residence to persons in my district. Moreover, some of the persons who were the beneficiaries of these bills have been granted relief through administrative procedures so that action on their bills was no longer necessary.

The aid given to these aliens is very gratifying. In one case, a woman, 76 years old and in ill health, was allowed to remain in our country, rather than be deported and separated from all of her close relatives. In two cases, foreign-born wives of American servicemen will be able to come to America and join their husbands. Finally, in two other cases, alien children will be permitted to remain in America with their parents.

Other private bills which I introduced involved claims of my constituents against the United States Government. One bill provided for the return of $2,500 which one of my constituents had lent to the Government so that the gold medal honoring Dr. Jonas E. Salk might be minted and presented to the doctor in time to spur this year's March of Dimes campaign. As you will remember, my resolution which passed in the first session and which authorized the medal was approved by the President after Congress adjourned and the appropriation for the medal could not be passed. This constituent was kind enough to lend the money for the medal to the Government and I am happy that his generosity was recognized by the Congress and by the President who signed my bill to repay him. Another of these bills provided for the return of $1,000 to a constituent, whose brother had been ordered deported but who had later been given the right to remain in America permanently. The $1,000 was paid for a bond to give the brother his freedom from confinement pending his deportation. The bond was forfeited when the brother failed to leave the country, even though a bill was then before the Congress for his relief. Since the brother was finally permitted to remain here the forfeiture of the bond was unfair, and I am happy that my bill was approved.

Mr. Speaker, there are still other areas to which I have devoted my attention on behalf of my constituents. I have had a great number of requests to aid families in obtaining visas to reunite husbands with wives and parents with children in this country. In these cases, my aid was sought to overcome the great time delays that are encountered in these situations, delays which cause great strains and in some cases great legal problems. In one such case, I was able to obtain visas for three minor children of a Jewish family; the children were living in Egypt. Time was extremely important, since the eldest child was just under 21 years of age. Had her birthday occurred before the issuance of her visa, she would have been placed under a heavily oversubscribed quota and would have had to wait years for a quota number before she could have joined her family.

I have also received innumerable requests for aid from constituents who desired my aid in solving personal problems. These requests required my intervention with every Federal agency: the Social Security Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the State Department, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Departments of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, to name but a few.

There were requests from constituents for thousands of Government publications and documents. I filled these requests as quickly as the publications and documents could be obtained.

Finally, there was the mail from constituents. The letters ran into the hundreds each and every week and covered every conceivable item of legislation and every phase of governmental activity. I was happy to be kept advised of the views of my constituents and I answered their letters with all possible speed.

I have proceeded at some length, Mr. Speaker, in order to set forth in detail the activities which have occupied my time as the Representative of the 20th Congressional District of New York. I have previously spread before you my voting record for the 2d session, so that that too would be available for inspection. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this record of my legislative activities, when combined with my record on major votes, will commend itself to you and to my constituents. I have endeavored to retain the trust and confidence of the kind people who gave me the opportunity to serve in this great legislative body. I hope that my record will strengthen that faith and trust as I seek to return to the judicial life which I left to serve as a Member of Congress.

Housing: The Challenge Is Clear—Shall We Meet It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we have seen passed in the closing days of Congress the Housing Act of 1956. This measure is a step in the right direction but falls far short of meeting the needs of the American people for low-cost housing. The population of our country is growing by leaps and bounds and the estimated census figures for 10 years hence should make any thinking person realize that this Nation is facing a critical shortage of low-cost dwellings.

I am acutely aware of the housing problem as I look at my own city of Detroit. The Motor City is a perfect example of the changing complexion of the American scene. It is but one of the many metropolitan areas throughout this Nation that must provide living facilities for the employees of local industries. I cannot help but think, as I view the substandard homes that are all too prevalent, that many of my congressional colleagues do not realize the crying need of so many American families for just a little better situation in which to raise children. The growing problem of juvenile delinquency is so intertwined with home environment that the two are inseparable.

Private industry has made a sincere effort to provide the necessary housing, but has not been able to keep pace with growing demand. The financial aspects of home construction virtually exclude

the low-income groups from ever owning their own homes. These are the people the Federal Government must assist with the long-term financing that private enterprise is not able to provide. I am not criticizing the home-building industry; I am merely stating that the monetary return from low-income housing is not enough to encourage investment capital.

The public housing bill of 1956, signed by the President on August 7, authorizes the construction of 35,000 public housing units a year for 2 years. I am quite happy that a total of 70,000 units will be built in the next 2 years, but this number falls far short of the required construction if we are to demonstrate to the world that all segments of our society share in the wealth of this great Nation. Legislation was introduced in this Congress to authorize construction of 130,000 units over a 3-year period; unfortunately, this measure was never released by the House Rules Committee and consequently never came before the House for consideration. This is the type of forward-looking legislation that we need to clear up the slums and blighted metropolitan areas. Thirty-three percent of our population is housed in quarters that are not fit for human habitation. At what point will we realize that the money spent on creating an atmosphere in which young Americans can grow up with the minimum requirements for decent living will return a hundredfold in reduction of prison and hospital operating expenses.

Several other facets of the housing problem are worthy of the most careful consideration. I was pleased to note that at least a modest amount of funds were made available this year for home-improvement loans. This will allow many homes now considered substandard because of structural conditions or lack of basic sanitary facilities to be repaired or rebuilt.

Another measure I sincerely regret was not included in the housing bill is special housing for the aged.

What do I mean by special housing for the aged? As we all know, people are living longer than ever before as a result of dietary and medicinal advances. These people are for the most part retired and living on a pension or social security. Being proud and self-respecting, they desire to live an independent, active useful life. Unfortunately, this is not always possible. Financial limitations quite often prevent the average retired persons from enjoying life in their senior years. This is most unjust treatment of those who have worked long and hard raising a family and contributing to the national welfare. Our older citizens are entitled to much more from a grateful country. The Federal Government should lead the way in planning communities in which retired people might gather, if they so desire, to live their remaining years with others who share their interests. I hope the 85th Congress will give sympathetic attention to the problems confronting the retired and soon-to-be-retired in this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is the duty of Congress to step in where private industry and local communities have been unable to cope with the housing problem and extend a helping hand. We have the potential to take our free way of life and refine it to a point that staggers the imagination. No one needs to go hungry; no one needs be improperly clothed; no one should want for adequate housing. The challenge is clear—shall we meet it?

Republicans Responsible for Success of President Eisenhower's Program in the Senate

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me as chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As chairman of the Senate Campaign Committee I want to show which party supported President Eisenhower in the Senate during the past 4 years. This can only be done by examining all rollcall votes in both the 83d and 84th Congresses. I have prepared a complete analysis which I am inserting in the RECORD so that the American people may have the facts.

The 83d Congress was under the control of the Republican Party; the 84th Congress was under the control of the Democratic Party. The votes in these two Congresses covering a period of 4 years are a measure of the support that the two parties have given President Eisenhower.

There were 271 rollcalls in the 83d Congress and 230 rollcalls in the 84th Congress, or a total of 501 rollcalls. Every rollcall has been reviewed and accounted for so that the record will be complete and all-inclusive.

After eliminating procedural votes, as well as issues which were clearly not a part of the President's program, I find that there were 220 rollcalls in the 83d Congress and 203 rollcalls in the 84th Congress which represented a clear test of support for President Eisenhower. In the 83d Congress on this entire group of issues, the Republican Members cast 7,525 votes in support of President Eisenhower's program or 64.7 percent of the total. The Democrats cast 4,114 votes, or 35.3 percent of the total.

In the 84th Congress when the Democrats were in control of the Congress, the Republicans cast 6,682 votes or 59.4 percent of the votes cast for President Eisenhower, and the Democrats cast 4,575 votes or 40.6 percent of the votes for his program. Over the 4-year period on these 423 issues, Republicans cast 14,207 votes for President Eisenhower's program or 62.1 percent of the total. The Democrats cast 8,689 votes or 37.9 percent of the total.

An examination of the votes cast in opposition to President Eisenhower's program shows a sharp party division. During the 83d Congress, Republicans cast only 1,630 votes in opposition to the President's program or 25.7 percent of the total. Democrats cast 4,701 votes or 74.3 percent of the total. During the 84th Congress once again we find Republicans casting only 1,715 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower's program or 29.7 percent of the total opposition votes with the Democrats casting 4,053 or 70.3 percent of the opposition votes. Over the 4-year period, the Republicans cast only 3,345 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower's program or 27.6 percent of the total opposition votes. The Democrats cast 8,754 or 72.4 percent of the opposition votes.

The 423 rollcalls included issues which were passed unanimously such as the ratification of treaties and issues which had bipartisan support where a majority of both parties voted in support of the President.

An examination of all issues which were not passed with bipartisan support is even more revealing. During the 83d Congress there were 126 votes in this category. Republicans cast 4,203 votes in support of President Eisenhower or 75.6 percent of all supporting votes. The Democrats cast 1,356 votes or only 24.4 percent of the total. When we examine the opposition votes, the Democrats cast 3,749 votes in opposition to the program or 77.2 percent of the total. The Republicans cast only 1,109 such votes or 22.8 percent of the total.

There is a remarkable consistency in the statistics between the 83d and 84th Congresses. During the 84th Congress 102 issues fell into this group. On these issues Republicans cast 3,106 votes in support of President Eisenhower or 76 percent of the total support votes. The Democrats cast 979 votes or only 24 percent of the total support votes. An examination of the opposition votes shows that the Democrats cast 3,405 votes or 73.7 percent of the total. The Republicans cast only 1,214 votes or 26.3 percent of the total. Over the 4-year period there were 228 rollcalls which were not adopted with full bipartisan support. Of all the votes cast in support of the President's program on these rollcalls, 75.8 percent were cast by Republicans and only 24.2 percent by Democrats. Of all opposition votes, 75.5 percent were cast by Democrats and only 24.5 percent by Republicans.

At this point I shall include a table which shows the position of the two parties in the two Congresses in their support of President Eisenhower:

All Eisenhower rollcalls

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	220	7,525	64.7	4,114	35.3	4,701	74.3	1,630	25.7
84th	203	6,682	59.4	4,575	40.6	4,053	70.3	1,715	29.7
Total	423	14,207	62.1	8,689	37.9	8,754	72.4	3,345	27.6

Immediately following is a tabulation showing the support accorded President Eisenhower on all rollcalls where a majority of the two parties was not in accord with the President's program. The 228 votes include 188 votes where a majority of the Republicans supported the President and a majority of the Democrats voted in opposition to him. It also includes the 40 votes where a majority of the Republicans voted in opposition to President Eisenhower.

Eisenhower rollcalls on issues without bipartisan Senate support

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	126	4,203	75.6	1,356	24.4	3,749	77.2	1,109	22.8
84th	102	3,106	76.0	979	24.0	3,405	73.7	1,214	26.3
Total	228	7,309	75.8	2,335	24.2	7,154	75.5	2,323	24.5

I have further subdivided the rollcalls in each Congress into 6 groups. Group 1 includes issues not included in the President's program which were adopted on a bipartisan basis. This group includes votes on Senate procedure.

Group 2 includes votes on issues which were not included in the President's program where the two parties were divided. The vote on the Niagara power development is an example of an issue in this category.

Group 3 includes issues which were included in the President's program and were adopted with no recorded opposition. The ratification of numerous treaties is included in group 3.

Group 4 includes issues where a majority of both parties voted in support of President Eisenhower's program. It is interesting in this connection that during the 84th Congress 69 rollcalls are included in this group and they account for 30 percent of all 84th Congress Senate rollcalls. While the majority of both parties supported the President's position on each rollcall, I find that 50.5 percent of the votes cast in favor of the President's program were cast by Republicans and 49.5 percent by Democrats. On this group of issues, the Democrats contributed 56.4 percent of all the votes cast in opposition to the President and the Republicans only 43.6 percent.

Group 5 includes those issues on which a majority of the Republicans voting were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program. There were 20 such rollcalls in both the 83d and 84th Congresses. The vote to restrict mutual security aid for Yugoslavia is an example of the type of issue included in this category. It is important to note that there were only 40 rollcalls included in this group during the 2 Congresses. They represented less than 8 percent of all Senate rollcalls.

Group 6 includes all issues where a majority of the Republican Senators voted to support President Eisenhower's program and were opposed by a majority of the Democratic Senators. On this group of issues, the Republicans supplied 81.7 percent of all the votes cast in support of President Eisenhower and the Democrats only 18.3 percent during the 84th Congress. Conversely, the Democrats supplied 82.2 percent of the votes recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower and the Republicans only 17.8 percent.

In reviewing this record it must be remembered that many items were never reported to the Senate during the last 2 years as the Democratic Party was in control of all the committees and decided which issues would receive consideration as well as the form in which they were reported.

I believe that this complete analysis of the votes cast over the past 4 years conclusively shows why President Eisenhower needs a Republican 85th Congress. I am inserting the entire tabulation in the RECORD at this point.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF SENATE ROLLCALLS, 83D CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the Senate rollcalls during the 83d Congress. Two hundred seventy-one rollcalls were taken. They have been placed into six groups as summarized below:

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The 2 groups together include 51 rollcalls, or 19 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
- Yeas ---------- 794
- Nays ---------- 559

Democrats:
- Yeas ---------- 755
- Nays ---------- 546

The number of issues included in group 1 is 33, accounting for 12 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Republicans ---------- 625
- Democrats ---------- 133

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Democrats ---------- 556
- Republicans ---------- 111

The number of issues included in group 2 is 18, accounting for 7 percent of 271 rollcalls.

Groups 3 through 6 include rollcalls on issues included in the President's program. They total 220 rollcalls or 81 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

VOTES CAST

Republicans:
- Yeas ---------- 355
- Nays ---------- ---

Democrats:
- Yeas ---------- 352
- Nays ---------- ---

The number of issues included in group 3 is 9, accounting for 3 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast ---------- 2,967
- Percent ---------- 55.2

Democrats:
- Votes cast ---------- 2,406
- Percent ---------- 44.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast ---------- 952
- Percent ---------- 64.6

Republicans:
- Votes cast ---------- 521
- Percent ---------- 35.4

The number of issues included in group 4 is 85, accounting for 32 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast ---------- 224
- Percent ---------- 43.0

Democrats:
- Votes cast ---------- 297
- Percent ---------- 57.0

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast ---------- 518
- Percent ---------- 46.8

Republicans:
- Votes cast ---------- 590
- Percent ---------- 53.2

The number of issues included in group 5 is 20, accounting for 7 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast ---------- 3,979
- Percent ---------- 79.0

Democrats:
- Votes cast ---------- 1,059
- Percent ---------- 21.0

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast ---------- 3,231
- Percent ---------- 86.2

Republicans:
- Votes cast ---------- 519
- Percent ---------- 13.8

The number of issues included in Group 6 is 106, accounting for 39 percent of 271 rollcalls.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all rollcalls not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 126 issues or 46 percent of all Senate rollcalls.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	224	----------	297	----------	518	----------	590	----------
6	3,979	----------	1,059	----------	3,231	----------	519	----------
Total	4,203	75.6	1,356	24.4	3,749	77.2	1,109	22.8

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all rollcalls representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 220 of the 271 rollcalls or 81 percent of all Senate rollcalls. These rollcalls are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 64.7 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 35.3 percent. The Democrats supplied 74.3 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 25.7 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	355		352					
4	2,967		2,406		952		521	
5	224		297		518		590	
6	3,979		1,059		3,231		519	
Total	7,525	64.7	4,114	35.3	4,701	74.3	1,630	25.7

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 83d Cong.

Record vote No.	Group	Description
1	1	Consideration of rules adoption for 83d Cong.
2	1	Membership on Armed Services Committee—Vote by ballot under rule XXIV.
3	4	Charles E. Wilson—Confirmation as Secretary of Defense.
4	1	Internal Security Investigation—Vote on resolution (S. Res. 46).
5	4	Harold E. Talbott—Confirmation as Secretary of the Air Force.
6	4	Reorganization Act of 1949—McClellan amendment.
7	1	Condemning persecution of minority groups by Russia (S. Res. 84).
8	4	Albert M. Cole—Confirmation as Housing Administrator.
9	4	Charles E. Bohlen—Confirmation as Ambassador to Russia.
10	4	Tidelands—Anderson motion to lay aside.
11	6	Tidelands—Taft motion to table Anderson amendment.
12	6	Tidelands—Douglas-Anderson Continental Shelf amendment.
13	6	Tidelands—Monroney 3-mile-mark amendment.
14	6	Tidelands—Douglas coastline amendment.
15	6	Tidelands—Lehman educational-use substitute.
16	6	Tidelands—Kefauver Commission substitute.
17	6	Tidelands—Neely revenue-use substitute.
18	6	Tidelands—Langer national-debt amendment.
19	6	Tidelands—Passage (H. R. 4198).
20	6	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Langer consumer-dollar amendment.
21	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—McCarthy housing amendment.
22	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Byrd congressional control-limitation amendment.
23	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Bricker standby-authority amendment.
24	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Bricker ceiling-exemption amendment.
25	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Dirksen 5-percent reduction amendment.
26	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Public buildings-service amendment.
27	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Douglas buildings-maintenance amendment.
28	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Dworshak public-housing amendment.
29	1	The Morse resolution (S. Res. 32)—To add Senator Morse and an additional Republican member to committees.
30	6	Reorganization Plan No. 2 (Agriculture Department)—Russell resolution to disapprove.
31	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—State Department buildings amendment.
32	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Business-census amendment.
33	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ferguson motion to lay on table Knowland motion to reconsider rollcall vote No. 32.
34	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ellender airport-aid substitute.
35	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ship-construction amendment.
36	1	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Bridges Communist China amendment.
37	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Bridges motion to suspend rules to permit United States marshal amendment.
38	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Mundt motion to reconsider vote by which Senate rejected amendment by rollcall vote No. 31.
39	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ferguson motion to suspend rules to permit employee-dismissal amendment.
40	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ellender motion to table Douglas motion to reconsider rollcall vote No. 38.
41	6	Treasury-Post Office appropriations, 1954—Douglas amendment to reduce amount for postal operations.
42	6	Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1954—Russell et al. substitute amendment to Williams soil conservation payments amendment.
43	6	Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1954—Williams amendment as amended by Russell substitute amendment.
44	5	Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1954—Williams soil conservation payment reduction amendment.
45	2	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Knowland motion to consider conference report.
46	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Knowland motion to table Long motion to reconsider consideration of conference report.
47	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Vote on adoption of conference report.
48	6	Outer Continental Shelf—Hill education substitute.
49	5	Outer Continental Shelf—Hendrickson-Case education-formula amendment.
50	4	Outer Continental Shelf—Long State-reimbursement amendment.
51	2	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Dirksen $25 million surplus-commodity amendment.
52	1	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Humphrey $50 million surplus-commodity amendment.
53	6	Mutual Security Act of 1953—McClellan currency conversion surplus commodity amendment.
54	4	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Goldwater French Indochina amendment.
55	6	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Case motion to table Long motion to recommit with $1.5 billion cut.
56	4	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Long motion to recommit with $1 billion cut.
57	5	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Long motion to recommit with cut to House figure.
58	6	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, 1954—Hill et al. hospital-construction amendment.
59	6	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, 1954—Langer tuberculosis amendment.
60	4	Agreement on German external debts—Douglas motion to recommit.
61	4	Agreement on German external debts—ratified.
62	4	NATO Status of Forces Agreement—Bricker criminal jurisdiction reservation.
63	4	NATO Status of Forces Agreement—Ratification.
64	6	Excess-profits tax extension, Williams amendment to increase minimum exemption.
65	1	Equal rights constitutional amendment (S. J. Res. 49)—Hayden saving-clause amendment.
66	1	Equal rights constitutional amendment (S. J. Res. 49)—Passed.
67	1	Legislative employees retirement (S. 2175)—Carlson motion to refer bill to committee.
68	1	Legislative employees retirement—Williams amendment to increase retirement deductions for Members of Congress and legislative employees.
69	2	Knowland motion that Senate recess until 10 a. m., Saturday, July 18.
70	4	Commercial treaties with Ethiopia, Finland, Israel, Denmark, Greece, Germany, Japan, Italy—Ratified.
71	6	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Douglas single-purchaser amendment.
72	6	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Douglas large producers limitation amendment.
73	6	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Long amendment to permit either House or Senate to reject one or more proposed sales.
74	4	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Passed.
75	5	Defense Department appropriations, 1954—Saltonstall motion to eliminate committee amendment.
76	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1954—Maybank amendment to increase Air Force funds.
77	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1954—Hayden amendments to increase pilot training.
78	4	International Sugar Agreement—Ratified.
79	3	Fishery Convention Between the United States and Canada—Ratified.
80	4	Immigration visas to certain refugees (S. 1917)—Jenner amendment authorizing President to suspend visas.
81	4	Immigration visas to certain refugees (S. 1917)—Ives-Ferguson-Hendrickson amendment to include nationals of Italy.
82	4	Special-quota immigration visas (H. R. 6481)—Passed.
83	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Long amendment to limit amount available for expenditure.
84	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—McCarthy motion to suspend rules to permit consideration of amendment to bar funds from countries trading with Red China.
85	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Ellender amendment to cut mutual aid military funds for Europe.
86	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Ellender amendment to cut economic aid funds to Great Britain.
87	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Jenner amendment to limit expenditures to $5.5 billion.
88	6	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Gore amendment to delete $50 million item for mutual special weapons planning.
89	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act (H. R. 6391)—Passed.
90	6	Outer Continental Shelf—Adoption of conference report.
91	1	Standing committees—Anderson et al.
92	1	Standing committees adjustment—Adopted.
93	4	St. Lawrence Seaway development—Long annual appropriations amendments.
94	4	St. Lawrence Seaway development—Flanders motion to recommit.
95	4	St. Lawrence Seaway development—Passage.
96	6	Robert E. Lee—Confirmation as FCC member.
97	4	Korean Mutual Defense Treaty—Ratification.
98	1	Subcommittee on Investigations personnel—Adopted.
99	4	Commodity Credit Corporation indebtedness—Conference report adopted.
100	4	Bricker amendment—Ferguson international-agreement amendment.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 83d Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
101	4	Bricker amendment—Knowland treaty-ratification amendment.
102	6	Bricker amendment—Ferguson supreme-law amendment.
103	6	Albert C. Beeson—Confirmation as member of the NLRB.
104	2	Johnson (Texas)—Motion to adjourn.
105	5	Bricker amendment—Bricker internal-law amendment.
106	1	Bricker amendment—Morse motion to recommit.
107	1	Legislative retirement—Conference report adopted.
108	5	Bricker amendment—George modified amendment.
109	5	Bricker amendment—George substitute.
110	6	Mexican farm labor—Passage.
111	6	Hawaiian Statehood—Anderson amendment.
112	2	Natural Gas Act—Morse motion to recommit.
113	2	New Mexico election—Cordon amendment.
114	2	New Mexico election—Passage.
115	1	Capehart motion to recess.
116	5	Excise taxes—Douglas home-appliances amendment.
117	4	Excise taxes—Douglas automobile amendment.
118	4	Excise taxes—Douglas radio-and-TV sets amendment.
119	4	Excise taxes—McClellan highway amendment.
120	4	Excise taxes—Williams-Byrd substitute.
121	4	Excise taxes—Passage.
122	4	Excise taxes—Conference report adopted.
123	4	Hawaiian statehood—Monroney et al. Commonwealth substitute.
124	6	Hawaiian statehood—Smathers et al. referendum.
125	4	Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood—Passage.
126	6	Federal Aid Road Act—Chavez State-apportionment amendment.
127	4	Lease-Purchase Act—Dirksen $20,000 limitation.
128	6	Lease-Purchase Act—Passage.
129	6	Wool bill—Ellender 90 percent of parity amendment.
130	4	Wool bill—Malone tariff amendment.
131	6	Wool bill—Humphrey dairy substitute.
132	6	Wool bill—Thye dairy amendment.
133	6	Wool bill—Ellender price-support limitation.
134	4	Wool bill—Passage.
135	4	International Sugar Agreement—Dirksen reservation.
136	4	International Sugar Agreement—Ratification.
137	1	District of Columbia public works construction—Morse substitute.
138	1	District of Columbia public works construction—Payne tax-plan amendments.
139	6	Taft-Hartley amendments.
140	2	Constitutional amendment—Supreme Court composition.
141	2	Time-lag bill—Motion to recommit.
142	6	Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations—Postal inspectors' amendment.
143	2	Transportation of fireworks—Johnston private transportation exemption.
144	1	Transportation of fireworks—Passage.
145	4	Independent Offices appropriations—FCC funds amendment.
146	5	Independent Offices appropriations—Cooper TVA-funds amendment.
147	2	Oregon public lands—Morse administration amendment.
148	1	HOLC amendments—Douglas nationwide-savings-and-loan amendment.
149	2	HOLC amendments—Douglas 39-States-savings-and-loan amendment.
150	6	Constitutional amendment—18-year-old voting.
151	5	Civil functions appropriations bill—Douglas $2-million-reduction amendment.
152	5	Civil functions appropriations bill—Douglas $3.6-million-reduction amendment.
153	4	Santa Margarita project—Douglas United States-rights amendment.
154	4	Agriculture Department appropriations—Schoeppel-Cooper experiment-station amendment.
155	6	Agriculture Department appropriations—Douglas REA amendment.
156	6	Agriculture Department appropriations—Morse motion tabling reconsideration of REA amendment.
157	6	Agriculture Department appropriations—Long school-lunch amendment.
158	4	Agriculture Department appropriations—Morse REA amendment.
159	4	Housing Act of 1954—Knowland public-housing amendment.
160	4	Constitutional amendment—Congressional emergency operation.
161	4	Col. Leland Hazelton Hewitt—Chavez motion to recommit appointment.
162	6	Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations—Monroney amendment with respect to McLeod.
163	6	Defense Department appropriations—Kennedy additional funds amendment.
164	6	Trade Agreements Extension Act—Gore 3-year amendment.
165	4	Trade Agreements Extension Act—Mundt farm-parity amendment.
166	4	Trade Agreements Extension Act—Passage.
167	4	Caracas Declaration reaffirmed—Resolution adopted.
168	4	Universal Copyright Convention—Ratified.
169	6	Universal Copyright Convention—Reconsideration tabled.
170	6	Indian hospitals transfer—Passage.
171	6	Tax revision bill—Millikin personal-exemption substitute.
172	6	Tax revision bill—George personal-exemption amendment.
173	5	Tax revision bill—Johnson (Colorado) dividend-study amendment.
174	6	Tax revision bill—Long individual-tax-credit amendment.
175	4	Tax revision bill—Morse depreciation-schedules amendment.
176	2	Tax revision bill—Gore life-insurance amendment.
177	4	Tax revision bill—Douglas farm-machinery amendment.
178	4	Tax revision bill—Douglas motion to recommit.
179	4	Tax revision bill—Monroney corporate-tax amendment.
180	4	Tax revision bill—Passage.
181	6	Vocational rehabilitation services—Morse Washington pilot center amendment.
182	3	Vocational rehabilitation services—Passage.
183	4	Military and naval installation construction—Long reduction amendments.
184	4	Military and naval installation construction—Long Director-of-Installations amendment.
185	6	Priest Rapids development—Magnuson power-preference amendment.
186	6	Employment Security Administrative Financing Act—Kennedy nationwide standards amendment.
187	6	Employment Security Administrative Financing Act—Kennedy State-use amendments.
188	4	Employment Security Administrative Financing Act—Passage.
189	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Anderson contractual-power amendment.
190	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Ferguson amendment.
191	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Johnson (Colorado) power-disposition amendment.
192	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Johnson (Texas) motion tabling reconsideration of Johnson (Colorado) amendment.
193	2	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Humphrey Civilian Application Division amendment.
194	1	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion to recess.
195	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Pastore's atomic-pool amendment.
196	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Kerr licensing amendment.
197	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Sparkman patent-licensing amendment.
198	2	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland cloture motion.
199	4	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Lehman international agreement-section amendment.
200	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Murray power-liaison amendment.
201	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Stennis domestic-section amendment.
202	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Daniel national-debt amendment.
203	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Fulbright education amendment.
204	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Humphrey license-regulation amendment.
205	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Morse fair-price amendment.
206	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Passage.
207	4	Housing Act of 1954—Conference report adopted.
208	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Capehart Export-Import Bank amendment.
209	1	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Red China U. N. seating amendment.
210	6	Tax revision bill—Conference report adopted.
211	5	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Malone strategic-materials amendment.
212	3	Expression favoring German sovereignty—Resolution adopted.
213	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Malone aircraft-construction amendment.
214	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Smathers Latin-American amendment.
215	6	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Johnston farm-surpluses amendment.
216	1	Flanders-McCarthy censure resolution—Knowland motion to refer to a select committee.
217	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Long $1-plus billion reduction amendment.
218	6	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Long one-half billion amendment.
219	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Passage.
220	4	Supplemental appropriation bill—Morse Hoover Commission amendment.
221	6	Supplemental appropriation bill—Ferguson civil defense headquarters amendment.
222	4	Agricultural Act of 1954—McCarthy 90 to 100 percent of parity amendment.
223	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Schoeppel 82½ to 90 percent of parity amendment.
224	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Aiken flexible-supports amendment.
225	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Thye dairy-products amendment.
226	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Aiken dairy-support-elimination amendment.
227	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Young 75 and 90 percent of parity for grain substitute.
228	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Aiken grain-support-elimination amendment.
229	4	Agricultural Act of 1954—Williams disaster-relief amendment.
230	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Anderson forest-administration amendment.
231	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Kerr beef-parity amendment.
232	4	Agricultural Act of 1954—Thye utilization amendment.
233	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Ellender wool amendment.
234	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Humphrey county-committeemen amendment.
235	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Johnston motion tabling reconsideration committeemen amendment.
236	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Passage.
237	6	Subversive Activities Control Act—Commission on Security amendment.
238	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Ives labor-organization amendment.
239	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Daniel separability amendment.
240	3	Subversive Activities Control Act—Humphrey Communist Party amendment.
241	3	Subversive Activities Control Act—Passage.
242	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Conference report rejected.
243	6	Mutual Security Appropriations—Maybank reduction amendment.
244	1	Corliss Lamont cited for contempt.
245	4	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Conference report adopted.
246	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Butler Communist Party amendment to House amendments.
247	6	Subversive Activities Control Act—Humphrey Communist Party amendment to House amendments.
248	6	Subversive Activities Control Act—Gore motion tabling reconsideration of Humphrey amendment.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 83d Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
249	4	Subversive Activities Contro Act—Senate concurrence in House amendments.
250	6	Rivers and harbors bill—Kennedy Delaware River amendment.
251	4	Rivers and harbors bill—Passage.
252	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Conference report adopted.
253	6	Santa Maria project—Pay raise rider.
254	6	Santa Maria project—Morse acreage amendment.
255	3	Subversive Activities Act—Conference report adopted.
256	1	Railroad Retirement Act—Goldwater amendment.
257	5	Pay raise bill—Knowland amendment.
258	5	Pay raise bill—Passage.
259	3	Tax Treaty With Great Britain—Ratified.
260	3	Opium Treaty—Ratified.
261	3	Tax Treaty With Germany—Ratified.
262	1	Adjournment until Nov. 29, 1954 (S. Res. 331)—Lehman amendment to change date in resolution to Nov. 22, 1954.
263	1	Adjournment until Nov. 29, 1954 (S. Res. 331)—Passed.
264	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Dirksen amendment.
265	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Mundt amendment.
266	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Bridges amendment.
267	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Adoption of committee amendment to sec. 1.
268	2	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Bridges motion to table sec. 2, as modified.
269	2	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Bennett amendment to second committee amendment (in the nature of a substitute therefor).
270	2	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Passage of second committee amendment, as amended.
271	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Passed.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
1	41	5	29	16
2	46	1	35	6
4	39		34	
7	39		40	
29	2	33	17	23
36	38		38	
52	3	27	9	27
65	24	19	34	6
66	42	1	31	10
67	12	27	9	29
68	12	27	7	31
91	3	36	23	23
92	39		45	1
98	44		41	1
106	1	45	17	29
107	33	13	28	17
115		41	1	43
137	5	31	10	20
138	13	23	10	22
144	38	2	35	1
148	1	36	13	22
194	44		12	
209	47		44	
216	40	3	35	9
244	38	1	33	2
256	7	30		38
262		42	2	34
263	42		34	2
264	21	22		44
265	15	29		45
266	20	23		45
267	23	20	44	
271	22	22	45	
Total	794	559	755	546

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
45	Yea	39		39	
51	Yea	22	6	32	10
69	Yea	34	6	27	4
104	Nay	45		47	1
112	Nay	35	17	19	6
113	Yea	36		48	5
114	Yea	36		48	5
140	Yea	43	15	19	
141	Nay	35	2	34	5
143	Nay	36	29	6	6
147	Nay	37	15	17	1
149	Nay	25	14	20	11
176	Nay	41	19	22	1
193	Yea	45	2	8	1
198	Yea	40	4	39	3
268	Yea	29	4	41	14
269	Nay	23		45	19
270	Nay	24		45	19
	Total	625	133	556	111

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

Vote No.	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
79	36		41	
182	44		38	
212	45		43	
240	43		41	
241	43		42	
255	39		40	
259	35		36	
260	35		36	
261	35		35	
Total	355		352	

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
3	Yea	47	30	6	
5	Yea	40	36	6	
6	Nay	36	28	14	2
8	Yea	40	24	16	2
9	Yea	34	40	2	11
10	Nay	42	19	18	3
34	Nay	38	20	17	2
35	Nay	22	32	6	18
38	Yea	29	19	17	6
40	Yea	38	26	12	4
50	Nay	38	23	17	1
54	Nay	30	34	6	11
56	Nay	21	27	13	21
60	Nay	35	16	13	3
61	Yea	29	17	11	5
62	Nay	27	26	12	15
63	Yea	37	35	6	9
70	Yea	43	43	1	
74	Yea	40	25	14	2
78	Yea	34	40	1	
80	Nay	26	23	23	17
81	Nay	32	30	16	13
82	Yea	38	25	22	8
83	Nay	27	26	18	17
84	Nay	23	27	15	19
85	Nay	24	28	14	18
86	Nay	21	24	17	20
87	Nay	26	23	18	15
89	Yea	31	38	1	9
93	Nay	31	24	23	11
94	Nay	27	24	18	14
95	Yea	25	26	18	15
97	Yea	44	37	5	1
99	Yea	23	26	9	1
100	Yea	36	26	18	2
101	Yea	40	32	15	1
117	Nay	39	24	20	5
118	Nay	39	25	19	4
119	Nay	36	25	20	7
120	Nay	26	28	16	18
121	Yea	38	38	3	5
122	Yea	34	38	4	4
123	Nay	37	23	20	4
125	Yea	33	24	19	9

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*—Continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
127	Nay	26	34		8
130	Nay	37	39		7
134	Yea	40	29	13	4
135	Yea	42	32	2	
136	Yea	38	22	11	5
145	Yea	37	32	5	1
153	Nay	29	19	12	
154	Yea	27	24	8	12
158	Nay	38	23	19	3
159	Yea	38	28	14	2
160	Yea	34	36	1	
161	Nay	40	19	18	
165	Nay	27	25	11	12
166	Yea	37	34	1	2
167	Yea	36	33		1
168	Yea	35	30	2	1
175	Nay	40	20	19	1
177	Nay	39	26	12	3
178	Nay	41	21	15	
179	Nay	40	18	14	1
180	Yea	41	22	9	
183	Nay	38	25	11	1
184	Nay	35	19	13	
188	Yea	43	35	3	
199	Nay	41	23	17	1
207	Yea	38	21	17	
208	Nay	26	31	13	20
213	Nay	39	42		7
214	Yea	44	42	1	1
217	Nay	24	24	18	20
219	Yea	29	38	4	15
220	Nay	37	18	18	1
222	Nay	43	38	8	4
229	Nay	28	37	6	19
232	Nay	34	22	18	12
238	Yea	46	41	1	
239	Yea	44	41	1	
245	Yea	39	20	17	
246	Yea	41	21	18	1
249	Yea	40	41	1	
251	Yea	40	37	2	
Total		2,967	2,406	952	521

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
21	Yea	3	16	24	38
25	Nay	16	27	12	23
26	Yea	10	9	31	25
27	Nay	12	24	15	24
28	Nay	11	23	13	25
44	Yea	16	6	32	19
49	Nay	3	39		37
57	Nay	17	25	16	22
75	Yea	15	10	33	29
105	Nay	17	33	13	29
108	Nay	16	14	31	30

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*—Con.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
109	Nay	14	17	28	32
116	Nay	15	8	36	28
146	Yea	8	15	23	33
151	Yea	1	4	38	44
152	Yea	2	2	38	43
173	Nay	10	3	38	33
211	Nay	18	22	21	28
257	Yea	16	----	38	17
258	Nay	4	----	38	31
	Total	224	297	518	590

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
11	Yea	38	18	26	7
12	Nay	39	19	21	5
13	Nay	41	18	20	2
14	Nay	34	16	18	8
15	Nay	38	22	25	5
16	Nay	38	21	26	6
17	Nay	42	22	25	2
18	Nay	36	20	26	8
19	Yea	35	21	26	9
20	Nay	36	9	26	4
22	Yea	33	12	28	13
23	Yea	24	2	38	23
24	Yea	40	8	33	7
30	Nay	35	11	28	1
31	Yea	21	13	23	15
32	Yea	25	16	22	16
33	Yea	27	12	22	13
37	Yea	35	----	36	----
39	Yea	35	----	36	----
41	Nay	32	12	25	6
42	Nay	32	5	32	6
43	Nay	32	6	32	6
46	Yea	41	----	41	----
47	Yea	42	----	44	3
48	Nay	30	7	34	11
53	Nay	29	6	35	14
55	Yea	30	18	22	12
58	Nay	35	6	35	8
59	Nay	35	3	33	6
64	Nay	36	16	25	9
71	Nay	38	11	28	3
72	Nay	37	8	31	3
73	Nay	35	----	40	7
76	Nay	46	9	38	----
77	Nay	42	6	40	1
88	Nay	37	18	21	2
90	Yea	37	8	37	6
96	Yea	40	18	23	2
102	Yea	38	6	39	4
103	Yea	42	3	41	1
110	Yea	42	17	21	1
111	Nay	41	2	43	3
124	Nay	39	20	23	3
126	Nay	29	15	24	13
128	Yea	36	11	26	4
129	Nay	37	11	33	7
131	Nay	40	20	25	7
132	Nay	37	16	29	9
133	Nay	45	21	22	1
139	Nay	42	----	47	3
142	Nay	40	4	26	----
150	Yea	27	7	24	----
155	Nay	37	3	36	6
156	Nay	37	2	38	5
157	Nay	37	6	36	3
162	Nay	41	----	35	----
163	Nay	40	10	37	1
164	Nay	39	6	32	----
169	Yea	41	11	23	----
170	Yea	44	13	27	----
171	Yea	46	----	48	1
172	Nay	45	4	44	2
174	Nay	41	9	31	2

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*—Continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
181	Nay	41	----	43	1
185	Nay	40	5	28	1
186	Nay	42	14	27	3
187	Nay	41	7	29	2
189	Nay	44	11	34	2
190	Yea	44	12	33	2
191	Nay	35	6	39	6
192	Nay	38	4	41	5
195	Yea	44	2	40	1
196	Yea	40	1	37	----
197	Yea	42	1	24	----
200	Nay	41	15	28	2
201	Nay	40	11	30	1
202	Nay	22	18	19	18
203	Nay	40	15	24	1
204	Nay	39	15	22	1
205	Yea	37	5	31	3
206	Yea	44	13	26	2
210	Yea	42	19	23	3
215	Nay	42	16	26	6
218	Nay	25	16	26	19
221	Yea	24	5	31	13
223	Yea	37	12	34	10
224	Yea	39	10	36	8
225	Nay	37	11	34	10
226	Yea	37	12	33	10
227	Nay	38	16	26	7
228	Yea	38	14	24	5
230	Yea	40	5	35	6
231	Nay	44	18	21	2
233	Nay	46	20	21	----
234	Nay	43	1	41	4
235	Nay	43	----	42	4
236	Yea	44	18	25	3
237	Nay	44	13	29	2
242	Yea	39	2	43	5
243	Nay	26	8	29	12
247	Nay	38	1	38	3
248	Nay	38	1	40	3
250	Nay	39	17	20	1
252	Yea	31	13	23	5
253	Yea	36	11	28	2
254	Nay	34	11	17	----
	Total	3,979	1,059	3,231	519

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF SENATE ROLLCALLS, 84TH CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the Senate roll calls during the 84th Congress. Two hundred thirty rollcalls were taken. They have been placed into six groups as summarized below.

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The two groups together include 27 rollcalls or 12 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
Yeas ---- 455
Nays ---- 381

Democrats:
Yeas ---- 492
Nays ---- 366

The number of issues included in group 1 is 20, accounting for 9 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Republicans ---- 204
Democrats ---- 77

No. 2 Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members—Con.

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Democrats ---- 221
Republicans ---- 85

The number of issues included in group 2 is 7, accounting for 3 percent of 230 rollcalls.

Groups 3 through 6 include rollcalls on issues included in the President's program. They total 203 rollcalls or 88 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

VOTE CAST

Republicans:
Yeas ---- 1,292
Nays ---- -----
Democrats:
Yeas ---- 1,361
Nays ---- -----

The number of issues included in group 3 is 32, accounting for 14 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---- 2,284
Percent ---- 50.5
Democrats:
Votes cast ---- 2,235
Percent ---- 49.5

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---- 648
Percent ---- 56.4
Republicans:
Votes cast ---- 501
Percent ---- 43.6

The number of issues included in group 4 is 69, accounting for 30 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---- 258
Percent ---- 43.1
Democrats:
Votes cast ---- 341
Percent ---- 56.9

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---- 526
Percent ---- 47.2
Republicans:
Votes cast ---- 589
Percent ---- 52.8

The number of issues included in group 5 is 20, accounting for 8 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---- 2,848
Percent ---- 81.7
Democrats:
Votes cast ---- 638
Percent ---- 18.3

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program—Continued

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 2,879
Percent 82.2
Republicans:
Votes cast 625
Percent 17.8

The number of issues included in group 6 is 82, accounting for 36 percent of 230 rollcalls.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all rollcalls not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 102 issues or 44 percent of all Senate rollcalls.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	258		341		526		589	
6	2,848		638		2,879		625	
Total	3,106	76.0	979	24.0	3,405	73.7	1,214	26.3

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all rollcalls representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 203 of the 230 rollcalls or 88 percent of all Senate rollcalls. These rollcalls are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 59.4 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 40.6 percent. The Democrats supplied 70.3 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 29.7 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	1,292		1,361					
4	2,284		2,235		648		501	
5	258		341		526		589	
6	2,848		638		2,879		625	
Total	6,682	59.4	4,575	40.6	4,053	70.3	1,715	29.7

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 84th Cong.

Record vote No.	Group	Description
1	1	Communist conspiracy and investigation—Daniel et al. sense of Senate resolution opposing communism.
2	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Langer amendment barring use of troops.
3	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Kefauver substitute.
4	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Lehman-Morse amendment to strike certain language re protecting related positions.
5	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Passage.
6	4	Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Ex. K)—Ratification.
7	4	Mutual Defense Treaty With Republic of China (Ex. A)—Morse amendment re legal status of territories applicable.
8	4	Mutual Defense Treaty With Republic of China (Ex. A)—Morse amendment to strike language making provisions applicable to other territories.
9	4	Mutual Defense Treaty With Republic of China (Ex. A)—Ratification.
10	4	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Bush amendments to strike language re increases for Members of Congress.
11	4	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Williams amendment to defer increase until budget is balanced.
12	4	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Passage.
13	3	Convention with Japan relating to taxes on income (Ex. D)—Ratification.
14	3	Convention with Japan relating to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts (Ex. E)—Ratification.
15	3	Convention with Belgium relating to taxes on estates and successions (Ex. G)—Ratification.
16	1	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Williams motion after rejection of conference report that conferees be instructed.
17	6	Corporate and excise tax rate extension—Johnson (Texas) et al. substitute for the reported bill.
18	6	Corporate and excise tax rate extension—Committee amendment re $20 tax credit.
19	4	Nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court—Confirmation.
20	6	Sale of 3 synthetic-rubber-producing plants in California—Thye and Humphrey resolutions re disapproval of sale of plants.
21	6	Sale of 24 synthetic-rubber plants as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission—Resolution re disapproval of sale of plants.
22	5	To amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended—Stennis amendment to increase acreage allotments by 1½ percent.
23	6	To amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended—Case (South Dakota) amendment increasing 1955 wheat allotments by 1½ percent.
24	6	To amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended—Passage.
25	6	Postal employees' pay increase—Johnson (Texas) motion to table Carlson substitute amendment providing average 7.6-percent increase.
26	5	Postal employees' pay increase—Passage.
27	4	Protocol on the termination of the occupation regime in Federal Republic of Germany (Ex. L)—Ratification.
28	4	Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany (Ex. M)—Ratification.
29	4	International Telecommunication Convention (Ex. R)—Ratification.
30	4	Colorado River storage project—Neuberger amendments en bloc to delete Echo Park Dam.
31	4	Colorado River storage project—Passage.
32	1	Department of Agriculture appropriation bill—Williams amendment to reduce funds for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices.
33	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Douglas amendment to eliminate peril-point provision.
34	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Morse amendment re 90-day delay period before future agreement shall take effect.
35	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Douglas amendment eliminating 2 Tariff Commission sections of bill.
36	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Passage.
37	5	Postal employees' pay increase—Conference report—Passage.
38	2	Repeal of sec. 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—Holland amendment to retain section 348 with certain exceptions.
39	4	Constitutional amendment re vacancies in the House of Representatives—Passage.
40	6	Postal employees' pay increase—Failure of passage over veto.
41	6	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1955—Martin (Pennsylvania) substitute amendment representing administration viewpoint.
42	6	Federal-aid Highway Act of 1955—Bush motion to recommit.
43	3	Postal employees' pay increase (8-percent bill)—Passage.
44	3	Great Lakes Fisheries Convention Between the United States and Canada (Executive B)—Ratification.
45	5	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Knowland amendment to Potter amendment re availability of 50 percent of economic development funds on loan basis only.
46	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Potter amendment re availability of 75 percent of economic development funds on loan basis only.
47	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Ellender amendment to cut defense fund for Europe, the Near East and Africa, and to Asia by one-half.
48	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Jenner motion to recommit with instructions to report back 2 bills.
49	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Long amendment reducing authorization by $318 million.
50	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—McCarthy amendment withholding aid to countries trading with Communist China.
51	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Ellender amendment striking President's $200 million Asian regional development fund.
52	6	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Capehart amendment re waiver of civil service termination laws re certain FOA employees.
53	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Passage.
54	6	Housing amendments of 1955—Capehart amendment reducing authorization to 35,000 units annually for 2 years.
55	4	Housing amendments of 1955—Passage.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 84th Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
56	4	Department of Commerce appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment increasing CAB payments to air carriers.
57	4	Department of Commerce appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment increasing ship construction and maritime activites.
58	4	Austrian Treaty (Ex. G)—Ratification.
59	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1956—Symington en bloc amendments to increase certain Marine Corps funds.
60	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1956—Mundt amendment to eliminate all of section 638 re Government in business.
61	3	Defense Department appropriations, 1956—Passage.
62	4	McCarthy sense of Senate resolution re Geneva Conference—Rejected.
63	6	Compulsory cumulative voting of stock re election of directors of national banking associations—Passage.
64	6	Construction projects by Atomic Energe Commission—Hickenlooper amendment re atomic-powered merchant vessel.
65	4	Home rule bill for the District of Columbia—Passage.
[1] 66–69	3	(66) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. D)—Ratification. (67) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. E)—Ratification. (68) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. F)—Ratification. (69) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. G)—Ratification.
70	3	Self-determination of peoples—Passage.
71	1	Colonialism and Communist imperialism—Passage.
72	4	Reserve Forces Act of 1955—Jenner amendment re assignment of personnel to a foreign country exercising criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel.
73	4	Reserve Forces Act of 1955—Passage.
74	6	Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950—Capehart amendment re employment of w. o. c.'s (persons without compensation).
75	6	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment restoring House cut of $420 million for military-assistance phase.
76	4	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Ellender amendment to reduce European defense funds from $85 million to $64 million.
77	4	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Ellender amendment to reduce Asian defense funds by $206.8 million.
78	5	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment reducing Asian (India) development assistance $10 million.
79	6	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment to increase President's Asian economic-development fund by $50 million.
80	4	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Passage.
81	3	German Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation—Ratification.
82	6	Railroad retirement increases—Smith (New Jersey) amendment striking sections 5 and 6.
83	3	Railroad retirement increases—Passage.
84	5	Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act, 1953—Passage.
85	4	Treaty of Mutual Understandings and Cooperation With the Republic of Panama (Ex. F)—Ratification.
[1] 86–89	3	(86) Netherlands Convention of Apr. 29, 1948, (Ex. I)—Ratification. (87) Protocol Supplementing Netherlands Convention of Apr. 29, 1948, (Ex. I)—Ratification. (88) Italian Tax Convention (Ex. C)—Ratification. (89) Italian Tax Convention (Ex. D)—Ratification.
90	6	Nomination of John A. Hall to be director of Locomotive Inspection, Interstate Commerce Commission—Confirmation.
91	4	Retirement of Government capital in certain institutions under supervision of the Farm Credit Administration—Vote on Williams amendment re application of assets on liquidation or dissolution of any bank for cooperatives.
92	4	Assistance to Federal personnel in exercising their voting franchise (conference report)—Rejection of vote on Morse motion to recommit conference report with instructions.
93	6	Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950 (conference report)—Capehart motion to recommit.
94	6	Nomination of Harold C. Patterson to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission—Confirmation.
[1] 95–96	3	(95) Protocol Amending the Slavery Convention (Ex. F)—Ratification. (96) Protocol Modifying the Convention re the International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs and the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs (Ex. P)—Ratification.
97	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Potter amendment to recommit.
98	2	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Pastore amendment requiring Federal Power Commission to determine the reasonable market price.
99	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Potter amendment re "fair and equitable formula versus reasonable market price."
100	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Humphrey amendment re escalation clauses.
101	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Douglas amendment re small producers.
102	2	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Passage.
103	1	Select Committee To Investigate Alleged Improper Attempt To Influence Vote of Senator Case (South Dakota)—Passage.
104	6	Sugar Act of 1948, to amend and extend—Capehart amendment re foreign-sugar quotas.
105	3	International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material (Ex. Q)—Ratification.
106	1	Special Committee To Investigate Illegal or Improper Political Influence—Passage.
107	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Anderson amendment re 90 percent of parity.
108	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey substitute amendment to amendment of Hickenlooper re farm base acreage.
109	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote rejecting the Humphrey substitute amendment.
110	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment to Kerr amendment re incentive payments for cattle and hogs.
111	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Kerr amendment re price supports for hogs and beef cattle.
112	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Aiken amendment to eliminate language re millable quality wheat.
113	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table motion to reconsider the vote agreeing to Aiken amendment.
114	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment to Williams amendment re 90 percent price supports to limited loans.
115	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Jenner amendment to Williams amendment re $25,000 limitation for participation in soil bank.
116	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Williams amendment, as amended, re limits on price-support loans and participation in soil bank.
117	3	Nomination of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones to be members of the U. S. Tariff Commission—Confirmation.
118	6	Agricultural Act of 1956.—Carlson amendment re 100 percent parity for wheat.
119	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Russell amendment re 100 percent parity for cotton.
120	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—George amendment to strike language which made the average grade of cotton the standard.
121	3	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment re brucellosis-control program and milk for school children.
122	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Payne amendment re other commodities eligible for acreage-reserve program of the soil bank.
123	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Aiken amendment to strike from the bill the dual parity formula.
124	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Aiken amendment was rejected.
125	6	School milk and brucellosis (conference report)—Hickenlooper motion to recommit with instructions.
126	3	Agricultural Act of 1956—Kerr amendment re inclusion of grazing lands in the conservation reserve.
127	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—First vote on Morse amendment to strike language in bill re contribution to cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief.
128	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Anderson amendment to strike language re reallocation of acreage among cotton States.
129	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Young amendment to limit imports of surplus crops to annual average of preceding 3 years.
130	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Welker amendment re surplus crops grown on reclaimed lands ineligible for soil-bank benefits and price-support legislation.
131	1	Agricultural Act of 1956—Magnuson amendment to eliminate a section of the bill repealing the so-called 50–50 cargo preference law.
132	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Kerr et al. amendment re certification from beef processors as to price paid.
133	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Kerr et al. amendment was agreed to.
134	5	Agricultural Act of 1956—Holland amendment re producer allocating a percentage of his acreage to the soil bank.
135	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Morse amendment was rejected.
136	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Second vote on Morse amendment to strike language in bill re contribution to cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief.
137	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment making mandatory the authority for set-aside of corn, upland cotton, and wheat.
138	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Passage.
139	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Langer amendment to Daniel et al. substitute: Selection of candidate by direct vote in both primary and general election.
140	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Lehman substitute amendment to Daniel et al. substitute: Abolition of electoral college and direct popular election.
141	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Case (New Jersey) substitute amendment to Daniel et al. substitute: Reduction of State's electoral vote in proportion to total vote cast.
142	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Daniel et al. substitute providing for a more direct popular vote.
143	4	Joint Committee on Central Intelligence—Passage.
144	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (conference report)—Agreeing to.
[1] 145–147	3	(145) Convention re international civil aviation (Ex. F)—Ratification. (146) Convention re customs facilities for touring (Ex. A)—Ratification. (147) Convention re importation of private road vehicles (Ex. B)—Ratification.
148	5	Increased appropriation for the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization—Bricker amendment to limit contribution.
149	5	Bank holding companies—Douglas amendment re companies acquiring additional assets.
150	4	Bank holding companies—Capehart amendment re nonbanking assets.
151	4	Bank holding companies—Morse amendment to revise definition.
152	2	District of Columbia Transit System—Allott amendment to make authority an agency of the United States.
153	2	District of Columbia Transit System—Passage.
154	6	Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—Knowland amendments re State participation after June 30, 1959.
155		Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—Passage.

[1] En bloc.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 84th Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
156	2	Niagara River power project—Bush motion to recommit.
157	2	Niagara River power project—Passage.
158	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Young amendment re sale of surplus wheat for feed.
159	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Williams amendment to strike mandatory support prices for feed grains.
160	1	Agricultural Act of 1956—Holland modified amendment re price support program for feed grains.
161	1	Agricultural Act of 1956—Smith (New Jersey) amendment to strike language re upland cotton.
162	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—First vote on Williams amendment re limit of payments.
163	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Saltonstall motion to reconsider vote agreeing to Williams amendment.
164	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Second vote on Williams amendment re limit of payments.
165	6	Civil Service Retirement Act revision—Carlson amendment re retirement age.
166	5	Civil Service Retirement Act revision—Knowland amendment re survivor annuity.
167	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Payne amendment raising the interest rate on loans under college housing program.
168		Housing Act amendments of 1956—Fulbright motion to table motion to reconsider vote by which Payne amendment was rejected.
169	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Bricker amendment to limit public housing units to 35,000 a year.
170	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Bush amendment restricting new public housing to localities with a "workable program."
171	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Knowland amendment as substitute re prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon Act.
172	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Bridges motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Knowland amendment was agreed to.
173	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Knowland motion to table Chavez amendment providing for application of the Davis-Bacon Act to wages on the Interstate System.
174	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Chavez amendment re prevailing rate of wages on Interstate System as determined under the Davis-Bacon Act.
175	5	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Capehart amendment setting up formula for apportioning authorized appropriations among the several States.
176	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Knowland motion to table motion to reconsider the voice vote by which the Fulbright amendment re review and appeal was agreed to.
177	6	Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956—Dworshak amendment limiting purchases to 5,000 short tons per calendar month.
178	1	Automobile dealers' right to sue manufacturers who fail to act in good faith—Passage.
179	4	Defense Production Act of 1950, to extend—Bush motion to table committee amendment declaring congressional policy re dispersal of industrial facilities.
180	4	Defense Production Act of 1950, to extend—Committee amendment declaring congressional policy re dispersal of industrial facilities.
181	4	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Motion to adopt conference report.
182	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1957—Bridges amendment to committee amendment re Air Force increased funds.
183	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1957—Committee amendment re Air Force increased funds.
184	3	Defense Department appropriations, 1957—Passage.
185	6	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Young amendment re agricultural commodities in surplus from increased imports.
186	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Johnston (South Carolina) amendment re limitation on imports of cotton and cotton textiles.
187	5	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—O'Mahoney amendment to committee amendment re aid to Yugoslavia.
188	5	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Bridges amendment to committee amendment re aid to Yugoslavia.
189	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Long amendment limiting appropriations to $2,765,875,000.
190	6	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Modified Knowland amendment re establishment of Commission To Study Foreign Aid Program.
191	4	Mutual-security program, 1957 authorization—McCarthy amendment re shipment of strategic materials to Russia.
192	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—O'Mahoney amendment re the furnishing of information relating to the program to congressional committees.
193	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Bridges amendment to cut funds for India.
194	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Passage.
195	5	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Williams motion to recommit.
196	6	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Williams amendment re "windfall" benefits.
197	6	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Humphrey amendment.
198	5	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Passage.
199	4	Ex. I, 84th Cong., 2d sess., International Wheat Agreement—Ratification.
[1] 200–202	3	(200) Ex. E, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Ratification. (201) Ex. G, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Ratification. (202) Ex. H, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Ratification.
203	6	S. 4146, to provide for a civilian atomic power acceleration program—Passage.
204	4	Confirmation of nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff to be United States circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals—Motion to recommit.
205	4	Nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff to be United States circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals—Confirmation.
206	5	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Modified Long amendment to liberalize matching formula for old-age assistance, aid to blind and totally disabled persons; and to provide temporary extension of 1952 matching formula for dependent children.
207	6	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—George amendment to pay cash disability benefits at age 50.
208	6	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Pastore motion to table Johnson (Texas) motion to reconsider vote on George amendment.
209	5	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Kerr amendment to lower from age 65 to 62, for all women, the age at which they can claim old-age and survivors' insurance benefits.
210	6	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Douglas amendment to allow recipients of old-age assistance to earn up to $50 a month without deduction.
211	3	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Passage.
212	6	S. 1333, to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon—Passage.
213	3	Ex. J, 84th Cong., 2d sess., a convention between the United States of America and the French Republic to eliminate double taxation—Resolution of ratification.
214	3	Ex. K, 84th Cong., 2d sess., a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Honduras for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of income-tax evasion—Resolution of ratification.
215	4	Nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be a United States representative to the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations—Confirmation.
216	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendment to reduce military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $1,735,000,000.
217	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendment to reduce military aid from $2.3 billion to $2 billion.
218	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendment to reduce military aid from $2.3 billion to $2.1 billion.
219	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—First committee amendment increasing amount for military assistance from $1.735 billion to $2.3 billion.
220	1	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations—Passage.
221	4	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendments to reduce defense support and development assistance appropriations $126 million.
222	4	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Senate Appropriations Committee amendments to provide $1,175,200,000 for defense support and $293,000,000 for development assistance.
223	5	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Knowland motion to suspend rules to permit vote on amendment barring use of funds under provisions of H. R. 12130 and any prior act, for military assistance to Yugoslavia.
224	5	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Modified Knowland amendment barring any use of funds in the bill for military assistance or military equipment to Yugoslavia.
225	4	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Passage.
226	1	Douglas motion that Senate stand adjourned for 5 minutes.
227	5	H. R. 12350, second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957—Monroney amendment to provide $15,000,000 for constructing a second air facility for Washington, D. C., at Burke, Va.
228	6	S. 2663, unemployment in certain economically depressed areas—Smith amendment creating an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to be in charge of redevelopment in the United States.
229	6	S. 2663, as amended by committee, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas—Passage.
230	6	H. R. 3210, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes—Passage.

[1] En bloc.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
1	46		38	
16	30	3	32	4
32	4	32	1	44
71	44		44	
97	11	34	19	30
99	13	30	20	29
100	14	30	19	29
101	14	30	21	28
103	45		45	
106	37	1	42	
131	27	16	30	7
139	2	41	11	28
140	1	41	16	25
141	10	32	10	34
142	22	19	26	18
160	40	4	33	10
161	12	30	1	41
178	37	1	38	
220	43		43	
226	3	37	3	39
Total	455	381	492	366

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
38	Yea	25	10	34	15
98	Nay	30	23	25	15
102	Yea	31	22	24	14
152	Yea	25	7	28	14
153	Nay	25	6	27	14
156	Yea	35	3	43	5
157	Nay	33	6	40	8
	Total	204	77	221	85

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

Vote No.	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
13	34		38	
14	34		37	
15	36		38	
43	35		43	
44	36		43	
61	40		40	
66	37		40	
67	37		40	
68	37		40	
69	37		40	
70	44		45	
81	41		42	
83	44		47	
86	41		45	
87	41		45	
88	41		45	
89	41		45	
95	43		41	
96	43		41	
105	35		41	
117	46		46	
121	44		45	
145	42		39	
146	42		39	
147	42		39	
184	40		48	
200	42		46	
201	42		46	
202	42		46	
211	45		45	
213	44		43	
214	44		43	
Total	1,292		1,361	

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
2	Nay	42	41	2	1
3	Nay	43	32	11	
4	Nay	42	32	12	1
5	Yea	43	42	2	1
6	Yea	40	42		1
7	Nay	27	30	10	1
8	Nay	27	33	9	1
9	Yea	27	38	5	1
10	Nay	42	38	2	1
11	Nay	34	37	6	9
12	Yea	32	30	13	11
19	Yea	39	32	9	2
27	Yea	33	43		2
28	Yea	33	43		2
29	Yea	33	41		1
30	Nay	29	23	22	8
31	Yea	27	31	15	8
33	Nay	47	35	9	
34	Nay	40	33	9	4
35	Nay	46	21	21	
36	Yea	38	37	6	7
39	Yea	40	36	3	
46	Nay	21	31	9	20
47	Nay	27	29	12	15
48	Nay	26	36	4	12
49	Nay	26	27	14	13
50	Nay	26	34	5	13
51	Nay	31	32	8	9
53	Yea	28	31	7	11
55	Yea	27	33	9	16
56	Yea	32	19	19	5
57	Yea	21	32	6	14
58	Yea	28	35		3
62	Nay	35	42		4
65	Yea	31	28	12	3
72	Nay	30	40		14
73	Yea	41	39		1
76	Nay	33	30	13	9
77	Nay	30	30	13	11
80	Yea	30	32	11	11
85	Yea	39	33	13	1
91	Nay	37	43	2	7
92	Nay	32	24	15	7
115	Yea	46	38	9	
116	Yea	43	35	10	1
122	Nay	25	33	10	19
129	Nay	25	22	22	21
130	Yea	41	22	22	6
138	Yea	44	49		2
143	Nay	38	21	19	8
150	Nay	31	37	3	10
151	Nay	30	21	20	8
155	Yea	35	26	5	2
179	Nay	24	26	7	13
180	Yea	22	26	2	11
181	Yea	42	47	1	
186	Nay	30	22	22	14
189	Nay	30	28	15	12
191	Nay	27	33	9	14
192	Nay	36	22	18	5
193	Nay	24	32	8	15
194	Yea	27	27	13	12
199	Yea	41	44	1	1
204	Nay	34	29	15	5
205	Yea	35	29	15	4
215	Yea	27	37	6	16
221	Nay	30	24	23	13
222	Yea	32	25	20	13
225	Yea	30	30	15	15
	Total	2,284	2,235	648	501

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
22	Nay	13	26	18	33
26	Nay	19	2	44	28
37	Nay	11		37	29
45	Nay	21	29	11	22
78	Nay	2	14	29	39
84	Nay	15	19	27	27
134	Nay	9	37	12	36
148	Nay	8	32	8	35
149	Nay	13	5	36	22

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*—Con.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
166	Yea	15	1	40	25
175	Yea	16	11	30	25
187	Yea	11	41	3	33
188	Nay	21	29	15	23
195	Yea	17	5	38	24
198	Nay	8	14	24	29
206	Nay	18	3	41	21
209	Nay	5	2	46	40
223	Nay	14	19	28	31
224	Nay	19	23	24	26
227	Yea	3	29	15	41
	Total	258	341	526	589

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
17	Nay	45	5	43	1
18	Yea	45	16	31	1
20	Nay	40	8	36	3
21	Nay	43	13	30	1
23	Nay	26	17	26	21
24	Nay	38	13	30	9
25	Nay	38	3	43	9
40	Nay	37	2	46	8
41	Yea	30	1	47	13
42	Yea	39		46	4
52	Yea	40		40	
54	Yea	32	6	35	9
59	Nay	37	2	37	3
60	Yea	32	1	39	9
63	Yea	35	18	20	1
64	Yea	40	1	42	
74	Yea	44	2	44	1
75	Yea	29	21	23	15
79	Yea	30	16	27	11
82	Yea	24		46	29
90	Yea	35	8	35	6
93	Yea	36		33	1
94	Yea	37	12	28	1
104	Yea	25	5	39	17
107	Yea	41	13	35	6
108	Nay	43	3	42	2
109	Yea	44	3	42	2
110	Nay	41	12	35	6
111	Nay	46	15	31	1
112	Yea	34	11	34	11
113	Yea	40	6	35	6
114	Nay	41	15	32	4
118	Nay	29	10	37	17
119	Nay	38	19	27	6
120	Nay	37	10	36	6
123	Yea	35	9	35	10
124	Nay	38	4	42	7
125	Yea	46		47	1
126	Nay	45	18	23	1
127	Nay	43		39	3
128	Yea	34	12	32	11
132	Nay	36	8	41	8
133	Nay	39	3	46	6
135	Nay	42	3	45	2
136	Nay	42	3	45	2
137	Nay	39	5	44	6
144	Nay	31	4	35	15
154	Yea	35	4	28	3
158	Yea	33	16	21	10
159	Yea	31	8	31	13
162	Yea	34	10	24	5
163	Nay	19	3	30	19
164	Yea	21	7	26	17
165	Yea	30	6	35	11
167	Yea	38	2	40	1
168	Nay	38	1	40	1
169	Yea	31	7	34	7
170	Yea	30	2	40	4
171	Yea	25	14	26	13
172	Yea	27	14	26	13
173	Yea	25	12	27	14
174	Nay	25	12	27	15
176	Yea	21	15	23	10
177	Yea	19	3	27	5
182	Yea	39	3	44	3

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*—Continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
183	Nay	37	3	43	5
185	Nay	25	20	25	18
190	Yea	41		44	1
196	Yea	25	12	30	16
197	Nay	29	14	24	8
203	Nay	40		46	3
207	Nay	38	7	41	6
208	Nay	41	2	46	3
210	Nay	26	8	38	18
212	Nay	43	8	39	2
216	Nay	31	15	29	13
217	Nay	29	15	24	13
218	Nay	29	15	26	16
219	Yea	32	18	26	13
228	Yea	43		42	1
229	Nay	27	3	44	16
230	Nay	30	3	37	6
	Total	2,848	638	2,879	625

The 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress draws to a close I would like to make an informal report to the more than 325,000 people I represent from the 19th Illinois Congressional District.

To my mind the most important thing to all of us is the fact that America is at peace. Since President Eisenhower concluded the tragic war in Korea, no Americans have been in combat duty any place in the world. Our leadership has been firm. The President has not jumped from one crisis to another, but has consistently demonstrated to the world our sincere desire for peace by positive and constructive acts. While there are many trouble spots, we are now in the fourth year of a world at peace, and tense though it might be, these years have given us a prayerfully welcome respite from the slaughter and destruction of major wars.

Along with peace has come the greatest prosperity in our Nation's history and the transition from war to peace has not brought about the depression predicted by advocates of "gloom and doom." On the contrary, the Nation, industry, and labor enjoy the highest and best level of prosperity in our history.

The American people have more houses, more automobiles, and more of the better things of life than ever before. This has been accomplished without the stimulation of a war economy.

FARM PROGRAM

The welfare of the American farmer was one of the most seriously considered problems of this Congress. After much deliberation notable changes were made in the law and governmental policies relating to agriculture. Farmers caught in the squeeze between falling farm prices and rising costs in production have not shared in the general booming prosperity of other industry and labor. A number of factors contributed to this situation. Tremendous stores of supported commodities continued over production of surplus crops which was a factor in reducing the farmers' gross income. At the same time his net income was reduced because of high operating costs.

Congress adopted legislation to strike directly at these problems. The principal part of the new program is the soil bank law. I sponsored such a bill. Other legislation and administrative actions deal with disposal and marketing problems. The administration is selling more and more agricultural commodities to foreign countries and I introduced legislation that has resulted in millions of dollars of farm products being disposed of through world markets. Still more farm products are being consumed through our expanded school lunch program and relief programs.

In an effort to bring farm prices back in line with operating costs the President increased the support levels on most of the basic crops and Congress raised the parity price on feed grains and dairy products. In recent months hog prices have shown a strong recovery from last year's slump and this means much to Henry County, Ill., which is the undisputed hog capital of the world. The cattle market too has been firm even though it has never recovered from the rollback ordered in 1952 by former President Truman. I believe the agriculture program enacted by the 84th Congress is constructive and forward looking.

To further relieve the economic plight of the farmer, Congress enacted legislation to exempt them from paying Federal excise taxes on gasoline and other special fuels used in the operation of their farm. This should mean an over-all annual tax relief to the farmers of about $60 million.

SOCIAL PROGRESS

At the same time we continue to make giant steps in social progress. Our social-security system has been improved and strengthened. The new law lowers the retirement age for women to 62 years, and provides benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50, continues benefits for physically disabled and mentally retarded children over 18 years, increases grants for public assistance to the needy aged, blind and disabled, and extends social-security coverage to many professional groups. This is certainly a significant step forward in meeting the needs of our older citizens.

The 84th Congress made a significant record in enacting programs to provide long-range health and research work to conquer disease and alleviate suffering. Funds were appropriated for intensive work in medical research in the fields of mental health, heart, cancer, arthritis, neurology, and blindness as well as dental research.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

One of the major accomplishments of this session of Congress was passage of a record $32.9 billion highway-construction program—which, of course, is the biggest such undertaking in our Nation's history. This legislation authorizes construction of 41,000 miles of super interstate highways which by 1969 will link most State capitals and other major cities from coast to coast. This road program will not only facilitate traffic and commerce but in case of a national emergency will also speed military communication. Federal funds, under the terms of this bill, will be allocated to the States. This giant bill should take care of the great overall need for the improvement of roads of our country and particularly improve rural, farm-to-market routes, city streets as well as interstate highways. There has been little argument over the need for sound highway legislation because of our year-to-year expanding population, and construction of adequate highways has not kept pace.

This giant road bill is another of the major accomplishments of the 84th Congress.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Recently I was appointed vice chairman of the investigating committee authorized by a resolution adopted by my Foreign Affairs Committee, to reexamine, reevaluate, and reappraise the entire foreign-aid program. It is my firm belief that the entire program should be overhauled and I believe this investigation is timely. In many instances requests are too large and cannot be justified. When the mutual-security bill came up in the House I voted to cut the funds requested by over $1.1 billion.

I want to assure all those I represent that I will do everything I can to bring about a thorough review of this program so we will know in what direction we are going and if the continuation of the program is for the best interests of the United States.

I might add that 82 percent of all the money appropriated is spent right here in the United States and the remaining American dollars must eventually be spent in this country.

I have the distinct honor of representing what is often referred to as the farm-equipment capital of the world. A close examination of purchases made under foreign-aid programs discloses that the farm-equipment industry and allied manufacturers in this area benefited to a large extent under these programs. In the period May 1949 through December 1955, the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies have financed orders from the following companies in the amounts shown:

J. I. Case	$11,330,000
John Deere	15,248,000
International Harvester	75,454,000
Minneapolis-Moline	1,448,000
Caterpillar	62,714,000
R. G. LeTourneau	7,547,000
Butler Manufacturing Co	2,200,000
Clearing Machine Corp	6,648,000
Rockford Machine Tool	638,000

REPRESENTING MY CONSTITUENTS

During my 18 years in the House of Representatives I have conscientiously endeavored to serve the needs of all the people I represent. So far as legislation is concerned, I have diligently tried to support measures which would truly benefit the greater number of our peo-

ple and which would serve the public interest. I feel, as an elected Representative, it is my duty to carefully consider all viewpoints. This I have tried to do to the very best of my ability before making my final decision on how my votes would be cast. I have consistently voted for what I thought was for the best interests of my constituents.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

It has been my privilege to personally serve the people of my district who have contacted me about particular problems involving some phase of Government. I have tried to give this service promptly, courteously, efficiently, and fairly to all who have sought my help. Such services range from routine request for Government publications to complicated problems involving veterans' benefits, tax problems, social security and railroad retirement cases, immigration problems, Government contracts, and many other types of services to citizens in their relationships with their Government.

HOME FRONT

Much activity should develop in the 19th Congressional District in the ensuing months. Ground has been broken for the new Federal building in Rock Island where the post office will be quartered as well as the United States court. This project will have an overall cost estimated at $2 million and is the first project to be constructed under the lease-purchase program of the Government. It involves no direct appropriation of Federal funds. The building will be financed entirely by private capital and the Government will acquire title upon completion of the purchase installments.

A bill which I introduced was recently signed by the President authorizing Rock Island to proceed with the building of new approaches to the Centennial Bridge. This will ultimately mean much toward alleviating bad traffic conditions that now exist there.

It is hopeful legislation can be completed next year for turning over the Hennepin Canal to the State for recreational purposes.

Clearing and snagging work is also to be done on Mill Creek and South Slough. Forty thousand dollars has been allocated to cover engineering planning work for flood control at Campbell's Island; and $28,000 for dredging a channel in Lake Potter for a boat harbor for recreational boating.

There is no question but what there will be much activity as a result of all this construction work.

Three Army Reserve training centers have been allocated for the 19th District and will be located in Rock Island, Galesburg, and Canton.

We also have had the distinct honor of a Federal judge appointed from Fulton County—Hon. Fred Mercer. He will be the first to hold court in the new quarters when they are completed in Rock Island.

A DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

We are all fully aware of the high degree of confidence placed in President Eisenhower. The American people sense his high purpose and his desire to be helpful to our people in all walks of life. They like what he has done in the 4 years he has served as our Chief Executive. They are in favor of what he seeks to do. But too often the people overlook the fact that it is difficult for the President to have enacted into law the legislation he proposes unless he has a Congress with the majority of his own party.

Anyone who believes in President Eisenhower and intends to support him should give him a Congress that will help him. It is not fair nor reasonable to elect him and then withhold a friendly Congress. To do so is only to handicap him from doing the very things for which he was elected.

Furthermore in these uncertain times when questions of great international importance are continually arising there should be assured unity of action between the President and Congress. With such unity our position is strengthened in world affairs. Therefore, it is to our own national interest and welfare, both from a domestic as well as foreign standpoint to have a Congress in full accord with our President. Our national welfare can best be promoted at this time by reelecting President Eisenhower and giving him a Republican Congress.

Some Comments on the Differences Between the Two Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress prepares to adjourn and the battle lines take shape for a fateful election on November 6—an election in which every American will have a high personal stake—I should like to call to the attention of the House some facts which I think are worthy of consideration in a political campaign year.

Sometimes visitors from foreign nations, noting the high degree of unity among Americans on foreign policy issues particularly, and noting how the Democratic Congress has been cooperating with a Republican President on international matters, ask us in surprise what is the difference between the political parties. They find it difficult to see the differences, because obviously they do not study our roll call votes on the individual issues but look only at the final results.

Yet, of course, there are very great differences between the two parties, and those differences come to the fore each time the Congress turns its attention to legislation intended to help the vast majority of our people—to help them achieve more of the good things of life and an opportunity for a better life for their children. Let us look at some of these differences as they have come to light in the legislative battles.

When you speak of legislation affecting the people, many voters immediately think of taxes, and the heavy bite which the withholding tax takes out of the pay envelope. Are taxes too high? Everyone tends to say "Yes" to that question. The Republican approach—the GOP solution on the tax issue—has traditionally been to lower taxes for the very wealthy—to provide gigantic windfalls and handouts to big industries—but to fight bitterly against such things as the Democratic plan for raising personal exemptions from their present $600 per person. Raising exemptions is a "must" next step in tax reform—along with closing some of these gaping loopholes which big business and the very wealthy have been able to use to avoid paying their full share to the Federal Treasury. The Republican tax law written by the Eisenhower administration and a Republican Congress in 1954, will go down in history as one of the most flagrant instances of "class legislation" ever enacted—legislation to aid the wealthy.

A TAX BONANZA FOR BIG INDUSTRIES

The new depreciation "gimmick," for instance—written into the 1954 law over my vigorous objections and over the bitter opposition of all of the other Democrats who serve with me on the House Committee on Ways and Means—has meant, and will continue to mean, literally billions in additional tax deductions for business and industry for years to come. I do not think we can ever fully catch up with that hole in the dike—a hole through which literally billions in profits have been able to escape free from taxation.

I am sure every American family would be overwhelmed if it were handed some similar giveaway on its tax debt, in proportion. Of course, if that were done, it could very well mean insufficient revenues for the Federal Government with which to do the things which have to be done to keep our country free, to keep it solvent.

That gives you an idea, however, of the extent of the special tax treatment—the privileged tax sanctuary—which big industries have received as a result of the Republican tax law of 1954—the Eisenhower law. The average taxpayer would have to search very hard, indeed, not only for any comparable favors in that tax law, but for any favors at all. Some one said at the time the bill was up in the Congress in 1954 that if an average family had a run of really tough enough luck—extremely high medical bills, for instance—it woud benefit from the new law. But that was about the only way the average family could benefit from this GOP bill.

EXTREMES UNDER THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Under the Eisenhower administration, and under the Republicans, the big industries got their depreciation bonanza in the tax laws and did very well for themselves as a result; the banks reaped the benefits of a deliberate administration "hard money" policy which raised all interest rates, and thus made billions more for the banks and bankers; the mortgage companies got their windfalls through higher interest rates put into effect by this administration on FHA and GI mortgages—forcing every veteran and home buyer to pay more for the home he purchased for his family.

and more each month to keep it; the giant monopolies in our industrial system got special favored treatment on Government contracts.

These have been some of the outstanding "achievements" during the 3½ years of the Eisenhower administration. On the other hand, small business has been forced more and more to the wall, with bankruptcies hitting record levels under this administration. Think of that! And while food prices went up to the consumer, farm prices went way down, and the farmers took the same licking they did under all the previous Republican administrations going all the way back to 1912.

SHADOWBOXING WITH RECESSION

Mr. Speaker, we have been lucky—mighty lucky—that the policies of the administration these past 3½ years in the economic sphere have not caused us anything even more serious than a very serious recession in 1953–54 which had the Pittsburgh area on the "distress" list for many, many months. While this recession was gathering momentum, and men were being thrown out of work by the millions, the Eisenhower administration was telling us each day that we just imagined there was a recession—they said everything was booming. It was hard to believe—particularly since all we had to do was look around us and see how many families depended on surplus food in order to keep going. But the administration shadowboxed with the recession, and—just as Herbert Hoover did in 1929–32—just sat and waited for things to improve. We were lucky—mighty lucky—that it did not get worse.

TO THE BRINK OF WAR

We have also been lucky—mighty lucky—that the "brink of war" policies of Eisenhower and Dulles have not destroyed the unity of the free world in our great alliance against communism. This alliance, formed under Harry S. Truman, stopped Communist expansionism in its tracks, finally forcing the Russians to try new tactics such as they are now engaged in. But in the meantime, the Republican foreign policy strategists seem to have deliberately confused and horrified our allies so often that we have inspired more and more neutralism among them—and fear that irresponsibility in our State Department high command might not only get us to the brink, but push us into the abyss.

In this connection, also, we have been lucky—mighty lucky—that the President's vague familiarity with the actions taken in his name by countless officials in his administration has not led to complete and utter administrative chaos. After all, in one great area of governmental activity after another, it was impossible for Congress to determine just who did speak for the Eisenhower administration or who did exercise the responsibility and direction which the Constitution places in the President's own hands.

"CHAIN OF COMMAND" THEORY INADEQUATE

This is not meant in criticism of the President for having been ill, Mr. Speaker, for illness can and does befall all of us at one time or another. I am referring instead to the whole pattern of the Eisenhower administration's concept of Government since the Republicans took office in 1953—the concept of the "chain of command" in which underlings take major steps on their own initiative, without even consulting the President. If things go all right, the Republicans ascribe the credit to the President. If they go all wrong, as often happens, then it is supposed to be the fault of some hapless bureaucrat down the line.

The President encouraged this concept upon taking office—it was the military concept which he knew so well. But it does not work in civil administration of a vast and complex nation such as ours. Policy must come from the top. The big decisions must be made at the top. These things—things on which our Nation's safety and future rest—cannot be left to lower echelon officials assuming vast powers on their own initiative and with limited knowledge of the overall situation. Harry Truman had on his desk a slogan "The buck stops here." He never passed it to others down the line. We do not elect the bureaucrats; we elect a President to direct them. He must be the boss.

I have never been one to attack Mr. Eisenhower on personal grounds and I never intend to. He is a decent man—a fine man. But he is less than successful as a President—that is obvious.

PRIDE IN DEMOCRATIC RECORD

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the end of this session of Congress, and of the 84th Congress, and look to the elections in November, we on the Democratic side of the aisle can take real pride, I believe, in our party's performance as a responsible party—a party of constructive criticism and affirmative solutions, a party which believes in legislating for the workingman and the average family, for the small businessman as well as the giant corporations, for the professional man, the teacher, the minister, the rank-and-file of citizens who day-in and day-out work hard at helping to make this a better world.

We have avoided obstructionism in this period when the political leadership of the Nation has been divided between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress. We have supported the President more effectively than his own party followers in the Congress have done on many major issues, and on all foreign policy issues involving the Nation's safety and security.

HOUSING, CIVIL RIGHTS FAILURES

But we have been obstructed, in that time after time the Republicans—including the Republican President—have blocked us from doing vital things in behalf of all of the people.

On housing legislation, we have had to take it or leave it on public housing—the Republicans even being willing to let Congress adjourn with no housing legislation unless we gave in on public housing on this measly 35,000 unit maximum set by Eisenhower. Obviously, he has never seen the successful housing projects in Pittsburgh, and seen how they have helped make possible the rejuvenation of our city. The Eisenhower housing record is a disgrace.

The Eisenhower administration killed public housing when it first took office. Furthermore, it appointed as the administrator of the housing agency, a Republican former Congressman who had been one of the leading bitter-end opponents of all public housing. Between the administration and the Republicans in strategic committee assignments in the House, housing legislation has been kicked around and beaten down time after time. It will take a Democrat administration once again to provide the kind of housing policies we need in this country.

The glaring failure of the administration on housing has been matched, I might add, on the question of enacting needed civil rights legislation. After waiting 3½ years to propose anything at all on this front, the administration sent up a draft of a weak bill, and then sat by and watched Republicans join with southern Democrats to torpedo the whole thing. This whole maneuver was so transparent anyone could see through it. There was none of the drive, none of the sincere effort, which characterized President Truman's efforts in this field.

GREAT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY ON SOCIAL SECURITY

On the other hand, there was nothing in the nature of a failure in the final results of the new social security bill which we have just passed. This represents perhaps the outstanding achievement among many achievements by the Democratic 84th Congress. The highway bill which will make possible a vast new network of interstate boulevards may do much to remake the face of America, the physical appearance of our countryside, but the social security bill will have a much greater effect upon our people and upon their future happiness.

We have done a truly great thing in the social security bill in extending coverage to virtually all groups except medical doctors—who have objected to being covered—and in establishing for the first time the principle of paying retirement benefits to persons before the age of 65. Disabled workers will be able to collect their social security benefits in full after reaching the age of 50, instead of sitting around and waiting for 15 years. This takes effect next year. Widows will be able to begin receiving full survivorship benefits at age 62, in cases where they no longer have minor children. Up to now they have had to wait until 65 to collect these benefits once the children attained the age of 18.

Workingwomen will be able to retire at any time between 62 and 65, although I am not at all satisfied with the compromise forced upon us by the Senate on this, requiring a penalty to be assessed for each month these retirement benefits are collected before reaching 65. The survivorship benefits for widows at 62 and the benefits for workingwomen retiring before 65 go into effect November of this year.

The Eisenhower administration fought these changes; the Democrats in Congress put them through anyway. A Democratic administration would have led the way for these improvements, rather than trying to block them.

DEMOCRATS HAVE WORKED FOR ALL GROUPS

After nearly 4 years of a Republican administration, I think we can look back and honestly say that the Truman ad-

ministration record looks better and better in all respects day by day; it looks positively dazzling in comparison from the standpoint of serving all of the people rather than the few. And the Roosevelt administrations show up like shining beacons of imagination and forthright action when compared to this Republican record of inaction and timidity. Just imagine Roosevelt attacking the depression the way Eisenhower "attacked" the 1953–54 recession; that is, by sitting and waiting for it to go away.

For me, there is deep satisfaction in being a member of the political party which for more than 20 years has promoted continuous progress in social security over bitter Republican obstructionism and opposition.

There is deep satisfaction in remembering how our party had the courage and imagination to launch the great housing and redevelopment programs of the past 20 years which, as I said, have helped to remake the face of Pittsburgh and the looks of the Golden Triangle.

There is deep satisfaction and genuine pride in recalling how our Demoratic Party developed the great flood-control projects which have made Pittsburgh safe—freed us from the specter of sudden disaster and tragic deaths from the rampaging rivers which meet at the point.

MOVING FORWARD TO A BETTER TOMORROW

I am proud to have had a part in the Congresses which have passed these and hundreds of other great Democratic programs to benefit all the people. I look forward to the 85th Congress next year, and to inaugurating a Democratic President to work with a Democratic Congress in furthering the cause of freedom and democracy—in expanding the frontiers of our economy to assure more of the good things of life for all of our people. The concept of full employment is our constant goal. Full employment does not come about merely by wishing for it—full employment must be worked for affirmatively through effective programs of government, in cooperation with industry and labor. As one of the original sponsors of the Full Employment Act of 1946, I believe this law holds within its provisions the key to our future economic development—if we have in the White House a President willing to use the tools this great law provides.

The Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, has blazed a brilliant trail toward a great future for our country. With God's help, America will move ever forward to a better tomorrow, with true brotherhood among men, and justice, dignity, contentment for all.

A Report to the People of the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the folks of the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio on my voting record for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Congress. This report includes only those questions and issues upon which there was a rollcall vote in the House of Representatives. This information is not generally available to the people of my district and I believe it should be made available to every citizen. It has been my policy by means of public opinion questionnaires to give the people I represent an opportunity to express their views on questions and issues of national interest, and I have endeavored to carry out what appeared to be their wishes in voting on bills, resolutions, and motions that were considered in the House of Representatives.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the following are some of the more important bills and resolutions which I supported and for which I voted "yea."

January 25, 1955: House Joint Resolution 159, a joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. On passage. Passed 410 to 3.

January 27, 1955: H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. On passage. Passed 366 to 0.

February 8, 1955: H. R. 3005, to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. On passage. Passed 394 to 4.

February 18, 1955: H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. On passage. Passed 295 to 110.

February 25, 1955: H. R. 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. On passage. Passed 242 to 175.

March 10, 1955: H. R. 4720, to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pay and allowances. On passage. Passed 399 to 1.

March 18, 1955: H. R. 4903, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. On Preston amendment providing $4 million for technical-assistance programs under the United Nations. Passed 175 to 107.

March 21, 1955: H. R. 4951, a bill directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Failed. Two-thirds required. Yeas 260, nays 152.

March 22, 1955: House Resolution 170, a resolution to declare that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to the Congress on January 24, 1955. Failed. Yeas 132, nays 283.

March 23, 1955: House Resolution 171, a resolution to disapprove proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic rubber facilities as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission report. On agreeing to resolution. Failed. Yeas 137, nays 276.

March 30, 1955: H. R. 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. Conference report on adoption, 387 to 8.

April 20, 1955: H. R. 4644, to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities. On Moss amendment to provide 8.2 percent increase, yeas 224 to 189 nays. On passage. Passed 324 to 85.

April 21, 1955: H. R. 4393, to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels. On passage. Passed 373 to 3.

May 5, 1955: H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by restoring 90 percent mandatory price supports for basic commodities. On passage. Passed 206 to 201.

May 9, 1955: S. 1, to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. Conference report on adoption, 328 to 66.

May 12, 1955: H. R. 6042, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. On passage. Passed 384 to 0.

May 23, 1955: S. 727, an act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court. On passage. Passed 283 to 33.

May 25, 1955: H. R. 2851, to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress. On passage. Passed 344 to 1.

June 7, 1955: S. 2061, an act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Two-thirds required. Yeas 410, nays 1.

June 8, 1955: H. R. 5923, to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. On passage. Passed 353 to 13.

July 13, 1955: H. R. 6766, a bill making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 316 to 92.

July 13, 1955: House Resolution 295, a rule providing for the consideration of

H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. On agreeing to rule, yeas 376, nays 24.

July 18, 1955: H. R. 7225, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Two-thirds required. Yeas 372, nays 31.

July 20, 1955: H. R. 7214, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956. On passage. Passed 362 to 54.

July 26, 1955: House Resolution 314, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7474, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. On agreeing to resolution. Passed, yeas 274, nays 129.

July 27, 1955. H. R. 7474, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. On passage. Failed, yeas 123, nays 292.

July 28, 1955. H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. On motion to recommit. Failed, yeas 203, nays 210.

July 29, 1955: S. 2126, an act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works. On passage. Passed 396 to 3.

August 1, 1955. House Resolution 299, a resolution providing further expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business. On passage. Passed 231 to 134.

I was paired for the following bills:

June 15, 1955: House Resolution 210, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee. On agreeing to resolution. Failed, yeas 178, nays 215.

June 30, 1955: S. 2090, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. On passage. Passed 273 to 128.

July 7, 1955: S. 2090, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 262 to 120.

August 2, 1955: S. 2126, an act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 187 to 168.

The following are some of the more important bills and resolutions which I opposed and on which I voted "nay."

February 16, 1955: H. R. 3828, to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress. On passage. Passed 283 to 118.

March 1, 1955: H. R. 3828, to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 223 to 113.

April 20, 1955: H. R. 4644, to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities. On motion to recommit. Failed, 125 to 287.

July 28, 1955: House Resolution 315, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. On agreeing to rule. Passed 273 to 135.

July 28, 1955: H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. On passage. Passed 209 to 203.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JAMES G. POLK, 6th District, Ohio (84th Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 26	Call of the House	Absent.
3	Jan. 31	H. R. 8780, relieving farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes: On passage. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
4	Jan. 31	H. Res. 352, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 385 to 1.)	Yea.
5	Feb. 1	H. R. 7993, authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 358 to 3.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 2	Call of the House	Present.
7	Feb. 8	H. Res. 396, disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber plant, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission: On adoption. (Rejected 61 to 310.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 20	H. R. 8710, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947: On passage. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
9	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
10	Feb. 28	H. Res. 311, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On adoption. (Adopted 354 to 26.)	Yea.
11	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
12	Feb. 29	Call of the House	Present.
13	Mar. 1	Call of the House	Present.
14	Mar. 1	H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On passage. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Nay.
15	Mar. 7	H. R. 9739, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act: On amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the General Services Administration. (Rejected 150 to 231.)	Yea.
16	Mar. 13	H. R. 9166, extending to April 11, 1957, the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Adopted 366 to 4.)	Yea.
17	Mar. 20	Call of the House	Present.
18	Mar. 21	Call of the House	Present.
19	Mar. 21	H. R. 8320, extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for fiscal year 1956: On motion to agree to the conference report. (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Yea.
20	Mar. 21	On motion to concur in Senate amendments extending above programs for 2 years. (Agreed to 406 to 0.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 21	S. 1271, authorizing the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, U. S. Army, retired: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 80 to 311.)	Yea.
22	Apr. 11	Call of the House	Present.
23	Apr. 11	H. R. 12, The Agricultural Act of 1956, providing 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to recommit conference report to conference with instructions to provide 82½ percent support for basic crops and 80 percent support for milk under a more liberal parity-equivalent formula and to delete dual parity provisions, mandatory support for feed grains and multiple price plans for wheat and rice. (Rejected 181 to 238.)	Nay.
24	Apr. 11	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 237 to 181.)	Yea.
25	Apr. 12	H. R. 9893, authorizing certain construction at military establishments: On passage. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
26	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
27	Apr. 18	H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, providing 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to pass bill notwithstanding the veto of the President. (Rejected 202 to 211.)	Yea.
28	Apr. 23	H. R. 7728, transferring responsibility for constructing and operating Jones Point, Va., bridge from Department of Interior to Department of Commerce: On passage. (Passed 284 to 9)	Yea.
29	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
30	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
31	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
32	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
33	Apr. 25	Call of the House	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JAMES G. POLK, 6th District, Ohio (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill:	
34	Apr. 25	On amendment fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Rejected 179 to 184.)	Nay.
35	Apr. 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956:	
36	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
37	May 2	Call of the House	Present.
38	May 3	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
39	May 3	On amendment to provide for an acreage reserve program for grazing lands. (Adopted 199 to 195.)	Yea.
40	May 3	On amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price for upland cotton. (Rejected 186 to 208.)	Yea.
41	May 3	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to incorporate provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Rejected 184 to 211.)	Nay.
42	May 3	On passage. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Yea.
43	May 9	Call of the House	Absent.
44	May 9	Call of the House	Absent.
45	May 10	Call of the House	Absent.
		H. R. 10986, the Defense Department appropriation bill:	
46	May 10	On amendment to delete sec. 633, containing language requiring Appropriations Committee approval before Department of Defense could eliminate governmental activities in competition with private business. (Adopted 222 to 156.)	Paired against.
47	May 10	On passage. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Not voting.
48	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
49	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 8901, providing for restoration of franchise to Capital Transit Co.:	
50	May 17	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 161 to 172.)	Yea.
51	May 21	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11124, providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges:	
52	May 21	On passage. (Passed 238 to 52.)	Yea.
		H. R. 11319, appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1957:	
53	May 22	On amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Adopted 179 to 170.)	Yea.
		H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
54	May 23	On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 305 to 59.)	Yea.
		S. J. Res. 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming:	
55	May 24	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 176 to 126.)	Yea.
		H. R. 10285, the Farm Credit Act of 1956:	
56	May 31	On passage. (Passed 247 to 4.)	Yea.
57	June 6	Call of the House	Absent.
58	June 6	Call of the House	Absent.
59	June 7	Call of the House	Absent.
60	June 8	Call of the House	Absent.
61	June 8	Call of the House	Absent.
62	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
63		H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act:	
	June 11	On passage. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Nay.
64	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 1840, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination:	
65	June 11	On passage. (Passed 394 to 3.)	Yea.
66	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
67	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
68	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
69	June 13	On motion to recommit conference report to committee. (Rejected 179 to 209.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4090, amending the Communications Act of 1934, to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators:	
70	June 13	On motion to recommit to committee for evaluation of reliability of device and other study. (Rejected 151 to 228.)	Nay.
		H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Act:	
71	June 13	On motion to recommit with instruction to delete section providing Federal grants for construction of sewage plants. (Rejected 165 to 213.)	Nay.
72	June 13	On passage. (Passed, 338 to 31.)	Yea.
73	June 20	Call of the House	Present.
74	June 25	Call of the House	Present.
		S. 3295, empowering the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October:	
75	June 25	On passage. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yea.
76	June 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7886, providing for presumptive disability at age 65, and increasing the monthly rates of non-service-connected veterans pension awards:	
77	June 27	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected, 110 to 305.)	Nay.
78	June 27	On passage. (Passed, 365 to 51.)	Yea.
79	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
80	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9852, extending until June 30, 1958, provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
81	June 28	On motion to agree to the conference report expressing approval of Defense Department dispersal order. (Agreed to, 200 to 197.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 554, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to the States for school construction:	
82	June 28	On adoption. (Adopted, 327 to 67.)	Yea.
83	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
84	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9801, authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal Zone at Balboa, C. Z.:	
85	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to, 325 to 59.)	Nay.
		S. 2379, providing grants of $925,000 to train professional personnel in the field of commercial fishing:	
86	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 254 to 133.)	Nay.
87	July 3	Call of the House	Present.
88	July 5	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to States for school construction:	
89	July 5	On amendment providing for payment of 1 percent of Federal income taxes to the State where collected for school construction purposes. (Rejected 168 to 250.)	Nay.
90	July 5	On amendment requiring States to comply with the Supreme Court antisegregation decisions. (Adopted 225 to 192.)	Nay.
91	July 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate provisions allocating aid on basis of need and effort. (Rejected 158 to 262.)	Nay.
92	July 5	On passage. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	Yea.
93	July 6	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11380, raising postal rates and establishing a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:	
94	July 6	On passage. (Passed 217 to 165.)	Nay.
		H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956:	
95	July 9	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to House managers to substitute Kalkaska, Mich., as a site for an air defense base, as recommended by the Air Force, instead of Manistee, Mich. (Rejected 29 to 343.)	Nay.
		H. R. 11967, reactivating National Stadium Commission and setting aside site:	
96	July 9	On passage. (Passed 287 to 80.)	Yea.
97	July 11	Call of the House	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JAMES G. POLK, 6th District, Ohio (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957:	
98	July 11	On passage. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 584, waiving points of order against provisions of H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:	
99	July 12	On adoption. (Adopted 362 to 30.)	Not voting.
		H. R. 12139, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957:	
100	July 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authorization for Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac River. Rejected 24 to 370.)	Nay.
		H. R. 12038, providing increases in veterans' service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances:	
101	July 12	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 391 to 0.)	Yea.
102	July 17	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations:	
103	July 18	On adoption. (Adopted 391 to 0.) (On this vote I was unavoidably detained by a long-distance telephone call. I favored the above resolution and if present, would have voted "yea.")	Not voting.
		H. R. 11708, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act:	
104	July 18	On passage. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
105	July 19	Call of the House	Present.
106	July 19	On motion to lay on table a motion that further proceedings under a call of the House be dispensed with. (Rejected 104 to 290.)	Nay.
107	July 20	Call of the House	Present.
108	July 21	Call of the House	Present.
109	July 23	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 627, providing means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the United States jurisdiction:	
110	July 23	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 131 to 275.)	Nay.
111	July 23	On passage. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
		S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies:	
112	July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 246 to 145.)	Yea.
		H. R. 12227, providing a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool hair:	
113	July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 216 to 123.)	Yea.
114	July 24	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7992, enacting into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Act:	
115	July 24	On the committee amendment giving Congress veto power over the elimination by the Defense Department of Government enterprises competing with private business. (Adopted 201 to 185.)	Nay.
		H. R. 12061, directing Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate plants to produce electric energy with atomic reactors.	
116	July 24	On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 195 to 199.)	Nay.
117	July 24	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 203 to 191.)	Nay.
118	July 25	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11742, the Housing bill of 1956:	
119	July 25	On amendment to the rule making in order an amendment to strike out title V, authorizing public housing. (Rejected 92 to 299.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 638, citing Arthur Miller for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
120	July 25	On adoption. (Adopted 373 to 9.)	Yea.
121	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
122	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 641, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 412, authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
123	July 26	On adoption. (Rejected 179 to 194.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 602, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
124	July 26	On adoption. (Adopted 184 to 178.)	Nay.
		H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
125	July 26	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 196 to 153.)	Nay.
126	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 625, the rule providing for the consideration of S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
127	July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 219 to 126.)	Yea.
		S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
128	July 27	On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Yea.
129	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
130	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 604, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7850, authorizing construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho:	
131	July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 173 to 168.)	Nay.
132	July 27	Call of the House	Present.

President Eisenhower in Opposing Communism Promotes Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, no longer does communism disturb us as it did a few years back. No longer is there any subversive element in the policymaking departments of Government. They have been sought out and dismissed from Government positions. None such have been appointed to office under the administration of President Eisenhower, nor will there be.

While the situation is much improved as I have indicated, yet the fact remains that communism is still a contending force in the world and ever alert to pressing forward its ideology whenever and in whatever way is possible. Its tone may have changed under the new leadership in Russia but the objectives remain the same. Therefore, it is necessary that we must at all times be on guard. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The policies of the Eisenhower administration have been a big factor throughout the world in off-selling and stopping the onward progress of communism in taking over nations and millions of people into its orbit and under its influence.

Immediately preceding this present administration we saw communism growing continually stronger throughout the world. Nothing that was said or done seemed to stop it.

The task of building a world force of sufficient strength to successfully meet the danger that confronted the free nations of the world was no easy task. It has required endless, and it seemed never-ending, activity upon our part in every corner of the world. Secretary Dulles has worked with zeal and ability in providing a leadership by this Nation in building a strong resistance against communism, and in working out the Eisenhower policies so successfully he deserves great credit. Never before has any Secretary of State been faced with greater responsibilities, nor has anyone performed them in every respect with more fidelity, courage, and ability.

This Nation has been particularly fortunate in having a man such as President Eisenhower at the head of our Government in this time of world uncertainty. His experience, gained as a result of his intitmate contacts with the leaders of other nations during his service as Commander of the Armies of the Allies in World War II, has been of incalculable value and help in drawing world plans. To accomplish this it was necessary to have unity of purpose and unity of understanding. With President Eisenhower as a central figure in all these negotiations, together with his acknowledged military knowledge, it was much easier to attain unity of action

among the nations of the world than otherwise would have been the case. Nor, can we overlook the fact that nonpartisan support in most cases has been given to the President by Congress in the fulfillment of his plans to build a strong resistance force against the aggressive policies of communism. This in itself has been of tremendous value because it has shown to the nations of the world that unity exists in this country regardless of political affiliations. This fact has strengthened our stand abroad.

As we ponder the importance of having unity of action among the free nations of the world, as well as in our own land, the question naturally presents itself as to who, what individual in this entire Nation, could claim or be likely to receive such unified support as President Eisenhower. Without in any way disparaging the ability of others who will be presented as candidates for the Presidency, I think it will be generally agreed there is no one who can exceed, or even approach, the importance of President Eisenhower in the maintenance of world peace and the promotion of good will among the nations of the world. He is in every sense of the word a world leader of far greater importance in maintaining peace and promoting good will than can be found in this or any other nation of the world. Thus, it would seem highly important to retain his services as President to combat the extension of communism in the world and strengthen the free nations of the world, and thereby promote the cause of world peace.

The New Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress this summer made some significant improvements in the social-security system. The bill was signed into law by President Eisenhower on August 1, 1956.

Coverage has been extended to 200,000 more self-employed. These include lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, optometrists, and doctors of osteopathy. Substantially all the self-employed, except doctors of medicine, now will be included in the system. These newly admitted groups will be eligible for benefits as the result of their own contributions after they are in the system for 18 months.

Two hundred thousand widows of deceased workers who were contributors to the social security fund will receive benefits at age 62. This is particularly important, for a woman of that age who has spent her life taking care of her family would find it extremely difficult to get a job if her husband passed away.

Dependent mothers who are the sole survivors of social security contributors will also receive benefits at age 62.

Other working women also may retire at age 62, but benefits will be permanently lower than they would be if they postponed retirement until age 65. For example, a woman whose average earnings were $2,400 a year would receive $62.80 monthly if she retired at 62; while she would receive $78.50 monthly if she waited until 65 to retire.

Wives of men who have retired after reaching the permissible retirement age of 65 can also apply for benefits at age 62. As in the case of working women, wives who elect the earlier benefit age must accept lower permanent benefit payments. For instance, the average industrial male worker in New Jersey earns a little more than $300 a month. A couple, which means a working husband and a nonworking wife, who had that average wage when the wife was 62 would receive $135.59 a month; but, if the wife waited for her benefits until she reached 65, the monthly payment would be $147.80.

Individual circumstances will dictate the decision to be made in the case of each couple, but it is pertinent to point out that it would be better for a woman, where possible, to wait until she is 65 before claiming benefits because the life expectancy of women at 62 is 17 years.

The reason for the setting of these lower retirement benefits for working women and wives who retire at 62 is that if they were to receive full retirement at that age, the solvency of the trust fund which has been set up for the benefit of those who have retired and who will retire in the future would be jeopardized. If such a cost was to be incurred, it would necessitate a further increase in social security deductions from the wages of all workers.

The first payment to widows, and to working women and wives of retired men who will benefit under these provisions will be for the month of November 1956, payment being made in the first part of December.

Another important provision in the new law is that which provides benefits at age 50 to totally disabled persons who have been in the social-security system for a substantial period of time immediately previous to receiving their disability. The definition of disability is: a physical or mental infirmity that prevents the worker from engaging in a substantial gainful activity and which can be expected to continue for a long and indefinite period.

It is estimated that 25 years from now nearly 1 million persons will be benefiting by this provision.

Some opposed this disability-payment provision on the grounds it is impossible to accurately estimate the cost of such a program and because of the possibility it might dissipate the money in the social-security trust fund paid by workers towards their retirement.

It is estimated the disability payments will cost anywhere between $900 million and $2 billion a year. To prevent a possible dissipation of the social-security retirement fund, the new law provides that a special trust fund for disability payments be established through a tax of one-quarter of 1 percent each on employer and employee. This tax will start January 1, 1957. The first payments to the disabled will be made in July 1957.

The new law also provides that survivors benefits for a disabled child unable to earn a living which now stop at 18 shall continue indefinitely.

Another important provision which was recommended by President Eisenhower is that the Federal Government will match to a limited amount payments by the States for necessary medical expenses to those receiving public assistance.

The law also states as one of its objectives the rehabilitation of those unable to earn a living. This means that every effort will be made to restore the disabled and those receiving public assistance to the role of self-supporting wage earners.

Of course, it is essential that additional benefits should not impair the soundness of the trust fund. You will note that cost of the new disability coverage is provided for by a new tax and the cost of earlier retirement of workingwomen and wives through actuarially sound reduction of benefits if they take them at the earlier age.

There is no special provision for paying the additional cost, which is substantial, for the earlier date of paying benefits to widows. This is taken care of in two ways. First, owing to the passage of the bill giving social security to soldiers and the inclusion of more self-employed, the cost of the system is slightly lowered; on all group-insurance systems, the more who participate the lower the cost. And, in the second place, owing to the fact that money rates are higher now than in the past, the trust fund is able to invest its funds at a rate of a little above 2½ percent where in the past it was only 2¼ percent. This difference redounds to the benefit of the beneficiaries of the social-security system.

These improvements in our social-security system, which now is 21 years old, may provide increased benefits to almost every family in our great Nation—either presently or in the future.

Douglas McKay, a Fabulous Soldier in Two Wars and an Excellent Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include some comments concerning Douglas McKay, I am including some information concerning the fabulous war record of this great man.

In World War I he was a first lieutenant in the famous 91st Division whose slogan was "Powder River let her buck." He served in the Meuse-Argonne offensive as a combat officer. In that same division were several interesting men in public life today. One of them is Harold Burton, now a member of the Supreme

Court as an Associate Justice, and the other one is Earl Warren, recently appointed Chief Justice of that Court. On the opening day of the great drive—September 26, 1918—the 91st Division had a very tough assignment. The resistance was terrific. The Germans knew that they had to muster all of their strength or be defeated. I may perhaps modestly say that I knew a good deal about that drive because on September 26 I was assigned the mission to fly over the area in which the 91st Division operated, and ascertain what progress its attack was making and I was assigned the mission to attack enemy troops and machinegun nests who might be slowing up the advance of our troops. I had seen thousands of the 91st Division troops as they moved north on the highway bordering on our airfield. I successfully carried out my mission by attacking and liquidating four German machinegun nests that were holding up the advance of our troops. Unfortunately Doug McKay was wounded by shrapnel from an 88-millimeter shell and the wound was so terrible that he did not fully recover until 12 years after the day that he was struck. The curious thing is that when the Japs made their sneak attack on Hawaii in 1941, Doug McKay was with the Willamette University football team in Hawaii. Instead of helping the team win its game, Doug McKay assisted in the organization of the defense of Hawaii.

When the Second World War was declared, he enlisted in the 44th Division under Gen. John Dahlquist, who later became the chief of the ground forces of the United States Army. General Dahlquist was very proud of the fact that this exwounded soldier was willing to offer his services in a division which was preparing for overseas duty.

Naturally, a soldier such as Doug McKay, when he was discharged, joined the American Legion as well as the Disabled War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Because of his wounds he was awarded the Purple Heart medal which was a medal originated by Washington, our first Commander in Chief. He is also authorized to wear the World War I Victory Medal with battle clasps for Meuse-Argonne and Defensive Sector, American Campaign Medal and World War II Victory Medal.

Like many of the men in public life, Doug McKay was a self-made man. He was educated in the Oregon public schools, and later attended Oregon State College, and graduated in agriculture. He was a leader as is evidenced by his being elected president of the student body and later as president of the Alumni Association of OSC.

He worked his way upward until finally he became a successful businessman and he organized the Chevrolet Co. of Salem, which was one of the outstanding dealerships on the Pacific coast. His leadership in his chosen field of business is evidenced by the fact that he was the State president of the Automobile Dealers Association.

When Doug McKay was selected as Secretary of the Interior, he carried on that office and administered its affairs in his usual capable manner. It is fantastic and sickening to read the perturbation, for political purposes, to which he was subjected, while in that office, by some Members of Congress. His administration was labeled a giveaway program when it had no earmarks of any such situation. He got along well with the people in the Department, who were career men, like the National Park Director and others. He jealously guarded the resources under the control of the Department of the Interior and faithfully carried out the trust which was imposed on him when he took the oath as Secretary of Interior.

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths Reports to the People of the 17th District of Michigan

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am taking this opportunity to provide the residents of the 17th District of Michigan a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 84th Congress.

This Congress, I am proud to report, has compiled a distinguished record of achievement in both foreign and domestic fields. Constructive legislation action has been taken to meet the needs and problems of our people.

BETTER HEALTH PROTECTION

My chief interests have included health and welfare legislation and I am happy to say that we in Congress have taken significant steps forward in these important fields. A 15-percent increase in funds to rebuild the Food and Drug Administration was voted this year. I entered testimony before the Appropriations Committee for this agency and urged the establishment of a testing laboratory in Detroit for better enforcement of food and drug laws.

On other fronts we approved establishment of a National Institute for Dental Research and created a National Medical Library. I worked for the enactment of a 3-year $90 million program to assist private institutions in the construction of medical and scientific research facilities. We in Congress boosted by $10 million the Federal program of research in such fields as cancer, heart disease, and mental illness; and provided the important Federal program for free distribution of Salk antipolio vaccine. More than $2 million has come into Michigan under the vaccine program.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The most important forward step since the program was started under a Democratic President and Democratic Congress 20 years ago was taken by this Congress in providing social-security benefits to women at age 62 and to individuals permanently disabled at age 50.

This legislation, guided to final passage under Democratic leadership and over the vigorous opposition of the Eisenhower administration, takes practical recognition of two important deficiencies in our program of care for citizens in their declining years. Women will now draw benefits 3 years earlier than in the past and disabled persons will no longer have to wait until they reach 65 to receive monthly checks under the program.

This is a great social advance, made urgent by our times, and I was proud to have supported this legislation.

VETERANS BENEFITS—RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

The House made a determined effort to expand and liberalize benefits for veterans and their dependents. The House approved measures providing a 10 percent increase in pensions for disabled veterans and a liberalized program of support for widows and orphans. This was needed legislation which I supported but the Senate failed to take affirmative action.

A 10-percent boost in retirement income for retired railroad workers was enacted into law as was a program to increase retirement benefits for civil-service workers. Both of these programs, however, gained only lukewarm support from the administration.

HOUSING

We in Congress moved forward in the field of housing legislation which was drafted by one of my committees, Banking and Currency. The new legislation extends the program of FHA mortgage insurance and liberalizes the terms of insured home improvement loans. A homeowner may now borrow up to $3,500—instead of $2,500—for up to 5 years—instead of 3 years—at moderate interest rates. This new Housing Act also contains provisions to encourage the construction of both private and public housing specially designed and financed for the elderly.

I took a special interest in these two provisions—liberalized terms for home improvement loans and housing aids for the elderly. Some of the provisions of one of my own bills on housing for the elderly were included in the final legislation.

HIGHWAYS

One of the outstanding domestic achievements of the 84th Congress was enactment of a $33 billion highway construction program. This is a pay-as-we-build program which will save us, as taxpayers, at least $11 billion which would have been spent in interest charges had a bond financing program, as advanced by the administration, been approved.

The program, which began July 1, 1956, means an additional $70 million for road construction in Michigan this fiscal year with $232.7 million earmarked for our State through 1959. I voted for this legislation in 1955 when it failed of passage largely because the administration insisted on the costly bond financing arrangement.

EDUCATION

It is disappointing to report the House failed to pass the $1.6 billion

school construction bill this session. This urgent legislation met defeat largely because the Powell antisegregation amendment was first made part of the measure.

I voted against the Powell amendment because the issue of segregation was extraneous to the legislation. Inclusion of the Powell amendment served to deprive the schools of our district of millions of dollars which could have been put to good use in building needed classrooms.

The Congress did, however, extend the program of school assistance to those districts affected by Federal activity. Since this program was started in 1950, Michigan schools have received more than $30 million for construction with Livonia, Northville, and Redford Township schools among those sharing in this aid.

I worked closely with superintendents of several Michigan school districts and with members of the Education and Labor Committee to obtain workable amendments to this law and then for its final passage.

SMALL BUSINESS

In addition to supporting extension of the Small Business Administration, I joined with other Members in successfully obtaining passage by the House of the equality of opportunity bill for small business. I was among the early signers of the discharge petition which was necessary to obtain House action on the bill.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The highlight of legislation in this field was extension of the Mutual Security Act for another year. I supported the action of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which cut the President's money request by $1 billion. It was this reduced figure of $3.8 billion which was approved by Congress. In the debate I supported the amendment which terminates military aid to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia who has returned to the good graces of the Soviet Union.

GENERAL

At my urging funds for completion of a flood-control survey of the Rouge River were included in this year's appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers.

My efforts, along with other Congressmen, to expand the distribution of surplus food to the needy of our country by a stamp plan met with strong opposition from the administration and was not approved. This program has the support of the Detroit Common Council, the Detroit Department of Welfare, and the Detroit Food Industry Committee.

Final action to bring the St. Lawrence Seaway to Detroit was taken by the 84th Congress in providing funds needed to deepen the connecting lakes channels. The sum of $5 million was approved for this year's work.

It was through my efforts that the Chief of the Corps of Engineers speeded up the bid procedure so that the good summer months for construction would not be lost this year.

PERSONAL REPORT

In addition to my legislative duties I should make reference to my other work and responsibility as your spokesman in Washington. I have attempted from the outset of my congressional service to keep the residents of the 17th District as fully informed as possible on my work.

To accomplish this, I have written a newsletter each month; I have maintained both a weekly and monthly radio report series through the cooperation of radio stations WWJ and WKMH; and I have written a short column each week for weekly newspapers and club and organization publications.

Your letters have been appreciated and I have attempted to answer each one as promptly as possible. The opinion of residents of our district are important to me.

I have been pleased to assist many residents of our district in their dealings with various Federal agencies. Some results have included bringing a Detroit family and their adopted Korean orphan child together; reuniting a family with their elderly mother from Germany; and cutting Air Force redtape so that a young airman could be with his family at Easter time.

MY LEGISLATION

Among the bills I have sponsored are measures to put the House and its committees on television; to give postal and civil service workers an adequate pay raise; to make it easier for older people to have homes of their own; to require humane methods in the slaughter of livestock; to provide the food stamp plan, to create a Federal agency for the physically handicapped; to assist libraries in rural and fringe urban areas; and to make inspection of poultry in interstate commerce compulsory.

In conclusion let me say that I have done my best to be responsive to the needs and opinions of the residents of our district and to discharge my responsibility as your Representative in Congress in a way which I hope meets with your approval.

The Russians Attempt To Capitalize on the Failure of Congress To Approve President Eisenhower's Request for OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, one item of unfinished business left by the 84th Congress was approval of President Eisenhower's request for United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

When President Eisenhower first proposed our becoming a member of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, I said that I could only approve of this action if an amendment to insure that the Organization for Trade Cooperation could not be converted into the International Trade Organization were added to the bill, H. R. 5550, which had been introduced in the other body. The Congress refused to accept the International Trade Organization, provided for in the Habana Charter, in 1950.

On June 20, 1955, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Department of State which compared the International Trade Organization with the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I then told the Senate that—

"I have no doubt whatsoever that the present administration means exactly what it said in the statement explaining the difference between the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the defunct International Trade Organization. However, the OTC agreement provides in part 4, article 16, that:

" 'Amendments to this agreement shall become effective, in respect of those members which accept them, upon acceptance by two-thirds of the members of the organization and thereafter in respect of each other member upon acceptance by it.'

"I have no fear that this administration would ever accept an amendment to the OTC agreement that would compromise its stated position. Unfortunately some future administration may not be so dedicated to these principles. Therefore, I shall support United States participation in OTC provided the resolution, which I know we shall adopt, contains a reservation that any new obligation to be imposed upon the United States as an amendment to this agreement can only be accepted by the United States with the concurrence of the Congress. Mr. President, with this one reservation I feel that we should wholeheartedly support the President in his effort to secure the maximum expansion of world trade which the Congress approved in its adoption of H. R. 1.

"President Eisenhower and the able team he has assembled in the Department of State merit the confidence of all those who believe in the ultimate triumph of free-enterprise economics."

The Russians, during the summer of 1955 at Geneva, once again proposed at the United Nations Economic and Social Council that the International Trade Organization be reestablished. I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate on July 29, 1955. I said:

"Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have addressed the Senate on the efforts being made by certain countries within the United Nations to implement portions of the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization. You will recall the Congress was asked to approve the Habana Charter by President Truman in 1949. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted hearings in the spring of 1950, but made no report. Late in 1950, President Truman announced that he would not ask the 82d Congress to again consider the Habana Charter. Mr. President, it is significant that the Soviet Union was not a signatory to the Habana Charter. Yet on Thursday, July 14, the Russian delegate to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Mr. Pavel Nikolayevitch Kumykin, announced that the U. S. S. R. was ready to join the nonexistent International Trade Organization. He introduced Resolution No. E/L. 677 which reads as follows:

" 'The Economic and Social Council—

" 'Observing, that the charter of the International Trade Organization drawn up in Habana has not so far been brought into operation;

" 'Considering the increasing need for setting up within the framework of the United Nations an international organization which would facilitate the development of international trade relations and thereby raise the level of living of the peoples and

mitigate the tension in international relations;

" 'Invites the governments of states members of the United Nations to ratify the charter of the International Trade Organization as soon as possible and requests the Secretary General to take appropriate steps for calling the first regular session of that organization.'

"Mr. President, this action by the Soviet Government once again emphasizes the importance of the stand which this administration has adopted in rejecting membership on the Commission on International Commodity Trade designed to implement chapter VI of the Habana Charter, and in rejecting the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices which was designed to implement chapter V of the Habana Charter. The Congress and the administration have both made it clear that this country is dedicated to furthering economic advancement through the development of free, competitive, private enterprise. Congressional approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation will make it impossible for the Russians to appear to be cooperating with the West by advancing the formation of an organization which would never be acceptable to the United States. They can then show their good faith by joining the Organization for Trade Cooperation and assume, of course, the obligations which such membership entails.

* * * * *

"The introduction of this resolution by the Russians makes my reservation absolutely necessary if we are to protect the economy of the United States. We are making progress, Mr. President, and I again commend the Secretary of State for the fine work by our delegation to the 20th session of the Council."

When H. R. 5550 was finally reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means, it contained the following language:

"Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States accept any amendment to the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation."

This provision completely met my original concern.

I am, indeed, sorry that, in spite of the perfecting amendments adopted by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Democratic leadership refused to bring this bill before the Congress.

My fears of a year ago have been completely confirmed. Our failure to act has caused a serious problem for the United States delegation to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. A dispatch to the New York Times, dated July 26, by its European correspondent, Michael L. Hoffman, shows how the Russians again attempted to sell the discredited International Trade Organization to the Economic and Social Council at its 1956 summer session. Michael Hoffman concludes his dispatch with this statement:

"Some western delegates, notably the French, are trying to persuade the smaller countries to avoid taking any position on the Soviet plan until after the United States elections. They say the western trade cooperation plan still has a chance of congressional approval. Privately even delegates who are passing this word around concede that they do not have much faith in their own arguments."

I sincerely hope that the 85th Congress will give President Eisenhower what he has asked for.

I am inserting Mr. Hoffman's entire article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that all of my colleagues may understand the importance of this issue to our overall foreign policy:

[From the New York Times, of July 27, 1956]

U. N. TRADE AGENCY PUSHED BY SOVIET—MOVE SAID TO BE DIRECTED AT EASING UNITED STATES RESTRICTIONS ON STRATEGIC GOODS

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, July 26.—While the United States stands more or less helplessly by, the Soviet Union is plugging steadily ahead with its campaign to get the United Nations to set up an international trade organization.

All the Soviet leaders are asking for this year is an Economic and Social Council resolution to set up a committee to "work out the proposals."

Debate on the resolution in the Economic Committee of the Council was postponed today, since most delegations said they lacked instructions.

According to the text of the resolution, the ultimate aim of Moscow is to get a new specialized agency established to promote trade cooperation.

From the wording of their various statements on the matter it is clear that by trade cooperation the Soviet leaders have mainly in mind steps to remove discriminatory restrictions and obstacles impeding international trade.

PRESSURE ON UNITED STATES IS AIM

In short, they want a new forum for putting pressure on the United States to take off restrictions on exports of so-called strategic products of Communist countries.

There is an organization for international trade cooperation on the books, called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. It is not at all what the Soviet leaders have in mind. It was planned and constructed with the object of establishing and interpreting commonly agreed rules of commercial policy for what Moscow would call the capitalist world. It was modeled on ideas that originated primarily in the United States.

However, this organization exists only on paper. It is thoroughly approved by President Eisenhower but the administration has never been able to get it past the committee stage in Congress. In Western Europe it is generally assumed now that the organization is defunct.

ADVANTAGE GAINED BY SOVIET

The failure of Congress to approve United States participation in the organization means that the western states have very little to offer in opposition to the very different, but superficially similar, Soviet proposal.

Soviet delegates have helped confuse the issue by borrowing the name of the Organization for Trade Cooperation for their own proposed creation.

The general recognition is that there is a glaring gap in provisions for consultation in the family of international organizations in the trade field. Such consultation not only is possible but also is essential because of the very nature of the problem. As a result more and more countries are receptive to the Soviet alternative.

Some Latin-American and Middle East countries are beginning to think they would get something out of the Soviet proposal if Moscow improved and enlarged its trade relations with non-Communist countries.

Some western delegates, notably the French, are trying to persuade the smaller countries to avoid taking any position on the Soviet plan until after the United States elections. They say the western trade cooperation plan still has a chance of congressional approval. Privately even delegates who are passing this word around concede that they do not have much faith in their own arguments.

"Jersey Joe" Walcott Solving Problem of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today we hear much of juvenile delinquency. It is highly disturbing to read day after day in our newspapers of incidents committed by teenagers that show a growing disrespect for law and order. This lack of respect and failure to observe even the ordinary rules of good conduct is surprising. Whatever may be the cause the fact remains the condition exists. Nor is there any doubt that it needs correction. It should have the careful consideration not only of parents but also of public authorities.

It is most gratifying to realize that in many cities public authorities have taken notice of the condition and are seeking to do something about it. One of the most outstanding efforts of this kind is the program that has been carried out in the city of Washington by means of its Boys Clubs, under the supervision and direction of the Metropolitan Police Department. The result has been very satisfactory.

Another instance of a worthwhile program that is being carried on under unique circumstances is that which has been inaugurated by a city commissioner in the city of Camden, N. J. Commissioner E. George Aaron, director of public safety in that city, has engaged the services of "Jersey Joe" Walcott, former heavyweight boxing champion of the world.

The selection of "Jersey Joe" to take over the direction of programs in the city of Camden to combat juvenile delinquency has proved immensely satisfactory. When I speak of good being done, I know whereof I speak as this is my home city and, therefore, I have personal knowledge of the situation.

There are several reasons that have helped make "Jersey Joe" a success in this work among the youth of our city. First, because he has been heavyweight champion he is looked up to by every boy in the city of Camden, regardless of race, color, or creed. Second, he is looked up to as a good-living man. He is well known as such in Camden, which is his hometown. He has always been known as a man of honesty and integrity and against whom there has never been a word of scandal or reproach. Third, he knows how to talk to boys. He can give them good advice without being too "churchy." He has a friendly disposition. He is kind. He is not rough. The boys enjoy listening to him. He has a good influence over them.

In addition to the personal qualities that make for success, "Jersey Joe" knows how to address groups of boys in their meetings, whether held under the auspices of school or church authorities or otherwise. He knows what to say and

how to say it to get to them and exercise a good influence over them.

I have gone into some detail in explaining the work being done by Commissioner Aaron through Joe Walcott because it already has accomplished so much good. It is a unique and new approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency and it is working out successfully. Both Commissioner Aaron and Joe Walcott are entitled to be commended for establishing this program in the city of Camden. It has been so successful that it merits a trial elsewhere by those who want to meet the problem of teen-age delinquency in a real man fashion.

Congressman Leroy Johnson Friend of Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and neighbor in the New House Office Building, Congressman LEROY JOHNSON, of California, is a true friend of the Reserves of all of the armed services. In addition to this, he has been responsible for some of the most far-reaching legislation, affecting the military services, enacted by Congress in recent years.

LEROY JOHNSON came to Congress in 1943, and at that time was assigned to the Military Affairs Committee. In 1947 the old Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee were combined into the present Armed Services Committee. The first chairman of this committee was the distinguished gentleman from New York, the late Walter Gresham Andrews, a noted soldier of the First World War. At that time he told me that he was anxious to have LEROY JOHNSON assigned to the Armed Services Committee, as he was desirous of having this highly decorated and combat-tested aviator on the committee because of his background and wide experience in military affairs and legislation affecting all of the armed services.

Very shortly after the Armed Services Committee was formed and my colleague, LEROY JOHNSON, of California, became a member, I recall that Chairman Andrews assigned him to some of the most important subcommittees and related tasks in the committee. Since Walter Andrews has passed on, we cannot give the exact reason why LEROY JOHNSON was chosen for this important work, but suffice it to say that his conduct in working on these problems, and solving them, became well known, not only in the committee but by virtually every Member of the House.

Bear with me for a moment while I briefly outline some of these assignments. During the 80th Congress when the Republicans controlled the House, LEROY JOHNSON was assigned to five separate subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee and was made chairman of one.

First he was assigned to the important Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization. This subcommittee was charged with the overall organization and plans for national security; military and industrial mobilization plans, including plans for the mobilization of our national resources for war as well as mobilization of the armed services and their civilian components, including the National Guard and Reserves; plans for coordination of foreign and military policies and coordination of civilian and war economies; occupation armies, military government, and all other military operations of the armed services overseas. In addition to this the subcommittee was charged with keeping closely informed of all plans and operations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to insure that all legislation affecting the military policy of the United States was consonant with foreign policy and overall security plans. Furthermore, while a member of this subcommittee, Congressman LEROY JOHNSON was designated to hold extended secret hearings in order to develop legislation for the establishment of a top Government security agency. This legislation resulted in the birth of the Central Intelligence Agency, and a large share of the credit for the establishment of this well-known and vital agency of our Government must go to LEROY JOHNSON, of California.

From what I have said you would think that the subcommittee assignment I have just described would have been sufficient to take all of the time of the average Congressman. But LEROY JOHNSON is far above the average and he plunged into the work of other subcommittees to which he had been assigned. For instance, I refer to the subcommittee on Heavy Munitions which was charged with the procurement and production of all heavy industrial munitions of war for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, requiring extraordinary tooling-up of industry and large quantities of strategic materials, including ship construction and heavy Army and Navy ordnance, and transportation equipment.

Another important subcommittee on which my colleague served was that dealing with legal matters and which had charge of all investigatory activities of the committee. On this subcommittee LEROY JOHNSON'S legal background served him well, for before this group came all of the legal business of the committee, including questions of subpena, committee jurisdiction and legal procedure, and considerations and proposals for the reform of existing systems of military and naval justice.

Probably the work closest to the heart of LEROY JOHNSON came as a result of his assignment to still another subcommittee, for although the Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Development was charged with matters concerning the maintenance of the supremacy of the United States in research and development, it so happened that much legislation affecting the Reserves was handled by this subcommittee. Thus it was that as chairman of this subcommittee Congressman LEROY JOHNSON conducted the hearings which resulted in the enactment of legislation authorizing for the first time the establishment of a retirement system for members of the Reserve components. Probably no other statute is so well known to our Reserves as the Reserves Retirement Act, and certainly every member of the Reserve components, whether retired under the provisions of this statute or authorized to do so in the future, can reflect with gratitude upon the work that Congressman JOHNSON did in connection with this law.

In the 83d Congress when the Republicans again controlled the House, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, became the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and, as was to be expected, appointed LEROY JOHNSON as chairman of the subcommittee to handle all Reserve and National Guard legislation. Shortly after this assignment LEROY JOHNSON introduced legislation and conducted hearings on one of the most far-reaching legislative items affecting the Reserve components ever enacted by Congress. He spent 8 continuous weeks in study and in public hearings on the bill which became the Reserve Officer Personnel Act, establishing for the first time a statutory system of promotion for all Reserve officers of the armed services. In testimony of the type of work that LEROY JOHNSON did on this legislation, it should be remembered that this legislation passed both the House and the Senate without a dissenting vote.

In the 83d Congress alone, Congressman JOHNSON introduced 18 separate legislative items in behalf of the Reserves, National Guard, and Civil Air Patrol. He sponsored legislation to equalize benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces, legislation to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act to authorize full and fair hearings of claims, a bill to increase the enlisted strength of organized units of the Reserve components, a bill to establish the Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the Air Force and to extend aid to the CAP in the fulfillment of its objectives, and so many others that I cannot take the time to describe them all fully.

When the Armed Services Committee was first organized in 1947, LEROY JOHNSON was the 13th ranking Republican on that committee. Today he is the fourth ranking Republican, and as such is constantly concerned with the overall policy of the committee and, in addition, serves as ranking minority member of one of the three important legislative subcommittees.

Since he came to Congress in 1943, the name of LEROY JOHNSON has become known throughout the armed services and the Nation as a Member of the House of Representatives dedicated to the furtherance of the national security and defense and to the welfare and well being of all members of the Armed Forces.

A Sound Conservation Policy—False Charges Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, probably more misinformation, half-truths, and distortions of fact have been circulated in recent months concerning oil and gas leasing on certain wildlife refuges, than about any other Interior Department activity.

Numerous statements have been issued which accuse the Department of acting to "reverse policies to preserve the integrity of the wildlife refuges" through the "opening" of wildlife refuges to oil and gas leasing.

These statements have appeared without in any way defining the real purpose of the wildlife refuge system. The availability of refuge lands for oil and gas leases for more than 20 years, as well as for other economic purposes, has been ignored.

MULTIPLE USES

Implicit in the attacks on the Department has been the charge that this was a brandnew activity initiated by the present administration.

This allegation completely disregards the multiple uses which historically have been made of wildlife lands.

The uses include sharecropping, grazing, timber removal and, in one case at least, a factory site. Oil drilling has been included, too, where it does not interfere with the use of the area for its primary purpose—wildlife conservation.

Former Secretary McKay's approval of new regulations last December to govern oil and gas leasing in these areas was immediately seized upon by administration foes as a pretext for charges of reprehensible conduct.

When the regulations—before they were signed—were submitted to the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation, no one raised a serious objection. Not until afterward did the critics open their barrage of acrimonious press releases, public statements, and canned speeches by certain Members of Congress.

Some of those who were loudest in their objections on later occasions were members of the advisory committee and had remained silent when the proposed regulations were considered prior to Secretarial approval.

THREE CATEGORIES

Before the facts of this controversy can be properly weighed and evaluated, it is necessary to understand that there are approximately 17½ million acres in the Nation's wildlife management system. They are divided into three categories as follows:

First. Wildlife refuges, areas over which the Fish and Wildlife Service has primary jurisdiction and which are managed primarily for wildlife purposes.

Second. Game ranges, areas over which the Fish and Wildlife Service shares jurisdiction with another agency and on which wildlife conservation may be one of several equally important uses rather than the primary purpose.

Third. Cooperative lands, areas owned by the Federal Government but administered by the State for wildlife purposes.

There are, all told, 272 wildlife areas in all categories of these lands throughout the United States.

Leasing has been allowed in a total of 20 areas, or approximately 7 percent of all the areas in the system.

The number of acres in the 20 areas opened to leasing is roughly 250,000. This is about 1½ percent of the acreage in the entire system.

The practice of oil and gas leasing in these areas is not new.

Issuance of such leases dates back to, and is authorized by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. The intent of this act was later reaffirmed by amendment.

The Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands, and the act of June 15, 1935, relating to administration of wildlife refuges, also authorize oil and gas leasing in wildlife areas.

The first regulations under which leases were issued in wildlife areas were signed in 1947 by Secretary Krug in the administration of President Truman. These were found lacking by the present administration and were superseded by the newer ones approved by McKay last December.

NUMBERS OF LEASES

The total number of leases which have been allowed up to now by the Federal Government is 612. Of these, 277 were allowed by previous administrations—270 between 1947 and January 20, 1953—while the present administration has allowed 335.

McKay's accusers have held him to be in a conspiracy with oil firms to enable them to fatten their purses at the expense of the Nation's wildlife population. After he signed the new regulations he was portrayed by some as indulging in a veritable orgy of leasing in areas which had been sacrosanct before this administration took office.

The figures show an opposite picture.

Under the administrations in the White House before January 20, 1953, a total of 13 areas were opened up to oil and gas exploration and development. As has been stated, there were 277 leases in these areas.

Under McKay seven new areas were opened to leasing. A total of 85 leases were allowed therein.

In other words, previous administrations opened nearly twice as many new areas as did McKay and allowed two-thirds more leases in the areas thus opened.

In six of the areas which had already been opened by the previous administration, the Department allowed 250 additional leases compared with the 277 issued prior to January 20, 1953.

NARROW MARGIN

Hence, the figures show McKay opened fewer areas to leasing than did his predecessors; he allowed fewer leases in the areas opened, and he allowed fewer leases in those areas already opened when he took office than had officials of past administrations.

Only when the leases granted in newly opened areas are combined with those allowed in areas already opened does the present administration come out with a total greater than that of past administrations. And the margin is only 58 more leases.

Considering each of the three categories separately, the figures are as follows:

Wildlife refuges: Previous administrations opened 7; allowed 20 leases. Present administration opened 4; allowed 11 leases. In 3 of those already opened by previous administrations, present administration allowed 6 leases.

Game ranges: The previous administration opened 1; allowed 241 leases. Present administration opened 1; allowed 21 leases. In the game range already opened by the previous administration, the present administration allowed 230 leases.

Cooperative lands: The previous administration opened 5; allowed 16 leases. The present administration opened 2; allowed 53 leases. In 2 of these areas already opened by the previous administration, the present administration allowed 14 additional leases.

OTHER FACTS

Figures on royalties paid over the years by oil drillers operating in wildlife areas further refute the implication that this activity is new with the present administration.

Total income to the Government from this source was $5,650,000 from 1947 through 1955. The amount collected under the previous administration was $3,650,000, or $1,650,000 more than has been collected by the present administration.

Leasing in refuge areas has also been attacked as an impropriety and injurious per se to the waterfowl and other wildlife. Opponents of the administration have consistently tried to paint a picture of derricks scattered across the landscape, spouting oil over the ducks while streams are polluted and the ground is torn up by workmen and their machines.

In flat refutation of this line of attack is the fact that the Audubon Society, one of the Nation's leading conservationist organizations, permits oil and gas leasing and development on its own private refuge holdings.

NEW REGULATIONS

Administration opponents have also claimed that the new regulations issued by former Secretary McKay were capricious and revolutionary. This is not borne out by the facts.

Soon after he took office, McKay noted that the 1947 regulations were not adequate to protect wildlife values. Under those mildly protective rules, an oil or gas lease had to be approved and issued automatically if certain minimum conditions were met by the operator-applicant.

The drawing of new regulations was ordered. When they were approved, they represented more than 2 years of preparation by the Department's career specialists in wildlife management and land use.

They were designed to strengthen the control of the Fish and Wildlife Service over this activity in wildlife areas, and

to provide the Service with a veto over the issuance of leases. They took certain areas out of leasing altogether.

Far from being the first Secretary to open refuge lands to oil and gas leasing, McKay actually was the first one in the history of the Wildlife Service to close some areas to exploration in deference to irreplaceable wildlife values.

The importance of the new regulations also lies in the future as well as in the present.

There are now approximately 3½ million acres in the wildlife refuges, as distinguished from game ranges and cooperative lands.

FUTURE NEEDS

Specialists in this field foresee a need within the next 25 years for 12½ million acres to provide food and living space for the desired population of 50 million birds, in the face of growing urban development and reclamation of wet lands for agricultural development.

The program of the Federal Government calls for the acquisition of an additional 4 million acres to serve as waterfowl habitat. The States are expected to provide an additional 5 million acres.

The land which the Federal Government adds to its refuge system will in almost all cases be acquired through purchase from private ownership.

It is significant that the Fish and Wildlife Service is finding more and more difficult the securing of mineral rights to land purchased for wildlife use. Owners of large tracts are unwilling to part with the subsurface mineral rights when they sell.

In the past, only about 20 percent of all land acquired by purchase had the mineral rights withheld by the sellers. Now the situation is reversed.

Only about 15 percent of the land being purchased currently has the mineral rights attached. This means that on over 85 percent of the land being bought today the previous owners retain the right, perhaps, to enter that portion of a wildlife area sometime in the future to drill for oil.

VAST DRILLING POSSIBLE

Thus, if the Fish and Wildlife Service is to fulfill its goal of adding 4 million more acres to the waterfowl refuge system, it faces the possibility that oil drilling may one day take place on about 3,500,000 acres of this land, regardless of conservationists, Congress, or ducks.

Under the new regulations, the Department is better prepared to cope with leasing and drilling activity on this unprecedented scale than it ever has been before. It cannot forbid private owners of mineral rights from exercising their rights. It can require them to exercise the most stringent precautions to avert destruction of the wildlife values.

DRILLING HERE TO STAY

A number of the critics of the new regulations have admitted privately that, if oil and gas drilling must take place, it would not be possible to draft a better or more protective set of procedures.

These individuals say they are against drilling in principle.

It appears they have not faced up to the fact that oil development on wildlife land is here to stay and must inevitably expand.

STOP ORDER

Much of the sound and fury generated by this controversy resolves about the so-called stop order issued August 31, 1953, for the announced purpose of allowing the Department time to study and rewrite the 1947 regulations inherited from the previous administration.

The order, in the form of a memorandum, was addressed to all field offices of the Bureau of Land Management and was signed by William Zimmerman, Jr., the Acting Director of the Bureau. This document enjoined Bureau field offices from processing oil and gas leases on refuge lands until further notice.

The pending applications were suspended, rather than canceled, to avoid inflicting an undeserved penalty on the applicants by depriving them of their filing priority, because of the shortcomings of the Government's regulations.

But the memorandum did not specify that action on leases on game ranges or cooperative lands should be suspended. Therein lies the crux of this matter.

The leasing activity which did occur during the period between the issuance of the suspension memorandum and the approval of the new regulations reflects a basic and unresolved conflict of policy between the Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The BLM has held traditionally that game ranges are not refuge lands within the meaning of the 1947 regulations. It based its position upon a literal interpretation of the minerals clauses in the Executive orders which created the ranges. This interpretation extends back into the last administration. Accordingly, the Bureau held that leasing on the ranges was not covered by its own suspension order of August 31, 1953.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, on the other hand, viewed game ranges as refuge lands and contended that they should be so regarded under the regulations and under the suspension order.

LEASES ACCOUNTED FOR

This policy difference was not impressed upon the congressional committee leading to the assumption, fostered by administration foes, that hundreds of leases were brashly issued during a period in which the Department was proclaiming a self-imposed restriction.

Similarly, BLM did not feel that the 1947 regulations or the suspension order related specifically to cooperative lands; that is, lands withdrawn for conservation management by the States. The view of the Fish and Wildlife Service again was wholly divergent.

These conflicts account for virtually all of the leasing activity following issuance of the BLM memorandum.

Of 293 leases allowed during the period, records show only 6 were on wildlife refuges. The rest were on game ranges, 222, and on cooperative lands, 65.

Four of the refuge leases were issued in error by BLM field offices which were not aware that the leases involved refuge land. The other two were approved by former Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis on the ground that they were in full compliance with the 1947 regulations and had been nearing approval at the time the memorandum suspending further processing went out to BLM field offices.

By far the greatest number of leases issued during the period were in the Fort Peck, Mont., game range where a total of 201 was allowed. Twenty-one other leases were issued in the Kenai, Alaska, moose range.

Fort Peck, it should be noted, was originally opened to leasing by the previous administration which had allowed 241 leases in the area before this administration took office, out of a total of 612 leases in all wildlife areas, leaving a balance of 170 scattered elsewhere in the system. It is further interesting to note that no oil has been discovered at Fort Peck and no drilling is in progress there.

OTHER LEASES

Of the 65 leases allowed during the same period on cooperative lands, a total of 52 were on the Railroad Valley, Nev., refuge, owned by the Federal Government but managed in the State of Nevada. Issuance of the leases was desired by Nevada. They led to the discovery of oil and development of the first producing field in the State.

Only about 5 percent of this 140,000-acre area is used for wildlife purposes. Its value for conservation has been enhanced during the oil exploration work through the drilling of water wells by the company, the construction of dikes and the impoundment of water.

The 13 other leases allowed on State-managed cooperative lands were divided between the East Fork, Wyo., elk pasture, 7; the Sun River, Mont., elk range, 5; and the Fox Lake, Mont., waterfowl project, 1.

In no case has any of the leases issued during the period been shown to be detrimental to existing or potential wildlife values on game ranges or cooperative lands.

SUMMARY

Although oil and gas exploration and development in wildlife areas has been permissible since 1920, little interest was shown in reserves beneath these lands until after World War II which was marked by an enormous drain on the Nation's petroleum resources.

There has been a continuing program of such activity since 1947, the year the first regulations governing these leases were drawn.

There have been no flurries of leasing or accelerated activity at any particular time since then.

These facts notwithstanding, a loud claque of administration accusers has charged that former Secretary McKay threw open refuge lands to oil and gas leasing. They have attempted to give substance to their allegations by constant repetition.

Through their horrified tones and the volume of their clamor, they have sought to convey the impression that there was no such activity before this administration took office.

The record shows otherwise. Since 1920, a total of 612 leases has been granted. Previous administrations allowed 277. The present administration allowed 335.

The inference has also been that oil and gas leasing in wildlife areas is indecent, inhuman, or corrupt.

This view is evidently not shared by the Audubon Society, a renowned conservationist organization, which permits such activity on its refuges.

New regulations approved by Secretary McKay last December have been lauded by career technicians in the Department as providing the greatest measure of protection the refuge areas have enjoyed in their history.

As Secretary of the Interior, McKay obviously could not forsake one resource while catering to another. It would have been as remiss for him to ignore publicly owned oil reserves while safeguarding wildlife, as it would for him to disregard wildlife while protecting the public's rights in oil reserves under public lands.

Much has been said regarding the leasing that took place during the "stop order period."

It must be understood that the purpose of the suspension or "stop order" was to afford this administration an opportunity to study and strengthen regulations existing when it took office.

The memorandum to suspend the processing of applications was an alert to the Bureau of Land Management field offices that such a study was being undertaken.

It was intended primarily to prevent final action on any applications for leases where wildlife values would need the added protection of strengthened regulations. The memorandum did not specify to field personnel that game ranges and cooperative lands were to be excluded from consideration for leasing.

Virtually all the leases issued during this period were issued on lands located within one game range—Fort Peck—and one cooperative unit—Railroad Valley. In neither case has it been shown that any damage to wildlife values resulted or is likely to result.

Finally, it is significant to note that this entire dispute involves only 20 wildlife areas throughout the United States, or approximately 7 percent of all the areas in the system. The acreage affected comprises only about 1½ percent of all of that which has been set aside by the Nation for wildlife purposes.

Hydroelectric Potential of the Hells Canyon Reach of the Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the hydroelectric potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The defeat by the Senate of the Federal Hells Canyon bill has not ended, unfortunately, the political misrepresentations which have so long beclouded this vital issue.

It is to be hoped, nevertheless, that even the ardent proponents of the Federal high dam will pause for a moment to give earnest consideration to the facts regarding the comparative benefits of the 3-dam plan and the high dam proposal.

As the Oregon Journal, an independent newspaper in the Pacific Northwest, has declared, Hells Canyon has been the subject of exaggeration, misstatement and planned confusion. Typical, the Journal points out, was the comment of Senator MORSE that the defeat was a "tragic blow to the welfare of the Nation." The Journal describes this statement simply as "unadulterated balderdash."

In order that we may attempt to place the Hells Canyon controversy in some perspective, I have attempted to examine objectively the facts on the development of the hydroelectric potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River.

THE FACTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HYDROELECTRIC POTENTIAL OF HELLS CANYON REACH OF SNAKE RIVER ON THE IDAHO-OREGON BOUNDARY

To compare the 3-dam plan licensed by the Federal Power Commission to a privately financed electric power entity with a high-dam plan to be federally financed is possible, but this requires a careful analysis of the facts and the rules controlling each proposal.

The licensee, in this instance, is the Idaho Power Co., and the Federal construction agency would be the Bureau of Reclamation. The company may not be paid for downstream benefits to Federal powerplants that result from regulation of the waters of the stream. The Federal project may credit its operations with the net value of downstream benefits to both Federal and privately owned plants, and from the latter class it may collect that value in dollars.

A Federal development does not pay taxes, but a privately financed development must. In both cases American citizens would be served by the production of electric power and service. It is estimated for the year 1955 that the private electric industry in the country, as a whole, received in operating revenues $6,930,000,000; that of this amount $625 million was paid in State and local taxes, being 9 percent of the operating revenues; $1,014,000,000 was paid in Federal taxes, being 14.6 percent of the operating revenues. The sum of these taxes is 23.6 percent of the operating revenues.

The records of the Federal Power Commission show that the Idaho Power Co. paid $3,870,000 annually in Federal income taxes, and $3,300,000 in State and local taxes for the year 1954. These amounts happen to be 3 percent on the investment of the company for Federal taxes and 2.42 percent on the investment for State and local taxes.

There are, admittedly, downstream benefits for power, flood control, and navigation from the operation of the 3-dam plan in Hells Canyon reach of Snake River. These benefits are paid for by the users of the power which is generated at the three dams and sold to consumers, and thus will not be paid for by the beneficiaries downstream, under present rules and regulations.

In the voluminous hearings before the Federal Power Commission on the application of Idaho Power Co., and in the hearings before the Senate Interior Committee on S. 1333, factual information of unquestioned validity was presented which unfortunately has been obscured by political exaggerations.

The Federal Power Commission had the duty to determine the best plan for development of this portion of Snake River. To do so they reduced the various plans to the common denominator of Federal financing and construction. Thus, this record must be searched and analyzed carefully to find what data, together with the testimony before the Senate Interior Committee, were presented which could be correlated to show plainly and directly the comparable facts which bear on the economics of the two plans. I have had these data reduced to four tables in order that physical and fiscal comparisons may be reduced to understandable terms.

These data clearly indicate that the job of supplying electric power to our people would be more equitably accomplished if there were no Federal taxes on privately owned systems, and if federally owned projects were required to pay the same State and local taxes as others.

It is common knowledge, I think, that Federal income taxes on the electric-power industry are paid by the users of electricity. To tax these industries is to tax the people.

I now refer to the technical data available to analyze and compare these two plans about which so much ill-advised controversy has been raised.

In the Hells Canyon reach there is a total fall of 602 feet. When dams are built, this fall is converted to a head, and the use of this head is the means of converting falling waters into electric energy. Both plans develop this head of 602 feet. In the 3-dam plan, the variation in the head is only 101 feet, because that is the maximum drawdown on the storage unit at Brownlee Dam. For the high dam, the maximum drawdown is 289 feet and thus the head will vary from 602 to 313 feet. The high dam will produce a little more power because it captures flood-waters which are not usable except with a larger storage volume.

I have assumed, as did the Federal Power Commission, that power data supplied by three engineers were the best in the large volume of evidence taken. These three engineers were from the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Federal Power Commission. These experts did not represent the licensee. In making allowances for upstream increases in irrigation use and the determination of critical periods of water supply to be firmed by storage, these engineers varied only about 5 percent in their estimates of nominal prime power.

I have taken the average of the values submitted by these engineers as the best figures available. For the 3-dam plan, the prime power at site is 565 megawatts with downstream benefits of 110 megawatts. For the high dam at site the prime power is 646 megawatts, and downstream benefits of 278 megawatts. At the site, then, there is a difference of only 81 megawatts. These data appear in my table A.

I stated that the foregoing values were the averages of data submitted by three witnesses. I note that the data of the Federal Power Commission witness is practically identical with the average. I find in the testimony that he made a special study of actual energy output for the 20-year period of streamflow records, 1929–48, allowing for about 8 percent more irrigation depletion than the average of the three witnesses who computed estimates for normal prime power. The average energy output of the period is as follows:

At site: 3-dam plan, 546 megawatts; high dam, 634 megawatts.

Downstream benefits: 3-dam plan, 59 megawatts; high dam, 113 megawatts.

The difference at the site is 88 megawatts, whereas in prime power calculations the difference at site was 81 megawatts. I hold that this study of energy output is the test of the projects. It is what would have been produced by them over a 20-year critical period containing years of high variation in stream flows and also containing the critical months for which storage uses must be relied upon.

When I have mentioned downstream benefits, I have done so on the basis of these engineers, and they included the following downstream powerplants, as if they were in full operation: Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, McNary, all on the Columbia River. I

also have assumed the existence of Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite, which are on the Lower Snake River, none of which may be constructed for many years. The average megawatts of output are shown on my table B.

Table C included general data and comparisons between the two plans for the proposed developments. The data shown are comparable one with the other for each plan, excepting that item 2 for the 3-dam plan shows the cost per kilowatt hour at 3.8 mills, which is not based upon item 11, but which is the accepted cost of construction by the licensee. The 3.8 mill figure is based upon Federal construction costs, which is nearly $50 million greater than the bid for constructing the 3-dam plan.

There was an estimate in the Federal Power Commission hearings of $21 million for transmission lines to market the power of the licensee, the Idaho Power Co. It is understood that this would bring the power to Boise, or to a similarly situated market. To connect the high dam with the Northwest power network is estimated to cost $77 million. The two latter items appear in item 13a of the table.

For the high dam plan, in order to supply the downstream benefits, the transmission cost was estimated to be $146 million. I have used the costs for the high dam and the transmission lines as given before the Senate Interior Committee. The combined cost of these items comes to about $55 million less than that testified to before the Federal Power Commission. A footnote on table C indicates the place where these values may be found.

Since contracts have been let for the 2 plant units of the licensee, there now remains little question of the sufficiency of the estimate of $133 million to cover the cost of the 3-dam plan exclusive of transmission.

At the beginning, I said that it was possible from the evidence available to compare the two plans. The data are arranged in my table D. The at-site costs have been substantiated. The annual costs for operating the projects are:

For the 3-dam plan, $8,400,000 for operation, maintenance, replacements, and depreciation, and fish facilities, together with fixed costs including interest on the investment. When there is added the Federal income tax on the basis now being paid by Idaho Power Co., and similarly local and State taxes, the total annual cost is $15,400,000. This results in 3.21 mills per kilowatt-hour of average generation over the 20-year period previously mentioned. If Federal taxes were deducted, the cost is 2.38 mills per kilowatt-hour. If all taxes were eliminated, the cost would be 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour.

For the high dam, there are no taxes, and I have assumed the annual cost to be that testified to by the Federal Power Commission engineer, who computed the average energy output over the 20-year period. The cost is 2.71 mills per kilowatt-hour. If there is added to the annual cost of the high dam, local and State taxes at 2.25 percent of the allocation of power, at site—$278 million—the total annual cost would be $21,300,000, and the cost per kilowatt-hour would be 3.83 mills. But, I have compared these kilowatt-hour costs at site for the reason that the licensee can receive no compensation for downstream benefits for power, or flood control, or navigation. The high dam, federally owned, can and does take credits for these downstream benefits. These credits are reflected in the annual cost as reduced to $15,045,000. If this were not done, the costs of power development for both plans would be approximately 3.2 mills per kilowatt-hour, in spite of the fact that the 3-dam plan carries $7 million annually in taxes, and the proposed Federal project carries none.

These startling data reveal the inequity of our treatment of our citizens. I have suggested a formula for equalizing the item of taxes. It is this: Relieve the privately financed generation industry from Federal income tax, and require that Federal projects pay local and State taxes. Consumers are entitled to such fair and equitable treatment.

The difference in power costs to the consumers in these plans is insignificant. To develop an additional 88 megawatts at site would require an additional expenditure of $328 million minus $133 million or $195 million. This is $2,220 per average kilowatt of incremental output. No one could justify such a cost to the Nation's taxpayers, who would have to advance the money for so little gain in power. If we use the 142,000 additional kilowatts in downstream benefits, the cost would be $1,375 per average kilowatt of incremental output. That is still four times too high for fiscal justification.

The additional 142,000 kilowatts is less than 1 percent of the power requirements of the Northwest by 1980, which according to the Federal Power Commission studies will be 17 million kilowatts. We certainly can find, without any difficulty, places to develop 1 million kilowatts with just the saving of $195 million.

In the Hells Canyon matter we have heard a lot of talk about much of little consequence. Yet, the defeat of the Hells Canyon bill saved the Nation's taxpayers nearly a half billion dollars that is needed for a multitude of better projects in the West. More important is the fact that the plan under construction is a better contribution to the Nation's economy. That the Federal Power Commission made a good decision under pressure of bitter opposition is a sign we should recognize for what it is, namely, the wisdom incorporated in the Federal Power Act which removed one phase of the development of natural resources from purely partisan politics.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER IN HELLS CANYON REACH, SNAKE RIVER

TABLE A.—*Estimated nominal prime power in average megawatts*

[Basis: Minimum release of 2,000 cubic feet per second; additional irrigation of 520,000 average acres; downstream powerplants, Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, McNary, Ice Harbor, lower Monumental, Little Goose, and lower Granite; critical period, average 29 months]

	3-dam plan	High dam
Physical data:	*Feet*	*Feet*
Maximum head	602	602
Minimum head	501	313
Maximum variation	101	289

Estimated nominal prime power

Witness	3-dam plan		High dam	
	At site	Downstream	At site	Downstream
McIntyre (Bonneville Power Administration)	585	117	647	314
Riter (Bureau of Reclamation)	550	105	654	257
Meadowcroft (Federal Power Commission)	559	109	637	264
Average	565	110	646	278
Average total	675		924	
Difference	249			

NOTE.—Relatively little variations between witnesses.

TABLE B.—*Estimate of average annual energy in average megawatts of output*

Basis: Additional irrigation, 563,000 acres, average of the 20-year period, 1929–48.

NOTE.—The estimates are from the testimony of Witness Meadowcroft. Table A indicates this witness' calculations are nearly the average of the three used.

Three-dam plan:	
At site	546
Downstream	59
Total	605

TABLE B.—*Estimate of average annual energy in average megawatts of output*—Con.

High dam:	
At site	634
Downstream	113
Total	747
Difference	142
Difference at site	88
Difference downstream	54

NOTE.—This table shows estimated actual generation of power; eight downstream plants in operation.

TABLE C.—*General data*

	3-dam plan	High dam
1. Power output (prime) (kilowatt) total	675,000	924,000.
1a. Power output (prime) (kilowatt) at site	565,000	646,000.
2. Power costs (per kilowatt-hour)	3.8 mills [1]	2.7 mills.
3. Active storage (acre-feet)	1,000,000	3,880,000.
4. Flood-control benefits (annual)	$1,000,000	$2,300,000.
5. Navigation benefits (annual)	$108,000	$189,000.
6. Recreation benefits (number annual visitors)	250,000 to 325,000	500,000 to 650,000.
7. Power revenues for aid to future reclamation	Yes, if Congress directs	Yes, if Congress directs.
8. Availability of power to entire region	Yes, required by FPC	Yes.
9. Development of phosphate fertilizer	No appreciable differences	No appreciable differences.
10. Development of electro-process industries	do	Do.
11. Cost of project (less transmission lines)	$133,000,000	$328,000,000.[2]
12. Best plan	Unanimously approved by FPC.	
13. Cost of transmission lines, total, including downstream plants.		$146,000,000.[3]
13a. Cost of transmission lines at site—generation to market.	$21,000,000 [4]	$77,000,000.[3]
14. Benefit-to-cost ratio	2.13 to 1 [5]	1.83 to 1.

[1] Based on Federal construction costs.
[2] P. 485, Senate hearings.
[3] P. 489, Senate hearings.
[4] FPC hearings.
[5] FPC brief, April 1956.

TABLE D.—*Cost estimates*

[Basis: Testimony before Federal Power Commission, and before Senate Interior Committee. Transmission costs not included.[1]]

	At site	
	3-dam plan (private development)	High dam (Federal development)
Cost of structures	[2] $133,000,000	[3] $328,000,000
Annual cost (operation and maintenance, and depreciation or amortization)	[2] $8,300,000	[3] $15,045,000
Estimated Federal tax [4]	[5] $4,000,000	None
Estimated local and State tax	[5] $3,000,000	None
Total annual cost	[2] $15,400,000	$15,045,000
Average annual million kilowatt-hours at site	[6] 4,793	[6] 5,554
Cost per kilowatt-hour (mills)	3.21	2.71
Cost, less Federal tax (mills)	2.38	----------
Cost, less all taxes (mills)	1.75	----------

[1] Transmission costs to market average, generally, 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour for Federal construction.
[2] Table 3, appendix A of FPC brief of staff counsel, and 5.48 percent for interest and depreciation. See p. B-94, staff brief, FPC. Includes fish facilities.
[3] Testimony before Senate Interior Committee, p. 485 of hearings, and appendix C of respondent's brief of April 1956. Table 1, average of lines 11 and 14, col. 6.
[4] Income taxes passed on to consumers.
[5] FPC brief (p. 22) gives a higher annual cost, but this is based on Federal construction estimates of cost. Basis for taxes from records of Federal Power Commission. See footnote 1 of table C.
[6] Values of table B multiplied by 8,760.

A Record of Some Achievements of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress draws to a close, I would like to review some of its major legislative action, under leave to extend my remarks. This Democratic-controlled Congress was a hard working, responsible Congress, as the record will show, and its accomplishments will prove that it was much concerned about the public welfare.

Being convinced that a well-informed public will be better able to evaluate the issues which will be raised during the coming Presidential campaign, I am listing some of the achievements of the 84th Congress. While over 22,000 bills were introduced, it is natural that many were not acted upon. However, 2,878 bills were approved by the Congress, and these represent many hours, days, and weeks of hearings, deliberations, and debates in committees and in both Houses of Congress. Many of the bills were of importance to certain areas of the country only, and many were private bills. I would mention, however, those bills only which are of national importance and special interest to the people of my district.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Over the administration's opposition, and in order to keep our country well prepared for any emergency, Congress voted $1.1 billion more than the administration requested for the Air Force; expanded research facilities in aeronautics; enlarged atomic energy projects, and increased funds for aircraft control and warning systems.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Because of the many injustices that had occurred and the extravagant statements that were made about security risks in the Government, Congress voted to create a Commission on Government Security to review the present program and to make recommendations thereon. It also voted to strengthen penalties for seditious conspiracy and for advocacy of overthrow of the Government; to prohibit Government employment of disloyal persons or those who believe in the right to strike against the Government; to provide rewards for information on the illegal importation, manufacture or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons; and to provide penalties for the willful damage or destruction of aircraft.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Laws were enacted to extend the reciprocal trade agreements and strengthen provisions for the protection of domestic industries; to provide for settlement of World War II claims against Hungary, Rumania, and other countries; to provide for the disposal of alien property seized during World War I; to continue the mutual security program of military, economic, and technical aid abroad; and funds were appropriated to complete the Inter-American Highway. A number of treaties were ratified by the Senate. These did not require House action.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

One of the major pieces of legislation approved was the increase of the minimum wage under the Federal Labor Standards Act from 75 cents to $1 per hour. Also approved were laws to continue the Small Business Administration to June 30, 1957, and increase its revolving funds for loans to a total of $175 million; to authorize a 4-year program of airport construction, providing $63 million a year grants-in-aid to States; to authorize a $33.4 billion highway construction program; to exempt from Federal admissions tax, tickets of 90 cents or less; to increase from $25 million to $125 million, the authorization of the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans and liberalize terms; to permit automobile dealers to sue under antitrust laws for unjust revocation of franchise; to establish a Federal policy to encourage the development of commercial fisheries industry, to create a $10 million loan fund, and to reorganize the Fish and Wildlife Service.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Many bills of interest to this group were approved, including ones to permit persons in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, to continue accrual of educational benefits; provide incentive pay increases of 6 to 25 percent and allowances, for members of Armed Forces; extend to July 1, 1959, provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act; provide social-security wage credits for military service before January 1, 1956; provide for educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II or Korea; put all military personnel under Social Security and increase benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans; extend home loan guarantees for home purchase or construction to July 25, 1958; provide for medical care of dependents of members of the Armed Forces; increase pay of 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act from $50 to $78 per month; and provide lump-sum readjustment payment for Reservists involuntarily released from active service.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

The discovery of the polio vaccine by Dr. Salk, resulted in enactment of legislation authorizing $30 million to assist States in providing this vaccine for needy children and expectant mothers. The program was later extended to July 1, 1957. Legislation was approved to authorize a 3-year $1.25 million program of Federal aid for nationwide research and reevaluation of problems of mental health; to authorize a training program to increase the number of public health specialists, aid to States for training nurses and practical nurses, and grants for improved mental health administrations; increase fund authorization and extend the school milk program, broaden distribution to include camps and nurseries for under-privileged children and to all nonprofit child-care centers and agencies; authorize survey by Public Health Service of extent and effects of chronic illnesses; and to provide $4 million for new equipment and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research.

In the field of housing, Congress authorized a 2-year program of public housing construction at the rate of 35,000 units per year; increased FHA insurance authorization by $3 billion; authorized additional military housing; permitted FHA loans for repair of homes damaged in floods and other major disasters. It also authorized $378 million Federal aid for school construction, maintenance, and operating costs, in districts affected by Government activities, and extended the program to June 30, 1958.

MARITIME LEGISLATION

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I am vitally interested in the maritime situation and all legislation which affects our shipyards, our port activities and matters related thereto.

When conditions in the shipyards became extremely critical, the administration finally gave approval to some measures to help remedy the situation and provide some work, to enable the yards to retain much of their skilled help and to keep the machinery in working order. One of the bills approved was a $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion for 1957, including a nuclear powered cruiser, and 50,000-ton aircraft carrier. Other legislation authorized the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce; granted authority to the Maritime Administration to conduct research and experiment in port and cargo handling of the atomic vessel; to require a periodic survey of national shipbuilding capability; to prohibit operation in the

coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, which I sponsored personally; to authorize the construction of prototype modern cargo vessel for mass production in the event of emergency; to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense by providing that in the case of special-defense vessels, the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to insure 100 percent of the principal and interest, on any mortgage eligible for insurance.

Another bill which I introduced which became law, eliminates the requirement that purchasers under the Merchant Ship Sales Act agree that the use factor in charter hire payable by the Government, shall not exceed 15 percent of the statutory sales price. Other legislation authorized the appropriation of necessary funds for the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Commission; authorized the sale of 2 war-built tankers; and extended the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act.

Mr. Clarence G. Morse, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, stated that at the start of the new fiscal year, July 1, 1956, there were 57 oceangoing merchant ships, including 7 passenger vessels, being constructed, reconditioned, or converted in United States shipyards, or on order. In addition, over $14 million of work was placed with the repair yards, in bettering naval-auxiliary type ships in the reserve fleet. He mentioned also that congressional interest and activity in maritime matters has been at a high peak during the past session, and listed 24 principal items of new legislation bearing on the merchant marine.

In addition to the approval of the above-mentioned legislation, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee spent many days on hearings and consideration of labor-management problems in the American merchant marine. Realizing that a strong, healthy, and vigorous merchant marine is dependent, to a great extent, on satisfactory labor conditions, the committee tried to get at the facts thoroughly and objectively, and made its recommendations to the Congress.

An investigation into the activities of foreign freight forwarders and brokers was also held by the committee. The inquiry extended to the activities of forwarders on the export shipments of Government departments and agencies, and the export shipments of private commercial firms. These areas of activity have been the subject of many years of complaints and costly litigation, yielding only dissatisfaction and confusion.

As a result of the sinking of the schooner *Marvel* in the Chesapeake Bay last year, with the loss of 14 lives, the committee held hearings on legislation to require inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers, and this has been enacted into law.

Another matter of concern to our Merchant Marine, were the efforts being made to repeal the Cargo Preference Act, better known as the 50–50 law. This law, passed in the last Congress, requires that 50 percent of all Government-financed commodities be transported by privately owned United States vessels, when they are available. This law is intended to provide additional work for American-flag ships. Since enactment, many charges were leveled against it, both by some of our own Government departments, and by foreign shipping associations. After a thorough investigation of the charges by the committee, which included weeks of hearings, the committee recommended to the House that it vigorously oppose all efforts to change or modify the present law.

The national wildlife system has developed slowly over a great many years, as the result of the efforts of many citizens, conservation organizations and official agencies. The tremendous growth of population, and the industrial and agricultural expansion of the country in recent years, has compelled the realization that the preservation of wildlife values can be achieved only through large-scale steps to preserve and manage suitable habitat areas for such purposes. Extensive committee hearings revealed that there is extreme administrative confusion in the administration of the laws governing the wildlife system. After careful study of the matter, the committee decided to try, for an experimental period of time, an arrangement between the Secretary of the Interior and the committee, under which each proposed alienation or relinquishment of any interest the Fish and Wildlife Service has in lands under its jurisdiction, would be submitted to the committee for approval or disapproval. If this arrangement does not work satisfactorily, the committee will recommend appropriate legislation.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

I was especially pleased with the passage of these amendments, as I believe this act must be continually reviewed, to make sure the benefits are kept abreast of economic developments, so that it serves the purpose for which it was intended. This legislation will affect more people in my district, than any other legislation enacted in this Congress, and is the greatest importance to them. Some of the major changes with respect to benefits under the law are:

First. It reduces the age at which women can qualify for old-age insurance benefits, or for benefits as the wife, widow, or dependent mother of an insured worker, from 65 to 62.

Second. It provides disability insurance benefits for certain persons who become disabled between the ages of 50 and 65.

Third. It provides child's insurance benefits to disabled children age 18 or over, in case the disability began before attaining age 18.

Fourth. It extends social-security coverage to lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, naturopaths, osteopaths, chiropractors, and optometrists.

Fifth. It provides matching Federal funds for medical care furnished by the States to recipients of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled up to a maximum average of $6 per adult and $3 per child receiving assistance. This is a new provision.

Sixth. It amends the matching formulas for grants to States for various forms of public assistance. For old-age assistance, aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the new formula calls for Federal grants equal to four-fifths of expenditures up to $30—formerly $25—for any individual, plus one-half of expenditures between $30 and $60—formerly one-half of expenditures between $25 and $55. For aid to dependent children, it provides for grants equal to fourteen-seventeenths—formerly four-fifths—of expenditures up to $17—formerly $15—for each person for whom benefits are paid, plus one-half of expenditures over $17 which do not exceed the maximum of $32—formerly $30—for the adult, $32—formerly $30—for the first child and $23—formerly $21—for each additional child in the same home.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACTS AMENDMENTS

A bill to raise the limitation on the amount of railroad-retirement annuity to spouses to maximum payable under the Social Security Act, was approved in the first session. The bill just approved, increases benefits under the act by approximately 10 percent. However, it does not increase an annuity which now equals an annuitant's average monthly wage. An annuity which has already been increased to the social-security minimum, will be further increased only where that minimum is less than the amount computed under the regular railroad-retirement formula, as amended by this bill. The present maximum of $54.30 for a spouse's annuity remains unchanged. These changes are effective as of July 1, 1956.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS

The merit system of Federal employment was improved and strengthened through the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission. The merit system was extended to 60,000 Federal employees by the granting of career-type appointments for indefinite Federal employees who were in positions in the competitive civil service on January 23, 1955, who had passed competitive qualifying examinations, or who would pass such examinations within 1 year, and who had 3 years of satisfactory service in the competitive civil service. A bill approved just recently, and which I sponsored, provided the same benefits for postal employees.

Classified Federal employees were given a salary increase of 7½ percent. An allowance was granted to all Government employees required to wear uniforms. Over one-half million Federal employees were bonded without charge. Where positions were placed in a lower grade due to reclassification, employees in those positions were protected from salary reductions.

The third of a series of increases in annuities for Federal employees already retired was approved. The Civil Service Retirement Act was completely rewritten, and some of its major provisions now are:

First. Annuities for Federal employees will be computed at (a) 2 percent of the average salary multiplied by all years of service in excess of 10, plus 1½ percent

of such salary multiplied by the first 5 years of service plus 1¾ percent, multiplied by the years of service from 5 to 10 or (b) 1 percent of the average salary, plus $25 multiplied by the total years of service, whichever is greater. Under the prior law, annuities were computed on the basis of 1½ percent of the average salary, or 1 percent of such salary plus $25, multiplied by the total years of service, whichever is greater.

Second. The annuity of an employee retiring before reaching 60 will be reduced by 1 percent for each year the retiring employee is under age 60 and 2 percent for each year under 55. The prior law required a reduction of 3 percent for each year under 60.

Third. The annuity of an employee electing a survivor annuity will be reduced by 2½ percent of the first $2,400 and 10 percent of the balance.

Fourth. For disability benefits, the act establishes a minimum of 40 percent of the average salary, or the annuity which would have been earned at age 60, whichever is less.

Fifth. A reduced annuity is granted upon involuntary separation from service after attaining age 50 with 20 years of service. Heretofore an annuity was granted upon involuntary separation after 25 years of service, regardless of age. This provision is continued.

Sixth. Survivor annuities of an employee who dies after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee who dies, are increased by an average of 150 percent.

All of these measures and many others which were in the public interest and necessary for our economy or national defense had my support. This Democratic-controlled Congress has again proved that the interest and welfare of all the people, are its major concern and prime consideration, and as a result, was able, despite considerable opposition in many instances, to achieve a splendid record of a most constructive nature, which will have far-reaching effects.

A Partial Review of Republican Misrule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better prelude to my annual report to my constituents than to remind them of what I said at the close of each of the first 3 years of this Republican administration. For purposes of better comparison, I point out that during the 83d Congress which coincided with the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, the Republicans were in the majority in both Houses.

On August 3, 1953, I said:

SO THE TIME FOR A CHANGE ARRIVED, AND CREEPING SOCIALISM BECAME THE BIG GIVEAWAY WHILE THE LITTLE FELLOW LOST HIS SHIRT

Mr. Speaker, this is the true story—I wish it were a fairy tale—of an America grown up—but not wiser.

If what follows sounds political, believe me it is intentionally so. After all, politics, according to all lexicographers, is the science of government and this saga deals only with government—your Government.

If it sounds partisan it is so only because the members of the opposite political faith have slanted the record that way by their actions.

If what I say hurts, it is only because the sponsors of inimical policies have failed to provide any armor against the cruelties inherent therein.

With such brief apologia, let me proceed to tell this tale of woe.

For 20 years almost every attempt by Democratic leaders and legislators to improve the conditions of our country and to establish world peace and to expand man's divine right of equal opportunity to earn a livelihood with a decent standard of living, has been ridiculed, derided and opposed by members of the Republican Party. In all those years there was little or no constructive criticism. There was much carping and bitterness as phony labels were sought to be attached to every progressive step that was taken to benefit the citizenry of our country.

Home loans, farm loans, small-business assistance, housing and power, rural electrification and telephones, soil conservation and flood control, farm subsidies and fuel regulation, savings programs and bank deposit insurance, development of natural resources for the benefit of all, social security and unemployment insurance, protection of the right to work, improvement of the lot of the civil servant, protection of the veteran, particularly the maimed and disabled, assistance to the orphan, the widow and the helpless, aids to health, education, and the public welfare were all labeled "creeping socialism" and worse.

Only in the field of foreign policy was there any semblance of bipartisan cooperation for the best interests of the country. Even there it was only agreement on principle. Despite the fact that a Democratic administration sought and obtained only the best available men, regardless of political affiliation, thus putting as many Republicans as Democrats in charge of administration, the sniping never abated.

We were told:

Time for a change—stop the monster from creeping further into the Nation's vitals—drive it out—return the country to free enterprise—stop inflation—bring prices down—produce more—pay less—get more—balance the budget—cut expenditures—reduce taxes.

Repetition had its effect. Even those who knew better, began to succumb to the never-ending stream of propaganda.

At the psychologically correct moment, the knight in shining armor appeared on the scene, a truly great soldier, deservedly honored as a world hero. When he, unacquainted with the ways of politics, but in the best of faith and intentions, began to sing the same song, the melody was indeed sweet and the words most beguiling.

Logic and reason took flight. Fantasy and wishful thinking wafted many into the land of make-believe. What could we lose? Is a Republican mink coat—or is it sable—different from the Democratic one? Is it not time for a change? Few asked: A change to what or why or for whom? After all—we can always change back. Nor did they stop long enough to inquire: If the change should be for the worse, can we regain our losses?

Election day, 1952, came and with it the first change as the people willed it. A Republican President and a Republican Congress.

Eureka, but not yet Utopia.

Democrats, who for 20 years winced under the tongue lashing of the Republicans, remembered the Biblical injunction to do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Like good American citizens, they bowed to the will of the majority.

They promised cooperation. They announced there would be only constructive criticism, no sniping, no back-biting, no invectives.

Came January 3, 1953, and the new Congress was sworn in and organized. They listened politely but impatiently and indifferently to the outgoing President. They waited for Inauguration Day.

Came Inauguration Day, January 20, 1953, and they listened, fearfully but enthusiastically, to the incoming President. And again they waited.

Be not impatient. Give them time. Give them a chance.

Time passed. And they acted—both the new President and the new Congress. Things happened. Not too much and, certainly, not too good.

Now as the 1st session of the 83d Congress comes to a close this fine summer day, August 3, 1953, would it be unfair if I stated the account, totaled the "do's" and the "don'ts," the "gives" and the "takes" and tried to get a balance—knowing full well that there will be little balance left for our fellow citizens.

Here goes:

Promise: A balanced budget.

Performance: More unbalanced than when the Republicans took over.

Promise: Spend less.

Performance: Spent more with an increase in future fixed charges of government.

Promise: Reduce taxes.

Performance: Increased by extending taxes due to expire.

Promise: A stabilized economy by reduction of prices and cost of living.

Performance: Higher prices to the consumer, higher costs to the home buyer, higher rents to the tenant, and lower prices to the farmer.

Promise: Reduce the national debt.

Performance: An attempt to increase it, prevented by an almost solid Democratic opposition in the Senate. It passed the House with 84 percent of the Republicans voting for it and 61 percent of the Democrats opposed.

Promise: A new foreign policy. Precisely what changes we were to expect were never told.

Performance: Absolutely no change in policy. The change in administration, however, is driving our friends and allies further and further away from us.

Promise: A new farm policy.

Performance: No change in policy. A change in administration that has antagonized the farmer who has voted 10 to 1 to continue the old policy.

Promise: A new tax program.

Performance: None presented. The only change is the reduction in individual income taxes effective January 1954, pursuant to a law enacted by the last Democratic Congress and signed by the last Democratic President. However, Mr. Taxpayer, do not spend that saving. The next session of this Republican Congress may take it away from you. They are even now threatening us with a Federal sales tax.

Promise: The Republican Party promised to keep the Taft-Hartley labor law intact. The Republican candidate for President said he recognized its inequities and promised amendments.

Performance: No change in that law.

Promise: Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Performance: Nothing.

Promise: A change in our permanent immigration laws to liberalize them and remove the inequities and unfairness thereof.

Performance: No change. The temporary Refugee Immigration Act to admit 217,000 immigrants over a 3-year period was part of the Democratic program and was enacted only because of Democratic support.

Promise: To conserve the natural resources of the Nation.

Performance: Submerged oil lands given away. This was promised by the Republican candidate and he was supported by southern Democrats who campaigned for reelection on that pledge. Public power, TVA, AEC, and soil conservation programs gutted. Rubber plants ordered sold, RFC assets, including defense plants, ordered disposed of.

Promise: Encouragement and improvement of health and education programs.

Performance: Cutting the budgets for these programs.

Promise: A comprehensive civil-rights program.

Performance: Nothing.

Changes that we got even though not promised:

First. Hard money, that is, money that is harder to get.

Second. Higher interest rates on Government bonds, thus increasing the cost of Government and the burden of the taxpayer; higher rates on mortgages; higher rates on consumer's financing; higher rates on veteran's loans; higher rates on business loans; higher rates on State and municipal loans; higher rates on farmer's loans; higher rates on auto loans.

Third. Depreciation of Government bonds, some are selling as low as 92 cents on the dollar.

Fourth. Destruction of the public-housing program.

Fifth. Impairment of the morale of civil-service employees by executive orders emasculating the merit system.

Sixth. Decrease in veterans' benefits.

In sharp contrast to all of the foregoing is the conduct of the responsible Democratic Members of the Congress.

They offered bills to implement their party platform. They could get no hearings from committees controlled by the majority party.

They offered bills and amendments to bills to effectuate the President's program to the extent that it coincided with the Democratic program.

The press, time after time, referred to the passage of such bills as Eisenhower victories. Actually they were part and parcel of the Democratic platform. They could never have been enacted without Democratic votes. In most instances there were more Democrats than Republicans voting for those measures.

Notable among these measures were, first, extension of the President's power to reorganize the executive departments—if he does not economize in that field, the responsibility is solely his; second, establishment of the Cabinet post of Health, Education, and Welfare; third, rejection of the cut in funds for REA; fourth, prevention of the weakening of civil service; fifth, rejection of cut in funds for soil conservation; sixth, restoration of funds for aid to schools; seventh, continuance of a nonpolitical tariff commission; eighth, extension of reciprocal trade-agreements authority; ninth, prohibiting arbitrary denial of medical care to veterans; tenth, authorization and appropriation of moneys for foreign aid; eleventh, extension of the mutual-security program; twelfth, gift of wheat to starving Pakistanians; thirteenth, admission of 217,000 immigrants over 3-year period.

That is the record to date.

Even if President Eisenhower should not acknowledge that his program could never have been enacted without Democratic votes, we in the Democratic Party will continue to vote for what we believe is in the best interests of our country.

In the not too distant future, the electorate will have an opportunity to voice its approval or disapproval of the changes it got and of the changes it did not get.

Until then, we will do our duty as we see it—let the chips fall where they may.

On August 19, 1954, I said:

To Secure These Rights the Fight Must Go On

Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first session of this Congress, on August 3, 1953, I reviewed for my constituents the accomplishments, and lack thereof, of our distinguished body. I pointed out the great divergence between the pledges and promises by the Republican Party and its presidential candidate in 1952 and their performance or lack thereof as the majority party in power in 1953.

Another legislative year has now gone by. It is time again to take a look. Perhaps not a New Look, but certainly a good look, even though we know it will not look good. I intend today to reverse the usual form of stating first the facts and then the conclusion.

CONCLUSION

When the 80th Congress was dubbed the worst Congress of history, our contemporaries overlooked that worse than a "do-nothing Congress" is a Congress that does nothing but give away the birthright of a nation.

The 83d Congress and this Republican administration have earned the right to be charged with doing nothing but giving away the people's rights and property.

The balance of this report will be devoted to documentation of the foregoing conclusion.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This is an excellent time to refresh our memories with a quotation from our Declaration of Independence of these immortal words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their health and happiness."

Those principles have been written into our Constitution as rights accorded to our citizens, and with restrictions against any impairment by executive, judicial, or legislative action.

If they are to be changed, that change can be accomplished only by constitutional amendment.

Nevertheless, we have seen during these last 2 years, a complete disregard of those basic concepts.

Fear runs wild, and hysteria has taken over.

Laws have been enacted in violation of article I of the Constitution, prohibiting ex post facto laws and bills of attainder. An ex post facto law imposes punishment for past conduct which was not previously criminal. A bill of attainder imposes punishment upon a person or group without indictment and trial.

Laws and executive orders violative of the Bill of Rights, as contained in our Constitution, have been enacted and promulgated.

I have done my best to resist such utterly un-American conduct, first because it is fundamentally wrong and secondly, because it strengthens our enemies and weakens our will to withstand their totalitarian philosophy.

I favor the right, under safeguard of court order or search warrant, to obtain evidence, even by wiretapping, to convict criminals. I opposed the bill to give the right to use such evidence previously obtained without court order or search warrant.

I favor empowering the courts to require witnesses to testify in criminal proceedings by granting them immunity where otherwise some other criminal might escape trial. I oppose giving that right to Congress, because Congress is a legislative body and not a court. Congress is supposed to investigate solely for the purpose of legislating; it is not the FBI; it is not a grand jury; it is not a petit jury; it is not a judge; it is not a prosecutor; it is not a President with power to pardon. No legislative body in our entire American history has ever been blocked from legislating because a witness or group of witnesses refused to testify.

The best evidence that I am correct in that statement is that despite witnesses who have refused to testify about communism, the Congress has, nevertheless, enacted a law finding that the Communist Party is not a political party but a criminal conspiracy.

I agree with the finding, but urged that the law was a very bad one because it usurps the function of the judiciary.

The bill to outlaw the Communist Party violates every principle of good government. Aside from being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law, it denies not only free speech but free thought; it denies the right of assembly and the right of petition for redress of wrongs. It is a completely totalitarian technique.

The manner in which these bills were foisted upon the Congress was even worse. Not only was gag rule imposed by limitation of debate, but they were brought before the House without having had adequate hearings, without reports for guidance of the Members, without copies of the bills, and under rules permitting no amendments.

That is the horribly terrifying manner in which a heretofore deliberative body struck down our liberties and impaired our freedom by pushing through in the closing days of this session bills which do violence to the things for which men and women have fought and died since before Magna Carta.

I attribute these bad bills to what has come to be known as McCarthyism. Those who contend that McCarthyism has alerted the country to the danger of communism must now concede that the direct result has been the creation of an unhealthy atmosphere of fear and suspicion which may easily destroy the very vitals of good government.

LIBERALISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

Our President has repeatedly told us that as to human values and human rights, he is liberal, but as to property and property rights, he is conservative. It sounds good. I wish it were true. I will not repeat here the many failures of President Eisenhower to perform the pledges of Candidate Eisenhower. They have been previously documented. Let us today analyze what has happened under our President's leadership and thereby make apparent his and the Republican Party's fulfillment of the converse of his declared policy.

OPERATION GIVEAWAY, OR BUNDLES FOR BILLIONAIRES

The gift of the submerged-oil lands was camouflaged as a return to certain States of their property. You cannot return to a State what it never had. The United States Supreme Court three times ruled that these lands and rights never belonged to any State. As a matter of fact, most of them were bought with funds from the United States Treasury.

If Congress and the President had not given them away for the benefit of the big oil companies and not the few States involved as is claimed, the revenues from those lands would have been used to educate the children of every State of the Union.

OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES: CREEPING FAVORITISM

The Nation's resources have been the subject of a whole series of gigantic giveaways, beginning with the offshore oil bill endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Perhaps the most incredible giveaway of all deals with atomic energy. The people of the country have spent $12 billion of their tax money in developing an atomic-energy program. The Eisenhower administration and the Republican-controlled Congress, however, chose to set the wheels in motion for giving away the rights to atomic energy to the few private power monopolies. The most fantastic Republican proposition was the Dixon-Yates contract whereby a certain private group was granted contract rights to provide power without competitive bidding; it was arbitrarily selected for the benefit, although other firms offered to do the job more cheaply. The Eisenhower administration even offered to pay all their taxes for them and guarantee them against any loss. I am proud of my vote against the atomic energy giveaway.

The efforts to dispose of our synthetic-rubber and tin-smelting plants and the attempt to wreck TVA and our entire public power program, are more of the giveaway philosophy in action.

MONEY: HARDER TO GET

I spent considerable time and effort in opposing the Republican giveaway to bankers through higher interest rates. The so-called hard-money policy actually made money harder to get. Republican bankers took over the Treasury Department and promptly proceeded to raise the interest rate to the highest level since 1933. They sold Government bonds below par value to bankers who profited immensely from unnecessarily higher interest rates. I joined with other Members of Congress in protesting this giveaway to bankers, and my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are quite numerous on this subject.

Not only did this hard-money policy constitute excessive profit for bankers, but it was perhaps the principal cause of the recession we have had. With interest rates excessively high, consumers and small-business men could not borrow money. As a result, mass unemployment occurred, causing a serious recession because of a lack of consumer purchasing power to buy the products of American industry.

The Eisenhower administration was disastrously slow in taking action against this recession; indeed, we still have close to 4 million Americans unemployed, with many more in jobs at only part time. Because of our constant pounding, the administration finally reversed itself and repudiated the hard-money policy, although its evil effects are regrettably still with us.

Call me a prophet of gloom, Mr. President. But it is your Secretary of Commerce who says that the gross national production is down $9 billion from 1953 to 1954, and it is your Federal Reserve Board that says that industrial production is down $12 billion from 1953 to 1954.

VETERANS' RIGHTS

Part of the liberal Republican policies was the increase of interest rates on veterans' mortgages. This was among the very first accomplishments of this administration.

As soon as we achieved a reversal of the hard-money policy, I started a campaign to decrease the veterans' loan interest rates to what they had been.

The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House, promised me such legislation would be enacted.

It has not even been reported to the Congress.

We did succeed in enacting a bill to increase veterans' pensions by 5 percent. Liberal, indeed. A monthly pension of $50 is now $52.50.

But all veterans' services—medical care, hospitalization, and the like—have been cut and cut more than 5 percent.

That was not being illiberal as to humans; it was being conservative as to money.

I have consistently supported measures to adequately compensate our Armed Forces and veterans for the sacrifices they make in the Nation's behalf. I have introduced bills providing free postage on letters to and from members of our Armed Forces, extra compensation for prisoners of the Korean war, income-tax exemption for members of the Armed Forces, and various adjustments to secure equitable pensions, compensation, and retirement pay.

THE CONSUMERS' POCKETBOOK AND THE FARMERS' PLIGHT

During these 2 years of Republicanism, the cost of living has reached an alltime high, as any shopper can testify and as Government statistics prove in black and white. Coupled with this record high cost of living have been the hardships caused by the recession, so that many millions of Americans have suffered reductions in their standard of living.

Particularly pernicious has been the price of food. Consumers are forced to pay twice for their food, first in their tax bill to the Government and then in the market place. There is something radically wrong with the present agricultural program, as I have often said in Congress. Official reports show that food prices to the consumer have actually risen, while prices to farmers have declined.

Yet the Republican leadership has done nothing to remedy this situation. The only solution the Secretary of Agriculture offers is to reduce farmers' incomes below their present level, despite his claim that no appreciable reduction in consumer food prices will result. The proposal I have made is to try the Brannan plan for all agriculture, which Candidate Eisenhower termed "moral bankruptcy," but which President Eisenhower has instituted for the wool industry.

The President and his agriculture experts pretend that a flexible price support program will reduce prices to the consumer and increase income to the farmer.

They continue in that fallacious claim even after they have proved themselves wrong.

We have never had rigid but only flexible price supports for the dairy industry.

One of the first things done by our Secretary of Agriculture, with the hearty approval of our President, was to drop price supports for this industry from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

Result: The farmer is getting less and the consumer is paying more.

That is not caused by any failure of the cut in prices to seep through.

I am talking about milk produced one day and sold the next day for which the farmer receives less and the consumer pays more.

How can they urge that any different result can come from products that will be stored for long periods of time.

Do not be fooled by any pretense that we will store less of the staples or basic commodities.

On the basis of the representations of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture that we will store more, this very session of Congress increased the buying, lending, and storing authority of the President and his Department of Agriculture from $6½ billion to $10 billion. That is in addition to all the billions to be taken out of storage and not charged to the authorization.

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the most important Republican pledges was amendment of the Taft-Hartley law. I favored the elimination of the Taft-Hartley Act's repressive measures against organized labor. I have always sought to promote legislation fair to labor and management.

But, as you may remember, President Eisenhower reversed himself when he refused to go along with Secretary of Labor Durkin's program for labor legislation, which followed Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Mr. Durkin resigned. The Republican leadership did not allow Congress to pass on the bills seeking to right the wrongs of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I sponsored a number of bills in the labor field, but as usual the Republican leadership did nothing. One called for equal pay for equal work and an end to discriminatory wage practices against women. Still another case where the Republicans did nothing was the minimum wage. My bill called for an increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. Secretary of Labor Mitchell agreed there should be an increase, but President Eisenhower's economic report flatly opposed one.

The most serious problem in this field is that apparently the Republican Party is not concerned over the tremendous loss of earnings of the wage earners of our country. I have called attention to the millions of Americans without jobs, largely due to the administration's hard-money policy, and to the millions more earning smaller wages and working only part time.

In the present Congress, I have been a cosponsor of H. R. 9430, the Forand bill, dealing with unemployment-compensation standards. I introduced H. R. 1270 to permit an increase in earnings without loss of social-security benefits. My bill, H. R. 1277, called for income-tax exemption on annuities and pensions, a principle adopted in part in the new tax law.

This administration takes credit for enactment of a broader social-security law, but soft-pedals the fact that this was a New Deal-Fair Deal measure that was supported and fought for by Democrats during all the years Republicans were resisting it as creeping socialism.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOUSING

I have always insisted that effective government action must be taken to improve the national health. Proper medical care must be put within the reach of every American. It is a duty of the Government to assure that and to do it without socializing medicine.

Yet the Eisenhower budget cut cancer research 28 percent, heart disease research 33 percent, and the National Institutes of Health allotment 34 percent.

The so-called health reinsurance bill, the administration proposed, merely came to the aid of certain insurance companies, and did nothing for the health of the individual American man, woman, and child. The only public health in the bill was in its title. It made neither health nor insurance available to any citizen.

A similar situation was the Republican housing bill, which I called "a sham and a fraud upon the American people." I have long maintained a particular interest in public housing, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with my attempts to try to provide decent housing for all Americans. I proposed amendments to legislation to deal with FHA abuses, but Republicans joined as a unit to vote them down, as they did my efforts to prevent discrimination against minority groups and to provide low interest rates on housing loans and veterans' home loans.

However, the Republican leadership insisted on guaranteeing excessive profits for builders and lenders and blocked my efforts and those of my colleagues to write into law even the minimum number of public-housing units requested by the President.

Here too, the only public housing in the bill was in the title. I think it is outrageous that the people of this country should be denied an opportunity to live in decent shelter.

The so-called housing bill passed this year prevents any new public housing and effectively kills the program. The same bill, however, makes it easier for the bankers,

mortgage lenders, and builders to get richer. It contains no real safeguards against a repetition of the FHA scandals now filling the newspapers. It does contain a provision subsidizing the mortgage lenders, guaranteeing them not only against loss, but also a profit, all at Government risk.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BEWITCHED, BOTHERED, AND BEWILDERED

The present world situation is one of crisis, and I have wholeheartedly supported the administration's continuation of the bipartisan policies initiated by prior Democratic administrations, including the point 4 program and foreign aid. I have urged the strengthening of our greatest potential instrument for peace, the United Nations.

Our position in world affairs, however, has worsened markedly under Republican leadership. World communism has increased, and we have lost much of the good will painstakingly built up by Democratic administrations with the non-Communist nations of the world. The present administration has cut our military strength and has foolishly tried to compensate for it by a series of transparently hypocritical slogans.

No one knows where we stand on anything. If you add up all the pronouncements made by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and assorted Republican leaders, the sum total is bluff and backtalk, threat, and retreat.

If the matter were not so very serious, we could sing Bewitched, Bothered, and Bewildered. We have learned a bitter lesson that Indochina could not be saved by the threats of Mr. Dulles and his colleagues. The situation in the Far East is bad.

The same muddled thinking is causing the situation in the Near East to worsen from day to day. This administration refuses to recognize that an enemy of a friend cannot be a friend and that you do not arm one who may use the arms against your friend.

I opposed the Bricker amendment, which would paralyze the President's right to conduct our foreign affairs.

I have supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements and lower tariffs to aid our allies, even though the President backed down from the request he has termed "essential."

I have tried to build up friendly relations with the Latin American Republics, and with Italy, whose late Premier Alcide de Gasperi I had the pleasure of greeting on his visit here in 1951.

I have striven for peace in the Near East and the proper development of that new addition to the family of free nations, Israel.

OPERATION TAKEAWAY: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

I have long felt that the Government should act as a model employer, and I have been deeply distressed by the methods of the present Republican administration as regards civil service. Aside from the reprehensible "numbers game" reflecting on many loyal civil servants, the Eisenhower administration has conducted the crudest sort of spoils system in taking away the jobs of Government employees for political reasons.

I have opposed the transfer of Government agencies from the New York and Brooklyn areas for political reasons, such as the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency and the diversion of contracts from the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I have sponsored bills to extend Federal compensation coverage to civil-defense workers, for longevity step increases in the civil-service scale, to exempt compensation and pensions from income tax, to excuse Government employees from work to permit them time to vote in elections, and similar measures aimed at making the Government an employer of which every citizen can be proud.

I realize full well the inadequate salaries paid civil servants, and I have supported proposed increases. Having worked as a railway mail clerk, I know the hardships of postal employees, and on their behalf have testified before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It is nothing less than reprehensible to deny postal and Federal employees a 5-percent increase in their pay. From the President down, every Republican concedes that these loyal men and woman are underpaid.

To deny them a pay increase unless we simultaneously provide additional revenue is a fraud and a sham. The subsidy given to business, by the Post Office Department alone, exceeds the entire amount of such increase. The dividend tax exemption alone exceeds the cost of such a pitifully inadequate increase. The additional depreciation tax cut to big business is about double that cost.

Conservative policy indeed, as to wages for the underpaid and liberal, as to tax cuts for the greedy.

IMMIGRATION

The inequities of our present immigration laws make a mockery of the splendid inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. I was happy to serve as a cosponsor with Senator LEHMAN and many other Members of Congress of a bill designed to rewrite completely our immigration laws and to remove every trace of bigotry therefrom.

In addition, I introduced a bill calling for 240,000 special visas during the fiscal year 1953–54, and have sponsored many private bills for the relief of my constituents and their families.

In this field, as in so many others, the fight must go on, and I am confident that someday the faults of our present immigration system will be corrected. They still remain under President Eisenhower's administration, although candidate Eisenhower pledged prompt reform.

TAXES: THE TRICKLE-DOWN BILL

Surely no part of the activities of government is more important than taxation—and it is in this field that we find the most glaring and inequitable giveaway.

Ninety-two percent of American families have good reason to be unhappy about the Republican tax bill that is now the law of the land, for they do not own any corporation stock. This Republican Congress and administration, however, have given tax benefits to the 8 percent of American families who do. In fact, the Republican program of "bundles for billionaires" especially benefits only six-tenths of 1 percent of American families, who own 80 percent of all publicly held stock.

The new Republican tax law provides benefits for stockholders, to the detriment of those Americans who earn their income through the sweat of their brow. Let us take as an example two families, each with husband, wife, and 1 child, and an income of $5,000. One of these 2 families has an income consisting entirely of wages or salary; its income tax will be $420. The other family, with income entirely from stock dividends, will pay an income tax of only $328. Thus unearned income is to be taxed less than earned income of the same size.

Of course, the tax difference increases greatly as income increases. Seventy-three and seven-tenths percent of taxpayers with incomes over $25,000 reported dividend receipts, while only 4.5 percent of taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 did so. It is primarily those with incomes of $10,000 or more per year who report dividend receipts. I might point out further that the Eisenhower administration asked for much greater benefits for stockholders, but Democrats in Congress managed to cut them down.

This Republican tax bill gives corporations, and the 20 percent of American taxpayers with incomes over $5,000, 77 percent of the total tax benefits. The 80 percent of American taxpayers with incomes less than $5,000 get only 23 percent of tax relief, thanks to republicanism. It seems that the basis for Republican taxation is the old "trickle-down" idea, which we thought had disappeared forever; it gives the wealthy the benefit of tax relief although they need it least, in the hope that some of the benefit will trickle down to the great mass of the people. I am proud of my vote against the trickle-down tax bill.

I believe in giving tax relief to those who need it most. Ever since 1948 I have introduced resolutions calling for an increase in personal exemptions to $3,500 for heads of families as the first step in reducing taxes. But of course this was in conflict with the policy of the Republicans in control who insist on giving tax preference to those wealthy enough not to need it. One of my proposals, however, was partially carried into effect: An exemption will be provided for the first $1,200 of retirement income. Another of my proposals gained some ground, too; child-care allowances were provided, but much less than adequate and much less than I called for in my bill.

One further fact should be mentioned here about taxes, because Republicans are very unlikely to mention it themselves; the general 10-percent decrease in individual taxes that became effective the first of this year was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by a Democratic President. The Republican tax bill is the one benefiting the well-to-do, and that is the giveaway I opposed.

Please understand, I am not opposed to eliminating double taxation. But I insist that inequities be remedied equally. The taxpayer earning interest on a savings account is entitled to the same relief as a taxpayer receiving dividends on stock. Furthermore, if we cannot remove all inequities because we will lose too much revenue, do not select one class as against another.

Do not increase and continue depreciation and depletion allowances at the expense of the wage earner. If we cannot save taxes for all, save taxes for him first. He spends all of his earnings almost as fast as he gets them. That is what makes for prosperity.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND BROTHERHOOD

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership defeated my efforts to prohibit discrimination in regard to public housing projects, and did nothing about my measures to prevent Federal aid to National Guard units practicing discrimination and to secure similar acts to guarantee civil rights for all.

I have always recognized the role of religion in life, and I have been privileged to participate in many religious and interfaith activities.

Although I recognize the separation of church and state guaranteed by our Constitution, I appreciate that the fundamental principles of civil rights are based on the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

We can legislate on these principles intelligently only if we understand them. We understand them only if we know religion.

That is why I constantly direct my colleagues' attention to the activities of all religious groups and do my utmost to stir them into action against all antireligious groups and activities.

In opposing McCarthyism and in deploring the current wave of hysteria in this country largely inspired thereby, I do not lessen my hatred of communism and all its works. My constituents may well remember the campaign of 1948 when my opponent was Lee Pressman, once described as the No. 1 Communist of the country. In that year the Communists spent a quarter of a million dollars trying to defeat me, and I was viciously attacked because of my vigorous anticommunism. I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago

and a leading Roman Catholic churchman and genuine anti-Communist. He said, among other things:

"I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them. even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen."

I am proud to stand alongside him in this vital fight for our civil liberties.

I am the only Member of any Congress who had an opponent who dared to avail himself of the privilege of running for office under the name and emblem of the Communist Party.

I am also proud of the autographed photograph given me by one of the great statesmen of the free anti-Communist world, the late Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, for my efforts in behalf of Italy's fight against communism. Indeed, when I think that a certain Senator first discovered communism in 1950, 2 years after I had opposed and defeated communism in a congressional election; when I think of my votes for foreign aid to bolster the anti-Communist allies of this country and the contrast with his votes against all foreign aid; when I think of his apparent objective, the catching of headlines rather than Communists, and the demoralizing effect of his wave of fear, then I am certain that even my humble efforts have done more against communism than his ever will.

I have called attention to the McCarthyite actions of the staff of the Reece investigating committee, branding as communistic the encyclicals of two Popes of the Catholic Church. I have opposed—even when almost alone—the serious threats to our civil liberties posed by actions taken during a wave of hysteria, when some legislators abdicated their responsibilities because of fear. In my position, I have been happy to coincide with the views of J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the FBI, and Judge Harold Medina, who presided over the trial which resulted in the conviction of the top Communists of the country.

THE FOLKS BACK HOME

It is with mixed humility and pride that I present this report. It is with humility, because I recognize my responsibility as a servant of my constituents and of the public interest. It is with pride, because I have never failed to carry out a campaign pledge, and because I have consistently striven to serve the public interest as I saw it to be.

My services have always been at the disposal of my constituents. I have never failed to try to help with their individual problems so far as I was able to do so. I joined with my colleagues in trying to keep local Federal services operating efficiently and at a maximum.

Some criticism has been leveled at me for eulogizing a departed former Member. It is traditional for the dean of a State delegation to lead in such a eulogy and for other Members to join him, regardless of political beliefs. One Protestant and four Catholic Members joined two Jewish Members on that occasion.

While I do not expect the electorate to agree with me at all times on all matters, at least we will make every effort to understand one another so that our respect for each other will survive our disagreement.

That is the American way.

On August 2, 1955, I said:

HOBGOBLINS AND REALITIES

Mr. Speaker, before the start of our legislative session, the President had great misgivings about the coming months. He reprimanded the voters of the Nation because they chose to send Democrats to Congress, while the administration was of the opposing political faith. He forecast that a Republican administration would not have the support of a Democratic Congress. During the 1954 congressional campaign, he even foresaw the possibility of a cold war within Government which could destroy the Nation's unity at this crucial time.

The same kind of talk from a Democratic President would have been labeled in the one-party press either as intended to scare our people or as an insult to our intelligence. Coming from the leader of the Republican Party, that same part of our American press repeated the reckless charge as though it were unimpeachable gospel.

How disappointing it must be to them to find that the hobgoblins and the gremlins disappeared into thin air even before the 84th Congress opened.

Now that the first session of this Congress has closed, the American people are entitled to the full story.

Even though an ardent Democrat, I will not pretend that none of my Democratic colleagues made any mistakes, nor that there was no occasion when some of my Republican colleagues did vote right. I do proclaim, however, as loudly as I can, that my Democratic colleagues voted right more frequently than my Republican colleagues and conversely, that the Republicans voted wrong more frequently than the Democrats—too frequently for the good of our country.

Let us now proceed to analyze the record.

The President greatly underestimated the caliber and character of the Democratic majority. He now admits that the political responsibility of the Democratic-controlled Congress made the successes of this session possible. The proof of Democratic leadership and support—the willingness to lay aside political antagonism, and jealousies—is a part of the record.

It is with great pleasure that I review these accomplishments. In doing so, we must have in mind that what is right or wrong is not determined by who sponsors a proposal, nor by which party supports it. The determination must be based on the sole test of what is best for the greatest number of our people.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS: UNITY AND STRENGTH

Nowhere is the story of cooperation and responsibility better illustrated than in the areas of foreign policy and national defense. The world situation threatens to remain a precarious one for many years to come. Although the great ideological conflicts between East and West show some indication of being eased, few are shortsighted enough to believe that the aims of international communism have changed so completely in so short a time. If these differences between East and West cannot be settled or at least compromised, the alternative is a global atomic war from which no side could emerge victorious. While urging thorough exploration of every path that might lead to world peace, the Democratic Party stood as one man in favor of keeping our guard up and our defenses strong enough to withstand a sneak attack. In our system of government the President and his State Department must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. Congress responded by supporting them completely on every major issue. The President was authorized to use United States military forces in defending Formosa and the nearby Pescadores Islands. Executive agreements were ratified establishing a mutual-defense treaty with Nationalist China and a NATO-type defense alliance for southeast Asia.

Despite overwhelming sentiment in the Congress for it, the executive branch of our Government took no firm or realistic step toward establishing permanent peace in the Near East.

The occupation of Germany was ended so that she could be armed and brought into the European defense system. Austria was reestablished as an independent and democratic state.

To carry out our foreign policy aims, Congress authorized $3.2 billion for economic and military aid to foreign countries.

To encourage the benefits of international trade, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended for 3 years so that the President has the full authority to continue his efforts to promote our foreign affairs. A bill simplifying our complicated and outmoded system of customs definition, classification, and rate structure was passed by the House of Representatives and awaits Senate approval in the next session of Congress.

A manpower reserve program was put into effect which provides for a trained military reserve of 3,900,000 men by 1959. Such a program, the President told us, will avoid the cost and inconvenience of a large standing army, while at the same time providing for the national defense. It was necessary, nevertheless, to extend the selective-service law for 4 more years, including the draft of doctors and dentists for 2 more years. I am far from satisfied with either of these laws, but believe they are the best compromise we could get at this time.

Atomic-energy projects were authorized to the extent of $237 million for research facilities and actual production of atomic peacetime projects, as well as atomic weapons. Funds were also authorized for the expansion of existing aeronautical research, for construction of foreign military bases and housing, and for a billion-dollar Navy shipbuilding program.

The only issue on which Congress and the administration clashed was the relatively minor one involving Marine Corps manpower. Congress refused to bow to the Republican demand for a 22,000-man cut in this important military unit.

All in all, the Democratic Congress was happy to follow a foreign-policy program whose principles were enunciated by President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, several years ago. The result has been a satisfying one. American prestige has grown abroad; the cold war tensions have lessened, if only temporarily, and a period of diplomatic negotiation has been vigorously begun. Democratic support, far from being absent, has been consistently greater than the support of the President's own party. Because of this support, the United States has been able to demonstrate its strength and unity.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION: FOR THE MANY AND NOT THE FEW

In domestic matters, of course, there was no comparable need for unanimity of thinking. The Democratic majority acted according to its political and economic principles and clashed with the administration where there was substantial difference. Once again, however, Mr. Eisenhower's forecast of a cold war was completely unfounded. The Democratic opposition to administration policies was as intelligent and high-minded as it was determined. There was no opposition merely for opposition's sake.

In the area of social legislation, several of the administration's proposals were extensions of earlier New Deal and Fair Deal ideas. These found enthusiastic Democratic support as far as they went—but often they did not go nearly far enough. Increased railroad retirement benefits, better FHA mortgage insurance coverage, and improved surplus property disposal to schools and hospitals were implementations of the Democratic program. Other parts of the administration program, however, proved quite inadequate.

A minimum wage proposal of $0.90 per hour, unreal at a time of high prices and general prosperity, was changed to a $1 minimum. This increase over the old $0.75 minimum will help keep industries from "run-

ning away" to the South and West where labor is so much cheaper, as well as preserve a decent wage for all American workers. More important, it raises the standard of living of all our citizens, nationally and not sectionally.

The administration's housing bill asked for only 35,000 public-housing units and made them well-nigh impossible of construction by improper restrictions. Congress increased the low-rent provisions by 10,000 additional units and eased the requirements to enable more extensive and better-balanced housing projects. Such liberalization of the law is necessitated by the acute housing shortage and the slum clearance needs of our urban centers.

To cure the unfortunate polio vaccine mixup, Congress authorized $2 million more than was asked by the President. In addition, all necessary funds are to be made available to the States to purchase enough vaccine for one-third of all the unvaccinated children, plus all expectant mothers. A more extensive and a better program was opposed by the administration as unnecessary and a step toward socialized medicine. The threat of a veto of the entire program effectually prevented the enactment of control legislation. Obviously, this administration is willing to risk black markets which may destroy the health of our people.

In appropriations for general matters of health, education, and social welfare, the Congress added more than $17 million to the Eisenhower program. The Congress felt that these were matters in which false economy was extremely dangerous. We were not willing to hear the responsibility of holding back research programs on cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and mental health so that the Federal budget might be a fraction of 1 percent lower. This, too, points up a basic difference of philosophy. The Democrats believe in being liberal with money to conserve the health of our people.

So too, an attempt to liberalize the social security laws and make the program more adequate to meet today's problems was stoutly opposed by the Republican administration. The Democratic majority in the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a bill to lower retirement age for women from 65 to 62, to allow disability benefits to 250,000 workers aged 50 or more, to continue disability benefits for children after age 18, and to extend coverage to the professions. Administration opposition in the Senate defeated this program there, although the need for such legislation has become more and more apparent in recent years.

Throughout the consideration of these matters, the Republicans consistently showed themselves for what they are—a party dedicated to the few rather than the many; a party which is more interested in budgetary figures than hunman needs; a party seeking to carry out a minimal social program at a minimal expense. Plenty of lip service, but no votes.

BUSINESS AND TAXATION: THE LITTLE FISH IN A BIG POND

The Eisenhower administration has time and again denied that it is an administration of, by, and for big business. And yet the record clearly shows that almost all of the major economic policies which seek to help the small-business man have orginated among the Democratic Members of Congress and have been opposed by the Republican administration.

The Small Business Administration, an agency dedicated to the plight of small business, was extended for 2 years. The administration opposed any increases in its authorized funds. The amount of any individual loan was increased to $250,000. These loans are intended for those deserving small-business men who cannot get help from regular bank sources. The disaster loan program and the small business participation in Government procurement were strengthened. The lending function together with the help given to small business in geting a fair share of Government procurement contracts makes SBA one of the most important agencies to have been started in recent years.

This is one of the few domestic policies, which in principle, has been consistently supported by both parties.

Bills were passed to halt the growing monopolistic practices in business. The antitrust penalty for violation of the Sherman Act was raised from $5,000 to $50,000. It was evident that $5,000 to a large corporation is merely a petty-cash transaction which was no deterrent to such a potential violator. In addition, the House passed a bill to curb the influence of bank holding companies by requiring Federal approval of new bank acquisitions by holding companies and requiring those companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking interests. This bill is designed to preserve the small independent bank as the banking unit best able to serve the interest of the small-business men. In the area of taxes, most of the existing income, corporate and excess-profits taxes were extended for another year. The only important proposal for tax relief came from the Democratic side of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Although this concerned a mere $20 cut in personal income taxes for each taxpayer and each dependent—relief aimed at the lowest-income bracket, yet equally fair to all income brackets—the Republican administration forcefully rejected the idea and caused its defeat in the Senate after the House had given its approval.

ARMED SERVICES AND VETERANS: SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING

Thanks to Democratic support, the serviceman and veteran were not forgotten during the past few months. Those who were in the service as of Janury 31, 1955, were allowed to go on building up GI schooling benefits until discharged from the service. The Veterans' Administration direct-loan program was extended for another 2 years and was broadened to include home improvements as well as home purchases. Disabled veterans, including those who fought in Korea, were given the privilege of starting purchase of a special automobile before October 1956.

To help the buildup of a strong backbone of career servicemen—an essential supplement to the new military Reserve program—Congress raised the pay and created greater benefits for servicemen as an incentive to a military career. Finally, Congress decided to continue regular pay to the dependents and relatives of missing or captured men who had fought in Korea.

The feeling was strong in the Congress that our Government should do as much as it could for the men who defend our country and are called upon to make great sacrifices. This program was both an expression of gratitude of the American citizen and a means of compensation for their sacrifices.

TRANSPORTATION: BUT NOT AT ANY COST

The pressing need to bring the Nation's transportation system up to date was apparent to the leaders of both parties. Airport construction was encouraged to the extent of $252 million in grants-in-aid to the States for 4 years.

In advocating a nationwide highway-construction program, the Eisenhower administration asked that the 10-year program be financed with special high-rate bonds. This would have involved at least $2.7 billion in unnecessary interest payments to bankers and other bondholders. The administration proposal was another unfortunate example of special-interest legislation which the Democratic majority has refused to stomach. The Democratic majority almost unanimously rejected this. They proposed in its place a system of user taxes on gasoline and tires, a plan by which those who benefited by the construction of the highways would pay their cost. Opposition to this proposal arose from many sources and the House defeated the bill even though the Senate had given its approval. The Republican opposition was almost unanimous.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: MORE OF THE SAME

With regard to the pay of Federal employees, the administration insisted it would approve only a straight 5 percent increase, while conceding the employees were entitled to more. The Democrats once again felt this to be bad business and false economy, having in mind how much Government workers' pay had lagged behind the cost-of-living increases and comparable wage increases among other workers throughout the country. We prevailed, though not to the full extent. Increased pay bills for more than the administration recommended were passed and approved.

THE GIVEAWAYS: BIGGER AND MORE

The minks are now sables. The 5-percenters are 10-percenters. Teapot Dome was a drop in a bucket compared to Dixon-Yates. First they gave away our oil lands. Now they are trying to give away all the rest of our natural resources.

The projects in which big business would not risk its stockholders' money are now beginning to pay back the taxpayer his investment. So the administration will now get the Government out of business by giving to big business the taxpayers' property.

To help do this our Government now uses WOC's. That is the old dollar-a-year man. He now works for us "without compensation." Big business pays him and lends him to the Government for nothing. For nothing to the taxpayer, but not for nothing to his private employer. He merely steers the Government business to his employer. He sits in on all the highlevel policymaking conferences, either as the head of the department or as his consultant. Maybe he does not give his private employer any advance information. Maybe he does not write the specifications that only his private employer can bid on. Maybe I am speculating. Then why did Secretary of Commerce Weeks refuse to tell a congressional committee what his big business advisers do? Why was it necessary to employ as a top executive in the Container Division of that Department, the Washington "special representative," on the payroll as such, of the country's largest container corporation? The testimony showed this man knew nothing about the business.

The full story is being developed now and promises to be the biggest scandal of our history.

THE FARMER AND THE CONSUMER: THEY NEED EACH OTHER

I have supported the Democratic farm program because I am convinced that neither farmer nor consumer can prosper alone. They live and prosper together, or not at all.

The Eisenhower farm program will destroy our country.

Our warehouses are bursting at the seams. Some because they are overloaded. Others because this administration bought and paid for defective storage facilities.

In various parts of the country there is unemployment so serious that our people are starving while surplus commodities in Government warehouses are rotting away.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration the farm program sustained losses of $1 billion. In less than 2½ years of Republican administration the farm program lost $2½ billion.

In 20 years under the Democrats, the maximum authorization for the program was $6¾ billion. In 2½ years under the Republicans, the Eisenhower administration increased it to $12 billion.

If you do not think cheese smells ask Secretary Benson to explain about the millions

of dollars he just handed to—no not the farmers—to the big cheese processors.

FISCAL POLICY: I HOPE YOU CAN ADD

Candidate Eisenhower promised to balance the budget. Of course, you know he was fooling. President Eisenhower, thinking you took Candidate Eisenhower seriously, has hastened to explain that he did not say when.

But he did promise as President, that if we increased the national debt limit in 1954 to $281 billion, he would cut back the increase in 1955. In the last days of this session, he sent word to your Congress that he could not keep his promise and that we must give him another year in which to do what he said needed only 1 year to do.

Let us not be too hard on him. I think that you, too, would have trouble with that much money. I know that I would.

MY OWN PROJECTS: SOMETHING FOR THE FUTURE

Every Congressman has his own particular interests that he hopes to see enacted. Throughout the years I have been able to gain the approval of many proposals while others still await congressional approval. Without attempting to set them forth in the order of their importance, some of the proposals I hope to see enacted in the near future are: low-income housing for the aged; a complete civil-rights program; revision of the refugee relief and immigration laws; no discrimination or segregation in National Guard units; measures to keep racist and defamatory literature out of the mail; power to the President to act in health matters in case of a national emergency; strengthening of our antitrust laws to help keep the small-business man as the backbone of our free-enterprise system; income-tax deductions for all educational expenses of dependents and exemptions for servicemen serving overseas; prevention of the giveaway programs of Government rights and property; free postage to and from members of the Armed Forces; a review of all disapproved veterans' claims by the United States Court of Claims; a sound and just security program that will weed out the disloyal, without destroying the loyal; a system of standby economic controls for the prevention of inflation; a system of allocations and priorities of fuel for emergencies; a Department of Civil Defense within the Department of Defense, with strengthened authority; greater consideration of consumer problems by establishing a congressional committee therefor, as well as an executive department to protect the consumer; better pay for Federal employees; equal pay for equal work by women; and a code of ethics in Government for Government officials which, among other things, will prevent big business from acquiring our birthright.

CONCLUSION: RESPONSIBILITY AND INTELLIGENCE

The record of the Congress this year has been a mixed one. And this is far from a complete record. It is merely a brief summary. Some of the more important legislation that might have been enacted this year has been left until next year.

The accomplishments, nevertheless, have been solid ones—the very opposite of what the Republican leaders told the American people to expect.

The moral of this story may be simply stated; the opposition to the administration by the Democratic majority has been intelligent and responsible. Where differences have existed between administration and Congress, there has been a give-and-take and compromise worthy of democratic institutions. The people of this country were not neglected by their Government in favor of partisan politics and petty jealousies. The Democrats of this country have a right to be proud of that record.

RECESS BUT NOT RESPITE

Although Congress is about to recess until January 1956, your Congressman will continue to serve you. His office—your office—is room 1305, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. It will remain open and fully staffed throughout the year. If visiting Washington, feel free to come in. If you have a problem that you think your Congressman can help you solve, write him a note to that address. He may not be able to help you, but you may be sure he will try.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this 2d session of the 84th Congress, I sent a questionnaire to the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to serve. The response to the questionnaire was most pleasing and in order that they may know the results I list the questions and answers:

First. Do you feel that, on the whole, President Eisenhower's recommendations to the Congress should be supported? Seventy-six percent yes. Eleven percent no. Thirteen percent no opinion.

Second. Do you favor: (a) Continuing foreign military aid? Fifty percent yes. Thirty-six percent no. Fourteen percent no opinion.

(b) Continuing foreign economic aid? Fifty percent yes. Thirty-seven percent no. Thirteen percent no opinion.

Third. Do you approve additional Federal expenditures to develop and apply atomic and hydrogen energy to peaceful purposes? Three percent yes. Eighty-seven percent no. Ten percent no opinion.

Fourth. Do you approve amending the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act? Forty percent yes. Thirty-nine percent no. Twenty-one percent no opinion.

Fifth. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget? Twenty-six percent yes. Sixty-six percent no. Eight percent no opinion.

Sixth. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States for education? Forty-eight percent yes. Forty-four percent no. Eight percent no opinion.

Seventh. Do you favor requiring registration of union pension and welfare funds and disclosure of financial transactions involving them? Eighty-eight percent yes. Nine percent no. Three percent no opinion.

Eighth. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet the postal deficits? Sixty-six percent yes. Thirty percent no. Four percent no opinion.

Ninth. Do you approve making all women eligible for old-age insurance benefits at 60 years of age instead of 65? Sixty-six percent yes. Thirty-two percent no. Two percent no opinion.

Tenth. Do you favor Federal plans for reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical insurance? Thirty-eight percent yes. Fifty-three percent no. Nine percent no opinion.

Eleventh. Do you favor continuation of the Federal low-rent public housing program? Fifty-one percent yes. Forty-seven percent no. Two percent no opinion.

Twelfth. Should the United States sell surplus farm commodities to Iron Curtain countries? Thirty-six percent yes. Fifty-nine percent no. Five percent no opinion.

Thirteenth. Do you favor free Federal medical treatment of veterans for non-service-connected disability? Twenty-six percent yes. Seventy-one percent no. Three percent no opinion.

On the 14th question, "If the 1956 presidential election were to be held today, whom do you favor?", 65 percent favored President Eisenhower, 12½ percent favored Mr. Stevenson, with the remaining 22½ percent distributed among 30 other candidates, no one of whom polled more than a partial percent. Thirty-six percent favored continuing Vice President NIXON in his present role, with 8 percent for Senator KEFAUVER for Vice President. The remaining percentage was given to 60 suggestions ranging from purely local names to national figures.

A study of the answers reveals a growing interest in good government. I am deeply appreciative that so large a number replied, and that so many took time to write additional comments.

The answers and comments were of great value to me in considering legislation upon which I had to vote. I intend to continue this procedure, if reelected, in order to know the views of the people whom I represent.

Despite television, radio, and all the advances that have been made in the field of communications in recent years, there is no substitute for personal visits by which a Member of Congress may learn the views of the people of his district and render to them the best possible service. As I have done on Saturdays this year and in previous years, I shall continue to travel throughout the district in my trailer office, meeting my constituents. It has been a pleasure to discuss with them legislation in which they were interested, national defense, veteran and social-security benefits, Academy appointments, immigration procedures, and business and personal problems.

The achievements of the present Republican administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower can be expressed in words understood by all—peace, prosperity, and progress.

PEACE

At the time President Eisenhower took over our boys were being killed in Korea. Today we have peace. Notwithstanding the troubled state of the world, arising from numerous and varied questions, creating problems that are new each day and causing deep concern, yet the fact remains we are at peace and our boys are not being called upon to die on foreign battlefields.

PROSPERITY

Today, as a people, we enjoy a degree of prosperity that exceeds that of the people of any other country in all the world. Our employment exceeds the fabulous figure of 65 million workers.

Our national production in value reaches toward $400 billion. All of this has enabled us to enjoy a standard of living that exceeds any other period in our Nation's history.

PROGRESS

Innovations in the social-security program which would give additional benefits to about 1,225,000 workers of this Nation.

The 2 major changes in the Social Security Act would, first, allow physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; and, second, reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The disability plan will take effect on January 1, 1957, and make about 250,000 more persons eligible for benefits.

The lowering of the age limit for women workers will provide benefits for about 325,000 workingwomen and 275,000 wives of workingmen. The bill also will provide benefits to about 175,000 widows at age 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

In an effort to improve the various veterans' programs of this grateful Nation, the Congress this year appropriated $4.7 billion for all veterans' benefits. This Nation has the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services, and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents.

Raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour; approved a 4-year program to stimulate airport construction; extended the life of the Small Business Administration and increased the revolving fund for loans to small business; strengthened our antimonopoly law and passed a law to curb the influence of large bank-holding companies.

Enacted improved housing laws, providing special aid in this respect to our elderly citizens; approved dynamic, farsighted programs for medical and dental research, for the training of public health personnel, and for hospital construction; and passed several laws which are specifically designed to benefit our youth.

Railroad retirement: Railroad retirement pensions were increased by 10 percent.

Civil service retirement: The Civil Service Retirement Act was liberalized and improved, thus benefiting the millions of postal and Federal employees.

On the international scene, we have authorized and appropriated $3.8 billion to continue and implement our mutual security agreements. The Congress has taken note of the increasing dissatisfaction of the people at home with the use of so much of our funds abroad. We have exercised our right over the purse strings of the Nation and decreased, so far as was commensurate with our security abroad, the funds authorized for this purpose. At the same time, we voted a ban on practically all future military aid to Yugoslavia. Our administration has taken note of this feeling also, as was evidenced by the recent withdrawal by the State Department of its offer of financial aid to Egypt for construction of the Aswan High Dam.

For our national defense, we have appropriated over $34½ billion for the armed services for the fiscal year. We have increased by $72 million the 1956 fiscal year authority for appropriations for construction of aircraft control and warning system; we have authorized a $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion for 1957, including a nuclear powered cruiser and a 60,000-ton aircraft carrier.

At this point, and with pleasure, I point out that construction of the new aircraft carrier, the *CVA 64* has been assigned to our own New York Naval Shipyard—the "Know-How Yard." Delegations representing the top skilled workers from the yard came to Washington, and with them I presented to the Secretary of the Navy the compelling reasons why our yard should build the new carrier. I was proud to be the spokesman for these fine men and am humbly grateful for the many expressions of appreciation I have received from the locals represented. This new construction means continued employment for over 16,000 men—6,000 more than before the Korean war.

In addition to my work in studying and voting on legislation which has been brought to the floor, I personally have sponsored measures which I thought were deserving of House consideration. One among these was a bill to amend the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of any pensions thereunder to individuals who have been convicted of espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities. I do not believe such persons should receive benefits from the very Government they seek to destroy.

Spurred by the inability of the FBI to act immediately in kidnaping cases, I introduced a bill designed to permit this fine agency to take immediate action.

One of the most important measures I introduced was designed to establish a commission to study the shortage of doctors of medicine in the United States. The New York Times, in commenting on the situation which so sorely needs study, said:

> Even with scheduled expansion American medical colleges cannot meet the demand for doctors needed or for admission of above-average students who want to study; 2,000 American students are studying medicine abroad and this source of training will become increasingly important.

The bill has met with enthusiastic response.

In the preceding paragraphs I have tried to show you, the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, how I have personally tried to serve you. You are the people who elected me to represent you in the Congress of the United States. If there is any way in which I can be of service to you in my congressional capacity, please do not hesitate to call upon me. Both my Washington and Brooklyn offices remain open. I have a competent staff, and my services and theirs are yours. I want you to know that even when the Congress is not in session, I am on the job.

America Faces the World Challenge—Will Meet the Oil-Suez Crisis Successfully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the 84th Congress concludes its session, we may well look forward to a most challenging period up ahead—challenging in both domestic and foreign affairs.

Events are moving so fast at home and abroad as to almost awe the imagination of man.

I ask unanimous consent that in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there be printed a statement by myself on the subject of America Faces the World Challenge.

I shall make particular reference to one phase of that challenge—the world petroleum problem, as tied up with the Suez crisis and the whole unfortunate problem of possible foreign nationalization of private resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"Will the Middle East countries some day make the tragic mistake of nationalizing oil? Will the Arab lands eventually commit the blunder of taking over foreign petroleum resources—the oilfields, the refineries, the pipelines?"

Those are the big questions in the minds of thinking people throughout the free world. Those questions loom behind the serious controversy over Egyptian nationalization of the Suez Canal.

The free world certainly hopes the tragic mistake of nationalization will not occur.

WE HAVE FAITH REASON WILL PREVAIL

Actually, it is our hope that reason and judgment and fair play will instead prevail. We trust that a sense of enlightened self-interest, a sense of playing by the rules of the game, the rules of contracts—will prevail in the Middle East.

We hope tempers will cool. Bitterness should subside. Commonsense should take over, as world diplomacy brings the full power of moral persuasion to bear.

The free world knows—even if all the leaders of the Arab lands may not know—that nationalization of the oil in the ground, of the pipelines which carry it or the refineries which process it—would be a calamity to the Middle East and a tragedy for the free world. Such a ruinous step—if it occurred—would work to the disadvantage most of all—of the Arab governments and peoples themselves.

MUCH MISUNDERSTANDING OF NATIONALIZATION PROBLEM

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding of precisely what is involved in this nationalization controversy.

Some few fuzzy-minded people in the West may tend to go along with the nationalization concept. They may do so on the ground, they say, that it is "within the legal right of a country to take over foreign property within its borders, provided fair and prompt compensation is assured."

What such people entirely forget is the net affect—direct and indirect—of nationalization. They forget that the legal issue, while obviously fundamental, is accompanied by other issues—political, economic,

military, moral. And the legal problem itself is by no means as simple as the fuzzy-minds assert.

INVESTORS AVOID NATIONALIZING COUNTRY LIKE A PLAGUE

The fuzzy-minds forget that as early as when a nationalization decree is possibly in the offing, an evil chain reaction begins to occur. And the end result is the inevitable tendency for investors forever after to avoid that country like a plague.

There are many reasons for such well-merited avoidance. Let me cite three such reasons:

1. In the first place, the very fact of nationalization indicates a breach of faith, a unilateral and illegal violation of contract.

The very essence of free enterprise is to abide by one's contractual commitments.

By contrast it should be noted, for example, that the Eyptian Government had concluded legal agreement after agreement with the Suez Canal Company, the most recent within the period of the last 2 months. But now, Egypt, by itself, is ripping up its own contract.

How can private investors in the future have faith in the word of the Egyptian Government?

POLITICAL DEMAGOGERY AND FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

2. In the second place, the very fact of nationalization usually indicates a country's fiscal irresponsibility.

When a country recklessly nationalizes, it is very often caused by some demagogic politician who wants to fasten his greedy hands on an alluring asset, which doesn't belong to him. He wants to convert it into a source of patronage and plunder.

The same type of politician who will arbitrarily nationalize a company will usually tend to wreck a country's financial position. If he thinks so little of private property that he will confiscate it, he probably has a poor concept of running his own country's treasury and its entire fiscal system.

History indicates that political demagogery is tied hand and glove with financial demagogery.

SO-CALLED COMPENSATION PAYMENTS MAY BE WORTHLESS

What does that mean, in turn? It means that the so-called compensation which a country may glibly promise in return for this confiscated property may not prove to be worth the paper it is written upon.

So-called bonds which are issued as compensation, may prove utterly worthless. The interest promised on them may not be paid at all, or may be paid in a currency which in the end is worthlessly depreciated. Money after all is only as good as the credit standing of the government which issues it and which backs it up.

FOREIGN CAPITAL WILL STAY AT HOME

So, nationalization, or even the threat of it, makes investors stay at home. It should be remembered that the great United States itself remains the foremost single attraction for United States investors' funds. Why should any American investor who can earn 4 or 5 percent or more with almost complete safety here in our own country, risk sending capital abroad, when he may get there only the same return or perhaps slightly more, but will be risking having his entire principal confiscated overseas?

Obviously, if a foreign land expects to attract capital, it must provide some measure of special financial attraction to make up for the risk which an investor may foresee even under the best of conditions.

If the chances are even one in a hundred that foreign capital may be nationalized, that in itself is serious. But if the chances of nationalization increase, then, there is no sensible investor who would think of going into such a land.

UNITED STATES CORPORATION HEADS ARE TRUSTEES

Foreign governments must realize that the executives of the United States corporations are trustees of corporate funds. A chairman of a board and his fellow members of a board of directors are charged with faithfully administering resources of the corporation. They dare not squander those resources. They dare not invest stockholders' or bondholders' capital in propositions of grave risk.

Some foreign governments complain that United States capital will not come in for relatively long-range projects. They say our corporations prefer instead to invest in projects which will pay for themselves relatively quickly.

What the foreign governments don't realize (or only pretend not to realize) is that it is their governments' own threatening policies which are the very cause of any private preference for short term, quick turnover investments.

Moreover, it is not simply the threat of nationalization which discourages United States corporations; it is often local governments' policies of harassment. Such harassment includes the unreasonable imposing of retroactive taxes or duties or the arbitrary, unilateral raising of pipeline fees or the like. Such arbitrary governmental policies can utterly discourage foreign companies. We Americans don't like to be squeezed. We don't like to be pushed around.

FAIRNESS FOR ARAB PEOPLES AND FOR FOREIGN COMPANIES

What I am saying in effect is that it is the total climate of a country—favorable or unfavorable climate—which will determine how much foreign capital will come into it and how much will remain.

Of course, the Arab peoples have pride. The Arab peoples are entitled to their due. Within the vast 3.6 million square miles—of the Middle East—with their 54 million inhabitants—are fortunately vast petroleum riches. And a fair return on their own wealth for the inhabitants is obviously essential.

But so, too, is a fair return for private foreign companies which have poured more than $2 billion of indispensable investment into the area.

Such companies are also entitled to their due. They are also entitled to be treated fairly and squarely.

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS COMMENTS ON THIS ISSUE

On previous occasions in the Senate, for example, on March 21 and July 25, I have referred to this same general issue of fair treatment. I have pointed out that how a country, like our friend Venezuela, which cooperates with foreign capital, which welcomes capital and treats it fairly, has prospered beyond almost the brightest dreams and hopes of its Government and its people.

I have pointed out by contrast how a foreign government which freezes out capital does itself no good and does the cause of the free world no good. My observations and analyses are based on personal review of this type of problem over a period of many years. I have directed supplementary studies, made at my request by a member of our committee staff.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A UNITED STATES SENATOR

I feel that it is incumbent upon me as a United States Senator and as senior Republican on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to follow this problem extremely closely.

After all, the American and other foreign oil companies working in the Middle East are hardly in the easiest position where they themselves can speak their own minds frankly and openly against local demagogic influences which may harass them.

But someone must certainly speak frankly to these Middle East lands. And that is why I feel that the executive branch deserves the fullest support, and why we in the legislative branch must likewise speak our piece firmly, but in a friendly way, as I am doing now.

MY BASIC PURPOSE TODAY: PROTECT UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY

I am speaking for the principle of morality.

I am speaking for the principle that any American, working or investing abroad, is entitled to reasonable protection from his own Government.

But I am speaking as well for a crucial strategic interest of my country. For it is Mid-East oil which fuels Western Europe's economy, which helps maintain Western Europe financially solvent, and which helps power NATO's defensive mechanism.

Moreover, we must never forget that an expanded foothold in the Middle East is what the Soviet Union covets for her own revolutionary purposes—a foothold which must certainly be prevented by the West.

OUR VAST OIL RESOURCES COMPARED WITH RUSSIA'S

A comparison between free world and Soviet world resources is of interest. For the total free world, the authoritative Oil and Gas Journal estimates for 1955: proven reserves of 177,984,314,000 barrels, 569,661 total wells in production, 13,690,000 barrels average daily production, 574 operating refineries with capacity for crude distillation of 15,887,000 barrels daily.

By contrast, the comparative figures for Red Russia and controlled areas are: 10,833,-300,000 barrels reserve, an undetemined number of wells, 1,450,000 barrels average daily production, 50 operating refineries with capacity of 1,481,000 barrels daily.

NATIONALIZATION OFTEN ACCOMPANIED BY SOCIALIST POISON

I have referred so far to two reason why investors will avoid like a plague certain lands which toy with nationalization.

3. A third basic reason to bear in mind is that a trend toward nationalization is very often accompanied by socialistic concepts.

The same demagog who may breathe fire and brimstone against foreign capital, may also falsely denounce the whole capitalist system as allegedly constituting "exploitation of the sweat on labor's brow."

Few criticisms are more unjustified.

It is capitalism—America's private enterprise system—which nas enriched the average man in this country to a greater degree than the common man has experienced anywhere else in the world.

The common man is king in America. Ours is a country of "people's capitalism."

And it is "people's capitalism which we believe in abroad, as well.

THE ROAD TO EGYPTIAN PROSPERITY NOT PAVED WITH RED TANKS

No people want to see the living standof the Middle East uplifted more than we.

Few peoples will get greater satisfaction than we will from seeing the life span of the average Egyptian extended, disease in Egypt eradicated, sanitation systems built, schools, houses, and the like.

But we know that the road to a higher standard in Egypt cannot be built by Czech or Soviet tanks. On the contrary, every bale of Egyptian cotton which is mortgaged to the Reds for Soviet arms is one bale of cotton which is not being used to uplift the standards of Egypt's own people.

The Soviet technicians pouring into Egypt are the ruthless disciples of the atheist Karl Marx; they have no sympathy for the prophet Mohammed, nor for Islam and its faithful.

ARAMCO AND OTHER COMPANIES' FINE RECORD

I say that, contrary to misrepresentations, the record of American companies operating

abroad in dealing with foreign governments and peoples makes for one of the finest of all chapters.

Far from constituting exploitation, the record shows that enlightened American companies have brought higher wages, better living conditions, modern schools, hospitals, and every conceivable modern service to foreign areas.

For example, I understand that the pay scale of the Arabian-American Oil Co. for the average Arab worker is $1,000 a year, whereas the pay for the non-oil-company workers in these lands is $50 per year.

So United States oil companies operating in the Middle East, individually and/or in conjunction with British, French, Dutch, or other foreign capital, have good reason to feel that they have operated more than fairly.

In any event, why should an American investor remove his capital from a country where free enterprise has flowered and is safe and place it in a country where Socialist confiscation thinking is rampant?

EARLY UNITED STATES NATIONALISM UNLIKE PRESENT MID-EAST NATIONALISM

Earlier, I referred to "fuzzy minds" which confuse the real issues.

Such fuzzy minded people think that the nationalism of the Middle East may be compared to the nationalism of America in our early days or as of today.

To be sure, there are some superficial resemblances. To be sure, each people—our own or any other—is entitled to its own sovereignty, its own nationhood—to love of its own flag, its own national anthem, its own national heroes, and culture.

But there, all resemblance ceases between our type of enlightened nationalism and the type of fanatic, blind, and self-defeating nationalism which is unfortunately arising in much of the Middle East and in other parts of the world as well.

UNITED STATES IN 1800'S WELCOMED FOREIGN CAPITAL

We of America welcomed foreign capital. It was foreign capital which built our railroads and many of our other great milestones of progress. Such foreign capital helped to generate local United States capital. We always treated foreign capital fairly. We welcomed, too, the contributions of emigrants to America.

We recognized from the very start that we could not adopt a two-faced policy—being capitalistic toward our own domestic capital, while being socialistic against foreign capital.

We recognized that if the free-enterprise system is to work, it must work uniformly for all groups in our land.

We welcomed friendly relations with all the peoples of the world. We recognized that prejudice against any people abroad would inevitably be harmful in our own land as well.

Fortunately, other lands, like Canada, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, West Germany, and Venezuela have displayed similar enlightened attitudes.

The more enlightenment, the better a country serves its own interests.

ARTICLE, NEW HORIZONS IN FOREIGN OIL

In the summer 1956 issue of the magazine the Lamp, published by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, there was a most interesting article entitled "New Horizons in Foreign Oil." It pointed out how favorable petroleum legislation in various countries provides heightened incentive to foreign capital.

Oil exploration is, of course, an exceedingly costly process. Today, the world's soaring fuel needs require more and more fuel reserves.

From Guatemala, from Haiti, to Zanzibar, Turkey, and beyond, intensive oil drilling is now taking place. But exploration cannot go on, and on the scale which is necessary, unless there is a continuing favorable climate in the foreign lands—a favorable economic, legal, political, and moral climate.

THE $63 BILLION WORLD OIL INDUSTRY

As I have already indicated, the oil industry is one of the free world's greatest resources. A study by the Chase Manhattan Bank estimates that the gross fixed assets of the free world's oil industry total $63 billion. Sixty-four percent of that huge sum is invested in the United States. It is, of course, here in our own land that the petroleum industry has made the greatest of all contributions toward the highest, most modern standard of living for an entire people.

What we have done constructively, other people can begin to do, if they will allow the rule of law and not of demagogs or mobs; the rule of free enterprise and not the rule of socialism, the rule of unbreakable contracts which cannot be changed except by mutual consent, as against the rule of one side tearing up contracts like scraps of paper.

WE HOPE FOREIGN LANDS WILL SEE THE LIGHT

In conclusion it is my earnest hope that those foreign lands which are, unfortunately, playing with dynamite by toying with oil-nationalization ideas, will see the light.

No object lesson is more illustrative of the utter folly of oil nationalization, than the pitiful record of Iran's mismanagement of the resources of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. during the period of nationalization. Iran's bankruptcy—economic and otherwise—during that period should certainly not be forgotten.

It is my hope that present fears of oil nationalization will prove groundless. I trust that moderate leaders in the Middle East—men of real understanding, men of vision and of courage, will put a brake on the extremists, the hotheads, the demagogs, who are trying to whip up supernationalist frenzy.

A WORD OF WARNING TO DEMAGOGS

But let not the demagogs think that the free world can be blackmailed into submission. Let not the demagogs think that the free world will not use its resources to devise alternative methods to cope with demagogery.

Admittedly the free world is heavily dependent upon the Suez Canal. Admittedly it is dependent upon Mid-East petroleum resources. But the free world is not without ample peaceful alternatives to utilize, so as to curb blackmailers and to show them that they cannot get away with extortion.

TANKER PRODUCTION MUST BE EXPANDED

Fortunately, world tanker production is constantly increasing. United States and foreign shipyards will have to lay still more supersized bottoms so as to help meet current and future oil transportation problems.

Thus, we will be in a stronger position to cope with efforts to blackmail us over the canal.

These are not simply my own frank views. They are views, I feel, which are shown by men of good will, by leaders of the free world generally. We want peace in the Middle East. We want security and justice. We want neither the Red flag of communism to fly there, nor the black flag of piracy.

REACTIONS TO SENATOR WILEY'S COMMENTS INVITED

I cordially invite now the reactions of readers of my comments to the frank remarks which I have presented above. I appreciate the very fine reactions which I have received in response to previous statements on the general theme of a green light for foreign free enterprise.

The Bradley Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the Bradley report, a report to the President by the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions, which was released on April 23, 1956, has caused grave concern to war veterans and to veterans' organizations. Veterans believe this report to the President to be a direct attack on the Federal war veterans' pension system which has been in effect in one form or another since 1818. Not since the Economy Act of 1933 have veterans been so concerned about the future of veterans pensions, disability compensation, widows and orphans allowances and other benefits granted by Congress.

I share in this concern and believe that all Members of Congress interested in veterans legislation should be alerted to the implications of the Bradley recommendations. The members of the Commission were Clarence G. Ademy, director, National Citizens Committee for Educational Television; William J. Donovan, attorney; Paul R. Hawley, director, American College of Surgeons; Martin D. Jenkins, president, Morgan State College; Theodore S. Petersen, president, Standard Oil Company of California; and John S. Thompson, vice chairman of the board, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. Gen. Omar N. Bradley was Chairman. The Commission made 70 specific recommendations and the report covers 410 printed pages.

I wish to call attention to certain specific statements in the report to which I cannot agree:

First. Survey data show that the overwhelming proportion of veterans believe that non-service-connected benefits should not be generally provided—page 9.

Second. Military service in time of war or peace is an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered inherently a basis for future Government benefits—page 10.

Third. It cannot justifiably be contended that all sacrifices, however small and transient, by those in the Nation's military service should establish entitlement to monetary claim and special privileges—page 10.

Fourth. Under present-day conditions, military service in itself cannot continue to serve as a basis for special privilege—page 16.

Fifth. The Commission recommends that veterans' pension benefits be coordinated with those payable under old-age and survivors insurance. It is proposed that this be done by maintaining a separate veterans' pension program, but changing the present eligibility standards to take account of all income, including OASI but not public assistance payments, as resources in determining need for a pension—page 18.

Sixth. As measures of need, present income limits are too high and result in

payment of tax-free pensions to persons who are not in genuine need—page 18.

Seventh. A disability of at least 30 percent should be required at ages below 70. Only those found incapable of rehabilitation and unemployable should be eligible for a pension—page 19.

Eighth. Military service in time of war or peace should be treated as discharging an obligation of citizenship and not of itself as a basis for future Government benefits—page 136.

Ninth. Special veterans benefits should be provided only for the significant requirements of veterans that arise directly out of their military service—page 136.

Tenth. The ordinary or nonservice connected needs which veterans have in common with all citizens should be met wherever possible through the general welfare programs under which veterans are covered along with other people. Veterans' non-service-connected benefits should be minimized and gradually eliminated—page 137.

Eleventh. The Commission's survey of medical specialists indicated that the statutory awards for arrested tuberculosis were unwarranted and unrealistic in the light of recent advances in medical knowledge. In this survey it was also observed that other statutory awards generally were obsolete and should be abolished—pages 166–167.

Twelfth. The presumption of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, tuberculosis, and multiple sclerosis as now listed should be withdrawn—page 178.

Thirteenth. That Government life insurance be issued to servicemen upon termination of active service only if they have a service-connected disability that will prevent them from obtaining commercial life insurance at standard rates—page 224.

Fourteenth. Under the more normal conditions now prevailing in the economy, there appears to be no need for special muster-out payments to ex-servicemen—page 339.

Fifteenth. Under present conditions of military service the degree of interruption of the educational process incurred by peacetime ex-servicemen does not warrant special programs of educational benefits—page 345.

Sixteenth. It is recommended that no special loan benefits be made available for peacetime ex-servicemen—page 346.

Seventeenth. Within the not too distant future a separate veterans' pension program should no longer be necessary—page 372.

Eighteenth. The test of impairment at ages 65 to 70 should be made more realistic by requiring at least a 30-percent disability. Pension applicants should be required to register with the State employment service. The fulfillment of this requirement should be attested by a statement from the veteran's employment representative that efforts made to place the applicant have not been successful. Applicants for pensions at ages below 55 and those aged 55 or over who claim to be unemployable due to a disability which is of a lesser degree than that required for a pension at their age should be referred to the Federal State Vocational Rehabilitation Service—pages 388–389.

The 18 statements and recommendations I have mentioned are not all of the statements and recommendations in the Bradley report to which I object, but they are typical of the many bad features of this report.

I strongly object to the philosophy which runs throughout the report, that military service in time of war or peace is similar to any other type of employment and not of itself causing any obligation on the Federal Government for special benefits or pensions. It is difficult for me to understand how a commission made up of reasonable men could come to this conclusion. It is contrary to American principles and traditions and must be repudiated by action in the next Congress.

I want to assure all veterans, their widows and dependents, and all veterans' organizations that I shall strongly oppose all Bradley report recommendations which would deprive any veteran, widow, or dependent of any benefits now in effect. Many veterans' benefits should be increased and substantially liberalized.

Congressman Wolverton's Seniority in Congress Helps First Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, my decision to be a candidate for reelection to Congress is based upon a desire to serve and with the thought that my long experience in Congress can be helpful in solving problems arising in these exceptional times.

I think all will agree that experience in any line of endeavor can prove beneficial in the fulfillment of the duties of that particular activity. This is particularly true in matters of legislation. Furthermore, in legislative bodies seniority is highly important. It naturally increases usefulness and influence.

As a result of the seniority I have gained by continuity of service I have become the ranking member of one of the most important committees of the House of Representatives, namely, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. And, in the opinion of many, it is the most important of all the committees from the standpoint of legislative duties.

The importance of this committee arises from the numerous and varied subjects of great importance to our Nation and its people which come within its legislative jurisdiction. There is no committee of the House that has such an extensive jurisdiction as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was one of the first committees of Congress, having been established in 1795, and it has had a continuous existence from that time to the present.

The committee has jurisdiction over all types of transportation, including railroads, buses, and trucks; all forms of communication, including radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and cables; civil aviation, both domestic and foreign; public health in all its many and varied activities to promote the health of our people, including research activities relating to heart, cancer, mental and circulatory diseases, cerebral palsy, muscular distrophy, arthritis, nervous diseases, and many others; advanced scientific endeavor by means of the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of Standards, and kindred organizations; the Fair Trade Commission, to guarantee fairness and truth in business; the Federal Power Commission, to control and regulate the interchange of electric power across State lines; food and drug legislation to guarantee and make certain of the quality of all such for public consumption; laws governing administration and disposition of alien property taken over from enemy countries during the last war; welfare legislation; railroad retirement and Mediation Service, and all activities pertaining to the welfare of railroad labor. These and many other activities indicate the wide scope of the work of this committee and its importance to the people, not only of the First Congressional District of New Jersey but throughout the Nation.

It has been a privilege and an honor to represent the First Congressional District for 15 terms in the Congress of the United States. During this period of time we have experienced high prosperity, so-called, in the late twenties, followed by a depression period that brought us to the very depths of distress. Then, before we had fully recovered from the depression came World War II and the Korean conflict. These brought postwar problems affecting our veterans and every other segment of our people.

All of these conditions have presented their particular problems for solution. The experience gained by participating in their solution and in others that have arisen cannot be otherwise than helpful in dealing with new problems in the future. In addition, there have been the problems incident to communism and our endeavor to maintain peace in the world.

In all of my service as a Member of Congress I have striven to render the best possible service to all of our people regardless of political affiliation or partisanship. By word and by deed I have sought to do that which I thought was right and for the best interest of the First Congressional District and its people. In recent months I have worked diligently to bring work to the New York shipyard. I led the fight against increased bridge tolls and against the Philadelphia wage tax. I shall continue to do so. I backed pay raises for postal and other Government workers, and assisted in obtaining funds for the deepening of the Delaware River channel to the end that the district may take on increased importance. These are only a few of what I consider worthwhile things done for the welfare of our people.

I will consider it a great honor to continue to serve the First Congressional District. I pledge my best endeavors at all times to do in the future, as I have done in the past, that which is in the best interest of our people and which will tend most surely to promote their welfare.

Mystery and Misery of the Backache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that the American people each year are becoming increasingly concerned about the overall status of our national health. For, as modern technology works its wonders in the field of science and industry, we as a people now are able to concentrate our public time and energy on improvement of our own human welfare.

One of the latest manifestations of this particular national trend has been the study recently undertaken by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D. C., a nonprofit, objective research organization which published the results of this study in a booklet entitled "The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic."

The Public Affairs Institute in its definitive study says:

> The present-day doctor of chiropractic is equipped both by training and experience to treat successfully many of the ills besetting mankind.

It also points out that the profession of chiropractic has specialized in the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses having their origin in the region of the back.

Considering the institute's new study, it is interesting to note that a recent issue of Life magazine concerns itself with a corollary subject entitled "Mystery and Misery of the Backache."

The national need for further information on this subject is apparent in Life's statement that—

> Something like 250,000 workmen a year hurt their backs while on the job and have to be sent home * * * most of them incapacitated longer than workers who have suffered such far more spectacular damage as broken legs or arms.

All Americans should realize, too, that the agonizing discomfort and pain of a backache is not, by any means, necessarily confined to those persons doing hard physical labor. The stresses and strains of modern living force every citizen to give consideration to what is now realized as one of our national health problems.

This situation is pointed up by the eminent psychiatrist, Dr. Thomas H. Holmes, of the University of Washington School of Medicine, who testifies from clinical experience that "almost invariably any anxiety, resentment, or hostility in a patient is reflected by muscle tension in the lower back. If the tension lasts long enough, it will produce pain."

LIFE RESEARCH GOES TO WORK

Considering the widespread prevalence of backache throughout all segments of our modern society, it is evident that Life magazine has done us all a real service in putting a team of researchers to work getting the facts which describe a backache, briefly and pointedly, in the following words:

> Mankind * * * insists on defying gravity by standing erect. His back muscles have to work 16 hours a day just to hold him up. He bounces up and down on his spine as on a pogo stick, putting a heavy load of weight and shock on the discs. And when he bends over from the waist to pick up a shoe or golf ball, as he is always doing, he exerts an almost intolerable strain on his lower back. The bend comes between the fused vertebrae of the sacrum and the lumbar vertebrae just above them.
>
> This point, called the lumbo-sacral joint, is like the fulcrum of a lever. It and the one or two joints above it must support the entire weight of the torso and do the hard work of lifting it. When a man straightens up from a bent-over position, the strain on the muscles, vertebrae, ligaments, and discs can amount to more than a quarter of a ton. If something is lifted at the same time, the weight of the object is multiplied by a leverage factor of 15 or more, depending on the length of the torso and the position of the arms. Thus the frailest stenographer who bends over to lift a portable typewriter or the housewife who picks up a sack of flour from the pantry floor subjects her lower back to tensions of as much as half a ton or more.
>
> While the spine is a most ingenious structure, it is also highly vulnerable under mankind's abuse. Anybody who has ever suffered a sprained ankle knows how much pain can come from a ligament stretched too far—and there are more ligaments in the back than in all the rest of the body put together. Anybody who has suffered a Charley horse knows the pain of a muscle spasm—and the back has layer after layer of complicated muscle. Anybody who has cracked his so-called funny bone knows how pain can radiate along a squeezed nerve—and the spinal cord has big trunk nerves branching off between each pair of vertebra and radiating out to all the extremities of the body. The human back, in short, is abundantly endowed with all sorts of potentially painful parts just waiting to be abused.

Certainly the problem has been very clearly presented by these statements from the Life magazine article.

With regard to the treatment for this widespread ailment, I think it pertinent to point out that the second largest branch of the healing arts—the profession of chiropractic—has specialized in the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses having their origin in the region of the back.

The fact that this profession has grown so rapidly in recent years is, in no small measure, due to the success this profession has had in relieving people's backaches and all the ills that appear to be dependent on bad back conditions.

Indeed, Life's article takes on new and hopeful meaning when brought into context with the modern doctor of chiropractic and his successful efforts in treating backache—now recognized as one of the Nation's far-flung illnesses.

The Public Affairs Institute study gives us the following facts:

> Today's doctor of chiropractic is a graduate of a 4-year college that accepts only high-school graduates or those with at least 2 years of general college work beyond the high school. In the 8 colleges accredited by the National Chiropractic Association a minimum of 4,000 hours of classroom lectures, clinical and laboratory work are required for graduation.
>
> Of this, 1,960 hours are devoted to the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses according to chiropractic principles, and this is premised on 740 hours of instruction and laboratory work in anatomy, 240 hours of physiology, 180 hours of biochemistry, 520 hours of pathology and bacteriology and 200 hours of public health and hygiene.
>
> With such a background of scientific training and clinical practice, today's doctor of chiropractic is licensed to practice his particular form of the healing art by boards in the several States of the Nation, all but four States having special laws to cover this body of practitioners.
>
> The broadest definition of licensure, that of California reads: "The basic principle of chiropractic is the maintenance of the structural and functional integrity of the nervous system. The practice of chiropractic consists of all necessary means to carry out this basic principle."

TWO MILLION NEW PATIENTS

> Public recognition has grown as doctors of chiropractic have become better trained and as the beneficial results of their treatments have become known to more people. Each year now, some 2 million new patients seek the aid of over 25,000 practicing doctors of chiropractic. Over 500 insurance companies now accept chiropractors' certification for claims.
>
> Business and industry, and the great labor unions such as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen have either contracts with doctors of chiropractic or arrangements for the treatment of their people, or have endorsed chiropractic as beneficial. The big motion-picture companies, such as Columbia Pictures, use the services of doctors of chiropractic so that "the show can go on."
>
> Sordoni Enterprises of Pennsylvania, headed by Andrew Sordoni, president of the American Automobile Association, employs five full-time doctors of chiropractic available to its corps of workers, which is typical of many industrial concerns. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, among other veterans' organizations, have consistently and actively supported chiropractic as an important means of treating illnesses.
>
> Chief among the virtues of the chiropractic treatment is the fact that, as Dr. Philip Lewin, associate professor of bone and joint surgery of Northwestern University's Medical School, so well points out—"Backache is one of the human crossroads where body and mind meet and where minor errors and variations may cause major discomforts and disabilities." On that one truism of medical science alone, the chiropractic treatment could well rest its case. For it is with the treatment of ills which have either their origin in the back area or are benefited by attention to that area that the chiropractic treatment has come to be recognized as most helpful.
>
> This has been pointed out succinctly by Dr. C. W. Weiant, chiropractor and doctor of philosophy, research director of the Chiropractic Research Foundation, in this brief statement: "Today the medical profession is beginning to recognize what the chiropractor has been contending for the past half century: (1) that the spinal column is the source of many physical ills and pains which appear in other parts of the body; and (2) that the human backbone is an intricate mechanism."
>
> With the National Safety Council reporting that 1 out of every 14 people suffers some accidental injury during the year, and over 10 million accidents occur within 12 months,

the Council said that back strain accounted for nearly 10 percent of all lost-time injuries. A survey of the State Workmen's Compensation cases in Colorado indicate that under chiropractic care the loss of time from work averaged about 2½ days, or about one-half the time averaged by other methods of treatment.

Now it is particularly interesting to note, in the Life magazine article, that research on cases of backache at the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at New York University has led to the conclusion that "practically all back trouble is functional."

ACCOMPLISHING GREAT GOOD

Thus we can realize, as the Public Affairs Institute has indicated, that a body of present-day trained doctors of chiropractic, using modern methods of diagnosis and treatment and prescribing proper hygienic care to restore the normal functioning of the back region and its related parts, can accomplish great good for the millions of Americans suffering from our Nation's widespread troublesome illness.

The Life article corroborates this with the statement that—

Because chiropractors specialize in manipulation of the spine, they attract a lot of patients who suffer from backache. They press against some suspect vertebra and often there is a sudden snap and the patient gets up feeling much better.

That statement, of course, is an oversimplification of the methods used by the modern-day doctor of chiropractic who, according to the scientific study of the Public Affairs Institute, "is a force for good in promoting the health of his community."

Small Business, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to express my disappointment because of the fact that the 84th Congress will pass into history without a single major legislation enactment in the interest of small business. There has been no lack of discussion on the subject of small business. It seems to me, in retrospect, that each legislative day has produced at least one speech or one statement on small business. Much of the discussion has been constructive and fair but for the most part, unfortunately, these discussions have not been concerned with legislation. However, I hasten to add that a number of statements purportedly on the subject of small business have, in fact, been attacks on President Eisenhower and the President's small-business program. Nobody has been fooled by these attacks, and particularly the small-business men themselves have not been fooled, because they know that business of every type is enjoying the greatest peacetime prosperity in the history of our country.

Many bills have been introduced to aid small business but very few have received any consideration whatsoever. A great many of these bills, had they been enacted into law, would have assured small business of further gains and the opportunity to advance to greater prosperity while maintaining a sound competitive position. I need hardly remind my colleagues that the Democrats have had complete charge of all legislative and investigative committees in both the Senate and the House. The legislative program, therefore, has been subject to the will and the control of the majority party in both Houses of Congress.

The few bills which have been reported out of committee and scheduled for further action have received the support of practically every Republican Member of the House and Senate.

THE GOOD-FAITH ISSUE

Thanks to Republican leadership in the House, one bill in which hundreds of thousands of small-business men were interested passed the House almost unanimously. This bill was strongly supported by our independent retail grocers, wholesalers, and other groups in the food industry. It was also supported by our independent druggists, tire dealers, filling-station operators, independent bakers, independent candy wholesalers, and, in fact, by practically every independent merchant in the country. This bill, as we know, proposed to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to strengthen the position of small business. It failed of passage in the Senate.

Why did not this bill, which had so much small-business support, become law? I think it is fair to say that if the acknowledged leaders of the Democratic Party had wanted this small-business bill enacted into law there would have been no question about it.

In addition to the bill designed to strengthen small business under the Robinson-Patman Act, many other bills looking toward the improvement and strengthening of our antitrust laws were introduced. However, the most important antitrust bill which affected corporate mergers failed of enactment.

CONGRESS AND SMALL BUSINESS

As I stated, I am disappointed with the legislative results for small business in the 84th Congress. This disappointment stems from the fact that constructive and remedial legislation is constantly needed to strengthen our free-enterprise system. As we all realize, most of our business institutions had small beginnings. It is through the initiative, imagination, rugged individualism and the hard work of American businessmen that our small businesses grow and prosper. For the most part, however, this growth is possible only when the scales of opportunity are in balance, and here the Congress has a grave responsibility. This responsibility is discharged either through the passage of laws or constructive investigations which will, in fact, keep the scales of opportunity in balance.

As the elected representatives of our respective districts we in the House of Representatives are in the best position to seek out and respond to the needs of our people as these needs develop. There are certain legislative areas in which it is the sole responsibility of the House of Representatives, under the Constitution, to initiate legislation. The Constitution requires that the House originate our tax laws. Therefore, we who are Members of the House of Representatives should be especially concerned with the present unequal and inequitable Federal tax structure which bears so heavily on small business. The majority in the 84th Congress has failed to listen to the pleas of small business for equitable tax treatment under the law.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND SMALL BUSINESS—INCOME TAXES

The Federal income tax burden on small business became more apparent in the 84th Congress than ever before. Many bills were introduced which would have lessened this burden and would have had the further effect of allowing small concerns to keep pace with the urgency and necessity for growth, expansion, and modernization. The Republican Members of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House introduced tax measures as well as bills to correct many of the inequities which exist in the law applying to Government contract renegotiation. These bills, which were designed to equalize the burden of Federal taxes, were never given even passing consideration.

It can be safely assumed that our free-enterprise society, as we know it here in America, will exist only as long as small business remains. Once small business disappears from our midst then our economic system will lose its health and dynamic character.

Where would the Fords, the Chryslers, and the rest of them be if they had not been able to grow and expand under the tax structure that was in effect in the early days of their existence? Under the present tax structure there are very limited possibilities for growing businesses to make their full contribution to a prosperous economy and to the economic well-being of our Nation.

It is very generally recognized that the present tax structure makes it difficult, if not impossible, for small business to accumulate sufficient working capital to purchase up-to-date fixtures and machinery, to improve its plants and equipment, and to expand to its full potential usefulness. We must face the issue as we see it today because small business now, as well as in the past, must depend on back earnings for equity and working capital. It is practically impossible for small, closely-held businesses to have access to the capital markets. The issuance of stocks and bonds, except to a limited extent, is not a realiable source for small business financing. In order to survive the ups and downs of the economic cycle it is absolutely necessary for small business to be able to retain a fair share of earnings so that when a bad period comes it can weather the storm. Big corporations, with their vast borrowing power and with their ability to put away money because of the large capital structure, can weather the economic crises. The small business cannot. Therefore, it is our duty to make sure that small business does survive and

that the tax structure is such that small business is always in a position to contribute in a full measure to our Nation's welfare.

THE SMALL-BUSINESS ISSUE?

As I mentioned earlier, measured by volume, the speeches on the subject of small business in the 84th Congress reached a new high, but certainly if legislative accomplishment for small business did not reach a new low it came pretty close to it. This was because most of the small business speeches of my Democratic friends were tirades against President Eisenhower's small-business program and were not, as they should have been, informative debates on legislation. The almost continual barrage of misstatement of fact regarding the well-being of small business under this Republican administration was only for the purpose of blowing up a false issue. False issues usually meet the fate of the Biblical house which was built upon the sands; they are destined to perish in the quicksand of untruths.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SMALL BUSINESS

It may have been a source of great satisfaction to some Democrats to belittle the efforts of the present administration to provide every possible aid for small business. Unfortunately, however, this belittling criticism carried with it the unhappy conclusion that business as a whole was not important to our total economy. This Democratic Party line is ridiculous from any viewpoint. Our gross national product has now reached a record high, and to supply the things which permit us to enjoy this high standard of living there are more businesses in operation than ever before. There are more persons gainfully employed and our wages and salaries have reached unprecedented high levels in 1956. Personal income and the average weekly earnings in our factories are at the highest rate on record. All of these beacons on the road to prosperity have required the goods and services of our total business population. The most important point to remember is that small business has contributed its part and has shared in this unprecedented era of prosperity which has brought with it the highest standard of living in our history.

The vast majority of the people of this country are interested in results. The important thing, of course, is to have a program—that you must have before you can achieve results. President Eisenhower and his administration have had a program for small business which has been earnestly and forcefully put forward. This administration, under the laws previously enacted by the Congress and to the extent of its executive powers, has made it possible for small business to more nearly fulfil its vital role in our business life.

The President himself has stated that small business must remain the bulwark of our economy. President Eisenhower, in furtherance of his conviction, has established a Cabinet Committee on Small Business to study its problems and to make recommendations for both legislative proposals and administrative action. The Eisenhower administration realizes that ever during our most prosperous times some smaller business concerns will have their problems, many arising from unfair competition.

The Eisenhower administration is keenly aware that our economy and our way of life will continue to be strong and to flourish as long as our businessmen possess their skills, their inventiveness, their initiative, and their desire to compete one against the other. This administration has and will supplement these sterling qualities of our businessmen by making certain that everyone plays the game fairly and by rendering particular assistance to small firms. We Republicans know beyond any doubt that a vigorous and healthy small-business community is one of the best assurances we have for the continued success and prosperity of our Nation.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Small Business Administration, an independent agency of the Government and responsible in the executive department only to the President himself, has been the keystone of the President's program. As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business in the 83d Republican Congress, it was my privilege to introduce the bill which became the Small Business Act of 1953. It was a source of great gratification to have had this legislation so strongly supported by President Eisenhower. It is equally gratifying that the Small Business Administration has had the unqualified support of our great President throughout the 3 years of its existence.

Under the direction of President Eisenhower the Small Business Administration has continually improved its services to small business and has constantly sought ways and means to broaden the scope of its operations.

The essential requirement for the success of any program is leadership. The personal interest of the President has enabled the Small Business Administration to make progress never before achieved in any other program of assistance to small business. President Eisenhower's leadership has secured for SBA a brand of cooperation from all other departments and agencies of the Government which small-business programs have sorely lacked under previous administrations. The Small Business Administration has been successful because the requisite cooperation has been forthcoming.

As we know from information which has been supplied for the record on numerous occasions, the financial program entrusted to the Small Business Administration has been increasingly effective. The small-business loan program has been constantly expanded to serve small business everywhere and in practically every line of endeavor. The operation of the disaster loan program has been outstanding. The efficiency with which the Small Business Administration has moved into disaster areas has brought much favorable comment. Such comment from those who had suffered through the tragic hours of disaster and who had witnessed the terrible loss of life and destruction of property is the best evidence of SBA's efforts to carry out its mission with no other thought but to serve—and to serve well.

The Small Business Administration's program to secure civilian and military contracts for small-business concerns has been continually improved and enlarged. The Department of Defense and the General Services Administration, the two major agencies of the Government charged with the responsibility of procurement, have, in cooperation with the Small Business Administration, broadened the opportunity for small business participation in both prime and subcontract awards. Every civilian agency including the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Post Office Department now have small-business programs. The Department of Defense has used every proper means to encourage subcontracting with small business by the larger prime contractors. The subcontracting program has been particularly effective in the aircraft manufacturing industry. The joint agreements of the Department of Defense with SBA which permits setasides of military purchases to be reserved for the exclusive competition of small-business concerns continues to grow in dollar value as well as in small-business participants.

The management and production assistance programs have been constantly improved. These programs have enabled thousands of small businessmen to learn of new management techniques and production skills, an opportunity they would not have had except for the sound provisions in the Small Business Act of 1953, which has enabled the Small Business Administration to carry on this important work.

The Small Business Administration has been accepted as the spokesman and proponent of small business in the executive department of our Government. SBA does not have to peer through a knothole in the fence to learn the score as did its predecessor agencies. The Small Business Administration is a full-fledged member of President Eisenhower's team. It shares full membership in the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business.

It is well, I believe, to enumerate a few of SBA's other important functions as a member of the Eisenhower team.

The SBA is a key member of the Office of Defense Mobilization's Committee for the Maintaining of the Mobilization Base.

It has a leading role in the Production Equipment program which is designed to secure maximum utilization of Government-owned and Government-procured defense tools and facilities, especially machine tools.

The SBA shares the responsibility, in an advisory capacity, for direct loans under section 302 of the Defense Production Act which are granted to expedite the performance of defense contracts.

It takes part in the programs designed to encourage and stimulate the expansion of mining and the recovery of strategic metals and minerals for the national defense.

The SBA attends, as an observer, all meetings of the Business and Defense Services Administration's Industry Advisory Committees in order to advise

ODM and BDSA on any matter which may affect small business.

It provides special assistance to small business in securing priorities for scarce materials which are needed for the execution of defense contracts.

The Small Business Administration represents small-business concerns before the ODM in securing fast tax write-offs for national-defense expansion and in the replacement of facilities destroyed or damaged by disasters.

Even the most casual, but fair, observer will recognize the growing usefulness of the Small Business Administration to the small-business community. As this usefulness increases the conviction grows that the SBA should not only be an independent agency but it should be a permanent agency. I repeat, the Small Business Administration should be made a permanent, independent agency of our Government. It should not be made a political football each time the act comes up for extension. It is my purpose to introduce legislation designed to give the Small Business Administration a permanent status on the 1st day of the 85th Congress.

We must remember that the Small Business Administration is a peacetime agency, and I emphasize—the first peacetime agency exclusively devoted to the interests of small business in the history of our country. It was not born as a stopgap agency in the midst of war; it came into being in a Republican Congress with the assistance of a Republican President in recognition of the basic fact that the scales must always be kept in balance, otherwise the free-enterprise society to which we owe our allegiance might not survive.

Report to the People of the 21st Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I feel it is my duty to the electorate of the 21st Congressional District, New York, which I have the honor to represent, to make part of the official RECORD some of my more important activities in the 84th Congress.

On more important issues, I voted in favor of increased minimum wage; Federal aid for housing; Federal aid for road construction; increased payments for retired Government workers; wage increases for postal and other Government workers; mutual security; expanded social security to permit, among other things, women to retire at 62, and the disabled at 50; Federal aid for local anti-pollution facilities; broadened health research plans; increased Federal aid to farmers, including the soil bank; Federal eral aid for education, including the Powell amendment; the civil rights bill; the appropriation of money for small-business loans; strengthening of the Anti-Monopoly Act against big business; payments for disaster loans on people's homes; continued and increased defense appropriations; continued increased and expanded veterans' benefits; Federal assistance in flood control; the continuation and expansion of the school-milk program, and the resolution opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Important measures which I voted against were the Natural Gas Act and the attempt to increase postal rates.

Legislation was introduced by me to repeal section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code—billion-dollar giveaway—to combat juvenile delinquency; to increase the minimum wage to $1.25; to amend and revise the Immigration Act; to provide increased safety regulations for railroad workers and passengers; to amend the Railroad Retirement Act; to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to provide increased benefits in the Civil Service Retirement Act; to provide increased annuities for former FBI and other Government enforcement officials; to expand the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide increased coverage for retail employees; to amend the War Risk Insurance Act; to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from floods; to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department of civil defense; to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for payments made on account of education in public or private institutions; to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to require financial responsibility for damages to persons injured from the operation of any aircraft; to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes for all disabled individuals for their expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for any taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself. I have also introduced over 40 private bills providing relief under the present harsh immigration laws for residents of my district.

In my 1955 report, mention was made of my successful effort to save the Government several billion dollars by detection of a loophole in the internal-revenue laws. These efforts received nationwide approval by newspapers and distinguished Americans, in the following exact excerpts and quotations:

The Washington Evening Star, March 1, 1955:

BIG BUSINESS TAX WINDFALL CHARGES RATTLE REPUBLICANS

Charges that businesses have been given a five billion dollar windfall through a widening loophole in the 1954 Tax Revenue Act were before the Congress today.

The windfall case was laid before Congress by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat-Liberal, New York, in his maiden speech to the House.

Mr. ZELENKO first made the charge when speaking during the last week's debate for the proposed $20 deduction from individual's tax bills.

The charges apparently caught the Republican leadership unaware. GOP spokesmen have not yet refuted Mr. ZELENKO's declaration that the revenue loophole, in effect, provided corporations multi-billion-dollar tax forgiveness.

Labor, March 5, 1955:

HUGE NEW TAX LOOPHOLE—FRESHMAN SOLON CITES GIMMICK WHICH MAY COST UNCLE SAM BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

Another huge windfall loophole in last year's rich man's tax bill was pointed out this week by Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York. In his first speech as a freshman Member of the House, he caused a sensation by making serious charges which made Republican leaders and top administration officials run for cover.

The Milwaukee Journal, March 16, 1955:

A horrible blooper in last year's mammoth revision of the Federal tax cut has been turned up by the freshman Congressman from President Eisenhower's home district, HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York, Democrat-Liberal. The size of it can be guessed as high as $5 billion of revenue loss this year, if the provisions are not retroactively repealed at once.

The Providence Journal, March 20, 1955:

A freshman Member, Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York, a Manhattan tax lawyer, surprised his leaders by popping up with a charge that under the 1954 tax law, sponsored by Humphrey's Department, business was being allowed to take a double deduction for expenses. That would cost the Treasury not $2½ billion but $5 billion.

On March 24, 1955, the loophole section of the law was repealed. The remarks of the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable JERE COOPER, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date, were as follows:

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that our distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. ZELENKO, was the first member to introduce the bill dealing with the subject now under consideration. He introduced a bill to repeal section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code. He has done a great deal of work on this subject and deserves a great deal of credit for the splendid contributions he has made. He spoke on this subject during a consideration of the tax bill in the House. I want to give him full credit for the splendid contribution he has made and to acknowledge the debt of gratitude to him for the assistance he has given in meeting and dealing with this problem.

Further comment on this subject appeared in Labor, April 2, 1955:

The House unanimously, and the Senate, are expected to pass soon a bill repealing tax Secretary George M. Humphrey's blooper, that is, the rich man's tax bill provision which would enable corporations to count 2 years' expenses in 1, thus reducing their tax by at least $1 billion. The blooper was first exposed by Congressman ZELENKO (Democrat, New York).

On June 16, 1955, the New York Daily Mirror reported as follows:

President Eisenhower signed a bill Wednesday closing a loophole in the tax law under which business firms might have saved an estimated $1 billion in taxes.

On May 6, 1955, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator from Illinois, in writing to Mr. Sidney Barnett, a prominent citizen of the district, stated as follows:

DEAR MR. BARNETT: Congressman ZELENKO has done a marvelous job in exposing the tremendous abuses in section 462 of last year's tax bill. Seldom, if ever, has a freshman Congressman hit the bull's eye with such a bang.

With best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senator.

The American Forum, a national television discussion program, on May 27, 1956, had for one of its guests the Honorable Paul M. Butler, chairman of the National Democratic Committee, who, in the course of debate, stated as follows:

If you do come up with a balanced budget and you have not yet arrived at that point, $1 billion of that, of any surplus that may arise, should be credited to Congressman ZELENKO, a Democrat, of New York, who found that loophole in the 83d Congress tax bill, as you will remember.

ON OTHER SUBJECTS

The New York Daily News, January 18, 1955:

Representative ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York, has introduced a bill to set up a $50 million appropriation for combating juvenile delinquency.

The New York Post, January 18, 1955:

Freshman Representative ZELENKO, Washington Heights, Democrat-Liberal today reported strong support for his measure proposing a $50 million Federal grant to help States combat juvenile delinquency.

ZELENKO said governors of some States have promised to ask their Congressmen to back the proposal.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun, May 12, 1955:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO said yesterday he found a way for Congress to give away $30 million a year without costing the taxpayer 1 penny. He introduced a bill to provide an across-the-board 10-percent boost in pension benefits to retired Government workers and their survivors. He said the money would come from the growing surplus of the Civil Service Retirement Fund, which now exceeds $6 billion.

The New York Daily News, November 9, 1955:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat-Liberal, New York, proposes that at least 5,000 screened volunteers from the Armed Forces be put through a short training period to help combat narcotic smuggling.

The New York Herald Tribune, November 9, 1955:

A proposal that at least 5,000 members of the Armed Forces be screened on a voluntary basis and assigned, after a short training period, to a Federal agency to help stamp out the flow of illicit narcotics into this country, was made yesterday by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Manhattan Democrat.

The West Side News, December 8, 1955:

Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat-Liberal, New York, this week presented to the Congressional Committee on Education and Labor in San Juan, P. R., which investigated increased minimum wages for the island, a letter from Gov. Averell Harriman of New York asking minimum wage increases in Puerto Rico.

Congressman ZELENKO has stated, in releasing the Governor's letter, that thousands of his constituents of Puerto Rican origin have asked him to do his utmost to help raise minimum wage standards in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun, March 1, 1956:

A bill giving a better income-tax break to parents of college students as well as to teachers who will take advanced courses was presented to Congress today.

Introduced by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, New York Democrat, it would allow Federal tax income credit of 30 percent, but not exceeding $450 a year, of money paid for tuition charges.

The tax credit idea intended to lighten the financial load borne by students and their families is essentially that proposed by the American Council of Education.

The West Side News, March 29, 1956:

Congressman ZELENKO introduced a bill to amend title 3 of the Social Security Act to provide, where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits under the act, and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled when living.

In introducing the bill he said:

"Many of our elderly married citizens who in the twilight of their lives are subsisting on the bare minimum of social-security benefits are entitled to this additional protection from an appreciative government."

The West Side News, May 17, 1956:

AID CRIPPLED ON TAX PAYMENTS

Congressman ZELENKO introduced before Congress a bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes in the case of a disabled individual for expenses of transportation to and from work. He said this legislation was vitally necessary to help the gainfully employed handicapped person to continue to be self-sufficient. The bill also provides for an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun, July 19, 1956:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, New York, freshman legislator, who first called Congress' attention to a loophole in the 1954 tax law paving the way for its repeal in time to save the Government billions of dollars in tax forgiveness to corporations, says that he is now out to save a few more million.

This time he is seeking to prevent adoption of legislation which he claims would cost the Government some twenty to twenty-five million more than is necessary in connection with a tanker-chartering program.

The Washington Daily News, July 20, 1956:

READ ABOUT THIS ONE, TAXPAYER—THE SHIPPING BILL THAT SMELLS LIKE $25 MILLION

It would cost the taxpayer some $20 to $25 million, according to Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, New York. Up to now he has been fighting the battle against the tanker bill almost singlehandedly. Representative ZELENKO is a freshman legislator who first called Congress' attention to a loophole in the 1954 tax law, paving the way for this repeal in time to save the Government billions of dollars in tax forgiveness to corporations.

Drew Pearson, writing in his column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 25, 1956, and commenting on my efforts to block the tanker giveaway, said:

It takes alert Congressmen to make the wheels of democracy run efficiently. ZELENKO, New York Democrat * * * was alert, blocked this giveaway from sneaking through on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. Pearson again wrote in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 5, 1956:

One of the best watchdogs in our recent Congress was HERBERT ZELENKO, former champion wrestler at Columbia University and Congressman from Ike's former voting district in Manhattan. * * * He blocked two bills which would have cost the taxpayers money. One was to give a ship to friends of Dictator Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, and another to permit the sale of ships to Uncle Sam at an inflated value by McLean Industries.

Cognizant of the cosmopolitan nature of my district, I have supported those measures and ideals which are closest to the hearts of my constituents. Some written verbatim comments with respect to these activities I believe will be of interest to my constituents:

Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 3, New York County:

APRIL 2, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The officers and members wish to express to you their appreciation for the fine article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your remarks on "The Great Contribution of the Irish people to America" * * *.

With every good wish for your success and my own kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES M. GRUNDY.

On the same subject, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 17, 1955, had the following to say:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO of New York, in a speech before the House of Representatives, spoke on Irish Builders of America * * * Among other things, Congressman ZELENKO said: "Irish blood, brain and brawn have played a valiant part in the fabric of America. People of Irish descent may take a pardonable pride in the Irish contribution to the development and preservation of the American Government."

Royal Greek Embassy, Washington, D. C.:

APRIL 19, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT ZELENKO,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like you to know how much I appreciate your appropriate remarks in the House of Representatives on the 24th ult. on the occasion of the 134th anniversary of the independence of Greece.

With my reiterated thanks for this public expression of your philhellenic sentiments which are fully appreciated, not only by the Greek people and the Greek Government; but also, I am sure, by the Americans of Greek ancestry, I remain,

Very sincerely,

GEORGE V. MELAS,
Ambassador of Greece.

Jewish Community News, June 1956:

CONGRESSMAN ZELENKO RECEIVES SCROLL FROM 10TH ZOA DISTRICT

At the 35th annual meeting of district 10, Zionist Organization of America, held on

Monday evening, June 25, Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO was presented with a scroll citing his leadership in the community.

Embassy of Israel, Washington, D. C.:
MAY 16, 1955.

DEAR MR. ZELENKO: I have noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that on April 27, 1955, you saluted the State of Israel on the floor of the House of Representatives on the occasion of Israel's Independence Day. Please accept the expression of my deep appreciation.

Sincerely,
ABBA EBAN.

In 1954 I received from Manhattanville Post No. 1057 the American Legion citation for merit in recognition of outstanding service and accomplishment.

This, then, is a general outline of my congressional activities. I trust it has met the approval of my constituency and in some way has proved of benefit and value to all in our beloved United States of America.

Additional Hospital and Medical Attention for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, during the time that it has been my privilege to serve in Congress problems affecting the welfare of our veterans have been before us for consideration every year.

It has always been a pleasure, as well as a privilege, to support the efforts that have been made to improve the welfare of ex-service men, their widows, survivors, and dependents. No nation can long succeed that does not recognize and hold sacred the sacrifices of the men and women who answer the call of their country in the hour of emergency.

It is gratifying to realize there has been a general recognition of this duty and an obligation by Congress throughout the years. I hope the time will never come when there will be any lack of desire to be helpful.

Although the benefits provided for veterans and their dependents have been numerous and varied, yet there are many ways that remain for further improvement. Without attempting to enumerate them in detail, I do wish to express the opinion that steps should be taken, by legislation or by administrative means, to improve and expand the right of veterans to have greater hospital facilities and the benefit of additional medical attention. Too often I have found that because of restrictions, limitations, or administrative interpretations it is difficult, and sometimes impossible, for a veteran to gain admission to a veteran's hospital. This should not be so.

I trust that the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, which has already done an excellent job for our veterans, shall give this subject careful and favorable consideration.

Report to My Constituents of the 11th Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each 2 years I have rendered a report to the 600,000 citizens I represent in Marion County which makes up the 11th Congressional District of Indiana.

In 1952, at the end of the 82d Congress, my first summary was written as a Republican Congressman serving as a minority Member in a Democratic Congress under a Democratic President, Harry Truman. The chairman and majority of the members of each subcommittee and committee were Democrats, the leadership was Democratic. The Republicans were knit tightly together as the party of loyal opposition fighting for economy, integrity, decentralization of Government, freedom from controls, and security for the country from enemies abroad and at home.

In 1954, at the end of the 83d Congress, my report was written from the viewpoint of a majority Member in a Republican Congress under a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. The responsibility of the Republican Party was clearly identified and readily accepted by both the executive and the legislative. In 1953, according to Congressional Quarterly, the new President submitted 44 proposals. Congress approved 32, giving President Eisenhower a record of 72.7 percent cooperation by a Republican Congress in his first year. In 1954, Congressional Quarterly states that President Eisenhower submitted 232 legislative requests of which 150 were approved by a Republican Congress for a cooperation score of 64.7 percent.

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS ENACTS 68.7 PERCENT OF EISENHOWER PROGRAM

Averaging the percentages for the 1st and 2d session of the Republican 83d Congress it becomes apparent that President Eisenhower received an overall support of 68.7 percent based on the Congressional Quarterly figures. The White House itself credited the Republican 83d Congress with passing 53 out of 64 bills requested by the President for a cooperation score of 83 percent for the 2-year period. This 83d "do something" Congress cut Government expenditures and reduced taxes by a whopping $7.4 billion of which individuals received $4.7 billion. Besides, it added 10 million to those eligible to receive social security benefits.

After 230 days in session and over 935 hours of debate, the House of Represenatives of the 84th Democratic Congress will adjourn today. This report to my constituents is prepared from the viewpoint of a Republican Congressman serving as a minority Member in a Democratic Congress under a Republican President. Again, the chairman and the majority of the members of every single subcommittee and committee are Democrats. The Committee on Rules, legislative traffic policemen for the House, again has 8 Democrat members and but 4 Republican members. The leadership is Democratic.

In spite of promises to support the Eisenhower program which were offered by the Democrats during the 1954 congressional campaigns, the record clearly indicates that the Democratic 84th Congress fell short of the record of cooperation with President Eisenhower made by the Republican 83d. According to Congressional Quarterly, a news service which has never been accused of being pro-Republican, the President submitted 207 proposals in 1955, of which only 96 were approved by the Democratic Congress which is a percentage score of only 46.3 percent cooperation. In 1956 the White House submitted 224 proposals of which 103 were approved by Congress, a percentage score of only 45.9 percent.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS ENACTS ONLY 46.1 PERCENT OF EISENHOWER PROGRAM

Averaging the percentages of the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Democratic Congress, it is apparent that President Eisenhower received an overall support of 46.1 percent based on the CQ figures. When you compare this 46.1 percent with the 68.7 percent which represents the cooperation extended by the Republican 83d Congress, it becomes obvious that it does make a difference as to which party controls the 2 Houses of Congress.

It makes quite a difference to the taxpayer, too, as to which party controls the Congress. A compilation of appropriations over the past 12 years established beyond question the difference between the 2 parties in the matter of spending and proves that the Republican Party, by its record, is truly entitled to be known as the economy party. In the past 25 fiscal years our Federal budget has been balanced only 4 times, twice during the Republican 80th Congress, once during fiscal year 1951, and again this year under the administration of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Let us look at the record:

APPROPRIATIONS (EXCLUDING PAYMENTS FROM TRUST FUNDS)

Democratic 79th Congress, fiscal 1946–47: $105,514,346,275.

Republican 80th Congress, fiscal 1948–49: $77,658,368,635.

Democratic 81st Congress, fiscal 1950–51: $127,542,497,308.

Democratic 82d Congress, fiscal 1952–53: $187,117,415,303.

Republican 83d Congress, fiscal 1954–55: $123,316,700,300.

Democratic 84th Congress, fiscal 1956–57: $128,566,274,914.

These appropriations during the 12 years indicated exclude approximately $83,325,000,000 payable from trust fund receipts. It is interesting to note that appropriations by the Democratic 82d Congress were the second largest in our entire history as a nation being exceeded only by the $204,863,924,329 appropriated by the 77th Democratic Congress during World War II.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS HAS BEEN WEAK BUT NOT VICIOUS

Mr. Speaker, even the kindliest of critics must admit that his has been a

weak Congress. The Democrats have advanced no challenging legislative programs and no major reforms. They have been so busy finding new ways to squander money that they have failed to build up a legislative record to which they can point with any great pride, althought the leadership responsibility was clearly theirs. To the Republicans, this was a frustrating Congress.

Only five times since the Civil War have both Houses of Congress been controlled by a political party opposed to that of the President. Contrary to predictions, there was no violent opposition to the President's program as such. It wasn't that kind of a war. It wasn't a cold war either. It was a disorganized struggle of sabotage and sit-down strike with plenty of time out for looting and raiding the Treasury. The sense of positive drive which was sometimes evident in the Republican 83d Congress was lacking.

THE BUDGET—SPENDING

The 84th Democratic Congress has apparently cinched two records. It looks like 2,875 to 2,880 bills will be passed during the 234 days it has been in session during the past 2 years for a new, all-time high. It is equally obvious that this Congress has appropriated more money to run the Federal Government than any other Congress in peacetime or time of cold war.

That the Federal budget was balanced this year with a $1.7 billion surplus to be applied to the Federal debt was no fault of the Democrats. The appropriations made this year at the height of the congressional spending spree will not be felt until next year, meantime unusually large revenue resulting from the high level of business and individual prosperity during the Eisenhower peacetime prosperity has enabled the Treasury to end the year in the black.

For fiscal year 1957, the President submitted to Congress requests for appropriations aggregating $59.9 billion. The House approved $57.7 billion while the Senate voted some $2.6 billion more for a total of $60.3 billion. Conference agreements between the House and the Senate on the individual bills resulted in a final total of $59.7 billion. The major increases of the Senate were $1,149,000,000 for defense, $686 million for foreign aid, $81 million for public works, and $75 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor. Eight hundred million dollars more was actually approved for the Department of Defense than the President requested. Two billion, five hundred million dollars was authorized for farm price supports more than in the January budget.

Only a Presidential veto can now save the taxpayers from authorizations for rivers and harbors projects, many of which have not been adequately screened. The commendable restraint of recent Congresses which refused to add new authorizations during debate on the floor was suddenly scrapped and authorizations were added on a "pork-barrel basis." While some of these projects may have been worthy, failure to provide for scrutiny by the Bureau of the Budget and consideration by trained subcommittee and committee personnel evidenced little concern for economy as compared to election year politics by a Democrat-controlled Congress. This may well be characterized as the "giveaway Congress of the century."

I believe it is fair to say that the foundation for today's prosperity was worked out in close cooperation between President Eisenhower and the 83d Republican Congress. Controls were removed, a $7.4 billion tax cut was made of which $4.7 went to individuals and the budget was brought into balance. The effect of the spendthrift programs of the last 2 years will be felt for at least 5 years in the future. What this fiscal irresponsibility will do toward increasing inflationary pressures and preventing future reductions in taxes is difficult to predict.

CIVIL RIGHTS

After introducing a resolution to make a discharge petition possible so that H. R. 627, President Eisenhower's civil rights bill might be brought to the floor, it was gratifying to me to have the Committee on Rules agree, finally, to schedule floor consideration for this measure.

The House approved this moderate and evolutionary civil rights bill by a vote of 279 to 126. This civil rights bill extended no new privileges. It would have set up a commission to investigate denials of civil rights, would have elevated the civil rights group in the Department of Justice to a separate division under the control of an Assistant Attorney General and would have protected the right to vote by empowering the Attorney General to initiate special civil suits against groups depriving, or about to deprive persons of their civil rights. The Senate did not consider the civil rights bill. The House vote was 168 Republicans for, 24 against and 111 Democrats for, 102 against.

DEFENSE

President Eisenhower's defense proposals sent to the 84th Congress stressed continued improvement in our armed services' combat readiness and effectiveness without straining the Nation's economy. For defense in the current fiscal year the President requested $34.1 billion in new funds. The Democratic Congress approved $34.6 billion, insisting on authorizing $900 million more for the Air Force than requested, finally agreed in conference committee that the additional funds need not be earmarked for B–52 bombers alone but, "the added funds should be utilized to expedite production of heavy bombers, tankers, and other essential Air Force weapons to the optimum limit of existing facilities."

The Democratic Congress did not renew its veto power, enacted in the first session, which made it easier for the Defense Department to remain in civilian type commercial operations that often competed directly with private businesses. Instead of having to come before the Committee on Appropriations to justify dispensing with these commercial operations, the Department is now given greater latitude.

Besides extending the Defense Production Act with provisions to require industrial dispersion of new plants, the 84th Congress extended the Renegotiation Act for 2 years and increased the exemption to $1 million, provided for an $87 million stockpile of tungsten, asbestos, and so forth.

Public Law 968 appropriated $2.1 billion for military bases, housing, and so forth.

The 84th Congress gave career status to Reserve Army and Air Force officers, put the Armed Forces under social security effective January 1 and equalized survivors benefits.

FARM PROGRAM

The farm problem was one of the most stubborn problems confronting the Congress. The farm bill which finally became law after exasperating delays and emphasis on partisanship by the Democrats was a barely statisfactory compromise.

The Democrats and a few Republican members of the farm bloc, chiefly from one-crop States, wanted a return to rigid price supports, the very system under which today's surpluses had been accumulated and today's low prices generated. Accordingly, the Democrats passed a bill to return to rigid price supports of 90 percent of parity. Parity is a formula intended to correlate the price a farmer gets for his crop with the price he paid for his supplies.

The President vetoed this bill. Although 173 Republicans and 38 Democrats voted to sustain President Eisenhower, 182 Democrats and 20 Republicans opposed him. The two-thirds vote required to override a veto was not obtained. The House and Senate Agriculture Committees went to work again and produced what is now Public Law 540.

It includes a $1.2 billion, two-part soil-bank plan with no authority for 1956 prepayments on 1957 crops. Administration foes in Congress argued that such payments might influence voting in November. Agriculture Secretary Benson decided to make soil-bank payments this year to farmers who plowed up some of their plantings. He did so and by the sign-up deadline of July 27 had obligated $224 million, which will be paid out this fall.

One-year spending under the soil bank is limited to $750 million for the short-term acreage reserve, $450 million under the long-range conservation reserve.

Public Law 540 also retains flexible supports for the basic commodities but gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to try a two-price plan on rice if he wishes; places feed grains at 76 percent of parity for this year; and increases from $300 million to $500 million the amount of surpluses that can be donated for disaster, famine, and foreign relief.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Government employees fared well sometimes as a result of administration pressures on Congress, othertimes as a result of a generous Congress opposing the President.

Legislation protecting classified employees against salary cuts in cases of job reclassification, bills given regular status to indefinite and temporary postal substitutes are cases in point. Last year's 7.5 percent pay increase for classified employees and 8.6 percent pay boost for

postal workers plus fringe benefits, gave Federal workers one of the largest single pay increases in history.

Many new retirement benefits for Federal employees are contained in Public Law 854 which was passed by this Congress. Annuities are increased for Federal workers and their widows and dependent widowers on the average of approximately 25 percent and those for surviving children by approximately 150 percent.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The first session of the 84th Congress authorized the President, by an overwhelming bi-partisan vote to use American Armed Forces to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions.

Both Chambers adopted unanimously, a resolution putting Congress on record as opposing the United Nations seating of Communist China. The Democrat leadership and majority in the Senate did not bring up the Bricker amendment for final action.

FOREIGN AID

The President requested $4.9 billion in new appropriations for mutual security, or foreign aid, compared to $2.7 for the fiscal year just ahead.

The House approved $3.7 billion, the Senate approved $4.1 billion the House-Senate finally agreed on $3.8 billion. I voted against the entire foreign aid program on the basis that Congress has lost control of the funds for the whole area of spending. There is now an $8.7 billion carryover in the pipeline even if not one cent were appropriated this year. This carryover plus the counterpart funds available abroad, together with the new authorization makes $12.9 billion which the Executive can obligate, deobligate, and reobligate without checking back with the Congress. I do not believe that represents responsible legislative stewardship over the taxpayers' money, no matter which party is in power.

There is a definite and noticeable restiveness about annual renewals of the blank check aid authorizations evidenced by the fact that both the Senate and the House have authorized sweeping investigations of foreign aid. Both debate and voting on mutual security this year disclosed some decline in enthusiasm on the part of many southern Members who had once been strong supporters.

FOREIGN TRADE

The President barely succeeded in getting through his reciprocal trade extension bill last year. The vote on the resolution to consider H. R. 1 was probably the critical vote. It passed 193 to 192 on February 17, 1955. I supported the President. The President's major foreign trade achievement in Congress this year was in winning further simplification in customs procedures. Public Law 927 shifts valuations to export value alone, with certain exceptions. Authorization for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, a key point in President Eisenhower's foreign trade program, was not brought to the floor in either House.

HEALTH

Public Law 911 is an omnibus law designed to reduce the shortage of nurses and health facilities and to improve mental health care authorizing Federal grants for training and extending the Hill-Burton Act which authorized up to $210 million a year for hospital construction. Public Law 835 authorizes $90 million over 3 years for the construction of research facilities. The 84th Congress also authorized $4 million for a dental research building at the National Institutes of Health and the establishment of a National Library of Medicine.

HOUSING

The 84th Congress revised the National Housing Act through Public Law 1020 extending to September 30, 1959 FHA home improvement loan authority. Loan maturities all increased from 3 years to 5 and maximums are raised to $3,500 for single-family dwellings, to $15,000 for nonsingle family units. FHA can insure up to 90 percent on dwellings costing not more than $8,100 per family unit built for elderly residents by nonprofit organizations. FHA mortgage insurance authority is increased by $3 billion. The military housing program is changed to allow a $16,500 maximum per unit with an overall ceiling of $2.3 billion and a cutoff date at the end of 1957.

Additional public housing is authorized at 35,000 units a year for this fiscal year and next but is tied to urban renewal in the local community. This is almost exactly the program the President wanted. The Democrats wanted a much larger program, 135,000 public housing units a year for 4 years. Public Law 898 extends the Veterans' Administration's home loan guaranty program to July 25, 1958.

IMMIGRATION

The President asked fundamental revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law, which opponents had long contended was unfair to some racial and ethnic groups. Nothing substantial was done by Congress. The result: An Eisenhower defeat.

LABOR

The President for the fourth time vainly recommended amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Democratic leadership, although making a campaign issue of Taft-Hartley repeal never seriously took up the issue in either house when they had a healthy Democratic majority to work with. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Education and Labor in the House met less frequently than in many other sessions. Since a majority of both parties supported the Taft-Hartley Act when it was originally passed in the 80th Congress, the Democratic leadership evidently feared that their party, too, would have been deeply split had the issue reached the floor for consideration.

NATURAL RESOURCES—POWER

The Republican administration and the Democratic Congress fought inconclusively over power projects. The Democrats compiled a pro-public-power record; the Republicans took a pro-private-power stand, combining the resources of Federal, local governments, and private capital to get the maximum power at the lowest cost to the taxpayer. The Hells Canyon public-power project on the Idaho-Oregon border was killed in the Senate. The House in turn killed a Senate-approved bill granting the State of New York authority to develop powerplants along the Niagara. Likewise, the House rejected a $156 million Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion bill, but both bodies came to an agreement to authorize the $1.6 billion development of the upper Colorado River Basin in a 5-State area. The only inroads Federal power could make in the State of Indiana would be through authorization of federally built atomic reactors. Efforts by advocates of public power to put the Government into the atomic electric power business were halted by House Republicans when a bill, S. 4146, granting $400 million to build pilot reactors failed 203 to 191. This measure came to the floor without the sanction of the administration and without any consultations with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Due to the devastation and hardship wrought on many sections of the country during recent floods, this Congress was prompted to pass the Flood Insurance Act of 1956, establishing a $5 billion insurance and reinsurance program to assist flood victims.

This Congress also passed Public Law 660, increasing by $1 million annually Federal research grants to the States for water pollution and passed 8 significant reclamation and flood-control projects.

POSTAL

The administration supported a raise in postal rates to overcome the deficit of the Post Office Department. In 1955, in spite of the wage increase to postal workers, the deficit was whittled to $363 million, as compared to the 1952 Democratic administration's postal deficit of $727 million.

The House passed by 217 to 165 a bill to require a 4-cent stamp on first-class letters and to raise the airmail rate from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce. This measure was killed in the Senate Post Office Subcommittee by a Democratic majority and the administration's efforts to offset the Post Office Department deficit failed.

REORGANIZATION

Pending before the 84th Democratic Congress were 19 major reports of the Second Hoover Commission Reports and 309 bills to implement the recommendations contained in these reports. The bipartisan Hoover Commission made a total of 314 recommendations of which 142 require legislative action. The balance can be enacted by administrative orders. A majority of the bills introduced were referred to the committee on which I serve, the House Committee on Government Operations. I constantly contacted our Democratic chairman, urging that action be taken on these measures which would result in increased efficiency and economy, but only one ever came out of committee to be passed by the Congress. Public Law 863 implements some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for the reform of Government budgeting and accounting procedures. The law requires submission of budget information on program costs and accomplishments, departmental budgeting and accounting on an accrued cost basis and

simplification of the subdivision in appropriations for funds. Even then, the bill was weakened by the House refusing to go along with the proposal that Congress appropriate funds on an accrued expenditure basis. Meanwhile, those recommendations which needed no legislative action were being implemented in the Federal Government by the Eisenhower administration at a savings of several billions to the taxpayer.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Federal aid to school construction bill drew heavy support from the Democrat majority and lesser enthusiasm from the Republican side of the aisle. After days of debating, the House approved 225 to 192 an amendment to deny Federal funds to school districts or States that did not comply with the United States Supreme Court's decision against racial segregation in public schools. Then, by a vote of 261 to 158, the House refused a motion to send the bill back to its Labor and Education Committee for reconsideration and defeated the bill on a final rollcall vote of 224 to 194. The 84th Congress did authorize a $378 million extension of Federal aid to school districts overburdened by Federal activities.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND RETIREMENT

When the Republicans replaced the previous administration in Washington, only 47 percent of the aged were eligible for social-security benefits. The Republicans immediately brought into the social-security program 3,600,000 self-employed farm owners and operators and 4,500,000 others, including domestic workers, ministers, accountants, architects, engineers, State and local government employees, and so forth, as well as increasing retirement and death benefits. The first session of the Democratic 84th Congress showed a callous indifference to continuing improvements in the Social Security System. The single exception was a bill supported by both parties raising the limitation on the amount of railroad retirement annuities for spouses to the maximum payable under social security. The second session, however, enacted two changes in the social-security law. The first places some 800,000 women on Federal pension rolls by dropping the retirement age from 65 to 62, with reduced benefit payments. Widows can claim benefits at 62 with no reduction in payments. The second allows 250,000 totally and permanently disabled workers to draw retirement pensions at the age of 50. Social security payroll deductions beginning January 1957, will be increased one-fourth percent each for employer and employee, and three-eights percent for the self-employee.

TAXES

The contrast between Democrat tax-and-spend policies and Republican economies is dramatically presented in the record of the Eisenhower administration. In addition to the huge $7.4 billion tax cut of the Republican 83d Congress, Government spending was reduced more than $19 billion. These two factors contributed in a major way to the generation of unparalleled prosperity based on a record of economy of almost $400 billion. Fiscal 1956 ended with a balanced budget. The national debt was reduced. The budget for fiscal 1957 promises another surplus.

The Democrats who said that individuals would not benefit from the Republican tax cuts which actually put $4.6 billion directly into the pockets of the wage earner and his family, returned to Washington last January with tentative plans to carry out an individual income tax reduction. Even though the leadership was theirs, the only move they made toward a tax reduction was to have a subcommittee of the House Committee on Ways and Means study the Internal Revenue Code during the adjournment of Congress this fall.

In fact the record on income taxes shows during the period of 1900–56:

Democrats: Enacted the first Federal income-tax law in 1913.

Democrats: Voted 14 out of the 15 tax increases since 1913.

Democrats: Have put low-income workers on the tax rolls. During 20 years, Democrats added 44,900,000 persons, chiefly low-income workers, to the tax rolls.

Democrats: Have drastically increased taxes on low-income families by reducing exemptions from $2,500 for a married couple, to $1,000; from $1,000 for a single worker, to $500.

Republicans: Enacted 7 out of the 10 reductions in income taxes.

Republicans: Have enacted only 1 of the 15 tax increases since 1913.

The 84th Congress extended the 52 percent corporation income tax rate to April 1, 1957—Public Law 458—and declined to cut excise taxes generally. Public Law 1010 is the exception which drops the 10 percent excise tax on amusement admissions of 90 cents or less.

TRANSPORTATION

The Democrat-controlled Congress delayed passage of the administration's comprehensive highway plan in 1955 because of a disagreement over the method of financing. The second session finally approved the proposed legislation, and President Eisenhower signed into law the biggest highway building program in history. It is to cost an estimated $32.9 billion of which the Federal share will be $27.7 billion. A Federal user's tax is expected to provide an income of $14.8 billion in added revenue over a period of 16 years. This program will provide a 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System linking State capitals and major cities with dual-lane, limited-access highways. It will take 13 years to complete.

Also authorized is an additional 3-year regular Federal-aid highway program in which the cost is shared equally between the Federal and the State governments.

In the line of shipping, this Congress authorized the building of the atom-powered merchant ship. This new ship will be a joint undertaking of the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The House voted increases in veterans' pensions and disability payments, but the Senate shelved the legislation. Both Chambers extended the veterans' home-loan program; extended social-security coverage to all military personnel; provided medical care for dependents of military personnel; raised the pay of medical and dental officers in the Armed Forces; continued the veterans' educational-aid program; raised the pay and allowances of military personnel; extended the dependents' assistance law; authorized loans to veterans for farm homes.

Voting record of CHARLES B. BROWNSON on major legislation of Eisenhower program

1ST SESS., 1955

House rollcall	Description and result	Date	BROWNSON vote	Eisenhower position	BROWNSON support
3	H. J. Res. 159.—Authorize President to use Armed Forces to protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions. Passed. Yeas 410, nays 3.	Jan. 25	Yea	Yea	Supported.
4	H. R. 587.—Veterans' education benefits, continued accrual of education benefits. Yeas 366, nays 0	Jan. 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
5	H. R. 3005.—Draft extension amendment extends military draft and dependent's assistance benefits. Yeas 394, nays 4.	Feb. 8	Yea	Yea	Supported.
6 (17)	H. R. 3828.—Salary adjustment for judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress. Yeas 283, nays 118.	Feb. 16	Yea	Yea	Supported.
10 (8 and 9)	H. Res. 142.—The resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1, reciprocal trade bill. On agreeing to resolution. Yeas 193, nays, 192.	Feb. 17	Yea	Yea	Supported.
11 (12 and 83)	H. R. 1.—Reciprocal trade, extends authority for President to make tariff agreements. On motion to recommit with instructions. Yeas 199, nays 206.	Feb. 18	Nay	Nay	Supported.
15 (1 and 33)	H. R. 4259.—Extends existing corporation and excise tax rates for 1 year. On motion to recommit with instructions to delete $20 credit for each personal exemption. Yeas 205, nays 210.	Feb. 25	Yea	Yea	Supported.
19	H. R. 4720.—Provides incentives for members of the armed services by increasing certain military pay and allowances. Yeas 396, nays 1.	Mar. 10	Yea	Yea	Supported.
27	H. Res. 170.—Declares that the House of Representatives opposes sale of synthetic rubber facilities to private enterprise. Yeas 132, nays 283.	Mar. 22	Nay	Nay	Supported.
29	H. Res. 171.—Disapproves of sale of synthetic rubber facilities to Shell Oil Co. as recommended by Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. Yeas 137, nays 276.	Mar. 23	Nay	Nay	Supported.
37 (23, 38, 39, 50, 51).	H. R. 4644.—Moss amendment to raise postal pay an average 8.2 percent instead of 7.5 percent administration proposed. Yeas 224, nays 189.	Apr. 20	Nay	Nay	Supported.

Voting record of CHARLES B. BROWNSON on major legislation of Eisenhower program—Continued

1ST SESS., 1955—continued

House rollcall	Description and result	Date	BROWNSON vote	Eisenhower position	BROWNSON support
48 (46 and 47)	H. R. 12.—Restore rigid supports at 90 percent parity for 5 basic commodities. Yeas 206, nays 201, present 5	May 5	Nay	Nay	Supported.
52 (57)	H. Res. 223.—Would prohibit amendments to Hawaii and Alaska statehood bill including amendments to permit separate action on each territory. Yeas 323, nays 66.	May 9	Yea	Nay	Opposed.
62	On Vinson amendment to Department of Defense Appropriation bill to eliminate sec. 639 which forced Defense Department to come to congressional committees before terminating business-type activities. This section was the subject of a strong Presidential attack when he signed the legislation. Yeas 184, nays 202.	May 12	Yea	Yea	Supported.
72	H. R. 2851.—Makes available agricultural commodities owned by the CCC to persons in need in areas of acute distress. Yeas 344, nays 1, present 3.	May 25	Yea	Yea	Supported.
79	S. 2061.—Raises pay of postal workers an average of 8 percent. Administration proposal after President's veto of 8.59 percent raise had been sustained. Yeas 410, nays 1.	June 7	Yea	Yea	Supported.
80	H. R. 5923.—Expedites survey and construction of Inter-American Highway. Yeas 353, nays 13	June 8	Yea	Yea	Supported.
93	H. R. 6040.—Custom's simplification. Motion to recommit bill which amends Tariff Act of 1930 and repeals obsolete provisions. Recommit with instructions. Yeas 143, nays 232.	June 22	Nay	Nay	Supported.
95	H. R. 6992.—Extends for 1 year existing temporary increase in the public debt ceiling, to $281 billion. Yeas 267, nays 56.	June 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
99 (100)	H. R. 3005.—Conference adds doctor's draft law to draft extension as passed by House. Motion to recommit conference report including doctor's draft. Yeas 171, nays 221.	June 28	Yea	Nay	Opposed.
105 (110)	S. 2090.—Mutual Security Act of 1954 amendments (foreign aid). Authorizes $3,285,800,000. Yeas, 273 nays 128.	June 30	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
109	H. R. 3210.—Water diversion. Authorizes increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway. (Similar pocket-vetoed in 1954.) Motion to recommit. Yeas 74, nays 316.	July 6	Yea	Yea	Supported.
129	H. R. 7000.—A bill to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, referred to by its opponents as a modified UMT measure. It spells out the individual's military obligation. Yeas 315, nays 78.	July 25	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
132 (130 and 133)	H. R. 7474.—Highway construction. On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Eisenhower program for Democrats 12-year plan with increased fuel and highway taxes. Yeas 193, nays 221.	July 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
141	S. 2576.—Housing. Authorizes construction of only 35,000 public housing units a year for 2 years, improvement of housing, elimination of slums and the conservation of urban communities. Yeas 396, nays 3.	July 29	Yea	Yea	Supported.

NOTE.—Using Congressional Quarterly, the congressional record of debate, and information from the White House as a basis, this record indicates that I supported President Eisenhower 21 times and opposed him 4 times during the 1st sess. of the 84th Cong. for an Eisenhower support percentage of 84 percent and an opposition percentage of 16 percent with the opposition centered around separate consideration for Hawaiian statehood, the doctor's draft amendment, $3.3 billion of mutual security authorization (foreign aid) and the increase of individual military contribution by those largely under 21 years of age. In the ground rules employed, all appropriation bills have been eliminated as being more or less noncontroversial and an attempt has been made to select 1 decisive vote on each matter.

2D SESS., 1956

House rollcall	Description and result	Date	BROWNSON vote	Eisenhower position	BROWNSON support
3	H. R. 8780.—Farm machinery tax. Relieves farmers from paying excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels for farm use. Yeas 387, nays 0.	Jan. 31	Yea	Yea	Supported.
5	H. R. 7993.—Navy shipbuilding and conversion. Authorizes $1.4 billion for construction of 22 combat vessels, an ammunition ship, landing and service craft, for converting 4 aircraft carriers and a nuclear reactor. Yeas 360, nays 3.	Feb. 1	Yea	Yea	Supported.
14	H. R. 3383.—Authorizes construction of the $760 million upper Colorado River irrigation and reclamation project. Yeas 256, nays 136.	Mar. 1	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
16	H. R. 9166.—Extends for 1 year existing corporate tax income rates and existing excise tax rates on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, gasoline, automobiles, trucks, and buses. Yeas 366, nays 4.	Mar. 13	Yea	Yea	Supported.
20 (19)	H. R. 8320.—Extends the school milk and brucellosis eradication programs through June 30, 1958. Yeas 406, nays 0.	Mar. 21	Yea	Yea	Supported.
23 (24)	On Martin (Republican, Massachusetts) motion to recommit the conference report on H. R. 12, Agricultural Act of 1956, with instructions to substitute 82.5 percent supports instead of Democrats rigid 90 percent of parity for the 1956 crop. Yeas 181, nays 238.	Apr. 11	Yea	Yea	Supported.
25	H. R. 9893.—Authorizes $2 billion for military construction at certain installations. Yeas 377, nays 3	Apr. 12	Yea	Yea	Supported.
27	H. R. 12.—Passage of Democrat's rigid farm support bill over President Eisenhower's veto. Yeas 202, nays 211.	Apr. 18	Nay	Nay	Supported.
36	H. R. 10660.—Amend Federal-Aid Road Act by authorizing a $51.5 billion 13 year national highway construction program. Provides for increased taxes to finance program. Yeas 388, nays 19.	Apr. 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
46	On Allen amendment to Department of Defense Appropriation bill to delete provision which makes it more difficult for the Government to get out of business-type activities. Yeas 222, nays 156.	May 10	Yea	Yea	Supported.
54 (39, 40, 41, and 42)	H. R. 10875.—Revised farm bill including soil bank provisions. Yeas 305, nays 59	May 23	Yea	Yea	Supported.
56	H. R. 10285.—Merges production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, provides for retirement of Government capital and for supervision of production credit associations. Farm credit. Yeas 246, nays 4.	May 31	Yea	Yea	Supported.
63	H. R. 11356.—Mutual Security Act of 1956. Provides for a 1-year extension of act and authorizes appropriations of $3.6 billion for the mutual security program. Yeas 275, nays 122.	June 11	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
72 (71)	H. R. 9540.—To authorize Federal money to help States combat water pollution. Yeas 338, nays 31	June 13	Yea	Yea	Supported.
78 (77)	H. R. 7886.—Veterans' benefits. To increase rates and liberalize the basis for payment of non-service-connected pensions. Yeas 364, nays 51.	June 27	Yea	Nay	Opposed.
92 (82, 89, 90, and 91)	H. R. 7535.—Federal aid to school construction. Yeas 194, nays 224	July 5	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
94	H. R. 11380.—Postal rates. To raise postage rates in an effort to decrease the Post Office Department's deficit. Yeas 217, nays 166.	July 6	Yea	Yea	Supported.
101	H. R. 12038.—Service-connected pension rates. Increases service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances. Yeas 391, nays 0.	July 12	Yea	Yea	Supported.
104	H. R. 11708.—Agricultural trade. Amends the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954 to provide an additional $1.5 billion to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities. Yeas 369, nays 6.	July 18	Yea	Yea	Supported.
111 (106, 110)	H. R. 627.—Civil rights. To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. Yeas 279, nays 126.	July 23	Yea	Yea	Supported.
115	On amendment to Defense Department appropriation bill requiring Secretary of Defense to notify Congress of proposed transfer of work to private industry and providing a 60-day period during which either Chamber of Congress could disapprove. Yeas 201, nays 185.	July 24	Nay	Nay	Supported.
117 (116)	H. R. 12061.—Federal civilian atomic powerplant acceleration. On motion to recommit. Yeas 203, nays 191	July 24	Yea	Yea	Supported.
119	Housing bill.—Compromise between Senate version of 135,000 units a year, House committee version of 60,000 units, and House version of 35,000. Extends and improves FHA property improvement loan program, authorizes $3 billion FHA insurance, etc. On amendment to rule to provide for striking out title V. Yeas 92, nays 299.	July 25	Nay	Nay	Supported.
123	Rule on authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado. Yeas 179, nays 194	July 26	Absent	Yea	Absent.
131	H. Res. 604 to consider H. R. 7850 authorizing the construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho. Yeas 173, nays 168.	July 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.

NOTE.—Support of the President's program is measured by many things; work in the committee, debate on the floor of the House, cooperation with the executive department and supporting as many administration measures as possible. Statistically, the best compilation of legislation in which the President was interested indicates that I supported him 20 times, opposed him 4 times, and was absent attending a meeting with General Twining at the time 1 rollcall vote was taken. It is, of course, impractical to indicate support on voice votes, division and teller votes, which are not recorded but are often of far greater importance than the final rollcall vote.

Report to the People of the 11th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, Congress has acted upon many bills during this second session that is approaching adjournment. All of them merit comment; but, as has been my practice since being a Member of Congress, I would like to report on those that are most beneficial to my constituents.

At the outset I wish to state that, because of the differences in opinions existing between Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, not all of the measures I favored were enacted into law in the form that I would like them to be in. Then, too, not all legislation I favored was considered. This is natural under the procedures in our representative form of government, and more so when the President and his administration are of one political party and the control of the Congress rests in the majority of another political party.

Another factor that has retarded the development of certain projects that we in the 11th District consider desirable has been the urgent need for restoring order to our Federal fiscal affairs. Now that the Eisenhower administration has ended deficit financing and achieved fiscal solvency, it is my expectation that American citizens can look forward to accelerated progress in the development of our economy, the conservation of our resources, and the preservation of our American heritage.

President Eisenhower again at the beginning of this session of this Congress submitted an extensive and worthy legislative program asking for soundly progressive action that would benefit all Americans equally.

Since all of my constituents live by or within close proximity to the Great Lakes I know they are all interested in the progress of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which will do so much to strengthen our Nation economically and militarily. The Corps of Engineers has recommended modification of existing projects on the Great Lakes to provide for further improvements to the channels in the St. Marys River, the Straits of Mackinac, the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River. So that an adequate draft for safe navigation would be possible, Congress passed legislation authorizing the controlling depth of the connecting channels to be not less than 27 feet. The estimated Federal cost for this channel improvement is $115,818,000 for new work and $200,000 annually for maintenance.

Living in a district that has approximately 1,000 miles of shoreline, we are aware that much work is needed to improve our harbors. During 1956 alone Congress appropriated $53,000 for the St. James Harbor at Beaver Island, with local interests providing an additional $7,500. One hundred and ten thousand dollars was appropriated for plans and specifications to initiate dredging work at the Cheboygan Harbor and River. Funds have been made available to permit the completion of the preliminary examination report at AuTrain-Shelter Bay Harbor. Harbor improvements which are quite urgent will be accomplished at Whitefish Point for which $100,000 was made available this year. It is estimated that to complete this project $394,000 will be needed.

Just within the last few weeks the Bureau of the Budget has released $241,000 to commence work on the Inland Waterway Route in the Lower Eleventh.

A resolution which I introduced was adopted providing for a review of the Waiska River Harbor.

Hearings have been arranged in Escanaba on September 12 by the Corps of Engineers on proposals to survey the needs of the harbor with a view to obtaining Federal assistance.

In September of 1955 I reported that there was included in the President's budget message $3,312,000 for the removal of the bridge island at the upper end of the Soo Locks and for the construction of a new railroad bridge. This expenditure will cover the 3-year period of 1956 to 1958. In July of this year the Congress authorized the Secretary of the Army to accomplish the alteration of the International Bridge across the St. Marys River under an agreement with the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co. The estimated cost of the alteration of the bridge is $2,620,000 of which the bridge company will pay $262,000.

The Escanaba Airport has received an appropriation of $87,500 to acquire land, grading, draining, and paving the east-west runways.

Seventy-three Capehart-type housing units will be provided at Camp Lucas. Two million one hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars has been allocated to Kinross Air Base for operation and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing, and community facilities and land acquisition.

New post office facilities have been made available at St. Ignace, Atlanta, and Charlevoix. Indian River will have a new post office within the next few months, and bids are being requested for a new facility at Stephenson. The Post Office Department also has under consideration plans for other new post offices in the 11th Congressional District.

I am sure many of you will recall that a treaty has been adopted relative to the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention between the United States and Canada. The purpose of the treaty is to control, and if possible eradicate the lamprey eel which has seriously injured our fishing industry in the Great Lakes area. To carry out the provisions of the treaty $620,000 has been appropriated for this fiscal year.

We must have a proper resource development of fish, and still we must maintain the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure, enjoyment, and betterment; and still further we must stimulate the development of a strong, prosperous, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry. In order to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with this respect and to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy, legislation was enacted creating a United States Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department of the Interior consisting of two separate agencies, both of which shall have the status of a Federal bureau. One of the agencies shall be known as the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the other as the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

At the urging of the Eisenhower administration newly passed farm legislation has brought into being the soil bank. Under this program an acreage reserve program is set up which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate the farmers for reducing their 1956 to 1959 acreage of basic commodities, feed grains, and so forth, at the discretion of the Secretary. Land put into the soil bank and retired from production may not be put to any other use. It is expected that with this legislation overproduction may be cut down in order to assist in the reduction of the multi-billion-dollar surplus agriculture stocks which are depressing farm prices and the income of the farmers. In addition we may expect that our precious farmland will be revitalized and replenished.

The school-milk program was extended to 1958. For each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending July 30, 1956, $75 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by schoolchildren. This program will promote the health of our children and foster the economic well-being of our dairy farmers.

As a means of stabilizing the dairy industry and suppressing and eradicating brucellosis in cattle $20 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit are to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

Early in this 2d session of the 84th Congress action was taken on a bill which relieves the farmers of the burden of the excise taxes they pay on the gasoline and special fuels used on their farms for farming purposes. The refund under this new section of the Internal Revenue Code will be 3 cents a gallon.

On June 26 of this year Congress completed action on the biggest roadbuilding program in United States history. This highway measure will result in the expenditure of some $33 billion for highway construction during the next 13 years. It will be financed through increased taxes upon highway users. I would like to point out to my fellow citizens that despite the increased taxes necessary to finance this highway development progress, motoring in the future will be less expensive because of reduced congestion and fewer stops. Highway experts tell us that the increased taxes will be more than offset by motoring economies and of course the increased

highway safety that will result from our improved road system more than justifies the added cost.

Amendments have been made to our Social Security Act which will make it possible for the totally disabled workers to begin to draw benefits at age 50; widows and workingwomen will be eligible for benefits at 62 instead of 65. Coverage has been extended to include all professional groups excepting physicians and osteopaths. In addition, increased Federal funds were voted for public assistance benefits and governmental medical help. I personally regret that more improvements were not enacted in our social-security law so that it would more adequate serve its intended purpose of providing for people in retirement and in adversity.

Effective January 1, 1957, under the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act the widows of servicemen and veterans dying from service-connected disabilities will receive $112 plus 12 percent of the deceased servicemen's base pay. There will be contributory social-security coverage after December 31, 1956, for all Armed Forces personnel. The lump-sum 6 months' death gratuity for in-service deaths occurring after December 31, 1956, will be continued with a minimum payment of $800 and a maximum of $3,000.

Many new retirement benefits for Federal employees are contained in legislation which was enacted in the closing days of this session. Annuities are increased for Federal employees and their widows and dependent widowers on the average of approximately 25 percent and those for surviving children by approximately 150 percent. The value of the benefits provided by this law is estimated at $340 million a year, of which the employees will contribute approximately $45 million, resulting from an increase in their payroll deduction from 6 percent to 6½ percent.

Every child, regardless of where he or she may live should have an equal opportunity to receive an education. We have large holdings of State and Federal lands in the State of Michigan upon which taxes cannot be levied and money received for educational purposes. Michigan itself has been negligent in assisting the poorer school districts to acquire the necessary facilities for the education of our youth. These are reasons for my feeling so strongly in favor of Federal aid for school construction and why I supported the school construction bill when it was before the Congress. I am sorry that it did not pass, but trust that in the future favorable consideration will be given to this much-needed legislation.

However, Congress did see fit to extend two laws which will assist those school districts where the federally caused impact of children anticipated from new or enlarged Federal installations create serious shortages of school facilities. Assistance will be granted to those school districts for school construction and also for the maintenance and operation of schools already in existence in areas affected by Federal activities. This assistance will be available until June 30, 1958.

The foregoing account is a dissertation on the mere highlights of the legislative accomplishments achieved in the past year. There were many other meritorious bills enacted that will benefit us all as American citizens. It is my hope and intention that the coming first session of the 85th Congress will bring about the passage of legislation beneficial to our farmers, aged, veterans, and Federal employees, and grant to the American people a substantial reduction in the tax burden they have shouldered so long. With the Congress and the President working together I am confident we can look forward to an America that is at peace, an America that is prosperous, and an America with a future that is limitless under God.

Biennial Report to Pennsylvania's 19th District Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has closed. When we look back over the months since January 1955, it looms as a constructive, progressive Congress, with its accomplishments far outweighing the disappointments.

Perhaps the greatest accomplishment of the 84th Congress has been to disprove, forever, the belief, widely publicized in the fall of 1954, that when the legislative branch is controlled by one political party and the executive another, a cold war must inevitably follow.

This has been true in past years; certainly a cold war existed during the 80th Congress. It may be true again in future years. But I am proud that the leadership of my party, the Democratic Party, in the House and in the other body, recognizes the responsibilities of service in a free society and upon that basis worked cooperatively with a Republican President in order to meet the problems of the day.

There have been many instances during the past 19 months when the majority in the Congress has not seen eye to eye with the President. In some instances our differences were fundamental and could not be resolved. In most instances we sought the common meeting ground so that a constructive, progressive effort resulted.

Instances where we failed include the matter of tax reduction. We Democrats were and remain firmly convinced that the national economy is best served by granting relief to the individual taxpayer. The administration was and remains just as firmly convinced that the right way to go about granting tax relief is to do it in such a manner that 90 cents of every reduction dollar benefits those with the highest incomes. We declined to give in because a matter of fundamental principle was involved. The result was no decrease in taxation. This was a disappointment.

Another "no compromise" area involves conservation of natural resources. We Democrats believe in a forthright, forward-looking program of development and conservation of resources for the benefit of all the people. The Eisenhower administration, by its actions, demonstrates that it believes in giving these resources for exploitation to special interest groups. In the absence of a forward-looking program from the administration, we have only accomplished negative results; we have halted the giveaways except those which may be accomplished by administrative procedures. We were able to force the administration to back up on its proposal to destroy the Dinosaur National Monument through its insistence upon including the Echo Canyon Dam in the upper Colorado project. This Congress saved this great educational and recreational area for the benefit of all the people, and thus has earned the gratitude of naturalists, sportsmen, and others devoted to preservation of great national parks, forests, and monuments. We have refused to compromise on this issue and the people are the benefactors. They will not, however, reap fullest benefits from these policies until the administration either changes its policies or is replaced.

There are several outstanding areas where common ground was sought, discovered, and where positive action was taken. One such instance was the highway program. Mr. Eisenhower recommended a moderate highway construction program. This was a program which we accepted and expanded. He also recommended a complicated system of budgetary legerdemain for financing the program which, at first glance, would have left the sacred cow budget with a paper balance, but would have saddled the taxpayers with terrific interest payments for years to come. For every dollar spent on highways, taxpayers would have been paying more than a dollar in interest. In the name of roads for the American people the administration was actually putting the New York investment bankers on easy street.

In contrast, the Democratic leadership in the Congress came up with a pay-as-you-go highway program under which every dollar collected for road construction will be spent on road construction. From this program which the administration finally went along with the people will benefit.

Another area where a common ground was sought involved minimum wages. We Democrats suggested an increase to $1.25 per hour. President Eisenhower recommended 90 cents. Throughout lengthy committee consideration, and throughout the debate in the House, the President remained obdurate. A veto was hinted. However, we compromised and the President did not go through with his veto. The result is that we now have a minimum of $1 per hour. This makes it possible for industries such as we have in the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania to compete on a more equitable basis with rivals from low-wage areas.

President Eisenhower has painted a picture of himself as being most concerned with matters of foreign policy—a field in which he felt his training as a

career Army officer eminently qualified him. He considers the conduct of foreign policy, the creation of new policies where needed, and all aspects of our relations with the other nations of the world, to be the most important task he faces.

In this vital field, instead of being faced with a cold war in the Congress, Mr. Eisenhower has enjoyed far, far more cooperation and support from the 84th Congress, controlled by the Democratic Party, than he ever enjoyed from the 83d Congress, controlled by the Republican Party.

In fact, if we may believe the recently published authorized story of the Eisenhower administration by Richard Donovan—and it is pertinent to note that there have been no disavowals—the opposition of his own leadership in the Congress was so great that, at one time, the President toyed with the idea of forming a new party.

Contrariwise, on the key votes in the 84th Congress, we Democrats have given General Eisenhower a greater share of our votes than he has received from his own party.

Early in the 84th Congress we spoke to the President, through the record of our proceedings, informing him of our constructive, positive approach to foreign policy. We assured him that we would earnestly follow the belief that partisanship ceases when we reach the Nation's borders. We pledged that we would not seek out the petty as the basis for carping criticism and demagoguery, the warp and the woof of Republican Party attitudes when Mr. Truman and Mr. Roosevelt were in the White House.

This is not to say that we abrogated our responsibility as the loyal opposition. We have criticized tactics; we have criticized the smugness, the wishing-will-make-it-so-isms of Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles; we have criticized such contradictions as the recent series of Eisenhower-Dulles-Nixon-Dulles statements when the independent nations were praised, castigated, praised, castigated, and then praised in virtually that sequence; we have criticized the lack of forceful leadership here in the United States by Mr. Eisenhower in behalf of the things that must be done—the hard decisions that inevitably must be made.

We have urged the President to chart bold, new courses in the pursuit of peace, and promised our backing and support in these. When he has gently swayed in this direction, that backing and support have been forthcoming. We, in the Congress, cannot be blamed for the inertia of the White House.

Mr. Speaker, it is pertinent to point out that the record of the 84th Congress has earned such complimentary descriptions as a "do something Congress," a "constructive Congress," a "hard working Congress," and similar phrases from leading newspapers and such outstanding reporters as Roscoe Drummond, of the pro-Eisenhower New York Herald Tribune, Drew Pearson, and many others.

In addition to legislation already mentioned, the record shows that we legislated for the people in many other instances.

We have expanded coverage of the Social Security Act to include many self-employed professionals, and liberalized its benefits to women, dependent children and the disabled. We have extended and expanded the hospital construction program, and pioneered new health protection and research programs. We have provided for the training of an increased number of nurses. We initiated the Salk polio-vaccine program under which needy children and expectant mothers may be inoculated against the long dreaded disease. The Congress tightened up laws to control narcotics, and provided for discretionary death penalty for sales of illicit drugs to minors.

Of particular value to the people of the 19th District of Pennsylvania, where prosperity is based, in part, upon the well-being of many small industries, has been our efforts in behalf of small business. Faced with the tremendous number of mergers during the past several years, accompanied by a sharp increase in outright business failures, we have stiffened penalties for violation of antitrust laws, gave the Government right to sue for recovery of damages, and curbed activities of bank-holding companies.

In the House we adopted a measure to plug a loophole permitting discriminatory price practices; another to require advance notice to the Government of a merger; and both Houses adopted legislation to free the local automobile dealer from the shackles of the manufacturer under existing stifling trade practices.

In the field of agriculture we enacted a soil-bank plan, giving the Government an additional weapon to use to combat a farm depression; we expanded and extended the school-milk program over early opposition by the Department of Agriculture; we provided an expansion of the Agricultural and Trade Development Act; we liberalized the farm-loan program; and expanded the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

We passed, but the President vetoed, a bill which would permit farmers who raise their own feed grains to plant unlimited acreage.

We passed a bill, of which I was a cosponsor, granting the farmer relief from special taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels when they are used in vehicles operated on the farm.

We adopted many measures in the field of national security and foreign affairs—two functions of the Government which are very closely related—which have strengthened both. By stepping up the procurement of intercontinental A-bombers we have attempted to retrieve some of the ground lost by the early budget philosophy of the administration. We have, and this is most important, strengthened the President's hand in carrying out his constitutional function in foreign affairs.

There follows a compilation of my record on key matters:

VOTED FOR

Reorganization and strengthening military reserves.

Stepped up procurement international A-bombers and jet fighters.

Special funds to prevent drastic cut in Marine Corps.

Increased funds for aircraft control and warning system.

$1.4 billion naval-construction program, including A-powered ships.

Measures to strengthen internal security.

Mutual-security program.

Study and revision of United States foreign-policy programs.

Resolution opposing admission of Red China to United Nations.

Resolution to strengthen hand of President in Far East.

Added protection to workers and industries harmed by foreign competition.

Government Reorganization Act of 1955—implementing Hoover Commission.

Improved budgeting and accounting practices in Government—Hoover Commission.

Code of fair practices for congressional committees.

Salary increases for postal and other Federal employees.

Improvements to Civil Service Retirement Act.

Improvements under Railroad Retirement Act.

Reorganization and improvement of Foreign Service.

More effective civil-rights program.

Income-tax reduction for average taxpayer.

Plugging $5 billion loophole in 1954 tax law.

Increase in minimum wage.

Long-range highway program.

More protection for small business against unfair price practices.

Good-faith bill favoring local automobile dealers.

Anti-bid-shopping contracting bill.

Incentive pay increases and allowances for military personnel.

Continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen.

Fair compensation for veterans and dependents.

Agricultural Act of 1956.

Freeing cattle and poultry farmers from restrictions on growing own feed—sponsored.

Relief for farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels used on farm—sponsored.

Repeal of acreage allotment ACP tie-in provisions of 1953 Agriculture Act—sponsored.

Relief of apple growers from Federal price practices.

Increased sales of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies.

Extension and expansion of school milk program.

Liberalization of farm loan programs.

Improved conservation research.

Extended and expanded brucellosis eradication program.

Retirement at age 50, under social security, for disabled.

Retirement at age 62, under social security, for women.

Increased benefits to aged and infirm under Social Security Act.

Federal aid to school construction—general.

Federal aid to school construction and maintenance—impact areas.

Federal aid to Carlisle Joint School District for new high school.

Federal aid to make Salk miracle anti-polio vaccine available to needy children and expectant mothers.

Expanded programs for medical-dental research, hospital construction.

Four year airport construction program.

Strengthened prohibition against mailing indecent literature.

Increased penalties for peddling dope to children.

Improved housing program.

Prohibit serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight.

VOTED AGAINST

Higher gas bills for consumers.

Higher costs for mailing letters.

Higher feed grain prices for 19th District cattle and poultry men.

Higher subsidies for big airlines.

Socialized transportation in Nation's Capital.

Analysis of All House Rollcall Votes During President Eisenhower's Administration, Both 83d and 84th Congresses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress has adjourned it is possible to examine the support which President Eisenhower received from the 83d and 84th Congresses in connection with his legislative program. The 83d Congress was a Republican Congress. The Republicans had a majority of 50.8 percent. The 84th was a Democrat Congress. The Democrats had a majority of 53.3 percent. In order to appraise the record of the Congress in dealing with President Eisenhower's program, I have had prepared a tabulation of every vote taken during the entire 4-year period covered by the 83d and 84th Congresses.

After eliminating procedural votes and votes on items which were not a part of President Eisenhower's program, there were 123 votes involving his program in the 83d and 129 votes in the 84th Congress—a total of 252 such votes. On the 252 votes, Republicans cast 37,954 of the votes for President Eisenhower's program, or 58.2 percent of the total. The Democrats cast 27,223 such votes, or 41.8 percent of the total. On these 252 issues, the Democrats cast 21,435 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower, or 69.9 percent of all the opposition votes. The Republicans cast 9,227 such votes, or 30.1 percent of all opposition votes. The tabulation shows a breakdown of the rollcalls for the 83d and 84th Congresses.

All Eisenhower rollcalls

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	123	19,985	61.5	12,498	38.5	9,717	71.7	3,833	28.3
84th	129	17,969	55.0	14,725	45.0	11,718	68.5	5,394	31.5
Total	252	37,954	58.2	27,223	41.8	21,435	69.9	9,227	30.1

The above tabulation included many votes which were adopted with full bipartisan support, including some on which there was no recorded opposition.

Mr. Speaker, all votes which were adopted with a majority of both parties supporting President Eisenhower's program have been eliminated to see what the picture looked like when the chips were down. This left 117 votes in the 2 Congresses which were not passed with bipartisan support. On votes falling into this category, Republicans cast 16,344 votes for President Eisenhower, or 74.3 percent of the total. The Democrats cast only 5,664 such votes, or 25.7 percent of the total. On this same group of 117 issues, the Democrats cast 17,306 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower, or 74.4 percent of all opposition votes, and the Republicans cast only 5,944 such votes, or 25.6 percent of the total. A breakdown of votes in this category for the two Congresses follows:

Eisenhower rollcalls on issues without bipartisan House support

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Vote cast	Percent
83d	54	8,296	77.0	2,479	23.0	7,421	75.9	2,352	24.1
84th	63	8,048	71.6	3,185	28.4	9,885	73.3	3,592	26.7
Total	117	16,344	74.3	5,664	25.7	17,306	74.4	5,944	25.6

Mr. Speaker, every vote we have taken during the past 4 years has been examined. This includes 296 rollcalls. They have been grouped into categories for each Congress.

The first group includes issues which were not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties. This group includes House organization and procedural matters.

The second group includes votes on items which were not included in the President's program but where a majority of the Republican Members took a position in opposition to the majority of the Democrat Members. The election of the Speaker would be included in this group.

The third group includes all issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition.

The fourth group includes those issues in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties. Passage of the Mutual Security Act and the Formosa resolution, as well as numerous appropriations measures, fell into this category.

The fifth group includes those comparatively few issues where a majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program. The vote on the Powell amendment to the school construction bill is an example of a vote which would fall into this category. During the 83d and 84th Congresses only 26 out of the 296 rollcalls—just 9 percent of the total—represented issues in this category. This clearly shows that the Republicans in the House have supported President Eisenhower's legislative programs.

The sixth group includes all those issues where a majority of the Republicans voted to support President Eisenhower's program and were opposed by a majority of the Democrats. There were 47 such votes in the 83d Congress and 44 in the 84th. Votes on issues in this group are a true measure of party support and opposition to President Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, included at this point is a summary of the tabulations for votes in category 6 for the 83d and 84th Congresses:

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	47	7,926	80.1	1,965	19.9	6,664	83.2	1,347	16.8
84th	44	6,736	82.2	1,460	17.8	7,596	83.8	1,466	16.2
Total	91	14,662	81.1	3,425	18.9	14,260	83.5	2,813	16.5

It will be noted that more than 80 percent of the votes cast in support of President Eisenhower's program in both the 83d and 84th Congresses on issues in this category were cast by Republicans, and that more than 80 percent of the opposition votes in each case were cast by Democrats.

House roll calls tell only a part of the story. Congressional committees determine the form in which legislation is presented to the Congress and in many cases, under our established rules, we have little opportunity to modify legislation on the floor. During the 84th Congress, the Democrat Party had control of all committees and they determined which issues would receive consideration.

The complete review of the voting patterns over the past 4 years should convince the voters of this country that they must support President Eisenhower by giving him a Republican Congress when we convene next January. As chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, I shall leave no stone unturned in furthering President Eisenhower's program by the election of a Congress which will give his program the sympathetic consideration it deserves .

Mr. Speaker, so that the record may be complete and that every vote may be accounted for, included as a part of my remarks is a complete tabulation covering all votes taken during the 83d and 84th Congresses:

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF HOUSE VOTES, 83D CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the House votes during the 83d Congress. One hundred forty-seven votes were taken. They have been placed into six groups as summarized below.

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The 2 groups together include 24 votes, or 16 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
- Yeas 1,648
- Nays 38

Democrats:
- Yeas 1,394
- Nays 157

The number of issues included in group 1 is 9, accounting for 6 percent of 147 votes.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Republicans 2,325
- Democrats 584

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Democrats 1,981
- Republicans 493

The number of issues included in group 2 is 15, accounting for 10 percent of 147 votes.

Groups 3 through 6 include votes on issues included in the President's program. They total 123 votes or 84 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

Vote cast:

Republicans:
- Yeas 2,123
- Nays ..... -----

Democrats:
- Yeas 1,949
- Nays ..... -----

The number of issues included in group 3 is 11, accounting for 7 percent of 147 votes.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast 9,566
- Percent 54.2

Democrats:
- Votes cast 8,070
- Percent 45.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast 2,296
- Percent 60.8

Republicans:
- Votes cast 1,481
- Percent 39.2

The number of issues included in group 4 is 58, accounting for 40 percent of 147 votes.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast 370
- Percent 41.9

Democrats:
- Votes cast 514
- Percent 58.1

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program—Con.

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast 757
- Percent 43.0

Republicans:
- Votes cast 1,005
- Percent 57.0

The number of issues included in group 5 is 7, accounting for 5 percent of 147 votes.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast 7,926
- Percent 80.1

Democrats:
- Votes cast 1,965
- Percent 19.9

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast 6,664
- Percent 83.2

Republicans:
- Votes cast 1,347
- Percent 16.8

The number of issues included in group 6 is 47, accounting for 32 percent of 147 votes.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all votes not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 54 issues or 37 percent of all House votes.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	370	----------	514	----------	757	----------	1,005	----------
6	7,926	----------	1,965	----------	6,664	----------	1,347	----------
Total	8,296	77.0	2,479	23.0	7,421	75.9	2,352	24.1

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all votes representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 123 of the 147 rollcalls or 84 percent of all House votes. These votes are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 61.5 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 38.5 percent. The Democrats supplied 71.7 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 28.3 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	2,123	----------	1,949	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
4	9,566	----------	8,070	----------	2,296	----------	1,481	----------
5	370	----------	514	----------	757	----------	1,005	----------
6	7,926	----------	1,965	----------	6,664	----------	1,347	----------
Total	19,985	61.5	12,498	38.5	9,717	71.7	3,833	28.3

Classification of all House votes, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
A		2	Election of Speaker.
1	3	4	Extend Reorganization Act of 1949 (H. R. 1979)—Passage of bill, Feb. 3, 1953.
2	4	4	Provide for second Under Secretary of State for Administration (S. 243)—Passage of bill, Feb. 3, 1953.
3	5	6	Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Motion to recommit to increase appropriations for Veterans' Administration by $10 million, Feb. 19, 1953.
4	6	4	Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Passage of bill, Feb. 19, 1953.
5	7	1	House Un-American Activities Committee appropriation (H. J. Res. 119)—Adoption of resolution, Feb. 24, 1953.
6	8	3	Repeal of military personnel limitation (H. R. 2332)—Passage of bill, Feb. 25, 1953.
7	9	4	Housing loan insurance (H. J. Res. 160)—Motion to recommit to limit interest rate to not more than 6 percent per year on unpaid balance, Feb. 25, 1953.
8	11	6	Hawaiian statehood (H. R. 3575)—Motion to recommit, Mar. 10, 1953.
9	12	6	Hawaiian statehood (H. R. 3575)—Passage of bill, Mar. 10, 1953.
10	17	4	Establishment of new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. J. Res. 223)—Passage of bill, Mar. 18, 1953.
11	18	2	Second supplemental appropriation for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Motion that House recede from disagreement with Senate on conference report, Mar. 19, 1953.
12	19	2	Second supplemental appropriation for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Amendment to conference report increasing rural telephone authorization funds by $10,000,000, Mar. 19, 1953.
13	21	4	Submerged lands within State boundaries (H. R. 4198)—Motion to recommit, Apr. 1, 1953.
14	22	4	Submerged lands within State boundaries (H. R. 4198)—Passage of bill, Apr. 1, 1953.
15	23	4	3-year extension on procedures for Mexican agricultural workers (H. R. 3480)—Passage of bill, Apr. 15, 1953.
16	24	6	National bank stockholders (H. R. 4004) to provide that national banks furnish list of stockholders upon request of the Comptroller of the Currency—Motion to recommit, Apr. 15, 1953.
17	27	5	First independent offices appropriation for 1954 (H. R. 4663)—Motion to recommit to insert authorization for public housing, Apr. 22, 1953.
18	29	2	Price supports for Maryland tobacco (H. R. 1432)—Passage of bill, Apr. 24, 1953.
19	30	1	Daylight saving time for District of Columbia (H. R 4363)—Passage of bill, Apr. 27, 1953.
20	32	6	Interior Department appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 4828)—Motion to recommit to increase funds for Southwestern and Bonneville Power Administrations, Apr. 28, 1953.
21	33	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 4974)—Motion to recommit striking out provisions permitting discharge of personnel whenever such discharge is deemed necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, May 5, 1953.
22	34	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 4974)—Passage of bill, May 5, 1953.
23	36	4	Submerged lands seaward from historic State boundaries (H. R. 5134)—Passage of bill, May 13, 1953.
24	37	6	Submerged lands within State boundaries (H. R. 4198)—Adoption of resolution (H. Res. 232) to concur in Senate passage, May 13, 1953.
25	41	6	Agriculture appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5227)—Amendment to reduce amount for soil conservation to $140 million, as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture, May 20, 1953.
26	42	4	Agriculture appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5227)—Passage of bill, May 20, 1953.
27	44	6	Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5246)—Amendment to increase by $6 million funds allocated for school districts affected by Federal activities, May 26, 1953.
28	45	6	Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5246)—Motion to recommit to increase funds for hospital construction by $25 million, May 26, 1953.
29	46	4	Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5246)—Passage of bill, May 26, 1953.
30	49	6	Resolution to disapprove President Eisenhower's reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture (H. Res. 236)—Motion to discharge Committee on Government Operations from further consideration, June 3, 1953.
31	52	2	Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953 (H. R. 5495)—Motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title increasing membership of Tariff Commission from 6 to 7, June 15, 1953.
32	53	4	Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953 (H. R. 5495)—Passage of bill, June 15, 1953.
33	55	6	Second independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 5690)—Motion to recommit with instructions to delete provision granting the Veterans' Administration power to determine the right of certain veterans to free hospitalization, June 18, 1953.
34	56	4	Second independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 5690)—Passage of bill, June 18, 1953.
35	57	4	Mutual Security Act extension (H. R. 5710)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 291) to consider bill, June 18, 1953.
36	60	4	Mutual Security Act extension (H. R. 5710)—Passage of bill, June 19, 1953.
37	63	4	Wheat for Pakistan (H. R. 5659)—Passage of bill, June 23, 1953.
38	66	4	Authorize sale of Government-owned rubber producing facilities (H. R. 5728)—Motion to recommit, June 25, 1953.
39	69	6	Resolution to disapprove President Eisenhower's reorganization of Defense Department (H. Res. 295)—Adoption of resolution, June 27, 1953.
40	70	4	Exempt Cabinet officers and Presidential appointees from annual and sick leave provisions (H. R. 4654)—Adoption of conference report, June 27, 1953.
41	75	6	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 5659)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for Air Force by $1.2 billion, July 2, 1953.
42	76	3	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 5659)—Passage of bill, July 2, 1953.
43	80	4	Unemployment compensation (H. R. 5173)—Motion to recommit with instructions to limit use of such excess taxes to payment of unemployment compensation and to delay State repayment of advances, July 8, 1953.
44	82	4	Financial aid for drought-stricken farmers and stockmen (H. R. 6054)—Passage of bill, July 9, 1953.
45	83	2	Develop Niagara River power through private enterprise (H. R. 4351)—Motion to recommit, July 9, 1953.
46	84	2	Develop Niagara River power through private enterprise (H. R. 4351)—Passage of bill, July 9, 1953.
47	86	6	Excess-profits tax extension (H. R. 5898)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase base period for calculating excess profits, July 10, 1953.
48	87	4	Excess-profits tax extension (H. R. 5898)—Passage of bill, July 10, 1953.
49	89	4	Mutual security (H. R. 5710)—Adoption of conference report, July 13, 1953.
50	91	6	Supplemental appropriations (H. R. 6200)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for Voice of America and eliminate personnel reduction provisions, July 15, 1953.
51	93	4	Resolution to disapprove reorganization plan covering foreign information functions (H. Res. 262)—Adoption of resolution, July 17, 1953.
52	95	1	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 4974)—Amendment expressing sense of Congress that Communist Chinese Government not be admitted to the United Nations, July 21, 1953.
53	96	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations (H. R. 4974)—Motion that House concur in Senate amendment providing appropriations of $12.5 million in funds for Federal aid to airports, July 21, 1953.
54	97	6	First independent offices appropriations for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 4663)—Motion that House concur in Senate amendment to authorize construction of 20,000 public housing units, July 21, 1953.
55	98	4	Army civil functions (H. R. 5376)—Motion to recommit with instructions to add $2.2 million for the Missouri River bank stabilization project, July 21, 1953.
56	100	4	Mutual Security Act appropriations (H. R. 6391)—Passage of bill, July 22, 1953.
57	102	5	Import quotas on petroleum products and sliding scale tariff on lead and zinc (H. R. 5894)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 347), July 23, 1953.
58	103	5	Import quotas on petroleum products and sliding scale tariff on lead and zinc (H. R. 5894)—Motion to recommit, July 23, 1953.
59	105	6	Small Business Administration (H. R. 5141)—Motion to recommit with instructions to delete terminating the RFC, July 27, 1953.
60	106	2	Investigations of foundations (H. Res. 217)—Adoption of resolution, July 27, 1953.
61	109	6	Refugee Act of 1953 (H. R. 6481)—Adoption of rule for consideration (H. Res. 353), July 28, 1953.
62	111	6	Refugee Act of 1953 (H. R. 6481)—Motion to recommit, July 28, 1953.
63	112	6	Refugee Act of 1953 (H. R. 6481)—Passage of bill, July 28, 1953.
64	114	4	Emergency Famine Relief Authority (H. R. 6016)—Motion to recommit, July 29, 1953.
65	116	4	Mutual-security appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 6391)—Motion to recommit to cut reappropriations for European military assistance, July 31, 1953.
66	117	4	Mutual-security appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 6391)—Adoption of conference report, July 31, 1953.
67	119	6	National debt limit (H. R. 6672)—Motion to recommit, July 31, 1953.
68	120	6	National debt limit (H. R. 6672)—Passage of bill, July 31, 1953.
69	122	2	Withholding of local income taxes (H. R. 6413)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 361) for consideration, Aug. 1, 1953.
70	123	6	First supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 6200)—Motion that House concur in amendment authorizing Director of U. S. Information Agency to terminate employment of certain personnel not having veterans' preference, Aug. 3, 1953.

Classification of all House votes, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
1	3	4	Establishment of Air Force Academy (H. R. 5337)—Passage of bill, Jan. 21, 1954.
2	4	4	Increase available funds for Commodity Credit Corporation (H. J. Res. 358)—Passage of resolution, Jan. 27, 1954.
3	10	6	Lake Michigan water level (H. R. 3300)—Amendment to provide that no withdrawals above present limit be permitted until survey by Army Corps of Engineers. Feb. 4, 1954.
4	11	6	Lake Michigan water level (H. R. 3300)—Motion to recommit, Feb. 4, 1954.
5	15	6	Exchange of timberlands (H. R. 4646)—Motion to recommit, Feb. 17, 1954.
6	17	1	Authorize funds for Un-American Activities Committee (H. Res. 400)—Adoption of resolution, Feb. 25, 1954.
7	21	6	Authorize recruitment of Mexican farm labor (H. J. Res. 355)—Motion to recommit, Mar. 2, 1954.
8	25	4	State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations for 1955 (H. R. 8067)—Passage of bill, Mar. 5, 1954.
9	28	6	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (H. R. 8224)—Motion to recommit with instructions that no tax shall be imposed on theater admissions of 50 cents or less, Mar. 10, 1954.
10	29	4	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (H. R. 8224)—Passage of bill, Mar. 10, 1954.
11	34	6	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Motion to recommit eliminating dividend credit and increasing personal income tax exemptions, Mar. 18, 1954.
12	35	4	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Passage of bill, Mar. 18, 1954.
13	41	4	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (H. R. 8224)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 30, 1954.
14	43	6	Independent offices appropriations for 1955 (H. R. 8583)—Motion to recommit providing no funds may be used for administrative expenses in connection with sale of any FNMA mortages at less than par value, Mar. 31, 1954.
15	46	5	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Motion to recommit to authorize 35,000 new public-housing starts, Apr. 2, 1954.
16	47	4	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Passage of bill, Apr. 2, 1954.
17	51	6	Wiretapping (H. R. 8649)—Amendment in the nature of a substitute to provide that evidence must be authorized by Federal court order as well as by Attorney General, Apr. 8, 1954.
18	52	4	Wiretapping (H. R. 8649)—Passage of bill, Apr. 8, 1954.
19	58	3	Defense Department appropriations for fiscal 1955 (H. R. 8873)—Passage of bill, Apr. 29, 1954.
20	62	4	St. Lawrence Seaway (S. 2150)—Motion to recommit, May 6, 1954.
21	63	4	St. Lawrence Seaway (S. 2150)—Passage of bill, May 6, 1954.
22	66	5	Fugitive extradition (H. R. 2556)—Motion to strike enacting clause, May 10, 1954.
23	68	1	Citation for contempt for Bernherd Deutch (H. Res. 533), May 11, 1954.
24	69	4	Cooperative research in education (H. R. 9040)—Passage of bill, May 12, 1954.
25	70	6	Establishment of National Advisory Committee on Education (H. R. 7434)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 532) to consider bill, May 12, 1954.
26	72	6	Establishment of National Advisory Committee on Education (H. R. 7434)—Passage of bill, May 13, 1954.
27	74	4	White House Education Conference (H. R. 7601)—Passage of bill, May 19, 1954.
28	76	3	Authorize expenditures for military and naval construction (H. R. 9242)—Passage of bill, May 26, 1954.
29	77	1	Adoption of rule (H. Res. 568) to consider social security amendments (H. R. 9366), June 1, 1954.
30	78	4	Social security amendments for 1954 (H. R. 9366)—Passage of bill, June 1, 1954.
31	80	4	Reciprocal trade extension (H. R. 9474)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 580), June 11, 1954.
32	81	4	Reciprocal trade extension (H. R. 9474)—Passage of bill, June 11, 1954.
33	83	2	Appropriations, District of Columbia (H. R. 9517)—Amendment to increase Federal contribution to general fund, while increasing funds for capital improvements, June 15, 1954.
34	85	4	Authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury (H. R. 8729)—Motion to recommit, June 16, 1954.
35	87	1	Adoption of rule (H. Res. 583) to provide that House disagree to Senate amendment to Housing bill (H. R. 7839), June 17, 1954.
36	89	3	Western Hemisphere protection (S. Con. Res. 91)—Adoption of resolution, June 29, 1954.
37	91	3	Mutual security authorization for 1955 (H. R. 9678)—Amendment to provide no funds authorized may be used on behalf of governments committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined area in Asia, June 30, 1954.
38	92	4	Mutual security authorization for 1955 (H. R. 9678)—Passage of bill, June 30, 1954.
39	96	6	Farm bill (H. R. 9680)—Amendment to provide flexible price supports, July 2, 1954.
40	97	3	Vocational rehabilitation (H. R. 9640)—Passage of bill, July 8, 1954.
41	98	6	Unemployment compensation (H. R. 9709)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase amount and duration of benefits, July 8, 1954.
42	99	4	Unemployment compensation (H. R. 9709)—Passage of bill, July 8, 1954.
43	100	3	Espionage (H. R. 9580)—Passage of bill, July 8, 1954.
44	102	4	Adoption of rule (H. Res. 623) to consider health insurance bill (H. R. 8356), July 13, 1954.
45	103	6	Health insurance (H. R. 8356)—Motion to recommit, July 13, 1954.
46	105	1	Opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations (H. Res. 627)—Adoption of resolution, July 15, 1954.
47	107	6	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Motion to recommit with instructions for 4-year public housing program, July 20, 1954.
48	108	4	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Adoption of conference report, July 20, 1954.
49	109	3	Extension of veterans' education and training (H. R. 9888)—Passage of bill, July 21, 1954.
50	110	3	Veterans' compensation and pensions (H. R. 9020)—Passage of bill, July 21, 1954.
51	111	6	Increase in both postal pay and postal rates (H. R. 9245)—Passage of bill, July 21, 1954.
52	113	1	Contempt citation, Bolza Baxter (H. Res. 664)—Adoption of resolution, July 23, 1954.
53	115	6	Atomic Energy Act (H. R. 9757)—Amendment to grant normal patent rights for nonmilitary development, July 23, 1954.
54	117	6	Atomic Energy Act (H. R. 9757)—Motion to recommit, July 26, 1954.
55	118	6	Atomic Energy Act (H. R. 9757)—Passage of bill, July 26, 1954.
56	120	4	Mutual security appropriations for fiscal 1955 (H. R. 10051)—Passage of bill, July 28, 1954.
57	121	6	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Motion to recommit conference report, July 28, 1954.
58	122	4	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Agreement to conference report, July 28, 1954.
59	124	6	Fryingpan-Arkansas project (H. R. 236)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 626) for consideration, July 28, 1954.
60	125	4	Increase borrowing authority of Commodity Credit Corporation (H. R. 9756)—Passage of bill, July 29, 1954.
61	126	2	Adjournment of Congress (H. Con. Res. 256)—Adoption of resolution, July 29, 1954.
62	129	3	Modifications in Railroad Retirement Act (H. R. 7840)—Passage of bill, July 30, 1954.
63	130	2	Reclassification of hardboard for tariff purposes (H. R. 9666)—Passage of bill, July 30, 1954.
64	131	2	Adjournment of Congress (H. Con. Res. 266)—Adoption of resolution, July 30, 1954.
65	132	6	Rogue River Reclamation (H. R. 8384)—Passage of bill, July 30, 1954.
66	135	4	Grant immunity to witnesses before congressional investigating committees (S. 16)—Passage of bill, Aug. 4, 1954.
67	137	5	Increase postal pay (H. R. 9245)—Motion to discharge Rules Committee from further consideration, Aug. 9, 1954.
68	138	5	Increase postal pay (H. R. 9245)—Passage of bill, Aug. 9, 1954.
69	139	2	Trout labeling (H. R. 2033)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 687) for consideration, Aug. 9, 1954.
70	140	4	Mutual security authorization for 1955 (H. R. 9678)—Motion to recommit with instructions to disagree to provision permitting President to waive certain contracting and procurement regulations, Aug. 9, 1954.
71	142	4	Subversive activities control (S. 3706)—Passage of bill under suspension of the rules, Aug. 16, 1954.
72	144	6	Subversive activities control (S. 3706)—Motion to direct House conferees to agree with Senate amendments making membership in Communist Party, per se, a felony, Aug. 17, 1954.
73	145	4	Mutual security appropriation (H. R. 10051)—Agreement to conference report, Aug. 19, 1954.
74	146	4	Mutual security appropriation (H. R. 10051)—Motion that House concur in Senate amendment, Aug. 19, 1954.
75	147	4	Subversive activities control (S. 3706)—Agreement to conference report, Aug. 19, 1954.
76	148	2	Establish Commission on District of Columbia Transportation Problems (H. R. 2236)—Motion to recommit conference report, Aug. 20, 1954.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
5	168		147	2
19	152	34	98	65
52	194		185	

2D SESS.

6	185		178	1
23	185		161	
29	171	3	99	71
35	192	1	169	18
46	199		182	
52	202		175	
Total	1,648	38	1,394	157

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
A	Martin	220		201	
11	Yea	155	10	153	38
12	Nay	162	12	140	31
18	Yea	84	26	130	82
31	Nay	200	15	179	6
45	Nay	184	70	112	18
46	Yea	182	80	102	18
60	Yea	140	69	114	49
59	Nay	117	44	120	72

2D SESS.

33	Nay	119	49	116	70
61	Yea	161	22	159	34
63	Yea	160	75	87	22
64	Yea	159	21	141	26
69	Yea	161	48	134	25
76	Nay	121	43	93	2
	Total	2,325	584	1,981	493

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

1ST SESS.

Vote number	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
6	196		174	
42	199		187	

2D SESS.

19	197		181	
28	175		171	
36	193		179	
37	199		190	
40	183		164	
43	175		149	
49	208		192	
50	209		190	
62	189		172	
Total	2,123		1,949	

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
1	Yea	205	184	2	3
2	Yea	192	150	15	3
4	Yea	188	181	1	1
7	Nay	198	92	77	2
10	Yea	194	97	73	13
13	Nay	191	92	91	15
14	Yea	188	97	90	18
15	Yea	155	104	61	26
22	Yea	185	159	1	4
23	Yea	193	116	79	12
26	Yea	195	189	2	10
29	Yea	199	197		2
32	Yea	179	184	9	25
34	Yea	202	195		2
35	Yea	172	169	15	20
36	Yea	119	161	27	81
37	Yea	119	161	27	81
38	Nay	190	126	56	2
40	Yea	132	138	21	44
43	Nay	189	103	86	7
44	Yea	194	194		4
48	Yea	169	156	39	38
49	Yea	95	127	29	80
51	Nay	166	144	8	3
55	Nay	141	111	79	58
56	Yea	129	160	33	82
64	Nay	194	128	72	10
65	Nay	101	99	95	97
66	Yea	115	122	72	84

2D SESS.

1	Yea	160	171	14	22
2	Yea	178	145	15	12
8	Yea	168	97	83	22
10	Yea	211	200	3	
12	Yea	208	132	74	5
13	Yea	201	194	1	
16	Yea	189	164	27	9
18	Yea	197	181	9	1
20	Nay	144	98	95	62
21	Yea	144	97	94	64
24	Yea	181	115	47	8
27	Yea	179	90	65	4
30	Yea	181	175	6	2
31	Yea	146	128	36	27
32	Yea	126	155	14	39
34	Nay	169	81	78	2
38	Yea	118	142	47	79
42	Yea	178	131	29	7
44	Yea	175	99	70	18
48	Yea	196	162	23	7
56	Yea	121	145	43	85
58	Yea	201	114	74	3
60	Yea	170	147	30	27
66	Yea	177	117	52	3
70	Nay	127	140	40	56
71	Yea	156	149	1	1
73	Yea	81	107	36	41
74	Yea	74	114	29	47
75	Yea	121	144	1	1
	Total	9,566	8,070	2,296	1,481

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
17	Yea	34	123	69	176
57	Nay	72	111	81	138
58	Yea	104	138	56	105

2D SESS.

15	Yea	48	128	61	150
22	Nay	66	2	128	100
67	Nay	23	5	180	166
68	Nay	23	6	182	170
	Total	370	514	757	1,005

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
3	Nay	176	23	163	19
8	Nay	199	28	167	15
9	Yea	177	97	101	37
16	Nay	169	71	78	1
20	Nay	187	25	156	11
21	Nay	160	8	154	27
24	Yea	184	94	99	17
25	Yea	152	44	147	54
27	Nay	140	16	176	61
28	Nay	173	30	166	31
30	Nay	204	57	127	1
33	Nay	165	15	178	39
39	Nay	169	66	97	11
41	Nay	196	34	156	5
47	Nay	185	90	106	21
50	Nay	177	67	130	24
53	Nay	180	50	138	22
54	Yea	173	66	125	36
59	Nay	197	30	159	2
61	Yea	152	98	100	52
62	Nay	133	89	113	73
63	Yea	132	89	111	74
67	Nay	203	22	173	
68	Yea	169	70	125	33
70	Yea	147		134	5

2D SESS.

3	Yea	144	33	153	49
4	Yea	123	27	161	73
5	Nay	126	35	160	66
7	Nay	164	86	114	42
9	Nay	210	3	200	
11	Nay	201	9	194	10
14	Nay	196	18	176	4
17	Nay	166		189	32
25	Yea	178	16	134	6
26	Yea	161	18	134	23
39	Yea	182	46	147	23
41	Nay	173	68	93	17
45	Nay	120	14	163	75
47	Nay	155	79	106	50
51	Yea	207	21	169	2
23	Yea	190	13	155	6
54	Nay	196	26	158	7
55	Yea	195	36	147	7
57	Nay	204	23	166	3
59	Yea	137	51	133	62
65	Yea	100	63	81	63
72	Nay	99	1	152	56
	Total	7,926	1,965	6,664	1,347

Summary of Analysis of House Votes, 84th Congress

This study reviews all of the House votes during the 84th Congress. One hundred and forty-nine votes were taken. They have been placed in six groups as summarized below.

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The 2 groups together include 20 votes or 13 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
- Yeas—1,778
- Nays—520

Democrats:
- Yeas—2,031
- Nays—504

The number of issues included in group 1 is 13, accounting for 9 percent of 149 votes.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Republicans—864
- Democrats—249

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members—Con.

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Democrats ---------- 1,106
Republicans ---------- 315

The number of issues included in group 2 is 7, accounting for 4 percent of 149 votes.

Groups 3 through 6 includes votes on issues included in the President's program. They total 129 votes or 87 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

Vote cast:
Republicans:
Yeas ---------- 1,078
Nays ---------- -----
Democrats:
Yeas ---------- 1,233
Nays ---------- -----

The number of issues included in group 3 is 6, accounting for 4 percent of 149 votes.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 8,843
Percent ---------- 46.2
Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 10,307
Percent ---------- 53.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 1,833
Percent ---------- 50.4
Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 1,802
Percent ---------- 49.6

The number of issues included in group 4 is 60, accounting for 40 percent of 149 votes.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 1,312
Percent ---------- 43.2
Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 1,725
Percent ---------- 56.8

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program—Con.

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 2,289
Percent ---------- 51.8
Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 2,126
Percent ---------- 48.2

The number of issues included in group 5 is 19, accounting for 13 percent of 149 votes.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 6,736
Percent ---------- 82.2

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program—Continued

EISENHOWER POSITION—continued

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 1,460
Percent ---------- 17.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 7,596
Percent ---------- 83.8
Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 1,466
Percent ---------- 16.2

The number of issues included in group 6 is 44, accounting for 30 percent of 149 votes.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all votes not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 63 issues or 42 percent of all House votes.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	1,312	----------	1,725	----------	2,289	----------	2,126	----------
6	6,736	----------	1,460	----------	7,596	----------	1,466	----------
Total	8,048	71.6	3,185	28.4	9,885	73.3	3,592	26.7

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all votes representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 129 of the 149 votes or 87 percent of all House votes. These votes are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 55 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 45 percent. The Democrats supplied 68.5 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 31.5 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	1,078	----------	1,233	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
4	8,843	----------	10,307	----------	1,833	----------	1,802	----------
5	1,312	----------	1,725	----------	2,289	----------	2,126	----------
6	6,736	----------	1,460	----------	7,596	----------	1,466	----------
Total	17,969	55.0	14,725	45.0	11,718	68.5	5,394	31.5

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
A	----------	2	Election of Speaker.
1	3	4	Formosa policy (H. J. Res. 159)—Adoption of resolution, Jan. 25, 1955.
2		3	Veterans' educational benefits (H. R. 587)—Passage of bill, Jan. 27, 1955.
3	5	4	Selective service extension (H. R. 3005)—Passage of bill, Feb. 8, 1955.
4	6	4	Congressional-judicial salaries (H. R. 3828)—Passage of bill, Feb. 16, 1955.
5	3	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. Res. 142)—First vote on closed rule, Feb. 17, 1955.
6	9	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. Res. 142)—Amendment to permit open rule, Feb. 17, 1955.
7	10	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. Res. 142)—Adoption of closed rule, Feb. 17, 1955.
8	11	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. R. 1)—Motion to recommit, Feb. 18, 1955.
9	12	4	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. R. 1)—Passage of bill, Feb. 18, 1955.
10	15	6	Taxes (H. R. 4259)—Motion to recommit deleting $20 individual tax credit, Feb. 25, 1955.
11	16	6	Taxes (H. R. 4259)—Passage of bill, Feb. 25, 1955.
12	17	4	Congressional-judicial salaries (H. R. 3828)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 1, 1955.
13	19	4	Military career incentives (H. R. 4720)—Passage of bill, Mar. 10, 1955.
14	21	5	Second supplemental appropriation (H. R. 4903)—Amendment to provide funds for United Nations technical assistance program, Mar. 18, 1955.
15	23	5	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Suspension of rules, Mar. 21, 1955.
16	25	4	Burley tobacco allotment redetermination (H. R. 4951)—Motion to suspend rules, Mar. 21, 1955.
17	27	6	Sale of Government rubber plants (H. Res. 170)—Adoption of resolution, Mar. 22, 1955.
18	29	6	Sale of Government rubber plants (H. Res. 171)—Adoption of resolution, Mar. 23, 1955.
19	33	4	Taxes (H. R. 4259)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 30, 1955.
20	34	6	Independent offices appropriation (H. R. 5240)—Phillips amendment limiting amounts paid for reports to Budget Bureau figure, Mar. 30 1955.
21	37	6	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Moss amendment to raise average pay increase 8.2 percent, Apr. 20, 1955.
22	38	6	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Motion to recommit, Apr. 20, 1955.
23	39	5	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Passage of bill, Apr. 20, 1955.
24	41	4	Navy shipbuilding and conversion (H. R. 4393)—Passage of bill, Apr. 21, 1955.
25	46	6	Farm-price supports (H. R. 12)—Amendment to eliminate peanuts from list of basic commodities, May 5 1955.
26	47	6	Farm-price supports (H. R. 12)—Motion to recommit, May 5, 1955.
27	48	6	Farm-price supports (H. R. 12)—Passage of bill, May 5, 1955.

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
28	50	6	Postal employees pay (S. 1, substitute for H. R. 4644)—Motion to recommit, May 9, 1955.
29	51	5	Postal employees pay (S. 1, substitute for H. R. 4644)—Adoption of conference report, May 9, 1955.
30	52	4	Alaska-Hawaii statehood (H. Res. 223)—Adoption of rule, May 9, 1955.
31	57	6	Alaska-Hawaii statehood (H. R. 2535)—Motion to recommit, May 10, 1955.
32	62	6	Defense appropriation (H. R. 6042)—Amendment to permit transfer of activities performed by civilian employees to private enterprise, May 12, 1955.
33	63	3	Defense appropriation (H. R. 6042)—Passage of bill, May 12, 1955.
34	69	4	District of Columbia judges' salaries (S. 727)—Passage of bill, May 23, 1955.
35	71	2	Indiana toll charges (H. Res. 244)—Passage of bill, May 25, 1955.
36	72	4	Donable commodities (H. R. 2851)—Passage of bill, May 25, 1955.
37	74	2	District of Columbia judges salaries (S. 727)—Motion to recommit conference report, May 26, 1955.
38	76	4	Reclamation (H. R. 5881)—Motion to recommit, May 26, 1955.
39	78	4	Alaska water resources (H. R. 3990)—Motion to recommit, June 1, 1955.
40	79	4	Postal employees pay (S. 2061)—Passage of bill, June 7, 1955.
41	80	4	Inter-American Highway (H. R. 5923)—Passage of bill, June 8, 1955.
42	83	4	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. R. 1)—Adoption of conference report, June 14, 1955.
43	84	4	Bank holding companies (H. R. 6227)—Passage of bill, June 14, 1955.
44	86	6	Federal securities investigation (H. Res. 210)—Adoption of resolution, June 15, 1955.
45	88	4	Federal employees pay raise (S. 67)—Passage of bill, June 20, 1955.
46	89	1	NATO Parliamentary Conference (H. Con. Res. 109)—Adoption of resolution, June 20, 1955.
47	90	4	Travel expenses (H. R. 6295)—Passage of bill, June 20, 1955.
48	91	5	Central Valley, Calif., reclamation project (H. R. 4663)—Passage of bill, June 21, 1955.
49	93	5	Customs simplification (H. R. 6040)—Motion to recommit, June 22, 1955.
50	94	1	Colonialism and Communist imperialism (H. Con. Res. 149)—Adoption of resolution, June 23, 1955.
51	95	4	Debt-limit extension (H. R. 6992)—Passage of bill, June 27, 1955.
52	97	4	Military public works (H. R. 6829)—Passage of bill, June 27, 1955.
53	99	4	Selective-service extension (H. R. 3005)—Motion to recommit conference report, June 28, 1955.
54	100	4	Selective-service extension (H. R. 3005)—Adoption of conference report, June 28, 1955.
55	103	1	District of Columbia judges salaries (S. 727)—Motion to recommit second conference report, June 29, 1955.
56	105	4	Mutual Security Act (S. 2090)—Passage of bill, June 30, 1955.
57	109	5	Lake Michigan water diversion (H. R. 3210)—Motion to recommit, July 6, 1955.
58	110	4	Mutual Security Act (S. 2090)—Adoption of conference report, July 7, 1955.
59	112	4	Mutual security appropriation (H. R. 7224)—Passage of bill, July 11, 1955.
60	114	5	Public works appropriation (H. R. 6766)—Adoption of conference report which included items not approved by the Bureau of the Budget, July 13, 1955.
61	115	4	Survivors' benefits (H. Res. 295)—Adoption of closed rule, July 13, 1955.
62	119	4	Social security (H. R. 7225)—Passage of bill, July 18, 1955.
63	125	4	Minimum-wage increase (H. R. 7214)—Passage of bill, July 20, 1955.
64	129	4	Reserve forces (H. R. 7000)—Adoption of conference report, July 25, 1955.
65	130	4	Highway construction program (H. Res. 314)—Adoption of rule, July 26, 1955.
66	132	6	Highway construction program (H. R. 7474)—Motion to recommit, July 27, 1955.
67	133	4	Highway construction program (H. R. 7474)—Passage of bill, July 27, 1955.
68	135	4	Natural Gas Act (H. Res. 317)—Adoption of rule, July 28, 1955.
69	137	6	Natural Gas Act (H. R. 6645)—Motion to recommit, July 28, 1955.
70	138	6	Natural Gas Act (H. R. 6645)—Passage of bill, July 28, 1955.
71	140	6	Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126)—Wolcott amendment, July 29, 1955.
72	141	4	Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126)—Passage of bill, July 29, 1955.
73	143	2	Increase in Small Business Committee funds (H. Res. 299)—Adoption of resolution, Aug. 1, 1955.
74	144	2	Repeal franchise of Capital Transit Co. (S. 2576)—Motion to suspend the rules, Aug. 1, 1955.
75	147	6	Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126)—Adoption of conference report, Aug. 2, 1955.

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
1	3	3	Gasoline tax refund for farmers (H. R. 8780)—Passage of bill, Jan. 31, 1956.
2	4	1	Appropriation for Un-American Activities Committee (H. Res. 352)—Adoption of resolution, Jan. 31, 1956.
3	5	4	Navy shipbuilding and conversion (H. R. 7993)—Passage of bill, Feb. 1, 1956.
4	7	4	Sale of Government rubber plant (H. Res. 396)—Adoption of resolution, Feb. 8, 1956.
5	8	4	Military procurement (H. R. 8710)—Passage of bill, Feb. 20, 1956.
6	10	4	Colorado River storage (H. Res. 311)—Adoption of rule, Feb. 28, 1956.
7	14	4	Colorado River storage (H. R. 3383)—Passage of bill, Mar. 1, 1956.
8	15	4	Independent offices appropriation (H. R. 9739)—Amendment on supergrade positions, Mar. 7, 1956.
9	16	4	Extension of corporate and excise taxes (H. R. 9166)—Passage of bill, Mar. 13, 1956.
10	19	6	Agricultural Act of 1954, amendment (H. R. 8320)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 21, 1956.
11	20	3	Agricultural Act of 1954, amendment (H. R. 8320)—Adoption of Senate amendment, Mar. 21, 1956.
12	21	4	Permission for President to appoint retired Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard to a civilian position in the Department of Justice (S. 1271)—Motion to recommit.
13	23	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 12)—Motion to recommit conference report, Apr. 11, 1956.
14	24	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 12)—Adoption of conference report, Apr. 11, 1956.
15	25	4	Military construction (H. R. 9893)—Passage of bill, Apr. 12, 1956.
16	27	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 12)—Motion to override President's veto, Apr. 18, 1956.
17	28	1	Potomac River Bridge (H. R. 7728)—Passage of bill, Apr. 23, 1956.
18	34	6	Justice appropriation (H. R. 10721)—Amendment to eliminate supergrade positions, Apr. 25, 1956.
19	36	4	Highway construction bill (H. R. 10660)—Passage of bill, Apr. 27, 1956.
20	39	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Amendment on grazing lands, May 3, 1956.
21	40	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Amendment re 84 percent parity support on cotton, May 3, 1956.
22	41	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Motion to recommit providing advance payments for soil bank, May 3, 1956.
23	42	4	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Passage of bill, May 3, 1956.
24	46	6	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 10986)—Amendment to permit transfer of facilities operating in competition with private enterprise, May 10, 1956.
25	47	3	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 10986)—Passage of bill, May 10, 1956.
26	50	2	Franchise of Capital Transit Co. (H. R. 8901)—Motion to recommit, May 17, 1956.
27	52	4	Annuities to widows and children of Federal judges (H. R. 11124)—Passage of bill, May 21, 1956.
28	53	5	Public works appropriations (H. R. 11319)—Amendment to provide funds for resurvey of Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, May 22, 1956.
29	54	4	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Adoption of conference report, May 23, 1956.
30	55	6	Payment to Crow Indian Tribe (S. J. Res. 135)—Passed May 24, 1956, vetoed June 7, 1956.
31	56	4	Farm Credit Act, 1956 (H. R. 10285)—Passage of bill, May 31, 1956.
32	63	4	Mutual Security Act (H. R. 11356)—Passage of bill, June 11, 1956.
33	65	1	Strengthen Robinson-Patman Act (H. R. 1840)—Passage of bill, June 11, 1956.
34	69	6	Reclamation (H. R. 5881)—Conference report, motion to recommit, June 13, 1956.
35	70	6	Require use of automatic radio-call selector on United States cargo ships (H. R. 4090)—Motion to recommit, June 13, 1956.
36	71	6	Water-pollution control (H. R. 9540)—Motion to recommit with instructions to delete Federal construction grants, June 13, 1956.
37	72	4	Water Pollution Control Act (H. R. 9540)—Passage of bill, June 13, 1956.
38	75	1	District of Columbia daylight-saving time (S. 3295)—Passage of bill, June 25, 1956.
39	77	5	Veterans' disability pension (H. R. 7886)—Motion to recommit, June 27, 1956.
40	78	5	Veterans' disability pension (H. R. 7886)—Passage of bill, June 27, 1956.
41	81	5	Defense Production Act (H. R. 9852)—Adoption of conference report, June 28, 1956.
42	82	4	School construction (H. Res. 554)—Adoption of rule June 28, 1956.
43	85	4	Panama Canal bridge (H. R. 9801)—Passage of bill, July 2, 1956.
44	86	6	Fishing industry (S. 2379)—Passage of bill, July 2, 1956.
45	89	5	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—Gwinn amendment, July 5, 1956.

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
46	90	5	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—Powell amendment, July 5, 1956.
47	91	6	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—McConnell motion to recommit, July 5, 1956.
48	92	5	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—Passage of bill, July 5, 1956.
49	94	6	Postal rates increase (H. R. 11380)—Passage of bill, July 6, 1956.
50	95	4	Military construction (H. R. 9893)—Motion to recommit, July 9, 1956.
51	96	1	National Memorial Stadium (H. R. 11967)—Passage of bill, July 9 1956.
52	98	4	Foreign aid appropriations (H. R. 12130)—Passage of bill, July 11, 1956.
53	99	1	Resolution to consider supplemental appropriations bill (H. Res. 584)—Passage of resolution, July 12, 1956.
54	100	1	Supplemental appropriations (H. R. 12138)—Motion to recommit with instructions, July 12, 1956.
55	101	3	Increase in service-connected disability pensions (H. R. 12038)—Passage of bill, July 12, 1956.
56	103	1	Resolution opposing admission of Communist China to the United Nations (H. Con. Res. 265)—Adoption of resolution, July 18, 1956.
57	104	4	Increase funds, agricultural trade bill (H. R. 11708)—Passage of bill, July 18, 1956.
58	106	4	Civil-rights bill (H. R. 627)—Smith (Va.) motion, July 19, 1956.
59	110	4	Civil-rights bill (H. R. 627)—Motion to recommit, July 23, 1956.
60	111	4	Civil-rights bill (H. R. 627)—Passage, July 23, 1956.
61	112	1	Construction Contract Act (S. 1644)—Passage, July 23, 1956.
62	113	2	Suspension of wool tariffs (H. R. 12227)—Passage, July 23, 1956.
63	115	6	Defense appropriations (H. R. 7992)—Amendment concerning the transfer of work to private industry, July 24, 1956.
64	116	6	Atomic power (H. R. 12061)—Amendment to strike enacting clause, July 24, 1956.
65	117	6	Atomic power (H. R. 12061)—Motion to recommit, July 24, 1956.
66	119	4	Housing (H. R. 11742)—Amendment to rule, July 25, 1956.
67	120	1	Contempt citation, Arthur Miller (H. Res. 638)—Adoption of resolution, July 25, 1956.
68	123	6	Fryingpan-Arkansas rule to consider (H. Res. 641)—Adoption of resolution, July 26, 1956.
69	124	6	Air carriers rule to consider (H. Res. 602)—Adoption of resolution, July 26, 1956.
70	125	5	Air carriers (H. R. 8902)—Motion to recommit, July 27, 1956.
71	127	6	Southwestern Power Administration rates rule to consider (H. Res. 625)—Adoption of resolution, July 27, 1956.
72	128	6	Southwestern Power Administration (S. 3338)—Passage of bill, July 27, 1956.
73	131	6	Adoption of H. Res. 604 to permit action on Senate bill 3227 to authorize Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho, July 27, 1956.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
46	142	23	195	8
50	167	--------	200	--------
55	82	98	76	128

2D SESS.

2	181	--------	204	1
17	136	8	148	1
33	179	3	215	--------
38	104	55	95	60
51	126	48	162	32
53	161	27	201	3
54	20	170	5	200
56	189	--------	202	--------
61	105	87	141	58
67	186	1	187	8
Total	1,776	520	2,031	504

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
A	Martin	198	--------	228	--------
35	Nay	161	5	197	8
37	Yea	103	67	118	47
73	Nay	130	4	198	33
74	Nay	90	60	138	77

2D SESS.

26	Nay	96	76	95	66
62	Nay	86	37	132	84
	Total	864	249	1,106	315

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
2	160	--------	206	--------
33	179	--------	205	--------

2D SESS.

1	180	--------	207	--------
11	193	--------	213	--------
25	178	--------	199	--------
55	188	--------	203	--------
Total	1,078	--------	1,233	--------

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
1	Yea	185	225	1	2
3	Yea	171	223	--------	4
4	Yea	117	166	59	59
9	Yea	109	186	35	75
12	Yea	104	119	53	60
13	Yea	191	208	--------	1
16	Yea	109	151	68	84
19	Yea	187	200	8	--------
24	Yea	176	197	1	2
30	Yea	121	202	8	58
34	Yea	134	149	16	17
36	Yea	156	188	1	--------
38	Nay	78	157	8	54
39	Nay	91	187	10	69
40	Yea	187	223	--------	1
41	Yea	161	192	1	12
42	Yea	150	197	18	36
43	Yea	158	213	--------	24
45	Yea	165	205	--------	3

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*—Continued

1ST SESS.—continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
47	Yea	131	189	11	30
51	Yea	133	134	43	13
52	Yea	143	173	1	1
53	Nay	94	127	88	83
54	Yea	176	213	1	4
56	Yea	113	160	51	77
58	Yea	109	153	48	72
59	Yea	105	146	53	70
61	Yea	179	197	12	12
62	Yea	169	203	8	23
63	Yea	170	192	29	25
64	Yea	146	169	38	40
65	Yea	153	121	94	35
67	Nay	164	128	94	29
68	Yea	143	130	88	47
72	Yea	185	211	3	--------

2D SESS.

3	Yea	170	190	2	1
4	Nay	167	143	59	2
5	Yea	171	201	2	--------
6	Yea	166	188	12	14
7	Yea	120	136	63	73
8	Nay	122	109	87	63
9	Yea	168	198	1	3
12	Nay	172	139	67	13
15	Yea	174	203	1	2
19	Yea	188	200	15	4
23	Yea	123	191	16	62
27	Yea	102	136	19	33
29	Yea	132	173	12	47
31	Yea	118	129	2	2
32	Yea	112	163	52	70
37	Yea	148	190	5	26
42	Yea	168	159	51	16
43	Yea	142	183	16	43
50	Nay	155	188	5	24
52	Yea	124	160	50	70
57	Yea	187	202	5	1
58	Nay	178	112	94	10
59	Nay	164	111	102	29
60	Yea	168	111	102	24
66	Nay	141	158	44	48
	Total	8,843	10,307	1,833	1,802

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
5	Yea	62	116	101	106
6	Nay	59	134	82	109
7	Yea	65	128	88	104
8	Nay	66	140	80	119
14	Yea	47	128	22	85
15	Yea	85	35	190	112
23	Nay	84	1	217	107
29	Nay	66		212	116
48	Yea	76	154	54	99
49	Nay	83	149	58	85
57	Yea	71	3	201	115
60	Nay	78	14	203	113

2D SESS.

39	Yea	71	39	182	123
40	Nay	41	10	213	152
41	Yea	65	135	76	121
45	Nay	88	162	61	107
46	Nay	46	146	77	148
48	Yea	75	119	105	119
70	Yea	84	112	67	86
	Total	1,312	1,725	2,289	2,126

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
10	Yea	189	16	205	5
11	Nay	173	2	221	21
17	Nay	191	92	131	1
18	Nay	189	87	132	5
20	Yea	137	17	187	40
21	Nay	172	17	202	22
22	Yea	122	3	215	72
25	Yea	178	15	201	14
26	Yea	175	24	193	19
27	Nay	172	29	185	21
28	Yea	117	1	211	64
31	Yea	113	105	107	63
32	Yea	147	37	168	34
44	Nay	185	29	177	1
66	Yea	186	7	214	7
69	Nay	123	87	136	67
70	Yea	123	86	136	67
71	Yea	151	66	152	36
75	Nay	131	37	153	34

2D SESS.

10	Nay	193	22	195	
13	Yea	167	14	211	27
14	Nay	146	35	189	48
16	Nay	173	38	182	20
18	Nay	92	92	99	80
20	Nay	178	17	191	8
21	Nay	184	24	183	3
22	Yea	183	1	207	4
24	Yea	158	64	133	123
28	Nay	166	4	178	1
30	Nay	125	1	159	17
34	Yea	119	60	147	62
35	Yea	133	18	185	43
36	Yea	140	25	176	37
44	Nay	100	33	170	86
47	Yea	149	9	215	47
49	Yea	178	39	162	4
63	Nay	169	16	179	22
64	Yea	174	21	179	20
65	Yea	176	27	174	17
68	Yea	126	53	140	54
69	Yea	107	77	109	69
71	Nay	122	4	172	47
72	Nay	134	6	167	34
73	Yea	170	3	168	
	Total	6,736	1,460	7,596	1,466

Better Roads for a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from Detroit, the motor city of the world, it gives me great pleasure to have voted for the Federal highway-construction bill—a multi-billion-dollar roadbuilding project that will take more than a decade to complete. At long last, the American people, through their representatives in Congress, have placed the automotive problem in its proper perspective. You might say that the average citizen has come to realize what we in Detroit have known for a long time, namely, the family car is now a vital link in our everyday routine. Slowly but surely America also has been awakening to the fact that this wonderful invention, the automobile, is of no use if the roads are too congested to drive in comfort and parking is not available at our destination. In recent years State and local governments have been hard put even to repair roads enough to keep traffic moving. Some new roads have been constructed, but all too many of these are toll.

America is on the move. Today we are capable of traveling in hours a distance that would have taken our forefathers months. Mr. and Mrs. America on a modern-day vacation trip may journey 2,000 or 3,000 miles. The degree of enjoyment derived from a trip of this nature will depend in a large measure upon the ability of various regions to maintain their through-traffic roads. Quite often indebtedness limitations and other factors will prevent proper maintenance of the right-of-way. What then are we to do? The problem, unfortunately, cannot be attacked on a local basis. It is too big. The answer is to face the question squarely, admit that the interstate system is inadequate, and then make an effort to supply a solution.

Much is at stake in our highway system. The very complexion of our country is dependent upon the free movement of motor vehicles, both pleasure and commercial. In recent years, there has been a virtual exodus from the crowded cities to the clean air of the suburbs. Needless to say, this would have been impossible without the family car. With the suburban growth, however, the road congestion problem moved from the city to the county. Many suburban residents now find themselves quite inconvenienced since they must travel considerable distance to jobs, stores, and social events over choked, unsafe roads. It has been estimated that as high as 85 percent of workers living 10 miles from their place of employment must depend on their car for transportation. If suburban growth is to continue, we must link new communities and metropolitan areas with adequate roads. It is wonderful that so many parents are afforded the opportunity to raise their children in pleasant suburban communities; let us do nothing to inhibit further utilization of noncity areas.

A principal factor in the road problem demanding immediate attention is the rising toll of dead and injured on our Nation's thoroughfares. Every major holiday brings another sickening tabulation, each more terrible than the last. The plain fact is that the majority of our highways built 20 years ago were designed for light traffic and light vehicles but not to carry our present high-speed traffic. The neglect of the war years, coupled with expanded postwar production of fast, heavy motor vehicles, makes our present interstate system grossly inadequate.

It is quite safe to assume that in addition to personal annoyance, congestion, and loss of life and limb, many segments of our economy are being hampered and restricted in growth by the strangulation effect of poor roads. The farmer quite often cannot get his products to the consumer quickly enough to prevent spoilage; truckers cannot haul rapidly enough to assure inexpensive delivery of manufactured goods to the wholesale dealer. This in turn raises prices as expanded delivery charges are passed on to the ultimate consumer and, as prices go up, the customer restricts his purchasing. This is but one small instance of the indirect effect of poor roads on America's welfare. There are many other examples of industries adversely affected by the road situation. The most striking of these, of course, is the automobile industry.

It should be obvious to everyone that when the automobile industry suffers, the entire American economy will, in a very short time, feel the ill effects of a slump in Detroit.

It is difficult to visualize the many important ties that the city of Detroit has with every crossroad in America. The automobile figures prominently in all phases of commerce and has contributed mightily to the fabulous progress of American business. In addition to providing the workhorse of business, the automotive industry encourages and sustains a myriad of allied and subordinate industries. The 45,000 automobile dealers are but one small element of Detroit's contribution to the Nation's economic health. The thousands of gas stations—employing thousands of people—that dot the highways provide dissemination of the products of still other concerns which therein display and sell their wares to the auto owner.

Tires, glass, and mechanical repair shops, car washes, upholstery and convertible-top manufacturers, drive-in theaters, and restaurants—all are indebted to the automobile and all must have good roads to survive.

There are many reasons why an adequate road system is vital to the continued and expanded well-being of the American people. One out of every seven persons employed in the United States—or almost 10 million persons—is engaged in highway transport industries. This country owns 73 percent of the world's passenger cars, and almost $5 billion a year is paid in automobile insurance premiums. The Federal Government and the States have greatly

benefited from auto vehicle taxes—some of which are too high. The automobile is a necessity, not a luxury.

The steel industry, the economic yardstick of the whole free-enterprise system, is also most dependent upon good roads to keep the sale of automobiles at a healthy level. As you probably know, the automobile industry consumes almost 40 percent of all sheet metal produced in the United States. Any economist will tell you that it is absolutely vital that the production of steel be kept as high as possible if the Nation is to remain financially stable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that our vast road system has made us think big. We have astounded the world with our transportation feats in both peace and war. In World War II, our ability to move large numbers of troops both here and abroad utterly fascinated logistical experts from other nations. We did not learn these transportation secrets by accident. We developed them through a steady production of the best automotive products in the world, which in turn encouraged the best road system in the world. However, advancements in production methods in recent years have brought about an imbalance that must be corrected if we are to prosper and grow. I am certain the Federal highway construction bill of 1956, in addition to creating 150,000 new jobs, will alleviate the majority of highway problems facing us today.

Department of Defense Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, during the 10 years I have had the honor of representing the people of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina, I have been increasingly impressed by the steady growth in the number and scope of congressional investigations.

There is no question but that the investigative function of the Congress is a most necessary adjunct to the legislative process. But it seems to me that greater care must be taken if these investigations are to fully serve the purposes for which they are intended. Where the matters being examined affect the executive branch of the Government, the investigation should be designed not only to help the Congress in its work but also the departments and agencies as well.

Since the Members of the Congress are themselves heavily burdened with their day-to-day legislative tasks, much of the actual investigatory work is, of necessity, placed in the hands of committee staffs. By and large, the staff personnel selected have been very good. However, I do not believe that the committees are making the best use of their potential. Individual members of committees are not always given an opportunity to participate directly with the staff and to guide their work. The staff, therefore, does not get the full benefit of the knowledge and experience of the entire committee.

The House Appropriations Committee, on which I have the honor and pleasure to serve, some months ago engaged a staff to investigate the procurement policies and practices of the Department of Defense. Although I was a member of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, I was not informed of the purpose and scope of this particular investigation. Other members of the subcommittee found themselves in the same situation. It was not until the investigating staff submitted its report that we were aware of the full nature of the investigation and the methods employed. We were thus deprived of an opportunity to make available to the staff the knowledge and experience which we had accumulated from our many contacts with officials at all levels in the Defense Establishment and from our personal inspections of defense installations throughout the world. I feel sure that the results of this investigation would have been of much greater value to both the committee and the Defense Department had the knowledge and experience of all the members of the subcommittee been brought to bear on this particular problem area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish these remarks to be construed as criticism of the committee and subcommittee chairmen. They are extremely able, conscientious, and courteous gentlemen, and grossly overburdened with work. I offer these remarks purely as a suggestion for improving the work of committee staff investigators and to better assure that their reports contribute to the objective of better government.

Voting Record of the Honorable Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting record during the 84th Congress. The purpose of this report is to provide my interested constituents with a simple compilation of the votes I cast on important legislation which came before the Congress.

For the purpose of identification I include a brief description of each bill. For further simplification I have divided the list into categories according to general subjects.

FARM LEGISLATION

Voted for H. R. 10875 with soil-bank provisions and other programs designated to bolster farm income.

Voted for H. R. 8780 to eliminate gasoline taxes on fuel used in operation of farm machinery.

Voted for H. R. 12 to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 with respect to price supports for basic crops.

Voted for H. R. 2851 to make Commodity Credit Corporation—farm surplus—commodities available for distribution to distressed areas.

Voted for H. R. 11708 to increase appropriations for disposal of agricultural products.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Voted for S. 67 to increase pay of civil-service employees and provide fringe benefits.

Voted for H. R. 4644 to increase postal workers' pay, eliminate inequities in service.

Voted for H. R. 7619 which liberalizes civil-service retirement benefits.

LABOR

Voted for H. R. 7214 to increase the minimum wage to $1 per hour.

Voted against H. R. 9852 which would require dispersal of defense industries.

Voted for Bacon-Davis amendment to highway bill that requires prevailing rates of pay for all labor on highway-construction projects.

VETERANS

Voted for H. R. 7886 to provide increased pensions for World War I veterans.

Voted for H. R. 587 to extend the GI education bill.

Voted for H. R. 12038 for increased payments for service-connected disabilities.

Voted for H. R. 7089 to provide increased survivor benefits for servicemen.

Voted for H. R. 9824 which provides for educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II or Korea.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Voted for H. R. 6042 in 1955 and H. R. 10986 in 1956. Both bills provided for appropriations to operate the armed services.

Voted for H. R. 4393 in 1955 and H. R. 7993 in 1956. These bills provided $1.3 and $1.4 billion for Navy shipbuilding and modernization of fleet programs.

Voted for H. R. 3005 to increase benefits under dependents' assistance program and provide for a continuing Armed Forces personnel program.

Voted for H. R. 7000 to strengthen the Armed Forces Reserve program which offers youths choice of several ways to fulfill their military obligations.

Voted for H. R. 6829 in 1955 and H. R. 9893 in 1956 which provided nearly $4 billion for military construction projects.

Voted for H. R. 4720 to increase pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Voted for House Joint Resolution 159 which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Voted for H. R. 1 which authorized the President to enter into beneficial trade negotiations with various nations of the world.

Voted for H. R. 7224 and H. R. 12130 which provided foreign aid funds.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 265 which expressed Congress' opposition to admittance of Red China into the United Nations.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Voted for H. R. 7535 to authorize a Federal aid program for school construction.

Voted for H. R. 7225 to lower the retirement age for women to 62 and start disability payments at age 50 under the social-security program.

Voted for S. 3272 which protects threatened communities by providing $15 million for Army engineers to construct without further authorization small flood-control projects.

Voted for H. R. 2840 which authorizes 5-year $7.5 million a year program of Federal aid for State library services in isolated rural areas.

Voted for S. 849 which authorizes Federal aid of $30 million annually for 3 years for construction of non-Federal facilities for research into various crippling and killing diseases.

Voted for S. 3616 to increase benefit payments under railroad retirement system.

Voted for H. R. 11861 which provides for Federal participation in the cost of protection of the shores of the United States from erosion and permits Federal assistance to shores other than those publicly owned where a benefit will accrue to or is incidental to the benefit to public property.

Voted for H. R. 10660 which sets up a 13-year $38 billion program to develop interstate primary and secondary highways in the Nation.

Voted for H. R. 8320 which extended school milk program and set up $75 million fund for program.

BUSINESS

Voted for H. R. 8710 which removed authority of Defense Department to negotiate big contracts. Bids must now be called on contracts over $2,500.

Voted for H. R. 7992 which would require Defense Department to submit proposal to Congress before contracting out work to private industry.

Voted for H. R. 6227 which provides regulation by the Government of bank holding companies.

Voted for H. R. 4259 and H. R. 9166 for extension of corporation taxes.

Voted for S. 3732—Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—provides liberal program for issuance of direct flood-insurance policies.

Voted for S. 3879 which permits automobile dealers to sue under antitrust laws for unjust revocation of franchise.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Voted against H. R. 6645, a bill which would have exempted independent gas producers from regulation under Natural Gas Act of 1938.

Voted for H. R. 12080 to authorize $1.3 billion for river and harbor improvements, flood and beach erosion control projects.

Voted for S. 890 which increases to $1 million a year Federal research grants to States and expands program for water-pollution control to $50 million a year for 5 years.

Voted for H. R. 8750 which broadens watershed and flood-prevention program—allocates shared costs among Federal and local interests.

Social Security and Benefits for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been from the very beginning a strong believer in the aims and purposes of social security, and consequently I gave my support to the first social-security bill that was passed and to every amendment that has been adopted since that time.

The first bill was not much more than an adoption of the principle that underlies social security, namely, assistance to workers in their old age and to others handicapped and in need of help. The amount of benefits fixed by the bill was not large. But it was, at least, something. As time went on deficiencies in the legislation became more and more apparent. This brought demands for correction. Congress was sympathetic. It recognized the need. It sought to remedy the deficiencies. Thus, throughout the years and even up to and including this session of Congress changes have been made that have greatly improved the status of retired workers, elderly people, and the handicapped. Benefits have been increased, but there is more that should be done in this respect.

In addition to the many improvements made in the past, an admendment adopted during this session of Congress has reduced the age of eligibility of women from 65 years to 62 years. The amendment also has provided that persons totally disabled shall be eligible for benefits at age 50 instead of 65. Furthermore, the act has been expanded so that it now includes an additional 10 million persons to come under its coverage in different activities.

More than seven and one-half million are receiving monthly payments under old-age and survivors insurance. Over 1,300,000 are receiving unemployment insurance payments. Five million are receiving public-assistance payments through the Federal-State programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the totally disabled, and aid to the blind. Additional millions are receiving services pursuant to the maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act. In all, 14,000,000 persons are receiving money payments today under our Social Security Act programs.

As I have already said, I am of the opinion there are many changes yet to be made to make the act all that it should be. These relate to increased benefits and further reduction of age limitations for eligibility for benefits. Furthermore, the act should be expanded until all persons are brought within its provisions. There should be no business or other activity excluded. It is a national law and should give coverage to all who desire to participate in its benefits.

It seems to me there is a distinct duty and obligation upon a nation such as ours to make provision for its elderly citizens. This applies not only to social-security benefits, but also with respect to housing, hospital and medical care, nursing homes, and in other fields of welfare activities. There is nothing more disturbing nor the cause of greater worry than to approach old age with no assurance as to how it will be possible to meet the conditions of that time of life with only meager savings or maybe none at all.

If there should be any disposition upon the part of those who do not feel or face the condition I have just described and doubt the existence of such, then I can assure them that a day's experience in any congressional office will be sufficient to convince them of the fact that such a condition does exist. The letters that come into a Congressman's office and the personal appeals that are made to him, either by the aged themselves or by those who, with incomes insufficient to care for their own families, must assume the obligation to care for aged relatives, show this condition of need to be all too general. It is a pathetic problem, and we must find a remedy for it.

Investigations of every kind and character are authorized by Congress, and millions of dollars are spent in carrying them forward. I know of no investigation that is more necessary or more justifiable than an inquiry that will show the dire need of many thousands of aged persons who are faced with distress as they reach old age, and to this I pledge my support.

Leopold D. Silberstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans are becoming better acquainted with the name of Leopold D. Silberstein, president of Pennsylvania's Penn-Texas Corp.

However, there is considerable significance in the fact that his name is being used, to the exclusion of 30 or 40 others, in reports on the works of a committee of Congress looking into the ownership of certain American industries.

This committee is doing a fine job, I am sure, and certainly a most important one.

It has been reported in the newspapers that 30 or 40 large business enterprises and businessmen are involved in the inquiry, but the stories always seem to mention only Mr. Silberstein by name, and refer to the others as "30 or 40 others."

This may or may not be a form of persecution for this man, but the evidence would seem to indicate that it is. It appears to me,

in the interest of fair play, that if one of those being investigated is to be named then the others should be named.

When one man is singled out of 30 or 40, the question of individual persecution must arise, under our American way of thinking and the accepted rules of fair play.

While I do not know who is responsible for the situation, nor the reasons behind it, I do want to express the thought before my colleagues that if one name is to be used they should all be used.

This is an appropriate time further to bring Mr. Silberstein to the attention of Members of Congress because of his many accomplishments in the field of business enterprise, humanitarian causes, and membership in groups and organizations dedicated to the help of mankind.

He is an example of the energetic businessman who is never too busy to devote his talents to worthwhile causes and bring to them the same measure of success that has characterized his business enterprises.

We need more of these men in America today. Mr. Silberstein is president of the Pratt-Whitney Foundation, Inc., dedicated to philanthropic work; cochairman of the New York Daily Mirror youth program to combat juvenile delinquency; a member of the fund-raising committee of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., and a member of the 1956 campaign committee of the cerebral palsy drive.

Recently, the Advertising Club of Washington awarded a citation, entitled "Award for Achievement," to Mr. Silberstein.

In 6 years, starting with a Pennsylvania coal company in financial difficulty, Mr. Silberstein has erected an enormously successful and job-providing corporation with 16 subsidiaries throughout the United States.

The important point is that Mr. Silberstein came to this country only 8 years ago as a refugee—one who had been forced to flee for his life from Nazi persecution.

The citation stressed the fact that he has set new standards in business public relations based on the belief that the investing, working, and consuming public have the right to know how America's leading corporations operate.

Nowhere in all the world could this happen but in a great free society under our inspired system of government.

Mr. President, when William Penn founded the colony of Pennsylvania he did so in the concept of what he himself described as the "holy experiment."

This experiment, to be a beacon light to the founders of our Nation, made of Pennsylvania a sanctuary for the persecuted of all Europe.

Under the benevolence of William Penn, true principles of freedom, liberty of conscience, and love of one's fellowmen were founded in Pennsylvania. There were no barriers—there was no discrimination. There was neither creed, nor color, nor race.

Leopold Silberstein has given us new proof that our country is still the land of liberty and freedom and that our boundaries are limitless and our frontiers still unexplored.

My distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Oregon has previously mentioned Mr. Silberstein on this floor, as did former Senator Hunt, of Wyoming, who commented on Mr. Silberstein's speech over the Voice of America to foreign countries.

His success, starting with the rehabilitation of the Pennsylvania coal company and providing many, many jobs for our people, led to the creation of numerous other companies.

Mr. Silberstein founded the Penn-Texas Corp., which he heads, and met with even greater success. A builder of companies, I note that Time magazine once described him also as a "professor of sick companies." None of his companies is sick today. He makes them strong by modern, sound business enterprise.

We in Pennsylvania believe in free enterprise and we welcome those with the know-how to provide jobs and add to our Nation's economic growth and well-being.

Pledge and Performance—A Record of Magnificent Republican Accomplishment for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, no political organization has ever done more to keep its pledges to the people of this country than the Republican Party under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The result is a record of magnificent accomplishment for America.

Less than 4 years ago the citizens of this Nation turned to President Eisenhower and the Republican Party because they wanted some changes made in the way the Federal Government was being run.

Small wonder.

Here are some of the things they were reading about in the newspapers:

New casualty lists from the stalemated war in Korea.

Prospects of a bigger Federal deficit with billions more added to the public debt in the year ahead.

Falling farm prices and mounting farm surpluses.

Scandal and corruption in government.

Communist subversion; new disclosures of Red sympathizers holding jobs on the Federal payrolls.

Inflation sending the price of consumer goods higher and higher.

Threats of new Government controls over an economy already in a straitjacket of regimentation.

Schemes to centralize more power in Washington at the price of State and local authority as well as individual freedom.

This was the sorry state of the Union after two decades of Democrat mismanagement, and the people of America were at long last wised up, fed up, and burned up with the record of a party that was long on promise and short on performance.

What a welcome contrast the stewardship of the Republican-Eisenhower administration has been.

The story of that stewardship—of achievement in the field of national security, domestic economy, and social progress—is on the books.

We have come far—farther than anyone believed we could come in such a short time—toward restoring sound, decent, far-sighted government.

In broadest outline, we have moved from war to peace and from a stagnating economy to a prosperity unsurpassed in the history of man.

Only the bitter partisan would insist the Nation's well-being today has all come about by accident.

Wars just do not end by themselves.

Our domestic economy is not run by perpetual motion.

Government plays a major role in the life of every citizen, and it is the individual himself who knows whether the government serving him is good or is bad.

Our people have had good government for the past 4 years and they know it.

They have never had better government.

The war in Korea—that frustrating, deliberately stalemated war—was ended by the new Republican-Eisenhower administration as the first order of business.

What is more important, there have been no new wars.

Under the experienced leadership of President Eisenhower, the Nation's defenses have been strengthened.

Americans are more secure today than ever before—safer from attack and from subversion.

A firm, consistent foreign policy has earned us world respect.

Our proposals for an enduring peace have bolstered the hopes of freedom-loving men and women everywhere and have confounded our potential enemies.

Thanks to competent administration of our defense buildup, we have made the taxpayer's dollar work harder, giving us greater armed might for less money.

We lead the world in the development of atomic weapons and we lead the world in a program for the peaceful use of nuclear power.

In 1950, Republicans adopted a Statement of Principles and Objectives, one of which held that "A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security."

The American economy has never been stronger than it is today.

Our economy is strong because of Republican policies which were put into practice by President Eisenhower and his administration, and supported by Republicans in the Congress of the United States.

What did we do to stimulate this record-breaking national prosperity? Many things.

Let me list a few:

We abolished artificial wage and price controls that were stifling economic growth.

We cut Government spending, eliminating waste and extravagance in the Federal household.

This operation involved reductions in the Federal payroll amounting to tens of thousands.

It involved more than a dozen reorganization plans adopted by the Republican 83d Congress on the recommendation of the administration.

It involved chopping out waste and luxuries in the Truman administration's budget by more than $10 billion in the first year of the Eisenhower administration.

With such savings it was possible for a Republican administration to make good on its pledge to cut taxes.

As a result, American taxpayers got the biggest break from the Republican 83d

Congress in the Nation's history—a $7.4 billion annual tax reduction program, with $2 out of every $3 staying in the pockets of individuals.

Beyond that, a monumental tax revision bill corrected scores of inequities which had grown up in our tax structure through the years, inequities that caused unreasonable hardship for many in lower income brackets who could least afford the burden.

A Republican administration and a Republican Congress moved rapidly and in harmony to get the Government out of competition with private industry where such competition was unjust and unnecessary.

A Small Business Administration was established, for the first time, to help the little operator solve his postwar problems and prosper as a vital part of our complex economic machine.

Recognizing agriculture's prime importance to the health of the Nation's economy, a Republican administration moved early to attack deep-rooted farm troubles with a sound and sensible program.

The new program, finally enacted after repeated Democrat attempts at sabotage, is now in operation and agriculture is moving ahead. The long downward trend of farm prices has been reversed and farm income is rising. Since 1954, nearly $3 billion worth of Government-owned surplus agricultural products have been disposed of, mostly by export.

Our goal is a fair share of the national income for the farmer without unwarranted regimentation by Government bureaucracy.

Republicans consider fiscal integrity a priceless ingredient of good government.

Careful handling of the people's money has been a hallmark of this Republican administration.

One of the major pledges of the Republican Party was to balance the Federal budget at the earliest possible time.

The budget has been balanced.

Moreover, the Federal Treasury has been able to announce a surplus of $1.7 billion to apply on the national debt.

These actions supplied the foundation for our present prosperity—a prosperity unprecedented in scope.

Here are the record-breaking aspects of our domestic economy today, an economy that is booming because our people have confidence in the policies and principles of this Republican-Eisenhower administration:

National income is at its highest level in history, surpassing by $33.5 billion the war-stimulated peak under a Democrat regime.

We have broken through the $400 billion mark on our gross national product.

Employment is beyond all previous expectations, with nearly 67 million Americans holding jobs.

What is more, hourly and weekly wages are running at an all-time high. Pay increases mean something today, in sharp contrast to cost-of-living wage hikes of past years which were always a step below a price level that kept going up and up.

Strike losses are at the lowest level since the long years of war and Government intervention in work stoppages.

Per capita disposable personal income is at a record high and so is production and consumer purchasing.

Far-reaching plans for the expansion of business and industry give assurance of even more and better job opportunities for young men and women now coming into the labor market.

Through the years, the Republican Party has always woven into the fabric of our social and economic orders the good that has developed generation by generation.

The surging progress of the last 4 years in the area of human well-being is without parallel in the past 20 years.

This short period has seen establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It has seen the country's social security system broadened and improved, with more than 10 million additional Americans brought into the program and benefits increased to the millions already participating.

Unemployment insurance coverage has been extended to millions of additional workers and railroad retirement benefits increased.

A program of hospital construction for the chronically ill is now in operation.

The dream of most American families—to own their own homes—has been realized by more households than during any other similar period in the Nation's history.

The record number of new homes—built by private industry under Government policies that have encouraged but not subsidized such activity—demonstrates that America can become a nation of homeowners without a vast public housing program.

The social progress we have made under Republican leadership has not been at the cost of individual self-reliance. It has not been accomplished through socialization of vast segments of our economy, but through well-ordered programs that have stimulated private initiative and free enterprise.

The Nation's long-neglected highway system, the network of roads so necessary to the orderly growth of America socially and economically, and to our very security, has come in for a full share of attention.

Never before has any nation embarked on a roadbuilding program so ambitious in its concept than the one put on the record books this year.

Blocked by a Democratic Congress for a year, the $33 billion program was finally enacted into law, thanks to the persistence of a Republican President and Republicans in the Congress, who put the national good above all other considerations.

It is this determination of a Republican President to serve all the people that has contributed so much to the success of the Republican program for a better America.

President Eisenhower has kept the faith.

He has restored the great prestige of the office of the Presidency by the example he has set.

The people of America believe in him because he has proved that he believes in them.

There is no favoritism in the White House today.

There is no petty bickering with the Congress, no ultimatums, no displays of spleen.

Citizens in all walks of life know that under Republican leadership they have been treated as Americans should be treated—fairly and with respect.

Small wonder President Eisenhower stands today as the most widely admired leader in the world.

Much remains to be done.

Under continued Republican leadership, it can and will be done.

We have come far along the road to an enduring peace, but problems and misunderstandings still beset mankind.

The prosperous times we presently enjoy can be but the prelude of an even better life for future generations of Americans if we hold to principles that have already made our Nation the envy of the world.

The Republican Party has demonstrated what sound leadership can do for America and for the world.

It is pledged to continue that kind of service in the years ahead.

Pay as You Go in Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my speech to my comrades of the Spanish-American War at the 57th reunion of the old 10th Pennsylvania Infantry, which fought with the greatest distinction in the Philippines.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Spanish-American War was our last armed conflict in which every man was a volunteer. It was the first war in which our troops fought beyond the seas. It started the course of the United States toward leadership as a world power.

The pay of the Spanish War serviceman was $13 a month, paid in gold. He didn't get a $10,000 insurance policy, a bonus, separation pay, adjusted compensation, or a college education at Government expense.

No service pensions were provided for Spanish War veterans until 20 years after the war ended and no hospitalization was available until 24 years after the war.

The food of a soldier consisted of meat, beans, potatoes, and hardtack. It took a troop train 8 days and 8 nights to cross the continent, and soldiers were carried in second-rate day coaches. It required 30 days to go from San Francisco to the Philippine Islands.

In view of present day conditions it is interesting to look back to those days and consider the situation in the United States in 1898.

At that time there were 45 States in the Union. The population of the United States was a little under 76 million. It is now more than 166 million.

In the year, 1898, the national income was a little more than $15 billion a year and

the money in circulation was less than $2 billion or about $24 a person. Now we have a national income in excess of $324 billion a year and the money in circulation amounts to $31 billion or $183 per person.

All taxes collected by the Federal Government preceding the Spanish-American War totaled less than $3 billion. Since that time the American people have paid more than $800 billion in Federal taxes.

In 1898 there were 200,000 Federal employees. Now we have 2¼ million.

At that time there were less than 1,000 automobiles in the world. There were dreamers who thought that someday we might travel in the air. There was no thought of radio or television.

There was not a single mile of paved road in the United States. Less than one-fourth of the homes of the country were equipped with plumbing. Practically every house had its own source of water supply.

There was practically no preventive medicine. Each year there was a heavy toll from fevers, pneumonia, measles, and diphtheria. Very little progress had been made toward modern sanitation.

Many people still lived in log and sod houses and miner's cabins. The greater number of our people still maintained themselves by work on the farm. There were few labor-saving devices.

Less than half of our young people had the opportunity to complete a high-school education, and only a few were able to go to college.

We are now the greatest power of all history. Our Capital City is the center of the world. While we possess only 7 percent of the world's population and area, yet we produce more than half of the world's goods.

What has brought this about? What great resources did we possess that made us, in less than 200 years, the strongest, the richest, and most productive Nation in the world?

We had freedom of the individual and an economy firmly established on the American system of free enterprise.

These precious assets will be the foundation of greater security, greater progress, and more expanding prosperity provided we keep our Government on a sound and strong financial footing.

To assure the safety and security of the United States and to perpetuate freedom of the individual the pay-as-you-go principle should be applied to Government financing at all levels.

Otherwise we face the dangers of high taxes and excessive debt which have destroyed more great nations than invading armies.

It is most important for Americans to consider that our national debt of $273 billion is more than the combined debt of 75 other nations of the world, including Soviet Russia.

The debt of State and local government is the highest in all history and they are continually reaching out for more taxes.

Individual indebtedness has climbed to the highest level in the history of the United States.

It should be a matter of deep concern to all of us that our public and private debt has reached the fantastic total of $658 billion.

The direct and hidden taxes paid by the American people for the support of Government are greater than the combined taxes of 75 other nations of the world, including Soviet Russia.

High taxes and burdensome debt are responsible for inflation and the severe hardships that result when the dollar is depreciated to half its value.

America must be awakened to these dangers. What can we do?

We must all take part in government. It is unfortunate that so many of our people fail to take an active interest in civic affairs.

We must all work for economy and sound fiscal policies at all levels of government, Federal, State, and local.

We must have a stable dollar, supported by a free economy, producing plenty of goods to buy with our earnings.

Every real American must be on guard against communism and all other subversive influences. We must all preach and practice patriotic Americanism.

Every man and woman must be ready and prepared to defend our freedom. It cannot be done with push button warfare.

We pray that we may never be forced into another war but in time of peril our Nation will again be defended by heroes in the mud, in the air, on the water, and in the jungles.

Our forefathers, in the development of this great country, carried with them into the wilderness the axe, the rifle, and the Holy Bible.

The axe is the symbol of work and self-reliance.

The rifle symbolizes the individual responsibility of every American to defend the way of life we are privileged to enjoy.

The Bible calls for faith in the greater power that rules the world and will protect those of courage, understanding, and righteousness.

The characteristics that have made America great are courage, freedom, justice, temperance, tolerance, faith, hope, and love of God. These characteristics, practiced by the individual, are the strength of our Nation.

Let us fill our knapsacks with those noble ideals and march forth, as you did and as have brave men of every generation, in the defense of our country.

Israel Should Have the Help of All Free Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Israel is one that should have the sympathetic and favorable consideration of all who are in a position to be helpful.

The long and sacrificial period of years that preceded the establishment of the state of Israel is one of the most outstanding and praiseworthy efforts of any people to have freedom and a nation with its own flag. The courage that was displayed, the fearless determination, and the indomitable will to succeed merits whatever help is necessary from America and the other free nations of the world to establish and make certain its sovereignty and security.

Israel is surrounded by Arab nations with unfriendly feelings and designs calculated to destroy it and its people. This attitude on the part of the Arabs cannot be explained or justified upon any reasonable basis. Certainly the little nation of Israel is not in any sense strong enough to menace or be harmful to the Arab nations that surround it. Nor is there any intention or desire to do so. The people of Israel are peaceful. They have no desire for war nor conflict of any kind. They want to live peaceably with all men. They have opened their gates to all people, the Arabs included. They have shown no resentment or discrimination against any race, creed, or people of any national origin, including the Arabs themselves. The people of Israel have no desire to be other than helpful and friendly and enjoy their homeland.

There is a need in my opinion, for the United Nations Organization to stand up and boldly admonish the Arab nations that the sovereignty of Israel as a nation is to be respected and its people are not to be molested but are permitted to enjoy to the fullest extent all the rights and privileges of a free people. It should be made equally plain that it is the purpose and intent to stand by and support Israel in these and all other attributes of a full and free sovereignty.

And what is the duty of our own Nation under existing conditions? Let us answer this question by asking ourselves what would we desire under similar circumstances. The answer is not difficult to make. We would want and expect the support of all free nations. Is not Israel entitled to the same? Our Nation is the most outstanding exponent of liberty and freedom in all the world. Our boys have fought and died in World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict to establish the principles of liberty and freedom throughout the world. We cannot afford to be lukewarm in support of any nation that holds aloft the flag of freedom. Israel is in a strategic position in the Near East. It is likewise in a position of danger because of the enemies that surround it. As these enemy nations are supplied weapons of war by Soviet Russia and its satellites, why should Israel be denied weapons of defense by the free nations of the world?

The important question to be considered in determining whether a nation should be armed or not is, What is its intention? If it be to make war, then it would be dangerous to put weapons of war within its grasp. If, however, the intention is to prevent war or for defensive purposes, then to put such in the hands of a peacefully inclined nation cannot be otherwise than to promote peace. The advice of President Theodore Roosevelt given many years ago, "Speak softly and carry a big stick," still holds good. Israel, with peaceful intentions, is entitled to have the help of other nations with like desire.

The peaceful activities carried on by Israel in industry, agriculture, and education have already made a marvelous improvement in Israel. Likewise, that which has been done to improve the living conditions of its people indicate that in years ahead, as given the opportunity, the progress that can and will be made is indescribable. I have had the opportunity of seeing whereof I speak, as a result of my visit a few years ago, and, consequently, I am most optimistic as to the future of Israel and its people.

With a full understanding of the aims and purposes that actuate the leaders of Israel and the high ideals that motivate them in all their activities, I deem it a privilege and an obligation to be helpful in the future as in the past whenever and in whatever way may be within my power.

Summary of Legislation Considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, there follows herewith a summary of the legislation considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the 2d session of the 84th Congress. For the benefit of the membership of the House each legislative act is preceded by a caption reference, together with the public law number, the House reports relating to the legislation, and the bill number of the legislation as considered in the House.

BANKING, CREDIT, AND FINANCE

Bank Holding Company Act

Public Law 511—House Report No. 609

H. R. 6227

This act authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to control the future expansion of bank holding companies, and requires that bank holding companies divest themselves of investments in nonbanking businesses. At the close of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, this legislation had passed the House but had not been acted upon by the Senate. During the second session, the Senate passed the House bill with amendments, and the House agreed to the Senate amendments. The measure became law on May 9, 1956.

The act defines a bank holding company as a company which controls 25 percent or more of the voting shares of 2 or more banks or of a bank holding company, or controls the election of a majority of the directors of 2 or more banks. Certain exemptions, however, are provided.

Bank holding companies are required under the act to obtain approval of the Federal Reserve Board before acquiring additional bank stocks or assets. Before acting on any application for such approval, the Board notifies the agency which chartered the bank or banks involved (Comptroller of the Currency for national banks and the State supervisory authority for State banks) and allows 30 days for submission of the views of the chartering agency. In determining whether to grant approval, the Board considers, among other factors, whether the proposed acquisition would be consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. The Federal Reserve Board cannot approve the acquisition by a bank holding company of the shares or assets of a bank outside the company's home State unless the law of the State in which the bank is located expressly authorizes such acquisitions.

The act prohibits bank holding companies from acquiring interests in nonbanking businesses, and requires them to divest themselves of any such interests which they now hold. Appropriate provisions are included with respect to tax treatment of forced divestments under the act. In addition, the act contains certain prohibitions against self-dealing between bank holding companies and their subsidiary banks.

This country has established a system of independent competing banks, in preference to the centrally controlled bank systems established by other countries. The holding company device has been used to bring many formerly independent local banks under the control of a few large corporations. The Bank Holding Company Act will provide a means of preserving the American system of independent competing banks and guard against monopolistic control of credit.

Purchase of Treasury obligations by Federal Reserve

Public Law 622—House Report No. 1843

H. R. 9285

This act extends until June 30, 1958, the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts totaling not more than $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Prior to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of $5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The $5 billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but the Congress has extended it from time to time so as to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority ever since.

The primary purpose of this direct borrowing authority is to help the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System work together in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly income-tax payments. This act was approved June 25, 1956.

Residence of national bank directors

Public Law 496—House Report No. 1815

S. 1736

This act, approved April 27, 1956, amended the law governing residence requirements for directors of national banks, in order to allow a somewhat wider range in the selection of such directors. Before this act was enacted, the law provided that at least three-fourths of the directors of a national bank must have resided in the State where the bank is located, or within 50 miles of the bank's office, for at least 1 year preceding their election, and must maintain such residence during their term of office. This act reduced the number of directors subject to this requirement from three-fourths to two-thirds, and increased the 50-mile limitation to a 100-mile limitation. Consequently, under the new law at least two-thirds of the directors must maintain a residence within the State or within 100 miles of the bank's office.

Examination of national banks

Public Law 502—House Report No. 1816

S. 1188

This act, approved April 30, 1956, makes three changes in the law governing examinations of national banks, in order that the Comptroller of the Currency may more effectively discharge his responsibilities with respect to such examinations.

The first change permits the Comptroller to waive 1 of the 2 examinations provided for each year, but this waiver cannot be exercised more than once in every 2 years. Such a waiver will result in 3 examinations in a 2-year period, instead of the previously required 4 examinations. The second change permits the Comptroller to assess all national banks on a yearly basis for examination services, regardless of whether 1 or 2 examinations are made. The third change relates to the charges made for examining the trust departments of national and District of Columbia banks. Under the new law these charges are based on the cost of making the examination, rather than on the amount of the trust assets, as was previously provided.

Revolving fund for purchases of coinage metals

Public Law 677—House Report No. 2121

H. R. 10230

Under this act, approved July 9, 1956, the minor coinage metal fund, which is a revolving fund used to purchase metals for coining pennies and nickels, was increased from $2 million to $3 million. The act also permits the silver profit fund, which is a revolving fund established from the gain arising from silver coinage, to be used to purchase alloy metal for dimes, quarters, and 50-cent pieces. The act established uniformity of practice in the purchase of all coinage metals in that all types are now purchased through established revolving funds.

Extension of Export-Import Bank Act

House Report No. 2620

H. R. 11261

The committee reported this bill on July 5, 1956, but the House did not act on it before adjournment. The bill would have extended the operating authority of the Export-Import Bank from its present expiration date of June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1963. The bank, which began operations in 1934, assists in financing and facilitating trade between the United States and foreign countries.

Cumulative voting in electing national bank directors

House Report No. 2855

S. 256

The committee reported this bill on July 21, 1956, but the House did not act on it before adjournment. The law now provides that in the election of directors of national banks each shareholder may vote the number of shares owned by him for as many persons as there are directors to be elected, or he may cumulate such shares and give one candidate as many votes as the number of directors multiplied by the number of his shares shall equal, or distribute them on the same principle among as many candidates as he wishes. The bill would have eliminated this statutory requirement as to cumulative voting, but would have permitted the shareholders of each bank to establish cumulative voting if they wished to do so by providing for it in the articles of association.

HOUSING

Housing Act of 1956

Public Law 1020—House Reports Nos. 2363 and 2958

H. R. 11742

H. R. 11742, referred to as the Housing Act of 1956, contains six titles modifying existing law and providing for several new programs which are noted in more detail in the summary which follows.

Title I of the new act deals with FHA insurance programs.

Title II relates to an expanded secondary mortgage market program.

Title III expands and broadens the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

Title IV revises and extends the low-rent public housing program, including a new program for the elderly and provisions for the disposition of federally owned housing.

Title V amends the military housing program and provides that the military must in certain instances acquire Wherry Act housing.

Title VI continues the authority of certain programs including college housing, hospital construction, and farm housing, as well as providing a new research program, and revises provisions relating to public facility loans and loans made by Federal savings and loan associations.

FHA title I home repair loans

FHA's title I loan insurance program has long been a basic part of our economy. In very recent years, however, the volume of title I loans has declined sharply from the peak of 2,200,000 insured loans during 1953 to currently about 1 million loans a year. No one factor can be singled out as a cause for this sharp decline, but two important influences have been (1) the effect of the change of the 1954 act which denied eligibility for title I financing for newly constructed homes until they had been occupied for 6 months, and (2) a discernible trend in recent years on the part of some lenders to make home-improvement loans on an "own plan basis."

Under the provisions of the new act the maximum loan amounts for this title are increased from $2,500 to $3,500 for the improvement of existing single-family structures, from $3,000 to $3,500 for new structures, and from $10,000 to $15,000 ($2,500 average per family unit) for multifamily structures. The FHA Commissioner is given discretionary authority to increase the maximum loan term from 3 years and 32 days to 5 years and 32 days on loans for improvement of single-family structures "if he determines such increase to be in the public interest * * *." A sliding interest rate scale is provided, with an annual $5 discount on loans below $2,500 and a $4 discount on that portion of the loan which exceeds $2,500. The program is continued to September 30, 1959.

FHA title II insurance programs

FHA title II provides mortage insurance programs for sales and rental housing, cooperative housing, and relocation housing in connection with urban renewal programs.

Under the new act provisions added to section 203 removed the former statutory disadvantage of mortgage terms for existing homes by making the ratios of loan to value the same for both existing and new construction (95 percent of first $9,000 of value and 75 percent of the excess), except that existing homes not built under FHA inspection must be at least 1 year old to qualify for the more liberal terms. Under former law existing homes were limited to 90 percent of the first $9,000 of valuation.

The maximum insured loans under section 203 (h) available to persons whose homes are damaged or destroyed by disaster is increased from $7,000 to $12,000.

The insuring authority under section 207, which is designed to assist the construction of rental housing, is modified by increasing the permissible loan-to-value ratio from 80 percent to 90 percent. Loan ceilings are increased from $2,000 to $2,250 per room and from $2,400 to $2,700 per room for elevator-type structures. The act also authorizes the Commissioner to increase the dollar ceilings per room by not to exceed $1,000 per room in high-cost areas.

The act authorizes modifications of two FHA programs to furnish housing assistance to elderly families and elderly single persons. A provision was added which permits the downpayment on the purchase of a home financed by an FHA section 203 mortgage to be made by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor where the mortgagor is 60 years of age or older. Provisions were also added which liberalize section 207 FHA mortgage insurance for rental housing projects sponsored by nonprofit corporations and designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons. Such mortgages cannot exceed $8,100 per family unit and 90 percent of estimated replacement cost of the project.

Under the new act the Housing Administrator is directed to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for elderly persons.

Cooperative housing insurance

The cooperative housing insurance authority under section 213, which is designed to assist middle- and low-income families in acquiring adequate housing at moderate monthly costs, was modified in the new act by reducing from 65 to 50 percent the proportion of veterans required to qualify a cooperative for a 95-percent FHA section 213 mortgage loan and for higher room and unit mortgage amounts. World War I veterans can be counted in determining the percentage of veteran cooperators. The FHA Commissioner is also authorized to increase the mortgage amount on cooperative housing by $1,000 per room in high-cost areas.

The act provides for a new class of eligible mortgagors for management-type cooperatives. Any such mortgagor who has certified to the Commissioner he intends to sell the project upon its completion to a cooperative may receive a commitment of a loan up to 85 percent of replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. Until he sells the project the sponsor-mortgagor will be regulated by FHA as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. If the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative, he may not use the special commitment insurance feature again.

The general mortgage insurance authorization of FHA is increased by $3 billion over the amount of insurance in force and commitments outstanding on July 1, 1956.

The insuring authority under section 220, which is designed to provide housing for slum clearance and urban renewal areas, is modified under the new act to give additional incentive to the production of multifamily rental housing in such areas. A profit and risk allowance of 10 percent of project cost (excluding land) for sponsors of housing projects is permitted, although the FHA Commissioner is authorized to prescribe a lesser percentage if he certifies that a 10 percent allowance is unreasonable. The Commissioner is authorized to increase dollar mortgage limitations by not to exceed $1,000 per room or per unit in any geographic area where he finds the cost levels so require. This increase applies to both garden-type and elevator-type apartments.

The insuring authority under section 221, designed to assist in relocating families displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment operations, is liberalized under the new act. The maximum dollar amount of mortgages is increased from $7,600 to $9,000 per dwelling unit or family unit and from $8,600 to $10,000 per dwelling or family unit in high-cost areas. The ratio of loan to value for single-family homes is increased from 95 percent to 100 percent of appraised value, but the mortgagor is required to make a payment of at least $200 in cash or its equivalent. The maximum maturity of section 221 mortgages is increased from 30 to 40 years.

The cost certification requirements of FHA (sec. 227) with respect to multifamily housing are modified (1) to provide that a cost certification, when approved by the FHA Commissioner, shall be final and incontestable except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor; (2) to permit an allocation of general overhead cost acceptable to the Commissioner to be included in total certified costs; and (3) to provide that if the insured mortgage is to assist the financing of repair or rehabilitation of housing already owned by the mortgagor, full credit will be given for actual renovation costs in determining the maximum amount of the loan where the owner has a sizable equity in the property.

Federal National Mortgage Association

Several of the operating provisions of the Federal National Mortgage Association are modified and a new program is added to the Association's operations by the new act. FHA's section 803 military housing mortgages and FHA or VA mortgages covering houses in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii are exempted from the $15,000 per dwelling unit limit on the amount of the mortgage which can be purchased by FNMA under any of its operations. The former requirement that a person who sells a mortgage to FNMA must purchase stock in FNMA equal to 3 percent of the unpaid mortgage principle is modified so that he must now purchase stock amounting to only 2 percent of the mortgage. FNMA may vary such requirement upward or downward, but in no event may such requirement be less than 1 percent. The new act changes the price criterion for FNMA purchases from "at the market price" or "within the range of market prices." It also authorizes FNMA to make advance commitments to purchase mortgages under secondary market operations "at prices which are sufficient to facilitate advance planning of home construction, but which are sufficiently below the price then offered by the Association for immediate purchase to prevent excessive sales to the Association pursuant to such commitments." The new act requires FNMA, in purchasing special assistance mortgages, to pay not less than 99 percent of the unpaid principal amount for a period of 1 year. The $50 million revolving fund available for advance commitments for cooperative housing mortgages was modified to make the limit apply to both mortgages held and commitments outstanding. Provision is also made for the FNMA $5 million advance commitment limit per State for cooperative housing mortgages to operate on a revolving fund basis.

Slum clearance and urban renewal

Under the new act amendments are made to title I of the Housing Act of 1949 which provide authority to the Housing Administrator to (1) make urban renewal planning advances to a single local public body acting on behalf of the local public bodies having authority for making surveys and plans for an urban renewal project; (2) make loans or capital grants on the basis of a local plan covering an urban renewal area without requiring the local public agency to submit a separate plan for each redevelopment project within the area; (3) make advances for the preparation of long-term "general neighborhood renewal plans" for urban renewal areas of such scope that the urban renewal therein may have to be carried out in stages rather than as a single project, provided the local agency proposes to undertake promptly an urban renewal project embracing at least 10 percent of the area; and (4) make advances to local public agencies for surveys of urban areas to determine where the undertaking of urban renewal projects may be feasible.

The act would also amend the definition of an urban renewal project and permit the cost of public facilities financed through special assessment against real property in an urban renewal area to be counted as a local grant-in-aid contribution where the property against which the assessment is levied is within the project area but is not acquired by the local public body. The act would also authorize local public agencies that do not pay taxes on land held for urban renewal purposes to include an amount equal to such taxes in computing the gross project cost, and to consider such amount as a local grant-in-aid.

The act would increase from $70 million to $100 million the aggregate amount of capital grant contracts which may be entered into, without regard to the 10 percent limitation on the expenditure of funds in any one State, in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted has been obligated.

New provisions were added by the act which authorize the Administrator to reimburse local public agencies for relocation

payments made to individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project respecting which a contract for Federal grant has been executed. These payments may be made by the local public agency involved to cover reasonable and necessary moving expenses and other losses of property (except goodwill or profit), for which compensation has not otherwise been made and which were incurred on or after the date of enactment. Such payments may not exceed $100 in the case of any individual or family, and $2,000 in the case of any business concern.

The new act provides that local grants-in-aid shall be required for each project but that such local grants-in-aid, together with local grants-in-aid of all other projects of the local public agency, shall not be required in excess of one-third of the aggregate net project costs of all projects of the local public agency.

The Housing Administrator is also authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, and that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, and without regard to requirements of public hearings and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas. The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal mortgage insurance programs are amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement. Urban renewal planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

The new act also increases the urban planning grant authorization from $5 million to $10 million.

Low-rent public housing

The new act authorizes contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than 35,000 additional low-rent public housing units each year for 2 years. Any balance of the authorization of 45,000 units provided by the Housing Amendments of 1955 which is not utilized by July 31, 1956. is carried over to 1957; any balance remaining in the authorization for 1957 and 1958 may be carried over for 2 years. The act reinstates the workable program requirement which requires that the locality have a workable program approved by the Housing Administrator before new contracts for annual contributions for additional units can be entered into. The proviso in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953 which prohibits the Public Housing Administration from committing itself to authorize the commencement of construction in any one year of more than 35,000 units of low-rent public housing is repealed. The act also increases from 10 percent to 15 percent the maximum portion of annual contributions and grant funds for public housing which may be made in any one State.

Public housing for the elderly

In order to meet the pressing needs of elderly families and persons in the lowest income group, the act makes low-income elderly single persons 65 years of age or over eligible for admission to low-rent public housing. The Public Housing Administration is also authorized to assist in the construction ot new housing or the remodeling of existing housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for elderly families. Local public housing authorities are authorized to give a first preference in admission to elderly families in respect to any low-rent public housing units suitable to their needs. The local authorities are also authorized in the case of the elderly to waive the requirement that tenants admitted to public housing must come from substandard dwellings. The act also increases the maximum cost per room for dwellings designed specifically for elderly families from $1,750 to $2,250.

Farm labor camps

The new act directs the Public Housing Administration to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies whose areas of operation include such projects. Requests for such transfers must be made within 18 months after enactment of the act. The local public housing agency must give first occupancy preference to low-income farm families and second occupancy preference to other low-income families. In the case of farm labor camps in the State of Florida, any public housing agency acquiring such farm labor camps is required in the event of sale of such project to use the proceeds to construct new facilities for low-income farm families.

Disposition of defense housing

The new act provides for the transfer of 41 temporary defense housing projects and 2 Lanham Act war housing projects from the Housing Agency to the Department of Defense on September 1, 1956. The Department of Defense is authorized to use revenues from such property for its maintenance, operation, improvement, and liquidation, and for related administrative expenses.

The act also provides that any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Services Act of 1951 which is not transferred to the Department of Defense shall be disposed of as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957.

The Housing Administrator is also directed to convey a Lanham Act project at Newport, R. I., to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, and two Lanham Act projects at Philadelphia, Pa., to the Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pa. Exception is made, however, so that it is possible to house military personnel in such projects without regard to their income, and for a period of 3 years a first preference is given to military personnel in respect to a specified number of dwelling units in each of these projects. The Lanham Act is amended by adding a new section 614, which provides for the accelerated disposition of those projects which must be sold for off-site use or as an entire project.

Provision is also made for the sale of the Chinquapin Village housing project to the city of Alexandria, or to the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority; for the sale of the Lakeshore Village housing project of the city of Euclid, Ohio; and for the sale of Techwood Dormitory, situated in Atlanta, Ga., to the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Payments in lieu of taxes

The Public Housing Commissioner is directed to approve payments in lieu of taxes in the amounts specified in the act for project fiscal years ending prior to April 1, 1956, by 11 local public housing agencies named in the act.

Military housing

The provisions of RHA title VIII military housing program are modified and liberalized in the act in the following respects:

First, FHA is permitted to insure mortgages covering military housing on Midway Island and the Canal Zone, in addition to the areas formerly covered.

Second, the program is continued to June 30, 1958.

Third, the insurance authorization is increased from $1,363,500,000 to $2,300,000,000. This will provide for a total program of military housing of approximately 150,000 units.

Fourth, the determinations of the Secretary of Defense as to the need for additional housing and the effect of such housing upon occupancy of existing housing are made subject to the approval of the FHA Commissioner. The act also requires the FHA Commissioner to report to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he requires the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss.

Fifth, an average cost of $16,500 per family unit per project is permitted, including the cost of ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and other fixtures.

Sixth, the total monthly payments that can be made by the Secretary of Defense to amortize military housing mortgages is increased from $9 million to $21 million.

Seventh, military housing plans developed after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1956 must follow the principle of modular measure.

Eighth, the same net floor area limitations are applied to title VIII military housing as now apply to appropriated funds military housing.

The act also clarifies the intent of Congress with respect to local taxation of the lessee's interest in Wherry Act projects. This provision provides that such interest shall be subject to local taxes and assessments. However, such taxes or assessments (unless they were paid or encumbered the property prior to June 15, 1956) may not exceed the amount of taxes or assessments on other similar property of similar value, reduced by the amount the Secretary of Defense determines to be equal to (1) any payments made by the Federal Government to the local taxing or other public agencies involved with respect to such property, plus (2) appropriate amounts for expenditures made by the Federal Government or the lessee for the provision or maintenance of streets, sidewalks, etc., which are customarily provided by the State, city, or other local taxing authority with respect to such other similar property.

Acquisition of Wherry Act housing

Wherry Act housing, most of which is presently held by private sponsors, is located at or near military installations, and was built by mortgages insured by FHA under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the Housing Amendments of 1955. Because of the probable impact of the construction of housing under the new FHA title VIII upon existing Wherry housing, the new act requires the Secretary of Defense to acquire any Wherry Act project which is located at or near an installation where a new title VIII project is programed. If the Wherry Act project is acquired through negotiation, the purchase price cannot exceed the FHA's estimate of the replacement cost of the housing and related property (excluding the value of improvements made with appropriated funds) as of the date of final endorsement for mortgage insurance, reduced by an allowance for physical depreciation determined by the Department of Defense with the advice of FHA. If the property is not acquired by negotiation, it must be acquired by condemnation.

The act provides further that housing acquired under this provision may be either assigned as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents or leased to military and civilian personnel. Amounts equal to such quarters allowance and allotments where housing is assigned as public quarters, and receipts realized from the rental of the housing, will be deposited in a revolving fund.

This revolving fund will be used to pay the purchase price of such housing, mortgage payments, and related expenses, and alteration and improvement costs. An appropriation to the revolving fund of $50 million is authorized. The Secretary of Defense is also authorized, with the approval of the President, to transfer, from unexpended balances

of any appropriations of the military departments not carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury, such sums as may be necessary to provide adequate capital for the revolving fund.

College housing

The act increases the loan fund for college housing and other educational facilities from $500 million to $750 million outstanding at any one time.

Research

The Housing Administrator is directed to conduct a research program which will develop information on the Nation's housing inventory, mortgage market problems, availability of low-income and middle-income housing, housing for elderly persons, and other related subjects. The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with State agencies or local governments, and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations, and into working agreements on a reimbursable basis with other Federal agencies. These contracts and working agreements may not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957. This limit will be increased by $1 million on July 1, 1957, and July 1, 1958.

Public facility loans

Title III of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by the act to permit public facility loans to be made by the Housing Administrator in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Federal savings and loan associations

The act raises the limit from $2,500 to $3,500 on property alteration, repair, or improvement loans made by Federal savings and loan associations. The act also increases from 15 to 20 percent the proportion of their assets that may be loaned without regard to the loan limitation of $35,000 for any one property and without regard to a requirement that the property must be located within 50 miles of the association's home office.

Hospital construction

The act revives upon a limited basis and extends until June 30, 1958, the authority of the Housing Administrator to make loans and grants for hospital construction to public and nonprofit agencies. Only those agencies which applied for such assistance prior to June 30, 1953, and were denied solely because of the lack of funds would be eligible. Appropriations are authorized for this purpose in the amount of $5 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, and June 30, 1958.

Farm housing

The act amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize, for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, (1) $450 million for farm housing loans, (2) $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments of loans for potentially adequate farms, and (3) $50 million for grants and loans for improvement and repair of certain farm structures.

VA direct home loans

The act provides for an extension of the Veterans' Administration direct home-loan program for 1 additional year.

FHA title I insured loans for repair of new homes damaged by major disasters

Public Law 405—House Report No. 1657

House Joint Resolution 471

Following the disastrous hurricanes and floods of last fall, one of the first actions taken by the committee in the 2d session of the 84th Congress was to report out this resolution permitting the FHA Commissioner to insure home repair loans on new homes damaged in major disasters without regard to the requirement that the home be completed and occupied for a period of at least 6 months. In some of the floods of last fall, subdivisions of new homes suffered severe damage and enactment of this legislation permitted the Commissioner to make the FHA title I program immediately available for use in financing the repair of damages incurred. The resolution became law on February 10, 1956.

Transfer of two war housing projects to the city of Euclid, Ohio

House Report No. 2876

H. R. 12020

This bill directs the Housing Administrator to sell to the city of Euclid, Ohio, for a total price of $6,125,000, two Lanham Act war housing projects, containing 1,300 dwelling units, located in the city of Euclid. The purchase price, secured by a mortgage, will be payable in 20 equal annual installments with interest of 4½ percent on the unpaid balance. The purchase price, which is based on two independent fee appraisals, represents the full market value of the property. The city desires to use the property to facilitate the carrying out of redevelopment plans for the area.

The House did not take separate action on this bill as its provisions were incorporated in section 407 (c) of the Housing Act of 1956, which, as previously noted, became Public Law 1020, enacted August 7, 1956.

Sale of Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.

Public Law 367—House Report No. 1554

H. R. 7340

Although this bill providing for the sale of a 248-unit Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex., was reported by the committee on July 28, 1955, action was not taken by the House until the second session when it was passed by the House on February 1, 1956. As passed the bill was amended to provide that the transfer would be made by the Administrator of the General Services Administration rather than by "the appropriate Government agency" as provided in the bill as it was reported by the committee. The act was approved June 4, 1956.

Transfer of war housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash.

Public Law 407—House Report No. 1340

H. R. 6298

As noted in the committee's summary of legislation for the 1st session of the 84th Congress, this bill was reported by the committee and passed by the House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress but action was not completed in the Senate. The bill provides for the transfer of two war housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash. These projects contain a total of 172 temporary family dwelling units. Action on the bill was completed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 84th Congress and the bill became law on February 15, 1956.

Extension of the time limit under Public Law 235 for the conveyance of certain property to the State of Louisiana

Public Law 437—House Report No. 1656

H. R. 7927

Public Law 235 of the 84th Congress, approved August 4, 1955, authorized the conveyance of dwelling projects containing 255 units to the State of Louisiana. These projects, which housed military personnel assigned to Alexandria Air Force Base during World War II, were designed in such a manner that they could be converted to eventual hospital use. The act provided for transfer of the projects to the State of Louisiana in consideration of the payment of $300,000 in 3 equal annual installments. The State was required to pay the first installment within the first 6 months after approval of the original act. Public Law 437, which was approved March 24, 1956, granted an additional 6 months to the period within which the State of Louisiana is required to make the first payment.

Housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces

Public Law 574—House Report No. 2215

S. 3515

Before enactment of this legislation the FHA mortgage insurance program was limited in its application at armed services research or development installations because the research or development activities of the military provided a disproportionate part of the economic base of the community. Under the regular FHA mortgage insurance program the agency must find that the property meets a test of economic soundness geared to long-term normal development of the community. This act under appropriate safeguards waives the economic soundness test in order that adequate housing may be provided for essential civilian employees.

This act adds a new section 809 to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance on homes to be owned by private individuals who are essential civilian employees of the armed services, or employees of contractors of the armed services, at research or development installations. Mortgage terms available under the bill are the same as those available under section 203 of the National Housing Act, the FHA's regular program of mortgage insurance for sales housing.

In order to qualify for insurance under the proposed new section, an individual is required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that (1) he requires housing; (2) he is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research or development installation of one of the armed services of the United States, or an employee of a contractor of the armed services; and (3) he is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary employee at such date.

In addition to issuing the certificate attesting to the employment status of each essential civilian and his need for housing, the Secretary of Defense is required to certify to the Commissioner of FHA that housing is necessary for these civilian employees and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installations. The latter certificate will be conclusive evidence to the FHA Commissioner of the need for housing, but if the Commissioner should determine that mortgage insurance on such housing is not an acceptable risk he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss with respect to the mortgages in question.

ECONOMIC

Extension of Defense Production Act

Public Law 632—House Reports Nos. 1983 and 2486

H. R. 9852

This act, approved June 29, 1956, extends the Defense Production Act of 1950 for a period of 2 years to June 30, 1958. A corresponding 2-year extension is made in the contract authority to purchase strategic materials under section 303 of that act. In addition, two provisions were added to that act. Under one of these, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a special study of the production, allocation, distribution, use of nickel, of its resale as scrap, and the supply and marketing of nickel, with particular attention directed to the adequacy of the existing system of nickel allocation between defense and civilian users. An

interim report of such study is to be made by August 15 and a final report made by December 31, 1956, containing such recommendations as the Secretary of Commerce deems advisable. The other provision added amends the Declaration of Policy of the Defense Production Act through providing it is a policy of the Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense.

The maintenance of a strong and flexible defense program requires that current military and atomic-energy programs proceed without interruption and that a broad and diversified mobilization base be established which will reflect new requirements resulting from changes in technology and strategy. The authorities provided in the Defense Production Act are essential to meet those objectives.

Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Public Law 1016—House Reports Nos. 2746 and 2959

S. 3722

The act provides for an experimental program to provide insurance and related forms of financial protection against flood losses.

The act authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (1) to issue Government insurance policies against property losses due to flood, (2) to reinsure flood loss policies issued by other insurers, and (3) to make contracts with private individuals and business concerns assuring them, in the event of any subsequent flood loss, of a line of credit to assist in restoring or replacing damaged or destroyed property.

The act authorized coverage of real and personal property against loss due to flood as defined in the act. The term "flood" is broadly defined to include the water component of any severe storm as well as rising waters and abnormally high tidal water, and the Administrator is authorized to assign such other specific meaning to the generic term "flood" as he may prescribe by regulation. Specifically, the act defines "flood" to include "any flood, tidal wave, wave wash or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landslide due to excess moisture" and such other meaning as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation. The act authorizes insurance and loan contract coverage against flood damage for property located in the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Administrator will establish a schedule of estimated rates for insurance offered under the act. This schedule will be computed on the basis of the risks involved; the estimated rates will be uniform for similar risks within a given class of property; and estimated rates will be fixed at levels that would, in the Administrator's judgment, be adequate, if collected, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses. The schedule of estimated rates is not to include any factor for payment of Federal administrative expenses; these are to be paid out of directly appropriated funds.

Once established, this schedule of estimated rates will be used by the Administrator as a ceiling from which to compute a schedule of fees the purchasers of flood-insurance policies will be required to pay. The testimony received by the committee indicates that a schedule of estimated rates based entirely on actuarial considerations will prove to be too high to serve as an adequate basis for providing flood-insurance protection to prospective purchasers. Therefore, the act provides that the Administrator shall establish a schedule of fees to be paid by purchasers of the insurance designed to provide insurance protection at reasonable costs and to achieve marketability of the insurance policies. No insurance policy, however, can be issued for a fee lower than 60 percent of the corresponding estimated rate for insurance provided by that policy. In effect, this difference between the estimated rate and the fee may be referred to as a subsidy.

The fees for reinsurance are to be established from time to time by the Administrator through a process of negotiation with insurance companies seeking reinsurance. These fees will contain no subsidy in the sense in which that term has been used above. The reinsurance fees are to be based on the consideration of the risks involved and are to be adequate, in the Administrator's judgment, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses covered by the reinsurance agreements. The fees are not to include any loading for administrative expenses for the Federal Government under this act.

Perhaps the most perplexing problem in devising a workable flood insurance program is the difficulty of providing insurance in high-risk areas at rates which are not prohibitive. In view of this problem, a supplemental program of protection is provided which should operate at much lower rates than those which will be charged for direct insurance.

Basically, this supplemental program will give potential flood victims, for a reasonable fee, the contractual right to borrow money in the event of loss due to flood. A person who purchases this protection and subsequently loses his home or business in a flood will have an assured line of credit to restore his property, and will be given an extended period of time in which to absorb the shock of his initial loss.

This protection will be afforded to private individuals and business concerns through loan contracts with the Administrator. If a person who has purchased such a contract suffers a flood loss, he will be assisted in either of two ways. First, if he is able to obtain a loan elsewhere to repair his loss, the Government will guarantee the lender against loss on the loan. Second, if he is unable to obtain such a loan, the Government will make the loan directly. As noted above this program should operate at a lower schedule of fees than those charged under the insurance program inasmuch as the Government's ultimate exposure to loss is limited to credit losses on flood loans rather than to the actual flood losses themselves.

The face amount of insurance policies issued under the act cannot exceed $250,000 per person, and cannot exceed $10,000 for any dwelling unit, including any structures and personal property connected with it. The same limits are provided for loan contracts.

In an effort to reduce "nuisance" claims, keep the cost of administering the program low, and provide the insured an incentive to protect the insured property against flood damage, the act requires a minimum loss deductible clause in each insurance policy issued by the Administrator that will relieve the Government from any liability for paying the first $100 of a proved and approved claim of loss, plus 5 percent of the remainder of such claim. The act further authorizes the Administrator to increase either the amount or the percent, or both, upon the issuance of an insurance policy, taking into consideration the class of risk involved. A loss deductible clause in the amount of $500 is provided in the loan contract program.

The act provides that insurance and reinsurance policies outstanding under this program cannot exceed $3 billion (or $5 billion with the approval of the President), plus an amount equal to the fees collected for insurance or reinsurance under the act, less claims paid. In addition, a limit of $2 billion is placed on the face amount of loan contracts outstanding at any time; this limit may be increased, with the approval of the President, by $500 million in any fiscal year.

The face amount of insurance policies issued and reinsurance agreements entered into under this act should be many times greater than the amount of losses expected to be incurred, just as in other forms of property insurance written by private companies actual losses incurred are only a small fractional amount of the face amount of policies written and in force. Likewise with respect to the loan contract program, the loans made or guaranteed to cover flood losses actually incurred will be only a small fraction of the dollar amount of loan contracts issued and on such loans the only loss the Government will suffer will be that resulting from failure to repay such loans.

The act expressly provides that insurance, reinsurance, and loan contracts cannot be issued under the act covering risks against which insurance is available on reasonable terms from other public or private sources.

The act provides that after June 30, 1959, each State will be required to pay into the disaster insurance fund one-half the difference between the fees charged for policies issued after that date on property in that State and the estimated rates needed to cover losses on such properties.

Although the act contains no fixed termination date, it requires that the annual report of the Administrator for the year ending December 31, 1961, must contain his opinion, supported by pertinent findings, concerning the advisability of withdrawing, in whole or in part, Federal assistance in the flood-insurance field, keeping in mind the desirability of offering flood-insurance protection. In the event the Administrator's opinion recommends withdrawal of entire or partial Federal financial support for the flood-insurance program, it is to be accompanied by appropriate legislative recommendations. In the light of conditions then existing, the Congress can consider in the public interest the procedures to be adopted for terminating the Federal flood-insurance program. These provisions will assure that at the end of 1961 the Administrator must come to grips with the problem of determining whether it is necessary for the Federal Government to remain in the flood-insurance field either as a direct insurer or as a source of reinsurance. This act was approved August 7, 1956.

Amendment of the Small Business Act of 1953

Public Law 402—House Reports Nos. 1633 and 1685

H. R. 7871

Although the Small Business Act from inception has contained authority for the Administrator to make disaster loans it became evident as a result of last year's severe storms that early action would be needed in this session of the Congress to increase the authorization provided for the making of disaster loans. This act, which became law on February 2, 1956, increased the disaster loan authorization from $25 million to $125 million outstanding at any one time. The act further modified the disaster loan authority by providing such loans could be made with maturities up to 20 years (previous limit 10 years) and made clear that in cases where the Small Business Administration participates with a lending institution in making a disaster loan the interest rate on the Small Business Administration's portion of the loan cannot exceed 3 percent per annum, which is the same rate applicable to direct disaster loans made by the Administration.

Redevelopment of depressed industrial and rural areas

House Report No. 2543

H. R. 11811

This bill was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee on June 29, 1956,

but was not acted on by the House before it adjourned on July 27, 1956.

H. R. 11811 contains seven major provisions.

First, the bill would create an Area Redevelopment Administration within the executive branch of the Government. It would be headed by an Administrator whose appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation.

Second, the bill would authorize the Administrator to designate two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural—in the United States. An area could be designated as an "industrial redevelopment area" if the Administrator determines that excessive unemployment has existed in the area for an extended period of time. Areas must be so designated where unemployment (a) is currently 8 percent or more and has been 8 percent for the major portion of each of the preceding 2 years, or (b) is currently 12 percent or more with no reasonable prospect for improvement in the immediate future, and has been at least 12 percent throughout the preceding 6 months. Those rural areas in the United States in which the Administrator determines that there exist an excessive number and percentage of low-income farm families, and a condition of substantial and prolonged underemployment, would be designated as "rural redevelopment areas."

Third, the bill would authorize the Administrator to make loans from a revolving fund of $150 million for constructing or rehabilitating industrial plants and similar facilities, and for purchasing or developing land for industrial usage, in redevelopment areas. Such loans could be made only if recommended by a local redevelopment committee.

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Administrator to make loans and grants for constructing or improving public facilities, or for purchasing or developing land for public-facility usage, in redevelopment areas. Such a loan or grant could be made only upon application from a redevelopment area. A revolving fund of $100 million would be established for loans, and appropriations of not more than $50 million a year would be authorized for grants.

Fifth, the bill would authorize the Administrator to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas. It might be provided by use of the staff of the Administrator or by contract with individuals or institutions.

Sixth, the bill contains two sections which would enable the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist industrial redevelopment areas. Grants and loans for slum clearance could be made in these areas under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 without regard to certain existing requirements of that act. Planning advances authorized by the Housing Act of 1954 would be made available to all communities in industrial redevelopment areas without regard to the population limitation otherwise applicable.

Seventh, the bill would require the Secretary of Labor to provide suitable training for unemployed persons in redevelopment areas in need of training, retraining, or reemployment, or vocational education. The training would be provided through the existing facilities of Federal and State Governments by contracts on a reimbursable basis, or by contracts with private institutions. The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall enter into agreements with the States whereby the States as agents of the Federal Government would make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation who are certified by the Secretary to be undergoing training for a new job. Retraining payments could not be made for more than 13 weeks in amounts equal to the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the State.

COMMODITIES

Commodity Credit Corporation

Public Law 864—House Reports Nos. 2211 and 2772

S. 3820

The committee reported a companion bill, H. R. 11132, the provisions of which were substituted for S. 3820 on the House floor. The conference substitute retained the Senate bill number.

This act increases the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $12 billion to $14.5 billion to enable the Corporation to carry out its farm crop price-support operations, and to provide initial financing for the new soil-bank program provided by the Agricultural Act of 1956. The act also amends the penal provisions of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to make it a Federal offense to willfully steal or convert property mortgaged or pledged to a private lending agency under a program of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to reduce from a felony to a misdemeanor certain offenses involving property of a value of $500 or less.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is a federally chartered corporation through which price support is extended on farm commodities through loans, purchase agreements, and purchases, in accordance with legislation passed by the Congress. While price-support operations constitute the major activity of the Corporation, it also conducts a storage facilities program, a supply and foreign purchase program, a commodity export program, and other activities as authorized or directed by Congress.

The Corporation, as required by its charter, utilizes private trade facilities, including banks, cooperatives, commercial warehouses, handlers, and others to the maximum extent practicable. This act was approved August 1, 1956.

Extension of Export Control Act of 1949

Public Law 631—House Reports Nos. 1998 and 2485

H. R. 9052

This act extends the Export Control Act of 1949 for a further period of 2 years to June 30, 1958. That act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce, authorizes the regulation of exports to the extent necessary (1) to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce commodities, (2) to safeguard the national security insofar as it might be adversely affected by exports of strategic commodities, and (3) to further our foreign policy. The need to control exports in the interest of national security will probably continue for the foreseeable future. It is clear that this country must continue to take special precautions to see that United States goods of strategic significance do not go unchecked to the troubled spots of the world.

One of the items in our export trade about which there has been considerable controversy recently as to the volume of permitted exports is iron and steel scrap. The extending legislation directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a survey of the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available and to file with the Congress an interim report within 3 months and a final report not later than January 31, 1957. This act was approved June 29, 1956.

Texas City tin smelter

Public Law 608—House Report No. 2159

House Joint Resolution 607

This act permits continued operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., up to January 31, 1957. It also authorizes the Federal Facilities Corporation (successor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in operation of the smelter) to dispose of the smelter and related assets by sale or lease before that date. In the event disposition is not made of part or all of the plant and related assets by January 31, 1957, then the property will be reported as excess property for transfer and disposal under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

The Texas City tin smelter was constructed by a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1942. While the Government continued to purchase tin metal thereafter, the operation of the smelter was nevertheless an important part of the program through which the Government was able to supply essential needs for tin during the war period. The smelter was also helpful in meeting demands for tin in the reconversion period after World War II and more recently in meeting stockpile needs. Tin smelting capacity in other parts of the world has been restored and since stockpile objectives have been achieved, it is no longer necessary for the Government to continue operations of the smelter. From the beginning of operations up to June of last year the smelter had produced a total of 420,000 tons of tin metal. This act was approved June 22, 1956.

International Wheat Agreement

Public Law 945

S. 4221

This act amends the implementing legislation (the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949) under which the United States, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, exercises its rights, obtains the benefits, and fulfills its obligations under the International Wheat Agreement, which has been extended to July 31, 1959. Under the agreement as now in force, 6 exporting countries (including the United States) have agreed to supply approximately 300 million bushels of wheat to some 40 importing countries, who in turn agreed to purchase this amount. Maximum and minimum prices are set at $2 and $1.50, respectively, for the basic grade of wheat at the basing point Fort William/Port Arthur, Canada. The Commodity Credit Corporation program, which is conducted pursuant to this legislation, enables commercial wheat exporters and millers to purchase wheat at domestic market prices and to sell the wheat or wheat-flour product to purchasers in International Wheat Agreement importing countries, at prices consistent with the price range contained in the agreement, in competition with other exporters in the world market. During the 7 years the wheat agreement has been in effect the United States wheat exports under it have approximated 1.3 billion bushels. This act was approved August 3, 1956.

MISCELLANEOUS

Justice Brandeis medal

Public Law 727—House Report No. 2678

H. R. 11000

This act, approved July 18, 1956, directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis. Three thousand of such medals will be furnished to the Brandeis University at Waltham, Mass., at the estimated cost of manufacture. The year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Justice Brandeis. He served with distinction on the United States Supreme Court for 23 years before retiring in 1939.

Use of surplus grains to prevent waterfowl depredations

Public Law 654—House Report No. 2210

H. R. 7641

This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation such wheat, corn, and other grains as the Corporation certifies to be available from its price-support inventories

for the purpose of feeding migratory waterfowl such as ducks and geese. The Secretary of the Interior may make the grain available for the feeding of migratory waterfowl directly or through Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials or private persons or organizations. Feeding must be so accomplished as to lure waterfowl away from farmers' fields where they are causing crop damage, yet not expose the waterfowl to shooting.

The legislation offers a procedure that should be of material assistance in solving the problem of protecting agricultural crops in those areas where the impact of a large migratory waterfowl population creates a special problem. This act was approved July 3, 1956.

The Farm Price Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, last April I was one of those who fought for the 90-percent-of-parity price support program which the Congress enacted and the President vetoed. This veto doomed the American farmers to the Republican sliding-down scale price support program which has tobogganed many small farmers into bankruptcy.

The speech I made to the Congress on April 11, when the Democratic farm bill was under consideration, and my other work in behalf of the farmers during my 4 years in Washington all tie in with the dramatic battle waged by the Democratic Party to maintain the high level farm prosperity of the Democratic years.

Voting Record of Representative James T. Patterson on Major Legislation of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to submit at this time my voting record on what I consider to be the 16 most important pieces of legislation which have come before the House of Representatives during the 84th Congress. It is my firm belief that every individual residing in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent has the right to know how I have stood on this important legislation, and I am proud to present it herewith:

Voting record of Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, 5th District of Connecticut, on major legislation considered by the House of Representatives in the 84th Cong.

How I voted	The issue	Status
Voted for	Agricultural Act of 1956 with Soil Bank	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	Increased social-security benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Increased railroad retirement benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing veterans' pensions	Passed House only.
Voted for	Public housing bill	Became law.
Voted for	Interstate Federal-aid highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis	Became law.
Voted for	Veterans' farm home loans	Became law.
Voted for	Bill strengthening and improving the Small Business Administration	Became law.
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen the free world	Became law.
Voted for	Federal aid for school construction	Defeated.
Voted for	Postal rate bill	Became law.
Voted for	Civil rights bill	Passed House only.
Voted for	Omnibus public works bill (Torrington and Winsted)	Vetoed.
Voted for	Flood insurance	Became law.
Voted for	Supplemental appropriations (Thomaston Dam)	Became law.

Highlights of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 enacted by the Republican 83d Congress was the most monumental legislative undertaking in the history of the Congress.

It represented the first comprehensive revision of the internal-revenue laws since before the turn of the century and the enactment of the income tax.

Approximately a half a million man-hours of work went into this gigantic achievement.

Over 3,000 changes in the revenue laws were contained in the tax-revision measure. In general, the purpose of these changes were to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

The new law closed over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers were able to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

The new law contained $827 million relief for individuals and $536 million relief for business. In addition, the new law extended the present 52 percent corporate income for 1 year which meant an additional $1.2 billion tax on business. This increased tax on business practically paid for all of the tax relief granted so that the net cost to the revenue was only $163 million.

The Republican Party is continuously charged with enacting tax legislation primarily for the benefit of big business. Just how ridiculous and unfounded this assertion is can be demonstrated by the fact that, after 4 years in office, the Republican administration has never proposed reducing this 52 percent corporation income tax rate. The Republican Party reduced the individual income tax, and it reduced excise taxes but it left the regular 52 percent corporation income tax alone.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 can deduct $60. The same family could deduct nothing prior to the 1954 law.

Third. The 1954 law doubled the maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter becomes en-

titled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, are in effect exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This means a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 paid about $300 in income tax prior to 1954. Under the new 1954 law, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

The same exemption extends to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The law allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, 10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The law increased from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million. The gain to charity has been incalculable.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans are not taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The new law exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the law also provides a simpler method for the taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

The law excludes the first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings is entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings excludes the first $50 entirely and then reduces his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The new law permits the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer is able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen. Of course, no permanent loss of revenue is involved because the provision simply shifts the timing of tax payments.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers have been relieved of the requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns are due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The law grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The law has brought tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two set of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

DEPLETION

The law increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

INVENTIONS

The law extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The law extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The law lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The law removes the two percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The law eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, once again at the close of a congressional session I offer a report to the people of the First Congressional District on my activities in their behalf.

During the 4 years I have been in Congress there have been 550 quorum and roll calls in the House. I have been there to answer 97 percent of them. On the few rollcall votes where I could not be present, I arranged when I could to be paired with a Member of Congress whose views on a bill were opposed to mine, so the people would know where I stood.

For the past 2 years we have had a Democratic Congress and a Republican in the White House. The cold war of partisan politics as predicted by President Eisenhower did not materialize. On most vital issues, the Democrats cooperated more fully with the President than did members of his own party.

This was a Congress with a heart, which placed the security and welfare of the American people first. It was a hard-working Congress—it passed more bills than any other Congress in history. And, according to the conservative Washington Star, it was a Congress which wrote a "good, moderate, and productive" record.

NATIONAL SECURITY

In foreign affairs, we Democrats were nonpartisan. The President has been free to talk and act without harassment. Deterioration of American prestige abroad demands a reappraisal of foreign policies when the Congress reconvenes next year. The people of the United States did not know we were on the brink of war three times until Secretary Dulles revealed this shocking fact in a magazine article.

In the field of national defense, we Democrats took the initiative for a strengthened military posture. We gave the President $900 million more than he asked for airpower because of Russia's apparent superiority in the field

of guided missiles and jet planes. Most of our best qualified military leaders agreed this increase in funds was prudent.

THE PEOPLE'S WELFARE

One of our most dramatic accomplishments was reducing from 65 to 62 the retirement age at which women can draw social-security benefits, and providing for the payment of benefits to the totally disabled at 50. These amendments were passed over the stiff opposition of the Republican administration. We were also successful in including many self-employed professional men and women under the social-security program.

We enacted a vast program of health and medical research which means hope for those who are ill—and those who may be stricken in the future.

We provided for an increase in old-age assistance payments of at least $5 a month for people in States which take advantage of the available increase in Federal funds.

We made home buying easier, and provided special housing aids for those over 65.

FARMERS

It was not our fault that the farmer had to take a second-best farm bill. The President vetoed the Democratic farm bill which would have quickly and substantially raised farm income. The watered-down bill which was finally enacted will give the farmer some help—but by no means enough. It does include long-range, though inadequate benefits from the soil-bank program.

Through legislation initiated by the Democrats, we also relieved the farmer from paying excise taxes on gasoline and oil used in farm machinery. We increased farm-loan funds and made credit easier to get.

THE WORKER AND THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN

For the worker, we adopted a minimum-wage law. The President advocated 90 cents. We gave the laboring man a dollar an hour.

For the small-business man, we strengthened and improved the Small Business Administration, and increased the revolving fund from which he can borrow. The House passed legislation to stop price discrimination between chains and hometown merchants, but the Senate failed to act. Had the administration been more sympathetic, much stronger and more effective programs would have been enacted.

HIGHWAYS

We set in motion the greatest road-building program in the Nation's history. On the sound pay-as-you-go basis, sponsored by the Democrats, it will provide 41,000 miles of interstate highways to crisscross the Nation, and increase Federal contributions for all forms of roads—primary, secondary, and urban.

BENEFITS AND ANNUITIES

We increased benefits for veterans, qualified additional veterans' widows for pensions, and provided educational assistance for children of veterans who die of service-connected disabilities. Here again administration opposition blocked a more humane program.

We granted badly needed increases in retirement annuities for Federal and railroad workers.

TAXES

In the field of taxation, we repealed the so-called "Humphrey blooper"—named for the Secretary of the Treasury. This Republican tax law would have given corporations a billion dollars in windfall profits.

POSTAL RATES

We succeeded in blocking the bill sponsored by the Republicans to increase first-class and airmail postage rates. The 4-cent letter and 7-cent airmail bill passed the House, where I voted against it, but it was killed in the Senate.

SCHOOLS

A bill to provide desperately needed school buildings was killed in a shameful debacle because the Republicans refused to support the President. He opposed the Powell amendment, which barred funds to segregated schools, but 76 percent of House Republicans voted for it. This amendment made it impossible for many sincere southern supporters of Federal school construction aid to accept the bill. Sixty-one percent of House Republicans then joined the southerners and defeated the measure. The net effect of this cynical maneuver by the Republicans was to deny our children the new and suitable class rooms they need so badly.

IDAHO AND THE WEST

Idaho won a victory when the bill was passed giving domestic sugar producers a right to a greater share in our increased national sugar consumption. I was one of the sponsors of this bill which will pour millions of dollars into the Idaho sugar industry. The Sugar Act is one of the original New Deal aids which did so much for our farmers.

Idaho will also benefit by measures I sponsored to increase Government purchase programs for domestically mined, strategic ores; Federal assistance for a sewage disposal system for Sandpoint; new and improved contracts for the Riverside Irrigation District at Parma; and appropriation of $519,000 for the rehabilitation of the Hayden Lake Irrigation District.

Idaho and its people lost immeasurably when the Hells Canyon bill was defeated in the Senate. The pressure brought by the White House was clearly the decisive factor in the measure's defeat. Jobs, opportunities, and Idaho's expanding future went down with the bill. In my opinion, the Eisenhower administration put selfish interests ahead of the welfare of the people of Idaho and the Pacific Northwest.

The 84th Congress wrote a constructive record. It will make America a better place in which to live. President Eisenhower was the first President in a century to lose his own Congress in the first congressional election after taking office. He cannot honestly attack the record made by the Congress the people in their wisdom gave him.

Projects and Achievements for Benefit of First District of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 years have been productive and good for the First District of Florida. It has been a pleasure and privilege to participate in the many projects and achievements that have made these years so successful. The following outline of my activities which have been of prime interest to the people of the district has been made and, under unanimous consent, I include their program as a part of the RECORD:

Project and problem	For fiscal year	Amount	Action and results
Rivers and harbors:			
1. Tampa Harbor ($11,000,000 project)	1956–57	$4,977,000	Work now underway.
2. St. Petersburg (Salt Creek and Bayboro)	1957	22,000	Completes harbor.
3. Anclote River (Tarpon Springs)	1957	68,000	Completes project.
4. Gulfport Harbor (channel survey)	1957	6,500	Study project.
5. Intracoastal Waterway	1956	12,000	To complete surveys.
Military public works:			
1. MacDill Field:			
Buildings, runways, etc.	1956	5,400,000	
Housing, operations, etc.	1957	3,626,000	
2. Air Reserve Squadron (Pinellas Airport)	1957	2,732,000	Authorized.
Civil public works:			
1. Pinellas International Airport (new buildings)	1956–57	423,000	Will complete 1956.
2. Tampa International Airport (additional buildings)	1956–57	395,000	Additional facilities.
3. Bay Pines (laundry and dietetic)	1956–57	800,000	Construction underway.
4. Tampa Municipal Hospital (construction)	1957	162,500	Underway.
5. Reserve armories (St. Petersburg)	1956	225,000	Planned.
6. Reserve armory (Tampa)	1956	225,000	Do.
7. New post offices:			
St. Petersburg	1956	1,500,000	Underway.
Tampa (mail handling)	1957	----------	Survey underway.
Dade City	1956	----------	Under construction.
Mango	1956	----------	Under study.
Safety Harbor	1956	----------	Completed.
Palma Ceia, West Tampa, New Port Richey, Ybor City.	1957	----------	Under study.
8. Tampa Federal Building	1957	----------	Survey started.
Research programs:			
1. Red tide (3-year program)	1956	164,000	Research underway.
2. Sponge industry (Tarpon Springs)	1956	26,000	Grants and study.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

1. Introduced bill for immigration of needed sponge divers.
2. Acquired conveyance to Pinellas County of 24 acres from GSA for two schools.
3. Requested of White House a reduction in tariffs on imported Havana leaf tobacco to offset reduction in tariff on Cuban cigars.
4. Acquired Federal aid in planning for mosquito problem (spray plane and trucks).
5. Worked for location of National Institute for Physically Handicapped in Hernando County.
6. Assisted in release of Henderson Field for Hillsborough County industry.
7. Introduced bill for 1,000 additional beds at Bay Pines.
8. Introduced bill for making Fort DeSoto a national Spanish-American War memorial.
9. Four hundred thousand dollar low-cost housing project for Plant City authorized.
10. Worked with Ybor City Redevelopment Committee to establish Latin center.
11. Acquired survey of Gulfport Harbor and Federal designation of channel by lower bay bridge.
12. Recommended action on interbay peninsula to mainland bridge causeway connection.

STATE AND NATIONAL PROBLEMS

1. Helped in acquiring $5 million Federal money for fruitfly fight.
2. Acquired 100 percent customs' inspection in fruitfly fight added money. Cooperated to get adequate Federal funds for spreading decline fight ($365,000 in 1957).
3. Worked for more funds to step up central and southern flood-control program.
4. Helped write $37 billion national highway program with roads to First District, including third bay bridge.
5. Helped write national water-pollution control and hyacinth-eradication programs.
6. Helped write beach-erosion control bill providing greater Federal participation.

The Republican Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 83d Congress in 1954 provided an overall tax reduction program of $7.4 billion. Of this amount, individuals received a total tax saving of $4.7 billion. This tax-reduction program surpassed any previous total in the history of Congress.

The tax program of the Republican Party in 1954 comprised the following:

(a) A 10-percent reduction in Federal income taxes which took effect January 1, 1954. This reduction saved individuals a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the Eisenhower administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

(b) A $2 billion tax savings represented by elimination of the wartime excess-profits tax.

(c) A comprehensive tax revision represented by the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954, providing tax savings of $1.4 billion. Of this amount, a total of $827 million was for the benefit of individuals, the balance of $536 million representing tax relief for business.

(d) A $1 billion excise tax, the largest excise reduction in history. Excises were reduced on a wide variety of items such as home appliances, ladies' handbags, telephone calls, movie admissions, travel, and so forth.

The corporation tax rate has remained at 52 percent without change during this Republican administration.

The excise reduction which I have described above primarily benefited individuals. This is because excises, even those which are paid in the first instance by businesses, are in fact universally passed on to the consumers of the country.

I would now like to examine how some of the other aspects of the Republican tax program have affected individuals.

Of the total tax reduction contained in the tax-revision bill, about 60 percent, or $827 million, went to individuals and only about 40 percent, or $536 million, went to corporations.

Now, let us see how the $827 million individual income-tax reduction in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was distributed between different income groups. It is estimated that approximately 40 percent of that relief was for the benefit of taxpayers with incomes below $5,000 and that about 60 percent of the relief went to individuals with incomes above that amount.

Perhaps there are some who will say that this proportion represents an improper and inequitable distribution of the tax relief. In that connection, let me point out this fact—taxpayers with incomes below $5,000 today bear about 29 percent of the total individual income-tax burden. Therefore, the tax-revision bill gave 40 percent of the individual income tax relief to those who bear 29 percent of the existing burden. On the other hand, the same bill provided 60 percent of the individual income tax relief to those who bear 71 percent of the burden. I would never for a moment deny that taxpayers of small incomes are hard pressed by present taxes. Those taxes must be reduced at the earliest possible time. But let us be fair in this matter. Let us not seek to create the false impression that people with incomes above $5,000 are somehow escaping taxation. Let us not be carried away by demagogery.

It is, of course, true, Mr. Speaker, that some of the particular relief provisions in the 1954 code were more to the benefit of one group than another. For example, I recognize that a substantial portion of the tax reduction on dividends is for the benefit of those with incomes above $5,000. On the other hand, almost the entire $130 million provided for working-mother child care is estimated to go to those with incomes below $5,000. In addition, approximately two-thirds of the tax relief for retired people goes to those below $5,000. These two provisions alone provided together about $50 million more tax relief for those with incomes below $5,000 than does the entire dividend provision provide with respect to those with incomes above $5,000.

Therefore, those who seek to create the impression that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides little or no relief for small taxpayers are simply not telling the truth.

Let us turn now for a moment to the 10-percent reduction in individual income taxes which took effect January 1, 1954. The $3 billion tax reduction amounted to about 10 percent for those in the lower brackets and ranged down to a reduction of only about 1 percent in the upper brackets. That was no rich man's tax bill.

The total $3 billion individual income tax reduction of 1954 was distributed by income groups as follows: 31 percent of the relief went to individuals with incomes below $5,000 and 69 percent of the relief went to those above $5,000. Approximately 25 percent of the reduction went to those with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000. As a result, more than half of the relief went to those with incomes below $10,000. Again, I would like to point out that this distribution of the relief almost exactly paralleled the existing distribution of the total income-tax burden. Moreover, the 1954 tax reduction was distributed in almost exactly the same manner in which the 1951 tax increase had been distributed. Under the 1951 Revenue Act, almost 70 percent of the tax increase was imposed upon those with incomes above $5,000. It seemed only fair that we should reduce taxes in the same manner by which we had previously increased them.

It can properly be pointed out that the $3 billion tax reduction which took effect January 1, 1954, had been written into the law by a Democratic Congress. Of course, that reduction could never have been given reality had not the Republican Party succeeded in slashing at least $11 billion from the Democratic spending program. But, to be fair, the law was written by the Democrats. Now let me remind you that that tax cut, designed by the Democrats, gave only 31 percent of the relief to those with incomes below $5,000. The Republican tax-revision bill, on the other hand, gave 40 percent of the relief to this same group—almost half again as much.

Personally, I regret exceedingly this continued Democratic emphasis on income classes. I was brought up in the tradition that we did not have classes, as such, in this great country of ours. I was taught that every American stood as an equal among his fellow Americans. I still believe that this principle is basic to our way of life. I have demonstrated that the continued Democratic efforts to label the Republican tax program as a rich man's program and as discriminating against the little taxpayer are without any foundation in fact. Such political propaganda adopts the theory of class struggle which is foreign to everything for which America stands.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Commerce reported that some 41 percent of American families have incomes

of $5,000 a year or more. Fifty-five percent receive incomes of more than $4,000 a year. More and more, we are becoming a Nation of middle-income people. As a result, I have been shocked at the persistent campaign of slander and vilification directed at this great group of Americans. I do not think that it is even good politics. I believe that this propaganda will be repudiated by the great majority of independent-thinking citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also timely to recall that prior to the advent of the New Deal in 1933, income-tax exemptions amounted to $2,500. The average person of small means paid no income taxes. Little by little, Democratic administrations and Democratic Congresses whittled away at the personal exemption until in 1948 it reached $500. The New Deal discovered that soaking the rich was not enough to support its extravagant programs. First, it had to soak the middle class and then finally it had to put the squeeze on even the lowest income groups.

The Republican 80th Congress reversed this trend and passed legislation increasing the level of the exemption to $600 and providing a double exemption for the blind and for those over age 65. President Truman vetoed that legislation but the Republican 80th Congress passed the law over his veto.

In light of some of the charges being made against the Republican tax program, it is useful to look at the record. It helps to keep these charges in their proper political perspective.

Regulation of Our Foreign Trade and National Economy and Its Effect on American Workingmen and Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the effects on the national economy of the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the abdication by Congress of its constitutional responsibility to regulate our commerce with foreign nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the foreign trade and the national economy of this Nation are now being regulated in Geneva, Switzerland, by 35 nations, of which we are 1, each with 1 vote; in direct contravention of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which places that responsibility directly in the Congress of the United States.

Our markets are being divided among them, through the simple expedient of multilateral trade agreements, lowering the duties or tariffs that this Nation had adjusted for a century and a half to equalize our wage-living standards with the European and Asiatic sweatshop labor costs, thus assuring American workingmen and investors equal access to American markets.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZED GATT AT GENEVA IN 1934

The Secretary of State has testified before the Senate Finance Committee that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended by Congress, not only transferred the Constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade and the national economy to the President, but by that same act authorized the President to set up the Geneva organization of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, which he did in 1947.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-FIFTY-YEAR PRINCIPLE ABANDONED

The 150-year principle of the regulation of foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—adjusting the duty or tariff to take the profit out of the foreign sweatshop wages at the water's edge—was abandoned in 1934 along with the workingmen and investors of this Nation.

As a result, the textile, crockery, machine tool, precision instrument, mineral, wool, chemical, livestock, and several hundred other industries are continually threatened through cheap labor produced imports—while our economy is being steadied through a war expenditure of $40 billion per year.

CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Mr. President, the Nevada State Republican Convention in Winnemucca, Nev., May 18 and 19, 1956, passed the following resolution:

"The Republican Party urges the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President to expire in 1958."

If the Congress shall repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, or not extend it in 1958, and revert to the Constitution, as the resolution sets out, then the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, would be guided by section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act on principle which says that:

"If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the difference in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences."

SENATE DEBATE

Mr. President, on March 31, 1954, in the debate on the proposed extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, I said on the Senate floor:

"Mr. President, the United States has the resources, the ability, and capital to maintain a strong, balanced economy. But, over a period of two decades there have been five approaches in an effort to destroy this Nation's living standards, built up over a period of 175 years, and to average them with the lower standards prevailing elsewhere in the world.

"First, the political approach, which has been identified as communism, did not start yesterday; it began in 1934, with the recognition of Communist Russia without any safeguards whatever.

"Second, there is the economic approach, beginning in 1934 with the passage of the Trade Agreements Act, when Congress transferred to the Executive its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign trade, and of determining and adjusting duties, imposts, and excises.

"The third approach has been the continual whittling away of constitutional provisions and safeguards through the medium of Executive orders, executive agreements, and other types of agreements, which needed the approval of only a majority of each House of Congress, instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate; and also by other means, including United Nations actions.

"Fourth, there has been the taxation approach, with the continual rise in income taxes, and the consequent inability of companies and individuals to build reserves with which to carry on through lean years, while at the same time they are taxed out of the international market.

"The fifth approach has been irredeemable currency. The gold standard was abolished in 1934, and the Government proceeded to print money and to go into debt.

"The American workingman and investor is entitled to a protection equal to the difference in wages and taxes paid in this Nation and those paid in the chief competing countries.

"The American taxpayer deserves relief from subsidizing foreign competitors reluctant to bear tax burdens necessary to support themselves.

"American industries and American workers deserve security from ruthless, unfair foreign competition subsidized by American aid in dollars, new equipment, and prodigal trade concessions.

"Give foreign nations equal access to American markets but no advantage."

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. President, in 1860 Abraham Lincoln's platform stated that tariffs should be adjusted to "encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country." For almost a century following that statement the Republican Party held to that principle, supporting a flexible duty or tariff adjusted to at all times equal the difference in the effective wages and general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing country on each product.

Such flexible duty or tariff would be adjusted then as the wage-living standard in such foreign country improved, and when it equals our own, free trade would be the automatic and immediate result.

The 1956 Republican Party platform to be prepared at San Francisco should include the Nevada foreign trade plank which supports a return to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign commerce and the century-old Republican principle of adjusting duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—a practical way of taking the profit out of cheap foreign labor at the water's edge and assuring American workingmen and investors of equal access to American markets.

As a matter of fact, if the profit is taken out of foreign cheap labor at the water's edge through an adjusted duty or tariff, the incentive to hold down foreign wages for profit is removed and such foreign nations might allow the workingmen's lot to improve and create a market of their own.

The subject at issue is the American system versus international socialism.

The Truth About Our Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, by virtue of the Mutual Security Act of

1956, we have voted away $3.7 billion of this country's money. This type of thoughtless extravagance is by no means new or unique. When Woodrow Wilson took office on March 3, 1913, our national debt was $1,195,684,244.

Then after World War I, through his Secretary of the Treasury, William Gibbs McAdoo, money was loaned in sums totaling $2,521,121,825.45. Now, how much of this money was repaid? Repayments totaled $14,361,173.38. The two figures do not match very well, do they?

I wish to insert at this point a table showing the amounts loaned and the amounts repaid. The little country of Finland was the only country repaying its loan.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Money loaned in the following amounts

Belgium	$177,434,467.89
Cuba	61,974,041.10
France	1,027,477,800.00
Great Britain	581,000,000.00
Greece	15,000,000.00
Italy	617,034,050.90
Liberia	26,000.00
Rumania	25,000,000.00
Yugoslavia	16,175,465.56

Money repaid in the following amounts

Belgium	$2,003,656.21
France	64,301,901.29
Great Britain	72,171,061.42
Italy	364,319.28
Rumania	1,798,632.02
Yugoslavia	720,600.16

Mr. LANGER. I call your attention to the fact that under the Republican administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, these loans were not increased, that interest was demanded, and in some instances paid, although these countries, angry because Uncle Sam wanted his money back, called Uncle Sam, Uncle Shylock.

Instead of making more loans under the Republican Presidents, $3,108,000,000 was paid in the reduction of the national debt.

Our national debt today is $272,719,052,855.57—July 1, 1956.

At the end of World War II came the visit from Winston Churchill. We saw Great Britain receiving a loan of $3,750,000,000, under promises, not a single one of which was ever kept.

Then we find—leaving out the war and the billions of dollars we contributed to it—that since July 1, 1945, and through March 31, 1956, we have given $54,150,000,000 away for foreign aid.

I wish to insert at this point a table showing the amount of loans made to foreign countries since World War II, up to 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Post World War II

Western Europe and dependent areas	$25,857,000,000
Austria	1,013,000,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	806,000,000
British Commonwealth	7,441,000,000
Denmark	291,000,000
Finland	128,000,000
France	5,070,000,000
Germany	3,891,000,000
Greece	1,209,000,000

Post World War II—Continued

Iceland	28,000,000
Ireland	147,000,000
Italy	2,647,000,000
Netherlands	1,243,000,000
Norway	$328,000,000
Portugal	47,000,000
Spain	41,000,000
Sweden	112,000,000
Trieste	46,000,000
Turkey	239,000,000
Yugoslavia	525,000,000
Unspecified Western Europe	605,000,000
Other Europe	1,160,000,000
Czechoslovakia	213,000,000
Poland	443,000,000
U. S. S. R.	465,000,000
Unspecified Other Europe	39,000,000
Near East and Africa	448,000,000
Egypt	19,000,000
Iran	42,000,000
Israel	218,000,000
Liberia	24,000,000
Saudi Arabia	21,000,000
Union of South Africa	28,000,000
Unspecified Near East and Africa	97,000,000
Asia and Pacific	5,600,000,000
Afghanistan	17,000,000
Australia-New Zealand	27,000,000
Burma	17,000,000
China	1,070,000,000
India	258,000,000
Indochina	37,000,000
Indonesia	208,000,000
Japan and Ryukyu Islands	2,414,000,000
Korea	717,000,000
Philippines	807,000,000
Thailand	17,000,000
Unspecified Asia and Pacific	11,000,000
American Republics	818,000,000
Canada	150,000,000
International and unspecified	928,000,000

Mr. LANGER. Apparently Uncle Sam had learned nothing from his experience of the giveaway program after World War I.

Although these World War I debts are still carried on the books of the Treasury as obligations owing the United States, we allowed ourselves to be bilked into loaning many times this amount following World War II.

In fact, this democratic administration went around begging countries to take money, and created such a scandal in foreign countries that Sweden refused to take $20 million, even as a gift.

Charity begins at home. Evidently this is an axiom that has not entirely penetrated the governmental mentality. After World War I we were the epitome of ludicrous laxity about collecting our accounts receivable on the international level. We see in this the incipient beginnings of the grotesque notion that friendship may be bought in the market place. Look at the treatment accorded our own farmers.

Did our Government, like Canada, cancel the seed and feed loans to them? It most certainly did not. Foreign governments which we had already aided to the limit, and in many cases beyond all reason, were accorded preferential treatment over productive citizens of our own country.

Time enough to worry about the economic plight of foreign nations when our own backyard is swept clean.

But this giveaway doctrine continued in 1953 when we donated $7,900,000,000. In 1954 when we donated $5,927,000,000. In 1955 when we gave away $3,676,000,000, and this year $3,766,570,000 was voted away for foreign aid.

The overwhelming percentage of this $3.7 billion is nothing more than an outright gift to our so-called allies, who are the same gentlemen who, after receiving billions of dollars from us in the Korean war, allowed 95 percent of the dying to be done by American boys and 95 percent of the paying to be done by the taxpayers of the United States.

The people of the United States are entitled to know the truth about this so-called foreign aid and giveaway program—how it began, how it was developed, and what it cost American people in the blood of their sons and daughters.

Mr. President, I have voted against every dollar of this giveaway program.

When I was back in North Dakota, some critics of these loans asked me why President Eisenhower, after being elected on the platform that the taxpayers thought would stop the making of these loans, continued to seemingly throw good money after bad.

The answer I was obliged to give was that the Democratic Presidents, Roosevelt and Truman, had made so many commitments that our Government was obliged to fulfill that the Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, had to make these commitments good just like ordinary farmers and businessmen have to when they have made a commitment to the bank.

In order that you may know what a billion dollars is, in ascertaining what these figures are, I have a statement from the State Tax Commissioner of North Dakota, Mr. J. Arthur Engen, showing that in 1954 all the real and personal property in the State of North Dakota was assessed at $1,678,952,473. The public utility and railroad property was assessed at $182,352,363.

Last year the interest on the national debt was $6,791,000,000; just the interest, you understand. That is nearly $7 billion. This is enough to buy the entire State of North Dakota, lock, stock, and barrel, three and a half times over.

It is hard to understand why this spending to no purpose continues, why we constantly milk our own financial resources with no hope of any reasonable return on our investment. I leave you with a question. When will we, the Senators and Representatives of the United States of America, learn that among nations, even as among individuals, friendship is won, not bought?

Report of Activities of the Committee on House Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the report of activities of the Committee on House Administration, 84th Congress.

During the 84th Congress nearly 300 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration. Hearings were held by the Subcommittees on Accounts, Elections, Library, and Printing on proposed items of legislation, after which recommendations were submitted to the full committee for final consideration and subsequent action by the House.

Funds in the amount of $3,500,132.89 were approved for the following standing and select committees to conduct studies and investigations authorized by the House of Representatives:

Standing committee:	*Amount authorized*
Agriculture	$50,000.00
Armed Services	150,000.00
Banking and Currency	150,000.00
District of Columbia	2,000.00
Education and Labor	125,000.00
Foreign Affairs	75,000.00
Government Operations	995,000.00
House Administration	85,000.00
Interior and Insular Affairs	60,000.00
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	60,000.00
Judiciary	225,000.00
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	85,000.00
Post Office and Civil Service	75,000.00
Public Works	50,000.00
Un-American Activities	500,000.00
Veterans' Affairs	85,000.00
Ways and Means	330,000.00
	3,102,000.00
Special and select committees:	
Baltic States (for 83d Cong.)	1,632.89
Campaign Expenditures	30,000.00
Small Business	330,000.00
Survivors' Benefits (Armed Service)	36,500.00
White County Bridge Commission	10,000.00
	408,132.89
Total	3,510,132.89

During the first session the committee held extensive hearings over a period of over 2½ months on a bill introduced by the chairman authorizing an adjustment and equalization of salaries in the House of Representatives, the first overall study of personnel, positions, and salaries which had been undertaken in the House for many years. The head of each department of the House was invited to make recommendations to the committee concerning his department. The committee recommended that many obsolete titles should be changed and salary adjustments made. It was later decided that the Committee on Appropriations should handle the bill. Some of the provisions were adopted in conference on the general legislative appropriations bill, H. R. 7117, and other recommendations have been approved by the House in separate resolutions from time to time during the second session.

The committee recommended changes in the law regulating the use of electrical and mechanical office equipment for Members and offices of the House of Representatives—Public Law 420—and also recommended an increase in the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members including for the first time an authorization for cablegrams in the amount of $2,000 per annum for each Member—Public Law 422.

After due consideration the committee recommended and secured the approval of 15 additional privates, Capitol Police force, for duty on the House side of the Capitol—House Resolution 448.

Seven bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration which would provide additional supervision for House pages. Hearings were held on the various bills, all of which indicated the sincere interest of the sponsors of the legislation in the welfare of the pages, but no decision was reached by the committee.

During the first session the Committee on House Administration, after a thorough study and investigation of existing facilities, recommended an expansion and improvement of the facilities of the House restaurant—House Resolution 218 and House Resolution 219. The committee's recommendations resulted in action of both the House and Senate in authorizing completion of the east front of the Capitol in accordance with the architectural plans which had been approved years ago. When completed, this addition to the Capitol will include ample restaurant facilities for Members and employees of both House and Senate.

Upon recommendation of the subcommittee on elections, which conducted hearings on the various subjects, the committee reported legislation which would amend the Hatch Act—H. R. 3084. Also, the committee recommended legislation—Public Law 296—providing certain framework which would permit members of the armed services, their families, and other personnel to exercise their voting franchise while absent from their legal residences. The committee also reported legislation—House Concurrent Resolution 94—which was agreed to by the Senate, recommending certain changes in State election laws by waiving State residence requirements in voting for President and Vice President of the United States.

Over 30 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee which would provide for memorials to outstanding individuals. Many of these bills were not considered because of the long-established policy of the committee of not recommending the expenditure of Federal funds for such purposes.

The committee recommended the acceptance of a gift from the Republic of Venezuela of a statue of the great South American liberator, Simon Bolivar—Public Law 109.

The committee recommended legislation—Public Law 107—which designated the former Arlington House as the Custis-Lee Mansion, which has been dedicated as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

Other memorials approved by the committee include the placing of a statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglas White in the United States Capitol with appropriate ceremonies of unveiling—Senate Concurrent Resolution 24; the establishment of a permanent committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise; the acceptance and erection of a memorial bell tower on the Capitol grounds as a memorial to the late Senator Robert A. Taft—Senate Concurrent Resolution 44; authorizing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing—Public Law 461; the establishment of a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt—Public Law 372; the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States of a replica of a bronze statue of Leif Ericsson, the original of which had been presented to the people of Iceland by the United States Government as a gesture of good will on the 1,000th anniversary of Althing, the Icelandic Parliament—Senate Joint Resolution 93.

At various times the committee has approved and recommended the appointment of Members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Committee on House Administration conducted hearings on 11 bills providing for the establishment of a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill. Action by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in reporting S. 3430 to the House removed any obligation of the House Administration Committee in recommending legislation.

Fifty-seven bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration during the 84th Congress providing for the printing of certain documents. Each proposal was carefully examined, and the committee recommended passage of only such resolutions as it deemed necessary and in the public interest.

In addition to authorizing the printing of many committee reports, hearings, and documents, the following outstanding publications were approved and authorized to be printed:

The Capitol in Story and Pictures—House Document 232.

The Prayer Room—House Document 234.

How Our Laws Are Made—reprint of House Document 210, 83d Congress.

Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?—House Document 465, 79th Congress, brought up to date.

Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives—revised edition; Public Law 230.

Prayers Offered by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House during the 83d and 84th Congresses—House Resolution 439.

The Constitution of the United States, as Amended to February 27, 1951, Together With the Declaration of Independence, Printed With an Index—House Concurrent Resolution 243.

The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States—House Resolution 549.

Printing of the song Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag—House Concurrent Resolution 161.

Preparation of a history of momentous scenes in Congress since the Revolutionary War—House Joint Resolution 689.

The subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, authorized pursuant to House Resolution 262, 84th Congress, to study Federal printing and Government paperwork management, has made fine progress. Several elements of congressional printing have been examined to focus attention on those which warrant the greatest need for corrective action. In this connection, a resolution has been prepared to correct the present condition in the House folding room, resulting from unsatisfactory distribution practices. Need is indicated for further action to eliminate waste in congressional printing by making more effective distribution.

Through the efforts of this subcommittee, the issuance of the Digest of Public General Bills was put on a more current schedule, providing for four cumulative issues and biweekly supplements to the first three issues. Studies have been made, which, it is hoped, will bring about some worthwhile recommendations for the best method to handle jointly sponsored bills.

Hearings have been held with officials of Government agencies most closely related to the paperwork management phase of the study. The subcommittee has filed a report on forms management which comprises the first part of the full report, entitled "Paperwork Management and Printing Facilities in the United States Government." The printed hearings, in connection with part I, Forms Management, are now being made ready for public use.

Due to the fact that the Committee on House Administration has jurisdiction over administrative procedures in the House, much of the work of the committee is necessarily not reflected in legislation, but in administrative details assigned by the chairman to the clerk and committee staff. This includes the enrollment of bills and their delivery to the President of the United States for signature.

The Committee on House Administration feels that it has made a distinct contribution to the 84th Congress through its consideration and recommendation of legislation providing the tools which the committee believes are necessary for the efficient administration of a congressional office, such as additional clerk-hire allowances, additional telephone and telegraph allowances, broadening of the regulations governing electrical and mechanical office equipment, and the printing of pertinent committee hearings and reports which prove to be of value both to Members of the House and their constituents.

In addition, the committee has worked closely with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in determining the means by which the Library can be of the greatest service to Members and committees of the House of Representatives.

Benefits for Women Under the 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, some rather important social security changes affecting women were recently enacted. I believe it is important that these changes be clearly understood.

Beginning with November 1956, a woman worker, who has done enough work to be insured under the social security law, may, if she wishes, become entitled to social security payments as soon as she reaches 62 years of age instead of having to wait until she reaches 65.

If she chooses to take the payments before she reaches 65, the amount of the monthly payments will be reduced. The amount of the reduction depends on the number of months before she reaches 65 that she starts getting benefits. If she has her benefits start as soon as she reaches age 62, the amount of each month's payment will be 80 percent of what she would get if she were 65. If she waits until her 63d birthday, the amount of the payments will be 86⅔ percent of what she would receive if she were 65, and if she waits until she reaches 64, the amount will be 93⅓ percent.

The table below gives some examples of the benefits that will be paid at different ages:

Women workers' benefits

Average monthly earnings [1]	Amount of monthly benefit			
	If claimed at 62d birthday	If claimed at 63d birthday	If claimed at 64th birthday	If claimed at 65th birthday or later
$45	$24.00	$26.00	$28.00	$30.00
$100	44.00	47.70	51.40	55.00
$150	54.80	59.40	64.00	68.50
$200	62.80	68.10	73.30	78.50
$250	70.80	76.70	92.60	88.50
$300	78.80	85.40	92.00	98.50
$350	86.80	94.10	101.30	108.50

[1] After 1950, and after drop-out of up to 5 years of lowest (or no) earnings.

If a woman chooses to take benefits in a reduced amount before she reaches 65, she will continue to get a reduced amount even after she becomes 65. However, if there are 3 or more months before she reaches 65 for which she does not receive benefits because she is working, her benefit will be automatically refigured when she reaches 65 to make allowance for the months in which she did not get a benefit.

PAYMENTS TO DEPENDENTS

Even if a woman chooses to take her benefits at a reduced rate, the payments to her dependents (her children or dependent husband or, in case of her death, her dependent children, widower, or dependent parents) will not be reduced. These dependents will receive their benefits at a rate based on the unreduced amount of her old-age insurance benefit.

AMOUNT OF WORK REQUIRED

The amount of work required to make payments possible on a woman's social-security account depends on the date she reaches age 62 or the date of her death. At least 1½ years of work are required but never more than 10 years. Two examples will give an idea of the requirements: For a workingwoman who died or reached 62 before July 1, 1954, no more than 1½ years of work is now needed; the woman who dies or reaches 62 in the first 6 months of 1958 will need no more than 3½ years.

Changing the retirement age from 65 to 62 makes payments possible for some women now over 65 who did not have enough work to qualify under the old law and for the survivors of some women who died after June 30, 1954, and were between 62 and 65 years of age at death.

THE WIFE OF A RETIRED WORKER

If a woman is the wife of a man who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits, she may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits at any time she chooses after she reaches 62 instead of having to wait until she is 65. If she takes the payments before she reaches 65, however, the amount of each monthly benefit will be reduced. The amount of the reduction depends on the number of months before she reaches 65 that she starts getting benefits.

If she chooses to start getting the payments as soon as she reaches 62, the amount of her payment each month will be only 75 percent as much as it will be if she waits until she is 65. If she waits until she reaches 63, she will get 83⅓ percent, and if she waits until she reaches 64, she will get 91⅔ percent of the amount she would get if she waits until she is 65.

The table below gives some examples of the benefits that will be paid at different ages:

Wife's benefits

Worker's benefit amount	Amount of monthly benefit			
	If claimed at 62d birthday	If claimed at 63d birthday	If claimed at 64th birthday	If claimed at 65th birthday or later
$30.00	$11.30	$12.50	$13.80	$15.00
$55.00	20.70	23.00	25.30	27.50
$68.50	25.80	28.60	31.50	34.30
$78.50	29.50	32.80	36.10	39.30
$88.50	33.30	37.00	40.70	44.30
$98.50	37.00	41.10	45.20	49.30
$108.50	40.80	45.30	49.80	54.30

If a woman chooses to take benefits in a reduced amount before she reaches 65, she will continue to get a reduced amount even after she is 65. However, if there are 3 or more months before she reaches 65 for which she does not receive benefits because she or her husband work—or in which she gets a mother's unreduced benefit because she has in her care a child entitled to child's benefits—her benefit will be automatically refigured when she reaches 65 to make allowance for those months.

If her husband should die at any time after she has begun to receive her reduced benefits, she may receive a lump-sum death payment and the widow's unreduced monthly benefits.

Example: Mary Jackson decides to claim benefits at the same time her husband claims his. He is 65; she is 62. Her husband's monthly benefit is $88.50. She will draw $33.30—her wife's benefit reduced from $44.30 because of her age. After a year, Mary's husband dies. Mary will then receive an unreduced lump-sum death payment of $255 and widow's unreduced monthly benefits of $66.40.

APPLYING FOR BENEFITS

If a woman is now 62 or over—or when she becomes 62—and if she is a workingwoman insured under social security, or the wife of a beneficiary, or the widow of an insured worker, or the dependent mother of an insured worker who died leaving no widow, widower, or child eligible for benefits, she may apply at her social-security office for the benefits described above. The first checks to women who qualify under the new provisions will be for the month of November 1956. If she is eligible for a benefit for November 1956, she can get it even if she does not apply until the end of November 1957.

Of course, monthly payments will be withheld under certain circumstances if she continues to work or returns to work.

IF A WOMAN HAS A CHILD IN HER CARE

If a woman has a child in her care and the child is entitled to child's insurance benefits based on her husband's earnings, she may be entitled to unreduced monthly payments regardless of her age. Under the old law, only a child under 18 could be entitled to benefits. Under the amendments a child 18 or over may also receive benefits beginning with January 1957 if he has been disabled since before he reached 18. This makes it possible for the mother of the disabled child 18 or over also to get payments beginning with January 1957 regardless of her age.

Mr. Speaker, the following question is one which many women are asking about the new law:

Suppose I claim my benefit now, rather than waiting until I am 65. How long will I be ahead in total benefits paid?

The answer is that as a workingwoman, if you choose the reduced benefit at any age between 62 and 65, you will be ahead for the first 15 years. However, if you receive a retired worker's benefits at the reduced rate for more than 15 years, the total amount you receive will not be as large as if you had waited until age 65 for the higher benefit. As the wife of a retired beneficiary, if you choose the reduced benefit at any age between 62 and 65, you will be ahead for the first 12 years. However, if you receive wife's benefits at the reduced rate for more than 12 years, the total amount you receive will not be as large as if you had waited until age 65 for the higher benefit.

Of course, certain events can cause a change in the total amount you will receive. A workingwoman may lose some checks because of return to work. A wife's reduced benefit would be changed to a widow's unreduced benefit if her husband should die.

A woman must make her own decision on whether it is worth more to her to have the benefits now, at reduced rate, or to wait awhile and get a higher rate. The people in the social-security office will be glad to furnish information, but they cannot tell her what her decision should be.

TO SPEED HANDLING OF WOMEN'S CLAIMS

A woman's payments may be started sooner if she can bring the proofs indicated below to the social-security district office at the time her claim is made. What proofs are needed depends on what type of benefit is claimed.

WIDOWS

The marriage certificate, the worker's death certificate, and proof of the widow's age are needed. Proof of age may be a birth or baptismal certificate, insurance policy, record of age on marriage license, or other old documents which clearly show date of birth or age.

DEPENDENT MOTHERS OF DECEASED WORKERS

Proof of the mother's age, the worker's death certificate, and any documents which may establish the extent to which the wage earner was contributing to the support of the dependent mother are needed.

WIVES

Proof of the wife's age is needed. It will help to have her husband accompany her to the district office, since a form signed by him will also be required.

Madison and the Empire of Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last September 11 the Bar Association of Madison County, Ill., held most impressive public ceremonies commemorating the creation of Madison County. But it was far more than just a civic occasion. It was, in fact, a program of rededication to the principles of constitutional government to which James Madison and other selfless patriots of his day devoted their lives. In the present climate, when the ideals and principles of free men stand in jeopardy, it is appropriate for all of us to recall and to rededicate ourselves to the political philosophy of that great American—the philosophy which found expression in our Constitution and which is embodied particularly in the Bill of Rights.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I commend to the careful attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the principal speech delivered on that occasion—an eloquent and provocative address entitled "Madison and the Empire of Free Men," by the former St. Louis newspaperman and distinguished historian, Mr. Irving Brant. Mr. Brant, as many Members of the Congress know, I am sure, has already published four volumes of a definitive study of the life of James Madison and that turbulent period in the growth of our Nation, and is now writing the fifth of what will be a six-volume history—a study which, I am confident, will prove of inestimable and abiding value to all students of American history, politics, and government.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made on the occasion in question by Mr. Burton C. Bernard, of Granite City, Ill., on behalf of the Madison County Bar Association, in presenting a plaque commemorating James Madison, and the acceptance remarks by Mr. Irving Dilliard, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who is past president of the Illinois State Historical Society and director of the Madison County Historical Society.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the messages sent for the occasion by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson; by the Governor of Illinois, William G. Stratton; by my colleagues in the Congress, Senator Paul H. Douglas and Representative Melvin Price; by the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, Harry B. Hershey; and my own message for this historic celebration.

There being no objection, the addresses and messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON AND THE EMPIRE OF FREE MEN

(By Mr. Irving Brant)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, during the first 70 years of our national history, naming counties after Presidents of the United States was a good American pastime. It was about as common as fiddling at a wedding. There are 20 Madison counties in the United States, scattered from New York to Idaho, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. In most of them the choice of a name meant only that James Madison was one of a quartet of Presidents, the others being Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, who were thought to rate that treatment when the lines of the governmental checkerboard were being drawn. However, there was nothing so routine as this in the relationship of Madison County, Ill., to the fourth President of the United States.

I do not merely have in mind that Madison occupied the White House when the first government of Illinois Territory was being organized, in 1809, and that he appointed all of its early officers. It was likewise natural that when new counties were being established in the young territory, one of them should have been named for the President then in office. Such obvious facts do not illumine, they rather conceal, the real connection between Madison and Madison County, Ill.

Before going into that, let us consider what sort of man James Madison was. He is generally recognized as the foremost of American political philosophers, the leading architect of the Constitution and the draftsman of its Bill of Rights. All of his work in this field was performed in the first 17 years of his adult life. Thereafter he served 7 years in Congress, 8 years as Secretary of State, and 8 years as President—23 years of public life which most historians have dealt with by progressing from moderate to severe disparagement. The verdict upon him as President could easily be represented by the following syllogism:

A great political philosopher cannot be a great President.

Madison was a great political philosopher.

Therefore, Madison was not a great President.

Ask for tangible evidence to support that conclusion and you will be told: Why, Madison was a timid pacifist who was pushed into the War of 1812, against his will, by the congressional War Hawks. But that is not evidence: it is accusation. Is the accusation true? Read the dispatch written by French Minister Turreau on November 2, 1810, a year and a half before the outbreak of the war. On that day, 5 weeks before Congress assembled, President Madison issued a proclamation cutting off commercial relations with England. And on that same day, said Turreau, the President directed the Secretary of State to tell him (I quote) "that the measures he (Madison) will take in case England continues to interfere with our communications with Europe will necessarily lead to war."

The evidence, it seems, contradicts the chief count in the indictment. The same is true, I might add, right down the line. But when was a syllogism ever overthrown by facts? Aristotle laid down the rule, which went unchallenged for 2,000 years, that the velocity of a falling body depends upon its weight. That is, a 10-pound stone falls 10 times as fast as a 1-pound stone. Galileo dropped two such rocks from the Leaning Tower of Pisa and then repeated the experiment before an audience of Italian mathematicians. The scholars saw the big stone and the pebble strike the ground at exactly the same moment. Then they reread Aristotle and said that Galileo was wrong. So I guess you had better accept the verdict that Madison was not one of our great Presidents.

Having made that as clear as the Missouri River, let us glance at some intriguing facts connected with the appointment, by Madison, of those first officers of Illinois Territory. In general, they were chosen on the recommendations of a Kentucky admiration society consisting of Senators Pope and Thruston and Representative Howard, leagued with ex-Kentuckian Jesse Thomas, who was congressional delegate from Indiana Territory and later Senator from Illinois. Of course, these Kentucky colonels were not seeking or bestowing political patronage. Their State was the only one that touched the new territory. Illinois had no Federal officeholders of its own, to give disinterested nonpolitical advice to the President, so the Kentuckians took this way of manifesting a benevolent interest in their neighbors' welfare. It was a cold spring, however, for Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Kentucky, the black sheep of the Democratic flock. "I was opposed to the election of Mr. Madison," he explained apologetically to a disappointed aspirant, "this accounts for my not mentioning your name for governor."

Ninian Edwards, for whom Edwardsville was named, is commonly regarded as the first governor of Illinois Territory. Actually, he was the second. John Boyle of Kentucky was appointed to that post 2 days after Madison became President. Boyle performed only one act as governor, he drew 3 weeks' pay as governor, but he never left Kentucky. Instead, he resigned to become a judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals; the duties of his Illinois office were carried on by the new territorial secretary, who was a brother of Kentucky's Senator Pope. In his letter to Madison explaining his resignation Governor Boyle wrote: "Permit me now, sir, to recommend Ninian Edwards as a proper person to fill the appointment of governor."

Since Edwards was then chief justice of the same court that Boyle was entering, this was in effect a plan to exchange jobs. Edwards also was endorsed for the Illinois governorship by his and Madison's close friend, William Wirt of Virginia, and by his own Kentucky relative, the ubiquitous Senator Pope. The latter, however, said be believed that Edwards would prefer the governorship of Mississippi Territory. Imagine the effect on American history if that suggestion had been carried out. In that case Ninian Wirt Edwards, who was 4 days old when Pope wrote his letter, might still have married Elizabeth Todd. But Abraham Lincoln never would have set eyes on Mary Todd. Without her, many students of history believe, Lincoln would not have become President. Without his leadership, could the Union have survived? Verily, in the choosing of a governor, what was good for Illinois Territory was good for the country.

Governor Edwards furnished the link in the special relationship, to which I referred, between President Madison and Madison County, Ill. That relationship was a thing of the spirit, a part of the American people's struggle for equal political rights, with Madison letting them know what rights they were entitled to.

What happened in Illinois Territory at the beginning of the 19th century is not part of the dead and buried past, to be exhumed for antiquarian display. The struggle that went on here in 1812 goes on today in the minds of men and women in every State, city, and hamlet of the American Union. In many States it is the theme of open controversy, and it is rising in acuteness in nearly every other part of the world. When you unveil a plaque to James Madison 143 years after his name was given to your county, you span the years with the principles he lived by, and make them a visible, vibrant part of the present and the future.

Illinois Territory, it is hardly necessary to say, was formed by splitting Indiana Territory in two along the Wabash River, with the line of division extending straight north from Post Vincennes to Canada. This vast area, including the present States of Illinois, Wisconsin, and much of Minnesota, was divided at first into only two counties. In September 1812 the Territory was divided into five counties, one of them Madison—not solely Madison County as we know it today, but reaching from the Mississippi River to Indiana, and up to Canada. Most of this county, in the language of the day, was a loathesome wilderness with the warriors of Tecumseh making it more so. This redivision into five counties was not a simple reflection of the growth of population. It was a political maneuver in a struggle for power between two groups in the community, between the haves and have-nots, between those who believed in the republican form of government as it was defined by James Madison, and those who sought to concentrate political control in a handful of privileged monopolists.

The act creating Illinois Territory, passed in the closing days of the Jefferson administration, gave it a government similar to that provided by earlier laws for more extensive territories. This meant, at the outset, government by Presidential appointees, without a legislature. However, the Illinois act required the Governor to call elections for a general assembly, whenever he was given satisfactory evidence that this was the wish of a majority of freeholders—a freeholder being defined as the owner of 50 acres of land.

In the spring of 1812, various freeholders began petitioning Governor Edwards to poll the qualified voters on the establishment of a legislature, and if a majority approved, to order the election of its members. On the surface this was a fair and natural move toward democratic self-government. At bottom it was the opposite.

Under a 1789 law which Congress made applicable to Illinois Territory, the right to vote was limited to adult males with a 50-acre freehold. To qualify for office, a citizen must own 200 acres. The expectation had been that with the Federal Government selling raw land at a dollar and a half per acre, practically every settler in the newly opened country would quickly become a freeholder. Suffrage would be practically universal.

In Illinois Territory, however, settlers streamed in before Congress established new land offices. The only freeholders were two or three hundred farmers and farmer-lawyers—my apologies to the bar association; I should say two or three hundred farmers and prospective candidates for office. These individuals had managed to secure Government land patents. The great mass of the people were unable to do so. They staked out claims, built homes, planted and harvested crops. But in law they were trespassers on the public land, and they could not vote.

When the freeholders began to petition for the election of a legislature, Governor Edwards saw what was up and wrote to his old friend Congressman Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky. The census of 1810, Edwards said, gave Illinois Territory a population of 12,282. Among these he was able to count 220 freeholders. This handful of men, the Governor wrote, would have the exclusive right of determining whether a new form of government should be established. They would then have the exclusive right to vote for the members of the legislature. The Territorial house of representatives, consisting of only 7 members, would nominate a legislative council of 5 members, to hold office for 5 years. These 12 men would write the laws and in joint session they would elect a Delegate to Congress.

Thus, Governor Edwards pointed out, he was being forced to call an election which would enable 220 persons—better say a few more than half of that number—to fix the measures of the Territory for the next 5 years. These freeholders, he declared, were men having an interest distinct from that of the great body of the people. They were a handful with power to act in opposition to the interest and wishes of the rest of the population. And what did the disfranchised masses think about it? Said the Governor: "Even if the danger to be apprehended should be considered problematical, still such are the jealous and independent dispositions of freemen that they never will be satisfied to depend for the security of their rights upon the mere courtesy of others."

The situation was made worse, Governor Edwards went on, by the fact that there were only two counties in Illinois. He had power to create additional counties, but was deterred from doing so by the reported fact that in the entire area from the Kaskaskia River to the Ohio—an area containing one-third or more of the whole population of the Territory—there were only three or four persons who owned enough land to entitle them to vote and apparently not a single one with a large enough freehold to qualify him for public office.

Furthermore, if he established the new form of government while there were but two counties, these two would get the entire membership of the legislature. Once the legislature came into existence, it alone would have the power to create new counties. He was not sure that the two existing counties would relinquish their power.

Congress, Governor Edwards suggested, could speedily remedy this extraordinary situation. "Under these circumstances," he wrote to Congressman Johnson, "I am sure I do not miscalculate when I suppose your attachment to republican principles will lead you to wish to extend their salutary influence to the people of this Territory by endorsing the right of suffrage." If he received word that Congress was likely to act quickly, he would hold back the elections until the mass of the people were given the right to vote.

Petitions went to Congress from Illinois Territory. From William Rector and 13

others came this sturdy assertion of American rights, including the right of protest:

"We cannot but view with the aversion natural to free men, Republicans, and lovers of equal rights, every manifestation of a desire among our fellow citizens to limit the exercise of all the rights aforesaid to a few individuals, to the exclusion of the great body of the people."

The last signature on that petition was "Laurance McClosky his mark." That man deserves a plaque all to himself—an American who didn't have to know how to write in order to know his rights.

Then there was a petition from 146 residents of the region below the Kaskaskia, men with still sharper words for the little group that was trying to seize control of the Territory. "To all our privations hitherto," they wrote, "we have submitted with patience in consequence of their resulting from the peculiar form of government adopted for the Territory." They had felicitated themselves with the pleasing anticipation of "an enjoyment of the equal rights of free men." But now they were sorry to see a disposition in some of the present freeholders "to exclude us from an equal participation in the benefits of government and to monopolize the whole power in their own hands."

Fittingly enough, the only petition sent to Congress from the other side was anonymous. Since freeholders must pay the added expenses of the general assembly, these nameless gentlemen asked, "would it not be unjust that those who do not contribute to it, should have a voice in the representation?" Nearly half of the entire population of the Territory, they remarked, lived south of the Kaskaskia, and all but four or five of those people were lawbreakers—unlawful intruders, guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to punishment. Extension of suffrage to them would not only countenance their infraction of the law but "by giving them equal rights with other citizens render their situation much more eligible."

It might be contended, the anonymous petitioners went on, that these intruders would purchase their lands whenever a land office was opened. A few might, they conceded, but a look at the history of the West would show "that the first settlers (being intruders generally) are but mere birds of passage." A few ambitious men, the petitioners concluded, were trying to throw the Territory into ferment and confusion, if not anarchy.

Well, there was the issue, thrown into the laps of Congress and the President—rule by the self-anointed few, or rule by the great body of the people; a helping hand to those who struggled to make a living, or fostering care for those who sit on top of their pile. Similar questions have come up in our own time. Should the Government play footsie with corporation farmers, or help the sharecropper get a stake in the soil he lives by? In the field of civil rights, the issue is typified by the long struggle to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting, and by the disfranchisement of a half million secondclass citizens, including myself, who have the dubious privilege of living in the District of Columbia. Judging by the speed with which Congress has undertaken to correct these current departures from democratic principle, one might suppose that it would have taken 50 years at least to secure action on the appeal by Governor Edwards and the supporting petitions from the disfranchised people of Illinois Territory.

Well, Ninian Edwards wrote his letter on March 14, 1812. It should have reached Washington during the week that ended April 7. On April 9, Congressman Johnson moved the appointment of a committee to consider extending the right of suffrage in Illinois Territory. Just 5 weeks later, President Madison signed a bill fulfilling that objective. In 5 weeks, Illinois Territory was converted from an incipient aristocracy into a republic with something very close to universal manhood suffrage. Besides other democratic features, the 1812 law provided that as soon as the governor should divide Illinois Territory into five districts, the voters in each of them should elect one member of the legislative council. Governor Edwards proceeded to subdivide the territory into five counties, coinciding with the districts of the legislative council, and that is how Madison County, Ill., came into existence.

If you search the public records for President Madison's official connection with these developments, you will find only that he signed the bill passed by Congress. But if you turn to the published writings of James Madison, as they were then known to the country, you will find that he laid the groundwork 25 years earlier for these 1812 occurrences in Illinois and in Congress. Running through the letter of Governor Edwards to Congressman Johnson, running through the petitions for relief sent to Congress by residents of Illinois Territory, are the thoughts and principles voiced by Madison in The Federalist No. 39. These men of Illinois used the very words in which Madison defined the republican form of government, as established for the Nation in the Constitution of 1787, and as guaranteed by that Constitution to every individual State of the Union.

What, asked Madison in The Federalist, are the distinctive features of the republican form of government? Were an answer to be sought, he said, not by recurring to principles, but merely by noticing what countries were called republics, that question could never be answered satisfactorily. Holland, in which no particle of the supreme authority was derived from the people, was called a republic. "The same title (I am quoting) has been bestowed on Venice, where absolute power over the great body of the people is exercised, in the most absolute manner, by a small body of hereditary nobles." In contrast with these and other examples, Madison defined the republican form of government within the meaning of the new Constitution:

"If we resort for a criterion to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their office during pleasure, (or) for a limited period, or during good behavior."

He continued:

"It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it; otherwise a handful of tyrannical nobles, exercising their oppressions by a delegation of their powers, might aspire to the rank of republicans, and claim for their government the honorable title of republic."

Again and again in those few paragraphs, Madison emphasized that under the republican form of government, all power must be lodged in the great body of the people. Observe how his words were echoed by Governor Edwards and the Illinois petitioners to Congress. Power was sought in Illinois, said the Governor, by a handful of men who had "an interest distinct from that of the great body of the people." When Edwards appealed to Congressman Johnson on the basis of his "attachment to republican principles," he was not referring to their common allegiance to what was then called the Republican Party, and is now the Democratic Party—the party of Jefferson and Madison. On the contrary, this attachment to republican principles was to help "extend their salutary influence * * * by endorsing the right of suffrage." The right to vote, not the way men voted, was in the mind of Governor Edwards, as it had been in the mind of Madison when he laid down the guiding principle.

So too, the thoughts and words of James Madison were in the minds of those Illinois petitioners who protested against the limitation of political rights "to a few individuals, to the exclusion of the great body of the people." These men of Illinois Territory were talking about their rights as freemen, as citizens of a republic, as lovers of equal rights. They contrasted the republican form of government with the "peculiar form" then existing in the Territory—existing quite by accident—under which a minority was seeking to "monopolize the whole power in their own hands."

In the 143 years since that political crisis gave birth to Madison County, Ill., the American people have gone far ahead in their concern for the general welfare. Some human rights have been fortified, others jeopardized or weakened. Education has been recognized as a responsibility of government. The Constitution has been enshrined for public worship, without regard to its contents. But do we know as much about the republican form of government as that illiterate Illinois farmer did when he drew a cross—Laurance McClosky his mark—on that petition to Congress in 1812? Just a few years ago one of the great liberal newspapers of the country, not, I am glad to say, the great liberal newspaper, dealt with this subject in a discussion of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. Its editorial writer challenged the assertion that Congress had power to abolish the poll-tax requirement under article IV of section 4 of the Constitution, which guarantees to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

"But a republic," said the editorial rebuttal, "is a state in which the sovereign power resides in the electorate without reference to any basis of election."

In other words, nine-tenths of the people may be legally disfranchised, and, if the remaining one-tenth have sovereign power to elect officers, you still have the republican form of government. James Madison thought otherwise. So did Ninian Edwards. So did Laurance McClosky. So would anybody else who approached the subject with a knowledge of history and devotion to the principle of human equality under the law.

Madison's connection with Illinois Territory goes much farther back, and has a broader basis, than this contest over the electorate. He is universally known as the father of the Constitution. Few indeed are those who know that he might also be called the father of the public domain. And it has passed virtually unnoticed in American history that the public domain and the Constitution form an interwoven chain of cause and effect, each reacting on the other.

At the outbreak of the American Revolution, the State of Virginia claimed ownership, under her royal charters, of all vacant land running west and northwest from her Atlantic waterfront, as far as the Mississippi and up to Canada. Illinois was at one time regarded as part of Orange County, Va., whose modern residue contains Madison's lifetime home. It was also regarded as part of Massachusetts and Connecticut, whose westward extensions to the Mississippi were intersected by Virginia's extension to the northwest. And it was claimed by the State of New York, which bought it from Indians who did not own it. Quite a mess. Anyway that was what Maryland thought. Maryland stoutly averred that she would never ratify the Articles of Confederation unless these vacant western lands, secured from the British Crown by the blood and treasure of all, were to be considered as a common stock of the 13 States, to be parceled out by Congress into free and independent governments.

Madison did not like the attitude of Maryland, New Jersey, and other landless States, whose righteous outlook was tainted by the

ambitions of big land speculators. But he recognized the justice of the demand they made, and the impossibility of disregarding it without imperiling the Union. So, as a Member of the Continental Congress, at the age of 29, he took the lead in a campaign of political persuasion and pressure, directed against the land claims of his own State, and finally brought about a cession of the western lands from Virginia to the Nation. Other States gave up their claims and the public domain came into existence—a Federal domain born in the birth pangs of the Nation.

Then, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, eastern commercial interests attempted to deny political equality to the western Territories. They were to be kept as colonies or admitted to the Union in an inferior status. Otherwise, with the westward spread of population, the seaboard States might lose their control of the National Government. Madison led the fight for equality, and won it. New States were to be admitted to the Union on a par with the Original Thirteen.

In taking this stand, Madison was fortified by the fundamental article of his political faith—his confidence in a large Federal republic democratically organized and subject to checks and balances. The Constitution of 1787 was founded on the doctrine he laid down in convention, that when a republic of free men is federally organized—that is, when it consists of a union of states with a supreme federal government properly constructed—every enlargement of the republic makes it more stable and makes liberty more secure. That is true, he told the convention, because every enlargement of the country increases the diversity of economic and other interests. Federal organization leaves local matters to local control, while diversity of regional interests reduces the likelihood that any one interest or element will gain complete control of the General Government.

The framers of our Constitution were men of property, but they were not tories. Accepting Madison's thesis, they gave the United States a Constitution which, in the federal realm, entrusts the protection of property rights and human rights to the checks and balances of a democratic government. Inherent in Madison's concept of government was a unique incentive to territorial expansion, not of a colonial empire held together by tyrannical force or doomed to explosive disruption, but an empire of free men—the expansion of a self-governing federal republic which would grow at the same time in freedom and stability. It would be erroneous to say that recognition of this fact governed the westward expansion of the United States. Pressure of population, hunger for cheap land and a sense of destiny were enough to carry American sovereignty from sea to sea. But Madison's political prophecy proved true, and territorial expansion was aided to an extraordinary degree by the ease of political assimilation on a democratic basis.

Today, much of this is forgotten. Especially in the last 3 years, we have heard men saying that the United States should go back to first principles, that we should give up the Federal ownership of the public lands and turn them back to the States from which the Federal Government hungrily snatched them away. In other words, national forests and national parks, Federal grazing districts and watersheds, great river systems, tideland oil and uranium reserves, belong traditionally to the States (that is, to lumber companies, big stockmen, private power interests, oil, and mining companies) and are held in Federal ownership because of a lapse from pure and pristine State rights principles. The time of the lapse is left somewhat vague, but with an impression that Presidents Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt were the principal culprits.

That is quite a mental achievement, considering that the question was actually settled, in favor of Federal ownership, between 1776 and 1784. But, as I said, people are forgetful, and some of them began to forget long before they were aided by the modern art of brain washing.

In 1831, former Gov. Edward Coles, of the State of Illinois, wrote to Madison, whose private secretary he once had been, that an agitation was going on in some of the newer Western States for the transfer of the public lands from the Nation to the States. People were saying that State ownership was the traditional American policy. Governor Coles wanted Madison to give him an answer at length to this unfounded claim. Madison replied that age and infirmities—he was then 81—made it impossible to comply. However, he was willing to express his private view of the argument for State ownership:

"I have always considered the claim as so unfair and unjust; so contrary to the certain and notorious intentions of the parties to the case, and so directly in the teeth of the condition on which the lands were ceded to the Union, that if a technical title could be made out by the claimants it ought in conscience and in honor to be waived."

That certainly leaves no doubt that the father of the public domain looked on it as a Federal domain. However, one fact must be admitted which at the present moment may reduce the value of his testimony. Madison, alack and alas, was a creeping Socialist. Worse than that, he made Gov. Ninian Edwards his accomplice in a nefarious plot against the noble institution of free enterprise. Edwards had not yet moved to Illinois when Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin wrote him that President Madison was placing the public salt deposits of the Territory under his superintendence. The object of the Government, said Gallatin, was to reduce the price of salt. Under the old lease, he said, the Government had tried to achieve this by charging a very low rental and reserving a right to buy all salt at a fixed low price. Unfortunately, the contract price had been set so extremely low that the lessees felt no stimulus to supply the public demand, while the rental charged by the Government was so small that a low production would cover it. The result was that a shortage of salt sent the market price still higher, enabling the buyers of the Government salt to resell it at a huge profit. This infuriated the Illinois farmers who wanted cheap salt for curing their pork and beef.

Governor Edwards was directed to pursue a new policy, more practical, but alas, no less cruelly socialistic. He was to raise the rental of the salt springs, thus forcing the lessees into heavy production to pay for their lease. The contract price of salt was to be raised, both to encourage production and to prevent profiteering resales by the purchasers. Listen to the reasons given for this policy. Listen and weep:

"My reasons for proposing that it should still be fixed somewhat below the market price, are the prevention of monopoly, and the hope of a reduction of that market price, during the continuance of the lease."

Just think of that, outdealing the New Deal, offering competition to monopoly, way back in 1809. It would be possible to go on at length with the sad story of Madison as a creeping Socialist. One could tell how, in 1777, he signed a petition for compulsory limitation of tobacco acreage by the State of Virginia—regimenting the farmers, with (horror of horrors) an extra allowance for the poor. Then there was Madison's brazen advocacy of the welfare state.

This began with his assertion, in 1787, that protection of seamen was one of the recognized objects of tonnage taxes. He picked up that idea from England, whose ruler, George III, was already showing other symptoms of insanity. When this subject came before Congress, of which Madison was a member, in 1792, it was proposed to combine the tonnage tax, which fell solely on the shipowners, with a compulsory deduction from seamen's wages. A direct anticipation, you see, of the mixed contributory system of the Wagner Social Security Act. When the bill finally passed, early in the Presidency of John Adams, the tonnage tax was omitted. That threw the entire cost of sick relief, hospital construction and old-age support onto the payroll tax. It relieved the shipowners, except as wages went up to cover the tax, but left the country saddled with a maritime social security system and with socialized medicine.

Well, you can imagine what President Thomas Jefferson did to this socialistic scheme, when he entered office with the slogan, which, oddly enough, nobody has ever been able to locate in his writings, that the prime business of government is to do nothing about anything. Jefferson took care of it all right. He put a bill through Congress extending the payroll deduction system to the owners and crews of Mississippi River flatboats.

Then came the crowning touch by President Madison. In 1813 he approved a bill creating a Federal vaccination agent, a public officer whose duty was to procure and distribute the new Jenner smallpox vaccine throughout the United States. But enough of this. The American Medical Association has plenty to feel bad about without adding Presidents John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison to its painfully long list of deviators from the true American spirit.

Let us, if we can, forgive and forget Madison's creeping socialism. We shall then see more clearly the link between his zeal for liberty and for westward expansion, a merger of turbulent ideas which stems more directly from his participation in the American Revolution than from his staid and proper private life. The United States has been throughout its history a disorderly country. It has been in general a free country. In the popular mind, disorder and freedom are closely linked and both of them are given a western locale. This doctrine of innocence by association can be carried too far. In the wild west movie, there is plenty of disorder, but nobody is really free except the bully, until the visiting cowboy plunks him and restores the reign of law. Nevertheless, even in the older Eastern States some of the most notable examples of disorder, in the early days, had justice and freedom as their motives. And with curious unanimity they originated in the western precincts of the States concerned.

Shays' rebellion—I don't suppose there's a representative of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this audience. * * * Still, I'll take no chances, Shays' rebellion, a wicked communistic revolt(!) against 40 percent interest on farm mortgages and imprisonment for debt, arose in the western part of Massachusetts.

Similarly, it was the mountaineers of western Pennsylvania who conducted our famous Whisky rebellion, an uprising against an excise tax and distillery charges which in combination (whisky being the only form of money in the community) were the equivalent of a $300 tax on a $600 corn crop.

To shift from spirits to spirituality, it was in the westerly portions of Virginia, which then included West Virginia and Kentucky, that the people rallied behind James Madison when he called on them to defeat the 1784 scheme for a State tax to support the teachers of religion.

Again, it was in the new State of Kentucky, and in the western counties of Virginia, that Jefferson and Madison found the majorities needed for their resolutions against the alien and sedition laws of 1798.

Madison's 1784 victory for freedom of religion was won within the orderly processes

of legislation. Nevertheless, his famous memorial and remonstrance against the establishment of religion through taxation employed language which could only be called an incitement to forcible resistance if the tax should be imposed. The preservation of free government, he wrote, forbade any branch of it "to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment * * * are tyrants. The people who submit to it * * * are slaves." As if this were not enough, he piled up praise on the freemen of America who, not waiting for usurped power to strengthen itself by exercise, fought the War of the Revolution against a three-penny tax on tea. Prudent jealousy for the preservation of liberty, he told his readers, was the first duty of citizens.

As a believer in public order, Madison was no supporter of armed uprisings against a democratic government. But when the Federalists in Congress made the Whisky Rebellion an excuse to assail the political liberties of American citizens, he was in the forefront of their defense. In the House of Representatives, a resolution was offered to censure the new and Radical Democratic Societies as alleged abettors of the revolt. Madison offered to join in denouncing those who actually took part in the uprising. But, said he, the Democratic Societies took no part in it. Their members were not in the public service. This was a proposal to censure private citizens for their political opinions. It was a sound principle, said Madison (and I am quoting), "that an action innocent in the eyes of the law could not be made the object of censure to a legislative body. * * * Opinions are not the objects of legislation."

The holding of opinions, Madison asserted, was one of the reserved rights of the people—that is, one of the unspecified rights and powers reserved to the people by the 9th and 10th amendments. The right to express opinions was specifically guaranteed by the first amendment. Start invading the reserved rights, he warned, and the censure would soon extend to freedom of speech and of the press. Furthermore, what would this proposed congressional resolution do to the people condemned by it? I quote his next remark:

"It is in vain to say that this indiscriminate censure is no punishment. * * * Is not this proposition, if voted, a bill of attainder?"

No, ladies and gentlemen, those words were not uttered by some recklessly courageous Congressman, during the last 10 years of governmental witch hunts and character assassination. They were not put forth in some judicial argument against the unconstitutional bills of attainder that have been flowing of late in a steady stream from Congress, congressional committees, and the executive branch of government. They were spoken in the year 1794, by the author if the American Bill of Rights, and Madison followed them with this fundamental rule:

"If we advert to the nature of republican government, we shall find that the censorial power is in the people over the government, and not in the government over the people."

If that is an axiom of American Government, it is one which this country now honors only in the breach. How was it in 1794? Madison won his fight against that resolution of censure, but it would be too much to say that he won it by converting the repressive majority which then ruled Congress. Confronted with his statement of principle, a number of Federalists suddenly realized that they were censuring too many people back home who had the right to vote. So they joined with the opponents, first in limiting the censure to four counties in Pennsylvania, and then subjecting the remnant of the motion to overwhelming defeat.

A victory so won is not to be belittled. On the contrary, it gives point to one of Madison's cardinal beliefs, not fully put into words by him, but distinctly present in what he said and did. The best defense of civil liberties, he believed, lay in general safeguards against autocratic government. Ardently devoted to freedom of religion, speech, and press, he saw little chance of maintaining these liberties intact against laws passed during great gusts of popular passion. Yet by solemn written affirmation, he remarked in 1788, declarations of liberties would gradually become axioms of free government, with the independent courts as their special champions. That is, the courts would stand up for oppressed or threatened minorities. The majority of the people, as long as they chose their own rulers and kept their senses, could protect themselves against the arbitrary acts of government. Preservation of civil rights would preserve civil liberties, and be thereby preserved.

This attitude of mingled skepticism and faith goes far to explain why Madison made no effort to incorporate a bill of rights in the original Constitution, yet drafted one willingly—the first 10 amendments—in response to popular demand. That his skepticism was justified has been demonstrated in our two great American brainstorms—the one that produced the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, and the one that followed the Second World War.

In the first of these emotional upheavals, the French Revolution was equated with Jeffersonian democracy in a vain endeavor to perpetuate the rule of the Federalist Party. In the second, the menace of international communism swept us into panic, partly genuine, partly simulated, over the handful of impotent neurotics who make up the American Communist Party—a panic shrewdly utilized for political though not for strictly partisan advantage. Yet we are recovering, and we are recovering the more surely because our fundamental right as citizens—the right to choose our governors in fair and free elections—is embedded in the very fabric of government.

Civil liberties must be protected in the minds and hearts of men, as well as in constitutional guaranties. But the empire of free men can be sure of freedom only as long as the people control their governors.

When the citizens of Illinois Territory sent their appeal to Congress for genuine self-government, they were acting for future generations of Americans as well as for themselves. When the name of President Madison was given to Madison County, Ill., that action, as far as this area was concerned, amounted to a second ratification of the Constitution and all the rights and liberties embodied in it. The commemoration today, of that 1812 event, turns the lamp of liberty toward the future.

REMARKS OF BURTON C. BERNARD OF GRANITE CITY, ILL., ON BEHALF OF THE MADISON COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION IN PRESENTING TO THE PEOPLE A PLAQUE COMMEMORATING JAMES MADISON, FATHER OF THE CONSTITUTION AND FOURTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE COURTHOUSE, EDWARDSVILLE, ILL., AT 3:30 P. M. SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1955

The Madison County Bar Association is happy and gratified to participate in this commemorating of James Madison on the occasion of the 143d anniversary of the creation of Madison County.

James Madison and his contemporaries faced community problems which were just as challenging to them as the problems of our own day are to us. We will profit by emulating the high purpose and dedication to the cause of liberty and good government which marked the lives of our early leaders.

The participation of the community in these ceremonies serves to counteract the influence of cynicism, defeatism, and apathy—those deadly enemies of liberty and good government. To recall now the faith of Madison in the ability of the people to govern themselves fairly and effectively; the struggle of Madison to improve the caliber of Government; and the unswerving dedication of Madison to the rights of the individual—these recollections will help to sustain our faith in and impel our implementation of the underlying principles of our Government. Our meeting here places in proper perspective those who may say that the people of Madison County, or of this Nation, no longer believe in those principles.

It is appropriate that we meet at our county courthouse to pay tribute to James Madison. Here, the people have continuous contact with their government; here, courts of justice function; and here, important county officials confront the responsibilities of their offices. And so, here, past our time, will remain the plaque which is now presented to the people of Madison County.

[Unveiling:] Engraved on the plaque under the likeness of James Madison are these words:

"James Madison. He was a member of the Virginia Legislature, Continental Congress, Federal Constitutional Convention, and the United States Congress. He later served as Secretary of State and fourth President of the United States.

"Forty years a public servant, he helped to lead the Nation through its formative years, and is known as the Father of the Constitution. He fought for religious liberty, the Bill of Rights and good government.

"He appointed as first Governor of the Illinois Territory, Ninian Edwards, of Kentucky, for whom Edwardsville is named. Madison County, named for President Madison, was created on September 14, 1812.

"Presented to the people by the lawyers of Madison County acting through the Madison County Bar Association.

"September 1955."

As we view this plaque, let us enshrine upon our minds and hearts these words of John Ruskin:

"Therefore, when we build let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for and let us think as we lay stone on stone that a time will come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them and that men will say as they look upon the labor and the wrought substance of them, 'See, this our fathers did for us.'"

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY IRVING DILLIARD, COLLINSVILLE, PAST PRESIDENT, ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, DIRECTOR OF MADISON COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, AND EDITOR OF THE EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. Brant, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Bernard, members of the Madison County Bar Association, the Madison County Historical Society, members of other civic and historical groups, fellow citizens, as one of the 200,000 residents of Madison County I humbly but proudly accept for the people of our county this memorial to James Madison, for permanent preservation and display at this seat of our intimate local government. I would have gladly come here as a spectator to see the presentation that the Madison County Bar Association has so wisely arranged and to congratulate its members upon it. I would have been content to listen to my friend over nearly a quarter century, Irving Brant, the one most appropriate speaker among the 160 million Americans for this occasion. In all the United States no one—and this does not exclude Dolley Madison—has ever lived from day to day with our fourth President as has the historian, and biographer, and student of government who so graciously has

come out from Washington to be with us today in the county Illinois named for James Madison. To have heard from Irving Brant is almost to have heard from the Father of the Constitution himself.

The least each of us can be is appreciative of the lives and works of the great men who have built the Nation we enjoy. One of the very greatest of these builders was the Virginian who became Thomas Jefferson's Secretary of State in whose administration the vast Louisiana Territory was purchased fram France. Under this same Secretary of State Madison, two young captains, Lewis and Clark, set out into the danger-fraught wilderness of the Northwest and pushed on 150 years ago to the Pacific Ocean—all from a winter campsite and recruiting and provisioning ground on the bank of the Mississippi, in this very county, at the point where old Wood River joined the Father of Waters. Thanks to public-spirited citizens and officials, some of whom are with us here today, that historic spot will soon be commemorated in an Illinois State Park in Madison County opposite the wonder of the Missouri-Mississippi confluence which men have wanted to look upon since the great river valley was first inhabited.

But Madison did a far greater service to this country than to participate in the purchase of Louisiana Territory, epochal as that act of statesmanship was. He more than anyone else gave us the words of the first amendment to the Constitution—the first article of the Bill of Rights with its guaranties of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. One way or another we, here at this gathering and at this very hour, are exercising all these liberties. Above all else Madison saw the necessity for keeping church and state separate. Indeed, he espoused the idea so firmly and so persuasively that it became known as Mr. Madison's Principle. If we are as wise as he and if we do our work a fraction as well as he did his, we will make sure that the wall of separation remains strong and high for the protection of members of whatever faiths. For only where no church enjoys special advantages can religion be wholly free and churches prosper as they have in the United States. Let us at this moment thank Madison and the other architects of our religious freedom that a Catholic priest could open this ceremony and that a Protestant clergyman soon will close it. Let us and our children and our children's children keep it ever thus in Madison County in the United States of America.

And now I ask that each and everyone present join in accepting this gift that makes Madison County richer, more understanding, more appreciative of its honored name and our priceless heritage.

JAMES O. MONROE, Jr.,
Madison County Bar Association, Collinsville, Ill.:

The purpose of this ceremony I heartily applaud, as must any person who cares at all deeply about the theory and practice of democracy. I think no man has made a greater, more permanent contribution to democratic theory than did James Madison; few have contributed more, through personal example, to the practice of democracy; and it is my sincere hope that the plaque you unveil there will stimulate many people to renew their acquaintance with James Madison's contribution to the Federalist Papers. The message of these papers to us of today is quite as urgent, and as wise, as it was in the late 18th century, for the problem it deals with—namely, the proper balance of freedom and authority in effective government—is, I suspect, a permanent one.

It gives me immense pleasure, therefore, to send to all of you assembled there my heartiest congratulations.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

JAMES MONROE, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.:

To have been named in honor of the father of the Constitution is a distinction that Madison County rightfully deserves. The free exercise of religion clause in the Constitution established him as an historic symbol of freedom-loving people everywhere. On behalf of the people of Illinois I want to congratulate the Madison County Bar Association for honoring its county's namesake on the 143d anniversary of its founding.

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

JAMES O. MONROE, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.:

I deeply regret that I cannot be with you in person for the ceremonies to honor James Madison, after whom your fine county was named, and to hear my friend, Irving Brant, deliver what I know will be a magnificent address. Madison has been a much-neglected figure in American history. More than any man, he drafted our Federal Constitution and was instrumental in getting it adopted by the States. Then he led the battle for the Bill of Rights and the first 10 amendments of the Constitution, the full meaning of which is not fully appreciated by some Americans even at this very day. He was a good Secretary of State and President; in all a splendid American, whose close association with Jefferson was one of the most fruitful partnerships in American history. All credit to you for seeing Madison's greatness and moving to honor it. Please give my best regards to the distinguished orator of the day, Irving Brant, the great authority on Madison.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

JAMES MONROE, Jr.,
President Madison County Bar Association, Collinsville, Ill.:

Sorry that previous committee assignments prevent me from attending dedication ceremony commemorating creation of Madison County. I want to congratulate Madison County Bar Association in sponsoring this event, recognizing the historic dedication of the great county of Madison which provided most of the early leaders in the government of the old Territory and the State of Illinois.

MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress.

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS,
Taylorville, Ill., September 8, 1955.

To the MADISON COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Care James O. Monroe, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: This is to acknowledge with thanks your kind invitation to attend the James Madison ceremonies this coming Sunday.

I regret very much that I will be unable to attend, because of my necessary presence in Springfield in preparation for the convening of the supreme court the following day.

Allow me, however, to congratulate the lawyers of the Madison County Bar for sponsoring this event. James Madison was in a large way responsible for the Bill of Rights, and the Bill of Rights is, without doubt, the crowning feature of American constitutional law.

Lawyers, above all, should keep these things in mind, and your association is a most appropriate group to lead any meeting commemorating Madison and the principles of constitutional freedom.

With best regards to your association and to my many friends among the lawyers of Madison County, I remain,

Sincerely,

HARRY B. HERSHEY,
Chief Justice.

JAMES O. MONROE, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.:

The Madison County Bar Association deserves the highest commendation and the wholehearted gratitude of all thoughtful citizens for this program of rededication to those principles to which James Madison dedicated the greater part of his life.

Madison lived in an era not dissimilar to ours—an era of wars and threats of war, of deprivation of liberty, of turbulence. He fought these evils; it is our duty now to protect the liberties we gained from this struggle against those who consciously or unconsciously under the guise of patriotism would undermine and destroy them.

We must go about this calmly, in a rational manner, in full possession of our best commonsense and good judgment. We must refrain from actions nurtured in emotion or hypothesis. Hysteria is our greatest enemy.

Only by proceeding in the typically American way, in an orderly fashion and with proper respect for the rights of all citizens can we succeed in this struggle to preserve our priceless heritage and remain true to the ideals of Madison and the other great men of his day to whom we owe our existence as a constitutional democracy.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate.

The Chairman's Progress Report on Activities of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting at this time the chairman's progress report on the activities of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. That committee was created in the 84th Congress by House Resolution 114, agreed to on January 27, 1955.

INTRODUCTION—ECONOMIC HEALTH OF SMALL BUSINESS

It is believed that this report on the activities of our committee will be more understandable when considered in the light of the facts regarding the present state of the economic health of small business. Therefore I shall introduce my report on our activities by pointing to a number of the indicators of the health of small business.

The past few years have seen unprecedented volumes of new investment in business enterprise. Furthermore, since a somewhat tentative business downturn in mid-1954, there has been a continuously increasing output of goods and services, and general business prosperity, with corporate profits and stock prices setting alltime records in the first half of the present year.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this business boom is that it has been accompanied by increasing rates of small business failures and by a general worsening of the economic position of

the small-business sectors of the economy.

THE PACE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Measured in 1955 dollars, the gross national product—that is, the value of goods and services produced in the Nation—grew from $295.8 billion in 1948 to $357.5 billion in 1952, an average annual growth of 5.2 percent. By 1955, the economy was turning out $387.2 billion of total annual product, an average annual increase of 2.8 percent over 1952.

At the same time, the Nation's population has also been growing—from 147 million in 1948, our population had increased to 167 million by March of 1956.

With the growth in population and general business it would be normal to expect the number of businesses to grow in rough proportion. But this has been far from the case. The business birth rate has fallen off while the death rate has increased.

Omitting the rapid and abnormally large growth of the business population in the years immediately following World War II, we may note that from 1948 to 1952, there was an average net increase in operating firms of 54,700 firms a year. The total number of firms in operation at the end of 1952 was 4,167,000.

During the past 3 years, however, net growth slowed down to an average of 28,300 a year.

In the manufacturing field, the field in which there has been the greatest volume of new investment and business expansion, there was actually a net loss of 19,000 firms during the past 3 years.

SMALL BUSINESS FAILURES ON THE RISE

Dun & Bradstreet reported 11,000 business failures last year—the highest number in any year since the early years of World War II, when business mortality was abnormally high as a result of war shortages, drafting of operators and key personnel of firms not essential to the war effort, and so forth.

Furthermore, the rate of small business failures has continued to rise during the first 6 months of this year—the period when big business profits and stock prices set all-time records. Comparing the past 6-month period with the same period in the previous 2 years, the total number of failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet is as follows:

Year (first 6 months):	*Number of failures*
1954	5,778
1955	5,626
1956	6,496

Dun & Bradstreet's failure rate, which is the number of failures per each 10,000 firms in operation, has increased from a rate of 5 in 1946 to a rate of 49 in the first half of the present year. These rates are shown as follows:

Business failures per 10,000 reporting firms

Year:	*Rate*
1946	5
1947	14
1948	20
1949	34
1950	34
1951	31
1952	29
1953	33
1954	42
1955	42
1956 (first 6 months)	49

THE PROFIT POSITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Although no data exists for comparing the profitability of different sizes of firms in all fields of business enterprise, such information is available for profits of corporations classified in the manufacturing field. This field includes most of the giant corporations; and while they are classified as "manufacturers", many also engage in distribution, trade, and service.

In 1952, the profit rate of the smallest size group of corporations—those with less than one-quarter million dollars of assets—was 9.3 percent after taxes. This rate dropped to 6.8 percent in 1953; to 3.2 percent in 1954; and then recovered somewhat—to a rate of 5.5 percent—in the boom year of 1955. In other words, in 1954, the profit rate of the smallest size group had dropped by 66 percent from 1952, and last year, 1955, the profit rate of these companies was 41 percent below 1952.

On the other side of the coin, the profit rate of the corporate giants—those with more than $100 million of assets—has shown a remarkable increase. In 1952, their profit rate, after taxes, was 11.8 percent. This increased to 12.1 percent in 1953 and 1954, and to 14.6 percent in 1955. In other words, the profit rate of the giant corporations as a group, last year, was 24 percent higher than in 1952.

When the profit rates are averaged for the period 1953–55, it is found that the smallest firms—those with assets of less than one-quarter million dollars—have been 44 percent less profitable in the past 3 years, than they were in 1952. In contrast, the giants with over $100 million of assets have been 9.3 percent more profitable over the past 3 years than they were in 1952.

Similar comparisons are made for each available corporate size class in the table below. In order to take account of changes in investment, and changes in the number of firms in each size class, profits after taxes have been stated as a percentage of stockholders' investment—which is the amount of capital paid into the firm plus all profits in previous years which were not paid out in dividends.

Rates of profits on stockholders' investment—after taxes in manufacturing corporation by size of corporations

Asset size of corporations (in millions)	1952	1953	1954	1955	Average, 1953–55	
					Rate	Percent of change from 1952
Less than $\frac{1}{4}$	9.3	6.8	3.2	5.5	5.2	−44.1
$\frac{1}{4}$ to $1	7.2	7.1	6.4	8.4	7.3	+1.4
$1 to $5	8.0	7.5	5.6	9.0	7.4	−7.5
$5 to $10	8.8	9.2	7.4	9.7	8.8	0
$10 to $50	9.7	9.9	8.7	11.0	9.9	+2.1
$50 to $100	9.9	9.4	8.7	11.5	9.9	0
Over $100	11.8	12.1	12.1	14.6	12.9	+9.3
All corporations	10.3	10.5	9.9	12.6	11.0	+6.8

Source: Federal Trade Commission-Securities and Exchange Commission Quarterly Financial Reports of United States Manufacturing Corporations.

SMALL BUSINESS' SHARE OF PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES

Since 1952 the relative position of the smallest-sized firms—those with less than one-fourth million dollars of assets—has worsened most markedly. Their proportion of all the assets owned by manufacturing corporations has dropped from 3.6 percent to 2.4 percent.

At the end of 1952 the 500 or so largest corporations—those with assets over $100 million—owned 51.5 percent of all the assets of all the manufacturing corporations in the country. By the end of 1955 the share of this size group had increased to 57.1 percent. If concentration of assets continues at this rate, which amounts to 1.9 percentage points a year, our Nation's entire manufacturing capacity will be in the hands of a relatively few $100 million—and bigger—corporations in a matter of 22 years.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND SUBSIDIES

One of the most portentous developments of recent years, bearing upon the future of small business, is the prodigious rate at which the United States economy is spending for research and development work. According to estimates of the National Science Foundation, the funds spent during the past 5 years on scientific and industrial research and development of all kinds have equaled the total funds spent for such purposes during the previous 60 years, or substantially the full span of the Nation's industrial and scientific history.

According to estimates prepared by the Department of Defense, the Federal Government is now supplying more than half of the funds spent for research and development in the Nation—Department of Defense, Secretary for Research and Development, Resources Division. According to the Federal budget for 1957 the Federal Government will supply $2,557,000,000 for these purposes in the current fiscal year.

Our principal concern here is with Federal funds supplied to private business concerns for research and development work of an industrial nature. The Department of Defense, which is the principal source of such funds, is currently disbursing between $1 billion and $1.5 billion per year for research and development pursuits in almost all fields. Such funds are awarded not merely for development of specific military items in which the Armed Forces are interested, but for both process and product developments in basic industrial fields such as metallurgy, chemistry, electronics, and so forth. It has long been a truism that military production contracts tend to follow the grants of research funds—in that those firms which make the developments on items in which the Armed Forces are more directly interested usually have the inside tract for receiving the contracts for producing those items. But what is perhaps of greater importance, the firms gaining the know-how with new products and new production techniques having commercial applicability naturally forge ahead in the commercial race. Furthermore, inquiries made by your Small Business Committee last summer brought out that the usual conditions under which the Department of Defense grants research funds to a private firm allow the firm making a patentable invention through the use of these funds to acquire the

patent, and this is without any requirement that others be licensed to use the patent for commercial purposes.

The allocation of such vast funds for industrial research and development by the Department of Defense seemed a matter of sufficient importance, to several members of your Small Business Committee, to warrant a requirement that the Department of Defense make some periodic report on the amount of such funds being spent, with a like indication of the proportion allocated to small business.

Consequently, when a bill for extending the life of the Small Business Act was under consideration by the House Banking and Currency Committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I made, on behalf of these Members, a recommendation that the new law require the Department of Defense to make a monthly report to Congress on this subject. This recommendation was accepted; and the information is now available for the period beginning July 1, 1955.

From July 1, 1955, through May 31, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded contracts to private firms committing $1,728,372,000 of Federal funds for research and development uses. Of this total only 5.9 percent was committed to firms having less than 500 employees.

Since the significance of the Department of Defense's subsidy for industrial research has been pointed out, along with the fact that 95 percent of these funds are going to a relatively few big corporations, several Members of the House have expressed grave concern, and have requested that the Small Business Committee make a more detailed investigation and study to determine what feasible steps should be taken to allow small business to share in the research and development work. Your Small Business Committee has this matter under study, and has dispatched to the Department of Defense questionnaires which are designed to throw more light on the distribution problem.

Contracts for defense supplies and facilities continue to account for a substantial share of the manufacturing and construction activities of the country. In the fiscal year just ended the Department of Defense awarded contracts for supplies, services, and construction totaling between $14 and $15 billion. Of the total for the first 11 months of the fiscal year—$13.4 billion—83 percent was awarded to contractors selected on the basis of negotiation; or conversely, only 17 percent was awarded on the basis of advertised competitive bid.

It is manifest that an inequitable distribution of such a huge volume of business as between large and small competitors would have, or is having, a decided impact upon the competitive structure of American industry. Congress has long been keenly aware of the consequences of an inequitable distribution, as well as the tendency for the lion's share of this business to find its way to bigger competitors; in no less than three separate statutes Congress has declared the national policy to be that small business shall have a fair proportion of such business.

Administrative efforts to carry out this policy have for the most part consisted of a joint determination, or as it is more recently called, a joint set-aside program, whereby representatives of the SBA obtain the military procurement office's agreement to earmark certain specific contract procurements for award on the basis of competition limited to small firms. This program involves a somewhat novel approach to diffusion of administrative responsibility, the efficacy of which is yet to be demonstrated.

The controlling statutes would seem to place responsibility directly with the Department of Defense for carrying out the declared national policy that small business shall have a fair proportion of the defense contracts. But in the absence of both targets and systematic procedure for carrying out the policy, within the Department of Defense, the SBA maintains a representative in each of a large number of military procurement offices over the country, whose representative's job it is to screen proposed procurements and recommend to the military procurement officer in charge that certain ones be earmarked for small business. Small business is taken to be a firm with 500 employees or less without respect to what line of work it may be engaged in or what its competitive position within its industry may be.

In the past 3 fiscal years, since the set-aside program has been in operation, contracts earmarked for small business amounted to $1,042,520,489, or 2 percent of the value of all the military contracts awarded in the period. In the same period, the contracts earmarked for small business and actually awarded to small business amounted to $706,091,117, which was 1.4 percent of the military contracts awarded in this period.

It is not known what portion of the contracts earmarked for small business would inevitably have gone to small business anyway, as for example contracts for many types of garments or for blueprints, where there is no firm having as many as 500 employees. In any case, the contracts which went to small business as a result of the set-aside program amounted to only a small fraction of the contracts which small business managed to obtain with the set-aside assistance. In the 3 fiscal years mentioned small business received 22.4 percent of the value of all military contracts awarded, with or without set-aside assistance.

Despite the set-aside program and other efforts by SBA and the Department of Defense to give small business an equitable opportunity to compete, the lion's share of the defense contracts continues to be placed with a few giant corporations. Moreover, there is some evidence of a recent tendency for the defense business to become more concentrated.

From June 1950 through June 1953, 63.6 percent of the value of all the defense contracts awarded were placed with the 100 largest contract holders. During the subsequent 18 months—July 1953 through December 1954—the latest period for which a report is available, 68.8 percent of the value of the contracts went to the 100 largest contract holders.

Beyond an occasional report on the 100 largest contractors, the Department of Defense makes public no meaningful report on the question how its contracts are distributed as between small firms and large firms, and appears to have no such report for its own information.

The Small Business Act of 1953 seems clearly to contemplate that the national policy will be concerned about the small competitors in each of the various industries. But the Administrator's decision to define small business as a firm with less than 500 employees, irrespective of industry, makes the national policy one which in theory is concerned about the small competitors in some industries and not those in others. For example, the policy would not be concerned with how the defense contracts may be distributed within the motor-vehicle industry, since even the smallest truckmaker in this industry has well over 500 employees. In practice moreover, since the Department lumps its data for all industries indiscriminately, the 500-employee definition results in a national policy which is concerned about the smaller competitors in no industry.

The percentage of the value of a fiscal year's contracts going to small business has ranged from 17 percent to 25 percent during the past 5 fiscal years. Such year-to-year variation may indicate, in part, that a better or a poorer job is being done to bring small business into the picture. Moreover, the indications on this question may be completely obscured by the addition or subtraction of a few more or less huge long-term contracts awarded for such items as aircraft, tanks, or ships. Such additions or subtractions may materially change the small business percentage in any fisal year, irrespective of whether there is any real change in the small business share of such contracts as firms with less than 500 employees might actually perform.

The Department of Defense periodically treats the public to a statistic on what has been called the amount of contracts which are suitable for award to small business, but here again the statistics raise more questions than they answer. The suitable contracts consist, in the first instance, of contracts for items for which the contracting officer happens to know of a small business source but from these there are then subtracted, first, such suitable contracts which were awarded to big firms, in order to maintain such firms in the mobilization base; and, second, such suitable contracts which were awarded to big firms in an emergency situation requiring schedules that cannot be met by a small business firm. In Department of Defense procurement practices emergency situations are more the rule than the exception. For example, according to a recent study made by the House Armed Services Committee 94 percent of the value of the nonconstruction contracts has been awarded, not according to the general policy requiring advertising for competitive bids, but under an exceptional provision of the law applicable to a period of national emergency. Report to Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services, from

chairman, Subcommittee for Special Investigations, on use of section 2 (c) (1) through (17), Armed Services Procurement Act, 1947, period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955, United States House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session, under the authority of House Resolution 112.

The most that can be said of the Department's statistics on contracts suitable for small business is that they show that certainly small business has not received more than 67.8 percent of its fair proportion during the past 3 years. In short, the contracts awarded small business in this period amounted to 67.8 percent of the amount which the Department reported to be suitable—or which it has more recently called the small business potential.

THE CREDIT SQUEEZE

In April of this year, the Federal Reserve Board announced a hike in the discount rate—the Board's fifth such action to squeeze commercial bank credit since April 1955. These credit restrictions, far from being general and undiscriminating, turned out to be highly selective and discriminatory against small borrowers.

Not only do small firms depend almost exclusively on commercial banks as a source of credit, having little practical access to the stock market, commercial paper, the insurance companies, and other sources available to big firms, but a general result of squeezing commercial bank credit is that the banks cut off their smaller borrowers and use their limited credit supply to serve their big borrowers.

The preferential treatment which big firms receive in bidding for a limited credit supply is of course no new phenomenon. As an indication of the extent to which small firms have recently been squeezed out of the credit picture, however, attention may be given to a report of the Standard Factors Corp. of New York, giving the results of its survey of some 127 banks and 727 manufacturing concerns in 33 industries.

This survey found that in April 1955, before the first boost in the discount rate, 89 percent of the companies surveyed were regular borrowers from the commercial banks. Just 1 year and 5 rate increases later, only 53 percent had bank lines of credit. Furthermore, it was the smaller firms that had been cut off, and the smaller the firms the greater the proportion among them that had been cut off.

For example, in the smallest size class of firms—those with a net worth between $5,000 and $25,000—53 percent of the firms had a line of credit with their local banks in March of 1955; but in March of 1956, only 18 percent of these firms had a line of credit. At the other end of the size scale—firms with a net worth of more than $2,500,000—the effects of the credit squeeze were not visible. In March 1955, 99 percent of the firms of this size had a line of bank credit; and in March of 1956, 99 percent still had a line of bank credit. The direct relationship between size of firm and ability to get bank credit is manifest in the table below:

Net worth of companies	Percent of companies with bank lines March—	
	1955	1956
$5,000 to $25,000	53	18
$25,000 to $100,000	82	44
$100,000 to $500,000	94	79
$500,000 to $1,000,000	99	98
$1,000,000 to $2,500,000	99	98
Over $2,500,000	99	99

The results of the Standard Factors report are entirely in accord with the impressions which this Committee has gained from a flood of letters from small-business people—except that there are two additional features to the problem.

First, small firms need increased credit—not less credit—to carry inventories and work in process—as a result of the almost continuous increases in the prices of products and materials coming from the big-business sectors of the economy.

Second, small firms, like big firms, use their credit lines with commercial banks to discount bills, carry inventory for processing or for sale, or to cover payrolls and other current operating payments until payments are forthcoming from sales.

Such current, or short-term, working capital is, of course, all that commercial banks are theoretically intended to supply—and about all they are, in practice, suited to supply. But in truth, small firms normally must, and do, make use of commercial-bank credit for their longer-term plant and equipment capital—for the lack of adequate sources of genuine long-term credit.

When small borrowers turn to commercial finance companies to replace their lost bank credit, they find that the finance companies—which, by and large, depend on bank lines of credit—are themselves squeezed. Consequently, only the very large commercial finance companies, those which are independent of the banking system for credit, can even begin to meet the demand for funds.

CREDIT ROLE OF SBA

That the present banking system and organization of the capital markets leaves small-business credit starved has long been recognized. This recognition gives the Small Business Administration one of its principal reasons for being. It was created to make sound loans to small business wherever private sources proved inadequate to small-business needs.

The SBA has promulgated definitions of "small business," for loan purposes, which are quite narrow. Nevertheless, according to these definitions an estimated 3½ million firms are potentially eligible for small-business loans. These 3½ million firms account for somewhere between one-third and one-half of total volume of nonagricultural business done in the United States.

In June 1955, when the Small Business Committee of the House investigated, SBA had been receiving inquiries about loans from small-business people at the rate of 11,000 per month. Since that time small businesses' needs for loans have been greatly increased, as a result of price increases and the successive squeezes on commercial bank credit.

It has been SBA's policy, however, to discourage small-business people from filing formal applications. SBA instructs its field offices to discourage the filing of an application unless the field office thinks the loan is going to be approved. From past experience, moreover, the field offices have learned that only a few applications with gold-plated security will be approved.

In 3 fiscal years—1954 through 1956—SBA accepted only 9,688 applications. Of these 2,950 were approved, not counting some that were approved and subsequently canceled or withdrawn.

SBA has made disbursements on only 2,220 of these.

The applications approved were in the amount of $136 million, including amounts to be lent by the local banks in bank participation.

SBA's share of the total loan commitment was $113 million, including $39 million of contingent commitments on deferred participation loans. Deferred participation loans are those on which the bank makes the entire loan, but has the option of calling on SBA to make good a certain share of the loan.

In the 3 fiscal years, SBA had actually disbursed only $52.6 million, of which $10.5 million had been repaid.

Some perspective may be given to this $52.6 million lent to United States small business during the past 3 fiscal years, by considering the organization and operations of 3 other lending organizations in which the United States Government participates.

The Export-Import Bank, financed wholly by the United States Government, makes loans to private importers and exporters. Principally, it is for the benefit of United States big business, in financing their exports. The bank is authorized to have a capital stock of $1 billion and may borrow from the United States Treasury up to $5 billion at any time. The bank is authorized to have outstanding loans and guaranties up to $5 billion.

In the 3 fiscal years—1954 through 1956—the Export-Import Bank authorized 325 credits, totaling $1.3 billion. In this period it actually disbursed over $1 billion.

In other words, the Export-Import Bank disbursed in the 3 fiscal years approximately 20 times as much, principally to finance big business exports to foreign countries, as the SBA lent to small-business people in the United States.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, called the World Bank, finances the projects of foreign governments and projects guaranteed by foreign governments. The United States Government has subscribed $3.175 billion to the bank. Our large United States big business profits from the bank's operations. It is big businesses who construct these foreign projects, supply the machinery and equipment for the projects, and profit in export trade from the dollar exchange made available by the bank.

In the 3 fiscal years 1954 through 1956, the World Bank authorized 72 loans, in the total amount of $1.192 billion and it actually disbursed $860.4 million.

In other words, the World Bank disbursed to foreign governments and foreign companies more than 16 times as much as the Small Business Administration disbursed to small business firms in the United States.

In addition, we now have a new subsidiary of the World Bank known as the International Finance Corporation, which is for the purpose of making loans to foreign projects without the guaranties of foreign governments. This new organization was provided for in Public Law 350 (84th Cong., 1st sess., approved August 11, 1955). The IFC is authorized to have a loan limit of $100 million, of which the United States has put up $35 million. The IFC has just now been organized, and is ready to do business. Here again we have another organization to make loans abroad, principally for the benefit of foreign companies and for the benefit of big business in the United States who will supply most of the plants and equipment that are to be put up abroad.

PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS ARE DESTROYING SMALL BUSINESS

During October and November 1955, the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings dealing with the practice of price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and related matters. Scores of witnesses appeared. The record of those hearings covers more than 1,000 printed pages. Representatives of large groups of small-business concerns appeared and testified. They complained that price discrimination practices of big business concerns were destroying small-business concerns wholesale. They appealed for a stronger law against price discrimination and asked that the Robinson-Patman Act be amended through the enactment of H. R. 11, which they had come to know as the "equality of opportunity bill."

Subsequently, during the period April 18–26, inclusive, 1956, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, held extensive hearings dealing with the practice of price discrimination and the need for the amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act as was provided for in H. R. 11, the equality-of-opportunity bill. Again representatives of large groups of small-business concerns appeared and asked for the enactment of that bill. During the course of those hearings, Administrator Wendell Barnes of the Small Business Administration appeared and testified in opposition to H. R. 11. He did that despite the fact that representatives of small business had asked for its passage to provide them with additional protection against monopolistic and destructive price discrimination practices of big business.

In the statement of his reasons for his opposition, Mr. Barnes pointed to the fact that Mr. Weeks, the Secretary of Commerce, had opposed the bill, and that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice also had opposed the bill. He stated he was guided by the opinions of the representatives of those agencies. To that statement, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary responded:

I know, but we set up the Small Business Administration primarily to feel the pulse of small business all over the country, and the pulsation of small business all over the country might reflect entirely different views than the enforcement views of the Federal Trade Commission and/or the Department of Justice. (P. 258 of the record of the hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, April 20, 1956.)

When Mr. Barnes of the SBA persisted in his opposition to H. R. 11, he was questioned closely in an effort to ascertain whether he was reflecting views of small business concerns. The record on that point is quoted as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get any correspondence or were any views presented to you from the small retail organizations which indicate a disposition to oppose H. R. 11?

Mr. BARNES. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an anomaly here that I sort of cannot understand.

Yours is a Small Business Administration, and all the small-business associations, from your own statement, have indicated that they want H. R. 11 passed.

Now isn't there an inconsistency there? You are supposed to represent small business, small business wants this bill, and you say there should not be such a bill. (Pp. 258–259 of the record of the hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, April 20, 1956.)

Although the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate reported favorably on the equality of opportunity bill and recommended its passage, the opposition to it persisted. It failed of passage when on the last day of the session in the Senate, Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, objected to the taking up of the bill for consideration in the Senate.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE, ITS SUBCOMMITTEES AND ITS STAFF—SERVICES RENDERED IN THE HANDLING OF INQUIRIES AND COMPLAINTS

Small business concerns without knowledge of the organization of the Federal Government direct their inquiries and complaints either to their Representatives in the Congress or directly to the House Small Business Committee. During the 84th Congress the staff of the House Small Business Committee has received and handled literally thousands of such inquiries and complaints from small business concerns.

When small-business people come to see or write to the Members of the House about problems that are especially knotty and take a lot of time and work to get straightened out, our committee usually gets those problems. Those are problems for the most part where the small-business firm is being mistreated or has gotten snarled up in some procedure of the executive agencies, such as when a defense contract has gone haywire or a loan application has fouled up in a backlash of redtape. All of these cases require a great deal of staff time in conferences as well as in the handling of the correspondence.

Since the beginning of the 84th Congress the committee has received 663 requests and cases from 202 Members of the House about problems of small business. In each of those instances a small-business man was involved and needed help. The Small Business Committee responded by assisting the Member and the small-business concern in getting the needed help. In a great many of such instances the staff participated in conferences and investigations regarding actions by the agencies of the Government and in getting reports thereon to the Members for their use in advising their constituents. That service has been rendered to the Members on both sides of the aisle. Our staff is devoted to the cause of assisting all Members in dealing with small-business problems. As I have said, the inquiries, requests, and complaints handled by the staff of the Small Business Committee during the 84th Congress have numbered in the thousands, including those which have been referred to us by the Members. The total of the inquiries, requests, and complaints which have been handled during the 84th Congress, up to and including July 31, 1956, amounted to more than 15,000.

STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS FOR LEGISLATION

The staff of the House Small Business Committee has devoted a great deal of time and effort in studying and analyzing the need for new legislation to help small business. In some instances the result of that effort has reflected itself in bills I introduced and fought for during this term of the Congress. In other instances members of the staff have worked with and assisted representatives of the legislative and standing committees in studying and analyzing proposals for legislation and in the drafting of some proposals. One example is the pooling provision which was included in the Small Business Administration Act of 1955. That pooling provision I think is one of the greatest provisions of that act. It provides for a group of small business concerns to pool their resources in the formation of a corporation to buy or produce raw materials used in their respective businesses. Also provided is the opportunity for corporations thus formed to secure loans from the Small Business Administration. The top limit of such loan would be $250,000, multiplied by the number of small business concerns which pooled their resources in the forming of the corporation to produce materials for the needs of their respective business. That was for the purpose of enabling small business concerns to assure themselves of their needed supplies in times of critical shortages. Other examples of instances where members of our staff assisted representatives of the legislative and standing committees in providing information for use in the consideration of proposed legislation which would affect small business are those involving the disposition of synthetic rubber manufacturing facilities and H. R. 8710, a bill which was introduced by Chairman Vinson of the Armed Services Committee providing for more competitive bidding

in the procurement of supplies for the armed services.

An indication of the amount of time and effort required to even keep up with and give some study to bills which were introduced during the 84th Congress relating to or affecting in some way some small business may be gathered from a listing of some of those legislative proposals. A description of some of those are as follows:

(a) Bills to amend the Robinson-Patman Act:

The bills in which small business showed the greatest interest during the 84th Congress were bills to amend the Robinson-Patman Act, to correct the weakening of that act which has resulted from several court decisions beginning with the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana against Federal Trade Commission.

A number of bills were introduced to correct this weakness; principally among these are the following:

H. R. 11, and a number of companion bills, including H. R. 1840.

(b) Tax bills:

A number of bills were introduced in the 84th Congress which would accomplish the following purposes:

First: Make the corporate form of business more attractive to small firms now under the partnership form of organization, so that such small businesses could enjoy the same advantage in accumulating retained business earnings at corporation rates; and

Second. To reduce taxes on smaller corporations and provide in place of the now substantially flat rate on corporate incomes, a graduated, or progressive, rate similar to that applicable to individual income tax.

In the Congress the principal bills introduced were:

First. H. R. 9067.
Second. H. R. 9851.
Third. H. R. 10081.
Fourth. S. 3128.
Fifth. S. 3129.

(c) Antitrust bills:

There were several bills which recognized problems growing out of the new structure of business which has been emerging for a number of years. This is an organization under which a few giant corporations control the raw materials, processing, and manufacturing segments of industry, which a large number of very small-business firms serve as retail distributors for these corporations. Retail gasoline dealers and automobile dealers to illustrate the problem.

At least two bills were introduced which would tend to restrict suppliers' freedom for canceling dealer's franchises without good cause, and particularly, to restrict suppliers' freedom to coerce dealers to follow policies, or to deal only in the brands of merchandise dictated by the suppliers. These are: H. R. 8395, S. 3879.

As a result of the great wave of corporate mergers which have been taking place, with obvious rapid deterioration of the competitive enterpise system, a number of bills have been introduced to strengthen the antimerger law. These include the following:

First. H. R. 6748.
Second. H. R. 5948.
Third. H. R. 7229.
Fourth. H. R. 8332.
Fifth. H. R. 9424.

The most important of the antitrust laws from the immediate standpoint of small business is the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. Perhaps the two most important sections are that restricting illegal monopolistic price discriminations, and that which prohibits exclusive dealing contracts and tie-in sales of such a nature which tie up entire markets and foreclose opportunity to small firms.

The Federal Trade Commission enforces the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. At present this law has a loophole in it. After the Federal Trade Commission proves a violation and issues a cease-and-desist order, there is no time limit within which the violator may file an appeal in a Federal court. If the Federal Trade Commission wishes to force compliance with its order must petition a Federal court, and it must moreover prove that its order is being violated. In other words, the FTC must prove two violations, and the violator gets one free violation.

H. R. 11454, introduced by Congressman ROOSEVELT, would correct this problem by making Clayton Act orders automatically final unless the company on which the order is issued fails to file an appeal within 60 days.

H. R. 3659, introduced by Congressman CELLER, increased the maximum fine for criminal violations of the Sherman Act from $5,000 to $50,000. This bill was passed and signed by the President.

Another bill, which became law, S. 2127, extended the life of the Small Business Administration, and increased the maximum loan which the Small Business Administration is authorized to make to small business firms.

(d) Government procurement:

H. R. 8710, introduced by Congressman CARL VINSON, was designed to assist small business in obtaining a fair proportion of Government contracts. It would tighten the requirement of awarding Government contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids, so that small business would have a better opportunity—during the past 3 years the Department of Defense has been awarding approximately 95 percent of the value of all contracts on the basis of negotiations. It would also authorize the Department of Defense to negotiate contracts with small business, by reason of the fact that contracts in question are suitable for small business.

STUDY OF THE PROPOSALS FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SYNTHETIC RUBBER FACILITIES

Early last year the staff of the House Small Business Committee analyzed the proposals for selling the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. That study led to the conclusion that the proposals did not meet the standards laid down in the Rubber Disposal Act of 1953, in that it would not create a free and competitive industry and that the sales contracts provided for in the plan did not provide assurance that small rubber fabricators would receive a fair share of available rubber supplies. On March 21, 1955, the staff prepared a report on the facts concerning the plans for the disposal of the plants, and I directed that a copy of that report be made available to each Member of the House, before it was necessary for the House to consider and vote on the question of whether the proposals should be approved or disapproved.

During the debate in the House on the proposals and as a result of the findings made in the report submitted by the staff of the House Small Business Committee, the big rubber and oil companies purchasing the rubber plants gave Members of Congress firm assurances that the small and independent fabricators would not be mistreated and that the price of synthetic rubber would not be advanced, if Congress should approve the plans as proposed.

After the plants were sold the price of natural rubber continued to rise. The price averaged better than 42 cents per pound during the last 9 months of 1955 and the price of synthetic rubber could have been raised to that level, but during that period of time the new owners of the former Government synthetic rubber plants held the price at 21 cents per pound. If they had raised the price of synthetic rubber up to the going price of natural rubber it would have meant the doubling of the price. On that basis the 1.6 billion pounds which they sold in the last 9 months of 1955 would have cost the consumers at least $337 million more. Several Members of the House have therefore expressed the view that the factfinding set out in the staff report from the House Small Business Committee was instrumental in saving the consumers of rubber in this country $337 million. I would hesitate to accept full credit for effecting such a result, but I am inclined to think we were in part responsible for that result.

I am also happy to report that to date there have been very few complaints that small rubber fabricators are finding it difficult to get supplies of synthetic rubber.

IRON AND STEEL SCRAP INDUSTRY

The staff of our committee has spent much time and effort in studying complaints which were received from semi-integrated steel companies and steel and iron foundries that they had been caught in a squeeze due to shortages and rising prices of scrap. It was pointed out that many of them are dependent wholly upon scrap in order to carry on operations, and that in instances in shortages and high prices of scrap, they are therefore in a much more difficult position than the large fully integrated steel companies which own or have ready access to plentiful supplies of ore.

When the staff of the House Small Business Committee initiated its consideration of this problem the price of No. 1 heavy melting scrap at Pittsburgh was up to $55 a ton. That compared with only $58.55 a ton for new basic pig iron. Two years earlier No. 1 heavy melting

scrap was $30 a ton and basic pig iron was $56 a ton.

As the study of the problem progressed with the members of the staff holding conferences with members of the different segments of the industry, the situation which had been faced by the small semi-integrated steel companies greatly improved from their standpoint. Prices of scrap dropped substantially. Despite that drop in the prices a greater supply of scrap appeared to be available to the small buyers than there had been earlier. In view of the changed circumstances, I did not order that hearings be held dealing with that problem. However, it has been noted that during the first week of August, 1956, the price of No. 1 heavy melting steel scrap rose sharply—$11 per ton at Cleveland to $56 to $57, $9 per ton at Pittsburgh to $55 to $56, and $10 per ton at Youngstown to $59 to $60. It appears that those matters will call for further study on the part of our staff.

HEARINGS ON PRICE DISCRIMINATION, THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT, AND RELATED MATTERS

During October and November 1955, the committee held hearings on price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and related matters. Many complaints had been made to the effect that price-discrimination practices were rampant, particularly in the food industry. It had been reported that the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, which are charged with the duty of enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act against price discriminations, were slowing down in their work in that respect. Representatives of those two agencies had served on the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws and had participated in writing a report which had ridiculed the Robinson-Patman Act and had advocated its emasculation. The purpose of our hearings was to record the facts about such matters.

Our committee held extensive hearings and heard testimony from more than 50 witnesses, covering more than 1,200 printed pages of record.

The record shows that the practice of price discrimination is practiced widely. Testimony of several witnesses from the manufacturing-baking industry was received. The testimony was to the effect that price discriminations are destroying the small and independent manufacturers of bakery products and that the situation is developing into one of a monopoly in the hands of a few chain bakers and a few chainstore operators.

What was said about price discrimination corroborated what we have learned about it each time we have studied that practice—that is, it is a weapon of sellers who have some degree of monopoly power and that it is effectively employed only by those who have such power.

Also, notwithstanding the wealth of factual information which heretofore has been gathered by the Congress regarding the unwholesome character of the practice of price discrimination, a lobby was formed to present and disseminate arguments in favor of price discrimination and against the laws designed to curb that practice.

It was discovered that the arguments in favor of price discrimination are part and parcel of the cleverest piece of propaganda ever conceived. That propaganda is one of the instruments of the high-powered lobby which has been working against small business and the Robinson-Patman Act. It has enveloped almost every office in Washington. It has influenced the thinking in the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the position of those agencies regarding price discrimination and their attitude toward the Robinson-Patman Act.

Therefore, it did not come as a surprise when representatives of those agencies came before the Congress in March of 1956 and opposed the strengthening of the laws against the monopolistic practice of price discrimination. In 1955 the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the person, who was at that time, serving as the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, were members of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. As I have said, the report published by that Committee in March 1955 ridiculed the Federal antitrust laws which were designed to curb the monopolistic practice of price discrimination.

STUDY OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT

The staff of the committee is continuously reviewing the record of the work of the Federal agencies charged with the duty of enforcing the antitrust laws. Particular attention has been given to the enforcement of those laws which directly affect small business. Out of those studies developed a staff report dated October 31, 1955, entitled "Statistics on Federal Antitrust Activity." A second staff report dealing with that subject was published January 2, 1956, entitled "Volume of Federal Trade Commission Antitrust Complaints." The latter report covered the record of the Federal Trade Commission in the handling of cases arising under the Clayton Antitrust Act over the period of 5½ years ending December 31, 1955. That report shows that for the last half of that period the Federal Trade Commission issued 59 new complaints charging violations of the Clayton Antitrust Act. In the first half of that period—covering a period of 33 months—the Federal Trade Commission issued 56 such complaints. However, the number of complaints did not tell the full story. The 56 complaints issued in the first half of the period were against 66 companies, the assets of which averaged $256,200,000 per company, while the 59 complaints issued in the last half of the 5½-year period ran against 60 companies with average assets of only $32,500,000. It was also found that during the last half of that period one small company was charged with violating the Clayton Antitrust Act, whose total assets were only $16,000. The company in question reported to the Small Business Committee that its total income from the sale of citrus fruits during the year 1954 was only $460. The disclosure of those facts has given rise to the question as to whether or not our Federal agencies have turned their big antitrust guns on small business and away from big business.

STUDY OF SUPPLY VERSUS DEMAND FOR PORTLAND CEMENT

When our committee began investigating the cement shortage last year, it was plain that there was a demand for a substantial expansion of cement capacity. Cement was generally short throughout the United States, and in many sections of the country there were acute shortages. Small distributors could not get cement and small contractors could not get enough cement to finish projects they had underway. The prospects were that those situations would worsen upon the enactment by the Congress of legislation providing for a vastly increased highway building program.

I called attention to this matter and sent questionnaires to cement users which called attention to the cement companies of unsecured demand.

Here again it may be coincidental that after this investigation was underway, there was a rapid increase in the cement companies' expansion programs. I suspect we may have helped make these companies aware of the need for expansion. At least several of the companies wrote to the committee telling us of their decisions to expand even before they announced it publicly.

THE STAFF HELD ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCES REGARDING PROBLEMS OF PARTICULAR INDUSTRIES

In certain instances when members of an industry brought to the staff of the committee a problem that needed consideration and when time and resources were not available to make an investigation, resort was made to the device of the roundtable conference. That was done in the hope that by bringing together persons who had responsibility for dealing with the problem, we would be able to discuss it with those directly concerned and, through an exchange of views, perhaps reach a conclusion that would facilitate an appropriate disposition of the matter. Some examples of such instances are those involving the manufacturing-baking industry, the importation of watch cases, the leasing of aircraft, and the importation of peanuts.

INVESTIGATIONS, STUDIES, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE VARIOUS SUBCOMMITTEES

A. Subcommittee No. 1, regulatory agencies:

Subcommittee No. 1 is composed of the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, chairman, and the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, and the Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

Earlier reports regarding the activities of this subcommittee pointed out that its goal is a careful study and investigation of the organization and procedures of the several independent Federal regulatory agencies. The duties of the agencies include the enforcement of trade and monopoly laws directly and vitally affecting small business. One allegation that the subcommittee has

been looking into is that these regulatory agencies have lost their independence and have fallen under the influence and control of the executive branch and of the interests they are supposed to be regulating.

Extensive hearings, therefore, were held covering the organization, procedures, and operations of the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Many witnesses have testified and the records of the printed hearings approximate 1,000 pages. The hearings were concluded on July 20, 1956, and a report dealing with those hearings of this subcommittee is being prepared.

B. Subcommittee No. 2, Small Business Administration and problems related to procurement, loans, and disposal:

This subcommittee is composed of the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, as chairman, and the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, and the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York.

The Small Business Act of 1953 expired June 30, 1955. Therefore, when this subcommittee was established in January 1955, its first order of business was to appraise the operations of the Small Business Administration and to determine whether there was a substantial need for continuing this agency. Consequently, during the first few months of its existence the subcommittee devoted a substantial amount of time commencing during March 1955 in holding hearings, studying, and reporting upon the activities of the Small Business Administration.

The subcommittee's report on the Small Business Administration, House Report No. 1045, and the record of the hearings held by the subcommittee were considered by the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee before the enactment of Public Law 268, which reestablished and provided for the continuation of the Small Business Administration until June 30, 1957.

The report of the subcommittee found that there was a substantial need for continuing a Federal small-business agency to carry out the functions which the Small Business Administration had been authorized to perform. The committee, however, also found that SBA's performance had fallen considerably short of the success that had been hoped for.

Subsequent to its hearings and report on the Small Business Administration, the subcommittee held formal and informal hearings on related subjects within its jurisdiction. Those included the following:

First. Urban renewal projects and slum clearance.

Second. Problems of small business doing business with the Government.

Third. The exclusion of small business from the disposal of surplus products and the difficulties encountered by small business in participating in the stockpile program.

Fourth. The definition of small business.

Fifth. The subcommittee continued its activities in overseeing the operations and procedures of the Small Business Administration, the agency in the Government which was created by Congress to aid and assist small business.

Numerous complaints were received by the subcommittee that small business was being treated inequitably in the dislocation and upheaval caused by urban renewal and slum-clearance projects. The situation appeared to be prevalent throughout the country. It was because of the great number of complaints received that this problem was recognized as extremely serious and difficult and that small-business concerns were being treated inequitably in the dislocation caused by the urban renewal development projects.

The subcommittee held public hearings on May 3, 1956. The committee heard complaints from witnesses from Chicago, Ill., Baltimore, Md., Washington, D. C., and New York City. Testimony was also taken from officials of the various Government agencies involved and participating in the urban renewal and slum clearance projects. The subcommittee's report, House Report No. 2303, was filed with the Clerk of the House on June 11, 1956. This report confirmed the findings of the subcommittee in its report which was filed in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, House Report No. 1588, which was based upon public hearings held by the subcommittee on April 19, 1955. The witnesses who participated and testified at this hearing were officials of the Government agencies involved and small-business men affected by the dislocation caused by the urban renewal project. The subcommittee found that small business concerns who find themselves on a site which is being taken over for an urban renewal project are in double jeopardy, first, with the closing of their business, and second, the financial problem of the displacement of the small business concern in weathering the long period of transition, whether it be to a new place of business in a new area or a place of business in the old area when reconstruction has been completed. The report pointed out that the law, as then in effect, made no mention whatsoever of aid to small-business men and the subcommittee felt that this was a grave oversight.

The committee found that attention was given to families who lose their residences because of such dislocation and suggested that similar provisions should be enacted to safeguard the business segments of the community. Such aid should go beyond the clearinghouse provisions utilized to replace families in living quarters because moving a business entails a great deal more than the moving of a family. Costs are often higher and in some cases suitable markets are left and new markets are yet to be obtained. It was unanimously recommended by the subcommittee that the Federal Government should alleviate these problems wherever possible, both through direct financial aid and expert guidance.

The subcommittee therefore concluded that, first, direct financial grants be awarded to small business concerns dislocated by urban renewal developments; and, second, a new loan program be created to aid dislocated small business concerns in the relocation and reestablishment of their businesses. Pursuant to the conclusions and recommendations submitted by this committee, action was taken by the legislative committees of the Congress and it should be noted that the Housing Act, as amended by the 84th Congress, carries a provision for compensation to small business concerns dislocated by urban renewal and slum-clearance projects.

The Small Business Administration was directed by the Small Business Act of 1953 to establish and publish a definition for small business on an industry-by-industry basis. To date, no such definition has been established for procurement purposes by the Small Business Administration. It was not until July 1956 that a proposed definition for procurement purposes as prepared by an Interagency Task Force, created by the SBA, was submitted to this subcommittee for prior opinion and advice. Upon examination of the proposed definition, the subcommittee concluded that it was necessary to hold hearings on the proposed definition. Such hearings were held on July 5, 1956. The witnesses who appeared at these hearings were the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of SBA and the members of the Interagency Task Force. It is interesting to note however, that the Interagency Task Force was only created by the Small Business Administration subsequent to the issuance of House Report No. 1045 by this committee filed with the clerk of the House on July 1, 1955. The report found that the SBA had not acted expeditiously on a revised definition applicable to Government procurement. The Interagency Task Force was established only after this subcommittee indicated that the 500-employee rule was arbitrary and failed to follow the intent of Congress.

After 18 months the Interagency Task Force finally submitted the proposed definition and it then became apparent to the committee that the intent of Congress had again been thwarted. This new proposed definition again fails to follow the will of Congress in that it does not establish a definition on an industry-by-industry basis. It is evident that the 500-employee rule is not a sufficient definition, and Congress has time and again stated that the only definition which would be suitable is one which would be flexible and adaptable, and one that would be based on an industry-by-industry criterion.

A report is now being prepared by the subcommittee for submission to the House on the hearings on the definition of small business.

The subcommittee received a large number of complaints from small business concerns alleging that they were not being treated fairly and equitably in the awarding of contracts by the Government. Furthermore, such concerns were afraid to testify before the committee because of the fear of reprisal. However, the committee was able, through executive and private sessions with officials of such small business concerns, to ascer-

tain the basis for their complaints. It also became quite apparent to the committee that unless it went to the small business concerns and gave them an opportunity to be heard, the small business concerns would not have an opportunity to voice their complaints to Congress. Therefore the subcommittee conducted a series of field investigations and hearings in Atlanta, Ga., and Jacksonville and Miami, Fla., in April 1956. The evidence adduced at these informal hearings established that small business is not receiving its fair share of Government procurement and is not being treated fairly and equitably in doing business with the Government.

The subcommittee found that the procurement practices of the Government in relation to small business concerns are unrealistic. The practice by the procurement agencies of utilizing change orders after the opening of bids and the awarding of contracts, specification requirements of crash programs, and the emergency deliveries on short-supply items or items stocked and warehoused only by big business and the delay of payment and the refusal of progress payments to small business, all worked to the detriment of small business.

The committee continued to watch and work for improvements in the operations and activities of the Small Business Administration. In this connection, the SBA sought out the opinion and advice of the subcommittee and the subcommittee gave informal advice and opinions to the SBA. In this connection, the Small Business Administration requested an opinion of the subcommittee as to the intent of Congress regarding certain amendments to the Small Business Act of 1953, as contained in Public Law 268 of the 84th Congress.

On September 14, 1955, a letter was directed to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in which the subcommittee indicated what, in their opinion, was the intent of Congress in the enactment of Public Law 268. The chairman of the subcommittee stated that it was the intent of Congress to expand and strengthen the duties and responsibilities of SBA. The letter from the chairman of the subcommittee stated further that nothing in the new act can or should be otherwise construed. The SBA is authorized, first, to determine whether business concerns of a particular size in a given industry are in fact small business concerns, and such determination is binding on all other Federal departments and agencies; second, to insure that a fair proportion of all Government contracts, including those for research and development, is awarded to small business; and, third, to participate in a joint determination program with procurement officers to insure that contracts go to small business in the interest of maintaining as well as mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity.

In the late summer of 1955, the New England area was devastated by floods incident to heavy rains causing extensive damage to small businesses in this area. The chairman of the subcommittee immediately toured the area to determine the extent of the damage, its effect upon the small business concerns located therein, and what help, if any, would be needed to assist these small business concerns. The chairman of the subcommittee conferred with State and local officials, as well as Members of Congress whose districts had been affected by this catastrophe. In September of 1955, because of the urgency and emergency created by the floods in the New England States and the request for disaster loans, based upon complaints received by the subcommittee, the chairman of the subcommittee directed a letter to the Administrator of SBA, dated September 29, 1955, in which it interpreted section 207 (b) (1) of the act which deals with disaster loans, specifically in connection with the requirement of collateral for such loans. And again in this same connection, the SBA requested aid and advice from the subcommittee on how to deal with the disaster loan program in view of the fact that it did not have sufficient funds to meet this dire emergency. On September 30, 1955, the chairman of the subcommittee directed a letter to the Administrator of SBA and gave its opinion and advice on this subject.

The committee received numerous complaints from small business concerns that they had been discriminated against and, because of the stringent regulations by the Government agencies, were unable to participate in the disposal of surplus products by the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly in its barter program for the stockpile of strategic and nonstrategic items. Formal hearings were therefore held on July 11, 12, and 17, 1956, on this problem. Witnesses were heard from the various Government agencies and the small and large concerns involved in the barter program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, General Services Administration, and Office of Defense Mobilization.

The hearings have been adjourned subject to the call of the chair and the staff of the committee is presently studying the voluminous amount of material submitted at the hearings in preparation for further hearings on this most important subject.

On February 23, 1955, the chairman of this subcommittee in announcing the program of the subcommittee stated:

> The procedures and practices surrounding the Government's transactions with private firms are vastly complex. It was largely for this reason that the programs of the Small Business Administration were established. In instituting these programs, Congress created an agent to stay on the job constantly, to work continuously at finding ways to carry out our public policy on safeguarding small business in these procurement and disposal matters—

In order to build up the Nation's economic strength, the chairman of this subcommittee introduced an amendment to the highway bill which was adopted by the House and in commenting on this statement, the chairman of the subcommittee stated that the adoption of the amendment by the House is another clear indication of the clear intent of Congress to aid and assist small business, since small business is the backbone of the American economy and extremely vital to our competitive enterprise system.

C. Subcommittee No. 3, minerals and raw materials:

Subcommittee No. 3 is composed of the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, chairman, and the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois.

As reported earlier, this subcommittee had undertaken an investigation and study of recurring shortages of certain raw materials. In that connection it was pointed out that a vast number of small businesses depend upon adequate production and ready availability of certain basic minerals and production materials, and that where recurring shortages of such minerals and materials are acute, small businesses cannot survive unless steps are taken to see that they get a fair share of whatever supplies are available.

Because complaints were received at the beginning of the 84th Congress from the nonintegrated aluminum fabricators, that industry received the attention and consideration of this subcommittee. Hearings were undertaken in an effort to help alleviate the shortages. During the course of those hearings scores of witnesses testified and the record of their testimony covers 1,144 printed pages. The report on that investigation and study, consisting of 150 printed pages, was submitted to the House on July 26, 1956, as House Report No. 2954. It stated in its summary and recommendations that the most significant question in the aluminum industry today appears to be that, absent a reversal of present trends, whether the position of small business will fail to improve and expand in keeping with the growth of the industry as a whole. This is particularly true of the segment of the industry dependent upon a fluid supply of primary metal.

The committee found that in this highly concentrated industry with only three prime producers that the two competitors to Alcoa, Kaiser, and Reynolds, had made substantial amounts of primary aluminum available to the trade. However, both Kaiser and Reynolds have already instituted and financed expansion programs for new fabricating plants which will mean relatively less primary metal for sale on the open market.

The committee recommended that the Office of Defense Mobilization study the problem of the small nonintegrated aluminum fabricators to determine whether the suggestions and recommendations of the committee to establish a buying corporation of these nonintegrated fabricators pursuant to the Small Business Act of 1953, is proper and within the law, or whether additional legislation would be needed to enable such buying corporation to enter into buying contracts.

In addition, the subcommittee recommended that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice undertake studies and investigations of the aluminum industry with respect to those factors which may hinder the growth of small business in the aluminum industry.

The committee pointed out that some of these factors are, first, the prices of aluminum pig, ingot, and billet and its

effect upon smelters and foundries; second, the effect of scrap acquisitions by the primary producers upon smelters and foundries; third, the complaints of nonintegrated users that they are subjected to price squeezes by the primary producers of certain alloys; fourth, the extent to which metal made available to nonintegrated users is taken by large concerns and not small business; and fifth, the reasonableness of the price spread between aluminum pig, ingot, billet, and semifabricated products.

D. Subcommittee No. 4, aircraft industry:

Subcommittee No. 4 is composed of the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, chairman, and the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, and the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.

This subcommittee held public hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 21 and 22, 1956, and in Washington, D. C., on June 27, 28, and 29, 1956, on the problems of small business in the aircraft industry. The hearings included testimony from 15 witnesses and cover 350 printed pages. These hearings were necessitated because of the numerous complaints received by the subcommittee that small business was not receiving its fair and equitable share of contracts in the aircraft industry. The committee pointed out that with the defense budget of close to $34 billion, the impact on the economy of such tremendous defense procurement necessitated a guarantee to small business that it would receive its fair share. Unless this tremendous expenditure by the Defense Department is permitted to enter into the small-business community it will endanger the free-enterprise economy of our country.

The committee in its study established that the aircraft industry is the largest employing industry in the country. It employs 797,000 men and women directly and hundreds of thousands more indirectly, in the form of subcontractors and suppliers. Such an impact of employment and dollars spent in the aircraft industry necessitated the examination of the problems in the aircraft industry to determine whether the policy of Congress to aid small business is being complied with.

The committee, upon conclusion of its hearings, determined that this important segment of small business must continue to have the careful scrutiny and examination of the Small Business Committee to insure that a fair share of Government contracts in the aircraft industry is placed with small business.

E. Subcommittee No. 5, distribution problems:

This subcommittee is composed of the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, chairman, and the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois.

The title of this subcommittee indicated the broad sweep of its jurisdiction and foretold to some extent that the problems it would tackle would make it one of the most active investigating units of the 84th Congress. Indeed it has become one of the most active investigating subcommittees in the history of the Congress. It has held public hearings in many States covering a period of many days. It has heard a total of 152 witnesses, whose testimony covers more than 1,800 printed pages. There have been submitted to the House of Representatives two reports dealing with the activities of this subcommittee:

First. House Report No. 1423: This report dealt with the subcommittee's investigation and hearings on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices of the major oil-company suppliers. That report summarized the record of testimony to the effect that major oil companies were coercing their lessee dealers into handling a full line of products sold by the lessor oil companies to the exclusion of competing products. The report also dealt with the testimony of witnesses to the effect that the major oil companies were engaging in the practice of price discrimination destructive of small-business enterprises.

Second. House Report No. 2895: This report summarized testimony which had been received by the subcommittee regarding problems faced by small-business concerns due to air pollution.

The subcommittee also studied the antitrust consent decree in the A. T. & T. case, and the record of its hearings on that matter is said to reflect a failure on the part of the Department of Justice to protect adequately small-business concerns in its agreement with the A. T. & T. in the settlement of that case.

The subcommittee studied the problems involved in a consent decree for settling the antitrust case against the United Fruit Co. A number of complaints had been received from importers and other traders, who had been handling bananas and who feared that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice would settle the case through an agreement with the United Fruit Co. which would not protect adequately the interest of small business. Before the hearings on that matter were concluded the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice announced that it did not appear that the United Fruit case would be settled by an agreement, although he admitted, before this subcommittee had undertaken hearings, that representatives of the Department of Justice and the United Fruit Co. had held conferences in an effort to reach a disposition of the case.

The Workingman Deserves To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach another national election and the climax of the first Republican administration to hold office in over 20 years, the great workingmen of America deserve to know how their economic status has changed, if any, during the past 3½ years.

As congressional Representative of one of the greatest and most important industrial areas in the United States, it is only natural that I am strongly concerned with the welfare of workingmen of the Naugatuck Valley and only proper that I continue to work unceasingly in Congress for their economic interests, as I have during my nearly 10 years as their Representative in Congress.

In this report it gives me great satisfaction to review the record of the past 3½ years and cite the tremendous advancements that have been made on behalf of labor during that period. In this connection, one of the most significant statements made thus far came from an outstanding leader in the American labor movement, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, who declared that "right now we never had it so good."

Why did Mr. Meany make this statement, and upon what did he base his remarks? The answer is simple and not hard to find. Today wages are higher than ever, and more people are enjoying the fruits of employment than ever before. These facts are reflected by accurate statistics taken from both Government sources and private industry. For example, in January of this year the Department of Labor announced that weekly earnings had risen to the record peak of $71.92 for workers with 3 dependents, and to $64.59 for workers with no dependents. This unprecedented spiral of prosperity is further indicated by record-breaking sales of consumer goods in department stores—and this is of vital importance to industrial workers of the Naugatuck Valley, since they manufacture many consumer products.

In my judgment, however, one of the most significant facts is that there is no indication whatsoever that the present spiral of economic prosperity will come to a halt. And I feel that if we in Congress continue to pursue certain labor policies of the past 3½ years, the prosperity that we now enjoy will continue, and the great American workingmen will remain in the best status that they have ever enjoyed.

Another aspect of major importance is the fact that the present prosperous conditions of American workingmen have been built in an era of peace. In early 1953, certain prophets of doom declared that an economic recession and possibly a depression would set in after President Eisenhower brought the Korean war to a close. How wrong they were. In sharp contrast, wages increased and continued to increase, individual purchasing power continued to rise, consumer goods continued to sell at record-breaking levels, and as a result the American workingman was elevated to an unprecedented peak of prosperity.

As your Representative in Congress, I intend to vigorously support any policy in the future that will advance the interests of American workingmen, just as I have in the past. As you may recall, I was one of the very first Members of Congress to openly advocate and call for a minimum wage law of $1.35 per hour. And as you read this report, you may wonder why I am so strongly pro-labor. There are several reasons. One reason is that I was born and raised among the

industrial workers of the Naugatuck Valley and am therefore entirely familiar with conditions of American workingmen and aware that we in Congress must constantly work to improve their economic welfare. Another reason is that the economic welfare of the entire Naugatuck Valley is dependent upon the individual welfare of its thousands of workingmen who turn the wheels, run the machines, and produce some of our Nation's most important products.

Toward the advancement of their interests I shall always work as long as I am honored with the privilege of serving and representing them in the Congress of the United States.

Foreign Aid Bill Is Not the Same as Defense Bill in Spite of CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 the Members of the House of Representatives debated and voted on the mutual security appropriations bill of 1957, commonly referred to as the foreign aid bill. I joined 119 of my colleagues in voting against the bill, because I am convinced the spending of the taxpayers' money in this way is neither as effective, efficient, nor economical as is consistent with sound government and our national interest. While I am sure that the majority of my constituents agree with me in my opposition to this present foreign aid bill, I recognize that there are some, perhaps significant numbers, in my district who still favor foreign aid. I have no quarrel with their position or their right to hold to that position, but I can no longer cast my one congressional vote in favor of the continuation of the present scheme for large-scale foreign assistance.

Misrepresentation of facts is, however, another question entirely. The Indiana CIO Council publishes, from time to time, a bulletin known as the CIO Fact Sheet which is mailed as matter from a nonprofit organization at Evansville. The CIO Fact Sheet is apparently edited by the CIO Council on Education and Research and sent to CIO members throughout the State. The pamphlet has an attractive format, is usually printed in two colors, and presents quite effectively the propaganda prescribed by the CIO leaders for consumption by the rank and file.

In spite of the name CIO Fact Sheet, this publication has been known to print and to reprint material which is not exactly factual—in fact, material which is distorted, twisted, and sometimes bluntly untrue. On one recent occasion I called to the attention of the editor of this Fact Sheet one definite misstatement of fact in an article quoted from the New York Post. The editors of the New York Post admitted the error, but I have never heard from the editors of the CIO Fact Sheet nor seen a correction of the erroneous statistics to which I called their attention. Evidently, the CIO Council on Education and Research believes that labeling an untruth as a fact settles the matter for all time—truth, proof, and right to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand volume 5, No. 14, of the CIO Fact Sheet for Tuesday, July 17, 1956. On page 5 of this issue, right at the top of the page, there is a very short article entitled "From the 'Hoss's Mouth'." So that this gem of misstatement may be shared by all present here today and by all who read the RECORD, under unanimous consent I ask, after I read this short item, that it may be included in the RECORD exactly as I have read it. I hope the Government Printing Office will preserve, if at all possible, the underlining, liberal use of punctuation marks and the underlining of the original so that this extract will appear exactly as it is in the copy which I read from today:

FROM THE "HOSS'S MOUTH"

On July 11, during the debate in the House on Ike's defense bill, Indiana Republican Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK was fighting hard to save Ike's defense program from being torn to shreds by his own Republican colleagues in Congress.

In the course of the debate, Mr. HALLECK said that all those who voted against funds to provide defense against Communist Russia would be "friends" of the Reds. Now, let's see who from our Indiana Congressmen are "friends of the Reds."

"Friends of the Reds": 3d District, CRUMPACKER, Republican; 4th District, ADAIR, Republican; 5th District, BEAMER, Republican; 7th District, BRAY, Republican; 9th District, WILSON, Republican; 10th District, HARVEY, Republican; 11th District, BROWNSON, Republican.

"Friends of Uncle Sam": 1st District, MADDEN, Democrat (paired for); 2d District, HALLECK, Republican; 6th District, HARDEN, Republican; 8th District, DENTON, Democrat.

He (HALLECK) remarked further, that the debate on the bill was a "spectacle" and called "shame on you for your conduct here today." We think Congressman HALLECK, after being around for a long time, should know whereof he speaks. Thanks, Charlie, for enlightening us on your colleagues; we sort of suspected it all along.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the editorial staff of the CIO Fact Sheet have a perfect right to operate as a propaganda arm of the Democratic State committee, if that is their desire. My only contention is that they do have an obligation to present as facts material which is factually correct. May I, line by line, point out the absolute errors in fact contained in just these short paragraphs.

CIO ERROR NO. 1 AND CORRECTION

On July 11 the debate in the House concerned the mutual security appropriations bill for 1957, not "Ike's defense bill." Page 11180 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, gives to the debate this exact title I have just mentioned. The major appropriation bill for the Department of Defense for 1957 which would be "Ike's defense bill" was H. R. 10986. This bill was voted on in the House on May 10, 1956, and passed 377 to 0 with only 1 vote of present. In other words, the CIO is discussing what is commonly known as the foreign aid bill. Could it be that because the CIO knows that foreign aid is an unpopular subject among many of its own members in Indiana, it deliberately chose to list this debate under the title of "Ike's defense bill" to create the impression that it authorized funds for our own Army, Navy, and Air Force?

It does not. In fact, of the $5.7 billion originally requested in this bill, H. R. 12130, only $3.1 billion was for military assistance to our allies and so-called allies. One billion one hundred million dollars was for defense support or installations somewhat connected with military assistance. One hundred and fifty-seven million dollars was for nonmilitary technical cooperation or point 4 aid. Other programs accounted for $401 million. It is significant that, in a Democrat-controlled Congress, a committee with a Democrat chairman and a majority of members from the Democrat Party cut the administration's request of $3 billion for military assistance by $1.2 billion for a total of $1.7 billion recommended for 1957. It is also significant that the actual defense bill did not receive one vote of opposition—of course not, you would never find 120 Members of the House voting to leave this Nation without arms as the CIO infers we did.

CIO ERROR NO. 2 AND CORRECTION

The CIO Fact Sheet goes on:

On July 11, during the debate in the House on Ike's defense bill, Indiana Republican Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK was fighting hard to save Ike's defense program from being torn to shreds by his own Republican colleagues in Congress.

This just is not true. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana spoke twice on July 11. His remarks were not directed primarily at his own colleagues, but rather represented an attempt to restore $550 million, cut in the Democrat-controlled committee which brought the appropriation level that much below the total authorized for foreign aid, or mutual security for 1957.

The speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is printed on page 11205 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 11. It is in the form of an exchange of remarks between Mr. HALLECK and the gentleman from New York, the Democratic chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. ROONEY]. A little earlier in the debate, as recorded on page 11203, Mr. ROONEY interjected in his discussion of the history of mutual defense a dispatch which he said he had just read on the AP wire that morning.

I am for Eisenhower—

Said Malik.

The people of Europe know him. They like him and trust him. We can do business with President Eisenhower.

Mr. HALLECK'S speech was in answer to Mr. ROONEY. His attack is directed toward Mr. ROONEY'S reading of the AP dispatch in connection with the debate on the mutual-security bill and against the action of the Democratic controlled Appropriations Committee in drastically

cutting below the total amount authorized. The exact interchange follows, taken from page 11205 of the RECORD:

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], for whom I have the highest regard, read something that he said was on the teletype. I do not know whether it was or not. But what he read was the Soviet Ambassador Jacob Malik said, "I am for Eisenhower." He said, and I refer to Ambassador Malik, "the people of Europe know him; they like him and trust him. We can do business with President Eisenhower."

Now, I do not know for sure just what the gentleman's purpose was in reading that, but I would like to remind some of my friends on the right that a few days ago the policy committee of my party in the other body issued a staff report, and they said in that statement, "that some convicted Communist in this country wanted the Democratic Party to win." I never heard such an outcry in my life from the people of your party as a result. Why, you said, that is associating us with communism, you are accusing us of being soft on communism, and we resent it.

I want to say to all of you and to the gentleman from New York, again may I say I respect and admire him, to use whatever Malik said for what seemed to be an obvious purpose hits something of new low, and I think the people of this country will resent it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman understand that I merely read verbatim what appeared in the Speaker's lobby as an AP dispatch? And I should like to inquire what interpretation does the gentleman place on Mr. Malik's remarks, assuming they are correct?

Mr. HALLECK. I would not know what interpretation to put on his remarks, but the very fact that the gentleman saw fit to bring that press report in here and read it, in my opinion, is susceptible to but one interpretation, because the gentleman speaks too well and too brilliantly to be up here for exercise only.

There is another thing I would like to point out to my friends on the right. As far as action here today is concerned and the action yesterday, in the Appropriations Committee as it has now been disclosed, who would be the friend of the Russians? Would it be the people who voted to provide the requested military assistance to develop our offshore strength to counter the threat of the Russians or the Communists, or do you find the people who oppose it in the corner with the Russians and their threat to us?

Mr. HALLECK is fighting hard, that much is true. He is fighting hard against the same Democrats on the Appropriations Committee who slashed the mutual-security program the day before and who are now debating the issue by dragging in partisan innuendo. From the viewpoint of those who favor foreign aid, the program has been torn to shreds already by the Democratic-controlled committee. The context of the speech clearly identifies the CIO Fact Sheet error.

CIO ERROR NO. 3 AND CORRECTION

The Fact Sheet continues:

In the course of the debate, Mr. HALLECK said that all those who voted against funds to provide defense against Communist Russia would be "friends" of the Reds. Now let's see who from our Indiana Congressmen are "friends of the Reds."

Mr. HALLECK just did not say this, at all. It is a paraphrase by the CIO editors for specific and rather tawdry political purposes. What Mr. HALLECK did say is clearly stated in my exact quotation from page 11205. He answered Mr. ROONEY's accusation based on Malik's remarks by pointing out that his friends on the right, the Democrats sit to the Speaker's right in the Halls of the United States House of Representatives, were in no position to throw the Malik statement in the Republicans' faces since the Russians undoubtedly would like the cuts made by the Democrats the day before in committee. Evidently, the CIO is so used to considering the "right" as identical in meaning to the GOP that the editors forgot the term can also indicate a simple spatial relationship.

CIO ERROR NO. 4 AND CORRECTION

The Fact Sheet continues:

He [HALLECK] remarked further that the debate on the bill was a "spectacle" and called "shame on your for your conduct here today." We think Congressman HALLECK, after being around for a long time, should know whereof he speaks. Thanks, Charlie, for enlightening us on your colleagues; we sort of suspected it all long.

Let us look at the RECORD. Mr. HALLECK never made the quotation attributed to him. What he did say is clearly printed in the paragraph of his remarks on page 11205 which follows the previous quotation I made from the RECORD. May I read it to the Members? Please note that the term "friends on the right" is again used to identify the Democrats, as represented by their spokesman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]:

I deeply regret that this matter has taken such a turn. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was correct when he pointed out this sort of legislation should not be the subject of politics. But I would like to remind my friends on the right that when we look in the RECORD to see what happened in the past, we find that I was majority leader of a Republican 80th Congress. The President was of your party and his name was Harry S. Truman. Communist aggression and infiltration threatened the world. I could make quite a speech, as I did when the Marshall plan was here on the floor, as to why something had to be done at that time. But may I say, as I said then, mistakes of the past many times must be forgotten and what we must do is to provide for the present. Your President asked the Republican 80th Congress to provide interim aid to France and Italy and to give aid to Greece and Turkey. Why? To meet Communist aggression. Yes, and he asked us for the Marshall plan.

I would like to remind you that it was the Republican 80th Congress, under Republican leadership acting out in front, that responded to the request of your President to meet the Communist threat. In the light of such history, it seems to me your conduct here today comes with poor grace, to say the least.

That is the story of four mistakes in fact in the CIO Fact Sheet. To answer the vicious insinuation that seven Republican Congressmen who did not happen to vote as the CIO wanted are "Friends of the Reds" is beneath the note of an elected official. It is interesting to see the depths of smear, innuendo, and emotionalism the vaunted protectors of civil liberties sing to when they think it will help the Democrats toward victory. It makes some of the CIO's protestations over the loyalty program, their professed indignation over the speeches of the Vice President and the aroused criticism of the actions of congressional committees sound a little hypocritical. Apparently, freedom from abuse is to be extended only to Democrats or those with 100 percent pro-CIO voting records. Friendly cooperation with local unions and local labor officials apparently does not count for much when the top level labor politicians move in just before election time.

The Rights of Disabled People Under the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Over a period of nearly 20 years, old-age and survivors insurance under the social-security law has become well known to most Americans. Now there is social-security protection against a third risk—the risk of being unable to work because of severe disability.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it will be useful to explain carefully exactly what this new law provides.

If an individual is so severely disabled that he is unable to work, he may have rights under one or more of these three parts of the social-security law:

First, if he is disabled and is 50 years of age or older, he may be eligible for disability insurance payments after June 1957.

Second, if he is disabled and his disability began while he was under 18 years of age, he may be eligible after 1956 to receive child's insurance benefits even after reaching age 18 if either his father or his mother is receiving old-age insurance payments or if he has lost the support of a parent through death.

Third, if he is disabled and has not yet reached 50 years of age, he may be eligible to have his social-security earnings record "frozen" to protect his own and his family's rights to future benefit payments because of old age, disability, or death.

HOW MUCH WORK IS REQUIRED?

In order to qualify for disability insurance payments at age 50 or to have his earnings record frozen while he is disabled, he must have social security credit for:

(a) Five years of work in the 10 years before the established beginning date of his disability; and

(b) One and one-half years of work in the 3 years before that date.

The amount of work required for him to get disability insurance payments is always at least as much as would be required for old-age insurance payments.

Active military service at any time after September 15, 1940, and work in the railroad industry after 1936 may

count toward the disability freeze but can count toward disability insurance payments only under more limited conditions.

HOW DISABLED DOES HE HAVE TO BE?

An individual can meet the requirements of these provisions of the social security law only

(a) If he is so severely disabled that he is not able to engage in any substantial work; and

(b) If his disability is expected to continue indefinitely.

If he is temporarily disabled, or if he is only partly disabled, he is not eligible.

The disability may be either mental or physical, but he must submit medical evidence to show what his condition is and how long it may be expected to continue. To have his earnings record frozen or to get disability insurance payments, he must have been disabled for at least 6 months.

The determination whether he is so severely disabled as to qualify under these provisions is made in accordance with the social security law. The fact that he may be receiving payments for "total disability" from another agency does not necessarily mean that he will be considered disabled under the provisions of the social security law.

WHEN DID THIS DISABILITY BEGIN?

The evidence in the individual's own case will show when he actually became disabled. If he met all the requirements at that time, the date he became disabled will be used by the Social Security Administration as the official beginning date of his disability.

If he did not meet all the requirements at the time he became disabled but does meet them at a later date, this later date will be established as the official beginning date of his disability.

DISABILITY BENEFITS AT AGE 50

If an individual is between 50 and 65 years of age and meets the work and disability requirements previously explained, he may be entitled to monthly disability insurance payments under the social security law.

The amount of the disability benefit depends on his average earnings it is the same as the amount of the old-age insurance benefit for which he would be eligible if he were 65.

Disability insurance benefits are not paid in addition to old-age or survivors insurance benefits. If an individual is eligible for more than one benefit at the same time, he will ordinarily receive an amount equal to the largest.

The first month for which disability insurance payments can be made is July 1957. No application can be accepted before October 1956.

Dependents do not get social security benefits based on an individual's social security account until he applies for retirement benefits.

His dependents may be eligible for survivors insurance benefits if he dies while he is receiving disability insurance benefits.

WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD DO IF HE BELIEVES HE IS ELIGIBLE FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

If an individual has received notice that his application for a disability freeze has been approved, and he is between 50 and 65 years of age, he may file an application for benefits on or after October 1, 1956. However, it is not necessary that he apply during October. He should make his application at some time between October 1, 1956, and July 1957. His social security office will let him know what proofs are required when he applies.

If he has applied for a disability freeze but has not yet been notified of the decision, he must wait until he receives his official notice. His social security office needs to know what decision was made on his freeze application in order to take the appropriate action on his claim. However, if he has not received official notice of the decision before June 1957, he should get in touch with his social security office and make his application.

If an individual's application for a disability freeze is denied, he probably does not meet the requirements for disability insurance benefits. However, if he believes that he now meets the requirements, he should get in touch with his local social security office.

If an individual believes that he is eligible for disability insurance benefits or a disability freeze, he should make an application for a disability freeze at once, if he has not already done so.

NO PAYMENTS AFTER 1957

If an individual meets all the requirements for disability insurance payments in July 1957 and makes his application for the payments no later than December 1957, he will get payments beginning with July.

If his application for disability insurance payments is made after December 1957, no payments can be made for any month before the application was made.

DISABLED CHILD'S BENEFITS

An individual may receive child's insurance benefits after he reaches age 18 if—

(a) He has been disabled since before he reached 18,

(b) He is unmarried, and

(c) He is dependent on a parent, stepparent, or adopting parent who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits under social security, or he was dependent on a parent who died after 1939 and was insured for survivors benefits at the time of his or her death.

It is not necessary that an individual himself have any record of work under the social-security law to get payments as a disabled child.

Two examples will help to show how this part of the law works:

Jim Hawkins was disabled at the age of 15 when his father was 50, and has been disabled ever since. His father is now 65 and is receiving old-age insurance payments under the social-security law. Jim may get child's insurance benefits after 1956 even though he is now 30 years of age.

Joe Burton became severely disabled 4 years ago when he was almost 13. His mother was working, but she died this year, and Joe was eligible for child's insurance benefits based on her social-security account. Under the old law his payments would have stopped in the month before he reached 18. Even though Joe will reach 18 next year, his social-security payments will now continue as long as he is disabled.

WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD DO IF HE BELIEVES HE MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS AS A DISABLED CHILD

If an individual believes that he may be eligible for social-security benefits as a disabled child, he or someone in his family should get in touch with his social-security office after September 1956.

If he is now receiving child's insurance benefits under the social-security law and he is disabled, he or the person who receives the payments in his behalf should get in touch with the social-security office a few months before he reaches 18.

The first payments possible under this part of the law will be for the month of January 1957. An individual will not lose any of the payments due in 1957 if his application is made before the end of January 1958.

THE DISABILITY FREEZE

If an individual is disabled but not eligible for disability insurance payments, he may be eligible to have his social-security earnings record frozen. Unless his earnings record is frozen, the period while he is disabled and has little or no earnings can reduce the amount of his own and his family's future benefits.

To be entitled to a disability freeze he must meet the work and disability requirements explained previously.

WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD DO IF HE BELIEVES HE IS ENTITLED TO A DISABILITY FREEZE

If an individual believes that he is entitled to a disability freeze, he should get in touch with his local social-security office right away and make his application for it. He should not delay, because his earnings record cannot be frozen until he has filed an application.

If he was disabled in 1956 or earlier, he should be sure to apply to have his earnings record frozen by June 30, 1957. If he has already applied to have his record frozen, he does not need to make another application.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

If an individual applies for disability insurance benefits, the disability freeze, or disabled child's benefits, his name will be referred to the vocational rehabilitation agency in your State. That agency may be able to provide him with rehabilitation services that will help him return to work.

Benefits will be withheld if he refuses without good cause to accept rehabilitation services offered by the State rehabilitation agency.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly remarkable what can and is being done today in the field of vocational rehabilitation. Thousands of individuals are being returned annually as useful and productive members of their community. The dollars and cents saving to the economy is enormous. The gain in terms of increased human dignity and self-respect is incalculable. I am proud to have been one of the early fighters for this program.

REDUCTION BECAUSE OF OTHER DISABILITY BENEFITS

The amount of any social-security benefit based on disability is reduced by

the amount of any other Federal benefit an individual receives based on disability, and by the amount of any State or Federal workmen's compensation benefit he receives.

FINANCING DISABILITY INSURANCE

To meet the costs of the benefits for disabled workers, an increase in the social-security tax will go into effect January 1, 1957. The amount of the increase is one-fourth of 1 percent each for employee and employer and three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed people on the first $4,200 of earnings in a year.

THE LOCAL SOCIAL-SECURITY OFFICE

If an individual wishes to apply for disability benefits or for the disability freeze, he should get in touch with his social-security district office.

If he is unable to visit the social-security office, he may telephone or write or someone else may make the call for him.

He can get the address of his social-security office from the post office or from the telephone directory under "United States Government, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration."

Warning to Those Who Would Put the Atom in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, during the coming months, the American people will hear a great deal of oratory, overstatement, oversimplification, and just plain nonsense about foreign relations, the farm program, the budget, taxes, and so on. In the great political tradition of this Nation the policies and programs of the party in power will be attacked vigorously by the party out of power, and with equal vigor defended by the party in power. Now, within the bounds of honesty and good taste, this will be a good thing, for in the course of public debate the truth usually emerges, though oftimes dim and cloudy, and the people of this Nation are thereby aided in their exercise of the sovereign right to choose their leaders and through that choice to indicate their approval or disapproval of past actions.

I shall do my part in this coming debate to tell the people of the solid, substantial programs of this administration, for I believe never has this country risen to such heights of technical excellence, economic and political freedom, prosperity, and well being as it has in the past 4 years under the enlightened and progressive leadership of President Eisenhower. I shall fight for the continuing leadership of this Government by the great Republican Party, but there is one area of national interest over which I beg for an absence of political debate and campaign oratory.

I do not here wish to deliver a political speech. Quite the contrary. I wish to make a nonpartisan plea that, at least in this one area of national interest and activity, prudence prevail over pique, progress over partisanship, perspective over personalities, and patience over petulance to the end that our Nation's development of atomic energy for the good of mankind everywhere shall proceed expeditiously and not become bogged down in the quagmire of partisan politics and personal venom.

Atomic energy is far too important to our Nation to be used as cat's-paw for some selfish political advantage, or to be sidetracked by insistence on controversial programs such as placing the Federal Government in the electric business and socializing this great new atomic-energy industry.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have been a member since its creation 10 years ago, and of which I was chairman during the 83d Congress, has traditionally approached its responsibilities in the field of development, use, or control of atomic energy in a truly nonpartisan manner. For 10 years that has been the policy and practice of the Joint Committee, but, alas, that admirable record has been marred and deeply scarred in the 84th Congress by some Members. So meticulously was this policy respected during my chairmanship that I refused to make a political speech on any subject lest I be charged with political bias and the work of the Joint Committee be thereby impaired.

Regretfully, I have observed a growing tendency by some in the present majority party in the Congress to attempt to use atomic energy for political advantage, and to use the powerful position given them by fact of majority control to work petty vengeance upon devoted and talented civil servants and officials whose viewpoints have differed from theirs. The recent and shameful action of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee comes to mind. So scurrilous and unsubstantiated was his attack upon the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that the vicious report he drafted was rejected by his own committee and redrafted, but not before he had distributed it to the press, resulting in libelous news articles. And this nefarious attack was made under the cover, under the pious purpose, of accelerating the Nation's atomic-energy program. It was made by the same man who last year, until reversed by action of this House, refused to include in the AEC appropriations bill any funds whatsoever for building plants and facilities needed in the AEC civilian power development program. I say with pride that the members of the Joint Committee, Republican and Democrat alike, successfully fought side by side on the floor of this House to restore those funds.

Now, I do not believe that the cause of moderation, of temperate action, of nonpartisan consideration that I am here pleading will be furthered by a recitation by me of all the events that have given rise to my concern. I shall not, in hoping to cure the situation, aggravate it instead, although many instances of deliberate political depredations on the atomic program could be cited and partisan purposes be established.

Rather would I seal my lips on some of the regrettable instances of political assault and instead call upon my friends of the Democratic Party to join with me in a concerted effort to keep the atom out of politics. The atom should be and must be above partisan politics—our national interest, security, and prestige require no less. If we do not, our national position will gravely suffer and we shall fail in our solemn obligation to bring the blessings of atomic energy to our fellow man throughout the world at the earliest possible time.

Let me cite, however, a recent example to illustrate my concern. The House had before it a bill written by the Joint Committee and reported without adverse vote by that committee, which had as its stated purpose the acceleration of the development of peacetime atomic power. I for one was not satisfied with the bill as it came from the Joint Committee and, therefore, offered a series of amendments in the course of debate in the House to remove its objectionable features. My amendments remove the last vestige of resemblance between the bill before the House and the original so-called Gore-Holifield bills which were an admitted attempt to place the Federal Government in the electric business and to socialize the atomic industry.

In the course of a lengthy debate, it became apparent that the vast majority of Members of the House were suspicious of the real purposes and intent of the measure. They were unwilling to take a chance on its subsequent perversion even though the amendments adopted made the bill more palatable. Therefore, the House killed the bill by sending it back to the Joint Committee.

Let me say that the defeat of that bill was the direct result of an attempt to use atomic energy as a vote getter in the public power areas and, under the cloak of a laudable purpose, to attract the votes of people everywhere who are eager to advance the atomic program.

I said that the stated purpose of the bill was to accelerate the development of peacetime atomic power. My great and good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] underlined in his remarks on the floor that the bill was not a public power bill. So too, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] reiterated that the purpose of the bill was in no way connected with the issue of public power. My amendments, among other things, made this clear; but, if the bill was intended solely to do what its title stated to be its sole purpose, it is most difficult to understand why those amendments were called "crippling" by one of the authors of the discredited public power bill I referred to previously.

The reason is simply this: Those amendments strengthened and accelerated the development of peacetime atomic power in accordance with our American philosophy of free and competitive enterprise. But they also removed the hidden avenues to Federal entry into the electric business of generating and selling electricity produced, not from falling water as in connection with

flood control, reclamation or navigation, but from atomic energy. Those amendments exposed the original Gore-Holifield bills as the "Trojan horse" of the atomic industry.

If the bill as reported from the Joint Committee was solely what it was stated to be, why did the gentleman from California describe the amendments I proposed and which were adopted by the House as "crippling"? The only explanation is that the amendments were indeed needed to keep the bill in accord with its stated purpose and that the suspicions of the great majority of Members of this House who believe the Federal Government should not become involved in the electric business were well founded.

The situation facing the House on the motion to recommit was this: The bill, as presented, was clearly shown to have hidden features which place the Federal Government in the business of generating and eventually selling electricity produced from atomic energy. It had passed the Senate without the amendments written in by the House to correct this weakness. As pointed out by the assistant minority leader, it was very likely that the bill, if passed by the House, would come back from conference in a form that would not be acceptable to the majority of Members of the House in that the necessary changes made in the House would not be accepted by the conferees.

The defeat of the bill was caused by the doubt and misunderstanding generated directly as a result of the efforts of a few dyed-in-the-wool proponents of socialized power production and distribution, aided and abetted by the repugnance the gentlemen of the House felt to the politically motivated and slanderous attack upon the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission by one of the recent, but I am afraid insincere, converts to a strong atomic development program.

Fortunately, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 already contains all the authority needed to proceed with any atomic power reactors needed to speed the development of atomic power. The Gore-Holifield bills were not needed to accelerate the atomic program. The Atomic Energy Commission has undertaken to appraise the entire field by a panel of eminent scientists and the Chairman has committed himself to push ahead on all fronts with the aid and assistance of private companies or cooperatives and, in the event no such participation is forthcoming, solely with Federal funds. That is the proper, the wholesome, the natural, and American way to progress.

Defeat of the Gore bill does no harm whatever to our national atomic program. In fact, the rejection of a Federal socialized power development program has given private industry new courage and hope. After the objectionable features of the bill were removed by adoption of my amendments, I voted against recommittal because I shall never vote against passage of any bill which, although not necessary, is directed solely at speeding atomic progress.

The action of the House in recommitting this bill is a warning to those who would put the atom in politics. It is a warning we should all heed lest, by mixing the atom in controversial matters such as the generation and sale of electricity by the Federal Government, we shall so cast suspicion upon any proposed action as to make its acceptance by a majority of the Congress doubtful, if not impossible.

The atom must not be socialized. Its tremendous force and power will not accept the straitjacket of Government monopoly.

I previously referred to pique and petulance. Pique over failure of the Gore bill to pass was apparently the basis for the refusal of the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate to consider and pass the measure which the atomic industry has been awaiting and without which real progress will be seriously hindered. I refer to the measure which would delineate the public liability of an owner and operator of an atomic reactor. For 2 years, the joint committee struggled to prepare an acceptable proposal which was adopted by the committee with but one dissenting vote. It was of such importance to the peacetime atomic program that President Eisenhower personally wrote to Vice President NIXON and Speaker RAYBURN urging enactment before adjournment.

The President's plea fell on deaf and unyielding ears. The consequence of petulance in the Democratic leadership deplorably and needlessly hinders our free, competitive atomic program.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I repeat my opening plea. The atom has no nationality, it has no religion—and, above all, it has no politics. It is neither Republican nor Democratic. But neither is it static; it will not await the machinations and manipulations of maneuvering politicians. It demands attention and action with a minimum of governmental restraint and regulation. If America does not give the atom the green light of go-ahead, it will find its proper place in foreign lands where its benign power is not only appreciated but will be realized.

Again, I beg that the atom be kept off the platform of political acrimony and out of the arena of partisan competition.

Statistics on Accomplishments of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the almost 19,000 bills and resolutions put into the legislative hoppers of the 84th Congress was the largest number in 20 years. The combined figure was 18,989—11,914 in the first session and 7,025 in the second. Not since the 74th Congress of 1935–36 has the number reached such heights. Of the total, in the biennial period, 14,104 were introduced in the House and 4,835 in the Senate.

The 18,939 of the 84th Congress exceeded the 16,385 of the 83d, the 14,164 of the 82d, the 16,670 of the 81st, and the 12,090 of the 80th.

During the past 20 years the totals have ranged between 9,536 and 17,245. In the 74th Congress the total was 19,745.

Measures reported totaled 5,751—2,954 in the first session, and 2,797 in the second. Figures for the House and Senate were 2,698 and 3,053, respectively. The total compares with 5,263 for the 83d Congress, 4,601 for the 82d, 5,880 for the 81st, and 4,272 for the 80th.

Measures passed totaled 5,713—2,922 in the first session and 2,791 in the second. Figures for the House and Senate were 2,833 and 2,880, respectively. The total compares with 5,201 in the 83d, 4,593 in the 82d, 5,764 in the 81st, and 4,132 in the 80th.

Laws enacted reached the number of 1,028 for public laws and 893 for private laws, making an aggregate of 1,921 measures enacted during the Congress. The first session accounted for 390 public laws and 490 private laws; the second session for 638 public, and 403 private. By comparison, the 83d Congress enacted 781 public laws; the 82d, 594; the 81st, 921; and the 80th Congress, 906.

Measures vetoed totaled 34 for both sessions, 11 in the first and 23 in the second. Among those vetoed were the 10 percent increase in postal salaries—S. 1, continuation of purchase of domestic minerals—H. R. 3373, agricultural price supports—H. R. 12, the natural gas bill—H. R. 6645, and the $1.6 billion rivers and harbors bill—H. R. 12080.

The Senate confirmed 82,694 executive nominations. This was considerably in excess of the 68,563 confirmed during the 83d Congress, the first during the Eisenhower administration.

Schedule of Meetings in the 11th Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years I have had the privilege of representing Marion County, known as the 11th District of Indiana, in the United States Congress. My district totals approximately 610,888 persons, which is well over half again the population of the average congressional district. I maintain a congressional office in downtown Indianapolis the year round, where a secretary is available to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government, so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

During the official congressional recess this year, I am scheduling meetings in the post offices throughout the county so every citizen of Marion County can have the opportunity of a personal conference with me. Special appointments

are not necessary. I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through these meetings will help me to render better service, both legislative and personal, to all of the people of Marion County.

The schedule is as follows:

Monday, October 1: Post office, West Newton, 9: 30 a. m.; post office, Camby, 10 a. m.; post office, Bridgeport, 10: 30 a. m.; post office, Speedway, 11: 15 a. m.

Tuesday, October 2: Post office, New Augusta, 2 p. m.; post office, Clermont, 4 p. m.; post office, Speedway, 4:45 p. m.

Wednesday, October 3: Post office, Southport, 2 p. m.; post office, Acton, 3 p. m.; post office, Wanamaker, 4 p. m.

Thursday, October 4: Post office, Beech Grove, 11 a. m.

Monday, October 8: Post office, Castleton, 9:30 a. m.; post office, Oaklandon, 10: 30 a. m.; post office, Lawrence, 11: 15 a. m.

Tuesday, October 9: Post office, Cumberland, 2 p. m.

The Adoption of the Reed-Dirksen Amendment Would Save Income-Tax Payers $10 Billion a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, during the two sessions of the 84th Congress proposals were introduced for constitutional amendments limiting the Federal power to tax incomes except in time of war or great national emergencies and requiring the President to submit to Congress each year proposals for a balanced budget. The so-called Reed-Dirksen joint resolutions—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182—proposed the repeal of the 16th article of amendment to the Constitution, and enacting in its stead a new amendment limiting the taxing power of the Federal Government on incomes to a maximum top rate of 25 percent and also eliminating taxes upon inheritances and gifts.

The so-called Byrd-Bridges joint resolution calls for a constitutional amendment requiring that "on or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of receipts."

Mr. Speaker, both of these worthy objectives now rest in the hands of the next Congress for their revival. I have taken time today to point out a few of the possible savings to the taxpayers that could come through the adoption of the proposed Reed-Dirksen amendment to our Constitution. The table which follows shows the difference between the taxes on incomes under the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, as amended, and the savings under the 25 percent maximum possible under the Reed-Dirksen joint resolution:

Income level	Taxes under 1954 Revenue Act	Taxes proposed under Reed-Dirksen [1]
$0 to $1,000	20 percent of net taxable	1 percent of net taxable.
$1,000 to $2,000	20 percent income	$10 plus income 2 percent.
$2,000 to $4,000	$400 plus 22 percent over $2,000	$30 plus 3 percent over $2,000.
$4,000 to $6,000	$840 plus 26 percent over $4,000	$90 plus 4 percent over $4,000.
$6,000 to $8,000	$1,360 plus 30 percent over $6,000	$170 plus 5 percent over $6,000.
$8,000 to $10,000	$1,960 plus 34 percent over $8,000	$270 plus 6 percent over $8,000.
$10,000 to $12,000	$2,640 plus 38 percent over $10,000	$390 plus 7 percent over $10,000.
$12,000 to $14,000	$3,400 plus 43 percent over $12,000	$530 plus 8 percent over $12,000.
$14,000 to $16,000	$4,250 plus 47 percent over $14,000	$690 plus 9 percent over $14,000.
$16,000 to $18,000	$5,200 plus 50 percent over $16,000	$870 plus 10 percent over $16,000.
$18,000 to $20,000	$6,200 plus 53 percent over $18,000	$1,070 plus 11 percent over $18,000.
$20,000 to $22,000	$7,260 plus 56 percent over $20,000	$1,290 plus 12 percent over $20,000.
$22,000 to $26,000	$8,380 plus 59 percent over $22,000	$1,530 plus 13 percent over $22,000.
$26,000 to $32,000	$10,740 plus 62 percent over $26,000	$2,050 plus 14 percent over $26,000.
$32,000 to $38,000	$14,460 plus 65 percent over $32,000	$2,890 plus 15 percent over $32,000.
$38,000 to $44,000	$18,360 plus 69 percent over $38,000	$3,790 plus 16 percent over $38,000.
$44,000 to $50,000	$22,500 plus 72 percent over $44,000	$4,750 plus 17 percent over $44,000.
$50,000 to $60,000	$26,820 plus 75 percent over $50,000	$5,770 plus 18 percent over $50,000.
$60,000 to $70,000	$34,320 plus 78 percent over $60,000	$7,570 plus 19 percent over $60,000.
$70,000 to $80,000	$42,120 plus 81 percent over $70,000	$9,470 plus 20 percent over $70,000.
$80,000 to $90,000	$50,220 plus 84 percent over $80,000	$11,470 plus 21 percent over $80,000.
$90,000 to $100,000	$58,620 plus 87 percent over $90,000	$13,576 plus 22 percent over $90,000.
$100,000 to $150,000	$67,320 plus 89 percent over $100,000	$15,770 plus 23 percent over $100,000.
$150,000 to $200,000	$111,820 plus 90 percent over $150,000	$27,270 plus 24 percent over $150,000.
$200,000 and over	$156,820 plus 91 percent over $200,000	$39,270 plus 25 percent over $200,000.

[1] Comparison prepared by Roger J. Moure, Arlington, Va.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the proposed Reed-Dirksen amendment would help every segment of our economy. It would relieve the strain upon family budgets, on small and independent business and upon the American farmers as well.

The savings to the American taxpayers are estimated at not less than $10 billion a year in income taxes alone. Now you will ask how can we offset these savings to the taxpayers and still carry on the necessary and normal functions of Government?

The answer is right at hand and needs only congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1955, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, created by Public Law 108, 83d Congress, wound up its work and submitted a report to Congress in which recommended savings of not less than $8,565,100,000 a year for the next 4 fiscal years were listed: These savings would be effected through detailed reorganizations as follows:

Budget and accounting	$4,000,000,000
Depot utilization (defense forces)	253,000,000
Federal medical services	290,000,000
Lending, guaranteeing, insurance	200,000,000
Overseas economic operations	360,000,000
Paperwork management	288,300,000
Personnel and civil service	48,500,000
Real-property management	185,000,000
Personnel problems, Defense Department	388,800,000
Food and clothing procurement	$400,000,000
Transportation economies	151,500,000
Use and disposal of surplus property	2,000,000,000
Recommended possible savings	8,565,100,000

This Commission report highlights the need for drastic reorganizations to reduce the bureaucracy which rides the backs of all our taxpayers and all our enterprises large and small. It is pertinent to observe, Mr. Speaker, that in the 25 years between 1930 and 1955, while the population of the United States increased approximately 30 percent, employment in the Federal Government's executive branch increased by more than 300 percent and the payrolls increased even faster than that to the amazing total of $10,400,000,000 in 1955 compared with $1,100,273,000 in 1930.

CUT OUT FOREIGN AID TO IRON CURTAIN SYMPATHIZERS AND COOPERATORS

Mr. Speaker, if we would adopt the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and also cut out the foreign-aid programs for countries sympathetic and cooperating with the Russians, we could reduce taxes as envisioned by the Reed-Dirksen proposed constitutional amendment.

BALANCING THE BUDGET WOULD HELP, TOO

And, Mr. Speaker, of course there can be no doubts about savings that would be effectuated with a balanced budget as required under the proposed Byrd-Bridges constitutional amendment. We now pay nearly $7 billion a year in interest on the public debt—an amount greater than the cost of Government in any peacetime year prior to 1937.

Mr. Speaker, the rates of taxes levied upon incomes and the failure in peacetime to balance the Federal budgets have had their dual effects upon our entire economic structure. Changes in the internal revenue laws have been followed by changes in the price indexes at the wholesale and consumer levels. Every dollar added to the tax burden is reflected by movements upward in the price indexes which reflect a decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Thus the tides of inflation rise and fall, but seeming always rising to new heights as indicated by the special table which follows, showing the price indexes and surplus or deficits in the 22 years prior to 1913 when the 16th amendment became effective, and in the 43 years from 1913 to 1955 inclusive since the 16th amendment became effective.

Income year	Range of tax rates (percentages)	Single	Married	Dependent	Wholesale price index 1926=100	Budget surplus or deficit (−)
1890					56.2	$85,040,273
1891					55.8	26,838,543
1892					52.2	9,914,453
1893					53.4	2,341,676
1894					47.9	−61,169,965
1895					48.8	−31,465,879
1896					46.5	−14,036,999
1897					46.6	−18,052,454
1898					48.5	−38,047,248
1899					52.2	−89,111,558
1900					56.1	46,380,005
1901					55.3	63,068,413
1902					58.9	77,243,984
1903					59.6	44,874,595
1904					59.7	−42,572,815
1905					60.1	−23,004,229
1906					61.8	24,872,168
1907					65.2	86,731,544
1908					62.9	−57,334,413
1909					67.6	−89,423,387
1910					70.4	−18,105,350
1911					64.9	10,631,399
1912					69.1	2,727,870
1913	1 percent to 7 percent	$3,000	$4,000		69.8	−400,733
1914	do	3,000	4,000		68.1	−408,264
1915	do	1,000	2,000	$200	69.5	−62,675,975
1916	2 percent to 15 percent	1,000	2,000	200	85.5	48,478,346
1917	2 percent to 67 percent	1,000	2,000	200	117.5	−853,356,956
1918	6 percent to 77 percent	1,000	2,000	200	131.3	−9,032,119,606
1919	4 percent to 73 percent	1,000	2,000	200	138.6	−13,362,622,819
1920	do	1,000	2,000	200	154.4	291,221,548
1921	do	1,000	2,500	400	97.6	509,005,271
1922	4 percent to 58 percent	1,000	2,500	400	96.7	736,496,251
1923	3 percent to 43.5 percent	1,000	2,500	400	100.6	712,507,952
1924	2 percent to 46 percent	1,000	2,500	400	98.1	963,366,737
1925	1.5 percent to 25 percent	1,500	3,500	400	103.5	717,043,353
1926	do	1,500	3,500	400	100.0	865,143,867
1927	do	1,500	3,500	400	95.4	1,155,364,766
1928	do	1,500	3,500	400	96.7	939,083,301
1929	0.5 percent to 24 percent	1,500	3,500	400	95.3	734,390,739
1930	1.5 percent to 25 percent	1,500	3,500	400	86.4	737,672,818
1931	do	1,500	3,500	400	73.0	−461,877,080
1932	4 percent to 63 percent	1,000	2,500	400	64.8	−2,735,289,708
1933	do	1,000	2,500	400	65.9	−2,601,652,085
1934	do	1,000	2,500	400	74.9	−3,629,631,943
1935	do	1,000	2,500	400	80.0	−2,971,052,100
1936	4 percent to 79 percent	1,000	2,500	400	80.8	−4,424,549,230
1937	do	1,000	2,500	400	86.3	−2,777,420,714
1938	do	1,000	2,500	400	78.6	−1,176,616,598
1939	do	1,000	2,500	400	77.1	−3,862,158,040
1940 [1]	do	800	2,000	400	78.6	−3,918,019,161
1941	10 percent to 81 percent	750	1,500	400	87.3	−6,159,272,358
1942 [2]	19 percent to 88 percent	500	1,200	350	98.8	−21,490,242,732
1943 [2]	do	500	1,200	350	103.1	−57,420,430,365
1944	23 percent to 94 percent	$500 per capita exemption			104.0	−51,423,392,541
1945	do	$500 per capita exemption			105.8	−53,940,916,126
1946	19 percent to 86.45 percent	$500 per capita exemption			121.1	−20,676,170,609
1947	do	$500 per capita exemption			152.1	753,787,660
1948	16.6 percent to 82.1275 percent	$600 per capita exemption			165.0	8,419,469,844
1949	do	$600 per capita exemption			155.0	−1,811,440,048
1950	17.4 percent to 84.357 percent	$600 per capita exemption			161.5	−3,122,102,357
1951	20.4 percent to 91 percent	$600 per capita exemption			184.0	3,509,782,624
1952	22.2 percent to 92 percent	$600 per capita exemption			189.0	−4,016,640,378
1953	do	$600 per capita exemption			195.0	−9,449,213,457
1954	20 percent to 91 percent	$600 per capita exemption			195.0	−3,116,966,256
1955	do	$600 per capita exemption			196.0	−4,180,228,921

[1] Exclusive of the defense tax of 10 percent of the total tax due.
[2] Exclusive of the victory tax applicable to 1943, which was imposed at the rate of 5 percent on net income after a specific exemption of $1,248 for a married couple filing a joint return and $624 for other taxpayers.

NOTE.—The relative purchasing power of the dollar can be ascertained for any year by dividing the wholesale price index into 10,000. Thus in 1890 the dollar was worth $1.77⁹⁄₁₀ in purchasing power while the 1955 dollar was worth but $0.51⁵⁄₁₀₀.

Meeting the Problems of Our Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the problems of America's aged have attracted an increasing amount of attention in recent years. As the life span has increased, the number of persons over age 65 has grown until they now form twice as big a percentage of our population as they did in 1900. In addition, the many private and governmental retirement plans have removed them from the labor force and created a distinct group with special problems.

The great extension in private pension plans, the Federal social-security and old-age assistance programs have made great strides in meeting the financial needs of our senior citizens. Many older persons do not receive an income adequate to their needs, but the day is approaching when few will live in need.

A start has been made in meeting the housing needs of oldsters, who have great difficulty in financing a home and must often live in substandard housing. The medical needs of these people are being met with increasing efficiency, and the fruits of the remarkable medical research of the last generation are being shared with those who often have the greatest physical problems.

But however essential these needs may be, to live usefully and happily in advanced years a person must have things to do. After an active life of earning a living and raising a family a person cannot be happy with nothing to occupy him. There are vast untapped resources in these older people which are going unused. In our own acquaintance we all know people who have made the golden years happy, productive ones. That a great many oldsters do not is the result of many factors, most of which can be changed by simple interest and cooperation.

In general our education is directed toward two-thirds of our life; the latter part is neglected. In even our grade and high schools we should study the latter part of life which is inevitable, unless we die prematurely. We should work toward making that part of life beautiful and happy so that we may approach it with confidence and expectation and not fear. We need to learn and know more about the autumn years from every aspect. We need to understand the problems of that period when we are young as well as when we are old. Each individual is unique, with his own characteristics and needs, whether he is 20 or 70. There are an infinite variety of

activities in which older folks are interested when an opportunity is presented to them.

Cooperation and encouragement can go a long way in aiding these people to find these useful outlets. Often very little money is needed, and some of the activities become self-supporting. But progress is much greater when it is organized and when a group is formed which allows concerted effort.

It has been effectively stated that retirement should not be considered as a cessation of activities and interests but as a changing of activities and interests. An increasing number of elderly people live a happier richer life in their changing of interests and may even lead a more productive life in their new endeavors.

One of my most pleasant associations is with the Borrowed Time Club, composed of men and women who have exceeded the allotted span of years. Formed in Bloomington about 7 years ago, it has done a remarkable job in expanding the horizons of its members and in interesting the community in its activities. It has concentrated on the positive side of old age, and has made the most of its potential.

When the State of Indiana took congnizance of the problems of older people by establishing a commission on the aging and aged, Dr. Frank Beck, founder of the Borrowed Time Club, was named as its chairman. A better qualified man could not have been found.

The first State conference of the Indiana commission will be held in Bloomington October 4, 5, and 6. It is hoped that this conference will be the first step in stimulating statewide activity which will increase the usefulness and happiness of our 400,000 Hoosiers over age 65. Those interested in further information concerning the conference may write: Conference for the Aged, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

I am pleased that seventh district people are taking a part in this undertaking and I wish them every successs.

Hon. Joaquin Miguel Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the membership of the House some salient facts to which I am sure most of you will wholeheartedly subscribe.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is important today, and will become increasingly important with time. The United States should help elect as director of that organization a highly competent person. The reasons for such a desirability are too numerous to mention. The director should be a man who knows agriculture from top to bottom; he should be an outstanding businessman and one with broad experience in diplomacy and foreign affairs. To wrap up all of these qualifications in one man is almost desiring to do the impossible. But look at our former colleague, the honorable Miguel Elizalde—he is a natural for this job; he is an outstanding businessman; a legislator of proven ability; a diplomat of vast experience—who has a personal acquaintanceship with more foreign dignitaries than most any man I know. And what about farming: he has been a successful farmer since boyhood in the Philippines. And, not only that, he operates successfully a large farm in the State of Maryland. He knows eastern and western agriculture.

Again I say—he is a natural for this world leadership in agriculture.

Republican Social Security Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration has compiled a magnificent record in the field of social security. The system has been strengthened, its finances put on a sounder basis, the benefits increased, and its protection extended for the first time to many millions of Americans. It was in the field of social security that the Republican Party, when it took power after nearly 20 years out of office, demonstrated once and for all that its policies were forward-looking and that its domestic program was based upon a fundamental and deep-rooted concern for human welfare.

The social-security legislation which has just become law contains some very significant changes, particularly with regard to the payment of disability benefits and the lowering of the benefit age for women. This legislation had bipartisan support in the Congress. After the legislation had passed the House, the administration quite properly evidenced concern over some aspects of the bill. It will be recalled that the Committee on Ways and Means which has jurisdiction over social-security legislation and which initially developed this legislation had refused to hold public hearings on the matter. Thus, this legislation, involving billions of dollars and the economic security of millions of Americans and their families, was developed in closed, secret sessions. The Republican minority of the committee strenuously objected to this procedure on the ground that it did not safeguard the vital interest of millions of Americans. This protest was a matter of public record.

As part of the Republican protest against the secret proceedings in which this legislation was developed, it was pointed out that there were a number of other areas in the social-security law to which consideration should be given. Among these was an increase in minimum benefits and a further liberalization in the so-called work clause which reduces an individual's benefit if he continues in gainful employment after 65.

In view of the method by which this legislation was considered, it was not surprising that the administration, which after all is responsible for administering the law, discovered certain problems under the bill as it passed the House. As a result, very lengthy public consideration was given the bill in the Senate and very substantial improvements made. Among these improvements were a very large reduction in cost, the establishment of a special trust fund to handle the financing of the disability-insurance program, and a smaller tax increase to finance the new program. There is no question but that a sounder law resulted from these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to recall some of the more important provisions of the administration social-security program which was enacted as the Social Security Act Amendments of 1954. I have a personal interest in that law, not only because it clearly symbolizes the Republican record in this field, but because I personally sponsored the legislation.

I. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

First. Farmers: The Republican Social Security Act Amendments of 1954 extended social-security coverage for the first time to self-employed farm owners and operators. This meant that old-age and survivors insurance protection has been extended to about 3.6 million farmers, their wives, and their children.

Second. Farm workers: The law also extended coverage to about 2 million farm workers. The 1954 law extended this same protection to those farm workers who earn $100 or more in the course of a year from one employer. Unfortunately, some of these same individuals whom we brought into the system in 1954 will now be removed from coverage as a result of the new 1956 law.

Third. Professional groups: The law extended social-security coverage to accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians. Lawyers and dentists would also have been covered by the bill as I introduced it and as it passed the House. These individuals will now be covered under the 1956 law.

Fourth. Ministers: The law covered ministers and members of religious orders, whether self-employed or employees, if they elect individually for coverage on the same basis as self-employed individuals. It was estimated that this amendment would extend coverage to about 260,000 persons.

Fifth. State and local employees: The 1954 law extended coverage to the employees of State and local governments who were covered by State and local retirement systems—other than policemen and firemen—under voluntary agreements between the States and Federal Government, if a majority of the members of the system voted in a referendum in favor of coverage. There were about 3.5 million persons in this group.

Sixth. Domestic workers: The law extended coverage to domestic workers in

private homes—and others who perform work not in the course of the employer's place of business—who are paid $50 in cash wages by an employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the 24-day test required in the prior law. This provision extended coverage to about 250,000 persons.

Seventh. Miscellaneous: The law also extended social security coverage to the following groups for the first time:

(a) American citizens employed outside the United States by foreign subsidiaries of American companies, under voluntary agreements between the Federal Government and the parent American company—about 100,000.

(b) Homeworkers who were excluded from coverage as employees—whether or not they were covered as self-employed persons—because their services were not subject to State licensing laws—about 100,000.

(c) Employees engaged in fishing and related activities, on vessels of 10 net tons or less or on shore—about 50,000.

(d) American citizens employed by American employers on vessels and aircraft of foreign registry.

(e) Cotton-gin workers.

The following is a breakdown of the additional coverage provided by the Republican social security law of 1954: 3,600,000 farmer operators, 2,100,000 farmworkers, 200,00 domestic workers, 3,500,000 State and local employees, 250,000 ministers, 100,000 homeworkers, 50,000 fishermen, 100,000 employees of foreign subsidiaries, 50,000 in employment not in course of trade or business, 100,000 professional self-employed, and 150,000 Federal employees; totaling 10,200,000.

II. INCREASE IN BENEFITS

First. More than 6.5 million persons then on the benefit rolls had benefits increased as of September 1, 1954. The average increase for retired workers was about $6 a month, with proportionate increases for dependents and survivors. The range in primary insurance amounts for those then on the rolls became $30 to $98.50, as compared to $25 to $85 under the then existing law.

Second. Persons who retired or died in the future would, in general, have their benefits computed by the following new formula under the 1954 law: 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage—rather than $100 as in prior law—plus 20 percent of the next $240—rather than 15 percent of the next $200. Thus, an individual's retirement benefit was made as high as $108.50 a month, and he and his wife together would receive as much as $162.75 in retirement benefits. These benefits have not been increased by the 1956 law.

Third. The minimum monthly benefit amount for a retired worker was increased to $30, and the minimum amount payable where only one survivor is entitled to benefits on the deceased insured person's earning, was made $30. This minimum benefit was not increased by the 1956 law.

Fourth. The maximum monthly family benefit of $168.75 was increased to $200; the provision of the then existing law that total family benefits could not exceed 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage would not reduce total family benefits below 1½ times the insured worker's primary insurance amount, or $50, whichever is the greater.

III. EARNINGS BASE

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed and contributions paid was raised from $3,600 to $4,200. This has not been changed.

IV. COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS

The individual became entitled under the 1954 law to drop out from the computation of his average monthly wage for benefit purposes up to 5 years of his lowest earnings.

V. RETIREMENT TEST

The earnings limitation was removed entirely at age 72—instead of at 75, as under prior law. For beneficiaries under age 72, the earnings limitation was made the same for wage earners and self-employed persons. A beneficiary can earn as much as $1,200 in a year from covered work without loss of benefits. He loses a month's benefit for each unit of $80—or fraction thereof—of covered earnings in excess of $1,200, but in no case can he lose benefits for months in which he neither earns more than $80 in wages nor renders substantial services in self-employment. Beneficiaries engaged in noncovered work outside the United States have their benefits withheld for any month in which they worked on 7 or more days.

No further liberalization of the work test was considered by the last Congress.

VI. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

(a) As an alternative to the then existing requirements for fully insured status, it was provided that an individual would be fully insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and up to the quarter of his death or attainment of age 65 were quarters of coverage, provided he had at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1954.

(b) It was provided that benefits would be paid to the surviving aged widow, widowed mother, and children, or parents of any individual who died after 1939 and prior to September 1, 1950, and had at least 6 quarters of coverage.

VII. PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

The 1954 law provided that the period during which an individual was under an extended total disability would be excluded in determining his insured status and the amount of benefits payable to him upon retirement or to his survivors in the event of his death. Only disabilities lasing more than 6 months would be taken into account. Determinations of disabilities generally would be made by State vocational rehabilitation agencies or other appropriate State agencies pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

VIII. RECOMPUTATION OF BENEFITS FOR WORK AFTER ENTITLEMENT

It was also provided that an individual may have his benefit recomputed to take into account additional earnings after entitlement if he has covered earnings of more than $1,200 in a calendar year after 1953 and after the year in which his benefit was last computed.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Republican social security record is one of solid accomplishment. It is a proud record, one which guarantees a more secure future for millions of Americans and their families.

Restoration of the First Newspaper Printshop in the Indiana Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a noteworthy step in the preservation and restoration of one of the great cultural landmarks of the Midwest will take place in Vincennes, Ind., on Sunday, October 7, 1956, at 2 p. m. At that time the Lincoln-Free Press Memorial Association will formally dedicate the restored printshop where the first newspaper of the Indiana Territory, the Indiana Gazette, was published on July 4, 1804, at Vincennes, then the capital of the Indiana Territory. At that time the Indiana Territory included the States of Indiana, Illinois, and parts of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. In 1807 the name of the paper was changed to the Western Sun. It is now the Vincennes Sun Commercial, one of the outstanding daily papers of Indiana. It is owned by Central Newspapers, Inc., of which Mr. and Mrs. Eugene C. Pulliam have the controlling interests.

This dedication is the culmination of the efforts of some of Indiana's outstanding citizens, who recognized that in connection with the first publication of a newspaper in the Indiana Territory was interwoven historymaking news and people.

Elihu Stout, who established this newspaper and operated it for many years, came to Vincennes in 1804. After a conference with William Henry Harrison, then Indiana Territorial Governor, he opened his printshop, using an old hand-operated Ramage press. The equipment is said to have been transported by water to Vincennes, and the supplies were hauled by horsedrawn cart over the buffalo trace. Issue No. 1, of volume I is lost, but the front page of issue No. 2 contains a copy of an act of Congress which so well illustrates the times of its issue. It is a law that has to do with Revolutionary War pensions and is signed by Nathaniel Macon, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Aaron Burr, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, and approved March 3, 1804, by President Thomas Jefferson.

Among the early books of Indiana printed in this shop was "Laws Adopted by the Governor and Judges of the Indiana Territory, at their Second and Third Sessions, Begun and Held at Vincennes 20th, January, 1802 and February 16, 1803". In 1816, Stout printed "The Constitution of the State of Indiana," with the imprint: "Vincennes;

printed by Elihu Stout, 1816." It is impossible at this late date to comprehend the vast influence in government, education, culture, and progress that this early printing press and newspaper have had in the development of the great Midwest. Abraham Lincoln saw a printing press for the first time when he visited the shop while passing through Vincennes on his way to Illinois.

This great job of restoring this printshop which has meant so much to the free people of America was started several years ago by Judge Curtis Shake of Vincennes. Other leaders in the project have included: Ross H. Garrigus, editor of the Vincennes Sun Commercial; Isaac K. Beckes, president of Vincennes University; Florence G. Watts; Ralph F. Meeks; Howard Greenlee; all of Vincennes, and a score of others. A Ramage press of the same type used in this early newspaper office, 1 of only 7 known to be in existence, has been presented by the John Wanamaker store, of Philadelphia, as a gift to this memorial.

People of United States Indebted to Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the people and the Government of these United States are greatly indebted to the Polish nation. Over long periods throughout our history hundreds of thousands of her finest citizens have emigrated to our shores.

Everyone recognizes the substantial integrity and fine character of those who have had the courage to leave their familiar environment in Europe and carve for themselves a new life in America. This emigration started long before the founding of our country and reached its climax in the decades before World War II.

In my district are many thousands of Polish people and their descendants. No one will deny that no finer group can be found in our national life. They are a most religious people. Their family life is outstanding, and the care they give their older people is remarkable. In the city of Flint is a most remarkable institution known as Dom Polski. It is one of the most outstanding of Flint's civic institutions.

Since the Polish people have become so valued and significant a part of America and of our American heritage, it is only natural that all of us should have great concern for the Polish people in Europe. Save for the Jews, no people in history have suffered more than have the people of Poland.

Throughout modern history Poland has suffered from one ruthless conqueror to another. The one bright spot over these many years was provided by the fairmindedness and determination of Woodrow Wilson. Following the First World War, and at last given the breath of freedom, the Polish people proved their ability to govern themselves and establish a sound economy. Now again under the domination of Russia—and this time in the clutches of communism—they have resisted, as much as any people could, the oppression of their Communist masters.

We, in America, with so many Polish people firmly in our midst as part and parcel of the American family, ought never admit that the situation now existing can be permanent. We have no way of knowing what opportunity for freedom may come to Poland. But when that time comes America must be at her side.

Dick Richards and Thurmond Chatham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in the final moments of the 84th Congress I want to take the opportunity to express my regrets that two of the most able members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee will not be returning in the 85th Congress.

I need not elaborate, for I know that it is only too evident who these two great statesmen are—the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Both of these distinguished Congressmen will be returning to their home States of South Carolina and North Carolina, respectively.

Mr. RICHARDS is retiring after 24 years of outstanding and distinguished congressional service. Mr. CHATHAM has served his Nation and State with great competence and ability over the past 8 years.

It will be difficult to see them leave the Washington scene, but I sincerely hope that they will be back many times in the days to come, to visit with us and to give us the benefit of their sound advice, which I remember so well from our years of service together in the House of Representatives.

I have served with both gentlemen on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I can say without qualification that seldom have I worked with two men of such untiring energy, wise statesmanship, and understanding. Both men have enviable records of service to the Nation and their States.

The vacancies created by the retirement of these two Members will be difficult to fill. The record and standards set down in the field of world affairs by these two great statesmen will make the task somewhat easier for those who follow in their roles as members of the distinguished House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Congress, the Nation, and the free world are better off because of the accomplishments and records of these two great Americans from the Carolinas. Both DICK RICHARDS and THURMOND CHATHAM will be remembered with gratitude and affection in the years to come.

It is not goodby to these two friends of long standing; it is only "so long."

Nonmilitary Operations of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from documentary material assembled by me to indicate the extent of the nonmilitary operations of NATO.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

This Congress remains the legislative branch of our National Government until the 31st of December. For every hour of that time we are responsible for our country.

I call your attention to the fact that significant developments are likely to take place, in foreign affairs, in this period, when our attention is centered on the national election.

Important developments are already taking place in NATO.

We have recently heard many references to plans for expanding the political, economic, and cultural activities of NATO.

This is curious, because NATO has, from its inception, been given political, economic, and cultural responsibilities, and has been developing the governmental organs needed to put them into effect.

The following quotations are meant to assemble in one place some of the basic documentary material which many people have been asking me to send them in connection with the following problems:

1. Implementation of article 2 of the treaty, giving NATO political, economic, and cultural powers and responsibilities.

2. Relation of NATO with the U. S. S. R.

3. The propaganda program for support of this transformation.

I hope every member of this body will follow with the closest attention every bit of the limited information we are allowed to see, on the growth of this new star in the galaxy of international organizations, operating above, and in restraint of, our constitutional government.

SOURCES

The principal sources of information on developments of NATO policy and governmental machinery are:

1. NATO. The First 5 Years, 1949–54, by Lord Ismay, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Paris, France, 1954.

2. NATO letter. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Information Division, Paris 16. Monthly. Available from the United States Department of State.

3. Reports of the United States Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration.

Recommendations of the NATO Council to the member governments, dealing with military affairs and other matters, are classified, and therefore not available to Congress, the press, or the public.

MILITARY ACTIVITIES

The military accomplishments of NATO have been fully discussed elsewhere.

We may note, as evidence of the trend, first the loss of the northern anchor of NATO, when the Icelandic Parliament asked the United States to withdraw its troops from NATO's military bases but to continue paying for them. Second, we may note the

weakening of the southeastern anchor, with the split between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus, the rapprochement of Yugoslavia with the Soviet Union, and the neutralization of the Austrian spearhead between Germany and Italy. Third, we may list the series of delays in the rearming of West Germany.

I quote from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 22, 1956, the following question and the answer by Henry Wales, Paris bureau chief, during the Tribune roundtable conference in London:

"Question. What does France think about NATO and SHAPE?

"Answer. I don't think any Europeans except such individuals as have soft jobs in NATO and SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe) take them seriously. At SHAPE's recent fifth birthday celebration about 400 generals and colonels watched a parade of 84 soldiers of the 15 nations which are members, with a half a dozen French gendarmes pinch hitting for Iceland, which has no army."

The political, economic, and cultural activities of NATO have always been important, but they grow increasingly important as military activities dwindle.

Congressman STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, who was 1 of 6 House Members at the NATO Parliamentary Conference last summer, said, "As a peacetime military economic alliance, NATO is without a precedent in history" (House Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearings on Bow resolution of repeal of Status of Forces Treaty, 1956, p. 499).

CIVIL POWERS IN THE NATO TREATY

Article 2 of the NATO Treaty reads as follows:

"The parties shall contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being.

"They seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

The first clause, "strengthening their free institutions," gives NATO political powers. The third, "promoting conditions of stability and well-being," gives them duties in the field of social welfare. The clause about economic collaboration gives them economic responsibilities. The phrase about "eliminating conflict" in economic policies establishes the goal of a directed, rather than a free and competitive economy.

The phrase "bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded" is a mandate for NATO to engage in propaganda activities.

This statement of objectives was ratified by the United States and other parties, as indicated in article 11, which says the treaty shall be ratified by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." This section refers to the method of ratification only, and does not imply that the constitutional system of any of the parties is unchanged by ratification.

This treaty was signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

NATO AREA

The NATO area is defined in article 6 of the treaty in connection with the area involved in event of armed attack.

The NATO area includes—

"The territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America.

"The Algerian departments of France.

"The occupation forces of any party in Europe.

"The islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

"The vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties."

NATO civil activities thus may apply to all of the United States, including Alaska, Western Europe, French North Africa, the territory of Turkey in Asia, and possibly to wider areas.

DEVELOPMENTS, 1949–55

We can follow the general development of NATO's political, economic, and cultural activities from documents published by the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration.

I quote from a pamphlet, NATO—Its Development and Significance, published by the ICA, in September 1955:

"While first priority has been given to the strength of their military defenses, the NATO countries are giving attention to cooperation for building and maintaining their collective political, economic, and moral strength" (p. 8).

"Since the economic capabilities of all the NATO countries including the United States are limited, NATO is constantly concerned with the problem of balancing political and economic needs against defense needs. The NATO agencies must offer whatever advice and assistance they can contribute to the solution of the difficult economic problems produced by the defense program and must make sure that defense plans themselves remain within the bounds of realism (p. 11).

All NATO governments have accepted the principle stressed by Secretary of State Dulles that NATO planning should not be based on short-term, emergency measures but should instead be adapted to the long haul. In other words, NATO is seeking types and levels of military power that can be maintained over a long period of years without intolerable political or economic risks. The NATO countries each year conduct an annual review in which the defense plans and economic capabilities of all member countries are jointly studied by member governments for the purpose of keeping NATO's total defense program balanced and realistic.

"While NATO has given top priority to defense problems, it offers many opportunities for useful cooperation in other fields. Article 2 of the treaty explicitly calls for cooperation in political, economic, and similar matters and the NATO organization structure affords readymade channels for the practical development of such cooperation" (p. 11).

"The Council is assisted by a number of committees that work on specialized problems. Some of these committees are formed to do one particular job and are temporary. In addition there are about 20 permanent civilian committees, which deal with such matters as defense production, labor mobility, civil and military budgets, wartime commodity problems, civil defense, plans for mobilizing ocean shipping and inland surface transport and information and cultural relations" (p. 16).

"Equally significant is the development of NATO's civil structure which not only guides and supports the military program but also provides a channel for cooperation in other fields of activity. Particularly important has been the growth of the practice of regular political consultation within NATO, which helps all member governments to understand one another's special problems and interests and to harmonize their global policies. There has also been useful cooperation on information, economic and cultural matters, emergency planning, labor problems and other non-military activities" (p. 23).

1949—WASHINGTON

We can trace these developments year by year, from communiques and resolutions issued by the North Atlantic Council.

The first session of the council took place in Washington on the 17th of September 1949.

Lord Ismay says:

"At this first session the Council recognized that comprehensive questions of military production and supply, and of economic and financial factors, would have to be studied. At their second session held in Washington on the 18th of November 1949, it was decided to set up two new agencies; namely, a Defense Financial and Economic Committee, and a Military Production and Supply Board.

"The Defense Financial and Economic Committee was to be composed generally of Finance Ministers and to report direct to the Council. It was to have, in particular, the following tasks:

"1. to develop, in coordination with the Military Committee (including the Standing Group) and the Military Production and Supply Board, overall financial and economic guides to, and limits of, future defense programs which North Atlantic Treaty countries as a group and individually should undertake within available financial and economic resources.

"2. to appraise the financial and economic impact on member countries of major individual defense projects formulated by the Military Production and Supply Board or the Military Committee (including the Standing Group); to consider also the availability of raw materials, capital equipment and manpower; and to make recommendations as to action on such projects.

"3. to recommend financial arrangements for executing military defense plans, and particularly financial arrangements for the interchange among North Atlantic Treaty countries of military equipment, surplus stocks, or materials and equipment to be used in producing military equipment.

"4. to measure and to recommend steps to meet the foreign exchange costs of imports of materials and equipment from nonmember countries required by defense programs under the North Atlantic Treaty.

"5. to consider, as may be found desirable and appropriate, plans for the mobilization of economic and financial resources in time of emergency" (Ismay, pp. 25–27).

1950—LONDON

Specific implementation of article 2 was made by formal resolution at the fourth session of the London Conference of the North Atlantic Council, May 15–18, 1950.

The resolution was needed because a year's experience had shown that there was "insufficient exchange of views" on the political side.

The resolution read:

"In view of this situation, the Council will in particular undertake the following tasks:

"(a) Study the inter-relationship of the various programs to support the plans for the defense of the North Atlantic area and ensure coordination of the work of the Defense Committee, and all other bodies established under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

"(b) Recommend to governments the steps necessary to insure that effect is given to the coordinated plans prepared for the defense of the North Atlantic area;

"(c) Exchange views on political matters of common interest within the scope of the treaty;

"(d) Promote and coordinate public information in furtherance of the objectives of the treaty while leaving responsibility for national programs to each country;

"(e) Consider what further action should be taken under article 2 of the treaty, taking into account the work of existing agencies in this field" (Ismay, p. 184).

1951—OTTAWA

The North Atlantic Council said in a formal declaration, at its meeting at Ottawa, September 20, 1954:

"The peoples of the North Atlantic community are united under the * * * treaty to preserve their freedom and to develop their

common heritage of democracy, liberty, and the rule of law * * *

"They will continue to work closely together to consolidate the North Atlantic community. All obstacles which hinder such cooperation on an equal footing should be removed * * *

"The strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the past 2 years has developed in the minds of the peoples a strong sense of their common interests and ideals. There is a desire within the North Atlantic community to meet specific needs in all fields where close collaboration will advance the welfare of the community. * * *

"A clear sense of the direction in which the community is developing should make it easier to take practical steps toward that end.

"The Council has therefore decided to set up a Ministerial Committee composed of representatives from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, and Norway, to consider the further strengthening of the North Atlantic community and especially the implementation of article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

"The Committee, assisted by the Council Deputies, will, in particular consider and make recommendations to the Council on the following matters:

"(a) Coordination and frequent consultation on foreign policy, having particular regard to steps designed to promote peace;

"(b) Closer economic, financial and social cooperation, designed to promote conditions of economic stability and well-being, both during and after the present period of the defense effort, within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or through other agencies;

"(c) Collaboration in the fields of culture and public information.

"In these and other ways the Council will build up the inner strength of the North Atlantic community, without implicating the work of other international organizations which promote the same objectives.

"The Council endorses the recent declaration of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation which called on all sections of the European community to increase production and play their part in the collective effort for peace and well-being.

"In developing the North Atlantic community, the Council will act in conformity with and seek to strengthen the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It is only by the work and by the enlightened understanding of the free peoples everywhere that the cause of freedom and democracy will be upheld against any challenge" (Ismay, pp. 201–203).

1951—ROME

The final communique of the eighth session of the North Atlantic Council, November 24–28, 1951, stated:

The report stressed the importance of further developing the habit of consultation on matters of common concern. The Council directed that fuller study be given to a number of proposals relating to economic, social and cultural matters and to the coordination of the activities of NATO civilian agencies with those of other international organizations. In this connection the Council recommended that particular consideration be given to facilitating the movement of labor from member countries with excess manpower to others where it could be effectively utilized" (Ismay, p. 190).

"Labor migration" and "manpower mobility" are similar to problems we refer to as "immigration."

Lord Ismay reports that changes made in American immigration policy have been recommended on the ground of "strengthening the Atlantic community" (Ismay, p. 153).

1952—LISBON

At the very important ninth session of the North Atlantic Council, at Lisbon, February 20–25, 1952, the Council said in its final communique:

"The Council adopted a report of the Atlantic Community Committee, established at its Ottawa meeting. This report emphasized the importance of economic cooperation, the expansion and liberalization of trade, and the possibility of working out closer cooperative arrangements with other bodies, particularly the OEEC. In approving the analysis of the problem of the movement of labor between member countries in the report of the Atlantic Community Committee, the Council acknowledged the importance of this problem and endorsed the resolution of the Temporary Council Committee on this subject. It was agreed that the permanent North Atlantic Treaty Organization should keep this problem under continuous review, and make recommendations for the elimination, by the most effective utilization of manpower resources, of general or specific manpower shortages which hinder defense production. As cooperation in the field covered by the Five Power Atlantic Community Committee is of direct and common concern to each member of the Council, it was decided that the future work in this sphere should be transferred to the Council" (Ismay, pp. 191–192).

Lord Ismay reports further on the Lisbon meeting:

"The Council also considered the report of the Atlantic Community Committee. This document, which covered topics ranging from political consultation to the liberalization of trade, from the mobility of labor to cultural relations, did not pretend to be a blueprint for NATO action; but it rendered useful service in sorting out the problems to which the Alliance should devote its attention in the future" (Ismay, p. 47).

Chairman of this Atlantic Community Committee was Hon. Lester Pearson, now Foreign Minister of Canada, and one of the three wise men appointed by NATO in 1956 to work out the implementation of article 2. In 1952 the Pearson Committee reported, according to Lord Ismay, that "little ground had been left untrodden, either in the economic, social, or cultural fields" (Ismay, p. 151).

1952—PARIS

The Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, at Paris, December 15-17, 1952, said in its final communique:

"The council received a progress report by the Secretary General, which outlined the structure of the International Secretariat. It described the work accomplished in the last 8 months by the council, meeting regularly through the permanent civilian and military authorities. It also dealt with the constructure work of the Council's Committee on Civil Defense, and of those concerned with nonmilitary aspects of the Treaty covered by article 2, such as overpopulation and social, cultural, and informational matters" (Ismay, p. 192).

The council also passed the following resolution at the Paris meeting of the North Atlantic Council and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Defense, Economics, and Finance:

"Convinced of the necessity of a continuing review and of an adequate solution of economic problems which face member states, not only to provide the defense effort with a firm foundation but also to promote social progress and the ideals of freedom which are the bases of the North Atlantic Community; and

"Having in mind article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty and the work already initiated within the Organization to give effect to the report of the Committee on the North Atlantic Community, approved by the council at its Lisbon session and particularly as far as overpopulation problems are concerned:

"Agrees that member governments should seek by individual and collective measures to strengthen their political and economic capacities by finding solutions to their problems such as balance of payments, increase of output, internal financial stability and manpower; and that the results of their endeavours should be examined periodically by the council" (1952) (Ismay, p. 194).

THE END OF A PERIOD

Lord Ismay sums up the political achievements of NATO, by 1954:

"The increasing responsibilities assigned to NATO by member governments necessitated the centralization and simplification of the civilian agencies still too complex and scattered despite the measure of coordination already achieved by the Deputies, whose work had been outstanding. Their main triumphs lay in the political field: It was they who practiced and daily developed what might be called the NATO method; that is, the technique whereby the representatives of 12 (later 14) sovereign governments reach unanimous agreement without formal vote. By bringing to bear on their governments the weight of opinion in NATO they assisted the attainment of an agreed common view which normally received the assent of the Council without further ado. For instance, it was largely due to the Deputies that Scandinavian hesitations about the inclusion of Greece and Turkey were overcome; it was they who did the most to obtain agreement on the principle of a German contribution to the defense of the NATO area; and it was they who reached agreement on the financial contribution to be made by governments to NATO military and civilian agencies" (Ismay, p. 48).

Congress has no official access to such agreements on financial contributions to be made by the member governments to NATO military and civilian agencies. Such reports are made to the executive branch, and are classified.

WAR POWERS

NATO has latent powers which may become explicit in time of war or emergency.

Lord Ismay speaks of the need for governments to make extensive preparations, in time of peace, for "the stability of the home front" (p. 142).

This area of operations apparently includes production, raw materials, labor supply, allocation of workers, refugees, and civil defense. Ismay says it is "imperative for partners in any modern alliance to work together in the civilian field." This involves, he says, "the organization and protection of the civil population" and "the direction of civilian activities in time of war" (p. 142).

The NATO Council has a Committee on Civil Organization in Time of War, which has full-time staff members working on "control of mass movements of persons anxious to escape from threatened bombardment," protection of industrial plants and other facilities against sabotage, and medical care, among other problems (p. 143).

NATO has also set up the Planning Board for Ocean Shipping, so that in time of war or emergency (not defined), "the great bulk of ocean-going merchant ships under the flags of NATO countries would be pooled and, for allocation purposes, put at the disposal of an interallied body to be called the Defense Shipping Authority."

This authority will be responsible for "the allocation of ocean-going shipping throughout the whole area controlled by and friendly toward the member governments of NATO, its allies and partners" (Ismay, p. 145).

A large part of American coastal shipping and shipping through the Panama Canal is oceangoing.

Since many NATO members have territory, allies, and dominion partners in Asia, Africa,

and Australia, it is difficult to decide what are the limits of NATO's operating area and its authority in this field.

The Board has been making its plans and choosing key personnel so that it will be fully operative at the outbreak of war.

Control of shipping involves in practice control of highways, railroads and ports. NATO has a planning board for control of these facilities in Europe.

NATO is also at work on plans for control of civilian requirements of imported commodities "on a strict austerity basis" (p. 147).

The Council has set up a Food and Agriculture Planning Committee (including agricultural machinery), a Coal and Steel Planning Committee, and an Industrial Raw Materials Planning Committee (p. 148).

They are at work on drafting the necessary governmental decrees, staff requirements for "preparing the measures in peacetime and operating them in wartime," rationing and preparation of the documents for rationing and price controls, including organization "within each country" (Ismay, p. 148).

FURTHER EXPANSION OF NATO

Secretary of State Dulles recently recommended expansion of NATO to "the totality of its meaning." He said:

"No NATO member, I suppose, wishes to drift into some new and ill-defined relationship which could be provocative of future misunderstandings. But the unanimity of our thinking upon the great basic issues makes it apparent that the time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning.

"The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable and vital instrument of the Atlantic community. But the time has, I believe, come to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generations. If that be the common desire of the NATO member nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring the possibilities which now beckon us forward" (Department of State Bulletin, April 30, 1956, p. 710).

Newspapermen questioned the Secretary of State at his news conferences. Among other points the Secretary stated that the President has the power to conduct foreign relations through whatever persons and means he chooses.

From the transcript of the news conference:

"Question. Mr. Secretary, I believe the United States has always been opposed to the maintenance of political standing groups in NATO as opposed to military groups. Is there any change in that position?

"Answer. Well, the question of whether we make the Atlantic community, through NATO or otherwise, into a body of greater political importance is one of the matters that is being considered. So far there has been no decision by any of the governments concerned to do that. So far, it has been operated primarily as a military alliance, and, while there have been reports from time to time on political matters, those have been primarily for the purpose of keeping the other Ministers informed on matters of interest rather than on the basis of the common position on these matters. We are quite prepared to consider, with an open mind and with the other countries, an evolutionary step which would place greater political responsibility upon representatives of the NATO or the Atlantic community countries.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, do you draw a distinction between NATO and the Atlantic community, when you or the President use those terms? And, if so, what is it, in your mind?

"Answer. There is a difference, I think, in this respect, that NATO is technically a creature of a treaty and that treaty is primarily a military alliance. As far as the treaty itself goes, the provisions of, let's say, article 2 and article 4, which are the two articles which deal with nonmilitary topics, those provisions are rather narrow and rather sketchy. And it may very well be that, if these broader aspects are to be developed, they could be developed through steps which were additional to, or you might say superimposed upon, the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. I do not think we need to be limited by the terms of the treaty, because there is within the President an authority to conduct foreign relations, and to negotiate through persons and by means that he chooses. If he chooses to conduct foreign relations through persons who at the same time are members of the NATO Council, he can do so. In other words, they would in a sense be wearing two hats" (Department of State Bulletin, June 4, 1956, p. 926).

At a news conference, the Secretary was asked:

"Question. Mr. Secretary, on the NATO business, could you say whether you have reached any opinion on whether the NATO treaty, as it now stands, has jurisdiction over political questions, if member countries are willing to commit such questions to NATO for consideration?

"Answer. Well, the NATO Council which exists is not only in the form of occasional meetings by the foreign ministers but, also in the form of a permanent council and does now discuss from time to time political matters. The question is whether or not it is important and desirable and agreeable to all concerned to develop that function. It is a function which to some extent is now used. You may recall that prior to the summit meeting, for example, there was a meeting of the ministers that was especially called for that purpose. And then, prior to the meeting of the foreign ministers that was held at Geneva in October-November, there was a meeting. There have been other meetings which have discussed political problems. So that, if we develop this, it would not be really breaking new ground. It would be developing further the ground that has already been broken.

"Question. Is it clear, sir, that the whole idea, as now considered in developing NATO, is entirely in the political field and not in the economic field? Your remarks would indicate that.

"Answer. Well, I cannot speak except for the United States in that respect. Certainly consideration is being given to development in the economic field, and there are certain respects in which it is hard to draw a clear line between what is political and what is economic. Economic policies are often part of your political machinery; and, to that extent, if there was to be a more full discussion of political policies, that would also embrace, I would assume, the economic policies of the member countries insofar as they concern the treaty area.

"Now, as far as being an operating mechanism in the economic field is concerned, it is the view of the United States that there are enough operating mechanisms there. We have the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), the EPU (European Payments Union), the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), the International Monetary Fund—all of which are operating agencies in the economic or related financial fields. And there would not seem to be much room or occasion to create a new operating agency. As I say, insofar as economic policies are involved as a part of the policies of the member states, those would be embraced within political exchanges of views.

"I want to emphasize that those are just the views of the United States that I am expressing. I don't know what the views of the other members will be" (transcript of Secretary Dulles' news conference) (Department of State Bulletin, June 25, 1956, p. 1069).

NATO AND THE SOVIET UNION

There is nothing in the North Atlantic Treaty, or in the organizational structure of NATO which requires it to oppose communism or restrict the influence of the Soviet Union or its fifth columns. NATO staff members are "international civil servants," not subject to American security requirements.

Mr. Dulles has stated that, at Geneva, in November 1955, the three western powers offered the U. S. S. R. a treaty of assurance, that is, an overall security treaty against "armed aggression."

Unless defined, this could mean that the NATO powers would be committed to assist the Soviet Union, in the event of an armed uprising from within the satellite countries.

Sir Winston Churchill proposed in May 1956 a grand alliance between the western powers and the Soviet Union, if its change since Stalin's death was sincere.

The NATO letter gives the following account:

"On May 10, Sir Winston Churchill was presented at Aachen with the Charlemagne Prize, for his services to Europe. In his speech of thanks, he said that the main theme of salvation should be the grand alliance between the European powers, the United States, and the British Commonwealth. Russia and the Eastern European States should not be excluded, and this could lead to the solution of grave issues such as the reunification of Germany.

"Much had happened, said Sir Winston, since he last visited Germany to attend the Potsdam conference in 1945. The Soviet Union had pursued a policy dividing her from her wartime allies. Then had followed the historic reconciliation between the United States and the Commonwealth, on the one hand, and West Germany on the other hand, and the formation of NATO. The North Atlantic Treaty, in which Germany was a partner, was a solemn affirmation of the unity of Europe.

"One of the supreme duties and privileges of France, Sir Winston Churchill went on to say, was to bury all bitterness and lead Germany back by the hand into the European family. The French contribution to European unity was very large, and the German reception of it had been invaluable.

"NATO itself was a very striking product. It was the expression of a world wearied of war and determined to build its own organization in such strength and power that there would be peace henceforward. The principle was simple and majestic: We all joined hands and swore to fight the aggressor whoever he might be. A new question, however, had been raised by the recent Russian repudiation of Stalin. If it were sincere, we had a new Russia to deal with, and if this were so he did not see why the new Russia should not join in the spirit of this solemn agreement.

"We must realize, Sir Winston Churchill said, how deep and sincere were Russian anxieties about the safety of her homeland from foreign invasion. In a true unity of Europe, Russia must have her part, and he was glad to see that Poland was already not unaffected by the recent changes in the Russian outlook. Other changes might follow. Czechoslovakia might recover her freedom. Above all, he added, Germany will be reunited.

"Sir Winston Churchill said it would be rash and blameworthy to attempt to solve the problem of European unity, of which German reunification was a vital part, by any violent stroke; the only unity that might come from violence would be a unity of ashes and death. It would be equally fatal for NATO to relax and let apathy overtake what had been achieved in the past 7 years, but he did not regard NATO as the sole effective expression of the moves towards European unity. No one could doubt the usefulness

of the Western European Union, the OEEC, the Coal and Steel Community, and the Council of Europe, but he believed that the main theme of salvation should be the grand alliance of European powers, linked with the United States, Canada, and other members of the British Commonwealth.

"The spirit of this arrangement should not exclude Russia and the Eastern European States. 'It may well be that the great issues which perplex us, of which one of the gravest is the reunification of Germany, could then be solved more easily than they can by rival blocs confronting each other with suspicion and hostility,' he said.

"In view of the interest which attaches to any remark of Sir Winston Churchill it is important to bear in mind exactly what he said in this context. This was that if the recent repudiation of Stalin by Soviet leaders was sincere he did not see why 'the new Russia should not join in the spirit of this solemn agreement' (that is, the North Atlantic Treaty).

"This is very far from saying that the U. S. S. R. should soon be invited to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty. M. Molotov, it will be recalled, suggested this at the Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers in 1954. There are, however, at present insuperable objections to Russia joining NATO. As Mr. Harold Macmillan, then United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, said at the Geneva meeting of Foreign Ministers in Geneva last October:

" 'The answer to this is made plain by the wording of the NATO Treaty itself. NATO is a system of States, sharing common aims and views. Unfortunately, it has not yet been possible for the members to establish common aims and views with the Soviet Union. Therefore, we cannot accept the membership of the Soviet Union in our organization; for since all the decisions of NATO must be unanimous we should be giving the right of veto to a State pursuing different aims and ends. It may not always be true, but we have to face the facts as they are' " (NATO letter, June 1, 1956, pp. 11–12).

STATE DEPARTMENT COMMENT ON THE CHURCHILL PROPOSAL WAS GENERALLY FAVORABLE

"Sir Winston Churchill has stated that, 'if' the Russian repudiation of Stalin is sincere, we have a new Russia to deal with and that, if so, there is no reason why the new Russia should not join in the spirit of the solemn agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty to fight the aggressor, whoever he may be. Sir Winston went on to say that 'that is for the future' and that in the meanwhile we should go forward toward that future by reinforcing patiently and surely the arrangements which we have so far achieved. He also spoke of the vital need for German reunification.

"The first suggestion of Sir Winston is in accord with the proposal which the three western Foreign Ministers made to the Soviet Union at Geneva on October 27, 1955, during the consideration of the linked problems of European security and the reunification of Germany. In this connection, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States proposed a 'treaty of assurance' which contemplated reciprocal renunciation of force and withholding of support from aggressors and an agreement that armed attack in Europe would endanger the peace and security and that all parties would then take appropriate action to meet the common danger. This proposal has never been accepted by the Soviet Union, even as a basis for discussion.

"Sir Winston's second suggestion for 'reinforcing' the arrangements which we now have is a welcome support for the action taken at last week's meeting of the NATO Ministerial Council, which established a committee of three of the Foreign Ministers to study ways and means to improve and extend NATO cooperation in nonmilitary fields and to develop their unity within the Atlantic community.

"The United States welcomes the spirit and substance of Sir Winston's important address on these points" (State Department Bulletin, May 21, 1956, pp. 837–8).

The press questioned Secretary Dulles on the proposal at his news conference:

"Question. Mr. Secretary, last week, as you know, Mr. Churchill made a suggestion that under certain conditions Russia ought to be included in a kind of expanded NATO. And I believe that was the same day that you testified something to the effect that in 10 years or so we might hope to look on the Russians as more respectable citizens. Could you comment first on Winston Churchill's proposal and, second, spell out a little bit more what you meant by your remark?

"Answer. I read quite carefully the full text of what Sir Winston Churchill said, and it seemed to me that he was saying in effect much the same thing which the three western powers had said last November at the Geneva Conference where we met with the Soviet Foreign Minister. At that time we proposed, as part of the European settlement which would bring about the reunification of Germany, that there should be some kind of overall security treaty which would engage the members of NATO, or certain of them, and certain powers on the other side to a comprehensive agreement which would assure that, in the event of armed aggression of any one against the other, we would all stand against the aggressor. That proposal was made by us with the British and the French at the Geneva Conference last November. And, as I say, I interpreted Sir Winston Churchill's remarks as being in essence a repetition of the thought and spirit of those remarks.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, is it correct to interpret the sense of your comments on Mr. Churchill's remarks as being that at Geneva we proposed to the Soviet Union that she participate in a European collective security or European nonaggression pact, that Churchill was at Aachen repeating that proposition or the sense of it, and that the United States is still backing such an invitation of the Soviet Union; that is, to enter a collective nonaggression pact and to come into NATO?

"Answer. I do not want to say whether or not what Churchill said was consciously based upon what had been said at Geneva. It may have been, quite likely was, his own spontaneous thinking. What I pointed out was that it was quite parallel with what we had done at that time. We had proposed what was called then a Treaty of Assurance to cover all of the essential parts of Europe and containing mutual guaranties, consultations, and the like. The United States is still adhering to that position.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, let me clarify that. I want to understand it completely. Churchill, I understood, at Aachen—that is the impression I had—urged that Russia be included in the NATO alliance. Is that the American position? Is that what we are saying?

"Answer. I do not think that Churchill proposed the inclusion of Russia in the NATO alliance. I think that what he proposed was that the Soviet Union should support the principles of the NATO alliance" (State Department Bulletin, May 28, 1956, pp. 884–886).

Additional comment on such an agreement was made by the Honorable Livingston T. Merchant, Ambassador to Canada:

"I honestly believe that some day the Soviets will understand and accept this fact. So far they have refused to, and they continue to direct their efforts to destroy NATO and divide its members one from the other. These efforts are more subtle than they once were. There is, however, no evidence that their long-term purpose and objective of world domination has been abandoned. The shifting tactics of international communism, however, require that we members of the North Atlantic alliance consider in what ways we can develop further our alliance in the interest of expanding cooperation in areas other than the military. The latter has rightly held the priority since the treaty was signed. Behind the defensive military shield which has been erected there are now the opportunity and the need to strengthen the relationship under the treaty in other directions. At the ministerial council meeting in Paris last month it was agreed that a committee of three Foreign Ministers should advise 'on ways and means to improve and extend NATO cooperation in nonmilitary fields and to develop greater unity within the Atlantic Community.' Fittingly, your distinguished Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, was one of the three Foreign Ministers selected by the Council for this task.

"Just as the United States believes that its security can best be assured by collective security arrangements, so also do we believe that no opportunity should be overlooked for peaceful negotiations to seek just settlements of the great issues which divide the Communist and the free world. In the past 3 or 4 years I have myself participated in literally months of negotiations with the Soviets, in company with the British and the French—at Berlin in 1954, at Geneva in the spring and summer of the same year, at Vienna in May 1955, at San Francisco a year ago, again at Geneva at the summit conference last July, and once more at Geneva last fall.

"Our fundamental policy is clear and simple—to join with our friends in measures to assure our common defenses in the face of a threat and yet to avoid no opportunity to seek peaceful solutions through negotiations" (State Department Bulletin, July 9, 1956, p. 57).

NATO CULTURAL AND PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

Activities designed to reshape public opinion were developed side by side with more tangible activities, in the first 5 years, and are increasing rapidly as emphasis on the civil powers of NATO increases.

NATO educational and propaganda activities have been carried on through all the standard media of mass communications—press, radio, moving pictures, teachers' conferences, international summer camps, information polls, and the rest.

Lord Ismay mentions, in the earlier period, the following activities of the Information Division, among others.

1. Tours of journalists.
2. Fifth anniversary coverage in radio, television, film, and press.
3. NATO Caravan of Peace.
4. Films.
5. NATO letter, handbook, picture book.
6. Briefings (including the United States National Defense College and "several groups of parliamentarians," and various pro-NATO organizations).

Over 100,000 copies of the NATO handbook are distributed every year.

"Some 250,000 copies of (the 'simple picture book') aimed at the schools and the armed forces, have been published in all languages of the member countries," said Lord Ismay in 1954 (Ismay, pp. 155, 156).

Troop information and what is called "military community relations" are high on the agenda. Here as elsewhere NATO emphasizes "coordination" and lets national agencies carry out the approved programs. This "solar system" of propaganda agencies has, says Ismay, "resulted in a marked increase both in the volume of troop information exchanged between countries and in the space given to NATO in national publications for the armed forces" (Ismay, p. 157).

NATO is also deeply interested in influencing the opinion of members of the parliaments of member countries.

NATO also has a planetary system of voluntary agencies helping to spread its views. These include organizations working for an Atlantic Community. An Atlantic Community Study Conference has met periodically.

NATO encourages support by voluntary societies. Ismay says, "The value of such spontaneous enterprises would be diminished if they became too closely linked with either NATO or member governments" (Ismay, p. 158).

Speaking in 1954, Ismay says NATO's information activities "demand the most patient and careful tending" because people "will be prepared to support further cooperation under the Treaty only when they are convinced that, as cooperation has increased their security, so it can increase their well-being" (Ismay, pp. 158, 159).

"Should the risk of aggression become less pressing than it is today," he continues, "it may be discovered that article 2 is the real battlefield."

Subsequent activities give evidence of the widening sphere of NATO information and propaganda activities since 1954.

The themes include:

1. The Atlantic Community.
2. Our common heritage.
3. We cannot stand alone.

The theme of "elements of strength" was developed by Mrs. Eleanor Dulles, of the State Department, as follows:

"The immediate question before us is to discern the elements of strength and try to increase them.

"The first of these lessons we have learned in recent years, as I see it, is that no nation can stand alone. Many have seen the handwriting on the wall and have shaped their national policy along lines of cooperation and mutual support. The North Atlantic Treaty countries are obvious illustrations.

"The second lesson in how to increase our strength is to realize that what we do locally in our own work and in our education and cultural activities makes a difference. This is a point of view that requires thought as to how our daily tasks conform to our accepted principles as a nation, whether we personally are in line with the policy of our Nation among nations. This takes us into the matters of foreign economic and financial relations. It requires an extension of our professional and business activities beyond the local scene and calls for seeing our own lives in a world setting.

"It is hard for us to realize that what is done in our local communities affects our international position.

"Recently this connection has been made very close. Impressions regarding our civic standard, the maintenance of order, the pursuit of justice, and the development of education in its broadest sense are of incalculable importance. In all these things we play a daily part. Our lives mirrored by press and movies, reported by visitors, and finding expression as we deal with persons from other lands shape foreign policy. It is the essence of our democracy that this should be so. We cannot escape these facts. We have shaped our Government and chosen our systems or national life along these lines. We as individuals are representatives of our nations. By our actions will the meaning of our national policy be judged" (Department of State Bulletin, July 9, 1956, p. 62 ff.).

The theme of "a common heritage" was developed by Deputy Under Secretary of State Murphy, at a symposium on NATO, sponsored by the College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, at Norfolk, Va., on April 2, 1956, in the following words:

"According to the 1950 census, there were wore than 33 million people living in the United States who either were born abroad or had parents born abroad. Of this number, nearly half came from the 14 other NATO countries. Of the remainder of our population, an even larger percentage can trace their ancestry back to one of the NATO nations.

"We Americans have developed over the years a political and constitutional structure that is peculiarly our own. But its basic principles, including representative authority, and guaranties of human and property rights, had European origins. Most of our European allies, despite varying political structures, still govern themselves under these basic principles. In simple terms, we and our allies share a devotion to the concepts of human freedom and political liberty. These concepts are what set the free nations apart in the world today.

"A look at the content of our educational program shows even more concretely our common heritage with Western and Southern Europe. Here at William and Mary, the second oldest university in the country and one of our best, we find as in other American universities numerous studies in literature, science, art, and the social sciences. If we forget for a moment the portion of this accumulated knowledge that has been produced by the minds and hands of our own countrymen, we will quickly recognize that the greatest part of the remainder has come from the NATO countries of Europe" (Department of State Bulletin, April 16, 1956, p. 645 ff.).

Skillfully planned efforts are being directed especially at teachers and students.

Fellowships are one instrument:

"The Department of State announced on April 4 that M. Margaret Ball, professor of political science, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., is the United States winner of one of the 11 NATO research fellowships offered by the North Atlantic Council. Simultaneous announcement of the award was made at NATO headquarters in Paris.

"The NATO Fellowship and Scholarship Program was announced last July in implementation of article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which provides for cooperation in nonmilitary fields. It is designed to promote the study of historical, political, constitutional, legal, social, cultural, linguistic, economic, and strategic problems which will reveal the common heritage and historical experience of the Atlantic countries, as well as the present needs and future development of the North Atlantic area considered as a community." (Department of State Bulletin, April 16, 1956, p. 649).

International study conferences are another among the many tools for forming the opinions of teachers and students.

"A study conference on 'The Role of the School in the Atlantic Community' will be held at the Palais de Chaillot from September 3 to 7, 1956. It is being organized by the Atlantic Treaty Association in collaboration with the NATO International Staff.

"The purpose of the conference is to consider the best means of promoting in schools greater knowledge of the international structure of the world today, including the Atlantic Community, the organizations serving it, and the peoples composing it.

"Membership of the conference will be limited to persons nominated by the official education authorities, or such other authorities as Governments may designate in the 15 States signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty. They will necessarily include representatives of certain Provinces, Laender, or States in the three Federal countries concerned, Canada, the German Federal Republic, and the United States of America.

"The reason for this decision, which has been approved by NATO, is that the ATA considers it necessary, as a first step toward obtaining the cooperation of teachers and of increasing the intelligent interest of boys and girls in the Atlantic Community on any considerable scale throughout the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, to secure the active support of the highest educational authorities.

"In order to insure genuine discussion, the membership of the conference will be limited to a maximum of six members for each national delegation, even allowing for the Federal States. It will be for the national authorities to decide whether they will send officials from the central or other educational administrations, inspectors or experienced heads of schools, or one or two of each.

"Schools, for the purposes of this conference, are understood to mean educational establishments below university level. The majority of young citizens in all the allied countries do not receive a university education. It is with the problem of increasing the standard of knowledge of certain essential facts of international life within that majority of the younger generation, as well as among boys and girls proposing to go to universities, that the conference will be concerned.

"The subject matter of the conference will be divided under four headings:

"1. Civic Education in the School: The Facts of International Life.

"2. Civic Education in the School: The Free Institutions of the Atlantic Nations.

"3. Mutual Understanding and Friendship Within the Atlantic Community.

"4. Practical Aids to Teachers." (NATO letter, July 1, 1956, p. 25 ff.)

The size and range of information activities are determined in part by the funds available.

It is not possible to trace what funds are available for NATO information activities, from United States tax sources.

Secretary Dulles testified on May 28, 1956, in connection with congressional hearings on the State Department budget, and especially on a cut in new funds for press officers for international organizations:

"The House reduced our request for this appropriation by $328,410. Three hundred thousand of this amount is of particular interest to me and to our efforts in redesigning the objectives of NATO, with emphasis on cultural aspects as well as military."

The closing of one channel of financing by Congress does not, however, mean that others were closed.

The executive branch can allocate funds from other appropriations, such as "Presidential funds," or assign any personnel from executive agencies, to serve on the staffs of international agencies.

There are so many channels through which financial support could be piped from American Government resources to NATO or other international agencies that no estimate would have any meaning.

A Graduated Corporate Income Tax Would Prevent the Growth of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging problems facing the country today is how small business can best be strengthened. Small business is the backbone of our economy. Its continued vitality is essential to our economic health. The fact that this Congress has done so little in this regard is a matter for widespread concern.

Most discussions of the small-business problem center around proposals for tax relief of various kinds. Actually, the difficulties confronting the small-business man arise from many different sources, and the tax structure is not solely responsible. The difficulty of obtaining new capital, advertising costs, the high price of labor—all of these and many others contribute to the small-business problem.

However, I certainly recognize that tax policy plays an important role in this area. Indeed, in 1954, the Republican 83d Congress enacted a number of new tax provisions which had long been recommended as particularly desirable from the standpoint of small business. Depreciation allowances were substantially liberalized for purchases of new plant and equipment. Greater freedom of action was granted to small companies to retain their earnings for their own business purposes without penalty. More realistic accounting provisions were adopted. These are but a few of the tax benefits provided by the Republican 83d Congress for small business. Again, I say that it is unfortunate that the Democratic 84th Congress has not compiled a similar record of accomplishment. True, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk here and shaking of heads about the plight of small business. However, these protestations of sympathy have been singularly unaccompanied by any constructive action.

One of the plans which has been advanced in this Congress for the alleged relief of small business consists of a graduated corporation income tax. Such a proposal, if enacted, would pronounce a death sentence to the American free-enterprise system. Normally, Mr. Speaker, it would not even be necessary to dignify such an unsound scheme by serious consideration. However, there is no question but that it has a certain superficial appeal to some businessmen, and for this reason, I believe it to be essential that the proposal be examined with the utmost care. A failure to understand its implications could lead to tragic results.

The present corporation income tax is made up of two parts. A so-called normal tax of 30 percent applies to all of a corporation's taxable income. In addition, a so-called surtax of 22 percent applies to that portion of a corporation's taxable income which is in excess of $25,000. In effect, therefore, there is a surtax exemption amounting to $25,000. Such an exemption has been contained in the law for many years as a special provision for small business. On the other hand, while a system of graduated or progressive corporation income-tax rates has been suggested from time to time, it has always been rejected by responsible individuals as completely unsound. Such a system has never been considered seriously by any of the tax committees of the Congress.

In order to appreciate the basic fallacy of this proposal, it is necessary to understand that the corporate tax burden is borne primarily by the individual stockholders who own and in fact constitute the particular corporation. As a result, in determining the taxpaying ability of a given business entity, it is essential that one look beyond the mere amount of its income. It is necessary to determine also the number of its stockholders or other owners and the amount of their individual investments. Suppose that one corporation has an income of $100,000 and has 10 owners, each having invested one-tenth of the capital of the business. Now, take the example of another corporation with only $10,000 of income but, by the same token, with only one owner. Under the theory of a graduated corporation income tax, each of the owners of the first corporation would be called upon to bear a substantially higher burden of taxation with regard to his share of the corporate income than would the single owner of the second corporation, even though the actual dollar amounts of their proportionate shares of the income are identical.

Let us look at it in another way. Let us take the case of two elderly individuals, each of whom has managed to save $10,000. One of these individuals invests his $10,000 in a large corporation, and the second invests his $10,000 in a smaller corporation. Under a graduated corporation income tax, the first individual would bear a proportionately heavier tax burden than would the second. I challenge any one to show me any justification, either in logic or in equity, for such a discriminatory tax system.

One of the unfortunate aspects of this proposal is that it is apt to have a superficial appeal to some small-business men. I can only say, in this regard, that their acceptance of such a fallacious and dangerous doctrine would be very shortsighted at best. The benefits of a graduated tax would prove completely illusory.

Every small-business man is ambitious to expand his business. That is as it should be. It is that very competitive urge which has made our free-enterprise system great and which has brought to the American people an abundance of goods and a way of life which are the envy of the world. However, adoption of a graduated corporation tax system would spell the doom of that system and its benefits.

Look at what would happen under such a system. The enterprising small-business man who develops a new product and thereby increases his earnings will immediately be penalized by a higher rate of tax. Should he develop more efficient methods of production or marketing, he would immediately pay the price in higher tax rates. If he expands his capacity through better machinery or by larger plant facilities, he will be punished for his enterprise by higher tax rates.

Therefore, small-business men who support a graduated corporate income tax are in reality digging their own graves. They seek tax relief, and properly so, in order to permit their businesses to grow and expand. What they forget is this—under a graduated tax system, the moment that their companies do in fact grow bigger, they will be slapped down by a higher rate of tax. In other words, the scheme contains a "built-in" mechanism designed to prevent the growth of small business. As a result, it is in reality an anti-small-business proposal. Advanced as a panacea for the ills of small business, the proposal has sinister implications for the entire economic system. It is the very antithesis of all that has made American enterprise strong and vigorous. Mr. Speaker, when Karl Marx declared that the graduated income tax could be relied upon to destroy the capitalistic system, he must have had a plan very similar to this in mind.

I am convinced that we can develop a constructive tax policy designed to strengthen small business and to foster its growth. On May 31, 1956, President Eisenhower appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business. I am confident that this Committee will be instrumental in developing a vigorous, forward-looking program. I am likewise confident that this Republican program will be designed to encourage the growth of small business and not to stifle and paralyze small business as would proposals such as that for a graduated corporation income tax.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point a copy of President Eisenhower's letter of May 31, 1956, to Chairman Arthur Burns, establishing the Cabinet Committee on Small Business:

MAY 31, 1956.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The important contributions made by small business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use. Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons, Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

The Federal Government has a number of programs now in operation that are significantly helpful to small business.

The Department of Commerce helps constantly in the solution of management problems for small business through its Office of Technical Services, Office of Area Development, Business and Defense Services Administration, and Office of Business Economics.

Financial assistance is available to small concerns through the Small Business Administration.

Jointly with the Department of Defense and with other Federal departments and agencies, the Small Business Administration assists small concerns in obtaining Government procurement contracts.

Many small construction companies and related businesses benefit from the home-financing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Office of Defense Mobilization seeks to strengthen the production potential of small firms in our defense programs.

Through its enforcement of antitrust laws, the Department of Justice helps maintain the competitive environment that is essential to the Nation's economic welfare.

These and other programs and policies of the Federal Government facilitate the establishment of new concerns and foster the growth of small businesses. Yet the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial

hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small businesses should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance.

To this end I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as chairman. By copies of this letter I am designating the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as members. Other department and agency heads will participate on an ad hoc basis as may be deemed desirable. The committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small businesses and to foster their sound development.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

President Eisenhower's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the primary objective of every American should be to continue our effort for permanent peace, progress, and prosperity for all segments of our economy, including agriculture and small business. Prosperity secured through another war and inflation will only bring economic disaster and loss of American lives and resources.

The 84th Congress is about to close, and I believe that it is appropriate for me to briefly discuss some of the major proposals which have been enacted into law after originating in my Committee on Agriculture. The production of food is a basic industry and the most vital to every person. As a member of this committee, I have always believed in and worked for a strong and prosperous agriculture. I definitely feel that this policy is for the benefit of our Nation's economy.

A careful survey of the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress discloses that success or failure of the men and women engaged in business, profession, and labor, depends to a great degree on a strong and active purchasing power by the farm families in the trade area. It is estimated that in many cities and villages, the buying power of the farmers represents from 40 to 90 percent of the business done in the particular community. While I have diligently worked for policies and laws to assure a prosperous agriculture, I have also worked with the same degree of vigilance for the success of small business and other occupations.

This Congress has approved nearly all of the proposals made by President Eisenhower in his nine-point farm program, which are listed as follows:

First. We have approved the President's soil-bank plan and authorized $1.2 billion a year for this program.

Second. We have strengthened the surplus disposal and commodity programs.

Third. Enacted the Great Plains program.

Fourth. Provided additional funds for agricultural research.

Fifth. Enacted new farm credit legislation.

Sixth. Approved a law providing for a refund of taxes on farm-used gasoline.

Seventh. Enacted laws to improve the soil and water conservation programs.

Eighth. We have enacted many other laws, including the interstate highway program, social security, and legislation relating to the general welfare which have been approved by the President to the benefit of all the people.

In addition, President Eisenhower, by Executive directive, increased the support price of soybeans to $2.15 a bushel, and flaxseed to $3.09 a bushel, which meant an additional income in 1956 of more than $1 million to the farmers of my district in Minnesota.

President Eisenhower, also by Executive directive, increased the support price on manufactured milk by 10 cents per hundred pounds, and the support price on butterfat to 58.6 cents a pound. This meant an additional income to the dairy farmers of my district of approximately $1,600,000 for the year 1956.

The President also established the support price for corn on allocated acreage at $1.50 a bushel, and $1.25 a bushel for corn grown in excess of the acreage allotment. He also increased the minimum support price of wheat to $2 a bushel. The action taken by the President on corn and wheat approximated additional income for the farmers in the First District by over $2 million for the crop year 1956.

The soil bank proposal as submitted by the President is undoubtedly the first realistic approach to reducing the production of surplus basic commodities, including wheat and corn, ever passed by Congress. As a member of the conference committee on the farm bill, I helped write the soil-bank proposal. I wanted to see it tried out although I had some doubt as to whether or not it would be of any direct value to the small farmers who work on restricted acreage and use most of their production to feed their livestock and poultry. I hope that the plan will work and that it will be both a direct and indirect benefit to all of the farmers whether or not they place acreage into the soil bank. It seems to me, that the reduction in tillable acreage should materially raise the price level of all farm commodities, and narrow the price squeeze which is so apparent today to every farmer. I do not favor the destruction of food or growing crops, and I hope that when the program goes into effect for 1957, it can be put into operation before any crops are planted.

It will be of interest to note the participation in the acreage reserve program for 1956. I am showing in the following tabulation the participation in the soil-bank program by counties in the First District.

The 1956 acreage reserve signup in the 1st Congressional District of Minnesota

County	Number of corn agreements	Acres	Amount paid to farmers
Dodge	229	2,254.9	$98,022.30
Fillmore [1]	435	4,092.9	179,675.85
Freeborn [2]	380	3,698.4	168,550.47
Goodhue [3]	391	2,977.0	141,299.30
Houston [4]	267	1,988.9	92,995.01
Mower [5]	524	5,717.0	237,784.92
Olmsted [6]	406	4,686.5	213,063.95
Rice [7]	409	3,610.7	159,186.57
Steele [8]	151	1,671.6	79,424.73
Wabasha [9]	216	2,122.0	99,166.66
Waseca [10]	262	2,783.5	133,773.24
Winona	162	1,368.0	62,527.30
Total	3,832	36,971.4	1,665,470.30

[1] Fillmore: 12 tobacco acreage agreements were accepted.
[2] Freeborn: 1 wheat agreement was accepted.
[3] Goodhue: 18 wheat agreements were accepted.
[4] Houston: 4 wheat agreements and 8 tobacco agreements were accepted.
[5] Mower: 2 wheat agreements were accepted.
[6] Olmsted: 4 wheat agreements were accepted.
[7] Rice: 3 wheat agreements were accepted.
[8] Steele: 1 wheat agreement was accepted.
[9] Wabasha: 5 wheat agreements were accepted.
[10] Waseca: 3 wheat agreements were accepted.

231 acres, involving 41 wheat agreements, were placed in the acreage reserve, for which payments of approximately $4,600 will be made.

33 acres, involving 20 tobacco-producing agreements, were placed in the acreage reserve, for which payments of approximately $5,300 will be made.

The recent boost in wages on account of the steel strike will further widen the price spread which is affecting all consumers, and the farmers in particular. This wage increase has largely set the pattern for other manufacturers to follow. It all means that consumers will have to pay more for the necessary things that they are required to buy. It is my hope that this question can be dealt with in the next session of Congress without disturbing the economy of our country.

The House Committee on Agriculture has considered more than 800 bills. We have heard hundreds of witnesses, including representatives of the leading farm organizations, and officials from the Department of Agriculture. Considering the wide diversity of views and opinions, it has not been an easy problem to deal with the agricultural subject. It is the hope of most members of our committee that the day is not far distant when Government controls will not be necessary in any degree and that the farmers can secure full parity prices in the open market.

Legislation of Interest to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to summarize the legislation which has been before the Congress which is of special interest to the veterans of the United States.

The veterans of America were shocked a few months ago when the Bradley Commission filed its report. The Bradley report, as it is referred to, apparently recommended material changes in the relationship between the Government and veterans, changes in the policy which has existed since the very beginning of our country. I had visits, calls and letters from veterans throughout my district expressing fear that the Bradley report would adversely affect their pension or compensation or hospitalization or would generally change their rights as a veteran. I explained to them that this Bradley report is merely the opinion of the Bradley Commission and has no force or effect unless Congress would pass legislation in conformity with its recommendations. I was perhaps especially interested in this report and the effects it might have for I have served as post service officer of both my American Legion and VFW posts. I have also served as veterans' service officer of my hometown.

I am especially happy to point out that Congress has not put into effect or attempted to put into effect the Bradley Commission recommendations. On the contrary, the House of Representatives has passed an unusual amount of legislation this year which is favorable to veterans. However, most of this legislation has not become law as the Senate has not acted on it.

Both the House and the Senate passed 14 laws for the benefit of veterans in the last session of Congress which have been signed by the President. In addition, the House passed 14 bills, many of them in the latter part of the session, which were not acted on by the Senate before adjournment. Notable among these bills were H. R. 7886, H. R. 2867, and H. R. 12038. H. R. 7886, which is commonly called the World War I veterans' pension, would have presumed World War I veterans at the age of 65 to be totally disabled for pension purposes. The veteran less than 65 years of age would have received $75 per month; if more than 65 years of age, or if he had drawn a pension for 10 continuous years, he would have received $90 per month. There were several other increases in this legislation. However, there was an income limitation for this total non-service-connected disability which would have prevented its being drawn if the single veteran earned more than $1,400 per year or if the married veteran earned more than $2,700 per year.

H. R. 2867 was passed by the House which would have increased the pension to widows of Spanish American War veterans to $75 per month.

H. R. 12038 would have increased the compensation for service-connected disabilities by 10 percent and more than that in some cases. It is regrettable that these three bills, H. R. 7886, H. R. 2867, and H. R. 12038, and 11 other similar but less extensive bills which were passed by the House, did not receive action in the Senate. This legislation, however, will be considered by the new Congress which will convene in January.

The veterans hospital program is making commendable progress. Today I doubt if there are any hospitals in the country which give better service than do the veterans hospitals. They are now engaged in a modernization program which will take several years to finish. There is a shortage of veterans hospitals, but we are trying to get caught up on that shortage. One difficulty, of course, is that in the past hospitals were often constructed without regard to the patient load in that area or as to the availability of doctors and technicians in the vicinity to staff the hospitals. That fault is being remedied and the new hospitals are being placed with a better view of the patient need and the medical service availability. We are working toward getting adequate facilities in Indiana. There is a special need for mental hospitals for veterans throughout the country.

A few years ago there was some difficulty encountered in getting appropriations through Congress to adequately take care of the veterans' pensions, compensation, and hospital needs. However, no difficulty was encountered this year.

The loan guaranty provisions of the GI bill of rights were extended by the Congress. In general, veterans legislation, except for the measures which I have mentioned above, received fair treatment at the hands of Congress.

There are other measures in which veterans are especially interested—those dealing with our country's defense. I believe our defense program is progressing satisfactorily and will adequately take care of our needs, yet will not place an undue burden on the American family and taxpayer.

There is a feeling that recent decisions of the Supreme Court have taken away from the American people proper protection from disloyal persons. I am not questioning the legality of these decisions but the job with which the country is confronted is that if existing laws are unconstitutional or did not properly cover the problems involved, then it is the duty of the Congress to pass additional laws to adequately protect us against disloyalty and subversion. At the close of Congress there was legislation being considered in several of these fields. If needed, they probably will receive favorable consideration in the next Congress which will convene in January.

Patterson Reports to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with intense gratification that I am able to report to the working men and women of my district on the tremendous advances made on their behalf under the leadership of Republicans in Congress and the Federal Government.

During the past 3½ years—as it has been during my entire 10 years in Congress—it has given me great satisfaction to work for those measures which were in the best interest of the American laborer.

Now the fruits of those labors are becoming more and more evident in the rapid flowering of benefits for all Americans, and particularly for the men and women who work with their hands.

And as the results of our work flow into the paychecks and the homes of the American laborer, our Nation is experiencing a shift of opinion on the part of working population with respect to political parties. In a very short span of years, the Democrat claim to be the only party working for the good of laboring groups in this country has been thoroughly debunked. In recent weeks, public opinion polls show sentiment among unionized workers shifting to Republican candidates. More and more union leaders are coming to the conclusion first expressed by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, that "right now we never had it so good."

On June 13, James C. Petrillo, head of the 25,000-member American Federation of Musicians and a lifelong Democrat, told a convention in Atlantic City that he had never talked to any man "as friendly and understanding about our problems as President Eisenhower."

The reason for increasing labor satisfaction with what we have done during the past few years is not hard to find. I have no hesitancy in saying that our record of achievements for the workingman is one of the great phenomena of the decade. It is fairly screamed by every statistic available to Government and private research organizations.

For example, employment—that vital take-home pay factor so essential to the working men and women—smashed all existing records in 1955. An average of 63,200,000 persons were employed and that figure is 4,500,000 more than in the last peacetime year under the Democrats. What is more, the level of jobs is even better in 1956. In May, a total of 65 million Americans had jobs and this means 3 million more jobs were held during the first quarter of 1956 than during any first quarter under the Democrats—even in war periods.

As you all know, the coal industry was having very rough sledding when the Republicans first took office. Now, almost unnoticed in the tremendous tide of events, that industry is staging such a dramatic comeback that L. C. Campbell, president of the National Coal Association, told that organization's 39th annual meeting on June 13 that coal "may well be entering its golden years."

This optimism stems from several developments of importance. One is the fact that under Republican policies, exports of bituminous and anthracite coal and coke are running at an annual rate which may make 1956 the highest year in history. Another is that the Republican atomic energy development program is producing a great demand. W. Kenneth Davis, reactor development director for the Atomic Energy Program, said the demand for coal will run well ahead of the demand for other fuels in the next 20 years.

During 1955, unemployment in all industries and fields of endeavor averaged less than 2,700,000—nearly three-quarters of a million below the last peacetime year when the Democrats were in control of Congress and the Government. The three GOP years from 1952 through 1955 averaged less unemployment than Truman's last term despite a nearly 3 million increase in the civil labor force in those years and despite the fact that two-and-a-half of the Truman years were war years.

At the same time, under the prosperity which we have developed, both hourly and weekly wages are at all-time record highs—averaging nearly 13 percent higher in peacetime 1955 than in wartime 1952. The average hourly pay of factory workers was $1.88 compared with $1.67; weekly wages were $76.61 compared with $69.97.

And this increase in take-home pay under the policies which we have adopted is continuing during 1956. I would remind you also that during the last 3 years under the Democrat Truman administration, the dollar bill lost 12 cents, or nearly one-eighth of its buying power through inflation. In the 3 Republican years, the inflation rate was cut to three-fourths of 1 cent.

Combined with lower taxes voted by us in the Republican 83d Congress, this means that labor's average take-home pay, adjusted for cost-of-living changes, was up 13 percent in 1955 over 1952 for the single worker. It was up 10 percent for the average family man with a wife and two children.

Added to this is the fact that, during the Republican years, our working men and women lost less time at work because of strikes. In 1955, for example, strike losses were down 53 percent from the last year under President Truman. During the 7 Truman years after World War II, the average man-days idle were 93 percent greater than in the 3 Republican years.

More directly, we of the Republican Party raised the minimum wage for the Nation's workers to $1 an hour. This affected more than 2 million workers and indirectly aided millions more through its great impact on general wage levels and purchasing power.

In another highly important sphere we tightened up the enforcement of the labor standards laws. The Republicans undertook 1,143 enforcement actions in 3 years. This compared with only 476 actions in the last 3 years of the Truman administration. More than $6 million in back wages due under the Fair Labor Standards Act were paid to over 80,000 employees by 15,000 firms following the Labor Department's investigations last year alone.

At the same time, the Republican campaign to encourage the employment of physically handicapped workers, helped 250,000 of our less fortunate members of the working force to obtain gainful employment.

During our stewardship of the Federal Government, the Republicans also recognized the need for some changes and refinements in the Taft-Hartley law. Consequently, President Eisenhower submitted 14 proposed improvements, covering such subjects as secret strike ballots, non-Communist oaths, strike settlement recommendations, contract reopening, welfare funds, injunctions, check-offs, and free speech.

However, the President's program was defeated by the solid vote of 46 Democrat Senators and no Taft-Hartley revision program has come from the Democrat 84th Congress.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Republicans have more than kept their pledge to do everything possible to better the lot of the American working men and women. It is true, as Mr. Meany has said, that American workingmen have never had it so good. But, we Republicans feel that they can and will have it a lot better. If our policies are permitted to be carried through to fruition, American labor will enjoy the fruits of more leisure, higher pay, better goods and services at less cost. In fact, the working men and women of America will benefit more than any other single group.

Edwin F. Ladd, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the late Senator Edwin F. Ladd, of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The commemoration this year of the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drug Act of 1906 recalls how much of the credit for this legislation belongs to the late Senator Edwin F. Ladd, of North Dakota. He was one of the most outstanding men ever produced by the State of North Dakota, a man who achieved the respect and devotion of not only his own State but of much of the Nation.

When he died in 1925, Dr. Ladd was a Member of the United States Senate from North Dakota, but long before he came to Washington he had become a world renowned personage, known at scientific congresses abroad and in demand as an expert in his field of chemistry.

Although primarily interested in the problems of agriculture, he never failed to take a stand on the side of justice and for the rights of the people. For 35 years, Senator Ladd fought the battles of the people of his own and other States, often almost singlehanded.

Born in Maine, Dr. Ladd studied chemistry at the State university and from 1884 to 1890 served the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station as chief chemist. In 1890 he went to North Dakota where his work began in the chemistry department of the Agricultural College at Fargo.

Within a short time he found himself involved in a series of food and drug adulteration controversies and these in turn led to the enactment of a pure food and drug law by the State of North Dakota. This law, passed largely at the instigation of Dr. Ladd, preceded by 3 years the enactment of the Federal law.

By the time the State legislation was passed, Dr. Ladd was so well known that his appointment as administrator of the law was taken as a matter of course. He proved to be as able and efficient an executive as he was a chemist.

It is interesting to trace the steps that brought Dr. Ladd to his preeminence. In the first place, before he ever had anything to do with politics, he had for years been engaged in food and drug analysis in his laboratory.

As a citizen of North Dakota this man of science became acutely conscious of what happened to what the farmer raised for sale, and conversely, what had happened to what the farmer bought.

His researches had some astonishing results. For example, he analyzed the brands of paint sold in the State and, when his work was published, a group of paint manufacturers were so impressed with the thoroughness of the job that they raised a fund and turned it over to Dr. Ladd for paint investigation. This, in turn, was followed by the practice of using on the college campus itself paints that were under investigation, leaving it to the weather to demonstrate the shortcomings of the merits of the product. Demonstrations of this character are commonplace now, but in Dr. Ladd's time they were not.

Gradually his work expanded.

One of his most celebrated accomplishments was the exposure of wheat bleaching. At the time certain types of North Dakota wheat commanded a high premium because they made an intensely white flour. Competing millers discovered that inferior wheat could be chemically bleached so as to produce a flour as white as they produced from Dakota wheat. Dr. Ladd got a law passed which required millers to stamp the word "Bleached" in large letters on every sack of such flour sold in the State. Action of this character spread to other States and eventually to a successful Federal Supreme Court case. In a way somewhat similar to his experiences with paint, Dr. Ladd's flour researches and the resulting pressures led to experiment and new and superior methods of blending wheat.

Canned corn bleached with sulfite and sweetened with saccharin, peas and string beans preserved with copper and alum salts, embalmed beef—the Spanish-American War had made this last notorious—phony maple sirup, and candy made of glucose and stained with coal-tar dyes were some of the products that Dr. Ladd helped to expose. In all this Dr. Ladd worked closely with the famous Dr. Wiley, Chief Chemist of the Department of Agriculture, and proved to be a devastating witness before the congressional committees when the pure food and drug bill was up for consideration.

Colored oleomargarine branded "butter" and 3½-ounce spice containers labeled 4 ounces got short shrift from Dr. Ladd. Half-strength formaldehyde—useless in treating seed grain for smut or potatoes for scab—did not long survive his attacks. He insisted upon the enforcement of the laws against the adulteration of drugs—digitalis was a case in point—and he made his enforcement stick. In commenting upon the North Dakota pure food law, he said: "The pure food law does not prohibit the selling of ground olive stones or coconut shells as such but it does forbid selling them for pepper or other food products."

A tireless worker, he was a member of numerous scientific bodies and a steady stream of his papers appeared in their professional proceedings. In this day when so many people have come to believe that all powerful government has the answers to everything, it is instructive to recall that Dr. Ladd had no such ideas. Regulatory legislation to him was a leverage, not a triumph of the police power. In his last years, before Stalin had

pulled down the Iron Curtain, Senator Ladd visited Soviet Russia and with a detached and penetrating eye examined the new utopia. His conclusion was, as Senator King, of Utah, put it, that "the knout of the Czar had produced repercussions and the mailed fist of the Communist was to be expected."

Senator Ladd was one of the most illustrious of all North Dakota public servants. He was a great man—great in his faith, great in his purpose, and great in his love of humanity.

Social Security for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant changes provided by the Eisenhower social-security program has been the extension of this essential protection to the Nation's farmers and their families. This was accomplished by the Social Security Act Amendments of 1954, which I sponsored and led the fight for on behalf of the administration.

The coverage of farmers had been resisted for many years prior to 1954 on the ground that farmers typically do not retire at age 65 and, thus, would seldom be in a position to take full advantage of the benefits of the system. In my opinion, this argument overlooked one vitally important fact. We are apt to forget that the social-security program provides not only retirement benefits for the covered individual himself but also provides very substantial survivorship benefits for his widow and his young children in the event of his untimely death. I agree that many farmers frequently do not retire at 65. I likewise agree that these individuals as a group are relatively more able to make adequate provision for their own security. But even accepting all that as true, the fact remains that the unexpected death of the family's breadwinner frequently spells economic disaster to his loved ones. How many young men in their twenties and thirties, for example, have been able to set aside enough to provide comfortably for their wives and children in the event that something should happen to them? Obviously, the answer is very few.

The social-security program provides substantial survivorship benefits. For example, a young widow with 2 children under age 18 can receive as much as $200 a month in such benefits, and these benefits are exempt from Federal income tax. Again, when his widow herself reaches age 62, she can receive as much as $81.40 a month, also tax free. These are not enormous amounts but they can spell the difference between family tragedy and decent security.

It is for this reason that I led the fight to extend social-security protection to our 6 million farm families. I grew up on a farm, and I remember from my own personal experience how suddenly a tragic accident would strike on one of our neighbor's farms. Today, with the ever-increasing use of machinery on farms, the danger of accident is even greater. I believe that the extension of the basic protection of the social-security system to our farmers has brought a new peace of mind into farm homes throughout the breadth of the land.

I have always wished that there could be some sound basis whereby coverage under social security could be made a matter of free individual choice, in line with our American traditions. Certainly, a voluntary system would have much to recommend it and would avoid many of the complaints which one hears today. However, if the system were made voluntary, experience shows that only those who would gain the most would elect coverage while those who would gain the least would stay out of the system. This would result in vastly increasing cost of social-security protection. It would then cost approximately as much as private insurance, or about 10 times as much as it does today. This would, of course, destroy the practical utility of the system.

Some rather important technical changes were made this year with regard to the social-security coverage of farmers. I would like to describe these changes briefly as I believe they will be of interest to many of our farm families.

OPTIONAL METHOD OF FIGURING SELF-EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS

Self-employed farmers who report on a cash basis have had an optional method of figuring their net earnings ever since they were first covered by the 1954 law. The 1956 amendments permit members of a farm partnership and individual farmers who keep books on an accrual basis also to use a revised optional method.

Under the new optional method, for taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1956:

(a) If a farmer's gross income from agricultural self-employment is not more than $1,800, he may count as his net earnings from farm self-employment either his actual net earnings or two-thirds of his gross farm income.

(b) If his gross farm income is more than $1,800 and his net farm earnings are less than $1,200, he may use either his actual net earnings from farming or $1,200.

(c) If his gross farm income is more than $1,800 and his net farm earnings are $1,200 or more, he must use the actual amount of his net farm earnings.

INCOME FROM LAND FARMED BY SOMEONE ELSE

Beginning with 1955, earnings from self-employment as a farm operator have counted toward social-security benefits. Under the old law, however, an individual did not get social-security credit for cash or crop shares he received as rent for his land.

Under the 1956 amendments, the cash or crop shares received from a tenant or share farmer will count for social-security purposes if under the individual's arrangement with the tenant or share farmer he participates materially in the production of the crops or livestock or in the management of the production.

In order to participate materially the individual must take an important part in the management decisions or in the actual production.

SHARE FARMERS

If a farmer uses farmland owned by someone else and he receives a share of what he produces, his earnings may have been covered by the social-security law since the beginning of 1955. The 1956 amendments make it clear that if, under an ordinary crop-sharing arrangement, the crops or livestock he produces are divided between him and the landlord, with his share depending on the total amount produced, then he is considered a self-employed farmer for social-security purposes. This is true even if the landowner takes an active part in the farm operations. This rule is effective for all taxable years ending after 1954.

WHEN FARMWORKERS ARE COVERED

If an individual worked for a farmer before 1957, he got social-security credit if the farmer paid him $100 or more in cash wages in the calendar year.

Under the new law, beginning with 1957 his earnings from farmwork will count toward social-security benefits under either of these conditions:

(a) If a farm employer pays him $150 or more in cash during the year, his cash pay from that employer is covered by the law.

(b) If he does farmwork for an employer on 20 or more days during a year for cash pay figured on a time basis (rather than on a piece-rate basis), his cash pay for that employer is covered by the law.

For the $150-a-year test, both piece-rate and time-rate cash pay count. The total number of days worked does not matter so long as he is paid $150 in cash by the employer in the year.

For the 20-day test, the total amount of his cash pay does not matter so long as he works for one employer on 20 days or more for cash pay based on some unit of time such as an hour, a day, or a week.

FARM LABOR CREWS AND CREW LEADERS

Wages paid to members of a labor crew, such as those used to pick cotton and harvest fruits and vegetables, may be covered by the social-security law, but in the past it has sometimes not been easy to tell whether the employer of the members of the crew was the farmer who was having the work done or the crew leader (or "labor contractor" or "row boss"). The new amendments make it easier to tell which is the employer.

If an individual is a crew leader, the crew members he furnishes and pays are his employees unless he and the farmer have entered into a written agreement which shows that the crew leader is his employee.

If an individual is a farm operator using crew workers, and he has entered into a written agreement with the crew leader which shows that he is his employee, then the crew members are also his employees.

This provision is effective for work performed after December 31, 1956.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The 1954 law did not cover agricultural work performed by workers from Mexico hired under contract or by foreign workers lawfully admitted from the British West Indies on a temporary basis.

Under the amendments, agricultural work performed by foreign workers ad-

mitted to the United States on a temporary basis from any foreign country will not be covered by the law after 1956.

ACTION TO TAKE NOW

If a person's work was brought under social security by the 1956 amendments and he does not have a social-security card, he should go to his social-security office and get one without delay. If there is no social-security office near him, he should ask for an application blank—Form SS–5—at the post office, fill it out, and mail it to the nearest social-security office.

After he gets his card, he should show it to his employer. He needs the social-security number to report the wages properly.

If he is self-employed he will need his social-security card when he makes out his social-security self-employment tax report. This report is part of the individual Federal income-tax return.

If a person is an employer and he is paying or expects to pay farmworkers taxable cash wages during the year, and if he does not already have an employer identification number, he should apply for one without delay. He can get the proper blank at his social-security office or at his Internal Revenue Service office.

Further information about social-security cards or social-security benefits can be obtained from the social-security district office.

Further information about social-security employment taxes or self-employment taxes can be obtained from the local Internal Revenue Service office.

The addresses of these offices can be obtained at local post offices.

Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means since July 14, 1932. During that period I have always been impressed with the industry and competence of my committee colleagues. This impression has recently been greatly enhanced by the information I have developed in the preliminary work I have done with respect to the preparation of this report of the committee activity during the 84th Congress. This preliminary work has entailed a review of the activity of the 84th Congress to date, which has left me convinced that the Committee on Ways and Means has worked as hard and as effectively in this Congress as any committee of Congress has ever worked.

At the outset of my remarks I would like to express my grateful appreciation to my committee colleagues who have served so constructively and so ably on the committee during the Congress that is now drawing to a close. As members of the committee, they have been instrumental in the preparation of legislation that proffers great benefit to the American people they represent. As members of the Committee on Ways and Means they have worked diligently for long hours, for long days, for long weeks, and for long months. They may derive satisfaction from the knowledge of the great accomplishments they have achieved. To all the members of the committee, Democrat and Republican alike, goes my grateful and heartfelt appreciation for their cooperation and endeavors without which our accomplishments would not have been possible.

In citing this record of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, it has been my purpose to devote special attention to the activities during the second session of this Congress, in view of the fact that a similar report in regard to the first session activities was set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 10, pages 13181–13183. However, so that the record may be complete, the statistical information that I will present will be for the entire 84th Congress, and I will necessarily refer to major legislation to which reference was made in my above-mentioned previous remarks.

Before proceeding to discuss the overall statistics and the details of particular measures, I should like to merely list at this point a few of the major bills which became public law and which were handled by this committee, to indicate the heavy responsibility which the committee bears with respect to our Federal legislation and the great importance of the committee's work in many complex areas of legislation. Some of these leading measures are: The social security amendments of 1956; the Federal Highway Revenue Act of 1956; the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955; the Customs Simplification Act of 1956; the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955; the Narcotic Control Act of 1956; the Renegotiation Amendments Act of 1956; and the exemption of farm uses from the Federal excise tax on gasoline.

That the workload of the Committee on Ways and Means has greatly increased is evident from a review of statistics from the 81st Congress to date. More bills were referred to the committee during the 84th Congress than were referred to it in the 81st and 82d Congresses combined. During the 84th Congress the committee had 1,324 bills referred to it for consideration as compared to 458 for the 81st Congress and 696 for the 82d Congress. In the 83d Congress 1,203 bills were referred to the committee.

During the 84th Congress the committee took favorable action with respect to legislation affecting the major subjects coming within the committee's jurisdiction, including social security, tariff laws and customs, the narcotic laws, the Internal Revenue Code, and the Renegotiation Act. In addition to legislation with respect to the major subjects, the committee also acted on legislation affecting the statutory debt limit and authorizing certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department.

During the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means reported on 99 bills to the House of Representatives compared to 54 bills in the 81st Congress, 64 bills in the 82d Congress, and 52 bills in the 83d Congress. In the 81st Congress 44 bills were reported by the committee which became public law, 51 in the 82d Congress, and 41 in the 83d Congress; whereas, 72 bills became public law during the 84th Congress.

Of the 102 bills coming within the committee's jurisdiction on which some favorable legislative action was taken during the 84th Congress, 29 of them related to tariffs and customs, 60 to tax matters, 3 to social security, 2 to the Renegotiation Act, 3 to narcotics, 2 to the public debt, and 3 to miscellaneous subjects. Ten of these bills might be regarded as major legislation. Specific requests for favorable action had been received from the administration on 24 of the 102 bills on which favorable legislative action was taken.

In order that the splendid record compiled by the Committee on Ways and Means in the 84th Congress may be publicly available, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a report I have prepared of the committee's activity for the 84th Congress:

RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

There follows a summary of the record of the Committee on Ways and Means briefly setting forth the activities and accomplishments of the committee during the 84th Congress:

I. STATUS OF LEGISLATION

The status of bills referred to the committee during the 84th Congress is indicated in the table set forth below:

Status:	*Total bills*
Reported by the committee	99
Passed by the House	91
Reported by Senate Finance	76
Passed by the Senate	76
Enacted into law	72

(NOTE.—One bill, H. R. 9083, passed the Senate with amendments in the closing days of the 2d session and time did not permit the House to take action with respect to the Senate amendments. Memorandums of disapproval were issued by the President on H. R. 4392, 6887, and 7634.)

The committee met 129 times in executive session during the 84th Congress and held a total of 54 days of public hearings on a variety of subjects. Testimony was received from 526 witnesses in the public hearings in addition to which a large number of individuals and organizations submitted statements for the record with regard to the subject matter under consideration in lieu of appearances. Data concerning these hearings follow:

Subject	Days	Witnesses
Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955	16	214
Prepaid income and reserves for estimated expenses	4	29
Revision of Philippine trade agreement	1	7
Customs Simplification Act of 1955	2	14
Individual Retirement Act of 1955	2	41
Bonding period for distilled spirits	1	12
Upjeweling of watch movements	2	11
Highway Revenue Act	6	44
Organization for Trade Cooperation	12	101
Public assistance	5	33
Public debt limit	1	2
Railroad Retirement Act	1	7

II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Social-security legislation

During the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means prepared and presented to the Congress for favorable consideration major amendments to the Social Security Act. The principal bill was H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956, which became Public Law 880. The major features of this legislation included (1) monthly benefits for permanently disabled insured individuals who have attained age 50; (2) a reduction to 62 years in the benefit eligibility age for women; (3) continued monthly benefits to disabled children after they attain age 18; (4) expanded old-age and survivors insurance coverage; (5) adjustments to the OASI contributions schedule to assure the continued actuarial soundness of the program; (6) a liberalization of the public assistance matching formula so as to assure the availability of increased Federal funds to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children; (7) a new program of medical care for the needy aged, disabled, etc., whereby the Federal Government matches on a 50–50 basis State expenditures for medical care of public-assistance recipients; and (8) provision of Federal funds for research and personnel training with respect to public welfare.

One of the important considerations with respect to H. R. 7225 is that it removed serious benefit gaps that previously existed in the social-security system. These benefit gaps in the program were removed by providing for social-security payments for disabled workers at age 50, continued benefits for disabled children 18 or over whose disability began before they reached age 18, and monthly benefits for women at age 62 instead of 65. It is estimated that in the first year of operation these amendments will make old-age and survivors insurance benefits in the amount of $550 million payable to approximately 800,000 persons. In the long run, it is estimated that 2.3 million people will be added to the benefit rolls who will receive approximately $1.5 billion in annual benefits.

The coverage provisions of H. R. 7225 extended for the first time social-security protection to a large group of people who are self-employed in certain professions such as lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, osteopaths, and optometrists. Doctors of medicine are now the only self-employed people who are not covered by social security. In addition, several important improvements were made in social-security coverage of farmers and farm workers which were directed to the clarification of the status of a farm landowner or tenant who derives income from a share-farming arrangement, to liberalized farm income reporting procedures so as to benefit small farmers, and to simplified reporting requirements with respect to occasional employees. Another improvement in the coverage provisions of the social-security laws that were provided by H. R. 7225 makes OASI coverage available to the employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the Federal Home Loan Bank. The 1956 changes in the law restore a remarried widow's benefit rights on the earnings record of her first husband under circumstances of her second husband's death within a year of their marriage. The 1956 amendments provide that social-security coverage will be denied for service in the employ of any organization that is Communist associated.

It is estimated that the amendments to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act provided by H. R. 7225 will make available in the first year of operation approximately $160 million in increased Federal funds which will be available to the States for augmenting the public assistance payments received by slightly over 5 million needy American citizens. The new medical care program authorized under the public-assistance payments is estimated to cost $65 million in the first year of operation and will do much to assure adequate medical care for our public-assistance recipients.

Amendments to the Social Security Act continuing OASI wage credits for military service and permitting application for lump-sum death benefits by dependents of deceased military personnel was separately enacted as was other legislation providing that members of the uniformed services of the United States—approximately 3 million persons at the present time—will be covered by the social-security laws beginning January 1, 1957, in the same manner as civilians.

The humane purpose and meritorious nature of these improvements in our social security law resulted in the overwhelming support which the legislation received in the two Houses of Congress.

B. Tax legislation

During the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means took favorable action with respect to 60 bills which amended the Internal Revenue Code. Many of these bills made important changes in our tax structure. Five of these bills might be deemed to be major legislation either as they were enacted into law or as they passed the House of Representatives.

Of the five that might be labeled major legislation, one of them passed the House of Representatives in the form of a major revenue bill but a major feature of the bill was deleted in the Senate. The House-passed version of H. R. 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955, provided a $20 tax credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption claimed by a taxpayer. The legislation also provided a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates. The House version of H. R. 4259 granted across-the-board individual tax relief amounting to over $2 billion to an estimated 71 million taxpayers. Because of extending existing corporate and excise tax rates for 1 year the net revenue effect of the legislation as passed by the House was to increase receipts toward a balanced budget. The Senate deleted the $20 tax credit from the bill and as H. R. 4259 was enacted into law (Public Law 18) it merely provided for a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates.

A major bill amending our Federal tax laws that became public law during the 84th Congress was H. R. 7201 which provided a revised formula for the income taxation of life insurance companies. The legislation made several changes in the taxation of life insurance income so as to improve the definition of income and to prevent abuse of the life insurance treatment by companies which are not entirely life insurance companies. The taxing method provided under this bill was intended to become a permanent formula as the legislation passed the House. The Senate-passed version provided that the formula would be in effect for 1 year. Because of the Senate action it was necessary to extend the formula for an additional year by the enactment of H. R. 11995 (Public Law 784) pending the development of further recommendations with respect to the establishment of a permanent formula for the taxation of life insurance companies' income.

A third bill that might be considered major tax legislation because of its effect in preserving the Federal revenue was H. R. 4725 which closed two loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It is estimated that these loopholes would have cost the Treasury in excess of $1 billion if they had been permitted to remain in the law. In taking this action to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the 1954 Code (relating to prepaid income and to reserves for estimated expenses), the committee directed a staff study to be made with a view to preparing legislation embodying the principles of these sections but providing adequate safeguards to prevent the existence of any loopholes.

A fourth major tax bill prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means was embodied in H. R. 10660 (Public Law 627) as title II of that bill to provide the necessary funds to pay on a sound and current basis the costs of the gigantic Federal highway program enacted during the 84th Congress. This legislation made moderate increases in the Federal excise taxes applicable to gasoline and other types of motor fuels, tires and tread rubber, and trucks, buses, and truck trailers. In addition, the bill provides for revenues to be raised from a use tax on heavy vehicles. It is estimated that in the 16-year period from 1957 to 1972 approximately $14.5 billion will be raised by the new or increased taxes provided under H. R. 10660 and that in addition to this amount there will be allocated to the Highway Trust Fund for road-development purposes $23.7 billion from taxes imposed under present law. As the contemplated improvements in our highway system are accomplished, the motorists of America will realize a saving in their annual motoring costs despite the tax increases included in this highway legislation. For example, it is estimated that the tax increases will cost the average motorist $8.60 per year but that the average motorist will save in annual operating costs on his vehicle $96 per year with the result that he will actually realize a net saving annually of $87.40 for the privilege of driving on a modern up-to-date road system. It is inevitable that the development of a modern highway system in the United States will contribute to the safety and economic welfare of the American public and will provide an increased measure of national security.

Difficult problems were involved in working out this equitable and sound method for financing the new Federal highway program, and the solution reached by the committee contributed in a major way to the overwhelming vote which the combined highway bill received in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The fifth tax bill that might be termed major legislation relieved farmers from Federal excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes by authorizing annual refunds of such taxes paid on gasoline and special motor fuels. Under this bill some relief was granted to the American farmer from the severe price-cost squeeze confronting him. This legislation will provide farmers with approximately $60 million in tax relief each year.

The remaining 55 tax bills which were approved by the Committee on Ways and Means were designed to eliminate existing inequities in our Federal tax structure and to grant appropriate tax relief in certain hardship areas.

C. Tariffs and customs legislation

During the 84th Congress the committee took favorable action on 4 major bills affecting tariff and customs laws and 25 minor bills. The 4 major bills are as follows:

H. R. 1: One of the most important pieces of legislation to be favorably considered by the Congress in the 84th Congress was the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. This legislation became Public Law 86 and continued through June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. The legislation made significant improvements in the administrative safeguards available to domestic producers against excessive imports and made other improvements in our reciprocal trade program. H. R. 1 also prescribed the delegation of authority

to the executive department for the establishment of our foreign economic policy which the President described as the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

Pursuant to the authority provided in H. R. 1 trade negotiations were conducted among 22 nations of the free world including the United States during the winter and spring of 1956. As a result of this conference the United States obtained concessions on American exports valued at approximately $400 million annually and expects to receive indirect benefits from other concessions of a substantial dollar amount. Products on which concessions were obtained by the United States cover a wide range of agricultural and industrial commodities and articles.

H. R. 5550: This legislation was favorably acted on by the committee to authorize the President to accept membership in behalf of the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The principal objective of the establishment of the organization and United States membership therein was to make possible the creation of improved international machinery for administering the most important trade agreement entered into by the United States under the Trade Agreements Act—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. During the course of the public hearings held by the committee on H. R. 5550, 6 members of the President's Cabinet and 1 Assistant Secretary testified as to the urgent need for the legislation on the grounds that the United States had as much to gain from membership in the organization as any other country by virtue of the fact that the organization would provide a means whereby our country could undertake to guard against impairment of the trade concessions granted to us. In reporting this legislation to the House, the committee adopted several amendments to the bill to make it clear that enactment of H. R. 5550 and the resulting membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation could not result in the overriding of domestic law by an international body and would not commit the United States to make further tariff reductions or adopt any other trade measures. The amendments adopted by the committee also made it clear that the legislation was not to affect the existing safeguards contained in present law for domestic producers.

H. R. 6040: During the 84th Congress further revision of our customs structure was enacted by the favorable consideration of the Customs Simplification Act of 1956 which provided improved procedures for the valuation of imports and the conversion of foreign currency into dollars for the purpose of existing customs duties. In addition, this legislation repealed certain obsolete provisions of our customs laws and streamlined other provisions so that the procedural aspects of our international trade may be handled more expeditiously. It has been stated that the enactment of this legislation will also introduce increased certainty and greater commercial realism in our customs laws. This legislation became Public Law 927.

H. R. 6059: This legislation, the Philippines Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955, authorized revision of the 1946 Trade Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines. This legislation became Public Law 196.

Comparable legislation passed the Philippine Legislature and the authorized charges in the existing trade agreement have been proclaimed by the respective chief executives of the two countries. It has been stated that the trade relations that will ensue from these modifications will further serve to strengthen the historic bond of friendship between the peoples of the two countries and will improve the economic relationship between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines.

In addition to the above-enumerated 4 major bills affecting our tariff and customs laws, the committee also took favorable action with respect to 25 other tariff and customs bills of somewhat lesser importance. Among other things these bills continued the suspension of duties on certain strategic and critical materials, extended the free-entry period on gifts for members of the Armed Forces abroad, and household and personal effects brought into the United States on Government orders, and made appropriate adjustments in the tariff and customs status of certain other articles.

D. Narcotics legislation

One of the most insidious and heinous crimes occurring in the United States involves violations of our Federal drug laws and the illicit trafficking in drugs. Not only does drug addiction that is encouraged and spread by this illicit trafficking dissipate the lives of the persons who become addicted, but other socially undersirable consequences result from the violence and crime that attend drug violations. To review the experience with narcotic legislation enacted during the 82d Congress in deterring the illicit drug traffic and to develop additional legislation that might be necessary in this area, the Committee on Ways and Means established a Subcommittee on Narcotics during the close of the first session of the 84th Congress. This subcommittee was composed of Mr. HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, as chairman; Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; Mr. IKARD, of Texas; Mr. BYRNES, of Wisconsin; Mr. SADLAK, of Connecticut; and Mr. BAKER, of Tennessee. This subcommitee utilized the adjournment period between the first and second sessions of the 84th Congress and continued its work into the second session and reported to the full committee its findings and recommendations resulting from its study. This subcommittee activity was the initiating factor in the development of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 (H. R. 11619) which became Public Law 728. This legislation provided more severe penalties for narcotic-drug law violations and provided improved enforcement authority for Federal agents charged with this responsibility. This subcommittee activity has also resulted in the introduction of legislation which has been referred to another committee in the House of Representatives to provide for the control of barbiturates and amphetamines. During the course of the consideration of this legislation the Commissioner of Narcotics, the Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, informed the Committee on Ways and Means that the enactment of this legislation would represent a major step forward in the eradication of the illicit drug traffic.

Favorable action was also taken on legislation (H. R. 2369) to correct an inadvertent error in the 1954 code relating to narcotic penalties and on legislation (H. R. 7018), to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to subpena witnesses, require the production of records, and to take other specified actions in connection with the enforcement of the narcotic laws.

E. Miscellaneous legislation

The Committee on Ways and Means acted favorably with respect to seven bills that might be incorporated under this miscellaneous category in the absence of listing them elsewhere in this report. Two of these bills, H. R. 4904 and H. R. 11947 related to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended. The latter bill was major in character in that it included important changes and liberalizations in the renegotiation authority. The bill increased from $500,000 to $1 million the statutory floor below which sales are not subject to renegotiation. The standard commercial article provision was changed and clarified, and the number of executive departments, contracts with which are subject to renegotiation, was reduced. The bill also provided for a 2-year carry forward of losses on renegotiable contracts so that losses sustained in 1954 and later years may be carried forward 2 years for purposes of renegotiation computations. In addition, filing requirements under the law are streamlined so as to minimize the administrative inconvenience of doing business with the Federal Government. These and other improvements in the Renegotiation Act became public law during the 84th Congress.

At the request of the administration, the Committee on Ways and Means twice acted to increase for 1 year in each instance the statutory debt limit. These bills, H. R. 6992 and H. R. 11740, became Public Laws 124 and 678, respectively.

Two other bills relating to certain Treasury administrative expenses (S. 1727, Public Law 57) and to the collection of State sales and use taxes on cigarettes (H. R. 6886, Public Law 335) were favorably acted on by the Committee on Ways and Means.

In addition, the committee acted on House Resolution 475 which was a resolution of inquiry regarding settlement of a tax claim by the Internal Revenue Service of a tax claim against the American Distilling Co.

III. SUBCOMMITTEES

During the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress three subcommittees were established. These subcommittees were (1) the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies, (2) the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems, and (3) the Subcommittee on Narcotics. With the exception of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems, the legislative work of the subcommittees has been referred to in connection with the discussion of legislation in the preceding paragraphs.

The Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems held extensive public hearings and met many days in executive session to develop legislation that would provide administrative simplicity in connection with our Federal excise tax structure and would remove inequities existing in present law. As a result of this subcommittee activity a report was submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means which was the basis for the preparation of legislation by the committee proposing major revisions in our Federal excise-tax laws. This legislation, H. R. 12298, was introduced by the subcommittee chairman, the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, and will receive continued study by the reconstituted subcommittee which is to be known as the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes and which will have added to the scope of its jurisdiction questions involving excise-tax rates. The membership of the reconstituted subcommittee is as follows: Hon. AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, chairman; Mr. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. HERLONG, of Florida; Mr. JENKINS, of Ohio; Mr. MASON, of Illinois; and Mr. HOLMES, of Washington.

In addition to the subcommittee activity described above, it is expected that two other subcommittee studies will be undertaken during the adjournment period.

The Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation under the chairmanship of Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, includes in its membership Mr. GREGORY, of Kentucky, Mr. O'BRIEN, of Illinois, Mr. IKARD, of Texas, Mr. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, and Mr. BAKER, of Tennessee. This subcommittee will review the 1954 Code to determine what technical and substantive corrections and changes in the Code may be necessary. The subcommittee will also study the correlation between the statute and the regulations promulgated thereunder and inquire into the administration of the Internal Revenue laws under the Reorganization Act of 1951.

The Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements, under the

chairmanship of the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, includes in its membership Mr. KING of California, Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, Mr. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, Mr. MACHROWICZ of Michigan, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. SADLAK of Connecticut, and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is expected that this subcommittee will make extensive inquiry into our tariff and customs laws and the administration thereof so as to determine the relationship and effect of these matters on the foreign economic policy of the United States and their effect upon domestic producers and employment.

These subcommittees which will be active during the adjournment period following the 2d session of the 84th Congress, will submit reports to the full committee prior to the convening of the 85th Congress so as to inform the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means as to the activities and findings of the respective subcommittees. It is expected that these reports will make important contributions to the development of legislation in the related fields of inquiry.

Growing Industrial Eminence of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, before this session of Congress concludes its business, I wish to state again my intense interest in the growing industrial eminence of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio. Much has been published in national periodicals calling attention to the economic rebirth of the Ohio Valley. In the June 1956 issue of Fortune, these dramatic developments were discussed fully in an article entitled "The Boiling Ohio." I am proud to state that the area which I have the honor to represent in this Chamber is very much a part of this new industrial empire.

The recent decision by the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. to construct its $120 million integrated aluminum-production plant in Monroe County is the most spectacular in the industrial growth pattern in which other companies also have notably affected the economies of Washington, Muskingum, and Guernsey Counties.

Still, let me say that this area of southeastern Ohio is only on the threshold of developing the full economic potential of its people and its natural resources. Decades of chronic unemployment and economic adversity have beset this area despite the wealth of its resources. Coal, water, natural gas, oil, and salt are but a few of the resources with which nature has blessed this area. To this we may add a central location with respect to the Nation's market centers; highway, rail, and water transportation; and an abundance of electric power. Most notable of all are the people of the area who are eager to improve the local economy and who have organized themselves into chambers of commerce and civic associations which are actively seeking to interest industries in becoming a part of their communities. Such organizations are working vigorously in Guernsey, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, and Washington Counties. I have worked closely with these groups and am familiar with their programs and operations. I pledge to continue my efforts in their behalf.

To them must go the credit for the notable achievements which have been recorded thus far. The fact that large areas still remain to be developed industrially is the challenge which faces them today. Their challenge is also an opportunity for American industry seeking sites in areas near the center of our Nation's commercial heart, yet disbursed from the crowded centers of industry where additional industrial development is inadvisable.

Report to the People of the 17th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 10th year that I have been privileged to represent the 17th Congressional District of New York in the House of Representatives.

From 1939 to 1946 I served in the New York State Senate, where I sponsored a substantial volume of legislation and was chairman of the Rapp-Coudert legislative committee, which unearthed the Communist and other subversive conspiracies in the New York City public educational system. In commenting upon this investigation the New York Times said:

> The Rapp-Coudert Committee is to be congratulated.

Through my congressional years I have fought for national security, stable money, tax reduction, and sound economy; civil rights; less restrictive entry of displaced persons; adequate school facilities; solution of housing problems, of problems of the aging, and for many other worthwhile objectives.

During the past 4 years I have supported the Eisenhower Administration's legislative program in the conviction that this was in the best interests of all the people. To my gratification, President Eisenhower saw fit to endorse me in the following letter:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, April 28, 1956.*
>
> DEAR FRITZ: I should feel remiss if I failed to express to you my appreciation of your cooperation in the Congress in connection with a number of matters of vital importance to our country which have come before the Committee on Appropriations. I am aware that on several occasions your efforts have contributed a great deal to the success of key programs, and for this I am personally grateful. I look forward to the continuance of your effective public service in the years to come.
>
> With kind regards.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Space limitation permits me to present here only the highlights of my 10-year congressional record.

The first objective of our Government during these difficult and troubled times has been safeguarding the security of the United States and the welfare of its people. Within the limitations of that framework I have worked ceaselessly as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations to reduce waste and unnecessary Federal expenditures to the end that the people of the United States may one day be relieved of much of their paralyzing tax burden.

TAXES AND INFLATION

I am a strong advocate of reducing taxes whenever that can be done without endangering the national security or adversely affecting the public welfare. I have favored adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, aimed at lowering the cost of governmental operation and thus making lower taxes possible.

When I became a Member of Congress one of my first concerns was to provide tax relief for our citizens who had borne the burden of providing funds for defense of the free world for so many years. In the Republican 80th Congress we passed 3 tax bills to provide needed relief, but President Truman vetoed all 3. I voted for all 3 and voted to override all 3 vetoes. The first veto was sustained in both Houses, the second in the Senate, and it was not until April 2, 1948, that we were able to override the veto and reduce tax rates from World War II levels.

In 1950 I voted for a bill passed by the House to cut excise taxes by a little over $1 billion. But the Korean war intervened before the Senate could act and Congress then had to increase taxes, rather than cut them, to provide weapons against the Communist aggression.

The Truman Administration asked for further tax increases in 1951. Believing the increases recommended by the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee were excessive, I voted to recommit the Revenue Act of 1951 to the Committee and also voted against its passage. With many of my Republican colleagues I felt that additional cuts in nondefense expenditures should be made before tax rates were further increased.

It was again my privilege to vote for a tax reduction in 1954. I voted on four rollcalls in favor of President Eisenhower's tax-reduction program. Early in 1955 the Democrat majority in Congress tried to embarrass President Eisenhower by a further income-tax reduction. This would have prevented achievement of the President's objective of reducing inflationary pressures through maintenance of a balanced budget. I was convinced that such a reduction would not benefit the low-income groups it was supposed to help, because it would ultimately be translated into an increase in the cost of living. Therefore, I supported President

Eisenhower's position in opposition to the Democrat-sponsored tax cut.

I have long sponsored and fought for legislation to compel a balanced budget in absence of war or national emergency in order to prevent the dangerous inflation resulting from Federal budget deficits.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have done all in my power to reduce unnecessary Government expenditures and to eliminate waste. It has been my objective to reduce the burden on individual incomes whenever possible so as to increase the incentives of our people to produce more and thus to expand our economy and its tax base.

Accordingly, on March 16, 1950, I proposed a constitutional amendment that would ultimately permit the Federal Government to resort to an income tax only in a national emergency and to reduce the national debt and pay interest thereon.

In 1956 I introduced a bill to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Federal Taxation to consider the defects and inequities of the present tax structure, particularly the income tax, and to recommend constructive changes. It is worthy of note that T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the Eisenhower Administration, has called for repeal or drastic modification of the Federal income tax law and has recommended a similar commission to study this question.

For some years I have been concerned about problems confronting many of my constituents who are self-employed or engaged in professional work. Employees of corporations are not taxed on part of the payments made into approved retirement plans. But the professional person or small-business man must provide for his own retirement from his income after taxes. On October 20, 1951, I first introduced and fought for a bill to allow an income-tax deduction to individuals for premiums paid on annuities and life insurance contracts. I intend to continue the fight.

Through the years I have supported rent-control and price-control measures when needed to protect the people from the ravages of inflation. I voted for such anti-inflationary measures from my first year in Congress until 1953, when upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower, Federal price, wage, and rent controls were repealed in order to stimulate the national economy. At that time New York State had its own rent-control laws.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In the struggle against the forces of communism the United States has long been committed to leadership of the free world. I have supported the necessary action to make this leadership effective.

I have supported a broad program of foreign aid under both the Truman and Eisenhower administration, but have sought to prevent misuse and waste of the taxpayers' dollars. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have frequently called attention to specific instances of waste and bad management. This in no way reflected lack of sympathy with the basic and necessary objectives of the program.

During my first year in Congress I voted for a relief program for war-devastated countries and also voted for the Greek-Turkish aid bill, authorizing $400 million aid to Greece and Turkey in their resistance to communism. I voted in 1948 for establishment of the Marshall plan, a program that has been continued with modifications ever since.

The first important action of the 84th Congress was the resolution to authorize the President to use the Armed Forces in defense of Formosa, necessitated by five years of promises to defend the Chiang National Government in the event of attack from the Red China Government on the mainland. I voted for it.

The fact that the President came to the Congress for the authority, thereby setting a precedent for the first time in such circumstances, was particularly gratifying to me. It was gratifying because of my long fight to amend the law so as to require Presidential consultation of the Congress before committing American troops to armed combat, except in self-defense or pursuant to the obligations of our mutual security treaties.

Believing it essential that we expand our foreign trade, I have supported the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. I voted for this program in 1948, 1949, 1951, 1954, and 1955. Our present law extends the program until 1958.

As another step to expand our international trade, President Eisenhower asked legislation to simplify custom procedures. I supported this program, which became law this year.

I have worked to facilitate the investment of capital in overseas businesses so that American techniques and resourcefulness can accompany our dollars overseas. I believe this is one of the best ways to stimulate development of the economies of friendly nations. With this in mind, I voted in 1949 for a bill, which became law, to permit Federal Reserve member banks to deal in and underwrite securities issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In this same field I voted in 1950 for a bill, part of the point-4 program, to expand the authority of the Export-Import Bank. This provided that the bank could guarantee, for an appropriate fee, private capital invested abroad up to $250 million against losses through expropriation or restricted conversion of foreign currency into United States dollars. The following year I voted for a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $1 billion.

In another phase of foreign affairs, I was recorded in 1947 in favor of statutory authorization for the State Department's Information Program. This included the Voice of America.

I supported the passage of a bill in 1948 to authorize admission of 202,000 additional displaced persons into the United States. Through the years I have consistently supported such legislation.

In 1952, I favored the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as a means of strengthening the Attorney General's authority to deal with subversives, Communist or otherwise. The act was faulty in a number of respects and President Eisenhower has recommended a revision, with which I am in accord.

DEFENSE

Provision for the military security of our country is the most important matter with which Congress and our Government must deal. I have voted for the multi-billion-dollar appropriations and other defense measures deemed necessary to make and keep our country strong.

As far back as 1948, I was one of those who recognized that our national defense must be based in large part on air superiority. In that year I voted for a bill to provide funds to start immediate expansion of our Air Force to 70-group strength, over the protests of President Truman. I have consistently supported the authorization of funds to provide adequate research in the defense field and development of new weapons.

While recognizing the vital importance of maintaining an adequate defense establishment, I have been ever mindful of the danger of waste and extravagance in military expenditures. I have fought to assure the greatest value out of every taxpayer's dollar.

In the course of this never-ending struggle, I participated with Representative HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, in 1952 in a move to impose an overall ceiling of $46 billion upon Defense Department spending during fiscal 1953. I did so because the Defense Department had available, with new funds requested and carryover funds, a total of over $100 billion legally spendable in 1953.

There were loud outcries from the professional military, their civilian chiefs, and a section of the press that the limitation passed by the House would hamstring the military and endanger national security. The House limitation did not become law because of failure of the Senate to agree. But it turned out in fact that the military was wholly unable to spend during 1953 even the $46 billion which the House had been prepared to allow. This fact completely vindicated the House action and my position.

To promote the efficient operation of the Military Establishment, I supported the National Security Act of 1947, which unified the Armed Forces under a Secretary of Defense with Cabinet rank. It also created a Department of the Air Force coequal in rank with the Army and Navy.

VETERANS

Having served overseas as an infantry soldier in World War I, I have always had a deep appreciation of the problems of veterans of our Armed Forces. I voted for legislation to increase allowances for veterans receiving college training; to pay half the cost of special housing for wheelchair disabled veterans; to permit holders of terminal leave pay bonds to cash them after September 1, 1947, instead of holding them 5 years; to permit payment to veterans of retroactive

benefits withheld during hospitalization; and to grant additional allowances for veterans paralyzed from service-connected injuries.

HOUSING

The need for decent housing for all our people has long been one of the great problems facing the Nation. I have proposed and pressed for passage of legislation to facilitate the private construction of homes for middle-income families in metropolitan areas. I consider this one of the most acute needs in the housing field.

I have supported measures for public housing where needed. From my first year in Congress I have supported measures to aid in construction and repair of homes, to expand and liberalize mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration, to eliminate and prevent slums, and to conserve and develop urban communities.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Perhaps the most important matter within this broad field is the vast Social-Security Program. Throughout my congressional career I have favored broadening the coverage of the Social-Security System and increasing the amount of benefit payments, while at the same time maintaining the program on a sound fiscal basis.

In 1948 I voted to override President Truman's veto of a bill which included, among other provisions, increased Federal grants for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and the blind. The following year I voted to extend coverage of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program to 11 million additional workers and to increase retirement annuities an average of 70 percent. In 1952 I voted for amendments increasing old-age and survivor benefits and raising to $75 a month the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits.

In 1955 I introduced a resolution to establish a commission on problems of the aging, with a view toward a program of care, encouragement, and rehabilitation, based upon authoritative study and recommendation.

I voted in 1955 for a proposal passed by the House to lower the pension age for women to 62 and to make totally disabled workers eligible for pensions at 50. A slightly different version, for which I also voted, became law in 1956.

To advance national health, I voted for a bill to establish a National Science Foundation to encourage scientific research, which was vetoed by President Truman. I also voted to establish a National Institute for Research and Heart Diseases.

In legislation on education, I supported establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education and a bill authorizing the President to call a White House Education Conference. In the last session of Congress I voted for the anti-segregation amendment to the Federal school aid bill and for passage of the bill.

In the field of civil rights I voted for a number of constructive measures, including the antipoll tax bill. I supported the original House bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission and fought a Democrat filibuster against it. In the last session of Congress I supported President Eisenhower's Civil Rights Program, which was passed by the House.

AGRICULTURE

In the field of agriculture, I have sought to protect the American farmer who represents an important segment of the national economy. But at the same time I have worked to protect the consumer against unnecessarily high-food prices. To keep down the cost of living, I voted for repeal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine. I have consistently voted against high rigid farm price controls which boost the cost of food to the consumer.

VOTING RECORD

The foregoing record is evidence that the voters of the 17th district have been faithfully represented in the significant and controversial issues acted upon by the House since I have been a Member of Congress. In the 84th Congress just closed I have voted on 90 percent of all rollcall votes and upon hundreds of additional votes taken by voice, division, and tellers.

In concluding this report, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the voters of the district who have given me the honor and privilege of representing them in Congress.

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 84th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I report that, with adjournment of the 84th Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has produced a record of constructive activity unequaled in any prior Congress since the formation of its present jurisdiction pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

During the first session, there were a total of 86 meetings of the full committee and its subcommittees. Eighteen pieces of legislation considered by the committee became law. During the second session, there were 131 meetings of the full committee and its subcommittees. As of this date, 56 legislative measures reported from the full committee in this session have been approved by the President.

Major legislation included authorization for the world's first atomic powered merchant ship; the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956; granting of permanent status to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; authorization of 100 percent mortgage insurance on privately financed loans for the construction of vessels; bills increasing the safety of operation of small craft, including the inspection and certification of vessels carrying more than six passengers for hire; and, several bills authorizing the sale of Government-owned ships to expand or inaugurate essential shipping service.

During the two sessions of this Congress, the committee launched and carried through a number of highly important inquiries pursuant to special investigative authority or in accordance with section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

At the outset of this Congress, it was decided that the greatest value could be rendered to the committee, a majority of whose members were freshmen Congressmen, by holding a series of hearings concerning the functions and workings of the several administrative agencies under the jurisdiction of the committee. Accordingly, during February and March of 1955 extensive hearings were held in Washington, studying the operations of, first, the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Board of the Department of Commerce; second, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, third, the United States Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury; fourth, the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce; and fifth, the Panama Canal Company and Panama Canal Zone Government. These hearings proved of great value and were welcomed not only by the new Members, but by those who had served with the committee during previous Congresses. They were strictly informative in nature and provided much useful background for the Members to enable them better to appraise legislation subsequently considered concerning the agencies involved.

During this same period, the committee held follow-up hearings on legislation enacted in the previous Congress to determine the effectiveness and administration thereof.

Hearings held before the committee in the 83d Congress disclosed the critical need for modern, large-capacity, high-speed tankers to keep the merchant marine in a state of readiness in case of emergency. All testimony indicated that the minimum speed for the tankers proposed to be constructed under a special trade-in and build program was 18 knots. However, when it came to the attention of the committee that the maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, was consummating trade-in transactions for new vessels to operate at a maximum speed not in excess of 16 knots, immediate inquiry was held. No acceptable explanation was given for the change in requirements, but it is gratifying to report at this time that the program has been proceeding substantially as originally represented to the committee.

Probably, one of the most important aspects of American merchant-marine policy has been the concept that the United States should carry "a substantial portion of its water-borne foreign

commerce" which has generally been construed to mean an ultimate goal of about half of the tonnage moved in the foreign commerce. In the free flow of American foreign trade, of course, this goal is subject to the fluctuations of normal competition and the willingness of the Congress to realize that the goal cannot be approached without recognition of the differential between American and foreign costs of operation and standards of living. However, in view of the extensive foreign aid and rehabilitation programs conducted under Government auspices following World War II, virtually all aid programs contained provisions to the effect that at least 50 percent of Government cargoes should be carried in American bottoms, provided such were available at fair and reasonable rates for American-flag vessels. This requirement, initially written into individual foreign-aid laws, enabled American-flag shipping to participate in the foreign commerce of the United States under the abnormal conditions of the postwar years. In the 83d Congress, the principle was enacted into permanent law in recognition of the apparent fact that United States Government programs would continue for some time to come. Notwithstanding the previously well-established principle, supported by precedent as far back as 1904, certain Government Departments, either misinformed or under pressure from foreign sources, charged that the law was thwarting important Government programs involving the exportation of surplus agricultural commodities. Full hearings failed to disclose any substance to these charges. Contrarily, they proved the soundness and workability of the so-called 50–50 law.

Another matter of considerable importance which was investigated during the first session of this Congress was labor-management relations in the maritime industry. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted at a time when the American shipping industry was at a perilously low stage, and industrial relations were substandard to the rest of American industry. Much of the philosophy of that act was aimed at bringing maritime labor up to the levels enjoyed by other groups in the citizen labor forces of the United States. Over the years, however, certain provisions of the act seem to have been ignored or not properly implemented. As a result, an impression has developed in more recent years that maritime labor is strangling the American shipping industry. With a completely wide-open mind on this subject, I called for a full-scale investigation of all phases of maritime labor-management problems. Staff members were sent to the Pacific, Atlantic, Gulf, and Great Lakes areas to interview and gather material from all key figures in labor and management, concerned with sea-going and shoreside personnel. A voluminous and valuable record of hearings was compiled over a period of 2 months in 1955. A unanimous committee report—House Report No. 1658—filed in the House on January 19, 1956, carefully analyzes all phases of this problem.

Hearings were also held on the vessel replacement program of the 16 subsidized operators holding contracts under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. These operators, representing the hard core of the common-carrier segment of the American merchant marine, are all soon to be confronted with obligations to replace and modernize their fleets. In the face of rising construction and operating costs, the committee was interested to hear a discussion of replacement plans and a recounting of the particular problems confronting the lines.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, H. R. 6243, by Mr. BONNER, and H. R. 6276, by Mr. TOLLEFSON, were introduced to authorize the construction of a nuclear powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy. Hearings held on these bills resulted in the reporting of H. R. 6243 to the House, and eventual favorable action by the Senate in slightly amended form in the second session. Implementation of this law will be a landmark in maritime history.

Other matters of importance during the first session were the investigation of longshore labor problems in southern California; the inauguration of extensive investigation of the ocean freight-forwarding industry; hearings on various fisheries and wildlife conservation bills; a study of the proposed abolishment of the Panama Railroad, and other matters relating to Panama Canal operations; and, bills authorizing the sale of the Government-owned warbuilt passenger-cargo vessels the SS *Monterey* and SS *La Guardia*, to private operators for expanding the essential passenger-carrying segment of our merchant marine.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

During the first session, emphasis was placed on indoctrination, orientation, and investigation of various problems of concern to the committee as a whole. With the exception of certain legislation which was referred to special subcommittees on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Panama Canal, and the investigations of longshore labor in southern California and of the freight-forwarding industry, the greater part of all activity was before the full committee. At the beginning of the second session, however, four standing subcommittees were appointed to distribute the workload and make possible more expeditious handling of the legislative backlog. These subcommittees are, first, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine; second, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation; third, Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation; and fourth, Subcommittee on Panama Canal. When considered preferable, some matters were held for the attention of the full committee, irrespective of category.

By subject matter, the principal activities of the second session may be summarized as follows:

I. MERCHANT MARINE

The convening of the second session found the Cargo Preference Act again subject to misinformed or prejudiced attack. In line with previous committee policy to give all interested parties an opportunity to be heard, full hearings were held in January and the first half of February to determine the substance, if any, of the current charges against the 50–50 cargo law and the possibility of need for change to avoid conflict with other national policy. Testimony from the Departments of Agriculture, State, and Commerce, agricultural and American shipping interests, and a leading representative of European shipping, either supported or failed to negate the soundness of the basic principle involving cargo preference where Government sponsored cargoes are concerned. These hearings are covered fully in a report entitled "Cargo Preference and Its Relations to the Farm Surplus Disposal Program," February 27, 1956—H. Rept. No. 1818.

As a followup to the extensive hearings on maritime labor relation problems, steps were taken via hearings and conferences to bring about the establishment of a uniform termination date of labor agreements in the maritime industry. Progress was made and much support was given to the idea that this would be a stabilizing force in maritime labor relations. No legislation was involved.

In the field of legislation, the second session was noteworthy for several important measures designed to strengthen existing law and in other ways encourage the further development of our merchant marine.

Bitter experience in World Wars I and II has shown that inadequacy of shipbuilding and ship repair potential can be our Achilles' heel in time of national emergency. Therefore, with depressing statements on the health of the ship construction and repair phases of the maritime industry before it, the committee (a) sought to provide for more effective information on shipyard availability by a bill to require periodic surveys of national shipyard capacity and capability, (b) extended the Emergency Ship Repair Act for an additional 2 years, (c) prohibited the use in coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and (d) recommended the establishment of a modern shipyard for use in emergencies in lieu of an existing reserve shipyard considered to be obsolete. This latter matter raised serious questions as to the adequacy of other reserve shipyards and the committee plans to make appropriate inquiry into the entire subject of standby shipyards.

After protracted debate in the House, and deep consideration in the Senate, the question of whether or not to make the first application of atomic energy to the merchant marine was resolved in the closing months of Congress when the Senate adopted the House bill with amendments. The amendments, while preserving appropriate division of authority between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Commerce, assure the development of a practical nuclear-powered merchant ship. The first ship will unquestionably be experimental but it should go far toward proving the feasibility of this great source of power in ship construction and design.

At the beginning of the second session, the President's budget message requested appropriations for the construction of a nuclear-powered tanker and two austerity prototype ships of new design designated as the *Freedom* and *Clipper* classes which would be especially suited for mass production in time of national emergency. The chairman and ranking members of both the majority and minority sides of the committee appeared before the Commerce Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to present arguments showing the necessity for legislative authority to construct these new special types of vessels intended for purposes other than the fulfillment of "the long-range program previously adopted" under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. The committee representatives contended that, however desirable the construction of these vessels might be, existing law did not provide sufficient authority. In other words, since the proposals were distinct departures from the 1936 act, specific requests should be referred to and approved by the appropriate legislative committees before appropriations were granted. The Appropriations Committee agreed with the position of the Merchant Marine Committee members, and in due course legislation was proposed to authorize the construction of prototype vessels of the *Freedom* and *Clipper* design, together with the experimental conversion of one Liberty ship.

After full hearing, the committee acted favorably upon House Joint Resolution 614, with an amendment eliminating the construction of the *Freedom* class prototype. This amendment was due to disclosure during the hearings that a private operator was already under commitment to build seven vessels of the *Freedom* class for its regular trade routes. Accordingly, it did not appear that the expenditure of some $8 million for the construction of one such vessel for Government account was justified. This legislation has since been enacted into law.

Other important legislation dealing with merchant marine matters included authority to use the Maritime Administration revolving fund to meet the expense of activation, repair, and deactivation of Government-owned vessels chartered to private operators; a bill to provide for biennial instead of annual inspection of merchant vessels; an amendment to the 1936 act to permit the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government personnel on commercially operated American-flag ships; a bill to provide a single standard of evaluation, and otherwise clarify existing provisions of law relative to marine war-risk insurance; and a bill to remove an inequity in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 affecting those who purchased war-built vessels prior to the enactment of that act.

In the close of the committee's activities during this Congress, forcible attention has been brought to the fact that, despite the needs of an expanding waterborne commerce, major gaps exist in several areas. One of the most serious deficiencies is in the important domestic coastwise and intercoastal trades. Essential trade routes 3 and 4 from the Atlantic Coast to Cuba and Mexico are not adequately served at present. Only two American-flag passenger ships are in service between the United States and northern Europe, with trade route 8 from New York to Antwerp/Rotterdam not presently being served by any American-flag passenger vessels. And excellent possibilities appear to exist for expansion of commerce between United States southern Atlantic ports and the Caribbean area.

The committee considered and favorably reported several proposals which would have authorized the sale of war-built vessels to citizens for operation in trades not presently being adequately served. Several of these matters contemplated the conversion of vessels to new types which would enhance their potential use for national defense purposes as well as increase their commercial efficiency. Some have been enacted into law, while others, due to misunderstanding or opposition from other forms of transportation and misinformation after being reported by the committee almost unanimously, failed of passage and will have to be reconsidered in the next Congress.

Probably the most important single piece of maritime legislation successfully acted upon in this Congress was that which authorizes the Government to guarantee up to 100 percent of privately financed mortgages or loans for the construction of new merchant vessels. Existing law permits direct Government financing of essential ship construction. However, in order to increase public participation in the merchant marine program and reduce appropriation pressure, there was enacted in the 83d Congress legislation which authorized 90 percent Government guaranty of ship construction mortgages and loans, except in the case of so-called special purpose vessels where 100 percent could be guaranteed. Experience with this law proved that, as a practical matter, it was not workable and would not serve the intended purpose of encouraging the development of the merchant marine. Private financing institutions were unwilling to tie up large sums of money over long periods of time and also assume a portion of the substantial financial risk involved. It is anticipated that the recent amendments to this law will make possible the early replacement of existing but obsolescent vessels, and will encourage expansion of American-flag shipping with new operators and additional modern vessels.

Shortly before the end of the session, Department of Commerce and Department of Defense officials were called to discuss with the committee the matter of the replacement of the Steamship *America* which, under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, will become obsolete in 1960. This hearing was purely preliminary and solely for the purpose of learning the plans of the executive branch in this matter so important to the national security and the prestige of the United States as a maritime Nation. It is desirable that this subject be followed up early in the first session of the next Congress.

II. FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

A major portion of the committee's activities were devoted to problems concerning commercial and sports fishing and wildlife conservation.

In recent years, the growth of population and the unprecedented expansion of our national economy have simultaneously increased the importance of these subjects and created serious difficulties demanding attention and correction.

The commercial fisheries are an important source for the Nation's food supply. Recreational hunting and fishing, becoming more popular each year, are affording employment to many thousands and adding millions of dollars to our gross national product. At the same time, fewer areas of our country are available for the conservation and management of our wildlife resources. Existing areas are being sought by conflicting interests for mineral or industrial exploitation.

One of the first legislative proposals referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine ind Fisheries in this session of Congress called for a sweeping reorganization of the governmental setup concerned with the problems of the commercial fisheries. Increasing costs of production of boats and gear, the need for discovering and developing new sources of fishery products, together with the problems of research and resource management, brought about the introduction of a number of bills designed to aid the commercial fishery industry. Extensive study and hearings over a period of several months resulted in the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956, giving recognition to the increasingly difficult problems of the commercial fishing industry, establishing a revolving loan fund, placing the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act on an expanded and permanent basis, and, through the process of amendments to the original proposals, emphasizing the growing importance of sports fishing, hunting, and wildlife conservation as sources of recreation. This act makes substantial changes within the Department of Interior and materially up-grades the status of the functions previously performed by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department.

A companion act to the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956 provides for the education and training of high school, college, and university students for the fishing industry. There is a growing shortage of manpower ranging all the way from the crews of fishing boats to laboratory researchers and other technicians. This act will meet the problem by authorizing funds for high school vocational training and grants to colleges and universities.

Among the major conservation matters considered by the committee during this session was a bill to establish the United States section of an international commission between the United States and Canada for the control and eventual elimination of the predatory sea lamprey in the Great Lakes. Over a period of years, the Congress has authorized research and experiment to find ways and means of controlling the sea lamprey which has virtually destroyed the once extensive white fish and lake

trout fisheries of the Great Lakes. The successful discovery of control methods will now be implemented through the international commission created by this legislation.

The committee considered and favorably reported to the House some six bills authorizing the establishment or modernization of fish hatcheries throughout the country. Five of these bills have become law and will result in new or expanded facilities in Vermont, West Virginia, North Carolina, Virginia, and Montana. An additional bill, introduced by Representative WINT SMITH of Kansas, was before the committee but departmental reports were not received in sufficient time to hold hearings and take action thereon prior to adjournment of Congress. In each case, substantial need was shown for the hatcheries legislation. It seems desirable, however, that the subject be thoroughly explored in the first session of the next Congress to examine the policies of the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the location of hatcheries, their overall need, and the formulation of standards by which applications for new hatcheries can be evaluated on a national basis.

Other conservation legislation included a bill to provide for adequate protection against drought for the unique Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia; a bill to provide for the continued preservation for conservation purposes of federally owned lands adjacent to the Jim Woodruff Reservoir in Florida and Georgia; and, a bill to prevent the extinction of the Key deer, a vanishing species inhabiting the Florida keys.

At the opening of the session, serious charges were made that wildlife refuges, or parts thereof, were being disposed of or dangerously exploited by conflicting interests. Several bills were before the committee which would have required congressional consent to any proposal to dispose of any refuge or part thereof for any purpose. The committee held extensive hearings on this subject and issued a report entitled "Preservation of National Wildlife Refuges"—House Report No. 1941—setting forth an arrangement arrived at with the Secretary of the Interior, whereby, in lieu of legislation, the committee would review any proposed changes in the national wildlife refuges. Since the establishment of this arrangement, the informal procedure has worked well. In only two instances, involving oil and gas leases, has it been deemed necessary to hold public hearings. In these cases, committee approval was forthcoming.

Hearings also were held on a proposal to transfer some 11,000 acres of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge to the Department of Defense. While no action was taken on the legislation involved in this case, it points up the need for constant vigilance on the part of the Congress to protect and preserve the remaining wilderness areas against unnecessary encroachment.

III. COAST GUARD, NAVIGATION, AND MERCHANT MARINE SAFETY

Several disasters have occurred in recent years involving extensive loss of life of passengers and crews aboard small craft operated for hire. These vessels, despite the large number of passengers carried, were not subject to inspection and certification by the Coast Guard with regard to seaworthiness, safety equipment, or qualifications of the operators. In each case, however, the evidence showed that the casualties would not have occurred had the vessels been subject to proper inspection. Legislation to provide for necessary regulation by the Coast Guard of small vessels, such as party fishing craft, carrying more than six passengers for hire, was thoroughly considered by the committee and favorably acted upon in this session.

Other proposals to improve safety of boat operation included a bill to clarify existing confusion by centralizing jurisdiction over navigation lights on fixed structures, and another to standardize lights on motorboats.

To increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard, one proposal establishes a supply fund to modernize accounting procedures along the lines of Hoover Commission recommendations.

The temporary promotion authority of the Coast Guard was extended for another 5 years, and its authorized officer strength was increased to 3,000.

Starting in May of this year, the committee embarked upon a full-scale study of the possible need for additional regulation of recreational boating. This sport has grown explosively in recent years, particularly in the field of boats of less than 16 feet propelled by outboard motors. At this time, the committee has held some 6 days of hearings in Washington on this important subject. Further hearings will be held in boating centers throughout the country during the balance of the year. No legislation is before the committee, and the investigation will be as thorough and as objective as possible before report and recommendations are made. It should be noted that this study was initiated at the suggestion of the manufacturers of pleasure boats, engines, and other equipment.

Just before adjournment, the Nation was shocked by the disastrous collision of the Swedish passenger ship, motor vessel *Stockholm,* and the Italian luxury liner steamship *Andrea Doria.* That such a catastrophe could occur today with all of the modern communications and safety equipment, and international standards of ship construction and navigation, raises serious questions as to whether existing requirements are high enough. Ocean passenger traffic is increasing yearly with American citizens comprising the great proportion of the traveling public patronizing the American and foreign passenger vessels which operate to and from the United States. Immediate authority was requested of and granted by the Congress to make thorough studies and investigations of merchant marine safety on the high seas, including the facts and circumstances surrounding the tragic collision of the *Stockholm* and *Andrea Doria.* Investigation is presently in progress and will continue throughout the balance of the year.

IV. PANAMA CANAL

Serious questions have been raised concerning the need to continue the operation of the Panama Railroad across the Isthmus of Panama in the Canal Zone versus proposals to depend upon highway transit from the Atlantic to the Pacific side of the zone. Some hearings have been held on this subject, and a railroad expert has been employed by the committee to make a special survey of the situation.

In addition to a number of minor bills, the committee approved a proposal authorizing the construction of a bridge across the canal at Balboa, C. Z., to carry out treaty agreements reached in 1955.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION

In addition to continued study and action predicated on the investigations currently underway relative to the safety of recreational boating, and the adequacy of international standards of construction and operation of passenger vessels on the high seas, the following subjects appear to be of importance for consideration early in the next Congress:

First. Tramp shipping under the American flag. Bills have been introduced on this subject several times in recent years including the second session of this Congress. The subject is difficult and carries many implications which should be studied with the greatest care and attention. Time did not permit full deliberation of the pending legislation in this session. Yet it is obvious that the present conception of liner services on fixed trade routes is not sufficient to even approximate the commonly accepted goal of quantity of shipping needed under the American flag. The present American-flag tramp fleet is composed mostly of vessels of obsolete design and well past middle age in service. Introduction of a bill similar to the one presently before the committee would afford an appropriate vehicle for the careful consideration of this important subject.

Second. Reserve fleet, ship transfer, and trade-in policy: The past several years have seen these subjects become so obscured as to make it impossible to determine whether there is any policy or any program of an organized and generally understood nature. Full investigation and hearings should be most helpful.

Third. Reserve shipyards: Investigation of 1 of the 4 reserve shipyards suggests the need for examining all of these yards to determine their adequacy and value in the event of future mobilization effort.

Fourth. Tourism by passenger ship: The startling fact that American vessels are carrying only 18 percent or less of the busy waterborne passenger traffic across the North Atlantic and are losing ground with air competition in other areas suggest that a study of tourism by ship would be of value in determining the possibilities of future development of this type of service. The popularity of passenger ship travel on the available ships suggest that expansion of American shipping, in private operation, is entirely feasible and desirable.

Fifth. Coastwise, intercoastal, and noncontiguous domestic shipping: Recent study by the Department of Commerce and hearing by the committee in

this Congress show that the important domestic trades can be revived. However, further planned study is needed.

Sixth. Unsubsidized shipping—tax deferment of earnings for new ship construction: This was considered in connection with the Long-Range Shipping Act of 1952, but no action was taken due to opposition from certain sources. Approximate equalization of opportunity for nonsubsidized operations with that of subsidized operations with that of subsidized operators on essential trade routes merits the most careful consideration. Hearings commenced this year and additional statements requested by the committee will provide useful background on the prospective value of this type of legislation.

This Congress has seen material development in our merchant marine, and other fields under the committee's jurisdiction. I pledge my continued and full support to carry out and advance all of the objectives of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to all of the members of the committee and its staff who have labored hard and devotedly to bring about the substantial and constructive achievements of this Congress.

A Factor of Important Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a factor of important public interest has been brought to light as a result of determinations recorded by the United States Supreme Court, by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and by the United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The aforesaid determinations were the result of law actions encompassing over 20 years of proceedings in the courts which 3 private citizen companies were obliged to carry on in order to protect their rights to have returned to them the balance of their cash funds which they had deposited and entrusted into the escrow of the treasury of a Government-owned corporation; the companies had faithfully performed their obligations which the aforesaid cash bond had guaranteed and the officers of that corporation had duly recognized the companies' performance and had ordered the return to the companies of the total of their cash bond amounting to over half a million dollars; however, only a minor part of the total of the companies' cash funds was returned to them by the corporate check of that Government-owned corporation, and the balance remained unreturned in the treasury of that corporation on invalid pretexts and was still in its treasury when that corporation was discontinued and dissolved and abolished by an act of Congress.

The Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary have recorded exhaustive reports on the facts and circumstances of this case, setting forth therein their judgment on court records, departmental reports, and the determinative probative evidence; such includes unrebutted evidence transmitted by the Department of Justice and by the United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Internal Revenue proving the companies' legal and equitable ownership of these cash funds; the recommendations of the aforesaid committees, and of Members of Congress of both political parties, have severely condemned therein the procrastination in the withholding of these private cash funds, and have recorded declarations that the integrity of the Government, expected and required of it in its dealing with United States citizens through Government-owned corporations which carry on corporate commercial business, requires the return of aforesaid funds to the depositors and owners thereof; for example, the companies.

There is on file with the aforesaid committees a memorandum dated June 30, 1956—in re S. 759 and H. R. 2940, 84th Congress—which sets forth the essential details of the aforesaid determinations and the pertinent facts and the applicable laws which are cited therein.

Members of Congress whose constituents deal with Government-owned corporations will obtain orientation by these determinations as to what occurs when such a corporation is discontinued and dissolved by congressional mandate and as to what concerns to its unfinished business. One of the important facts recorded in aforesaid memorandum is the determination by the High Court that the sovereign United States, when becoming the liquidator of a Government-owned corporation, merely takes the place of such a corporation, and is placed into a nonsovereign status and must carry on as if it were such a corporation until the unfinished business of such a corporation is fully terminated, unless Congress mandates otherwise.

A nonpartisan Commission appointed by Congress has recorded finding of facts pertaining to a number of government-owned corporations now in existence as corporate entities and Congressional investigation thereof may decide that some of these corporations have outlived the purpose for which they were created and no longer serve national interests and need no longer be supported by the expenditure of public funds; such corporations may be discontinued and dissolved by congressional action. Citizens who have unfinished business with such corporations will be helped by the determinations on record in aforesaid memorandum; its last paragraph is as follows:

A FACTOR OF IMPORTANT PUBLIC INTEREST

The law actions which the companies in this case had to proceed with to preserve and establish their rights and their claim and which encompassed over 20 years of court proceedings, resulted in clarifying the confusion which prevailed in the past about Government-owned or Government-controlled corporations.

These corporations come into corporate and commercial existence by virtue of the corporate laws of a State or of the District of Columbia; they become active in commercial, industrial, public service or other pursuits like any other corporation in the respective fields of activities which was or is incorporated and financed by private United States citizens.

The following statement is pertinent:

"There are a large number of private corporations which have been created by, or availed of or by, the Government of the United States.

"The determinations in this case of the United States Supreme Court and of the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia where the herein concerned Government-owned Merchant Fleet Corporation was incorporated, are therefore of transcendant importance to those who have dealt, are dealing, or may deal with such Government-owned or Government-controlled corporations, so they may know the extent of their rights against such corporations, after having dealt upon their faith in normal commercial practice with such corporations.

"The determinations of the aforesaid high courts are succinct and definite, and final.

"Likewise of importance is the determination in this case by the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue of the United States Treasury Department that companies which are associated and are operating under one coordinated management in dealing with such a Government-owned corporation and which are performing their obligations covenanted in an agreement with such a governmentally controlled corporation, are not permitted to make joint-returns but are required to make individual returns for each of the associated companies."

Provisions of the New Social-Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the social-security program which have been enacted by the 84th Congress will affect millions of Americans. All should be made aware of their rights, privileges, and responsibilities resulting from these new amendments. The House passed these amendments on July 18, 1955, but the Senate did not act on them until July 17, 1956.

Women's benefits: Under the new amendments, women otherwise eligible for benefits will be able to receive them after reaching age 62, instead of age 65. This is perhaps the most far-reaching of the new changes. Many widows have been left in dire circumstances waiting until they reach age 65; they will now be able to receive full benefits at age 62. Many working women have found it difficult to continue in employment until age 65 but have had to carry on until they could receive benefits at age 65. They will now be able to retire at age 62, although their benefits will be less than they would be if they continued working until age 65. Many men over 65 have had to delay retirement until their wives also reached 65, so that they would receive both his and her benefits. Such

couples will now be eligible for benefits if he is age 65 and if she is 62, although the wife's benefit will be reduced if she elects to receive it prior to age 65. Women electing benefits prior to age 65 will be able to receive them for the month of November of this year.

This lower retirement age for women demonstrates the increasing interest in a general lowering of retirement age requirements to a more realistic level. Although this Congress did not drop the social-security age for men, such legislation will surely be carefully considered by the new Congress which will convene in January.

Farm coverage: The amendments of 1954 extended social-security coverage to farm operators for the first time, beginning with their income for 1955. When this extension was approved, most of us in Congress believed it would clearly include all farm operators who exercise any substantial part of the management of the farm. Purely rental income from real estate has always been excluded from the social-security tax. It was believed, however, that farm owners who participate in the decisions concerning production, buying and selling stock and produce, and other management policies would clearly be covered. During 1955, as farmers began to make inquiries about social-security coverage, we began to fear that the 1954 amendments were not being properly interpreted by the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which collects the tax. When the House approved the new amendments in 1955, some language was included to clarify the status of farm operators. Early in 1956, when farmers filed their first social-security returns on their 1955 income, the confusion and misinterpretation became even more obvious. Congressman Ralph Harvey, the only Hoosier on the House Agriculture Committee, and I had had repeated consultations with the Social Security Administration and Internal Revenue Bureau about these problems. We decided it was necessary to spell out in legislation the obvious intent of Congress. The bill which the House had approved in 1955 was pending before the Senate. Working with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART we composed a brief amendment which we believe will put the definition of farm operators beyond dispute. Senator CAPEHART introduced the amendment in the Senate, where it was accepted. Under it a farm operator may report his farm income if he participates materially in the production or in the management of the production of the farm. Those given coverage under this new clarification will be able to report all of their 1956 farm income for social-security credits.

Farm income reportable under social security has also been changed for small farmers and farm workers. A farmer whose gross income from farming is $1,800 or less in a year will be allowed to report and pay taxes on either his actual net earnings or two-thirds of his gross income. Under the latter option he has previously been able to report only one-half of his gross. A farmer whose gross income is more than $1,800 will report his actual net earnings, unless those earnings are less than $1,200, in which case he will be permitted to report $1,200.

Farm workers will be covered only if they earn $150 from one farmer in a year, or if they work for one farmer at least 20 days in a year.

Disabled workers: Many families have been economically wrecked when the wage earner has been disabled. Under the law, a worker over age 50, who has been working long enough to be covered, and who becomes permanently and totally disabled, will be eligible, after a 6-month waiting period, to receive the benefits he would have had to wait for until age 65. This will allow the family some income while the breadwinner is disabled. This provision will become effective January 1, 1957.

Dependent children: Dependent children of deceased workers presently receive benefits until they reach age 18. The new law would continue such benefits beyond age 18 to children who become mentally or physically incapacitated prior to reaching age 18, and to the mothers of such children. This provision will also become effective January 1, 1957.

Professional groups: Coverage is now extended to several self-employed groups, including lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, and optometrists. Such persons will be able to report their entire 1956 income for social-security credits.

Social-security tax: Effective January 1, 1957, the social-security tax will be increased from 2 percent to 2¼ percent for all covered employees. The tax on self-employment income will be 3⅜ percent effective January 1, 1957.

Public assistance: The formula by which the Federal Government matches State expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and dependent children is changed and the maximum amount matchable is increased. It is not known at this time how this will affect increases in old-age pensions. Directors of public welfare from the various States will soon meet in Washington to study this new program.

It is difficult to explain these new provisions in sufficient detail to answer all questions about specific cases. Social-security field representatives will answer the questions of persons with specific problems. Seventh District counties are served by the following offices:

Greene, Morgan, Monroe, and Owen: 312 South Washington, Bloomington.

Daviess, Knox, and Martin: 214 La Plante Building, Vincennes.

Clay and Sullivan: 631 Cherry Street, Terre Haute.

Johnson: 36 South Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis.

Gibson: Courthouse, 4th and Vine Streets, Evansville.

Representatives from these offices visit each county regularly.

As usual my office will be happy to assist Seventh District people in getting needed information concerning the social-security program or any other Government matter. My address is 1017 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Your Congressman Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress adjourns, I wish to again make my report to the people I am honored to represent in our 17th District of California. For the past 14 years I have had the privilege of serving this district as its Representative in the Congress of the United States, one of the most populous and fastest growing constituencies in the country with perhaps more industries and varied problems than any other district. It includes two of the Nation's greatest ports of entry—our Los Angeles harbor and our Los Angeles international airport—as well as a major portion of the Navy's Roosevelt base on Terminal Island, the Army's Fort MacArthur at San Pedro, and the world-renowned Catalina Island. It also includes the greatest food-fish producing port in the world; the greatest aircraft production, with hundreds of subsidiary manufacturing concerns; one of the greatest oil-refining and export centers; one of the greatest shipbuilding centers during the war; and is one of the heaviest industrial areas in the West.

It will not be possible to discuss in detail or even touch upon all the bills considered, as the Democratic 84th Congress was one of the most productive in our history—in fact more bills were passed than in any other Congress, and we are proud of a constructive, substantial record of achievement.

As a member of the most important Committee on Ways and Means, having so much vital legislation before it, including social security, tax revision, reciprocal trade agreements, narcotics legislation, and the great highway program, the 84th Congress proved a very busy one for me. I will be obliged to confine my report to those proposals that have dealt largely with the general welfare of our people and in which my constituents have indicated their greatest interest.

SOCIAL SECURITY

From my first days in Congress, I have consistently supported the Social Security Act and have sought to liberalize it over the years. I derived considerable satisfaction from my part in the enactment of amendments to the Social Security Act that became law during the 84th Congress, as I was the original author of the amendment allowing women to receive benefits at age 62 rather than 65. I was also privileged to have made the motion providing benefits at age 50 to persons permanently disabled, which was enacted into law this session. Although these measures were opposed by the administration, I am pleased to say they are now a part of the social-security law, and considered one of the outstanding achievements of this Congress. My proposal granting increased benefits to the aged, blind, and dependent children was also included in

the new social-security measure adopted this session, in addition to extension of coverage to lawyers and other self-employed groups.

There were, however, a number of proposed amendments which I regret were not approved by the committee. One of the most important was the increase in earnings allowed retired persons before forfeiting their benefits. I was not only in favor of raising the present limit, but introduced legislation and advocated that the limitation be removed altogether.

Despite misguided opposition to social security through the years, and the selfish, prejudiced attempt by reactionaries to tag it as a form of creeping socialism, the law is now an integral part of the American way of life. The sooner the law is perfected and made more adequate, the sooner will be abolished the fear of insecurity that attends the approach of later life, and the sooner we will be rid of the heavy burden of direct relief from local tax rolls. What greater bulwark against communism could there be than the contentment of a citizenry assured of a security in retirement that they have earned in their productive years?

NARCOTICS

I have been deeply concerned over the serious threat that confronts our Nation from the vicious narcotic traffic. In my long and continuing study of this pernicious evil, I have worked closely with Federal Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, who is recognized worldwide as the outstanding authority on narcotic traffic matters. I introduced appropriate legislation to strengthen enforcement and administration of the narcotic laws and am pleased to report the 84th Congress has incorporated my bills into law as amendments to our narcotic control laws.

Although narcotic agents are forced to deal with the most dangerous and unscrupulous criminals, I found no statutory authority for narcotic agents to make arrests or carry guns with which to protect themselves, such as the authority granted FBI agents. I therefore introduced H. R. 7018 which was enacted into Public Law 362 this session which, in addition to providing some measure of protection to our narcotic agents, grants Federal narcotic enforcement agencies the power to subpena witnesses and demand production of pertinent records in cases relating to narcotic violations. Narcotic agents inform me this authority helps them immeasurably in enforcement of our Federal narcotic laws.

One of the very important features of the new narcotics control law pertains to penalties applicable to the illicit sale of heroin to juveniles. The law provides that any adult selling or furnishing heroin to any person under 18 years of age may be fined $20,000 and shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 years, with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, and upon recommendation by the jury a death penalty may be imposed. Effective enforcement of this new Federal law will be most helpful in eradicating the dope peddler who spreads his poisonous influence over the youth of our land.

To further aid narcotic and customs agents in their war upon the underworld, important provisions of my bill H. R. 3676, providing improved customs procedures and increased authority for customs officials with respect to narcotic violations were enacted into law as sections of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956. We on the west coast are most crucially confronted with the drug problem, as the major opium and heroin export centers are Tientsin and Canton, China. It is my firm determination to see that this vicious drug traffic is eliminated, and it is my hope that combined Federal, State, and local endeavors can achieve our common objective of ultimately abolishing the pernicious drug evil as a problem of national concern.

TAXATION

It was my hope that a reduction in the individual income tax rate could have been accomplished during this session, and I again introduced legislation calling for an across-the-board tax reduction credit. However, the unfortunate international situation, coupled with determination to bring about a balanced budget, precluded successful efforts during this Congress.

I believe the 85th Congress holds great promise for overall tax relief, as the Ways and Means Committee has established two subcommittees for this purpose. If the Congress remains under Democratic control, the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation will conduct an overall study of our entire income tax structure with the view toward removing existing inequities and providing a reduction in tax rates.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

The huge highway construction program which I was pleased to support will aid materially toward maintaining full employment. The pay-as-we-build measure adopted this session will save taxpayers at least $11 billion which would have been spent in interest charges had the bond financing program as advanced by the administration been approved.

While employment today is of paramount importance, we should always be mindful of the time when the productive years are over, and I was pleased to take an active part in passage of the bill increasing railroad retirement benefits. It was also with deep satisfaction that my bill which liberalized the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act was enacted into law. This legislation has been referred to as the model workmen's compensation bill, which provides increased benefits and other important improvements, and sets the scale of workmen's compensation payments for more than 400,000 longshoremen, harbor workers, and ship servicemen and repairmen. By extension of its provisions, it also served as the basic workmen's compensation law for many thousands of other workers under Federal jurisdiction.

EDUCATION

I have been an active advocate of every possible aid to education. One of the prime problems in our great State—and particularly southern California—is the extreme overburdening of local educational facilities with the constant influx of citizens from other sections of the country. It has been most gratifying to have taken an active part in having the benefits extended to federally impacted areas for school construction which have been of considerable benefit to a number of school districts within our own 17th Congressional District.

America's educational needs are well known to every parent who sends a child to an overcrowded classroom operating several shifts a day. They are well known to every overworked teacher responsible for handling a classroom jammed with children. I believe that every possible incentive should be offered to the teaching profession, particularly in the matter of adequate compensation, to encourage and insure the perpetuation of a high standard of education.

I was one of the authors and sponsors of the legislation enacted in the last Congress that has eased the tax burden on our retired teachers, and later retired firemen, policemen, and civil service were added as beneficiaries of this legislation. A number of school districts in our area have been included in the program of assistance to schools in crowded defense areas, and I am pleased to have been instrumental in having obtained Federal funds which eased the tax burden for these school districts.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Consistently through the years, as in this Congress, I have supported legislation in behalf of our veterans and servicemen and their dependents. I was very gratified to have my proposal enacted into law during this session of Congress extending the retirement income-tax credit to members of the Armed Forces. I was also pleased to support provisions which were enacted into law to grant educational benefits to children of veterans who lost their lives in World War II and Korea; social-security coverage extended for military personnel; increased pay of trainees under the Reserve program; legislation to provide medical care for the dependents of members of the Armed Forces; extension of Veterans' Administration program of guaranteed loans for home purchase or construction; increased pay of medical and dental officers in the armed services and Public Health Service; authorization of loans for the purchase of farm homes by veterans under the same terms as for residential housing; extension to 1960 of the unemployment program for veterans of the Korean war; extension of mustering-out pay provisions for Korean veterans; as well as the important increase in pay of all members of the armed services.

Leading veteran organizations have rated my voting record in behalf of our veterans at 100 percent, and I shall continue to work to expedite correction of inadequacies for their benefit and comfort.

SMALL BUSINESS

Recognizing the great importance of small business in our national economy and defense-production efforts for the preservation of our democratic system of free competitive enterprise, I have consistently supported and protected

their interests, and have continuously encouraged subcontracting practices to our small businesses by large corporations having defense contracts.

I have assisted in the establishment of industries in our area—both large and small—and through the years have devoted my best efforts to aid the businesses of my district where discrimination or other inequitable treatment was evident, and have succeeded in enacting corrective legislation for their relief.

During the closing weeks of this session, I was successful in having one of my excise tax revision bills approved by both Houses of Congress and enacted into law. My bill removed the 10 percent tax on admissions of 90 cents or less. This measure will greatly aid many thousands of community motion picture theater operators throughout the country, of which more than one-half are in trouble, and make it possible for them to remain in business. Since January of this year, 1,073 theaters have closed, and it is estimated that 5,500 theaters are operating in the red and 5,400 are operating at the break-even point. This exemption also applies to sporting events, concerts, and amusements generally.

I was also successful in having several of my bills enacted into law this session providing for the easing of certain restrictions and import duties which brought about material aid to several important local industries. It is my firm intention to devote continuing diligent effort to foster the welfare of our business community so that our 17th Congressional District will realize economic progress and job opportunity for all.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The world's largest fishing industry operates out of our port of Los Angeles. I have worked very closely with this important industry all through the years of my congressional service and am constantly in touch with the industry's local and Washington representatives on their problems.

Included in the numerous measures I have sponsored in behalf of our great fishing industry is my proposal for the protection of our fishing vessels on the high seas, and another of vital interest to the sports fishing and water-taxi craft operators which were enacted into law last session. Additional proposals I introduced in behalf of our fishermen during this session of the Congress—all of which have been opposed by the present administration—include H. R. 7238 which would grant fishing boat subsidies; H. R. 322 which would extend more favorable income tax treatment to our fishermen such as has long been accorded farmers; and my most recent bill, H. R. 11342, establishing a national policy for fisheries, is a companion bill to Senator MAGNUSON'S S. 3275 which was enacted into law during the closing days of this Congress in a modified form.

Following my efforts with appropriate officials in the interested executive departments, with regard to the plight of our domestic tuna industry, effective action was taken to double the duty on imports of canned-in-brine tuna where such imports were in excess of 20 percent of the domestic peak.

The National Fisheries Institute lists me a leader in the House of Representatives for championing the welfare of the fishing industry.

SHIPPING

The shipping industry is of vital importance to our port and to the 17th Congressional District. I have long been associated with those interested in shipping and our United States merchant marine, and served for several years on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. I authored, and was successful in securing enactment into law, legislation providing relief for the shipping industry from the imposition of certain unfair and arbitrary duties. This legislation was enacted, keeping in mind the highly competitive conditions American shipping meets from foreign lines.

I was also the sponsor of a successful legislative effort providing for a program of merchant ship construction in American shipyards, as well as legislation to promote and maintain domestic ship-construction and ship-repair yards, in addition to the law providing that 50 percent of all cargoes originating in the United States be carried by American shipping.

My bill on behalf of our Los Angeles harbor gained Federal assistance for the dredging and improving of the east basin to enhance the usefulness of our $8 million terminal, which is rated the largest and most modern passenger-cargo terminal in the world. A recent resolution by the board of harbor commissioners expressed their appreciation of my efforts in successfully obtaining Federal funds to cover reimbursement for dredging the east basin in the sum of $485,000 and a Federal contribution of $245,000 toward cost of removal of the west basin drawbridge.

NATURAL RESOURCES

I have remained alert at all times in my determination to protect and preserve our vast national forests and parks that have been set aside for the enjoyment of all our people, to insure against the incessant attempt at encroachment for selfish privileges by special interest groups. I am also alert to the attempts of certain private power interests to acquire for personal profit the remaining great water and power potentials, and I am co-author of the resolution creating the National Conservation Commission.

The American people are quite properly concerned over indications that we as a nation may be abandoning some of the proven conservation policies that in the past have done so much to preserve our irreplaceable natural resources.

It was very gratifying to have the proposal, of which I was author, passed by the Congress this session, authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting our shores, having for its purpose prevention of damage to public and private property and promoting and encouraging the healthful recreation of the people.

We need firm national conservation policies putting foremost the public's stake in preservation of our great natural resources for useful purposes in generations to come.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER

I am pleased to be considered one of the leaders in Congress in the fight to protect southern California's water rights. Water represents to the people of southern California a basic necessity to insure the needs of its thriving, ever-growing population, industry, and agriculture. Southern California has been confronted since the turn of the century with the problem of an adequate water supply. Very critical complications are presenting themselves due to the threatened encroachments from other States that are parties to the Colorado River compact, because of the machinations of land speculators and promoters who seek to deprive southern California of its contractual rights and its fair share of the water of the Colorado River.

The Los Angeles County flood-control district has expressed its great appreciation for my assistance in securing Federal appropriations which approximate $20 million for Los Angeles basin flood-control projects.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL WORKERS

The 84th Congress enacted several laws to improve civil-service employment and liberalize retirement benefits of Federal workers. Benefits upon retirement have been substantially increased, as have family survivorship benefits, and all other phases of retirement and survivorship benefits have been liberalized under the new legislation.

The pay increase granted by Congress last year for civil-service workers and postal workers was much needed legislation, but, in my opinion, fell short of the amount necessary to compensate them for the increased cost of living which is at an all-time high. I have always supported improved and just compensation for our Federal workers and believe the general unattractiveness of Federal pay scales has been the paramount reason that many civil servants are leaving Government services for private industry, where they secure wages more in line with the increased cost of living.

REDONDO BEACH HARBOR

I am pleased to report that success has finally been achieved in my efforts to provide Redondo Beach with a small boat harbor which will not only give this city and the surrounding area a priceless asset, but will protect the shoreline from the devastation caused by winter storms which eroded away a once beautiful beach, and encroached into the very streets of the city, causing serious damage to public utilities and property.

Initial success came in 1950, when I brought the plight of Redondo Beach to the attention of Congress and the President. I was successful in gaining approval for the project; however, the Korean conflict precluded construction of such nondefense projects by the Government. In 1954 I obtained an appropriation of $50,000 for further planning and engineering to bring the harbor to the construction stage. This was one of the first appropriations by the Federal Government for a nondefense project following the Korean war. In the first session of this Congress, I was successful in securing an appropriation of $1,500,000 to start actual construction of

the harbor; and in this session of Congress, gained approval of an additional $250,000 to insure earlier completion of this much-needed shore protection and boat haven.

CONCLUSION

Being mindful that the voters of my district have reposed trust and confidence in me for many years, my energies and efforts have been dedicated to fulfilling my responsibilities. My overall voting record is one of the best in the Congress, attested to by the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Confronted with the difficulty of having to serve the better part of each year 3,000 miles distant from my constituency, I have conscientiously endeavored to serve you and bring credit and progress to our district. My office staff and I take pride in the reputation our office has gained for promptness and efficiency in handling congressional services.

My files are replete with letters of appreciation from individuals and organizations for services rendered. I treasure these "thank you" expressions and encouraging good wishes, and shall always strive to justify your confidence and good will. The measure of success we have achieved has been with your guidance and encouragement that I have always welcomed in our partnership in public affairs.

Your Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding achievements of this Democratic 84th Congress is the just completed House-Senate passage of the bill, H. R. 7225, amending the social security and public assistance programs. Following the action of the other body earlier today, this bill is now at the White House awaiting the President's signature.

In 1950 the Congress made extensions in the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance program, raised its benefit levels and afforded coverage to most self-employed Americans, outside the professions and the farm industry. Again in 1954, the benefits were increased and millions of additional people covered, so that 9 out of every 10 American workers are now within the scope of the system, and 9 out of 10 of the Nation's mothers and children have rights to survivor payments in case of death of the head of the family. I am glad to have had a part in 1950 and 1954 in supporting and voting for these improvements of our social security system.

I also voted for the passage of the present bill, H. R. 7225. In my opinion, it is a splendid piece of progressive humane legislation. Throughout the Nation there has been deep concern and interest in its provisions.

I believe that one of the most important provisions of the 1956 amendments is the reduction in the retirement age of widows, working women and wives from age 65 to 62. For quite some time I have advocated reduction in the retirement age for women. When the bill passed this body last year, the retirement age for all of these categories of women was reduced from 65 to 62. When the bill came back to us from the other body a provision was made for reduction in the retirement age to 62 with full benefits for widows, but it provided further for actuarial reduction in retirement benefits for wives and working women if they decided to retire at age 62 rather than 65. In the case of wives, 75 percent of full benefits may be received by them if they begin receiving them at 62 and in case of the working women 80 percent of their full benefits if they retire at 62 instead of 65. As I have indicated, under the House version of the bill, all women were permitted to retire at 62 with full benefits. I am still convinced that this was by far the better plan. However, I am cognizant of the fact that this modified version of the bill was apparently the only proposal acceptable to the Senate.

I have all along favored legislation providing for the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 60 and it is my intention to advocate and work for legislation in the future in this regard.

Another extremely important provision of the 1956 amendments is the provision for disability insurance protection for the permanently and totally disabled after 50 years of age. The inclusion of this most desirable provision firms up the protection of our social-security program and inaugurates what, in my opinion, is one of the most humanitarian steps which could have been taken by this Congress. Formerly, a worker who was insured under the system and who became disabled, regardless of his age, was compelled to wait until age 65 before attaining eligibility for any benefits. This was, in my opinion, neither sound nor fair. A breadwinner who is unfortunate enough to become permanently and totally disabled at age 50, and who has been fully insured under social security, should certainly not be compelled to wait for 15 years before entitlement to benefits.

There are approximately 250,000 people who may become eligible for benefits during the first year under this humane provision of the bill and this basic protection is extended to some 35 million insured persons. I, personally, would have much preferred not to see the age limit of 50 placed in the disability-insurance provision and it is my intention to work on improvement in this regard.

Provision is also made for the payment of benefits after age 18 to the dependent child of a retired or deceased worker if the child has been permanently and totally disabled since before age 18. The mother of such child will also be eligible for benefits under this provision so long as the child continues to remain in her care. This provision originated in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and, in my opinion, is one of the most desirable and commendable provisions in the entire bill. The problems faced by those unfortunate individuals who have to care for a physically or mentally handicapped child are extremely sad and their suffering is increased as the result of their concern as to what may happen should the family's income be cut off by death or retirement of the wage earner. This meritorious provision will certainly help improve such a situation.

Coverage is extended to many additional individuals, so that now our social-security program is almost universal in its coverage. Some 250,000 persons are aided, and perhaps many additional people, depending upon State and local action. Almost all self-employed professional people are now included under the coverage of social security except physicians who were left out at their request; coverage is made available to more State and local employees, and additional groups are brought into the system, such as employees of Federal home-loan banks, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and others.

Several improvements are made with regard to grants-in-aid for public assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children. The Federal share for such programs is increased, and the program for aid to dependent children is considerably broadened and improved. Federal support for research is provided, and Federal funds for child welfare are also increased.

I believe everyone will agree that the social-security laws have surely given our elder citizens some measure of protection in contrast to the situation which confronted them before the first social-security bill was enacted into law in 1935—21 years ago. I have long advocated lowering the retirement age for men and women to 60. While this legislation does not go that far, I feel that the current amendments constitute a well-won victory for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to briefly cover the major provisions of this humane legislation. It has afforded me great pleasure to support and vote for it. It is presently my intention to work for further improvements in our social-security system so as to afford adequate protection and security for all of our people.

The Importance of Highway Safety and the Meaning of Wisconsin's Great Highway Expansion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, here is a grim fact: From January through July

1956 there were as many as 21 percent more traffic fatalities in Wisconsin than in the first 7 months of 1955.

This is the serious toll reported to the people of our State by R. C. Salisbury, safety director for our State motor vehicle department at Madison.

FIVE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT BADGERS KILLED ON ROADS ALREADY IN 1956

In all of 1955 we hit a tragic new high in traffic fatalities. Nine hundred and thirty-two Badgers were killed.

Already this year 578 Wisconsinites have been killed on the roads and highways. Each day the press, radio, and TV report more accidents on the streets and in the countryside.

Five hundred and seventy eight already dead in 1956 represents a shocking record. It gives pause to every Wisconsinite to think.

WISCONSIN'S FINE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Let me state quite clearly that my State, despite these statistics, has done a great deal in the direction of increased highway safety.

Wisconsin has always had a fine safety program. It has always had an excellent road system. More than 11,000 miles of State roads, well maintained. We enjoy too some of the finest highway experts and builders in the Nation in Madison and in our 71 counties.

Yet it is obvious from the above statistics that, despite our admitted progress, despite our high caliber of highway leadership, we still suffer from the heartbreaking accident toll which I have just mentioned.

I have prepared a statement on the issue of highway safety, and improved roads for my State—from the smallest secondary and feeder roads on State trunk highways to the most modern superhighways. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the final edition of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

It has always been my approach to "accentuate the positive."

I am glad, therefore, to mention at the outset some of other fine groups which are working very constructively to increase road safety in our State.

Foremost are, of course, as I have indicated, the top-grade men heading up and staffing our State highway department, and our county road departments. They are as hardworking and dedicated a group as we would be proud to meet almost anywhere.

There are other praiseworthy individuals and groups as well. Right now, for example, Wisconsin's highly respected Council of Safety, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Oil Industry's Information Committee, and the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, is enlisting the support of many motorists at our State fair. Drivers are asked to sign a safety pledge and are given a car sticker signifying that they are cooperating in the "Save a Life" campaign.

This work is being spearheaded by Mr. James Bolton, director of industrial expositions for the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.

GREAT JOB DONE BY AAA

Simultaneously, full credit is due to another great job which is being performed by the always alert Wisconsin division of the American Automobile Association. Few, if any, groups in our country have worked longer, harder, or more effectively in the field than has the pioneering AAA.

In Wisconsin, courteous, enterprising AAA offices, under the leadership of Stuart Wright, have been in the vanguard of encouraging greater safety, whether it is through the wonderful school safety patrol, or excellent driver training of youngsters and adults, or pedestrian protection, or other worthwhile programs.

GOOD RESULTS IN PEDESTRIAN PROTECTION

On this last point, fortunately, good progress can be reported in protecting pedestrians on our streets and highways.

Since 1937, Wisconsin pedestrian deaths decreased—I emphasize—decreased from 270 a year to 141 a year in 1955. Thus, pedestrian deaths dropped 48 percent, while motor vehicle registrations climbed 66 percent.

This shows that we can, indeed, improve protection of life and property.

One of the keys to this program is through better traffic engineering. The vast city of Milwaukee, in particular, has done an outstanding job in this respect. It handles huge numbers of shoppers, office workers, factory employees, and other folks walking along the streets—particularly in rush hours. It protects their lives, while keeping the wheels of traffic moving effectively. Our Milwaukee police are entitled to a salute for this record, just as are our hard-working police officers, sheriffs, highway patrolmen and other law enforcement protectors, throughout the State.

WARNING AS LABOR DAY WEEKEND APPROACHES

The approach of any holiday is, of course, a particular reminder of the need for highway safety. With Labor Day weekend coming up, it is especially important that every one of us bear in mind the importance of slowing down so as to save a life—including our very own.

The tragic fact is that in 1955, throughout the 48 States, motor vehicle accidents were the No. 1 killer. They killed 26,725 men, and 8,861 women. This is a greater number than the total of battle deaths in Korea, which was 33,629.

WE KILL MORE ON ROADS THAN DIED ON ALL BATTLEFIELDS

Further, the amazing facts are that more people have been killed by cars since the first auto appeared on the scene than have been killed in all the conflicts which we, as a nation, have waged.

Thus, from America's Revolutionary War through the Korean war, 1,130,000 Americans have been killed as a result of wars. But the National Safety Council reports that since 1900 alone, traffic accidents have taken 1,149,000 lives. Certainly, there is a statistic which every American should ponder. We actually have slaughtered more of our citizens on the highways than were killed by our enemies on the battlefield.

THE INTANGIBLE COSTS OF ACCIDENTS

The list of the killed is not, however, the only toll. Actually, in 1955, 1.3 million Americans were injured in some way from motor vehicle accidents.

Insurance experts may be able to compute the staggering direct cost of these injuries and fatalities. But they cannot compute the intangible costs—the inestimable heartbreak, the suffering, the pain, represented in that 1.3 million figure of the injured and the 38,000 death toll.

FROM WHITE HOUSE COME SAFETY APPEALS

It is understandable, therefore, why at all levels of government, we are redoubling our efforts for highway safety. From the White House, from State capitols, from county courthouses, from city halls, are coming renewed appeals for cooperation in protection programs.

I am particularly impressed with the fine job—the constructive theme—which has been emphasized by Presidential Assistant Howard Pyle, former Governor of Arizona. Speaking with the full support of our great Chief Executive himself, Governor Pyle has sounded a timely keynote to curb the ghastly toll on the highways.

STUDY BY HOUSE COMMERCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meanwhile, a House of Representatives subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS is making very important studies on the safety factors in American cars themselves.

NEW 40,000-MILE SYSTEM WILL FURTHER SAFETY

Fortunately, under the new Federal-State highway system, as authorized just a few weeks ago, we are going to have a very important means to further highway safety.

My readers are well aware of the general provisions of the new $28 billion, 13-year program. Under it, Uncle Sam carries 90 percent of the cost in developing the 40,000-mile interstate highway system.

Some folks may not be aware that in section 117, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining what action should be taken by the Federal Government to increase highway safety. The Secretary will submit a report to the Congress by March 1, 1959.

FINE GRASSROOTS LEADERSHIP FROM LOCAL OFFICIALS

Inherent in that section is the realization that Uncle Sam has a vital role to play. But it must never be forgotten that roads and road safety are basically a community job—a county job—in coperation with the officials of the 48 States.

I look, therefore, to Wisconsin's splendid highway department, and to our highway officials in the 71 counties of America's Dairyland for continued grassroots leadership.

WE ARE PROUD OF WISCONSIN ROAD OFFICIALS

We, of Wisconsin, pride ourselves in our excellent road program. Our highway officials, including engineers, are numbered among the best in the Nation. Thanks to their foresight, our detailed plans were long ready for the new Federal-State program. Efficiency, honesty, reliability, have been the hallmarks of construction by our State and county highway departments and by private contractors.

Like other States, we could use a lot more engineers, of course. But we are certainly not caught short, the way some States are, in their highway plans. Under State Highway Commission Chairman Harold L. Plummer, we are moving full speed ahead, and we are planning for up-to-the-minute revisions, as fast as proves necessary.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS AFFECTING WISCONSIN

I should like to include now a summary of some of the principal features and advantages of the Wisconsin phase of the Federal-State highway program.

The interstate system in Wisconsin includes a route from the Illinois line straight north into Milwaukee, a bypass around Milwaukee, a route west from downtown Milwaukee to Madison, a northwest route from the Illinois line near Genoa City to St. Paul, a route from Tomah on the west near La Crosse to Minnesota, and an extension from Duluth into Superior. A great share of the routes in Wisconsin will be built on new location. The total mileage has not been precisely determined, but it may reach nearly 500 miles. Milwaukee is the only city in Wisconsin with an interstate route through the heart of the city.

About 500 miles at a total cost of nearly half a billion in new work will call for additional common and skilled labor, new capital and equipment for contractors, and a

large market for colcal sand, gravel, crushed rock. Oil and fuel to operate the machines will boost sales of local suppliers. The heavy industry in the State and the employment it provides will be enhanced by sales of highway construction equipment all over the Nation in addition to the sales for Wisconsin construction. Estimates have been made that this increase alone will amount to 200 to 300 percent in the peak years of the 13-year program for the National System of Interstate Highways. Milwaukee is the Nation's foremost center of manufacture for highway equipment.

Transportation will benefit the carriers as they bring in increased amounts of steel, cement, asphalts, products not generally originating in Wisconsin, and take out Wisconsin-made machinery and equipment for use in the rest of the country.

BENEFITS TO STATE WHEN COMPLETED

Manufactured products from Wisconsin centers of industry, Milwaukee, Waukesha, Racine, Kenosha, Eau Claire, Madison, La Crosse, Superior, will be in a better competitive position for out-of-State markets, as will the great Fox River Valley feeding into Milwaukee over an excellent new highway connecting there with the Interstate System. Excellent feeder roads, State and county trunks all along the I-system, will bring milk and dairy products into the I-system for faster arrival to out-of-State markets. Even now, Wisconsin ships more liquid out of the State by tank truck than is produced by the next three highest milk-producing States. Similar benefits will occur for pulp and paper products down from the central north.

The Interstate System will greatly enhance Wisconsin's position as a leading recreational State. The Interstate System passes through the Lake Geneva area, the Wisconsin Dells area, and skirts the bottom of the Indian Head country of northwest Wisconsin. Where the Dells, for example, is now about a 5- to 6-hour drive from Chicago, and varying greatly by congestion encountered depending on time and day chosen for the trip, Interstate System roads should cut this time by as much as 2 hours. Uniform speed, lower driving costs, much more comfortable travel with less strain, in addition to saving time, will bring many more tourists to Wisconsin attractions. The Northeast Lakeland, 200 miles away from the route of the Interstate, will greatly benefit from it to a marked degree, simply because Wisconsin will be so easily reached when the Interstate System is completed in the other States. More tourists will come, a lot more, and the excellent primary roads branching off from the interchanges on the Interstate System will bring many of these additional visitors into every part of the State.

Wisconsin roads now serving the areas to be reached by the Interstate System are the most congested in the State. Divided roadways planned for the Interstate System and limiting all access to interchanges a few blocks apart in Milwaukee to several miles apart in rural areas will eliminate much of the driving tension. Our own citizens using the Interstate System will get to work feeling fresher and will get home earlier and less tired from driving. Tourists will arrive relaxed. And with the Interstate System easily absorbing a great volume of the traffic in the State, the rest of our trunklines and local roads will be in a position to serve their normal traffic more efficiently.

On the Interstate System, sometime in 1957 will probably see the start of construction on a 60-mile section between Eau Claire and Hudson, and on a 26-mile piece between the Illinois line and Milwaukee.

Already under construction is a part of the Milwaukee expressways with more work to begin in 1957, and a portion of the Milwaukee-Madison leg in eastern Waukesha County.

WHY I AM COMMENTING IN THIS MUCH DETAIL

Let me point out that I am presenting these comments in this length because I feel that it is necessary that we take a truly broadgaged look at the whole highway scene.

SUPERHIGHWAYS ARE NOT ACCIDENT CURE-ALL

Let me mention, too, that superhighways in and of themselves are not accident cure-alls. A speedster who mistakenly thinks that he can casually operate at jet speeds along a 4-lane highway can be just as much of a danger as a man who has exaggerated notions of speed while operating on a limited 2-lane road.

Along superhighways there tend to be a considerable number of rear-end collisions, as cars attempt to overtake and pass other cars. There are accidents as well at entrances and exits to cloverleaf intersections. There are accidents, too, from following too closely behind the car in front of you—not realizing the enormous amount of space which you will require if you have to hit the brakes in an emergency.

At 40 miles per hour a car will go 44 feet between the time we see danger and the time we get our foot on the brake; then 84 additional feet to stop if our brakes are good. But at 70 miles per hour it will take 77 feet to get on the brakes, and then 256 more feet to stop. That is an enormous amount of driving room which we had better allow ourselves.

Wisconsin's speed limits—65 miles per hour in daytime and 55 miles per hour at night—will of course continue to be strictly enforced by our police departments, our sheriffs, and our judiciary.

BEWARE THE POOR CAR AND POOR DRIVER

Readers should note, too, that vehicles in poor driving condition—with bad brakes, improperly functioning headlights, and the like—are just as much of a menace or even more dangerous on a high-speed highway than on a less modern road.

And, of course, the negligent driver is a menace anywhere, particularly the man who has had "one too many." Alcohol and gasoline don't mix. The bleary-eyed fellow who mistakenly assures everybody, "I'm perfectly all right; I'm steady as a rock; I can stop on a dime—let's have another"—that fellow may end up in the hospital or morgue, and he may take some innocents with him as well.

Fortunately, Wisconsin's point demerit system should serve to rid us of that type of road menace by promptly denying him his license.

FULL COOPERATION NECESSARY

All in all, good roads are, therefore, an important device for greater highway safety, but they are not going, all by themselves, to solve the highway accident problem overnight.

Instead, we must all cooperate—every pedestrian, every driver—with city, county, State, and Federal officials, with fine organizations like the Wisconsin Council of Safety, the Wisconsin Division of the American Automobile Association, and others.

LANDSCAPING INCREASES ROAD BEAUTY

Fortunately, our improved highway system is going to contribute to our enjoyment of the beautiful Wisconsin countryside. This is especially important since tourism is Wisconsin's No. 2 industry. Along our estimated 483 miles of highways under the Federal-State system will be attractive trees and shrubbery. R. L. Williams, of Madison, State engineer of ways and landscaping with the highway commisison, estimates $200,000 is being spent yearly for roadside improvement work. Plantings along the roads not only furnish pleasant eye appeal, but help deaden noise and help screen homes and businesses from the rush of traffic.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AMERICAN CAR

Lastly, I point out that the American car remains as one of the key features of the American scene. The automobile has almost revolutionized American life, bringing untold benefits, economic and social. With 64 million vehicles already registered on the Nation's highways, it is inevitable that a safety problem results.

But in the years ahead, we are going to have 80 million, 90 million, and more vehicles—cars and trucks. We must, therefore, act now to establish sound patterns which will reduce the accident toll immediately, and in years up ahead.

Good highways are good business, and they are good protectors of life and limb, as well.

COOPERATION—FROM COUNTY TRUNKS TO SUPERHIGHWAYS

I pledge my continued cooperation with our highway experts—with the men striving to improve our road system, whether it be the smallest county trunk or the most modern four-lane superhighway.

A farmer transporting his goods to market, a vacationer heading for the muskies of the lake country, a truckdriver bringing in items for Wisconsin's thriving factories, a motorist commuting to work—all these are entitled to top roads and top protection.

House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Statistical Summary and Accomplishments in the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment sine die of the 84th Congress, another Congress will have closed its official books; by that action Members are announcing to the world that they are heading home to stand or fall on the record of accomplishments during the 417 calendar days and 234 legislative days falling between convening on January 5, 1955, and—absent a special session—the July 27, 1956, adjournment.

As Members are aware, the measurement of the permanent record of accomplishments of the 84th Congress cannot be based solely on having attempted the physically impossible—listening to and observing the frequently simultaneous proceedings on the House and Senate floors, which consumed nearly 2,300 hours of total time, let alone attending the thousands of hours of proceedings in the 19 standing committees of the House and 14 standing committees of the Senate.

It is probable that perusal of the more than 60 million words contained in the some 25,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of proceedings, and more than 12,000 pages of the daily Appendix, might well tend to confuse, rather than clarify, the picture of accomplishments during the 2-year period—since it is particularly under our Federal system that reasonable men can, may, and do differ as to cause and effect.

A more positive measure of accomplishment might be reflected by a study of the history and disposition of the 18,939 measures introduced during the 84th Congress—but again, such a study

would challenge even the most energetic and industrious individual among us.

In the end, it appears that the answer to the question of performance by any given Congress can only be found in the laws actually written into the books. In the end, there has merged from the 167 years' accumulation of billions of spoken and written words, millions of pounds of paper consumed, and tens of thousands of hours of debate and discussion by Congresses which preceded this one—just 68 volumes of United States Statutes at Large, occupying roughly 30 linear feet of bookshelf space. Just as volume 1, United States Statutes at Large, at pages 23 and 24, serves to preserve for all time the text of the first act approved by the 1st Congress of the United States, so will volumes 69 and 70 serve to preserve for tomorrow and the future the positive record, the real accomplishments of the 84th Congress.

In short, with gavels sheathed, the smoke cleared, the vocal thunder sienced, the galleries emptied, and the final rollcall tallied, the 417 calendar days, 230 legislative days, 2,300 hours of House and Senate floor action, 37,000 pages of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and daily Appendix, 18,939 bills, and more than 60 million words officially spoken or written in the 84th Congress—boil down to just about 14 pounds of paper, ink, goldleaf, cardboard, leather, thread, glue, and buckram, in two additional volumes of the official statutes.

Having in mind the foregoing, I would like to outline the contribution made by the committee which I serve as chairman, and refer to some of the factors which make possible our accomplishments during the 84th Congress.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has broad responsibilities in the field of natural resources and the public domain, including administration and development of our national parks system, and in the field of human resources, with respect to the administration and welfare of our Indians and Indian tribes, and our fellow citizens in the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Reflecting recognition of the breadth of our assignment, the committee roster of 32 members shows representation from 19 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. A substantial portion of our legislation deals with matters directly affecting the development and economy of the West and our offshore areas, which perhaps accounts for representation from 14 of the States west of the Mississippi River—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington—and 5 east of the Mississippi—Florida, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

This geographic distribution of the membership results, I believe, in a balanced legislative approach in the national interest and, at the same time, retains the regional know-how which permits full understanding of the matters considered. For example, this distribution means that—

Members come from States, Territories, or possessions embracing approximately three-fourths of the land areas, continental and offshore, of the United States.

Of the 17 States of the reclamation West, 13 have members serving on the committee.

Of the 11 mining States of the West, 9 have representatives on the committee.

More than 320,000 of the approximately 405,000 Indians of the United States and Alaska have a direct voice by reason of the areas represented.

The achievements of the Congress just ended—and I believe the statistical references which follow emphasize this—were made possible only through the cooperation and diligence of all of the 32 members of our committee. But for the energy and leadership of our subcommittee chairmen—Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee; Chairman LEO W. O'BRIEN, Territories and Insular Affairs Subcommittee; Chairman WALTER ROGERS, Mines and Mining Subcommittee; Chairman GRACIE PFOST, Public Lands Subcommittee; and Chairman JAMES A. HALEY, Indian Affairs Subcommittee; and the continuing cooperation, guidance, and counsel of the ranking minority member and former chairman, Dr. A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, and his colleagues, we would have been unable to perform our mission.

STAFF ORGANIZATION

Again during the 84th Congress our professional and clerical staff have met a high standard of performance in committee activities, in their service to members. The professional staff, composed of George W. Abbott, counsel; Sidney L. McFarland, engineering consultant; George H. Soule, minerals and lands consultant; and John L. Taylor, Territories and Indians consultant, have all made a substantial contribution to the achievements of the committee.

The clerical and stenographic staff headed by Nancy J. Arnold, chief clerk of the committee, and made up of Nelda Boding, Eve Fatzinick, Gertrude Harris, and Laura Ann Moran—supplemented during a part of the sessions just ended by Geraldine W. Eaker and Linda Glavey—complete the staff organization without which the committee legislative and administrative workload could not be met.

BROADENED LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

A brief reference to some readily available statistics will serve, I believe, to sustain an assertion that the responsibility of the legislative branch had broadened immensely in its complexities in the past 100 years, and that the statistical work output of the 84th Congress approaches an all-time high, with a major contribution by our committee.

Between the convening of the 1st Congress in 1789, and the adjourning of the 83d Congress in 1954, a grand total of 31,782 public laws had been written into the Federal statute books—an average or roughly 383 public laws per Congress.

The 26th Congress, which sat from 1839 to 1841, wrote 55 public laws into the books, for the all-time low total, while the 84th Congress, with 1,028 public laws enacted, is second only to the all-time high total compiled by the 70th Congress which served 1927–29.

Of the 1,028 public laws enacted by the 84th Congress, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs accounted for 191—which means that just under 1 of 5 bills which became public law originated with our committee. In sharp contrast, just 100 years ago, the total number of public laws enacted—by the entire 34th Congress, sitting 1855–57—was 157.

Finally, and put another way, the overall statistical comparison reveals that bills which became public law, processed by 1 standing committee alone—the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—equal or exceed in number the total output of any 1 full Congress of the 36 Congresses which sat between 1789 and 1861, excepting the 27th Congress—1841 to 1843—with a total of 201 public laws.

While I believe that such comparisons are of great interest from a historical standpoint, I hasten to add that I leave to others the conclusions to be drawn from their examination.

While a more detailed breakdown and description of the measures acted on by our committee in the Congress just adjourned will be carried in a committee print now being compiled, I wish to point here to some of the landmark legislation handled.

I. PUBLIC LANDS, LAND RESOURCES

Through its Public Lands Subcommittee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has legislative responsibility for utilization, conservation, and development of more than 459 million acres of public lands and associated resources in the United States and Alaska, together with in excess of 24 million acres embraced within more than 180 units of the national park system, and nearly 160 million additional acres of lands within national forests created from the public domain.

THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

During the session of Congress just ended, our committee reported, and the Congress approved, legislation providing for the establishment or recognition of six new units within the national park system: Virgin Islands National Park, St. John-St. Thomas Islands, V. I.—Public Law 925; City of Refuge National Historical Park, Island of Hawaii, T. H.—Public Law 177; Pea Ridge National Military Park, Ark.—Public Law 744; Booker T. Washington National Monument, Va.—Public Law 464; Mikveh Israel Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of Independence National Historical Park—Public Law 1009; and Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, Ala.—Public Law 800.

Four laws enacted direct studies of the desirability of bringing into the park system the proposed Brooklyn Monument, N. Y.—Public Law 75; historic properties in Boston, Mass., and vicinity—Public Law 214; Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument—Public Law 590; and historic properties in New York City and vicinity—Public Law 341.

In keeping with its policy of continuing reevaluation of existing units of the park system, the full committee and Congress voted to abolish Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak.—Public Law 891; Castle Pinckney National Monument, S. C.—Public Law 447; Old Kaasan National Monument, Alaska—Public Law 179; and Verendrye National Monument, N. Dak.—Public Law 846; approve construction of a sewage disposal system—Public Law 454; and to permit certain land exchanges to ready Colonial National Historical Park, Va., for the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown celebration in 1957—Public Law 448—to exclude certain surplus lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and thus make them available for recreational purposes for local governmental subdivisions—Public Law 755; provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo.—Public Law 287; add certain lands to Pipestone National Monument, Minn.—Public Law 593; consolidate Zion National Monument and Zion National Park, Utah—Public Law 695; redesignate Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor as Liberty Island—Public Law 936; relocate Trenton Massacre National Monument, Nebr.—Public Law 453; designate the General Grant Tree, King's Canyon National Park, Calif., a national shrine—Public Law 441; complete acquisition of non-Federal lands with the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area, North Carolina—Public Law 1000; authorize additional road construction in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.—Public Law 275; and to revise the boundaries of Theodore Roosevelt National Park, N. Dak.—Public Law 438.

Two other public laws will contribute measurably in administration of the park program—Public Law 127, providing broader authority in managing the various museum properties within the system, and Public Law 712, to reduce substantially the number of proposed park concession awards required to be transmitted to the Congress prior to execution.

CEMETERIES LEGISLATION

Two measures dealing with national cemeteries were approved: One authorizing burial in national cemeteries of the remains of Public Health Service officers who served during World War II and the Korean war—Public Law 501; and the other amending a 1954 act so as to provide for erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries for individuals who die or are killed while serving with the Armed Forces during peacetime, as well as those whose death occurred during wartime from reasons other than contact with an enemy and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable—Public Law 651.

PUBLIC LAND ENTRY, USE

Five measures enacted into law will help to assure fuller utilization and development of public lands and their resources: Public Law 171, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire rights-of-way and existing connection roads adjacent to public lands when needed to provide access to timber on public lands under his jurisdiction; Public Law 76, bringing uniformity into the laws governing entry under the Desert Land Act by permitting maximum entry on mineral lands up to 320 acres, the same maximum allowable for many years on nonmineral lands; Public Law 247, requiring recording of all "paper" in the form of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights outstanding as claims for rights to public lands by reason of more than 40 acts of Congress between 1815 and 1922 authorizing issuance of such "paper"; Public Law 39, extending to an additional 80,000 acres of land within Coconino National Forest, Ariz., present statutory authority providing for supervision of mining locations so as to preserve to the maximum public recreation and timber values while mineral resource development goes forward; and Public Law 834, suspending for 3 years from March 1, 1956, the requirement that entrymen under the Desert Land Act must reclaim and continue to reclaim entered land and put it in shape to produce crops—this in the face of the existing crop surpluses in several basic commodities.

LAND TITLE, CONVEYANCE

A number of measures enacted into public law after reporting by the committee reflect a continuing policy of attempting to equitably resolve historic land title disputes, remove Federal clouds on title by reason of erroneous surveys or faulty recording, and to assist local governmental subdivisions in carrying out their public functions which require use of real property.

Among acts in this category are those which provide legislative authority in Interior for the management and disposition of the Federal interest in approximately 20,000 acres of reconveyed Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian lands scattered in small tracts throughout a 6,000 square-mile area in eastern Oklahoma—Public Law 215; settling substantial title uncertainties to lands bordering the Indian River, Fla., by authorizing patent issuance to long-time occupants—Public Law 258; clarifying the law relating to granting of school sections to the States so as to pass title notwithstanding outstanding mineral leases at the time of survey, an act principally of interest to the State of Utah, but also applicable in California, Arizona, and New Mexico—Public Law 699; conveying land to the Lake County School District, Oregon, for school construction purposes—Public Law 456; extending for 5 years a 1950 act authorizing conveyance of certain public lands in Miles City, Mont., for essential city-planned industrial development—Public Law 191; removing narrow use restrictions on 154 acres of land deeded in 1923 to the ctiy of Chandler, Okla., and conveying the land for public utilization—Public Law 241; authorizing conveyance under the Recreation Act of certain lands in Phillips County, Mont., substantially improved and long utilized for public recreation by the local American Legion post, to the post—Public Law 589; to quitclaim to the city of Saginaw, Mich., all rights of the United States, if any, in a 640-acre key urban tract in the city and thus remove a 137-year-old cloud on the title to the lands involved—Public Law 444; to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., upon payment of fair market value, 6,859 acres of arid, undeveloped public lands adjoining and confining this World War II federally-created, and now third-largest city in Nevada—Public Law 522; authorizing the State of Arizona to convey to an agricultural improvement and power district, a State political subdivision, for use as a building site, approximately 29 acres of land previously conveyed under restrictive covenants precluding the proposed public use—Public Law 36; removing a cloud on title resulting from a pre-1900 fraudulent survey to approximately 240 acres of lands located within the exterior boundaries of Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., which lands have for a number of years been improved and occupied by some 70 claimants, and treated as private lands by Federal administering agencies—Public Law 449; authorizing transfer to the State of Wyoming in the Camp Guernsey, Platte County, area 7,680 acres of land for National Guard and Air National Guard purposes, with reversion if not so used—Public Law 77; and quitclaiming Federal interest to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla., where the United States had presumably acquired title when Florida was acquired in 1819, but in fact was in private title some 6 years earlier—Public Law 499.

II. MINING, MINERAL RESOURCES

The House Mines and Mining Subcommittee—reflecting its responsibility for mining interests generally, mineral land laws and the claims and entries thereunder, geological survey, and mineral resources and petroleum conservation on the public lands—during the 84th Congress considered, and the full committee and the Congress approved, several landmark pieces of legislation in the evolutionary Federal program for maximium development, utilization, and conservation of the minerals and materials resources of the public lands of the United States.

MULTIPLE SURFACE USE ACT

Probably the most significant change in the mining laws of the United States since adoption by Congress of the first general mining laws, in 1872, is the Multiple Surface Use Act of 1955, Public Law 167. Put succinctly, it operates to amend historic law so as to permit the use of the surface and subsurface of the same tracts of public lands for prepatent prospecting and mining activity at the same time management and utilization of forestry products, forage crops, grazing, fish and wildlife, wilderness, water, scenic, and related resources go forward; its provisions will also assure that existence of a mining claim cannot, prior to patenting, be used to block access to adjacent lands—all without limiting or interfering with prospecting and mining activities on the claim proper.

POWER WITHDRAWAL, COAL RESERVE ENTRY

Another public law put on the books by the 84th Congress, after lengthy committee consideration—the Mining Claims Restoration Act of 1955, Public Law 359—opens to entry approximately

7 million acres of public lands, all in the West, withdrawn or reserved for power development. Approximately 95 percent of these lands had been closed to mining development for 45 years, since around 1910. Its enactment is one more legislative step in the drive to encourage search for, and development of, the strategic and critical domestic minerals and materials resources so vital to our economy.

Similarly, in the area of compatible resource uses, the Congress approved legislation providing for entry and location of mining claims on the discovery of a valuable source material on public lands classified as or known to be valuable for coal—Public Law 357. This law was found necessary to clear title complications to a large number of mining claims located in the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana in good-faith compliance with the mining laws, and to further the exploration and development of uranium-bearing lignite coal deposits considered by the Atomic Energy Commission as an important potential source of uranium.

CONSERVATION OF ANTHRACITE

As a major step in conservation of the all-important anthracite coal resources in Pennsylvania, Congress enacted Public Law 162, which provides for a Federal-State program, and authorizes up to an $8.5 million Federal contribution to the State on a matched-fund basis, to meet the capital cost of a program designed to control and drain water in anthracite coal formations. Effecting of this program will not only conserve irreplaceable natural resources and strengthen the national security, but will prevent injuries and loss of life, and preserve public and private property constantly threatened by huge quantities of water in subsurface coal workings.

DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM

Pending development by the Executive agencies of a recommended long-range domestic minerals program, the committee moved in the 84th Congress to respond to an acute need for interim assistance which would help to decelerate the rapidly eroding domestic mining industry—an erosion brought on by the flow of raw materials from foreign mines, price manipulations in world markets, and the destructive effects brought about by the dumping of foreign production on American markets.

After assurance from the Executive that domestic purchase programs for high-grade manganese, chromite, mica, beryl, metallurgical grade fluorspar, and antimony were being extended, Public Law 733 was enacted to establish programs for the purchase of tungsten concentrates, 1.25 million short ton units; acid grade fluorspar, 250,000 short ton units; nonferrous asbestos, up to 4,000 tons, specified grades; and columbium-tantalum bearing ores and concentrates, 250,000 pounds, combined pentoxides, from mines in the United States. Initial appropriations of $21 million were voted by the 84th Congress to meet the maximum anticipated cost of the program—$92 million—with purchase authority terminating on December 31, 1958.

III. WATER RESOURCE UTILIZATION, DEVELOPMENT

In the field of water resource utilization and development so immediately vital to the Reclamation West, and so essential in the long run to our Nation's economic strength, the 2-year legislative period just ended stands out in two major respects: first, it marks a reversal of the trend which in the past several years brought the Federal reclamation program to a virtual halt; second, it stands not only as a reversal of that trend, but goes into the books as the Congress which approved 35 separate pieces of legislation authorizing the most far-reaching reclamation program to come out of a single Congress since the Federal program was initiated 54 years ago.

This monumental program, statistically, means this: against a $367 million program in 1950 which had dropped in 1954 to less than $150 million, and saw the 83d Congress authorized several small projects with an estimated total cost of about $56 million—and against all-time total accrued appropriations up to June 30, 1953, totaling slightly more than $3 billion—the 84th Congress authorized appropriations for new construction in excess of $1.3 billion.

Against 7.1 million irrigable acres ready to be served on Federal projects after 51 years, in 1953, this legislation provides for ultimately bringing—from 10 to 20 years hence—471,000 acres of new land under irrigation, and furnishing supplemental water to an additional 805,000 acres. It will result in creation of the long-range base for production of the food and fiber needed to meet the demands of a projected population in 1975 of as many as 220 million people.

This legislation adds to the 4.4 million kilowatts of installed hydroelectric capacity at Federal projects existing in 1953, an assurance of an additional 1.5 million kilowatts, and this additional power potential will furnish over 6.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually to the farms, cities, and industries of the West. Additional benefits resulting include flood control, stream pollution control, recreational benefits, stabilizing municipal and industrial water supplies, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife benefits.

A total of 9 new projects were authorized to be constructed in a total of 11 of the 17 States of the reclamation West.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

To initiate development of the last of the Nation's major undeveloped river basins—the upper Colorado—the committee reported and the Congress approved Public Law 485, to authorize construction of the $760 million Colorado River storage project in the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona. Construction of the four main-stem storage units initially authorized—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho Dams and Reservoirs, with a combined storage capacity of about 32.5 million acre-feet—will operate to provide holdover storage to meet interstate compact apportionment commitments and to permit the upper basin States to make full use of their apportioned share of the water; produce an estimated 5.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy to meet the ever-expanding power needs in the area and contribute to the overall financial feasibility; assure sound financial bases for the 11 participating—that is, reclamation—projects initially authorized—central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, Labarge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork—and future additional participating projects.

TRINITY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Legislation—Public Law 386—authorizing construction of the Trinity River addition to the Central Valley project, California, constitutes the third major leg of Federal participation in Valley development. The $225 million Trinity Dam and Reservoir on the Trinity River, a tributary of the Klamath River in northwestern California, will have a storage capacity of 2.5 million acre-feet. From this reservoir an average of about 700,000 acre-feet will be diverted annually to the Sacramento River Basin, and this amount, when coordinated with system operation, will provide about 1.2 million additional acre-feet of water annually for use in the Central Valley. In addition to fish, wildlife, and recreational benefits, the Trinity project will ultimately generate more than 1 billion kilowatt hours of electric energy annually at the dam's powerplants.

WASHOE PROJECT, NEVADA-CALIFORNIA

The $43.5 million Washoe project—Public Law 858—will regulate East Carson and Little Truckee Rivers flowing out of California into Nevada to supplement the present irrigation water supply for about 45,000 acres and furnish a full water supply to about 5,000 acres; will serve, when coordinated with flood control works existing and to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, to protect the Reno area from repetition of several devastating floods in the last few years; will generate approximately 96 million kilowatt-hours of energy annually for the Reno area, and substantially restore fish, wildlife, and recreational benefits at Pyramid Lake.

WASHITA PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

An area that has been repeatedly hard hit by alternate drought and flood conditions over a number of years, the Washita River Basin in southwestern Oklahoma, will benefit from enactment of Public Law 419 authorizing construction of the $40.6 million Washita project. This project will furnish flood protection, vitally needed municipal water, irrigation water in an area which has seen crop production drop 50 percent in the past 20 years, and related benefits.

AINSWORTH, FARWELL UNITS, NEBRASKA

Northwest central Nebraska—through construction of the $26 million Ainsworth dam, reservoir, and delivery system, on the Snake River—Public Law 531; and central Nebraska, through construction of the $30.5 million Farwell unit—Public Law 952—on the Middle Loup River—both units of the Missouri River Basin project, will have provided

in these key agricultural areas important irrigation, flood control, fish, wildlife, and recreation benefits. The Ainsworth unit ultimately will provide irrigation water for some 34,000 acres of land, while Farwell will provide water for about 52,500 acres.

CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OREGON

Authorization of the $6.6 million Crooked River project, Oregon—Public Law 992—will operate to furnish assured water supplies for irrigation of approximately 20,000 acres of land, make available an additional 51,000 acre-feet of water annually for other lands, to to provide protection against floods which have in the past resulted in extensive damage to the city of Prineville and the surrounding area.

LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

Expenditure of $1.9 million for the Little Wood River project in Blaine County, Idaho—Public Law 993—will result in construction raising the height of an existing dam, increasing storage capacity from 12,000 to 30,000 acre-feet, and thus provide—in addition to flood protection, fish and wildlife benefits—a supplemental water supply for irrigation of 9,550 acres of land which presently experience critical water shortages every year.

VENTURA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The $27.7 million Ventura River project, California—Public Law 423—involves primarily the storage of water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial uses, and will meet the urgent need for an additional firm water supply for both agricultural and municipal uses because of the rapidly expanding population in this southern California coastal area.

WAPINITIA PROJECT, OREGON

Finally, legislation was enacted—Public Law 559—to authorize the $500,000 Wapinitia project in north-central Oregon, providing for construction of a dam on Clear Creek, a tributary of the White River, to assure supplemental water for 2,100 acres currently suffering from an inadequate water supply.

MEASURES NOT APPROVED

Three measures reported by the committee, but not enacted, had as their purpose authorizing project construction in three other areas: H. R. 4719, authorizing construction of the $484 million multipurpose Hells Canyon project, on the Snake River, Idaho-Oregon, was never taken up on the House floor after counterpart legislation was defeated in Senate floor action; the $156-million Fryingpan-Arkansas project legislation, proposing a self-contained multipurpose development on the Arkansas River in southwestern Colorado, passed the Senate but the rule on the House measure, H. R. 412, was defeated in the House; and House Joint Resolution 672, clearing the way for construction of a 230-kilovolt transmission line from Fort Randall Dam, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr., was reported but failed of enactment.

Three measures constituting important supplements to reclamation law were reported and enacted into law, while several others amending existing law became public law.

SMALL PROJECTS ACT

The Small Reclamation Projects Act, Public Law 984, is probably the most important supplement to reclamation laws since the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. Applicable to the 17 western reclamation States, the new law provides for cooperation between the Federal Government and State or local public agencies in the development of small reclamation projects. It permits up to $5 million Federal participation in any single proposed locally planned, constructed, operated, and maintained reclamation project, such Federal funds to be made available in the form of loans for project benefits traditionally reimbursable under Federal reclamation law—irrigation and related benefits, such as power, municipal and industrial water supply, and drainage—or grants for benefits traditionally nonreimbursable because supplying public benefits—flood control, stream pollution control, fish and wildlife benefits—so long as the project requesting Federal assistance does not exceed in total cost $10 million.

DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS ACT

In a similar vein, legislation applicable only to Federal reclamation projects, Public Law 130, as amended by Public Law 520, authorizes loans to local irrigation districts for construction of distribution systems, thus reducing overall costs to the districts by less complex local planning and associated costs, and while Public Law 575 is designed to facilitate completion of drainage systems and other minor construction work on authorized reclamation projects by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract with water users' organizations for the accomplishment of such work.

ADMINISTRATION, REPAYMENT LEGISLATION

The committee also reported, and Congress approved, legislation clarifying repayment provisions of existing reclamation law by removing several major objections directed against the water-service contract or utility-type contract written under existing law, particularly in the Central Valley, Calif., and the Missouri River Basin project area, Public Law 643; amending existing law to provide that excess lands in Federal reclamation projects acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily, but not more than 5 years, Public Law 690; resolving a question raised as a result of an Arizona Supreme Court decision holding that percolating waters are not subject to the doctrine of prior appropriation by declaring—Public Law 226—that entrymen under the Federal Desert Land Act in Arizona who had depended on percolating waters for reclaiming their entries are granted a waiver of the Federal requirement that such entries "shall depend upon bona fide prior appropriation"; providing a financial boost to organizations short of funds upon project completion by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire movable property with funds appropriated for reclamation project construction and to transfer such property to the organization when it assumes project operation and maintenance, thus accelerating the date of local takeover, Public Law 924; and striking from existing law an archaic and offensive provision prohibiting employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of Federal reclamation projects, Public Law 517.

Five measures cleared the way for execution of repayment contracts in connection with Federal projects, delayed for various reasons, and assuring sound businesslike operation of Tule Lake Irrigation District, California—Public Law 877; Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District of the Gila project, Arizona—Public Law 394; Yuma County Water Users' Association, Arizona—Public Law 633; Riverside Irrigation District, Idaho—Public Law 849; and the Toston Irrigation District, Montana—Public Law 374.

SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTS

Seven measures enacted into law relate to specific projects and are designed to transfer from Interior to Army the administrative jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, and from Army to Interior similar responsibility from the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska—Public Law 505; modify the boundaries of the Yuma Auxiliary Project, Arizona—Public Law 409; authorize construction of a sewerage system for the construction camp serving Glendo Dam and Reservoir, Wyoming—Public Law 283; authorize amendment of certain contracts with the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for furnishing municipal water in connection with the Rapid Valley unit, and thus permit the city to issue bonds for constructing water system improvements—Public Law 964; quiet title to certain land in the city of Carlsbad, N. Mex., in the Carlsbad Irrigation District, where the improved lots involved were transferred by the district to the United States in 1905 as project repayment security, which obligation has been discharged—Public Law 762; designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam, Solano project, California, as Lake Berryessa—Public Law 494; and legislation to repeal a provision included in a 1938 act as an antispeculuation measure in connection with the Arch Hurley Conservancy District, Tucumcari, N. Mex., which provision has served its purpose and has subsequently worked hardships on parties involved in normal land transactions—Public Law 277.

Two other measures in separate categories were acted on, but were not finally approved: S. 3338, which would have required that rates for power and energy marketed to preference customers by the Southwestern Power Administration—in Missouri, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana—not be revised before July 1, 1957, a measure aimed at permitting further study before a proposed 40-percent rate increase took effect, meantime benefitting farmers in the area hard hit by drought conditions and depressed farm prices, was vetoed by the President; and H. R. 11685, providing for acquisition of Navaho Indian lands required in connection with the construction and operation of the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, failed to get action in the House.

INTERSTATE STREAM COMPACTS

Three pieces of legislation became law which grant the consent of Congress to

certain States to negotiate and enter into compacts relating to waters of interstate streams; the compacts, States, and streams involved are Red River compact, Public Law 346, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; Klamath River compact, Public Law 316, California and Oregon; and a California-Nevada proposed compact involving the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers—Public Law 353.

Finally, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 111, which extends the saline-water research program through fiscal 1963, and increases the amount authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $10 million.

IV. TERRITORIAL, INSULAR AFFAIRS

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, through its Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, is responsible for legislation affecting Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the coordinate responsibility of exercising a continuing oversight of the administration of these areas by the Department of the Interior.

Statistically, this responsibility involves more than 2,000 islands in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, the Bering Sea, and the Caribbean Sea, and the approximately 4 million inhabitants of these offshore areas. In terms of legislation, during the 84th Congress, a total of 49 public laws were enacted.

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH

After several years of failing to secure enactment of predecessor legislation, the committee acted on, and Congress approved, one of the most significant of all the Territories measures reported: The Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act, Public Law 830. By its provisions: responsibility for the Territorial mental health program is vested in Alaska; grants-in-aid amounting to $6.5 million for construction of facilities, and $6 million over a 10-year period to implement the program prior to full assumption of financial responsibility; and authority is granted the Territory to select up to 1 million acres of otherwise unappropriated lands over a 10-year period, with income therefrom to be first applied to meeting the expenses of the mental health program; and necessary transitional provisions are included.

Enactment of this legislation represents not only a major step toward fuller self-government in the Territory, but in a very real sense speaks loudly for the ability of Members of Congress to arrive at a sound conclusion in the face of an antienactment campaign earmarked by assertions embracing gross misinformation, half-truths, patent untruths, scurrilous and abusive language, and personal attacks directed at the committee, its members, and Members of Congress at large.

GUAM OMNIBUS ACT

The Guam Omnibus Act, Public Law 896, is designed to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and among the 25 Federal statutes made applicable to this unincorporated Territory are those extending certain educational, public health, opium and marihuana, agricultural, and library provisions to the area, together with a provision bringing the Governor's salary into line with that paid the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

HAWAII GENERAL MEASURES

A number of measures relate to governmental and fiscal matters in the Territory of Hawaii and operate to: reapportion the membership of the Hawaii Legislature—Public Law 895; increase the annual salaries of the Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, as well as the salaries of circuit court judges—Public Law 500; extend from 4 years to 7 years terms of the Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, and from 4 to 6 years the terms of circuit court judges—Public Law 508; authorize the issuance of not in excess of $50 million in highway revenue bonds, payable from highway vehicle fuel tax receipts—Public Law 716; amend existing law respecting territorial debt limit so as to make it clear that the ceiling is $95 million, or 10 percent of the assesed value of property, whichever is higher, and to ratify and confirm acts of the Territorial Legislature, thereby in effect declaring $17.7 million in authorized Honolulu city and Hawaii county school bonds to be within such limitation—Public Law 720; authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the amount of $14.5 million for construction of a municipal auditorium, Kalihi tunnel and approaches, park and playground construction and improvements, and sewage, flood control, and drainage facilities—Public Law 694; establish, with attendant redesignation of existing positions, the position of post-auditor in the Territorial Government, his functions to somewhat parallel those of the Comptroller General of the United States on the Federal level—Public Law 906; and legislation directing the National Science Foundation to investigate the need and feasibility of locating a geophysical institute in the Territory—Public Law 909.

HAWAII LAND USE

Extended hearings held by a special subcommittee in the Territory of Hawaii in 1954 served as a sound base for consideration and final action on several measures involving land utilization and land resource development: return to the Territory of 69.90 acres of land comprising part of Fort Armstrong and Kakaukukui, Honolulu, for conversion from spasmodic and limited military use to concentrated essential usage for warehousing, dockage, and freight handling facilities along the Honolulu waterfront—Public Law 894; authorization for acquisition by the Territory of littoral rights to certain tidelands abutting Waikiki Beach to permit initiation of construction by the Henry J. Kaiser interests of a multimillion dollar hotel and tourist attraction to be known as Crescent Beach—Public Law 199; ratification of Territorial legislation providing a practical method of disposing of small public land remnants resulting from eminent domain proceedings and abandonment of all or portions of existing but unused public roads, streets, and other rights-of-way—Public Law 478; authority for amendment of restrictive covenants in patents to tracts of not more than one-half acre so as to broaden permissive use—Public Law 481; and to permit construction of a church—Public Law 476; authorizing sale, under special circumstances, of certain public lands at Weliweli, Island of Kauai—Public Law 839—and Kaneohe Bay, island of Oahu—Public Law 900—to private individuals; making unnecessary a requirement for readvertisement of sale where public lands have once been offered for sale for residential purposes and not sold—Public Law 482; authorizing sale of 682 scattered and landlocked remnants of Territorial public lands—approximately 240 acres—with preference to abutting landowners without prohibitive expense of public auction—Public Law 869; amending existing law to increase the number of qualified farmers who may secure homestead lands in Hawaii—Public Law 903; permitting a number of eleemosynary organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry to file claims for lands conveyed by them to the Territory of Hawaii during World War II—Public Law 542; authorizing exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the Puna district, county of Hawaii, to persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic action during March–April, 1955—Public Law 844; and legislation providing for establishment of the 180-acre City of Refuge National Historical Park, Island of Hawaii—Public Law 177.

HAWAII-ALASKA WATER RESOURCES

Three measures deal with water resources development in Hawaii and Alaska: Authorizing the Hawaii commissioner of public lands to include in future conveyancing instruments future Territorial rights to enter on and to assess such lands for irrigation project development—Public Law 477; implementing the Hawaiian Irrigation Act of 1953 by giving clear statutory authority for orderly planning and construction of essential Territorial irrigation projects—Public Law 899; and Public Law 322, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to utilize more fully the Bureau of Reclamation facilities in Alaska to investigate and report to Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources in the Territory.

ALASKA GENERAL MEASURES

As in the case of Hawaii, several Alaska measures enacted into law relate to performance of governmental functions: Public Law 154, making members of the Territorial legislature eligible to qualify and to serve as delegates at the constitutional convention during November-December 1955; Public Law 201, making adjustments in boundaries between the second and fourth judicial districts; and Public Law 908, authorizing an increase in the amount retainable by United States commissioners from fees collected; Public Law 56, correcting a technical deficiency so that Alaska will be able to obtain full benefits of the Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1954; Public Law 904, extending for 2 years, or until December 31,

1958, authority for the Territory to acquire, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, personal property surplus to the needs of the Federal Government; and Public Law 923, directing Interior to select a site for port-of-entry facilities on the Alaska Highway nearer to the Alaska-Canadian border than the present one, 97 miles distant.

ALASKA LAND, RESOURCES, USE

Very substantial accomplishment in the direction of assuring further resources utilization and future economic development is reflected in enactment of additional Alaska measures: Public Law 213, eliminating the former requirement that an 80-rod space be reserved between public land entries on navigable waters, thus permitting fuller utilization of key shoreline areas; Public Law 158, authorizing road-building activities on through highways within the boundaries of Alaska municipal corporations; Public Law 163, authorizing renewal of a lease of Annette Island Airport, southern gateway to Alaska, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; Public Law 884, providing for establishment of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission to develop comprehensive recommendations for location of rail and highway facilities deemed most feasible economically and from a security standpoint for connection of the continental United States with Alaska; Public Law 232, permitting the Alaska Railroad to execute 55-year leases for location of industrial warehouses on railroad property, thus qualifying under national bank and other loan requirements; Public Law 507, authorizing Federal construction of camp grounds, parking areas, and other public recreation areas, including necessary access roads thereto, in Alaska; Public Law 516, authorizing issuance of $12.5 million in bonds to finance additional needed public improvements; Public Law 625, permitting export and sale of walrus hides by Alaskan indigenes, and prescribing regulations for taking of walruses by non-indigenes for purposes other than food and clothing; Public Law 698, making unnecessary both a presurvey final proof and postsurvey final proof of compliance with homestead requirements where entry is made on originally unsurveyed lands; Public Law 892, permitting disposal of lands restored from highway, telephone line, and pipeline withdrawals, and permitting abutting landowners to acquire extension of their present holdings; and Public Law 931, broadening the homestead law in Alaska to permit sale or other conveyance of allotted Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo homestead lands.

PUERTO RICO, VIRGIN ISLANDS MEASURES

Finally, in the Caribbean area, Public Law 692 transfers from Interior to Agriculture responsibility for servicing Puerto Rico hurricane relief loans, and to the Public Housing Commissioner the duty of servicing the sales contract of the Falansterio Apartments in San Juan; Public Law 925 authorizes establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park; and Public Law 186 directs the transfer of 60 acres of lands on St. Croix, V. I., to the Department of Agriculture for use in the Department's extension and research program.

V. INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Indian and native—Eskimo and Aleut—populations of the United States and Alaska approximates 435,000; Indian landholdings and reservations subject to varying degrees of Federal control total approximately 52 million acres in some 28 States. With 189 measures proposing Indian legislation refered to the committee, and in turn to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, the committee made what I believe to be substantial progress in its continuing effort to aid effectively in the management and conservation of Indian human, natural, and economic resources and funds, to assist in improving individual and tribal economic conditions, and to resolve difficulties arising from claims against the United States.

While the bulk of the 50 Indian measures enacted into public law deal with specific areas or tribes, landmark legislation of general significance was approved.

INDIAN VOCATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL TRAINING

Heading the list, and having far-reaching effect on the future welfare of our Indian citizens, is Public Law 959, authorizing a program of vocational training for adult Indians living on or near Indian reservations. With up to $3.5 million in Federal funds authorized to be appropriated annually, Public Law 959 is aimed primarily at improving the job skills of Indian workers in the 18–35 year age group, and provides authority for the Secretary of the Interior to contract with State and local agencies for the training, and to provide trainees with necessary transportation and subsistence.

In similar vein, and looking to a revitalized program in the field of Indian education, Public Law 702 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States and Alaska, and to report to the Congress on findings made.

INDIAN CLAIMS ACTS

Public Law 767, extending the life of the Indian Claims Commission for five years from the previously established expiration date of April 10, 1957, will permit the Commission needed time to tackle the job of disposing of 750 pending claims, while Public Law 717 provides for partial settlement of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Utes, by quieting in the tribes title to the mineral estate in more than 36,000 acres of land for which compensation is being claimed in the Court of Claims.

TERMINAL TRIBE MEASURES

Termination or adjustment legislation for three small tribal groups in northeastern Oklahoma, following tribal requests for terminal legislation, resulted in Public Law 887, affecting the Wyandotte Tribe; Public Law 921, the Peoria Tribe, and Public Law 943, the Ottawa Tribe. Three additional acts, Public Law 715, Public Law 721, and Public Law 718, will implement and facilitate the termination program for the Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, by amending the 1954 Termination Act to improve timber stands and resource management generally, and to relieve the tribe of costs incurred in developing management plans.

Public Law 920 corrects certain deficiencies in the 1954 Uintah-Ouray, Utah, Terminal Act, dealing with distribution of tribal property, while Public Law 696 transfers to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah, title to 600 acres of tribally-used land, in order to implement that group's terminal program.

INDIAN RESOURCES UTILIZATION

Significant legislation in Indian resource utilization and development legislation approved by the 84th Congress includes Public Law 255, the Indian long-term leasing act, permitting Indian owners of restricted lands to lease all or part of their holdings for a period of up to 25 years, for specified purposes, and should operate to add substantially to income received; Public Law 390 providing long-term lease authority during a 2-year trial period, applies only to unassigned lands of Mohave and Chimehuevi Indians, Arizont; Public Law 47, withdrawing from general mining law entry some 2.7 million acres of lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz., and conveying assets of very substantial value, the unappropriated mineral estate, to the tribe; Public Law 188 authorizing the Yakima Tribe, Washington, to purchase, sell, and exchange trust lands in heirship status, thus providing for blocking up to achieve more economic operation and improved management; Public Law 263, authorizing the State of Utah to effect exchange of state-owned mineral lands lying within the exterior boundaries of the Uintah-Ouray Indian Reservation, for mineral-bearing public domain lands outside, to the mutual advantage of both the Indians and the State; Public Law 252, supplemented by Public Law 686, authorizing the Pueblo Indians of San Lorenzo and Pojaoque, New Mexico, to sell certain lands to the Navaho Indians, making needed funds available to the former, permitting land-consolidation for the latter; Public Law 187, authorizing the Yakima Tribe, Washington, to lease to the State some 200 acres of tribal land for preservation of historic Fort Simcoe; and Public Law 480, transferring improved Federal lands used for educational purposes to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo, New Mexico.

INDIAN LAND CONVEYANCE, USE

Included in other enactments involving land conveyances or land use are Public Law 772, which restores to tribal ownership—without cost to the tribe—818,000 valuable acres of "open" and undisposed of lands on the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; Public Law 450, which simplifies the obtaining of loans from commercial sources by Indian landowners, by permitting encumbrance of trust or restricted property, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior; Public Law 736, which conveys to the Seminole Tribe, Florida, beneficial ownership of approximately 27,000 acres of land, a major contribution to the land and economic base of this tribe; Public Law 991, which is designed to provide authority for conveyance to Indian tribes

of any Federally owned buildings or improvements on tribal or "administrative reserve" lands no longer needed for their original purposes; Public Law 857, which permits the subsurface storage of oil or gas on restricted Indian lands, assuring an additional source of income in several tribal jurisdictions; Public Law 261, providing for conveyance to the State of Federal and Standing Rock Sioux Indian tribal lands containing the original burial site of Chief Sitting Bull; Public Law 592, authorizing, at tribal request, partition or sale of inherited interest in allotted lands of the Tulalip Indian Reservation, Wash., to pave the way for location of a major oil refinery thereon, with attendant economic benefits; Public Law 539, directing issuance to holders of individual exchange assignments on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., patents to lands embraced therein; Public Law 572, directing transfer of 9 acres of Hualapai Indian Reservation land, Arizona, to a school district for school purposes; Public Law 443, providing for conveyance of the Lower Lake Indian Rancheria, California, to Lake County, for an airport; Public Law 252, to convey 15 acres of Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation land, California, to a school district for use as a school site; and Public Law 563, providing for the sale of 10 acres of land owned by the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, for the same purpose.

INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

Several measures involving Indian tribal funds will permit direct individual financial assistance by providing for fund distribution, or will simplify administration of funds programs: Public Law 202, providing for distribution of funds of the Creek Indian Nation, Oklahoma; Public Law 281, dealing with distribution of $2.1 million to members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; Public Law 278, providing for quarterly—as against semiannual—per capita payments to members of the Shoshone-Arapahoe Tribes; and Public Law 794, extending for 2 years the time during which payments of tribal funds to members of these two tribes are authorized to be made; Public Law 553, to segregate, on the basis of approved membership rolls, some $4.2 million in trust funds held for the Three Affiliated Tribes, North Dakota; Public Law 560, authorizing a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band, Chippewa Indians, Minnesota; and Public Law 769, providing for payment and distribution to some 125 families of the Pine Ridge Sioux Indians, South Dakota, as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge Aerial Gunnery Range in 1942.

MISCELLANEOUS INDIAN MEASURES

Other Indian measures give authority, in Public Law 837, to the Secretary of the Interior to charge purchasers of Indian timber for special services such as scaling, cruising, and marking, provided by Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel; Public Law 348 extends the period of restrictions against alienation or encumbrance of lands belonging to the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes—Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole—Oklahoma; Public Law 546, extends until 1965 the authority of Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for the payment, on a reimbursable basis, of operation and maintenance charges assessed on approximately 117,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands; Public Law 926 declares that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez, N. Mex., some 77,000 acres; Public Law 956 deals with administration of the Red Lake Indian Forest, Minn.; Public Law 203 repeals provisions of existing law providing for recoupment of certain public school construction costs attributable to the Indians attending schools in Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, and California; Public Law 568, relieves the Navaho Tribe of reimbursing certain costs of maintaining highways across the Navaho Indian Reservation, Ariz.-N. Mex.; Public Law 570, recognizes about 4,000 Indians of mixed blood presently residing in North Carolina as Lumbee Indians; and Public Law 912, which commends the organization known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for undertaking to establish a permanent memorial in New Mexico to the North American Indian.

FIELD, SPECIAL HEARINGS

During the Congress just ended, and in order to lay a sound base for understanding of pending legislation or development of needed new legislation, the committee, through its subcommittees, conducted a number of field or special hearings.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation held hearings in the field on the Mid-State and Red Willow projects in Nebraska; Wapinitia project, Oregon; Coulee Dam municipal development, Washington; Tule Lake project, California; Washoe project, Nevada-California; Boulder City municipal development, Nevada; inspected existing or proposed irrigation projects in Nebraska, Wyoming, and Idaho; attended the National Reclamation Association meeting at Lincoln, Nebr.; and, with members of the House Public Works Committee, made an inspection trip of flood-stricken areas of northern California.

The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs held extensive hearings throughout the Territory of Alaska, described by Delegate BARTLETT as "the most extensive and intensive congressional inquiry in Alaska's history." Special subcommittees held hearings at Portland, Oreg., on operation of the Morningside Hospital for Alaska mentally ill, and in the Virgin Islands to inspect the proposed Virgin Islands National Park and to take testimony with respect to proposed changes in the Virgin Islands Organic Act.

Field hearings on Indian matters were held on the Seminole, Fla., Cherokee, N. C., Flathead, Mont., Crow Creek, S. Dak., Lower Brule, S. Dak., Pine Ridge, S. Dak., and Rosebud, S. Dak., Indian Reservations; at Muskogee and Anadarko, Okla.; Tucson, Ariz.; Browning and Great Falls, Mont.; Bismark, N. Dak., and Pierre, S. Dak.

Mines and Mining Subcommittee or special subcommittee members held hearings in Washington on the coal research program and on progress of the defense minerals program, and attended the annual meeting of the American Mining Congress at Las Vegas, Nev., while a staff employee inspected uranium and lead-zinc operations in Colorado, and manganese mines and ore-buying depots in Arizona and New Mexico.

In addition, a special research consultant formerly associated with the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Eugene D. Eaton, was retained to complete the preparation of a badly needed compilation of material relating to the Central Valley project, California.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

As it must in every Congress, the committee and staff devoted hundreds of man-hours to legislation or projects which fall under the hearing of unfinished business.

A partial and necessarily incomplete list of major projects for consideration in the 85th Congress includes investigation into, and development—or reintroduction and reconsideration—of legislation involving: Alaska statehood; Hawaii statehood; water rights settlement legislation; implementation of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission recommendations or alternatives; Territorial control of Alaska fisheries resources; Alaska land grants; possible revision of the Virgin Islands Organic Act; evaluation of Department of Defense security program in the Pacific Islands; native claims in Alaska; law and order on Indian reservations; evaluation of Indian relocation program; evaluation of public information regarding Indians and the overall Federal Indian program; centralizing in a single, permanent, Federal agency the responsibility for information and activities relating to Antarctica; policy respecting the comprehensive long-range National Park System program known as "Mission 66"; returning to Congress the direct control over withdrawal and reservation of public lands for defense purposes, and requiring strict compliance with State or Territorial fish and game laws within such reservations; authorizing a Federal program to develop recreational, wildlife, and related public benefits in national forests and woodlands; payments in lieu of Federal taxes; policies respecting sale and disposition of federally generated electric energy and power; and a comprehensive, long-range domestic minerals program.

CONCLUSION

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs processed nearly 1 of every 5 of the bills which became public law in the 84th Congress; I believe that statement, and the foregoing summary of legislation help to support the assertion that committee members and staff were kept busy.

Between the opening day of the 84th Congress, on January 5, 1955, and the adjournment sine die at the end of the second session on July 27, 1956, 417 calendar days elapsed, while Congress was in session a total of 230 House legislative

days. There were a total of 294 working days—Mondays through Friday—during that period.

During those 417 calendar days, 294 working days, or 230 legislative days of the 84th Congress, our committee convened a total of 352 separate meetings—257 of them subcommittee meetings, and 95 meetings of the full committee. I believe those figures speak for themselves.

Committee output does not just happen, Mr. Speaker. It takes the energy, leadership, initiative, and cooperation of many individuals to fulfill the legislative mission; the Congress just ended has demonstrated how successfully that mission can be fulfilled. I am proud of the contribution of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, am grateful for the opportunity to again have served as its chairman, and sincerely believe the committee has contributed more than its share of what will serve as the permanent record of accomplishments of the 84th Congress—the official United States Statutes at Large.

A Report to the People of the Seventh Congressional District in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress. In all probability we will adjourn sine die before this day is over.

In evaluating the legislative actions of this Congress there naturally will be honest differences of opinions. Bitter partisans will naturally claim too much while their opponents will admit too little in the way of accomplishments.

However much Republicans and Democrats may differ, I believe all reasonable Members will avoid extreme views by claiming that the work of this Congress was all good or all bad. A true appraisal will show, I believe, that this Congress passed much good legislation, defeated some bad, but perhaps could have written a better record. One must never be satisfied with his present achievements.

AGRICULTURE

More than 2 years ago, on Monday June 28, 1954, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made the following remarks:

We all recognize agriculture as our basic industry and that dairying comprises the most important segment of it. I firmly believe that dairy products should be supported under the same system as basic commodities. It is manifestly unfair to force the dairy farmer to pay inordinately high prices for grain and feeds supported by high fixed Government subsidies at the same time he has his milk, cheese, and other dairy products sold on a lower flexible scale.

Actually, the basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—account for only about 23 percent of the Nation's total farm income. Yet nine-tenths of the $6.5 billion committed to price-support operations is tied up in these basic commodities.

During 1953 Missouri farmers received $705 million for their livestock and livestock products while crops returned only $310 million. This works a distinct hardship on our Missouri farmers because only 14 percent of Missouri's farm income is supplied by the so-called basic commodities. No one branch of agriculture should be favored over another.

During the middle of this session Congress attempted to return to the high fixed 90 percent parity price supports on the so-called basic commodities. That would have increased the prices for grains and feeds for the dairy farmers and poultry raisers in my district. That bill would have worked a tremendous hardship on farmers in the Ozarks and would have further added to the surpluses and storage costs from which we have been suffering. I voted against the passage of that obnoxious and harmful measure—when we had $8 billion of surplus agricultural commodities and were paying almost a million dollars a day storage on them.

President Eisenhower wisely vetoed the measure and I voted to sustain his veto. The Committee on Agriculture immediately brought in a revised farm bill which provided for a soil bank, whereby the Secretary of Agriculture enters into contracts with producers for a minimum period of 3 to 10 years, under which the producer receives payment for taking parts of his surplus croplands out of production and puts them to conservation uses. The cost of the program is limited to $450 million annually but $1,200,000,000 were set aside for the soil bank.

While I do not consider this, by any means, the final solution to our farm problem, I did reluctantly vote for this bill and gladly for several other constructive farm measures.

To further relieve the economic stress of the farmers, the Congress voted to exempt farmers from paying Federal excise taxes on gasoline and other special fuels used on the farm. This will result in a savings of $60 million in tax relief annually.

Congress voted to extend for 2 years soil conservation payments of the Federal Government to our farmers and appropriated $250 million for the next fiscal year for this purpose providing a maximum payment of $2,500 to any individual farmer.

Another benefit to the farmers of the Nation, as well as to our citizens generally, was the allocation of funds to establish certain research centers in various sections of the country for the purpose of studying the forestry program, eliminating animal and plant diseases, improving marketing methods, and improving machinery for the disposal of our farm products abroad. It opened wider the doors of our warehouses to provide food for needy people in our own country, and enacted legislation to protect the interest of small farmers and to improve the agricultural credit system with special emphasis on the well-being of family-operated farms.

We also enacted legislation and appropriations to expand and improve rural electrification and telephone service. We increased appropriations from sixty to seventy-five million dollars to provide milk in our school lunch programs for millions of schoolchildren.

We authorized the greatest appropriations for agriculture that any Congress in history has ever authorized. The total for all agricultural purposes for the fiscal year 1957 was nearly $2 billion. This is $1 billion more than was appropriated for agriculture during the last fiscal year. Of course, $1.2 billion of this year's appropriations has been earmarked to finance the soil bank program. The remainder of the funds will go to continue the work of the Agriculture Research Service, Soil Conservation Service, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Service, Marketing Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Commodity Credit Administration, Farm Credit Administration, and other assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

I was happy to support and vote for all these constructive measures and the present price of farm products and livestock shows that we are on the right road to a sound and stable agriculture. We are bringing production and consumption into proper balance without the artificial demands created by war.

HIGHWAYS

One of the major accomplishments of this session of Congress was the passage of the biggest roadbuilding program in our Nation's history.

Congress appropriated $33 billion to construct 41,000 miles of super interstate highways by 1969, and to improve primary and secondary highway systems as well as roads on Federal land.

The matching formula for the Interstate System will be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State. Allocations for primary, rural, and urban roads will be made on a 50–50 matching fund basis. This gigantic highway construction program will take care of our rapidly increasing population and expanding cargo traffic. It will not only aid our domestic commerce, but builds up our national defense.

EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that no nation is stronger than the intelligence and character of its citizenry. A great philosopher once said: "Nothing is great but man, and nothing in man is great but mind." The Father of Our Country spoke of the necessity for having an enlightened citizenry and we all, regardless of party, realize the inadequacy of our school plants over the Nation, and the dire need of more teachers, better teachers at higher salaries.

Notwithstanding this realization, the Federal aid to education bill was defeated because certain racial and religious considerations were injected into the measure. There are many of us who fear the ultimate possibilities of Federal interference or thought-control of our State and local school systems should any improper type of Federal aid to education bill be adopted. This question is

fraught with grave danger and we need no better examples than Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

The Congress must move with great care and caution in extending Federal aid to education, but I was happy to vote with other Members of both parties for legislation authorizing the expenditure of $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period—the funds to be allocated to States matching grants for educational aid and rural library service. This bill will serve to improve if not equalize educational opportunities in this regard for our rural citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, I have always and consistently supported social security and have helped literally thousands of our old people in getting their pensions. I am glad that in the last Republican-controlled Congress we expanded social security to bring more than 10 million additional citizens into the program. At this session of Congress we approved major innovations in the social-security program which would give additional benefits to about 1,225,000 workers in this Nation.

The two major changes in the act would allow, first—totally disabled persons to obtain cash benefits at age 50, and second—reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

VETERANS

My record on veterans' legislation has been clear and consistent ever since I came to Congress. Always I have supported and voted for the benefits for the veterans of all our wars and their dependents.

Ours is a grateful Nation, and the Congress appropriated $4.7 billion for all veterans' benefits—an increase of $20 million over the amount appropriated for the 1956 fiscal year and $8 million more than was recommended by the President.

This Nation has the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services, and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents.

This Congress appropriated $51,635,000 for hospital and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year. In spite of the fact that the veterans' hospitals of this Nation represent an investment of more than $2½ billion, many of the buildings are in need of repair or replacement, and it is difficult to understand why we have to wait so long to get disabled veterans hospitalized.

Of particular interest is the fact that during this session of Congress we passed legislation which will allow 10,000 more widows of World War I veterans to be eligible for veterans' pensions. The House passed a bill that would take care of the veterans of World War I who have been overlooked or neglected.

Under the House bill all veterans of World War I upon reaching the age of 65 would automatically draw a pension of $90 per month, but the Senate has taken no action on the measure.

The Congress did approve legislation which provides assistance to children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea who died from service-connected disabilities. Monthly payments to the children range from $110 for full-time training to $80 for three-fourths and $50 for half-time training. This measure will provide educational benefits to more than 150,000 children of soldiers who died in the service of our country.

FEDERAL EMPLOYERS

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to vote for legislation increasing pay and granting additional benefits to all classified Government employees to meet the sharp rise in the costs of living. Particularly was I happy to vote increases and benefits for our postal employees, who have always been my good friends and to grant retirement benefits to all employees at the Federal medical center at Springfield, Mo., and other similar institutions throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be of assistance to other people outside the Government service. I supported the original Railroad Retirement Act, and was happy to vote for amendments liberalizing it.

I also supported Senate bill 3879, a bill enabling automobile dealers to bring suit in Federal district courts against manufacturers not acting in good faith in complying with terms of franchises.

Without injury to members of our medical profession, I have succeeded in getting recognition and establishing standing for the doctors of dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry, all of whom can now receive commissions in our armed services. It has been my privilege and pleasure to address the national associations of these three branches of our healing arts, and I am pleased with the fine letters of appreciation and commendation received from their associations. Osteopathy and optometry are at last getting the consideration and recognized dignity that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, giving it Cabinet rank. No other administration in our history has been so concerned over and helpful to the mental and physical health of our citizens. During the past 4 years the 83d and 84th Congresses have voted enormously increased appropriations for the control and eradication of heart, cancer, and all kinds of physical and mental diseases.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Everyone knows that we are living in trying and troublesome times. The cold war is still on and the conflict between Christianity and communism, freedom and slavery continues. The greatest guaranty of security for the free world against aggression is to maintain an adequate national defense.

When I became chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the last Congress we were spending $53 billion a year on national defense. That was twice our national debt at the end of World War I. That is two-thirds of all the taxpayers' money today. By wise management and honest administration we have reduced that expenditure to about $36 billion a year without weakening our security. We still have nearly 3 million men in all our Armed Forces, and will maintain that approximate strength for the forseeable future—at least until 1960.

While more emphasis is being placed on scientific research and technologial development in this atomic and hydrogen age, we cannot depend altogether on nuclear power and guided missiles to protect this Nation. We will always need the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. Men will always be needed along with machines but manpower perhaps can be reduced as we increase our firepower with new weapons in units of mobility, speed and flexibility.

At this session of Congress $34,656,727,000—or more than half of the taxpayers' money, $508,877,000 more than the budget estimate—was appropriated for our Defense Department. Our expenditures for the present fiscal year will be more than the amount appropriated because we have several billion dollars in unexpended funds and balances.

We have a well balanced defense and this administration will never weaken the security of the Nation in order to balance the budget. However, we must realize that no nation can have military might without economic strength. Destroy one and you will destroy the other.

Our firm but considerate foreign policy has ended the shooting war in Korea, avoided a war in Formosa and Indochina, successfully stopped the spreading of communism in Guatemala, helped settle the knotty problem in Trieste, and thus far succeeded in preventing a violent eruption of world conflagration at Suez and in the Near East. It has required patience, perseverance, endurance, understanding, broad vision, and strong leadership to chart the course of our ship of state through the many troubled waters to the harbor of safety and peace. Much nonsense, distortion, and misstatement of facts have been recently made by cynical critics who would better serve their Nation by cooperating with this administration in its mighty efforts to maintain peace among ourselves and all nations. Much more I will have to say about our national defense and international relationships when I return home to tell the people first hand.

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MISSOURI

Mr. Speaker, neither time nor space will allow me here and now to discuss fully many of the issues that will confront us in the campaign this year. In closing I do want to express my deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks to the good people of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri for their unfaltering confidence and steadfast friendship over

the many years it has been my honor and privilege to serve them.

For nearly a quarter of a century I have been a Member of this body and my people well know that for 8 of the 24 years I have represented them in Congress I was the only Republican from Missouri. For 20 long years I have struggled under the New-Fair Deal, most of the time a lone wolf against great odds.

However, under this Republican administration in the past 3 or 4 years I am glad to see Table Rock Dam, an $87.5 million project, started, and it is now almost half completed. Fort Crowder, near Neosho, has been made a permanent military post, and we are now building two permanent barracks there and 66 housing units.

After a long, hard struggle Fort Leonard Wood has been made a permanent military installation and is destined to become one of the outstanding training centers in the Nation. While it is not in my congressional district, it has a vital economic impact not only on my district but on the entire State of Missouri. I was happy to work for the reactivation of Whiteman Air Force Base at Knob Noster near Sedalia, which is a B–47 base of our Strategic Air Command. Neither is this installation in my district, but I was glad as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the last Congress to get $22 million allocated for military housing there, and in the session just closed I got an additional $3 million as a backlog added. My efforts also were put forth to expanding and developing our Air Force Base at Grandview, near Kansas City, Mo.

After many weeks and months of hard work we got established and built at Joplin the Pacific Mercury plant, now manufacturing wiring and cables for the Boeing B–52 bomber.

One of the great enterprises to come to southwest Missouri will be a guided missiles plant being built by Aerojet at Fort Crowder, but it will be developed and operated by the Rocketdyne division of the North American Aviation, Inc. The first unit of this plant will cost approximately $10 million and will ultimately employ around 3,000 people.

It was my pleasure recently to dedicate a new armory at Anderson. A new armory is assured for Carthage, and we are hoping to get one at Springfield in the not distant future. It must not be forgotten that we already have a splendid Naval Reserve training unit at Joplin, one at Drury College, Springfield, and I also worked hard to get established the ROTC unit at Southwest Missouri State College at Springfield.

Marshfield will get a new post-office building and Lockwood has already moved into their new post-office building.

Dropped into my lap when Springfield and Greene County were added to my congressional district was the O'Reilly Hospital, which was closed by the Veterans' Administration in the former administration on the President's orders. I have been pleased to help the Assemblies of God Church in establishing Evangel College there and pray for its continued growth and success.

I am sure Carthage will not forget the flood-control levee which I have worked for during several years—and which is now becoming a reality. I know I will be pardoned if I remind the people at Diamond and in Newton County that I introduced the original bill for the George Washington Carver National Monument and later former President Truman, then a United States Senator, introduced a companion bill in the United States Senate, and we got that legislation through under the Roosevelt administration. Quite an accomplishment for this Ozark Hillbilly Republican.

It is my intention, if returned to Congress, to introduce a new bill for the creation of a national park or memorial at Wilsons Creek at Battlefield, south of Springfield. This project has a personal interest for me since my Grandfather Short fought in that battle to preserve the Union. He lost that battle, but won the war.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things we have done recently for southwest Missouri. I would not be so conceited or selfish as to claim credit for these accomplishments, but I think I can humbly and truthfully assure the people I represent that these installations and activities would not have been accomplished without DEWEY SHORT. The only reason I succeeded is because of the many friends—Democrats as well as Republicans—that I have made during the past 24 years I have been a Member of Congress. Seniority counts in this body and a newcomer here is like a freshman in college. It requires time, training, experience, and friends to get things done, I care not who the man is or to what political party he belongs. He might be the richest, smartest, and best man in the country but he will have to serve 2 or 3 terms in the Congress before he can become effective.

God has been good to me and my people have been very kind. I know that they rejoice with me in the Dewey Short scholarship that has been established by Aerojet, giving some bright, energetic, and ambitious young man in our district a chance to acquire a 4-year course of education in engineering at the school of his choice. After his graduation he will be in a position for a brilliant career with Aerojet or some other great company.

Mr. Speaker, recently my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in the House, along with some other personal friends, raised a fund to have a portrait done of me, which will hang longer than I am on this earth in the room of the House Armed Services Committee. Naturally, I am deeply touched and shall forever remain grateful to you and others who participated in the unveiling ceremonies of that portrait. I know I do not deserve all the fine, complimentary things said about me on that occasion, but I am naturally pleased to know that long after I have left this body my friends from back home when they visit the Nation's Capitol, can get a look at this Ozark hillbilly's portrait hanging on the wall near the portrait of our fine colleague and beloved friend, Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

I trust no one will think I have been boasting unduly, but this is an election year, Mr. Speaker, and "He that tooteth not his own horn, the same shall not be tooted."

Accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on the accomplishments in the 84th Congress of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman.

There being no objection, the report was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in reporting to you a year ago on the work of our committee in the 1st session of the 84th Congress I predicted that the 2d session, just concluded, would be busier and result in more legislation than the 1st session.

That prediction has been borne out. In fact, Mr. President, our committee has done about twice as much work this year as we did in the 1955 session. We reported to the Senate last year 46 measures as compared to 82 bills this year. The Senate passed 43 of our bills last year and approved 77 of them this year, while the President signed 24 of our bills last year and 71 this year.

Last year we held 21 days of open hearings in the full committee as compared to 65 days of such hearings this year, while our subcommittees in 1955 held open hearings on 30 days as compared to 84 days of such hearings this year. Here is a table showing exactly what we did in the 84th Congress:

Committee activities as of July 12, 1956

Number of bills (Senate and House), resolutions, and amendments referred to committee	295
Number of bills reported by committee	128
Number of bills passed by Senate	120
Number of Senate bills pending in House committees	13
Number of Senate bills reported by House committees	63
Number of Senate bills passed House	59
Number of bills signed by President	95
Number of bills vetoed by President	1
Number of routine nominations referred to committee and confirmed	1,673
Number of major nominations referred to committee and confirmed	32
Number of executive meetings of full committee and subcommittees	56
Number of days of open hearings conducted by full committee	86
Number of days of open hearings conducted by subcommittees:	
Communications Subcommittee	4
Surface Transportation Subcommittee	8
Aviation Subcommittee	27
Merchant Marine Subcommittee	33
Subcommittee on S. 2060	1
Subcommittee on S. 2643	6
Subcommittee on Freight Car Shortage	5
Subcommittee on International Air Agreements	5
Subcommittee on Merchant Marine Training and Education	7
Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices	19
Total	114
Total	200

I would be remiss if I did not, first of all, extend my appreciation to the members of our committee for their fine cooperation during the past 2 years. Republicans and Democrats worked as a team and cooperated in producing the legislation that met your approval.

I especially want to tell the chairmen of our subcommittees of my gratitude for their unselfish cooperation in moving along the various bills which were referred to them. They worked long hours and participated in tedious study by our staff of the various bills until they were in shape to put before the full committee.

The Honorable JOHN A. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, conducted most of the hearings on the bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, many of the hearings on the overall study of television as chairman of our Communications Subcommittee and advanced our 3-year study into the subject to the highest point we have yet reached. I conducted some of the hearings on each of these subjects.

The Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman of our Subcommittee on Aviation, deserves much credit for his work in the field of aviation. Under his skillful guidance, a legislative proposal, which I had the honor to cosponsor, reactivating our neglected airport program, was carried to a successful conclusion. And as chairman of a special Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices, Mike has been accorded nationwide recognition for the work he did which already has brought about voluntary changes in automobile marketing by the manufacturers that will benefit the dealers and the public.

The Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, as chairman of our Surface Transportation Subcommittee, held long hearings on the trip-lease bill, his study of the International Air Agreements situation has had a beneficial effect for the Nation's airlines and his work with other transportation matters has been of great aid.

My own Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on and reported to you 66 bills which you approved.

We enacted much important legislation of which our committee is proud. We believe the bills we approved, and which the Senate and House enacted, will help ease the burdens of many of our Government agencies, solve conflicts in operations between the agencies and public, and provide safer air, truck, railroad, and shipping operations.

Mr. President, your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is proud of the fact that we initiated legislation, and are happy that you approved it, to construct a nuclear-powered merchant marine vessel. Congress approved a total of $22 million for construction of a specialy designed hull in which will be fitted a nuclear engine that will be designed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission and bring the completed cost of this first step in peaceful use of the atom to more than $40 million.

When Congress approved this expenditure it made it possible for the United States to be the first country to put the atom to use in international commerce, and that will do more to encourage the peaceful use of atomic power than any step that has been taken. The cost is large, but, Mr. President, the experience and know-how this country will gain from building the ship and the engine will be worth far more in the future than the dollars it will cost.

My committee and I also are proud of the passage by the Congress and approval by the President of legislation we initiated to establish a sound and comprehensive policy to aid the Nation's fishing industry recover from administration neglect which has caused it to face ruin because of lack of needed aid and the free importation of fish which is in competition with products of our fishermen.

We, through congressional approval, have provided a revolving fund of $10 million from which loans can be made to fishermen, boatbuilders and processors. The good effects of this legislation, which sets up a new division within the Department of the Interior to supervise commercial fishing and encourage and aid sports fishing, will be enjoyed by fishing interests through the entire Nation and also will give our commercial fishermen high level representation in all international conferences affecting the fishing industry. The voice of our fishermen and their reaction to proposals for international agreements will be heard for the first time in future international negotiations.

Our legislation also provides for rehabilitating the Alaska salmon industry which has dropped to the lowest point in history because of neglect, overfishing, predators, and human indifference to the declining salmon runs. And, we hope, will bring new life to the Pacific tuna industry.

We reported favorably and you approved the trip-leasing bill, also a report urging construction of a second airport in the Nation's Capital where congestion in the present facility is becoming more dangerous each day. Our committee has repeatedly warned the administration officials that a serious disaster may occur at the National Airport unless prompt action to relieve the congestion. Enabling legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to construct this facility has been on the books since 1950.

Early in 1955, your committee reported out a resolution to establish a joint committee to study the air navigation facilities in the United States. This measure died in the House. Later, during hearings on a bill to make the CAA an independent agency, considerable evidence on this problem was heard. The committee staff attended the CAB hearing on the Grand Canyon crash, and we plan further inquiry into this whole navigation picture, looking to a system of navigation that will be geared to the jet age rather than the DC–3 age.

We also initiated the legislation to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant permanent certification for feeder airlines in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii. This legislation will enable the feeder lines to expand and provide better service for airminded American travelers.

The chairman of your committee also sponsored legislation which was enacted into law providing stiff penalties for the sabotage of airplanes, and for the elimination of fraud by radio aimed at fraudulent stock promotion schemes originating in foreign countries, also legislation to set up safety standards for the transportation of migrant farm workers. We also were successful in piloting through the Congress bills to construct new fish hatchery facilities in several States.

As a result of hearings held last fall on the west coast and Alaska, reports have been filed recommending numerous steps to be taken to assist Alaska and the west coast States with their transportation and fishery problems.

We took other important steps we hope will help alleviate the constant boxcar shortage which causes so much distress and loss to our grain growers and other shippers every year during harvest season. We will have more boxcar inspectors to expedite return of boxcars after they are unloaded. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads have promised their unstinted aid in this effort.

Mr. President, we have worked hard this year to try to solve the problem of better television service to the people of the Nation. The committee has felt such service is for the benefit of all of our citizens and we are determined that they get it.

After 3 years of work by your committee on the television subject, we are watching closely a proposal of the Federal Communications Commission which promises results, though it is expected to take as much as 7 or 8 years to make effective a program that will give good TV service to all parts of our Nation.

Our committee also has taken an active interest in the subject of international communications and probably will go thoroughly into this field in the next session of Congress.

The 84th Congress—It Emphasized Interest in People and Accomplished More Than Any Congress Since Social Security Was Passed Under F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is inventory time for the 84th, a Democratic Congress, as it adjourns. The U. S. News & World Report, certainly no Democratic organ, describes the 84th as "a Congress that did a lot." In the Democratic manner we put people ahead of other considerations. We put America's welfare above all else. We approved 103 of President Eisenhower's 225 requests, but while we were highly cooperative, we knew when to say "No." The Democratic 84th Congress will be remembered for its enactments designed to help the average man and woman. Here are a few of them.

WHAT DID WE DO FOR WORKERS?

Minimum wages were raised from 75 cents to $1 per hour, over the Eisenhower suggestion of 90½ cents. Again, over his objections, we reduced from 65 to 62 the age at which women are eligible for social-security benefits and made the totally disabled eligible at age 50. We effected a pay raise for postal workers and for civil-service employees not in the top pay brackets.

WHAT DID WE DO FOR PUBLIC HEALTH?

We provided $90 million in grants to build medical research facilities in nonprofit institutions, over a 3-year period. We extended for 2 years the Hill-Burton Act, a hospital construction program, and authorized grants for training nurses and public-health specialists.

Provided $34½ million for polio vaccine.

Extended the Water Pollution Control Act and authorized $500 million to be spent in matching funds to help communities build sewage disposal plants, with a limit of $50 million per year.

WHAT WE DID FOR THE MILITARY AND OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

My committee in the House is Armed Services. In 1955 we passed the draft law which extended the Selective Service Act of 1948 until July 1, 1959. Authority to draft doctors was extended to July 1, 1957. In this day of a highly mechanized Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, career men as specialists are a downright first requisite. The 84th Congress provided pay increases ranging from 6 to 25 percent for career officers and enlisted men.

The Ready Reserve was authorized to reach a strength of up to 2.9 million men.

Established reserve obligations up to 11 years for men between 17 and 35, and authorized a new 6-month training program for up to 250,000 men between 17 and 18½.

The Defense Production Act was extended to June 30, 1958, which directed promotion of geographical dispersion of industry. This would prevent our Nation being taken out of a war by a well-aimed enemy bomb on Detroit, Philadelphia, or other strategic industrial center.

WHAT ABOUT THE FLOODS WHICH HAVE BEEN VISITING PENNSYLVANIA?

No conceivable engineering program could circumvent or give real alleviation to the floods which have devastated our area since we have lately been visited by hurricanes almost annually. It has been said that the huge volumes of waters which descend from the skies flow through the age-old channels which nature has carved out over the centuries. Insurance is the immediate answer. The 84th Congress passed S. 3732, authorizing a $7.5 billion Federal flood insurance and loan program.

The disaster-insurance rate was materially reduced.

WHAT DID WE DO FOR ROADS?

We passed a huge road building program after we rejected the Eisenhower plan which would have floated bonds and been costly to you and me but fine for the bankers. The 84th Congress authorized a roadbuilding program which will employ more than $30 billion in Federal-State funds over a 13-year period. Rather than the banker plan a modified pay-as-you go scheme will provide most of the costs through a tax on gasoline and other items purchased by the people who use the highways.

WHAT ABOUT THAT DELAWARE RIVER CHANNEL?

Delaware Valley, USA, is very much with us. Philadelphia is no longer just one of America's big cities. It is a center which projects into adjoining States and northward and westward and to its south. Modern personal and mass transportation have wiped out the municipal boundary lines, if not on the map, at least in influence.

So manifest is this to all, that both Republican and Democratic Members of the Philadelphia area joined in the fight to deepen the Delaware Channel to Trenton.

The Eisenhower administration took the unique view that the States affected and even private industry should share the cost. This plan was so unprecedented in our national history and Philadelphia was to be the guinea pig. Our national defense was involved along with the shipment of iron ore from Venezuela, sugar from Cuba and oil from many foreign nations. The 84th Congress refused to make an experimental laboratory of the Delaware River ports by forsaking its traditional responsibility for navigable rivers and harbors. We asked for $95 millions. We got $6 million which will start a 35-foot channel to Trenton. We had asked for 40 feet to take the large draft vessels of today.

It had been argued by the opposition that the channel was of particular benefits to the United States Steel at Morrisville. As a matter of fact, employment and small business throughout Delaware Valley are the beneficiaries. United States Steel interests us because it hires many workers, a number of them living in northeast Philadelphia. These deeper channels pay for themselves in bigger income tax returns and in customs collected at the ports. Sixty miles of waterfront will be opened for industries which will dot both sides of the Delaware now that raw materials can be delivered to dockside and the finished product shipped.

HOW DID THE 84TH, A DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS, DO IN FOREIGN POLICY?

Working with a Republican President and Secretary of State we demonstrated that we were American before we were Democratic and that politics ended at the shoreline. The records will show that we backed the Eisenhower foreign policy more completely than Members of his own party. This is because he followed the FDR-Truman line in foreign affairs.

In his quest for foreign aid, President Eisenhower was giving unspoken endorsement to the wisdom of the Marshall plan. When he showed an inclination to keep on arming Tito the 84th Congress balked. There was no inclination on the part of the 84th Congress to build Nasser's Aswan Dam on the Nile and thereby thwart our chances of selling cotton now stored in our warehouses. The 84th Congress had a feeling of "Love thy neighbor as thyself, but not more than thyself."

In an explosive age, the 84th gave full cooperation to the administration in foreign affairs. We have been a party of responsibility over the decades and participation is ingrained. Along with the late Senator Vandenberg, President Franklin D. Roosevelt set up the bipartisan foreign policy. Men like John Foster Dulles were given such high assignments as handling the Japanese Treaty. Other Republicans held high posts in the Department of State. This befitted the Government of a nation which believes utterly in the two-party system. It vanished in the past 4 years.

We have had Democratic cooperation without any visible Democratic participation. Democratic criticism of the administration's foreign affairs has been held to a minimum. But now we are in a campaign year and it is proper that the weaknesses of the Eisenhower-Dulles record be exposed in the national interest. Our foreign relationships have degenerated. Friends have become enemies. New dictatorships are on the rise. The Communist orbit is ever widening. The 1952 promises of General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have become mere words. America, the alleged world leader, itself suffers from lack of achieving leadership.

The Democratic 84th Congress has acted as an invaluable check on the Republican administration. Although we have not thwarted the legitimate measures proposed by the President he has been made ever mindful that the utmost scrutiny was being maintained by the 84th Congress in the best constitutional tradition of checks and balances. In the 1954 congressional elections he predicted a "cold war" if a Democratic Congress were elected. After the Nation elected a Democratic Congress he quickly apologized for the prediction. In many instances his measures would have failed of passage but for Democratic support.

DOES THE LACK OF PROSPERITY ON THE FARM AFFECT PHILADELPHIANS?

If you are old enough to remember President Hoover's administration, you know that depressions begin with lowered farm income, spotty unemployment like we have now, and an active and fluctuating stock market. These conditions existed through Harding and Coolidge and became the Hoover depression with accompanying apple selling and breadlines. President Eisenhower can well become the Coolidge of his day. As in the Coolidge administration we hear voices saying that the old order has passed and that a new era of endless economic expansion is at hand. How remindful of the same Pollyanna phrases uttered when the Harding and Coolidge administrations set up the suffering under Hoover. Economic laws are immutable. Big business spawned the Hoover panic with "the new era talk." That same big business came, hat in hand, to F. D. R. to be bailed out.

When farmers' incomes are greatly reduced, as they have been under Eisenhower, less Philco radios and TV sets and washers and refrigerators are sold. Fewer Exide batteries are purchased. Smoke does not issue from stacks along Lehigh and Allegheny Avenues. Merchants on Frankford and Kensington and Germantown Avenues sell less and maybe go out of business. And all of this could have had its beginning on the farms of Kansas or Nebraska or California. Such is the interdependent nature of our national economy. The causes should be stopped before they ruin our national business health.

HAVE THE INVESTIGATIVE BODIES OF THE 84TH CONGRESS ACTED AS A CHECK ON THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION TO THE BENEFIT OF THE NATION?

Decidedly yes. The Dixon-Yates grab was identified despite White House secrecy. An executive of the First Boston Co., due to finance the Memphis Power & Light Utility in the TVA orbit, was found to be simultaneously the Budget Bureau adviser. This "conflict of interest" was disclosed and the deal was called off when the city of Memphis decided to build its own utility. Many of us liken this attempt to the infamous Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration. Alert investigation by the 84th Congress killed Dixon-Yates before it got completely off the ground.

The numbers game that was played with Federal employees, alleged to be guilty of Communist affiliations, was exposed by the 84th Congress. Disclosure of the political racket of Red hunting began with the Army-McCarthy hearings. It was carried over by the Eisenhower administration to prove that many dangerous subversives were hired by the Truman administration. Various numbers of "guilty" employees were said to

have been discharged from Government service. The 84th Congress revealed that some of these had resigned for various reasons, in no way associated with Communist connections. Many were just plain, ordinary alcoholics. Most were in jobs that were in no way sensitive, such as doing clerical work for the Veterans' Administration. Records were being faked to support false political premise, heard much in the 1952 elections. Reputations were being sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. The Eisenhower security program proved to be too much for his Republican appointee, former Senator Cain. He resigned rather than be a part of making a political football of our Nation's security.

No Congress in these crisis years could accomplish all it hoped for. The greatest disappointment was the failure of the school construction legislation which became ensnarled with the segregation problem. Both of these issues have had their trial run in the 84th and will be met and decided as a result of these preliminaries.

The Egyptian crisis over the Suez Canal has been developed by urging Britain to withdraw her troops. The only democracy in the vital Middle East, Israel, has been treated like a stepchild. Nasser has said that he stands ready to shed the last drop of Egyptian blood. Hitler was just as generous with German blood. These little Caesars run to a pattern. What Chamberlain was to Hitler, Dulles without an umbrella has been to Nasser. The Eisenhower-Dulles team has practiced the art of losing friends. Massive retaliation talk had scared nobody. There are about 30 depressed areas in Pennsylvania. When you hear "peace and prosperity," have your mind stray to the Suez Canal and to the many unemployed in the textile and coal industries in our State. The people out of work are our people. The Democratic Party always puts its emphasis on people.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank here and now the people I represent in the House of Representatives. They have sent me to Congress five times. Most of them realize that being a Congressman is as much a business as any other calling and that there is no substitute for experience.

In the words of the poet:

A man must serve his time at any trade save censure.
Critics all are ready made.

Report to the 15th Congressional District of Ohio on the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these final hours of the 84th Congress, I wish to review some of the legislative actions which are regarded as especially important to the people of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio and to discuss as well some of the things which I have done in pursuance of their interests in Washington.

The 15th District is composed of Guernsey, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, and Washington Counties. In representing the people of these counties in the Nation's Capital it is necessary to argue for or against legislative proposals which will be of benefit or harmful to them and to the Nation. It is also necessary to represent their interests in the interpretation of existing laws and regulations by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. In this regard I have received several thousands of communications from individuals and groups seeking aid during the past 2 years. In pursuing these matters with all the vigor at my command, it has been a source of great satisfaction to me that I have been able to render assistance in many instances.

INDUSTRIALIZATION

One of the most distressing problems in southeastern Ohio has been the need to attract new industries to provide greater job opportunities and to stimulate improved economic conditions throughout the seven counties. This requires cooperative action in Washington with local groups seeking to reverse the three-decade trend whereby we have not prospered in accordance with the growth or prosperity of the rest of the country. I pledged 2 years ago to assist these groups in every possible way.

As a first step early in 1955, I requested that the Department of Labor classify all of the counties of the 15th District so that official recognition could be made of the unemployment situation there and to enable our area to take advantage of the Federal Government's program to encourage industrial development through the placement of Government contracts in such areas and the construction of defense plants in regions suffering high, chronic unemployment. Unless this official classification was made, our area could not participate in such special programs regardless of how much employment actually existed. Early in January 1955 only Perry County was accorded these privileges.

The 15th District was not regularly surveyed because none of the so-called "labor market areas" within it possessed sufficient population to meet the standards for regular classification which had been established by the Department of Labor. A special request was required.

In due course, all seven counties were found to have unemployment exceeding 6 percent of the available labor force and were accorded special privileges with relation to defense contracts. This also conferred upon the seven counties a great new advantage since companies which would construct plants that the Government deemed essential to national defense would be given special Federal tax privileges.

Under this labor classification, the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. investigated the advantages of a Monroe County site and elected to locate its huge new integrated aluminum plant there. This $120 million plant marking the entry of Olin-Mathieson into the aluminum industry has immense economic implications for the entire 15th District. It will provide the basic aluminum metal which will be the source of supply for many new aluminum fabricating plants which will locate throughout our area. I have also been assured that Olin-Mathieson's present plans include a vast expansion of its facilities in Monroe County even before construction of the first plant is completed.

With a general pattern of industrial expansion developing in Cambridge, Zanesville, Marietta, and in all of the seven counties, actual and prospective employment opportunities have received a tremendous impetus.

In recognition of this fact, new labor surveys made by the Department of Labor late in 1955 resulted in the finding that unemployment in our seven counties had decreased markedly and that the region no longer suffered sufficient unemployment to justify a distressed labor area classification.

Despite these findings, I believed that some small areas in the 15th District might still deserve special consideration for advantages provided under Defense Manpower Policy 4, especially where classifications of several counties into one labor area might prove to be unrealistic. Therefore, several months ago, I began a series of conferences with the Department of Labor and the Office of Defense Mobilization pertaining to this issue. As a result of my representations, I am informed that Defense Manpower Policy 4 will be amended shortly to permit certification largely at the State level of counties not regularly classified. This will allow tax amortization privileges for new defense plants. The amendment will be of benefit to our own area as well as to others in the Nation.

I am continuing my efforts to call the attention of American industry to the advantages of locating new plants in the 15th district. At this time I am in contact with over 50 corporations in carrying out this program.

PROTECTING LOCAL INDUSTRIES

Unemployment in the 15th district has traditionally resulted from the effects of our trade policies allowing low tariffs on the products of cheap foreign labor. This is particularly true in our potteries, glass plants, coal mines, and tile manufacturing plants. I, therefore, opposed the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts before the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Although the act was extended last year, opposition to low tariff policies is growing in the Congress.

I also opposed H. R. 5550, the bill which would have permitted the United States to join an international organization known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation. This move would have, in effect, delegated much of the control over United States tariffs to the international organization. Fortunately, the opposition to this measure, although small at first, gathered strength in the Congress, and because of this fact the bill was never brought to the floor of the House, although it received the approval of a majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

I have also undertaken a survey to learn the specific effects of foreign imports on our pottery, glass, tile, and coal industries. With this information, I intend to dramatize the need for greater tariff protection for these industries.

DILLON DAM

Two years ago, I pledged to work for the resumption of construction of the Dillon Dam on the Licking River above Zanesville. This dam was intended to provide the final link in the comprehensive flood control plan for the Muskingum River Valley. After an expenditure of nearly $9 million, work on the dam has been stalled since 1950. No funds were requested from the Congress by the Corps of Engineers to continue the construction because of strong local opposition near the site of the dam. In the meantime, the flood threat to Zanesville and the Muskingum Valley persisted.

With the excellent cooperation of the people of the Muskingum Valley and of both of our Senators, we were successful this year in obtaining an appropriation of $1.5 million to resume construction. I am now informed by the Corps of Engineers that with this expression of congressional approval, it will press for funds to complete this valuable project at the earliest practicable date.

MUSKINGUM CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

This year a levy of special assessments against thousands of residents of the Muskingum Conservancy District would have been required had the Federal Government not made its final payment on the United States' debt for properties in the District acquired many years ago. No appropriation request for this purpose was contained in the Federal budget. Therefore, with Congressman FRANK T. BOW, representing Ohio's 16th District, we were able to prevail upon the Bureau of the Budget to submit a request to Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $425,000 to pay this debt to the Conservancy District this year. The appropriation was approved by the Congress and the President and the payment is now being made. Thus, a special levy on landowners in the Muskingum Conservancy District was prevented.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

The need for better airport facilities and air transportation service is vital to the increased requirements of air traffic developing in the 15th District. This year, I was able to obtain approval for the construction of two new radio navigation facilities important for safer and better air navigation in bad weather. These omni-range radio stations will be built at a cost approaching $100,000 by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce. One will be built at Newcomerstown to direct planes flying over the District. The other is to be built at the Zanesville airport to provide safer instrument landings for planes there.

Unsatisfactory routes of the commercial airline serving the Zanesville airport have been an annoyance and inconvenience to residents of the district. To assist Lake Central Airlines in its efforts to gain approval of more favorable routes from the Federal Government, I recently appeared before the Civil Aeronautics Board to urge that it approve Lake Central's application to extend its route to operate from Zanesville to Erie, Pa. It is my understanding that the Board is favorably disposed toward this application.

LOW INCOME FARMERS

Although I was anxious for the passage of soil bank legislation, the elimination of agricultural surpluses, and the other means recommended by the President for dealing with the immediate problem of low market prices for farm commodities, I strongly supported the President's program for raising the income levels for family farmers. This program was long-range in character, yet it contained much which would be of benefit to southeastern Ohio. It involves a concentrated effort, using the resources of the Department of Agriculture to help farmers in low income areas to help themselves. The program did not receive the approval of Congress until this year—and then only half-heartedly, but the Department had already undertaken those parts of it which did not require Congressional action.

I urged the selection of counties of the 15th District where experiments in the rural development program could go forward and I was pleased that Monroe County was finally selected as the only such "pilot" county in Ohio. Within the near future, I understand that another county in the district may be selected for this program.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Our seven counties are vitally affected in some way by virtually every legislative proposal before the Congress. Therefore, I believe the record of this Congress is of keen interest to southeastern Ohio. This record seems to me to be one which can be regarded with mixed feelings. It has accomplished much which will aid and assist the people of southeastern Ohio. Other legislation has not been favorable or has been disproportionately costly.

In casting my vote on the many issues brought before the House in these 2 years, I have carefully weighed each proposal against my convictions that the Federal Government must be responsive to the needs of the people. At the same time, I believe the vitality of local and State government has waned in this country. I have opposed the further absorption by the Federal Government of the proper rights and privileges of local and State Government. I believe we can best pursue our goal of a dynamic democracy operating for the common good if a maximum number of governmental functions are carried out at the level most responsive to the will of the electorate. Where all citizens are accorded the right to vote without undesirable obstructions, the local and State levels are, by all odds, the proper and most responsive forums for the expressions of people's will.

Our Federal Government has in the past several decades swelled to colossal proportions. Too often, there has been a costly tendency in the country to look to Washington for many decisions which could be better made in each of the 48 States. This tendency has been expensive and is directly related to high Federal taxes and the astronomical national debt. The past 4 years have seen an encouraging reversal of this process which I believe is very much in the interest of all of our people. The national budget has been balanced through effective management and favorable fiscal policies without sacrificing the services our citizens receive from their Government in Washington. With this, a relatively small but notable reduction in the national debt has been made. If such balances continue, we can justify needed tax reductions which will affect all our people. On the other hand, policies which cause us to spend ourselves into even greater debt will delay the day when taxes can be safely reduced. Every dollar spent by the Federal Government must eventually come out of the pockets of our citizens into the hands of the tax collectors.

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AID

Our largest single expenditure has been the cost of maintaining our arsenal of defense in readiness should we need to defend ourselves. In 2 years, the 84th Congress has appropriated over $66 billion for this purpose. The foreign-aid program received a total of almost $6.5 billion in these 2 years.

In the belief that the defense of the United States is the paramount consideration of our time, I supported the defense appropriations bills as they were referred to the House of Representatives. I did not support the foreign aid bills since I am convinced that this decade-long program requires redefinition to prevent the kind of free spending that has characterized it in the past. If aid is given to countries abroad by the American taxpayers, I believe we must be assured that we are investing in genuinely friendly countries who are sincerely anti-Communist, but who lack the means to defend themselves from Red encroachment. We cannot buy friendship abroad and our tax dollars are too urgently needed by our people at home to try to scatter funds over the globe to assist foreign nations in ill-defined programs of dubious or indirect value to the United States.

HIGHWAY ACT

The Federal Highway Act of 1956 was one of the outstanding bills passed in this Congress and will provide badly needed highways for our Nation over the next decade. This costly program will be paid for through added gasoline taxes on motor vehicle operators who will receive the greatest benefits from the new highway sytem. I supported this legislation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The broadening of social security benefits this year will aid many citizens of the 15th District, particularly as it will apply to benefits for disabled persons at age 50 and to women at age 62.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN'S LEGISLATION

Legislation extending the World War II home loan provisions of the GI bill and the extension of medical care to dependents of servicemen were among several notable pieces of legislation enacted in this Congress. All laws relating to the service-connected disability or death compensation for servicemen, veterans, and their survivors were also simplified and codified for the first time. Legislation to provide pensions for World War I veterans and increased compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities was enacted by the House of Representatives but was not considered by the Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A similar fate overtook the civil rights legislation recommended by the President when the Senate failed to act after the passage of a bill to guarantee civil rights by the House of Representatives.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Federal aid for school construction bill was defeated in the House. I opposed this measure because I am convinced that Ohio's need for new and better schools should be taken care of in Ohio. I believe we should not invite Federal interference in our school system. We can maintain control over our schools and obtain a 100 percent return on the money we spend for them. Under this bill, Ohio taxpayers would have paid heavily increased Federal taxes and, in return, would have received back far less than its investment in the Federal program.

We need new school buildings, but I believe we must meet this problem at home. We must pay for the schools either way, but we shall lose much if we send our money to Washington first to have it returned to us in lesser amounts and with Federal strings attached.

COMMITTEE WORK

In my work as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, a great number of measures were considered. A total of 685 bills and resolutions were referred to the committee. Over 350 were considered either in whole or in part. Ninety-six hearings were held and eight investigative reports published. Forty-four bills were favorably reported, 38 of which became law.

The committee's work, among other things, resulted in a new classification and pay system for the postal field service, the rewriting of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the readjustment and rewriting of laws relating to the pay of Federal workers, and a new postal-rate bill.

Investigations by the committee have resulted in strengthening Federal Civil Service procedures and the stricter control on eliminating obscene and objectionable literature from the mails. In cooperation with departments and agencies, the work of the Manpower Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has resulted in recommendations for better utilization of Federal employees which will lead to reductions in the Federal payroll estimated at $500 million annually.

Second-Class Citizens in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position very clear at the outset. I am heartily in favor of American partnership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I am in favor of this Nation entering into foreign commitments that follow logically from its undoubted position as leader of the free world.

And I certainly am in favor of dealing with our allies as free men deserve to be dealt with, honorably, candidly, and respectfully.

But I am unalterably opposed to using our vital NATO partnership, our necessary foreign commitments, and the national honor of our allies as the excuse for undercutting the constitutional rights of Americans, least of all the rights of the men we send overseas to protect the free world against Communist aggression.

That, in my view, is precisely the effect of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement.

Under the terms of this outrageous agreement, the United States permits an American serviceman stationed abroad to be tried in foreign courts, before foreign judges and juries, and under foreign rules of legal procedure for alleged crimes allegedly committed on foreign territory. And to serve his sentence, if convicted, in a foreign jail.

DENIAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION

The agreement does, to be sure, list certain safeguards. There is to be a prompt trial, competent legal advice, and consultation with American representatives for any American serviceman tried in a foreign court.

But these safeguards cannot truly be enforced by the United States. They guarantee nothing. They are simply promises by foreign governments.

They carry no assurance that an American serviceman accused of a crime in a foreign country will receive the full protection of the guarantees embodied in the United States Constitution and in the rules and procedures of American jurisprudence.

He may even be accused, tried, and convicted of a crime that does not so much as exist in the eyes of American law.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the very fact such so-called safeguards had to be spelled out at all, lends substance to the fear that an American serviceman cannot count on receiving full justice at the hands of foreign judges and juries.

AN IRRESPONSIBLE AND IMMORAL AGREEMENT

The Status of Forces Agreement offends against both morality and good sense.

It is immoral because it makes second-class citizens of the very men to whom we owe the greatest of obligations, the men we send abroad to defend this Nation and the entire free world against the aggressive designs of Communist imperialism.

As I said in a floor debate last year:

> Our people are entitled to the protection of the Constitution of the United States when they are abroad to defend us and our friends. When we ask them to go out of this country not of their own choice but at the command of the Government, I see no reason in the world for not making doubly sure that their constitutional rights are protected.

And this agreement also offends against good sense. It assumes that our posture in the world should be one of timidity with respect to the principles and the free institutions that have made this Nation great.

It smacks, too, of the subservience that the present administration often shows to the least whim of our allies, and of its retreat before the least hint that so-called world opinion will be offended by our bold adherence to principle. I sometimes suspect that such world opinion is simply a handy extension of the soft minds and faint hearts of the appeasers among us. I suspect that it is a "red herring" drawn across the path of moral conviction.

I must, in conscience, go on record against such immoral senselessness.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT

The United States entered into this agreement in June 1951. It was ratified as a treaty by the other body on July 15, 1953.

I think it is especially important to note that, before ratification, the other body held but 3 half days of hearings in which a score of high administration officials appeared to testify. The other body heard but one critic of the agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that the other body acted irresponsibly in this matter.

But I do mean to suggest that, on the record, it neither studied nor exhaustively debated the many ramifications of this agreement; that it acted primarily on the advice of administration officials whose testimony reveals scant regard for the effect of the agreement on the constitutional rights of American servicemen; and that, to put it bluntly, it ratified a bad agreement.

We owe a great debt to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], for seeing to it that the basic issues involved here were brought forcibly to the attention of the American people. On May 18, 1955, he proposed a joint resolution urging the President to seek immediate revision of the agreement or, at least, to let it lapse as scheduled, in July 1958.

The Bow resolution—House Joint Resolution 309—further expressed the sense of Congress that criminal jurisdiction over American forces abroad should never again be granted to foreign countries.

I am squarely in favor of the sense and substance of the Bow resolution.

ADMINISTRATION ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE AGREEMENT

When as a consequence of the proposal of the Bow resolution the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings in the summer of last year, those of us on the committee heard testimony on both sides of the question. And we heard some curious arguments, indeed, from those who supported the Status of Forces Agreement.

We heard, for example, that the agreement actually provides more protection to American servicemen abroad than they would otherwise have, that it actually guarantees their constitutional rights.

Such an argument begs more questions than it answers. What is meant by more protection, more than what? Surely not more than the Constitution itself. And surely not more than some alternate agreement which would have reserved criminal jurisdiction over American forces to American authorities.

But this agreement, we were also told, was the best we could get from our NATO partners. It was the best they would agree to. Perhaps it was the best, but only in the absence of a firm stand that this Nation will never default in its obligations to its citizens, home or abroad, civilian or military.

I wonder if our negotiators ever proposed some sensible compromise plan.

Without spelling out the details, perhaps the agreement might have provided for a review panel made up of both American and foreign judges to check over every criminal case involving American servicemen to make absolutely sure that their rights as Americans had not been abridged. We on the committee heard of no such compromise proposals.

FOREIGN COURTS VERSUS UNITED STATES COURTS-MARTIAL

We heard, moreover, the curious argument that the Status of Forces Agreement substitutes foreign courts not for United States civil courts but rather for United States courts-martial and, thus, that the rights of American servicemen are further protected by this agreement.

Does this argument mean to imply that United States courts-martial are not conducted in accordance with the Uniform Code of Military Justice, as revised by Congress in 1951?

Does it mean to imply that courts-martial are not as a consequence conducted in accordance with basic principles and practices of American justice?

With the single exception of no-jury trial, courts-martial are in fact surrounded with every normal guarantee of fair, impartial justice, and with adherence to every cherished principle of American jurisprudence.

I can go one step further: Courts-martial even involve mandatory appeals procedures, right on up to the President himself if the crime carries with it capital punishment.

Most important of all, courts-martial are American courts. Every recourse open to the American citizen is open, as well, to the servicemen who feels he has been denied justice.

How can this protection be seriously balanced against that afforded by French courts, for example, where the defendant is presumed guilty unless he can clearly prove his innocence, courts that have been described even by French critics as "aiming to convict the guilty, and not to protect the innocent"? The comparison falls apart on the most cursory analysis.

THE PRECEDENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Then, too, we on the committee heard much dispute about the precedent, in this matter, of international law. There is, of course, a major school of competent international legal authorities who subscribe to the view that the flag and the Constitution go wherever our Armed Forces go and that this agreement, therefore, flies in the face of accepted legal practice.

But even assuming, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case, even assuming for the sake of argument that the status of America's NATO army is unprecedented in international law and custom, I am convinced that the Status of Forces Agreement is still wrong in principle.

Our NATO forces are not an army of occupation, they are in Europe as the guardians of freedom. They are there not on suffrance but at the specific request of our NATO partners. They are the symbol of our determination as a Nation to help halt the forces of Soviet Communist despotism.

How, then, can we ask the members of this army of freedom to forego the guarantees of their own freedom?

THE FLIMSY PRETEXT OF RECIPROCITY

We also heard administration officials make much of the argument that the agreement is reciprocal. They insisted that the Status of Forces Agreement is of positive benefit to the United States because, under its terms, NATO forces in this country are subject to the jurisdiction of American courts.

This is an argument built of equal parts cheesecloth and begged questions.

In the first place, the numbers involved are of the order of 100 to 1—100 Americans in Europe for every 1 European soldier in the United States.

In the second place, whereas our forces are a semi-permanent military establishment, most of the Europeans in this country are here on short training missions, excluded by diplomatic immunity from the jurisdiction of American courts.

In the third place, therefore, who can be so gullible as to credit the notion that our Government entered into this agreement in order to insure its control over such visiting soldiers?

NATO is a partnership, to be sure, and a keystone of the United States defense system, but the movement of troops is almost wholly one-way, from the United States to Europe. And problems involving the status of NATO forces in foreign areas are almost wholly, from our point of view, those of the nation that sends troops abroad rather than those of the nation that welcomes them.

I want to be consistent in my position, however. If the price of retaining full control over our NATO forces and of guaranteeing them the protection of the Constitution is to waive all jurisdiction over NATO forces in this country, then that is a price I am willing to pay.

JURISDICTION IS USUALLY WAIVED ANYWAY

Finally, those of us on the committee heard the argument that foreign courts waive jurisdiction in a great majority of cases and that, for all practical purposes, the Status of Forces Agreement cannot do very much damage to the rights of American servicemen.

This is a doubly self-defeating argument. It has in it the ring of a last-gasp defense.

It implies that the privilege of trying Americans in foreign courts is so lightly regarded among the NATO countries that they usually waive their jurisdiction. Yet we are asked to believe, at the same time, that in order to station our troops overseas we had to enter into this agreement. These two arguments are flatly contradictory.

In essence, though, it makes no difference how many Americans run the risk of being denied their rights as American citizens. This is, to me, a matter of clear principle. And in matters of principle, numbers are of no consequence. Denial of rights is as indefensible in one case as it is in a thousand.

We do not, as a nation, guarantee our people their most basic rights only sometimes and at the convenience of other countries. Guaranties of impartial justice are as firm as our national honor is precious to us and should remain so, certainly not least to the men we send abroad to defend it.

These are the arguments we heard from those who defended the NATO Status of Forces Agreement before the Foreign Affairs Committee. They are weak and contradictory arguments. And they are basically immoral.

They take no account of the fact that, under this agreement, we draft our young men, send them overseas, and then fail to guarantee them either their rights as citizens, under the Constitution, or their rights as members of the Armed Forces, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

A SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE AGREEMENT

Let me briefly review the arguments that have weighed heavily on my decision to oppose the Status of Forces Agreement.

Despite a specific reservation to the contrary when the other body ratified this agreement, it was used as the pattern for a like agreement with Japan before even a half year had gone by. And if the courts of France and Turkey and Greece and the other NATO countries are foreign to American law, how much more so are those of Japan.

Under this agreement, one indiscreet remark by an American boy about the government or rulers of a foreign country, and he may be hauled into court on criminal charges. This would be true in Turkey and Greece, and even in Great Britain.

It is entirely possible that an American soldier may be tried by Communist judges and juries, before a Communist-influenced public, and made the pawn in a game of calculated anti-Americanism. Such a situation could be almost an everyday occurrence in France or Italy.

No matter how many safeguards are written into the agreement, the fact re-

mains that the courts, along with their judges, procedures, customs, and language, will all be foreign, and foreign as well to the experience of nearly all American servicemen.

Prisons in Europe and Japan often fall below the absolute minimum of American standards, and yet at this moment American soldiers are jailed there under the terms of this agreement.

Although our diplomats and Foreign Service representatives, many of them of draft age, are covered with diplomatic immunity wherever they go, this agreement puts our servicemen at the mercy of foreign systems of justice.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO ABOUT THIS AGREEMENT?

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for my unalterable opposition to the principle of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement.

I say "to the principle" deliberately because I feel that however mistakenly and with whatever indefensible lack of responsibility to our servicemen abroad, this Nation has undertaken a solemn international obligation from which it cannot now withdraw.

To abrogate it now would throw into confusion the present status of our NATO forces. It would make us appear to the world both weak and vacillating. It would suggest that our word is not absolutely trustworthy and that we treat our obligations lightly.

We would only compound a bad situation by unilateral action now.

Fortunately, this agreement will be effective for but 2 more years. We must, I feel, let it run its course.

But we must also, in my view, learn the lesson of our experience.

This Nation must never again, any time in the future, enter into such an agreement as this one. I shall fight for this principle with all my heart and mind.

This Nation must never believe that it can bargain away the most fundamental of all the constitutional rights of American citizens and still maintain its world position as the bulwark of human freedom.

This Nation, when it sends its men abroad to defend this position of leadership, must send them as first-class citizens with every one of the constitutional protections that are their due. It should not do so arrogantly, but rather with justifiable pride in those institutions that have made us both free and great.

There are the issues, Mr. Speaker, that I see involved in the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. And there is my stand.

"Increase Wisconsin's Milk Checks—We Are With You, Senator, in Your Fight"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the final edition of the RECORD there be published a statement by me on the subject of the Grassroots Viewpoint of Wisconsin Dairy Farmers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S DAIRYLAND PRAISES ALEX WILEY'S EFFORTS

"Dairy parity must be raised."

"The farmer must get a break from his present cost-price squeeze."

"Conditions are serious in America's dairyland."

This is the voice of rural Wisconsin.

It is what folks on the rural routes throughout the Badger State have been writing to me about.

Into my office each day come hundreds of letters. They come from individual farmers and from their wives and sons. The letters come particularly from our elderly farmers, who are thinking of retiring. Why? Well, obviously because they cannot make enough, despite all their hard work, to make it worth while to continue.

FARMER ONLY MAKES 50 CENTS AN HOUR

Do city people know what a farmer and his family actually make on the average despite all their labor and all their heavy investment? Only around 50 cents per hour. That is a terribly low return. It doesn't amount to a fourth of what city people are getting on the average for their 40-hour week (plus city folks' paid vacation, time and a half for overtime, etc.).

"MR. BENSON, GET BUSY"

So naturally, letters of deep concern from farmers continue to pour into my office.

Most of these letters say, in effect: "Senator WILEY, we know that you are deeply interested in our welfare. Well, now, we ask you to work still harder so as to get Secretary of Agriculture Benson 'on the beam' and raise dairy parity support."

That is exactly what I am trying to do.

SENATOR WILEY'S EFFORTS TO RAISE DAIRY PARITY

It is why I have always voted to raise dairy parity. It is why I have written to Mr. Benson, time after time, stating that "$3.25 for 3.5 test milk for manufacturing purposes is absolutely too low a return."

The dairyman isn't getting enough for his fluid milk. And he is getting a particularly raw deal—a particularly inadequate return—for his manufacturing milk. Remember, over 80 percent of Wisconsin milk is nonfluid milk. But nonfluid milk isn't getting even the minimum $3.25 per hundredweight support today.

That is why family-size farms are closing. It is why our farm population keeps shrinking.

COSTS GOING UP, UP, UP

What does the farmer face?

Higher and higher costs, higher prices on that part of the feed which he must buy.

Higher and higher labor costs (if he can even get labor at all).

Higher machinery costs.

Higher repair costs, gasoline costs, fertilizer costs. Higher costs on money which he must borrow—if he can get credit.

NOT ENOUGH MILK, CHEESE CONSUMED

Meanwhile his milk check isn't rising. Consumption of dairy products is not increasing sufficiently. We Americans don't drink enough milk. Our youngsters don't and our adults don't, unfortunately. And we don't eat enough cheese. We don't get enough body-building, vitamin-rich other dairy products.

This situation must be remedied. Uncle Sam has to "get on the ball" and help boost consumption of dairy products.

WILEY BATTLES FOR FARMER

I pledge my continued efforts for that end. Good publicity for dairying and for America's dairyland has been my constant aim. "Drink more milk," I've told everyone—young and old, civilian and soldier, Senators and citizens.

But more milk drinking must be accompanied by more prodairy legislation.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I personally am glad to have battled for sound farm legislation night and day—52 weeks a year, for 17½ years in the Congress. I am humbly proud of the laws I've helped to write. That includes the Wiley Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway law. It will provide a great boost for the Wisconsin farmer. The Wiley seaway law is what we in Wisconsin fought for during 30 long, hard years. It is the historic law that we battled for—against the railroads and the greedy eastern monopolists who tried to deny us of the Midwest an outlet to the oceans of the world.

Now, however, the oceans have been brought to our doorstep; 25,000-ton deep-water ships, rather than 2,500-ton ships (the present limit) will carry Wisconsin farm products inexpensively to the world. And we will be able to buy more inexpensively from the rest of the world. This is all due to the Wiley seaway law which has been praised by President Eisenhower and praised by Wisconsin's press.

WILEY SOIL BANK, GAS REFUND, SCHOOL MILK, ANTI-BANG'S BILLS

Other Wiley bills, likewise, I believe, have served our farmers. That includes the Wiley bill which I introduced and cosponsored time and again for 90-percent dairy parity.

It includes Wiley cosponsorship of the soil-bank law, the Wiley cosponsored bill for refund of gasoline taxes. I am especially proud of my school milk legislation, plus Wiley-sponsored appropriations against the dreaded Bang's disease, plus the Wiley amendment against oleo misrepresentation.

These half dozen major fights have been but a few of my hundreds of efforts down through the years.

BATTLING ENEMIES—FROM MASTITIS TO DEPRESSION AND WAR

Now, additional battles must be fought. Wisconsin is fortunately Bang's-free, but we must still defeat mastitis (which costs our dairymen $50 million a year), and we must fight other enemies of dairying.

I'm glad to say that I've always been available to battle on these and other issues for every farm organization which has ever called upon me. I've battled for our REA's, our marketing co-ops, our livestock associations, our dairy-herd improvement groups, our soil-conservation districts, and others.

Yes, I've battled, too, against depression, and I've battled against war, and I've battled against bossism. Depression, war, bossism—these are enemies which Wisconsin farmers and others rightly despise.

GRASSROOTS LETTERS HAVE PRAISED WILEY EFFORTS

I am proud to say, moreover, that in my files are literally hundreds and thousands of letters from Wisconsin farmers, expressing appreciation for my fight for the Wiley seaway law, and for other Wiley bills, as well as my fight for peace, for prosperity, and for progress.

FARMERS KNOW HOW IMPORTANT A SENATOR'S EXPERIENCE IS

The farmer remembers his friends. The farmer knows what it means to have a man battle faithfully for the farmer night and day. The farmer knows how important it is to have a man of experience in the Senate.

I personally am glad to have risen to be the second highest Republican in seniority in the Senate. Let me make this clear: I am not interested in that fact from any personal standpoint. What counts is not ALEX

WILEY. What really counts is the fact that Wisconsin at last has a high-ranking Republican Senator who is fortunately in a powerful position to serve the interests of his State and Nation.

Seniority in the Senate means strength for Wisconsin. Seniority means strength and power for the individual dairy farmer.

Had I not been senior in position, had I instead been low on the long list of 96 Senators, we might never have achieved the St. Lawrence Seaway law. We would probably still be struggling for it, as we did for 30 unsuccessful years.

SERVING PUBLIC INTEREST AS WALTER GOODLAND DID

Now, if a newcomer were to try to take my position, he would have no seniority. It would probably require 20 or 30 years for him to build up as much seniority as I now fortunately have.

I repeat—it is not ALEX WILEY personally that counts; it is the fact that he is in a high-up position to serve the public interest. That is what counts. Service is my aim, just as it was the aim of Wisconsin's great Gov. Walter S. Goodland—also a man of deep, independent convictions.

RURAL WISCONSIN SPEAKS

But now, let rural Wisconsin speak for itself.

Here are messages from Wisconsin grassroots farmers, exactly as these messages came to me. These are excerpts from what they have said on behalf of higher dairy parity and in kind comments on the work of their senior Senator; I am humbly grateful for their support.

From a letter from a farmer on route 1, outside Eldorado, Wis.:

"Senator, I heard your broadcast last evening.

"I was busy milking at the time * * *. You ask five important questions (which you wanted us to help answer). Question No. 1 about keeping a stable economy ties right in with agriculture. If agriculture can be stabilized and farm income brought in balance with other segments of our economy, I think then our whole national economy would be on sound footing. So, the question as you know, is how to help agriculture. I think the soil bank is in the right direction. We must, however, reduce the price spread between producer and consumer, through co-ops and even direct subsidies."

From a farmer outside Chetek:

"I am going to vote for you this fall. I think your record in Congress is excellent. Your efforts on behalf of the seaway project, the school-milk program, and the dairy research laboratory at Madison plus other programs have been very commendable. I shall urge others to support you by pointing out your record in Congress to them. My best wishes in your forthcoming campaign."

From Hillpoint, Wis:

"Farmers just can't stand this low income and high outgo. They are at the breaking point—where they have been for months. The neighbor that joins me on the west has moved to town (closer to a big city) where he can get work. And the farm that joins us is having a sale this coming Friday. He is going to live there awhile, or until he can sell. Then he is going to do carpenter work near Madison. The wife of our neighbor on the east works in town and the wife of one of our neighbors on the north works in town. That isn't farming by any stretch of the imagination."

From a neighbor near my own dairy farm in Barron County:

"Dairying is in very bad shape, Senator, and I am sure you will do your part to help us. * * * Thank you for past favors."

From route 1, Winneconne, Wis.:

"It is time the dairyman got a decent wage, so his wife and children would not have to assist free of charge in order to produce enough for an adequate income."

From Spring Valley, Wis.:

"The farmers keep going broke in this part of the country. About one-third of the farm buildings are empty."

From a farm in Dane County:

"The Wisconsin farmer wants something done for him now. The soil bank may help in the long pull, but now is the critical time for the farmers of Wisconsin. All farmers should be treated equally. Dairy farmers are discriminated against and Wisconsin is principally a dairy State: My tenant had to quit—so now I am trying to hang on by hiring him on a salary basis, and I will take the loss."

From Merrill, Wis.:

"I have lived on this farm more than 56 years. But even the depression was not like this, even with a lot of debts."

From rural route 3, Jefferson, Wis.:

"I am confident that you have the best interests of the dairy farmer at heart."

From rural route 2, Oshkosh, Wis.:

"If something isn't done soon, the small farmer will soon fall out of the picture. Lots have already. I know you have always done your share to help us. So keep up the good work—please."

From Milton, Wis.:

"I have always regarded you as a Christian statesman eager for Wisconsin's welfare. I have kept my allegiance to you as a Senator and expect to vote for you. * * * The St. Lawrence Seaway project alone should assure your victory. It is a great thing for the Middle West. * * * Best wishes for your success."

From Rock County, Wis.:

"We have a dairy farm of 160 acres, which we own free and clear. We operate the farm ourselves, together with our 22-year old son. We are writing in regard to the dairy parity amendment in the present farm bill. It is the only portion of the bill that will give any manner of assistance to the Wisconsin dairy farmers. We are very appreciative of your efforts in our behalf."

Industrial Development in the Seventh District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress naturally desires prosperity and a sound economic condition in our country and especially in the district he represents.

In a free enterprise system such as we have in America, an individual Member of Congress or even the Government itself cannot cause business to locate or remain in any certain locality. While the Government has authority in locating defense establishments, such as Crane Naval Ammunition Depot, these establishments form only a very small part of the overall commercial activities which make prosperity in a country. An interested and an aggressive citizenry can help to provide the proper publicity and interest in a community which may attract industry to it. Certain branches of the State government, as well as both State and national officers, can assist. The citizens of the Seventh Congressional District have been showing great interest in industrial development and have been working with local service and citizens' groups in interesting new businesses in their localities. Localities within the Seventh Congressional District have become increasingly successful in attracting business to this area. Two departments of the State government have been working with these communities: the department of commerce and public relations under the Lieutenant Governor of the State and headed by Ed Beaman; and the Indiana Industrial Council, headed by John Mellett, with offices in the State library. Southern Indiana, Inc., an organization of several communities of southern Indiana, is also very active in industrial development. There have been more than a score of new businesses located in the Seventh District within the last 2 years, including those at Linton, Sullivan, Jasonville, Carlisle, Vincennes, Bicknell, Bloomington, Oaktown, Farmersburg, Princeton, Shelburn, and others. There are also groups in almost every locality working toward obtaining new industries. A few of these communities are Dugger, Franklin, Edinburg, Greenwood, Worthington, Bloomfield, Fort Branch, Oakland City, Mooresville, Martinsville, Brazil, Plainville, Washington, and many others. Much remains to be done, but we are definitely making progress. I have greatly enjoyed working with many of these groups.

A typical example as to what a community can do for industry occurred when gypsum development was begun in Martin County. Incidentally, Indiana University was helpful in the exploration and study which led to the development of this great industry. It took a united effort on the part of local people to get certain State lands made available for gypsum mining. I have never seen finer community effort and spirit than was shown in the effective activities of the people of Martin County in obtaining this most useful industry. Another community enterprise which is of untold benefit was the united effort of the people of Vincennes in obtaining Federal legislation for the Vincennes seawall. It was very gratifying to me to have an opportunity to work with the citizens of these communities in these very worthwhile projects. Space prevents my discussing other similar projects in the Seventh District.

Southern Indiana, especially the coal-mining area, suffered a severe drop in industrial activity during the last two decades as people began to shift from coal to gas and fuel oil for heating their homes. Thousands were thrown out of work and there has been genuine hardship in the area. Today, however, the industrial outlook for southern Indiana is very bright. The demand for electric power in the United States is increasing at a tremendous rate. Hydroelectric power from the large rivers in the Midwest has been developed to the limit;

from now on we will be dependent on coal for our industrial power. Coal production in the United States has gone up 20 percent in the last year and will continue to increase. This will help the Seventh Congressional District in two ways: mining will come back with increasing importance, and new industries will locate where they can get ample and cheap power. That area will be near the great coalfields of Indiana. Coal is found in substantial quantities in 7 of the 11 counties of the district, enough coal to meet Indiana's power needs for a thousand years, and that favorable condition will benefit the entire Seventh District.

There are four great attributes that encourage industry to move to any locality: an available supply of capable labor; power and the facilities for increasing that power as needed; ample water supply and adequate transportation facilities. The Seventh Congressional District possesses all of these to a high degree. There is a strong possibility that a large chemical plant will locate in the area in the near future.

No area in the country has a better supply of workers than does the Seventh Congressional District. This is clearly shown by comparison of the labor force at Crane Ammunition Depot with that of Government installations in other parts of our country. I have investigated this matter and find that there is less absenteeism, less attrition, and a higher degree of productivity at Crane than at any similar installation in the country. This same area has an ample water supply and a glance at the map shows that no area has better railroad and highway transportation facilities.

A Congressman cannot send industry to any locality but he can work with the people in that community toward attracting it. I have met with the people of many communities in the Seventh District to assist in industrial development. Southern Indiana is definitely advancing, and I am always happy to lend every support I can to this advance.

Legislative Achievements of Congressman Patterson Praised by President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Cabinet Members, and Others

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was pleasantly surprised and deeply appreciative when President Eisenhower singled me out for special mention in connection with my modest legislative contributions to our national defense program. And I am also grateful to Vice President NIXON and Secretary of the Army Brucker for their commendation of my efforts in behalf of the Eisenhower national security program.

I wish to take this occasion to also thank Secretary of Labor Mitchell for his words of appreciation for my support of "legislation which benefits our working men and women and thereby our whole economy," and to Secretary of Agriculture Benson for what he described as "your consistent support of the Eisenhower administration's farm program"; and the kind words of Chairman Strauss of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Furthermore, I wish to express my gratitude to House Republican Leader JOE MARTIN, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking minority member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and my many friends and constituents for their kind words of appreciation.

Following are the texts of letters mentioned:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Now that the Congress has adjourned I want to thank you most sincerely for the major contributions you made throughout the 84th Congress in behalf of our many programs to strengthen the Nation's defenses and to build an America stronger and better in every way. For your effective support, and especially for your leadership in respect to my proposal for an atomic-powered peace ship, I am grateful indeed. I wish you every success in your campaign this fall.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: As the 1956 campaign swings into action, I cannot help but recall our long association together and the steadily growing respect which you have so rightfully earned from your colleagues in both the House and the Senate.

You and I first came to Congress 10 years ago, and during that time I have come to regard you not only as one of my closest friends but, even more important, as one of the most outstanding men in the House of Representatives. Your steadfast devotion to the people you represent, your energy in protecting their rights above and beyond the boundaries of political partisanship, have created for you among your fellow colleagues a position of leadership.

It is impossible to look at the record of the past 4 years without realizing what a tower of strength you have been to the Eisenhower administration. Your great work as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has helped give this Nation the greatest military power in its history and atomic legislation which will have far-reaching consequences in promoting the welfare of the American people in both the fields of defense and peace.

I am well aware of the fact that your congressional district suffered terrible devastation during the New England floods last year. But you met the challenge in a forthright manner, and it was largely through your vigorous efforts that the Federal agencies created a well-coordinated flood rehabilitation program.

I have also followed closely your work in behalf of flood control, flood insurance, and hurricane warning measures and feel that your contribution in these areas of legislation has been outstanding.

The continuance of the successful policies of the Eisenhower administration depends on the election of a Republican Congress in which the experience of men like you is a vital necessity.

With best personal wishes for another great Republican victory in November.

Sincerely,

DICK NIXON,
Richard Nixon.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: As a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, I want to express my appreciation to you for the position you have taken in support of legislation which benefits our working men and women and thereby our whole economy.

I particularly recall your support in the 84th Congress of the administration's proposal to increase the minimum wage and your support of President Eisenhower's 1954 proposals to amend the social security law, as well as your sponsorship last year of the District of Columbia wage collection bill which was enacted into law on August 3, 1956.

It has been a privilege to work with you in securing the labor surveys you have requested in your district's interest, and I am gratified that you believe that these surveys have paved the way for the people of your district, through their industries, to benefit from special provisions of the Government's contracting laws.

I am happy to learn that you have been renominated as the Republican congressional candidate for Connecticut's Fifth District and I wish you every success in the campaign.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: Now that the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your consistent support of the Eisenhower administration's farm program. Had it not been for the cooperation of Members of Congress like you we would never have been able to enact the Soil Bank Act of 1956.

I well recall your personal visit with me last fall after floods had ravaged many of the farms in your district. Furthermore I am sure you are aware of the fact that most of the recommendations contained in your September 28, 1955, letter to me were substantially carried out by the Department of Agriculture.

The farmers of the Fifth District of Connecticut must indeed be appreciative of your continued efforts in their behalf. I am happy to learn that you have been renominated and wish you every success in the forthcoming campaign.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington.

Hon. J. T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: As the work of the 84th Congress is about to come to a close, I would like to express on behalf of the

United States Army, my appreciation for your many courtesies and for your cooperation.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, you have accorded the Army a fair hearing and an unbiased audience on all occasions and your efforts to provide for our needs are sincerely appreciated.

On my own behalf, let me congratulate you on the dedicated and valuable service that you are rendering as a Member of the Congress.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: With the adjournment of Congress for this session, I shall probably not be seeing you for some months. I write this, therefore, to tell you how much I appreciate the encouragement and help you have given to the atoms-for-peace program. It means a lot to those of us who spend all our time and strength in these endeavors to have the kind of intelligent and enthusiastic support which you have provided.

As I look at my calendar, I am reminded that just about a year ago I was with the President as he flew over the New England area, including your district, to see the flood damage at first hand. Since then, you have certainly done a great job of helping your own people.

For their sakes, as well as my own, I hope you will be back in Washington in the next Congress.

Faithfully yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I do not want you to leave for home without expressing my deep gratitude for your loyal support of the Eisenhower program and your great assistance to me. Your renomination is a tribute to the fine service you have rendered your district and the country in a trying and difficult period.

Considering the fact that we did not have a majority, our record was a remarkable one. We have made it possible for President Eisenhower to go before the country this fall with a record of achievement that has contributed much to peace and prosperity. The country is on the march upward, and you have helped to make it so.

We face a hard campaign this fall. The opposition, realizing how difficult—if not impossible—it is to defeat President Eisenhower will concentrate on the candidates for the House and Senate. They believe this is where they can defeat the Eisenhower program.

Recognizing the perils ahead, Republicans must present a united front. After the primaries there can be no differences. United we will be able to advance our program—prosperity through peace instead of war, a stable economy, a balanced budget, and progress in the American way. The people of the United States, I believe, want President Eisenhower to have a fair chance in his splendid efforts for a better America. This requires a Republican Congress. The last 2 years should have taught the American people that a Republican Congress is necessary if he is to have a chance to adequately serve America and the world.

It has been a great pleasure to serve with you. You have had a hard job, and your work has been fortunate in having the benefit of your good judgment and your courageous service.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Although we are all very busy in these closing hours of the 84th Congress, I want to take time out to commend you for your outstanding contributions to this Congress and to the lives of all Americans. I can think of no one whose position on all worthwhile legislation is more valuable to Connecticut and to the whole Nation.

Your wonderful efforts in behalf of all veterans, particularly those who were disabled while fighting for their country, are unsurpassed by anyone in the Nation. When I was chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, you were always the first to help. This can be proven by the fact that legislation which you sponsored was so important that it became law under your name. Only a few Representatives, of all the hundreds, have received such a tremendous honor.

I know of your great military record during World War II, and I cannot commend you too highly for your courageous fight as a member of the Armed Services Committee which has resulted in our having the strongest national defense establishment in the world. Your work on the Atomic Energy Committee has been of vital importance to our security.

I am particularly grateful for your untiring efforts to bring relief to the sections of New England which were ravaged by last year's floods and hurricanes. My people as well as yours will never forget your long, hard struggles to relieve the suffering and to enact legislation to make such disastrous results impossible in the future.

My warmest personal regards to you and your family. I know you will continue to fight for your people as well as for the entire Nation, exercising the same high standards of integrity which have won you such complete respect from all of your colleagues. You are a great American and an outstanding Congressman. We cannot do without you.

Looking forward to seeing you again when the Eighty-fifth Congress convenes in January, I am,

Cordially yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

CONNECTICUT STATE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn.

Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: The letter dated February 6 to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, regarding the advisability of constructive action by our Government to relieve Middle East tensions and to carry through with our commitments to free nations, such as Israel, has come to the attention of our organization.

We feel your signing of this letter was a sound action. We hope it will contribute toward a firming up of our Government's foreign policy so that the United States may exert maximum leadership toward the objective of ameliorating the serious Middle East situation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. DRISCOLL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Hamden, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your note of January 24 pertaining to the union amendment to the Commissioners' transit bill.

I am sure that the members of the A. A. Street Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America throughout the country will be grateful for your position on this important bill.

My best to you.

Sincerely,

JOE ROURKE,
Joseph M. Rourke,
Secretary-Treasurer.

FIRST DIVISION, NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept our sincere thanks for your recent vote in supporting S. 1, the pay raise for postal workers. Almost 4 years without an increase in wages, in the face of increasing prices and economic pressure, should come to an early end.

Thanking you again, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEX FEDEROWICZ,
President, Connecticut Branch, NPTA.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: On behalf of the more than 100,000 members of the National Association of Letter Carriers, we want to express our thanks to you for your vote in support of S. 1, as reported by the conference committee.

In our opinion, this bill is a very fair compromise. It gives to the Post Office Department the major part of the reclassification program it requested, and it gives a fair increase in pay to the postal employees.

Two positions on reclassification and pay legislation were presented to the Congress. It is our opinion that the Congress did an excellent job in working out a compromise and we want to thank you for your support in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Vice President.
PETER J. CAHIL,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

FIRST DIVISION NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The 47th convention of the First Division, National Postal Transport Association, in regular session assembled desires to commend Congressman PATTERSON for his efforts in maintaining an efficient postal service, and for his valuable support in our efforts to protect the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. HAGAR,
Secretary.

NATIONAL TAX CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
COUNCIL OF MOTION PICTURE ORGANIZATIONS,
New York, N. Y.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: In behalf of the 230,000 men and women engaged in this motion picture industry, I wish to tell you how deeply we appreciate the support you gave the King bill, H. R. 9875, which has just been signed into law by the President.

By helping to pass this legislation you unquestionably saved many of this country's movie theaters from extinction and made it possible for them and all other theaters to operate with some degree of hope for the future.

We hope that conditions will soon arise making it possible for our Government to remove the Federal admission tax entirely; but until that happy day we want you to know that we are grateful for your action in reducing this tax as much as you have.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. O'DONNELL.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Representative from Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: We of the Department of Connecticut, the American Legion, wish and desire to express our sincere thanks for the interest and support you gave in restoring the 14 acres of property at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Newington, to that facility. We are most grateful for your assistance in this matter.

We certainly hope that conditions will not arise from a similar situation at the Veterans' Administration hospital located in West Haven, Conn., for us to have to call upon you.

We understand that a portion of that facility's property has been declared surplus. In order to get the proposed surplus property on the market, a portion of adjacent property which is used by the patients for recreational purposes may be linked with the surplus property.

If such a situation does arise, we will certainly be calling upon you. Sincerely hope nothing comes of this.

Again thanking you for your assistance and consideration of the welfare of our veterans, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. PARKER,
Department Adjutant.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States Representative
from Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Permit me to express my deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks to you for your very fine expressions to the President of the United States on June 1 concerning the recommendations of the Bradley Commission.

I know that you will join with other veteran organizations in opposing this heartless and discouraging report concerning the veterans of this great Nation of ours.

We will keep in close touch with you within the next few months to ask your assistance and cooperation on important matters concerning the veterans.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. BENNETT,
Department Commander.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Fifth Connecticut
District, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: In behalf of the Disabled American Veterans of Connecticut we wish to thank you most cordially for your prompt and courteous attention to our recent communication in regards to the objectionable questionnaire which had been sent out to veterans concerning their compensation.

We are appreciative of your assurances that our wishes in the matter will be given thoughtful and favorable consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

FREDERICK J. RUNDBAKEN,
Department Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States Representative
from Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I am writing at this time to thank you for the interest and help you have given our organization, and the other veterans' groups in the recent action which rescinded the order of disposing of the 14 acres of land at the Newington VA Hospital.

It is gratifying to know of your continued interest in the welfare of the veterans of our State.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD N. BACHAND,
Department Commander.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I want to thank you for the many favors you have extended this office in the past, and particularly for the daily copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the session just ended.

I realize that you have many demands for this useful document and hesitate to request that you keep us on your mailing list. However, if you find it possible, it will be greatly appreciated.

Trusting that you can get some well-earned rest and recreation for the balance of the summer months I am,

Very sincerely yours,

OMER W. CLARK,
Director of Legislation.

CONNECTICUT FARM
BUREAU ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New Haven, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the past several weeks we have had occasion to write to you several times regarding our position on the farm bill.

It makes us very happy to learn that your vote last Tuesday clearly indicates that you have the welfare of the Connecticut farmer at heart.

Once again we thank you.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. CLARKE, *Secretary.*

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Boston, Mass.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: As a gallery observer yesterday I hasten to congratulate you upon the magnificent way in which the flood-control survey amendment was handled.

May I say how pleasing it is to witness such a demonstration of New England congressional unity on a New England issue.

Thank you on behalf of our 3,300 members.

Sincerely,

WALTER RALEIGH.

CITY OF TORRINGTON,
Torrington, Conn., April 30, 1956.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated April 27, 1956, in which you very kindly enclosed copies of correspondence with the United States Weather Bureau, concerning a flash-flood warning system for the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut.

The interim report is very interesting and I know when this system is in operation it will be of great value to the Naugatuck River Valley and Connecticut in general.

We, in Torrington, appreciate everything that you have done and are doing to help us in getting back to normal and to be in a position to better control high waters when they come in the future.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

BILL,
William T. Carroll,
Mayor.

THE AMERICAN BRASS CO.,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of April 27 attaching a copy of letter dated April 20 from Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., New England Division Engineer, Army Corps of Engineers, and a copy of letter dated April 26 from Mr. D. M. Little, Assistant Chief of the United States Weather Bureau.

You are to be complimented for your painstaking and ceaseless effort to obtain adequate flood protection in the Naugatuck Valley and I am deeply grateful for your thoughtfulness in keeping me advised of developments.

With very best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ELMER LANG,
Vice President.

CONNECTICUT PACKAGE STORES
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New Haven, Conn.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It is my wish to express my appreciation for the stand you took in our behalf against H. R. 4697.

Your realization and understanding of the necessity of supporting small business is gratifying to both our association and myself.

Therefore your definite position against this measure is one that I think is important.

Respectfully,

NATHAN M. KASOWITZ,
President.

CARPET INSTITUTE, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

Hon JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I want you to know that the carpet industry is highly appreciative of the support you gave Congressman HARRISON'S carpet wool bill when it was voted upon in the House on Monday, July 23.

While the necessary two-thirds vote was missed by a very narrow margin, the results of the vote were highly gratifying to our industry. To us it is a good indication that we will have an excellent chance in the next session of Congress to get the much-needed relief this bill will give the industry.

We are hopeful that we will have your continued support on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL M. JONES,
President.

THE ALDON SPINNING MILLS CORP.,
Talcottville, Conn.

Hon JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: One of the members of our organization has written you commending the position you have taken on H. R. 5550. I wish to add my applause for the down-to-earth, courageous position you have taken against H. R. 5550. It seems unlikely that any straightforward-thinking Congressman can circumvent the logic expressed by you, and the effect H. R. 5550 would have on the Nation as a whole.

My hearty congratulations, and keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,
THE ALDON SPINNING MILLS CORP.,
ALFRED W. CAVEDON.

COUNCIL OF MECHANICAL SPECIALTY CONTRACTING INDUSTRIES, INC.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, a nonprofit organization with subscribing members from all branches of the mechanical specialty contracting industry, in the interest of the 87,000 independent small-business men in this field appreciates your support and vote for the Federal construction contract bill, S. 1644.

All of our member companies are aware of your help.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

GEORGE B. ROSCOE,
Executive Secretary.

Development and Conservation of Our Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, water is something we take for granted if we have just the right amount of it. It is also something we view with concern when we have either too much or too little.

Americans are beginning to appreciate what it means to control our water resources. We are aroused by floods that sweep through the valleys of New England, or California, or the Mississippi Delta. We have sympathy when droughts sweep through the Midwest and Southwest creating duststorms and destroying crops. We don't want our basements flooded and our plants swept away or our homes swept away with loss of life. Nor do we want to sprinkle our lawns and gardens and crops on rationed water.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has existed for 43 years. I have been its president the last 2 years. Since its organization in Baltimore in 1901, it has been concerned with water control in the form of floods and in the use of water for traffic on rivers and seas.

In addition to this interest, the Rivers and Harbors Congress has kept abreast of new developments in water use and control.

After its May 11–12 convention, in Washington, the Rivers and Harbors Congress sought a comprehensive report on the water problems of the Nation. A questionnaire was sent to all the Federal agencies that are concerned with the matter. It is encouraging that the Federal Government is studying water control and water use from so many directions. Our questionnaire went out to 40 agencies. The replies constitute must reading for those of us who have long been concerned with these matters.

The departmental replies are not yet fully completed. But, already they constitute a textbook that gives us a wide comprehension of the activities of our Government in the field of water control, usage and improvement.

These are the questions that the Rivers and Harbors Congress posed in the questionnaire. Time will not permit all the replies to these specific questions, but I hope to give you some of the highlights. The questionnaire asked replies—where applicable—to the following:

First. Possible control of hurricanes, and techniques being used in reporting hurricanes.

Second. Artificial rainmaking through seeding of clouds and other methods.

Third. Conversion of salt water into fresh water.

Fourth. New weather-reporting devices such as the unmanned weather reporting stations now being anchored in midocean; and weather-recording balloons.

Fifth. The effect of fallout upon reservoirs and lakes which supply our cities with water.

Sixth. The prospect that atomic power may replace water power and steam power as a major source of energy.

Seventh. The possibility that atomic power may make our maritime fleet obsolete.

Eighth. The decline in the ground water level in most parts of the country.

Ninth. The problem of obtaining sufficient amounts of water for industrial purposes.

Tenth. Methods to reuse industrial water.

Eleventh. Stream pollution: What can be done to clean up our rivers and streams?

Twelfth. Tornadoes: Can they be predicted? Can they be controlled?

Thirteenth. Without breaching military secrecy, of course, what can be said about weather observations in the Arctic and Antarctic insofar as it affects weather in the United States?

Fourteenth. What are your views with regard to control of duststorms? Are we on the verge of another cycle of duststorms? How can we control them?

Fifteenth. What are your views about disaster insurance—flood, hurricane, tornado, dust-storms, atomic fallout, and so forth?

Sixteenth. Has your agency made any study of the effect of fallout on the fishing industry in such areas as the Chesapeake Bay, the Gulf of Mexico shrimp, the tuna off the Pacific coast, and so forth?

Seventeenth. Has your agency studied the effect of stream pollution on the fishing industry in various areas?

Eighteenth. Has your agency studied the effect of pollution fallout with regard to wildlife? For instance, have you studied the results that might occur if military firing ranges were established close to bird refuges or fishing grounds?

Now that the hurricane season has started, it is encouraging to know that this year, the Weather Bureau Advisory Committee on Weather Control has launched an exhaustive hurricane research program. Back in 1947, a tropical hurricane was seeded with dry ice from an aircraft, but the results were negative.

Subsequent observations of cumulus clouds were made for warning purposes, but without seeding. The Rivers and Harbors Congress was informed that seeding devices are being used in the present program while these destructive storms are in their formative stages.

Under a 1955 act of Congress, the United States Army engineers were charged with methods of "preventing loss of human lives and damage to property with due consideration of the economics of proposed breakwaters, seawalls, dikes, dams, and other structures, warning services, or other measures."

It is certain that the Weather Bureau and the armed services have greatly improved their hurricane warning systems. Warning itself is most important, for to be forewarned is to be prepared against loss of life and possessions.

Various agencies were asked about weather reporting in general, including not only hurricanes, but also tornadoes, droughts, and hailstorms. Their interest in this matter ranged from the Arctic to the Antarctic. What happens in these distant regions, especially in the Arctic, affects our weather, it was pointed out.

Of course, one of the most intriguing activities of man has been control of the rains and the weather. In answer to the questionnaire, the Weather Bureau's Advisory Committee made these interesting comments about artificial rainmaking:

Seeding individual clouds and storm systems with ground-based silver iodide generators. At times these operations may be

supplemented by aircraft seeding with silver iodide or dry ice. Ground-based generators are used extensively in the United States and to some extent in many foreign countries.

Aircraft seeding of individual clouds and storm systems with dry ice or silver iodide dispensed from the aircraft. The Australians have reported increases amounting to 30 percent in precipitation over the mountains southwest of Sidney, but the operations have not been under way long enough to give statistically significant results. Because of the rugged terrain, the Australians have indicated that the use of aircraft is the most economical method of seeding in this area. The United States and other countries use aircraft for supplementary seeding only due to the high cost of operating aircraft.

The seeding of individual cumulus clouds, so-called warm cumulus in the subtropics, with water dispensed from an aircraft. Rainfall has been initiated by this method, but operations have not been extensive enough to determine whether this method is economically feasible. This research has been carried on quite extensively by the Department of the Air Force.

In Pakistan, cloud seeding has been carried out, using powdered salt to increase precipitation. Results to date appear to be inconclusive. The Japanese have reported using aluminum oxide occasionally with a fair degree of success. Quite recently Switzerland has reported a new nucleating agent, cupric sulfide. This powdered chemical is blown into the air and preliminary results indicate that it may have many superior advantages over silver iodide or any other nucleating agent.

Suppression of lightning and hailstorms. At present, extensive research is being conducted into the possibility of inhibiting lightning fires in the western forests and reducing the frequency of or eliminating destructive hailstorms. It is reasoned by some scientists that if lightning and hail-producing storms can be seeded with silver iodide or dry ice in the early stages of development, the storms will rain themselves out before reaching lightning or hail proportions. At the present time, Project Skyfire, now being conducted by the United States Forestry Service, is searching out breeding areas for cumulus clouds which produce lightning fires in the national forests and just recently experimental seeding operations have been conducted at San Francisco Peaks near Flagstaff, in Arizona, to develop techniques for seeding potential lightning-producing thunderstorms. More than 85 percent of the recent forest fires in Arizona and New Mexico have been caused by lightning strikes according to reports from the Forestry Service.

Hail suppression experiments are under way in several areas in the United States. Scottsbluff, Nebr., has an extensive program under way to prevent hail damage to sugar-beet crops. Condon, Oreg., has similar experiments to prevent damage to wheatfields and, recently, similar cloud-seeding experiments were started in the Hudson River Valley to prevent damage to the apple crop. A similar experiment is being conducted in Washington State where very extensive apple crops are grown.

These latter cloud-seeding experiments are being conducted for additional information which may result in more efficient methods of increasing precipitation.

The Tennessee Valley Authority reported that the President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control is considering an experimental rainmaking project on a selected watershed in the Tennessee River area. However, the TVA and other agencies point out that "serious legal questions" may arise where there is any change in precipitation brought about by artificial means.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management reported that artificial rainmaking had been tried extensively over the public lands in the West. The Bureau commented:

The development of successful techniques in this field would be of tremendous benefit to the livestock industry in the Western States and to the local and regional economies dependent thereon.

From responses to our questionnaire, it would appear that more study should be given to the effect of fallout in the event of a nuclear attack. Interior's Bureau of Land Management said this was a matter of immediate concern to them. The acting head of the Bureau, Mr. Falch, said this:

The contamination of stock waters in the range country by atomic fallout could cause wholesale destruction of range livestock. I recognize also the serious effect such fallout would have on headwater sources of water supplying downstream domestic and irrigation needs of population centers.

The question of flood and disaster insurance was one that was discussed at our Rivers and Harbors Convention and also on the floors of Congress this year. In its resolutions last May, the Rivers and Harbors Congress took the position that Federal insurance was no substitute for flood protective works. In response to our questionnaire, the Department of the Army made this comment:

Insurance against flood losses would be beneficial in spreading the impact of specific flood events among a larger number of persons than those directly damaged. But insurance would not reduce the aggregate physical and economic loss nor would it ameliorate the distress and suffering and great indirect losses inflicted by catastrophic floods. Such insurance would not, therefore, provide a substitute for protective works. To be most effective flood insurance should be used to supplement protective works in situations where for any reason, physical or economic, such works are not feasible or cannot be provided immediately.

Flood insurance has not proved feasible on a commercial basis. Before a Government-sponsored program of flood insurance can be established, difficult technical problems in determination of flood frequencies, risks to individual properties, rate determination, etc., will have to be resolved. Thus, an exploratory experimental period appears desirable.

It should be anticipated that the availability of flood insurance, particularly on a subsidized basis, will encourage greater use of flood-plain property. But, as pointed out above, insurance will not reduce flood losses. Therefore, in order to avoid uneconomic flood-plain development and increased expenditures for protective works, the availability of flood insurance should be made conditional upon appropriate regulation of flood-plain development and use.

On the matter of conversion of salt water into fresh water, the Congress authorized a saline water conversion program in 1952. Here is the latest progress report from that agency, which is set up within the Interior Department:

The problem of saline water conversion is essentially a matter of reducing the cost of the water produced, whether accomplished by new processes or by improvement of existing processes. Technically, feasible methods of producing fresh water from either sea water or brackish inland waters have been known for many years, and are practiced on a large scale in various arid regions, but the cost of the water produced is far too high for general use.

The research under the program to date indicates gradual progress toward lower-cost production. Estimates of the probable cost of large-scale conversion of sea water show that it is approaching the maximum existing costs of municipal water in the United States and is considerably below the maximum being paid for industrial water, although still several times higher than that of currently used irrigation supplies. At the same time, economical improvement of brackish waters for many irrigation uses, which is inherently less expensive than conversion of sea water, is definitely in sight.

In view of the scope of the subject of water resource activities on the part of Federal agencies, I can cover but one more point, and that is:

The prospect that atomic power may replace waterpower and steam power as a major source of energy.

The Federal Power Commission, the Army engineers, the Tennessee Valley Power Administration generally agreed. They agreed that nuclear power would supplement rather than displace steam power and waterpower. The consensus was that atomic power would not become competitive before 1965.

The subject is so important, as we plan ahead for the best possible use of our water resources, that I quote the answers to our questionnaire:

The Federal Power Commission:

The staff of the Commission has from time to time studied the place of atomic power in the overall picture of power supply throughout the United States. Present indications of the staff are that atomic power will augment and become a large part of the future power supply, but waterpower and steam-electric power will continue to be important segments of the total.

The Tennessee Valley Authority:

TVA believes that ultimately nuclear powerplants will be more economical than coal-burning plants, and that, once their superiority has been clearly demonstrated, new installations will be nuclear. It is felt that nuclear plants are not likely to be competitive with coal-burning plants in this area much earlier than 1965, and that perhaps several additional years will elapse before nuclear power will represent a substantial portion of the total generating capacity.

TVA does not believe that the useful life of existing steam plants will be affected by the advent of nuclear power. It seems likely that nuclear plants will be most advantageously operated at high-load factor and that existing steam plants will be used for peaking. Thus nuclear plants are not expected to replace steam plants, but rather to supplement them; even this effect will not be substantial during the next decade. Since hydroplants have very low out-of-pocket operating costs, it is not expected that existing hydroplants will be replaced by nuclear plants.

The Department of the Army, United States Army engineers:

Atomic power should not be viewed as replacing water or steam power but rather as a new energy source arriving at a time when overall power shortages are predicted within the foreseeable future. Undoubtedly,

atomic power will play an increasingly important role in meeting our future national requirements. However, it may be expected to complement instead of replace waterpower and steam power in meeting these pyramiding demands.

The Bonneville Dam Authority, Department of the Interior:

If all major hydropotential in the Pacific Northwest is developed as needed, it will supply the estimated energy requirements to about 1975. Due to economic feasibility and conflict of interests, such as migratory fish, navigation and irrigation, some of the hydropotential may never be developed, and some sites may be delayed for many years. If the projects now considered to be economically competitive are all developed when required, they will supply the estimated needs of the region to between 1970 and 1975. A certain amount of thermal firming capacity is desirable and should be in operation before that time.

Since the Pacific Northwest does not have large reserves of oil or gas, and the coal reserves are of relatively low quality, fuel cost for conventional thermal electric generating plants will be high, probably not less than 30 to 40 cents per million B. T. U. even in large quantities. We are convinced that the cost of producing electric energy through the use of nuclear fission will gradually come down, while the cost of hydroenergy will continue to increase after the low-cost sites have been developed. It appears at present that incremental hydro costs may reach the conventional-thermal level in this area in 15 to 20 years. By that time, several generations of power reactors will have been constructed and nuclear power should be competitive. Thus it appears that nuclear power is destined to supplement rather than replace both hydro and conventional thermal power resources.

These are but a few answers to our questionnaire and more will be reported as further replies are received. We are trying to make a composite picture of the water situation in the Nation.

We are encouraged by the amount of activity in the field of water use and control. We urge even greater activity in the future. Our water resources must be used and controlled to the extent of human wisdom and human capacity.

Reflection Is Good for the Political Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a giant hoax was perpetrated on the American people. They were promised a new approach to government, one that truly was to represent them. In 1952, they were promised a world of peace and prosperity, lower taxes, higher wages, lower prices, and a balanced budget. The best business heads in America were to run our Government.

Two years went by, and the disillusioned American people went back to their own party, the Democratic Party, by electing a Democratic Congress. The administration moaned and warned of a partisan cold war, of a stalemate within the Government. President Eisenhower cried loudest. Let us now review what happened.

Whatever good there was in the President's program had more support in every instance from the Democratic Party than from his own Republican Party. The President, himself, presently admits that the Democratic Congress produced a substantial amount of worthwhile legislation.

In 1952 the American people were fooled into believing in a program that its authors themselves did not believe in. We hope in this election year they will not fall prey to the hoax that the elephant will again try to foist upon them.

Evaluation of the past will help us to spot the election year myths when they are presented by Republican campaigners.

THE ADMINISTRATION—ABSENTEE MANAGEMENT; WHO'S MINDING THE STORE?

We were promised a President who would be a guiding knight, an active and strong manager, a leader of our country, an expert in military affairs, and a friend of our foreign allies.

Instead we have an ailing gentleman, who had no experience in government, and who has shown no interest or desire to learn about his tasks. On several occasions he has told his press conferences about seeking the enactment of bills he had already signed into law. This disinterest or lack of knowledge cannot be attributed to ill health. Eisenhower's pleasing personality and past military achievements are no substitute for political leadership. There can be no justification for his delegating the authority and responsibility vested by our Constitution solely in the President.

The business managers of our Nation, such as Secretary Wilson and Secretary Humphrey, may be fine in business, but they have proved they do not belong in government. The promotion of the national well-being for the benefit of the many rather than the few is foreign to their philosophy.

It is not true that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. Profits of an automobile industry are not equivalent to the welfare of a people.

Our health program should not be measured with an eye to a balanced budget. Nor has Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey earned the right to act as an adviser to our Armed Forces. Defense and national security must not be impaired by a desire for a balanced budget.

THE CONSUMER, LABOR, AND THE FARMER—THE TIGHT SQUEEZE

The one problem common to the farmer, to labor, and to all of us, is that of the consumer.

Candidate Eisenhower promised us a lower cost of living. President Eisenhower will surely disclaim responsibility for a higher cost of living.

Consumers prices are at a record high. The National Consumer Price Index rose for the fourth successive time in a year. It has reached the highest peak in 5 years. Next month another rise is expected.

The Democratic farm program is based on the knowledge that general prosperity cannot be maintained while we continue to depress the farmer. President Eisenhower vetoed our Democratic farm price support bill and then quickly raised price supports himself. Apparently his sliding scale had slid too far, for farm income is down 30 percent in the past year.

Milk prices to the consumer have continued to rise. Secretary Benson decided to raise dairy prices just when manufacturers had warehouses filled with cheese and butter bought at the lower price level. The farmer who sold his milk at the lower price then had to buy it back as high priced butter. This apparently is the Republican idea of how to aid the dairy farmer. No wonder so many of these farm families spread oleo on their bread.

Milk prices no not worry Secretary Benson who finds that the little farmer is of no importance. Benson is more concerned with the three members of his Advisory Board whose firms have been indicted for monopolistic practices. Mr. Benson is apparently fully occupied in directing the administration's ever-changing farm policy. He first opposed and then supported a soil bank; he first opposed and then approved the plowing under of crops; first opposed and then approved the idea of farm policy as a political issue.

The present administration makes many boasts as to the increase in the size of the labor force. This increase is largely a result of our ever-increasing population. Of far greater significance is the fact that at least 2,900,000 people who want jobs cannot find them. In the past year one million persons have been added to our unemployed rolls. That represents a total of nearly 10 million American men, women and children who have lost their means of support. The billion dollar year that General Motors has just concluded does not help these people.

The Democratic Party sponsored a bill to help our unemployed learn new skills when their previous trades no longer offer employment. Retraining these people will help to relieve all of us of the burden of support. This is the type of constructive, positive legislation which brought our country to the prosperous state which it enjoyed to 1953 when Republican businessmen began to tear it down.

Candidate Eisenhower pledged himself to the amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. President Eisenhower has consistently refused to live up to his campaign promises. Former Secretary of Labor Durkin offered the President 19 amendments, which were in accord with Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Eisenhower refused to go along with any of them. Instead he submitted to Congress a program which would toughen the Taft-Hartley Act. His Labor Secretary resigned and was replaced with another big-business man. Congress refused to go along with President Eisenhower's labor program as presented.

In an attempt to meet the increased cost of living, Congress has raised the minimum wage to $1 per hour over Presi-

dent Eisenhower's protest that 90 cents was adequate.

The Republican Party as represented by President Eisenhower may be a party of the people—but of and for a very few people.

BAD GOVERNMENT

During his 1952 campaign Candidate Eisenhower had much to say about corruption in Government and useless personnel in the Government.

We said then and repeat now: no political party has a monopoly on virtue or efficiency. Every party when trusted with the privilege to govern must be ever alert to weed out the loafers, the incompetent, and the criminal.

President Eisenhower has sadly failed the people in that regard.

The executive departments, in almost every instance, are employing more people and more top executives at higher salaries than in any previous administration. The exceptions are in the so-called service departments.

The Post Office Department serving all of the American people is using fewer employees and giving the worst service we have ever experienced.

The Veterans' Administration, serving our veterans and particularly our disabled veterans, has been reduced in force, moved around, kicked around and made a less useful agency to those who need it most.

The Agriculture Department has been reorganized to take out of the hands of the farmers most of the things they can do best for themselves.

Misappropriating funds is the order of the day for this administration. This administration has appointed more corrupt officials than any other in our history.

Starting with Secretary Benson using Department funds to refurbish a government lodge for his personal use, we find corruption rampant in every department.

Warehouses bursting at the seams, because improperly constructed; selling millions of dollars worth of cheese to the processors and buying them back at higher prices, without the cheese ever leaving storage or changing hands; indictment of three members of Secretary Benson's Advisory Board; self-dealing for his private profit of one of his paid subordinates; loading the school lunch program with more than $400,000 worth of phony transportation charges in Illinois for the sole benefit of one of his Republican friends. There are no doubt many more such incidents which have not yet been exposed. We are just beginning to investigate the monopoly enjoyed by three companies in disposing of surplus commodities.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration the Commodity Credit Corporation never exceeded an authorization of $6¾ billion. The total loss in those 20 years from operation of the program was about $1 billion. During 3½ years, the Republicans have increased that authorization to $14 billion. The losses have increased by at least $4 billion. No small part is attributable to the increased interest rates paid to bankers and much of it paid in violation of law.

Dixon-Yates was bad, so bad that even the Republican administration has backed down on its spurious claim of legality.

The cancellation of a Defense Department contract awarded to the Chrysler Corp. and awarding the same business to General Motors is only a small part of the wrongdoing in that Department.

The foot-in-mouth statements of Secretary Wilson are least important of the many things that are bad in this administration.

The Small Business Committees of the Congress have devoted some part of almost every day to urging the Defense Department to follow the law and its own regulations in awarding contracts and making payments earned thereunder.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have also been managed in a manner adverse to the public interest.

The big banks and big holding companies have grown bigger with the aid and abetment of the Republican appointees to those agencies.

The responsibility for the Illinois bank scandal, the theft of State funds through bank manipulations, must be borne at least in part by those same Republican Federal appointees.

Internal mismanagement by those officials of their offices, I hope, will soon be the subject of thorough investigation.

Under the leadership of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency attempts are being made to weaken our banking laws for the benefit of the big banks and to the detriment of the small banks and small investors. A part of that scheme was the abortive attempt to destroy the right of minority stockholders to minority representation on the directorates of national banks.

The full story about the giveaways by the Interior Department, the attempt to destroy TVA, REA, and our other public facilities and natural resources requires much more time than I can give here.

SMALL BUSINESS

Since 1953 our Government has been taken over by big business and the big banking interests of the country. The little fellow has had no representative in the Cabinet or at the top of any executive department. On the contrary, he has had as antagonist big business and the big banks, not only in the market place but also in every department of the Government.

What is even worse, the so-called WOC—the big-business man on loan to the Government, drawing no compensation from the Government, but being paid by his big-business employer—has an inside track keeping big business constantly informed as to Government plans and channeling Government business away from the small-business man and to big business.

Credit restrictions are manipulated so as to dry up all sources of credit for the small-business man.

Except in times of war or emergency, WOC's should not be employed by the Government.

I have contended and will continue to urge that the Small Business Administration Act must be strengthened by eliminating the Policy Board now dominated by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks. The agency must be made not only permanent, but permanently independent of the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce.

The small-business man, displaced by slum clearance and highway construction, should be entitled to low interest rate loans based upon character and ability to perform, rather than bankable collateral.

The Defense Department must be directed by the Small Business Administration to discard, as required by law, the old arbitrary, numerical definition of a small-business firm, and follow a more realistic one. This will give small business a larger and more equitable share of Government contracts.

The Small Business Administration may boast that during 3 years it has approved 3,560 business loans in an aggregate amount of $137,915,000 on account of which it disbursed $52,578,000. Compare that, however, to what this administration has done for big business in the same period through the Export-Import Bank alone, to wit: 805 loans for a total authorized aggregate amount of almost $7,500,000,000 against which it disbursed over $5,171,000,000. The Export-Import Bank made 22 percent as many loans with an average disbursement of over 426 times more per loan. To put it more simply, SBA's loan disbursements averaged less than $15,000 each and the bank's more than $6,400,000 each.

While big business has made more and bigger profits than at any time in the history of our country, small business has been going into bankruptcy in greater numbers than at any time since the depression days of the early 1930's.

For years, I have led the fight to establish offices of the Small Business Administration in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico so to enable American citizens residing so far from the mainland to avail themselves of the privileges accorded by law to all. I personally urged the Appropriations Committee to give the agency the money for that purpose. The money was voted. I am still waiting to be informed that even one of those offices has been opened.

GIVEAWAYS: THE GOVERNMENT'S PRIVATE CHARITY

The administration in its "partnership" plan gives, and gives, and gives, and the people get nothing in return. First, it was offshore oil lands, then TVA, then natural gas. Now, any river or forest that big business wants, it can have for the asking.

The President wanted and got a Federal water storage project on the upper Colorado River. Since no big business wanted it, the President's partnership plan was forgotten. And Idaho Power Co. wanted to build a private power project at Hells Canyon, so the administration opposed the public-sponsored Hells Canyon project. The administration opposed the idea of municipalities in New

York State having priority purchase rights to the electric power which would issue from the Niagara River power development program.

The development of atomic energy for peace is an idea that the Democratic Party sponsors wholeheartedly. But we voted against the administration's atoms-for-peace program since it would have given a few big businesses a monopoly in the development of atomic energy for peacetime use.

Incidentally, Attorney General Brownell now has completely disavowed the Dixon-Yates contract and has accepted the view of the Democratic Party that the whole agreement was illegal.

It took New Deal reclamation programs to give us back our forests. It has taken less than 4 years of an Eisenhower administration to lose them. The administration's policy is to lease them to private industry—which flagrantly abuses them.

We have no right to expect anything else of the Department of the Interior under this administration. Its consistent policy is to put political appointees in the place of ardent careermen. It has been no accident that many of these political appointees have been anticonservationists. There is no necessity for commenting on the scandals that have evolved over the private uses that many of these appointees have made of the assets of the Department.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Anyone aware of the importance of all Federal and particularly the postal employees can see no reason why they should not have many of the rights that are accorded to workers in private industry.

We have, over the objection of the administration, raised their wages, to enable them to meet the rising costs of living. This, while the President kept clamoring for increased pay for those already in the highest brackets. We have also liberalized the civil-service retirement benefits.

We have not yet devised any method to stop administrative destruction of the merit system.

Nor have we been able to abolish the brazen gag order that Republican Postmaster General Summerfield has imposed on postal workers. He has forbidden them to complain about the post office to anyone but their superiors in the post office. Members of Congress and the press have become off limits to these employees. We must now write into the law permission for these employees to complain to their Congressmen without impairing their merit standing.

The Supreme Court's decision, limiting the scope of the security program to those areas of government which can be defined as sensitive, would seem to have eliminated the problem created by the unwarranted administrative security clearance procedures. The administration is now sponsoring a bill which would classify all Government positions as "sensitive." The recommendations of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which fundamentally agree with the decision of the Supreme Court, should be followed in this regard. No American wants subversives in our Government. We can and must provide adequate means for protecting the Government's best interests. But we must do it without needless duplication of effort and without destroying our fundamental principles of fair play and of good government.

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES

Neither the veterans nor the Armed Forces have been forgotten by the 84th Congress. Aware of our debt, we, the Democratic Party, sponsored and supported measures to better their lot.

The veteran home-loan program has been extended, as have been the disability benefits for the veterans of World Wars I and II. Neither forgetting the youth of our Nation nor those who were their fathers, we are providing educational assistance to children of servicemen who died in World War II and in Korea. We have extended the Missing Persons Act authorizing continued pay for service personnel missing or captured in Korea.

To maintain a strong Armed Forces, we have extended the draft law to 1957. To provide greater incentive for career personnel—a necessary essential in our defense program—we have placed all military personnel under our social-security program, and have increased the benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans. We have also provided for medical care for the dependents of members of our Armed Forces. We have raised the pay of our 6-month trainees under the Reserve program as well as the pay of the Armed Forces in order to attract and keep better men in the service.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION—THE UNBALANCED SCALE

Social legislation is not a partisan matter to the Democratic Party. The welfare of the Nation is more important than party politics. We, of the Democratic Party, were happy to note that much of the welfare legislation of the administration was an extension of New and Fair Deal plans. These acts and others of a similar nature were supported wholeheartedly by the Democrats.

Over the administration's protests we succeeded in amending the Social Security Act by lowering the retirement age for women to 62 and permitting the disabled to become eligible for full benefits at the age of 50. Democratically supported and New Deal initiated, and administration sponsored, the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act were increased.

National Disaster Insurance for the victims of flood and hurricane disasters was established.

We have extended the Federal school milk program to include child care centers, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps and other similar nonprofit associations.

I sponsored a Federal Scholarship Act. Worthy students who desire a college education or postgraduate work would be enabled to apply for these loans to aid them through school. This is no giveaway, since the students will repay these loans when their education has been completed. Such a program has been found feasible in prior years. It should never have been abandoned.

We have also authorized $378 million in Federal aid for school construction, in areas which have become overcrowded by increased governmental activity.

Little need be said of the failure of the school-aid bill. Due to a shameful coalition of a minority of the members of my own party and of a majority of the Republicans, this much-needed bill was defeated.

In matters of national health and medical research we went beyond what the administration requested. The Oveta Hobby attitude, of health being a strictly private affair, did not reoccur during this session. Ninety million dollars have been set aside for medical research of crippling and killing diseases, for extended hospital construction and for training nurses and health specialists. Four million dollars have been set aside for a Dental Research Institute.

The housing bill authorizes a public housing program of only 35,000 units a year for 2 years. The Democratic majority in the House felt that this was an unrealistic attempt to remedy the housing shortage. Administrative opposition proved too strong and we were compelled to settle for less than is needed. We did succeed in liberalizing the terms of Federal mortgages; for financing home improvements, for financing single-family home purchases, and for financing rental dwellings. We also liberalized, not enough, but somewhat, the Federal mortgage terms for elderly people and for urban renewal projects.

The administration sponsored a civil rights bill which was quite innocuous. It provided for things which the President now has the right to accomplish without any new laws. Once again a self-interested coalition of a few Democrats and a great many Republicans thwarted this measure. That action will no doubt be President Eisenhower's excuse to do nothing about the matter.

We did not enact the health insurance program of the President since it would have done nothing except help some insurance companies. It would have done nothing for the individuals who need medical and hospital assistance or insurance to pay therefor.

Throughout this program, the unbalanced scale continued to dominate the administration's thinking. No matter who sponsored the legislation, the Democratic Party approach was: If it was for the benefit of the people as a whole, we supported the bill. This cannot be said of the Republican Party. Their narrow interests and petty insights have not yet revealed to them the importance of the broadest approach for the benefit of the greatest number.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—PERILOUS PATHS

Under our system of government, the President must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. He must make the policy in the first instance. His State Department should be his spokesman. Congress may respond by approving appropriations or

by senatorial action on proposed treaties.

The path of peace is always difficult. The Democratic Party believes it can only be maintained by an unequivocal but honorable approach to foreign affairs. To find a permanent peace, we must be vigilant and alert, honest with ourselves and with our allies, and firm with our potential enemies.

The ideological conflict between the East and West continues. The Communist countries have changed their outward demands, but they have not changed their aims of world domination. This administration has made no attempt to move forward in this field. It has mumbled and fumbled, it has bluffed and been rebuffed, it has bleated and retreated.

The Democratic Party has supported President Eisenhower in his attempts to find a road to peace. We have supported his foreign-aid program authorizing $3.9 billion to be used for military, economic, and technical assistance to our friends and allies during the next year. Although the President asked for more, his aides have admitted that they cannot spend in the next year the funds now appropriated for those purposes.

The removal of United States troops from Japan is imminent and will permit her, as our ally, to regain her true place in the world of nations. The House passed a resolution asking that Japan be admitted to the United Nations.

I have been continually opposed to the Near East policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. Their blindness, if not stupidity, has helped raise Egypt's Nasser to a position in which he threatens the peace of the world.

Our demand for arms for Israel have been ignored. Instead of firmly insisting upon a cessation of hostility, Dulles has encouraged Arab fighting. We demanded that Dulles and Eisenhower protest against blocking the Suez Canal to Israeli and Greek ships. My question is still unanswered: "What will the United States do when American ships are barred?"

The anti-Semitic boycott by the Arab States has been approved by a delinquent administration. It has excluded American soldiers and American civilian employees of the Jewish faith from American bases in Saudi Arabia.

PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

From the very earliest days of the establishment of our Nation, we have insisted that American citizens, wherever they may be and wherever they may go, must be treated as such regardless of race, color, or religion. We have a long history of having come to the aid of American citizens wherever their rights have been threatened, impaired, or impeded.

This administration has sadly failed the American people and has repeatedly and constantly backed away from that fundamental principle of American freedom.

The protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens to lawful trade and travel and other activities abroad is a basic principle of United States sovereignty. It is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based upon individual religious affiliations.

Any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinction among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access, or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens, is inconsistent with and contrary to our principles. Any such distinctions directed against United States citizens are incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations.

We should insist that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state, that every reasonable effort should be made to maintain these principles. We should carry on no negotiations and engage in no conventions, agreements, or treaties with any foreign nation that does not recognize these principles or violates them.

These principles have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that up to 1952, no political party found it necessary to restate them in a political platform.

In 1952, however, the Republicans inserted these words in their platform, to wit:

> We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution.

That should have been a warning signal. We had no such treaties or agreements then and have none now. No prior administration, Republican or Democratic, ever permitted the rights of American citizens to be impaired by any foreign country.

This administration, however, has permitted the Arab States to disregard, ignore, and even trample upon the rights of American citizens in travel and trade. They prohibit Americans from traveling into, through, or over these nations because of religion. On the same basis they refuse to allow Americans to trade with their own citizens.

This administration has ignominiously permitted a foreign nation to violate a treaty obligation and acquiesced in that country, Saudi Arabia, banning American citizens from an American base on the sole ground of religion.

CIVIL DEFENSE

To aid our civilian defense program Congress has increased the appropriation for construction of aircraft control and warning systems.

Testimony adduced before congressional committees established that our so-called civilian defense is utterly worthless and completely valueless in the event of an atomic bomb attack. Every penny presently being spent by the so-called Department of Civilian Defense is wasted.

Nevertheless, this administration would do nothing to improve this horrible and horrifying situation.

CONCLUSION

The record of the 84th Congress speaks well for our country. It could have been better. I am sure it would have been better, if we had had a Democratic President.

The levelheaded approach of a Democratic Congress under a Republican President produced meritorious legislation. We did not enact all the legislation that should have been passed. What was accomplished, in the main, is a record that the Democratic Party can be proud of. Even though we worked under an unsympathetic administration, the national interest was our first thought at all times. I am proud to have had the privilege to serve in the responsible 84th Congress.

During the ensuing recess I will continue to serve my constituency. My office at room 1305, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., will remain open and fully staffed for that purpose.

Fogarty Reports on 10 Years of Progress in Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during hectic but vitally important weeks which precede the closing of a session of Congress, rarely does a busy legislator find an opportunity to express his appreciation of those who have aided him in the achievement of his objectives, either through support within the legislative Chamber, or by way of encouraging support by the people—which, after all, is the essence of successful relations between a legislator and his constituents.

In the session of Congress which has just concluded, I have been accorded heart-warming support of both kinds. For this I am deeply grateful, not so much for me as an individual, but more because of the programs which I have been privileged to propose and carry through to constructive and affirmative action.

I want the RECORD to affirm my appreciation for that support.

I wish it were possible for each American to observe and come to understand the inner workings of his Government.

He would find, for the most part, industrious, well-educated, and generally enlightened men and women dedicated to their tasks—men and women whose primary motivation is to assess and then endeavor honestly to reflect the will of the people and to act always in their best interests.

For a Congressman, this responsibility and obligation has a special meaning. Each of us, of course, represents his immediate constituents—those who by their majority action at the polls in his district have expressed their confidence in his ability to represent them at the national level. In addition, each of us represents the people of the United States as a whole. The essence of our democratic government rests on the

ability of the elected members to discharge their trust with wisdom and integrity.

Moreover, each of us—particularly those of us who have served our country for many years—assumes responsibility for specific segments of the legislative process. This is not only a matter of seniority, it is also a matter of interest and preference. Those who have earned key positions on important committees of Congress are thus able to and are expected to provide leadership in that committee's area of responsibility.

With the support of my constituents, who have returned me to Congress for consecutive terms beginning back in 1940, and because of my own interest, I have devoted special attention to the activities of the Federal Government in the field of health and welfare. For 10 years I have been a member and for 6 years chairman of that committee in the House of Representatives which has responsibility for the programs and activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The primary concern of my committee is appropriations. It is our job to insure that adequate funds are provided for the important work of this Department, and that there is no waste or extravagance or useless expenditure.

Anyone who has planned a budget of any kind—household, business, civic group, or whatever—knows that one quickly gets involved in assessing relative needs and priorities. This is true, too, for a committee of your Government. Thus in order to handle the work of the committee with integrity, I have had to study health programs at the national, State, and local level. It has been a rewarding experience.

One of these programs is medical research. During the 10 years I have been on the committee, and particularly while I have been chairman, there has been sustained growth in our Nation's medical research effort. I am pleased to say that this strengthening process has been the result of private and voluntary action as well as Government action. But the Government has had a large role, as it should, and it has been my privilege to be in a position to work on the congressional side of your Government's activities in this field.

On June 27, when final consideration was being given this year's medical research appropriations on the floor of the House of Representatives several of my colleagues took occasion to speak of the support which the rank and file of the American people had given to this cause and of the leadership I had been able to provide in order to assure that the wishes of the people were reflected in legislative action.

I, of course, appreciated the compliment. But mostly I appreciated the realization that I had fought long and hard and successfully for something urgently desired by every person in the United States: ultimate victory over heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and the rest of the tragic diseases that cause most of the 1½ million deaths in our country each year.

In this same discussion on the floor of the House, many of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, were kind enough to stress that I had for years given leadership in the House to a course of action which has had a major impact on the national research attack on disease. They pointed out that I had spent a great deal of time over the years learning to understand the intricate problems involved in more and better research, assuring a continuing supply of research manpower, developing new medical research facilities, and doing all of the other things required for the Federal Government to play an appropriate, helpful, nonregimenting role, including making available the necessary funds.

The remarks of my colleagues on this particular occasion were a tribute I shall never forget. They know that strong support of medical research had immediate, practical values. They also know that in taking action on the many bills and measures before us, the best Congressmen always strive for what is best for the Nation and for our individual and collective constituents.

In the 10 years since 1946, more progress has been made against disease in the United States than in any other period in our history.

This is a fact of which we may all be proud. For advances in medical science and public health are not to the exclusive credit of any individual. True, great names are usually associated with great medical discoveries. But, increasingly, medical science has become a part of, instead of standing apart from, our society. And if there is to be a cure for rheumatoid arthritis or a preventive measure for high blood pressure or an effective treatment for leukemia—and, sooner or later, there surely will be—the triumph will be attributed not to an individual scientist, or to a team of scientists, but to all of us who helped create a productive and creative medical research environment from which such progress can surely be expected.

Let me cite some of the health gains that have been made and others certain to come.

It is difficult to believe, but the average child born today is expected to live 5 years longer than his brother born a decade ago. It is difficult to believe, but true, that just yesterday death came twice as often as it does now from such diseases as pneumonia, influenza, tuberculosis, and syphilis. Once commonplace killers, these disorders have been tamed by a wide spectrum of antibiotics, a major development in medical science during the past decade. Appropriations for research which I succeeded in getting Congress to approve have played a vital role in winning these victories.

Not only has death been stayed by modern medical research, but crippling and pain have been reduced as well. Many arthritics have arisen from their beds and wheelchairs because of the benefits of two drugs that were developed just 2 years ago. Those who might have been blind, but can still see, may do so because of the benefits of cortisone and ACTH. These were developed about 9 years ago. While we do not yet know the exact benefits of the recently introduced drugs for the relief of mental illness, it is a fact that very large numbers of the mentally disturbed have been able to leave the confines of barred sanatorium rooms to rejoin their families at home. This is great progress, heart-warming progress.

Today, we have a method for preventing kernicterus, a disorder of infancy which previously resulted in cerebral palsy, mental retardation or death in about 2,000 children yearly. Tax dollars voted by my committee in Congress made the work possible. The recent trials of a diagnostic test for cancer of the cervix, deadly to many women each year, show that such tests if applied on a mass scale can catch this cancer early enough to reduce mortality to almost zero.

There has been encouraging progress against heart disease—a term which includes "heart attacks," hardening of the arteries, high blood pressure, heart and blood vessel defects children are born with, and damage to the heart valve resulting from rheumatic fever. In terms of death, heart disease is the greatest burden of all. Over 50 percent of all deaths in the United States each year are caused by it.

What has happened in the past ten years? We in Congress determined, at the people's request, to start a realistic, large-scale attack on heart disease. As a member of this committee I helped in establishing the National Heart Institute in 1948 and have since done everything possible to induce Congress to support it to the hilt. The work made possible by Federal dollars, and the private support that has grown up parallel to the Federal program, has begun to turn the tide—and in the near future we may well see the number of untimely heart deaths and the amount of suffering from cardiac disabilities dramatically reduced.

In every aspect of the gains over heart disease, the funds provided by Congress have meant the difference between little being done and an intensive attack. Before we in Congress determined, knowing what people wanted, to get resources mobilized, heart disease was almost like an untilled field or an inlet or bay that had never yielded its catch to the fisherman's net.

This, of course, was true in other disease conditions. And I shall be eternally, humbly, glad that I have been privileged to serve in Congress at a time when I could lead the support for these medical research and public health activities on the scale that they should and must have if our children and kin and friends and neighbors are to have the way opened for better health and longer, happier, more productive lives.

I have enumerated only a few of the medical triumphs of the past decade. There have been many more. Words cannot describe what they mean and will mean—to the father, mother, son, daughter, grandparents, to all the members of a family—when one or another of them sees his loved one helped or saved when suffering from such conditions as heart disease, tuberculosis, cancer, men-

tal illness, diabetes or neurological disorders.

This is not to say that the end is in sight. Actually, it is only a good beginning. True, physicians are saving people who a few years ago could not be saved. But—as all of us know—there are still vast gaps in our knowledge, many afflictions which remain unconquered. Everybody agrees that the fight must go on—that this is a thing we cannot afford to stop. And I shall continue, in the future as in the past, with the support of the people of my district of Rhode Island, to provide leadership in the conquest of disease.

I shall be privileged and proud to continue this fight against disease as long as I live.

A Report to Constituents of Accomplishments of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has come to an end and I think it an obligation on my part to give to the people of Michigan, whom I represent, a brief account of what Congress has done on legislation and a report on other matters of particular significance to the welfare of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan.

With few exceptions, an enviable demonstration of party responsibility by Democrats has exploded Republican predictions of 1954 that a Republican President could not expect the proper kind of cooperation with the legislative branch of our Government in the hands of those of opposite political faith. As the legislative record shows, while some Republican Members of Congress laid aside partisanship for the welfare of the people, the major credit for the successes of the 84th Congress lies with Democratic Members who cooperated with the White House over opposition by its own party to give it its estimated record of 57 percent of the 37 pieces of major legislation requested. In addition, a Democratic-controlled Congress went on to make substantial achievements in the interest of a people's program.

These accomplishments include a $1 minimum-wage law; a postal pay increase of 7 percent; a Federal pay increase for all workers of 7.5 percent—all pushed through by Democratic leadership with increases larger than the President recommended.

Democrats sponsored a farm measure providing for a return to 90 percent farm price supports, but Presidential veto forced a compromise measure lowering the range to between 75 to 90 percent of parity.

In foreign policy, over Republican opposition, a Democratic-controlled Congress gave the President the 3-year extension of authority to negotiate trade agreements which he had requested. Foreign aid appropriations were less than the President requested in each of his four annual budgets, but it was Democratic leadership in both Houses which fought against and prevented further cuts in the program than were made by Republican opposition. In exemplary cooperation, however, in 1955 the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands was authorized by Congress.

A social security measure establishing a new program of benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers, beginning at age 50, and reducing the age of eligibility for women from 65 to 62 was passed under Democratic House and Senate leadership.

In 1955, Congress passed a public housing bill for 35,000 units and in the closing days of this session, a multi-billion-dollar housing bill extending the Veterans' Administration home-loan program, providing $3 billion of mortgage insurance, insuring 5-year loans to finance repairs instead of the maximum 3-year loans, insuring long-term mortgage loans for disaster relief, authorizing 70,000 units of public housing for 2 years, increasing the slum-clearance program mortgage loans, extending the military housing program, and providing mortgages for housing for elderly persons.

Democrats, principally from the North, were defeated in efforts to overcome the alliance between Republicans and Democrats from gas-producing States to exempt natural-gas producers from Federal regulations. A White House veto, in disfavor of pressures by lobbyists, saved the public—temporarily, if administration programing is successful in the next Congress—from unwarranted increases in gas bills.

Congress in 1955 and 1956 extended corporate and excise tax rates, but Democratic efforts to win a reduction in individual tax rates were defeated in both instances.

On the credit side of the congressional record, health measures were passed providing for $90 million in grants to build medical research facilities; to extend the Hill-Burton Act hospital construction program for 2 years; and to continue the polio vaccine program. A highway program calling for more than $30 billion in Federal-State funds for 13 years was authorized. To conserve national resources, a $760 million irrigation and reclamation project was authorized for the upper Colorado River area. An Armed Forces pay increase and a military Reserve program was established.

On the debit side of congressional action were matters of extreme importance to the welfare of our Nation. With many of my colleagues, I am extremely disappointed that the 84th Congress was not able to achieve action to revise and amend the discriminatory and arbitrary McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1950 and to liberalize the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. I regret that the House-passed bill to increase rates and liberalize pensions for veterans died in the Senate and that an antilabor coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats discouraged consideration of revisions to the Taft-Hartley Act in its restriction of the labor movement.

It is a particular blot on the record of the 84th Congress that the same coalition of Republicans, opposed to a Federal-aid program, and Dixiecrats of the South, with defiance of Supreme Court decisions its aim, combined to defeat the school construction program.

With civil rights the major issue in our national and international life, the passage of a bill by the House to protect the right to vote of Negro citizens was an historic achievement. However, despite the predictions of death of the bill by Senate filibuster, the responsibility for cutting off opportunity of the liberal bloc of Congress to fight for enactment of this legislation rests with the administration which withheld its recommendation until late in the 2d session of Congress and delayed its request to Senate leadership for action on the bill until it was certain that adjournment was imminent. Another alliance between Republicans and Dixiecrats defeated the passage of bills to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska to spread the blot on the record of the 84th Congress on matters of human rights.

These are but some of the legislative actions which concerned the people of Michigan and our Nation. There were numerous other important issues to come before Congress, but mention of them could only be handled in a voluminous report. Those I have mentioned are principally the issues which concerned the greatest number of people.

I do not think this summary of congressional action would be complete without inclusion of a résumé of my own record of activity and accomplishment as Representative in Congress of the 13th District of Michigan. The following report is therefore included:

THE RECORD OF CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., DURING THE 84TH CONGRESS, 1953–56

Voting record: Has won the approval of labor, veterans, and nationality organizations. Has been consistent in support of the Diggs platform of 1954, the interests of the people of Michigan and the Nation and consistently with the vote of the liberal bloc in Congress.

Legislation: Introduced a total of 25 public bills, covering the areas of civil liberties, immigration, Government employees' salaries, minimum wage, veterans' benefits, and civil rights, among others, and a total of 17 private bills pertaining to immigration cases of hardship, separation of families, and loss of scientific talents to the United States.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE ACTION

Housing: Supported all legislation to extend the public housing program and increase housing units; established continuing contact with the Housing and Home Finance Agency to keep informed of housing administrative policies and their application to needs and to communicate needs, problems, and interests of various groups, as Corktown Home Owners Association, Oakdale Residents Cooperative Housing, Inc., and the Detroit Real Estate Brokers Association. Petitioned the Detroit Real Estate Board to open its membership to minority group

brokers as a means of helping to resolve problems in this area. Through Washington and Detroit offices, have processed hundreds of cases to assist constituents and other persons in obtaining low-cost rental facilities—private or public—and to obtain home financing.

Civil liberties: Supported and initiated action to achieve revision of military security regulations. Investigated and pressed 4 separate security risk cases, 3 involving servicemen and 1 a Government employee—all successfully concluded by retention in service. Investigated individual cases of discrimination involving applicants for Federal employment, employees, armed service personnel, veterans, and cases of discrimination concerning public-service facilities. Investigated and reported to CAA discriminatory practices by airports participating, contrary to law, in building programs involving Federal funds. Made an on-the-spot investigation of civil rights violations in Mississippi and Alabama. Investigated discrimination against Negroes and Jews in rentals of downtown Detroit office buildings; assisted Michigan Credit Union, Ford Rouge and Flint Buick Credit Unions in presenting complaints to Health, Education, and Welfare Department concerning alleged abusive tactics of the Federal Bureau.

Immigration: Introduced legislation to amend and revise McCarran-Walter Act; petitioned Senate Foreign Affairs Committee for revision and liberalization of Refugee Relief Act; interceded with Department of State and Immigration Department in cases not involving private bills, including assistance to servicemen in approval of visas for alien wives.

Aged and youthful: Cosponsor of Townsend pay-as-you-go social-security program; supported and voted for legislation to extend social-security benefits; introduced legislation to permit 18-year-olds the right to vote.

Interior affairs: Served as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Territories and Insular Affairs, and Indian Affairs Subcommittees. Consistently in support by action and vote of legislation to conserve natural resources and legislation to compensate Indians for lands and for adequate health, education, and social-security programs. Maintained close contact with executive director of the National Congress of American Indians to determine Indian views on legislation pending and desired. Investigated alleged abuses in awarding of school lunch programs for Cherokee Indian children. Supported such public power programs as upper Colorado River and Hells Canyon projects.

Veterans: Served as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee; the Administration and the Compensation and Pension Subcommittees. Voted consistently for improvements in veterans' welfare; protested closing of VA medical service in Grand Rapids; investigated firing of ten veterans at Ordnance Tank Automotive Command; interceded to obtain sanitary and standard facilities for mentally ill at Battle Creek Hospital; requested Post Office and Justice Department intervention concerning the use of mails by debt-collecting agencies to deceive veterans; investigated cases of discrimination against veterans in administration of GI benefit and loan programs; made visits to VA hospitals to determine needs; periodically contacted all Michigan veterans' organizations for recommendations regarding needs and to offer service of congressional office in their interest; was the author of Public Law 92 to extend for 2 years time for disabled veterans to apply for down payment on automobiles—other conveyances.

Action of interest to Detroiters and the Nation: Urged United Nations and Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committee to protest Cyprus action by British and to offer American aid in resolution of problems and American support of the principle of self-government; joined with 86 Democratic colleagues in joint declaration requesting arms for Israel—urged Congress, White House, State Department, Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees to take action. Protested Department of Agriculture increase of income eligibility scale in Michigan for participation in the surplus-food-distribution plan; joined in requesting aid for Detroit in unemployment situation and made contact with the Department of Labor, Defense Department, General Services Administration, and United States Atomic Energy Commission in this behalf. Associated with Governor Williams in asking for increase in unemployment-compensation and welfare benefits to aid in problem. Joined with colleagues in asking Department of Agriculture for special allotment for Detroit's school milk program; interceded with Civil Aeronautics Board for reconsideration of Wayne University's petition for charter flight service in connection with its travel-study program. Requested commemorative stamps, on behalf of interested citizens, to honor Dr. Albert Einstein, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, and Walter White. Of nominations to the three service academies, had four successful candidates—Thomas J. Jozwiak, 1427 Burlingame Street, Detroit, Air Force Academy, class of 1955; Roland M. Navarro, 2019 Clairmount Street, Detroit, Military Academy, class of 1956; Thomas G. Curtis, 1450 Brainard Street, Detroit, Naval Academy, class of 1956; and George D. O'Brien, Jr., son of former Congressman George D. O'Brien, 757 Covington Drive, Detroit, Naval Academy, class of 1956. Sought and obtained 13th District representation at the 1955 White House Conference on Education; made known support of and offered cooperation concerning promotion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, port of Detroit project, and adequate airport facilities in the Greater Detroit community.

Presenting to Congress for inclusion in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions, articles, and other materials representing the viewpoint of organizations in Detroit and Michigan on major issues—the Federation of Hellenic Societies, Inc., of Detroit, the Jewish Daily News, the Jewish Community Council of Detroit, the Detroit Common Council, among a few. Aid to district travel agencies in tracing and obtaining action on passports—also to numerous individuals. Assisting constituents in expediting foreign documents through the State Department; in tracing and speeding up Government payments. Furnishing Government publications, maps, and other literature to public libraries, schools, constituents, and students. Presenting American creed certificates to district high-school graduates in effort to emphasize good citizenship; obtaining research information for constituents, schools, and organizations; furnishing information to interested families concerning the adoption of war orphans; obtaining flags flown over the Capitol for interested organizations; placing orders for reprints of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks for interested constituents; periodic contact with Detroit and Highland Park governmental bodies and officials to make the service of the congressional office available in matters within jurisdiction.

Cases: Through congressional offices in Washington and Detroit, assistance has been given to hundreds of citizens in problems of wide variety. Cases have concerned such matters as—welfare aid, social security, old-age pensions, aid to blind and handicapped and dependent children; housing and home financing; referrals of unemployed to Government and private sources of employment; obtaining information for school students on scholastic requirements for designated careers; checking civil-service status, promotion possibilities, investigation of reasons for terminations, requesting reinstatements, verifying career status, intervening in cases of unjustified discharge, requesting reviews of appeals for Government employees; assisting in expediting claims for compensation for injury while Government-employed and action on retirement fund payments; furnishing letters of recommendation for placement with public institutions; assistance in obtaining birth records—foreign and domestic; assistance in investigating scholarship opportunities for students; referrals of families for counseling service and to legal aid and other agencies for court representation; providing legal counsel through staff attorney, Basil W. Brown, on civil matters; assistance to servicemen in applications for morale leave, hardship discharge, compassionate reassignment; in establishing validity of applications for allotment to dependents; investigating service promotion opportunities, requesting foreign service duty; investigation and appeals of courts-martial, general discharge, dishonorable discharge, and revocation of commissions; aid to veterans in cases concerning disability compensation, processing claims for change in disability ratings, appealing adverse decisions; making applications for loans under GI loan program and for pension and benefits. Assistance to widows of veterans in determining eligibility for pen-

sion benefits; assistance to prisoners in petitioning for transfer, emergency visits home in family death or illness, investigation of parole possibility, of discrimination and adequacy of medical care; and referral of cases to proper agencies for legal counsel and representation in cases apparently meriting such intervention.

These, and other activities and concerns of your Representative in Congress including the attendance of well over 200 conferences and meetings, community programs and receptions in Detroit and Washington to promote and forward the interests of my district, people of Detroit and Michigan, and interests of the Nation and speaking engagements before a variety of groups in Ohio, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Indiana, Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, California, are matters which have made it a welcomed opportunity and the highest privilege to serve in this office in the 84th Congress.

At the spring convention of the Michigan Democratic Convention, over which I presided, I was selected as one of the two people from Michigan to serve on the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention. I was happy for the opportunity to serve as a vehicle to reflect the desires of various segments of the 13th Congressional District in that position and as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention.

I will continue diligently to work for great accomplishments in the interest of promoting the welfare of all people.

Stimulate American Construction: More Home Building, More Home Ownership, Keys to United States Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a key foundation of the free enterprise system is America's great construction industry.

There are few other industries which more crucially affect the well-being of the American people as a whole.

It is understandable therefore why the Nation follows so closely current construction reports on residential, industrial, and commercial installations.

Recently, we have noted with disappointment the estimate that only perhaps 1.1 million new homes may be begun this year. That relatively small number is a source of concern to all of us who are deeply interested in assuring a completely prospering economy. We had hoped to reach and surpass last year's 1.3 million figure of new home starts.

I ask unanimous consent that in the final edition of the RECORD, there be published a statement by me on the overall problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"A Nation of homeowners," is the American ideal.

Already, fortunately, 55 percent of our people own their own homes. That percentage is constantly climbing.

We want still more Americans to "strike roots," so to speak, in their own homesteads. And we want them to enjoy ever finer, ever more modern, relatively fireproof, and comfortable homes.

WISCONSIN—A HOMEOWNING STATE

Wisconsin, in particular, has always prided itself in its high proportion of homeownership.

Last year, 21,283 new nonfarm homes were started in my State. Thus, we ranked 13th among the 48 States in home-building volume.

We of Wisconsin not only like our homes, we are constantly improving our homes.

Figures cited by A. A. Lenroot, Jr., our State FHA director in Milwaukee, show that Wisconsin homeowners spend a bigger percentage of their income on housing than do homeowners elsewhere in the Nation. Thus, in 1955, Wisconsin FHA homeowners spent 25.7 percent of their incomes on housing which included principal, interest, taxes, insurance, maintenance costs, and regular operating expenses.

Our attractive, well-kept homes are an asset to our communities. They are, moreover, as any realtor will point out, a priceless asset to the individual family as well.

HOME BUILDING—AN INDUSTRY OF SMALL-BUSINESS MEN

All in all, our home-building industry is of course a mainstay of our Wisconsin prosperity. I have been glad to be in constant touch with it. Earlier this year, Mr. Lowell E. Garretson, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Builders Association, pointed out to me that "the average home builders in Wisconsin—in fact, a majority, build less than seven homes a year. The number of home builders that build more than 50 homes a year is very small."

In other words, our home builders are small-business men and are certainly entitled to every bit of encouragement we can give them.

Lately, the lot of small business has not been an easy one.

To be of help to them, I am delighted that, at the very minimum, we of the Congress have wisely extended the GI home-loan law for another year until July 25, 1958. Under the extension, an ex-GI can apply right up to July 25, 1958. He is allowed even an additional year in which to complete loan arrangements and sign the final papers.

I had personally introduced legislation for extension of this GI home-loan law, just as I have been pleased down through the years to offer many other prohousing bills, as recommended by builders, realtors, contractors, and other experts in this field.

MONEY FOR FINANCING STILL TIGHT

Unfortunately, today, the mortgage money situation in Wisconsin remains tight. For example, mortgage lending by the Nation's savings and loan associations during the first half of 1956 showed a 7 percent drop below the like period in 1955, the United States Savings and Loan League reports.

Our savings and loan associations remain nonetheless a bulwark of our prosperity, along with other lending institutions.

This year, our savings and loan associations have celebrated their 125th year of business in our country, and their 80th year in my own State. The assets of 154 savings and loan associations in Wisconsin at the end of 1955 totaled more than $980 million. Members totaled approximately 500,000. This is a tremendous jump over the figures of previous years.

Throughout the postwar period, savings and loan associations financed throughout the Nation the building of 2.3 million new homes. They helped 9.7 million families buy homes through the issuance of about 40 percent of all home loans made. They recorded an increase in the number of savings accounts from 7.4 million in 1946 to 18.7 million last year.

These savings and loan associations are, therefore, a tremendously valuable contribution to home financing, along with other sources of sound credit.

LETTER FROM MR. JOE M. BAKER

As important to the financing of homes is, of course, the solid construction of homes.

From time to time, I am pleased to receive from various expert sources within the construction industry comments as regards improved and safer methods of construction.

I was pleased recently to hear from Mr. Joe M. Baker, executive secretary of the National Bureau of Lathing and Plastering. I believe that his comments will be of interest, and I should like to reprint excerpts from his letter at this point.

NATIONAL BUREAU FOR
LATHING AND PLASTERING, INC.,
311 Tower Building, 1401 K Street NW.,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1956.

(Edmond F. Venzie, president; John E. Rooney, vice president; Lloyd A. Mashburn, vice president; Robert L. Maidt, secretary-treasurer; Loyd G. Peterson, executive board; Joseph D. McNulty, executive board; Joe M. Baker, executive director.)

Hon. ALEX WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Much has been said about elimination of slums and also fire prevention to save the lives of our women and children which are lost in home fires. To begin with, it is our opinion that "slums for tomorrow" are being constructed faster today than we can demolish the slums of yesterday and this is brought about by the minimum specifications recommended by our Government agencies.

First, let us look into the loss of life by fires. It is estimated that 6,180 men, women, and children lose their lives in home fires during the year. Many of these lives could be saved if our Government agencies would lead the way in promoting construction of firesafe materials instead of looking at the initial cost and calling it economy to build homes with imitation materials which later on result in the loss of lives.

This happened recently in a large development project in which three small children lost their lives. We are advised that this home was constructed of material which will not retain a fire in 1 room more than 30 minutes. Furthermore, homes of this type of construction are being built in many areas today and they are what we refer to as "slums for tomorrow."

If an impartial survey were made today, anyone would soon realize that such homes will not stand up for 20 to 30 years—the period of time on which the Government guarantees the mortgage thereon. Is this economy?

Isn't it about time that our Senators and Congressmen looked into these minimum specifications and insisted on better grades of materials being used on homes guaranteed by the Government, especially when it means protecting our middle-income-bracket buyers who are purchasing these homes on long-term mortgages?

The minimum specification of the Government permits interior finishes to be one-fourth inch, three-eighths inch, and one-half

inch thick, which is not firesafe, nor does it furnish any privacy to a family. If genuine lath and plaster is used, it would carry from 45 minutes to an hour and a half fire rating, according to the type of material used. Lath and plaster construction would result in a wall thickness of seven-eighths inch, which in addition to being firesafe, would also create privacy due to the sound absorption.

Very little is saved when imitation materials are used in place of the genuine product. In fact, the average home can be completely plastered for as little as $100 to $150 additional, and many a life may be saved. Why not prevent fires by building homes, schools, and commercial buildings as nearly fireproof as possible?

Let's prevent fires by planting the seed that will insure homes being built of firesafe materials and at the same time save the precious lives of our loved ones.

We have a number of files in our office to substantiate our statements and would certainly appreciate your lending your influence in having our Government agencies set a standard for the minimum requirements that would not only protect our loved ones from being destroyed by needless fires in homes but also to protect them economically.

Sincerely yours,

JOE M. BAKER,
Executive Director.

HOME OUTLOOK IS BRIGHT

Fortunately the overall future is quite bright for United States housing.

The omnibus housing law of 1956 should prove a fine "shot in the arm." It continues and liberalizes FHA title I home repairs, extends to existing homes under FHA section 203 the same loan-to-value ratios as for new dwellings, and provides for FHA assistance for housing for elderly people (an important subject which I have previously discussed in the Senate).

ROAD PROGRAMS WILL SPUR HOUSING

I am glad to state, too, in addition, that the Nation's new Federal-State superhighway program should open up vast areas for new developments. Thirty-three billion dollars will be spent on the 40,000-mile Interstate System and on related programs during the next 13 years. This will mean that we can expect bulldozers to be clearing the land for new homes in areas which were once off the beaten track, but which will now be easily linked by fast new superhighways.

CONCLUSION

I pledge in the period up ahead continued constructive contacts with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Department of Commerce, and with national, State, and local trade associations in the housing field, so as to increase to a peak the prosperity of the great construction and related industries.

Report to the Constituents of the First District of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress adjourns, I believe it is appropriate and purposeful to make this report to my constituents, the people, estimated at 600,000, of the First District of Florida, summarizing some of the activities of this Congress and my actions thereon.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

I have always believed that an informed and alert citizenry is the cornerstone of our republican form of government. I further feel that my constituents are entitled to know what is being done in their interest by their Representative in Washington. Thus, I have attempted, during my first term in Congress, to advise the folks at home and, as far as possible, to be advised by them. To implement this, I have made biweekly television and radio broadcasts; sent out newsletters; instituted district-wide telephone polls on important issues arising suddenly and on which, otherwise, there is no means of determining the wishes of the people at home; and have taken annual tours, with my "office on wheels" and staff in accompaniment, of every city, village, and settlement in Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Hernando Counties that comprise the First District of Florida. Incidentally, these activities in the main were not at Government expense although they could probably be classified as proper governmental activities. This report is made consistent with my belief that the people have the right to know.

My actions this session have been based on what I believe to be the best interests of all the people of my district, and services have been rendered on a fair and impartial basis, regardless of political affiliation, personal motivation, or any other consideration. All views, majority and minority, as well as individual, have been given careful consideration and careful and thorough attention has been paid to the issues involved, while maintaining an awareness of the effect of my actions on the district, State, and Nation. This is representative government in action.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

One of the more important and personal functions of the congressional office is to be of service to the many constituents your Congressman represents. This includes action for individuals with many small problems, as well as the representation of larger groups and organizations. For example, in your Washington office, we have handled during the last 2 sessions of Congress over 375 veterans' cases, dozens and dozens of applications for passports, have forwarded hundreds of Government documents, and have met several thousand visitors in the Nation's Capitol.

ATTENDANCE

As your Representative in Congress, I have deemed it a privilege to be on the job and attend to the many problems of legislation which is presented. In the 2 sessions of the 84th Congress in which 133 quorum calls were made I was absent on only 3 occasions, and in the 148 roll-calls I was absent on only 4 occasions, a total attendance record of 97.5 percent of which I am very proud. Incidentally, all occasions on which I was absent from the floor were necessitated by duties attended in the First District.

DISTRICT

At all times since being elected to this Congress, I have for your convenience maintained a district office. This office has been staffed and is completely prepared to meet constituents and to gain a first-hand knowledge of their problems. Many times, through the operation of the district office, I have been better prepared to represent my constituents in the Nation's Capital. There has been at hand at all times a staff that is prepared and understanding of the problems facing various individuals and, further, a staff that is able at first hand to completely report all activities of your congressional office through the press, radio, and television to all people of the district so that they might be informed. In addition, I have made dozens of reports to groups following the first session and plan to do so again following this second session of Congress, attempting to bring the Government closer to the people.

WASHINGTON VISITS

One of the greatest pleasures that I have had in the Nation's Capital has been to greet the many visitors, families, school patrols, class groups, high school organizations, and others who have come to see and learn about their Government. It has been a pleasure in many instances to renew old friendships and in others to make the acquaintance and assist in visits and tours of new friends. The opportunity to visit the Nation's Capital and at first hand see the many agencies and departments of Government in action is one which should be afforded every American. Consistent with this, I shall urge that this be done, particularly by young people who will grow up to be the great men and women of tomorrow.

COMMITTEE WORK

One of the most important functions of your Representative is to consider legislation referred to committees on which he serves. I was fortunate in being appointed to the Public Works Committee and the Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control and Roads Subcommittees thereof early in the session. This committee is vital to Florida because of our many harbor, erosion, river, flood control, drainage, beach erosion, and public building problems. Upon the death of the former chairman, Chauncey Reed, of the powerful Judiciary Committee, I was unanimously appointed to the vacancy created and served also on the Claims Subcommittee. My district was highly honored by this appointment not only because this is one of the major and most sought after committees but because I was the first Floridian ever appointed to it. This committee considers immigration, claims, court, States rights, and other matters, including over 50 percent of all the legislation introduced.

HONORS RECEIVED

As the first Republican Representative elected from Florida I, and in turn my district, received many honors. I was chosen to represent all freshmen members of my party in the 84th Congress as speaker at the Board of Trade dinner in Washington upon the convening of Congress and shared the platform with Sen-

ator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina. Thus the South gained unprecedented recognition in both parties on this occasion. By House resolution, I was unanimously chosen to read Washington's Farewell Address before the House on Washington's Birthday. Being appointed to the campaign committee and the committee on committees representing Florida and the district, I was privileged to have an effective voice in committee appointments and party policies.

The Chowder and Marching Organization chose me a member as one of two freshmen Congressmen selected and the insight into legislative procedure and issues gained from this association with experienced Members of the House, Senate, and executive branch proved invaluable. Many sections of the country, including New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Virginia, Nebraska, and West Virginia are now better acquainted with Florida and the First District as the result of the many invitations to visit and speak which I received. The Georgetown Forum of the Air invited myself and Senator BIBLE of Utah to appear on its nationwide weekly program and many other local programs invited me as their guest. Thus the people of the district were represented in many areas before many groups and many mediums.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

Perhaps one of the best keys to the aggressiveness and effectiveness of a Member of Congress is the bills and amendments to bills he introduces and the action taken on the subject matter contained in them. Of course, as a minority Member of the House, it is usually necessary to join with others on the majority side in order to accomplish the objective sought, and an analysis of the bills which I introduced and the action taken on the subject matter contained in them is important.

MATTERS OF PARTICULAR LOCAL INTEREST

First. I introduced two immigration bills and one was passed permitting a young Spanish girl who had been living in Tampa for years to be adopted by those who had grown to love her.

Second. A bill to convey 16 acres of surplus Government property adjoining Bay Pines to the Pinellas County School Board. This served the purpose of keeping the land from being sold to private interests until it could be conveyed under existing law. This was 16 acres in addition to the adjoining 10 acres conveyed on my request, the Pinellas school system having thus received some 26 acres valued at $62,000 at no cost.

Third. Bills to serve veterans' interests were pushed, including one to establish a national veterans' cemetery in the First District, which is under study and survey resulting from introducing the bill, and one introduced after Veterans' Administration surveys made at my request were completed showing that a need exists to add 1,000 general medical and surgical beds to the overcrowded Bay Pines Veterans' Hospital on which hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee are being planned during adjournment—this is in addition to the proposal to build a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville—and one to continue the GI home loan program which was continued as the result of interest shown by many of us who introduced bills and constantly sought the support of committee members.

Fourth. A bill to determine the feasibility of making a National Spanish-American War Memorial and Shrine out of Fort De Soto on Mullet Key in Tampa Bay and Pinellas County is presently under study by the United States Park Service and a report on the bill will be available for early action next session.

Fifth. A bill to provide for the location of a National Institute for the Physically Handicapped in Hernando County to serve the State and Nation, as well as the First District, is receiving attention of General Services Administration and Health, Education, and Welfare Department after numerous conferences in Washington and in Brooksville, and there seems to be an excellent chance for accomplishing this objective on a negotiated basis.

Sixth. A bill to make greater Federal protection to eroding beaches and shores available to local governing units in the protection of public beaches and other public property was considered by my Public Works Committee and a bill similar to mine which contained the principle of protecting all public property that might be subject to eroding action even though it does not actually abut on the water was enacted by the Congress. This should mean that the Pinellas County beach-erosion project will, for example, have a better chance of getting under way.

Seventh. A bill to expedite the immigration of skilled sponge divers to help the rehabilitation of the Tarpon Springs sponge industry, which had as its purpose the permitting of skilled divers, when need is shown and income is guaranteed, to be brought in under existing law, but without having to wait for 18 months to 2 years for entry, has received favorable Immigration Subcommittee action and was scheduled for passage, but other Members of the delegation in the House and on the Senate side were unwilling to act on the bill without further study. Thus, action awaits next session, after full investigation of the merits of the bill.

Eighth. A bill for preliminary survey of Gulfport Harbor and Sunshine Skyway Channel was passed as a part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This bill was vetoed by the President because so many pork-barrel projects were included that were not justified. A new bill will be acted on next session.

MATTERS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

First. The greatest public works program in the history of the world was first acted upon by my Roads Subcommittee and the full Public Works Committee and then the entire Congress this session. I sat in on and was a part of these hearings and debates, both in 1955 and 1956. Many weeks of hard work and diligent effort went into this $47 billion program, $33 billion Federal and $14 billion State funds, that will see the completion of the 41,000-mile interstate program and acceleration of all other systems in order to accommodate the anticipated 86 million cars to be on the roads in the next 10 years. It was an inspiration to me to be a part of this monumental work, probably the most important new legislative action of the 84th Congress, and to have contributed something to making it a good program. I introduced a bill early in the second session to make Federal-road funds available for the purchase of rights-of-way up to 5 years in advance of construction which, when applied to the entire program, it is estimated could save as much as $1.5 billion. This is a new concept in roadbuilding with Federal funds and means substantial savings to Florida, too, because more roads can be built with less money if right-of-way can be purchased substantially before actual construction is programed. It also makes possible long-range planning. This new concept was unanimously accepted by the subcommittee and the full committee on my motion as a part of the new 1956 road bill and is now the law. Many other amendments which I proposed, in an effort to enact the best possible bill, were accepted.

ON PENSION, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND RETIREMENT

Second. A civil-service retirement bill was introduced which increased pensions to those who retire in the future as well as those on retirement and improved the retirement system. A similar bill was passed which will mean greater job security to all postal and Federal employees but, despite the efforts of many, the provisions were not made applicable to those already retired. There was, of course, a pension increase, as an interim approach, passed in 1955 for which I worked assiduously. This session Spanish War widows' pensions were increased, along with a 10-percent increase for retired railroad employees, and about an 8-percent increase in postal employees' salaries. Thus, those on retirement and those to retire in the future received my active efforts and attention.

I pressed for the social-security amendments providing retirement of women at 62, disability retirement at 50, greater coverage and children's benefits.

Third. Again as a member of the Public Works Committee when the water pollution bill was up for consideration, I was able to get the committee to unanimously accept my amendment to make Federal grant funds, which had already been approved by the committee, available for use for advanced planning and engineering for sewage disposal plants to be done by the local governing authorities. Although the House unanimously accepted this amendment on the floor the actual designation of 10 percent of the funds to be used for this purpose was deleted in conference although the advance planning and engineering was retained in the definition of "construction" so such funds as the Surgeon General might decide are merited can still be used for this purpose as the result of my amendment. This is important in the many

communities that are planning new or expanded sewage disposal plants.

Fourth. I introduced a bill to eliminate the 5-percent absorption clause in the Federally Impacted Area School Act which provided previously for Federal contribution in areas affected by Government installations of Federal funds—such as to the school system of Hillsborough County serving MacDill Air Force Base—only when up to 5 percent of total county enrollment was attributable to the Air Force installation. Hillsborough was 4.9 percent impacted under this formula and it was necessary to have the unreasonable formula waived to entitle the county to some $100,000 in Federal funds. This was done in 1955 and again in 1956 when the efforts of many of us resulted in the elimination of the 5-percent absorption feature altogether, and at the same time the base figure for determining the contributions was changed to benefit Hillsborough another $46,000. This is an example of little-known or publicized services which a member of Congress is expected to render.

Fifth. A bill to modernize and make more effective the commercial and conservation fish and wildlife services of the Federal Government was introduced by me and a number of other Congressmen and a compromise bill was enacted. With the commercial industry worth over $10 million per year to Florida, and the sports fishing industry being of more than 10 times that value, this creation of an Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife in the Department of Interior and a deputy for commercial and one for conservation interests will mean much to Florida.

Sixth. A bill to provide an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Florida was cleared informally by the Judiciary Committee of the House and was to be offered as a committee amendment to the omnibus judgeship bill. This bill was not reported out by the Rules Committee for obvious political reasons until after the presidential election.

Seventh. I introduced and pushed before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee a bill to provide Federal funds for airport terminal construction. A similar bill was enacted and both Pinellas and Hillsborough International Airports have received nearly a total of $500,000 for terminal construction under this legislation.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Of course, I appeared before many congressional committees presenting petitions submitted by constituents and groups in the district and in an effort to secure favorable committee action on matters of importance to the district and the Nation. There were too many such appearances to enumerate here but statements made are contained in the records of the committee hearings.

In addition, numerous conferences were held with the executive branch of the Government on such problems as the rehabilitation of the sponge industry—a research program resulted of which $26,000 has been allocated and $20,000 still programed—the cigar industry and the reduction of tariffs on tobacco leaf importation needed to offset reduction in Cuban cigars, the establishment of the National Institute for the Rehabilitation of the Handicapped in Hernando County—add to these other conferences. Numerous arguments on the floor of the House were made in the interest of good legislation.

ON THE LOCAL SCENE

As your Representative, most particular interest was paid the demands and needs of the First District. Florida being threatened with the invasion of the Mediterranean fruitfly called for immediate Federal assistance in combating this dread peril to our citrus growers. I am proud of the cooperation given me and the rest of the Florida delegation by the Department of Agriculture and the appropriation of some $5 million in emergency matching funds. The Department also has proved outstanding in research against the spreading decline, which is also a threat to Florida citrus production. The Post Office Department has seen the need for expanded facilities in a great and growing State, and new post offices are either under way or are being planned for St. Petersburg, Tampa, Dade City, Mango, Safety Harbor, Palma Ceia, West Tampa, New Port Richey, and Ybor City. I was proud to be of assistance in obtaining Federal aid for mosquito-control measures—assisting a low-cost housing project for Plant City—working with the Ybor City Redevelopment Committee in establishing a Latin center—to receive authorization for reserve armories in Tampa and St. Petersburg—achieve establishment of an Air Reserve Squadron at Pinellas International Airport of over $2,500,000—and, perhaps, what is the greatest single development feature of the west coast in many years to have gotten under way and actually see development of the $11 million Tampa harbor improvement project.

This has been a year of great progress for the First District of Florida, and I feel that many benefits were received through the cooperation of local representatives, citizens' groups, and the hard work of many individuals. I am proud to offer this record as a proof of progress.